UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 3

FEBRUARY 10, 1966, TO FEBRUARY 26, 1966
(PAGES 2817 TO 4180)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1966

J
11
.R
v. 112
pt 3

stacks
DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
10-5-67

Congressional Record
United States of America
PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Jude 25: *To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever.*

O Thou eternal God, source of light and of love, in this moment of prayer may we experience the fellowship and blessings of Thy presence, Thy peace, and Thy power.

We humbly acknowledge that in seeking the right answer to our many perplexing problems we are becoming increasingly aware of our own failings and limitations and that we need Thy guidance.

Grant that we may understand more clearly that our own spiritual life, in its simplest motive and highest manifestations would be a life of sanctity and of service.

May the social order, which we are longing and laboring to establish upon the earth, have in it the spirit of reverence for Thee, of good will toward all mankind, and mutual trust and helpfulness.

We offer our prayer in the name of Him who is our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 10, 1966, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 327. An act to amend section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8210. An act to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act with respect to the European Space Research Organization; and

H.R. 8445. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass., in 1969.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House with amendments to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 9. An act to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1698. An act to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

FEBRUARY 10, 1966.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate in due form of law showing the election of WALTER B. JONES as a Representative-elect to the 89th Congress from the First Congressional District of the State of North Carolina, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Herbert C. Bonner, is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. JONES of North Carolina appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION BY THE HONORABLE DON FUQUA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, due to important business in my district, it was necessary for me to be absent for the following rollcalls: Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" for rollcall No. 11, the peacetime veterans benefits bill, and "yea" for rollcall No. 13, the Bank Merger Act amendment.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, Mr. Speaker, there is no further legislative business for this week. There are some messages to be read.

Monday is District day. There are no District bills, and no legislative business.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day.

For Wednesday and the remainder of the week—and I am not able to advise Members yet whether the bill will come up on Wednesday or Thursday—the only bill we can now announce is S. 1666, to provide for additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

This announcement, of course, is made subject to the usual reservation that any further program may be announced later and that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, on the assumption that the Rules Committee meets, S. 1666 will be scheduled Wednesday or Thursday of next week?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I ask the distinguished majority leader if he has any additional information concerning the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966?

Mr. ALBERT. I have just been advised by the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. Speaker, that they will not be able to obtain a rule on that bill early enough to bring it up next week, so that it probably will be brought up the following week.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1966

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the so-called post-Korea GI bill has just passed in the other body by a vote of 99 to nothing, with a very minor amendment, which actually changes nothing.

All of the amendments are technical in nature except one.

In accepting this one amendment I would like to point out that under the World War II and Korea education and training programs, veterans did obtain high school training. Many thousands attended accelerated or specialized education courses offered by public schools for the purpose of completing their high school education. I expect this practice will continue under the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966. Some problems were encountered in the World War II program by a few individuals attempting to enroll and attend classes with youngsters. By concurring in this amendment I do not wish it to be inferred that I expect that practice to be tolerated. Practically all veterans, I am sure, who need high school education will obtain it in classes specially designed for adults. In those rare instances where it is necessary for the veteran to attend regular high school classes, I certainly expect the Administrator to handle these applications very carefully and grant his approval in such a manner as to preclude abuse of and to eliminate local administrative problems.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period, with Senate amendments to the House amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 11, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out lines 3 to 12, inclusive.

Page 11, line 13, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "'(e)" and insert "'(d)".

Page 16, line 3, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "veterans'" and insert "veteran's".

Page 22, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out lines 19, 20, and 21, and insert:

"(7) striking out in the first sentence of section 1772(a) the phrase 'under subchapter V of this chapter' and inserting in lieu thereof 'under subchapter V of chapter 35 of this title', and striking out the phrase 'this chapter' the first two times it appears in the first sentence of such section 1772(a), and each time such phrase appears in the second, third, and fourth sentences of such section 1772(a), and each time such phrase appears in section 1772(b) and in sections 1773 and 1774, and inserting in lieu thereof 'chapters 34 and 35'."

Page 31, line 17, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "programs of" and insert "program or".

Page 32, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out lines 9 and 10 and insert:

"(m) Section 1734 of such title 38 is amended by (1) striking out '33' in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof '34', and (2) striking out '1634' in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof '1684'."

Page 38, line 5, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "(b)" and insert "(2)".

Page 38, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out lines 18 to 22, inclusive, and insert:

"(c) (1) Section 2001 of title 38, United States Code, clauses (3) and (5) of section 2002 of such title, and sections 2003 and 2004 of such title are amended by inserting the phrase 'or of service after January 31, 1955' immediately after the phrase 'veterans of any war' each time such phrase appears therein.

"(2) The first sentence of section 2002 of such title 38 is amended by inserting the phrase 'or of service after January 31, 1955' immediately after the phrase 'veteran of any war'.

"(3) Clauses (1) and (4) of section 2002 of such title 38 are amended by inserting the phrase 'or of service after January 31, 1955,' immediately after the phrase 'veterans of any war' each time such phrase appears in such clauses."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOLOMON N. PETCHERS

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, when Solomon N. Petchers died recently, New York lost more than a philanthropist and businessman: it lost a fighter for civil liberties. The newspaper obituaries reported that he gave away almost a million dollars during his lifetime. But his greatest investments were in Jewish charities, in the Hebrew Home for the Aged in Riverdale, and in the library for the blind in Jerusalem.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to count Solomon Petchers as a friend and constituent. His abiding sense of justice and his concern for humanity motivated him to play a leading role in our community. He will be greatly missed by all those who were associated with him in his many endeavors.

I knew Solomon Petchers best as the national treasurer of the American Jewish Congress. He was always at the forefront of that organization's many battles for human dignity. His own career, from Turkish immigrant to New York realtor and philanthropist, embodied what is best in mankind.

I want to take this occasion to express my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Petchers, their son Jesse, and all the other members of his family.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times and New York World Telegram and Sun paid tribute to Solomon N. Petchers in full obituaries. I wish to include them at this point in the Record.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 29, 1966]

S. N. PETCHERS, 65, DONATED MILLION—PHILANTHROPIST DIES, MADE FORTUNE IN REAL ESTATE

Solomon N. Petchers, real estate investor, manager, developer, and broker and a philanthropist who, his associates say, had given away about $1 million, died Thursday at the Lenox Hill Hospital. He was 65 years old and lived at 200 Central Park South, with an office at 33 Riverside Drive.

Mr. Petchers, a short, heavy-set, energetic and quiet man, started in real estate in 1921, the year he came here as a poor immigrant from his native Turkey. He had been graduated from the Alliance Francaise in Istanbul and spoke English, French, Turkish, Hebrew, Yiddish, and Russian.

From his small beginnings, he rose to become sole owner and part owner, through corporations he headed and partnerships, of many business buildings and apartment houses, mostly in Manhattan, the Bronx, and Queens. Others were in Westchester County, Camden, N.J., and Inglewood, Calif.

As a youth, he worked in a real estate office during the day and taught Hebrew at night in a Jewish religious school until he began to branch out for himself with great success.

Mr. Petchers had been a crack chess player from the age of 7 until a few years ago.

He had been national treasurer of the American Jewish Congress and was a director and an associate chairman of the United Jewish Appeal of Greater New York. In 1961, he received its distinguished service award.

He was a vice president and a director of the Hebrew Home for the Aged in Riverdale, the Bronx, and had been a founder and president and honorary president of its men's club. He was also a vice chairman of the home's foundation fund.

Mr. Petchers was the founder and president of the Central Library for the Blind in Jerusalem. He was also active in the development of port facilities in Ashdod, Israel, and of housing facilities for immigrants in that country.

He was a founder of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University, a director of the American Association for Jewish Education and a member of the Town Club of the City of New York and the Real Estate Board of New York.

Surviving are his widow, Mrs. Frances Sack Petchers; a son, Jesse N. Petchers of Manhattan; six brothers, Isaac N., of Los Angeles, Hyman, of Freehold, N.J., Louis, of Bayside, Queens, Benjamin, of New Rochelle, N.Y., and John Joseph, of Manhattan; four sisters, Mrs. Ruth Bukantz, Mrs. Shirley Rosen, Mrs. Mollie Hascoe, of Scarsdale, N.Y., and Mrs. Dora Kossoy, of Manhattan, and a granddaughter.

A funeral service will be held at noon tomorrow at the Riverside Memorial Chapel, Amsterdam Avenue and 76th Street.

[From the New York World Telegram and Sun, Jan. 29, 1966]

S. N. PETCHERS RITES SET; PHILANTHROPIST GAVE $1 MILLION

Services for Solomon N. Petchers, 65, president of S. N. Realty Investments and a prominent philanthropist who gave away $1 million, will be held tomorrow at noon at the Riverside Memorial Chapel, West 76th Street and Amsterdam Avenue.

Mr. Petchers, of 200 Central Park South, died Thursday of cancer in Lenox Hill Hospital.

A native of Turkey, Mr. Petchers came here in 1921. He worked in a real estate office during the day and taught Hebrew at a Jewish school at night.

Mr. Petchers rose to head a number of corporations in the city which controlled several business buildings and apartment houses.

An active leader in charitable and philanthropic organizations, Mr. Petchers served as national treasurer of the American Jewish Congress and as a director and associate chairman of the United Jewish Appeal of Greater New York. In 1961 he received the UJA's distinguished service award.

Mr. Petchers was a founder of the Albert Einstein Medical College at Yeshiva University and was a founder and president of the Central Library for the Blind in Jerusalem.

He was also a vice president and a director of the Hebrew Home for the Aged in Riverdale, Bronx, and a founder of its men's club. He was a member of the American Association for Jewish Education, the Town Club of the City of New York and the real estate board of New York.

Mr. Petchers is survived by his widow, Frances; a son, Jesse, six brothers and four sisters.

MEDICARE DISCLAIMER

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that Robert M. Ball, Commissioner of Social Security, has advised me that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will recommend the repeal of those provisions in the medicare bill by virtue of which the Department has required the filing of disclaimer statements by persons who are not eligible for cash benefits under the social security program or the railroad retirement program.

In a letter to me yesterday, Mr. Ball stated that the Department believes "this exclusion is undesirable." He went on to say that the Department would recommend to the Congress that the provisions be repealed.

On January 10, when this session of Congress opened, I introduced a bill, H.R. 11922, to strike out these disqualifying provisions.

I urge that the House move expeditiously and pass this bill so that some 2 million elderly Americans, who might otherwise be denied much needed hospital benefits, may meet the March 31 deadline for applying for inclusion in the medicare program.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I disagree with Mr. Ball and the Social Security Administration that the medicare law specifically requires applicants to sign a disclaimer.

This requirement is based on an administrative decision and is not mandated by law. However, I certainly hope that the Congress will repeal the provisions on which the requirement is based so that this inequity can be corrected.

TAYLOR CAN HELP MIDDLE EAST

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, since there has been some criticism of my good friend and fellow townsman, Mr. Tony Taylor, of Santa Fe, N. Mex., I would like to call your attention to this editorial in the Santa Fe New Mexican, Santa Fe, N. Mex., which appeared January 28, 1966. I think it is most appropriate and certainly echoes my feelings:

TAYLOR CAN HELP MIDDLE EAST

It is widely recognized that Government service often is a losing proposition for successful business and industry leaders—whether it be for a Democratic or Republican regime. This holds true for many high officials, Members of Congress, and part-time consultants.

Such is the case of Tony Taylor, successful Santa Fe importer, who has drawn criticism from a couple of Republican Members of Congress in conjunction with a current trip to the Middle East to promote native handicrafts.

The criticism resulted from Taylor's fortune in being the brother of the First Lady, Mrs. Lady Bird Johnson. Is this relationship a valid reason to ignore Taylor's vast knowledge of handicraft importing? We think not.

Taylor has operated the Old Mexico Shop in Santa Fe for decades and is nationally recognized as a leading authority on selling of handicrafts and folk art from south of the border and across the seas. There is no doubt that his vast experience can be highly helpful to the handicraft industry of Jordan and other Middle East countries.

As for those Middle East nations, most are in serious trouble because of unfavorable balance of trade. Successful promotion of handicrafts could go a long way toward solving the trade deficits of these nations. Taylor's consultant payments of $75 daily for the 3-week junket is a mere drop in the bucket if he can whip ease this deficit balance of trade.

Meanwhile, Taylor is paying his wife's expenses with personal funds while losing valuable time from his own business.

Would those tossing criticism send a lesser man—little versed in imports—to tackle the mountainous job? Would the critical Congressman and Congresswoman deny that each cannot break even in their own governmental service or that they could make more money in private business?

AMENDING THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. This bill would restore the labor provisions of the immigration laws to the status which existed prior to December 1, 1965.

Today every alien immigrant other than one coming here in a relative status must secure a certificate from the Secretary of Labor attesting that there are insufficient workers available to perform the type of work he is engaged in and that his entry will not affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed. These provisions apply to aliens coming here from Canada, England, Europe, Asia, Central and South America—from anywhere in the world. Today, we permit 170,000 immigrants to enter the United States from all countries of the world other than Western Hemisphere countries which have no quota limitations.

The procedure set forth in the present immigration laws have bogged down our Labor Department and our Secretary of Labor with thousands of applications for certifications and have so multiplied the paperwork of labor agencies throughout the country that a Frankenstein of impracticalities has been established. Applications are required to be processed through local, city, State, regional, and national offices. The time lag in processing these applications strains the patience and endurance of employers. The employment offices throughout the country are cluttered with alien forms which take them 6 months to a year to process. Instead of devoting themselves to actual employment of persons needing jobs, these agencies are weighted down with forms and procedures which may never result in bringing jobs and applicants together.

Nothing was the matter with the old law where by blanket negative certifications, alien workers were kept out if their entry would adversely affect working conditions in the United States. The new legislation has pyramided procedures, application forms, and the work of Government employees without accomplishing any benefits to our immigration or labor practices. Instead of improving our immigration policies, the new law has stultified and degraded them. Instead of giving us an efficient, practical, and rational process, we have incorporated into the administration of the law a dilatory, aggravating, paper pushing, and frustrating procedure.

It is necessary to return the labor provisions of our immigration laws to reason, to practicality, and to efficiency. The procedure of the immigration laws prior to December 1, 1965, was far more practical and efficient than under the present law. My amendment therefore seeks to reinstate the procedure of the laws previously in force.

PROPOSED BUDGET CUTBACKS IN SCHOOL LUNCH AND SPECIAL MILK PROGRAMS

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, the proposed budget calls for cutbacks in Public Law 874 and the National School Lunch Act and the companion program, the special milk program.

This is one of the best programs our Government has. One could say it is among the oldest of the antipoverty programs, because it aids in providing food to students of poor families throughout the Nation. And its long-range benefits are incalculable, for it aids in establishing better nutritional habits of millions of American schoolchildren.

In the Memphis school system, last year 11 million hot meals were served at a cost of 25 cents to the child. Without the assistance of the National School Lunch Act, prices would have to be raised to the point that thousands of children now buying their lunches could not afford them.

In addition to the lunch program, approximately a million free lunches are provided to Memphis children whose parents cannot afford this quarter a day charge. Any cutback in the availability of national school lunch funds would seriously reduce the number of lunches provided without charge to deserving children.

This same general argument also holds true regarding 12 million half pints of milk served each year in the Memphis city schools.

I realize that the President's message on these programs has not yet been received by the Congress. Our committees are still holding hearings on this general subject.

But I would hope that my colleagues would join in letting their opinions be known concerning any plan to cut back these programs.

REVISING AMERICAN MILITARY COMMITMENT IN EUROPE

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution which would declare the sense of the House that the President should undertake revisions of the American military commitment in Europe to enable us to withdraw such troops as may be withdrawn without jeopardizing American security.

Last week, I introduced legislation to close American ports to ships trading with North Vietnam. This week, I announced that I would seek to amend this year's foreign aid legislation to make economic aid to South Vietnam payable in scrip usable only in the United States. This would keep the AID dollars from flowing into the black market and winding up bankrolling international Vietcong intrigue.

Today, my resolution would have the effect of freeing more troops for service on the home front and southeast Asia. It would also greatly aid our balance-of-payments problem. All these measures, in my opinion, reflect measures this administration should be taking to declare its real commitment to the southeast Asian war effort.

I am not urging escalation or deescalation. I am proposing measures which show that we mean business in southeast Asia. We would show friend and foe alike that we intend to roll up our shirtsleeves.

The resolution I introduced today speaks first of the strain on our military capability of protecting Europe while we fight an ever-more-difficult war in southeast Asia. Our European commitment clearly interferes with the strength we can bring to bear on Vietnam.

I would also hasten to point out that our European military commitment is very costly. The billions we are spending in Europe could be trimmed to bring our budget closer to balance, and help head off the need for a tax increase.

Not only is our commitment costly in budget terms, but it is costly in balance-of-payments terms. The administration has talked of success in dealing with our balance-of-payments problems. They have had about as much success in this respect as they have had in Vietnam. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have seen a mounting credibility gap with reference to the severity of our Nation's balance-of-payments problem.

Last year—in the middle of the administration's much-heralded war on balance-of-payments difficulties—this country lost $1.6 billion in gold. This was the biggest loss of gold since 1960. I would like to tell the Members of this House which countries take this gold. It is the Spanish and the French, and indirectly, the Germans. We have almost 300,000 troops stationed in these three countries, and the dollars paid to support these troops constitute a high proportion of the dollars traded in for U.S. gold.

There is nothing like gratitude. France, Germany, and Spain, directly or indirectly, have bilked us of $5 billion worth of gold since 1960.

Our military presence in Europe is a great boon to our allies and a great burden for the United States. This year, our commitment is helping to unbalance our budget. It keeps our taxes high and holds out the promise of even higher taxes. But what does it do for Europe? It keeps European taxes low. It eases the strain on European budgets through minimizing defense expenditures. The European nations, in effect, subsidize their industries through the lower tax rates made possible by American provision of military defense that Europe should be paying for.

The reduced European taxes subsidize European industry, making European exports more competitive with American exports. This hurts our trade situation. We are kicking ourselves indirectly, as well as directly.

I believe that the long-range impact on our balance of payments is best where we reduce Government spending overseas rather than private investment. Private investment reduction backfires.

Another reason for reduction in the United States troop commitment to Europe is the fact that some of our NATO allies are trading with North Vietnam. The British are even supplying North Vietnam with oil. How can we expect diplomats to take our war effort seriously while we tolerate a heavy strain in keeping up the military protection of those who trade with our enemies? No one is convinced by "Uncle Sucker."

I advocate substantial troop withdrawal from Europe for another reason. If we shift some troops from Europe to Vietnam, we can meet increased military needs in Vietnam without further resort to the draft of college students and other young Americans in unusual number. There are 330,000 American military personnel in Europe. There is no reason to keep this number of personnel in Europe—and now the Vietnam war underscores that point. As long as we are keeping troops in Europe that could better be used on behalf of American interests in Vietnam, we are making our boys face a military draft so that America can protect Europe while Europe's youth escape the service Europe might otherwise require of them. I do not want American students drafted so that we might fight in Vietnam and protect Europe. I do not want American students in rice paddies while American soldiers keep Europe's young people free for wine, women, and song. Perhaps the threat of troop withdrawal would make Europe take our Vietnamese effort more seriously.

I would like to make very clear my feeling that some of our American troops are there for Europe's benefit and not ours. I know that the Defense Department was considering some troop reduction last fall. Why not now? The need is great. I do not urge the removal of any troops in Europe who are clearly protecting our interests. Let us withdraw those who are protecting European and not American interests. Retired General Gavin said just this Wednesday that "our commitments in Europe are far in excess of our needs."

What exactly is wrong with Europe protecting Europe? Our strategies which say otherwise are based on postwar military psychologies which have ceased to be realistic now that the great

Communist threat is China—at least for the moment.

I urge the House to pass this resolution and express its opinion to the President that our military commitment in Europe ought to be revised to enable withdrawal of American troops consonant with U.S. security.

THE SO-CALLED COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted with the agreement on the so-called cold war GI bill. This is a tribute to one of the most able and beloved Members of the House of Representatives, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, on which I am privileged to serve, our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague], who has worked so painstakingly and diligently on this matter for so many years.

Mr. Speaker, it is also a tribute to another distinguished lawmaker from the great State of Texas, the senior Senator from that State, the Honorable Ralph Yarborough, who has done so much on this subject and guided the legislation so commendably through the other body.

SLASH IN IMPACT AID FUNDS MEANS MORE FEDERAL CONTROL ON SCHOOLS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn today that if the administration's plan to cut the Federal impact aid to education program is enacted that two-thirds of the fund now available to public schools in Duval County, Fla., under this program will be missing from the school budget in 1966–67.

In his budget message, President Johnson proposed to reduce the impact aid to education program from $400 to $200 million. This would mean to an area like Duval County, which has some 13,000 federally attached children in public schools and another 12,000 whose parents work on Federal installations in the county, that the entitlement under Public Law 874, enacted in 1951, would drop from $1.8 million in fiscal year 1967 to $425,000.

I have long been a supporter of the impact aid program, having been one of the original sponsors of this legislation when it was introduced in 1950. The public school system of my area asked for this program; they felt it was fair to the local community and that it was needed in order to take care of the federally attached children in the county. The uncertainty of the permanent residence of federally attached families and the vast land occupied by Federal installations causes important tax problems. In the first instance, with the temporary status of such families there is no normal tax base, and in the second instance, federally occupied and owned property is not taxable.

The local people of Duval County are solidly behind the Federal impact aid program. There are three major reasons:

First. The program is a logical one to have the Federal Government assist when it brings in the children for the county to educate while at the same time reduces the local real estate tax base.

Second. The community needs the money in order to provide adequate education for the children.

Third. The plan is not subjected to unwarranted controls from Washington.

In place of the Federal impact aid program the administration is directing its energies to another Federal aid to education program, but this one is controlled from Washington, and the local school system must fall into line in order to receive Federal aid so vitally needed across the country for public school education.

Under the new poverty-type program the school systems must think up projects and ways to spend the taxpayers' funds now available to them under the new law, and then these programs must be acted upon by Washington and they must be approved, bringing more and more Federal control over education. The end result is more Federal controls and less real assistance in the schools on an overall basis. The approved plans may in fact have little to do with lifting the overall educational facilities of the area even though more Federal dollars are spent.

This is distressing to me, and I plan to do everything in my power to retain the present impact aid to education program, which is not controlled money, to be spent in a way that the Federal Government directs. The impact aid program meets a local need caused by the presence of thousands of federally attached children, where the Federal Government has reduced the tax base available to local taxes.

I am pleased to insert in the Congressional Record an editorial on this subject:

[From the Sentinel, Orlando (Fla.) Feb. 2, 1966]

Impact Funds Must Be Forthcoming

The Budget Bureau proposes to allocate only $183 million during fiscal 1967 to schools in communities with Government installations with large numbers of Federal workers or military personnel.

The Office of Education estimates that the need is for $416 million in these impact funds. In central Florida, such areas as Brevard, Orange, and Seminole Counties are affected because of the Federal installations and military bases.

If Congress should slash impact funds in half, the school year might have to be shortened, particularly in a heavy impact area such as Brevard. Teacher pay might have to be reduced.

It is true that Vietnam war expense impels certain budget reductions, but in our opulent society we are not yet reduced to paying for the war out of the schoolrooms of America.

Our Florida delegation in Washington can do a great deal to see that the cut in impact funds is restored to guarantee the children of our fighting men the kind of education they deserve.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order of today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES—APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SERVE AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

February 8, 1966.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1966: Hon. Thomas N. Downing, of Virginia; Hon. John M. Murphy, of New York; and Hon. Charles A. Mosher, of Ohio.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

Edward A. Garmatz,
Chairman.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES—APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SERVE AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

February 8, 1966.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy for the year 1966: Hon. Alton Lennon, of North Carolina; Hon. Frank M. Clark, of Pennsylvania; and Hon. James R. Grover, Jr., of New York.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. GARMATZ.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1, 1966, REORGANIZATION OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS FUNCTIONS IN AREA OF CIVIL RIGHTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 379)

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganization of community relations functions in the area of civil rights.

After a careful review of the activities of the Federal agencies involved in the field of civil rights, it became clear that the elimination of duplication and undesirable overlap required the consolidation of certain functions.

As a first step, I issued Executive Orders No. 11246 and No. 11247 on September 24, 1965.

Executive Order No. 11246 simplified and clarified executive branch assignments of responsibility for enforcing civil rights policies, and placed responsibility for the Government-wide coordination of the enforcement activities of executive agencies in the Secretary of Labor with respect to employment by Federal contractors, and in the Civil Service Commission with respect to employment by Federal agencies.

Executive Order No. 11247 directed the Attorney General to assist Federal agencies in coordinating their enforcement activities with respect to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination in federally assisted programs.

As a further step for strengthening the operation and coordination of our civil rights programs, I now recommend transfer of the functions of the Community Relations Service, established in the Department of Commerce under title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to the Attorney General and transfer of the Service, including the office of Director, to the Department of Justice.

The Community Relations Service was located in the Department of Commerce by the Congress on the assumption that a primary need would be the conciliation of disputes arising out of the public accommodations title of the act. That decision was appropriate on the basis of information available at that time. The need for conciliation in this area has not been as great as anticipated because of the voluntary progress that has been made by businessmen and business organizations.

To be effective, assistance to communities in the identification and conciliation of disputes should be closely and tightly coordinated. Thus, in any particular situation that arises within a community, representatives of Federal agencies whose programs are involved should coordinate their efforts through a single agency. In recent years, the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department has played such a coordinating role in many situations, and has done so with great effectiveness.

Placing the Community Relations Service within the Justice Department will enhance the ability of the Justice Department to mediate and conciliate and will insure that the Federal Government speaks with a unified voice in those tense situations where the good offices of the Federal Government are called upon to assist.

In this, as in other areas of Federal operations, we will move more surely and rapidly toward our objectives if we improve Federal organization and the arrangements for interagency coordination. The accompanying reorganization plan has that purpose.

The present distribution of Federal civil rights responsibilities clearly indicates that the activities of the Community Relations Service will fit most appropriately in the Department of Justice.

The Department of Justice has primary program responsibilities in civil rights matters and deep and broad experience in the conciliation of civil rights disputes. Congress has assigned it a major role in the implementation of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The Department of Justice performs related functions under other acts of Congress. Most of these responsibilities require not only litigation, but also efforts at persuasion, negotiation, and explanation, especially with local governments and law enforcement authorities. In addition, under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act the Department will be supporting local programs in the area of police-community relations.

The test of the effectiveness of an enforcement agency is not how many legal actions are initiated and won, but whether there is compliance with the law. Thus, every such agency necessarily engages in extensive efforts to obtain compliance with the law and the avoidance of disputes. In fact, title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires each agency concerned to attempt to obtain compliance by voluntary means before taking further action.

Among the heads of Cabinet departments the President looks principally to the Attorney General for advice and judgment on civil rights issues. The latter is expected to be familiar with civil rights problems in all parts of the Nation and to make recommendations for executive and legislative action.

The Attorney General already has responsibility with respect to a major portion of Federal conciliation efforts in the civil rights field. Under Executive Order No. 11247, he coordinates the governmentwide enforcement of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which relies heavily on the achievement of compliance through persuasion and negotiation.

In the light of these facts, the accompanying reorganization plan would transfer the functions of the Community Relations Service and of its Director to the Attorney General. In so providing, the plan, of course, follows the established pattern of Federal organization by vesting all the transferred powers in the head of the Department. The Attorney General will provide for the organization of the Community Relations Service as a separate unit within the Department of Justice.

The functions transferred by the reorganization plan would be carried out with full regard for the provisions of section 1003 of title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 relating to (1) cooperation with appropriate State or local, public, or private agencies; (2) the confidentiality of information acquired with the understanding that it would be so held; and (3) the limitation on the performance of investigative or prosecutive functions by personnel of the Service.

This transfer will benefit both the Department of Justice and the Community Relations Service in the fulfillment of their existing functions.

The Attorney General will benefit in his role as the President's adviser by obtaining an opportunity to anticipate and meet problems before the need for legal action arises.

The Community Relations Service, brought into closer relationship with the Attorney General and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, will gain by becoming a primary resource in a coordinated effort in civil rights under the leadership of the Attorney General. The Community Relations Service will have direct access to the extensive information, experience, staff, and facilities within the Department and in other Federal agencies.

Finally, the responsibility for coordinating major Government activities under the Civil Rights Act aimed at voluntary and peaceful resolution of discriminatory practices will be centered in one Department. Thus, the reorganization will permit the most efficient and effective utilization of resources in this field. Together the Service and the Department will have a larger capacity for accomplishment than they do apart.

Although the reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will not of themselves result in immediate savings, the improvement achieved in administration will permit a fuller and more effective utilization of manpower and will in the future allow the performance of the affected functions at lower costs than would otherwise be possible.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1966.*

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the history of law enforcement in this Nation emphasizes the importance of what has been called a climate of compliance. When Americans have been in ignorance of the law, or in strong opposition to it, we have frequently faced long and difficult periods of social tension. Under such circumstances, we have often quarreled and dissipated our national strength, and weakened the quality of life in a Nation based on a system of equal justice before the law.

The Justice Department, as the chief instrument for law enforcement in the United States, has long recognized the need for citizen support of the legal process. It has also had considerable experience with conciliation as a means of eliminating long and costly litigation.

This has been particularly true of recent activities in the civil rights arena. Here, the emotionally charged atmosphere has sometimes made it difficult to secure either justice or the best interests of the community. The solution to that problem is a program for community education and communication which can reduce the need for governmental actions of a punitive nature.

The Community Relations Service was created for the purpose of carrying out such a function. It has an intimate relationship to the Justice Department's own responsibility for assuring the civil rights of all American citizens. There is a natural link between the two efforts. A Community Relations Service within the Justice Department can anticipate conflict. It can work to prevent the escalation of conflict. Located within the Department of Justice, it can recommend alternative solutions for the wide range of problems which come to the Attorney General. And it can give the Attorney General competent professional assistance in implementing any such recommendations.

It is also worth noting that there is nothing unusual about conciliation or mediation functions being housed within the agency which also has the enforcement responsibilities. For example, more than 20 of the 28 States which have established civil rights agencies house both the conciliation and the enforcement responsibility within the same agency. This is also true with respect to more than 30 city agencies across the country.

The Justice Department, with its specific charge to coordinate title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, is in particular need of a resource such as the Community Relations Service to bring about community understanding and commitment to the principle of equality guaranteed by the civil rights law. The Community Relations Service, which has the skills to accomplish this, merits the opportunity to use them within that Department of Government most vitally concerned and involved in achieving this goal.

For all these reasons, I urge support of the President's reorganization plan transferring the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Justice Department.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, there is a serious need for reorganizing the structure and functions of civil rights efforts within the executive branch of the Federal Government. The President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 is in line with that need. This proposes transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice.

There is need to deal with all aspects of civil rights problems as the interlocking unity they are—both in elimination of basic causes of civil rights strife and in enforcement and implementation of civil rights orders, laws, and judicial decisions. By Executive order, the Attorney General now has some responsibility for coordinating civil rights activities within the executive branch. He is also the President's principal adviser in civil rights matters. The Community Relations Service, because of its experience and knowledge of the problems of the whole community, can render invaluable service to the Attorney General by constantly keeping before him the interlocking nature of these problems.

There is also a need for the Attorney General to have additional resources at his command, with a broader range of alternative actions, in civil rights matters. Community disputes, disagreements, and difficulties arising from discrimination and local tradition are not always covered by Federal law but are nevertheless disruptive of racial harmony and retard compliance with the law. The Community Relations Service can furnish the Attorney General with just such an alternative action.

For these reasons, I support President Johnson's reorganization plan. It makes sense and I urge that we give it our approval.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has submitted Reorganization Plan No. 1 to the Congress, proposing to transfer the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice. I wish to speak briefly in support of that measure.

I have followed the work of the Community Relations Service from its first days in 1964, both in its activities in the South and in the larger urban centers of the North. In this brief period, the Service has demonstrated its value in encouraging communities to move voluntarily toward compliance with the law. The transfer to the Department of Justice will serve to enhance this value.

Since the passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964, there has been a need for coordination of the various governmental activities in the field of civil rights. The President acted to meet this need last fall by assigning to the Attorney General the responsibility of supervising enforcement by all Federal agencies of title VI of the act. The Attorney General already had a major responsibility in the civil rights area as the officer charged with enforcement of civil rights legislation through litigation in the courts. Now, by making Community Relations Service a part of Justice, we will further advance the coordination of the Federal involvement in civil rights.

Some have questioned whether the move observes the desire of Congress to separate the conciliation function from the prosecutive activities of the Department of Justice. This separation, however, is not destroyed by the transfer. The Community Relations Service will not, under the plan, become a subordinate part of the Civil Rights Division of the Department, which is engaged in enforcement litigation.

The Service will be a separate internal unit, coordinate to the Civil Rights Division, with both units reporting directly to the Attorney General or his deputy. The prohibition in the act against participation of CRS personnel in litigation against violators will still be applicable, insuring, as Congress intended, that CRS personnel will not aid in the prosecution of a case in which they have previously been active for the Service.

This I am convinced, that the plan will increase the effectiveness of the Community Relations Service and of the Federal Government in dealing with the Nation's major domestic problem. I urge that the Congress permit it to become effective.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FOR A WORLD AT PEACE—WORLDWIDE COOPERATION TO SUPPLY MANKIND WITH FOOD, CLOTHING, AND SHELTER—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 378)

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

Men first joined together for the necessities of life—food for their families, clothing to protect them, housing to give them shelter.

These are the essentials of peace and progress.

But in the world today, these needs are still largely unfulfilled.

When men and their families are hungry, poorly clad, and ill-housed, the world is restless—and civilization exists at best in troubled peace.

A WAR ON HUNGER

Hunger poisons the mind. It saps the body. It destroys hope. It is the natural enemy of every man on earth.

I propose that the United States lead the world in a war against hunger.

There can only be victors in this war. Since every nation will share in that victory, every nation should share in its costs. I urge all who can help to join us.

A PROGRAM FOR MANKIND

The program I am submitting to Congress today, together with the proposals set forth in my message on foreign assistance, look to a world in which no man, woman, or child need suffer want of food or clothing.

The key to victory is self-help.

Aid must be accompanied by a major effort on the part of those who receive it. Unless it is, more harm than good can be the end result.

I propose:

1. Expanded food shipments to countries where food needs are growing and self-help efforts are underway.

Even with their maximum efforts abroad, our food aid will be needed for many years to come.

2. Increased capital and technical assistance.

Thus, self-help will bear fruit through increased farm production.

3. Elimination of the surplus concept in food aid.

Current farm programs are eliminating the surpluses in our warehouses. Fortunately the same programs are flexible enough to gear farm production to amounts that can be used constructively.

4. Continued expansion of markets for American agricultural commodities.

Increased purchasing power, among the hundreds of millions of consumers in developing countries, will help them become good customers of the American farmer.

5. Increasing emphasis on nutrition, especially for the young.

We will continue to encourage private industry, in cooperation with the Government, to produce and distribute foods to combat malnutrition.

6. Provision for adequate reserves of essential food commodities.

Our reserves must be large enough to serve as a stabilizing influence and to meet any emergency.

AMERICA'S PAST EFFORTS

This program keeps faith with policies this Nation has followed since President Franklin D. Roosevelt proclaimed the four freedoms of mankind.

After World War II, we helped to make Europe free from want. We carried out on that Continent massive programs of relief, reconstruction and development.

This great effort—the Marshall plan—was followed by President Truman's point 4, President Eisenhower's Act of Bogotá and its successor, President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress. Under these programs we have provided technical and capital assistance to the developing nations.

Our food aid programs have brought over 140 million tons of food to hungry people during the past decade.

Hunger, malnutrition, and famine have been averted.

Schools and hopsitals have been built.

Seventy million children now receive American food in school lunch and family and child feeding programs.

Nevertheless the problem of world hunger is more serious today than ever before.

A BALANCE IS REQUIRED

One new element in today's world is the threat of mass hunger and starvation. Populations are exploding under the impact of sharp cuts in the death rate. Successful public health measures have saved millions of lives. But these lives are now threatened by hunger because food production has not kept pace.

A balance between agricultural productivity and population is necessary to prevent the shadow of hunger from becoming a nightmare of famine. In my message on international health and education, I described our increased efforts to help deal with the population problem.

IMPROVING LOCAL AGRICULTURE

Many of the developing countries urgently need to give a higher priority to improving and modernizing their own production and distribution of food. The overwhelming majority of these who till the soil still use the primitive methods of their ancestors. They produce little more than enough to meet their own needs, and remain outside the market economy.

History has taught us that lack of agricultural development can cripple economic growth.

The developing countries must make basic improvements in their own agriculture.

They must bring the great majority of their people—now living in rural areas—into the market economy.

They must make the farmer a better customer of urban industry and thus accelerate the pace of economic development.

They must begin to provide all of their people with the food they need.

They must increase their exports, and earn the foreign exchange to purchase the foods and other goods which they themselves cannot produce efficiently.

In some developing countries, marked improvement is already taking place. Taiwan and Greece are raising their food output and becoming better cash customers for our food exports every year. Others have made a good beginning in improving agricultural production.

THE NEED FOR SELF-HELP

There is one characteristic common to all those who have increased the productivity of their farms: a national will and determination to help themselves.

We know what would happen if increased aid were dispensed without regard to measures of self-help. Economic incentives for higher production would disappear. Local agriculture would decline as dependence upon United States food increased.

Such a course would lead to disaster.

Disaster could be postponed for a decade or even two—but it could not be avoided. It could be postponed if the United States were to produce at full capacity and if we financed the massive shipments needed to fill an ever-growing deficit in the hungry nations.

But ultimately those nations would pay an exorbitant cost. They would pay it not only in money, but in years and lives wasted. If our food aid programs serve only as a crutch, they will encourage the developing nations to neglect improvements they must make in their own production of food.

For the sake of those we would aid, we must not take that course.

We shall not take that course.

But candor requires that I warn you the time is not far off when all the combined production, on all of the acres, of all of the agriculturally productive nations, will not meet the food needs of the developing nations—unless present trends are changed.

Dependence on American aid will not bring about such a change.

The program I present today is designed to bring about that change.

BETTER NUTRITION

Beyond simple hunger, there lies the problem of malnutrition.

We know that nutritional deficiencies are a major contributing cause to a death rate among infants and young children that is 30 times higher in developing countries than in advanced areas.

Protein and vitamin deficiencies during preschool years leave indelible scars. Millions have died. Millions have been handicapped for life—physically or mentally.

Malnutrition saps a child's ability to learn. It weakens a nation's ability to progress. It can—and must—be attacked vigorously.

We are already increasing the nutritional content of our food aid contributions. We are working with private industry to produce and market nutritionally rich foods. We must encourage and assist the developing countries themselves to expand their production and use of such foods.

The wonders of modern science must also be directed to the fight against malnutrition. I have today directed the President's Science Advisory Committee to work with the very best talent in this Nation to search out new ways to:

Develop inexpensive, high-quality synthetic foods as dietary supplements. A promising start has already been made in isolating protein sources from fish, which are in plentiful supply throughout the world.

Improve the quality and the nutritional content of food crops.

Apply all of the resources of technology to increasing food production.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR OUR ABUNDANCE

Our farm programs must reflect changing conditions in the United States and the world. Congress has provided—

For American farmers, a continuing prospect of rising incomes.

For American consumers, assurance of an abundance of high-quality food at fair prices.

For American taxpayers, less dollars spent to stockpile commodities in quantities greater than those needed for essential reserves.

Today—because of the world's needs, and because of the changing picture of U.S. agriculture—our food aid programs can no longer be governed by surpluses. The productive capacity of American agriculture can and should produce enough food and fiber to provide for:

1. Domestic needs.
2. Commercial exports.
3. Food aid to those developing countries that are determined to help themselves.
4. Reserves adequate to meet any emergency, and to stabilize prices.

To meet these needs, I am today directing the Secretary of Agriculture to:

1. Increase the 1966 acreage allotment for rice by 10 percent.

Unprecedented demands arising out of drought and war in Asia require us to increase our rice crop this year. I know that our farmers will respond to this need, and that the Congress will understand the emergency that requires this temporary response.

2. Buy limited amounts of dairy products under the authority of the 1965 act.

We must have adequate supplies of dairy products for commercial markets, and to meet high priority domestic and foreign program needs. Milk from U.S. farms is the only milk available to millions of poor children abroad. The Secretary will use authority in the 1965 act whenever necessary to meet our needs for dairy products.

3. Take actions that will increase soybean production in 1966.

The demand for soybeans has climbed each year since 1960. Despite record crops, we have virtually no reserve stocks. To assure adequate supplies at prices fair to farmers and consumers, the Secretary of Agriculture will use authority under the 1965 act to encourage production of soybeans on acreage formerly planted to feed grains. Feed grain stocks are more than sufficient.

These actions supplement earlier decisions to increase this year's production of wheat and barley. Although our present reserves of wheat are adequate to meet all likely shipments, the Secretary of Agriculture has suspended programs for voluntary diversion of additional spring wheat plantings.

Our 60 million acres now diverted to conservation uses represent the major emergency reserve that could readily be called forth in the critical race between food and population. We will bring these acres back into production as needed—but not to produce unwanted surplus, and not to supplant the efforts of other countries to develop their own agricultural economies.

These actions illustrate how our domestic farm program will place the American farmer in the front ranks in the worldwide war on hunger.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

I recommend a new Food for Freedom Act that retains the best provisions of Public Law 480, and that will:

Make self-help an integral part of our food aid program.

Eliminate the surplus requirement for food aid.

Emphasize the development of markets for American farm products.

Authorize greater food aid shipments than the current rate.

Emphasize the building of cash markets and the shift toward financing food aid through long-term dollar credits rather than sales for foreign currencies. Except for U.S. requirements, we look to the completion of that shift by the end of 5 years.

Continue to finance the food aid program under the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Increase emphasis on combating malnutrition. The act will authorize the CCC to finance the enrichment of foods.

Continue to work with voluntary agencies in people-to-people assistance programs.

Provide for better coordination of food aid with other economic assistance.

FOOD AND FIBER RESERVES

I recommend a program to establish the principle of the ever-normal granary by providing for food and fiber reserves.

This program supplements food for freedom.

It establishes a reserve policy that will protect the American people from unstable supplies of food and fiber, and from high prices in times of emergency.

The legislation I recommend to the Congress will enable us to draw strength from two great related assets:

The productive genius of our farmers.

The potential that lies in the 60 million acres now withdrawn from production.

In case of need, most of those acres could be brought back into productive farming within 12 to 18 months. But because of the seasonal nature of farming time would be needed to expand production even under the flexible provisions of the Agriculture Act of 1965. Therefore we need a reserve to bridge this gap.

We have been able to operate without a specific commodity reserve policy in recent years, because the surpluses built up in the 1950's exceeded our reserve needs. This condition has almost run its course.

Under present law, the Secretary of Agriculture must dispose of all stocks of agricultural commodities as rapidly as possible, consistent with orderly marketing procedures. As we continue to reduce our surpluses we need to amend the law to authorize the maintenance of reserve stocks.

The act I recommend will do that.

It will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish minimum reserve levels. Under the act, he must take into account normal trade stocks, consumer and farm prices, domestic and export requirements, crop yield variations and commitments under our domestic and foreign food programs.

The reserve would be used to meet priority needs, under prices and conditions to be determined within the broad guidelines established by existing law.

The act could be implemented in the year ahead without any additional cost to the Government. We are still reducing our surpluses of most agricultural commodities. During the first year of the new program, it is not likely that we will have to purchase any commodity to build up a reserve.

Under the two acts I recommended today, with the farm legislation now on the statute books—and with the foreign assistance program I have recommended—we will be able to make maximum use of the productivity of our farms.

We can make our technology and skills powerful instruments for agricultural progress throughout the world—wherever men commit themselves to the task of feeding the hungry.

A UNIFIED EFFORT

To strengthen these programs our food aid and economic assistance must be closely linked. Together they must relate to efforts in developing countries to improve their own agriculture. The Departments of State and Agriculture and the Agency for International Development will work together, even more closely than they have in the past, in the planning and implementing of coordinated programs.

In the past few years AID has called upon the Department of Agriculture to assume increasing responsibilities through its International Agricultural Development Service. That policy will become even more important as we increase our emphasis on assisting developing nations to help themselves.

Under the Food for Freedom Act, the Secretary of Agriculture will continue to have authority to determine the commodities available. He will act only after consulting with the Secretary of State on the foreign policy aspects of food aid and with other interested agencies.

We must extend to world problems in food and agriculture the kind of cooperative relationships we have developed with the States, universities, farm organizations, and private industry.

AN INTERNATIONAL EFFORT

It is not enough that we unify our own efforts. We cannot meet this problem alone.

Hunger is a world problem. It must be dealt with by the world.

We must encourage a truly international effort to combat hunger and modernize agriculture.

We shall work to strengthen the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The efforts of the multilateral lending organizations, and of the United Nations development program should be expanded—particularly in food and agriculture.

We are prepared to increase our participation in regional as well as worldwide multilateral efforts, wherever they provide efficient technical assistance and make real contributions to increasing the food-growing capacities of the developing nations. For example, we will undertake a greatly increased effort to assist improvements in rice yields in the rice-eating less-developed countries, as part of our cooperation with FAO during this International Rice Year.

FOR A WORLD AT PEACE

The program I recommend today will raise a new standard of aid for the hungry, and for world agriculture.

It proclaims our commitment to a better world society—where every person can hope for life's essentials—and be able to find them in peace.

It proclaims the interdependence of mankind in its quest for food and clothing and shelter.

It is built on three universal truths:

That agriculture is an essential pursuit of every nation,

That an abundant harvest is not only a gift of God, but also the product of man's skill and determination and commitment,

That hunger and want—anywhere—are the eternal enemies of all mankind.

I urge Congress to consider and debate these suggestions thoroughly and wisely in the hope and belief we can from them fashion a program that will keep freemen free, and at the same time share our leadership and agricultural resources with our less blessed brothers throughout the world.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1966.*

TRANSITION TO LONG-TERM DOLLAR CREDIT

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important features of the President's new food-for-freedom program is its emphasis on systematic and orderly transition from the stage in which a recipient country pays for food aid only in local currency to the stage in which it buys on long-term credit payable in dollars.

To those familiar with the past Public Law 480 program, this means a transition from the title I approach to the title IV approach. Title IV is the Poage amendment and was added to the law several years ago.

This long-term dollar credit feature is an important part of the food-for-freedom program. It recognizes that many nations which have promising basic economies may not be able to buy our farm products on short-term commercial credit at this time, but can afford to buy when long-term credit is made available.

This program is growing. Last year it accounted for well over $200 million of export sales. Several countries have become dollar customers for part or all of their purchases through this route. Greece is on that list. So are Yugoslavia, Iran, Iraq, Formosa, Portugal, and some of the Latin American republics, and, of course, our best customer, Japan, was in the process of transition just at the time this amendment was put in the law. Today Japan is our best dollar market and she is now paying cash. As the nations of the world develop economically, we can sell more food for dollars and we can collect more dollars in cash. Our greatest sales are to the developed countries. Let us never fear that it will injure our trade to develop the productive capacity of other countries.

Experience has shown that the shift to long-term credit can be made successfully, but only as the underdeveloped country builds its own economy. I think that it would be a mistake to confuse emergency shipments of food to starving people with long-time market development. We can increase markets—dollar markets—but we will not do it simply by increasing our gifts to India or any other country, no matter how proper those gifts may be at the moment. I look upon the gift provisions of this program as temporary provisions. I foresee in the dollar sales provision an opportunity to expand American business on a permanent basis. Both are needed, and I understand the President envisions both.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM—NEW AND ENRICHED FOODS

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, because of its departure from the surplus disposal concept, the President's new food for freedom will provide for much greater flexibility in the commodities offered through the program. It will also enable us to introduce enriched and fortified foods that will greatly step up the nutritional contributions of the program.

Nonfat milk distributed under the program, for example, can be enriched with vitamins A and D. Wheat flour and cornmeal can be fortified with calcium, fats and oils with vitamin A, and cereals with vitamin B^6. Many other fortification possibilities that have been explored on an experimental or limited basis can now be expanded.

It will also be possible to introduce new foods with special nutritive qualities. For example, there has already been a favorable reaction in pilot programs to Ceplapro, a corn-based formulated food. Consideration has been given to including fish protein concentrate in the program. Tests have been made with a beverage made from soybeans for infant feeding.

The President's new program will make it possible to go ahead with these and a variety of other nutritional improvements. This is a modern, forward-looking proposal which deserves our full support.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM—THE IMPORTANCE OF CHILD NUTRITION

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the merits of the President's new food-for-freedom program is its approach to the worldwide problems of poorly fed children.

We know from our own experience that how we bring up our own children—through good schools, good meals, and good homes—determines the kind of citizens and the kind of nation we will have in the years ahead. Exactly the same thing is true in foreign nations. What happens to their children today determines the shape of those nations tomorrow.

More and more we are coming to realize that adequate nutrition is a basic key to child development. Scientists are finding that proteins are the building blocks of brains, bodies, and abilities in the growing child. Deny a child the essential proteins and his potential as a human being may never be fully realized. Let him have the proteins he needs, and the accompanying essentials of a balanced diet, and he has the opportunity then to absorb knowledge, to become physically and mentally vigorous, and to become the kind of active citizen a developing country requires.

We are doing much through present programs to help bring improved diets to children of other countries. More than 40 million children in such countries are eating school lunches made up in part of foods from the United States. But more needs to be done—not necessarily by us but more in joint projects or more by the countries themselves. The President's new program will give flexibility, it will give new emphasis, it will provide even better ways of bringing about progress in this highly important area of building tomorrow's citizens.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM—EMPHASIS ON SELF-HELP

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the President's new food-for-freedom program for the assurance it gives that recipients of food aid will undertake, or continue, efforts to help themselves by improving their own agricultural systems.

There is a danger in any assistance program that the recipient will fail to face up to reality, will come to look upon assistance as the natural state of affairs, and will make insufficient efforts to help himself. We all know this can happen to people. It can happen to nations, as well.

If the food-for-peace program of the past has had this weakness, it is the President's obvious intention to eliminate it in the future.

We must never be in a position where the advanced state of our own agricultural technology substitutes for and in fact stands in the way of the development of a sound agriculture in the countries with which we share our bounty. For the time would certainly come when not even our own vast resources would be enough to feed the world's growing population.

The President's new food-for-freedom program, with its emphasis on self-help, assures that the developing nations will take greater steps toward self-sufficiency.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TODD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, the message submitted by the President to the Congress today is a historic one. It brings into sharp focus our deep concern with mankind's eternal struggle to provide enough food for life and to allay the elemental fear of famine.

It is entirely proper that we should commit ourselves to eradicate hunger from the world. Man has, at last, the knowledge to do so. It is our responsibility to help make this knowledge available and put it into practice. This the President proposes to do.

But the President has called our attention not only to the hunger that prevails in so much of the world today, but also to the race we are in: The race to expand the food production of the world more rapidly than the rate at which the world's population is growing. So far, we have not succeeded in this. But it is a race that we must win. For the alternative is continued famine and starvation for individuals and the social and political turmoil for the nations in which food shortages occur. Peace and progress for the world depend upon a diffusion of agricultural technology, but this can have no positive effect if something is not done, on a massive basis, to cope with the onrushing population explosion.

The proposals made by the President for utilizing our own agricultural potential to help other nations in developing their agricultural resources are sound. It is proper that currencies generated by sales of food, which are not convertible into dollars, be used to assist in developing agriculture in the participating countries. For such a provision means that the program not only treats the immediate symptoms but also opens the way to the longrun solution of the problem of famine.

Mr. Speaker, close relationship of onrushing famine and exploding population growth prompts me to make an additional suggestion. A portion of the soft currency funds generated by this program—say 15 percent—could be set aside, in the manner of Cooley funds, to be made available at the wish of governments involved, for maternal and child health care, with a substantial emphasis on family planning and health programs.

Such funds could be administered through a number of agencies. One which seems particularly appropriate would be the World Health Organization, which has become increasingly concerned with family planning and child care.

Just as techniques of agriculture have improved to make it possible to feed the present population of the world, techniques of family planning have been developed and tested which make it possible to control the population explosion, without impinging on individual conscience or religious conviction. By bringing together agricultural development and family planning by using nonconvertible funds generated in the food-for-peace program, we may well have set the stage for fulfilling human hopes for security against famine, within the next generation.

DEATH OF JOSEPH RUSSELL KNOWLAND

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to the House the death of the Honorable Joseph Russell Knowland, the father of Senator William Knowland, who was Republican floor leader of the Senate until a few years ago. Mr. Knowland lived in Piedmont, Calif.

Mr. Knowland served in the House of Representatives from November 8, 1904, until March 3, 1915, when he was an unsuccessful candidate for election to the U.S. Senate.

Mr. Knowland was a publisher of the Oakland Tribune and was noted for the work that he did as a member of the Beaches and Parks Commission in California, in preserving for future posterity the beauty spots of our State, and for his great work in the field of western history.

Although of a different political persuasion—and the Knowland papers have never supported me—I recognize in Joseph Russell Knowland a great American and a great patriot, a man who has made a great contribution to his country, and I regretfully inform the House of his passing.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from California yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Although I never met, and consequently never knew, Joseph Knowland, I had heard a great deal about his distinguished career in the Congress of the United States. He was, as everyone knows, the father of a former Senator from the State of California. This is a fine family of dedicated Americans, and I join with the gentleman from California in expressing our sorrow and deepest condolences to the family.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ENROLLMENT IN PROGRAM OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEDICAL INSURANCE BENEFITS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend to June 30, 1966, the period for initial enrollment in the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of this title.

The section of the Social Security Act dealing with the voluntary medicare program is rather important as it is available to all citizens 65 and over. However, since only 11.5 million of our senior citizens have enrolled in this program to date, it is apparent that there has not been enough time to adequately inform qualified individuals of the details of the program or of the financial responsibilities involved. In addition, if a qualified person does not sign up by the deadline, he must wait 2 years before he is again eligible to participate.

This is of particular concern to me as some 50,000 of my constituents might qualify for this program. Of these, almost 15 percent do not receive social security benefits and therefore have not been formally notified of the opportunities available to them under the supplemental medical insurance program. It seems unrealistic to believe that this complicated program can be fully explained to these individuals in the short time remaining before the presently scheduled termination of the enrollment period March 31.

Thus I am introducing this bill today in hopes that those individuals already contacted might have additional time to consider the program and that additional time might be made available to explain its details to those who have not yet been contacted. I hope this bill will receive favorable consideration by the committee to which it is referred and by each Member of Congress.

EQUALITY UNDER THE LAW

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to further protect the rights and privileges of our Nation's citizens from discrimination on the basis of sex. This measure is strongly supported by the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

While the rights of various minority groups throughout the country have received considerable attention of late, those of a far larger group also need attention. Discrimination on the basis of sex has plagued primarily the women of the Nation and has by no means been eliminated. Today's women participate in virtually every field of endeavor, many holding positions of great authority and responsibility. Yet in some sectors of the country the fairer sex does not always enjoy an equal opportunity to fair competition.

The amendment introduced by this joint resolution would provide means by which the rights of these citizens might be further protected. I urge my colleagues in both bodies of Congress to join in support of this measure, which is of such interest to the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, as the following letter from Miss Emma C. McGall, national legislation chairman, of Westfield, N.J., attests. I include as part of my remarks this letter as well as the text of the joint resolution.

THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC. OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1966.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: It was a pleasure to be able to meet with you at the breakfast on Thursday, January 26, during the course of the National Legislative Conference of our federation. This was a very auspicious beginning to a most successful conference and it was a pleasure to be with you and to talk with you at this occasion.

In accordance with his promise Congressman PAUL KREBS introduced on January 26, House Joint Resolution 816 providing for the equal rights amendment to the U.S. Constitution. If you have not already done so the members in our New Jersey federation, and particularly the members in your congressional district, would be most appreciative of your introducing a similar joint resolution.

Thanking you for taking time out of your very busy schedule to be with us, I am

Sincerely yours,
(Miss) EMMA C. MCGALL,
National Legislation Chairman.

H.J. RES. 834

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

"SEC. 3. This amendment shall take effect one year after the date of ratification."

ANNUAL PRESIDENTIAL TRADE POLICY REPORT SHOULD BE TIMELY, NOT A YEAR LATE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the President's ninth annual report on the trade agreements program for 1964, prepared by his special representative for trade negotiations, was sent to the Congress in final form in the first week of the current year, 1966, even though the President's letter of transmittal was signed on October 31, 1965. This report is required by section 402(a) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1803 (a)), which reads:

> The President shall submit to the Congress an annual report on the trade agreements program and on tariff adjustment and other adjustment assistance under this chapter. Such report shall include information regarding new negotiations, changes made in duties and other import restrictions of the United States, reciprocal concessions obtained, changes in trade agreements in order to effectuate more fully the purposes of the trade agreements program (including the incorporation therein of escape clauses), the results of action taken to obtain removal of foreign trade restrictions (including discriminatory restrictions) against U.S. exports, remaining restrictions, and the measures available to seek their removal in accordance with the purposes of this chapter, and other information relating to the trade agreements program and to the agreements entered into thereunder.

No date is fixed in this section by which the President shall submit to Congress his annual trade report.

It is reasonable to assume, however, that the intent of Congress when enacting the Trade Expansion Act was to have available at the beginning of a calendar year a comprehensive report on the trade agreements program for the year immediately past. Congress would expect this report at the beginning of the year because it would then have before it information on which to base legislative decisions having to do with foreign trade during the current year. Accordingly, the President's trade report for calendar 1964 should have been received in final form in Congress at least within the first 3 months of 1965.

Thus, I am introducing today a bill to amend section 402 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 by inserting immediately after "Such report" in the second sentence the following:

> shall be submitted on or before March 31 of each year and

This very simple amendment would make explicit the intent of Congress that it have available for reference and use early in each year the President's report on trade for the previous year. As evidence of the need for this amendment I cite the fact that since 1960 no trade report has been submitted before July 1. Incredibly, President Kennedy's report for 1961 was not transmitted to Congress until January 28, 1963.

The trade report is not only an important document through which the Congress can judge the operations of the Executive in this important field, it is also necessary for congressional decisionmaking. The trade report can in addition be an important vehicle for public information especially at present, when U.S. international trade negotiations are widely followed and the subject of public interest—if only by virtue of the name "Kennedy round." It would be source material for articles and papers prepared at the academic level as well as in the thousand-odd trade and professional associations and unions which have a deep interest in foreign trade and the U.S. trade agreements program. Of course, such an annual report is useless if it is a full year late, or even 9 months late. By that time the consumers of such information have gone to other, perhaps less dependable sources for information about the previous year's foreign trade program.

TOM CURTIS' CONTRIBUTION TO DEBATE ON THE BUDGET AND INFLATION.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the February 8 Washington Post praises my colleague, TOM CURTIS, Republican, of St. Louis County, Mo., "for performing a most useful function by subjecting the administration's budget to the scrutiny that it deserves in a period of great uncertainty."

Representative CURTIS has argued throughout the just ended Joint Economic Committee hearings on the President's Economic Report that inflation is now in progress due in part to the existence of high spending since September to support both a war economy and costly domestic programs, and is reflected in the rising wholesale price index. CURTIS argues that the fiscal year 1967 budget, and the revised fiscal year 1966 budget which increased the Federal deficit from $3.9 to $6.9 billion, is highly unrealistic in terms of the goal of price stability that the President and his Council of Economic Advisers claim to be seeking. In spite of the inability of administration witnesses to reconcile their stated goal with a budget that they have been forced under cross-examination to admit is potentially highly inflationary, officials refuse to concede that inflation is in fact a clear and present danger.

Though the Washington Post disagrees with Curtis, it has recognized the important — indeed crucial — function played in national decisionmaking by a loyal opposition, and cites Tom Curtis' contribution to this process through his aggressive leadership and presentation of opposition viewpoints as "the leading Republican spokesman on economic affairs."

Following is the complete text of the editorial:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 8, 1966]

The Budget and Inflation

If the current hearings before the Joint Economic Committee foreshadow future debate, the issue that separates Republicans from Democrats will be inflation. Representative Thomas B. Curtis of Missouri, the leading Republican spokesman on economic affairs believes that the rise in Federal expenditures for the current fiscal year has already resulted in inflationary pressures, and he charges that the administration's 1967 budget will further intensify them. The administration, through the testimony of Budget Director Charles L. Schultze and Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler, has counterattacked by denying that the current price increases are inflationary or that they are related to the budgetary deficit.

In replying to Representative Curtis on the issue of prices, Schultze argued that the recent rise in the wholesale price index is principally the result of increases in the prices of agricultural commodities. Since farm prices are still somewhat below the high point reached in 1958, Schultze maintains that the increase in the wholesale price index is "not an inflationary phenomenon. It is a cyclical phenomenon."

Without quarreling over the term "cyclical"—over whether farm prices as a whole are subject to distinct cycles, it is sufficient to note that agricultural commodity prices are far more responsive to shifts in supply and demand than the prices of manufacturers. Therefore, the increases in agricultural prices that are experienced when aggregate demand expands rapidly may be ephemeral. To the extent that they are, Schultze's argument makes good sense. But there is, of course, always the danger that the rise in agricultural prices can affect nonfarm prices through their impact on wages.

On the second issue of whether the budgetary deficit for fiscal 1966 has contributed to inflationary pressures, the administration clearly has the better of the argument. But in awarding it points for debating, the administration must be faulted for the weakness of its defense against potential inflationary pressures.

It was refreshing to hear a Secretary of the Treasury warn the opposition, that "We have seen too many expansions turned into recessions by slammiug too hard on the brakes." But Mr. Fowler's declarations about the administration's willingness to apply the brakes at the propitious moment would be more convincing if he were to make some specific proposals for a first line of fiscal defense. The 1967 budget, being approximately in balance is at best "neutral," neither augmenting nor diminishing the total stream of expenditures.

But that neutrality may be a serious weakness if excessive demands for goods and services develop. In that event, what will be needed is a neutralizing budget, a tight budget that absorbs the gap between aggregate demand and supply by incurring a substantial surplus. Two steps can be taken in advance of the forces of excessive demand. Congress should be asked to enact income tax increases without specifying an effective date. Action to raise taxes at the propitious moment can then take the form of a joint resolution. And Secretary Fowler's remarks to the contrary notwithstanding, action should be taken now to modify or temporarily suspend the 7 percent tax credit for business investment enacted in 1962. Tax incentives to invest are not needed in a year when outlays on plant and equipment are scheduled to rise by 15 percent.

Even where his line of reasoning misses the mark, Representative Curtis is performing a most useful function by subjecting the administration's budget to the scrutiny that it deserves in a period of great uncertainty.

FREEMAN ADMITS HE WAS WRONG

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of one-price cotton legislation in 1964 I repeatedly warned that the bill advocated by the Johnson administration would be costly and ineffective, and would not benefit consumers. The facts now bear out my warning.

Secretary Freeman in 1964 took the opposite view. He predicted better prices for consumers, increased domestic consumption of cotton and lower costs to the taxpayer. In one of the most impressive displays of legislative arm twisting in history administration forces pushed the bill and hooked to it another legislative mistake, the wheat certificate program.

It is somewhat gratifying, therefore, to see that Secretary Freeman now admits he was wrong. He did so in a speech to the American Textile Manufacturers Institute January 27 in New York City.

Part of Mr. Freeman's speech is devoted to glowing predictions about the future success of the 1965 cotton bill—predictions which echo his erroneous forecast of the year before. Next year, no doubt, Mr. Freeman will belatedly explain to the long-suffering taxpayers that he was wrong in 1965, too.

Now the same administration which was so wrong about cotton legislation in 1964 in trying to put through more cotton legislation, this time a compulsory checkoff to finance additional research and promotion.

Here is Mr. Freeman's speech text:

Remarks Prepared for Delivery by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, Before the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, January 27, 1966

I have looked forward for some time for this chance to be together with you. It provides us an opportunity to discuss together some matters of mutual interest.

I am glad that I can meet here with you in these good times. We are in the midst of the longest sustained business prosperity in our peacetime history.

Only yesterday the Secretary of Labor predicted that the unemployment rate would be in the neighborhood of 3.5 percent by the end of June. This would be the lowest unemployment rate since 1953 and one of the lowest in the Nation's history.

More than 70 million people are gainfully employed in our country—a figure that was laughed at when predictions were made in past years that we would reach this level of employment.

Corporation profits last year were 20 percent up after taxes, and up 67 percent from 1960. Our gross national product will top $720 billion—a figure undreamed of a few years ago.

I am pleased when I look back over 1965 and see that net farm income was the best in 12 years; that per farm income is at record levels—and that 1966 promises to be even better.

This prosperity was not an accident. Since 1961 there has been a conscious effort on the part of the administration to bring about a cooperative effort between business and Government to develop programs and take administrative action to bring about these gains. I heard about wringing of hands among businessmen in this country when there was a change of administration in 1960. The hand wringing has changed to handclapping as the Kennedy and Johnson administrations have brought this Nation into the 20th century.

As Secretary of Agriculture, I am sure that many of you wonder why I have this interest in business. Food and agriculture is the largest single business enterprise in our Nation. As Secretary of Agriculture, I am concerned with your interests—business interests—with the interests of the farmer, the consumer, the taxpayer, and each and every one of our citizens.

I am gratified that the prosperity of the Nation has extended to the textile industry. Your investment of more than a billion dollars this year in new plants and facilities means that you are doing well and that you are confident enough to make a record investment in the future. Your investment will mean stronger economies in those places where new facilities are built or old facilities are expanded. It will mean new jobs for our workers and it will mean new markets for the cottongrower.

My task, and your task, is to build on the base we have constructed to insure that these trends will continue. Whether we improve or decline from today's level will reflect the decisions we make now and in the days, weeks, and months to come.

This is what I want to discuss with you. Let me first review briefly some of the steps which brought us to where we are today in the textile industry.

Five years ago the Nation's economy had dipped into the third recession in the past decade, and earnings in the textile industry showed little prospect for improvement.

There was a crisis in confidence in the textile economy. The administration set out to dispel it.

We negotiated with other textile producing countries arrangements which assured them of access to U.S. markets; in return, these countries have shown restraint in not flooding domestic markets.

A number of tax policy actions were taken to encourage greater investment by U.S. industry in general, and this has been of particular benefit to the textile industry. A more rapid tax depreciation schedule was instituted in 1961 and 1962, and corporate taxes were reduced in 1964 along with personal income taxes.

While these actions helped to strengthen the financial condition of the textile industry, even more basic changes in cotton production and cotton pricing policies were essential to the long run health of the cotton and textile economy.

The cotton program which had served the Nation well for many years had simply run out of gas. Cotton exports were declining, cotton consumption in domestic mills was losing ground to test tube fibers, and the cotton carryover was increasing rapidly.

New cotton legislation was enacted in 1964. It helped in some ways. It made the breakthrough on one-price cotton but the 1964 cotton program was not a success. You will recall that in 1964 many of us, and I include myself and I know many of you here, claimed that the move to one-price cotton would increase domestic consumption by more than a million bales and bring about a reduction in the cost of cotton goods to the consumer. We were wrong and it became obvious that a new program was needed. With the new legislation the carryover of cotton continued to increase; the annual cost of the cotton program moved toward a billion dollars and it appeared it would continue to rise.

This was the setting in which we considered cotton legislation in 1965.

The legislation we adopted last year sets price support loans at near world prices and should enable cotton to move freely—and without Government participation—in domestic and world markets. A system of direct payments will maintain grower incomes at levels which will enable the farmer to meet his costs and obtain a decent income for himself and his family.

With our price support loan at 21 cents per pound for the 1966 crop, and our export prices at more competitive levels, we can, and should have, larger cotton exports. Although exports during the current season will be low because countries abroad will be reducing their stocks on hand in anticipation of lower U.S prices for the 1966 crop, we expect exports in the 1966–67 marketing year to increase sharply. Part of this increase will be to replenish the low stocks which will be held abroad on August 1, 1966, and part will be the result of the new program and its effect on production abroad.

We expect the new legislation to slow the rate of increase of world cotton production—but not to cause a decline in cotton production abroad. Lower cotton prices can encourage the consumption of cotton abroad because of more effective competition with rayon.

Slight changes in the rates of growth of cotton consumption and production abroad can cause a rather significant change in cotton exports from the United States. Cotton production abroad (excluding mainland China) totals around 31 million bales and cotton consumption is around 34 million bales. Foreign consumption has been increasing at a rate of about 2.7 percent a year and foreign production about 4.1 percent a year for the past 10 years.

If we could slow the rate of growth in production by just 1 percentage point and increase the rate of consumption by just 1 percentage point, U.S. exports could reach roughly 6 million bales in about 2 years. This is the kind of effort we must be making.

With higher exports and strong participation by producers in the new cotton program, we can bring a substantial reduction in the present record 16 million bale cotton carryover. Production on an annual basis likely will decline about 1.5 to 2 million bales from the recent levels of about 15 million bales.

Another factor which can help increase cotton consumption, and speed the decline in carryover, is an effective cotton promotion program. Congressman HAROLD COOLEY, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, introduced yesterday a bill to establish a self-help research and promotion program for cotton. I believe this kind of activity can benefit the whole industry and consumers and taxpayers alike.

But the rate and extent to which the mountainous surplus of cotton is reduced will depend, as much as anything, on the actions and policies of you in the textile industry. In effect, it is within your power to help determine how successful the new cotton program will be, and whether the American people will accept it as reasonable public policy.

I emphasize this fact, not because it is a startling revelation. but rather to impress upon you the need for us to continue the spirit of cooperation which has brought the Nation's economy to its present level of efficiency and prosperity.

When the search for an effective cotton program began, the textile industry took the position it would support any program which would achieve one-price cotton. You soon discovered that sound public policy was not that simple. You had to decide what that policy should be, and then to give active and sustained support to that policy as it was being developed in the Congress.

There is no less need today for responsible action on the part of the textile industry.

Since early in 1964, prices paid by domestic mills for cotton have declined about 9 cents a pound. In 1964 the index on broad woven goods and yarns declined as well. It is an interesting fact that, during this same period, imports went down and exports went up.

Then late in 1964 the price on woven goods began to rise—the prices on yarns began to rise. The price for broad woven grey goods, for example, has increased nearly 8 percent during the period from 1964 to date. What has happened? Exports of cotton textiles have declined and imports of cotton textiles have increased.

This is what I am referring to when I suggest that you and everyone in the textile industry needs to give your full consideration and your every thought to action in this vital area of the cost of goods.

While it is true that mill consumption did increase last year by some 200,000 bales over 1964, to a level of 9.2 million bales, declines in exports and a sufficient increase in imports to bring about a 400,000-bale balance in favor of imports indicates that this is a 400,000-bale domestic market the textile industry has turned over to foreign producers.

I am sure we both recognize the value and worth of this new one-price cotton program, and we must make every possible effort to insure that it works for the benefit of all segments of the economy. Our failure would be a smashing blow at the textile industry of this Nation.

That is why I have come here tonight. We are beginning a new phase of the cooperation which has brought us a long way from the dismal outlook of just 5 years ago.

I pledge you to carry forward the spirit of cooperation undiminished, and I am confident that you will do the same.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS ON RHODESIA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it was my recent privilege to visit the newly independent nation of Southern Rhodesia. Next week, I will present a full report on the observations which Ralph DeToledano, Dr. Max Yergan, and myself have after our visit, along with our recommendations. Specifically, however, I would like to make two of my own recommendations to the House of Representatives.

First, I believe we should authorize a special subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to visit Southern Rhodesia and get a firsthand look at what is going on there. I ask this because it is my belief that we are not getting the whole story or the true story from our State Department. This request has been forwarded to the able chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Second, I believe this Congress should take a serious look at our State Department policy regarding Rhodesia. We should specifically consider, at minimum, a congressional resolution which would urge the State Department and the administration to withhold any cooperation in the British sanctions and boycott until that nation ceases its shipping into North Vietnam. It is a travesty of justice and offensive to commonsense that we should aid them in their boycott against Rhodesia, a questionable policy in the first place, when they give no reciprocity to our position in South Vietnam where we are fighting a Communist enemy and they are currently the chief free world shipper to North Vietnam.

Africa is in ferment. We failed in Asia because the people—indeed, as the late President Kennedy once pointed out, even the diplomats and the Congress—failed to understand the dimensions of what was taking place, the relative position of the contending forces and our policy therein. To make sure this does not happen in Africa we need the piercing light of public and congressional inquiry not the paper curtain of the State Department with its handed-down press releases and positions. We can do no less.

FREE WORLD SHIPPING TRADES WITH NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, American men are dying in Vietnam to preserve the free world from further encroachment by Communist aggressors.

It is ironic, therefore, that our free world allies persist in permitting their shipping interests to trade with North Vietnam. Although the exact figures are classified, it is a matter of record that in 1965 there were more free world than Communist ships carrying goods to and from North Vietnam.

Regardless of their cargoes—and we have only the assurance of the shipping firms involved that they consist of nonstrategic goods in most cases—this amounts to giving aid and comfort to our enemy. This is an economic war as well as a military conflict. If economic pressures can be applied to Ho Chi Minh, they must be, just as they have been to Castro.

I say it is time for the United States to talk the only language these free world foreign-flag shippers apparently understand: serve notice on them that they cease delivering goods of any sort to Hanoi or stand barred from doing any business at all in U.S. ports.

I am today introducing legislation which would prohibit foreign vessels which trade with North Vietnam not only from carrying U.S. Government-financed cargoes but from doing any business at all in our ports. I urge the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to take prompt action on this bill.

SKI WEEK IN THE BERKSHIRES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, thanks to swift action by both the House and Senate last month we have just observed National Ski Week. May I say, as the Representative to this body who enjoys serving perhaps the finest large-scale ski area in the Nation, I welcomed the proclamation and the national observance.

I think it is entirely in keeping with the renewed emphasis in recent years from the National, State, and local governments on outdoor recreation and on wholesome sports activity in which all may participate. It also stresses the encouragement of recreational development of otherwise marginal mountain areas which we in Massachusetts have been doing for some years.

For anyone who skis, I know I need not extol the merits of the Berkshire Mountains in my district. Spotted throughout the Berkshires are the resorts and ski areas of Berkshire Snow Basin, Bousquet's, Brodie Mountain, Burrington Hill, Butternut Basin, Catamount, Chickley Alps, Dutch Hill, Jiminy Peak, Jug End, Otis Ridge, Petersburg Pass, and Thunder Mountain.

I am equally proud of Avaloch, Springside Park, Goodell Hollow, Happyland Ski Area, the Thunderbolt Trail on Mount Greylock, Oak N' Spruce, Osceola Playground, Pittsfield State Forest, and Shaker Village on Mount Lebanon.

Also in my district are the ski facilities of Cheshire Ski Area, Eastover, Mount Mohawk, Mount Tom, the Northfield Inn, and the Sawmill Hill Ski Area.

Most of these are as familiar to skiers as the names of Hialeah, Aqueduct, and Churchill Downs are to horse players. These resort areas and ski slopes rank among the best in the world and annually draw thousands to the Berkshires.

I am personally proud to serve the many enterprising and forward-looking men and women who have taken the initiative in developing these fine facilities in anticipation of the present boom in skiing and other winter sports. They are performing an invaluable service to the economic and physical well-being of our State and of the Nation.

Of course, the idea of ski week is nothing new to these ski lodge innovators. For quite some time now, most have been offering a package 5-day ski week for winter vacationers at reduced rates. The response has been most gratifying. Most of these package deals include lodging from Sunday through Thursday nights with skiing from Sunday through Friday. Many include ski lessons, meals, and special entertainment.

Prices start about $40 on up for the 5-day deal, a bargain in these days of increasing prices and costs. Full details, I might add, are available from the Berkshire Hills Conference in my hometown of Pittsfield, Mass.

The Berkshire Eagle, the largest daily paper published in my district, recently ran their annual ski supplement issue. While I regret that the pages of the Congressional Record are not equipped to reproduce the many fine illustrations which graphically reveal the scenic grandeur and fine facilities awaiting the skier in the Berkshires, I can request consent to include as a part of my remarks one of the articles from this special supplement. I am sure you will agree it captures some of the flavor of excitement and good fun that is an integral part of skiing and for which we designated National Ski Week.

The article follows:

[From the Berkshire Eagle, Dec. 11, 1965]

Resorting to Ski

(By Lee Goerlach)

Berkshire resorts have catered to the ski bunny so effectively that winter may supersede summer as the busy season, despite Tanglewood and various other summer attractions.

Realizing that the majority of their guests are tackling the long boards for the first time, the resorts tailor their programs to a beginner's apprehensions.

Guests are pampered, protected, and taught the fundamentals of the sport by instructors chosen for personality and patience.

"We need men who can teach our guests how to put on their skis and walk, and how to do a snowplow, then stop at the bottom of our little hill," owner George Bisacca of Eastover in Lenox, says.

"We keep an eye on them, even to anticipating falls. If our efforts to keep them on their feet fail, we pick them up and serve them soothing hot chocolate right on the hill if they are shaken.

"We get them before they are beginners," Eastover ski director Jeff Roche says. "They become so accustomed to being served that they are apt to walk off the hill, leaving their skis behind them. So we pick up the skis and put them back where they belong. The key word here is attention."

Proving that nothing is too good for his guests, Bisacca installed a 1,500-foot chair lift last year to supplement the little rope tow.

The fact that he didn't have a hill big enough for the chair didn't faze Bisacca. He bought a neighboring hill and moved all 14,000 cubic yards of it truckful by truckful to Eastover.

Swimming, movies, skating, dancing, and various after activities keep the guests happy even if rain washes out the ski hill. "And skiing is so leisurely that we stop at noon for a full-course meal," Bisacca said.

This is the pattern in varying degrees at all four Berkshire winter resorts. With the exception of Avaloch in Lenox, all have snowmaking.

At Jug End in South Egremont, skiing seems more serious than at the other resorts. Ski director Dave Scott received his U.S. Amateur Ski Association (USEASA) certification along with Olympic skier Andrea Mead Lawrence last winter.

"I'll put my ski school up against the bigger areas anywhere," he says. But diplomacy and the value of individual attention also are part of the training he gives his staff.

"Focus your smile on the homeliest girl in the class." Dave tells his instructors. "She will be pleased and the rest of the class will love you for it. If you choose the prettiest girl, everyone will hate you," he warns.

Dave is from northern Ireland and has his full share of Irish wit and charm. "I'm probably the only certified instructor in the world from northern Ireland," he says.

Jug End has a 1,500-foot T-bar and a rope tow. The hill is challenging enough to attract transient skiers. Jug End also conducts a program for children of nearby towns. About 50 youngsters (from 9 to 16 years old) participated in the third year of the program last season.

Oak n' Spruce in South Lee also has a USEASA certified ski director, Rainer Schmidt of Germany, who has taught in famous ski areas all over the world, according to resort owner Frank Prinz.

Oak n' Spruce has the smallest hill and smallest snowmaking operation. "Isn't it ridiculous," Frank says, as he proudly displays the miniature electric compressor. "But it keeps the hill covered. That is what counts."

The South Lee resort has the largest skating rink of the foursome. It floods the tennis courts.

"We offer social skiing, a combination of both daytime ski activities and nighttime pleasures associated with resort life," Prinz says. "Our slopes have been designed for the novice. Our ski school knows how to instruct the beginner. The slopes are not challenging enough for the experts. The expert can find his match at nearby Berkshire ski areas."

Avaloch added a 1,000-foot T-bar to its ski complex this year. The 18-sided Gazebo, which serves as a summer dining room, is flooded for ice skating. Guests are provided most anything they ask for.

"We have a juke box and hi-fi for dancing, but if the crowd wants live music, we'll provide it," Manager Dave Green says.

Owner Michael Bakwin directs the ski program, assisted by Ed Weiss of Lenox. Accommodations are limited to about 100 overnight guests at present. But ground is being broken for an additional 20 units. "We expect the T-bar will increase interest enough to warrant construction of a ski lodge next season," Green says.

Swiss fondues, ski talk around the fire at night, parlor games, ping pong, skating on illuminated rinks—you name it, and the Berkshire resorts have it. (If they haven't got it, they'll get it for you.)

All four resorts have special midweek rates that run about half the cost of weekends or holidays. All four have rental equipment. Seldom does a beginner have his own skis and boots. When he does, they are apt to be unsuitable.

Dave Scott tells, for example, about the 86-year-old doctor from White Plains, N.Y., who arrived in class with head skis, marker toe piece and turntable heel with longthongs, equipment usually worn by racers or hot shot skiers.

Dave assumed that the doctor was one of the rare species to show up at a resort—the expert. But the doctor had never before been on skis. He had purchased the unsuitable gear from a salesman obviously as unfamiliar with skiing as his customer.

This was New Year's 2 years ago, a bitterly cold day if you remember. The doctor may not have known his ski equipment, but he knew frostbite when he saw it. About halfway through the lesson he said to Dave, "Sonny, your ears are turning white, you'd better go inside."

Eastover attracts mostly single people. The others have everything from singles to families. Some come dressed in the latest style. Others ski in car coats and levis.

"One girl had such an extensive wardrobe that she changed her clothes several times a day," Jug End's Scott remembers.

"By and large we get family groups at Avaloch," Green says. "We still are host to singles in tour groups in January through March, but have mostly families on holiday weekends. Except for the tours, ours is a family business."

There is very little repeat business from the resort skier. "We get a whole new wave each season," Bisacca says. "Once the ski bug bites them, they go off to ski at the big areas," Prinz agrees. "We are the cradle of the industry."

Guests arrive at the resorts on Friday night for the weekend.

"They dance until midnight, then are up at the crack of dawn waiting in line at the ski shop to be fitted to boots and skis," Prinz says. "They stay up until all hours again Saturday. By Sunday they start to wear out a little. Activity on the ski slopes doesn't start until about 11 a.m. And they start leaving for home by late afternoon."

U.S. POSITION ON VIETNAM

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson went to Honolulu with the overwhelming support of the vast majority of the people of this country. I think the cause of peace can best be served at this juncture by reaffirming that support and making it clear to all the world.

What is the United States trying to accomplish in Vietnam? The answer to that question is quite clear. It is the same answer we have been giving for more than 10 years. We are in Vietnam to reaffirm the right of any people to determine its own destiny in its own way. We are there to prove that force and violence are no longer acceptable ways for any power to impose its will upon its neighbors. The fact that the kind of force and violence being employed in South Vietnam is aggression in a new disguise does not change the nature of what we are trying to do. President Johnson has stated our purpose in Vietnam again and again. He has said:

> Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam and its freedom from attack. We want nothing for ourselves—only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way. We will do everything necessary to reach that objective and we will do only what is absolutely necessary.
>
> I wish it were possible—

And I am still quoting the President—

> to convince others with words what we now find it necessary to say with guns and planes: armed hostility is futile—our resources are equal to any challenge—because we fight for values and we fight for principles, rather than territory or colonies, our patience and our determination are unending. Once this is clear, then it should also be clear that the only path for reasonable men is the path of peaceful settlement.

President Johnson has said on a score of different occasions that he is prepared to go anywhere, any time, and discuss with any government a peaceful solution for Vietnam—unconditionally. Dozens of world leaders have urged the Communists in Hanoi and Peiping to participate in such discussions. They have refused. They are trying to keep discussions out of the United Nations.

It is obvious that the Chinese Communists and probably the Communists in Hanoi do not want to talk peace. They do not want to talk peace because they still believe that they can achieve a military victory. They believe that we will get tired of the struggle, that the American Government will lose popular support and be compelled to retreat.

They are wrong.

We know they are wrong.

Support for American actions in Vietnam is and always has been widespread among the American people. This can be amply demonstrated by quotations from two great Americans. One is from a letter written by President Eisenhower to Prime Minister Churchill in 1954. Speaking of the situation in southeast Asia, President Eisenhower said:

> If I may refer again to history, we failed to halt Hirohito, Mussolini, and Hitler by not acting in unity and in time. That marked the beginning of many years of stark tragedy and desperate peril. May it not be that our nations have learned something from that lesson?

Now here is another quote from that same year of 1954. This was a speech at Harvard University by General Eisenhower's chief political opponent—the late Adlai Stevenson:

> It has fallen to America's lot to organize and lead that portion of the world which adheres to the principle of consent in the ordering of human affairs. It is an assignment we undertook not by choice but by necessity and without prior experience. The burden is without historic parallel and so is the danger, and so is our response. The first phase is ending. The outward thrust of aggression in Europe has been arrested. Now we shall have to address ourselves to Asia, to perpetual siege and to the unending tasks of greatness. For the quest for peace and security is not a day's or a decade's work. For us it may be everlasting.

There you have the political consensus in America on the subject of aggression in southeast Asia. We have not changed. Today we have a Democratic President—and he enjoys the same firm support from Republican former President Eisenhower that General Eisenhower received from Mr. Stevenson.

There are some who are honestly and sincerely confused about what is going on in South Vietnam. And there are some others who are more than willing to increase the confusion. But the facts speak for themselves.

What is being attempted in Vietnam is the same cynical totalitarian aggression we have fought for a generation. Only now it is trying out a new strategy. It is now trying to prove that a small group of well-armed and ruthless terrorists can be sent into a country to first subvert its government and then to enslave its people before the world realizes that an invasion has begun.

The whole history of our century proves conclusively that the appetite for aggression is unlimited. There is no known instance of an aggressor leaving his neighbors alone because his appetite was satisfied. If we do not stand by South Vietnam today, then—as surely as night follows day—we will be called upon to face the challenge somewhere else tomorrow.

President Johnson has chosen to face reality and meet the challenge here and now. He has the firm support of the vast majority of the American people.

A FARCE IN ONE ACT

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, considerable attention has been devoted of late to what might occur in various of our State legislatures following reapportionment on a population-only basis.

Those of us who support the pending reapportionment constitutional amendment affecting State legislative reapportionment believe that the ultimate decision in such a vital area of government must lie with the American people themselves. That is the purpose of the pending resolution regarding reapportionment.

This issue is clear and fundamental. The point, I believe, is interestingly made in a recent column appearing in the San Francisco Examiner by Jack S. McDowell where an excellent, whimsical commentary on the problem is set forth.

With unanimous consent, I therefore ask that this article be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Nov. 2, 1965]

A FARCE IN ONE ACT

(By Jack S. McDowell)

SACRAMENTO.—The time: 1967 or thereafter. Californians have been saved from themselves by the U.S. Supreme Court. Reapportionment, back in 1965, made all State senate districts about equal in population—but not in geography or economic interests. Some new senators now represent a dozen counties.

Senator Paul Pullet of the first senatorial district answers the phone in his office in Petaluma. Sam Sawtooth, one of his constituents in Crescent City, is calling (at 90 cents for the first 3 minutes).

Mr. SAWTOOTH. Senator, a number of us are having nothing but trouble from the division and we need your help.

Senator PULLET. Always glad to help the people of our district, sir. Why don't you and your associates drop around to my office right after lunch and——

Mr. SAWTOOTH. After lunch. Why, Senator, it's 333 miles from here to Petaluma, not counting detours around the bridge washouts.

Senator PULLET. Yes, you are in the northern neighborhood of the district, aren't you? Well, maybe we can handle it on the phone. Now, you mentioned trouble with the division. Which division of the agriculture department is that, sir? Compliance, or the bureau of poultry inspection?

Mr. SAWTOOTH. Ag, shmag, Senator. I'm talking about those division of forestry guys.

Senator PULLET. Oh, forestry, huh? Hmmm. Well, what seems to be the problem, Mr. Sawtooth?

Mr. Sawtooth. Well, one of those division guys got so noisy shouting the rulebook at two of our scalers that the whistlepunk got so rattled he signaled wrong, somebody hit the winch and we almost laminated one of our best toppers into about 500 board feet of second-growth.

Senator Pullet. Scalers? Whistlepunk? Topper? Uh, by the way, Mr. Sawtooth, what's the name of your firm?

Mr. Sawtooth. The Mountainside Logging Co.

Senator Pullet. Logging? Oh, yes. I've heard of your company many times. Fine reputation. Well, it sounds as if you do have a problem and I will demand a full report from the director of agri * * * I mean from those forestry people. By the way, Mr. Sawtooth, how did you people up there ever come to plant redwood trees instead of raising chickens or some nice wine grapes?

As the senator hung up, his secretary stopped in.

"Senator Quartzly wants you to call him right away at his office at the Modoc Mining Co., in Alturas," she said. "He wants to know what peach blight and pear decline are, because he just told some of his Stanislaus County constituents he'll introduce a bill to have them repealed."

JUDGE PERRY B. JACKSON

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vanik] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, between November 1947 and February of 1954, it was my privilege to serve as associate judge of the municipal court of Cleveland, a trial court of general jurisdiction in the city of Cleveland. In the course of this association, it was my privilege to serve with the Honorable Perry B. Jackson who has since become a judge of the court of common pleas of Cuyahoga County.

During my two terms of office on the Cleveland municipal court, I had the opportunity to frequently counsel with Judge Jackson and very often relied on his wise experience in trial procedure and legal research.

On Thursday, January 27, Judge Jackson celebrated his 70th birthday. His life story is a story of perseverance and integrity. Mr. James T. Cox, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, paid proper tribute to this eminent jurist on Sunday, January 23. Mr. Cox's article follows:

Judge Jackson Turning 70—Racial Emphasis Erased

(By James T. Cox)

Judge Perry B. Jackson considers as one of his lesser achievements his indirect responsibility for tradition-bound newspaper writing in Cleveland.

For many years after 1942, when he was appointed a Cleveland municipal judge by Gov. John W. Bricker, a typical newspaper story about him would start like this: "Judge Perry B. Jackson, the first Negro to serve as a judge in Ohio."

Times changed, as do social attitudes. A Negro on the bench is commonplace today. And newswriting concentrates more on the person, not the race.

Judge Perry Brooks Jackson, now on the common pleas court bench, will celebrate his 70th birthday Thursday. He will be in court that day, presiding at a murder trial.

He wants only one birthday gift: an abundance of energy to preside at trials for many more years.

At 70, every man is entitled to philosophize a little. Sitting in his court chambers last week at the close of a trial day, a desk lamp reflecting on his ever-present Phi Beta Kappa key, Judge Jackson did just that.

"Oh, I guess I have much to be thankful for," he said, "and I thank Almighty God for giving me talents, the energies and the desire for public service. For giving me the finest parents a man could want, and the most devoted wife in the world.

Throughout his life, one of his talents has been for hard work. To earn his college and law school tuition, he worked at a variety of jobs—bus boy, waiter, steel mill employee.

"Those were the days, though, when it was literally possible to work one's way through college. The tuition today makes that ideal prohibitive," the judge said.

"Of course, the money was not as good in the old days. The summers I worked in a steel mill I worked 60 hours a week, for $9.60—a week. The next summer I got a rise—to 18 cents an hour, or $10.80 a week.

As a young man with a fresh law degree in 1922, Judge Jackson tried to prove to a law school dean that a large law firm would hire a Negro.

"After about a month of job hunting, I had less than a dollar in my pocket. An uncle gave me an old desk and chair, and I started my own practice in the anteroom of another Negro lawyer's office. The dean had been correct."

In 1942, Judge Jackson said, the time was at last politically "right" for a Negro judge.

"The feeling in Columbus, however, was that because four Negroes had been previously defeated for municipal judge, it might be best to appoint a Negro to the bench, to 'prove' to the community that a Negro was capable of doing the job, so to speak.

"To be quite honest, however," the judge said, "the idea of 'the first Negro' is more often annoying than amusing. One has hardly heard of the first Italian, or the first Jew, to hold an office. Only the Negro. You only have to study the mayoral race here last November."

This "first" concept does have rewards, however, he admits.

"As a judge, and as a representative of the Negro community, I was asked to serve on many civic committees. Too many, in fact, so I was able to recommend other Negroes. You'd be surprised how quickly the white community discovers the large number of qualified people in a minority group that can do an equally good job."

The youth who came from Zanesville carrying a cardboard suitcase containing a meager supply of clothes and a few celluloid collars, was elected to three terms in municipal court and elected twice to the common pleas court bench. He will be running again this November.

The signal honor in his life was receiving an honorary doctor of laws degree from Western Reserve University, in 1961.

"I believe," he says, "that an honorary degree given by one's college is the finest award a man can receive in his lifetime. That is how I feel about mine."

He did not say so, but Judge Jackson was the first Negro awarded an honorary degree by WRU.

PIGGYBACK RAILROADING

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more interesting to observe than a new idea that grows to be a success, bringing more efficient services to the public as well as profit to those who carry out the idea.

Right after World War II, a new idea was called "Piggyback Railroading." It was a proposal that the railroad and trucking industries cooperate to their mutual benefit by the transport on the railroads of loaded trailer vans over long distances. Upon arrival at the destination, tractors would be ready to pull the trailers away to distribute the goods at various warehouses. Piggyback railroading caught on and today comprises a large part of railroad business.

Now we observe the development of another piggyback program—called piggyback marketing by the Department of Commerce, although a more accurate name would probably be cooperative exporting.

The concept is easy to understand. It refers to a situation in which the products of smaller companies ride the back and shoulders of larger, big-name companies into world markets that would otherwise be difficult or impossible to reach. The Department of Commerce acts as a middleman or clearinghouse in order to bring prospective carriers and riders together.

Just as examples, a large flour milling company exports the jams and jellies of a small businessman; and a big steel corporation markets the metal doors and frames made by a small company.

When agreements between companies are worked out, the result is new opportunities for sales and profits for businessmen, in that it permits exporting by small companies whose marketing organizations are not geared to overseas trade. It enables the big companies to broaden the product lines which they can offer overseas and to bolster their export sales.

Though the mechanics of a piggyback operation are fairly basic, the arrangements vary from company to company. The most common arrangement is simply one in which the big company buys the products of the small company outright at the best price it can get, and sells on its own terms. Other arrangements are those in which the big company buys the smaller company's product at discount or it may sell for a commission.

The carrier companies also vary in deciding what products they will market. All companies want products they can market at a profit, but in addition, some companies will market only those products which are related to their own. The piggyback process is not necessarily limited to products that round out a marketing package, however. It can involve a variety of goods whether related or unrelated.

The clearinghouse services of the Government include communicating with companies established overseas to determine if they are interested in selling a product. Then when a rider company applies for carrier service, the Government supplies it with the names of three interested carriers and helps the rider and carrier firms arrange negotiations. To expand the efficiency and scope of the program the Department of Commerce is now setting up an automatic data processing system which will enable it to pinpoint which U.S. companies might piggyback for which rider companies. It is anticipated that the computerized system will be ready by late spring, at which time the information will be available to any American manufacturer interested in the program. The eventual agreements regarding terms and cost are privately negotiated by the companies involved, with no government participation.

All in all, piggybacking or cooperative exporting seems to have a very bright future. A firm interested in the idea either as an exporter or as one which would like to export need only contact the Assistant Director, Bureau of International Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. The local Commerce Department field office will also furnish information regarding this program.

Through piggybacking, thousands of companies whose business is now confined to the domestic market could grow and become exporters. This would be good for them and good for the country.

A SERVICE CORPS FOR OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I join many of my colleagues in seeking to establish a National Senior Community Service Corps. Today, I introduced a bill identical to the one offered by them, that would provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps.

The Senior Corps would be established within the Administration on Aging of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and would be charged with channelling the abilities and energies of our citizens, past 60, to projects of benefit both to the elderly, to their neighbors and to our communities. Sponsors would submit programs to State agencies, now responsible for formulating plans for the elderly, for approval of the Administration on Aging. This would make Senior Corps programs a major part of State plans.

The new program would give national impetus, technical assistance and funds to programs of benefit to our elderly, their neighbors and our communities. Our older citizens represent a potent reservoir of experience, wisdom and skills that we should not allow to dry up unused. To appreciate the wealth of human values stocked in this reservoir, we have but to consider that in 1960 there were 4.6 million persons 60 years of age and over in the labor force, many of whom are now retired or about to retire. Among them were 126,000 public school teachers, 35,000 lawyers, 18,000 college faculty members, 11,000 librarians, 32,000 physicians and surgeons and 43,000 professional nurses, to mention only a few categories.

Many of these people are vigorous, enjoy good health and wish to continue actively in the lifestream of their communities. These are people who can never be happy on the shelf no matter how comfortable it may be. In our expanding economy many of the skills possessed by these people can be put to good use. We should not shut the door on these people and exclude them from participation in the life of our communities.

I suggest that a new alternative be given to these people and that alternative is embodied in the senior service concept.

America with its prodigious production capacity tends to accelerate obsolescence to the point where much of its goods are relegated to the scrap heap long before they have outlived their usefulness. We must not allow that thinking to carry over to our human material. Such values as wisdom and understanding are slow to nurture and are found mostly in people who have lived full and useful lives. They are too precious to be lightly discarded.

What is it that these people would do under my bill. Briefly, they would serve the great social needs of our communities. Two new programs sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity come to mind. Under their foster grandparent program men and women past 55 years are giving care and attention to very young children in hospitals. All concerned are delighted with the new mood in the children's wards. Operation Medicare Alert enlists older Americans to notify isolated elderly citizens about their social security benefits before the March 31 expiration date.

This Nation should awaken to the present waste of the energies and abilities of our older Americans and should determine to stop this waste and to put it to effective use. The number of elderly American citizens is expected to increase in the years to come. Today we have 19 million people past 65, in 20 years their number will probably rise to 25 million, an increase of 6 million.

What we as a nation do with the energy, experience, and imagination of these people could affect our course and history. This bill is an attempt to provide a partial answer.

JACK HOOD VAUGHN OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the time allotted me to pay tribute to a fellow Montanan, Jack Hood Vaughn, who recently has been named Director of the Peace Corps.

Jack Vaughn has combined unusual ability with great dedication in a long-term effort to make a contribution in the foreign affairs field. In 1961, Jack came to Washington to organize the Latin American programs of the Peace Corps. Under his direction, a program of 123 volunteers grew in 3 years to 3,000. In 1964 he was sent to Panama to serve with distinction as our Ambassador there in the difficult period following the Canal crisis.

A year later Jack was called again to Washington to serve as U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress and Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs. In this job, he has made important contributions toward continuing and strengthening our efforts to assist Latin America to build institutions which can reach down to help all the people of the hemisphere. He has also distinguished himself as a brilliant envoy. He speaks fluent Spanish, acquired in his early days when he lived and studied in Mexico and even for a while he was a professional boxer. In addition, he has a very special understanding of the Latin spirit, and a great ability in that always difficult task of communication between peoples. On a recent tour of the hemisphere, cheering crowds carried him on their shoulders.

Now Jack Vaughn moves on to devote his energy and his interest in people to the Peace Corps which he helped start. His achievement stands as an example of what a dedicated man can do, and I am sure we will all benefit from the service he will render in his new assignment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a news item accounting his service to his job and country be printed.

THE PEACE CORPS—YANKEE, DON'T GO HOME

"Sargent Shriver," said Washington wags last week, "is only a corporal now." Shriver had not exactly been demoted, since he had been pleading for 6 months to be relieved of one of his two jobs. Finally, Lyndon Johnson decided that Shriver, who had been Director of the Peace Corps since its inception in 1961, should now devote full time to the 16-month-old Office of Economic Opportunity, which he has also headed from the start.

After assigning Shriver to the war on poverty, the Great Society program nearest his own heart, Johnson named as Peace Corps Director Jack Hood Vaughn, 45, former U.S. Ambassador to Panama and, since March 1965, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. Before his ambassadorial assignment, Vaughn had directed the Peace Corps' Latin American program and will now, as Johnson said it, "return to his first love."

HAD 149 VICTORIES

A slight (5 ft. 8 in., 150 lbs.), combative redhead, Vaughn was reared in Michigan, where he spent so much of his youth boxing that he did not graduate from high school until he was 20. He won the Michigan Golden Gloves as a 124-lb. featherweight, logged 149 victories in 172 amateur and professional fights—and was never knocked out (though his nose was broken three times, his jaw once).

After graduating from the University of Michigan, Vaughn enlisted in the Marine

Corps, was twice wounded on Okinawa, and was eventually discharged as a captain. He earned his master's degree at the University of Michigan in 1947, then spent 10 years in Bolivia, Costa Rica, and Panama as a U.S. Information Service officer and coordinator of U.S. aid projects. In 1961, Shriver grabbed him. Says Vaughn: "The Peace Corps idea had great appeal to me, and the people I knew who were putting this idea into effect appealed to me even more."

BEEKEEPERS AND FISH HATCHERS

Vaughn takes over the Peace Corps as it approaches its fifth birthday. Since its first year, when there were 526 volunteers in 13 countries, the Corps has grown apace, now has 10,380 volunteers at work in 46 countries from Afghanistan to Venezuela. Its annual appropriation has risen from $30 million to this year's $114.1 million. Fifty percent of the Corpsmen are teachers, the rest are involved in rural and urban-community development, health projects, agriculture, and public works.

Nonteaching volunteers wind up as beekeepers in Cameroon, accountants in Afghanistan, architects in Tunisia, fish hatchers in Togo. Two dozen men and women volunteers live in some of the world's most scabrous slums, the hillside favelas outside Rio de Janeiro, where they run medical clinics, teach and do social work. This month, when torrential rains and landslides claimed some 200 favelados' lives in Rio, the Corpsmen helped evacuate stricken families, set up emergency health stations, staffed mass vaccination centers.

FEATHER IN THE CAP

The Peace Corps today recruits 85 percent of all volunteers directly from college—and because U.S. campuses have become hotbeds of social protest, finds itself looking for a new kind of volunteer. "We don't want beatniks," says Deputy Director Warren Wiggins, "but we have nothing against beards." The "quiet activists" that Wiggins seeks "don't carry placards. They do things like tutoring Negro school kids. They work without fanfare." In Wiggins' view, the best volunteer has "a basic service motivation, a certain flexibility, a lack of racial prejudice, a certain degree of adventurousness, a sense of idealism."

Plainly, with Shriver's departure the first handcrafted era of the Peace Corps is ended. Under his guidance, says Wiggins, "we have transited from a feather in the cap of America to a large-scale operation of sufficient human resources to be of consequence in the changing nations." Now, adds Vaughn, "its character is established. My job is to help it continue to do well." But Vaughn's task may prove tougher than it looks.

INNATE ALTRUISM

Like any other 5-year-old, the Peace Corps is experiencing growing pains. It suffers from sibling rivalry with VISTA, the domestic poverty corps directed by Shriver. Despite intensive recruiting on 1,500 U.S. campuses, an advertising campaign mounted at cost (and sometime too cutely) by a major agency, a whopping 42,068 applicants—not to mention the added inducemnet of a 2-year deferment for draft-age men—the corps in 1965 fell nearly 1,000 short of its 9,500 volunteer goal. One reason is that today's college student tends increasingly to postpone any job commitment and is often able to discover foreign lands on his own.

The truth is that joining the Peace Corps no longer has quite the glamor it once had—or seemed to have. As Samuel Babbitt, a former Peace Corps staffer and now assistant dean of the Yale Graduate School, points out, the Corps no longer holds for potential volunteers the "tremendous emotional response keyed off by the hero worship of President Kennedy."

Nonetheless, the Peace Corps still appeals to the innate altruism of American youth, and virtually every country to which volunteers have been assigned has welcomed them, asked for more, and often given singular sendoffs to homebound corpsmen who have completed their tours of duty. In a remote settlement in southern India recently, a young corpsman announced that he would soon be returning to the United States to get married. Distraught villagers tried to induce him to stay by offering him anything he might want—including his pick of the local maidens.

THE PLIGHT OF MISSISSIPPI NEGROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Keogh). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, 2½ hours were spent yesterday in debate on the subject of Mississippi Negroes who are now living in the delta counties. Basically I pointed out that these Negroes were hungry, in some cases homeless, and that the State of Mississippi, rather than helping, was doing everything in its power to block Federal efforts to distribute food in Mississippi.

Instead of responding to the problem, the Mississippi delegation spent their time trying to lay down a smokescreen, complete with all the tired old red herrings and diversions of Communists, agitators, Federal intervention, and so forth. They questioned my political motives, my political beliefs, my judgment, and experience. But they were not content with just attacking me by reading various derogatory newspaper columns. They had to go on to attack the National Council of Churches and its delta ministry, calling it a leftwing organization, accusing it of supporting revolutionaries, and trying to discredit this outstanding organization, whose only crime that I can see is trying to help those unfortunate Negroes who have been left virtually friendless in eight delta counties. I am happy to enter into the Record at this time, this statement from the Right Reverend Paul Moore, Jr., chairman of the commission on the delta ministry:

> The delta ministry is an integral part of the National Council of the Churches of Christ, set up by a resolution of its general assembly. The clergy on the staff are all clergy in good standing in their own denominations, and are vouched for by their ecclesiastical authorities. The stance of the delta ministry has to do with our identification with the poor people there and our concern for their desperate needs. These needs are increasingly urgent. They have not been dealt with by the local or Federal Government. Thus, the people are trying in any way they can to call attention to their plight. I hope and trust that the local and Federal governments will respond.

The whole proceeding yesterday reminded me of the story of the dean of the law school who was instructing a new graduate. He said: "Remember, when you do not have the law, quote the facts; when you do not have the facts, quote the law; and when you have neither, just holler." And this is exactly what the gentlemen from Mississippi did yesterday. They just hollered.

They also seemed to have developed a new disease—TV phobia.

Several times during the debate, they expressed what can only be interpreted as fear of having the TV cameras turned on Mississippi. They seemed to be deathly afraid of what the TV camera and other news media might reveal about conditions in that State.

I would like to point out to these gentlemen that from the beginning of time people who have had something to hide—and who are somehow trying to cover up their actions—are the people who have avoided public exposure.

I have nothing to fear. I have nothing to hide, and neither do the Negroes of Mississippi. So we welcome public discussion. We welcome the TV cameras. We welcome the newspaper reporters.

During the course of the debate I offered to go to Greenville with these gentlemen. My offer was ignored. I also offered to arrange a conference here in Washington with the people who have the facts—Sargent Shriver of the Office of Economic Opportunity and Under Secretary Schnittker of the Department of Agriculture. Again, I was ignored.

I suggest respectfully to the Mississippi delegation that they should join with me in sponsoring a House resolution calling for a special or select committee made up of Members of this distinguished body to investigate the situation in Mississippi.

After all, this is what we are here for—to learn the facts and to get the truth. Now, if I am wrong, I will be very happy to stand corrected either in Greenville, Miss., or in the offices of the administration downtown, or here on the floor of the House. If I have the wrong information, I would like to know about it. They have not refuted any of my allegations. They have not refuted my statement that the Negroes are hungry in Mississippi, but instead they tried to divert our attentions by telling us about riots in Harlem and riots in Rochester and racial violence in all sorts of places.

I recall what my grandmother said, and I thought she was a wise old woman. She said that "2 wrongs never make a right; and 5 wrongs do not make a right, and 1,000 wrongs do not make a right." No matter how many stories we hear about racial violence and wrongs in Watts and in Rochester or in Detroit, this does not detract from the fact that there are people in Mississippi that are being denied food because they are Negroes.

The distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, John Bell Williams, told a very touching story about a Negro friend of his who would not eat certain surplus commodities and brought them to the Congressman's home. One of the items that the distinguished gentleman mentioned that his good friend brought him was cheese. I tell you, Members of this House, that the only part of the cheese that Mr. John Bell Williams' friend got from Department of Agriculture surplus commodities was the holes from swiss cheese. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has not, for the past couple of years, had any cheese to distribute as surplus. Mississippi Congressmen then turned their fire on Federal intervention. During the debate yesterday I tried to put in some figures which I thought were very cogent and interesting, because there is one type of Federal intervention that the Mississippi delegation does like. As a matter of fact, they like it so much that they have been known from time to time to request more. This is Federal intervention in the Mississippi State treasury. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] took out his part of this debate, as is his privilege, but it is also my privilege to put it back in.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. RESNICK. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not do that. The only part of the debate, the only thing I took out, was the colloquy about your middle initial. That is the only thing I took out of the debate.

Mr. RESNICK. I believe the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], at the time I arrived in the Chamber, was talking about Federal intervention in the State of Mississippi, and that was not in the RECORD as I read it today. If I am proven wrong, I will apologize to him.

During the debate I did my best to point out that according to the figures that I read in a Mississippi paper—and again I stand corrected if I am wrong—in the next 2 years the budget of the State of Mississippi will have $350 million raised by local taxes. I would like to point out, also, that the vast majority of these taxes will be raised by a 4½ percent sales tax. I would also like to point out that this 4½ percent sales tax is on food as well as every other item. Mississippi is one of the few States in the Nation that taxes the food people eat. I would also like to point out that a very small part of this money is raised by personal or property taxes.

The U.S. Government in its policy of Federal intervention in the State of Mississippi will make a direct contribution of $280 million for the next 2 years. This is direct contribution. It does not count any other moneys going into the States, such as OEO programs and so on.

Now, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture figures, in fiscal 1966—and this is just 1 year—$304,540,000 will go to Mississippi in Federal farm payments. This kind of intervention is fine. But when I, as a Member of this House who has to vote on these appropriations, say something is wrong down there, this is Federal intervention of the wrong kind. You cannot have it both ways. Either Mississippi wishes to be part of the federal system or not.

The question was asked by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], Where do I get my facts on the starving Negroes and whites of Mississippi? I would like to quote Mrs. Evelyn Gandy, the State welfare commissioner of the State of Mississippi. This is a quote from the Delta Democratic Times:

> Five hundred thousand people in the State of Mississippi, both white and Negro, would benefit from food distribution.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a statement by any leftwinger. This is not a statement by any Communist agitator. This is not a statement by a Congressman who is supposed to have ulterior political motives. This is from the State welfare commissioner of Mississippi. And she ought to know.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to castigate the State of Mississippi. I am here simply to try to get justice for people who are crying out for justice, for people who are crying out for the most basic of all things: food. I once again ask the distinguished delegation from the State of Mississippi to join with me and see that this food gets to those who need it. If the food is not needed, I am sure that it will be turned back.

Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy if we could discuss this problem, honestly and privately, in Mississippi, or in Washington, or anywhere else that the distinguished gentlemen from the State of Mississippi would like to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I am calling out to America not to be indifferent to this terrible problem.

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of an old saying: "I am not worried about my enemies, for they can only kill me. I am not worried about my friends because they can only betray me. But I am concerned about the indifferent, for it is the indifferent that will permit my enemies to murder me and my friends to betray me."

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to the American people and to the Members of this House, let us not be indifferent to these calls for help.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, as I did during yesterday's debate I commend the gentleman from New York for having so forcefully brought to the attention of the House the conditions which exist in Mississippi. Congress and the American people must be awakened to these conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is especially appropriate today, as this is a most historic day for the House of Representatives. This is the second anniversary of the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Two years ago, on the 10th day of February 1964, when the distinguished gentleman, who now presides over the House, was then presiding as chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, the debate came to a conclusion. By a vote of 290 to 130 the House of Representatives passed that historic bill.

Mr. Speaker, that vote represented the culmination of years of effort on the part of those of us who were determined that the House recognize its responsibilities in the field of civil rights. Nevertheless, that bill did not deal with other questions which remained unanswered, such as the disenfranchisement of Negroes in the South. In the following year we passed the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Again, this year, the House of Representatives must pass effective legislation to deal with violence and murder directed at those who are exercising their constitutional rights or assisting others to do so. And southern justice must be rendered colorblind. Legislation must be enacted to eliminate discrimination in the selection of juries in the South.

Mr. Speaker, there are many, many things yet to be done to achieve full equality for all Americans. But I believe today we should recall the historic step which was taken in this body 2 years ago and commend all Members of the House who voted for that most forward step in civil rights.

Mr. RESNICK. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that in the course of the debate yesterday the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] wanted the figures as to what the State of New York received and how the State of New York fared in this Federal situation.

New York State, this coming year, will have a budget of $3.98 billion. We raise this money ourselves. In addition, we will receive only $800 million in direct Federal aid.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that this represents a far cry, percentagewise, from what the State of Mississippi receives in Federal funds.

I would also like to point out that the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] stated that the city of Greenville has the biggest heart of any city in the South, and if for 1 minute the Negroes were really starving and homeless, the city of Greenville would have made accommodations available to them in a minute.

Mr. Speaker, from all I can see, this is one of the longest minutes in the history of creation, because over 100 homeless Negroes, who were evicted from farms, and who have no source of income whatsoever, have been living in tents right outside the city of Greenville since last October.

Mr. Speaker, the good people of the city of Greenville must be pretty myopic if they could not see this right under their noses.

I should also like to state that another gentleman from Mississippi, Hon. PRENTISS WALKER, pointed out that a good many Negroes in Harlem and other places in the North are anxious to go back to the South because the South took such good care of them.

Let it be noted here and now that the South has taken such good care of its Negro citizens, that 650,000 of them have fled the South in the last 5 years alone. This figure is provided by the U.S. Census Bureau. This is, of course, what I believe to be the policy of the State of Mississippi. They wish that the Negroes today in the State of Mississippi and especially those in the delta counties who have become obsolete—there is no more need for them in the fields—to leave the State. They do not want them voting in the elections.

I would like to conclude by saying—justice must be done for the hungry and homeless. I invite all my colleagues, particularly those from Mississippi to join me in a supreme effort to help the needy in this time of emergency.

KOSCIUSKO DAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1966

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEOGH). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as we honor our great American hero, Abraham Lincoln, this Saturday, it is a great coincidence that we also join on that day with Americans of Polish descent to pay honor to the memory of a celebrated hero of our American Revolution and of Poland's fight against oppressors. Today the loyal Polish-American citizens commemorate the 220th anniversary of the birth of Tadeusz Kosciusko, that great Polish soldier and patriot who gave so freely of his military genius to help George Washington develop our raw and untrained army into a telling military force.

From his earliest years, Kosciusko demonstrated a passion for independence along with unusual talents of leadership. Bereft of his beloved father at the age of 13, the boy prepared for admission and obtained a scholarship to the famous military academy in Mezieres, France. His record here was so impressive he was graduated with the rank of captain of engineering and artillery.

In the year 1776, while in Paris, Kosciusko heard much of the struggle of the American colonists for independence. He became so passionately concerned with this struggle for liberty, that he borrowed money to sail to America. Immediately after disembarking at Philadelphia in August, he applied and was accepted for military service with the American forces.

As a result of the outstanding plans which he drew for the fortification of the Delaware River, Kosciusko was commissioned a colonel of engineers in the Continental Army and subsequently to the Northern Army where he accomplished a magnificent fortification of West Point.

Later he was to see action in the battle of Charleston, S.C., where he again distinguished himself with both courage and valor as well as superior military ability.

In October of 1783 he was promoted to brigadier general and prepared to devote himself to the military needs of this new Nation. However, his concern for his own people and their struggle for a measure of independence caused him to return to his homeland. In Poland he was made a major general and led the Polish patriots in a bitter but hopeless fight.

Overwhelmed by the military and manpower of the enemy, Kosciusko fell wounded on the historic battlefield of Maciejowice. He was imprisoned in Russia. Later this brilliant military strategist and planner died of a broken heart while living in exile in Switzerland.

In spite of General Kosciusko's failures and disappointments in his later life, Americans can never forget what he did to bolster our military defenses when our own Continental Army was so close to starvation and defeat. The young Polish officer's enthusiasm, his impressive military training, and his brilliant mind gave our officers and men a much needed lift in their morale which in turn helped greatly to turn the tide of one defeat after another into a succession of victories.

Mr. Speaker, I commend our great Polish-American organizations and all our citizens of Polish origin for keeping alive the memory of Tadeusz Kosciusko so that all Americans can be reminded of the contribution of this great patriot.

By remembering Kosciusko's magnificent deeds and the accomplishments of the other great Poles who so valiantly helped this Nation to gain its independence, we find ourselves drawn closer to all our fellow Americans who so rightfully glory in their Polish heritage. It is with great pride and in the spirit of true brotherhood that we join them in saluting and lauding the memorable deeds of such an American and Polish patriot as Tadeusz Kosciusko.

MILK FOR SCHOOLCHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today the President has sent to the Congress his message on food for freedom. It is a challenging message in which the President said, and I quote him:

> I propose that the United States lead the world in a war against hunger.

I applaud the President's purpose to make our agricultural abundance available to fight hunger and starvation in the developing world.

At the time of this bold approach abroad, it is anomalous and disappointing that at home the administration intends to cut back on both the school lunch program and the special milk program.

Through the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Government has subsidized a school lunch program since 1949 and a program of milk to school youngsters since 1955.

According to the budget submitted for the fiscal year 1967, which the President sent to the Congress on January 24, the special milk program appropriation will be cut from the current $100 to $21 million. The school lunch program will be trimmed from the $202 million figure for the fiscal year 1966 to $183 million for the fiscal year 1967.

Now the Department of Agriculture states that in the case of the special milk program, that is the program under which children buy milk during the recess period as distinguished from the milk that they get under the school lunch program itself, the cutback is an attempt to "reorient and redirect" the program so that only the needy children will get free milk while other children "pay as they drink."

The Department contends that under the program contemplated, needy children will be better taken care of.

This desire to do more for needy children is commendable, but it seems to me that this kind of distinction should not be drawn.

For the amount of money spent on either the special milk program or the school lunch program, we ought to continue to pursue a nondiscriminatory policy that provides milk and lunches to all children. Making a distinction between needy children who are eligible for free milk and those children who have to pay for their milk creates the obvious risk of stigmatizing those children who are not able to pay.

There will be needy youngsters and nonneedy youngsters attending the same schools. This is false economy. We gain so little and yet would cause irreparable harm to many youngsters.

Mr. Speaker, I deplore the imposition of a means test on these programs. These programs are admirable. They have been most effective since their inception. I see no compelling reason why the programs should be cut back. If we are not doing enough for needy children now, then we should provide more money for the special milk program and not take milk from other children.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of the war in Vietnam should not deprive American schoolchildren of milk and lunches.

A national economy, which the administration says can support both guns and butter, certainly can support both missiles and milk.

LEGISLATION TO CORRECT INEQUITIES IN THE LAW GOVERNING COOPERATIVE HOUSING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation which is clearly needed to correct inequities in the law governing cooperative housing. In 1961, I introduced a bill to authorize a reduction in premium rates for management-type cooperatives, and this measure was enacted. Last year, I sponsored legislation to provide mutuality for cooperative housing, and this was incorporated in the Housing and Urban Devlopment Act. Yet, the premiums have never been reduced, and the new mutual fund has not been fully put into effect.

The legislation I have introduced today will make the premium reduction mandatory, and will settle the confusion and hesitation which exists in some quarters with respect to the mutuality program, thus paving the way for its effective and expeditious implementation. If ever there has been good mortgage experience, it has been with cooperative housing owners. They have contributed over $18 million to the FHA housing fund with losses amounting to less than $34,000. They deserve a break; their superlative record justifies meaningful relief.

Since the inception of their mortgage experience in 1950, owners of management-type co-ops have demonstrated their ability and determination to meet their mortgage commitments. Over the years, they have been paying the standard premium rate for FHA mortgage insurance—one-half of 1 percent—and have thus contributed over $18 million. The ratio of premiums to losses is an amazing 568 to 1. Ordinarily, of course, good insurance experience brings about direct reduction in premiums, so 5 years ago, we authorized the FHA to reduce this premium to one-fourth of 1 percent. In August of 1964, Congressman Rains, then chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, stated that it was the expectation of the Senate-House conferees on the housing bill of 1964, that this authority would be exercised before the next housing bill was considered. Well, this time has come and gone, Mr. Speaker, and the authority has never been exercised; the premium still stands at one-half of 1 percent. I am tired of waiting for this discretionary authority to be exercised. I have, therefore, introduced a bill to require the reduction of the premium rate charged to management-type cooperatives to one-fourth of 1 percent. This fund is sound beyond doubt, and the annual savings to these families of upwards of $30, is clearly warranted.

Because of the superb record which the owners of co-ops have established, the Congress, last year, established a separate mutual fund for the cooperatives. It was our intention at that time—and I am speaking as one of the sponsors of this legislation—to create a special management fund for all management-type cooperatives, so that their premium payments, administrative costs and any losses, would be segregated from the general fund. We provided that when this management fund was sufficiently strong, the FHA would distribute shares or rebates to the co-op owners whose premiums had provided this strength. In fairness, we also stipulated that no such disbursements may be paid out until any funds which might be transferred to the management fund from the general fund, had been reimbursed.

Since that time, the question arose as to whether this reimbursement requirement applied to initial transfers to the management fund, or only to any loans which might be made to that fund by the general fund. The obvious answer is that it applies only to subsequent loans, and the FHA apparently understands this to be the case. However, lest there be any possibility of misconstruing congressional intent on this point, I introduced a bill today to make this absolutely clear. In addition, the bill provides that the Commissioner of the FHA will transfer to the new management fund, an amount equal to the premiums already paid by the co-ops which will come under that fund, minus the administrative expenses theretofore incurred. In this way, the management fund will reflect the full strength of the co-op program, right from the start.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the legislation I have drafted is designed to overcome a key obstacle to the implementation of the mutuality provision we enacted last year. At that time, we amended section 213(m) of the National Housing Act to authorize the transfer of funds from the general insurance fund to the management fund, and we provided that before this transfer could be effected, the mortgagee or lender would have to consent to the transfer. There is no legal basis for requiring this consent, for it was not required in the case of other funds which were consolidated into the general fund. In any event, mortgagees have disapproved the transfer of at least 69 cooperative funds, thus thwarting the primary aim of those of us who fought for mutuality. Their disapproval of these transfers is based upon a restriction on the use of FHA debentures, which appears to me to have been a result unintended by the drafters of that provision. I therefore introduced perfecting legislation to remove this restriction. With the restriction removed, the requirement of consent is no longer appropriate and accordingly is also removed. Thus, all accounts of management-type cooperatives will be transferred into the management fund, which we established for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the sole objective of the legislation I have introduced today is to provide equitable treatment for owners of management-type cooperatives. Where a class of property holders has demonstrated over the year its determination and ability to meet its obligations, they should not be called upon to bear the brunt of the defaults of other classes of property holders less heedful of their responsibilities. Outstanding performance must be recognized and rewarded. This has been my steady purpose over the past years, and this is my purpose today. I shall exert every effort to secure the early enactment of this necessary legislation, and I invite all my colleagues to join me in this endeavor.

COLD WAR GI BILL OF RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted with the Senate acceptance of the so-called cold war GI bill of rights. This is a testament to the hard work and dedication of two men: OLIN TEAGUE, the able and beloved chairman of our Veterans' Affairs Committee, and Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, the respected and learned gentleman who chairs the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs in the other body.

Chairman TEAGUE, the author of the Korean war GI bill, initiated both the interest and the legislative action on this issue 8 years ago, and I think he is truly deserving of our heartiest compliments. I know how gratified he must be to see his long years of work come to fruition, and I commend him for his steady and inspiring leadership. It has been a privilege to serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee under his wise and skilled leadership.

Senator YARBOROUGH has labored long and hard for this noble objective. His leadership in the other body, and the public support he inspired, was vital to the realization of this goal. It was a privilege to witness the Senator's testimony before our committee last August. It was a remarkable presentation and clarified many aspects of this subject, contributing greatly to its success.

I think that the veterans of this country, and we in the Congress, can count ourselves fortunate that we have leaders of the caliber of these two gentleman from the Lone Star State of Texas. For without their high purpose and tenacious perseverance, this historic legislative achievement would not have been possible.

AUTHORIZATION FOR FILING OF REPORTS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have until midnight Saturday to file reports on several bills, including H.R. 12264, 12265, 10431, 10674, 1784, and H.J. Res. 343.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE WORK OF THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN VIETNAM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, to our ornithological galaxy about Vietnam—the hawks and the doves—we now add the cuckoos.

Since Columnist Walter Lippmann is the creator of this aviary, I suggest he identify the new species by reading that lulu, the Declaration of Honolulu.

In this, without consultation with them, the American taxpayer and public pledge themselves to "the work of social revolution" in Vietnam and "to the attack on hunger, ignorance and disease" there.

These aims are laudable. I only wish we could carry them out at home. I was, however, apparently under a grand delusion: I thought we were fighting with arms to defeat Communist armed intervention in South Vietnam.

With due respect to all concerned, I can only say that this compulsion by the administration to support the whole world is a real bird.

BUTTER AS WELL AS GUNS TO THE VIETNAMESE FIGHTING THE COMMUNIST INVADERS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Declaration of Honolulu is a true lulu.

The American taxpayer is now pledged to give butter as well as guns to the Vietnamese fighting the Communist invaders. We are pledged to "social revolution" in Vietnam at the same time the administration has cut the school milk program for needy American boys and girls for fiscal 1967 from $30 million way down to $21 million. This is declared to be an austerity move in connection with Vietnam. This is what we used to call playing up to a neighbor while starving your own family.

This is the first practical step by which, through the Federal Government, the American taxpayers are going to raise the standard of living of the whole world. Let us hope this does not end up as such efforts usually do in lowering the standard of living in our own country.

The administration took what its spokesmen concede, is a calculated gamble in trying to produce both Federal guns and Federal butter here at home. Apparently someone forgot our kids would have to give up the milk to make the butter.

I suggest this financial irresponsibility, this making the taxpayer, without asking him, finance a world "revolution," is opposed to everything usually regarded as American.

THE ADMINISTRATION HAS COMMITTED THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER TO FINANCING A SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN VIETNAM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, now that the administration has committed the American taxpayer to financing a social revolution in Vietnam, I wonder how they are going to make sure our social aid of millions or billions does not help the Vietcong.

If there are any true experts on Vietnam, the results to date there do not show it. But I have read in various publications, and in statements by our military, that one of the problems in South Vietnam is that the Vietcong are shooting at our American men one day and peacefully hoeing the primitive fields the next after burying for the time their weapons.

Do our Far Eastern wizards have some way of making sure that most of our taxpayers' money will not reach these farmers so peaceful one day and killing Americans and the innocent in Vietnam the next?

It has been noted that we have been pouring $600 million down the social rathole in Vietnam and the Vietcong still fight.

Anyway, I thought it was the Soviet Union that fostered world revolution, not the United States. Are our taxpayers to be treated like serfs and called upon to pay and pay and pay to help foreigners to a revolution without being consulted, let alone having a chance to vote?

BIG MEETING OF THE BRASS IN HONOLULU

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Dickinson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, we had a big meeting of the brass in Honolulu to deal with the rice paddy branch of the Great Society. A joint pledge was made for a "revolution"—a "social revolution"—which we are to finance.

This is the first practical demonstration we have had of committing the American taxpayer to pay for raising living standards through Government aid in all parts of the world. Outside of the fact that this could well break even this rich country, I find the idea of our conducting "social revolutions" and financing them abroad rather frightening.

I should like to point out that the administration has been pouring $600 million of your money and mine into social reform in Vietnam and, as far as I can learn, the Vietcongs have not even been driven from the south of Vietnam yet.

Maybe if we pour in more of what the administration clearly regards as our unlimited resources, the Communists will not just hold their own but will win in Vietnam. The loser so far, anyway, is the American taxpayer who is tapped daily for some new giveaway.

ADEQUACY OF U.S. SHIPPING

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Tupper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, the first 3 days of House Merchant Marine Subcommittee hearings on the adequacy of U.S. shipping in respect to Vietnam have been informative and enlightening. I am confident that these hearings ordered by the distinguished chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Garmatz], will focus attention on the broader question of the sufficiency of the American merchant marine in relation to its ability to carry our oceanborne commerce and assume the burden of military logistical support when called upon.

The U.S. public must take a greater interest in our merchant marine. More people must seek answers to why American-flag ships carry less than 9 percent of our goods today and why we rank 12th among shipbuilding nations of the world.

I must, in all candor, say that I was amazed at the budget request for appropriations for only 11 to 13 ships for fiscal year 1967 under the Federal ship construction program. In view of the possibility of a long drawn-out conflict in southeast Asia and other U.S. commitments throughout the world, this meager budget request seems incomprehensible. In 1959 the Maritime Administration recommended a level of 20 ships per year. Surely our needs today are not less. In 1961, 31 contracts for ships were awarded; by 1965 this figure had dropped to 14 ships.

There are few if any members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee who agree with the recommendations of the Interagency Maritime Task Force—comprised of representatives of nine Federal agencies—calling for a drastic curtailment of the ship construction program and for building of American ships in foreign shipyards. In my opinion such a policy would be self-defeating and neither in the interests of our maritime industry nor our country.

Mr. Thomas Gleason, president of the International Longshoremen's Association, was a witness today at the Merchant Marine Subcommittee hearings. Mr. Gleason has visited Vietnam on at least two occasions at the request of our Government. He testified that new ships can be unloaded 100 percent quicker than the old Victory ships and at 100 percent less cost to U.S. taxpayers. In reply to a question I addressed to him regarding the cut in ship construction funds that would allow no more than 13 new ships for fiscal 1967, Mr. Gleason commented:

> The Egyptians build more than 13 ships per year.

The distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Morton], a member of the subcommittee, has spoken of the reserve fleet as a "pile of iron" that "cannot be activated fast enough."

Mr. Speaker, we cannot consider one phase of the plight of our U.S. merchant marine without considering the total picture. There must be speedy and drastic action to preserve the American merchant marine, to strengthen it, and to improve upon its quality. Certainly we have some of the most modern and up-to-date ships afloat, but we must look at the entire fleet and act accordingly. It has been my personal opinion for many years that the so-called runaway flag device should be curbed and many more cargo vessels should be built each year in U.S. shipyards with help from the U.S. Government.

The President of the United States in his 1965 state of the Union message pledged that he would recommend a new policy for our merchant marine. I sincerely hope that the Chief Executive will now consider it timely to introduce a bold new program calling for more U.S.-built ships of the highest quality, equipped with the most up-to-date equipment.

END U.S. DISCRIMINATION ABROAD

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Schweiker] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I have today asked the President to end the religious discrimination practiced in the assignment of U.S. employees to some overseas posts. This outrageous practice is preventing assignment of qualified Jewish employees to U.S. posts in Arab bloc countries.

For several months I have been investigating this matter and my inquiries have now produced an admission of the administration's discriminatory practice in a letter which I have received from the Department of State.

By its demonstrated willingness to go along with the anti-Semitism practiced by these Arab bloc countries when assigning U.S. personnel abroad, the administration is guilty of following a double standard, properly outlawing discrimination by private employers at home but improperly discriminating in assigning its own employees abroad.

The Department of State informs me that:

> While the United States does not normally take into account the religion of its employees in assigning them for duty abroad, this is regrettably a factor which cannot be ignored in the case of certain countries whose policies in this respect we cannot control however much we disagree with them. The United States tries not to assign any employee to a country where he will be unacceptable to the host government.

U.S. military and civilian employees are required to state their religion when applying for a visa to enter Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United Arab Republic. The State Department advises me that "a person of the Jewish faith might not be allowed to enter these countries."

The administration defends its discriminatory practice by pointing out that any government can refuse to accept an employee officially assigned by another government through the simple expediency of declaring him persona non grata.

The deplorable discrimination practiced by the administration in the assignment of U.S. employees to Arab bloc countries is a national disgrace. The people of this Nation can be justifiably outraged to learn that this administration has been practicing religious discrimination in the assignment of Government employees.

I have asked the President today to immediately advise all Government departments and agencies that no religious tests or distinctions will be tolerated in the travel or overseas assignment of Government employees.

A much-needed change of attitude by the administration might do a great deal to curb the effect of these anti-Semitic travel sanctions on U.S. citizens and employees.

The United States should refuse to respect the discriminatory restrictions which these nations seek to impose, not honor them. U.S. leadership in this matter might well attract widespread support from other nations.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in requesting most vigorously that President Johnson stop this discrimination at once.

Mr. Speaker, I should like at this point to insert an article from the Philadelphia Inquirer relating the disturbing case of a constituent, Edward P. Hunt, of Bala-Cynwyd, Pa. Mr. Hunt was fired from his job with the U.S. Army-Air Force Exchange Service last year when he refused to sign an anti-Israeli visa sought by the Libyan Government. He was reinstated with full back pay after I protested the firing to Defense Secretary McNamara.

PENTAGON BOWS ON BIAS PROTEST—AREA MAN WINS VISA CASE

WASHINGTON, November 13.—Congressional protests have won reinstatement and back pay for a graduate of St. Joseph's College in Philadelphia who was fired from his civilian job with a Pentagon agency for refusing to sign a visa declaration requested by the Libyan Government.

Edward P. Hunt, 31, would not sign because he regarded the declaration as anti-Jewish. "I just feel that discrimination against any religious group is wrong," he said.

TAUGHT TOLERANCE

Hunt is a Roman Catholic, one of 11 children of Mr. and Mrs. John J. Hunt, of 138 Union Avenue, Bala, Lower Merion Township. From his earliest years, he said, his parents taught him to respect the religious beliefs of others, even though they differed from his own.

Adherence to this teaching received perhaps its most severe test for Hunt last spring when he arrived at Nuremberg, Germany, on his way to Wheelus Air Force Base in Libya as a food management specialist of the Army-Air Force Exchange Service.

As related by Representative RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Republican, of Pennsylvania, who helped him win ultimate vindication, Hunt was asked in Nuremberg to sign a Libyan visa application containing the following statement:

"And I know that in case of obtaining any Israeli visa my visa to Libya will be considered invalid."

REFUSES TO SIGN

He refused, on the grounds that signing would make him party to the antireligious conviction of the Libyan Government toward Israel. Libya is a predominantly Moslem country.

SCHWEIKER said Hunt was warned he would be fired if he refused to sign the application. Citing his religious beliefs, Hunt withheld his signature and asked for a hearing. He got, instead, formal notice of his discharge from Brig. Gen. John D. Hintes, commanding general of the European Exchange System.

Returning to the United States at his own expense, Hunt told his story to SCHWEIKER at his office here on May 20. The Congressman wrote a letter of protest to Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara. Senators HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, and JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, also protested.

As a result, Hunt was notified in July he had been reinstated and was reimbursed his 2 months of lost pay, his travel expenses and the cost of shipping his car home from Libya. His point made, Hunt resigned and is now working for Automatic Retailers of America-Slater as manager for food and beverage service at the Davos Ranch Resort at Woodridge, N.Y.

EXPLAINS STAND

Interviewed by telephone at Woodridge, Hunt explained why he refused to sign the application.

"I just feel that discrimination against any religious group is wrong," he said. "I feel a particular affinity for the Hebrew faith because of its similarities to my own faith, the faith in which I was brought up."

Hunt said he has "great respect" for the Moslem faith as well, but believes its practitioners should neither persecute nor be persecuted.

"This goes back to when I was 7 or 8 years old," Hunt said. "During Lent my mother would tell me to stop in at church and say a prayer. Often I would stop at a Hebrew synagogue instead.

"I didn't see any difference then and I don't see the difference now."

COUSIN IS CHAPLAIN

Hunt's father operates an electrical contracting business. He has several cousins in the religious life, including Commander John O'Connor, a Navy chaplain recently decorated for his service in Vietnam.

Hunt was graduated from St. Joseph's College in 1956 with a major in political science, and had 8 years in the restaurant industry in this country before signing on with the Army-Air Force Exchange Service in September 1964.

The service operates post exchanges at U.S. military bases.

Hunt was assigned to Fort Knox, Ky., until January of this year, when he was transferred to Fort Belvoir, Va., for training before his assignment overseas.

A bachelor, Hunt said he signed on with the exchange service out of a desire to travel and also to broaden his professional experience.

There were times, he admitted, when he wondered whether he had made the wisest of choices. Particularly when he found himself several thousand miles from home—jobless at the command of an Army general.

PROBLEMS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE JOB CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], and I addressed this House with reference to problems in the administration of the Job Corps, as illustrated especially by a case in Mountain Home, Idaho. Although two of our colleagues, the gentleman from Idaho, Congressman COMPTON WHITE, and the gentleman from Florida, SAM GIBBONS, have adroitly answered with a smoke screen, both of these gentlemen and the Job Corps have admitted the truth of the important facts we presented. I regret that they chose to conceal these admissions amidst a rain of ill-conceived and unfounded charges that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], and I are misrepresenting an isolated case to undermine the Job Corps. I will not reply in kind because I have great respect for my colleagues. Let me simply say that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and I were proposing the Job Corps concept before either of these worthy gentlemen were in Congress and we have consistently advocated the merits of a sensible Job Corps program.

NOT AN ISOLATED CASE

I shall recount later in my remarks the specific admissions camouflaged by these gentlemen, but let me first deal with their charge that the Mountain Home incident is an isolated case. Far from it. I shall cite today only a few of the large number of cases from all over the country.

CAMP GARY, TEX.

Last July, three Job Corps enrollees in Camp Gary, were charged with shooting two Air Force policemen. Having been booked for assault with intent to murder, they were returned to regular duty in the camp. Job Corps officials hired three separate lawyers to defend the enrollees and the case has not yet come to trial due to delays and "absence of key witnesses."

CAMP BRECKENRIDGE

In August last year a Job Corpsman on leave in Billings, Mont., was charged with shooting at a policeman and wounding a woman in a Billings bar. Job Corps officials not only posted a $2,500 bond and are paying for an attorney, they have flown the enrollee and a security guard back and forth from Camp Breckenridge, Ky., to Billings at least twice and perhaps more. The case has still not come to trial and the corpsman remains an enrollee in Camp Breckenridge. The apparent estimate of cost in this case is a minimum of $1,000 to the taxpayers and perhaps a great deal more. Senator LEE METCALF, Democrat of Montana, was quoted as saying:

> The idea of the Job Corps in my opinion is a great idea, but this incident is wrong and really burns me up.

The Senator continues:

> These dropouts and malcontents are being coddled and complimented for their derogatory behavior.

KINGSPORT, TENN.

In December a warrant was issued in Kingsport, Tenn., against two young men for allegedly bludgeoning two victims with a lead pipe. They left the town that morning for two Illinois Job Corps camps before the warrant could be served.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on with examples of this nature. Job Corps camps are, and should be, for hard core youngsters, many of whom have had brushes with the law. They need sympathetic understanding. They also need to learn discipline and social values such as respect for law and order. The present policy of Job Corps officials too often undermines this whole purpose.

MOUNTAIN HOME, IDAHO

In the Mountain Home case, my two colleagues and the Job Corps have now openly admitted the following devastating facts:

First. An enrollee named Paul Dennis Jones did attack a fellow corpsman with a deadly weapon in a Job Corps dormitory.

Second. Jones was a three-time felony loser, including conviction for attempted murder.

Third. Job Corps screening procedures are so haphazard that they had no idea of Jones' previous record when they took him in the Job Corps.

Fourth. Jones was in a capacity of leadership in the Mountain Home Camp, serving as dormitory leader, wing leader, and squad leader.

Fifth. The Job Corps does not deny that the victim of the assault was drummed out of the Job Corps by friends of Jones.

Sixth. The Job Corps did pay for an attorney and apparently for psychiatric treatment. A maximum of $50 of this cost may be deducted from the enrollee's readjustment allowance, the rest to be paid from Job Corps funds.

Seventh. Job Corps officials from Washington did telegraph the court that they would accept Jones back in the Job Corps. This was done at the time of sentencing by the court, when the full probation report showing his previous convictions was certainly available. Job Corps officials blithely claim that even at that time, when they agreed to accept Jones back, they knew nothing of his previous felony record.

Eighth. The Job Corps still has no procedure for screening applicants with felony records so that they can conform to parole and probation requirements.

Mr. Speaker, the latter point raises one of the silliest of the answers apparently given to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], by Job Corps officials. I quote my colleague:

> There is no national file of parolees or juvenile offenders; and there is no way, except for a prohibitively costly security check, in which every facet of an applicant's life can be checked.

I would inform my colleague and the Job Corps that every State maintains records of parolees and probationers in a bureau of identification. In addition, if applicants were fingerprinted, as every inductee in the military service is fingerprinted, felony records could be checked overnight with the FBI. This is done constantly by sheriffs and police officials in our smallest communities around the country.

Mr. Speaker, when the Job Corps takes an applicant who has a felony record, they should know about it. The Job Corps has a direct responsibility to work out provisions so that they are not a party to removing parolees and probationers from States, thereby violating State law. I am informed that the Council of State Governments has been unsuccessfully trying to work out this matter with the Job Corps. It should be done immediately. The cases the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and I have cited are but a few of the many that have occurred in the Job Corps. They are not isolated instances. They are established policy of the Job Corps.

I am aggrieved that our two colleagues chose to slash back blindly and personally when we brought the Mountain Home case to the attention of the House. Our statements were based solidly on facts compiled by the attorney general of Idaho, Mr. Allan Shepard, and a large number of other officials in Idaho, including the prosecuting attorney, Mr. Fred Kennedy, who told me he had reviewed the attorney general's memo and approved it. As I stated to the House on Tuesday, the prosecuting attorney wanted it made clear that Job Corps officials cooperated with him fully after he refused to return Jones to the Mountain Home Camp for administrative action.

I include at this point in the RECORD the full memorandum of facts given to us by Idaho officials, along with an excerpt from Bulletin No. 66-40 of the Job Corps, relating to legal services for corpsmen in Job Corps conservation centers:

DECEMBER 31, 1965.

This memorandum is written at the combined suggestions of certain persons who attended a meeting recently in the office of Mr. Sylvan Jeppesen, U.S. attorney. In attendance were Mr. Fred Kennedy, prosecuting attorney for Elmore County, Mr. L. E. Clapp, warden of the Idaho State Penitentiary, Mr. Mark Maxwell, vice chairman of the board of corrections, Mr. Al Roard, parole and probation officer, Mr. Bill Lesh, of the Employment Security Agency, Mr. Allen G. Shepard, attorney general of the State of Idaho and his two assistants.

Mr. Jeppesen stated that he had been requested by Senator CHURCH to attend said meeting, which was called primarily at the instance of Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Clapp.

The discussion involved a recent criminal incident at the Job Corps camp at Mountain Home, Idaho. It was the consensus of those present at the meeting that the entire congressional delegation should be informed both as to the circumstances and the thinking of the group regarding corrective action which should be taken.

On or about November 15, 1965, a vicious fight took place in one of the dormitories of the Job Corps camp at Mountain Home. Said assault allegedly took place as a result of Truley Tillman, a corpsman, playing a radio in a manner disturbing to the other occupants of the dormitory. The dormitory leader, one Paul Dennis Jones, brutally beat Truley Tillman about the head and face. While sitting astride the prone body of Tillman, Jones produced a knife and slashed Tillman about the face and hands, and then plunged the knife into the abdomen of Tillman inflicting a wound of approximately 2½ inches in depth.

The matter was reported almost immediately to Mr. Kennedy as county prosecutor. Because of the question of Federal enclave, the Federal Bureau of Investigation had been called. An FBI investigator was dispatched to the scene that night, interrogated Jones and obtained from him a statement admitting participation in the assault. Mr. Kennedy was approached that night by officials of the Job Corps, who attempted to convince Mr. Kennedy that there should be no criminal proceedings filed against Jones and he should be released to the Corps for administrative action. No person in the Job Corps camp, either corpsmen or official, would sign the criminal complaint against Jones for assault with a deadly weapon, and Mr. Kennedy was, therefore, required to sign the complaint himself.

It was necessary to issue subpenas and require attendance of Job Corps witnesses in court. The Job Corps officials, through their Washington, D.C., office, hired Mr. Robert Rowett, an attorney at Mountain Home, to represent the accused at Federal expense.

At the hearing held therein, Jones entered a plea of guilty to assault with a deadly weapon, and as is usual in such cases, the district judge deferred imposing sentence pending presentence investigation.

At the hearing for sentencing, officials from the Job Corps camp were present. A telegram from the Job Corps headquarters in Washington, D.C., was submitted to the court, which requested that the judge place Jones on probation and affirmatively stated that if said Jones were placed on probation by the court he would be accepted by the Job Corps and returned to the Job Corps camp.

In the course of the presentence investigation, it was determined that Jones is a three-time loser on felony charges, having been convicted and served sentences in California State correctional institutions. The criminal record of Jones can be summarized as follows: At the age of 16, he attempted to kill two persons by firing nine shots from a revolver. He was admitted to the California Fort Springs Boy's Camp. In 1962 he was convicted of auto theft and received a jail sentence and 3 years probation. Later in 1962, he was convicted of auto theft and sentenced to an additional 2 years probation. In 1963, he was adjudged a parole violator, convicted of another auto theft and sentenced to the Soledad Correctional Institution. In 1964, he was paroled and on September 8, 1965, was arrested for driving with a revoked or suspended driver's license, and served a total of 25 days in jail.

At the time of his induction into the Job Corps, he was, and still remains a parolee of California correctional system. Idaho, as are all States, is a member of the Interstate Compact on Parole and Probations. Under the terms of said compact, each State agrees that it will not permit one of its parolees or probationers to move to another State's jurisdiction without, in advance, informing the receiving State of such desire and making arrangements for the supervision of such parolee or probationer by the receiving State during the balance of parolee or probationer's time. No such notification was received by the State of Idaho, or its board of corrections from either the State of California or the Job Corps. We were informed that said Jones, while at the Job Corps camp, was made a supervisor of other corpsmen in three capacities: Dormitory leader, wing leader, and squad leader which would indicate he had rather close supervision of other corpsmen.

Mr. Kennedy has further stated that he has received practically no cooperation from fellow job corpsmen witnesses in investigating or processing the defendant for what is obviously a serious crime in the felony category. This, in spite of the fact that the defendant was a three-time convicted felon and but for extremely fortunate circumstances, his latest victim would have died.

One of the eyewitnesses to the assault, another corpsman, called by Mr. Kennedy to testify under oath, refused to state that he had seen the assault with the knife, although standing within 3 feet of the scene. Mr. Kennedy states that he is convinced that this witness is guilty of outright perjury. The victim of the assault was so mistreated and threatened by friends of Jones that he has now resigned from the Job Corps and has left the State of Idaho.

Jones was recently brought before the Third District Court in Boise for sentencing, at which time Job Corps officials and his lawyer, Mr. Rowett, also appeared. The district judge, Hon. J. Ray Durtschi, withheld sentence on Jones and placed him on probation for 2 years, with the condition that he serve 4 months in jail, and then return to the Job Corps. A further condition was that he receive psychiatric treatment.

I am sure I reflect the consensus of the group in stating that the concept of the Job Corps and the philosophy which led to its establishment is laudable in every respect. Such provides an opportunity for underprivileged youth to be trained for work and obtain necessary education. We think it is obvious that a group of young people in the 16 to 21 age bracket, most of whom are lacking in education and in the opportunity to compete in our society, are perhaps the most highly impressionable group of persons who could be assembled. Many of them have already had minor brushes with the law. I cannot think of a greater tragedy than having such a group of young people exposed to what is obviously a vicious and mentally disturbed person. To compound the problem, such a person was placed in a position of authority and responsibility over these same highly impressionable corpsmen.

We feel from this incident can be drawn the obvious conclusion that the screening process of the Job Corps is at times, at least, a complete failure. We are informed that the officials at the local Job Corps camp are unable to, or have not determined how many, if any, of their corpsmen are on a present active status of parole or probation from other States. The State board of corrections is reasonably positive that such situations exist and in conformance with the interstate compact, are desirous of being informed of the existence of parolees and probationers from other States who are presently residing within Idaho. We feel this is particularly necessary since we are informed that the Job Corps has no interest in the supervision of parolees or probationers.

We also feel it pertinent to point out that the officials of the State of Idaho concerned with supervising probationers and parolees have had very fine cooperation with the armed services regarding such supervisory problems.

It is also the consensus of the group that the basic concept of a Job Corps, as announced to the public at large, was not to provide rehabilitation institutions for criminals. The public acceptance of the Job Corps locations was, we felt, based on the asserted purpose of the Job Corps as providing training and education for underprivileged young people who deserved an opportunity.

From my own personal standpoint, and while I may not reflect the concensus of the group, I must state that I am highly shocked and indignant at the use of Federal moneys to furnish legal counsel, bail, psychiatric evaluation and treatment, etc., to an accused, regardless of whether he be a Federal employee, State employee or whatever.

As you know, our system of criminal justice in the State of Idaho for many years has required the appointment of legal counsel for indigent defendants and the reports of our supreme court are replete with opinions stating that the failure to fully and fairly advise an accused of his right to legal counsel, and to furnish such counsel, constitutes the deprival of constitutional rights. I seriously question the existence of any statutory authorization for such expenditure of Federal funds. Such certainly has never been the case in regard to armed services personnel and I can see no difference between the furnishing of counsel to a job corpsman, Federal employee, and the furnishing of legal counsel to a mailman, a U.S. attorney, an elevator operator in a post office building or a U.S. Senator, any one of whom could be charged with murder or an attempted murder.

We sincerely believe that these matters demand your attention and investigation, if the Job Corps is to continue to have the public confidence and carry out the very laudable program for which it was designed.

I should add that Mr. Kennedy some time ago, wrote to the Director of the program, Mr. Sargent Shriver, relative to the problems discussed herein, and has not, as yet, received the courtesy of a reply.

Allan G. Shepard,
Attorney General,
State of Idaho.

Excerpts From the Office of Economic Opportunity Bulletin No. 66–40

It is Job Corps policy to provide legal services to corpsmen faced with criminal proceedings. The Job Corps is intensely interested in protection of the rights of corpsmen at all times from the moment they are enroute to Job Corps conservation centers for initial assignments until they are discharged.

Attorney's fees shall be deducted from the corpsman's readjustment allowance at a rate of $5 per hour for time expended in a judicial proceeding and $3 per hour for time expended in office consultation and preparation. The total amount thus deducted from the corpsman's readjustment allowance shall not exceed $50 in any case. The difference between the corpsman's contribution to his legal defense payments and the actual fees of the attorney will be paid by Job Corps up to the limits of the Criminal Justice Act of 1964. Reasonably necessary expenses incurred by the attorney in handling the case will be reimbursed by the Job Corps, but will not be charged to the corpsman.

When a corpsman is faced with criminal proceedings, the center director should retain an attorney to represent him.

* * * * *

Provide the corpsman with the opportunity to select an attorney of his choice, and inform the corpsman that fees will be deducted from his readjustment allowance at the rate of $5 per hour for time expended in a judicial proceeding and $3 per hour for time expended in office consultation and preparation, up to the $50 limit. If the corpsman refuses an attorney on this basis, the center director should attempt to have an attorney supplied by a local legal service organization or appointed by the court. In any case where a corpsman is faced with criminal proceedings, the center director should immediately notify Job Corps Operations Center by teletype.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. Is it not true that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie], were not basically opposed to the principle of fighting poverty? I know that the gentlemen are interested in the battle against poverty. Their opposition, therefore, is not on the basis of principle but on the basis of the administration of the program, the way it is put together, and the manner in which it was pushed through the Congress, as well as the manner in which the administration was attempting to rush this through—partially for political gain. Is that a good summation?

Mr. GOODELL. It certainly is. I thank the gentleman for that observation; and I would document this with the fact that both the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] and I, proposed a residential skills center on an experimental basis as early as 1961. We proposed it then as an amendment to the Juvenile Delinquency Act.

I have long believed that there is a place for this kind of training center, for youngsters requiring a change of environment in order to respond to education and training. We wanted it done at that time, in 1961, on an experimental basis, and then to extend this experience into a broader national program.

We were opposed in that effort by the administration and by the leadership of the committee at that time. Subsequently, in 1963, we were able to get a residential skills center as an amendment to the Vocational Education Act, which was landmark legislation in 1963. It would have provided for a major installation here in the District of Columbia and in several other metropolitan areas.

Once again, however, the administration did not fund this program, so that it never got off the ground.

In 1964 the poverty program started mass production of Job Corps camps, without the benefit of the experience that would have prevented many of these problems.

I will say to the gentleman that I strongly favor the Job Corps concept, and I think Mr. QUIE and I have proven this by our record.

We also proposed preschool and early school training as early as 1961. This was before it derived its name from our gracious first lady of Headstart, when it was put in as a part of the poverty program in 1964.

From 1961 through 1963 we were trying to get such a program funded federally through our States and our educational system. I believe this has been essentially a successful program despite some administrative problems with it, but we could not get it until 1964 in the Poverty Act when it was put in as a part of the community action program. Unfortunately, because it was put in there, they are not getting enough funds and we will not be able to fund anywhere near all of the applications for Headstart in the coming year. There are something like $650 million in applications for Headstart pending. In the President's new budget he has put $260 million for this, which will fund about half of these programs out of the poverty program.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. GOODELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BELL. Is it not also true, aside from the point you have mentioned, that the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], were instrumental in developing many amendments that were opposed during the writing of this bill, which were automatically defeated by the other side of the aisle for reasons that are difficult to understand, due to the fact that not enough time was given to a study of these amendments? Was it the feeling of the gentleman from New York, that this was true?

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman from California is too modest. He served on the same committee. He also prepared and offered a great many amendments in the committee and on the floor with reference to the poverty program when it was originally proposed and debated in 1964. The gentleman is absolutely correct. At that time there was a feeling prevailing in this Congress that we could not change the poverty program at all. They had to take what the President offered us without constructive change of any nature. Democrats and Republicans had amendments turned down in the committee on this basis. Subsequently, in 1965, when many of us were concerned about the problems that had developed, and which incidentally we had been warning of in the original debate, we were still unable to get constructive amendments properly considered in the committee or on the floor. They were voted down almost automatically.

Mr. BELL. If the gentleman will yield further, is it not true there were some amendments proposed, and the one that comes to mind is the one referred to as the "three-legged stool," under which certain members of the poverty areas would be represented on the various committees?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes.

Mr. BELL. These proposals were made, but were defeated in committee. They were the very proposals that would have precluded the controversy over representation of the poor. As I recall it, it was proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct. Mr. QUIE offered a specific amendment in committee and offered it again on the floor of the House. I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], offered one on the floor, also, to require participation of the poor at the policymaking level. Mr. QUIE's amendment was to require at least one-third of the representatives on the community action board to be selected by, and representative of, the poor themselves. This amendment was turned down by the other side of the aisle with the words that it was not necessary. I think the history of the poverty program since those amendments were offered proves how necessary they were. We could have avoided a great deal of difficulty, and the waste of human resources and monetary resources which occurred, if we had taken that amendment at that time.

Mr. BELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TODD. I take it that the gentleman is offering constructive criticism of Job Corps operations.

Mr. GOODELL. I certainly am. I want it taken in that spirit. I think that the original speech that Mr. QUIE and I made on Monday was constructive in this respect. We pointed out how much we believe in the Job Corps concept if it is done properly. We are very concerned at the philosophy which we think now permeates the administration of the Job Corps in this respect.

Mr. TODD. Would the gentleman agree, with a massive need such as we have in terms of education of the boys who need help, that we need a massive program? And, of course, to develop a massive program we realize that we need new concepts of education and that we require patience, understanding, and a degree of imagination? We have to try this, and if this does not succeed, we have to try that. Really, time is going to be the test of whether this is the most successful and most economical and most helpful way for the boys to become productive and responsible members of society. Would the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. GOODELL. I agree very wholeheartedly with the concept of experimentation and demonstration. I agree that the Job Corps offers a very significant opportunity here to help youngsters who need help in helping themselves. I strongly support this concept. As I said in my earlier remarks, I wish that in 1961, when Mr. QUIE and I were proposing this on an experimental basis, we had been able to get the votes and the support of the administration. Then we could have had experience in some of these camps before we launched into mass production of camps. But the point of my remarks and those of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] on Monday is that we should get this back on the track now. There are demonstrated mistakes being made by the Job Corps officials in their training and in their selection of enrollees. One of the worst things that is happening is the haphazard screening process when they take these enrollees. As the gentleman is perhaps aware, I was the author of the Manpower Development and Training Act that was substituted here on the floor of the House in 1962. We have many facets of that program that are available to young people 16 to 22.

Then, we expanded it the following year on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. Speaker, there should be an evaluation of each youngster in order to see if he can best perform some of this kind of work in his home environment under manpower or other programs, or if he should be transferred to a Job Corps camp elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, the Job Corps policy is to send these boys a long way from their home. There should be a very careful evaluation to determine if this is the best thing for a particular youngster. That kind of careful evaluation, coordinated with other programs, is not being followed today. It is a very haphazard operation.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TODD. Is it my understanding that the Job Corps does have such an evaluation program underway, and that they do hope to make some determinations in order to determine whether it is advisable to send boys as far away as they do at the present time? In my consideration this is still an open question, and it is difficult to resolve, I believe, because of the very nature of the program. We cannot say whether or not this or that is a correct answer as to the course we may have to follow within the next year or two. We would like to have more reliable figures and other data on which to act in order to come to that judgment.

Mr. GOODELL. I will concede that in any large program of this nature one could expect some mistakes to be made in any event in the screening and the assignment of these boys. But in this instance there is really no good, acceptable screening procedure being followed by the Job Corps.

This case that I cited of the three-time felony loser who was taken to the Job Corps camp at Mountain Home, Idaho, is a case well in point. This boy was put into a position of leadership over other boys. This represents a good example of what I am talking about, because the Job Corps officials, when we pointed this out to them on the floor of the House on Monday, responded that they had no idea that he was on parole. We said "Why can you not check this kind of thing? You certainly can find out if a man has been convicted three times as a felon. We have all of the fingerprint records in the FBI to which you can go." The Job Corps said that they do not fingerprint these boys. But we do fingerprint all of the inductees who are taken into the military service. I do not feel that these young men who are taken into the Job Corps are any better than the average boy who serves his country in the military service. I do believe that it is a very simple procedure to determine an applicant's criminal record. I do not say that they should automatically bar people who have a felony record from the Job Corps camps. However, I believe they ought to know about that record. Proper experts ought to assess this problem fully before they induct a man into the Job Corps. Their haphazard kind of screening is very well illustrated by the Mountain Home case. However, we obviously have many, many other examples of this kind of thing, not quite as extreme as the case at Mountain Home. The Job Corps by their selection procedures cannot even tell how many fugitives from justice they have in their camps, perhaps leading the other enrollees with official authority.

The Job Corps officials finally responded by saying:

> We were referred this man Jones from the California Employment Security Office, and they never told us that he had a felony record.

This clearly illustrates the fact that the Job Corps officials do not have a screening procedure themselves. They apparently just said to the office in California "Send us some young men that you think will work out in a Job Corps program," and the employment service did so. It is not the obligation of the employment service to find out if a man has a felony record, but it should be the responsibility of the Job Corps.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield further to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TODD. I would like to comment to the effect that I, too, believe that we should offer constructive criticism to the operations of the Job Corps. I feel that this has been one of my responsibilities. I have tried to offer my suggestions in a constructive manner. I am well aware of some of the administrative problems which they have had. I think these problems have been most difficult in some cases. I think they could have solved them more rapidly and with a much better effect on the community involved.

But at the present time I am inclined to believe that these problems—at least, those with which I am familiar—are well on their way to being behind us. I believe that in the last year the Job Corps with which I am familiar has made great progress, and that there is a reasonable expectation that it will fulfill its important duties.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Michigan, and I wish I were as optimistic as he is about this. However, I see no indication at this point, from the highest level of the Office of Economic Opportunity or the Job Corps, that they are going to change the present policy of handling situations such as that described at Mountain Home, where this assault occurred. They are defending it. They are not admitting any mistakes, except one: "We did not know he had three felony convictions on his record." However, they took Jones into the Job Corps and when this situation came to light they threw up their arms and said: "How are we to know? How could we possibly know?"

Mr. Speaker, any village police chief of this country could tell them how to find out about felony records, and if they do not know how to do this, they are not competent to be in charge of the Job Corps in this country.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. I would like to commend the gentleman from New York for the study which he has made of the poverty program in the last 2 years. I also commend him for his efforts throughout the country to bring out the difficult problems that this program faces as a result of poor administration and the poor wording of the bill in its conception.

I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of his efforts, we may bring some changes in this legislation through sound amendments.

Then perhaps we may all share some of the optimism of the gentleman on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend the gentleman for the statement he has made to the House of Representatives with respect to this situation. To me it is incredible that there should be, especially in any Job Corps camp, a leader of young men who is a three-time loser on felony convictions. This is unpardonable. It is inexcusable to put that kind of a leader over young men who have clean records. I am unable to understand why the administration of the Job Corps is so lax that this sort of thing can possibly happen.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. Let me say that the stock answer that has been given to that is that we are harping on an isolated case. Unfortunately, the tragic thing about it is that it is not an isolated case. The Job Corps by its own admission has said they could have hundreds of felony violators in the Job Corps camps because they do not know whether the Job Corps enrollees have felony records or not. They do not know whether they are on probation or on parole in a State. The obligation under parole or probation is to remain in a State under supervision.

The Job Corps goes in and solicits young men and takes them out to a Job Corps camp somewhere else, where they are in violation of parole. The Job Corps officials then come back, and my two colleagues come back, and say that the Job Corps did not violate the interstate compact on parole and probation. The Federal Government is not a party to these compacts, they say. The States make these compacts. The Federal Government is not bound by it. What kind of a technical evasion is that? The Federal Government put these boys in the Job Corps camp, having taken them out of the States where they are supposed to remain under supervision.

This kind of thing is going on elsewhere as you know. The Job Corps officials refuse to say that they will change this policy. They should call such slipshod practices to an abrupt halt.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by saying once again—I am a very strong advocate of a poverty war—I believe this country has been waging an effective war on poverty throughout its history. We were spending in 1964, when we passed the poverty act, $100 billion total from State, Federal, and local and private sources to fight poverty. This fact was cited in a social security bulletin from the administration itself. We urgently need to do more. The right kind of war on poverty can win this important war in the future—in the foreseeable future.

But the kind of war that we are waging today will not do that. It wastes money and wastes human resources and worst of all, it plants the seeds of even greater frustration and cynicism in the poor who have had their expectations raised so high by the great fanfare attached to the war on poverty.

CURB NUCLEAR WEAPONS SPREAD

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the gravest threat to mankind today—graver even than the war in Vietnam and starvation in the subcontinent—arises from the rapid spread of nuclear weapons. It is essential that we find some means to curtail further proliferation.

I have today introduced a resolution calling for stepped-up U.S. efforts on this most serious problem.

I should like now to express my strongly held view that all present nuclear powers, including France and Red China, should be invited to the World Disarmament Conference recently proposed by the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

While I recognize that any treaty that may be negotiated with other nations in this field would be referred to the U.S. Senate, the limitations of nations having independent nuclear weapon capability is of such importance to the whole world that an indication of the consensus of the House of Representatives as well as the Senate is desirable.

ENACT A FAIR PACKAGING AND LABELING LAW NOW

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a fair packaging and labeling bill, similar to S. 985 introduced by my esteemed colleague, Senator Hart, of Michigan, during the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is frequently said that there is nothing new under the sun. Whether this statement is true or not, the concept of legislation to enforce truthful packaging and labeling is certainly not new.

This year, 1966, marks the 60th anniversary of the original pure food and drugs law, enacted in 1906. This act forbade adulteration and misbranding of foods and drugs sold in interstate commerce.

The 1906 law was a milestone in the history of pure food and drugs and truth-in-packaging legislation.

The next substantial amendment to the basic law occurred 32 years later when the Copeland Act or the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938, passed.

Without going into details at this time, let me just state that this new act strengthened earlier definitions of adulteration and misbranding. Essentially, the act requires that foods, drugs, and cosmetics sold in interstate commerce must meet certain minimum requirements of purity, safety, and labeling.

During the hearings held as early as 1933 on proposed amendments to the 1906 law, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce, chaired by Senator Royal S. Copeland, of New York, many ingenious arguments were cited in opposition. For example, the proposed bill was deemed a "further attempt to extend Government control over business."

Furthermore, one witness declared:

> If we are to meet adjustments proposed by the bill, then you are going to have thousands, yes, millions of dollars lost.

These costs would, of course, necessarily be passed on to the consumer.

Then again, another witness declared that existing laws are adequate; the need is for more vigorous enforcement of these laws. This witness could see nothing wrong with the cumbersome existing procedure of enforcement by which the Government must prove violation of the law on an individual case by case basis.

Eventually those who favored additional legislation won the day in 1938.

In a nutshell, their point of view was this: "The 1906 law has been effective in controlling adulterated and misbranded foods and drugs; it has served to correct many of the abuses that existed at the time of its enactment. But present-day conditions in the food and drug industries are very different from what they were more than a quarter century ago."

And now here we are in the 1960's and again there is much agitation for further truth-in-packaging legislation.

Let me mention briefly some of the most common deceptive practices which have made necessary new legislation to close the gaps in existing law.

First. Lack of standardization of sizes of products and proliferation of fractional amounts.

Because of the widespread use of fractional measures, it is frequently impossible for shoppers to compare prices of goods.

For example, which is the better buy? Two 6¾-ounce cans of tunafish for 63 cents, or one 9¼-ounce can for 43 cents?

In today's market, the plain ordinary pound has frequently shrunk to 15½ ounces, the half-pound is 7¾ or 7½ ounces.

One Federal weights-and-measures official tells us that potato chip packages come in 74 different sizes all under 3 pounds.

Second. Use of deceptive sizes, shapes, and proportions to exaggerate the quantity inside.

For example, plastic jars of hair pomade often look as if they would hold 2 ounces but thanks to hollow sides and a hollow bottom actually held only 1 ounce.

Third. Use of deceptive descriptive adjectives, such as "jumbo quart," "giant" size, and so forth.

When introducing a State truth-in-packaging bill, a Wisconsin State legislator cited the following example of confusion in the marketplace: Among three sizes of soap powder sold by the same manufacturer, there was the "king size" package, containing 5 pounds, 11 ounces, and costing $1.33; the "giant size," containing 3 pounds, 5½ ounces, and costing 79 cents; and the regular size, containing 1 pound, 6 ounces, at a cost of 32 cents. It is difficult to tell at a glance or even to figure with pencil and paper which is the best buy. However, "king size" and "giant size" suggest a bargain. Long division will show in this case that the best buy was the regular size package.

Fourth. "Cents off" promotions. Cents-off labels do not provide the meaningful price information they appear to. They are not price guides at all. They are promotional devices designed to make the buyer believe he is being offered a bargain, and they are deceptive because bargains cannot be determined without price comparisons.

Fifth. Labels with very fine print, obscure location of information, and lack of contrasting colors. For instance, Consumers Union received the following letter:

> Brooklyn, N.Y.,
> *March 8, 1965.*
>
> Dear Consumers Union: ———'s stores have large signs in their windows: "Almond bark, $1.08." It doesn't say per pound or per box or what weight—it says nothing else.
>
> My question to the saleslady produced the following reply: "It is 12 ounces." Upon my query: "Does it say so on the box?" she replied, "I'll try to find it for you. They want people to think it is 1 pound." I enclose the "12 ounces net weight" marking she found on the box; print about 3/32-inch high in a color blending into the color of the box.
>
> This proves again how necessary legislation is as to size and contrasting color of print concerning contents.
>
> Should there already be a regulation by the department of markets of New York City or by some other Government agency, I request that you call their attention to this.
>
> B. G. F.

Sixth. Advertisement of misleading servings. Congressman Seymour Halpern, of New York, stated in his testimony on the proposed 1965 fair packaging and labeling measure:

> Another interesting phenomenon may be witnessed in advertisements which boldly proclaim "four servings" or "six servings." These may be true if we are serving small children who have been nibbling all day long, but if the product is intended to be served to adults, then these ads are grossly misleading.

Seven. Slack fill. One of the most common complaints of consumers is "slack fill." This refers especially to the detergent industry.

As one pamphlet on packaging practices stated:

> There's nothing like air to fill a package. The practice of letting air occupy a significant part of the container is known as "slack fill." Manufacturers usually excuse slack fill by claims that the product settles in the box. Slack fill goes beyond normal settling and is a prevalent practice.

My bill could correct these abuses by:

First. Requiring the net quantity of contents to be stated on either the front panel of packages or labels affixed thereto.

Second. Establishing minimum standards with respect to the prominence of net quantity statements.

Third. Prohibiting the addition to such statements of qualifying words.

Fourth. Specifying exceptions to the foregoing which may be required because of the nature of the particular commodity.

Fifth. Prohibiting the placement upon such packages by persons other than retailers of data relating to possible retail price savings through the purchase of the commodity.

Sixth. Preventing the use of deceptive illustrative matter on packages.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Federal Trade Commission to promulgate regulations, and additional regulations as needed, to preserve fair competition among competing products by enabling consumers to make rational comparisons and to prevent deception.

Such regulations would:

First. Establish reasonable weights or quantities in which the commodity would be distributed for retail sale, provided that no weight established is less than 2 ounces.

Second. Prevent distribution of packages likely to deceive retail purchasers as to net quantity with exceptions for certain packages of distinctive appearance.

Third. Establish standards relating to package size which may be used to characterize quantitatively the contents of packages.

Fourth. Define the net quantity of a commodity which constitutes a serving if such commodity bears a representation as to the number of servings contained.

Fifth. Define standards for the quantitative designation of package contents if such cannot be described in terms of weight, measure, or count.

Sixth. Require the ingredients and composition of commodities to be placed in a prominent position.

Jurisdiction over food, drugs, and cosmetics would be assigned to the Food and Drug Administration of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, while all other consumer commodities would be under the authority of the Federal Trade Commission.

Let me now review briefly what I consider to be the main arguments in favor of my bill.

First. Informed demand by consumers for goods and services is, theoretically at least, the force which directs production into appropriate channels. However, it is very difficult to make rational choices based on quality, quantity, and price, in view of the many different sizes and shapes of packages, cans, and bottles of food products and other merchandise.

Second. If a fair packaging and labeling bill were enacted into law, most of the abuses which I discussed a moment ago would become illegal.

Third. Cheating resulting from questionable packaging techniques is blatant dishonesty.

> Fraud and cheating are commonly practiced in our prepackaged foods—

Charged Arch W. Troelstrup, chairman of the Consumer Education Department of Stephens College. Some sources claim that the American consumer is done out of almost $20 million in grain products alone by these tactics.

Fourth. The ethical businessman is penalized by unfair marketing methods. The honest dealer is severely handicapped by trickery involved in misleading labeling and packaging.

Mr. George P. Larrick, the former Commissioner of Food and Drugs, said in testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee in April 1965, that although most businessmen endeavored to label and package their products legally, a minority indulge in "dishonest and undesirable practices and that this forces the honest competitor to adopt such practices to remain in business."

Mr. Larrick reported further that his agency, the Food and Drug Administration, receives as many complaints about unfair packaging from businessmen as from customers—even more.

Fifth. Protective powers under existing legislation are inadequate for today's conditions.

The Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act are the basic laws concerned with the commodities and practices covered by the bill. In part, they respectively prohibit labeling that "is false or misleading in any particular" or the use of containers "so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading," and "unfair methods of competition in commerce, and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce."

However, the conventional weapons in present legislation were not designed to deal with the complexities of the modern marketplace. Instead, they were designed to deal with the occasional deception which was not a great problem when the relatively few products then available were sold across the counter in the neighborhood store.

Essentially, present law fails for lack of any enforcible authority at all, or for lack of authority to establish generally applicable standards of interpretation. Where authority does not technically exist, each case must nonetheless be fought out individually with no general ground rules for reference. It is no wonder that enforcement is inadequate.

For example, the Food and Drug Administration had one case—concerning packaging of thin mints—in the courts for 3 years and finally lost it. So this requires the Food and Drug Administration to proceed on a case by case without general ground rules to which it can refer and which it can enforce on the manufacturers subject to its jurisdiction.

Of course there is opposition to this bill. It is opposition very much akin to the opposition to the Food and Drug Act 60 years ago. As then, opponents of this measure claim that it is antibusiness, that it involves an unwarranted additional extension of Government into the affairs of business, that it is enough to enforce the laws now on the statute books. In hearings on truth in packaging last spring, we heard such statements as:

> The bill would restrict price reducing competition, be costly to enforce, and hurt free enterprise.

And—

> It will immeasurably increase the cost to the consumer and will not give the consumer any benefits not already provided by existing law.

But just as the fears to the woeful impact of the food and drug laws have proved to be an unwarranted myth, so we need not take too seriously the forebodings of the present opponents of truth in packaging.

Ladies and gentlemen, in the midst of our grave concern over world developments, especially our commitments in southeast Asia, let us not forget the homefront and abandon the goals of the Great Society. To protect the American consumer against abuses in packaging and labeling and to protect the American businessman against unfair methods of competition, we must delay no longer in passing a fair packaging and labeling law. Therefore I urge favorable action by this legislative body on my bill, H.R. 12759.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight Tuesday, February 15, to file a report on H.R. 12752.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Teague of Texas (at the request of Mr. Fountain), for February 10 through February 28, 1966, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Rooney of New York (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Ryan, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, February 16; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Ryan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Gross), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. Goodell (at the request of Mr. Gross), for 60 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Resnick during his special order today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Pucinski.

Mr. Tunney.

Mr. Perkins.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Todd) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Ottinger.

Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Annunzio.

Mr. Satterfield.

Mr. Hansen of Iowa.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gross) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Saylor.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Todd) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Huot.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

> S. 1698. An act to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 14, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 89th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (2 U.S.C. 25), approved February 18, 1948: WALTER B. JONES, First District, North Carolina.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2025. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2026. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of audit of the exchange stabilization fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2027. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the disposal of certain foreign excess property, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 398, 40 U.S.C. 514; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2028. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

2029. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 232, *The Sac and Fox Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, the Sac and Fox Tribe of Missouri, the Sac and Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa, et al., Petitioners* v. *The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2030. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 337, *Absentee Delaware Tribe of Oklahoma, et al., Petitioner* v. *The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2031. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 138, *The Iowa Tribe of the Iowa Reservation in Kansas and Nebraska, the Iowa Tribe of the Iowa Reservation in Oklahoma, et al., Omaha Tribe of Nebraska, et al., the Sac and Fox Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, the Sac and Fox Tribe of Missouri, the Sac and Fox Tribe of Mississippi in Iowa, et al., Petitioners* v. *The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2032. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on measures being taken to control the emission of air pollutants from Federal facilities, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-206; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2033. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of final evaluations of properties of certain carriers, pursuant to the provisions of section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 12752. A bill to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS:

H.R. 12753. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 12754. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 12755. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction or credit against the individual income tax for contributions made to National and State political committees or to certain other political organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 12756. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to provide that the President's annual report to Congress shall be submitted on or before March 31 of each year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 12757. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 12758. A bill to amend section 501(c) (14) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations organized to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARNUM:

H.R. 12759. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 12760. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12761. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 12762. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 12763. A bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12764. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12765. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to reduce the premiums charged for the insurance of certain cooperative housing mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12766. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to permit the more effective operation of the Cooperative Management Housing Insurance Fund; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 12767. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 12768. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to provide that certain forms of copper be admitted free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 12769. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 12770. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 12771. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 12772. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12773. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as it relates to those areas to be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 12774. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to provide for the free importation of certain specialized educational equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 12775. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit certain activities in time of war or armed conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12776. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant leaves of absence with pay to personnel of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in certain instances if he determines that it will serve the national interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 12777. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 12778. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend to June 30, 1966, the period for initial enrollment in the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 833. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that certain activities shall be prohibited during a period of war or armed conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 834. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 586. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all foreign aid be suspended to countries maintaining diplomatic or trade relations with North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Con. Res. 587. Concurrent resolution officially recognizing Waterloo, N.Y., as the birthplace of Memorial Day and authorizing the President to issue an appropriate proclamation relating to the centennial anniversary of the first celebration of Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H. Res. 727. Resolution relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Res. 728. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the withdrawal of American troops from Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. Res. 729. Resolution in support of President Johnson's efforts to negotiate international agreements limiting the spread of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 12779. A bill for the relief of Calogero Palermo and Adelina Turco Palermo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12780. A bill for the relief of Antonio Balsamo and Maria Balsamo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 12781. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mario Orlando Santos-Estevez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 12782. A bill for the relief of Domenico Duca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 12783. A bill for the relief of Dr. Byung Du Hahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1966

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 26, 1966)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Remey L. Clem, rector, St. John's Military School, Salina, Kans., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, Our Heavenly Father, Thou whose infinite power created the unfathomable reaches of time and space yet who willest to live in the hearts of men, we thank Thee for all the blessings of life, and more especially, for Thy manifold gifts to our Nation. They are more than we could desire or pray for. Grant us an increasing awareness of Thy presence among us. Enlighten, we beseech Thee, those who sit in council, give purity of purpose to those who lead, and so transform the hearts of all men that they may place devotion to Thy purposes above personal gain. Bless our country that we may be a constant stronghold of righteousness and a champion of worthy causes. These things we ask through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1966—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 379)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966. If there is no objection, the message will be considered as read and appropriately referred.

The message was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganization of community relations functions in the area of civil rights.

After a careful review of the activities of the Federal agencies involved in the field of civil rights, it became clear that the elimination of duplication and undesirable overlap required the consolidation of certain functions.

As a first step, I issued Executive Orders No. 11246 and No. 11247 on September 24, 1965.

Executive Order No. 11246 simplified and clarified executive branch assignments of responsibility for enforcing civil rights policies and placed responsibility for the Government-wide coordination of the enforcement activities of executive agencies in the Secretary of Labor with respect to employment by Federal contractors and in the Civil Service Commission with respect to employment by Federal agencies.

Executive Order No. 11247 directed the Attorney General to assist Federal agencies in coordinating their enforcement activities with respect to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination in federally assisted programs.

As a further step for strengthening the operation and coordination of our civil rights programs, I now recommend transfer of the functions of the Community Relations Service, established in the Department of Commerce under title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to the Attorney General and transfer of the Service, including the office of Director, to the Department of Justice.

The Community Relations Service was located in the Department of Commerce by the Congress on the assumption that a primary need would be the conciliation of disputes arising out of the public accommodations title of the act. That decision was appropriate on the basis of information available at that time. The need for conciliation in this area has not been as great as anticipated because of the voluntary progress that has been made by businessmen and business organizations.

To be effective, assistance to communities in the identification and conciliation of disputes should be closely and tightly coordinated. Thus, in any particular situation that arises within a community, representatives of Federal agencies whose programs are involved should coordinate their efforts through a single agency. In recent years, the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department has played such a coordinating role in many situations, and has done so with great effectiveness.

Placing the Community Relations Service within the Justice Department will enhance the ability of the Justice Department to mediate and conciliate and will insure that the Federal Government speaks with a unified voice in those tense situations where the good offices of the Federal Government are called upon to assist.

In this, as in other areas of Federal operations, we will move more surely and rapidly toward our objectives if we improve Federal organization and the arrangements for interagency coordination. The accompanying reorganization plan has that purpose.

The present distribution of Federal civil rights responsibilities clearly indicates that the activities of the Community Relations Service will fit most appropriately in the Department of Justice.

The Department of Justice has primary program responsibilities in civil rights matters and deep and broad experience in the conciliation of civil rights disputes. Congress has assigned it a major role in the implementation of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The Department of Justice performs related functions under other acts of Congress. Most of these responsibilities require not only litigation, but also efforts at persuasion, negotiation, and explanation, especially with local governments and law-enforcement authorities. In addition, under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act the Department will be supporting local programs in the area of police-community relations.

The test of the effectiveness of an enforcement agency is not how many legal actions are initiated and won, but whether there is compliance with the law. Thus, every such agency necessarily engages in extensive efforts to obtain compliance with the law and the avoidance of disputes. In fact, title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires each agency concerned to attempt to obtain compliance by voluntary means before taking further action.

Among the heads of Cabinet departments the President looks principally to the Attorney General for advice and judgment on civil rights issues. The latter is expected to be familiar with civil rights problems in all parts of the Nation and to make recommendations for executive and legislative action.

The Attorney General already has responsibility with respect to a major portion of Federal conciliation efforts in the civil rights field. Under Executive Order No. 11247, he coordinates the Government-wide enforcement of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which relies heavily on the achievement of compliance through persuasion and negotiation.

In the light of these facts, the accompanying reorganization plan would transfer the functions of the Community Relations Service and of its Director to the Attorney General. In so providing, the plan, of course, follows the established pattern of Federal organization by vesting all the transferred powers in the head of the department. The Attorney General will provide for the organization of the Community Relations Service as a separate unit within the Department of Justice.

The functions transferred by the reorganization plan would be carried out with full regard for the provisions of section 1003 of title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 relating to (1) cooperation with appropriate State or local, public or private agencies; (2) the confidentiality of information acquired with the understanding that it would be so held; and (3) the limitation on the performance of investigative or prosecutive functions by personnel of the Service.

This transfer will benefit both the Department of Justice and the Community Relations Service in the fulfillment of their existing functions.

The Attorney General will benefit in his role as the President's adviser by obtaining an opportunity to anticipate and meet problems before the need for legal action arises.

The Community Relations Service, brought into closer relationship with the Attorney General and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, will gain by becoming a primary resource in a coordinated effort in civil rights under the leadership of the Attorney General. The Community Relations Service will have direct access to the extensive information, experience, staff, and facilities within the Department and in other Federal agencies.

Finally, the responsibility for coordinating major Government activities under the Civil Rights Act aimed at voluntary and peaceful resolution of discriminatory practices will be centered in one department. Thus, the reorganization will permit the most efficient and effective utilization of resources in this field. Together the Service and the Department will have a larger capacity for accomplishment than they do apart.

Although the reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will not of themselves result in immediate savings, the improvement achieved in administration will permit a fuller and more effective utilization of manpower and will in the future allow the performance of the affected functions at lower costs than would otherwise be possible.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1966.*

WAR AGAINST HUNGER—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 378)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

Men first joined together for the necessities of life—food for their families, clothing to protect them, housing to give them shelter.

These are the essentials of peace and progress.

But in the world today, these needs are still largely unfulfilled.

When men and their families are hungry, poorly clad, and ill housed, the world is restless—and civilization exists at best in troubled peace.

A WAR ON HUNGER

Hunger poisons the mind. It saps the body. It destroys hope. It is the natural enemy of every man on earth.

I propose that the United States lead the world in a war against hunger.

There can only be victors in this war. Since every nation will share in that victory, every nation should share in its costs. I urge all who can help to join us.

A PROGRAM FOR MANKIND

The program I am submitting to Congress today, together with the proposals set forth in my message on foreign assistance, look to a world in which no man, woman, or child need suffer want of food or clothing.

The key to victory is self-help.

Aid must be accompanied by a major effort on the part of those who receive it. Unless it is, more harm than good can be the end result.

I propose:

1. Expanded food shipments to countries where food needs are growing and self-help efforts are underway.

Even with their maximum efforts abroad, our food aid will be needed for many years to come.

2. Increased capital and technical assistance.

Thus, self-help will bear fruit through increased farm production.

3. Elimination of the "surplus" concept in food aid.

Current farm programs are eliminating the surpluses in our warehouses. Fortunately the same programs are flexible enough to gear farm production to amounts that can be used constructively.

4. Continued expansion of markets for American agricultural commodities.

Increased purchasing power, among the hundreds of millions of consumers in developing countries, will help them become good customers of the American farmer.

5. Increasing emphasis of nutrition, especially for the young.

We will continue to encourage private industry, in cooperation with the Government, to produce and distribute foods to combat malnutrition.

6. Provision for adequate reserves of essential food commodities.

Our reserves must be large enough to serve as a stabilizing influence and to meet any emergency.

AMERICA'S PAST EFFORTS

This program keeps faith with policies this Nation has followed since President Franklin D. Roosevelt proclaimed the four freedoms of mankind.

After World War II, we helped to make Europe free from want. We carried out on that continent massive programs of relief, reconstruction, and development.

This great effort—the Marshall plan—was followed by President Truman's point 4, President Eisenhower's act of Bogotá and its successor, President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress. Under these programs we have provided technical and capital assistance to the developing nations.

Our food aid programs have brought over 140 million tons of food to hungry people during the past decade.

Hunger, malnutrition, and famine have been averted.

Schools and hospitals have been built.

Seventy million children now receive American food in school lunch and family and child feeding programs.

Nevertheless the problem of world hunger is more serious today than ever before.

A BALANCE IS REQUIRED

One new element in today's world is the threat of mass hunger and starvation. Populations are exploding under the impact of sharp cuts in the death rate. Successful public health measures have saved millions of lives. But these lives are now threatened by hunger because food production has not kept pace.

A balance between agricultural productivity and population is necessary to prevent the shadow of hunger from becoming a nightmare of famine. In my message on international health and education, I described our increased efforts to help deal with the population problem.

IMPROVING LOCAL AGRICULTURE

Many of the developing countries urgently need to give a higher priority to improving and modernizing their own production and distribution of food. The overwhelming majority of those who till the soil still use the primitive methods of their ancestors. They produce little more than enough to meet their own needs, and remain outside of the market economy.

History has taught us that lack of agricultural development can cripple economic growth.

The developing countries must make basic improvements in their own agriculture.

They must bring the great majority of their people—now living in rural areas—into the market economy.

They must make the farmer a better customer of urban industry and thus accelerate the pace of economic development.

They must begin to provide all of their people with the food they need.

They must increase their exports, and earn the foreign exchange to purchase the foods and other goods which they themselves cannot produce efficiently.

In some developing countries, marked improvement is already taking place. Taiwan and Greece are raising their food output and becoming better cash customers for our food exports every year. Others have made a good beginning in improving agricultural production.

THE NEED FOR SELF-HELP

There is one characteristic common to all those who have increased the productivity of their farms: a national will and determination to help themselves.

We know what would happen if increased aid were dispensed without regard to measures of self-help. Economic incentives for higher production would disappear. Local agriculture would decline as dependence upon United States food increased.

Such a course would lead to disaster.

Disaster could be postponed for a decade or even two—but it could not be avoided. It could be postponed if the United States were to produce at full capacity and if we financed the massive shipments needed to fill an ever-growing deficit in the hungry nations.

But ultimately those nations would pay an exorbitant cost. They would pay it not only in money, but in years and lives wasted. If our food aid programs serve only as a crutch, they will encourage the developing nations to neglect improvements they must make in their own production of food.

For the sake of those we would aid, we must not take that course.

We shall not take that course.

But candor requires that I warn you the time is not far off when all the combined production, on all of the acres, of all of the agriculturally productive nations, will not meet the food needs of the developing nations—unless present trends are changed.

Dependence on American aid will not bring about such a change.

The program I present today is designed to bring about that change.

BETTER NUTRITION

Beyond simple hunger, there lies the problem of malnutrition.

We know that nutritional deficiencies are a major contributing cause to a death rate among infants and young children that is 30 times higher in developing countries than in advanced areas.

Protein and vitamin deficiencies during preschool years leave indelible scars.

Millions have died. Millions have been handicapped for life—physically or mentally.

Malnutrition saps a child's ability to learn. It weakens a nation's ability to progress. It can—and must—be attacked vigorously.

We are already increasing the nutritional content of our food aid contributions. We are working with private industry to produce and market nutritionally rich foods. We must encourage and assist the developing countries themselves to expand their production and use of such foods.

The wonders of modern science must also be directed to the fight against malnutrition. I have today directed the President's Science Advisory Committee to work with the very best talent in this Nation to search out new ways to:

Develop inexpensive, high-quality synthetic foods as dietary supplements. A promising start has already been made in isolating protein sources from fish, which are in plentiful supply throughout the world.

Improve the quality and the nutritional content of food crops.

Apply all of the resources of technology to increasing food production.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR OUR ABUNDANCE

Our farm programs must reflect changing conditions in the United States and the world. Congress has provided—

For American farmers, a continuing prospect of rising incomes.

For American consumers, assurance of an abundance of high quality food at fair prices.

For American taxpayers, less dollars spent to stockpile commodities in quantities greater than those needed for essential reserves.

Today—because of the world's needs, and because of the changing picture of U.S. agriculture—our food aid programs can no longer be governed by surpluses. The productive capacity of American agriculture can and should produce enough food and fiber to provide for:

1. domestic needs,
2. commercial exports,
3. food aid to those developing countries that are determined to help themselves,
4. reserves adequate to meet any emergency, and to stabilize prices.

To meet these needs, I am today directing the Secretary of Agriculture to:

1. Increase the 1966 acreage allotment for rice by 10 percent.

Unprecedented demands arising out of drought and war in Asia require us to increase our rice crop this year. I know that our farmers will respond to this need, and that the Congress will understand the emergency that requires this temporary response.

2. Buy limited amounts of dairy products under the authority of the 1965 act.

We must have adequate supplies of dairy products for commercial markets, and to meet high priority domestic and foreign program needs. Milk from U.S. farms is the only milk available to millions of poor children abroad. The Secretary will use authority in the 1965 act whenever necessary to meet our needs for dairy products.

3. Take actions that will increase soybean production in 1966.

The demand for soybeans has climbed each year since 1960. Despite record crops, we have virtually no reserve stocks. To assure adequate supplies at prices fair to farmers and consumers, the Secretary of Agriculture will use authority under the 1965 act to encourage production of soybeans on acreage formerly planted to feed grains. Feed grain stocks are more than sufficient.

These actions supplement earlier decisions to increase this year's production of wheat and barley. Although our present reserves of wheat are adequate to meet all likely shipments, the Secretary of Agriculture has suspended programs for voluntary diversion of additional spring wheat plantings.

Our 60 million acres now diverted to conservation uses represent the major emergency reserve that could readily be called forth in the critical race between food and population. We will bring these acres back into production as needed—but not to produce unwanted surplus, and not to supplant the efforts of other countries to develop their own agricultural economies.

These actions illustrate how our domestic farm program will place the American farmer in the front ranks in the worldwide war on hunger.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

I recommend a new Food for Freedom Act that retains the best provisions of Public Law 480, and that will:

Make self-help an integral part of our food aid program.

Eliminate the "surplus" requirement for food aid.

Emphasize the development of markets for American farm products.

Authorize greater food aid shipments than the current rate.

Emphasize the building of cash markets and the shift toward financing food aid through long-term dollar credits rather than sales for foreign currencies. Except for U.S. requirements, we look to the completion of that shift by the end of 5 years.

Continue to finance the food aid program under the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Increase emphasis on combating malnutrition. The act will authorize the CCC to finance the enrichment of foods.

Continue to work with voluntary agencies in people-to-people assistance programs.

Provide for better coordination of food aid with other economic assistance.

FOOD AND FIBER RESERVES

I recommend a program to establish the principle of the ever-normal granary by providing for food and fiber reserves.

This program supplements food for freedom.

It establishes a reserve policy that will protect the American people from unstable supplies of food and fiber, and from high prices in times of emergency.

The legislation I recommend to the Congress will enable us to draw strength from two great related assets:

The productive genius of our farmers.

The potential that lies in the 60 million acres now withdrawn from production.

In case of need, most of those acres could be brought back into productive farming within 12 to 18 months. But because of the seasonal nature of farming time would be needed to expand production even under the flexible provisions of the Agriculture Act of 1965. Therefore we need a reserve to bridge this gap.

We have been able to operate without a specific commodity reserve policy in recent years, because the surpluses built up in the 1950's exceeded our reserve needs. This condition has almost run its course.

Under present law, the Secretary of Agriculture must dispose of all stocks of agricultural commodities as rapidly as possible, consistent with orderly marketing procedures. As we continue to reduce our surpluses we need to amend the law to authorize the maintenance of reserve stocks.

The act I recommend will do that.

It will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish minimum reserve levels. Under the act, he must take into account normal trade stocks, consumer and farm prices, domestic and export requirements, crop yield variations and commitments under our domestic and foreign food programs.

The reserve would be used to meet priority needs, under prices and conditions to be determined within the broad guidelines established by existing law.

The act could be implemented in the year ahead without any additional cost to the Government. We are still reducing our surpluses of most agricultural commodities. During the first year of the new program, it is not likely that we will have to purchase any commodity to build up a reserve.

Under the two acts I recommend today, with the farm legislation now on the statute books—and with the foreign assistance program I have recommended—we will be able to make maximum use of the productivity of our farms.

We can make our technology and skills powerful instruments for agricultural progress throughout the world—wherever men commit themselves to the task of feeding the hungry.

A UNIFIED EFFORT

To strengthen these programs our food aid and economic assistance must be closely linked. Together they must relate to efforts in developing countries to improve their own agriculture. The Departments of State and Agriculture and the Agency for International Development will work together, even more closely than they have in the past in the planning and implementing of coordinated programs.

In the past few years AID has called upon the Department of Agriculture to assume increasing responsibilities through its International Agricultural Development Service. That policy will become even more important as we increase our emphasis on assisting developing nations to help themselves.

Under the Food for Freedom Act, the Secretary of Agriculture will continue to have authority to determine the commodities available. He will act only after consulting with the Secretary of State on the foreign policy aspects of food aid and with other interested agencies.

We must extend to world problems in food and agriculture the kind of cooperative relationships we have developed with the States, universities, farm organizations, and private industry.

AN INTERNATIONAL EFFORT

It is not enough that we unify our own efforts. We cannot meet this problem alone.

Hunger is a world problem. It must be dealt with by the world.

We must encourage a truly international effort to combat hunger and modernize agriculture.

We shall work to strengthen the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The efforts of the multilateral lending organizations, and of the United Nations development program should be expanded—particularly in food and agriculture.

We are prepared to increase our participation in regional as well as worldwide multilateral efforts, wherever they provide efficient technical assistance and make real contributions to increasing the food-growing capacities of the developing nations. For example, we will undertake a greatly increased effort to assist improvements in rice yields in the rice-eating less developed countries, as part of our cooperation with FAO during this International Rice Year.

FOR A WORLD AT PEACE

The program I recommend today will raise a new standard of aid for the hungry, and for world agriculture.

It proclaims our commitment to a better world society—where every person can hope for life's essentials—and be able to find them in peace.

It proclaims the interdependence of mankind in its quest for food and clothing and shelter.

It is built on three universal truths:

That agriculture is an essential pursuit of every nation,

That an abundant harvest is not only a gift of God, but also the product of man's skill and determination and commitment,

That hunger and want—anywhere—are the eternal enemies of all mankind.

I urge Congress to consider and debate these suggestions thoroughly and wisely in the hope and belief we can from them fashion a program that will keep freemen free, and at the same time share our leadership and agricultural resources with our less blessed brothers throughout the world.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1966.*

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Commerce and the Executive Reorganization Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 924 and that it and the following three measures be considered in sequence. I assume this time will be charged to my side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORRECTION OF INEQUITIES WITH RESPECT TO THE BASIC COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN TEACHERS IN THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 6845) to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments, on page 2, after line 12, to strike out:

(c) (1) Section 5 of such Act (73 Stat. 214; Public Law 86-91; 5 U.S.C. 2353) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) A teacher shall not be eligible to hold any teaching position or positions for any period in excess of five consecutive years, except that—

"(1) a teacher who has performed service in any teaching position or positions and has returned to the United States for a period of not less than one year shall be eligible to hold a teaching position or positions for an additional period of not to exceed five consecutive years, and

"(2) the secretary of each military department is authorized, when he deems it necessary in the public interest in individual cases, to provide, in accordance with regulations which shall be prescribed and issued by the Secretary of Defense, for the extension of any such period of five consecutive years to not more than eight consecutive years."

(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall apply only to teachers appointed after the date of enactment of this subsection to teaching positions for any school year but shall not apply to teachers holding a teaching position on the

date of enactment of this subsection who are transferred without a break in service after such date.

On page 2, line 14, after the word "by", to strike out "subsections (a) and (b) of"; in line 15, after the word "effective", to insert "on the first day of the first pay period"; in line 16, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "as of the beginning of the first school year"; and, in line 18, after the word "Act", to strike out "or which is in progress on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever first occurs".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 951), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 6845 would require that the Department of Defense establish and maintain salaries for teachers in the overseas dependent school system at rates comparable to those paid teachers in school jurisdictions of 100,000 population or more in the United States.

AMENDMENT

Subsection 1(c) of the bill as referred, which would have required the periodic rotation of teachers after 5 consecutive years of service overseas, has been eliminated. The committee believes that a rotation system, such as is in effect in certain areas of military employment of civilian personnel in overseas areas, is not suitable for the overseas dependent school system. The U.S. Government does not operate a public school system in this country. The overseas educational program is unique, and the Government is unable to offer suitable employment opportunities for teachers returning to the United States after 5 years' service. The only domestic market for teachers is in individual State school systems, and it would be difficult, to say the least, for a Federal employee teaching overseas to secure an appointment in a school district in the United States during the spring or summer months (when most appointments are made) while the employee is physically located in Germany, Okinawa, Great Britain, or any other foreign country. A significant number of these teachers remain abroad, teaching American children, for a number of years. Evidence developed in public hearings by the Civil Service Subcommittee indicated that most if not all of these teachers are loyal and dedicated public servants doing an outstanding job in circumstances that are usually difficult. The committee sees no point in adding to the problems of operating an American school program overseas by advising any prospective teacher that at the end of 5 years' service they will have to return to the United States and look for a job.

The committee has revised the effective date of the bill to make it take effect on the first day of the first pay period after enactment. As referred, the bill would have taken effect as of the beginning of the present school year—September 1965. Teachers received an increase in salary at the beginning of this school year by administrative action of the Department of Defense. At the time the bill was referred to the committee, August 4, 1965, it was not intended to have retroactive effect, particularly for a period of several months. Retroactivity always involves considerable administrative problems; in this instance the committee believes it is justifiable to amend the bill to make it effective prospectively.

THE INTERNATIONAL PETROLEUM EXPOSITION

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 63) authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held at Tulsa, Okla., May 12–21, 1966, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. Res. 63

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to invite by proclamation, or in such other manner as he may deem proper, the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition, to be held at Tulsa, Oklahoma, from May 12 to May 21, 1966, inclusive, for the purpose of exhibiting machinery, equipment, supplies, and other products used in the production and marketing of oil and gas, and bringing together buyers and sellers for the promotion of foreign and domestic trade and commerce in such products.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 954), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 63 is summarized in its title. It involves no expenditure of Federal funds. The purpose of the exposition is the exhibiting of machinery, equipment, supplies, and other products used in the production and marketing of oil and gas, and the bringing together of buyers and sellers for the promotion of foreign and domestic trade and commerce in these products.

COMMITTEE ACTION

Senate Joint Resolution 63 was introduced on March 15, 1965, by Senator MONRONEY, for himself and Senator HARRIS, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee agreed, on January 25, 1966, to report the joint resolution favorably to the Senate without amendments. Similar action has been taken frequently in the past with respect to industrial expositions and trade fairs without involving official U.S. Government participation in them. The committee therefore recommends that the courtesy embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 63 be extended to the International Petroleum Exposition in Oklahoma.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHARTERING OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68) recognizing the 50th anniversary of the chartering by act of Congress of the Boy Scouts of America was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 68

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby pays tribute to the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the granting by Act of Congress of the charter of the Boy Scouts of America, and expresses its recognition of and appreciation for the public service performed by this organization through its contributions to the lives of the Nation's youth.

The preamble was agreed to.

WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY, 1969

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 403) authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass., in 1969 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 955), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

1. PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

House Joint Resolution 403 authorizes the appropriation of an amount not to exceed $500,000 to defray the expenses for a meeting of the 22d World Health Assembly in the United States.

House Joint Resolution 403 recommends Boston, Mass., as the site of the 1969 meeting of the World Health Assembly in connection with the centennial celebration of the Massachusetts Department of Health, the first State health department to be established in the United States.

2. BACKGROUND

The World Health Organization usually designates Geneva, Switzerland, as the site of its annual Assembly meeting. In 1958, however, after congressional action similar to that suggested here, the 11th World Health Assembly was held in Minneapolis, Minn.

A similar resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 80, to authorize appropriations to defray the costs of organizing and holding the 20th Annual World Health Assembly in the United States, was sponsored by Senators KENNEDY of New York and JAVITS.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lisle C. Carter, Jr., of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force and the U.S. Army placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED—CLOTURE MOTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if any Senator wishes to ask me for time to speak on the cloture motion, I am available. Mr. President, we suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, my relations with the press have always been very cordial and very affable. Seldom do I complain. However, my attention was directed to a column published in the Washington Daily News, dated February 8, 1966, which calls for a bit of response from me.

The column was written by Mr. John Herling. I presume that he is a regular columnist for the Scripps-Howard chain. I do not know Mr. Herling. He called me once, long distance. Frankly, I do not know whether he is possessed of a bias or a prejudice. That I cannot say, but his column is styled, 'No Deal'. It is in single quotes, for reasons that I do not know.

I read the first paragraph:

> Organized labor could have made a deal with Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, the Republican minority leader, by which he would have backed away from his filibuster against repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. But AFL-CIO President George Meany considered the price too high. He balanced the narrow benefits which would accrue to more stable labor-management relations against the larger good affecting the State and National welfare, and said, "No deal."

Mr. President, I do not know how they come by this. I know of no one in our whole entourage who has ever suggested or been approached about any kind of deal.

Mr. President, I do not deal on principle. When we do, it is no longer a principle.

Little squibs have been published in the press since the first of January to the effect that I, or someone, had been approached on this matter. I have no idea who it was, but evidently it was taken out of a quote made by Mr. Meany. I read further from the column:

> So, says Mr. Meany, "The issue of 14(b) repeal and the issue of reapportionment in particular and progress in general are solidly and inescapably intertwined. There is no illusion about that either in our minds or in the mind of the Senate minority leader."

The article states further:

> "I hope the Nation understands that this filibuster is a punitive and coercive tactic."

Then Mr. Meany says, according to this column:

> Mr. Meany says. "It is a cynical invitation to a deal. It is the crafty politician's way of saying: 'Come around to the back door. Give up your opposition to the reapportionment amendment and you can have 14(b) repeal.'"

Mr. President, I would not cross Mr. Meany's doorstep. I do not have to. Nor do I have to take this kind of thing without a proper response.

I know Mr. Meany. I have a proper regard for him. I know Mrs. Meany. I have a high regard for her.

I have wondered how these little squibs which are so euphemistic and so involved ever see the light of day; but I have to say for Mr. Herling, the columnist, that he is extremely careless; and I might use a harsher term. The record, however, will have to show that he made the statement here that I could have had a deal, when there is not a scintilla of fact or truth in the whole matter.

So, before the record closes, that must be said.

I am not a dealer. I know my mind. I know my convictions. I have some devotion to principle, and that is all I need for guidelines. I need no dealing with Mr. Meany or anyone else. I am sure that Mr. Meany would be the first to say that EVERETT DIRKSEN never approached him or any of his associates about a deal.

I wish to clarify the record on this subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the column written by John Herling printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 8, 1966]

NO DEAL

(By John Herling)

Organized labor could have made a deal with Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, the Republican minority leader, by which he would have backed away from his filibuster against repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. But AFL-CIO President George Meany considered the price too high. He balanced the narrow benefits which would accrue to more stable labor-management relations against the larger good affecting the State and National welfare, and said, "No deal."

Specifically, Senator DIRKSEN's main legislative target is the attempt to wash out the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision by which the reapportionment of State legislatures must comport to the clearly enunciated rule which eliminates the rotten borough system of choosing State legislatures.

This decision—which was handed down in a Tennessee suit after an intensive educational campaign to which organized labor gave considerable support—marks the ending of rural domination of State legislatures. For more than 30 years, social, labor, and welfare legislation has often been blocked by the opposition of such legislatures. Their opposition did not arise always from a clear clash of interests between country and city folks. Quite frequently, the opposition was exacerbated by business groups which sought to intercept liberal legislation by escalating the suspicions of country versus city.

Like King Canute, Senator DIRKSEN has undertaken to turn back the tide of change. With the aid of a heavily financed public relations campaign and through legislation already introduced in the Congress and through actions in process in various States, Mr. DIRKSEN seeks to manipulate the Senate into approval of a constitutional amendment to set aside the one-man, one-vote reapportionment procedure set in motion by the Supreme Court.

"That, in the last analysis," said Mr. Meany, "is what the filibuster in the U.S. Senate is really all about. The Senate minority leader is conducting a bitter rearguard action against the relentless advance of the 20th century, to preserve intact the strongholds of political and economic reaction in America, and to prevent or delay the kind of progress that is necessary to meet the new problems and challenges of modern society."

So, says Mr. Meany, "The issue of 14(b) repeal and the issue of reapportionment in particular and progress in general are solidly and inescapably intertwined. There is no illusion about that either in our minds or in the mind of the Senate minority leader."

Mr. Meany reinforces the union movement's determined support of the one-man, one-vote principle.

"I hope the Nation understands that this filibuster is a punitive and coercive tactic," Mr. Meany says. "It is a cynical invitation to a deal. It is the crafty politician's way of saying: 'Come around to the back door. Give up your opposition to the reapportionment amendment and you can have 14(b) repeal.'

"Well, as badly as we in the labor movement want 14(b) repealed, we do not want it that badly. And the Senate minority leader and all his antilabor stooges can filibuster until hell freezes over before I will agree to sell the people short for that kind of a deal."

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED—CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the pending question, which is the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, during the debate on legislation to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, I received letters from many people in Arkansas as well as almost every State in the Union. Some were for repeal, others were against—most were from working people, many of whom were union members. I have made every effort to inform my constituents and others who have written me why I oppose repeal of this section of the Taft-Hartley Act.

One of the letters I received came from a prominent labor leader in my State, Mr. J. Bill Becker, president, Arkansas State AFL–CIO. Mr. Becker urged me to support repeal. He also submitted a resolution adopted by the general executive board of the Arkansas State AFL–CIO urging all Members of the Senate and particularly my colleague, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and me to vote for repeal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of Mr. Becker's letter, dated January 14, 1966, together with the resolution adopted by his organization's executive board, and my response to him dated February 9, 1966.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a copy of the right-to-work amendment to the Arkansas constitution, which was adopted in 1944 by ballot at a general election, and also a copy of the State statute passed pursuant to that amendment, and a copy of a resolution adopted by the Arkansas State Senate just last year, urging the Arkansas delegation in the Congress of the United States to oppose repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARKANSAS STATE AFL–CIO,
Little Rock, Ark., January 14, 1966.

Hon. JOHN McCLELLAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR McCLELLAN: Enclosed please find a copy of a resolution that was adopted by the general executive board of this organization last Saturday. Approximately 125 members of the board were present at the meeting.

We sincerely hope that you will look favorably upon our request to vote for repeal of section 14(b). If, however, you cannot do so, we would very much appreciate your using your influence to bring this issue to a vote.

In many ways the right of the Senate to decide controversies goes to the heart of basic democratic government, and is of greater importance than H.R. 77 itself. Certainly a filibuster is contrary to accepted democratic procedures and no small group should be able to block the will of the majority.

Thank you for your consideration.

Always with a good wish, I remain

Respectfully yours,
J. BILL BECKER,
President.

RESOLUTION URGING 14(b) REPEAL

Whereas since 1944 the State of Arkansas has been afflicted with a so-called right-to-work law, forbidding unions and employers to negotiate union shop agreements; and

Whereas this law restricts free collective bargaining and freedom of contract, weakens trade unions, thus slowing the economic progress of workers, and promotes distrust and disharmony between labor and management; and

Whereas the inevitable result of these handicaps has been to retard the progress of our State and to curtail the prosperity of the people as a whole; and

Whereas State right-to-work laws are made possible by section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, a Federal statute; and

Whereas section 14(b) is the only provision in Federal law which cedes authority to the States in a field otherwise preempted by Congress for the Federal Government, and therefore singles out the labor movement for unique and unfavorable treatment; and

Whereas the House of Representatives has taken favorable action on the repeal of 14(b) by passage of H.R. 77, which has been prevented Senate consideration by filibuster: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Executive Board of the Arkansas State AFL–CIO hereby calls upon the Members of the Senate to take every action possible to halt any filibuster of this measure and bring the issue of repeal of 14(b) to a vote, and be it finally

Resolved, That we call upon our Senators to vote for the repeal of section 14(b) in order to restore free collective bargaining, improve the lot of wage-earners and enhance the prosperity of all the people in Arkansas.

FEBRUARY 9, 1966.

Mr. J. BILL BECKER,
President, Arkansas State AFL–CIO,
Little Rock, Ark.

DEAR MR. BECKER: I apologize for not having acknowledged sooner your letter of January 14, with which you enclosed copy of a resolution adopted by the general executive board of the Arkansas State AFL–CIO, calling upon Senator FULBRIGHT and me to vote for the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. During the past few weeks, my mail has been unduly heavy, and I have been unable to keep current with correspondence.

As I recall, you were among a group of labor officials from Arkansas who visited me in my Washington office in January of last year at which time we discussed this repeal proposal. I advised you then that I could not vote for repeal and stated a number of reasons why I could not do so.

First of all, I do not believe in compulsory unionism or compulsory membership in any organization. I do not believe a workingman should be compelled to join a union in order to work or to retain a job; nor do I believe a worker should be denied a job or discharged from his employment because he is a member of a labor union. My concept of freedom is to permit the individual worker to make the choice—to decide for himself whether he wishes to join a union—and to be free from coercion or compulsion on the part of either the union or his employer in making that decision.

The constitutional amendment which the people of Arkansas adopted by ballot in 1944 guarantees those rights to the worker. The enabling statute which was later adopted, in effect, carries out the will of the people as expressed in that constitutional amendment. The resolution and those of your members who have written me requesting that I vote for repeal would have me vote to nullify the Arkansas constitutional provisions which our people adopted by ballot in a free election. I cannot do that. I do not think that I should be asked to do it.

You and others who oppose the provisions of this State constitutional amendment and want to have it repealed can initiate a referendum and have the issue again submitted to the source of its adoption, to the people of Arkansas who can repeal it, if they choose to do so, by the same process—by the ballot in an election.

I regret, therefore, that I cannot comply with your request in this instance, but I simply cannot vote to deny to the workers—to the citizens of my State—their inalienable right to choose.

With very kindest regards, I am.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. McCLELLAN.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 TO THE ARKANSAS CONSTITUTION ADOPTED ON NOVEMBER 7, 1944, IN A GENERAL ELECTION

SECTION 1. Discrimination for or against union labor prohibited.—No person shall be denied employment because of membership in or affiliation with or resignation from a labor union, or because of refusal to join or affiliate with a labor union; nor shall any corporation or individual or association of any kind enter into any contract, written, or oral, to exclude from employment members of a labor union or persons who refuse to join a labor union, or because of resignation from a labor union, nor shall any person against his will be compelled to pay dues to any labor organization as a prerequisite to or condition of employment.

Pursuant to amendment No. 34, the following statute was enacted (Ark. Stat. 81–202): "No person shall be denied employment because of membership in, or affiliation with, a labor union; nor shall any person be denied employment because of failure or refusal to join or affiliate with a labor union; nor shall any person, unless he shall voluntarily consent in writing to do so, be compelled to pay dues, or any other monetary consideration to any labor organization as a prerequisite to, or condition of, or continuance of employment."

ARKANSAS SENATE RESOLUTION 3

Senate resolution requesting the Arkansas congressional delegation to oppose the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act

Whereas the people of this State adopted amendment No. 34 to the constitution of the State of Arkansas which establishes the rights of labor and prohibits discrimination for or against labor unions; and

Whereas section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act recognizes the right of each State to enact provisions comparable to amendment No. 34, thereby leaving to each State the right to determine whether the closed shop shall be permitted; and

Whereas the President of the United States has announced his support of legislation which would repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, thereby nullifying amendment No. 34 to the constitution of the State of Arkansas and denying rights of labor guaranteed under the constitution of the State of Arkansas; and

Whereas it is the consensus of the General Assembly that the Arkansas delegation in the Congress of the United States should exert their full efforts to oppose the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the first extraordinary session of the 65th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, That the Arkansas General Assembly respectfully requests the Arkansas delegation in the Congress of the United States to oppose legislation now under consideration which would repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; be it

Resolved, That upon adoption hereof a copy of this resolution shall be furnished by the secretary of the senate to each member of the Arkansas congressional delegation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, now I should like to read from the letter which I wrote Mr. Becker. I read excerpts from it. I wrote:

> As I recall, you were among a group of labor officials from Arkansas who visited me in my Washington office in January of last year at which time we discussed this repeal proposal. I advised you then that I could not vote for repeal and stated a number of reasons why I could not do so.
>
> First of all, I do not believe in compulsory unionism or compulsory membership in any organization. I do not believe a workingman should be compelled to join a union in order to work or to retain a job; nor do I believe a worker should be denied a job or discharged from his employment because he is a member of a labor union. My concept of freedom is to permit the individual worker to make the choice—to decide for himself whether he wishes to join a union—and to be free from coercion or compulsion on the part of either the union or his employer in making that decision.
>
> The constitutional amendment which the people of Arkansas adopted by ballot in 1944 guarantees those rights to the worker. The enabling statute which was later adopted, in effect, carries out the will of the people as expressed in that constitutional amendment. The resolution and those of your members who have written me requesting that I vote for repeal would have me vote to nullify the Arkansas constitutional provisions which our people adopted by ballot in a free election. I cannot do that. I do not think that I should be asked to do it.

In my letter to Mr. Becker, from which I have read excerpts, I stated succinctly the reasons and principles upon which I base my opposition to this proposal. There are many other reasons and factors that entered into my considerations, but those stated in my letter to Mr. Becker are wholly compelling and sufficient to sustain my position.

I thank the distinguished minority leader for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF THE COMMUNITY RELATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in respect of the President's reorganization plan of the Community Relations Organization, I am today introducing a resolution of disapproval and will seek hearings by the Committee on Government Operations.

I consider it wrong to transfer this agency to the Department of Justice, the prosecuting arm. It ought to go to an agency of the executive where mediation and conciliation can be practiced. As a member of the Committee on Government Operations, I shall seek early hearings on this proposal.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED—CLOTURE MOTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

There appeared in the Miami Herald on February 7, 1966, a very short editorial which bears the title "A Principle Goes to Jail." It reads as follows:

> ### A PRINCIPLE GOES TO JAIL
>
> The Senate debate on repealing the right-to-work provision of the Taft-Hartley Act has little significance for Levi Mews, a Milwaukee businessman. Wisconsin already has exercised its option and made the union shop compulsory.
>
> But Mr. Mews can testify what it means when the right to work is lost.
>
> One of his longtime workers refused on principle to join the union and Mr. Mews said he would respect the decision. The court said otherwise.
>
> Because he didn't fire his employee forthwith, Mr. Mews was sentenced to jail for 30 days. The Wisconsin Supreme Court upheld the verdict last week.
>
> While Mr. Mews worries about who will mind his store while he serves his term, Senators debate putting all American employers under the same threat of prison if they insist on the right to work without paying tribute to a union. We hope Mr. Mews' plight will help them decide to preserve a basic freedom.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the repeal of section 14(b) would erode the already restricted authority of the citizens of the States to legislate according to their expressed desires in this field.

It would represent the diminution of powers enjoyed by the States.

Not only would repeal nullify right-to-work laws which are now a part of the constitutional or statutory law of 19 States, but it would also deprive all of the 50 States of their regulatory power in this important area of labor-management relations. This would be particularly unwise at a time when we keep weakening and taking away the police powers of the States.

Adoption of repeal would mean that citizens could not legislate specific guarantees of economic and political freedom in the constitutions or statutes of their States.

The reservation of this right to the people of each State is in keeping with the principles of federalism set forth in our Constitution and proven by the passage of time.

One of the reasons why our constitutional system has survived so long, and one of the reasons why ours is the oldest written Constitution in force and effect in this world is because of the wisdom of the founders in devising this organic law, and because of the flexibility that is given to it by the dissemination of certain governmental powers among the States.

The economy of my State of Texas has fared extremely well in recent years under our right-to-work law, as compared with non-right-to-work States, as Texas has gained a great deal under its present system of permitting freedom of choice about union membership.

Labor and management have benefited in Texas. The economy of my State has expanded at a greater rate than the average of non-right-to-work States, and in an atmosphere of labor-management harmony.

By virtually every index of economic growth it can be shown that not only my State, but all right-to-work States, have fared better than non-right-to-work States.

Growth of union membership in right-to-work States has demonstrated that compulsory membership is not necessary for the continued good health of labor unions.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor and other nationally recognized reports show that right-to-work States lead the Nation in the rate of new jobs created in business and industry.

In the first quarter of 1965, the unions in Texas, a right-to-work State, won 43 of 56 National Labor Relations Board conducted representation elections for a win figure of 76 percent. This compares with a win figure of approximately 60 percent for the 2 previous years in Texas, and 57 percent over the entire Nation.

It can be seen that in our right-to-work State the unions have had greater success in organizing shops than they have in the non-right-to-work States.

Productivity and capital investment in an atmosphere of voluntarism create the most dynamic employment opportunities. Restrictions, whether by labor or Government policy, cause the employment opportunities to go elsewhere, as indeed they are doing these days.

Repeal of 14(b) would inevitably lead to heightened tensions and conflict throughout the land. Repealing a law strongly supported by a clear majority of the American people would create discord, not stability.

If we were to proceed with the consideration of H.R. 77 and to enact it into law we would create the most powerful monopoly that this country has ever seen. We would create a tremendous force acting with little restraint to influence the course of public affairs, and to influence the economy of this country. Should we create such a monopoly it would not be by popular demand of the people of the United States. It would be the result of the concerted political activity of the great union organizations of this country.

It would be only a manifestation of the tremendous political influence exercised by trade unions, an influence out of all proportion to its numbers, and an influence that sometimes flouts the popular will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I will yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. It is inconceivable to me that a man should be required to pay a tribute for the privilege of earning his bread. It is inconceivable to me that the unions would be so preoccupied with the goal of compulsory unionism that they would resort to the use of political threats, such as they have done.

I have received notification from union leaders, not of my State, I may hasten to add, but without my State, threatening me with political extinction if I continue to oppose repeal of section 14(b).

Perhaps they do have the power to extinguish me politically, but if I should lose my seat in this august body because of my position on this issue, it is well worth it, because I believe that those of us who oppose repeal will prevail, and regardless of what happens to us in the future, I believe generations of Americans yet to come will thank us for preserving one last vestige of freedom in the United States, and that is the right of a man to seek employment to better himself, and to sustain his family regardless of whether or not he belongs to any organization, regardless of whether or not it is in his conscience not to belong to such an organization.

Therefore, Mr. President, I trust the Senate, in its good judgment, will vote against cloture.

WHAT GENERAL GAVIN REALLY SAID ABOUT VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield not to exceed 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Harper's magazine for February 1966, in its department termed "The Easy Chair," has published an article entitled "A Communication on Vietnam," written by Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, retired.

Inserted prior to this article, and signed "The Editors," is a statement which starts as follows:

> In the following letter General Gavin presents the first basic criticism of the administration's policy in Vietnam by a major military figure. As an alternative, he urges the stopping of our bombing of North Vietnam, a halt in the escalation of the ground war, withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnam coast, and renewed efforts to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva.

As the result of this testimony, in a hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Tuesday, February 8, I asked General Gavin if it was true that he urged the stopping of our bombing of North Vietnam. He said that that assertion was not true.

I then asked General Gavin if it was true that he recommended a halt in the escalation of the ground war. He said that it was not true.

I then asked the general if it was true that he recommended a withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnamese coast. He said that that was not true.

Because of this extraordinary development in the discussions about Vietnam, I ask unanimous consent that the covering letter in this magazine, signed "The Editors," be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A COMMUNICATION ON VIETNAM FROM GEN. JAMES M. GAVIN

In the following letter General Gavin presents the first basic criticism of the administration's policy in Vietnam by a major military figure. As an alternative, he urges the stopping of our bombing of North Vietnam, a halt in the escalation of the ground war, withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnam coast, and renewed efforts "to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva."

General Gavin argues for such a change in policy on purely military grounds. His views on the Vietnam war cannot be taken lightly, since he has established a reputation during the last 30 years as one of America's leading strategic thinkers. At the time of the French defeat in Vietnam, he was Chief of Plans and Operations for the Department of the Army, and his advice is generally believed to be largely responsible for the United States refusal to enter the southeast Asian conflict on a large scale at that time. He enlisted in the Army as a private in 1924 and rose to the rank of lieutenant general before his retirement in 1958; he had a distinguished combat career as a paratroop commander in World War II; and he served for a time as Chief of Research and Development for the Army. After retirement he was Ambassador to France, and is now chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Arthur D. Little, Inc., an industrial research firm in Cambridge, Mass.

He left the Pentagon because of disagreements on what was, in 1958, the basic military policy of the Eisenhower administration. His reasons for such disagreements were set forth in his book, "War and Peace in the Space Age," published by Harper & Row; as he indicates in the following letter, most of the changes he then urged have since been carried out.

The editors hope that General Gavin's communication may stimulate a searching reexamination of American military and foreign policies by other public figures who are especially qualified by experience and training to discuss them. In the coming months Harper's hopes to publish further contributions to such a reappraisal.

THE EDITORS.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a colloquy between General Gavin and myself on this subject.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator SYMINGTON. General, it is always a privilege to see you, sir. The reason you are here is because of a letter you wrote to Harper's magazine. Did you discuss the letter with the editors at the time you sent it in?

General Gavin. No, I did not, Senator Symington.

Senator Symington. I will make my questions as short as possible and would appreciate your answers being as short as possible, because of the 10-minute time limit.

I would run through the letter with you, if I may.

General Gavin. Surely.

Senator Symington. The editors say, "He urges the stopping of our bombing of North Vietnam"; is that true?

General Gavin. No, it is not true.

Senator Symington. Then they say you want "a halt in the escalation of the ground war." Is that true?

General Gavin. No, it is not true.

Senator Symington. Then they say you recommend "withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnamese coast"; is that true?

General Gavin. Not true.

Senator Symington. I wonder why the editors deceived as to what your thoughts were?

General Gavin. I do not know. I suggest you bring the editor in here and talk to him.

Senator Symington. That might be a good idea because, based on what the general says, this statement by the editors who published this article is false, and is one of the reasons why there has been so much misunderstanding.

General Gavin. Yes, I agree with you.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, later on in this hearing the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] again brought up this matter, asking for clarification. General Gavin took the same position with the Senator from South Dakota that he did with me. Then he volunteered that a Harper's magazine advertisement in last Sunday's issue of the New York Times magazine which said that he, Gavin, was challenging "Johnson's strategy in Vietnam" was wrong; and that he had written Harper's as follows:

"I was shocked to see the advertisement in yesterday's book review section of the New York Times," and I was, because it misrepresents entirely my point of view.

In order that the truth as to what General Gavin actually did say be reported accurately, not only to the Senate, but also to Congress and the people, I ask unanimous consent that this part of the dialog between the Senator from South Dakota and General Gavin be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Mundt. I think maybe part of the problem which has confused the public may come from what the editors of Harper's said about your use of the word "enclave."

Of course the general public is hopefully looking for any way, as we all are, to avoid the war from getting any greater, and the grasp on this phrase. The editor said:

"In the following letter General Gavin points out some basic criticisms of the administration's policies in Vietnam."

Then he says "as an alternative he urges the stopping of our bombing in North Vietnam."

I think you have clearly made it obvious that that is not your point, even though the editor reads that into your article.

"A halt in the escalation of the ground war," but no definitive procedure for getting that done has been worked out.

"Withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnamese coast," this is what he says. After reading your article, the average layman is likely to read into this exactly what the editor of Harper's read.

We get a lot of letters. I get a lot of letters from friends around the world saying, "General Gavin has got a very fine way of handling this thing without loss of life, sort of an operation fortress they call it or a holding operation."

Now I take it that that is not what you meant to say.

General Gavin. That is absolutely——

Senator Mundt. The editor of Harper's read it wrong. Is that right?

General Gavin. Senator, this is not what I meant whatsoever. Senator Symington asked me about these points earlier. I might say furthermore in the Sunday issue of the New York Times magazine Harper's advertised, in this current issue of their magazine, with a lead, what appeared to be an article by Gen. James M. Gavin versus Johnson's strategy in Vietnam, and I wrote to them Monday, and I have the letter in front of me, and I said:

"I was shocked to see the advertisement in yesterday's book review section of the New York Times," and I was, because it misrepresents entirely my point of view.

I do not know how one controls that, but I would suggest that you bring the editor in here.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that General Gavin's letter to Harper's be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Harper's magazine, February 1966]

A Communication on Vietnam From Gen. James M. Gavin

Last November our Secretary of Defense, while in Vietnam, finally gave battlefield approval to the concept of Sky Cavalry. Harper's should take some pride in the fact that it published my article, "Cavalry, and I Don't Mean Horses," in 1954. That was the genesis of the idea for this new form of mobility for our ground forces. It was too revolutionary for acceptance in the Pentagon then, and Harper's performed a public service in helping advance the idea.

I would like to comment about the Vietnam situation further. I should emphasize at the outset that I am writing solely from a military-technical point of view. I was Chief of Plans and Operations in the Department of the Army when Dienbienphu brought the French endeavors in Vietnam to an end. The Chief of Staff, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, directed that we go into the situation quite thoroughly in case a decision should be made to send U.S. forces into the Hanoi Delta. As I recall, we were talking about the possibility of sending 8 divisions plus 35 engineer battalions and other auxiliary units. We had one or two old China hands on the staff at the time and the more we studied the situation the more we realized that we were, in fact, considering going to war with China, since she was supplying all the arms, ammunition, medical and other supplies to Ho Chi Minh. If we would be, in fact fighting China, then we were fighting her in the wrong place on terms entirely to her advantage. Manchuria, with its vast industrial complex, coal, and iron ore, is the Ruhr of China and the heart of its warmaking capacity. There, rather than in southeast Asia, is where China should be engaged, if at all.

I should emphasize at the outset that there are philosophical and moral aspects of the war in southeast Asia that are understandably disturbing to every thoughtful person. My comments, however, are based entirely upon a tactical evaluation of our efforts there. At the time of the French defeat, it seemed to us military planners that if an effort were made by the United States to secure Vietnam from Chinese military exploitation, and that if force on the scale that we were talking about were to be employed, then the Chinese would very likely reopen the fighting in Korea.

At the time, General Ridgway thought it prudent to bring this situation directly to the attention of President Eisenhower, pointing out that we should be prepared for a large-scale war if we were to make the initial large-scale commitment to the Hanoi Delta that we were thinking about. I thought at the time that it took great moral courage for General Ridgway to take this action, but he has never been a man to lack such courage. The President decided not to make the commitment and in his book, "Mandate for Change," he commented that to have gone to war under those conditions would have been "like hitting the tail of the snake rather than the head," which is a good analogy.

Today we have sufficient force in South Vietnam to hold several enclaves on the coast, where sea and air power can be made fully effective. By enclaves I suggest Camranh Bay, Danang, and similar areas where American bases are being established. However, we are stretching these resources beyond reason in our endeavors to secure the entire country of South Vietnam from the Vietcong penetration. This situation, of course, is caused by the growing Vietcong strength.

The time has come, therefore, when we simply have to make up our mind what we want to do and then provide the resources necessary to do it. If our objective is to secure all of South Vietnam, then forces should be deployed on the 17th parallel and along the Cambodian border adequate to do this. In view of the nature of the terrain, it might be necessary to extend our defenses on the 17th parallel to the Mekong River, and across part of Thailand. Such a course would take many times as much force as we now have in Vietnam.

To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnam troops into the south. Also if we were to quadruple, for example, our combat forces there, we should then anticipate the intervention of Chinese "volunteers" and the reopening of the Korean front. This seems to be the ultimate prospect of the course that we are now on.

On the other hand, if we should maintain enclaves on the coast, desist in our bombing attacks in North Vietnam, and seek to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva, we could very likely do so with the forces now available. Maintaining such enclaves while an effort is being made to solve the internal situation in Vietnam, and in the face of the terroristic war that would be waged against them, poses some serious problems, and the retention of some of the enclaves may prove to be unwise; but the problems that we would then have to deal with would be far less serious than those associated with an expansion of the conflict.

I do not for a moment think that if we should withdraw from Vietnam the next stop would be Waikiki. The Kra Peninsula, Thailand, and the Philippines can all be secured, although we ultimately might have heavy fighting on the northern frontiers of Thailand. But we should be realistic about the dangers of the course that we are now on. A straightforward escalation of our land power in southeast Asia to meet every land-based challenge, while at the same time we leave China and Cambodia immune from attack, poses some very forbidding prospects. I realize that our Secretary of State was recently quoted in the press as having said that "the idea of sanctuary is out." However, the initiative is not ours and there is an abundance of evidence now that both China and Cambodia are sanctuaries for Communist military strength that is used to support the Vietcong.

To get to the heart of the problem, I doubt that world opinion would tolerate the bombing and seizure of Manchuria. If the Chinese Communists continue on their present course of aggression and, at the same time continue to develop more devastating weapons—and I refer to nuclear weapons—the time may come when China will bring upon herself a nuclear war. But that time is not here yet. In the meantime, we must do the best we can with the forces we have deployed to Vietnam, keeping in mind the true meaning of strategy in global affairs. Economics, science and technology, and world opinion will, in the long run, serve our strategic interests well if we handle our national resources wisely. On the other hand, tactical mistakes that are allowed to escalate at the initiative of an enemy could be disastrously costly. Since the advent of the Space Age, there has been a revolution in the nature of war and global conflict. The confrontation in Vietnam is the first test of our understanding of such change, or our lack of it. The measures that we now take in southeast Asia must stem from sagacity and thoughtfulness, and an awareness of the nature of strategy in this rapidly shrinking world.

Referring again to the sky cavalry concept, which we are now employing in South Vietnam, it is the kind of innovation that is generally unpopular in a conservative society, and in the military establishment of such a society. But many more innovations, both technical and in management methods, must be found if we are to continue to survive as a free people. Merely making bigger bombs or using more of them is not the answer. So I hope that Harper's will continue to support innovative methods when they are suggested, as you did when you first published the idea of sky cavalry in 1954.

When I retired in 1958, I said that I would be happy to serve as a private in the Army if it were the kind of an Army that I wanted it to be. I think it is that kind of an Army now, and I would be happy to serve in it in any grade in Vietnam or anywhere else. It is doing a splendid job in Vietnam and needs the support of all of our people.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me relating to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act be accepted and printed in the RECORD as if fully given by me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, there have been few public debates infected with more political emotionalism than the one over whether section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed. In such emotionally charged debates, basic issues are often obscured and relevant consequences are often distorted. The debate over 14(b) is no exception. All of us who have taken part in this debate have been guilty, at one time or another, of making sweeping generalizations and predications as to the effects of State right-to-work laws which are authorized by 14(b), and about the consequences that would be incurred with the repeal of 14(b).

Without attempting to present myself as a wholly detached and neutral observer I would like to review, as dispassionately as possible, the significant facts of the matter as I see them—the facts which I have drawn upon in deciding what position to take on the question of whether or not 14(b) should be repealed.

First it is absolutely necessary to get firmly in mind the legal meaning of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, what it does and does not do, and what its repeal would or would not mean.

Section 14(b) was included in the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 because Congress wanted to specifically spell out the fact that the individual States had the right to enact laws declaring that the right of persons to accept employment, if offered, shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in a labor union. In short, Congress wanted to make it very clear that the States could, if they so chose through their democratic majority rule processes of political debate and lawmaking, ban union security arrangements such as the union shop. In so acting Congress was not conferring upon the States a power that they did not previously possess. The historic Wagner Act of 1935, which labor leaders, with some justification, point to as the Magna Carta of the labor union movement, contained no provision aimed at precluding the States from legislating in this area. During the period from 1935 to 1947 four States did enact such laws. In 1947, seven more put right-to-work laws on their statutes. Since then, several other States have adopted such laws, some have repealed laws that they had earlier adopted, leaving 19 States in which right-to-work laws are currently in effect.

The State laws which declare the union shop to be illegal are generally called right-to-work laws. This designation is taken from the fact that where such laws are in force no worker can be denied the opportunity to work because he refuses to join a union. Because it is not commonly understood it needs to be pointed out that all right-to-work laws are impartial in their wording, protecting the rights of both union and nonunion employees. That is, they not only specify that workers shall not be denied a job because he prefers not to belong to a union, they also prohibit employers from denying employment to a worker simply because he belongs to a union. Right-to-work laws, of course, do not guarantee any worker a job. In that sense the terms is misleading.

On the other hand, the absence of right-to-work laws does not mean that all wage earners must belong to a union—a simple point, but one that is often overlooked in the heat of debate. It must be kept in mind that a union can be established only after a majority of the workers of a particular plant or business agree to establish a union. The elected representatives of the union can then bargain with management for a union security arrangement. A union shop is legally put into effect only after both labor and management have so agreed.

By the same token, the existence of right-to-work laws does not preclude the possibility that all workers in a particular plant or business will belong to a union. Right-to-work laws are in no way aimed at preventing any worker who wishes to join a union from doing so. They are aimed only at preventing union membership as a condition of employment. It is also necessary to note here that the existence of a right-to-work law does not in actual practice necessarily eliminate compulsory unionism. The promulgation of a law and its practical enforcement are two different things. Students of labor-management relations have long agreed that the Taft-Hartley Act's legal ban on the closed shop did not in fact eliminate such arrangements. The closed shop has been driven underground, but not out of existence. The same parallel often exists in regards to State laws banning the union shop and lesser forms of union security contracts.

It should also be kept in mind that national labor-management relations laws apply only to those business enterprises found to be in the flow of interstate commerce. Thus, repeal of 14(b) would in no way affect the status of right-to-work laws applicable to those enterprises of a purely intrastate nature, that is, the smaller and localized business concerns.

A great number of political observers have pictured the debate over 14(b) as a sociopolitical struggle involving the question of the acceptability of unions, their role in society and the political power they exercise.

Without question this element is involved. Most labor leaders see right-to-work laws as being antiunion both in intent and in effect. Of the individuals and groups who have campaigned for right-to-work laws and who oppose repeal of 14(b) there are those who implicitly agree with this view. They believe that unions have become, or are threatening to become, so economically and politically powerful as to endanger the public interest.

Due to the very nature of conflicting economic interest and the inevitable variations in ideological outlook, certain tensions between union interests and nonunion interests will always exist. These tensions have affected the debate over whether or not 14(b) should be repealed.

But, Mr. President, it is my sincere belief that this aspect of the debate has been blown out of all reasonable proportion, and in the process many of the significant factors and issues in this great question have been ignored, obscured, and distorted. Another result of this situation is that it has become increasingly difficult for any individual to participate in the debate without being categorized as either a rabid partisan or foe of labor. This is most unfortunate. Against the background of labor-management legislation of the past three decades and in the context of present social, economic, and political climate of this country there are few citizens and fewer political and public opinion leaders who are seriously opposed to unions as such. Thus, it is a considerable injustice to see the 14(b) debate as simply one of prounion against antiunion forces.

This is the age of big business, and regardless of where one's economic or ideological interests may lie, fairminded judgment recognizes that big labor is perhaps an inevitable, and on the whole, a proper counterdevelopment.

But precisely because of the existence of big labor and big business it is necessary at times for Government to intervene to the extent of establishing ground rules within which labor and business are to compete with each other so as to assure that this natural and inevitable struggle of economic interests be carried out in such a way as not to endanger the public interest.

Independent observers note that prior to the 1930's Government intervention in disputes between business and labor more often than not worked to the advantage of business. This situation was dramatically changed by the enactment of a series of national laws during the 1930's. Under the climate of New Deal legislation the power of organized labor was widely and dramatically expanded.

Since the end of World War II the Government has steered a more neutral course. Although this has varied somewhat between the various administrations and Congresses, the dominating theme of labor-management legislation in the postwar era has been the development of ground rules designed to assure the fair treatment of both business and labor, and particularly to protect and promote the overall public interest.

The Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 is symbolic of this approach. Whereas the Wagner Act of 1935 had spoken only of the rights of labor, the Taft-Hartley Act spelled out the rights of business and the obligations of labor, and also gave the National Government greater power to intervene in stalemated labor disputes where a work stoppage would be clearly against the national interest.

The establishment of labor-management ground rules by Congress always involves two types of questions. First, what types of ground rules shall be developed. Second, shall the ground rules be applied with national uniformity. Both of these questions always involve issues of much broader concern than the particular economic interests which are directly affected. They inevitably involve the larger questions of individual rights and freedoms, and the question of the basic governmental structure of this Nation and the nature of the political process by which public policy is made.

In many aspects of labor-management relations Congress quite properly had judged that in the best interests of labor, business, and the public as a whole, national uniformity is necessary and desirable. In the matter of union security arrangements, however, Congress, in the past, has judged that national uniformity is not necessary. Thus Congress has clearly expressed its intent that the individual States had the right to legislate in this area in accordance with the State's own particular economic, social, and political situation.

President Johnson has now asked that Congress remove this authority from States by repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. Although the President had voted for the Taft-Hartley Act—including the 14(b) provision—in 1947, and against repeal of 14(b) in 1948, and had voted for amending the Railway Labor Act in 1950 to include a provision similar to 14(b), he said in his state of the Union message of 1965 that repeal of 14(b) was needed so as to "reduce conflicts in our national labor policy that for several years have divided Americans in several States." In his message of 1966 he repeated his request for repeal so as "to make the labor laws in all our States equal to the laws of 31 States which do not have right-to-work measures."

The President, then, has said that national uniformity in this area of labor legislation is now necessary and desirable.

In attempting to decide whether or not such national uniformity is now necessary or desirable several basic questions of fact must be asked. One of the first, and one that no individual, regardless of his attitudes toward labor unions can avoid, is whether or not right-to-work laws have, in fact, acted to restrict labor union membership.

The more vigorous advocates of repeal of 14(b) argue that right-to-work laws do indeed adversely affect labor union membership; that membership, and therefore overall union strength, would be significantly greater in those States which have right-to-work laws than is now the case. Labor groups have produced statistical arguments supposedly "proving" this point.

On the other hand, right-to-work advocates have, with equal facility, produced a myriad of statistical analyses refuting this argument and, indeed, often "proving" that more often than not union membership has grown faster in right-to-work States than in non-right-to-work States.

Such statistical wars are common to political debates of this type. The adage that statistics can be used to prove any point of view is a sound one. Usually, however, independent analysis can prove which point of view is the more reasonable. In this particular case the hard, reliable evidence proves neither point of view.

As James R. Wason, specialist in labor relations for the Library of Congress, concluded in his study:

> Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and State Right-To-Work Laws; An Inquiry Into Their Effects
>
> Union membership both rose and fell in both right-to-work and non-right-to-work States.
>
> The overall changes in right-to-work States as a whole were as follows:
>
> | | 1958 | 1960 | 1962 |
> |---|---|---|---|
> | Total AFL-CIO membership | 13, 881, 000 | 13, 872, 800 | 13, 375, 500 |
> | Membership in right-to-work States | 2, 147, 300 | 2, 118, 000 | 2, 048, 000 |
> | Percent of total in right-to-work States | 15. 5 | 15. 3 | 15. 3 |
>
> These differences are not statistically significant. The changes of union membership follow more closely the changes in industrial employment than any other factor. * * * We have not been able to isolate a trend in union membership in right-to-work States as opposed to States without such laws. The supposed direct effects of right-to-work laws in causing members of unions to drop their membership does not appear. * * * These findings would appear to be consistent with the observation of other students of right-to-work laws.

Approaching this matter from another direction one needs to ask: Do right-to-work laws have a beneficial impact on the State's economy? Again it is extremely difficult to isolate the impact of right-to-work laws, or their absence, from basic regional economic growth patterns that have been underway over the past several decades. Using such indicators as trends in personal income, employment, industries, Mr. Wason concluded that while there was some data suggesting that such laws were a factor in fostering economic growth, the evidence simply was not conclusive either way.

Labor spokesmen invariably argue, and many sincerely believe, that right-to-work laws are rooted in antiunionism. This is a gross exaggeration. It does a great disservice to those who defend the right of States to enact right-to-work laws for reasons quite unrelated to the attitude toward labor. Such a sweeping indictment speaks poorly for the judgment of those who promote this argument.

While deploring the recklessness with which this indictment is made I would not attempt to argue that the charge, in some instances, is not without basis in fact. But the significant question is not whether such and such an individual or group is antiunion in outlook and motivation, but whether or not right-to-work laws do in fact have a significant adverse impact on the membership of unions and their overall economic and political strength.

After careful study of independent analyses such as Mr. Wason's I cannot but conclude that right-to-work laws do not, in fact, have this adverse effect.

Labor leaders have made repeal of 14(b) a symbol. They have declared that it weakens unions. It does not. But because they have so pictured it, repeal has become a symbolic test of their political strength. Unfortunately it has also become, for many, a symbolic whipping boy for the ills that plague the labor movement.

Against this background we can now turn directly to the question of whether or not the national uniformity that President Johnson has asked for in this area of labor-management relations is necessary or desirable. Is Congress in 1966 justified in taking from the States those powers which Congress expressly declared to be their rightful prerogative in 1947?

If it could be conclusively established that right-to-work laws definitely undermine labor union strength, or conversely that they act as a positive asset in a State's efforts to attract new industry and, therefore, to improve its overall economic position, then one's economic ties and ideological predisposition would be a major factor in his decision. But the hard, reliable evidence on these points simply does not prove a significant pattern in either direction on either of these points.

Because of this the other issues involved in the proposal to repeal 14(b) take on even greater importance, and in fact, become the most meaningful and most important factors which Congress must consider in deciding this question.

The first, and I believe the most important, of these is the persistent and absolutely fundamental issue of the proper relationship between the States and the National Government. The Federal system of government has been the source spring of many of this country's greatest political strengths.

The Founding Fathers did not intend that the Federal system in all its particulars be rigid and unflexible. If it had been so designed it would have long since been abandoned, for changing conditions demand changes in process and procedures of politics and government. Thus, great changes have occurred, but the basic principles of federalism remain intact. There are none among us who would seriously argue that the Federal system has not served us well in the past, and only a rare few who would argue that it cannot continue to serve us well in the future.

Thus, there is no likelihood that Americans will purposely choose to formally discard the Federal system. But, of course, the Federal system in any meaningful sense, can be effectively destroyed without changing the letter of the Constitution. Many observers have argued that the changing relationship between the National Government and the States over the past several decades foretells just such a development. I do not share the more alarmist of these views.

However, I firmly believe that we must be constantly vigilant not to render the delicate web of National-State relations. Diligence is necessary not so much because of the existence of those who would purposefully destroy the Federal system. Those who are motivated by this desire are few in number and weak in power. Rather, diligence is necessary because the delicate and interlocking web of federalism can be sundered just as easily by default as by intent. In fact, the danger of default and negligence is by far the greater.

I am not arguing the extreme position that the repeal of 14(b) will constitute the straw that will break the backbone of federalism. I am arguing, however, that to repeal 14(b) is to cut yet another strand of the Federal web. And while most of those who argue for repeal do not intend it, the end result would be a further weakening of the federal system.

Mr. President, this is not a constitutional issue. I have little doubt but that the Supreme Court would uphold congressional action to repeal 14(b). And I agree that Congress, if it so chooses, has the authority to act in this area. But the important question here is whether it is necessary or desirable that Congress exercise this authority. I believe that the answer is no. To exercise this authority is both unnecessary and undesirable.

The struggle over 14(b) has been intense and often bitter not because it has significantly and directly affected the relative balance of strength between labor and business, but because it has become, for too many on both sides of the question, a symbolic political issue. In such a climate the repeal of 14(b) would invariably be widely interpreted as a victory for the cause of organized labor, defeat of the effort to repeal would, by the same token, be interpreted of a victory for antiunion forces. The position of many participants in the debate has been largely dictated by this factor.

This is most unfortunate, for candor forces the conclusion that in terms of hard concrete results the direct effect of repealing section 14(b) would be slight. This is so because the direct effects of 14(b) have been slight.

I am not arguing that political symbols are unimportant. Images sometimes become extremely important aspects of our reality. But these political symbols must be kept in proper balance so that in the heat of emotional commitment we do not make those decisions which, while they have little meaningful impact on the concrete problems at hand, do unintended damage in other areas. I believe that to repeal 14(b) would constitute just such a mistake.

Diversity is the hallmark of federalism. This diversity is at the same time its greatest liability and its greatest asset. At times, this diversity, born of the independent sovereignty of the 50 States, can constitute a barrier to the promotion and protection of the overall national interest. Therefore, the National Government has, from time to time, been obligated to enact legislative programs to be uniformly applied in all States.

Diversity is also the Federal system's greatest asset. I wholeheartedly agree with my honorable colleague, Senator William Fulbright, when he said:

> I have never thought uniformity, as a doctrine or principle, a desirable goal of a society striving for greatness.

Each State differs in its cultural background, its political and social outlook, its economic structure, its labor and business climate. A major reason why this Union, so diverse in its peoples and regions, has endured is the fact that the Federal system is ingeniously designed to accommodate these differences. Because of these differences the political processes and the public policies of each State differ in style and content from the processes and policies of every other State.

How can we justify depriving the citizens of the States to legislate in this area of labor-management relations according to their own particular situation and their democratically expressed desires?

The President has said that this is necessary to eliminate conflict that has divided Americans. In reality, repeal of 14(b) would magnify conflict, not eliminate it. The fact that the citizens of 31 States have implicitly or explicitly decided not to enact right-to-work laws in no sense justifies the demand that all States regardless of their political and economic backgrounds must follow suit.

To ask Congress to remove this authority from the States is not to ask Congress to endorse an existing consensus, but to violate it. To repeal 14(b) would not be to fulfill the consensus of the American people on this issue but to pervert it and to corrupt it.

Any discussion of this question must address itself to the issue of individual rights and freedom. Some have argued that the single greatest issue involved in this debate is that of individual freedom of choice versus the demands of compulsory unionism.

This states the case too simply. I certainly accept the general principle that a worker should be free to decide whether or not to join a union. But lofty ideals do not always fit hard realities. However regrettable it may be, the extreme complexity and interdependence of our modern society means that individual freedom is often restricted. Economic employment is no exception.

If the freedom-of-choice argument is followed to its logical conclusion one would have to demand a national right-to-work law. But such a law would violate the right of the citizens of the individual States to decide this question according to their own desires in the same sense that repeal of 14(b) would nullify the right of each State to decide this question.

In some types of economic environments, restrictions on individual freedom, such as occur in union security arrangements, may actually be desirable. But this is a matter that must be left to citizens of the individual States to decide.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield as much time to the Senator from Alabama as he may desire.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, for the last 6 years interparliamentary meetings have been held each year between Mexico and the United States, the meetings alternating between the two countries. This year it is the good fortune of the United States to be the host to this interparliamentary conference. We have with us today, in the Senate Chamber, the parliamentarians representing the great country of Mexico.

We have just started the conference and have concluded our opening plenary session. Immediately following the vote which is to take place shortly, we shall return to our session and divide into committees for the purpose of discussing various problems and issues of common interest to the two countries.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to present the Mexican delegation. First, I wish to introduce Senator Moreno, who is the chairman of the Mexican delegation. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, since our guests are standing, I am pleased to present the entire Mexican delegation to the Sixth Interparliamentary Conference between our two countries. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the privilege to point out that the pending vote on cloture is not the only noteworthy event to occur in the Senate this morning. I refer to the presence on the Senate floor of a number of our distinguished guests from the Congress of the United Mexican States.

Every year at this time the parliamentarians of Mexico and the United States meet together to discuss problems of mutual interest to our countries in an atmosphere of warm understanding, mutual tolerance, and respect, and good fellowship. This year, the Sixth Annual Mexican-United States Interparliamentary Conference convenes at a time when the spirit of friendship is particularly strong and the atmosphere is unclouded by divisive issues. The year just ended was a notable one in Mexican-United States relations marked by great strides toward the solution of the Colorado River salinity problem. And so it is that problems which have long stood between our two countries have been ameliorated, proving beyond doubt that neighbors can live together, side by side, in an atmosphere of cooperative friendship and good will.

To those distinguished delegates we already know, we extend the special greetings reserved to good friends of long standing. To the new members of the delegation of Mexico who have come here to participate in these meetings for the first time, we wish you a hearty welcome in the hope that this will mark the beginning of a long and lasting friendship which we hope will grow even closer with the passage of time.

The success of these conferences which alternate each year between Mexico and the United States is truly a reflection of the wisdom and hard work of the distinguished chairmen of the respective delegations. Our own distinguished colleague, Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, an outstanding member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has served as chairman of the U.S. delegation ever since the first Conference in 1961. The continued success of the U.S. participation in these conferences is largely due to the fine service that Senator SPARKMAN has performed each year, and, I might add, to the leadership of Representative ROBERT NIX, of Philadelphia, on the House of Representatives side.

Senator Manuel M. Moreno, senator from the State of Guanajuato and chairman of the Mexican delegation this year, has a long and distinguished career in the Mexican Government and is a friend and delegate to these conferences of long standing. Senator Don Manuel Tello, from the State of Zacatecas, a former Foreign Minister of the Republic of Mexico, a former distinguished Ambassador to the United States and last year's Chairman, is with us once again, as is Deputy Jorge De La Vega Dominguez, of Chiapas, who is the coordinator of the delegation from the Chamber of Deputies. Each of these eminent and simpatico gentlemen have made great contributions to the fine record of accomplishment that these Interparliamentary Conferences have made in their short but notable history.

To all of you I extend a hearty welcome along with my hopes that this Conference will again prove to be the great success that it has been in the past. Welcome, friends. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from Illinois, the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Senor Moreno and all other members of the delegation, in the City of Chicago we have a very substantial Mexican population who have contributed to the community life in the city and State. It has been my privilege to be their guest on many an occasion.

Today I should like to say to you in the language of a song that was very popular years ago, and sung everywhere in America, "Hi, Neighbor; Hi, Neighbor."

Today, with pleasure, may I say to all of you, "Hi, neighbor. We are delighted to have you." [Applause.]

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, representing the State of Texas, which has a common land boundary with our sister Republic of Mexico extending for more than 1,000 miles, I extend greetings to the members of the Interparliamentary Conference.

The State of Texas has had long and fine neighbor relations with the states in the northern part of the Republic of Mexico.

I join in extending a warm welcome on behalf of a State whose people contain approximately 1½ million people with Spanish names, most of whom speak the Spanish language.

Texas has a closer contact with Mexico than Mexico does with any other part of the United States, and Texas probably has closer contact with Mexico than all other parts of the United States put together.

We welcome these distinguished members from our sister Republic. I hope that you can stop in Texas on your way home.

We are glad to have you here. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I doubt that in the history of the people of Mexico and the people of the United States there has ever been a time to equal the present time with its fidelity and strength of fellowship between our two countries. One by one over the past many years, problems which have plagued us have been solved.

As one who has been privileged to serve on several of these Mexico-American Interparliamentary Conferences, it is my view that much of the bases on which the problems have been solved has been the work of these annual conferences.

I shall dust off my Anaheim, Calif., Spanish for a moment.

(Mr. KUCHEL then greeted the delegates in Spanish.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield briefly to the distinguished President pro tempore, the senior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Como Senador de Arizona les extiendo una bien venida. Gracias, Amigos. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I am indeed happy to be associated with this group representing the U.S. Congress. I am happier still that we have the distinguished parliamentarians from Mexico present this morning.

I was a part of the first team from the United States back in 1960 and have been continuously with this group.

We have noticed through the years that an affinity has been developing between the two Congresses which indeed forebodes increasingly better relations between our two countries.

As a Senator from the State of New Mexico and a neighbor to the parliamentarians, I extend a warm welcome not only on behalf of the State of New Mexico, but also on behalf of the U.S. Senate.

(Mr. MONTOYA then greeted the delegates in Spanish.) [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD a list of the delegates to the Sixth Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, together with other material contained in this publication.

There being no objection, the list and material were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIXTH MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON—PHILADELPHIA—SAN FRANCISCO, FEBRUARY 9–15, 1966

MEXICAN DELEGATION

Senators and wives

Lic. Manuel M. Moreno, Carmen Contreras de Moreno.

Don Manuel Tello Baurraud, Guadalupe Macías de Tello.

Lic. Arturo Llorente González, Bertha M. de Llorente.

Lic. María Lavalle Urbina.

Dr. Mario C. Olivera, Celia Olivera Martinez (daughter).

Lic. Arturo Moguel Esponda, Inocencia D. de Moguel.

Lic. Amado Estrada Rodriguez, Margarita C. de Estrada.

Ing. Eulalio Gutiérrez Treviño, Margarita T. de Gutiérrez.

Gral. Ignacio Bonilla Vázquez, Ma. de los Angeles V. de Bonilla.

Ing. Juan de Dios Bojórquez Leon, Carlota Bojórquez del V. (daughter).

Mayor Oswaldo Cravioto Cianeros, Consuelo H. de Cravioto.

Don Antonio Flores Mazari, Magdalena Flores (daughter).

Deputies and wives

Lic. Jorge de la Vega, Hermila G. de de la Vega.

Don Mauro Berrueto Ramón, Juana B. de Berrueto.

Lic. José Antonio Cobos, Susana Pons de Cobos.

Lic. Luis Dantón Rodriguez, Evelyn M. de Rodriguez.

Lic. Alejandro Carrillo, Aurea C. de Carrillo.

Dr. Raúl Legaspi, Elizabeth C. de Legaspi.

Lic. Abraham Aguilar Paniagua, Carlota G. de Aguilar.

Prof. Vicente Fuentes Díaz, Rosa Pintado de Fuentes.

Dr. Antonio Martínez Manaoutou, Ma. Elena S. de Martínez.

Profra. Aurora Navía Millan, Dr. Raymundo Moreno Navía (son).

Profra. Martha Andrade de del Rosal, Martha del Rosal Andrade (daughter).

Don Rubén Moheno Velasco, Gracia O. Moheno V. (daughter).

Alternates

Dr. Humberto Morales, Humberto Morales Quintero (son).

Dr. Arnulfo Treviño Garza, Ma. de la Luz C. de Treviño.

PERSONNEL ACCOMPANYING THE MEXICAN DELEGATION FROM MEXICO

Advisers and wives

Humberto Martínez R. Romero, Elva Pelayo de Martínez.

Lic. Juan Gallardo Moreno, Director General of Consular Service, Ministry for Foreign Relations; Juliana de Gallardo.

Enrique Pérez López, Chief Director, International Economic Relations, Ministry for Foreign Relations; Maria Elguézabal P.

Lic. Gonzalo Mora O., Manager of the National Bank of Foreign Commerce; Rosario B. de Mora.

Jorge Leipin Caray, Eva B. de Leipin.

Lic. Sergio González Gálvez, Chief, Dept. of U.N. and O.A.S. Affairs, Ministry for Foreign Relations.

Lic. Agustin López Munguía, Asst. Dir. General of Public Financing Studies, Ministry of Finance.

Lic. Benito Berlín, Director General of Economic Studies, Ministry of Industry and Commerce.

Press

Luis M. Farias, Coordinator of Press (Administrator of Tourism in Mexico); Maria Emilia M. de Farias.

Miss Rose Mary Mackey, Aide to Mr. Farias.

Administrative personnel and wives

Sen. Antonio García Rojas, Treasurer, Senate; Belen B. de García R.

Dip. Agustín Arroyo Damian, Treasurer, Chamber of Deputies; Bertha Legaspi de Arroyo.

Capt. David Romero Vargas, Assistant Coordinator, Senate.

Bernardo Picaso, Assistant Coordinator, Chamber of Deputies.

Documentation personnel

Lic. Juan Pérez-Abreu J., Chief.

Marcelo Aragon del Rivero.

Salvador Mercado Moreno.

Manuel Alemán.

Francisco Bravo Villarreal (Translator).

Stenographers

Joel Hernández, Jesús Sánchez Niño, Héctor Contreras, Alberto Moreno Carsolio, Lic. Francisco López Alvarez, Fernando Hidalgo.

UNITED STATES DELEGATION

Senate delegates

John Sparkman, Alabama, chairman; Wayne Morse, Oregon; Albert Gore, Tennessee; Mike Mansfield, Montana; Ernest Gruening, Alaska; Daniel K. Inouye, Hawaii; Gaylord Nelson, Wisconsin; Joseph M. Montoya, New Mexico; George D. Aiken, Vermont; Thomas H. Kuchel, California; Paul J. Fannin, Arizona; George Murphy, California.

House delegates

Robert N. C. Nix, Pennsylvania, chairman; Harris B. McDowell, Jr., Delaware; James C. Wright, Jr., Texas; Harold T. Johnson, California; Ronald Brooks Cameron, California; John M. Slack, Jr., West Virginia; Henry B. Gonzalez, Texas; Edward R. Derwinski, Illinois; F. Bradford Morse, Massachusetts; James Harvey, Michigan; Alphonso Bell, California; Chester L. Mize, Kansas.

PROGRAMA

Febrero 9 (Miércoles)

3:10 p.m.: La Delegación Mexicana arriba al Aeropuerto "Dulles" a bordo de un avión de Aeronaves. Una Guardia de Honor y miembros de la Delegación de los Estados Unidos recibirán a los visitantes en "Dulles" y, después de las ceremonias de bienvenida, se dirigirán conjuntamente en autobús al Shoreham Hotel.

5:00 p.m.: Llegada al Shoreham Hotel. Recepción. (Buffet ligero) Resto de la noche libre.

Febrero 10 (Jueves)

9 a.m.: Salida del hotel (los Co-Presidentes).

9:30 a.m.: Reunión de los Co-Presidentes, Sala S–116, Capitolio.

9:15 a.m.: Salida de hotel (lo delegados y sus señoras).

10 a.m.: Apertura de la Sesión Plenaria. Vieja Cámara de la Corte Suprema, Capitolio de los Estados Unidos. Saludo del Secretario de Estado Dean Rusk y del Representante Nix, Presidente de la Delegación de la Cámara de Representantes. Replica del Presidente de la Delegación Mexicana. (Se invita a las esposa de los miembros de ambas delegaciones a concurrir al acto.)

10:40 a.m.: Los Delegados Mexicanos visitarán la Cámara de Senadores. (Las esposas de los delegados y el personal se hallarán en la Galería del Senado.)

11 a.m.: Reuniones de los Comités:

12:30 p.m.: Comité Político—Vieja Cámara de la Corte Suprema.

Comité Económico y Social—Sala H–227, Capitolio.

(Durante las reuniones de los Comités, se invita a las esposas de los delegados a un café que se servirá en la oficina del Senador Mansfield, Capitolio, Sala S–208 [Será anfitriona la Sra. de Mansfield], seguido de una gira por el Capitolio.)

1 p.m.: Comida en el Departamento de Estado, Salón Benjamin Franklin, para las Delegaciones de México y de los Estados Unidos, y respectivas exposas. (Anfitriones: Senador Sparkman y Representante Nix.)

3:30: Reuniones de los Comités en el Capitólio:

5 p.m.: Comité Político—Vieja Cámara de la Corte Suprema. Comité Económico y Social—Sala H–227.

6 p.m.: Salida del hotel (los delegados y sus señoras) con destino a la Embajada de México.

6:30–8 p.m.: Recepción en la Embajada de México.

Febrero 11 (Viernes) (Ver Programa separado para las damas)

9:15 a.m.: Salida del hotel (los delegados) con destino al Capitolio de los Estados Unidos.

10 a.m.–12 mediodía: Reuniones de los dos comités, Capitolio de los Estados Unidos: Comité Politico—Vieja Cámara de la Corte Suprema. Comité Económico y Social—Sala H–227.

12 mediodía. Gira por la Cámara de Representantes.

1 p.m.: Comida en el Edificio Rayburn, Sala B–369.

Anfitriones: Representante Nix y Senador Sparkman, Co-Presidentes de la Delegación de los Estados Unidos.

3 p.m.: Sesión Plenaria de Clausura, Vieja Cámara de la Corte Suprema, Capitolio. Palabras del Senador Sparkman y de un Miembro de la Delegación Mexicana.

7:30 p.m.: Recepción.

8:30 p.m.: Cena, Shoreham Hotel, Salón Palladian, ofrecidos por la Delegación de los Estados Unidos en honor de la Delegación Mexicana.

Febrero 12 (Sábado)

11 a.m.: Salida del Shoreham Hotel con destino al Monumento a Lincoln.

11:45 a.m.: Colocación de una ofrenda floral en el Monumento a Lincoln. Banda Musical. Lectura del Discurso de Gettysburg por el Senador John Sparkman, Presidente de la Delegación E.E.U.U. del Senado.

12:30 p.m.: Salida del Monumento a Lincoln con destino al Cementerio Nacional de Arlington para la ceremonia de la colocación de una ofrenda floral en la tumba del Presidente John F. Kennedy.

1 p.m.: Salida del Cementerio Nacional de Arlington con destino al Shoreham Hotel.

1:30 p.m.: Llegada al Shoreham Hotel.

Por la tarde: Libre.

8 p.m.: Salida del Shoreham Hotel con destino al Coliseo de Washington (Delegaciones de México y de los Estados Unidos.)

9 p.m.: Ice Capades (Revista de Patinaje sobre Hielo), Coliseo de Washington.

Febrero 13 (Domingo)

9:15 a.m.: Salinda del Shoreham Hotel en autobús con destino a Philadelphia (Delegaciones de México y de los Estados Unidos).

12:30 p.m.: Llegada a Philadelphia.

12:45 p.m.: Recepción.

1:15 p.m.: Comida en el último piso del Edificio PSFS (Philadelphia Saving Fund Society, 12th and Market Streets).

2:30 p.m.: Salida en autobús con destino a Parque de la Independencia.

2:40 p.m.: Llegada a Parque de la Independencia. Sesión Solemne en Congress Hall. Visita a la Campana de la Libertad. Palabras del Representante Nix, Presidente de la Delegación E.E.U.U. de la Cámara de Representantes, y de un Miembro de la Delegación Mexicana.

4-5 p.m.: Gira en autobús por Fairmount Park, en ruta hacia Independencia.

5 p.m.: Gira en autobús por Fairmount Park, en ruta hacia el aeropuerto.

6 p.m.: Salida de Philadelphia con destino a San Francisco, en un avión de propulsion a chorro de los Estados Unidos para Misiones Especiales. (Ambas Delegaciones.)

9 p.m.: Llegada a San Francisco (Base Hamilton de la Fuerza Aérea) y salida con destino al Fairmont Hotel.

Febrero 14 (Lunes)

Por la mañana: Libre. Comida sin compromiso.

1:30 p.m.: Salido del Fairmont Hotel en autobús con destino a Fisherman's Wharf (Puerto de Pescadores).

2–3:15 p.m.: Gira en lancha por lo Bahía de San Francisco.

3:15–5 p.m.: Gira en autobús por la ciudad. (Si el estado del tiempo no permite la gira en lancha, ésta será reemplazada con una gira de 3 horas en autobús.)

Por la noche: Libre. Cena sin compromiso.

Febrero 15 (Martes)

10:30 a.m.: Embarque en autobuses en el Fairmont Hotel para el viaje hacia la zona vitivinícola.

Mediodía: Llegada al establecimiento vitivinícola de Charles Krug (a unas 65 millas al Norte de San Francisco, cerca de St. Helena). Guías de habla española se unirán al grupo en Napa. Comida después de la gira.

2:45 p.m.: Salida en autobús con destino a San Francisco.

4:15 p.m.: Llegada a San Francisco, Fairmont Hotel.

7:30 p.m.: Recepción.

8:30 p.m.: Cena ofrecidas por la Cámara de Comerico de San Francisco.

Febrero 16 (Miércoles)

La Delegación Mexicana parte con destino a México. La Delegación de los Estados Unidos parte con destino a Washington, D.C. en el Avión para Misiones Especiales.

Tengan la Bondad de Llevar sus Tarjetas de identificacion.

PROGRAMA PARA LAS DAMAS

Febrero 9 (Miércoles)

3:10 p.m.: La Delegación Mexicana arriba al Aeropuerto Dulles. Los Delegados de los Estados Unidos y sus respectivas esposas recibirán a los visitantes en Dulles y se dirigirán con ellos al Shoreham Hotel para asistir a la recepción.

5 p.m.: Llegada al Shoreham Hotel. Recepción. (Buffet ligero). Resto de la noche libre.

Febrero 10 (Jueves)

9:15 a.m.: Salida de hotel (los delegados y sus señoras).

10 a.m.: Apertura de la Sesión Plenaria de la Conferencia en la Vieja Cámara de la Corte Suprema, Capitolia de los Estados Unidos.

10:40 a.m.: Ias esposas se hallarán en la Galeria del Senado cuando los Miembros de la Delegación Mexicana sean recibidos en la Cámara de Senadores.

11 a.m.: Café ofrecido en Sala S–211, Capitolio. (Será anfitriona la Sra. de Mansfield). Gira por el Capitolio.

1 p.m.: Comida en el Departmento de Estado, Salón Benjamin Franklin, para les Delegaciones de México y Estados Unidos, y respectivas esposas. (Anfitriones: Senador Sparkman y Representante Nix, Co-Presidentes de la Delagación de los Estados Unidos).

Salida con destino al hotel.

Por la trade: Libre.

6 p.m.: Salida con destino a la Embajada de Mexico.

6:30 to 8:30 p.m.: Recepción en la Embajada de México para los Delegados Mexicanos y Norteamericanos y sus respectivas esposas.

Febrero 11 (Viernes)

10:30 a.m.: Salida del hotel.

11 a.m.: Llegada al museo de Historia y Technologia Recorrido del museo.

11:45 a.m.: Recepción y comida.

2:15 p.m.: Llegada al Club de Mujures del Congreso.

2:30 p.m.: Te y exhibicion de modas.

4:30 p.m.: Salida para el hotel.

7:30 p.m.: Recepción cena, Palladian Room, Shoreham Hotel.

Del 12 al 15 de Febrero, inclusive

El mismo programa de los Delegados.

Please wear your identification badge.

SCHEDULE

February 9 (Wednesday)

3:10 p.m.: Mexican delegation arrives at Dulles Airport aboard Aeronaves Airlines jet. Honor guard and members of U.S. delegation to meet visitors at Dulles and, after welcoming ceremonies, proceed together by bus to Shoreham Hotel.

5 p.m.: Arrive Shoreham Hotel. Reception. (Light buffet.) Remainder of evening free.

February 10 (Thursday)

9 a.m.: Cochairman of Mexican delegation depart Shoreham Hotel for U.S. Capitol.

9:15 a.m.: Delegates and wives depart Shoreham Hotel for U.S. Capitol.

9:30 a.m.: Meeting of four cochairmen, room S–116, Capitol.

10 a.m.: Opening Plenary Session. Old Supreme Court Chamber, U.S. Capitol. Greetings by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Representative Nix, chairman of House of Representatives delegation. Response by chairman of Mexican delegation. (Wives of both delegations invited to attend.)

10:40 a.m.: Mexican Delegates visit Senate floor. (Wives of delegates and staff to be in Senate Gallery.)

11 a.m.: Meetings of committees:

12:30 p.m.: Political Committee—Old Supreme Court Chamber. Economic and Social Committee—Room H–227, Capitol.

(During Committee meetings, wives of delegates are invited to coffee in Capitol room S–211 (Mrs. Mansfield, hostess), followed by tour of Capitol.)

1 p.m.: Luncheon at Department of State, Benjamin Franklin Room, for Mexican and U.S. delegations, and wives. (Cohosts: Senator Sparkman and Representative Nix.)

3:30 p.m.: Meetings of committees at Capitol:

5 p.m.: Political Committee—Old Supreme Court Chamber. Economic and Social Committee—Room H–227.

6 p.m.: Delegates and wives depart Shoreham Hotel for Mexican Embassy.

6:30–8:30 p.m.: Reception at Mexican Embassy, 2829 16th Street NW.

February 11 (Friday)

(*See separate schedule for ladies*)

9:15 a.m.: Delegates depart Shoreham Hotel for U.S. Capitol.

10 a.m.–12 noon: Meetings of the two committees, U.S. Capitol: Political Committee—Old Supreme Court Chamber. Economic and Social Committee—Room H –227.

12–12:30 p.m.: Tour of the House of Representatives.

1 p.m.: Lunch in Rayburn Building, room B–369. Cohosts: Representative Nix and Senator Sparkman, cochairmen of the U.S. delegation.

3 p.m.: Closing Plenary Session, Old Supreme Court Chamber, Capitol. Remarks by Senator Sparkman, and a member of the Mexican delegation.

7:30 p.m.: Reception.

8:30 p.m.: Banquet, Shoreham Hotel, Palladian Room, given by the U.S. delegation in honor of the Mexican delegation.

February 12 (Saturday)

11 a.m.: Depart Shoreham Hotel for Lincoln Memorial.

11:44 a.m.: Wreath laying ceremony at Lincoln Memorial. Band. Reading of Gettysburg Address by Senator John Sparkman, chairman, Senate delegation.

12:30 p.m.: Depart Lincoln Memorial for Arlington National Cemetery for wreath-laying ceremony at the grave of President John F. Kennedy.

1 p.m.: Depart Arlington National Cemetery for Shoreham Hotel.

1:30 p.m.: Arrive Shoreham Hotel.

Afternoon free.

8 p.m.: Depart Shoreham Hotel for Washington Coliseum (Mexican and U.S. delegations).

9 p.m.: Ice Capades, Washington Coliseum.

February 13 (Sunday)

9:15 a.m.: Leave Shoreham Hotel by bus for Philadelphia (Mexican and U.S. delegations).

12:30 p.m.: Arrive Philadelphia.

12:45 p.m.: Reception.

1:15 p.m.: Lunch on top floor of PSFS Building (Philadelphia Saving Fund Society, 12th and Market Streets).

2:30 p.m.: Depart by bus for Independence Park.

2:40 p.m.: Arrive Independence Park. Solemn session at Congress Hall. Visit Liberty Bell. Remarks by Representative Nix, chairman of House of Representatives delegation, and a member of the Mexican delegation.

4–5 p.m.: Bus tour through remainder of Independence Park.

5 p.m.: Bus tour of Fairmount Park, en route to airport.

6 p.m.: Depart Philadelphia by U.S. special mission jet for San Francisco. (Both delegations).

9 p.m.: Arrive San Francisco (Hamilton Air Force Base) and proceed to Fairmont Hotel.

February 14 (Monday)

Morning: Free. Lunch open.

1:30 p.m.: Depart Fairmont Hotel by bus for Fisherman's Wharf.

2 p.m.: Tour of San Francisco Bay by boat.

3:15 p.m.: Tour of city by bus.

5 p.m.: (If weather does not permit boat tour, a 3-hour bus tour will be substituted.)

Evening: Free.

February 15 (Tuesday)

10:30 a.m.: Board buses at Hotel Fairmont for trip to wine country.

Noon: Arrive at Charles Krug Winery (about 65 miles north of San Francisco, near St. Helena). Spanish-speaking guides will join party at Napa. Buffet lunch following tour.

2:45 p.m.: Depart by bus for San Francisco.

4:15 p.m.: Arrive San Francisco, Hotel Fairmont.

7:30 p.m.: Reception and dinner given by San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

February 16 (Wednesday)

Mexican delegation departs for Mexico. U.S. delegation departs by special mission jet aircraft for Washington, D.C.

Please wear your identification badge.

LADIES SCHEDULE

February 9 (Wednesday)

3:10 p.m.: Mexican delegation arrives Dulles Airport. U.S. delegates and wives meet visitors at Dulles and proceed with them (by bus) to Shoreham Hotel for reception.

5 p.m.: Arrive Shoreham. Reception. (Light buffet.) Remainder of evening free.

February 10 (Thursday)

9:15 a.m.: Depart Shoreham Hotel for U.S. Capitol.

10 a.m.: Opening plenary session of conference in Old Supreme Court Chamber, U.S. Capitol.

10:40 a.m.: Wives to be in Senate Gallery when members of Mexican delegation are received on Senate floor.

11 a.m.: Coffee in room S–211, Capitol. (Hostess: Mrs. Mansfield.) Tour of Capitol.

1 p.m.: Luncheon at Department of State, Benjamin Franklin Room, for Mexican and United States delegates and wives. (Cohosts: Senator Sparkman and Representative Nix, the cochairmen of the U.S. delegation.) Depart State Department for Shoreham Hotel.

Afternoon: Free.

6 p.m.: Depart Shoreham Hotel for Mexican Embassy.

6:30 p.m.: Reception at Mexican Embassy for Mexican and United States delegates and wives.

February 11 (Friday)

10:30 a.m.: Depart Shoreham Hotel.

11 a.m.: Arrive Museum of History and Technology, Smithsonian Institution, Constitution Avenue between 12th and 14th Streets. Tour of museum.

11:45 a.m.: Reception and luncheon.

1:45 p.m.: Depart Smithsonian.

2:15 p.m.: Arrive Women's Congressional Club, 2001 New Hampshire Avenue.

2:30 p.m.: Fashion show and tea.

4:30 p.m.: Depart Congressional Club for Shoreham.

7:30 p.m.: Reception and dinner, Shoreham Hotel, Palladian Room.

February 12–15, inclusive: Schedule same as for delegates.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and in the meantime we may all go in the corner of the Chamber to extend our best wishes to our guests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 11 o'clock having arrived, the pending question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate shall be brought to a close on the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959, and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended? Under the rule, the clerk will call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, under the rule, the time has now arrived for the Chair to ascertain a quorum of the Senate; and I suggest the absence of a quorum. This will be a live quorum.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 33 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Under rule XXII, the yeas and nays are required on the pending question, which is as follows: Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 77, to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] is necessarily absent.

I also announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[No. 34 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Brewster
Burdick
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—49

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
McGovern
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—1

McNamara

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). On this vote there are 50 yeas and 49 nays. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting not having voted in the affirmative, the cloture motion is rejected.

Mr. THURMOND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement follow the vote on the motion to limit debate on whether to take up the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Today the Senate of the United States has laid to rest the issue of compulsory unionism, at least for this session of Congress. I am in hopes, however, that this victory will prove to be of much longer lasting consequence and that we have seen the last of this issue for some time to come.

It is quite apparent that union leaders need no additional powers beyond those that they already possess. It is apparent, too, that the people of this Nation consider the right to work a basic freedom and are very much in favor of the right to be free to join or not to join a union.

Today's victory is a victory for the workingman and the freedom for our people. I am happy and proud to have had a part in it.

The distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is especially to be commended for his fine leadership in this matter. The able Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] and the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and many others played a vital role in preserving section 14(b). I am proud of the stand that was taken on the Republican side of the aisle on this issue. This record of solidarity on behalf of freedom is one of which I am particularly proud.

POSITION ON CLOTURE VOTE BY SENATOR TYDINGS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I voted for cloture to terminate the debate on the repeal of section 14(b).

The country is entitled to a vote on this issue. It has been an issue in numerous referendums and election campaigns over the past 18 years. It has been considered in hearings in this and other Congresses. It has been debated at great length in both sessions of this Congress. It should be settled one way or the other, so that the business of the Senate can go on.

Unfortunately, the debate in the Congress and in the country over this issue has been dominated by slogans, scare-arguments, and emotional appeals on both sides. In my judgment, this issue has been magnified out of all importance. Labor has focused its prestige and invested a large share of its political capital on an issue that many feel is of less importance to it and to the country than such other issues as minimum wage legislation. Many groups and organizations representing management and other nonlabor interests have reacted violently to the effort to repeal section 14(b) and have flooded the country with foolish propaganda that denounces labor unions in general and certain labor leaders in particular.

It is therefore important to examine closely exactly what repeal of section 14(b) does and does not mean.

Repeal of section 14(b) will not make the union shop compulsory. Rather it will allow unions and management freely to reach agreement on whether a union shop should be instituted. In the 31 States which do not have right-to-work laws a union shop cannot be created without the consent of management. Nor can a union shop be instituted without the support of a majority of the workers in a bargaining unit. Repeal should thus mean less compulsion, not more. It will permit workers and employers to agree on what degree of union security is appropriate for their establishment. Since the union, selected by majority vote, must bargain for all, and since the fruits of the bargaining are enjoyed by all, I see no reason why, if union and management agree, that the union should not be supported by all the employees.

Nor is a vote for 14(b) a vote for arbitrary power of unions or union leaders over their members. There are abuses of power, corruption, and denial of democratic processes within unions just as there are in any organization run by fallible human beings. But those abuses occur both in union shops and nonunion shops, in States with right-to-work laws and those without them. Problems of union democracy will neither be solved nor worsened by repeal of 14(b).

In those cases where collective bargaining already goes on, repeal of 14(b) will not affect the present balance of bargaining power between unions and management. The union's right to strike, the employees right to replace strikers, and mutual duty to bargain in good faith and all other rules of collective bargaining apply to union and nonunion shops alike. Section 14(b) did not prevent the transit strike which recently paralyzed New York City and its repeal will not enlarge or reduce the possibility of such strikes occurring in the future. Finally, labor relations in 31 States, covering the great majority of American workers and industry, will not be at all affected by repeal of 14(b).

There are legitimate questions to be raised about the balance of bargaining power between labor and management and about the protection of innocent third parties affected by a labor dispute. But those questions will not be solved by permitting union shops to continue in 19 States. I would welcome a broad-scale inquiry into our labor management relations policies that could lead to reforms in all areas where problems exist.

Having said this, the question is, Why should 14(b) be repealed?

The first reason is the need to return to a uniform national labor law. Uniformity is no abstract goal. It has real and immediate consequences. Our great companies operate in every State in the Union. Their manufacturing operations are often spread over many States; they buy their materials and sell their products everywhere. The unions which represent their employees are also national in scope.

Lack of uniformity in our labor laws encourages States to compete with others for industry by making union organization more difficult. Competition for industry is a natural and often a healthy thing in our economy. But that competition should not be waged at the expense of American workers, or of their rights to bargain freely on the terms and conditions of employment—including the union shop.

Another reason for the repeal of 14(b) is that it contributes to wage levels which are unacceptably low. Average weekly wages in manufacturing enterprise in States without right-to-work laws in 1963, for example, where $101.52. For comparable enterprises in States with right-to-work laws, the average weekly wage was $91.80.

Of course, wages are affected by much more than right-to-work laws. But it cannot be denied that these laws, by handicapping union organization, contribute to an imbalance of bargaining power as compared to the rest of the Nation. With one exception, for example, every State in the southeastern part of the United States is a right-to-work State. In these States, the average weekly wage in manufacturing in 1963 was $77.77. But for Louisiana, the single non-right-to-work State in the area, the average weekly wage in manufacturing was $100.62—$23 more a week than the average for the region, as much as $30 a week more than wages in some neighboring States, a wage on a par or even better than those paid in Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, or Illinois.

When average wage levels are this low it means that many manufacturing workers in these States are working for $50 or even $40 a week—far below the line officially declared by Congress to represent poverty; and it means that workers in States like Maryland, where living costs are far higher, must forego requests for wage increases in order to keep their own wage levels competitive—so that their employers will not leave the State.

In short, no one, as a result of repeal of 14(b), will be forced to join a union—only to contribute with his dues toward the work of the union which improves his own wages and working conditions. The only States right which is at issue is the right to compete for industry with other States by hindering union organization and keeping wage levels low.

While I have supported repeal, I have done so feeling that we were debating the wrong issue at the wrong time and in the wrong way. I would have preferred the Congress consider section 14(b) in the context of a more fundamental review of our labor laws. The potential power of the Teamsters and the tragedy of the New York subway strike suggest to me that a number of changes in our labor legislation are needed.

By focusing on the relatively unimportant issue of section 14(b), the whole debate was, in my judgment, singularly unproductive. I hope that any future Congress of which I am a part will approach labor-management relations problems in a more constructive way.

VETERANS' READJUSTMENT BENEFITS ACT OF 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous unanimous-consent order, the Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 9) entitled "An Act to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period," do pass with an amendment.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President——

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we cannot hear a thing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be order in the Chamber.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 9) entitled "An act to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period," with certain amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendments.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendments.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I requested the yeas and nays on the motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendments, as follows:

On page 11 of the House-engrossed amendment, beginning with line 3, strike out all down through line 12.

On page 11 of the House-engrossed amendment, strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)".

On page 16, line 3, of the House-engrossed amendment, strike out "veterans'" and insert in lieu thereof "veteran's".

On page 22 of the House-engrossed amendment, strike out lines 19, 20, and 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(7) striking out in the first sentence of section 1772(a) the phrase 'under subchapter V of this chapter' and inserting in lieu thereof 'under subchapter V of chapter 35 of this title'; and striking out the phrase 'this chapter' the first two times it appears in the first sentence of such section 1772(a), and each time such phrase appears in the second, third, and fourth sentences of such section 1772(a), and each time such phrase appears in section 1772(b) and in sections 1773 and 1774, and inserting in lieu thereof 'chapters 34 and 35'."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I cannot hear a word. I do not know whether the Senate is in order, but I cannot hear a word.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May we have order? The clerk will not continue reading until there is order, so Senators can hear what is being read.

The clerk will continue to read the amendment.

The legislative clerk resumed the reading of the amendments as follows:

On page 31, line 17, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "programs of" and insert in lieu thereof "program or".

On page 32 of the House engrossed amendment, strike out lines 9 and 10, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(m) Section 1734 of such title 38 is amended by (1) striking out '33' in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof '34', and (2) striking out '1634' in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof '1684'."

SEVERAL SENATORS. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The clerk will not continue to read until there is order.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A parliamentary inquiry is not in order until the clerk has read the amendments.

The legislative clerk resumed the reading of the amendments, as follows:

On page 38, line 5, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)".

On page 38 of the House engrossed amendment, beginning with line 21, strike out all down through line 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c)(1) Section 2001 of title 38, United States Code, clauses (3) and (5) of section 2002 of such title, and sections 2003 and 2004 of such title are amended by inserting the phrase 'or of service after January 31, 1955' immediately after the phrase 'veterans of any war' each time such phrase appears therein.

"(2) The first sentence of section 2002 of such title 38 is amended by inserting the phrase 'or of service after January 31, 1955' immediately after the phrase 'veteran of any war'.

"(3) Clauses (1) and (4) of section 2002 of such title 38 are amended by inserting the phrase 'or of service after January 31, 1955,' immediately after the phrase 'veterans of any war' each time such phrase appears in such clauses."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOMINICK. I should like to ask the Chair whether the words we just heard read by the clerk were amendments to a House bill or whether the House bill is an amendment of the Senate bill. No member of the committee has ever to my knowledge been consulted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the House amendment is a substitute for the Senate bill. These are amendments to the House substitute.

Mr. DOMINICK. I did not hear the Presiding Officer in his last statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. These are amendments to the House substitute. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. DOMINICK. I feel that the Senate deserves some explanation.

I should like to state another parliamentary inquiry before we proceed. Is it to be my understanding that the House bill when it came over to the Senate was intercepted before it went to the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that House amendments are not referred to committee unless a motion is made to that effect.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The yeas and nays were just ordered, but were they on the bill and amendments or on the amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays were ordered on the motion of the Senator from Texas, and that is to concur in the House amendment with the other amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The motion, then, is on the amendments and not on the bill itself?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is on the House amendment and the amendments thereto.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This goes back to the House of Representatives.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the practice, and I think the Senate ought to understand it, is that the bill passed by the House has come over here.

The Senator from Texas, who has been certainly the great developer and protagonist of this idea, now asks the Senate to concur in the House amendment, with amendments. The further amendments he has proposed, aside from technicalities, would allow the GI who did not complete his high school education to complete it under the bill. The bill also, of course, would allow him to complete his college education. The GI who is now getting out of the service needs that kind of assistance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an agreement that the matter would not be debated. There was a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that 5 minutes be set aside for debate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there are some Senators who have reservations and wish to leave.

I hope that if we agree to 5 minutes of debate we shall not have occasion to extend it beyond 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope so, too.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I think we ought to have time to understand what we are doing. We are rushing along in what we are doing. I am not going to be limited to 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The time is already limited.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I did not understand that it was limited. I want to know what it is all about.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands the situation, the Senate will proceed on the question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I agree to the 5 minutes, but I would like to know what this is all about. I do not understand it, with all the talk that is going on.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like to say to the distinguished majority leader that we are considering a very important bill involving an enormous amount of money and many GI's. We are being asked to vote on a House amendment that has not been explained, and amendments to the House amendment which the committee has not heard of.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to answer under Senator DOMINICK's reservation of objection, I would remind the Senator that this matter was debated yesterday. The amendments of the House to the Senate bill were explained in detail as well as the proposed amendment which to some extent is in the nature of a technical amendment. I was not present yesterday but did read the RECORD this morning.

With the debate and discussion completed yesterday, the unanimous consent agreement entered into certainly appeared reasonable.

In view of the questions raised here today, I hope that the short period the minority leader and I have proposed will be granted.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I would like to extend that time 5 minutes, if we may.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that we had discussed this question yesterday evening. The discussion is on page 2724 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Senator YARBOROUGH discussed it at considerable length.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if we had agreed to the original request, without the many reservations, the explanation would have now been completed and the vote commenced. I think we are defeating our desire to convenience Senators who have relied upon the unanimous-consent agreement.

I renew my request for a limitation of 5 minutes to a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Equal time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Senator DOMINICK, who is the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, should have all of the time. I would, however, like the Senator from Texas to understand that I tried to clear it for him with the minority members of the subcommittee.

My understanding is that this bill came from the House with an amendment which the Senator will explain. Second, he is dealing with the matter of the inclusion of high school education, as the bill now only provides for college education; third, he gives the Senate his assurance that this amendment, if sent back to the House, will be accepted in the House.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in answer to the inquiry of the distinguished Senator from New York, and to clarify the matter, a unanimous-consent agreement was made between the distinguished leaders of the Senate that the Senate vote immediately after the vote on cloture. That was pursuant to the request of many Senators on both sides who have reservations and desire to leave.

There was no disposition on the part of the managers of the bill to cut off debate. A number of Senators asked for accommodation. We discussed this matter yesterday, printed the House amendment in the Record, and explained the proposed Senate amendments, all of which is at page 2732 of the Record.

Since this bill was passed by the House, I have been in numerous conferences with Chairman Teague. They had reached agreement on many amendments but paragraph (d) of section 1673, as it passed the House would likely prohibit servicemen from using the GI bill to finish high school.

Under the GI bill of World War II, 44 percent of the veterans had not finished high school; under the Korean GI bill 34 percent of the veterans had not finished high school.

We have reached an agreement to delete this paragraph.

Chairman Teague assures me that if that is the only amendment the House will accept it. He leaves for Vietnam today, and it is hoped that this bill will be passed today.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, for the purpose of the Record I wish to make this crystal clear. I am supposed to be the ranking minority member on the Veterans' Subcommittee. At no time has the manager of this bill consulted with me or called my office, so far as I know, about the House passed bill, or included me in any of his talks with Mr. Teague or anyone else. He has not given me the courtesy of informing me that something was to be done yesterday by unanimous consent, nor has he told me at any time the substance of the amendments which he is asking for today.

I want that clear in the Record. I can say that although I am going along with this procedure this time, this is the last time, inasmuch as I consider the position that I have as a responsibility on me. But in the future I will not go along on this kind of slipshod method of acting on a bill which involves millions of dollars.

I wish to make my position clear. I will support this bill today. But I at least deserve the courtesy of being informed what is going on when I am the ranking minority member on the subcommittee.

Furthermore, it is my opinion that we should have had a committee meeting to study this bill and establish what position we are to take. This was not done.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am the ranking member on the committee. First I should like to say that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is acting correctly and in a most statesmanlike manner. I was persuaded—and I believe he is persuaded now—that, because of the exigencies in the situation and because of the fact that Representative Teague is leaving, and the further fact that we would not be able to get the necessary quorum in committee, the matter might be delayed. Of course I do not believe anyone wishes to delay the matter. I offered to call the minority members on the subcommittee, and the Senator from Texas agreed that I should do so. Without the cooperation of the Senator from Colorado, this could not have been done. What he is doing is the perfectly proper way to proceed. It is perfectly proper to serve notice that this is not the way to do it, and that this is a one-shot proposal.

Of course, no one is charging anyone with bad faith. This is only a statement of fact for the Record. I believe the Senator from Colorado is acting perfectly properly in the situation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we are proceeding on a privileged matter. The Senate bill was amended in the House. I do not promise in the future to try to destroy a rule of the Senate. We are following the rule of the Senate to the letter in connection with this matter. I did tell the distinguished Senator from New York that I would try to have my staff contact the majority members on the subcommittee and that he would try to contact the minority members. The Senator from New York and I agreed to do that. The committee itself could not be polled except on the order of the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill].

I see no reason why the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare should have any different rules apply to it than are applied to other committees. We have followed the rule. I resent the implication that we have tried to do something that we should not have done. We followed the rule to the letter.

I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall take only a minute. A part of the House amendment fell clearly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance. Our committee met a couple of days ago and discussed it. We decided we would not assert any jurisdiction; that we were prepared to vote on it at any time, practically, after the House amended the bill. The Senate agreed by unanimous consent to vote on the amendment if we first had a quorum call.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday two privileged matters were before the Senate—the amendment of the House to the bank merger bill and the amendment of the House to the GI bill. The distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] had hoped to have the amendment to the GI bill considered first. I objected on the ground that it was necessary to meet a court deadline on the bank merger bill, and that bill was disposed of yesterday. The Senator from Texas can now clear up the amendment to the GI bill at any time, because it is privileged.

I must say in his behalf that I moved heaven and earth calling Senators who knew something about the GI bill, to try to have them come to the Chamber. At long last, the Senator from Texas returned to his office, obtained his data, came back, and made an explanation of the bill on the floor of the Senate. We remained here until that was concluded toward the end of the day. But I tried to invite every Senator who was interested to come to the Chamber and participate in the discussion. So whatever is fair is fair; that must be said.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 seconds. The distinguished minority leader is exactly correct. He pressed to have this bill taken up yesterday. He called my office several times. He insisted that our explanation be made yesterday and not today, so that Members of the Senate could read it in the Record. It was at his insistence that this debate was opened and these amendments were explained and are now ready for approval.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. One additional fact is that the Committee on Banking and Currency voted 9 to 2 to consider the House amendment to the bank merger bill, notwithstanding that it was just as privileged as the GI bill, and that is the best practice.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I also rise to give my support to S. 9, the cold war GI bill. I continue in my endorsement of this long-overdue legislation.

It strengthens our military forces by making service more attractive and strengthens our civilian population by providing a supply of better educated GI bill veterans. Veterans educated under the World War II and Korean war GI bills continue to make important contributions to our rising standard of living.

This bill provides useful assistance to servicemen during that difficult period of readjustment to civilian life. By providing not only educational assistance but also home loans, job counseling, and Federal employment preference to the veteran this bill shortens the time period before the returning serviceman becomes a contributing member of the community. There is no question but that military service is a hardship and an inconvenience as well as a very necessary duty. Every assistance should be given to these men upon the completion of that duty.

One of the reasons I am enthusiastic in my support of this legislation is that it is a bargain. Just as with the past GI bills, this program will pay for itself twice and perhaps thrice over in additional taxes paid by the higher earning veterans. It is a pleasure to vote for a legislative program which will repay its cost in the near future.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I am happy to support H.R. 12410, the cold war GI bill which is now before us for consideration.

The Federal Government has taken an important step in its endeavor to provide a readjustment bill for our cold war veterans who have been honorably released from the Armed Forces since January 31, 1955. No one can deny that the whole Nation has benefited enormously from the World War II and Korean conflict GI readjustment bills. It is only logical and fair to extend these benefits to the young men and women who have served their country honorably in hot spots such as Vietnam, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Berlin, Laos, Lebanon, and Taiwan-Matsu.

The bill before us will provide a just and equitable readjustment bill for those deserving young men and women who have given to the United States critical years and months of their lives. It represents an investment in the future of America and is a testimony to our recognition of those who gallantly serve our country. This bill will insure that our Nation will continue to utilize the skills and abilities of our veterans in the very best possible way.

I am proud to vote for this legislation which will give to our veterans not only a reasonable opportunity to obtain education and training, but will offer them home loan assistance, medical, and other benefits.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am very glad to cast my vote today for S. 9, the new GI bill providing veterans' benefits for those who have served in our Armed Forces since 1955. The current war in Vietnam, with its increasing requirements and the growing number of our men called to participate, makes the passage of this bill imperative and just.

This new GI bill will provide a permanent program of educational assistance, with monthly allowances for training and for helping to support the families of those who use its benefits. The benefits for veterans will also include new provisions for both guaranteed and direct home loans, as well as for extending VA medical care on the same basis as is available to veterans who have defended our security in earlier wars. Additionally, preference in Federal employment is also extended to our veterans who have served since 1955, and provision is made for coverage of home rental payments of individuals called to military duty now.

In the past 2 months, I have had the opportunity of visiting Vietnam twice. It is a difficult war, and we hope it can soon be ended with honor. In Vietnam, I found the members serving in our Armed Forces performing, as always, with high morale and great courage. With sadness, I saw also those who had been wounded in fulfilling their duty.

We know that many of our men have already given their lives in Vietnam in the service of our country, and there are thousands more serving in danger areas around the world, with still others at home subject to the call of the Nation. In Vietnam and elsewhere, the dangers emphasize the task and the patriotism of the men whom this bill is designed to assist. These men are serving to afford security to our country and to its institutions, and I know that the unanimous support given this bill reflects the appreciation of their fellow countrymen.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, it seems incredible to me that when the Nation has an opportunity to show its gratitude to the men who now are called upon to make such sacrifices as we ask of them in Vietnam that we should be closefisted. These men are like ourselves—they have their families and their loved ones who daily pray for their safety. Many of these are young men barely past their voting age. Their whole life course has been diverted unnaturally into the battlefield. They serve a nation which is great not only in wealth but also in its generosity of spirit.

It seems to me entirely fitting that the provisions asked for in this bill should be granted. It has had its inception in the GI bill in which I and many of you found a salvation. Many of the men I know in public life received their emancipation from a life of menial occupation through the instruments of the GI bill. It has proven its effectiveness. Therefore, it seems to me that on this basis there can be no opposition.

But there is also a second factor to this extremely crucial national effort which we undertake today. In recognizing the need to have an educated public and in its consideration of the domestic responsibilities of many people, this Nation has seen fit to exempt or to defer the services of many and fill their places with a few.

I need not point out the divisiveness of such a policy, essential and humane as it may be. Loyalty and responsibility to collective security is the first responsibility. But by what justification can we defer a man on the basis of intelligence, for instance? If his reward from the state is great, his responsibility to that state cannot be less. I am not in opposition to such deferment. I simply wish to point out that the presence of these deferments can divide our national unity, and that if we do not take quick steps to compensate those who serve their country in this most dangerous undertaking, we will separate ourselves at a time when unity should be our goal.

Finally, I should like to point out that the whole philosophy of the new society is to encourage to the fullest the development of the individual's potentialities. For this, we inaugurated the war on poverty. This is the goal of one branch of our overseas program in Vietnam. Why is it not a sound investment in American manhood? These men will return to peaceful pursuits, broadened no doubt by their experience, their appetites whetted for the better life. It seems the Nation could have no better opportunity for development than to provide the apparatus through which these motivations can be channeled into that of the richest of human resources—the human mind.

I therefore because of its precedence, its fairness, and its potentialities for good, give my wholehearted support for this measure. I would solicit the combined efforts of my colleagues to bring it to speedy passage.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I want to commend all those who assisted in the development and support of this legislation from its inception to enactment.

One of the finest investments this Nation ever made was the original GI bill of rights program following World War II. Now, the sons and daughters of those who benefited from that first program can look forward to the same helping hand from the Government they are protecting by their military service.

I am confident that this legislation to establish a permanent and equitable scheme of educational, housing and other assistance to veterans of our Armed Forces will repay incalculable benefits to the national welfare in years to come. Helping those who want to help themselves is in the finest tradition of Federal action and I am proud to have participated in the legislative consideration of this bill.

THE NEED FOR A COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to announce my full endorsement of S. 9, which has become generally known as the cold war GI bill. As a cosponsor of this measure, I believe it is a most equitable readjustment program for our veterans who have served in our Armed Forces during the induction period dating since January 31, 1955, the period that has been recognized as the cold war.

Our colleague, Senator YARBOROUGH, who is the author and chief sponsor of the legislation, and who is the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, deserves our commendation for his persistent leadership during the years in which the final outcome of the measure was in doubt.

Senator YARBOROUGH believes, as I do, that the events in Vietnam have dramatized the necessity for the enactment of the legislation. It will provide some of the same equitable and fully deserved readjustment assistance to our cold war veterans as was determined to be wise for servicemen of World War II and the Korean conflict.

Only a few days after the introduction of S. 9 in the Senate in 1965, the President presented his message to the Congress regarding the state of our defenses. At that time, he stated:

> Our soldiers, sailors, and airmen, and marines, from whom we ask so much, are the cornerstone of our military might * * *. Men and women, who have devoted their lives and their resources to the needs of their country, are entitled to help and consideration in making the transition to other pursuits.

I was wholly in accord with President Johnson then, as I am now, in this belief. During the 86th Congress, I cosponsored a cold war GI bill, S. 1138, which passed the Senate. During the 87th Congress, I cosponsored S. 349, a bill to provide educational benefits for post-Korean conflict draftees and volunteers who served for 6 months since January 31, 1955.

During the 88th Congress, I cosponsored S. 5 to provide educational and vocational training assistance and to guarantee and direct loan assistance for the purchase of homes and farmlands by veterans.

I feel that the men and women on military duty during the period of the cold war should be given the same educational and vocational training opportunities which our Nation justly and wisely provided to World War II and Korean peace action veterans. Any serviceman, having been drafted by his local draft board and thus prohibited for a period of time from establishing himself in civil life, who might have been in Vietnam, who understandably find it hard to believe that his military service under fire in Vietnam, in defense of his country, was not equally deserving as that of earlier GI's with similar World War II and Korean war experiences.

For those who may feel that the provisions of this bill are not economically justified, I wish to point out that tremendous benefits have accrued to our Nation as a result of the enactment of the original GI bill. These benefits have elevated the economic level of our country and its citizens. The year before last, shortly after the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the signing of the original GI bill by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in June 1944, I reported to the people of my State of West Virginia that I felt the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944 represented a great bargain for Uncle Sam. It is my belief that one of his best-paying investments has been the expenditures on American veterans under the provisions of this act, which permitted veterans, generally, to adjust themselves more compatibly to civilian life.

Under the GI bill, 1 out of every 5 homes built since the end of World War II has been financed by GI loans. More than 5,268,000 World War II veterans were granted home, farm, and business loans, totaling $43 billion. The approximately 5 million home loans sparked a housing boom beginning in the mid-1940's that has made America into a Nation of homeowners. The accompanying wide use of credit gave an enormous impetus to the economy through the purchase of new furniture, new appliances, new cars, and school construction. And 20 years later, more than one-third of the GI loans are already paid in full.

But particularly pertinent to the provisions of S. 9, at the peak of the original GI bill activity, under the education and training provisions, 7,800,000 veterans—nearly half of all who saw wartime service—received training. Over 2 million were in colleges at one time with another 3,500,000 in other institutions such as trade and technical schools. About 1,400,000 veterans increased their skills in on-the-job training, and 700,000 learned new agricultural techniques in on-the-farm training.

Our Nation is vastly enriched today as a result of skills acquired under the GI bill—including 450,000 engineers; 180,000 doctors, dentists, and nurses; 360,000 schoolteachers; 150,000 scientists; 243,000 accountants; 107,000 lawyers; 36,000 clergymen; 17,000 writers; 711,000 mechanics; 383,000 construction workers; 288,000 metalworkers; 138,000 electricians; and about 700,000 who trained for business and executive careers. The total cost of this vast program of mass adult education is $14.5 billion—recouped at $1 billion per year from increased income taxes paid by better-educated, higher-earning GI bill veterans. Obviously, Uncle Sam invested wisely.

Worthy of special note in this context, the 1960 Census showed nearly 17 million families headed by war veterans. Included in this total are 184,652 such families in my own State of West Virginia. These families, on a nationwide basis, had a median income of $6,469 a year, over $800 more than the median for the total 45 million U.S. families. In West Virginia, 10 percent of the families headed by veterans had an annual income of $10,000 or more, and 32 percent had incomes ranging from $6,000 to $10,000.

During the 88th Congress, this committee's report on S. 5 carried statements to the effect that the need for legislation of this nature was clear, compelling, and urgent. It pointed out that today's cold war conditions are such that thousands of young Americans are required by the compulsory draft law to serve on active duty in the Armed Forces and that without the exigencies of the cold war the majority would remain in civil life, pursuing personal goals.

Young persons entering the service since January 31, 1955, have been called upon to make personal sacrifices but have not had even the limited benefits proposed under S. 9—for educational assistance or vocational training.

The inequity should be redressed. Such action has been too long delayed.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I should like to express my full support of the new GI bill, which I am confident this body will overwhelmingly approve in the vote scheduled for today.

I am particularly pleased that a number of Texans have played important roles in achieving passage of this legislation. My distinguished senior colleague [Mr. YARBOROUGH] has long sought passage of such a bill. He has labored session after session for the bill, and he deserves the lion's share of the credit for what will occur today.

Representative OLIN TEAGUE, also of my State, and the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, has been a key figure in consideration in the other body. This occurrence today, too, is in large measure due to his noble efforts.

I was glad to have the opportunity more than a year ago to introduce the Vietnam GI bill, elements of which may be found in the bill we will vote on today.

Many Texas editors and thousands of individual Texans also have urged adoption of a new GI bill of rights.

Among the major newsapers of my State which have editorialized in support of the GI bill are these: Wichita Falls Record News, Waco Times-Herald, Austin Statesman, Houston Tribune, Denton Record-Chronicle, Kilgore News-Herald, Irving News Texan, Cuero Record, Longview Morning Journal, Waco News-Tribune, Lubbock Avalanche-Journal, Marshall News-Messenger, Austin American, Lufkin News, Wichita Falls Times, Beaumont Enterprise, Beaumont Journal, El Paso Times.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that at the conclusion of my remarks selected editorials from these papers be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. TOWER. Throughout our Nation's history, we have provided special benefits for the fighting men who defend our country against foreign enemies and work with our allies in maintaining a climate of freedom in this world.

The assistance this new GI bill provides will be of tremendous value to our younger veterans as they complete their Vietnam service, and their service in other aspects of the cold war. It will help them as they seek to return to an active, contributing civilian life.

We owe these men nothing less for their dedication and valor in service to us all.

General Eisenhower once said:

> To live for your country is as demanding a duty as to die for it.

I think that living for our country means searching out opportunities to serve and to strengthen it. It means being a doer in the community, accepting responsibility for improving the environment in which our children play, study and worship. It means showing respect for the flag and displaying it proudly as the symbol of the ideals and institutions we hold dear.

In addition, living for our country means living up to our responsibility to provide well in pay, equipment and benefits for those men and women who are ready to die to protect us.

I returned only a few weeks ago from a tour as an Armed Services Committee member throughout the combat areas of southeast Asia. Many of the men I saw there asked me what the chances were that America would remember them with GI bill benefits such as their fathers and older brothers received after World War II and Korea. I told those men they had no fear.

"America will remember you," I said.

And, tomorrow, with enactment of the new GI bill we will do just that.

These men who fight for us today are an amazing group. Those of us who participated in World War II know that there were fine American troops in that conflict. Certainly, the men who served us in the Korean war were topnotch soldiers, too.

But, I must in all candor say that the men who defend us today in southeast Asia, in Korea, in Europe, in Latin America and elsewhere in this Nation and overseas, are the best, most qualified and most dedicated troops America ever has been able to call upon.

I was tremendously impressed by these Americans who are helping defend the independence of South Vietnam and, indeed, of all southeast Asia. These men are hard fighters. They do their job day in and day out. They do not gripe. They have high morale. They are doing a magnificent job for the free world.

Sometimes it seems every generation of Americans is called upon to make sacrifices in blood to preserve freedom. As I visited the field hospitals, I saw sights I will not forget. And yet, the wounded men I saw understand—just as the American people must understand—that we are making our stand in Vietnam today to preclude a fight on a much broader front at greater cost later on.

Besides fighting, our fine soldiers, sailors, and airmen are busy doing many constructive things to help the people of South Vietnam.

They are building schools, teaching local leaders how to govern, teaching about sanitation, giving out soap and food, tending sores and wounds and tropical diseases—all this in marked contrast to the terror of the Vietcong, who close schools and even force children and girls into combat situations.

Mr. President, these men deserve a new GI bill. I will support them in that need today as I have in the past. I hope the Senate will return a unanimous vote in favor of our fighting men.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Kilgore (Tex.) News-Herald, January 1966]

NEEDED: VIETNAM GI BILL

On his return from a tour in southeast Asia last month, Texas Senator JOHN TOWER reported that scores of servicemen asked about prospects for enactment of a Vietnam GI bill.

He found many of them ready to utilize loan and education assistance if it were made available to them after their combat service.

Senator TOWER introduced a Vietnam GI bill a year ago. Later the Senate approved, with Senator TOWER's affirmative vote, the more extensive cold war GI bill authored by Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas.

Either of these bills would fill the current need, but House of Representatives action is still awaited. Representative OLIN TEAGUE is pushing for such House action, and the administration says it may present a modified bill more acceptable to budgeting problems.

Enactment of a Vietnam GI bill is a project involving many Texans, as well as thousands of others who are serving in Vietnam. There will be many more who serve, and no one knows at this time the probable length of that conflict.

These men, as did those in other wars, deserve the help and opportunities which this type of legislation can provide.

We hope that the administration and Congress will see fit to push a GI bill through as quickly as possible.

[From the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Record News, Jan. 12, 1966]

IMPORTANT BILL

On returning from Vietnam recently, Senator JOHN TOWER, of Wichita Falls, reported the servicemen there had asked him about the prospects for the enactment of a Vietnam GI bill.

Early in the session of the 89th Congress last year, Senator TOWER introduced such a bill, providing the Vietnam servicemen receive exemption from income tax, and provide home loans and education provisions similar to those of the Korean GI bill.

Another bill including these provisions and extending the benefits to all cold war veterans passed the Senate, and was caught in the rush in the House and never came to a vote.

Representative OLIN TEAGUE is working this year for House action, and the Wichitan promises to start immediately for Senate action on the stalled bill. It is also understood that the administration may suggest a modified bill, suited to current budget conditions.

Whatever form such a bill takes in the current session of Congress, it deserves the fullest backing of all of us. It is a must for us to give the same protection to the men now in the firing lines as we gave other veterans.

Let your Congressmen and Senators know how you feel about this deserving proposal.

[From the Waco (Tex.) Times-Herald, Jan. 14, 1966]

GI BILL HAS BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FROM CONGRESS

Republican Senator JOHN G. TOWER, of Texas, informs us that when he was in southeast Asia last month, scores of U.S. servicemen asked about the prospects for enactment of a Vietnam GI bill. The Senator said he found them ready to utilize such loan and education assistance if it were to be made available to them after their combat service.

Senator TOWER introduced the Vietnam GI bill a year ago. Subsequently the Senator approved, with his affirmative vote, the more extensive cold war GI bill authored by Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas.

Either of these measures would satisfy the current need, Senator TOWER says, but action by the House of Representatives still is awaited. The President Wednesday night endorsed the objective of these proposals.

Representative TEAGUE is pushing for such House action and the administration says it may present a modified bill more acceptable to its budgeting problems. Thus the enactment of a Vietnam GI bill is a project involving many Texans, and Senator TOWER says he believed it would be most helpful at this time.

A chief proposal of legislation introduced by TOWER were proposals to declare Vietnam a combat zone for purpose of Federal income tax exemption of U.S. servicemen there, and a proposal to extend home loan and educational benefits similar to those accorded to Korean war veterans, to those who have served in South Vietnam and adjacent waters.

Senator TOWER believes that those who face our enemies on the battlefield deserve all we can provide for them in the way of opportunities to share fully in the society they have helped and are helping to preserve.

[From the Austin (Tex.) Statesman, Jan. 11, 1966]

VIET GI BILL AWAITS ACTION

Republican Senator JOHN G. TOWER, of Texas, informs us that when he was in southeast Asia last month, scores of U.S. servicemen asked about the prospects for enactment of a Vietnam GI bill. The Senator said he found them ready to utilize such loan and education assistance if it were to be made available to them after their combat service.

Senator TOWER introduced the Vietnam GI bill a year ago. Subsequently the Senator approved, with this affirmative vote, the more extensive cold war GI bill authored by Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas.

Either of these measure would satisfy the current need, Senator TOWER says, but action by the House of Representatives still is awaited.

Representative TEAGUE is pushing for such House action and the administration says it may present a modified bill more acceptable to its budgeting problems. Thus the enactment of a Vietnam GI bill is a project involving many Texans, and Senator TOWER says he believed it would be most helpful.

A chief proposal of legislation introduced by TOWER were proposals to declare Vietnam a combat zone for purpose of Federal income tax exemption of U.S. servicemen there, and a proposal to extend home-loan and educational benefits similar to those accorded to Korean war veterans, to those who have served in South Vietnam and adjacent waters.

Senator TOWER believes that those who face our enemies on the battlefield deserve all we can provide for them in the way of opportunities to share fully in the society they have helped and are helping to preserve.

These newspapers also subscribe to that belief.

[From the Longview (Tex.) Morning Journal, May 16, 1965]

TASK HALF DONE

It is an anomaly of American equity and justice that while our servicemen are engaged in deadly combat for the cause of freedom in Vietnam, we here at home must wage campaigns to get our Government to give these fighting men the material benefits and protection accorded other veterans such as those who have served in Korea.

Texas' able and alert Senator JOHN G. TOWER early in the days of this session of Congress introduced a number of bills relating to the war in Vietnam. Among those bills were S. 459 to declare Vietnam a combat zone for purposes of Federal income tax exemption for our servicemen there, and S. 458 to extend home-loan and educational benefits similar to those accorded our Korean veterans to those serving in South Vietnam and adjacent waters.

The task which Senator TOWER undertook with these two bills really was the task of all of us here at home. A man of concern and compassion, he undertook the task because he knew that in all fairness it ought to be done, and because he felt the people here at home would want it done for our servicemen in Vietnam.

Senator TOWER offered one of the bills, S. 549, as an amendment to legislation pending before the Senate. The amendment failed, but the Texas Senator's efforts to bring the matter to public attention brought results. President Johnson, by executive decree, declared the area a combat zone and Senator TOWER approved his action. So do we all.

Today, with Congress in the fifth month of this session, the task undertaken by the energetic Texas Senator for the combat veterans of Vietnam remains half done. It behooves the people of Texas, who are his constituents, as well as fairminded Americans in all States, to help bring understanding and support to S. 458 which would extend home-loan and educational benefits to our servicemen in Vietnam.

We as responsible citizens must agree that those from among us who face our enemies on the battlefield deserve all we can reasonably provide for them in the way of opportunity to share equally in the society they have helped to preserve.

The United States has some 46,500 servicemen in Vietnam, by recent official report. A naval force of carriers and supporting ships is operating from adjacent waters. Servicemen in Vietnam face the enemy on all sides, day and night, whether engaged in a battle or trying to get some rest. More than 350 have been killed or lost, and more than 2,000 have been wounded by the enemy. Vietnam is a combat zone, by any standard.

These men deserve our best attention and support here at home. For our cause of freedom and against the spread of communism, they risk their lives 24 hours a day. Some will never return, more will come home partially crippled and handicapped for life, and all will have lost valuable time and energy needed in preparing themselves for useful and productive lives for themselves and their families.

Senator Tower is to be commended for his foresighted and untiring efforts to secure the necessary Government action to extend to our Vietnam veterans the benefits accorded the veterans of Korea. This is just and equitable. The task is half done. Let's finish it, without further dilly-dallying.

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Times, May 13, 1965]

Right Thing To Do

If our forces in Vietnam are not engaged in combat, we wonder exactly what they are doing.

For that reason, we wish to endorse S. 458, offered in the U.S. Senate by Senator John G. Tower, of Texas, and others.

That bill would extend home loan and educational benefits to servicemen in South Vietnam.

We have some 45,000 troops in South Vietnam. The latest official tally shows some 350 American servicemen have been killed and some 2,100 wounded. Yet Vietnam is not classified as a combat zone.

It seems only too obvious that the United States is making it a combat zone more and more every day.

We think our men engaged in combat in Vietnam are entitled to the same consideration as those who have been engaged in combat elsewhere.

That is the least we can do.

[From the Cuero (Tex.) Record, May 14, 1965]

Says Vietnam a Combat Area—Tower Bill Would Reward Servicemen

Although he was unsuccessful in securing passage of Senate bill 459 which would have provided Federal income tax exemptions for servicemen in Vietnam, Texas Senator John G. Tower is still hopeful another of his measures (S. 458) will survive in the National Congress.

Senate bill 458 would extend home loans and educational benefits, similar to those accorded our Korean veterans, to those who have served in South Vietnam and adjacent waters.

Senator Tower made this hope known in a letter last week to Jack Howerton, Record publisher.

While S. 459 which was offered as an amendment to legislation before the Senate failed, Senator Tower wrote, it did result in bringing the matter more forcibly to public attention when some of the newspapers, such as the Washington Star, treated the subject editorially. The President, by Executive decree, then declared the area a combat zone and I approve his action.

"There now remains the question of extending home loan and educational benefits to our servicemen in Vietnam. This is embodied in S. 458, by myself and others. I believe you will agree with me that those who face our enemies on the battlefields deserve all we can provide for them in the way of opportunities to share fully in the society they have helped to preserve. I do hope you will lend your editorial voice to passage of this legislation."

The Record most certainly concurs with Senator Tower in his contention that Vietnam unquestionably is a combat zone and servicemen participating in the Vietnam conflict are entitled to the same privileges and benefits as those who have participated in previous wars.

We sincerely endorse passage of Senate bill 458 and believe we speak for at least 95 percent of the citizens of Cuero and DeWitt County in urging its passage.

According to recent tallies approximately 350 American servicemen have been killed and more than 2,000 have been wounded by the enemy in Vietnam since the beginning of 1961. We have approximately 30,000 troops on duty there, plus a naval force of carriers and supporting ships. Our planes are constantly in the air protecting our military installations and attacking Communist supply routes and bases.

Repeating a question asked by the Washington Star we ask our Senators and Congressmen in Washington concerning Vietnam:

"If it isn't a combat zone, what in heaven's name is it?"

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Journal, May 13, 1965]

Aid for Servicemen

Senator John Tower is cosponsor of a bill to extend home loan and educational benefits to U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam. The President has already, by Executive decree, declared the area a combat zone for purposes of Federal income tax exemption, which Tower had favored doing.

The proposal has merit. Undeclared or not, we are fighting a war in South Vietnam. The serviceman there is doing precisely what other servicemen did in World War II and, later, in Korea. He is putting his life on the line at the same time he is sacrificing opportunities at home.

Senator Tower wants to extend benefits, similar to those accorded to Korean war veterans, to men who serve in South Vietnam and adjacent waters. Fairness dictates that this should be done.

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise, May 13, 1965]

They Deserve It

We agree with Senator John Tower that "those who face our enemies on the battlefield deserve all we can provide for them in the way of opportunities to share fully in the society they have helped to preserve."

The Texas lawmaker has translated his interest into action in a number of ways. Early in the year he introduced in Congress a number of proposals on Vietnam. These included a bill to make Vietnam a combat zone for purposes of Federal income tax exemption for servicemen there, and one to extend home loan and educational benefits, similar to those accorded Korean veterans, to those who have served in Vietnam and adjacent waters.

The proposal on tax exemption later was offered as an amendment to a bill before the Senate. Although the amendment failed, it helped to bring countrywide attention to the whole question of benefits for the southeast Asia fighters. This particular issue was cleared up when President Johnson by Executive decree, declared the Vietnam area a combat zone.

Unfortunately, the other question, that of home loan and educational benefits, has not been so happily resolved. We urge, therefore, passage of Senate bill 458, authored by Tower and others in the upper Chamber.

It is only right that Congress approve this measure. The war in Vietnam is war in every deadly sense of the word. We cannot fail to do our duty by American men fighting for us—and for freedom—in that faraway part of the world.

[From the Marshall (Tex.) News Messenger, May 20, 1965]

Combat Zone

Our advisers in South Vietnam are fighting and dying and undergoing all the ordeals of a war in a strange and terrible land. Yet they enjoy none of the tax advantages, including income tax benefits and combat or hazardous duty pay which were extended to our soldiers in Korea and in World War II.

Senator John Tower has introduced a bill in the Senate designating Vietnam as a combat zone for tax purposes. A similar bill has been offered in the House by Representative William E. Minshall. Still another bill has been presented to give our men hazardous duty pay while stationed in Vietnam.

Perhaps only Congress can deal with added pay for combat duty. But an executive order designating Vietnam as a combat zone might clarify the other part of the problem.

There may be some very good legal reasons why this situation has been permitted to arise and to continue. But no one should pretend that the reasons will make much sense to the men on the scene in Vietnam.

[From the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times, May 12, 1965]

A Deserving Proposal

Early in the present session of Congress Senator John G. Tower introduced a number of bills relating to the war in Vietnam. Chief among his proposals, as he has declared, were one measure that would exempt the income of servicemen there from provisions of the Federal income tax, and a second that would extend home loan and educational benefits similar to those accorded Korean war veterans to those who serve in South Vietnam and adjacent waters.

The latter bill is still pending and Senator Tower has expressed the hope that support can be gained for its passage. It is a proposal of merit and should be adopted.

President Johnson, by Executive decree, recently declared the area a combat zone and thus automatically provided for income tax benefits to the American military men in service there, but in all fairness and equity Congress should extend the home loan and educational benefits as Senator Tower and other sponsors of this action have outlined.

Those who face our enemies on the firing line deserve the opportunities others of our fighting men have been presented from the society they have helped to preserve.

The bill in question is Senate bill 458 and one way of speeding it to passage is for constituents to write their Members of Congress. The Times endorses the movement for the enactment of the bill and invites public response in writing to Representatives and Senators in Washington.

[From the Austin (Tex.) American, May 18, 1965]

A Desirable Bill

In January of this year, during the early days of this session of Congress, Senator John G. Tower of Texas, introduced a number of bills relating to the war in Vietnam. Chief among these bills were proposals to declare Vietnam a combat zone for purposes of Federal income tax exemption of U.S. servicemen there, and a proposal to extend home loan and educational benefits similar to those accorded to Korean war veterans, to those who have served in South Vietnam and adjacent waters.

One of the bills, S. 459, subsequently was offered as an amendment to legislation pending before the U.S. Senate. While it failed, it did result in bringing the matter more forcefully to public attention when some newspapers treated the subject editorially.

The President, by Executive decree, then declared the area a combat zone, and Senator Tower approved his action.

Says Senator Tower: "There now remains the question of extending home loan and educational benefits to our servicemen in South Vietnam. This is embodied in S. 458 by myself and others. I believe you will agree that those who face our enemies on the battlefield deserve all we can provide for them in the way of opportunities to share fully in the society they have helped to preserve."

These newspapers also subscribe to that belief, and hope Senator Tower's bill will meet with favor by Congress.

[From the Lufkin (Tex.) News, May 11, 1965]

SENATOR TOWER WOULD EXTEND BENEFITS TO VIETNAM TROOPS

A letter from Senator JOHN TOWER accompanies a copy of S. 458, which he and other Senators have introduced.

His letter includes the following remarks: "In January of this year, during the early days of this session of Congress, I introduced a number of bills relating to the war in Vietnam. Chief among these bills, from my point of view, were proposals to declare Vietnam a combat zone for purposes of Federal income tax exemption for our servicemen there (S. 459), and a proposal (S. 458) to extend home loan and educational benefits, similar to those accorded our Korean veterans, to those who have served in South Vietnam and adjacent waters."

Senator TOWER points out he offered S. 459 as an amendment to legislation pending before the Senate, and "while the amendment failed, the act did result in bringing the matter more forcefully to public attention when some newspapers, such as the Washington Star, treated the subject editorially. The President, by executive decree, then declared the area a combat zone and I approved his action."

Senator TOWER hopes to build up support for S. 458, to extend home loan and educational benefits to our servicemen in South Vietnam. He declares, "I believe you will agree with me that those who face our enemies on the battlefield deserve all we can provide for them in the way of opportunities to share fully in the society they have helped to preserve."

We are in full agreement, and we trust Congress will enact this bill—even if it is introduced by Texas' Republican Senator—instead of leaving it to the President to do the same job by Executive decree (and thus take credit for the Democratic administration).

W. R. BEAUMIER.

[From the Lubbock (Tex.) Avalanche-Journal, May 13, 1965]

TIME FOR ACTION IS NOW—VIETNAM VETERANS DUE BENEFITS

Senator JOHN G. TOWER is hoping for a "break" which would achieve the second of two principal objectives designed to benefit servicemen on duty in the Vietnamese struggle.

The first objective was reached last month, although not exactly in the manner which Senator TOWER and other sponsors of S. 459 had in mind. This bill proposed the declaring of Vietnam as a combat zone for purposes of Federal income tax exemption for servicemen.

This bill was offered early in the year as an amendment to other pending Senate legislation, but it failed. Irate newspaper comment, however, was credited with bringing the idea to such extensive public attention that President Johnson used the Executive decree method to put it into effect, giving GI's tax relief on their returns for 1964.

The second objective, of even greater importance than the first, is the extension of home loan and educational benefits to our servicemen in South Vietnam. This proposal, providing the same benefits given to veterans of the Korean war, is contained in S. 458, by TOWER and eight other Senators.

Surely the vast majority of the American people would approve the move, in appreciation to servicemen who are facing the nation's enemies in battle. And the time to get it done is now, not months or years after service in South Vietnam is completed.

[From the Denton (Tex.) Record-Chronicle, May 18, 1965]

CONCERN FOR VETERANS

Senator JOHN TOWER has proven himself a friend of the fighting man. His voice is heard frequently as he tries to get reasonable, desirable benefits for the men in uniform in South Vietnam.

On the day of the income tax filing deadline—April 15—336 Americans had been listed as killed, and more than 2,000 wounded, in Vietnam. Yet, incredibly, Vietnam wasn't classified as a combat zone and the servicemen there did not get the income tax benefits normally available to our men and women who are serving in a theater of war.

Senator TOWER was one of the sponsors of a bill to remedy this deplorable situation. It was offered as an amendment to other legislation but failed. However, it focused attention on the situation. The Washington Star, for example, ran a cartoon showing an American soldier in a Vietnamese foxhole, with bullets whizzing all around him, reading a letter; it said "Dear Sir: Your deduction for combat service has been disallowed. Sincerely, IRS."

President Johnson finally declared the area a combat zone by Executive decree, and the servicemen will get their tax benefits, after all.

Senator TOWER also is a sponsor of another bill (S. 458), one which would extend home loan and educational benefits, similar to those given Korean veterans, to those who have served in the Vietnamese war.

The Senator says "those who face our enemies on the battlefield deserve all we can provide for them in the way of opportunities to share fully in the society they have helped to preserve." We couldn't agree more.

President Johnson has called for pay increases for the military. This is all to the good but, as Senator TOWER pointed out, Johnson's proposal "would still leave privates and seamen far below the level" of the untrained volunteers in the antipovery program.

Privates and seamen would get approximately $87, including the pay raise. The Job Corps or antipoverty trainees would get about $105.

The proposed pay increases for the military are "completely inadequate," Senator TOWER said.

The Senator's efforts in behalf of our servicemen deserve the support of all of us.

[From the Kilgore (Tex.) News Herald, May 20, 1965]

THEY DESERVE IT

At the beginning of this year Senator JOHN TOWER, of Texas, introduced several bills relating to the war in Vietnam. Among them were proposals to declare Vietnam a combat zone for purposes of Federal income tax exemption for our servicemen there, and a plan to extend them home loan and educational benefits similar to those accorded Korean veterans.

In the meantime, President Johnson, by Executive decree, has declared southeast Asia a combat zone, thus giving servicemen involved a tax break. This is as it should be.

There now remains the question of extending home loan and educational benefits to the men in South Vietnam. Provisions to do so have been embodied in S. 458, by Senator TOWER and others.

There should be no doubt among Members of Congress or anyone else that the servicemen who have been sent to do a difficult and dangerous job, involving many hardships, in South Vietnam deserve the help and opportunities which this legislation can provide.

These men are risking their lives to hold back the tide of communism in that area. Surely we can do no less than to show the Nation's appreciation, in a small way, by passage of these proposed benefits. The legislation is pending in Congress.

The right thing to do is to pass it as soon as possible.

[From the Irving (Tex.) News Texan, May 14, 1965]

NEW GI BILL NEEDS APPROVAL

Senator JOHN TOWER and eight other colleagues have finally officially recognized that American soldiers fighting in Vietnam are engaged in a war as certainly as those men in World War II and Korea and have taken steps to assure these men an education, if they want it, after release from the Armed Forces.

A bill now pending before the Senate would reactivate the GI bill which was discontinued in 1954.

Under the Senate bill, members of the Armed Forces which have served in the Asian battle zone would be entitled to an education at Government expense for a period of time equal to 1½ times the duration of their service in the area with a limit of 36 months.

The bill is generally the same as the one which provided an education for thousands of servicemen following this country's last two major military operations.

Provisions in the bill provide for payment of the veteran's subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books and equipment. Payments for veteran's subsistence would vary from $110 per month for a full time course to $50 per month for part-time courses if the individual had no dependents. Payments would be as high as $160 per month with a veteran enrolled in a full-time course of study with more than one dependent.

The bill provides for vocational rehabilitation training and on-farm training as well as college courses.

Veterans who have served in Vietnam and other Asian areas, which will be designated by the President, will be eligible under the bill if their service has come since January 1, 1961.

The provisions of the bill will be administered in each State by an agency set up by the Governor.

There is no doubt that this bill deserves favorable consideration by Congress to aid the American soldier who daily faces death in defense of freedom.

[From the Waco (Tex.) News-Tribune, May 21, 1965]

ALL AMERICANS CAN SAY YES TO THIS PROPOSITION

In January of this year, during the early days of this session of Congress, Senator JOHN G. TOWER, of Texas, introduced a number of bills relating to the war in Vietnam. Chief among these bills were proposals to declare Vietnam a combat zone for purposes of Federal income tax exemption of U.S. servicemen there, and a proposal to extend home loan and educational benefits, similar to those accorded to Korean war veterans, to those who have served in South Vietnam and adjacent waters.

One of the bills, S. 459, subsequently was offered as an amendment to legislation pending before the U.S. Senate. While it failed, it did result in bringing the matter more forcefully to public attention when some newspapers treated the subject editorially.

The President, by Executive decree, then declared the area a combat zone, and Senator TOWER approved his action.

Says Senator TOWER: "There now remains the question of extending home loan and educational benefits to our servicemen in South Vietnam. This is embodied in S. 458 by myself and others. I believe you will agree that those who face our enemies on the battlefield deserve all we can provide for them in the way of opportunities to share fully in the society they have helped to preserve."

Most Americans, we believe also subscribe to that belief, and would hope Senator TOWER's bill will meet with favor by Congress

[From the Houston (Tex.) Tribune, May 20, 1965]

Our Boys in Vietnam Deserve Wartime Benefits

Picture the U.S. soldiers bogged down in the dirty day-to-day fighting in the mud and jungles of Vietnam; battling the elements and the enemy; dodging bullets, and in some cases, catching them.

According to the latest official tally, 336 American servicemen have been killed and 2,021 wounded by the enemy in Vietnam since the beginning of 1961. Another 13 have been captured.

We have some 45,000 troops there, plus a naval force of carriers and supporting ships. Planes flown by American pilots are conducting repeated strikes at Communist supply routes and bases, at considerable hazard to themselves.

This is a picture of a combat zone. This is war.

But apparently it is not war so far as official Washington is concerned. Our boys are fighting and dying in this land halfway around the world and are not eligible for normal benefits provided for war veterans.

Those who served in our Armed Forces after the Korean war were eligible for home loan and educational benefits even though the only bullets they saw were on the rifle range.

By contrast, our men actually being shot at in Vietnam today are not eligible.

To correct this obvious discrepancy, Senator John Tower, Republican, of Texas, has introduced a bill in the Senate (S. 458) which would extend home loan and educational benefits to our servicemen in South Vietnam.

Commenting on the bill, Senator Tower declared, "I believe that those who face our enemies on the battlefield deserve all we can provide for them in the way of opportunities to share fully in the society they have helped to preserve."

We concur.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Abraham Lincoln a century ago sounded the responsibility of the Government "to care for him who has borne the battle." This bill seeks to apply that eloquent standard to the veterans of Vietnam and to those who have stood ready to serve their Nation during these times of crisis.

However, as the distinguished sponsor of the cold war GI bill, Senator Yarborough, has pointed out, this measure falls short of its promise. For example, the monthly education allowance of $100 for current veterans is less than the $110 per month allowed under the Korean GI bill despite the fact that college costs have risen, and continue to rise, at the rate of some 5 percent each year and the cost of living has risen considerably since the Korean GI bill was enacted in 1952. It is heartening to know that Senator Yarborough, as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, intends to next year seek improvement of this and other shortcomings in the present bill.

There is one further matter of particular concern to me; namely, the adequacy of facilities for veterans. In the past year, there has been a diminution of the facilities providing services to veterans, hospitals, domiciliary centers and service centers. Now we are faced with upwards of 240,000 veterans annually availing themselves of the new educational benefits and many thousands more availing themselves of the hospital and other benefits for which they are now eligible. We are to be continually faced with the question of whether existing facilities are adequate to the task.

I am hopeful, therefore—and suggest to the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee—that a close and continued oversight will be conducted over these VA facilities to make certain that they are adequate to the responsibilities which they must now undertake under the new and heavier loads imposed by this bill.

One final note. This bill, as did the predecessor GI bills, permits foreign study for veterans. But there is an inconsistency with other education aid programs enacted by the Congress; similar provisions are not included. For example, despite the shortage of doctors in this Nation, young Americans studying abroad cannot avail themselves of the benefits available under the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act. We must, I believe, find the means to assist the foreign study of these other young Americans by making available to them, where possible, the benefits of student aid programs now available for domestic study only. It is my intention to seek to amend the pending international education proposal accordingly.

Finally, I was pleased to arrange with the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], who is the sponsor of the bill, for a poll of the members of the subcommittee in order to obtain a consensus on a conference bill. The Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] has brought the House amendment up by motion and urges the adoption of the House amendment. I urge that the Senate follow that recommendation and take such action.

GREAT NEED FOR THE COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I rise to express my strong support for S. 9, the Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966.

This legislation, more commonly known as the cold war GI bill, has commanded my strong support ever since I first came to the Senate.

As a cosponsor of the measure now before us, I am delighted by the prospect of final approval.

Around the world today tens of thousands of young Americans, called from the familiar routine of family, school, and career, are guarding the lives and safety of 185 million of their fellow citizens. Many of these young men and women, who have served their country so well, face a possible handicap in their future careers. S. 9 is designed to make educational assistance and farm and home loan guarantees available to the 5 million veterans of the cold war similar to that made available to the veterans of World War II and Korea.

I am particularly pleased that the bill we are considering provides for a permament program of benefits of cold war veterans.

The total of American dead and wounded rises every day in South Vietnam. It would certainly be an injustice to the more than 200,000 American fighting men engaged in this conflict to deny them the benefits which have been accorded to the veterans of the Korean conflict. When these young men return home from southeast Asia they will face similar problems of securing education and employment. The situation is particularly severe for the soldiers of today because of the increased automation which makes finding employment that much more difficult.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to give their overwhelming approval to S. 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Williams of New Jersey in the chair). Under the unanimous-consent agreement, all time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the House amendment to the bill (S. 9), with the amendments of the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] is necessarily absent.

Also I announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] would vote yea.

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 35 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—1

McNamara

So the House amendment, with the amendments of the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] was agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, during the last session when the Senate was considering the merits of S. 9, the cold war GI bill, I voiced my concern that the bill was lacking in fiscal prudence. That bill was opposed by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Veterans' Administration and had been opposed by three administrations.

The bill which we have just passed differs substantially from the previous one and is a much welcomed improvement. It broadens the coverage in many ways and reduces the cost. These improvements are reflected in the support of both the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. While the bill is still substantially in excess of the budget recommendations, it is certainly one which can be afforded by a prosperous country calling on its skilled manpower to fight in Vietnam and to defend freedom in many other areas of the world. It should serve as a warning to our enemies that Congress and the Nation intend to support our Armed Forces wherever they may be, and as a welcome sign to our young men and women in service that we recognize the problems which they face and support programs to back their efforts.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I consider the enactment of S. 9, the cold war GI bill, as one of the most significant and important bills before the Congress this session. While the bill as amended by the House does have some shortcomings, nevertheless, it will be welcomed by our men who have served this country so ably and courageously since 1955. I am particularly disappointed that the House bill did not provide for on-the-job training benefits and, of course, would have preferred the more generous educational benefits provided by the Senate bill.

Mr. President, at a time when demonstrations against this country's policies in southeast Asia seem to be all too fashionable, the enactment of this measure today will be a fitting way to demonstrate the Nation's gratitude to our men presently on the firing line and the many other veterans who have been responsible for our Nation's successfully meeting the Communist challenge in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Taiwan-Matsu, Lebanon, Berlin, and Laos.

Many men and women have benefited from earlier World War II and Korean GI bills. Of course the Nation has benefited even more for these veterans have become more productive citizens of our society and have greatly enriched our national life. A total of 8 million veterans of World War II were trained under the GI bill. Of this number over 2 million went to college, 3½ million went to other schools, nearly 1½ million attended on-the-job training, and three-fourths of a million were trained on the farms.

The Korean experience was even better, for 1 of the 3 million who took advantage of the educational benefits over half attended college. The Korean and World War II GI bills certainly helped to make us a stronger Nation and provided us with the needed skilled and professional manpower to meet the challenges of this competitive century.

I am certain, Mr. President, that the enactment of this legislation will be most beneficial to the veterans and will see this Nation reap the same benefits as it has from previous GI bills.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the entire Nation should applaud the Congress for the passage of S. 9. I join my colleagues in recognizing the leadership and dedication of the senior Senator from Texas. He has worked long and tirelessly to achieve the passage of this bill, and I extend to him my sincere congratulations.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of S. 9. The investment in the skills and talents of young American men and women authorized by this bill will be repaid many times over by their increased contributions to the economic life of the Nation.

This legislation is a significant addition to the Federal educational assistance programs enacted in the first session of this Congress. I hope that all the young men and women, who are eligible for the educational benefits of S. 9, will take full advantage of their eligibility. Our people, our economy, and our society will be joint beneficiaries of their efforts.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as one of the original cosponsors of S. 9, the cold war GI bill, which has been approved in its final form by the Senate today, I would like to discuss the many fine aspects of this measure.

The need for legislation providing readjustment benefits to veterans is clear. During the years since January 31, 1955, when the Korean conflict was officially terminated, U.S. servicemen have been defending the cause of freedom in a variety of circumstances. One need only recall such familiar names as Lebanon, Berlin, the Dominican Republic, and South Vietnam to understand the broad range of activities undertaken by our servicemen. In South Vietnam, of course, our troops are fighting for liberty and the right of self-determination in the most intense manner since the Korean conflict. The men who have served in these situations have done an outstanding job for their country, and they deserve the gratitude and praise of all their fellow citizens.

Principles of justice as well as the traditions of our country demand that veterans should be properly rewarded for their service. Compensation is particularly necessary during the period immediately following an individual's term of military service, for this is the time in which he must readjust to civilian life and find his place in the economy. Quite often, readjustment is difficult because the veteran may not have a secure income or the educational benefits which many of his contemporaries have earned.

Persons who have served in American military forces deserve a maximum opportunity to rejoin American society in a constructive manner. They especially deserve educational opportunities, which they might have been able to obtain if they had not been involved in military service. Furthermore, they deserve maximum opportunities to obtain homes and jobs.

The cold war GI bill attempts to provide these opportunities by a variety of means. First, a basic monthly educational allowance is provided to veterans who have served at least 180 days, or who have been discharged because of a service-connected disability. Maximum benefits are $100 per month for single veterans, $125 for a veteran with one dependent, and $150 for a veteran with two or more dependents. Eligible veterans will qualify for 1 month's benefits for each month of service, up to a maximum of 36 months. Both full-time and part-time college level or below college level training in trade, vocational, and technical schools are included.

Second, persons still serving on active duty may receive educational aid through a program of tuition grants. These grants will be made if the serviceman has served more than 2 years, a portion of which occurred after January 31, 1955.

Third, the Veterans' Administration home loan guarantee program is extended to veterans discharged after January 31, 1955. The Government will guarantee private loans up to $7,500, and will make direct loans for homes in rural areas and small towns, up to a maximum of $17,500.

Fourth, the Labor Department's job counseling and placement service is extended to the new group of veterans.

Fifth, Veterans' Administration hospital care, which now is provided to persons with service-connected disabilities, is extended to all veterans who have served since January 31, 1955, provided that a bed is available and that the individual signs an oath saying he is unable to pay for hospital services. The presumption of a wartime service-connected disability is extended to those veterans who suffered disability from chronic and tropical diseases.

Sixth, presently existing preferential status for entrance into the Federal civil service is extended to the new veterans.

Seventh, the VA is authorized to provide a flag for the casket of a cold war veteran.

Eighth, the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act is amended to protect individuals who are renting homes when called into service. The amount of rent covered is increased from $80 to $150 per month.

This act will make a substantial contribution to the national welfare. For example, a single veteran who pursues an education during the regular 9-month school year could receive as much as $900, which would be sufficient to cover tuition fees in most publicly supported schools and more than 60 percent of the fees charged by typical private schools. Keeping in mind the other possible sources of financial assistance which Congress, the States, and private contributions have made available, it becomes clear that veterans will be eligible for many educational opportunities when they return from service.

This is the best type of investment which can be made to help develop and maintain a strong, vital nation. It is an investment which will improve the competence and skill of our people, thereby insuring greater human resources for future development of the American way of life. By providing the cold war veteran with academic vocational training, this act will more than pay for itself by helping the veteran increase his employable skills and his income.

Because this measure will bring to these worthy veterans enlarged educational, training, and housing opportunities and will be of great benefit to the Nation as a whole, I am personally proud to be a Member of the Congress in which it was enacted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I doubt if I can recall during my 30 years in Congress a more gratifying moment than this. As the cold war GI bill, of which I am a cosponsor, approaches the final stages of enactment, I look back with pride and humility on the sacrifices and efforts of our fighting men, who so truly deserve this measure of recognition.

For nearly a decade, I have encouraged efforts to obtain these benefits for our young men who have carried our national responsibility and preserved the democracy of the free world.

In 1959, 1961, and 1963, when I testified before the subcommittee, I gave several compelling reasons for passing this bill, reasons which are even more compelling today.

Our fighting men in Vietnam and in other "hot spots" around the globe are running great risks. These risks will apparently continue. Therefore, I cannot help but feel that servicemen should be adequately rewarded for taking such risk. In view of the fact that selective military service is calling some of us to the job of insuring the peace while others of us are permitted to follow our own civilian pursuits, I feel that an incentive such as the cold war GI bill is essential.

Under this present bill to extend GI benefits, over 65,000 Alabama veterans would be eligible for benefits by June 30 of this year. Because of the open-end provision in the bill, this number would grow larger each year.

This cold war GI bill would make cold war veterans eligible for educational benefits, home and farm loans, medical care, veteran's preference, job counseling, and unemployment benefits, as well as entitlement to benefits under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, of which I was also a cosponsor.

Mr. President, I am particularly pleased to see that provisions for extending the VA direct home loan program not only to cold war veterans but also to Vietnam veterans is included in this measure. Earlier this year, the distinguished majority leader introduced for me and others a bill, S. 2732, to extend eligibility under the VA direct loan program to our Vietnam veterans. Under Senate procedure, my bill was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee and subsequently to the Housing Subcommittee and it was my hope that in due course this bill would be reported to the Senate for action. Now that this provision regarding the direct loan program is contained in S. 9, it, of course, avoids the necessity of action on my measure by the Senate.

I was one of the original sponsors of the direct loan program in 1950 and since that time some 186,189 loans, totaling about $1.7 billion have been made to veterans of World War II and more than 70,000 loans, totaling over $687.7 million have been made to veterans of the Korean conflict.

I am very proud of my sponsorship of this program.

Losses under this highly successful program have amounted to less than 1 percent of the total amount of loans made. Furthermore, after repayment to the U.S. Treasury of funds used plus interest and deducting all losses, the direct loan program had a net profit of over $154 million as of June 30, 1965.

To me, this shows conclusively that the confidence we placed in our veterans of World War II and Korea when developing the direct loan program has been proven repeatedly. I am confident that the very same thing will hold true of all our veterans that we would make eligible under this bill to receive the benefits that a grateful nation can give to them.

This proposal does not constitute a handout. I think of it as part of the debt all of us should be willing to pay to those who serve their country in the military forces. As long as we continue to draft our Nation's youths, we should be willing to contribute to the well-being of these same youths.

June 22, 1966, will mark the 22d anniversary of the signing of the World War II GI bill. Since enactment, it has raised the educational level of the entire Nation through its various schooling and training provisions. A total of 7,800,000 World War II vets entered into training under this program.

In Alabama alone, nearly 231,000 out of the 346,000 Korea and World War II veterans have been educated and trained under the GI bill.

The record shows that veterans have a higher income than nonveterans. This can be attributed in part to the beneficial effects of the GI educational program. Hundreds and thousands of World War II GI's who took advantage of this program are now leaders in their communities. They are respected citizens who are earning good incomes and who bear a large measure of responsibility for their community's growth and progress. These same GI's can now assist their younger brothers as a result of their success. Because of their higher incomes and resulting higher taxes, a measure such as this cold war GI bill can now be enacted and properly financed.

The original GI bill, which I was also pleased and honored to cosponsor, stimulated an unparalleled record of homeownership. In promoting homeownership that had been stimulated from previously enacted laws, this program has resulted in well over 6 million veterans being able to buy homes.

Mr. President, the battle between democracy and communism continues, even increases daily. To my way of thinking, education is a most critical weapon in that battle. Accordingly, I believe that the so-called cold war GI bill can play an extremely significant part in this battle. I am indeed happy to have had an opportunity to help promote this legislation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I was most gratified today to participate in passage of the cold war GI bill.

This legislation illustrates the recognition by Congress that those men and women who have served their country during the cold war—and sometimes hot wars—since 1955 have suffered the same disruption of their lives and careers as the veterans of other wars.

Passage of the bill was long overdue and I was proud to be a cosponsor of what I know will be regarded as landmark legislation.

But the man who deserves the highest recognition and commendation for his untiring efforts is the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

He has been the leader in this endeavor since 1959, and he has never wavered in his efforts, even in the face of some years of inaction.

The Senator has performed a great service and I salute his outstanding leadership and determination in pursuing and securing passage of this outstanding legislation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the House has improved the educational program in two changes by making it permanent and by making provision for active duty servicemen to further their education. But I fear that the House bill weakens the education program as compared to the Korean GI program by decreasing the duration of educational benefits possible for length of service, by eliminating on-the-job, on-the-farm, and apprenticeship training—although full entitlements for institutional vocational training are preserved—and particularly by reducing the monthly allowances paid while the veteran is obtaining his education. In 1952 when the Korean GI bill was passed, the reasonably monthly allowances set by Congress to cover the veterans subsistence, tuition, and expenses were at the rates of $110 for a single veteran, $135 for a veteran with one dependent, and $160 for the veteran with two or more dependents.

Now 14 years later, after a gradual but substantial increase in the cost of living, and sharp increases in tuition charges, I see little justification for the House's action in cutting back the barely adequate Korean bill rates in the Senate-passed bill.

The House-passed rates of $100, $125, and $150 appear insufficient to accomplish the purpose of the bill, of encouraging veterans to continue their education after their period of service. I think it will not be many months before the need to improve this feature of the bill will be apparent.

One of the important features of the bill is that it carries forward provisions for the training of veterans in educational institutions other than colleges and universities. It recognizes the fact, which some educators wish to ignore, that a college degree is not the only type of education necessary in our society.

This bill also provides for education in a business school, technical institute, or similar postsecondary educational institution. I think it is most fortunate that this measure calls upon these types of postsecondary educational institutions to contribute to the readjustment education of our veterans. The business, trade, and technical schools are a very important part of our postsecondary educational system.

On the whole, this is a good bill. It follows the pattern of the Senate-passed bill and largely meets its objectives. The slight differences that are disappointing to me are yet not seriously crippling to the goal of providing a full program of educational and other readjustment benefits. I have no hesitancy in urging the Senate to adopt the language of the House-passed bill. There is relatively little in dispute that could possibly be gained by a conference with the House as compared to the benefit to be gained by enactment of this long-awaited act of justice in the shortest possible time.

No bill of this magnitude can attain passage without the help and cooperation of a great many people. I pay tribute to the members who have served on our Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee for their support and encouragement through the many hearings and meetings we have had on this bill. The cold war veterans who will benefit by this bill owe special thanks to the chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, LISTER HILL, who never failed to meet any request aimed at furthering its enactment. The supporters and cosponsors of the bill are to numerous to name, but I ask unanimous consent to list the cosponsors of S. 9 at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FONG, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. RIBICOFF.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Many dedicated staff members have devoted many hours to work on this bill; particular recognition is due to Stuart McClure and Jack Forsythe of the Labor Committee staff, Charles M. Johnston and Fred Blackwell, former counsels of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, and Hugh Evans, assistant Senate legislative counsel, and to my legislative assistant, Richard Yarborough, Alan Mandel, Gene Godley, and to many others.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I extend the heartiest congratulations to the Senator from Texas. He has waged a long and successful fight on the legislation that has just been passed.

I am particularly pleased that a provision that the Senator from Texas and I and others introduced was incorporated in the bill so as to extend the benefits of direct loans on housing to veterans.

I am delighted that provision was included in the measure.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I also commend the Senator for the fact that he was one of the coauthors and leaders in the fight for the first GI bill of 1944. The Senator has consistently supported every measure to help GI's since his original authoring of the first GI bill. No bill of this magnitude can attain passage without the cooperation of many persons.

When this bill passed the Senate last year, it had the support of all members of the subcommittee, including Senators on both sides of the aisle. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], who was the ranking minority subcommittee member, supported the measure.

I extend my thanks to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He has helped us through 7 long years and four different Congresses. His committee reported the bill every time under the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama.

I pay special tribute also to the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], who is a member of the subcommittee, as is his brother, the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. The Senator from New York last year, by his incisive cross-examination, pointed out the weaknesses and fallacies of the opposition arguments. He tore each obstruction apart.

The distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts spent more hours with me in hearings on the bill than did any other member of the committee.

I am grateful to all the supporters and coauthors of the bill, who are too numerous to mention. There are more than 40.

When the bill was reported last year, it had the support of every member of the committee, Democrats and Republicans alike. I am delighted that this 7-year fight has been concluded. In the course of this fight, the Senate has been the legislative body responsible for the passage of the bill. The Senate committee always reported the bill. The Senate as a body passed the measure every time it was presented. The measure always received support from both sides of the aisle. The other part of the coequal legislative branch and the administration held the measure up for 7 years. The Senate did not do so.

I thank all Members of the Senate because the Senate, as an institution, has been the only branch of the Government to keep alive the hopes of millions of veterans. For 7 long years, we have been receiving letters asking: "Is there any hope for the passage of this measure?" We have always replied that the Senate of the United States supports the bill and that there is hope.

I yield the floor.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I join other Senators in commending my senior colleague for his long and successful leadership, and for his never-give-up attitude and the tremendous amount of work that he has put in on the GI bill.

The senior Senator from Texas has earned the approbation of the entire Senate and certainly of all men in the Armed Forces everywhere in the world. The senior Senator from Texas is responsible, more than any other person, for the passage of this measure. He deserves full credit for the Senate having enacted this important measure today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] upon the Senate's final action today on the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966. The success was achieved through his indefatigable efforts in behalf of the veterans of this Nation in this and in many prior sessions of the Congress. His reputation as "Mr. Veteran" is richly deserved.

This action today represents a high mark in many long and arduous battles for veterans by the senior Senator from Texas. Veterans are indeed fortunate in having an advocate of his great skill and tireless devotion.

Tribute also should be accorded the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. As chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, he, too, demonstrated considerable devotion and great effort in behalf of this most recent GI bill. Our thanks to both of these distinguished Americans.

Finally, the Senate salutes all of the distinguished members of the subcommittee, including the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNDEY], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]. Today's final action is attributable to their splendid assistance, effort, and cooperation.

(Mr. LONG of Louisiana obtained the floor.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT AND THE FOLLOWING WEDNESDAY.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10 a.m., Monday, February 14; and that, immediately after convening on that day, the Presiding Officer shall, without the transaction of any business or debate, declare the Senate adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday, February 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

VIETNAM CONSTRUCTION AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 2791, the Vietnam construction and procurement authorization bill be made the pending business when reported today from the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no debate is anticipated on this measure today, but it will be the unfinished business at the conclusion of business today and debate thereon will commence next

Wednesday, immediately after the completion of morning business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this would automatically withdraw the motion to consider H.R. 77.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the Senate adjourns, the motion dies.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD ASKS AND ANSWERS A PERTINENT QUESTION—POLICE BRUTALITY OR PUBLIC BRUTALITY?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, many statements have been made about police brutality—whether or not it exists and, if it does, to what extent. Our colleague, Senator Byrd of West Virginia, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, has long been interested in this subject.

An article by Senator Byrd, entitled "Police Brutality or Public Brutality?" appears in the February edition of the Police Chief, the official publication of the International Association of the Chiefs of Police.

Senator Byrd also was the principal speaker at a recent seminar at Airlie House, Warrenton, Va., on "Police Operation Versus Crimes of Robbery, Burglary, and Auto Theft," sponsored by the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia in cooperation with the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia.

This seminar was attended by representatives of police departments in 17 major cities in the country including New York, Boston, Baltimore, Los Angeles, Chicago, Detroit, and others.

Because of the importance of this question, I believe it is well for Members of the Senate to read both the article and address by Senator Byrd. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article and address were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Police Chief, February 1966]

Police Brutality or Public Brutality?

(By Hon. Robert C. Byrd, U.S. Senate)

(Note.—U.S. Senator Robert C. Byrd, of Sophia, W. Va., began his political career in 1946 when he was elected to the West Virginia House of Delegates. After completing his second term in that office, he was elected to the West Virginia Senate in 1950 and to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1952, 1954, and 1956. In 1958 he was elected to the U.S. Senate and in 1964 he was reelected by the greatest vote ever accorded a West Virginia candidate. He is a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Armed Services Committee, and the Committee on Rules and Administration. He earned the LL.B. cum laude from American University.)

There is a great cry that the police of this Nation must hew to the letter of the law, whereas others who do not agree with it have the right to break the law with impunity.

Law enforcement in America is in trouble.

To me, this situation reflects that our entire country is in trouble, because when our law enforcers are weakened and made impotent, then the laws which govern our Nation are in danger of collapsing.

For any number of reasons and alleged lofty causes the men and women of the law enforcement establishment are being made ineffectual. Alarmingly, a long parade of individuals with odious tactics are straining the tolerance of our Constitution to the breaking point. At the same time, this small cadre of confused idealists and irresponsible extremists are seeking to tear down respect for law and for the law enforcement officer.

The American public is more and more being subjected and exposed to every conceivable kind of outrage by hordes of ragtag beatniks, agitators, and professional troublemakers who insist upon lying down in the streets, blocking traffic, forming human walls in front of business establishments, swarming over private property, and staging noisy sit-ins and demonstrations. All of this is supposedly being done in order to dramatize grievances against our society and against the policies of the American Government at home and abroad.

This small band of demonstrators have so successfully cloaked themselves in the mantle of martyrdom that few people have dared to voice an objection for fear of being labeled "bigot." They have succeeded in mesmerizing large segments of our population to the extent that representatives of law and order have become pictured as the villains while lawless marchers and sitdowners have become the figures for compassion.

One of the unfortunate by-products of this curious public attitude is the denigration of the law enforcement officer. There is a great deal of furor these days over discrimination against Negroes and other minorities. Few stop to think, however, that a group most discriminated against today is the law enforcement officer. He is constantly the subject of usually unsubstantiated charges of police brutality. His will and his morale are being shattered because the clamor of such charges is not counteracted by support from law-abiding, decent citizens. He is being psychologically assailed and physically assaulted, and few responsible individuals have come to his aid. In 1964, 1 out of every 10 police officers was attacked as he attempted to carry out his duties. There is every reason to believe that when the figures for 1965 are compiled they will show an increase in such attacks.

It seems everyone is concerned with police brutality and yet no one is concerned over what I like to term "public brutality"; that is, the maltreatment of our officers of the law by citizens of every type. Until the American public realizes the brutality which is being inflicted upon our police officers, the law, which is the cornerstone of our Republic, will continue to be flaunted and diluted.

I am appalled at the lengths to which some charlatans are going as they take advantage of sometimes legitimate civil rights protests. Piteously, they cry of persecution by police who use what they term, of all things, "oral brutality." At the same time, however, they themselves delight in using the same type of brutality against police officers by characterizing them as gestapo, fuzz and in terms too opprobrious to be printed. It is truly amazing that as far as these insincere street marchers are concerned, there is only one side to the coin. They are the only ones persecuted; the policeman wears the uniform of authority—which, in itself, is anathema to the hoodlum element—and, as an officer, he becomes a ready target for oral abuse, vituperation, and, yes, physical assaults. To overly militant leaders, a Negro policeman should not wince when he is called an "Uncle Tom" or a "hankerchief head," because he is on the side of the law.

To the exploiters of the strife which America is enduring, the only victims are the rioters, the looters, the arsonists, the snipers, the thieves, and the murderers who commit vicious crimes while falsely wrapping themselves in the banner of the civil rights movement. I do not mean to imply that Negroes and other minorities in this country have not been discriminated against nor that they have escaped injustices at the hands of the majority. As Mr. Quinn Tamm, executive director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, has said, however, "We are tired of the cry that because one segment of our population has been deprived for 100 years the balance of society must accept a 100 years of anarchy." The majority happens to have some rights also, and it, too, has suffered some injustices.

In the last several years, the law has been made to work quite effectively for the benefit of the downtrodden. It seems, however, that the more the workable processes of democratic justice have been applied to right grievous wrongs, the more greedy and impatient some factions in our society have become. Not satisfied with what the law has done for them, they seem bent upon destroying the only truly effective safeguard they have.

This incongruous philosophy is also apparent in the activities of those who protest the overseas policies and activities of the U.S. Government. Again, the police are the prime targets of weird individuals who have infiltrated groups sincerely concerned about our involvement in Vietnam and elsewhere. We have seen these ideologically confused individuals storm the White House, the very ramparts of our country's dignity; we have seen them, in effect, pledging allegiance to the Government of Hanoi by holding aloft Vietcong flags and promoting blood banks for the enemy; we have seen attempts in Oakland, Calif., at thwarting the movement of military goods to our fighting men in Vietnam; we have seen police officers assaulted, cursed, spat upon, and bitten by so-called nonviolent demonstrators allegedly seeking academic and political freedom on the campus of the University of California in Berkeley.

In these situations, the police have stolidly suffered the unjustified charge of "brutality" and "gestapo." To my way of thinking, the police in all of these incidents have handled their responsibilities with restraint, patience, and a gentleness which would be unknown in most any other country in the world. Meanwhile, however, pseudoliberal organizations continue to harp upon the necessity that it is the duty of the police to insure that both protesters and counterprotesters each have the opportunity to express their views. The galling aspect of this admonition is that the police are already aware of this. They are men of the law and know more about their responsibilities than many of their detractors.

I wish to reiterate that the police have done an outstanding job of protecting all factions. Of course, there have been exceptions, and there will always be. Police are supposed to be impartial; yes, but at the same time, they are not automatons. They are men of emotions who happen to be wearing uniforms. It takes a man of steel to ignore a Vietcong flag on America's streets. It takes an imperturbable man to calmly witness bearded idiots trampling the Constitution and Bill of Rights. It takes a strong man to hold his temper as he is spat upon and reviled by unwashed, scraggly haired revolutionaries and uncouth, insolent, irresponsible hoodlums.

When it is borne in mind that the police are a military-like organization, it is surprising that they are able to maintain any degree of composure in the face of such senseless rebellion. Many of them have sons and brothers in Vietnam, and a draft card burner to them is anathema—but they are not allowed to show it. Police also have a great deal of sympathy with the troops in Vietnam because they fight a similar type of dirty war in which the enemy is forever striking from the shadows. The police know guerrilla warfare because they fight it day in and day out with criminals in America's streets. They also know that among the chief goals of communism and other un-American ideologies is that public faith in the police must be destroyed in order for the seeds of dissension to be planted.

The police also know that the campaigns against them are not reckless ones. They are well planned, and there are pamphlets written to educate militant demonstrators in ways of skirmishing with police in order to make the law enforcement officer appear to be the brutal aggressor.

The police accept this. They also accept the fact that it is their sworn duty to uphold the law and that they cannot be dissuaded from their responsibilities by the fact that they are made to look bad in the eyes of the public.

Since the beginning days of the modern sit-ins, wade-ins, and sleep-ins, the police have worked through their professional organization, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, to devise means of counteracting these despicable tactics. Of course, the simple answer would be retaliation, but the police officer of today is more professional, and, through conferences, research and study, he is getting closer to devising means of nullifying these tactics; that is, carrying out the letter of the law with as little violence as possible despite the efforts made to place him in an untenable position.

So-called civil disobedience cannot be countenanced by the law enforcement officer. Under our legal system, when there is an intent to break a law the act which follows the intent constitutes a crime and the individual should be punished. Unfortunately, those who seek martyrdom do not wish to understand this. They prefer to violate the law and then receive amnesty. Civil disobedience and lawlessness cannot be excused. We cannot allow one American to blithely burn his draft card while another bravely gives his life for the honor of his country in Vietnam.

The enigma surrounding the exhibitionists who seek martyrdom is compounded by the fact that some well-intentioned souls, understandably worried about the dangers present in an age of nuclear energy and a day when injustice to minorities still exists, will continue to demonstrate as they have in the past. To people who act in a mature and sincere manner, I say it is their constitutional right to peaceably and lawfully assemble and to petition the Government, but laws must be obeyed and police officers respected by all. With regard to those who counsel and perpetrate unlawful acts, the majority of Americans must react with vigilance, sternness, and speed in the dispensing of just and legal desserts for the offenders.

I am appalled when I hear or read statements to the effect that this gang of hirsute ragamuffins is so small and their impact so negligible that they should be ignored. That this is not so is the reason this type of lawlessness must be stopped. The morale of our troops in Vietnam is obviously affected. The North Vietnamese concept of the American will is without question a misconstruction since the Hanoi government believed such attitudes to be so widespread that it issued commemorative stamps depicting Americans picketing against the war and even went so far as to picture the grisly self-immolation by that unfortunate man on the grounds of the Pentagon as an indication of American beliefs.

Persons responsible for aiding our enemies and destroying Americans' faith in other Americans must be punished. Not the least among the reasons for this is the fact that our police who bear the first brunt of these activities must be supported by their community officials, by the press, and by the public. What does it avail a police officer, moreover, to risk life and limb in arresting rioters and unlawful protesters if they are freed and even lauded, by the courts and when our Constitution and Bill of Rights are twisted well beyond any meaning that our forefathers attempted to convey?

Recent events have emphasized that there has been a violent breach of two cardinal principles of our American society—the respect for law and order and the recourse to orderly process of law to seek redress of wrongs. There is a great cry that the police of this Nation must hew to the letter of the law, whereas others who do not agree with it have the right to break the law with impunity. The vast majority of the 300,000 men and women of the police service in this country are remaining within the framework of the law in the face of great provocation daily. When we reach the stage that the other side can break the law without punishment while the police must continue to use Marquis of Queensbury rules, then it is obvious which will be the loser. The loser will be John Q. Citizen—you and me, our wives and children, old and young, black and white, in city and hamlet all over America.

Our country cannot stand firm upon laws that are manipulated like clay. America can endure only so long as it has as its foundation solid bedrock. And, that bedrock is the law and the men and women who enforce it.

If the police of this Nation are not supported now, the law will perish, and this Republic cannot endure long thereafter.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERT BYRD AT LAW ENFORCEMENT SEMINAR

I welcomed the invitation to be with you today because I know of no more important objective to be attained than that of this seminar—reversing the shameful growth of our Nation's crime rate.

Long before I became a Member of the U.S. Senate, and continually since then, this problem has been a matter of growing concern to me. This concern has led me to devote a great portion of my senatorial efforts toward solving this problem.

While the more vicious crimes receive the most editorial attention, it is my firm conviction that the very crimes you will work on during this seminar—robbery, burglary, and auto theft—form, in large part, the seedbed from which the greater ones often spring.

From our learned psychiatrists, sociologists, and others of like ilk flow a steady stream of obtuse literature explaining the sources of crime.

I am inclined to be a little more blunt about the matter, and boil most of it down to the old Biblical injunction—spare the rod and spoil the child. All too often, I believe, crime springs from lack of parental discipline. Young men "borrow" a car and go for a joy ride "just for kicks." They rob to pay for a drug habit started "just for kicks." Probably early application of the parental hand to the area usually reserved for kicks would have nipped this problem in the bud.

Unfortunately, when these undisciplined youths get into trouble with the law it is not they or their parents who are castigated—too often it is the police for taking the proper law enforcement action. Too often, in recent years, the courts turn these malcontents back on society with only a compassionate slap on the wrist.

Despite these situations, the duty of the police is clear and their trust from our citizens inviolable. You gentlemen and your colleagues must enforce the laws if society as we know it is to exist and prosper.

This calls for professional capability and integrity of the highest caliber. Today's policeman must be a professional in his capabilities and his philosophy. He must be an expert in police techniques and in understanding of the sociological and philosophical implications involved in performing his duty. Of major importance is continued professional growth.

That is why I was so heartened to hear of this seminar and delighted to attend personally.

During this week, you have had the opportunity to learn of new innovations, advanced procedures, and improved methods for adding to your professional competence. Through face-to-face communication with your peers, from our major metropolitan areas, you have had an opportunity to broaden and expand your own scope. And, it will not stop with you. The results of the progress you achieve here will be seeded throughout police agencies across the country.

And, it cannot happen too soon. Our national crime index during the first 9 months of 1965 increased 5 percent over the similar period in 1964. Burglary in cities over 25,000 rose 5 percent, robbery 5 percent, and auto theft 4 percent. These figures present a grim picture, not only to our citizens throughout the Nation, but to those of us in the Congress who make our laws.

The Congress is endeavoring to act to assist local law enforcement, and I think you gentlemen can take great heart in the passage of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965 and the creation of the President's Commission on Crime and the Administration of Justice. I can report to you also that growing numbers of my colleagues in the Senate and in the House are showing great concern over the crime situation and are focusing their attention upon ways in which you can be supported in carrying out your tasks. On an increasing scale, my colleagues are taking to their feet to call for citizen respect for the law and support for their police, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflects a growing number of comments and published editorials and documents echoing this vital need.

You might be interested in knowing that sometime in the very near future I intend to make a speech on the floor of the Senate in which I hope I will be able to call the attention of the American public to the plight of the police service in this country and to rally the American public to your assistance.

I have authored an article which will appear in the February issue of your magazine, the Police Chief, in which I very bluntly condemn the charlatans who are exploiting the use of civil rights demonstrations, and in which I also criticize the hordes of bearded beatniks and their comrades. I wanted to present my views in this respect because I believe it is high time that the police of this Nation be spared the insults and the physical assaults which are being inflicted by these categories of irresponsible and un-American exhibitionists. I believe it is high time also that more of our Government and industry leaders let it be known that decent, law-abiding citizens are weary of this intimidation and that our society will not continue to ignore these assaults upon our institutions.

While the Federal Government is rapidly coming to your aid, it is obvious that there is not a great deal that the Federal Government and the Congress can do. This is as it should be, since crime is a local problem, it should be handled by local authorities and there must never be a great encroachment by the Federal Government on the responsibilities of our communities and States. I will say to you, however, that within the bounds of what your elected representatives can do, I hope that the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives will exert every effort to create legislation and make available to you the wherewithal to perform your duty of protecting our society from the criminal army which now threatens the safety of every man, woman, and child in this country.

I believe there is a great deal that can be done along these lines by our Nation's business community and our industrial leaders. For instance, some $2 billion was the bill for industrial theft, embezzlement, and sabotage last year. This $2 billion, of course, represents a tremendous expenditure in police man-hours—hours that might well have been spent protecting the personal safety of your constituents and mine. One of the best deterrents to a growing crime rate, of course, is a program of prevention; that is, making the attractive fruit less available to the criminal. Throughout our land there are industries which are slipshod in their security and which use archaic methods of protection. I would call upon all industries to reexamine their methods of protecting their property in order that the task of the police service might be made easier.

While I am on this subject, I heard recently that a former prosecuting attorney stated that it is very difficult to find witnesses to a crime who are willing to take time off from their jobs to testify. As we all know, the process of justice is a long and tedious one. It sometimes requires that a worker be away from his job for several days. According to the former prosecuting attorney, he knew of numerous cases in which witnesses said that they would never again perform this duty because they were being intimidated by their superiors at the place in which they worked. In other words, their bosses resented their taking time off from their jobs for this purpose and a number of the witnesses were threatened with dismissal because of their absence from work and others had their pay deducted for days missed from work. This, of course, is appalling, and I am not so sure that State legislatures and the Congress of the United States should not look into this situation to afford some protection to workers who conscientiously attempt to serve as witnesses in local and Federal criminal cases. Of course, the most satisfactory solution would be for leaders of industry to make sure that their firms are not guilty of such civic derelictions.

Industry must take a great interest in the manner in which society is faring. While I do not wish to single out any particular industry, one of your topics here at this conference is auto theft and the ways in which it can be minimized. It has been long said by the public, by the police, by insurance people, and by automobile manufacturers themselves that motor vehicles must be made more secure and less susceptible to theft. Some automobile manufacturers have turned their attention to this problem and have made their cars more secure against tampering, but I believe that the great technological genius of the automobile industry should be devoted to the development of some safe locking measures which will prevent the ease with which cars are stolen today. Not only would the temptation to irresponsible young people be lessened, but a great contribution would be made to crime prevention. I cannot believe that such a simple matter as this is too difficult for the engineers of the automobile industry to solve. Again, the ideal solution is for the automobile manufacturers to take this action voluntarily. Otherwise, I can foresee that they will be compelled to do so by legislation.

I am pleased to say that many civic and service organizations such as the National Exchange Clubs, Optimist International, Kiwanis, U.S. Jaycees, the American Legion, Rotary and others have created or revitalized national and regional programs calling for more respect for the law and for the policemen whose duty it is to enforce the law. This is the type of citizen action which will ultimately reap great benefits, not only for you gentlemen but for the communities you serve, and I salute the men and women who are unselfishly devoting themselves to these programs. They are holding out their hands to you, and I urge each of you and your colleagues around the country to respond and work with them. A collaboration between decent citizens and the police service can build a wall which criminals will find difficult to surmount.

I need not tell you gentlemen that there are many conditions which affect the amount and type of crime which occurs from place to place. As you know, I represent the State of West Virginia, and the crime rate in our State is among the lowest in the Nation. You are also aware that my State has suffered some economic reversals in the last several years. At the same time, the people in my State are a realistic breed whose mores and whose belief that right is right and wrong is wrong are, generally speaking, extremely strong.

There have been a great number of claims in modern times that poverty is a cause of our spiraling crime rate, and there has been a great deal of compassion lavished on lawbreakers because of their so-called "lot in life." I do not subscribe to this maudlin theory. The people of West Virginia have not turned our State into anarchy because some of them are poor. Yet, in areas in which the citizens are infinitely better off, they have rioted and looted and broken the law and, at the same time, succeeded in placing the blame upon society in general and police in particular.

To my way of thinking, some Americans have cast aside their pride, their spirit of independence, and the diligence which characterized their forefathers. In the place of these attributes, they have assumed that their Government owes them a living and have turned to the dole as a way of life. When the dole does not come through, they feel that they have the right to take from their more prosperous neighbor.

Until these attitudes are reversed, crime in this country will continue to be a blight on our way of life.

It seems clear to me that our Government, organizations representing law-abiding citizens, and the great might of American industry must embark on a program of bringing back luster to our traditional beliefs in respect for law and for the police.

I happen to know that the International Association of Chiefs of Police has done a tremendously fine job in the last five years of bringing greater professionalization to the police service. With limited funds, it has become the nerve center of the local law enforcement effort in this country, disseminating knowledge and techniques, standardizing procedures, and conducting the type of research which law enforcement has sorely needed for a long time. I also happen to know that the International Association of Chiefs of Police has, in the last several years, turned to industry in this country in an effort to secure funds so that it could expand its services to the police in the country. The efforts have largely been met with apathy on the part of leading industries, and financial assistance has been almost non-existent.

It seems to me that no one has a greater stake in a safe and orderly society than does American industry. I am appalled that industrial leaders have ignored the needs of the police of this country who provide so many services for industry. The International Association of Chiefs of Police, as you know, is a nonprofit, professional, educational association. Its goals are not only laudable; they are indispensable to the security of everyone in this country. I would, therefore, suggest to every industrial leader in this country that he reexamine his obligation to the police service and reconsider what assistance can be given to you dedicated men.

This seminar here is a perfect example of what can be done with proper support.

It is most gratifying to me that the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia and our District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department have taken the initiative to cope with crime problems by means of this seminar. It is equally gratifying that your own organization, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, is cooperating in this commendable program.

Gentlemen, you truly fight in the front lines in the war against crime. Like Vietnam, the end is not in sight. As it is for your sons, relatives and friends in Vietnam, the battle is a deadly one. But, you must win—the citizens of our Nation have placed their trust in you to that end. The dedication and purpose with which you have studied gives me assurance that our trust is not misplaced. Gentlemen, I commend you for your labors.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague the senior Senator from Louisiana.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLLAND BEFORE THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a fine statement made by the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] before the Mississippi Valley Association at the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., on February 7, 1966.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Spessard L. Holland, of Florida, Before the Mississippi Valley Association, Washington, D.C., February 7, 1966

I am pleased and highly complimented that your executive vice president, Mr. Winter, invited me to be the guest speaker at this luncheon today.

Coming from the State of Florida which has been blessed with a great abundance of water, I have devoted a great deal of my time to the development of this great natural resource, not only in the State of Florida but throughout the Nation. I have served on the Senate Public Works Committee and later on the Appropriations Committee in which I have always been a member of the Public Works Subcommittee under the able chairmanship of your great Senator from Louisiana, Senator Ellender, one of our finest and most dedicated Senators. Therefore, I am very much aware of the excellent job your organization is doing. I know that you have assisted my State of Florida in the development of its water resources and have testified many times before committees of the Congress in support of our efforts. For this I wish to thank you—and I might add that we have with us today a delegation of some 35 to 40 from Florida, who are members of the Mississippi Valley Association which will attest to what I have said.

During my nearly 20 years that I have had the honor to represent Florida in the U.S. Senate, there have been great accomplishments in the development of our natural water resources, but we still have a long way to go to provide for our ever-expanding economy—more power for industry—improvement of our harbors—hurricane protection—beach erosion—flood control—all these are necessary as well as improvements in our inland waterway systems. Yes, we still have a tremendous job to do and together we can do it.

I will not consume time dwelling on statistics and cost figures as I am sure that all of you are well aware of the trends and have kept abreast of actions in this vital field. I will only mention that development of our water resources has been a major factor in the transformation of our country from a wilderness to the geatest industrial nation on earth.

The development of our national commerce and its continued virile growth is due in considerable measure to the construction of navigation facilities—22,000 miles of inland and intracoastal waterways; some 500 commercial harbors and constant improvements to them to keep abreast of the ever-increasing traffic demand.

To provide for these improvements the Army Engineers, using funds appropriated by Congress and to a lesser degree by cooperating local agencies, have more than doubled expenditures nationwide in the last decade, from $503 million in 1955 to about $1.3 billion in fiscal year 1966.

The development of our river systems and the harnessing of power of our water resources have produced essential electricity for our ever-increasing industrial might.

Those are sound investments, producing lasting values, values that will benefit our Nation in the years to come. As President George Washington, an engineer who envisioned the vast inland possibilities of the United States, once expressed the fervent hope: "Would God that we may have the wisdom and courage to improve them."

We should be grateful that we have had, and continue to have such wisdom and courage.

This brings me to the first of two points I wish to emphasize as strongly as possible and if I accomplish nothing else by this talk, you will know my positions and know that I will fight vigorously for these positions since I feel very strongly that the continued development of our water resources is dependent upon the defeat of these proposals I am about to discuss.

You are all familiar with the efforts of the Corps of Engineers, and I say this in all candor as I know the Engineers must take policy guidance from the Bureau of the Budget, to improve their methods of evaluating navigation benefits in carrying out the instructions issued by the Chief of Engineers under date of November 20, 1964, subject: "Waterway Improvement Studies—Navigation Benefits."

Most of you are aware of the method that has been used in the past to calculate the so-called cost-benefit ratio of a project. Under the old and proven method, a survey of the resources of an area would be made to determine the products and tonnage that would be generated to move on a waterway, and the difference in the rate between the existing freight rate and the barge rate would be the savings attributable to the project. If the total of these annual benefits exceeded the annual total costs, including amortization and operation and maintenance, the project had a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio and was considered feasible; and the higher the ratio, the more desirable the project, therefore placing the project in an excellent position for congressional approval.

Now comes the new criteria as prescribed by the Bureau of the Budget policy. In essence, the proposal would compare the barge rate with a theoretical rate that the competing modes of transportation might be compelled to adopt if a waterway were placed in operation. Of course, such a thing as this would tend to greatly reduce the benefits and frequently result in an unfavorable report.

Should the competing forms of transportation place such theoretical rates into permanent effect there could be no argument, but they are not required to do so nor do they anticipate doing so.

The new directive provides:

The traffic that would move over a considered waterway improvement will depend on the competitive rates by barge and alternative means that would likely be in effect with the waterway improvement. Therefore, estimates of waterway traffic will be prepared on the basis of projected water-compelled rates with consideration of all data and factors that are likely to modify current rates to take account of the competitive situation anticipated with the waterway in being, and foreseeable technological developments applicable to the several transport media.

The benefits for the traffic (estimated as in above) that would move over an improved waterway will be computed as the difference in the projected competitive rates or charges for the movement by the alternative means that would be used in the absence of the waterway and the projected rates and charges utilizing the waterway. In developing the projected rates or charges, consideration will be given to all pertinent data and factors, including the competitive situation in the absence of the waterway, current rates, and foreseeable technological developments applicable to the several transport media. The benefits determined in this manner will be used in project justification and in the benefit-cost ratio.

In addition, reports will include an estimate of benefits obtained by applying unit savings based on the rates prevailing at the time of the study to the waterway traffic also estimated on the basis of rates prevailing at the time of the study.

Based on this criteria, which seems absurd to me, a railroad might very easily fix rates in an area of a proposed project to discourage waterway traffic and thereafter raise the rates to the original level. Therefore, if on the basis of projected water compelled rates the benefits from an otherwise justifiable navigation project can be so depressed as to result in its rejection by the Engineers, the railroads can practically control the development of our inland waterways for navigation purposes by simply projecting totally unrealistic rates.

The new directive is so ambiguous that few engineers can agree on its interpretation, and to me it seems to be a shortsighted policy to insist on criteria which would tend to perpetuate a static or no growth climate for industrial development by continuing high transportation rates that the project would materially reduce.

Incidentally, it is my understanding that no new projects have been approved under the new criteria, that is, since November 1964, and that a review of many approved projects—with which we are in complete accord as being feasible and justified—under the new criteria would find them wanting for lack of a favorable cost-benefit ratio.

I personally will continue to fight for the full development of our water resources and for reinstatement of the original criteria used by the Corps of Engineers in determining cost-benefit ratios. I am sure many of my colleagues support my position, but your help is needed and I know from experience what your organization can do when it has an objective in mind.

Now my second point is that I am vigorously opposed to the so-called Moss bill which is the "one big agency" approach to natural resource problems. If enacted, all resource development programs would be lumped into a super Department of Natural Resources.

I am not in favor of building this proposed new bureaucracy and I am not in favor of taking an organization, functioning effectively and efficiently in one agency out of that agency and establishing a separate empire. For many years the Government's only concern was improvement of waterway transportation. Then in 1917 and 1927, in the Mississippi Valley, the Federal Government took its first steps in flood control, and nationwide flood control authority was given to the Corps of Engineers in 1936. They have performed magnificently in this field as they have in the field of waterway transportation.

Senator Moss' bill, if enacted, would transfer to a new super Department of Natural Resources the Soil Conservation Service, now in the Department of Agriculture where it has been ever since it was founded and which is closely allied with farming interest; the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture; the Bureau of Reclamation, Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Department of the Interior; TVA; the Federal Power Commission; Water Pollution Control now in HEW; the Geological Survey; the Office of Saline Water; and the civil functions operations of the Army Engineers—what a colossal new Bureau that would be. All of these agencies, in my opinion, have performed outstandingly and their consolidation could do nothing to improve the present status or the high degree of cooperation now existing.

The greatest loss of all under the proposed bill would be the removal of the civil works program from the Corps of Engineers who were the pioneers in the public works program, a program built on 143 years of experience. To transplant or transform this activity would cause such dislocations that I do not believe any possible benefit would be gained to counterbalance them.

The Corps of Engineers, experienced in peace and war, have met most situations successfully. They are to be commended and are the logical ones to perform the civil works functions.

Further, a system of coordination has been established under the present civil works program between the Corps of Engineers, other Federal agencies, State and local governments and officials and independent groups which would take a new agency much time and effort to match.

Last year the Congress enacted the Water Resources Planning Act and personally, I do not think Congress is going to abandon the approach embodied in that act without giving it a fair trial. This act is in the main line of the American conservation movement. It offers a maximum of coordination and cooperation with a minimum of disruption while the one agency concept under the Moss bill would involve great uprooting and upheaval.

Fundamentally, the problem of overlap and conflict in our resource programs is not due to the fact that we have several agencies at work. It is due to the different laws and national policy under which those agencies' activities were established and the different purposes or aims that the American people have undertaken and assigned to those agencies from time to time. For this reason you will not solve these problems simply by reshuffling and rearranging organizational structures, but rather by the coordination of national purposes and objectives. This can be accomplished better under the Coordinating Council created at cabinet level under the Water Resources Act.

I, for one, do not see that lumping many diverse elements together under one roof would help at all, and I will vigorously oppose such action.

I find no merit in the basic concept of the one big agency approach to natural resource problems, and I cannot believe that Congress will abandon the Water Resources Act which was enacted after a half century struggle. I am committed to the wisdom of the path we have chosen and oppose any radical demolition of our experienced and capable organizations, such as the Army Corps of Engineers, and the program through which they have helped to make this the most prosperous and strongest nation in the world.

These are two of but many battles with which we are confronted, and any relaxation of our fight on the battlefront for sound water resources development makes it doubly difficult to ward off the next attack which might well be the battle of the user charge or tax which I have not discussed but with which I know you are all thoroughly familiar. Suffice it to say, I join with you on this subject, as I do on the other subjects I have mentioned. But let me assure you constant vigilance is necessary and the problems must be met head on if we are to arrive at realistic solutions. We must work together as never before.

Again I thank you for inviting me to be with you today and I express my appreciation to you for the wonderful support your organization has given to the State of Florida in the development of its waterways.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call special attention to the discussion by Senator HOLLAND, of the criteria recently promulgated by the Bureau of the Budget, in respect to the benefit-to-cost ratio in navigation projects. Several paragraphs in his speech have to do with the so-called directive of November 20, 1964, which directive has been forced upon the Corps of Engineers against its wishes, against the wishes of Congress, and against the wishes of all our citizens who are concerned with the continued development of our Nation's waterways.

This speech calls attention to the disastrous effect of the criteria set forth in this directive upon the future development of our navigable waterways. The directive's effect is to make it almost impossible to maintain the current progress being made on our navigable streams.

In short, the new criterion which has been forced upon the corps for determining economic benefits and benefit-to-cost ratios requires the Engineers to assume a freight rate which might be put into effect by our railroads in the event the waterway under study were actually constructed.

For this purpose, implemental costs would be the floor for such an estimate of a future freight rate. Then, as I said, the Engineers are to estimate how much of the future commercial traffic would move under this "assumed" freight rate and how much would move on the waterway under consideration.

In other words, the estimates of prospective waterway commerce are twisted and distorted and the benefits are reduced to a point where the proposed project cannot be justified.

It goes without saying that the directive of November 20, 1964, contains no requirement for any railroad to adopt such an assumed rate whether or not the waterway is actually constructed.

In his speech before the Mississippi Valley Association last Monday, Senator HOLLAND correctly points out that no new major navigation projects have been approved by the Corps of Engineers under this new criterion. This is exactly the situation that I predicted when it was first brought to my attention in January 1965.

The pity is that this criterion affects not only navigation projects but it can also prevent the construction of multiple-purpose projects which depend upon navigation benefits for their justification. As I said, I think this is against the wishes of the Congress and against the best interests of our Nation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in connection with the statement of my senior colleague, I wish to state that I agree with Senator HOLLAND 100 percent. The position taken by some in the Bureau of the Budget, who have been elected to no office, is completely irresponsible, and a great disservice to this country.

For some strange reason, when a man becomes President of the United States and is separated from the people, as must necessarily be the case, and surrounded by bureaucrats, there is a tendency to listen to the logic of people who would urge false economy upon the President, in this case to the extent that we would not be able to develop our resources. As much as I would favor some of the new programs the President has recommended, I must say that if I had to choose, I would much rather dispense with some of the new programs and continue the sound, valid program of resources development which the senior Senator from Louisiana has so stanchly advocated and for which he has worked so hard.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I say to my junior colleague that since the issuance of this new directive, no new projects have been sent to the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Probably not; but we ought to be continuing the full development of our water resources.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I wish the senior Senator from Louisiana to know that I have read the statement by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] to the Mississippi Valley Association. I associate myself not only with the compliments paid the Senator from Florida by the knowledgeable Senator from Louisiana, but I also express my commendation of Senator HOLLAND's forthright and effective references to the new standards for evaluating navigation improvements prescribed by the Chief of Engineers in November 1964.

As the Senator now speaking pointed out at the time of debate last year on the omnibus flood control-rivers and harbors bill—popularly known as the public works authorizations—there is considerable support for the request made by several river valley associations that the Chief of Engineers review and hopefully modify the new criteria. This is a matter of serious concern to several members of the Senate Committee on Public Works. I appreciate the fact that Senator HOLLAND has brought problems created by the new navigation improvement criteria into clear focus.

The senior Senator from Florida delivered a thoroughly meaningful and informative speech in his February 7, 1966, participation in the program of the Mississippi Valley Association at Washington's Sheraton-Park Hotel.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I note that my distinguished friend and colleague, Senator ELLENDER, who has great and longstanding concern for the water resources development of our Nation, has asked that an address by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] before the Mississippi Valley Association, meeting in Washington, on February 7, 1966, be printed in the RECORD today. I have read Senator HOLLAND's remarks, particularly as they regard the new navigation improvement criteria of the Corps of Engineers. Along with other Members of the Congress, including members of the Senate Public Works Committee, on which I serve, I have been concerned that these new criteria will cause unnecessary difficulties in furthering the development of the waterways of our Nation. I would hope that the Senate Public Works Committee will give its early attention to this subject and to the use of these criteria, as I believe the points made in this discussion ought to be fully considered by the Congress, and by the responsible officials of the Federal agencies involved.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I join my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] in commenting on the superb statement delivered by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] before the Mississippi Valley Association on February 7, here in Washington. In commenting on Mr. HOLLAND's remarks, I would like to especially point out paragraph 6, page 2. I feel he has touched upon a subject of concern to many of my colleagues. Senator HOLLAND states, and I quote:

> You are familiar with the efforts of the Corps of Engineers, and I say this in all candor, as I know that all engineers must take policy guidance from the Bureau of the Budget, to improve their methods of evaluating navigation benefits in carrying out the instructions issued by the Chief of Engineers under date of November 20, 1964—Subject: "Waterway Improvement Studies—Navigation Benefits."

Senator HOLLAND in this statement is referring to the new criteria which the Corps of Engineers is using in determining the benefit-cost ratio of our inland navigation projects. This new criteria constitutes an attempt by the Corps of Engineers to evaluate projected freight rates on existing transportation facilities, and the effects of possible reduction in existing rates upon the amount of freight which will ultimately be transported by barge.

As a member of the Senate Public Works Committee, I feel that it is imperative that we as a committee investigate the effect which this new criteria is having on the benefit-cost ratio of our proposed new inland navigation projects. Historically, our navigation projects have far exceeded the most liberal estimate of the amount of freight which they would carry. I feel, therefore, that more weight is being given this new criteria than is justifiable, and I feel that a reexamination is in order. Second, I would like to comment on my distinguished colleague's remarks concerning the proposed user charges on our inland waterways. Again, I feel as a member of the Senate Public Works Committee that this is a proposal deserving of much consideration and evaluation. Transportation is and always will be a vital link in the continued progress of our economy. I feel that inland water transportation is destined to be the salvation of many of our previously landlocked metropolitan centers. It would be a drastic mistake at this time to curtail the continued development of our inland waterways with the imposition of a restrictive user charge. I, therefore, feel that the Senate and House Public Works Committees should give a great deal of close scrutiny to this proposal.

Mr. President, I would like to commend my honorable colleague from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for his excellent statement. It is gratifying for me to be able to join with him in his continuing efforts to promote the development of the water resources of America. His record on this subject is long and enviable, and I certainly look forward to working closely with him in the years ahead.

I commend both him and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for calling his remarks to our attention.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York.

DEATHS OF SOPHIE TUCKER AND BILLY ROSE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate the deaths of two great Americans in show business within a few hours of each other, Sophie Tucker and Billy Rose. I had the honor of knowing both of these wonderful people as personal friends of mine of many years' standing.

SOPHIE TUCKER

Mr. President, Sophie Tucker was probably the most glittering character in American show business, "The last of the red-hot mamas," as Broadway called her. She had a career of 60 years which spanned and embraced almost all of the high spots of the rise of American vaudeville and night club entertainment.

But at this sad time, it is also interesting to remember that Sophie Tucker's career was truly an American success story. Miss Tucker, born in a Russian farmhouse 78 years ago, as her mother was traveling to join her father in the United States, started her working life by waiting on tables in her father's 25-cents-a-meal restaurant in Hartford.

She liked to tell her friends that, true to show business tradition, she "opened in Connecticut before arriving on Broadway." And arrive she did in 1906 to begin the long climb that was to make her one of the most beloved show business personalities over the years.

All this is fairly well known. But the recitation of the highlights of her career cannot capture the warmhearted humanity of this woman who was ever quick to help hundreds of friends and acquaintances—in and out of show business—throughout the years. She was never too busy to help a friend or a worthy cause, and this, too, will remain forever in the hearts of the thousands who knew her.

BILLY ROSE

Billy Rose had probably the most exciting and well-rounded career of anyone in the United States, in and out of show business. He won a championship as a shorthand expert when he was in his twenties, and went on to be Bernard Baruch's assistant when Baruch was head of the War Industries Board in 1918. He became a songwriter, and then became America's top showman. He was a remarkable, well-rounded man: art collector, humanitarian, philanthropist, stock market operator, and showman. One of his last great acts of philanthropy was the gift of an extraordinary collection of sculpture to the people of Israel, which is one of the most magnificent cultural monuments in that country or anywhere in the world.

Both have now gone to their last reward. I know that the people of our country are the richer for having had the songs, the sentiment, and the humor of Sophie Tucker and the laughs, the entertainment, and the music of Billy Rose. They left us with a song and a smile.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD obituaries on Sophie Tucker and Billy Rose.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOPHIE TUCKER, 78, DIES IN HER HOME

Sophie Tucker, the indefatigable "last of the red-hot mamas," died last night at 7:35 of a chronic lung ailment and kidney failure in her apartment at 737 Park Avenue. The show business star for more than six decades was 78 years old. Her family was at her bedside.

Last October, Miss Tucker was admitted to Mount Sinai Hospital. She remained there for several weeks undergoing treatment for what her physicians described as an intestinal inflammation. She then returned to her apartment, where she was reported to be recuperating.

Miss Tucker last appeared in public at the Latin Quarter in October. Her 4-week engagement ended after 2 days, however, because of illness.

"She was a giant—10 feet tall," Abe I. Lastfogel, president of the William Morris Agency, who represented Miss Tucker since 1910, said last night at the singer's apartment. "She was unique. She was a star who stayed important through her lifetime. Her work and effort and her willingness to help those who needed help will be remembered in years to come."

For 60 years, Sophie Tucker punched out songs in her spectacular style—big, brassy, and flamboyant. She cried and laughed and sang with such zest, such vigor, that audiences were swept up in an irresistible torrent of lush sentiment.

She was always risqué and was always kidding herself, but no one really believed that Sophie could ever utter an offcolor line. In recent years, she would step out into a shimmering stage with her 192 pounds draped in a gown of 24-karat gold cloth, festooned with brilliants, a white mink coat with a golden train, and a cloth-of-gold headdress sprinkled with diamonds.

"I'm the 3-D mama with the big wide screen," she would roar, and the audience would burst into applause.

She would begin singing—maybe the voice didn't have the tremor of a Piaf or the power of a Garland, but who cared?—such songs as "There's No Business Like That Certain Business, That Certain Business Called Love," or "I May Be Getting Older Every Day (But Getting Younger Every Night)."

The audience would laugh and applaud and maybe weep, when Sophie sang "My Yiddishe Momme," and wait, finally, for the big one, the only one, "Some of These Days."

"When I step out on the floor at the beginning of each season," she remarked in 1960, "there's $50,000 riding on me—$25,000 in all new gowns and $25,000 in new material. And I give it everything I've got every night."

And Sophie gave it everything she had—even when her voice finally crackled and she found it difficult to move around. She still performed, she still made personal appearances, she still trouped with the same vigor and restlessness as in the days when she earned $1,000 a week at the Palace Theater.

"I'm an old timer," she admitted several years ago, "but let me tell you something. I was never satisfied to sing a song. I wanted to know how to get more, how to bring that salary up, how to be a star. And when I put the greasepaint on and get out on that floor, there's nobody younger. I am an old timer, but I want to see more, more, more."

Show business liked to laugh at the fact that Miss Tucker had been "born on the road"—not the vaudeville circuits but on a road leading from Russia across Poland to the Baltic.

That was true. Her mother was traveling by wagon from Russia to join her husband in the United States. Miss Tucker was born in a farmhouse. That was perhaps her last contact with rural life. The date was January 13, and the year, according to the best available records, was 1887.

Miss Tucker was born of a Russian-Jewish family named Kalish. Her father had fled Russia to escape military service. He arrived in Boston, and a short time later sent for his family.

When Miss Tucker was 8 years old the family moved to Hartford. The entertainer liked to say in later years that, although she learned her English in Boston, "no one has ever admired my Harvard accent."

Her parents opened a 25-cent-dinner restaurant in Hartford. Sophie and her two brothers and a sister worked in the establishment. The future star discovered that she could pick up dimes—sometimes quarters—singing for the customers when she wasn't serving pickled herring and gefüllte fish.

At 16 Sophie was married to Louis Tuck. They had one son Bert Tuck. The marriage did not last, but when Sophie decided to go into show business she added a syllable to her husband's surname and became Sophie Tucker.

In 1906 she came to New York. In classic style, she made the rounds, got nowhere, ran low on money. Then she got a job at the German Village, a rathskeller at Broadway and 40th Street, for $15 a week and "throw money."

From the German Village, Miss Tucker went on to the small-time vaudeville circuits, burlesque, Tony Pastor's. In 1909 she got a part in the "Ziegfeld Follies." But the star, Nora Bayes, cut Miss Tucker's numbers drastically. And when Eva Tanguay then replaced Miss Bayes, she took over Sophie's remaining routine. Both stars later became good friends of Miss Tucker's.

Five years later, however, Miss Tucker was earning $1,000 a week at the Palace Theater. By that time she had already introduced the song that became as much Sophie Tucker as her robust voice and eyecatching costumes—"Some of These Days," by Shelton Brooks.

There followed engagements at Reisenweber's in New York, at clubs and music halls in London, appearances at Sophie Tucker's Playground, her own club on 52d Street, off Broadway; another engagement at the Palace in 1928, where she first sang "I'm the Last of the Red Hot Mamas," written for her by Jack Yellen.

When talking pictures gave vaudeville the "hook," Miss Tucker switched to night clubs and also made movies, including "Honky Tonk," "Broadway Melody," "Thoroughbreds Don't Cry" and "Atlantic City."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 10, 1966]

SOPHIE TUCKER IS DEAD; LAST OF RED HOT MAMAS

NEW YORK, February 9.—Singer Sophie Tucker, long billed as "the last of the red hot mamas," died tonight. She was 78.

Death came to the brassy-voiced singer at her Manhattan residence.

Last October, Miss Tucker was admitted to a New York hospital and remained there for several weeks undergoing treatment for what physicians described as intestinal inflammation.

At that time, she left the hospital and returned home where she was reported recuperating.

A family spokesman said the entertainer had suffered for the last 4 months with a chronic lung condition and a kidney ailment.

She lived in a swank apartment at 737 Park Avenue in recent years. She last appeared in public late last year at the Latin Quarter.

The big and brassy singer with the voice to match was born on the road and never left it. She sang her way all over the world.

"HI-YA KING" (GEORGE V)

Like a luxury liner with a battleship beam she would sail into the spotlight, ablaze with jewels, and belt out tunes with the same lusty good nature—no matter who was in her audience.

"Hi-ya, King!" she shouted with a jaunty wave toward the royal box as she opened her command performance for King George V and Queen Mary at London's Palladium in 1934.

At the end of the show, the audience wouldn't stop applauding when the King and Queen sat down, the signal that the performance was over. So the royal couple got back to their feet and rejoined the applause which brought Sophie back onto the stage for two more numbers—"Louisville Lady" and "Some of These Days."

"Some of these days, you're going to miss me, honey." It was Sophie's song. No matter how she altered the lyrics, or her styling, audiences always wanted it. And the song title became the book title of her memoirs, published in 1945.

She sang it for fathers and their sons. As other stars waxed and waned, Sophie remained a headliner, seemingly indestructible. Her secret of longevity was simple: "Keep breathing."

"Show business has been my life," she said. "I wouldn't have had any other. It is the life I always wanted."

BILLED WITH THE STARS

She shared billings with the greatest of them—Will Rogers, W. C. Fields, Eddie Cantor, Al Jolson, Jack Benny, Fanny Brice, Judy Garland, Jimmy Durante, and Bea Lillie, to name but a few.

She knew Irving Berlin when he was a singing waiter at a Bowery spot. And she taught the Duke of Windsor to dance the Charleston when he was the Prince of Wales.

She sang whatever the times demanded—jazz, blues, swing; you name it.

"Show business is changing all the time," she once said. "If you want to stay with it, you have to change with it. Performers who refuse to do that are stranded."

She sang in nightclubs, in burlesque, and vaudeville; she sang in Broadway shows and motion pictures, on television and radio.

But broadcasting wasn't her dish—"You can't do this. You can't do that. I couldn't even say 'hell' or 'damn,' and nothing, honey, is more expressive than the way I say 'hell' or 'damn.' "

BORN IN RUSSIA

She was born Sophie Abuza somewhere in Russia while her Jewish family was migrating to America, via Poland and the Baltic. She said it was January 13, 1888. Some reference works make the year 1884. Sophie said the confusion resulted from her having added 4 years to her age when she started work in Manhattan cabarets at age 16.

She also said the family name was Kalish, or Kallich, and that the Abuza came from an Italian's passport her father used.

She was 3 months old when the family reached Boston and settled there.

When she was 8, they moved to Hartford, Conn., where her parents opened Abuza's home restaurant, featuring a 25-cent gefüllte fish dinner. As an added attraction, Sophie sang for the customers—for nickels and dimes.

Recalling those years, she said:

"We all have dreams, ambitions. It wasn't that I dreamed in a house of splendor, a house of riches. I didn't have it. I hated everything I did as a girl because I wasn't a normal child.

"NO PLAYMATES, NOTHING"

"I didn't play. I had no playmates. I had nothing. I was 4, 5, 6, and I had to make my own cup of coffee. I had nothing, and I was determined to have it, and I got it.

"The happiest thing of all is that in getting it I hurt nobody. Some people are ruthless. Some hurt others, but I did it the hardest way and the longest one, too.'

In 1961, when asked how much she had earned as a performer, she replied, "I'm not rich, but I can tell you that nobody's going to have to hold a charity performance for me. I'm doing all right."

Sophie was married three times, each ending in divorce. Her first husband was Louis Tuck, from whom she got her stage name of Tucker. They had one child, Bert. Her next husband was Frank Westphal, the pianist for her vaudeville act. And her last was Al Lackey, her business manager.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 10, 1966]

Billy Rose Dies at 66; Millionaire Showman

Montego Bay, Jamaica.—Billy Rose, the master showman who made a fortune out of the unlikely combination of extravaganza, curvaceous girls, and the stock market, died today in Montego Bay.

Rose, 66, died at 2:15 a.m. of lobar pneumonia at the Eldmire Nursing Home.

He had come to Montego Bay, where he maintains a winter home, to recuperate from cardio-vascular surgery performed in Houston, Tex., in December.

Rose, an impresario, theatrical producer, newspaper columnist, nightclub owner and writer of such songs as "That Old Gang of Mine," "Without a Song" and "Me and My Shadow," returned to his New York home December 22.

RECUPERATION PRESCRIBED

He flew to Montego Bay Tuesday with his sister, Polly Gottlieb, wife of Hollywood producer and writer Alex Gottlieb. Doctors had prescribed 6 weeks of recuperation.

In New York, a close friend, Broadway producer Arthur Cantor said, "one of the reasons Billy went to Jamaica was because he was feeling better."

Gottlieb said in Beverly Hills, Calif., that his wife had called him and said Rose had caught a slight cold 2 days ago and developed pneumonia Wednesday.

Mrs. Gottlieb was planning to accompany the body to New York today, where funeral arrangements will be completed.

Besides Mrs. Gottlieb, he leaves another sister, Miriam Stern of New York City.

Death of the flamboyant figure came just hours after the death of another show business personality, Sophie Tucker. She died last night in her New York apartment.

The 5-foot-3 Rose scrambled out of the Manhattan slums and at the time of his death was worth more than $25 million. He once jested that "if my luck holds out by 1970 I will really be a rich fellow."

He made his first million 3 months after the 1939 New York World's Fair opened. His "Aquacade" was the hit of the fair and its star, Eleanor Holm, became one of his four wives. He was actually married five times, but he married one wife, Joyce Matthews, twice.

MARRIED FANNY BRICE

Another wife was Fanny Brice, the comedienne whose life story was told in the hit Broadway musical "Funny Girl." He was also married to Doris Warner, daughter of motion picture executive Harry Warner.

He once characterized success as "a combination of good health, good friends, and a financial career where the winners make $2 more than the losers."

As to marriage Rose said he didn't consider himself "a monumental success in that department because at 65 I'm a bachelor."

Last spring in an interview he said this about death:

"I'm not afraid of it. For the past 5 years I have felt that I'm on velvet after 60 very active years * * *. I just want to spin out life as gracefully as I can with the least amount of storm * * * I have no fears about death. By the same token, I'm not rolling out a red carpet and inviting it in."

SHORTHAND CHAMPION

Rose first gained national attention as a teenager. At 17 he was national shorthand speed champion and 2 years later was chief stenographer to Financier Bernard M. Baruch, who was then the head of the War Industries Board.

From Baruch, a lifelong friend, Rose picked up a knowledge that guided him on many paths. "I learned from him always to get the facts," he said. "Experience and judgment mean little if you don't get the facts."

Rose, who was often referred to as the bantam Barnum, said "I've been more in the tradition of Barnum than in the tradition of Baruch," he said. "I wish it had been the other way around."

Last year Rose donated his million dollar collection of sculpture from his palatial East Side townhouse to the National Museum of Israel.

"BALLYHOO, NOT GENIUS"

Rose gained his real fame from the extravaganzas he staged. "I sell ballyhoo, not genius," he said.

In 1936, when Texas celebrated its statehood centennial with an exposition at Dallas, neighboring Fort Worth hired Rose to stage a wild west show at its rival frontier centennial. His take was $1,000 a day. Fort Worth's slogan was "Dallas for education, Fort Worth for entertainment."

Then Cleveland asked him to glamorize its Great Lakes exposition in 1937. He thought up a water ballet that he called the "Aquacade." Two years later he took it to the New York World's Fair and became a millionaire.

In his theatrical productions Rose borrowed from the late Florenz Ziegfeld and used plenty of pretty girls, sentimental music, and soft lights. Later he was to buy the Ziegfeld Theater for $630,000 cash.

OWNED 17 NIGHTCLUBS

His musicals included "Sweet and Low," "Crazy Quilt," "Carmen Jones," "Seven Lively Arts," and "Jumbo." Among his serious productions were "The Great Magoo" and "Clash by Night."

In 1938 he opened the plush Diamond Horseshoe nightclub. At one time he owned 17 nightclubs.

His syndicated column, "Pitching Horseshoes," was published in 400 daily and 2,000 weekly newspapers. He was the author of "Wine, Women, and Words."

After five childless marriages Rose ended up single again. "The single life," he said, "is like a red-and-gold box of Christmas candy. When you open it, all it holds is a couple of lousy bonbons."

Rose made this critical assessment of himself:

"I size myself up as a fellow who has been a grain of sand in the public eye. Thanks to a tremendous amount of work and a tremendous amount of luck, I've made out reasonably well in a series of toy careers. I don't see myself as an important fellow. When I'm recognized in a small town, I've never ceased to be amazed by it."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS ON THE FOOD-FOR-PEACE PROGRAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have just finished reading the President's food-for-peace address delivered to the Congress today. I wish to take this opportunity to commend President Johnson for a constructive and positive statement, committing the United States to a greater effort to eliminate hunger in the world.

The President says:

> I propose that the United States lead the world in a war against hunger.

As he goes on to point out, there can be only victors in that kind of war.

I believe the most significant feature of his message is its change in the concept under which our overseas food programs have been operating since 1954. In the past, our food aid programs have been dependent entirely upon what we happen to have in surplus stocks at any given time.

What the President now proposes is that the Secretary of Agriculture take a careful look at food needs around the world and, on the basis of that survey to determine the amount and types of food that the United States should produce to meet our share of the world food deficit, and, after consultation with the Secretary of State, to make provision for necessary production.

The President properly places a heavy emphasis on self-help programs, so that our food aid will stimulate rather than depress efforts on the part of the countries we are trying to assist to develop their own economies.

There are some things which the Congress must do to implement the concept of the President's message. There may need to be new administrative machinery and a central coordinating office to give direction to this expanded program. Also, strong budget support will be needed. There is need to recognize the very serious distribution bottlenecks which face us overseas—inadequate port facilities, and inadequate warehouse and distribution systems.

However, I am sure that problems of that kind will be faced by the Government and by Congress. This is a hopeful, positive, and constructive message.

The message signifies a change, both in the direction of our overseas aid program, and also in our domestic agricultural policies here at home. I think it is quite clear that in the years ahead, we shall be relying less and less on acreage restrictions and more and more utilizing our production to meet very real needs overseas.

So I wish again to commend the President on this message. Since it moves in the direction of a bill, S. 2157, which I introduced last summer, the International Food and Nutrition Act, I read this message with special interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message of the President be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE ON FOOD FOR FREEDOM

To the Congress of the United States:

Men first joined together for the necessities of life—food for their families, clothing to protect them, housing to give them shelter.

These are the essentials of peace and progress.

But in the world today, these needs are still largely unfulfilled.

When men and their families are hungry, poorly clad and ill-housed, the world is restless—and civilization exists at best in troubled peace.

A WAR ON HUNGER

Hunger poisons the mind. It saps the body. It destroys hope. It is the natural enemy of every man on earth.

I propose that the United States lead the world in a war against hunger.

There can only be victors in this war. Since every nation will share in that victory, every nation should share in its costs. I urge all who can help to join us.

A PROGRAM FOR MANKIND

The program I am submitting to Congress today, together with the proposals set forth in my message on foreign assistance, look to a world in which no man, woman, or child need suffer want of food or clothing.

The key to victory is self-help.

Aid must be accompanied by a major effort on the part of those who receive it. Unless it is, more harm than good can be the end result.

I propose:

1. Expanded food shipments to countries where food needs are growing and self-help efforts are under way.

Even with their maximum efforts abroad, our food aid will be needed for many years to come.

2. Increased capital and technical assistance.

Thus, self-help will bear fruit through increased farm production.

3. Elimination of the surplus concept in food aid.

Current farm programs are eliminating the surpluses in our warehouses. Fortunately the same programs are flexible enough to gear farm production to amounts that can be used constructively.

4. Continued expansion of markets for American agricultural commodities.

Increased purchasing power, among the hundreds of millions of consumers in developing countries, will help them become good customers of the American farmer.

5. Increasing emphasis on nutrition, especially for the young.

We will continue to encourage private industry, in cooperation with the Government, to produce and distribute foods to combat malnutrition.

6. Provision for adequate reserves of essential food commodities.

Our reserves must be large enough to serve as a stabilizing influence and to meet any emergency.

AMERICA'S PAST EFFORTS

This program keeps faith with policies this Nation has followed since President Franklin D. Roosevelt proclaimed the four freedoms of mankind.

After World War II, we helped to make Europe free from want. We carried out on that continent massive programs of relief, reconstruction, and development.

This great effort—the Marshall plan—was followed by President Truman's Point Four, President Eisenhower's Act of Bogotá, and its successor, President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress. Under these programs we have provided technical and capital assistance to the developing nations.

Our food aid programs have brought over 140 million tons of food to hungry people during the past decade.

Hunger, malnutrition, and famine have been averted.

Schools and hospitals have been built.

Seventy million children now receive American food in school lunch and family and child feeding programs.

Nevertheless the problem of world hunger is more serious today than ever before.

A BALANCE IS REQUIRED

One new element in today's world is the threat of mass hunger and starvation. Populations are exploding under the impact of sharp cuts in the death rate. Successful public health measures have saved millions of lives. But these lives are now threatened by hunger because food production has not kept pace.

A balance between agricultural productivity and population is necessary to prevent the shadow of hunger from becoming a nightmare of famine. In my message on International Health and Education, I described our increased efforts to help deal with the population problem.

IMPROVING LOCAL AGRICULTURE

Many of the developing countries urgently need to give a higher priority to improving and modernizing their own production and distribution of food. The overwhelming majority of those who till the soil still use the primitive methods of their ancestors. They produce little more than enough to meet their own needs, and remain outside of the market economy.

History has taught us that lack of agricultural development can cripple economic growth.

The developing countries must make basic improvements in their own agriculture.

They must bring the great majority of their people—now living in rural areas—into the market economy.

They must make the farmer a better customer of urban industry and thus accelerate the pace of economic development.

They must begin to provide all of their people with the food they need.

They must increase their exports, and earn the foreign exchange to purchase the foods and other goods which they themselves cannot produce efficiently.

In some developing countries, marked improvement is already taking place. Taiwan and Greece are raising their food output and becoming better cash customers for our food exports every year. Others have made a good beginning in improving agricultural production.

THE NEED FOR SELF-HELP

There is one characteristic common to all those who have increased the productivity of their farms: a national will and determination to help themselves.

We know what would happen if increased aid were dispensed without regard to measures of self-help. Economic incentives for higher production would disappear. Local agriculture would decline as dependence upon U.S. food increased.

Such a course would lead to disaster.

Disaster could be postponed for a decade or even two—but it could not be avoided. It could be postponed if the United States were to produce at full capacity and if we financed the massive shipments needed to fill an ever-growing deficit in the hungry nations.

But ultimately those nations would pay an exorbitant cost. They would pay it not only in money, but in years and lives wasted. If our food aid programs serve only as a crutch, they will encourage the developing nations to neglect improvements they must make in their own production of food.

For the sake of those we would aid, we must not take that course.

We shall not take that course.

But candor requires that I warn you the time is not far off when all the combined production, on all of the acres, of all of the agriculturally productive nations, will not meet the food needs of the developing nations—unless present trends are changed.

Dependence on American aid will not bring about such a change.

The program I present today is designed to bring about that change.

BETTER NUTRITION

Beyond simple hunger, there lies the problem of malnutrition.

We know that nutritional deficiencies are a major contributing cause to a death rate among infants and young children that is 30 times higher in developing countries than in advanced areas.

Protein and vitamin deficiencies during preschool years leave indelible scars.

Millions have died. Millions have been handicapped for life—physically or mentally.

Malnutrition saps a child's ability to learn. It weakens a nation's ability to progress. It can—and must—be attacked vigorously.

We are already increasing the nutritional content of our food aid contributions. We are working with private industry to produce and market nutritionally rich foods. We must encourage and assist the developing countries themselves to expand their production and use of such foods.

The wonders of modern science must also be directed to the fight against malnutrition. I have today directed the President's Science Advisory Committee to work with the very best talent in this Nation to search out new ways to develop inexpensive, high-quality synthetic foods as dietary supplements. A promising start has already been made in isolating protein sources from fish, which are in plentiful supply throughout the world; improve the quality and the nutritional content of food crops; apply all of the resources of technology to increasing food production.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR OUR ABUNDANCE

Our farm programs must reflect changing conditions in the United States and the world. Congress has provided for American farmers, a continuing prospect of rising incomes; for American consumers, assurance of an abundance of high-quality food at fair prices; for American taxpayers, less dollars spent to stockpile commodities in quantities greater than those needed for essential reserves.

Today—because of the world's needs, and because of the changing picture of U.S. agriculture—our food aid programs can no longer be governed by surpluses. The productive capacity of American agriculture can and should produce enough food and fiber to provide for: (1) domestic needs, (2) commercial exports, (3) food aid to those developing countries that are determined to help themselves, and (4) reserves adequate to meet any emergency, and to stabilize prices.

To meet these needs, I am today directing the Secretary of Agriculture to:

1. Increase the 1966 acreage allotment for rice by 10 percent.

Unprecedented demands arising out of drought and war in Asia require us to increase our rice crop this year. I know that our farmers will respond to this need, and that the Congress will understand the emergency that requires this temporary response.

2. Buy limited amounts of darly products under the authority of the 1965 act.

We must have adequate supplies of dairy products for commercial markets, and to meet high priority domestic and foreign program needs. Milk from U.S. farms is the only milk available to millions of poor children abroad. The Secretary will use authority in the 1965 act whenever necessary to meet our needs for dairy products.

3. Take actions that will increase soybean production in 1966.

The demand for soybeans has climbed each year since 1960. Despite record crops, we have virtually no reserve stocks. To assure adequate supplies at prices fair to farmers and consumers, the Secretary of Agriculture will use authority under the 1965 act to encourage production of soybeans on acreage formerly planted to feed grains. Feed grain stocks are more than sufficient.

These actions supplement earlier decisions to increase this year's production of wheat and barley. Although our present reserves of wheat are adequate to meet all likely shipments, the Secretary of Agriculture has suspended programs for voluntary diversion of additional spring wheat plantings.

Our 60 million acres now diverted to conservation uses represent the major emergency reserve that could readily be called forth in the critical race between food and population. We will bring these acres back into production as needed—but not to produce unwanted surplus, and not to supplant the efforts of other countries to develop their own agricultural economies.

These actions illustrate how our domestic farm program will place the American farmer in the front ranks in the worldwide war on hunger.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

I recommend a new Food for Freedom Act that retains the best provisions of Public Law 480, and that will make self-help an integral part of our food aid program; eliminate the "surplus" requirement for food aid; emphasize the development of markets for American farm products; authorize greater food aid shipments than the current rate; emphasize the building of cash markets and the shift toward financing food aid through long-term dollar credits rather than sales for foreign currencies—except for U.S. requirements, we look to the completion of that shift by the end of 5 years; continue to finance the food aid program under the Commodity Credit Corporation; increase emphasis on combating malnutrition. The act will authorize the CCC to finance the enrichment of foods; continue to work with voluntary agencies in people-to-people assistance programs; provide for better coordination of food aid with other economic assistance.

FOOD AND FIBER RESERVES

I recommend a program to establish the principle of the ever-normal granary by providing for food and fiber reserves.

This program supplements food for freedom.

It establishes a reserve policy that will protect the American people from unstable supplies of food and fiber, and from high prices in times of emergency.

The legislation I recommend to the Congress will enable us to draw strength from two great related assets:

The productive genius of our farmers.

The potential that lies in the 60 million acres now withdrawn from production.

In case of need, most of those acres could be brought back into productive farming within 12 to 18 months. But because of the seasonal nature of farming time would be needed to expand production even under the flexible provisions of the Agriculture Act of 1965. Therefore we need a reserve to bridge this gap.

We have been able to operate without a specific commodity reserve policy in recent years, because the surpluses built up in the 1950's exceeded our reserve needs. This condition has almost run its course.

Under present law, the Secretary of Agriculture must dispose of all stocks of agricultural commodities as rapidly as possible, consistent with orderly marketing procedures. As we continue to reduce our surpluses we need to amend the law to authorize the maintenance of reserve stocks.

The act I recommend will do that.

It will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish minimum reserve levels. Under the act, he must take into account normal trade stocks, consumer and farm prices, domestic and export requirements, crop yield variations and commitments under our domestic and foreign food programs.

The reserve would be used to meet priority needs, under prices and conditions to be determined within the broad guidelines established by existing law.

The act could be implemented in the year ahead without any additional cost to the Government. We are still reducing our surpluses of most agricultural commodities. During the first year of the new program, it is not likely that we will have to purchase any commodity to build up a reserve.

Under the two acts I recommend today, with the farm legislation now on the statute books—and with the foreign assistance program I have recommended—we will be able to make maximum use of the productivity of our farms.

We can make our technology and skills powerful instruments for agricultural progress throughout the world—wherever men commit themselves to the task of feeding the hungry.

A UNIFIED EFFORT

To strengthen these programs our food aid and economic assistance must be closely linked. Together they must relate to efforts in developing countries to improve their own agriculture. The Departments of State and Agriculture and the Agency for International Development will work together, even more closely than they have in the past in the planning and implementing of coordinated programs.

In the past few years AID has called upon the Department of Agriculture to assume increasing responsibilities through its International Agricultural Development Service. That policy will become even more important as we increase our emphasis on assisting developing nations to help themselves.

Under the Food for Freedom Act, the Secretary of Agriculture will continue to have authority to determine the commodities available. He will act only after consulting with the Secretary of State on the foreign policy aspects of food aid and with other interested agencies.

We must extend to world problems in food and agriculture the kind of cooperative relationships we have developed with the States, universities, farm organizations, and private industry.

AN INTERNATIONAL EFFORT

It is not enough that we unify our own efforts. We cannot meet this problem alone.

Hunger is a world problem. It must be dealt with by the world.

We must encourage a truly international effort to combat hunger and modernize agriculture.

We shall work to strengthen the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The efforts of the multilateral lending organizations, and of the United Nations development program should be expanded—particularly in food and agriculture.

We are prepared to increase our participation in regional as well as worldwide multilateral efforts, wherever they provide efficient technical assistance and make real contributions to increasing the food-growing capacities of the developing nations. For example, we will undertake a greatly increased effort to assist improvements in rice yields in the rice-eating, less-developed countries, as part of our cooperation with FAO during this International Rice Year.

FOR A WORLD AT PEACE

The program I recommend today will raise a new standard of aid for the hungry, and for world agriculture.

It proclaims our commitment to a better world society—where every person can hope for life's essentials—and be able to find them in peace.

It proclaims the interdependence of mankind in its quest for food and clothing and shelter.

It is built on three universal truths—

That agriculture is an essential pursuit of every nation,

That an abundant harvest is not only a gift of God, but also the product of man's skill and determination and commitment,

That hunger and want—anywhere—are the eternal enemies of all mankind.

I urge Congress to consider and debate these suggestions thoroughly and wisely in the hope and belief we can from them fashion a program that will keep freemen free, and at the same time share our leadership and agricultural resources with our less blessed brothers throughout the world.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1966.*

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, President Johnson's message of food for freedom just presented to the Congress promises a bold, imaginative, and realistic attack on a problem which is surely one of the greatest our century will have to face. In its approach, in its scope, the President's message has shown the determination of the administration to use our unmatched agricultural capacity to win the war on hunger in the world.

I have been among several Senators who have long argued for a strong world-hunger program. The growing menace of hunger throughout the world, so starkly illustrated by the present Indian food shortage, has made it clear that a strong action is needed. This message makes it clear that the administration is determined that our country will truly meet the need.

I am particularly gratified with the emphasis on self-help, for in my own proposal, the Food for Freedom Act, S. 2826, I placed top priority on programs to help poor countries improve their own farm production. I am also pleased that the President proposes to give not just our surpluses, but to produce enough and give enough to really do the job.

I feel it an honor to sit on the Senate Agriculture Committee, which will consider this proposal. It is my sincere hope that, after giving careful consideration to all the proposals to meet the world food crisis, the Senate will pass this year bold, far-reaching legislation on this matter so vital to our farmers at home, peoples overseas, and the success of our foreign policy in years to come.

I am also pleased that the President proposes to establish a program of food and fiber reserves. If we are to meet the challenge of world hunger, and also make sure we have enough food for our national emergency needs, it is essential that we keep adequate stocks of all major commodities to meet unexpected emergencies.

TIME FOR COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance have until midnight, Wednesday, February 16, 1966, to file its report, with minority views, on H.R. 136 (S. 1912), to amend section 1, 17(a), 64(a)(5), 67(b), 67(c), and 70(c) of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes; and H.R. 3438 (S. 976), to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PRICE-FIXING CONSPIRACY IN BROAD-SPECTRUM ANTIBIOTIC DRUGS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, there exists today one of the worst conspiracies ever foisted upon the American people. What makes this conspiracy so reprehensible and so shameful is that its chief victims are the aged and the poor, not only in our country but also in many of the most impoverished areas of the world.

For more than a dozen years, American drug manufacturers have been involved in a worldwide cartel to fix the price of "wonder drugs"—broad-spectrum antibiotics—at identical, grossly inflated, and unconscionably high prices.

These drugs, developed in part through Government facilities and which cost about 1.6 cents per pill to make,[1] were, until recently, sold to the American public at 51 cents per pill and now sell for about 30 cents per pill.

Although children, the elderly, and the poor have been and are still, unable to afford such drugs, and although the existence of at least one aspect of this conspiracy has been known to Federal agencies since at least 1958, the cartel continues to operate in all its vigor. In fact, documentary evidence which I shall today make available to the Senate will conclusively show that it is operating not only in the United States but also in Canada and Latin and South America.

Among these documents is a secret code used to disguise price fixing and "payoff" communications. Fictitious names, decoded, become drug names: "Pluto" becomes the manager of a U.S. firm overseas, a "sinner" denotes a person who has dared to depart from unlawful price-fixing agreements. A "disturbed family" refers to a price-cutting situation and a "powwow" is a price-fixing meeting. When decoded, an innocuous-looking letter containing highly personal references and a sprinkling of company names becomes a startling document on price fixing.

The American pharmaceutical firms involved are: Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., American Cyanamid Co., Bristol-Myers Co., Inc., the Squibb Division of Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., and the Upjohn Co.

To understand the scope and effect of this cartel, it is necessary to explore in detail the nature and use of the drugs involved and the steps leading up to the formation of the conspiracy.

BACKGROUND

Antibiotics are widely used by the medical profession for the treatment of human infectious diseases and are dispensed upon a doctor's prescription. The earlier antibiotics such as penicillin and streptomycin are known as "narrow-spectrum" antibiotics because they are normally effective against either gram-positive or gram-negative bacteria but not both. "Broad-spectrum" antibiotics are effective against both kinds of bacteria, as well as various other disease-producing organisms, and for that reason are commonly referred to as the "wonder drugs."

The major broad-spectrum antibiotics are (1) Parke Davis' Chloromycetin, (2) Cyanamid's Aureomycin, (3) Pfizer's Terramycin, and (4) tetracycline—all of which are marketed under various brand names by the five companies mentioned. All four are effective against substantially the same range of disease-producing micro-organisms and are generally interchangeable in medical use. Aureomycin, Terramycin, and tetracycline, which account for most of the broad-spectrum antibiotic sales, have closely similar molecular structures.

Aureomycin is manufactured and sold exclusively by American Cyanamid Co. under a patent issued in 1949 and was among the first broad-spectrum antibiotics, coming on the market in 1948. Terramycin is manufactured and sold exclusively by Chas. Pfizer & Co. under a patent issued in 1950. Tetracycline, the most widely used broad-spectrum antibiotic, is manufactured by Pfizer, Cyanamid, and Bristol-Myers, under a patent issued to Pfizer on January 11, 1955.

In 1953, Aureomycin and Terramycin were being sold on the market by Cyanamid and Pfizer respectively at identical prices. With the discovery of tetracycline in late 1952, it became necessary to secure a patent on tetracycline because, if tetracycline was unpatentable, its marketing would destroy the existing monopoly price structure for Aureomycin and Terramycin. The reason is that tetracycline was better than the other broad-spectrum antibiotics and was substantially interchangeable with them in medical use.

According to the Federal Trade Commission:

> Cyanamid and Pfizer knew that tetracycline, if produced and sold commercially, would be fully competitive with Aureomycin and Terramycin. They both knew or had reason to believe that the value of their respective patents and their dominant positions in the broad-spectrum antibiotic market would be impaired by the unrestricted production and sale of tetracycline by other firms. Moreover, they knew or had reason to believe that, if tetracycline could be sold by other firms in free and open competition, the price of this product as well as that of other broad-spectrum antibiotics would be forced downward as the price of penicillin had been in recent years.[2]

Mr. President, I digress from my prepared remarks to point out that—if I recall correctly—in open competition, the price of penicillin had been forced down to about 1 percent of what it was when it was first marketed. It is in the public domain and available for any other pur-

---

Footnotes at end of Mr. LONG's remarks.

pose. The same thing could have happened with regard to the broad-spectrum antibiotics, if tetracycline was, in fact, not subject to a patent because it was already known and merely had to be identified.

Recognizing this danger, Pfizer and Cyanamid entered into an agreement to assist one another to secure a patent, the successful patentee to cross-license the other, and, as a result of misrepresentations made to the Patent Office, Pfizer eventually secured the patent in 1955. Tetracycline was introduced on the market in late 1953 and early 1954 by Cyanamid and Pfizer at prices substantially identical to those of Aureomycin and Terramycin.

Bristol, a competitor of Pfizer and Cyanamid, also attempted to secure a patent on tetracycline and during the course of the patent fight the Pfizer and Cyanamid misrepresentations came to light. Rather than risk exposure and possible loss of the patent, and with the assurance that Bristol and its licensees would strictly adhere to the price structure, an arrangement was made in late 1955 whereby Pfizer agreed to: first, license Bristol to manufacture and sell tetracycline; and second, license Bristol's licensees, Squibb and Upjohn, to sell tetracycline. In this connection, the FTC found that Pfizer settled the patent infringement suit because it knew or had reason to believe that Bristol, Squibb, and Upjohn would be able to prove that Pfizer had obtained the tetracycline patent by means of false and misleading representations to the Patent Office or that the patent would otherwise be declared invalid.[3]

From 1954 to the present, Pfizer, Cyanamid, Bristol, Squibb, and Upjohn have been selling tetracycline at identical prices and at prices substantially identical to Cyanamid's aureomycin and Pfizer's terramycin.

I ask unanimous consent that a chart showing these identical prices be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tabulation of price to retailer of tetracycline, aureomycin, and terramycin 1951–58 (when FTC brought suit)

	Cyanamid achromycin	Pfizer tetracyn	Bristol polycycline	Squibb steclin	Upjohn panmycin	Cyanamid aureomycin	Pfizer terramycin
Capsules:							
100 milligrams, 25's	$3.61	$3.61	$3.61	$3.61	$3.61	$3.61	$3.60
100 milligrams, 100's	13.77	13.77	13.77	13.77	13.77	13.77	13.77
250 milligrams, 16's	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10
250 milligrams, 100's	30.60	30.60	30.60	30.60	30.60	30.60	30.60
Intramuscular: 100-milligram vial	.94	.94	.94	.94	.94		.94
Intravenous:							
250-milligram vial	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62
500-milligram vial	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.90
Ped. drops: 100 milligrams per cubic centimeter, 10 cubic centimeters	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47
Oral suspension: 250 milligrams per 5 cubic centimeters, 1 ounce	2.54	2.55	2.54	2.54	2.55		2.55
Syrup:							
125 milligrams per 5 cubic centimeters, 2 ounces	2.54	2.55	2.54	2.54	2.55		2.55
125 milligrams per 5 cubic centimeters, 16 ounces	18.36	18.36	18.36		18.36	18.36	18.36

THE PRICE FIXING CONSPIRACY—DOMESTIC ASPECTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Cyanamid entered the tetracycline market in November 1953 under the brand name "achromycin" and was followed shortly thereafter in January 1954 by Pfizer with "tetracyn." The published prices of these drugs were identical to one another and to Cyanamid's aureomycin and Pfizer's terramycin. The identity of these prices, however, was not the result of accident, but was the result of agreement. Let us take a look at some relevant documents.

On May 27, 1954, the Cyanamid Chicago regional manager sent the following message to his sales manager:

> Apparently Pfizer and Roerig [a sales division of Pfizer] are abiding by reduction of samples because the number of calls from all reports from the field since my return from Absecon, have been practically none. (CX 593B)[4]

As you can easily imagine, if you give away 1 bottle with every 10 bottles sold, the practical effect is a reduction in price. This letter shows that an agreement had been reached by the companies to close this particular loophole for price cutting. That it was successful is indicated by Cyanamid's Chicago regional manager when he wrote on June 17, 1954, that:

> Within the last 30 days, complaints from the field regarding the Pfizer and Roerig operations have been practically nil. From all indications, it is presumed that these competitors are adhering to the operation that was reported by Mr. Wendt [Cyanamid's director of sales] at the regional manager's meeting. (CX 494A)

About 1 year later the same Cyanamid representative made the following comment with respect to the furnishing of free tetracycline to Michael Reese Hospital, Chicago, Ill.:

> Approximately 1 year ago, we were furnishing this same institution material for clinic use through Dr. Kagan, chief of pediatrics. This procedure was stopped due to a report by Pfizer to Mr. Wendt. (CX 595)

As previously stated, Mr. Wendt is Cyanamid's director of sales. In other words, Pfizer complained to Cyanamid and as a result Cyanamid stopped furnishing free tetracycline for clinical use. During this period, Cyanamid and Pfizer were following an agreed-on policy with respect to supplying free samples to physicians and clinics.

In addition, governmental agencies at all levels were the victims of bids which were absolutely identical even to the third decimal place.

In March 1955, shortly before a 14-month period of noncompetitive bidding to the Veterans' Administration, a Cyanamid representative complained to his superiors that Pfizer was undercutting Cyanamid and "everybody" on bid prices to certain city, county, and State hospitals. He stated that "this should be checked into the prices arranged as we have done on the VA setup." CX 558B—Another Cyanamid representative stated on July 30, 1955:

> If Pfizer is trying to hold the price line, would it be helpful to collect some copies of bids showing the low-cut bids by Pfizer's accounts so that Pearl River [Cyanamid] could show them to Pfizer officials?" (CX 597B.)

Bristol entered the tetracycline market in April 1954 with "polycycline," followed by Squibb in September 1954 with "Steclin" and Upjohn in October 1954 with "panmycin." Squibb and Upjohn, Bristol customers, were cautioned not to deviate from the existing price structure inasmuch as the Bristol-Pfizer patent fight could only be settled if Pfizer was satisfied that Bristol and its customers would adhere to the price structure. In this connection, the FTC said:

> Numerous intracorporate memorandums prepared by Squibb's sales officials demonstrate that insofar as its tetracycline products were concerned, Squibb suddenly became obsessed with a desire to correct its "loose business practices" to live down a reputation as a price cutter.[5]

Notice, Mr. President, that if someone ceased to do something he was not supposed to do under the law, he was engaged in "bad business practices." We have a situation in which, when we are talking about doing something wrong, the industry is talking about doing something right, and when we are talking about doing something right, the industry is talking about doing something wrong.

On September 17, 1954, the day Squibb began marketing tetracycline under the trade name Steclin, the Squibb manager of marketing, Heberger, sent the following message to all representatives of his firm:

> The Steclin pricing schedule must be adhered to strictly. Steclin is not to be involved in any special terms used to meet competitive situations on other antiobtiotic products.
>
> Steclin should be sold direct in every case possible. When a handling credit situation must apply we will arrange 10 percent handling credit only on a drop shipment basis.
>
> We have had some reports of competitive prices of Tetracycline products at variance with public schedules. Please send along to your branch promptly any specific information regarding such deviations you run into on your territory. (CX 204.)

Footnotes at end of Mr. LONG's remarks.

On October 13, 1954, Squibb's Heberger informed his Atlanta branch manager by telegram:

> Squibb cannot be officially connected with any price maneuver on Steclin which can be construed as cutting the price. There can be no compromise with our position of maintaining prices on this product. (CX 207.)

On November 12, 1954, all of Squibb's field managers were informed:

> It is our fixed policy not only to avoid price cutting on Steclin but to avoid any practice which might lay us open to such an accusation." (CX 210.)

On April 27, 1955, Heberger again wrote:

> I was disturbed to learn that we were the successful bidder to Los Angeles County because we bid on tetracycline 250 Mg. capsules $22.49 per 100 less 2 precent discount. It is nice to get a Steclin order finally from Los Angeles County but I have my fingers crossed, anticipating certain reactions to what we did, which may not be good.
>
> As I say, it would be nice to get the order but I am hoping there are no serious results. (CX 213.)

Here was someone who feared he might have made a competitive bid, and he was fearful of the consequences.

Now, Mr. President, here we have a strange situation where a bidder, Squibb, is actually disturbed because he was successful. The reason, of course, is that Squibb was violating the price-fixing agreement to which it was a party, and in the eyes of Squibb, violating this agreement was more disturbing than violating the laws of the United States.

On August 19, 1955, the assistant manager of Squibb's marketing department wrote the following letter to a sales representative:

> We are well aware of the problem that you are confronted with on the tetracycline quotations. We too want the bid at King County for the 10,000 250 Mg., but under no circumstances can we give you authority to quote less than $22.49 per 100.
>
> You may of course allow a 10 percent handling allowance to the Northwest Medical Supply less the usual 2 percent cash discount. If they are inclined to pass this handling allowance on down I don't think we can do anything about it, however, it would be inadvisable for you to suggest this arrangement, particularly in writing." (CX 217.)

On April 6, 1955, an Upjohn branch manager wrote the following letter to Upjohn's price determination department manager concerning a low bid by Squibb:

> As requested, we are enclosing the results of the bids at Los Angeles County Hospital:
>
> 864 Tetracycline Caps. 250 Mg. went as follows: Pfizer, $22.49 2 percent 15th Proximo; Squibb, $22.49 2 percent open; Lederle, $22.49 net; Bristol, $22.49 net.
>
> Homer Hammond feels Squibb will get the bid with an open 2 percent time limit.
>
> * * * * *
>
> We will forget that one. On the panmycin it looks like Squibb scuttled our ship. I wonder if Bristol will complain to them as they did with us. (CX 473.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. I regret I did not get to the Senate Chamber in time to hear the opening remarks of the Senator from Louisiana, and I regret that more Senators are not present, because the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is one of a handful left in this country who are concerned about this problem over all of its aspects, and particularly the consumer aspects. Is the Senator saying in his speech that there was a bid on certain medicines and that—was it four companies?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This is what these four companies have done. Actually there are five companies.

Mr. NELSON. All came in with the same bid?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They started by obtaining a patent by fraudulent representation.

Mr. NELSON. Who obtained the patent?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Pfizer first obtained the patent for these broad-spectrum wonder drugs. There is doubt that that patent is valid and it would appear that it was obtained by misrepresentation. In fact, this was turned down several times by the Patent Office on the basis that it was not properly subject to patent.

Having done so, they proceeded to enter into a conspiracy with five other companies, all bidding all over the world. They bid identical prices which were 50 times the cost of the product. They use all sorts of procedures and lawsuits to see that the public did not get the benefit of competition.

Mr. NELSON. Are these offers for bids by companies in which they say to each company:

> We want to bid on *x* amount of these wonder drugs.

And then, they come in with identical bids?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NELSON. What I am curious about is whether this situation has been referred to the Department of Justice, and if so, why has the Department of Justice not started prosecution? Can the Senator answer that question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Department of Justice has known about this for 5 years. It may be more than 5 years. It has been since 1961, and in some instances since 1958. Yet, this case has not been prosecuted. It absolutely defies me to understand why they would have all of this and know that the public in this country and all over the world is being completely robbed by illegal conspiracy and they have not moved to do something about it.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator might send a copy of his address to the Attorney General. He is a courageous Attorney General, and if there is a violation of law he would not hesitate to prosecute.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. He will know about it.

Mr. President, this might be called the effective working of an industrial Gestapo. The policing prices by the five companies involved was so tight that, when one of them gave a 2-percent discount with no time limit specified on payment, it was reported. And the culprit had committed a treasonable act and was accused of "scuttling the ship." Does this sound like a competitive system?

On November 22, 1955, shortly before the Pfizer-Bristol patent suit was settled, Richard Anderson, director of sales for Bristol Laboratories received a letter from Henry Wendt, director of sales for Cyanamid. This letter was found by FTC attorneys in Bristol's files in a mutilated condition with the letterhead and the sender's name torn off. Apparently this was regarded as a very "hot" letter—so hot that neither the company nor the executive's name was to be kept in the Bristol files in the event that a Government agency got curious and made an investigation. And when one hears this letter, it will be understood why they wanted to be so careful. The letter reads:

> NOVEMBER 22, 1955.
>
> DEAR DICK: I am enclosing the most recent prices on all of our achromycin prices, together with what we call a trade class chart. This trade class chart is our standard procedure for classifying accounts for our Lederle purchase plan and our handling charge policy.
>
> Our branches are instructed to follow this chart with great precision. Basically, except for the subject of our discussion Friday afternoon, there are no deviations. I might say that the branch offices do not report to the sales department but rather to the treasurer's office, so that the opportunity for special situations is nonexistent.
>
> Our Dominion price for 250-milligram capsules has been and will continue to be $17.01. This price applies to the Department of Defense Production and the Department of Veterans' Affairs. Our price to the Canadian Provincial departments is $25.50.
>
> The name of the hospital survey group is Davee, Koehnlein & Keating at 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> (CX 328).

This "Dear Dick" letter I just read is especially interesting because it shows:

First, that Bristol Laboratories and American Cyanamid were exchanging price information.

Second, that a price-fixing discussion was held.

Third, that prices were being rigged in Canada, also.

Fourth, that at the time when our own Defense Supply Agency had to pay $19.58 on a bottle of one hundred 250 milligram capsules, the Canadian Defense Department was purchasing this bottle for $17.01 less 2 percent, both prices resulting from bids rigged by the conspirators.

Despite the price agreements, continual vigilance had to be used to keep the conspirators in line. Each spied on the other.

The Pfizer-Bristol patent suit was settled on December 14, 1955. On December 16, 1955, Heberger, Squibb's manager of marketing, sent the following letter to a sales representative in regard to a Lederle—Cyanamid—bid:

> On bid No. 635 for 100's of tetracycline 250 milligrams Lederle's product was offered at $21.08 per 100. In order to properly record this violation I must know whether this was a direct bid by Lederle, or whether the bid was made through a dealer. (CX 220).

On April 5, 1956, Squibb's Heberger wrote to another sales representative:

> In checking back over your recent report on tetracycline bids to the King County Hospital, I notice that Joseph Hart and Northwest Medical quoting on the Pfizer

> product cut the price to $20.23 and $20.44, respectively. Bracken quoting on the Lederle product quoted $21.
>
> You will notice that all three dealers quoted within the framework of their 10-percent handling credit. We can only assume that it was a decision made by the dealers and that there is no official approval of what they are doing. Of course, our own bid must be strictly in accord with the schedule. (CX 222).

The official approval referred to here, let me add, is not official governmental approval but approval by the illegal conspiracy.

On May 11, 1957, a Bristol sales official complained that Squibb has deviated slightly from the price agreed upon by the conspirators and that this was a bad precedent:

> On a bid that opened on May 10, 1957, for the Ohio State University Hospital, which called for a 10–100 tetracycline phosphate complex, both Bristol and Upjohn conformed to the stated price (stated price means the price agreed upon by the conspirators) whereas Squibb bid it at 22.04 net. I fully realize that 22.04 net is theoretically the same as 22.49 less 2 percent, and on this particular bid it amounts to the same thing. However, supposing the bid had called for 100–100 or 150–100 which they have been buying of the HCL Salt, then Squibb would have been awarded the bid because they would have been .02 or .03 less than our bid.
>
> I am only calling this to your attention, Charlie, in order to stop whatever precedent may occur in the future. This is a very technical point, but as you know, .02 or .03 can make the difference whether you are awarded the bid or not.
>
> The bid or inquiry number is 2791–D–61510, and was signed by Paul Wherry, one of the Squibb representatives.
>
> I hope this does not happen in the future, and if we can nip it in the bud I am sure that it will not be tried elsewhere. (CX 843.)

Here we see that Bristol was quarreling because Squibb had bid $22.04 net instead of $22.49 less 2 percent, and it was conceivable that, with a minute change in the capsule, Squibb's bid might be 2 cents lower than Bristol's bid. Yet one of the documents taken from Bristol's files during the Federal Trade Commission investigation showed their actual cost of production at that time was $1.66. No wonder they had to be a bunch of "eager beavers" in policing the price structure where this kind of a margin—$1.66 as against $22—existed between cost and price; in fact, $22.49—quite a difference. In other words, that is a difference of ten times the cost.

Mr. President, if all prices and terms are going to be the same, how can it be determined who should get the business? One method could be by rolling dice, and this is exactly what happened in a bid to New Orleans Charity Hospital. Each of the five conspirators, as well as three dealers, bid identical prices on quantities of 200, 600, and 1,000 bottles of tetracycline capsules. Cyanamid won the award in a roll of the dice as explained in a letter written by Upjohn's Memphis branch manager to Upjohn's assistant director of branch sales. This letter will be included among the documents which will be placed in the RECORD. It will be noticed that Upjohn's assistant director of branch sales, in a penciled notation addressed to Upjohn's pricing manager and hospital sales manager, described the competitive nature of the bidding as follows:

> Too bad that our boy isn't a better crap shooter.

This, Mr. President, is the conspirator's idea of how a free competitive market should operate. In fact, Upjohn's man said that "maybe this is a good trend, too." For them he is undoubtedly right; but very bad for the rest of us.

On October 22, 1957, a Squibb official stated that Squibb would be competitive on penicillin and streptomycin products and that it would be "willing to meet or beat anything Pfizer quoted. We cannot do this on the broad spectrum, but in our own penicillin and streptomycin products we can"—CX 250.

The documents I have just read make clear that Pfizer, Cyanamid, Bristol, Squibb, and Upjohn were engaged in a scheme to fix the retail price of tetracycline capsules in the United States at 51 cents per pill—a pill which at that time cost about 1.6 cents to make and which, today, costs even less. Let me refer back to the "Dear Dick" letter of November 22, 1955, from Cyanamid's Wendt to Bristol's Anderson, which I read only a few minutes ago. The FTC points out that:

> The most significant feature of this (letter) is that it contains assurances to Bristol that Cyanamid would adhere to its published prices. Certainly Cyanamid would not give such assurances to Bristol without an understanding that it would not be undercut by Bristol. Clearly both firms must have agreed not to deviate from the published prices. In the third paragraph the writer discusses Cyanamid's price for 250-milligram capsules to agencies of the Canadian Government. The Dominion price was secret information, but Cyanamid not only furnished it to Bristol but again gave assurance that the price "will continue to be $17.01." It is also of some significance in this connection that Pfizer was also bidding $17.01 to the Canadian Government."[6]

This one document, which so clearly shows the existence of a price-fixing conspiracy both in the United States and in Canada, sets the stage for the next branch of our inquiry. For if these pharmaceutical manufacturers who were fixing the price of broad spectrum antibiotics in the United States were also fixing the price in Canada, in what other countries were they fixing prices?

THE PRICE-FIXING CONSPIRACY—INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS

Mr. President, here are some examples of prices in other countries:

In Australia, for example, the 1959–60 price[7] to the druggist for a bottle of 16 250-milligram tetracycline capsules was as follows:

Cyanamid (achromycin)	$5.62
Pfizer (tetracyn)	5.62
Squibb (steclin)	5.62
Upjohn (panmycin)	5.62

Cyanamid's Australian price for Aureomycin was—you guessed it—$5.62.

Keep in mind that while these drugs are called by different names, they are identical. There is no difference in them whatever except the difference in trade names.

In Austria, the 1959–60 price[8] to the druggist for the same bottle of tetracycline capsules was:

Cyanamid (achromycin)	$6.02
Pfizer (tetracyn)	6.02
Hoechst (Bristol licensee) (hostacyclin)	6.02
Bayer (Bristol sublicensee) (tetracycline)	6.02

In West Germany, the 1959–60 price[9] to the druggist for the same bottle of tetracycline capsules was:

Cyanamid (achromycin)	$4.31
Pfizer (tetracyn)	4.31

Cyanamid's West German price for Aureomycin was exactly the same—$4.31.

In Italy, the 1959–60 price[10] to the druggist for the same bottle of tetracycline capsules was:

Alfar (Cyanamid licensee) (acromicina)	$5.86
C. N. B. (Bristol licensee) (bristaciclina)	5.86
Squibb (steclin)	5.86
Pfizer (tetracyn)	5.86

Twelve other Italian tetracycline manufacturers charged the same price, and Cyanamid's Italian price for aureomycin was also the same.

In Japan, the 1959–60 price[11] to the druggist for the same bottle of tetracycline capsules was:

Cyanamid (acromycin)	$4.58
Pfizer-Taito (tetracyn)	4.58
Banyu Pharmacol (Bristol licensee) (Bristocycline)	4.44

Cyanamid's Japanese price for aureomycin was $4.58.

In Mexico, the 1959–60 price[12] to the druggist for the same bottle of tetracycline capsules was:

Cyanamid (acromicina)	$5.82
Pfizer (tetracyna)	5.82

Cyanamid's Mexican price for aureomycin and Pfizer's Mexican price for terramycin was exactly the same—$5.82.

In Panama, the 1959–60 price[13] to the druggist for the same bottle of tetracycline capsules was as follows:

Cynamid (acromicina)	$5.40
Pfizer (tetracina)	5.40
Squibb (steclin)	5.40
Bristol (bristaciclina)	5.40

Cyanamid's Panamanian price for aureomycin and Pfizer's Panamanian price for terramycin was exactly the same—$5.40.

Note, Mr. President, that while the prices vary from country to country, they are identical within the country.

In Venezuela, the 1959–60 price[14] to the druggist for the same bottle of tetracycline capsules was as follows:

Cyanamid (acromicina)	$5.31
Pfizer (tetracina)	5.08
Bristol (bristaciclina)	5.31

Cyanamid's Venezuelan price for aureomycin and Pfizer's Venezuelan price for terramycin matched the prices each was charging for tetracycline, that is, $5.31 and $5.08, respectively.

Mr. President, are these examples of identical and near-identical pricing practices the result of accident? Or do

---

Footnotes at end of Mr. LONG's remarks.

they demonstrate something more frightening and sinister, such as a worldwide price-fixing agreement—an American-sponsored cartel?

If we look at the evidence from Venezuela—where prices were not always identical despite the conspirators' efforts to make them so—the facts, I believe, will startle everyone. It is unfortunate that these startling facts were unavailable to the Federal Trade Commission, which has been trying since 1958 to put a stop to this conspiracy.

On May 9, 1957, Luis H. Ball, an executive of Biogen Laboratories Corp., Cyanamid's Venezuelan distributor, sent a communication to a Cyanamid official in New York. That communication reads in part as follows:

> Mr. B. G. PRIETO,
>
> *Cyanamid Inter-American Corp., Lederle Laboratories Division, New York, N.Y.*
>
> DEAR MR. PRIETO: Yesterday afternoon we tetracycline distributors had a meeting in the offices of the Pfizer Laboratories, to talk once again about the prices of these products. Attending the meeting were the manager Remedia, S.A., representative of Hoechst, the manager of Squibb, Mr. Miguel Octavio, representative of Le Petit; Mr. Keblinger, sales manager for the Western Hemisphere of Bristol Laboratories, and their representative in Venezuela, the manager of the Royal Drugstore, the gentleman from Pfizer, and I.
>
> At that meeting, we were accused of not having adhered to the agreement which, according to them, we had made in October of last year with respect to these products. This agreement—to recall in a way what we had been talking about with them—had applied solely to the presentations of pure tetracycline, i.e., acromycin, tetracyn, and hostacycline, which at that time were the only ones on the market, and had not applied to aureomycin and terramycin; furthermore, we, for our part, had always taken for granted that each of the firms would deposit with a bank, in favor of the other firms, a check for 25,000 bolivares, which would become effective in case any one of the firms were to violate the agreement—

Imagine that, Mr. President, here is an illegal conspiracy with earnest money being put up so that in the event someone should do what the law requires and compete for the market, the other fellow is entitled to take his money. It is a payoff in the event that someone should accidentally obey the law.

Mr. President, I continue to read from the letter:

> our proposal, which of course was not accepted, Pfizer giving us the excuse that the Caracas branch could not commit the company.
>
> The main purpose of arriving at that agreement was to equalize the list prices of the products, and we did so in almost all cases, with small exceptions such as, for example, pediatric drops which we offer at 4.55 bolivares to the pharmacies, and Pfizer at 4.80 bolivares. Of course, we had not been willing to raise the price since this would give the press and interested persons of the Medical Federation a reason to vociferate against Lederle, and I feel it is easier to lower a price than to raise it.
>
> In yesterday's talk, the gentlemen from Prizer, who have been selling terramycin to the Government also for 17 bolivares per bottle of 250 x 16's ever since they started to distribute the product, want us to raise the aureomycin price from 15.50 bolivares to 17 bolivares. This we did not want to do, because aureomycin, in contrast to acromycin, is selling very satisfactorily to the principal Government outfit, which is the Social Security Institute, and, moreover, we have no argument to present to the Comptroller General of the Nation—which is the office in charge of control of the prices at which the Government buys all its requirements—in support of this increase.
>
> Consequently, we decided not to increase the aureomycin prices and we shall say so to the gentlemen from Pfizer in another talk which we will have tomorrow. I am telling you all this for your cognizance, and also asking that you let Mr. Bogan (cyanamid official) know so that he may be informed of the present price situation in Venezuela, and to enable you, in case Pfizer tells you that we are fooling around with prices, to answer them immediately that we have at no time lowered the prices.[15]

Note that language. Fooling around with prices means offering a competitive bid or failing to keep a price-fixing conspiracy agreement.

Six months later, on October 30, 1957, Mr. Ball, Cyanamid's Venezuelan distributor, again write Prieto (Cyanamid) in New York complaining that Pfizer-Venezuela was giving the Brion Pharmacy in Caracas a 20-percent discount on broad spectrum antibiotics:

> As you will understand, the name of this pharmacy must be kept in strictest confidence, and I don't believe that things are going to be settled by a simple telephone conversation between you and Pfizer in New York.[16]

This was followed by a cabled instruction from Prieto to Ball directing Ball to telephone Bogan, Prieto's superior, in New York. Bogan—Cyanamid—thereafter contacted his opposite number at Pfizer, Frank P. Wilson, pricing manager for Pfizer-International, who, in turn, telephoned R. N. Silva, Pfizer's manager in Venezuela.

The pattern in general went something like this: When the Venezuelan distributor violated the price-fixing agreement in his area, he would complain to his superior in New York who, in turn, would call the New York office of the company that was violating the price-fixing agreement. The New York office of the violating company would then communicate with its representative in Venezuela.

And let me say something right here. We know that whenever the local boys get caught in a price-fixing conspiracy, the important fellows at the top of the company always say, "We never knew a thing about it. We told them never to do anything like that." That, we will remember, is what happened in the famous antitrust case against General Electric and the other electrical companies. And it was practically impossible to pin anything on the top officials, and the lower guys took the punishment. But here the top fellows in the New York offices were directly involved. If the matter could not be solved locally, the big guns were called in.

On December 10, 1957, Silva—Pfizer-Venezuela—wrote Wilson—Pfizer-New York—as follows:

> This memorandum will serve the purpose of introducing Mr. Charles Anderson to your good self. Mr. Anderson is the manager of the Royal Drugstore of Caracas, one of the largest pharmaceutical wholesalers in this country which firm also happens to be Bristol's exclusive distributors for Venezuela.
>
> Mr. Anderson is, therefore, a person fully familiar with what goes on in the pharmaceutical field here. He has been a party to the countless powwows held in Caracas re broad-spectrum talks and re wholesalers-retailers-laboratories talks. Mr. Anderson, a good friend of Pfizer's and of Mr. Juan Franco's and of mine as well, is anxious and willing to go along with you and/or any authorized Pfizer executives and talk to the respective ACCO (American Cyanamid) people to explain what is really going on in the Venezuelan market re the latest Biogen complaint to ACCO and all related matters, specially with reference to the Brion case.
>
> If possible, one of the Ball gentlemen should be present so that things would be squared away once and for all (perhaps a vainless hope) in front of the respective ACCO executives that you are already familiar with.[17]

Immediately thereafter, Ball was instructed to come to Cyanamid's New York office to discuss the matter with Ralph Roland, at that time export sales manager for Cyanamid-International. And while Ball was in New York complaining to Roland about Pfizer, Silva and Anderson were also in New York complaining to Pfizer about Cyanamid.

On December 30, 1957, Ball wrote Roland from Venezuela as follows:

> DEAR RALPH: This is my first day in the office after 3 weeks of what we might call vacation in New York. I had a meeting here this morning with our general sales supervisor and with the man in charge of special affairs, Messrs. Ghiorai and A. J. Osorio, respectively. The latter had informed me that Mr. R. N. Silva called him during my absence to complain that we had reported to New York the special discounts which the Pfizer branch in this city is giving to the Brion Pharmacy.
>
> In the first paragraph of the second page of my letter * * * of October 30, I clearly indicated the desirability of keeping in strictest confidence the name of the pharmacy which supplied us with the copies of invoices showing the special discount. Pfizer is granting them, and now my fears have become a reality, since somebody in the New York office has informed Pfizer of the name of that pharmacy, which is taking reprisals against us and does not want to buy Lederle products from us.[18]

Obviously, the special discounts granted to this pharmacy by Pfizer violated the price-fixing agreement.

Subsequently, Ball learned from his father, Dr. R. R. Ball, that both Pfizer and Bristol had complained about him to Cyanamid and in a letter to a Cyanamid official dated January 30, 1958, Ball wrote as follows:

> DEAR MR. BOGAN: My father related to me the conversation he had with you about the charges made against me by the representatives of Pfizer and Bristol in connection with the prices of the wide-spectrum antibiotics. I want to thank you warmly for the confidence you have shown in me by not listening to those false accusations.[19]

Mr. President, here is one criminal thanking another criminal for the confidence he showed in him in confiding to him that other people were failing to violate the law.

The following day Ball wrote another Cyanamid official, explaining the situa-

---

Footnotes at end of Mr. LONG's remarks.

tion more fully, referring to the price-fixing conspiracy he was accused of violating:

> DEAR MR. PAGAN: I enclose copy of the letter which I am writing to Mr. Bogan, LHBM 63, dated the 30th of this month and year.
>
> In it, I refer to a conversation which my father had with Mr. Bogan, because the latter was informed that Mr. R. N. Silva and Mr. Charles Anderson, manager of the Royal Drugstore and distributor of Bristol in Venezuela, had complained to Lederle that I had been indulging in all sorts of price schemes in Venezuela and ignoring the agreements with which you are already familiar.
>
> Once again it was my experience that at Lederle's they don't take care of the problems of this market. To the eight letters which I wrote in the course of last year, to you and to New York, about the problem of the Pfizer maneuvers, I only got your reply. When I was in New York in December of last year, I took up the matter in person, and the only token of attention to these problems was that I was invited to lunch with a Pfizer vice president and Mr. Silva, which invitation I naturally did not accept because I was convinced of the futility of talking once again with representatives of that firm, which was confirmed to me by the absurd charges that are now made against me.[20]

These "absurd charges" are that the man failed to violate the law.

On August 7, 1958, following meetings in Venezuela in May and July at which time the Pfizer-Cyanamid pricing dispute was apparently settled, Frank P. Wilson (Pfizer-New York) wrote R. N. Silva (Pfizer-Venezuela) as follows:

> DEAR RAFAEL: We have been advised that [Luis H. Ball] has stated that [our] * * * quotation in Maracaibo of Bs. 4.00 on pediatric drops was under his quotation of Bs. 4.15, and therefore he considers the entire situation as being changed and intends to authorize his detailmen to aggressively quote on all Government business. Is he looking for a reason to go after Government business? [21]

This letter is marked "Personal and confidential" and contains the handwritten notation on the bottom, "Please destroy." There was a good reason, Mr. President, why Wilson wanted this letter destroyed. It contains a written admission that Cyanamid's officials contacted him concerning a "price variation" by Pfizer-Venezuela—the clearest kind of evidence that Pfizer and Cyanamid were fixing prices on an international scale.

Pfizer-Venezuela received this letter on August 13, 1958, and 5 days later Luis H. Ball, an official of Cyanamid's Venezuelan distributor, was on an airplane to New York. In a letter-memorandum, Ball said:

> On August 19, I had lunch with Mr. Ralph Roland, at the time export sales manager of Cyanamid Interamerican Corp. and Cyanamid International Corp., and explained to him that once again Pfizer's Venezuelan branch was giving special discounts of 10 percent on all terramycin purchases, contrary to the previous agreements to the effect that such a discount was to be accorded only to wholesalers. It was agreed during that lunch, that Mr. Roland would contact Mr. Frank P. Wilson, manager of pricing for Pfizer Corp., to see what could be done about it.
>
> The following day, when I arrived at Cyanamid's office at the time in the U.S. Rubber Building on 6th Avenue, I was told that a luncheon had been agreed with Mr. Wilson, during which we could discuss the whole matter of Pfizer's pricing. Mr. Roland, Mr. Tamblyn, his assistant, Mr. J. R. Porro, sales manager for the Latin American area and myself went to the restaurant at the Drake Hotel to meet Mr. Frank Wilson (Pfizer). I had met Mr. Wilson during several opportunities in the past, and had the impression that he was a very capable man in his field. Throughout this lunch I confirmed this opinion, and I was glad to hear him say that he would take the matter up with his Venezuelan branch manager, Mr. R. N. Silva at the time, so that the situation would be finally stopped.
>
> Later, we were joined at this lunch at the Hotel Drake with Mr. Wilson, by Mr. H. C. Hesse, at the time director of Cyanamid International.
>
> That lunch ended by assurances given by Mr. Wilson to the effect that he would correct the situation, and assurances given by me that we would wait for them to do it and not start a price competition. Late that afternoon, coming out of Mr. Flag's office, who at the time was manager of the Formica Division of Cyanamid, I saw both Mr. Frank Wilson and Mr. R. N. Silva enter Mr. Hesse's office.[22]

These documents I have quoted from show that the price conspiracy was going on right here in our own country—in New York City. And they show that top officials of these corporations were involved in setting prices and getting all the local people back in the price harness which they had arranged.

The agreement not to engage in price competition so carefully worked out on August 18 and 20, 1958, at the Drake Hotel in New York City had to be shored up. Unfortunately, that is what happens when there is the kind of a margin which these companies had to play with. Remember, their costs were about a cent and a half a pill as against a price of 51 cents to the consumer. When people have that kind of a situation, they have to work hard to keep their price conspiracy in perfect running order. In late September 1958, an employee of Biogen, Cyanamid's Venezuelan distributor, discovered that Pfizer and Bristol were again quoting discounts on broad spectrum antibiotics. When Dr. R. R. Ball, father of Luis H. Ball, and head of Biogen Laboratories, was informed, he wrote a Cyanamid official on September 29, 1958, that he was matching "the prices of the competition, which I hasten to tell you since this news will surely already have been transmitted to you by interested parties." Dr. Ball added:

> I have just telephoned Rafael Nicanor (Silva of Pfizer) to communicate to him my conversation with Casas and the order I had given him to adjust our products to the prices quoted by the competition. He assured me that there is no such discount by his company (Pfizer); that it may possibly be an employee who had become overanxious to get the order and had given the discount, but inasmuch as the billing is done from Caracas there will be no such discount. He also told me he would call Anderson (Bristol) to talk with him about the matter so that Bristol won't reduce prices.[23]

On October 12, 1958, Dr. Ball wrote a Cyanamid official, making his position explicit. The trouble was that not all of the gentlemen in this "gentlemen's conspiracy" were real gentlemen. Ball was getting sick and tired of the fact that some of his colleagues occasionally yielded to temptation when they had just sworn on a stack of Bibles that they wouldn't cut prices:

> I assure you that * * * I will not lose one more order because of price cuts from the competition. I will not make any "fuss" nor will I fight with anybody, but simply return to the independent policy which I maintained in the past without agreements for such nonsense. * * * [24]

This really got results. When it was discovered that one of their number was going to kick over the traces and try a little real competition for a change, the conspirators got busy. This letter touched off a visit to Venezuela by a Pfizer official, Meredith C. Hough, who discussed the matter with Silva, Pfizer's Venezuelan manager.

Now, Mr. President, what follows is the most startling price-fixing document I have ever seen, and even though it is long, I shall read it, because I think the Senate will find it as interesting as I did: [25]

> CARACAS, *November 7, 1958.*
>
> DEAR FRANK: When Houghie was here not long ago, I had the opportunity to chat with you over the phone with reference to the difficulties we were experiencing in the brdspctrm field. Following Houghie's departure, a powwow was convoked in our office with brstlhstchldrllpttpfzr in attendance. Our friend, sqbb could not attend but was no party to any offense and was fully desirous of others reestablishing the previous atmosphere of confidence. Of the participants in attendance, the third one herein listed Olympianly limited itself to merely sending an unauthorized observer with instructions to say that it was not willing to participate any further in any such agreements. Fesa (see today's memo to Herb Bauer) had not attended because it had not done so previously but said, prior to and after the powwow, that it would abide by whatever collective conclusions were reached, and, so far, has not sinned following said powwow.
>
> During this powwow it became evident that brstl was engaged in a nationwide cutting scheme, granting a 10 percent by means of either free goods or a like open or disguised discount. It also became evident that ldrl had followed suit without consulting the remaining partners; what is even worse, the old man personally told me that he had authorized his salesmen to go down to whatever level was necessary in order not to lose any business, something very dangerous because things of this nature, as you know, can't be entrusted to the very limited and uncoordinated judgment of individual salesmen. Apparently the origin of the whole thing was simply that brstl has a sales force headed by a special representative reporting directly to stateside headquarters while the distribution is in the hands of our friend Charlie; said special representative wants to become a branch manager and, to this end, is trying to prove to his superiors that he can sell lots, while lacking in managerial training and experience that would show him that such methods can be disastrous to a p&l.

In other words, Mr. President, profits come from rigged prices, not from increased sales.

The letter continues:

> During the powwow the previous confidence was restored and it was said and agreed "let's try again" Fesa and sqbb, informed a posteriori, were happy about the conclusions.

Footnotes at end of Mr. LONG's remarks.

Yesterday lptt phoned me saying ldrl was at it again. The news, having originated in the Interior, I immediately sent over one of my aids and he just came back confirming the fact that in Maracaibo, to the Hospital Chiquinquira and to the Zulia State Medicine Purchasing Department, ldrl was selling its equivalent of our LACAR at the proper level but delivering 10 percent of free goods, what caused lptt to lose appreciable business.

Next week I shall call another powwow, as agreed upon at the last one, in order to thrash out this Maracaibo violation. I anticipate, however, that ldrl will in all probability refuse to attend and shall deny the sins. This is tantamount to saying that it shall be most difficult to hold the brd-spctrm governmental prcg totem pole in the future. The stubbornness of a disturbed family shall be, as usually, the cause of it all.

I shall keep you further posted.

PLUTO.

P.S.—Next week I shall also call a powwow to discuss sinning in the field of glccrtods (hrmns). We have the strength of being a major party that has not sinned at all.

P.P.S.—It should be noted that, at these powwows, no objections have been raised with regard to steps similar to those of our special G–13.

Thank you.

Now, Mr. President, this letter is obviously in code, which the writer used in an attempt to disguise price-fixing and "pay-off" communications. What, for example, does brstlhstchldrllpttpfzr mean? What does "violation" actually mean? One must first know the identity of the persons and firms referred to and the meaning of the code employed before we can fully understand the letter. The key to the code, fortunately, was supplied with the other documents.

"Frank" is Frank P. Wilson—that very fine and estimable person referred to earlier in my remarks who made such a fine impression on the Venezuelan representative who came up with the suggestion to get this crooked conspiracy straightened out so that it could go back to its old efficient operation—Pfizer-International's pricing manager; "Houghie" is Meredith C. Hough, then a Pfizer-International area manager; "brd-spctrm" stands for "broad spectrum."

"Powwow" is a code word meaning inter company price-fixing discussion; "brstlhstchldrllpttpfzr" refers to Bristol, Hoechst,[26] Lederle (Cyanamid), Lepetit,[27] and Pfizer; "sqbb" refers to Squibb; "offense" means a competitive price variation; now that is a specially nice term, I think. Anyone who engages in price competition is an outlaw; he is committing an "offense"—probably a capital offense.

"Previous atmosphere of confidence" means a prior understanding on prices.

"Fesa" refers to a local antibiotic dosage form producer, Farmaco Especialidades; "Herb Abuer" is a Pfizer-International staff lawyer in New York; "the old man" refers to Dr. R. R. Ball, head of Biogen Laboratories, Cyanamid's Venezuelan representatives.

"Charlie" is Charles Anderson, Bristol's exclusive distributor in Venezuela; "Lacar" is Pfizer's code name for a broad spectrum antibiotic; "violation" refers to a price cut.

"Sinner" means a person or firm who has departed from a price-fixing agreement; "prcng" means pricing; "a disturbed family" means a price-cutting situation among competitors; "Pluto" is the code name for Rafael N. Silva, Pfizer's Venezuelan manager.

"Glcrtds" refers to glucocorticoids; "Special G–13" refers to "Murray G–13 disbursements," Pfizer-Venezuela's "pay-off" fund to "facilitate" sales to governmental purchasers in Venezuela.

It is important to understand that these meetings, agreements and understandings to fix the price in Venezuela were part of the same conspiracy which "fixed" the price in the United States. Complaining about stateside instructions from Cyanamid not to compete with Pfizer and Bristol in Venezuela, Dr. Ball wrote on October 12, 1958 that:

> Certain narrow mentalities (at Cyanamid) see and think only about the domestic market. * * * When they sign an agreement with their overseas agents they commit themselves to a moral obligation, and, therefore, have no right to make us waste our efforts and money by trying to level us to the domestic policy.[28]

Cyanamid's Dr. Ball was entirely correct in that the primary concern of the American companies was the maintenance of identical prices in the domestic market. The constant pressure by the drug companies on their foreign distributors to adhere to the agreements in their own areas was due to the fear that if one of the companies got away with a price deviation with impunity, such deviations would become infectious and would spread to the U.S. market. The one fact that should be kept uppermost in our minds is that to the conspirators the domestic market was the most important one and prices had to be maintained there at all costs.

This consideration—keeping the agreed-upon price structure intact in the United States—was advanced by Pfizer some 8 months later in refusing to let Pfizer-Venezuela compete with Biogen—Cyanamid-Venezuela—on antibiotic animal food supplements. Wilson wrote Silva on June 16, 1959, that:

> The prices as quoted in the United States to this account (Ralston Purina) by both of us (Pfizer and Cyanamid) are about the same, and therefore it looks as though, at the present, without destroying the price pattern, we cannot compete too aggressively at the local level. I know this must hurt you but it is out of my control. * * * We know that the above does not help you obtain the sales at a local level, yet we feel to do so on a price basis would create a situation which in the long run would be detrimental to the overall profit picture of Pfizer.[29]

DRUG PRICES AND DRUG PROFITS

In November 1957, Bristol was making 250 milligram tetracycline capsules at a cost of about 1.6 cents per pill.[30] which were priced to the consumer at $51 per hundred or about 51 cents per pill—the list price to the consumer for a bottle of 16, the most popular quantity sold, was $8.50 or about 53 cents per pill. Since at that time Bristol accounted for about one-third of the total U.S. output, its cost figures can probably be taken as representative.

The drug industry may dispute this cost figure on the ground that it fails to account for expenditures for drug research. Indeed, this is the industry's traditional response to the charge that drug prices are unconscionably high. But since research costs represent only 6.4 percent of the industry's total sales dollar[31] this argument is obviously absurd. For every 6 cents of a sales dollar spent on research, the large companies spent 25 cents on promotion and advertising of their brand names.

In other words, they spend more than four times as much on advertising brand names as they do on research.

Because of the high prices they charge, they can afford to spend over $600 million a year trying to impress upon prescribing physicians the existence of fictitious differences which will induce them to order brand name products for their patients.[32]

Today, with improved production methods, the cost of producing a 250 Mg. tetracycline capsule is undoubtedly much lower than 1.6 cents. This is confirmed by recent bids to the Defense Department as low as $1.49 per hundred capsules, which suggests a production cost of less than 1 cent per pill.

Sale of broad spectrum antibiotics in this country exceed $200 million annually and tetracycline accounts for more than half of this total. Yet, notwithstanding a production cost of 1.6 cents, the American public paid these millions at a rate of 51 cents per pill during the period 1954 to 1961 and is paying them at a rate of 30 cents per pill today. The sole reason for the price reduction is not improved production methods; it is the fact that in about 2 percent of the prescription market[33] a number of firms are today marketing tetracycline under its generic or nonproprietary name at prices to the consumer of 10 cents per pill and less. Drugs sold generically are uniformly less expensive than trade name drugs, despite the fact that, as most experts agree,[34] the only difference between them is the name under which they are sold.

Rather than engage in price competition, the conspirators have embarked on an extensive campaign to destroy their competitors. This campaign includes: First, filing patent infringement suits, second, excluding the competition from other markets, and third, waging a public relations program against the use of generic drugs. Here are their actions in detail:

First. Although the Federal Trade Commission found that Pfizer's tetracycline patent was obtained as a result of misrepresentations made to the Patent Office,[35] from October 25, 1960, to June 1, 1965, Pfizer brought patent infringement suits against 31 drug companies who were marketing generic tetracycline. I ask unanimous consent to

---

Footnotes at end of Mr. LONG's remarks.

have printed in the RECORD a list of the names of these companies and the dates on which these suits were brought.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Defendant	Filed	Court	Civil action No. —
Mondial Chemical Co. et al	Oct. 25, 1960	District of New Jersey	927-60.
Noramco	Feb. 8, 1961	Western district, Texas	2929.
Philipp Bauer Co., Inc	Apr. 13, 1961	Southern district, New York	51/1230.
International Rectifier Corp. et al	Oct. 2, 1962	Southern district, California	62/1350 CC.
International Drug Trading, Inc. et al	Aug. 28, 1963	Eastern district, Michigan	24280.
Premo Pharmaceutical Laboratories, Inc	Sept. 20, 1963	District of New Jersey	766-33.
TMCO Pharmaceuticals, Inc	Sept. 30, 1963	Eastern district, Missouri	63C-364.
Narco Drug Co., Inc	do	do	63C-363.
Hallmark Laboratories, Inc	Nov. 12, 1963	Northern district, Illinois	63C-2026.
Zenith Laboratories, Inc. et al	do	District of New Jersey	936-63.
Approved Pharmaceutical Corp	do	Northern district, New York	9832.
Davis-Edwards Pharmacal Corp	Nov. 13, 1963	Southern district, New York	63 C 3327.
Pennex Products Co	Nov. 14, 1963	Western district, Pennsylvania	63-1011.
West-Ward, Inc	Dec. 12, 1963	Southern district, New York	63 C 3619.
Pennex Products Co	Jan. 23, 1964	do	64 C 233.
Vitamin Pharmaceuticals, Inc	Feb. 19, 1964	Eastern district, Pennsylvania	35119.
Hance Bros. & White Co	Mar. 11, 1964	do	35120.
Columbia Pharmaceutical Corp	do	Eastern district, New York	64C-258.
Barry Martin Pharma., Inc	Mar. 19, 1964	Southern district, Florida	64-175 Civ-EC.
Delta Drug Corp. et al	Mar. 25, 1964	Middle district, Florida	64-71-J.
Ortega Pharmaceutical Co., Inc	do	do	64-72-J.
Garden Labs., Inc	Apr. 13, 1964	District of New Jersey	341-64.
Freedman Pharmacy	June 26, 1964	Eastern district, Pennsylvania	36060.
Stoneham Lab. et al	July 16, 1964	Eastern district, New York	64C-752.
McKesson & Robbins, Inc	Aug. 11, 1964	District of Connecticut	10, 600.
Evsco Pharma Corp	Jan. 11, 1965	Eastern district, New York	65C-18.
Diamond Labs., Inc	Mar. 29, 1965	Southern district, Iowa	6-1652-C-2.
Biocraft Labs., Inc	do	District of New Jersey	323-65.
Bates Labs., Inc	do	Northern district, Illinois	65C-486.
Henry Schein	May 5, 1965	Eastern district, New York	65C-475.
Wolins Pharmacal Corp	June 1, 1965	do	65C-543.
Mike Berk Associates	do	Southern district, California	65-810 EC.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, many of these firms were unable to withstand the cost of litigation and signed consent decrees agreeing to get out of the tetracycline market. Others, such as McKesson & Robbins, Inc., Premo Pharmaceutical Laboratories, Inc., and International Rectifier Corp., are waging legal battles to prove the patent invalid and, thus, to stay in the tetracycline market.

Second. On July 31, 1964, McKesson, the country's largest drug wholesaler, which had been selling Cynamid pharmaceutical products to the drug trade for more than 30 years, announced it was going to market tetracycline in the United States at approximately one-third the price charged by Pfizer, Cyanamid, Bristol, Squibb, and Upjohn. One day later, Pfizer announced it would sue McKesson for infringing its tetracycline patent. Two days after that, Cynamid announced that McKesson would no longer be allowed to wholesale Cyanamid products to the drug trade. This is another example showing how the conspirators coordinate their activities to protect their monopoly. The Cyanamid cutoff maneuver was stopped by a Federal Court injunction on November 4, 1964.[36]

Two years previously, McKesson had bought a half interest in a Latin-American drug firm and started marketing drugs generically at prices substantially below the Latin-American prices fixed by the conspirators. Retailers were told to boycott the generic line; doctors were advised that it was impossible to produce quality pharmaceuticals at the prices being offered; literature, some of which originated in the United States, was sent to doctors attacking generic drugs; medical journals refused McKesson's advertising, and McKesson found it difficult to secure pharmaceuticals for use in its generic program.[37]

Third. Many large hospitals in this country purchase drugs under their generic names. The same procedure is followed by the Defense Supply Agency, the Veterans' Administration and State and local governments purchasing for institutional use. Welfare departments in Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Michigan, and a number of other States require that prescriptions for welfare patients be written in generic names. The reason in all cases is the same—drugs purchased generically are uniformly less expensive than trade name drugs.

Let me just cite for you a couple of examples. In 1960 Schering bid $17.97 on prednisone—important in the treatment of arthritis—on sales to the military procurement agency. Its price to the druggist at that time was $170 for the same bottle—5 mg. tablet, 1,000 in bottle—selling under the trade name Meticorten. Schering did not get the order from the Military Medical Supply Agency; one of the smaller companies won out with a bid of around $10.

Note that, Mr. President. Here the product, which is being traded under a trade name in competition with a small company which, presumably, is making money on it, instead of being sold at $170 is sold for $10.

What is the price situation today? According to the 1966 Red Book, which publishes the prices provided by the drug companies themselves, Schering is still selling at the price of $170 to the druggist. And, if you add the druggist's markup, the price to the patient is about $280.

Imagine that. A small company is willing to sell, on competitive bid, at $10 to the Defense Department, what is being sold for $170 to a druggist.

If the doctor writes the prescription under the generic name the prednisone instead of Meticorten, the consumer can buy the identical drug for less than $20. Instead of $170, some companies sell the same amount for $7.50, and, with the druggist's markup, the price to the public is about $17.50.

Or, take the case of reserpine, an important hypotensive drug. In 1959, Ciba was bidding 60 cents on sales to the military, and, believe me, it was not losing money at this price. At that same time, its price to the druggist was $39.50 for the same quantity—.25-milligram tablet, bottle of 1,000.

Imagine that. It was sold to the druggists for $39.50 while a bottle of 1,000 250-milligram tablets was sold for 60 cents. And the patient paid about $65. And even today this same differential exists. By 1964 the military people were buying for around 47 cents. And, according to the 1966 Red Book, Ciba's price for the same drug, sold under its trade name of Serpasil, is $39.50 even today. The consumer still pays $65 or more.

Imagine that difference, Mr. President; here is a drug that someone has to have. If the company has to bid for the business, it sells it for 47 cents, but the poor fellow who is ill and goes to the drugstore to buy it has to pay $65. That is a high price to pay for merely using a drug with the name "Serpasil."

To prevent the spreading use of generic name buying by experienced purchasers, the conspirators—Pfizer, Cyanamid, Bristol, Squibb, and Upjohn—joined with others in 1953 to form the National Pharmaceutical Council, the main purpose of which was, and still is, to discourage the sale to institutions and to the public of drugs under generic names. When this council was formed in 1953, only four States had laws prohibiting pharmacists from substituting for an expensive brand-name drug the same drug under a generic name. As a result of the National Pharmaceutical Council's activities, by 1959 some 44 States had adopted similar laws and, in those States, generic drugs at lower cost could be obtained by the patient only if the doctor added at the end of the prescription "or its generic equivalent."[38]

Those drug firms marketing tetracycline generically at prices to the consumer of 10 cents per pill and less have by reason of their competition in only 2 percent of the prescription market forced the conspirators to reduce the price from 51 cents to 30 cents per pill across the board and it is precisely for this reason that the conspirators' attack on the sale of generic tetracycline continues unabated.

In this price-fixing conspiracy or broad spectrum antibiotics, the real pressure on the conspiracy came almost entirely from one source—the institutional buyers such as hospitals, Government agencies, and the like. These experienced purchasers had a pretty good idea of what was going on; and they knew that their orders were substantial enough to tempt the price conspirators to do a little price cutting to get the business. As a result, much of the correspondence which I am

---

Footnotes at end of Mr. LONG's remarks.

putting into the record today deals with the price backsliding that occurred here and there on this business, and the continuous efforts of the parties to keep everybody in lockstep on prices.

This kind of problem does not exist at the drugstore level. For one thing, the ordinary druggist does not buy enough tetracycline at any single time to make his business so attractive that the drug companies will break their price agreement in order to get his business. And there is another factor—and this is of the greatest importance. Here is where the prescribing physician comes in, and, believe me, at this point he is a key figure in the maintenance of monopoly prices. If he can be persuaded, bludgeoned, brainwashed to write a prescription in terms of a company's particular brand name, the druggist is by law required to supply only that company's product. And today perhaps 98 percent of the prescriptions written by doctors for broad spectrum antibiotics is in terms of major companies' brand names.

Mr. President, imagine that. Here is a sick man and a poor man. A physician writes down a fancy name, "Serpasil." Having written down the word "Serpasil," the man goes to the druggist and the druggist has to sell this poor fellow—and maybe he cannot even buy a pair of shoes—that drug for $65. If he had not written the word "Serpasil," the druggist could sell him the same bottle of pills for 47 cents or perhaps slightly more.

So it can be seen the price conspirators had little to worry about on their sales through drugstores. Through the prescribing physician, they held both the drugstore and the patient in captivity. Once the prescription was written in terms of Achromycin—the brand name for Cyanamid's product—or Tetracyn—Pfizer—or Polycycline—Bristol—the business was all wrapped up. There could be no shopping around for a less expensive brand of tetracycline. So there is little correspondence here on price backsliding at the druggist's level. There did not need to be any for the simple reason it did not exist. Here the price conspiracy worked fine.

At 30 cents per pill, broad spectrum antibiotics cost the American public $4.80 for the average prescription. This is the price of a pair of children's shoes, the combined weekly milk and meat bill for a family with an annual income of $3,000 and less, and 40 percent of the same family's total weekly food budget. No wonder "that one-third of all prescriptions are not filled." [38]

When the price to the consumer—30 cents—is 30 times higher than the cost of manufacture—1 cent—when gross profits on sales are 85 percent and higher,[39] when price competition is nonexistent in more than 98 percent of the prescription market,[40] we must ask whether the American public and people in other lands are paying for these drugs—a price which is based on competitive market forces or whether they are victims, as is most likely the case, of the most monstrous price-fixing conspiracy of our time.

In this country in 1962 people of all ages with a family income of $2,000 a year and under spent $112 a year on health expenses, $28 of which was spent on medicine and $28 of which was spent on hospitalization. People of all incomes in the age bracket of 65 and over spent $208 per year on health expenses, $54 of which was spent on medicines and $53 of which was spent on hospitalization. People 65 and over with an annual family income of $2,000 and under spent $162 per year on health expenses, $48 of which was spent on medicines, $40 of which was spent on hospitalization and $47 of which was spent on doctors' bills.[41]

In other words, poor people of all ages spent the same amount of their health expense dollars for medicines as they did for hospitalization; people 65 years and over spent more of their health expense dollars for medicines than they did for hospitalization, and poor people 65 years and over spent more of their health expense dollars for medicines than they did for either hospitalization or doctors.

Without essential drugs, people die. Yet those who need them most—poor people 65 years and older—are those who can afford them least. These are the real victims, the persons from whom Pfizer, Cyanamid, Bristol, Squibb, and Upjohn have been wringing the fat expense accounts, the company cars, the six-figure executive salaries, and profit margins unheard of anywhere else in American industry.

Since 1954, these conspirators have been victimizing us all. It is high time that we stop them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the documents I have referred to, as well as other relative documents and supporting footnotes, be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the documents and footnotes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOTNOTES

[1] Hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Dec. 7–9, 1961, pp. 2407–8.

[2] In the Matter of American Cyanamid Co., et al., FTC docket No. 7211.

[3] Op. cit. supra, footnote 2; FTC finding No. 28, Aug. 8, 1963.

[4] "CX" refers to an FTC exhibit in Matter of American Cyanamid Co., et al., FTC docket No. 7211.

[5] Op. cit. supra, footnote 2; FTC opinion, p. 92, Aug. 8, 1963.

[6] Op. cit., supra, footnote 2; FTC opinion, p. 101, Aug. 8, 1963.

[7] Hearings, Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, 86th Cong., 2d sess., Sept. 8, 1960, pp. 13741–43.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid.

[15] See exhibits, annexed hereto.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Hoechst, a German company, is licensed by Bristol to manufacture tetracycline.

[27] Lepetit, a French company, is licensed by Pfizer to manufacture tetracycline.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Op. cit. supra, footnote 1.

[31] S. Rept. No. 448, 87th Cong., 1st sess., 12 (1961).

[32] Administered Prices—Drugs, Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly. Rept. No. 448 (1961), p. 157.

[33] John McKeen, former president of Pfizer, in a speech before the New York Society of Security Analysts, as reported in Drug Trade News, June 22, 1964, estimated the "market penetration less than 2 percent."

[34] Hearings before Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, 86th Cong., 2d sess., May 10–11, 1960, pp. 11569, 11592, 11632.

[35] Matter of American Cyanamid Company, et al., Aug. 8, 1963, finding No. 26.

[36] *McKesson & Robbins, Inc.* v. *Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., et. al.,* 235 F. Supp. 743 (E. D. Pa., 1964).

[37] New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 11, 1963, pp. 1, 16.

[38] S. Rept. No. 448, 87th Cong., 1st sess., 235–238 (1961).

[39] Berkov, "Development and Administration of a Pre-Paid Drug Program," Pension and Welfare News, p. 35 (October 1964).

[40] Hearings before Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, 87th Cong., 1st sess., December 7–9, 1961, pp. 2403–2406.

[41] "Medical Care, Health Status, and Family Income," p. 48, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (1964).

THE UPJOHN CO.,
MEMPHIS BRANCH,
October 25, 1957.

Subject: Bid on Panmycin 250 mg. capsules.

Mr. W. C. PEZE,
The Upjohn Co.
Kalamazoo, Mich.

(H.E.W.—Hal—too bad that our boy isn't a better crap shooter—maybe this is a good trend too.—KID.)

DEAR RED: On our recent bid to Charity Hospital of Louisiana, New Orleans, La., on Panmycin 250 mg. capsules the following bids were submitted:

[In bottles of 100]

	200	600	1,000
I. L. Lyons	22.49	22.49	[1] 22.49
McKesson	22.49	22.49	[1] 22.49
Bristol	22.49	22.49	[1] 22.49
Pfizer	22.49	22.49	[1] 22.49
Upjohn	22.49	22.49	[1] 22.49
Lederle (successful)	22.49	22.49	[1] 22.49
Squibb	22.49	22.49	[1] 22.49
SS Drug	22.49	22.49	[1] 22.49
Legendre	25.50	25.50	[1] 25.50

[1] Less 2 percent.

Lederle was awarded the bid on 200—100's as their representative threw the highest dice, which is done when all bids are equal.

Thought you would like to have this information.

Very truly yours,

THE UPJOHN CO.
————.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The enclosed attachments—all in photostatic copies (the originals still available at this writing, whether "incoming originals," "outgoing carbon copies," etc.)—could in principle be duplicated at any time.

Such attachments basically pertain to correspondence—on pricing matters—exchanged primarily, during the period 1956–59, between the Pfizer Venezuelan branch and the Pfizer International headquarters.

These attachments are hereafter divided in several basic exhibits, to wit:

Exhibit 1: This exhibit consists of only one piece of correspondence (RNS–90), addressed by the Pfizer-Venezuela manager to

his immediate superior, an assistant area manager.

It is of particular interest to note—in the bottom paragraph on page 3—that Pfizer-Venezuela was seemingly in possession of advance information as to what Lederle (and its Venezuelan distributors, Biogen) and Schering Corp. were expected to do in certain pricing fields.

It should further be noticed that two Pfizer-International executives, Messrs. Kapp and McGoodwin, were seemingly getting copies of said correspondence.

Exhibit 2: This exhibit consists of several communications between Pfizer-Venezuela and Pfizer-International—beginning with RNS-959 and ending with another identifiable as "Dear Frank," dated "Caracas, November 7, 1958," and signed by "Pluto" (Pfizer-Venezuela's manager's code name for intercompany secret purposes)—all referring, one way or another, to price agreement difficulties in Venezuela arising principally, between Pfizer-Venezuela on the one hand, and upon the other, Laboratorios Biogen (Cyanamid's exclusive distributors for Venezuela), but not excluding other firms such as Bristol Laboratories, Hoechst, Lepetit, and Squibb, etc.

RNS-959 was prompted by a phone call, from Mr. Frank P. Wilson, Pfizer-International's pricing manager, directly from New York, relaying a Biogen complaint to Cyanamid (ACCO) re Pfizer-Venezuela's pricing policies with regard to a Caracas drugstore (Farmacia Brion). It should be noted from this cablegram that, in order to confuse the outside reader, "vowels are pulled out," i.e., "prc" stands for "price" and "dscnts" for "discounts." "Hesse" refers to Mr. Ernest G. Hesse, financial director of Cyanamid International.

RNS-961 and 962 are self-explanatory, except for two items, i.e.:

(a) "Ball" refers to the fact that the Venezuelan Ball family are the controlling shareholders of Biogen.

(b) "Roland" is one Cyanamid International executive, Mr. Ralph Roland.

(e) "Powwow/s" hereinafter denotes a word used to cover up inter-company private price discussions.

RNS-1209/14/16 are self-explanatory. However, let it be noted that:

(a) "Brodspctrm" obviously stands for "broad-spectrum."

(b) "Murray G-13 Disbursements" stands for Pfizer-Venezuelas "war chest" to "facilitate" sales to governmental purchasers in Venezuela.

"Dear Frank," ("Caracas, November 7, 1958"), is quite a comprehensive piece of "powwow" reporting. It comprises terms such as:

"Frank," i.e., Mr. Frank P. Wilson.

"Houghie," i.e., Mr. Meredith C. Hough, a Pfizer-International area manager.

"Brstlhstchldrllpttpfzr," i.e. Bristol, Hoechst, Lederle, Lepetit, Pfizer.

"Sqbb", i.e., Squibb.

"Fesa", i.e., one local antibiotic dosage form producer, Farmaco Especialidades.

"Herb Bauer", i.e., a Pfizer-International staff lawyer in N.Y.

"Charlie", i.e., Mr. Charles Anderson, someone already referred to.

"Disturbed family", i.e., competitors wary of coming to price agreements that might prove detrimental to each firm's interests.

"Glccrtcds", i.e., glucocorticoids; same for "hrmns", i.e., hormones.

"Special G-13", i.e., war chest as described above.

Exhibit 3: This exhibit consists of several pieces of correspondence, ranging from RNS-932 of "Re: Ralston Purina" of "June 16, 1959."

RNS-932, addressed to Mr. J. T. Smart (Pfizer-International pricing executive), begins to spell out the difficulties in reconciling Pfizer's and Cyanamid's pricing policies on animal feed supplements when it comes to dealing with Pfizer-Venezuela's main animal feed supplement buyer and exclusive veterinary product distributor, Protinal, on the one hand, and, on the other, Pfizer-Venezula's animal feed supplement prospect, Purina, the latter being, at the same time, Cyanamid's execlusive distributor for Venezuela's Biogen's main potential buyer of animal feed supplements.

RNS-1441, addressed to Mr. James Mathew (a Pfizer-International Area Manager's Assistant for Agricultural and Veterinary Products), ends with a plea to Mr. Frank P. Wilson to try to intervene—stateside—with Cyanamid and Purina.

RNS-1634 conveys a complaint about a breach of understanding on the part of Cyanamid's exclusive distributors for Venezuela, Biogen, re animal feed supplements.

RNS-1666 is kind of the same thing as RNS-1634.

RNS-1702 conveys a plea for a stateside intercompany discussion re animal feed supplement pricing problems in Venezuela.

"Re: Ralston Purina" closes the chapter in a dramatic fashion. Please read carefully the last paragraphs of said communication. It is signed by Mr. Frank P. Wilson.

Exhibit 4: This exhibit consists of several communications beginning with "Dear John" of "Caracas, May 29, 1957," till a cable of May 16, 1958, sent "Pfizer Folkestone (England)" by Mr. Frank P. Wilson from Caracas.

"Dear John,"—addressed to Mr. J. T. Smart by Pfizer-Venezuela's R. N. Silva—begins to spell out the difficulties in finding out the proper agreeable selling price level for Pfizer's oleandomycin (Matromycin) because of the necessity of being on a comparable level with:

(a) Lilly's & Abbott's erythromycin.

(b) Hoffmann-La Roche's oleandomycin (at least abroad).

(c) Pfizer's tetracycline, oxytetracycline and tetracycline-oleandomycin human dosage forms.

Idefra Caracas is a cable sent to a private address (not Pfizer-Venezuela's but intended for the latter), by Pfizer-International's Mr. Neil A. Morton, questioning the advisability of several New York billing prices to Pfizer-Venezuela, including for Matromycin.

RNS-783 throws further light on the problem. Again code words are used.

NY-VEN-29 and NY-VEN-30 plus a memo to Mr. T. J. Raineri (a New York Pfizer-International executive about a visit to Caracas), dated October 14, 1957, illustrate—in a guarded way—New York's desire that, at least initially, in Venezuela Pfizer's Matromycin be sold at a price level comparable with Hoffmann-La Roche's Romicil; particular attention should be paid to paragraph 2 of Smart's memo to Raineri.

RNS-907 transmits several Product Price Schedule requests, as suggested by New York.

Pfizer Folkestone (England) is a cable sent by New York's Frank P. Wilson to somebody in England. It is very interesting to note the mentioning of "Bowie and Kuster" because Bowie stands for Mr. Robert Bowie, a Hoffmann-La Roche's international executive usually headquartered at Montevideo, Uruguay, and Kuster stands for Hoffmann-La Roche's Venezuelan distributor; i.e., Alfredo Kuster & Co.

The whole case ended when, at a later date, and in view of Pfizer-Venezuela not having raised Matromycin's prices to Romicil's levels, all Pfizer-Venezuela's stocks of Matromycin were ordered by New York transferred to Pfizer-Panama.

Exhibit 5: This exihibt consists of communications RNS-1745, RNS-1791 and RNS-1796. The whole thing being so clear, it needs no explaining.

Exhibit 6: This exhibit consists of several communications, beginning with RNS-1890 (with attachments) and ending with RNS-2021. It should be obvious, to the careful reader, that there have been countless price talks between Pfizer executives and some of other drug companies.

FINAL REMARKS

The above comments refer to the situation as it existed, personnelwise, etc., during the period 1956-59.

[RNS-90]

SEPTEMBER 10, 1956.

Mr. ALLEN M. DEBOVOISE, New York

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA, Caracas

Proposed sales policy.

This is with further reference to my memorandum to you RNS-39 of August 13, 1956, on "Sales Controversy." Bill Kapp has already replied to it with his No. 175 of August 21, 1956, and I can readily see that Bill was mislead by some of the facts outlined in my memorandum under reference. I cannot in all fairness blame Bill for it because the information I gave you in my memorandum was incomplete and of a highly tentative nature. I think, therefore, that it would be much better if I would completely forget about my previous memorandum in question and would give you now the whole story together with the ideas regarding the plans that we would like to put into practice in this market.

Background: The ethical pharmaceutical business in this country is presently going through a period of crisis owing to some basic reasons, among which stand out the following:

(a) The further spreading of the social security and other public welfare programs chiefly of medical nature, with their subsequent sequelae and complications so familiar to your good self. In other words, this has resulted in the channeling through the respective institutions of much of the ethical pharmaceutical business that used to be handled by drugstores.

(b) The growing competition in the ethical pharmaceutical business arising chiefly from the efforts, sometimes quite unethical, on the part of the basic suppliers (national and foreign manufacturers, manufacturers' agents, etc.) toward securing each a larger share of the market.

(c) The bitter competition that until recently there existed here among the wholesale druggists. This competition was started by that Filipino gentleman, Mr. Galata (who in the Philippines, I know, is quite a troublesome businessman), who is the chief owner of one of the major pharmaceutical wholesale firms in this country. Mr. Galata, in order to increase his firm's business, some time ago began to grant excessive credits to retailers and to finance the establishing of an excessive number of seemingly independent pharmacies.

The end result has been that a good percentage of pharmacies are in bad or extremely poor financial shape and that some wholesalers find themselves likewise and some of the latter are going out of business.

The Venezuelan Chamber of Pharmacy has been urging the Ministry of Health and Public Welfare to once more legally restrict the number and distribution of new retail stores, but nothing has been accomplished so far along these lines.

Proposals: The wholesalers themselves have finally gotten together and have agreed to reshape their policies. Even Sr. Galata, an individual to be very wary of, has definitely fallen into line and he could not act otherwise because the wholesalers' movement is guided by businessmen of undisputed power and of moral integrity.

The wholesalers have agreed:

(a) To not compete creditwise with one another in regard to their transactions with retail stores.

(b) To not deal with pharmaceutical products smuggled into this country. You see, some of the foreign labs like Squibb and Winthrop have been plagued by the fact that products of theirs are smuggled in from Colombia to be sold here at prices much lower than those locally established by the respective houses in this country. The wholesalers, not only will not carry such products but have promised that, in the event the Venezuelan Chamber of Pharmacy should find a given drugstore guilty of such transactions, the wholesalers would abide by the disciplinary recommendations that the chamber may decide upon, for instance, to stop supplying goods to the guilty pharmacy for a certain period of time.

(c) To invite the basic suppliers to sell to drugstores at prices and discounts not inferior to the same ones that the respective products would be sold at by the wholesalers to the retailers.

(d) To fully cooperate with the basic suppliers in respect to the latter's selling and sales promotion activities.

As you also know, an autonomous unit of the Caracas Chamber of Industrialists has been formed under the title of National Association of Pharmaceutical Laboratories and distributors and representatives of national and foreign pharmaceutical products. The majority of the members of this association agrees with the wholesalers' proposals and plans; a small minority does not agree and is currently creating a great deal of confusion but these are precisely the firms that are operating in a devious manner and who would prefer not to be bound by any businesslike agreements.

As you know, Pfizer has by now joined the said association and I am enclosing a clipping which shows that the undersigned is one of the alternates of the Junta Directiva of that entity. I did not wish to be a member of the said Junta Directiva because I felt that some unpleasant tasks should rather be left to others, but I was elected just the same. Pfizer-Venezuela will continue to be a member of the association in question until such time when it may be contrary to our business; for the time being it is good for us to be one of their members. By the way, the comments made in the same clipping are a misrepresentation on the part of the press of some of the basic points discussed and agreed upon.

With regards to the wholesalers' proposals we would like to put into effect here in Venezuela the following sales policy:

Prices and discounts: As you know, at the present time we have basic schedules of discounts for our products in this country, excepting for the "institutional sales" which are handled in a peculiar fashion in some respects.

[In percent]

	To wholesalers	To retailers
Broad-spectrum antibiotics	10+10	10
Narrow-spectrum antibiotics	20	5
Hormones	15+5	None
Vitamin products	20	10
Miscellaneous pharmaceuticals	20	5

After very carefully studying this matter, we have come to the conclusion that the chart in question should be changed so that wholesalers would get 20 percent on every thing and the pharmacies 6 percent, also on everything. This is precisely what most basic suppliers are doing and/or will do shortly. This is precisely what the wholesalers are asking for. It would enable us to give consistency to our sales policy. The list prices to the retailers, that is, without the 6 percent discount, would be based upon what the most important competitors have or will set as list prices for the respective products (particularly Biogen-Lederle for tetras and Schering for prednisolone). Such competitors are following or will follow the same policy of 20 percent and 6 percent with regards to those basic list prices. On such list prices the retailers will have the markup of approximately 23.08 percent they are legally authorized to have, thus arriving at the retail prices to the consumer. When a wholesaler would sell one of our products to a retailer, the wholesaler would effect the sale at the list price minus the 6 percent.

If this policy is put into effect, we would:

(a) Have consistency in our prices and discounts as said before.

(b) Place the wholesalers in a position to carry our products and sell them at a reasonable profit to the retailers.

(c) Obtain that the retailers, while making a good profit on our products, would prefer to buy from the wholesalers for the most part. This, to us, would mean less credit problems, a simplification of our administrative task, and a wider, less burdensome distribution of the Pfizer products.

(d) Have the wholesalers as our strong allies, particularly against Squibb, Hoechst and Glaxo who are the chief firms that, in the field of narrow-spectrum antibiotics, go around all the time giving all sorts of discounts, extra benefits, etc. The wholesalers being in a position to strongly influence the retailers when it comes to choosing among similar products, would cooperate with Pfizer against these competitors of ours that maintain poor relations with the wholesalers or none at all.

(e) Be sacrificing ourselves only something like 2 percent on our present gross income from sales to wholesalers and retailers, something very small if one considers that it can be reasonably expected that our sales to these customers would become more solid and would tend to increase.

It is of utmost urgency that you review this matter and give us your consent at the earliest possible opportunity. Here we are dealing with a case of public relations of the first order, because almost inevitably practically everybody will have to adopt the same policy in Venezuela. If we fall in line right now, we would place ourselves in a most favorable position with the wholesalers, and indescribable but very significant benefits would derive from it.

We realize that the foregoing information is by no means complete. We realize that the formulation of a sales policy is something of vital importance in any business and that all factors must be taken into consideration; this we have done to the best of our ability and, in fact, we have not made this proposal to you before because we wanted to feel very sure about the whole thing. Countless deliberations, consultations, staff meetings and personal contacts have gone into this affair. Logically if you have any particular questions with regards to one point or another, we would be more than happy to try to supply you with the requested additional information.

In point of fact the whole thing is so complex that the undersigned would have rather liked to have the opportunity to personally discuss these proposals with you but it is clear to him that this would be too much to ask for.

For your information and guidance, please find enclosed a local price structure schedule that will give you the contemplated list prices (to retailers without the 6 percent) the real list price (to retailers minus the 6 percent) and the wholesale prices (to wholesalers, list prices minus the 30 percent). We hope this schedule will help clarify matters in your eyes.

I most eagerly remain waiting for your reaction concerning the above proposals with regards to which time is of the essence.

Cordially,

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

[LHBM–292]

CARACAS, *May 9, 1957.*

MR. B. G. PRIETO,
Cyanamid Inter-American Corp.,
Lederle Laboratories Division,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. PRIETO: Yesterday afternoon we Tetracycline distributors had a meeting in the offices of the Pfizer Laboratories, to talk once again about the prices of these products. Attending the meeting were the Manager Remedia, S. A., representative of Hoechst; the manager of Squibb, Dr. Miguel Octavio, representative of Lepetit; Mr. Kemblinger, sales manager for the Western Hemisphere of Bristol Laboratories, and their representative in Venezuela, the manager of the Royal Drugstore, the gentlemen from Pfizer and I.

At that meeting, we were accused of not having adhered to the agreement which, according to them, we had made in October of last year with respect to these products. This agreement—to recall in a way what we had been talking about with them—had applied solely to the presentations of pure tetracycline, i.e., acromycin, tetracyn, and hestacycline, which at that time were the only ones on the market, and had not applied to aureomycin and terramycin; furthermore we, for our part, had always accepted [taken for granted?] that each of the firms would deposit with a bank, in favor of the other firms, a check for 25,000 bolivares, which would become effective in case any one of the firms were to violate the agreement—our proposal, which of course was not accepted, Pfizer giving us the excuse that the Caracas Branch could not commit the company.

The main purpose of arriving at that agreement was to equalize the list prices of the products, and we did so in almost all cases, with small exceptions such as, for example, "Gotas Pediaticas" [Pediatric Drops] which we offer at 4.55 bolivares to the pharmacies, and Pfizer at 4.80 bolivares. Of course, we had not been willing to raise the price since this would give the press and interested persons of the Medical Federation a reason to vociferate against Lederle, and I feel it is easier to lower a price than to raise it. As for the negotiations with the Government, we agreed to offer our products at list prices (you have various copies of it) insofar as acromycin, hestracycline, and tetracycline were concerned. This united us, because, as you know, that way, up to a certain point, we would be able to again take orders from Social Security which, in view of the higher special discounts offered by Hoechst, we had completely lost, though for us that had represented a great sacrifice, because, when we sold acromycin for 15.50 bolivares and gave a special discount of 10 percent, or 1.55 bolivares, the net price came to 44.95 bolivares, and starting in October when we began to sell it for 17 bolivares per 250 by 16's to match Hoechst, we had to give 20 percent, or 3.40 bolivares, which meant a net price of 13.60 bolivares, i.e., we had to give, as special discount, 1.35 bolivares more per bottle.

In yesterday's talk, the gentlemen from Pfizer, who have been selling terramycin to the Government also for 17 bolivares per bottle of 250 by 16's ever since they started to distribute the product, want us to raise the aureomycin price from 15.50 to 17 bolivares. This we did not want to do, because aureomycin, in contrast to acromycin, is selling very satisfactorily to the principal Government outfit, which is the Social Security Institute, and, moreover, we have no argument to present to the Comptroller General of the Nation—which is the office in charge of control of the prices at which the Government buys all its requirements—in support of this increase.

Consequently, we decided not to increase the aureomycin prices and we shall say so to the gentlemen from Pfizer in another talk which we will have tomorrow. They sneakily threatened us that if we did not raise the prices they would set off a price war. Personally, I don't believe this is true, or that they are in a position to do so, and I view all this as a trap which they have set for us in order to improve their own situation by profiting from the difficulties which we would undoubtedly have with the hospitals if we were to raise the prices to them.

I am telling you all this for your cognizance, and also asking that you let Mr. Bogan know so that he may be informed of the present price situation in Venezuela, and to enable you, in case Pfizer tells you that we are fooling around with prices, to answer them immediately that we have at no time lowered the prices.

Another matter which was taken up was the price of the presentations of all tetracyclines in 250 by 100's containers on which we had agreed some time ago that all of us interested parties would sell them at a minimum price of 90 bolivares per bottle. Lepetit has been selling them for 80 bolivares, but agreed not to continue to do so; I personally believe in what Dr. Octavio said. In return, Pfizer, who stated that he would not sell at less than 90 bolivares—and, in reality, all his invoices to the hospitals show that price—is delivering bottles of 100's to complement the discount and (thus the price?) to the amount of 81.50 bolivares. Obviously, this is very difficult to substantiate; but we have, however, been able to establish it from the number of bottles they show on their invoices, and from the entries in the hospital checklists of stock on hand. Furthermore, what clinches the evidence even more is that our sales to many hospitals of this presentation, of aureomycin as well as acromycin, have dropped.

I realize full well that Lederle is not interested in entering into a price war, and we are not either because we would be the first to suffer; but this Pfizer maneuver must be immediately counteracted, and therefore we submit, for your consideration, the following proposal which we hope will be approved:

For the year 1956, you authorized and send us 12,000 samples of aureomycin in bottles of 8's, which represent 960 bottles of 100's. These samples are naturally for promotion, for the doctors, and we cannot use them for some other purpose. Therefore, we would like you to authorize us to take 100 bottles of 250 by 100's from out sales stock, or that you send up 100 bottles of the same presentation with sales labels, for use in the same way as Pfizer is doing. This way the invoicing prices would not be lowered and we could recoup this sale that we are losing.

Please submit this case to Messrs. Tamblyn and Bogan for consideration, and inform me as soon as possible of the decision they would take.

As you will understand, this is a matter which requires the greatest urgency; therefore I am sure you will not wait until you come here to let me know.

Waiting to hear from you, I remain,

Biogen Laboratories Corp.
Luis H. Ball M.

[LHBM–530]

Caracas, *August 14, 1957.*

Mr. Rafael Pagan Torres,
Lederle Laboratories Co., Avenue Fernandez Juncos, Santurce, P.R.

Dear Mr. Pagan: We take pleasure in informing you that Pfizer continues to be Pfizer, although they may [sic] have changed the manager of their branch in Venezuela.

Those gentlemen called me at the end of last week to inform me very politely that they have decided to change their sales policy in the interior of the country with reference to the retail drugstores. According to them, from now on they will give drugstores only 6-percent discount on prices [for drugs bought from them], instead of 10 percent which they had been giving to majority of them. This is, according to Dr. Silva, following instructions which they have received from the United States urging them to unify their discount policy all over the country.

Naturally, at first glance, this seems to be a big mistake on their part, which would, in consequence, create a very satisfactory situation for us. However, viewing as everything coming from Pfizer must be viewed, the representative of Bristol, of Hoechst and myself, in an exchange of ideas on this situation came to the conclusion that Pfizer is now considering those firms in the interior as drug retailers to whom one cannot sell anyway because of their very bad credit, those firms which, traditionally, all of us laboratories have left to the wholesalers; in other words, all of the Republic's good clients, who are those to whom all of us laboratories sell, are being declared wholesalers by Pfizer.

Furthermore, Frenco himself confessed to me that to the retailers to whom they will give only 6-percent discount will be compensated for by larger discounts on other products of their line.

I don't believe any imminent danger exists for us because of this new policy of Pfizer's, but naturally we shall keep our eyes peeled. As I told you when you came to visit us several months ago, I feel we are making our own rules in the antibiotic trade, and we are not going to give up easily our position as leader, but I deemed it desirable to keep you in touch with what is going on here in connection with this business, because, as I said at the beginning of this letter, so far as I am concerned, Pfizer will always be Pfizer.

With a firm embrace,
Very truly yours,

Biogen Laboratories Corp.
Luis H. Ball M.

[LHBM–649]

Caracas, *October 11, 1957.*

Mr. Rafael Pagan Torres,
Lederle Laboratories Co.
Avenue Fernandez Juncos,
Santurce, P.R.

Dear Mr. Pagan Torres: When you receive this letter you will have returned to Puerto Rico, because of which I hasten to convey to you certain points of extreme interest.

It will not be possible for me to send Ghiorsi to you on the 20th of this month as we had planned in Mexico, because extremely serious things are going on here in Caracas right now, to which I shall refer later, because of which his traveling on that date would not be convenient. If you agree, Ghiorsi could go to Puerto Rico on November 1, and stay there until the 16th, when he would go to Cuba, returning to Caracas on the 22d of that same month. I am very grateful to you for this invitation which you extended to Ghiorsi, which will undoubtedly be very profitable for him and for the Lederle business in Venezuela, and please let me know whether you agree with this itinerary.

On returning to Caracas I found that the wholesalers had made the drugstores sign an agreement under which they promise to purchase all their requirements solely through the wholesalers or otherwise the latter would stop selling them pharmaceutical goods. Furthermore, the Association of Laboratories knows that once this agreement were signed by all pharmacies, the drugstores would come to the laboratories to demand bigger discounts, which would apparently be 25 percent plus 5 percent for cash payment. As you will understand, this is an extremely grave situation, because it establishes a monopoly of the pharmaceutical trade on the part of the wholesalers, because of which the Association of Laboratories (AFIDRO) has decided that, if the wholesalers do not withdraw this agreement by next Monday, the 14th, they will be no longer sell to those establishments and will make their distribution directly to the pharmacies. Of the 52 members of the association, 30 have already signed this agreement, including ourselves, because, though I don't think this is the solution, it would be difficult for us to keep out of it at this time because it would mean the breaking up of that association, which would put each of us laboratories individually into a weaker position with respect to the drugstores.

I view this problem as extremely grave and am afraid that it won't be solved for many months to come, since there is also the possibility of intervention by the health authorities, which would complicate things even more. All this is extremely regrettable because our business this year had been going very well. Our plans for 1958, as you know, were for an even more considerable increase in sales, and the many projects I brought from the convention in Mexico will have to be postponed indefinitely, unless a solution is brought to this serious situation which will extend to the whole country if it is not possible to arrive at an understanding with the wholesalers in what is left of this month.

There is the aggravating circumstance that some firms who signed the agreement among the laboratories will not comply with it, among whom is Pfizer; and therefore they will avail themselves of the upheavals, which the first weeks will bring to us, to take care of the drugstores directly. Serious also is the fact that this convention, by being restricted solely to the city of Caracas, leaves a free hand to wholesalers with branches or affiliates in the interior to stock up that way and so to make fun of the blockade which is tried to be imposed on them.

Upon my arrival I also found out that Pfizer's friends have been trying to lure away two of our men: Carbonell, who has been 7 years with the company, and Molina, who joined us at the beginning of this year. Both told Silva, who went to Argentina last Saturday, to get lost, and I am waiting for him to come back so that I can tell him off, because, apparently, he has lost all the refinement acquired in long years of honest work for Lederle. These tactics have never been used by Pfizer in Venezuela until now, and it is not that I am afraid to lose two men because nobody makes a contract with us for life, but I am not willing either to keep quiet and swallow those insults until I choke.

Personally, and coming back to the matter of the drugstore, I am trying to establish some point of understanding between laboratories and drugstores which would be a basis for a renewal of talks and, thus, for arriving at a solution to this situation which hurts all of us equally.

I want to thank you once again for your good advice at the conference in Mexico, and, with my affectionate greetings to Digna. drg. Dignita, receive a cordial embrace from,

Biogen Laboratories Corp.
Luis H. Ball M.

[LHBM–709]

Caracas, *October 30, 1957.*

Mr. B. G. Prieto,
Cyanamid Inter-American Corp.,
49 West 49th Street,
New York, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Prieto: I am sending you with this letter, statement and copies of invoices of the Pfizer Corp. to the Brion Pharmacy of Caracas for merchandise sold in September.

You will be able to see from these that this firm is giving the pharmacies [and/or drugstores] a 20-percent discount on the price of its entire line of pharmaceutical products, including wide-spectrum antibiotics, plus 2 percent for payment within 30 days.

We do not yet have all the information together, but we have sufficient data to be sure that Pfizer is giving these discounts to at least 15 pharmacies [or drugstores] in Caracas. As you will understand, this puts us into an extremely unfavorable position with those clients since they are getting better conditions from Pfizer than we are able to give to the wholesalers.

It is not our intention to act hastily to counteract this new Pfizer maneuver. We are going to wait until December to see how our sales to that pharmacy develop in those 2 months. Meanwhile, we would like to prepare ourselves so that, in the event our sales go down, we can act vigorously and positively, for which we need your prompt recognition of the extra credit of 12 percent on prices f.a.s. New York for the sales we are making to these pharmacies, seeing ourselves forced to grant them more discounts, as is the case now with the wholesalers.

As you will understand, the name of this pharmacy must be kept in strictest confidence, and I don't believe that things are going to be settled by a simple telephone conversation between you and Pfizer there in New York. As I told you at the conference in Mexico, they are losing ground and are therefore trying to recoup it with all these maneuvers. We cannot go on relying on the good faith of that company, and it is necessary, therefore, to give it back to them, blow for blow.

The Brion Pharmacy has demanded the same discounts from us. It is a very important pharmacy and controls several others. Our conversation has been that we must consult with you on this matter, because of which they are expecting our reply within the next few days.

I have heard that Mr. Pagan Torres will arrive in New York very shortly. Please show him this letter to keep him informed of these latest happenings.

Waiting to hear from you, I remain,
Very truly yours,
LUIS H. BALL M.

[RNS-962]

DECEMBER 10, 1957.

Re Mr. Charles Anderson.
Mr. M. C. HOUGH,
Mr. FRANK WILSON,
New York,
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas:

By means of this memorandum I wish to confirm the wireless message I sent you on 12-6-57 with reference to the impending visit to New York of Mr. Charles Anderson.

This memorandum will also serve the purpose of introducing Mr. Anderson to your good self. In point of fact, Mr. Anderson will be the bearer of it.

As I tried to explain to you in the cable under reference, Mr. Anderson is the manager of Broqueria Royal, of Caracas, one of the largest pharmaceutical wholesalers in this country, firm which happens to be also Bristol's exclusive distributors for Venezuela. Royal is, in addition, one of Pfizer's best customers here.

Mr. Anderson is, therefore, a person fully familiar with what goes on in the pharmaceutical field here. He has been a party to the countless powwows held in Caracas re broad-spectrum talks and re wholesalers-retailers laboratories talks. Mr. Anderson, a good friend of Pfizer's and of Mr. Juan Franco's and of mine as well, is anxious and willing to go along with you and/or any authorized Pfizer executives and talk to the respective ASCO people to explain what is really going on in the Venezuelan market re the latest Biogen complaint to ASCO and oil related matters, especially with reference to the Brión case.

If possible, one of the Ball gentlemen should be present, so that things would be squared away once and for all (perhaps a vainless hope) in front of the respective ASCO executives that you are already familiar with.

Any courtesies that you may wish to extend to Mr. Anderson shall be greatly appreciated by Pfizer-Venezuela.

Cordially,
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

[LHBM-837]

CARACAS, *December 30, 1957.*

Mr. RALPH ROLAND,
Cyanamid Inter-American Corp., Lederle Laboratories Division, 49 West 49th Street, New York, N.Y.

DEAR RALPH: This is my first day in the office after 3 weeks of what we might call vacation in New York. I had a meeting here this morning with our general sales supervisor and with the man in charge of special affairs, Messrs. Ghorisi and A. J. Osorio, respectively. The latter had informed me that Mr. Pfizer called him during my absence to complain that we had reported to New York the special discounts which the Pfizer branch in this city is giving to Brion Pharmacy. In view of this, I deem it my duty, in order to protect the interest of Lederle in this country, to present to you my most vigorous complaint because of the manner in which this matter has been handled by the New York office.

In the first paragraph of the second page of my letter LHBM-709 of October 30, I clearly indicated to you the desirability of keeping in strictest confidence the name of the pharmacy which supplied us with the copies of invoices showing the special discounts Pfizer is granting them, and now my fears have become a reality, since somebody in the New York office has informed Pfizer of the name of that pharmacy, which is taking reprisals against us and does not want to buy Lederle products from us.

I insist that it is necessary to give it back to Pfizer, blow for blow, and to abandon the policy of not giving battle which Lederle has supported up to now; and at the same time I hope that incidents like this, which have the gravest consequencies for your business in this market, are not going to be repeated and that the person responsible for it has learned his lesson.

I look forward to hearing from you on this particular with the despatch that the case requires, and with my best wishes for a happy and prosperous New Year, I remain, with a firm embrace,

Very truly yours,
BIOGEN LABORATORIES CORP.
LUIS BALL, *Manager.*

[LHBM-63]

CARACAS, *January 30, 1958.*

Mr. E. T. BOGAN,
Cyanamid Inter-American Corp., Lederle Laboratories Division, 49 West 49th Street, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. BOGAN: My father related to me the conversation he had with you about the charges made against me by the representatives of Pfizer and Bristol in connection with the prices of the wide-spectrum antibiotics.

I want to thank you warmly for the confidence you have shown in me by not listening to these false accusations. However, I note, from what my father reports to me, that you were not informed of the many letters I wrote to Lederle in the course of last year about the maneuvers Pfizer was and still is carrying on in this market, because of which I beg to include photostatic copies of all of them.

With most cordial greetings, I remain, once again,

BIOGEN LABORATORIES CORP.
LUIS H. BALL M.

[LHBM-70]

CARACAS, *January 31, 1958.*

Mr. R. PAGAN TORRES,
Lederle Laboratories Co., Av. Fernandez Juncos, Santurce, P.R.

DEAR MR. PAGAN: I enclose copy of the letter which I am writing to Mr. Gogan, LHBM-63, dated the 30th day of this month and year.

In it, I refer to a conversation which my father had with Mr. Bogan, because the latter was informed that Mr. R. N. Silva and Mr. Charles Anderson, manager of the Royal Drugstore and distributor of Bristol in Venezuela, had complained to Lederle that I had been indulging in all sorts of price schemes in Venezuela and ignoring the agreement with which you are already familiar.

Once again it was my experience that at Lederle's they don't take care of the problems of this market. To the eight letters which I wrote in the course of last year, to you and to New York, about the problem of Pfizer maneuvers, I only got your reply. When I was in New York in December of last year, I took up the matter in person, and as the only token of attention to these problems was that I was invited to lunch with a Pfizer vice president and Mr. Silva, which invitation I naturally did not accept because I was convinced of the futility of talking once again with representatives of that firm, which was confirmed to me by the absurd charges that are now made against me.

You will possibly remember that when I went to New York in the spring of 1956 to discuss the price competition which Hoechst was carrying on against us at that time the [only] attention given to the problem which I had brought with me, was that I should go to Germany to talk with the heads of that firm. Now, in 1957, after writing eight letters, copies of which I enclose again, explaining the problem with the competitors with respect to wide-spectrum antibiotics, Mr. Bogan was informed of what the people of the competition had said, but obviously not the content of my correspondence.

Friend Pagan, you have known me for many years, you know this company, and you have seen the way we do business in Venezuela. Because of that I count on all your understanding and consideration, and these are the only reasons prompting me to write you this letter and to inform you of what has happened. Insofar as I am concerned, the matter is finished, and I don't want to blame anyone for what has happened, or to see ill will where I am sure there is none; but I do feel it necessary to put on record, to you who have always given me your friendship and good advice, the truth of these facts. I also want to tell you that the books of this company are at your disposal so that you may, at your convenience, check the prices and the discounts offered by us in our antibiotics line.

Moreover, I know that you will share my satisfaction in seeing that in 1957 our acromycin trade increased 77.61 percent; aureomycin 4.34 percent; and pharmaceutical specialties, 43.73 percent; or a total increase of 40.37 percent above the totals of fiscal 1956. These figures speak for themselves and will determine the policy of this company for 1958, aimed at obtaining even greater increases in our sales, and at solving our own problems here without writing to New York because we see now that it leads to nothing good for us.

With a firm embrace from your friend,
BIOGEN LABORATORIES CORP.
LUIS H. BALL M.

[RNS-1214]

APRIL 30, 1958.

PFIZERSUB,
New York:

F. P. Wilson Mytel refers human line only. Of course, we've in common with Biogen only broad spectrum but obviously forces us general human adjustment to Government accounts.

Regards,

RNS.

PFIZER CORP.,
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

AUGUST 7, 1958.

Mr. R. N. SILVA,
Pfizer Corp., Apartado de Correos Caracas, Venezuela.

DEAR RAFAEL: We have been advised that Luis Enrique has stated that the Seguro Social quotation in Maracaibo of Bs. 4.00 on pediatric drops was under his quotation of Bs. 4.15, and therefore he considers the entire situation as being changed and intends to authorize his detailmen to aggressively quote on all Government business.

We are still awaiting a new schedule of local prices as our records indicate that this product is sold to the public and hospitals at Bs. 4.55, to the retailer at Bs. 4.28, and to the wholesaler at Bs. 3.64. Will you please advise as soon as possible.

Is he looking for a reason to go after Government business?

Sincerely yours,

FRANK.

P.S.—Is there any possibility of you reconsidering the matromycin prices and raising them to the romicil level as we are still being pressed on this matter?

JULY 23, 1963.

Mr. EDWARD J. GINER,
Vice President, International, McKesson & Robbins, Inc., New York, N.Y.

DEAR ED: I have received a number of letters from you today, and shall immediately answer the one dated July 18, which seems the most urgent at the moment.

I am afraid it will be impossible for this letter to reach your hands before next Thursday since tomorrow we have another official holiday in the country and therefore, no mail service.

I arrived in New York on Monday, August 18, 1958, with my wife on Pan American flight 202. I had traveled there on my way to London, and planned to remain for 4 days to discuss with the Cyanamid people, of whom Labroatorios Biogen was the exclusive distributor for Venezuela, two important matters. The first one dealt with the renewal of the agency agreement, and the second, with Pfizer's price policy in Venezuela which was in conflict with the agreed policy with all tetracycline distributors and branches operating in Venezuela at the time. Since I was traveling abroad, unfortunately I did not have access to secretarial help and therefore did not keep written minutes of the discussions during my stay in New York, but only some handwritten notes in my agenda book.

On August 19, I had lunch with Mr. Ralph Roland, at the time export sales manager of Cyanamid Interamerican Corp. and Cyanamid International Corp., and explained to him that once again Pfizer's Venezuelan branch was giving special discounts of 10 percent on all terramycin purchases, contrary to the previous agreements to the effect that such a discount was to be accorded only to wholesalers. It was agreed during that lunch, that Mr. Roland would contact Mr. Frank P. Wilson, manager of pricing for Pfizer Corp., to see what could be done about it.

The following day, when I arrived at Cyanamid's office, at the time in the U.S. Rubber Building on Sixth Avenue, I was told that a luncheon had been agreed with Mr. Wilson, during which we could discuss the whole matter of Pfizer's pricing. Mr. Roland, Mr. Panblyn, his assistant, Mr. J. R. Porro, sales manager for the Latin America area, and myself went to the restaurant at the Drake Hotel to meet Mr. Frank Wilson. I had met Mr. Wilson during several opportunities in the past, and had the impression that he was a very capable man in his field. Throughout this lunch I confirmed this opinion, and I was glad to hear him say that he would take the matter up with his Venezuelan branch manager, Mr. R. N. Silva at the time, so that the situation would be finally stopped. The whole thing sprang from previous price maneuvers by Pfizer, which I am sure you will understand from my memorandum of May 16, 1958, to Dr. R. R. Ball, general manager of Laboratories Biogen, on a meeting held in Caracas with all the tetracycline distributors and branches operating in the country. I am attaching a photostat of this memorandum.

Later, we were joined at this lunch at the Hotel Drake with Mr. Wilson, by Mr. H. G. Hesse, at the time director of Cyanamid International.

That lunch ended by assurances given by Mr. Wilson to the effect that he would correct the situation, and assurances given by me that we would wait for them to do it and not start a price competition. Late that afternoon, coming out of Mr. Flag's office, who at the time was manager of the Formica division of Cyanamid, I saw both Mr. Frank Wilson and Mr. R. N. Silva enter Mr. Hesse's office and I imagined that they would discuss what we had talked about at lunch that same day.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

LABORATORIES BIOGEN, C.A.
LUIS H. BALL M.

CARACAS,
September 29, 1958.

MY DEAR RAFAEL: Last Friday, Angel Casas telephoned me to tell me that Pfizer, Bristol, and another laboratory, the name of which I don't remember, had quoted to the Government of the State of Zulia, products, equivalent to acro(mycin), at the present prices plus a 10-percent discount.

I asked Casas to send me a photostatic copy of those price quotations, and he replied that he could not secure them for the moment because they had been refused, but that he hoped to be able to get them later on.

I told Casas that I was holding him responsible for whatever decision the management would take in view of false data supplied by him, and he replied that he accepted the responsibility since he had seen the price quotations with his own eyes.

I also admit that previously those same laboratories were giving a 10-percent [discount] on merchandise, but that this time they had dared to quote in writing, indicating 10 percent.

In view of this, I authorized Casas to match the prices of the competition, which I hasten to tell you since this news will surely already have been transmitted to you by interested parties.

I have just telephoned Rafael Bicanor to communicate to him my conversation with Casas and the order I had given him to adjust our products to the prices quoted by the competition. He assured me that there is no such discount by his company; that it may possibly be an employee who had become enthused [overanxious] to get the order and had given the discount, but inasmuch as the billing is done from Caracas there will be no such discount. He also told me he would call Anderson to talk with him about the matter so that Bristol won't reduce prices.

I am thinking of sending Ghiorsi to Maracaibo to check on Casas' information, but meanwhile there is the danger of our losing a sale which, it seems, is a very considerable one, and for that reason, while I clear up the business some more, I am going to let the order stand which I gave to Casas to match prices with those of the competition.

I am sending a copy of this letter to our friend Prieto.

With a cordial embrace from your friend,

RICARDO.

EXTRACT FROM DR. BALL'S LETTER TO MYSELF DATED OCTOBER 12, 1958

The antibiotic situation in Maracaibo continues to give us trouble. Next Tuesday I will send Ghiorsi to Maracaibo to confirm all the information sent by Casas so that I can act with assurance. I will inform you in New York so that you may submit this matter to Mr. Bogan. I assure you that (and please make it known there) I will not lose one more order because of price cuts from the competition.

I will not make any fuss nor will I fight with anybody, but simply return to the independent policy which I maintained in the past, without agreements or such nonsense. Tell Bogan that this is the last time I am informing New York about it * * * that from now on I will fight here with my own resources until the business ceases to be profitable and I place it at the disposal of Lederle so that others may manage it.

During my long history of doing business with Cyanamid they have done very little to help me fight the competitors. They act exactly like the State Department toward Russia; they calm me down with promises of agreement, etc., etc. They do not give me weapons, and meanwhile, slowly but surely the competitors take away from us the markets that we have conquered during years of work with our money and our efforts.

One example of this is the Titanium Dioxide and Formica. With the former they left us to "cool our heels" by refusing to accept orders that we had taken from clients so that they could take care of the importunate policy of one of the many big bosses who germinate in Cyanamid as if by spontaneous generation. Every day a new one pops up.

With formica they give us such bad service that all our great efforts to take over this market are neutralized; our shipping instructions are not followed, they do not send us samples in spite of the fact that their expenses are charged to our account as if we ordered them because we have the pleasure of doing so or because we are going to use them to make our own colored quilts.

Certain narrow mentalities over there see and think only about the domestic market. If this is so, why do they spend money on the export markets? Why don't they close them altogether? When they sign an agreement with their overseas agents they commit themselves to a moral obligation and therefore, have no right to make us waste our efforts and money by trying to level us to the domestic policy. We are getting the short end of the deal, and nevertheless, it is we who must pay for the broken dishes for their ignorance about export, for their eagerness to earn merits in the eyes of the executives and for their shortsightedness.

On January 1, the European Common Market Agreement will commence. We shall soon see the pocket statesmen of Cyanamid very busy revising their export policy and asking us to work miracles in order to correct their mistakes.

On October 18 in another letter, Dr. Ball goes on to say:

"Chiorsi arrived yesterday from Maracaibo. I did not inform you about his trip before because I have been very busy. As far as the antibiotics are concerned, he found that Bristol is openly giving discounts in merchandise as you will notice from the credit notes I am attaching. It has not been possible to confirm anything about Pfizer although Casas insists that they are also giving discounts in merchandise; but it has not been possible to obtain any credit notes. Casas asks me to give him time to obtain them. What we have been able to prove is that they have openly been giving a price reduction of ophthalmic ointment from Bs. 95 to Bs. 70, and I have given orders to meet these prices.

"Chiorsi brought with him some orders from the Hospital Chiquinquira and the Hospital Niños for achromycin and aureomycin in capsules and syrup with a 10-percent discount. On Monday I will have a meeting with Fabiano, Chiorsi, and Osorio to see what we can decide. I might call Silva and Anderson to let them know before I give the discount. Nevertheless, I am more inclined to take the order away from them, giving the discount this time, until I learn the outcome of your conversations with Bogan and Roland."

CARACAS,
November 7, 1958.

DEAR FRANK: When Houghie was here not long ago, I had the opportunity to chat with you over the phone with reference to the difficulties we were experiencing in the brdspctrm field. Following Houghie's departure, a powwow we convoked in our office with brstlhstchldrillpttpfar in attendance. One friend, sqbb. could not attend but was no party to any offense and was fully desirous of others reestablishing the previous atmosphere of confidence. Of the participants in attendance, the third one herein listed Olympianly limited itself to merely sending an unauthorized observer with instructions to say that it was not willing to participate any further in any such agreements. Fesa (see today's memo to Herb ———) had not attended because it had not done so previously but said, prior to and after the powwow, that it would abide by whatever collective conclusions were reached, and, so far, has not sinned following said powwow.

During this powwow it became evident that brstl was engaged in a nationwide cutting scheme, granting a 10 percent by means of either free goods or a like open or disguised discount. It also became evident that ldrl had followed suit without consulting the remaining parties; what is even worse, the old man personally told me that he had authorized his salesmen to go down to whatever level was necessary in order not to lose any business, something very dangerous because things of this nature, as you know, can't be entrusted to the very limited and uncoordinated judgment of individual salesmen. Apparently the origin of the whole thing was simply that brstl has a sales force headed by a special representative reporting directly to stateside headquarters while the distribution is in the hands of our friend Charlie; said special representative wants to become a branch manager and, to this end, is trying to prove to his superiors that he can sell lots, while lacking in managerial training and experience that would show him that such methods can be disastrous to a p&l. Apparently too, Charlie has no recourse but to reluctantly go along lest he should lose that distributorship.

During the powwow the previous confidence was restored and it was said and agreed "let's try again." Fesa and sqbb, informed a posteriori, were happy about the conclusions.

Yesterday lptt phoned me saying ldrl was at it again. The news, having originated in the interior, I immediately sent over one of my aids and he just came back confirming the fact that in Maracaibo, to the Hospital Chiquinquirá and to the Zulia State Medicine Purchasing Department, ldrl was selling its equivalent of our LACAB at the proper level but delivering 10 percent of free goods, what caused lptt to lose appreciable business.

Next week I shall call another powwow, as agreed upon at the last one, in order to thrash out this Maracaibo violation. I anticipate, however, that ldrl will in all probability refuse to attend and shall deny the sins. This is tantamount to saying that it shall be most difficult to hold the brdspctrm governmental prong totem pole in the future. The stubbornness of a disturbed family shall be, as usually, the cause of it all.

I shall keep you further posted.

With kindest personal regards.

PLUTO.

P.S.: Next week I shall also call a powwow to discuss sinning in the field of glucocorticoids (brmns). We have the strength of being a major party that has not sinned at all.

P.P.S.: It should be noted that, at these powwows, no objections have been raised with regard to steps similar to those of our special G–13. Thank you.

JULY 7, 1959.

Mr. RALPH ROLAND,
Cyanamid Inter-American Corp.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR RALPH: Confirming our today's telephone conversation, I wish to point out the highlights of my trip to Venezuela, where the situation can be summarized as "SNAFU."

The week before last, importers of tetracycline (capsules 250 mg. by 16) had a meeting to compare import prices which had been requested by the Ministerio de Fomento. Prices compare as follows:

Lepetit, $2.37 f.o.b., Milan.
Hoechst, $2.81 c.i.f., La Guaira.
Pfizer, $3.83 f.a.s., New York.
Bristol, $3.43 f.a.s., New York.
Squibb (misteclin), $4.32 f.a.s., New York.
Lederle, $4.04 f.a.s., New York.

As you will note there are variations in prices from $1.95 to 44 cents.

Upon my arrival, Henrique and I had a luncheon with Dr. Ayala and Mr. Rubio (Bristol), Mr. Finch (Squibb), and Dr. Silva (Pfizer); all of us representing U.S. firms.

The seriousness of the situation was accepted by all. If the above prices were declared and submitted to the Ministerio de Fomento, it will mean the end of tetracycline business in Venezuela. Whichever the markups to be fixed by the Ministerio, they would greatly favor Hoechst and Lepetit.

After a long and thorough review of all the matter involved, and at my request, it was accepted to hold another luncheon next day together with Mr. Franco Fracasso Mason (Lepetit) and Mr. Henrique Hartung (Hoechst). This second luncheon meeting lasted 3½ hours and Mr. Mason and Hartung were briefed on what happened during the previous meeting.

Both Mr. Mason and Mr. Finch were very well aware of the great danger on Lepetit and Hoechst's tetracline [sic] business if they officially declare the prices of $2.37 f.o.b. Milan and $2.81 c.i.f. La Guaira. Each one of us made our contributions as to what will happen should the government establish percentages for the distributors, wholesalers and retailers on such rockbottom prices. There will be not a penny left for promotion, advertising, overhead, etc. Mr. Hartung (Hoechst) was willing to jack up the prices to more or less our levels and so was Mr. Mason of Lepetit. However, Mr. Mason had no authority to make such a price decision and was expecting the visit of some high official from Lepetit. We should have their decision either today or tomorrow.

We all are very hopeful that an agreement be reached as otherwise Luis Henrique and I anticipate a price war on the tetracycline and other wide spectrum antibiotics. And I am not only concerned about Venezuela, but I fear that these extremely low prices in this market will have a repercussion in other countries. Furthermore, I anticipate a flow of low-priced tetracycline, being smuggled into Colombia, Curacao, Trinidad, etc.

When I inquired as to what was the attitude of the wholesalers and retailers regarding this regulation of prices by the Ministerio de Fomento, I was informed that they do not seem to be worried at least.

My recommendation was that we all should inform the wholesalers and retailers in a frank, firm and definite way, that none of us will be able to allow a single (under the table) discount. In other words, to let wholesalers and retailers know that we are not going to be the "goat" again and that they should make common cause with us protesting firmly this new Government ruling. If they can "make this sale" they could count with five important institutions—Camara Venezeluna de Farmacia, Asociacida Nacional de Droguaries, AFIDRO (distributors and branches), and Camara Nacional de la Industria Farmacutica to back them up in this protest.

It was completely impossible to find out what is in the minds of the Ministerio de Fomento as to the percentages to be fixed. However, everybody agrees that the Government is going to be pretty tough as they must quiet down the public's demand on the high cost of drugs.

Presently there is not a thing that we or anyone else can do but hope for the best. However, looking forward to the future we are going to have a lifesaver on our Ledermycin. As I said in the meeting at New York, let us get out of the tetracycline crowded subway and ride alone in our Ledermycin soft and air-conditioned Cadillac.

Mr. L. H. Ball will keep us fully informed on further developments and I can assure you that the whole matter is being handled very nicely and in complete harmony with Dr. Silva, Hoechst, Lepetit, Bristol, and Squibb.

Cordially yours,

R. PAGAN TORRES.

MANAGERS ACCOUNT, REIMBURSEMENT REPORT

(The First National City Bank of New York, Brooklyn, N. Y., branch, Caracas, Venezuela, May 20, 1959.

REIMBURSEMENT SUMMARY

	Amount
Balance before reimbursement	US$10, 000. 00
Amount of this reimbursement	6, 429. 44
Total	3, 570. 56
Approved limit for this account	10, 000. 00

REIMBURSEMENT DETAILS

Apr. 30, 1959, check No. 26, paid to Rafael Nicanor Silva	U.S.$1, 634. 79
May 11, 1959, check No. 27, paid to Rafael Nicanor Silva	1, 163. 66
May 19, 1959, check No. 28, paid to Rafael Nicanor Silva	3, 630. 99
Total	6, 429. 24
Venezuelan Institute of Social Security, Caracas	Bs9, 993. 10
Venezuelan Institute of Social Security, Karakaibo	2, 104. 00
Onarico Hospital, San Juan de los Morres	96. 30
Navy's Health Service, Caracas	80. 30
Vargas Hospital, Caracas	798. 70
Children's Hospital, Caracas	901. 75
Sala's Emergency Medical Hospital, Caracas	426. 00
Ministry of Defense, Caracas	4, 532. 60
University Hospital, Caracas	89. 90
Sagra State Medicine Purchasing Department, Caracas	244. 50
Central Hospital, Valencia	464. 00
Carabobo State Medicine Purchasing Department, Valencia	517. 00
Rodriguez Rivero Hospital, San Felipe	764. 00
National Armed Forces Social Welfare Institute, Caracas	395.70
Total	21, 410. 05

NOTE.—Exchange rate, Bs3.33 to US$ as per attached bank slips.

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

Managers Bank Account Reimbursement Report

(First National City Bank of New York, Brooklyn, N.Y., branch, Payer Corporation, June 25, 1959.)

REIMBURSEMENT SUMMARY

Balance before reimbursement	US$10,000.00
Amount of this reimbursement	4,947.96
Total	8,953.94
Approved limit for this account	10,000.00

REIMBURSEMENT DETAILS

June 27, 1959, check No. 29, paid to Rafael Nicaner Silva	US$2,215.14
June 17, 1959, check No. 30, paid to Rafael Nicanor Silva	2,732.82
Total	4,947.96
Venezuelan Institute of Social Security, Caracas	Bs8,988.65
Cuarico Hospital, San Juan de les Morres	697.35
Vargas Hospital, Caracas	874.20
Children's Hospital, Caracas	1,176.15
Navy's Health Service, Caracas	31.00
National Armed Forces Social Welfare Institute, Caracas	423.45
Sala's Emergency Medical Hospital, Caracus	419.00
University Hospital, Caracas	3,063.25
Suere Caracas Centeral Hospital, Postain	176.25
Suere State Medicine Purchasing Department, Caracas	183.00
Monagas State Medicine Purchasing Department, Martarin	233.00
Valencia Central Hospital, Venezuela	305.00
Curatatey State Medicine Purchasing Department, Valencia	326.00
Total	Bs16,476.70

(NOTE.—Exchange rate, Bs3.33 to US$, as per attached bank slips.)

RAFAEL VICAURBLIR.

Managers Bank Account Reimbursement Report

(The First National City Bank of New York, Brooklyn, N.Y., Caracas, Venezuela, August 18, 1959.)

REIMBURSEMENT SUMMARY

Balance before reimbursement	US$10,000.00
Amount of this reimbursement	4,092.31
Total	529.14
Approved limit for this account	5,378.55

REIMBURSEMENT DETAILS

June 23, 1959, check No. 31, paid to Rafael Nicanor Silva	US$529.41
July 3, 1959, check No. 32, paid to Rafael Nicanor Silva	4,092.31
Total	5,378.55
Venezuelan Institute of Social Security, Caracas	Bs4,297.75
Venezuelan Institute of Social Security, Maracaibo	2,623.00
Navy's Health Service, Caracas	87.30
Caurico Hospital, San Juan de los Morros	81.50
Vargas Hospital, Caracas	965.50
Children's Hospital, Caracas	645.25
National Armed Forces Social Welfare Institute, Caracas	308.40
Sala's Emergency Medical Hospital, Caracas	620.25
Emergency Medical Hospital, Pariata	83.60
University Hospital, Caracas	3,993.30
Sucre State Medicine Purchasing Department, Cumaniá	Bs140.75
Monagas State Medicine Purchasing Department, Matarin	432.50
Araque State Health Department, Naracay	90.00
Central Hospital, Valencia	462.25
Carabobo State Medicine Purchasing Department, Valencia	359.00
Rodriguez Rivero Hospital, San Felipe	198.50

(NOTE.—Exchange rate, Bs3.33 to US$ as per attached bank slips.)

Managers Bank Account Reimbursement Report

(The First National City Bank of New York, Brooklyn, N.Y., branch, Venezuela, Sept. 22, 1959.)

REIMBURSEMENT SUMMARY

	Amount
Balance before reimbursement	US$10,000.00
Amount of this reimbursement	2,324.52
Total	2,758.57
Approved limit for this account	4,916.91

REIMBURSEMENT DETAILS

Aug. 21, 1959, check No. 33, paid to Rafael Nicanor Silva	US$2,324.52
Aug. 28, 1959, check No. 34, paid to Rafael Nicanor Silva	2,758.57
Total	5,083.09
Venezuelan Institution of S.S., Caracas	Bs14,709.15
Guarico Hospital San Juan de los Morros	126.85
Ruiz & Paéz Hospital, Ciudad, Bolivar	540.45
Emergency Medical Hospital, Pariata	272.15
Vargas Hospital, Caracas	775.35
Children's Hospital, Caracas	181.30
National Armed Forces Social Welfare Institution, Caracas	318.35
Sala's Emergency Medical Hospital, Caracas	392.20
Luis Ortega Central Hospital, Porlamar	198.25
Cumana Hospital, Cumana	42.70
Sucre State Medical Purchasing Department, Cumana	1,279.20
Monages State Medical Purchasing Department, Maturia	281.00
Cumanatoa Sugar Mill, Cumana	216.40
Aragae State Health Department, Maracay	90.00
Central Hospital, Valencia	465.20
Carabobo State Medical Purchasing Department, Valencia	643.20
Unclaimed	(1,002.05)
Venezuelan Institution of S.S., Maracaibo (not paid)	(2,623.00)
Total	Bs16,923.70

(NOTE.—Exchange rate, Bs3.33 to US$, as per attached bank slips.)

Managers Account Reimbursement Report

(The First National City Bank of New York, Brooklyn, N.Y., Branch Venezuelan, Oct. 27, 1959.)

REIMBURSEMENT SUMMARY

	Amount
Balance before reimbursement	US$10,000.00
Amount of this reimbursement	7,391.41
Total	2,108.58
Approved limit for this account	10,000.00

REIMBURSEMENT DETAILS

	Amount
Sept. 11, 1959, check No. 35, Rafael Micanos Silva	US$1,646.69
Sept. 25, 1959, check No. 36, Rafael Micanos Silva	2,277.21
Oct. 19, 1959, check No. 38, Rafael Micanos Silva	2,076.23
Oct. 27, 1959, check No. 38, Rafael Micanos Silva	1,901.27
Total	7,891.40
Venezuelan Inst. of S.S., Caracas	Bs7,427.55
University Hosp., Caracas	8,241.80
Susra State Med. Purch. Dept., Camand	3,560.00
Luss Ortega Cent. Hosp., Perlamar	291.40
Camand Hospital, Camand	94.80
Hanadas State Med. Purch. Dept., Maturfa	815.25
Salas Emerg. Med. Hosp., Caracas	192.00
Grarios Hosp., San Juan de les Mares	207.00
Central Hospital, Valencia	1,044.75
Arsgsa State Health Dept., Karagay	45.00
Emerg. Med. Hosp., Pariata	103.15
Navy's Health Service, Caracas	1,035.50
Fuiz & Koaz Hosp., Ciudad Bolivar	554.00
Guarico Santo Med. Purch. Dept., San Juan de les Mares	671.00
Vargas Hospital, Caracas	1,036.70
Nat'l Armed Forces Social Welfare Inst., Caracas	938.45
Total	26,278.35

NOTE.—Exchange rate, Bs3.38 to US$, as per attached bank slips.

RNS.

[RNS–1956]

AUGUST 20, 1959.

Re G–13 RNS–20.
Mr. J. W. MURRAY,
New York.
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas.

I take pleasure in listing below the information you would like to receive in connection with the aforementioned G–13:

Invoice 26936	Bs 33,495.00
Invoice 27074	52,460.00
Invoice 27079	26,230,00
Invoice 26270	932.00
Invoice 26243	814.00
Invoice 26729	675.00
Invoice 26787	140.00
Invoice 26663	3,558.55
Invoice 26341	509.49
Invoice 26940	2,590.60
Invoice 24796	3,956.00
Invoice 23726	247.50
Invoice 24580	247.50
Invoice 24709	1,993.93
Invoice 26637	2,476.00
Invoice 26691	3,712.50
Invoice 26887	2,490.00
Invoice 26760	836.25
Invoice 26366	9,000.00
Invoice 26967	5,940.00
Invoice 24906	9,000.00
Invoice 26907	3,600.00
Invoice 26797	2,015.00
Invoice 26974	6,250.00
Invoice 27035	2,400.00
Invoice 26069	1,000.00
Invoice 27047	4,622.50
Invoice 25739	1,900.00

Invoice 26913	Bs820.00
Invoice 27006	870.00
Invoice 26678	166.00
Invoice 27034	1,800.00

Cordially,

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

[RNS-1970]

SEPTEMBER 22, 1959.

Re G-13 RNS-21.
Mr. J. W. MURRAY,
New York.
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas.

I take pleasure in listing below the information you would like to receive in connection with the aforementioned G-13:

Invoice 27303	Bs111,504.00
Invoice 27462	18,000.00
Invoice 27545	9,846.00
Invoice 27665	5,440.00
Invoice 27899	149,373.50
Invoice 27323	495.00
Invoice 27404	98.40
Invoice 27616	675.00
Invoice 27132	1,378.00
Invoice 27387	4,026.00
Invoice 26740	836.25
Invoice 27206	[1] 942.50
Invoice 27049	1,297.40
Invoice 27114	2,048.40
Invoice 27344	1,170.90
Invoice 27404	810.60
Invoice 27055	1,250.35
Invoice 27111	2,039.70
Invoice 27192	1,260.35
Invoice 27451	1,314.60
Invoice 27062	450.00
Invoice 27112	2,555.00
Invoice 27363	1,467.00
Invoice 26675	900.00
Invoice 26919	897.50
Invoice 27179	900.00
Invoice 27419	817.50
Invoice 27464	450.00
Invoice 27373	1,253.75
Invoice 27292	15,720.00
Invoice 27463	270.00
Invoice 27158	400.00
Invoice 27319	5,220.00
Invoice 27075	4,328.00
Invoice 27212	1,800.00
Invoice 27497	4,652.00
Invoice 27296	3,402.00
Invoice 27491	3,030.00
Unclaimed disbursements	[2] 1,002.05
Invoice 27079 not paid	[3] 2,623.00

[1] As a result of a computation error, the respective G-13 disbursement should have been Bs177.90; therefore, the next G-13 will show a Bs94.25 surplus.

[2] Self-explanatory.

[3] Disbursement decision reversed.

Cordially,

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

[RNS-2036]

OCTOBER 28, 1959.

Mr. J. W. MURRAY, *New York.*
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA, *Caracas.*
Re G-13 RNS-22.

I take pleasure in listing below the information you would like to receive in connection with the aforementioned G-13:

Invoice 28030	Bs6,460.00
Invoice 28332	6,285.00
Invoice 28222	4,950.00
Invoice 28446	124,291.00
Invoice 28496	6,685.00
Invoice 27502	3,940.00
Invoice 27974	5,821.50
Invoice 28006	7,200.00
Invoice 28007	7,200.00
Invoice 28008	7,200.00
Invoice 28209	4,789.00
Invoice 28210	5,910.00
Invoice 28211	11,600.00
Invoice 28312	216.00
Invoice 27790	9,835.80
Invoice 27795	Bs1,050.00
Invoice 28028	900.00
Invoice 28027	10,405.00
Invoice 28189	20,510.00
Invoice 28213	1,280.00
Invoice 28419	800.00
Invoice 27563	450.00
Invoice 27628	495.00
Invoice 27780	900.00
Invoice 27927	895.00
Invoice 28014	450.00
Invoice 28058	895.00
Invoice 28276	188.00
Invoice 28343	900.00
Invoice 28387	655.00
Invoice 27923	1,896.25
Invoice 27841	6,718.00
Invoice 28019	560.00
Invoice 28185	8,475.00
Invoice 28214	560.00
Invoice 27690	1,105.00
Invoice 27733	265.00
Invoice 28033	965.00
Invoice 28450	1,105.00
Invoice 27918	4,767.00
Invoice 28377	450.00
Invoice 28404	5,230.40
Invoice 27686	900.00
Invoice 27849	2,023.75
	[1] −942.50
	1,081.25
Invoice 28649	20,389.80
Invoice 28670	320.00
Invoice 27713	1,704.90
Invoice 27730	108.00
Invoice 28078	1,700.50
Invoice 28344	540.00
Invoice 28460	1,478.70
Invoice 28375	13,420.00
Invoice 27552	406.00
Invoice 27584	2,103.45
Invoice 27738	900.00
Invoice 27814	1,085.70
Invoice 27866	91.35
Invoice 27975	980.45
Invoice 28017	730.80
Invoice 28043	1,833.60
Invoice 28315	1,380.65
Invoice 28339	180.00
Invoice 28440	735.60
Invoice 27111	2,039.70
Invoice 27192	1,260.35
Invoice 27451	1,314.60
Invoice 27583	237.25
Invoice 27754	2,165.55
Invoice 28005	1,859.10
Invoice 28114	459.80
Invoice 28173	932.15
Invoice 28357	2,565.30
Invoice 28462	984.15

[1] Please see RNS-1970(1).

Cordially.

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

EXHIBIT 3

[RNS-932]

NOVEMBER 22, 1957.

Re Agrivet price schedules VEN-98 and 97.
Mr. J. T. SMART,
New York.
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas.
Mr. JUAN FRANCO M.
Mr. M. C. HOUGH.
Dr. LUIS POCCHIO.

I am referring herein to the memorandums on the above subject matter Mr. Niel A. Morton wrote us on October 8, 1957, and October 11, 1957.

With regards to VEN-98, that is, vigofac, we agree with the point of view explained in the above-said memorandums, and, as a matter of fact, please find attached a revised VEN-98. However, and merely by way of comment, I only wish to add that our branch billing price issued on April 1, 1957, was US$30.315 in 100-pound drums. On the other hand we realize that your information price list carries a quantity price schedule and we shall bear this point in mind henceforth.

With regards to VEN-97, that is TM-3+3, this is a different story, and here it is:

(a) In the first place, we wish to state that, so far as our animal feed supplements are concerned, we find it necessary to apply to protinal's indent orders the corresponding F.A.S. level depending upon the amount to be ordered for each individual shipment. This is so in order to evade any price conflicts arising from any price differential with regards to Purina-U.S. and Purina-Venezuela (the same could be the case with any American feeds manufacturer that may decide to operate in Venezuela in the future). In other words, as originally agreed upon, we want protinal to have its own indent orders billed at the same F.A.S. levels at which any Purina indent orders would be billed (the latter in keeping with the respective domestic billing prices).

(b) In the second place, you already know we have been allowing protinal a set of markups having complete regularity and consistency (28%—31%—25%) in connection with our animal feed supplements line. If we were to give protinal a higher markup with reference to a given product of this type, Protinal could very well then request that the same thing be done in connection with the other like products.

(c) In the third place, we don't find it necessary to have absolute consistency, pricewise, on a gram-per-gram basis, regardless of the antibiotics and/or vitamins concentrations of the feed supplements involved. We say this because, for one thing, Pfizer itself doesn't adhere strictly to this principle of absolute price consistency. In point of fact, to prove yourself the point the only thing you have to do is to compare, for instance, concentrationwise and pricewise, TM-5 with TM-10 and TM-1+3 with TM-3+3. Moreover, Biogen (the Cyanamid distributor here) ain't following the same principle when marketing the Cyanamid animal feed supplements in Venezuela. To illustrate the point, Biogen's price to the public here for Aurofac D (similar to our TM-5) is Bs204.00, and that of Aurofac 10 (Similar to our TM-10) is Bs275.08, in both cases such prices to be understood per bag of 50 pounds each.

(d) In the fourth place, the Bs9.50 per kgm. price to the public Mr. Morton suggested in the bottom paragraph of page 1 of his memorandum of 10-11-57 cited above, would be on a gram-per-gram basis higher than the corresponding price to the public here of Biogen's plain Aurofac listed in VEN-97, taking into consideration that both this type of Aurofac as well as our TM-3+3 are mixtures of antibiotics plus B12.

(c) In the fifth place, we are reluctant, speaking again about Protinal's markups, to allow these people much higher markups on a product which is basically the same as others. We say this because, for one thing, we have already established the principle of the need of uniformity concerning F.A.S. prices, and because, for another, if while giving Protinal the regular F.A.S. we establish the price to the public suggested by Mr. Morton, Protinal would have to be given unusually higher markups which might possibly invite the attention of the Venezuelan price control organisms.

Consequently, please find attached a new VEN-97 which bears the following characteristics:

1. Firstly, the F.A.S. therein used is U.S.SO.455 (the one currently applicable to shipments of 2,000 lbs., the most likely case at the present time).

2. Secondly, the markups for Protinal, as you can plainly see, are definitely in line with what the case happens to be with the other Pfizer animal food supplements here.

3. The price to the public has been figured out taking into consideration what Biogen's price to the public is here for Aurofac 1.02

plus 1.82, plus the fact that ours does not have the same concentration of both antibiotic and vitamin as Biogen's. In reality on the basis of this twofold comparison we should have arrived at a price to the public, on a gram-per-gram basis for the antibiotic-vitamin mixture only 21 percent lower than for the corresponding Biogen mixture. We are, nevertheless, proposing a price to the public which is actually 27 percent lower, on the basis just stated, than Biogen's; this should be no cause for alarm owing to the fact that, in the first place, we are thus upsetting neither the F.A.S. nor the local markups, and, in the second place, please do not think that Biogen's prices to the public here for Cyanamid animal feed supplements do follow a pattern of absolute consistency. Hence, if Biogen and/or Cyanamid should scream, we are also in a position to scream.

Cordially,

Rafael Nicanor Silva.

[RNS–1441]

November 26, 1957.

Re Ralston Purina.
Mr. James Matheu,
México
Rafael Nicanor Silva,
Caracas
Dr. L. Pecchio B.

I should like to make reference to your kind and interesting memorandum on the above subject, VA–43 of October 6, 1958.

Yes, we have kept an eye on Purina ever since this giant began gnomishly operating here; by now, I suppose you could call it just a little man that is growing.

Cuz of the above, and cuz of what your letter sez, we have of late given undivided attention to Purina and, in a nutshell, the situation is as follows:

(a) Purina is presently managed locally by a gentleman named Mr. Dietrich F. Rosenberg. We have spoken to Messrs. Rosenberg and Palmer (the latter being the assistant general manager) and they acknowledge the fact that Purina is presently using Aurofac–10. We are told that Purina cannot switch over to TM–10 owing to the twofold reason that, for one thing, Purina-Venezuela has to follow to the letter the formulas exactly as handed down by Mr. Lamar Kishlar, a Purina executive of St. Louis, Mo. There seem to be no hedging on that and no compromising as well. For another, the same gentlemen advise us that they enjoy special ACCO concessions pricewise while, at the same time, they refuse to tell specifically what are the concessions in question. They simply ask us what have we got to offer.

(b) Biogen also acknowledges the fact that Purina-Venezuela is locally supplied by Biogen with Aurofac-10 at special prices dictated by ACCO–N.Y. (? as usual) but refuse to tell us what are these price levels.

The price per carload for TM–10 (40,000 pounds) stateside of U.S.$0.09 per gram of activity, that is U.S.$0.09 per pound f.a.s. New York, that you suggest in your memorandum we should give to Purina-Venezuela, said price to include freight and duties, we have not openly mentioned it to Purina-Venezuela yet inasmuch as we know that these people are presently not in a position to buy the stuff by the carload. Therefore, may I ask you the question of whether or not same price could be passed on to Purina for fractions of carload? This seems to be the crux of the matter.

Most kindly rest assured that our local contacts with Purina have been pleasant and rather frequent ones.

Can you help?

Cordially,

Rafael Nicanor Silva.

P.S.: As early as June 18, 1958, Dr. Pecchio in his memorandum LPB–492, addressed to Mr. Richard Wilson with copy to your good self, explained that Purina-Venezuela would not deviate from using Aurofac-10 unless specific instructions were given by a certain Bob Woodward of the "Product Control Department" in St. Louis, Mo. Thank you. Why don't you pass a copy of this memorandum on to Mr. Frank P. Wilson, who may be in a position to help by making contacts stateside both with ACCO and Purina. Thank you again.

[RNS–1634]

Caracas, Venezuela,
March 20, 1959.

Mr. Frank P. Wilson,
New York, N.Y.

Dear Frank: Please see a memo that John Smart wrote to us on February 19, 1959, on the subject of order No. 695–433.

What actually happened was that Biogen suddenly decided to drop the local price to the public of Aurofac 1.82+1.82 from Bs5.41 to Bs4.95 per kgm. This entails, as you can plainly see, a cut of 8.5 percent also at the level to the retailer. When caught using this new price, Biogen simply explained that the New York f.a.s. has been lowered by ACCO and that locally a corresponding reduction was made. I would like to on record—and please remember this very clearly—that this is one more instance of complete lack of cooperation on Biogen's part; to say anything else would be utter nonsense.

By means of separate, normal and formal correspondence Luis Pecchio is replying to John in a perfunctory manner proposing a new product price schedule. Please intercede with John so that same shall be granted approval. Please also remind John that, because of the difference in concentration between the above Aurofac and TM 3+3, in the past we had a whale of a time trying to come with New York to a meeting of the minds as regard the calculations leading toward the respective equivalent comparison between these two products. Luis, therefore, is simply just proposing a similar reduction percentagewise, without any further ado. It makes me mad to think of all this nonsense about the local ACCO people cooperating with Pfizer; to hell with it, as this is purely a misrepresentation insofar as these people are concerned.

With kindest personal regards.

Pluto.

[RNS–1666]

Caracas, Venezuela,
April 8, 1959.

Mr. Frank P. Wilson,
New York, N.Y.

Dear Frank: I am sorry having to bring something else to your attention which would be completely useless to do on a local basis cuz, as you know from past experience, one would only meet denials and counter-accusations (the latter completely unfounded as ever).

As you know, our animal health line has a certain level of prices to the public/consumer below which the retailers ("distribuidores"—in local lingo) have a 20-percent discount, i.e., a 25-percent markup with reference to their purchase prices from our exclusive distributors, Protinal. This is supposed to be the same situation that Biogen should have with reference to the respective competitive items.

Many a time Dr. Luis Pecchio and myself have considered the advisability of our authorizing Protinal (Protinal would be more than willing to do this) to grant a discount to certain major retailers/semiwholesalers larger than 25 percent; however, even you yourself have never heard from us in this respect before cuz we understand that this would be out of line with what our understanding is with Biogen.

Now then, we have discovered that Biogen is giving to certain such "distribuidores" special discounts beyond that 20 percent which results in an obvious reluctance of these accounts to handle our line.

I realize that this is for all intents and purposes an incurable illness and that ACCO would never succeed in getting the local gents to allow an examination of the latter's billing practices to ascertain the accuracy of this complaint. Just the same, can you help * * * or can we at least go on record and threaten with taking, in specific cases, a similar course of action?

Please drop me a line re this matter.

With regretful sincerity,

Pluto.

[RNS–1702]

Caracas, Venezuela,
April 28, 1959.

Mr. Frank P. Wilson,
New York, N.Y.

Dear Frank: Sorry having to bother you again.

For one thing, I haven't received any news from you with reference to mine (RNS–1666 of 4–8–59, personal), although I realize that the required contacts take time. I continue, however, entertaining the hope that you will let me hear from you.

Now, another item. I am attaching hereto photostat of a memorandum we received from James Matheu back in October of last year. I am also attaching hereto photostatic copy of my reply to Jim. I have a twofold reason for directly bringing this exchange of correspondence to your personal attention. To begin with, not having heard any further from Jim and the situation here with regard to Purina continuing to be the same, I am assuming that this problem is one that obviously hinges on top contacts stateside. For another, Dr. Luis Pecchiò had a conversation just a few days ago with Dr. Félix Arostegui, a Puerto Rican agronomist who handles at Biogen here everything pertaining to the farm and home ACCO line including the vet one, and, of course, the animal feed supplements. Amid drinks, Arostequi freely acknowledged the fact that Biogen locally keeps separate stocks of ACCO animal feed supplements, most particularly of Aurofac–10, specially for Purina and to be supplied to Purina at special conditions specifically authorized by ACCO. Now then, in view of the fact that to Purina here we have offered our animal feed supplements, on an indent order basis, at the corresponding f.a.s. levels quantitywise which are listed in your informational price lists, etc., and we haven't gotten anywhere with Purina in Venezuela, one must logically conclude that there must be a Negro in the woodpile. In other words, we just find ourselves completely helpless in dealing here with the Purina situation. Therefore, I am simply invoking the close friendship that Jim Matheu sez (first and second paragraphs of his memorandum to me on Purina) exists between Pfizer and Purina in the United States, in the hope that we at least be told without pulling punches what the ACCO–Purina deal re Venezuela consists on and that we be authorized to match the respective conditions even though the latter may be a slightly risky proposition if one considers that, on the other hand, we do not grant such special concessions even to Protinal.

As I did with my RNS–1666, I am sending Houghie a complete set of copies of the aforementioned communications purely for his very own personal information and consideration and with the plea that he should destroy this RNS–1702.

With kindest regards,

Rafael Nicanor Silva.

June 16, 1959.

Re Ralston Purina.
Mr. R. N. Silva,
Pfizer Corp.,
Caracas, Venezuela.

Dear Rafael: We have done all possible to find out how the competitor handles this account and feel that the following information is basically correct:

First, the sales are made direct to St. Paul in the United States, and there are no local sales made in Venezuela (unless very minor) regardless of what Mr. Rosenberg has stated. The only sales that possibly could be made in Venezuela would be made at or about the local price. The reason why I say "at or about" is because you know New York has no absolute control over the prices quoted by their distributor, although they have stated that the local distributor could not quote prices which would be attractive to Ralston Purina without having the same prices come back to New York from this account in St. Paul.

The prices as quoted in the United States to this account by both of us are about the same, and therefore it looks as though, at the present, without destroying the price pattern, we cannot compete too aggressively at the local level. I know this must hurt you but it is out of my control.

However, it is a natural inclination of all purchasing agents to attempt to try and obtain a much better price than the home office and therefore it would be quite a feather in his cap if he could obtain from Pfizer a price locally which was much better than currently quoted from their St. Paul office. This, of course, could create quite a situation here and should be guarded against by you.

We know that the above does not help you obtain the sales at a local basis, yet we feel to do so on a price basis would create a situation which in the long run would be detrimental to the overall profit picture of Pfizer.

Sincerely yours,

J.P.W.

EXHIBIT 4

CARACAS,
May 29, 1957.

DEAR JOHN: When I was there last April I discussed with you the tentative price schedule we should have originally proposed for Matro.

Upon further reviewing this matter here I encounter the following situation:

Ilo: 100 x 12's (1.2 gm.), Bs. 14; 200 x 12's (2.4 gm.), Bs. 23.50.

Brythro: 100 x 12's (1.2 gm.), Bs. 10.23.

Matro: 250 x 12's (3 gm.), Bs. 34, Bs. 30, Bs. 25.60.

Terra/atras: 250 x 8's (2 gm.), Bs. 9.50; 250 x 16's (4 gm.), Bs. 17.60.

The Ilo, Brythro, and Terra/tetras (regardless of the brand of the latter) prices are the so-called "list prices" presently existing here. The three Matro prices are the ones that would be the equivalent on a gram-per-gram basis to the two Ilo and the Brythro, respectively. Please note the discrepancies with the Terra/tetras ones(please note that for the tetras including oxy- and chlor- such prices are identical here).

In view of this situation, senor Franco and I prefer to let you decide which one should be the level at which we should propose predatedly the Matro prices. We should be happy to oblige.

Two copies of this personal memorandum I am attaching hereto, one for FP and the other for AMDeB, so that they may have a chance to help you out in what I would appreciate your conveying to me in an equally personal memorandum.

Cordially,

RAFAEL.

NEW YORK A CARACAS:

En nuestro cablegrama de fecha 18 del presente dirigido idefra Caracas. Favor insertar como firma del expedidor Morton.

IDEFRA,
Caracas.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1957.

NEW YORK (USA):

"Morton reorder 18th FSPRCS were higher owing samje samfa samdy matci matog having been figured basis plus percentage for lamef etc. rather than torhu etc. Sending corrected P10155 forms with fsprcs similar torhu etc.

PFIZERVEN.

SEPTEMBER 25, 1957.

Mr. N. A. MORTON,
New York.
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas.
Pricing.

I am sorry that I did not reply to your idefra wire of September 18, 1957, until yesterday. The message I wired you was the following:

"Morton reorder 18th FSPRCS were higher owing samje samfa sandy matci matog having been figured basis plus percentage for lamef etc rather than torhu etc. Sending corrected P10155 forms with FSPRCS similar torhu etc."

In the point of fact, may I explain to you that our FAS prices for LAMEF & Co. are slightly higher than those for TORHU & Co., owing to the fact that the latter line has a more complete variety of dosage forms owing to which, and because of the cost vs. weight ratio, the transportation, insurance, and other "plus" factors listed on the P-101-55 forms, gives us a higher percentage (5 percent) in the case of TORHU & Co. than in the case of LAMEF & Co.

Inasmuch as we presume, on the basis of your above-cited idefra wire, that you would rather have us follow the TORHU line instead of the LAMEF one when dealing with SAMJE & Co. and MATCI & Co., we have revised the P-101-55 forms we were just about to send you on SAMJE & Co. and MATCI & Co. when your idefra wire came, in order to fall in line with what we surmise is your wish.

Your idefra wire is also asking us for "compet" data to be included in the respective P-101-55 forms. You will recall that last June, at lunch time, Allen, Frank, John, and myself agreed that SAMJE & Co. should locally follow here the TORHU & Co. party line, and that MATCI & Co. should do likewise. Specially in connection with MATCI & Co. John could once more show you my personal memorandum to him dated May 29, 1957, in which I reviewed the flabbergasting local MATCI & Co. "compet" data. At the same luncheon engagement we all agreed that, consequently, MATCI & Co. should be placed in line with TORHU & Co. regardless of ILO and its relatives.

Toodle-oo, old boy.

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

Date: October 11, 1957.
To: Mr. R. Silva, Caracas.
From: New York Pricing Department.
Subject: Family relations.

Kindly refer to your memorandum No. RNS-783 dated September 25.

Enjoyed your message and understand the company relationships which exist in Venezuela. Since I am the only one presently in New York who enjoyed lunch with you last June, I am taking the opportunity of reminding you of our pleasant discussion.

I concur with your thoughts concerning our luncheon date that Samje & Co. should follow the Torhu & Co. family line in your neighborhood. It would also seem logical that your FAS be in with Lamef & Co. and the explanation in your second paragraph seems very logical to me and certainly would substantiate any questions concerning Samje & Co.'s local activity; and so in a nutshell, we will not use the FAS as indicated with form P-101-55, but will use those pertaining to 71603-18-1, 71603-16-1, and 71603-08-1 now in your possession.

Now the other half of our conversation at lunch time seems to fall in a slightly different direction. As I recall, we discussed the Matci & Co. family problems and how these problems were solved in Cuba. We mentioned that Matci & Co. was announced in Cuba at "compet" with the understanding that if happiness and success was not to be enjoyed, Matci & Co. would move in to the same apartment and floor currently being maintained by Torhu & Co. This establishes a good record in case the teachers and principals of our family question us. I was under the impression after lunch time that you would proceed to announce Matci & Co. locally with "compet," thus being consistent. (This was to be done whether Matci & Co. was or was not available.) Naturally, this would make us consistent and clean. We also indicated that when you wanted to really get to work with this company, we would cooperate and comply with your request that Matci & Co. get their feet on the ground and be consistent with Torhu & Co.

If this has been the fact, then we are in agreement and you can now relate Matci & Co. with Torhu & Co. locally. If for some reason this has not been done, we suggest you do so, complain about it and change it. We will assume it has been done or you are doing it and FAS will be based on the final family line.

J. T. SMART.

OCTOBER 11, 1957.

Mr. R. SILVA,
Caracas-New York pricing department.
Family relations.

Kindly refer to your memorandum No. RNS-783 dated September 25.

Enjoyed your message and understand the company relationships which exist in Venezuela. Since I am the only one presently in New York who enjoyed lunch with you last June, I am taking the opportunity of reminding you of our pleasant discussion.

I concur with your thoughts concerning our luncheon date that Samje & Co. should follow the Torhu & Co. family line in your neighborhood. It would also seem logical that your f.a.s. be in line with Lampf & Co. and the explanation in your second paragraph seems very logical to me and certainly would substantiate any questions concerning Samje & Co.'s local activity; and so in a nutshell, we will not use the f.a.s. as indicated with form P-101-55, but will use those pertaining to 71603-18-1, 71603-16-1 and 71603-08-1 now in your possession.

Now the other half of our conversation at lunchtime seems to fall in a slightly different direction. As I recall, we discussed the Natoi & Co. family problems and how these problems were solved in Cuba. We mentioned that Natoi & Co. was announced in Cuba at "compet" with the understanding that if happiness and success was not to be enjoyed, Natoi & Co. would move into the same apartment and floor currently being maintained by Torhu & Co. This establishes a good record in case the vouchers and principals of our family question us. I was under the impression after lunchtime that you would proceed to announce Natoi & Co. locally with "compet," thus being consistent. (This was to be done whether Natoi & Co. was or was not available.) Naturally, this would make us consistent and clean. We also indicated that when you wanted to really get to work with this company, we would cooperate and comply with your request that Natoi & Co. get their feet on the ground and be consistent with Torhu & Co.

If this has been the fact, then we are in agreement and you can now relate Natoi &

Co. with Torhu & Co. locally. If for some reason this has not been done, we suggest you do so, complain about it and change it. We will assume it has been done or you are doing it and f.a.s. will be based on the final family line.

J. T. SMART.

MEMORANDUM

Date: October 30, 1957.
To: Mr. R. Silva-Caracas.
From: New York Pricing Department.
Subject: Matromycin.

Kindly refer to our memorandum No. NY-VEN-29 dated October 11.

Unfortunately, we have not received your reply and we can no longer delay the establishment of your branch prices for Matromycin 12's and 100's. Therefore, we have priced the Matromycin items on order No. 695-66-1 based on our calculations in New York. We hope that the branch prices so established will be in line with your recommendations which we hope to receive in the near future.

J. T. SMART.

Date: October 14, 1957.
To: Mr. T. J. Raineri.
From: Pricing department.
Subject: Prices—Venezuela.

Should you have the opportunity to discuss our memorandum of October 12 with Mr. R. Silva, we would appreciate your mentioning the following points:

1. Sigmamycin should be priced at the Tetracyn levels for the purposes of billing the branch. This higher branch price and consequently, the higher landed cost in Venezuela, should justify the local market price levels which are to be established.

2. As we mentioned to Rafael, it was our desire to have our records indicate we had established Matromycin at the unusual high competitive levels. Once we had this in our records for a short period of time, it was our understanding that a complaint would be registered with the recommendation that we reduce the prices to the levels of Terramycin. Naturally, we would comply with Rafael's request and launch the product at the Terramycin levels.

3. If this establishment of records has not been accomplished, we suggest that it be done immediately. We will be happy to help on this by issuing a price change authorization if you will bring back from Venezuela the attached penciled product price schedule listing theoretical prices for Matromycin 250 capsules x 12's and 100's.

4. The matromycin capsules 250 x 100's is at the levels of Terramycin and we will propose Rafael's prices for this dosage form. On the other hand, the pack of 12's appears to be more closely priced with the Terramycin. 250 x 16's than the 8's.

Price per gram

	Proposed matromycin 12's	Terramycin	
		8's	16's
Public price	5.666	6.125	5.50
List price	4.333	4.75	4.25
To retailer	40.73	4.465	3.995
To wholesaler	3.466	3.80	3.40

It would appear that Matromycin 12's should have a list price of 4.50 per gram which we hope results in a price to the wholesaler of about 3.60. If Mr. Silva agrees to this per gram price, will you please bring back with you product price schedules establishing these prices.

We trust that this explanation will permit you to discuss the subject with Mr. Silva and that the local market prices can be established promptly upon your return to New York. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

J. T. SMART.

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

NOVEMBER 9, 1957.

Mr. J. T. SMART—New York
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA—Caracas
Mr. J. FRANCO
Mr. M. C. HOUGH
Mr. N. A. MORTON

Personal—family relations.

Reference is made herein to your NY-VEN-29 of October 11, 1957 and to your NY-VEN-30 of October 30, 1957, plus to the one you gave to Tully dated October 14, 1957.

Attached hereto you'll find the following papers:

(a) VEN-20-A, wherein the two list prices set forth we believe have an accurate correlation on a gram-per-gram basis, with the exception of the minor rounding off to comply with the peculiarities, already known to you, of the Venezuelan currency when it comes to figures of less than Bs0.05, such fractions being uncollectable.

(b) VEN-140, where we raise hell and make MATCI follow the corresponding terra party line. I'm sorry to say that we're in disagreement with your October 14, 1957, memo to Tully; we are using a list price of the Bs13.25 owing to the fact that (speaking of list prices only), terra caps 250 mgm. 8's being Bs9.50 and 16s being Bs17.00, 8 plus 16 being 24, and Bs9.50 plus Bs17.00 adding up to Bs26.50, so if 12 is one-half of 24 likewise Bs13.25 is one-half of Bs26.50.

(c) VEN-20-B, wherein we use a list price of Bs199.70 because terra caps 250 mgm. 100's are Bs90.00, and matro caps 250 mgm. are Bs13.25, the ratio being 14.72 percent, so Bs29.40 (please see VEN-20-A) is the 14.72 percent of 199.70.

(d) VEN-141, wherein we again raise hell, and make matro caps 250 mgm. 100's follow the corresponding terra party line.

I hope these preschedules throw a reasonable amount of peace into the MATCI & Co. family relations.

Cordially,

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

P.S. I know your electric calculator is like a machinegun in your capable hands. When verifying the figures given in the above said preschedule, please bear in mind the fact that, whenever we had to set forth a local external price, some rounding off had to be made when necessary in order to make the corresponding figures fully collectable as indicated above.

P.P.S. With reference to your NY-VEN-30, we hope that these preschedules will reach you in time to be used, if OK with you, in connection with the first trip to Caracas of MATCI & Co. Thank you.

PRODUCT PRICE SCHEDULE

Venezuela, October 14. Matro 250 mg. 12's.

List price:
Present Pfizer schedule, $30.
Present competitive schedule, $13.50.
Remarks: Impossible to sell at these prices. Must be in line with Lena, etc.

A product price schedule in duplicate must accompany all requests for price revisions.

PRODUCT PRICE SCHEDULE

Venezuela, June 12, 1957. Matro 259 mg. 12's.

List price:
Present Pfizer schedule, $30.
Present competitive schedule, $23.50.

A product price schedule in duplicate must accompany all requests for price revisions.

[RNS-1745]

MAY 19, 1959.

Re Venezuelan pricing situation.

Mr. W. J. DONOHUE,
Mexico.
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas.
Mr. M. C. HOUGH,
Mr. C. G. HURLIMANN,
PAUL P. MCDERMOTT, Esq.
Mr. F. P. WILSON.

I have received today your cable reading as follows:

"Silva if U.S. Government representative requests info as to our products advise New York McDermott by cable and forward request direct New York McDermott."

This morning too I had the opportunity to basically discuss over the phone the same problem with Conrad and Houghie.

As of this moment (for the situation is very fluid), the whole thing could be summed up in this manner:

(a) Definitely the question of medicinal prices continues to be a political football of great importance, definitely the Government continues to investigate back and forth, and definitely something is bound to happen.

(b) Up to the present, other than the requirement enacted late last year to the effect that each package of finished pharmaceuticals for human use should carry stamped on the outside the public price, no concrete measure has been taken save for the fact that price authorization requests filed with the Ministry of Development in connection with human pharmaceuticals have not been approved yet. I am not referring to Pfizer for fortunately enough we have not of late experienced the urgent need to file any such requests and, anyway, before doing so, we'd rather wait till we see what is exactly going to happen to those competitors of ours who did already file requests of this nature.

(c) One thing we do know; i.e., that the above requests are not being considered lightly. This simply means that all such requests have prompted the Government to in turn request the applicants to furnish miscellaneous data such as billing prices to Venezuela, complete internal price structures in the country, selling prices in the countries of origin, and billing prices to other Latin American countries as well with apparent emphasis on Mexico and Panama.

(d) We do know also that the Venezuelan Government is asking the local legations/embassies of the respective countries of origin for data re billing prices to Venezuela, various selling price levels in the countries of origin and billing prices to other Latin American countries.

(e) If we are locally approached by the U.S. Embassy in connection with what the previous paragraph refers to, we shall play dumb turning over to Paul in New York the case as per your wireless instructions, something we wholeheartedly agree with.

(f) With reference to the previous paragraph, upon comparing our human antibiotic billing prices to Venezuela with Pfizer's billing prices to domestic wholesalers and with Lederle's (I don't have Pfizer's) billing prices to the U.S. Government, it seems to me that said Pfizer billing prices to Venezuela are the lowest of the three. This is, as you know, an excellent argument insofar as Venezuela is concerned, but, may I humbly raise the question, should Pfizer put any U.S. Government official in the know to the effect that our billing prices to Venezuela are lower than our selling prices to the U.S. Government? As far as we locally are concerned I don't think the disclosure of this information is essential in connection with the local Venezuelan pricing problem.

(g) Nobody but nobody, I think, is in a position to say what is exactly going to happen here except that something is going to happen. One very likely probability is that we would be forced to sell directly to retailers at our current prices to wholesalers, thus bringing about a reduction of public prices while keeping the retailer's profit margin within constrained limits.

(h) I don't know to what extent this recommendation may be welcome, but, just the same, I should like to suggest that, if the New York headquarters are approached there in connection with the Venezuelan case, we here be confidentially informed as to what the reply is going to be like in case we here again were in a position to make helpful comments which would make it easier for the New York headquarters to go ahead in a safer fashion in dealing with such a delicate situation which is fraught with im/complications.

Needless to say, if and when any major development should take place here, we would advise headquarters without delay. Incidentally, as I told Conrad this morning over the phone, this continuing unsettled situation coupled with pertinent factors unrelated to pricing has caused us to temporarily postpone making in writing a pretty final proposal with reference to the investment project for Venezuela that Conrad and Houghie looked into on the occasion of their last visit to Caracas recently.

With kindest regards.

Rafael Nicanor Silva.

P.S.: With reference to paragraph (f), it would be a lot safer to bring out the reality that the prices to the public (Government approved) in Venezuela, of the majority of our finished human pharmaceuticals, are lower than the respective prices to the public in the U.S.A. (the country of origin). Thank you.

June 18, 1959.

Pfizersub,
New York (U.S.A.):

McDermott Embassy representative came today requesting data. Please refer memo RNS1745 May 19th, addressed Donohue, copy yourself as info wanted was meager and publicly known, see no reason for alarm, writing details.

Regards,

Rafael.

[RNS-1796]

June 22, 1959.

Paul P. McDermott, Esq.,
New York.
Rafael Nicanor Silva,
Caracas.

Re request for data.

On 6-18-59 I wired you the following message:

"McDermott Embassy representative came today requesting data, please refer memo RNS1745 May 19th, addressed Donohue copy yourself as info wanted was meager and publicly known, see no reason for alarm, writing details. Regards."

What actually happened was that Mr. Eldon Joseph Cassoday phoned me on 6-17-59 saying that he, as First Secretary to the U.S. Embassy here and as the person in charge of commercial affairs, would appreciate my receiving his Assistant, Mr. Russell Edward Olson, a Third Secretary, who had been detailed to look me up to obtain certain commercial data.

Not knowing what the score was, I welcomed Mr. Olson the following day, who explained to me that the Department of Commerce, at the request of the U.S. Congress, was gathering certain data abroad with regard to drug prices.

Specifically, Mr. Olson wanted to know about the following:

(a) If the Pfizer products sold in Venezuela were manufactured within the country. He already knew that they weren't and I simply confirmed verbally this publicly known fact.

(b) If said products were distributed in Venezuela by Pfizer Corp., to which he obviously already knew the answer.

(c) If, in connection with a listing of a rather small group of pharmaceutical dosage forms for human use (including some of Pfizer such as terramycin capsules 250 16s, same for tetracyn, moderil tabs, and diabinese tabs) were retailed at the prices established by decree of the Ministry of Development late last year. He too did know the answer except for moderil and diabinese which he couldn't locate at any drugstore and I simply told him that they were not available in Venezuela.

(d) He sort of wanted to know what were the prices at which the retailers would buy human pharmaceuticals in general and I kind of insinuated to him that said prices would vary somewhat depending upon the relationship between a given retailer and a given wholesaler, etc., but he understood that on the whole a retailer makes a 30 percent markup, something which is inaccurate because below the respective purchase price the retailers enjoy certain discounts including from us.

(e) He wanted to know who sold a few items that he could not locate here from U.S. manufacturer such as Chlorpromazine (this one, for instance, is sold in Venezuela from French origin only) and I helped him out with explanations in this respect.

In a nutshell, his visit was basically of a chatty nature, he impressed me as a young man bored with the factfinding he was entrusted with, and as someone who had already been given the runaround, also, by other people he had previously interviewed without his actually getting to the core of the matter.

I was quite mindful of the instructions given me by cable from Mexico by Bill Donohue to the effect that all such requests for data should be referred to your good self. I am sure that you will agree with me that in view of the meagerness of the information Mr. Olson wanted and in view as well of the fact that he was already in possession of the general data, publicly known, described above, it might, if anything, have produced adverse results if I would have refused in an outright manner to discuss the matter with him at all.

Please rest assured that if these people want to secure price lists from us, or information about costs and f.a.s. values, etc., I shall diplomatically remain mum while referring the case to your office.

With kindest regards,

Rafael Nicanor Silva.

Venezuelan Pricing Situation

[Strictly personal and confidential]

August 14, 1959.

RNS-1890
Mr. Conrad G. Hurlimann,
Mr. M. C. Hough,
Mexico
Rafael Nicanor Silva,
Caracas.

I ain't going to pull any punches in this memo as this is the only way I can give you (and New York through Conrad) a picture clear enough on the above subject. Naturally, you and Conrad may even wish to destroy this piece of correspondence for obvious reasons.

BACKGROUND

Back in 1944 drug prices were frozen at the retail level; it was also established (no provisions were made re locally made items) about new pharmaceutical dosage forms that would thereafter be imported into Venezuela, the importer could make a 25 percent markup over his warehouse costs (C.i.f. and landing charges and transportation from port of entry to warehouse) when selling to the wholesaler, the latter 15 percent when selling to the retailer and this one 30 percent when selling to the consumer; no provisions were made as to what should be the case when the importer would sell directly to the retailer. In 1952 antibiotic preparations were regulated on a special basis, i.e., the same as above except that the markup levels were set at 12, 10, and 15 percent respectively. These regulations had fallen into disuse and the wholesalers and the retailers were having a somewhat merry time, but, said regulations have never been revoked, and, therefore, legally they continued to be very much mandatory. One firm acted very wisely, and that was Biogen (the Lederle distributors) that, in connection with the Lederle products, made up price structures so that their selling prices to wholesalers were basically tagged at the 25 or 12 percent markup depending upon whether the items involved were nonantibiotic ones or not. When I came here with Pfizer in 1956, I found out that we were completely ignoring such regulations; in the spring of 1957, practically over the dead body of Price-Waterhouse and against the reluctance of some New York executives, I proposed and obtained that billing prices to Venezuela be revised to conform with the above regulations and we made accounting adjustments so that we would appear to be good boys retroactively to December 1, 1956. During the past few years a very strong boisterous campaign has been conducted against the pharmaceutical industry in Venezuela, accusing the trade of making outrageous profits, when making and/or selling drugs at all levels. The background of this campaign, which I have—I believe—described to you people before, is outlined in the attached aide-mémoire which I'll explain about hereinafter. Late in 1958 we all importers and local manufacturers were asked by the Ministry of Development to submit a listing of our prices to retailers, something which we did ignoring the confidential discounts generally in use throughout this market, and on this basis the Director of Commerce of the Ministry of Development made it compulsory that human pharmaceuticals should carry stamped on each package the respective prices to the public which were arrived at, in most instances, by allowing the retailer a 30 percent markup over the price levels by us submitted.

Meanwhile too the same Ministry of Development has been conducting an exhaustive investigation of the drug prices in general, initially with particular emphasis on human antibiotic preparations. Legal opinion is to the effect, unanimously so, that the Ministry of Development has the power to request from us any type of local data that may be wanted; consequently we have had to turn in many kinds of information on landing and operational costs, etc. AFIDRO, the national association of pharmaceutical manufacturers and distributors—we are one of its members—has been most helpful in trying to help solve the situation in a manner that we would come out not too badly beaten. The Ministry of Development is under very strong pressure on the part of socialistic-minded M.D.'s of Sanidad, of the Seguro Social, of the Venezuelan Medical Federation and others. I have been of late acting as chairman of a 4-man committee appointed by AFIDRO to discuss with Fomento the whole problem; furthermore, I have been leaving of late, in consideration of the seriousness of the situation, no stone unturned (please excuse my apparently praising myself) and I have taken the initiative of making a series of contacts, of propitiating a series of private agreements within the trade, etc. The brdspctrm importers (only Lederle and Pfizer have consistently been complying with the 12-percent antibiotic markup; Bristol, at my suggestion, took advantage of their setting up their branch here to do likewise) agreed to give Fomento warehouse costs at certain levels, Lederle's being the highest and Lepetit the lowest. Many a cloakish approach has been made taking advantage of personal and/or official means of contacting the people involved in both sides. Mr. John E. Finch (Squibb's manager here) and myself took the matter up with the commercial attaché of the U.S. Embassy who, much to our surprise, said that the Embassy had poor contacts with Fomento (imagine this * * * Fomento controls protection to the local industry, import licenses, prices and other basic functions of economic nature), that the Embassy would prefer to wait till the blow would take place before taking any action; please be assured that Mr. Finch and myself were most careful about what we said to that Embassy official. To go on record as having pointed out to the Embassy that this situation is nothing to laugh about, I have sent, with just my card clipped onto it, the attached aide-mémoire (unsigned and on plain paper) to the commercial attaché and to the Ambassador himself. AFIDRO, inasmuch as it seems that the issuance of a decree on human antibiotic prices is only a few days away, voted in favor of my proposal that AFIDRO, upon finding out that the Government no longer wishes to discuss the matter with the industry, should go on record too by sending a white paper official letter to the Minister of Development outlining the problem, outlining the gist of what has transpired in conversations held between AFIDRO and the Government, and going down on record as to what the consequences would be if the Government does what apparently it is going to do; I have been appointed one of the three members whose responsibility will be early next week to draft the communication in question.

FUTURE

The governmental decree in the making—I found out this morning through a close friend of the incumbent Director of Commerce at Fomento—will establish new retail prices for all imported human antibiotic preparations presently in the market. They are going to apparently use a formula to arrive at said prices by computing over the individual warehouse costs a 20-percent markup for the importer, a 20-percent one for the wholesaler and a 30-percent one for the retailer; this formula, however, will not be made public. If the formula would lead to a higher retail price for a given product of a given firm than the one presently authorized since late in 1960, then the retail price will not be changed. If the formula, on the other hand, gives a lower retail price, then this one will be adopted.

The consequences are likely to be the following:

(a) The Lederle and Pfizer retail prices would be the same as now. In all likelihood the same would apply to Bristol and Squibb.

(b) The Lepetit and Hoochst retail prices are in all probability going to be much lower.

(c) The national industry (Venezuelan and foreign-owned alike) could not manufacture locally the respective products at a cost that would permit matching the lowest retail prices of the respective imported equivalents. The Government, on the other hand, could not give protection to the national industry re those items because it would result in costly drugs.

(d) Pfizer, Lederle, and other American houses would then face a puzzling sitation. If we go down to the lowest competitive levels, how could we explain then our previously submitted costs? And how could we afford to have from the States billing prices much lower than the ones used stateside with the U.S. Government? If we don't go down, how can we sell? Maybe the solution might be, as suggested recently here in Caracas by two visiting Squibb executives, that of dumping into Venezuela products made in Italy, Japan, or some other low-cost country. As for local production, many factors would have to be considered, in the light of the present situation and in the light particularly of what is about to happen, before one could say that that is the solution.

(e) Prices to the Government, presently not under discussion, are likely to sharply go down accordingly.

(f) The wholesalers and retailers are likely to quarrel with us over who makes what and on what, as the Government is apparently not going to say anything other than fixing retail ceilings.

(g) As a period of grace during which to make the price adjustments is apparently going to be granted, sales are likely to go down and our customers are likely to attempt to return to us higher priced units.

The Venezuelan Government is investigating billing prices of foreign firms to other countries. In this respect Ecuador appears to gloomily loom on the horizon, as Lepetit is selling the Ecuadorian Government, c.i.f. Guayaquil, in U.S. dollar values, tetracycline, 259 mgm. capsules 100's at $15.10, 100 mgm., IM at $.49 and 250 mgm., IV at $1.05. Our Government is investigating antibiotic prices in Chile and in Colombia. Our Government feels on the other hand, that Cuba should not be taken into consideration as prices there were forced down dictatorially.

So, Houghie, goes the story. I have omitted many a detail so as to try to get this memo out today. I am afraid, though, that before long we might have to revise the 1960 Venezuelan budget.

With kindest regards,

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

AIDE-MEMOIRE

The Venezuelan Government, through the Director de Comercio of the Ministerio de Fomento, seems to be about to take pretty drastic steps re prices to the public and to pharmaceutical wholesalers and retailers in connection with antibiotic preparations for human use.

The background is as follows. There has been in this market a very active, boisterous, and effective public relations campaign, chiefly through the press, quietly drummed up by a socialistic-minded, very influential physician in governmental and medical circles, Dr. Armando Castillo-Plaza, presently the Director de Asuntos Socialos of the Ministry of Health and Public Welfare, who is a disgruntled former employee of the local distributors of Lederle Laboratories. Dr. Castillo has in the past, through the Venezuelan Medical Federation, tried to exact outrageous tributes from the pharmaceutical trade toward the funds of said professional association. Having failed in his efforts, he is trying to cause the Venezuelan Government to establish a national laboratory to monopolize the supply of pharmaceutical products in general as much as possible that governmental entities, including the social security, consume in very appreciable quantities, and to eventually sell such products through regular trade channels as well. At present, these efforts seem to run in the direction of the creation of a National Institute of Antibiotics, taking advantage of the fact that narrow-spectrum antibiotics (penicillin and streptomycin in particular) are cheaply available in bulk from Western European sources and that broad-spectrum antibiotics (tetracyclines in particular) are also cheaply available in bulk from sources behind the Iron Curtain in violation of U.S. patents that would be very difficult to enforce in Venezuela if the Government itself would become involved in this type of trade. As it would be probably impossible, for a number of reasons, to directly come out and practically put the entire pharmaceutical manufacture and commerce in the hands of a Government-owned-and-run monopoly, efforts are being made in a different direction but that would in the end lead to the same destination. This is how. The Ministry of Development has been conducting a drug price investigation chiefly with reference to the importers and distributors of antibiotics for use in human medicine, said investigation and the resulting measures to be gradually broadened to cover all drugs brought into the country. Owing to requests that may not be legally unheeded, the respective firms have had to supply all kinds of data to Fomento including income tax returns, importation costs and whatnot. The Government is apparently planning to issue very shortly a decree allowing each importer of human antibiotic products a very limited markup only. This measure would, if enacted, make it impossible for the respective products of U.S. origin to be sold in Venezuela, as there are a number of factors that enter into the picture. One such factor is that most such antibiotics, Fomento knows, do have European equivalents that are being brought into and sold in Venezuela on the basis of very low warehouse costs; true, presently the respective importers from European sources do sell such products here at prices roughly equivalent to the American ones in this market, but if the price regulation is to be based upon equal markups, percentagewise, then the American firms would be unable to operate in this field of human antibiotic products, with the exception of some such products for which there are no European equivalents and that accounts for only a very small share of this particular business field.

It is suggested that the U.S. Embassy would, in an unofficial, casual, private and friendly manner, bring to the attention of the respective Venezuelan Government officials the impact which the contemplated measure about to be enacted would have upon the U.S. pharmaceutical industry operations in Venezuela. Several points could be brought forth such as the fact that retail prices of U.S. antibiotic preparations for human use are generally lower in this country than they are in the U.S.A. owing to price control regulations in existence in Venezuela since World War II times; the respective U.S. manufacturers bill said drugs to Venezuela at prices basically similar to the billing prices applicable to the U.S. wholesalers, and these antibiotic products coming into Venezuela duty free in most instances and being of light weight, and the Venezuelan wholesalers and retailers having limited markups, this is why said retail prices tend to be lower here than in the U.S.A. Another factor to consider is that the U.S. drug firms are making tremendous contributions to the welfare of mankind through costly and well-directed research work—the local officials seem to shrug off this matter. A good point too is that U.S. firms make some other products available at no profit and even at a loss for good will reasons and because such products are essential for the practice of medicine.

Governments of other Latin American countries, such as has been recently the case of Mexico, have tackled the problem of the high cost of drugs through friendly conversations with the industry, and have not adopted, Cuba being the exception, steps that, one way or the other, would be discriminatory against the American interests.

Once the Venezuelan Government would come forth with a new measure, it would be difficult for said measure to be rectified. Moreover, if what appears to be in the making takes place, the local pharmaceutical industry, regardless of who owns what, would be unable to manufacture to any extent the respective products in the country because of the local production costs being higher for a number of reasons. This would be a point where, as the Castillo Plaza-headed medical clique aspires, it would be quite easy for the Government to justify the creation of a

Government owned and run pharmaceutical drug lab to make antibiotic preparations and gradually but swiftly broaden its activities into other drug fields.

More data, chiefly about specific detailed ideas and/or names, would gladly be submitted upon request. The main points are, however, that it would be best to take action right now rather than later, and that, should the contemplated measure be enacted as expected, this would constitute a heavy blow to the U.S. pharmaceutical international trade not only in Venezuela but with international repercussions as well, mainly in other Latin American countries. Furthermore, if the U.S. pharmaceutical firms are forced, for economic reasons, to withdraw to a large extent from the Venezuelan market, publicly they would be considered as doing something detrimental to the welfare of the country, etc.

Respectfully submitted.

CARACAS, *August 13, 1959*.

[Private and confidential]

CARACAS, *August 7, 1959*.

Mr. H. F. BLISS,
Cyanamid International,
30 Rockefeller Plaza,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR HARRY: I wish to inform you about the latest developments as to the price regulation which is being proposed by the Dirección de Comercio (Commerce Secretary) of the Ministry of Development.

On Saturday, August 1, Dr. Thula Campos, Secretary of Commerce, called a meeting of the members of the board of AFIDRO (laboratory association). This meeting I was unable to attend. There Dr. Thula Campos informed them that he would not only address them as Secretary of Commerce and Assistant to the Minister but also under precise instructions from the President of the Republic. That it had been decided to make a drastic reduction of the prices of medicines because the Government considered, after having studied the reports submitted by the laboratories, that there definitely existed speculation. This regulation would commence with the imported antibiotics and vitamin products (among which are antianemics, geriatrics, etc.). But, that at the same time the Government was willing to reduce the cost of living of the population, it did not want to damage the pharmaceutical business and therefore suggested to the Directors of AFIDRO that they propose to the Secretariat of Commerce the percentages with which the prices to the public should be reduced.

In the case that AFIDRO should not propose a substantial reduction in antibiotics and vitamins, there would be proceeded with a drastic and immediate regulation of all medicines.

As an outcome of these words by the Secretary of Commerce, a meeting of the members of AFIDRO was held Tuesday 4th inst. wherein the president of the association reported on the happenings and proposed to the assembly that they consider the alternatives put forth by Dr. Thula Campos. In this meeting the majority voted for a price regulation of imported antibiotics and vitamins. Unfortunately the representatives of Pfizer, Hoechst, and Lepetit did not attend the meeting. The representative for Squibb, an American newly arrived in Venezuela who speaks very little Spanish, voted against his own interests, which he realized after the meeting was over. Only the representative of Bristol and myself voted against a regulation of the antibiotics. Although the vote was 2 against 26 I managed to get the voting annulled arguing that it was an intervention of foreign companies in our enterprise and that I was not willing to accept even if I had to resign my place as director and founding member of that association. At the same time I suggested that AFIDRO accept a 10-percent regulation on the retail price of all medicinal products sold in the country which total amount is calculated at Bs450 million annually. Furthermore, that it also be suggested to the Ministry of Development the no intervention in the price scale and discounts which we grant in the different distribution channels, that the frozen-price decree passed last October be repealed and that starting from this new price-regulation order, the price to the public be fixed annually according to the index of cost of living which the Banco Central de Venezuela publishes in its annual report.

The majority of the importing firms were in accordance with this proposal, however, not so the national laboratories. In view of this a final decision was postponed to a new meeting which will be held this afternoon.

Yesterday morning I was called to the Secretariat of Commerce were I was met by Dr. Thula Campos and he informed me that he knew that North American manufacturers were very smart and that they had prepared themselves by modifying invoices to make ineffective any action which the Venezuelan Government might take, wherefore he considered false the information on the price of antibiotics submitted by Laboratorios Biogen. As you know some days ago we handed that office all the details of costs, cost of importation, orders to you, etc., on the antibiotics. Dr. Thula Campos added, that the costs submitted by us were too high, that he was sending a representative of the Government of Venezuela to the United States to verify these costs and that if his doubts were confirmed I would have to face a Bs200,000 fine plus a jail sentence. To such strong words I replied with like firmness until achieving that this person adopt a more reasonable attitude.

This interview or inquisition lasted 3 hours and from it I reached the following conclusions:

1. The Secretariat of Commerce does not accept a 10-percent reduction on the price to the public, although this means a yearly savings to the consumer of Bs 45 million, that is, a sum far above that of the total sales of tetracyclins in Venezuela.

2. Dr. Thula Campos considers that any price reduction of the tetracyclins less than 30 percent on the retail price would not be accepted by that office.

3. They showed me the cost index's presented by our competitors. Among them there is one which makes a 60-percent benefit above cost, but unfortunately I was unable to read his name (see letter of Mr. R. Pagan Torres dated July 7, 1959).

4. The Secretariat of Commerce will proceed, after decreeing the regulation of the price of antibiotics with the vitamins, and so on successively with all imported products.

5. The possibility of avoiding any reduction exists only with the locally made products.

That same afternoon the representatives of tetracyclins, whom I had called, met in my office, with the purpse of discussing the developments of the meeting of AFIDRO on the 4th inst., and to reach a unanimous proposition on our part, seeing as we are the most affected. Present at this meeting were Dr. Silva, of Pfizer, Dr. Finch, of Squibb, Messrs. Rubio and Ayala, of Bristol, Mr. Kust, representative of Remedia, which represents Hoechst and who excused himself for not having the authority to take any decision, Dr. Mason representative of Lepetit did not come to the meeting.

There we decided not to accept in this afternoon's meeting that the firms which do not represent tetracyclins intervene or give their opinion as to the regulation of these products, wherefore this meeting is of no consequence to the facts of this letter. In this meeting, also, I informed them of those points I considered prudent they should know about my meeting with Dr. Thula Campos. It is obvious that only a European manufacturer could have such benefits and so it was acknowledged by the American manufacturers present.

If the regulation which Dr. Thula Campos wishes to make with a rebate of 30 percent on the retail price is carried out, the price scale of acromycin on this market would be as follows (on the basis of the 250 mg. bottle x 16 capsules):

Retail price	Bs16.10
Pharmacy price	12.38
Wholesale price	9.90

In view of this Mr. French of Squibb said that naturally this wholesale price of Bs9.90 would be below the cost of the American manufacturers, that Squibb is not willing to give this market to the European manufacturers and as they will soon finish their manufacturing plant in Japan, where costs are below even those of Europe, he would possibly receive tetracyclins from that country.

Now I wish to underline that we have presented our costs based on the f.a.s. price of $4.04 which is the price at which Lederle sells to all the countries of the world. So I demonstrated it to Dr. Thula Campos in my interview with him, showing the list of prices of the representatives and distributors of Lederle in Latin America, invoices of Cyanamid Inter-American to oil companies which operate in Venezuela and invoices of Cyanamid Great Britain, Ltd., to Sheel Petroleum Corp., for use in Venezuela. I do not know whom the representative of the Venezuelan Government is going to get in touch with, or whether he is leaving or has left for the United States. Naturally he will pay a visit to Lederle, where I hope you will be able to prove that our prices are $4.04 f.a.s. (on the basis of the 250-mg. bottle by 16 capsules). As to this the ball is in your court.

Here it is now very little what we can do. Next week my father and I shall call on the Minister of Development to complain about the attitude of his Secretary of Commerce and try once more to warn him as to the consequences which such regulation as that which this gentleman is trying to carry out, informing him that contrary to the rest of the Latin American countries where regulations have been carried out of late, specifically in the case of Mexico last week, where it is only intended to equal the prices to those of the American domestic market, here where the prices are much less, the intentions are to make the manufacturing and distributing firms lose money.

I understand that the price scale in the United States on the basis of the 250x16 bottle is the following:

Retail price	$8.50
Pharmacy price	5.10
Wholesale price	4.25

I consider it would be convenient to our mutual interests that you send me immediately by air mail a product description catalog and a salesman product and package manual, which I understand include the whole scale of prices for the domestic market.

I take this opportunity to urge once more to send us the information for the manufacture of your products in Venezuela. My correspondance on this subject has not been replied to, although I well know that the New York office has the best of intentions and wishes in this respect, it seems that Pearl River does not send the necessary information to New York. If we at this date had been manufacturing the products here we would have nothing to fear as to price regulation of pharmaceutical products.

With my best regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

LABORATORIOS BIOGEN, O. A.
LUIS H. BALL M.

VENEZUELAN PRICING SITUATION

[Strictly Personal and Confidential]

RNS–1893.

AUGUST 17, 1959.

Mr. CONRAD G. HURLIMANN,
Mr. M. C. HOUGH,
Mexico.
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas.

Further to my memo RNS–1890 of 8–14–59, I should like to make the following comments:

1. Said memo was written in very great haste. Therefore, please excuse some transcription errors such as "likehood" instead of "likelihood."

2. As you know it already, we, the brdspctrm importers, got together when Fomento was inquiring about our warehouse costs, and exchanged information as to the respective billing prices from abroad taking as a basis 250 mgm. caps 16's. Biogen was the highest at US$4.04 although it's quite possible that part of the confidential commissions and allowances Biogen receives, this outfit may enter into the local books a 10 percent commission from ACCO which would bring down that price to about US$3.64. Next were Pfizer & Bristol averaging US$3.40, this value being the correct one from the point of view of the local selling prices and the markups allowed by the price regulations presently in effect. Hoechst was at about US$2.80 and Lepetit at about US$2.66, Squibb being in the order of US$4.32 (this last figure, though, applies to the tetracycline-nystatin combination which is sold at a premium here). It was agreed that Lepetit and Hoechst would maneuver the matter so that their costs would be declared as being more or less equal to the Bristol/Pfizer level

Two things then happened. Luis Henrique Ball, of Biogen, was called in by the Director of Commerce who threatened Luis Henrique with jail and a fine of Bs200,000 for allegedly giving the Government false information. Luis Henrique, fortunately, and because of the consistent pricing policies of ACCO specially with regard to brdspctrm items, was well equipped with all kinds of supporting documents, including domestic and international ACCO price lists, copies of ACCO invoices to innumerable countries, etc., with which documents he was able to show that his costs were real ones. He even invited the Director of Commerce to have someone examine the Biogen books and to have someone also go up to New York and examine ACCO billing documents there. The Lepetit case was an entirely different one; to begin with I understand that the Lepetit plant in Milano is being moved for which reason this firm was incapacitated till October to effect quick shipments to Venezuela at higher billing levels so that the local people would have complete evidence including that of the respective shipping documents. The local Lepetit distributor, being a former prison fellow (for political reasons) of the incumbent Director of Commerce, was able to get by with incomplete evidence but, in order to keep Fomento from growing too suspicious about his costs, decided to declare costs at about 10 percent or so lower than the Bristol/Pfizer ones.

Fomento, in the face of the cost discrepancies existing in the information presented by the various importers, took the cunning decision outlined in the first paragraph of page 3 of RNS–1890.

3. Now then, as I tried to outline it in RNS–1890, the situation is likely to be a very puzzling one.

If we stay at our present f.a.s. levels, we are going to have selling prices higher than the respective European ones. If so, our sales will suffer the impact of the price difference.

If our f.a.s. levels are lowered, then the Venezuelan Government will conclude that there is a cat in the bag with God only knows what results. And, what about the repercussions in the domestic market?

If Pfizer decides that we could get shipments from low-cost countries at lower billing levels, as Messrs. Rehm (from New York) and Ellis (from Mexico) intimated that Squibb would do, what are then going to be the financial repercussions on the general P. & L. of the whole company as this solution might have some implications that escape my limited knowledge of the company's general operational picture?

If we go for local production, what about the respective higher costs in Venezuela, and, what about the respective billing prices from abroad to us re the raw materials? As a matter of fact, the local industry would be unable to make and sell similar products at prices competitive with regard to the respective European ones. The Government could not give tariff/import quota protection, for the Government has foolishly committed itself to lower drug prices.

As you can see, Houghie, there is nothing concrete I might propose at this stage, specially right now that the contemplated decree hasn't come out yet. Furthermore, the fact and figures we would then be in a position to submit on the basis of our local limited knowledge, would have to be analyzed and decided upon with the much broader view that the general Pfizer management has at headquarters about the international operational picture.

In conclusion, we'll have to wait till the expected measure is enacted by the Government. Meanwhile, renewed efforts are being made to prevent said measure from being taken although the consensus of opinion is to the effect that things had gone too far already.

I shall keep you posted, and, if necessary, I shall not hesitate to visit with you in person (with your prior knowledge and consent, of course) if events call for it.

With kindest regards.

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

TENTATIVE REACTION

AUGUST 19, 1959.

RNS–1903.
Mr. CONRAD G. HURLIMANN,
Mr. M. C. HOUGH,
Mexico.
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas:

This is with reference to my memos to you, RNS–1890 and 1893, of which Conrad was sent copies.

It is expected that the Government decree re antibiotics will be issued very shortly. When that happens, we the American houses will get together on a local basis to review the then newly created situation. In all probability we shall also have to meet with our European counterparts and at least with the wholesalers as well. As far as I am concerned, I don't think we shall be able to come to any definite agreements here till the situation is also reviewed and decided upon by our respective home offices, and accordingly I may have to go to Mexico and/or New York for this purpose as my colleagues also plan to do with their respective headquarters.

It would be very helpful, though, if feasible, that you and/or Conrad should want to give me a tentative reaction to RNS–1890/3, because it might give me an idea as to what is the possible course of action that the company might wish to pursue in the future if the expected takes place as hopelessly expected now.

Please refer particularly to (d) on page 3 of RNS–1890 and to 3 of RNS–1893.

With kindest regards.

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

P.S.—If you use garbled, personalized language, I think I'll get the point. Thank you.

PFIZER MEMORANDUM

SEPTEMBER 1, 1959.

To: Mr. R. N. Silva, Caracas.
From: Frank P. Wilson, New York.

We have recently been advised in New York that several changes have taken place within Afidro itself and that the group is now split into three factions—the local labs, the ones with antibiotics as major items, and then those without major antibiotics. Also, that governmental pressure has been brought to bear on the group as a whole indicating that a 30-percent reduction across the board is the Government's objective and that as a counteroffer Afidro has now suggested a 10-percent reduction in major antibiotic prices.

Will you please advise us whether or not this information is correct as we are being queried in New York as to our position and also our intentions as to the future. Since we know neither, it puts us in an embarrassing position.

FRANK P. WILSON.

PFIZER FOREIGN TRADE SUBSIDIARIES, INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

August 25, 1959.

To: Mr. Rafael N. Silva, Venezuela.
From: Mr. M. C. Hough, Mexico.
Subject: Prices.

DEAR RAFAEL: Based upon your various memos concerning the above subject, it appears that there is nothing that can be done at the moment except to await the final decision of the Government. I discussed the matter with Frank Wilson yesterday and he advised me that he has some information from other companies which would seem to indicate that the Government is interested in applying a formula other than that which you have mentioned. We are assuming, however, that your information is more accurate.

If the formula which you mention should be used then it would appear that the decrease in prices to the commerce would be slight, but that because of the competitive situation prices to the Government would come down drastically. With the information which I have at hand it would be my suggestion that we meet competition Government-wise, but to try to obtain a premium on sales of sigmamycin and terramycin to the commerce. We would, of course, have to discuss the feasibility of this idea before putting it into effect, but I would guess that the effect upon prescriptions from consultorios would not be serious if there were slight difference in price between our products and the tetracyclines.

I have asked Frank to write to you and will await further information from you concerning the Government's action. Subsequent discussions on the matter should be held before actually changing our present price structures.

Kindest personal regards.

M. C. HOUGH.

PRICES

AUGUST 31, 1959.

RNS–1932.
Mr. FRANK P. WILSON,
Mr. M. C. HOUGH,
Mexico.
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas.

I have received your courteous memo of August 25, 1959, on the above subject.

Yes, I would very much like to hear from Frank. Needless to say, as indicated before, we would not change our present price structures without fully clearing the matter up with headquarters.

From what you tell me I understand that Frank has received different information through other companies as to the formula that the Venezuelan Government is in all probability going to apply.

My only comment is that whatever information I have passed on to you gentlemen is, to the very best of my knowledge, based upon the fullest appraisal of everything that has been going on here. Recognizing the paramount importance of this matter, I am keeping myself completely abreast of the local developments even though, naturally, we shall not know anything final till the expected decree is actually issued, especially from the point of view of what are going to be the price differentials between the American products and their respective European counterparts. I have nothing further to report on the subject matter at this moment save the fact that the whole Venezuelan pharmaceutical industry and commerce are presently in the state of great anxiety waiting to see what are going to be the real steps that the Government is going to take re antibiotics and the repercussions of such steps. I may also add that one of my friends here, manager of an American pharmaceutical branch in this country, tells me that the reaction he has gotten from his New York headquarters suggests to him that apparently in New York the Venezuelan case has not been completely understood as in all probability some local branch managers and distributors have not accurately told their stateside headquarters what actually has been going on in Venezuela of late.

With kindest regards,

Rafael Nicanor Silva.

[Strictly personal and confidential]

September 3, 1959.

RNS–1947.
Mr. M. C. Hough,
Mr. Frank P. Wilson,
New York.
Rafael Nicanor Silva,
Caracas.

Yours of September 1, 1959.

My reply is the reaffirmation of mine to Houghie with copy to you, RNS–1932 of August 31, 1959.

However, as you probably know, I have sent Conrad copies of certain memos I had written to Houghie already. As AFIDRO groups together local labs, foreign firms with local manufacturing facilities, foreign firms like ourselves that do not manufacture anything locally, and, local distributors of foreign producers, it's only naturally that now and then certain dissensions should take place; furthermore. I did report to the Nola Headquarters last March 18 (RNS–1631), among other things, the "recent formation of an association (chamber) of strictly national pharmaceutical labs * * * of Venezuelan capital only * * * even with the exclusion of local labs that handle foreign lines as well * * * that will fight for the Government to enact laws making compulsory that at least 80 percent of the capital of pharmaceutical labs operating in Venezuela should be in the hands of Venezuelan nationals. * * * We don't think that these extreme steps will succeed but they are an indication of the nationalistic spirit presently infiltrating the country." True, the major group ones—even one non-AFIDRO member—get together to discuss affairs of mutual interest, but, the split you have been told about in New York is not exactly a reality. True, the press and some Government officials have spoken about great price reductions, but, the approach seems to be more in the order of what is described in the first paragraph of page 3 of RNS–1890 (Houghie/Conrad). True, at a given moment during the course of the countless conversations that had taken place between AFIDRO and the Government, it was informally mentioned (on AFIDRO's part) the possibility of a 10-percent reduction at the expense of chiefly the 6-percent discount that retailers in the human field enjoy below the so-called list price. Suggestion that was rejected on the ground that the Government wanted to make a thorough investigation re each product group (as it has been done with antibiotic preparations for human use—see page 2 of RNS–1890) to then consider the taking of more specific action; however, at no time has AFIDRO "suggested a 10-percent reduction in major antibiotic prices."

The expected decree hasn't been issued yet, and RNS–1914 (Houghie/Conrad) may have had something to do with it; nonetheless, the Government is committed to do something. One thing, though, that may happen is that, if the Government does what apparently is going to be done in connection with human antibiotic prices, the repercussions could be so great as to causing the Government—much to the misfortune of U.S. antibiotic producers—to be more cautious in the handling of price control measures relative to other pharmaceuticals.

Cordially,

Rafael Nicanor Silva.

International Pfizer Subsidiaries
Memorandum

September 17, 1959.

To: Dr. R. N. Silva, Caracas.
From: Frank P. Wilson, New York.
Subject: Local Prices.

I appreciate the thoughts reflected in your memo of September 3 and can well understand how the situation can become cloudy and confusing very easily with numerous individuals and companies all striving for different objectives, and some purposely and deliberately muddying the water. We have the above conditions as a permanent hazard in New York, therefore, the following comments are passed on in the sense that they have been received in the above atmosphere.

We understand that, insofar as broad spectrum prices are concerned, the Venezuelan Government has now said to all importers that there will not be any price adjustment required. However, they have copies of previous import prices and expect that these import prices will be the basis of future selling prices, and that the formula percentage buildup over landed costs, distributors margin, wholesaler and retailer markups will be observed. In this respect we will then have a selling price based on our imported cost, and Lepetit and others will have a selling price within the market based on their imported cost. Since their imported costs were substantially lower than ours, we will be forced to sell at a higher price, or in order to negotiate business (particularly with governmental agencies) reduce our prices substantially and thereby the Government will effectively have reduced prices without forcing any company to do so. Is this basically correct?

We have also been advised that governmental purchases will now be based on the application of these markups to the invoice prices which are in the hands of the Government. If this is also factual, we will then in the future not do any business with the Government because our quoting price will be substantially higher than some of our competitors.

Our future looks rosy.

Frank P. Wilson.

Price Control

October 2, 1959.

RNS–2021.
Mr. J. C. Hough,
Mr. Frank P. Wilson,
New York.
Rafael Nicanor Silva,
Caracas:

Thank you for your memo of September 17, 1959. I understand the informational cloudiness in New York and I would like to make some clarifications.

No, it is not true that the Venezuelan Government has said to all importers that there will be no price adjustments required re broad-spectrum antibiotics. Please refer to previous correspondence.

Your assumption at the bottom of the second paragraph of your memo is correct.

No price controls re sales to the Government exist as yet. The only exception to this is that Federal Government entities have to have their purchase orders approved by the Federal Controller's Office; and the rule is that this Office, in connection with a given item, regardless of who sells it, will not approve any purchase orders except at the lowest price that may have been effectively quoted by any supplier. In other words, once in connection with a given product someone goes down pricewise, all suppliers of the same product also have to go down if they want to sell to the Federal Government.

Attached you'll find photostats of interesting local press publications of recent dates in connection with the subject matter.

With kindest regards.

Rafael Nicanor Silva.

Enclosures.

P.S.—Apparently the Ministry of Development is now going to investigate veterinary antibiotic dosage forms. We'll see. Thank you.

[Translation from Spanish]

Caracas, *May 31, 1956.*

(By Telephone)
Bogan,
Cyinteram,
New York:

Manager Hoechst Distributors. At present in Germany. Price situation continues same way as I had reported to you. Writing greetings.

Luis Ball Biogen.
For Biogen Laboratories Co.

[English translation]

LHBM–4154

Caracas,
May 31, 1956.

Mr. E. T. Bogan,
Vice President, Cyanamid Inter-American Corp., Lederle Laboratories Division, 49 West 49th Street, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.

Dear Mr. Bogan: As soon as I returned to Caracas, I informed my father of all the conversations we had about the price problem presented to us by the special discounts of Hoechst and of the possible solution at which we arrived in New York.

I am cabling you today as follows:

"Manager Hoechst Distributors. At present in Germany. Price situation continues same way as I had informed you. Writing greetings."

The assistant to Mr. Hartung, manager of Remedia which distributes the Hoechst products, is not a person with sufficient authority to warrant my discussing this problem with him.

In fact, I have found that our unfavorable position continues just as I left it on my departure to the United States, and I was informed that in May it was again impossible for us to sell a single bottle of acromycin to the Social Security Institute because that institute continues stocking only hestacycline owing to the special conditions which its distributors continue to grant it. My father, as well as Mr. Escendon and Mr. Osorio feel that Hoechst will hardly diminish these special conditions because (otherwise) social security would most certainly stop not only to buy hestacycline but all other products which it has been purchasing from them, especially penicillins, since, as you know, Hoechst is social security's only supplier of this product with whom it maintains a very large volume (business). As you will remember, this argument came up in New York in our conversation about this matter.

So then, the prospects are that our acromycin sales will go down considerably, and, in the long run, the aureomycin sales will also suffer, as it is logical to think that this antibiotic will gradually be replaced by the superiority of tetracycline.

I am sure you will be interested in knowing that many of the U.S. laboratories are in a very difficult situation in Venezuela right now. We have had information to the effect that Pfizer sales continue to drop, that Sharp & Dohme is losing ground more and more, and, in addition to this, as I informed you in person, with reference to Wyeth, its sales had gone down from a monthly average of 360,000 to 100,000 bolivares.

I don't want to close this letter without thanking you again, both you and Mrs. Bogan, for all the courtesies and kindnesses which you so generously bestowed on us during the time Mercedes and I were in New York.

With cordial greetings, I remain, as always.

Very truly yours,

LUIS H. BALL, M.,
Assistant Manager
(For Biogen Laboratories Corp.).

INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

NEW YORK OFFICE,
February 21, 1957.

Attention of: Mr. B. C. Prieto.
Subject: Bulk Prices, Venezuela.

Confirming recent discussions, we submit the following information:

Code No.	Product	"93" price	Unit
0363	Diamox Pd	$194.19	Kilo.
1208	Miltown Pd	107.70	Do.
1846	Sulfadiazine Pd	22.85	Do.
4613-46	Porihemin capsules	27.97	1,000 capsules.
4351-46	Lederplex capsules	13.35	Do.
4245-46	Prenatal capsules	17.16	Do.
4333-46	Vi Magna capsules	16.18	Do.
4127-46	Delphicol capsules	18.48	Do.
3153-01	Ledinac	4.63	Kilo.

Above prices, with the exception of Sulfadiazine powder for which we indicated the fine chemical division's highest price, are "backed off" prices. The backed off price for Sulfadiazine powder contained in tablets is $27.50 per kilo. This should be sold by the fine chemical division.

On Miltown powder we submitted a price based on Carter's selling price of $2.60 per 50 tablets instead of ours to Venezuela of $1.59 for 25 tablets, as the latter will yield a price $114.27 per kilo of powder.

Prices for premixes on Rhinazine and Lederplex liquid will be submitted as soon as Pearl River foreign manufacturing and cost departments supply us with the pertaining technical and cost data.

T. PIAGET.

TM cap 250 mg. 16's.
P. lista (1.F).

P. mayousta (20 percent)	3.40
	13.60
Pto pago (2 percent)	0.2F2
	13.328
Fanu 1F (6 percent)	1.02
	1,598 68

Con prorito pago

Costo	13.328
Venta	15.98
Uhlid (19.90 percent)	2,652

Sin prorito pago

Costo	13.60
Venta	15.98
Uhlid (1F.50 percent)	2.38

JUAN FRANCO M.,
Sub-gerencia.

Hoticina
Grageas:
100 mgs.×72=74.00.
100 mgs.×24=25.00.
100 mgs.×700=96.00.
Grageas:
200 mgs.×12=23.50.
Pediatico:
×60 cc.=14.50.
1×250=9.75.
UT×½ oz.=3.50.
U opt. ⅛ oz.=1.75.
Albamycin:
1 oz. 250=20.60—17.50—15.45.
Cathomycin:
16×250=21.00—2.50.

[Cablegram]

NEW YORK.

Idefra Caracas:

Pit advise reason higher fas your orders samje samfa samdy matag than comparable TM also require local schedules with compet info.

Samje: Sigma 250×8s.
Samfa: Sigma 250×16s.
Samdy: Sigma 250×100s.
Matag: Matro 250×100s.

JM-PD.

[BGP-166]

CYANAMID INTER-AMERICAN CORP.,
LEDERLE LABORATORIES DIVISION,
April 25, 1958.

DR. R. R. BALL,
Laboratories Biogen, C.A.,
Apartado 741, Caracas, Venezuela.

DEAR DR. BALL: After discussing with our management the matter of prices of the products competing with Ledercort in Venezuela, the price FAS of US$5.60 was established for the 30-tablet 4 mg. container, as we informed you in our cable of yesterday which said: "Recable April 21 matter, price Ledercort discussed in detail with Mr. Vogan, Price approved $5.60 FAS. We feel this price will permit offer price to public of 35.75. Writing greetings."

Replying to your cable of April 23, we would like to mention certain points in order to clarify the situation of the Ledercort prices on the different markets.

Before Ledercort was introduced, a study was made of similar products of the competition. That study disclosed that the largest volume of products on the majority of markets was Meticorten, and it was decided to adjust our price as closely as possible to the price of that product.

We find, however, that Meticorten, instead of having equivalent prices on all markets, had very different prices from one market to another. Owing to this, it was necessary in some cases to reduce the price at which we would normally have offered our Ledercort, such as we are doing now in the case of Venezuela.

Later, the problem arose of the entry of Manacort into the market, with which product we must match our prices, since it competes directly with ours.

We trust that the price we have established for Ledercort in Venezuela will enable you to compete on equal terms with the Squibb product.

I would appreciate any comment you would care to make on this particular.

Very truly yours,

B. G. PRIETO,
Territorial Sales Manager.

JULIO 7, 1959.

PAGAN
CYANAMID
SANTURCE
(Puerto Rico):

Fracasso tuvo exito cinco centavos baja Bristol.

LUIS.

Es auténtico:
por Laboratorios Biogen, C.A.
VICTORIA ACOSTA D.

Lt. BIOGEN CARACAS:

Prensa ee uu ayer publico primera plana articulo de cargo de monopolio y fijáron precios hecho por gobierno ee uu a 6 principales companias drogas incluyendo cyanamid punto si prensa su pais les interroga o da mucha publicidad este articulo tenemos declaración hecha por.

DR. MALCOLM REFUTANDO,
Los Cargos.

Punto favor cablegrafiarme si creen conveniente publicar declaracion punto hagan ninguna declaracion sin previa aprobacion, New York, punto.

ROLAND.

FECHAS DE REUNIONES DE FABRICANTES Y DISTRIBUIDORES DE TETRACICLINA PARA CONVENIR PRECIOS

17 de setiembre de 1956.
26 de setiembre de 1956.
4 de febrero de 1957.
8 de mayo de 1957.
10 de mayo de 1957.
14 de mayo de 1957.
15 de mayo de 1958.
2 de julio de 1958.
20 de agosto de 1958.
25 de junio de 1959.
2 de julio de 1959.
3 de julio de 1959.
13 de julio de 1959.
3 de febrero de 1960.
5 de febrero de 1960.
22 de febrero de 1960.
25 de marzo de 1960.
28 de marzo de 1960.
31 de marzo de 1960.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HART. I congratulate the Senator from Louisiana for performing a valuable public service by calling our attention to what appears to be a highly questionable practice in the worldwide sale of broad-spectrum antibiotics. I believe it is reading that all of us should engage in in the next few days. I hope that the record made here this afternoon will be the subject of thoughtful consideration by all of us.

While much of the evidence which the Senator cites comes from past hearings of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, many of the facts he reports shed further light on the problem and raise a serious question whether there is, as he suggests, a worldwide cartel among drug manufacturers to fix the price of wonder drugs at identical and excessive amounts.

The facts set forth by the Senator and the allegations he has made are extremely serious and are of great interest to me as chairman of the Antitrust Subcommittee. For years this subcommittee has been concerned with problems of monopoly in the drug industry. We have also been actively concerned with international business practices that may be monopolistic in nature. Indeed this year the subcommittee plans extensive hearings on foreign trade and the antitrust laws. For my part I have been concerned with prices of drugs and with the cost of medical care. Our hearings have caused me to introduce legislation that would help reduce the cost of medical care by forbidding doctors to profit from the sale of goods they dispense—S. 2568.

Our past interest in drug prices and in questions of monopoly in the drug industry, however, in no way reduce the importance of the material offered today by the Senator from Louisiana. He has placed the problem in a larger, international perspective. The facts he recites strongly suggest that a world cartel may exist. This may help explain even more adequately why drug manufacturers have traditionally sold drugs at identical prices in countries throughout the world.

The issues to which the Senator has directed our attention are, of course, complex. But they deserve careful study for the likelihood of antitrust violation is great. As the Wall Street Journal reports today—February 10—the Justice Department is investigating certain aspects of international trade in the sale of drugs by American companies. It has issued a number of civil investigative demands as part of its inquiry, partly in response to an earlier investigation by the Antitrust Subcommittee. Thus, we await the outcome of the Department's investigation. However, I can assure the Senator that the facts he has produced are of great interest to me. We will examine them closely to determine whether the subcommittee should take any further action of its own.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan. As the Senator knows, it is no particular fun in exposing these corrupt business practices. These corporations have executives who are fine men and highly regarded people. None of us likes to be the man who insists on exposing these kinds of activities. But when poor people are made to pay from 20 to 100 times what they ought to have to pay for medicine, not only in this country but all over the world—poor people who have to pay more for medicine than they make in a month in some of these unfortunate countries—it is time that someone called a halt.

We must do something about it. I am certain that we shall have occasion to discuss the subject later.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HART. Especially would I hope that we give some thought to the comments which the Senator has just made with respect to the generic-name prescriptions. There is much else in the speech but this is a sensitive nerve in the ethical drug-producer field. They jump up and insist that to change the generic prescription would be running the risk of exposing a patient to substandard unsafe drugs.

The Kefauver bill responded to that problem up to a point. It assures that there will not be produced and marketed in this country a drug that does not meet standards and open wide the doors of every producer for inspection. But more basic, and what has caused me over the past few years to suggest frequently the desirability to prescribe generically, is that many jurisdictions in this country require that a patient who is on welfare be given a generic prescription, and medical associations participate in this practice.

If it is unsafe for the fellow whose bank account is zero, it is unsafe for everybody. But it is not unsafe, apparently, to give the person who is receiving welfare benefits a generic prescription. Therefore, how can it consistently be argued that except for the welfare patient, a generic prescription is unsafe? It does not add up. All of us should bend every effort to persuade physicians to prescribe generically. Another feature of the Kefauver bill was intended to encourage this practice.

Now it is required that the generic name appear prominently on the label, even though the trade name be more conspicuous. This is an effort, again, to remind physicians that there is a way that they, in their role as purchasing agent for the patient—which is their role—can make life, if not healthier for the patient, at least easier.

Again, I salute the Senator from Louisiana for his comments on this subject.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan, like myself, has had the experience of being chairman of a subcommittee on monopoly. I think he shares the frustration I have felt on occasions when we have tried to protect the public from some of the highway robbery and gouging that have occurred in some situations.

It is perfectly all right, so far as I am concerned, if manufacturers wish to spend huge sums of money to advertise a trade name, so as to make the product appear better. However, I recall, from my law school days, a case concerning the advertising of the Bayer Co., which sought to restrict the use of its trade name "Aspirin." Aspirin is nothing but monosalicylic acid. It is a good pain reliever. Anybody can make it. Once he knows the process, there is nothing to it. It has been in the public domain for a long time.

The Bayer Co. sought to prevent anyone else from using the name "Aspirin." If aspirin were sold, it must be called monosalicylic acid. One can imagine how many sales would be made if it were required that the product be called monosalicylic acid. That big name would scare anyone to death.

Bayer finally won the case; anyone else would have to call the product something other than "aspirin." If one buys Bayer aspirin, he buys himself a nice tablet with "Bayer" stamped on it. He is told that there is no better aspirin in the world—and that is correct. There is no better, and there is no worse; they are all the same.

If one goes to Dr. Calver's office in the Capitol and says he wants something to cure his headache, Dr. Calver will proceed to hand him a little box containing tablets that are not even marked. When one opens the box, he finds little pills. They do not have the name "Bayer" on them; they do not have the name "St. Joseph" on them. They are nothing but little pills. But if one takes them, they will do the same thing for his headache that Bayer aspirin or anybody else's aspirin will do. The Government buys these pills for far less than the price at which the company sells them under its trade name.

Other drugs that are in the public domain often have product trade names. For instance, reserpin is manufactured under the trade name Serpisil. When the doctor writes a prescription for Serpisil, rather than reserpin, it means that one has to pay several dollars instead of 47 cents for the product. Druggists customarily receive a 100-percent markup on drugs. I do not complain about that. I do not believe they are getting rich. I do not know of a druggist who became a millionaire selling drugs. But having paid 47 cents for the product, he could afford to sell it to the customer for $1 and be happy with the profit he made.

But no, the manufacturers are going around the country, brainwashing State legislators who do not understand what is taking place, seeking to have laws passed which would require purchasers to pay 165 times the actual cost of a product.

Mr. HART. The Senator from Louisiana will recall that we have not been very successful in persuading the industry to develop less complicated generic names. What is taking place is a minor part of the effort to deter the use of generic name prescriptions. I suppose that on occasions the effort is successful. A generic name should be simple. When a physician has busy days and many things to do, the more complicated a generic name can be made, the less easy it is to remember it, even if the physician would like to pass onto the patient a prescription which could be filled more easily.

During the delivery of Mr. LONG of Louisiana's speech,

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a moment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I regret very much that I must leave the Chamber. I am a delegate to the Mexican-American Conference and it is necessary for me to go to their meeting now. However, I wish it to appear in the RECORD that as a member of the Monopoly Subcommittee I appreciate very much the superb work the Senator from Louisiana is doing in the monopoly field. I would commend this subject to the attention of every Senator.

Again, I thank the Senator for his excellent contribution.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator. The Senator has been a very strong advocate of competition and he has been an opponent of monopoly.

I would urge him to take a copy of my speech with him over the weekend and read all of the details.

I thank the Senator.

JOURNAL OF FEBRUARY 9, 1966

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 9, 1966, be approved.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS-16, 17, AND 18

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS-16, 17, and 18, for the calendar year 1965 which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF VERMONT LEGISLATURE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, relating to the special milk program for schoolchildren. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was received and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

H.J. Res. 16

Joint resolution relating to special milk program for schoolchildren

Whereas annually the U.S. Congress appropriates funds for a special milk program for schoolchildren, and

Whereas during the last session of Congress, the sum of $103 million was voted for for such purpose, and

Whereas millions of schoolchildren throughout the country greatly benefit from this program, and

Whereas the U.S. Budget Bureau has recently issued a directive, effective February 1, 1966, cutting $3 million from said program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the Vermont General Assembly oppose such cutback of the milk program, and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the State be directed to send a copy of this resolution to our congressional delegation.

Approved February 1, 1966.

Philip H. Hoff,
Governor.
Richard W. Mallary,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
John J. Daley,
President of the Senate.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

S. 2791. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 992).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2912. A bill to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 2913. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Thurston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 2914. A bill to extend for 2 years Public Law 815, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance for school construction in federally impacted areas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Montoya when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2915. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to grant fellowships for graduate study in highway transportation engineering; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2916. A bill to provide for a weather modification program to be carried out by the Secretary of Commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. Kuchel):

S. 2917. A bill to improve the statistics of the United States by providing for a census in the years 1967, 1975, and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Smathers when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2918. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to reinstate a certain oil and gas lease; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 2919. A bill to extend for 2 years Public Law 815, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance for school construction in federally impacted areas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Cannon when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 2920. A bill for the relief of Jean Meledain Auguste; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Tydings, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 2921. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Proxmire when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. Clark, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Lausche, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McNamara, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 2922. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin Compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. Case, Mr. Hart, Mr. Javits, Mr. Morse, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Dodd, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Scott, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Mondale):

S. 2923. A bill entitled "The Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Douglas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 2924. A bill to provide for the establishment of a pilot plant at Grand Forks, N. Dak., to carry out research relating to low ash coal; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION

DISAPPROVAL OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NUMBERED 1 OF 1966

Mr. JAVITS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 220) to disapprove Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1966, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Javits, which appears under a separate heading.)

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 815

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to extend the provisions of Public Law 815 for another 2 years.

Public Law 815 provides construction funds for federally affected school districts which have problems of overcrowding caused by the construction of new military facilities, school population increases on Indian reservations, and the like.

This valuable legislation has, since its enactment by the 81st Congress, helped hundreds of hard-pressed school districts around the country to provide adequate facilities for the education of our youth.

Unless we of the Congress act promptly, Public Law 815 will expire on June 30, and I doubt that very many of us will want that to happen.

Schools in every State in the Nation have benefited from construction funds provided by Public Law 815.

Since its inception, New Mexico schools alone have received a total of $41,065,516 through Public Law 815. Last year, 11 New Mexico districts received a total of $3,610,230, and the estimate for the current year is nearly $2 million.

Throughout the country, Public Law 815 has financed $1,204,279,711 worth of school construction since 1951, and every dollar thus spent met an essential local need.

In recent years, annual expenditures have been about $50 million. The need will be as great next year, but unless we act, there will be no funds to meet the need.

Mr. President, I believe a number of Senators will wish to join as cosponsors on this bill, and for that reason I ask that it lie on the desk until February 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

The bill (S. 2914) to extend for 2 years Public Law 815, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance for school construction in federally impacted areas, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FELLOWSHIPS FOR GRADUATE STUDY IN HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to grant fellowships for graduate study in highway transportation engineering. It is aimed directly at overcoming a severe shortage of experts in this field so vital to highway safety.

There are many important phases to any effective program of highway safety. All are important. If we are to end the tragedy of senseless slaughter on our roads we must move forward on all fronts with determination and aggressiveness.

The availability of trained experts in the field of traffic safety engineering is an important point in curbing accidents. Yet there is a shortage of these engineers authoritatively estimated at 1,400. This shortage will grow to 2,200 in the next 15 years at the current rate of training. There are only some 30 fellowships a year in highway transportation engineering now, supported by private funds. There is no indication that these will increase substantially.

According to a recent professional study of this problem, the shortage is much worse than we think and is bound to grow worse still. This comprehensive study was conducted by the Automotive Safety Foundation last year. I think the findings are important and I will summarize them:

First. There is a present need for an estimated 8,000 highway transportation engineers to effectively manage and operate our highway system. Only 6,600 trained engineers are now available. The current shortage of 1,400 engineers means 1 out of 5 positions cannot be filled.

Second. Despite efforts of the universities, not enough students are being trained to keep pace with the demand. Unless additional students are recruited, the current shortage of highway transportation engineers will increase to more than 2,200 by 1980.

Third. Universities offering comprehensive graduate programs in highway transportation engineering are presently operating at one-third to one-half of optimum capacity. These schools could adequately handle 100 more students per year without an increase in faculty or facilities. However, programs will have to be developed in other schools to help accommodate future anticipated needs.

Fourth. There is presently a shortage of students with interests in highway transportation engineering. This shortage results primarily from two causes: First, lack of motivation—highway transportation seems lusterless to most students when compared with new fields such as aerospace and electronics; and second, inadequate fellowship support as compared to competitive fields.

Fifth. Essentially all fellowship support in highway transportation engineering is provided by ASF and the Insurance Institute of Highway Safety. These programs have approximately 30 fellowships per year and there is no indication that there will be an increase in future years.

Sixth. More fellowships are needed to fulfill the demands for better trained highway transportation engineers.

Seventh. There should be more effort to stimulate greater interest in this field.

The idea of Federal fellowships in certain areas of training is nothing new, of course. The National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the U.S. Office of Education, the National Institutes of Health, and others administer thousands of fellowships. These previous programs were taken into consideration in drawing up the one proposed in my bill.

Right now, the Bureau of Public Roads does not have a specialized fellowship program for advanced training in highway transportation engineering, although this Bureau is obviously the Federal agency most involved with this problem. Mr. Rex Whitton, the Federal Highway Administrator, is extremely concerned with the shortage I have discussed.

Several conferences were held with the chief of the Bureau's training section. The mechanics for establishing a specialized Federal fellowship program in highway transportation engineering were discussed in detail. It was clear that enabling legislation would be needed.

My bill proposes a fellowship program to be administered by the Bureau of Public Roads for graduate students in highway transportation engineering. To meet minimum needs the program would initially provide 100 fellowships annually. There is authorization to expand to 200 fellowships the second year and to 300 the third year. This degree of support is required, certainly, to meet the anticipated demands for highly trained engineers.

Each fellowship, to be competitive with those offered by other Federal agencies, provides an annual basic stipend of $2,400, a $500 allowance for each dependent and instructional allowance of $2,500 in lieu of tuition and fees—an average of $6,000 per fellowship per year.

There should be two methods of applying this program. One would be a regular fellowship program with candidates selected by the administering agency. The other would be a traineeship program. Universities and qualifying institutions would submit proposals for fellowship grants and take the responsibility of selecting candidates.

These two approaches would not only insure a greater number of high quality students taking graduate study in highway transportation engineering but would permit an effective geographic distribution and encourage more colleges and universities to offer this type of training.

This proposal is of course but one of the many approaches needed to achieve effective traffic safety in our Nation. I pointed this out last month in an address to the National Asphalt Pavement Association convention in Las Vegas.

Many of my comments are appropriate to my discussion now. To save time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that significant portions of that address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the portions of the address will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2915) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to grant fellowships for graduate study in highway transportation engineering, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The portions of the address presented by Mr. BIBLE are as follows:

> I submit we are building a monumental dilemma even as we are building a magnificent travel system. I submit further that we can no longer brush aside this dilemma. Otherwise our tremendous road construction will have a built-in flaw.
>
> I'm speaking now of highway safety. That is the dilemma. And it is a dilemma that has accelerated with the speed and length of travel.
>
> Don't misunderstand. I'm not merely going to preach safe driving practices or call for public awareness or quote slogans about highway safety. I want, for just a few moments, to talk plainly and clearly about what I consider a real and urgent crises in our Nation. And I want to suggest some real and effective action. I'm going to suggest that organizations such as yours have a direct interest in helping to solve this dilemma.
>
> There is no question of the urgency. We know—but we prefer not to think too much about it—that highway fatalities are climbing toward 49,000 a year—that 20 to 40 million accidents a year cost our people and our economy $10 to $15 billion—that traffic accidents are now the leading cause of death among young adults.
>
> And we know—but we prefer not to think too much about it—that the amount of attention and money we spend on highway safety is but a very, very small fraction of the amount we spend on highway travel.
>
> Time has run out. Let's face that fact. We must realize now that all our highway safety efforts of the past, no matter how well intentioned, simply have not been adequate.
>
> Now we need a major national effort in money and energy. It must be determined, continuing effort mounted at every level of American society and government. Nothing less will do the job. The alternative is surrender by default to a death and injury toll that will remain a national tragedy.
>
> As Nevada's attorney general and as a U.S. Senator, I have long been painfully aware of this tragic and wasteful dilemma. I have sponsored programs and legislation dealing with it. But I, along with too many others, have not devoted enough serious attention to it.
>
> The fact that highway safety is a formidable national problem has been recognized by President Johnson. He will propose to

Congress a broad legislative program on this issue. I cannot tell you the specifics of it now. But it will be hard hitting—doubtless controversial—and it will recognize the need to spend money to save lives.

If we can spend billions on highways and cars, if we can budget nearly $70 million to beautify the highways, then it seems both urgent and compelling to me that we can afford to spend significantly more to save human lives.

The President's Committee for Traffic Safety, in studying this highway safety dilemma, has recommended an action program. It embraces the time-tested principles of engineering, laws, traffic accident records, education, motor vehicle administration, police supervision, traffic courts, public information, research and public support. You've heard of all of them. You may point out that they haven't been too effective. Singly, they haven't. Collectively, they can. But there must be one more principle—money. Money will supply the action to the action program. I'm not talking solely of Federal money. I'm talking about money from local and State governments, from organizations, from individuals.

You recall I mentioned engineering as one phase of traffic safety. A survey conducted 2 years ago by the Institute of Traffic Engineers, a professional society, revealed there is a shortage of some 1,500 traffic engineers in our Nation now. One out of every five positions cannot be filled. To attack this one problem I intend to support the introduction of legislation in the near future calling for a Federal program of scholarships to promote and expand graduate study in highway transportation. To meet the minimum needs, this plan will initially provide for 100 scholarships annually with authorization for expansion to 200 in the second year and 300 in the third year.

This program would be administered by the Department of Commerce. It would, I hope, encourage more universities and colleges to offer graduate programs in this field.

This is but one phase and one approach. It will be my purpose in the 89th Congress to work consistently on other developments in traffic safety. In all instances I will adhere to the belief I have maintained throughout my 30 years in public life. That is, that these matters should be handled and developed mainly at the State and community level. But we must also recognize that with the complexity of the problem as it has developed, the great resources of the Federal Government must also be brought to bear. Our National Government must offer maximum aid and encouragement consistent with the overall effort.

Mr. **BIBLE**. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that this bill lie on the table until the close of business on February 23 so that any Senators who may wish to cosponsor this bill will have that opportunity.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED WEATHER MODIFICATION PROGRAM

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for a weather modification program and ask that the bill lie on the table for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

Public Law 510 of the 85th Congress gave broad authority to the National Science Foundation to initiate and support a program of study, research, and evaluation in the field of weather modification. That was in 1959. The prime need then was for intensive basic research. The National Science Foundation has performed that task in a commendable manner. One of their finest achievements is support of the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colo.

In 1966, the art and science of weather modification present a different picture. The need for basic research is still great, but there are other needs too. The Science Foundation has recognized and reported on these needs. The NSF Special Commission on Weather Modification has urged that an agency of the executive branch be assigned the overall responsibility for the national weather modification program. I agree with the Commission that now is the time to take action. Accordingly, I am introducing a bill which will assign such a mission to the Department of Commerce. This bill in no way derogates from the splendid performance of the National Science Foundation, and will not interfere with their support of the National Center for Atmospheric Research.

Many other Federal agencies are conducting programs in the field of weather modification. My bill takes cognizance of these programs.

I recognize that this bill will serve only as a beginning point of discussion. I invite debate so that Congress can come up with the best possible legislation consistent with present scientific achievement.

The Committee on Commerce began hearings on weather modification in Nevada last year. Hearings are now scheduled to begin before the committee on February 21. It is our desire to examine this bill, the general subject of weather modification, the sociolegal economic considerations, the interrelationship of weather prediction, and S. 23.

The report of the National Science Foundation as well as the excellent report by the National Academy of Sciences will serve as a beginning point for these hearings. These reports indicate the need for a comprehensive legislative program. This is not a time to consider fragmenting responsibility. Weather modification and weather prediction are intimately related. The Department of Commerce is therefore ideally suited to have this overall responsibility. Other agencies having mission-oriented programs have a legitimate interest in carrying out their programs, but not in the overall direction.

Scientific weather modification is a comparatively new subject. Accordingly, the Congress has the unique opportunity to develop complementary laws as the science develops. This is no modest undertaking. Weather systems are nationwide and worldwide. Our approach to constructive legislation must be as comprehensive as the subject.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2916) to provide for a weather modification program to be carried out by the Secretary of Commerce, introduced by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PROVISION FOR A CENSUS IN THE YEARS 1967, 1975, AND EVERY 10 YEARS THEREAFTER

Mr. **SMATHERS**. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference on behalf of myself and the very able and distinguished minority whip, Senator KUCHEL, of California, a bill to improve the statistics of the United States by providing for a census of population, housing, and unemployment in the years 1967, 1975, and every 10 years thereafter.

The effect of this legislation will be to establish a reasonably complete national census every 5 years in place of our present program of decennial censuses combined with special surveys and estimates.

The need for a full and accurate periodic inventory of the American people has been recognized from the founding of our Republic. The Constitution of the United States requires a census once in each decade, and since 1790, we have taken 17 such head counts. From the information they provide, lawmakers and administrators at every level of government conceive and execute a broad spectrum of programs, ranging from educating our young to building the highways that span the continent. Business and industry analyze census statistics when arriving at decisions involving the investment of billions of stockholders' dollars. Historians and social scientists trace and record the ever-changing population patterns of our Nation and reach conclusions about where we have come from and where we may be headed.

Mr. President, with the passing of each year, the demands for detailed, up-to-date data on America's most vital resource, her people, are multiplying.

Since 1960, it is estimated that the United States has gained over 16 million new residents. Between April 1960 and July 1964, Nevada's population is said to have shot up 43 percent; Arizona's, 21 percent. Among the metropolitan States, my own State of Florida, has gained nearly 18 percent. Last year, approximately three-quarters of a million more people enjoyed the benefits of our sunny climate as permanent residents than did in 1960.

Furthermore, growth has not been the only characteristic of the dynamic American population. Demographers tell us that one American in five changes address at least once a year. Although there are those who move three or four times in a year and others who are born and die in the same home, on the average, 100 percent of the national population moves within a 5-year period. The impact of this migration is most keenly felt in those States which are rapidly absorbing new citizens. State and local governments must provide expanded public services such as more schools, police and fire departments, highways, and the other facilities necessary to the life of every community.

To give an indication of the magnitude of the problems posed by restless Americans, one need only note that between 1950 and 1960, the State of Florida added 1,617,000 new residents through migration from other areas. Similarly, New Jersey during the same period, gained approximately 600,000 persons who had formerly made their homes elsewhere.

Probably the single most significant fact concerning the statistics on growth and mobility which I have just cited is that only those figures for the decade between 1950 and 1960 are known to be precise. The others, based on sample surveys and projections, may not be accurate and cannot be proven—under present law—until 1970. According to statistical experts, the farther we move away from 1960, the more woefully inadequate our census data will become.

Yet, it is from this data that decisions affecting the lives of every American and involving billions of dollars must be made. State and local governments, recognizing the necessity for more up-to-date information concerning their citizens, have had to request special censuses from the Census Bureau. In the 6 years that have elapsed since 1960, more than 550 of these special inventories have been made in 23 States. However, they have involved only about 12 million people in a Nation of 195 million.

Such special censuses are an invaluable aid to State and local administrators, but they cannot give us an overall, national picture. They cannot provide the U.S. Congress or Federal administrators with exact statistical knowledge on all areas of this vast land. Thus, for instance, such legislation as the Economic Opportunity Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Library Services Act Amendments of 1964, and many others which provide for fund allocations according to need, must be administered with reliance on 1959 income figures—figures that are now 7 years out of date.

Because we have tied ourselves to a census program devised when the entire population of this country did not equal the population increase between 1950 and 1960, we are currently distributing billions of dollars to State and local governments using population and income data collected over 5 years ago.

Mr. President, already the United States takes a quinquennial census of agriculture, and it is a sad commentary that today we have a more accurate count of our pigs than we do of our people. We know exactly how many cattle there are in Nebraska, but not exactly how many people there are in New York City.

In the decade between 1945 and 1955, 20 nations, including Japan, West Germany, Sweden, Norway, Australia, and New Zealand took more censuses of population than we did.

We cannot lag behind these countries in this vital statistical field. If we are to keep pace with the growing needs of our changing society, we must be able to trace precisely the changes that are taking place.

For instance, as Chairman of the Senate's Special Committee on Aging, I have a particular interest in the problems of our elderly citizens. We know that daily 3,800 people reach the age of 65 in the United States, and that today approximately 18 million of our citizens are 65 or older.

And, we also know that our current methods for counting these people between census years are totally inadequate. Yet, without good census data, the administration of such programs as medicare is made more difficult, and the conception of new programs must be based on conjecture.

Mr. President, I am confident that the adoption of a quinquennial census will do much to strengthen our Nation's statistical program. It will aid business and government in making the vital decisions that will keep our Nation moving forward. I sincerely hope that the committee to which this measure is referred will act promptly and favorably so that its enactment into law can be achieved in this session of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2917) to improve the statistics of the United States by providing for a census in the years 1967, 1975, and every 10 years thereafter, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION IN FEDERALLY IMPACTED AREAS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, an amendment to Public Law 815, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance for school construction in federally impacted areas.

My amendment would extend Public Law 815 for 2 years, making its expiration date consistent with Public Law 874, the second impacted areas bill which authorizes funds for operation and maintenance and teachers' salaries in school districts in which a substantial number of children of servicemen and other Federal employees attend school.

Since their inception in 1950, the Federal impacted areas laws have been the model of wise and efficient Federal cooperation in our Nation's educational endeavors.

Public Laws 815 and 874 are special programs of education assistance with special reasons behind them. They may be said to have a dual purpose: to compensate for the weakened tax base which results when much of the real property in a school district is federally owned, and thus not subject to local property taxes; and to help local districts to manage the increased outlay necessary for making good schools available to the children of Federal employees.

The Congress took action last year to extend the provisions of Public Law 874 until 1968. This was a wise decision and illustrated the support of the Congress for the principle of requiring the Federal Government to meet its obligation to those school districts which have the burden of educating dependents of Federal workers, many of whom do not pay the property taxes the district must have to meet the rising costs of operation and maintenance and teachers' salaries.

As the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] stated earlier this week:

> The theory behind impacted area aid is just as valid in 1966 as it was when the original legislation was passed by Congress.

The amendment I offer today, Mr. President, is needed by thousands of school districts throughout the United States which have increased school construction requirements. It is consistent with action taken by Congress last year in extending until 1968 the impacted areas law dealing with operation and maintenance and teachers' salaries.

And it is consistent with the words of President Johnson last month when he told us we were mighty enough, healthy enough, strong enough so that pursuit of our goals abroad need not curtail our progress here at home.

Extension of Public Law 815 is imperative to the continuation of our national goal to provide every child the best possible education, and I urge my colleagues to give this bill their strongest support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2919) to extend for 2 years Public Law 815, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance for school construction in federally impacted areas, introduced by Mr. CANNON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2919

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first sentence of section 3 of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 633), is amended by striking out "1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "1968".

(b) Subsection (b) of section 14 of such Act is amended by striking out "1966" each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1968".

(c) Paragraph (15) of section 15 of such Act is amended by striking out "1963–1964" and inserting in lieu thereof "1965–1966".

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am, today, introducing a bill for myself and Senators MCGOVERN, HART, TYDINGS, YARBOROUGH, and KENNEDY of New York, which is designed to extend and make permanent the special milk program for children and to make the program available for the benefit of all children among our growing population.

The Congress of the United States has supported nutrition programs for many years. It has recognized the value of good nutrition among children as a means of improving the health and strength of the Nation. Programs of this type also serve to strengthen agriculture by expanding markets.

The special milk program for children was first enacted in 1954.

The special milk program for children has been a very popular program among parents and school officials. It has expanded the market for fluid milk for farmers throughout the United States through regular commercial outlets which serve the schools, but most important are the nutritional benefits derived by participating children.

The special milk program for children is not a compulsory program. It encourages children to drink more milk by making it available at a price that most children can afford and at no cost to those children who are unable to pay for the milk.

The special milk program for children has grown with each succeeding year, limited only to the extent that growth was inhibited by the appropriation of insufficient funds or through limitations due to the allocations of funds among the several States. The growth of the program has been accomplished through increased participation of schoolchildren, increased enrollment in schools, and increased numbers of schools and child care institutions participating in this program.

The program was originally designed for the school, but later was expanded to make milk available to children at summer camps and nursery centers and other child care institutions.

The special milk program for children is scheduled to expire June 30, 1967. The Congress should remove this termination date and make the program permanent. A program of such national importance should not be temporary. It should be done now, so that the schools may properly plan their activities for next year and for succeeding years.

The special milk program for children is a modest investment in the health of the Nation and should not be limited for lack of funds. Although program growth indicated a need for more money, the present budget limits expenditures for the 1965–66 fiscal year to $103 million. The Department of Agriculture, moreover, has indicated that it would hold expenditures to no more than $100 million. This seriously hampers the program and places an unwarranted burden on the schools, which are maintaining the program on behalf of children. After announcing the rates of payments to schools, the Department of Agriculture last year reduced its reimbursement rate to 95 percent of its obligation and has announced that it will further reduce the reimbursement rate to schools and child care centers to a level of 90 cents on the dollar beginning February 1 of this year in an attempt to save money. Sacrificing the health and welfare of our children is certainly a poor way to effect savings.

These moves prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that the present appropriation is insufficient to provide opportunity for all schools, summer camps, and day care centers to participate in the program as Congress intended.

In view of the nutritional benefits of this program and its popularity, I was greatly disturbed by the proposed budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, which for all practical purposes will eliminate the special milk program for children. The budget proposes a reduction in funds from $103 million to $21 million or a cut of over 80 percent in the program.

My bill will overcome these deficiencies by making the program permanent and by committing Congress to the provision of sufficient funds so that all children can participate and so that there will be adequate funds for program growth in succeeding years.

The special milk program for children is perhaps one of the most popular pieces of legislation among the consuming population and America's dairy farmers' and the whole dairy industry that has been passed in recent years. It is a program that must receive the support of each and every Member of Congress and I feel that it will.

I introduce the bill at this time to allow for necessary hearings and so that it can be enacted this year. It would be a gross injustice to our children and to the schools if we were to postpone consideration of this need until 1967. Furthermore, we just cannot let the matter stand in view of the slash in appropriations for this worthwhile program as provided by the proposed budget.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill lie on the table for 3 weeks for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will remain at the desk for 3 weeks, as requested.

The bill (S. 2921) to provide a special milk program for children, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

GREAT LAKES BASIN COMPACT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of myself and Senators BAYH, CLARK, DIRKSEN, DOUGLAS, HARTKE, LAUSCHE, MCCARTHY, MCNAMARA, MONDALE, NELSON, PROXMIRE, SCOTT, and YOUNG of Ohio, a bill granting the consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin Compact.

The Great Lakes Commission which has its headquarters in Ann Arbor, Mich., has been in existence for 11 years. It is formed by representatives of the States of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. It concerns itself with promoting the orderly, integrated, and comprehensive development, use, and conservation of the water resources of the Great Lakes Basin.

Basically the Great Lakes Commission is a deliberative, consultative, and recommendatory body. None of its actions or decisions are binding on any State, and of course, none of them are binding on the Federal Government and/or its agencies. The sole and only purpose of the organization is to provide a permanent and continuing forum where the representatives of the Great Lakes States can come, discuss, and consider the problems that face these States in connection with the best utilization of this vast and common resource, and after such deliberation make recommendations as to the solutions which are proposed.

On two previous occasions legislation granting consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin Compact has passed the Senate. However, no action has ever been taken in the other body. In 1962, in response to a request for his views, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, then the Deputy Attorney General, expressed the opinion that this agreement among the States requires congressional consent under the compact clause.

Accordingly, the Commission is again seeking enactment of consent legislation and I hope that with the significant sponsorship in this body we may soon have favorable action by the Congress.

I ask appropriate reference of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2922) granting the consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin compact, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRANSFER OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today, the President of the United States sent to the Congress a reorganization plan proposing the transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Commerce Department to the Department of Justice.

I send to the desk for appropriate reference, a resolution disapproving this reorganization plan, and reiterate my request of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], who is chairman of the Executive Reorganization Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, to schedule early hearings on this matter.

As one who took an active part in the drafting and the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which created the Service, I emphasize that it was intended as a mediation and conciliation service, not as an arm of the Federal prosecutor. In my view, the effectiveness of the Service could be seriously jeopardized if the element of coercion replaces that of conciliation.

Many Senators on both sides of the aisle have expressed to me their feeling that this transfer should not be effected. I welcome their support and express the hope that at the very least a full inquiry be had in this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 220) was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 transmitted to Congress by the President on February 10, 1966.

A REASONABLE SOLUTION: A 3-YEAR HOUSE TERM

AMENDMENT NO. 48

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the other body has begun hearings on the proposal set forward by President Johnson in his memorable state of the Union message to extend the terms of the Members of the House of Representatives and has focused the attention of the American public on this proposal, which I believe will rank as one of the most important issues to come before the Congress in recent years.

The President's proposal that House terms be extended to 4 years and that the entire House be elected at the same time as the President has been introduced in the Senate by my good friend, the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH].

Mr. President, I have joined in sponsorship of that measure because I feel very strongly that if the democratic process is to survive and is to work with a reasonable degree of efficiency, we must free Members of the House from perpetual campaigning and the sometimes demeaning search for campaign financing that too often has characterized political life since the end of World War II. I have joined in cosponsorship to indicate how strong is my conviction that House terms must be extended.

However, when the time comes for deliberation on this issue in this body, I intend to submit an amendment which will mean a basic change in the proposal as now set forward in Senate Joint Resolution 126. The crux of my amendment is that the House term be extended from 2 to 3 years and that one-third of the House be elected each year.

Mr. President, I think that this plan would eliminate the vast majority of the arguments that have been presented in opposition to extension of the House term and would be a means by which that body could fulfill its historic responsibility, while at the same time giving the individual membership an opportunity to greatly increase their effectiveness as legislators.

There is validity in the argument that our Founding Fathers made the House term shorter than that of the Senate in order to give that body a chance to reflect changes in the attitude of the people regarding the issues facing the Nation. Under my proposal, each year one-third of the House will be chosen, thus giving ample opportunity for the voice of the people to make itself heard in Washington. On the other side of the coin there would be the continuity of having two-thirds of the body carry over so that there would not be a total disruption in plans, programs, and policies from year to year.

While it can be suggested that a 4-year term concurrent with that of the President would give him the support necessary to carry out the mandate of the people who elected him to the Presidency, I cannot help but feel that the disadvantages of this proposal outweigh its merit. Under my plan, there would be a reading at the end of each year which could be and should be very valuable to determine how well the public thinks the President has carried out its mandate. Furthermore, it would seem obvious that not all House Members would benefit from running with the President, whether he is of their party or of the opposition. A 3-year rotation of elections would eliminate the perpetual sharing of the platform with the added requirements and difficulties created by a national campaign. Each Member according to sequence would run in a national election year, but he would not be irrevocably sentenced to this type of candidacy.

I realize full well that by splitting the House into three parts that problems of division occur both in the House as a whole, and in individual State delegations, but these are merely housekeeping chores which can, I am confident, be solved with a minimum of problems. My amendment provides that the House after the first election following adoption of this amendment be divided by lot into three classes and that the number of Members from each State assigned to each class would be as nearly equal as possible. In the case of those States which lose or gain representation following a census, all Members' terms would end at noon on the third day of January after the election which next follows since in that election a new slate of Representatives would have been chosen. Immediately these newly elected Representatives would be divided into terms in in the same manner as the original division. This latter point is put forward as a possible solution to the reapportionment problem, but it is entirely possible that during our deliberations improvements can be made.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly that there are significant strengths in this proposal that make it a logical and suitable means of dealing with the problem and making the Members of the House of Representatives more efficient without lessening their responsiveness to the public will. This problem is not new; indeed, Senator McGEE took over the job from Professor McGee who had for some years before carried on research and ruminations toward the goal of a responsive and responsible House of Representatives.

It should also be noted that this solution has been reached after long and varied consultations with politicians and political scientists across the country, and I am pleased to say that I have received considerable support from many people who represent a wide divergence in political opinion and academic attitude.

When the Founding Fathers drafted the Constitution and for many years after that, a House Member was in Washington only a few months out of any year and the problems he faced were, in comparison with today's world, few and far between. To cite the extremes—the First Congress met March 4, 1789, considered fewer than 150 bills and each Member of the House of Representatives spoke for 45,000 people. Last year the 1st session of the 89th Congress considered 16,882 bills and resolutions, and each Representative spoke in behalf of 450,000 constituents. From this sheer volume of work it is obvious that some respite is needed and that the quality of a legislator's work and the desirability of a legislator's job can only be improved by extending the length of his term.

Indeed, it seems fair to comment that because of the advances in communications and travel, a 6-year term is more responsive to the will of the people—in terms of contact with the constituency—that a 2-year term was in post-colonial times. What we are seeking to do in this amendment is to keep the constitutional principles of representation intact, while updating the system to the space age.

There are those who suggest that the present 2-year term is still adequate to the needs of the space age, as there are always those who prefer the status quo. But I sincerely believe that if the Nation is to expect a first-class job from its Congress—and such a job is necessary for our survival—it must provide first-class working conditions. My proposal would give the needed relief from continual campaigning and still preserve the vital role of the House in reflecting changes in public opinion and providing a continuing review of Government policy by the electorate. By dividing the House into three groups we assure that this review does not totally disrupt the legislative process, but takes place within the context of continuity.

We face a challenge in this issue of providing leadership for the strongest Nation in the world. We have a dual responsibility to represent our constituencies and to represent the general interests and welfare of the Nation. I believe this responsibility would be best served by an extension of the term of House Members to 3 years.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my proposed amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 126 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 484) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S.J. RES. 126

Strike out all after the resolving clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen by the people of the several States and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Except as otherwise provided in this article, the terms of office of Representatives shall be three years.

" 'SEC. 2. The Representatives shall be divided by lot into three classes. The number of offices assigned to each class shall be as nearly equal as may be, and the number of offices from each State assigned to each class shall be as nearly equal as may be.

" 'SEC. 3. The first division of Representatives into classes shall be made immediately after the House of Representatives shall be assembled in consequence of the first election of Representatives to whom this article applies.

" 'A further division of Representatives into the three classes shall be made immediately after the House of Representatives shall be assembled in consequence of each election of Members which next follows a reapportionment of Representatives among the several States. Such further division shall apply only to those States the representation of which has been increased or decreased by such reapportionment. The term of office of all Representatives from such States shall end at noon on the third day of January after the election which next follows such reapportionment.

" 'The offices of the Representatives from any newly admitted State shall be assigned to the three classes immediately after the House of Representatives shall be assembled in consequence of the first election of Representatives from such State.

" 'Sec. 4. In order that, as nearly as may be, one-third of the Representatives will be chosen in each year, the term of office of Representatives whose offices are assigned to the first class at the first division shall be one year, and the term of office of Representatives whose offices are assigned to the second class at the first division shall be two years. The term of office of any Representative whose office is assigned to one of the three classes at any subsequent division shall expire at the time of expiration of the term of the other offices assigned to that class.

" 'Sec. 5. The first sentence of section 2 of article I of the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

" 'Sec. 6. No Member of a House of Congress shall be eligible for election as a Member of the other House for a term which is to begin before the expiration of the term of the office held by him unless, at least thirty days prior to such election, he shall have submitted a resignation from such office which shall become effective no later than the beginning of such term.

" 'Sec. 7. This article shall first apply in the case of Representatives elected for terms beginning on January 3 of the first year which begins more than one year after the date of ratification of this article.

" 'Sec. 8. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.'

"Amend the title so as to read: 'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives shall be three years.' "

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] be listed as additional cosponsors of Senate bill 2911, the next time the bill is printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 2857, my distinguished colleagues, Senator Javits and Senator Bayh, be included as sponsors of this bill, which would increase the investment credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution. I believe I should say that both Senators indicated their desire to join in sponsoring this bill on Wednesday of this week, and according to the request I made when I introduced this legislation on February 1, the bill was to be at the desk through Wednesday, February 9. Through an error in notation, the bill was printed a day earlier than the request noted, so I want to be sure that the record is clear that the sponsors include Senator Bayh and Senator Javits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on the 19th of January, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 71. Some 53 Senators joined with me as cosponsors of the resolution. Since that date and since the printing of Senate Concurrent Resolution 71, a number of other Senators have called asking to be listed as cosponsors. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that further printings of Senate Concurrent Resolution 71 include as cosponsors the following Members of the U.S. Senate:

Lister Hill, George A. Smathers, George D. Aiken, Carl T. Curtis, Philip A. Hart, George McGovern, Frank J. Lausche, Abraham Ribicoff, Edward V. Long, John O. Pastore, Winston L. Prouty, Harry F. Byrd, Carl Hayden, Jacob Javits, Gaylord Nelson, William Proxmire, Albert Gore, J. William Fulbright, Wayne Morse, Russell B. Long, Lee Metcalf, George Murphy, Everett McKinley Dirksen, Joseph S. Clark, Ralph Yarborough, Jennings W. Randolph, John Sparkman, Roman L. Hruska, Maurine B. Neuberger, Milton R. Young, John Sherman Cooper, B. Everett Jordan, Thomas J. McIntyre, Thruston Morton, Herman Talmadge, John McClellan, Norris Cotton, Caleb Boggs, and Thomas Dodd.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to my colleagues for this expression of support for the U.S. Olympic Committee in its selection of Utah as the nominee of the United States for the site of the 1972 winter Olympic games. When the International Olympic Committee meets in Rome, Italy, in April of this year, the U.S. delegation will be fortified in its bid for the winter Olympic games by this strong expression of support of the U.S. Senate.

I hope that our colleagues in the other body will act promptly and with equal unanimity to make the expression of the Congress complete that the United States urges the holding of the 1972 winter Olympic games in Utah.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 3, 1966, the names of Mr. Clark, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Long of Missouri, and Mr. McCarthy were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2872) to encourage private enterprise in the establishment and development of outdoor recreation areas and facilities for public use, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Brewster (for himself and other Senators) on February 3, 1966.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 1522, TO REMOVE ARBITRARY LIMITATIONS ON CERTAIN ATTORNEYS' FEES

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on February 28, 1966, the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure will hold a hearing on S. 1522, a bill to remove arbitrary limitations upon attorneys' fees for services rendered in proceedings before administrative agencies of the United States. This bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, Senator John L. McClellan.

Numerous agencies of the Federal Government now impose limitations upon fees which attorneys may charge clients for services rendered in administrative proceedings. S. 1522 would abolish all these provisions of law or agency regulations, and would allow each administrative agency to pay attorney's fees in an amount equal to the reasonable value of the services rendered by the attorney concerned.

We hope to hear from all witnesses who are desirous of testifying on any aspect of S. 1522. Such persons who would like to testify should contact Mr. Benny L. Kass, assistant counsel to the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, room 3214, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225–5617.

NOTICE ON HEARINGS ON ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I wish to announce that the hearings on electoral college which were to be held on February 7 through February 10 and were rescheduled for February 14 through 17 have necessarily been postponed.

Since the subcommittee does intend to consider this question at the earliest possible date, I suggest that interested persons or organizations who wish to be heard on this subject contact the subcommittee staff in room 419, Old Senate Office Building, phone extension 3018.

POPULATION HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, AT 10 A.M., IN ROOM 3302, NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senate will be in recess from the conclusion of business today until noon of Wednesday next, February 16, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures will continue hearings on S. 1676 on Wednesday, February 16. The public hearing will be held in room 3302 in the New Senate Office Building, starting at 10 a.m.

NOTICE OF RESCHEDULING OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM J. LYNCH TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been rescheduled for Thursday, February 24, 1966, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of William J. Lynch, of Illinois, to be U.S. district judge, northern district of Illinois, vice Michael L. Igoe, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself, as chairman.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 10, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1698) to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–420, the Speaker had appointed Mr. DE LA GARZA, of Texas, as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group, to fill the existing vacancy thereon, vice Mr. SLACK, of West Virginia, excused.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 706. An act to amend the Railway Labor Act in order to provide for establishment of special adjustment boards upon the request either of representatives of employees or of carriers to resolve disputes otherwise referable to the National Railroad Adjustment Board, and to make all awards of such Board final; and

H.R. 12563. An act to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 706. An act to amend the Railway Labor Act in order to provide for establishment of special adjustment boards upon the request either of representatives of employees or of carriers to resolve disputes otherwise referable to the National Railroad Adjustment Board, and to make all awards of such Board final; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 12563. An act to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 194 of title 14, United States Code, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries appointed Mr. LENNON of North Carolina, Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GROVER of New York as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 301, 78th Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries appointed Mr. DOWNING of Virginia, Mr. MURPHY of New York, and Mr. MOSHER of Ohio as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1698) to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

OHIO STUDY SHOWS SCHOOL MILK NEEDED FOR ALL CHILDREN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have been speaking daily on the floor of the Senate to protest the action of the Bureau of the Budget in withholding $3 million in appropriated funds from the special milk program for schoolchildren. The Federal share of the expenses of providing milk for schoolchildren has, as a consequence, been cut by 10 percent from last year's levels. The President's budget for fiscal 1967 indicates that the program is headed for virtual extinction. It would be cut from $103 to $21 million and redirected only to those children who can qualify as needy with some sort of a means test. None of this will save money because the CCC must buy milk under price support laws that the schoolchildren do not drink.

I invite the attention of Senators today to a pamphlet published by the Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station entitled "Recommendations for More Effective School Milk Programs." On page 3 the pamphlet states, under the heading "Keep the Price Low":

> Without exception, studies show that one of the most important ways to get more children to drink more milk in schools is to keep the price as low as possible. This price will depend upon the amount the school pays for milk, the margin it takes to cover the expense incurred in handling and serving milk, and whether it receives partial reimbursement for that milk by participating in one or both of the Federal programs (school lunch and school milk).

Obviously the administration's attempts to slice school milk funds by 80 percent will make the price the child must pay high, resulting in a dropoff of milk drinking all the way from preschoolers to high school seniors. This is evident from the pamphlet's statement that "research shows that average milk consumption per pupil is generally higher in schools that serve milk under the Federal programs than in schools that serve milk outside these programs."

Mr. President, I particularly emphasize the following advice given on page 5 of the pamphlet, under the heading "Having Milk Available":

> Studies have indicated that children drink more milk when they can obtain it at various times during the day. A minimum goal is to have milk available at least three times a day, at midmorning, at noon, and at midafternoon. Some schools report that large quantities of milk are drunk by children as they arrive or leave, especially by those who must walk or ride long distances to school.

This statement deserves serious consideration because the Department of Agriculture seems to hold the view that when milk is served at the noon meal as a part of the school lunch program, it is not needed in midmorning or midafternoon. I believe this assumption is one of the underpinnings of the move to cripple the program in fiscal 1967. All the evidence I have been able to gather indicates the school milk program will be curtailed only in those schools having a school lunch program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

URGENT NEED FOR BIG INCREASE IN EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND FARM AID TO VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I rise today to ask for a prompt and vast stepup in educational, health, and agricultural assistance and land reform in South Vietnam.

In the last few years we have increased our Vietnam military effort more than a hundredfold.

We have often talked about the necessity for making a comparable economic, educational, and health effort; but we have done far less than we can do, than we should do, or—if we are going to have any chance to achieve our objectives—we have done far less than we must do.

Today we have less than one American in Vietnam working for all nonmilitary purposes combined for every 200 American soldiers and marines.

Today we spend $1 on schools, health, agricultural assistance, and land reform in Vietnam for every $400 we spend on military action.

Now listen to the words of Gen. Edward Lansdale, a distinguished American and a recognized expert on subversion and revolution:

> The harsh fact, and one which has given pause to every thoughtful American, is that, despite the use of overwhelming amounts of men, money and materiel, despite the quantity of well-meant American advice and despite the impressive statistics of casualties inflicted on the Vietcong, the Communist subversive insurgents have grown steadily stronger, in numbers and in size of units, and still retain the initiative to act at their will in the very areas of Vietnam where Vietnamese and American efforts have been most concentrated.

As Lansdale further said:

> The Communists have let loose a revolutionary idea in Vietnam. It will not die by being ignored, bombed, or smothered by us. Ideas do not die in such ways.

THE VIETCONG PITCH

What is that idea? There is not one, but three. They are powerful. And the Vietcong has suited their action to the triple pledge. Here they are:

"Land to the tiller."

In a nation teeming with landless tenant farmers, the Vietcong has given the tenant the local authority and the military power.

"The soldier helps the peasant."

The Vietcong soldier tortures and terrifies the peasant. He helps him—physically helps him—when the peasant cooperates.

"The government exists for the people."

This Vietcong slogan is given believability precisely because the Vietcong helps the landless tenant.

WEAPON NEEDED TO KILL VIETCONG IDEA

What is our answer?

We have an answer—a brilliantly proven answer.

We know how to make farms thrive as no people in history ever have before. And we know what the family-owned, family-operated farm means to a people's will to fight and sacrifice for their nation. We know how to make it work as a marvel of efficiency.

American medical achievements are the envy of the world.

In Medicare we have just given a great national example of how to put that medical know-how to work for millions.

American education is our real glory. And this President, this Congress has shown how we can advance education to bring the abundant life to all of our people.

Can this education, health, farm know-how help us in Vietnam? It can. It has. Indeed, in Vietnam itself we have over the years a great and proud record of achievement through American assistance.

It is not a question of whether more educational, agricultural, and health aid will work in Vietnam. We know it will.

Last March I spelled out the details of that great story on the floor of the Senate. Today I bring it up to date.

1965 AMERICAN CONTRIBUTION TO VIETNAM

Since last year, the 9 two-year trade schools financed by the United States have increased to 20, more than doubling this vital area's capacity.

Three million textbooks had been published a year ago. Today, the total stands at 6 million for elementary school use, 500,000 for secondary schools and 40,000 for university use.

American aid supplied five dredges to augment the eight at work last year in developing ports and harbors.

We completed a modern microwave telecommunications system. This links Saigon with the principal towns of the Mekong Delta provinces.

American medical know-how gave 83 percent of the population protection against malaria. The incidence rate rose, however, from .77 percent in 1962 to 1.57 percent because medical teams still are barred from some Vietcong-controlled areas.

We have helped build more than 45 bridges and culverts, over 400 miles of secondary roads, and almost 220 miles of major highways.

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE

The National Institute of Administration, built and staffed with American funds, now has 450 students training for administrative leadership in the Provinces. This is a 55-percent increase over last year.

We have increased the 21 Provincial training centers for village officials to 27. Five more are scheduled for completion by June 30 and another 12 are planned for the following year.

Eleven Provincial training centers now provide basic instruction and refresher training to all members of the national police.

VIETCONG HARASSMENT

The Vietcong have hindered the fresh water well project. In spite of this interference, we helped drill 208 more sanitary wells, bringing the total to 1,608. This particular program is geared for rapid expansion once conditions permit.

The rising number of refugees seeking haven in the cities of South Vietnam has gravely overtaxed the municipal water supplies. While awaiting the day when the countryside is stable enough for orderly development, most of the well drills are at work in many of the 65 cities of the south.

The Vietcong have also hit the electric power supply hard. Last May they sabotaged a 160-megawatt transmission line in Saigon from Danhim in central Vietnam.

As work was rushed on a 33-megawatt powerplant, financed through a $12.7 million U.S. loan, we helped the Public Works Ministry design, construct, and equip a 22-megawatt plant near Saigon.

In the countryside, we helped install diesel generating units in 32 towns and villages. The United States helped organize three rural electrification cooperatives and made plans to begin work on electrical projects early this year. We already have shipped the equipment for these projects.

Stronger transmitters and better broadcast facilities improved the 7-station Radio Vietnam network. We supplied 85,000 low-cost radios for the public and 11,000 for the armed forces and other groups.

These radios supplement 6,000 community listening centers already established, and almost 5,000 radios supplied through Australian and Japanese aid.

INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

The United States financed 8 new industrial plants and 51 expansions of existing plants in 1965. These projects represented more than $7 million in imported equipment.

Two teams of Vietnamese industrialists came to the United States and an American team went to Vietnam to explore investment possibilities. We opened up some 40 such possibilities as a result of these visits.

Some 70,000 jobs in textile manufacturing were made available because of plant expansion. These goods provide vital business and consumer income and meet 90 percent of South Vietnam's cotton textile requirements.

Between 1954 and 1961, America helped rebuild the country's transportation system almost completely. This included a mainline railroad from Saigon 700 miles north to the 17th parallel.

Rice production surpassed by 40 percent South Vietnam's prewar annual average output of 3.5 million metric tons.

American assistance helped build many small- and medium-sized factories. We doubled the hydroelectric power supply. We helped begin land reform.

I wish to comment on the extent to which we have started on these programs, how they have been interrupted, and how the programs in all cases have shown that they work, that they work out well, that it is possible, even in a country at war, even in a country suffering the instability and the many difficulties that Vietnam does suffer, it is possible to make these investments productively, but that we have not begun to do nearly enough.

As I say, we helped begin land reform. The South Vietnam Government, with American assistance, authorized almost 300,000 peasant families to receive title to land or to homestead on abandoned land.

We spent more than $2.1 billion on economic assistance between 1954 and 1964.

REAL GOAL OF VIETCONG ATTACK

It was exactly this progress toward orderly, stable development that the Vietcong had to stop. Ho Chi Minh as well as Mao Tse-tung must have known that progress like this would make a Communist South Vietnam impossible.

So along this road to orderly development, the Vietcong stepped up their attacks and subversion.

Prof. Wesley R. Fishel is certainly one of the leading American experts on Vietnam. He has spent many years in the country. He has written a brilliant, scholarly analysis of our aid program in current history.

Fishel, incidentally, served as adviser to the Prime Minister of Vietnam in 1955 and chief adviser to Michigan State University's Vietnam project in Saigon from 1956 to 1958. Fishel reports that the emphasis of our aid program changed in 1958.

At that time we replaced economic assistance with counterinsurgency programs designed to support the war directly in rural areas. U.S. dollars went to commodity imports instead of public works, education, and public health.

Professor Fishel wrote last fall:

> A smaller percentage of American aid went into purely technical assistance, intended to create the human and institutional resources needed to sustain Vietnamese freedom through the training of Government workers in the fields of education, health, public administration, public works, and the like.

The military struggle claimed among its victims the impressive gains made in the mid-1950's, a promising social welfare program, especially in education.

Civic action or self-help projects were undertaken but Communist insurgency grew so active that, as Professor Fishel said:

> By the spring of 1965, less than 50 percent of the Vietnamese countryside was generally available for aid operations, and in many areas token assistance at best was all that could be undertaken.
>
> By 1965, the emphasis was once more on measures of an emergency nature. Survival once more became the primary objective.
>
> Fundamentally, it is now accepted doctrine that elementary social justice is an element that has frequently been lacking in Vietnam, and that this gap must somehow be repaired.
>
> At the same time, the dynamic political activity that is necessary to the achievement of social justice requires corollary economic and social assistance. But if any or all of these measures are to be effective or sustained, there must be continuing physical security against the Vietcong.
>
> The vicious circle is a continuing dilemma for U.S. officials as well as for the Vietnamese themselves. Yet without some resolution of this dilemma, a successful outcome to the struggle in Vietnam is hard to visualize.

NEEDED: MONEY WHERE MOUTH IS

We have not yet resolved this dilemma.

President Johnson said only a few days ago:

> We must make it clear to friend and foe alike that we are as determined to support the peaceful growth of southeast Asia as we are to resist those who would conquer and subjugate it.

In discussing his plans for American foreign aid, the President also said:

> Our response must be bold and daring. It must go to the root causes of misery and unrest. It must build a firm foundation for progress, security, and peace.

I admire the President's words. I applaud him.

But last year, we had only 700 Americans working with the nonmilitary assistance program in South Vietnam. This year there are only 100 more.

As I have said, we have less than 1 American working for AID in the entire nonmilitary effort in Vietnam for every 200 American soldiers.

The total proposed American aid for schools, health and agricultural development in Vietnam for all three is only $31.7 million. We will spend 400 times as much in the strictly military effort in Vietnam.

I am not one of those who believe that we can do without military force. We must have it. It is essential. In fact, I support it without reservation. But I should like to add two things: First, we should keep in mind that our military effort has a single purpose, and that is to achieve negotiations in order to bring a just peace to this troubled nation. Any time our military effort can be interrupted or limited because it might possibly give rise to negotiations—we should certainly do so.

In the second place, it seems to me that all the firepower in the world cannot kill the idea that the Communists are on the side of the landless peasant.

And yet we do have the weapon that can destroy that basic source of Communist strength in Vietnam. We have the ability to improve the lot of the Vietnam little man swiftly and decisively.

Between 1955 and 1964 we helped increase the school attendance in South Vietnam from 300,000 to more than 1,500,000, an amazingly heartening achievement. I do not believe that there is a country in the world which has had a fivefold increase in school attendance in 10 years, whether in peace or in war. In South Vietnam it has been done under most difficult circumstances with American assistance.

But this year we plan to devote only $5.3 million to Vietnam schools.

The ratio of population to doctors in Vietnam is several hundred times what it is in America. Where we have brought our marvelous medical capacity to bear in Vietnam—for example, to counteract malaria—it has been a smashing success.

Yet this year we plan only $20.5 million for public health in Vietnam, which is substantially less, as I calculate it, than what we spend in one day in our military effort.

URGENT NEED FOR LAND REFORM

Most conspicuous of all, we have permitted the Vietcong to win the support of the majority of peasants who are landless with the Vietcong theme: "Land to the Tiller."

Only the landless are given miliary and local governmental authority by the Vietcong.

And in these tenant farmer areas, American military and civilian observers agree there are more Vietcong today than there were a year ago.

Why? Because too often we have permitted ourselves to be identified with South Vietnamese policy that has done just the opposite: give the power and authority strictly to the landlord.

The Ky government has modest land reform plans. But they are strictly limited and inadequately financed.

Best estimates are that an approximately $200 million program of buying some 2 million acres of Mekong Delta land would permit a 5- to 7-acre per-farm-family redistribution to landless peasants.

Similar attempts by the Diem regime foundered on a patently inadequate financing program.

The $200-million program I am suggesting represents a costly investment but in comparison with the military effort it would equal the cost of just 1 week of the Vietnamese military effort.

It could have a dramatic effect on the attitude of Vietnamese farmers who are now caught between the Vietcong and bloodsucking landlords, many of whom charge double the legal rents.

In Long An Province, one of South Vietnam's most fertile districts, more than 85 percent of the peasants are tenant farmers.

This Mekong Delta province was considered a showcase project of a combined Vietnamese and American military and economic pacification effort to defeat Communist subversion.

Long An's tenant farmers heard "Land to the Tiller" often from the Vietcong. What is more, the Vietcong show they mean what they say. They have directly alined themselves with the landless.

What has been the countermove of the South Vietnamese Government? Appeals—until recently—were almost exclusively to the 15-percent landlord class. These are the same people who occupy virtually every position of authority and power in the army and in local government.

The 85 percent landless have been practically ignored.

LAND REFORM: A BARGAIN OPPORTUNITY

We are spending $250 million a week on the military effort in South Vietnam. From 1961 to 1965 nothing was spent for land reform.

For the current fiscal year, $1.1 million was allocated for land reform. For all agricultural purposes, we are spending only $5.9 million.

An investment of $200 million in land reform would undermine the Vietcong's peasant support in the Mekong Delta.

Only 260,000 farms out of 1.2 million in the delta are owner operated. The rest are operated by the tenants who do not own the land. More than 500,000 are rented and 330,000 more are partly rented. Some 3,000 rich families in Saigon are the big landlords.

Long An Province, according to an official U.S. survey made last July, has 65 rich landlords, 3,000 farmer-owners and 28,000 tenant farmers.

What a bloodless victory awaits a really vigorous and adequate land reform program on our part.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that the military effort in Vietnam is a tragic but, in my judgment, essential action. Without military security against the Vietcong, the best social program in the world can make little progress.

Indeed, the fact that the Vietcong control half the countryside obviously slows down schools, health, land reforms, or any other action until the Vietcong are driven out.

But how many times do we have to learn the lesson in Vietnam that military conquest evaporates and blows away, if the mind and the heart of the peasant and villager are on the side of the Communists? Again and again the Vietcong are welcomed back in when the successful South Vietnam and American troops move on.

When we do win a rural area, we need to be prepared to do a far more ambitious job of schooling, health, and land reform than the $1 we are spending for these purposes for each $400 we spend to do the essential military job.

The President has wisely acknowledged that we should spend more on education, more on health, and more on agricultural assistance in our foreign aid program and less on large capital investment. And yet in this most crucial of areas—Vietnam—we are making a pitifully inadequate effort to do just that. If we are to win the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese people, we must do better—and I mean far better.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD these important documents:

First. A brilliant analysis of the history of American aid to Vietnam during the past decade. It was written for Current History by Prof. Wesley R. Fishel, a former adviser to the Prime Minister of Vietnam and former chief adviser to Michigan State University's Vietnam project in Saigon. Professor Fishel speaks with authority and his credentials to do so are without question.

Second. A thoughtful and penetrating, but apparently little-noticed, discussion of Vietnam and revolution by retired Maj. Gen. Edward G. Lansdale. General Lansdale, once again a member of the U.S. mission in Vietnam, is our country's leading expert on counterinsurgency. His views, written for Foreign Affairs, deserve the consideration of everyone concerned with our role in southeast Asia.

Third. Detailed analyses of the pacification program and nonmilitary effort in Vietnam by two veteran New York Times reporters, Charles Mohr and R. W. Apple, Jr. Both speak with the authority and clarity of on-the-scene observers.

Fourth. A thought-provoking account of the need for land reform in Vietnam written by Richard Critchfield, the informed and articulate Asia correspondent of the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Current History Nov. 1965]

AMERICAN AID TO VIETNAM

(By Wesley R. Fishel, professor of political science, Michigan State University)

(Wesley R. Fishel was an adviser to the prime minister of Vietnam in 1955, and chief adviser to Michigan State University's Vietnam project in Saigon in 1956–58. In 1961–62, he was a Guggenheim Fellow. From 1952 to 1956, Mr. Fishel was a consultant to the Foreign Operations Administration. He is the editor of "Problems of Freedom: Vietnam" (New York: Macmillan, 1961) and author of other works on Asia.)

NOTE.—Because of "Communist subversion of the South Vietnamese Government," as this author sees it, "By 1965, the emphasis [in United States foreign aid] was once more on measures of an emergency nature." Once more, economic development is not so important as measures of an emergency nature aimed at survival for South Vietnam. In the words of this specialist, "* * * American aid appears * * * to have come full circle."

In the strictest sense, American aid to Vietnam might be said to be in its 16th year. For it was in May 1950, that the Griffin Mission was dispatched to the Associated States of Indochina, recommended assistance to the French in their war against the Communist-led Viet Minh, and prepared the way for the expenditure of our first $44 million in aid money to that area. Now, a full 15 years and $5 billion later, the American aid program in Vietnam has become this country's largest and most critical involvement of its type in the world.

Foreign aid is an instrument of foreign policy. This simple fact has been at the core of many controversies and misunderstandings concerning the United States aid program. For in its initiation and its implementation since the early days of the Marshall plan in 1947, foreign aid has been seen variously by different people as an act of humanity, a measure of reconstruction, or an instrument of national interest.[1]

In the case of Vietnam, it has been all of these. Begun initially in 1950 with funds left over from the huge postwar program of assistance to Nationalist China, American aid has carried the complexion of humanitarian relief in that much of it was given for immediate assistance to people suffering from the ravages of war. At the same time, since it was given through the French rulers of the three colonial territories of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, and included a significant measure of military support, it also partook of a quality of national interest and was clearly related to United States foreign policy as a whole. For this was the period in which open conflict with Communist states began. On June 25, 1950, Communist North Korea had invaded the Republic of Korea to its south, and American armed forces, acting in the name of the United Nations, had come to the defense of the South Koreans.

Even as the fighting mounted in South Korea, the United States was aware that along the frontiers of North Vietnam, mainly in the Province of Yunnan, some 250,000 Chinese Communist troops were stationed and (it was then feared) poised for imminent attack toward the south. Although the threatened invasion never occurred, Communist China did lend important assistance to the Viet Minh forces in Indochina, with major shipments of material and substantial technical assistance as well. The United States, whose interest in the French colonies of Indochina had at first been of purely secondary character and had leaned toward support for the anticolonial nationalists fighting under Communist leadership in the Viet Minh, shifted sharply to full military and economic assistance to the French. For while American policymakers had severe misgivings about the purity of French motives and considered that the only real solution to the conflict in Indochina lay in granting independence to its subject peoples, the presence of Communist power on Vietnam's northern frontiers loomed ominously in their minds and came finally to dominate their thinking and their planning.

By 1953, what had begun in a haphazard fashion and without plan 4 years earlier had become a major and costly program of military assistance and economic aid. In its Activity Report for 1951–53, the Special Technical and Economic Mission to the Associated States of Indochina stated the United States purpose for being there as stemming from the fact that Indochina constituted "the key to all of free Asia." It then continued:

"It is in the interest of the United States to prevent by all available means these states from falling to the Communist bloc, since defeat here would foreshadow defeat in surrounding areas and undoubtedly engender the loss of southeast Asia. In such eventuality, it is probable that all of Asia would succumb."[2]

One may discern in this statement an early and simplistic rendering of the "falling domino" concept, later enunciated publicly by President Dwight Eisenhower. The report continued, however, with a second paragraph which is especially striking given the problems and solutions which have regularly been discussed since that day.

"The tremendous struggle in Indochina has been going on for more than 6 years. It is becoming increasingly apparent that, in order to achieve a decision, it will be necessary not only to strengthen the military effort of the Associated States and the French, but further to develop in the Indochinese peoples the will to fight and to support their governments. Thus the problem is not purely a military problem. The solution is not purely a military solution. What is needed here is simultaneous military, political, and economic action."

To this end, STEM saw its responsibility in five areas:

1. To increase government effectiveness and broaden popular support;
2. To help create a political, economic and social atmosphere which would "appeal to the individual and fire his self-interest in support of his government";
3. To assist military action by economic support;
4. To increase production, particularly in agriculture;
5. To maintain supplies by bringing in items for which foreign exchange was short.

The major difficulty, however, lay in the fact that France, while desiring American aid, did not wish partnership. Thus, the United States accepted a contributory role in a French colonial war (with whose objectives it was scarcely in sympathy) to prevent the achievement of Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Laotian national independence, but did not at any point prior to the final defeat of French arms secure even a minimum voice in deciding how that war should be fought or might be won.

GENEVA, 1954

By the time that the conference of great powers met at Geneva in April 1954, it was painfully clear to all that France had to all intents and purposes lost the war and was seeking a way out. The Geneva agreements of July 20–21, 1954, brought a temporary cessation of hostilities to the war-torn lands of Indochina and terminated 90 years of French domination of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. The legal achievement of independence for these peoples did not come, however, until December 1954, when France formally conceded that status to them.

The U.S. position in the Geneva negotiations was at best equivocal. Participating, yet firmly determined not to agree to a "Munich" type of agreement, the American delegation refrained at the close of the conference from signing the accords. U.S. policy at this time was twofold; to deny control of southeast Asia in general and of South Vietnam in particular to the Communist world, and to attempt to develop a viable and friendly government in that part of Vietnam which remained attached to the free world. The area was considered then, as now, to be one of vital interest and major importance to the United States, and while the United States had no specific formal commitments to Vietnam at that time which bound it to the defense of Vietnam's political or territorial integrity, there were a number of explicit and implicit American commitments which bore upon this assumption of responsibility and consequent involvement. In addition, the United States had made a major financial contribution to the French prosecution of the war in Vietnam ($4.2 billion) between 1950 and 1954, and was loathe to see this stake lost unless the situation were indeed irretrievable—which American policymakers were reluctant to concede.

---

[1] A useful symposium on the "why" of overseas assistance is Robert A. Goldwin's (ed.), "Why Foreign Aid" (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1962).

[2] Special Technical and Economic Mission to Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam (STEM), "Cumulative Activity Report to June 30, 1953" (Saigon, 1953), p. 6.

A NEW ADMINISTRATION

With the close of the Geneva Conference, a new administration in Saigon, under Catholic nationalist Ngo Dinh Diem, faced a galaxy of seemingly insoluble problems: housing, feeding, clothing and rendering self-sustaining some 860,000 refugees from the Communist areas in the north; governing with a bureaucracy that had been virtually paralyzed by the confusion and chaos of 8 years of civil war; reasserting central government authority over vast stretches of territory which had been ruled for years by the Communists or which were even at that moment under the sway of the Cao Dai and Hoa Hao sects; coping with the problems of economic dislocation resulting from the wartime flight from the southern countryside to the cities of more than 1 million peasant families; reorganizing the national army and provincial defense forces, which had been defeated along with the French; finding funds (at a time when the national income had virtually disappeared) so that governmental programs could go forward and services be brought to the population. The tasks were enormous, and the means at hand were slight.

With the end of French colonial rule, the Vietnamese turned to the United States for both aid and support. STEM, which had worked modestly and cautiously through the French, was at this point transformed into a large U.S. operations mission (the designation for aid missions representing the Foreign Operations Administration of the U.S. Government), and after January 1, 1955, it dealt directly with the Vietnamese. French influence over Vietnamese affairs diminished thereafter, and American responsibility began to assume substantial dimensions.

GOAL: SURVIVAL

Given the absence of technical, financial, and military wherewithal on the part of the Vietnamese, the mere act of survival became an objective. More than that, survival was a major challenge to the combined resources of the new regime in Saigon and to its American ally, as well as a vital prerequisite to any program of development which might be contemplated. American aid thus became a primary instrument in South Vietnam's struggle for survival, filling as it did the vast gap between the Vietnamese Government's capacities and its needs.

Apart from assistance in the restoration of internal security, through technical, financial, and economic support of the Vietnamese National Army and the national police and security services, which has at all times been the largest component of American aid programs in South Vietnam, the major preoccupation of the United States during the early days of the Diem period was the reception and resettlement of the refugees from Communist North Vietnam. Skilled advice and financial assistance was proffered and accepted gratefully by the Vietmanese Government, which thus was enabled to plan and program effectively for the resettlement of refugee families in hundreds of new villages across South and Central Vietnam, to aid them in the construction of new homes and villages, and to find gainful employment or otherwise develop self-sustaining economic programs. The Vietnamese Government at this time organized its refugee programs under a Commissariat General for Refugees, bringing together under one coordinator all administrative operations of a relevant nature.

This temporary administrative agency became a model of efficiency in a generally apathetic and tradition-bound bureaucracy. The handling of the refugees, furthermore, gave a psychological shot in the arm to the Vietnamese Government, and many observers consider that it was the stimulus needed to keep the Government alive and to enable it to begin treating more routine kinds of problems with effectiveness.

The accomplishment of Vietnam independence from France was one of Ngo Dinh Diem's first acts. A slow and complex process, this involved transferring military, legal, economic, and monetary authority from the French to the Vietnamese and was completed in December 1954. Nonetheless, financial independence was not matched in the military sphere until April 1956. France continued to subsidize the private armies of Cao Dai, Hoa Hao, and Binh Xuyen (then opposing the Saigon government) until March 1955, and the French High Command in Vietnam continued to operate until a year after that.

With independence came new problems, some of emergency character, some of more lasting nature and import. Most were dealt with on an ad hoc basis during those early years, for the United States at that time still had no expectation that it was going to be involved in the little southeast Asian republic over a period of many years. Planning was not a concept that was then acceptable to the Foreign Operations Administration (nor its successor agency, the International Cooperation Administration). Such industrial growth as did occur resulted from occasional spurts of initiative, prompted by recognition of the fact that an independent Vietnam had different economic and industrial needs and problems than had been the case when the land was a colonial possession of France.

ECONOMIC PROGRESS

Some noteworthy economic steps were, however, taken between 1954 and 1961, principally through American aid cooperation. The transportation system, for example, was almost entirely rebuilt, including a main railway line running 700 miles north from Saigon to the demarcation line at the 17th parallel, and a reconstructed highway network. Rice production was stimulated to the point that South Vietnam exceeded by 40 percent its prewar annual average production of 3.5 million metric tons of paddy. Rubber production exceeded prewar totals. A number of small- and medium-sized manufacturing plants were built, forming a modest base for planned industrial growth and bringing into the Vietnamese economy a mixed cluster of Vietnamese and foreign investors linked in their enterprises by participating Vietnamese Government capital. An extensive agrarian reform program was undertaken by the Vietnamese Government, which ultimately resulted in nearly 300,000 peasant families receiving titles to land or being authorized to homestead on abandoned land. Japanese reparations provided a large hydroelectric plant on the Ca Nhim River in South-Central Vietnam, which has more than doubled Vietnam's electric power capacity.

SOCIAL WELFARE

Social welfare, too, received a substantial share of American aid attention. Teacher-training was a fundamental area of Vietnamese-American cooperation, as was the building of classrooms, with the result that between 1954 and 1961, school enrollments increased from about 400,000 to nearly 1,500,000, while the number of primary schoolteachers was increased from 30,000 to nearly 90,000. Public health measures involved the establishment of more than 12,500 village and hamlet aid stations and maternity clinics throughout the country, and a malaria eradication program which sprayed systematically and repeatedly more than 2 million homes and succeeded in bringing down the incidence of this endemic disabler from 7.22 percent in 1958 to 0.77 percent in 1962.

Over the years, as American aid committed more than $2.1 billion in economic assistance to Vietnam between 1954 and 1964, the number of American personnel in the country steadily increased until, by 1965, there were nearly 700 aid personnel directly employed in Vietnam. "Economic assistance" ceased to be the principal category of aid, after the resurgence of Communist subversive warfare after 1958. In its place, counterinsurgency assistance programs were formulated, to support directly the war and security efforts of the Vietnamese in rural areas. And commercial import programs, which provide funds for the purchase of essential commodities such as medicine, machinery, trucks, steel, fertilizer, and cement, played a major role. A smaller percentage of American aid went into purely technical assistance, intended to create the human and institutional resources needed to sustain Vietnamese freedom through the training of government workers in the fields of education, health, public administration, public works, and the like.

The much discussed and criticized strategic hamlet program (renamed the new life hamlet program after the overthrow of the Diem government in November 1963) was a principal focus of American technical assistance from 1962 on. Communist insurgency had created acute conditions of insecurity in the countryside of South Vietnam, and a program was organized to create as many as 11,000 defended hamlets for protection of the peasantry. Unfortunately, it was overzealously and clumsily administered by the Diem government, and ultimately failed to achieve its purpose.

It was in this context, however, that American aid first began to be delivered to the Vietnamese peasantry without passing in all cases through the intervening Vietnamese Government hierarchy. Carefully planned projects were developed between Vietnamese and American authorities for integrated pacification efforts, involving security activities, administrative arrangements, psychological efforts, and economic and social programs. Civic action (self-help) programs were undertaken on a large scale. Yet so great was the strain imposed by growing Communist-directed insurgency, and so intrinsically weak was the central Vietnamese Government, that advisers representing American aid programs in the rural provinces found during 1963 and 1964 that their geographical horizons of activity were becoming increasingly restricted. By the spring of 1965, less than 50 percent of the Vietnamese countryside was generally available for aid operations, and in many areas token assistance at best was all that could be undertaken.

Disastrous floods in central Vietnam in the autumn of 1964 brought tens of thousands of peasants into the cities and towns of central Vietnam seeking refuge. This influx coincided with and was followed by an even larger movement of humanity. In the presence of ever-intensifying Vietcong terrorism, and the concomitant trauma of war, nearly 600,000 peasants and their families fled villages and isolated hamlets in the hinterlands, and sought shelter and help in the cities and towns of the central Vietnam plain. This second major mass uprooting of Vietnamese peasantry has brought grave political, administrative, economic, and social problems to the Government of Vietnam. It offers a major challenge to that Government and its American ally which, if successfully dealt with, could redound to the credit of Saigon, but which is also fraught with the most serious of consequences in the event that it is not dealt with effectively.

Although long-range economic planning had never been a significant feature of the American aid effort in Vietnam, after the Diem regime had consolidated its control in 1956 some thought was given to the problems of economic development. It was understood that Vietnam's agricultural base was, by Vietnamese and American agreement, a priority area for systematic development. A number of new crops, including kenaf and jute fibers, were introduced and added a degree of supporting sustenance. Some 700 factories of varying sizes were established. Improved municipal water systems and a number of thermal- and diesel-powered electric installations were provided. And in all, an encouraging start was made on the development of what would become, hopefully, a viable economy.

This promising start, however, was rendered virtually meaningless by the onset of the Vietnamese Communist subversion of the South Vietnamese Government. By 1965, the emphasis was once more on measures of an emergency nature. Survival once more became the primary objective. Restoring Government services, which had been terminated because of insecurity and war hazards, was once more a high priority target. And American aid appeared at the time this article was written to have come full circle. An enormous augmentation in American military strength in Vietnam (from approximately 700 advisory personnel in 1960 to more than 130,000 advisory and combat troops by September 1965) has changed the nature of the war in that country and the character of the aid effort.

The war in Vietnam is now clearly understood to be an essentially political struggle in which the support of the people is a principal objective for both sides. Consequently, aid to the peasantry has become a prime element in the U.S. approach. The deterioration of the military situation during the years from 1960 to early 1965 brought serious reverses, loss of territory, and persistent political instability which prevented the attainment of many physical and political objectives of American aid. Although the military side of the war occupied much of the attention of United States and Vietnamese officials dring this period recognition of the political lacunae in the struggle caused increasingly vigorous efforts by aid officials in particular to achieve a satisfactory balance between military, economic, social, and political measures.

Fundamentally, it is now accepted doctrine that elementary social justice is an element that has frequently been lacking in Vietnam, and that this gap must somehow be repaired. At the same time, the dynamic political activity that is necessary to the achievement of social justice requires corollary economic and social assistance. But if any or all of these measures are to be effective or sustained, there must be continuing physical security against the Vietcong. The vicious circle is a continuing dilemma for U.S. officials as well as for the Vietnamese themselves. Yet without some resolution of this dilemma, a successful outcome to the struggle in Vietnam is hard to visualize.

[From Foreign Affairs, October 1964]

VIETNAM: DO WE UNDERSTAND REVOLUTION?

(By Maj. Gen. Edward G. Lansdale)

Whatever course the long struggle in Vietnam finally takes, short of nuclear holocaust, one thing seems certain: the people of Vietnam still will be there. This is a reminder that war in Vietnam is a "people's war." As such, it is a constantly recurring phenomenon of this period of man's history. How it is fought and what happens to the Vietnamese people as a result have meanings, therefore, far beyond today or the boundaries of Vietnam itself. "People's wars" elsewhere will also make demands on the American people to help solve them. Thus, although the hour is late in Vietnam, terribly so, there is time yet for Americans to consider the war in Vietnam in its "people" nature, especially as regards what American assistance in these critical months will come to mean to the Vietnamese people in their own future, and to us in ours.

Nearly 4 years ago now, on December 20, 1960, the Communists set up the political base with which they hoped to win Vietnam by revolutionary struggle. The base consisted of an idea and of an organization to start giving that idea reality. Both the idea and the concept of the organization were foreign, having traveled the distance in time and space from Lenin in the Soviet Union via Mao in China.

The Communist idea was to gain control of the 14 million people living in South Vietnam by destroying their faith in their own government and creating faith in the inevitability of a Communist takeover. The organization to do this through a phased series of disciplined actions was called the "National Liberation Front of South Vietnam." It had a central committee to direct its operations for political-psychological-military actions, and a wide assortment of member "fronts" manned by small cadres, to appeal politically to mass groupings of Vietnamese people: the farmers, the workers, the youth, the intellectuals, and even the civil servants and military.

Ever since the creation of a Communist political base in Vietnam, the successive governments of Vietnam and their supporters and counselor, the United States, with the approval and sometimes the help of other free-world peoples, have given their substance and made their sacrifices to prevent a Communist win. The harsh fact, and one which has given pause to every thoughtful American, is that, despite the use of overwhelming amounts of men, money, and materiel, despite the quantity of well-meant American advice and despite the impressive statistics of casualties inflicted on the Vietcong, the Communist subversive insurgents have grown steadily stronger, in numbers and in size of units, and still retain the initiative to act at their will in the very areas of Vietnam where Vietnamese and American efforts have been most concentrated.

Most American reactions to this stark fact have fallen within three general categories. Some believe that we should disengage in Vietnam, preferably by setting up means to end the struggle and bloodshed through international accommodation. Some believe we should plainly identify the struggle as a war and make use of our military proficiency to force the Communist regime in Hanoi to cease its adventure in the south. Some believe we should continue along the present course, but greatly increasing the quantity and effectiveness of what is done so that it eventually smothers and kills the Communist insurgency. The anomaly in these reactions is that each falls short of understanding that the Communists have let loose a revolutionary idea in Vietnam and that it will not die by being ignored, bombed, or smothered by us. Ideas do not die in such ways.

A fourth belief, admittedly in a minority in the free world at present, is to oppose the Communist idea with a better idea and to do so on the battleground itself, in a way that would permit the people, who are the main feature of that battleground, to make their own choice. A political base would be established. The first step would be to state political goals, founded on principles cherished by freemen, which the Vietnamese share; the second would be an aggressive commitment of organizations and resources to start the Vietnamese moving realistically toward those political goals. In essence, this is revolutionary warfare, the spirit of the British Magna Carta, the French "Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité" and our own Declaration of Independence.

For American consideration, this fourth belief might be put another way. It is this. In trying to help the Vietnamese, the United States has been contributing in generous measure those things which it so far has felt most qualified to give and which the Vietnamese may lack—money, equipment, and technical advice. In general, though, the United States has felt inhibited about trying to make a contribution in areas in which it feels that the chief responsibility must rest with the Vietnamese themselves, particularly in finding the motivation for conducting a successful counterinsurgency effort. The thesis of this paper is that, due to the extent of our involvement, and because everything depends on that motivation, Americans cannot escape responsibility in this area either.

It will be stanchly maintained by some that no nation can endow another nation with the will to be free, that only an indigenous movement can have genuine popular appeal, that Americans should not interfere in the domestic affairs of another nation, and that the Vietnamese war is now in such a state that political innovations could invite disaster. This makes it necessary to examine the revolutionary solution in some detail.

Two near neighbors of Vietnam offer examples of countries which were successful in maintaining their freedom when attacked by Asian Communist subversive insurgents. True, the circumstances were not the same as in Vietnam today. Yet in each case the insurgencies were conducted as "wars of national liberation" by native Communists using a revolutionary political base, and these insurgencies were defeated.

The unconventional methods which were developed and used in the successful campaigns in Malaya and the Philippines are the lessons most often studied and adapted for use elsewhere, including in Vietnam. They have their importance. However, both of these successful campaigns had one great lesson in common, which the leaders recognized as the single most significant and vital factor in victory. The great lesson was that there must be a heartfelt cause to which the legitimate government is pledged, a cause which makes a stronger appeal to the people than the Communist cause, a cause which is used in a dedicated way by the legitimate government to polarize and guide all other actions—psychological, military, social and economic—with participation by the people themselves, in order to bring victory. In Malaya, the cause was to safeguard the impending national independence from seizure by Communist neocolonialism. In the Philippines, the cause was to safeguard the Constitution whose true value came to be appreciated as it was made a working document for the people, so that appeals by the Communists to the people to join them in overthrowing the constitutional government by force actually made the Communists a minority against the people's best interests.

These necessarily brief descriptions of two causes cannot convey the strength of their tremendously moving appeal to the people on the two battlegrounds. As with most fundamental truths, their concepts were plain to understand once they were explained correctly. After they were discovered and made effective, they seemed so natural and obvious that many people who had not shared the deep emotions of the insurgent battlegrounds tended to overlook them or underrate their vital significance, looking elsewhere for more romantic or technical foundations from which the victories might be supposed to have been started.

Of specific interest to those concerned with the problems of Vietnam, and as a commentary on the frailty of human perceptions, it should be noted that the vital causes which became the rallying points in Malaya and the Philippines were disregarded during years of tragic struggle in those countries. Once they were recognized and given dynamic use by leaders such as Templar, Magsaysay and others, even though this was done after there had been years of indecisive fighting, the climax of each campaign came quickly. If it can be expressed by a formula, the lesson might be stated as: When the right cause is identified and used correctly, the anti-Communist fight becomes a propeople fight, with the overwhelming majority of the people then starting to help what they recognize to be their own side, and the struggle is brought to a climax. When the propeople fight is continued sincerely by its leaders, the Communist insurgency is destroyed.

This concept of revolutionary warfare seems to lie close to the heart of American beliefs. In the President's June 23, 1964, press conference, in which he restated our southeast Asian policy, he said, "This is not just a jungle war, but a struggle for freedom on every front of human activity." The month before, the Secretary of Defense explained to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs that "the mission of our men in South Vietnam is the same as of those Europeans (he named Kosciusko, Von Steuben, and Pulaski) who came to assist us in our fight for liberty."

Now as already mentioned, the concept that the United States should give advice and counsel on waging revolutionary warfare in the form of a pro-people fight involves exporting American political principles, and some see such an export as something improper, or even immoral. Such an inhibition deserves close scrutiny when it is applied to a life-or-death struggle, such as the one in Vietnam, since it rules out or at least weakens American help in providing the attacked country with a dynamic political answer with which to meet and overcome the foreign ideas introduced by the Communists as the political base of their attack. Lacking such a dynamic answer, the country is left to make do with its own political resources—which, as we have witnessed time after time, often evolve into a one-man leadership with strict control over all national resources, in order to save the country. Americans see this result as a dictatorship and feel a moral inhibition against giving it assistance; some well-meaning people go so far as to attack it. Not surprisingly, the United States thus comes to be looked upon abroad as immature or callous or self-righteous.

Admittedly, great wisdom and sensitivity are required if the United States is to help in the internal political problems of foreign peoples. It would be a drastic change for most U.S. officials to try to satisfy the hesitantly expressed desires of leaders and peoples of sovereign states for political advice with a higher content of American idealism in it. Some might do the task badly, lacking the required perceptivity and understanding of the political backgrounds of either the host country or our own.

Yet the United States has undertaken political tasks of this sort in foreign nations in the past, and the results have brought it considerable honor and prestige. The two most recent examples were Japan and West Germany, defeated nations with which it somehow became "correct" to share the best possible American political thinking. Another example was the Philippines. We tutored the Philippine people and encouraged them in self-government in the same brotherly spirit which elsewhere today could make all the difference in struggles between freedom and Communism. While the Philippines, Japan and Germany are primarily examples of U.S. Government efforts, others which have been most useful were private or semipublic, such as the work of American lawyers abroad in helping establish the legal foundation of government. It is not surprising or unseemly that the Constitution of India contains so many provisions based upon decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, that the 1955 Constitution of Ethiopia recognizes so many of the same rights as does the U.S. Constitution, that the 1940 Constitution of Cuba remains the very antithesis of Castro and the eventual return to its observance one of the great hopes of the Cuban people.

The great cause in Vietnam which last united the overwhelming majority of Vietnamese, both North and South, was "independence." For many of the Vietnamese, including nearly all the Vietnamese leaders with whom we work today in South Vietnam, "independence" was a goal to be won by revolutionary means against a colonial power. In this aspect, Vietnam's revolutionary spirit was close to that of the American Revolution.

The tragedy of Vietnam's revolutionary war for independence was that her "Benedict Arnold" was successful. Ho Chi Minh, helped by Vo Nguyen Giap, Truong Chinh, Pham Van Dong, and a small cadre of disciplined party members trained by the Chinese and Russians, secretly changed the goals of the struggle. Instead of a war for independence against the French colonial power, it became a war to defeat the French and put Vietnam within the neocolonial Communist empire. When they discovered the truth, those patriots who could escaped. It is worth remembering that, after the Geneva Accords were signed in 1954, Vietminh troops were stoned by the population in Qui Nhon, the farmers of Ho Chi Minh's home province of Nghe An revolted against their Communist overlords, and a million Vietnamese fled from Communist territory.

The national revolution was reborn in South Vietnam when Ngo Dien Diem placed the fate of the new nation in the people's hands in 1955. Their secret ballot elected him almost unanimously to become their President, with the mandate to hold further elections for a constitutional assembly which would establish a government to govern with the consent of the governed. This was a revolutionary act, and the Vietnamese people rallied to the cause. Again, it is worth remembering that soon after this election, which had so roused the people to the cause of freedom, the Soviet Union sent representatives to London to meet with the representatives of the other cosponsor of the Geneva Accords, Great Britain. The two sponsoring parties agreed to call off the plebiscite which the accords had scheduled to be held in 1956. An internationally supervised secret ballot in Vietnam might well have gone heavily against the Communists at that time.

Unlike the American Revolution, the reborn national revolution in Vietnam lost its momentum. The spirit of revolution began to be replaced by the spirit of "business as usual," and Diem became more and more shut off from the people. The Communists kept up unceasing psychological pressure to weaken the bonds between government and people, both through character assassination of government leaders and by means of terror. (Informed observers estimate that more than 6,000 minor Vietnamese officials, such as village elders, rural police, and their families, have been murdered by the Vietcong since 1959.) The forcible overthrow of Diem last November and the later coup in January were revolutionary acts in themselves, but appear to have been outside a national revolution at the rice-roots level, since they put the government largely into the hands of the army and the bureaucracy. While these are sizable, organized groups, they still are not the majority of the Vietnamese, the people among whom the Vietcong hide and get support for their operations.

Widely shared feelings about revolution were summed up ably in a document written by the patriot, Dan Van Sung, addressed to other Vietnamese nationalist leaders in July 1963. He wrote:

"Emergent nations like Vietnam are in the midst of a political revolution. They are groping toward a new political and social order. In the process, many ideological schools may be fighting one another. On the one side are the Communists; on the other side are grouped the Nationalists of various tendencies, each of which is still in need of development. Whether the United States likes it or not, the aid program has to take the local revolution into account because American aid is bound to affect the revolutionary course and direction in one way or another, for the benefit or the damnation of the recipient people. This gives rise to a new responsibility which, while not propounded in the implementation of the Marshall plan, must be dealt with realistically. Within the framework of American foreign policy, anticommunism now has a revolutionary context. The American respect for the recipient people's self-determination can no longer be guaranteed by a negative policy of nonintervention which, practically speaking, may lead to just the contrary. In order to make sure that an emergent people really control their own destiny, the United States is expected to make positive efforts helping them develop control of themselves. In other words, American aid ought to be devised so as to help their legitimate aspirations come true through the achievement of their political revolution. This cannot be done without getting to the bottom of the revolutionary situation and taking sides in it, not only for anticommunism but also for democracy. * * * By emphasizing anticommunism rather than positive revolutionary goals and from lack of a better adaptation to the local situation, the United States has reduced its anti-Communist efforts in Vietnam to the maintenance of an administrative machine and of an army. * * * The way out, to our mind, is not by an abandonment but, on the contrary, by going deep into every local revolutionary problem and helping solve them using principles of justice and freedom, and perhaps in fusing them with the revolutionary spirit of 1776."

The foregoing leads to the final question of the feasibility of American help in banding the leaders, the military, the civil servants, and the people of Vietnam into a united force for freedom. This was tried by edict in the emergency national mobilization of August 1964. Yet, the sovereign Vietnamese people, even in such a time of stress, are unlike the defeated Japanese and Germans who had no choice but to submit to a rule by edict, supported by massive American advisory help throughout all echelons of government. In a revolutionary or people's war, such as the war in Vietnam, where the enemy is embedded within the population, the lasting quality needed for a win is the voluntary action of the population in joining together with the government forces, and with the American influence coming from respect and trust earned by the spirit in which individual Americans give their help.

There is no shortcut, no magic formula, to be used in engineering a great patriotic cause led by some universally loved Vietnamese of American selection. This type of puerile romance should not be attempted in real life. Nor does it seem probable in the light of Vietnam's recent history, despite the cheering urban crowds in all too brief moments of great emotion, that the Vietnamese themselves will find quickly and easily any revolutionary solution which will carry them all the way to victory.

At this point in time and experience, perhaps the most valuable and realistic gift that Americans can give Vietnam is to concentrate above everything else on helping the Vietnamese leadership create the conditions which will encourage the discovery and most rapid possible development of a patriotic cause so genuine that the Vietnamese willingly will pledge to it their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honor. Among the attributes of such a cause are that it shall give hope for a better future for each Vietnamese, that it shall provide a way for all Vietnamese to work for it, and that it shall have such integrity that it will induce Vietnamese leaders to start trusting one another. A number of actions can be undertaken, step by step, to create the conditions required. Some of them will now be suggested.

Foremost among the specific actions open to the United States is one to help the Vietnamese stabilize their government, even in its caretaker status, so that its leaders can afford to pay less attention to protecting their backs and more to the future. It is reported that there are several Vietnamese proposals about how to do this among the present leadership. It should not be too difficult for the United States to influence the adoption, as a matter of urgency, of the proposal most acceptable to Vietnamese leaders. Its success should be insured through American advisers counseling individual Vietnamese on how to make the project work most harmoniously for the good of all, while being alert to curtail intemperate moves toward a coup or studied disobedience.

Another important need is to help the Vietnamese make the present caretaker government just that, a temporary caretaker, in accord with the government's own expressed desire. It would seem premature to set a precise day to hold elections, such as those announced for late in 1964. The Vietcong subversive insurgents dominate too many villages for truly free universal elections. It would seem more realistic to say that an election will be held on the date when a simple majority of the population can vote by secret ballot, free of any threat.

If democracy is ever to become established in Vietnam, as Vietnamese patriots hope, then political leaders and political parties need encouragement to gain experience and strength. They cannot do this on the political sidelines. Some new place should be found in the government for political leaders not now included, perhaps in a new Assembly of Notables which would fill the void left by the abolition of the consultative Council of Notables. A truly practical task for such an Assembly might be for it to send out committees to check on the situation in hamlets and villages, to certify when conditions become favorable for holding a free popular election for hamlet and village officials, and then to help organize such an election. As a next step, similar procedures could open the way to elections for district chief, then province chief, and, when a majority of provinces are freed, to national elections. This program would provide a practical short-range political goal, give hope that a longer range goal is attainable, stimulate a healthy growth of political parties and start giving people their own government at the rice roots in direct confrontation to the Communist idea.

Americans could add to the attractiveness of these political goals by designing our local aid program to increase social and economic progress at a more rapid pace in villages where elections have been held. The incentive of a system of reward of visible material benefits along with the political benefits of freedom should be a dynamic instrument for accelerating progress. If rewards are given when conditions are stable enough to merit them, rather than in an attempt to buy the loyalties of the people, word of this will spread rapidly throughout the country; and they will not only become a brake on Communist recruiting efforts but also put the American presence in a most favorable context.

A Vietnamese provincial official told an American friend in August that the country would be saved if each of Vietnam's leaders "acted as though each day were his last day to live." Some form of spirited and selfless motivation for all Vietnamese in positions of authority does seem to be required. Perhaps it could be achieved through a Declaration of Liberty or other pledge to serve the country, signed in blood and providing strong penalties for failure to honor it. In any case, American advisers in all echelons, who are in daily association with Vietnamese in positions of responsibility, can encourage loyal patriotism by paying them proper respect. When American advisers express contempt for the fighting quality of the Vietnamese, as reported in our press this summer, it is a sign of the failure of such advisers to help develop the inherent quality of the Vietnamese. They might note and remember that the well-motivated "Sea Swallow" troops of Binh Hung, under Father Hoa, have fought against great odds, and that in almost constant engagements from the end of 1960 to the summer of 1964, 189 of them have been killed in actions in which 2,272 Vietcong were killed.

The most urgent military need is to make it the number one priority for the military to protect and help the people. When the military opens fire at long range, whether by infantry weapons, artillery or air strike, on a reported Vietcong concentration in a hamlet or village full of civilians, the Vietnamese officers who give these orders and the American advisers who let them "get away with it" are helping defeat the cause of freedom. The civilian hatred of the military resulting from such actions is a powerful motive for joining the Vietcong.

If American leaders in Vietnam are to make this war "a struggle for freedom on every front of human activity," and if the Americans with them are to become today's Kosciuskos, Von Steubens and Pulaskis in spirit, they should keep fresh in mind what happened in the hamlets of Tay Ninh province earlier this year, as an affront to every American doctrine, civilian or military. In Tay Ninh province, which is on the Cambodia border and not far from Saigon, two Vietcong battalions had entered a cluster of six adjoining hamlets. They fought their way in, overwhelming and destroying the civil guard post, whose men stood to the last in defense of the hamlets. Once inside, the Vietcong announced that they were going to stay for 72 hours. Then at noon the next day, ARVN, the Vietnamese Army with its American advisers, arrived. ARVN deployed along a half perimeter and for 18 hours poured into these six hamlets all the firepower it could, from the ground and from the air. Meanwhile, of course, most of the Vietcong had slipped out of the unguarded part of the perimeter, not waiting to become targets. Many of the men, women and children of the hamlets had to stay there and take it. Afterwards, survivors said they were grateful to the Vietcong, who had made them dig foxholes.

American bounty, whether in the form of military-civic action or economic aid by U.S. civilians, cannot make up for such mistakes. Nor can it buy the friendship of the Vietnamese people. However, the U.S. military can give a major boost to the political effort simply by upgrading the importance they assign to military-civic action and to guiding the Vietnamese military into accepting it as a basic soldierly quality in this war, just as the Vietcong do. Civic action means more than giving economic help; it is an attitude of behavior, an extension of military courtesy, in which the soldier citizen becomes the brotherly protector of the civilian citizen. The Vietcong practice it, under severe penalties for misbehavior, as point nine of their military oath of honor, which General Giap adopted from the 8th Route Army code of Mao Tse-tung known as the "Three Rules and the Eight Remarks." This code implemented the concept of the people as the water where the troops live as the fish. It must be puzzling to Communist observers to note that Americans in Vietnam usually initiate "civic action" in the form of public works by special ARVN units and not as a performance expected of every soldier. Observers who are most experienced in insurgent warfare believe that the Vietcong will not be defeated until ARVN catches the spirit of civic action and practices it through all ranks.

Vietnam is predominantly an agricultural nation, and what happens in the countryside may well determine the outcome of the war. The Communists are short of food, and the countryside is the prize which they seek above all. When American fertilizers increase by 100 percent the rice production in one season in one region, the prize becomes all the more tempting to the Communists (however galling must be the comparison with North Vietnam, where Chinese agricultural advisers have had so many failures). But this must not impede the process of economic development. The Americans have also introduced a rudimentary cooperative method in pig raising in the northerly provinces of South Vietnam; if it is recognized and developed to its fullest politico-economic potential, it could be the start of one of the biggest changes in Vietnamese life yet seen. The pig-raising project has brought about the formation of farmers' associations, to handle the paddy-farm end of agrarian credit from the government as well as the distribution of piglets and feed. These farmers' associations are a new form of social unit in Vietnam. If they are encouraged to grow, and become an economic success, and begin having a voice in national affairs, strong bonds will have been created between people and leaders. This operation deserves the attention of the best American political thinking, along with American economic help.

The foregoing are just a sample of actions which Americans can undertake to create favorable conditions for the emergence of a powerful Vietnamese "cause." If devotion to a true revolutionary cause can bring the struggle in South Vietnam to a favorable climax, its revolutionary appeal might eventually spread to the people of North Vietnam, wounding communism at its most vital point—communism's control of the masses.

Whatever course the war in Vietnam takes, Americans will do well to remember the importance of "Nguoi Thuong Dan," the symbolic Vietnamese. It is the name the Vietnamese give to "the man in the street," the rice-paddy farmer, the shopkeeper, the artisan—the citizen. He is the key piece in the whole war in Vietnam, both its subject and its object, the pawn, and in an ultimate sense the decider. There is still time for Americans to help him determine rightly the fate of his country.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 24, 1966]

Saigon's "Pacification" Planners Awaiting the Peasant's Verdict—Repeated Failures Cast a Long Shadow as New Rural Program Is Begun Under More Ambitious Chiefs

(By Charles Mohr)

Saigon, Jan. 23.—Although the South Vietnamese Government has given its highest priority this year to a new plan for "rural pacification," some old Vietnam hands express doubt that this is the year when pacification will achieve much.

One official said: "1966 is not the year for pacification. This is going to be the year when the peasant is going to want to sit on the fence more than ever and not choose sides. He will want to see who is winning this war."

But a number of equally hard-bitten veterans of past disappointments in politics and pacification suggest that there is reason for realistic optimism this year.

History seems to be on the side of the cynics. Pacification—the campaign to drive the Vietcong out of the countryside and implant programs that will win the peasants' support for Saigon—has never worked in the past.

"POISONOUS FISH"

As Premier Nguyen Cao Ky said in a major speech recently, all previous governments have had plans "to win the hearts of the people and to remove the poisonous fish from the pure rural waters."

"What about the results?" he went on to ask. And caustically he answered his own question: "There is no need to repeat the results."

On the other hand, those who are more optimistic also marshal some strong arguments. The Ky government appears to mean what it says when it gives "rural reconstruction" its highest priority. And most American officials suggest that the South Vietnamese and U.S. leadership of the program has vastly improved.

GENERAL PUT IN CHARGE

Last fall, Brig. Gen. Nguyen Duc Thang was appointed Minister of Rural Construction. He got his budget prepared on time for the start of the fiscal year, on January 1, and, in the words of one American official, "has shown an administrative drive and determination to get things done that haven't been seen before in pacification work."

Col. Nguyen Van Chau, chief of Kienhoa Province and an admired innovator of psychological warfare and pacification techniques, was placed in charge of the corps of rural reconstruction teams to be sent into the field.

Edward G. Lansdale, a former Air Force major general who holds the intentionally vague title "senior liaison officer" of the U.S. Embassy, has been the chief adviser to the Government and to Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge on pacification.

Mr. Lansdale has had a long career advising Asian governments on combating Communist subversion. He has critics, but his admirers tend to admire him fervently.

The concepts of pacification to be followed this year are not new to the art of counterinsurgency, but many officials describe the overall plan as more coherent, creative, and exciting.

One goal is to put 42,000 rural construction workers, organized into 80-man teams, into the field. These teams are to carry out agitation and propaganda work, set up economic development plans and try to form functioning locally elected hamlet governments.

They will also carry out "census grievance" work, interrogating each peasant in the hamlet once every 10 days. The project will work something like a dental clinic: the peasant will be given his next interrogation appointment as he ends his first session. The work is aimed at identifying the real grievances of the population, correcting them and eliciting intelligence information on the Vietcong secret organization in the countryside.

Meanwhile an effort will be made to see that each person becomes a member of at least one Government-sponsored organization to link the peasants to some disciplined group.

Rural construction teams will train local residents to continue the work after the hamlet has been "pacified."

SOME PROBLEMS EASE

Perhaps it is too early to say that the situation in Vietnam has fundamentally changed in the 7 months of the Ky Government, but some changes appear to have taken place. Some of the problems that doomed past pacification programs may no longer exist, officials say.

One reason for past failures is that from the middle of 1963 to the middle of 1965 the military situation in South Vietnam steadily deteriorated.

Increasingly strong bands of Vietcongs guerrillas made the countryside so dangerous that pacification workers could not operate or in some cases survive.

The military situation is still serious. There are, in fact, more Vietcong troops than ever before. But almost 200,000 American ground troops are in the country, and the weary South Vietnamese armed forces have begun to rebuild battle-torn units and to grow in size.

Officials voice hope for a new military situation in which regular allied troops will harass and pursue full-time guerrilla units in their stronghold areas, creating a shield behind which pacification groups and militiamen can try to root out local part-time guerrillas and the Vietcong political organization.

If such a military situation does not develop, officials say, the 1966 pacification plan will be unlikely to achieve significant results.

Another reason that past pacification plans did not work, officials add, is that the efforts were given lip service by everyone from U.S. Cabinet members to junior military officers but were never given real priority.

"We talked about it and drew graphs," an American official has remarked, "but we concentrated on conventional military actions."

Vietnamese province chiefs, for example, tended to expropriate any really effective pacification workers and use them as emergency military reinforcements, informed sources say.

[From the New York Times]

VIETNAMESE WAGE BATTLE ON INFLATION

(By R. W. Apple, Jr.)

SAIGON.—There are two wars in South Vietnam.

United States and South Vietnamese soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen are fighting the more dramatic one—sweating under the tropical sun and risking their lives against an unconventional enemy in a rugged country.

Their struggle may be no more important than that of the American economists who, with their South Vietnamese counterparts, spent last year and will spend this year struggling to hold back economic chaos that could wreck this country as quickly as the Vietcong could.

The chief economic enemy is inflation, and the fight against it was a dominant theme in South Vietnam's life last year.

WOES FOLLOWED SHAKEUP

Until the fall of President Ngo Dinh Diem in November 1963, South Vietnam's economy was rudimentary, and its expenditures were relatively small. Then Government spending jumped, putting more money into circulation, and the armed forces swelled, curtailing the work force.

Other developments were equally unhealthy: the enormous influx of American personnel (200,000 servicemen are here now, and no end is in sight); the "taxes" levied by the Vietcong on goods that merchants brought to market; the tendency of many frightened merchants to hoard, and the relatively unskilled management of national economic policy. In such a situation, inflation was inevitable. Money was plentiful; goods and services were scarce.

RICE PRICE SOARS

For the Saigon housewife shopping in the public marketplace, 22 pounds of rice went from 80 plasters in January to 110 in August, to 125 in October (A hundred plasters may be worth 55 cents to $1.67, depending on the exchange circumstances.)

Two pounds of shrimp went from 60 to 80 to 120 piasters, a loaf of bread from 6 to 7 to 8, a pedicab ride from 10 to 12 to 15.

Government spending, which totaled 25 billion piasters in 1964, approached 50 billion piasters last year.

In some areas, such as construction, wages have kept pace with costs. But for those on fixed incomes, such as civil servants, white-collar workers and taxi drivers, inflation has meant hardship.

"The only way to put up with the prices," a Saigon woman said the other day, "is to manage somehow to live off the Americans—sell them something, rent them something or work in their offices. They pay well."

U.S. diplomats fearful that a sharp rise in prices would bring blame on the Americans and might undercut the government of Premier Nguyen Cao Ky, have taken extraordinary steps to combat the pressure.

By importing rice to replace the portion of the Vietnamese harvest that is seized each year by the Communists, and by airlifting rice from areas where there are surplus stocks, economic planners have prevented great leaps in the rice price. In fact, the price of 22 pounds of quality rice on the Saigon market dropped from 150 to 125 piasters in the final 8 weeks of last year.

This victory was important because the demand for rice is—in the language of economics—extremely inelastic: each peasant must have his portion every day, and he will pay steep prices for it if necessary.

To put the matter another way, rice prices are extremely susceptible to inflation.

Another major step was the Americans' adoption of a system of military payment currency, or scrip. Since its introduction in September, the system has limited the circulation of dollars in Vietnam. Servicemen must exchange their scrip for piasters before shopping or eating in Saigon.

In the last 3 months of 1965, about $6 million worth of scrip a month was exchanged for piasters. Before the institution of scrip, roughly this amount in dollars was finding its way onto a flourishing black market here.

DOLLAR FLOW CONTROLLED

The advantages of the innovation are dual: The dollars are kept off the black market to defeat corruption, and they provide foreign exchange to the South Vietnamese Government instead of ending up in Communist China or elsewhere.

The most important American anti-inflation effort remains the commodity-import program, under which Washington buys such goods as dentist chairs or paper-back books for dollars in the United States and sells them to private citizens here for piasters. This system creates a flow of goods to soak up excess spending power.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 24, 1966]

PEASANTS TOIL FOR THE EARTH, NOT FOR A GOVERNMENT

(By Richard Critchfield)

TAN AN, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"This earth which formed their home and fed their bodies and made their gods."

The Asian peasant's deep attachment to the soil he tills and in which his ancestors are buried, described in Pearl Buck's "The Good Earth," is strongly evident here in the Mekong Delta rice bowl of South Vietnam.

It is harvest time now. The golden fields of the great fertile plain between the Mekong, Bassac and Saigon Rivers are dotted with men and women winnowing the precious rice against tall, curved shelters of plaited bamboo so as not to lose a grain.

In black pajamas and pointed straw hats, barefoot, bronzed by the January sun, the peasants have the sturdy look of men and women who can endure disease, natural disaster and war so long as they have some land to farm.

But very few have land of their own. In Long An, one of Vietnam's most fertile Provinces, more than 85 percent of the peasant population are tenants.

This landownership pattern may help explain why, despite a tremendous cost in lives and material, the war in Long An is no closer to being won than it was several years ago.

Last year, the heaviest fighting raged in the jungles and rubber plantations north of Saigon, the rain forests and grasslands of the high plateau and in the swamps and rice paddies of the narrow central coastal plain.

But if the main theater of war lay elsewhere, the rice-rich heartland of the Saigon region and the upper Mekong Delta, linked together by Long An, remains the prize for which the war is being fought.

Here, in less than 14 Provinces, live almost two-thirds of the 15 million South Vietnamese.

In June 1964, the summer before the Vietcong began massing multibattalion forces for pitched battles, Long An was held up as the showplace of how a combined Vietnamese-American military and economic pacification effort could defeat a Communist insurrection.

Visitors went to Long An if they wanted to see how the protracted, guerrilla war was going in the countryside.

But now, 18 months later, little has changed.

There has been no dramatic turn in the guerrilla fighting; the government has won some villages and lost some.

There are no signs of any serious deterioration. But there has been no real improvement either; since it is primarily a war of subversion in Long An, the creeping Communist initiative simply has crept further.

Other peasants have replaced the hundreds of Vietcong killed in battle, and American military and civilian advisers agree there are many more Vietcong than a year ago.

OPPOSING SIDES

Most important in Long An, however, the government and the mass of peasantry still seem to be on the opposing sides of the fight.

None of the successive Saigon governments, has succeeded in analyzing the peasants' grievances and then tried to right these wrongs, though there are signs Premier Nguyen Cao Ky's regime is moving in this direction.

Land is of such paramount importance here that the Vietcong allow only the landless or very poor farmers in the delta to command guerrilla units or qualify as party members.

The provincial government's social order is the exact reverse. Most of the military officers, civil servants, and community leaders come from the landowning gentry.

The same is true in Saigon where only one of the 10 generals now sharing power has any rapport with the masses. He is central Vietnam's erratic Maj. Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi, who also is the only one of peasant origin.

The traditional Mandarin ruling class fell from power with Ngo Dinh Diem, but their political heirs are the nonpeasant urban middle classes and their relatives.

LODGE PUSHES REFORM

Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and his top aids have made it clear that the United States regards major land redistribution as essential in successfully prosecuting the war.

Ky recently announced a land reform program that will initially convey 700,000 acres to 180,000 peasants.

Eventually, the program will be expanded to encompass over 500,000 acres of land formerly owned by the French, 660,000 acres now farmed by "squatters" and 300,000 acres where free titles will be awarded in resettlement areas.

The crux of the problem, however, has yet to be tackled. This is the redistribution from big to small owners of more than 2 million acres in the Mekong Delta.

Good delta land is worth about $50 an acre; it is roughly estimated by the South Vietnamese generals that it would cost between $150 and $200 million to carry out equitable reform programs here.

Land reform under Diem left a bitter aftermath, since 2,279 dispossessed landlords were paid only 10 percent in cash as compensation and given low-interest, nontransferable, 12-year bonds for the rest. The bonds since have plummeted in value.

UNITED STATES GENERATING MONEY

The United States could solve this problem by generating $150 million in local currencies so that an outright compensation could be made.

It already is generating piasters to pay for the Vietnamese share in the war—to the tune of $350 million this year—by giving the Saigon government imported commodities to sell to local merchants.

Both North Vietnam's Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap and the U.S. commander Gen. William C. Westmoreland describe the Vietnam conflict as "a people's war," and not "a war of attrition."

Since the emphasis, first, is on converting and, second, on killing, the investment of $150 million in land reform to undermine the Vietcong's peasant support would seem like a bargain in a war that is costing $16.5 million a week.

During the early days of the Diem regime, the United States spent $4 million on land reform. From 1961 through 1965 nothing was spent. And $1.1 million is budgeted for the current fiscal year.

PROBLEM NOT UNIFORM

The problem is not uniform throughout the country. With the exception of the Saigon area, the upper Mekong Delta and a thin, populated strip along the coastline, South Vietnam is mostly empty terrain. More than 85 percent of the land total is covered with jungle, swampland or dense foliage.

Along the overpopulated coastal fringe, now heavily burdened with refugees, most farms are small and owner-operated and there is real land hunger.

In the highlands, the problem could be solved simply by giving the Montegnard tribes clear title to land they have farmed for centuries.

The real problem is in the delta.

Out of 1.2 million farms, only 260,000 are owner-operated; 520,000 are rented and 330,000 more are partly rented.

There are 71 farms of more than 250 acres and 85,000 more over 12 acres (though all one peasant family can reasonably handle is 5 to 7 acres).

Some 3,000 rich Saigon families still are the big landlords.

In Long An, the pattern is even more lopsided. According to one official U.S. survey made last July, 65 rich landlords, 2,000 farmer-owners, and 28,000 tenant families comprise the population.

COULD INFLUENCE ELECTION

The land-ownership pattern probably would significantly influence the outcome of a free election, such as envisaged in the 1954 Geneva agreements.

Lodge has observed the Communist promises of land to the tiller is "perhaps the greatest appeal the Vietcong have."

Why there is so much opposition to sweeping land reform among some Saigonese is suggested by the tremendous wealth of a delta province like Long An.

In a good year, such as 1963–64, Long An produced 320,000 tons of rice (Saigon's annual requirement is only 600,000 tons.) It also sold that year 10,000 tons of pineapple, 70,000 tons of sugar cane, plus chickens, ducks, pigs, and other cash earners.

The legal land ceiling is 220 acres. Even so, a Saigon landlord who charges double the legal rental rate of 25 percent, as he can do if the land is fertile enough, stands to profit as much as $40,000 in a single year on 220 acres.

This compares with a Vietnamese policeman's monthly wage of $25, or the monthly cash allotment of a Vietcong guerrilla, which is 40 cents.

POLITICAL ATTITUDES AFFECTED

More important perhaps, is how this unequal distribution of land affects the political attitudes of the Vietnamese.

What seems to be absent here is the kind of political code that Theodore H. White has described as President Johnson's "grass roots liberalism":

"You get yours and he gets his and we all share what there is to share."

In Long An, this gets no further than "you get yours" and he, the peasant, can either lump it or try to get his by joining the Vietcong.

But most of the peasants have learned by now that under the Vietcong nobody keeps his.

This has created the kind of political vacuum where many Vietnamese peasants regard the war as a pointless slaughter. They still feel they stand to be the losers no matter who wins.

CAUGHT IN VISE

Caught between bloodsucking landlords, many of whom charge double the legal rents, and pitiless Vietcong tax collectors, who shoot first and talk later, the peasants appear ready to call a plague on both sides of this indecisive struggle.

Yet there is an appeal to the Vietcong's three main propaganda themes: "Land to the tiller," "The soldier helps the peasant," and "The government exists for the people."

These are novel and explosive ideas to a man who works knee deep in mud 14 hours a day, growing half his rice for somebody else, whose idea of government may be a venal local tax collector, and whose chickens and ducks may have disappeared when the last militia patrol passed through his village.

If his home has been destroyed or relatives killed by ill-directed bombs and shells, he might make a ready Vietcong convert without knowing what for.

U.S. MILITARY FRUSTRATED

Within the American military command in Saigon, there is widespread frustration over the failure of pacification efforts in the delta provinces like Long An.

One hears talk that the only way the Vietcong fish can be deprived of the water in which they swim is to make things so hot in Communist held zones that the peasants will come over to the Government side as refugees.

Others argue there is no substitute for thoroughgoing land reform.

One veteran American adviser in Long An said:

"These people have country that doesn't need a government. They could go back 2,000 years and they'd be happy, fish in every pond, crabs in every paddy, bananas, coconut, and ducks. All they need is a little land of their own to be happy. Five percent of the Vietnamese in this province are honestly pro-Government by their own personal beliefs and ideology, 5 percent are with the Vietcong for the same reason and the other 90 percent are right."

SENATORS FROM MAINE WHO HAVE SERVED AS CHAIRMEN OF THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, this coming March 6 the Senate Appropriations Committee will have its 99th birthday, it having been established on that date in 1867 through Senate approval of a resolution submitted by Henry Anthony, a Republican from Rhode Island.

Of all the States, Maine has the most unique record with respect to the chairmanship of this great committee. It is a record of which I am very proud. Maine has had four Senators serve as chairman, an unusual record, since no other State can boast of having had more than one. In addition to this, a fifth chairman was born and raised in Maine although he served as chairman as a Senator from New Hampshire.

The four Maine Senators serving as chairmen of the Senate Appropriations were Lot M. Morrill, William Pitt Fessenden, Eugene Hale, and Frederick Hale. A fifth chairman, Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire, was born in Pembroke, Maine, and attended the University of Maine.

The Maine story on the Senate Appropriations Committee is even more unusual and unique than Maine's championship in the number of chairmen. Senators Eugene and Frederick Hale constituted the only father-son combination in the history of the chairmanship of the committee. Eugene Hale was chairman of the committee from 1909 to 1911 and 2 decades later Frederick Hale served as chairman from December 8, 1932, to March 8, 1933.

Another strikingly unique aspect of the main story in the Senate Appropriations Committee is that of Senators Morrill and Fessenden, as Senator Fessenden succeeded Senator Morrill as chairman of the committee and then later Senator Morrill succeeded Senator Fessenden as chairman. If that sounds confusing, it is understandable because it runs counter to two basic aspects of the chairmanship—first, that the chairmanship ordinarily goes by seniority to the most senior majority member of the committee; second, that such State monopoly of chairmanship is unparalleled.

This is how it happened: Lot M. Morrill, of Maine, became the first chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee with its creation in 1867. He served as chairman for 2 years. He had been elected to the Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Hannibal Hamlin when Hamlin resigned in 1861 and that year became Vice President of the United States.

Senator Morrill served in the Senate until 1869 when he was succeeded by Hannibal Hamlin whom he had previously succeeded. When Senator Morrill left the Senate in 1869, Senator William Pitt Fessenden, of Maine, became his successor as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. This was very unusual because Senator Fessenden had not previously served on the Senate Appropriations Committee when he was made chairman. He held the chairmanship from March 4, 1869, to September 9 of that year, the date of his death.

Former Senator Lot Morrill was then appointed to the Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Fessenden—and contrary to present-day custom, he was again made chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, thus succeeding the man who had succeeded him as chairman of the committee. He held the chairmanship this second time from December 8, 1869, to March 4, 1871, when he left the committee. However, he returned to become chairman a third time on March 12, 1873, and held the chairmanship until July 7, 1876, when he resigned to become Secretary of the Treasury in the Cabinets of Presidents Grant and Hayes. He has the distinction of being the only Senator to serve as chairman of the committee on three occasions.

Other Maine Senators who have had the privilege of serving on the Senate Appropriations Committee are Senator James G. Blaine, who once won the Republican nomination for President, Senator Wallace H. White, Jr., who was Senate majority leader during part of his tenure and who was my predecessor, and myself.

Among the historical highlights of these Maine Senators who served as chairmen of the Senate Appropriations Committee are the following facts. The Fessenden family had the unusual distinction of having three brothers in the Congress at the same time, with Senator William Pitt Fessenden's two brothers, Samuel and Thomas, both serving in the House of Representatives in 1863.

Senator Eugene Hale had one of the longest services in the history of Congress with total House and Senate service of 40 years. In his 30 years in the Senate from 1881 to 1911, Senator Eugene Hale had a longer continuous service than anyone then in the Senate, when he retired. He was offered and declined two Cabinet posts, one as Postmaster General in the Cabinet of President Grant, the other as Secretary of the Navy in the Cabinet of President Hayes. His son, Frederick Hale, was elected to the Senate 5 years after he retired and served in the Senate for almost 24 years.

Mr. President, I am, indeed, proud of Maine's contribution to the leadership of the Senate Appropriations Committee as provided by these great Maine statesmen who served as chairman of this great committee. As I view their historical accomplishments, I feel extremely fortunate to have served on this great committee for 13 years and since 1953.

ADMINISTRATION PLANS TO DESTROY SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AS AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY—CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have learned that the Johnson administration is electioneering among private groups to gain support for its plan to destroy the Small Business Administration as an independent agency.

This explains why the President has failed to appoint a new Administrator of SBA.

This explains why the funds of the agency have been so dried up that hundreds, perhaps thousands, of small business loan applications are gathering dust in the regional offices of the SBA.

This explains why Eugene P. Foley, former Administrator of the Small Business Administration, has been transferred to the Department of Commerce.

Perhaps we are seeing a new trend in politics that first became manifest when the Democratic leadership in the Senate opposed the efforts of Republicans to give the Senate Small Business Committee legislative authority. This "small business be damned" attitude, which destroyed the attempt to give the Senate committee the power it should have, has now been unleashed again and may bring about the undoing of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency.

Yes, we are witnessing a strange development in American politics—a development that will see the President embrace big business with his right arm while clasping big labor with his left. And woe unto any force that stands in the way of this great triumvirate.

Before reaching their present exalted status, both Lyndon B. Johnson and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY spoke with passion about the need for an independent agency to give small business an effective voice in government, but it seems that times have changed and each has remained silent about the proposal to put small business under the heel of the Department of Commerce.

Why is all this happening, Mr. President? No one really knows, but perhaps some speculation is in order. The special report of the Congressional Quarterly for the week ending January 21, 1966, may provide the clue we are seeking. That report points out that of Democratic individual contributions, in the last presidential campaign, 69 percent were in sums of $500 or more, whereas the bulk of Republican contributions came from the truly small giver.

"Put up or shut up" used to be a gambling expression but it may soon become the password of the Democratic administration.

One wonders what will happen to the small entrepreneurs of America if they must come as supplicants to the Department of Commerce.

Will a department long accustomed to dealing with corporate giants care much or know much about the problems of the small firm? Can such a Department understand how difficult it is for a small businessman to stand up to the competition of his powerful competitors?

Mr. President, I think we all know the answers to these questions.

Lyndon Johnson was right years ago when he supported the establishment of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency. He is wrong now if he plans to let this agency slip down the drain of the Department of Commerce.

Let all the facts come out, Mr. President. Those of us who want small business to survive are ready for a fight.

Mr. ALLOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, I congratulate my distinguished friend the Senator from Vermont on his remarks with respect to the Small Business Administration.

Many of us have been interested for a long time in making the Small Business Committee of the Senate a committee which would have legislative authority. As the Senator from Vermont has so well pointed out, this has been supported in the past, when those gentlemen were Members of the Senate, both by the President and the Vice President of the United States.

What the Senator from Vermont has called attention to is something which should demand the attention of everyone in the Senate. He, in doing it today, has been extremely timely, with the steps which are being taken, I am afraid, to degrade the Small Business Administration.

I think it would not be inappropriate, at this point, to make a few remarks about an experience that the Senator from Colorado had with the Small Business Administration during the floods which afflicted the State of Colorado in 1965, during the month of June.

As everyone knows, the part played by the Small Business Administration is quite great in disaster areas. At that time, Mr. Foley, who has since been transferred to the Department of Commerce, was the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. Over a period of a month, I called Mr. Foley's office, I do not know how many times, and finally, through the assistance of other people in the Government, was able to get a call back from him when he was in California. He seems to be one of the most peripatetic men in the whole administration, and that is saying a great deal. At least, I could never find him in his office, and was able to talk with him, in a period of 30 or 45 days, on only one occasion; and I had to talk with him from California that time.

The only way I could get any action or any answer out of the Small Business Administration, administered by Mr. Foley, was to go through the Office of Emergency Planning, the office directly under the President, which is charged with the planning of aid and assistance following major disasters.

If the Small Business Administration should be moved, as perhaps some people plan, to the Department of Commerce, I am afraid it might go back to this unable administrator who was formerly the Administrator of the Small Business Administration; and if that should happen, the small businessman in this country might as well give up the thought of being able to get a fair and equal shake in the economics of this country under the legislation we have passed to help him.

These days we hear much about prosperity and unemployment. But, Mr. President, as I go throughout my own State and throughout the country, I cannot but observe that while it may be that the big businesses of this country are prosperous, as their financial records seem to indicate, one cannot walk up and down the streets of the cities of this country, whether they are big cities or small towns, and find many small businesses which are prospering—one out of a hundred, or perhaps fewer.

It is time for those of us who are charged with legislative authority to start thinking seriously about what we can do to preserve the small businessmen in this country, because they are suffering in a hundred ways, under the tax yokes and other burdens and restrictions under which Congress and, more so, the regulatory agencies, have put them.

NEW HONOR TO JOSEPH A. BEIRNE

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a very pleasant bit of news came to my desk this morning. It means yet another honor to a dedicated worker in the field of communication. As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Communications this is an area well known to me. And I know and appreciate both the friendship and endeavors of the worker—Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communication Workers of America AFL–CIO.

The news comes from the biennial conference of the United Community Funds and Councils of America meeting at Toronto.

Joe Beirne was named today as volunteer president of the Association.

All of us are thrilled in our own communities by these organizations that promote practical charity, social justice, personal service, organized agency programs and institutional services in many fields of human need.

We applaud their voluntary effort and sense of individual responsibility which becomes more important as it seems easier to surrender to Government invasion of the social welfare field.

Perhaps it is only natural that good hearts and able minds enlisted in the American labor movement should become deeply involved in the social justice and social welfare obligations of the whole community.

Indeed, labor leaders have given direction and valuable support and example to the public concern with human relations.

At first hand, labor leaders have developed ideals in health, leisure time activities, education, pension and welfare services out of their own immediate problems and obligations.

Therefore individuals in the labor movement have acquired an experience, expertness and devotion to altruistic service that community fund organizations are eager to draft for duty if their purposes are to be realized.

Joe Beirne is such an individual and the United Community Funds and Councils of America is the acme of organization in the public welfare field.

The organization is an old hand at correcting the ancient weaknesses of community existence. It has been finding the remedies for 57 years. Its labors have been monumental and its leaders have been mighty to meet the challenge.

For the first time in its 57 years the organization will be headed by a labor union officer—Joe Beirne.

To be sure, they did not have to look far for Joe. He has been a board member and officer of the national association for 10 years—chairman of the executive committee for 5 years.

In 1963 he received the National Community Service Award for outstanding national volunteer service for the advancement of the United Way in community health and welfare services.

Today he moves up to the presidency from the vice president's chair.

The presidency of the association is no small honor and no mean responsibility; for it embraces 2,200 community members.

But Joe Beirne brings to his added duties a record of some 30 years of responsibility in organization where the human element creates the dominant theme.

Mr. Beirne began his official union life in 1937 as president of his local and president of the union which represented all Western Electric Co. workers. He became principal officer of CWA in 1943, a post to which he has been reelected every 2 years. His first job in the communications industry began in 1928 at a Western Electric plant in New Jersey, at Jersey City, where he was born in 1911 of Irish immigrant parents.

He fortified his early education with night studies at Hudson College and New York University.

In 1946 he was named one of the 10 outstanding young men of America by the junior chamber of commerce. In 1949 he was elected a vice president of the CIO which CWA had just entered.

Intensely interested in international affairs, Mr. Beirne was the principal figure in establishing an alliance for progress for Latin American workers which developed into the American Institute for Free Labor Development cosponsored by labor, business, and government.

For the late President Kennedy Mr. Beirne served on a number of advisory boards including the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, and the Committee on Youth Development. Under President Johnson he serves on the Automation Commission to meet the great economic challenge of our time, automation.

I get inspiration as I quote from Mr. Beirne's philosophy. He says:

> Successful adjustment to change will permit American labor in the years that lie ahead to fulfill its responsibility not only to its members but to the whole nation. With courage we can surmount the present challenge of change. We can, if we fully realize labor's creative intelligence, help make not only America but the entire free world more interesting, a more satisfactory, a more wholesome environment for our children and for our children's children.

I speak today with the thought that when labor may be a topic in this Senate Chamber we may reflect on the lives and labors of men dedicated not only to that movement but to America.

Such a man is Joseph A. Beirne.

I congratulate both him and the association as he ascends to its presidency.

CIGARETTES AND LUNG CANCER—IT DOESN'T ALWAYS HAPPEN TO THE OTHER GUY

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] has brought to my attention a thoughtful article which appeared February 1 in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin. The article is by Mark Waters, a longtime reporter on military and business affairs for the paper. The following is his final bylined story. It is his own obituary, for he died from lung cancer the day it appeared. Despite his physical weakness, he worked hard to leave behind this document that it might help others to avoid his fate.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORTER MARK WATERS MET HIS KILLER 42 YEARS AGO—THIS IS HIS OWN STORY

(The byline of Mark Waters has long been known to Star-Bulletin readers. He was always an enterprising writer, able to tackle any story. For some time, he was the military reporter and most recently, handled the business beat. Today the Star-Bulletin prints his final bylined story. It is his own obituary. He wrote it last Thursday and made final corrections yesterday. He died today in Queen's Hospital of lung cancer.

(Despite his physical weakness, he worked hard to leave behind this document in hope it might help others, particularly the young. Mass will be offered at 10:30 a.m. Thursday in Our Lady of Peace Cathedral on Fort Street, followed by burial with military honors in the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific in Punchbowl. Friends may call at Borthwick Mortuary after 9:30 a.m. Thursday.)

(By Mark Waters)

Cigarettes were the death of me.

I became acquainted with my killer when I was about 14 and began stealing several Camels a day from my father's pack.

Inhaling caused some nausea at first but persistence conquered.

I was born in a miniature Hell's Kitchen in Davenport, Iowa, on June 2, 1909.

For economic reasons I've seldom admitted I was 56 and my continued bush of hair allowed me to sometimes get away with being 10 years younger than I actually was.

At 16, my family, including two sisters, Dorothy and Edith, moved to Baltimore, a city which I loved greatly and adopted as my hometown.

It was still no problem getting cigarettes.

I got odd jobs after school to buy them and tried all sorts of queer brands, such as Melachrinos, a scented Violet cigarette, Omars and English Ovals.

I felt quite sophisticated but I can't recall now that I enjoyed smoking them.

In 1926 the coming depression cast its shadow before us and odd jobs for youth became nil.

My father, a beautiful person who never hit me in his life, began counting his Camels.

A chum and I then took to picking butts off the street, toasting the soggy tobacco in the oven, and rolling them into rice paper cigarettes. They were horrible.

Things were very bad so I decided to join the Navy—a mouth removed from the table and I could send money home.

The night before I left, a warm summer's night, I found my father weeping on the back porch in sad frustration because he couldn't help his son enough to keep him from joining the Navy.

Now cigarettes became no problem at all. I think they were $1.20 a carton. If you were at sea, they were 40 cents a carton.

The 20-year Navy tour ended and I went to the University of North Carolina, where I was graduated.

Nearby Durham makes cigarettes by the billions and the whole town smelled like the wet weed.

I got a job after college with the San Diego Union.

One night while walking to my car, I had a slight stroke and staggered to the left.

I had been smoking one cigarette after the other that night and I felt that was what caused the stroke.

Muriel, my wife, and I tried to quit. We lasted 8 days only.

It wasn't that I got any real pleasure out of smoking. Except for the cigarette in the morning with my first cup of coffee, I never enjoyed smoking.

My mouth always tasted like a bird cage. It took away my appetite. It brought on emphysema that made it hard to breathe. My chest colds were real dillies—all because of cigarettes.

It's pure addiction. I guess there's a deep-seated psychological reason why people smoke, but I don't know what that is.

My wife smokes two packs a day, although she doesn't inhale. I've always smoked two packs a day, inhaling most of the smoke.

In 1956 I came to Honolulu to work for the Star-Bulletin, still smoking more than ever.

In June 1965, I accepted Dave Eyre's offer as assistant public relations director at Castle & Cooke.

I made the pressure and put it on myself. There is no grander boss than Dave or finer company than Castle & Cooke.

I smoked incessantly. My stomach began to hurt and I would get up every hour or half hour during the night to drink milk and smoke a cigarette.

In September 1965, I came down with a horrible cough. I was hoarse and there was a nasty soreness in my left lung.

I went to my doctor for my bad stomach.

The doctor listened to my chest and ordered an X-ray.

"You have a lung tumor," he said.

How could this be possible? I had had a thorough physical exam only 3 months before.

Figure the odds against your getting lung cancer.

Impossible.

But, a bronchoscopy by my lung surgeon confirmed it.

Four days later, he took out a left lobe.

A month later, I was back at work. I hadn't smoked since the day before my operation.

It wasn't hard to quit for one simple reason—motivation.

I came along fine, gained 10 pounds, and really felt good.

Then, on January 3, I thought I had caught a cold.

I stayed home for a day and then went to my surgeon who tapped a quart of burgundy fluid from my left chest cavity.

I went back several times and my surgeon said: "The time is drawing closer."

Later, my wife told me he had told her that after the operation I had less than a year to live. But she wouldn't believe it and didn't tell me. I find no fault with that.

The American Cancer Society's propaganda, I don't think tells the whole story because they try to soften the blow.

For instance, there are four cell types of lung cancer and the type seems to have a lot to do with the rate of growth.

My doctor told me this, as he should, but the American Cancer Society's publications for the public don't mention virulence.

We need more honest lay facts on cancer.

The American Cancer Society indicates I had at least a 50-50 chance—the figure for all cancers—when I scarcely had any chance at all.

My doctor said out of every 10 lung cancer cases, only 1 survives. The other nine die.

That's the survival rate for lung cancer, taking into consideration all forms of treatment available to medical science.

There is no 50-50 chance for this type of cancer.

My doctor has understandable missionary zeal about getting people to quit cigarettes.

He walked in the other day and said he just did surgery on another lung cancer case—another heavy smoker.

He points out that there's no question of the relationship between cigarette smoking and lung cancer. The statistics are overwhelming. One in every seven males who've been smoking heavily (20 cigarettes or more a day) for 20 years get lung cancer.

It's like playing Russian roulette with yourself.

He points out that in Hawaii the incidence of lung cancer has increased twofold in the last 10 years and will keep going up because the population is getting older.

The bad effect of cigarettes doesn't end with lung cancer. Smoking doubles the chances of coronary artery disease and the chances of getting emphysema are 14 times greater among smokers than nonsmokers. Then, there's cancer of the mouth, larynx, esophagus, and all the rest, too.

I think doctors get to feeling pretty helpless at times. They keep warning people—like me—but their warnings go unheeded.

And there's all that cigarette advertising in the papers, magazines, television and what have you.

As my doctor was saying the other day: "Millions of dollars of advertising in all forms are unleashed on the public and they're all aimed at giving the image that cigarettes can make up for a number of shortcomings."

The doctor said that in Italy, they've passed a ban against all cigarette advertisements on TV. In Great Britain, the ban is on during the hours that youngsters are apt to be watching TV.

I think that's a beginning in the right direction because, as the doctor says, the big effort should be to stop kids from getting started.

Another idea he mentioned is for the Government to increase the tax on cigarettes—say, $5 for a carton of cigarettes and up. That should smoke cigarettes right out of the market—maybe.

When you're told you are going to die, there is momentary shock and grief. But they wear off.

Now I assure you, I do not fear to die.

I am survived by my two sisters, my daughter Marcia and my beloved wife, Muriel, who owns Waters World Travel in Kailua.

Whether this story will stop anyone from smoking, I don't know. I doubt it.

Not a soul I've preached to has quit smoking—not a single, solitary soul.

It's one of those things. You always think, it'll happen to the other guy; never to me.

When you get your lung cancer—God help you.

All you need to see is the shadow on your chest X-ray.

It's a real shocker. There's nothing you can do or say. You can't get out of it. You're stuck.

You tell your doctor: "Please, I can't stand up to that."

And all he does it point to the shadow in the X-ray.

At this point, I'm very comfortable. The nurses give me something without a question whenever there's pain.

I'm very short of breath. I can't take five steps without having to sit.

The cancer has gone into my liver and I don't know where else.

I don't have a ghost of a chance.

It's too late for me.

It may not be for you.

VIETNAM—"THE WHOLE THING WAS A LIE!" A MUCH DECORATED COMBAT VETERAN'S TESTIMONY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in the February 1966 issue of Ramparts, there is published an article entitled "The Whole Thing Was a Lie!" written by former M. Sgt. Donald Duncan, holder of the South Vietnamese Silver Star, the Combat Infantry Badge, the Bronze Star, and the U.S. Army Air Medal.

The article illustrates Master Sergeant Duncan's disillusionment with the variance between what he was told about the situation in Vietnam and what he actually found there.

The article is well worth reading and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, certain statements in the article are worth underscoring. Master Sergeant Duncan makes the observation that:

> The whole thing was a lie. We weren't preserving freedom in South Vietnam. There was no freedom to preserve. To voice opposition to the Government meant jail or death. Neutralism was forbidden and punished. Newspapers that didn't say the right thing were closed down. People are not even free to leave and Vietnam is one of those rare countries that doesn't fill its American visa quota. It's all there to see once the Red film is removed from the eyes. We aren't the freedom fighters. We are the Russian tanks blasting the hopes of an Asian Hungary.

He further states:

> It's not democracy we brought to Vietnam—it's anticommunism. This is the only choice the people in the village have. This is why most of them have embraced the Vietcong and shunned the alternative. The people remember that when they were fighting the French for their national independence it was the Americans who helped the French. It's the American anti-Communist bombs that kill their children. It's American anticommunism that has supported one dictator after another in Saigon. When anti-Communist napalm burns their children it matters little that an anti-Communist special forces medic comes later to apply bandages.

These are important observations by a fighting man who served 18 months on active combat duty in Vietnam. The position of the United States in Vietnam and its future course of action should be judged in the light of these observations and the other matters discussed in this article.

EXHIBIT 1

THE WHOLE THING WAS A LIE

(M. Sgt. Donald Duncan left the U.S. Army in September of 1965 after 10 years of service, including 6 years in the special forces and 18 months on active combat duty in Vietnam. While in Vietnam he received the South Vietnamese Silver Star, the Combat Infantry Badge, the Bronze Star, and the U.S. Army Air Medal. He was nominated for the American Silver Star and was the first enlisted man in Vietnam to be nominated for the Legion of Merit. Both nominations are still pending. He participated in many missions behind enemy lines in war zone D, Vung Tao, and the An Khe Valley. Last March he turned down the offer of a field commission to the rank of captain. Instead he left Vietnam on September 5, 1965, and received his honorable discharge 4 days later.)

(By Donald Duncan)

When I was drafted into the Army, 10 years ago, I was a militant anti-Communist. Like most Americans, I couldn't conceive of anybody choosing communism over democracy. The depths of my aversion to this ideology was, I suppose, due in part to my being Roman Catholic, in part to the stories in the news media about communism, and in part to the fact that my stepfather was born in Budapest, Hungary. Although he had come to the United States as a young man, most of his family had stayed in Europe. From time to time, I would be given examples of the horrors of life under communism. Shortly after basic training, I was sent to Germany. I was there at the time of the Soviet suppression of the Hungarian revolt. Everything I had heard about communism was verified. Like my fellow soldiers I felt frustrated and cheated that the United States would not go to the aid of the Hungarians. Angrily I followed the action of the brute force being used against people who were armed with sticks, stolen weapons, and a desire for independence.

While serving in Germany, I ran across the special forces. I was so impressed by their dedication and elan that I decided to volunteer for duty with this group. By 1959 I had been accepted into the special forces and underwent training at Fort Bragg. I was soon to learn much about the outfit and the men in it. A good percentage of them were Lodge Act people—men who had come out from Iron Curtain countries. Their anticommunism bordered on fanaticism. Many of them who, like me, had joined special forces to do something positive, were to leave because things weren't happening fast enough. They were to show up later in Africa and Latin America in the employ of others or as independent agents for the CIA.

Initially, training was aimed at having U.S. teams organize guerrilla movements in foreign countries. Emphasis was placed on the fact that guerrillas can't take prisoners. We were continuously told, "You don't have to kill them yourself; let your indigenous counterpart do that." In a course entitled, "Countermeasures to Hostile Interrogation," we were taught NKVD (Soviet Security) methods of torture to extract information. It became obvious that the title was only camouflage for teaching us other means of interrogation when time did not permit more sophisticated methods; for example, the old cold water-hot water treatment, or the delicate operation of lowering a man's testicles into a jeweler's vise. When we asked directly if we were being told to use these methods, the answer was, "We can't tell you that. The mothers of America wouldn't approve." This sarcastic hypocrisy was greeted with laughs. Our own military teaches these and even worse things to American soldiers. They then condemn the Vietcong guerrillas for supposedly doing those very things. I was later to witness firsthand the practice of turning prisoners over to ARVN for interrogation and the atrocities which ensued.

Throughout the training there was an exciting aura of mystery. Hints were continually being dropped that at this very moment special forces men were in various Latin American and Asian countries on secret missions. The anti-Communist theme was woven throughout. Recommended reading would invariably turn out to be books on brainwashing and atrocity tales—life under communism. The enemy was the enemy. There was no doubt that the enemy was communism and Communist countries. There never was a suggestion that special forces would be used to set up guerrilla warfare against the government in a Fascist-controlled country.

It would be a long time before I would look back and realize that this conditioning about the Communist conspiracy and the enemy was taking place. Like most of the men who volunteered for special forces, I wasn't hard to sell. We were ready for it. Artur Fisers, my classmate and roommate, was living for the day when he would "lead the first 'stick' of the first team to go into Latvia." "How about Vietnam, Art?" "To hell with Vietnam. I wouldn't blend. There are not many blue-eyed gooks." This was to be only the first of many contradictions of the theory that special forces men cannot be prejudiced about the color or religion of other people.

After graduation, I was chosen to be a procurement noncommissioned officer for special forces in California. The joke was made that I was now a procurer. After seeing how we were prostituted, the analogy doesn't seem a bad one. General Yarborough's instructions were simple: "I want good, dedicated men who will graduate. If you want him, take him. Just remember, he may be on your team someday." Our final instructions from the captain directly in charge of the program had some succinct points. I stood in shocked disbelief to hear, "Don't send me any niggers. Be careful, however, not to give the impression that we are prejudiced in special forces. You won't find it hard to find an excuse to reject them. Most will be too dumb to pass the written test. If they luck out on that and get by the physical testing, you'll find that they have some sort of a criminal record." The third man I sent to Fort Bragg was a "nigger." And I didn't forget that someday he might be on my team.

My first impressions of Vietnam were gained from the window of the jet while flying over Saigon and its outlying areas. As I looked down I thought, "Why, those could be farms anywhere and that could be a city anywhere." The ride from Tan Son Nhut to the center of town destroyed the initial illusion.

My impressions weren't unique for a new arrival in Saigon. I was appalled by the heat and humidity which made my worsted uniform feel like a fur coat. Smells. Exhaust fumes from the hundreds of blue and white Renault taxis and military vehicles. Human excrement; the foul, stagnant, black mud and water as we passed over the river on Cong Ly Street; and, overriding all the others, the very pungent and rancid smell of what I later found out was nuoc mam, a sauce made much in the same manner as sauerkraut, with fish substituted for cabbage. No Vietnamese meal is complete without it. People—masses of them. The smallest children, with the dirty faces of all children of their age, standing on the sidewalk unshod and with no clothing other than a shirtwaist that never quite reached the navel on the protruding belly. Those a little older wearing overall-type trousers with the crotch seam torn out—a practical alteration that eliminates the need for diapers. Young, grade school girls in their blue butterfly sun hats, and boys of the same age with hands out saying, "OK—Salem," thereby exhausting their English vocabulary. The women in ao dais of all colors, all looking beautiful and graceful. The slim, hipless men, many walking hand in hand with other men, and so misunderstood by the newcomer. Old men with straggly Fu Man Chu beards staring impassively, wearing wide-legged, pajama-like trousers.

Bars by the hundreds—with American-style names (Playboy, Hungry 1, Flamingo) and faced with grenadeproof screening. Houses made from packing cases, accommodating three or four families, stand alongside spacious villas complete with military guard. American GI's abound in sport shirts, slacks, and cameras; motorcycles, screaming to make room for a speeding official in a large, shiny sedan, pass over an intersection that has hundreds of horseshoes impressed in the soft asphalt tar. Confusion, noise, smells, people—almost overwhelming.

My initial assignment was in Saigon as an area specialist for 3d and 4th Corps tactical zone in the special forces tactical operations center. And my education began here. The officers and noncommissioned officers were unanimous in their contempt of the Vietnamese.

There was a continual putdown of Saigon officials, the Saigon government, ARVN (Army Republic of Vietnam), the LLDB (Luc Luong Dac Biet—Vietnamese Special Forces) and the Vietnamese man in the street. The Government was rotten, the officials corrupt, ARNV cowardly, the LLDB all three, and the man in the street an ignorant thief. (LLDB also qualified under "thief.")

I was shocked. I was working with what were probably some of the most dedicated Americans in Vietnam. They were supposedly in Vietnam to help "our Vietnamese friends" in their fight for a democratic way of life. Obviously, the attitude didn't fit.

It occurred to me that if the people on "our side" were all these things, why were we then supporting them and spending $1.5 million a day in their country? The answer was always the same: "They are anti-Communists," and this was supposed to explain everything.

As a result of this insulation, my initial observations of everything and everyone Vietnamese were colored. I almost fell into the habit, or mental laziness, of evaluating Vietnam not on the basis of what I saw and heard, but on what I was told by other biased Americans. When you see something contradictory, there is always a fellow countryman willing to interpret the significance of it, and it won't be favorable to the Vietnamese. This is due partially to the type of Vietnamese that the typical American meets, coupled with typical American prejudices. During his working hours, the American soldier deals primarily with the Vietnamese military. Many (or most) of the higher ranking officers attained their status through family position, as a reward for political assistance, and through wealth. Most of the ranking civilians attained their positions in the same manner. They use their offices primarily as a means of adding to their personal wealth. There is hardly any social rapport between GI Joe and his Vietnamese counterpart.

Most contact between Americans and Vietnamese civilians is restricted to taxi drivers, laborers, secretaries, contractors, and bar girls. All these people have one thing in common: They are dependent on Americans for a living. The last three have something else in common. In addition to speaking varying degrees of English, they will tell Americans anything they want to hear as long as the money rolls in. Neither the civilian nor military with whom the American usually has contact is representative of the Vietnamese people.

Many of our military, officers and enlisted, have exported the color prejudice, referring to Vietnamese as "slopes" and "gooks"—two words of endearment left over from Korea. Other fine examples of American democracy in action are the segregated bars. Although there are exceptions, in Saigon, Nha Trang, and Da Nang, and some of the other larger towns, Negroes do not go into white bars except at the risk of being ejected. I have seen more than one incident where a Negro newcomer has made a mistake and walked into the wrong bar. If insulting catcalls weren't enought to make him leave, he was thrown out bodily. There are cases where this sort of thing has led to near riots.

It is obvious that the Vietnamese resent us as well. We are making many of the same mistakes that the French did, and in some instances our mistakes are worse. Arrogance, disrespect, rudeness, prejudice, and our own special brand of ignorance, are not designed to win friends. This resentment runs all the way from stiff politeness to obvious hatred. It is so common that if a Vietnamese working with or for Americans is found to be sincerely cooperative, energetic, conscientious, and honest, it automatically makes him suspect as a Vietcong agent.

After my initial assignment in Saigon, which lasted two and one-half months, I volunteered for a new program called Project Delta. This was a classified project wherein specially selected men in special forces were to train and organize small teams to be infiltrated into Laos. The primary purpose of dropping these teams into Laos was to try and find the Ho Chi Minh trail and gather information on traffic, troops, weapons, etc. This was purely a reconnaissance intelligence mission, but the possibility of forming guerrilla bases later was considered. There was some talk of going into North Vietnam, but not by Project Delta. Another outfit, Special Operations Group (SOG) was already doing just that. SOG was a combined forces effort. The CIA, Air Force (U.S.) Navy, Army, and detached special forces personnel were all in on the act.

Project Delta was paid for by Uncle Sam from CIDG funds. We had to feed, billet, and clothe the Vietnamese. Free beer was supplied and lump sums of money were agreed on, money to be paid after completion of training and more to be paid when the teams returned.

Here we are in South Vietnam to help these people "preserve their freedom, etc.," willing to risk our lives to that end and here we are paying them to help themselves. These were men already being paid their regular pay in the Vietnamese Army and we actually had to pay a bonus each time they went to the field on training missions or made a parachute jump, all of which was supposed to be a normal part of their duties.

Originally, it was thought that the teams would be composed of four Vietnamese and two Americans. Although many of the people we were training had natural aptitudes for the area of operations, strong and effective leadership was lacking. It was emphasized constantly to the Pentagon and to the ambassador by those intimately involved in the training program, that if any degree of success was to be realized it was imperative that Americans must accompany the teams.

When at the last minute we received a firm "No Go" for the U.S. personnel, we asked, "Why?" The answer was that it was an election year and it would cause great embarrassment if Americans were captured in Laos. Anything of that nature would have to wait until after the election. The reaction to this decision on the part of the Americans was one of anger, disappointment and disgust.

The one thing that made it possible to accomplish the things we did was the relationship we had established with the Vietnamese. Each man took it upon himself to establish a friendly relationship with the men on the teams. We ate the same food, wore the same clothes, lived in the same tents, shared the same hardships. We worked more hours and carried the same loads. We made ourselves the guinea pigs in experiments. The pitch was, "We don't ask you to do anything we won't do ourselves." It worked. We had dedicated teams.

After the decision to eliminate Americans from the drops, the Vietnamese felt that they had been cheated. Petty complaints became rampant; e.g., if we do not get wool sweaters and better watches we will not go. They felt this was one more example of Americans standing back advising Vietnamese on how to get killed without risk to themselves. We started getting an increase in a.w.o.l.'s. The Americans had to watch their teams board the infiltration aircraft without them Hands were shaken but with eyes averted. "Good lucks" were said but with bent heads. We felt guilty. We had strongly advised that the teams not be sent until the Americans could go, but to no avail.

Like everyone, I was disappointed. This was the one thing, if I had to single one out, that made me really start questioning our role in Vietnam. It suddenly occured to me that the denial of American participation was not based on whether it was right or wrong for us to be going to Laos. The primary concern was the possible embarrassment to President Johnson during an election campaign. Toward this end we sent people on a mission that had little or no chance of success. It became apparent that we were not interested in the welfare of the Vietnamese but, rather, in how we could best promote our own interests. We sent 40 men who had become our friends. These were exceptionally dedicated people, all volunteers, and their commanding officer showed up drunk at the plane to bid the troops farewell—just all boozed up. Six returned, the rest were killed or captured.

As it turned out, the mission found damned little. Most teams didn't last long enough to report what, if anything, they saw. The six survivors came completely through the areas and observed no troop movements, no concentrations of troops, and little vehicle traffic, day or night. In the final stages, two of the project helicopters flew two missions a day for 4 days, looking for the teams. They saw nothing and were not fired at. As for the highway from Tchepone to Muong Nong, one helicopter flew the highway, taking pictures with a hand-held 35-millimeter camera. It was low enough to take straight-on shots of people standing in doorways.

To many in Vietnam this mission confirmed that the Ho Chi Minh trail, so-called, and the traffic on it, was grossly exaggerated, and that the Vietcong were getting the bulk of their weapons from ARVN and by sea. It also was one more piece of evidence that the Vietcong were primarily South Vietnamese, not imported troops from the north. One more thing was added to my growing lists of doubts of the "official" stories about Vietnam.

When the project shifted to in-country operations Americans went on drops throughout the Vietcong-held areas of South Vietnam. One such trip was into war zone D north of Dong Xoi, near the Michelin plantation. There is no such thing as a typical mission. Each one is different. But this one revealed some startling things. Later I was to brief Secretary of Defense McNamara and General Westmoreland on the limited military value of the bombing, as witnessed on this mission.

As usual we went in at dusk—this time in a heavy rain squall. We moved only a nominal distance, perhaps 300 meters, through the thick, tangled growth and stopped. Without moonlight we were making too much noise. It rained all night so we had to wait until first light to move without crashing around. Moving very cautiously for about an hour, we discovered a deserted company headquarters position, complete with crude tables, stools, and sleeping racks. After reporting this by radio, we continued on our way. The area was crisscrossed with well-traveled trails under the canopy. A few hours later we reached the edge of a large rubber plantation without incident. Keeping to the thick growth surrounding the plantation, we skirted the perimeter. We discovered that it was completely surrounded by deserted gun positions and foxholes, all with beautiful fields-of-fire down the even rows of rubber trees. None gave evidence of having been occupied for at least 3 or 4 days. We transmitted this information to the Tactical Operations Center (TOC) and then the team proceeded across the plantation, heading for the headquarters and housing area in the center.

When we arrived at a point 100 meters from our destination, the team leader and I went forward, leaving the team in a covering position. As we got closer, we could hear sounds from the houses, but assumed these were only workers. The briefing had neglected to tell us that the plantation was supposed to be deserted. Crawling, we stopped about 25 meters from the first line of houses. Lifting our heads, we received a rude shock. These weren't plantation workers. These were Vietcong soldiers, complete with blue uniforms, webbing, and many with the new Soviet bloc weapons. The atmosphere seemed to be one of relaxation. We could even hear a transistor radio playing music. After 30 or 40 minutes we drew back to the team position. We reported our find to the TOC and estimated the number of Vietcong to be at least one company. The whole team then retraced the two kilometers to the jungle and moved into it. Crawling into the thickest part, we settled down just as darkness and the rain closed in on us.

Underneath ponchos, to prevent light from our flashlights escaping, the Vietnamese team leader and I, after closely poring over our maps, drafted a detailed message for TOC. In the morning we sent the message, which gave map coordinates of a number of small landing zones (LZ's) around the area. We also gave them a plan for exploiting our find. It was fairly simple. Make simultaneous landings at all LZ's and have the troops move quickly to the deserted Vietcong gun positions and man them. At the sight of bombers approaching, the Vietcong would leave the housing area for the jungle. This would involve them having to travel across two kilometers of open plantation into prepared positions. We told TOC that we were going to try and get back to the housing area so we could tell them if the Vietcong were still there. If they didn't hear from us on the next scheduled contact, they were to assume that we had been hit and hadn't made it. If this occurred it would be verification of the Vietcong presence and they were to follow through with the plan. We would stay in the area and join the Rangers when they came in.

This time, we were more cautious in our trip across the plantation. On the way, we found a gasoline cache of 55-gallon drums. We took pictures and proceeded. Again the Vietnamese team leader and I crawled forward to within 25 meters of the houses. It was unbelievable. There they were and still with no perimeter security. Now, however, there was much activity and what seemed like more of them. We inched our way around the house area. This wasn't a company. There were at least 300 armed men in front of us. We had found a battalion, and all in one tight spot—unique in itself. We got back to the team, made our radio contact, and asked if the submitted plan would be implemented. We were told, yes, and that we were to move back to the edge of the jungle. There would be a small delay while coordination was made to get the troops and helicopters. At 1000 hours (10 a.m.) planes of all descriptions started crisscrossing this small area. I contacted one plane (there were so many I couldn't tell which one) on the Prick 10 (AN/PRS-10 transmitter-receiver for air-ground communications). I was told that they were reconning the area for an operation. What stupidity. No less than 40 overflights in 45 minutes. As usual, we were alerting the Vietcong of impending action by letting all the armchair commandos take a look-see. For about 30 minutes all was quiet, and then we started to notice movement. The Vietcong were moving out from the center of the plantation. Where were the troops? At 1400 hours Skyraiders showed up and started bombing the center of the plantation. Was it possible that the troops had moved in without our knowing it? TOC wouldn't tell us anything. The bombing continued throughout the afternoon with never more than a 15-minute letup. Now we had much company in the jungle with us. Everywhere we turned there were Vietcong. I had to agree that, in spite of the rain, it was a much better place to be than in the housing center. Why didn't we hear our troops firing?

Finally, the bombing ended with the daylight, and we crouched in the wet darkness within hearing distance of Vietcong elements. Darkness was our fortress. About 2030 (8:30 p.m.) we heard the drone of a heavy aircraft in the rainy sky. We paid little attention to it. Then, without warning, the whole world lit up, leaving us feeling exposed and naked. Two huge flares were swinging gently to earth on their parachutes, one on each side of us. At about the same time, our radio contact plane could be heard above the clouds. I grabbed the radio and demanded to know, "Who the hell is calling for those flares and why?"

"What flares?"

"Damn it, find out what flares and tell whoever is calling for them that they're putting us in bad trouble." I could hear the operator trying to call the TOC. I figured that friendly troops in the area had called for the flares to light their perimeter. Crack—crump. I was lifted from the ground, only to be slammed down again. I broke in on the radio. "Forget that transmission. I know why the flares are being dropped."

"Why?"

"They're being used as markers for jets dropping what sounds like 750-pounders. Tell TOC thanks for the warning. Also tell them two of the markers bracketed our position. I hope to hell they knew where we are." A long pause.

"TOC says they don't know anything about flares or jet bombers."

Another screwup. "Well how about somebody finding out something and when they find out, how about telling us unimportant folks? In the meantime, I hope that 'goonie-bird' (C-47 plane) has its running lights on."

"Why?"

"Because any moment now the pilot is going to find he is dawdling around in a bomb run pattern. Come back early in the morning and give me the hot skinny."

"Roger—we're leaving—out."

I was mad, a pretty good sign that I was scared. The bombing continued through the night. Sometimes it was "crump" and sometimes it was "crack," depending on how close the bombs fell. When it finally stopped sometime before dawn, I realized that it was a dazzling exhibition of flying—worthless—but impressive. The flare ship had to fly so low because of the cloud cover that its flares were burning out on the ground instead of in the air. The orbiting jets would then dive down through the clouds, break through, spot the markers, make split-second corrections, and release their bombs. However, while it was going on, considering what a small error became at jet speeds, a small error would wipe us out. Should this happen, I could see a bad case of "C'est la guerre" next day at air operations. I couldn't help wondering also how "Charlie" was feeling about all this—specifically the ones only 25 or 30 meters away. It didn't seem possible, but I wondered if the shrapnel tearing through the trees tops was terrifying him as much as us.

First thing in the morning, my Vietnamese counterpart made contact on the big radio (HC-162D). After some talk into the mike, he turned to me with a helpless look:

"They say we must cross plantation to housing area again."

"What? It's impossible—tell them so."

More talk. "They say we must go. They want to talk to you."

When the hollow voice came through on the side band, I couldn't believe it—it was the same order. I told them it was impossible and that we were not going to go.

"You must go. That is an order from way up."

That figures. The Saigon wheels smelling glory have taken over our TOC. "My answer is, Will not comply; I say again, will not comply. Tell those people to stop trying to outguess the man on the ground. If they want someone to assess damage on the housing area send a plane with a camera. Better yet, have the Rangers look at it, there's more of them."

"There are no other friendly troops in the area. You are the only ones that can do it. You must go. There will be a plane in your area shortly. Out."

Up to this point we had assumed friendly troops were in the area and that if we got in trouble, maybe we could hold out until they could help us. No troops. Little wonder the Vietcong are roaming all over the place not caring who hears them.

Soon a plane arrived and I received: "We must know how many Vietcong are still in the housing area. You must go and look. It is imperative. The whole success of this mission depends on your report. Over."

"I say again, Will not comply. Over." (Hello court martial.) I looked at the Vietnamese team leader. He was tense and grim, but silently cheering me on. While waiting for the plane I asked him what he was going to do. He replied:

"We go, we die. Order say we must go, so we go. We will die."

Tell me Vietnamese have no guts. Another transmission from the plane:

"Why won't you comply? Over."

These type questions aren't normally answered. I knew, however, that the poor bastard up there had to take an answer back to the wheels. Well, he got one: "Because we can't. One step out of this jungle and it's all over. I'm not going to have this team wiped out for nothing. There are no Vietcong in the village; not since 1400 yesterday. The mission was screwed up when you started the bombing without sending in troops yesterday. As for the mission depending on us, you should have thought of that yesterday before you scrapped the plans and didn't bother to tell us. Over."

"Where are the Vietcong now? Over."

"Which ones? The ones 25 meters from us, or the ones 35 meters from us? They're in the jungle all around us. Over."

"Roger. Understand Vietcong have left houses—now in jungle—have information necessary—you do not have to go across plantation."

This was unbelievable. On TV it would be a comedy—a bad one.

Shortly after this uplifting exchange, the bombers returned, and we spent the remainder of the day moving from one Vietcong group to another. We would come upon them, pull back, and then an A1-E (bomber) would come whining down, machine-gunning or dropping bombs.

I discovered that the old prop fighter-bombers were more terrifying than the jets. The jets came in so fast that the man on the ground couldn't hear them until the bombs were dropped and they were climbing away. The props were something else. First the droning noise while in orbit. Then they would peel off and the drone would change to a growl, increasing steadily in pitch until they were a screaming whine. Under the jungle canopy, this noise grabbed at the heart of every man. And every man knew that the plane was pointed directly at him. The crack of the bomb exploding was almost a relief. Many of these bombs landed 25 to 35 meters from where we were lying on the ground. The closest any of us came to being hurt was when a glowing piece of shrapnel lodged in the pack on my back. I couldn't help thinking, "These are our planes. They know where we are. What must it be like for a woman or child to hear that inhuman, impersonal whine directed at them in their open villages? How they must hate us!" I looked around at my team. Others were thinking. Each of us died a little that day in the jungle.

At 1730 (5:30 p.m.) the last bomb was dropped. A great day for humanity. Almost 28 hours of bombing in this small area with barely a break.

On the next afternoon we were told by radio to quickly find an LZ and prepare to leave the area. We knew of only one within reasonable distance and headed for it. A short distance from the LZ we could hear voices. Vietcong around the opening. We were now an equal distance between two groups of the Vietcong.

Finally they allowed the pickup ship to come in. Just as the plane touched down and we started toward it, two machinegun positions opened up—one from each side of the clearing. The bullets sounded like gravel hitting the aluminum skin of the chopper. My American assistant took one position under fire and I started firing at the other. Our backs were to the aircraft and our eyes on the jungle. The rest of the team started climbing aboard. The machineguns were still firing, but we had made them less accurate. I was still firing when two strong hands picked me up and plumped me on the floor of the plane. Maximum power and we still couldn't make the trees at the end of the clearing, but had to make a half circle over the machineguns. All of a sudden something slapped me in the buttock, lifting me from the floor. A bullet had come through the bottom of the plane, through the gas tank and the floor. When it ripped through the floor it turned sideways. The slug left an 8-inch bruise but did not penetrate. Through some miracle, we were on our way to base—all of us. We would all get drunk tonight. It was the only way we would sleep without reliving the past days. It would be at least 3 days before anybody would unwind. That much is typical.

I had seen the effect of the bombing at close range. These bombs would land and go for about 15 yards and tear off a lot of foliage from the trees, but that was it. Unless you drop these things in somebody's hip pocket they don't do any good. For 28 hours they bombed that area. And it was rather amusing because, when I came out, it was estimated that they had killed about 250 Vietcong in the first day. They asked me how many Vietcong did I think they had killed and I said maybe six, and I was giving them the benefit of the doubt at that. The bombing had no real military significance. It would only work if aimed at concentrated targets such as villages.

One of the first axioms one learns about unconventional warfare is that no insurgent or guerrilla movement can endure without the support of the people. While doing research in my job as an area specialist, I found that, in province after province, the Vietcong guerrillas had started as small teams. They were now in battalion and regimental strength. Before I left, the Vietcong could put troops in the field in division strength in almost any province. Such growth is not only impossible without popular support, it actually requires an overwhelming mandate.

We were still being told, both by our own Government and the Saigon Government, that the vast majority of the people of South Vietnam were opposed to the Vietcong. When I questioned this contradiction, I was always told that the people only helped the Vietcong through fear. Supposedly, the Vietcong held the people in the grip of terror by assassination and torture. This argument was also against doctrine. Special Forces are taught that reliable support can be gained only through friendship and trust. History denied the terror argument. The people feared and hated the French, and they rose up against them. It became quite obvious that a minority movement could not keep tabs on a hostile majority. South Vietnam is a relatively small country, dotted with thousands of small villages. In this very restricted area companies and battalions of Vietcong can maneuver and live under the very noses of Government troops; but the people don't betray these movements, even thought it is a relatively simple thing to pass the word. On the other hand, Government troop movements are always reported. In an action against the Vietcong, the only hope for surprise is for the Government to move the troops by helicopters. Even this is no guarantee. Gen. Nguyen Khan, while still head of the Saigon Government, acknowledged that Vietcong sympathizers and agents were everywhere—even in the inner councils—when he made the statement: "Any operation that lets more than 4 hours elapse between conception and implementation is doomed to failure." He made these remarks in the last days of his regime, right after a personally directed operation north of Saigon ended in disaster.

To back up the terror theory, the killing of village chiefs and their families were pointed out to me. Those that were quick to point at these murders ignored certain facts. Province, district, village, and hamlet chiefs are appointed, not elected. Too often petty officials are not even people from the area but outsiders being rewarded for political favors. Those that are from the area are thought of as quislings because they have gone against their own by cooperating with Saigon. Guerrillas or partisans who killed quislings in World War II were made heroes in American movies. Those who look on the Vietcong killings of these people with horror and use them as justification for our having to beat them, don't realize that our own military consider such actions good strategy when the tables are reversed. When teaching special forces how to set up guerrilla warfare in an enemy country, killing unpopular officials is pointed out as one method of gaining friends among the populace. It is recommended that special assassination teams be set up for this purpose.

I know a couple of cases where it was suggested by special forces officers that Vietcong prisoners be killed. In one case in which I was involved, we had picked up prisoners in the valley around An Khe. We didn't want prisoners but they walked into our hands. We were supposed to stay in the area 4 more days, and there were only eight of us and four of them, and we didn't know what the hell to do with them. You can't carry them. Food is limited, and the way the transmission went with the base camp you knew what they wanted you to do—get rid of them. I wouldn't do that, and when I got back to operation base a major told me, "You know we almost told you right over the phone to do them in." I said that I was glad he didn't, because it would have been embarrassing to refuse to do it. I knew goddam well I wasn't going to kill them. In a fight it's one thing, but with guys with their hands bound it's another. And I wouldn't have been able to shoot them because of the noise. It would have had to be a very personal thing, like sticking a knife into them. The major said, "Oh, you wouldn't have had to do it; all you had to do was give them over to the Vietnamese." Of course, this is supposed to absolve you of any responsibility. This is the general attitude. It's really a left-handed morality. Very few of the special forces guys had any qualms about this. Damn few.

Little by little, as all these facts made their impact on me, I had to accept the fact that, Communist or not, the vast majority of the people were pro-Vietcong and anti-Saigon. I had to accept also that the position, "We are in Vietnam because we are in sympathy with the aspirations and desires of the Vietnamese people," was a lie. If this is a lie, how many others are there?

I suppose that one of the things that bothered me from the very beginning in Vietnam was the condemnation of ARVN as a fighting force: "the Vietnamese are cowardly * * * the Vietnamese can't be disciplined * * * the Vietnamese just can't understand tactics and strategy * * * etc., etc." But the Vietcong are Vietnamese. U.S. military files in Saigon document time and again a Vietcong company surrounding two or even three ARVN companies and annihilating them. These same files document instances of a Vietcong company, surrounded by ARVN battalions, mounting a ferocious fight and breaking loose. I have seen evidence of the Vietcong attacking machine-gun positions across open terrain with terrible losses. This can't be done with undisciplined bandits. For many years now the tactics and strategy of the Vietcong have been so successful that massive fire power and air support on our side is the only thing that has prevented a Vietcong victory. These are all Vietnamese. What makes the difference? Major "Charging Charlie" Beckwith, the special forces commander at Plei Me, used the words "dedicated," "tough," "disciplined," "well-trained," and "brave' to describe the Vietcong—and, almost in the same breath, condemned the Vietnamese on our side.

It became obvious that motivation is the prime factor in this problem. The Vietcong soldier believes in his cause. He believes he is fighting for national independence. He has faith in his leaders, whose obvious dedication is probably greater than his own. His officers live in the same huts and eat the same food. His government counterpart knows that his leaders are in their positions because of family, money, reward for political favors. He knows his officers' primary concern is gaining wealth and favor. Their captains and majors eat in French restaurants and pay as much for one meal as they make in a week. They sleep in guarded villas with their mistresses. They find many excuses for not being with their men in battle. They see the officers lie about their roles in battle. The soldier knows that he will be cheated out of his pay if possible. He knows equipment he may need is being sold downtown. His only motivation is the knowledge that he is fighting only to perpetuate a system that has kept him uneducated and in poverty. He has had so many promises made to him, only to be broken, that now he believes nothing from his government.

I have seen the South Vietnamese soldier fight well, and at times ferociously, but usually only when in a position where there is no choice. At those times he is fighting for survival. On Project Delta there were many brave Vietnamese. When I knew them well enough to discuss such things, I asked them, "Why do you go on these missions time and again? You are volunteers. Why do you not quit and do less dangerous work?" The answer was always the same: "We are friends. We fight well together. If we quit, it will make the project bad." Never, "We are fighting for democracy—freedom—the people"—or any cause. The enemy he was fighting had become an abstraction. He was fighting, and fighting well, to sustain the brotherhood of his friends. The project had created a mystique of individualism and eliteness. He felt important. Trust and faith was put in him and he returned it in kind. The Americans didn't condescend to him. The life of every American on the team was dependent on the Vietnamese, and we let them know we were aware of it. We found out early that appealing to them on the basis of patriotism was a waste of time. They felt that they were nothing more than tools of the scheming Saigon politicians.

ARVN troops and their commanders know that if they don't bother the Vietcong they will be safe from Vietcong attacks. I'll never forget what a shock it was to find out that various troop commanders and district chiefs were actually making personal deals with "the enemy." The files in Saigon record instances where government troops with American advisers were told by the Vietcong to lay down their weapons and walk away from the Americans. The troops did just that and the Vietcong promises of safety to the troops were honored.

In an effort to show waning popularity for the Vietcong, great emphasis was placed on figures of Vietcong defections. Even if the unlikely possibility of the correctness of these figures is accepted, they are worthless when compared to ARVN desertions. The admitted desertion rate and incidents of draft dodging, although deflated, was staggering. Usually, only those caught are reported. Reading OPSUMS (Operational Summaries) and newspapers while in Vietnam, I repeatedly saw references made to hundreds of ARVN listed as missing after the major battles. The reader is supposed to conclude that these hundreds, which by now total thousands, are prisoners of the Vietcong. They are definitely not listed as deserters. If this were true, half of the Vietcong would be tied down as guards in prisoner-of-war compounds—which, of course, is ridiculous.

This lack of enthusiasm and reluctance to join in battle wasn't difficult to figure. The majority of the people are either anti-Saigon or pro-Vietcong, or both, and ARVN is drafted from the people.

I was not unique among my contemporaries in knowing most of these things. However, whenever anybody questioned our being in Vietnam—in light of the facts—the old rationale was always presented: "We have to stop the spread of communism somewhere. If we don't fight the commies here, we'll have to fight them at home. If we pull out, the rest of Asia will go Red. These are uneducated people who have been duped; they don't understand the difference between democracy and communism."

Being extremely anti-Communist myself, these "arguments" satisfied me for a long time. In fact, I guess it was saying these very same things to myself over and over again that made it possible for me to participate in the things I did in Vietnam. But were we stopping communism? Even during the short period I had been in Vietnam, the Vietcong had obviously gained in strength; the Government controlled less and less of the country every day. The more troops and money we poured in, the more people hated us. Countries all over the world were losing sympathy with our stand in Vietnam. Countries which up to now had preserved a neutral position were becoming vehemently anti-American. A village near Tay Ninh in which I had slept in safety 6 months earlier was the center of a Vietcong operation that cost the lives of two American friends. A special forces team operating in the area was almost decimated over a period of 4 months. U.S. Operations Mission (USOM), civilian representatives, who had been able to travel by vehicle in relative safety throughout the countryside, were being kidnaped and killed. Like the military, they now had to travel by air.

The real question was whether communism is spreading in spite of our involvement or because of it.

The attitude that the uneducated peasant lacked the political maturity to decide between communism and democracy and "we are only doing this for your own good," although it had a familiar colonialistic ring, at first seemed to have merit. Then I remembered that most of the villages would be under Vietcong control for some of the time and under Government control at other times. How many Americans had such a close look at both sides of the cloth? The more often Government troops passed through an area, the more surely it would become sympathetic to the Vietcong. The Vietcong might sleep in the houses, but the Government troops ransacked them. More often than not, the Vietcong helped plant and harvest the crops; but invariably Government troops in an area razed them. Rape is severely punished among the Vietcong. It is so common among the ARVN that it is seldom reported for fear of even worse atrocities.

I saw the airborne brigade come into Nha Trang. Nha Trang is a government town and the Vietnamese airborne brigade are government troops. They were originally, in fact, trained by special forces, and they actually had the town in a grip of terror for 3 days. Merchants were collecting money to get them out of town; cafes and bars shut down.

The troops were accosting women on the streets. They would go into a place—a bar or cafe—and order varieties of food. When the checks came they wouldn't pay them. Instead they would simply wreck the place, dumping over the tables and smashing dishes. While these men were accosting women, the police would just stand by, powerless or unwilling to help. In fact, the situation is so difficult that American troops, if in town at the same time as the Vietnamese airborne brigade, are told to stay off the streets at night to avoid coming to harm.

The whole thing was a lie. We weren't preserving freedom in South Vietnam. There was no freedom to preserve. To voice opposition to the government meant jail or death. Neutralism was forbidden and punished. Newspapers that didn't say the right thing were closed down. People are not even free to leave and Vietnam is one of those rare countries that doesn't fill its American visa quota. It's all there to see once the Red film is removed from the eyes. We aren't the freedom fighters. We are the Russian tanks blasting the hopes of an Asian Hungary.

It's not democracy we brought to Vietnam—it's anticommunism. This is the only choice the people in the village have. This is why most of them have embraced the Vietcong and shunned the alternative. The people remember that when they were fighting the French for their national independence it was the Americans who helped the French. It's the American anticommunist bombs that kill their children. It's American anticommunism that has supported one dictator after another in Saigon. When anticommunist napalm burns their children it matters little that an anticommunist special forces medic comes later to apply bandages.

One day I asked one of our Vietnamese helicopter pilots what he thought of the last bomb raid. "I think maybe today we make many Vietcong." In July, when Mr. McNamara asked me how effective the bombing was in war zone D I told him. "It's an expensive defoliant. Unless dropped in a hip pocket it was only effective in housing areas." He didn't seem surprised. In fact, his only comment after my recital of my team's experiences in war zone D, was when he turned to General Westmoreland who was sitting on my right, "I guess we still have a small reaction problem." Ambassador Taylor said nothing.

While I was in Vietnam the American and/or Saigon Government was forever carping about North Vietnam breaking the Geneva accords. Yet my own outfit, special forces, had first come to Vietnam in civilian clothes traveling on civilian passports for the specific purpose of training and arming the ethnic groups for the CIA, a violation of the accords. The Saigon respect for the accords was best symbolized by a political cartoon in the Saigon Post. It showed a man urinating on a scroll labeled Geneva accords 1954. When the troops of Project Delta uncovered the arms cache at Vung Ro Bay, Gen. Nguyen Khan pointing at the weapons, happily presented them to the three ICC men as proof to the world that Hanoi was breaking the accords. Evidently they were too polite to point out that they had been found by men wearing American-supplied uniforms, carrying American weapons; men who had been trained by Americans and were being paid by Americans. Neither did they mention that the general flew to this spot in an American helicopter and that the weapons were being loaded onto an American-made ship manned by American-trained sailors.

It had taken a long time and a mountain of evidence but I had finally found some truths. The world is not just good guys and bad guys. Anticommunism is a lousy substitute for democracy. I know now that there are many types of communism but there are none that appeal to me. In the long run, I don't think Vietnam will be better off under Ho's brand of communism. But it's not for me or my Government to decide. That decision is for the Vietnamese. I also know that we have allowed the creation of a military monster that will lie to our elected officials; and that both of them will lie to the American people.

To those people who, while deploring the war and bombings, defend it on the basis that it is stopping communism, remember the words of the Vietnamese pilot, "I think maybe today we make many Vietcong." The Nazi bombing of London didn't make the Londoners quit. We have no monopoly on feelings for the underdog. People of other nations will continue to be increasingly sympathetic to this small agrarian country that is being pounded by the richest and most powerful Nation in the world.

When I returned from Vietnam I was asked, "Do you resent young people who have never been in Vietnam, or in any war, protesting it?" On the contrary, I am relieved. I think they should be commended. I had to wait until I was 35 years old, after spending 10 years in the Army and 18 months personally witnessing the stupidity of the war, before I could figure it out. That these young people were able to figure it out so quickly and so accurately is not only a credit to their intelligence but a great personal triumph over a lifetime of conditioning and indoctrination. I only hope that the picture I have tried to create will help other people come to the truth without wasting 10 years. Those people protesting the war in Vietnam are not against our boys in Vietnam. On the contrary. What they are against is our boys being in Vietnam. They are not unpatriotic. Again the opposite is true. They are opposed to people, our own and others, dying for a lie, thereby corrupting the very word "democracy."

There are those who will believe that I only started to feel these things after I returned from Vietnam. In my final weeks in that country I was putting out a very small information paper for special forces. The masthead of the paper was a flaming torch. I tried in my own way to bring a little light to the men with whom I worked. On the last page of the first issues were the names of four men—all friends of mine—reported killed in action on the same day. Among them was Sergeant Horner, one of the men I procured for special forces when he was stationed at the Army Presidio in San Francisco.

To those friends I wrote this dedication: "We can best immortalize our fallen members by striving for an enlightened future where man has found another solution to his problems rather than resorting to the futility and stupidity of war."

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, when the Congress created the Community Relations Service by voting approval of title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, we had high hopes that the agency would prove able to help local communities with their civil rights difficulties by encouraging rationality, good will, and progress in place of conflict, fear, and resistance to change.

In the short period since its creation, I have been impressed by the actual accomplishments of this stripling agency. I am impressed by the fact that, in one southern community, both city fathers and militant civil rights leaders now acknowledge its usefulness; by the fact that, in a major northern city community, local leaders say that they had never established true communication and cooperation with their underprivileged until the Community Relations Service showed them how it could be done.

Such accomplishments are the result of professional skill.

It is my belief that future accomplishments of the Community Relations Service will depend principally on three factors:

First, the professional quality of its service, of which I spoke; second, the independence with which it is permitted to function; and third, the resources, in terms of budget and manpower, which determine the extent of its activities.

Less important than these factors is the department of Government in which it is housed.

There was a certain logic that guided us in placing it initially in the Department of Commerce. It was thought that its first great task would be winning compliance with title II of the Civil Rights Act—desegregation of public accommodations. Here, the Department of Commerce has a primary responsibility.

Although title II compliance problems persist, it is now clear that they do not require the overriding attention of the Service to the degree we anticipated. The need for keeping the Community Relations Service within the Department of Commerce has therefore faded.

On the other hand, the Attorney General has expressed his enthusiasm and respect for the work of an agency which can help communities solve their civil rights problems without Federal law enforcement activity. It was, in fact, his recommendation that the Service be transferred to the Justice Department, reporting directly to him, and not subordinate to any intermediary department of Government. His respect for the value of the Community Relations Service is clear. It is also clear from the proposed budget for 1967 that the administration intends the Community Relations Service to have, within the Department of Justice, the resources it needs.

The President's proposal that the Community Relations Service be transferred to the Department of Justice is one which we should look upon with favor. It will strengthen the word of that agency.

THE HIDDEN PERIL

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, throughout the free world, thinking people are convinced that our involvement in Vietnam is the vital test of the will and determination of the United States to oppose aggression in the Pacific area no less than in the Atlantic. President Johnson has given the Communist Vietcong aggressors every indication of his desire for peaceful solutions in the present conflict, provided only that the iron hand of aggression is ruled out in the process.

In the Washington Post of January 23, 1966, the International Latex Corp. caused to be published a perceptive article in paid space, as a public service, written by French historian, M. Jacques Chastenet, member of the Academie Francaise. It is particularly telling, coming as it does from a Frenchman of such stature.

In the introduction to it, Mr. A. N. Spanel, founder and chairman of the company, presents briefly and well-reasoned the soundness of this Nation's firm stand against aggression in southeast Asia.

This patriotic effort on the part of a founder of a private company, this continuing and costly interest in international and national affairs which spans more than a quarter of a century is as encouraging as it is commendable, and I am confident it will not be lost either on informed Americans or on their allies.

I ask unanimous consent that this article which appeared in the Washington Post on January 23, 1966, to be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HIDDEN PERIL

FOREWORD

In a recent article in these columns we had occasion to write: "In South Vietnam President Lyndon B. Johnson faced soul-searing and agonizing decisions. To a man of his strong political instincts, the temptations must have been to push for peace however illusory. Better than anyone else he understood that there was no political profit in assuming the risks of military action.

But courageously he brushed aside short-term expediency, and chose instead, commitments to the long-range interests of this Nation and of the free world. He recognized that failure to stop the current Communist aggressions—masquerading as wars of liberation—would guarantee more and more aggressions; that temporizing and surrender in southeast Asia now, far from securing peace, would invite larger and bolder Communist confrontations, each escalating the danger to world peace."

Today we received a clipping from France of a perceptive article written by the eminent historian, M. Jacques Chastenet (de l'Académie Francaise) which appeared in the widely read publication, Sud-Ouest.

We are pleased to present it at this time, in the public interest.

A. N. SPANEL,
Founder, Chairman, International Latex Corp.

The truce has not lasted long in Vietnam, and it is not certain that the truce proposed for the celebration of Vietnamese New Year will be much more durable. The American authorities seem to be preparing the public for a long continuation of hostilities.

Viewed from Europe and limited to the present field of operations, this war may seem to some to be absurd and even condemnable.

The United States has already sent over 200,000 men to Vietnam and within 6 months they plan on sending many thousands more. By intensive bombing, they have transformed wide woody areas to vast lunar deserts; the United States has suffered heavy losses and has inflicted the same, if not more, on the adversary; they have placed themselves in a delicate position at the U.N.; they have compromised their budgetary balance, thereby courting inflation. Why all this?

Could it be only to prevent North Vietnam from annexing South Vietnam? Such is the official explanation, but it is not the whole answer. The South Vietnamese (the mass of the people, not the Government) would probably prefer anything to the prolongation of the struggle.

In truth, the problem is quite different. The real question is whether or not southeast Asia and South Asia (perhaps also Australia) will become prey to the imperialism of the Chinese Communists. And possibly beyond that, the question is whether Communist China will be allowed to have at its disposal powerful nuclear armaments which it could use in an attempt to dominate the world.

The London government has just made it known that, for financial reasons, it was compelled to reduce the military forces it had kept until now in southeast Asia. The United States in large measure has carried on in its place. If it were brought to conclude a patched-up peace in Vietnam, that is to say to acknowledge defeat, there is no doubt that its prestige would be irreparably damaged, and that Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Malaysia, and Indonesia would successively fall in the orbit of Chinese communism in spite of local resistance.

India, so weak in spite of or because of its immensity, highly divided and endangered by desperate food shortages, would, in all probability, fall in its turn. Much more to the east, Australia, so insufficiently populated, would itself be threatened. And the repercussions in Latin America would be enormous.

One should not rely too much upon the Soviet Union to give all-out opposition to China. Whatever its interest may be, it would be hampered by the ideology of its leaders, an ideology which these men can hardly forgo. At most, it might, through indirect assistance to the threatened countries, delay the process.

Thus, through a war which may appear inglorious, it is in freedom's cause of the whole world that the United States is defending Vietnam. One may be tempted to blame the American people, but this is shortsighted and worse.

Some in the Pentagon consider this to be the time to nip in the bud the growing Chinese nuclear threat and for these reasons: Communist China has at present a considerable conventional army at its disposal, 115 divisions, among which 4 are mechanized, approximately 2,300 planes, embracing about 40 strategic bombers. This is more than needed to break any resistance in the Asiatic countries we mentioned. However, its thermonuclear armaments are still in a state of infancy, and the installations where they are being constructed (mainly Manchuria) are extremely vulnerable. It is probable that within 10 years China will have atomic missiles enabling it, from its home bases, to reach Russia and, very likely, North America.

Indeed, it is because they want to fulfill their nuclear program in peace, that the leaders in Peiping are not declaring open hostilities in Vietnam. They know that the American reaction would be immediate and that classical-type bombings would be enough to destroy for a long period of time their hope of seeing their counrty become a nuclear power.

Are the Americans expected to take the initiative of this supreme escalation? Some, in the Pentagon, consider it; but one is obliged to agree that, world opinion being what it is at present—including French opinion and British opinion—it would be most difficult.

One must, however, look at things realistically, for apart from an unlikely change in the aspirations of its Government, Communist China will, around 1976, be able to inflict indescribable damage to Russia, to the west of the United States and, all the more, to Australia. Reprisals would be certain. But Mao Tse-tung has repeatedly said that the lives of 200 millions of his compatriots would be a price China is prepared to pay for the triumph of communism.

The "China peril" is no longer an empty phrase, at least in this phase. At present, the Americans alone seem to realize it clearly.

This does not mean that, susceptible to all the pressures exerted upon them, they will not end up in Vietnam, as they did before in Korea, with uncertain peace.

SPEECH BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY AT ROCKEFELLER PUBLIC SERVICE AWARDS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, our distinguished Vice President in a recent speech discussed the rewards and high obligations of a career in Government service.

His remarks were made on the occasion of the Rockefeller Public Service Awards. The Vice President pointed out the important role that the career public servant has in making our Government truly a government for the people and the vital assistance he gives the President in the development of new and constructive legislation and the smooth administration of the Government.

The Rockefeller Awards are one means by which we can recognize and honor the skills and devotion of exceptional public servants. I know that the Vice President's thoughtful commentary on these awards and on the meaning of public service will be of interest to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey, Rockefeller Public Service Awards, Washington, D.C., December 8, 1965

Every government in history has found ways to honor those who render outstanding service. But our own Government has never completely solved the problem of how to pay tribute to men and women whose performance in public service has been exceptional.

In many countries this problem is solved by medals, orders of knighthood, and titles of nobility. But our ability to do this sort of thing has been limited by the traditional and constitutional restrictions which are part of our democratic heritage.

Mr. Rockefeller and Princeton University are to be congratulated for the sensitive understanding which enabled them to see this lack of recognition for public service, and for the generous and imaginative way they have set out to fill it.

The effectiveness of their ideas is best proved by the fact that they stirred the Government itself to belated action.

Originally, the Rockefeller Awards gave a sabbatical year of travel to outstanding midcareer civil servants. But Congress recognized a good idea when it saw one and passed the Government Employees Training Act of 1958 which, in effect, adopted the idea and expanded the program. The Rockefeller Awards were then changed in nature, and converted into tributes to officials at the highest ranks of Government service.

This imitation should in itself be a source of pride to the sponsors of this award.

For I know that, in the world of the foundation, nothing gives more pleasure than to see one's own seedling nursed by others. (And on this basis, may I say, Mr. Rockefeller and his family have had a very high batting average. For instance, one might well say that the great medical research facilities endowed by the Rockefeller family were the forerunners of the National Institutes of Health, which will go down in history as among the finest contributions our Government has made to our world.)

But to get back to these public service awards: I think it is worth remembering that this idea was conceived at a time when Federal employees were going through a dark period of trial and tribulation.

The time was 1950 and 1951, and we were hearing a great deal about corruption in Government. Calumny and scandal were being heaped upon hardworking Federal employees. And the public was being led to believe that the Federal civil service was a nest of spies and traitors.

It was at this moment of our history that John D. Rockefeller III, approached President Dodds of Princeton University and said something like this: "Our career officers in the Federal Government are far better than the public is being led to believe. Let's do something to tell the public the other side of the story—to remind the Nation that it has a dedicated, honest, and able career service in its Government."

These awards are the result of that conversation.

Today, happily, the Government employee enjoys high public respect. But I think it is worth remembering that our benefactor came to us, not in the van of a cheering multitude, but as a lone voice.

As a nation we are fortunate indeed in the kind of people who have devoted their lives to careers in Government. The morale and spirit which pervades their ranks, and their dedication to public service, are precious national assets.

Indeed, it is remarkable that the executive branch of our Nation, which has accumulated both power and responsibility over the years, has maintained a tradition of humility and service—and has erected stringent standards of honesty which have reduced corruption to levels far below those, I must say, which exist in many nonpublic activities.

To what do we owe this record? It is worth asking this question for a variety of reasons.

In the first place—if you will permit me to be coldly realistic—we must cite the fact that our Government employees are well paid in dollars.

In some countries we hear people say, "The poor fellows are underpaid, you can't blame them for a little graft on the side."

Happily, this kind of false governmental economy is not practiced here. On the whole, our Federal staff is well paid. They are not so well paid, of course, that many of them couldn't work elsewhere at a higher rate. But they are well enough paid so that their families can maintain decent standards of living and their children can be well educated.

So income tax is at least not today so much a negative factor in Government service.

But, more importantly, the Government employee is doing what he wants to do. Deep down, every alert and intelligent mind longs to play a creative role in building a better world.

Indeed, many men work hard to accumulate a fortune just so they can perform public service later on.

Who in private life can share the satisfaction of knowing that, in the last 24 hours, he has been able to cut red tape that will help make it possible for man to reach the moon * * * or that he has devised a program that will enable 5,000 high school dropouts in a Western city to find a niche in schools or in industry—or has averted a minor war—or has added a few hundred dollars a year to the income of families who desperately need that income.

And, finally, there is the factor of power: power for change and constructive initiative.

Time and again I have seen the bright ideas of Federal executives, often well below the top echelon, become major national programs.

Medicare, for example, is a concept which came to life on the desk of a junior executive some 25 years ago. It became a major issue for a few courageous liberals in the prewar and immediate postwar years. It finally was approved by President Truman, espoused by President Kennedy, and led to enactment by President Johnson. That Federal official is in the Federal Government today. Several universities and insurance companies would give him three times his salary. But can you tell me that any compensation could outweigh the satisfaction that came to him in seeing a boyhood idea transformed into a reality?

This, in short, is what the Federal Government can offer you: The opportunity to serve others, the opportunity to think far ahead, to think big, and to help a better world come into existence. If this is what you want in life, then Federal service is your great opportunity. If this doesn't interest you, you're wasting your time in the Federal service.

The Federal service, as I have described it, is a dynamic service, an imaginative service, a service whose top executives should be intimately and courageously identified with the program and platform of their President.

The Constitution of the United States says very little about the vast executive branch, which has grown so numerous. The Founding Fathers put it all in one sentence: "The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America."

That is all. The rest is merely a matter of appointment and delegation.

The President, in turn, embodies a program, a platform, and a popular will. It is the job of the Government employee to support and effectuate that program. The civil service is not an end in itself. It is not permanent government which goes on serenely unperturbed behind a meaningless facade of electoral contests. It is an instrument available to the President to help him accomplish the tasks to which he is committed. It is responsible, through him, to the American people.

Inevitably, Federal officials at many levels will play a role in helping the President to understand and define those tasks, but they must never confuse institutional inertia with Government policy. The decisions which the people make at elections are real issues, and their decisions must be respected and effectuated.

And they must be carried out with efficiency and good management.

This is why President Johnson insists today that all departments and agencies subject their policies and programs to constant review and evaluation. And this is why the President himself, and his Bureau of the Budget, comb through each department and agency budget—cutting away duplication, waste, and programs which have outlived their usefulness and may continue solely by inertia.

Woodrow Wilson, the great political scientist and President after whom your graduate school is named, Mr. Goheen, envisaged a dynamic role for the Government administration. He saw the development of pressure groups representing special interests—a development which has progressed by geometric proportions in the years since his death—and he said, quite rightly, that the business of government is to mobilize the general interest against the special interest.

This, of course, is more easily said than done, because the government office becomes the honey pot which draws the special interest flies, and with the best of intentions, a government administrator may hear only one side of the story unless he makes a heroic effort to learn what is in the best interest of the vast unorganized public.

The regulatory agency which becomes, in time, the meek handmaiden of the regulated, is an old story. It is seldom—at least in our Government—a result of the corruption of bribes. It is more often a result of laziness, or lack of interest, which is a more serious danger to good government than venality.

But, as I inferred earlier, the even greater danger to good government is the danger of inwardness, of rivalry within and between Government agencies.

It is all too easy for the government official to become a bureaucrat. It is all to easy to forget that ours is a government for the people and that those in government are in public service, not self-service.

In undertaking any action—in considering any policy—there should be one measure: Will this benefit the people?

The constituency of the Presidency is the Nation at large, and it is this constituency which the executive branch must bear in mind. And the needs of the Nation will not always be reflected in the Washington lobbies, in pressure mail, or in newspaper editorials. Sometimes, it will require great tenacity and curiosity to discover these needs. But this is the job of the men and women who help the President bear the executive burdens.

For the President is the people's lobbyist.

And, as he has recently made clear: He expects our departments and agencies to produce programs and proposals which they believe to be, to the maximum degree, in the interests of our citizens. He will determine what may be politically possible or difficult.

And that is as it should be.

Before he reached the White House, President Wilson once remarked: "Men of ordinary physique and discretion cannot be Presidents and live, if the strain be not somehow relieved. We shall be obliged always to be picking our chief magistrates from among wise and prudent athletes—a small class."

Our guests of honor tonight clearly fall within that class. I congratulate them on having survived the rigors of office. I thank their wives and families, who have missed their presence at many suppers and on many weekends—I am sorry, Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Goheen, that you do not have "his" and "her" medals, because I know that behind every hardworking official is a wife who works even harder. And I congratulate the American people on their good fortune in having these award winners as their servants.

MANY BENFITS FROM FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the importance of flood control projects, so dramatically illustrated by floods last year in my State and the Midwest, is also emphasized by the adequate flow in the main channel of the Missouri River during the relative dry spell earlier this winter. The water held back and stored in upstream reservoirs during spring and summer rains later was used to good purpose in relieving the subsequent drought.

But much remains to be done. As the Congress studies the President's budget requests for 1967, it ic important that we consider all benefits of our water control and utilization program. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial, "Winter Water," by Jim Monroe, of radio station WCMO, Kansas City, Mo., be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Winter Water

Plenty of water in the midst of a winter drought. Dry weather isn't so critical in winter as it can be in the growing season, yet a shortage of winter water causes its own troubles.

Our winter water lies ready for use in the huge reservoirs upstream on the Missouri River. It will not be used to relieve dryness of the land, but gates will be opened on a calculated basis to generate new record amounts of electric power and to maintain the Missouri at a good level to assure downstream users of plenty of intake capacity without the common winter ice jams.

In years past, ice floes were regular problems as they served to cut the flow of water like dams. Dynamite and bombs were used on occasion to break loose the big packs. City water intakes were bogged with mud in the low water. Now, the six upstream reservoirs are at record high levels to provide plenty of winter water downstream. By spring, they will be lowered sufficiently to take care of floodwaters and prevent damage along with maintaining a good navigation level.

The Missouri River is now tamed as far down as Omaha. Plans are developing slowly to control the river farther downstream in Kansas and Missouri. With public support, flood control and its fringe benefits could become one of the outstanding achievements of the century.

OMBUDSMAN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, last week I informed my colleagues that the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure will hold a series of public hearings on the possibility of creating the office of ombudsman here in the United States. The ombudsman is a Swedish institution created in 1809; it is a form of guardian of the people's rights against abuses and malfunctions by government, its programs, and its officials.

Mr. Alfred Bexelius, the present ombudsman of Sweden, will be in this country next month. He has graciously consented to appear before the subcommittee on March 7, 1966, to explain the history and function of his office. I urge my colleagues to attend this hearing if their schedules permit.

There have been a few proposals in Congress in recent years to create such an institution as an arm of the Congress of the United States. Most active in this area has been Congressman Henry S. Reuss, from Milwaukee, Wis., who is the author of a bill to create an administrative counsel of the Congress—or Federal ombudsman. Congressman Reuss has recently written a very interesting article which appeared in the February 1966 issue of the Progressive magazine entitled "A Troubleshooter for Congress." I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Troubleshooter for Congress

(By Representative Henry S. Reuss)

The same 89th Congress which passed such progressive measures as medicare, aid to elementary and secondary education, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 also passed, after only the briefest consideration, an inflammatory declaration of the right to unilateral intervention in Latin America. In another regressive action it so distorted the proposed highway beautification program that the measure finally enacted, to the dismay of most Members, proves to be a step backward for the 20 States which will be deprived of their right to continue to remove billboards under their police powers. The Congress also adhered to its unhappy precedent of spending $16 billion yearly for research and development—90 percent in defense, space, and atomic energy, 10 percent in health, education, and all other areas—without ever examining the entire program and relating the allocation of funds to the priorities among our national needs.

Clearly, the infusion of some 40 "additional" progressive Congressman and the limited rules changes made in the House last January have not solved all the problems involved in developing a more effective Congress.

The biggest single barrier to an independent, positive role by Congress is the inability of its members to devote enough time to thought, study, and debate on the great questions of national and international policy. Instead, they find that much of their time, and the time of their staffs, is devoted to what they call their "casework"—the job of helping citizens with their problems with the Federal bureaucracy.

Citizens' problems with the bureaucracy are an inevitable concomitant of the modern state. For example, social security and welfare programs spawn individual injustices when there is administrative error, abuse of discretion, delay, or dicourtesy. Or the hapless citizen may be baffled by seemingly endless redtape or the kind of jargon that often slips into agency forms and Government statements. He may be unaware of any legal recourse he may have. Litigation, moreover, is slow and costly. So, in reality, the aggrieved citizen is without any remedy to fit the grievance in most cases—except to write his Congressman.

And this is exactly what millions of Americans do every year. "Cases" are estimated to comprise anywhere from a third to two-thirds of all the mail that pours into congressional officers. Every year, the average Representative must deal with several thousand "cases." They range from simple ones that can be cleared up with a telephone call—such as a delayed social security check—to complex matters which require many hours of work by the Congressman and his staff.

How complex these cases can be may be judged from the following example.

In 1958, male employees of the Hilltop post office in Milwaukee were outraged by an invasion of their privacy. Toilets in the post office men's room were without doors. When the door to the men's room was open, the toilet facilities were in full view of the occupants of the adjoining lunchroom. The employees got nowhere with their complaints and turned to me for help. I wrote scores of letters to the Milwaukee postmaster, regional postal officials, Washington postal officials, and finally the Postmaster General. I inspected the station. I even offered to buy a partition to allow some privacy. I argued against a series of "reasons" why nothing could be done—such as the need for inspectors to be able to watch for thefts from the mails, and the cost of doors. Not until last year, after I threatened a House committee investigation, was an elementary right to privacy respected. In an historic decision, the Post Office Department put up partitions.

Take another case. In the summer of 1960, John J. DeFrancisco of Milwaukee, penniless and unable to hire an attorney, came to me after the Army had obtained a $5,253 judgment against him.

DeFrancisco, a copper miner, had been drafted into the Army on August 7, 1942. After 3 months of basic training he was sent with other "soldiers" to Houghton, Mich., with instructions to report to the copper mine. He was issued a card by the Army stating that he was "on furlough from the U.S. Army." He was ordered to keep his uniforms in shape and be ready to move out on 24 hours' notice. Thinking they were still in the Army, DeFrancisco and his companions worked in the mines from November 4, 1942, until June 11, 1945, when DeFrancisco was sent with an Army unit to the west coast. He was discharged at Camp Beal, Calif., on April 19, 1946. While working in the mines, DeFrancisco was paid $4.60 a day by a mining firm, almost all of which was spent on room and board. He received no pay from the Army. His wife, a son, and his wife's two minor sisters lived on an $80-a-month Army allotment check.

In 1958 the Army filed suit to recover the allotments plus interest. DeFrancisco, who had only a grade school education, ignored the notice of the suit and the Army obtained the judgment.

After listening to DeFrancisco's story, I dug out his Army records. They confirmed his story in every respect except that they listed him in the "ready reserve" instead of "on active duty" during the period he worked in the mines. Following exhaustive legal research which showed that the Army had no legal basis for recovery of the allotment, I went into Milwaukee Federal court on several occasions to plead DeFrancisco's case. By this time the case had attracted national publicity. Finally the Army decided to drop its unjust claim.

As a result of the newspaper stories, other men who had been drafted and sent to the mines were able to have similar judgments against them dismissed. Several men who were disabled in mine accidents, and had been denied veterans' disability payments, instituted court proceedings to collect compensation as a result of the DeFrancisco case.

This congressional casework role is important in humanizing Government bureaucracy and making it responsible. It is constructive to have the actions of remote, permanent civil servants reviewed continually by Congressmen and Senators who must answer to the people every 2 or 6 years. The effect is to prod bureaucrats into the best possible administration of the laws.

But the great difficulty is: How can Members of Congress continue to give citizens the help they need in problems with the Federal bureaucracy and still find time to be effective, thoughtful, original legislators?

A solution I have advanced is the ombudsman—the outlandish Swedish word for "representative." The ombudsman originated in Sweden in 1809 as an agent of Parliament to assure proper administration of the laws—which is still his role today. He stands ready to receive any Swedish citizen's complaint concerning Government administration. He has discretion to investigate a complaint or not, and he may undertake investigations on his own initiative. He may compel testimony and the production of evidence.

He may make unannounced inspection trips. When he has completed his investigation, he may make recommendations for the correction of any abuse or error he finds. He may suggest changes in procedure to avoid future difficulties. He may publicize his findings and make recommendations to the Parliament. Although he has no power to change an administrative decision, the prestige of the office has given the ombudsman's recommendations for remedial action great weight. The possibility of adverse publicity, marshaling public opinion against an agency, or of legislative action, adds to the tendency of administrators to heed the ombudsman's recommendations.

Other nations, looking for a means of redressing individual grievances against the bureaucracy, have been attracted to the ombudsman concept. Finland established an ombudsman in 1919, Denmark in 1955, New Zealand in 1962, and Norway in 1963. In October, 1965, the British Government issued a white paper announcing its intention to establish an ombudsman during this session of Parliament.

Widespread interest in the institution has resulted in a second printing of a new book edited by Prof. D. C. Rowat, "The Ombudsman: Citizen's Defender" (University of Toronto Press).

In July 1963, and again in February 1965, I introduced legislation to establish an American ombudsman to help Congressmen help their constitutents. Senator CLAIBORNE PELL of Rhode Island introduced a companion bill in the Senate. Ombudsman bills have also been introduced in five State legislatures, with a California bill winning passage in the lower house.

The Federal ombudsman—or administrative counsel of the Congress, to give the office its formal name—would centralize much of the casework now being handled by 535 Congressmen, Senators, and their individual staffs. He would be appointed by the Speaker and the President pro tempore of the Senate solely on the basis of fitness and without regard to party. An eminent jurist or administrative expert, he would be paid the same salary as Members of Congress. Assisted by a staff of experts in the major types of casework, he would investigate cases referred to him by Members of Congress. He would have power to obtain any necessary papers and files and to consult with Federal officials without the permission of their supervisors.

When he completed his investigation, he would report to the Congressman who referred the case to him and also make known to the agency concerned any recommendations for remedial action.

In a case where an agency was unwilling to correct what the ombudsman considered a serious administrative error or abuse, the ombudsman could make a special report to Congress which would be printed as a public document and be available to the press. He would also make an annual report to Congress, containing more general recommendations and reports. Thus, like his overseas prototypes, he would have the power to investigate, recommend, and publicize.

Establishment of an American ombudsman would have four major advantages:

First. It would free time for Members of Congress and their staffs to work on the important national and international issues that confront Congress.

Second. It would more effectively protect citizens' rights against administrative abuse. Under the present system, congressional casework is handled by men-of-all-work in the offices of Representatives and Senators, almost none of whose staff budgets can afford true experts in even the major categories of casework. The result is that in complex cases the citizens' advocate a congressional office is frequently at the mercy of the administrative branch's experts. Through centralization under the Federal ombudsman, Congress could have its own experts looking into citizens' grievances.

Third. It would allow more effective diagnosis and the elimination of root causes of recurring difficulties between citizens and the bureaucracy. With complaints so scattered under present arrangements, it may not be recognized that a vast number of problems arise from a single source. The ombudsman, seeing the entire pattern of citizens' complaints, would be better able to identify trouble spots and recommend remedial action.

Fourth. It would be more efficient than continuing increases in individual Congressmen's staffs. The casework burden is bound to increase in the years ahead. The population of House districts is growing rapidly and in 1980 will average 564,000 inhabitants per district, compared with 410,481 in 1960. Most Senators also will serve larger populations. In addition, new programs, such as Medicare and rent supplements, will generate added cases. To respond by merely adding to existing office staffs would provide only an unwieldly, costly, inefficient means of handling the growing volume of casework.

The American ombudsman is based not only on the Scandinavian institution but also on our own experience with the Legislative Counsel and the Legislative Reference Service. Through them, Congress has given itself the benefits of expert, centralized assistance in the drafting of legislation and in legislative research. The ombudsman or Administrative Counsel would extend this service into the area of casework.

The ombudsman proposal is currently under consideration by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which will make its recommendations for congressional reform this year. Ombudsman bills are before the Committee on House Administration and the Senate Rules Committee.

Recently, the Gallup poll asked some questions about the ombudsman idea. Forty-two percent thought it was a "good idea" to "set up an independent agency in Washington to handle the complaints of citizens who think they have not been treated properly by Government officials." Twenty-nine percent thought this was a "poor idea," and an equal number had no opinion.

Then Gallup posed the issue in the following terms: "As you may know, Congressmen spend about half their time doing errands and favors for people in their districts. To give Congressmen more time to consider new legislation it has been suggested that all letters and requests—except those dealing with policy matters—be turned over to a central bureau for handling."

Forty-six percent thought this was a "good idea." Forty-one percent regarded it as a "poor idea," and 13 percent had no opinion.

A 46-to-41 plurality is not to be disregarded for a proposal such as this. Yet I suspect that opposition was exaggerated by implications in the question that the ombudsman would be asked to do "errands and favors" and that Congressmen would wash their hands of any concern about the fate of citizens' grievances and nonpolicy requests.

In fact, under the language of the ombudsman bill, cases could be referred to the ombudsman only when a citizen "alleges that he believes that he has been subjected to any improper penalty, or that he has been denied any right or benefit to which he is entitled, under the laws of the United States, or that the determination of award of any such right or benefit has been, is being, or will be unreasonably delayed." The law would rule out any possibility that the ombudsman would become a favor-seeker or errand boy.

Moreover, Congressmen would continue their interest in their constituents' problems. Cases could come to the ombudsman only through Members of Congress. Congressmen could refer cases or continue to handle them themselves as at present. If dissatisfied with the ombudsman's investigation or report, they could pursue cases further.

Funneling cases through Members of Congress allows the Congressman to remain directly concerned with his constituents' problems, but relieves him of much of the time-consuming work involved. It would build on the firmly established tradition of "write your Congressman."

The British ombudsman proposal, which is strikingly like the American scheme in many ways, also would channel complaints through members of the legislature. Like the United States, Britain is a country with a tradition that its national legislators help constituents with their problems with the Government.

"In Britain," says the October British Government white paper, "Parliament is the place for ventilating the grievances of the citizen—by history, tradition, and past and present practice. It is one of the functions of the elected Member of Parliament to try to secure that his constituents do not suffer injustice at the hand of the Government. We do not want to create any new institution which would erode the functions of Members of Parliament in this respect, nor to replace the remedies which the British Constitution already provides. Our proposal is to develop those remedies still further. We shall give Members of Parliament a better instrument which they can use to protect the citizen, namely, the services of a Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration."

The United States has created many of its institutes of government by borrowing and adapting. We took the name of our Senate from Rome, our Speaker from the English House of Commons, and our doctrine of separation of powers from the French philosophers. We could do worse than to borrow the concept of the Swedish ombudsman.

Perhaps the proposal will have a better chance if we can resolve one problem. Hardly anyone can pronounce "ombudsman," and trying to pronounce it tends to provoke titters among the uninitiated. On the other hand, Administrative Counsel of the Congress sounds awfully bland. A better name, anyone?

THE JOB CORPS CENTERS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the February 8 issue of the Wall Street Journal, James C. Tanner reports that our Job Corps centers are making a promising beginning in training idle youth. Mr. Tanner's article grew out of his visits to the centers and his talks with the corpsmen themselves. He gives an insight into a typical corpsman's day and comments on the functional and realistic approach to learning being used by the Job Corps. Young men and women, bored by orthodox teaching methods, are now learning valuable skills. The real success of the Job Corps will be the useful employment of these young men and women and their emergence as productive and responsible citizens. Industries are recruiting Job Corpsmen who, 10 months ago, would never have been considered for employment. This is the proof of the wisdom and promise of this program. I have personally visited two of these Job Corps centers and I was much impressed by them.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Tanner's article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Salvaging Dropouts—U.S. Job Corps Makes Promising Beginning Training Idle Youths—First "Graduates" Find Work Easily; a High Quit Rate at Camps Is Big Problem—A Look at L.B.J.'s Pet Center

(By James C. Tanner)

San Marcos, Tex.—Robert Coffey and Curtis Lemarr are 19-year-old high school dropouts. Still, they share what is temporarily one of the Nation's rarest educational distinctions. They are among the first "graduates" of the U.S. Job Corps—and their stories exemplify what this antipoverty agency is trying to achieve.

A year ago they seemingly had no future. Robert, a Negro, had quit school to help support his mother after his sister died in an auto crash, but he could find work only as a $1.15 an hour delivery boy for a Little Rock, Ark., department store. Curtis, shy son of a disabled Tennessee coal miner, left school after an argument with his principal, and could find no regular job at all.

Last fall, after passing a machine-shop course at the Job Corps' Gary camp here in the Texas hill country, both found jobs at the Longview, Tex., oil field equipment plant of U.S. Industries, Inc., for $1.78 an hour. Already Curtis has been raised to $1.95 and Robert, who now runs a turret lathe, to $2.10. Moreover, the company gives both a good chance to work up to machinist—a job paying over $3 an hour. "They're more eager than most," says George R. Jenkins, personnel manager of U.S. Industries' petroleum equipment division.

BLUE BLAZERS

Will comparable prospects await the 4,500 youths a month who will come out of Job Corps camps by mid-1966? No firm answer is yet at hand. The Corps is barely a year old, and though 17,900 young men and women now wear its blue blazers, its graduates on February 1 numbered only 819.

But the question is one of the most vital in the whole war on poverty. During the fiscal year beginning July 1 the Corps is scheduled to grow from its present 90 camps to 124, accommodating 45,000 youths, and the Government plans to spend $350 million on it—more than a fifth of all planned antipoverty spending in fiscal 1967. So perhaps a close look at the Corps, and at the Gary camp as one of its leading centers, is in order.

The Corps is intended to make productive citizens out of some of the estimated 500,000 American youths, aged 16 to 21, who are out of school and lack marketable skills. Men and women, in separate camps, are taught both academic and vocational courses, but the stress is on job training.

The camps for men combine the atmospheres of an Army post, a boarding school and a college campus. Most numerous are the rural or conservation centers, which were set up mostly to teach farming or forestry work, but now are broadening their courses to include such things as "culinary arts." Bigger urban centers, such as Gary, offer courses in retail sales, welding, auto repair and the like. The Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), parent antipovery agency, contracts running of the camps to companies, universities or nonprofit groups. Operators include units of Litton Industries, Inc., International Business Machines Corp. and Ford Motor Co.

MANY CRITICS

The program has drawn harsh criticism. Some worriers fear the Corps is training youth for the wrong jobs in tomorrow's economy—though business firms help plan the courses, and some, including U.S. industries, are looking to the Corps to supply skilled workers now in short supply.

"At first I expected a bureaucratic boondoggle, but these boys are taking courses attuned to industry," says Ronald Keener, assistant vice president of Texas Instruments, Inc. He also is vice president of Opportunities, Inc., a group of 79 companies that have volunteered to oversee training at Gary and help place its graduates.

Other critics have called the camps "country clubs for juvenile delinquents." There have been charges that some girls in the Charleston, W. Va., camp have practiced prostitution, and in November 11 trainees from the Custer Camp were jailed in Kalamazoo, Mich., after a window-smashing melee. Poverty fighters concede there are some troublemakers in the camps, but contend there are proportionately many fewer than among young dropouts outside the Corps.

TOO SMALL?

Some, in contrast, think the corps is too small. "The idea is a superb one, but to have any real social meaning it must be expanded a hundredfold," says Herbert Hill, director of labor programs for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

In fact, the corps, like other antipoverty agencies, has had its growth slowed since Vietnam spending began to soar. The targets it now is scheduled to hit in fiscal 1967 originally were to be reached this fiscal year.

Still, the corps has generated much enthusiasm among poor youths. Some 300,000 have applied. Most haven't been screened, since the corps tries to keep its pool of accepted youths waiting for camp assignment to a couple thousand.

The corps studies environmental, educational, and behavior records of youths, and gives them medical, IQ, reading, and arithmetic tests. "Functional" illiterates may get in, but complete illiterates don't. Neither do youths with histories of repeated criminal behavior.

Youths who are taken are assigned to camps on the basis both of choice and of test scores. Those doing well on math tests usually are urged to go to urban centers. Rural camps take the less intellectually agile.

At Gary, which took its first trainees last March 3, enrollment is rising by 150 a week, and will reach a peak of 3,000 soon, making the camp the biggest in the corps. It offers the most courses, too—39, including training for such jobs as male nurse, bulldozer operator, and underwater welder.

In other ways, also, Gary is a Corps showplace. President Johnson announced and dedicated it personally, and its training schedules have been expanded continually at his urging. It's self-sustaining, with its own housekeeping crews, fire department, security force, and hospital. Though financed and supervised by OEO, it is, unlike most camps, run by a nonprofit group—Texas Educational Foundation, Inc., whose three members are appointed by Gov. John Connally.

Gary's training methods and problems, however, mirror those in other camps—and so do its accomplishments.

"There was no precedent in Texas for such a facility," says San Marcos Banker J. R. Thornton, president of Texas Educational Foundation. "We're really running a boarding school. We've had to live through a period of public acceptance. You're on trial with a program like this until you can prove it's worthy."

Like many camps, Gary occupies an abandoned military base, and takes trainees from all over the country. They're required to work around the base, sweeping the barracks, helping in the kitchens and maintaining the grounds. For this they draw salaries of $30 a month, and an additional $50 a month is set aside as a terminal leave bonus. A youth can have half his terminal leave bonus, or $25 a month, sent home to a dependent. If he does, the Government matches his contribution, so that the dependent gets $50 a month.

DAILY LIFE

A corpsmen's weekday begins at 6. After breakfast, he cleans his room, then reports to class at 8. He's required to spend 3 hours a day in academic courses, 3 hours in vocational training, and 1 hour in physical education. A citizenship class is mandatory.

One innovation at Gary is integration of vocational and academic courses. Cooks and bakers in math classes are taught fractions so that they can measure ingredients; machine operators learn to translate fractions into decimals. Apprentice auto mechanics spend a part of their time in English class learning to spell "carburetor" and other vehicle parts. In science classes they pick up the theory of what makes an engine run. The average youth takes a year to finish his training, though some graduate in less time and some will take up to 2 years.

On the theory that a busy boy is a happy one, trainees are encouraged to use Gary's two swimming pools, movie theater, tennis courts, gymnasium, and television lounges, and to participate in the vigorous intramural sports. Cooperative corpsmen are given passes for off-base visits, and any trainee can quit the program if he chooses.

MANY DROPOUTS

Despite the careful preliminary screening, many do quit. Homesickness takes the biggest toll, but some youths come down just for an airplane ride. At Gary, 32 of every 100 enrolled in the initial months failed to complete prescribed training.

Jobs Corps staffers expect the dropout rate to decline, and insist that even brief exposure to a camp can change the life of a youth conditioned to poverty. "If they stay here a month, they have gained," says John C. Henry, a Gary community relations coordinator. "They're eating regularly, and they've got clothes. They will not be content to go back to the old way of life."

Gary has traced many who quit and finds that some are readmitted to other Job Corps camps. Others often find jobs, go back to school or enter the military. One corpsman left before graduating, for example, but credits the training he did get for helping him through Marine boot camp; he spent his first leave back at Gary. The Job Corps considers it has succeeded when a trainee is placed in a job, returns to school or is accepted by the armed services.

The director of Gary, Oscar J. Baker, a noted Texas educator, makes no pretense that his charges aren't a challenge. "Students here have one common factor," he says. "They come to us with a sense of failure and various degrees of skepticism that they will ever be much more." First objectives of Gary, he says, are to rekindle their hope and restore their confidence.

While costs of training a Job Corpsman haven't been pinned down yet, they likely will turn out to be more than it would take to keep him in Harvard. "Public schools," says Mr. Baker, "operate 7 hours a day while we operate like a city. In training corpsmen, you are concerned with them 24 hours a day." He also contends, "statistically, if less than 5 percent of the Job Corps trainees hold responsible employment for the remainder of their working years, they will have paid back the investment the Government has made in the program."

The original OEO contract for operation of Gary estimated costs for the first 18 months at $8,100,000. However, Mr. Baker recently had to get a fatter budget approved by the OEO, partly because the center is training at least 1,000 more than had been initially expected. Payroll costs alone are running nearly $500,000 a month.

To attract top quality teachers, Gary pays them more than they generally would make in comparable public school posts. All told, Gary has 1,116 staffers for 3,000 trainees, but many of these are guidance counselors and housekeeping and medical employees. Some 90 percent of incoming trainees need immediate dental treatment. "In most you also see the ravages of malnutrition and lack of immunizations," a doctor here adds.

A SECOND CHANCE

Trainees generally credit the Job Corps with giving them "a second chance." Denver Sexton, 17-year-old son of a Kentucky coal miner, says he had to quit school in the eighth grade because of financial problems. He came here March 3 with the first trainees. "You should have seen him then," says a Job Corps staffer. "He had long hair, looked like a beatnik, and wouldn't talk to anybody." Recently, Denver, neatly attired and clean-cut, got up before a banquet here to make a brief and articulate speech of thanks after he was named November Corpsman of the month.

Kenneth (Mike) Wyatt, 20, finished the 11th grade at Waco, Tex., but an auto accident put him in a coma for 5 months and erased his plans for completing high school. After a stint at Gary, however, he passed entrance exams at Southwest Texas State College the other day. He intends to study there soon; meanwhile he is selling shoes in a Waco store.

Alex Maynard, also 20, from McAlester Okla., was a freshman in a Negro college until financial strain forced him to quit. He worked a while as a stock boy in an Oklahoma department store, but his wages never topped $60 a week. He enrolled here in retail sales, graduating the other day. He is now employed as a men's clothing salesman at Foley's, a Houston department store, earning $351 a month plus 12 percent commission on his sales.

PLACEMENT RECORD

Gary has graduated 188 so far. All have quickly found jobs, gone back to high school or college or enlisted in the armed services. And prospective employers are seeking other Gary grads.

At this point, indeed, "we can't meet demand," says Harold Massey, Gary placement director. Texas highway builders are clamoring for all the bulldozer operators Gary can turn out. Other employers, like Mr. Jenkins of U.S. Industries, are coming here to recruit. Even the New York Mets baseball team sent scouts here, though Job Corps staffers are inclined to brush that off as a publicity stunt.

Job Corps officials are confident the bulk of graduates from Gary and other camps will be placed in coming months, too, if the Nation's economy continues to grow as predicted. "We won't guarantee placing 100 percent, but that's our objective," says Lewis D. Eigen, an associate director of the Job Corps in Washington. Mr. Eigen has set up a placement system and is enlisting the aid of businessmen to promote and hold jobs open for Job Corps graduates. A plastics bottle manufacturer already has assured him it will need at least 15 to 20 Job Corps grads when it opens a new plant several months from now.

HERBERT C. BONNER, LATE A REPRESENTATIVE FROM NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to pay a word of tribute to the late Congressman Herbert Covington Bonner, whose death has deprived us of a good and kind neighbor.

Herbert Bonner was born in the year 1891 in Washington, N.C., the son of Herbert Macon and Hannah Hare Bonner. His father was the captain of the steamboat *Hatteras* which carried passengers and cargo from the port of "little Washington" to points along the intercoastal waters. Herbert sometimes accompanied "Captain Mac" on these excursions and his early love of the water and boating never left him.

After attending Graham's Academy in Warrenton, N.C., he joined the George B. Helms Tobacco Co. as a traveling tobacco and snuff salesman. By horse and buggy he covered the roads and byways of a five-county area selling his wares. He loved these trips and looked forward to the warm hobnobbing at the country stores.

He opened his own tobacco company in 1911 with his brother-in-law and continued as a salesman for the company until World War I when he left to serve as a sergeant in the 81st Army Division. In 1925 he accompanied his boyhood friend, Lindsay C. Warren, to Washington as his secretary, and brought his lovely bride of 6 months with him. When Warren was appointed Comptroller General in 1940, Herbert Bonner was his uncontested successor. He encountered opposition only 3 of the 13 times he ran for reelection during the 25 years he served in Congress.

I know of no Congressman in the past or present who was more fervently dedicated to the well-being of those he represented than was Herbert Bonner. He felt a genuine empathy with the people back home he so loved, and his efforts for them were tireless. With his instinctive avoidance of ostentation, he went about the attainment of his aims with a noted absence of display.

Among his legislative achievements was passage of the measure which led to the establishment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, the first of the seashore areas in the Nation to be set aside as a public playground. He was responsible for construction of the bridge which bears his name and links the once isolated Outer Banks of North Carolina, and was one of the first to recognize the need for a revised acreage allotment tobacco program. He continually worked for improvements in the postal facilities and service for the people of his district, and his competence in obtaining his objectives was remarkable.

Herbert Bonner's accomplishments, however, were not confined to the State level, and he left an impressive legacy as chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. His good friend, Speaker Sam Rayburn, said of him in this capacity:

> His committee has been chairmaned by some of the greatest Members of Congress, but none greater than Herbert Bonner.

Herbert's interest in marine affairs was profoundly earnest and the work of the committee during the 10 years of his chairmanship bore the mark of his imagination and courage. Through his own tenacious efforts, he offered and steered to enactment legislation authorizing construction of the first nuclear-powered merchant ship, the SS *Savannah*. It was his idea that the ship should be a cargo-passenger vessel which could be practically employed in its demonstration of the peacetime possibilities of nuclear power rather than simply a showboat for display purposes. After the sinking of the *Andrea Doria* in 1956, he chaired a subcommittee investigation of the incident which resulted in the 1960 Convention for Safety of Life at Sea. He was one of the first to recognize the unique adaptability of atomic power to icebreaking vessels, and in 1958 his proposed legislation for a nuclear-powered icebreaker successfully passed both the House and Senate but was defeated by Presidential veto. In all likelihood the future will be the beneficiary of his vision. He initiated a congressional study of the efficiency of the Panama Canal as a modern interoceanic waterway, and led efforts that resulted in the revision of obsolete passenger shipping laws and thus insured the survival of American passenger shipping. He also concerned himself and his committee with labor-management relations in the maritime industry which he considered to be the basis of many of the maritime problems. In the last speech he was to deliver in the House of Representatives on October 20, 1965, less than a month before the death which he knew to be inevitable, he argued for the establishment of an independent Federal Maritime Administration. He stated:

> I intend as soon as possible in the next session to hold hearings on this legislation with the hope that by giving everyone a full opportunity to express themselves, we will be able to get our merchant marine policy back on course.

His courage and optimism never failed, and unlike Tennyson's Ulysses who feared to "rust unburnish'd," Herbert Bonner's life up to its end "shined in use."

I never knew him to hold bitterness or enmity in his heart against his fellows, and his generous nature was quick to forgive anger and malevolence in others. He possessed an extraordinary facility of getting along with men of heterogeneous political faiths, and his native temperance together with his political acumen and sincere liking of people enabled him to accomplish ends which would have eluded others.

He was a man of relentless honesty and when he gave his word it was his honor. With all his astuteness as a political leader, he was on occasion deceived by very reason of this honesty since he assumed the same allegiance to it in others. He never lost his eager interest in everything and his wonderful teasing and dry humor was a source of much pleasure to those who knew him.

Congressman Herbert C. Bonner was known and addressed as simply "Herbert" by the people back home, young and old alike. He was one of them and they knew it. It is a moving tribute to the man that his name has been given to many of the children of those who loved him. One of his most devoted friends and longtime employee named her only son Herbert, and if it could be determined, we might well find that there are as many Herberts scattered throughout the First District of North Carolina as there were Georges in the Colonies during the days of the American Revolution.

Herbert Bonner was always interested in the opinions of his friends and associates, and he listened to others with respect and attention. He once remarked that during his early days in Washington he observed a sign in Speaker Sam Rayburn's office which read:

> When you're talkin you ain't larnin.

He received this homely instruction well, and many years later when he had distinguished himself as a Congressman, Speaker Rayburn was moved to say of him:

> Herbert Bonner doesn't talk too much. So when he does talk, he challenges the attention of the House because he knows what he's talking about.

And indeed he did.

He felt a special warmheartedness for children and expressed this fondness in many kindnesses for them. He once read an item in his hometown newspaper which casually alluded to a little boy with ragged pants who was seen rolling a warped wooden hoop down the street. The boy was described as looking rather forlorn. Herbert Bonner called the newspaper editor from his Washington office and said:

> You go buy that boy a pair of pants and also a real hoop and let me know how much they cost.

In the final weeks of Herbert Bonner's life when death was close at hand, he made every effort his failing body would allow to attend the sessions of the House of Representatives. On several occasions he had an aid rush him back from his visits to Walter Reed Hospital in order that he might cast his vote.

Herbert Bonner was survived by his devoted wife, Eva Hassell Hackney Bonner, who had been his constant inspiration in all his public services.

Since his passing, those of us who called him friend remember with a new awareness the poignant truth expressed by the Persian poet ages ago:

> For some we loved, the loveliest and the best
> That from his vintage rolling time hath prest,
> Have drunk their cup a round or two before,
> And one by one crept silently to rest.

THE VALUE OF COAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, those of us from coal-producing States have long realized the economic value of our greatest natural resource. Its total value has been estimated at more than $2 billion annually to the people in 25 States.

The importance of the coal industry has been justly dramatized in a special edition published by the Welch, W. Va., Daily News on January 29, 1966.

I ask unanimous consent that one article in that special edition, dealing with the revenue-producing aspects of coal, be printed in the Record for study by Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

Coal Means $2 Billion Annually to 25 States

The mining and transportation of bituminous coal and lignite directly add $2,290 million in wages, purchases and taxes to the economy of hundreds of American cities and towns in 25 States each year, according to a report from Operations and Policy Research, Inc., of Washington, D.C.

The report is based on the first company by company survey ever undertaken of coal producers, coal carrying railroads and mining machinery and equipment manufacturers. The survey was limited to wages, State and local taxes paid and expenditures for services and supplies. The objective of the survey was to measure the impact of coal-generated wealth on the trade and livelihood of the communities in which it is produced or transported.

The report shows that $1,323 million in wages are paid annually to coal miners, railroad workers engaged in transporting coal and employees of manufacturing companies who work solely on coal mining machines and supplies.

Coal companies, railroads and manufacturers each year pay $866,666,996 for supplies and supplies and services for the parts of their operations directly related to coal.

State and local taxes paid by these industries total $106,995,912.

Coal means $541,608,506 annually to West Virginia. A total of $271,547,420 is paid in wages.

Coal wages go back into the economy in these ways: $76,304,825 is spent for food each year by coal workers in West Virginia; $73,860,898 is spent on wearing apparel; medical expenses total $15,749,750; transportation takes $31,771,058; $6,245,591 is spent on personal care (beauty and barber shops, cosmetics, etc.); $14,935,108 goes for recreation; and $30,684,858 is spent on other goods and services not listed.

BOB HOPE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, Bob Hope has performed an invaluable service to all Americans by entertaining U.S. service personnel throughout the world. Since 1941 this great citizen has unselfishly devoted his time and talents to the task of bringing joy and humor to our men and women who are far from home.

Many of Mr. Hope's performances have been conducted during the holiday seasons when most persons prefer to remain at home with their families and friends.

Bob's recent trip to Thailand, Vietnam, and Guam is a fine example of his many visits to military installations. Television viewers and radio listeners are familiar with this tour because of the film clips and tape recordings which have been broadcast widely in the United States, permitting the general public to appreciate the fine quality of these performances.

At my request, the Department of Defense has compiled and forwarded to me a list of the widespread posts and areas in which Bob Hope and his troupe have entertained. It also has prepared lists of associates who traveled with Mr. Hope during the 1964 and 1965 trips.

As a small tribute of the deep appriciation for these services and the esteem of the American public for these fine people, I ask unanimous consent that this information be printed in the Congressional Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the listing was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Chronological Listing of Bob Hope's Association With the Military

March 1941 to June 1948: All of Hope's weekly broadcasts originated at military installations.

December 1948: Performed for Berlin airlift personnel in Germany and England.

December 1949: Alaska.

December 1950: Japan and Korea.

December 1954: First oversea TV filming accomplished at Thule, Greenland. One performance at Goose Air Base, Labrador. Sponsored by Secretary of the Air Force.

December 1955: Hope and small troupe entertained in Iceland at the request of MATS commander.

December 1956: Entertained at one Army post, three Air Force bases in Alaska. Sponsored by commander, Alaskan Command.

December 1957: First tour under Department of Defense sponsorship through Armed Forces Professional Entertainment Branch (AFPEB) and USO. Toured Japan, Korea, Okinawa, Guam, Hawaii, plus planeside show during refueling at Kwajelein Island.

December 1958: Second AFPEB tour, Morocco, Spain, Italy, Germany, and Iceland.

December 1959: Third AFPEB tour, Alaskan Command.

December 1960: Fourth AFPEB tour, Caribbean.

December 1961: Fifth AFPEB tour, northeast area (Greenland, Labrador, Newfoundland, etc.).

December 1962: Sixth AFPEB tour, Far East (Japan, Korea, Okinawa, Taiwan, Philippines, Guam).

December 1963: Seventh AFPEB tour, Near East (Turkey, Greece, Libya, Italy).

December 1964: Eighth AFPEB tour, Pacific (Vietnam, Thailand, Philippines, Guam, Korea).

July 1965: Ninth AFPEB tour, Dominican Republic (July 12–15).

December 1965: Tenth AFPEB tour, Pacific (Thailand, Vietnam, Guam) (December 18–29).

THE 1964 BOB HOPE CHRISTMAS SHOW

Bob Hope, Jerry Colonna, Anita Bryant, Janis Paige, Jill St. John, Ann Sidney (Miss World-British Subject), Anna Maria Alberghetti, John Bubbles, Peter Leeds, Les Brown and his band.

JULY 1965 BOB HOPE SHOW TO DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Bob Hope, Jerry Colonna, Tony Romano, Joey Heatherton, Lola Dee, Tuesday Weld.

THE 1965 BOB HOPE CHRISTMAS SHOW

Bob Hope, Jerry Colonna, Les Brown and his band, Anita Bryant, Jack Jones, Peter Leeds, Kaye Stevens, Carroll Baker, Joey Heatherton, Dianna Lynn Batts, Fayard Antonio Nicholas, Harold Lloyd Nicholas.

SENATOR MAGNUSON—FISHERY LEADER

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the January 1966 anniversary issue of the Fishermen's News, published and edited in Seattle by John H. Wedin, contains 42 important articles relating to the U.S. fishery. Among the authors are Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and many of our colleagues in the Senate and the House, together with fishery experts from all parts of the country.

"The golden age begins" is the phrase Editor Wedin used to title the anniversary issue. The front page is almost covered by a photograph of a man who ever since coming to Congress over a quarter of a century ago has led in the long, hard fight to preserve and to expand the American fishery. He is my colleague, my chairman, and my friend, Senator Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington State. Of him Editor Wedin wrote:

> Of all those associated with the present golden age of Pacific fisheries, none has been more dedicated toward developing the fleets than Senator Warren G. Magnuson, chairman of the powerful Senate Commerce Committee. His 25-year record of adopted fishery legislation was the subject of a feature in the 1965 annual, and is unequaled in national fishery legislative history. One of the prime problems in the present world fishery explosion is that of resource conservation.

Mr. President, I concur in this flattering and factual statement. And I take pleasure now in asking unanimous consent to have the article written by the Senator from Washington for this anniversary issue printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

High Seas Fishery Conservation—1965

(By Senator Warren G. Magnuson, chairman, Senate Commerce Committee)

For this Fishermen's News anniversary edition, it has been suggested that we look forward 20 years and speak of what can be seen for the fisheries. This is a constructive and helpful thing to do at the beginning of the year. Attention could be focused on any one of many aspects of the fisheries for the future. I would like to concentrate on what I personally consider to be the most perplexing international fishery problem—the conservation of high seas fishery resources.

I am firmly convinced that during the next 20 years the international law of fisheries will be drastically changed. For the past 300 years the taking of fish has been considered one of the "freedoms" on the high seas. The resource has been common property. This system of international law, or "no law," has permitted, and, even encouraged, the excessive exploitation of certain fishery resources. With everyone having an equal right to the resource on a first-come-first-serve basis, conservation doesn't pay. No nation unilaterally will postpone exploiting the resource to permit replenishment unless there is some assurance that the nation will later have a special right to benefit from the sacrifice made. There can be no such assurance under the present scheme of international fishery law.

In recent years enormous modern and efficient foreign fishing fleets have operated in the coastal waters of the United States and other coastal nations. Foreign fleets have concentrated in coastal waters over and adjacent to the Continental Shelf generally 10 to 50 miles off the coast. Under the present international law the coastal state cannot be certain what fishery stocks or what quantity of fish are being taken or, therefore, what effect the foreign catch is having on coastal fishery resources. If the United States as a coastal nation wants information on the foreign catch off our coast or possibly a reduction in the foreign fishing effort, we must, under present international law, persuade the sovereign foreign nation to surrender the information voluntarily or voluntarily to comply with restrictions on their fishing effort. A brief "no" is considered too blunt by the foreign nation. Talks can commence and then be continued and continued, particularly if other nations can be brought into the discussions. In the meantime, back in the water, the resource can be plundered with the highest profit going to the most militant exploiter. We from the Pacific Northwest remember the days when the halibut and fur seal resources were devastated and know the price that must be paid and cooperation that is necessary to revive a renewable resource after excessive exploitation.

But I have stated that the present international regime will be replaced before 1985. What will come to take its place? I will suggest that a new international order for the fisheries will be found in which either (1) the coastal state will have exclusive jurisdiction over its coastal fishery resources, or in the alternative (2) the 1958 Geneva Fishery Convention will be fully implemented. In either case, there will be a means whereby the fishery resources beyond territorial waters can be effectively conserved. How would this look in more detail?

If the present trend continues, a world fishery catch of over 150 million tons can be expected by 1985 compared with the present catch of about 50 million tons, and I for one am convinced that the increase in world population and the need for animal protein will only accelerate the present rate of expansion of fishery catch. With this increased pressure on fishery resources, more and more nations will be pressed to claim exclusive fishery jurisdiction out to the Continental Shelf and beyond.

If no other solution to the fishery conservation problem is found effective within the next few years, I believe coastal fishery nations will obtain absolute jurisdiction over their coastal fishery resources either by a Geneva-type international convention or by mass unilateral action by individual nations. If an international conference is called at some time within the next 5 years similar to the Geneva Conferences on the Law of the Sea of 1958 and 1960, to consider jurisdiction over fishery resources, I believe the developing nations would predominate in any vote to assume absolute and exclusive jurisdiction over coastal fishery resources. Generally, at such international conferences a two-thirds vote is required for formal action, but it is my opinion that the necessary votes might be marshaled for extending jurisdiction with strong U.S. support. But even if this would fail, I believe the same result might eventually prevail through independent unilateral national action and through bilateral and similar agreements among nations.

This has been the historical development of the 12-mile fishery zone. It, or something that strongly resembled it, lost in Geneva in 1960. Nevertheless, during the past 5 years every coastal nation except the United States and a handful of others has adopted a 12-mile coastal fishery zone anyway. No one seriously doubt that a 12-mile fishery zone is acceptable international law today, although not included in any convention adopted at the Law of the Sea Conference.

It can be reasonably argued that exclusive jurisdiction over other more valuable resources such as oil, natural gas, and mineral resources of the Continental Shelf, which were also previously considered high seas resources, have been in recent years allocated among nations on the basis of geographical location under the 1958 Convention on the Continental Shelf. The fact that fishery resources are more mobile than minerals is no acceptable distinction. King crab, which is a living resource that qualifies under the Continental Shelf Convention, is probably more mobile than certain species of bottom fish that live on or above the shelf. Moreover, with multiple State regulatory jurisdiction in the United States, we have found that fishery resources can be reasonably conserved so long as some jurisdiction has the immediate responsibility even if that responsibility shifts according to the location of the fish in different State waters. I repeat, if no other solution to the conservation of high seas fishery resources is found, coastal nations will assume exclusive jurisdiction.

The alternative development lies with the implementation of the 1958 Geneva Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas. My personal preference, at least initially, is to work for the implementation of this Convention which for the first time under international law gives a responsibility to all nations to conserve fishery resources and gives to each coastal state a special interest and the primary responsibility for initiating coastal fishery conservation regulations on the high seas. Under the Convention, fishery resources are no longer considered simply property common to all nations, since the coastal state has the dominant and effective interest in the conservation of the resource. This dominant interest in the conservation of the resource does not give to the coastal state any exclusive right to harvest the resource, but it does give the coastal state a means to make certain that these coastal resources will not be extinguished but will survive as a renewable resource and source of food for future generations. Any dispute between the coastal state and any foreign nation fishing in the waters of the coastal state can be settled finally by arbitration.

In my opinion, the 1958 Fishery Convention can provide the international legal framework necessary to assure the conservation of world fishery resources on the high seas. Twenty of the necessary 22 nations have signed the Convention, and it is reliably reported that several other nations are seriously considering ratification in the near future. It certainly appears the Convention will become effective and in force this year. The problem then lies in getting all nations to conform to the Convention and for the terms of the Convention to be uniformly interpreted by all nations. Immediately after the 22d nation ratifies the Convention, there will remain the question of how to interpret this new law and whether the Convention restrictions and duties apply to nations that have not ratified. This question is important because several of the most important fishing nations have not taken this action, including Russia and Japan. If the Convention does not apply to these two countries, it will be of very limited value.

In my opinion the most effective means to obtain additional ratifications of the 1958 Convention and to obtain uniform application and interpretation is to call an international conference to discuss the implementation of the Convention. This will have the effect of increasing interest in the ratification of the Convention and will provide an opportunity to obtain a consensus on its implementation. The U.S. Senate has already passed a resolution calling for such an international conference and I believe this conference will make possible the full implementation of the 1958 Fishery Convention.

By 1985, I believe therefore that the coastal high seas fishery resources of the world will be under some form of conservation scheme other than by the present one in which no nation has a dominant interest and all nations must agree or the conservation program fails.

THE POLL TAX IN TEXAS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Senate the February 9 decision of a Federal three-judge court regarding the use of a poll tax in the State of Texas. The ruling of this court provides us with the first poll tax decision under the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The court unanimously struck down the use of the tax as a prerequisite to the constitutional right to vote in the State of Texas, on the ground that the imposition of such a tax "constitutes an invalid charge on the right to vote. It is in effect a penalty."

Many of us in the Senate who were deeply concerned about the right of all citizens to vote can recall that the original bill submitted to the Congress last year paid homage to this voting barrier. The original bill provided that wherever a poll tax existed it would be collected by the very Federal officials sent into certain political areas or subdivisions to remove impediments to the voting process. Many of us considered this an unacceptable treatment of what we thought to be the one remaining weapon that could be used by those who would seek to limit the voting rights of citizens. Thanks to the original efforts of some 39 Senators we were able to bring this section of the bill into question and we attempted to remove the poll tax entirely from our voting system through congressional action. While unsuccessful in our attempt, the treatment of the poll tax in the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was completely reversed. Rather than allowing the collection of a poll tax in any area, the Attorney General was directed to bring suit wherever he found the poll tax in use.

It was because of this that the Texas Federal court had a case before it—and it was because of this action in the Senate that many in the State of Texas, now deprived of the right to vote by the payment of a tax, have the hope that this voting impediment has fallen with the rest.

It is my hope that a final and favorable determination of this constitutional question will soon be forthcoming from the U.S. Supreme Court. At that time the full intent of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 will have been realized.

EXPANSION OF THE NATIONAL WATER RESEARCH EFFORT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in 1964, Congress passed the Water Resources Research Act to significantly expand the national water research effort. The problem of providing enough water for all of our needs has come to be recognized as national in scope. The water research program reaches every State.

Secretary of the Interior Udall has submitted the first annual report of the Office of Water Resources Research which was created by the 1964 act. The report covers the operations of the Office of Water Resources Research for fiscal year 1965. The document illustrates the continuing concern of the Interior Department with problems related to water resources. In cooperation with other Federal agencies, and agencies at the State and local level, the Department has led the way in the inauguration of water resources and research training programs in each of the 50 States and Puerto Rico. At present, some 400 new projects are underway across the country, and I feel certain that a giant stride has been taken toward more adequately meeting the Nation's future water needs. Research alone, of course, does not produce more water; but it helps tell us how to do that.

The rapid and widespread response to the program is most heartening. The problems and oversights that characterize any new program are now in the process of being corrected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's letter of transmittal, the report, and the summary of the report be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1966.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: This is my first annual report to the Congress of activities authorized by the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 329), as required by section 104 of the act.

The program of supporting non-Federal research and training in the field of water resources is authorized as a means of strengthening the Nation's capability in water resources conservation and management for assuring the Nation at all times of a supply of water sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the requirements of its expanding population. Even the first year's operation of the program provides abundant grounds for optimism that it will be successful in furthering the objectives of the authorization.

Promptly responsive to passage of the act, there has been widespread high-quality participation by scientists and engineers representing many of the disciplines of the natural, life, and social sciences. Academic and nonacademic scientists and engineers throughout the Nation are evidencing their readiness to help develop the knowledge and understanding that are essential for effective solution of the critical problems of these States, regions, and the Nation.

The program of research and training has broadly based support—in the Congress, among the executive agencies, by the scientific community, by State and local public officials, and citizen organizations of all kinds. This widespread involvement lends confidence in the continuing vigor of the program, its balance of the many scientific and practical components of water resources problems, and its focus on problems of urgent public concern.

During the first year, pursuant to the statutory authorization, a water resources research center in each of the 50 States and Puerto Rico formulated an approved program of research and received an initial allotment of Federal grant funds. Already these 51 research institutes have started working on several hundred new projects. In addition to strengthening research itself, the impetus of the new program has strengthened and enlarged university faculties and curriculums in water resources-related subjects. Part-time employment as research project assistants and technicians is enabling several hundred students to continue their training for professional work in the water resources field.

Progress also has been most encouraging on another one of the objectives of the Water Resources Research Act: improvement of coordination of research. An extensive network of formal and informal communication among the 51 research centers, the Office of Water Resources Research, and Federal, State, and nongovernmental research organizations, is facilitating and expediting mutual awareness of current work among all who are engaged in water resources research.

With the cooperation of other Federal agencies and in collaboration with the Science Information Exchange of the Smithsonian Institution, the Office of Water Resources Research published the first volume of the Water Resources Research Catalog, which presents information on some 2,000 current research projects dealing with water problems. Ready access to information about who is doing what has already demonstrated its value in minimizing unproductive duplication of research.

Recognition of effectiveness of scientific communication in increasing the productivity of research manpower and funds encourages the Department of the Interior to proceed now with a strengthened and expanded water resources scientific information center that will serve the 51 State research centers, the agencies of the Department of the Interior, and other Federal or non-Federal organizations as they may request. Operation of this water science information center, employing labor-saving procedures and equipment, should significantly reduce the unproductive drain on manpower and funds that is consequent to decentralized, frequently duplicative and inefficient literature search by individual investigators, and laboratories.

Attached hereto is the report and recommendations of the panel of scientists, engineers, and other persons experienced in public affairs related to water resources. It is a highly knowledgeable examination of the first year's activity in the new program. It identifies accomplishments and also points to gaps on which attention must be focused promptly. Especially noteworthy in the Panel's report is that, while warmly commending the Office of Water Resources Research for its first year progress, the Panel finds that the Office of Water Resources Research should give more attention to the breadth and balance of the total program and its relevance to the most important local, State, and regional water problems needing research. Immediate steps are being taken to meet these suggestions.

The Panel report also points out that "the water research effort and the training of water scientists are being gravely restricted by the failure of the Water Resources Research Act to enlist, on a par with the land-grant colleges and universities, the contributions and talents of other well-qualified institutions, individuals, and agencies." The Panel correctly states: "The enormous dimensions and complexity of the Nation's oncoming water supply problems, and the urgency of solving them in time, demand that we use the best-trained scientists and facilities available, wherever they are."

I am fully in accord with the Panel's emphasis on the pressing need to amend title II of the Water Resources Reseach Act at the earliest possible hour and thereby to implement fully the program that President Johnson has termed "vital."

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

JANUARY 5, 1966.

Report and Recommendations of the Panel Convened To Review Operations of the Office of Water Resources Research, U.S. Department of the Interior

The Nation's appetite for water is voracious. On all sides, the mounting demands are insistent and relentless. Municipalities, industry, recreation, agriculture, and other users are asking for more and more. Daily consumption is expected to double, approximately, within the next 15 years—if the water is available. Already it is rated in excess of 300 billion gallons a day. By 1980, it is likely to reach 600 billion gallons or more.

In order to assist in assuring the Nation at all times of a supply of water sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the requirements of its expanding population, Congress passed the Water Resources Research Act of 1964. The specific purpose of the act is to stimulate, sponsor, provide for, and supplement present programs for the conduct of research, investigations, experiments, and the training of scientists in the fields of water and of resources which affect water.

In oversimplified terms, the Nation must learn how to be more efficient in the use, reuse, management, and control of its water resources in order to meet its immediate and long-range requirements. This calls for an accelerated and sustained research effort across the entire frontier of water knowledge. It calls for the training of a corps of water scientists throughout the country to maintain the effort and intensify it as the needs of the population dictate.

In the Department of the Interior, the twin assignments of water research and the training of water scientists under the act have been centered in the Office of Water Resources Research (OWRR). Clearly, the OWRR has recognized both the urgency and the magnitude of its responsibilities from the outset. In its first year of operation, it has pressed forward with vigor and has, in fact, been the instrument through which a nationwide water research and training program has been initiated.

The accomplishments to date are impressive and merit commendation. Under the stimulus of title I of the Water Resources Research Act, and the leadership of OWRR, 51 water resources research institutes are now in being—one in each State and in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. In each the first stages of a water research program have been developed. A wide range of study has been started. A significant beginning has been made in the training program. The machinery has been established to carry forward, refine, and evaluate the total research and training effort in collaboration with the institutes. There is a widespread, important, and growing enthusiasm for the research and training effort in the associated land-grant colleges and universities.

The prompt development of water research programs by each of the 51 institutes, with participation by several hundred highly qualified scientists and engineers, is evidence of the readiness of the academic community to undertake research on water resource problems of significance to their States, their regions, and the entire country.

Three additional gains must be noted. There is evidence that operation of the Water Resources Research Act is prompting a wider recognition and understanding of the urgency of the Nation's water problems. It shows early indications of retaining able, young scientists at the smaller universities, where they are needed and can serve local and State water needs. And, a long-needed Water Resources Research Catalog has been compiled, identifying more than 2,000 current research projects. This catalog will not only contribute to orderly program development, but help avoid wasteful duplication.

The panel recognizes the time-consuming administrative details and procedures involved in launching a new program. Now that the effort is well started, it is evident that OWRR and associated water scientists across the country must, very quickly, begin to focus more attention on identification of critical gaps in water knowledge and move to foster research that will fill the gaps.

The Nation's water research and training program must be responsive, at all times, to the Nation's water needs. This will require in OWRR the exercise of an imaginative and creative leadership, not only in the identification of problems and in the development of specific research projects to deal with them, but in coordination of the total research and training effort under the act to give it purposeful balance and perspective.

In the exercise of this essential leadership function, the panel believes the OWRR must foster general and specific lines of research as well as respond to the proposals originating in the water research institutes and other places.

The panel believes the OWRR should now develop, as a matter of high priority, the additional criteria it will use in identifying the kinds of research it will and should foster. It should further develop procedures for eliciting the judgments of the institutes on the most important local, State, and regional water problems needing research. And, it should provide guidance to the institutes in selecting the most needed projects.

The panel could not and did not undertake to evaluate the quality of the research projects initiated during the past year. At this early stage we are content to rely on what appears to be an eminently thoroughgoing process in OWRR for reviewing and evaluating project proposals. The panel did note, however, an imminent need for OWRR to give more attention to the breadth and balance of the total program. In this connection, the following points merit emphasis:

1. The first round of approved projects appears to concentrate heavily on problems of hydrology and the water cycle.

2. Few projects, to date, focus on the economic, political, social, legal, and organizational problems associated with the Nation's water future—although these are obviously among the more critical ahead. There is meager research underway, for example, into the water problems associated with the sharply urbanizing trends of the Nation.

3. An increase in the tempo of river basin planning throughout the country is on the horizon, under provisions of the Water Resources Planning Act. Inevitably, this planning function will uncover a host of unanswered questions, demanding answers. The OWRR should begin to gear itself to this oncoming challenge. For the solution of basin-wide problems, as in other fields, there will be need for a multidisciplinary approach, probably on an unprecedented scale.

In the fulfillment of its mission, the OWRR should also find ways of exercising an intellectual leadership in water research. We believe there must be emphasis on the development of challenging ideas and innovations in the water field—ideas and innovations to which the water research institutes and the scientific community across the country will feel impelled to respond.

Providing such leadership in research is a sensitive and frequently difficult task, because much creativity results from researchers pursuing their own intellectual interests rather than responding to central direction. Certainly it is not in the province of OWRR to dictate what research the institutes should undertake, but it is incumbent on OWRR to foster the type of intellectual exploration and interchange which will focus attention on areas of critical importance in the water field.

With this function in mind, we recommend that the OWRR consider, among other possible actions, the following:

1. Sponsorship of a series of perspective studies. This could be accomplished by employing or contracting with individuals of outstanding competence to prepare papers, from time to time, directing attention to broad areas of subject matter, or geographical regions needing water research attention. Periodically it would be useful, for

example, to sponsor a broad study of the water resources situation, to evaluate the overall water research and training program in relation to demonstrated national needs, to identify gaps or weaknesses in the program, and to recommend specific remedial actions. Such studies would have an additional benefit as the basis for national and regional conferences on research needs, where the findings could be examined and debated.

2. Establishment of a system for continuing liaison with the many organizations and agencies having a significant interest in water resources. This would permit the OWRR to be informed, on a current basis, about the water research views and needs of people and organizations operating in a wide range of environments. As part of the liaison system, there is need to augment water research communications to serve the needs of the nationwide program. The communications system should be designed not only to report on developments and to inform water research institutes about significant problems and progress, but to stimulate multidisciplinary communication and thought about water problems at institutes and universities associated in the research and training effort.

3. Development of arrangements, by contract or otherwise, with a number of highly qualified persons charged with keeping themselves currently informed about the origins, objectives, urgency, progress, and other pertinent details of water research in a wide range of specific fields. This would provide OWRR and the Nation's water research effort with a corps of experts throughout the country, knowledgeable in their specialized fields, and competent to assess the direction and adequacy of work in these fields

Finally, it is the unanimous judgment of the panel that the water research effort and the training of water scientists are being gravely restricted by the failure of the Water Resources Research Act to enlist, on a par with the land-grant colleges and universities, the contributions and talents of other well-qualified institutions, individuals, and agencies.

The enormous dimensions and complexity of the Nation's oncoming water supply problems, and the urgency of solving them in time, demand that we use the best-trained scientists and facilities available, wherever they are. The plain and indisputable fact is that they are not always associated with the land-grant colleges and universities. Indeed, we block out large areas of unique competence from the Nation's water research service when we arbitrarily limit ourselves to the land-grant institutions.

Accordingly, the panel wishes to emphasize the very pressing need to amend title II of the Water Resources Research Act at the earliest possible hour. The present situation with respect to title II effectively deprives the Nation of the water research resources available at such academic institutions as the Universities of Michigan, Texas, Chicago, Duke, Syracuse, and Princeton; and also such nonacademic organizations as Franklin Institute, North Star Research Institute, the Research Institute of the Illinois Institute of Technology and numerous private firms and State agencies. The title should be revised to remedy this situation, to secure the additional research competence, and to provide adequate financial support for their participation in the program.

The OWRR has received scores of unsolicited applications for authorization of research projects under title II. The authorizations and collateral financing could not be granted because of the prevailing restrictions, even though the proposed research could not, in all probability, be carried forward elsewhere with comparable skill and competence, if at all.

Until title II of the act is amended, to remove the existing limitations, the OWRR and the Nation's water research program must be pushed along under a severe handicap, at half power.

MEMBERS OF SPECIAL PANEL

Dr. Irving Fox, vice president, Resources for the Future, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Mr. Milo W. Hoisveen, secretary and state engineer, North Dakota Water Conservation Commission, Bismarck, N. Dak.

Dr. Omer J. Kelley, manager, Agricultural Research Center, Stanford Research Institute, South Pasadena, Calif.

Dr. Arthur Maass, professor of government and chairman of the Department of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Mr. Joseph W. Penfold, conservation director, the Izaak Walton League of America, Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Haskell Rosenblum, director, League of Women Voters of the United States, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Harold G. Wilm, chairman, Conference on Interstate Water Problems, Council of State Governments, State of New York Conservation Department, Albany, N.Y.

Mr. Gordon K. Zimmerman, executive secretary, the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Washington, D.C.

SUMMARY

The Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 329), approved by President Johnson July 17, 1964, states: "In order to assist in assuring the Nation at all times of a supply of water sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the requirements of its expanding population, it is the purpose of the Congress, by this Act, to stimulate, sponsor, provide for, and supplement present programs for the conduct of research, investigations, experiments, and the training of scientists in the fields of water and of resources which affect water."

That purpose is now implemented by cooperative Federal and State support of water resources research in each of the 50 States and Puerto Rico. The projects supported under the act are directed primarily to strengthening the involvement of non-Federal scientists and engineers in finding improved means for dealing with critical water resources problems throughout the Nation. Title I of the act, in large part, adapts the successful experience of State agricultural experiment stations established at land-grant universities.

The program authorized by the Water Resources Research Act is widespread: It is strengthening local professional competence to deal with the water resources problems of each of the States and regions, and it is developing competence to deal with complex water problems of national concern.

Consistent with the statutory provisions, activities supported under this program do not duplicate established programs of other Federal and non-Federal agencies; the new program focuses especially on important areas that require additional research emphasis. The background and legislative history of the act emphasize multidisciplinary research projects that bring together the physical, life, and social sciences and engineering in solving public problems.

The readiness of academic institutions and their facilities to engage in the attack on water resources problems resulted in vigorous progress of the program even in its initial year. Federal agencies have been highly cooperative in assisting the universities in formulating research programs and in assisting the Department of the Interior in its administrative responsibilities. State agencies, citizen organizations, private enterprises, and nonacademic research entities also have contributed to the breadth and strength of the program. State water research centers are supported by statewide involvement of public officials and private interests who, through various types of advisory boards and coordinating committees, assist in directing the research toward important public problems of water resources conservation and management.

During the first year after enactment of the Water Resources Research Act, a center in each of the 50 States and Puerto Rico formulated an approved research program, and utilized its initial allotment of Federal funds to meet startup costs, particularly the purchase of technical equipment. The 51 research programs generated some 400 new water resources research projects under the leadership of more than 300 senior faculty research scientists and engineers. Training of new hydroscientists was strengthened by addition of more than 100 new faculty members and over 170 new water-related courses of instruction. More than 550 students received financial support through the program as part-time paid research assistants on approved projects.

Research and training associated with the program extends through the scope defined in the act: "Such research, investigations, experiments, and training may include, without being limited to, aspects of the hydrologic cycle; supply and demand for water; conservation and best use of available supplies of water; methods of increasing such supplies; and economic, legal, social, engineering, recreational, biological, geographic, ecological, and other aspects of water problems."

The Office of Water Resources Research, established by the Secretary of the Interior to administer the program, consists of a small professional and administrative staff. It collaborated with the 51 State water research centers in the prompt and effective utilization of the $3,450,000 appropriated for the initial year's support of title I activities.

Formulation of the approved research programs afforded opportunity for progress in coordinating research and avoiding duplication. This objective is furthered by development of improved channels for information about water-related research throughout the country. To this end, OWRR carries on extensive consultation with research center scientists, and further facilitates coordination and avoidance of duplication by means of catalogs of current work, specialized bibliographies, and advisory reports by special consultants.

Substantial progress has been made in the first year because of the readiness of highly-qualified academic scientists to engage in research on water problems, and because of the willingness of public and private interests to aid in strengthening the program. However, difficult tasks remain. Among the most important of these is to develop improved methods for identifying the highest priority problems; to sharpen the focus of research on these urgent problems; and, through improved knowledge and understanding of the problems, to provide the scientific and engineering basis for their effective and practicable solution. Particularly significant will be strengthening the emphasis of research in multidisciplinary approaches to the economic aspects of water conservation and management, to problems of public administration and water law, and to water resources planning.

Ground water conservation and water quality management are other problem areas in which multidisciplinary research is needed. Broadly stated, research should provide improved understanding of the complex relationships of water resources to the total environment: physical, biological, and human.

To meet the many complex problems of water conservation and management, the work of the 51 water research centers supported under the act should be complemented by involvement of the academic and nonacademic research scientists whose institutions are not affiliated with the research centers. This can be especially significant in certain specialized fields such as those associated with water resources planning, water quality management, and industrial water problems.

SENATOR LISTER HILL AT THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON HEALTH

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, participants at the White House Conference on Aging in November gave an affectionate, heartfelt ovation to one of their principal speakers, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. It was a memorable occasion. As the Senator said, the conference met on a note of triumph during a dramatic year of a dramatic decade. What he did not tell the audience—but what the audience knew—was that the Senator had created much of the dramatic achievement that culminated in the mood of triumph at the conference. The Senator who had fought so many battles for the betterment of health in this Nation could—for a few moments—take deep satisfaction at a record of almost total victory.

But, satisfying as the record is, Chairman HILL was concerned about the future. He described shortages of men and facilities; he said we have not yet learned how to use our knowledge fully or effectively; he reminded us that there are millions more who continue to be denied health services provided within recent years for millions of others. And he said:

> It is to the credit of the public and the health professions alike that one of the reasons we have never attained that goal (delivering services to everyone who needs them) is that we have constantly broadened our definition of what is adequate. Our reach continues to exceed our grasp.

Mr. President, our reach is much longer than it would have been if the Senator from Alabama had not helped us to turn in new directions, and our reach will continue to grow with him to create and guide new tools for the future.

I ask unanimous consent to have a summary of his address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary of the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LISTER HILL AT WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON HEALTH, WASHINGTON, D.C., NOVEMBER 4, 1965

It gives me particular pleasure to be here and to address this Conference on Health. That it has been called by the President of the United States, that you—its active participants—are among America's most distinguished citizens, are to me of the highest and of the most gratifying significance.

This, indeed, underscores the value which the people of this Nation place on health problems. It demonstrates how clearly we recognize that personal problems of health can also be national problems. It signals our understanding that assuring a high standard of health is a national concern—demanding the time, the energy, the knowledge, and the skill of us all as individuals and as a Nation.

The eminent British statesman Benjamin Disraeli declared almost a century ago:

"The health of the people is really the foundation upon which all their happiness and all their powers as a state depend."

We meet today on a note of triumph. For this is a dramatic year of a dramatic decade. It is fitting that this Conference should be called in the year which has seen the enactment by the Congress of the United States of a series of laws which will help open the doors to better health for all our people.

As chairman of the legislative and appropriations committees that have jurisdiction over health legislation, I am naturally gratified over this record—a record which is the latest addition to a historic series of Federal legislative actions, each addressed to a different facet of the very complex health problem we face today. Taken together, they form a solid base upon which we can, if we will, build the healthier future we envision for ourselves and our children, and for their children after them.

There are the programs of Federal support for medical research, symbolized by the National Institutes of Health, and reaching through and beyond them into every corner of the land. There are the sister programs in applied research and demonstration, also centered in the Public Health Service, but working in close cooperation with State and local health departments, schools and hospitals, clinics, and private practitioners throughout the land. There are the Hill-Burton Hospital and Medical Facilities Act, the Health Research Facilities Act, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, the Mental Health and Mental Retardation Act, the Medical Libraries Act, and the Acts in the field of Environmental Health. There is the regional medical programs legislation stemming directly from the bold and imaginative work of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke.

I have said that we meet on a note of triumph. We meet also on a note of challenge. Let no one present—be he legislator or physician, educator or scientist—consider that the strife is over, that the battle is won.

The ever-present need for more knowledge of diseases—their cause, their prevention, their cure—the shortages and maldistribution of physicians and dentists and other key health personnel—the lack of adequate research and treatment facilities—the economic and geographic obstacles to care—all these have been recognized, and, what is far more important, acted upon with programs of substantial and sustained financial support.

We have become a world leader in medical research. We are building not only more hospitals, but hospitals better designed and better equipped. We are steadily enlarging our professional school capacity, and we are even now launching a historic national effort to solve the problem of costs.

We have done much. And yet anyone who looks at our medical status today must add, however reluctantly, we have not done enough. The very vigor, the vitality which has made it possible for us to act so constructively in finding solutions, has created still further problems, and these now cry out to be solved. Our Nation continues to grow, and so, despite all our endeavors, we are still short of men and facilities. We amass knowledge at a rate undreamed of even a generation ago, yet we have not learned how to use our knowledge fully or effectively. We provide fuller access to health services for millions of people who would perforce have gone without a few years ago, yet there are millions more who continue to be denied these same services, for reasons beyond their control, but within our capability. There is the further sobering fact: that many of those who get care do not get enough, and the care they get is not always the best. We have not, indeed, solved the most basic problem of all—the hard and practical problem of delivering services to everyone who needs them.

It is to the credit of the public and the health professions alike that one of the reasons we have never attained that goal is that we have constantly broadened our definition of what is adequate. Our reach continues to exceed our grasp. We no longer are content to measure the adequacy of our supply of health services simply in terms of average needs—serving the majority who can and do seek and find health services without prodding or prompting.

For we are too much aware of those who do not know that they should seek services or where to find them. We are too much aware of those who cannot seek it—not only the poor—but the other ill and unfortunate people who cannot be served within the traditional patterns of care, for they must be helped also. The spastic child in need of dental services—where does he turn? The mentally ill, for whom there are too few services and facilities available—how are they to be helped? The sufferer from chronic illness, who requires long-term and costly rehabilitative services, both physical and psychological services which neither the health professions nor the community planners have geared themselves to provide—who will reach out to him?

These questions are all the more difficult to answer because they are being asked at a time when the Nation is so hard pressed to maintain our existing standards of health services. And yet they are being asked, and with increasing urgency, by the health professions, by public servants, by the general public alike. It goes without saying that answers will be found.

Finding answers means intensifying the Nation's effort to assure sufficient supplies of professional manpower and facilities. It means the acquiring of still further knowledge through research. But more than that, and perhaps even more difficult than that, finding answers means finding ways to put every professional skill that exists and every piece of knowledge we have attained to the fullest and most effective use and with the greatest possible speed. Manpower and facilities are not in themselves enough. Knowledge alone is not enough. But when we have succeeded in making it possible for men to use knowledge in a productive environment for the personal benefit of the patient—then we will have our answers.

Five centuries before the coming of Christ, the ancient philosopher cried out, "The essence of knowledge is, having it, to apply it."

More than 2,000 years later, from the quickening intellectual world of Elizabethan England, Francis Bacon declared, "Knowledge is not * * * a tower of state for a proud mind to raise itself upon; or a sort of commanding ground for strife and contention; or a shop for profit and sale; but a rich storehouse for the glory of God and the relief of man's estate."

The purposeful use of knowledge is the age-old goal of mankind. It is the definition of progress in medicine. It has never been easy to achieve. My own father was a physician. He devoted a lifetime to the pursuit and use of that knowledge which meant health and life to those who turned to him for care. He learned much, but he was ever aware of the pressing need to know more and still more and to use his knowledge more skillfully.

For today's doctors, the need and the difficulties are even greater. To harness the flood of knowledge pouring endlessly from our laboratories and classrooms will be a monumental undertaking, not only for the health professions, but for us all—technicians and technologists, engineers and educators, legislators and architects, planning commissions and public health agencies, and, yes, the individual himself. For in the end, each of us bears a major responsibility in the protection of our own health.

We must not lag in our pursuit of scientific knowledge. For the great thrust of research has brought us to the threshold of still greater wonders. But at the same time we must give as much emphasis to activities devoted to the discovery of the proper application of knowledge as our basic research gives to acquiring it. The beginnings we have made in understanding the peculiar needs of groups like the aging and the chronically ill must be diligently pursued. How these needs can be met—what is needed in terms of home care programs, what role can be filled by especially designed and centrally located out-patient clinics, what can only be provided in facilities for long-term care and how these should be designed, what can be done to reduce the terrible financial burden long-term care places upon hapless families, what skills and techniques can restore strength to the disabled through medical rehabilitation and how can communities marshal their resources to provide them?

Still further, we cannot stop with understanding of these problems. We must not only hammer knowledge into methods and techniques, but also we must teach our practitioners to use them. And that demands the development of postgraduate and continuing education courses realistically designed so that they can be fitted into the heavy schedule of a busy doctor without exhausting him or depriving his patients.

Undergraduate professional education itself must be constantly assessed and strengthened, so that the doctors we educate will be better doctors when they graduate and better equipped by the education to meet changing needs.

And the schools we are now in the process of building must be better built. Designed to accommodate the curriculum we now know, they must nonetheless be so adaptable that they may further, rather than hinder, the dramatic new educational concepts which our changing times will inevitably make possible and necessary.

The planning of all our health facilities must be equally knowledgeable and farsighted. The imaginative proposals for regional programs for research and treatment of heart disease, cancer, and stroke are a good example of what can be done in this regard. But even this must serve, not as a fixed pattern for future action, but as an incentive to further exploration and innovation.

Let these—exploration and innovation—be our bywords as we dedicate our efforts to a healthier people. Let no one be content with a pattern because it is traditional, with a procedure because it is hallowed by usage. We are met today, in this great White House Conference on Health, not for self-acclaim, but for self-appraisal and self-renewal.

I look to this Conference, and the American people look to this Conference, with high expectations. Out of your knowledge and experience can come the designs that will shape the better future we envision. I have no doubt but that you will fulfill these hopes, that you will be outspoken in your criticisms, unswerving in your determination to achieve the highest possible levels of health care, and uncompromising in demanding the best that all of us can give to this great and worthy cause.

In his eloquent and compassionate state of the Union message to the Congress on January 3, 1934, one of the greatest Presidents of all time—Franklin Delano Roosevelt—proclaimed that:

"Human welfare has not increased and does not increase through mere materialism and luxury, but * * * it does progress through integrity, unselfishness, responsibility, and justice."

Let these words inspire and challenge all of us here today and in the days to come.

THE WELFARE OF NEEDY CHILDREN OF THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, for some years now, I have been concerned with the welfare of the needy children of our Capital City. I am, of course, concerned with the welfare of needy children in any city.

But it has always seemed wrong to me that the Congress has granted certain opportunities to the families of children elsewhere while denying them to children in Washington—a city which should serve as a model to the Nation and the world for humane government.

This issue has come to revolve around the question of whether the children of the District's needy unemployed parents should be entitled to public assistance—as they are entitled to assistance when they are deprived of support through death, or severe disability, or desertion. The program insuring such support is the unemployed parent segment of Aid to Families with Dependent Children—AFDC–UP. Such programs are optional with the States, and States must put up money to match Federal funds. The Congress, wearing its national legislative hat, has approved AFDC–UP for States across the country, but wearing its local legislative hat, has denied it to the needy children of the District.

President Johnson, in the budget he has proposed for the District of Columbia, has showed his continued concern for the needs of the Capital's children. He has proposed that the current program—adopted last year instead of AFDC–UP—be expanded and improved. Time and money ceilings would be taken off the TAFUP program giving help to families awaiting training in the poverty program's title V Work and Training Opportunity Center—WTOC. The hope here is that the program would then qualify for Federal matching funds under national legislative provisions.

I feel that the President's proposals constitute a step in the right direction. They show considerable promise. What I am concerned with is the welfare of our children, not technical quibbling as to how this welfare can be secured. Our children's suppers must not become political footballs.

I am pleased to tell you today that I am assured by officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that if the proposed budget program meets the asserted requirements—through removal of time and money ceilings—it would qualify for Federal matching funds. I will support it, at least for this coming fiscal year, while the Capital's improved public welfare program gets off to a belated start.

At my request, I have been receiving monthly reports from the District Department of Public Welfare on the public assistance picture here. The latest, giving figures on the winter month of December, is now on my desk. These reports have been most helpful to me, and I greatly appreciate the efforts local officials have made to keep me, my colleagues, and the public in touch with the situation as it progresses.

I feel I must point out some factors in the current Capital public welfare picture—factors highlighted in these reports—which are of interest to citizens here, and throughout the Nation. For the needs of the District's children have gained national attention through Senate debate epitomizing different points of view toward the whole program of public welfare. These needs will be reexamined carefully in the next Congress. At that time, the monumental Public Welfare Amendments of 1962—which I first presented to the Congress as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—are scheduled for reconsideration. Under the law, these amendments—including AFDC–UP—will expire on June 30, 1967. As a member of the Senate Finance Committee which has jurisdiction over this legislation, I intend to examine the program carefully in relation to the needs of the Nation and its poor and to the District of Columbia especially. AFDC–UP, for instance, has been adopted by 19 of our States—including many large urbanized ones. Two others will begin in the near future. But there are still 29 States and four jurisdictions that have not adopted it. Where do unemployed families in these States turn for help?

One of the chief principles behind the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 was prevention—the seemingly apparent fact that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Knowing it would cost less in public funds and human suffering in the long run, we strove to keep families together. The AFDC–UP program sought to enable a father to get public assistance while he was out of a job. Then he would not have to desert them so they could qualify for public support. Here in the Capital City, the Public Welfare Director's latest response to my queries shows that we are reaching our most needy families too late:

Three hundred forty-three household heads are in training in WTOC—the Work Training and Opportunity Center, funded temporarily under title V of the poverty program. Sixty-seven of these heads of households are men. The women are now heads of households; the men have left. The women are carrying the family burden. For the most part, then, we are picking up the pieces in broken families. We are giving some mothers work training, so they can achieve gainful employment. And we are hoping that their children are adequately cared for while she works, under approved child care plans.

To recapitulate, only one out of every five of the household heads in training is a man. Under the circumstances, we must aim to make the women self-supporting, and do it in the best way we can without damage to the children. If this means more attention to day care and other child care programs—such as the Head Start and Summer Adventures for Youth programs of last summer—then we must provide it. We must provide it not only when the mother is in training—but when she is on the job. For she is absent from the home in any case and she is the supporting parent. And we must face the fact that this may, at least in part, be due to restrictive welfare practices which made leaving his family the only door open to the father of her children.

Now, in asking for the AFDC–UP program last year, District public welfare officials gave us a figure of 1,105 families for an estimated 12-month caseload and 490 families for a 6-month case load. In other words, based on local resources, on unemployment figures, and on the experiences of similar cities, we have assumed that children of about 490 household heads would benefit from AFDC–UP over a 6-month period and that this figure would build up to over 1,100 in 12 months. Welfare Director Brewer's last report to me shows that as of the last day of 1965, 485 household heads were either in training or receiving help while they waited for training—on TAFUP. If the program builds up as it should, and the caseload figure reaches the 1,100 mark, then the program will be moving toward our goals of achieving skills and independence for those denied them before.

But I am still concerned with the fate of those children whose parents applied for training but did not make the grade in the selection process. There were 107 household heads, for instance, disapproved in December. There is still much unmet need in the District of Columbia. Statistics should not be used to mask human suffering. The very success of the crisis assistance and temporary shelter programs here—long overdue and now much used—shows that many children in our Capital are in terrible need. Since these programs started, according to Mr. Brewer's reports to me, 353 families with 1,197 children have been helping during rockbottom crises. And the family emergency service program has provided special child welfare services to 119 families with 478 children. The cold month of December—the last covered by the reports—accounts for the bulk of this caseload. The statistics for January, which saw the blizzard of 1966, will give us more concrete evidence, I think. The heavy snow was a nasty inconvenience for most of us. For the poor, deprived of their marginal construction jobs, or their day's work, flocked to the city's welfare agencies. When my staff, and some of yours too, I assume, got an SOS to bring cans of food for an emergency collection at Friendship House nearby, I asked myself: Is this the Capital of the world's richest Nation? Can we turn our backs on children starving beneath our legislative noses while statistics are interpreted and programs discussed?

Look, for instance, at the persistent drag in handling applications for the basic aid to families with dependent children program—applications for families: 282 new applications were received in the month of December; 609 additional applications were in process at the beginning of the month—a total of 891 applications. But only 283 of the 891 applications were processed and handled during December. In most States, such applications are handled between twice and three times as fast. A child can slowly starve in this long waiting period.

Look, too, at the fact that in the Capital no active cases can be referred from the regular AFDC program to the Work Training Opportunity Center. Nationally, about 63 to 65 percent of the trainees in the title V work training programs come directly from the AFDC programs—they come right off the relief rolls and into training. This means that if they are women—and most AFDC family heads are—they have been considered employable and have worked out satisfactory child care plans. What most people do not realize is that here in the Capital, the work training programs have absolutely no effect on reducing the current relief rolls of our AFDC programs. As Mr. Brewer puts it in his report to me:

> Families receiving AFDC assistance are not employable and are automatically ineligible for the WTOC program. Therefore, no active AFDC cases are referred to the WTOC program.

I have pointed out that one of the chief principles underlying the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 was prevention—to prevent a family from going on relief in the first place. Another was rehabilitation—to give a family opportunity to get off relief—to achieve independence, to make a fresh start. I will never forget the remark of the 23-year-old mother who did get off relief through a rehabilitation project:

> Believe me working is much better—

She said.

> You are independent. As long as I can get a job I will not go back on public assistance. If I got laid off in a slack time at the laundry, I would look for something in another field until things picked up again.

But you cannot take people off relief rolls for rehabilitation when they have already been screened off because they are not eligible for one technical reason or another. When local restrictions so hamper a relief program—even a program with good intentions—it cannot achieve its humane and constructive purposes of prevention and rehabilitation. Where potential employability of an unemployed parent, for instance, rules out the family for financial help to children, there is obviously no current relief roll reduction to be gained from work training opportunities.

Most communities respond to hunger and need and no job by providing assistance in such cases. But our Capital's needy children have slim chance for food, if they happen to be born to a mother who could work at something if that something were available.

Let me reaffirm my position. I am willing to experiment with different methods to bring help to the Capital's needy children—as to all needy children. I consider the program proposed in the President's budget promising and will support it. In the next Congress, we will be taking a good hard look at the public welfare picture and the needs of the poor in the entire Nation. What we must try to do is develop public assistance programs that will meet people's immediate needs and then develop opportunities for them which will channel them toward independence.

Meanwhile, in our Capital, we should continually test proven methods and try new approaches. Here are some of the programs—used elsewhere with success—which I would like to see emphasized in the District during this experimental period:

First. Why not launch an aggressive attempt to locate families with an unemployed father while he remains with his family—and to locate the marginal unemployed father with a big family. These are high-risk groups. With counseling, guidance, employment help, and crisis financial help, we could really prevent dependency. This will not be easy because the unemployed man with a family has shied away from community assistance—after all, he knew it was not there for him. But the District has a huge staff of welfare investigators—many more than New York City or Los Angeles, I believe—and this is a job they could do.

Second. As long as we are dealing primarily with families headed by women, let us make an all-out effort to prepare these women for jobs which are sorely needed and hold some sort of promise for the future. The Work Training and Occupation Center should place heavy emphasis on the current—and future—demand in the health services. In other cities, food handlers, orderlies, nurses' aids, practical nurses, and even a few registered nurses are being trained from public assistance caseloads. Such trainees can be found among applicants who are rejected for our District programs because they have potential employability. We are on a treadmill when we train marginal people for marginal jobs which have no future.

Third. How about some kind of community organization—perhaps connected with the work training center—which can systematically handle inquiries and placements for odd jobs and fix-it types of work. Many men wandered about suburban streets looking for a few dollars worth of snow shoveling jobs during the blizzard. It seems to me that this beleaguered city could have used a central service where they could have applied for jobs. Such a service would benefit the community and the temporarily unemployed—among whom we would probably find many unemployed and deserting household heads. And it would be a center of contact—aggressively to interest and enroll marginal workers into training classes which would eventually lead to more stable and promising employment.

Fourth. Our gracious First Lady has pioneered with her beautification plan for the Capital City. Let us get behind her—help make the Capital more beautiful—and help men achieve independence at the same time. The projects she and her Society for a More Beautiful National Capital have outlined for Washington will need maintenance as well as building. I understand Neighborhood Youth Corps boys helped in such prevocational work last summer.

But such prevocational experience should not be limited to young adults of high school age. Our priority problem is to get male household heads into a training stream which will upgrade their potential work skills. Why not offer paid employment tied into the beautification plans? This is not busy work or made work. It is real work, with a constructive and useful purpose. I am certain that most men would prefer it to relief—it would get them started along work training and employment avenues which can be tested out in an imaginative program in gardening, lawn care, construction work, landscaping work, or carpentry, electrical work, masonry, and roofing. Such a program would combine doing productive work for pay with counseling and direction toward job skill training.

Fifth. Disability—especially when it is suffered by a man who heads a household—often causes family breakdown. Chronic diseases usually associated with old age begin to hit the marginal worker in his forties. Studies show that by the time the man becomes disabled enough for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, he has suffered his chief impairment for about 13.3 years. Under the Federal law there is considerable leeway for the regular AFDC program to pick up these incapacitated parents at a stage where physical rehabilitation and retraining is possible. Let us be sure the Capital is helping this group of fathers in the early stages of disability—when they would be considered employable for off-and-on, part-time work.

In our Nation as a whole we now have about 35 million poor. A quarter of these—the poorest of the poor—are on relief. Now we have about 8.1 million people on public assistance—7.5 million in federally aided programs. But we must remember that our population is increasing—we have more children and people are living longer.

The great bulk of these people on relief are very old, or very young, or blind, or seriously disabled. Almost no one questions the terrible authenticity of their plight.

But the program giving help to children of needy families—aid to families of dependent children—captures the public attention. This program gives badly needed help to children during crises times. The turnover is high—where humanely administered, the program and services help people off relief and into independence.

We will consider this broad problem thoroughly in the next Congress. Meanwhile, let us continue to work together as best we can to achieve a humane and constructive welfare program in the richest nation of the world, and in its Capital.

COMPULSORY UNIONISM: A DENIAL OF FREEDOM

Mr. **ERVIN.** Mr. President, section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act empowers the States to ban compulsory unionism. Nineteen of them have done so by right-to-work laws which vest in every man the freedom to stand erect on his own two feet and decide for himself with his own God-given faculties whether he will join or refrain from joining a labor union.

Acting upon the demand of certain union labor leaders, the administration is urging Congress to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, and thus nullify these State right-to-work laws. The administration justifies its request for repeal by the single unconvincing argument that such action would make the laws of all 50 States uniform. I respectfully submit that if it shares the administration's view that uniformity of law is desirable in this field, Congress can best secure such uniformity and at the same time manifest its character as the legislature of a free country by enacting a national right-to-work law, which will restore to Americans in the other 31 States the right to carry their own sovereignty under their own hats.

The demand for the repeal of section 14(b) brings to mind the ancient saying in Ecclesiastes: There is no new thing under the sun.

The doctrine prevailed in France at the time French kings possessed virtually absolute power over the lives of their subjects that "the right of working is a royal right which the Prince can sell and the subjects must buy." The demand for repeal of section 14(b) is a call for compulsory unionism, and compulsory unionism is based upon this adaptation of the doctrine prevalent in France in despotic days: The right to work is a labor union right, which the labor union can sell and the individual worker must buy if he is to be allowed to earn a livelihood for himself and his loved ones with his own hands and talents.

During a previous generation, labor unions rightly condemned so-called yellow dog contracts whereby employees were required to agree either to join a union selected by their employer or to abstain from joining any union whatever. To free employees from such coercion and secure for them the freedom of choice now embodied in the right-to-work laws of the 19 States, these yellow dog contracts were wisely outlawed by Federal and State statutes.

The demand of certain union labor leaders for the repeal of section 14(b) is really a demand that another kind of yellow dog contract, that is, the union shop agreement, be given legal sanction throughout the United States.

The union shop agreement is an anomaly in law. Such an agreement is made by an employer operating a shop or industry and a particular union without the participation of the employees whose compensation or terms of employment are concluded by it. By the term "a particular union," I mean the union which is recognized in any way by the National Labor Relations Board as the bargaining agent for such employees.

Under a union shop agreement, every employee, old or new, is forced to become and remain a member, pay dues, and submit to the discipline of the particular union, or else lose his job. It is wholly immaterial whether the particular union is good or bad, or whether the individual employee has sound reasons for not wishing to be affiliated with it.

It is appropriate to note in passing that since the Supreme Court has adjudged the act of Congress barring Communists from union offices to be an unconstitutional bill of attainder, a union shop agreement may compel loyal Americans to become involuntary members of a Communist-controlled union, which is disloyal to them and their country.

An unbiased analysis readily demonstrates that the union shop agreement is repugnant to the freedom of those who labor.

The union shop agreement is a coercive instrument designed to draft into unions as dues-paying members employees who will not voluntarily join them. It operates by economic intimidation. Few men are so situated that they can afford to lose their jobs. This is particularly true of those who have acquired wives and children and thus given hostages to fortune.

Union shop agreements are often detrimental to employees because of the way in which they are negotiated. The employer wishes to obtain an employment contract favorable to him rather than his employees, and the labor union wishes to secure a compulsory unionism agreement which will enable it to avoid the task rightly resting upon it as a voluntary association, that is, the task of procuring its members by voluntary persuasion. They succumb to the temptations stimulated by these wishes and enter into a sweetheart contract in which the union grants to the employer terms of employment advantageous to him and detrimental to the employees in exchange for a compulsory unionism agreement whereby the employer forces all his employees to join the union contrary to the desires of many of them.

By outlawing union shop agreements, right-to-work laws remove the motive of the union to subordinate the interests of the employees to its wish, and thus leave it free to conduct negotiations for the sole purpose of obtaining an employment contract advantageous to the employees.

Note has been taken of the fact that compulsory unionism robs workers of freedom of choice and compels them to join particular unions regardless of whether such unions be good or bad unions.

Those who demand compulsory unionism apparently assume that all unions are good unions. To be sure, most unions merit this description. Unfortunately, however, any assumption that all unions are good is certainly ill-founded.

I had the rather melancholy experience of serving on the Senate select committee headed by an able and courageous Senator, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, which spent more than 2 years investigating activities in the labor-management field. The committee investigated some 20 unions which had acquired the power in one way or another to represent several million supposedly free Americans. The facts showing how this power had been exercised by these unions proved conclusively the truth of Lord Acton's aphorism: Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Despite thousands of fifth amendment pleas by scores of officers and agents of the unions investigated, the McClellan committee took 20,432 pages of testimony, which made it manifest that the unions investigated were unworthy to receive either the voluntary or the coerced support of freemen.

I can summarize with accuracy what the investigation revealed by quoting a statement made by me at the conclusion of the McClellan committee's work. I quote:

> The testimony taken by the committee has shocked the conscience of the Nation.
>
> This is true because the testimony has made it crystal clear that some or all of the following things have occurred upon frequent occasions in some of the unions investigated:
>
> First. Union moneys in enormous amounts have been converted to their own use, or that of their cronies, by union officers whose duty it was to safeguard them.
>
> Second. Union officers committing such raids upon union treasuries have destroyed union records to conceal their financial misdeeds from union members, income tax authorities, law enforcement officers, and investigating committees.
>
> Third. Union members have been deprived of any real voice in the election of union officers or the management of union affairs by dictatorial activities of union officers, undemocratic regulations, wanton abuse of the trustee process, and even, on occasion, sheer terrorism.
>
> Fourth. Persons convicted and sentenced to prison for armed robbery, burglary, extortion, and other infamous crimes have been placed in positions of authority over honest and law-abiding union members shortly after their release from prison and before they had brought "forth fruits meet for repentance."
>
> Fifth. Union charters have been granted to known racketeers and their associates who have used them as devices to prey upon the public and helpless workers compelled to earn their bread in the sweat of their brows.
>
> Sixth. Union officers and agents of employers have entered into conspiracies resulting in sweetheart contracts or other arrangements which constitute betrayal of the union members such officers were supposed to represent.

On an occasion 2 years earlier, Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, made some illuminating comments upon the facts revealed by evidence presented to the McClellan committee during the first months of its investigation. Mr. Meany's comments corroborate in substantial part the accuracy of my statement. I quote his comments as set out in an article headlined "Meany Is Shocked by Rackets' Scope," which appeared in the New York Times for November 2, 1957:

> When the AFL and the CIO merged nearly 2 years ago, he said, the concern of labor leaders about corruption was written into the constitution. "We thought we knew a few things about trade union corruption," he said, "but we didn't know the half of it, one-tenth of it, or the one-hundredth part of it. We did not know, for instance, that we had unions where a criminal record was almost a prerequisite to holding office under the national union. We didn't know that we had top trade union leaders who made it a practice to secretly borrow the funds of their union. We didn't know that there were top trade union leaders who used the funds for phony real estate deals in which the victims of the fraud were their own members. And we didn't know that there were trade union leaders who charged to the union treasury such items as speed boats, perfume, silk stockings, brassieres, color TV, refrigerators, and everything else under the sun." Mr. Meany asserted that "some of these things are still going on." "Of course," he remarked, "you can't get much cooperation from a national union the officers of which are practicing the same sort of larceny on a national scale as is being practiced by their so-called local representatives on a local scale."

This ends the quotation from the article in the New York Times, whose writer stated that Mr. Meany was commenting on the conduct of leaders of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Some of those who demand compulsory unionism assert, however, that the McClellan committee ended its work in March 1960, and that in consequence the American people ought to presume that the evils revealed by its investigation no longer exist anywhere in the labor movement.

It is not likely that the American people will be so naive as to indulge such a presumption as long as irresponsible labor unions call jurisdictional strikes at Cape Kennedy in contempt of the national security, or James R. Hoffa remains the president of the country's most numerous and powerful union, or the officials of a supposedly respectable union miscount 25,509 of the 133,000 ballots cast in an election for a national president in order to thwart the will of the members and make it appear that the incumbent was reelected by a majority of 2,193, when he was actually defeated by a majority of 23,316.

The vast preponderance of corruption, denial of member rights, and maladministration discovered by the McClellan committee in unions was in unions which depended upon the coercive provisions of union shop agreements to obtain and retain their members. It is not surprising that this was so.

The tragic truth is that union shop agreements are calculated to make union members unable to secure their rights against dictatorial union leaders or to prevent corruption or maladministration by corrupt leaders.

This is so because union shop agreements permit dictatorial control of workers by union leaders. The workers are compelled to become and remain dues-paying union members under penalty of losing their means of livelihood.

As Wallace Turner, who acquired expert knowledge of the subject while working as a reporter for the Portland Oregonian, testified before the McClellan committee, members of unions are reluctant "to get out of line" for fear "that their union cards will be taken up and they will be out of employment."

Sylvester Petro, professor of labor law in the New York University School of Law, and author of the wise commentary on the McClellan investigation entitled "Power Unlimited—The Corruption of Union Leadership," declares that "the 40-odd volumes of the McClellan Record may accurately be summed up as an overwhelming documentation of Mr. Turner's Point." He adds, in substance, that "union officers would not be so highly tempted to abuse members and thugs and racketeers would not find unions so attractive" if members "were free at any time simply to quit paying dues"—page 139.

I share in full measure Professor Petro's views. No amount of sophistry can erase the truth that those who work for their daily bread must have the right to belong or refrain from belonging to a union if they are to be really free.

The recognition of this fundamental freedom does not impair any privilege rightly belonging to labor unions. Each union is left free to number among its dues-paying members all those it can induce by voluntary persuasion to join it. Surely, it is no injustice to require labor unions to obtain their members in the same way in which churches and all other voluntary associations secure theirs.

When all is said, yellow-dog contracts are simply not acceptable in a free country, regardless of whether they are imposed upon workers at the employer's behest or the union's demand. In either case, they rob the workers of a basic freedom—the right to make their own choice in a matter of crucial import to them.

The proposal to repeal section 14(b) raises once again an ever recurring and age-old issue—the issue of tyranny versus freedom.

I make a promise to you and all other Americans who loath tyranny and love liberty. I shall urge Senators to read and ponder a great poem—Rudyard Kipling's "The Old Issue"—before the Senate votes upon the question of repeal.

In "The Old Issue," Kipling tells in eloquent and truthful words how freedom was bought for us by our fathers at great cost long ago, and how it will be lost by us unless we resist the unceasing attempts of government, which he calls the King, to take it from us bit by bit. I quote a few lines from this great poem:

> All we have of freedom, all we use or know,
> This our fathers bought for us long and long ago.
> Ancient Right unnoticed as the breath we draw,
> Leave to live by no man's leave, underneath the Law.
> Lance and torch and tumult, steel and grey-goose wing,
> Wrenched it, inch and ell and all, slowly from the King.
> So they bought us freedom, not at little cost,
> Wherefore must we watch the King, lest our gain be lost.

I close with this observation: Right-to-work laws enforce, and union shop agreements nullify, the ancient right which Kipling calls "leave to live by no man's leave." One does not have leave to live by no man's leave if he is compelled to pay a labor union for leave to earn his livelihood.

SURPLUS NO LONGER THE KEY

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I am pleased to note that in the new food-for-freedom legislation, the administration proposed to depart from the surplus concept in food aid.

In my judgment, the time has passed when we can afford to operate this fine program on the basis of a surplus disposal. It is true that we had heavy agricultural surpluses on hand when the original food-for-peace legislation was passed nearly 12 years ago, but they are now greatly reduced. World conditions have changed. What is needed now is not a surplus disposal program for the United States, but a positive food program for our friends around the world that makes sense in terms of meeting human needs and stimulating economic development. The President's food-for-freedom program meets that requirement.

The surplus disposal concept has made the program difficult to administer. In some instances it has led to unbalanced food programs, with heavy emphasis on grain and too little emphasis on other useful products. It has brought accusations from others that we dump our surpluses. It has not sufficiently prompted recipient countries to build their own economies.

The time is ripe for this basic change. President Johnson and all who participated in formulating these new proposals are to be commended. I am confident that the Congress will endorse this change of emphasis.

NEW AIRCRAFT FOR U.S. AIRLINES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in this Monday's New York Times, there was an article describing the new aircraft that the U.S. airlines plan to put in service in 1966. The article is based upon an Air Transport Association report which indicates that these aircraft are valued at $1.4 billion.

The deliveries in 1966, of course, are just a part of an overall airline reequipment program that totals $3.8 billion. The program began in 1965 and will continue through 1969. As of the end of 1965, the airlines had 574 new aircraft on order for deliveries between now and 1969.

Airline orders of this magnitude have enormous significance for the aircraft manufacturing industry, as well as the entire economy of the Nation. I know that the economy of the State of Washington will benefit enormously from the 350 Boeing jet transports that will be delivered to the airlines in the next several years.

Airline orders mean jobs and I was very pleased to note a recent statement from the Boeing Co. which pointed out that the orders for commercial jets have created 15,000 new jobs for that one manufacturing company alone.

The airlines are to be commended for their vase reequipment program. It has a great meaning for the economy of the Nation as well as the millions of passengers and shippers who will be taking advantage of this new shipment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to reprint the full text of the Air Transport Association of America's statement which describes the new equipment on order; also several news articles on the same subject.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. AIRLINES TO ADD 282 NEW JET AIRCRAFT DURING 1966

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The U.S. scheduled airlines expect to place 282 new turbine-powered aircraft in service during 1966, the Air Transport Association of America said today. The new aircraft are valued at $1.4 billion.

The 282 airplanes to be delivered in 1966 are the largest number ever added to the airline fleets in any one year. The $1.4 billion cost of the aircraft also represents a new high.

"The additional capacity will be needed to provide for and properly anticipate the Nation's growing demand for air transportation," Stuart G. Tipton, president of ATA said. "For the domestic trunks, this means an estimated 14 to 17 percent increase in available seat miles in 1966, depending on the rate of retirement of older equipment and assuming no material changes in seating configurations.

"It's interesting to note that during 1965, the airlines disposed of well over 100 obsolete piston aircraft. Some 80 percent of all airline revenue passenger miles are now accounted for by pure jet aircraft and that figure will continue to increase during 1966 as airlines dispose of still more piston aircraft and replace them with new jets," Tipton said.

This year's deliveries are part of a 5-year program—1965–69—designed to reequip the Nation's airlines with new pure jet and turboprop aircraft. The total airline commitment for the purchase of the aircraft in this period is now $3.8 billion. One hundred sixty-one airplanes valued at an estimated $880 million were delivered in 1965.

An ATA survey of airline equipment in service and on order as of December 31, 1965, showed that the airlines now have a total of 574 new jets and turboprops on order for delivery in 1966 through 1969. The cost of the new aircraft will be $2.9 billion.

Tipton noted that 396 of the new jets on order are designed for short and medium hauls. "Service to the many smaller cities in the United States is in the process of being improved with the new jets and the response from passengers so far indicates that they are providing a significant stimulus to air travel," he said.

As of yearend 1965, the survey showed, the airline fleet totaled 1,925 aircraft of all types. The fleet was broken down into 704 pure jets, 299 turboprops, 898 piston aircraft, 14 turbine-powered helicopters and 10 piston helicopters.

(Attached is the ATA survey of flight equipment in service and on order as of December 31, 1965, and a delivery schedule for the new aircraft.)

Aircraft in service and on order by U.S. scheduled airline industry (Dec. 31, 1965)

Type and manufacturer	Model	In service	On order
Fixed wing:			
Jet:			
Boeing	B-707	187	103
	B-720	115	8
	B-727	163	[1] 173
	B-737		60
British Aircraft Corp.	BAC-111	21	32
Convair	CV-880	47	
	CV-990	18	
Douglas	DC-8	129	31
	DC-9	4	131
Sud Aviation	Caravelle	20	
Total		704	538
Turboprop:			
Canadair	CL-44	23	
Convair	600	8	([2])
	580	20	([3])
Fairchild	F-27	62	3
Hiller	FH-227		24
Lockheed	Electra	117	
	L-382B		2
Nord Aviation	262	6	6
Pilatus	P-6A	4	
Vickers	Viscount 700	48	
	Viscount 800	11	
Total		299	35
Piston:			
Convair	240	53	
	340	50	
	440	95	
Douglas	DC-3	141	
	DC-4	2	
	DC-6	185	
	DC-7	84	
Lockheed	Constellation	35	
	Super Constellation.	68	
Martin	202	8	
	404	76	
Others		101	
Total		898	
Total fixed wing		1,901	573
Helicopters:			
Turbine:			
Boeing Vertol	107	10	
Sikorsky	S-61	4	1
Total		14	1
Piston:			
Bell	47-G	3	
Sikorsky	S-51	1	
	S-55	2	
	S-58C	4	
Total		10	
Total helicopter		24	1
Total scheduled industry		1,925	574

---

[1] Includes 51 leased aircraft.

[2] 44 conversions of piston aircraft to turboprop.

[3] 22 conversions of piston aircraft to turboprop.

Delivery schedule—New aircraft on order by U.S. scheduled airline industry (Dec. 31, 1965)

Manufacturer	Model	Total aircraft on order	Aircraft on order for expected delivery in— 1966	1967	1968	1969
Boeing	B-707	103	49	47	4	3
	B-720	8	8			
	B-727	173	88	60	16	9
	B-737	60		3	49	8
British Aircraft Corp	BAC-111	32	32			
Douglas	DC-8	31	14	12	5	
	DC-9	131	55	71	5	
Fairchild-Hiller	F-27	3	3			
	FH-227	24	24			
Lockheed	L-382B	2	2			
Nord Aviation	262	6	6			
Sikorsky	S-61	1	1			
Total, all aircraft		574	282	193	79	20

[From the New York Times, Jan. 31, 1966]

TRANSPORT NEWS AND NOTES: 282 TURBINE-POWERED PLANES TO BE ADDED—PACIFIC CARGO RATE CUT SCHEDULED

Scheduled airlines in this country expect to place 282 new turbine-powered aircraft in service this year, the Air Transport Association of America reported yesterday. The new planes are valued at $1.4 billion.

A survey of airline equipment showed that 96 of the new jets on order are designed for short and medium hauls.

Stuart G. Tipton, president of the association, said: "Service to many small cities in the United States is in the process so far indicates that they are of being improved with jets, and the response from passengers so far indicates that they are providing a significant stimulus to air travel."

The survey showed the airline fleet totaled 1,925 aircraft of all types at the end of 1965. There were 704 pure jets, 299 turboprops, 898 piston aircraft, 14 turbine-powered helicopters, and 10 piston helicopters.

PACIFIC RATE REDUCTION

Lower trans-Pacific cargo rates on a wide variety of commodities have been agreed on by member airlines of the International Air Transport Association for introduction on March 1.

The lower rates are subject to the approval of the interested governments and follow reductions in cargo rates on the North Atlantic that were put into effect in September and on January 1.

Like the transatlantic rates, the new Pacific tariffs are intended mainly to encourage quantity shipments and eliminate directional load imbalances.

Under the new rates, for example, electronic data-processing equipment in shipments of more than 11,000 pounds would be shipped between San Francisco and Tokyo at 65 cents a pound. This is for westbound shipment only, and compares with the general rate of $1 a pound.

Radios, television, household electrical appliances, optical goods and photographic projection equipment from Tokyo to San Francisco would be shipped at 68 cents a pound, compared with the current cost of 75 cents a pound for minimum shipments of 440 pounds. On shipments of a minimum of 1,100 pounds the proposed rate would be 62 cents a pound.

Similar rate cuts would apply in other traffic sectors.

ZIM REPLACING VESSELS

Zim Lines has assigned two 18-knot freighters to its cargo service between New York and Mediterranean ports, according to A. Manor, executive vice president of American-Israeli Shipping Co., Inc., representing the line.

The motorships *Yafo* and *Hadar*, built in 1964 and 1965, respectively, will replace the combination passenger-cargo liners *Israel* and *Zion*, which are being withdrawn from transatlantic service. The *Yafo* is scheduled to sail from Haifa on February 11 and from New York on March 4. The *Israel* will make her last sailing from New York March 25.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 31, 1966]

MORE JETS FOR AIRLINES

The Nation's airlines are expected to put a record 282 pure jets and turboprops in service this year, according to the Air Transport Association of America. The cost will also be a record $1.4 billion. The expanded fleet will increase the industry's available seat miles by 14 to 17 percent depending on the rate of retirement of old equipment, the ATA said. Last year the airlines retired more than 100 piston aircraft. About 80 percent of all airline revenue passenger miles are now realized from pure jets. The airlines have a total of 574 new jets and turboprops on order for delivery in 1966 through 1969 at a cost of $2.9 billion.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, Feb. 1, 1966]

PLANES

The U.S. scheduled airlines expect to place 282 new turbine-powered aircraft in service during 1966, the Air Transport Association of America said. The new aircraft are valued at $1.4 billion.

The 282 airplanes to be delivered in 1966 is the largest number ever added to the airline fleets in any 1 year. The $1.4 billion cost of the aircraft also represents a new high.

The additional capacity will be needed to provide for and properly anticipate the Nation's growing demand for air transportation, Stuart G. Tipton, president of ATA said. "For the domestic trunks this means an estimated 14- to 17-percent increase in available seat miles in 1966, depending on the rate of retirement of older equipment and assuming no material changes in seating configurations," he said.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE JOPLIN (MO.) ROTARY CLUB

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, 50 years ago this week a small group of men held the first meeting of the Joplin, Mo., Rotary Club. I am pleased to report to the Senate that after five decades of outstanding community service, the Joplin Rotary Club is today stronger and more active than ever.

This week in Joplin is Rotary Week and tonight around 600 people—including community leaders from Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas—will be on hand for the historic golden anniversary banquet.

As a past director of Rotary International, and I know I speak for the many Senators who are also members of Rotary, I am deeply proud to congratulate the Rotarians of Joplin for a half century of contributing to the dynamic growth of southwest Missouri.

Rotary in Joplin has spelled progress in every area of civic, economic, and social development. The history of the Joplin Rotary Club is a fine record of dedication and community service.

In 1917 the newly-organized Joplin Rotarians raised enough money to finance a new YMCA building. During World War I and World War II members of the club were hard at work in a variety of homefront tasks so vital to the success of the war effort.

The club has done a great job with crippled and underprivileged children. Through the club's work these youngsters have been provided the spark of hope that every American boy and girl deserves.

Mr. President, one of Missouri's leading newspapers, the Joplin Globe, carried a moving account of the first 50 years of the Joplin Rotary Club. I ask unanimous consent that this fine article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTY-YEAR HISTORY: JOPLIN ROTARY CLUB EXPANDS GOALS AND WORK WITH GROWTH

The Joplin Rotary Club, celebrating its 50th anniversary this week, had its origin in 1915, 10 years after the first Rotary Club had been organized in Chicago.

A basis for the Joplin organization was provided by a group of local business and professional men meeting as the Noonday Luncheon Club. On October 15, 1915, 10 Joplin men met with a Kansas City Rotarian, Frank Kelly, to begin steps toward forming a local Rotary organization.

The group was comprised of a newspaper manager, candy manufacturer, milling company manager, music store owner, operators of an engineering firm, a baking company, a wholesale grocery company, a cigar manufacturing company and an adding machine company and an auditor.

The club was chartered in 1916 and held its first meeting as a Rotary Club February 12, with 12 members attending. Since it was necessary for the group's bylaws to be revised before approval, the club became a unit of Rotary International September 4, 1916.

Since then, the club has grown until its current membership includes 157 persons, comprised of business, professional and civic leaders of the community.

Twenty wives of Rotary members united in 1919 to form Women of Rotary, an organization which has thrived and taken on numerous goals of its own.

The Joplin club is now one of 12,238 Rotary units with 583,750 members in 131 countries and geographical regions. Records of Rotary International indicate that 132 new clubs have been formed since July 1965.

The Joplin club is a unit of district 611, which consists of 69 clubs in Arkansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Kansas. Joplin was host to its first district conference in 1920, when some 2,000 Rotarians convened in the then newly constructed Interstate Grocers Alliance Building, with President William Landreth presiding. Since then, Joplin has been the site of district conventions in 1932, 1938, 1949, 1953, 1957, and 1961.

As reorganizations took place, Joplin Rotary Club has been included in district 11 (1915–19), district 17 (1918–22), district 15 (1922–37), district 136 (1937–49), district 198 (1949–57), and district 611 (1957 to present).

As the Rotary Club grew in membership and complexities of the 20th century increased, the organization experienced a broadening of purposes and functions.

The first primary objective of the club, adopted December 4, 1916, was financing of a new YMCA building. The club launched a 7-day campaign, and on March 31, 1917, committees reported that the goal of $250,000 had been oversubscribed by $5,000. The present YMCA building was erected at 5th Street and Wall Avenue.

The custom of having a "ladies' party," with a gift exchange and a dinner dance, has been held regularly since December 14, 1916. Also in 1916, the club undertook another charitable activity by donating $100 worth of shoes to needy persons.

In 1917, the club set objectives of encouraging patriotism and encouraging sports on the community level. On April 12 of that year, the club gave escutcheons of the flag to each public school and has continued to donate patriotic emblems and flags to the city. The club demonstrated its support of athletic activities by staging a parade before the first Western League baseball game here April 20, 1917.

The Rotary Club was instrumental in efforts to obtain a concrete-paved highway into the Kansas and Oklahoma mining fields. Led by a committee headed by J. M. Evans, the club raised $100,000 in the Joplin district, which was matched by State and Federal funds. With that beginning and additional contributions, West 7th Street road and its extension to Baxter Springs were constructed.

When the United States entered World War I, the club determined to aid the Government's pleas for internal support. On May 24, 1917, the club pledged to support the first liberty loan drive and voted to suspend dues and hold classifications open for all members in military service.

Other events of 1917 included establishment of the Carthage Rotary Club, which was instituted by the Joplin Rotary Club, and opening of the first "Rotary Inn." The Rotary Inn was located at Sagmount 2 months as summer quarters.

Wartime activities of the club included donation of phonograph and records to Company G, Missouri National Guard; support of the second liberty loan drive; leading the campaign for war funds by the YMCA, YWCA, and Red Cross; sponsoring a football game between Camp Doniphan, Mo.; serving in the thrift stamp campaign; erecting a flagpole as a community patriotism shrine; staging a patriotic parade on the first anniversary of the Nation's entry into the war; subscribing $99,300 on Rotary Day during the third liberty loan drive; holding an "old tier day" for benefit of the Red Cross, and leading in united war work fund efforts for which $148,000 was obtained in the fall of 1918.

On February 24, 1918, the Joplin club attended in a body worship services at the First Presbyterian Church, originating Rowdy Sunday. In order to promote cordial intercity relations, a flying squadron was organized that year.

The Joplin club was instrumental in formation of the chamber of commerce on June 20, 1918.

A group of members donated a room to Freeman Hospital in memory of Rotarian Robert M. McGuire, who died after an operation intended to fit him for military service.

As a hospitable gesture, the local group invited Carthage and Miami Rotarians to attend an intercity meeting September 13, 1918, which was followed by a series of meetings. Other practices for which the club has gained recognition include holding meetings at industrial plants and conducting model luncheons. The first such luncheon was held by Joplin, at a district conference in Oklahoma City in 1919.

Other projects of 1919, included appropriation of $3,000 for public health services in the county, in a drive launched by the public service committee; presenting a charter to the Springfield club; arranging picnics for inmates at the Joplin Children's Home; entertaining soldiers of the 35th Division returning from the war; participating in publicizing of zinc ore mined in the district; and opposing subversive elements in labor unions.

The Joplin Rotary Club helped lay the groundwork for the Ozarks Playgrounds Association, arranging a good-will trip into Arkansas in 1919.

On Armistice Day in 1919, Rotarians planted memorial trees in Schifferdecker Park, one for each Joplin veteran who had lost his life.

Among its many activities in early days, the Joplin club contributed to formation of an American Legion band, raised $6,500 for local road construction, assisted in a recount of the Federal Census in 1920, sponsored park improvements, and joined the movement which led to far-reaching improvements in the school system.

Throughout their history, Joplin Rotarians have given support to community improvements through support of bond elections. On April 20, 1922, a public celebration was staged "welcoming the return of prosperity" to arouse optimism among citizens of the community.

In the early 1920's the club helped in financing the Schifferdecker Municipal Golf Course and in raising a $125,000 fund for Freeman Hospital.

In 1939–40 President John W. Garrett inaugurated the sons' and daughters' Christmas party for children of Rotarians and the Jasper County Rotary meeting for Joplin, Webb City, and Carthage Clubs. Both of the events have been observed annually since that time.

With the advent of World War II, the Joplin Rotary Club again gave its full support to the war effort. Sixteen active members served with the Armed Forces, and all members joined the war enterprises at home. Members took leading parts in war bond drives, war chest campaigns, and USO and Red Cross activities. They donated to blood banks and served as hosts to soldiers at Camp Crowder and Camp Clark.

In the postwar years, the organization resumed its civic projects full scale and continued to take on new ventures. One practice which was begun in the late 1940's was the plan of bringing Rotary International Institute speakers here each year. Speakers are sent out by the international organization, but at the expense of the local clubs.

Funds of the club to finance district conferences and activities were doubled when, in 1950–51, the district conference assessment was increased from $1 to $2 per member.

The Harry Pate Memorial Award was established in the late 1940's and early 1950's under Presidents William R. Thurston and Frederick G. Hughes. The awards are gold-lettered footballs presented annually to lettermen of the Joplin High School and Missouri Southern College (at that time Joplin Junior College) football teams.

The Joplin Rotary Club has expanded its goals by providing community service through direct donations in many instances. The club has been principal organizer or has participated to a large extent in numerous charitable and youth projects.

In 1924, the club endorsed expansion of trade school activities at the high school, and several members took an active part.

Individual members had been helping crippled children for some time when, in 1929, the club formed a crippled children's committee. Later that year the Jasper County Crippled Children's Committee was created, with members of the Rotary Club in charge and taking care of most of the expenses.

The club still maintains a custom of furnishing lunches to the crippled children's class at North Junior High School, a project which was begun in the 1951–52 year.

A dental clinic was installed by the Joplin Rotary Club in 1929, free to all needy schoolchildren. The following year, other clubs began contributing to the clinic's upkeep, and that fall the city administration assumed full responsibility. The establishment of the clinic is credited largely to the efforts of the late Dr. John A. Cotton.

After the dental clinic, the Rotary also participated in establishing a sight clinic and has assisted in supplying eyeglasses to needy schoolchildren.

At other times, the club has assisted needy schoolchildren by purchasing books, clothing, and other essentials.

In 1946–47, when S. Warren Coglizer was president, the club inaugurated an annual camp for "less chance" boys. The first year, 62 boys attended the camp at the Boy Scout camp. Each was sponsored and financed by an individual club member.

During the 1956–57 year President Philip Emrich started the junior achievement program, which has been continued. The club also helped in organizing Joplin Boys' Club.

The club also has contributed to aid for retarded children, the Boy Scout camp at Childress Farm and the American Field Service program.

The Joplin Rotary Club has been one of many civic organizations to participate in the American Legion's Boys' State program sending qualified sons of Rotarians to the 3-day conference on practical government.

Rotary funds are available as loans for college and nursing school students. The Rotary International Foundation Fund annually finances a foreign exchange program at the graduate level for some 240 promising students.

The Joplin club, formed early in the century, has played an active role in the ever-expanding Rotary movement. Clubs Joplin has assisted in organizing include those at Springfield, Lamar, Webb City, Butler, Rolla, Lebanon, and Neosho in Missouri and Pittsburg, Kans., and Eureka Springs, Ark.

UTAH AS THE 1972 OLYMPICS SITE

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I have asked Senator Moss to add my name as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 71, which would express congressional approval of the U.S. Olympic Committee's decision to recommend Utah as the site of the 1972 Winter Olympic Games.

I am glad to join as a cosponsor of this resolution. As a New Yorker I was disappointed that Lake Placid was not chosen, not just because Lake Placid is in New York, but because the people from Lake Placid made an excellent presentation to the USOC. I hope Lake Placid will make another effort in 1976. Now, however, we must all unite to work on Utah's behalf for 1972. I hope, therefore, that the resolution gains wide cosponsorship and quick passage, because that kind of support may help Utah's case when the International Olympic Committee makes its final decision in April of this year. Utah has excellent winter sports facilities, both natural and manmade, and has transportation and hotel-motel facilities which are both ample and conveniently available.

I know that we will be proud as a nation if Utah is selected as the 1972 winter site, and I know that we will be even prouder after a winter Olympics held in Utah proves to have been a great success. That is why I am proud to be a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 71.

NEW HAMPSHIRE'S GOVERNOR SPEAKS OUT ON FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, last Monday, I sponsored a conference between municipal officials and Federal officials to discuss the various Federal programs providing financial and other assistance to local governments.

Some 165 New Hampshire mayors, selectmen, town and city managers, and other local officials met in Concord, N.H., to discuss such programs as the water and sewer grants programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Health, Education, and Welfare, Commerce and Agriculture, urban renewal programs, community action programs, and many others.

One of the highlights of the day's activities was a speech by New Hampshire's outstanding Governor, John W. King.

Governor King's address is an enlightened commentary on Federal assistance to States and local communities. I believe that it should be read by every Member of Congress who is interested in the subject of Federal grants-in-aid.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the speech by Gov. John W. King, of New Hampshire, delivered at a Conference on Federal Cooperation with Local Government, printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech by Gov. John W. King, of New Hampshire, at Conference on Federal Cooperation With Local Governments February 7, 1966

On behalf of the people of New Hampshire, I should like to welcome all of you today, and thank you for taking time out of your busy schedules to attend the conference. It is very gratifying that so many of you have come to learn more about how these programs can help the people of your communities.

There used to be a prevailing opinion in New Hampshire that we wanted no part of Federal grants-in-aid. We were proud of Yankee independence and felt secure in the conviction that we would take care of ourselves. This opinion still exists in some quarters. I have been criticized at times for advocating the greater use of Federal programs. A few of our communities have recently taken a strange pride in refusing Federal aid to education.

But there is increasing evidence that this is strictly a minority view in New Hampshire now. This is partly a result of the problems of growth which have affected New Hampshire as much as the larger centers of population in this country. Increasing urbanization has affected small towns as well as large cities. You have all wrestled with the problems created by the increasing need for public facilities. Much of the attention of any local official is consumed by the struggle between the tax rate and the pressure for more schools, better police and fire protection, new sewage treatment facilities, improved housing, and the other demands created by growth and change.

It has become obvious to most of us that we simply do not have the resources to solve all these problems by ourselves. As a result, Federal programs involving grants, loans, and technical assistance have been established by the Congress from time to time. There is no question that the Federal Government will play an increasingly important role in local affairs.

While it is fashionable in some quarters to view this development as an evil trend, I cannot bring myself to look upon the Federal Government as a fire-breathing monster pounding at our gates. If Uncle Sam is deeply involved in State and local government, it is because State and local government have been unable to solve their problems acting by themselves.

This is not to say that the Federal Government is perfect, or that it has a monopoly on good ideas. I have been as ready as anyone to criticize a Federal program when I believed it was poorly conceived or poorly administered. We should not blindly accept a grant-in-aid simply because they are available.

As government officials, it is our obligation, and an obligation which we are fulfilling today, to study each Federal program carefully. We must ask ourselves if it fulfills a genuine need which we cannot meet ourselves. We must find out if it will create an obligation for support on the part of our State or community which would place an undue burden on the taxpayers in comparison to the benefits they would receive.

While we have this obligation to be critical and to examine carefully the consequences of our actions, it should not be carried out in a negative frame of mind.

In the last analysis, the reason for the increasing Federal role in State and local affairs is a simple fact of life. Only the Federal Government has the means and the machinery to collect the revenue necessary to meet the needs of the people of this country.

The revenues of the Federal Government are increasing at the rate of $6 billion a year. State and local revenues are growing at a much slower rate. Yet the demand for the services provided by State and local governments is rising most rapidly at this time. The result is obvious.

To quote from a recent issue of the Kiplinger letter which discussed this trend, "Much of the Federal spending will be via State and local governments, to help them with social programs that they can't handle themselves, with money and advice.

"By 1970, State and local governments will get about $20 billion a year from the Federal kitty, double last year's total. This year, it was $12 billion.

"Many people see a threat in all this. The danger of the Federal Government taking over too much, getting its hands too far into States and cities. They want the lower governments to resist, refuse to take any Federal money less they lose their self-reliance. But bear in mind three things: (1) The money is going to be spent. If not spent in one place, it will go to another. Refusing it won't reduce the overall outlays; (2) States and cities must put up some of their own money, too, if they want Federal funds. This gives them a stake in watching the use; (3) Federal Government wants local decisionmaking on money handling."

I think that this is a very clear statement of the case. It is a generally accepted fact that the larger units of government can collect revenue more easily, but the smaller units of government can spend it more wisely. The Federal Government, in its tax collecting power, derives benefit from the economy of size. However, local governments, because they are closer to the people, know more about what the needs are and can meet them more effectively.

Personally, I favor some form of the so-called Heller plan whereby a certain portion of the Federal Government's revenue would be turned over to the States as a part of their general revenue. I am convinced that the situation which I have just described will lead to the enactment of such a plan in the future. By making available more funds without strings or conditions attached, it would allow the States to meet the demand for those services which are rising at the most rapid rate in each individual case.

Regardless of the exact form it takes, we can be sure that cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments will increase. Conferences like this one will help make that cooperation more effective. I should like to compliment Senator Tom McIntyre for sponsoring this conference, to thank the Federal officials who have come here to speak to us today, and to express my appreciation to all of you who have come to learn more about these programs. The knowledge you gain here can be a most effective tool in meeting the problems which face you back home.

TRIBUTE TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS, MEMPHIS, TENN.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the boards of commissioners of Drainage Districts Nos. 16 and 17 of Mississippi County, Ark., have adopted a resolution expressing appreciation for service rendered by the officers and employees of the Corps of Engineers district office in Memphis, Tenn. I share the appreciation and gratitude expressed in this resolution, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution

For more than 40 years, the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, has cooperated with Drainage Districts Nos. 16 and 17, of Mississippi County, Ark., in protecting the fertile lands in this great delta region from the threats of inundating floodwaters of the Mississippi, St. Francis, and Little Rivers. Prior to construction of new levees, the corps worked with the two districts and advised with their engineers and employees. Almost 30 years have now passed since the corps assisted the two districts in constructing a modern and formidable levee system on either side of Little River and Big Lake in Mississippi County. Since that time, the corps has assisted, cooperated and advised with the two districts in related drainage and flood control problems. During all of these years, the association with district engineers in Memphis office; with other military personnel and with civilian personnel, has been most pleasant, and has been most beneficial to the welfare of all land owners in Mississippi County, Ark.

These two districts are looking forward to many more years of continued pleasant and mutually agreeable and beneficial association between the districts on the one hand and the Corps of Engineers on the other hand. These districts feel that no other Government agency is qualified to do as good a job and accomplish the same results at the same cost as can be done under the guidance, control and direction of the corps. Past history supports these views.

In particular, the Memphis district has been most fortunate in having as district directors the most outstanding officers in the U.S. Army. All of these officers have been qualified, courteous, cooperative, ready and willing to advise and assist at all times and most competent: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of Drainage Districts Nos. 16 and 17 of Mississippi County, Ark., That the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, and particularly the Memphis office, be and it is hereby commended for the many contributions that its personnel, military and civilian, have made to the welfare of Mississippi County, Ark.

The secretaries of these two districts shall deliver in person or shall mail copies of this resolution to the district engineer, Memphis office, to the engineer in charge, Vicksburg office, and to the commanding general, Corps of Engineers, Washington, D.C.

Adopted January 31, 1966.

CHAS. ROSE,
President, Board of Commissioners, Drainage District No. 17.
EARL H. WILDY,
Chairman, Board of Commissioners Drainage District No. 16.

GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY—PARTNERS IN OCEANOGRAPHY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Rear Adm. O. D. Waters, Jr., oceanographer of the Navy, on January 27, addressed the Ocean Science and Technology Advisory Committee and the Oceanography Subcommittee of the Antisubmarine Warfare Committee of the National Security Industrial Association

The two NSIA oceangraphy groups, as many of us know, held an important 2-day joint conference here in Washington, attended by executives and marine experts of scores of industries throughout the country.

Admiral Waters' informative address at the closing luncheon of the joint conference, emphasized the role of industry in the full exploitation of our ocean resources, and in the application of our broadening scientific knowledge of the marine environment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Admiral Waters' address at the ASWAC-OSTAC luncheon be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY—PARTNERS IN OCEANOGRAPHY

As you can imagine, I attend quite a few meetings, on a wide variety of subjects, with lots of different people. There are none that I find more enjoyable and profitable than those of the NSIA and its committees. This current one is no exception.

The reason for this is that industry representatives always bring fresh viewpoints and new approaches. This is to be expected, since you represent different companies, many of which are engaged in healthy competition. Any firm that ever slows down in its production of new and salable ideas would soon be out of business. Associating with industry helps to remind Navy men that we must also be competitive, whether we are dealing with new weapon system concepts, or the oceanography needed to support them.

We are most happy to have you as a member of the Navy team, helping to solve our problems in antisubmarine warfare and oceanography. As you know, industrial concerns have always been a key part of our Navy effort in oceanography. As one example, industry can take credit for much of the development work in our marine instrumentation program. Over half of the work sponsored by our instrument center has been done under contract by private firms.

A recent large project of which we are rather proud was the integrated shipboard survey system, installed on board our new ship, the U.S.N.S. *Silas Bent*. The *Bent* and the survey system are at present shaking down concurrently, since they are designed to operate as a unit. Thanks to the good work of industry in building both the ship and the instrumentation, we are confident that *Bent* will mark a real turning point in ocean surveying.

As another example of our confidence in our business community, last summer we let two multi-million-dollar survey contracts to private industry. These surveys are designed to explore vast tracts of the world oceans. They are gathering a wide variety of oceanographic and geophysical data, which will give us answers to many of our operational problems. Here too we have confidence that industry, with a minimum of supervision, can function effectively as a team member.

We in Navy oceanography are quite proud of this team. It was by no means accidental, but carefully designed. In addition to industry, it includes the support of good science at our private institutions and universities. Over the years, the Office of Naval Research has led the Nation in backing this type of endeavor. As a result, the foundations for long-range progress in the ocean sciences are laid.

A key concept, however, of basic research is that it must be untrammeled and even free to make mistakes and go up blind alleys from time to time, for only in this way can we determine which of our theories are valid and which are not. The Navy therefore decided to conduct much of its study on specific military problems, where the end product desired is accurately known, through the second member of the team—our in-house laboratories. Over the years the material bureaus, Ships, Weapons, and Yards and Docks, have built up a formidable capability. Their specialized laboratories are second to none in the world. In collaboration with the survey and research capability of the Oceanographic Office, they provide the means for sharply focused developmental work on specific military problems.

This team of industry, institutions, and in-house laboratories, using the unique talents of each contributor, has made the Navy a key member in the national oceanographic program. It has made us a leader not only in the dollar size of the program, but in the value and utility of what we do.

Since taking over this job as oceanographer of the Navy, I have, of course, studied up on the history of Navy oceanography. It seems to me that there is a definite pattern which events are following, not only in the Navy but in oceanography in general.

In the late forties and early fifties, most of our Navy effort in oceanography was going into fundamental research. We really knew relatively little about the ocean. This research was designed to solve a few general problems, using data which was on hand or which could be readily obtained.

In the fifties, we began the second phase, the massive collection of data. Comprehensive information on the oceans was needed not only as the groundwork for further broad-scale basic studies, but for future applications and exploitation.

At about the same time, there began a shift in emphasis, trending away from pure research and toward developmental work and applied research. In the Navy, this was a period of growth for our in-house laboratories which specialized in this type of work.

Now we are just entering a new phase, that of full exploitation and application. Our surveys continue to increase, since the conversion of science to useful ends will require vast amounts of detailed information.

It is significant that last year, for the first time, the national oceanographic program included a section on engineering. This year it will increase, as we move toward an unlimited variety of applications in every field. The National Academy of Engineering, shortly after its establishment last year, set up a Committee on Ocean Engineering.

The real opportunities for industry in the oceans are just beginning, and the companies who have gained experience through their association with the NSIA will certainly be in an advantageous position in the future.

But no matter how good the teamwork, no matter how well planned the cycle of evolution, nothing will come of it unless you have something worthwhile to sell. We in Navy oceanography feel that we have a good and useful product.

When you consider the Polaris submarine, it is obvious that you need to know quite a lot about the ocean in which these boats will be submerged for months on end.

Many of you here today remember the amphibious landings of World War II, and the troubles we had then. It's easy to sell an oceanographic program which tells you about the beaches, currents and waves, which control amphibious operations.

Destroyer skippers, faced with sonars which don't always detect and weapons systems which don't hit the target regularly, want to hear from the oceanographers who can offer valid explanation and solutions.

We have found it particularly important in Navy oceanography to talk to the customers. It's no use giving a destroyer skipper (or a tuna-boat skipper, for that matter) a complex scientific paper. He isn't interested in reports on research projects. We must have a problem-solving science, speaking in Navy language, and addressing Navy operational problems.

That is why you gentlemen from industry are here today—to find out from the Navy and our coworkers in the Government, what we're doing and what our problems are.

Some of you will be looking at very specialized problems, those of ASW. But in many respects, the fundamental questions being asked about ASW oceanography are applicable in principle to the utilization of any oceanographic data.

What factors do you need to know?

What accuracy do you need?

What distribution of data in time and space?

What capability for forecasting into the future?

How do you present this information in meaningful and useful forms?

I won't even attempt to answer these questions, since we have here at these meetings probably the best assortment of talent in the country to work on them. I would just like to reemphasize that if we can answer them successfully, Navy oceanography, and all other sorts of applications, will succeed. And let us never forget that turning the sea to our useful purposes is rapidly becoming more than an attractive goal—it will soon be essential to our survival.

I wish all of you, industry, Navy, and scientists, the very best of success in your meetings and deliberations. If you can arrive only at approaches to good solutions for the problems that face us, your efforts will have been worthwhile.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, we have just received from the President a reorganization plan which proposes to transfer the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Justice Department. The Community Relations Service, in its short lifetime, has proved extremely valuable in finding solutions to very difficult problems in the field of civil rights. I believe that the President's plan will greatly strengthen the work of this agency, and that we should support this proposal.

The President proposes to move Community Relations Service to the Justice Department as a fully integrated agency, independent of other arms of the Department, with its Director, bearing the rank of an Assistant Attorney General, reporting directly to the Attorney General.

He has also requested that in the fiscal year 1967 the budget—and manpower—of the Community Relations Service be increased 50 percent—in spite of the Spartan nature of the entire budget due to Vietnam.

The President, as recently as February 4, told the American people via press, radio and television, his reasons for enlarging the mission of the Community Relations Service.

The Attorney General has also expressed his enthusiastic support for this proposed enlargement of Community Relations Service activities—and his pleasure at having available for close consultation in his role as coordinator of Federal civil rights efforts this agency which, perhaps more than any other, maintains true and compassionate communication with those who are struggling for the full realization of civil rights.

The idea of a Community Relations Service was first proposed in the Congress by President Johnson when he was in the Senate 7 years ago. Few know better than he how useful it has been thus far in aiding the objectives of this Government for peaceful and full achievement of civil rights for all Americans. He has requested that the Congress endorse a change which he believes will enhance its usefulness.

I urge that the Congress give this endorsement.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in 1918, after 2½ centuries of foreign exploitation and domination, the people of the Ukraine charted their own course to freedom by declaring their independence. Two years later, their hard-won independence was lost and the Ukraine was absorbed behind an iron curtain.

As short lived as Ukrainian independence was, these peoples' commitment to liberty and freedom has not faded or weakened. Today, their devotion to freedom, which was kindled during those 2 short years, draws inspiration from this country and her commitment to self-determination for all oppressed peoples.

On this 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, all of us join our Ukrainian friends in looking forward to the day when the Ukraine will have regained the freedom and national identity which is rightfully hers.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE HATCH ACT TO THE COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM AND VISTA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced S. 2908, which extended the Hatch Act to cover employees of the community action program and the VISTA volunteers who receive the principal part of their salaries from Federal funds. I am most pleased with the enthusiastic reception that this amendment has received. Already nine Senators have agreed to cosponsor this bill, and, of course, I expect many more from both sides of the aisle. Those who have already added their names are Senators Prouty, Mundt, Dominick, Thurmond, Fannin, Morton, Lausche, Saltonstall, and Allott. Since the measure will be on the desk for 10 days, I urge my colleagues to join with us in this effort.

Mr. President, as I said yesterday, this is not a partisan bill and, in my judgment, this is a much needed amendment which will help to alleviate the main problem that has been plaguing the poverty program and help to assure that the benefits of the program will reach the country's needy citizens.

Today in the Washington Daily News there appeared an editorial entitled, " 'Hatch' the Poverty Bunglers." This editorial strongly supports my amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it appear at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"Hatch" the Poverty Bunglers

Since the outset, some phases of President Johnson's war on poverty have been complicated, if not disrupted, by squabbling and grabbiness among local politicians.

Senator George Murphy, of California, thinks he may have a remedy, although probably not a cure.

He said he will introduce a bill to apply the Hatch Act to all administrators in the so-called community action and VISTA aspects of the program. These are the places where the most trouble has turned up.

The Hatch Act, on the books since 1939, bars Federal employees from using their offices to influence voters or taking an active part in politics or political campaigns.

Senator Murphy doubts his proposal would "solve all the problems," but he hopes it would "make them pay more attention to the needs of the poor," and less to politics.

There isn't any sound reason at all why Congress shouldn't apply the same limitations to antipoverty employees as to other Government people. In fact, in the case of the antipoverty employees, the restrictions are especially needed.

WHERE WERE THE PICKETS?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in the continuing public debate of the role of the United States in South Vietnam it is important that we recognize the efforts of our Government to meet the Communist leaders to discuss an end to the fighting.

The Welch, W. Va., Daily News, in an editorial on January 29, 1966, asked the question "Why did we not see a march on Washington, or at least a few pickets outside the White House, to dramatize support for these efforts of the Government?"

The question should be answered by those marchers and pickets who are now criticizing our Government for its efforts to protect the lives of our Armed Forces.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

Where Were the Pickets?

Any time during the past month would have been an ideal time for a demonstration by the Vietnam war protesters—a demonstration not against the United States but against the Hanoi regime.

It was that long and more since this country first halted bombing raids over North Vietnam. For 4 days during the Vietnamese new year's celebrations our troops maintained a strictly defensive posture, although the Vietcong's unilateral cease-fire did not include Americans.

In the meantime, Presidential peace emissaries continued to scurry between Washington and a dozen world capitals seeking the diplomatic formula that could lead to an armistice.

Why did we not see a march on Washington, or at least a few pickets outside the White House, to dramatize support for these efforts of the Government? Why no mass meetings putting a bit of pressure on the North Vietnamese who, as they themselves said, have been heartened by the activities of peace-loving American students?

Why indeed?

The silence of the past weeks has done more than the noisiest demonstration to expose the double standard of the Vietniks and to prove the shallowness, naivete and essential futility of their cause.

This is not to charge them with the blame for the failure of the peace offensive. They are not that important, and in any event a demonstration in support of the Government at this stage would probably have counted for little in the international balance.

It would, however, have been a welcome gesture of moderation and conciliation at home and have gone far toward reversing the trend that seems to be driving Americans into two extreme camps.

EFFECTIVE CHEMICAL PESTICIDES

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, we are talking very seriously about helping feed a world where hunger is almost as great a threat as that of nuclear warfare. The need is so great that we must also help the underdeveloped nations to modernize their agriculture. One indispensable tool in this modernization is effective chemical pesticides.

Nevertheless, these indispensable tools have been under persistent attack since the publication of "Silent Spring," the book by the late Rachel Carson in 1962.

This book, while brilliantly written, is primarly a propaganda tract, and the charges it brought against pesticides have been refuted time and time again. Nevertheless, our Government itself has taken punitive action against pesticides, and damage to the milk industry, to forests, and to other crops has resulted. Outmoded and unnecessary restrictions remain in effect regardless of the facts spread upon the record.

I think it is time to treat this whole matter in a commonsense manner, and to those who want to know what has happened and is still happening, I recommend the reading of a brilliant address by K. T. Karabatsos, director of government relations of the Velsicol Chemical Corp., of Chicago.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Karabatsos' speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Where Do We Go From Here?

(By K. T. Karabatsos, director of government relations, Velsicol Chemical Corp.)

I am stating a truism when I say that the advent of synthetic pesticides has heralded a new era both in health and in agriculture. The production of most of the important farm commodities is impossible without pesticides, and if we did not have them, such diseases as malaria and typhus—nonexistent in the United States—still would be helping fill our hospitals and cemeteries. We depend so much on pesticides that we take them for granted. Consequently, it is amazing to find these chemical agents under attack in this country by agencies of Government itself, and for reasons which, when closely examined, turn out to be ephemeral.

Nowadays we move at an increasingly fast pace in many areas. The past decade has seen marvelous achievements in science. Man has taken a walk in space, lived for weeks under the sea, developed a vaccine to protect against the crippling disease, polio, and is building airplanes which move much faster than the speed of sound. One of the places which he intends to visit in the next few years is the moon, and perhaps other planets.

Yet none of these is more fantastic than the agricultural technological revolution in our own Nation.

Within the past 25 or 30 years, the production of most major agricultural commodities has either doubled or tripled. For example, corn production in the 1925–29 period approximated 26 bushels per acre; in 1965 it is estimated at 72.1 bushels per acre. One reason that we have enough wheat for consumption here at home and hundreds of millions of bushels for export every year is that in the 1925–29 period we averaged 14 bushels per acre; in 1965 production per acre is estimated at 27.2 bushels. Or, to put it another way, we can grow approximately as much wheat as we produced 30 years ago on half the acreage. Cotton production today per acre is about three times what it was 30 years ago. Milk production per cow is not far from double that in 1929—and so it goes in almost every area of farm production.

There are many factors which have entered into this technological revolution—more fertilizer, better seed, the substitution of the machine for the horse, and the elimination of the burdensome drudgery involved in hand harvesting by the substitution of such efficient instuments as the reaper and the corn and cotton pickers. But close up front in the list of tools on which man increasingly depends for modern agricultural production are synthetic pesticides. They save billions and billions of dollars every year. It has been estimated that, without them, 50 percent of the labor force could be needed on the farm, instead of the less than 8 percent which we find there today.

Once again, let me emphasize that it is simply amazing that we find an unremitting and sustained attack on the use of these indispensable chemicals. Today millions of people accept as gospel the conclusions by the late Rachel Carson that the widespread use of pesticides threaten death and destruction to the human race. These conclusions were drawn in the face of the fact that not one case of death or serious illness in this country has been traced to pesticides, where the latter were used as prescribed. Since Miss Carson had a magic way with words and since her book was widely read, it is understandable that many laymen suspect and fear pesticides. It is almost incomprehensible the responsible agencies of Government back the propaganda in Miss Carson's book, "Silent Spring," and are conducting a persistent campaign against the agents which help make modern agriculture possible.

Agricultural efficiency has a tremendous meaning to all of us. Let us look at it in terms of one very sensitive nerve, the pocketbook nerve. Food costs in the United States amount to about 18 cents of every dollar left after taxes and other fixed costs. Compare that to Russia where only 50 cents is left; Nigeria, 70 cents; Japan and Yugoslavia, around 45 cents. Or, if you feel that these countries do not offer fair comparisons, look at Italy, 43 cents; France, 31; and Britain, 28.

To give you a more startling example, last year Americans spent $80 billion for food. Payment of taxes to Federal, State and local governments at the same time totaled almost $157 billion. So the cost of Government was just at double the cost of food. Most human beings throughout history, and even prehistory, have been primarily engaged in getting enough to eat. Even today 2 billion persons go to bed hungry in our food-short world.

Unlike most nations in the world, our major problem isn't the grocery bill or having enough to eat, but the tax bill instead. However, I am not here today to talk about dollars and cents, but rather numbers and commonsense. The numbers are the parts per billion that are raising havoc in agriculture. With new and very sensitive devices, pesticide residues can be found now where none could be found before. Some of the residues found are in billionth parts, or even trillionth, in relation to the whole. In the case of foods like milk where any residues (zero tolerance) are banned, these new instruments and their application have resulted in some costly and unpleasant results. We need commonsense to straighten out this mess.

This mess affects you, the sugarbeet growers, directly. You were told by one department of Government to use certain pesticides to protect your crop from damage due to soil insects. You followed those recommendations only that another branch of the same Government wants to seize your crops because of what it terms illegal residues.

You haven't been told that these residues would be harmful to the public health. Actually, they pose no health hazard. This is Government gobbledygook and redtape in full flower. And, as is customary, the innocent bystander—you, in this instance—gets hurt.

Fifteen years ago Congressman Delaney, of New York, instigated an investigation on chemicals in food. Briefly, that committee heard charges that chemicals—pesticides in particular—were possibly (a word that covers a world of territory) the cause of polio, stomach cancer, hepatitis, virus X, and just about anything else for which science had not yet been able to determine a cause.

Because of these possibilities, there was a public clamor for legislation. As administrative assistant to Dr. A. L. Miller, then a Member of the House, I was called upon to help direct the so-called Miller amendment through the Congress. Nearly everyone considered it an excellent bill. It was, according to the experts, ideally drawn, taking into consideration all facets of control, with safety the primary concern. It was hailed as the most significant legislation in the food and drug field of modern times. To this day it has served as the model for ensuing legislation regarding food additives, hazardous substances, and pesticide registration.

It has been about 10 years since that legislation became law. Unfortunately, as you here today can attest, the results were quite different from our anticipations.

Perhaps there is no one more aware of this than Dr. James H. Jensen, chairman of the "Zero—No Residue" Committee of the National Academy of Sciences. This committee this year issued a report saying zero tolerance is unworkable. It certainly must have looked into the legislative history of the Miller amendment and must know that the congressional intent differed sharply from administration of the act.

Mr. Miller and I were invited to the White House when President Eisenhower signed the amendment. Doc said to me at that time that, while he thought the bill was a good one, he feared that unless it was properly administered, it might stifle industry research. It has, in my opinion, had that undesirable effect.

In that connection, over 10 years have elapsed since a major new insecticide has been developed and placed on the market. I don't know that we can blame the amendment entirely, but certainly it has been a contributing factor in hindering exploration. Today, as the Miller amendment and related legislation is administered, the launching of a new pesticide is a task which is discouraging to many scientists and manufacturers. And the furore in the wake of "Silent Spring" made the job much, much harder.

Another discouraging factor is the interdepartmental struggle to determine which agency will be given the most responsibility over pesticides. For with that authority goes bigger appropriations and more personnel. The question is not whether pesticides should be regulated (that was answered a long, long time ago), but rather who should regulate them and, more important, where should regulation end?

Often when I tell an audience that more agencies of government concern themselves with pesticides than any other product of industry, I encounter disbelief. More testing and premarketing clearances are required for pesticides than anything else available to the American public. This is true even though, as I have stated, there has not been one case of illness or death traced to pesticides when the latter were properly used. I feel there is overregulation, which is cause for real concern and alarm.

Under the terms of the Miller amendment, the Department of Agriculture is to determine how much of a residue may remain on a raw agricultural product when it is harvested. The Food and Drug Administration then, if it finds no health hazard, will establish a numerical tolerance for that specific crop. Residue studies must be made on every crop for which the chemical will be used. In other words, the tolerance applies directly to the crop.

This point has created a problem which has been ably described by Representative Jamie Whitten, chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

He pointed out that, under the law as interpreted by Government agencies, a residue of

7 parts per million of DDT would be perfectly legal on certain crops, but if a 10th of a part per million were detected on another crop, the latter would be subject to seizure. This is in direct conflict with the intent of the Miller amendment. It throws both scientific judgment and commonsense to the winds.

Earlier I mentioned some of our startling scientific achievements in space and communication, as well as health. I pointed out the most startling, in my opinion, were the achievements we have made in agriculture.

My company, Velsicol Chemical Corp. is considered a leader in the field. The chemical industry has developed insecticides which kill crop-devouring insects on contact. It has developed: Those which kill over a long period of time; those which give us more complete control of weeds and disease; those which actually regulate the growth of plants, or those which defoliate crops for simpler harvesting.

As I have indicated, these pesticides, with fertilizers and other techniques, have created the technological revolution in agriculture.

Nowhere but in America can one farmer produce enough to feed himself and 30 other persons.

Today we are in a great conflict with the Communist world. One of our strongest weapons is our superiority in agriculture.

Do you realize that the Soviet Union needs 4½ times as many farmworkers as we have in the United States, and still it produces only one-third as much meat and three-fifths as much grain? And over there they don't have acreage limitations. Instead of cutting back on intensive production, they regularly add more land to the plow.

I was born and reared in a small agricultural community in Nebraska. My city cousins in the East don't think much of the rural western areas but, believe me, this is ignorance on their part. Because there are many more people living in the cities than there are on the farm, the Congress and the Government agencies tend to have a citified approach to farming.

I don't know what the figures are today, but 5 years ago Dr. Karl Brandt, a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, reported that there were then 15 million trucks, cars, and combines, plus many millions of electric motors, on fewer than 4 million American farms. He noted that the total horsepower of this mechanical equipment was equal to all the power used by all the factories and railroads in the Nation put together.

The American farmer is the largest consumer of gasoline, tires, steel and, as the rate of fertilizer use increases, he will soon be the largest consumer of chemicals.

Next to the atomic bomb, the most serious threat facing mankind is hunger. It is calculated that today, as we meet here, 165,000 children will be born, while 8,000 other people may die of malnutrition, and billions will go to sleep hungry. And so it will be tomorrow, and the next day, and the next.

Our population is about 195 million, and at the present rate of increase it will be about 340 million by the year 2000. That means there will be 145 million more people seeking shelter, transportation, heat, light, clothing, schools, churches, and recreation. Biological man being what he is, these millions will also seek weddings and food. So we shall have nearly 75 percent more mouths to feed.

In the face of these near calamitous thoughts, I am amazed at the continuing attack on pesticides and the Government's attitude toward certain necessary chemicals.

It is this attitude which is, in effect, depriving you of the economical and effective use of the chlorinated hydrocarbons—DDT, aldrin, dieldrin, and heptachlor. Yet, let me repeat once more, there is no case on record of injury from pesticides where the latter are properly used. Moreover, all the evidence available indicates that there is nothing to the theory that pesticide residues continue to accumulate in animal and human tissue until they reach dangerous proportions. This is the fundamental basis for the attack on the chlorinated hydrocarbons, or persistent pesticides, and without going into detail, let me say that not one of the antipesticide theories seems to hold up.

About 3 years ago the late President Kennedy's Science Advisory Committee issued a report on pesticides which made a number of recommendations. Many of these recommendations were immediately accepted by the various Government agencies handling pesticides and by the scientific community at large. As is the case with many reports coming out of Washington, the agricultural interests had not been considered. As far as that goes, the Food Protection Committee of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council—was not even consulted. The Department of Agriculture and Food and Drug Administration were summoned only to answer specific questions.

It was alarming to me that while the report recognized the essentiality of pesticides in modern agriculture, the point was admitted reluctantly by the Committee. The report actually advised that one objective should be the elimination of the use of the chlorinated hydrocarbons. However, the report presented no evidence to support this conclusion, and I have already stated that the available scientific data points in the other direction.

Also there was a lack of balance of values in that the report appeared to be oriented to a substantial degree to the protection of fish and wildlife, while placing a secondary value upon the adequacy of our food supply in quantity and quality.

Now, to quote Senator JAMES PEARSON, of Kansas, a member of the Senate committee which conducted hearings on the report, he said: "Without conclusive scientific basis, it set as a national goal the elimination of persistent pesticides. And this was done without defining persistency, without attempting to evaluate the impact of such a goal upon our food supply, the national income, or our competitive position in the export markets of the world."

The fact is, persistent pesticides, as we know them, represent 75 percent of those used in the United States and throughout the world.

Some would lead you to believe that persistence is bad per se and that the only reason we have them is because industry has not been able to develop other types of control.

Well, this just isn't so.

They must be persistent because insects are persistent, and the only effective way to control them is to use a compound which will have an effect over a full period of growth and maturity.

What is the alternative to persistent pesticides?

Simply this, the repeated use of more expensive chemicals and often a much greater hazard to the grower. I don't believe you want this—I know my father-in-law who farms in Nebraska certainly doesn't want it.

Following the report of the President's Science Advisory Committee, the Academy of Sciences, the Food and Drug Administration, the Department of Agriculture, land-grant colleges, and industry conducted extensive studies.

Working independently, these groups gave new assurances that the public health is not in danger from pesticide residues.

Another recommendation of the President's Science Advisory Committee was to review the tolerances of chlordane. Velsicol Chemical Corp. is the sole manufacturer of technical chlordane, and we monitor that product continually—not only in the environment but also as to its toxicity to man. These studies are published and available to the scientific community for review. The special committee of experts named by the Food and Drug Administration, in conjunction with the Academy of Sciences, studied all phases of chlordane and its uses and reported the product was less toxic to man today than when tolerances were originally established. Also, the product had been used extensively for over 15 years without harm to man. In other words, it was given a clean bill of health.

Certainly this report casts grave doubts upon the other recommendations of the President's Committee, and one wonders just how much study went into the report.

Another example stems from the recommendations on "zero" and "no residue" requirements of the Miller amendment. I have already said that the Academy of Sciences in a strongly worded report stated the concept was scientifically untenable. Dr. Emil Mrak, chancellor of the University of California, stated: "We are being asked to give up proven benefits because of unproven fears."

Senator PEARSON commented further on the latter report, stating: "I am advised that these last two reports have met with general acceptance in the scientific community, and some scientists have observed that the whole question of pesticides should be resolved by the National Academy of Sciences rather than the President's Scientific Advisory Committee which was, in fact, established in response to the Russian sputniks and was originally charged with the responsibility of relating science to our military establishment."

The Academy of Sciences' report states that "zero" should mean "negligible" and that "permissible" residues should be determined on the basis of actual daily acceptable intake. Now that we have been shown the road, it is our job to demand that the public policy on pesticides follow this mandate.

By way of reminder, the primary purpose of the Miller pesticide residue amendment was to insure the public health. Safety and only safety was its aim.

In the beginning, zero tolerances and no residue registrations had to be based on available methods, which were only able to determine residue levels of around 0.1 ppm. The scientific community, chemists, and pharmacologists were aware that while these were the limits of detection, they believed some residue remained. Then along came the new analytical methods utilizing more sophisticated machines—machines that purported to determine billionths and trillionths of a part.

This, gentlemen, is when we got into the big numbers game. What is the significance of a billionth or trillionth? I defy anyone to explain it clearly enough for a layman to comprehend.

We should dismiss these mathematical exercises. We are the unsuspecting victims of our scientific achievements.

Rather than being fearful, we should be reassured that we can measure amounts so small, even if the results are doubtful. For this can give us an unprecedented early warning of any significant build-up of chemicals in our environment.

Meantime, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior and a segment of the Public Health Service should stop issuing reports which attack pesticides by inference and innuendo.

In 1964, the Public Health Service blamed the death of over 5,175,000 fish on endrin, a chlorinated hydrocarbon. This charge was denied, and PHS changed its story on the circumstances which led to its conclusions several times. Five million of the fish were menhaden, a salt water variety, which died in the lower Mississippi and which ordinarily would be out of range of any pesticide residues that might be in the water. It developed that PHS analyzed only one menhaden and that little could be told from the condition of that fish.

The Fish and Wildlife Service has issued several releases which inferred that certain species of birds might be vanishing because of pesticides. Yet in 1964 the Fish and Wildlife Service asked for over $600,000 to combat the depredations of birds in the rice-growing areas of the Arkansas-Mississippi Delta where persistent pesticides are intensively used. On the one hand to blame pesticides for the scarcity of certain bird species, and on the other to ask for money to combat birds in a territory where the chlorinated hydrocarbons drench the soil puts the Fish and Wildlife Service in a farcical position, but apparently the Service does not mind. In a Senate speech on October 22, 1965, Senator Dirksen said of this situation:

"Offhand, it would seem that the Department of the Interior is going out of its way to make itself ridiculous. On the one hand, it solemnly issues warnings that pesticide residues may be exterminating the bald eagle, ospreys, the whooping crane, and so on, and on the other, it solemnly goes to Congress to ask for money to combat the millions of birds which are eating rice and other grain in a section where chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides—the great bugaboo of the Department of the Interior—are used more widely than in almost any other part of the country."

The Department of the Interior had banned the use of the chlorinated hydrocarbons on lands it administers, although, as I have pointed out, there is nothing which warrants such a ban. There is evidence that the substitutes for the persistent pesticides are not doing the job, although they are costing more. As a consequence, damage to the forests and lands under the administration from pests is mounting, but the ban on the persistent pesticides remains. In my opinion, it will be lifted only when ravages to forest lands become so costly that the Department will have to retreat.

In September 1965, the Public Health Service put out a press release which announced it was going to help New York State health authorities try to determine whether pesticides were a factor in cancer deaths in that State. Down in the statement it was said there was no evidence to connect pesticides and cancer, but, as Senator Dirksen pointed out: "The release is couched in language designed to arouse alarm and apprehension over the use of pesticides."

One has only to look around him to see that birds and other forms of wildlife are flourishing in the sections where pesticides are put into the ground and on growing crops. This alone, it seems to me, should allay the apprehension which Fish and Wildlife and Public Health Service are trying to arouse.

The most important thing the agricultural community can do during the coming year is to put forth all its efforts to see to it that the residues report is fully implemented. This report says that the zero concept is foolish and that residue content should be based on safety factors. This makes sense:

If this is done, many of the problems you have been facing the past couple of years will fade away, and you will be able to get back to the business of producing wholesome, free from insect damage, sugar beets.

THE JAYCEES' FINEST HOUR

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in the January edition of the U.S. Jaycees Future and JCI World, the lead article is entitled "The Jaycees' Finest Hour."

The article refers to the 20th Junior Chamber International World Congress held in Sydney, Australia, in November 1965. The article lists the election of Edward A. Merdes, of Fairbanks, Alaska, as international president as one of the reasons for the glowing description of the conference.

I concur, for I know Mr. Merdes personally and am confident that he will be an excellent representative of the organization and of his nation in his world travels as president of Jaycees International. As an example of the dedication with which he approaches his office, Mr. Merdes requested that I help arrange a series of briefings with State Department officials on the countries he was to visit. I was happy to do so.

Mr. Merdes is currently on a tour of Central America. Before he left, he spent 2 days meeting with officials of the Central America desks at the State Department. In March he will tour South America. Before he leaves on that trip he will receive a briefing at the State Department.

It is a source of pride for all Alaskans that a Fairbanks resident was the first American to be elected president of Jaycees International since 1956–57. It should be a source of pride to all Americans that this Fairbanks attorney approaches his duties with such dedication. It is comforting to know that the State Department took such a strong interest in briefing a man who while representing an international organization will also be representing the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the first part of the article entitled "The Jaycees' Finest Hour" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Jaycees Finest Hour: A Report of the 20th JCI World Congress

(By Stokely Hays, manager, international relations, the U.S. Jaycees)

There are 130 U.S. Jaycees who will remember the 20th Junior Chamber International World Congress because of the warmth and hospitality of the Australian people.

There are over 1,500 members of Junior Chamber International who will remember the 20th World Congress because of the strong contributions made to the organization by Jaycees from the United States.

For the U.S. Jaycees, the 20th World Congress of Junior Chamber International was their finest hour. Not since the founding of JCI in 1944 have the U.S. Jaycees played such an important role at an international congress, nor have they accomplished so much. The accomplishments will long be felt and remembered with satisfaction by all members of JCI.

U.S. Jaycee President Jim Skidmore summed it best when he said, "We not only have an obligation to extend leadership to U.S. Jaycees, but also to share our talents and many years of experience throughout the world."

Ed Merdes, past U.S. Jaycee vice president, and present general legal counsel of Junior Chamber International, was elected world president of JCI.

Ed is the first U.S. Jaycee to run for or be elected president of JCI since Ira D. Kaye of San Francisco in 1956–57.

Ed was elected to this honor unanimously and without opposition, but not until after two very strong and popular Jaycees gave strong consideration to standing for JCI's highest office. The fact that they chose not to run shows the great respect Ed Merdes has built for himself and the U.S. Jaycees within the international organization.

In his acceptance speech, Ed said in part: "Being elected president of Junior Chamber International is, I believe, the finest tribute a young man, his family, and his country can receive. There is an awesome feeling and deep sense of humility just considering the possibility of being elected president of this dynamic organization. I approach this coming year with an attitude of determination and dedication to give my best and all as your president.

"We surely all agree that the Jaycees have just barely scratched the surface in finding ways to build our communities in this ever-changing world so that freedom, justice and the better way of life prevail.

"It is my intention to work for these goals and at the same time, serve our organization so that I may in some small way repay Junior Chamber for the inestimable benefits it has showered upon me. I pray that with your help and that of Junior Chamber members throughout the free world, to discharge the obligations of world president with dignity."

Ed was born near Pittsburgh, Pa. on January 12, 1929, one of 13 children. He is now married and the father of six.

A graduate of Cornell University of Law, Ed is a partner in the law firm of McNealy & Merdes in Fairbanks, Alaska.

Besides his Jaycee activities, Ed is the general legal counsel to the president and regents of the University of Alaska. He is the former deputy attorney general of the State of Alaska and is now the city manager and city attorney of Fairbanks.

He is the past president of the Alaska Junior Bar Conference, past president of the Alaska National Guard Officers Association, an officer of the Knights of Columbus, a scoutmaster, and serves on the board of directors of the Alaska State Bank and Alaska Airlines.

In 1956, he was a charter member and initial vice president of the Juneau (Alaska) Jaycees. One year later, he organized the State organization and was the first president of the Alaska Jaycees. In 1958, he was elected the first vice president of the U.S. Jaycees from Alaska.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the University of Missouri—the first State university to be founded west of the Mississippi—has for over 100 years been of tremendous service to the people of Missouri. The growth and development of our State has been deeply intertwined with the history of this great university.

In 1954, Elmer Ellis was promoted from professor to president and the school began an important and vigorous movement toward higher standards in curriculum, facilities, and students.

A recent Time article traces the advances made under the administration of Dr. Ellis and looks ahead to the challenges that will be facing Dr. John Carrier Weaver when he succeeds to the presidency on the retirement of Dr. Ellis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Universities: Missouri's Upward Reach

Six Ionic columns, cracked and ivy-covered, remind students at the Columbia campus of the University of Missouri that they attend the oldest State university west of the Mississippi. The columns are all that remain of the university's first academic hall, opened in 1843 and destroyed by fire in 1892. Ironically and ionically, age was almost the only distinction that the university could claim 15 years ago. Now Missouri is making up time vigorously and fast.

Missouri's early growth was hindered first by envious legislators from other counties who refused to appropriate funds for it, later by the belief that the university was a seedbed of rebel sentiment in the Civil War. In 1907 Missouri's medical school was one of many singled out in a study by Education Critic Abraham Flexner as scandalously incompetent, and was cut back to a 2-year course.

In the late 1920's President Stratton Brooks faced a year-long student-faculty revolt, triggered by his suspension of three sociology instructors for having asked 600 students if they thought the low economic status of women had any effect upon sexual relations. By then Missouri had long been caught, as President Elmer Ellis puts it, "between northern aspirations and southern methods of taxation."

TOUGH AND FOLKSY

The university's upward reach began in 1954 with the promotion of Ellis, a placid history professor and dean, to the presidency. He turned into a tough administrator who managed to excite his faculty even while driving it hard, yet remained folksy enough to coax money out of a rural legislature. A new 4-year medical center, opened in 1956, now trains 316 students, treats 10,000 hospital patients and 6,500 clinic patients a year. Ellis worked to promote a $75 million State bond issue in 1958, a third of it going to finance 17 new buildings. His energetic lobbying helped boost operating funds from $18 million to $82 million a year. In the same period, money devoted annually to university research multiplied ninefold to nearly $20 million, and enrollment tripled to 30,000 full-time students.

In addition, Missouri changed from a school that had largely served agricultural interests into a many-faceted science-conscious institution trying to meet the needs of the State's urban growth. It took over the impoverished private University of Kansas City in 1963, made it a coequal university campus with schools of dentistry, pharmacy, and music. It elevated a St. Louis junior college, to similar status, will convert it to a 4-year curriculum this fall. Another campus in Rolla, which is about 100 miles southwest of St. Louis in the Ozarks, was created out of a school of mines and metallurgy.

This statewide system now boasts the Nation's largest university nuclear reactor (10 megawatts), will offer a Ph. D. in nuclear engineering next fall, has a forward-looking space science research center exploring the possibilities of creating permanent settlements on the moon. Its pioneering school of journalism, first in the Nation when founded in 1908, produces a citywide daily newspaper and operates the only television station in Columbia. The university is looking for a topflight dean of graduate studies to direct its growing research activities—and is willing to pay $30,000 to get him.

TOWARD FERMENT

Whether Missouri now moves into the top rank of public universities will depend largely on John Carrier Weaver, 50, vice president for academic affairs and dean of faculties at Ohio State, who will succeed Ellis next August. Son of a former speech department chairman at the University of Wisconsin, Weaver holds a Ph. D. in geography from Wisconsin and has spent most of his career in Midwestern public universities, including Minnesota, Kansas State, Nebraska and Iowa. These schools, he insists, represent "the full flowering of the public land-grant concept—education, research and service combined."

Weaver has no doubts about which of these comes first. He contends that "teaching is a university's prime reason for being" and that "what really matters in higher education is individual young people and their individual minds." A teacher's aim, he argues, is "to produce disquiet, make students question dogma. Good education doesn't produce stability. It should produce ferment." Unlike Weaver, the lowly undergrad is not likely to be forgotten, and the ferment is already going.

HISTORY AND ACTIVITIES OF THE U.S. COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, AND THE SERVICE OF VICE ADM. H. ARNOLD KARO AS DIRECTOR

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it is my pleasure today to speak to you in behalf of myself and Senator JACKSON, about the oldest scientific organization in our Federal Government, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, on this 159th anniversary of its founding, and of the remarkable record of its former Director, Vice Adm. H. Arnold Karo.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY AND THE WEATHER BUREAU

The Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Weather Bureau, both of the Department of Commerce, were consolidated on July 13, 1965, to form the new Environmental Science Services Administration—ESSA—of the Department of Commerce. The Central Radio Propagation Laboratory of the National Bureau of Standards was transferred to ESSA in October 1965. ESSA now provides a single national focus for all of the environmental science activities of the Department of Commerce, and is moving vigorously ahead in meeting the expanding environmental science and service needs of the Nation. These activities are essential to the Nation's industry and commerce, and they are of critical importance to its overall scientific effort including the space programs. The primary activities of ESSA include surveying and charting services, weather services, the use of satellites for weather observation and other environmental uses, and scientific exploration and study of the oceans, of the lower and upper atmosphere, of the size and shape of the earth, of seismology, the earth's magnetic field, in fact all of the geophysical sciences.

The consolidation of these two old-line scientific agencies of the Government, and part of a third, into one larger organization was a logical step in recognition of the complexity of present-day science and technology, and of the need to pool the instrumental and human resources of a number of scientific specialties to attain better direction and greater efficiency for the overall effort. The Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Weather Bureau have retained their names as major components of the new organization, and President Johnson nominated Dr. Robert M. White, Chief of the Weather Bureau, to be Administrator of ESSA, and Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo, Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to be Deputy Administrator of ESSA with the rank of vice admiral. These appointments were confirmed by the Senate on July 20, 1965. Both of these gentlemen are eminently qualified and I am sure that we can look forward to great accomplishments from this new organization.

Each of these agencies has a long and enviable record of service to this Nation. It is for this reason that I note with a certain nostalgia the end of their existence as individual bureaus in our Government, since the consolidation in a very real sense means the loss of the individual identity of the Weather Bureau and the Coast and Geodetic Survey. For this reason, I speak to you today of the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey and its recent Director, Vice Adm. H. Arnold Karo, and to officially recognize his more than four decades of dedicated service.

HISTORY OF THE U.S. COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

On the 10th of this February, the Coast and Geodetic Survey will have completed 159 years of service to this Nation. Beginning early in the 19th century this agency started and developed the science and art of higher surveying and cartography in the United States and has maintained one of the world's leading higher surveying and charting organizations for nearly a century and a half. The Coast and Geodetic Survey and its leaders played a prominent part in the 19th century development of science and technology in the United States. They were identified with a great variety of scientific developments such as the organization of the National Academy of Sciences, the Smithsonian Institution, and the National Bureau of Standards. I repeat here the proclamation of the President of the United States of February 1957 in honor of the 150th anniversary of the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas by an Act of Congress approved February 10, 1807 (2 Stat. 413), President Thomas Jefferson was authorized and requested to cause a survey to be taken of the coast of the United States and to take such further action as he deemed proper for completing an accurate chart of every part of these coasts; and

Whereas the observance of the 150th anniversary of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which traces its origins to the above-mentioned act, will honor the services of the officers and employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey who have maintained so zealously the reputation of our Nation in the development of mathematical and physical sciences related to higher surveying and cartography; and

Whereas the Coast and Geodetic Survey, in surveying uncharted coastal waters and in mapping virgin regions of our country and its territories and possessions, has been safeguarding life and commerce for a century and a half; and

Whereas the devotion, industry, efficiency, and enterprise of Coast and Geodetic Survey personnel throughout the years have set an enviable record of public service: Now, therefore,

I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the month of February, 1957, as Coast and Geodetic Survey Month, and I call upon my fellow citizens to salute the Coast and Geodetic Survey during that month with ceremonies designed to give appropriate recognition to one of our oldest and most respected Federal agencies on the occasion of its sesquicentennial anniversary.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 10th day of January in the year of our Lord 1957, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 181st.

(Signed) DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

First called a Survey of the Coast, later the Coast Survey, and, since 1878, the Coast and Geodetic Survey—this organization had its origin in the recognition of Federal responsibility to provide nautical charts and related publications to insure the safety of maritime commerce. This is still a major function of the Bureau and practically all of today's activities are an outgrowth of the scientific and engineering work required to produce and maintain up-to-date nautical charts for the coastal waters of the United States.

Before charts could be compiled and printed, however, a great amount of surveying had to be done to measure the coastline and the adjacent waters. The field surveys required to produce nautical charts included: Geodetic surveys to establish the latitude and longitude, and elevation above sea level, of selected places or points—so that each place on each chart would be uniquely related to all other places on the earth, and so that each chart would fit exactly into a perfectly connected series of hundreds of charts that would be required to cover the coastal waters of the United States; topographic surveys to map the coastline and to position features of importance to navigation; hydrographic surveys to determine the depths of the waters, to locate submerged dangers to navigation, and to find and position the safe passages for shipping; tide observations and tidal current observations to reduce the soundings to least depths and to provide the navigator with information about the tidal forces affecting his movements; and observations of the earth's magnetism to map the direction and force of the magnetic field so that the mariner could know the relationship between magnetic north and true north at any place.

The fact that this small organization, from its very modest beginning in the early 19th century, was able to provide a rapidly growing Nation with a Master Surveying and Charting Agency and has been able to provide a continuing service to science and commerce for more than 150 years is due in no small part to the fortunate circumstances of its early history. Many men of high talent and ability grace the pages of its early record—men such as George Davidson, who authored the "Pacific Coast Pilot" of 1889, the most complete record of the coast ever to be published for the use of the mariner; Rollin Harris, who pioneered in the field of tidal research, and published a voluminous manual of tides in which a new and comprehensive theory was formulated; Henry Whiting, who served the Bureau with distinction for 59 years and whose professional excellence as a topographer was internationally recognized; Charles Sanders Peirce, who pioneered in the development and use of pendulums in gravity measurement, and who laid the foundation for the philosophy of pragmatism; Charles Schott, who for 50 years directed all the intricate computations and adjustments of field observations required in the geodetic, magnetic, cartographic, and tidal operations; and John Hayford, whose investigations of the size and shape of the earth resulted in the derivation of a new figure—the International Ellipsoid of Reference. These are only a few in a long roll—a roll of honor in the annals of the Survey. But particular mention should be made of two early leaders—Ferdinand Rudolph Hassler and Alexander Dallas Bache—who stand in the front rank of those who left the greatest impress on the bureau's work during its difficult, formative period, and under whose direction the Survey evolved from a mere concept into an organizational entity with a fully developed plan of execution that became easily adaptable to a developing and expanding America.

Ferdinand Hassler, the first Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, was selected with the assistance of the American Philosophical Society. This was a fortunate and historical choice. Professor Hassler was a Swiss geodesist and mathematician. He recognized the vast surveying effort, and the quality of surveying that would be required to produce the charts for a new nation in such manner as to be a permanent asset. He knew how to bring the instruments and the techniques needed from Europe and to train the engineers and scientists that would be needed here. Further, he was a person who could not be stampeded into haphazard work, or hasty decisions, in order to attain spectacular but impermanent results.

Alexander Dallas Bache, the second Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, was a noted scientist of his day and an able administrator. He understood the foundations laid down by Hassler and he was able to maintain those standards in the great period of expansion that occurred during his administration. The 10-year period following Bache's appointment in 1843 saw more territory added to the United States than any other decade of American history. Texas and the entire Pacific region were added during his tenure. Surveys were started along the gulf coast in 1845, and in California in 1848.

When the Bureau was authorized in 1807, the tidal shoreline of the Nation comprised about 30,000 statute miles along the Atlantic seaboard. The acquisition of new territories on the gulf coast and the Pacific coast, the acquisition of Alaska and the Hawaiian Islands, and the stewardship that we assumed over the Philippine Islands increased the shoreline of the country to 110,000 statute miles. Bordering this extensive coastline was a belt of over 2,500,000 square miles of coastal waters that required surveys in the interest of waterborne commerce and navigation.

The plan of operations for the Coast and Geodetic Survey as set forth by Hassler and developed by Bache and his successors includes three broad phases: First, scientific study and investigation to develop knowledge, procedures, and instruments for surveying and charting the continent; second, a diversified system of surveys to literally measure the earth and to obtain the data required for charts and for other scientific and engineering purposes; and third, the cartographic activities required to compile, reproduce, print, and distribute charts and other information.

Today, the work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey includes these primary activities:

A geodesy program to determine the size and figure of the earth, including measurement of the earth's gravity, and to establish the basic geodetic control—monumented stations of known latitude and longitude and bench marks of known elevation above sea level—that provides the framework for all mapping and charting, for many types of surveys, and for engineering works including projects dealing with long-range missiles and space exploration.

Aeronautical and nautical charting programs to produce aeronautical and nautical charts of the United States including all of the survey activities required for this purpose such as hydrographic surveys, the mapping of land areas, tide observations, and the measurement of the velocity and direction of tidal currents.

An oceanography program to survey, to explore and to study the physical, chemical, and biological properties of the world's oceans and the underlying topography—to produce charts for subsurface navigation, and for the discovery and better utilization of the mineral and food resources in the oceans.

A program in geomagnetism to make magnetic surveys and operate magnetic observatories to chart the distribution of the strength and direction of the earth's magnetic field, and to study the fluctuations as well as the long-term changes in the magnetic field. The results are used as an aid to navigation and surveying; they also constitute a part of the national and international effort to understand, to predict, and to utilize the magnetic field in connection with geophysical exploration, radio propagation forecasting, physics of the solid earth, and the exploration of interplanetary space.

A seismology program to operate a worldwide system of seismograph stations for the location of earthquakes, and to study the nature and magnitude of destructive earthquake motions—to provide information for the design of buildings and structures in earthquake areas, and eventually to find some means of predicting the place and time of occurrence of destructive earthquakes. This activity also includes the operation of a seismic seawave warning system in the Pacific to protect life and property on the islands and around the rim of the Pacific Ocean.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey has in the past and continues to render many public services in addition to the specific programs mentioned above. In the early years it included the Office of Weights and Measures until the Bureau of Standards was organized in 1901. It has been associated with the demarcation of our national boundaries since 1857. One of the three commissioners appointed for the joint effort of Mexico and the United States to remonument their common boundary was from the Coast and Geodetic Survey. The Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey represented the United States on the Alaska Boundary Commission, for the joint undertaking with Canada, to perpare maps for the Alaska boundary tribunal and later to lay out that boundary on the ground. Under the treaty with Canada of 1908, the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey represented the Government of the United States for the demarcation of the boundary between Canada and the United States from the eastern seaboard to the Pacific Ocean except for the water boundary through the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes. The Coast and Geodetic Survey has surveyed many State and local boundaries, as for example the Mason-Dixon Line. Recently this Bureau surveyed and marked the boundary between Arizona and California.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey rendered extremely important technical services to the Nation during the Civil War and during subsequent wars. Fifty-five percent of the commissioned personnel of this bureau and six of its major survey vessels were transferred to the Armed Forces during World War II, and most of the remaining facilities of the bureau were devoted to various phases of the war effort, particularly to the preparation of both aeronautical and nautical charts for the armed services. Support of the military services has continued since the war. The Coast and Geodetic Survey assisted the Department of the Army in organizing and conducting the field work for the extended arc of triangulation along the 30th meridian in Africa. It readjusted the entire triangulation network of Western Europe for the Department of the Army and assisted that Department in organizing and starting the Inter-American Geodetic Survey. It conducts geodetic surveys for the location of optical and radar tracking stations along the missile ranges for the missile and space effort.

VICE ADM. H. ARNOLD KARO

I come now to the career of Vice Adm. H. Arnold Karo and to his outstanding record as Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from August 1955 to July 1965 when the Coast and Geodetic Survey was merged into ESSA.

When Admiral Karo became Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, that agency was at one of the low points of its long career. Because of financial and staff limitations since the end of World War II, the bureau had dropped out of the mainstream of modern scientific effort of our Government. Its accomplishments in the production of surveys and charts were still impressive, but research and development were being neglected and the Coast and Geodetic Survey was not filling its rightful place in the scientific community of our Government and Nation; the place for which it was so well fitted by tradition and experience.

Karo changed this situation, he changed it completely. With great energy, tireless effort, rare judgment, and unusual dedication—he pried the necessary support from a sometimes reluctant executive and a sometimes reluctant Congress—and he literally took the Coast and Geodetic Survey by the scruff of its neck and shook it out of the past into the modern scientific period. He retooled and reorganized the Bureau for a new scientific and engineering effort. He effected the greatest change in the Coast and Geodetic Survey that has occurred in nearly a century. The job is done—the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the last several years has a new spirit and a new look; it is now well prepared to take its proper role as a part of the new ESSA organization. Time does not permit me to enumerate all of Admiral Karo's accomplishments as Director, but I would be remiss not to mention some of the most noteworthy of these. Hydrography and oceanography are major activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and of increasing importance to this Nation, but, in 1955 when Admiral Karo became Director, the Bureau's fleet of vessels was completely inadequate for present day needs—there were too few of them and many were too old for effective and efficient service. The new ships construction program, initiated by Admiral Karo and still in progress, comprises the most extensive modernization and enlargement of the survey fleet in the history of the Bureau. Nine new ships now in various stages of construction will join the fleet within the next few years and thus follow three that have been completed since 1960. These new vessels will be equipped with the latest electronic, navigational, and surveying instruments available. Three class 2 hydrographic survey ships and two class 1 oceanographic ships are now under construction. Also under construction are two additional class 3 hydrographic survey ships and two class 4 wire drag vessels. Bids have been requested for an additional class 1A oceanographic ship. The class 1 ship *Oceanographer* now nearing completion is 303 feet long and is the largest ship ever to be constructed in the United States specifically for oceanography. This vessel will have the most modern oceanographic and navigational equipment with adequate laboratory space for ocean surveys, over 4,000-square feet of laboratory space.

Realizing that the Bureau could not stand still in science and technology but must either advance or regress, Admiral Karo reorganized the Coast and Geodetic Survey completely to permit a new emphasis on oceanography and the physical sciences. He established an Office of Research and Development for research and development in oceanography, geodesy, seismology, terrestrial magnetism, and supporting disciplines; and invited prominent and well-qualified scientists to join the Bureau's staff. This staff now includes a group of highly qualified scientists and engineers, and the Bureau programs are being conducted with a new emphasis and within the mainstream of the Nation's scientific activity. Scientists from other nations have been invited to the Bureau, have accepted, and are making valuable contributions to Bureau programs.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey, under Admiral Karo's direction, has taken a prominent part in the Nation's newly emphasized oceanographic program. The Bureau's part in this program will increase as the new ships are completed, but a notable start has already been made. Surveys by the ships *Explorer* in the South Atlantic, *Pioneer* in the Indian Ocean, and *Surveyor* and *Pathfinder* in the Central and North Pacific, together with the new research effort in oceanography, are indicative of the Bureau's future in this program.

Admiral Karo invited Dr. Hellmut Schmid, one of the world's foremost geodesists, to join the Bureau's staff—and the Coast and Geodetic Survey with the assistance of Dr. Schmid and its own staff of experts has devised and put into operation a system of satellite triangulation that permits the accurate measurements of long distances, even across the oceans, to connect the continents and the many different geodetic datums of the world. This system of satellite triangulation is now being used by the Coast and Geodetic Survey in cooperation with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense to establish a system of triangulation that will encircle the earth.

Admiral Karo expanded and broadened the Coast and Geodetic Survey programs in terrestrial magnetism and seismology to meet present day needs for basic information for geophysical exploration, radio propagation forecasting, space exploration, for the design of structures against earthquakes, for the maintenance of a seismic seawave warning system around the Pacific basin, and finally to work toward the development of means of forecasting destructive earthquakes. During his term as Director, the Bureau has built 10 observatories for geomagnetic and seismological observations and research. These observatories are now operating at Fredricksburg, Va.; San Juan, Puerto Rico; Dallas, Tex.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Castle Rock, Calif; Newport, Wash.; at Anchorage and Adak, Alaska; Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands; and on Guam. The Bureau is cooperating in the U.S. Antarctic research program and in 1960 Admiral Karo went to Antarctica and to the South Pole to inspect Coast and Geodetic Survey installations and to encourage the Bureau personnel stationed there.

Admiral Karo was born December 24, 1903, at Lyons, Nebr., where he attended elementary and high school. He was graduated from the University of Nebraska with the degree of bachelor of science in civil engineering in 1923 and entered on duty with the Coast and Geodetic Survey immediately thereafter. He has devoted his entire professional career of over 42 years to service in the commissioned corps of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Admiral Karo is a graduate of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces at Washington, D.C., and in 1958 he received the honorary degree of Doctor of Science from Union College, New York, in recognition of his national and international leadership in surveying and cartography.

Admiral Karo served for more than 3 years as Chairman of the Committee on Cartography of the National Academy of Sciences, which advised the State Department on matters concerning international cartography. He was Chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Second United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Far East held in Toyko in 1958, and headed the U.S. delegation to the Third United Nations Cartographic Conference held in Bangkok in 1961. He represented the United States at the British Commonwealth Survey Officers Conferences at Cambridge, England, in 1951, in 1959, and in 1963. He participated in the conference of the International Federation of Surveyors at Cracow, Poland, in 1959. In 1963, he served as the U.S. representative for geodesy and mapping at the United Nations Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas, at Geneva, Switzerland, and later in 1963, he served as Chairman of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Africa, at Nairobi, Kenya.

Admiral Karo was national president of the Society of American Military Engineers in 1957. He is a past president of the American Congress on Surveying and Mapping, vice president of the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, Department of Commerce member of the Federal Council's Inter-Agency Committee on Oceanography and has served as a U.S. member of the Consultative Committee, delegate to the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, UNESCO, and in 1965, as Chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Fourth Session. As the Coast and Geodetic Survey member of the Mississippi River Commission, Admiral Karo plays an important part in furthering the national program of developing and improving one of the great waterways of the world. He is also a registered professional engineer in the District of Columbia.

During World War II, Admiral Karo was transferred to duty with the U.S. Army Air Forces. He held various assignments, including commanding officer, beginning in 1943, of the Air Forces Aeronautical Chart Plant at St. Louis, Mo., with the rank of colonel. As a result of Karo's administration and guidance, outstanding achievements were accomplished in organizing the plant which today is recognized as being among the most important reproduction plants in the world. Special commendations by the commanding general of the Air Forces and members of the Air Staff were received for work completed under his command.

Admiral Karo received special recognition for his important comprehensive treatise on "World Mapping," completed during his course of study at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. He was awarded the Philippines Legion of Honor, degree of Officer, for eminently meritorious service in the Philippines during two tours of duty there early in his career. He is a member of the American Geophysical Union, the Cosmos Club of Washington, the U.S. Naval Institute, American Society of Photogrammetry, American Congress on Surveying and Mapping, Society of American Military Engineers, American Society of Civil Engineers, Explorers Club, Sigma Xi, and Sigma Tau.

In closing this account of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and its director, I salute Adm. H. Arnold Karo as one of our able administrators and one of our most dedicated public servants.

SENATOR JORDAN RECEIVES SILVER BEAVER SCOUT AWARD

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as part of the national observance of Boy Scout Week, I think it is fitting for me to announce at this time to the Senate that my colleague, B. Everett Jordan, has recently been presented the Silver Beaver Award of the Boy Scouts of America.

The Silver Beaver Award is the highest scouting award that can be bestowed by the local councils throughout the Nation, and it was presented to Senator Jordan by the Cherokee Council of North Carolina. The award was established in 1931 in the Cherokee Council, and in the 35 years since that time, the council has awarded it to only 76 men.

Those North Carolinians who are familiar with the scouting program are aware of the fact that Senator Jordan has been active in scouting during his entire adult life, and he has brought truly outstanding leadership and inspiration to the scouting movement in our State and elsewhere.

The Silver Beaver Award was presented to Senator Jordan in ceremonies at Leaksville, N.C., on January 21, 1966, and I would like to include as part of my remarks excerpts from the citation accompanying the award. The citation was read by Mr. Allan Lewis, of Wentworth, N.C., who is an outstanding scout leader himself.

The excerpts are as follows:

> Senator Jordan might be classed as an oldtimer since he made his appearance in the universe before the turn of the century. He served for his country during the First World War and then organized his own company during the 1920's. He has been involved in the textile business ever since. His civic activities have been too numerous to cover all of them here but particularly noteworthy are his services to the Tuberculosis Association, the Red Cross, the County Hospital, Duke University, American University, Elon College, Rotary, the Masons, and the Methodist Church where he serves in many capacities.
>
> He first served in Scouting as a scoutmaster in the Piedmont Council of North Carolina. He later moved to the Cherokee Council and helped to organize a troop in his own community in 1942. This troop continues to be one of the strongest in the council. Our recipient continues to be active on the troop committee and in addition has served on the executive board of the Cherokee Council. He is currently registered as an honorary member of the executive board.
>
> He was recently instrumental in the erection of a building for scouting purposes in his own community and has honored Eagle Scouts from his community's Scout units with 4-year college scholarships.
>
> It is impossible to do justice to this man in the little time I have here tonight. Ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor for me to present to you the Honorable B. Everett Jordan, U.S. Senator.

DENTAL HEALTH

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the National Dental Health Assembly meeting in Washington February 7, concentrated on its concern for the dental health of Americans. The meeting was cosponsored by the U.S. Public Health Service and the American Dental Association. The subject matter was mostly limited to the question of fluoridation of water supplies.

The dinner audience of over 500 delegates was treated to a remarkable address given by Dr. Robert Felix, now the dean of the School of Medicine at St. Louis University, but known to many of us in Washington and in the Senate because of his service as Director of the National Institute of Mental Health.

As Dr. Felix said:

> We have had extremism with us from our earliest days as a Nation. We can even testify that some of these extremists, such as Samuel Adams and Henry David Thoreau, were not only not enemies of the Republic, but even, paradoxically, contributors to its strengths, directly or indirectly.

At this meeting, members of our own Public Health Service contributed much by participating in panels, and the dentists themselves gave scientific witness to the effectiveness of controlling dental caries.

Dr. Felix' address is not only a convincing argument for fluoridation, but is an enlightened treatise on the subject of extremism.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Felix' address be included in the Record following my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Psychiatrist Looks at Extremism

(By Robert H. Felix, M.D., M.P.H. dean, School of Medicine, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo., formerly Director, National Institute of Mental Health and president of American Psychiatric Association)

I can sympathize with the bruises you have received, and console you by reminding you that the intensity of feeling can be no greater, nor the edge of the invective heaped on you can be no sharper than what we in my chosen field of mental health have and still are experiencing.

If you think you have had problems from people with extreme points of view, I refer you to the testimony on the Alaska mental health bill or much that has been said both pro and con about psychoanalysis. I suppose one reason why we in mental, and you in dental health, find so much in common is because the two words differ only by one letter; and, anyway, in both cases the trouble is in the head.

Webster has a simple definition for extremism: "The quality or state of being extreme: radicalism."

It may be true that the instant images you bring to this consideration of Webster's definition are such as these: hooded Ku Klux Klan members and fiery crosses; attacks upon former President Eisenhower and Chief Justice Warren by certain quasi-political groups, college students on a sit-down demonstration; antifluoridationists, especially the "little old women in tennis shoes,"—flambuoyantly waving their poison pamphlets.

Let us keep one or two points ever before us, however. In many cases, today's extremist is tomorrow's conservative, and sometimes he can be as extreme in his conservatism as he was in his extremism. To be extreme is not necessarily to be wrong any more than to be conservative is necessarily to be right. To be irrationally extreme is dangerous but to be out in front of the majority may be evidence both of wisdom and bravery. By the standards of this day, the barons who forced King John to sign the Magna Carta were extremists. Those who tossed the tea into Boston Harbor were extremists. The women who demonstrated for suffrage were extremists. To be an extremist usually is to be a nonconformist, but not necessarily to be evil or stupid. By the same token, some extremists are both. The problem is to tell the difference between them.

A ROSE BY OTHER NAMES

General use of the word, "extremism," is rather new. As the late Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr., wrote, in a posthumously printed article in the Saturday Review:

"The presidential campaign of 1964 introduced the word 'extremism' into our political vocabulary as a synonym for ultraconservatism but the phenomenon itself is anything but new. Throughout our history it has lurked under the surface of public life, finding an escape hatch at more or less definite intervals. Psychologically the outbreaks have also borne striking resemblances, even though the professed objectives have shifted as occasion required."

Thus, we have had extremism, or its equivalent by some other name, with us from our earliest days as a Nation: The Antimasonites in the early 1800's; the Know-Nothings of the middle 19th century; both the carpetbaggers and Ku Klux Klan after the War Between the States; and the latter again in the post-World War I era, and today in their third resurgence; and the American Protective Association in the late 19th century. It is interesting to contemplate on the fact that in my final draft of this manuscript, I included other examples of extremism from more recent times, but that I eliminated them finally, because they are still so feeling-laden that I could possibly distract some to whom these words eventually might come because of the emotions those examples could trigger off.

We have had eminent men in our history who, at one time or another, were classified as extremist types: Samuel Eliot Morison describes respectable Samuel Adams of Boston, master of the town meeting and member of the Massachusetts Assembly as "alone among leaders of the American Revolution a genuine revolutionary, resembling in several respects the Communist agitators of our time." Henry David Thoreau, the New England writer and philosopher whose books became the great inspiration for the action patterns of Mahatma Gandhi, was censured for his unorthodoxy and imprisoned for his opposition to paying taxes. It was Thoreau who wrote a rather lovely defense of individualism:

"If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer. Let him step to the music which he hears, however measured or far away."

We can say at this point in our discourse that the prospect of evidences of extremism on our landscape today is not a bleak one. The Republic has stood. Young though we feel our Nation is, ours is the oldest stable government in the world. In the words of Schlesinger, "The outcome of all the extremist movements was in every case the same, for each upon reaching its peak speedily declined, as if the public, surprised at itself, suddenly recovered its balance."

We can also say that some of our impassioned spokesmen who have, indeed, heard a different drummer, and who have recommended to their audiences a radical approach, have not only not been enemies of the Republic but even, paradoxically, contributors to its strengths, directly or indirectly.

ALL OPPONENTS OF FLUORIDATION ARE NOT EXTREMISTS

Before we delve more deeply into the issue, I believe I should make clear that all the opponents of fluoridation are not extremists; on the other hand all extremists are not opponents of fluoridation. We can cite sincere individuals, some of them men of science, not yet able to swallow fluoridated water if they know what they are drinking. We can ask how much of this is due to poor health education and how much is due to basic prejudice against water which has been "tampered with."

I am sure that we are all aware of the fact that we tend to label as extremist, those who oppose our point of view most vigorously. Thus, those who oppose fluoridation but exhibit some restraint and decorum, even though they may write professional tracts, or letters to the editor, we tend not to include under the label. They do not make such immoderate statements as "fluoridation is a Communist plot." They do not ride the bus lines, as I am told was done in one western city, and fan out from the main arteries to every home carrying the word, "poison" as if to light a bonfire of desperate opposition. The fact I would speak as I just have demonstrates how deeply ingrained in most of us is opposition to the behavior of extremists who disturb our accustomed way of life. It is not difficult to recall instances from our own history of similar behavior by men now considered national heroes.

Are there individuals showing extremist behavior in the ranks of the antifluoridationists? To be sure. They are there in the ranks of the opponents of mental health clinics, and many other institutions established for social good and for progress of the human race.

Have we overestimated the strength of the violent opposition to our favorite health measures and other institutions? Probably. We find it necessary to hold a national conference to hasten the implementation of fluoridation; the obstacles to universal acceptance of this great public health benefit are considerable. And yet, last November a national poll of usual accuracy showed that 63 percent of the citizens interviewed declared that they favored fluoridation; 20 percent said "no"; 17 percent had no opinion. A fraction of that opposing 20 percent may deserve its extremist spurs. See, then, how a noisy few can intimidate susceptible people and can actually slow the forward march of society. And this in spite of scientific discoveries which have been proved by meticulous scientific investigation to be safe and effective.

THE COMPLAINTS OF THE EXTREMISTS ARE ROOTED IN REALITY

Drs. Lowenthal and Guterman, in their "Portrait of an American Agitator," affirm that the chronic, vehement opposer of our commonly accepted social institutions, beliefs, and practices does not manufacture his grumblings out of thin air:

"His feelings are rooted in social reality.

"The modern individual's sense of isolation, his so-called spiritual homelessness, his bewilderment in the face of seemingly impersonal forces of which he feels himself a helpless victim, his weakening sense of values—all these simply supply the basic motifs of the greatest writers of our time. This malaise reflects the stresses imposed on the individual by the profound transformations taking place in our economic and social structure.

"Correlated with this phenomenon are such developments as the replacement of the class of small, independent producers by gigantic bureaucracies, the decay of the patriarchal family, the breakdown of primary personal ties between individuals in an increasingly mechanized world, and the substitution of mass culture and traditional patterns."

All of us can respond to that picture of today's rocketed, computerized world and its effects.

WHO ARE THE CLASSICAL EXTREMISTS?

It is excessive reaction and excessive demonstration against the changes we are all experiencing which causes concern and even anxiety.

The extremist attempts to transmit his strong emotional feelings to all whom he can reach. He encourages distrust of those in positions of power and consequence; he describes the helplessness of the average individual in the face of fancied dilemma; he suggests that the citizen is barred from the councils of power and decision; he pictures dire disasters to come; he invites disillusionment, implying that under the cloak of humanitarianism and justice current leaders perpetrate sinister plans.

Emotion, clearly, is the extremist's instrument. We are told that Grand Wizard Simmons of the early Ku Klux Klan movement said quite plainly: "The Klan does not believe that the fact that it is emotional and instinctive, rather than coldly intellectual, is a weakness. All action comes from emotion rather than from ratiocination."

It cannot be argued that the extremist is ipso facto anti-American, frightening though his words and behavior may be, and though his deeds may run the gamut from character assassination to actual assassination. The extremist has been described neatly as "a well-meaning person believing earnestly that he is fighting dragons that threaten catastrophe to himself and his country."

Doctors Marmor, Bernard, and Ottenberg have done interesting work on the "Psychodynamics of Group Opposition to Health Programs." They describe the vehement opponents as leaders who fall into two main groups: Those who are motivated by factors of personal power, prestige, or gain; and those who are motivated by powerful anxieties or hostilities, the true sources of which are unconscious. They are often individuals of great ability, intelligence, and the capacity to arouse intense fervor and passion in others. In extreme forms they assume the role of the godlike crusader, the charismatic leader, who is ready even to endure martyrdom for the sake of "the cause."

SOME POSSIBLE MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS

The psychiatrists who have participated in the study mentioned believe that the potential extreme opponent may be: "Any individual whose life experiences have been such as to leave him with deep feelings of vulnerability, either physical or psychological, in the struggle for existence; he is apt to respond with anxiety to anything which he perceives as a threat to his sense of intactness—or which, by virtue of being coercive, arouses in him, fears of being overwhelmed or dominated by forces which are endowed by him with mysterious or superhuman power.

"It is our conviction that the basis for most of the irrational anxiety that some health measures arouse in certain individuals is that the measures are perceived as constituting a threat either to their sense of bodily wholeness, or their sense of psychic wholeness including freedom of choice, or else to the wholeness of what we might call their life space.

"This is the common denominator which explains why we find the same individuals passionately defending themselves against the forcible entry of any foreign body—whether it be a vaccination, a mental health proposal, interracial contact, or a wave of immigrants from overseas.

"Measures which involve introducing something foreign into the human body, such as the fluoridation of water, are seen by such individuals as threatening their bodily integrity. On the other hand, the intense fear that mental health proposals arouse in certain people seems to derive from feelings of being threatened psychologically. The reactions of some of these individuals seem to reflect a fear that any psychiatric insights may expose their own underlying mental instability."

"Often these people," the team continues, "come from homes in which rigid, repressive, and authoritarian patterns have dominated their early developmental years, with consequent patterns of deeply repressed hostile strivings. To protect themselves against the emergence of these impulses, such individuals develop patterns of intense characterological rigidity, repression, and an ever-ready tendency to discharge their repressed hostility, or project their repressed strivings, whenever a convenient cultural scapegoat is presented to them."

THE CARE AND HANDLING OF EXTREMISTS

There are things we can do about extremism. We cannot wish it away. We cannot simply condemn it. We cannot even, logically, contain it unless the Nation's security is in jeopardy; for to do so is to jeopardize our own freedom. We can, of course, deal with the individual extremist who commits violence, but this is not getting at the whole problem.

The extremist invites militant opposition. He may feel that someday the masses will turn to him as a voice crying in the wilderness. Do you not know violent opponents of fluoridation, who have lost their cause to prohibit the fluoridating of a local water supply, who look to the day when something will go wrong with the machinery, or someone's demise is traced to fluoridated water? Today, that opponent sees himself as a prophet wrongly abused; tomorrow, he prays he may gain the victory.

Quoting again Drs. Marmor, Bernard, and Ottenberg: "Sometimes proponents of scientifically grounded health programs react to unreasonable opposition, not by withdrawal, intimidation, counterattack, or unperturbed determination, but by intensified advocacy. Apparently the experience of being attacked in these ways can stimulate deep personal anxieties and unconscious patterns of defense. As a result, a person's prior scientific basis for supporting a health measure may shift to a blindly emotional espousal of a cause, with all the concomitant drawbacks that this entails." Well said. We must be careful how we battle for our social benefits.

Here, then, are some general suggestions:

1. Guard against treating the vociferous opponents as though they were stereotypes, not individuals. Abandon the terms "crackpot," "lunatic fringe."

2. Stop trying to outreason the opponents, however satisfying this might be to you. This approach is a double-edged weapon. To outreason another is an aggressive act, creating frustration and disequilibrium in the intellectually overpowered individual. Listen with patience and magnanimity, or try cooperative thinking.

3. Guard against projecting your own conflicts onto the opponent. Projection is a complex, psychological device by which the individual frees himself from conflicts by blaming others for attitudes he dislikes in himself.

4. Avoid creating a stereotype of the dangerous, all-powerful anti. It is a seductive escape from reality. Too often it is an excuse for not taking a courageous stand, for not trying alternative action that will achieve constructive goals.

5. Develop a more flexible and intelligent approach in dealing with individuals and groups. You can proceed with greater soundness by breaking the mass into its constituent individuals, and by approaching each person as a distinct individual—a person with a name and a face.

THE COMMUNITY CLIMATE FOR MENTAL HEALTH

We are at a juncture now where I could expand for hours did I not realize it would be an extreme thing to do. I want simply to plead for emphasis on building a strong community climate for health. The great health programs which are developing today at all levels of government constitute a promise, eventually, of the elimination of the kind of obstructive forces we have been considering tonight.

For instance, you realize that the proposed mental health clinics have been as embattled as fluoridation. You understand, I am sure, that valuable research has been slowed by seemingly senseless opposition to these forward-looking, intensely human, programs.

Yet I believe, with all my heart, that answering the extremist critics of the mental health plans will gain us no advance. Ceaseless, dedicated, determined action, and constant interpretation to those in authority and those around us, can gain us the funds, the manpower, and the facilities that will develop the resources for individual help and, in the process, begin the creation of the kind of community climate that generates mental health.

BACKGROUND READING

"Battle for the Mind," William Sargant.

"The Ordeal of Change," Eric Hoffer.

"People in Quandries," Wendell Johnson.

"Science and Sanity," Alfred Korzybski.

"A New History of the United States," William Miller.

"Prophets of Deceit," Leo Lowenthal and Norbert Guterman.

"Extremism in American Politics," Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr., Saturday Review, November 27, 1965.

"Psychodynamics of Group Opposition to Health Programs," Judd Marmor, M.D., Viola W. Bernard, M.D., Perry Ottenberg, M.D., American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, April 1960.

"Papers by Robert H. Felix," American Journal of Psychiatry, Community Psychiatry, Rhode Island Medical Journal.

"Checkmate for Rabble Rousers," Solomon Fineberg, Commentary, September 1946.

"Language Habits in Human Affairs," Lee.

"From Death Camp to Existentialism," Viktor E. Frankl.

"Oxford History of the American People," Samuel Eliot Morison.

SENATOR RIBICOFF AND TRAFFIC SAFETY

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, during the last year, as a member of the Subcommittee on Government Reorganization, I have had the privilege of working closely with its able chairman, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], on the problem of traffic safety. His creativity and diligence in attacking this critical problem have been exceptional. He has contributed immeasurably to the recent heightening of public awareness of the fact that this is a problem that we really can do something about. And he is in large part responsible for recent efforts elsewhere in the Government on the part of the automobile industry to develop safer automobiles and other safety measures.

Two recent articles recognized the magnitude and significance of Senator RIBICOFF's contributions. One is an editorial in the Washington Post for Sunday, February 6, 1966; the other is Raymond Moley's column in the issue of Newsweek dated February 14, 1966.

Although Mr. Moley places more emphasis on driver behavior and less on the building of safer cars than I would, his recognition of Senator RIBICOFF's contributions is gratifying, as is that of the editorial writer in the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that these two articles be inserted in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 6, 1966]

CREATIVE SAFETY PROGRAM

Senator RIBICOFF is right in insisting that the new approach to traffic safety shall reach beyond the commonplace proposals that have been kicking around legislative halls and executive desks for a decade or more. It is true that there has been a serious lag in the adoption of standard safety measures. The country must now make up for past neglect by putting into effect many practices that it has heretofore merely talked about. But it also needs a more creative approach. For this reason we have great sympathy with Senator RIBICOFF's provocative stance.

A good case can be made for a crash program of research into the building of safer cars. Meanwhile much could be done through Federal legislation requiring safety devices that are known to be useful in averting sudden death on the highways. The National Safety Council seems to place too much emphasis on State and local measures. When local communities have done all that they can by way of improving their traffic laws, making their highways safer, providing for driver education and for automobile inspections, there will still be an important field for Federal legislation.

In our view, cars should meet minimum safety standards laid down by Congress or an expert body set up for that purpose. New cars failing to provide the required equipment should not be sold or utilized in interstate commerce. Of course, imports should be held to the same standards. It is not yet clear what kind of legislation President Johnson has in mind, but his promise of comprehensive regulations designed "to arrest the destruction of life and property on our highways," may well include a safety code for manufacturers as well as for motorists.

Congress recently passed laws permitting the Federal Government to require safety standards on the automobiles that it buys and to aid the States in setting up safety rules. We do not agree with those who say that these laws are adequate. But the task ahead is for a united drive against mayhem by motor and not merely a debate or controversy among the safety-conscious forces.

[From Newsweek, Feb. 14, 1966]

PERSPECTIVE: AUTOMOTIVE SAFETY

(By Raymond Moley)

Some years ago residents of and visitors to the State of Connecticut came to realize that there was a Governor there who was determined to take vigorous action to reduce the high rate of motor vehicle accidents. Among the measures he adopted were drastic policing, road improvements, public education, and warnings to drivers by signs and other methods. After the initiation of Governor RIBICOFF's "crusade"—his word—I was one of those who noted vast improvement in the behavior of drivers. There has been substantial statistical evidence of this change, for Connecticut has less than a third of the number of serious accidents that afflict a State such as Nevada.

For a time RIBICOFF was chairman of a Governors' committee on automotive safety. Later, as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, he initiated many studies of the subject. Still later, as Senator he continued his crusade as chairman of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations. Last year he held extensive hearings which received testimony from many agencies, government and private. He has a bill before the Senate which provides for very considerable Federal study and regulation. This bill may be supplanted soon by a Presidential message and bill which was promised in the annual message.

TENTATIVE CONCLUSIONS

This investigation, together with the President's interest, makes the subject one of the most important public questions that will be faced this year. Such efforts as have been made will provide a vast amount of public education which, in itself, will have a salutary effect, I hope, upon the millions of automobile drivers and owners, government officials, at all levels, and also manufacturers.

A laborious examination of the testimony in those hearings, as well as material supplied by many public and private agencies interested in the subject, leads me to a number of very tentative conclusions:

1. In almost every accident there are three components: the driver or drivers, the environment outside the vehicle, and the vehicle itself. By the environment I mean the roadway; the regulatory agencies, including the police; and, in some cases, the weather and terrain.

2. Of those three, the driver almost always is the major cause of accidents. The environment is next, and the vehicle is third.

3. Measures to assure more safety must be directed at all three, with most emphasis upon the first two. And here the leadership must come from Government and the automotive industry.

4. Accident reporting is sketchy and varied, according to the jurisdiction in which the accident occurs. Thus, the raw data on which remedial conclusions can be reached are insufficient.

5. This lack of data greatly handicaps the many research activities that have been conducted for years by the automotive industry, the governments and various private agencies. The result is that those concerned have inadequate information upon which methods of improvement can be built.

6. In the automotive industry a great deal has been spent in money and talent, in individual companies and cooperatively, to create better and safer cars, to provide information for the guidance of many public agencies, and for the purpose of education in the schools and research institutions.

7. It must be realized that the tremendous impact of the automobile on our civilization has created problems which have accumulated so fast that all those concerned have had difficulty in mastering them.

8. The pressing needs are not only for more information, study, and research but, on the basis of what we now know, for more uniform and stricter tests for drivers; for more driving education, especially for the young; for inspection of all cars by public authority; for national standards in road construction and improvements and for more safety devices in new cars. Whether any or all of these should be done by the Federal Government or by cooperation among the States and local governments or, in the case of car design, be left to the industry are major issues in 1966.

THE GREAT URBAN CHALLENGE—ARTICLE BY MR. MORRIS KETCHUM, JR.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Morris Ketchum, Jr., the distinguished President of the American Institute of Architects recently wrote a most interesting article urging sound planning and the energetic cooperation of private business, local government, and the Federal Government as partners in building livable and beautiful towns and cities. Speaking from long experience as a distinguished architect and designer, his article makes clear that we can and must make our cities places of delight and beauty rather than dreary barracks and neon-lighted slums. At a time when the vast majority of Americans live in urban areas, Mr. Ketchum's call for sound planning and creative thinking for our cities is a message that cannot be repeated too often, and I am sure his thoughtful comments will be of interest to my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "The Great Urban Challenge," which was published in the G. E. Forum, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT URBAN CHALLENGE

(By Morris Ketchum, Jr., F.A.I.A., president, American Institute of Architects)

[NOTE.—Morris Ketchum, Jr., is president of Morris Ketchum, Jr. & Associates, an architectural firm which has designed buildings in 30 American States and several nations. Among the firm's recent projects are the U.S. Embassy in Rabat, Morocco; campus planning and buildings for the State University of New York; and several large schools and housing projects in New York City. Besides his position as president of the AIA, he is past president of the Architectural League of New York and the Municipal Art Society of New York. A recognized authority on department store planning, Mr. Ketchum has been a lecturer or critic at Yale University, Pratt Institute, New York University, and the Cooper Union.]

The greatest domestic challenge we face today, this distinguished architect believes, is the future of the city. For practical solutions to urban problems, he says we must:

Redefine the political and economic philosophy concerning use of public and privately held land.

Reorient our urban technology to solving, rather than creating, metropolitan problems.

Enlist the wholehearted commitment of business, local government, and the design professionals to create livable, beautiful communities.

The next 10 years may be the most critical in the history of our Nation, not excluding the wars which have attended its founding, consolidation, and defense of the free world. During this next decade, our mounting population, expanding technology, and the rapid decay of our urban centers will force radical changes upon the form, function, and appearance of the American city.

In the next few years, we may prove to the world that, for the first time in man's history, a democratic people can build cities that are efficient, livable, and beautiful—in short, an urban environment of excellence. It is equally possible, however, that in these same few years, we may, through default and apathy, create the most terrifying urban mess that man can imagine. America the Beautiful may, in all its glory and technical excellence, go down the drain.

HAVE WE GROWN TOO FAST?

My own feeling is that we have created the mess around us because we have grown so fast. In the headlong process of learning new things, we have forgotten a great deal.

An architect I know says of this: "It isn't that we're stupid. We just have lousy memories." It is a cogent statement. We have a rich and valid heritage in community design. Thomas Jefferson, our third President and an architect, designed not only Monticello and the campus of the University of Virginia, but several towns. He also made a design for the city of Washington before L'Enfant did, and he proposed a national public works program. William Penn's original design for Philadelphia was strong enough to guide the orderly development and redevelopment of that city to this day.

For whatever reason, these and other early communities were designed and built according to a plan. We design our mechanical contrivances and space vehicles and we plan our business affairs. The businessman who did not plan would be considered a fool. Yet, we continue to rebuild our towns and cities, expand our metropolitan areas, and tear up the suburban countryside without plans. We try to control unwholesome uses of land with nothing more than the weak and negative tool of zoning. We are just beginning to see the result.

The greatest domestic challenge we face today, I believe, is the future of the city. The problems are apparent, and the solutions, at least in outline form, are beginning to appear. In my view, they include: (1) a redefinition of our political and economic philosophy concerning the use of public and privately held land; (2) a reorientation of our urban technology; and (3) the energetic and wholehearted commitment of the business community, local government, the architectural profession—as partners—creating livable and beautiful towns and cities.

The political issue is no longer one of planning versus haphazard growth. Only the most misguided sort of person would argue today that community design is undesirable. We have seen and are still seeing the kinds of urban ugliness and disorder that result from the philosophy that land can be treated as a commodity for random, unlimited exploitation.

COMBINING PUBLIC AND PRIVATE RESOURCES

Now we face a fundamental decision. We know that our present system of unlimited and uncontrolled speculation is disastrous; yet we tend to find repugnant the policy of sweeping Government control which planned and built the new towns of Great Britain and Scandinavia.

We combine the use of public and private resources when the Government condemns, assembles, and clears a tract of land under the urban renewal program and then sells it to a private entrepreneur. One of the best recent examples of this process is Constitution Plaza, in Hartford, Conn. Roger Williams, the astute vice president of the Travelers Insurance Co., which invested $40 million in the project, recently pointed out that the site, prior to development, contributed $90,000 per annum to the city in taxes. As of 1965, it will contribute $1,456,000 per annum, and it has created a substantial building boom around it, literally rejuvenating the city.

There is no good reason why government should not participate in the redevelopment of the American city. Similarly, there is no good reason why private enterprise should not participate more fully and expertly than it is doing at present. Government could encourage this a great deal by granting tax rebates for property improvements, to name but one of many possibilities.

This, of course, would touch only a part of the problem. It is possible, as was suggested by an architect at the American Institute of Architects 1965 convention on the future of the city, that landowner corporations might be formed to make large-scale redevelopment projects both feasible and profitable, with development funds coming from both private and public sources.

SOLUTIONS THROUGH URBAN TECHNOLOGY

The technical issue is the present orientation of our urban technology. We have rarely used it to solve our massive problems of urban transportation—only to create them.

The size and scale of our cities are growing to a point that conventional cars and roads must, inevitably and soon, be considered obsolete as transportation tools of the 20th century. Thus, in our transportation plans we are turning to refinements of the train; in our transportation studies, we are considering new systems that combine the functions of private car and public train.

COMMUNITY COMMITMENT NEEDED

Finally, and perhaps most crucial of all, we urgently need the absolute commitment of the community leadership to this task if we are to make any significant progress. We have the resources in virtually every community to eliminate ugliness and create an efficient and beautiful environment. Government has the power to utilize programs available at Federal, State, and local levels. It has the power to make regulations and enact ordinances which control the use to which land can be put; it has the authority to launch large-scale design projects and to do many smaller but useful things such as regulating the size and appearance of store and street signs, establishing a municipal tree-planting program, and seeing to it that power lines are placed underground.

The city planning commission is generally the only agency with the authority to create the master plan which the progressive community needs to guide its development. The business leadership, with its demonstrated ability to get things done, is often the only cohesive element within the community which can provide the necessary inspiration, finances, and staying power. Architects and their fellow design professionals are the only ones who can provide the design skills needed to translate social and economic needs into structures, spaces, and beauty.

PUBLIC SUPPORT IS ESSENTIAL

Each of these three forces—local government, the business community, the architectural profession—has a second role to play. It is the common duty of each to help awaken the interest and then to educate and finally to enlist the continuing support of the public.

The American Institute of Architects, for example, has launched a nationwide war on community ugliness to awaken and inform the general public. Architects in 160 Institute chapters are being armed with technical information and promotional tools. We recently produced a major motion picture entitled "No Time For Ugliness." A series of "aesthetic responsibility" conferences has been held with business and government leaders in many communities throughout the Nation. Three filmstrips have been placed in thousands of high schools. We are planning a new program to create an appreciation of the urban environment in primary-grade children. All of these activities have been backed up by a continuing publicity effort in newspapers, magazines, and broadcast media.

Given an enlightened public, a sympathetic Government, and the unrelenting leadership of the business community, what is it that we can aspire to? We can create great compositions of urban design to remake the urban core, separate pedestrians and vehicular traffic, and attract people to the center of the city as we did many years ago at Rockefeller Center in New York and recently at Constitution Plaza in Hartford.

We can replace the gray areas around our midtown districts with greenbelts which rival the beauty of those in Stockholm. We can create great parks such as those of Rock Creek Park in Washington and the Boston Commons; shape delightful small parks and squares as we have done in San Francisco and Philadelphia; enhance the beauty of our small manmade waterways, as in San Antonio; and transform blighted and rundown streets into gay, stimulating malls, as those of Canton, Ohio, and Fresno, Calif.

We can at last create great outdoor spaces of the stature of the Spanish Steps, the Campidoglio, and St. Peter's Square in Rome; the Piazza San Marco in Venice; and the Place Vendome and Place de la Concorde in Paris. Such a great urban space is part of the Pennsylvania Avenue Plan for our Capital City.

We can create new, self-contained satellite towns with appropriately related houses, townhouses, apartment buildings, business structures, village centers, and open spaces, as is being done at Reston, Va.; Columbia, Md.; and Irvine Ranch, Calif. We can make dynamic plans for the redevelopment of great cities, as is being done in Detroit and Boston. And we can, as we have done in Canton, Fresno, and a few other places, demonstrate how well-designed benches, pools, trash baskets, telephone booths, street lighting fixtures, and textured pavements can enhance urban living in the most modest of circumstances and smallest of spaces. These cosmetic improvements are highly desirable, and can add gaiety and stimulation to the city. But they must not be confused with the need for large-scale design changes in our urban centers.

THE CITIES WE DESERVE

The city is the natural gathering place for our thinkers, our innovators, and our specialists. It is where education flourishes and art is born. It is the generator of our national wealth. There is no earthy reason why it should be dirty, dull, urgly, and generally unlivable. It should be, in fact, our greatest work of art.

It has been said that the values and accomplishments of any age can be measured by the quality of the architecture it leaves behind. Another way of saying this is that people get the kind of urban life they deserve. But if they never have a chance to know what city life can be like, then we cannot justly blame them for spending their lives in drab and ugly surroundings.

If, after experiencing urban beauty and stimulation, the Nation's citizens reject it at the polls and in their citizens' meetings and elect to ride through the neon jungle eating chicken-in-a-basket, we can say they got the ugly cities they deserve. But not until that day. It is our mission to give them the opportunity to make an informed choice. For myself, I have no doubt what it will be.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF MEDICARE ENROLLMENT PERIOD

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I have today asked my able and distinguished colleague from Delaware [Mr. Boggs] to add my name as a cosponsor to his bill S. 2882, which would amend title 18 of the Social Security Act to extend to June 30 the period for enrollment in the program of supplementary benefits for the aged as provided under part B of that title. This program is an important part of the medicare legislation which we enacted last year.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, despite the miracle of modern instantaneous communications, many older citizens who are eligible for the part B program do not realize that the deadline for enrollment in it, which is March 31, is virtually upon us. If they fail to sign up, they will have to wait 2 more years before they again become eligible.

In my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, many elderly people are not fully aware of the fact that there is more to medicare than the hospitalization program in which they have been automatically enrolled. Pennsylvania's able and compassionate secretary of public welfare, Arlin M. Adams, has told me that he has appeared on television several times in an effort to spread the word about the supplementary benefits of medicare and about the imminence of the March 31 deadline for signing up.

S. 2882 has been referred to the Committee on Finance. I respectfully urge its distinguished chairman, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] to schedule early consideration of this urgently needed measure. Meanwhile, I urge my fellow Pennsylvanians who are 65 or older to enroll in the part B program before the March 31 deadline.

VIETNAM VICTIMS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a revealing article entitled, "The People Beneath the War," by Raymond R. Coffey, appeared in a recent issue of the Nation magazine. Coffey has just returned from a 4-month reporting assignment in Vietnam for the Chicago Daily News.

This article, which is a straight piece of reporting, is one more illustration of the folly of our military commitment in southeast Asia, a folly the enormity of which will be increasingly apparent as this undeclared war goes on.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "The People Beneath the War," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The People Beneath the War

(By Raymond R. Coffey)

Representative Robert McClory, Republican, of Illinois, was winding up a 2-day visit to Vietnam when he was encountered one afternoon armed with a movie camera and loping down Saigon's Le Loi Boulevard in a late November downpour. One of the more obscure Members of the Illinois congressional delegation, McClory had dropped in for a firsthand look at the war as it can be seen from the well-traveled VIP path being worn into the Vietnamese terrain these days.

"I find the (Vietnamese) people range from indifferent to hostile," McClory began as he came in out of the rain, joining a reporter in the shelter of an arcade. "But things are going well for us," he concluded. Though he appeared oblivious to the paradox in what he said, McClory had neatly stated one of the saddest facts of the war.

Everyone talks about this being a political war in which the key to victory is, as the weariest cliche in Saigon goes, to "win the hearts and minds of the people." And yet, as the fighting grows in scale and intensity, there appears to be more and more inclination to judge progress in military terms alone. What's happening to the Vietnamese people, what they're getting out of it all, and what they think about the war appears to be of ever-diminishing concern.

The shooting war is coming to be such a full-time job that political and social problems get shuffled to the bottom of the pile. And, almost imperceptibly, people like McClory—and others with considerably more experience and responsibility in Saigon—develop the notion that the war can be going well even if the Vietnamese are indifferent, hostile, apathetic, or unhappy. The fact is, the long-suffering people have been given little reason to support the Government side of the war. The U.S. goal, supposedly, is to guarantee them liberty and an opportunity to establish some kind of free and representative government. But if the shooting stopped tomorrow, the populace of Vietnam would still be stuck with a military dictatorship, a system that is astonishingly corrupt and incompetent.

It's probably true, as U.S. officials in Saigon insist, that the military is the only organization in the country capable of running a government in the current situation. It is also perhaps true that the last thing the country needs for a while is another coup. But it does seem that, with all the leverage our economic and military presence gives us, the United States should be able to lean on the Saigon government a lot harder to make it more responsive to and more concerned with the people.

The Vietcong are hardly popular heroes, despite what many of the antiwar demonstrators at home appear to think. They can be harsh and terroristic, they conscript labor and troops by force, they bleed the peasantry for rice and taxes. But they do, as one U.S. counterinsurgency expert in Saigon put it, have an "image of morality" and they do promise the people a better life, even if they haven't delivered. That puts them far ahead of the Saigon regime, with its generals roaring around in big black limousines and their wives getting rich by speculating in real estate near American bases.

Premier Nguyen Cao Ky, the jaunty little air force general who heads the present government, is considered to be personally honest and to have a genuine concern for his country. His own position, however, is precarious and he is trapped with very little personal power in a sick system that almost daily gives the people another reason to doubt in victory and its rewards.

Several weeks ago the U.S. mission pulled its aid representatives out of Binh Tuy Province on the basis of evidence that the province chief, a Lt. Col. Pham Dinh Chi, had diverted to his own uses a substantial amount of U.S. money. The aid men also had reportedly been threatened with death if they exposed the situation. Ky hemmed and hawed for weeks under U.S. pressures to oust Chi. Finally he did—but only to give him another post in the defense ministry where the pickings may be even better.

The government also talks a good game of political freedom. Ky informs student groups, for example, that they are free to discuss and criticize the government. Anyone who takes him at his word is looking for trouble. "We are not going to have seminars [demonstrations] in the streets," Ky says. One of Saigon's English-language newspapers was recently slapped with a 5-day suspension because a censor decided that it was printing news stories comforting to the Vietcong. Anyone who shows promise of leadership or of developing a following is looked upon as a dangerous threat to the incumbents, instead of as an asset to a county that needs leaders as much as it needs peace.

Shortly before leaving Vietnam, I wrote a story about a political-social action project in one of Saigon's worst slum quarters. A small group of dedicated young army officers and government officials had persuaded Ky to let them try a new approach among the poor who are most vulnerable to the Vietcong and have the least reason to believe in the government. They had recruited hundreds of part-time student volunteers who were helping the people to build schools, establish dispensaries, organize hog-raising co-ops, even to hold unofficial hamlet elections to choose their own spokesmen. The project greatly interested the United States; it was a hopeful new effort to "win the hearts and minds of the people." Ky and U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge themselves had visited the project.

But less than 24 hours after the story about the project had gone through the government-run cable office, a young army lieutenant, who is one of the leaders of the project, was called upon by a representative of the national police and reprimanded for getting "too much personal publicity."

The Vietcong promise the people land reform and a better break in life. Now and then the Ky government talks about reforms, too, but mostly it simply lectures the people sternly about how it is everyone's duty to support the war and the government. No one bothers even to tell the people what they might expect in the way of improvement if and when the war ends.

"They (the government) don't trust the people," the young lieutenant who was reprimanded said. "The crisis in our country is that no one has confidence in anyone any more. We cannot have a (social) revolution just by changing the actors in the scenario. We must start at the bottom with the people." The people, according to the lieutenant, don't believe anything the government says. They want to see action—the kind of action they were getting from the student volunteers in the slum project—before they will start believing words again.

The most discouraging thing about the whole situation is that the government, from Saigon to the remotest district, is indifferent to what the people want or expect. Every province and district chief is appointed by Saigon and is a military man with command responsibilities, as well as civilian administrative duties. U.S. military and civilian representatives out in the country complain that often they have a hard time even getting their Vietnamese counterparts to stand around and look interested in village civic action programs, such as visits by American medical teams. The U.S. representatives take great pains to make it appear that such aid comes from and is arranged by the Vietnamese Government. But their efforts are often futile, because the local Vietnamese government man makes plain that he knows nothing about the program and cares less.

A U.S. adviser, giving one typical example, said that his district chief agreed to take part in a food and clothing distribution program only after he was permitted to take for his wife a few of the surplus WAC blouses that were to be distributed among the needy women of a village.

If, then, the job is winning over the people, it is a job that is going very badly. And, despite McClory and the U.S. military brass whose opinions he was obviously echoing, the military side of the war is not going a great deal better. It's perhaps true, as Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara says, that we've "stopped losing," but we're still a long, long way from winning, even militarily.

Astonishment is sometimes expressed that Hanoi does not seem exactly panting for the chance to negotiate. The reason seems plain enough; the other side is nowhere near convinced that it has lost all chances for victory. American and Vietnamese troops are inflicting tremendous casualties on the enemy. But our own losses are mounting, and, despite the thousands of enemy soldiers killed in the past year, enemy strength has grown. The Vietcong now control a greater part of the countryside than they did a year ago. Thus the Saigon Government is invisible and unknown in many areas of the country. How can people be persuaded to support something they can't even see, a government that offers them no security against the Vietcong?

The U.S. forces in Vietnam, now totaling around 200,000 men, are performing splendidly. They are brave, tough, resourceful, well motivated in battle. Beyond that, they generally exhibit more interest in and compassion for the people they're living amongst than does the Vietnamese Government. The same, unhappily, cannot be said of the Vietnamese military. They continue to suffer many more casualties than do the Americans, and that indicates something about their willingness to fight. However, many of their casualties still result from an apathetic unwillingness to learn the lessons of guerrilla warfare, and from a lack of aggressiveness and leadership among their officers.

The officer corps is very weak, excessively occupied with keeping Saigon happy and inclined to duck a fight. Vietnamese commanders are always more than ready to break off an engagement in time to get back to camp for lunch. They tend to look upon their jeeps as something they have been given to get their kids to and from school. Beyond all this, it is a fact that Americans don't really trust the Vietnamese who fight beside them. American commanders privately complain that security is often compromised as soon as the Vietnamese are informed of a military operation.

Another factor that weighs against the "things are going well" judgement of McClory and others is the massive increase in enemy arms and men being infiltrated from the north. The enemy is no longer a ragtag bunch of poorly armed guerrillas wearing black pajamas and wondering where their next bowl of rice is coming from. In the recent major battles in the Ia Drang Valley, for example, the U.S. 1st Air Cavalry Division tangled with North Vietnamese regulars who were well equipped and well armed with Russian and Chinese weapons, including a high proportion of automatic weapons that can be deadly against low-flying aircraft. The enemy troops were carrying, in many cases, a basic load of 120 rounds of ammunition per man. That is more than a whole platoon of Vietcong guerrillas would often have in days not long past.

The one great weapon we have that the enemy still lacks is air power. But air power, the way it is being used in this war, is not always an asset. There have been many calls for an end to the bombing of North Vietnam, but it appeared to some in Vietnam that a more urgent problem was restricting the "in-country" bombing of South Vietnam.

Our pilots have done a magnificent job of providing close air support for troops engaged with the enemy on the ground. And no one argues with the use of air power in those situations. However, there are also hundreds of air strikes every day against villages and other targets "suspected" of harboring the Vietcong in cases where there is no ground engagement. Thus one day just outside Saigon six Vietcong were reported seen among a string of thatch huts lining a canal. Hours later, long after the enemy had left, I rode along with a forward air controller in a light Cessna who directed a flight of eight Skyraider dive bombers in an attack on the target. Four huts were destroyed, four were damaged and huge black craters were torn in the surrounding rice paddies. Should it take eight airplanes and thousands of pounds of bombs to knock out eight flimsy huts? And what evidence was there really that the huts and rice paddies were owned by the Vietcong?

On another day, a paratroop unit approaching a small village drew half a dozen rounds of small-arms sniper fire. The unit halted and called in an air and artillery strike that level the village. It seemed an extraordinary response to a few rounds of sniper fire, and one not likely to "win the hearts and minds" of any innocent civilians in the village.

Many of the Vietnamese jamming the refugee camps all over the country make clear that they came into the government areas not out of any particular fondness for the government and not to escape the Vietcong, but to get out from under our bombs. Top military authorities in Saigon say great care and discrimination is exercised in selecting targets. But some of the top counterinsurgency experts in the U.S. mission, and some of the advisers working out in the countryside, still believe the "in-country" bombings in some cases are hurting our cause among the uncommitted people.

But, as Congressman McClory's distressingly innocent comments made so discouragingly plain, there are people who somehow believe the war can be going well regardless of what the Vietnamese people think or feel or want.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF BUREAU OF RECLAMATION IN 1965

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in this year of water shortages in so many areas of our Nation, and with our growing awareness of the clear and present danger of food shortages resulting from the population explosion, a report from the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, summarizing its accomplishments during 1965, will be of interest to all of the Members of the Senate.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I ask unanimous consent to have this summary report printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the summary report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Reclamation Bureau's 1965 Accomplishments Summarized in Statistical Report

Accomplishments of the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation during fiscal year 1965 played a significant role in establishing the new high level attained by the economy of the Western States and the Nation, Reclamation Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy said yesterday.

The agency chief made this comment in connection with releasing statistics on operations of the Bureau during the 12-month period ending June 30, 1965.

A highlight of achievement during the year was completion of Glen Canyon Dam on the Colorado River in Arizona. The second highest dam in the United States, Glen Canyon won the Outstanding Engineering Achievement Award—1964, which is presented annually by the American Society of Civil Engineers to "the engineering project that demonstrates the greatest engineering skills and represents the greatest contribution to civil engineering and mankind."

The multipurpose dam is the principal feature of the farflung Colorado River storage project, and revenues from its powerplant will pay the lion's share of the cost of the entire project, including the participating projects. The reservoir behind Glen Canyon Dam, Lake Powell, with its unique, beautiful scenery and its many-faceted outdoor sports opportunities, has already become one of the leading recreation areas in the Nation.

The other five dams completed in 1965 are: Norman Dam on Little River in Oklahoma; Clark Canyon Dam on Beaverhead River in Montana; Cheney Dam on the North Fork of the Ninnescah in Kansas; Norton Dam on Prairie Dog Creek in the Republican River Basin in Kansas; and the Willard Dam on Bear River in Utah.

These bring to 216 the number of Bureau storage dams and dikes. The reservoirs behind the structures have a total capacity of nearly 127 million acre-feet of water, or more than 40 trillion gallons.

The water stored in these lakes, when they are full, would be sufficient to supply all the water needs of every man, woman, and child in the United States for approximately 3 years.

During 1965 the Bureau of Reclamation also completed power facilities capable of generating 450,000 kilowatts. It operated 48 hydropower plants with a combined capacity of 6,248,800 kilowatts of electricity, and from these and 6 other federally operated plants it marketed more than 33 billion kilowatt-hours, realizing revenues of $100.9 million from the sales and other power income.

Reclamation's benefits to recreational opportunities and fish and wildlife enhancement were also cited by Commissioner Dominy, who said that 34.3 million visitor-days were recorded during the 1964 tourist season at 210 recreation areas on reclamation projects.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICES

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, when we created the Community Relations Service in 1964, we did so in the belief that one of the major hurdles in implementing the Civil Rights Act would be in the field of public accommodations, primarily in the South. This has not developed as we had anticipated.

We placed the Community Relations Service in the Department of Commerce because we felt it would be an instrument for assistance in public accommodations compliance, and the Commerce Department would be an appropriate place to carry out this mission. Now experience has shown that the Community Relations Service has not had to devote nearly as much of its efforts to conciliating disputes over public accommodations discrimination as we had expected.

The experience of the Service also has shown that there is an area where the Service increasingly has been called upon to provide assistance. And that is the area of our large urban centers where racial problems are on the rise. Just about everyone who has been concerned with the problem foresees now that this trend is likely to continue. Our legal instruments for dealing with racial problems are, of course, lodged in the Department of Justice. And just as we turned here for law enforcement when the problems were centered mainly in the South, Northern problems also land in the Attorney General's office. Unhappily, the problems that beset urban and Northern areas cannot always be approached through law enforcement.

As the Attorney General and his staff more and more ponder what they can and cannot do in these broadening areas, let us provide them with an alternative. Let us place the Community Relations Service where it can best function in the light of our emerging needs. Let us place it closer to the frequent point of entry of most of Federal Government's concern in civil rights matters. Let us equip this Government so that it can carry out its responsibilities in the most flexible, coordinated and swiftest manner.

AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is indeed a privilege for me to join our distinguished colleague of Kentucky, Senator Cooper, in cosponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 133 designating February of every year as American History Month.

Today our greatest concern is the struggle for freedom in Vietnam. Our heritage demands the presence of American boys in that distant country. My concern is that some Americans are not fully aware of this heritage and why it requires that we honor our commitments in foreign lands. Setting aside 1 month out of the year to recognize American history will emphasize its importance and relevance to current affairs.

In the history of mankind, this country has played a recent but nonetheless vital and significant role. Here man has found freedom and has established a form of government to secure that freedom. Here man has found economic freedom and has devised an economic system to perpetuate that freedom. Here man has found freedom of opportunity and has organized a social order in which he has been able to extend this freedom to all levels of society.

This is the story of American history, a story which does not grow old with its retelling.

It was just 200 years ago that the liberties which we take for granted today were few indeed. This establishment and growth of freedom, which is the history of America, must be understood to be defended. As a writer once said, it is necessary that freedom be won by each generation of Americans or it will die. In order to win freedom anew, each generation must be vitally aware of its heritage and have such a stake in its preservation that they will offer their lives if necessary in freedom's defense.

Making February American History Month will stimulate a greater interest in our history in all parts of the country. Local and State historical associations and private individuals could effectively advance programs to stimulate and to further this interest generated by a Presidential proclamation.

February is the ideal month. It is the birth month of two of our greatest Presidents—George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. Both of these men played monumental roles in the establishment of this Nation, Washington as the father of our country and Lincoln, who kept the Nation united and who helped to bind up the Nation's wounds after a bitter Civil War. It is difficult to imagine what the United States would have become had not these men come to the front to guide the Nation through turbulent times. February is also the month in which the U.S. Supreme Court held its first session back in 1790 when John Jay was the Chief Justice.

One historian reminds us that "out of the world of yesterday the world of today has grown; out of the world of today will come the world of tomorrow." Mr. President, how true those words are. Knowledge of the past is a prerequisite to wise action in the present. And the actions which we take today will determine the future of tomorrow.

With this compelling obligation to know the past and to understand the consequences of our actions upon the future, it is right that renewed interest in American history is encouraged and stimulated.

We have been counseled that those who fail to know the past are doomed to relive it. Designating February as American History Month is a proper response to that counsel.

History teachers in schools throughout this country have continued to play their essential role in exposing young people to the American story. American History Month would serve to call attention to this profession and its vital work. It would give recognition to those dedicated men and women whose labors in the classroom are so necessary to freedom's preservation. They have our deepest appreciation for a job well done. American History Month would be an expression of our gratitude and assist their future efforts.

It is indeed satisfying to me to join Senator COOPER in his proposal that February be designated American History Month.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I commend the selection of the new name for this program—food for freedom. It grows logically out of the history of the program.

You may recall that when the food aid program was originally established, it was known almost entirely by its legislative designation—Public Law 480—and still is so known by many of the people associated with it.

But the people of the United States do not think in numbers—they think in meaningful concepts. So the name food for peace came into being as a fuller means of identifying the food aid program. It has been a fine name, a useful name. It is known by millions of Americans and by people all over the world.

Now, however, we are proposing to expand the program—to meet a greater depth of human needs. Food for peace does not fully delineate the new concept and the new framework of the expanded program. We need a name that indicates our broadened thinking and aspirations.

So the President has given us a new name—food for freedom. It suggests a program designed to meet the needs of the ultimate human aspiration: personal dignity under free institutions.

A STUDY OF DURHAM RATIONALE COMMITMENTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a controversy has been evident for some time in the District of Columbia regarding the so-called insanity test, or test of criminal responsibility established by the Durham decision written in 1954 by Judge David L. Bazelon of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

I have received complaints from both professional people and private citizens in Washington, charging that too many of these insanity acquittals take place on the basis of the Durham rule.

I have heard charges that too many criminals are back on the streets too soon after a brief stay at the St. Elizabeths Hospital for the mentally ill.

I have heard numerous proposals for changing the Durham rule.

And I have even heard suggestions and recommendations that we go back to the M'Naghten test of knowledge of right and wrong in determining criminal responsibility of mentally disturbed offenders.

As you know, under the Durham rationale a person is held not responsible for a criminal act if at the time of commission of the act he suffered from a mental disease or defect, and if the act was a product of such disease or defect.

I am very concerned about the complaints concerning this rule.

I am concerned because whatever we do in controlling crime and delinquency in the Nation's Capital has wide repercussions throughout the rest of the country.

I am concerned because I believe that our Capital City must have the best, the most enlightened methods of crime control and the most advanced procedures for the administration of justice.

And I am concerned because the mental patient and his status under criminal law constitute a problem that has defied solution throughout history; indeed, it is a problem that remains unresolved even today.

Mr. President, because I consider the Durham decision a remarkable step forward in the administration of justice, I do not want to see this advance dismissed lightheartedly. I do not want us to adopt less satisfactory procedures because of peripheral rather than substantial difficulties involved in maintaining this one. I do not want the courts to revert to injustice because it is too difficult or too expensive or too inconvenient to make justice work.

To avert these dangers, I have studied the Durham rationale. I have studied the court procedure and have deliberated the insanity defense as it is seen by jurists, psychiatrists, and other specialists in the field of crime control. I, and staff members of the committee, have gone to the Metropolitan Police; we have talked to the professional staff of the St. Elizabeths Hospital, and we have asked the Federal Bureau of Investigation to check its files regarding the subsequent behavior of individuals who have invoked the "Durham rule" in the District courts.

We have done all this because I want to make certain that we do not condemn the Durham rationale for the wrong reasons.

We have done this because I consider the Durham rule more than just a rule of procedure or just a test of criminal responsibility.

We have done this because I suspect that the Durham decision has brought to the fore certain basic difficulties involved in using the insanity defense.

I believe that it has illuminated difficulties and raised questions which were hidden from view under the older insanity rules. These are questions that go to the very heart of the matter of determining who is legally insane and of proving it in court.

Under other insanity rules, these basic problems are often obscured by definitions of terms, by rules of procedure, by instructions to the jury, and by attitudes of the court and the law which are still imbedded in the age-old "classical" approach to crime that presumes, in all but the most extreme cases involving complete lunatics, that man's behavior is always governed by free will.

I do not want to belabor the free will question, but I believe that these are difficulties and problems connected with the insanity defense that should not be "swept under the rug" by rearranging unclear definitions and burdensome court procedures.

The Durham rule and our experience with it has confronted us with certain questions that need broader answers and with problems that require more basic solutions than are supplied by even such alleged refinements of the decision as those contained in the case of McDonald against United States, which raises standards for some evidence of insanity introduced by the defendant, lessens the burden to prove sanity for the Government and simplifies the causal connection between mental disease and crime.

I believe that these redefinitions and reformulations may have some value. However, I want to make certain that we do not attempt to eliminate substantive problems going beyond matters of definition and procedure with superficial solutions confined to definition and procedure.

It is true that today we still do not know exactly what to do with the psychiatrist in court. We do not know how to make the jury understand psychiatric testimony and most important of all we do not know how to bring legal and medical concepts in line with one another to serve the cause of justice rather than to frustrate the court.

Today we may deliberate the burden of proof issue and we may note the difficulties involved in explaining to the jury the meaning of such terms as "productivity," "substantial capacity," and other similar concepts. These are problems of definition and procedure.

But beyond this there is an even more basic problem. We do not know how many crimes are actually caused by mental disease or defect of the individual, nor do we have a standard of comparison by which we can judge whether the insanity plea is used excessively, or whether it is not used enough.

All we know today is that this society has recognized some offenders as being so mentally disturbed that they cannot be held responsible for their criminal behavior.

Should we persist in this recognition, it seems imperative that we exert our juridical and crime control efforts with respect to mentally disturbed offenders in two ways.

First, we should abolish obviously inadequate or erroneous tests of criminal responsibility or of insanity as such inadequacies or errors are discovered and reported by experts in the field of psychiatry and jurisprudence. A classical example of such inadequate tests is the "knowledge of right and wrong" test established by the M'Naghten decision.

Second, in order to assure protection for the public and justice for the defendant, in testing criminal responsibility we should rely more on psychiatric examinations in hospitals by staffs of experts than on legal maneuvering and manipulations in court. We should attempt to identify all mentally ill or defective offenders.

What I am saying is that we should be more concerned with determining whether or not an offender is mentally incompetent than with inventing techniques, definitions, and procedural devices to keep insanity pleas to the minimum.

In line with this, I believe that the test of the effectiveness of an insanity rule should not be established by counting the individuals who use the insanity plea in court, but it must rather be established by gaging the behavior of these offenders subsequent to their release from the mental hospital. These are important considerations in the overall picture because of imperfections both in our scientific knowledge in psychiatry on the one hand and in our legal concepts and court procedures on the other.

The thin line between criminal responsibility and irresponsibility because of mental disease is not always clearly visible.

Thus, we are confronted with questions of policy regarding how we want to react to marginal cases. It seems that the general public and certain segments of the legal profession and law enforcement would like to treat them as criminals rather than as patients.

And yet, if we send even marginal cases to the mental hospital and rehabilitate them so that they no longer break the law, we have scored a success.

On the other hand, if we send such marginal cases to prison, they may come back to haunt society after their release, more mentally disturbed, more irresponsible, and more crime prone than ever before, because whatever the prison does to men, it does not cure mental illness.

This is the type of reasoning which has led me to support in principle a rather general and inclusive rule of criminal responsibility instead of a narrow and restrictive one.

This is the type of reasoning that has led me to undertake a study of the extent of lawbreaking by individuals released from St. Elizabeths Hospital subsequent to a mandatory commitment after an insanity defense.

The important thing is to render the dangerous person harmless. And it is best to do this by correction rather than simply by incarceration.

I have attempted to determine to what extent the Durham rule offenders contribute to the crime problem here in the District subsequent to their release from a mental hospital. I have tried to determine what steps must be taken to protect the community from the violent and destructive acts of mentally disturbed persons, and what must be done in turn to protect these sick people from gross injustice and mistreatment because of a lack of understanding on the part of law enforcement officers, the administrators of justice, and the public.

We found that between 1954 and 1961, 324 persons were committed to St. Elizabeths Hospital after the court found their crimes to be "products" of mental disease or defect under the Durham rationale. From these 324, 116 who were subsequently released from the hospital became the subject of the subcommittee's inquiry.

During these 7 years, insanity acquittals under the Durham rule increased from 4 in 1954, to 110 in 1960, which was the peak year. The number of successful insanity defenses dropped to 90 in 1961 and have ranged annually between 50 and 90 through 1965. Many critics pointed to the initial overall increase as proof that mentally competent criminals were using the insanity plea as a device to evade the law. However, I submit that these figures have no real meaning since they neither show that some of the insanity pleas were unwarranted nor do they show that the insanity defense has been used to excess.

The statistics we obtained are not spectacularly revealing because they lack a standard of comparison. However, certain insights can be gained from a closer look at the figures.

A repeated complaint has been that the Durham rule offenders who are released prematurely contribute seriously to the crime problem in the District of Columbia. Some complaints went so far as to ascribe the mounting crime rate in this city in large part to the releases from St. Elizabeths.

I would like to rebut this as an irrational and largely groundless contention. The 50-or-so offenders that were involved with police subsequent to their release from St. Elizabeths, and this study covers a decade, hardly compose even an appreciable segment of the thousands of offenders tried in the District courts during this same period of time.

Another charge has been that one inducement to plead insanity might arise from the knowledge that the mandatory commitment to St. Elizabeths Hospital can be expected to last for a shorter period of time than a respective commitment to a Federal penitentiary.

The records show that for 26 persons acquitted under Durham for felonies, the mean period of incarceration was 15.2 months, and the median was 10.4 months. For 12 persons acquitted of misdemeanors, the mean period of incarceration was 10.5 months and the median was 8.0 months. Had these persons been found guilty and sentenced to a penal institution, they could expect to have been incarcerated for substantially longer periods of time. Such crimes as housebreaking and larceny carry penalties of 2 to 4 years, while robbery carries a penalty of 4 to 5 years.

If such statistics were known to defense attorneys and defendants themselves, this might induce some to rely on an insanity defense. On the other hand, the stigma attached to such a plea and the subsequently uncertainty regarding the length of hospitalization could just as easily discourage its use in other cases.

Another set of statistics obtained from the Federal Bureau of Investigation which are important for a broad evaluation of the Durham rule, concerns the subsequent behavior of the 116 persons released from St. Elizabeths Hospital. We found that 54 of these persons, or 46.5 percent, had been subsequently involved with law enforcement agencies at the time our study was concluded. Records indicate that 28 of these 54 releasees were arrested on felony charges, while 35 were arrested for misdemeanors. In addition, 10 of these individuals were charged both with felonies and misdemeanors. Thus, between them, these 54 individuals were arrested 63 times for a total of 48 felony charges and 87 misdemeanor charges.

I felt it would be significant to determine how the subsequent crimes of these 54 individuals compared with the original offenses which resulted in their insanity pleas and commitment to St. Elizabeths Hospital. We found that 18 individuals were charged with more serious types of crimes than those for which they went to court in the first instance; 18 of them were charged with approximately the same type of crime as before, and 18 were involved in less serious types of crimes. The average period of time between release from St. Elizabeths and the commission of the first offense was 1 year; 30 persons committed their first subsequent offense in 1 year or less; 20 persons from 1 to 3 years; 4 persons after 3 years or more.

In an effort to obtain as complete a picture as possible, we also submitted the Durham case names to the Metropolitan Police Records Bureau. From this check, we obtained relatively detailed information regarding 38 of the 54 persons handled by the Metropolitan Police Department. It is of some importance that 25 of them had felony and misdemeanor arrests and convictions before their insanity pleas and their commitment to St. Elizabeths Hospital. Subsequent to their release from the hospital, 10 of these 38 persons were charged with more serious offenses than the ones which led to their insanity plea; 14 persons were charged with the same type of crime and 14 others were charged with lesser offenses. The District figures are not in addition to, but are included in the figures supplied us by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

In reviewing these figures with respect to judging the effectiveness of the Durham rule, one must conclude that they are somewhat inconclusive. The 46.5 percent of those St. Elizabeths inmates sentenced under Durham who have subsequently been charged with crime compares well with the much higher percentage of repeaters among inmates released from State and Federal penitentiaries. The increasing use of the insanity defense under Durham likewise seems a normal manifestation of a new law or procedure. It can probably be viewed as an expected growth occurring as defense attorneys and defendants become gradually familiar with the new defense.

Most of the figures we have obtained do not indict the Durham rule.

However, these figures do reveal a problem.

They show that certain potentially dangerous individuals find their way into society before they are cured, rehabilitated or made harmless to society in still some other way.

They show that close to a half of the Durham rule offenders released from St. Elizabeths are charged with subsequent offenses.

I note these figures because the primary purpose of our legal and correctional procedures is the protection of the public, protection of the men, women, and children on this city's streets, in our schools, in our homes, and on our playgrounds.

And, if we are to carry out this responsibility, we must make sure that all individuals who are dangerous to others are rendered harmless.

But we must make sure that in reaching for this goal, we do not bark up the wrong tree. We must make sure that we do not attack the law when the deficiency, may lie elsewhere, for example, in the release procedures from our institutions.

I believe that in evaluating the effectiveness of the insanity defense established under the Durham rule, we must be concerned with what happens to the offender before and after court, rather than what happens in court.

The following are my suggestions on the basis of the study I have carried out as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency:

I see no justification for a dramatic modification of the Durham rule, or as is sometimes suggested, for a return to the M'Naghten rule. The argument has been advanced that the language of the Durham rule is confusing to the jury, that it does not give concrete guidance to the jury, although there is some clarification under the more recent case of McDonald against the United States.

Mr. President, I believe that mental disease is a complex and intricate matter and we cannot make it simple and understandable to everyone just by inventing simple words or phrases to describe it.

I must emphasize once more that in criminal cases where insanity is used as a defense, we will have to rely more and more on the examination of experts regarding the substantive aspects of the case and less on litigation.

We may even have to force the psychiatric witness to decide the case, as it were, but we will not achieve justice by merely reducing our psychiatric and legal concepts to such simple and concrete terms or definitions that they can be understood by lay jurors, but at the same time no longer portray the true complexities of the factors involved in the case.

I believe that the Durham rule must be maintained because, with all its shortcomings, it is far superior to the M'Naghten test of criminal responsibility. If we retreat from this advance in our legal practice, we are playing a game in our courts according to arbitrarily established rules rather than according to the facts set forth by a reputable and growing science of human behavior.

I want to emphasize, however, that handling mentally ill offenders as patients rather than as criminals does not absolve us from our responsibility to protect the public. We must recognize that a mental patient can be as dangerous as the most deliberately vicious hired killer of the underworld.

I cited figures showing that 46.5 percent of offenders committed to St. Elizabeths Hospital under the Durham rule and subsequently released have been arrested again and charged with an offense. I also have figures which show that a considerable number of persons have escaped from the hospital and have been arrested and charged with an offense.

These figures do not signify that the Durham rule should be abolished or that it is ineffective. But they do signify that the security measures at St. Elizabeths Hospital or any other facility handling dangerous mental patients must be similar in some respects to those maintained in prisons.

In line with this, I think it is of the utmost importance that the administration of St. Elizabeths Hospital have the necessary staff, facilities, and resources to establish adequate security, classification, and evaluation measures. The director of the hospital should be able to maintain court-committed patients in the institution until such time as they are pronounced sufficiently cured by the staff of experts retained by the hospital.

I hope that the administration of the hospital and the Metropolitan Police Department can maintain sufficient liaison and cooperation so that we do not have to be confronted with the situation we have seen in the past where the hospital did not know that some of its inmates who had escaped were rearrested and the police were not aware that the persons they arrested were escapees from the hospital.

I recommend that if the necessary security measures cannot be adopted to general mental hospitals, funds should be made available to build special new facilities either at the hospitals or separate from them to house mentally disturbed offenders subsequent to a court commitment. By definition, a mentally ill person must be committed to an institution for an indeterminate period of time. We owe the public the protection of keeping him there until cured. Conceivably, some such patients must remain in the institution for life.

In my support of the principles contained within the Durham rule, I do not fail to recognize that some difficulty is involved concerning the burden-of-proof question. It has been said that since the prosecution needs to prove sanity, while the defense does not actually have to prove insanity, many offenders who plead on this issue are committed to a hospital not because they are in fact insane, but rather because the prosecution could not prove otherwise beyond a reasonable doubt.

We can appreciate the logic in this argument. However, there is no question in my mind that we must go beyond this type of logic.

First, let me stress that if we can rely at all on the competence of psychiatrists we can rely on their ability to reflect a patient's mental disease in their expert testimony, despite the fact that many times they are unable to indicate the depth and intricacy of the ailment.

Second, let me stress that if we can more effectively return a disturbed person to a normal life through means other than penal commitment we have achieved our objective.

We are increasingly proposing laws that provide treatment to criminal offenders in place of penal commitment and punishment. A case in point is the administration's Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1965, which is presently before a special judiciary subcommittee of which I am chairman.

The individuals covered under these proposals are not insane by any conventional definition of the concept of insanity.

Yet, we are committing them for treatment because their crimes are often, we feel, products of a mental or emotional condition over which they have little control. There are I am sure other types of offenders who could be effectively rehabilitated by procedures other than those which are strictly punitive.

Therefore, I would not question the kind of leniency that allows marginal cases to be handled as mental patients rather than as willful criminals.

However, if we want to protect the public from destructive acts of mentally disturbed persons, and I believe this is our foremost obligation, then failing to put them in prison as we do with convicted felons, we must keep them in sufficiently secure institutions as if they were felons. And we must make certain that when they are released, the hospital records show substantial cause for proclaiming them cured or rehabilitated.

I believe this is a sound procedure because it affords protection to the public and it gives the treatment to the mental patient which he would not receive in a penal correctional institution.

I believe this procedure is by far sounder than the "ostrich approach" of sending mentally diseased men and women to prison, hoping that they will be miraculously cured and rehabilitated in a place we know to be traditionally incapable of producing such resurrections.

Mr. President, to help carry out these suggestions on a nationwide basis and to determine additional ways of handling persons whose crimes are found to be products of mental diseases or defects or other special conditions, I propose that a conference be held under the auspices of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, including representatives of the bar, the medical profession, the judiciary, law enforcement agencies and the staffs of mental and correctional institutions to review and evaluate present policies and procedures for implementing the Durham rule and other tests of criminal responsibility especially in light of the experiences in this regard in the District of Columbia.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT OF 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators CASE, HART, JAVITS, MORSE, MCNAMARA, PROXMIRE, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, DODD, MCCARTHY, SCOTT, YOUNG of Ohio, HARTKE, NEUBERGER, BAYH, NELSON, RIBICOFF, MCINTYRE, MONDALE, and KENNEDY of New York, I introduce the Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966.

We had hoped, when the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 were passed, those acts would be the last for a period of time that it would be necessary for Congress to pass in the field of civil rights.

What has happened is that, despite the judicial findings of the Federal courts and despite the affirmations by Congress in the form of legislation, it has become extremely difficult for individuals to advocate their constitutional rights in certain sections of the South. In fact over a large portion of the country, men and women do not feel free in asserting their legal and constitutional rights.

NEED FOR BILL

It is not my purpose today to call the roll of the brutalities and murders which have been committed, nor cite the instances in which juries have refused to convict when the evidence would seem to the outsider to be clear, or to go into too much detail and discussion of the composition of those jurors and of the influences which were being brought to bear upon them.

I have assembled a large number of such cases and, if challenged, they can be submitted. But in the some 17 years in which I have debated this issue on the floor of the Senate and spoken about it to the country, I have been careful not to use any language which might inflame the passions or set one race against another or one section of the country against another.

I know that this is a real world, and that passions exist and the injustices occur, and; as a human being, I, like the vast majority of my fellow Americans, feel keenly about these issues. However, I believe we have been successful in conducting the discussion in the Senate on the basis of logic, with a minimum appeal to the emotion-arousing instances which could be multiplied at great length.

DIFFICULT TO ASSERT RIGHTS

Nevertheless, we as Senators cannot pretend to be ignorant of what as men we know is real. We read the newspapers. We have friends over the country. We talk to aggrieved parties. We even have friends in the South. And so we know what has been going on. What has been happening has been that it is a matter of great risk, in certain sections of the South—I do not say in all—for people to assert their constitutional rights, and excessively difficult, even when the case is overwhelming, to get action in State courts, and sometimes in Federal courts.

Those are the clear facts of the situation. They can be documented in great detail. I am not indicting any section of the country. The great crime of slavery, and for that crime we have been paying for a century after the abolition of slavery, has poisoned the relationships of people, not merely in the South, but over wide areas of the rest of the country as well. We in the North are not at all sinless in this respect.

I have often said that if the situation were reversed the people in the North would not behave any better than the people in the South and would have acted in a similar way.

The bill, which 20 of us have introduced today, is a relatively simple bill. It is designed to assure due process of law and the equal protection of the laws where crimes of intimidation, violence, and murder against Negroes and civil rights workers lawfully seeking to enforce the Constitution now go unpunished. I emphasize the words "lawfully seeking to enforce the Constitution."

The bill would carry out many of the proposals of the Civil Rights Commission.

In going over the report of the Commission on Civil Rights, I would say that virtually every enforcement provision of the present bill merely carries out a recommendation previously made by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. I have on my desk the report for 1963 and the report for 1965.

IMPROVE JURY SELECTION

In the first place, the bill is designed to improve the selection of juries in both State and Federal courts. Jury lists are sometimes manipulated in a strange way to obtain virtually all white juries or such overwhelmingly white juries as to make any other representation merely token and of no account. It provides for a representative cross section of the population on jury lists, and to avoid discrimination on grounds of race or color in the selection of juries.

That is buttressed by provisions which would set up jury commissions in each Federal district court, which would put into effect a sampling plan subject to the approval of the Director of the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts, which would furnish a representative cross section of the population of the Federal district without exclusion on the basis of race, color, sex, religious or political affiliation, or economic or social status.

In addition, literacy tests are banned for Federal juries, but the judge may exclude illiterate jurors from particular cases where reading is a significant factor, except that no person shall be excluded on this ground who has completed the sixth grade in an English-language school.

CAN APPLY TO STATE COURTS

With regard to the State courts, when a Federal district court finds that there has been discrimination on the ground of race or color, the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts would take over and would administer the selection of juries under the Federal system created by this act, and he might use the Federal jury list if that were practical. In other words, discrimination on grounds of race or color is the trigger for Federal action, but where this discrimination is found, the jury rules for fair juries apply.

These can be ordered into effect only by a Federal judge and upon appeal of the Attorney General. Of course, the assistance of the Bureau of Census can be called upon in the preparation of representative cross-sections.

JURISDICTION OF AND REMOVAL TO FEDERAL COURTS

The second feature is an important one because it makes it possible for the Federal courts to have jurisdiction of certain crimes when Federal prosecution is necessary to assure equal protection of the laws. That may seem to some of those who read the RECORD, as well as to those who are listening to my speech, to be a very radical proposal, but I would like to read from the report of the Civil Rights Commission for 1963, page 125, recommendation No. 4. The Commission recommended:

> That Congress amend section 1443 of title 28 of the United States Code to permit removal by the defendant of a State civil action or criminal prosecution to a District Court of the United States in cases where the defendant cannot, in the State court, secure his civil rights because of the written or decisional laws of the State or because of the acts of individuals administering or affecting its judicial process.

So, we are merely carrying into effect the very important recommendation on this point by the Civil Rights Commission That was a unanimous recommendation.

If we may put this in simple terms, if a county or other political subdivision should exclude Negroes from juries, or deny the voting process to them, or otherwise discriminate in the administration of justice, State crimes against Negroes or civil rights workers would be triable in Federal court. But in order to give the Federal court jurisdiction there must be proof of such a segregated system of justice and, in the second place, a certificate by the Attorney General of the United States that prosecution in the Federal court would fulfill the responsibility of the U.S. Government to assure equal protection of the laws.

Under similar circumstances, the Attorney General may remove to Federal court a case which has already been commended in a State court. These provisions last for only 10 years and expire on the 1st of January 1975, or perhaps more technically speaking, 10 years after the date of enactment of this measure.

I hope that this will stimulate the States to purify their own jury systems and to improve their own systems of justice so that the transfer of jurisdiction need not occur in many cases, but will be held back in reserve and can be employed if the States and the civil subdivisions thereof continue to be derelict.

BROADENS FEDERAL OFFENSES

This title would also amend section 241 of the United States Code to broaden Federal offenses in the area of civil rights. It is believed that this broadening of Federal offenses may be the less important part of the title. The killer of a civil rights worker ought to be tried for the crime of murder rather than for depriving someone of his constitutional rights. Basically, that is what this title does.

EXTENSION OF OLD PART III

In addition, we have part III, which provides civil preventive relief to those who exercise rights under the 14th amendment to the Constitution. In a sense, this is the old title III or part III of the 1957 bill, which was debated before this body for many weeks, and upon which there was a rather close vote. It permits an individual or the Attorney General to obtain injunctions against violations of constitutional rights. This is now true in many circumstances, such as segregation in the schools, segregation in public facilities, the denial of voting rights, and the rest; but the proposed authority would also provide protection against police violence and private violence, and do it in advance, rather than to have, as so often occurs at present, futile subsequent trials, almost universally resulting in acquittal.

REMOVAL OF DEFENDANTS

The fourth title provides for the removal of defendants in certain cases from State to Federal district courts. This is where a county or other political subdivision provides a segregated and discriminatory system of justice.

Where a county or other political subdivision provides a segregated and discriminatory system of justice, those who attack Negroes and civil rights workers have almost universally done so with impunity, and Negroes and civil rights workers who themselves are charged with crime have not received fair trials.

Just as title II of this bill provides for the prosecution in the Federal courts of those who attack Negroes and civil rights workers in areas of segregated justice, so title IV permits the removal to Federal courts by Negroes and civil rights workers who are subjected to prosecution in such areas.

CIVIL INDEMNIFICATION

A somewhat novel feature is introduced by title V, which I think is crucial. It provides for civil indemnification awards by a Federal board in certain cases where a person is injured in his person or property or is deprived of his life while he is lawfully exercising rights protected by the Constitution. This would be done by creating an indemnification board within the Civil Rights Commission to indemnify persons killed or injured or who have lost their property because of lawful civil rights activities. Just as the Federal Government assists those who have served their country, and just as States provide compensation for injured workmen, so those hurt in the struggle for civil rights should also be compensated.

Under this title, the Federal Government would make payments to the injured person and would then have the right to collect such payments from the person who caused the injury and from the State or political subdivision where the injury was caused by a person acting under color of law.

The idea that persons injured by unlawful acts should be allowed to bear the full burden of their losses, physical and financial, is being gradually replaced by the idea that the community owes some responsibility to those people. This proposal is an attempt to apply that principle to the field of civil rights.

FEPC EXTENDED TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Title VI provides that the FEPC provisions of the 1964 Civil Rights Act shall now be made applicable to State and local governmental units. It is only by integrating State and local personnel engaged in the administration of justice that equal protection of the laws can be made a reality.

BROAD SUPPORT OF PROVISIONS NEED IS GREAT

As I have said, the Civil Rights Commission supports most of these provisions.

A recent study by the Southern Regional Council cites 93 deaths between 1955 and 1965.

The American Friends Service Committee, the National Council of Churches, and the Southern Regional Council have documented more than 500 cases of violence from January 1961, to May 1965.

The Civil Rights Commission reports 150 serious racial incidents in Mississippi.

The NAACP has forwarded hundreds of complaints to the Department of Justice.

I do not call the roll of these complaints, for the reasons I have mentioned; but the solid evidence indicates that there is a need for action. It may be that not every feature of the bill is perfect, but I hope that it will be seriously considered, not only by the appropriate committee, but also by the general public, and that we shall recognize the deep practical problem which underlies this whole matter.

We sometimes say that justice delayed is justice denied; but justice which operates under the threat of fear, intimidation, physical violence, and the rest is a justice which largely tends to be inoperative. We can enact all the laws we want; the courts can hand down all the decisions they wish; but if there is no will to obey those decisions, and if those who resort to the crudest of methods and then deny them are often almost certain to be freed in any court before which they may be brought, we have an inoperative system.

BILL MAY STIMULATE LOCALITIES

I do not believe anyone is more desirous of preserving the functions of localities than I am. I started my political life in a humble way as an alderman in a city. I have always felt the importance of local self-government.

It is my sincere hope that this threat of the removal of cases to the Federal court may serve as such a stimulus to State action that it will be seldom invoked.

I live in the hope that a new spirit is rising in the country underneath the ashes, and that more and more the American people in their hearts want to make these principles of equal rights a reality and are not condemning people because of their race or color.

This requires a good deal of change in our thoughts.

My mind goes back to 1956, when we were able to get only six votes in the Senate for a civil rights measure. However, something was started with that discussion, which helped to bear some fruit in 1957, 1960, 1963, 1964, and 1965. I hope that the measure we are introducing today may have a somewhat similar effect.

In conclusion, I should like to read a telegram which I have just received from Mr. Clarence Mitchell on behalf of some very fine American groups. It reads:

> The bipartisan civil rights bill that you have introduced today offers hope and reassurance to millions of our fellow countrymen who are appalled by the unpunished, wanton, and destructive acts of violence against Negroes and other persons who work for the implementation and strengthening of civil rights. The objectives included in the legislative package offered by you and your colleagues have been discussed extensively and with deep concern by legal and lay representatives of the following organizations:
>
> American Civil Liberties Union, American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, American Veterans Committee, Americans for Democratic Action, Anti-defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Congress of Racial Equality, Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, National Council of Catholic Women, National Urban League, Protestant Episcopal Church Division of Christian Citizenship, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Unitarian Universalist Fellowship for Social Justice, United Automobile Workers of America, United Steelworkers of America, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. All of us hope that these principles will become the law of the land.
>
> Thank you for taking this historic step.
>
> Additional organizations supporting your civil rights bill are: A. Philip Randolph Foundation, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, Negro American Labor Council, and Clarence Mitchell, director, Washington Bureau, NAACP.

I thank all my colleagues who have joined me in sponsoring this measure on both sides of the aisle. I am very grateful to them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD and that it lies on the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk for 1 week, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The bill (S. 2923) entitled "The Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966," introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as "The Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966."

TITLE I—JURY SELECTION IN FEDERAL AND STATE COURTS

Jury selection in Federal courts

SECTION 101. Section 1864 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1864:

"DUTIES, COMPENSATION AND METHODS OF SELECTING AND DRAWING JURORS.

"(a) JURY COMMISSION.—A jury commission shall be established in each judicial district, consisting of the clerk of the court or a duly qualified deputy clerk acting for the clerk and one or more jury commissioners, appointed by the district court. The jury commissioner shall be a citizen of the United States of good standing, a resident of the district, and, at the time of his appointment, shall not be a member of the same political party as the clerk of the court or a duly qualified deputy clerk acting for the clerk. If more than one jury commissioner is appointed, each may be designated to serve in one or more of the places where court is held, and the clerk and the jury commissioner so designated shall constitute the jury commission for that part of the district. In the event that a jury commissioner is unable for any reason to perform his duties, another jury commissioner may be appointed, as provided herein, to act in his place until he is able to resume his duties.

"(b) JURY SELECTION.—(i) In the performance of its duties, the jury commission shall act under the direction and supervision of the chief judge of the district.

"(ii) The names of persons who may be called for grand or petit jury service shall be obtained under a sampling plan prepared by the jury commission with the approval of the chief judge and designed to provide a representative cross-section of the population of the judicial district without exclusion on the basis of race, color, sex, political or religious affiliation or economic or social status. The plan for obtaining such names and the method for carrying out such plan shall be prepared in consultation with and approved by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, who may call upon the Director of the Bureau of the Census for advice and assistance.

"(iii) From the names obtained under subsection (ii) of this subsection, the names of not less than 300 qualified persons, publicly drawn by chance, shall be placed in the jury box, wheel, or similar device.

"(iv) The names of jurors for service on grand and petit juries shall be publicly drawn by chance from the jury box, wheel, or similar device.

"(v) In determining whether persons whose names are to be placed in the jury box, wheel, or similar device are qualified as jurors under section 1861 of title 28, as amended, the jury commission may use such questionnaires and other means as the chief judge, with the approval of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, may deem appropriate, including the administration of oaths. The questionnaires may be filled out by the individual or by another on his behalf. With the approval of the chief judge, the jury commission may designate deputy clerks and other employees in the office of the clerk of the court to assist the commission in the performance of its duties, and to perform under its direction such of the detailed duties of the commission as in the opinion of the chief judge could be assigned to them.

"(c) RECORDS.—The jury commission shall keep records of the names obtained under subsection (b)(ii) of this section, the names of persons placed in the jury box, wheel or similar device, the questionnaires, if any, returned by said persons, the names and race of the persons drawn from the jury box, wheel or similar device, the names of those performing jury service and the dates thereof, and such additional appropriate records as the chief judge may direct. Such records shall be retained for a period of not less than four years.

"(d) ENFORCEMENT BY COURT OF APPEALS.—On application of any citizen residing in, or litigant in, any judicial district or of the Attorney General of the United States, alleging that the jury selection procedures or record-keeping requirements set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of this section are not being fully implemented, the United States Court of Appeals for the judicial circuit in which said judicial district is located shall, upon a showing thereof, appoint jury commissioners responsible to said Court of Appeals and direct such jury commissioners in the selection of juries and the keeping of records in accordance with such subsections (b) and (c) of this section. Where evidence is required for a determination by the Court of Appeals, the court may hear the evidence itself or appoint a master to act for it in accordance with law.

"(e) RETURN OF JURY SUPERVISION.—The Court of Appeals may, on its own motion or on application of the chief judge of the judicial district, direct the return of supervision and control of the jury selection procedures to the chief judge and to the jury commission for said judicial district at any time when the Court of Appeals finds that there is reasonable cause to believe that the jury selection procedures and record-keeping requirements prescribed in subsections (b) and (c) of this section will be fully implemented.

"(f) COMPENSATION.—Each jury commissioner appointed on a part-time basis shall be compensated for his services at the rate of $25 per day for each day in which he actually and necessarily is engaged in the performance of his official duties, to be paid upon certificate of the chief judge of the district.

"Each jury commissioner appointed on a full-time basis shall receive a salary to be fixed from time to time by the Judicial Conference of the United States at a rate which, in the opinion of the Judicial Conference, corresponds to that provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for positions in the executive branch with comparable responsibilities.

"Each jury commissioner shall receive his traveling and subsistence expenses within the limitations prescribed for clerks of district courts while absent from his designated post of duty on official business.

"(g) DELEGATION.—Any of the powers or duties conferred upon the chief judge under this section may be delegated by him to another judge of the district: *Provided, however,* That where part of a district by agreement or order of court is assigned to one particular judge and he customarily holds court there, as to such part of the district he shall perform the functions and fulfill the duties conferred upon the chief judge in this section."

SEC. 102. Section 1861(2) setting forth qualifications of Federal jurors is amended by striking out the words "read" and "write."

SEC. 103. Section 1863 is amended by adding the following sentence to subsection (b): "If the district judge determines that the ability to read or write English is reasonably required in order for jurors to perform their duties in any particular case or cases, he shall be empowered to exclude those who cannot read or write English, except that no person shall be excluded on this ground who has completed the sixth grade in an English language school."

SEC. 104. Section 1871 is amended by striking the words "$10.00 per day" and inserting in their place "$15.00 per day or loss of pay, whichever is greater"; and by striking the words "$14.00 for each day" and inserting in their place "$20.00 per day or loss of pay, whichever is greater for each day"; and by striking the words "subsistence of $10.00 per day shall be allowed" and inserting in their place "subsistence allowance given to Federal employees shall be allowed"; and by striking the words "jury fees in excess of $10.00 per diem" and inserting in their place "jury fees in excess of $15.00 per diem."

Jury selection in State courts

SEC. 105. RECORDS.—Each State or local court shall keep records of the names of all persons on the jury list for said court, names of those persons placed in the jury box, wheel or similar device, questionnaires, applications, or documents of any sort used in the selection of jurors, the names and race of the persons drawn from the jury box, wheel or similar device, the names of those performing jury service and the dates thereof, and such additional appropriate records as the judge or judges of said court may direct. Such records shall be retained for a period of not less than four years.

SEC. 106. JURY DISCRIMINATION.—(a) On application of any citizen residing within the area of, or any litigant in, any State or local court, or of the Attorney General of the United States, alleging that persons have been systematically excluded from grand or petit juries on grounds of race or color in such State or local court or that the record-keeping requirements of section 105 are not being fully implemented, the Federal district court for the district in which said State or local court is located shall, upon a showing thereof, direct the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, directly or through subordinate officials, to assume responsibility for the selection and administration of juries in that State or local court and the Director shall administer and supervise the selection of juries in accordance with the procedures set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 101. The Director may, if practical, use the Federal list or part thereof of jurors for the area in which said State or local court is located. The Director shall act without regard to State and local laws and regulations applicable to jury selection and service in said State or local court and all judges therein shall apply Federal law governing jury selection and service. The Director may, in accordance with civil service laws, appoint and fix the compensation of such officers, attorneys and employees, and make such expenditures, as may be necessary to carry out his duties under this section. The Director may call upon the Director of the Bureau of the Census for advice and assistance in carrying out his duties.

(b) Any final judgment of any Federal or State court within five years prior to the filing of the application in the district court and whether prior to or after the effective date of this Act, determining that there has been systematic exclusion from jury service on grounds of race or color in any State or local court, shall establish such exclusion unless the State or local court, through its clerk or other appropriate official, satisfies the district court that such exclusion no longer exists.

(c) Whenever it is shown that over a period of two years the ratio which the number of persons of any race or color within the area of any State or local court bears to the total population of that area exceeds by one-third or more the ratio which the number of persons of that race or color serving on grand and petit juries bears to the total number of persons serving on such juries, this shall be deemed to establish systematic exclusion on grounds of race or color: *Provided, however,* That in case all or part of the two-year period antedates the effective date of this Act, the State or local court, through its clerk or other appropriate official, shall be given the opportunity to demonstrate that such exclusion no longer exists.

SEC. 107. The State or local court may make application for reinstatement of State procedures to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia which may approve the reinstatement of said procedures if it finds that there is no longer reasonable cause to believe that persons will be excluded from jury service by reason of race or color, or that there will be continued failure to keep records.

SEC. 108. Whenever the Attorney General has reasonable cause to believe that any change in the qualifications, standards, or limitations on the right to a jury trial, operation of the jury system, or the selection of, or challenges to, individual jury members or panel, for any case or class of cases in any State or local court different from those in force and effect on January 1, 1966, will have the purpose or effect of circumventing this title, he may bring an action in the Federal district court for the district in which such State or local court is located to enjoin such change in qualifications, standards, limitations, operation, selection, or challenge and the district court may grant such temporary or final relief as may be necessary to prevent such circumvention of this title.

General

SEC. 109. Sections 106(c) and 202(f)(ii) shall not apply in any area unless a racial or color minority constitutes at least 10 percent of the total population of the area.

SEC. 110. Any person who willfully fails to comply with the record-keeping requirements of this title shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

SEC. 111. The provisions of 42 U.S.C. 1974 (a), (b), (c), (d), shall apply with respect to jury records required to be maintained under this title.

SEC. 112. This title shall become effective ninety days after the date of its enactment.

TITLE II—PROSECUTION IN AND REMOVAL TO FEDERAL COURTS

Federal trial of State offenses

SEC. 201. The district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction, concurrent with the courts of the States, of all prosecutions for offenses (whether felonies, misdemeanors or other offenses) defined by the laws of the State or of any subdivision of the State where acts or omissions constituting the charged offense occur, whenever prosecution of such offenses in a Federal district court is necessary and proper to assure equal protection of the laws.

SEC. 202. (a) Objection to the jurisdiction of the district court conferred by section 201 shall be entertained only if made before trial and in the manner authorized by the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure in effect at the time of the objection. If such objection is not made before trial, the jurisdiction of the district court shall not thereafter be questioned in any manner or by any court.

(b) In the event of a properly presented objection to the jurisdiction of the district court under section 201, the question whether the prosecution of the charged offense in a Federal district is necessary and proper to assure equal protection of the laws shall be promptly decided by the district court sitting without jury, and its decision sustaining or overruling the objection shall be reviewable by interlocutory appeal to the Court of Appeals within ten days after the entry of the order.

(c) If any one of the circumstances specified in subsection (d) of this section and any one of the circumstances specified in subsection (e) of this section are established by a preponderance of the evidence, the district court shall find that prosecution of the charged offense in a Federal district court is necessary and proper to assure equal protection of the laws.

(d) The circumstances first referred to in subsection (c) of this section are that the victim of the offense is:

(i) A member of a racial or color group subject to the discrimination set forth in subsection (e) of this section; or

(ii) A person who, by words or action, was advocating or supporting at or near the time of the offense the exercise or enjoyment by any member or members of such group of equal protection of the laws.

(e) The circumstances second referred to in subsection (c) of this section are: that in any county or other political subdivision, where, under applicable State law the offense might be tried, the members of any racial or color group are—

(i) Systematically excluded from actual service on grand or petit juries in the State or local courts, whether their absence be caused by exclusion from the venires, or by excuses or challenges peremptory or for cause, or otherwise; or

(ii) Systematically denied in any manner the franchise in elections at which any prosecuting official or judge in the county or other political subdivision, or any official who appoints any such prosecuting official or judge, is elected; or

(iii) Systematically segregated in, or discriminated against in any manner in connection with the services or facilities of, State or local jails, prisons, police stations, courts or other public buildings related to the administration of justice; or

(iv) Systematically subjected to harsher punishment upon conviction of crime than those to which persons generally convicted of crime are subjected; or

(v) Systematically subjected to more onerous terms or conditions of bail or conditional release than those to which defendants generally are subjected.

(f)(i) Any final judgment of any Federal or State court within five years prior to the commencement of the prosecution under section 201 determining that there has been, on grounds of race or color, systematic exclusion from jury service in the State or local courts of the county or other political subdivision, or systematic denial of the franchise in any election in the county or other State political subdivision shall establish the circumstance described in subsection 202(e) (i) or (ii), as the case may be, unless the defendant satisfies the court that the circumstances described in said subsection (i) or (ii) no longer exist.

(ii) Whenever it is shown that over a period of two years the ratio which the number of persons of any race or color within the county or other political subdivision bears to the total population of said county or other political subdivision exceeds by one-third or more the ratio which the number of persons of that race or color serving on grand and petit juries bears to the total number of persons serving on such juries, or the ratio which the number of persons of that race or color registered to vote bears to the total number of persons registered to vote, this shall be deemed to establish the circumstances described in subsection 202(e) (i) or (ii); provided, however, that in case all or part of the two-year period antedates the effective date of this Act, the defendant shall be given the opportunity to demonstrate that such exclusion from juries or franchise no longer exists.

SEC. 203. (a) Prosecutions under the jurisdiction conferred by section 201 shall be commenced by indictment by a Federal grand jury in all cases in which the Constitution requires that prosecution be by indictment; in other cases, prosecution may be by indictment or by information.

(b) The district court shall not proceed in the exercise of jurisdiction conferred by section 201 unless, as or prior to final arraignment in the district court, there is filed with the district court a certificate of the Attorney General of the United States that prosecution of the cause by the United States in a Federal district court would fulfill the responsibility of the United States Government to assure equal protection of the laws. Upon the filing of such a certificate, the jurisdiction given by section 201 shall become exclusive of the courts of any State, and the prosecution shall thereafter be conducted exclusively by the Attorney General of the United States or his designate. Upon the filing of the certificate, no State court shall have or retain jurisdiction of any offense charged against the defendant prosecution for which would constitute jeopardy in respect of the offense described in the certificate. The certificate of the Attorney General shall not be subject to review by any court.

(c) If the certificate of the Attorney General described in subsection (b) of this section is not filed at or prior to final arraignment in the district court, the district court shall dismiss the prosecution without prejudice.

(d) Notwithstanding the certificate of the Attorney General described in subsection (b) of this section has not yet been filed and no judicial finding has yet been made sustaining the jurisdiction of a Federal court under section 201 of this Act, Federal judicial, executive, administrative and law enforcement officers and agencies, including but not limited to Federal judges, commissioners, marshals, grand juries, prosecuting attorneys, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation may exercise all powers given them by the laws of the United States in order to prevent and investigate any offense within the jurisdiction conferred by section 201 and to apprehend and prosecute the offender or offenders. In any case where such powers by the general laws of the United States are restricted to felonies, the same powers may be exercised in cases involving misdemeanors or other offenses within the jurisdiction conferred by section 201. The authority given Federal executive, administrative and law enforcement officers and agencies under this subsection shall be exercised subject to the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, but if the delay of their exercise until a direction of the Attorney General is received is impracticable in order effectively to prevent or investigate any offense within the jurisdiction given by section 201 of this Act or to apprehend or prosecute the offender or offenders, they may be exercised without direction of the Attorney General. The Attorney General is authorized to issue rules and regulations for the implementation of this subsection.

Removal by the Attorney General

SEC. 204. (a) Where a prosecution has been commenced in any court of a State in respect of any offense within the jurisdiction conferred by section 201 of this Act, the United States may at any time before jeopardy attaches remove the prosecution for trial to the district court for the district embracing the place wherein the prosecution is pending.

(b) Such removal shall be instituted by the filing in the district court of the certificate of the Attorney General described in section 203(b) of this Act, which certificate shall identify the prosecution to be removed. The filing of this certificate, together with the filing of a copy thereof with the judge or clerk of the State court in which the prosecution is pending (which filing may precede or follow or be contemporaneous with the filing of the certificate in the district court) shall effect the removal, and the jurisdiction of the State court shall thereupon terminate and all State court proceedings thereafter shall be null and void for all purposes unless and until the case is remanded. Following removal under this section:

(i) The jurisdiction conferred by subsection (a) of this section shall be exclusive of the courts of any State, and the prosecution shall be conducted exclusively by the Attorney General or his designate; and

(ii) No State court shall have or retain jurisdiction of any offense charged against the defendant, prosecution for which would constitute jeopardy in respect of the offense described in the certificate.

(iii) The certificate of the Attorney General shall not be subject to review by any court.

(c) Where the offense charged is one required by the Constitution to be prosecuted by indictment and no such indictment was returned prior to removal, indictment by a Federal grand jury shall be required within a reasonable time or the proceeding shall be remanded to the State court.

Sec. 205. (a) The Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure shall apply to proceedings under sections 201 through 204.

(b) Any person convicted in proceedings under sections 201 through 204 shall be sentenced to the fine, term of imprisonment, or both, prescribed by the State law applicable to the offense of which he is convicted. For all other purposes of imposition or execution of sentence, including but not limited to the payment of fine, custody, probation, parole, and pardon, he shall be treated as a person convicted and sentenced under the criminal laws of the United States.

(c) Sections 201 through 205, inclusive, shall become inoperative on and after January 1, 1975.

Investigation of jury exclusion

SEC. 206. (a) The United States Commission on Civil Rights shall investigate the service on grand and petit juries by members of racial or color groups in the State and local courts of any county or other political subdivision in which it believes that there may be disparate treatment of members of different racial or color groups.

(b) Before publishing the results of any such investigation, the Commission shall furnish a copy of its proposed findings to the State or local court, the jury commissioners and any other officials responsible for jury selection in the county or other political subdivision concerned and shall give them an opportunity to controvert any of the proposed findings. Upon consideration of their responses and such consultation with the affected commissioners and officials as may be indicated, the Commission may revise its proposed findings. If any of those proposed findings remain controverted, the Commission shall cause a public hearing to be held in the county or other political subdivision concerned to consider the remaining issues of fact. Such hearing may be held by the Commission or by a person or persons designated by it who may but need not be a member or members of the Commission or its staff; the person or persons thus designated shall have all the powers the Commission would have in regard to the conduct of such a hearing. If any such hearing is not held by the Commission itself, the person or persons conducting it shall prepare a report which shall be forwarded to the Commission together with such comments thereon as local officials may make and with the record of the hearing. The Commission shall thereafter publish its findings and a detailed summary of the data on which those findings are based. Judicial notice of the findings of the Commission and the data contained in its detailed summary shall be taken in any judicial proceeding in any court.

(c) In any action or proceeding under this Act, the Commission's findings and summary of data under subsection (b) of this section shall constitute evidence of the facts presented therein and, except to the extent that the party controverting those facts satisfies the court, by evidence on the record as a whole, that particular findings or data are not correct, the courts shall accept the Commission's findings and data as adequately probative of all facts contained therein and shall make its findings in accordance therewith.

(d) In proceedings under this section, the Commission shall have all the powers granted it under all other statutes; and the powers conferred on it by this section are in addition to its powers under such other statutes.

Federal offenses

SEC. 207. 18 U.S.C. 241 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Whoever, whether acting under color of law or otherwise,

"(1) Willfully injures, oppresses, threatens or intimidates any person in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right, privilege, or immunity granted, secured, or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or

"(2) Intentionally commits an assault or an assault and battery upon any person exercising, attempting to exercise, or advocating the exercise of, any right, privilege, or immunity secured or protected against discrimination on the grounds of race or color by the Constitution or laws of the United States; or

"(3) Intentionally commits an assault or an assault and battery upon any person using directly or indirectly, the facilities of interstate commerce, or traveling therein, or upon any person where the assailant uses, directly or indirectly, any facility of interstate commerce, or anything that has moved in interstate commerce, in the commission of the assault or assault and battery, when the purpose or reasonably foreseeable effect of such assault or assault and battery is to prevent any person or class of persons from exercising or advocating equal rights or opportunities free from discrimination on the grounds of race or color, or to intimidate any person or class of persons in the exercise or advocacy of such rights or opportunities; shall upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both; except that if in the course of the act or acts for which he is convicted he inflicts death or grave bodily injury, he shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned for not more than twenty years, or both.

"(b) If two or more persons go in disguise on the highway or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder the free exercise or enjoyment of any right, privilege or immunity covered by subsection (a) of this section, they shall, upon conviction, be subject to the penalties in subsection (a) of this section."

TITLE III—CIVIL PREVENTIVE RELIEF

SEC. 301. Whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage in any act or practice which would deprive any other person because of race or color, of any right, privilege, or immunity, granted, secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, such other person in his own right or the Attorney General for or in the name of the United States, may institute a civil action or other proper proceeding for preventive relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, order requiring the posting of a bond to secure compliance with any order of the court, or other order.

SEC. 302. Whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage in any act or practice which would deprive any other person of, or hinder him in the exercise of, the right to speak, assemble, petition or otherwise express himself for the purpose of advocating equality of persons or opportunity free from discrimination because of race or color, such other person in his own right, or the Attorney General for or in the name of the United States, may institute a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, order requiring the posting of bond to secure compliance with any order of the court, or other order; provided that such other person above mentioned is a person described in subsection 202(d) (i) or (ii) and any one of the circumstances specified in section 202(e) is established by a preponderance of the evidence. The provisions of section 202(f) shall be applicable in proceedings under this section.

SEC. 303. In any proceeding under this section the United States shall be liable for costs the same as a private person. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this title and shall exercise the same without regard to whether the party aggrieved shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law.

TITLE IV—REMOVAL BY CERTAIN DEFENDANTS

SEC. 401. Any defendant in a criminal action or in a civil or criminal contempt action in a State or local court may remove said action to the district court of the United States for the district embracing the place wherein it is pending if the defendant is a person described in either subsection (i) or (ii) of section 202(d) and if any one of the circumstances specified in section 202(e) is established by a preponderance of the evidence. The provisions of section 202(f) shall be applicable in proceedings under this section.

SEC. 402. Any defendant in any action or proceeding (civil, criminal or otherwise) in a State or local court may remove said action or proceeding to the district court of the United States for the district embracing the place wherein it is pending if the action or proceeding is maintained for or on account of any act or omission in the exercise of the freedoms of speech, of the press, of assembly or of petition guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States for the purpose of advocating or supporting racial equality or of protesting the denial of racial equality; or any act or omission protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States against abridgment or interference by reason of race or color.

SEC. 403. The procedures set forth in sections 1446 and 1447 of title 28 shall be applicable to removal and remand under this section, except that any order of remand shall be reviewable by appeal or otherwise.

TITLE V—CIVIL INDEMNIFICATION

SEC. 501. (a) There is hereby established within the United States Commission on Civil Rights an Indemnification Board, hereafter referred to as the Board. The Board shall be composed of three members, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate one member as Chairman. No more than two members of the Board may be of the same political party.

(b) The term of office of each member of the Board shall be five years, beginning with the effective date of this Act, except of those members first appointed, one shall serve for five years, one for three years, and one for one year. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

(c) The Chairman shall be compensated at the rate of $25,000 per annum, and the other members at a rate of $24,000 per annum.

(d) Two members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

Sec. 502. The Board may, in accordance with civil service laws, appoint and fix the compensation of such officers, attorneys and employees, and make such expenditures, as may be necessary to carry out its functions.

Sec. 503. The Board shall make such rules and regulations as shall be necessary and proper to carry out its functions.

Sec. 504. The Commission on Civil Rights shall have the authority and duty to receive and investigate or have investigated written complaints from or on behalf of any person injured in his person or property or deprived of his life (i) because of race or color, while lawfully exercising, attempting to exercise, or advocating, or assisting another in the exercise of, any right, privilege or immunity granted, secured, or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or for having so exercised, attempted, advocated or assisted or (ii) by any act, the purpose or design of which is to intimidate him or any other person from seeking or advocating equality of persons or opportunity free from discrimination based on race or color.

Sec. 505. (a) The Commission on Civil Rights may request and the Department of Justice shall make available any investigative reports that the Department of Justice has that are relevant to the complaint and investigation.

(b) The Commission may request and the Attorney General is authorized to direct that additional investigation of matters relevant to the complaint be conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(c) The Commission shall supply copies of all of its investigative reports to the Attorney General.

Sec. 506. If, after such investigation, the Commission shall determine that probable cause exists for crediting the complaint, it shall direct the Board to conduct a hearing thereon as provided in section 507; if, however, the Commission shall determine that probable cause does not exist or that no substantial damage has occurred, it shall dismiss the complaint.

Sec. 507. (a) Any hearing may be conducted by the Board or any member of the Board designated by the Chairman.

(b) In the event the Board determines that because of the number of complaints or for other valid reasons it is not in the interest of justice for it or a member to conduct a hearing, it may designate an agent or employee of the Board or a person not associated with the Board to conduct the hearing, provided any such agent, employee or other person so designated shall be a member of the bar of the highest court of one of the States of the United States.

(c) Any person not an agent or employee of the Board shall be reimbursed for services rendered in connection with such hearing as determined by the Board, subject to approval of the Civil Service Commission.

(d) The Board or any member or hearing officer may administer oaths or affirmations.

(e) The Board shall have the same powers of investigation and subpoena as those granted the National Labor Relations Board in 29 U.S.C. 161 (1) and (2).

(f) A full record shall be made and kept of all hearings conducted.

Sec. 508. (a) After hearing, the Board, member or hearing officer conducting the hearing shall make findings of fact based upon the record.

(b) After a hearing conducted by the Board, it shall, if it finds that any complainant has suffered injury referred to in section 504, make a monetary award of indemnification to compensate such complainant for such injury.

(c) After a hearing conducted by a member of the Board or hearing officer, he shall, if he finds that any complainant has suffered injury referred to in section 504, make a recommendation of an award of indemnification. All such recommendations shall be reviewed by the Board. Upon review, the Board shall review the findings of fact and shall affirm, reject or modify findings and such recommendations and enter or deny an award.

(d) All awards made hereunder shall include reasonable attorney's fees.

Sec. 509. (a) In the event that the investigation of the complaint or the hearing thereon indicates the person or persons responsible for the injury for which an award is sought, such person or persons shall be notified and shall have a reasonable opportunity to intervene in the hearing and to be fully heard.

(b) In the event that such investigation or hearing indicates that the injury resulted in whole or in part from action taken under color of law, the political subdivision and/or the State under whose authority such action was taken shall be notified and shall have a reasonable opportunity to intervene in the hearing and to be fully heard.

(c) Notice under this section may be by personal service or by registered mail.

(d) Notice to a State or political subdivision may be given to the chief executive or principal legal officer of such State or political subdivision.

(e) The Board shall, if necessary to secure a full hearing for any intervenor, continue the hearing from time to time.

Sec. 510. The United States may, on the motion of the Attorney General, intervene at any stage of the hearing or appeal.

Sec. 511. (a) The complainant or any intervenor may obtain a review of the final decision of the Board in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia or the Court of Appeals for the judicial circuit in which the injury occurred or the person seeking review resides.

(b) Such review shall be made on the basis of the record before the Board and the findings of the Board with respect to questions of fact, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive.

Sec. 512. (a) In any instance in which the injury or death for which an award is made results in whole or in part from action taken under color of law, or from action whether or not taken under color of law which in any way impedes or infringes upon the exercise or advocacy of any right, privilege, or immunity granted, secured, or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, the United States shall have a cause of action for recovery of the amount of such award against the person or persons responsible for the injury for which the award is made.

(b) If the injury for which an award is made resulted in whole or in part from action taken under color of law, the political subdivision and/or the State under whose authority such action was taken shall be jointly and severally liable with the person or persons responsible for such injury.

(c) In any case brought under this section against anyone notified under section 509, the findings of fact as made, modified, or approved, by the Board pursuant to section 508 shall be admissible and shall constitute prima facie evidence of the facts determined by the findings, and the award of indemnification shall be admissible and shall constitute prima facie evidence of the damages suffered by the complainant.

(d) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to hear cases brought under this section.

Sec. 513. (a) In the event the person injured dies, a complaint may be filed by any representative of his estate, or by his or her spouse, child, or dependent and the Board shall determine to whom any award shall be made.

(b) In the event of the inability or incapacity of the person injured to file a complaint, it may be filed by his or her spouse, child, dependent, or counsel.

Sec. 514. All complaints must be filed within six months of the injury for which an award is sought, except that where the injury results in death, the complaint may be filed within twelve months of death.

Sec. 515. Nothing herein shall deny to any person the right to pursue any action or remedy granted him under any other law of the United States or any State, provided that in the event that any person receives in any other action an award of damages for which an award of indemnification has been made under this title, the United States shall have a lien against such award in the amount of the award of indemnification. In the event such other award is made prior to the award of indemnification, the amount of such other award shall be considered by the Board in determining whether to make an award and, if so, the amount of the award.

TITLE VI—AMENDMENT TO TITLE VII OF 1964 ACT

Sec. 601. Title VII of Public Law 88-352 (the Civil Rights Act of 1964) is amended as follows:

(a) Add a new paragraph to section 701(a) as follows: "The term 'governmental unit' means a State or a political subdivision thereof or an agency of one or more States or political subdivisions."

(b) Amend so much of section 701(b) as appears before the word *"Provided"* to read as follows:

"The term 'employer' means: (1) a person engaged in an industry affecting commerce who has twenty-five or more employees for each working day in each of twenty or more calendar weeks in the current or preceding calendar year, and any agent of such a person, but such term does not include (i) the United States, a corporation wholly owned by the Government of the United States, or an Indian tribe, (ii) a bona fide membership club (other than a labor organization) which is exempt from taxation under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; (2) a governmental unit and any agent of such governmental unit:"

(c) Add the words "or governmental unit" following the word "person" wherever it appears in section 701(c).

(d) Delete the phrase "or an agency of a State or political subdivision of a State," from section 701(c).

(e) Add a comma and the following language after the word "charge" on line 9 of section 706(e): "unless the respondent is a State."

(f) Insert the words "or governmental unit" in section 707(a) following the word "persons" on lines 2 and 12 of such subsection.

(g) Insert the words "for or in the name of the United States" following the word "action" on line 6 of section 707(a).

(h) Insert the words "or governmental unit" following the word "person" on line 4 of section 709(a) on lines 1 and 5 of section 710(c) and on lines 2 and 7 of section 713(b).

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 701. (a) The term "State" as used herein shall include the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "because of race or color" shall mean because of hostility to the race or color of any person, or because of his association with persons of a different race or color or his advocacy of equality of persons of different races or colors.

(c) The term "hearing officer" shall mean an agent or employee of the Indemnification Board or a person not otherwise associated with the Board who is designated by the Board to conduct a hearing.

(d) The term "action taken under color of law" shall include the knowing refusal or failure to act where action could or may have prevented injury.

(e) The term "injury to property" shall include any financial or economic loss.

(f) The term "judicial district" shall mean a division thereof where the judicial district is divided into divisions.

SEC. 702. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, including payment of awards under title V.

(b) If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of the provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I have asked that my name be added as a cosponsor to S. 2923, which Senator DOUGLAS introduced a few moments ago on behalf of a bipartisan group of Senators. This bill is an omnibus set of proposals, the main purposes of which are to create a Federal assurance of fair selection of jurors, both Federal and State, and to bring a better measure of Federal protection for the personal security of Negroes and civil rights workers in the South.

Both of these are matters which we in the Congress should deal with this year. In cosponsoring this legislation, I wish to make clear that I am firmly committed not only to enacting a full and effective new civil rights measure this year, but also, as I have stated before, to enacting the kind of legislation which will help the Negro in the ghettos of the North meet his problems and be able to lead a better life.

With reference to S. 2923, I want to make clear that I am not convinced that every one of its provisions is the best way to handle the problem that it deals with. These are difficult and technical problems which involve intricate judgments about what approach will work most effectively. I have been studying this entire matter for some time and I shall offer my thoughts, insofar as they differ from today's bill, at the appropriate time. I know that many other Senators will have useful suggestions to offer to the same end. And we shall all want to study the administration's proposals with great care when they are introduced.

Nevertheless, because I agree with the overall purpose of S. 2923, I am glad to join as a cosponsor. It will serve as a useful starting point for the further discussion that we must undertake if we are to enact the most careful and constructive, the most responsible and practical legislation possible.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, it is my distinct privilege to speak today as a sponsor of the Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966.

Since I arrived in the Senate I have worked for and voted for legislation to protect the rights of all American citizens to equal justice before the law. I supported the civil rights legislation in 1963, 1964, and 1965 because I believed the legislation necessary to protect the rights guaranteed under the Federal Constitution to all our citizens.

Recent history has shown the effectiveness of this legislation, but it has also shown that further legislation is necessary. This situation was pointed out very clearly last year by the failure of local authorities to protect lives and enforce the law in Lowndes County, Ala.

On Friday, August 20, 1965, Jonathan Daniels, an outstanding young man from Keene, N.H., and a student at the Episcopal Theological Seminary in Cambridge, Mass., was working on behalf of civil rights in Hayneville, Ala. This young man had graduated at the head of his high school class in Keene, had been valedictorian of his class at the Virginia Military Institute, and had completed 2 years of study at the Episcopal Theological Seminary. He was truly an outstanding man, who at the age of 26 had earned the respect and admiration of all who knew him.

On that Friday he was murdered, struck down by a shotgun blast, because of his work on behalf of his fellow citizens. His murderer was tried, and, after a trial which the attorney general of Alabama himself characterized as a "whitewash" of a "coldblooded, premeditated murder," acquitted.

Later that year I went to Alabama to see for myself what the facts were. I spoke with law enforcement officials, citizens, civil rights workers and opponents of civil rights. I left feeling that Federal legislation was necessary to protect not only the civil rights workers who were acting in full accord with the law of the land, but also to protect the law-abiding citizens of many communities who had a right to expect their laws against murder enforced.

The bill which has been introduced today will, if enacted, provide this needed protection to the law-abiding citizens of our Nation.

This bill represents the thinking and work of many people. I am pleased that it includes some of the ideas which I have urged. It is a fine bill, and after such changes as the Senate may think proper, I hope for its rapid enactment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am happy to join in the latest bipartisan effort with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in introducing the Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966. This bill could be called the "Equal Justice Act of 1966," because its main thrust is to bring to an end the discriminatory system of justice and law enforcement which now prevails in many communities throughout the South.

It seeks to bring to an end a system not of justice but of injustice which has denied Negro citizens and civil rights workers the equal protection of the laws and which has for years permitted acts of racial violence including murder to go unpunished.

This legislation has been made necessary because State and local law enforcement officials in some areas have defaulted in their constitutional obligation to provide equal justice to all. By their biased and partial administration of justice, by their misuse of the legal process to harass and intimidate civil rights workers, by their failure to protect those engaged in civil rights activity from violence and by permitting such violence to go unpunished, these officials have made a mockery of justice. This bill would do no more than to restore the balance to the scales of justice which they have weighted so heavily against the Negro citizen and persons lawfully exercising rights guaranteed them by the Constitution.

To those who will contend that this legislation would upset the traditional Federal-State division of responsibility for law enforcement, let me say that the Federal Government has both the obligation and authority to act when persons are denied their constitutional rights by State officials. If State and local officials would recognize and assume their constitutional responsibility and take steps to end the discriminatory pattern of justice, Federal action would be unnecessary. This legislation will not touch a single community where law enforcement officials are administering justice fairly and equitably. It will reach only those officials who persist in abdicating their sworn constitutional duty to uphold the law.

On January 28, I joined in introducing two bills to meet the problem of racial discrimination in law enforcement. One bill would strengthen existing Federal criminal statutes under which civil rights violations may now be prosecuted; the other would put an end to racial discrimination in the selection of juries.

Since then—indeed only on Monday—a three-judge Federal court in Montgomery, Ala., in an unprecedented ruling ordered court officials in Lowndes County, Ala., to cease excluding Negroes from jury duty, to draw up new jury lists from which Negroes would not be excluded and to make periodic reports to the Federal court giving the name and race of everyone found unfit for jury duty along with a statement of the reasons why each had been turned down.

Lowndes County is not unique in excluding Negroes from jury duty. It is only the most glaring example of a continuing and persistent unconstitutional practice of racial discrimination in the jury selection process in violation of the 14th amendment.

In addition to addressing itself to the problem of racial discrimination in the selection of juries and making it a Federal crime to attack or intimidate civil rights workers, the bill we are introducing today would also permit the removal to the Federal courts for trial of State offenses where it can be clearly shown that a pattern of discriminatory justice exists in the State courts and where such Federal court prosecution is necessary to assure the equal protection of the laws.

The bill would also authorize Federal court injunctions to protect citizens in the exercise of their constitutional rights. The Attorney General now has the power to bring such injunction proceedings in voting rights and school desegregation cases. This bill would extend his authority to bring such proceedings to prevent the deprivation of constitutional rights generally.

Another key provision of the bill is one which would provide restitution by the

Federal Government to civil rights workers who are injured while lawfully exercising their constitutional rights and make States and counties liable to the Federal Government where police or other local officials are responsible for the injury. This bill would not only recognize the responsibility of government to protect the constitutional rights of its citizens but also its moral obligation to compensate the innocent victims of anticivil rights violence who have suffered physical injury while seeking to vindicate their constitutional rights which the Government is mandated by the Constitution to protect.

There are some, of course, who will call this legislation too far reaching. But the evils of unequal justice and unpunished violence, intimidation, and terror are matters of grave national concern to which the Congress cannot remain indifferent so long as State and local governmental officials persist in defying the plain command of the Constitution.

This bill, which follows closely the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission for new Federal legislation, is essential if all our citizens without regard to race or color in every city and hamlet in our land are to enjoy equal justice and live in freedom without fear of physical violence.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am proud to join Senators DOUGLAS, HART, and several of my other colleagues in sponsoring a bill which will, if enacted, close the loopholes which have allowed nightriders and bombthrowers to escape justice in some of our States.

This legislation will apply to the 50 States. But, it can be no secret that the abuses it is aimed at correcting have been prevalent, for the most part, in our Southern States. And that is primarily where the legislation will have an effect.

First, the legislation will insure that southern juries will be selected from a cross-section of the general population. It will end the practice of excluding Negroes and other minority groups from jury service. It will accomplish this by providing Federal guidelines for jury selection and by applying these guidelines to the State courts, when it is determined that there has been systematic exclusion from jury selection because of race, color, sex, religious, or political affiliation, and economic or social status. This provision will insure each individual his constitutional right to trial by a jury of his peers. It is designed to provide juries which will take an impartial view of the evidence, especially in civil rights cases, and will not flinch from bringing in a verdict of "guilty" when the evidence warrants such a finding.

The second major provision of this legislation will enable the Federal courts, in certain carefully limited instances, to assume jurisdiction over criminal matters when it is determined that such action is required to insure equal protection under State laws. This provision would apply both to defendants who are not receivng equal justice and to the prosecution of civil rights cases where it is clear that justice cannot be served because of a segregated system of justice.

Finally, this legislation provides machinery for compensating those who have been killed or injured, or who have lost their property by the illegal act of those who have tried to keep dedicated civil rights workers from their lawful activities. A Federal indemnification board would be established, within the Civil Rights Commission. That board would make the initial determination of liability and that determination would be reviewed in the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia. Further, local and State governments would be made civilly liable for interference with the rights of others, whereas they have previously escaped liability by invoking the doctrine of "governmental immunity."

Mr. President, there may be some who say this legislation goes too far. It does not. This legislation is drafted in accordance with the Constitution of the United States. Moreover, it goes only far enough to put an end to the sorry spectacle of southern juries ignoring the most patent evidence in order to set free murderers, bomb throwers, conspirators, and those who have run the gamut of crimes against civil rights workers and members of minority groups. And it goes only far enough to end the kangaroo courts which have convicted Negroes and civil rights workers on flimsy, sometimes manufactured evidence and then compounded the injustice by invoking exceedingly harsh penalties.

This legislation will go a long way toward translating from myth into reality, the motto which is engraved on the front of the Supreme Court Building across the street: "Equal Justice Under Law."

FRANK E. LIPP

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on the bill, S. 1407, for the relief of Frank E. Lipp.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1407), for the relief of Frank E. Lipp, which were, on page 1, line 8, strike out "any", and insert "the", and on page 1, line 11, strike out "any", and insert "the".

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT

During the delivery of Mr. DOUGLAS' speech,

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, pursuant to the previous unanimous-consent agreement, lays before the Senate the pending business, the bill which has just been reported by the Committee on Armed Services, which the clerk will state by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> A bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN SUGGESTS FULL DISCLOSURE ON SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Mr. Harry Golden, a trenchant and perceptive writer whose column appears in the Washington Daily News among other Scripps-Howard newspapers, has provided us with memorable quotations from the speeches and writings of Abraham Lincoln, whose birth date we mark Saturday.

Mr. Golden makes this observation:

> Lincoln's simple opening of his House Divided speech in 1859 serves us for today: "If we would first know where we are, and wither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it."

More than a century after these words, our Nation is again divided on the issue of an undeclared war.

Mr. President, I submit that indeed "we could better judge what to do, and how to do it" if this administration would offer full discussion of the issues in southeast Asia.

Only then can "we know where we are, and whither we are tending."

Only when the people, and the elected representatives of the people, are provided with all the facts can we make a judgment on our policy in Vietnam.

As determined as I am, as determined as we all are, to halt the encroachment of communism, the methods we use in this objective must be worthy of public examination and judgment.

I ask that we have full and open discussion of the issues motivating the decisions being made today, affecting as they do the course of history for years to come.

Mr. Golden reminds us that after three bitter and frustrating years of the

American Civil War, Mr. Lincoln wrote to a friend:

> I have been controlled by events.

What a lesson is there here for us today.

Are we being controlled by events, rather than controlling those events?

Is our foreign policy as applied to southeast Asia one of reaction to the Communists? Are we then to be led by them step by bleeding step into a land mass war with Red China in a place and at a time of their choosing?

Mr. President, the American people deserve a more complete exposition of the facts decisive to their destiny.

TESTIMONY OF GEORGE KENNAN ON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the men most qualified to guide our thinking on American foreign policy is Mr. George Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to Yugoslavia, and author of the U.S. containment policy of the post-World War II period.

His statement before the Committee on Foreign Relations today is one of the finest presentations I have seen, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE F. KENNAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, FEBRUARY 10, 1966

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the Foreign Relations Committee, the subject on which I am invited to give my views this morning is, as I understand it, the complex of problems connected with our present involvement in Vietnam. May I explain, in undertaking to speak to this subject, that southeast Asia is a part of the world for which I can claim no special knowledge. I am not familiar with the official rationale of our policy there, except as it has been reflected in the press. I cannot recall that I have ever, either during my service in Government or subsequently, been consulted by the executive branch of our Government on the problems of our policy in southeast Asia or even been made privy to the official discussions in which that policy was decided. I am sure there are many data relevant to any thoroughly founded judgment on these matters which are not available to me. This being the case, I have tried not to jump to final conclusions, even in my own thoughts, and to remain sympathetically receptive both to our Government's explanations of the very real difficulties it has faced and to the doubts and questions of its serious critics. I have not been anxious to press my views upon the public; but I gladly give them to you for whatever they are worth, claiming no particular merit for them except that they reflect an experience with Communist affairs running back, now, for nearly 40 years, and that they flow from the deepest and most troubled concern that we should find the right course at this truly crucial juncture.

The first point I should like to make is that if we were not already involved as we are today in Vietnam, I would know of no reason why we should wish to become so involved, and I can think of several reasons why we should wish not to. Vietnam is not a region of major industrial-military importance. It is difficult to believe that any decisive development of the world situation is going to be determined by what happens on that territory. Were it not for the considerations of prestige that arise out of our existing involvement, even a situation in which South Vietnam was controlled exclusively by the Vietcong, while regrettable and no doubt morally unwarranted, would not present, in my opinion, dangers great enough to justify our direct military intervention. Given the situation that exists today in the relations among the leading Communist powers, there is every likelihood that a Communist regime in South Vietnam would follow a fairly independent political course. There is no reason to expect that such a regime would find it either necessary or desirable, in present circumstances, to function simply as a passive puppet and instrument of Chinese power. And as for the danger its establishment there would unleash similar tendencies in neighboring countries, this would depend largely on the manner in which it came into power. In the light of what has recently happened in Indonesia and on the Indian subcontinent, the danger of the so-called domino effect of a limited Communist success in that area seems to me to be considerably less than it was when the main decisions were taken that led to our present involvement.

From the long-term standpoint, therefore, and on principle, I think our military involvement in Vietnam has to be recognized as unfortunate—as something we would not choose deliberately if the choice were ours to make all over again today; and by the same token I think it should be our Government's aim to liquidate this involvement just as soon as this can be done without inordinate damage to our own prestige or to the stability of conditions in that area.

It is obvious, on the other hand, that this involvement is today a fact. It creates a new situation. It raises new questions, ulterior to the basic long-term problem, which have to be taken into account. A precipitate and disorderly withdrawal could represent in present circumstances a disservice to our own interests and even to world peace greater than any that might have been involved in our failure to engage ourselves there in the first place. This is a reality which, if there is to be any peaceful resolution of this conflict, will have to be recognized not only by the more critical of our friends but by our adversaries as well.

I have, at the same time, great misgivings about any deliberate expansion of hostilities on our part directed to the achievement of something called victory—if, by the use of that term, we envisage the complete disappearance of the recalcitrance with which we are now faced, the formal submission by the adversary to our will, and the complete realization of our present stated political aims. I doubt that these things can be achieved even by the most formidable military successes. There seems to be an impression that, if we bring sufficient military pressure to bear, there will occur at some point something in the nature of a political capitulation by the other side. I think this is a most dangerous assumption. The North Vietnamese and the Vietcong have, between them, a great deal of space and manpower to give up, if they have to, and the Chinese can give them more if they need it. Fidelity to the Communist tradition would dictate that, if really pressed to extremity on the military level, they should disappear entirely from the open scene and fall back exclusively on an underground political and military existence, rather than accept terms that would be openly humiliating and would represent in their eyes the betrayel of the political prospects of the causes to which they are dedicated. Any total rotting out of the Vietcong from the territory of South Vietnam could be achieved, if it could be achieved at all, only at the cost of a degree of damage to civilian life, and civilian suffering generally, for which I should not like to see this country responsible. And to attempt to crush North Vietnamese strength to a point where Hanoi could no longer give any support for Vietcong political activity in the south would almost certainly have the effect of bringing in Chinese forces at some point, whether formally or in the guise of volunteers, thus involving us in a military conflict with Communist China on one of the most unfavorable theaters of hostility that we could possibly choose.

This is not the only reason why I think we should do everything possible to avoid the escalation of this conflict. There is another one which is no less weighty. This is the effect the conflict is already having on our policies and interests further afield. Not only are great and potentially more important questions of world affairs not receiving, as a consequence of our preoccupation with Vietnam, the attention they should be receiving, but in some instances assets we already enjoy, and hopeful possibilities we should be developing, are being sacrificed to this unpromising involvement in a remote and secondary theater of activity. Our relations with the Soviet Union have suffered grievously as was to be expected—and this at a time when far more important things were involved in those relations than what is involved in Vietnam, and when we had special reason to cultivate them. More unfortunate still, in my opinion, is the damage being done to the feeling entertained toward us by the Japanese people. The confidence and the good disposition of the Japanese is the greatest asset we have had—and the greatest asset we could have in east Asia. As the greatest industrial complex in the entire Far East, and the only place where today the sinews of modern war could be produced on a formidable scale, Japan is of vital importance to us and indeed to the prospects generally of peace and stability in east Asia. There is no success we could have in Vietnam that could conceivably warrant the sacrifice by us of the confidence and good will of the Japanese people. Yet we abuse that confidence and good will in the most serious way when we press the military struggle in Vietnam, and particularly when we press it by means of strategic bombing.

I mention Japan particularly because it is an outstanding example, both in importance and in the intensity of the feelings aroused, of the psychological damage that is being done in many parts of the world by the prosecution of this conflict, and that will be done in even greater measure if the hostilities become still more bloody and tragic as a result of our deliberate effort. It is clear that however justified our action may be in our own eyes, it has failed to win either enthusiasm or confidence even among peoples normally friendly to us. Our motives are widely misinterpreted; and the spectacle of Americans inflicting grievous injury on the lives of a poor and helpless people, and particularly a people of different race and color, no matter how warranted by military necessity or by the excesses of the adversary our operations may seem to us to be, produces reactions among millions of people throughout the world profoundly detrimental to the image we would like them to hold of this country. I am not saying that this is just or right. I am saying that it is so, and that it is bound, in the circumstances, to be so. A victory purchased at the price of further such damage would be a hollow one in terms of our world interests, no matter what advantages it might hold from the standpoint of developments on the local scene.

These are the reasons, gentlemen, why I hope that our Government will restrict our military operations in Vietnam to the minimum necessary to assure the security of our forces and to maintain our military presence there until we can achieve a satisfactory peaceful resolution of the conflict; and why I hope that we will continue to pursue vigorously the question for such a resolution of it, even if this involves some moderation of our stated objectives and if the resulting settlement appears to us as less than ideal. I cannot, of course, judge the military necessities of our situation; but everything I know about its political aspects suggests to me that General Gavin is on the right track in his suggestions that we should, if I understood him correctly, decide what limited areas we can safely police and defend, and restrict ourselves largely to the maintenance of our position there. I have listened with interest to the arguments that have been brought forward in opposition to his views, and I must say that I have not been much impressed with some of them. When I am told that it would be difficult to defend such enclaves, it is hard for me to understand why it would be easier to defend the much wider areas which expanded hostilities, if successful, would presumably bring under our nominal control. Nor do I understand the argument that our allies will lose confidence in us if we fail to press forward aggressively in Vietnam. In the first place, I am not aware that any serious commentator has been pressing for anything like a total and immediate withdrawal from Vietnam. But even if that were the case, it seems implausible to me that we should suffer much loss of confidence on that account at the hands of a Britain which has wisely and tolerantly liquidated great portions of its former colonial empire since the recent war; of a France which has only recently, in an impressive exhibition of statesmanship, withdrawn from its former North African possessions; or of a Netherlands which, under our urging and encouragement, has had the generosity to give up the great territories in Indonesia. In matters such as this, it is not, in my experience, what you do that is decisive: it is how you do it. I would submit there is more respect to be won in the opinion of the world by a resolute and courageous liquidation of unsound positions than in the most stubborn pursuit of extravagant or unpromising objectives.

And finally, when I hear it said that to adopt a defensive strategy in South Vietnam would be to rat on our commitment to the Government of that territory, I would like to note what that commitment really consists of and when and how it was incurred. What seems to be involved here is an obligation on our part not only to defend the frontiers of a certain foreign political entity but to assure the internal security of its Government in circumstances where that Government is unable to assure that security by its own means. Now any such obligation is one that goes, obviously, considerably further than the normal obligations of a military alliance. If we did not really incur it in any formal way, then we should not be inventing it for ourselves, and assuring ourselves that we are bound by it, today. But if we did, then I fail to understand how it was possible for us, in entering into any such commitment, to bypass the processes of senatorial advice and consent which were meant to come into play when undertakings of even lesser import than this were entered into.

Now just two concluding observations:

First, I would like it understood that what I have said here implies nothing but the highest respect and admiration for the fighting qualities of our forces in the field. I have the greatest confidence in them, men and commanders alike. I have no doubt that they can and will, if duty requires, produce military results that will surprise both our skeptical friends and our arrogant adversaries. It is not their fighting qualities but the purpose to which they are being employed that evokes my skepticism.

Secondly, let me say that I am not looking at this whole problem from the moral standpoint but from the practical one. I see in the Vietcong a band of ruthless fanatics, partly misled perhaps by the propaganda that has been drummed into them, but cruel in their methods, dictorial and oppressive in their aims. Their claim to represent the people of South Vietnam is unfounded, arrogant, and outrageous. A country which fell under their exclusive power would have my deepest sympathy. And I would hope that this eventuality, at least, can be prevented by our present effort.

But our own country should not be asked, and should not ask of itself, to shoulder the main burden of determining the political realities in any other country, and particularly not in one remote from our shores, from our culture, and from the experience of our people. In saying this, I am only paraphrasing, and very poorly, words once uttered by one who had at one time been a Member of the U.S. Senate and who, had a Foreign Relations Committee existed in his day, would certainly have been a member of it. This was John Quincy Adams, and I would like your permission to recall, before I close, the words of his that I have in mind. They were spoken in this city 145 years ago, on the Fourth of July 1821. Some of you may be familiar with them, but they will stand repeating at this moment.

"Wherever the standard of freedom and independence has been or shall be unfurled, there," Adams said, "will be America's heart, her benedictions, and her prayers. "But she goes not abroad," he went on, "in search of monsters to destroy. She is the well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all. She is the champion and vindicator only of her own. She will recommend the general cause by the countenance of her voice, and by the benignant sympathy of her example. She well knows that by once enlisting under other banners than her own, were they even the banners of foreign independence, she would involve herself beyond the power of extrication, in all the wars of interest and intrigue, of individual avarice, envy and ambition, which assume the colors and usurp the standards of freedom. The fundamental maxims of her policy would insensibly change from liberty to force. * * * She might become the dictatress of the world. She would no longer be the ruler of her own spirit."

Gentlemen, I do not know exactly what Adams had in mind when he spoke those lines; but I think that, without knowing it, he spoke very pertinently to us, and very wisely.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move, under the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m., Monday, February 14, 1966.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the previous order, adjourned until 10 o'clock a.m. on Monday, February 14, 1966.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 10 (legislative day of January 16), 1966:

THE JUDICIARY

Miles W. Lord, of Minnesota, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Minnesota vice Dennis F. Donovan, retired.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Environmental Science Services Administration:

To be commanders

Clinton D. Upham
Floyd J. Tucker, Jr.

To be lieutenant commanders

Francis D. Moran
John W. Bricker
Donald J. Florwick
Sigmund R. Petersen
J. Rodney Lewis
C. William Hayes
Seymour R. Kotler
Darrell W. Crawford
Frederick H. Gramling

To be lieutenants

Carl N. Davis
Edward E. Jones
John E. Dropp
Joseph W. Dropp
Walter F. Forster II
Delwyn C. Webster
Joseph T. Smith
Peter M. Schidrich
Robert C. Westphall
Billy G. Morrison
William R. Klesse
Gerald M. Ward
Woodrow E. Bliss, Jr.
Phillip C. Johnson
Rodger K. Woodruff
James M. Wintermyre
Karl W. Kieninger, Jr.
Karl S. Karinch

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

James P. Brown, Jr.
Richard M. Petryczanko
Leonard T. Lynch, Jr.
William S. Plank
Richard V. O'Connell
Philip L. Richardson
Ralph H. Rhudy
Walter S. Simmons
Frederick G. Paulsen
Jeffrey L. Gammon
Peter K. Reichert
Ellis G. Campbell III
Gary E. Rorvig
Bobby D. Edwards
Donald R. Rich
Marshall A. Levitan
A. David Schuldt
George M. Ensign
George C. Chappell
John P. Vandermeulen

To be ensigns

Fidel E. Smith
Charles H. McClure
Christopher C. Mathewson
Otto F. Steffin
Carl W. Fisher
Arthur P. Sibold III
John O. Rolland
Phillip F. Dean
Steven M. Erickson
Joseph L. Scott
Lance W. Pape
Glen R. Schaefer
Harold D. Nilsson
Duane D. Helton
Lionel Greve
James L. Murphy
William M. Goodhue, Jr.
William S. Richardson
A. Conrad Weymann III
David L. Sweetland
Gordon P. Dodge
George R. Knecht
Jack L. Wallace
Henry M. Coghlan II
Michael W. Chalfant
Roy K. Matsushige
Richard T. LeRoy
Larry K. Nelson
Arthur D. Ross
Colin L. Campbell
Richard F. Coons
Arthur J. Kuhn
John K. Callahan, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 10 (legislative day of January 26), 1966:

U.S. AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment in the Air Force Reserve to the grade indicated, under the provisions of chapter 35 and sections 8373 and 8376, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

*Brig. Gen. Howard W. Cannon, FV383170, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. J. Clarence Davies, Jr., FV904230, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Donald S. Dawson, FV582705, Air Force Reserve.

*Brig. Gen. Benjamin W. Fridge, FV365107, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Richard C. Hagan, FV307796, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. William C. Lewis, Jr., FV944440, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. William D. Price, FV286176, Air Force Reserve.

To be brigadier generals

*Col. Earl O. Anderson, FV705280, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Joseph W. Barron, FV423421, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Richard T. Cella, FV378228, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Stanley J. Czyzak, FV364077, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. Dan B. Dyer, FV2212700, Air Force Reserve.

Col. William R. Harpster, FV662780, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Herman L. Harris, FV344153, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. John W. Hoff, FV828596, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. Joseph S. Hoover, FV907184, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Joe M. Kilgore, FV437412, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Tom E. Marchbanks, Jr., FV669752, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Maurice I. Marks, FV367334, Air Force Reserve.

Col. James L. Murray, FV386624, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Gwynn H. Robinson, FV791240, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. Martin H. Scharlemann, FV402684, Air Force Reserve.

Col. John H. Stembler, FV342806, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Evelle J. Younger, FV391177, Air Force Reserve.

The following officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of sections 8218, 8351, 8363, and 8392, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Joseph P. Gentile, FG384460, Massachusetts Air National Guard.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Raymond A. Fortin, FG420587, Maine Air National Guard.

Col. Roy A. Jacobson, FG2054045, Arizona Air National Guard.

Col. Raymond J. Kopecky, FG740462, California Air National Guard.

Col. Michael C. Malone, FG1849428, New York Air National Guard.

Col. William D. Prescott, FG484947, Pennsylvania Air National Guard.

Col. Valentine A. Siefermann, FG794707, Hawaii Air National Guard.

Col. Walter E. Williams, Jr., FG766815, Colorado Air National Guard.

(NOTE.—Asterisk (*) indicates selection by 1963 selection board and submission provided for in section 8373(d), title 10, United States Code.)

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of chapter 835, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Jack N. Donohew, FR1319 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas B. Whitehouse, FR1677 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Milton B. Adams, FR1712 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Charles R. Bond, Jr., FR1937 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Horace A. Hanes, FR2060 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas K. McGehee, FR3809 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Fred J. Ascani, FR4036 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert W. Burns, FR4142 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James C. Sherrill, FR4910 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Abe J. Beck, FR5831 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Gordon M. Graham, FR7761 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Harry E. Goldsworthy, FR1631 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William B. Campbell, FR2000 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John D. Lavelle, FR4359 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Donald W. Graham, FR4361 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Otto J. Glasser, FR4368 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Duward L. Crow, FR18061 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William J. Crumm, FR8663 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John W. Vogt, Jr., FR8709 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, Jr., FR8956 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James W. Humphreys, Jr., FR19928 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Manson, FR1800 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert L. Delashaw, FR1913 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Alvan N. Moore, FR2062 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Ernest A. Pinson, FR3117 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell, Jr., FR4063 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert W. Paulson, FR3871 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig Gen. John L. Locke, FR4042 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Andrew J. Evans, Jr., FR4072 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig Gen. Harrison R. Thyng, FR4414 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard A. Yudkin, FR4480 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Kenneth C. Dempster, FR4633 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Albert W. Schinz, FR4646 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Frank B. Elliott, FR4681 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gordon F. Blood, FR4766 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force,

Brig. Gen. Sam J. Byerley, FR4875 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edward H. Nigro, FR4889 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert F. Worley, FR4906 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William Burke, FR4950 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William C. Lindley, Jr., FR5006 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen John M. McNabb, FR5037 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William B. Kyes, FR5064 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert L. Petit, FR5213 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Glen J. McClernon, FR5217 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas N. Wilson, FR5255 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John L. Martin, Jr., FR7556 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Ralph G. Taylor, Jr., FR8660 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lee V. Gossick, FR8679 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James T. Stewart, FR8692 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William H. Reddell, FR8874 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Andrew S. Low, Jr., FR8890 (colonel, U.S. Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard D. Reinbold, FR8927 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William C. Garland, FR8934 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Howard E. Kreidler, FR9177 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. George B. Simler, FR9236 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Norman S. Orwat, FR9489 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John W. Baer, FR9820 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. David C. Jones, FR9887 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William W. Berg, FR9961 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Russell E. Dougherty, FR9985 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard F. Schaefer, FR10096 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles H. Roadman, FR3379 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Archie A. Hoffman, FR19222 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

U.S. ARMY

Lt. Gen. Charles Hartwell Bonesteel III, O18655, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), for appointment as indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711, to be senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations.

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Andrew Jackson Boyle, O19924, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. James Benjamin Lampert, O20147, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3306, and 3307:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. George Ruhlen, O19733, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Autry Joseph Maroun, O19865, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Hamilton Austin Twitchell, O19843, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Joseph Rieber Russ, O19860, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Hart Caughey, O19885, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Roy Lassetter, Jr., O51714, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Edward Landrum, Jr., O20216, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert George Fergusson, O20267, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Pelham Yarborough, O20332, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Benjamin Franklin Evans, Jr., O20368, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Charles Haneka, O20263, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Arthur William Oberbeck, O20569, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Francis Seedlock, O20609, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Alexander Day Surles, Jr., O20622, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Albert Ollie Connor, O20699, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ferdinand Thomas Unger, O20734, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Benjamin Franklin Taylor, O20779, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U..S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Joe Stallings Lawrie, O20914, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. David Bennett Parker, O20571, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Chester Lee Johnson, O20681, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Jarvis Tolson III, O20826, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Donald Ralph Pierce, O43332, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Wayne Whitney, O31855, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Richard Giles Stilwell, O21065, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Gregory Wickham, O21073, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Walter Edward Lotz, Jr., O21090, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Claire Elwood Hutchin, Jr., O21092, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Fillmore Kennady Mearns, O21106, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Welby Beverley, O21107, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Roland Bennett Anderson, O21108, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frank Wade Norris, O21110, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Braden Latta, O21119, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Samuel Knox Eaton, O21132, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ferdinand Joseph Chesarek, O21177, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Jaroslav Thayer Folda, Jr., O21193, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Charles Fremont Tillson III, O21196, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Milton Finn, O21252, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Arthur Sylvester Collins, Jr., O21260, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ben Sternberg, O21286, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Joseph Denholm, O21293, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Howard York, O21341, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Raymond Peers, O21366, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Peter Stone, O21376, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Carroll Hilton Dunn, O21427, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, O21739, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Julian Johnson Ewell, O21791, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frederic William Boye, Jr., O21891, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Raymond Bradner Marlin, O21899, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Edward Pickett, O21938, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Walter Thomas Kerwin, Jr., O21963, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Welborn Griffin Dolvin, O21980, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, O21990, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Frank Thomas Mildren, O21992, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Henry Schellman, O22002, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Michael Shannon Davison, O22051, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Joseph McCaffrey, O22065, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Stanley Robert Larsen, O22094, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Augustine Kenan, O22670, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Allen Corcoran, O31721, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles William Eifler, O32614, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Charles Joseph Denholm, O21293, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Patrick Francis Cassidy, O32809, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Julian Johnson Ewell, O21791, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Norton, O23858, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Leland George Cagwin, O23200, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Charles Gribble, Jr., O23695, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Eugene DePuy, O34710, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Irvin Forsythe, O24510, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Henry Augustine Miley, Jr., O22993, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles William Eifler, O32614, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Vincent Wilson, O23564, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Milton Hightower, O23531, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Jaroslav Thayer Folda, Jr., O21193, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Samuel Knox Eaton, O21132, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Fillmore Kennady Mearns, O21106, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Walter Edward Lotz, Jr., O21090, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Pershing Brown, O23544, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Keith Lincoln Ware, O33181, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Woodrow Wilson Vaughan, O23004, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Joseph McCaffrey, O22065, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Raymond Bradner Marlin, O21899, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Roderick Wetherill, O23158, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Bibb Pickett, Jr., O23932, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Carroll Hilton Dunn, O21427, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Wayne Whitney, O31855, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Braden Latta, O21119, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Thomas Cassidy, O23213, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Howard Bayer, O23551, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Arthur Lorenzo West, Jr., O25269, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Dayton Willis Eddy, O24565, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Augustine Kenan, O22670, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Raymond Chandler Conroy, O33276, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard George Ciccolella, 034117, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Allen Corcoran, O31721, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Donald Ralph Pierce, O43332, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Hancock Hay, Jr., O25290, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. James Joseph Gibbons, O25355, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Francis Hollingsworth, O34155, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Mulford Van Harlingen, Jr., O22016, U.S. Army.

Col. Donald Hugh McGovern, O36851, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Burbank Webster, Jr., O23425, U.S. Army.

Col. William John Durrenberger, O25099, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Orwin Clark Talbott, O24617, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Burnside Elijah Huffman, Jr., O23759, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Kenneth Mace Gonseth, O24417, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Kenneth Lawson Johnson, O36285, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Warren Kennedy Bennett, O35691, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Arthur Lionel Friedman, O32474, U.S. Army.

Col. Willis Dale Crittenberger, Jr., O24893, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Haywood Young, Jr., O36242, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Thomas Bradley, O21768, U.S. Army.

Col. John Reiley Guthrie, O36240, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army.)

Col. Salve Hugo Matheson, O36253, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edwin I. Donley, O34887, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Harris Whitton Hollis, O53724, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James McMenamin Shepherd, O21068, U.S. Army.

Col. Thomas Matthew Rienzi, O24715, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army.)

Col. John Joseph Kenney, Jr., O23114, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Murphy Williams, O22206, U.S. Army.

Col. C. Craig Cannon, O39008, U.S. Army.

Col. Allan Langdon Leonard, Jr., O32898, U.S. Army.

Col. Wallace Leo Clement, O23167, U.S. Army.

Col. Bernard Richard Luczak, O22196, U.S. Army.

Col. Frederick Charles Roecker, Jr., O24681, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Albert Ray Brownfield, Jr., O21905, U.S. Army.

Col. Daniel Arthur Raymond, O24670, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Leo Bond Jones, O24255, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Alden Burke, O46646, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Francis Paul Koisch, O24669, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Leon Baldwin, O36864, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Alfred Judson Force Moody, O23685, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Davis Terry, O24739, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Albert Becker, O24267, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edward Bautz, Jr., O34750, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William McKinney Mantz, O33403, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Howard Keller, O21871, U.S. Army.

Col. Morgan Garrott Roseborough, O22681, U.S. Army.

Col. Karl William Gustafson, O45560, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles George Fredericks, O22092, U.S. Army.

Col. James Kyle Terry, O33375, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel (U.S. Army).

Col. Henry Alfred Rasmussen, O40502, U.S. Army.

Col. Glen Carl Long, O24170, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Robertson Desobry, O24262, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Felix John Gerace, O23954, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Thomas Harwell Barfield, O35425, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Edgar Shedd III, O24971, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Ivey Oscar Drewry, Jr., O33224, U.S. Army.

Col. John Pershing Traylor, O25060, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Samuel Blanchard, O26737, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Louis Klingenhagen, O39223, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Earl Franklin Cole, O64999, Army of the United States (major, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3806:

MEDICAL CORPS

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. Conn Lewis Milburn, Jr., O20405, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Thomas McGibony, O20406, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

DENTAL CORPS

Col. Clare Thomas Budge, O21050, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

MEDICAL CORPS

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Robert Estes Blount, O19612, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Charles Harold Gingles, O20920, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joe Morris Blumberg, O29332, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Robert Lee Rhea, Jr., O29285, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. James Arista Wier, O26416, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list, in grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. William Wilson Quinn, O19283, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Ashton Herbert Manhart, O18773, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be brigadier general

Chaplain (Col.) Francis Leon Sampson, O30951, U.S. Army.

U.S. NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade indicated, in the staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

To be rear admirals

Frank T. Norris.

SUPPLY CORPS

George E. Moore.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Robert R. Wooding.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade indicated, in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

To be rear admirals

Norvell G. Ward
Constantine A. Karaberis
William S. Guest
Edward C. Outlaw
Russell Kefauver
Allan F. Fleming
John M. Alford
James W. O'Grady
William F. Bringle
Edward E. Grimm
John D. Bulkeley
Ben W. Sarver
Don W. Wulzen
Frederick J. Harlfinger II
Dennis C. Lyndon
Fred G. Bennett
David C. Richardson
Richard R. Pratt
Norman C. Gillette, Jr.
William P. Mack
Paul E. Hartmann
Donald Gay, Jr.
Charles S. Minter, Jr.
John P. Sager
Emery A. Grantham
Nathan Sonenshein

MEDICAL CORPS

Edward P. Irons.
John W. Albrittain.
George M. Davis, Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Harry J. P. Foley, Jr.
Jack J. Appleby.
Winston H. Schleef.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

William M. Heaman.
Walter M. Enger.

To be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years

Rear Adm. Edward J. Fahy, U.S. Navy, for appointment as indicated.

The following-named officers, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving:

To be vice admirals

*Vice Adm. John L. Chew, U.S. Navy.
*Vice Adm. John J. Hyland, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. Frederick L. Ashworth, U.S. Navy.

(NOTE.—Asterisk (*) indicates an interim appointment.)

The following-named officers, when retired, for appointment to the grade indicated, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

To be vice admirals

Vice Adm. Charles L. Melson, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. Edmund B. Taylor, U.S. Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Lisle C. Carter, Jr., of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Robert G. Taylor, to be a permanent professor, U.S. Air Force Academy, and ending Donald L. Rouland, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 17, 1966; and

The nominations beginning Alvin D. Aaronson, to be major, and ending Edward R. Ward, Jr., to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 31, 1966.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Nellie J. Zalesney, to be major, and ending Richard H. Zeller, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 31, 1966.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mr. Michael Monroney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to join the Postmaster General, Lawrence O'Brien, in expressing my deep regret over the resignation of his Executive Assistant, Mr. Michael Monroney.

I am sure that I speak for my colleagues in saying that Mike Monroney's vast experience in Government affairs will be missed. He has made great contributions to the Post Office Department which will long be remembered by the citizens of the Nation.

Mike has served his country well under President Kennedy and President Johnson. Mike Monroney began his present assignment in early 1961 under former Postmaster General J. Edward Day, assisting him during the transition of the Post Office Department to the Kennedy administration.

Monroney brought to his postal job considerable and varied experience in journalism and in local and Federal Government affairs.

Moving into nearby Silver Spring, Md., following his graduation from Dartmouth College in 1951, he covered suburban affairs as a staff reporter for the Washington, D.C., Post and Times-Herald during most of his 5 years with the newspaper.

In 1957 and 1958, he served as a top aid to the county manager of Montgomery County, Md., adjacent to the District of Columbia. In 1956 he served on the presidential campaign staff of Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson.

The 38-year-old Monroney served for 2 years as administrative assistant to Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana, during which he worked on a variety of legislative problems, including aid to distressed areas, Federal aid to education, the Federal airport construction program and labor-management reform legislation.

He left Congressman BRADEMAS' staff in January of 1961 to assume his present position. As executive assistant to the Postmaster General, Monroney is in charge of congressional liaison for the Post Office Department in addition to other assignments at the direction of the Postmaster General.

Named Maryland Young Democrat of the Year in 1961, Monroney was also nominated that same year for one of the 10 outstanding young men of the year awards sponsored annually by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce.

A Navy veteran, he is the son of U.S. Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma.

I would like to wish him the best of success in whatever field of endeavor he chooses to enter. Past experience shows that Mike is a man who has a deep understanding and sympathy for his fellowman and is dedicated to serving his country.

NBC Honors Chicago's Len O'Connor on His 25th Year of Reporting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last night the National Broadcasting Co. honored one of Chicago's most highly respected journalists, Len O'Connor, who is observing his 25th year of reporting.

Len O'Connor is one of Chicago's most popular television journalists and commentators. NBC is to be congratulated for honoring him on his 25th anniversary.

He is frequently called the "Guardian of Chicago's Conscience." Because of his thorough understanding of the problems of a large city like Chicago; his deep insight into problems of America and his thorough knowledge of international affairs, he today has several million people in the Midwest following his daily commentary both on radio and television.

Len O'Connor is a newspaperman's journalist. He is penetrating, perceptive, understanding and often pungent, but never unfair. He has earned the respect not only of those he reports about, but also those he reports for.

Mr. Speaker it was a privilege to be invited yesterday to see the top management people from the National Broadcasting Co.'s Midwest facilities present Len O'Connor with a wristwatch in grateful recognition of his 25 years of outstanding journalism.

May time be kind to him so he can observe his golden jubilee of enterprising and dedicated contributions to the highest standards of American journalism.

Padded Agricultural Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I have long been interested in the progress of agricultural exports and, judging by official reports, they have been performing admirably in recent years.

The following table will show the progress during the past 12 years, through 1964:

U.S. exports of agricultural products, 1953–64

Year	Exports (millions)	Share of total exports (percent)
1953	$2,847	18.0
1954	3,054	20.0
1955	3,199	21.0
1956	4,170	22.0
1957	4,506	22.0
1959	3,955	23.0
1960	4,832	24.0
1962	5,034	24.0
1963	5,585	24.0
1964	6,347	25.6

Source: U.S. Foreign Agricultural Trade by Commodities, calendar year 1963, June 1964, ERS, U.S. Department of Agriculture; also October 1965.

By looking at these statistics we are struck not only by the doubling of dollar exports since 1954, but also by the increase in the share of total exports enjoyed by agricultural exports. This share rose from 18 percent in 1953 and 20 percent in 1954 to 25.6 percent in 1964.

This fact would seem to call for congratulations to the Department of Agriculture.

However, let us not forget that Public Law 480 was passed in 1954 In 1956 agricultural exports jumped to $4,170 million or by a billion over 1955. Since 1959 there has been a steady growth in exports of farm products, rising to $6,347 million in 1964, a record high. The 1965 total is not yet available but the indications are that there was a slight decline to $6.2 billion in that year, from the 1964 high.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested in a statement in the November 1965 issue of "Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States, Economic Research Service, Department of Agriculture." It said, to quote:

> The major factor behind such a rapid export expansion was the high rate of industrial growth in Western Europe and Japan.

However, if we look at page 7 of the same publication, table 1, we find that the share of Europe in our total agricultural exports dropped from 48 percent in 1959 to 43 percent in 1964. Asia's share went in the opposite direction, or from 25 percent of the total in 1959 to 31 percent in 1964. However, Japan's share dropped from 39.5 percent of our total agricultural exports to Asia in the 1955–59 period to 36.9 percent in 1964. India's share, on the other hand, rose sharply from $153 million in the 1955–59 period to $480 million in 1964 or from 15.6 percent of our total agricultural exports to Asia in the 1955–59 period to 24.6 cents in 1964. There was also a sharp rise in such exports to Iran—a sixfold increase—and a threefold increase to Pakistan—see table 14, same publication, pages 17–18. The upshot is that of the billion-dollar increase in our agricultural exports to Asia during this period only a third went to Japan while two-thirds of the increase went to other Asiatic countries, mostly to India, Pakistan, Iran, and Iraq.

It is therefore difficult to follow the statement quoted above, to the effect that the major factor behind the rapid rise in our agricultural exports has been the high rate of industrial growth in Europe and Japan.

When Europe's share of our total agricultural exports dropped from 48 to 43 percent between 1959 and 1964 and Japan's share of our exports to Asia dropped from 39.5 percent in the 1955–59 period to 36.9 percent in 1964, it must be apparent that some other factor was at work; and of course it was the increase in shipments to such countries as India, Pakistan, and so forth. These were, as we know, heavily dependent on Public Law 480 shipments.

Mr. Speaker, we are very much in need of clear statistics in this field, particularly if we are to unravel unsubsidized and unassisted exports of farm products from exports that move in private channels on a competitive basis.

For the latest fiscal year the Department of Agriculture reports total agricultural exports of $6.09 billion. This was for the year ended June 20, 1965. Of this total $1.669 billion were indeed reported in the Agriculture Department's publication as exports under Government-financed programs, leaving a total of $4.426 billion which were classified as "commercial" exports.

The trouble with this classification so far as reflecting the competitive position of this country is concerned, is that it does not go far enough. My reason for saying this is that we export "commercially" about a billion dollars worth of wheat, wheat flour, raw cotton, rice, and so forth, outside of the Public Law 480 or AID program. These sales are made because of a considerable Federal subsidy of these products and not because we are competitive.

If we add such exports to those that we shipped under titles I–IV of Public Law 480, and so forth; that is, those classified by the Department of Agriculture as Government-financed programs, the $1.669 billion rises to $2.605 billion. This will leave $3.599 billion as truly commercial competitive exports of agricultural products in the 1964–65 fiscal year instead of $4.426 billion—see table 3, page 15, of the above cited Department of Agriculture publication.

This leaves a considerably less brilliant accomplishment. No doubt we could export well above $6 billion in agricultural products if we first, sold more for foreign currencies under title I, Public Law 480; second, moved more exports under famine and emergency relief under title II of Public Law 480; third, increased foreign donations under section 416, Agriculture Act of 1949 and section 302, Public Law 480; and fourth, and offered more shipments under barter programs—CCC Charter Act; section 303, Public Law 480; and so forth.

But if we did so we would not advance by one iota the competitive capacity of this country in foreign markets. This is a matter of production costs, and giving away agricultural products does not reduce costs of production. It tends to raise them because of the higher tax burden created.

Mr. Speaker, the false impression created by the inclusion of subsidized farm products in our exports and shipments under Public Law 480, and so forth, is matched by another statistical practice that is equally pernicious in its effects. I refer to what has been called the f.o.b.-c.i.f. distortion. All the other leading trading nations report their imports on the c.i.f. basis. This merely means that they record the true cost of the goods imported by adding to the foreign price, the cost of shipping and insurance incident to bringing the goods to their ports of entry.

What is our practice? We leave off these charges and record the value of our imports at their foreign price, point of export. If anyone believes this to be a minor matter he should compare the price of an automobile at its f.o.b. Detroit level and what the cost would be if he took delivery several thousand miles away.

From calculations made on the basis of actual import and export statistics of this country in its trade with England and Japan, it seems safe to say that our imports from these countries are undervalued from 20 to 25 percent for the reason just set forth. This represents a serious distortion, and we should review all our import statistics with this distortion in mind.

Surely we cannot base our trade policies on unreliable statistics. Yet that is what we have been doing.

It has been estimated that in place of a $5.2 billion surplus in our exports over imports for 1965 as reported recently by the Department of Commerce we actually ran a deficit of about $2 billion, when the figures are corrected by the guides I have set forth above.

I am very anxious to see this statistical practice corrected as soon as possible and am introducing appropriate legislation to that end. I urge all who are concerned about a sound foreign trade policy to take an interest in this matter and to support the legislation.

Community Antenna Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. OLIVA HUOT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks my office has received literally hundreds of letters and telegrams from residents of my State who are subscribers to Community Antenna Television. These people are deeply concerned about reports that the Federal Communications Commission is planning to impose restrictions upon the CATV industry which will impair the service which they presently receive. After some study of the problem, I can only conclude that their fears are not unjustified.

It is not my purpose to maintain that the FCC is without authority to regulate CATV. Nor is it my contention that no regulation is needed. However, the authority of the FCC to regulate and actual regulation are not the same thing. Moreover, judging from the substance of staff recommendations at the FCC and the basic assumptions underlying these recommendations, I seriously question the correctness of what I anticipate the regulations will be.

I do not intend at this time to delve too deeply into the technical aspects of the problem. I will, however, cite the possible effects that regulation will have upon CATV subscribers in my district, specifically in Laconia, N.H., which presently has the sole CATV system in my district. It is my impression that the situation in Laconia is not dissimilar to other situations throughout the country.

Laconia is a small city in central New Hampshire. It has no local television station of its own. As a matter of fact, the only TV broadcaster in New Hampshire is located in Manchester about 45 miles from Laconia. By present FCC standards, Laconia is located within the grade B contour of three Maine broadcasters who represent all three major networks. A grade B contour is one in which the broadcaster delivers an acceptable signal to 70 percent of the locations 50 percent of the time. The plain and simple fact is, however, that for those who live within the city of Laconia, normal off-the-air reception is inadequate and unreliable. Therefore, many people desirous of better reception have made the financial outlay to subscribe to Community Antenna Service. The very fact that people subscribe to the system is evidence of the inadequacy of off-the-air reception.

The Community Antenna Service also furnishes, by way of microwave relay, a major New York independent station. This service is particularly attractive since this station carries the New York Yankees baseball games.

If the FCC staff recommendations are incorporated into regulations much of the service now provided will be severely curtailed. For example, the nonduplication requirement of the recommendations would require the CATV to black out any show which is being carried by any other stations in a grade B contour. The practical effect would be to require the viewer to watch the weak signals transmitted by the Maine broadcasters, or watch nothing at all. Such a regulation would be totally unrealistic. It would effectively deprive a large segment of the subscribers of decent television reception.

The FCC has indicated that one of the reasons it wants to restrict CATV is to encourage the development of local television stations. There is undeniably merit in this purpose. However, to the best of my knowledge, no one has ever evinced an interest in establishing a local station in or near Laconia.

A further justification for restricting CATV has been its "economic impact." *This can be and often is a valid justification.* The underlying assumption involved is that CATV has a negative effect on local advertising. But when the community involved lies on the outer fringe of a station's B contour, this *justification is less persuasive.* A Maine television station is not the logical medium for Laconia, N.H., advertising. I would, therefore, seriously doubt that CATV in Laconia has adversely affected the advertising revenues of the Maine broadcasters.

I have not attempted to discuss all the effects that unwise and unduly restrictive regulation would have upon CATV. I have attempted to briefly outline the most harmful effect that such regulation would have upon one community. Undoubtedly, there are countless other communities in the same position. I want to make it perfectly clear that my primary concern is for those subscribers who without CATV would not receive adequate television service. I will vigorously oppose any regulation which will impair this service.

Failure To Remove Snow at District of Columbia Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mrs. **BOLTON.** Mr. Speaker, several days ago I commented on the failure of the District of Columbia to deal effectively with the snow situation which paralyzed the city. Since then I have had many reports and examples of dangerous situations which were permitted to exist. For instance, I am told that a week after the snow fell, along the school grounds at 13th Street NW., at Military Road, little tots still had to choose whether to defy the deady rush-hour traffic on 13th Street or brave the chin-deep snow, still untrampled on the school walk.

In front of Wilson High School on Nebraska Avenue, the snow, higher than a tall man stands, remained untouched for days after the children returned to school. The report which came to me indicated that similar conditions were found at most other District of Columbia schools. It seems that the only thing brought to bear on the snow surrounding our public schools here were the cold, damp feet of courageous children beating a path to classes that were declared reopened, with a dare to get there if you can.

In times of such emergency, why cannot we recruit from among the ranks of those men who are drawing upon the various Federal sustaining programs, at least to perform the public service of clearing a path to our school buildings—before we order the children to return? Perhaps the Job Corps could help in such instances—or those who, under better *weather circumstances, would be working* on the beautification program.

Clifford R. Shaw Award Presented to *Elliott Donnelley*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. **ANNUNZIO.** Mr Speaker a very distinguished citizen, Elliott Donnelley, of Chicago, was honored on Sunday, January 30, 1966, by the Chicago Federation of Community Committees.

Mr. Donnelley, vice chairman of R. R. Donnelley & Co., located in the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois and one of the largest printing firms in the country, was presented the Clifford R. Shaw Memorial Award in recognition of outstanding contributions in human relations, youth welfare, and delinquency prevention.

Attended by 500 persons at Luigi's Restaurant, 2550 West North Avenue, the award was presented in behalf of the federation by Anthony Sorrentino, delinquency prevention supervisor for the division of community services of the Illinois Youth Commission.

In making the presentation Mr. Sorrentino remarked:

> I greatly appreciate the privilege and honor accorded me by the Chicago Federation of Community Committees to present its special award, the Clifford R. Shaw Memorial Award—bearing the name of a distinguished social scientist and humanitarian—for presentation to an eminent industrialist, philanthropist and humanitarian, our good friend Elliott Donnelley.
>
> I know that Clifford R. Shaw, the sociologist, founder and director of the Chicago area project, would have been pleased and proud to know that this first award bearing his name is being presented to the man we are honoring this evening. For the man we are honoring is an extraordinary man.
>
> Our honored guest has an illustrious record in the field of human relations and youth welfare. Last year, for example, he was given special recognition and an award by the United Negroes Fund for his outstanding contribution in promoting the education and welfare of our Negro citizens.
>
> Mr. Donnelley is especially noted in our city as the founder, organizer, and major supporter of the Chicago youth centers, one of the most valuable resources for thousands of disadvantaged, culturally deprived children. Under his able leadership, and boundless generosity, the Chicago youth centers have grown during the past decade from a few boys' clubs to over six major institutions. In addition the centers carry on special community services and work with street gangs, performing vitally needed programs for youth welfare and delinquency control.
>
> Another unique project started by Elliott Donnelley about 6 years ago was the establishment of the job-finding investigating committee. Financed almost singlehandedly by him, with staff services by the Illinois Youth Commission, this project was the very first in the city of Chicago to focus attention on the need for special services for our unemployed youth, and particularly for those who had been in trouble with the law. This project paved the way for other special projects in the field of youth employment which were later supported by foundations and by city and State government and more recently by the war on poverty by the Federal Government.
>
> Those of us who are identified with the *Chicago Federation of Community Committees* and the Chicago area project which work with and through the division of community services of the Illinois Youth Commission, are especially grateful for Mr. Donnelley's interest and financial support to our community projects for the treatment of delinquents and the prevention of delinquency. Under Mr. Donnelley's leadership a plan was initiated last year to give financial assistance to *self-help community committees* and to assist them in the further development of their programs, and hopefully to prepare them for participation in the Community Fund of Chicago.
>
> These are just a few highlights of Mr. Donnelley's activities and contributions. In addition he is a generous supporter of numerous other charitable, welfare, and educational programs, too numerous to mention.
>
> In conclusion, I should like to mention just a few of Mr. Donnelley's affiliations. He is a former mayor of Lake Forest. At the present time he is vice chairman of the board of R. R. Donnelley & Co. In 1961 he was appointed by Gov. Otto Kerner to the advisory board of the division of community services of the Illinois Youth Commission. A fishing enthusiast and world traveler, he is virtually a railroad engineer with an avid interest in all things pertaining to trains from model trains to locomotives on the narrow gage to the sleek, modern diesels.
>
> Above all, our honored guest is a man who is endowed with great commonsense, who has deep insight in identifying a problem and great capacity for making intelligent decisions and plans for an attack on the problem. In short, he is a down-to-earth man of action and a great humanitarian in the best sense of the word.

Neighborhood volunteers and professional workers in youth welfare were also honored. Walter S. Klimek, Illinois

Youth Commission member, also presented awards to 31 volunteers who support the work of community committees affiliated with the Chicago area project.

Dr. James E. McKeown, chairman of the Sociology Department of De Paul University, also presented awards of merit to four professional youth workers for unusual dedication to their work. The four are: Mrs. Lural Evans, an attendance officer for the Chicago Board of Education; John F. McGuire, probation officer for the Family Court of Cook County; Donald E. Thomas, of the Chicago Police Department Youth Bureau; and Edward Miller, a parole officer for the Illinois Youth Commission.

During the meeting, the Honorable John Troike, chairman of the Illinois Youth Commission, spoke on the value of volunteers in delinquency prevention.

The main speaker was Arthur H. Kruse, executive director of the Community Fund of Chicago, who stressed first that we need to join leadership and money of the total community with the leadership and money of the local neighborhood. Second, we need to join together the motivations and inspirations of volunteers and professional people. Third, we should strive to mobilize and coordinate all resources in the community.

Currently, with our Government's emphasis on the war on poverty and in the prevention of juvenile delinquency, this approach by the Chicago area project and the Illinois Youth Commission, is especially worthy of our attention. It was Clifford R. Shaw who first stressed the indispensability of involving the local residents in any attempts to deal with community problems, and especially the problem of delinquency. Shaw was truly a pioneer in this field and it is heartening to see our Government and many private agencies now employing these self-help ideas.

Since the Chicago area project is so little known, yet so significant, a brief account of the story of this enterprise by Anthony Sorrentino is herewith included for the RECORD.

Excise Taxes To Eliminate Junkyards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in testifying before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, prior to his confirmation as Director of the Bureau of Mines last week, Dr. Walter R. Hibbard, Jr., noted that very promising progress is being made on the Bureau's research project for the use of automobile scrap in modern steelmaking. In view of the numerous steps that are in the making to contend with the auto junkyard problem, I feel that every Member of Congress should familiarize himself with all facets of the subject.

The Highway Beautification Act of 1965 provides that the establishment and use and maintenance of junkyards in areas adjacent to the Interstate System and the primary system should be controlled in order to protect the public investment in such highways, to promote the safety and recreational value of public travel, and to preserve natural beauty. Among the provisions are Federal participation in junkyard removal, landscaping and screening, as well as a reduction in federal highway funds to states which fail to provide effective controls.

Also during the last session of Congress, I proposed that 1 percent of the auto excise tax be used by the Federal Government to dispose of auto junkyards, with as much as half of the income to be put into research to determine whether the junked cars have further economic use. Numerous recommendations have come from the general public as well as from interested businesses in response to this suggestion, and meanwhile considerable development toward economic disposal of scrapped cars has taken place. I have received correspondence from representatives of the scrap industry who are convinced that research thus far clearly indicates that the time is near when through proper crushing and incineration old cars can be dismantled and the steel salvaged profitably. Meanwhile Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall has invited universities, nonprofit organizations, business firms, and individual citizens to submit constructive recommendations and proposals to the Bureau of Mines for expanded research on disposal of scrap autos and other solid mineral wastes.

The Bureau's own scrap-auto research is described as follows:

> Bureau research on the scrap-auto problem is directed toward overcoming presently known economic and technological barriers—such as changes in steelmaking and automobile manufacturing practices—that have caused once-sizable markets for these discarded cars to shrink. Out of the Bureau's research have come two promising metallurgical processes, both of which are scheduled for early testing in large-scale demonstration plants.
>
> One process involves the conversion of all the iron and steel in auto body scrap to a high-grade iron ore for which there is a ready market. With this process the scrap can be used as a reductant for low-grade, nonmagnetic taconite that is abundant in the United States. This is done by carefully controlled roasting of the scrap and the taconite in a rotating kiln, which converts both the iron in the taconite and the iron and steel in the scrap to magnetic iron oxide. After roasting, any unconverted scrap is screened for recycling, and the iron oxides are concentrated by magnetic separation into a high-grade form of iron oxide. All nonferrous materials in the scrap, as well as the gangue in the taconite, are rejected in the process. By changing the roasting conditions, the process can be made to operate without taconite. In this variation iron in the scrap is obtained as an oxide, which can be separated magnetically from nonferrous contaminating elements in the scrap.
>
> In the other process being developed by the Bureau, cylindrical shaped bales made from cannibalized automobiles, less engines and transmissions, will be run through a rotary kiln at a temperature high enough to burn the combustible materials and melt the nonferrous metal parts. The kiln gases will be cleaned to prevent air pollution. Resulting clean scrap, upon discharge from the kiln, will be compacted to any desired density for steelmaking charges. After the technique for burning and separating nonferrous metals from baled automobile hulls is developed in a pilot plant, a larger demonstration plant including a modern electric steelmaking furnace with necessary accessories will be built for demonstrating the economic feasibility of the thermal treatment technique. The objective is to show that many types of steel can be produced from thermally treated automobile scrap only, and that almost any type of steel can be economically produced from thermally treated scrap and directly reduced iron ore.

Mr. Speaker, as these efforts continue, the number of junked cars to blight suburbs and countryside rises annually. More than 5 million were dumped onto the heaps last year. The president of General Motors predicted on January 17 that the average annual demand for cars and trucks in the United States could exceed 11 million by 1970, thus blazing the way for bigger and bigger junkyards.

While the unsightly cars are piled higher, adjacent land tracts—whether they are business, residential, or farm areas—suffer correspondingly. Regardless of how attractive your own plot of ground may be, its beauty is quickly marred if a neighbor is unconcerned about the trash in his yard. In our particular region of Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Electric Co., has long practiced beautifying to the fullest possible extent the properties on which its facilities are located, including the rights-of-way for power lines. Trees are planted and carefully nurtured, and the company takes pride in helping to keep our State beautiful.

Responsible mining companies needed no laws to insist upon reclamation of stripped properties. For years they have been turning earth from which coal has been extracted through surface operations into attractive forest, farm, and recreational areas.

These operations by the utilities and coal companies have been carried out at their own expense, without cost to Federal or State government. By the same token, it would seem reasonable for auto manufacturers and consumers to provide the means for proper disposal of cars that are no longer usable, and the use of a portion of the excise tax would appear to be the least injurious or objectionable means of absorbing the cost.

The Bureau of Mines projects are commendable and should receive high priority, but once a satisfactory method of economic disposal of auto bodies is developed, the Federal Government should retire from this activity and permit commercial growth of the industry. I am hopeful that such plans will be achieved prior to July 1, 1970, in order that it will not be necessary for Federal and State governments to finance removal and screening of auto junkyards, as provided in the Highway Beautification Act of 1965.

Newspaper Columnist Joe Crump has observed:

> Making junked automobiles commercially profitable is a sure way to remove them from the scene.

With a portion of the excise tax available in support of the junked car disposal program, there is all the more reason to assume that research can and will make it a profitable undertaking.

While some development engineers are confident that small disposal plants—even portable facilities—can dispose of junked cars economically, the consensus would appear to favor—at least in the early stages—large centers to which the steel shells would be hauled from points within a wide periphery. In the latter event, I would hope that automobile transportation firms will be ready to assume a role in the operation without delay. Stackback and piggyback railroad cars as well as the two-deck auto-carrying trucks that move from assembly centers with new vehicles snuggled closely together should quickly be converted for hauling remnants from scattered junkyards to points where giant incinerators have been established.

We are obviously making headway in our battle to eliminate the ghastly auto junkyard. Let us give it a boost by applying 1 percent of the excise tax to this crusade.

About Raised Interest Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the recent raising of the interest rates by the Federal Reserve Board has caused quite a furor. Those of us from the Midwest feel especially unhappy about these developments.

The farm economy of our area has never progressed under a tight money policy. Because we must borrow funds for most of our farm operations, the raise in interest rates is costing the farmers of the Seventh Iowa District considerably more than previously. This is neither wise nor fair.

One of the editors of our district, F. S. Nelson of Shenandoah, commented on this is his paper the Weekly Times. His recent article along with a news story quoting two of my colleagues, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, and Congressman WILLIAM BARRETT, fairly well expresses my personal feeling on this matter.

[From the Red Oak (Iowa) Weekly Times, Jan. 12, 1966]

ABOUT RAISED INTEREST RATES

(EDITOR'S NOTE: the noted financial columnist J. A. Livingston recently tried to explain why the Federal Reserve Board raised interest rates. His widely read column, usually very succinct and profound, caused a furor across the Nation, President Johnson openly opposed McChesney Martin, Federal Reserve chairman, in the move. The following letter by veteran Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, sums up the administration views on the matter quite clearly, and we publish it for your enlightenment. F.S.N.)

To the EDITOR:

Columnist J. A. Livingston has now given us the Christmas bedtime version of the continuing and constantly shifting story of "Why the Federal Reserve Board raised interest rates."

Mr. Livingston assures his readers that the action was all part of a Christmas Eve urge by the Federal Reserve Board to benefit the little savers of the Nation. Yes, Mr. Livingston, there is still a Santa Claus.

But for the average consumer who does not subscribe to the Santa Claus theory of economics, Mr. Livingston's column has a cold, hard ring. For they are the ones who will be reaching down deep to pay an added $25 billion in interest charges in 1966, up 25 percent from the interest rate bill of $100 billion in 1965.

Mr. Livingston's theory is based on the fact that there are millions of savings accounts in various financial institutions. Therefore, according to the Livingston theory, millions benefit when interest rates are increased. The columnist attempts to imply that among these savers are millions of low-income Americans.

What Mr. Livingston leaves out of this Santa Claus image of the Federal Reserve Board's action is astounding.

First, Mr. Livingston ignores the income distribution figures. The fact is that more than half of the population has annual income of less than $4,600. Surely the columnist does not suggest that this group has amassed huge fortunes in savings accounts.

About one-fourth of the Nation's families and single individuals have no liquid assets—that is, no savings. On the other hand, virtually all of this group must borrow to survive. Higher interest rates take more dollars out of the already inadequate incomes of this segment of the population.

Another 28 percent have liquid assets or savings of under $500 and another 12 percent, liquid assets of between $500 and $999. In other words, 64 percent of the Nation's families and single individuals have savings of less than $1,000.

But the big question is how much debt is on the backs of this group of nonsavers and small savers which make up the great majority of the population. The interest on this debt is staggering and does not begin to be offset by the minimal interest gained on small savings accounts.

Millions of Americans have home mortgages ranging between $10,000 and $20,000. Millions of the same Americans also owe $1,000 to $1,500 on an automobile. Millions of small businessmen and farmers are deeply in debt for capital. All of this group must pay the 25-percent increase in interest imposed by the Federal Reserve Board. It is nothing less than a tax on this group.

I hope Mr. Livingston is not suggesting that the small saver who may draw interest on a $300 or $400 savings account is benefited when he must pay 25 percent more for interest on a $20,000 home. For example, a 1-percent increase in interest rates adds $4,734 in interest costs to a $20,000 loan over a 30-year schedule of maturity. This is roughly equivalent to the annual income for more than half the population.

Mr. Livingston's upside-down economics notwithstanding, the truth is that interest income goes primarily to a handful of high-income groups, large corporations, and financial institutions. It takes money from the pockets of the average- and low-income citizen.

Mr. Livingston cannot escape the fact that it takes money to make money with money.

WRIGHT PATMAN,

Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. House of Representatives.

Two veteran congressional leaders today charged that the increase in interest rates on FHA mortgages was the direct result of the Federal Reserve Board's defiant action in increasing the discount rate on December 6.

"Now William McChesney Martin has succeeded in jeopardizing President Johnson's housing programs to the detriment of millions of American homeowners," Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat of Texas, and Representative WILLIAM BARRETT, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, said in a joint statement released following the announcement of the FHA interest rate increase. Mr. PATMAN is chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, and Mr. BARRETT is chairman of that committee's Subcommittee on Housing.

The two Congressmen described the FHA action as "highly regrettable."

"This one-fourth of 1 percent increase in the FHA rate will add millions of dollars to the cost of homes purchased in 1966," they said. "For example, a home buyer who purchases a $20,000 house will pay $1,122 in additional interest charges over the life of a 30-year loan."

Mr. PATMAN and Mr. BARRETT said that although the FHA increase was held to one-fourth of 1 percent, there is "grave danger that this rate hike will lead to even larger increases in the cost of conventional home mortgages." This has been the traditional pattern in previous interest rate increases, they noted.

"Much of the effect of the 1965 Housing and Urban Development Act will undoubtedly be wiped out by increased interest costs," they said. "These increases will hamstring and slow the building industry throughout the country, placing decent housing out of the reach of many Americans."

The two Congressmen said that the increase of the interest rate on housing added another "substantial reason" for forcing the Federal Reserve Board to rescind its December order raising interest rates.

"The Congress cannot sit idly by while the housing and other vital programs are threatened by a one-vote majority of the Federal Reserve Board," they said.

The Congressmen said that interest already represents too high a proportion of the total cost of housing. With the new increase in FHA rates, they noted, homeowners will pay a total of $20,881 in interest on a 30-year, $20,000 mortgage—more than the cost of the home itself.

"These are costs that should be brought down and not raised," they said.

Bringing the Ohio River Valley to Its Finest Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have just had an opportunity to read the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], who was principal speaker at the christening of the first seagoing vessel built on the Ohio River since World War II. His salient observations point up the importance of this great river to the general economy of the entire valley and, indeed, its value to our Nation. Like the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], I foresee the

Ohio River's vital role in our future progress and economic prosperity.

I commend his remarks to the attention of all the Members and, under unanimous consent, I insert them in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF HON. LEE H. HAMILTON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM INDIANA, AT CHRISTENING OF M/V "PHAEDRA," JEFFBOAT, INC., BOATYARDS, JEFFERSONVILLE, IND., DECEMBER 18, 1965

You may not be aware of it, but today you are witnessing a historic occasion in the life of the Ohio River Valley. You may not be aware of it from my speech because I'm not that good at conveying thoughts, but in spite of my speech, and not because of it, this is a historic occasion.

In Shakespeare's "Henry V," the king is about to lead his men into battle; he gives them a stirring oration urging them to arms. In part, he says: "And gentlemen in England now abed shall think themselves accursed they were not here." Well, I don't know if your friends and neighbors who are not here today will think themselves accursed 5 or 10 or 20 years hence, but I do think they might regret it because this is a significant day in the history of the Ohio River Valley.

It is significant because Jeffboat has reached a milestone by producing a seagoing vessel, the first since World War II. And it is because a milestone has been reached that our thoughts naturally turn today to our inland waterways, their importance to the Nation, to the Ohio River Valley, and to Louisville, Jeffersonville, and Jeffboat.

This is a day to remember because we see today the evidence that the Ohio River Valley is on the move in meeting one of its and the Nation's greatest needs—good transportation. The evidence is all about you.

IMPORTANCE TO THE NATION

The milestone reached today reminds us of the importance of the inland waterways to this Nation.

Water carriers today move 431 million tons of freight annually—14½ percent of all of the Nation's domestic freight. And they do it at an average cost to the shipper of 3 mills per ton-mile. This compares with an average cost to the shipper by rail that is five times that of the water freight cost or 15 mills per ton-mile. Truck freight service costs the shipper an average of 6½ cents per ton-mile—and average aircargo rates are in the range of 22 cents per ton-mile.

The savings realized on our waterway transportation are diffused widely throughout the Nation's economy. Coal is an excellent example of that and very important to us because almost 47 million tons moved on the Ohio River in 1964. The savings in transportation costs of coal is reflected, for example, in the price of electricity in home and factory.

The inland waterways are the workhorse of our transportation system. They have set the floor under transportation pricing in this country for many years and will continue to do so as long as water transportation is an effective competitor for business.

Our inland waterways have had a substantial effect on water resource development. Navigation requires that a stable supply of water be maintained in a channel in order to provide a standard operating depth for commercial vessels. In most water resource development projects, this is done by building a series of dams which create relatively deep stillwater pools. But in order to feed that system, dams are built on headwaters and tributary streams to conserve water supplies which feed into the main channel. The water supplies created in these navigation projects are among the most precious and most valuable assets which this Nation has.

Our inland waterways are big business in America. The United States has 25,260 miles of usable, navigable inland channels exclusive of the Great Lakes; the Ohio River alone is 981 miles. In all, there are some 1,700 companies operating on the waterways, some 2,600 tank barges, more than 14,000 dry cargo barges and scows and approximately 4,000 towboats and tugs, representing a total investment of over $1.6 billion.

The inland waterway business is booming. It stands in stark contrast to our oceangoing merchant marine which required a total Government subsidy during the calendar year 1964 of $319 million for construction and operational differentials.

The inland waterway system is a recognized instrument of national defense.

IMPORTANCE TO OHIO RIVER VALLEY

This milestone reached today of producing the first seagoing vessel since World War II reminds us of the importance of inland waterways to Jeffersonville, Louisville, and southern Indiana.

In my congressional district, we talk a great deal about industrial development. And the history of recent years shows that off-river plants constitute the industrial base of much of southern Indiana: the powerplant in Madison, the distilleries in Lawrenceburg, Jeffboat, and the detergent and soap business in Jeffersonville. In the last decade a high proportion of industry's capital investment dollars have been spent in adding new facilities or expanding existing facilities along the navigable inland channels—or very close to these channels.

These waterways become vital to the communities. Traffic on the Ohio River doubles on an average of once every 11 years. It is now pushing 90 million tons annually. In 1963 there was an average of 64 tons for every household in Louisville. It is easy to see what an impact on income and prosperity the waterways have in the Louisville metropolitan area. And for each 100 water-based jobs, it is estimated there are 100 to 135 additional jobs created by the waterways.

In my congressional district, I have said repeatedly that we have no greater concern than the development of our water resources. I usually say this in the context of reservoirs, watersheds, flood control, and water supply, which are very important to my district. But the same concern applies to the development of waterways which abut the Ninth Congressional District in Dearborn, Ohio, Switzerland, Jefferson, and Clark Counties. A sound use of our waterways creates a firm industrial base, helps create jobs, produces income, and brings economic vitality and prosperity to the region.

So I share your concern that the Nation's future is vitally dependent on full development of water resources, vigorous prosecution of a dynamic policy of water resource development. American national policy, from the writing at least of the Federalist papers and the famous Northwest Ordinance of 1787, has been for the free use of the Nation's rivers, harbors, lakes, and water courses.

The Northwest Ordinance said "Navigable waterways shall be common highways, and forever free—without any tax, impost or duty."

This policy is based on the sound recognition that the waterways have served and will continue to serve a variety of basic public purposes. Among them are unification of the country, furtherance of western expansion, defeat of sectionalism, low-cost transportation and lower prices to the consumer. water resource development, water supply, power, recreation and conservation.

So I join you in opposing special charges and user taxes on America's historically free waterways. Such taxes would retard essential development, upset competitive balance, bring economic hardship to businesses which depend on water commerce (and many do), raise prices of transporting goods and materials, and it would be an economic hardship to inland cities like Louisville and Jeffersonville.

JEFFBOAT

And the milestone reached today of producing the first seagoing vessel by Jeffboat since World War II symbolizes the contribution of Jeffboat and its parent company, American Commercial Lines, Inc.

Jeffboat is a producer. In 1965 it completes its greatest peacetime operation in its history—with 233 barges, 2 towboats, 1 deepwater vessel. In 1966 things look even better—250 barges, 7 towboats, and another deepwater vessel. A barge a day.

Jeffboat is a wealth creator. In 1965 its revenue will exceed $20 million and in 1966 this figure is expected to exceed $25 million. It is now the Nation's biggest manufacturer, tonnagewise, of barges, towboats, and related marine equipment. And it meets a staggering production schedule.

Jeffboat is an employer, too—920 people approximately were employed in 1965 and this figure will probably exceed 1,000 next year. Its present annual payroll is approximately $6.3 million.

And, of course, it's a consumer, too, using, for instance, about 9,000 tons of steel a month.

Jeffboat and the American Commercial Lines have had a distinguished history reaching back into World War II when it produced 125 LST's. It was honored five times by the U.S. Navy. The best is ahead.

So I am exceedingly pleased to be here, because this is a happy occasion. All of us want to build and grow and create. And you have done this in a remarkable way. You are helping the Ohio River Valley and southern Indiana and the Louisville metropolitan area take a giant stride forward in meeting the needs of its citizens. You are conserving, improving, and making use of our natural environment—the waterways—to the benefit of all of us. And many of us here today draw strength and encouragement from what you do—do for yourselves and for the Ohio River Valley and for the Nation.

I look forward to a great future for the Ohio River Valley—a future in which we will match our performance with our potential, our wealth with our resources, our power with our purpose.

I look forward to an Ohio River Valley—
Developing its natural environment.
Harvesting its rich crops.
Achieving in the arts and sciences.
Using its waterways to make the economy vital and vibrant.

And I salute you in the major part you are playing to bring the Ohio River Valley to its finest hour.

Medicare and Your Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, because of the many inquiries my office has received from constituents who expect to participate in the medicare program but want to know what they will need in the way of supplementary private insurance or financial assistance in the event of sickness, I have developed a fact sheet which I hope will be of some help to them.

The Social Security Administration, of course, has made complete material on the program available but has approached the task with information as to the coverage medicare will provide. The fact sheet developed in my office shows exactly what the program does not cover.

This information, which has been checked for accuracy by the Social Security Administration, should be helpful to those persons who want to provide, through private insurance, for those expenses not covered by medicare. Many people, I find do not realize that medicare will not pay all the bills.

My concern about the eventual cost of this program and the philosophy behind it is a matter of record, but my purpose in setting forth the limitations of medicare is not to find fault with it but to make sure my constituents know exactly what it will provide. With this knowledge, they should be better prepared to participate in the program.

Because of the great interest that has been shown in this approach to the problem, I am pleased to insert the fact sheet at this point in the Record for the benefit of any Member who might find it useful:

The Limitations of Medicare

This fact sheet has been prepared to acquaint you with the limitations of the Government's new medical care program for people 65 and over and, hopefully, to assist you in the selection of private health insurance to supplement the Government plan. Actually, there are two Government insurance programs, both starting next July 1. One helps you pay your hospital bills, the other helps you pay your doctors' bills. In either case will the Government program cover all of your expenses. Listed below, for your use as a participant in the program, is a brief description of the limitations.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE

(Eligibility is automatic if you are 65 or over and now get social security or railroad retirement benefits. If you are not getting these benefits—whatever the reason—you are probably eligible. If so you must fill out a routine application to establish coverage. There are no monthly premiums.)

Hospital bills: Limited to 90 days each illness. You must pay the first $40 in each spell of illness. After 60 days in any one spell, you must pay $10 a day for the additional 30 days of hospital care to which you are limited.

Outpatient diagnostic services: Limited to 20 days. You must pay first $20 in costs and 20 percent of remaining cost during the 20-day period.

Posthospital nursing home care: You must have been in the hospital at least 3 days before you qualify for this convalescent care in a nursing home or specially designated extended-care section of a hospital. After 20 days of this care, you must pay $5 a day for each of the remaining 80 days provided in a single spell of illness.

Home health care: Does not pay for doctors' bills. Program will pay for 100 visits to your home (by nurses, etc.) in any 365-day period following your hospitalization.

MEDICAL INSURANCE

(You must enroll and pay $3 a month for this plan, which will help you pay your doctors' bills. The Government also pays another $3 a month for you. If you were 65 by last year, you must enroll on or before March 31, if you want to be covered under this plan when it starts in July 1966. Those who are 65 or over and are getting social security, civil service or railroad retirement benefits will, upon enrolling, have the $3 deducted each month from benefit checks. Those not getting monthly benefits will be told later how and where to pay.)

Doctors' bills: You must pay the first $50 of medical expenses, including doctors' bills and other medical services (see "other medical services" below), in any calendar year and 20 percent of the remaining "reasonable" charges in that year.

Home health visits: You are entitled to up to 100 home health visits per year (in addition to the home health visits under hospital insurance) subject, of course, to a plan having been approved by the attending doctor for the same.

Other medical services: Other medical services, such as X-rays, surgical dressings, splints, casts, etc., are also covered.

SERVICES NOT COVERED AT ALL

You must pay for routine physical checkups, eyeglasses, hearing aids, dental expenses (except in certain surgical cases), private duty nurses, custodial care in a nursing home, and such personal services as a telephone and television in your room. Doctors' bills are not covered unless you sign up for the medical insurance plan.

DRUGS

Under hospital insurance, drugs are covered only when furnished in a hospital or extended care facility.

Under medical insurance, drugs are covered only when actually administered by a physician; not when self-administered, even if at a doctor's direction.

WHAT IF YOU HAVE OTHER HEALTH INSURANCE?

Although medicare doesn't cover all your hospital and medical expenses, it does offer some benefits (home health care, and nursing home convalescent care, for example) not normally covered by private health insurance policies. In fact, many insurance companies have indicated that to the covered individual, medicare is a bargain and have advised people over 65 to sign up for the medical insurance feature before the March 31 deadline. There are indications that many companies are now in the process of changing their policies so that after July they can offer to persons over 65 covered by medicare new policies to cover those things for which medicare does not pay. There is nothing in the act to prohibit private coverage and it is suggested that you consult your insurance agent concerning additional coverage.

Remember, though, that medicare doesn't start until July 1, 1966, so if you sign up for it, don't cancel any health insurance you now have, at least until then. If you have any questions about how your present insurance will be affected by medicare, get in touch with your insurance agent.

SHOULD YOU SIGN UP FOR MEDICARE'S DOCTOR BILL INSURANCE?

That decision is entirely your own. Coverage is not automatic. However, as your Representative in Congress, I would urge you to sign up without delay. If you sign up by March 31, you will protect your rights to all medicare benefits, and you can also carry one of the new supplementary private insurance policies if you wish. However, if you miss the March 31 deadline, you won't have another chance to sign up until the end of 1967, when the premiums will be higher.

In order to sign up for medical insurance one need not visit the local office in person but may do so by mail. All inquiries should be addressed to your district office of the Social Security Administration.

Appointment of Jack Hood Vaughn To Head the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to visit the other body yesterday and to testify before the Foreign Relations Committee on the nomination of Jack Hood Vaughn, to be the Director of the Peace Corps.

While my primary purpose in testifying was to urge the committee to approve Mr. Vaughn's nomination, I also discussed the role of the Peace Corps in our oversea assistance efforts.

Because of the great respect I have for Mr. Vaughn and the importance I attach to the position to which he has been nominated, I thought my testimony would be of interest to our colleagues and offer it herewith for insertion into the Record.

Testimony of Hon. Richard L. Ottinger, of New York, Before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Relative to the Nomination of Jack H. Vaughn, as Director of the Peace Corps, February 9, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful and delighted at the opportunity you have afforded me to testify in behalf of the nomination of Jack Hood Vaughn for Director of the Peace Corps. I warmly endorse his nomination.

While I know it is usual to speak primarily of a nominee's qualifications at these hearings, I should like to concentrate first on the importance of the position, for I think it has been underrated both in Congress and by the public.

The Peace Corps too often still today is viewed as a mere idealistic outlet to absorb the energies of the starry-eyed do-gooders of our society. While under the brilliant leadership of Sargent Shriver it has earned universal praise from the complete spectrum of our society—from its most conservative to its most liberal elements—its weight and importance is still not generally recognized. One has but to ponder that one of the President's highest aids, Bill Moyers, aspired to this post as the "Everest" of his ambitions, to come to second thoughts about its significance.

In my view, the Peace Corps demonstrates an approach to success in our endeavors with the developing countries, where all other approaches have to a greater or lesser degree failed. I think I will meet little argument that the future of the world and of our role in the world lies largely with these developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The Peace Corps has proved the validity of working from the bottom up rather than from the top down in these countries. It has demonstrated the success potential of community development techniques of having our people live with the people they are assisting in the slums that surround all of the major cities of these countries and in the countryside in the rural peasant villages. It has demonstrated the importance and practicality of stimulated self-help—and the economy of such programs. It has shown that work in primitive societies does not necessarily require top technical background—that the average citizen of this country can play a meaningful role in the development of a country where infant mortality is over 50 percent and the people don't know the significance of feces disposal, water impurities, or sound diet. It has proved the feasibility and efficacy of intensive language and cultural preparation of our foreign cadres, of having them live within the communities they serve rather than in isolated American ghettos, of having them receive compensation comparable to their host counterparts and play roles not as superior advisers but as coequals.

The future expansion of our foreign assistance endeavors should be along lines demonstrated successful by the Peace Corps—and no more appropriate person could be found than Jack Hood Vaughn to preside over this extension.

Indeed, by standards of experience, knowledge, ability, personality, character, and temperament, no equal could be conjured.

Jack Vaughn is a close personal friend and became so when he was my boss at the Peace Corps. He was Regional Director for Latin America and I, Director of Programs for the west coast of South America under him, virtually from the start of the Peace Corps.

I, therefore, am able to speak of him from a vantage point of an associate as well as a friend, and as a person intimately familiar with the Peace Corps operation he is to head, for I was the second staff member brought on board by Mr. Shriver to formulate the concept of a Peace Corps early in 1961. I can also speak of him from a personal familiarity with his knowledge of Latin America and the respect Latins hold for him.

What an unusual combination of experience. Jack Vaughn has served in virtually all of our overseas agencies—the State Department as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America and before that as Ambassador to Panama; our foreign aid agency as mission director in Senegal; he started his Government career in the early days of USIA in Bolivia and Costa Rica; and, of course, he served as a Regional Director of the Peace Corps itself.

The geographic diversity of his foreign experience has been broad, bringing him in direct contact with two of the three continents of the world with which the Peace Corps deals—Africa and Latin America—and with incomparable breadth and depth where the greatest Peace Corps concentration of activity lies, in Latin America.

Jack Vaughn's rise to responsibility has been meteoric and hard won. He came up the hard way, by his bootstraps. It's a real American success story worthy of Horatio Alger—how a golden gloves fighter from Columbus, Mont., going under the inauspicious pseudonym of "Johnny Hood" made good. He graduated from the University of Michigan in 1943 and volunteered for the Marine Corps where his talents earned him promotion from private to captain in just 3 years. He got a master's degree from Michigan when he got out and taught there and at the University of Pennsylvania. In 1949 he offered his services to USIA and from there had the spectacular span of Government service and rise of personal success previously recounted.

In the Peace Corps, Jack Vaughn built the Latin American program from insignificance to the dominant program. He was a man who was universally respected in a highly competitive organization and whose advice and counsel were sought by all. As a boss, he encouraged his associates to innovate and inspired from them an indescribable devotion which led to uncanny productivity. This human quality no doubt played an important part in his continuing series of successes and his warm following among his associates and the foreign peoples with whom he worked. He was immensely popular and respected both as Ambassador to Panama and previously as ICA mission chief in Senegal as well as at his other posts. The universal acclaim he received from all Latin capitals during his recent trip as Assistant Secretary of State is well known and recognized as a major contribution to our Latin American relations.

It gives me great pleasure to give this nomination my unqualified praise and to urge upon you and the committee the confirmation of a most unusually well qualified man for this job of great national and international importance.

SENATE

Monday, February 14, 1966

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. Robert C. Byrd, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. Robert C. Byrd, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under its previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until Wednesday noon next.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 16 seconds a.m.), the Senate adjourned under the order of Thursday, February 10, 1966, until Wednesday, February 16, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Ralph B. Winders, director, department of student work, Mississippi Baptist Convention, Jackson, Miss., offered the following prayer:

Mark 6: 34: *And Jesus, when He came out, saw much people, and was moved with compassion toward them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd: and He began to teach them many things.*

Our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for Thy great mercy and compassion as revealed by Jesus.

This day we recognize ourselves as individuals needing guidance and wisdom even as the shepherdless sheep in His day.

Look upon us with love and mercy and grant unto us that we may know Thy will for us, and having known it, give us the courage to act accordingly.

Make Thy presence known in a special way to this assembled body as they deliberate this day.

Forgive us our sins and lead us in ways of righteousness.

We pray in the name of Christ and for His sake and in His presence. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 10, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6845. An act to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 63. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held at Tulsa, Okla., May 12 through 21, 1966; and

S. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the chartering by act of Congress of the Boy Scouts of America.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1407. An act for the relief of Frank E. Lipp.

THE WASHINGTON POST HAS NOT PRINTED THE TRUTH

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I realize that there is an open season on Congressmen at all times, and that newspapers feel privileged to take potshots at us at any time they so desire. But I do think there are certain ethics and certain rules of sportsmanship that should be observed.

I am referring to an article that appeared in the—I will call it the Washington Post; I have another name for it—when they included under my picture a statement that I was one who had contacted the FCC on behalf of Midwest Video. I have written a letter to the managing editor or publisher of the Washington Post. I know, and I have been advised, that it will not be printed.

Though I cannot get the letter printed in the newspaper, I am going to get it before the public. I might say that I wrote this letter yesterday, and I was angry and incensed when I wrote it:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 13, 1966.

MANAGING EDITOR AND/OR PUBLISHER,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: With reference to an article which appeared in the Post today, may I state categorically that the individual who was responsible for the caption which appeared below my picture on page 10, is a reprehensible, contemptuous, malicious liar, when he wrote that I had "contacted FCC on behalf of Midwest Video."

Furthermore, I state that there was libelous intent, when no effort was made to ascertain from me the accuracy of that statement, especially in view of the fact that I was called on the telephone about 2 p.m., Saturday, February 12, to inquire if I could furnish the Post with a late photograph. I asked no question as to what use was to be made of the photograph, presuming that it was to be used in connection with one of several statements which I have made on the floor of the House since the reconvening of this session of Congress. The party who called requesting this photograph expressed surprise that I would be in my office on Saturday afternoon. What I am saying is that there was an opportunity to check with me at that time to determine the accuracy of the statement which was to be used in connection with the picture. It was about 3 p.m. Saturday when a messenger from your newspaper called to pick up the photograph.

By inference, innuendo, and insinuation, you have left the impression that I have been involved in some sinister, illegal, and unethical actions which I feel was intended to reflect upon my reputation. I will not sit idly by, permitting this inference to stand unchallenged.

As a former newspaperman, a graduate of the University of Missouri School of Journalism, and one who has spent approximately half his life as an editor and publisher, I believe I am acquainted with what I consider to be one of the first obligations of a newspaper, and that is to publish the truth, and to not rely on assumptions or presumptions, as was obviously done by the writer of the article in question.

I am herewith demanding a full retraction of your statement, insofar as it refers to me; an acknowledgment that it was an error; and a public apology for suggesting or inferring that I was acting on behalf of either Midwest Video or their Mr. Morrell, whom I do not know and with whom I have had no dealings of any kind or character.

The only connection I have had in any way with Midwest Video's controversy with FCC, is the forwarding to the FCC of correspondence from constituents of mine, living in Poplar Bluff, Mo., expressing their opposition to the blacking out of one channel in St. Louis, carrying a national network program, in order to protect a satellite (repeater) station in Poplar Bluff which rebroadcasts programs from a parent station in Illinois, the local content of which is of no interest whatsoever to the audience in Poplar Bluff, who would prefer the programs from the St. Louis station which are received via CATV with greater clarity, more satisfaction, and preferred, I believe, by all of those who are connected with the CATV in Poplar Bluff.

Regretting that your reporter did not see fit to contact me before carrying the story which gave an entirely erroneous impression, and reflected on my integrity and my recognition of my responsibility to the constituents whom I am privileged to represent, I am,

Respectfully yours,
PAUL C. JONES,
Member of Congress.

I would like to insert as a part of my remarks a letter that I wrote to the FCC on September 30, 1955, in response to a number of letters from my constituents complaining about one feature of a decision that they had, and they were asking for a rehearing. On this I asked permission to appear and to present the facts on behalf of my constituents.

I do not care a tinker's dam about Midwest Video or any other company, but I am interested in my constituents in southeast Missouri, and any time I feel that their interests are not being best served, I reserve the right to go to any agency of the Government—to the President of the United States, if necessary. And if that is treason, make the most of it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I was wondering yesterday what was generating all that thunder and lightning around River House I. Now I know.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I was up here in the office when that storm was going on, but that storm was not half as powerful as I felt at that time.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I think the gentleman's anger is just and proper. I read the story. I know the man who wrote the article. I had considered him fair-minded and objective. I am surprised to see him write such an unfair story. He did not do me the courtesy of calling me which was surprising. He had plenty of time to talk to me. He did not think about calling me because "his story" may have been cluttered up with facts rather than unfounded allegations of pressure or influence.

I make the same denial as the gentleman. My office in a routine fashion sent a letter asking for a report.

When the time comes that a Member of Congress cannot ask an agency for a report, then we do not have a democracy. I have no connection with any of these people of any nature, type, or description, and I have no interest in them.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House and the Members of Congress must take it upon themselves to make the newspapers and other news media observe some accuracy and some truth, and especially when they lie, to make them retract those lies. I am incensed over this thing. I will admit that I am emotional about it, but I will not stand by and permit someone to try to besmirch my reputation. That is the most valuable thing I have in this world, a good reputation, and I intend to keep it.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 20, 1965.

HON. E. WILLIAM HENRY,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am the Congressman from the 10th District of Missouri which emcompasses Poplar Bluff.

A considerable number of my constituents in Poplar Bluff are presently subscribers to the Midwest Video CATV system. I am informed that these constituents presently receive TV service from the stations in St. Louis, via microwave service, which is thoroughly satisfactory to such persons. I am also informed that, as a result of the Commission's recent decision in July 1965, in docket No. 14321 regarding the microwave licenses of Black Hills Video Corp. which brings these signals to Poplar Bluff, the service to my constituents who are subscribers may be seriously affected—at least as to the programs of one of the principal networks.

There is pending before the Commission a petition for reconsideration and rehearing and Black Hills has asked the Commission to hear argument on the impact of the license conditions which the Commission's decision has imposed. These conditions will seriously affect service to my constituents, particularly since it will require the CATV system to black out the more desirable St. Louis signal for a poorer quality signal which comes from an out-of-State station through a repeater station located in Poplar Bluff. The people of this community are interested in the affairs of the State of Missouri, and the programs which come from a station located in one of their principal cities are more important to them than those from a station in Illinois.

I think, in the circumstances, and since the decision was adopted by only a 3-to-2 vote, that the entire Commission should hear the arguments made by Black Hills as to why it would be unfair to the subscribers to impose such conditions.

As the duly elected Representative of these people, I respectfully request that the Commission grant me the privilege of appearing before it in this rehearing to place before it the facts as to the impact of its decision upon my constituents.

I would appreciate your careful consideration of this request and being advised of your determination in the matter. I am taking the liberty of sending copies of this letter to each Commissioner directly, and would appreciate your notifying the parties of my request.

Sincerely yours,
PAUL C. JONES,
Member of Congress.

THE CRITICS

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the U.S. Congress a very well written editorial that appeared in the Quincy Patriot Ledger on February 12, 1966, Lincoln's Birthday. It points up the problems that President Johnson faces with many of the so-called experts who are making divisive statements. It is timely and pinpoints the arguments over Vietnam that are being brought into focus somewhat by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's hearings and the dire need for getting the views from those persons who are eminently qualified authorities on southeast Asian affairs.

It is my opinion that unqualified persons, whether in Government or outside of Government, should be more discreet in their statements to the public concerning Vietnam unless they have all the facts before them. The security of the United States is too serious a problem, and the subject matter should not be bandied about by reckless individuals who are careless with the facts:

The article follows:

THE CRITICS

While President Johnson pushes ahead seeking the best way for peace in Vietnam—without utter surrender by the United States—it is worthwhile to look at who is rocking the boat.

The latest "experts" to blast off at the President are Senator WAYNE MORSE, who has trouble agreeing with anyone, and former Ambassador George Kennan, whose background doesn't show any skill in dealing with the problems of southeast Asia.

Mr. Kennan thinks the United States should "dig in and wait," neither withdrawing nor escalating until a political solution can be reached.

Senator MORSE is harping away at fears that President Johnson is leading the country into a war with China while keeping the American people in the dark as to what his intentions are. This was the Senator's line in a speech this week at Boston University in which he claimed that the "Government has led us so far down the road to government by secrecy you don't know what the facts are."

Mr. Kennan may be a reputed authority on Communist affairs, but his service in the Soviet Union was as an Ambassador during the Stalin era. He has also held State Department planning positions and he retired as Ambassador to Yugoslavia in 1963 after 2 years of service. Mr. Kennan is not an authority on southeast Asia and has had no diplomatic service in the Far East.

Senator MORSE is a lawyer, a former professor of law, and a nominally Democratic Senator who knows little about southeast Asia. It is not particularly surprising that he disagrees with the President on Vietnam, since he has seldom demonstrated a constructive attitude on any important issue.

The arguments over Vietnam are being brought into focus somewhat by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's hearings. These hearings ultimately may result in a meaningful debate of objectives and methods in southeast Asia.

But so far the results have not been entirely useful.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has once again gone over the administration's policy without adding much new to the picture and without convincing the Government's critics.

With the exception of Mr. Rusk, who is obviously informed on the day-to-day details on the overall thrust of American policy, none of the other witnesses qualifies as an expert in southeast Asian affairs or has the latest inside information from the Government available to him.

The American people should realize from whence comes the opposition to the Johnson policy. It may be helpful to the Senators to get varied opinions on the Vietnamese situation, but the Foreign Relations Committee would perform a greater service by getting the views of persons who are eminently qualified authorities on southeast Asian affairs.

JUSTICE FRANCIS L. VALENTE

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York State judiciary has lost one of its most illustrious members. Justice Francis L. Valente, of the Appellate Division of the New York State Supreme Court, died Friday night.

Justice Valente was a careful lawyer. As demonstrated by his steady rise in the judiciary, he was also a careful and conscientious judge. He served as a judge of the court of general sessions from 1945 to 1955 when he was elected to the supreme court. A few months after he took office in 1956, he was named to the appellate division by Gov. Averell Harriman. In 1961 he was reappointed by Governor Rockefeller.

As an assistant district attorney for New York County, I was privilege to appear often before Judge Valente in the court of general sessions. He presided over many trials which I prosecuted. He was always considerate and always conscious of the rights of both the defendant and the people. He thoroughly understood complicated questions of fact and law. It was a pleasure to try a case before him. Through this association I knew at first hand Justice Valente's great ability as a trial judge, and he became a valued friend.

On Saturday, Justice Bernard Botein, presiding justice of the appellate division, spoke for the entire court when he said:

> The State has lost a great and learned judge and the court a stanch and cherished comrade.

I want to take this occasion to express my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Valente and their two sons, Francis, Jr., and Peter.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD articles about Justice Valente which appeared on February 13, 1966, in the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 13, 1966]

FRANCIS VALENTE, JUSTICE, 60, DEAD—IN APPELLATE DIVISION OF STATE SUPREME COURT SINCE 1956

Francis L. Valente, associate justice of the appellate division of the State supreme court, died Friday night at University Hospital at the age of 60. He suffered a heart attack 2 weeks ago.

Justice Valente had been the liaison between the appellate division and the criminal courts of New York City on problems of administration and procedure.

He was extremely knowledgeable about city affairs and active in civic organizations, particularly those involving Americans of Italian descent.

In tribute to him, Bernard, the presiding justice of the appellate division, first department, said yesterday, "The State has lost a great and learned judge, and the court a stanch and cherished comrade."

Judge Valente was born in Greenwich Village. At his death, he still lived in that area, at 37 Washington Square West. He was educated in the public schools and then went to New York University, where he received a bachelor of science degree in 1926 and a law degree the next year. He was admitted to the bar in 1928 and was in private practice until 1944, specializing in corporate, probate, and criminal law.

FIRST ELECTED IN 1945

In 1945, Mr. Valente, a Democrat and a nephew of State Supreme Court Justice Louis A. Valente, was elected judge of the court of general sessions. Five years later he was elected to the supreme court. A few months after he took office in 1956, he was named to the appellate division by Gov. W. Averell Harriman and in 1961 he was reappointed by Governor Rockefeller.

One of the most widely publicized rulings was made in the general sessions court during the 1953 trial of Minot F. Jelke, the heir to an oleomargarine fortune, on charges of procuring women for prostitution. The judge barred the press and the public from the court "in the interests of good morals" and to curtail reporting of a trial "steeped in filth."

This ruling was reversed by the court of appeals in 1955, which held that Jelke had been improperly convicted because of this refusal to allow the press and the public into the court. However, Jelke was retried the same year, convicted, and sent to Sing Sing Prison.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY ALUMNI PRESIDENT

Justice Valente was president of the New York University Alumni Federation from 1956 until his death and president of the New York University Law Alumni Association from 1959 to 1961. He was a member of the Elks, the Grand Street Boys, and the Holy Name Society. In 1956, he received an honorary doctor of laws degree from Manhattan College. He served as American chairman of the advisory board of research of the Italian-United States Center of Judicial Studies in Milan.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 13, 1966]

JUSTICE FRANCIS L. VALENTE

Justice Francis L. Valente, of the State supreme court's appellate division, a central figure in a Tammany Hall fight in 1948, died at University Hospital Friday night. He was 60.

The Carmine DeSapio faction of the New York County Democratic Party chose Justice Valente as its candidate, in 1948, for Surrogate of New York County over the protests of Mayor O'Dwyer and Tammany leader Frank J. Sampson.

The original DeSapio choice had been Justice Valente's uncle, Supreme Court Justice Louis A. Valente. He was withdrawn after protests by leaders of the bar. Francis Valente, a general sessions court judge at the time, became the substitute.

The ensuing furor, which threatened to bring a primary fight between Francis Valente and Vincent Impellitteri, led to the ouster of Mr. Sampson. Peace within Tammany was restored when Francis Valente withdrew as a candidate and Hugh E. Rogers became the compromise candidate.

JELKE CASE

Five years later, in 1953, Justice Valente against became a controversial figure, as general sessions judge trying the sensational case of Minot "Mickey" F. Jelke, heir to an oleomargarine fortune, who was charged with forcing women into compulsory prostitution behind the doors of cafe society.

"In the interest of good morals," Justice Valente banned the public and the press from the courtroom while pretty call girls gave the intimate details of their work with Mr. Jelke.

As a result of the ban, the court of appeals ruled that Mr. Jelke was entitled to a new trial. Justice Valente again presided, and the young heir was again convicted and sentenced to 3 to 6 years in prison, of which he served 2.

During his 10 years as general sessions judge, 1945 to 1955, Justice Valente liked to make moral pronouncements on cases before him. In 1950, he convicted a man and a woman for illegally placing babies with foster parents and taking a fee for their service. Justice Valente called this a nauseating and revolting practice of trading in human flesh.

In 1953, when he sentenced two public loaders working on the New York piers for extortion, he denounced "the craven surrender of business to crime in the interest of 'business as usual.' "

He was born in New York City and received his law degree from Manhattan College. Admitted to the bar in 1928, he maintained a private practice until 1944, when he was named to the bench. In 1955 he was elected to the supreme court.

He was appointed to the appellate division in 1956 and reappointed in 1961.

Bernard Botein, presiding justice of the appellate division, said yesterday, "the State has lost a great and learned judge and the court a stanch and cherished comrade."

Justice Valente was president of the New York University Alumni Federation from 1956 until his death, and president of the New York University Law Alumni Association from 1959 to 1961.

He was a member of the Elks, the Grand Street Boys Association, the Holy Name Society, the Catholic Club, and a number of law associations.

Manhattan College awarded him an honorary doctor of laws degree in 1956.

Surviving at the home, 37 Washington Square West, is his wife, Aurelia. He also leaves two sons, Francis, Jr., and Peter C. Valente.

A requiem Mass will be offered at 10 a.m. Tuesday in St. Joseph's Church, 371 Avenue of the Americas.

HEADSTART PROGRAM IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on December 27, 1965, as a new administration was taking office in the city of New York, the Office of Economic Opportunity made $6.5 million available to New York City to provide Headstart programs for some 11,843 of our youngest and neediest children. We are all familiar with Operation Headstart, which puts Federal antipoverty funds to work through local groups to provide preschool education to underprivileged youngsters. It is one of the most promising long-range programs of the war on poverty.

If the proper groundwork had been done early in January, some 49 groups approved by the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity would have been making plans. The funds could have been put to work, and children could have been in preschool education by now.

On February 11, 6 weeks later, not a single approved group had been officially notified by the city that funds were available or authorized to proceed.

Now, even after the groups are notified, it will take some time to get started.

From my investigation, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that there is no excuse for this long delay in implementing the Headstart programs. There is no way to make up the time lost forever. There is no way to repay these children with education that they did not get. There is no way to go back.

Yesterday I sent both the mayor of New York and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity telegrams urging immediate action to break this bottleneck and make these funds available to the children of New York City.

The telegram is as follows:

FEBRUARY 13, 1966.

Mayor JOHN V. LINDSAY,
New York, N.Y.
Hon. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.:

Urge action to insure immediate use of $6.5 million made available on December 27, 1965, by Federal Government for New York City Headstart programs. Some 11,843 needy children have lost forever more than a month of essential preschool education. There is no excuse.

WILLIAM F. RYAN,
Member of Congress.

AUTHORITY FOR SPEAKER TO DESIGNATE MEMBER TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS ON FEBRUARY 22

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, February 22, 1966, George Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF MRS. MINK TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the special order agreed to today, the Chair designates the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately following the approval of the Journal on February 22, 1966.

THE PROBLEM OF FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago I spoke in this Chamber on the problem of free world shipping to North Vietnam and what I felt could and should be done about it. Among other things I suggested that we establish a blacklist of these ships which would prohibit them from carrying U.S. Government-financed cargoes. Such a blacklist has existed for 3 years with respect to those trading with Cuba. I am gratified to be able to acknowledge that late last week I was informed by the State Department, in a response to my letter of February 4 urging the President to take such action, that such a blacklist has been approved. The details of this Presidential order are found in the Federal Register of Saturday, February 12, 1966, on page 2706.

In my opinion, such action is overdue since our official policy too long has maintained a double standard of exempting those who trade with Ho Chi Minh from the penalties imposed on those who trade with Castro. In no way should the Hanoi regime be led to think we consider trade with them in any sense less detrimental to our national interest than trade with Cuba.

This action is a step in the right direction and I shall continue to press for the enactment of legislation prohibiting free world ships that aid Hanoi from doing any business whatsoever in U.S. ports—public or private—and to insure that no U.S. aid goes to any country that allow its ships to help supply North Vietnam's war economy. We have tolerated this aid and comfort to Ho Chi Minh far too long.

THE PROBLEM OF FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM: WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO ABOUT IT?

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, on various occasions, I have called upon this administration to bring an end to the shipment on their ships by our allies of goods for our enemies in North Vietnam. I made speeches from this rostrum of the House calling for an end to free world shipping to North Vietnam by any means necessary: Specifically, I did so on January 12, January 19, January 26, and February 2.

In the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a week ago, it was said that the British could effect an embargo on Rhodesia with our overeager help in 48 hours. Yet we have been unable to get their support in cutting off the supply of the Vietcongs by sea. After many months of effort, Britain is still the

No. 1 violator among the free world nations.

On December 21, I telegraphed the President urging action on this and, to this date, I have received nothing more than an acknowledgment from the White House.

Now, finally, the administration has stuck out its chest and announced that, as of January 25—25 days after my telegram—it was blacklisting any vessel shipping goods into, or out of, the North Vietnam port of Haiphong.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud this action.

However, it seems to raise this question. We have been fighting in Vietnam since mid-1962. We have suffered 2,005 dead and 9,658 wounded through February 7, 1966, and spent almost uncountable billions.

Why, Mr. Speaker, are we just starting to blacklist these ships? Either it should have been done 3 years ago or this is a blind to avoid effective action, diplomatic or naval.

It simply boils down to this. If blacklisting is not effective, why bother with it at all. If it is effective, why did we not do it in 1962 or 1963 instead of waiting until 1 week ago.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the American fighting men in Vietnam have a right to know the answer to this question. So do the American people.

One further question: Is this all we are going to do about free world shipping to North Vietnam?

THE QUESTIONS THAT PATRIOTS SHOULD ASK

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, we are at war in Vietnam. It is a war none of us wanted and a war we want to end honorably as quickly as possible.

Every good citizen would like to support his President. Every citizen wants the President, the executive branch, the Defense Department, the generals, to be right.

In order to find the correct solutions as quickly as possible, we need open debate and deliberation.

Secret decisions, managed news, "pat" answers, summary dismissal of inquiries, refusals to respond to proper questions do not supply the right answers, or fortify the confidence of the U.S. fightingman, or the public.

Every patriot can support his country and yet ask pertinent questions at the same time.

One of the most knowledgeable patriots in my district—with practical military experience and firsthand experience in Chinese and southeast Asian affairs—Col. Allen Griffin, asks a number of questions, editorially, in the Monterey, Calif., Peninsula Herald newspaper.

Each Member of Congress, as well as the President and his advisers, ought to ponder these questions.

The full text of the editorial by Colonel Griffin follows:

THE QUESTIONS THAT PATRIOTS SHOULD ASK

The pursuit of the war in Vietnam has been a demonstration of a series of wrong "estimates of the situation."

This is a term that is used by military people, usually preliminary to a decision to move, to remain in place, go backwards, or what have you. It is a term particularly of military intelligence. Nearly everything that is involved in the strength and weaknesses of the enemy is comprehended within the "estimate of the situation."

And, of course, the enemy also is making his estimate of the elements of strength and weakness in your situation, local, regional, global.

President Charles de Gaulle gave the late President John F. Kennedy his estimate of the situation in Vietnam and suggested that the United States begin a process of seeking peace immediately.

The late President was not convinced by General de Gaulle's estimate and decided, contrariwise, to become more involved. That was the tragic beginning of escalation—the beginning of an infantry war of Americans against Asians on Asian land among Asian people, the last thing the U.S. Army ever wanted to be engaged in again after Korea.

Up to this time this wasn't a war in which U.S. ground forces were engaged, but one in which U.S. materiel backed by a handful of advisers was sent to the assistance of a friendly government. Now by degrees it became our war. Escalation by manpower became a fact.

When President Lyndon Johnson took the oath of office he inherited a war as well as a vast, scattered domestic program.

Determined to do everything better and faster than his predecessor, he was psychologically prepared to provide the force necessary to push this war to an early conclusion. After all, it was a war against the spread of communism, which was and is further justification.

Surely his advisers gave him an estimate of the situation. That called for escalation. It didn't work very well. Then came a further estimate and a further escalation. That also fell short. And so on until nearly 200,000 American troops became hostages to this war, and North Vietnam came under continuous bombing attack except in the immediate vicinity of the capital city, Hanoi, and the most important seaport, Haiphong.

Then again, surely operating under an estimate of the situation, the time was deemed ripe for a peace offensive. That estimate could not have been on anything other than the possibility of bringing the war to a peace table. Wrong again. It didn't work.

Now we have returned to bombing. Where do we go from here? How much of a land war of Americans against Asians are we going to throw our Army into? And where do we go from there? These are legitimate questions for congressional debate. And they are legitimate questions for the debate of patriotic citizens.

NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

This is the first annual report required of the National Capital Transportation Agency by section 6 of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965—Public Law 89-173.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-five was marked by significant advances toward solving the transportation problems of the Washington area.

Congress approved plans for a rapid transit system, authorized its construction, and authorized grants from the Federal and District Governments as a first stage in financing its development. As soon as funds were made available, the Transportation Agency began the necessary work still remaining before actual construction can begin.

There is, nonetheless, much left to do. The rapid transit system will achieve maximum usefulness only when it is extended into Maryland and Virginia suburbs. The interstate compact among Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia will be promptly presented to Congress for its consent, in order that the interstate authority may develop plans for a full regional system and a financial plan for its construction. Arrangements must be perfected to transfer the responsibility for the system in an orderly and proper way from the Agency to the interstate authority. These tasks are not easy, and it will require diligent effort on the part of many people and agencies to master the problems that remain.

The Congress can be assured, however, that all of these problems are being given the fullest and most diligent consideration, and that none of them will be allowed to stand in the way of an uninterrupted schedule of construction.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 14, 1966.*

PRESERVATION OF WILDERNESS AREAS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 381)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The period of expansion and exploration, the great era of successive western frontiers, has now become a part of our American past. To the pioneer of history the wilderness was a foe to be conquered, so that he might make farms and pastures out of the endless forests.

Today's pioneer has a new purpose—to preserve some remnants of that wilderness from the onrush of modern civilization.

The ax and the plow will not serve us in this struggle. Today's instruments are more subtle. They are progressive law and informed public opinion—demanding that we maintain our wilderness birthright.

The Wilderness Act is one in the long list of creative conservation measures that Congress has passed and I have signed into law.

Legislation is one thing; administration is another. The executive branch must fulfill its responsibility with commonsense and imagination. Our people must be given the opportunity to know, even for short periods of time, the wonders of God's creation expressed in earth's wilderness areas.

The maintenance of our existing wilderness system is a priority program of the Federal Government. We are constantly reviewing primitive and roadless areas to determine whether they should be recommended for preservation as part of our wilderness system.

The Congress has wisely provided for public participation as reviews of the primitive and roadless areas proceed. I am determined to assure that both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior will provide full opportunity for the expression of public views before final recommendations are prepared for transmittal to the Congress.

I am pleased to send to Congress today the second annual report of our progress in implementing the Wilderness Act. We are well underway toward protecting God's gift of mystery and wonder that is the American wilderness.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 14, 1966.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1965—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 333)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the U.S. Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 14, 1966.*

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, due to a speaking engagement at the 45th annual stockholders meeting of the Central Livestock Association, Inc., at South St. Paul, Minn., on Wednesday, February 9, 1966, it was necessary for me to be absent on rollcall No. 16. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 16 on H.R. 706, the bill to amend the Railway Labor Act.

ISOLATION OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION FROM DOMINANCE BY BIG BUSINESS

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, isolation of the Small Business Administration from dominance by big business has long been preached and praised by the Congress. From the agency's beginning in 1953, its independent status has been jealously guarded and constantly supported. Among the most vociferous champions of such organizational independence when Members of the Senate were President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY. Without doubt the status selected for it by the Congress has proven the most effective in order for it to best serve the small business community.

Such independent status, however, cannot alone guarantee the success of an agency or of its programs, nor can it countervail the absence of leadership, direction, and inspiration.

Of late we have seen the business loan program, the key program of SBA, through poor planning and poorer management, virtually disappear. We have seen another important SBA responsibility, procurement assistance, dwindle to ineffectiveness.

And now, we hear rumors that what remains of the Johnson administration's operation of the Small Business Administration is to be buried by its transfer to the Department of Commerce. Apparently, this once fine and potentially great agency is to be swept under the gigantic rug of a major department.

The proposed transfer of the Small Business Administration represents White House recognition of its failure; this alone explains the present condition of SBA and its programs. Loss of its independent status will only make permanent the injury. Without independent status, the agency cannot and will not provide the services small businesses across the country so desperately need. The spokesman for small business in big government will be dead.

Mr. Speaker, bipartisan support of independent status for the Small Business Administration will prevent the piracy of a facility dedicated solely to the betterment of the small business community.

To preclude this demotion, if not the disappearance of SBA, the Nation's 4.7 million small businesses call upon us to reiterate our long held insistence upon independent status for the agency. I urge unanimous approval of the following concurrent resolution, which today has been introduced by all the Republicans serving on the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives:

H. CON. RES. 588

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Small Business Administration should continue to be an independent agency within the executive branch of the Federal Government, under the general direction and supervision of the President but not within or affiliated with any other department or agency of the Federal Government.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, as a delegate to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, it was necessary for me to be absent from the Chamber on Wednesday when rollcall No. 16 was taken. U.S. delegates to the Conference were at the airport welcoming the Mexican delegation Wednesday at the time of the rollcall. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye." I respectfully ask that the RECORD so indicate.

TADEUSZ KOSCIUSZKO

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 12, we commemorated the birthday of Tadeusz Kosciuszko, whose anniversary is observed by the Polish people throughout the free world. Unfortunately, the Polish people are captives of communism, and public celebration of this great holiday is forbidden by their present Red tyrants.

Therefore, on this great historic day, we must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to the brave people of Poland and all the other captives of communism.

The birthday of Tadeusz Kosciuszko is also of historical significance to the United States, since this great Polish hero made an outstanding contribution to the American Revolution. He served courageously in a number of Revolutionary War battles and worked on the planning and construction of fortifications for the Delaware River, Fort Defiance, and West Point. Kosciuszko was given the rank of brigadier general in the American Revolutionary Army for his contribution to our struggle for independence.

Kosciuszko then returned to his homeland and served in Poland as a leader in the unsuccessful insurrection against the Russian invaders.

It is fine for us to commemorate these days, Mr. Speaker, but our commemoration should be a practical one. Therefore, I strongly recommend the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

In addition, I believe it is necessary that the Voice of America provide lengthier and more effective broadcasts to pierce the wall of Communist propaganda and deliver the truth to the brave people of Poland. As we know, Mr. Speaker, in recent years the Voice of America has been cutting back both its hours of broadcast in the Polish language and in the nature of these broadcasts. The Voice of America gives daily straight news and is fearful under present administration policy of offending the Soviet Union. However, the brave people of Poland deserve the truth.

The Voice of America should be a vehicle for delivering the message of truth to them so that they would not be brainwashed and their resistance weakened by the constant propaganda from their tyrannical Moscow oppressors.

A BUSINESSMAN AND MONEYLENDER SPEAKS OUT AGAINST HIGH INTEREST RATES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, high interest rates have always been a beneficial tool for the big banks, providing them with prosperity while the rest of the country suffers from the ill effects of tight money and higher prices.

Many people from all levels of the economic ladder are seriously affected by high interest rates. The small businessman finds it impossible to obtain loans at his bank, the small homeowner faces more expensive home mortgages, even the prosperous businessman encounters difficulty. I am in recent receipt of a letter from such a businessman, who wishes to remain anonymous, expressing his thoughts and complaints over the resulting high interest rate policy being pursued by the Federal Reserve Board. The businessman in his letter describes the wartime financing of the Roosevelt administration and the business world's cooperation. Perhaps the Federal Reserve Board and big business in our Vietnam crisis now may learn something from this old policy of holding down rates. We know that the cost of our Government debt has risen almost a billion dollars this year, thanks to Federal Reserve monetary policy, and our cities and local governments are finding it most difficult to sell bonds.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the following letter to the Members:

THE PRESIDENT,
Johnson City, Tex.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a citizen, I would like to agree with your recent actions in the aluminum, copper, and steel prices, and your position on interest rates. My interest is particularly in the area of interest rates. High interest rates increase the cost of living for the masses and work to the advantage of the financial institutions. Very few people recognize the extent to which a small interest rate increase works to the advantage of the commercial bank. For example, the bank will borrow $1 million from the Federal Reserve at a stepup of one-half percent and loan $10 million of its own funds at the increased rate, collecting the one-half percent increase on a total of $11 million.

In the last years of the Roosevelt administration, short Government bonds sold to yield approximately three-fourths percent and long bonds sold to yield some 2½ percent. About that time, I had occasion to be transacting some business with the treasurer of one of our major life insurance companies and he remarked to me that his company was paying 3 percent on its reserves and had been trying to get 3 percent on its Government portfolio, but had been unable to do so. Still, they were buying 2½ percent's. They felt that this is what the Government wanted so that's what they were going to do. Apparently, the Government's wishes had been communicated.

Near this same time, a wave of liquidating government bonds occurred in the community. Again, one of the larger New York banks told me that they had a call in the midst of this wave asking them not to sell—so they didn't sell. The price immediately stabilized. Unfortunately, capital and labor both tend to be a little greedy from time to time. At this time, public officials have to be depended upon to protect the public good. It now appears to be one of those times. I would like to encourage you in your actions. Stabilize prices, and particularly, the price of money. As far as the average consumer is concerned, it is just another commodity that has to be paid for.

Who am I? I am a moneylender. During 1964, my small business ranked in the top 100 underwriters of municipal bonds in the Nation. In addition, I am one of the largest real estate developers in this part of the country, have two contracting firms, an industrial supply house and an interest in several banks and insurance companies. My biggest financial interest lies in banks and insurance—two fields that directly benefit from high interest rates.

Yet, recent history has shown that high interest rates throttle our economy and work a hardship on those least able to pay. Sometimes I feel that my dear friends, the bankers, feel we should have a good depression sometimes. Please protect us from them.

Yours for a stronger and greater America.

ILLINOIS BUSINESS REVIEW ATTACKS FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD ACTION AS BANK PROFITEERING

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve Board's decision to raise interest rates on December 6 continues to receive outspoken condemnation throughout the country.

Among the latest to join the mounting opposition to the Federal Reserve's action is the Illinois Business Review, a monthly publication of the Bureau of Economic and Business Research of the University of Illinois located at Urbana, Ill.

This excellent analysis written by V. Lewis Bassie, director of the bureau, cuts through all the Federal Reserve Board's high-sounding phrases and places the blame squarely on the desires of the bankers for more profits.

I quote this significant paragraph from the article:

> As an issue of profiteering * * * the objections had just as much force as they do with respect to an increase in the price of aluminum or any other commodity. The prize of the lenders' victory is the extra increment of income which will be received from all the people who must borrow to do the things they want to do. The latter issue, by all reports, was never raised, either in the Fed's own deliberations or in the controversy with the administration. There seems to be a kind of gentlemen's agreement not to mention the mundane matters of dollar gains to the banking industry or of its consistent lobbying efforts to attain this result.

I congratulate Mr. Bassie on his incisive analysis. The Illinois Business Review joins a rising chorus of voices from all areas of the American economy which are demanding action to prevent recurrences of the Federal Reserve Board's December 6 action.

How long can the Congress ignore these demands?

I place in the RECORD the text of the article from the January issue of the Illinois Business Review entitled "Makers of Monetary Policy":

MAKERS OF MONETARY POLICY

Controversy over interest rate policy erupted briefly in December and dropped back beneath the surface of undisputed prosperity. It was, in the words of some who feel satisfied "making a mountain out of a molehill."

Announcement by the Federal Reserve Board (the Fed) that the discount rate had been raised to the highest level since 1930 was the signal lenders had been waiting for. The banks put up the prime rate by the same amount and other rates schedules were raised appropriately. This increase in interest rates across the board has been the main, immediate effect.

The Fed acted in the name of "the fight against inflation"—though it was potential rather than actual price increases that were feared. The opposition was provided by the Council of Economic Advisers (CEA) and the Treasury, which manages and pays the interest on the Federal debt. They undertook to fight the battle on the high ground chosen by the financial community. Here there was plently of room for differences in judgment about the nature of the current situation and its policy needs. The Fed's action could certainly be considered inappropriate: If war were to escalate sufficiently to give shape to the phantom of inflation, the day of a price rollback would have to be faced; but if huge war spending were avoided, there would be no real threat of inflation and no need to slow the pace of activity. As a move toward restraint, however, the action taken was little more than an idle gesture. Small changes in the rate of interest are hardly a decisive influence, and under present circumstances, the prospect that the economy might be depressed is uncertain and remote. In the confusion of generalities and abstractions on this high economic level, President Johnson could hardly have agreed to carry the fight to Congress and the people.

As an issue of economic stabilization, the objector's cause was lost. As an issue of profiteering, however, the objections had just as much force as they do with respect to an increase in the price of aluminum or any other commodity. The price of the lenders' victory is the extra increment of income which will be received from all the people who must borrow to do the things they want to do.

LARGER INCOMES FOR LENDERS

The latter issue, by all reports, was never raised, either in the Fed's own deliberations or in the controversy with the administration. There seems to be a kind of gentlemen's agreement not to mention the mundane matters of dollar gains to the banking industry or of its consistent lobbying efforts to attain this result. The fallacy in this approach has been pointed out by Galbraith: "Those who lend money are permitted to urge higher interest rates not for the greater return but as a selfless step designed to protect the Nation from the evils of soft money, loose financial practice, and deficient economic morality. An economist who sees the need for a higher weekly wage may well be suspected of yielding to the unions; one who urges an increase in the rediscount rate is, however, invariably a statesman. This should not keep anyone from penetrating to the fact. There is a lively, insistent and durable preference by the moneylending community for high rates of return; this is related to an intelligent view of pecuniary self-interest."

The Fed's action was responsive to industry pressures consistently applied since the recession of 1960–61 ended. The word "inflation" has been bandied about in such a way as to exploit all our fears of economic collapse, of international payments problems, and of war stringencies. At the same time, the interest equalization tax and other restrictions on foreign lending have been strongly opposed. Although total commercial banks loans and investments have been rising about twice as fast as gross national product in recent years, the banks were not satisfied to gain from volume increases alone but wanted the kind of price increase that high demand always encourages. This has now been granted, in an action intended not to halt the credit expansion but merely to moderate its pace. With other interest rates higher, the banks lose nothing by discounting at a higher rate. The accompanying order to permit them to pay higher rates on time deposits was designated to insure that they could compete for available liquid balances.

It is true that not all of the gains are retained by the banks. The interest they receive is partly passed on to the holders of time deposits, and other costs have also risen. Nevertheless, the primary effect is to benefit savers and lenders in general at the expense of borrowers and spenders. The more widely the benefits are shared, the more the high level structure of rates is solidified.

MASTER OR SERVANT?

If there was any real need to restrain the expansion of credit, action that would have been directly effective could have been taken. A moderate tightening through open-market operations during the past year had already shifted the free reserve position of member banks from a moderate plus to a moderate minus. More was possible, and a still sharper restriction could have been accomplished by raising reserve requirements. That, however, would really have cut into the bankers' lending and earning capacity. It would have brought the Fed into conflict with the banks as well as with the administration. Chairman Martin felt that there were "compelling financial reasons" for taking the moderate, banker-approved action without delay.

As an isolated incident, one should not exaggerate the importance of this decision. It conforms, however, to the whole pattern of behavior that has persisted since the Treasury-Federal Reserve Accord of 1951. Successive policy steps led to ever-rising assets and operating revenues for the banking system. The discount rate moved irregularly upward—from 1¾ to 4½ percent—with temporary setbacks being confined to recession periods. In each of the three recessions experienced since then, reserve requirements were lowered. The first set of changes had effective dates from July 1953, to August 1965, the second were in the first half of 1958, and the third in the fall of 1960. Altogether, required reserves were reduced from 24 to 16½ percent for central reserve city banks, from 19 to 16½ percent for reserve city banks, and from 14 to 12 percent for country banks. The reasons cited for these changes varied with the circumstances of the economy and the banking system. One consistent effect was to enable the banks to pay off indebtedness and improve their assets and earnings position in recession as well as in prosperity years.

The latest change in reserve requirements was the reduction on time deposits from 5 to 4 percent in the fall of 1962. This increased moderately the differential from the 12 to 16½ percent requirements on demand deposits. Together with the progressive increases in the maximum rates of interest payable on time and savings deposits (which were raised, for example, from 1 percent to 5½ percent on 30- to 90-day certificates), it facilitated and encouraged the dramatic upward sweep by which the volume of commercial-bank time deposits doubled from the beginning of 1961 to the end of 1965.

The rules of the game that result in uninterrupted banking expansion are as follows: Favorable decisions on the volume of credit in slack periods encourage the use of credit to expand demand, so that with recovery there is a tendency for prices to be bid up. Then the rise in prices is taken as a sound basis for raising interest rates. With volume and price of credit both rising, banking prosperity is assured. The results may be seen in almost any city across the country; often the newest, tallest, and most luxurious office buildings, complete with original art works, are owned by banks and other financial institutions.

The Fed has cooperated so consistently in this game that one may well ask, "Who is controlling whom?"

No matter how one may be inclined to answer this question, it is hard to avoid the thought that the perverse cyclical elasticity of the money supply, which was the subject of so much discussion in the 1930's, has never been corrected. In a downswing, it may again operate against us, just as it has operated for us in this long postwar upswing. Events seem to warrant the conclusion that a public governing body cannot transform a private banking system which creates money on the basis of fractional reserves into a reliable instrument of public policy.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON ASKED TO VETO THE BANK ACT MERGER AMENDMENTS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, Thursday I asked President Johnson to veto the Bank Act merger amendments passed by the House February 8, and cleared for Presidential action by the Senate February 11.

This bill will hurt the public, will hurt the banking industry, and will hurt the Federal Government.

The so-called guidelines for evaluating proposed mergers will guide the banks right back into the courts for another protracted round of expensive litigation. In the end, after the Supreme Court tells us the meaning of what Congress intended in drafting the vague and ambiguous language contained in this bill, we are liable to find ourselves at the same place we were before this bill was enacted. Further, the intent of some of the proponents to remove the banking industry from under the antitrust laws is unworthy of Congress.

Second, the forgiveness provisions of the bill is a bald act of favoritism. We ought to forgive all the banks that have violated the antitrust laws or none of them. I fail to see why Congress should select three banks for special treatment and not the others.

Finally, we have demoted the Attorney General to the rank of lieutenant. The bill permits any Federal banking agency approving a merger to intervene, as a matter of right, in a suit instituted by the Attorney General. We are thus stepping back into the 19th century when the legal business of the Federal Government was handled among different public officers, departments, and branches. We will have under this bill the unique situation of Federal Government attorneys appearing on both sides of a suit involving a bank merger.

I am convinced that many of the Members who supported this hastily and desperately drafted bill did so reluctantly, and that they will secretly rejoice should the President refuse to sign it. I urge my colleagues to reread this bill, S. 1698, and see what we have done. The public and the banks deserve better treatment.

BOY SCOUT MANUEL RODRIGUEZ

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to have as my guest in my office last week, an outstanding young man from my district who would be a credit to any district. His name is Manuel Rodriguez III and he is representing the Cuban Boy Scouts in my district at the ceremonies here in Washington which mark the 50th anniversary of the signing of the congressional charter of the Boy Scouts of America.

Manuel is a refugee from the Communist totalitarianism which grips his native land. He came to Miami 4 years ago from Havana with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Manuel Rodriguez, Jr., of 341 West 36th Street, Hialeah, Fla. His father now works for a Miami firm of certified public accountants and Manuel has an ambition to become a lawyer.

At 13, Manuel has distinguished himself in the Boy Scouts. Since he joined this great youth organization in November 1963, he has earned 22 merit badges, become a patrol leader in Troop 3061, been active as a den chief, and earned the Eagle Scout Award. He was chosen for outstanding school, church, community, and scouting records. Manuel attends the North Hialeah Methodist Church and Henry H. Filer Junior High School.

It is with great pride that I welcome Manuel to Washington. He has made a fine contribution to the Third District of Florida as a distinguished representative of the Cuban Boy Scouts. We applaud him as a fine example for our youth to follow.

ONE-MAN, ONE-VOTE LEGISLATURE REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to my colleagues' attention a statement on the subject of legislature reapportionment which has been approved by the National League of Women Voters and the Miami Metropolitan Dade County League of Women Voters who called it to my attention. It is recorded as follows:

STATEMENT OF POSITION ON APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES AS ANNOUNCED BY THE NATIONAL BOARD OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY 12, 1966

The members of the League of Women Voters of the United States believe that both houses of State legislatures should be apportioned substantially on population. The league is convinced that this standard, established by recent apportionment decisions of the Supreme Court, should be maintained and that the U.S. Constitution should not be amended to allow for consideration of factors other than population in apportioning either or both houses of State legislatures.

Of overriding importance to the league in coming to this decision is the conviction that a population standard is the fairest and most equitable of assuring that each man's vote is of equal value in a democratic and representative system of government. Other considerations influencing the league decisions are that the U.S. Constitution should not be amended hastily or without due condideration because of "unpopular" court decisions, and that individual rights now protected by the Constitution should not be weakened or abridged.

Against the background of its longstanding interest in State government, the league also hopes that by maintaining a population standard State government may be strengthened by insuring that State legislatures are more representative of the people wherever they live. Finally, the league feels certain that the term "substantially" used in Supreme Court decisions allows adequate leeway for districting to provide for any necessary local diversities.

VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my wholehearted support to H.R. 12410, the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, which is commonly known as the cold war GI bill of rights. I offer this support as a grateful veteran who gained a college education and a law degree through the original GI bill of rights for veterans of World War II.

I speak as one who knows from experience what it means for a young man to be uprooted in his late teens or early twenties to serve in the Armed Forces. This vital period of a man's life can be the deciding factor in determining what he will accomplish in the years ahead. The education and training that a young man ordinarily receives in these years provide him with the skills and knowledge that he will use to earn his living, raise his family and contribute what he can to his country and to the world.

When a national emergency requires a young man to spend these years in military service, both common sense and common decency demand that we do all we can to replace that which we take away from him. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that we have a solemn duty and obligation to these young men whom we have placed in the forefront of our worldwide battle to contain communism. I contend that we owe them the opportunity for education or vocational training, for financial help in buying a home—the things they might have been able to do for themselves had they been permitted to remain in civilian life.

We have done these things for some 8 million veterans of World War II and for some 2,400,000 who served during the Korean war. Our boys who are fighting today in Vietnam, and those who are serving and have served throughout the world during the past 10 years are no less entitled to these considerations.

I think we should emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that we are not paying these boys for what they have done; we are repaying them for what we have taken away. It is important that we understand the difference. In light of this difference, it becomes apparent why the benefits of this act should apply to every soldier, sailor, airman, and marine, no matter whether he fights the Vietcong, stands guard in Berlin, or mans a missile silo in Nebraska. When they have served their time, and are ready to again take their places in civilian life, we must be ready to help them make a smooth and satisfactory transition.

The following summary explains the major provisions of H.R. 12410, and how it would provide this needed assistance to our returning veterans:

SUMMARY OF H.R. 12410

EDUCATION

Provides a permanent program of educational assistance for individuals serving in the Armed Forces, discharged after January 31, 1955. College-level and below-college-level training in trade, vocational, and technical schools is provided. Part-time training is permitted. Eligibility accrues at the rate of 1 month of training for 1 month of service, not to exceed 36 months. Persons serving on active duty for training do not accrue eligibility. The education and training allowances provided are as follows:

Type of program	No dependents	1 dependent	2 or more dependents
Institutional:			
Full time	$100	$125	$150
Three-quarter time	75	95	115
Half time	50	65	75
Cooperative	80	100	120

Fees and tuition are paid for less than half-time training. Education must be completed within 8 years from the date of discharge or 8 years from the effective date of the act, whichever is later. Training is provided for active-duty members of the Armed Forces who have served at least 2 years, a portion of which occurred after January 31, 1955. These active-duty members may receive payments for fees and tuition. Administrative provisions of the GI bill for veterans of the Korean conflict and the war orphans' training program are applicable to this proposed program. Schools will be approved by State approval agencies of the various States, and these agencies will be responsible for extending supervision to approved schools. First-year cost: $327 million.

GUARANTEED AND DIRECT HOME LOANS

Benefits of both the guaranteed and the direct home loan programs are extended to veterans discharged after January 31, 1955. The guarantee of a loan by a private lender in the amount of $7,500 is extended to this group and, in areas established as direct loan areas where guaranteed financing has not generally been available, a maximum direct loan of $17,500 is authorized. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to regulate interest rates, consistent with the ceiling established for Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. A fund is established for the Administrator to offset losses under this program, by requiring the veteran to pay 0.05 percent of his loan closing.

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED MEDICAL CARE

At the present time, veterans serving after January 31, 1955, are eligible for medical care in Veterans' Administration facilities only for service-connected disabilities. This group is made eligible under the provisions of this bill for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities on the same basis as war veterans. Eligibility for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities is based on availability of a bed and the signing of a statement of inability to pay for treatment elsewhere, as is required of veterans of earlier conflicts.

PREFERENCE IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

Preference in employment in Federal service is extended to the group of veterans discharged after January 31, 1955, on the same basis as is currently applicable to war veterans. This benefit is not extended to those on active duty for training.

PRESUMPTION OF SERVICE-CONNECTION OF CHRONIC AND TROPICAL DISEASES

This presumption of service-connection of numerous chronic and tropical diseases, as listed in section 301, title 38, United States Code, now applicable to war veterans, is extended to those veterans with service after January 31, 1955.

BURIAL FLAGS

The bill will permit the Veterans' Administration to furnish a flag for draping the casket of deceased veterans of service after

January 31, 1955, as is now provided war veterans. First-year cost: $47,000.

JOB COUNSELING AND JOB PLACEMENT ASSISTANCE

Places veterans discharged after January 31, 1955, on the same basis as veterans of earlier conflicts for assistance through the Department of Labor in job placement and counseling. First-year cost: $2 million.

SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF

Amends the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act by increasing protection for individuals who are renting homes when called to service from $80 monthly rental to $150 monthly rental.

THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION IS TO BE COMPLIMENTED ON A MAGNIFICENT JOB THAT WAS RENDERED TO THE TRAGIC VICTIMS OF HURRICANE BETSY IN LOUISIANA AND OTHER STATES—THE WORST HURRICANE THAT HAS HIT THIS COUNTRY IN HISTORY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, so often in Congress, Members find themselves frustrated at times when they cannot, on behalf of their constituents, always get many a difficult problem solved. On occasions, this frustration causes many of us to criticize unsatisfactory results, as it is difficult, many times, to tell our constituents that we were unable to work their problem out. However, I do think that certainly simple justice would be served if when an agency does do an outstanding job that their work be brought to the attention of this membership, and certainly give them a commendation that they deserve and so justifiably earned. So, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD a letter which I have sent to the Honorable Ross Davis, Executive Administrator of the Small Business Administration which is self-explanatory and which follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1966.

Hon. ROSS D. DAVIS,
Executive Administrator,
Small Business Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: I am writing to convey to you the deep gratitude of the people of Louisiana for the outstanding assistance which the Small Business Administration has rendered to those who suffered damages and losses last fall during the tragic Hurricane Betsy.

Never before has a single Federal agency helped so many in Louisiana, so quickly, efficiently and willingly. I was naturally made well aware of the fine job which your agency was performing from many reports I received, both from businesses and individuals, but it was not until I read your latest statistics that I realized in full the tremendous scope and extent of this help—27,000 applications received requesting $125 million and as of this writing, 23,000 approved for funds totaling nearly $100,000,000. In the 5 months following Hurricane Betsy there were more loans disbursed than in all the previous 13 years of the Small Business Administration's history—this record of the Small Business Administration certainly tells the story of this great accomplishment.

It must be a tremendous source of satisfaction to you to know how well and ably your fine agency has performed and to see the great amount of good that has come about in Louisiana as a result of your efforts. Your Small Business Administration employees and representatives and all those directly and indirectly connected with your agency worked long and hard, and went beyond the ordinary duty required of Federal employees over these many months to bring about this magnificent assistance. It was something the people of Louisiana and we in Congress as their Representatives will always be grateful for. No agency in the 23 years that I have been in Congress has ever done a finer job. It was truly one of the finest hours in the history of our Government agencies.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

BOBBY C. PAPPAS OF LOUISIANA NAMED NATIONAL CHAIRMAN OF GREEK SECTION, ALL AMERICANS COUNCIL, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to extend brief words of congratulations to Bobby Constantine Pappas, of Monroe, La., who was recently named national chairman of the Greek section of the All Americans Council of the Democratic National Committee.

In recognizing Mr. Pappas, I speak both as the only Member of Congress of Greek descent and as the honorary chairman of the Greek section of the All Americans Council.

Bobby Pappas' accomplishments as an American citizen of Greek origin make him an excellent symbol of the contribution to the American heritage of citizens whose antecedents are in other lands and a symbol as well of the justice of the action of Congress last year reforming our outmoded and discriminatory immigration laws.

President Johnson directed himself succinctly to this point when, in a letter directed to you last August, Mr. Speaker, he said:

> Our present restrictions say that Italians, Greeks, Spaniards and those from all the southern European countries in particular are not as desirable as others. What a shameful declaration.

I was privileged to be among those present when, 2 months later, in ceremonies at the Statue of Liberty, President Johnson signed into law a bill that struck down that shameful declaration.

Born in Arkansas, Bobby Pappas spent 2 years in the land of his heritage, studying under private tutorship in Athens and Missolonghi. Since 1939 he has made his home in Monroe, La., where he is president of the Rendezvous Restaurant Corp. His business has brought him success, and he is a board member and past president of the Louisiana Restaurant Association.

But Mr. Pappas has not confined his energies solely to private business.

COMMUNITY LEADER

In community service, he served as an area campaign chairman for United Cerebral Palsy in 1955 and for the following 7 years acted as national director of United Cerebral Palsy as well as Louisiana chairman of that organization. He also has served on several committees for the State government and in that connection received in 1958 the Axson-Chopin Distinguished Service Award from the Louisiana Public Health Department.

In service to his political party, Mr. Pappas has acted as campaign manager in his area for several outstanding Democrats. In 1960 he was the Fifth District campaign manager for Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Johnson; in 1964 he did a similar job, with added responsibilities as district finance chairman for the ticket of President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY.

Mr. Pappas is a board member and past president of the Greek Orthodox Church of Monroe. He is as well a past district governor of the American Hellenic Educational and Progressive Association for the States of Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas.

I want to mention that in his new capacity as national chairman of the Greek section of the All Americans Council, Mr. Pappas succeeds another distinguished American of Hellenic origin, Gregory Lagakos, a Philadelphia attorney who was recently named judge of the county court of Philadelphia. I wish to note also that the executive committee of the Greek section recently unanimously approved the appointment of another outstanding citizen, Commissioner Charles Mesenazos, of Elizabeth, N.J., as its national executive director.

It will be the task of Bobby Pappas to continue the work of his organization in broadening the channels of communication between the Democratic National Committee and Americans of Greek heritage. But in a larger sense, it will be his task, through his active participation in our Nation's public life, to follow the invitation extended to him by Vice President HUMPHREY, to "work together in strengthening the goal which Greece itself first gave to mankind—liberty, freedom."

U.S. SAVINGS BOND GUARANTEE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to introduce a bill authorizing the Treasury Department to initiate a new series of savings bonds guaranteeing the investor a redemption equal to the purchasing power of his original investment.

I realize this is a new concept in dealing with the public debt. I would urge the committee to whose attention my bill is directed to give it close scrutiny. But I believe the concept is valid as a protection of the small investor who puts his faith in the United States, who is unfamiliar with more sophisticated investment techniques and who, in the past, has been penalized by inflation. We have all heard the claim that savings bonds will return $4 for every $3 invested. But we know through sad experience that the $4 return has often bought less in goods and services that the original $3 investment.

I would tie the return on this new series of bonds to the Labor Department's cost-of-living index. I would restrict the total value of bonds that could be held by any individual, so that the small investor remained the principal beneficiary. I would apply the index provision only to bonds held to maturity, which would reduce speculation on price changes. I would keep interest at a reasonable rate, but probably somewhat less than that available for other bonds.

This plan, I believe, would contribute to fiscal stability in encouraging savings in times of rising prices, when we normally are plagued by excessive spending. I also believe it would diversify holdings of the public debt, which is healthy. Finally, it would add an important constituency to those opposing inflation. I think it is realistic to say that we are not likely to face a threat of intensive price deflation. Prices have a way of remaining at a level, even during economic recession. It is inflation that will continue to threaten the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the committee will study the draft of this bill and work out its details with the Secretary of the Treasury. I do not presume to fix every detail myself. But the principle, I am convinced, is sound and should be implemented.

SETTLED POLICY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker:

> U.S. policy in the Vietnam war appears to be definitely settled for the time being—

The Times-Picayune of New Orleans declares.

> It is one of building up military and economic strength in South Vietnam and, though it may take years, to exterminate or banish the Vietcong—

The newspaper states. And it adds:

> President Johnson has now indicated the definitive shape of the policy by saying that he had the overwhelming backing of the country and of Congress for the course the administration is pursuing.

The editorial declared:

> Why we are in Vietnam, it seems to us, is becoming better understood. The short reason: To stop aggression. But it is not merely to stop the attempted take-over of the Vietnamese. It is even more to raise a barrier to the almost limitless plans of the Peiping Reds to spread their wars of liberation as fast as they can find opportunities * * *. A long war in Vietnam carries with it some hazards. But the hazards of failing to meet the challenge now are probably much more grave.

Here is a thought-provoking article on an issue of national concern and I am making it available for the RECORD, where others can study it in depth:

[From New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Feb. 14, 1966]

U.S. VIET POLICY SEEMS SETTLED

U.S. policy in the Vietnam war appears to be definitely settled for the time being. It is one of building up military and economic strength in South Vietnam and, though it may take years, to exterminate or banish the Vietcong.

President Johnson has now indicated the definitive shape of the policy by saying that he had the overwhelming backing of the country and of Congress for the course the administration is pursuing. He avers that there is little or no difference between that policy and what main witnesses have said before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. "No one wants to escalate the war * * * no one wants to surrender and pull out," he said.

As we read it at the moment the outlook is this: A long gruelling war with gradually rising pressure on the Communists but also restrictions on escalation that might result in a bigger war; intensified efforts to eliminate the guerrillas combined with economic improvement projects to lift the spirit of the Vietnamese in the villages and strengthen their will to thrust out the Vietcong infiltrators.

The economic-morale problem won't be solved in a month or a year but it has to be a part of a winning war (and after war) strategy. Experts believe that the job can be done if it is pursued with the determination that should mark all aspects of the war effort.

This country will pursue its drive for negotiations to end the hostilities. Nothing promising has yet developed. Until it does, there is no alternative to getting on with the war business.

The "quit Vietnam" element in the United States has been having its say. From here out it probably will be looked on with increasing disapproval wherever it is shown to interfere with the deadly serious war effort.

Why we are in Vietnam, it seems to us, is becoming better understood. The short reason: To stop aggression. But it is not merely to stop the attempted takeover of the Vietnamese. It is even more to raise a barrier to the almost limitless plans of the Peiping Reds to spread their wars of liberation as fast as they can find opportunities. There is nothing secret about these Chinese sponsored national liberation fronts as standing policy with the Mao regime and its satellites. Any success with it in Vietnam would probably open up a bag of troubles in areas outreaching southeast Asia.

A long war in Vietnam carries with it some hazards. But the hazards of failing to meet the challenge now are probably much more grave.

THE FEDERAL IMBALANCE OF PAYMENTS IN MY COMMUNITY—THE RATIO OF FEDERAL EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES IN THE CLEVELAND AREA FROM 1963 TO 1965

The **SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, over the past year, I have endeavored to determine the extent of Federal dollars spent compared with Federal tax dollars collected in the Cleveland area.

It was my purpose to show how vital the role of the Federal Government has become in assisting other levels of government, as well as the individual citizen. In addition, it has been my purpose to make available information indicating fluctuations in Federal, State, and local expenditures which affect these programs, and how these changes directly relate to the lives of people in my congressional district, the city, and the State.

By calculating Federal expenditures and commitments in the Cleveland area, I have been able to inform my constituents and residents of the Cleveland metropolitan area exactly how much of their Federal tax dollars are returned to serve them each year in the form of Federal grants, contracts for goods and services, mortgage guarantees, research agreements, education programs, and other assistance benefits, as well as the judicial and regulatory functions, operated for their benefit.

This information is provided at the conclusion of this report which is the 11th in the series of separate reports I have sent out since August 1965. I will list each of the reports which was written, the date of release, and a very brief summary of its contents, so that the ratio of Federal expenditures to Federal tax revenues from the Cleveland area will have more meaning for my constituents.

SUMMARY OF REPORT ON FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN THE CLEVELAND AREA

On August 20 of last year, I made public an education study, the first of my studies on Federal programs and expenditures in the city of Cleveland and Cuyahoga County. At that time, I was pleased to announce an increase in Federal assistance to all levels of education from $24.8 million to $58 million, or 133 percent, between fiscal year 1964 and fiscal year 1965. Federal assistance to the Cleveland Public School System jumped from $2.1 million to $5.7 million with marked increases in the Agriculture Department's food assistance program and new and innovative Office of Economic Opportunity programs in the area of education. Federal assistance and grants to institutions of higher education went from $18.3 million to $33.8 million, while Federal assistance for retraining and vocational assistance went from $4.7 million to $18.5 million.

A week later, a study of foreign aid was completed which showed that 83 greater Cleveland area firms received AID production and technical assistance contracts for $4,911,650 in fiscal year 1965.

At the beginning of September, I released a study on Federal assistance to cities and noted that the Bureau of Public Roads spent almost $83 million in the Cleveland area in fiscal year 1965. HHFA, since the inception of its various programs, has committed a staggering $1.248 billion to the Cleveland area. Of this amount, $983 million was in FHA's mortgage guarantee program, $12.5 million in public housing, $13 million in subsidized senior housing, $14.7 million in college dorm construction, and offers of $59 million for urban renewal assistance, of which only $14 million has been used thus far.

On September 10, I listed the independent regulatory agencies with offices in Cleveland working for the public's benefit. These small but very important Government offices spend a little over $4 million a year in Cleveland.

Toward the end of September, I found that the Federal Government in fiscal year 1965 spent $312 million in Cleveland on health and welfare activities, a figure up $10 million from fiscal year 1964. Included in this was $150 million in social security benefits to the county—a figure which will rise to $214 million in fiscal year 1966—and $147 million for the assistance of veterans.

On October 15, a study on Federal law enforcement expenditures was announced, showing that about $4.3 million was spent in Cleveland on this area.

A defense and space programs study was released on October 30, and, not counting veterans assistance, showed, despite a decline, $230 million spent on these activities in the Cleveland area. In fiscal year 1965, defense procurement was $102.7 million, Atomic Energy Commission activities, $26.2 million, and space activities, $84.2 million.

On November 13, I released a study on Federal aids to business. These programs rose from $60 million worth in fiscal year 1964 to $80 million in fiscal year 1965. Of this amount, $7 million went directly and almost exclusively to businessmen through such programs as small business loans.

On January 21 of this year, I finished a major study on natural resources and antipollution programs. I found that, although major steps are being taken in these areas, and the Federal Government spent $6 million in the Cleveland area on water and natural resources, northern Ohio's proportion of these types of expenditures is very low and totally inadequate.

On February 14, I released the 10th report on tax collection, Post Office Department, and General Services Administration activities in the Cleveland area. The expenditures for these groups went from $67.1 million in fiscal year 1964 to $88 million in fiscal year 1965, with post office expenditures of $53 million and GSA expenditures of $24.7 million in fiscal year 1965.

The results of these studies and some final summary conclusions are listed here in the RECORD:

Total expenditures of all Federal agencies in the Cleveland area

	Fiscal year 1964	1965
Judicial branch: Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts	[1] $850,000	$860,000
Legislative branch:		
General Accounting Office	[1] 670,500	678,800
Government Printing Office	381,853	526,138
Executive branch:		
Department of Commerce	51,810,055	78,818,781
Department of Defense [2]	129,729,000	124,815,000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	134,017,454	141,968,057
(Social security benefits to rest of county)	+70,000,000	+70,000,000
Department of Housing and Urban Development	56,319,432	59,931,414
Department of Agriculture	6,707,174	7,712,319
Department of the Interior	[1] 800,000	825,045
Department of Labor	6,113,396	8,213,238
Department of Justice	1,116,000	1,176,000
Post Office Department [2]	49,336,350	53,857,355
Department of State [2]	[1] 4,500,000	4,911,650
Department of the Treasury	12,423,000	12,649,000
Atomic Energy Commission	29,186,000	2,247,000
Civil Aeronautics Board	(3)	(3)
Export-Import Bank of Washington loans	3,650,000	3,650,000
Federal Aviation Agency	2,538,638	2,449,000
Federal Communications Commission	450	3,450
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	189,680	198,363
Federal Power Commission	(3)	(3)
Federal Reserve System	(4)	(4)
Federal Trade Commission	117,000	117,000
General Services Administration	8,704,000	24,690,000
Interstate Commerce Commission	101,675	101,675
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	81,910,000	84,195,000
National Labor Relations Board	454,000	504,000
National Mediation Board	15,000	15,000
National Science Foundation	1,490,605	8,907,477
Office of Economic Opportunity		14,451,665
Railroad Retirement Board	[1] 15,000,000	15,173,326
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	800,000	900,000
Securities and Exchange Commission	[1] 120,000	124,165
Selective Service System	[1] 190,000	190,266
Small Business Administration	[1] 1,000,000	[1] 1,700,000
U.S. Civil Service Commission	[1] 142,000	142,005
Veterans' Administration	[1] 144,867,000	[1] 146,639,952
Grand total: [5]		
City	745,250,000	827,346,000
County	815,250,000	897,342,000

[1] Estimated.

[2] These 3 Departments' figures are for the Greater Cleveland metropolitan area. Although all the other figures are for the city of Cleveland, they may (with the exception of HEW) be used for county figures as well, since Federal activity in the county is generally centered through a city office. The activities of the three Departments in the Greater Cleveland metropolitan area cannot be separated from the economy of the city of Cleveland.

[3] No regular expenditures Cleveland area.

[4] The Cleveland bank actually returns large sums to the Federal Treasury.

[5] The grand total has been rounded to thousands and it (and the figures composing it) include no double accounting.

FEDERAL TAX REVENUES FROM THE CLEVELAND AREA

One of the major purposes of initiating these staff studies of Federal expenditures in the Cleveland area is to compare the ratio of Federal revenues generated from our area with Federal funds being committed and spent for various programs in the same geographical area.

This ratio has only been estimated in the past because of the immense difficulties in determining the sum total of all Federal dollars for the growing number of programs in which the Federal Government acts alone or in concert with other levels of government.

In addition to these difficulties, the only statistics currently available for internal revenue collection are based upon a district comprised of 47 counties in the northern half of Ohio. Therefore, it became necessary to develop a clear definition of how Federal revenues could be delineated for the city of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, as well as the base figures for the internal revenue tax district of 47 counties. For purposes of comparison, such statistics are also provided for the State of Ohio and the country as a whole. The formula to determine tax revenues for geographical areas smaller than the tax district can be found in the footnote appended to the table of statistics which follows.

Between fiscal years 1963 and 1965 the total amount of Federal taxes collected in the city of Cleveland rose from $641 million to $718 million or an increase of 12.1 percent. During the same period revenues to the Federal Government from the county rose from $1,227 million to $1,409 million or an increase of 14.8 percent; while the Federal tax revenues for the 47-county tax district rose from $3,985 million to $4,520 million or an increase of 13.4 percent. During this period, Federal revenues from the whole State of Ohio rose 10.5 percent. It is interesting to note that the Federal revenues in each of these areas was well above the 8-percent increase in Federal revenues nationwide.

As a direct result of the impressive effects of the 1964 tax cuts, business activity increased, as did revenues and profits. These gains are reflected in increased tax revenues to the Federal Government which rose from $267 million in fiscal year 1963 for the county to $349 million in fiscal year 1965. For a similar period Federal tax revenues for the city rose from $165 million to $216 million.

RATIO BETWEEN FEDERAL TAXES AND SPENDING

The total amount of Federal funds expended in the Cleveland area for fiscal year 1964 was $815,250,000 and the total amount of all Federal revenues generated from the same area was $1,369,302,000. Therefore, for every $1 the Cleveland area pays to the Federal Government in taxes, it received nearly 60 cents in return. During fiscal year 1965 $897,343,000 was expended or committed by the Federal Government in the Cleveland area and $1,409,094,000 was taken out in Federal tax revenues indicating an increase of 4.6 per dollar or a 63.66 return to Cleveland for every Federal tax dollar taken out.

The gathering of this information has provided me with a valuable measurement of Federal activity and programs in my community. In this way, I have been able to compare Federal programs with their legislative intent. More importantly, these records provide a means by which the taxpayer can determine whether he is getting his money's worth.

TABLE A.—*Internal Revenue Service collections in Cleveland, Cuyahoga County and tax district* [1]

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of tax	Fiscal year 1963			Fiscal year 1964			Fiscal year 1965		
	Tax district	Cuyahoga County	Cleveland	Tax district	Cuyahoga County	Cleveland	Tax district	Cuyahoga County	Cleveland
(1) Total collection	3,985,600	1,227,235	640,826	4,408,392	1,369,302	704,880	4,520,066	1,409,094	718,925
(2) Corporation income tax	826,050	266,814	165,425	963,413	311,182	192,933	1,079,032	348,527	216,087
(3) Individual and employment taxes, total	2,588,074	789,023	387,420	2,819,108	871,375	416,516	2,800,304	868,268	404,611
(4) Income tax not withheld	424,899	120,671	59,259	459,982	130,635	62,444	516,317	146,634	68,331
(5) Income tax withheld	1,580,027	475,651	233,545	1,721,450	521,158	249,113	1,627,833	495,590	230,945
(6) Social security	520,596	172,100	84,501	566,473	196,863	94,100	597,458	207,690	96,783
(7) Railroad retirement	27,959	7,940	3,899	40,740	11,570	5,530	38,192	10,846	5,054
(8) Unemployment insurance	34,593	12,661	6,216	30,463	11,149	5,329	20,514	7,508	3,498
(9) Estate tax	47,534	13,499	6,628	62,318	17,698	8,459	57,098	16,215	7,556
(10) Gift tax	5,289	1,502	737	14,083	4,000	1,912	10,293	2,923	1,362
(11) Excise taxes, total	518,654	156,397	80,616	549,469	165,047	85,060	573,339	173,161	89,309
(12) Alcohol taxes	31,049	9,687	5,124	33,414	10,425	5,515	39,517	12,329	6,522
(13) Tobacco taxes	2,440	761	403	2,318	723	382	2,478	773	409
(14) Stamp taxes	1,250	390	206	1,616	504	267	1,522	475	281
(15) Manufacturers gasoline tax	74,602	18,949	8,527	78,444	19,925	8,966	83,426	21,190	9,536
(16) Manufacturers motor vehicle tax	52,100	15,161	7,399	56,580	16,465	8,035	54,411	15,834	7,727
(17) Manufacturers other	291,954	91,090	48,187	312,883	97,619	51,640	328,430	102,470	54,207
(18) Retailers excise	9,604	2,996	1,585	10,097	3,150	1,666	10,885	3,396	1,796
(19) Miscellaneous excise tax	55,651	17,363	9,185	52,040	16,236	8,589	53,507	16,694	8,831

	Collections in Ohio			United States		
	1963	1964	1965	1963	1964	1965
Total	6,179,114	6,693,373	6,823,098	105,900,000	112,260,257	114,400,000
Corporation income tax	1,350,906	1,521,198	1,696,028	15,205,000	24,300,863	26,100,000
Individual and employment taxes	3,998,385	4,315,889	4,240,605	66,472,000	71,592,859	70,143,000

[1] For a description of how these figures were obtained, see below.

TABLE B.—*Basic statistical data*

POPULATION

	1960 [1]	1963	Percent of change [1]
The State of Ohio	9,706,397	10,247,000	5.6
The Northern (Cleveland) Ohio Tax District [2]	5,803,340	6,128,327	5.6
Cuyahoga County	1,647,895	1,740,177	5.6
Cleveland	876,050	[3] 810,858	−7.4

SOCIAL SECURITY COLLECTIONS [4]

Calendar years	State of Ohio	County of Cuyahoga
1961	641,700,000	147,300,000
1962	723,900,000	157,600,000
1963	832,900,000	186,600,000
1964	878,300,000	([5])

MANUFACTURERS [6]

	Total establishments (plants)	With 20+ employees	Value added, 1958	Value added, 1963
Cuyahoga	3,625	1,295	$2,409,156,000	$3,093,667,000
Ohio	15,177	5,614	$11,472,503,000	$15,443,018,000
Cuyahoga:				
Percent of State	23.8	23.0	21	20.0
Percent of tax district	37.0	36.2	([5])	32.3

[1] The figures were obtained from "Population Estimates, series P–25, No. 324, Jan. 20, 1966," of the Bureau of Census.

[2] The Northern Ohio (Cleveland) Tax District is composed of 47 counties: Allen, Ashland, Ashtabula, Auglaize, Belmont, Carroll, Champaign, Columbiana, Crawford, Cuyahoga, Darke, Defiance, Erie, Fulton, Geauga, Hancock, Hardin, Harrison, Henry, Holmes, Huron, Jefferson, Lake, Logan, Lorain, Lucas, Mahoning, Medina, Mercer, Monroe, Ottawa, Paulding, Portage, Putnam, Richland, Sandusky, Seneca, Shelby, Stark, Summit, Trumbull, Tuscarawas, Van Wert, Wayne, Williams, Wood, and Wyandot.

[3] This was obtained from the "Special Census of Cleveland, Ohio, Apr. 1, 1965," series P–28, No. 1390, Nov. 5, 1965.

[4] The Social Security Administration has these figures for the States and selected counties.

[5] No information.

[6] These figures are obtained from the Department of Commerce's Bureau of the Census "1963 Census of of Manufacturers; Area Studies/Ohio (MC 63(P)–S36), Preliminary Report" and the Bureau's "1958 Location of Manufacturing Plants by County, Industry, and Employment Size." Adjustments have been made for the omission of Monroe County in the 1963 report by reference to the 1958 report.

NOTE.—The population figures for the intervening years can be calculated from these figures. Cuyahoga County's population is 28.4 percent of the tax district's population. Cleveland's population has gone from 49.1 percent of the county's in fiscal year 1963 to 46.6 percent in fiscal year 1965.

TABLE C.—*Basic statistical data*

RETAIL TRADE[1]

	1963	
	Establishments	Sales
Ohio	84,346	$12,905,181,000
Cleveland tax district	51,182	$7,733,262,000
Cuyahoga County	13,177	$2,414,239,000
City of Cleveland	8,177	$1,278,144,000
Cuyahoga's percentage of tax district	25.8	31.2
Cleveland's percentage of county	62.0	52.9

BUSINESS PATTERNS[2]

	Employees, March 1964	Total business units
Ohio	2,608,482	166,890
Cleveland tax district	1,575,531	99,603
Cuyahoga County	577,735	30,409
County's percent tax district	36.6	30.5

AUTOMOBILES[1]

	1963			
	Auto dealers		Gas stations	
	Establishments	Sales	Establishments	Sales
Cleveland tax district	2,918	$1,511,000,000	6,297	$594,020,000
Cuyahoga County	454	$440,101,000	1,331	$150,969,000
Cleveland	288	$214,719,000	692	$68,658,000
County percent of district	15.5	29.1	21	25.4
City percent of county	63.4	48.8	52	45.0

[1] These figures may be obtained from the Department of Commerce's Census Bureau's "1963 Census of Business: Retail Trade in Ohio (BC 63-RA37)."

[2] These figures are from the Department of Commerce's Bureau of the Census report CBP-64-37: "County Business Patterns, 1964."

CLEVELAND METROPOLITAN AREA AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS[3]

[Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, and Medina Counties]

	State average		Cleveland average	
	June 1965	June 1964	June 1965	June 1964
Manufacturing	$128.36	$121.75	$133.24	$126.63
Contract construction	166.04	153.53	178.24	165.72
Wholesale and retail	88.21	85.46	100.97	95.25

[3] Ohio Labor Market Information, "Employment, Hours, and Earnings in Ohio June 1965."

NOTE.—About ⅔ of Cleveland's workers are in manufacturing and ⅓ in nonmanufacturing trades. Using a weighted average, Cleveland may be said to have had wages 7.2 percent higher than the State average in fiscal year 1965, 6 percent in fiscal year 1963, and 6.6 percent in fiscal year 1964.

Notes to tables A, B, and C.

The Cleveland tax district figures for fiscal years 1963, 1964, and 1965 are given in the annual report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The county figures for line 2 were obtained by multiplying the tax district figures by the percent manufacturing value added by the county (32.3 percent). This percentage was not adjusted between fiscal years 1963 and 1965, because the county appears to have grown at the same rate as the State, and the State only slightly less than the Nation. There are no figures on the number of corporations in Cleveland, so the county corporation tax figure was multiplied by the city's percent of the county's retail firms (62 percent).

Lines 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 10 were broken down by means of the population percentages and line 5 was adjusted to reflect the higher average wage of the area.

Line 6 was obtained by adjusting the State and county social security collections from calendar years to fiscal years (allowing a growth of 5.5 percent in collections between fiscal years 1964 and 1965, similar to the change between 1963 and 1964). The tax district's contribution was obtained by noting that the tax district paid 66.2 percent of the State's withheld taxes. City collection figures were obtained by use of the population percentages.

Lines 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, and 19 were obtained by determining that Cuyahoga County accounted for 31.2 percent of the tax district's retail sales and the city of Cleveland accounted for 52.9 percent of the county's sales. This was done because it is assumed that excise taxes are actually paid by the consumer and that it is more accurate to try and determine what the people of the area pay in excises than what the manufacturers pay. Customs collections have been included in these figures. The post office in Cuyahoga County has collected about $44,000,000 in revenue in each of the last 3 fiscal years, but the cost of operating the post offices has usually been about $50,000,000 per fiscal year.

Lines 15 and 16 were obtained by multiplying the county and city's percentages of the value of gasoline and automotive products sold in the tax district by that value.

A VICTORY IN OUR FOREIGN AID

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. RONCALIO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. foreign air program has been severely criticized in the past on the grounds that the money has been wasted through graft and corruption of some foreign governments, through unnecessary expenditures upon economically useless monuments and stadiums, and because of aid money being dispersed to an excessive number of countries. In response to these valid objections, President Johnson has presented to Congress a bold, new look in foreign aid, designed to help friendly countries which are determined to help themselves.

Foreign aid Director David Bell has said:

> The major lesson we have learned in the past 10 years is that unless the people we help are willing to commit themselves, are prepared to take on reforms, are prepared to make policy decisions, there is not much an outsider can do to help them.

In line with this realistic attitude, aid will now be available only for those countries willing to invest their own resources in improved farming techniques, schools, hospitals, and critical industry. They must undertake land and tax reforms, alleviate their population problems, attract private foreign investment, and encourage local saving.

This new emphasis upon the efforts of recipient countries has resulted in the economic aid request being scaled down to $2.469 billion, a reduction of $235 million from last year's request. Instead of being widely dispersed, the economic aid will be concentrated on a select group of countries. The biggest grants will go to 20 nations and the great share of loans to just 8.

This year's aid program shows another favorable departure from the past, in that military assistance has been separated from economic assistance. This practice should be continued, as it allows for a more rational consideration of the relative merits of military and economic aid programs.

The recommended program has another innovation, which is less acceptable. It proposes to extend aid authorizations from the present 1 year to 5. There is no doubt that U.S. aid should be integrated with the development plans of recipient countries and, to do this, the United States may have to commit itself to an assistance program for longer than 1 year at a time. But a 5-year commitment is too long, as this would seriously impair congressional control and oversight of the aid program. Extending some authorizations for 2 years would be sufficient for the time being.

In selecting the recipients, the administration has given primary emphasis to our national aim of defending world peace and security. The chief threat to world peace and security today is Communist revolutionary guerrilla warfare. Poverty is a necessary prerequisite for the success of this type of warfare. It is those who have the least to lose who will be most likely to join a guerrilla force. People who have decent living standards will tend to be more conservative regarding revolutionary military action.

This thesis is supported by Columbia University Prof. Doak Barnett, in his book "Communist China and Asia."

> In its efforts to build up the defenses of friendly nations in Asia, the United States must not forget that economic progress is at least as important as military strength, if not more so in the long run. It must strive therefore to achieve a sound balance between economic and military aid in its support of Asian nations. In some countries the emphasis is now heavily weighted toward military support, which creates risks not only of neglecting important problems of economic development but also of actually creating serious economic difficulties. Large scale American military aid to Asian nations cannot be regarded as a substitute for economic aid but rather as a factor which calls for even greater efforts in the strictly economic field.

In recognition of these principles, the largest single aid request is for South

Vietnam. This is a sound choice, for historical experience demonstrates that progress in economic development is essential if internal Communist seizures are to be prevented. In 1947, the Greek Government was engaged in a struggle for survival against Communist guerrilla forces. President Truman pronounced the Truman doctrine—that Americans must support free people who were resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure. He asked Congress to appropriate $400 million for economic assistance to Greece and Turkey. By 1950, the Communist guerrillas in Greece had abandoned their struggle. Similarly, in the Philippines, after World War II, the Communists built a force composed of dissatisfied peasants. As it became obvious that military measures by themselves would not solve the problem, the Philippine Government carried out a broad program of social and economic progress in connection with renewed military offensives. Only in this manner was the Communist guerrilla movement in the Philippines actually destroyed.

The revised aid program not only protects our vital national interests but it does so in an economically sound fashion. We can look forward to the day when the aid program will no longer be necessary.

Economic aid to Western Europe was terminated for most of the nations by 1960. Progress in Greece and Israel permitted the United States to terminate grants in 1962. Self-support was achieved in Lebanon in 1963. Iran is in a transition to self-support. Turkey plans to eliminate reliance on foreign aid by 1973. India and Turkey now finance over three-fourths of their development programs from their own resources, and Pakistan over 60 percent. All told, about 14 nations are approaching the time when they will not need any further low-interest loan or grant assistance from the United States.

In the past 15 years, the burden of foreign assistance on the U.S. taxpayer has declined sharply. As a share of gross national product, economic aid has fallen from 2 percent to 1949 to less than two-fifths of 1 percent this year. As a share of the Federal budget, economic aid has declined from 11.5 percent to 2 percent over the same period. Most developed countries are contributing about the same percentage of their gross national product as the United States, some even more.

Foreign aid spending has little effect upon our balance-of-payments position. Eighty percent of the funds will be used to purchase goods and services in the United States. In fact, a sizable share of some American exports are now financed by foreign aid programs. In 1962, 33 percent of our locomotive and fertilizer exports and 25 percent of U.S. exports of iron and steel products were purchased under the foreign aid program.

Foreign aid also helps to boost foreign trade indirectly. AID workers abroad introduce American products and techniques in places where they may never have been seen. Trade connections are established and a market for reorders is created.

The aid program has also facilitated private investment abroad. Since November 1961, AID has authorized 17 loans totaling $146 million directly to private firms to establish new plants and extend existing facilities in the Near east and south Asia countries alone. Technical assistance also helps to foster private enterprise. The investment guarantee program provides a strong stimulus to U.S. firms investing abroad.

The State of Wyoming has a right to be proud of the significant role it has played in assisting less fortunate people through the foreign-aid program. The University of Wyoming has a contract with AID for a 3-year technical assistance program in Somalia. A team of Wyomingites in Somalia is working to improve present agricultural crops and survey other crops that may prove feasible. The University of Wyoming and Columbia University are assisting the faculties of engineering, agriculture, and education of Kabul University, Afghanistan, as well as assisting the Afghan Institute of Technology and the Secondary schools.

As the self-sacrificing Wyoming citizens working on these projects are aware, the path to economic development is not an easy one. Yet, the proposed aid program, with its justification embodied in the defense of our vital national interests, its basis on a sound economic foundation, and its mechanisms encouraging self-help on the part of recipients, is a remarkable bargain for the American people. There will be spectacular successes and ignominious failures in the years ahead. But, as Economist Robert Heilbroner states, we must proceed with our foreign economic aid:

> Once the great march has begun, it is no longer possible to turn back. The changes in the balance of the old static society cannot be undone. There is no choice but to tread the road to its conclusion—however long and agonizing the journey may be.

WAR AND HOPE

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I feel that only good can come from the meeting of heads of state and the restatement of aims and policies in the Vietnam war.

As is well known, the Allies agreed on "a growing military effectiveness," and at the same time on an "unending quest for peace."

The candid, face-to-face exchange between the heads of state in Hawaii "should be enormously useful in the joint effort to rid Vietnam of its invaders and establish the country as a going nation," the Washington Daily News has commented, and it adds that "more meetings, as suggested by the communique, could only enhance the effectiveness of the effort."

The newspaper feels that the resolution evidenced at Honolulu is good cause for encouragement.

Here is a concise and well-presented résumé of the events—and of the encouragement we can take from them—and I should like to suggest that the editorial be printed in the RECORD, where many may want to read it.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Feb. 9, 1966]

WAR AND HOPE IN VIETNAM

Even if Ho Chi Minh has started, or eventually does begin, some type of "peace offensive" of his own, this would be no cause for an abrupt change in the plans President Johnson and Vietnamese leaders worked out at Honolulu.

Communists don't normally cave in suddenly. (It took 2 years of talks to arrange the settlement in Korea.)

The United States is engaged in Vietnam to achieve two objectives: to free the Vietnamese people of the communism invasion and to help them build a country of independence and stability, something they never before have had a chance to accomplish.

Anything which stands in the way of these goals (particularly the Communist terrorists and armies now being fought in South Vietnam) must be overcome. Anything, including a possible change of mind in Hanoi, which may help reach these goals is to be diligently encouraged.

But the success of the effort to restore freedom in Vietnam and to give the country a real chance in life depends almost altogether on the Vietnamese themselves and heavy American assistance.

The Vietnamese not only have to fight but they must take care of refugees from the battle areas, organize local government, and stabilize the economy.

The understandings reached in Honolulu between President Johnson and the Vietnamese leaders (Premier Ky and others) are designed to meet these needs.

The two allies agreed on "a growing military effectiveness" and at the same time on an "unending quest for peace."

Mr. Johnson said, for our part, we would "move steadfastly ahead" on the military front and at the same time "move vigorously" to assist the Vietnamese with their economic, social, and political problems.

All of this appeared to support Premier Ky's position that the allies must operate from strength, and evidence of willingness to use their strength, if there is to be "any kind of just and lasting settlement" with the Communists. There is no other way, as history has shown, to deal with Communists.

The payoff for the Honolulu conference does not lie in the stilted communique, but in the results over the long haul.

Nevertheless, a restatement of aims and policies for this war—this time jointly by the top leaders of the two countries, is another step in smoothing out world opinion of the justice and necessity of the U.S. presence in Vietnam.

And, as a practical matter, the candid, face-to-face exchange between the heads of state—who never before had met—should be enormously useful in the joint effort to rid Vietnam of its invaders and establish the country as a going nation. More meetings, as suggested by the communique, could only enhance the effectiveness of the effort.

No one knows how long it will take to force a decision from Hanoi—either by military force, diplomatic means, or both—but the resolution evidenced at Honolulu is good cause for encouragement.

HAVE YOU REGISTERED TO VOTE?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on January 25 of this year, I introduced H.R. 12297, which is designed to encourage voter participation by reminding citizens through a special postal cancellation mark of the need to register to vote. The cancellation mark proposed by the bill would bear the words, "Have You Registered To Vote?"

When I originally introduced this legislation during the 88th Congress, it was endorsed by the president of the Advertising Council, Mr. Theodore S. Repplier, and Mr. Thomas D'Arcy Brophy, president of the American Heritage Foundation. Most of us are aware of the continuing efforts of these organizations to encourage more Americans to vote.

Since reintroducing my bill, I have again heard from Mr. Repplier. I include his letter of February 10 as part of my remarks at this point in the Record:

The Advertising Council, Inc.,
Washington, D.C., February 10, 1966.

Hon. James G. O'Hara,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman O'Hara: Thank you very much, indeed, for your letter of January 26 enclosing a copy of the Congressional Record of January 25.

I was happy that you included my letter and am encouraged that you have reintroduced your proposed legislation authorizing a postal cancellation mark to encourage registration for voting.

We are, of course, still enthusastic about this idea. We have by now had sufficient experience with the problem to know that constant reminders do increase the number of people who go to the polls. Certainly such a mail cancellation mark would be an effective reminder.

With kindest regards.

Cordially,

T. S. Repplier.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Cohelan (at the request of Mr. Boggs), from February 14 through February 28, 1966, on account of official business.

Mr. Johnson of California (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for an indefinite period, on account of official business (interparliamentary).

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Vanik, for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Roncalio, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Edmondson (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, February 16, 1966; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Teague of Texas.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Boggs) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Love.

Mr. Scheuer.

Mr. Natcher.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass., in 1969.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 63. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held at Tulsa, Okla., May 12 through 21, 1966; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 15, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2034. A letter from the Acting Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the 32d Annual Report of the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; paragraph 3, section 4, of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended; the Executive order of March 27, 1933, creating the Farm Credit Administration; and section 6 of the Farm Credit Act of 1953 (H. Doc. No. 338); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2035. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental appropriations request for three urgently needed and essential programs of Government: the National Teachers Corps, the rent supplement program, and the Selective Service System (H. Doc. No. 380); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2036. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish and maintain reserves of agricultural commodities to protect consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2037. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2038. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Bostwick Park project, Colorado, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 83–172; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2039. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the Battle Act Report for 1965, pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1965; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2040. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report of negotiated contracts for disposal of materials during the period July 1 through December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87–889; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2041. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 1966 report of the Office of Coal Research relating to coal research activities undertaken during calendar year 1965, pursuant to Public Law 86–599; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2042. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the annual report of the Board for fiscal year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 205 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, and Executive Order No. 11007, issued February 26, 1962; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2043. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting copies of certain publications, as follows: Glossary of Important Power and Rate Terms, Abbreviations, and Units of Measurement, 1965; Statistics for Interstate Natural Pipe Line Companies, 1964; Sales by Producers of Natural Gas to Interstate Pipeline Companies, 1964; All-Electric Homes, Annual Bills, 1965; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2044. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for a temporary period the existing provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 10, 1966, the following bills were reported on February 11, 1966:

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1784. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10431. A bill to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; without amendment (Rept. No. 1279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10674. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 12264. A bill to declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administrative purposes is held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 12265. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.J. Res. 343. Joint resolution to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 12784. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish and maintain reserves of agricultural commodities to protect consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12785. A bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 12786. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 12787. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12788. A bill to extend the period within which certain requests may be filed under the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 12789. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.R. 12790. A bill to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 12791. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend to September 30, 1966, the period for initial enrollment in the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 12792. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to grant fellowships for graduate study in highway transportation engineering; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 12793. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to exclude from income pension and annuity payments under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 for the purpose of determining eligibility for a veteran's pension under chapter 15 of that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12794. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 12795. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove certain limitations on the amount of the deduction for contributions to pension and profit-sharing plans made on behalf of self-employed individuals and to change the definition of "earned income" applicable with respect to such plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 12796. A bill to authorize a separate sleeve insignia for Merrill's Marauders, a volunteer unit of the U.S. Army that served in the China-Burma-India theater of operations during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 12797. A bill to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers Systems, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 12798. A bill to protect domestic consumers against an inadequate supply of soybeans and soybean products, to maintain and promote foreign trade, to protect producers of soybeans against an unfair loss of income resulting from the establishment of a reserve supply, to assist in marketing soybeans for domestic consumption and exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 12799. A bill to provide for the establishment of the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 12800. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from authorizing the development or removal of certain oil or gas deposits underlying the Pacific Ocean; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12801. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 12802. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIDER:

H.R. 12803. A bill to provide for a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 12804. A bill to provide for a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 12805. A bill to provide for a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 12806. A bill to provide for a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 12807. A bill providing for jury selection in Federal and State courts, prosecution and removal to Federal courts, civil preventive relief, civil indemnification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H. Con. Res. 588. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the continued independence of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H. Con. Res. 589. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the continued independence of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H. Con. Res. 590. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the continued independence of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CONTE:

H. Con. Res. 591. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the continued independence of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Curency.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H. Con. Res. 592. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the continued independence of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. Con. Res. 593. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the continued independence of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

396. By the **SPEAKER:** Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to support of the U.S. policy in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

397. Also a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 12808. A bill for the relief of Sergio Samano Roche and Luz Maria Samano Roche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 12809. A bill for the relief of Barbara Zakrzewska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 12810. A bill for the relief of Maydis Esmada King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.R. 12811. A bill for the relief of Cavit Alidede; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

325. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Pioneer Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., Piqua, Ohio, relative to loans to rural electric cooperatives; to the Committee on Agriculture.

326. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to trading with the enemy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Future Farmers of America—Guardians of the Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, our country is once again preparing to celebrate the birthday of our first President. Americans, throughout the land will pause on that day, February 22, and pay due tribute to the splendid and unselfish genius of this great man who gave so much of himself and his talents in his efforts to establish and sustain this then fledgling young Nation. History records George Washington as a leader in many fields and certainly not the least of his accomplishments were in the area of agriculture. At heart, George Washington was a farmer and recognizing this, a group of America's finest young men have selected the week of his birthdate as their national week. I am speaking of the Future Farmers of America who will observe their 38th anniversary the week of February 19 to February 26.

I am sincere when I speak of the Future Farmers of America as a group of this Nation's finest young men. At home, in the Second District of Kentucky, one cannot but be aware of the very strong and the very positive influence that the members of this organization exert in their homes and in their communities. I know of no group that commands more respect or receives more wholehearted support than our future farmers and I am sure this is true not only in our section of Kentucky, but across the board expanse of our country.

Thirty-eight years ago, some high school students in Kansas City, Mo., believed in the future of farming. They formed a new organization—an organization for farm boys—and employed this belief in their creed. Their faith has been justified, for it was then as it is now—farming is the backbone and the heart of agriculture.

It was in 1928 that these boys first met and set forth their ideals and goals. The outgrowth of their meeting has been a national organization, the Future Farmers of America, with more than 454,516 active members in 9,156 local chapters. This membership is distributed throughout our 50 States and Puerto Rico. Operating under the provisions of the National Vocational Education Acts, it has become an educational, nonprofit, and nonpolitical farm youth movement and has as its aim and purpose the development of agricultural leadership, of citizenship, and of patriotism.

As our great Nation has expanded its growth and power, as our population has increased, and America, in its compassion for the hungry of the world has increased its foreign commitments, so too have the Future Farmers of America augmented their program to meet these new demands upon our agricultural resources. Vocational agriculture now embraces the study of science, technology, and management. The American farm and American farmworkers remain the center link in our present agricultural system. Servicing and supplying these 7 million people are some 6 million workers. In the third and final link, an additional 10 million handle and process our abundant farm produce. Agriculture, in a sense, has become agribusiness.

To those who love the land, however, agriculture is more than a career—more than a business. It is a very rich and rewarding way of life. The dreams of our forefathers are nurtured and harvested and the good earth is replenished with hope for the farmers of tomorrow to tend. A farm is a masterpiece of nature and a symbol of the eternal bond between man and soil.

I salute the Future Farmers of America upon their 38th anniversary. A great trust is theirs and I wish for them a future of even greater achievement.

Small Business Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act.

This bill would replace the present revolving loan fund utilized by the Small Business Administration with three separate funds. The first of these funds would finance the business loan program authorized by section 7(a) of the Small Business Act and the loan program established by the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act. The second fund would support the disaster loan program, and the third would finance loans under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, other than the lease guarantee functions.

As you probably know, Mr. Speaker, since October 11 of last year, the Small Business Administration has not only failed to grant any further business loans, with a minor exception during the New York transit strike, but they have also refused to accept any applications for direct financial assistance, regardless of need. The city of Dayton, Ohio, which is in my congressional district, made application for a small business development center but was turned down. I was told by the Small Business Administration that these drastic steps are necessary because of drains on the present loan fund due to several natural disasters.

I strongly feel that this emergency requires another supplemental appropriation as well as a change in the structure of the loan program itself.

Congress created the Small Business Administration in 1953 because independent and vigorous support was needed in the executive branch of Government for the Nation's 4.6 million small businessmen. There is no area where such support is more essential than the granting of small business loans.

Big business often has the flexibility to withstand temporary setbacks simply by shifting resources from another section of the firm or calling upon their ample conventional credit sources. When the same challenge is hurled against a small businessman, he may go under, not for any lack of ability or dedication, but simply because he does not have time to gather money needed to provide a transition to the next opportunity for profits, financial repair, and growth.

Since last October, however, the assistance that Congress has declared should be available from the Small Business Administration has been denied. In effect, we have said to the small businessman, "When disaster strikes elsewhere in the Nation, you must bear a special burden. You must survive without the programs that Congress said you should have." And, Mr. Speaker, this is by no means the first time that regular business loan suspensions have been decreed. And, unless Congress acts, it will not be the last.

The loan program suspension comes upon the heels of another serious blow at small business credit by the Government—the increase in the rediscount rate by the Federal Reserve Board. The consequent rise in the cost of credit is already being felt throughout the Nation. Therefore, small business now faces a two-pronged crisis in credit.

The purpose of this legislation is to insulate the business loan program against drains caused by natural disasters. I recognize that my bill does not solve the problem of stabilizing the disaster loan program so that its proper benefits will

always be available. The unpredictable timing and scope of such disasters poses special dilemmas in assuring the full effectiveness of such a program. Possible remedies in this field merits the attention of Congress but I strongly insist that the brunt of such disasters should not be placed upon small businessmen throughout the United States.

The business loan program must be given a permanent and protected status. Appropriations for these loans must be carefully planned, fully evaluated by Congress, and should not be permitted to rise and fall on the whim of nature.

Congress has wisely recognized the crucial value of small business to our free enterprise economy, therefore, I come before you today, Mr. Speaker, to plead for the reform and reinvigoration of the small business loan program and recommend this bill as a most important measure to translate congressional promise into permanent performance for the small businessmen of America.

Several of my colleagues have introduced similar bills and I am happy to join with them in this legislation.

Rehabilitation Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems facing urban Members is the deterioration of once sound neighborhoods within their districts. I think those of us who have this problem have a responsibility to bring Government agencies into the area to reverse the trend. I have been working very hard on such a project in the Highbridge neighborhood of my district.

I have prepared a newsletter to be sent to the residents of the area explaining what I am doing and enlisting their cooperation. I include the text of the newsletter for the benefit of those of my colleagues who may be considering similar projects.

DEAR HIGHBRIDGE RESIDENT: I am delighted to greet you and to wish you and your family the best of health and good fortune for 1966.

This year has begun in a truly auspicious way for Highbridge. The city of New York and the Federal Government has officially committed themselves to arresting the deterioration of the neighborhood. A massive aid program, which will include $1,600,000 for enforcement of building, sanitation, and electrical codes, street improvement work, streetlighting, street signs, and tree planting, will start in Highbridge in a few months. By spring, we should all see the beginnings of a new and more beautiful Highbridge.

In addition, construction for a combination new P.S. 126 and middle-income housing project at Ogden Avenue and 167th Street, will also commence this year. This is most welcome news to the community. I would like all the Highbridge residents who have worked unceasingly over the years to improve their community to know that their unselfish efforts are now being capped by concrete success. The power and resources of the Federal and city governments are being martialed to serve Highbridge and its residents.

P.S. 126 BECOMES A REALITY

After years of promises and negotiations, New York City announced on December 23 that construction on the P.S. 126 housing complex will begin this spring. The new P.S. 126 will replace P.S. 11, which was built in 1890.

In an important "first" for Highbridge, a 25-story apartment house will be built on top of the school. This is the first school-housing project ever built in the United States. I am hopeful that many Highbridge residents will obtain apartments in the project. It is now estimated that the apartments will rent at approximately $25 per room per month.

The announcement by the city that construction on P.S. 126 will start this spring is the culmination of years of effort by several people living in Highbridge and a stepped up campaign by my office, headed by Jack Delaney. Jack and I worked very closely with Ernie Minott, Jim Egan, and the PTA's of P.S. 11 and 73 in bringing the attention of the highest echelons of Government to the many years of frustrating and disappointing delays in the development of P.S. 126.

We held repeated meetings with Eugene Hult, director of construction for the New York public school system; Herbert Evans, Director of Housing and Redevelopment Board; Budget Director Shea, and Chief Engineer Joseph Fitzpatrick, to get this project moving.

P.S. 126 will accommodate about 1,200 students. I will do everything in my power to assure that construction does start on schedule and that P.S. 126 is an example of the best in school architecture and design in the United States.

REHABILITATION OF HIGHBRIDGE BEGINS

When I was elected to Congress last year I assigned a top priority to the rehabilitation of Highbridge. Over the last few years, I have been concerned with the continued deterioration of the area. I was determined that this trend should be arrested promptly.

The first step I took was to invite a large number of civic, community, business, and religious leaders in Highbridge to become members of a Highbridge Conservation Committee.

The response of the community to my plea was immediate and encouraging. Within a few weeks, the committee was operational and Leo Weins, vice president of H. W. Wilson Co., took over as chairman. Leo brought to the committee his tremendous organizational and administrative expertise, and his splendid leadership qualities. We were also fortunate in having the full cooperation of Father Kavanagh and Father Reisig of Sacred Heart Church as well as Rabbi Taragin of the Highbridge Jewish Center.

The committee worked swiftly to draft a report outlining the specific problems in Highbridge for submission to Herbert Evans, director of the city housing and redevelopment agency. After a series of meetings with our committee, Mr. Evans agreed to assign a full-time staff director to coordinate the rehabilitation effort in Highbridge. The staff director will work out of an office which the Highbridge Conservation Committee has just leased at 1155 Woodycrest Avenue, at 167th Street.

We plan to invite all of you to a gala opening of this office, later this month, to help us drink a toast to the "New Highbridge."

The details of the program to rehabilitate Highbridge are as follows: The city of New York has applied to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for Federal funds under the Housing Act of 1965. As a result of our joint efforts, Highbridge will receive $1,600,000 over 3 years. The largest single amount of money, $500,000, will be spent to provide for strict enforcement of building, sanitation, and electrical codes, for community organization specialists, and for architects and planners; $300,000 is allocated for street improvement work, $175,000 for curbs and gutters, $220,000 for street lights, police and fire communications systems, $5,000 for new street signs, and $120,000 for the planting of trees.

In addition, property owners will receive federally insured 3-percent loans to carry out rehabilitation and the FHA will insure mortgages at 6½ percent interest. Low income homeowners are eligible for $1,500 outright nonreturnable grants to improve their homes.

As you can see, the mighty resources of the Federal and city governments will now be used to give Highbridge a thorough face-lifting and will serve to stabilize the neighborhood.

The new borough president, Herman Badillo, has offered his full cooperation and that of his staff and office to insure the success of our project.

The members of the Highbridge Conservation Committee include: Leo Weins, chairman; Father Reisig, Father Kavanagh, Rabbi Taragin, Dan and Barbara Cetrone, John Clark, Al Correa, Bob Croghan, Jim Egan, Harold Finkelstein, Theodore Frank, Lillian Friedlander, Tom Goldrick, Pearl Granoff, Phyllis Grunauer, Eddie Green, Joe Hirsch, Rita Karig, Bernard Marcus, Mary McCrystal, Douglas Merrill, Ernie Minott, Frank Negron, Daniel Noonan, Florence Parker, John Respol, Stuart Rosensweet, Jean Sealo, Carl Sontz, Max Silverman, and Joe Polser. (These members have attended two or more meetings.)

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CLEAN VACANT LOT

To the tune of the latest rock and roll music provided by the Highbridge Crickets, 80 Highbridge youngsters cleaned the vacant lot opposite P.S. 73 (Anderson Avenue between 164th and 165th Streets) on Saturday, December 4.

The young men who worked from about 10 a.m. to 1 p.m., were supervised by Father Kavanagh from Sacred Heart Church, who, in a scene reminiscent of the Pied Piper of Hamlin, led the lads from Sacred Heart Church over the hill and down onto Anderson Avenue to attack the assortment of beer cans, broken bottles, abandoned bed springs, mattresses, ancient ice boxes, and other debris which disfigured the lot.

Other supervisory "straw bosses" were Patrolman Tom Goldrick, Charlie Minsberg of PAL, and John Minnich of the Boy Scouts.

By 1 p.m. the lot was cleaned and some 30 tons of debris were removed by a shuttle of sanitation department trucks. This is a great day's work which demonstrated once again the unusually high caliber of community spirit in Highbridge so evident in young and old alike.

The lot cleaning was organized by John Respol and Leon Weins of the Highbridge Conservation Committee in cooperation with Jack Delaney of my office. The men who worked so hard that chilly December morning are: Capt. Anthony McNally, of the 44th precinct; Supervisor Charles Byrnes, of the sanitation department; Dan Cetrone, of the Highbridge Capital; Roland Carpenter; William Cronin; Dan Duggan; Dr. Benjamin Fleissig; Joseph McTiernan; John McNamee; John Minnich; Paul Noonan; Dan Quinn; and Neil Sullivan.

WATCH FOR THE OPENING OF THE HIGHBRIDGE CONSERVATION PROJECT, 1155 WOODYCREST AVENUE (167TH STREET)

As you can see, Highbridge is finally on its way. I would like to thank the entire community for the vital support and cooperation which has enabled me and my entire congressional staff to serve you effectively in pushing forward with these exciting programs. I look forward to working closely with an increasing number of Highbridge residents in the months ahead, for a newer and finer Highbridge neighborhood.

Statement by Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey Before the 25th Anniversary Celebration of United Service Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 3, 1966, there were held throughout the Nation a series of celebrations marking a quarter of a century of service by the United Service Organizations. No one who has been a member of our Armed Forces or who has had a loved one serving for our flag could fail to be indebted to this great organization for the wholesome entertainment and recreation it has provided our troops throughout the world.

In New York City, the principal speaker at the USO banquet was Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. His vital theme was the historic challenge facing our Nation for the defense of Vietnam against Communist aggression.

A Gold Medal Award was presented to the Vice President. Previous high winners of the award, I am happy to point out, included His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman and Gen. Douglas MacArthur—posthumous.

I insert the text of Vice President HUMPHREY's outstanding address in the RECORD and precede it by the inscription of the award which was so appropriately conferred upon him.

TEXT OF INSCRIPTION ON GOLD MEDALLION PRESENTED ON FEBRUARY 3, 1966, BY USO OF NEW YORK CITY

The USO of New York City takes pride in presenting to the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States, its Gold Medal Award in recognition of his dedicated leadership and wholehearted support of USO as it continues to keep the faith with America's Armed Forces, February 3, 1966.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, USO, NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 3, 1966

It is a high honor to receive your Fifth Annual Gold Medal, as it is a privilege to join with you in celebrating the 25th anniversary of the USO.

During this quarter of a century, over 20 million American men and women who have worn the uniform of their country have found in the USO a home away from home.

USO seeks to answer the two questions always on the mind of every GI wherever he is:

"Does anybody know I'm here? Does anybody care?"

And to these two questions you answer, in actions as well as words: "Yes, we do know and we do care."

We have an obligation to our American young men away from home—young men serving without complaint and with a high standard of performance.

At Clark Field, near Manila, I saw recently young Americans—some of them terribly wounded—fresh from the battlefields of Vietnam. As I talked with them, they showed in every word and action those special qualities of courage and determination which Americans have always demonstrated in every war. We can surely be proud of them.

In Korea, I traveled north to the truce line and talked with American and Korean soldiers in this cold and bleak place.

Here, over a decade after the U.N. repelled Communist aggression, our American soldiers are still standing guard in one of freedom's loneliest and most remote frontiers.

The soldiers I saw in Clark Field and Korea, like those in other remote and often dangerous areas of the world, deserve the assurance that the American people have not forgotten them. And USO—which I saw in action at Tokyo, Manila, and Seoul—provides that kind of assurance.

And I think it is in the best spirit of American democracy that USO, representing our three major faiths, is nongovernmental and represents a wholly voluntary commitment on the part of the American people.

Why are so many American soldiers in Asia either standing guard or engaged in a shooting war?

They are there, primarily, to insure the peoples of the countries in which they are stationed the right to choose, the right to decide their own futures—in other words, to have the basic human rights of self-determination and of independence.

Self-determination and independence are threatened today by Asian communism. And so is man's search for peace. For we face adversaries who seek to prove that peaceful coexistence is a fraud—that militancy and force are the paths to final Communist victory.

During my two recent trips to Asia, I had the opportunity to talk with many national leaders. I sought their impressions of Asian communism, with which all of them have had firsthand experience. I did so because it is vital to know one's adversary as thoroughly as possible, and through many different eyes.

I did not come back with simple answers or simple panaceas.

Asian communism is a complex ideology. It is deeply rooted in the tragic past of Asia, yet it is raw and dynamic.

It isn't the timeworn, bureaucratic communism that has evolved in other places. It is aggressive. And its leaders are convinced of their ultimate success.

Its approach is not merely economic, although it capitalizes on the poverty and despair of the Asian peasant.

Its tactic is not merely political, although its hard-core followers are dedicated believers in Marxist doctrine, and although it wraps itself in the robes of nationalism to attract those who aren't yet ready for the full gospel.

Its thrust for power is not simply military, although it never has won power except by ruthless use of force—and I believe it never will.

The immediate threat is in Vietnam. What are the realities of today in Vietnam?

First, there is the reality that we face in South Vietnam no mild-mannered liberal evolutionary reformist party. We face dedicated Communist-led revolutionaries seeking by force to subject a nation to their will. Some of these revolutionaries are from the south. Some are from the north. Some are irregulars. Some are regular North Vietnamese soldiers. Some of their supply and direction comes from the south. Some of it comes from Hanoi. Some of it comes from Peiping. Their creed is communism and their means is terror.

Second, there is the reality that what is happening in Vietnam is not an isolated occurrence, unconnected to events elsewhere. Those who inspire and support the use of force in Vietnam have made their plans clear. Those plans include the use of subversion, of propaganda, of assassination, of sabotage, and of outright military action to gain their objectives throughout the world. In some places, such as Vietnam, aggression has come in the guise of a war of national liberation. In others, such as India and Korea, it has come as movement of regular troops across a national frontier.

The Communist-backed terrorism in Vietnam is being felt not only in Asia, but also in Africa and in Latin America.

Third, I would point to the reality that—faced with this aggressive force—our response has been measured and our objective peaceful.

Last April, President Johnson, at Johns Hopkins University, made clear the unconditional nature of our offer toward peaceful negotiation. He has reiterated that offer many times. He has emphasized that so-called National Liberation Front representatives could be represented in the negotiations.

Last May the President ordered suspension of bombing in the north in the hope that this might stimulate negotiation. In December we suspended the bombing again.

In the past several weeks, the President has sent emissaries throughout the world to seek some means toward peaceful negotiation.

Initiatives outside our own—by the U.N. Secretary General; by 17 nonalined nations; by the United Kingdom, Ghana, India, and other Commonwealth nations; by Japan, by the United Arab Republic; by Pope Paul VI—have been undertaken without success.

We have stated unequivocally that we support any effort toward negotiation, no matter where initiated. And we have directly communicated to Hanoi our willingness to begin immediately unconditional discussions.

What has been the response from Hanoi and Peiping? I read from Ho Chi Minh's letter of last Friday:

"The U.S. imperialists are clamoring about their desire for peace and their readiness to engage in unconditional discussion in the hope of fooling world opinion and the American people.

"Obviously the U.S. search for peace is only designed to conceal its scheme for intensifying the war of aggression."

From Peiping has come an unusually violent torrent of hate propaganda regarding President Johnson's—and I quote—"filthy and vicious * * * basket of peace."

It is clear that—in this time as in the past—those whose creed is force disbelieve the determination of democratic societies to resist their force.

Given this response to the U.S. peace offensive, President Johnson had no choice but to take steps to restore military pressure on North Vietnam.

In announcing this decision, the President emphasized that "the end of the pause does not mean the end of our own pursuit of peace."

For we must not permit the struggle to become purely military, either in Vietnam or elsewhere.

We must persist with diplomatic initiatives for peace, in the United Nations and in all the capitals of the world.

We must counter the Communist political thrust with better politics—the politics of democracy, of self-determination, of human dignity.

We must help the nations of Asia move forward with economic and social reform so that the Asian citizen will have a real stake in his country.

This is where the struggle will be decided in the long run.

We have a clear obligation to help the people of Asia and of other continents to help themselves. It is for this reason that I commend to you the foreign aid program which President Johnson submitted to Congress this week.

The President has proposed, and I quote, "to help give the people of the less developed world the food, the health, the skills, and education—and the strength—to lead their nations to self-sufficient lives of plenty and freedom."

We have set ourselves no easy task. It will require patience and fortitude for years ahead.

But I believe we can, in the end, succeed. For I believe Americans have learned the lessons of history so that we may not be doomed to repeat them.

We have learned that the appetite of aggressors is never satisfied.

We have learned that a threat to freedom elsewhere can soon become a threat to freedom here.

Can we accept the possibility that the struggle against Communist expansion can go on for years ahead?

Can we adapt the use of our military power to achieve limited goals while possessing military power in almost limitless quantity?

Can we persevere in our search for peaceful negotiation in the face of rejection by our adversaries?

Can we devote ourselves to patient efforts toward economic and social progress in an environment of violence and terror?

Can we maintain our own devotion to free institutions while opposed by those without regard for them?

Can we, finally, convince those who live by force that time is on our side?

Can we demonstrate to them that we are too strong to be afraid, too determined to be defeated?

I answer: Yes, we can and we shall.

Americans are capable of waging the long, hard battle for freedom around the globe for as long as freedom is threatened. We have the leadership and the resolution to fulfill our responsibility as leader of the free world. And we shall.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Capt. Harold F. Menges, Chaplain's Corps, U.S. Navy, offered the following prayer:

St. John 9: 4: *And Jesus answered, I must work the works of Him that sent Me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work.*

Holy Father, and God of all mankind, hear us pray.

Accept our grateful thanks for every blessing of Thine which has brought us to this good hour.

Bless us now with wisdom, good judgment, and sound counsel that we may do that which is pleasing in Thy sight. Help us to be intelligent, resourceful, and alert that we may face and solve the problems of the day in such a way as to spread justice and freedom throughout the land.

When we are ignorant, give us knowledge. When we are asleep, awaken us. When we walk in darkness, lead us in the path of the just which is as the shining light which shineth more and more unto the perfect day.

We thank Thee for Thy servant with whom we walked and worked for a little while upon this earth. Thou hast received him into Thy nearer presence. Give unto his family and loved ones the consolation of Thy grace.

For in the Master's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF CALL OF PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar in order for today may be transferred to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of making an announcement. I advise the House that, pursuant to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi, just granted, three bills from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be called up tomorrow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, would the distinguished majority leader indicate what those bills are?

Mr. ALBERT. They are House Joint Resolution 343, the Wind River irrigation project, Wyoming; H.R. 10674, disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgment for Otoe and Missouria Indians; and H.R. 1784, Cape Lookout National Seashore.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Could the distinguished majority leader indicate whether those three bills have rules?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. The request just made by the gentleman from Mississippi, to have until midnight tonight to file certain rules, related to those bills.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS IN THE APPENDIX OF THE RECORD

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, without establishing a precedent, that all Members desiring to do so today may extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include pertinent extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDERS FROM TODAY UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special orders in order for today be transferred to tomorrow and that they be called before those special orders previously scheduled for February 16.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 382)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting the Fifth Annual Report of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

This report describes a year of intense negotiation and research. It reveals an increased seriousness on the part of many nations toward the problems of arms control and disarmament.

In 1965, under the increasing pressure of the nuclear threat, arms control and disarmament was taken up at the first meeting of the United Nations Disarmament Commission in 5 years; at the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva; in the fall session of the 20th General Assembly; and in private diplomatic exchanges.

In all of these activities the U.S. position benefited from the thorough research and careful preparations of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, carried out under the authority granted it by the Congress.

This research and preparation has been carried out on a wide variety of problems—from weapons inspection to the economic consequences of reductions or shifts in military spending. In all this work our guiding principle has been the long-range security of the United States, which inevitably involves the long-range peace and stability of the world.

HALTING THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

During 1965 the concern of the world turned increasingly to the vital question of preventing nuclear weapons from becoming standard equipment in the world's arsenals. We are approaching a critical period in efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. Many countries now have the resources, the technical ability, and the scientific manpower needed to build nuclear weapons systems. We hear voices saying that these countries can afford such costly weapons, even though they would have to be bought at the expense of the basic needs of their people.

I have committed my administration to the task of persuading the nonnuclear countries that it is neither in the interests of their security, nor of world peace, to develop nuclear weapons. This has been the main thrust behind the efforts of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency during the past year, and it will continue to be in the year we are now entering.

On January 27, 1966, I presented to the 18-Nation Committee on Disarmament at Geneva a 7-point program designed to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, to halt the nuclear arms race, and to reduce nuclear stocks. I have instructed our negotiators to walk the extra mile necessary to insure that the weapons of war submit to man's need for peace.

In giving these instructions, and in transmitting this report, I reaffirm my belief that it is possible through reason and through patient effort to translate the world's common interest in survival into concrete acts of restraint and accommodation between the nations.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 15, 1966.*

THE LATE HONORABLE ALBERT THOMAS, REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce the death of our beloved colleague, the gentleman from Texas, ALBERT THOMAS. Time for eulogies by Members of the House will soon be arranged and announcement made.

Memorial services for Congressman THOMAS will be held tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock a.m. at the National Cathedral here in Washington, at the Bethlehem Chapel.

Funeral services will be held at 2 o'clock p.m. this Friday at the First Methodist Church, Houston, Tex.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 730

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That a committee of fifty Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 16, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2045. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report setting forth the financial condition of working capital funds, and the results of their operation, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2208; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2046. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report on the progress and accomplishments of the anthracite mine water control and mine sealing and filling program, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87–818; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2047. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report on the lead and zinc mining stabilization program, for the year ending December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87–347; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 8188. A bill relating to the deduction for income tax purposes of contributions to certain organizations for judicial reform; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 12752. A bill to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 731. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 1784, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1286). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 732. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 10674, a bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1287). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 733. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.J. Res. 343, a joint resolution to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1288). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 734. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 1666, an act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1289). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 12812. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 12813. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to reduce the premiums charged for the insurance of certain cooperative housing mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12814. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to permit the more effective operation of the cooperative management housing insurance fund; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 12815. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 12816. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12817. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the Federal income tax for State and local income taxes paid by an individual during the taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 12818. A bill designed to prevent crimes of intimidation, violence, and murder against Negroes and civil rights workers lawfully seeking to enforce the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Iowa:

H.R. 12819. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 12820. A bill to establish a self-supporting reinsurance program to protect employees in the enjoyment of certain rights under private pension plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 12821. A bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 12822. A bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 12823. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to remove the existing percentage limit on the amount of assistance which may be provided thereunder for projects in any one State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 12824. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.J. Res. 835. Joint resolution declaring May 29 in each year as Kennedy's Birthday which shall be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 12825. A bill for the relief of Sophia Padilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARNUM:

H.R. 12826. A bill for the relief of Kim Kap Yung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 12827. A bill to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of Brown University; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 12828. A bill for the relief of Isabel P. Magno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 12829. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jasmine T. Boyd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 12830. A bill for the relief of Evangelos Perrakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

National Eye Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, today it is my privilege to introduce a companion bill to one introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman Fred B. Rooney, to establish a National Eye Institute as part of the National Institutes of Health.

It is time for us to wake up to the tragic waste in human resources that takes its toll each year in eye diseases.

With over 11 million people in the United States either partially or totally blind, we need to face this problem with more than a hope of better days.

In Iowa we have one of the finest programs for rehabilitation of the blind in the entire country. Under the exceptional direction of Mr. Kenneth Jernigan, this program has been able to revitalize lives that were doomed to despair and discouragement. Along with this rehabilitation work, the fine Lions Club eye bank project has restored sight to a number of fortunate individuals.

It does not in any way detract from the excellent work of these organizations to say that we are failing in our efforts. We fail, because so little is known, and the problems are multiplying faster than we can provide answers. In 1963, the cost of caring for those already blind amounted to more than $1 billion. At the same time, public and private sources spent only $9 million on research. It is easy to see that much work is needed in this area.

With more than 80 percent of all loss of vision in our Nation due to diseases whose causes are unknown to science, we have an urgent responsibility to press forward in this area.

The emotional, psychological, and physical disturbances that arise from blindness are well known. We now have to bring the power of our scientific age to bear upon this major health problem.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure, so that the fear that stalks our land in the form of blindness may be put aside.

Albert Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, once again we pause to note the passing of a beloved colleague. Too often the stalwarts of the Congress, who have written so much of the history of their times, are suddenly gone from the scene. In awe of God's inscrutable ways we meet today to register our sincere thoughts of Albert Thomas, what he meant, and how we will miss him.

To know Albert was to love and respect him. During the years he so ably served the Eighth Congressional District of Texas, I learned to appreciate what a fine, outstanding job he did in carrying out his responsibilities to his people. Loved and respected for his fairness, sound judgment, deep courage and devotion to America, his rare capacity for leadership will be sorely missed in the years to come.

He was quiet and soft spoken, and as he went about his daily tasks, he had a kind greeting for everyone.

In thinking of Albert, I am reminded of the words penned by the late Sir William Osler, the noted Canadian physician:

> I have three personal ideals. One, to do the day's work well and not to bother about tomorrow. The second ideal has been to act the Golden Rule, as far as in me lay, toward my professional brethren and toward those committed to my care. And the third has been to cultivate such a measure of equanimity as would enable me to bear success with humility, the affection of my friends without pride, and to be ready when the day of sorrow and grief came to meet it with the courage befitting a man.

Albert Thomas fully measured up to such ideals. We shall miss him, but he has left forever with us countless memories of a wonderful person.

Albert Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, the death of Albert Thomas, Representative from Houston, is a particularly great loss to the Texas delegation, of which he was a senior member. An alumnus of two fine Texas institutes of higher learning—Rice University and the University of Texas, he was also a veteran of World War I and a distinguished attorney at law. He came to Washington some 30 years ago to distinguish himself further, this time as a U.S. Congressman. As the years passed, he became an important member of the House Committee on Appropriations, heading several key subcommittees, and serving on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

But it is not just for his great public service that I shall remember Albert Thomas. I shall first and foremost forever cherish my remembrance of him as a fine human being and as my friend. When I first came to Congress in 1963, Mr. Thomas was a great help to me in learning the fine details of the legislative process. Always considerate and gracious, he was what I think a true gentleman must be. A Democrat who contributed greatly to his party, he was liked and admired by Democrats and Republicans alike. He was my friend, and I shall truly miss him. But even more important to note here today is that the loss of this fine Member of Congress will be felt by the Nation for many years to come. The place of such a fine gentleman as Albert Thomas is not easily filled in the world today.

Income Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide for a Federal income tax credit for payments for State and local income taxes.

This legislation will help produce the answer to New York State's fiscal problems. Under the legislation I propose, New York State will be able to raise its taxes, and the Federal Government—and not the taxpayers of New York State—will pick up the tab. My bill would also provide a credit for any city income tax.

Under my legislation, New York State and New York City will be able to get the extra revenues they will need in years to come, although I believe that New York's needs will also be reduced by the great financial success of the lottery about to be established in New York.

Under the Fino tax credit bill, our States and cities will be able to institute or raise income taxes to get more money without this money coming out of the pockets of the people. The Federal Government will be surrendering some of its revenues back to the States so that the States will be able to conduct programs without running to Washington for money. The dollars that are spent in the States will go further than the dollars spent by the Federal Government, hopefully, because they will not have to pay for a round trip to Washington, and resultant shrinkage.

This is a measure in support of waning federalism. Today, when the Federal Government is seeking to saddle our cities and States with Federal coordinators or commissars to supervise Federal programs, I think it is important to provide the financial wherewithal for the return of these programs to the States without Federal control.

Federal tax credits for payments of State income taxes would have several advantages. It would encourage all States to resort to State income taxes, aiming for much greater tax uniformity. It would also mean, as I have said, that the States and not the Federal Government would decide just what should be done with the revenues they raise. Nor would there be any danger that revenues would be cut off in a recession, which means that States could be in a position to maintain their expenditures.

This idea is not a panacea. I would worry that some States might institute excessive income taxes so as to get vast slush funds. They might be able to get away with this because the people of the State would not be hurt, just the Federal Government. Obviously, there has to be some kind of limit on the credit that can be given.

As a start, I propose that the Federal income tax credit for State income tax be limited to an amount which shall not exceed 20 percent of the Federal income tax paid. This will give real meaning to the idea of creative federalism.

Tribute to Albert Thomas: A Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the flag of our country flies at halfmast today and the hearts of our people are saddened because of the death of Albert Thomas—our colleague—one of the great men of our time.

Permit me to take this means of paying a brief but sincere tribute to his memory and to his life of selfless and dedicated service to our country.

We are indeed saddened by the realization that Albert Thomas is gone—never to return to the House—never to be with us again in the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations or in the Congress.

It is my firm conviction that there has never been a greater chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee than Albert Thomas.

He worked long.

He worked hard.

He was dedicated to the Congress—to his district—to his beloved State of Texas—and to this great Nation. America will bear the imprint of the creativity and imagination of Albert Thomas for generations to come as the work he did here continues to unfold in growth and progress. Our children and our children's children will live in a better America because of the foresight and wisdom of Albert Thomas.

His grasp of complex and difficult problems was remarkable and his judgment was sound. He will long be remembered for his vision and initiative in the fields of space and science and technology—and in other areas of growth and progress.

Albert Thomas was one of the first to visualize the importance of space exploration and the technological byproducts that such exploration has developed—and will continue to develop. He was a member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee and played a crucial role in the development of atomic energy.

He was a member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and took a consistent and strong position for a powerful defense posture for our country—for great national strength—for an America more powerful than any nation in history.

The unselfish dedication of Albert Thomas to the national interest will echo down the corridors of history as the United States meets the challenges at home and abroad which he anticipated.

It was my great honor to serve with Albert Thomas on the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations for some 14 years. I sat at his side and learned great lessons from this great man and this great teacher.

Albert Thomas saw this committee as an instrument of service and progress—an instrument that touched the lives of almost every American through the independent agencies our committee funded. Albert Thomas realized this and it gave him vision and dedication—and a will to create a greater America.

But—in addition to his great record of public service and his devotion to the national interest—Albert Thomas was a warm human being. He had a great capacity for friendship—I was his close friend. Working with him, I came to know him well. He was not only a great man but a good man—a man of concern and compassion.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we are saddened by his passing. We are shocked and shaken by the departure of this wonderful man, good friend, and statesman.

Although Albert Thomas would have wanted the Independent Offices Subcommittee to continue its work, in deference to his memory, hearings were suspended this morning.

This Congress and the Nation mourn the passing of this great man from Texas. I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Thomas, to his two lovely daughters, and to the other members of his family in their bereavement.

Hon. Albert Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heart full of sorrow that I eulogize my good friend Albert Thomas, who this day was called by his Maker after many years of personal suffering. He was one of the most unforgettable characters I have ever met, but I know I am the richer for it. He never complained to anyone and always had a happy and hearty "Hi there" for everyone, together with a wave of his hand.

His service in the House of Representatives spans three decades in which much important legislation was written, and in which much history was made. It is marked with the same characteristic of no thoughts for himself, but always for his fellow man, and his welfare. The people he represented saluted this characteristic by returning him 15 times to this great body.

Albert Thomas' position on the Appropriations Committee brought him into daily contact with officials of the various independent offices of our Government. His knowledge of fiscal affairs and budgetary procedures was uncanny. He was a shrewd inquisitor of witnesses who appeared before his committee and yet was respected by all.

I join his family in mourning the loss of this great statesman who served his country well.

Statement on National Committee for a Nonsubsidized Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, critical decisions are about to be made regarding the future financing of the St. Lawrence Seaway. The Seaway Corporation and its Canadian counterparts are obligated to submit to the Secretary of Commerce, by July 1, 1966, recommendations on the toll structure.

Originally, these recommendations were to have been submitted and acted on by July 1, 1964, but a 2-year extension was given to further observe performance of the new waterway system.

The past 2 years have, we believe, strengthened the position consistently taken by this committee that adjustments in the tolls should now be made aimed at reaching the self-supporting level decreed by law.

When approved by the Congress of the United States, the seaway project was conceived as a taxpayer-supported investment which would repay its heavy debt through revenues collected from tolls. The original toll tariff was, in the opinion of many observers, much too low to accomplish this purpose. The failure of the seaway to live up to original traffic projections further diminished the probability of establishing a self-supporting basis.

Advocates of the seaway have claimed that the toll structure was too high and was one of the factors limiting the use of the ports along the waterway system. As recently as last year, seaway interests suggested that moves be made to either, first, reduce tolls on the seaway; second, hold them at their present low levels; or third, eliminate them entirely. While any of these courses would seem inconceivable in view of the vast money commitments of both governments and the performance of the seaway to date, pressures are mounting from seaway interests to attempt to attract additional business through lowering or elimination of tolls.

This thinking was evident in some testimony which was submitted to a special subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee during 1965 by seaway advocates. There was a strong feeling that the Federal Government should support, through direct or indirect subsidies, seaway operations, particularly promotion of seaway ports and solicitation of cargo for these ports. Despite the fact that North Atlantic ports and others protested strongly before hearings of this same special Senate Commerce subcommittee, none of these protests found their way into the report of the committee which was released in September 1965.

The report itself was so slanted in favor of the seaway that the North Atlantic Ports Association and many of its individual members filed strong exceptions with Senate and Department of Commerce officials.

The essential problem in dealing with the St. Lawrence Seaway has been the insistence on the part of its advocates and some officials and agencies of the U.S. Government that the taxpayers, having made a huge financial commitment to the seaway, should be forced to further subsidize this quasi-government operation in order to increase its usage. This is a flagrant violation of the spirit and the letter of the law upon which seaway development was founded. It also has a very severe impact on competing ports on North, South Atlantic and gulf coast ranges, which ports have historically and are now presently supporting their own port development and promotion activities.

Because the seaway was nationally financed, it is a matter of national concern. This is one of the reasons why the National Committee for a Nonsubsidized Seaway was formed. This committee now feels that the whole matter of seaway tolls should be given a very thorough and public airing.

It is prepared to join others in presenting reasons why the tolls should be raised to assure sufficient revenue to pay out the capital investment in the seaway. This would not only assure a fair and equitable program as far as the taxpayers and the North Atlantic ports are concerned, but would follow the course set out by law and legislation of the U.S. Congress.

Evidence mounts that seaway interests are dedicated to spending more of the taxpayers' money while not willing to pay the costs of additional investments. Indeed, the Senate subcommittee found that the seaway proponents would ask that the Corps of Engineers deepen and clear Great Lakes channels and harbors to 27-foot depths and that they would like a concerted effort, including Government participation, to interest American-flag vessels in utilizing the seaway to a greater extent than at present. There are also requests that lock facilities be improved and expanded, because, according to those who testified on behalf of the seaway before the Senate subcommittee, this waterway system may be overtaxed within the next 10 years.

Of great significance is the fact that seaway proponents have suggested several alternate refinancing methods. Inevitably, these methods recommend the extension of amortization periods or the lessening or elimination of financial commitments on behalf of the seaway itself.

Obviously, if the seaway is to be as successful as these proponents say it will be, then there should be no need for lowering tolls nor even maintaining them at the present level. Instead, they should be raised to more fully repay the American taxpayer for his investment in this waterway system. However, more specific evidence of why seaway tolls should be brought into a more realistic level will be submitted by this committee at such time as it is called before proper bodies to present its opinion on the seaway toll structure.

At this time, the committee wishes to state that it feels the upcoming review of seaway revenues and tariffs to be of vital importance to the whole Nation, and that it should be conducted in public; and that every segment of transportation, shipping, port, and civic interests be given the opportunity to appear before the appropriate bodies.

The actions of the Federal Government in attempting to divert cargo, through promotion and other means, to the seaway away from ports which are more self-reliant and which have historically done their own port promotion and developing, is shocking. The committee feels that more should be said on this subject, and that definite guidelines should be established to make certain that the Government does not unfairly use its resources to promote seaway ports to the disadvantage of other ports in the United States with whom the seaway competes.

At this time, the committee prefers to call attention to the requirement that the toll program of the seaway be reviewed and recommendations made by July 1, 1966, and to ask that this review be made part of a public dialog considering the tremendous investment the taxpayers of this country have made in the St. Lawrence Seaway, and the potential impact of further tax subsidy upon the non-federally-supported ports in the North, South Atlantic, and gulf.

Foreign Commercial Fishing Is Damaging Our Sports Fishing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, most of our citizens are unaware that the excellent sports fishing long available in the coastal waters bounding the North American Continent is being subjected to severe injury. This injury results chiefly from the entry of foreign fishing vessels into waters close to our coasts and the use by these vessels of commercial fishing techniques which take many tons of sports fish from the seas immediately off our shores. The consequence is that a major source of recreation for many thousands of persons is being damaged severely and the livelihood of the many persons who provide equipment and services to sports fishermen is affected adversely. The problem, as well as the difficulty of finding a good solution, is explained clearly in an article by Martin Kane in the January 31, 1966, issue of Sports Illustrated. This article was inserted in the daily RECORD for February 14, 1966, at page A713, by the distinguished Congressman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and the public.

Mr. Speaker, I would support efforts which can legally be taken by appropriate authorities of our National Government to provide relief from this depredation. Such efforts should extend to negotiation of new international agreements if necessary.

The Ford Foundation's Mexican-American Study Project at the University of California, Los Angeles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, a great deal is heard these days about poverty, disadvantaged groups, and ethnic and racial minorities.

The impact of rapid technological change, the crowded urban areas, and the tense conditions of poverty have all contributed to a growing national concern for the less privileged who live in our country.

We, here in Congress, have voted enormous amounts of money to cope with these problems through the Economic Opportunity Act, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, to name only two of the most recent pieces of legislation.

On the administration side, the President has tried to carry out the intent of Congress to improve the lives of the long-forgotten inhabitants of our American pockets of poverty.

The task has been difficult in the extreme. Men like Sargent Shriver have sought data that would help them to implement our congressional intent. Studies have been made by the Office of Economic Opportunity and other agencies across the length and breadth of this Nation to discover the poor and to assess properly the conditions of their lives. In many areas the task of helping the poor has often been made more difficult by the lack of meaningful information. Many areas of poverty, we now realize, are little known to the larger society.

According to the 1960 census, in the Southwest, the Mexican-American people number 3½ million, and nearly 1½ million of them live in California where my district is located. These numbers are substantially larger at the present time.

For many years Mexicans in the United States have been somewhat of a mystery in the history books. Today they represent a virtually unknown factor to national decisionmakers and social scientists.

I have noted that in Washington, New York, and other places far removed from the Southwest, the term "Mexican" often evokes the image of a Mexican contract laborer. The Mexican population of the Southwest, long an integral part of America, is little known on the east coast and not much better understood in the Southwest itself.

Books in the public libraries and the texts used in classrooms tell the casual reader that Mexicans are a rural, romantic people, when they are, in fact, about as highly urbanized as the rest of our population. For years Mexican-American scholars have tried to change the image of the Mexican-American; to prove to the larger society that the Mexican-American people, like many immigrant groups, are part of the American social drama and that they, the Mexican-Americans, are also here to stay.

Unfortunately, these sporadic and usually local research efforts were not sufficient, and they did little to alleviate the grievances of the Mexican community. Systematic, reliable, and comprehensive information was rarely found. Consequently, the Mexican-American people remained an enigma on the American scene.

Not long ago, the Ford Foundation turned its attention to the plight of the Mexican-American. The Ford Foundation recognized that, unlike the Negro people and other minorities, Mexican-Americans could not point to a comprehensive analysis of their problems comparable to Gunnar Myrdal's "An American Dilemma."

At about the same time, an academic group at the University of California, Los Angeles, began to explore the Mexican-American population and its problems. This group was led by Dr. Leo Grebler, a well-known economist and professor at the UCLA Graduate School of Business Administration.

Professor Grebler himself is an immigrant and a refugee from the savagery of of Nazi Germany. His work with census data and his extensive research in urban economics made him curious about gaps in the data, and about the appalling differences between widely held stereotyped views of Mexican-Americans and the real facts. Who were these Mexicans? Why were they so terribly deprived in a society of plenty?

Why was so little known about this minority and why was so much that is purported to be known so wrong?

Dr. Grebler felt that only a comprehensive, full-scale study could provide the answers and so, together with his associates he submitted a research proposal to the Ford Foundation, which the foundation approved and funded.

Because of this man's scholarly concern and because of the empathy that he felt for a people whom he suspected to be considerably underprivileged, the Mexican-American study project was established at the University of California in Los Angeles. It is the most elaborate study of the social and economic conditions of the Mexican-American people ever undertaken.

Dr. Grebler gathered a staff about him. Among the staff members is Prof. Joan Moore, a sociologist trained at the University of Chicago and now teaching at the University of California, Riverside; a young woman of great promise who has a special interest in minority problems and is the associate director of the project.

Another staff person is Frank G. Mittelbach, also a refugee from Nazi Germany who, as a child, was smuggled into England to escape the persecution of Adolf Hitler. Mittelbach, a highly competent statistician, is assigned the task of gathering and analyzing hard data on the Mexican-American people.

To round out his central staff, Professor Grebler looked for a Mexican-American scholar who would be the only full-time staff person and who would perform both scholarly and administrative work. For this task he chose Ralph Guzman, a doctoral candidate in political science at UCLA and a man long active in Mexican-American community affairs, who, at the time of his selection, was serving as the Peace Corps Director for northern Peru.

Many other scholars representing different academic fields are working on the project. For example, Prof. Julian Samora, chairman of the department of sociology at Notre Dame University, is doing a special study of the Mexican-American population living in East Chicago, Ind. Prof. Nancie Gonzales, a cultural anthropologist at the University of New Mexico, is in charge of a study of the Spanish-American people in that State. In Texas, Prof. Arthur Rubel, an anthropologist, and Dr. Richard Brymer are looking into the problems facing the Mexican-American people in San Antonio. Many young Mexican-American students have been brought in to do the research.

Recently, the Mexican-American study project released two advance reports. One, on the relationship between education and income, has provided important insight into the social mobility of young Mexican-Americans who work hard to achieve and are later inhibited by society. The other report concerns immigration. It provides, for the first time, a comprehensive record and analysis of Mexican immigration to the United States.

Other advance reports are scheduled for release within the next few months. And a textbook to be published shortly on "California Politics and Policies" contains a chapter dealing with the Mexican-American community by Ralph Guzman, the assistant director of the project.

Beyond its many research contributions, the staff of the Mexican-American study project has been engaged in numerous lectures, training programs, conferences, and consultations. The research work is closely associated with community advisory committees in

Los Angeles and San Antonio, where intensive local studies are in process. These committees include outstanding persons drawn from the Mexican-American communities. I am proud to serve on the Los Angeles committee.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the Mexican-American study project performs an extremely significant role, and I believe that it promises to provide an unprecedented factual basis for better public policies and for improved understanding between this minority group and American society at large.

I am convinced that this tireless effort to discover truth will help people like you and me to understand reality more thoroughly and to serve more effectively the best interests of our constituencies. The Mexican-American study project at UCLA deserves recognition and the support of us all.

Tribute to the Honorable Albert Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the loss of ALBERT THOMAS, as a Representative of the State of Texas and as a symbol of great statesmen is an irreplaceable one.

My admiration for him began during my first days as a Member of Congress from the State of New York. All of the outstanding attributes for which the image seekers of today search, veritably shone in the great mind, the wit and above all, the character of Congressman THOMAS. I hasten to join in tribute today with my colleagues. He was a gentleman and a scholar.

His magnificent verbal sparring on the floor of the House of Representatives, either in the presentation of a supplemental budget or in his flawless elucidation of an argument, was eagerly anticipated by each and every Member of Congress.

I am grateful to have served with Congressman THOMAS in his capacity as chairman of the Democratic caucus and I am proud to have called him my colleague.

I wish to express my deep sympathy to the Thomas family and pray for God's blessings upon them to endure their sorrow.

The Serbian Fight for Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we join the Serbians throughout the world in commemorating the revolt for independence from the Turks which was led by the famed Karageorge. Unfortunately, the Serbian people are now captives of communism, and this great holiday is forbidden in their homeland by their present dictator, Tito.

On this historic day we must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to the brave people of Serbia and all the other captives of communism.

The great Serbian leader Karageorge offered his life and fortune to rid Serbia of the oppressive rule of the Turks and the Serbians were victorious in their fight for independence and freedom. Serbia achieved international recognition when the Treaty of Bucharest was signed in 1812 and secured a limited autonomy.

Mr. Speaker, we must not only observe historic events such as the Serbian fight for independence in words, but in deeds as well. I urge, therefore, that a Special House Committee on Captive Nations be established to study the present conditions of oppression under which the Serbians and other captive peoples are suffering.

Furthermore, the Voice of America should provide more effective and lengthier broadcasts to pierce the wall of Communist propaganda and deliver the truth to the brave people of Serbia. In recent years, Mr. Speaker, the Voice of America has been reducing both its hours of broadcast in the Serbian language and in the nature of these broadcasts. The Voice of America gives only straight news and under present administration policy is fearful of offending the Soviet Union. However, the brave Serbian people deserve the truth, and the Voice of America should give it to them in order that their resistance to communism be strengthened.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. Francis Valiukevicius, pastor, St. George's Church, Rochester, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, what can a poor parish priest say to this great body, on this, the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's independence in modern times? Well, first, Almighty God, please bless every day our President and Vice President in their arduous tasks, bless this group along with our Representatives in their decisionmaking, bless our judges, please bless all our fellow Americans, bless all the Lithuanians throughout the free world, and especially, those behind the Iron Curtain; but most of all, shower Your blessings on the Lithuanian exiles in Siberia.

On Lithuania's most important day, February 16, we Lithuanian Americans come to You, the only wise God, for help in our troubles. As citizens of Lithuanian heritage, what must we do to help our enslaved people, our people of sorrow? Many of you here in our Senate have known loss and hurt, perhaps the death of someone very close, upholding and defending freedom. We Lithuanian Americans also know pain—personal and national—in behalf of freedom. But now we need your help.

The very sound of that name—Lithuania—conveys a cause to us. And those who have borne pain will hear and understand that cause most fervently. Grant understanding, dear Lord, to those who have never shared our personal sense of loss: who do not know what it means to have thousands of our Lithuanian people buried in Siberia.

Almighty Father, what can I say that others may understand that fierce desire that burns inside us to have our beloved Lithuania regain her independence and freedom once again?

Dear God, with Your help, we will continue our sacred struggle to restore Lithuania's freedom. Su Diev.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 14, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON 1964 AMENDMENTS TO THE ALASKA OMNIBUS ACT

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on 1964 amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Authority for Commodity Credit Corporation To Establish and Maintain Reserves of Agricultural Commodities

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish and maintain reserves of agricultural commodities to protect consumers, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Food for Freedom Act of 1966

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report of Farm Credit Administration

A letter from the Acting Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Reapportionment of an Appropriation

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Employment Security," for the fiscal year 1966, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Extension of Certain Naval Vessel Loans

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Working Capital Funds of Department of Defense

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on working capital funds of that Department, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Audit of Exchange Stabilization Fund

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on audit of the exchange stabilization fund, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Authorization of Appropriations for Certain Equipment for the Coast Guard

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Civil Aeronautics Board

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Final Valuations of Certain Properties

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on final valuations of certain properties (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Publications of Federal Power Commission

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, copies of publications entitled "Glossary of Important Power and Rate Terms, Abbreviations and Units of Measurement, 1965"; "Statistics for Interstate Natural Gas Pipeline Companies, 1964"; "Sales by Producers of Natural Gas to Interstate Pipeline Companies, 1964"; and "All-Electric Homes, Annual Bills, 1965" (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Operations of Government of the District of Columbia

A letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the operations of the government of the District of Columbia, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Extension of Provisions of Law Relating to the Free Importation of Certain Personal and Household Effects

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for a temporary period the existing provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

Report of Administrator of Veterans' Affairs

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his report, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Operations Under the Battle Act

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on operations under the Battle Act, for the year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on Disposal of Certain Foreign Excess Property

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the disposal of certain foreign excess property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Coal Research Activities

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on coal research activities, for the calendar year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Anthracite Mine Water Control and Mine Sealing and Filling Program

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress and accomplishments of the anthracite mine water control and mine sealing and filling program, for the year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Lead and Zinc Mining Stabilization Program

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the lead and zinc mining stabilization program, for the calendar year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Certification of Adequate Soil Survey and Land Classification of Lands in Bostwick Park Project, Colorado

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Bostwick Park project, Colorado, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Reports on Negotiated Contracts for Disposal of Materials

A letter from the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on negotiated contracts for disposal of materials, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report of Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission

A letter from the chairman, Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the final report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Reports on Final Settlement of Claims of Certain Indians

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of Absentee Delaware Tribe, Oklahoma, docket No. 337 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin, docket No. 159 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Yakima Tribe, for and on behalf of the Wishram Band of Yakima Indians, docket No. 165 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Osage Nation of Indians, docket No. 127 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, White Earth Band, Leech Lake Bank, Mille Lac Band, Ed Wilson, James Davis, John Carbow, William Morell, Harold Emerson, Joseph Morrison, Ole Sam, Monroe Skinaway, Eugene Reynolds, Frank La Roes, Joseph Monroe, Archie Libby, and John Squirrel, docket Nos. 18–B and 18–N (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, docket Nos. 264, 264–A and 264–B (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Sac and Fox Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, the Sac and Fox Tribe of Missouri, the Sac and Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa, et al., docket No. 232 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Iowa Tribe of the Iowa Reservation in Kansas and Nebraska, the Iowa Tribe of the Iowa Reservation in Oklahoma, et al, Omaha Tribe of Nebraska, et al., the Sac and Fox Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, the Sac and Fox Tribe of Missouri, the Sac and Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa, et al., docket No. 138 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Audit Report of Federal Bar Association

A letter from the Secretary, the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that association, for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Survey of School Desegregation in the Southern and Border States

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on survey of school desegregation in the southern and border States 1965–66 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Positions in Grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., tranmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18, relating to the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, for the calendar year 1965 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Report on Air Pollution by Federal Activities

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on air pollution by Federal activities, dated January 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Woks.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. Monroney and Mr. Carlson members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"S.J. Res. 725

"Joint resolution in support of the U.S. policy in Vietnam

"We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and Senate of the State of Maine in special session of the 102d legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

" 'Whereas the United States of America stands committed to a policy of resisting the forces of Communist aggression which imperil the freedom and liberty of the people and nations of the free world; and

" 'Whereas it is of vital importance that the forces of totalitarianism recognize that the United States of America, as a nation, will utilize every means at its disposal to honor such commitments; and

" 'Whereas the present use of American military forces in Vietnam manifests the determination of the United States of America to implement this policy whenever and wherever the freedom of the nations of the free world are threatened; and

" 'Whereas our military forces, in this great struggle, are proving a decisive factor in implementing American policy, not only in the defense of Vietnam against Communist aggression, but as a developing arsenal of strength which will provide the means of securing a final peace: Now, therefore, be it

" '*Resolved*, That we, your memorialists, urge that the Congress of the United States of America, in recognition of the sacrifices and heroism of our fighting men in Vietnam, extend the profound thanks of the Congress and the people of the United States to the military forces of this country in Vietnam for their valiant efforts; and be it further

" '*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution, duly authenticated by the secretary of state, be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress and to the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives from this State.'

"In senate chamber, February 1, 1966.

"Edwin H. Pert,
"Secretary.

"House of representatives, February 1, 1966.

"Jerome G. Plante,
"Clerk."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"S.J. Res. 711

"Resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to presidential succession and inability

"Whereas the 89th Congress of the United States of America, at the 1st session begun and held at the city of Washington, on Wednesday, the 6th day of January 1965, by a constitutional two-thirds vote in both Houses adopted a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to wit:

" 'JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY AND VICE-PRESIDENCY AND TO CASES WHERE THE PRESIDENT IS UNABLE TO DISCHARGE THE POWERS AND DUTIES OF HIS OFFICE

" '*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" ' "ARTICLE —

" ' "Section 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

" ' "Sec. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

" ' "Sec. 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

" ' "Sec. 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

" ' "Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within 4 days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within 48 hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within 21 days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within 21 days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office" ': Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of Maine hereby ratifies and adopts this proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Maine notify the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the

Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Administrator of General Services of the United States, and each Senator and Representative from Maine in the Congress of the United States of this action of the legislature by forwarding to each of them a certified copy of this resolution.

"In senate chamber, January 21, 1966.

"EDWIN H. PERT, *Secretary.*

"House of representatives, January 24, 1966.

"JEROME G. PLANTE, *Clerk.*

"KENNETH M. CURTIS,
"Secretary of State."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9

"A concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States to direct the Bureau of Public Roads of the U.S. Department of Commerce to adjust certain administrative policies immediately so that the planning and construction of Interstate 90 Highway in South Dakota, may be completed with a minimum of permanent economic hardship to the land area and the adjacent land area severed.

"Whereas administrative policies of the Bureau of Public Roads have not considered the economic impact of Interstate 90 on the agricultural businesses and livestock operations in the semiarid country of South Dakota; and

"Whereas under present administrative policy of the Bureau of Public Roads a sufficient number of practical sized land service facilities cannot be included in the design of Interstate 90; and

"Whereas cattle and equipment passes should be justified on the basis of need rather than the Bureau of Public Roads present policy that these access facilities must be justified on the basis of the monetary value of severance damages minus the cost of the structure; and

"Whereas there is a need for the Bureau of Public Roads to establish administrative flexibility in recent national policies for land service access facilities for cattle and agricultural pursuits which will not force South Dakota operators to sell their units and not make agricultural units unworkable and impossible to manage; and

"Whereas proposed changes have been submitted to the Bureau of Public Roads for approval by the South Dakota Department of Highways which represent a sincere attempt to minimize the detrimental impact the interstate has on certain land holdings which have incorporated sound engineering practices and resulted in a reduction in cost of Federal expenditures and these proposals have been rejected; and

"Whereas Interstate 90 construction from Cactus Flat to Chamberlain must be accomplished recognizing it is in the public interest to construct an adequate number of cattle and equipment underpasses even though the reduction in right-of-way damages of an individual severed is insufficient to offset the cost. Policy must consider multiple owner use and the area economy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 41st Legislature, of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States, be and is, memorialized to direct the Bureau of Public Roads of the U.S. Department of Commerce to make administrative policy changes in regard to access structures included in Interstate 90 which will allow these facilities at reasonable intervals based on need considering the land use of the area and the economy of the area; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States, the members of the congressional delegation from South Dakota, the Administrator of the Bureau of Public Roads of the U.S. Department of Commerce, and to the South Dakota Department of Highways, Pierre, S. Dak.

"Adopted by the house of representatives January 28, 1966.

"Concurred in by the senate February 2, 1966.

"LEM OVERPECK,
"Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.

"CHARLES DROZ,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Attest:

"PAUL INMAN,
"Chief Clerk."

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; ordered to lie on the table:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO REPEAL SECTION 14(b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

"Whereas section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act permits States to prohibit labor agreements that make union membership a condition of employment; and

"Whereas 19 States have such laws, which organized labor and President Johnson have stated are detrimental and cause irreparable harm to the cause of unionism in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted, February 7, 1966.

"THOMAS A. CHADWICK, *Clerk.*

"A true copy.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution adopted by the Council of the city of San Jose, Calif., favoring the restoration of the funds deducted from the special school milk program by the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the Pioneer Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., of Piqua, Ohio, relating to the availability of funds approved by the Congress for the Federal Bank for Cooperatives; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the National Association of Travel Organizations, Washington, D.C., favoring the establishment of a National Visitors Center in the city of Washington; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted at the convention of the Macomb County, Mich., AFL-CIO Council, relating to a Macomb County community college; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by Local Union 150 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, favoring the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; ordered to lie on the table.

The memorial of Bertha Allen, of Hebo, Oreg., remonstrating against the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARTKE in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

This is the first annual report required of the National Capital Transportation Agency by section 6 of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-173).

Nineteen hundred and sixty-five was marked by significant advances toward solving the transportation problems of the Washington area.

Congress approved plans for a rapid transit system, authorized its construction, and authorized grants from the Federal and District Governments as a first stage in financing its development. As soon as funds were made available, the Transportation Agency began the necessary work still remaining before actual construction can begin.

There is, nonetheless, much left to do. The rapid transit system will achieve maximum usefulness only when it is extended into Maryland and Virginia suburbs. The interstate compact among Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia will be promptly presented to Congress for its consent, in order that the interstate authority may develop plans for a full regional system and a financial plan for its construction. Arrangements must be perfected to transfer the responsibility for the system in an orderly and proper way from the Agency to the interstate authority. These tasks are not easy, and it will require diligent effort on the part of many people and agencies to master the problems that remain.

The Congress can be assured, however, that all of these problems are being given the fullest and most diligent consideration, and that none of them will be allowed to stand in the way of an uninterrupted schedule of construction.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 14, 1966.*

REPORT OF U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 382)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting the Fifth Annual Report of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

This report describes a year of intense negotiation and research. It reveals an increased seriousness on the part of many nations toward the problems of arms control and disarmament.

In 1965, under the increasing pressure of the nuclear threat, arms control and disarmament was taken up at the first meeting of the United Nations Disarmament Commission in 5 years; at the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva; in the fall session of the 20th General Assembly; and in private diplomatic exchanges.

In all of these activities the U.S. position benefited from the thorough research and careful preparations of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, carried out under the authority granted it by the Congress.

This research and preparation has been carried out on a wide variety of problems—from weapons inspection to the economic consequences of reductions or shifts in military spending. In all this work our guiding principle has been the long-range security of the United States, which inevitably involves the long-range peace and stability of the world.

HALTING THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

During 1965 the concern of the world turned increasingly to the vital question of preventing nuclear weapons from becoming standard equipment in the world's arsenals. We are approaching a critical period in efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. Many countries now have the resources, the technical ability and the scientific manpower needed to build nuclear weapons systems. We hear voices saying that these countries can afford such costly weapons, even though they would have to be bought at the expense of the basic needs of their people.

I have committed my administration to the task of persuading the nonnuclear countries that it is neither in the interests of their security, nor of world peace, to develop nuclear weapons. This has been the main thrust behind the efforts of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency during the past year, and it will continue to be in the year we are now entering.

On January 27, 1966, I presented to the 18-Nation Committee on Disarmament at Geneva a 7-point program designed to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, to halt the nuclear arms race, and to reduce nuclear stocks. I have instructed our negotiators to walk the extra mile necessary to insure that the weapons of war submit to man's need for peace.

In giving these instructions, and in transmitting this report, I reaffirm my belief that it is possible through reason and through patient effort to translate the world's common interest in survival into concrete acts of restraint and accommodation between the nations.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 15, 1966*.

REPORT ON PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE WILDERNESS ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. 381)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

The period of expansion and exploration, the great era of successive western frontiers, has now become a part of our American past. To the pioneer of history the wilderness was a foe to be conquered, so that he might make farms and pastures out of the endless forests.

Today's pioneer has a new purpose—to preserve some remnants of that wilderness from the onrush of modern civilization.

The ax and the plow will not serve us in this struggle. Today's instruments are more subtle. They are progressive law and informed public opinion—demanding that we maintain our wilderness birthright.

The Wilderness Act is one in the long list of creative conservation measures that Congress has passed and I have signed into law.

Legislation is one thing; administration is another. The executive branch must fulfill its responsibility with commonsense and imagination. Our people must be given the opportunity to know, even for short periods of time, the wonders of God's creation expressed in earth's wilderness areas.

The maintenance of our existing wilderness system is a priority program of the Federal Government. We are constantly reviewing primitive and roadless areas to determine whether they should be recommended for preservation as part of our wilderness system.

The Congress has wisely provided for public participation as reviews of the primitive and roadless areas proceed. I am determined to assure that both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior will provide full opportunity for the expression of public views before final recommendations are prepared for transmittal to the Congress.

I am pleased to send to Congress today the second annual report of our progress in implementing the Wilderness Act. We are well underway toward protecting God's gift of mystery and wonder that is the American wilderness.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 14, 1966*.

REPORT OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 333)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the U.S. Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 14, 1966*.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 207. Resolution to authorize printing additional copies of hearings on S. 4, 89th Congress, for the Committee on Public Works (Rept. No. 993);

S. Res. 208. Resolution to authorize printing additional copies of hearings on S. 3, 89th Congress, for the Committee on Public Works (Rept. No. 994); and

S. Res. 219. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "Report on the Five-Year Record of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and Its Future Role" (Rept. No. 995).

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 5831. An act to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass and cement windows for Our Lady of the Angels Seminary of Glenmont, N.Y. (Rept. No. 1000);

H.R. 10625. An act relating to the tax treatment of certain amounts paid to certain members and former members of the uniformed services and to their survivors (Rept. No. 1004);

H.R. 11006. An act to extend the statutory burial allowance to certain veterans whose deaths occur as a result of a service-connected disability (Rept. No. 1001);

H.R. 11007. An act to provide statutory authority for the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to assume the duties of Administrator during the absence or disability of the Administrator, or during a vacancy in that office, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1002); and

H.R. 11747. An act to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care (Rept. No. 1003).

STATUS OF TAXES AND TAX LIENS IN BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS—MINORITY VIEWS—REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, with recommendations:

S. 976. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy (Rept. No. 996);

S. 1912. A bill to amend sections 1, 17a, 57j, 64a(5), 67(b), 67c, and 70c of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 997);

H.R. 136. An act to amend sections 1, 17a, 64a(5), 67(b), 67c, and 70c of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 999); and

H.R. 3438. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy (Rept. No. 998).

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for myself and the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] I file minority views on the recommendations proposed by the Senate Finance Committee.

Those bills were in the Judiciary Committee for quite some time, and then, by common understanding, they were referred to the Committee on Finance. That committee is prepared to report them, and they will be reported sometime before midnight.

I ask that the minority views be printed with the report of the Committee on Finance.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, the report will be so printed.

ADDITIONAL STAFF MEMBERS FOR COMMITTEE ON FINANCE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 224); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance is authorized, until otherwise provided by law, to employ six additional professional staff members and six clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

WILFRED C. ROBERTSON—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 222); which was placed on the calendar:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Wilfred C. Robertson, widower of Elizabeth Bond Robertson, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

FRED W. FRAY, SR.—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 223); which was placed on the calendar:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Fred W. Fray, Sr., widower of Iva L. Fray, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to seven months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2925. A bill for the relief of Chester E. Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 2926. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to eliminate, in certain cases, the requirement that an insured individual have first been admitted to a hospital in order to qualify under such title for the extended care services provided thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. BAYH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S. 2927. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to establish an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations", approved September 24, 1959; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUSKIE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

S. 2928. A bill to amend title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to authorize the Commissioner of Education to provide technical assistance and grants to school boards in support of programs designed to overcome any racial imbalance in the public schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 2929. A bill for the relief of Therese Elgrably; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 2930. A bill to amend the act of August 4, 1950 (64 Stat. 411), to provide salary increases for certain members of the police force of the Library of Congress; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for Mr. SPARKMAN):

S.J. Res. 137. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning April 17, 1966, as State and Municipal Bond Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

STUDY BY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE OF THE FISCAL AND MONETARY POSITION OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT

Mr. SMATHERS (for himself, Mr. HARTKE, and Mr. METCALF) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 221) to authorize the Committee on Finance to make a study of the fiscal and monetary position of the U.S. Government in view of our commitments in Vietnam, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. SMATHERS, which appears under a separate heading.)

WILFRED C. ROBERTSON

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 222) to pay a gratuity to Wilfred C. Robertson, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

FRED W. FRAY, SR.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 223) to pay a gratuity to Fred W. Fray, Sr., which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ADDITIONAL STAFF MEMBERS FOR COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 224) to provide six additional professional staff members and six additional clerical assistants for the Committee on Finance, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees".)

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE ALBERT THOMAS OF TEXAS

Mr. TOWER (for himself and Mr. YARBOROUGH) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 225) relative to the death of Representative ALBERT THOMAS of Texas, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. TOWER, which appears under a separate heading.)

EXTENDED MEDICAL CARE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would amend the Social Security Act to eliminate in certain cases the requirement that an insured individual must first have been admitted to a hospital in order to qualify for extended care services.

Last year when Congress adopted Public Law 88-97, it was provided that to be eligible for extended care services a person must first have been a patient in a hospital for not less than 3 consecutive days before being transferred to another facility. While in the majority of cases elderly persons who become ill may require hospitalization, there are many other instances in which the nature of the illness does not first require the specialized treatment such institutions provide.

I have been informed by reliable sources that from a medical standpoint there is little justification for requiring a prior 3-day stay in a hospital for many older patients who are in need of extended care. The result of this provision inevitably will be to increase unnecessarily the heavy burden on our specialized medical facilities which are already overcrowded in many instances and which are likely to become more so as soon as the new act becomes effective.

Probably one of the reasons for insisting that persons first be admitted to a hospital before being eligible for assignment to a nursing home was to make sure beyond any doubt that their physical condition necessitated and would benefit from extended care treatment. While this is entirely proper, it seems to me that the same objective can be attained without requiring a preliminary 3-day period of residence in a hospital. Consequently, my bill proposes that extended care should be made available to an eligible person who has received outpatient hospital diagnostic services if both his physician and the hospital from which he received such services certify within 7 days that he is in need of extended care and if he is admitted to an extended care facility within 14 days after that need was certified. It seems to me that this would provide adequate safeguard against any possible lessening of standards or collusive arrangements, because each eligible patient would be subjected to diagnostic tests by a hospital and would have to be certified in need of extended care services by both the hospital and the patient's physician.

Mr. President, although the hospital insurance feature of Public Law 89–97 becomes effective on July 1 of this year, the extended care benefits are not scheduled to begin until next January 1. There is still ample time to make this relatively minor amendment in the law which I believe would help relieve pressure for space in our hospitals but would not in any way reduce the standards or complicate the administration of the act. There is no reason why hospital beds, which are at a great premium, should be occupied by elderly persons whose indisposition is such that they can receive thoroughly adequate care and treatment in nursing home facilities. Because of the obvious benefits which could result from this change in the law, it would be advantageous to consider and adopt such an amendment before this part of the Medicare Act becomes effective next year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2926) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to eliminate, in certain cases, the requirement than an insured individual have first been admitted to a hospital in order to qualify under such title for the extended care services provided thereunder, introduced by Mr. BAYH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2926

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1814 (a)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(D) in the case of post-hospital extended care services, such services are or were required to be given on an inpatient basis because the individual needs or needed skilled nursing care on a continuing basis for—

"(i) any of the conditions with respect to which he was receiving inpatient hospital services (or services which would constitute inpatient hospital services if the institution met the requirements of paragraphs (6) and (8) of section 1861(e)) prior to transfer to the extended care facility or for a condition requiring such extended care services which arose after such transfer and while he was still in the facility for treatment of the condition or conditions for which he was receiving such inpatient hospital services, or

"(ii) any condition requiring such extended care services and the existence of which was discovered or confirmed as a result of findings made while the individual was receiving outpatient diagnostic services, or, in the case of an individual who has been admitted to an extended care facility for such a condition, any other condition arising while he is in such facility;".

(b) The first sentence of section 1861(i) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "The term 'post-hospital extended care services' means extended care services furnished an individual (A) after transfer from a hospital in which he was an inpatient for not less than three consecutive days before his discharge from the hospital in connection with such transfer, or (B) after he has received outpatient hospital diagnostic services, if, after reviewing the findings revealed by such services, his physican and the hospital from which he received such services certify (not later than 7 days after the termination of such services) that he is in immediate need of extended care services, and if he is admitted to an extended care facility within 14 days after the date on which his need for extended care services was so certified."

AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 86–380, AN ACT TO ESTABLISH AN ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, of which I am the chairman, recently released its "Report on the 5-Year Record of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations." This survey was based on hearings held by the House and Senate Subcommittees on Intergovernmental Relations in May 1965 on the operations of the Commission. Those proceedings revealed that the Commission has achieved a high level of competence and productivity in its continuing and vital study of problems affecting intergovernmental relations at the Federal, State, and local levels. The Commission, composed of members from all levels of government, has developed a reputation for sound legislative recommendations and meticulous staff work. This was attested to by some 19 witnesses, among them the senior Senator from South Dakota and the senior Senator from North Carolina, as well as 47 of the 56 reports and statements submitted by State and local officials and organizations, professional and public interest groups, and other interested individuals.

I shall not attempt here to summarize the accomplishments of the Commission; the report of the subcommittee details this record thoroughly. But it should be remembered that the far-reaching economic and social legislation of the past 5 years cannot be realized unless and until we have improved intergovernmental machinery to provide a high degree of coordination and cooperation among administrators and programs at all levels of government. It is precisely in this area that the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is making a vital contribution.

During the course of the hearings last year, several witnesses suggested changes in Public Law 86–380, the act which established the Commission in 1959. The subcommittee has studied these suggestions and recommends five for consideration by the Congress. These have been incorporated in the bill which I am presenting today.

Most of these changes are minor and of a corrective or procedural nature.

First, changes in names of two organizations named in the original act require correction.

Second, an amendment is proposed which will allow a member of the Commission to serve until his reappointment, or until his successor is appointed. This will eliminate gaps in the Commission at those times when there are delays in appointments and reappointments to the Commission.

Third, an amendment is proposed to set the salary of the Executive Director of the Commission at level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964. This would be equal to salaries paid to such Federal positions as members of regulatory commissions, assistant departmental secretaries, and the Chairman of the Tariff Commission, and would conform with the original intent of legislation which set the Executive Director's salary at a level comparable with the heads of small Federal agencies.

Fourth, a minor change in the wording of the original act concerning compensation of Commission members who are not full-time Federal, State or local officials is proposed. Use of the word "shall" in the original act has resulted, in at least one instance, in a mandatory construction by a State attorney general which prevented a State legislator from accepting appointment on the Commission.

Finally, a fifth proposal would permit State and local governments and their organizations, as well as interested nonprofit organizations, to contribute funds toward supporting the operation of the Commission.

The bill has been recommended by the subcommittee and incorporates these five changes. I believe it will strengthen the Advisory Commission in its continuing work of resolving critical Federal, State, and local questions.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2927) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations," approved September 24, 1959, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraphs (6) and (7) of section 3(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to establish an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations", approved September 24, 1959 (73 Stat. 703; 5 U.S.C. 2373(a)), are amended to read as follows:

"(6) Four appointed by the President from a panel of at least eight mayors submitted jointly by the National League of Cities and the United States Conference of Mayors; and

"(7) Three appointed by the President from a panel of at least six elected county officers submitted by the National Association of Counties."

SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 3 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2373(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The term of office of each member of the Commission shall be two years; members shall be eligible for reappointment; and, except as provided in section 4(d), members shall serve until their successors are appointed."

SEC. 3. Subsection (f) of section 6 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2376(f)) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) No individual employed in the service of the Commission shall be paid compensation for such employment at a rate in excess of the rate provided for grade 18 under the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, except that the executive director of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level IV in the Federal Executive Salary Schedule of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964."

SEC. 4. Subsection (b) of section 7 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2377(b)) is amended by striking out "shall receive compensation" and inserting in lieu thereof "may receive compensation".

SEC. 5. Such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 9. The Commission is authorized to receive funds through grants, contracts, and contributions from State and local governments and organizations thereof, and from departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and from foundations and nonprofit organizations. Such funds may be received and expended by the Commission only for purposes of this Act. In making appropriations to the Commission the Congress shall consider the amount of any funds received by the Commission in addition to those funds appropriated to it by the Congress."

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL BOARDS ATTEMPTING TO CORRECT RACIAL IMBALANCES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to provide Federal assistance to local school boards acting to correct racial imbalance in their schools.

Any matter affecting the quality of our education and the well-being of our children must concern us seriously. An adequate education is the cornerstone of good citizenship, and in today's complex world, an economic necessity. It is not a privilege made available only to the few. It is the indispensable equipment of all freemen and their key to equal opportunity. A good education is important for all children. But it is especially vital for the disadvantaged, particularly our Negro citizens.

The American Negro, if he is to have faith in any of our society's institutions, must have faith in our schools. A school is the only institution which, by its very nature, involves a daily effort to give to its students something they did not have before, and make of them something they were not before. Without equal educational opportunities, the American Negro will never obtain the full citizenship which is his birthright. Because of racial imbalance in public schools, many a Negro child today is being denied this opportunity. Once it is denied, the harmful effects in most cases can never be completely overcome.

The harm occurring from racially imbalanced public schools affects many American families, both in my own State of Massachusetts and in many other areas of the country.

The legal consequences of de jure and de facto segregation may be different, but, because the harm is the same, I believe it should be a part of our national policy to support local programs designed to overcome the problem of racially imbalanced schools.

Brown against Board of Education established conclusively that the enforced assignment of students to public schools on the basis of race is forbidden by the U.S. Constitution. These decisions and others which have followed directly affected all of our Southern States, and the District of Columbia, which at that time had educational facilities based on a system of legally enforced or de jure segregation.

But the legal impact of the school segregation cases on segregated public school systems in the North and West of our Nation is less clear. With some exceptions, segregation in educational facilities in the North and West does not exist as a result of purposeful official actions. But it does exist nonetheless. As a result of a past history of residential segregation combined with a commonly observed school policy of pupil assignment based on place of residence, school systems which are highly segregated de facto by color can be found in almost every major city in the North and West.

In my own State of Massachusetts, for example, a study last year by the Massachusetts Advisory Committee on Racial Imbalance and Education found that "most Negro children in Massachusetts attended predominantly Negro schools while the overwhelming majority of white citizens attend schools that are either all white or have fewer than five nonwhite children enrolled." Massachusetts is one example, but by no means the most striking one. The problem of de facto school segregation, or racial imbalance, is even more severe in those Northern and Western States which have a higher percentage of nonwhite citizens than my own State does.

Whether school segregation is de jure, as in the South, or de facto, as in the North, it causes the same injury to our schoolchildren, white or Negro. As Chief Justice Earl Warren said in Brown against Board of Education, the separation of some children from others of similar age and qualifications because of their race "generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone."

Segregation by color, whatever the reason, is harmful to schoolchildren. The eminent authorities cited in Brown against Board of Education and numerous studies since that ruling testify to this. The studies indicate that separation of schoolchildren by race leads to ignorance of other races, and that this ignorance breeds prejudice and fear. The damage is particularly severe for the Negro child, whose preschool experiences with the harmful effects of racial discrimination are reinforced by a racially imbalanced school.

As the Panel on Education of the planning session for the White House Conference put it:

> All the evidence indicates that Negro children receive an education deficient in quality by every standard of quality—academic, achievement, teaching, supervision, materials, facilities, curriculums, building standards, and so forth—and by every measurement of consequences—reading ability, attendance at college, dropout rate, IQ, and other tests, and incidence of personal alienation and social disorganization (crime and delinquency, drug addiction, family instability, menial jobs, and unemployment). There is clear documentary evidence of a direct relationship between segregated schools and inferior education, and of cumulative academic retardation among children in Negro ghettos. There is evidence also that this waste is remediable, hence the greater tragedy.

A public school system should provide the means and the opportunity for each child to develop his unique individual potential to its fullest capacity. It should also be the training ground for the child's future life as a citizen in a multiracial culture. A racially imbalanced school may not achieve the first objective because a Negro child's motivation to learn may be crippled by the segregation he experiences in his school environment. And it may not achieve the second objective because a Negro child who has been isolated from the majority group during his school years will often be ill-equipped to take his place in an integrated world.

Small children, Negro or white, do not make fine legal distinctions between de jure and de facto segregation. But they do know what they see—and they observe that the separateness they experience is based on color.

But although the harmful effects of both de jure and de facto segregation are the same, the law until now has distinguished between them. The most recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court suggest that, although a local board of education has the legal power to correct racial imbalance, it does not have the legal duty to correct such imbalance.

These decisions reflect in part the jurisprudential problems contained in the 14th amendment's requirement of "State action." And they also reflect, I believe, judicial recognition both of the complexities involved in the administration of a public school system and of the historic faith we have placed in the ability of a local community to best run its own schools.

I realize that correcting racial imbalance is often difficult, and that a local school board is justified in weighing the competing considerations which inevitably attend the formulation of sound school policies. And I recognize that if we are to eliminate concentrations of Negro pupils in certain schools, we must try to do it without violating logical attendance areas or sacrificing other sound educational considerations. There are important values to be preserved in the neighborhood school concept, and in keeping to a minimum the dislocations to which small children are subjected.

And I am also aware that the problem we face in our schools is not simply one of racial imbalance, but also a problem of inferior schools and of culturally deprived children. I tend to agree with the findings of the Allen Report in New York, that "total desegregation of all schools is simply not obtainable in the foreseeable future and neither planning nor pressure can change that fact." That day will not come until we have succeeded in breaking completely all aspects of the cycle of poverty, ghetto housing, ghetto schools, and unskilled jobs which deny Negroes equality of opportunity.

But these qualifications and competing considerations do not alter the basic reality—that racial imbalance in schools is harming our children, hampering our educational objectives, and denying our principle of equal educational opportunity. Although there may be no constitutional compulsion requiring the complete and immediate elimination of racial imbalance, it seems basic to me that those school districts which wish to alleviate this problem should receive the encouragement and support of the Federal Government.

For this reason I introduce today a bill which would amend title IV of the civil rights of 1964, to authorize the Commissioner of Education to provide technical assistance and grants to school boards which have drawn up programs for overcoming racial imbalance in their public schools.

Present law does not provide for Federal assistance to education programs designed to deal with this problem. Title III of the original administration civil rights bill of 1964 did make specific provision for the inclusion of areas of racial imbalance in all programs, loan, grant, and assistance projects concerned with the study and alleviation of segregation in public education. But these references were eliminated in committee, and the bill as passed provided specifically that "desegregation shall not mean the assignment to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance."

In administering this bill, therefore, the Office of Education has been severely limited in the assistance it could provide to educational programs designed to deal with de facto segregation. This assistance is even further limited by the fact that only $5 million is currently available for all programs in grade school, high school, and universities dealing with racial segregation; while requests for assistance presently exceed $20 million.

The proposal I offer today would restore the present law to its original form, and permit the same kind of assistance to school boards acting to correct de facto segregation as it currently makes available to school boards acting to correct de jure segregation.

This proposal would authorize the Commissioner of Education:

First. To include studies of racial imbalance in his survey of equality in educational opportunities throughout the United States;

Second. To make technical assistance available upon request to those school districts which want to prepare, adopt, and implement plans for the correction of racial imbalance;

Third. To arrange for the operation of special training institutes designed to improve the ability of personnel who deal with educational problems occasioned by racial imbalance in school systems.

In addition to the programs already authorized in title IV, section 405—providing for inservice training for teachers and school personnel and the employment of special advisors on problems resulting from desegregation or racial imbalance—my bill would also make grants available for the following school projects on racial imbalance.

First. The development and introduction of new curricular material.

Second. The taking of surveys and assessments leading to redistricting or reallocation of school facilities.

Third. The development of teacher exchange programs.

Fourth. The establishment of transportation projects within a school community.

Finally, a new provision under this section would make supplemental construction funds available for two purposes: the increasing of facilities in centralized districts so these districts can absorb outlying and outmoded schoolhouses and, the encouraging of new methods of school design and construction which can contribute to eliminating racial imbalance.

Under the proposal I offer today, $50 million would be appropriated for title IV. This increase is necessary both to finance the expected projects forthcoming from the expansion of the act to include racial imbalance plans, and also to finance more adequately the existing authority to assist de jure desegregation programs. The Office of Education estimates that this amount is the absolute realistic minimum required if a satisfactory Federal effort is to be made.

Mr. President, I want to stress that my proposal contains no coercive features whatsoever. It does not require any school board to take any action. It is simply designed to help those school boards who have determined that a program to correct racial imbalance is necessary and who can make good use of the Federal funds which my proposal would provide.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 10 days for the purpose of permitting additional Senators to join as cosponsors.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The bill (S. 2928) to amend title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to authorize the Commissioner of Education to provide technical assistance and grants to school boards in support of programs designed to overcome any racial imbalance in the public schools, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

THE NEED FOR A THOROUGH INQUIRY INTO OUR FISCAL AND MONETARY POLICIES BY VIRTUE OF THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, today the brooding specter of the war in Vietnam looms large over Washington.

Government officials, members of the communications media, and the American public in general, all realize that the single most important issue currently facing this Nation is the conduct of our policy in a small beleaguered country thousands of miles from our own shores. In fact, whether they uphold, or would have us renounce our commitment to the people of South Vietnam, Senators, columnists, businessmen, students, and all men of good will affirm that the pursuit of peace in southeast Asia is of overriding importance to the United States and every one of our partners in the free world.

But, concerned as we are over events in South Vietnam itself, we cannot lose sight of the problems related to the economic strength which undergirds America's ability to meet her responsibilities there—as well as in other friendly nations and at home. We cannot and must not allow the political and military questions about the Vietnamese struggle to obscure the implications for our economy of the increased spending required to sustain that struggle.

Yet, though a thorough knowledge of present and future economic trends is vital to intelligent policymaking, there has been a surprisingly small amount of public concern and no widespread debate thus far in this area. A few economists and some business leaders have come forward with varying economic analyses and widely differing proposals, but their efforts have received scant attention.

Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States places the final responsibility for the conduct of our foreign relations in the hands of the President. So, while debate in Congress over the conflict in Vietnam may prove healthy, may help clarify the issues at stake, and may even develop workable alternatives—still, in the final analysis—we cannot displace that ultimate responsibility of the Chief Executive—that final decision which is always his.

However, the same Constitution vests in Congress the primary responsibility for the American economy. It is we who must enact the laws levying taxes, imposing duties, appropriating moneys, and regulating commerce. And, if we are to legislate in a manner that will permit us to meet our international obligations while maintaining a growing, expanding domestic economy, Congress must assemble all the facts and information necessary to the task.

We must probe beneath surface appearances and examine in detail rankling questions that have yet to be resolved to everyone's satisfaction.

Mr. President, I, for one, am convinced that the United States is following the only just and honorable course of policy open to us in Vietnam.

But, I also believe that we would be derelict in our duty if we did not ascertain whether we can truly afford "guns and butter" without endangering our economic health; whether a sudden increase in military expenditures combined with growing domestic programs will generate unbearable inflationary pressures; whether future tax increases may be required to keep growth steady and stable; and, whether our balance-of-payments deficits can be further reduced. These are just some of the matters we need to look into in order to discharge our responsibilities.

Mr. President, such an investigation is not just desirable and timely, it is urgent and necessary.

For that reason, I am today submitting a resolution on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the able junior Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], and myself, which would authorize the Senate Committee on Finance to make a full and complete study of all matters relating to the fiscal and monetary position of the Government, and their effect on the state of the economy. The resolution would require the committee to report its findings and make such recommendations as it deems advisable to the Senate not later than 90 days after the day on which the resolution is agreed to.

I sincerely trust that this resolution will be speedily adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 221) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. Res. 221

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to all matters relating to the fiscal and monetary position of the Government of the United States in view of our increasing commitments in Vietnam, including, but not limited to the adequacy of the revenues of the Government, the need for increasing the statutory limit on the public debt, methods for further improving the United States balance-of-payments position, the problem of interest rates and other matters related to the Nation's economic welfare.

Sec. 2. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable, to the Senate not later than the 90th day after the day on which this resolution is agreed to.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS TO S. 2888

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a week ago I asked unanimous consent that S. 2888 remain at the desk for the convenience of those Senators who desire to cosponsor it.

I now ask unanimous consent that S. 2888 remain at the desk for an additional week for the convenience of those Senators who are not present today, until February 23. This bill would give priority to school lunch programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 2882, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend to June 30, 1966, the period for initial enrollment in the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title, the names of Senator Javits, of New York, Senator Allott, of Colorado, Senator Fong, of Hawaii, and Senator Scott, of Pennsylvania be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2911) to amend section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930, introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as a cosponsor to S. 2797 at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Tydings in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and joint resolution:

Authority of February 1, 1966:

S. 2855. A bill to amend chapter 207, title 18, United States Code, to prescribe procedure for the return of persons who have fled, in violation of the conditions of bail given in any State or judicial district of the United States, to another State or judicial district, and for other purposes: Mr. Bayh, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Javits, and Mr. Smathers.

S.J. Res. 133. Joint resolution designating February of each year as American History Month: Mr. Allott, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Case, Mr. Church, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Javits, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Morton, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Scott, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

Authority of February 3, 1966:

S. 2871. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes: Mr. Allott, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bible, Mr. Clark, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Inouye, Mr. McGee, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Moss, and Mr. Pell.

S. 2874. A bill to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research: Mr. Clark, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pell, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Yarborough.

Authority of February 4, 1966:

S. 2877. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps: Mr. Clark, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mrs. Neuberger, and Mr. Ribicoff.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I wish to announce forthcoming hearings on electoral college reform. The hearings are scheduled to begin at 10 a.m. on February 28, March 1, 2, 3, and 4, and March 7 through 10. They will be conducted in the auditorium, G-308 of the New Senate Office Building.

Any persons or organizations interested in presenting their views to the subcommittee should contact the subcommittee staff in room 419, Senate Office Building, phone extension 3018.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 2704, A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE REGULATION OF BANK COLLECTIVE INVESTMENT FUNDS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold a hearing on S. 2703, a bill to provide for the regulation of bank collective investment funds.

The hearing will begin on Tuesday, March 8, 1966, at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify in connection with this bill are requested to notify Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225-3921.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Albert Thomas, late a Representative from the State of Texas, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3314) to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Whitener, Mr. Williams, Mr. Horton, and Mr. Roudebush were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 647) to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MULTER, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Mr. SPRINGER, and Mr. NELSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10304) to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physical abuse of children; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MULTER, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Mr. SPRINGER, and Mr. NELSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9985) to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and hospitals or similar institutions in the District of Columbia of injuries caused by firearms or other dangerous weapons; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. MULTER, and Mr. HARSHA were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 9. An act to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period;

S. 1407. An act for the relief of Frank E. Lipp; and

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass., in 1969.

FOOD FOR PEACE PROGRAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have been a friend and supporter of the food for peace program ever since those days of serious agricultural surpluses back in 1954, when we enacted the original Public Law 480 legislation.

Last week the President submitted to Congress a comprehensive and expanded food for peace program. The President called it food for freedom. Personally, I regret the change in name as the name food for peace was established in our own Nation and the world. The program, as we have known it through these 11 years of operation, has been useful to us and to our foreign friends. It has reduced our surpluses. It has opened new outlets for our fields and our farmers. It has brought increased jobs and income to our city people. It has fed millions of hungry people overseas. It has stabilized food prices where otherwise there would have been severe inflation. It has stimulated economic development and laid the basis for expanded private trade. It has won friends for us. It has strengthened free world relationships and has advanced the peaceful aims for which we stand.

The program has done all that we originally hoped for it, and more. The fact that we propose now to change that program is in the spirit of progress rather than dissatisfaction.

Food for peace has been not only a useful tool in feeding people and expanding trade, but also has been a highly instructive teacher. The lessons we have learned are the basis for the changes now proposed.

We have come to have second thoughts, for example, about use of the word "surplus" in a world where millions are hungry or underfed. The same can be said for the "disposal."

The farmers of Kansas are producing wheat on about 9 million acres of their farmland, and a substantial amount of this wheat has been moving to foreign destinations under the food-for-peace program.

To the child in Bombay who stays alive because of Kansas wheat, this food is the most important thing in his existence. For a life-giving substance, the word "surplus" sounds singularly inappropriate. The fact that we are making this food available as a warmhearted, humanitarian gesture can scarcely be described as "disposal." I am glad that in the new program we will be getting away from this terminology. I am glad that the emphasis will be on positive use of our agricultural abundance—feeding people, supporting their economic development, and helping them to create new jobs, build financial independence, and expand commercial trade.

I particularly appreciate the recognition in the new proposed legislation that trade—not aid—in the final analysis is the key to world progress. We are glad to see wheat from Kansas farms put to use in feeding hungry people—but we are even happier as these people emerge from poverty, perform useful work, earn wages and salaries, and buy our good Kansas wheat in the marketplace.

This is already happening in many parts of the world. Feed grains, soybeans, and livestock products from my State are being sold in the world market, in larger and larger amounts, for dollars. It is deeply satisfying to know that my State is able to make this important contribution—and it is doubly satisfying to know that our food aid program, as we visualize it for the future, will put new emphasis on helping countries make this necessary transition from food aid to food trade.

ELMER B. STAATS—NEW COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Nation is fortunate and the President is to be commended on the appointment of Elmer B. Staats as Comptroller General.

Mr. Staats is a native born Kansan and has devoted most of his life to Government service. His 25 years in the Budget Bureau will stand him in good stead in his new position.

The Comptroller General's Office is one agency that reports directly to Congress and is truly the watchdog of Federal expenditures.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled, "New Comptroller General," which appeared in the Washington Daily News, issue of February 14, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Last summer the Comptroller General of the United States, Joseph Campbell, was compelled to retire because of ill health. Which was too bad because Mr. Campbell, who had had the job since 1954, was able, independent, and dedicated.

Now, finally, President Johnson has found a man he thinks will be an appropriate successor to Mr. Campbell. His choice is Elmer B. Staats, a career Government executive who has been Deputy Director of the Budget Bureau since 1959.

When his appointment is approved by the Senate, Mr. Staats will take over one of the truly vital jobs in the Federal Government. He will boss the General Accounting Office, a wholly independent agency accountable directly and only to Congress. In brief, GAO's job is to watch how the money is spent and to rap knuckles when any is misspent. The Comptroller General has been dubbed, with good reason, as the "taxpayers' best friend."

Mr. Staats will be only the fifth Comptroller General since the office was created in 1921, and all have been singularly competent men. To keep the office wholly independent, the Comptroller General is appointed for a 15-year term (longest in the Government) and can be removed only for hardrock cause and only by Congress.

With 25 years in the Budget Bureau, Mr. Staats probably knows as much about the Government's inside workings as anyone—unless it would be the Assistant Comptroller General, Frank H. Weitzel, who has been on that job since 1953. In our view, he too would have been a first-class choice for the top post.

Every year the GAO saves the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars by its audits, investigations, and otherwise. But the real savings probably run much higher than the statistics in the annual reports—because just having such an office is a deterrent to waste. So go to it, Mr. Staats; everybody is on your side but the wasters—and they abound.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I join in the sentiments of the Senator from Kansas with reference to the appointment of Mr. Elmer B. Staats to the office of Comptroller General. I have had dealings with the gentleman, and I think he represents the very finest of the people in the bureaus and in our Government here in Washington.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the comments of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to identify myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] with respect to the new Comptroller General, Elmer Staats.

I remember over the years when he served as assistant to Maurice Stans, the Budget Director, and worked in close association with him throughout the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. Staats is a dedicated public servant. He rings a high degree of ability and competence to his job. I am confident that he will make an outstanding Comptroller General.

I compliment the administration on the selection of Mr. Staats to be Comptroller General, and also compliment Mr. Staats for the dedicated service he has already rendered to Congress and the country.

IT IS TIME TO PUT SOME IDLE ACRES BACK TO WORK

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the world food situation is such that the United States must give immediate consideration to the release of several million acres for the production of food that are now being held out of production through allotment acreage programs.

The diminished surpluses over the past 10 years make more concentrated use of U.S. farmland most imperative. Those big surpluses we have been hearing about for many years simply do not exist today.

A typical example of how we are reducing our surpluses is our export of wheat to India. We have been providing India one-fifth of our entire wheat crop. This amounts to two shiploads every day. Since 1951, the United States has sent $2¼ billion worth of food to India.

Present indications are that our wheat exports this year may top 900 million bushels. Some predict it may reach a higher figure. These figures indicate that there is a distinct possibility of a carryover of only 400 or 500 million bushels on July 1, 1967.

Everyone, I believe, will agree that this is a reserve that is too low for our Nation's present needs and the export demands.

It is my sincere belief that we must give consideration to increasing the 47.8 million acres alloted for the 1966 crop to at least 55 or 60 million acres for the 1967 crop.

I am fully aware of the possibility of increasing our surpluses to unmanageable proportions, but on the other hand, we cannot take chances with our food reserve during present world conditions.

In the last issue of the GTA Digest, published by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, there appeared an editorial written by M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the farmers union grain terminal, entitled "It Is Time To Put Some Idle Acres Back to Work." I am in accord with the views expressed in this article and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S TIME TO PUT SOME IDLE ACRES BACK TO WORK

It is the view of many knowledgeable people in this country that we could run short of wheat. Before long we may not have enough to meet national commitments.

These people also point out that we do not have too much corn. The carryover is only about a 3-month supply. Soybean supplies may be used up by the time another harvest is ready.

Top officials in the U.S. Department of Agriculture do not hold to this view. They continue to say that we have plenty. In turn, this is a view that we do not share here at GTA.

We cannot forget the lessons that history has taught us. We have been through food crises twice in contemporary history. Memories of these are fresh to us.

Herbert Hoover, after World War I, did the world a wonderful service when he organized our facilities and carried food to hungry people. His efforts avoided a catastrophe. More recently, after World War II, that great champion of people and human rights, Fiorello La Guardia, was given the task of obtaining food for starving Europe.

Mr. La Guardia went to the Department of Agriculture, but said that he could get no cooperation there. They told him there was no wheat in the amounts required. That was when Mr. La Guardia appealed to us here at GTA. You know what happened. We launched the mercy wheat campaign of 1946, and we scraped the wheat bins of the Midwest. We delivered a hundred million bushels of mercy wheat. All that was left then was seed for the new crop.

We said then that wheat is the crying need of the world. Those words are as true today as they were then, just 20 years ago.

How stupid and blind can this Nation be? We face a world food crisis. It is beginning now. Yet we have not learned that even too much can be too little. Where does the responsibility lie for making food decisions now that may well determine whether we have peace or war on a global basis in only a few years?

It is time to begin using some of our idle acres. That is the only sensible thing to do. I feel that very strongly. Just as surely as God created us, within 5 years this Nation's farmlands will be in full production. We can't wait for great debates and administrative angleworming to get this job done.

People are going to be fed, or we might as well dig our bomb shelters and crawl in now. A hungry person does not give a rap about communism, or socialism, or capitalism. He wants to know what he is going to eat for breakfast. He wants to know where he can get food for his wife and his children.

Hungry people understand food. They don't understand a country that cuts back its farm production and pays farmers to do it, when millions of people are dying, literally dying, of hunger.

Our farmers are good people. They cooperate with farm programs, because they understand how necessary they are. But they want to produce food. They want to run their farms efficiently and take care of the soil over which they have stewardship with the Lord, but they want to produce food when there is such a great need for it.

That great need is here now. It is a time to produce and to share, if we want peace for our children's children. Let us be intelligent about this, and begin bringing some of our idle acres back into production.

SUPPLEMENTARY MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement with respect to the matter which is the pending business, S. 2791 on the question of the supplemental military and procurement authorization for fiscal 1966. For the RECORD, I wish to object to any requests for unanimous consent which would limit the debate on any amendment, or on the bill itself.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as an old filibusterer myself, I say to my able and distinguished friend the Senator from Indiana that I had in mind making no unanimous-consent requests on the matter in the near future, but I say to him that if the debate should run on over a long period of time, Senators who are conducting an extended debate should always arrange to keep some Senator on the floor to object, because that is one way to lose a filibuster—to fail to object when a unanimous-consent request is made. I am sure my friend knows that unless the leadership agrees otherwise, it is the privilege of the leadership to make a unanimous-consent request.

I do assure the Senator that he is safe today.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, all I wish to do is make this a matter of record. I am not talking about any filibuster, but it is true that a number of Senators who are out of town would like to discuss this matter—including the majority leader, incidentally, who is not here. So I think, in all deference to the majority leader himself, though it is not a question that he has asked for time, that Senators who wish to speak should have the right to express themselves on a matter of such vital importance to the future of the Nation and, indeed, the future of humanity.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Certainly the Senator has a right to express himself. I respect the Senator's right. I do not anticipate that we will vote today. But I say to my distinguished friend that the majority leader has not asked that there be any delay.

Mr. HARTKE. I understand. I am not asking that there be any delay, either.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, 48 years ago, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania declared herself an independent nation, free from the hardships and deprivations caused by years of subjugation to Russia, free to determine her own destiny. And, for more than 20 years, this small nation, in spite of the political intrigues of Europe, maintained herself under a democratic government. In the full enthusiam of a free and progressive spirit, Lithuania made extraordinary strides in all phases of the lives of her people—in land reform, industrial reorganization, financial stability, and in education and social improvement. Constitutional guarantees of speech, assembly, religion, and communication were firmly established.

However, freedom was not new to Lithuania, and February 16, 1918, is remembered less for the emergence of a new nation than for the reemergence of an old nation, rich in its own political and cultural heritage—a once powerful empire which had made valuable contributions to European civilization. For many years following the Middle Ages the independence of Lithuania was a source of encouragement to European civilization. By 1795, however, conditions had changed, and Lithuania was annexed to Russia. She was subjected to the cruelty and oppression of the aggressor who crushed every uprising and revolt, and who attempted to destroy the Lithuanian language and culture. The deep-rooted nationalism and unity of the Lithuanian people sustained them through these long, dark years of Russian domination, and through the hard and destructive days of the German Army's invasion during World War I, until, once again, conditions were such that Lithuania realized her national dream of freedom as an independent Republic.

Certainly Lithuania, in her independence, was a shining example of what can be accomplished by a people who have a firm belief in human ideals, and the courage and determination to make their long-desired freedom a working reality.

But, during the late 1930's, the chaos of a troubled Europe again caught Lithuania in the tragedy of foreign domination, and she suffered under the occupation of Germany and then Communist Russia. In 1940, Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. through the Communist method of annexation with which we are all so familiar now.

The United States, as well as many other free nations of the world, has never recognized the Soviet incorporation of Lithuania. To do otherwise would be totally inconsistent with our objectives of a free and peaceful world, and our strong belief that the desire for freedom is in the hearts of all Lithuanians.

Under Soviet domination, massive deportation policies have changed the composition of Lithuania's population. Thousands of her people were forced to flee injustice and save their lives, and many have come to the United States. My own State of Massachusetts has many Lithuanian Americans. Just as Lithuanians throughout history have made valuable contributions to European civilization, so has our country benefited greatly by the contributions of Lithuanians and their descendants.

I am pleased today to join with Lithuanians everywhere in commemorating the historic struggle of Lithuanians for liberty and self-determination, and in marking today as the 48th anniversary of their national independence.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, 48 years ago, Lithuania declared its independence after more than a century of Russian domination. But a Lithuanian living in Lithuania today has little cause to celebrate this occasion. If he is 48 years old on February 16 of this year, he has known 22 years of freedom and 26 of oppression. He has seen his country fall a victim of Soviet aggression as a result of the infamous Nazi-Soviet pact of 1939, and to fall a victim of Nazi aggression in 1941. When other countries were being liberated in 1944 and 1945, he was only able to witness the absorption of Lithuania into the vast Soviet empire.

Since that time, he has seen countless numbers of his fellow countrymen deported to Siberia or other remote regions of the Soviet Union. Many thousands of others have been executed or are living in exile. He has seen the rich farmlands of his country collectivized by force, his living standards lowered following Soviet exploitation, his religion mocked by Soviet authorities, his freedom to travel curbed, and the scenic coast of his country turned into a military camp by the Soviet armed forces. In 1952, he saw the brave Lithuanian freedom army finally forced to cease active resistance. Over the years, his country has been turned into a vast prison.

In sum, our 48-year-old Lithuanian has known treachery, invasion, persecution, and occupation. Does he know hope? Or, does he sometimes wonder whether he has been forgotten? Let us make sure that he knows that he has not been forgotten. The hopes of almost 3 million people behind the Iron Curtain are important to us. Our voices can be heard. Be they raised only in protest, they can keep hopes alive that are important to the future of the free world.

No free nation can afford to forget the fate of a people whose traditions and ideals are linked to its own. No free nation can afford to give the impression by word or deed that it leans toward the proposition that might makes right. The United States does not accept this proposition. It recognizes the right of the Lithuanian people to determine their future in freedom. It looks forward to the day when they will once more be able to join the community of free nations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, commemorating the proclamation of the independence of a nation is a magnificent event. We know how the Americans cherish the annual Fourth of July celebration. Among nations that have fallen to the onslaught of the Soviet Communist Union the passion for commemorating their independence day grows stronger in each succeeding year that these people must remain slave rather than free.

Each year Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle raise their voices in the Halls of Congress extolling the gigantic struggles for freedom from Soviet communism and further urging that the peoples behind the Iron Curtain be given the opportunity to again become freemen. The world knows of the gallant fight of the Ukrainans, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Hungarians, Rumanians, Polish, and the other peoples behind the Iron Curtain, trying to break away from the chains of slavery, even though that gallant fight ended in further destruction to these people behind the Iron Curtain. Irrespective of many killings, the shedding of blood and untold sacrifices, these people still dream, hope, and pray for national independence.

Mr. President, on January 22, February 16, and February 24 are the independence days of the Ukrainians, Lithuanians, and the Estonians respectively. Independence days of other peoples behind the Iron Curtain will follow on through the year. Speeches in the Halls of Congress give strength and hope to the people behind the Iron Curtain but their quest for freedom cannot live on speeches alone. For this reason, Mr. President, for a number of years I have introduced in the Senate of the United States Senate concurrent resolutions which, if passed by Congress, would ask for specific action. For example, Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 would resolve:

> That the President is hereby requested to take such action as may be necessary to bring before the United Nations for its consideration the question of the forceful incorporation of the Baltic States Republics into the Soviet Union, and a resolution declaring that—(a) the Soviet Union shall withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from the Baltic States; (b) the Soviet Union shall return all citizens of the Baltic States to their homelands from places of exile in Siberia, and dispersion in prisons and slave labor camps throughout the Soviet Union; and (c) the United Nations should conduct free elections in the Baltic States under the direct supervision of the United Nations and sit in judgment on the Communist counterparts of the Nazi war criminals convicted at the Nuremberg trials.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 would ask for similar authority as stated in Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 and would include all of the peoples who are now behind the Iron Curtain, such as the Ukrainians, the Hungarians, and the Poles.

Mr. President, it is time for Congress to act on this matter.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, today it is our privilege to mark the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Lithuania is an old country. Its history is a troubled one, marred by centuries of foreign imposition and domination. For this reason, February 16, 1918, was a joyous day for Lithuanians. On that day, this proud country declared, as we once did, its national independence.

But unlike our country, Mr. President, the nation whose independence we so commemorate is not now independent, for the free Government of Lithuania lasted only a short 21 years. After a mere 21 years of freedom and prosperity, external domination returned to Lithuania.

Since 1939, Lithuania has been an oppressed land. It has struggled with tyranny from the right and from the left, with nazism and with communism. Even today this small, but fearless, nation, like so many others, struggles to regain its rightful place in the councils of free nations. The courage and dedication of the Lithuanian people, confronted by pressures from powers many times its size, should be a constant inspiration for us. Lithuanians have contributed substantially to the growth, prosperity, and the cultural and spiritual life of our own country.

To those now seeking self-government within Lithuania itself, let us say: We admire your hope and determination; to those now away from their homeland but who are still working for Lithuanian independence: We salute your courageous efforts.

Lithuanians have helped to make America strong, vigorous, and free. Americans in turn recognize the drive for the restoration of a free and independent Lithuania.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, we are faced with a very practical problem which, if it is to be solved, will require a great deal more courage than has heretofore been evident. We cannot advance freedom while accommodating communism, as long as communism is dedicated to the elimination of freedom. We cannot advance justice by placating Communists who despise justice. We cannot serve self-determination by permitting its elimination under Communist ruthlessness.

It seems clear to me that the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day marks another milestone in our failure as free Americans to meet our test of courage. Our official attitude toward Lithuania has been one of encouragement ever since the Russians illegally annexed that country in 1944. We have constantly and continually preached our desire to see them rise once more as a free nation, but our words have not been followed by positive and definitive policies. Therefore, today I think we should make special note of Lithuania's continuing hope for freedom and begin positive steps toward her eventual realization of her dream.

We, as a nation, have the greatest economic power in the history of mankind at our command. Our farmers and our businessmen have shown themselves willing to devote this almost unlimited potential in our fight against Communist terrorism and aggression, not only in Lithuania, but everywhere in the world. Therefore, whenever we negotiate with any Communist nation for something the Communists want to buy—food, plastics, rubber, or any other material—we should make certain we also obtain in return concessions helpful to the advancement of freedom throughout the world. I am talking about major political concessions, for we have an economic capacity and potential which require courage and strength across the bargaining table. These concessions in return for trade could take the form of open access for American news reporters in Lithuania, thus giving the citizens of that enslaved nation a freer voice in the world. We could insist upon freedom of religion for Lithuanians who have clung to their heritage and national consciousness under the onus of brutal, illegal Soviet occupation. We should, for example, sell wheat to Russia only if at the same time we obtain for Lithuania and the other Baltic States at least some measure of the freedom which is rightfully theirs.

Mr. President, it strikes me that any other policy would simply shore up the weaknesses in the Communist systems which would otherwise make certain the eventual liberation of the captive nations. Any other policy would admit our failure to rise to Lithuania's exemplary dedication to freedom.

We salute today on February 16 the brief, bright flame of liberty which Lithuania so carefully tended 48 years ago. We honor the many Lithuanian patriots who have sacrificed and endured under burdens we cannot even comprehend. We must, at this time, also recommit ourselves to the eventual liberation of Lithuania, for we can and must express our ideals of freedom through courageous utilization of our economic system to the betterment of the captive Lithuanian people.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, today is the 48th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Forty-eight years ago, we saw the beginning of an era of relative stability in the history of a nation which, for centuries, had been subjected to the whims of rapacious rulers. Yet, freedom for the Lithuanians, a brave and tolerant people, was not to endure for long. Since the end of World War II Lithuania has suffered under the heel of the Soviet boot.

In 1952, in a speech to the American Legion, that great American, Dwight Eisenhower, declared:

> The American conscience could not be at rest until the enslaved peoples regained their liberty. * * * It is only by keeping alive the hope of liberation, and in taking advantage of each opportunity to realize that hope, that the present situation may be changed.

The stouthearted Lithuanians have, in their constant quest for freedom, truly stirred the American conscience.

I, along with all Nebraskans, want to pay tribute to the perseverance and courage of these sturdy people. Their determination to one day throw off the Soviet yoke and walk with heads high, free, and independent, can only strengthen our own resolve to help bring about that end.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, we commemorate today's 48th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence at the same time we honor the courageous spirit of the Lithuanian people whose hope for freedom has survived over a quarter century of oppression.

But we can do more than merely speak of that day, 48 years ago, when the people of Lithuania did manage to end 123 years of oppression and establish a Republic for which they had great love—and great hope.

We should speak also of the valuable contributions Lithuania made to European civilization throughout its history—a history first recorded as early as the 13th century. And we should speak of the contributions of our Lithuanian-Americans whose heritage has enriched our own culture.

For the more than 3 million people who are still living in Lithuania, we extend not only our sympathy but reaffirm our friendship and encourage their efforts to secure the freedom they have so steadfastly sought—and only briefly enjoyed.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, today marks the 48th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, one of three Baltic States whose peoples have made a unique contribution to the development of America.

It is an occasion for sorrow and hope—sorrow over the fact that an independent Lithuania, as well as Estonia and Latvia, lost their freedom to an aggressive and expansionist Soviet Union, and hope that that freedom may one day be restored.

In my own State of New Jersey, Americans of Lithuanian descent have expressed that sorrow and hope, which I fully share, in two recently adopted resolutions. I ask unanimous consent that these expressions by the Lithuanian American Council and the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objections, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED ON FEBRUARY 6, 1966, BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF LINDEN, N.J., GATHERED UNDER AUSPICES OF LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, LINDEN BRANCH, FOR COMMEMORATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Whereas February 16, 1966, marks the 48th anniversary of the formation of a free and independent Lithuania, an act strongly supported by President Woodrow Wilson's declaration of 14 points, which expressed the principles of national self-determination; and

Whereas Lithuania has been occupied and its peoples subjugated by the Soviet Union since 1940, yet the will and the spirit of the enslaved population to this date has not been overcome; and

Whereas Americans of Lithuanian descent on the occasion of this anniversary pledge to continue all efforts toward the restoration of a free and independent status for the Baltic countries, and on this day repeat to those behind the Iron Curtain—We have not forgotten; and

Whereas the U.S. policy of nonrecognition of the forcible incorporation of the Baltic states into the Soviet Union remains a symbol of our Government's consistent good faith in the performance of her foreign relations as presently demonstrated by the strong commitment taken regarding the critical southeast Asian situation, where freedom is also under attack; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we Lithuanian Americans are determined to support all efforts toward the restoration of freedom in Lithuania; and

Resolved, That the current U.S. policy and commitment in the Asiatic area offers renewed encouragement that the 26-year status of the Baltic nations may be reappraised consistent with U.S. determination to support and maintain freedom in other forcibly dominated areas of the world; further be it

Resolved, That we hereby reaffirm our earnest hope that the power and prestige of our great Nation, the United States of America, can be effectively exercised for the ultimate liberation of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania; and be it

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Lyndon B. Johnson; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk; to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg; to the U.S. Senators of New Jersey, the Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE and the Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS; to the Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey, the Honorable FLORENCE P. DWYER and to the Governor of New Jersey, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes.

VLADAS TURSA, *President*.
STASYS VAICIUNAS, *Secretary*.
MARGARITA SAMATAS,
Chairman of Resolutions Committee.

FEBRUARY 6, 1966.

We, Americans of Lithuanian ancestry, having called a mass meeting on the 13th day of February 1966 at St. George's Hall, 180 New York Avenue, Newark, N.J., to observe the anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence 48 years ago, on February 16, 1918, and mindful of the sad fact that the homeland of our forefathers is still oppressed and suffering under the cruel yoke of Soviet Communist enslavement illegally and treacherously imposed by the Soviet Union in 1940, unanimously adopted the following:

"Whereas the United Nations and the United States have been instrumental in freeing many formerly foreign colonial lands and bringing them into the community of free nations; and

"Whereas the Soviet Union, a member of the United Nations and vociferous in demanding that an end be put to all foreign colonialism, in fact and in deed has made the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into modern-day European colonies in the Soviet empire; and

"Whereas the Soviet Union is striving by any and all means to win recognition of its illegal seizure, and incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That we thank our Government for its just and firm stand in denouncing and refusing to recognize the Soviet aggression and occupation, and ask the administration to continue, whenever and wherever possible, to demand that the Soviets end their colonialism, withdraw their administration and forces from Lithuania and the other two Baltic States, and allow them to restore their independence, sovereignty, and self-rule; also be it

"*Resolved,* That we urge the administration not to ratify the consular convention under discussion with U.S.S.R., inasmuch as this would only serve to increase the number of Communist espionage centers in our country; also be it

"*Resolved,* That this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; to the Secretary of State; to the Senators and Congressmen from our State, and the press."

Done at Newark, N.J., the 13th day of February 1966.

Lithuanian Council of New Jersey.
Valentinas Melinis, *Chairman.*
Albin S. Treciokas, *Secretary.*

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], could not be in the city today, and for this reason he asked me to put into the Record his statement in honor of the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Senator Douglas has for many years been one of the leaders in the fight against Communist aggression and tyranny and the fight to continue to encourage people to work to achieve an independent Lithuania.

I think my colleague's remarks on this occasion are meaningful and worthwhile and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Douglas

In February of 1918, in enthusiastic response to the doctrine of self-determination that was carried to a ravaged Europe by Woodrow Wilson, a popularly supported government formally declared Lithuania's independence. To understand how momentous an event this was, one has to know that it was preceded by more than a century of Russian domination, and that during the First World War, German aggression succeeded Russian suppression.

At the time of that brave declaration of independence the people of Lithuania were struggling to protect their country against yet another takeover by the Russians. In the face of this peril an extraordinarily progressive and enlightened government set to work with the exuberant support of the people. Free Lithuania was recognized by the great powers and, in 1921, became a member of the League of Nations. In the 20 years of freedom that followed, Lithuania developed with remarkable speed. The economy was stable and at the same time dynamic. Agriculture thrived. The people's education, health and welfare were considered matters of the first importance and their needs were served. The success of free Lithuania was noticed and admired by the entire Western World. Communist Russia, limping along nearby with a faltering economy and a hungry population, could not tolerate the contrast. Like Goliath, Russia resorted to brawn in the absence of brains. Lithuania, along with her neighboring states along the Baltic, was brutally annexed in 1940 and thousands of her people were murdered and deported to Siberian prison camps. The accomplishments of independence were torn asunder, but the experience of freedom and self-government was not erased from memory.

Lithuanian resistance began on the first day of the Red army's invasion. The President of the Republic left the country to carry on in exile the struggle for restored independence. Several resistance organizations were founded and they fought valiantly against the Russian occupying forces. The struggle continues.

There is no evidence that the devotion of Lithuanians to their national identity and to the goal of independence has waned. The Communists have tried to subvert those customs and institutions that foster patriotism and pride in Lithuania's cultural heritage. Such efforts will never work. The principle that men have a right to live in freedom and to govern themselves cannot be excised from their hearts and minds. Indeed, as Thomas Jefferson said over a century ago, "The flames kindled on the 4th of July 1776, have spread over too much of the globe to be extinguished by the feeble engines of despotism; on the contrary, they will consume them and all who work them."

We recall Lithuanian Independence Day each year to reaffirm our friendship and support of the people in Lithuania for whom freedom is still a memory and a dream. The Lithuanians who have come to the United States since World War I are a vital, contributing group of citizens. They know, as few can who have lived in freedom all their lives, the speed and ease with which liberty can be stolen and the suffering endured until it is regained.

Most of all, on this day we look to the future and resolve that we will never recognize the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States and we will never forget the true Lithuania which must one day again be free.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, this day marks the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, a day which is commemorated not only by Lithuanians but by all who cherish freedom, independence, and self-determination.

After centuries of czarist rule and subjugation the Lithuanian people, on this day in 1918, established a government of their own and proclaimed their independence.

No people in the world have fought more courageously for their freedom, and few have suffered so much at the hands of a policy which did not recognize the nature of communism and which at the conclusion of World War II abandoned the captive peoples of Europe to tyrannical rule.

For neither now nor at that time can any of the world's problems be solved by turning freemen over to tyrants, or by extinguishing independence by replacing it with subjugation.

We have at a high cost learned the lesson that peace does not mean simply the absence of physical conflict. There is this illusory peace whenever tyrants have destroyed those who would challenge their autocratic rule, but it is based upon slavery and the denial of human dignity. I do not suggest that we embark upon a war which would turn out the Communist leaders of the captive nations. I do, however, suggest that we use every political, economic, and diplomatic weapon at our disposal to achieve this end. In short, I think we can do far more than we have been doing.

By their steadfast refusal to reconcile themselves to tyranny, either under the czars or under the Bolsheviks, the Lithuanian people have inspired all of us to fight harder and work more resolutely for the eternal cause of freedom.

The history of the Lithuanian people is an epic story of heroism and suffering and man's unquenchable will to assert his God-given human rights. It is a story to be told again and again, for freemen everywhere have much to learn from it. It is a sad fact of life that we often fail to learn the most important lessons from those who have learned them at a high cost. Freemen cannot afford to pay the price of the enslavement of their fellow men before they understand that tyranny cannot be tolerated but must be defeated.

When some men are slaves then none can be truly free, and as the Iron Curtain has descended upon country after country we failed to realize that, in fact, the bell was tolling for us.

When the Lithuanian people, at the close of World War I, established their own Government and proclaimed their independence, the Bolsheviks invaded the newly established state. There were many bitter battles but finally the Lithuanian people emerged triumphant. On July 19, 1920, the Soviet Government signed a treaty of peace. It declared in this treaty that it "voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and their territory."

For 20 years Lithuania knew peace and independence. During this period there was a great renaissance of national literature and culture. A free people lived under a government it had instituted, not under the rule of others, and under this rule it flourished.

But then came the Hitler-Stalin pact and the partition of Poland between Germany and the Soviet Union. Almost immediately, the Kremlin demanded permission to place 20,000 troops in Lithuania for the duration of the war. These troops, it was emphasized, would be removed at the end of the war. Prime Minister Stalin himself stated:

> We respect the independence of the Lithuanian state. We are disposed to defend its territorial integrity.

On October 10, 1939, the Soviet Union concentrated its armed forces on the Lithuanian frontier. The Government of this brave little nation had no alternative but to sign the pact of mutual assistance which the Kremlin placed before it. But at the point of signing, they discovered that the clause stipulating that Soviet bases would be maintained in Lithuania only for the duration of the war had been stricken from the agreement.

Eight months later on June 14, 1940, the Soviet Government demanded that the Lithuanian Minister of the Interior and Director of Security be brought to trial, that a government friendly to the Soviet Union be installed and that the Red army be granted free entry in force into the territory of Lithuania. There was not even time to reply to this ultimatum. The very next day, on June 15, the Red army occupied Lithuania and the Government was compelled to flee abroad.

On July 7, 3 weeks after the occupation, the quisling regime ordered the liquidation of all non-Communist parties and the arrest of their leaders. On July 14 and 15, the people were compelled to vote in national elections with only the Communist Party represented. The Lithuanian people resisted heroically, desperately. But they were fighting against hopeless odds. On July 17, the regime announced that 95.1 percent of the people had voted and that 99.19 percent of these had cast their ballot for the Communist Party.

Two days later, on July 21, the so-called Peoples Diet convened for its first session. In less than 1 hour, without any debate, it voted unanimously to ask the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. to admit Lithuania into the Soviet state as one of its federated Soviet Socialist Republics.

This presents us with an object lesson to all those who insist that we must be trustful, who wish to believe that the world's difficulties can be resolved by signing another treaty of nonaggression and coexistence with the Kremlin, who think that we somehow can improve relations by signing treaties with those who have repeatedly violated almost all of the treaties they have already signed.

In enslaving the captive nations, the Soviets were guilty of violating a whole series of international agreements that guaranteed free elections. In imposing their regimes and maintaining them in power, they have used the Soviet Army in the most flagrant manner as an instrument of political intimidations; and when intimidations failed in Germany and in Hungary in recent years, they resorted to open military intervention and repression. They have violated the U.N. Charter repeatedly and at almost every point.

Let us spread the facts about Soviet imperialism on the record at every available opportunity. Let us continue to demand that the Soviets respect all their obligations.

Above all, let us make liberation a cardinal goal of our diplomacy. I do not underestimate the difficulty of persuading the Kremlin to liberate its satellite empire. But, after Hungary, I find it easy to conceive of a situation where a combination of division within the Kremlin, unrest in the satellites and hard bargaining on the part of the West will induce the Soviets—in their own interest—to grant freedom to the unyielding, troublesome captive peoples of Europe.

Liberation is not a pipedream. It is the only conceivable way in which we can recapture the political offensive. And, as every schoolboys knows, a side which defends itself when attacked but never takes the offensive is bound to lose. The same is true in politics.

The message for this day and this hour is a vital one. Americans are today engaged in battle in Asia against the same forces which have enslaved the gallant people of Lithuania. As we pledge ourselves to the freedom of the people of Vietnam, so we must rededicate our pledge to the people of Lithuania.

Our pledge of freedom to the Lithuanian people must be redeemed and we must match their faith with our own in bringing that day forward.

LITHUANIAN HERO REMEMBERED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in 1795, just 6 years after the American colonies accepted the present U.S. Constitution and George Washington was halfway through his second term as President of the United States of America, Lithuania was annexed by Russia after several centuries of Polish domination. The brave Lithuanian people attempted to throw off the Russian domination, but each attempt brought an intensified policy of Russification. The czarist government tried to replace the Lithuanian language and culture with Russian, but all attempts failed. Finally, the Russians gave up in 1905. The Lithuanians had kept their culture, religion, language, and traditions.

The Lithuanian people, however, did not gain their freedom, a goal they had been striving for for many centuries. For this enobling act—their declaration of independence—they had to wait until February 16, 1918. This joyous event was short lived, for just two decades later the little nation was again under Russian domination when it was occupied by the Red army during World War II. The Lithuanians involuntarily traded Russian domination for German domination when the Nazi armies occupied the country between 1941 and 1944. In 1944 the Russian Army again occupied the country, and so Lithuania has remained: a ward of Kremlin colonialism.

Mr. President, although we are today celebrating the 48th anniversary of that short-lived Lithuanian independence declaration, it is of an event that took place 102 years ago next month that I wish to call to your attention on this memorable date: the execution of Constantine Kalinauskis, that great Lithuanian patriot and "apostle of democratic ideals" as he was known to his contemporaries. Although Kalinauskis lived only 26 years, dying on the gallows in March of 1864, at the hands of the Russians, his contributions to Lithuanian independence cannot go unremembered.

The son of impoverished parents, Simon and Veronica Kalinauskis, Constantine was born in Mastaulenai on January 21, 1838. Constantine Kalinauskis was a flaming patriot, a fighter for justice for the Lithuania he loved and an extremist of the best sort because he had so much faith in the common people of his country. He also had a vision of a free Lithuania, a vision that in reality only materialized for 21 years beginning 54 years after his execution.

From his death cell below the gallows in February 1864, Kalinauskis was able somehow to smuggle out of prison his last penned lines to his people. I should like to quote part of those grand lines, for they are as truthful and enobling and meaningful as though they were written today.

> I am writing to you from underneath the Muscovite gallows, probably for the last time. It hurts to leave the native soil and you, my dear fellow countrymen. My breast is rending apart, my heart is breaking, but I do not regret my dying for the cause of justice to you. * * * For I say unto you * * * you shall be able to live in happiness only when the Muscovite shall have been removed from your necks.

Perhaps in our lifetime, Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian peoples will find the independence from foreign domination they have so ardently sought for so many years.

L.B.J.'S EXCELLENT APPOINTMENT OF LEE WHITE TO FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there have been times in the past when I have been critical of Presidential appointments to the Federal Power Commission. I have fought the appointment of men who, in my judgment, had long backgrounds of representing vested interests to the FPC. On one occasion, I held the floor for more than 24 hours to bring to the Senate's and the country's attention an appointment to the FPC that I firmly opposed.

Also, I have criticized the failure of Presidents to reappoint men of the proved capacity of William Connole and Joseph Swidler.

With this background in mind, it is a happy occasion for me to be able to rise today on the floor of the Senate and thank President Johnson for his appointment of Lee White, as Chairman of the FPC. Mr. White replaces Joseph Swidler, who has done a superb job. Mr. Swidler not only fought hard for fair and equitable regulation that fully considered consumer interests, but he also had the competence and integrity to win the approval of the industry itself. He has been a great and trailblazing Commissioner during a most trying and difficult time for the industry and for consumers.

Lee White is extraordinarily well qualified to carry on in this tradition. As a matter of fact, Mr. White has worked closely with Mr. Swidler in the past. Mr. White has a record of immensely industrious, hard driving work. He is intelligent, gifted with a careful judicious temperament, and substantial experience in working with the power industry.

President Johnson deserves great credit for a fine appointment.

I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial published in the New York Times supporting the White appointment printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITE TO FPC

> The appointment of Lee C. White, as Chairman of the Federal Power Commission is an excellent solution to what has been one of President Johnson's most difficult personnel problems. The Chairman of the FPC has to provide leadership—and often cast

the deciding vote—on complicated cases arising in the natural gas and electric power industries.

Joseph C. Swidler, who stepped down as Chairman late last year, proved that it was possible to protect consumers and still be fair to the gas and power producers. Rates went down and yet profits went up during his tenure. Mr. White can be expected to carry forward Mr. Swidler's policy of vigilance and fairness. The new Chairman has been a tireless, tactful and effective public servant. He has done important work behind the scenes on civil rights, conservation, and many other pieces of domestic legislation.

Mr. White's first task in his new job will be to carry out the recommendations Mr. Swidler made in his report on last November's blackout. Some of these require additional authority from Congress. Mr. White's experience on Capitol Hill should help him in this assignment.

THE MISSILE CRISIS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the head of the Washington Bureau of the Chicago Tribune, Willard Edwards, has written an excellent review of the book entitled "The Missile Crisis," written by Elie Abel. This review is concise and shows the excellent nature of Mr. Abel's book, which analyzes the situation in 1962, when the world was so close to nuclear catastrophe, and the terrible decision that President Kennedy had to make, under those circumstances.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the review written by Willard Edwards entitled, "At the Abyss of a Nuclear War."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AT THE ABYSS OF A NUCLEAR WAR: THE MISSILE CRISIS—A REPORT BY ELIE ABEL

(Reviewed by Willard Edwards)

Early in the morning of Saturday, October 20, 1962, President Kennedy, occupying the Presidential suite in the Sheraton Blackstone Hotel in Chicago, announced that he had a slight cold.

The weather was raw and rainy and physicians had warned him to take no chances. He was cutting off a campaign trip, started the day before in behalf of Democratic candidates in the November elections of that year, and flying back to Washington.

Puzzled correspondents noted the President's obvious fitness, recognized the excuse of illness as fictitious and speculated that something was up. Six hours later, they and the American people knew that the United States and Russia were peering into the abyss of nuclear war.

The President had no cold but he had reason for a variety of emotions—anger and dismay among them. For 4 days, he had been wrestling with a crisis created by an act of massive treachery. Still suffering from the humiliation of the Bay of Pigs disaster, he had been informed on October 16 that Russia had planted ballistic missiles, with ranges of 1,000 and 1,500 miles in Cuba, 90 miles from Florida.

Premier Nikita Khrushchev, having bullied Kennedy about the Bay of Pigs at their Vienna meeting in June 1961, and having taken, as he believed, the young President's measure, had decided this was a timid adversary, unwilling to use the vast power of the United States, who could be blackmailed and intimidated.

It is a measure of the fantastic political necessities imposed upon American officeholders that Kennedy, buffeted by conflicting advice from his military and civilian advisers, believed it necessary to depart from Washington October 19 for a round of campaign speeches in the Midwest.

As he touted the virtues of party candidates at political rallies, he was inwardly tormented by doubts over the dread decision he had to make. With polite inanities on his lips, he had to ponder a course of conduct affecting the future of his country and the world. It is a bizarre episode and its significance is not lessened by Kennedy's own sardonic reflection: "I guess this is the week I had better earn my salary."

The story of the 13 dramatic days of the Cuban missile crisis, October 16 to 28, has been told and retold in a host of newspaper and magazine accounts and in the flood of Kennedy books. But there is much that seems new in Abel's recitation and more that is genuinely fresh. By comparison with the history currently most popular, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.'s "A Thousand Days," it is more exciting and, of course, much more detailed. Schlesinger gives this incredibly dangerous period of the Kennedy administration less than 50 pages of his monumental 1,031 page work. The "insider" view is always valuable but Abel, a good reporter relying upon interviews and records, has provided a perspective and an emphasis which makes the whole terrifying episode live again.

He says he did not realize how close the world came to disaster until he began research for the book and it is perhaps best that this realization was withheld from the American people and the world at the time of the crisis. Even now, more than 3 years later, the reader will have a tendency to gasp as he comprehends the guesswork, the fumbling, the groping, the agonized conjectures which distinguished the thinking of Russian and American leaders as they somehow stumbled out of darkness into the light.

It's a good, exciting book about the most dangerous 13 days of this or perhaps any century, containing much that's omitted in the Sorensen and Schlesinger accounts of the Cuban missile crisis.

The story begins with McGeorge Bundy, Presidential assistant for national security affairs, asserting firmly on October 14 that there was no evidence and no likelihood of Russia putting missiles into Cuba. One day later, Bundy had the embarrassing task of informing Kennedy that U-2 plane photographs revealed that missiles not only were in Cuba but had been there for months.

The entire Washington intelligence community had been caught napping, simply unwilling to believe that Khrushchev would do in Cuba what he had never done on the territories of other nations, not even on the territories of his Warsaw pact allies. Bundy decided to permit Kennedy 1 night of peaceful sleep in preparation for the ordeal ahead.

Hour by hour, day by day, Abel reports the frantic secret conferences that followed; the advances and retreats, the controversy between the hawks who wanted to bomb the missile bases and the doves who counseled appeasement. A letter from Khrushchev to Kennedy, paraphrased but given here in detail for the first time, is rightly described by Abel as "the nightmare outcry of a frightened man." It is a fitting exhibit in an account of men under pressure who sincerely believed that the world might blow up at any moment.

FRED FRIENDLY'S SACRIFICE SHOULD NOT BE IN VAIN

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, yesterday, it was announced that Fred W. Friendly, president of Columbia Broadcasting News, had terminated his relationship with the Columbia Broadcasting System after 16 years with that organization.

His resignation is in the highest traditions of journalism. His sacrifice—his resignation in protest against an attempt to keep from the American public the live broadcast of the public hearings on the crisis in Vietnam being conducted by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations—should not be in vain.

Indeed, his resignation raises serious questions as to the duties and responsibilities of the networks in the coverage of news and its transmission to the public.

The simultaneous announcement by CBS of Mr. Friendly's resignation and its decision to resume the live coverage of the committee hearings on Thursday and Friday may well mean that CBS has received the message intended to be conveyed by Mr. Friendly.

However, the question remains: What lies behind this attempt to keep from the American television audiences the true facts about our involvement in Vietnam? What were the pressures—if any—exerted on CBS to cause it initially to decide that its viewers should not see a live broadcast of the testimony by Mr. Kennan before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. Friendly's resignation was covered by the New York Times in excellent fashion. It was treated as front page news—which it was—deserving of an excellent editorial, which the Times gave it.

I ask unanimous consent that the news story, the editorial, and the reprint of the letter of resignation of Mr. Friendly as printed in the New York Times of February 16, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Feb. 16, 1966]

FRIENDLY QUITS CBS NEWS POST IN DISPUTE OVER VIETNAM HEARING: HIS NEW SUPERIOR CANCELED LIVE COVERAGE OF KENNAN BEFORE SENATE PANEL

(By Jack Gould)

Fred W. Friendly resigned yesterday as president of the Columbia Broadcasting System News Division in protest against working under a new superior who canceled live coverage of last Thursday's hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. Friendly charged that John A. Schneider, newly appointed to the No. 3 post in the CBS hierarchy, lacked adequate experience in national and international affairs to have a veto power over the news department.

Mr. Friendly, who first achieved renown as coeditor with the late Edward R. Murrow of the controversial "See It Now" documentaries, said that Mr Schneider's cancellation of Thursday's hearing was "a business, not a news, judgment." He argued that the autonomy of the news department had suffered a "form of emasculation."

CBS management vigorously supported Mr. Schneider's qualifications as group vice president, broadcasting, the post in which he will have responsibility for the news, television, radio, and station divisions.

The overall CBS record in news deserves to be remembered, an official of the broadcasting organization said, and he added that both William S. Paley, chairman, and Dr. Frank Stanton, president, are as interested now as before in thorough reporting.

The network announced last night that CBS would carry live the testimony of Gen.

Maxwell D. Taylor, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at tomorrow's hearing of the Senate committee and Secretary of State Dean Rusk's appearance on Friday. The National Broadcasting Co. which carried last Thursday's hearing, had announced similar plans on Monday.

Mr. Friendly's resignation came as a climax to 5 days of corporate drama that showed no signs of subsiding last night.

Sixteen news producers at CBS sent a joint telegram to Mr. Paley, Dr. Stanton, and Mr. Schneider urging that new efforts be initiated to reconcile the intracorporation difference. Walter Cronkite, the network's star commentator on its evening news show, voiced regret over Mr. Friendly's departure and said it meant the loss of his "brilliant, imaginative, and hard-hitting guidance."

The three vice presidents working directly under Mr. Friendly—David Klinger, Bill Leonard and Gordon Manning—joined in the appeal to find "some means to make it possible for Mr. Friendly to resume his leadership."

Prospects of a successful appeal are not considered bright because reinstatement of Mr. Friendly would mean a lessening of the stature of Mr. Schneider, according to WTV officials familiar with the industry's periodic shakeups.

Last week's realinement of the top CBS executive structure carried the approval of the board of directors and Mr. Paley.

It was reported last night that in the first few days a number of prominent persons in Washington had voiced hopes to CBS that Mr. Friendly would be retained.

Mr. Friendly first offered his retirement on Thursday when he watched NBC present the testimony of George F. Kennan, former Ambassador to Moscow, while CBS was carrying a rerun of "I Love Lucy." A showdown over the weekend was postponed, but yesterday Dr. Stanton announced acceptance of the resignation.

The text of his statement follows:

"It is with deep regret that I accept the resignation of Fred W. Friendly as president of the CBS News Division. Mr. Friendly feels that he is unable to continue in his post as a result of a decision made by the recently appointed group vice president, broadcasting, John A. Schneider, not to schedule live television coverage of the testimony of George F. Kennan before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week.

"Fred Friendly has been an outstanding leader of broadcast journalism. His contributions to the public, to his profession and to CBS have been great indeed. My associates, his colleagues and I will miss him."

Mr. Friendly, who has always displayed a fierce dedication to the journalistic potential of TV, released a four-page letter in which he asserted the failure to carry Thursday's hearing made a "mockery" of the crusade by Mr. Paley, Dr. Stanton and the Columbia News Division to obtain access to congressional debates.

QUALIFICATIONS QUESTIONED

But the heart of Mr. Friendly's thesis, echoed in his quotations from a 1958 speech by Mr. Murrow, was directed at Mr. Schneider's qualifications. For 8 years the new head of the broadcasting divisions worked in the sales end of the television business and then became a station general manager in Philadelphia and New York. As president of the CBS television network until last week, he was chiefly concerned with entertainment matters.

Mr. Friendly noted that historically, final decisions on news matters were rendered either by Mr. Paley or Dr. Stanton.

"Mr. Schneider, because of his absolute power, would have more authority than William Paley or Frank Stanton have exercised in the past 2 years," Mr. Friendly said. "This in spite of the fact that Mr. Schneider's news credentials were limited in the past to local station operations, with little experience in national or international affairs."

Mr. Friendly's resignation stunned the broadcast industry more than any other executive upheaval in recent years because his letter raised the question on commercial influences over TV content, probably the most perennially debated aspect of the medium. In addition, his association with Mr. Murrow has made him a symbol of provocative journalism.

The 50-year-old Mr. Friendly's height and broad shoulders have earned him the nickname of "the big bear." Within the industry the passion of his commitment to video journalism is legendary and it has been especially pronounced in the current Vietnam crisis.

The substance of the management's position was learned informally. In the past Mr. Friendly has not always obtained the live coverage he wanted from Dr. Stanton and Mr. Paley, it was noted, yet their veto did not result in an open break. It was learned that Dr. Stanton asked Mr. Friendly to give Mr. Schneider some time in his new job to see how the new executive reacted to a series of requests for special time for the news department.

VIETNAM VERSUS LUCY

Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, can be sure of this: A great many of us will share his "deep regret" at the resignation of Fred W. Friendly as president of CBS News.

How the radio and television networks manage their internal corporate affairs is no business of ours, but how they use the air waves is of concern to everyone.

To carry live on television the major testimony of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's inquiry on American policy in Vietnam is public service of a high order. We agree with Mr. Friendly that this is a contribution to "one of the crucial debates of our time," and that there is no TV substitute for live coverage. We doubt that CBS gained any durable audience by playing a rerun of "I Love Lucy" while NBC continued to televise the hearings.

Mr. Friendly has fought hard for prime TV time for programs of news and public affairs. He has won great respect for the reporting in depth achieved in "CBS Reports," as well as for his collaboration on many public affairs programs with the late Edward R. Murrow. In fact, Mr. Friendly's appointment as head of CBS News in 1964 gave the network's correspondents and news editors a boost in morale badly needed since Mr. Murrow's departure to enter Government service in 1961. He will be missed, and the circumstances of his departure speak ill for CBS's sense of news responsibility.

TEXT OF FRIENDLY'S LETTER OF RESIGNATION TO CBS

(Following is the text of the letter of resignation sent yesterday by Fred W. Friendly, president of CBS News, to William S. Paley, chairman of the Columbia Broadcasting System, and Dr. Frank Stanton, president.)

DEAR BILL and FRANK: This is the third time since last Thursday that I have asked you to accept my resignation as president of CBS News, and this time you have an obligation to accept it.

It is important that you and my colleagues in the news division know that I am not motivated by pique or change of status in a table of organization, or lack of respect for Jack Schneider. He is, as you have both recalled, someone I had asked to join the news division in an administrative role more than a year ago, when he was station manager of WCAU–TV.

I am resigning because CBS News did not carry the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings last Thursday, when former Ambassador George Kennan testified on Vietnam. It was the considered news judgment of every executive in CND (Columbia News Division) that we carry these Vietnam hearings as we had those of the other witnesses. I am convinced that the decision not to carry them was a business, not a news, judgment.

I am resigning because the decision not to carry the hearings makes a mockery of the Paley-Stanton CND crusade of many years that demands broadest access to congressional debate. Only last year, in a most eloquent letter, you petitioned the Chief Justice for the right to televise live sessions of the Supreme Court. We cannot, in our public utterances, demand such access and then, in one of the crucial debates of our time, abdicate that responsibility. What happens to that sense of fairness and balance so close to both of you, when 1 day's hearings, and perhaps the most comprehensive, are omitted? How can we return on Thursday and Friday of this week without denying Schneider's argument that "the housewife isn't interested?" Why were NBC's housewives interested? What would have happened to those housewives if the Supreme Court had said "Yes" to your plea for live coverage? Where would broadcast journalism have been last Thursday if NBC had elected not to carry the U.S. Senate hearings on the war?

When last Thursday morning at 10 o'clock I looked at the monitors in my office and saw the hearings on channel 4 (pool production, by the way, via CBS News crews) and saw a fifth rerun of "Lucy," then followed by an eighth rerun of "The Real McCoys," I wanted to order up an announcement that said: "Due to circumstances beyond our control the broadcast originally intended for this time will not be seen." It was not within CND's control because the journalistic judgment had been by a sudden organizational act transferred to a single executive. Mr. Schneider, because of his absolute power, would have more authority than William Paley or Frank Stanton have exercised in the past 2 years. This, in spite of the fact that Mr. Schneider's news credentials were limited in the past to local station operations, with little experience in national or international affairs.

The concept of an autonomous news organization responsible only to the chairman and the president was not a creation of mine. It is a concept almost as old as CBS News, and is a tradition nurtured by the Ed Klaubers, the Ed Murrows, the Paul Whites, and rigidly enforced by both of you. The dramatic change in that concept is, to my mind and that of my colleagues, a form of emasculation.

Actually, it is the second step of the emasculation that began when CBS News was shorn of its responsibility in the news operation at WCBS–TV here in New York. Had I been in my current position at the time of this change, I should have resisted it as I do the current weakening. It denied CBS News a highly professional outlet in New York, a competitive position with the other networks, and the training apparatus for the Sevareids, the Cronkites, the Reasoners of the future.

My departure is a matter of conscience. At the end of the day it is the viewer and the listener who have the biggest stake in all this. Perhaps my action will be understood by them. I know it will be understood by my colleagues in news and I know Ed Murrow would have understood. A speech he delivered to the Radio Television News Directors Association in 1958 spelled it all out:

"One of the basic troubles with radio and television news is that both instruments have grown up as an incompatible combination of show business, advertising, and news.

Each of the three is a rather bizarre and demanding profession. And when you get all three under one roof, the dust never settles. The top management of the networks, with a few notable exceptions, has been trained in advertising, research, sales, or show business. But, by the nature of the corporate structure, they also make the final and crucial decisions having to do with news and public affairs.

"Frequently they have neither the time nor the competence to do this. It is not easy for the same small group of men to decide whether to buy a new station for millions of dollars, build a new building, alter the rate card, buy a new western, sell a soap opera, decide what defensive line to take in connection with the latest congressional inquiry, how much money to spend on promoting a new program, what additions or deletions should be made in the existing covey or clutch of vice presidents and, at the same time—frequently on the same long day—to give mature, thoughtful consideration to the manifold problems that confront those who are charged with the responsibility for news and public affairs * * *."

Such a day was last Thursday when a nonnews judgment was made on the Kennan broadcast.

Murrow went on to say:

"Upon occasion, economics and editorial judgment are in conflict. And there is no law which says that dollars will be defeated by duty. Not so long ago the President of the United States delivered a television address to the Nation. He was discoursing on the possibility or probability of war between this Nation and the Soviet Union and Communist China—a reasonably compelling subject. Two networks—CBS and NBC—delayed that broadcast for an hour and 15 minutes. If this decision was dictated by anything other than financial reasons, the networks didn't deign to explain those reasons. That hour-and-15-minute delay, by the way, is about twice the time required for an ICBM to travel from the Soviet Union to major targets in the United States. It is difficult to believe that this decision was made by men who love, respect, and understand news."

In that speech Ed also said:

"There is no suggestion here that networks or individual stations should operate as philanthropies. I can find nothing in the Bill of Rights or the Communications Act which says that they must increase their net profits each year, lest the Republic collapse."

I now leave CBS News convinced, ironically, that my leaving will help insure the integrity and independence of the news operation. I believe that the Senate hearings next Thursday and Friday will be televised live because of circumstances within the control of the man you choose to succeed me. For the kind of news executive who would warrant the trust of the two recipients of this letter would insist upon such a mandate. Senator George Norris, quoted in John Kennedy's "Profiles in Courage," says "Whatever use I have been has been accomplished in the things I failed to do rather than in the things I actually did do."

I now leave CBS News after 16 years, believing that the finest broadcast journalists anywhere will yet have the kind of leadership they deserve. I know that I take with me their respect and affection as, indeed, I hope I do yours.

Faithfully,

FRED.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in contrast, the Washington Post, which has a CBS television affiliation, did not carry Mr. Friendly's resignation as news. Instead, it was adverted to in the column written by Lawrence Laurent on the next to last page next to the comics. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Laurent's column printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 16, 1966]

FRED W. FRIENDLY: ONE MAN WHO QUIT

(By Lawrence Laurent)

Fred W. Friendly, with an independence that has been his trademark through 28 years of broadcasting, made the decision all by himself to resign as president of CBS News.

This is a rare occurrence at broadcasting networks. Usually, if a man is fired, the event is referred to as a "resignation." The toughest term ever permitted is that a departed employe's services were "terminated by mutual consent."

But Fred W. Friendly, a volatile, emotional man, quit after a disagreement with his new boss, John A. Schneider. Schneider was promoted last Wednesday from president of the CBS television network to group vice president, broadcasting.

In the elaborate organization of CBS, Inc., Schneider had been Friendly's equal. On Wednesday, Schneider moved up, second only to Dr. Frank Stanton (president of CBS, Inc.) and to board chairman William Paley.

The Wednesday date is important, for on Thursday came a debate between Friendly and Schneider. Friendly wanted live TV coverage of George F. Kennan's testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Schneider decided to go with the regular schedule but added that live coverage might come this week.

The official announcement, made yesterday by Dr. Stanton, said: "Friendly feels he is unable to continue in his post as a result of a decision made by * * * Schneider not to schedule live coverage of the testimony * * *."

Stanton added: "Fred Friendly has been an outstanding leader of broadcast journalism. His contributions to the public, to his profession and to CBS have been great indeed. My associates, his colleagues and I will miss him."

Fred's emotions were shown plainly in his letter of resignation. He called it "a matter of conscience." After the decision not to broadcast Kennan's testimony, Friendly watched the four TV monitors that are in his office. While NBC telecast the hearing, Friendly said, CBS was showing "a fifth rerun of 'I Love Lucy' and an eighth rerun of 'The Real McCoys.'"

"I wanted to order up an announcement that said: 'Due to circumstances beyond our control the broadcast originally intended for this time will not be seen,'" Friendly wrote.

His letter of resignation also said: "I am resigning because the decision not to carry the hearings makes a mockery of the Paley-Stanton CND (Columbia News Division) crusade of many years that demands broadcast access to congressional debate."

Friendly, TV's most honored producer of news documentary programs, moved to the presidency of CBS News, March 2, 1964. His success continued after he introduced the national TV "test" programs and as the Walter Cronkite news program gained ground and sometimes won higher ratings than the NBC team of Chet Huntley and David Brinkley.

One good source in New York said yesterday: "Of course, CBS hates to lose Fred. But he stood on principle and made his fight at the wrong time. The network has no choice in such a fight but to uphold its top executive."

Speculation began immediately about Friendly's successor. The names that cropped up immediately were those of Gordon Manning and Bill Leonard. Manning was executive editor of Newsweek for 3 years before Friendly selected him to become CBS News vice president and director of television news in December 1964.

At the same time, veteran broadcaster Leonard was promoted to vice president and director of news programing. The promotion came after Leonard had pioneered new techniques for covering elections.

Privately, Friendly has complained, rather mildly, that the presidency of CBS News brought him smaller earnings than he had made as a documentary producer. There's almost no doubt that he'll return to making documentaries and there's even less doubt that a network will hire him.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield at that point?

Mr. GRUENING. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I commend the Senator from Alaska for his statement. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to express appreciation for the coverage which television provided for the committee hearings. I believe that the action of the Columbia Broadcasting System and the success of the hearings in reaching the American people raises an interesting question. Many thoughtful Americans express apprehension as to the imbalance of power between the executive and legislative branches of Government. The President has frequently resorted—and properly so—to every means of communication.

The state of the Union message is not a message to Congress any more, but, over the heads of Congress, to the American people. I do not speak critically of this situation, because we have a people's government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARTKE in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GORE. I ask unanimous consent that 3 additional minutes be allowed to the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. If the legislative branch is without the facility to communicate with the American people, how is this imbalance to be corrected, I ask the Senator?

Mr. GRUENING. I believe that the remarks of the senior Senator from Tennessee are extremely pertinent. I know of no more important function in a democracy, in a government of free people, than that the people shall have full access to all the actions of their government. Very frequently that has not been forthcoming.

I believe that broadcasting by the national networks by TV, the hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations, was one of the most important public services for the benefit of our democratic system that has been rendered in our time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the hearings deal with the most important issue before the Nation and the world today. I doubt that a more important committee hearing has been held in the last 20 years. Fortunately, the message is reaching the American people. Millions of people have been able to see and hear the issue questioned. It has not been a side show. I believe the Senator will agree that it has been a thorough examination of the commitments, the issues, and possible consequences.

If the American people are not entitled to the fullest information on such an issue as this, the issue of war and peace, then for what purpose should the Government permit the use of the ether waves?

Let us never forget that every single television station operates at the license of the Government. The wavelengths belong to all the people of the country. In my view, Congress should give very careful consideration to an allocation of a certain amount of time of certain wavelengths, for presentation, for discussion, for examination of public issues, not alone by the Congress, but surely partly by the Congress.

Mr. GRUENING. I could not agree more with the wise and penetrating statement of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. It is very much the business of the American people. The southeast Asian involvement is one of the most critical issues before us, as we are being led more and more deeply into a war in which Congress has had no real voice.

Mr. GORE. And the Government has been very profligate in allowing the wavelengths to be monopolized by commercial organizations. The very idea of a vast television network using the wavelengths that belong to the whole people to advertise soap, when we should be having a critical examination of the issue of war and peace, makes it apparent that there should be a reexamination of the whole question of licensing television.

Mr. GRUENING. I hope Congress will not only examine this case, but the whole subject, which affects the right to know of the American people.

OUR COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, with my responsibilities of being chairman of a committee as well as the assistant majority leader, I was not able to be present at the hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee, but I want to say that these advocates of retreat, defeat, surrender, and national dishonor have not been doing the country any good when they went before a television network suggesting that this Nation was not committed to fighting aggression in this area. The Senate voted for the resolution last year, and Senators voted that this country would help that country resist aggression, and specifically authorized the President to take whatever steps he felt necessary to resist further aggression. We are committed. We have more than 200,000 men there. We have at stake our national honor. We are committed to resisting Communist aggression. That is what this is all about. It has been going on for some time.

The Senator from Alaska voted against the resolution, and he was privileged to do it, but once the Congress adopted that resolution, it had taken a firm position. Once Congress authorized the President to do that which he felt necessary, the President was authorized to do it. It was authorized in the resolution and discussed specifically during the debate on the floor of the Senate. He was authorized to send troops wherever necessary to resist aggression in the area.

It is not helping our country when Senators go before the Nation and express their fears on this issue that the Red Chinese might come in, and the fact that we are losing some American boys. We are inflicting at least 10 to 1 damage on the North Vietnam invaders compared to the losses suffered by our forces.

If this great nation is to be humiliated, is to be defeated and run out and be downgraded to a second-class power by that little nation, then I wish Red China would come in. It would be a great humiliation for this Nation to be defeated by a small nation of 16 million people. If we must be defeated, it would be better to lose to a large nation of 700 million people.

This Nation was founded because we had courageous men. We became a great nation because the people had courage. They did not give up because they had to fight Indians. If the men who came on the *Mayflower* were frightened to helplessness the first time they had to fight Indians, they would have gone back to England on the *Mayflower*. But they fought the Indians and won, meanwhile losing some fine Americans, until this Nation became great. We are upholding our commitments in the proud tradition of our fathers, grandfathers, great-grandfathers, and many other courageous Americans who fell on the field of battle.

I only wish that back during the Civil War there had been a humorous element in the Congress that would have appeared daily before a nationwide television network and have said, "We fought and lost a Yankee today. We lost a boy today let us quit." If they had spread that propaganda, it might have spread fear. Maybe the war would have gone the other way. Then we would have won the principles of States rights. We would prove that we were the strong people. Having achieved victory we could have offered to rejoin the Union with considerable pride that our theory of States rights had been sustained.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. If the hearings continue to be televised, the American people may learn of the mistaken concept stated by our distinguished majority whip, that we have a solemn commitment. They will learn there was no such solemn commitment; that we were never so committed; that our commitment was a tentative one, dealing only with economic aid and further conditioned on reforms by the South Vietnam Government which were never made. There was never any commitment to send our troops into combat. We must inform the public of these facts, and they must be brought home to the American people.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not regard this Nation as being an international criminal, as the Senator from Oregon has said, and I do not regard this Nation as being an international aggressor, as the Senator from Alaska has said. I regard the Communists as the aggressors. We helped organize the peaceful nation of South Vietnam. We are members of the SEATO agreement. We let those people know that we would help them resist aggression. We said we would put ships and advisers in there at that time to help those people defend themselves against subversion and aggression.

Then, the Communists came and they attacked our ships in the Gulf of Tonkin. That was an act of war. We shot back. Not only did we shoot back, but we bombed the bases from which those torpedo boats came to attack our ships.

So that there will not be any misunderstandings, at the time I was in charge of debating the equalization tax here on the Senate floor, the President asked Senators on the Republican side of the aisle and Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle to come to the White House and talk with him. While Senators were debating on the floor, the entire matter was discussed. The President asked for that resolution for authority broad enough to authorize putting troops in there and we understood that, if need be, the resolution said that he was authorized to take any steps necessary to resist aggression in that area.

It was explained on the floor of the Senate by the chairman of the committee. The resolution was broad enough to put Army men on the land mass of Asia.

Then, North Vietnam regular army units proceeded to march on South Vietnam. We put our troops there to resist aggression. They are the aggressors. We went in after that date. We are fighting there pursuant to that resolution. Our national honor is committed to it.

I do not believe it serves the purposes of this country to have two Senators who voted against the purpose of this Nation making a speech every week and sometimes every day against our determined national purpose to uphold our national honor and to keep our word and our commitment.

I do not believe it is helpful to go on national television and suggest that we are the international criminal when we are, in truth, the international good guys. We did not start this fight. They did. We are ready to talk peace at any time. They are not.

Our children will call us blessed and courageous if we stand fast and defeat Communist aggression.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They will call us courageous because we have the courage to stand up and resist aggression in the tradition of our fathers, our grandfathers, and great grandfathers. I am proud of my forebears who helped to give us this great Nation.

I have just come from Louisiana. I had an occasion to visit with these fine young men who are preparing to fight in Vietnam. There is not a coward in the crowd. They are courageous young men. They have high morale and high spirit.

Those whom we have sent are whipping the Communists. They are going to beat the aggressors unless the best fighting men in the world—the American soldiers—are pulled out of there. They might be defeated, but they are not going to get whipped in Vietnam. If they are beaten, it will be in Washington.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to say in connection with the criticism of the Senator of those who have expressed publicly their dissent from an undeclared war and an unconstitutional——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I will finish my sentence, if I may.

Abraham Lincoln, who was not too greatly admired in the State of the Senator from Louisiana, opposed the entry of the United States in the Mexican War, spoke against it in the Congress and elsewhere and today no one vilifies the memory of Abraham Lincoln or castigates him for that courageous and proper attitude.

Those of us who oppose and continue to oppose our entry in an undeclared war and the sending of our boys to slaughter where there was no act of aggression against us, and where those people whom we are supporting are not willing to fight effectively for themselves, have no regrets or apologies to offer.

We will find that more and more American people will come to our point of view that we have no business down there. We were not attacked, and we have no right or obligation to involve ourselves all over the world as policemen and sending our boys to their slaughter, whenever someone scents a Communist threat. An examination of the record will show that there was aggression on both sides and that we, too, were guilty of aggression and violation of commitments far more solemn and binding than those that are alleged to justify our military adventures in southeast Asia.

Mr. GORE. Mr President, I am glad that the hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations have not been characterized by intemperate and flamboyant language and arm waving.

I invite the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana to attend the hearings and present the views he has here presented. I would like to suggest to him that the issue before the committee is not defeat, retreat, and surrender, to use his words.

This issue is rather whether this war is to be held within bounds which we can reasonably anticipate to be manageable, whether the goal be limited and the commitments be limited, or whether this be an open end commitment for total victory militarily against whatever forces may appear in opposition in southeast Asia.

The issue is rather whether this war is a global war. Such an issue deserves the deliberate consideration which the committee is giving it.

It is far too important to be considered with catch phrases and loosely selected slogans.

I hope the committee hearings for the next 2 days will be observed by countless millions of Americans. It is for their country, and it is their sons who will die if this degenerates into a war between the United States and China, and from that who can tell what holocaust may develop.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. GORE. I yield, but I have only a minute left.

Mr. McGOVERN. It has been suggested here that those who share the Senator's concern about a major war in Asia are somehow lacking in patriotism and willingness to defend our country's interest.

I have not been in the Senate very long. The Senator from Tennessee has. Does the Senator from Tennessee recall the warning of General MacArthur some years ago that anyone who——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGOVERN. Does the Senator recall General MacArthur's warning some years ago that anyone who committed the United States to a major war on the Asian mainland "ought to have his head examined"?

Mr. GORE. I recall that and that General MacArthur gave this country the warning that if we went to the Yalu in Korea, China would not come into the war. Unfortunately he was in error. They did come in and we lost many thousands of men in a few days.

Mr. McGOVERN. Does the Senator remember during the discussion of whether we should send forces into southeast Asia in 1954 that General Ridgway, who was then the Army Chief of Staff, vigorously opposed it and said that he regarded it as a harebrained idea?

Mr. GORE. And we also heard from General Gavin last week.

Mr. McGOVERN. It seems to me that no one would be foolish enough to suggest that General MacArthur and General Ridgway and General Gavin are lacking in patriotism or in knowledge of the problems we are up against if we get into a major war in Asia. It is easy for gentlemen to talk about our children calling us blessed if we get involved in war with China. But if that happens, there may not be any children left to call us blessed.

Mr. GORE. Chauvinism is not the issue here. The issue is the wisest course for this country involving war and peace.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I rather resent the suggestion that this Nation is waging illegal war. One hundred and twenty-five times in our history the President has sent American troops into action, either to defend our position or to help our friends without a declaration of war or any prior authorization whatever.

Most of our declarations of war—in fact, I suspect that perhaps all but about one—actually occurred after the fighting had begun, sometimes after it had been going on for a long time. Our boys at Pearl Harbor did not wait for Congress to declare war before shooting back at the Japanese who were attacking. General MacArthur did not wait for Congress to declare war before he took action in the Philippines to attack the Japanese forces with our Air Force.

The President has the authority—and I have said this both under a Republican President and under Democratic Presidents—to send American servicemen into action to defend the position that this Nation decides to take, and he has the power to make such a decision.

I might add that when we fought the war in Korea, there was no declaration of war. But hardly anyone challenged the legality of what we were doing in Korea. There was no serious challenge of that action. We thought we were acting in pursuance of a United Nations treaty commitment.

In this instance, an act of aggression was committed against us. We were attacked, and we fought back. We attacked those who attacked us. Then Congress considered the matter and voted for a resolution that gave the President the specific power to take whatever action he thought would be necessary to resist in that area. Look at article 51 of the United Nations Charter. It specifically authorizes the right of individual and collective self-defense.

Then what happened? The Communists proceeded to march organized units from North Vietnam into South Vietnam. When they did that, we proceeded to send units of the U.S. Army and Marine Corps into South Vietnam to hold the land that the Communists were trying to take by outright aggression, and our forces are doing a magnificent job.

When I speak of my love for my great country, I am not embarrassed because now and then I become a little enthusiastic. I swell with pride when I see Old Glory flying from the Capitol. I swell with pride when I see Old Glory flying around the Washington Monument. I swell with pride when I see it flying from the Senate Office Building. I am proud of this country. I pray that no other flag will ever fly over it.

While sometimes I may be dismayed to see that flag flying at half mast, as it is today in honor of a patriotic, courageous American, who did his best to serve his country, as God gave him the light to serve it during his time here, my prayer is that there may never be a white flag of surrender up there.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. I do not believe that anyone is questioning the glory of the American flag. The question is, What is in our national interest?

Does not the Senator from Louisiana believe that Members of the Senate have the right to raise questions about our policy in southeast Asia, when we consider that the backers of that policy have been consistently wrong about what they have told us?

The Secretary of Defense, not many months ago, gave it as his assessment that the American military combat role in Vietnam would be largely over by the end of 1965 and that our boys would be on their way home. We have come to the end of 1965 and have entered 1966. Instead of bringing the American forces home, we hear from those same sources that we shall have a force of 400,000, 500,000, or 600,000 in Vietnam before the end of 1966. That is only one of the more notable predictions that have been wrong. Each time we have had a disappointment in our effort in southeast Asia, our policymakers have merely asked us to redouble the prescription.

In view of that record, does not the Senator from Louisiana believe that Senators have some right to raise questions about our policy there and about the course we are on, without being reminded that the glory of the flag is involved?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Senators have the right to ask questions, but when the Nation is committed and our men are fighting in the field, we have a responsibility not to do things that will divide and confuse the people and prolong the war. The information I am getting—and it is coming from very high sources in the Government—is that one of the greatest difficulties in bringing the war to an end is that every time a Senator suggests that we retreat and accept defeat or surrender, that word goes right back to Hanoi, Ho Chi Minh, and the powers at Peiping, who say, "If we will just keep after those Americans, even though they are killing 10 of our men to every 1 of theirs that is being killed that great nation will lose courage and quit."

So every time a Senator makes another speech in fear that Red China might come in, he helps the Communist cause.

If the United States had been so timid and afraid of Red China during the Korean war, South Korea would be a Communist country today. Instead of trying to liberate only a part of Korea, we tried to liberate the whole country, but we did it in the interest of freedom. I am not ashamed that our troops went there. They achieved our national purpose, even though the Red Chinese did come in. Some of us felt that we should have fought the Red Chinese with more determination than we did.

But our Nation is committed in Vietnam. My own judgment is that we will see this action through. We will come out of it with honor worthy of all Americans who have gone before us.

To those forces of doubt and defeat who advocate, "Oh, my goodness; get out; Red China might come in," I say that if Red China thought that this Nation was so much afraid of Red China, Red China would be in the war. But Red China knows that we are a great, big, strong country, a first class fighting power. They know they can do us much injury, but they also know that we can do a lot more damage to them. It works both ways.

Mr. McGOVERN. Did I correctly understand the implication of the Senator's earlier statement to be a recommendation to extend our action to a war with China?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I did not say that at all, and the RECORD will not show that I did. I merely said that if Red China thought that if by sending some of her troops in the United States would turn tail and run, as some Senators have advocated, Red China would be in the war tomorrow. But I am of the impression that Red China believes that if she came into the war, she would have a first-class modern fighting power to contend with, and she will be right.

I maintain that speeches on the floor of the Senate and on television, advocating that our boys not fight for their country, and that the people back off from the effort to help their country, handcuff our fighting men and to hold our country down when the going gets tough, do nothing but encourage the Communists to continue the war.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I take issue with the Senator's statement that our boys are fighting for their country. We are fighting in another country where we have taken sides in a civil war. The fact is that the new "white-haired boy" whom we have built up, Mr. Ky, made a statement in answer to a press request, "Who are your heroes?" His reply was, "I have only one, Adolph Hitler. We need four or five more Hitlers in Vietnam." That is the man whom we are now supporting. He is the man we are entrusting with domestic reforms. Actually his is the kind of corrupt government we have been supporting, of which there have been nine different specimens since Diem was "bumped off." That is the kind of so-called freedom we are fighting for, not the real freedom of the people.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have never seen it fail, at any time when this Nation chooses to support a government that is resisting communism, that the Communists always put forth the argument that the head of that anti-Communist government is a "bad guy"; that he is corrupt and vicious; and pick out a statement the man may have made—perhaps an ill-advised misunderstood statement—to show that perhaps he is not the kind of fellow that we should support, and that he is not our kind of guy.

After all, Mr. President, this man is not chopping off the heads of innocent people. That is what cannot be said for the opposition, however.

Mr. President, for the life of me I cannot understand, when people stand and fight for our friends and keep fighting side by side with us, in resisting communism, why some persons will find so much fault with our friends and cannot even find one fault with the murderous assassins who want to kill us, as soon as they have disposed of our friends.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe that one statement made in the course of the very interesting discussion which we have just heard should perhaps be corrected to some degree in this Lincoln's birthday period.

I believe I am the only Member of Congress whose father was a Confederate soldier. Many Members of Congress had two grandfathers who were Confederate soldiers. In my case I knew for years all three of the men whom I have mentioned, my father and my two grandfathers. I never heard any of those three men speak with anything save respect, and sometimes they spoke almost with veneration, of Abraham Lincoln. They felt, as do most of the people in the part of the country from which I come, that perhaps the greatest national tragedy in connection with that war which split our country asunder was the assassination of Abraham Lincoln.

I want the RECORD to show that most of us in the southland venerate the memory of Abraham Lincoln and believe that if he had lived we would not have had the troubles that came after the conclusion of that war.

DISCLOSURE OF TROOP MOVEMENTS IN ON-THE-SPOT REPORTING IN VIETNAM

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I recently received a letter from a retired chief warrant officer of the Army which I believe reflects the deep feeling and concern that parents throughout the Nation have for their sons who are currently on the battlefront in Vietnam. The concern centers around the fact that the movement of our forces is "telegraphed" to the enemy through on-the-spot reporting of the news media.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article written by Raymond L. Hughes, chief warrant officer, U.S. Army retired, of Plant City, Fla., which appeared as a letter to the editor in the Tampa Tribune of Sunday, February 6, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUST SHIELD TROOP MOVES IN VIETNAM

PLANT CITY.—We note with alarm and considerable apprehension the almost total lack of security afforded our troops in South Vietnam by every news medium; and the fact that newspapers, radio, and television seem to be vying with each other to disclose information which, by all standards of secrecy and commonsense, should not be disclosed.

Freedom of the press is one thing but when one can pick up the morning paper, listen to the radio, or look at television and see and hear disclosed the most minute details of troop movements and deployments right down to platoon and squad locations and even to pinpoint where private Joe Blow has his pup tent—and what road to take to find it, the whole aspect of freedom of the press begins to be asinine and literally explosive. If I were Private Blow—or his security officer—I would blow my top, clear to the Pentagon.

A recent news release from security agencies in Washington counseled all news media to use self-censorship and discretion in disclosing troop movements in Vietnam but if this had any effect at all it has not become evident.

Commanders in the area of this vicious and nasty conflict to which so many of our men have been committed, and to which many more thousands will be committed, complain that they are extremely hampered by the lack of intelligence concerning location and movement of the Vietcong.

You may be sure that the Vietcong, Hanoi, and Red China (if any of their people can read English at all), have no trouble at all in tracing the movement and minutest operation of our troops and that of our allies. To them we must indeed be stupid to bare for all to read (who have the price of a newspaper) information which should reach only the Pentagon and then only in a top secret communication.

If this were only a game of marbles and the teams were not playing for keeps, instead of a deadly war where your boy, or mine, could be killed next week, I would say tell where the boy's tent is pitched, or where his foxhole is—and how to reach it from Saigon; but with my 18-year-old boy likely to arrive there at any time, I would prefer to let him tell me where his squad is billeted or bivouacked rather than to read it in the paper or see it on TV.

As a combat infantryman and communications officer in a war where we knew who the enemy was (and how to recognize him) I shudder for our boys every time I pick up a paper and read about an enemy who surrounds him and creeps out of holes in the night and who is unrecognizable; and yet who is furnished the minutest detail about where to locate our GIs—even in the dark.

The papers have a right to detest censorship but they also have a duty to make censorship unnecessary instead of aiding and abetting our enemies. This will be a long, bitter, and bloody war. Let us not show all of our cards to the enemy.

RAYMOND L. HUGHES.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, so that Senators may realize the travail which parents are now experiencing because of news reporting of many of our troop movements too soon and in too much detail I wish to read the covering letter Mr. Hughes addressed to me dated February 9, 1966, and reads as follows:

PLANT CITY, FLA.
February 9, 1966.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Note attached clipping from last Sunday's Tampa Tribune.

Is there nothing that can be done about the flagrant disclosure of our every troop movement in Vietnam?

This week every move of an attempted entrapment of three battalions of Vietcong in a valley they had held for 10 years was announced in advance, by every news media. To no one's surprise they were gone when our troops enveloped the area.

For God's sake (and our boys' sake) read this in the Senate. And put the attached clipping in the Senate RECORD.

My 18-year-old son is to be in Vietnam June 1.

It is nothing short of murder what the news media is doing to our troops.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND L. HUGHES,
Chief Warrant Officer,
U.S. Army, Retired.

Mr. President, not being a member of the Armed Services Committee or the Foreign Relations Committee, I am not in possession of all the facts relative to our situation and the restrictions imposed on the news media in Vietnam, and it is not my intent, here on the floor of the Senate, to suggest any unreasonable limitation on the freedom of the press as provided in our constitution. However, if, as seems to be the case, on-the-spot reporting—by newsmen accompanying our troops—enables the enemy to establish a pattern of our operations or actions in advance, then I believe the news media should certainly impose their own censorship of information, which I am sure will be their desire if they are advised that such reporting has comforted and aided and abetted the enemy. If such voluntary reporting is not effective, then steps should be taken by the military to censor news from the battlefront.

LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENTS CONCERNING COMMUNITY ANTENNA TELEVISION SYSTEMS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, for the past 2 weeks many Senators have been asking me about the legislative developments regarding the community antenna television systems. Many of the senatorial offices have been deluged with literally thousands of letters from people who have been informed that their television service via the cable systems will be curtailed because of the pending proposals by the FCC.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications of the Senate Commerce Committee, I have dealt with this problem at great length and, therefore, should set forth, as clearly and precisely as I can, some of the history of the present situation as it involves CATV systems.

First, the Subcommittee on Communications, anticipating the problems that the growth of CATV systems were facing, conducted long and extensive hearings in 1958 and 1959. These hearings were held in Washington, D.C., the States of Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Utah, and Wyoming. Numerous witnesses representing Government agencies affected, representatives of various organizations including television stations, CATV owners, association officials as well as the general public, submitted their views.

It was apparent that the FCC was reluctant and slow to take any constructive action in this field. In July 1959, in open hearing, I told the Chairman of the FCC:

> You have CATV people coming in and setting up their systems contrary to all standards and no one seems to be policing it. There is no supervision on the part of anyone. We have to have rules and regulations. We have to have standards.

I urged him to move—to take action.

As a token effort, the Commission, finally, at the urging of our committee, sent a man out into the field to investigate the situation.

Again, in 1960, I stated that the FCC was rather lukewarm with regard to whether they should assume responsibility. It was obvious from the testimony developed by the committee that some action was necessary. If Congress did not act, a hodgepodge growth of CATV would take place with possible serious consequences to an orderly development of TV, particularly with reference to local live TV service. As a consequence, the committee drafted original legislation setting forth appropriate guidelines that, in my judgment, would have permitted an orderly growth of both CATV and broadcasting under the umbrella of the FCC. The bill was reported favorably by the committee to the Senate and after many discussions and refinement of language, the representatives of the National Association of Community Antenna Systems agreed to accept the legislation. However, certain CATV interests at the last minute decided to vigorously oppose the bill and after 2 days of full debate on the floor of the Senate, the bill was recommitted by one vote. There is no question in my mind, and this will be agreed to by most of the CATV operators today, that if the legislation that the committee reported in the 86th Congress had been enacted, many of the questions that are now being raised, as well as the proliferation of the State and municipal regulations in the CATV field, may have been eliminated and CATV allowed to grow in an orderly fashion.

In 1961, the FCC's concern with the matter of CATV and its impact on the development of local as well as nationwide television service began to increase so that in May 1961 it asserted jurisdiction over a common carrier microwave serving a CATV system in Wyoming. The CATV representatives opposed this action of the FCC and appealed the decision to the Federal courts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in a landmark decision—*Carter Mountain Transmission Corp.* (32 FCC 459)—the Commission assertion of jurisdiction was sustained by the court—321 F. 2d 359 (C.A.D.C.) cert. den. 375 U.S. 951. The language of the court is quite interesting and very specific with reference to the FCC's responsibility.

Following the Carter Mountain decision, the Commission instituted further intensive studies and began accumulating additional data on the overall CATV situation. In April 1965 the Commission adopted rules governing the grant of microwave authorizations being used to relay television signals to CATV systems—first report and order, docket Nos. 14895 and 15233. In general, these rules require that any microwave-served CATV system, upon request, carry the signals of local stations and refrain from duplicating their programs from 15 days before and after the local broadcast.

On the same date in April 1965, the Commission also instituted a further CATV rulemaking proceeding, divided into two parts, which is presently in progress—notice of inquiry and notice of proposed rulemaking, docket No. 15971.

Part I of this proceeding proposed to finalize the Commission's initial conclusion that it had and should also exercise jurisdiction over the CATV systems not served by microwaves and, pursuant thereto, to extend to them the same requirements now governing the microwave-served systems. In part II of the proceeding, the Commission initiated an inquiry looking toward possible rulemaking on broader questions posed by the trend of CATV development. These included the effects on independent UHF stations in major markets of CATV entry into those markets; possible limitations on the long-distance extension of stations' signals by CATV and on CATV program origination, together with several other matters related to CATV impact on our broadcast system. Part II also included a notice of proposed rulemaking under which rules or other measures, interim or final, might be taken to deal effectively with some of the more pressing problem areas.

Interested parties have, of course, been provided an opportunity to submit counterproposals, comments, and replies on the matters raised by the Commission's proposals and inquiry. All such filings have not been completed.

Final action was taken by the Commission on Tuesday, February 15, 1966—which was yesterday—in which they announced plans for the regulation of all CATV systems. A copy of the Commission's report has been made available to me, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FCC ANNOUNCES PLAN FOR REGULATION OF ALL CATV SYSTEMS

Following meetings held February 10, 11, and 14, the Commission has reached agreement on a broad plan for the regulation of community antenna television systems, including a legislative program. To insure the effective integration of CATV with a fully developed television service, the new regulations will apply equally to all CATV systems, including those which require microwave licenses, and those which receive their signal off the air. Excluded from these rules will be those CATV systems which serve less than 50 customers, or which serve only as an apartment house master antenna. The CATV rules concurrently in effect for microwave-fed systems will be revised to reflect the new rules adopted for all systems.

Coupled with the new CATV rules, to be incorporated in a Report and Order shortly to be issued, the Commission will send recommended legislation to Congress to codify and supplement its regulatory program in this important area.

The Commission's new CATV program includes eight major points:

1. Carriage of local stations: A CATV system will be required to carry without material degradation the signals of all local television stations within whose Grade B contours the CATV system is located. The carriage requirements thus made applicable to all CATV systems will be substantially the same as those applied to microwave-served systems by the Commission's first report and order in dockets Nos. 14895 and 15233, adopted in April, 1965.

2. Same day nonduplication: A CATV system will be required to avoid duplication of the programs of local television stations during the same day that such programs are broadcast by the local stations. This nonduplication protection, as under the existing rules, will apply to "prime-time" network programs only if such programs are presented by the local station entirely within what is locally considered to be "prime-time." It will also give the CATV subscribers access to network programs on the same day that they are presented on the network. Nonduplication protection will not be afforded to programs which are carried in black and white by the local station and are available in color from a more distant station on the CATV system.

The new nonduplication rules thus embody two substantial changes from those adopted in the first report and order. First, the time period during which nonduplication protection must be afforded has been reduced from 15 days before and after local broadcast to the single day of local broadcast. Second, a new exemption from the nonduplication requirement has been added as to color programs not carried in color by local stations.

3. Private agreements and ad hoc procedures: The Commission will continue to give full effect to private agreements between CATV operators and local television stations which provide for a different type or degree of protection for the local station than do the Commission's rules. Moreover, the Commission will give ad hoc consideration to petitions from local television stations seeking a greater degree of protection than provided by the rules, or from CATV operators seeking a waiver of the rules.

4. Distant city signals—New CATV systems in the top 100 television markets: Parties who obtain State or local franchises to operate CATV systems in the 100 highest ranked television markets (according to American Research Bureau (ARB) net weekly circulation figures), which propose to extend the signals of television broadcast stations beyond their grade B contours, will be required to obtain FCC approval before CATV service to subscribers may be commenced. This aspect of the Commission's decision is effective immediately, and will be applicable to all CATV operation commenced after February 15, 1966.

An evidentiary hearing will be held as to all such requests for FCC approval, subject, of course, to the general waiver provisions of the Commission's rules. These hearings will be concerned primarily with (a) the potential effects of the proposed CATV operation on the full development of off-the-air television outlets (particularly UHF) for that market, and (b) the relationship, if any, of proposed CATV operations and the development of pay television in that market. The hearing requirement will apply to all CATV operations proposed to communities lying within the predicted grade A service contour of all existing television stations in that market.

Service presently being rendered to CATV subscribers will be unaffected. However, the Commission will entertain petitions objecting to the geographical extension to new areas of CATV systems already in operation in the top 100 television markets.

5. Distant city signals—New CATV systems in smaller television markets: The Commission's prior approval after an evidentiary hearing will not be required by rule for proposed CATV systems or operations in markets below 100 in the ARB rankings. However, the Commission will entertain, on an ad hoc basis, petitions from interested parties concerning the carriage of distant signals by CATV systems located in such smaller markets.

6. Information to be filed by CATV owners: Pursuant to its authority under Section 403 of the Communications Act, the Commission will, within an appropriate time be prescribed, require all CATV operations to submit the following data with respect to each of their CATV systems: (a) The names, addresses, and business interests of all officers, directors, and persons having substantial ownership interests in each system; (b) the number of subscribers to each system; (c) the television stations carried on each system; and (d) the extent of any existing or proposed program origination by each CATV system.

7. Assertion of jurisdiction: To the extent necessary to carry out the regulatory program set forth above, the Commission asserts its present jurisdiction over all CATV systems, whether or not served by microwave relay.

8. Legislation to be recommended to Congress: The Commission will recommend, with specific proposals where appropriate, that Congress consider and enact legislation designed to express basic national policy in the CATV field. Such legislation would include those matters over which the Commission has exercised its jurisdiction, as well as those matters which are still under consideration.

Included in these recommendations will be the following:

(a) Clarification and confirmation of FCC jurisdiction over CATV systems generally, along with such specific provisions as are deemed appropriate.

(b) Prohibition of the origination of program or other material by a CATV system with such limitations or exceptions, if any, as are deemed appropriate.

(c) Consideration of whether, to what extent, and under what circumstances CATV systems should be required to obtain the consent of the originating broadcast station for the retransmission of the signal by the CATV system.

(d) Consideration of whether CATV systems should or should not be deemed public utilities. In this connection, Congress will be asked to consider the appropriate relationship of Federal to State-local jurisdiction in the CATV field, with particular reference to initial franchising, rate regulation, and extension of service.

The Commission, of course, stands ready to discuss all of the above matters with the appropriate congressional committees at any time.

STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER ROBERT T. BARTLEY

I cannot agree that the Communications Act confers jurisdiction over CATV; however, I endorse legislation which would prohibit a CATV system from originating program matter.

SEPARATE STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER KENNETH A. COX

I concur fully in those portions of the Commission's action in which it (1) asserts jurisdiction over all CATV operations, (2) requires carriage of local stations on CATV systems, (3) provides for expedited ad hoc procedures for the consideration of special relief requested either by broadcasters or CATV operators, (4) requires disclosure of information as to ownership of CATV systems and certain other matters, and (5) calls on Congress to give prompt consideration to the problem of integrating CATV operations into our overall television system, with particular attention to the questions of program origination by CATV systems, possible extension of the principle of rebroadcast consent, and overlapping jurisdiction with the States.

As to the balance of the action taken, I agree with what is done but believe it falls far short of protecting the public interest in an expanding television service. I agree that local stations should not have their programs duplicated, but believe that the protection afforded them is totally inadequate. As to network programs, they should be accorded exclusivity—that is, should not be duplicated—as to all programs which they propose to present in a comparable time period within 15 days.[1] This Commission found in the first report that, for cogent reasons, delayed nonduplication served the public interest. (See pars. 101–127, 38 FCC at 721–731.) But the majority now cuts back on such delayed nonduplication to a single day. This 1-day protection is patently inadequate as to network programing (see first report, par. 125, 38 FCC at 730, where it is pointed out that only 10.2 percent of local stations' delayed broadcasts are delayed less than 1 day, with roughly 79 percent being delayed between 1 and 15 days). As to nonnetwork programs, the majority previously pointed out that such material was not distributed on a simultaneous nationwide basis and that, therefore, a 15-day protection was "clearly a minimal measure of protection against the duplication of syndicated or feature film programs, considering the extended periods—up to and exceeding 5 years—for which stations now bargain and obtain exclusivity in relation to such programs."

As to feature film, syndicated series, and other filmed or taped programing for which they have acquired local exhibition rights, they should be assured the right of first run—which is only one of the rights normally bargained for, but certainly the most important one. I realize that this is more protection than was proposed in this proceeding, but since I feel this would be necessary to assure the station of the most important of the program rights it has acquired as against prior exhibition by an entity which has acquired no rights at all, I certainly cannot agree with the majority's refusal to recognize any rights as to such programing. Some nonsimultaneous nonduplication is necessary to afford local stations sufficient flexibility to provide the best possible service to those viewers who do not subscribe to the cable service.

Similarly, I agree that some measures are needed to curb the indiscriminate extension of television signals by CATV systems. Section 303(h) of the Communications Act gives us clear authority to establish zones or areas of service for broadcast stations. In television, I think we have undertaken to do this by establishing a carefully designed channel allocation and by fixing maximum limits on heights and powers. While there are many situations in which deficiencies of service can and should be corrected by supplemental means such as CATV, satellites and translators, I do not believe that any of these auxiliary services should be permitted to disrupt the basic television system that Congress, the Commission and the broadcasters have worked so hard to establish.

The majority contents itself with saying that it will carefully examine proposals to provide CATV service in the top 100 television markets. I would greatly prefer an approach which would bar new systems—for a specified period—from extending a station's signal beyond its Grade B contour, except upon authorization by the Commission in certain carefully defined situations. I believe this is necessary to stem the current proliferation of CATV systems in areas already receiving substantial television service. Without such action, I am afraid that CATV—a supplemental and derivative service—will stunt the future growth of our free television system, and perhaps even impair the viability of some of the service which the public is now receiving.

It is all very well to study the problems posed by CATV's threatened invasion of the major markets. It is true that the most immediate hopes for expanded UHF service are centered there, and that the risk of CATV operators' building a pay television system on the basis of signals appropriated from the broadcasters who now provide our free service is greatest there. But if we turn our backs on the smaller markets by assuring cable operators that they can pump in multiple competing signals from New York and Los Angeles unless a local broadcaster can prove that he will be driven out of business, I think we are on the way to substituting a shrinking for an expanding system, with an artificial ceiling on network and local service alike—all in the name of a multiplicity, if no real diversity, of service for a part of the public. I am afraid we may end up with a shrunken, substantially wired pay service for the majority of the public, and a really vestigial system for those who cannot afford, or cannot be provided, this service.

I am not comforted by the majority's confidence that it would reverse such a trend if it really became a clear threat. The Commission does not have a good record for taking such drastic measures—in fact, I think much of my colleagues' reluctance to take more meaningful action now stems from fear of disrupting the existing service of a rather small number of CATV subscribers who have been galvanized into pressuring Congress and the Commission by a campaign of outright misrepresentation by the CATV industry. If this bothers them, what likelihood is there that they will ever roll back any part of the greatly expanded CATV operations which I think their actions will bring into being? New York City signals have already been carried to points near the Ohio border, and service from Los Angeles is proposed for Oklahoma and Texas. Once such service is instituted, I am afraid it is impossible to roll it back. I think the majority itself recognizes this problem, as is indicated by the fact that in the release announcing their action they twice very carefully pointed out that service now being rendered to CATV subscribers will be unaffected by what they are doing.

I do not mean to suggest that I know or can prove that the consequences I fear will actually result—though I think my concerns are shared by many leaders of the broadcast industry, by certain organizations which represent elements of the public who stand to be disadvantaged by increased reliance on wired television, and by other interested and informed parties. But on the other hand, my colleagues cannot prove that my fears are groundless. My approach would not impair the viability of existing cable systems and would not bar all further extension of CATV service. But it would confine such service to its proper supplemental role in areas which receive substandard over-the-air television for a limited period—say 5 years. That would give Congress and the Commission time to study the whole problem further, would permit continued UHF development, and would, hopefully, permit resolution of the copyright questions which are basic to the future of CATV.

By not taking the admittedly more rigorous course which I favor, the majority has, I believe, invited developments which may make further study futile, may stifle UHF development which otherwise would have occurred, and may make it politically difficult, or even impossible, to adhere to normal copyright principles. I do not think that the benefits it is claimed CATV will bring are worth the hazards to our television system created by the limited action here taken by the majority. If there is one thing that even critics of the Commission concede it is that this agency was created for the purpose of allocating communications facilities. Both sections 307(b) and 303(h) of the Communications Act make this clear. I think the majority is simply refusing to discharge this responsibility. Now is the time to take hold of the problems posed by the explosive development of the CATV industry and to fit cable operations into an appropriate place in the overall television structure. I think we are at a real turning point as far as the development of American television is concerned—and I think the majority has taken the wrong direction.

Statement of Commissioner Lee Loevinger Regarding FCC CATV Plan

The analysis of jurisdiction set forth in my prior opinion in this proceeding, 38 FCC 683, 746 (1965), still represents my view. The significance of that analysis and its divergence from the course now adopted by the Commission need no elaboration. On the other hand, the substantive position now adopted by the Commission seems to me to be a moderate and reasonable compromise of conflicting views and positions, and the Commission now recognizes the desirability, if not necessity, of requesting Congress to legislate on jurisdiction and other important aspects of this subject. In these circumstances I think it is more constructive and useful to support affirmative action by the Commission leaving the jurisdictional issue to be decided by Congress and the courts, rather than stand on legalistic grounds or inflexibly insist on complete adoption of my own ideas. Accordingly, with a dubitante recorded as to jurisdiction, I concur in the plan now approved by a majority of the Commission for regulating community antenna television systems.

Mr. PASTORE. It will be noted that the Commission is making a number of legislative recommendations. They are as follows:

First, clarification and confirmation of FCC jurisdiction over CATV systems generally, along with such specific provisions as are deemed appropriate.

Second, prohibition of the origination of program or other material by a CATV system with such limitations or exceptions, if any, as are deemed appropriate.

Third, consideration of whether, to what extent, and under what circumstances CATV systems should be required to obtain the consent of the originating broadcast station for the retransmission of the signal by the CATV system.

Fourth, consideration of whether CATV systems should or should not be deemed public utilities. In this connection, Congress will be asked to consider the appropriate relationship of Federal to State-local jurisdiction in the CATV field, with particular reference to initial franchising, rate regulation, and extension of service.

The Commission has been requested to submit the legislative proposals as soon as possible and as soon as the proposals are received, I intend to proceed with hearings in order to resolve this issue. Opportunities will be afforded all interested parties to present their views.

I am hopeful that legislation can be enacted in this session of Congress.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at 12 o'clock, today, I was presiding as acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations at a public hearing on the Asian bank bill. We heard able testimony by Eugene Black, David Bell, and Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Barr in support of the bill. The bill is sound in its objectives. It was clearly my obligation to be there for the meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

---

[1] I agree that as to network color programs the local station should not be protected unless it will present them in color.

I understand, since coming into the Senate Chamber, that an exciting and inciting speech was made by the acting majority leader, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. It left at least the impression with some of my colleagues, as they reported it to me, that the acting majority leader gave them the impression he thought that some of us who are opposed to the unconstitutional and illegal war in South Vietnam may not share the same loyalty to our Government as he does.

Mr. President, I know that these are hysterical days and some people become emotionally aroused in many places—apparently even some Senators in the Senate. But I believe we should pause and take a look at the fact that we are living in a historic hour with a great historic debate now going on in the Senate, where there are sincere and honest differences of opinion among us as to what American foreign policy should be followed in Asia.

I do not intend to engage in any ad hominem exchange, directly or indirectly, with the acting majority leader, but I do intend to keep my sights on what I consider to be some of the great issues confronting this country in this critical hour.

If anyone believes that it is pleasant or enjoyable for those of us in the Senate who find ourselves in serious disagreement with the administration, he could not be more wrong. But, Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to let history be the judge of the outcome of this debate. I am perfectly willing to let history be the final determinant as to who is right and who is wrong. However, each of us, irrespective of how he views this great crisis, has the same obligation under the oath which he took when he came into the Senate—and I took that oath four times—and I do not intend to walk out on that oath, no matter how many stones of innuendo are cast at my skull.

Mr. President, I intend to keep faith with what I believe my trust to be. I do not yield to anyone in the Senate in my desire to give the fullest protection to American boys in South Vietnam. However they should not be there. They never should have been sent there in the first place, and the means should be found to bring them home.

Those of us seeking to bring an end to this war by recommendations for procedures other than those which our President is following, are seeking not only to protect those boys by seeking to bring the war to an end, but are also seeking to prevent the killing of what we believe will be increasing thousands of American boys in Asia in a war to which we should not be party. It is a war in which others should be in there enforcing a peace.

Mr. President, briefly those who favor this war and those of us who are opposed to it represent the two sides to this great controversy.

We opposed to it are perfectly willing to let the American people be the judges, too. Let me say most respectfully to my President that the American people will be the judges of this issue. I believe that the President is quite wrong if he believes that there is a consensus of American public opinion in support of the war or of his policies in connection with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I believe that there is not a consensus of American public opinion in support of this war, but that there is a consensus in support of peace. Thus far, the President has succeeded in giving the impression to many Americans that his road is the road to peace.

Some of us who disagree with him are of the opinion that if we continue to follow the course of action of the President of the United States, the United States will be involved in a massive war in Asia. Hundreds of thousands of American boys will die as that war escalates.

I have been saying for some weeks now, that there may be a surrender of the Vietcong and North Vietnam in a matter of not too many weeks from now; at least, their capacity to fight conventional warfare may be destroyed. But that is not going to produce peace, for guerrilla warfare can still be carried on indefinitely. That will only bog us down and bed us down in Asia for decades to come as, eventually, the Asians carry out what I believe to be inevitable; namely, their unflagging determination to see to it that no Western Nation—including the United States—succeeds in exercising a dominating influence in Asia.

That is a part of this debate. I rise at this moment only to register by caveat and say to my acting majority leader, and anyone else in the Senate who shares his view, that I would not trade my loyalty to my country for the loyalty of anyone in the Senate—and all of us are loyal, in my judgment, on both sides of the issue. But, as I stated the other day, and repeat, I am very unhappy and saddened over the differences which have developed over viewpoints in respect to this war, but it will never be a personal difference, so far as I am concerned. I regret the difference which has developed between the President and me in respect to how the President is conducting foreign policy. I believe that he is dead wrong, but I continue to love him. However, he knows I love my country more. I am not going to change my course of action merely because some think unkindly of me and are prone to express unkind remarks.

Our real job, as I see it, is to do everything we can to try to substitute the rule of law for the jungle law of military might which the United States is presently practicing in Asia without a scintilla of right under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that some telegrams, pro and con, and some letters which I have received, and certain newspaper material, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press, Feb. 8, 1966]

JOHNSON'S POLITICS MAY RUIN HIS OWN DIPLOMACY

President Johnson, the politician, just about cut the throat of President Johnson, diplomat, in Hawaii this weekend.

As a politician, Johnson made the speech traditionally made upon greeting foreign dignitaries. He praised the South Vietnam war effort extravagantly and, in one of the silliest statements of his Presidential career, said that those who "counsel retreat" belong "to a group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope."

Rhetoric aside, such a simplistic statement indicates that Johnson has neither an adequate grasp of history nor the openness of mind required to recognize honest opponents. Would he count Martin Luther King among the group? Is Pulitzer Prize-winning historian and Kennedy aid Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., blind to experience and deaf to hope? Are the leaders of most of the major nations in the world less learned than Lyndon Johnson?

But this, for the moment, is not the point. The danger in such a politically motivated statement is what it might do to the course of diplomacy. And the answer is that at best it can do nothing good.

By this jingoistic speech aimed at cheering South Vietnamese Premier Nguyen Cao Ky, Johnson has undermined his own diplomacy.

Starting with his Johns Hopkins speech last year, the President gradually has moved the United States away from rigid and unrealistic goals in Vietnam to something that might be attainable. The 14 points outlined 2 months ago, which many considered a workable basis for negotiations, have been modified since to make them even more workable.

Only Sunday, Ambassador at Large W. Averell Harriman said that the United States would be willing to have the South Vietnam National Liberation Front as an "independent group" at any peace talks. The NLF is the political arm of the Vietcong, and its inclusion would mean recognizing that it is more than a Hanoi puppet.

Certainly the Harriman statement was not made without Presidential approval, but the President destroyed its effectiveness in Honolulu.

He talked of "victory," when the best we could do, with a million troops and 30 years would be occupation.

He talked of "naked aggression" and "subjugation by an armed minority," when most Vietnamese in both north and south consider us the aggressors and the armed minority. He talked about "free elections," when the people to whom he was speaking, the leaders of South Vietnam, were put in power by the United States, not by votes of their own people.

The President, we feel sure, has changed his thinking greatly in the past year. He may prefer old myths to new realities, but for the most part he has begun to show the flexibility to accept the facts.

What he has not learned, apparently, is that the President as a politician is indivisible from the President as a diplomat. What he says in Honolulu is heard in Hanoi, and a statement issued in Johnson City changes the balance of forces in Geneva.

If the purpose of the speech was to flatter Premier Ky, Johnson should have settled for a 10-gallon hat and a bowl of chili.

[From the Oregon Statesman, Jan. 30, 1965]

IS VIET WAR LEGAL?

Is the U.S. war in Vietnam "illegal" and "unconstitutional"? Senator MORSE has been saying so all along. Friday, Chairman FULBRIGHT of the Foreign Relations Committee told Secretary of State Rusk, who was under interrogation, that there is no legal basis for what the Government was doing in Vietnam, either under the southeast Asia treaty or under the congressional resolution of August 1964. Later in the day President Johnson, replying to a letter signed by Senator HARTKE of Indiana and 14 other liberal Senators asking the President to seek their collective judgment in Vietnam affairs, asserted he was acting under authority granted him in that resolution.

Saturday, Senator MORSE announced he would introduce a resolution to rescind the authority granted the President in that 1965 resolution. If MORSE can get this before the Senate for action we will have a full-dress debate. Adoption of the resolution would certainly undercut the President's authority to conduct the war. Defeat of the resolution would confirm him in his interpretation of his power.

The Morse proposal is timely and proper. Another way to test this exercise of Presidential power would be to go into court. Getting a question before the court would not be easy, and probably months would pass before a final decision was reached. We are quite confident that the Morse resolution if it gets to a vote will be defeated. After all, the House voted for the 1965 resolution authorizing him to use force in defense of South Vietnam, 504 to 2. In the Senate only two dissenting votes were recorded: MORSE and GRUENING. The administration will throw its full weight against the Morse resolution; and Members will be reluctant to go against the administration.

Now this question: If MORSE's resolution is defeated will he stop declaiming the Vietnamese war is illegal and unconstitutional? We doubt it.

It would be more convincing for the public at large however if an affirmative resolution were presented to Congress, endorsing the actions the President has taken and confirming his power to use military force to sustain South Vietnam and resist aggression. It would not be necessary to declare war against any nation; but this resolution, if adopted, would certainly end any contention that the war is illegal and unconstitutional.

One way or another we should get this question settled. Let us have a fresh vote by Congress, with the understanding that it will decide whether or not we are to continue to use force in southeast Asia. Then we can get on with the business either of war or peace.

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 14, 1966]

U.S. AND VIETNAMESE ON THE MOVE: "MUTUAL DEESCALATION" OFFER SEEMS TO BE OUT

(By R. H. Shackford)

The decline in Communist military activity in South Vietnam since the Christmas ceasefire and U.S. "peace offensive" has been answered with increased offensive actions by both American and South Vietnamese forces.

This would seem to be a contradiction of President Johnson's offer in his state of the Union message to engage in a "mutual deescalation" of the fighting.

"We will respond if others reduce their use of force," the President told Congress.

Last Friday, U.S. Ambassador Arthur H. Goldberg revived this almost forgotten offer as part of his new instructions from the President after the Honolulu conference.

RECIPROCAL

"President Johnson believes," Mr. Goldberg said, "there might be a reciprocal reduction of hostilities, without negotiations, which could be a significant step toward peace."

This is what some Americans have called the "peter out" theory of how the war ultimately might end. But it takes both sides to indulge in "reciprocal reduction of hostilities."

Facts about what actually goes on in South Vietnam are hard to get. Every official has his own version of what is happening, usually keyed to what he thinks U.S. policy should be.

The President himself was asked at his Friday press conference whether there had been any change in the "war or peace picture" since the U.S. resumed bombing, and he gave this baffling response.

"I don't know how to answer that. I just don't know."

RUSK'S VIEW

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, who sees the war as a test of wills with Red China, insists that the Communist Vietcong have not reduced their activity and says the weekly average of "incidents" during January was above that of the last 3 months of 1965.

However, a different story was given in Honolulu by Gen. William C. Westmoreland, commander of U.S. forces in Vietnam. He told a press conference there had been an increase in terrorism but added:

"The attacks by large units (battalion-size or larger) have not been as great during the last several weeks as was the case during November and December."

North Vietnamese Regular Army units (in contrast to the Vietcong) have not been engaged in battle in the south since late November.

SLOWDOWN

In a dispatch from Saigon at the end of last week, Scripps-Howard Staff Writer Walt Friedenberg quoted an official spokesman of the South Vietnamese Army as saying that Vietcong activity during the first week in February was the lowest in 18 weeks.

For the first time in 10 months, a whole week passed with no attacks or acts of sabotage in the Saigon military region.

Despite this suggestion of "deescalation" by the Communists, there is no sign of reciprocity by United States or South Vietnamese forces.

On the contrary, news reports from Saigon and statements here by official spokesmen suggest increased offensive activity by our side.

INITIATIVE

Gen. Maxwell Taylor, who will defend the Johnson policies before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee later this week, says "we have the initiative now" and predicts U.S. ground actions will be "more active."

General Taylor is one of the architects of U.S. military involvement in Vietnam.

General Taylor admitted more GI's will be needed but dismissed as "fantastic" reports they would number 800,000 or a million. Last summer General Taylor similarly dismissed reports that the total would be 400,000 to 500,000—a figure now generally accepted as the next goal.

CONTRADICTIONS

Official statements about the complex military situation in Vietnam are often contradictory.

For example, one of the arguments for resuming the bombing of North Vietnam was that the "pause" allowed the north to increase its infiltration of the south.

"Substantial" was the word used at the Pentagon to describe this increase.

But at Honolulu, General Westmoreland denied there had been any increase in infiltration during the pause.

Asked the present rate, he said: "Approximately 4,500 a month."

"Would that be since the pause or during the pause?" he was asked.

"I would say before, since and during," General Westmoreland replied.

WARRENTON, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for having the courage to say to us, who were watching Today's program panel on Vietnam, that we were not being told the truth about foreign policy and our involvement in this war which to so many of us does indeed seem an immoral action and America an aggressor.

It is very, very frustrating to listen to statements saying that the vast majority of our people are in agreement with President Johnson for this is just not true.

Everywhere one goes sooner or later the subject of Vietnam comes up and nearly everyone says it is all wrong, that our Government had no right to involve us in this dreadful mess. They always (the Government) keep saying we have to honor our commitments. Most of us say they should never have made them. It is so wrong to send our young men to die for a cause they do not believe in and call them Red sympathizers if they protest our involvement.

And it seems as the threat of conflict with Red China hangs over all the world.

I think Dean Rusk and McNamara are liars and working against peace. And I think our President is two-faced and devious and I regret the vote I cast for him. I have no more confidence in him or his advisers.

I hope you will continue to protest and I know it takes much courage.

I wish there was some way to help but all I can do, I guess, is to write letters, and pray.

AN OREGON MOTHER.

JANUARY 31, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your magnificent articulation and dignified appearance on television Sunday evening and Monday morning made me very proud to be an Oregonian. I've always supported you, but never before have I seen or heard you express your views so clearly. Thank you for not prostituting your ideals and intelligence and for help in making this world a place I can raise my children to walk with dignity knowing that politicians like you made people think and were not afraid.

Sincerely and keep fightin',

SHERRY CURRY.

JANUARY 31, 1966.

DEAR SIR: You are to be commended for your noteworthy and prolonged efforts to stay the hand of those who would involve us in a massive Asian war.

There appears to be much merit to your latest proposal to curtail the war powers granted to the President and have the Congress reassume autonomy over issues that affect the lives of thousands, so that they can be resolved in the light of open discussions instead of being decided in secret by the exclusive hierarchy in the White House and Pentagon.

In view of the fact that a large percentage of the Vietnamese people are Vietcong, the administration's unrealistic refusal to deal with it at the conference table as well as its increasing military posture and now the renewed bombing of the north poses in question its sincerity in its efforts to obtain peace.

Every effort should be made to localize, contain and effect a settlement, instead of constant escalation that will commit and expend the lives of thousands of young Americans, in an unjustified and genocidal war.

These views and support of your position in these matters have been forwarded to the White House and our Congressmen in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD KOCH.
ARNOLD KOCH.

Scio, Oreg.,
February 1, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Many times in the past I have disagreed and openly criticized some of your political ideas and actions.

Now on the most vital and important issues (foreign policy and Vietnam) we agree. I cannot buy the idea of conducting an undeclared and illegal war that could cost us a half million lives of our American youth. Billions in dollars that could embarrass us in the financial world, has and will cost much in prestige in the free world, the respect and cooperation of our allies.

The President was elected by an overwhelming majority with the idea he could and would keep us out of war. No one could have gotten us in a more difficult situation than we now are facing.

I commend you on the stand you have taken; I believe you are right.

Yours very truly,

Albert Julian.

Portland, Oreg.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I feel as you do that to the United Nations belongs the authority for peace action in Vietnam. The United States under the doubtful leadership of our President, Lyndon B. Johnson, however, seems to feel that it is our responsibility alone to keep this world free from communism. Unfortunately we are beyond our element. We are not the all-powerful entity that can peacefully negotiate the world into peace.

Only a united front can successfully deter Communist China from its course. That united front cannot be just the United States of America. It must also include the other 100 or more countries who also have an interest in maintaining peace for their homeland. They do not and cannot accept and allow our total usurping of their rights.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

Joan C. Bowlby.

Rogue River, Oreg., *January 31, 1966.*

Dear Senator Wayne Morse: Words cannot express how much I appreciate your heroic and sensible stand regarding our most shameful involvement in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

Sincerely,

Earl R. Goodrich.

Athena, Oreg., *February 4, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Wayne: We approve 100 percent of your stand on foreign policy.

Thank God we still have someone in Washington who has guts enough to say what he believes. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Alton L. Alderman, M.D.

Coos Bay, Oreg., *February 1, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I listened to the broadcast Sunday, and want you to know how proud I am of you. Would God there were more men like you in the Government; maybe we all would be safer from an all-out war with China and Russia. Please keep up your good work.

Sincerely,

Claudine H. Kaufman.

The Dalles, Oreg.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This is to let you know I am behind you all the way in your fight to bring the Vietnam war—or conflict—under the control of the Congress and the people instead of exclusively under the control of the President.

Let's do away with the 1964 law which allows the President this control.

Yours truly,

Mary Ann Dickenson.

Coos Bay, Oreg., *February 1, 1966.*

Dear Senator Morse: Your courageous stand on the Vietnam issue compels us to write you this letter of commendation, and to express our wholehearted support.

Very truly yours,

Edith Kowunen,
Ilmar Kowunen.

Portland, Oreg.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Senator: We are applauding your efforts on Vietnam and praying that you will finally achieve some results.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Fred Koennecke.

Oakland, Oreg., *January 30, 1966.*

I am burned up and if I do not get rid of some of this pressure I will blow up, hence this letter to you. But first I want to thank you for your prompt and courteous answer to my letter regarding railroad retirement.

For quite some time you have told the people of this country, in the press, radio, and television that the question of Vietnam should be taken to the United Nations for settlement but the administration did nothing about it.

Now that the Pope has come out for the same thing, it is headlined in the papers, radio, and television and they are trying to make it appear that it was the Pope's own idea. I say if it was such a good idea coming from the Pope, why was it not a good idea coming from you and why was it not acted on, instead of sending good American boys over there to fight, get wounded or killed and for no good purpose at all.

Enclosed I am sending clippings cut out of the World, printed in Coos Bay.

You can see that we people at home are in for a hectic summer with union and management fighting and the politicians screaming at each other and the cost of living going up at a rapid rate.

Respectfully yours,

Robert H. Wilson.

GOP Not Seen as Victorious

Some of my Republican friends would like to believe that Mark Hatfield will lead the ticket to a glorious victory for himself and fellow Republican candidates in November. They are encouraged by some newspapers.

They believe that the Democrats will have a lackluster senatorial primary and that, for some obscure reason, Wayne Morse will not campaign for the Democratic nominee. I have news for them. They are dreaming. There will be a hot Democratic senatorial primary. The winner will have Wayne's vigorous support, with the same result enjoyed by Dick Neuberger when he was elected in 1964.

Never in my 15 years in Oregon congressional politics have the Democrats had better issues against the Republicans. The Boardman bonanza for Boeing, masterminded by Hatfield, beats the Al Sarena public timber steal in the amount of public money involved and for sheer brazenness by the Republicans.

Our lovely streams and ocean-washed air are shamefully polluted in many areas because Hatfield and his sanitary board neglected and refused to enforce laws against the big mills.

The issue above all today is peace. Hatfield has talked on Wayne Morse's side but he has shown no constructive leadership at all. This is what he did for the Republican liberals in 1964. After giving them a stirringly liberal speech, he then got on the Goldwater bandwagon, such as it was, and campaigned for Barry.

Republican Governors Romney and Rockefeller, with principles less flexible, refused to campaign for Goldwater. They had the courage of their convictions.

The Democratic doldrums are ending. A stormy Democratic primary is in prospect. The Democrats have a 110,000-voter registration edge over the Republicans. When they hear the issues debated, they will vote like Democrats in November. So will many Republicans. This means a Democratic Senator, a Governor named Bob Straub, and a firm Democratic majority in both houses of the legislature.

Charles O. Porter.

G-P Sales, Earnings Set Record

Portland.—Another record year—in sales, earnings and cash flow—was reported to stockholders of Georgia-Pacific Corp. in a preliminary report preceding distribution of the annual report in late February.

In the preliminary report from Chairman Owen R. Cheatham and President Robert B. Pamplin, the company indicates new highs on both a total and per-share basis. Sales for 1965 are indicated at $575 million as compared with $535 million in 1964, a 7.5-percent increase. Earnings after taxes are indicated at $46,060,000 against $42,015,000 in the previous year, a 9.6-percent increase. Cash flow is shown at $82,340,000 compared with $78,855,000, a 4.4-percent boost.

On a per-share basis, Georgia-Pacific reports 1965 earnings at $3.15 compared with $2.89 in 1964 and cash flow at $6.21 compared with $6.10 a year earlier, with both comparisons based on the average number of shares outstanding in the respective years adjusted for stock dividends and, in 1964, to reflect the pooling of interests with Bestwall Gypsum Co.

During the year, the Georgia-Pacific officers said, the company invested approximately $125 million in new and improved manufacturing and sales facilities and to expand its natural resources. Twelve new plants were built during the year, all of which will reflect increased earnings in 1966 and beyond. "The future for Georgia-Pacific's forest and mineral products looks bright," said Cheatham and Pamplin, "and promises another outstanding year in 1966."

IWA Goal Pay Raise

Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.—Wage increases, a fourth week of vacation and a seventh holiday will be major demands of the International Woodworkers of America when negotiations begin with Pacific Northwest lumber firms in April, IWA officials said Friday.

Delbert Gunvaldson, Portland, vice president of Regional Council 3, met with local union officials to discuss the negotiations.

North Bend, Oreg., *January 30, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: As has been the case with many other Americans, we have confined our debate on our country's military and political adventure in Vietnam to our personal circle of friends and associates. In so doing we have been tardy in advising you, our elected representative, of our admiration and wholehearted support for your courageous and continuing stand against those who would recklessly commit us to this illegal and immoral war.

We will not repeat here all of the many actions of our Government in Vietnam that tend to give the lie to its public statements of "moral" rationalizations. We're sure that you are only too aware of these hypocrisies.

Suffice it to briefly mention only a few of the more blatant examples: our support of the French colonial war to overthrow the Democratic Republic of Vietnam; our tacit approval and support of the suppressive measures enacted under the unpopular Diem regime and its successors to eliminate all religious and political dissent; our approval and support of the Diem regime's uncooperative attitude in dealing with the International Control Commission; our open flouting of the Geneva agreement of 1954 by introducing men and weapons into South Vietnam (long before there was any talk of infiltration from the north) and our insistence on the sovereignty of the "state" of South Vietnam in contradiction of the terms of the Geneva settlement; our approval and support of the Diem regime's decision to ignore the provision of the Geneva settlement calling for free elections throughout Vietnam in 1956; and our bombings of the regrouping zone called North Vietnam and of Laos, and our war effort on the ground to suppress a popular (and well justified) rebellion in South Vietnam (at the same time our President piously speaks of our willingness to enter into "unconditional negotiations" for peace that would exclude active participation of the National Liberation Front).

Our Government's decisions regarding Vietnam seem to rest on certain basic assumptions given wide currency in the Eisenhower-Dulles years, most of which are false. The first, and perhaps most dangerous, assumption arises from an ethnocentrism that assumes our country to be morally and in every way superior to every other nation. The facts that we have never lost a war and that our economy has, by and large, been prosperous are used as quasi-religious assurances that we are always in the right. Therefore, we feel justified in presuming to impose our policies on other countries. Needless to say, the brand of "democracy" that we export has little in common with the freedoms that we enjoy at home.

Also central to our foreign policy is the assumption that communism is a monolithic monster. While this may have had a kernel of truth to it 15 years ago it does not coincide with the realities of today. Thus, we further assume, incorrectly, that every popular rebellion against a corrupt and suppressive regime is inspired and controlled by either Peiping or Moscow. The fact that popular rebellions often number some Communists among numerous other religious and political elements should in no way be taken as proof that these people desire to exist under a puppet Chinese or Russian Government (any more than they desire to exist under a puppet American or French Government).

Another assumption needing some revision is that communism can be successfully contained in Asia as it was in Europe; i.e., by military might. Unfortunate for the credibility of this theory is the fact that Asian communism does not often take the form of large invading armies, hence our show of military force is a less-than-effective deterrent. On the contrary, Asian communism amounts to the spread of an idea that is seen by Asians as a viable alternative to unpopular dictatorial regimes on this continent where capitalism, not communism, is the dirty word (based on the historical experiences of these peoples). The American presence in southeast Asia, far from preventing the spread of communism, insures it.

We will not reiterate some of the more common arguments against further escalation of the war as we take these to be self-evident. That escalation, proven to be an unsatisfactory policy, poses the imminent risk of either a large-scale land war with China, a nuclear war, or both, is even recognized by those who advocate (sometimes with unseemly relish) further escalation.

We would again commend you, Senator Gruening, Governor Hatfield, and those few others in positions of public responsibility who have continued to speak out on this issue, thereby demonstrating your willingness to place your convictions on such vital concerns as war and peace above partisan loyalties. The vilifications heaped upon you by the press, which seems to be strangely content to report only one side of this issue, will one day be regarded as a high tribute to the steadfastness of your courage and moral convictions at a time when most others seem to lack these qualities.

We support your continuing efforts to bring questions concerning our activities in Vietnam before a Congress which until recently has all but abdicated its responsibilities in this area. Events of the last few days, in which you have taken an active role, are encouraging, although (alas) tardy by several years. It is our earnest desire, however, that Congress not attempt to make respectable our unwarranted actions of the past by a declaration of war at this too-late date. It would be far better if Congress were to honestly attempt to untangle us from the impossible mess in which we so perversely entangled ourselves and to salvage some of our dignity and respectability before the eyes of an outraged world.

Our misguided policies of the past, replete with self-fulfilling prophecies, oversimplifications and falsities, and overoptimistic jingoism, must not be allowed to circumscribe future options and certainly must not dictate such a transparent face-saving device as a declaration of war to justify our irresponsible activities of the last decade and more. Such a declaration would only serve to silence opposition to the war at home while in no way absolving us of the blame that is ours for creating the war.

It would appear to us that the Vietnam question must be promptly laid before the United Nations and a reconvened Geneva Conference. Our obligations to these organizations, which we have heretofore blithely ignored, are certainly more binding than our so-called commitment (which we promoted) to an illegitimate and dictatorial regime of our own making, which has been continually overthrown only to be replaced by another of its kind, and which is self-serving and in no way representative of the political wishes of the people of Vietnam, who (ironically) we are fighting under the pretense of giving them their freedom. The fact that we and the French puppet government of South Vietnam did not sign the final treaty at Geneva is not ample justification for our aggressive activities.

The temporary South Vietnamese Government became bound by the terms of the agreement when it succeeded the French, who did sign the treaty, when they pulled out just prior to the elections which were pending in 1956 and subsequently never held. We are supposedly in Vietnam only at the questionable invitation of this Government and are therefore tacitly bound by the agreements governing them, which agreements we have continually been their partner in violating. We are also bound by the unilateral statement made by our representative to the Geneva Conference, Mr. Bedell Smith, to "refrain from the threat or the use of force to disturb them (the Geneva agreements) in accordance with article 2 (sec. 4) of the Charter of the United Nations dealing with the obligation of members to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force * * *" and "to seek to achieve unity (in nations divided against their will) through free elections. * * *" In addition our Government has made several public statements expressing its willingness to achieve a settlement based on the 1954 Geneva agreements, thereby implying its recognition of its terms.

We will continue to support your efforts and those of others who wish to extricate us from our present position in Vietnam and put an end to this useless and disastrous war by the peaceful means at our disposal in accordance with our membership obligations in the United Nations and with a return to the terms of the Geneva agreement of 1954. We also support your efforts to place before the American people the relevant facts concerning Vietnam of which the administration has kept them in ignorance; and we would appreciate receiving copies of the Galbraith report and the Mansfield report when and if they became available to the public. We will continue to oppose an administration that follows a foreign policy of warmaking predicated on a misreading of the national aspirations of former European colonies.

Respectfully yours,
Roger K. Siegner,
Sandra J. Siegner,
Mr. and Mrs. Roger K. Siegner.

Portland, Oreg., *January 30, 1966.*

Dear Senator Morse: The members of our family quite literally applauded this afternoon when you stood up for the principles you have so often stated in regard to our preposterous situation in Vietnam. The three adults present have never voted for you, and have disapproved of many actions and attitudes in the past years of your political career.

But today, we clapped hands and fervently cried, "Three cheers for Morse."

There will be another voter in the family next fall, and we shall help send you a distinguished colleague in the Senate who is also outspoken regarding the present situation. Three cheers for our next Senator, Mark Hatfield.

Very truly yours,
Henry M. Browne Family.

Eugene, Oreg., *January 31, 1966.*

Dear Senator: Congratulations on your heroic stand over Vietnam. I cannot understand any good reasons for this war. I keep feeling some people have seen too many western movies or are living the 1960's according to what should have been done in the 1930's and wasn't.

I am distressed. I have the feeling we are fighting on the wrong side and that we shouldn't be fighting at all there. I have served my time but yet I have no desire of any sort to die on some sandblasted beach with my guts strung out to air. Or no desire to kill anyone who might feel he has a reason to defend that beach.

I don't understand this war. I try and try to build a case for the Government and it is sand that is washed asunder by the first wave of logic, of fact, of thought.

Let's get out.

Respectfully,
Glenn S. Chambers.

Portland, Oreg., *February 3, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you very much for your courageous views on Vietman. I am in hearty agreement.

Best wishes always.

Sincerely yours,
Ruth G. Peterson.

Albany, Oreg., *February 5, 1966.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I watched and heard you on television this morning when you were questioning the Secretary of AID.

I am completely in accord with you on your opinion in regard to Secretary Robert McNamara's refusal to "Face the Nation" on TV when questioned by this committee next week.

Stick by your guns.

Let us hope that the President will realize the true worth of not only Secretary McNarama but that of Dean Rusk and perhaps more.

I feel the time has come that these advisers to the President should be replaced by capable people before we are brought to destruction, by McNamara, Rusk, etc.

Most respectfully submitted.

Edwin P. Savard.

P.S.—Also, please, vote against the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. Let all people live.

Boring, Oreg.,
January 30, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Morse: I wish to commend you for your very courageous stand on Vietnam.

I have not agreed with you politically on many issues but they have not involved a moral issue. As you continually point out this problem does.

I hope you will continue to work toward getting this issue before the United Nations. I cannot see how it can be solved justly any other way.

I teach sixth graders and as I look at them I silently pray that they will not have to be fighting in Asia. If we do not settle this justly they will be.

I am sure you will have some support in the Congress now. You have practically carried the load alone but there are others now that will help.

I intend to write to Mrs. Neuberger and Mr. Wyatt tonight urging them to take the same stand as you do.

Surely, if we support the United Nations we must have faith enough to support them all the way, morally as well as financially.

I would like to urge you to look into another problem that bothers many of us concerning the draft.

Before we start eliminating students by testing can't we look into some of these graduate students that just go on and on—one grant after another—and produce practically nothing. This is wonderful in peaceful days—but not when some will be deprived of a bachelor degree because of the draft.

As you know, all tests are based on reading ability alone. What about the boy that is sincere, honest, ambitious, but still not a fast reader? He may make a far better citizen in the long run. Yet, he is to be drafted in preference to the fast reader. If we take one college student I feel we should take them all.

I was at the University of Oregon when you were head of the law school so I know you share a teacher's viewpoint and I am writing this from that standpoint.

Thank you for your time and again I offer my support toward your courageous stand.

Respectfully yours,

Lauese H. Shields.

Dear Sir: I too commend you for your lone fight. Do not be afraid. The right way always will win.

Sincerely,

Matt Shields.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 1, 1966.

Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Please continue your fight to bring some sanity into our foreign policy. Along with many other Americans, I am deeply concerned over the course our country has taken in the past decade in regard to foreign policy. If we must police the entire world, then heaven help us, democracy has failed.

You are one of the few bright rays left in Washington and I hope you will continue your fight to bring the truth to more Americans. Perhaps then, and only then, a solution can be found.

Very truly,

Mrs. Ted Evans.

Corvallis, Oreg.

Senator Wayne Morse: Thank you for your recent letter and enclosure. Sincerely appreciate your taking time to write. It is heartening to note that several other Senators are at long last awakening from their lethargy and rallying to your aid. Their past neglect of duty in illegally delegating their duty and authority to L.B.J. has been most discouraging. To have had so many of them do this makes one despair that our form of government can long endure, and to delegate this authority to a man so temperamental and impressed with his own omniscience as L.B.J. makes the danger imminent indeed.

Sincerely hope that your recent proposals concerning the war in Vietnam meet with success but even if they don't at this time that you'll continue to persevere.

Rest assured also that many people who do not write you are also anxious that you continue your efforts, notwithstanding the so-called opinion polls that seemingly favor L.B.J. Most of the people I'm acquainted with are violently opposed to our actions in Vietnam.

Could write on some other topics but feel that the war in Vietnam is the summum bonum at the moment.

Sincerely,

Charles Christman.

Netarts, Oreg.,
January 31, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: We heartily endorse your stand on referring the Vietnam war to the United Nations.

We agree that we are not being informed about the true situation.

We feel that the decisions that are very vital to all of us are decided by a small group of politicians.

We hate to wait until the next election to express our feelings.

We are 100 percent behind you.

Truly yours,

Evangeline Van Buren,
Cecil A. Peterson,
Jean W. Mock,
Mrs. Dorothy I. Croes.

Portland, Oreg.,
January 13.

Mr. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

If last night's report on the state of the Union is any true indication of the American way of life, it is imperative that we start all over again and build anew.

It's time we stopped worrying about saving our precious face and gave considerable thought to salvaging what remains of our sacred honor.

I am sick at heart and ashamed to the core of my being for/of what my country is doing in Vietnam.

Commitments. We made a commitment to the world in the 18th century. What, in the name of God, has become of it? Is this Nation going mad?

There are many who feel this way. Unfortunately, there are not enough of you.

Vivian Johannes.

Portland, Oreg.,
January 17, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for the speedy fulfillment of my recent request for a copy of a certain law.

A suggestion: Keep blasting Johnson's fumbling re Vietnam. It is ridiculous isn't it?

We are trying to achieve a victory we can't even define.

Sincerely yours,

John J. Howard.

Imnaha, Oreg.,
January 15, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: It was very interesting and most encouraging to read your views in the Oregon Journal last Friday. Indeed it is always encouraging to read what you say and to know for what you are working.

In a mad world you seem to be one of the few free spirits.

It is very hard for us lay people to understand the true position regarding Vietnam, etc.

We, here, read the Nation and the Manchester Guardian (we are English, some of us) which I think give a fairly true picture of affairs.

It seems as if military minded people here have too much influence and that it is high time humanity worked for a different way of solving all problems. Surely there are many people alive today—such as top psychologists, lawyers, and practical philosophers with excellent minds who could be used to work out the urgent problems affecting all the world in this time of crisis such as there never has been before. There are signs that sanity is breaking through, but I'm afraid not soon enough.

Please carry on with your wonderful work.

Yours sincerely,

Dorothea Bell.

P.S.—If only the President would publicly clarify the U.S. position; otherwise the offer of unconditional negotiations doesn't mean much. Also if only we would use the United Nations more.

Klamath Falls, Oreg.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: In light of domestic and world affairs, I am impelled to write my views on these subjects.

My first concern is Vietnam. I don't feel I fully understand what is going on there, nor do many educated Americans. From what I do know I am very dissatisfied.

It seems to me we are committed to a long war with no real goal in sight. As an American and a reservist, I feel deeply for those giving their lives for this cause and for their families. It would be different if we had a goal and could finish the job and get out. To flounder for years, as it has been predicted this war will last, seems to be hopeless, needless, and expensive.

For the number of troops we have in Vietnam, it seems we hold very little ground. I could write much about what we are not doing, but others have done that. To end this crisis, I propose the following:

1. Let's either use a combined force with other countries or get out. Why should we carry the burden, treaty or not, if countries who are receiving American aid and other European and southeast Asian countries adjacent to this troubled area are not willing to support us or fight for freedom?

2. With a combined force, if that be the decision, we should clean out of the country to a predetermined location like we did in Korea. Maintain the area with a taken force and let the Vietnamese establish their government under the supervision of this token force. Then let the rest of the forces go home. I would be willing to join forces in the type of situation I have suggested, but to go there now and play peekaboo with the Vietcong in the jungle—no, thanks. Perhaps you can't blame draft card burners and demonstrators. They may have a point.

3. With the course of action in (2) above, bombing should be aggressively and effectively carried out in North Vietnam. This includes Hanoi and all supply points and routes. We would either win militarily or have successful peace negotiations as a result.

Please give the above serious consideration. I hope you and your colleagues will support this policy.

I would like to draw your attention to the enclosed article which tells of a poor reaction of the people in the country we are financially aiding, guiding, and in which our men are losing lives. I personally know Mr. Tiede's writing from college, and he gives a true picture of what exists.

I would like to know what we are going to do about Cuba. Ignoring that country is not the answer.

On the domestic scene I oppose the following:

1. President Johnson's Great Society programs. We are quickly heading toward socialism. The policy is to take from the rich and give to the poor. Gravy trains will never solve the problem.

2. Government controls. Let's get programs on a State and local level. We have too much Federal control now.

3. Violation of church and state relations. Please oppose legislation to aid churches and church-related activities. I suggest that you subscribe to Church and State, a P.O.A.U. publication from Washington, D.C.

Thank you for considering my views.

Sincerely yours,

Dale R. Petersen.

Department of Comparative Literature, University of Oregon,
Eugene, Oreg., February 9, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: With admiration for your uncompromising integrity I support entirely your efforts to recall U.S. policymakers from the brink of disaster to which they have led us. Do all you can to rescind the powers which the President has so flagrantly abused. If the legislative bodies do not force a change in the direction of our foreign policy to one of peaceful coexistence, identification with reform movements instead of repression, and adherence to international law, there is little hope. The Dominican Republic incident has shown us that Vietnam is only one of many places where U.S. violation of peoples' basic right of self-determination can and may lead to the ultimate disaster.

Although I have great hope for the U.N. I think the the NLF, DRV, and China are justified in their distrust of it. By using the U.N. as a tool for its own aims in the Congo (and to a more questionable and perhaps forgivable extent in Korea, and in ignoring it in favor of an OAS mission which it was able to make to its own specifications during the Dominican crisis, the United States has rendered the U.N. unacceptable to the Vietnamese as an arbitor. I support both the desire of the NLF and the DRV to return to the Geneva Accords of 1954, and the jurisdiction over elections by the International Control Commission created therein.

The peace that has to be made soon in Vietnam must be a just peace; the NLF must figure largely in any settlement made. If they are now largely Communist that is our fault. It is glaring proof that U.S. policy must be turned from its support of anything anti-Communist, no matter how horribly reactionary, to support for popular movements. If we persist in seeing the world in solely Communist versus anti-Communist terms, the emerging nations and downtrodden will have no choice but to turn against us. The need for and inevitability of revolution and social change must be made the cornerstone of a new foreign policy. In hypocritically paying lipservice to this as the President has done, and in calling us the force of revolution, as he did last night in Los Angeles, he is talking in the idiom of 1984.

I would like to encourage you to renew your pleas for recognition of China and her admission to the U.N. Also, I would like to recommend to you a recently published report by the American Friends Service Committee, "A New China Policy: Some Quaker Proposals," Yale University Press (New Haven, 1965). Its only bias is in favor of humanity. I am horrified by the fact that many people to whom I talk actually believe that the war we are fighting is against Chinese soldiers who have invaded Vietnam. Is there nothing one can do to stop the Government from encouraging these distorted views? Although I cannot be certain of my facts I believe that we were not even fighting against any North Vietnamese in the south until after the Gulf of Tonkin incident was used as an excuse to widen the war to the north.

I leave you with two final requests for legislation and action:

1. Push for an extensive investigation into the CIA, an institution which I feel is largely responsible for our errors; and

2. I would support nationalization of defense industries—profits made on war or its possibility serve only to sustain or encourage slaughter.

I am no longer proud to be an American; I am ashamed. My only allegiance now is to honest and fearless men like you, and to human beings regardless of their political stripe. If there is ever any service I can render you, please do not hesitate to ask.

Please put me on your mailing list, and send me any available copies of your recent speeches. I would also appreciate as many copies of the Mansfield Report on Vietnam as you can send me (up to 25 copies). If bulk is not available I would be content with one.

Sincerely yours,

Stephen H. Arnold,
NDEA Fellow in Comparative Literature.

Klamath Falls, Oreg.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne D. Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: As one of your constituents I am becoming increasingly alarmed over the war in Vietnam and the secrecy with which it has been conducted by our Government. And I wish to commend you for your courage in endeavoring to bring the facts before the American people and your efforts in behalf of peace. I am sure more and more people are convinced that we should have a top level policy change and not escalate a war that we can never win.

I am enclosing an article on the skyrocketing population, which I am sure you are aware of. The gist of the article is that the Government should make greater efforts to meet this challenge.

In writing this letter, I am also speaking for my daughter and her husband.

Sincerely yours,

Marian H. Geary.
Mrs. Edward Geary.

Chemult, Oreg.,
February 7, 1966.

Senator Wayne L. Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I would like to say bully for you. I watched you on Friday on the Senate investigation of Vietnam. We certainly need more people in our Government who feel as you do and are not afraid to say so. I must admit I do not understand all about what we are doing there in the first place and can't seem to find out much about it. There is of course quite a lot in the papers about what we are doing and a little on why, but not much that makes any sense to me. I keep getting the idea that we are in some way supposed to be protecting southeast Asia from a complete takeover by the Communists or to be more definite, China. If this is true why aren't these countries more worried about it and in there helping us? Are we in a position where we say what is good for these people regardless of what they think? It seems to me that the Communist ideology would have a mighty poor chance if we were offering something better. I realize that covers a different area but if our great giveaway program was handled with a little more commonsense we wouldn't have the Communist problem in the first place.

I would like to know where I might find out what the 1954 and 1962 Geneva accords were. I have read a good deal about them in connection with Vietnam but can't find what it is.

I would also like to know what is the difference between the Vietcong and the North Vietnam government troops, their respective positions in the government, aims and ideals.

Thank you.

Davis Elms.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 7, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We wish we had more men like you in our Federal offices. Keep up your fight and your vigilance. We fear for our country's future. Wish you were the President. I listened to a discourse on TV by a Dr. Frank Munk of Portland State College the other night in which he made the comment that the American people will have to stand up and speak for our defense. I called him tonight and asked him how we could. He said to write to our representatives. He said you and Governor Hatfield are right. Dr. Munk teaches Political Science at Portland State.

I am a teacher at Sunnyside School in Clackamas, Oreg., and, as I said to many, I am teaching these little children to prepare their lives for a peaceful world but why teach them if their future is going to be gone? This world will be obliterated if we keep on the present course, I fear.

We pray for you to have health and perseverance and to keep lambasting with your excellent oratorical discourses.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Keirtz.

Hubbard, Oreg.,
February 7, 1966.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Honorable Sir: Greetings and salutations. I wish to congratulate you on your recent TV speeches. They are my opinions exactly. It is about time someone took a stand on the Vietnam situation and am happy to see it is you.

There is a suggestion I would like to make as I am not of draft age, and that is, I wish you would run for President the next time—I am sure you would get the job as you are a person of rare courage and intellect. On this issue alone I am certain you would get the votes.

In this community we don't believe in any of Johnson's policies. I was certainly amused at his face when he did announce the fact he was putting this issue up to the U.N. Boy, that must have hurt.

We the people, are not as stupid and vulnerable as that man seems to think we are. I wish you would run him out of town.

I wish you would get the boys out of prison for refusing to go 9,000 miles to fight an undeclared war. I haven't been able to sleep, thinking about them. And the ones at the front do really haunt me, indeed.

God bless you Senator, and more power to you. You are a real fighter as you always have been and I think you are magnificent and glamorous and everything else nice.

Sincerely,

Ellen Milroy.

SANDY, OREG.,
February 10, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I wish to express my feelings and give all the moral support I can to your stand on the war.

Give them hell WAYNE, I think any clear thinking person can see the mess stinks.

I think Johnson, McNamara, and Lodge are determined to sink us all.

There seems to be no limit of commitments they can make.

We have nothing to gain in another war that is not to be won.

If we are there to fight Communists, why not fight them to win or get out, and try to keep our economy stimulated in some other way.

Want to thank you for your reports you send.

You can depend on my support any time.

Yours truly,

E. P. RICHARDSON.

ASHLAND, OREG.,
February 8, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree with you on your stand against Johnson's war in Vietnam, a most senseless conflict. I have asked myself many times, "Why should we the American people, take on the duties of the United Nations?" I understand the United Nations was organized to settle world disputes; so far the United Nations has been a failure.

Watching on TV the Foreign Relations Committee hearing last Friday, when the committee was questioning David R. Bell, foreign aid administrator. As near as I can see, Mr. Bell thinks the people and Congress should not question the President's policies, should grant he, "The President," all he asks for; men, money, and materials, and should trust the President blindly.

As for foreign aid, why should the people of the United States support some 80 Nations of the world?

In the President's state of the Union message he proposes to make heaven on earth for all the peoples of the earth, at the expense of the American taxpayers.

In 1964 when Congress granted the President full authority, to decide as he pleased to conduct the affairs of South Vietnam, I said to friends of mine, that was a grave mistake for Congress to do; most of the people thought I was out of my mind; they are beginning to see I was not far wrong. The President should not have so much power, unless we had a formal declaration of war, which we do not have; he is muddling and fuddling; going around in circles, has a tiger by the tail, does not know when to turn loose. I never voted for the man, still do not think he is the man for so high an office. He and ex-President Kennedy both had their heads in the clouds, had not learned to walk on solid ground.

On this July 4, 1776, we the United Colonies, declared our independence from England. Why in the year 1965, the United States, should impose an embargo on Rhodesia, for declaring their independence from England? Sure I know they are a white minority, there are more black men in Rhodesia, the majority of the black men, are living in a savage state, if we leave the white minority alone, they will in time civilize the black man, and merge into a stable government, if the black man now is given governing power, this country will end in choas, and destruction.

Yours truly,

STEPHEN BOYER.

OAKLAND, OREG.,
February 8, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: First of all let me tell you I am a Republican. My father, Hon. Joseph Thomas Bridges served in the legislature in the nineties. Was helpful in getting an appropriation for the Drain Normal School in Drain, his hometown. He was a Republican, so it follows I am also in that party. However I consider myself very openminded, and I like good people, honest in their convictions.

I am strongly behind anyone who holds high, good, sound, and honest government right down to the county and city levels. It seems to me that too many of our politicians use their elected status to feather their own or the nests of their colleagues. I am most happy in my belief that you are not among these.

Today I listened with much interest to the questioning and remarks in your committee's interview with Gen. James Gavin. It seemed to me that your views and those of the general coincided. I liked his views in trying to contain the war and not to expand it. And this seemed to be quite general among those who questioned the general.

I feel that a military victory would be quite hollow. It would mean another Berlin affair, policing probably both North and South Vietnam. The thought comes to me that a strong personage could get the two heads together, in some neutral country, possibly India, and come to terms acceptable to both. Sort of like we do with our unions as there always seem to be a certain give and take that would mend all their troubles. I feel sure that the north folks do not wish to see all of that slaughter, and if the south were to have a good government, peace would follow.

I served through both World War I and World War II, the 91st Division in 1917–18 and as a troop ship commander in World War II. I know what war is. During the peace years I was regimental adjutant of the 382d Infantry, 96th Division. Col. Carl Abram was my commanding officer.

I just thought that you would possibly like to hear from a Republican who respects you and your views regarding the unlisted war we are having. My son and I along with my son-in-law served in World War II, but I surely would hate to have my son serve in this one, a war where we are not mad enough to kill the North Viets over nothing. For it's one thing to tell our boys that we are fighting for our country and another thing to tell them that we think that the Vietcong wish to help take over the world. Heavens. And us with a major communistic government only 90 miles off our coast. If we wish to do some good lets turn that island back to the good Cubans and let them go back home.

Sincerely,

R. D. BRIDGES,
Lieutenant Colonel AUS (retired).

CENTRAL POINT, OREG.,
February 8, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to tell you how much I admire you for giving voice on your opinion on the U.S. policies in Vietnam. It takes great courage to speak out against President Johnson's administration.

If there is so much dirt going on in Vietnam, it should be stopped. Our boys should not be dying, while others are making huge profits from this war. Of course that is why we have wars so the few can profit from them.

EDITH GREEN states we are sending the "cream of the crop" to Vietnam, instead of sending the drifters on the street corners and the uneducated. The uneducated can take orders and follow them and it would be a good place for hoodlums to get discipline and learn the facts of life quick.

I have great faith in you and wish our Government had more men like you.

Sincerely,

MARIE VAN MIDDLESWORTH.

TILLAMOOK, OREG.,
February 8, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
417 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed please find two pictures taken from our Oregon newspaper. I now find it much easier to see both sides of the Vietnam problem. I have only one problem. Perhaps you are able to advise me. A return letter would be most appreciated. My married son, father of two children, is now rated up A–1 and subject to military call. I have studiously examined the picture of the 15-year-old child who was wounded fighting for Vietcong and next studied the suave Madam Ky, depicted dancing with the military might. Please tell me why I can't feel like dancing in the nightclubs instead of spending so much time in prayer and penance that my handsome son and all the other sons who inherit the wrath of war may by some heaven sent miracle be spared. I have struggled to keep my composure since my own brothers served the country well during World War II. But there is something wrong with American policy in Vietnam.

Senator MORSE, the people of Oregon sent you to the Senate to reckon with all the problems that beset us as a people. Involvement in war most certainly demands your attention. We, the people, demand that you do first things first; namely, fight for peace and try to get us out of the frightful mess we are in.

Please suggest to President Johnson that a fine nightclub be provided Madam Ky in or near the puppet government of Vietnam as some of us poor, heartsick mothers cannot bear gaiety and rejoicing right now. I am sincere in this as I am not given to sarcasm. I have served with faith and performed the duties of long years of work as an officer in the Democratic Party and I have reason to make the statement that we Democrats have had enough.

When election day arrives let's see you run for the Presidency since you seem to remember what the people who elected you have in mind. History is being written for all generations to read and judge.

An ardent supporter,

E. HEDIGER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 9, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator from Oregon.

SIR: I watched the TV showing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee yesterday, and I have read many items in the press outlining your views on Vietnam and am in full accord with your views.

I can't understand why the administration is so concerned about Communist aggression 10,000 miles away after letting Cuba, 90 miles away, be taken over.

Also, I note the administration does many things to "keep our commitments." My question is whether these commitments are made with the consent and advice of the Congress.

Yours truly,

JOHN A. GRANT,
Seventy-nine years of age, 51 years Oregon resident.

ROSEBURG, OREG.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I am sitting near my TV and watching you on the Senate hearing committee's questioning of David Bell about the administrative situation in South Vietnam. I am 100 percent with you about this fiasco in that area. It was very foolish to send our troops in unknown jungle country to fight on the terms of an enemy that already even had Saigon under seige. We should have kept our troops with the ships in the waters surrounding that area and fought the enemy or contained them from there.

There is no front in South Vietnam as I can see it. The enemy is everywhere and so we drop our troops and supplies in the middle of all this to be subject to destruction and confiscation by the enemy everywhere at will.

Meanwhile the cost of all of this goes up in astronomical figures. Mr. Bell is not giving a very satisfactory answer as to the best use of all of this money—according to papers I have read and from what I've heard from local commentators. American goods sent to South Vietnam is being black marketed to the rank and file South Vietnamese—by even American officials sent in there to posts of trust. Money from the sale of some of these goods have already returned to this country to the wife of one of these officials since discharged I imagine by now.

As I said I'm watching you on TV as you are criticizing the administration about our illegal war—the war we are carrying on without the support we should have from the rest of our allies, and a war we never declared to the world from the start.

This is a hopeless situation at the moment. My suggestion if it would be of any value would be for us to carry on this war against Hanoi from the waters surrounding the country and ravage them with consistent raids both from the air and hit-and-run commando type from the ground, and leave the inland fighting to the now well-armed South Vietnamese troops alone.

I certainly hope you can bring your influence to bear and get Mr. McNamara and other officials before the Senate hearing and before our TV cameras so we can at least see what exactly is going on in this struggle in South Vietnam.

I enjoy your letters and look forward to hearing from you again soon.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM C. LEWIS.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.

Mr. WAYNE MORSE,
State Capitol Building,
Salem, Oreg.

DEAR MR. DEBATER: Yes, I know how hard it is to keep your temper in a deep debate as you had in the "Vietnam Prospective" that was on television.

However we believe as you stated, let the public know what is going on over there; the public's judgment is fair, not always good, but always just.

We enjoyed your side of the debate very greatly and there is something to be said for their (the other Senators') side and comments; however, you will be getting our vote the next time you want it, and for whatever office you desire. I believe you can do a good job in whatever office you would think yourself capable of handling. I would like to see you open your "guns" up on some more Senators in the near future; we all agree on your outlook of Vietnam and its conditions.

Cordially yours,

DON GIBSON.

PACIFIC NATIONAL ADVERTISING AGENCY,
Portland, Oreg., February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: While you and I have had a few differences in the past, I must tell you how much I admire your stand on the Vietnam situation. Your position is not only legal but logical. It is good to have a voice sound out with the courage you show.

Also, on the foreign aid you again have shown great courage. In some ways foreign aid is like the United Fund here in Portland. It increases and increases and the bureaus and offices increase and increase. So do all the officeworkers, executive secretaries and caseworkers. As a consequence, some of the people in Portland who should be getting the benefits are neglected.

On the President's international health and education program, I cannot believe that any man, in good conscience, could propose all this, when we have hundreds of people dying in the United States of kidney disease because there are only a few kidney machines. We have a situation in the Portland-Vancouver area where $60,000 was volunteered to help keep two women alive. Surely, we must take care of our own first.

This doesn't mean that I am not sympathetic with the plight of the whole world, but sometimes we seem to forget that the smallest country is fiercely nationalistic and is not impressed with the United States or its power one whit.

Keep up the good fight.

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD H. SYRING,
Vice President-Manager.

GARIBALDI, OREG.,
February 7, 1966.

Mr. WAYNE MORSE,
Democrat, Senator of United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your determined stand against our bungling war-mad handling of the Vietnam situation. This meeting in Hawaii is a disturbing move also. We have no faith in McNamara. The enclosed clipping from the Oregonian expresses my view of him.

President Johnson must be getting very poor advice.

Sincerely,

ELSIE ERICKSON.
Mrs. E. W.

TARNISHED IMAGE

Robert McNamara, the brilliant, dynamic, superefficient Defense Secretary, built up as the No. 1 whiz kid of two administrations, has come upon hard times imagewise. Once considered almost infallible he is now the object of growing disenchantment both in and out of Congress. After seven inspection trips to Vietnam his assessments of the war there appear consistently wrong. European observers who admire his cost accounting maintain that McNamara's defense advice to President Johnson has proven fallacious. They fault McNamara for not realizing that the No. 1 U.S. enemy in Asia is not little North Vietnam but massive Red China. It is no secret to McNamara that Red China is currently stockpiling nuclear weapons, that it will have operational by 1967 a medium-range ballistic missile, that it plans to equip submarines with nuclear rockets, that it is preparing its people for a war against the United States, that until it is ready to wage such a war it wants the Vietcong and Ho Chi Minh to keep fighting the United States endlessly. McNamara is accused of having fallen into a Red Chinese trap from which he refuses to extricate himself because he would then have to admit an error in basic judgment.

HEPPNER, OREG.,
February 7, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: To begin with, I will explain to you that I am a veterinarian, 42 years old, World War II combat veteran, and that I conduct a general practice here in this great eastern Oregon country (Morrow County) with the invaluable assistance of my loyal wife, who helped compose this short note.

We like to think of ourselves as being independent, and most of our clientele are cattlemen—who are certainly known to be an independent breed.

When you destroy the initiative in the American people to root hog, or die, you may destroy all. Now this initiative is being destroyed by the Great Society in setting up these tremendous Government aid programs, both here in the United States and in foreign countries. It has gone beyond all reason. No longer are we, as free people, encouraged to make an individual place in life for ourselves and our families. We are instead encouraged to live off of the Government, because it is easier and simpler. Free enterprise? Very little of this left in the pure form anymore. A few of us diehards have not given up yet, but we are constantly being tempted by the offers of this great bureaucracy of ours.

Lately, we have seen some hopeful signs of resistance in some quarters. We are thankful to see you, Senator MORSE, and others who have the fortitude left to stand up and demand that some of these higher-ups be questioned in front of the public. We should continue to probe the question of Vietnam. Encourage the Vietnamese to stand up if they want to resist communism, but on the other hand, do we really have the right, or the obligation, to conduct a war, and to choose sides in a country which is divided ideologically and very unstable politically?

We were very interested (spellbound) watching the telecast of the hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Friday, February 4. Hopefully, we anticipate more of this type of probing into the administration, and after the probing we would like to see some favorable action take place.

We hope that through this break into looking at this part of our Government policy, that it could be carried further and explore other aid programs.

On the surface of things, at the present rate, we could all be Government serfs: educated by, fed by, and cared for in old age by poor old "Uncle Sugar." Business people and laborers to pay taxes for hordes of the federally (as well as State) supported people to live on. Then where are we? Carried to the extreme, this would lead to a picture where all work for the Government. Then, who would pay for it?

Our own children are becoming embued with the philosophy of Government that does all for everybody. They are more concerned with security, and health plans, and old-age shelter, and easy working hours than they are to strike out and attempt independent efforts of support.

Now we will thank you for your time and efforts again, and wish you well on your investigation of the present policy and actions in Vietnam.

Yours truly,

MRS. JAMES W. NORENE,
JAMES W. NORENE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Someone made a criticism of you to me sometime ago and I replied: "Senator MORSE usually turns out to be right." And whether you win on your two resolutions which you are entering in the Senate about Vietnam you are still right. Certainly the President should have his power to put us deeper into the swamps of Vietnam taken away.

The enclosed copy of "Famine Stalks the Earth" is mainly for your information and to indicate that we are backing the idea. We have sent one to President Johnson urging him to really do something about it. We know you have been doing all you can about it and will continue to do all you can to help solve the terrible population problem and increase world food production.

You probably know about Dr. Charles A. Wells and his publication "Between the Lines." I hope you are a subscriber. I have taken it for many years and find it very helpful, especially because it is so condensed and well documented and courageous. Just this week he is speaking at the Montevillo Methodist Church in southeast Portland. You and he would make a great "team."

Again, urging you to do all you can in your struggle for a fair deal in Vietnam and elsewhere, we are,

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. Stanhope R. Pier.

Cottage Grove, Oreg.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Morse: Since I do not have a television, I listened to your debate on Vietnam on the radio. To say the least, it was interesting, but more, it was tragic. Just when did we become aggressors? I am not trying to paraphrase your views, but from the knowledge that I have been able to assemble, I am partially in agreement with your views on the Vietnam situation. I do not think we should withdraw from the war though. We should withdraw to the border and take up a defensive position. This, of course, would be a disheartening position for us as there would be in all probability little chance of making this a short war. Since we are being hypothetical I would then go to the U.N. and ask for police assistance not only in Vietnam, but along all communistic borders that we are holding. We might even go further and put U.N. troops in all the free countries whether they border Communist countries or not, and withdraw all our troops from every country and replace them with U.N. troops. Isn't this in fact what the League of Nations and the U.N. were innovated for?

What I cannot understand is this false fear our adversaries have to a repetition of a Hitler type takeover of South Vietnam. How could the Communists possibly take over South Vietnam if we took up an effective defense as we did in Korea? It is sad indeed that we approve the minority in this war. It is even more sad that no matter how idealistic we may be, we are wrong. What really galls me is the subtle way that the press influences the public to support our actions in Vietnam. Their patriotic views and interviews with servicemen who are brainwashed into thinking what they do is in defense of our freedom; their publicity concerning anti-Vietnamists who demonstrate against something just to exercise their right to dissent; their efforts to put Congressmen who approve of the action in Vietnam in the limelight and push those who disapprove in the background where little notice is taken of them. Of course this is to be expected, I suppose, with Moyers as press secretary, and the press is honor bound to support the President. But enough of that. I am treading on ground that I am not too familiar with.

Enough on Vietnam for the present. I would like to talk about China for a few lines. I think China should be allowed to join the U.N. Now from what I read in the papers and other news sources I am led to believe that China is a nation of warmongers, or I should be led to believe this. I am not trying to be naive but I am sure the Chinese as a whole are not a warring people. The Germans were not a warring people either, but they were deceived and caught up in a web that they could not break. Now, the point I am trying to make is this: If we allow China into the U.N. this will open the way for talks with the leaders, but further than that we would be allowed to have ambassadors exchanged who would have a tremendous influence on the various business and social Chinese that they would meet in the course of their stay. In other words, we should get it across to the Chinese people that we are not monsters. And in turn maybe we could be influenced to think a little more of the Chinese. I know that we have influenced China, or certain Chinese businessmen already, but it isn't publicized since we are not to recognize China. What I am wondering is, if we are not to trade with China openly, is it legal to do as we are doing and trade with them undercover? Would Congress prosecute those caught trading with China from the United States? Or is Congress fully aware of this and just turn their backs? The reason I know we are trading with China is due to the fact that I know several people affiliated with shipping and I have also talked with several Chinese detainees who resided in Communist China, but took tours on ships going to and from China.

I have one thing more to add and that concerns our present Government administration. I do not think there is any danger of Johnson influencing our country to the extent that he will be a dictator. Now, that is not what I wanted to say, but what I mean is that we as a people make our President. We knew what we were voting for when we voted for Johnson. I shouldn't say we, but since I did not vote I have to put myself in accord with the present administration. What I am trying to point out is that you shouldn't criticize Johnson, but instead criticize those who voted for him. Our Nation has become too commercialized. We are too wealthy. We are so intent on making money that we tend to lean toward politics that will make us more money and are instead of making friends, accumulating enemies. Money produces greed and if you hand a fistful of greed to a poor person he will spit on it. I think our whole attitude in aid, be it foreign or right here in the United States, is much, much too caustic. We are too severe with recipients of foreign and local aid. They are made to feel that they are just so many cattle who have to be fed. They are asked a million questions, made to sign several papers then they are given their food and rushed out without ever a kind word or even a simple salutation. But, maybe you realize this already. I realize too that funds for aid are misappropriated and spent foolishly for things that are not necessary.

Well, I think I have rambled enough. The real reason I wrote this letter was to tell you that I think you are doing a very good job on the committee this time and to keep up the good work. I imagine you are making Johnson a little nervous, but it should be good for him. It is too bad that you are not a little more conservative, you would make a good President. But with your humanitarian views you would not stand a chance in an election. We as a nation are no longer humanitarians. Am I wrong? Goldwater was or is a humanitarian.

Paul Goddy.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: First I want to say I'm thoroughly confused.

I admire your forthright stand on Vietnam. But I don't know whether I agree in all respects. I don't think we should have been there in the first place. But the sad part is, we are. So what can we do from this point on? I don't think the U.N. can or will resolve this dispute.

First why did the representatives ever give Johnson all the power he has? It seems that he has thrown a fear into the representatives that they won't be elected again if they disagree with him. It's time the power was taken away from him.

As to a solution of southeast Asia would be to put an ultimatum to the free world that they get in and help resolve this thing or we will pull all of our forces back to Hawaii and let southeast Asia settle their own troubles. Communism must be stopped, but not by us alone.

Another thing, are you sure that Johnson's Great Society program is not a copy of Karl Marx's "Communist Manifesto." It's time the Democratic Party leaders read Karl Marx's "Capital" and see where they are leading this country. It appears to me Johnson is in a race with Moscow and Peiping to see who can communize this world first.

Yours truly,

W. M. Twiford.

Eagle Point, Oreg.,
February 6, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse.

My Dear Sir: To begin with, I voted against escalation.

I believe that foreign wars (especially undeclared) are instituted to control the homefolk and impose statism and controls on them.

You should mention this in your quest for peace. We support peace and freedom here at home.

I have been watching your appearances on TV (committee hearings), and have yet to hear you mention that this Vietnam war is a fraud and excuse to tax us into socialism.

Are the British going to sink Russian vessels trading with southeast Rhodesia?

I am World War II pilot and Korean war veteran.

Being under 44 years of age, I qualify for the draft.

Do you believe I should kill people in Vietnam when your foreign relations committee and David Bell argue semantics and public policy? Which way are we going?

Why should we support this Government? We support the Constitution.

I believe the President is a traitor and should be so charged by you (as a man of high principles that you are).

I believe the President should be impeached.

I believe treason is treason and when the swearing to uphold the Constitution is violated, the people have a right to replace this Government with a responsive and constitutional government. Congress (only) can declare war? Well do it or get out.

Confusion becomes a powerful voice, doesn't it?

Truth is so obfuscated by dialectics.

Hypocrisy has no rightful place in the Senate, has it?

Do your best at all times and we will not fault you.

Sincerely,

Ray Hannibal.

Corvallis, Oreg.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Your efforts in behalf of the American public's right to hear debate of the Vietnam problem is appreciated.

Many people feel a vague uneasiness about our present policy and for some of us the feeling is less than vague—it's real unease.

Surely with the tremendous resources and power of the United States a more constructive, imaginative approach to realization of the aspirations of the world's deprived people should be devised. Our paranoid posture ill becomes us.

Sincerely,

Jean D. Dellinger.

YAMHILL, OREG.,
February 3, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Just a few lines to you about what at least one taxpayer thinks of some of these goings-on.

About 2 weeks ago this coming Saturday or Sunday, we bombed for 6 hours with a fleet of planes and I think lost one and the crew. The news report seemed real pleased with the result, which was a count of 40 bodies. Why do we bomb where there is no bodies?

I am an old man but if you could get me a man or two that can talk their lingo I'll go over there and hire their whole guerrilla army for $10 a week and a bucket of rice and maybe a jug or two. All they want to do is make a living and what it cost to kill those 40 (maybe innocent people) we could hire them all and have them fight on our side and there wouldn't be nobody to fight but the big shots and racketeers.

All the billions we send over there goes to racketeers and big shots and the people still starve.

Looks like it would be cheaper and better to deal with the people.

Surely we don't have to lose our own boys and tax our people for a war just to have good times.

When we have a little internal trouble over here no country from across the sea steps in and makes bad matters worse.

So why should we stick our nose in their troubles?

I was in World War I and I guess we are the only vets that have never been given a pension, school, GI loans, etc. I understand if you are broke and haven't means of any kind or are a crip you can get something but if able-bodied and have a roof, to hell with you. Would only take 2 days' expense on this war to pay what few of these old guys there are left $75 or so a month, no strings. Would be real nice and would help the times and kill nobody.

If you should get to read this, thanks a lot.

I think maybe I'll vote for you any time on any office you might run for.

HARRY H. WILLIAMS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.

To the EDITOR:

Reply to **Mark J. Richardson on letter of** February 4, 1966. Not a bad idea, only we shouldn't have to depend on some Asiatics to put the right men in our public offices. The present occupants are creating widows and old maids. Protecting the interest of Wall Street brokers.

JERRY WALTER.

ALBANY, OREG., *February 6, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to present you with a copy of a letter I wrote to my 19-year-old son, Bill. Bill received his notice to report for induction into the U.S. Army on February 13.

"DEAR BILL: Today you received your notice from the local draft board to report for induction into the U.S. Army. It was with apprehension that I noted its arrival. My apprehension is whether I have done wrong and whether our country that you are being asked to serve and possibly give your life for is wrong.

"I remember only too well 8 short years ago encouraging you to seek an afterschool job of delivering the evening edition of the local daily newspaper. I remember that you were the youngest carrier boy they ever had. I remember with pride the fact you never missed any customers nor did any weather, no matter how miserable, did you fail to deliver. I remember you coming home, night after night, long after myself, soaked and half frozen from your deliveries and collections. I know you would have much rather been off playing with your friends for they constantly asked you—yet your stock answer was 'I have my route to attend to. My father says I should and I think I should.' I believe the postman's creed 'Neither rain, snow or dark of night shall deter them from their line of duty' would very well have fitted you and your determination to a job well done. This you did faithfully for 5 long years. Then one day you realized you had grown a little too old for a paperboy. With reluctance you announced to the newspaper you were resigning your position at the end of that spring term of school.

"Again I immediately encouraged you to seek employment in the local beanfields. This you did and many long hot and tedious hours you did toil through that summer (Vacation?). Yes you elected to stay home and work while we took our vacation. The school term commenced that fall as your beanfield job ended. Again at my urging you obtained a job at a local supermarket 4 hours each evening and all day Saturday and Sunday. Thus you were working 40 hours a week as a stock and sack boy in addition to a full school load. I suspect you would have much rather been off playing with your friends, having a good time and out driving around in your car. But you never deterred in your determination of 'I have my job to tend to—my father says I should and I think I should.' Then you graduated from high school. The local supermarket offered you a full-time position with them as they knew from the past they could depend on you. I don't know if it would be quite correct to say full time as you had been full time through 2 years of high school. That pretty much brings us up to the present time.

"I have apprehension now as to whether I did wrong. Did I make a mistake in not allowing you free hours to play with your friends and have fun-free time of your own? Or was I right in keeping you busy as I always told you a busy person would not get in trouble. I now have grave doubts as to my wisdom since you received your abrupt draft notice.

"I would like to say to you, Bill, that you are answering the call of your country and Commander in Chief. That you are answering a call that is right and just and necessary. That you are answering a call that many other lads have answered and served honorably and many gave the full measure of devotion. In these previous cases of the call to arms our cause seemed to be right and just and necessary. I wish I could say all these things apply to your present situation but I can't. I cannot because:

"1. We are in a war which your Commander in Chief refuses to ask for a declaration of war.

"2. You are being asked to fight in a war against union, a war to keep two peoples all of the same race separated.

"3. You are being asked to fight in a war that your country managed to maneuver to get around the Geneva Treaty providing elections to let these two people vote on union. Your country on the other hand has been urging elections to bring unity between East and West Germany, urging elections in Latin America, all over the world—except in these two little countries now torn by civil war.

"4. You are being asked to fight a war in which the enemy you must face has certain safe sanctuaries which are "off limits" to your shooting at them. No such zone exists for you.

"5. You are being asked to fight a war that most all of your country's allies say they profess great sympathy—and that is all—just great sympathy but no help and no aid and no soldiers. In fact ships of these great allies daily steam into the ports of the enemy with shiploads of cargo.

"Two long years ago a lone voice was heard in the Senate protesting our policy in Vietnam. It must have been a lonely person—because he was all alone and at a time when it would have been good politics to have remained silent and followed in the flock of sheep being led by the goat to the slaughter. But this lone voice kept saying the war should be taken to the United Nations where it rightfully belongs. Today many, many people can now see the wisdom and foresight that lone voice had. That lonely voice belongs to your U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE. History has and will prove WAYNE MORSE a man of wisdom, courage, foresight, and 'guts.'"

Senator MORSE, as near as I can determine the sentiment, is running 9 out of 10 in being 100 percent behind you in your courageous and rightful stand. Keep up the battle. You know you are right.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT R. PALMER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. MORSE: We have been listening to the Senate Foreign Relations meetings on TV. We are very thankful that you are on that committee.

The Lord bless you and keep you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. C. F. STUCK.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 5, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was gratified not only as to your position taken before the television audience, but also as to the greatly favorable response you received upon it. I had begun to fear that your views were those of a minority, but the 446–4 plurality gave me cause for hope. I have just read a letter to the editor from a woman in Portland who thinks "it is about time for someone to put a gag in the mouth of Senator WAYNE MORSE and Gov. Mark Hatfield." Heaven help the United States if constituents with her views constitute the majority of Oregon voters. They may help to vote democracy out of this democratic Republic.

It seems to be a fairly popular opinion that since the administration in Washington constitutes the "expertise" in foreign affairs, that it is therefore presumptuous for students to picket, for anyone to disagree with the administration. Such an attitude spawns apathy, and apathy will, as history says it must, lead to either autocratic government, eventual disintegration, and downfall, or both.

I am surprised and pleased with the results which your efforts have achieved in Congress: consultation with the U.N. about and congressional review of our Vietnamese policy. I sincerely hope your boycott of the review may result in its being made public, and that your efforts for a reevaluation of our presence in Vietnam will prove successful.

Sincerely,

JAMES AVERILL.

NEWPORT, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.

DEAR SIR: I am now watching you on television and I certainly believe in what you said. I believe everything should be allowed to be known to the public and as an American citizen, I feel we should know. This program right now is very good and I believe these sessions, no matter who is being questioned, should be open to the American people.

I was once told if a person was not of voting age, letters to Senators and Representatives were a silly thing. I am not of voting age but will be soon and as a mother of a small boy and wife of a U.S. serviceman I feel I have the right to write to you. Also as a future voter.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. Martin Stanwood.

Lakeview, Oreg.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We are behind you 100 percent as to your views and opinions on Vietnam. We can't understand why our sons have to be slaughtered and murdered in Vietnam.

We oppose the repeal of the section to the Taft-Hartley law.

We are not in favor of the draft law as now administered. The basis for qualifying should only be physical not your family position or financial.

Mr. and Mrs. R. L. Richmond.

Lake Oswego, Oreg.,
February 4, 1966.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: First of all, I am 59 years of age. We are in the sawmill machinery business in Portland. To me, my family and country is the most important.

We have been shortchanging our country for many years. I am not proud of this change, and I am fearful of what our grandchildren will have. We won't live to see it, but socialism seems to be around the corner. I'm not proud of it, either.

I want you to know we believe in your stand in the Vietnam war. We give our money to foreign nations, and they give aid to the Vietcong. It is about time the American people wake up, and start thinking about their own selves.

I can't see why our men are in Vietnam in the first place. The stand should have been Cuba—off our eastern shores, less than a hundred miles.

Seems like we have too many people willing to trade their country off for dollars.

Thank you again.

Mrs. W. A. Thompson.

Bend, Oreg.,
February 2, 1966.

Dear Senator: Just a note to give a few personal beliefs. I saw your debate on TV Sunday, January 30 and I want you to know I support your views on Vietnam. I respect the President, but believe he is doing just the opposite of that which he campaigned on. I believe the excutive branch of our Government is becoming too powerful, while at the same time our States are being ignored.

I hope you will see your way clear to protect the basic freedoms of our country. One of the foremost freedoms is the workingman's right to join or not to join a union. I believe no man should be forced to join simply because someone else thinks he should. Please vote to retain 14(b) in the Taft-Hartley labor bill.

My best regards.

Eugene D. Brink.

Forest Grove, Oreg.,
February 3, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I have just mailed to the editor of the Oregonian. It exceeds the allowable limit for the length of letters which are accepted for publication so its main function will be to get a load off my chest. It will also serve to let you know that I am with you, with Senators Clark, Church, Gruening, Fulbright, and others who are putting up the good fight.

Sincerely yours,

Hubert W. Prescott.

Forest Grove, Oreg.,
February 3, 1966.

Editor, The Oregonian,
Portland, Oreg.

Dear Editor: During the course of the Vietnam conflict we have witnessed a storm of condemnation by some letterwriters, columnists, and editors, directed against certain expressed minority views alleged to give comfort to the enemy and to undermine the morale of our combat forces. The expression of such views has often been described as bordering on treason.

On the assumption that all good citizens are supposed to be concerned when their nation is at war, I have been greatly concerned by the agonizing and sanguinary conflict in Vietnam. But my efforts to express that concern have been confounded by the difficulty I find in choosing meaningful words that could not be construed as giving comfort to the enemy, hence courting treason. The problem might be solved by adopting the "Fuhrer" principle whereby one would echo our national leader's sentiments, whatever they happened to be on any particular day. But in the absence of that universally respected signal for unanimity, contained in a formal declaration of war, this would be equivalent to abdication of one's civic responsibility to debate with one's fellow citizens issues of crucial import to our democracy. It would also be abdicating the field of opinion and judgment to the warhawks whose views would then be glorified and expanded without restraint from countervailing attitudes. So long as a large segment of the press sees fit to grant prime space for the syndicated nonsense columns of Barry Goldwater, et al., it is with poor grace that it attempts to bludgeon much better informed professors and students into silence.

Almost every component of human society has an albatross around its neck in one form or another. For some it is an embarassing lunatic fringe or inimical extremist group. The Dominican rebel movement had it with recent disastrous consequences to itself. The Republicans have it in their John Birchers, the Democrats in their Ku Kluxers, and the student dissenters in their draft-card burners or worse. But the fringe elements do not constitute the true essence of such social entities despite detractor's efforts to convince the public that such is the case.

The correct determination of utterances that might give comfort to the enemy is not always a simple and infallible process. There has been from time immemorial much confusion and consequent false identification on the part of mankind with respect to just who are—just what is the real enemy. We have refined the process of enemy identification in several categories since the 1692 Salem witchcraft trials and since the time we were beating the Devil out of the afflicted on the presumption that the Devil was the causative agent of our physical and mental torments. But there are many other categories of enemy identification in which the results are very unreliable if not outright sinister, and in which we still seem to be chasing spooks. If, however, humankind outside the Communist orbit were to accept (which it has not) the contention of the most doctrinaire wing of the private-enterprise capitalist cult that communism, as such, is intrinsically malevolent, hence is the real enemy, the situation would still be fraught with dire contradiction. For in these days it seems that much which gives comfort to the Russian Communist enemy gives apoplectic fits to the Chinese Communist enemy, and vice versa. But aside from such external contradictions we also have a multitude of internal ones of our own.

Some would have it that nothing would please the Communist world more than to suck our Nation stealthily into a massive land war in the forbidding jungles of southeast Asia where, with preponderant manpower, the enemy could hold out indefinitely while bleeding us white. Generals Omar Bradley, Gavin, and Ridgway and columnists Lippman and Reston are reputable spokesmen who have warned us of such a possibility. If this concept has validity then it would follow that one is giving comfort to the enemy, hence verging on treason, who advocates escalation of the Vietnam conflict through commitment of larger ground forces. The obverse side of this coin is that one who advocates cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam, negotiations, and return to the 1954 Geneva accords with a plebiscite to permit the Vietnamese people who have survived the holocaust to determine their own future fate, is giving excruciating pain to the enemy, hence is a dedicated patriot.

With respect to the Vietnam conflict, the President, in his January state of the Union message, indicated such a dramatic shift in our Nation's position as to bring our basis for negotiation fairly closely in line, in many respects, with the long-standing demands of Ho Chi Minh. This suggested that our Chief was nudging over closely to the side of the teach-in professors and students who a few weeks before, because of their advocacy of almost identical proposals, were being roundly roasted by the mass news media and the administration alike on the score that they were giving comfort to the enemy and undermining the morale of our combat forces.

Most citizens still have memories of a time when a large segment of the same Republican-oriented press that is now striking such a self-righteous pose in their condemnation of the professors and students of teach-in fame, was derisively calling the Korean conflict "Truman's War" and glorifying General Eisenhower for his preelection pledge to go to Korea and get the boys home by Christmas. Throughout all of this the American people, by and large, did not pillory either the press or General Eisenhower for committing an alleged treasonable enemy-comforting act, but gave him a hero's welcome on his return home and gratefully elected him to the highest office in the land.

And to add to this weird melange of contradictory oddities, the Republican-oriented press has conspicuously refrained from hostile criticism of Republican Gov. Mark Hatfield for joining Senators Morse and Gruening in their denunciation of our heretofore Vietnam policy. Would political expediency also have somethnig to do with this?

To put a frosting on this cake of incongruity I must add that I happily cast my ballot for President Johnson in 1964 and will take pride in doing so again in 1968. And if Hatfield doesn't watch his step more carefully he is likely to end up getting my vote next November at the conclusion of his bid for a seat in the U.S. Senate.

Sincerely yours,

Hubert W. Prescott.

Medford, Oreg.,
February 4, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: We have seen you in action on TV last Sunday and again this afternoon and I want to say that you are representing us 100 percent.

We sincerely hope that you will withhold aid of any kind to any country that does not come to our assistance at this time.

We hope that you will not approve of any billions for the poor of any foreign country until the very poor of this State of Oregon have been taken care of. We know that the poor of Jackson County cannot qualify under the "war on poverty" bill because they are American born, and they are white.

Please continue your courageous fight for the right, and please continue sending our newsletters. We deeply appreciate them.

Sincerely,

WAYNE R. PILAND.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 5, 1966.

The Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is simply to let you know how completely I agree with your stand on both the Vietnam situation and the foreign aid program. From conversations I had yesterday with various members of the Portland City Club, it was obvious that you have their unanimous support.

There has never been a time when I have been so utterly disgusted with a President and his administration. Johnson and Co. act like warmongers—corrupt with power—and I can't develop any feeling of trust or respect for them. The one word I would like to hear mentioned from Washington is impeachment. Andrew Johnson escaped it by one vote and unless Lyndon Johnson can change things very quickly, he wouldn't and shouldn't escape.

I am quite active in alumni and fraternity matters at Oregon State University and can tell you that this draft business is undermining the academic interests of men students in no small way. The draft boards have no business demanding the young men's grades. It is none of their business. As long as the schools allow these young men to matriculate—they should be deferred. To draft young men because they fall below a "C" average and let a man like Cassius Clay be deferred makes absolutely no sense at all.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

R. H. THIELEMANN.

PORTLAND, OREG,
February 3, 1966.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I am happy to say that the nationwide television program on which you and five other Senators debated the Vietnam issue was a most interesting experience. I am just now beginning to perceive those things which you have been saying over and over since the Vietnam mess began. I am beginning to realize the situation a little more each day. However, like I said, I'm just beginning to understand it. I need more information and knowledge to help more fully understand the situation, particularly such things as why we can't possibly win a military victory in Vietnam.

Because of my youth, I am unable to rely upon the aid of experience. Therefore, I must rely upon what I can learn. However, I've read so many magazine articles, etc., that I am beginning to find myself, in many cases, rereading the same thing, only in different words. I want to know those things that are necessary in order to achieve a truly candid, realistic, responsible outlook on the Asian situation. Nothing would make me happier than to be literally flooded with information concerning this critical problem in Asia. I would also be very grateful if you could send a report of the hearings to be held in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

You have my prayers and support, in the hope that you succeed in convincing the men who make our foreign policy of a wise and realistic policy which will result in success, rather than utter chaos and possible disaster.

Very sincerely,

SYL L. PIENOVI.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 2, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: The young man who has barely completed his education has not had to face the realities and complexities of a domestic and foreign world but he has been sent to Vietnam to fight a war that he does not know of except that our "honor" (STENNIS, Mississippi) is at stake.

I have read history, current news, politics, economic systems of the world and I cannot understand why we are fighting this war in Vietnam.

I feel that the situation has become so serious that I must indicate my endorsement of your stand on Vietnam.

I also wish to state my disapproval of President Johnson's desire for a 5-year foreign aid program. One year of this is bad enough, but let's keep the brakes on the President.

Respectfully yours,

MRS. KATHERINE H. CORRIE.

HILLSBORO, OREG.,
February 2, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have written to Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT some brief thoughts on the Vietnamese problem, copy of which letter is enclosed. The possibility of another world war transcends any other issue before the Congress today and there must be a full and open debate on the matter to the end that the public can have all issues and alternatives. This should have occurred long ago. Your efforts in attempting a solution to the matter is appreciated and of the greatest importance. I am convinced that we cannot afford the possibility of another world war under any circumstances unless our immediate security is threatened.

Very truly yours,

JAMES E. BURDETT.

HILLSBORO, OREG.,
February 2, 1966.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Your appearance on CBS on the evening of February 1 was greatly appreciated and I feel was highly informative and of the greatest importance in value to the citizens of our country. My thoughts on Vietnam have now jelled.

I have had an uneasy feeling about our position in Vietnam for some time as it has been my belief that since there has been no open and free discussion of the Vietnamese problem, the public has had no opportunity to form a valid opinion on the matter. I have great faith in the citizens of our country and believe that without question, if the public is given a full and honest picture, it will come up with a right answer.

To date we have been led step by step into deeper and deeper water to the point where we are forced to swim without knowing why or where. This has been done and accomplished because of the fact that Congress has not debated the matter and brought the facts and issues into the open so that the consensus of the citizens can be learned. I am happy to see that there is a good probability that Congress will now have an open and free discussion concerning Vietnam. This should have been done long ago.

The horror of another world war must be avoided; otherwise, nothing can survive as we now know it and certainly we must do everything to avoid such a possibility unless our immediate security is at stake.

Your continued efforts to bring the issues and alternatives fully into the open so that the citizens can make a valid judgment is essential.

Very truly yours,

JAMES E. BURDETT.

SALEM, OREG.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for the television report in which you stated the views of many in Oregon, both Republican and Democrat. Congratulations for helping to get the matter before the United Nations.

For a nation that carries "Pray for Peace" on its postage stamps and proclaims on its money "In God We Trust" we certainly are doing everything in Vietnam to prove that in reality we are a band of pagans, throwing our sons by the hundred thousand into the fiery altars of the god of war and of capitalistic profits for military-minded munitions makers. The Jews, supposedly, ended human sacrifices when Isaac was spared, and a goat was substituted, giving us the word "scape-goat."

The Greeks gave up human sacrifices when a lamb was substituted for the "vestal virgins" and even the descendants of the Druids, if any, have no human sacrifices in England.

Is it true, in fact, that today, in order to perpetuate the system of profits for munitions makers, for Boeing and other aircraft factories, and to prevent the U.S.A. from total internal collapse due to unemployment, that these thousands of young human "animals" which our politicians feel are necessarily expendable, be thrown into a fiery altar called war and that all the rest of us must be muzzled to keep our lips sealed?

What kind of Great Society is this? We murder our own men by errors. How can we do otherwise than to accept the verdict of other areas of the world that we are, in their eyes, a nation of false hypocrites?

Even the most uneducated Buddhist must feel this falsity in Americans. Some say the Vatican puts out soft-soap—lather minus substance. Perhaps, for whose are the profits from aircraft?

People are emotional, yes, very much so, sickened by the brutality shown in the news and in the papers, brutality committed by Americans. "Christian nation?" "How come?"

Very truly yours,

MRS. R. C. THOMAS.

TURNER, OREG.,
February 2, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to thank you for the speech on the Senate floor on the President war at South Vietnam. Are we to police the world?

And as it is only a mandate by Congress to do what is best at that time in 1964, it should be repealed. Also, Congress should strip the President of his Executive powers or near a dictator and for Congress to take over.

One more thing we the people wish that we had more Senators like you that are willing to stand up and be counted for a principle.

Thank you.

Your respectful voter,

C. D. SHELLENBERGER.

REED COLLEGE,
Portland, Oreg., January 13, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I watched you with appreciation yesterday—and the rest of the group, including Sevareid, with dismay. You were courageous to accept the 5-to-1 odds.

Is there any chance that you might put your Vietnam argument into a book? A collection of speeches would help, I should think, and would surely be reviewed widely and get a great deal of editorial attention. A more sustained attack would be even better, especially if it could provide a general manifesto for the various parts of the protest movement. I may be mistaken, but it does seem to me that a book by a major figure is above all what is called for now, and that it might solidify resistance to official policy on a scale not to be hoped from any amount of Senate debate. Though Lord knows we need the Senate debate too.

Sincerely yours,

William H. Halewood.

Ashland, Oreg.,
January 1966.

Senator Wayne L. Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Senator Morse: We, the undersigned, wish you to use the power of your office to influence the U.S. Congress and the Office of President of the United States to take the following immediate action concerning the now unpopular situation in South Vietnam:

1. Either the full military strength of the United States and that of all its allies of the SEATO pact should be employed to its fullest extent to shortly end the "Vietnam meat-grinding machine" or:

2. The United States should pull all troops out of South Vietnam and renounce to the world all the commitments we have made there.

We believe that the free world and its allies have the strength to end the Vietnam crisis very quickly and that this strength should now be used.

Sincerely yours,

Dean S. Todaro, Donald Carl Burnett, Tom L. Shollenburg, Heather Rode, Douglas Hearrell, Victor Calin, Sr., C. Tige, John T. Dillard, Dale L. Sumner.

Corvallis, Oreg.,
January 30, 1966.

President L. B. Johnson,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: The analytical insight of Walter Lippmann is something that could be of immense benefit to the people of this country and of all the world if it were applied to the Vietnam problem. You have the opportunity to take advantage of his wisdom.

It is my impression that Mr. Lippmann feels that if the Mansfield report is accurate, it is further proof of the obvious failure of a year's escalation of the war. Please don't continue a dead end path of additional escalation.

I urge you to continue the halt on bombing to give conviction to our peaceful claims. We simply must not prove to the world that our peace effort is only a large-scale advertising campaign. It would appear that the other side is also involved in the same kind of buildup preparations that we are so self-righteously doing during our highly publicized peace offensive.

The real solution probably is a coastal holding action on our part. All the rest of our enormous unused energy, power, and finances could then be made available to a truly United Nations effort.

Respectfully,

Bobb F. Brown.

Dear Senator Morse: Your views and actions concerning the Vietnam war are a source of deep satisfaction. Thank you for your efforts.

I know you will continue your vigorous activities against this unnecessary war. I hope you are able to convince more and more people to speak out and act in this cause.

My wife and I support you and want to encourage you again and again.

Thank you.

Bobb F. Brown.

Monmouth, Oreg.,
February 1, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: What can I do to help stop the war, win it, or something in Vietnam? I'm just an ordinary American and am so confused as to what to think or do.

Maybe it's a terrible thing, but I feel inside as though I can't trust the Government or believe what I'm told. Maybe I'm all wrong; I don't know. Don't get me wrong. I'm a true blue American. And I've never written a letter like this before.

If we are wrong in Vietnam, why can't the President see it and say so, or do something about righting a wrong? It takes more strength to admit to a wrong than to keep making matters worse. This last year things have seemed to go from bad to worse. It seems to me every move we have made has made things worse instead of better.

Who is advising the President? After watching Senator Fulbright on TV tonight, he didn't seem to know and if a U.S. Senator doesn't know or can't find out, what happened to government for and by the people.

Do the people of America have a say in our Government?

I hear Senators, experts on foreign policy, radio and TV announcers, and everywhere I turn people disagreeing with the President. Are the people really for or against his policy and shouldn't the people's thoughts have some consideration?

Among friends and relatives and nearly everywhere all I hear are doubts and fears. What are we to do?

I pray continually for God's guidance for our country and that His will be done. Maybe God's way is not ours.

I am so fearful for my children. We have two boys, 9 months and 2½ years. Did we have them to love and keep only to be burned to death in a horrible war? The thought of the children all over the world—who must be loved as our own—suffering so make me sick inside.

My brother was in the Army in Vietnam for 3 months and he said the United States has gotten into something there is no graceful way out. Is this true? Who cares about grace as long as we do the right thing.

Oh, if we could just do something to help end this terrible mess.

God help us.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Wesley Burbank.

Clackamas, Oreg.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am thankful that there is at least one Senator who has the wisdom and the courage to tell the American people where we are headed. Equating this thing in Vietnam with the Munich appeasement, the invasion of Ethiopia, and Manchuria as the Secretary of State does, is, in my opinion, pure sophistry.

If there is a country where the survival of the fittest is exemplified it is in China. They are a tough and stubborn people. I have recently read that the Hanoi government regards Americans, not as prisoners of war, but as war criminals. It does take much imagination to see the price of peace become another Nuremberg. Where do we go from there?

The United States is rich and powerful. We have developed a megalomania but we are neither omnipotent, omnicient, nor omnipresent.

Again, more power to you.

Sincerely,

F. W. Brodie.

Linfield College,
McMinnville, Oreg., January 30, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: For the second time I am writing you to commend you for your courageous and farseeing stand on our involvement in Vietnam. This most dreadful situation must somehow be stopped before we are involved in an unwinable war in Asia with consequent loss of thousands of lives and economic dislocation and hardship here at home.

Good luck to you, Senator. I wish there were more like you.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Malone,
Head, Department of Modern Languages.

Salem Oreg.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Bravo. I agree with you that our military presence in Vietnam is illegal. Only the Congress has power to declare war.

Let's either fight over there—or get out. At present it is just another Korea—which will eventually "bleed us to death."

Sincerely,

Herman Pfiug.

Salem, Oreg.,
January 30, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Although my family and myself are not of the same party as yourself, we wish to express for them and many of my friends a most emphatic and favorable reaction to your launching of an attack on the President's conduct of the Vietnam war and his unpopular foreign policy including foreign aid and general conduct under the powers granted to him by Congress.

It is time that he be deprived of the unlimited power to initiate undeclared wars under pseudonym of police action. This country has suffered one no-win war, namely the Korean War, and we are aghast that this country has been committed to another in Vietnam.

It does not make sense to us that we are fighting in Asia to save a country from Communists and at the same time the Communists in this country has been permitted to infiltrate our Government, especially the State Department and many other facets of our lives, to the point of assassinating our President.

On one hand, we are taxed to drive Communists out of Asia and at the same time we are taxed to support foreign aid to our allies who are supplying the very country we are fighting. How long is Congress, be he Democrat or Republican, going to allow this erosion of our country and all the freedoms permitted by our Constitution?

We look up to Congress to prevent socialistic crackpot schemes from spreading throughout our country; before we get into bankruptcy. Hitler led his country to destruction. Are we being led along the same route?

Thank you for listening.

Respectfully yours,

E. A. Meola,
Commander, USNR.

Lake Oswego, Oreg.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations. Your stand on the tragic Vietnam situation is admirable. I hope your mail is loaded with messages supporting your position. Keep up your good work. I pray that that Texas cowboy in our White House will listen to your stateman's words.

Sincerely,

Colin J. Greene.

FAIRVIEW, OREG.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was most gratifying to hear the senior Senator from Oregon defend the rights of the American people during the television discussion regarding Vietnam, on Sunday, January 30. Never have I felt more grateful—just to know that at least one Senator had the courage to speak for what he believed to be right.

As to the tremendous "give away" programs—for foreign aid, slum clearance and education—it was good to hear that you had not forgotten the taxpayer. Within our own country the so called "under privileged" are using nothing short of blackmail to gain their demands. Why should tax money be used to transport children to other school districts other than their own? If there is a true desire for self-improvement is there a better place to start than within one's self. Is it right for the substantial citizens of our country to bear the ever increasing burden of taxes to carry out so many fantastic ideas? Slums? No one likes them—except those who choose to live there—but the fact remains that we have always had slums and ghettos and will continue to have them—no matter what is done.

Again many thanks for your wonderful service to the people of Oregon and to our grand country, the United States of America.

Sincerely,
ESTHER A. BOWEN.

BEND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your firm stand on the U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war on today's TV forum was to say the least very admirable. I believe that perhaps of all the U.S. citizens who daily read their local and other newspapers and listen to the many daily broadcasts on radio and TV are in the greater majority well aware that Oregon has a Senator with both feet on the ground and a well tuned ear to the pros and cons of this type of war and positively no fear to speak out against our involvement in this type of war.

Keep up the fight, Senator. You and a lot of us simple people know that right is might and must therefore win in the long run even though that may at the present seem like a mighty steep uphill pull. I am sure that you have many a fervent prayer given to our God Almighty to give you the strength and the courage to stick with your guns against what seems like unsurmountable odds to take this Vietnam war before the United Nations Security Council. It is about time that a body like that should be in a position to really get at the roots of the situation. Also, we may find out at long last who, if any, are our friends and allies and will give forth with more than just lipservice on this vital issue.

I have faith in our President that he is really trying to get at an honorable solution. In numbers there is strength so why not have the combined efforts of such great nations as the United States, Great Britain, Japan, France and with the head of the Roman Catholic Church who is already on record as working hard toward a peace in Vietnam to head the united effort toward this most necessary goal.

I am sure that there must be many good upright citizens who feel like I do that human nature surely cannot have become so perverted in their thinking that they feel like war is the ultimate way to settle differences. This sort of thinking could also lead people to believe that there is honor among thieves.

With the greatest admiration, and with a prayer for help and guidance from God who is after all above any of us, may He lead you in your fight for right.

Very sincerely,
JOE STUCKY.

PORTLAND, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up your great fight in opposition to our present policy in Vietnam.

Enclosed are copies of leaflets some 6,000 of which have been distributed around Multnomah County.

Personal regards.

WALLY PRIESTLEY,
State Representative.

STATE OF OREGON,
House of Representatives.

Fellow citizens, this news item was recently printed in the Oregonian. It made me wonder if we fully understand what is going on in Vietnam in the name of protecting the people who live there so that they may live in freedom:

"[From the Oregonian, Jan. 7, 1966]

"SCORCHED EARTH TACTICS ADOPTED BY YANKS

"SAIGON.—To break the back of the Vietcong, United States and allied forces are adopting a program of destroying houses and crops in areas which feed and shield the Communist forces.

"For years, Americans refused to participate in scorched earth efforts, leaving them to the Vietnamese. Now Americans are directly involved. They are trying to protect innocent people.

"The broad-based program includes the establishment of free bombing zones in Vietcong regions, killing rice crops in enemy areas, and burning other crops and homes.

"The rich, intensely cultivated flatlands south of the Vaico Oriental River west of Saigon are prime scorched earth targets. U.S. paratroopers from the 173d Airborne Brigade began operating there last weekend.

"They laid their base camp among the blackened frames of burned houses. Within 2 miles of the paratroopers' camp not a house was left standing. Constant pounding by artillery and planes had reduced every building to rubble.

"The paratroopers' mission was to move out farther, round up all the people they could find, evacuate them north of the river to resettlement camps, and burn and destroy everything eatable and livable.

"Patrols waded in neck-deep canals slicing through the canefields, crept stealthily down high dikes, and pushed through thick brush.

"Every house they encountered they burned to the ground. Most were of thatch but some were large with heavy wooden frames and neat gardens.

"Every cooking utensil was smashed, every banana tree severed, every mattress slashed.

"On the first day, the men of C Company found more than 60 Vietnamese women and children weeping as they lay in trenches around their devastated homes. These people were sent in helicopters to Bao Trai district, north of the river, and resettled.

"Their menfolk stayed hidden in the canefields and the canals, sniping at the searching paratroopers and mining the trails. The province chief had told the Americans that every man south of the river was a Vietcong.

"'They must be either shootin' or diggin' all the time,' said one paratrooper as he picked his way from one covered bunker to the next. These bunkers, some built years ago, others fresh, were in strategic positions around every home and canal.

"The Vietcong had not chosen to defend them with any show of determination.

"The American paratroopers are remaining in the area, enlarging the scorched earth zone. They know that the Vietcong will rebuild the razed homes when they leave, make new earthenware pots and breed new chickens.

"Capt. Henry Tucker, from Columbus, Miss., said:

"'Maybe if we can keep them busy rebuilding their houses and replanting the crops, then they'll have no time for shooting.'"

Even if you believe the general policy of the United States is correct in Vietnam, what are your feelings about military operations told about in this news item?

Please write me a note or post card telling me how you feel about what our country is doing to the people of Vietnam.

Sincerely,
WALLY PRIESTLEY,
State Representative.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

YOUR HONOR SENATOR MORSE: I saw and heard your reasoning on TV Sunday, January 30.

Now I do not doubt that you have all the truth on your side, and the ability to deliver, but I beg of you to hear me.

A Texan's expression, "Well, what you all goin' a do about it?" We need to dig down.

Who was it made the vow to help any people needing assistance from communism?

I assume it was the Congress, and I believe that is where the trouble is. Had the Congressmen known that in case of such war that they would be the first to be drafted, well, they would never have made such a promise, but would have been content to deal with each case as it came up and plan then and there what they would do and what they would not.

I believe the fact is also that we have a dictator in the White House and, as of now, we are all his subjects to do just as he says.

It is to be hoped this will be our last Texan in the White House.

As long as people prosper they do nothing to resist high-handed rule. He has played politics at every turn. Our capitalists will be destroyed because the unions represent the votes. Riots, disturbances of the peace, disorderly conduct strikes are encouraged. Votes!

And what about our States rights? Oh, yes; we have a right—a birthright. And the South has a right to maintain their States rights as they have always done. (I am a Pennsylvanian), now an Oregonian.

The Civil War is ended or should be. My contention is for American liberty.

"We the sons of men,
Who made it free by sword and pen,
Our task it be to foster thee,
Sweet liberty. Sweet liberty."

Sincerely,
MRS. EVA L. ROBERTSON.

JANUARY 30, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just listened to the TV discussion of Vietnam. (Sunday, Jan. 30.)

The odds were stacked against you (even to Mr. Sevareid, I'm afraid), but you stated more clear, incisive truth than the lot of them—in fact, for practical purposes, all of the truth.

If Senator CLARK was purported to be your ally, he was ineffective. Where were Senators AIKEN, YOUNG, CHURCH, MANSFIELD, etc.?

I salute you for your courageous, brilliant, and tireless efforts against the seemingly insuperable wall of pompous, self-willed ignorance that prevails, not only in the street, but in the Congress and throughout the entire executive branch of the Government.

As you know, there is a significant stirring at the "grassroots," among churchmen, and workingmen, which, I assure you, I am aiding and abetting at every opportunity.

I support your every statement about Vietnam, without reservation. Our children will not live to see the shame of this illegal, immoral, un-Christian, and impractical war erased from the escutcheon of America, even if we are able to avoid the holocaust for which our policy is so surely headed at this time.

Your colleagues stipulated peace with honor. That luxury is impossible for us, because we are there without honor. The best that we can hope for (and it is imperative), is that we cease to be dishonorable.

Senator Mundt said he wished the President would use statesmanship to win support from, for instance, the NATO nations. We can't expect support from them, because they too, are appalled at our arrogant, unilateral aggression.

I believe NATO has long since ceased to be more than a word, which is fine with me. I disapproved of it at its inception, because it served notice on the world that if we didn't like the U.N.'s decisions, we were already preparing to fight.

President Truman had paid too high a price for unity when he instituted his bipartisan foreign policy, and NATO is the proof.

I cannot quite share your approval for Mark Hatfield's stand on Vietnam. He waited until it was comparatively safe to say anything that might be considered controversial, and has not once considered that there is a legal and moral issue involved.

We need that kind of support, too, but it has not transformed him into a statesman. He saw the light, or got his courage up, a few thousand lives too late to be entrusted with leadership.

To deplore the war only on a practical basis (cost and risk of world war) is to be devoid of morals, or in total ignorance of the legal aspects.

The President's "peace emissaries" were very careful about whom they talked to, and twice as careful not to let the public know what answers they got. I suspect they were told, in diplomatic terms, to go fly a kite.

I suspect the various heads of state were asked to persuade Ho Chi Minh to recognize the United States rather than the United Nations as a legitimate party to negotiation, and this, in itself, is ridiculous.

I can see so reason why Ho should accept any arrangement other than that all of Vietnam should go back to the situation that prevailed before the first American soldier invaded that country, and that then the Geneva accord be belatedly implemented. I also believe the U.N. should determine the amount of reparations the United States should pay for the damage she has caused.

Before you made your statement on TV that the President should not have the right to send one American soldier to his death without a declaration of war, I had written for my column in the Eastern Oregon Review, two suggestions for avoiding future Vietnams.

One was a law embodying the foregoing premise, and the other was a law to the effect that no foreign aid may be given, except nonmilitary aid, except in time of declared war. What do you think?

With kindest regards.

Mel Byers.

Otter Rock, Oreg.,
February 4, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations for your forthright statement and attitude toward secret testimony by McNamara and others behind closed doors.

Your statements are comforting; to know there is someone to speak out against the snowballing authoritarian and omnipotent attitude so prevalent at this time.

Sincerely,

Beatrice Wilcox.

Eugene, Oreg.,
February 7, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I want you to know that my husband and I agree completely with your stand on Vietnam, and that we appreciate your efforts to bring about a saner course of action for our country in that area. I wish there were some way to make more people listen to you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Albert R. Kitzhaber.

My Dear Senator: My heart has so many things it could say about your efforts to stop the death in Vietnam. But perhaps the most meaningful words are simply, "Thank you."

May God grant you eternal strength, direction, and love; and bless us all forever.

Sincerely,

Mary Hitchman.

Portland, Oreg.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 6, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: We in our family have been in agreement with what you have been saying about the administration's Vietnam policies.

We are also glad of the public debate in Congress by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Yours truly,

Eleanor C. Peirce.

Willamina, Oreg.,
February 6, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: Just heard your response to President Johnson's Hawaii speech.

It was great, as have been all of your recent appearances on TV.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

Fritz Mishler.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 7, 1966.

The President,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: You have not given us any facts that justify sending American men to Vietnam to fight and be killed.

We want a President that will get our soldiers out of Vietnam and we hope that you do not wait until many more Americans are killed before you get them out.

Sincerely,

E. J. Stevens.

Dear Senator: We strongly support your position and urge you to keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

E. J. Stevens.

Springfield, Oreg.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Senator: I heard you on the Senate Investigating Committee which was on TV today and I wish to commend you on the stand you have taken, I know that there has been a lot of adverse criticism of the stand you have taken, but I consider these people are the unthinking kind that do not realize the terrible consequenses that our involvement in Vietnam can lead us into. Your views about why we are in this mess without a declaration of war is exactly the way I feel about it and all of my friends that I have talked to feel the same way.

My oldest son was killed in 1943 in the invasion of Sicily, and perhaps I feel more strongly about the needless killing of our boys than most people do. When it comes to the defense of our country I believe in giving everything that we have, but we have been suckered into this Vietnam mess, and those that are responsible are floundering around and wondering how to get out of it without losing face.

Your record in the Senate is admirable, and I wish that you will have many more years as our Senator from Oregon.

With best wishes for your continued success.

Sincerely,

George W. Alther.

Ashland, Oreg.,
February 5, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: God bless you. A veteran with 11 battle stars, I stand behind you all the way in your position on Vietnam.

With all my heart I wish you every success in getting our troops out of Vietnam.

Thank you for your efforts for all of us.

Sincerely,

Sanford Goodman.

Medford, Oreg.,
February 3, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I would like to commend you for the definite stand you take on all important issues of the day. I do not always agree with you nor do I always approve of your opinions as stated, but at least there is no doubt which side of the fence you are on, and we always know where you stand. That is more than I can say for many of the others who are supposed to represent the people in Washington.

I endorse your views on the horrible Vietnam situation—I try to believe the President when he says we have a commitment, but I can't help but feel he protests too much. Frankly, Senator, I never am sure just which side of his mouth he is speaking from, frankly, I do not trust him, and for the first time in my adult life I am afraid of our leaders and the way our Government is heading. I am more afraid of the power of our own Government than I am of communism in some other part of the world. I have more fear of the Communists in our own country than those in Vietnam, and I feel we are waging the war on the wrong front.

How can we justify killing Vietcong Communists in far off Asia, while we buy and sell with them somewhere else, coddle them in Government, give them free license to flaunt their views and parade with their flags and banners in our Nation's Capital. It seems we are straining at gnats and swallowing camels. All in the name of freedom. Freedom for whom? Minority groups who yell "equal rights." The vast majority is forfeiting their rights to that yelling minority and I don't like it.

And I don't like the President's struggle to maintain his public image of a great white father and playing politics while my son and other mothers' sons are being sacrificed to preserve a commitment I am not sure is a bona fide one. I cannot help but feel that the only commitment we have or had, was one of financial assistance, then somewhere along the line our Government set up an unstable puppet regime in southeast Asia (for moneyed interests or greed for power) and now we are pulling their chestnuts out of the fire.

My son, who supposedly had only 6 months more to serve on his tour of duty with the Navy and was to be separated in August 1966, now finds he has been assigned to a battalion due to ship out to southeast Asia in March. Can you help me to get equal rights for him?

If the President does more than give lip-service to his policy of equal rights for all American citizens, he should be willing to grant my son and I the same right that he so ably made possible for his future son-in-law (who has not yet served in any area, as I understand) and daughter, and will see that my son is transferred to a naval station near at home for the remaining 6 months of his service.

I would never consider such a request, if this war was justified, or if he were needed to defend this country against aggression, but I feel he has done his share and should be allowed to come home when his 4 years are finished in August.

Please do not ever let yourself be pressured or "arm twisted" into becoming a "yes man." Be always your own man, as I firmly believe and hope that you are now. I have hopes that you and Gov. Mark Hatfield and Wendell Wyatt will remain stanch and true to your principles and to this America and the concepts of its origin, and will act as a warning and a guard against too much "government."

Thank you for sending me your news reports. I have been receiving them for several years and appreciate it. I am a registered Republican but a nonpartisan at heart as I usually vote for the man or woman whom I feel will do the best job for American and Oregon.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Ruth H. Boyd.

P.S.—Where do you stand on bill 8282? I feel it should not be allowed to pass.

Pendleton, Oreg.,
February 7, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Wayne: Last Friday morning I saw you just briefly on the Foreign Affairs Committee's telecast. The State of Oregon should be proud of the manner in which their Senator conducted his part of the hearing. As in other hearings that I have seen you participate or conduct in the Senate, I was impressed of the pertinence of your questions at all times, the directness of the questions, and the courtesy which you extended the witness. This was quite a contrast to some of your colleagues who tend to get a little abstract.

Respectfully yours,

Gene B. Conklin.

Salem, Oreg.,
February 6, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Your courage to speak out on the Vietnam question is highly commendable and, I feel quite certain, morally right. During the past several years it has appeared to me entirely too many of those we have elected to high office simply drift along with whatever is proposed or advocated without thinking profoundly of the overall consequences.

The public airing of the whole question will undoubtedly result in the disclosure of a great deal that is unknown to the average American. I, for one, have long felt the existence of a cloak of secrecy in high places that amounts almost to conspiracy. The effort to understand the issues and all the reasons why they must be resolved without open debate are difficult to reconcile with the basic meaning of our system itself.

Our Secretary of Defense's unwillingness to submit to questioning openly under the pretext that such a hearing would risk disclosure of information that might be comfort to the enemy reminds me of a similar excuse made over the radio to the American public shortly after Pearl Harbor. To me, one of some 35,000 licensed radio code operators at the time, it was an apocryphal statement, for on that Sunday afternoon of December 7, I had copied the uncoded message sent direct from Pearl Harbor to Washington detailing the damage that had been done that morning. Did the Japanese not also copy that message?

One of the primary differences between our form of government and communism is our stout belief in the rights of the individual and it includes his right to know what is going on, be it good or otherwise. Except for the possible involvement of some highly technical defense secrets, I doubt that Mr. McNamara knows very much more than our major enemies already have learned.

With best personal wishes for your continued work and ultimate success with your program, I am,

Yours sincerely,

Ethan Grant.

Oregon State University,
February 4, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: The attached letter has recently been sent to the editor of the Corvallis Gazette-Times. I thought that you might be interested in it also as a support for your forthright stand on the Vietnam situation. Your followers do not at present represent the majority of Americans nor the administration, but somehow a more flexible and humane foreign policy must be forged. Keep up the good work. We will try to support you as best we can.

Respectfully yours,

Nicholas J. Yonker, Ph. D.

A Foreign Policy Alternative

Corvallis, Oreg.,
February 4, 1966.

To the Editor:

I would like to have considered eight basic points with regard to future U.S. foreign policy. It differs with the present policy, but I believe it is the more creative one for the long pull ahead.

1. Our long-range goal for each national power should be a representative government combined with some version of a mixed economy. Our own political and economic forms grew out of unique historical circumstances and we must now give each nation an opportunity to forge and evolve their own path toward these goals.

2. Russia has recently swung to the right economically and has liberalized to some extent politically. It is likely that this will continue and unless there is a major war in southeast Asia, it is likely that China will follow a similar course over the next 15–25 years.

3. China is bounded by the sea, Russia, the Himalayas, and southeast Asia. She has no navy and therefore does not present any immediate threat to Japan, the Philippines, Indonesia, or Australia. The only place she can possibly move in the near future is toward southeast Asia.

4. All of the countries in southeast Asia, Communist or not, have been opposed to China. Only our military attacks push North Vietnam and China closer together.

5. A major war in southeast Asia would kill thousands of human beings but would accomplish very little more. It would hardly win many friends for the neocolonialist white America.

6. Consequently, at this point, we can perhaps best hold our positions in the coastal area (as Generals Gavin and Ridgway have advised), stop the bombing of North Vietnam, and try for a U.N. resolution with full recognition given to the Vietcong who control at least two-thirds of South Vietnam.

7. It is almost certain, unless we control South Vietnam with a dictatorial military regime, that she will swing socialist or Communist in any eventual election. In any case, we should try, quite possibly with Russia's assistance, to turn all of Vietnam into an Asian "Tito" to act as a buffer against China until there is a gradual shift of leadership within China.

8. In the meanwhile, we should try to aline ourselves with the creative liberal forces in most of the underdeveloped countries around the globe rather than with corrupt military dictatorships. Such creative forces are very likely to have a socialistic bent. However, such men are usually the only ones who are concerned with the impoverished majority in their land and yet are still working toward some semblance of political democracy. This policy is imperative in Latin America if we don't want these countries to explode in our faces during the next 20 years. Such a policy is our last best hope against extremely totalitarian Communist governments.

At present, our foreign policy has indeed become "foreign" to the great majority of hungry, suffering humanity. It is not that Johnson, Rusk & Co. are evil men; rather it is because they have not made an adequate appraisal of the long road ahead that our present policies are ill advised. What may look sound militarily could disastrously alienate us from the rest of mankind politically. It is for lack of vision that a people perish.

Sincerely,

Nicholas J. Yonker.

Cove, Oreg.,
February 7, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Morse: I am a sixth grade teacher in Imbler School. We follow your speeches in the press and on TV.

We are behind you in your protests against undeclared war in Vietnam, etc. Please keep up your courageous fight for what is right.

We have a 19-year-old son, Patrick, on the U.S.S. *Higbee* and like all the other parents who have sons over there we wish this crisis was over.

We feel you can do much with your commonsense arguments. Keep them up, we're all for you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Kenneth Foster.

Ronde Valley Lumber Co.,
Union, Oreg., February 7, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: We take this means to highly commend you for the stand you have taken on our being in Vietnam and also your stand on foreign aid.

We cannot agree with you on the repeal of 14(b). This repeal takes away another freedom of the individual and if repealed will give the already powerful labor bosses a chance to control all workers and jobs. If not why are they so eager to get it repealed?

Sincerely yours,

H. E. Kuhn,
Assistant Secretary
(For the management).

Coos Bay, Oreg.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: As a veteran of World War II, U.S. 2d Marine Division, and a constituent of yours, I am in complete favor of your stand on Vietnam.

I do not condone the killing of our younger generation, or the men, women, and children of the Vietnamese just for a profit for few or the prestige for a few.

Yours truly,

EINO KOWNEAR.

DERRIG REALTY,
Azalea, Oreg., February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For many months I have put off writing you that I am most appreciative of your efforts to effect a civilized, workable policy in southeast Asia. If we are to be a Great Society you will have to be successful, for surely no nation can call itself great if it must rely on massive, overwhelming destruction to enforce its foreign policy.

I can't remember a time when so many people have expressed doubt as to the aims, and consternation as to the direction we are traveling. Nor do I remember a time when there was such widespread belief that our administration employs deception, hypocrisy, and chauvinism to cover up its grisly mistakes and silence honest criticism.

Interestingly enough, February 4, 1966, Murray Fromson, reporting on CBS News from South Vietnam, discussed the shortage of bombs as well as the shortage of pilots. Could these have been factors in the recent bombing lull rather than an earnest desire for peace? Fromson also stated that more rigid censorship was to be employed by the military command thus diminishing the probability that we will hear factual reporting from Vietnam in the future.

By the way, does anyone know what happened to the two American prisoners released by the North Vietnamese a couple of months ago? The last report I saw they were on Guam being debriefed.

Best regards,

RICHARD A. DERRIG.

P.S.—Don't feel obligated to answer this letter—you have many more important things to attend to.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 7, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I have not agreed with your ideas and thoughts in the past—in fact I have never voted for you. However, your courageous stand on Vietnam is certainly to be commended. I also agree with your thoughts that President Johnson is dead wrong and also that he has a badly informed group of advisers.

I believe the President says that 62 percent of the people are back of him and his ideas. I am in the retail drug business and a registered pharmacist. Of all the hundreds of people I wait on and talk to every day, I can honestly say that I haven't found one of this so-called 62 percent.

Keep up the good work, and believe me, you now have one more stanch supporter from Oregon.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND P. MCGREW.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 7, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

Senator MORSE: Many Republicans and Democrats alike agree with you on your stand on the Vietnam situation. The President and his so-called smart advisers leave many of us in the dark. No one has explained to me, for one, why we were there in the first place.

Please do not falter. You know you are right, and so do many others.

Very truly yours,

JULIA D. HART.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 1, 1966.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I hereby voice my approval of your stand in Vietnam. My husband and I are very proud of you.

Respectfully yours,

Mr. and Mrs. R. J. BEACH.

P.S.—How we enjoyed that program Sunday. We were so proud of you and your stand.

FOREST GROVE, OREG., *February 3, 1966.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing you to let you know that I am 100 percent behind you on this damn Vietnam situation. Everybody I talk with thinks it stinks too.

Keep on shouting for us, the country needs the truth.

I have a Purple Heart from World War II. So I think I know something about war and I don't want my sons put in any slaughter chute.

Too bad there isn't more like you in Congress and in the White House.

So keep shouting for us.

Yours truly,

DONALD HOFFMAN.

THE DALLES, OREG.,
February 2, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We concur with your stand that this inhuman, senseless involvement by the United States in Vietnam must be stopped, and that the resolution in Congress, giving President Johnson such sweeping power, be curbed.

It is time for the United States to show its greatness, by word and deed. This Government should honor its commitment to the world and citizens of this country by showing its willingness to help mankind by peaceful means. We are losing face all over the world by insisting that our position in Vietnam is a just one. This is a ridiculous and dangerous course to follow. We applaud your stand on this issue and thank you and other officers in the public service for having the courage and good sense not to back down on this issue.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. GENE ADKISSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are in complete accord with your stand on Vietnam.

Keep up the good work and you have our full support.

Mr. and Mrs. A. J. CLOSSEN.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I watched the special CBS television report of Sunday, January 30, in which you and four other Senators discussed the American involvement in the war in Vietnam. I was very much impressed by what you said and I congratulate you on your courageous and patriotic stand. I realize that you are in the minority but I hope this will change soon. I have been against this kind of war ever since I could understand what was going on (which is more than most people).

I am 18, a student in high school, and thus too young to vote, but I am able to participate in discussion groups and keep up with the events concerning Vietnam. I am the senior class president at my school and I belong to the National Honor Society and thus I am able to influence somewhat the opinions of my fellow students at school. I can tell you that support for your position at my school is fairly strong and growing.

Basically, the fear of being drafted (although I stand a pretty good chance of continuing my education) is not really the reason I protest the war in Vietnam. My sincere sympathy and feeling of despair goes out to those Americans who have been killed and to those that are now fighting a senseless ground war, without a formal declaration of war from Congress, in southeast Asia. This, plus the threat of a world war, the strain on our national economy, and the complete illegality of the whole affair makes me feel the way I do.

I would like very much to educate more of my friends and more of my teachers concerning Vietnam, but the true facts and information concerning the Vietnam war are hard to find. Do you know of any excellent and reliable information concerning the side of the story that is never reported to the American public by the State Department? Is it possible to obtain any of the reports that you mentioned on the television program? I would appreciate it very much if you could inform me of any such material and the procedure to get it concerning this illegal war in Vietnam.

Please continue your efforts to stop the American involvement in Vietnam and to place it instead in the hands of the United Nations. Please also continue your efforts to drastically cut foreign aid as you have done in the past.

Hoping to hear from you soon.

Thank you,

CHARLES T. BRIDGES.

SALEM, OREG., *February 1, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to congratulate you for your firm stand regarding our war involvement in Vietnam.

In my opinion, we never should have become involved in Vietnam, after the French pulled out. Our leaders talk about honoring our commitments to the Vietnamese. What are our commitments there? And why did we make them?

You know better than I do how unstable the South Vietnamese Government is. Why didn't our Government permit free elections there?

I understood only Congress had the right to declare war: So stand firm. Don't let the State Department or anyone else undercut the authority of Congress.

I wonder why our military are so anxious to fight in Vietnam? Why not liberate Cuba from communism right next door?

I fear for the consequences we will face if we continue on. It could lead to nuclear war.

Mr. MORSE, I'm a Republican by registration. The political name means little to me. I'm for men of honesty and integrity regardless of party affiliation.

Now, as never before our Nation needs divine leading; my prayers are that God will give wisdom and guidance to you, all Congressmen, and especially to our President and all those making the policy of our foreign operations.

Sincerely,

HERMAN A. HAHN.

MEDFORD, OREG., *February 1, 1966.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You were wonderful on the Sunday telecast. You are the bright shining star trying to shed light on the necessity of settling differences (real or imaginary) by arbitration, by the U.N.—by nonviolent methods.

If we fail, if there is too much caveman left in us, let us knock skulls together and see whose skull is the most dense. Then the surviving thick skulled individuals may look to their ashes in a desolate world and ponder their plight.

Remember for each individual who takes time to write, as I am doing, there are 100 more of similar appreciation who love you for your statesmanship.

IRVING S. THOMAS.

Canby, Oreg.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Your appearance on the Vietnam war special Sunday, January 29, 1966, was welcomed by many. It seems to us that people like you and Senator Joseph Clark and others who have the nerve to speak up, are the ones who are keeping the war hawks from getting us into an all-out war.

Also it looks as if an all-out effort must be made in Congress and elsewhere to keep the U.S. citizen informed on what is really going on in this world, and not a diet of Johnson strained stuff. Also to keep our sadistic members in the Government from killing off too many of our Armed Forces in an unnecessary war. Even one person is too many.

We certainly do not think that war should be declared, but also we think that bombing other countries is illegal without such a declaration. If the United States is so afraid of what all the other countries would do to us in the U.N. or other world conferences, shouldn't we think about the idea that we may be wrong on the course we are taking?

We believe we have a misguided President, a weak-armed Congress (not all Members), of course, who insist on spreading the war.

Please believe us when we say that we stand behind you 100 percent in your stand against the treacherous, uncivilized war in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. John Kumms.

(A Republican from way back.)

Portland, Oreg.,
February 2, 1966.

Dear Mr. Morse: Oh, thank you so much for your valiant stand on what you believe is right. I listened to you Sunday and how proud I was of you. I do wish though that you (and the President) could hear from more of the people who are so violently opposed. Many of us would have protested publicly but were afraid of losing our jobs. I have written the President as to my stand. We must get out of Vietnam.

Respectfully yours,
Mrs. H. M.

Central Point, Oreg.,
February 7, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Keep up the good work. As far as I am concerned, you are 100 percent correct all the way down the line in your attack on our aggressive foreign policy.

I was in the military service in combat in World War II and back in as a recalled reservist during the Korean business and consider myself just as patriotic as the next man, but I cannot see this present U.S. policy of trying to convert the entire world to our way of thinking. In the end it is bound to lead to allout war. I don't want my boy in the Army. I want him home.

Sincerely,
Deane R. Brandon.

Pendleton, Oreg.,
February 4, 1966.

Sir: Although it has not been my habit to write to my elected representatives, I believe that the subject of our involvement in Vietnam is of sufficient gravity to warrant such a letter. Having seen the publicly broadcast meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee today, I can only say that I was amazed to find that the confusion about policy, objectives, and so forth, reflects in large measure the confusion expressed by the laymen that I talk to here.

Although I can't say that I wholeheartedly endorse everything I heard you say, I must say that my own thoughts parallel most closely those of your own. My one reservation is the thought that the policy of containment would seem to have some merit, as evidenced by the more relaxed Russian attitude in recent years coupled with their rather limited success at expansion during the past decade.

I would fully support your idea of sounding out the administration on the objectives, policy, results expected, some statement about prosecution of the present conflict, with the results of such a search made available for the enlightenment of the public.

I realize that this problem has become a real dilemma, but I would like to hear your personal view of what should, and more important, what could be done in Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, on a legal basis.

I must add that I find our support of military regimes, however stable, distressing—this policy smells too much like sacrificing another people in defense of our own ideology, while not allowing them the benefits of this ideology.

Second, since my work is in the field of water pollution I am greatly interested in the recent legislation in this area.

I apologize for the extended length of this discourse—I realize your time is valuable. Thank you for whatever response you can make.

Sincerely yours,
Dennis G. Duncan.

Broadbent, Oreg.,
February 4, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: The stand you have taken concerning testimony asked of the Secretaries of State and Defense in the current inquiry into U.S. policy on Vietnam by the Foreign Affairs Committee, is entirely reasonable. Direct answers should be required of these officials and unless or until they are forthcoming there should be no thought of granting the requested appropriation of funds.

In fact this seems an appropriate time to consider whether there is a question of misuse of funds in the conduct of the executive branch of our Government. If the various departments of the executive branch continue to divert funds in the manner described by Mr. Bell, this morning, it can only promote tremendous confusion in considering the budgetary requests. These matters are surely subject to audit but, if they are not now audited proper safeguards should be provided by the Congress.

No one wants another global war but, if our position in this war requires that we mobilize our productive capacities for the winning margin then, I think, the people of this country will solidly support this effort as we have in the past wars. However, if the executive department of our Government is allowing our resources to be poured down a rathole perhaps an impeachment is indicated.

For your information, I am a member of the Republican Party in Oregon and have been for more than 20 years. In many of the positions you have taken in the past I felt you were wrong and have opposed you. However, in this I feel that you have not only my support but that of every thinking citizen of Oregon.

Respectfully yours,
R. T. Green.

Weston, Oreg.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Both my husband and I appreciate the open committee hearing televised Friday, February 4. It gave us a better insight of the workings of our Government and a number of reasons why, and what our Government is doing.

We would like further televised hearings of other committee hearings if they can be arranged.

We appreciate your stand on getting the information before the general public. Our vote says please continue.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. D. G. Hunter.

Portland, Oreg.

My Dear Senator Morse: We have read and listened to you and read your views for a long, long time. May God grant you strength to keep up the good fight until the victory is won. You have more good sense than many other of the wise men in Washington. So glad that others are joining you. Tell Mrs. Morse, you are not just her sweetheart—you are the sweetheart of all God-fearing and decent Americans who believe in peace. For the life of me I cannot see why little children are ripped apart and lose their limbs from our bombs in the name of freedom. After we bang up that part of the world at a horrible price, and add millions of cripples and dead, and destitute people, what have we gained? Who will feed and care for them? The whole Vietnam war farce stinks to high heavens. You are so very, very right. If I were of draft age, as much as I love my country, I would choose jail rather than go to Vietnam. This is not our war. If Herr McNamara feels so keenly for these people and this "just war," why is he not in it? Why is not his son in it? Another of our fine lads in Portland gave his life for that idiotic good-for-nothing war. May God have mercy on us.

Say, Senator Morse, we love you to the point of idolizing you—and we are stanch Republicans. We always for you. Why are you against our Governor Hatfield joining you in the good fight up Capitol Hill? Is it just paper talk? We love both you and Mr. Hatfield—what a nice pair of Oregon good men we would have up there. We are sorry about this. We hope you are not seriously against Mr. Hatfield. We think he is great.

Sincerely yours, with Christian love,
Mrs. Fred Mueller,

Klamath Falls, Oreg.,
February 7, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: Seldom have I been aroused to the point of revolt over the illegal war we are waging in Vietnam.

It is beyond belief that Johnson and his ilk would have the audacity to force the American people into accepting the responsibility for this inhuman affair.

I am satisfied that this war is for the interest of big business, in order to secure sources of raw materials and markets. It is also to bolster a sagging economy here at home. I have taken time out to read the history of Vietnam and I find that we have supported one of the most reactionary governments in Ngo Dinh Diem and we have merely done the act over again in placing Minister Nguyen Cao Ky in power. Recently the press revealed that Ky had great admiration for Hitler, and the manner in which he handled the problems of Germany. Can you imagine our Government aiding any puppet who regarded a despot like Hitler as being a great man? Many of us fought to destroy all that Hitler stood for and now this Texas blowhard is out to revive this specter again by taking us to war in its behalf.

I came here from Colorado and I am a great friend of former Senator Ed C. Johnson. I ran for the house there in 1958.

We always did feel that Oregon had a great Senator in you and when I say we I mean all of the progressive Democrats in Colorado.

I want you to know, Senator, that you have done a tremendous job for all of the

American people and Oregon should be justly proud of you. In the near future I hope it is my pleasure to meet you and say hello.

Sincerely yours,
Fred J. Peltzer.

Beaverton, Oreg.,
February 7, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your effort to bring Secretary McNamara and General Wheeler before open sessions of the Foreign Relations Committee. Do hope the hearings continue. I watched with high interest the proceedings on CBS–TV.

Welcome, too, is the news which just came over CBS radio reporting your remarks challenging the President's statements made in Honolulu. Many of us hope you continue your efforts to bring some sanity to the scene.

That our country is using its great power, including napalm, to destroy Vietnamese civilians and their country is a living nightmare. We keep asking ourselves: How is this possible? So many cold statistics from administration leaders who appear to ignore humanity. As a Democrat, I feel betrayed by the President. I worked for his election, as did many Republicans, in rejecting what we considered Senator Goldwater's reckless approach to foreign policy. Many of us are frightened that the world will not survive 3 more years of his administration.

I am sending a newspaper clipping which gives the account of the recent convention held by Washington County Democrats who passed a resolution expressing gratitude for your contribution in clarifying the Vietnam war issues and pledging you continued support. Another resolution was passed supporting the Vietnam peace drive—before bombing of the north had been resumed.

Best wishes to Mrs. Morse.

Sincerely,
Lorene Smurthwaite.

Lake Oswego, Oreg.,
February 6, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I want to express my approval of your efforts to get the Vietnam war before the United Nations and to have it debated in Congress,

It is of vital importance that the people of our country are informed of the true issues at stake in Vietnam and of the danger to world peace if the war there continues.

Sincerely yours,
Charles W. Jensen.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 6, 1966.

Dear Senator Wayne Morse: First I say thanks for you doing such good work for our peace-loving people all over the world.

Peace—not bombs and napalm for Vietnam.

Don't escalate—Peace now in Vietnam. Negotiate.

Yours sincerely,
Hilda Hendrickson.

Coquille, Oreg.,
February 4, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have just listened to your report from Washington, D.C. over radio KWRO, Coquille, Oreg.

We are with you all the way on your Vietnam policies. Keep these reports coming and if possible wake up the American people.

You seem to be one of a few of our Senators whom we have sent to Washington, D.C., to protect our interests at home that hasn't fallen under the hypnotic spell of Johnson, Rusk and McNamara.

Keep these reports coming and we'll be listening.

Respectfully,
Mrs. Ana A. Spencer.

Beatty, Oreg.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse: I do want to thank you for standing up for us here in Oregon. We love you. Do not let them get you down. I am sitting here now watching you on TV question that man. I was very glad to here say that you had came into that meeting to lean over backways but it wasn't doing any good to change your mind and that Senator Williams that is now talking is a good one to. You are now asking him about the ships that are going into the north part if they are British. I tell them to stop anyway or we would sink them. And you are so right about this right to do declare war. I do not think that we have any right at all over there. We cannot win anything just like Korea and why not the U.N. It is just a veto game. And where is our friends? Are we just the one keeper of the world. Why oh why are they not there? We have had some poor leaders they have taken us from the gold standard to the plastic standard in our money and that foreign aid money is awful. They say that we was asked to come over there and help them. I sure would like to have that answered. I am just like you on that. How could they ask when they did not have a government? I am not much of a writer but there are lots of good people just like me here in Oregon that think this way. I do wish you was President. You could save this country. It sure is in a mess now and not getting any better fast. It sure looks bad. I am 64 years old working out 6 miles north of Beatty, Oreg., on a cow ranch feeding cattle—rain, snow, and mud—just got my wage slip. I made $3,672 last year in wages. They have taken $133 in taxes out of it. More power to you Senator. Stay with them.

Write me if you can and let me know what we can do.

Jack Weimer.

Reedsport, Oreg.,
February 3, 1966.

Senator Wayne L. Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We would like you to know that we appreciate your effort against the unlawful and disgraceful war in Vietnam.

Sincerely,
H. Strong.
Ila S. Strong.
John Strong.

Myrtle Creek, Oreg.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator Wayne L. Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I want to let you know how much my family and I appreciate your news-letters, we are all so very interested in all you are doing for us and the rest of the world.

My folks have followed you all through the years and when we lived in Eugene, we lived just a short way from your home there.

I am sorry that so many people are so blind and fail to realize what would happen to us were it not for a person like you.

Oregon is real proud of you and there will be many prayers offered I know for your success and hope hope that Johnson will open his eyes and realize that America cannot afford to go through another long war, we have already lost too many men and war as you know never accomplishes anything.

God bless you Senator Morse and good luck.

Sincerely,
Grace L. Condrey.
Floyd Condrey.
Floyd J. Condrey.

Phoenix, Oreg.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: Only too often I feel that people such as myself remain silent when we should speak out in support of our beliefs. It has finally come to pass that I feel obligated to state that I support the stand that you have taken on Vietnam. As a teacher I quite often have the opportunity to discuss our foreign policy with other professional men and find the majority in agreement with you. If there is any service that I could render other than moral support, I would gladly accept.

Sincerely
Gary Hendrix.
Diane Hendrix.

North Bend, Oreg.
February 5, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Honorable Senator: Your efforts to present the facts in the Vietnam situation are appreciated. It is an extremely frightening situation when the apparent majority of U.S. citizens feel that the declaration of war is a legitimate function of the executive branch of the Government instead of the Congress. How can the United States say it is supporting the popular will of the people of Vietnam (or South Vietnam) when it has instigated and supported junta governments of the South?

There must be a complete lack of inventiveness in the State Department as they are still dedicated to the outmoded policy of containment. Certainly a revision in most of our foreign policy is in order. We must instigate or formulate an ideology appealing enough to combat that of communism. There is no war of ideologies since we have none in our foreign relations. The solution may be quite simple—just make our adherence to the Constitution, Declaration of Independence, and Bill of Rights applicable to foreign policy as well as our domestic policy. There is no reason for a cession of humanitarian principles at the geographical boundaries of the United States. On one hand we clearly state in these great documents that we believe in the worth and equality of man and in the virtue of freedom—and on the other we support people such as Batista, Franco, Salazar, and the South Vietnam juntas. The only explanation is that we are sacrificing principles for short-range objectives.

Thank you for any consideration you may give to my opinions. Put me on your Newsletter mailing list. You typify the quality of man the late President Kennedy wrote about—"A Profile in Courage."

Yours,
James D. Cunningham.

La Grande, Oreg.,
February 4, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We wish to advise you that we are in full support of your opposition of the undeclared war, and the escalation of same in Vietnam, and asking that this grievance be placed before the U.N. for their final decision. Why have a Congress if we are going to be governed by the decisions of the executive branch of our Government and the military staffs?

We have always labored under the assumption that our Government is of the people, by the people, for the people without any secrecy only in case of war on essential military strategy being the exception. Secrecy in our Government, in our opinion, points to suspicion and distrust in our elected Government servants in Washington, D.C., and most assuredly will not be tolerated by the American people for any considerable length of time.

We advocate it is high time that someone in Washington awake to the fact that our Nation and people are heading for bankruptcy in our efforts to police the world, and handing out billions of dollars of our hard-earned tax moneys to any so and so regardless of any benefits to be derived in our behalf for these expenditures.

As a committee of one, Senator Morse, you are doing an admirable job in bringing this deplorable situation to the eyes of the American public. We congratulate you as we were beginning to assume that we did have a rubberstamp Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. Emery A. Coles.

Eugene, Oreg.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator Morse: My congratulations on your stand, especially regarding McNamara, Rusk, and their testimony in secrecy. (I'm referring to TV program February 4.)

You are a very worthy Senator—America needs more people like you in Washington.

Keep up the good work.

Very sincere regards,

H. F. Ayer.

Sweet Home, Oreg.,
February 4, 1966.

Dear Senator Wayne Morse: We strongly support your views on the Vietnam war. We admire you for the way you speak out, with no beating around the bush. You certainly have our votes. I've talked to many people that feel as we do.

It is time the American people know the truth of what is going on in our Government.

We can't see all the suffering and killing of our young American boys, just to keep the economy of our country up. If the companies that produce defense equipment had to produce it at cost, instead of cost plus in the time of war, I believe that would stop a lot of the pressures to create war. Do you agree?

As for President Johnson, it's too bad when we let one man have so much power.

I firmly believe that the Office of the President has assumed much too much power. I also believe he needs some new advisers. I'm afraid those few men of power are going to destroy our America and many others, if they aren't stopped.

Is there any way to stop them?

We just wanted to say keep up the good work and the public certainly should be behind you. Bring the pressure to bear that you deem necessary to force these men to make the right decisions. With our support.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Eva Dixon.

Gleneden Beach, Oreg.,
February 3, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Honorable Sir: You are a statesman along with Senator Fulbright, Senator Dirksen, Governor Hatfield, and perhaps a few others.

The war in Vietnam must be stopped; also foreign aid to those countries who are not cooperative in our efforts toward peace and freedom.

It would seem to us taxpayers, voters, and parents that our cause could best be attained by seeking out those Senators who share our thinking and with a combined effort of all of you that you can force the powers that be to withdraw now, stop the bombing and bring our troops home.

Our President is leading us into a world war and the consequences are unthinkable. The people of foreign nations hate us, our foreign aid is not appreciated.

The only way we voters can say our little bit is through people like yourself and our vote at the polls. Unfortunately we cannot express ourselves at the polls at this time, otherwise you would see a new President and many new Congressmen.

We appreciate the fine job you are doing and please keep it up. We know and hope that you will seek others to help you.

Yours very truly,

Roy R. Dexter.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 7, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Now that the war in Vietnam has reached a climax of different opinions, I cannot refrain from offering my suggestions of discipline to fit the case.

There is no doubt that Russia and China are both intensely afraid of the United States. That we are on their eastern shoreline is scaring them to death. From our position we can bomb them to utter destruction. If these countries were to crowd so close to us in America we too, would be scared to death. We were equally frightened when Russia did aline itself to Cuba and we were equally demanding they get out. They got out until they seemed to us to be no menace. Why do we not do the same by getting out of Vietnam with as much grace as possible without waiting to be beaten over the head? Your contention that the undeclared war by us is unconstitutional is an excellent route to do just this. The TV debate which presented you demanding authority for the United States to continue the war was very well stated and must have inspired many people as it did me.

Why don't we give them a chance to prove their suggestions for peace? Why don't we prove our good will by giving them a free hand? It could be no more devastating than the present strategy of slaughtering our young men aimlessly to an unknown goal.

If they do not keep their word we can put pressure on them later when we have full authority to do so.

Vietnam is a country imbued with democratic ideals that seem a direct threat to their neighbors, the Communists. A thoroughly communistic regime in the Western Hemisphere would be a real threat to us, too. Cuba may be trying for one stronger than ever before. We are watching all American countries, not for aggression, but for protection. The world looks to United States for protection and leadership. As such we have worldwide decisions to make in interest of the rest. Such as the head of a family must make, or a teacher in a classroom. When faced with two strong unruly members of either, who must cooperate with the leader and other members, is beating the only answer? Are leaders who ask other members of the group how best to deal with the unruly ones forced to accept their final decisions? Do or should the lesser members expect their own opinions to sway the leader beyond his better judgment? Is not judgment the main characteristic of a leader? Is not part of good leadership the ability and willingness to trust the unruly ones until he wins their good will? Does not every parent experience to this extent? Does such a parent lose face? Not so long as it is the psychological thing to do?

When Asian countries demand we get out, we should get out. Bow low and get out, with the understanding that if we return it is not for aggression, but defense of our commitments.

Russia bowed out for us and we respected her for it. Let us not be too proud of ourselves to reciprocate. If what we are doing now is unconstitutional, let us work to prove it to everyone so as to ease the explanation of our retreat.

The cost of a legal unlimited war will be staggering; of an illegal war with its regular and extended benefits to veterans will be prohibitive. Those who feel as I do are hoping and depending on you and your supporters to demand that this war be declared by Congress only so we can return home with honesty to base our war activities with basic judgment of all the American people. Let us demand it.

Mrs. Bertha C. Perrine.

Newberg, Oreg.,
January 30, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: I listened today to the congressional conference with great interest and respect for you. You are the one man who seems to possess the courage and integrity of speaking the truth. That you say what must be said in spite of all the clever mish-mash of concealment; that you feel it imperative to let the public know what the real status quo is, makes you not only outstanding as a Congressman, but a man of conviction and a man furthermore, who realizes the importance of getting the truth across to the average U.S. citizen in spite of his or her apathy. I will say a prayer for you tonight and just hope that enough people heard and listened to what you had to say to write in and express themselves.

I have agreed with you all down the line. Where indeed are our allies? That we did not utilize all the machinery set up for peace via the U.N. is a scandal. Why do we fear the Communists so much that we should take such unilateral tactics? Endangering the whole earth. We should possess more wisdom and more humility.

No despot lives forever, even mad dogs like Hitler, this is one instance where warfare was necessary, but an emerging nation wishing to settle its own destiny should be allowed to. Interfering is much like the fallacy of trying to take sides in a marital dispute. A civil war such as our own, bloody, tragic and in many ways a universal question, was, in all intrinsic ways, our own private matter. Had England or France taken sides, it should have incurred nothing but hatred for decades to follow. England did in a sense. All nations try to gain economic advantage in one way or another, but it doesn't excuse it. Our moral right to go into Vietnam with military force is, as you have reiterated so many times, completely unethical and immoral. And as I see it the Vietcong will naturally refuse to negotiate so long as we are there in such force, with our bombers, bases, men and ammunition primed—what's more they are playing a wise game indeed. How long can we maintain such a widescale action, ever necessary to escalate, always more costly? It is a question of pure logic. They will bleed us white. Once China is involved, it will be interminable, and a young militant country, having such a loss of face due to our exclusion of them from the U.N. from our indifference to them as a nation, will be able to expend more manpower, and hatred and zeal than we could possibly conceive of. Most of the young men drafted have only the vaguest concept of what we are doing or trying to do, some are actively opposed. Our heart isn't in it if the truth be known, and no amount of expensive and advanced material of war will make up the deficit. And the Vietnamese are bewildered and confused and little wonder. They are truly deserving of settling their own destiny. Rusk was rather embarrassed today when asked why we hadn't signed the Geneva agreement. Why we had selected a puppet government had prevented a plebiscite in

1954. We have acted like a paranoid nation, convinced that we, and we alone, have the answers, that we, and we alone, can judge how and where the little nations of the world should go. And like all paranoids, the driving force is fear. Why should we fear communism so damned much? Russia has become more and more democratic, we have become more and more socialized. The demarcation is becoming less and less. We have an increasing population, an automated civilization, more people to feed, house, clothe, entertain, educate, care for in sickness and old age; outer space to explore, oceans to study and utilize for mankind, deserts to make productive, many, many human ills to eliminate or control. Cancer, birth defects, mental illness, etc. Our own civil rights problems, good heavens, we have enough to do, and by doing these things and helping the small countries, the large impoverished countries with their socio-economic, and perhaps their medical problems, why do we need wars? Even madmen like Hitler could be constrained and controlled by the civilized machinery set up in the U.N. charter and with the wholehearted support of the greater nations. It is rather ironic that we were the only large nation who failed to support Woodrow Wilson's Geneva Treaty, and that we failed again to utilize the U.N. or sign the Geneva Treaty in 1954. The charter was written and signed in our own United States and we fail to acknowledge it. I am angry Senator Morse, and very ashamed and sad.

This may not be proper procedure, but I'd appreciate your referring this to President Johnson—my letters to him are never answered—thank you.

Sincerely,

Mary Louise Diamond.

Newberg, Oreg.,
November 20, 1965.

Dear Senator Morse: As you know from my previous letters, I am violently opposed to the policy of the United States in Vietnam. It is indeed unethical and immoral. Now that it is escalating to the point of utter massacre, I am sick at heart. Not only for our own, but all the others involved, civilians and yes even the North Vietnamese. Had we pursued an ethical course, letting them have a plebiscite, a free choice, and they had then requested our assistance, we might have a moral reason for being there, but as it is—

I was recently in San Francisco and visited the Berkeley campus. I was rather amazed and appalled by the students' campaigns for so-called freedom. Freedom for sex. As through this has not always been to some extent. Now with oral contraceptives it is without doubt completely a matter of choice. Another table was set up for freedom to smoke marihuana. Now, possibly this is a good way to let off adolescent steam, but when a serious and vital problem such as our involvement with Vietnam is concerned, I found it thoroughly objectionable. Furthermore, the students representing the anti-Vietnam, were terrible looking people, unshaven, unwashed, dressed in sloppy clothes and in every respect evil smelling and repellent. Had I not been with friends, or shall I say, my husband, I'd have had the courage of my convictions and told them exactly the way I believe most people feel. It definitely is not necessary for them to appear unshaven and unwashed to make their rebellion known. Far better that they conform in the small things in order to gain acceptance and recognition in the real issues. However, unlike you, dear Senator Morse, I didn't have my tongue until I had left the scene of action. Incidentally, our friends were Bob Ginsberg and wife, your former campaign assistant.

This is not written as an appeal for my own children, since my eldest is a doctor practicing in Ashland, Oreg., the rest of my children are girls, married to men beyond the age group. It is written in a sincere attempt to avert this awful holocaust.

Please forgive this dreadfully typed letter, it is a machine long abused by my four children.

Let me congratulate you on your South American contacts. I just wish there were more of you in our Senate.

Sincerely,

Mary Diamond.

P.S.—Forgive—this was never mailed thought I'd stick it in just to let you know. I meant well—way back in November.

Toledo, Oreg.,
February 3, 1966.

Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand on the Vietnam war.

J. E. Wright.

La Grande, Oreg.,
February 2, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We wish to tell you how very much we appreciate your efforts in trying to stop the slaughter of our young men in Vietnam. We also feel this is a senseless war and should be stopped.

Glad also for the men in Congress who are beginning to see the light, but wish they weren't so weak kneed about it but had some of your drive.

Yours very truly,

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Chandler.

Portland, Oreg.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I listened to President Johnson's speech this morning, and I can assure you I am very concerned. I have little faith in the so-called peace offensive that has been taking place. I don't know what you can do to slow our headlong pace toward world war III, but I am confident you will do all you can.

We can say goodby to the Great Society because any realist knows you can't have both, guns and butter. As I see it, it is an old man's war and a young man's fight, but if it goes too far it may be everybody's fight.

Hoping something can be done before it is too late.

I remain your constituent for a sane foreign policy.

Harriet M. Cooper.

Grants Pass, Oreg.
February 1, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. Senator Morse: Last Sunday I viewed part of the press program on the discussion of the Vietnam war and appreciated very much your consideration and concern for the rights of the American public. We are concerned to see the individual freedoms dwindling in our beloved country.

I had not thought of writing until the enclosed clipping appeared in last night's paper. You may be aware of this procedure by the draft boards already, but in any event I would like to register my disapproval. I do not know how to make my voice heard except to bring this matter to your attention and register my feelings against this unfairness.

It brings to my mind the efforts of Hitler to produce a pure race of high intelligence by eliminating the average or less. Is our fair country following in his footsteps in sending the ones of average intelligence off to Vietnam to be eliminated and spare the ones with the high IQ? There was much said in the press and over the air against such cruel discrimination by Herr Hitler in trying to produce a race of masterminds. Have we forgotten? There are many with high IQ's in the mental institutions and behind prison bars. I personally know of some with high IQ's who are misfits in society and have to be cared for by the state.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Respectfully,

Arnold C. Lien.

[From the Grants Pass Courier]

BOARD MEMBER QUITS OVER STUDENT DRAFT

La Grande.—The program for drafting college students into military service is both unrealistic and unfair, Lyle H. Johnson said in a letter released today, announcing his resignation from the La Grande draft board.

Johnson, who also is registrar of Eastern Oregon College, suggested it would "be more fair to use some form of random selection" than to base selection on grade point averages and test scores.

Moreover, he said, "I find myself in an untenable position of calling college students into the Armed Forces on the one hand and on the other as registrar at Eastern Oregon doing everything possible to keep these students in school."

He said there is little correlation between college grade point averages and success in later life, and to base draft selection on these is "entirely unrealistic and unfair."

Johnson said the registrar's office had been deluged "with students presenting forms from their respective boards asking for the number of credits they are carrying, their cumulative grade point average and their grade point average the past term. Furthermore, these young men are advised by their boards that unless this information is furnished within 2 weeks they will be classified 1-A. The college had not been notified of this procedure and as of this date has not been able to figure the cumulative grade point averages since the fall term. * * *"

The resignation was sent to Sprague Carter, Portland, Oreg., director of Selective Service, who had announced last week that the information was going to be required and the deadline for getting it back was 2 weeks. At the time he said it was up to the institutions to meet the deadline if they didn't want their students to lose their deferments.

A spokesman at Portland Community College said counselors had been handling some of the clerical work in order to keep up with the students' requests for reports.

Eugene, Oreg.,
January 28, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Among the confusion of protests over the war in Vietnam, the bases for the protests are often lost. One of the least understood positions is that of those who support the goals of U.S. foreign policy but not the means being used to implement these goals. Too often the assumption is made that if a person protests U.S. actions, he is also protesting U.S. goals.

I fully believe in the goals of protecting the world from Communist domination and providing a climate in which democratic growth is possible. In underdeveloped areas the latter goal is often contingent on the former.

The United States has concentrated on military power as a means to achieving the above goals. The frequent threat to our goals in areas such as Vietnam would suggest that this concentration on a single means has not been sufficiently effective to sustain our goals through time.

Perhaps the greatest achievement of the Kennedy administration in foreign policy was in creating a shift in American perception. Kennedy created a climate in which

Americans were no longer so worried about the imminence of Communist military threat.

With this climate it would have been possible to move into new areas, new means, of confronting the Communist challenge. Instead of taking advantage of this climate, Johnson has gone back to heavy reliance on military means of policy implementation. Part of this may have been necessitated by deteriorated conditions in Vietnam. But I have seen no evidence of any basic change of means of implementing foreign policy goals in respect to other areas of the world. Either the opportunity for new directions was not perceived, or it has been ignored.

What I as a citizen expect from my Government in international relations is not reliance on the same assumptions about the usefulness of military power, but creative new ideas in foreign policy and diplomacy. I expect some novel thinking coming from the State Department, not continuing reliance on old ideas from the Pentagon.

The idea of finding nonmilitary alternatives to support American goals is fairly common, especially in the academic community. As far as I know, little research has been done to find ways to implement realistic alternatives. Studies of both first steps and long-range projects are, of course, crucial in order to realize new methods of pursuing American foreign policy. Such studies are also beyond the interested but unskilled citizen such as myself. My suggestion is that some time, effort, and money be devoted to such a search, and I feel that such a search and its results would interact favorably with the desires of many Americans.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. James P. Boggs.

State of Oregon,
Salem, Oreg., February 7, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Just a note to say that I was very pleased to talk with you last week in Washington, D.C., and to congratulate you on your victory in finally getting the Vietnam issue before the United Nations. To use a Morsism, I believe you are dead right.

Yours very truly,
Lawrence A. Aschenbrenner,
Public Defender.

Clackamas County Democratic Party,
Milwaukie, Oreg., February 2, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: A nation is only as strong as the confidence of the people in its leaders. We are weak and divided when our people do not understand where the Government is taking them and how it expects to reach its announced end of peace in Asia. Trying to crush public discussion on these issues only repells the citizens reliance in our Government. Thus I have been greatly concerned about our Nation. Seldom do I discuss the personalities of our leaders with my neighbors, but lately I find more and more people coming to me voicing their disapproval of the President's action concerning our current struggle in Vietnam.

Although we know the period of isolationism is over, and we trust that it shall never advance again; we believe that our intervention in the struggle of the people of Vietnam is illegal. On numerous occasions, the American people have been told by the past administrations, that we are in South Vietnam as a guest of that Government. However, according to the agreements of Geneva of 1954 no legal government was established. Further, we were to help supervise free elections to unify the people of both sections of Vietnam in 1956. We established a puppet government and put Diem in as premier. This we advocate was an illegal action. Why did we not ratify the Geneva Treaty of 1954?

How does our present administration expect the citizens of this great Nation to offer any moral support to its programs when we are purposely told lies upon lies about the southeast Asian struggle. Both the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State issue conflicting stories with each other and the President of the United States. At one moment, the public is informed that the war will soon be over—then, in a few days, a reassessment has been made and it will be several years until our servicemen are returned home.

It appears that money is being wasted on around-the-world crusades for peace when President L. B. Johnson does not appear willing to talk peace on any conditions but his own. The President said he would not negotiate with North Vietnam. However, it appears that he groups the Vietcong as part of the North Vietnam forces. From all surveys and reports that we have in our possession, we are drawn to the conclusion that the Vietcong are in reality citizens of South Vietnam.

President Johnson has approached Congress on various occasions seeking unlimited power in regards to continuing war in Vietnam. We believe the President seeks his "vote of confidence" from Congress, knowing that he could not get such from the citizens of the United States.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America does not grant Congress the power to give the President of the United States inherent powers. Powers to declare war are delegated to the duly elected Members of Congress. This power cannot be given to a President by resolution. It may only be delegated to a President by a constitutional amendment. This has not been done. We, therefore, commend you for upholding the Constitution of the United States when asked to grant the President unlimited powers.

We believe inherent power of the President lasts only as long as it is necessary for him to respond in the interest of meeting an emergency. Further, we advocate that he has the clear duty of proceeding as quickly as possible to Congress and ask for a declaration of war.

As a result of Congress granting the present administration the inherent power he requests, our foreign policy has become placed more and more in the hands of the military. Thus making the role Congress and the people play in this area much less.

Machavelli once wrote that the power of might makes right. We shudder with a fear our present leader, at times, follows this much rebuked philosophy. He seeks consent of the Congress, but often forgets that we, the people believe that he should also listen to the advice of the Congress. We fear that in 1966 and again in 1968 many Members of Congress will realize that the people of America are alert and knowing of the contradictions being given by the President and his close advisers. A time of reckoning will come for all Members of Congress when their names appear at the ballot box.

Our responsibilities to South Vietnam are no more than any other nation that belongs to the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. Currently we are paying 97 percent of all the costs of financing a war in Vietnam, and have not requested the other seven members of SEATO to share their burden. It is somewhat ironic that Vietnam is not even a member of this organization.

No war has been declared in southeast Asia and yet we are bombing North Vietnam. Surely no one can rationalize such an act as being legal. All authority to wage war, if there really ever is any such authority, lies within the United Nations Organizations and not with a single nation. History has proven that every nation which has become drunk with military power has fallen. Our leaders believe our conspiracy with economic aid binds all nations to our dictates. When will the leaders of this Nation realize that our dollars will be sucked from under us by every nation that we allow to do so; but, they will not, in return, stand beside us?

Senator, we urge you to continue your present public discussions about our illegal actions in Vietnam. We believe the public will stand behind the Constitution of this Nation, if they know the facts. Further, we are sure they will not condone giving the President unlimited powers in an illegal and undeclared war in Vietnam.

Thanking you for displaying that we, in Oregon, have a man we can trust to let the world know when we, the people, are losing some of our rights and trusting that I may once again serve you in some way here in Oregon to get the message to the voters, I remain,

Democratically yours,

Frank C. Clore.

The Wallowa County Chieftain,
Enterprise, Oreg., February 8, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have admired your courage, independence, and intelligence in the Senate for many years and think that it is about time I told you so. In my own work as a newspaper editor I realize how gratifying it is sometimes to know that somebody appreciates a fellow's efforts.

Your strong stand in opposition to the war in Vietnam has been so forceful and so logical that I feel sure it is primarily responsible for the fact that there are now a large number of key people speaking out against our southeast Asia policies where a short time ago you were standing almost alone.

When I saw you on television at the Foreign Relations Committee hearings and heard your remarks, I was thrilled. I was equally impressed by your arguments on "Meet the Press," and again when you answered the President after his attack in Hawaii on those who oppose him in Vietnam.

If we can somehow recover our senses, stop this war in Vietnam, and get this problem before the United Nations, we may find that this period of unilateral violence marks the end of an era of big stick diplomacy. If it does, history will, I feel sure, accord to you one of the key roles in bringing this about.

I regret that other members of the Oregon delegation in Congress have not been as statesmanlike and as courageous as you have in these trying times.

Please convey to Senator Fulbright my very high regard for him. He has always been a great man, and he is having his finest hours today.

Sincerely,

Gwen T. Coffin.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I recently moved to Oregon from New Jersey, having chosen to work in Portland and to sample the pleasures of the Northwest. I am writing at this time simply to state my unqualified support for you in your position regarding the atrocious war in Vietnam. I heartily concur in your responses to the administration, past and present, and I hope that you will continue to state the position of what I hope is a majority of American citizens.

Your recent refusal to accept Jack Vaughn as the new Director of what is probably the only truly worthwhile foreign assistance program of the U.S. Government is also heartening. I shall do everything in my power to support you in your seemingly hopeless defense of civil liberties and in your continuing quest for peace.

With best wishes for a successful session this year and an even more successful prosecution of the peace effort.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL STOCKMAN.

BEND, OREG.,
February 7, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: Congratulations on your stand on Vietnam; you have many people behind you in this community. Two senior high school students, taking social science, took it upon themselves to canvass 50 homes in Bend. Forty-seven said "stop the war" and didn't care how; two were noncommittal and one wanted the war escalated.

This propaganda that only 3 percent of the university students are opposed to this war is false. From my contact with university students in Oregon the percentage is much over 50 percent and of social science students the percent in is excess of 80 percent.

Of friends I come in contact with there is only one (a banker) that doesn't feel as I do and he is against integration, too.

This Vietnam war is the biggest blunder this Nation has made in the 60 years I have lived in this great Nation. The only real commitment we have is to thousands of acres of rubber trees representing millions of dollars to a few people. I suspect that there are tungsten and tin mines involved, too. How long do you think we would stand still for China or Russia's waging war of this nature as close to our borders as we are to China's border.

I can understand our fear of China after the way they were exploited by England for so many years, but that is no excuse for us to kindle this fire of hatred and get us into a devastating war and there is where we are heading.

China should not be kept out of the U.N. I am convinced that China is making great strides toward becoming a flourishing, progressive and powerful nation so we had better bolster some good relationships before it is too late. I feel that Felix Greene's book, "China, the Country Americans Are Not Allowed To Know," published paperback (Ballantine Books, New York, No. 628) gives an accurate and valid picture of China.

These trips L.B.J. is sending people around to foreign countries are not to find ways of peace but rather to bolster his propaganda machine. In his message to the Nation, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 145, paragraph 7: "Able and experienced spokesmen have visited in behalf of America more than 40 countries. We have talked to more than a hundred governments—all 113 that we have relations with and some that we do not. We talked to the United Nations and we called upon all the members to make any contribution that they could toward helping gain peace."

The next paragraph, last sentence, "America has made her position abundantly clear." Then the fourth paragraph in the second column, "We have found understanding and support and we know that they wait with us tonight for some response that could lead to peace." Maybe you put some meaning to these nice words; I am unable to. Unless he can tell me what the specific attitudes of these nations are, it means nothing.

I wish you were in a position to call the shots for a while; I believe you would get us out of this mess. Russia's communistic operations are just the same as the powers in Washington today. Withholding information from the public and worse yet, from people like you. There should be no information that has to be filtered before it is handed to you and your colleagues. We had better clean up some of the cancerous conditions in this country before we tell other nations how to live and what is good for them.

The things that finally got me to write this letter are the statements made by L.B.J. on TV. In particular such as "we do not intend to abandon Asia to conquest." In history, no great nation has been conquered by force except that it decayed from within. Let's clean up our cancer spots: integration, slums, dishonesty, rackets (begin with Baker) the KKK and the Mafia. Get the plank out of our own eyes before we try to remove the splinter from our brother's.

I am not a "Johnny come lately"; my ancestors fought in the American Revolution, my grandparents helped build Oregon and one of my grandfathers was on the committee that planned our first statehouse. We have the most wonderful nation that has ever existed but if we get to throwing our weight around we will go the way of great nations of the past—history repeats itself.

There is a book, "The Eleventh Commandment," by Francis Nelson, that gives a picture of what is happening to us. Just substitute gratitude for freedom and a few other labels and it fits today's picture.

These military men who come up with "we can only accept an honorable settlement." What is an honorable settlement? In my book, if we offer to get out of Vietnam, if the Vietcong guarantees there will be no reprisals against the people and allow us to keep a small force there to see there are no reprisals and perhaps bring some of the leaders back to this country.

Let's get McNamara and some of these so-called military experts out and get some expert humanitarians in office. No nation is going to attack us if we are as strong as we are led to believe, but if we persist in bleeding our people for such as Vietnam, we will reach the saturation point and overnight we will be engulfed in communism. Russia has made the statement she would impose communism on us without firing a shot. Well, she is being successful.

I am convinced that the statement made by Adlai Stevenson, just before his death, to Eric Sevareid, about the peace offers, were valid and true. I was always an admirer of Mr. Stevenson because I felt he was honest, sincere, and wholeheartedly for America at all times. We are told that these offers are not valid or acceptable but do you yourself know what these offers are? If you don't I believe you have the right to see the original communications. If you want to know why I feel as I do let me know and give me 60 days to reply and I will send you quotes and give you the names of the people I believe are telling the truth.

I don't like the taxes but I won't complain too much if we use it to successfully cure the cancers I mentioned earlier and educate our youth. I don't mind the foreign aid program but feel less should go for administration and more to help them build programs that would help them to help themselves.

Thank you.

CARL KLIPPEL.

THE GREATER PORTLAND COUNCIL OF
CHURCHES,
Portland, Oreg., February 1, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed please find a copy of "A Call to End War in Vietnam" adopted unanimously at our recent board of directors meeting, January 26, 1966.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. CATE,
Executive Secretary.

A CALL TO END WAR IN VIETNAM

Approved by Greater Portland Council of Churches, Christian Social Concerns Commission, January 18, 1966.

Approved by board of directors, January 26, 1966.

The basis for our Christian concern for all human need and trouble, and for the present conflict in Vietnam and southeast Asia, are in Biblical theology and in Christian ethics. God's love in Christ has reconciled all men to himself and to each other. Through this reconciliation we acknowledge God as Father and all men as brothers. He calls us to make this reconciliation known, manifest, and effectual in human life everywhere.

God calls us to witness to His love and mercy has made known to us in Christ. He summons us, prompted by his Spirit and motivated by love of neighbor, to perform those deeds of mercy and those acts of reconciliation which will bind up the wounds of the suffering, the orphaned, the homeless, and will overcome the fear, suspicion, enmity, and hate which has set man against man and nation against nation. As men and women of Christian compassion we cannot fail to try in every possible way to respond helpfully to the devastation, hunger, injury, and death caused by the conflict now raging.

We have as our heritage the words of the prophets that "nations shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks," and that they shall not "learn war any more." We are called to open our lives to the influence of God's will and to relate the deepest ethical insights of our faith to deal constructively with all of the forces now involved in conflict. We are constrained to seek peace and pursue even in the midst of a world at war.

We speak, therefore, out of compassion for all. We seek faithfully to carry out our brotherly and pastoral roles for those in our congregations and in our community, particularly parents, who have loved ones in Vietnam. We heartily support the church's ministry to the Armed Forces and to those involved in war. We wish to strengthen the ministry of prayer and intercession, both private and public, including prayers for peace, and, as our Lord commanded us, prayers for our enemies. We make every effort to sustain the work of our missionaries who witness to a love that knows no boundary lines. We share materially in the humanitarian programs which are providing food, clothing, medicines, and other forms of assistance and support to peoples engulfed by the present conflict. Above all, we desire to do all that we can to create the attitudes and to find the ways that will bring peace with justice in southeast Asia.

We, therefore, as the Greater Portland Council of Churches, concerned for the world community, the Vietnamese, and the Americans, add our voices to seek an end to the warfare which continues to destroy Vietnam and to kill Vietnamese, Americans, and others. We call upon our fellow human beings everywhere to help end that destruction and to regard that war as a threat to the world community. Because the war is a problem to all men, we address ourselves to all men and governments, including our own, the warring parties, and governments of Vietnam, and the United Nations Secretary-General. Military action is validated only by aims beyond itself and serves these ends insofar as it leads to negotiation and speedy settlement of conflict and must be judged by its effectiveness in achieving these goals.

We support these goals in Vietnam and elsewhere:

The emergence of governments which are representative and which guarantee free expression and organization.

The accomplishment of social and economic reforms desired by the peoples.

The engagement of all governments in the responsibilities of developing a world community of law and order based upon a strengthened United Nations.

The Greater Portland Council of Churches supports the President of the United States in his recent efforts to secure negotiations by diplomatic means, commends the U.S. Government for its temporary cessation of bombing in the interest of aggressive and unremitting efforts to explore every possible way of moving the struggle from the battlefield to the conference table.

We propose these efforts to reach a negotiated settlement:

We ask our Government and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam (South Vietnam) to call for a cease-fire. To that end:

We ask our Government to make a continuing effort to avoid resuming the bombing in Vietnam and to avoid further military buildup in South Vietnam.

We ask our Government to affirm its intention to negotiate with all parties, including the National Liberation Front, clearly recognizing that if there is to be a stable government it will have to include all the major groups in the country.

We ask our Government to place the question of the conflict on the agenda of the Security Council of the United Nations, to declare its support for United Nations or other international procedures for supervising a cease-fire, for providing for the peaceful establishment of representative government in South Vietnam, for protecting the lives and rights of minority individuals and groups, for exploring the possibilities of reunification, and for establishing the whole of Vietnam as a neutral and demilitarized zone.

We ask our Government to change the emphasis of its involvement in Vietnam by increasing its programs of aid to the social and economic development of Vietnam.

We ask the National Liberation Front and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (North Vietnam) to reciprocate by stopping military action and the introduction of additional military aid; and by cooperating in a cease-fire and negotiations leading to the attainment of the other objectives listed in this call.

We ask the Governments of all nations and the Secretary General of the United Nations to use their good offices to urge a cease-fire and negotiations among all affected parties.

We recognize the thrusts and disruption of our civilization, partly caused by totalitarian ideologies, movements, and governments of many forms in our times, the threats of force they represent and the need for stronger agencies of conflict adjustment; but, we affirm that the great conflicts of our time need not run the course of violence with its threat of universal destruction.

We call on all nations to transform these conflicts into political struggle without mass violence and joint efforts to meet human needs by the use of the United Nations, the World Court, and other institutions of international security.

Corvallis, Oreg.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: It was a great pleasure to hear the President announce that he is instructing Mr. Goldberg to set up a meeting of the Security Council of the United Nations.

Our family has just moved to Oregon from Colorado in July 1965. I have always admired your spunk for standing up for the right things for our country.

Your participation in the panel, Sunday, must have influenced the President's decision. Bravo for you.

I do hope that the United Nations move will help us toward peace. We have a 19-year-old boy (adopted) about whom we worry at present.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. Ione C. Nelson.

Coos Bay, Oreg.,
February 1, 1966.

Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
Oregon Senator, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for your courageous stand on the Vietnam war, on the TV panel of Sunday, January 30, 1966.

Aside from physical combat, we are fighting the Oriental mind—on their own territory—while our allies, so-called, supply the enemy with war materials, paid for by the United States.

With Communists doing everything possible to disrupt our country by manpower and funds—it is time to shelve alibis—and for Uncle Sam to wake from his long sleep.

Very truly,
Genevieve Sengstacken,
Republican.

Portland, Oreg.,
January 31, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: I agree entirely with your position on the Vietnamese war. I hope you will continue to speak against this illegal action and urge a proper solution to this threat to peace. Reescalation of this war by renewed bombing of North Vietnam is no step toward victory or peace.

Respectfully,
Mark Wallig.

Garibaldi, Oreg.,
February 3, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your fearless statesmanship. We need many more with your honesty and foresight.

The January 30 TV special had us rooting for you all the way and seems to have produced results the next day(?) Let's have the "face" to get out of Vietnam and stop this terrifying powerplay. Our disgraceful chickens are coming home to roost these days and our confidence is being undermined by lies and omissions.

Mrs. Patricia Sullivan.

Hillsboro, Oreg.,
February 3, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for your strong stand on the illegality of our position in Vietnam. I'm sure the American people are much confused by our aggressive action, and would appreciate more clear statements of the truth.

I for one do not want to assume any responsibility for such action, and I'm sure most people do not. This is a most critical situation and should be stopped before it is too late.

Thank you again,
Martha E. Burdett.

Lake Oswego, Oreg.,
February 2, 1966.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Just want you to know how right I think you are in your views of the situation in Vietnam. It seems that more and more of us are feeling and expressing ourselves that this terrible mess must be settled and quickly, but why do not the people in command and the ones who make the decisions appear to listen?

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Muriel A. Hopp.

P.S.—Am writing to Senator Fulbright too. Heard him last night.

Hillsboro, Oreg.,
January 30, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator from Oregon.

Dear Senator: I have just finished listening to the discussion of the Vietnamese situation carried over TV channel 6 on the above date. I say without any mental reservations whatsoever that I am in the fullest agreement with your position in this matter.

It has been my feeling and opinion for some time that the present administration is "out in left field" in the choice of action which they are pursuing in Vietnam. I feel as you do that it cannot be defended either on legal or even moral grounds. I believe that Johnson and his advisers are on a highly dangerous and untenable safari; and that they have been a little less than candid with the rank and file of us folks who may either have to pay for this war via blood or dollars.

I despair with the lack of confidence that this administration has in us folks in that they cannot or will not tell us the things about this "undeclared war" that we are entitled to know.

In conclusion let me say, "give it all you've got, Wayne; we hear you loud and clear in Oregon," and approve.

Respectfully yours,
Norris R. Joyce.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 2, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I wish to thank you for your appearance on CBS–TV January 30 and to let you know that many of us here in Oregon approve your position and I am thankful we have men of courage to stand for the right and uphold the position you have assumed. There are too many "me too" Senators in Washington and unless we have men of courage to do what is right, how much longer will it be before we are instructed how to vote.

I hope you will maintain your thinking and that some decisions that are now being made in backrooms are smoked into the open where we as American citizens can know what is going on. We ordinary citizens are not cowards and we should be told truthfully what our position is. I believe in military secrecy but political policy should be exposed to the public view. Some of the decisions which are now being made by one man should be put back in the hands of Congress where they belong. We elected people to represent us in Congress—and now many of them have abdicated and submitted to "arm twisting" and conniving which must be stopped.

We are rapidly losing faith in our head of government as truth will always win out over deceit.

Thank you for your courageous effort.

Sincerely yours,
Ernest R. Wagner.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 2, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: In the light of the announcement Monday morning by President Johnson of the unfortunate decision to resume bombing North Vietnam, your statements and arguments on Sunday's TV program are even more significant. We want you to know, therefore, that we fully support your opposition to the administration's illegal, immoral, and exceedingly dangerous policy.

Despite the claim that the present policy reflects the wishes of the American people, the truth appears to be quite the contrary.

There are many indications from personal conversations to such things as the "talk" radio programs, that most Americans are deeply troubled and anxious to see an immediate end to this dirty war.

While there may be those who feel that the peace offensive that the administration has been conducting during the past month absolves the United States of any further responsibility, the resumption of bombing Monday gives our peaceful protestations a most unfortunate taint.

Your continued, courageous stand on this vital issue is supported, we have found, by Americans of every political persuasion and we think more and more Americans will join you.

Our warmest good wishes.

Mr. and Mrs. HOWARD GLAZER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a word to let you know that I agreed wholeheartedly with the remarks you made on television this past Sunday, January 30, and that I share your views on the President's policy in Vietnam.

Most sincerely,

Miss MARY JO RASK.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: So many people here at Klamath Falls were cheered by your courage to speak up against continued bombing. We have been kept in the dark too long.

We feel that all parties involved in Vietnam should be at the conference table.

With appreciation and admiration to you and for you.

BERTHA LUND
Mrs. L. F. Lund.

ASTORIA, OREG.,
February 3, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Congratulations, for your courage in daring to speak out regarding U.S. involvement in Vietnam. My husband and I feel exactly as you do, and I pray we can soon stop the slaughter of our young men over there.

Yours truly,

Mrs. EDWIN HANSEN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.

Mr. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator, Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: You are the greatest. It has been a long time since the American people have had a Congressman who isn't afraid to tell the truth about the war in Vietnam.

As a registered Republican, I feel your truthfulness is an inspiration to us, who are tired of the wishy-washy votegetters of both parties.

I have great reverence for my country and do not want to see it buried along with those fine boys who have died thus far in this senseless war.

Keep up the good work.

I am,

Mr. ROBERT R. WARNER.

AGATE BEACH, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am not much at letter writing. But I believe at this time you need all the support you can get.

It makes us feel good to know that we have men like you who are not afraid to stand up and be counted. I am glad that you are getting this Vietnam thing out in the open so the people can see what is really going on.

I know the truth will win. We are praying for you and your supporters. So keep up the good work. So we can bring our boys back home and bring an end to this war.

Yours truly,

RICHARD HANSEN,
IDA HANSEN

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
February 3, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from the State of Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am in agreement with you. We must stop the escalation of the war in Vietnam. We need more credible information than we now receive concerning the war there, and until the shadow of doubt is dispelled, we must not do more than hold some original line.

I believe in foreign aid, so long as it does not degenerate into military aid.

There are probably many others who are not as convinced of the right of the administration's policy as our silence may indicate.

Very truly yours,

MAURI J. PELTO.

SALEM, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your stand on Vietnam and also for your part in the investigation being made by the Foreign Relations Committee. Please continue to use your influence to bring this war to the conference table.

We appreciate television coverage given to this foreign aid hearing.

Sincerely,

RAMONA O. MYERS,
Mrs. Arthur V. Myers.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am newly moved to the State of Oregon and have only this month joined the ranks of registered voters.

It is with gratitude and relief that I follow your questioning of the present Johnson policy in Vietnam. An executive war is a dangerous matter, but an executive offensive war is worse. Nothing in the history of Vietnam tells me that the presence of Chinese influence is surprising. In fact ignoring Chinese influence is a bit of geographical nonsense. Just what are the facts about the containment of Communist domination in southeast Asia?

Please accept my moral and political support for your questioning of the U.S. involvement in southeast Asia.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH FRENKEL.

OREGON CITY, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.

SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations.

It is indeed a blessing to have you as our senior Senator in Washington, D.C. I am writing as I listen to you bringing your enlightening questions and comments as you talk.

Please hold the line in demanding that Secretary Rusk and Secretary of Defense McNamara be brought into public questioning. They have evaded the most important facts far too long. As a property owner in Oregon and a voter, I thank you.

Very truly,

Mrs. G. L. DOUGLASS.

NEWBERG, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: We want to let you know that we are in full accord with your views opposing President Johnson's war in Vietnam. We believe it is the law that Congress alone has the power to declare war. Also, we do not believe that a President of the United States, according to our Constitution, has any more right to break our laws than any other citizen.

We want you to know that we appreciate your efforts in letting the people know how horrible this is. A war is bad enough if it is legal—let alone a one-man brainstorm.

Thank God we do have a man of your stature that does dare—and does let the American people know the truth about this critical situation.

We do appreciate your efforts, what you are doing and your honesty and integrity in reporting this vital information to the American people.

Yours truly,

Mrs. R. E. SKIPPEN,
R. E. SKIPPEN.

EUGENE, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just been watching the TV coverage of your committee meeting on Vietnam policy.

I am in complete agreement with you, that we should not be in Vietnam. About 2 years ago I wrote to President Johnson and the White House mailed me printed forms saying: in effect, "We are in Vietnam and the United States would 'lose face' to withdraw our troops from Vietnam."

This week we have gone to the United Nations with an olive branch while our planes are still dropping bombs in Asia.

Does the President want to send us into total war? I am a housewife and church organist. I am middle-aged and a voter.

I feel the most sincere effort in recent months is the Pope's visit to New York to pray for peace. And we are Presbyterians.

Can't you bring influence or pressure upon the American people to help?

What we are doing in Vietnam is wrong.

Respectfully yours,

MARGARET GRAEFF.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 3, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Bravo. We are proud of you for your courageous debate on the Vietnam war. Please keep up the good work. You are the only hope these young folks have. If the President could only see what a great injustice he is doing our young men he might realize that they, who are our future adults, are now floundering in a state of hopelessness and are unable to study or become interested in a career.

Television has made war a real horror to them and they have no desire to kill—just because our Government says they must.

There are so many of us who feel ashamed of our actions in Vietnam—but who do nothing about it, and the few who protest and demonstrate are not enough to help change anything.

Thank you for your strong stand in behalf of our young boys and the poor souls in Vietnam. Keep fighting hard, loud, and long.

Respectfully yours,

GRACE I. BERRY.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON MEDICAL SCHOOL,
Portland, Oreg., February 2, 1966.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to remind you that a great many Americans are deeply grateful for your continued bold stand against the immoral, illegal, inhuman, and irrational war which our administration is waging against the people of Vietnam. Know, in this time of crisis, that every one of your public actions in opposition to blind continuation of the war and in favor of direct negotiation with those against whom we fight—the National Liberation Front—makes it easier for private individuals to mobilize public opinion in our own communities. Please don't abandon your position; don't weaken, in the face of what I am sure is almost unbearable pressure either to concur or be silent.

I am sure that your work would have been easier had we, your constituents, taken pen in hand sooner; please continue to lead, now that we have begun to follow.

Sincerely,

Herman M. Frankel, M.D.

Shaw-Mickelson Lumber Co.,
Medford, Oreg., February 4, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Just wanted to drop you a line to say that my wife and I are in 100 percent agreement with you on your stand regarding Vietnam.

We feel that your view is realistic and if there is anything that we can do to further your ideas in southern Oregon, please let us know.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

James B. Shaw, *President.*

Sheridan, Oreg.,
February 3, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This is just a note to let you know how much many of your friends in Oregon feel about your part in the debate televised last Sunday. We are proud that you took the stand you did and know that it will have a great effect on future decisions made regarding the Vietnam situation.

My husband and I called our friends during the first part of the program to be sure they were listening and they were all very impressed with your stand and I can tell you we are all backing you up.

Years ago you called at our home, along with Dean Holmes and Francis Bradley, when my husband was not disabled and I did not get to meet you as I was still at work; but we still treasure the picture taken at that time of yourself and wife and friends.

I work at the bank in Sheridan but my husband, Fulton, is disabled and stays at home but he reads up on you and your work and we are faithful followers of yours. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Fulton V. Smith.

Parkdale, Oreg.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Many people in the Hood River Valley whom my husband and I have talked to are agast at the privileges which President Johnson feels are his—mainly carrying on the Vietnam war without a declaration of war from Congress. The American people are certainly losing their rights which were so carefully guaranteed to them under the Constitution.

Having just viewed the 1½-hour-long CBS program on "Congress and the War," I would like you to know that I stand behind you 100 percent, Vietnam, possible Asian war and violation of U.N. Charter and Geneva Accord of 1954.

The United States is acting like a spoiled brat in regards to ignoring the U.N. Charter. She seems to be saying, "I won't play unless I can have my own way." We cannot go to the U.N. only when our policy will be benefited. We have an obligation to the rest of the world, that of keeping the peace, as expressed by Senator Clark and yourself.

My compliments on points well founded and expressed on CBS today.

Sincerely,

Irene Lilja.

Grants Pass, Oreg.,
February 2, 1966.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: I thank God we still have one Member of Congress who is not afraid to stand up and tell the American people what he believes to be the truth, even though it is not in accordance with the policies our country is following.

I completely agree with you our boys should not be fighting and dieing in Vietnam under the present circumstances.

I sincerely hope you will introduce your motion to repeal some of the power granted our President in this matter, or at least force a thorough and open discussion in the Senate on the whole affair.

I hope you will seriously consider and thoroughly investigate and discuss from all angles the enormous amount of Foreign Aid the President has now requested. Most especially in view of the remarks made on TV Sunday that AID money was going to countries that are shipping supplies to Vietcong. Surely if we are going to ask our boys to die there, we can at least be sure it is not by the very weapons their own tax money supplies.

I firmly believe no country should be given any form of AID money, either economic or military, that is not willing and ready to sign an agreement the money will not be used to aid our enemies.

I believe we will surely lose our place as a leader of the world if we continue to cause the world to lose their respect for us. We cannot buy their respect or loyalty if we continue to dole out huge sums of money to be used to supply our enemies and graft for their leaders.

I believe we have to again show we expect respect in return for what we are trying to do for the people of the world. And until this respect at least is promised us, I hope you will not give this requested appropriation to the President. I hope you will let him and the world know, we are willing and able to help our friends but we are through assisting our enemies, either directly or indirectly.

Respectfully,

Mrs. Beatrice Bennett.

Alsea, Oreg.
February 5, 1966.

Mr. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Morse: The purpose of this letter is to give you assurance that your wholehearted effort in the interests of this Nation is realized, as never before, by myself, my family, and, I am positive, by millions of American citizens, who love this Nation and the heritage of democratic principle which helped to make it great.

Your most recent appearance on live TV of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is a credit to you and a comfort to many troubled citizens who are concerned with the direction our military commitments are taking us.

I have watched the expressions of some of our present political leaders on TV and I am troubled that they seemingly glory in the killings of other human beings and that they are attempting to fight with bullets, that which could be better won by other channels of endeavor.

I do not represent any pacifist thought but the wisdom of our foreign policy, is, I consider, a matter of grave concern.

Even so, casting aside all discussions of our foreign policy, it seems to me, that from time immemorial, it has been proven, that to successfully engage an enemy, that enemy is not fought on their own terms, their own type of warfare, and in their own terrain.

May you be given strength and health to continue your work in the future as you have in the past, in the interests of this great Nation of ours.

Sincerely yours,

Bethel Vernon.

Moore Haven, Fla.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am an Oregonian living at Kerby, Oreg., Josephine County, but at the present time I am sitting with my wife in our 18-foot travel trailer listening to the televised hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mrs. Oliver and I heartily agree with your views and are proud of you for taking the firm stand that you have. We hope that many other Oregonians and other citizens as well will commend you for your action.

Very cordially yours,

Edward W. Oliver.

Grace Presbyterian Church,
Milton-Freewater, Oreg., February 4, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I want to tell you how thankful I am to have you in the U.S. Senate at the present time—a person with the courage to think honestly unthinkable thoughts that too many of us have not the courage to think—and with the "guts" to stand up on his hind feet like the men we are supposed to be, and give voice to the conscience of our Nation concerning the course the administration is pursuing in Vietnam. My daughter, a senior in high school speaks of you and Senator Fulbright as "statesmen," which is high praise coming from her.

How can a man of intelligence as our President get trapped into taking the same course openly advocated by Barry Goldwater whom he so roundly, soundly defeated—or was he trapped into it?

How can intelligent persons advocate a policy of escalation of the war, when it is not possible to destroy an idea or philosophy or religion by any such means—both ancient and recent modern history provide abundant illustration of this. It seems that persons are forgetting the old cliche of not so long ago that no one wins a war nowadays—if they ever did—both lose.

Senator Morse, has our Government seriously considered and undertaken measures in Vietnam to help build up the economy, and a system of education for the people, so they can and will help themselves? Really, do you not agree that such a course is the best way to strengthen the forces of democracy there? The expenditure in money and lives of our boys would be but a fraction of pursuing the present course. Power to you and Senator Fulbright in your investigation.

Dick D. Morgan.

Medford, Oreg.,
February 3, 1966.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: After viewing the CBS program on Vietnam on Sunday, January 30, my husband and I want you to know you have our full support. There are entirely too many voices in responsible positions, who seem to have a very unrealistic idea of the costs of war. The American people should be completely apprised, via newspapers, of the costs in manpower and money they may expect to bear; also of the many years of involvement.

Many times I have wished to write you of our support, other than the ballot. The U.S. Congress, but especially the American people, are truly in your debt. Our wish is that you continue to make your voice heard for a long time to come.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. Hector Langdon.

Portland, Oreg,
February 6, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am thrilled and heartened when I see the leadership you are exercising in bringing our bloody role in Vietnam to an examination before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and before the American people. Bewildered and troubled citizens welcome this opportunity.

Until we view the Vietnamese as people, instead of as automations to be directed and maneuvered according to our will, we can never help to bring about peace and justice in that area, or anywhere in the world.

The idea of "credibility" is the most dangerously oversimplified concept the United States has ever had. George III was trying to "establish credibility" when he answered the colonists reasonable requests by sending more of his Redcoats across the ocean.

Your longtime supporters (such as I) are being joined by new supporters—citizens who seriously mistrust the morality of bombing whole areas of civilian population and of instituting a counterterror against those native "terrorists" who must feel they are defending their homes against an invader.

Keep up the vital work.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Robt. C. Schley.

Albany, Oreg.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We enjoyed the television debate on CBS last Sunday and are in complete accord with your views on the Vietnam situation. The war must not be allowed to escalate there, and our only recourse is to "keep the peace," as you stated.

I am also writing to CBS to tell them we want more of this type of enlightening program.

We enjoy your newsletter and commend you for your many years of service to Oregon and the United States.

I am a teacher of business education at the Albany Union High School, and my husband is the assistant manager of the Chas. H. Lilly Co. here in Albany.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Barbara A. Lowery.

Lebanon, Oreg.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: In your recent television appearance as chairman of the hearing on foreign policy, you were very fair in allowing the State Department to present its views while asking questions which also revealed your stand on the issues.

Oregon and the Nation can be very thankful that a man of your ability and courage is in the U.S. Senate. Of great importance is your leadership in taking away the impetus toward headlong military buildup to police other nations and eventually weaken our own Nation.

In our community which is representative of many, I am sure, your point of view is shared by a great majority. It would not be difficult to secure signatures to a resolution in your support but possibly this personal letter to you will give you a measure of confidence in your pursuit of peace.

Sincerely yours,

Leslie Swanson.

Eugene, Oreg.,
February 3, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This is a letter in further support of your heroic efforts to bring peace to the Vietnam situation.

We deplore, as you do, the resumption of bombing in North Vietnam and trust that the U.N. debate on the reconvening of the Geneva powers will bring some resolution to the problem.

Sincerely,

Robert and Dorothy Leeper.

Ashland, Oreg.,
February 3, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Portland, Oreg.

Dear Sir: Athough I have disagreed with you many times in the past on various issues, it was with great interest I listened to your views concerning the war in Vietnam. It expresses my sentiments exactly as I have two sons who will probably have to get into this fracas before it is settled soon. My one son has just turned 18. Therefore, I would like to say that despite many criticisms you are receiving from various sources, I believe more mothers will be for your stand in the situation than will be against it. God bless you in your efforts concerning this great tragedy. Our country is still great and with God's help it can certainly remain so. Thank you again for your efforts.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Albert C. Livingston.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 4, 1966.

The Honorable Senator Morse,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator: Please continue your courageous stand on the Vietnamese war. I haven't heard any dissenters regarding your position on the Vietnam war from my fellow employees.

Thank you.

Clinton E. King.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 4, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I was just one American who heard the Senate investigation on television today.

To say I was shocked and angered is expressing it very mildly. What a shame and what a mess? How long has this been going on?

You never looked so good as our Senator as you did today. I have lived in Oregon since 1941, and must admit that I have not always agreed with your thinking, but today we were together in every thought and point. May I suggest that you please go into this matter deeply and end up with a suggestion that the whole thing is turned over to the United Nations where it should have gone in the first place.

Keep our foreign aid at home to aid our own people who might have a worthy need for it. Turn it over to the health and welfare program.

Sincerely,

Albert S. Hidy, Sr.

Salem, Oreg.,
February 3, 1966.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have just watched part of a hearing of the Foreign Relations Committee at which State Secretary Rusk was being questioned about our Vietnam policy.

May I say that I completely agree with your views, both on the Vietnam war and almost everything else about which you have been so outspoken.

Your opinions on foreign aid, I believe, could well serve as a guideline for our foreign aid policy. It is time we quit giving our hard-earned money away to every country who would like to bid their country away between the Americans and the Communists.

I have no argument with those who believe we should defend our country and our national honor but I believe that we should be very careful about deciding what is honor and what is stupidity. I am proud to live in this country and would give my life to defend it but this conflict in Vietnam is sheer idiocy.

I would also like to commend you for the strength of character which you show when you vote as your conscience dictates rather than on a party-line basis. In my opinion anyone who votes an issue a certain way just because the others in his party are voting that way is a traitor to his constituents.

Please add my opinion to the others you must have.

Very sincerely,

Vernon J. Golay, D.M.D.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 1, 1966.

Dear Mr. Morse: I am blind, so my sister (Mrs. Mead) is writing for me. I want you to know that I am behind you and your stand on Vietnam 100 percent. Wish you could have heard the people call in on the Mark C. Haggert show on KGW Sunday night. The large percent that endorsed your stand was wonderful. I think if the President really knew how the majority of educated Americans feel it might help. Many misinformed Americans are those who have always followed the group—no matter what—with no thought of future consequences.

Thank you, Mr. Morse, for having the integrity to always stand up for what you feel is right, regardless of pressures or threats.

I wish to be put on your mailing list.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. John Di Nucci.

P.S.—My husband shares my views.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 3, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Senator: We must confess we are heartsick over the apparent failure of many to bring the war in Vietnam to an end, and we do want to commend you on the stand you have taken. The people of the United States do not want war, and do not want to sacrifice their boys. The war in Vietnam is a cruel and rotten war. Keep up the fight to end this war. We appreciate your sincerity and untiring efforts.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. Thos. W. Nelson.

Drain, Oreg.,
February 4, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: We love you. We love you. We love you. We are this moment watching you on TV (speaking in committee). We take this opportunity to tell you how much we appreciate you. My husband is a registered Democrat—I am a registered Republican—but we both have voted for you and will continue to vote for you as long as you choose to run for public office.

(Our decision does not come from this one instance, but from close following of your record of achievement in the past.)

Most sincerely,

MRS. WAYNE TUCKER.

EUGENE, OREG.,
February 7, 1966.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: General Gavin renews my faith in the United States, its aims, its principles, and the honest good will behind its occasionally bumbling course. For 5 hours today, I watched and listened to your committee's hearing with growing admiration for this man.

Why was business allowed to pluck him from public life? Surely, such a brilliant, literate, and articulate man—and one of such infinite patience—should be serving us in a governmental or diplomatic position, if not in the military.

You're right, Senator MORSE. The hearing today is what the country needs—an open discussion of where we're going and how far and why. I feel more fully ready to back my country's policies than in a long, long while.

Please convey to General Gavin my sincere and heartfelt appreciation for his appearance.

And, Senator—if General Gavin made me proud to be a fellow American, you made me proud to be a fellow Oregonian. You're all right.

Respectfully,

MRS. PHILIP R. GILBERTSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 5, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Courthouse,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Unquestionably you are in the same situation as most people in that you always hear plenty when it comes to criticism but if compliments are involved seldom is a word heard.

I want to express my personal appreciation for the stand you have taken many times and the fact you have the courage to stand up for your convictions. We need more people like you in public office as well as in other places.

Along with expressing my appreciation to you I thought it well to bring up a few points that are really bothering many people these days—just to let you know how we feel about them.

Most people these days are particularly disturbed by several items which I will merely list without going into a long discussion of them for I am sure you know exactly what we mean.

1. We deplore the ways our Government is acting in the Vietnam situation and the fact our people in high places are not giving us full and honest information. They seem to think we are swallowing it all but we certainly are not.

2. The United States has come to a sorry mess when lies have to be told rather than the truth; as has been brought out at various times by our news media.

3. We cannot understand why young men in the Reserves seem to be freed from service—usually the only reasons they joined the Reserves was to avoid such service and to get the pay involved.

Also, we are appalled that some of these so-called "morally unfit" are rejected and young men in school are pulled out and forced to go—such as is covered in the enclosed article.

Most assuredly when the next election comes around—if we are still able to retain such freedom—our votes will not be for most of the democratic machine now in power.

Keep up the good work and stand your ground. We are behind you.

Very truly yours,

D. V. WILKINSON.

HILLSBORO, OREG.,
February 2, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to thank you for your instrumental work in getting the Vietnam issue to the United Nations. I feel that you are to be complimented for plugging away in the face of some tough opposition. Keep up the good work.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM K. LYNN.

SALEM, OREG.,
February 9, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are deeply grateful for your stand on Vietnam, and for your constant grappling with our foreign policies.

We trust there will be immediate and open discussion in both Chambers of Congress of the Vietnam war. Why should American citizens' lives be given in support of South Vietnam government which to date has made no changes in landholding policy or in tax policy? The United States surely has the right to demand these changes before we are committed further. May you be given wisdom and strength for your arduous task.

Sincerely yours,

LAURA B. MILES.

MEDFORD, OREG.,
February 7, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God someone has guts enough to tell the American people the truth about the Vietnam war.

Sincerely,

PAUL CULBERTSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 25, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks. It was good to see again in last night's Oregon Journal a 5-inch item about your stand and urgent advice about the present war and the Security Council. We all owe you a great deal for your vocal and persistent position on this highly important issue.

One can commend President Johnson at many points, but even a layman can see that devastating results may follow escalation.

Respectfully yours,

RUTH P. WHITCOMB.

NORTH BEND, OREG.,
February 3, 1966.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I enjoyed the TV appearance so much February 3. I do hope as you asked that there be more public hearings. It is much better than the newspaper.

Thank you also for your newsletter that comes to our home.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. JOHN H. WICKS, Jr.

P.S.—Keep up the good work for our State.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 7, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: President Johnson's Honolulu statement is distressing for three reasons. First, as you point out, its antecedents are unclear. Second, his commitment of the United States to "victory" in Vietnam is without Congressional sanction. Finally, and most grievously, it may jeopardize the continuing peace offensive by neutral nations and the United Nations.

Continue your courageous and crucial role in bringing sanity to an underdeveloped area: foreign relations. You certainly have my support.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM C. KERBY,
Assistant Professor of Economics, Portland State College.

LA GRANDE, OREG.,
February 7, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I feel I must write and commend you on your courageous stand on our Vietnam involvement and other issues vitally affecting the American people. Every day I meet people who say: "I have never voted for MORSE but I'm with him now."

It takes a rare brand of courage to oppose the top brass of the administration even when they are leading us down the road to disaster.

In my opinion we need more voices like yours in the Senate, also in the House.

Keep up the good fight. I think you have already accomplished some good results.

Yours very truly,

WM. ZIEGLER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 7, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
417 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a citizen and taxpayer I am definitely on your side in your endeavors to get the administration to state what their purpose is in Vietnam.

I believe if a person has nothing to hide and knows he is right he should be happy to openly state his case, and especially our situation in Vietnam which concerns every citizen of the United States, who are the ones who supply the blood and money to fight the policymakers' war.

I have reached the horrifying and frightening conclusion that our Government is telling us that war has become an integral part of our American way of life. The philosophy of the people in charge of running our country say so through the policy they are setting forth.

The President says we are to have guns and butter on an equal basis. We are to accept this war as a way of life for 10 years or more and as every month the cream of our manhood is skimmed off to be sent to Vietnam, the rest of us will be buying the latest model cars, eating steaks and along with that have the war on poverty, the Job Corps, and sundry other items, and supply the rest of the world too.

This is a brandnew philosophy that the Nation has not had to accept before. This is the full meaning of the Great Society.

The Secretary of Defense says to the parents that as soon as our sons are 19 they must go off to bleed, not to defend our land but for a cause that no one else in the world finds worth upholding. For no other nation has voiced the desire to help uphold freedom and liberty. If our cause is so just why have none of the 50 nations we help around the world extended a hand or raised a voice in our support? In our small world of today the defense of freedom should be a united effort by all free people.

We stand alone without friends, regardless of all our endeavors toward the nations of the world. All the things we have worked for and given for during the past 20 years are not supporting us in our own time of peril. The countries we have backed, the causes we have supported are just empty shadows which are dark and silent now that our turn has come to need help.

And because we stand alone and because we are at war I protest not using our Regular Army and especially the men in service stationed in France, Italy, and West Germany. This battle of ours that the President says we must fight alone needs seasoned men now, not youngsters who have not even tasted life. These countries by this time, after 20 years have men of their own who should hold the line for Europe. We are in a desperate emergency in Vietnam if this fighting will go on as our Government decrees.

It is time our so-called allies found out for themselves if they can stand on their own two feet. Let's keep our money and troops by our own side now that we are threatened. For we have no one to fall back on. Let's not continue being a bunch of suckers for the whole world. As of now we are a big and strong nation. But we cannot save the whole world by ourselves. We will be stretching all our resources too thin.

At this point in history with the world's tremendous knowledge in fields of science and capabilites in technology, when it is in our grasp to better man's lot, war should be an outmoded effort. War does not solve problems—it creates problems for our children to bear.

I say let the warmakers explain to the 19-year-olds, the citizens, and the taxpayers. Let them explain why we stand alone in this battle for freedom and democracy.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. KARL GARLICK.

LEBANON, OREG.,
February 7, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wholeheartedly endorse your courageous fight on behalf of the American people on your stand on Vietnam and foreign aid. It is good, once more, to finally see the Congress taking a more active part in the tasks we send them there to do. We are tired of rubberstamping all the executive branch asks for. After all, there are few choices one can make in the executive branch and we try to vote on issues and not men. It has become increasingly apparent that the executive branch tends to forget the issues when the campaign is over. It might be well for them to consider why Barry Goldwater was not elected this last election.

Aside from this, it is becoming increasingly apparent that we cannot and should not police the world alone. Even if we managed to achieve some kind of victory in Vietnam, my question still remains: What have we won? There are still over 700 million Chinese who need food, land, and shelter and they undoubtedly will infiltrate southeast Asia unless those people in the areas involved care enough to put all of their own efforts toward stopping them. Let us see some real action on the part of some of these nations themselves first and limit our aid to resources. Why must our boys be sent to areas where population is greater than our own? Why must we citizens of the United States of America pay income tax on 50 cents per hour berry picking to support regimes that do not even tax their own people to the extent we pay to support their conflicts?

If we are supporting the United Nations, why aren't we supporting it wholeheartedly? Why are we tying the hands of our own representatives there? This has been done for too many years. Why have we waited all of these years before presenting the Vietnam issues before the Security Council or the Geneva Conference? Our own policies relative to this organization we all so thoroughly endorsed need questioning. We are living in 1966, not 1950. Changes in the world have to be recognized whether they are to our liking or not. They are there. Perhaps we could reach a common ground of understanding with nations we differ with if we recognize they do exist. Unfortunately, we have been a party to their existence whether we like that or not.

Sometime ago one of the major TV networks presented a program relative to streamlining Congress so you would have materials you need at your fingertips to enable you to sift through the massive legislation, budgets, etc., that you must do more easily. I personally was unaware that the executive branch have all of the machinery at their disposal to help them with this great problem, and I think it would be money well spent to make such machinery available to Congress.

Again, our hats off to you and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Don't let the diversion deter your efforts. We watch the proceedings on TV and praise the networks for carrying them.

Very truly yours,

MRS. REDA H. ERWIN.

FOREST GROVE, OREG.,
February 9, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please excuse stationery and lack of typewriter, but I am away from home on business. This, I am ashamed to say, is the first I have written to a Senator or Representative so please excuse also any improper form.

I am a 36-year-old father of four, registered as a Republican. Many times I have differed with what you have said and probably will continue, but feel I owe you a note of thanks. Today I watched part of the testimony of General Gavin. This was a refreshing experience. Our society, I feel, is made stronger as policies are forced into the glare of public attention. There has been a death of information concerning our policy and its reasons in southeast Asia. Thank you for your part in focusing attention on this area.

I would also appreciate very much if you could extend to General Gavin my thanks also. He will no doubt be reviled by some, but he should know there are some that admire his courage and the service he has performed.

I don't know what is best for our country but I am certain the more informed the public becomes the better chance we have to formulate the best policy.

Thanks again,

AL BAUGHMAN.

ASCENSION LUTHERAN,
Medford, Oreg., February 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know that I appreciate very much your recent comments on the Vietnam situation. You are certainly justified in your criticisms of the present policy, both in its insistence on playing God and meddling in the self-determination affairs of other peoples of the world, and the recent return to an escalation of the war in spite of louder voices of dissent at home.

At a time when strong voices of dissent and disapproval of administration policy are desperately needed, and when the attempt is made to mute the dissenters by threats and insinuations I hope that you will continue to call out your clear warnings. I am confident you will do that, but I wanted you to know that I wholeheartedly support and appreciate your stands and I know of a number of others who do, too.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

VERNON R. HANSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 5, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I thank you for the long, lonely battle that made the present Senate investigation of the Vietnam war possible.

Sincerely,

ALLEN A. SMITH.

FEBRUARY 5, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know that I have been following your public statements on the Vietnam situation with great attention. Last Sunday's televised discussion was a fascinating but frightening experience. I salute you for your stand, and I want you to know that I am proud that you are the senior Senator from Oregon. More than 20 years ago I rang doorbells and solicited for your first campaign. Honesty compels me to add that there have been times when I wondered why I had, but the wheel has come full circle, and now I know.

I have no son to serve in the Armed Forces, so my concern is not an immediately personal one, but it is nonetheless intense and increasing. I lived in Asia for nearly 4 years between 1947 and 1950, and therefore I can make some small claim to knowledge of the people and the countries from Japan to Indonesia. I was living in Japan in 1950 when the Korean war began. I can feel nothing but horror at the prospect that confronts us now. In my view this is the ultimate stupidity in a long succession of incredible diplomatic blunders in southeast Asia.

I should like to say that although I have never been polled by any of Mr. Gallup's young men, I expect to register my opinions at the ballot box, but by then it may well be too late for my vote to signify. In the interval I am depending on you. Please keep on with what you are doing and saying. With every good wish and deepest gratitude for your brilliant articulation of this present danger.

Most sincerely,

JANE W. KILKENNY.

WEST LINN, OREG.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
Eugene, Oreg., February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Once again I feel the need to write to you and urge you to continue your courageous stand on the issue of Vietnam. We in Eugene are doing our small part to try to make people realize the futility of the present American effort; but it is obvious that so much more is accomplished when one of great national fame and respect holds and expresses similar views.

As a side effect of your actions on this matter, I must tell you that you are serving a purpose of which you are probably unaware. There are several in this community who have been active Democrats for sometime but who are now finding it quite difficult to remain active in the party. Several times, both at local Democratic affairs and at other places statements similar to that of W. H. Ferry have been made. Those statements are, in effect, "I can no longer be a party to what the President and my party are doing * * * therefore, I quit all work in the Democratic Party." There is only one answer that can be given to these people. That answer is that as an Oregonian one must remain a Democrat in order to more effectively work for Senator MORSE and the ideals he represents (for, as you well know, there are no other elected officials with guts enough to take similar stands).

So, please continue what you are doing. You are serving the world, your country, and, hard as it may be to imagine in view of the national administration, your party.

Sincerely,

Stephen A. Kaye,
Instructor in Speech.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 6, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: You have my admiration and support and I am sure many passive persons who would not consider any direct action themselves are in agreement with you on this issue—and grateful to you, as I am.

Yours truly,

Mary L. Brown.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I want to say that as an ordinary American who has been concerned about our Government's actions in this current Vietnam crisis, I thank God for a voice of courage and integrity such as yours to hold fast, as I see it, the basic tenets of our American beliefs.

May the U.S. Senate always have more such voices. America needs them, now, as never before.

E. G. Brooks.

Milwaukie, Oreg.,
February 3, 1966.

Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We are behind you 100 percent in your views on Vietnam. I hope there was a big response from the TV program and that people took the time to write the President expressing their views, as we did.

Keep on doing all you can.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. Jack Henrickson.

White City, Oreg.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I am glad to say that you are my Senator.

Your stand on Vietnam is, to me, very realistic.

Yours truly,

M. C. Lucas.

VA domiciliary.

Gresham, Oreg.,
February 4, 1966.

U.S. Senator Wayne Morse,
417 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Mrs. Davies and I listened, this morning, to the preliminary debate before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on matters pertaining to our conduct in the undeclared war in Vietnam.

We wholeheartedly commend you, as well as those who stand with you, for the courageous and determined fight you are making for honesty in Government policies * * * especially those which pertain to our continued existence as a Nation constitutionally dedicated, under God, to world leadership through peaceful pursuits (law, diplomacy, reason) rather than by aggressive, warlike moves such as we are now employing.

Although you have seemed to be alone in your efforts to slow the Pentagon's war machine, we believe McNamara's war group will find the going rougher as these hearings progress. We believe others will find the courage to aline with you to bring truth to the fore.

Rest assured, Senator Morse, there are more of the common people of this fair land in support of your fight for an airing of the issues in this Pentagon-inspired war than the polls show. Polls killed the Literary Digest; remember?

Again thanks for forcing this Senate hearing before the cameras. We want to know. And we know you grow weary, but not in well doing.

Very loyally, we are,

Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin H. Davis.

Klamath Falls, Oreg.,
February 4, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: I listened to the discussion on TV last Sunday and my wife and I agree with all your views on the situation in Vietnam. More power to you from this home.

Respectfully yours,

David Hall.

P.S.—And we are not Communists either.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 5, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
The Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to thank you for your courageous statements on Vietnam. I am in complete agreement with you, and admire you for the stand you have taken.

Cordially,

Doris Grant
Mrs. A. Raymond Grant.

Salem, Oreg.,
February 3, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: I have watched with admiration your participation in the Vietnam hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I support Senator Gruening's amendment to the Vietnam bill, which would prohibit the Government from sending drafted men to Vietnam, unless they request to be sent.

Keep up the good work, and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

Janice Rademaker.

February 5, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Please continue speaking out against the war in Vietnam. My daughter, who is a student at the University of Pennsylvania, heard you speak recently and was impressed with your views, as well as your oratory. Few politicians are honest enough or brave enough to speak out against this infamous war. Of course, young men of draft age dare not speak out, or they will be reclassified 1–A. This is a fine example of the freedom of speech and democracy that we're fighting for in Vietnam.

I agree with your proposal that the Government be prohibited from sending a single draftee to Vietnam unless he actually volunteers for duty there.

I don't know the system for calling up the Reserves or National Guard, but it seems rather inefficient to be training and paying these men if they can't be called into action, rather than calling up untrained, green kids. I know of one "hawk" who has become a brigadier general in the Reserves. He thinks the war is great. It enhances his position, without endangering his life. This one is in Oregon, my home State and yours.

Senator Morse, continue to speak out against the Vietnam war. The hopes of the world are with you.

Yours truly,

LaVerne Mansfield Hagan.
Mrs. Paul Hagan.

January 17, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: I fear that too few citizens are voicing their approval of your gallant stand on the present war in Vietnam so I write to tell you that you have many supporters. The present conflict is the topic of conversation from day to day and it is a rare occurrence when I hear anyone approve of our present foreign policy.

Please continue to bring every bit of weight that you can to end what to us is a futile waste of manpower and money. The average citizen feels so helpless—like being caught in a whirlpool of circumstances. I just don't feel that dropping on my knees daily and praying for peace is enough.

Thank you again for your efforts. We are grateful.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Ruth Roper.

Portland, Oreg.

February 7, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This note is being sent simply to reiterate our support for your continuing efforts on behalf of a settlement of the dangerous mess which the administration has created in Vietnam.

Especially are we grateful at the moment for your public rebuttal of President Johnson's "blind of experience and deaf to hope" insult.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. Don E. Dumond.

Eugene, Oreg.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Real proud of the way you are speaking out about our involvement (and intervention) in foreign countries.

We face national bankruptcy in trying to carry our present great load of foreign commitments. * * * how can we dare to continue it, let alone increase it?

As you point out, communism is a state of mind * * * why should our country try to fight it with men, weapons, and possibly bombs for other countries? I say, let these foreign countries look to their own collective thinking, rather than to our might and our money, to cure their ills for them.

A nuclear war could destroy the United States in more than one way, for even if bombs weren't dropped directly on our country, should they be dropped in the area of the North and/or South Pole icecaps, the resulting tidal waves from the sudden melting of the icecaps would submerge and sink this whole country.

Somebody's got to have some sense. Keep on speaking up for us sensible ones, Senator Morse. More power to you.

Cordially yours,

Mrs. Ethel E. Thompson.

Myrtle Point,
February 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: This letter is written to express profound appreciation of your efforts to reach people and carry this debate on Vietnam out where it counts—campuses, etc. I feel Kennan, Gore, and Gavin are doing their best to secure attention and scrutiny of the problem. Inform Senator Fulbright of our admiration of his conducting the Senate inquiry. There doesn't seem to be too much time left to prevent our country making further peril-fraught errors in foreign policy. But there really is aroused Christian conscience actively dissenting now. You know that the World is widely read in Coos County and the World supports your policies in Vietnam.

I am also pleased that you are continuing to take a farsighted and continuing interest in education. More power to you.

Sincerely yours,

M. J. Schuddakapf.

Salem, Oreg.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: As one citizen of this great country of ours, and as an Oregon voter, I wish to express sincere thanks and gratitude to you and/or whoever else is responsible for the bringing before the American people (via TV) the vital and important discussion now ensuing on issues relating to Vietnam and our whole foreign policy. Please continue to do all in your power to promote as much as possible, this vital information being brought before the American public via TV (the best medium for gaining unbiased information). I believe there has been much confusion in our country regarding attitudes toward Vietnam and indeed our whole foreign policy. The present discussions being televised, are of great help in aiding the American people to more clearly understand issues involved.

It is to be hoped that out of complete "airing" of all these issues, will emerge a better understanding of heretofore a very confusing situation (Vietnam for one) and consequently a more united support among the American people brought about to back whatever eventual consensus is arrived at as to what should be done from now on in Vietnam and so forth. My hope is, like that of many other citizens, that America can, out of necessary public debate, emerge with a more united front than has heretofore (unfortunately) been displayed to the world.

Again, the whole committee is to be commended for this step that has been taken to "air" the issues of foreign policy in the manner you are now pursuing.

Sincerely,

Helen B. Peine.
Mrs. Robert H. Peine.

Grants Pass, Oreg.,
February 8, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Morse: In just a few words, you are doing a wonderful job, and we like it.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. A. R. Stout.

February 8, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
417 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I would like to thank you (for representing Oregon) and extend my thanks to all concerned for bringing to us, via television, the hearings now in progress concerning the Vietnam war situation. I appreciate, especially, Gen. James M. Gavin (whom I am now watching and listening to) talking to the American people and giving his time and patience to the committee. This is terrifically interesting to me and to many, many people—I hope. I feel, for the first time, as if a breeze were gently moving the haze of confusion which, to date, has been so prevalent and surrounding the Vietnam war. It is too bad that you each have but 10 minutes to discuss with the general, but I suppose, with the exception of you and a few others, this is necessary in view of the fact that some of the Senators seem more inclined to talk rather than listen.

I would like to add that General Gavin has given me much to think about and reconsider concerning the question of allowing Red China to enter the U.N. I wish that our Government would also give this some very long and serious thought in the very near future. I, too, have felt that a large problem with Red China and the world has been (and continues to be) isolation from the rest of the peoples of this world.

In closing, it is too bad that President Johnson hasn't seen fit to give the committee and these hearings his close attention. It would seem that he surely could stand some better informing on this subject * * * indeed, it seems that his choice of advisers and informants has been extremely bad * * * especially that Edsen man.

Sincerely,

Judy Kime.

Lake Oswego, Oreg.

Salem, Oreg.,
February 8, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: I have been listening with interest to the open hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which are being televised live from Washington, D.C.

It is a great service being rendered to the enlightening of the American people on our involvement in South Vietnam. For, after all, an informed citizenry is the cornerstone of democracy.

The enclosure which includes a quotation by Albert Einstein on nuclear war may be of interest to you, if you haven't already seen it.

Respectfully yours,

Freda E. Columbus.

Central Point, Oreg.,
February 8, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: For some time now we have been receiving your Washington reports and would like you to know we agree with you on your views about the Vietnam war.

We feel it should be brought before the United Nations and not just a few making all the decisions. Also that the American people should know more about what is going on and we don't mean military strategy to aid the enemy.

We are paying high taxes and sending our boys over there and feel we have a right to know.

We feel very fortunate to have a Senator who is not afraid to state his views on the situation. Keep up the good work.

Yours truly,

Darold and Floy Garman.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 9, 1966.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
The Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: May I commend you for your courageous stand regarding Vietnam.

I have appreciated your efforts in support of the position that we should abide by our treaty with the United Nations. I think that if the administration would have listened to your council in this regard months ago the U.N. might have received enough real support to effectively work toward solutions. A great many of your constituents, including myself, realize that lasting solutions in Vietnam will not be achieved by military action alone. I am convinced that our administration has thought almost entirely in terms of military solutions. Our lack of support for the Mekong Delta project over a year ago, surely was a grave mistake. Charles A. Wells, editor and publisher of "Between the Lines" has indicated that several countries in Asia were willing to send free agents to provide the necessary defense for the Delta project. Rather than support this constructive solution, President Johnson turned the responsibility over to the Pentagon. I hope you may have occasion within the Foreign Relations Committee to work for support of the Delta project.

Mr. Wells, mentioned above, indicated recently that it is now practically impossible for persons seeking high elective positions in our Government to oppose the "military-industrial complex." I would appreciate your thoughtful reaction to this thought. I remember President Eisenhower warned against this powerful complex as he left office.

I am deeply grateful to you for the excellent work you are doing in confronting the administration and the military and the Nation with alternatives to escalation.

Cordially yours,

Paul Jewell,
Pastor, Metzger Methodist Church.

Gold Hill, Oreg.,
February 8, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I have been watching with great interest your recent appearances on television, in the panel discussion of January 30, and on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings. I wish to congratulate you on your stated stands, with which I wholeheartedly agree, and on your courage in stating them in opposition to our President and his advisers. I personally feel that we are very close to having a dictatorship in this country which worries me more than Vietnam does and I am grateful to have men like you and Senator Dirksen and a few others who "dare" to speak out against the President.

I am against any escalation of the Vietnam war. While my husband is beyond draft age, having served in the Marines during the Korean war, and my two sons are only 2 and 8 years old, I would feel very bitter against the administration if I did have a loved one in Vietnam.

Being one of the "independent Oregon voters" one reads about in news magazines and papers, I am very proud to be an Oregonian when I watch our one effectual Senator making our views heard.

I thank you,

Joanna J. (Mrs. R.W.) Abbott.

Salem, Oreg.,
February 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I merely want to go on record as approving of your opposition to our war by executive order in Vietnam.

Your recommendation that we work through the United Nations is excellent even though Vietnam, North, and Red China will not be represented in the debate. It seems to me to be quite obsolete to keep those whom we do not like out of the U.N.; peace will hardly be promoted by this kind of isolationism.

Sincerely,

A. Weston Nienula.

Eugene, Oreg.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I would like to thank you and the Fulbright committee for bringing before the people the true situation as it now stands.

Like many other Americans, I have neglected to voice my opinion as to how I felt. With mounting fears I have watched the escalation of the war and wondered where it would lead us.

When I read of the President's further commitment of military as well as monetary, I was appalled. Also at the audacity of the Saigon government not being willing to sit down at a conference table with representatives of the National Liberation Front under any circumstances. Since the United States is supplying the greatest burden, military as well as money, I do not agree with this highhanded policy.

I am opposed to staying in Vietnam. In the year that we have been there I do not see that we have accomplished enough to warrant our staying. Enough of our men have lost their lives. Which is better, for us to lose face, or thousands more of our young men to lose their lives.

In the eyes of the world we are losing our image by being in Vietnam. We speak of peace, while we continue to send in troops. How can we hope for a peaceful settlement as long as we continue on this course.

Sincerely,

Helen Neuschwander.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 9, 1966.

Senator Morse.

Dear Senator: We thank God for you and your courage. We know the pressures against you must be terrific.

If more people weren't afraid we are certain there would be more voicing their support.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. C. W. Bumbarger.

Whitespires United
Presbyterian Church,
Albany, Oreg., February 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I wholeheartedly support your efforts to open a full debate in Congress on the Vietnam question and on the military strategy being pursued there by the administration. President Johnson should feel increasing pressure upon him to seek honorable alternatives to his present policies.

Although well intended, it does not appear that these policies can achieve the desired results. It appears far more likely they will lead to a major war in Asia which could drag on for years or escalate into a nuclear encounter, in which case nobody wins and everybody loses. In light of these facts it is clear that to get the Vietnam war to the conference table is in the national interest.

I do not think criticism of the Vietnam war is confined to a minority of leftwing agitators. In reality many citizens are deeply troubled about it, but do not voice their misgivings out of loyalty to their country and their Government. These misgivings are shared by many of the best minds in the United States as well as among our allies in Western Europe.

As an outspoken critic of President Johnson's policies on this issue I hope you gain the support of many of your colleagues in Congress. I am sending this letter to Senators Mansfield, Fulbright, and Dirksen. No matter how difficult this task, it will be easier to prevent an all-out war than it would be to stop one once it got started.

I support the statement on Vietnam issued by the general board of the National Council of Churches on December 3, 1965, together with the peace efforts of Pope Paul VI.

Very truly and respectfully yours,

Robert C. Duncan,
Stated Supply Pastor.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 7, 1966.

Sir: My wife and I had occasion to see your portion of the interview with General Gavin on the CBS Special of this date.

Although I have had occasion to disagree with you in the past and undoubtedly I will disagree with you in the future; I admire your stand on Vietnam.

I admire your stand on the issue that we should have a declaration of war by Congress, as opposed to our present nebulous state.

I only hope that more of your colleagues follow your example.

Sincerely yours,

Gary F. Hart.

Corvallis, Oreg.,
February 8, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: As one of your constituents I wish to commend you for your unwillingness to go along with the Vietnam warfare without careful exploration and questioning. I feel so inadequately informed about what is going on. But I am far from convinced that we should be there, and even further from being convinced that we will achieve what we say we want by staying there.

I think President Johnson's "peace offensive" was to the good, but couched in terms which were certain to arouse resistance and resentment. To extend an olive branch, yet at the same time to threaten to clobber if it is not accepted, seems to me designed to obtain rejection rather than acceptance. Why must we always flaunt riches and power?

This problem, of course, goes much beyond Vietnam. How can we negotiate with China when we bend every effort to keep her out of the United Nations? How can we hope to be regarded as peaceloving when we ring the perimeters of other nations with arms and troops? Are our so-called enemies all unreasonable persons?

Virtue is neither side's exclusive possession. I hope we can take this point of view, and feel that national honor is best assured by humbling power and force in order to obtain peace and understanding.

Sincerely yours,

Lester A. Kirkendall.

Portland, Oreg., *February 8, 1966.*

U.S. Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: On the question of the war in Vietnam. It is hard for me to understand how any civilized person, with as much as a grammar school education, could say that the U.S. Government is justified in intervening in the internal affairs of a small nation like Vietnam, by sending our armed military forces to that country and ordering such forces to bomb and kill and destroy the lives and property of those people. You and some other Members of Congress, have deliberately and consistently spoken out against this outrageous and lawless policy of President Johnson's of intervention. I am in full accord with your views, which I feel safe in saying, are gaining the support of more and more people by the hour, and I sincerely commend you and others who have spoken out and fought against those barbarous military actions which have taken place by our Armed Forces in Vietnam.

Respectfully,

Charles E. Woodward.

Rogue River,
February 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: I am writing my thanks to you, for your courageous outspoken, stand on Vietnam—the more we have to speak up for us—the thousands who are against our involvement in Vietnam—because—for every active one, there are a thousand inactive ones.

I have just finished a trip, from the Canadian border to the Mexican border, questioning people on their views of Vietnam, and sir, with no exceptions, everyone I spoke to was against this war, this sacrificing of our young men—it just doesn't make sense to anyone; and we so desperately need your help in voicing our views.

Many have written to the Pope, and to Prime Minister Wilson, and many others, for their help in this matter; we are indeed a desperate people, afraid to speak up, as the Government will call us Communist, if our views differ from them.

Again we thank you sir.

Sincerely,

Emily S. Beltrome.

Corvallis, Oreg.,
February 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I admire your courage and respect your integrity, and am honored to be one of your constituents. I believe that your outspoken opposition to our policy in Vietnam has been largely responsible for forcing overall reconsideration by the administration.

On legal, moral, and tactical grounds I am with you and Senator Fulbright.

Earnestly,

Winifred E. Francis.

Milwaukie, Oreg.,
February 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing this letter to thank you for the stand you are taking in the war in Vietnam.

I think we should bring our men home and give up the fight as I do not think we are doing enough good to warrant what it will cost us in the lives of our men who are fighting.

I think we should solve some of the problems we have in our own country before trying to solve other peoples' problems. I am sure that would be a full-time job. I think President Johnson has made a great mistake in getting involved in Vietnam and we should get out before it is too late.

Keep up your good work and good luck.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Alene Croft.

February 7, 1966.

Senator Morse: I support your stand on the Vietnam issue. Most of my colleagues are also behind your views.

Sincerely yours,

Gene Koivunen,
Student, University of Oregon.

Oregon City, Oreg.,
February 12, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Morse: Do keep on trying. There are many more than these clippings indicate, who support you—and surely there is more support for peace everywhere, than before you began.

Your speech at Boston University echoed my thoughts—"How can one man—Johnson—go running off to Hawaii making 'commitments' while congress sits and waits for him and his henchmen?"

Listening to the foreign relations hearings, many of us took hope that we still have a Congress. But he still seems able to override all opposition. And, of course, many Congressmen must have been so busy getting hitching posts for constituents that they didn't know or care where he was leading us.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Donald Sutherland.

THE PEOPLE SPEAK ON DRAFT

To the EDITOR:

The difference between fighting in a muddy hole in Vietnam and living in a cozy berth on a college campus is simply too great to ignore the proposal by Senator MORSE that no draftees be sent to Vietnam.

The pictures of bearded beatniks and other juvenile intellectuals protesting from the snug security of their college status adds acid to the contrast between them and those either not as intelligent or wealthy, or both, who must, instead, face the very real prospect of death in the humid jungles of southeast Asia.

Compound this contrast with an intelligence test that Sergeant York wouldn't even have been able to read plus a physical exam that eliminates professional athletes and you have a set of fair standards for draft eligibility that approaches the absurd.

It's easy to say someone must do the dirty job and we must conserve our intellectual elite (who also have the financial resources to go to college), but I'd hate to be the one who has to explain to parents of Vietnam victims that their son was not smart enough or not wealthy enough to stay home with some of the bearded wonders who frequent our college campuses today.

ALDEN MUNSON.

MORE FAIR

To the EDITOR:

Lyle H. Johnson, registrar at Eastern Oregon College and La Grande draft board member for 11 years, quit the draft board in protest over the student classification policy whereby the grade status of a young boy is the criterion that determines whether or not he will be drafted or get to finish his education—and may possibly be the criterion that will decide as to whether he will live or die. I heartily agree with Mr. Johnson when he stated that the so-called slower students often turned out to be among the more brilliant men.

In our democracy, we try to give our children an equal chance at education, withstanding personal economics, but we do not start from the cradle teaching them that the GPA is the criterion of life. Maybe we should. However, these boys should be given an equal chance when it comes to the draft according to our standards of democracy. As Mr. Johnson stated further, "Even a random selection of students would be more fair than drafting them on the basis of grade point averages, or a test."

My boys are only average students hoping to get the chance to finish their education in technical training or colleges locally, but I shall feel as deeply about their absence to fight a war and chances of survival as will the mother of a "brain child" that is allowed to remain home.

Put it on an equal basis. At least when my boys go, I'll have the comfort of knowing they weren't "second-class citizens." I also know that this thought is voiced by many other mothers who love and cherish their "average GPA sons."

Mrs. J. R. HARTFIELD.

REAL IDEALS

To the EDITOR:

I read with great interest the story headlined in the Sunday Oregonian: "Morse Challenges President's War Power."

We in Oregon have good reason to be proud of Senator MORSE, and our other political leaders—Senator NEUBERGER, Governor Hatfield, and Representatives GREEN and ULLMAN—who are all playing leading roles in the courageous resistance to further escalation of the Vietnamese war.

Senator MORSE, in particular is revealing himself as a great American. He remains insistently devoted to the real ideals of our society at a time when too many of our countrymen are succumbing to a worship of military prowess.

CAROL URNER.

ONLY?

To the EDITOR:

Living a harsh and substandard existence with ever so many sacrifices all through their boyhood days, they held their heads high, nevertheless, and believed in the saying: "My country, right or wrong. * * *"

Drafted at 18, they were sent to Vietnam, postponing their youthful dreams and aspirations for a time. After all, their beloved country came first. That was about a year ago.

Just recently this terse UPI news report: "Only two marines killed in Kien Hoa skirmish."

The impact of their death report was almost too much for the parents. And what did they mean by the word "only"? Their little boys meant more to them than all the gold and silver and crown jewels in all the world.

The cold and impersonal word "only" had no rightful place in the context of that news report.

L. W. FREIER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I am writing this letter to let you know that I support your views on Vietnam.

Tonight I talked to my son (who turned 18 in December) at Oregon State University. His spirits were so low, and I gathered that the general morale of the young men has hit a new low. The pressures and adjustments of the first year of college are being compounded by the uncertainties of the draft boards whose policies appear to change from day to day. This threat which hangs over their heads has an adverse effect on achievement.

It is not because one wants to shirk his responsibilities or is unpatriotic, but this war seems to be so futile, to have no good reason for being, although I have tried to have an open mind and have truly tried to see the other point of view.

This is why I am writing to let you know that I support your stand on the war in Vietnam.

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM C. HAGLAN.

FAITH UNITED CHURCH,
Portland, Oreg., February 10, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your reply to President Johnson's criticism of those who counsel retreat was extremely well stated. As I recently wrote your colleague, Senator NEUBERGER, it is a relief to find that Members of Congress have at last found their voices. The idea that just because a proposal or policy is about the Vietnam war, therefore, it is a good one, constitutes a dangerous path for our Nation. A careful investigation of every policy, especially of an undeclared war, is of utmost importance.

Yours very truly,

ROY R. WINKELMANN.

PORTLAND, OREG.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I feel that I must write to you and tell you how much I admire you for the stand you have taken on Vietnam. I have watched the Senate hearings with great interest. As one who loves her country deeply, I am terribly concerned with our involvement in Asia. To see our great Constitution ignored is hard to take.

Keep up the good work. Many of us from Oregon are behind you, as are many people throughout the country.

Very truly yours,

HELEN SKIPWORTH WALLSINGER.

TILLAMOOK, OREG.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

SIR: Stick to your guns on this Vietnam war. I honestly believe four out of five men in the street are with you. Polls and be damned.

Challenge your opponents to hold a national election on the issue. Just dare them.

We, the people, fight the battle, shed the blood, and pay the bills. Why should our wishes be ignored?

Signed, just another taxpayer.

DON TRASK.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 3, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I say, I agree with you on the Vietnam situation. I commend you for taking a firm stand.

Yours truly,

J. GRISCHOW.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 5, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was extremely proud of the responsible statements concerning the war in Vietnam you made on the television debate Sunday, January 31. I am also proud of the part you have taken in the Senate investigation of our actions in Vietnam.

Thank you for representing Oregonians so well.

Sincerely,

MARJORY B. HUBBARD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 7, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: All through the years you have done a wonderful job for the people of Oregon and the Nation.

You have the support of many people on the question of Vietnam. This country has not been this divided since the Civil War. We the people have been sold down the river by Congress not doing the job they were elected to do. When are they going to get on their feet and act?

The munition's makers are gambling this war will not turn into a nuclear war. This is madness. We all know what happened in Japan when the war lords took over in the thirties.

I have an only son who has been called to be trained to be a butcher of people he has nothing against. Vietnam or Vietcong.

It has been reported in the Oregon newspapers that the draft boards are scraping the bottom of the barrel and we have not begun to fight China. If Congress has not the guts to act, then let us as Americans vote on it.

It may be that the draft law can be changed to read the first to go would be all men 80 years old on down the line including Congressmen.

I know you are doing all you can and may God bless you for it. I hope you get some help from these other Congressmen that are taking pay from the American people and doing nothing.

I went through hell on Leyte and Okinawa in World War II—with the 96th Division, as a combat engineer, 321st Company C—a war to end wars.

Yours, Truly

CHAS. C. GEORGE.

P.S.—We would like to see and hear you more often on TV. My friend and I would contribute what we can. You are getting home to a lot of people.

ALBANY, OREG.,
February 3, 1966.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Stick to your olive branch, let the others stick to their guns. This type of "big shot" isn't getting heard 'round the world these days. I am so proud of you.

Thoreau has said that one can sit a risk as well as run one. Thank Heaven you are in there pitching for us. You shall be remembered long after the warmongers are swept into the dustpan of oblivion.

Respectfully,
MRS. MARIE PHELPS.

EUGENE, OREG.,
February 7, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Having received several letters from me during the past year indicating my appreciation and support for your Vietnam stand, you will not be surprised to hear that I strongly approve of the current hearings on our foreign policy in the Foreign Relations Committee.

It seems to me that the climate of opinion about the war, here in Oregon and throughout the country, has changed markedly since you first began to speak out clearly and forcefully against the Vietnam war. Saddening as it is to think of the hundreds of people, Vietnamese and American, who have lost their lives in recent months because the warning you brought was not heeded, it is at least somewhat encouraging to know that a person who continues to champion reasonable and ethical conduct in foreign affairs does gradually build up support for his position. As a citizen of Oregon I am proud of you. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,
LEONA E. TYLER.

MEDFORD, OREG.,
February 8, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It pleases me to know we have a Senator from Oregon who has the guts to say what he believes in his conscience and best judgment to be the best policy for the approach to the Vietnam.

Your attitude and questions are in complete accord to my own feelings about our present policy which is surely heading us head on to another world war that will make other wars seem like backyard squabbles with neighbors.

The further we stick our noses into other people's business the harder it is to pull it out again and still save face.

Our President is doing just what you said in committee meeting. Following Barry Goldwater's campaign speeches which were only intended to get votes. Like the rest of his utterances, which were irresponsible because he was not the President and he was not in a position to have to follow through on his rantings.

I sincerely hope you will be our Senator for many more years to come.

Yours very truly,
HENRY G. CORBIN.

PORTLAND, OREG.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations to you. This letter is a protest against the present use of our power in Vietnam.

I will not make this letter long. Suffice it to say I am an informed citizen as much as any layman can be by reading about and listening to both sides of the question.

There is no need for a response to this letter. I want it used as a statistic against our present policy in Vietnam. I can explain my reasons if it were ever necessary.

I'm not a pacifist, a crackpot, naive, or a Communist. I am a Democrat and I deplore our big-bomb attitude and our great power being used as it is.

Yours truly,
MRS. RUTH ASHFORD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
417 Old Senate Building,
Washington D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am 100 percent with you on your stand on Vietnam war.

I am one of these folks who have become disenchanted with the way the whole thing is being handled. This thing needs to be deescalated back down to our 15,000 to 20,000 advisers we started with in Vietnam. Better yet turn it over to the United Nations. I am for doing our part, but only with economic aid and not with the lives of any American unless he volunteers. All the other nations seem to be sending only volunteers.

Also, lets trim that budget back down to 100 billion and reduce taxes. I don't subscribe to this we are a rich and healthy nation and can afford to take care of the whole world.

I'd like to see more opposition to all these requests for more money to finance more giveaway programs.

Sincerely,
LEROY W. MILLER.

ESTACADO, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: We listened to your discussion on TV yesterday, and I want you to know that we are 100 percent for you.

Just stick to your guns and keep up the fight. Also please try and stop some of these big giveaway programs to foreign countries.

I take this time to thank you for the job you have done for our country.

We, "my wife and I" are Democrats, but we can't go along with President Johnson's views.

Respectfully yours,
HAROLD R. BAKER.

P.S.—Would you please put me on your mailing list?

SALEM, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I thank God we have a Senator that knows what is right for the people of the United States, as well as the rest of the world. Stick to your guns.

History will prove you are right if we live long enough for someone to write about it. I don't think the people know what is going on.

As long as we are losing men and money the commies are getting just what they want, or they would ask for peace.

As for the right-to-work law, I feel that it should not be repealed, although I have been a union member most of my 72 years.

Yours truly,
G. D. LAND.

HILLSBORO, OREG.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for standing so loyally by your convictions in regard to Vietnam. I'm sure there are thousands of Americans with the same sane logic.

The enclosed clipping by the writer in Saigon coincides with your views, showing that the goal of our Government is not to help the Vietnam people as a good neighbor as President Johnson voices to the people, but to occupy, dictate or rather, supervise the government of this small Asian country.

Why? To profit by war? Are the citizens of America to be governed by one man's dictates?

I have wondered how I, one person, can help. The only way I know is the Master's way, to pray "Our Father—Thy will be done in earth as it is heaven." For in Psalms 22:28 it is written: "For the kingdom is the Lord's: and He is the governor among the nations."

Oregon is proud of you. Keep your faith strong in "the Governor among the nations" and all must be well.

Sincerely,
MRS. HENRIETTA I. HARRISON.

WHY ARE WE FIGHTING?

(By Takashi Oka)

SAIGON.—"We cannot wait until the countryside is pacified in order to negotiate," the professor earnestly said. "We must fight, we must pacify, we must negotiate—all at the same time."

I cannot disclose the professor's name, for what he said is contrary to official Saigon policy, and freedom of speech is still severely rationed in wartime South Vietnam. But he is a man who was imprisoned under the Ngo Dinh Diem regime, and who served in a short-lived legislative body appointed by one of the post-Diem governments. Today he represents one of the more conservative elements among South Vietnamese intellectuals dissatisfied with the military government's adamant stand against negotiations with Hanoi.

"My students don't like the war," he said, "but they are willing to go and serve in the Army. So are the young men from my village. But more and more, they are asking, 'Why are we fighting?' And no one gives them a clear answer. Anticommunism is not enough.

"They certainly were not fighting for Ngo Dinh Diem, in the days when he was in power. They are not willing today to fight simply for Diem's replacement. They aren't fighting for the generals.

"A Vietnamese will fight only to defend what he feels really belongs to him. He will fight for a regime if he can be sure it is his own regime. He will not fight for a person, nor for a corporation.

"Now that the question of negotiations with Hanoi has come up, it is more important than ever that we obtain a government that really represents the people of South Vietnam. Who has the credentials to negotiate on behalf of the people of South Vietnam? Not the generals; nor this or that man. Unless we have a government representing the majority of the people of South Vietnam, peace cannot be realized."

Prime Minister Nguyen Cao Ky has announced that elections for a representative government will be held in 2 years. The professor and his friends feel this is too long to wait. "It will be the Vietcong who will be holding the elections, if we wait that long," said one of them.

"Americans say that the war is going better now," the professor continued. "But this is not because of the actions of the Vietnamese side. It is only because of the Americans. And the war is going better only in the field, in the sense that more Vietcong are being killed.

"But for the population, the war isn't going better—it's worse. Last year there were no Vietcong in my village, which is 15 kilometers from a large city. Now there are at least five. Between my village and the city there is a pagoda, where Buddhist nuns run a dispensary. Recently the Vietcong came there and asked the nuns for money and drugs. Now the nuns have had to leave their pagoda, for fear of what the Vietcong might do.

"The question for us is not how to make war—it is how to pacify, to reconstruct." In the professor's view, the Government could not pacify the countryside effectively so long as it remained a closed corporation of generals.

Younger intellectuals are far more fiery than this professor. "We cannot go on like this much longer," a university instructor said. "We must have negotiations. But I don't think the Americans want to negotiate."

When I suggested that it was Premier Ky's government, rather than Washington, which distrusted negotiations, the young man cried, "Do you think that with 200,000 foreign troops in our country, we are still independent. We don't have representative government here, and the Americans don't want us to have a representative government, because this will make things more difficult for them."

"Are you saying that you want the Americans to leave?" I asked.

"No," he replied. "All I am saying is that we, the people of Vietnam, had nothing to do with inviting the American troops to come here in such quantity. It was the generals that invited them, and the generals are not representative. We need the Americans, but only as friends, not as an occupation force."

These comments reflect the growing estrangement between the generals ruling South Vietnam and the intellectual community, including students. The generals have branded their opponents as parlor politicians and draft-dodging youth who prefer the comforts of the city to hard toil in the field. There is an element of truth in the accusation, but as long as the generals themselves do not lead exemplary lives, the population at large is not likely to respond to appeals for greater sacrifice. Meanwhile discontent grows over the military regime's unimaginative and restrictive attitudes on a host of issues from negotiations to press censorship. Sooner or later the discontent tends to crystallize into a form of anti-Americanism, on the assumption that the overwhelming American presence in South Vietnam makes Washington responsible for everything that goes on in the country.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God for your courageous action in this matter of Vietnam. I have the feeling that your committee is the last desperate hope we have to avoid a massive land war in Asia. All our young men of this generation and all our national resources could go down that rathole, with no success.

I hope that you will look into the matter of the Michelin rubber plantations, which apparently have been protected by our troops, and which have gone on operating at great profit, even though war was waged all about for all these years. Not much is printed about it, but one gets the feeling that this war may have been originally supported to protect the property rights of very large corporations, and that the whole thing got out of the relatively simple war we thought was needed to do this. A simple holding operation to maintain vested interests, gotten out of hand because the native population resisted—is this a possible explanation of this war which seems so inexplicable? Eisenhower said that 80 percent of the people would vote for communism—we do not fight communism in Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Russia, and numerous other places where the majority supports it.

This is a matter which deserves the attention of your committee, in any case, if only to dispel the impression that we are fighting to maintain the stock market quotations for Michelin. In any case, we are using the most modern weapons to fight primitive people, against whom we have not declared war—so we deserve an explanation of why we must use these means, and what ends we hope to attain. My two sons will undoubtedly be drafted into this war if it does not stop, and at present it seems the most senseless and immoral war of modern times.

Sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH GRUDIN.
MRS. ARNOLD GRUDIN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have just heard you and four other Senators in a panel on Vietnam. I agree with you perfectly, have said the same all the while. This is for the U.N. to settle. May someone see the light. And may the world finally have peace.

May I remind you that I helped elect you originally as a Republican? Today you were more convincing than the GOP panel member. I'm sure you have no affinity for the Great Society. Come on back to the Republicans; all is forgiven.

Most sincerely,

VIVIAN BRUGGER
Mrs. Andrew J. Brugger.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
January 28, 1966.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Thank God for your outspoken opposition to Government policy and war in Vietnam. Keep up the good work. We are appalled by the U.S. international irresponsibility in these critical days.

We also hope that you will help to see that some bill for home rule for Washington, D.C., gets through both Houses of Congress this year.

Sincerely yours,

PORTIA B. FOSTER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 19, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to congratulate you on your stand concerning the war in Vietnam and hope you can make your voice heard even more forcibly on the floor of the Senate this session. It is agonizing to see the United States trying to police the whole world and particularly so escalating the situation in South Vietnam that we are in considerable danger of setting off World War III—and for what? There may be some feasibility in the argument we were pledged to help this nation in case of Communist aggression, but "help" in the form of a police action seeking to stave off the Vietcong and "help" in the form of the all-out war it has become, without laying the matter before the United Nations, without the President seeking a formal declaration by Congress, is, I think, not only muddled foreign policy, but terribly dangerous.

I think, too, there is a neat point in semantics involved here. When we talk about "freedom and democracy" and wishing these things for all nations, theoretically we may be in the right, but bringing it down to hardcore reality, how can we project our concept of democracy onto nations where a high rate of illiteracy prevails, where there has been no background or education in democratic principles, and where every political wind that blows can bring on a different government? I have twice heard statements from reputable reporters that should some kind of peace be made and elections opened, if the Vietnamese wish to elect a Vietcong government, then there isn't a thing we can do about it. Is it for this we are fighting and young men dying every day?

It is becoming apparent even to the most utopian thinkers in this country, that we simply can't eradicate communism, that Red China and Russia are probably going to continue Communist for decades to come, and that the best hope for our own economy and the world is to try to get along with them, but to keep a sharp watch on any aggression that would threaten our own Monroe Doctrine. We simply can't be policeman to the world. Sadly enough, what we may think is championship other nations consider aggression and imperialism.

President Johnson's state of the Union message certainly had an "Alice in Wonderland" concept—bigger and better war, bigger and better domestic programs, and if we don't have the money, just saddle the middle class with more taxes.

In the Oregonian of January 17 there was an editorial entitled "Gravediggers," imputing this term to anyone who opposes or criticizes the war in Vietnam, which I think is quite shocking, carrying ominous overtones of the very thing we are supposedly fighting for—the five freedoms. The editor seems to think we should be 100 percent behind the war effort and to object to it is to fall for the Communist line. Well, a lot of fine people must fall in this category then, according to such a concept, like yourself, Senator FULBRIGHT, Representative WYATT, Governor Mark Hatfield, James Reston of the New York Times, Emmett Hughes of Newsweek, editors of Saturday Review of Literature, etc. There is a real threat to our way of life in communism, I'm not denying that, but we've made communism such a national bogeyman its gigantic shadow obscures our own commonsense and the sturdy pioneer qualities which made this country great.

Sincerely,

MRS. J. S. MOZZANINI.

GRANTS PASS, OREG.,
February 3, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Despite the fact the cards were stacked against you numberwise on Sunday's television program, you gave a most excellent account of yourself and your position. Your repeated words directed at the President was a brilliant stroke. This alone will elevate your status considerably in the minds and hearts of your constituents. Your remarks, "If we escalate the war we invite Red China to wage a major aggression against us"; "How can we forget 1945 so soon"; "What makes us think we have the resources or manpower to police the world"; "The United States has violated the Geneva accords" and your remarks anent the administration's "fooling" the American people as did Hitler and his Government the German people, gave you status, Senator, as the truth will.

I have often disagreed with your stand on some issues—sometimes you make a lot of us angry but, by God, I give you this—in my book you are honest, sincere, and almost unthinkable under this administration endowed with an abundance of intestinal fortitude.

With lifelong service in the Coast Guard behind me and thinking as a professional naval career man, my sentiments are that it is a crying shame we are pulling our young people out of college and subjecting them to the draft. If we must "police" southeast Asia then let us do it with our professional military people. This is what they are being paid for.

Would like you to read the enclosed editorial from the Grants Pass Courier of February 2. The writer, H.L.E., is one Harry L.

Elliott, our new editor, formerly of the Sacramento Bee. That he is a rabid Republican is his prerogative. I can tolerate his sniping at some issues of the Great Society; in fact, I often go along with him, but when he comes out with "nothing" off the top of his head as in the enclosed piece, I have to take issue with him—and I have.

Maintain your position, Senator. Your colleagues on Sunday's program lost a lot of friends in southern Oregon.

Sincerely,

JOHN JAMES MURRAY.

MILWAUKIE, OREG., *February 4, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I watched the hearings on television this morning of which you were a part. I am very concerned and interested in the AID program which has received some adverse publicity recently about some of the operations in Vietnam. I may have missed some of the testimony and questions, but I didn't hear anything about the AID money that is used on the black market by some United States personnel and South Vietnamese and which ultimately ends up in the pocket or bank of the Vietcong.

Many of our people are questioning our rightness and purpose in the conflict and procedure in Vietnam. We who are loyal, patriotic Americans are encouraged to support the administration's policy in this conflict and to voice this support for the morale of "our boys" in Vietnam. But who is being more demoralizing? These poor children are sent in to fight an enemy who must laugh themselves sick at the round-robin attempts to search and destroy in those horrible, unfamiliar jungles and who is being financially aided by the tax money of the folks back home. I resent this terribly, and I don't care if its gone on in every war we've ever been in. It's still wrong.

We have been treated to a recent drama of whether to continue bombing North Vietnam or not. Past history and experience shows us that adversity only sharpens determination. If 9 months of bombing didn't do any good why in the world start it all over again?

Why are we allowing our allies, particularly England to continue to supply North Vietnam? I believe that if we were to become a great deal more adamant about this, it would help. What friends our foreign aid has made.

I have long defended some of our governmental decisions and people such as Robert McNamara. What about this munitions strike which lasted a month? Surely, there was no big crisis, but could this happen again and what about future mistakes? "Our boys" are still, for the most part, babes, sent out into this jungle war, created by God knows who, and they deserve to at least die with the best equipment and protection they can give them. I resent any mismanagement and inefficiency on the part of our acknowledged, brilliant Secretary of Defense.

I was aware of the last administration's attitude of "the masses are asses" theory, and perhaps we are. Perhaps we can't master our own destiny, but it is our heritage and I will not stand by and see my five draft-age nephews placed on the altar of sacrifice in Vietnam without voicing my opinion of this secretive and hopelessly complex war in which we are never sure who the good guys and the bad guys are. No wonder they are sacred. No wonder they dodge the draft. The Vietnam conflict is coming closer to home and I trust these hearings will get some definite results and answers from the administration.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

JACQUELINE DEPLOIS.

P.S.—Please forgive this messy letter, but if I don't send this right now I'll tear it up and remain a part of the mass.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Bravo. Your intention of not being present at committee meetings with Mr. Rusk and the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, that are not held in public is so right.

I feel strongly that our President, Mr. Rusk, and Mr. McNamara have forgotten that we, the people, exist, or should I say, we the people have failed to make known our sentiments?

World war III must be averted even if we take a step backward. Only through peace can we be a strong Nation in any attempts to make this world better for the masses.

You make so much sense I can't understand why more support does not come your way. Only when it is too late, I fear, they will see "light."

I back you 100 percent.

Yours truly,

GENEORA J. NEWBERRY,
Mrs. Charles L. Newberry.

EUGENE, OREG.,
January 10, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: This is my first letter to a Senator. I feel I must write and voice my protest against the war in Vietnam. I am not a Communist nor radical (either way) but a plain old American who doesn't think we have any business over there. We cannot help every country that asks us for help.

My husband and I traveled many miles over the western half of the United States (10 States) last fall, and I'd say that at least 80 to 85 percent of the people that we talked to, are very disappointed in President Johnson's foreign policy in Vietnam.

I don't feel that it is our responsibility to "police" the whole world. It's no wonder so many countries hate us.

Also, how can a handful of men in Washington get us so involved in such a fierce war without the sanction of the Senate and House? These men in Washington are responsible for the bloodshed of our fine men, who want to live as much as they do.

So, I say, let's get out of Vietnam now before it spreads any farther. We can still hold our heads high. It will make our President stand taller in the eyes of the people by getting out than drawing us into world war III.

Most sincerely,

ESTHER E. LINDEEN.

MEDFORD, OREG.,
January 8, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I respectfully request that you continue to do all in your power to end the participation of the United States in the war in Vietnam. In no way can our participation in such a war be justified, and it is a war that can never be won. It is no more than a useless sacrifice of American boys, which could go on forever, and which no doubt, if continued, will erupt into World War III and eventual destruction of the civilized world.

We have no more business in this war than the Germans had in the revolution in Spain, which was actually only a training ground for them for World War II. I can well understand the rumblings of the countries around Vietnam, when they see the United States enter into the Vietnamese revolution, even as the Germans did into the Spanish revolution, and what else can they think, than that the United States is busy preparing to attempt to take over the world? More often than not, history does repeat itself.

We have no backing in this war. The United Nations has done all it can do to get us to withdraw, and yet we persist. Why?

We can hope to gain nothing for the world, nor for the United States by persisting in taking part in a revolution where even the people we are supposed to be aiding do not want our help. We are wasting the lives of American boys who may some day be needed to protect their own country; and we are wasting these lives in a foreign country, for a foreign cause, which by any name we choose to call it, does not justify our presence in the war in Vietnam.

Please continue your good work. We in Oregon will not forget it, and I am sure many more States watch you with a great deal of interest and approval. Somehow our President must hear the voice of the people, and how else can it be accomplished than through our able and learned Representatives and Senators?

Sincerely,

CARVEL WALL.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 8, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The crowd running our Government in Washington has me so upset over their foreign policy, both military and political, that I don't know what to do. I am a small businessman with a family of two children and my wife. We have been married 24 years, our son is 20 years of age and our daughter is 19, and both attend OSU.

I was in the Navy from 1942 to 1945, and for this reason we found it necessary to postpone having our family, even though we were very eager to have children. However, I felt that what I was fighting for was both necessary and worthwhile. I certainly can't say that I feel the same about this senseless war in Vietnam where thousands of our young men are being committed and where thousands are to die in this distant and unfortunate little country for a policy which is creating new Communists and strengthening the movement, as well as building enmity for generations to come. It is absolutely idiotic. By no stretch of the imagination can anyone say that the Vietcong pose a threat to our security or way of life. If this were indeed true I myself would want to do service again and would certainly be most proud to have my son fight in defense of our country.

I am writing you this letter because I highly respect your knowledge of foreign affairs and your integrity in opposing our present suicidal policies. I am not willing to furnish my son to be slaughtered for such a cause as our military and administration leaders are foisting on the American people. The money to support this undeclared war through increased taxes, though regrettable, is expendable, but a son is certainly not in the same category.

I am hoping you will keep the pressure on the President and Congress this session. The solution for Americans is simply to go home and stay home and quit meddling in the affairs of other nations. They could take of their affairs much better without our too often stupid intervention, and we have a few problems of our own to which we could certainly devote more attention, time, and money.

Very sincerely,

HOWARD W. HARRIS.

PENDLETON, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: May I take this occasion to command you on your firm stand on the Vietnam situation.

It is my humble opinion as a citizen and a father that we the people should be the first to understand a logical reason for an undeclared war to be carried on year after year without any beneficial results to anyone.

We hear of our commitments abroad. Does this not apply to the United Nations as a whole? Why should we enter alone into any and every foreign situation under the guise of our commitments.

I would like to have it explained, not in incoherent political terms, but in everyday English, why we should engage in an undeclared war that costs countless millions of dollars, but most important the lives of boys, that could and should be at home building a strong Nation on our own shores.

Again I would assure you, speaking I am sure for a majority in your home State, stand firm.

Sincerely yours,
W. L. Crawford.

Portland, Oreg.

Dear Senator Morse: I am a registered Republican and have always voted against you. Due to your stand on Vietnam, both my wife and I will back you in your political future.

Sincerely,
Robert York.

Portland, Oreg.,
January 16, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Just a few lines to thank you for your continuing efforts against the war in Vietnam. When President Johnson acknowledges that it is the national liberation forces that he is fighting and must deal with them to end the fighting there, then the war will be placed in its proper perspective. We are doing what we can here to help you, distributing literature and trying to get speakers before small groups, but the propaganda machine for continuing the war is a very well oiled machine.

May you enjoy good health and strength to keep on with your good work.

Sincerely,
C. E. Bergquist.

Portland, Oreg.,
January 17, 1966.

Dear Mr. Morse: It is time we let you know how we feel in regard to the Vietnam problem. If enough of us come forward to be counted surely our feelings will carry some weight. We must find a way to stop this tragedy.

We follow your moves with much interest, and are extremely proud to have you representing us. Please let us know of any way we can be of help.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. J. R. Magwood.

Medford, Oreg.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We probably learnt more about the Vietnam war, on your television program Sunday, than all of the reports combined which we have heard and seen, during the last several months.

We wholeheartedly support your stand, and believe the whole Vietnam situation should be aired within the structure of the United Nations. Certain individuals may think the United States is pursuing the right course in that area. We feel however, only the majority of the members of the United Nations should make such a determination, support it too.

We are proud to have you as a Senator from our State, not only because you believe as we do, about Vietnam, but because you have the candor to tell the truth, and let the chips fall where they may. Please keep up your good work.

Sincerely,
C. A. Hanson.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: May I congratulate you for your stand on the Vietnam situation, and your proposed legislation for draftees to volunteer for their duty rather than be compulsory.

I, like many others, have a son presently in college. We hope he will be able to obtain his degree. We also expect him to fulfill his military obligation, probably by reserve training or direct enlistment. I have talked to many of my friends and business associates in recent months, and I have found no one who wants their son or sons fighting in Vietnam. It is too bad that people who feel this way do not take the time to write. Maybe I am wrong in doing so, but I want you to know you have support in your efforts in this endeavor. We all hope and pray peace will come soon or some favorable solution.

Respectfully yours,
R. C. Christman.

Alvadore, Oreg.,
January 27, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Morse: I feel called upon to applaud your stand on the Vietnam situation. I am sure your well-publicized attitude has done much to help influence our President's peace offensive.

As a member of the United World Federalists to whom you have spoken on more than one occasion, my opinions on unilateral action bypassing the U.N. may be easily guessed by you. The stakes being what they are, my feeling is that none of us can afford to overlook any possibility for contributing to a saner world.

You will need no urging, I know, to support any action that will bring about a ceasefire and eventual self-determination of the Vietnamese people. My question is: When, oh when, will we press for world law to adequately deal with world problems? Isn't that a job for this generation now, as quickly as possible? What is lacking?

Yours,
Willard Berg.

Portland, Oreg.,
January 26, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: I'm so glad to find that you, who have a position of authority, share my views of our country's involvement in Vietnam. (I've been feeling somewhat like James the snail—when he gave the huffle of a snail in danger. Nobody heard him at all.) Please carry on—I hope that somehow we shall prevail.

Sincerely yours,
Mary S. Farnham.

Carbondale, Ill.,
January 27, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Although we currently live in Illinois while I'm attending graduate school, my wife and I, as residents of Oregon, both wish to express to your our deep approval of your stand on the situation in Vietnam. We would specifically like to express our support of the amendments to the defense supplemental bill for Vietnam which you and Senator Gruening are sponsoring. If we can aid you in any possible way please let us know. It is time that separate concerned citizens found some way to effectively shatter the myth of a majority "consensus" approving the current policies of the United States with respect to Vietnam.

Very truly yours,
Stephen Rathman.

Prospect, Oreg.,
January 26, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am a high school teacher of social science. In previous correspondence I have expressed my views on a number of subjects. It was also my privilege to visit Washington and your office last summer. I had hoped to be able to meet you personally, but this didn't work out.

I indicated my sympathy with your criticism of our present Vietnam policy in these previous letters. Whereas I am sometimes encouraged to hope for a change by hearing of an increasing criticism of our military action there, it seems that the consensus still supports the use of force as necessary to a suitable negotiation.

This seeming willingness to support principle with actions appeals to public nationalism and is in accord with our military containment policy of the last 20 years. However, the principles of freedom and self-determination can hardly be seriously considered as goals to be reached in this part of Asia. Does our national security demand a military victory in Vietnam? Or, will we experience the tragedy of France by sacrificing not only our wealth, but hundreds of thousands of our youth in a futile attempt to use force to convert Asians to love America.

I am proud that we have a Senator from Oregon who has been consistently and courageously raising his voice in warning and protest. I continue to support your stand on this momentous issue.

Sincerely,
Gerald O. Gardner.

Idleyld Park, Oreg.,
January 25, 1966.

Wayne Morse,
Eugene, Oreg.

Dear Sir: When writing to you I do not need to apologize for my opinions on the administration's policy in Vietnam because they are the same as yours.

Will you add my voice to the growing chorus—"Do not start the bombing of North Vietnam now." If we must fight, let us fight for a negotiated peace, and get out of this mess.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Helen Davis.

Sheridan, Oreg.,
January 28, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: From the press I see the good work you are doing in fighting the escalation of the war in Vietnam, and I agree with your stand in the U.S. Senate, and outside of the Senate, with everything you say, and the position you take. I cannot help but believe you are right.

I served Uncle Sam in World War I and II which gives me an insight into the position you take, and I know it is right. I am sure the people of the State of Oregon, if a vote were to be taken, would approve of your position by at least three to one in your favor.

I am somewhat convinced if this war continues until the next presidential election the voters of this country will force a change of leadership in the Presidency, and that result is almost bound to be inevitable.

Thanking you again for your wonderfully good work for peace and discontinuation of the conflict, I am,

Respectfully yours,
Otto W. Heider.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

SENATOR MORSE: Thank God for your lonely sane voice in the midst of all this madness—we pray it may be listened to.

Mr. and Mrs. R. M. GRIMM.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 27, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know that I am, as you are, appalled at our Nation's leaders' lack of zeal in seeking a peaceful end to the Vietnam conflict.

My prayers are with you and your colleagues who are trying to make your voices heard over the shouts of people who want to escalate the fighting in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

LOIS MCNALLY.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Hon. Senator MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A warm appreciation is in order to you and to others of the Foreign Relations Committee for challenging the "status quo" policies of the United States and for challenging our blind commitments to governments that are just as autocratic as those we try to contain. Congratulation are also in order to your committee for putting Secretary of State Rusk on the line, to you for your challenges against our foreign aid policies and our Vietnam stand, and to your colleague, Senator FULBRIGHT, for challenging our stand in the Dominican Republic and elsewhere.

DOUG NEELEY,
A supporter from Oregon.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

HONORABLE SIR: We watched, and heard the discussion yesterday on our involvement in Vietnam, by you and other Senators on CBS.

May I take this opportunity to commend you for your honesty, courage, wisdom, and integrity. Your position from the beginning has been factual, logical, and forthright. I cannot say enough in my support of you and your stand on this immoral, abortive mess, which being esculated, may exact the lives of 2 or 3 million of our young men, to say nothing of the waste of money. Each passing week more clearly vindicates you and the positive stand you have taken in this Vietnam carnage, as well as your protests on the senseless waste of our billions of dollars—down foreign aid ratholes. My family joins me in wishing you the best of everything.

And may the good Lord open the eyes of our people, before it is forever too late.

Thanking you for your monthly legislative letter. And may the blessings of Heaven attend you.

I am, sincerely yours,

VICTOR E. LEWIS.

TIGARD, OREG.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Keep up good work on the Vietnam situation.

Pleased to see you in action on television yesterday, Sunday, January 30.

Sincerely yours,

WESLEY C. HEISE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I liked the stand you took on, "The Vietnam Contest." I urge you to continue your fight. Your TV discussion was grand and we all think you sure told them every time you opened your mouth. I highly honor you for your fight and convictions.

Have they started bombing again in the North Vietcong.

We get your letters every mailing. Much success.

Sincerely,

Mrs. J. L. THOMPSON, Sr.

LINCOLN CITY, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Thank you for forceful and courageous presentation of facts regarding our Vietnam involvement on the CBS broadcast.

I hope and pray you may gain sufficient support to thwart this senseless tragedy.

Sincerely,

KATHRYN MCDANIEL.

HOOD RIVER, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: After hearing the panel discussion monitored by Eric Sevareid on television Sunday afternoon, we were certainly convinced of the soundness of your stand on our Government's war in Vietnam.

Evidently this program had been taped prior to press announcements of resumption of bombing in North Vietnam. It is most unfortunate that our Government now sees fit to escalate what could easily become world war III.

Your recommendation that this conflict and the plea for a peaceful settlement be submitted to the U.N. requiring "placing on the spot" all nation members now sitting on the sidelines, make sense to us.

May we congratulate you for having the courage to state your convictions so eloquently in the face of so much opposition.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT R. TYLER.
LOTTA M. TYLER.

WARRENTON, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard you on "Congress and the War."

It was an interesting and informative 1½ hours.

Your suggestions for a possible Vietnam solution should be tried.

Not calling the Vietnam war a war is like calling cancer appendicitis.

I'm interested in reading the Mansfield report "The Vietnam Conflict." Is it possible to obtain a copy?

Thanks to God for a man working for peace as you are.

GENEVIEVE DUNNING.

LAKE GROVE, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for the stand which you take on Vietnam.

My friends and I certainly support you.

Sincerely,

T. I. LANE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 28, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My compliments to you; my gratitude to you for the stand you are taking on Vietnam. Nothing but catastrophe can be the lot of America as well as of the Asians by a persistance in the foolhardy course we have been pursuing.

Many, many people share the view that I do. I am sure most do, especially if they are reasoned with.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD WENDEL.

ESTACADA, OREG.,
February 1, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your outspoken stand against our Government's policy in regard to Vietnam. I trust that many citizens will uphold you by writing our Congressmen.

Also I trust that an enlightened, reasonable approach may be pursued to get us out of such an involvement which has begun to grow like a cancer throughout our country.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. LUCILE P. JENKINS.

WATERLOO, OREG.,
February 2, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Both of us, as well as most other people we have talked to about the Vietnam "war" are in complete agreement with your stand on the situation. We deeply appreciate your splendid efforts to do something to end the fiasco.

May we assure you of our hearty support, and if at any time we can be of any other assistance, we stand ready to do anything we possibly can to back you.

Thank you more than we can say, dear friend, for your work in behalf of the American people, and thank God for you and those working with you. We are proud that among them, you stand first.

Sincerely,

GEORGE S. VAWTER.
MIRL VAWTER.

ROCKAWAY, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Hurrah. For you. Your debate on Vietnam Sunday was marvelous. If only we had a few more statesmen that had the courage to stand up and say what they really thought.

Bully for you. You have my respect and great admiration.

Sincerely,

Mrs. CLAYTON MCCORMICK.

PORTLAND, OREG.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Daily I thank God for your firm stand against this ungodly war our Nation is carrying on.

Also I pray that you may be given strength to carry on this battle for righteousness.

We are proud to have our State sending out this voice. We uphold you.

With you for peace,

EDITH RIGGS GILLET.

P.S.—As this was ready for mailing their came a glimmer of hope when hearing that our President had asked that United Nations Security Council take up the matter of Vietnam.

May it be done in a united voice for peace. My husband has untiringly worked with others to spread true knowledge of the Vietnam situation. I hope this copy we send will strengthen your hope.

E.R.G.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We listened to the television broadcast on Vietnam on Sunday, January 30.

We thank you for your courage and integrity.

Sincerely,

RUTH M. PAGE.

DEAR SENATOR: We enjoy your monthly bulletin; and, we are 100 percent behind you in your stand on foreign policy.

Most sincerely,

DARWIN E. PAGE.

LINCOLN CITY, OREG.,
January 31, 1696.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We listened to the Congressmen debate on TV yesterday in which you were a participant. We are very much in agreement with your stand on Vietnam. To many of us it is the most constructive stand anyone has taken.

We are proud to have a Senator who has the courage to stand up for what is right.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. R. B. WALKER.

ALBANY, OREG.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Just a note to let you know that I am 100 percent in favor of your stand on Vietnam. Please continue to fight for this.

Sincerely,

DONALD MORELAND.

LAKE OSWEGO, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My husband and I would like to offer our sincere congratulations for your stand this afternoon, Sunday, January 30, on CBS–TV in regard to the Vietnam situation. We have long admired and approved your tremendous courage in the face of strong opposition from popular opinion. Your knowledgeable, understandable presentations of your views have always made us very proud that you are representing our State. We want you to know that we are in complete accord with you on the Vietnam problem.

Thank you very much for your unselfish and devoted service to all Oregonians.

Respectfully yours,

MARIE L. YOUNGBAR.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 29, 1966.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Just a line to let you know that your words regarding Vietnam are certainly words of wisdom. How any adult with normal intelligence could believe otherwise is what I can't understand. I am with you 100 percent. I believe, as you have often said and restated by the Pope of Rome, that this matter of war should be settled by the United Nations, regardless of what the final verdict is.

Would it be possible for you to obtain the "report" which was made by the Senators after their journey through southeast Asia? I would like this report if you could get it for me.

Yours respectfully,

FRANK H. ANDERSON.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
February 2, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your contribution to the altogether-too-small public examination of U.S. activity in Vietnam is greatly appreciated. It is my hope that the points made during your television appearance last Sunday will cause more citizens to stop a moment to ponder the type of means we are utilizing to resolve the Vietnam conflict. Your effort to keep alive a public examination and to provide information that is not generally available and yet contributes to the debate is most commendable. I hope that you find sufficient support from both colleagues and the electorate to maintain a continuing focus on this important issue.

The information about the Vietnam situation that is generally available in Oregon is woefully inadequate. We receive cut versions of the press service releases from southeast Asia and Washington and elsewhere. It is almost impossible for the residents of this area to acquire the depth and analysis of news and events that will permit a meaningful examination of the situation. Many of our newspaper publishers and editors do not seem able to print the variety of views and sufficient coverage of events that would make the printed word a real service to the citizenry in the decisionmaking process. Decisions are now made out of the fear that is generated from ignorance and myth.

Can you send me a copy of the Mansfield report of the Senate committee that toured Asia? There has been little coverage of this in local papers. For example, most people appear to believe that the U.S. forces are engaged face to face with hordes of Chinese and North Vietnamese. Yet, I believe, the Mansfield report indicates that best estimates suggest that only about 10 percent of the so-called Vietcong combatants in South Vietnam are from the north.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY VAN DYKE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on bringing the Vietnam mess to the people in the United States, and putting the President and the State Department on the "spot" where they belong.

You have my full support on your stand. My hope is for you to have the strength to continue your battle for what is right. Oregon is lucky to have you for her Senator.

Sincerely yours,

MARY A. GALVIN.

MCMINNVILLE, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My family and I have just watched the CBS report on the Vietnam situation, and may I say that we fully agree with you on every point that you discussed.

As your supporters, let us urge you to continue your efforts to force the administration to bring this issue before the United Nations Assembly for settlement.

Also, we wish to express our appreciation for this type of debate, and we would like to see more of it.

Again let me assure you that we are 100 percent behind you.

Sincerely,

ROBERT R. CRUMP.

NORTH BEND, OREG.,
February 2, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your courage is tremendous. You surely are trying to get the truth to the U.S. people regarding the Vietnam war.

Too many of our Senators and Congressmen have become sheep and do whatever President Johnson tells them. They should read our U.S. Constitution again.

We are proud of you, and the other courageous ones like you.

Sincerely,

MARGUERITE GROB.

ROSEBURG, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: I am in agreement with you that our unfortunate involvement in Vietnam and the carte blanche powers which our President and military seem to have assumed represent a grave threat to our country and to world peace. I applaud you for speaking out and insisting on proper congressional authority to make war.

Respectfully,

R. FIES.

STANFORD, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR MORSE: I am a native of Eugene, Oreg., writing from Stanford University in support of your opposition to the resumption of bombing in Vietnam. Last year I had the opportunity of interviewing you for the KWSF Young Citizens Forum. Then I did not understand your position as I do now.

My reaction yesterday was that of many other students and faculty—helpless despair. The news had a profound effect on this typically apathetic campus. Persons such as myself who had for some time felt general objections to the President's policy were shocked into action. Yet what can you do when you disagree with the U.S. Government. How can your voice be heard?

I am not usually in favor of protests, and I don't know just how much they accomplish. But you reach a point when you are so frustrated to somehow express your feelings that you must do something, anything. Last night I joined 1,000 other Stanford students and associates in a protest march.

I do not want escalated war in southeast Asia. I do not think it is either purposeful or morally right to bomb North Vietnam. I do not think the United States is entirely justified to be in Vietnam in the first place. And I do not think it is right for the President to be able to conduct a war without the legislative control of the U.S. Congress.

I have never before been afraid of my Government and its actions, but I am afraid now. There are many others like me. Please help us.

Sincerely,

Miss ELLEN SMITH.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,
February 7, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For some time we have been concerned about the direction of American foreign policy and particularly the machinations in Vietnam directed by the "Washington Triumvirate": Johnson, Rusk, and McNamara.

Much has been mentioned in the news media about our commitment in Vietnam, but we are still at a loss to know just what the commitment was and by whom it was made. Would it be possible for you to furnish us the wording of the commitment as well as the authority for its making? It seems to us that under our form of constitutional government, any such commitment would have the status of a treaty and should require the advice and consent of the Senate. In the absence of such consent we see no obligation on the part of our country to send American boys to the slaughter swamps of Asia.

Recently we have watched on television your appearance on the Eric Sevareid CBS program and also on televised proceedings of the Foreign Relations Committee. We greatly admire your courage, as well as your logical analysis as to the gravity of the situation that our country is seemingly being pushed into. We want you to know that you have our complete support in your stand on this matter and we might also add that many people in this area, who have previously opposed you politically, speak out in admiration for the sensible and courageous stand that you are taking.

Even before hearing you on the Eric Sevareid program, we had decided between us that we would not vote for a gubernatorial or congressional candidate who advocated a program for the escalation of the Vietnam war.

With assurance of our continued support for your efforts, we remain,

Respectfully yours,
JAMES A. LITTLE.
BLANCHE M. LITTLE.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
January 19, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I take this opportunity to again congratulate you for your efforts to reduce the involvement of our Government in the Vietnam situation and to place this whole matter before the United Nations where it should be. I can see nothing but continued tragedy in the course that we are presently pursuing.

I have talked to many of my friends and they are deeply concerned about the whole matter.

As an educator, may I also express my concern for apparent efforts on the part of the Office of Education to closely control the expenditures of Federal funds that have been appropriated recently for new Federal programs. It seems to me that it is best for these funds to be directly channeled to State departments of education and from there distributed to local districts. As you know, this is presently being done under the Elementary and Secondary School Act.

May I express my thanks to you for the great service you are rendering to the people of this State and Nation. May God guide you in the decisions which you make.

Sincerely yours,
DR. LESTER BEALS.

LEBANON, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you to please do all you can, in getting a Senate investigation on the war in Vietnam and especially on the "goings-on" of McNamara and Rusk. It seems that this administration has kept so much from the American people; everything going on behind closed doors. I believe it is coming to a showdown now and soon, to get the truth on a lot of things. More power to you.

Taxpayers' money going to help countries who hate our insides and have told us so.

I try to watch all programs pertaining to the Government: Face the Nation, Meet the Press, Issues and Answers, etc., but sometimes wonder if that is not all controlled and none of you can say what you really think.

Can one believe the editorials we read? Probably depends upon the viewpoint of the one reporting.

The administration won't listen to experienced men in Army, Air Corps, etc. After all this time, in bombing North Vietnam, what results have we seen? Why don't they take the advice of some of these men to bomb Hanoi and those ports and get it over with? Of course, I understand your views, but can't agree, as, while the bombing was stopped recently, they have built up roads, etc., and will come at our boys harder than ever. Sure has been a mistake from the very beginning and it makes everyone so confused and stirred up all the time (this terrible war, in the first place).

Dr. Frank Munk sure painted a gloomy picture the other night on channel 6.

I probably shouldn't even be writing this, but after all, I'm a taxpayer and a voter, and when I think of our young boys being killed and wounded and no one will even help us, I get clear sick.

Is there any way to get rid of McNamara and Rusk?

Thanks for doing all you can; even Mrs. NEUBERGER and Mrs. GREEN (Democrats all this time) have plenty to say about the way many things are going.

Sincerely,
MISS ZADA MCCRIGHT.

NORTH BEND, OREG,
February 2, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue your courageous efforts to curtail our war mania. Your outstanding determination to retain some degree of sanity in our Senate and foreign affairs policy is greatly appreciated by all thinking people.

MR. LYTLE O. SWEATT.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January, 27, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Eighty Oregon clergymen concerned about Vietnam join to state we are appalled by inhumanity of the war in Vietnam, and the extension of hostilities to neighboring countries. Impending national decisions about Vietnam will fundamentally influence the political, military, and above all morale future of our Nation and world.

We are heartened by your recent efforts for peace, and we urge:

1. That the cessation of bombing in North Vietnam be maintained;
2. That you continue to press for negotiated peace, and that the National Liberation Front be given direct representation in all discussions;
3. That you vigorously resist all pressures toward further escalation;
4. That economic development for humane purposes at home and abroad be given budgetary priority over military spending.

DANIEL E. TAYLOR,
Secretary, Oregon Emergency Committee.

EUGENE, OREG.,
January 10, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Trust you in this crisis to urge cease fire in south; recognition National Liberation Front as major party negotiations with major role future government South Vietnam. Otherwise acceleration clearly ahead. Support you as always.

DAVID F. ABERLE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Referring to today's news me and my household are against Vietnam war.

MRS. L. LINDBERG.

PORTLAND, OREG.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo Senator MORSE. Your speech as of 2:15 today very much upheld.

MRS. DOROTHY O'DELL.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 14, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organizations commend your hearings on Vietnam. We oppose the war and believe continuation of its present course can lead only to catastrophe. We recommend the earliest possible disengagement. Please enter this in the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee's records. We request permission to send four representatives to testify before your committee in our behalf. They will be specialists in the Vietnam and China area from Stanford, San Jose College, and University of California. Reply to Olive Mayer, 245 Josselyn Lane, Woodside, Calif.

Stanford Committee for Peace in Vietnam (Students), California for Peace in Vietnam (Stanford Faculty), the San Jose Peace Center, the Palo Alto Friends Meeting, Concerned Citizens of Palo Alto, Peninsula Women for Peace, Steering Committee for the Leaders of Faith and Diplomacy, Palo Alto Ministers' Association, Monterey, Santa Cruz, San Jose, Palo Alto, San Francisco, Berkeley, and Marin Branches of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

MADISON, WIS.,
February 14, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your Vietnam position. Congratulations on hearings. No escalation, no bombing. Negotiate for peace, Senator WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. and Mrs. HUGH ILTIS.

LAWRENCE, MASS.,
February 14, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue your struggle for truth. May God sustain you in seeking peace in Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. ANTHONY TRIPOLI.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
February 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Your probing and critical views re Vietnam are vital if this country is to prevent world war III and survive as a democracy. Keep up this vital work for the safety of our country.

FRANKLIN FRIED.

MORTON GROVE, ILL.,
February 14, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You have my admiration and support in your courageous criticism of administration policy in Vietnam.

TITUS TREVOR.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 14, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We, like millions of Americans admire and support your position respecting Vietnam and Santo Domingo.

MORSE and DOROTHY ERSKINE.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
February 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Admire your stand concerning Vietnam war. This citizen for peace. Do not believe Rusk and McNamara have right to send thousands of Americans to death to support unrepresentative government in Saigon as voice of democracy in Senate. Demand the de-escalation of war negotiations with all countries, including Vietcong.

SHIRLEY LEWIN

Studio City, Calif.,
February 14, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Doing wonderful job—continue. You men making system of checks, balances, and reality. Stop war now.

Dr. Murray Mann.

Santa Barbara, Calif.,
February 13, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Saw TV coverage hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee. Like a breath of fresh air. God bless you, Mr. Fulbright, and all those responsible.

Mr. and Mrs. J. Howard Campbell.

New Brunswick, N.J.,
February 13, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We would like you to know that we, too, share your deep concern over our involvement in Vietnam and would respectfully urge that your voice continue to speak for those of us who also want the slaughter ended and a negotiated peace.

Dr. and Mrs. Milton Kleinman
and Family.

Hillsborough, Calif.,
February 13, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

In agreement with your views on Vietnam. We do not agree with the administration viewpoint.

Martin J. Ness.

New Orleans, La.,
February 13, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

God bless you for your efforts on behalf of our country. We feel so helpless as just citizens, though we write often to the President and to our Congressman. Please keep on helping us change the U.S. position in Vietnam.

Dr. and Mrs. Marvin Miller.

Northville, Mich.,
February 13, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Our respect, appreciation, and support for your voice in time of a sweet, ugly silence.

Joan Root and Dr. William Hylander.

New York., N.Y.,
February 14, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your wonderful Vietnam hearings.

John K. Jordan.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 14, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As a former Oregonian I am fully behind your stand on Vietnam. As a physician you and your committee have the endorsement of myself and at least 100 of my colleagues. Please continue your fight against our leaders' pointless and suicidal policy in Asia.

Richard H. Barr., M.D.

Pueblo, Colo.,
February 14, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Wish to express wholehearted support for your courageous and magnificent opposition to the administration, unreasonable policy in Vietnam. Urge every effort toward deescalation and establishment of truce.

Drs. D. and W. Van Camp.

New York, N.Y.,
February 13, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Kindly advise why small groups of our soldiers with only small arms are instructed to jeep-travel dangerous roads in Vietnam and subjected to ambush as reported today. Why do they not get ample protection?

Respectfully,

L. Klein.

Chicago, Ill.,
February 14, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are to be commended and applauded for your action with the Vietnam war. It is imperative that the American people be made aware that McNamara and Wheeler are reluctant to discuss the situation in a public session and the inconsistency of our objective regarding settlement contrasted with that of the South Vietnam Government.

Marvin Letwat.

Reading, Mass.,
February 14, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Dear Sir: Thank you for February 10 brilliant speech. I agree totally.

Mrs. Harold Swanson.

Berwyn, Pa.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

We are following each day, hearings with prayers. We are in agony for our sons.

Mrs. Patrici S. Stevens.
Mrs. H. Harrington.

Richmond, Calif.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support wholeheartedly yours, George Kennan's recent TV news Vietnam comments. Please expedite action.

Mr. and Mrs. Jerome Martinez.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 12, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of entire membership of the Henry B. Gonzalez Democratic club I congratulate and thank you for your sustained struggle in defense of freedom and justice and commend you for opposing nomination of Vaughn whose stand on Latin America deserves your censure. Our Spanish-speaking community also thanks you.

Gonzalio Molina, *Chairman.*

Dover, Mass.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We in Saltonstall's hometown of Dover are behind you 100 percent.

Lester Mathews,
Norma Mathews,
Lois Mathews,
William Domineau.
Madelyn Domineau.

New Ulm, Minn.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

We wholeheartedly support your efforts to inject a degree of sanity into our foreign policy.

Noel S. Iverson,
Harold Bierbaum.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 12, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Eastside Democratic Club of Los Angeles in regular membership meeting unanimously passed motion to commend you for defending the cause of freedom and justice for all people and especially for opposing Vaughn's nomination in view of his stand on intervention in Latin America. Thank you friend of all peoples.

Esther Helfrich, *Chairman.*

Long Beach, Calif.,
February 12, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Dear Senator Morse: Many, many thanks for saying what we are thinking in regard to American foreign policy. It is such a relief to hear honesty after all the doubletalk from the White House. Thanks.

Keith Gordon.

Pittsburgh, Pa.,
February 11, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D.C.:

We are dedicated Democrats working to support your Vietnam stand.

Mr. and Mrs. J. R. Walgren.

Cambridge, Mass.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your committee's attempt to bring Vietnam facts and issues to open and public debate and your courageous personal stand on issue of escalation. Tragic course of war reflects lack of public participation in decisionmaking.

Faculty, Staff, and Students of Harvard University, Dr. and Mrs. A. Antonovsky, Dr. Barbara Ayres, Mrs. Ellen Bare, Mr. and Mrs. Timothy Bodman, Jean Briggs, Becky Brown, Mickey Clamp, Mrs. Cynthia Cole, Dorothy Datz, Shelton Davis, Eric Delsar, Dr. and Mrs. Irven Devore, Karl G. Heider, Adris Heyman, Nancy Howell, Robert Jaffe, Mr. and Mrs. Neal Johnston, Dr. and Mrs. Richard Katz, Dr. Richard Lee, Rex Leghorn, Joel Levine, John McClellan, Mrs. Karen Sacks, Leonard Saphier, Mr. and Mrs. Mike Schwartz, Dr. Evon Z. Vogt, Thomas S. Weisner, Allan M. Winkler, Michelle Zimbalist, Ezra Zubrow.

Shawnee, Okla.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree with your policy in regard to Vietnam. Let's pull out tomorow.

All the Smiths in Shawnee, Okla.

Glendale, Calif.,
February 11, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Morse: May you continue on your course. I shall thank you respectfully.

Mrs. Dorothy Reid.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I fully support your position and your courage in expressing them in the hearings on television.

Mary Zeitlan.

Miami Beach, Fla.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Peace Corps needs a great humanitarian, educator, and Administrator to fulfill its original announced purpose.

Mr. Vaughn who has opposed constitutional government throughout Latin America and favors aid to brutal, corrupt military dictatorships is not the man to improve U.S. relations with other countries.

Our relations with other countries have deteriorated far too long and far too much.

A. Coan.

Dallas, Tex.,
February 10, 1966.

Wayne Morse,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Wholeheartedly concur with your sentiments concerning the United States, Vietnam, and Ky. Thank you.

Mary Agnes Thompson.

Norridge, Ill.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

I agree your policy on Vietnam is correct. We need more representatives of your character.

Ben Zaida.

St. Louis, Mo.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Our deep appreciation for your hearings. They encourage all who desire a rational foreign policy.

Gloria and Barry Commoner.

Lancaster, Pa.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Since this new useless war is so vital to our American way of life and the moment of truce approaches, isn't it logical at this time to invite to your body two living persons who could qualify what was gone before and what course we are on today? Why should we wait 25 to 50 years to hear the history of our country? Let us hear it today in 1966. Let's hear Citizen Harry Truman and what actually happened at Potsdam. Let's hear from Ike Eisenhower why he stopped the Korean war only to being a wrong inhumane war in South Vietnam. Both these gentlemen are now only American taxpayers like this writer—so, since neither are Christ is it not appropriate these two former most influential persons should be approached as to what they think now about our country's involvement in a too great adventure. Let's get down the real bottom.

Quandarily,

John A. Shultz.

Front Royal, Va.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your courageous and highly effective statement today.

Edward A. Harris.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

We unequivocally support your views on Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. Max Rothman.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 11, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I applaud your sane outlook and pray that your courageous suggestion on behalf of peace will be quickly realized.

Marie C. Bean.

New York, N.Y.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The astute logical forthright positions taken by you Senators Church, Fulbright, McCarthy, and Gore should help sway us citizens and hopefully legislatures away from doom and insanity. Letters follow.

With gratitude,

The Willingers.

New York, N.Y.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you. How unfortunate you are not President the dangerous days. I wanted that for years. I am the literary agent of Abby Mann who wrote "Judgment at Nurenburg." Hundreds of my associates and clients are for you and your magnificently intelligent and decent stand. Thank you, yours cordially.

Helen Savaron.

Drexel Hill, Pa.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We bless your efforts. Hold negotiate save our country and humanity.

Mrs. Mary M. Wilson and children.

Webster, N.Y.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo for adamant stand. Insist on congressional debate in House and Senate. Do not allow apparently deranged Executive to railroad our country into impossible war. Withdraw, let Asians fight Asians, spend our resources in the Americas.

George R. Clark.

Millbrae, Calif.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God we have people like you in the Senate.

Eleanor Atherley.

Shafter, Calif.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Hearing Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for making public the Senate hearing concerning such vital and potentially dangerous issues as our involvement in Vietnam. We must know the truth no matter whose image topples. We have reached the point where the American citizen no longer has a voice in the preservation and revitalization of our Constitution.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. Eda Mary McWhorter.

New York, N.Y.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Wish express complete support for your Vietnam views hope you will continue to speak.

Arnold M. Cooper.

Boston, Mass.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your courage and statesmanship in opposing the administration's unfortunate policy on Vietnam.

Dr. and Mrs. Robert M. Goldwyn.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 11, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senior Senator from Oregon, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The public hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Vietnam is an outstanding display of statesmanship and public service on the part of you and your committee colleagues and the only hopeful development of recent months. We fully agree with your desire to avoid further escalation of the war and your hope honorably to extricate our Nation from this ghastly involvement. May your efforts be successful in persuading our President to get off the collision course with China.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. C. J. Meske.

Salinas, Calif.,
February 11, 1966.

Wayne Morse and George Kennan,
Washington, D.C.:

Let us convae not convex and southeast Asia.

Ray Bennett.

Chicago, Ill.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Replace Rusk with George Kennan as SOS.

Mr. and Mrs. William Becic.

Castro Valley, Calif.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate your efforts to remedy the intolerable situation in Vietnam. May sanity prevail.

Barton Darnell,
Member of American Foreign Policy Committee, Chabot College, Hayward.

Beverly Hills, Calif.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

High time someone spoke out. Support you 100 percent on view of Vietnam investigating committee.

Mrs. Charles D. Aberle.

Fontana, Calif.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Morse of Oregon,
Member of the Foreign Relations Committee now in session, Washington, D.C.:

Add two more voices to the public clamor for ending war in Vietnam immediately. God bless you.

Walter R. and Catherine A. Zeller.

Great Neck, N.Y.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartfelt thanks for your unflagging determination to maintain the national conscience we support your every effort to inform the American people and to end the administration's war in Asia.

Helene and Norman Hall.

Cambridge, Mass.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I wish to congratulate you on the public service you have performed by your intelligent questioning of witnesses brought before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I urge you to continue the effort to limit our commitment in Vietnam.

Gilbert Steil.

Mobile, Ala.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Want to thank you for bringing to the attention of the American people our policies in Vietnam. And demanding the present administration to clarify the condition existing in Vietnam and also to coordinate with U.S. Congress any further ventures in regarding sending any further troops to Vietnam without an explanation to the American people and U.S. Congress. Thanking you for your efforts exerted on this issue.

Joseph A. Dumas, Jr.

Winston-Salem, N.C.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate the truth that is being presented to the American people by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on television. How gratifying to know there are men in Government with your concern for our country.

Grady Shumate.

Berkeley, Calif.,
February 10, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Foreign relation hearings are reviving democracy. Appreciate your questioning of witnesses. A nation thanks you.

A. Elliott Castello.

Borger, Tex.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

I have listened with deep concern of the testimony of your committee as being broadcast this week by TV and am appalled at the indecision or indifference with which witnesses are allowed to claim "That is not in my category, sir," or "I do not know, I do not handle it." May I suggest you seemed to be concerned about the grassroots, so why not call in an inexperienced, dumb, but honest citizen of these United States, to give his honest opinion of the world situation, as it affects the present strife in Asia or the entire part of Asia. Just common man asking common, honest Government.

C. A. Jacobs.

Philadelphia, Tenn.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You were so wonderful.

Mrs. Arthur E. Newbold.

McAllen, Tex.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Could not agree more with the thinking of you and the witnesses. Keep pushing.

Mr. and Mrs. S. G. Maher.

Mount Vernon, N.Y.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are a great and truly brave man. Keep attacking this monstrous war.

Dr. Bernice Bauman.

Burbank, Calif.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I support your position on Vietnam.

Sincerely,

Jack Warden.

Sewanee, Tenn.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Please bring out Ky's views on Hitler and political ideology in Senate hearings. Thank you.

John Friedel.

New York, N.Y.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: May God bless you and yours for taking a stand against our policy in Vietnam. It makes Americans like myself able to sleep a little better knowing that there are some men like you in Washington. Take care of yourself. We need you.

Mrs. J. Mann.

Inglewood, Calif.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Listening to you on TV. Keep up good work. All mothers are behind you.

Mrs. E. W. Shenefield.

Sarasota, Fla.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Although I am not one of your constituents I wish to applaud your stand at the Foreign Relations Committee hearing. You have expressed my sentiments perfectly and I thank you.

R. C. Euchenhofer.

Shaw Island, Wash.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree with you completely. Shocked at President's Honolulu statements. Are we heading toward dictatorship?

Mr. and Mrs. Delbert Hoffman.

Atlanta, Ga.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We love you for the fight you are waging for the American people. We wish our two Senators were with you.

Mr. and Mrs. C. H. Dyer.

Concord, Calif.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

I am greatly impressed with the stand that you have taken on Vietnam and your efforts to safeguard our Constitution. Today's telecast is most important step toward informing the American people. We owe many thanks to Ambassador Kennan.

Carl Kitchem.

Boston, Mass.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

I congratulate you at your outspoken speech condemning our involvement in Vietnam.

Elizabeth C. Barr,
Republican, York Harbor, Maine.

Burbank, Calif.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We support your position on Vietnam completely.

Sincerely,

Dan Frazer.

Minneapolis, Minn.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Deeply apprehensive total southeast Asian escalation. Beg gravest caution.

Thomas E. Taft.

STATEMENT BY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES CONCERNING FEDERAL BUDGETARY CUTS IN FUNDS FOR LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on Friday, February 4, 1966, the executive committee of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges released a statement which I am sure will be of interest to Senators concerning the budget proposals of the administration insofar as they affect our great land-grant institutions.

It is a thoughtful statement and one which sets forth very well the grave concern of these public institutions over the proposed curtailment of financing envisaged in the budget document.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the statement to which I have alluded be printed in the Record, together with tabular data appended thereto.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by the Executive Committee of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges Regarding Proposed Federal Budgetary Cuts in Funds for Land-Grant Institutions

The executive committee of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges views with surprise and shock the proposals in the 1967 Federal budget for a reduction of more than $20 million in instructional and research funds going to the 68 land-grant institutions, and for a shift of $10 million in support of cooperative extension programs with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, from institutional allocation by formula to Federal allocation.

The executive committee feels that the implications of these actions are of great concern to the 98 members of the association, and to higher education generally.

Relationships between the Federal Government and the land-grant institutions, in which for more than a century desirable national objectives have been accomplished with a maximum of institutional independence and decentralized decisionmaking, have long been hailed as a model of Federal-State relationships in education. An across the board modification of these institutionally related programs, at a time when Federal support of higher education is being increased in federally selected categories, may be viewed as raising fundamental philosophic issues. We were of the opinion that these were not fully understood or considered under the unusual conditions which surrounded preparation of the 1967 budget.

The proposed reduction in instructional and research funds of more than $20 million represents more than 2,000 faculty members and if put in terms of endowment represents a capital of $400 million. The Federal instructional funds cut is particularly disturbing in terms of the programs of the 16 land-grant institutions predominantly attended by Negro students. A more detailed discussion of each item appears below.

TEACHING FUNDS

The budget proposes a reduction of nearly $12 million, or 80 percent, in Federal appropriations for the further endowment of the instructional programs of the land-grant institutions. These annual appropriations, administered by the U.S. Office of Education, are for instruction or instructional materials in the natural sciences, mathematics, engineering, agriculture, and related subjects. They were initiated by unanimous act of Congress in 1890 by Senator J. S. Morrill, of Vermont, for the purpose of placing these institutions on a firm instructional foundation "for as long as this Nation shall live." As recently as 1960 Congress reviewed this program and, by unanimous action in both Houses, increased its support from $5 to $14.5 million annually, based on inflation and population growth since the last review. The proposed reduction is the equivalent of 1,200 faculty members and at least 18,000 students, at a time when enrollments are at an all time high and increasing rapidly, and students are being denied admission for lack of adequate staff. The budget message states that these funds are no longer needed because of other Federal aids for higher education.

This statement represents a gross lack of information on current Federal funds relating to higher education. The Federal Government has substantial programs to help students get into college. It helps build buildings, construct educational television facilities, and purchase equipment. It finances a wide variety of research programs. But, aside from the modest amount it now proposes to eliminate, it nowhere helps finance the central function of instruction of the undergraduates about which there is so much national concern today.

We note particularly the impact of the proposed cut on the 16 land-grant institutions predominantly attended by Negro students, which involves a reduction in instructional support of more than $1 million, representing more than 100 staff members at current rates and, through them, some 1,500 students. This is the equivalent to a 15 to 20 percent reduction in next fall's freshman class at these institutions, unless the funds are replaced from other sources—emergency appropriations from State legislatures, many of which are not in session and some of which meet only biennially, or increase in student fees and tuition. In several institutions, the Federal support proposed to be withdrawn represents the total amount of Federal funds going to the institutions. In one case, it represents one-fourth of the entire instructional budget.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

The proposed reduction of $8.5 million in research funds for the agricultural experiment stations of the land-grant institutions, coupled with a substantial reduction in U.S. Department of Agriculture research funds, is shocking at a time when our concerns are turning from agricultural surpluses to possible shortages, and food for peace is being emphasized as never before. The actual reduction in federally supported research amounts to substantially more than 20 percent, since research costs increase at the rate of 5 to 6 percent a year. This is the spigot theory of research: Under this theory one simply turns on the spigot when research results are needed, and results flow forth. Then one turns off the spigot until more results are needed. Unfortunately science has not reached the point at which faculty members and their families may be stockpiled pending the development of a food crisis in which their talents are urgently needed. Nor can research assistants, forced to turn to other careers, be quickly retrained or redirected.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK

The proposal for a shift of $10 million in support of the cooperative extension program of the land-grant institutions and the U.S. Department of Agriculture from institutional allocation to Federal allocation is described as for the purpose of assuring increased concentration of effort on rural community development and work with low-income families. The objective is praiseworthy, the method unnecessary and undesirable. The land-grant institutions have pioneered the work of rural community development and shifted resources to this area and to work with low-income families, in full cooperation and consultation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. They have also repeatedly urged additional Federal assistance for this work, which has not been forthcoming. The implications of change from cooperative consultation to Federal direction are disturbing, to say the least.

CONCLUSION

We would emphasize that the need for action is immediate and critical. Faculty arrangements for the coming academic year must normally be made within the next 2 or 3 months. Some State legislatures are on a biennial funding basis and do not meet this year. In the substantial majority of others, appropriations actions have already been concluded or will be within a brief period, leaving no available source of funds for support of the faculty positions involved in the proposed Federal budget cut.

The following members of the executive committee of the association participated in the meeting at which the above statement was unanimously agreed on: President David D. Henry, University of Illinois, chairman; President Edgar F. Shannon, Jr., University of Virginia, president of the association; President James H. Jensen, Oregon State University, president-elect; President Lewis C. Dowdy, Agricultural & Technical College of North Carolina; President Mason Gross, Rutgers University; President Fred H. Harrington, University of Wisconsin; President Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., Indiana University; Chancellor W. Clarke Wescoe, University of Kansas; Vice Presidents Robert Kerley, University of Kentucky; Boyd Page, Iowa State University; Herman Spivey, University of Kentucky; Deans Paul Sheats, University of California; and C. C. Murray, University of Georgia. Also President Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., University of Connecticut, chairman, legislative committee.

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION FUNDS

The following table shows the proposed reductions under Hatch (agricultural experiment station) formula funds, by States, which would be effected if the 1967 Federal budget proposals are approved. It does not show the total effect of the $8.5 million cut proposed, as $2,380,000 in regional research funds allocated on the basis of regional projects, are also involved:

Effect of reduction on Hatch formula funds by station

Alabama	—$154, 803
Alaska	—39, 276
Arizona	—54, 246
Arkansas	—125, 614
California	—170, 852
Colorado	—71, 560
Connecticut	—59, 084
Delaware	—42, 568
Florida	—101, 213
Georgia	—166, 981
Hawaii	—40, 973
Idaho	—67, 937
Illinois	—198, 255
Indiana	—178, 709
Iowa	—187, 918
Kansas	—117, 055
Kentucky	—185, 706
Louisiana	—117, 313
Maine	—59, 662
Maryland	—84, 252
Massachusetts	—72, 620
Michigan	—185, 031
Minnesota	—176, 166
Mississippi	—171, 854
Missouri	—174, 967
Montana	—63, 165
Nebraska	—107, 063
Nevada	—38, 280
New Hampshire	—46, 324
New Jersey	—63, 952
New Mexico	—55, 340
New York	—181, 601
North Carolina	—268, 872
North Dakota	—81, 446
Ohio	—217, 165
Oklahoma	—108, 035
Oregon	—81, 508
Pennsylvania	—217, 112
Puerto Rico	—207, 080
Rhode Island	—38, 602
South Carolina	—143, 824
South Dakota	—81, 790
Tennessee	—192, 444
Texas	—236, 724
Utah	—48, 998
Vermont	—50, 502
Virginia	—165, 377
Washington	—95, 018
West Virginia	—98, 001
Wisconsin	—176, 452
Wyoming	—45, 710
Subtotal	—6, 120, 000

NOTE.—This table does not take into account regional research funds.

RESIDENT TEACHING FUNDS FOR LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS

The following is a table by States and institutions for distribution of resident teaching funds. If the proposed budgetary cut stands there would remain of these funds only $50,000 per State, and where more than one institution is involved, this $50,000 would be allocated in the same ratio as the total now going to the State is allocated:

Funds for instruction and facilities (Morrill-Nelson, and Bankhead-Jones funds)

All land-grant institutions	$14, 500, 000
Alabama:	
Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College	95, 170
Auburn University	182, 477
Alaska: University of Alaska	205, 376
Arizona: University of Arizona	230, 951

Funds for instruction and facilities (Morrill-Nelson, and Bankhead-Jones funds)—Con.

Arkansas:	
Agricultural, Mechanical, and Normal College	$66,125
University of Arkansas	176,333
California: University of California	573,580
Colorado: Colorado State University	241,689
Connecticut: University of Connecticut	260,260
Delaware:	
Delaware State College	42,122
University of Delaware	168,486
Florida:	
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University	103,357
University of Florida	214,386
Georgia:	
Fort Valley State College	83,507
University of Georgia	210,216
Hawaii: University of Hawaii	215,040
Idaho: University of Idaho	215,858
Illinois: University of Illinois	439,618
Indiana: Purdue University	310,822
Iowa: Iowa State University of Science and Technology	265,544
Kansas: Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science	251,783
Kentucky:	
Kentucky State College	39,471
University of Kentucky	232,743
Louisiana:	
Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College	188,920
Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College	88,496
Maine: University of Maine	223,038
Maryland:	
Maryland State College, Division of the University of Maryland	32,844
University of Maryland	240,856
Massachusetts:	
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	16,667
University of Massachusetts	305,709
Michigan: Michigan State University	385,949
Minnesota: University of Minnesota	281,144
Mississippi:	
Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical College	127,519
Mississippi State University	124,253
Missouri:	
Lincoln University	18,917
University of Missouri	283,760
Montana: Montana State College	216,038
Nebraska: University of Nebraska	233,546
Nevada: University of Nevada	206,781
New Hampshire: University of New Hampshire	214,426
New Jersey: Rutgers, The State University	344,201
New Mexico: New Mexico State University	222,605
New York: Cornell University	598,897
North Carolina:	
Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina	101,737
State College of Agriculture and Engineering, University of North Carolina	206,557
North Dakota: North Dakota State University	215,032
Ohio: Ohio State University	430,710
Oklahoma:	
Langston University	25,534
Oklahoma State University of Agriculture and Applied Science	229,807
Oregon: Oregon State University	242,040
Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University	$469,049
Puerto Rico: University of Puerto Rico	255,846
Rhode Island: University of Rhode Island	220,429
South Carolina:	
Clemson Agricultural College	128,316
South Carolina State College	128,316
South Dakota: South Dakota State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts	216,175
Tennessee:	
Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University	51,599
University of Tennessee	233,187
Texas:	
Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College	106,924
Texas Agricultural and Mechanical University	320,774
Utah: Utah State University of Agriculture and Applied Science	221,169
Vermont: University of Vermont and State Agricultural College	209,267
Virginia:	
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	196,193
Virginia State College	98,097
Washington: Washington State University	267,818
West Virginia: West Virginia University	244,220
Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin	293,929
Wyoming: University of Wyoming	207,845

[From Oregon State University News Bureau, Feb. 7, 1966]

OSU PREXY CONCERNED OVER FEDERAL BUDGET CUTS FOR EDUCATION

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY.—Oregon higher education stands to lose upwards of half a million dollars annually in Federal funds if the cuts in funds for land-grant institutions in the proposed Federal budget are finally approved, President James H. Jensen, of Oregon State University, said today.

Oregon State, as this State's land-grant university, will suffer the greatest cuts. But the proposals, which caught officials of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges by surprise, will also affect the State system of higher education, President Jensen said.

The Federal budget proposes a reduction of more than $20 million in instructional and research funds going to the Nation's 68 land-grant institutions, plus a shift of $10 million in support of cooperative extension programs from institutional and State allocation to Federal allocation.

Oregon's cut in instructional funds is estimated at about $242,000, of which $157,000 will come from Oregon State University.

Dean Wilbur Cooney estimates that research funds lost to the agricultural experiment station would be up to $120,000 annually. Dollar evaluation of the effects of shifting cooperative extension funds has not been estimated but these designated programs would be allocated from Washington rather than on a State or county level.

Dr. Jensen, as president-elect of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, met with top Department of Agriculture and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare officials along with other members of the association's executive committee earlier.

The association's executive committee, President Jensen said, "viewed with surprise and shock the proposals in the 1967 Federal budget."

He said the committee, representing 97 major State and land-grant universities in all 50 States, felt that implications of those actions are of great concern to members of the association and to higher education generally.

The committee's statement recalled the Federal Government land-grant institution relationships over the past 100 years and how they had been hailed as a model of Federal-State relationships in education. It explained that this satisfactory relationship is now threatened by the Federal proposals.

"The proposed reduction of $8½ million in research funds for the agricultural experiment stations, coupled with a substantial reduction in U.S. Department of Agriculture research funds, is shocking at a time when our concerns are turning from agricultural surpluses to possible shortages and food for peace is being emphasized as never before," the university leaders said in their statement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say that at the early hearings on my subcommittee we shall call witnesses, some of them not only from land-grant colleges, but also from elementary and secondary schools, as well as other colleges and universities from whom we are hearing these days, in opposition to various aspects of the President's budget in relation to education.

They point out that if some of those budget reductions were ultimately approved by the Congress, great damage would be done to the implementation of educational legislation passed in the 88th and the first part of the 89th Congresses.

CONFRONTATION WITH CHINA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, President Johnson has stated repeatedly his desire is to negotiate for an armistice and cease-fire in Vietnam. He has submitted the Vietnam question to the United Nations Security Council. This action at long last is what he declined to do months ago. He has stated that there are no conditions attached to our efforts to sit down at a conference table to try to accomplish peace in Vietnam. He said he would go anywhere in the search for peace. Then he proposed that the Geneva Conference of 1954 could be reconvened and we would participate in this without conditions.

Unfortunately, these peace gestures were made by our President directly following the time he ordered a resumption of bombing of North Vietnam. This was poor timing, it seemed to me.

Furthermore, it is doubtful if the limited amount of destruction perpetrated in bombing targets in North Vietnam is justified by the loss of precious lives in planes shot down and by the destruction of more than $600 million cost value of our bombers and helicopters.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk is neither frank nor honest in dealing with the American people. In his speeches he repeatedly says that if the Communists from the North would leave their neighbors to the South alone, we Americans would withdraw our forces. He was asked, at a meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate whether he would agree to the Vietcong being represented at peace talks. He refused to answer this question. He said he would have to consider it. Secretary Rusk's position is at variance with the recent public representations of President Johnson.

Of course, the Vietcong or National Liberation Front, so called, must be represented by delegates at any conference seeking to end this conflict. The members of the National Liberation Front, so-called, or Vietcong are in control of nearly 75 percent of the land area of South Vietnam, whereas the Saigon government of Prime Minister Ky, controls only 25 percent of the land area of South Vietnam. We are involved with more than 200,000 men of our Armed Forces in a civil war in Vietnam.

The leader of the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam, Nguyen Huu Tho, is a Saigon lawyer. He is not a Communist. He was born and reared in South Vietnam. Prime Minister Ky, who was installed as dictator by 10 generals who revolted and maneuvered a coup overthrowing the civilian government of Prime Minister Quat, was born and reared in Hanoi, North Vietnam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Prime Minister Ky talks about his democratic government of South Vietnam. It is evident that he could not remain as Prime Minister of the Saigon Government for 1 week without the support of the CIA and of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Let us hope that the Vietnam question will be considered very soon in the United Nations or by reconvening the Geneva Conference of 1954. Vietnam is of no strategic importance to the defense of the United States.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch recently published an editorial, "The U.N.'s Hard Task in Vietnam." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

Also, Mr. President, in the Washington Post of Tuesday, February 15, there appeared a very convincing column by Walter Lippmann entitled, "Confrontation With China." I commend this to my colleagues and ask that it also be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Jan. 31–Feb. 6, 1966]

THE U.N.'S HARD TASK IN VIETNAM

In submitting the Vietnam question to the United Nations Security Council, President Johnson has done what for many months he declined to do. The reversal of policy is welcome, and all who want peace in southeast Asia will hope that the Security Council can find a way out of the morass.

If it is to do so with American help, another policy reversal will be required: we shall have to stop insisting that the Vietcong, who control two-thirds of South Vietnam, be excluded from peace talks and from the political future of the country.

Unfortunately the President has made the U.N.'s task extremely difficult by resuming the bombing of North Vietnam. That he rejected the counsel of Pope Paul, U Thant, and many others for extension of the bombing pause, at least for a period long enough to permit U.N. consideration of his request in a relatively calm atmosphere, can only be regarded as tragic.

Mr. Johnson says that resumed bombing is necessary to save the lives of American and South Vietnamese troops. The contention is difficult to accept in the absence of a showing that any lives were lost as a result of the 37-day suspension that ended Monday.

On the contrary, this was a period of unusually light operations by the Vietcong. It was a period when the United States continued its own troop buildup with impunity; 4,000 more marines, in addition to the 7,000 landed 2 weeks ago, went ashore only last Friday. It was a period when American air attacks throughout South Vietnam continued with unabated fury.

The President also hinges his decision on President Ho Chi Minh's letter of last Friday, which he interprets as total and unqualified rejection of his peace talks proposal. Yet as Marquis Childs reported in the Post-Dispatch, Ambassador Harriman was telling the dissident Senators on Thursday, before Ho's reply was broadcast, that the decision to resume bombing had already been made.

Ho's position, it seems to us, is subject to two interpretations. While he laid down unacceptable conditions for peace, such as American recognition of the National Liberation Front as the sole representative of the South Vietnamese people, he did not make these demands a condition for negotiations, and seemed to be opening a dialog on the President's 14 points as compared with his own 4 points. Mr. Johnson claims to base his 14 points on the Geneva agreements of 1954. Ho claims to base his 4 points on the same agreements. Clearly, the way to a political settlement lies in a reconciliation of the two programs calculated to apply the Geneva accords to the situation that now exists. In our view, Ho's letter did not necessarily rule out an ultimate settlement along those lines.

He did, however, seem to rule out the possibility of any political settlement so long as North Vietnam is under bombing attack. The resumption of bombing therefore would appear to make negotiations more difficult than ever to obtain. One must hope that the Security Council can overcome the difficulties, whether through Pope Paul's suggested arbitration procedure or otherwise.

The essentials of the problem remain what they were. Ho Chi Minh interprets American policy as determined to impose an anti-Communist puppet government on South Vietnam as a whole: The United States interprets Hanoi policy as determined to impose Communist rule upon South Vietnam as a whole. At the same time, the United States claims it wants no bases in Vietnam will accept neutrality, and favors free elections to give the South Vietnamese a government of their own choice. Ho Chi Minh, for his part, claims to want only "independence, democracy, peace and neutrality" for South Vietnam.

In general, the stated objectives of both sides are within negotiable limits if each can be convinced that the other means what it says in terms of specifics. Somehow the United States must demonstrate that it is ready to accept Vietcong participation in the political future of South Vietnam, and Hanoi must demonstrate that it does not demand a Vietcong monopoly of that future.

An agreement based on these principles, and on the essentials of the Geneva accords, would correctly reflect the military realities, and pave the way for an end of intervention on both sides. It is earnestly to be hoped that the Security Council, despite the handicaps under which it now must labor, will be able to move both sides in this direction.

CONFRONTATION WITH CHINA

(By Walter Lippmann)

The televised hearings, at which General Gavin and Ambassador Kennan appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, have done an inestimable service to our people. For they broke through the official screen and made visible the nature of the war and where our present policy is leading us. On the rule that if you cannot beat them, join them, which in its modern form is that if you cannot debate with them, say you agree with them, the President takes the position that there is not much difference between the Gavin-Kennan thesis and the Rusk-McNamara policy.

There is in fact a radical difference, the difference between a limited and an unlimited war. The President may not want to fight an unlimited war. I have no doubt myself that he does not want to do so. But the promises he made in Honolulu which the Vice President is now broadcasting so lavishly in Saigon and Bangkok, are—if they are to be taken seriously—an unlimited commitment of American soldiers and American money. It is this unlimited commitment which those of us who belong to the Gavin-Kennan school oppose. For we see that as the numbers of our troops and the range of our bombing are escalated, and as the theater of the war becomes widened, it is highly probable, indeed it is well nigh inevitable that the United States will find itself confronting China in a land war on the mainland of Asia.

Last week's hearings made visible that this is where the course we are taking leads. Congress and the people would be frivolous if they did not examine with the utmost seriousness how real, how valid, how significant is the hypothesis that the kind of war the Johnson administration is conducting is leading to a confrontation with China.

Gen. Maxwell Taylor, who since 1961 has played a leading part in our military intervention in South Vietnam, has recognized that the prospect of a land war with China is today our greatest worry. In an interview published in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report, General Taylor is asked about the danger of "a military confrontation with Communist China." He replies that "one can never rule out the possibility. But I would list the probability quite low in terms of percentage."

This has an ominous resemblance to the colloquy in 1950 between President Truman and General MacArthur. (Cf. Lawson, "The United States in the Korean War," p. 79.)

"In your opinion" President Truman asked General MacArthur, "is there any chance that the Chinese might enter the war on the side of North Korea?"

MacArthur shook his head. "I'd say there's very little chance of that happening. They have several hundred thousand men north of the Yalu, but they haven't any air force. If they tried to cross the river our Air Force would slaughter them. At the most perhaps 60,000 troops would make it. Our infantry could easily contain them. I expect the actual fighting in North Korea to end by Thanksgiving. We should have our men home, or at least in Japan, by Christmas."

At the very moment that President Truman and General MacArthur were talking there were already more than a hundred thousand Chinese Communist troops in North Korea, and another 200,000 were ready to cross the Yalu. By mid-November at least 300,000 Chinese would be poised to strike—and the ROK, the American, and other U.N. forces would not even be aware of their presence. Before the war was over the Chinese Communist armies in Korea would reach a peak strength of more than a million men.

On the question of the need to contain the military expansion of Red China, there is virtually universal agreement in this country. The containment of Red China today, like the containment of Stalinist Russia after the World War, is necessary to the peace of the world and is a vital interest of the United States. What is debatable is the diplomatic policy we are pursuing in order to contain Red China. If we compare what Mr. Rusk and Mr. William Bundy are doing with the diplomatic policy by which some 15 years ago Stalin was contained, the differences are very striking.

The cardinal difference is that our Chinese containment policy is a unilateral American policy, whereas our Stalinist containment policy was shared with and participated in by all the Western Allies. It is often said officially that in the Far East today we are repeating what was done so successfully in Europe. If this were what we are doing, there would be an alliance to contain China in which Japan, Russia, India, Pakistan, the United States, Great Britain, and France were alined in a Far Eastern Marshall plan and NATO. Instead, owing to the miscalculations and blundering of the Vietnamese war, we have alienated and indeed neutralized all the great powers of the Asian mainland.

The difference between the two containment policies in Europe and in the Far East is the difference between realism and verbalism, between professionalism and amateurism. Our present policy is as if we had set out to contain Stalinist Russia by ignoring the British, the French, the Italians, and the Germans, and had decided to make our stand against communism by the defense of—let us say—Bucharest.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Ohio for the statement which he has just made and for his fearless leadership in the Senate on this foreign policy issue.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OBJECT TO LIMITATION OF DEBATE ON THE SUPPLEMENTAL MILITARY AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there was one notification which I understand was made in the Senate a few minutes ago, and also before I could get to the floor of the Senate, to which I wish to refer. It was announced that no unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate with regard to the pending measure will be made today.

I shall object to any unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate on the pending measure at any time.

I also want to make it clear that I shall not be a party to any dilatory tactics, to any deliberate attempt to prevent a vote from coming on the floor of the Senate after there has been an opportunity for normal debate. But when we are living through the hours that Americans historically will be living through as this historic record is made I am not going to agree to have any limitation on debate whatsoever. Therefore, I announce now that if I am on the floor I shall object to any limitation of time on debate. I inform my leadership that I am opposed to any limitation of debate, and if I do not have assurance from the leadership that there will not be any limitation of time, I shall see that some Senator is present on the floor to make objection in my behalf.

"VIETNAM PERSPECTIVE: CONGRESS AFTER HONOLULU"—A TELEVISION PROGRAM BY CBS TRULY IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last Sunday afternoon—February 13, 1966—the Columbia Broadcasting System, in continuation of its praiseworthy series of informing the American public about the issues involved in the undeclared war in Vietnam—a series ably directed by Eric Sevareid and Fred Friendly—presented an hour-long discussion of those issues.

I was honored to be invited to participate, along with my able and distinguished colleagues, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. TOWER.

The discussion on the program—which was broadcast live—was spirited and, in the short time available, sought to bring forth all possible points of view.

The distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] summed up the basic problem confronting this Nation when he said:

> I am for getting a good policy that will deal more effectively with the phenonema of revolution. We are going to live in a generation of revolution throughout all of Latin America, Africa, Asia, for a long time to come.

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of that television broadcast be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM PERSPECTIVE: CONGRESS AFTER HONOLULU

(A broadcast over the CBS Television Network and the CBS Radio Network, Sunday, February 13, 1966)

Guests: Senators FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho; ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska; JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York; STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri; JOHN G. TOWER, Republican, of Texas.

Moderator: Eric Sevareid.

Producer: William J. Small.

Director: Robert Camfiord.

ANNOUNCER. As part of its continuing coverage of the Vietnam conflict, CBS News presents "Vietnam Perspective: Congress After Honolulu."

Here to lead the discussion this afternoon is CBS News Correspondent Eric Sevareid.

Mr. SEVAREID. Good afternoon. Two weeks ago today five Members of the U.S. Congress sat at this table and debated the Vietnam war, its premises, its legality, its conduct, and its possible outcome.

The next day the President resumed the bombing of North Vietnam and took his plea for peace to the United Nations.

The fighting goes on as before. The talk about peace goes on, but no peace negotiations seem to be in prospect. And in the meantime the President has held a dramatic conference in Honolulu with the leaders of the Saigon government.

How much of all this represents forward movement, either toward peace or prosecution of the war, and how much is just motion is rather hard to tell.

If anything anywhere has changed, it is the intensity of the domestic debate over Vietnam.

As broadcast viewers and listeners, as letterwriters, as demonstrators and counter-demonstrators, the American people are entering this argument more and more.

Let us try again today to put this complex and troubling combination war and peace effort into some focus.

Five more Senators of differing persuasions are with us this afternoon. Let me introduce them in alphabetical order.

FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, member of the Foreign Relations Committee which has been holding public hearings this week.

ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, of the Government Operations Committee, who has been opposed to this war from its beginning.

JACOB JAVITS, of New York, recently back from South Vietnam, for the Government Operations Committee.

STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, member of the Foreign Relations and the Armed Services Committees, and former Air Force Secretary.

JOHN TOWER, of Texas, member of the Armed Services Committee, also just returned from Vietnam.

Gentlemen, I think we might try first to deal for a little while with this Honolulu conference just over. I would like to know how you read its results and what you make of it. Senator CHURCH.

Senator CHURCH. Well, Eric, I think there are pros and cons. Only the future will tell.

On the debit side, the President has laid hands, so to speak, upon Air Marshal Ky and thus has invested him with the great prestige of the American presidency. This could prove a problem in the future if a need should develop for broadening the popular base of the Saigon regime.

On the credit side, I am glad of the emphasis that was given to the need for social and economic, political, reform in this situation in South Vietnam.

But I recall that—I think even in the first letter that President Eisenhower sent out that committed us to the initial assistance in 1954, there was mention of the need for reform, at that time relating to the Diem regime. And if I am not mistaken, Lyndon Johnson, when Vice President, went out there in 1961, again on a mission which gave emphasis to the need for reform and securing a broader popular base. And now Vice President HUMPHREY is there for that same purpose. And obviously, this is a problem, a continuing problem, that we recognize, but a problem easier to define than to solve.

Finally, one caveat.

I think at Honolulu the statements of Air Marshal Ky and of our own Government indicate a definite split on the question of negotiation and on the question of the possible inclusion of the Vietcong.

If this split is as serious as it seems, that is a warning flag for the future.

Mr. SEVAREID. Any of the rest of you think it is serious?

Senator JAVITS. Well, a word on that Honolulu Conference.

It seemed to me that a number of things developed and a number of things did not develop.

For one, I think it showed to the liberals that the President means to follow that line, by espousing the social revolution in South Vietnam—the aspirations of the people for better health, better housing, better land tenure and all the things they fought for for so many years.

It is interesting to me that notwithstanding the fact that this should appeal to the liberals, and that the liberals should be for the limited struggle in Vietnam, because it is a struggle for freedom, the Honolulu conference showed up even more sharply the divisions within the President's own party and, interestingly enough, the real consensus on the Republican side, which is giving him all kinds of backing.

Just one other point which seems to me to be clear from Honolulu.

The central thing now stands out to be what are you going to do with the Vietcong if there is ever going to be a peace conference, and I do not think there is any question about the fact that they have to be a party, whether they are an independent party or a group or whatever you call them—they have to be a party. And the sooner that we state that unequivocally, I think, the more chance there will be to get to the negotiating table.

Finally, I think it is mature consensus on the part of the people, which was contributed to by the Senate hearings, that there is a way of limiting the South Vietnam conflict, and that is in the effort to consolidate and pacify the coastal areas and the Mekong Delta and area around Saigon where there are 70 to 80 percent of the people all within ready reach of air and naval power. And that I think is the ultimate thrust of the Gavin idea and the way in which a consensus can be developed on that.

Mr. Savareid. We may get back to the Gavin idea in just a moment.

I think Senator Symington wanted to talk about this conference.

Senator Symington. Yes. As Commander in Chief of this country, inasmuch as CINCPAC in Hawaii runs the Far East militarily, it seemed quite logical to me for the Commander in Chief, with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, to go out and talk with Admiral Sharp and General Waters and General Harris, and then at the same time to have General Westmoreland, who wears two hats, one toward Hawaii and the other to the Joint Chiefs here, to be in the discussion—and also to have Ambassador Lodge there to give his position with respect to it.

In addition to that, I think it was probably wise that he brought the head of the Government out there, Ky, because General Ky—because I was in Saigon last month and my impression was that if we were going to recognize the Vietcong separately, within a few hours that automatically meant the fall of the Government. Therefore, if General Ky felt that way, he was probably reassured by the attention that was given him.

Finally, I would like to join my colleague, Senator Church, in saying that I was very glad to note the emphasis that was paid in Hawaii to the economic and social developments that are at least as important as any other in this overall picture.

Mr. Savareid. Most of you so far seem to think there was not just a waste of effort. Senator Tower, do you have different ideas?

Senator Tower. No. I agree that this was not a wasted effort. I think it is altogether mete and proper that the President should go there and that he should meet with the Vietnamese heads of state. I think it is good that we should add a little prestige and stature to that Government, because apparently it is the most stable Government we have had there since the Diem regime.

I think, too, that it is good that we have placed emphasis on the civic action programs that we have already been engaged in over there.

Actually the idea of assisting these people agriculturally, healthwise, assisting them with political and social reforms is not new. We have been doing this in Vietnam. Our servicemen, as well as fighting, have been on the constructive side, working with our USAM officials over there, in conducting these civic action programs, which I think are turning out to be a great success.

They are teaching these people the rudiments of sanitation, they are showing them how to get pure water supply, helping them combat disease, infection, showing them how to get the maximum utilization out of their land. And, more important, teaching them the art of self-government. The French failed to develop any native leadership over there. We are currently doing that now.

Mr. Sevareid. Senator Gruening has been listening. Would you like to speak, sir?

Senator Gruening. This Honolulu Conference was a big buildup for the Premier, Nguyen Ky, who is the ninth head of government since our first white-haired boy, Diem, was disposed of 2½ years ago. How useful he will be in bringing freedom to his people and having these reforms may be judged by his statement when he was interviewed by the London Mirror last July 4, when he said:

"People ask me who my heros are. I have only one—Adolf Hitler. We need four or five Hitlers in Vietnam."

That is the man we have built up, he is the man whom we depend upon to bring about these reforms. I have no confidence these reforms will take place any more than they have taken place in the last 12 years when we said the same thing. Eisenhower tried to do the same thing. It is not going to happen—not with that man.

Mr. Sevareid. That may be a question that would be pretty hard to answer, except over a course of time, I would think.

But let me ask you gentlemen this.

Do any of you find the same objection to that Conference that our ex-diplomat George Kennan had this week in testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee? He thought it wrong to have this public tieup with the Saigon government at the same time that we had taken this issue to the United Nations.

Does that bother anyone?

Senator Church?

Senator Tower. Well, I would disagree that the timing was bad. I think that the timing was very good, because I'm afraid that with our long peace offensive, with the long moratorium on bombing, that perhaps some people in Asia had gotten the impression that we had no real will or determination to prevail in southeast Asia, that we were trying to find some face-saving device to enable us to withdraw. And therefore I think that this Conference was very timely, to show our determination to stay in South Vietnam until we have achieved what the President said is our minimum objective, and that is the guarantee of the independence of South Vietnam.

Senator Church. Since you first turned that question to me, may I say a word or two about it.

I think that what was unfortunate was the statement that Air Marshal Ky himself made—I agree with Senator Gruening.

I think there are grounds to wonder whether this man really represents the wave of the future in southeast Asia. And I think that when he said in Honolulu that he in effect was not much interested in negotiations, and that in any case there would be no negotiating with the Vietcong, that this did render our position more difficult for us at the United Nations. And I should think it renders the President's position more difficult. I thought that was one of the—one of the unfortunate consequences.

Senator Symington. There is a side to that also—and that is that the Premier Ky comes from the north country and there has been increasing irritation in the south, including Saigon, about the dominance of people in the north, which to some extent must have affected his control.

For example, I was told out there that there might be another coup—although Ambassador Lodge said—well, he was only supposed to last 6 weeks and he has now lasted over 6 months.

On the other hand, I think it is unfair to compare him to Hitler. We have had our own President and our own Foreign Relations Committee—recently there was some talk about Hitler——

Senator Gruening. No one has compared him to Hitler. Ky said the one man he admired most was Hitler.

Senator Symington. Because if you take something out of context about the man—the truth is that he has come much further in his emphasis on the importance of land reform and on the importance of a new deal than anybody else who has been in charge of that Government so far. And I would rather take somebody who has been there a long time, like Cabot Lodge, or like the other people—I would rather take their word for the possibilities under him than I would people who would take a long-distance approach and have never discussed the matter with him, which I have done myself.

Senator Javits. Well, Senator, I do not think it is necessary for us to say we are all out for Ky. This statement that he made about Hitler is pretty rugged, very hard for anybody in the world to take.

I think the answer is that this is the Government for the time being, and we have got to work with him. And that should not inhibit our independent attitude toward the development of the country in economic and social terms.

I think for one that Honolulu was essential, because at the United Nations we said we want peace at almost any price. That is great. Now, if the other side won't negotiate for peace, Honolulu had to answer what do we do. Well, we are going to launch a new campaign on the social revolution front, with Humphrey as its coordinator. We need it sadly—a basic coordinator. And secondly, we are developing and putting forward a strategy which is viable for us until there are not just one. to wit, ourselves, but two to talk peace.

And so I think Honolulu was very needed and very constructive.

Mr. Sevareid. Gentlemen, I don't want to go too far with the Honolulu Conference. Our time is running on, and there are some other things probably of more importance.

Now, one thing is this Foreign Relations Committee hearing this past week. They have dealt with the issues. But these hearings themselves have become something of an issue—whether they are injuring the morale of troops, or our negotiating position, or our fighting position.

How do you feel about this? How about you, Senator Symington? You have sat on them.

Senator Symington. I think these hearings are all right. The witnesses so far have been pretty critical of our current administrative program, just as you have illustrated, Eric, with respect to Mr. Kennan's thinking about the Commander in Chief going to Hawaii.

But, on the other hand, let's ventilate the subject, as Mr. Dirksen would say—and it is being done.

I would hope that people postpone their final opinions about it until they hear General Taylor on next Thursday and Secretary Rusk on Friday.

Mr. Sevareid. Is there any man at this table who believes these hearings are harmful to the national interest?

Senator Javits. I think they are very good, Eric, and I will tell you why.

What you really ought to have is the President coming back to Congress for an updating of the resolution of August 1964, the dog-eared one he carries in his pocket and constantly refers to, which gives him power to use the Armed Forces of the United States, etc. That is completely outdated. And anything that leads to getting the President to do that—and I think these hearings are definitely a step in that direction—is good.

It is high time the whole country were crystallized behind what is the new policy, and the only way to do that is to get the backing of the Congress. And personally I think that is a very serious mistake the President is making, in not coming back to the Congress for a new resolution.

Mr. SEVAREID. In other words, you think the hearings are going to help him in the end, not damage his position.

Senator JAVITS. They will help the people's cause by crystallizing the Congress and the American people behind a policy which will be enough like his policy so that he ought to come and ask for that kind of support.

Mr. SEVAREID. I know you have a new resolution to crystallize it.

Senator GRUENING.

Senator GRUENING. I think these hearings are long overdue; they should have taken place years ago, when we engaged in what is called a commitment—although I am convinced there never was any such commitment—but if the administration thinks so, then that kind of commitment required a treaty from the Senate. And way back, when we made or alleged we were making that kind of a commitment, the President then or his successor should have gone to the Senate for the treatymaking power.

What right have we got to commit ourselves to defend the frontiers of another country and send our troops down there without the consent of the Senate formally sought and obtained? We have none.

Mr. SEVAREID. You are saying in effect the hearings have come about because of the manner we got into this war, that there would have to be such hearings at some point.

Senator GRUENING. Yes—that they are overdue.

Senator CHURCH. Eric, at that point let me say—I would like to emphasize the fact that the Foreign Relations Committee has a constitutional responsibility to advise and consent in the matter of foreign policy. And for years the committee has been tending to conduct its business more and more behind closed doors.

Now, when we came back to Congress this year, the gravity of the situation had become such in southeast Asia that we felt we had to come out from behind closed doors, and in the public, examine the premises that have led us into this situation, and take stock of the situation, and try to determine what is portended for the future. And this business is the business of the American people, and they should be included, and they have been through those hearings.

Mr. SEVAREID. Well, now, gentlemen, the President said 2 days ago, as I recollect, that he had followed these hearings, or the testimony from them, and that he could not see that any concrete, clear alternative policies had been proposed at the hearings by people like General Gavin or Mr. George Kennan; the tone of their testimony appeared to be in opposition to what we are doing.

Did you discover, those of you who sat there, any concrete alternative that struck you as worth following?

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, General Gavin's testimony was rather difficult to follow, because in the covering letter it said that he wanted—did not want to resume bombing in North Vietnam, and that he did want to withdraw to coastal enclaves. But then in direct testimony he denied that he felt that way about it. And also he denied that he was against the policies as advertised in an advertisement in the paper which said that he was against the President's policies.

So I think it is fair to say, and perhaps a little charitable to say, that his testimony was fuzzy as to just exactly what he stood for.

In the case of Mr. Kennan, I think that his position was more clear. He, in effect, as I gathered his testimony, wanted to strictly stick to a land war, if any war, in South Vietnam.

Mr. SEVAREID. To a land war.

Senator SYMINGTON. Yes.

Mr. SEVAREID. Well, gentlemen, as I tried to follow those hearings, it seemed to me that both General Gavin and Mr. Kennan were talking about far more than just how the war should be conducted now—what the aims should be in Vietnam. They were looking at it in terms, as I gathered, of our whole world position. We have troops in Korea, in West Europe, and many places where things could happen. And that this was what one of them I think called possibly a baited trap. I suppose meaning that China might come in or that we would get overcommitted there in relation to our other commitments.

Do any of you have a feeling that Vietnam is sucking us into a position where we will be way off balance?

Senator GRUENING. Well, I think that there was no effort on the part of Mr. Kennan, whose testimony was most useful, to come up with a solution. He was relating it to the whole situation. He was not asked for a particular solution. And I think that some of us have ideas on the subject—but I think that would emerge from the findings of the committee.

I think at the end of the hearings they will probably come up with some recommendations. I hope so.

Senator JAVITS. Well, I would say, Eric, that I think the testimony of both Kennan and Gavin was extremely useful in crystallizing a position the administration has left very fuzzy.

For one, it is a fact that we do not want general mobilization for Vietnam, but we are willing to devote to it—and I think this is a national consensus—such resources as can be devoted without general mobilization. And that seems to be in the general order of magnitude of up to 400,000 troops, and all the other things we are doing there.

Now, what Gavin and Kennan said in effect—and you cannot hold them word for word—is there is a strategy of consolidating our hold on the coastal regions, the Mekong Delta, the Saigon area, engaging in a pacification program there, and in a sense making that our stand—just as when we withdrew from the Yalu into South Korea that became our stand.

Now, it seems to be a generally accepted proposition that even if the Communist Chinese come in—and you cannot tell when they will come in—that is in their control—even if they do come in, the long logistical lines which represent our stand on the coast around Saigon and in the Mekong Delta makes our position viable.

Therefore, what Gavin and Kennan, as I see it, were laying before the country in effect, was here is the way in which you can take a limited position, devoting to it the resources which you have available and reasonable without jeopardizing your situation in the rest of the world and without general mobilization and without a declaration of war, which I am against, and at the same time maintain a position in the confrontation between ourselves and the Communist Chinese push in Asia.

As I see it, that is in effect what they recommended, and it seems to me that gave the lines of a perfectly viable position for the United States.

Mr. SEVAREID. It seems rather unusual for me that Senators would sit and try to thrash out alternative military strategies for this country, which is in a war.

Senator CHURCH. I don't think, Eric, that the purpose of this hearing is to come up with any miracle cures in Vietnam. I think it is generally recognized that what has been done there cannot be suddenly undone.

There are some omelets that are not digestible, but I don't know of any that can be unscrambled. And the President's options are narrowing.

Now, he is striving to find the rudiments for a satisfactory political settlement. He is striving to locate that diplomatic door which will lead to the negotiating table and he is striving to keep the war confined within manageable limits. And in all of these endeavors he certainly has my full-hearted support.

I think what the committee is looking to is to something both behind and beyond Vietnam. What kind of role are we assuming on the mainland of Asia and in the underdeveloped world that led us into Vietnam in the first place, and don't we have to take another careful look at these premises? Do we have the kind of policy that is well-designed to cope with the problem of guerrilla warfare, of wars of so-called national liberation in the ex-colonial part of the world? And is the best means the massive intervention of American troops imported from the opposite side of the world?

These are the things, I think, the long, searching questions, that we have got to grope with if we are going to fashion a policy in Asia that will work for the United States.

Mr. SEVAREID. While the Senate and others argue about overinvesting or not overinvesting resources, men, and money in that tip of Asia, the investment goes on, decisions by others.

Is this fruitful at all—Senator SYMINGTON?

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, first, if I may, Eric, I would like to go back to the question of "fuzzy". I don't think the administration's position is fuzzy today. I think it is clear. I don't agree with all of it, but I think it is clear.

I explained why I thought that General Gavin's testimony was fuzzy.

Now let's take Ambassador Kennan's testimony.

Don't misunderstand me. I want to get into the big, broad problems that have just been discussed by my good colleague from Idaho.

But we have a problem. We are killing a great many American boys every week.

Ambassador Kennan—former Ambassador Kennan—said "I am opposed to strategic bombing."

I said "Well, will you define strategic bombing."

He said, any bombing that hasn't got a direct relationship with troops.

Well, I said "For example, would you consider strategic bombing bombing a bus that was going down the Ho Chi Minh Trail full of ammunition and soldiers and guns?"

He said yes, it would be; therefore he would be opposed to it unless you were sure it was going to be used against our troops.

Now, there have been a great many figures used in executive sessions of the Armed Services Committee about the number of additional troops that would be required—from 600,000, I believe, John, to 500,000 and then 100,000 to 300,000.

And I asked him this question. "Would you agree to bomb military targets in North Vietnam," military targets, let me emphasize, "if that would save 100,000 men, additional Americans, being needed and drafted out of their homes into South Vietnam."

And he said "Well, that is a serious question. I would have to study it."

Now, I think his testimony was fuzzy. I think—that, to me, is a fuzzy answer. And I would hope that at some time we would get a witness up there who would be clear as to just why it is we don't go after the military targets, and military only like power and petroleum, at the same time we know that they are coming down in such heavy quantities down the Ho Chi Minh trail and being used against the troops of the United States and the South Vietnamese in South Vietnam.

Senator CHURCH. Can I just say in that respect that I don't regard Ambassador Kennan as an authority when it comes to bombing, and certainly some of the questions you posed to him we would have no argument about. But I do regard him as an authority with respect to the overall strategy of dealing with the Communist world.

He was the architect of the successful containment policy in Europe, and his opinions are entitled to a lot of respect, and I think this was where on the diplomatic front, the strategic front, that he really made a very fine contribution, and what he said, in effect, was, let's not let the tail wag the dog, and invest so much resource in manpower, in treasure, in southeast Asia that we find ourselves at serious disadvantage elsewhere. And the President has just said that he is in agreement with that, that he does not—that he does not propose the kind of an accelerated war that might engage us in a massive confrontation in Asia.

Senator SYMINGTON. But he brought it up, FRANK. I didn't bring it up. He said no more strategic bombing, so I asked him to define it.

Senator CHURCH. Well, he is a diplomat. He is not an airman and not a bomber, and I think it is in that phase of his testimony that he made a real contribution.

Mr. SEVAREID. Does Senator GRUENING wish to come in?

Senator GRUENING. I think that the questions that the former Secretary of the Air Force asked Mr. Kennan had to do with military details which were not in Mr. Kennan's field.

What he hoped to bring out was that this was a great error in view of our worldwide commitments, and I am hoping that this investigation before we get through with it will point out how completely false the premises are which justify our going in there.

I can demonstrate—there won't be time on this program—conclusively from the very documents which are used by the administration to prove why we are in Vietnam—this one (holding up the State Department's brochure entitled "Why Vietnam?")—that there was no commitment. President Eisenhower made no commitment to send in troops. He offered economic aid on a very tentative basis and we were not, as alleged, asked in there by a friendly government. We asked ourselves in. And Jack Kennedy never did anything more than send in advisers.

It is only under this administration that we sent troops into combat, and those are questions which I hope the Committee on Foreign Relations will bring out. I think the American public, which has been misled so long, is entitled to know these facts. And I hope in the subsequent hearings these facts will be thoroughly aired. It is about time the American people were let in on what has been going on without their knowledge.

Senator TOWER. The fact remains that North Vietnam has intensified its effort in South Vietnam during the course of this administration, necessitating some reaction on our part. Had we not literally sent the cavalry to the rescue last summer, the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese would have cut through the central highlands, cut their country in two. It would have probably overrun it by now.

Now, certainly it is true that Vietnam, South Vietnam, taken alone has no great geographic and strategic importance. But southeast Asia does. And this is where the front is. This is where Communist aggression is manifest. If we don't combat it here, aren't we going to encourage the precipitation of so-called wars of national liberation in other spots?

Senator JAVITS. Well, the whole idea is that you are encouraging the technique of wars of national liberation because you show an inability to deal with them, and you've got upsets right now in northern Thailand. You had it in northern India.

Senator TOWER. The point I was making.

Senator JAVITS. Exactly right, and you are going to face the situation in south and southeast Asia when you are facing it here, and you are getting prepared for.

I did want to say a word, Eric, about this bombardment thing, which I think is very—to my mind, has been a big obsession with lots of people.

The fact is that once you determine the size and character of your commitment in South Vietnam, and let's assume that the American people are getting to some consensus on that, then everything falls into place. If you are trying to do just so much and you have just so many people involved, then what bombardment you have to undertake, and I am not against the bombardment of the supply lines at all, relates to the size and character of your military decision as to exactly what you are going to commit.

But I do believe that what you are going to try to do, the purpose you are going to try to accomplish, and the means you are going to try to commit to it, this is a very important element of congressional as well as Presidential decision, and I feel very strongly that we should have our say in that, and I believe that it will come down to pretty much this philosophy of pacification of the areas which are within reach, 30 to 50 miles of the coast, Mekong Delta, the Saigon area, where there is 70 to 80 percent of the population, the necessary men to do that, and then everything that follows to protect that position en suite, including the extent of bombardment which is required for it, and we have to be prepared to face that as a total strategy, a total political decision with the military consequences which ensue.

Mr. SEVAREID. Gentlemen, I hate to interrupt at this point even for the 5 seconds necessary, but let us pause now for station identification.

* * * * *

Mr. SEVAREID. Gentlemen, some very fundamental questions have been raised in the debate in the Senate and in the press recently and in some of the remarks of the President. In Honolulu he said something to the effect that subjugation by an armed minority in Asia is not different from the same phenomenon in Europe, that we have expended a lot of treasure and blood to reverse such things.

But from our position in the world, are these two things equal? Is Germany or France, for example, equal to this little country in southeast Asia? Senator Church?

SENATOR CHURCH. No, Eric. We have got to make better distinctions, I think, than that.

In the first place, we went back to Europe after the Second World War because we recognized that if all of Europe fell to the Russians and the Red Army in occupation of Eastern Europe was moving the Iron Curtain inexorably westward, that then the balance of power would shift from our favor to theirs, and I think we must not confuse the situation in Europe with the problem that faces us in Asia.

In Europe, after all, we went back and were welcomed among people with whom we had a common civilization, common culture. The great majority of these people found communism as repugnant as we found it and willingly joined in a real system of collective defense against it, and that was the NATO line. But the NATO line just stopped the Iron Curtain from moving further west. It didn't exterminate communism behind the Iron Curtain.

And today in Europe we are not faced with the problem of guerrilla wars of national liberation simply because these countries with strong democratic traditions have cohesion and internal support.

But the situation is quite different in Asia, and I think our basic mistake has been to assume that policies which worked in Europe could be superimposed in Asia and would work there.

I think the facts betray that those policies designed for Europe are not suitable for Asia.

Mr. SEVAREID. Well, you seem to be taking issue with really the most profound argument and premise behind the whole war as often expressed by Secretary Rusk. We are told again and again that if we do not stop this aggression in South Vietnam, we are going to have to meet it somewhere else in southeast Asia.

Senator GRUENING, is that necessarily true in your opinion?

Senator GRUENING. I want to dissent completely from the basic premise of our action down there, that we are repelling aggression.

The facts are that we are just as much, if not more, the aggressors. We came in to help the French with a military mission. We did not engage in combat because Congress would not stand for it. President Eisenhower could not get the support of other powers. But we were there with a military mission. We gave them a lot of supplies and a lot of training and we stayed on there, and then we continued to escalate.

We are in a foreign country. The Vietnamese are all Vietnamese, North and South. We are much more the aggressors than the others and their aggression, their infiltration, did not start until long after we had escalated our participation in violation of agreements which we approved unilaterally although we did not actually sign them.

I think this is the important issue and we will not have a suitable meeting at the peace table until we confess a certain amount of error on our part, and that is the basic issue

Of course, we have got to negotiate with the people who are doing the fighting. This is a civil war.

President Kennedy said so. Just recently our colleague, Senator YOUNG of Ohio, came back from there convinced that this is a civil war, that the overwhelming majority of the Vietcong are South Vietnamese fighting the tyrannical governments which we have supported down there. This is the basic issue, and we are not going to have a solution at the peace table unless we meet that question and confess a certain amount——

Mr. SEVAREID. Are you suggesting, Senator, that we go to a peace conference trying to settle this now rather big war and say that we should never have been in it in the first place? How can a great country do that?

Senator GRUENING. When individuals do it, confess errors, they are praised. Nations find it more difficult to do that, but we should do it.

De Gaulle did it in an analogous situation in Algeria. When he first came in he was never going to leave Algeria. Algeria was French. The French had been there for 130 years. But after a time he realized that it was wiser for him to get out. He lost no prestige. He lost no face. He is stronger than ever.

We are losing face there every day. We would have far more face and we would save a great many American lives if we stopped right now and made a far greater effort to be made by admitting our errors and admitting that we are as much aggressors as the others.

Senator SYMINGTON. I would like to comment on what Senator CHURCH said about Europe. I do not think today the way that the telescoping in time and space, that there is a big difference between Europe and Asia that so many people consider that are interested in this subject.

For example, today every country in effect is in the same county. I illustrate it in my State by presenting the fact that by time, militarily, by air, Red China is closer to St. Louis, Mo., than Kansas City is to St. Louis, Mo., by the fastest commercial jets, and therefore I completely agree with Dean

Rusk when he says this is simply a question of whether we want to resist communism the world over.

We cannot pick, as I see it, the places that we want to resist.

As far as—incidentally, someone mentioned that I used to be the Air Force Secretary. It was a long time ago. I have been in the Senate 14 years. But I was mighty proud of it. My only point is that Socrates said "note se ata," know your terms. What is it we are talking about? And it begins to look to me as if some of the people who are so interested in what we are doing out there want to force us into a ground war only in Asia and not the utilization of our air power which I do not think we could ever win.

Now, finally, I have a little pin here which was given me at the political action team—my good friend from New York knows a great deal about—and which is the finest thing I saw in South Vietnam. The three T letters stands for victory, love, and sincerity, and I would hope that those who think that there is a predominance of Vietcong thinking in South Vietnam would go there. It is easy to talk long distance, and see and talk in the villages. There are 700,000 South Vietnamese fighting today on our side in South Vietnam and only 5 percent of them are conscripts, and in my opinion the very fact that thousands of these young men are being trained in this program prove that the South Vietnamese, if they were given a chance without terrorism and without a war that is dominated by the North Vietnamese in South Vietnam, that they would elect a South Vietnamese government.

Senator JAVITS. There is one sure thing and that is when you—you have got to be convinced that the North Vietnamese are in this is an organized way, without question, throughout their units, et cetera, and I think that the question, with all respect to Senator GRUENING, is begged by what he says and that the main question is the one you stated, the one Senator CHURCH and Senator SYMINGTON have addressed themselves to, what is the importance of Asia to American and free world security?

And I think one thing we had better never forget, World War II, as far as we were concerned, was started from Asia by Japan. That is an Asian country and a mighty big one, and very important one, and World War II, through Japan, was the only time that we have ever been threatened in modern times in our own Nation, on our shores. California was in a state of alert at that time.

Now, what is threatened in Asia, as far as we are concerned, with its enormous preponderance of population, represents the overwhelming security problem of the free world for the very reason that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization remains the most important alliance.

Why? Because that is the backing which the free world gives to the ideas for which we are fighting in South Vietnam. The support, the backing, the structure of the great industrial nations of the Atlantic basin is what makes the struggle for freedom in the world likely to succeed, but that struggle is now being fought at its central core which is Asia, the preponderant population mass in the whole world, the change of which over to Communist aggression would make the whole difference between security and freedom for the world and a condition of such jeopardy as to make our country almost immediately a garrison state.

Mr. SEVAREID. Senator, if there is a kind of relentless general tide of advancing communism or the threat of it in Asia, what do we make of such things as the complete turnback of the Communists in Indonesia, which is the biggest country in that part of Asia? Must be assume that this is an irrevocable, remorseless, general advance?

Senator JAVITS. If I may answer that, Eric, it is an excellent question, but the very change in Indonesia is attributable to the fact that Indonesia for a long enough time was shielded from the tidelike power which flows from Communist China, and that is precisely, it is exactly that kind of a breakwater that we are trying to erect in all of south and southeast Asia by strengthening in South Vietnam, in Thailand, in India, in Pakistan, and in Malaysia and in the Philippines and in Japan, what is the spirit which will hold on or hold back that onrushing tide.

Mind you, someday we will find a way to get along with the Communist Chinese. I am not for atomic war and I don't think it is inevitable at all, but at some point in the process you have to show steel. That is the only thing that will—that is an answer at this moment. That doesn't mean that it is a permanent answer, and I am not for it as a permanent answer.

Mr. SEVAREID. Senator CHURCH.

Senator CHURCH. Well, Eric, I think that this kind of discussion begs the point a great deal. Your original question had to do with the comparison of Europe with Asia.

Now, my good friends "STU" SYMINGTON says the world is much smaller. Of course it is. My good friend "JACK" JAVITS says that Asia is very important. Of course it is.

The problem that we face is whether the spread of communism which we would like to discourage in Asia represents the same kind of problem, and therefore can be dealt with with the same kind of policies that we used in Europe.

Now, in Europe communism was spread by the Russian sword. In Asia communism is being spread not by the same method but by revolution.

Now, unless we are prepared to say there is no distinction between revolution and the kind of westward movement of the Red Army in Europe, then we have got to recognize that this is a problem for which we must devise new policies.

I simply disagree completely with the proposition that by sending a tremendous western army into Vietnam that this somehow is going to bring an end to the problem of guerrilla wars. Why, we are there now with 200,000 troops. We have spent $15 or $20 billion. We will spend more before this war is—this year is over. Yet already we are being told that the war is spreading into Thailand right next to Vietnam.

That is not because we have pulled out. And your illustration was a very good one. The most effective work that is being done against the Communists is being done by the Indonesians themselves, not with our help but without it.

And talk about the tide moving inexorably southward from China, why, Burma dealt with a guerrilla war without any great western intervention, and that war was dealt with by a country that has over 1,500 miles of common frontier with China.

Revolution must be dealt with differently and we need a policy that is better adapted to deal with it. And that is all that I am pleading for.

Mr. SEVAREID. Senator TOWER.

Senator TOWER. I think it should be pointed out that there was an internal situation in Indonesia in which Sukarno played off the military against the Communist politicians. Ultimately, the Communists were a little bit precipitive in trying to hurry the process of takeover and the military reacted swiftly and have now gone about systematically exterminating Communists. And we have been treated to the spectacle of Subandrio having a soul-searching experience in an agonizing reappraisal. As far as——

Senator CHURCH. I am merely pointing out that they are doing this on their own and U Thant said that had we come in with a massive western force at the time Burma was dealing with her problem, we might very well have——

Senator TOWER. Well, Indonesia and Vietnam are not the same.

Senator CHURCH. Invested that government with the kind of front of puppetry that would have lost the support of its own people.

Senator TOWER. Indonesia and Vietnam are not the same.

Mr. SEVAREID. That is not a good——

Senator TOWER. The fact of the matter is that North Vietnam is actively engaged in armed aggression against South Vietnam. There are North Vietnamese troops concentrated in regimental strength in South Vietnam today.

Senator CHURCH. Nobody is arguing that.

Senator TOWER. Well, all right. When the aggressor nation moves in militarily against a non-Communist country, you cannot say, well, the way to solve this is not by the intrusion of troops. Let us go over there with specific action programs. Well, civic action programs are great, they are fine, if that is correct, but when the aggressor uses military power, then we must combat that military power. I remember a statement made by a great commentator who said, goodness without power is impotent and power itself is impotent without the willingness to use it, if necessary.

Senator CHURCH. Well, now, of course, JOHN, but you are pushing an open door here. No one is suggesting that we should use—that no power should be used against power. All that I am suggesting is——

Senator SYMINGTON. You compared——

Senator CHURCH. All that I am suggesting, "STU," if I may just finish——

Senator SYMINGTON. But let me just finish.

Senator CHURCH. All I am suggesting is this.

Senator SYMINGTON. I am taking up for his side because you interrupted him. Now let me interrupt you.

I think that you felt that everything was the same in Asia and differently in Europe and used what had been done in Indonesia and Burma to show what could be done in North and South Vietnam.

What JOHN was doing, as I understood it, was to explain why he felt that Indonesia was totally different from anything in North and South Vietnam, and I think there is great merit.

Senator JAVITS. May we add one further fact, gentlemen. Every one of us who has been there knows that if we had not moved in as we did beginning in February of 1965, South Vietnam was finished——

Senator TOWER. Gone. Gone.

Senator JAVITS. Through, folded up and out of business.

Senator TOWER. Absolutely.

Senator JAVITS. That was not true in Burma.

Senator CHURCH. That is not true. I have been there and that is not the argument at all. The argument is from the experience in Vietnam and looking around at other guerrilla wars, let us try and determine what will be best adapted to discouraging the spread of communism and recognize that revolutionary situations are different basically than the situations that faced——

Senator GRUENING. Indeed. Indeed.

Mr. SEVAREID. Senator GRUENING has the floor.

Senator GRUENING. I would disagree with all my colleagues to the effect that Asia is so important that it justifies the kind of military and financial all-out action we have taken.

Mr. SEVAREID. Senator, you live very close to Asia.

Senator GRUENING. It has some importance, but if we kept out, I am convinced we would have had in Vietnam a reunited Vietnam which would have been independent of Peiping, an analogy to which is the situation in Yugoslavia where the United States invested $2 billion in support of Communist Tito because he was independent of the Kremlin. That could be demonstrated if there were time. Ho Chi Minh had no use for the Chinese; the Vietnamese hate the Chinese. If we had just left the situation alone. But we were observed with our fears, with our mistaken beliefs that all communism was of the same kind.

Senator JAVITS. Well, the defect in that argument is that South Vietnamese people do not agree with Senator GRUENING. They did not want it——

Senator TOWER. That is right.

Senator JAVITS. And they fought against it.

Senator TOWER. That is right.

Senator JAVITS. And they are fighting against it to the tune of 700,000 right now, and that invalidates the thesis completely.

Senator TOWER. And too often the critics of administration policy say, well, we are not supporting a popularly based government in South Vietnam. How on earth can you determine what a popularly based government is?

Senator GRUENING. Well, why then did we have to take over a whole war?

Senator TOWER. Could you have a meaningful election in South Vietnam today?

Senator GRUENING. Why did we have to take over the whole war ourselves——

Senator TOWER. Of course you could not.

Senator GRUENING. If this was such a popular cause in South Vietnam?

Senator SYMINGTON. Because of the North Vietnam forces. The North sent in support.

Senator GRUENING. They only came in after we sent in American aid.

Senator SYMINGTON. I wish you would go out there. I told you that. You would change a lot of your thoughts. I changed a lot of mine.

Mr. SEVAREID. I gather the thrust of a good bit of your talk a few minutes ago was to the effect that what we are really trying to do in a groping way is to get some kind of a balance of power in Asia comparable to the balance that was achieved and which has protected Europe these last 20 years.

Is this always going to have to require American armed presence? Should we have not taken a different policy with Japan, then? Should not Japan be armed if this is a problem? Japan at one end and India at the other?

Senator JAVITS. Well, isn't this really—we may ask a question of ourselves and of the people—a transitional phase in Asia?

Now, Europe is pretty well equipped to deal with its problems, whatever may be its unwillingness to venture outside of Europe. The fact is that the NATO alliance has held Europe together and now it is getting to be much more integrated, et cetera.

This is a nascent stage, a growing stage in Asia. India is getting a greater sense of nationhood. The accord between Pakistan and India at Tashkent, indeed, the fact that Russia is emerging as a power itself, able to bring two parties together I think is a very significant aspect of world affairs. And I think that the United States is fitting into what is somewhat of a vacuum.

For a time and in this terribly tortured world where you are seeking to hold off an atomic war, a real big holocaust, it seems to me that that kind of interim action is essential on the part of the leader of the free world which is in the best position to do that, and one must admit it, has the will to do it, and indeed I am grateful that our country does have the will and still the pioneering spirit in which to see that far down the road so that it will itself assume a burden which must be assumed if no one else will.

Senator SYMINGTON. I would like to answer your point about India and Japan, if I may, to some extent.

India today is heavily armed by the Soviet Communists. They have the biggest air force by far in their part of the world.

So far as Japan is concerned, where recently I spent quite a lot of time, you have a treaty, and in that treaty the Japanese do not guarantee to protect us, but we guarantee to protect them. And they are very peaceful minded.

Of course, they don't like to see any fighting out there. Unfortunately they had a sad and tragic ending to World War II, but, on the other hand, if it wasn't for the guarantee that the United States has given them, that goes through 1970 or to 1970, I am sure that they would have a totally different approach to their own defenses.

I only mention this again because I think Europe, where incidentally we have heard talk of NATO—I don't think there is any greater enemy fundamentally to our future than France, which is perhaps the core of NATO, geographically, anyway. I think each and every one of these cases is different and what my apprehension is, listening to these witnesses before the Foreign Relations Committee, is that they are too prone to continue a phase which perhaps could be best summed up in the words "spheres of influence."

I believe spheres of influence, the way the world is today, when you go around it in 90 minutes, is getting to be a rather obsolete term.

Mr. SEVAREID. Gentlemen, we haven't talked much about the prospects and possibilities of peace. There has been no hard signals from Hanoi so far as anyone knows in the direction of peace negotiations.

Is there any of you at this table who think there is any chance that Hanoi is going to talk peace before there is some military change in the battlefield that makes her realize she can't win this war and will take very great losses?

Senator TOWER. I think that the only way Hanoi can be brought to the conference table with a reasonable attitude is for us to make the war so costly that they do not choose to pursue it any further. I think to reduce their will to wage an aggressive war against South Vietnam we must reduce their capacity to do it. We have tried it. We have tried desperately to bring them to the conference table. We have sent our peace mission all over the world and they have rebuffed us. So apparently force is the only thing that they understand, because they have not yet I think been convinced of the determination of the United States to stay and defend non-Communist governments against Communist encroachment.

I think one thing that we in the United States had better resign ourselves to and understand; that is, because we are the most powerful nation in the free world, we are necessarily the free world's first line of defense, and it is incumbent on us from the standpoint of maintaining our own security to maintain our defense perimeter as far from our own shores as possible, and as close to the enemy's as possible.

Mr. SEVAREID. Senator CHURCH, did you wish to come in?

Senator CHURCH. I just want to say I think we do ourselves an injustice by using terms that are really not accurate. We talk about the free world and the Communist world as though these were two great monolithic blocs. Neither are and most of the countries in the so-called free world aren't free and never have been free, and this is the reason in so much of Asia, in so much of Africa, where the people retch in poverty and suffer the yoke of ancient wrongs that revolutions are going to occur, and we have got to recognize that the Communists are going to try to take these revolutions over, and this is a different situation than faced us in Europe.

I was reading in the official statement of administration policy about the kind of military alliance system we have established in Europe, NATO, and then SEATO and CENTRO, around the rest of the Communist world, and the discussion of this alliance system is a great barrier to Communist penetration.

Well, Eric, if this is a barrier, then a sieve is a barrier to water and a plate glass window is a barrier to sunlight.

These alliances are not stopping the penetration of communism. We stand in Vietnam today practically alone and the only allies that we can honestly claim as military allies are South Korea, Taiwan, and Thailand, and all together they constitute less than 5 percent of the people of Asia.

Senator GRUENING. Who are on our payroll.

Senator CHURCH. Now, I must say we are deluding ourselves if we think this is the bulwark of a policy. It is evidenced that we lack a policy. I am for getting a good policy that will deal more effectively with the phenomena of revolution. We are going to live in a generation of revolution throughout all of Latin America, Africa, Asia, for a long time to come and we have yet to devise a policy that will deal effectively with the——

Senator JAVITS. Well, the basic ingredients——

Senator GRUENING. I could not disagree more with Senator TOWER. We tried bombing for 1 year and we have been totally ineffective. It has merely hardened resistance of the people, and one reason Hanoi is not interested is because our approaches, our alleged unconditional terms are very conditional. We have got to negotiate with the people who are doing the fighting. That is the first thing we have got to do. We are not doing it. If we were willing to negotiate with the National Liberation Front, the Vietcong, we would be realistic about it. Hanoi is not the villain in this thing. Hanoi came in late to infiltrate when the revolution, the civil war had already gone on for some time, and this is a reality that we have refused in our administration circles to face.

Senator TOWER. The Vietcong cannot wage war without Hanoi.

Mr. SEVAREID. We have about a minute and a half or so.

Senator GRUENING. They did.

Mr. SEVAREID. I wonder if any of you had time to form any opinions about Senator RIBICOFF's ideas published today, that we have a conference right away now in Geneva, invite the Vietcong representatives and offer a partial withdrawal of our troops if Hanoi will do the same. Is there merit in this?

Senator JAVITS. Well, I will tell you, the weakness of it is the very weakness of the things that Senator CHURCH and Senator GRUENING have been discussing. It is a unilateral effort to bring peace. We are going to sit down in Geneva and invite people to come who then will not come which will set the effort back a lot further than it is now.

Senator TOWER. Further negotiation from weakness.

Senator JAVITS. I do not believe that escalation necessarily will do it. I think the maintenance of our position with integrity and viability on a unilateral basis, that is what we are doing in order to defend, pacify, reconstruct a viable area of South Vietnam is our best position. Let us remember that the South Vietnamese, Vietcong, could flow back to the villages just like they left them and the North Vietnamese could go home, and you would not need a peace conference at all, and that is very likely to be the result.

Senator SYMINGTON. If you sit down with the Vietcong alone, then automatically you lose all the Government of South Vietnam.

Senator GRUENING. That would be no loss.

Senator SYMINGTON. Why do you want to turn over to the Vietcong South Vietnam which you would be doing if you sat down with the Vietcong.

Mr. Sevareid. Gentlemen, I want to thank all of you for coming on this rainy Sunday afternoon. Our time has about run out. I wish we could talk for another hour, and perhaps in the future we will have occasion to have all of you back again. It looks like a long war to come.

I suppose there is some danger in public debate about the validity in the conduct of a war in which thousands of Americans are already risking their lives. There is some danger of encouraging the enemy to hang on, perhaps, when he hears all this, danger I would think to the political careers of those who speak out before this is all over, people on either side of this argument, but there are many precedents in our history for questioning an American war even after it is underway. And this Lincoln's Birthday weekend is a good time perhaps to remember that.

On January 12 of 1848 a young Congressman, Abraham Lincoln, stood up in the House and he denounced the Mexican War as unnecessarily and unconstitutionally commenced by President Polk, and that speech was described by many people and many papers in this country as unpatriotic, a great disservice to the fighting man. He had a thousand of them from his own district in that war. And he never got reelected to Congress. Well, if there are dangers over this—he became President—this present national debate on this war, I think maybe we have to remember that life in the free society is not supposed to be safe. It is supposed to be free, in the belief that only in this free conflict of ideas do you ultimately find the way to the final safety.

This is Eric Sevareid in Washington. Good afternoon.

Announcer. This has been "Vietnam Perspective—Congress After Honolulu," part of CBS' News continuing coverage of the Vietnam conflict.

TONY SCHWAMM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, Tony Schwamm, postmaster of Anchorage, who only a few weeks ago was 1 of 14 postmasters in the United States visiting Washington to be given citations by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien for the able way in which they had carried out the President's natural beauty program by improving the appearance of their respective post offices and their surrounding grounds, died suddenly of a heart attack. His passing is a great loss not merely to the city of Anchorage but to all Alaska, throughout which he was widely known and loved.

Only weeks ago, on January 18, after his award, I placed an item in the Congressional Record about him, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

An Alaska Postmaster Is Honored—Citation of Merit Is Conferred on "Tony" Schwamm of Anchorage

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, I am happy to record that of the 14 postmasters in the Nation who are being honored this week with a citation of merit by Postmaster General O'Brien, one is from Alaska. He is George S. "Tony" Schwamm, the competent postmaster of Alaska's largest city, Anchorage.

The citation of merit is awarded because of the able way in which Postmaster Schwamm has carried out the President's natural beauty program by improving the appearance of the various post offices in his jurisdiction and their surrounding grounds.

Postmaster Schwamm is an outstanding Alaskan, a former World War II pilot who thereafter served with great ability as the head of the territory's department of aeronautics. In that capacity he started a most effective airport construction program and built airfields which are still in use and have stood up under the wear and tear of service. He then became the manager of the International Airport at Anchorage, which, under his direction, became the air crossways of the Northern Hemisphere. It links the three great continents of that hemisphere. "Tony" Schwamm's dynamic leadership contributed substantially to this airport development. Today, the passengers from Europe and Asia have the opportunity to stop off at Anchorage and enjoy the outstanding scenic beauties of the last frontier.

It is a pleasure to salute "Tony" Schwamm for his outstanding performance in every position that he has occupied and to congratulate Postmaster General Larry O'Brien for making this award.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, what was so essentially true of Tony Schwamm was that he was a live, kindly, alert, dynamic individual, who performed every task that he undertook with great zest and competence.

In addition to his various personal undertakings, he was unofficially an Anchorage greeter, an assignment derived not merely from his innate outgiving nature but from the fact that for many years before his postmastership he was the manager of the International Airport at Anchorage, to which an ever-increasing number of visitors from abroad came. Tony had seen the beginnings of their influx. He took a personal interest in them. It was his delight to welcome the arrivals from the Scandinavian countries, from France, Japan, Germany and other countries, and to transmit to them the spirit of friendliness and warm hospitality which is characteristic of Alaskans, and which Tony embodied to a superlative degree.

A World War II aviator who was retired because of damage from lead poisoning received while in the service, it might truly be said of him that he was outstanding and dedicated both in war and in peace.

In his relatively short term of service as postmaster, he did a superlative job in distributing the vast volume of mail to a rapidly growing community.

He will be sorely missed, but the memory of his sterling character and his outstanding contributions will be remembered and treasured as long as those who knew and loved him remain alive.

MILWAUKEE MOTHER AND TEACHER TELLS HOWS CHILDREN NEED SCHOOL MILK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I rise again to protest the administration's unrealistic and totally unacceptable cutback in the special school milk program.

I have spoken out daily on this subject. Today I want to put into the Record the words of one who should know better than anyone else what this calamitous proposal means. This person, Mrs. Meyer Bloom of Milwaukee, is the mother of three children and a teacher of many more.

She says, in part:

> I frequently have observed a marked change in attitude and responsiveness in a child after he or she has had the morning milk.

Are we going to permit the administration to eliminate this? I say we cannot afford it. Nothing is more vital than the health and education of our children, our most precious asset.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mrs. Bloom's letter printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dear Senator Proxmire: As a teacher and a mother of three growing (fast) children I have very little time to write notes to anyone—even the milkman—but I did want to write to support your actions regarding the special milk program for our schoolchildren.

Your February 1966 report states probably the greatest truth regarding the situation—"You can't teach a hungry child." I have been teaching in one of Milwaukee's so-called core schools and frequently have observed a marked change in attitude and responsiveness in a child after he or she has had the morning milk. So very many of these children come to school without breakfast (among other things, including adequate sleep, etc.). I have always urged the parents I have come in contact with to send the 2 cents per half pint of milk for their child. Frequently this is the only milk children have each day.

Our school is now on a hot lunch program and the morning milk has been eliminated. It worries me to know that of the many children not purchasing the hot lunch, that is, those that bring sandwiches, a sizable proportion of them do not purchase milk. Is there some way we can work out this situation in the classroom or with the parents? Do you have any suggestions? I could provide you with statistics of our school's program alone if that would be of any help.

Most sincere best wishes in your efforts.

Mrs. Meyer Bloom.

TIMBER ALLOWABLE CUTS—II

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on January 17 I discussed the subject of allowable cuts of timber in the national forests in Oregon and the effort some people were making to use a 5-year-old working paper to exploit the national forests.

The man who assisted in preparing this 5-year-old document was a Dr. William A. Duerr of Syracuse, N.Y. I sent my remarks to Dr. Duerr and received a letter from him dated January 26, 1966. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Syracuse, N.Y.,
January 26, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: It was kind of you to write me on January 18 and to enclose a copy of your remarks on the floor of the Senate concerning the allowable cut of timber. And I appreciate the invitation you gave me to comment in confidence.

I am much relieved to have the record set straight, for over the years it had gotten pretty muddled. As you observed, I was being badly used. And yet I believed it best not to enter the squabble personally, lest I embarrass my associates. How fortunate for all of us that you came to our rescue.

As you know, the allowable-cut issue continues lively. My friends in the Bureau of Land Management tell me that Director Stoddard is determined to fight the recent insistent demands for an immediate upping of the cut in western Oregon. He proposes to make a basic study during 1966 of the whole policy and procedure for setting the cut, meanwhile sticking with the formula used in recent years. Such studies are essential to the public interest. The problem is technically difficult and cannot be resolved quickly. It would be a blow to Federal forestry if the Bureau were forced by local pressures to move prematurely.

Again, thanks to you, and kindest regards.

Most sincerely,

William A. Duerr.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it became quite obvious, after a careful reading of an October 27, 1965, letter sent to Dr. Duerr by a State senator from Oregon and Dr. Duerr's November 2, 1965, reply to the State senator, that those who were seeking to use Dr. Duerr in exploiting the allowable cut issue were not going to get any help in their efforts. Now Dr. Duerr himself observes that he was "being badly used."

In view of these developments I am pleased to insert in the Record Dr. Duerr's letter of January 26, 1966, addressed to me so that all interested individuals may have the benefit of his comments.

It is my desire to have this allowable timber cut issue placed out in the open where true conservationists—which include many in the timber industry—can see it in full focus.

As one who has labored as an educator, I should point out that another great principle is at stake here. It goes beyond the forest issue. It involves the right and the obligation of an educator to examine into a subject freely and fully and the right of a researcher to look at all possible alternatives and not be used because he dares to think. It includes the precious right to think new thoughts—the obligation to test new ideas—the responsibility to challenge the accepted policy. Above all, we must never abandon the right to bring the disciplines and knowledge of science, economics, and sociology to bear upon the problems that confront us—free from political harrassment.

For decisions on resource management to be sound, they must be based on facts. For decisions to be supportable, they must rest on logic. Any consideration of a decision must first be based on a study of the alternatives, and thus, recognition that there are alternatives.

The right of constructive inquiry is the foundation on which progress is built. Therefore, I want to make it clear that I am also addressing my remarks to the leaders of our great institutions of learning and research in Oregon who have an obligation to defend free and penetrating inquiry.

I also take special note of Dr. Duerr's observation that there are "insistent demands for an immediate upping of the cut in western Oregon" on BLM lands. Accordingly, I am glad to have the assurance of Assistant Secretary of the Interior Anderson that the Bureau of Land Management is working on a comprehensive review of forest management goals and objectives.

This review is scheduled for completion by January 1, 1967. In the interim the Bureau will continue all programs at presently planned levels. This is a particularly significant development because it gives recognition to the fact that the forest resources we pass on to future generations should be in better condition than they were when our generation received them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point Assistant Secretary Anderson's letter of February 7.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This letter is to advise you of the Bureau of Land Management's course with respect to the management of its forest properties in western Oregon. We recognize the importance of this valuable forested resource to Oregon and its economy, both for the present and the future.

The growing population of our Nation creates an expanding need for public timber to meet industrial use along with increasing requirements for watershed protection, outdoor recreation, and wildlife.

To meet this responsibility we have now in progress a comprehensive review of our forest management goals and objectives which we plan to complete by January 1, 1967. The result will be a careful definition of goals and objectives. During this period we shall continue all programs at presently planned levels.

Our consideration of critical recreation and scenic strip requirements is also nearing completion and will be useful in this broad review.

Our present budgeted timber sale program of 1.180 billion board feet consists of volume attributable to the allowable cut as well as volume from salvage and thinnings.

As we proceed there will be consultations with various interested groups in Oregon and especially with our advisory boards.

We want to keep you abreast of developments. When the review is complete we will be prepared to discuss it with you.

Sincerely yours,

Harry R. Anderson,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

TRIBUTE TO HENRY J. KAISER

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, it is my privilege to report that the businessmen of Hawaii have just given their highest award to one of America's greatest industrialists, Henry J. Kaiser.

The coveted Honolulu Chamber of Commerce award, the Order of the Splintered Paddle, was bestowed recently upon Mr. Kaiser by Gov. John A. Burns. In my estimation Mr. Kaiser typifies the meaning of this tribute which recognizes those who have expressed the spirit of the law of the splintered paddle in their daily lives and in the contributions they have made to the welfare of their fellowmen without thought of personal gain.

I salute the presidents of the Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Filipino, and Honolulu Chambers of Commerce for their wisdom in nominating such a deserving humanitarian for the award.

As most of my distinguished colleagues know, the roots of our history are thrust deep into the ages of Hawaiian life. But you may not be aware that the Splintered Paddle Award emanates from one of the best known laws of King Kamehameha I, the Mamalahoe Kanawai of 1797, often referred to as the Magna Carta of Hawaii.

This "law" is based on the following legend:

> While plundering off the Puna coast as a young man, Kamehameha skirmished with two fishermen. During the encounter, his foot slipped into a crevice of lava rock and held him fast. One of the fishermen seeing his helplessness, struck him on the head with his paddle so hard that the paddle was splintered. Kamehameha eventually escaped but years later, after becoming King of all Hawaii, conducted an extensive search for the two fishermen and found them. Although they admitted their guilt, Kamehameha decreed they should be spared, but mandated that henceforth any wanton attack upon the helpless or the innocent should be punished by death.

You need not be reminded that Mr. Kaiser played a vital role in helping to make America the greatest Nation on earth. You have heard me say before that Henry J. Kaiser is the single most productive man in industry in our times, and America, indeed the world, has recognized him for that.

You will quickly recall, I am sure, that the highest award of the American labor movement was given last year to this very same man. It was presented to him, as the first businessman ever to receive the award, for his outstanding human relations and humanitarian principles.

Similarly, the Splintered Paddle Award does not recognize Mr. Kaiser for his industrial know-how and accomplishments, but rather, as Governor Burns pronounced:

> For the contributions he has made in achieving these successes through his vision, leadership, beliefs, and his deep and abiding understanding of the need for good human relations.

I am proud that the people of my State have so honored this man. It is a privilege for me to call Henry Kaiser a friend.

As testimony to Henry J. Kaiser's precept of people partnerships, a perceptive writer for the Honolulu Star-Bulletin saw the award in this manner:

Partners for Progress

Three kindred spirits sat at the head of the Royal Hawaiian Hotel's Monarch Room yesterday as the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce held its annual meeting.

Gov. John A. Burns was performing a labor of love in presenting the Order of the Splintered Paddle to Henry J. Kaiser, the industrialist who has adopted Hawaii as his home.

The Governor wishes more businesses would show the venturesomeness and imagination that Kaiser has demonstrated, and the willingness to pour back profits into future investments.

LeRoy Collins, the Under Secretary of Commerce and former Governor of Florida, spoke for Government and business partnership in developing the Nation to its fullest potential.

The concept of aggressive Government leadership to stimulate private enterprise may hold fears for others, but not for Messrs. Burns, Kaiser, and Collins.

The Governor and the industrialist sometimes wax mystical in their faith in Hawaii and its future.

They got no disagreement yesterday from the Commerce Secretary, nor was any discernible from the business audience, which gave rising ovations to all three men.

TRIBUTE TO FLEET ADM. CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, one of the greatest heroes in the history of our country is Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz. I am very proud to be included as one of his friends. He and Mrs. Nimitz are among my best friends and they have given me much inspiration in my efforts dating back to my early days in the House of Representatives as a Member of the House Naval Affairs Committee.

The February 1966 issue of Naval Affairs has a wonderful article by Admiral Nimitz. It is wonderful because it gives an insight of a very personal nature into the thinking and character of this great man. Because I know that this article will be of vital interest to all Members of this body and of the House of Representatives, I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY WAY OF LIFE—THE NAVY

(By Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz)

I didn't know my father, because he died before I was born. But I had a wonderful, white-bearded grandfather. He was Charles H. Nimitz, who settled in Fredericksburg, Tex., and built a steamboat-shaped hotel. Between chores and homework I listened wide eyed to stories about his youth in the German merchant marine.

"The sea—like life itself—is a stern taskmaster," he would say. "The best way to get along with either is to learn all you can, then do your best and don't worry—especially about things over which you have no control."

I had an opportunity to test grandfather's wisdom in 1900, when I was a 15-year-old. That summer, Battery K, 3d Field Artillery, camped in the brown hills near Kerrville, where we then lived. I was fascinated by the spanking-new uniforms of 2d Lts. Cruikshank and Westervelt—both West Point graduates.

Up to then my boyhood ambition had been to become a surveyor. After watching Battery K, however, I decided to become an Army officer. When I applied to Congressman James L. Slayden of San Antonio to take the West Point examination, he informed me that all his appointments were filled.

"But I have an opening for the U.S. Naval Academy," he said. "Are you interested?"

Being a poor boy, I realized this might be my only chance of getting an education beyond high school. So I swallowed my disappointment and set my course for Annapolis instead of West Point. With the help of my mother, stepfather, and a devoted teacher named Miss Susan Moore, I boned up on algebra, geometry, history, geography, and grammar.

This meant sandwiching extra bookwork into a busy boyhood schedule. I got up at 3 a.m. and studied until 5:30, when it was time to light the stoves. School was from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.—followed by more chores and homework until 10 p.m.

When the time arrived for my 3-day Annapolis examination, I found myself pitted against seven other hopefuls. Grandfather Nimitz's advice ran through my head: "Learn all you can, then do your best and don't worry." It paid off. I emerged No. 1 in the test and thus began a long career that has taken me from naval cadet fourth class to five-star fleet admiral.

The Navy is an old and honored profession—one that I would heartily recommend to any young man. Perhaps you will understand why if I tell of some of the things that have happened in my life and how they shaped my philosophy.

After graduation from Annapolis, I was sent to San Francisco and then to the Philippines, where I was given my first command. It was as skipper of the gunboat *Panay*, with 31 men aboard, and of the naval base at Polloc, Mindanao, where 22 marines were stationed. It was like a Swiss Family Robinson adventure. We were practically on our own—no radio, no mail, no supplies. But we did a lot of fishing and hunting and thus ate well. A seaman told me one day that he "couldn't look a duck in the beak again."

Two years later, as a 22-year-old ensign, I was given command of the U.S.S. *Decatur*—a beat-up old destroyer that had been out of commission for some time. There was no crew aboard, no water, coal or supplies—not even any guns or torpedoes. And my orders were to have the *Decatur* at Olangapo—60 miles away—in 2 days.

It was a real challenge. I knew the only hope of getting the ship ready to sail was to seek out a group of warrant officers with whom I'd learned to play cards.

"You assemble a crew, and we'll deliver the stuff to you," one of them said.

Soon bargeloads of equipment, tools, coal, supplies, and guns began to arrive. Working around the clock for 2 days and nights, we got the *Decatur* underway. Our only mistake was that the engine telegraphs were hooked up backward. When I ordered quarter speed astern, the ship moved forward; when I signaled full speed astern, it shot ahead like a scared dolphin. Navigation was difficult, but we managed to reach Olangapo on time.

I have another very special memory about the *Decatur*. In those days, surveys and charts of Philippine waters were sketchy or nonexistent. One dark night in Batangas harbor, while we were proceeding at dead slow, the leadsman at the bow reported excitedly, "We're not moving, sir."

At first I could not understand why. Then it dawned on me: the *Decatur* had run aground on a mudbank. Such a mistake could ruin a young naval officer—or, at the very least, keep him on shore the rest of his career.

I tried to back the *Decatur* down, but she was stuck for good. On that black night somewhere in the Philippines, the advice of my grandfather returned to me: "Don't worry about things over which you have no control." So I set up a cot on deck and went to sleep.

Next morning a small steamer, the *Buena Suerte*, heaved a line and pulled us off. Afterward there was an investigation and I stood court-martial aboard the cruiser U.S.S. *Denver*. I was convicted, and my sentence was a letter of reprimand for "hazarding" a ship of the U.S. Navy.

Many years later, near the end of World War II, the U.S.S. *Indianapolis* was sunk and 880 men lost. Capt. Charles B. McVay III was court-martialed and found guilty—but because of a good record, his sentence was remitted. By then I was Chief of Naval Operations in Washington, D.C. One day Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal called me into his office.

"What will this do to McVay's career?" he asked. "Has there ever been a court-martialed officer in the history the U.S. Navy who was later promoted to flag rank?"

"You're looking at one right here," I chuckled.

After the *Decatur* incident, I requested assignment to battleships—then the glamour vessels of the fleet. Instead, I drew submarines. In those days they were a cross between a Jules Verne fantasy and a humpbacked whale. I was disappointed, but applied myself as skipper of the *Plunger*, the *Snapper*, the *Narwhal* and the *Skipjack*. I wanted to learn all I could about underseas warfare, and I became something of an expert on submarines and diesel engines. This experience stood me in good stead in 1917 and 1941, when submarines were crucial to America's defense.

In World War I, I was assigned to the staff of Rear Adm. Samuel S. Robinson, commander, Submarine Force Atlantic Fleet. We had almost as many problems in getting along with the British as we did fighting the Germans.

Admiral Robinson and others of his staff were concerned with protocol. But I decided that the British would respond to good performance and friendliness on our part. I drilled this into our junior officers and men, and the ice was quickly broken. British-United States relationships improved immediately.

In those days I was beginning to develop my theories of leadership; namely, that leadership consists of picking good men and helping them to do their best for you. The attributes of loyalty, discipline, and devotion to duty on the part of subordinates must be matched by patience, tolerance, and understanding on the part of superiors. "Loyalty up and loyalty down," the Navy calls it.

In 1926 I was ordered to take charge of an experimental NROTC unit at the University of California, Berkeley. A new idea was being tested: making naval officers out of college youths. Some of my friends predicted that this assignment would be the end of the line for a career naval officer—as surely as running a ship aground on a mudbank.

But I pitched in and gave the job all my energy. I spent 3 years at Berkeley. In the end we produced a model that was duplicated in 52 other colleges and universities across the Nation. Over the years the program has produced thousands of fine young naval officers.

When Japan attacked the United States on December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor, I was serving as Chief of the Bureau of Navigation in Washington, D.C., a job concerned largely with personnel administration. Shortly afterward, Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox asked me to relieve Adm. Husband E. Kimmel who was commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet.

Disguised in civilian clothes and bearing the name "Mr. Wainwright," I rode a train across the United States and then flew to Pearl Harbor. That trip gave me plenty of time to ponder the fate of Admiral Kimmel and his staff. There but for the grace of God go I—or any other naval officer unlucky enough to be CINCPAC (Commander in Chief—Pacific) on December 7, I thought.

To restore fleet morale and confidence after America's worst naval defeat, I decided to keep the staff intact. Nobody was transferred, nobody sent home in disgrace, nobody court-martialed.

My instincts were right. By giving them a second chance, I restored the self-confidence of those CINCPAC officers. I've never known a harder working, more dedicated staff, and to them must go much of the credit for the ultimate victory in the Pacific.

I also knew that the confidence of the American public in the U.S. Navy had to be strengthened. One way to do this, I reasoned, was to create an atmosphere of quiet determination and orderly planning at CINCPAC Headquarters.

I set up a pistol range just outside my office. Near my living quarters, a half mile away, I had a horseshoe court built. I spent a lot of time at both places, and often invited war correspondents to join me. I hoped they would report the confident, relaxed atmosphere. And they did.

During the Battle of Leyte Gulf, one of the most crucial sea battles in history, all of us at CINCPAC Headquarters eagerly awaited news of the outcome. I was on pins and needles, but couldn't show it. So I went to my quarters to pitch horseshoes, telling my staff, "If word comes, you can reach me there." Most of the dispatches from that great battle in which the Japanese fleet was destroyed reached me on the horseshoe court.

In staff meetings during World War II, I found that three basic questions could be asked about almost any problem. I had them tacked up above my desk so that subordinates would come prepared to answer them:

1. Is the proposed operation likely to succeed?

2. What might be the consequences of failure?

3. Is it in the realm of practicability of material and supplies?

These are the kinds of questions that all of us can apply to the problems of our daily lives. If we think ahead, we can prevent many problems from arising. Or, if they do arise, to minimize them.

I've always found that a little humor can leaven the stern realities of almost any situation. It does no harm to let junior officers know that the "old man" can appreciate a good joke or a ridiculous situation.

I got a lot of chuckles out of the letters that were sent to me while serving as CINCPAC. Every one was answered by my staff, but I asked to be informed of the humorous ones—and then passed them on to others.

For example, one man wrote that Japan could be defeated by diverting the Kuroship—a warm, tropical current that flows north along the Asiatic mainland—and freeze Japan into quick surrender.

An anxious Mississippi mother wrote that her son on Kwajalein was homesick. He had written her, "If I could only get my feet into some of that good old Mississippi mud again, I've feel better." She also sent a 5-pound sack of dirt. Mixed with water, it was guaranteed to produce Mississippi mud. I sent word to the boy's commanding officer to round up all the Mississippians on the island—and give them a chance to squish their toes in the muddy mess. Whether or not it cured homesickness, I don't know. It did help relieve the grimness of the war.

As I discovered from my early days in the Philippines, some of the best help and advice I've had comes from junior officers and enlisted men. I have always made it a practice, therefore, to listen to anyone, no matter what his rank or rate.

A President I admire greatly was Teddy Roosevelt. He was a physical-fitness advocate. He was a man who understood the art of leadership. And he got things done. It may have been Teddy Roosevelt who coined that bit of philosophy I've long quoted: "If you need a helping hand, there it is—right on the end of your arm."

Young men sometimes ask me: "Is it still possible to achieve a full and satisfying career in the U.S. Navy?"

My answer goes something like this:

Contrary to the prophets of doom, there will always be a U.S. Navy—and opportunities abound for those who take advantage of them. In spite of substitute methods of transportation, we will for many years use the surface of the sea to carry the bulk of our trade and to defend our shores.

Fleets of the future may bear little resemblance to present-day ships. But I am convinced that there will be naval aviation in some form, aircraft carriers, submarines, and small, fast ships for escort duty. These are all battle-tested types and least vulnerable to nuclear bombs—if such weapons of mass destruction are used in the future.

To fulfill its mission, the Navy must have the finest, most dedicated officers and men it can attract. Being a part of the Navy is honorable, soul satisfying, and sufficiently remunerative to reward any active young man who loves his country and is willing to accept his responsibilities.

Last November 7, I remarked to my Marine Corps driver, "Today is a very special day for me because it was just 63 years ago that I entered the Naval Academy."

"Well, Admiral, do you think you'll make a career of it?" he quipped.

Yes, I think I shall. I'm still learning every day. I'm still trying to do my best (by Navy regulation a five-star admiral never retires). And I refuse to worry about things over which I have no control. If I had a chance to relive my life, I'd still follow Grandfather Nimitz' philosophy—even if it led to another court-martial for running the U.S.S. *Decatur* aground.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Reprinted through courtesy of Boy's Life magazine published by the Boy Scouts of America.) In speaking of the Boy Scouts, Admiral Nimitz stated:

"My boyhood occurred before Scouting came to the United States, but I have long been interested in its growth, development, and principles. If I were to sum up the qualities required of a good naval officer, I would be hard put to add anything to the qualities required of a good Scout.

Of the 2,500,000 men under my command at the height of the war in the Pacific, fewer than half were former Scouts. Yet this 40 percent won 60 percent out of all the medals awarded."

MAINE LEGISLATURE SUPPORTS U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and myself I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine in support of U.S. policy in Vietnam.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE STATE OF MAINE IN SUPPORT OF THE U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and Senate of the State of Maine in special session of the 102d legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

Whereas the United States of America stands committed to a policy of resisting the forces of Communist aggression which imperil the freedom and liberty of the people and nations of the free world; and

Whereas it is of vital importance that the forces of totalitarianism recognize that the United States of America, as a nation, will utilize every means at its disposal to honor such commitments; and

Whereas the present use of American military forces in Vietnam manifests the determination of the United States of America to implement this policy whenever and wherever the freedom of the nations of the free world are threatened; and

Whereas our military forces, in this great struggle, are proving a decisive factor in implementing American policy, not only in the defense of Vietnam against Communist aggression, but as a developing arsenal of strength which will provide the means of securing a final peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, urge that the Congress of the United States of America, in recognition of the sacrifices and heroism of our fighting men in Vietnam, extend the profound thanks of the Congress and the people of the United States to the military forces of this country in Vietnam for their valiant efforts; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, duly authenticated by the secretary of state, be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress and to the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives from this State.

In senate chamber, read and adopted, sent down for concurrence, February 1, 1966.

EDWIN H. PERT,
Secretary.

House of representatives, read and adopted, in concurrence, February 1, 1966.

JEROME G. PLANTE,
Clerk.

CURTAILMENT OF REA LOAN PROGRAM WILL CAUSE FURTHER DEPRESSION OF RURAL AREAS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in his budget message last month the President proposed sharp curtailment in rural electrification loan funds. This cutback, if agreed to by Congress, will have a sharp effect in Montana.

Right now there is a large backlog of loan applications at the Rural Electrification Administration. This backlog, plus applications which will normally come in this year, amount to about three-quarters of a billion dollars.

Congress authorized the loan of about $400 million to meet part of this demand.

However, the budget message proposed that about one-third of the amount Congress appropriated be impounded, its use withheld until next year. The administration proposes an REA loan program of about a quarter of a billion dollars next year, which is several hundred million dollars short of the need.

The 24 cooperatives in Montana will need about $8 million during the next year and a half. If the budget cutbacks are accepted, several million dollars needed for expansion of rural electric service in Montana will have to be raised elsewhere, at a cost considerably above the 2-percent rate on REA loans. This will mean higher rates for consumers on farms and in small towns.

I think that it is time for the Government to take a hard look at the ways it helps finance essential electric service.

The Government grants special powers and privileges to all suppliers of electricity, because electricity is essential and because it is most economically distributed on a monopoly basis.

A number of investor-owned utilities have received 2-percent REA loans on exactly the same terms granted the cooperatives. Any supplier who obtains one of those low-interest loans has to agree to serve the entire area, not just the lucrative, high-density areas.

Many power companies found they could make more money by serving selected populous areas with conventional financing than by serving an entire area with construction financed at only 2 percent. The investor-owned utilities take in about 15 times as much revenue per mile of line as the rural co-ops do. If the privately owned, consumer-managed rural cooperatives had that kind of density and revenue they could certainly finance their growth without any 2-percent loans.

Another point—there has been a big shift in financing of the major segment of the power industry—the investor-owned utilities—within recent years. A substantial proportion of the cost of their expansion has been shifted from the stockholders to the customers. About half of the I O U's—the investor-owned utilities—will not have to go to the marketplace for new money at all during the sixties.

In other words, these companies will pay zero percent interest on new construction capital.

The companies have already collected a lot of that capital, month after month, from the customers.

But the customers of the investor-owned utilities did not get any stock, or dividends. And they would not get their money back.

If the REA program is curtailed, either through increase in rates or inadequacy of service, needed employment opportunities cannot be developed in rural areas. It will be more difficult for us in Montana to keep our young people in these areas.

That is why I have told the President—and a number of other Senators, of both parties, have joined in the request—that the REA loan program must be restored.

Beyond its enormous value in the areas it serves it has a beneficial effect in cities served by investor-owned companies, because of the yardstick effect of competition. The program is especially useful in this regard in Montana, which is the only one of the States—except for Hawaii—without a single city-owned power system.

I believe the Congress will give the President better advice on REA matters than he received from his Budget Bureau.

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has submitted its seventh annual report to the President of the United States, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Members will recall that this Commission was established by Congress in 1959, for the following basic purposes:

First. To bring together representatives of the Federal, State, and local governments, for consideration of common problems.

Second. To provide a forum for discussion of the administration of Federal grant programs.

Third. To give critical attention to the conditions and controls involved in the administration of Federal grant programs.

Fourth. To make available technical assistance to the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government, in the review of proposed legislation, to determine its overall effect on the Federal system.

Fifth. To encourage discussion and study at an early stage of emerging public problems that are likely to require intergovernmental cooperation.

Sixth. To recommend, within the framework of the Constitution, the most desirable allocation of governmental functions, responsibilities, and revenues among the several levels of government.

Seventh. To recommend methods of coordinating and simplifying tax laws and administrative practices, to achieve a more orderly and less competitive fiscal relationship between the levels of government and to reduce the burden of compliance for taxpayers.

The Advisory Commission is composed of representatives of the public and of each level of government. The senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and I have served on the Commission since its establishment. On the House side, Representative FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina, chairman of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, and the original sponsor of the bill creating the Commission, and Representative DWYER, of New Jersey, are also charter members. The other House Member is Representative KEOGH, of New York.

In addition to the six Members from Congress, the Commission has three from the executive branch: the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Other members include four Governors, four mayors, three State legislative leaders, and three elected county officials. The public is represented by three members, one of whom is the Commission's Chairman.

A year has elapsed since the submission of the Commission's sixth annual report, and it is appropriate that the Senate be apprised of the Commission's activities during the past 12 months.

Mr. Frank Bane, of Virginia, Chairman of the Commission, continues to skillfully guide the Commission, while Mr. William G. Colman, its executive director, provides able leadership in overseeing the activities of the 23-member professional and clerical staff.

During 1965, general meetings of the Commission were held in January, May, and October; and this year, in January. The following major reports requiring implementation were adopted during the course of the sessions:

First. "Relocation: Unequal Treatment of People and Businesses Displaced by Governments." This study explores the need to achieve consistency and equity in the treatment of those persons and businesses forced to relocate because of Federal and federally aided public improvement programs.

The Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations acted swiftly to implement the Commission's findings. On April 1, 1965, I introduced S. 1681. Companion measures to S. 1681 were introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressmen FOUNTAIN—H.R. 7821, and DWYER—H.R. 7970. H.R. 10212, introduced by Congressman SICKLES, includes provisions similar to S. 1681. Hearings were held by the subcommittee on June 30, July 1, 13, and 14, 1965. Final action by the Senate is expected in the near future.

Second. "Federal-State Coordination of Personal Income Taxes." If our States are to remain viable partners in our Federal system, their fiscal position must be strengthened. This report looks at this problem and develops a number of useful recommendations, including a proposed Federal tax credit for State income tax payments.

Third. "Metropolitan Social and Economic Disparities: Implications for Intergovernmental Relations in Central Cities and Suburbs." This report investigates:

> Who lives in the central cities and corresponding suburban rings of each metropolitan area? What are the fiscal resources in our central cities and suburbs? How do governmental expenditures differ among these jurisdictions? What changes, if any, should be made in Federal, State, and local policies regarding such social and economic disparities, and what specific legislative and administrative actions should be taken to implement these changes?

Current work projects on the Commission's agenda include:

First. State taxation of interstate commerce. This report considers policy issues raised in H.R. 11798—WILLIS, Democrat, of Louisiana, pertaining to State taxation of interstate commerce.

Second. Intergovernmental responsibility for building codes and regulations. The variety of building regulations and how greater uniformity can be achieved were considered at the January meeting of the Commission.

Third. Effect of tax and expenditure practices on location of industry and economic development. State laws designed to attract industry pose serious intergovernmental problems. This question is now being scrutinized by the Commission.

Fourth. Intergovernmental relations in the poverty program. The war against poverty is running into serious obstacles and is being attacked in some quarters. The Commission is exploring ways in which more effective cooperation among levels of government can be achieved in the administration of this program.

Fifth. The Advisory Commission has contracted with the Department of City Planning at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to reassess Commission recommendations relating to urban areas and to measure their effectiveness as devices for relieving pressing metropolitan problems.

Sixth. In October, the Commission sponsored and chaired a meeting to consider the need for a fullfledged conference to discuss the question of urban research. The staff of the subcommittee participated in the conference.

Of more general concern to those interested in intergovernmental relations is the tracing by the Commission of significant intergovernmental events in 1965. Brief descriptions of the Voting Rights Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a grant program for the improvement of State and local law enforcement are included. Two major fiscal problems, State taxation of interstate commerce and the treatment of income derived from securities of State and local governments, are also discussed.

The brief survey of State legislative reapportionment in 1965 will be of special interest to all Senators.

The Commission's report also highlights a number of significant developments at the State level, including increased State interest in urban problems, improvements in intergovernmental fiscal relations, new and higher State and local taxes, and greater concern with revising State constitutions. A number of recent examples of greater areawide cooperation in urban areas were cited.

The Commission's report takes note of other significant intergovernmental relations developments that took place at the Federal level in 1965. The creation of the Department of Urban Affairs brings into better focus Federal activities as they affect our cities. The passage by the Senate of S. 561, the proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965, also marks a real milestone in intergovernmental relations. S. 561 will help to better coordinate Federal efforts as they influence State and local affairs

The continuing debate on the so-called Heller proposal suggests that the topic of intergovernmental finances will occupy much of our attention in the months to come.

The report takes special note of joint hearings held by the House and Senate Subcommittees on Intergovernmental Relations last May on the 5-year record of the Advisory Commission.

In transmitting the subcommittee's findings to the Senate Committee on Government Operations, I pointed out:

> The hearings revealed that the Commission, in its 5 years of operation, has achieved a high level of competence and productivity in its continuing study of problems which affect intergovernmental relations at the Federal, State and local levels.

Nothing reveals this more than the Commission's success in the implementation of its recommendations at the Federal and State levels since the issuance of its last annual report.

The Housing Act of 1965 contains eight provisions that stem from Commission recommendations. Two suggestions offered by the ACIR are found in the medicare bill. An amendment to the Water Pollution Control Act, offered by the Commission, was accepted and included in the final bill. Finally, the Commission was successful in having one of its recommendations adopted in the Manpower Development and Training Act. There are also a number of Commission recommendations presently being considered in bills pending before the Congress.

At the State and local government levels, Commission recommendations met with even greater success. Each year, model laws based on these recommendations are drafted for State consideration. Thirty-nine States have implemented one or more Commission proposals during the past 2 years. The ACIR should be well satisfied with their efforts at the State level.

Increased concern over the operation of our Federal system is of major significance to both the subcommittee and the Advisory Commission. The President is working to reduce interlevel friction that is impeding the implementation of Great Society programs. This effort will require a substantial research effort and thoughtful legislation. As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations and as a member of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, I feel certain that each will play a significant part in attaining President Johnson's goals of a truly "creative federalism."

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES ENDORSES FISH PROTEIN CONCENTRATE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, an exceedingly strong and bright ray of hope has been cast on the world hunger and malnutrition problem by the National Academy of Sciences' endorsement and support of a fish protein concentrate. This significant development was mentioned in President Johnson's food-for-freedom message to Congress and was elaoorated upon this week by releases from Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall. The letters and reports from the National Academy of Sciences make it quite clear that the research work done by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in recent years to develop a wholesome fish protein concentrate has been enormously successful. I was particularly pleased by the resolution adopted by the National Academy in support of my bill, S. 2720, which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct and operate experimental pilot plants for the production of fish protein concentrate in a program similar to the one now being carried out under our saline water program. It is my hope that the splendid work done by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and by the National Academy of Sciences will be helpful to the Food and Drug Administration in their consideration of this new fish protein concentrate product. It is my hope also that hearings can be held on the legislation Senator MAGNUSON and I have introduced as soon as action is taken by the Food and Drug Administration on this matter.

Mr. President, I ask that a copy of the letter from Frederick Sertz, president of the National Academy of Sciences dated December 1, 1965, addressed to Secretary Udall on this matter, be included in the RECORD at this point along with a copy of the resolution recommending the construction of a suitable pilot plant for fish protein concentrate adopted by the Advisory Committee on Marine Protein Resource Development of the National Academy of Sciences and the committee's statement concerning the commercial production of a wholesome protein concentrate made from whole fish for human consumption.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES,
Washington, D.C., December 1, 1965.

HON. STEWART L. UDALL,
The Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On behalf of the Advisory Committee on Marine Protein Resource Development, operating under our Food and Nutrition Board, I am pleased to transmit two statements concerning fish protein concentrate resulting from the research program of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

The first statement gives the Committee's judgment that fish protein concentrate, from whole hake, as prepared by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries process is safe, nutritious, wholesome, and fit for human consumption. The second statement urges the erection of a suitable pilot plant to provide a source of fish protein concentrate for nutritional projects and studies in developing as well as to obtain needed additional plant operation data. Both statements have the endorsement of the Food and Nutrition Board.

You will note that the Committee recommends continuation of the research at the Bureau of Commerical Fisheries because of the wide range of fish protein concentrates that can be developed which can be used to good effect in meeting the grave problem of protein malnutrition.

We are pleased to have this opportunity to be of continuing service to the Department of the Interior.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK SEITZ,
President.

FOOD AND NUTRITION BOARD, ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON MARINE PROTEIN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT,
NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES-NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C.

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING CONSTRUCTION OF A SUITABLE PILOT PLANT FOR FISH PROTEIN CONCENTRATE

The Committee recommends that the U.S. Government, through the appropriate agency or agencies, fund and arrange for the production of a fish protein concentrate suitable for human consumption to the extent that 3,000 tons of such product will have been made available for large-scale nutritional projects addressed to human protein malnutrition within 2 years from this date, or as soon thereafter as possible. The Committee believes that this can be done most effectively by the construction and operation of an experimental pilot plant scale installation, based on the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries process, which can produce about 10 tons of product a day from whole hake. The plant and the production should be under the operational control of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Department of the Interior. This size of plant is also required for further experimentation on the technology of the process so that scale up to an industrial scale by private industry can be more readily accomplished.

Adopted: October 14, 1965.

FOOD AND NUTRITION BOARD, ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON MARINE PROTEIN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT,
NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES-NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C.

STATEMENT CONCERNING THE COMMERCIAL PRODUCTION OF A WHOLESOME PROTEIN CONCENTRATE MADE FROM WHOLE FISH FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION

Since 1963 the Committee, through meetings, through its executive secretary, and in discussions with the research workers, has kept a close surveillance on the research program of the Technology Laboratory of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries at College Park, Md. This research is concerned with the development of a fish protein concentrate suitable for human consumption, made from whole fish, which is wholesome, nutritious, and capable of commercial production at costs low enough to be of practical value in the mitigation of human protein malnutrition problems.

The Committee has reexamined the report of the temporary Committee on questions submitted by the Secretary of the Interior concerning fish protein concentrate, dated October 29, 1962, of which a copy is attached hereto. The Committee is of the opinion that the judgments made in that report have now been affirmed.

It became apparent during 1964 that a process using whole red hake gave promise for a suitable fish protein concentrate. The process involved the extraction of water, oil, and other unwanted solubles in the fish by the use of isopropanol. On the advice of the Committee, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries concentrated its work on the necessary process development and testing of this product. A report on the results of this work was reviewed in detail by the Committee at its meeting on September 16 and 17, 1965. On the basis of this report, the Committee believes that the fish protein concentrate developed by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries is wholesome, highly nutritious, stable, safe, and capable of economic production and marketing.

Red hake together with silver hake (Merluccius billinearis), are abundant on the Continental Shelf off the northeast United States and Canada and can be harvested at relatively low cost. A near relative (Merluccius productus) occurs in large volumes off the west coast of the United States, Mexico, and Canada. These fish have been used for human food for a long period of time. However, they do not enjoy a sufficiently broad market to utilize the resource fully since their delicate flesh does not stand up well under marketing procedures because of excessive drip (loss of tissue moisture).

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries process involves the solvent extraction of this fish using isopropanol in a sanitary food plant. The resulting concentrate of the solid parts of the fish retains most of the nutritious material originally in the fish except for the oils and other soluble residues. The product contains a minimum of 80 percent protein, as well as minerals useful in human nutrition. It is, as manufactured, a dry powder without any distinctive fish odor or taste. It is highly stable and can be stored and shipped economically.

Microbiological tests showed that the processing of the fish further reduced the original low microbial content of the raw material and resulted in a product with exceptionally low total bacterial count.

In this process the oil content of the fish is reduced to a level of 0.2 percent in the finished product. This level results in a satisfactory, wholesome, and stable product. There is also reason to believe that a product with a somewhat higher residual oil content might be equally satisfactory and be cheaper to produce. Further research aimed at elucidating this upper level of satisfactory residual oil content is in progress.

The product obtained by this process, when biologically tested, yielded an average protein efficiency ratio of 3.44, compared to 3.2 for the average casein controls. The difference is statistically significant.

Toxicological tests of a very stringent nature carried out thus far have yielded no evidence that the product is otherwise than wholesome.

The product blends well with other forms of food. The Committee has tested it as an ingredient in beverages, noodles, gravy, bread and cookies. In percentages high enough to be of nutritional significance, the product is scarcely detectable, and in most forms not at all.

The calculated costs of the product in the pilot plant, extrapolated to commercial sized installations, indicate that manufacturing costs will enable the product to be used as an additive to other foods cheaply enough to reach the population of developing countries. The ability of the process to use whole edible fish insures cheap raw material costs and quantities of raw material adequate for making a major impact on human protein malnutrition problems.

The Committee does not imply by this report that other equally satisfactory and wholesome fish protein concentrates cannot be made from other kinds of whole edible fish by other suitable processes. The work at the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Technology Laboratory, and the Committee's work, is continuing and should continue for some years to come because of the possibility of developing a large range of fish protein products that can be used in a wide variety of dietary situations in the world to much good effect.

In the judgment of the Committee, fish protein concentrate, as produced by the BCF progress is not in any way filthy or otherwise unfit for human consumption. On the contrary, after reviewing in detail the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries report on the hake project and questioning the BCF research personnel on further details, the Committee has concluded that the fish protein concentrate made by the BCF process is a product that is wholesome and safe for human consumption, is highly nutritious, blends well as an additive to many types of food normally used, can be produced at a reasonably low cost and, in the view of the Committee, is suitable at present for commercial production, distribution, and use in human nutrition.

Adopted: October 14, 1965.

JETPLANE NOISE IN THE CHICAGO SUBURBS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, recently I read an article in the Christian Science Monitor by Staff Correspondent John Allan Long on the intolerable noise level in certain Chicago suburbs caused by jet air traffic at nearby O'Hare Airport.

I submit that the terrible situation so vividly described in this article is the prospect we will face in certain Washington neighborhoods and in the northern Virginia suburbs bordering National Airport, should jet airliners be allowed to land there.

The incessant, thunderous roar of jet engines proved so annoying to the residents of Park Ridge, Ill., that the mayor of that Chicago suburb was forced to institute repressive measures. Even so, the battle against the deafening jets continues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by John Allan Long in the February 12, 1966, edition of the Christian Science Monitor be reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATTLE OF THE DECIBEL

(By John Allan Long)

PARK RIDGE, ILL.—"When landing, it makes a horrible, whining sound; on takeoff, a roar which, in summer, can drown out my lawnmower 2 feet before me."

This is what one Chicago suburbanite hears as jet aircraft enter and leave O'Hare International Airport.

Sixty percent of the 1,400 planes handled daily at O'Hare are jets. During early morning and evening, jet noise bombards certain suburbs every 40 seconds.

For almost 10 years, the suburbs encasing O'Hare have fought the noise problem. Now Park Ridge, using finesse and a local law permitting ticketing of noisy planes, is making itself heard.

"There are two things you can do if you are a suburban mayor," says Mayor W. Bert Ball, of Park Ridge. "You can gnash your teeth, or you can stop aircraft from flying over your city."

Park Ridge has chosen the latter approach. Small towns around the country faced with the same problem are beginning to take notice.

As a sort of modern giant killer, Park Ridge has boldly taken on the airlines and the Federal Aviation Agency in defense of a quieter town.

Aircraft still fly over the city. But, says Mayor Ball, "we have much less noise than 2 years ago." No other suburb can say that much.

The secret is a special town ordinance which states that noise "more than 95 decibels in intensity shall be * * * an unusually loud noise and is prohibited."

It further provides for the police chief to levy a $10 to $200 fine on jets making too much noise over its city. In effect, Park Ridge may ticket aircraft.

To monitor the noise an overhead jet makes, the police use a special truck parked 3 miles from the end of O'Hare runway 9/27.

Using a radio, a policeman identifies airplanes by tuning in on the tower frequency. As the plane comes over, either landing or taking off, he measures the amount of noise on a decibel meter.

The type of plane, airline, and decibel reading are recorded for each flight. This information is given to the airlines.

SEVENTY-SIX PERCENT OVER 90 DECIBELS

Last September, for instance, 76 percent of the flights monitored were over 90 decibels. Twenty-seven percent were over 95 decibels. That is a lot of noise.

When an airline's planes exceed the tolerance level of 95 decibels, representatives are called into Mayor Ball's office and given a stern lecture.

Given the size and importance of the airlines, the results have been almost phenomenal.

"We have made the airlines aware of an extreme noise problem," asserts Alderman James D. Cole. "They didn't know how much noise they were making until we recorded it."

Robert Schwank, assistant chief of the FAA tower at O'Hare, says that noise now is second only to safety as a concern for the airlines.

RUNWAYS ALTERNATED

When weather permits, no one runway is used for too long a time. This distributes the noise more evenly over all suburbs.

The approaches to O'Hare over northwest Chicago and Park Ridge, weather permitting, are not used by 4-engine jets from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m.

Park Ridge had a hand in making these changes.

Here is what came out of one meeting with officials of Trans World Airlines and Mayor Ball.

TWA's chief pilot at O'Hare, R. E. Simpkins, wrote a letter to the airline's chief pilots at other major airports directing them to change their flight patterns when leaving O'Hare:

"An aircraft taking off on runway [9/27] and starting a turn to the northwest at 300 feet would pass directly over Park Ridge's most sensitive area," he wrote.

"A record kept by Park Ridge * * * showed 13 of our flights * * * with recorded decibel readings above 95. * * * "In summary, when taking off on runway [9/27] at O'Hare do not start your initial turn at 300 feet * * * [continue] all the way to 2,000 feet before turning."

NO PLANES TICKETED

By not turning until reaching a higher altitude the jets will dump much less noise on the city. This directive is one startling result of Park Ridge's efforts.

Alderman Cole says that of a list of 22 noise-abatement objectives, all but a few have been met.

To date it has been done without ticketing an airplane. If the airlines refused to pay the ticket, Park Ridge could be expected to take matters to court.

Such a court battle already is being waged by one New York suburb. It, too, has a noise law, which Park Ridge used as a pattern for its own. The New York case has been in the courts a year and a half.

By "being reasonable," Mayor Ball says, "Park Ridge has managed to avoid court action." Yet, his city, with the noise law behind it, has done a lot to limit noise.

Representative ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, of the 11th District in Illinois, has fought for years to limit noise. His district is at the foot of O'Hare's runways.

MIDWAY RECOMMENDATION

Despite progress in at least Park Ridge, he says a poll of his district shows 41 percent of the people are "still bothered by jetplane noise."

THE OCTOPUS IN THE STATEHOUSE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Saturday Evening Post of February 12 carried a very interesting article by Trevor Armbrister, on the financial crisis confronting many States and the need for reform confronting State governments. The article, "The Octopus in the Statehouse," analyzes some of the problems that beset State legislatures today as a result of antiquated constitutions, fiscal insolvency, conflicts of interest, and urban growth.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OCTOPUS IN THE STATEHOUSE

(By Trevor Armbrister)

(NOTE.—Greed, laziness, inefficiency, waste, stupidity—there are many forces that have been strangling and bankrupting our State governments. But today, under pressure from the Supreme Court, a vast process of change is underway—threatening some of us, promising hope to others. Here is a nationwide report—1 year in the making—on the roots of a major American problem and the search for a solution.)

SYMPTOMS OF DECLINE IN STATE LEGISLATURES: DRUNKEN SPEECHES, FISTFIGHTS, IMPROMPTU BARBERSHOP SINGING, HOOTS AND CATCALLS

The small, uncomplicated world of Frank A. Hutchins began to crumble shortly after 3 o'clock on the afternoon of May 14, 1965. Nodding glumly to his colleagues, the tall, 66-year-old Republican from the town of Stannard stepped slowly down the aisle and took his seat in Vermont's House of Representatives. On the rostrum, a clerk began to call the roll: "Adams, Alexander, Anderson, Andrew, Arthur, Baird * * *." The vote was on a bill to abolish a form of government that had existed in the State since 1793. Frank Hutchins knew the measure would pass. He knew also that it would mean the end of his political career.

Frank Hutchins, of course, had never thought of himself as a politician. To him the word was odious. It conjured up images not at all in keeping with his personal credo. He liked to think of himself instead as a gentleman farmer imbued with a high sense of civic duty. This sense of duty had first impelled him to run for the State legislature in 1931. As the representative from Stannard (population 113), he had crusaded for economy in government. He worried about the State's mounting debt, and he fought hard against what he considered to be unnecessary expenditures in health, education, and welfare. Over the years his efforts seemed to meet with less and less success. The total State budget—a paltry $16 million when he first trudged down to Montpelier in 1931—had already soared to a dizzying $135 million. Now it seemed likely to climb even higher. For on this sweltering afternoon in May, the legislature was voting to reapportion its membership on the basis of population and thereby purge from office the scores of small-town representatives who had stood together for so long as the last bastion of commonsense and frugality.

"Myers, Nelson, Nolan, O'Brien * * *." The clerk droned on through the list of 245 legislators. Inside the historic, high-ceilinged chamber, the temperature climbed past 90 degrees. A few men peeled off their coats and milled about in shirtsleeves. Frank Hutchins kept his coat on and stared straight ahead. "Wiquest, Woodward, Yeaw, Zampieri * * *." At last the rollcall was over. The measure had been approved overwhelmingly. A few lawmakers shouted endorsement; cheers broke out among the spectators in the balcony. Alone at his desk, Frank Hutchins began to cry.

Hutchins is only one of several hundred casualties in a battle that has been raging for almost 2 years in State capitals across the Nation. The name of the battle is reapportionment. It was touched off in June 1964, when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that both houses of a State legislature must be apportioned on the basis of population. The decision has caused consternation, upheaval, and panic and subjected the High Court to fierce attack. Yet by changing the complexion of the legislative branch, reapportionment has also given the States a final opportunity to reassert themselves as meaningful units of government. "It's a revolution without guns," says a graying, soft-spoken Washington, D.C., attorney named Charles S. Rhyne. "If reapportionment hadn't come along, the States would be practically going out of existence. They'd reached the point of inaction anyway."

"Crisis," perhaps, would be a more appropriate word. Nearly every State faces the specter of further Federal encroachment into areas it once considered to be its own responsibility. Nearly every State faces a fiscal emergency. Nearly every State is inefficiently and wastefully governed—stymied in its actions by an outmoded constitution. Under many capital domes, stagnation reigns.

For the citizens of the States the result is tragic—bad government in all its frustrating, dispiriting aspects. All this is acutely apparent to that canny breed of journalist, the statehouse reporter, but he also sees drama and levity, for he is witness to perhaps the most colorful and outrageous spectacle that American politics provides. Nowhere but in the State capitals are able men quite so earnest or scoundrels quite so base. And nowhere else do native American characters collect in such profusion to display their assorted traits.

Consider, for example, Nebraska Senator Richard Proud, who entered the chamber in Lincoln last year clad in striped bib overalls—his way of emphasizing that legislators are the people's representatives. "I'm striking a blow for liberty," he announced. Consider also Joseph Zaretzki, an able New York senator with a Rabelaisian disregard for daintiness. Last session he startled his colleagues by shouting down a Republican suggestion while his mouth was full of banana. Nearby sat his rotund, rosy-faced colleague, Senator Max Turshen, who is known for his ebullient pronouncements that he is "300 percent" for a bill. Noted Georgia journalist Celestine Sibley recalls that on the final night of the 1965 session, "Representative Grover Lee gave an exhibition of train calling. Representatives Howard Rainey and Ben Jessup gave spirited demonstrations of automobile auctioneering. Representative Dewey Rush rose on a point of personal privilege and ended up by singing a country ballad, "I've Been Hanging Around This Old Town Too Long." Representative James Hull cried, "Kill the bull, kill the bull." whereupon the House took up the cry, "Olé, olé."

With men like these in the paneled chambers, it is no wonder that legislative proceedings frequently veer off into areas of somewhat less than momentous significance. Last year the Maryland Legislature found itself unable to agree on a reapportionment plan, nor could it act on bills concerning the distribution of guns, fair housing, equal access to public accommodations, or an educational TV network. During the final hours of the regular session, however, while the clock was running out, the senators found ample time for a spirited debate on the location of a garbage incinerator in the city of Annapolis.

For years New Hampshire's legislators have expressed concern over porcupines. There is always someone who introduces a bill to poison the animals, and someone else who says the State should no longer pay bounties for their skins. During the 1965 session lawmakers decided that the best way to reduce the porcupine population was to raise the bounty from 50 cents to 75 cents per animal. But some representatives still seemed troubled. "How can you tell if a porcupine is really a native of New Hampshire?" one asked. "How can you be sure he hasn't slipped across the border from Vermont?"

Florida has no porcupine problem, but legislators did pass a bill last session which, in effect, prohibits monkeys from driving automobiles on State highways. Connecticut's lawmakers deliberated the merits of "an act prohibiting cats from roaming at large." And in North Carolina last spring a bill aimed at protecting alligators won passage only after Senators beat back amendments that would have included elephants and kangaroos.

For pure nonsense, however, few legislatures can rival Tennessee's. Last session it decided that the Volunteer State needed a poet laureate and promptly nominated a gentleman named R. M. (Pek) Gunn for the job. Most Tennesseans knew Gunn only as the director of prison services in the department of correction. But suddenly he was being praised as the author of a poem which read:

When I came to the city, boys
I sure was in a pickle.
For deep down in my pocket,
I couldn't find a nickel.

Midway in the debate over Gunn's qualifications, Representative Joan Strong jumped up to suggest that her colleagues select a poet laureate from within their own esteemed ranks. And she had just the candidate: Representative V. F. Goddard, who had once written a poem beginning "Sam Houston, you bum * * *." (Gunn won.)

Toward the end of the Tennessee session, the talk turned to nudism. Representative A. Gaines Morton was against it. "I'd like to bring out a few points," he explained one day—to general laughter. Representative Charles Galbreath then rose to ask, "How many nudists does it take to make a colony?" Morton wasn't sure, but he thought the answer was more than one. His colleagues took his word for it, and promptly banned all nudist colonies in the State.

Such tomfoolery is only one symptom of the general decline in State government. Other symptoms are less amusing. In Louisiana, for example, State Senator Jack Fruge was to go on trial last week on charges that he and a woman in the State conservation department conspired to commit forgery to get funds from the senate payroll. In Minnesota last fall a Federal grand jury indicted State Insurance Commissioner Cyrus E. Magnusson on charges of fraud and conspiracy in connection with the collapse of a St. Paul auto-insurance company. In Massachusetts, after conducting a 3-year probe, the State's crime commission reported that "The reality has been worse than we imagined. We have observed with indignation the ways in which some of the most highly placed and powerful figures in the State have betrayed the public trust. We have noted with increasing concern the moral blindness of so many who have appeared before us * * *." Already, 19 corporations and 95 individuals—including more than 2 dozen present and former public officials—have been indicted on charges ranging from bribery to the filing of false reports. With similar scandals grabbing headlines elsewhere, it is not surprising that the image of State government is woefully tarnished.

"Geographically, the States are obsolete," insists Writer-Prof. Jerome Ellison. "Their boundaries were drawn on the bases of political realities of 50 to 300 years ago * * *. The States have more often than not proved to be failures as political units. They have rarely been able to carry through administrative jobs more complicated than mailing out license plates * * *. In many aspects, State government is dead and ripe for burying."

Ellison's elegy seems premature. For the States today still retain broad powers. They control most courts and pass most laws affecting most citizens. They make the ground rules for local governments. They levy and collect taxes. They regulate voting and control the police. They build and operate public schools, colleges, and universities. They build and repair most roads and highways. They maintain most prisons and hospitals. They regulate such industries as banking and insurance. The States, in short, attempt to perform—in Thomas Jefferson's phrase—"whatever acts they can do as well as the National Government."

The difficulty is that in the past 25 years the line of separation between what the States should do and what the Federal Government should do has become increasingly fuzzy. And when in doubt, the Federal Government has moved—not always wisely but always on a broad scale—to take up the slack. In 1932, the Federal Government operated 13 grant-in-aid programs totaling $229 million. Today, it maintains roughly 120 such programs adding up to $13.6 billion, and these programs encompass many fields previously left to the States.

What most disturbs State officials about some of the recent programs—aid to education, water pollution, the war on poverty—is the fact that they funnel Federal dollars directly to cities, schools, and private organizations. The war on poverty, for example, bypasses the States entirely in five of its six separate titles. Last year, when the State Governors fought to retain the right to veto local antipoverty projects, they suffered a galling defeat. Their veto power had to be taken away, said Antipoverty Program Director Sargent Shriver, to insure that "community action is not stultified by State action."

"The Federal Government is moving to usurp State government in medicare, education, poverty," warns California Assembly Speaker Jesse M. Unruh. "Pretty soon, there won't be anything for the States to do except maintain a police force and issue parking tickets."

"The States are just as willing to do what should be done as the Federal Government," says Alabama's Gov. George C. Wallace, gesturing with the stump of a dead cigar, "but they took our tax sources years ago and you can't assume responsibilities without taxes." In State after State other harried executives bemoan the loss of income tax revenues. And while revenues were vanishing, they point out, the States have had to shoulder the brunt of the population explosion. Throughout the country, education costs have skyrocketed. Welfare costs have risen sharply too, and so have the price tags on highways, sanitation systems, and hospitals. Often the States have failed to find ways to finance these services adequately, and the Federal Government has had to help.

But money is just part of the difficulty. Social problems today are not only more costly to tackle but vaster. In the past, most of a State's concerns fitted neatly inside its own boundaries. But civil rights, unemployment, education, urban sag and suburban sprawl—such problems are now scattered willy-nilly across State lines. Because the States can so seldom cooperate on common problems, Federal intervention is inevitable.

Contrary to the popular myth, this broad expansion of Federal power cannot be attributed solely to the activities of greedy bureaucrats in Washington. To a surprising degree the States have psychologically lost the ability to solve complex problems. In 1953 President Dwight D. Eisenhower appointed a special commission to determine what responsibilities the States wanted to take back from the Federal Government. Commission members launched a lengthy probe, then reported that the States really didn't want to recapture a single important function. This attitude persists today. "We can be talking about a problem like water pollution," says Pennsylvania Representative K. LeRoy Irvis, "and someone will get up and say, 'Let's not do anything on a State level until we find out what the Federal Government's going to do.' So we wait."

"The first and most natural attachment of the people will be to the governments of their respective States," wrote James Madison nearly 200 years ago. Today that attachment seems tenuous at best. Over a martini at the faculty club on the campus of New Jersey's Rutgers University, Political Science Prof. John Bebout says, "State governments have become relatively less meaningful ever since the New Deal. A whole generation of Americans were brought up with a demonstration that basic issues could be dealt with only by a massive national program. They gave up on the States." Adds Laszlo Ecker-Racz, a curly-haired, Hungarian-born economist: "For 25 years the United States has been taught by the academic community that the States are on the way out."

Ecker-Racz points out that a major share of Federal expansion has come about only because the States were unwilling to act in areas where they had both time and resources. "Urban areas," he says, "have long tried to get the States to do something about public housing, urban renewal, and water pollution. The States were reluctant to act. In the more politically oriented atmosphere of Washington, where the value of votes is recognized, the cities found a ready ear and an open purse."

In the past 4 years Detroit has received more than $60 million in Federal funds. "There's an almost total lack of interest, lack of help on the part of the State," says Mayor Jerome Cavanagh. "Then, along comes the Federal Government and, almost apologetically, it gives a little help. The Federal Government has been much more oriented toward solving the real problems that exist in this country, and those problems exist in urban areas."

Examples of State default are easy to pinpoint. Most States have laws against water pollution. Yet in their frantic efforts to retain large industries, they enforce these laws lackadaisically. Sometimes, they are even more cooperative. In 1947, for instance, the Florida Legislature passed a bill allowing manufacturers in Taylor County to pour their industrial and chemical wastes into the Fenholloway River.

Today the Fenholloway stinks. Yet during the 1965 session, Senator L. P. (Pete) Gibson introduced a bill to allow further pollution of the river and its tributaries. The legislature passed the measure and sent it on to the Governor. By this time, opposition had developed. Gov. Haydon Burns vetoed the bill. But then, in one of those Byzantine twists that typify Florida politics, he agreed to let another bill pass which states that no river or lake can be polluted unless the rules and regulations of the State board of conservation are followed. Since the State board of conservation has no rules covering pollution, anything goes.

Consider also the field of medical care. In 1960, Congress passed the Kerr-Mills Act. This program called for financial aid from the Federal Government but insisted on a minimum of Federal control. It offered the States, in other words, an opportunity to prove they could solve the problem themselves. Eventually, 28 States took advantage of Kerr-Mills. But 22 others failed to use it in any way. Enter medicare.

"State governments are unequipped to understand urban problems, let alone solve them," says Mayor John Collins of Boston. "How can anyone logically expect any State government to develop the expertise to pass on a program like urban renewal—and what is the sense of putting 300 people to work in a State capital trying to second guess what the cities are doing? Uncle Sam knows what we're doing. I say, let State government ship out."

II. THE ONE MAN, ONE VOTE MESS

Not long ago in Tallahassee, Fla., the State senate was locked in a bitter debate over urban renewal when up jumped Senator Dempsey Barron with a remarkable suggestion: "Don't you think that we could make a good argument that we need some slums in America so people can realize there is somewhere for them to work up to?"

How is it possible for State governments to be so out of touch with the realities of the urban age? A primary cause of the illness is the malapportionment of State legislatures, a system under which rural representatives ("The Cornstalk Brigade" in Ohio; "Appleknockers" in New York; "The Kerosene Kult"—because they oppose electricity—in

Vermont) have been able to strangle their colleagues' attempts to pass laws smacking even faintly of the 20th century.

This malapportionment is a relatively recent phenomenon. The original constitutions of 36 States provided that representation in both houses of a State legislature should be based predominantly on population. In 27 of these States, population was to be the sole basis. Until 1900, most States obeyed their own constitutions and reapportioned every 10 years. But suddenly they stopped. One reason was the mass migration to the cities, a migration that as early as 1920 gave urban America a majority of the population. Understandably, rural legislators didn't want to reapportion themselves out of office. But there was still another factor to be considered. By 1920, control of municipal government in Boston, Chicago, Kansas City, and many other American cities had fallen into the clutches of corrupt political machines. The vision of these machines extending control across the State made rural lawmakers shudder.

So malapportionment spread. By 1960, 11.9 percent of Connecticut's population could elect a majority in the State's house of representatives. Hartford (population 162,178) had two delegates; so did Union (population 383). In California, State Senator Tom Rees of Los Angeles County had 6,800,000 people in his district. His colleague, Senator William Symons, Jr., was accountable to a mere 15,300 constituents spread over three barren northern counties. And in Vermont, where the vote of Frank A. Hutchins from Stannard (population 113) could cancel out the vote of Richard H. Schmidt from Burlington (population 35,532), some districts had extremes of 987 to 1.

"To the beleaguered, smalltown legislators in an unfriendly world of cities," write Michigan State University Profs. Charles Press and Charles R. Adrian in the Antioch Review, "it often seems as if they are themselves the last stronghold of sanity and morality. Low taxes and simplicity in State government are [their] goal."

To gain these ends, the rural representatives have seldom needed to devise programs of their own. They needed only the power to impose a veto. Where malapportionment has existed, they have had such power, and often they have used it mercilessly.

For years the rural-dominated Indiana Legislature prohibited Indianapolis from accepting Federal grants for such programs as urban renewal, thereby denying the city an estimated $40 million. Nor would the legislature allow gasoline-tax receipts to be used for improving the city's streets. It was permissible, however, for these receipts to be used to pay for repairing roads and highways outside Indianapolis. A similar situation exists in Louisiana where—despite the decay of downtown Baton Rouge—the legislature still refuses to allow Federal participation in urban renewal.

In Connecticut not long ago, the legislature devised a State-aid formula that gave towns with less than 500 population $27.19 per student; cities with more than 100,000 people received only $4.95 per pupil. By the same token, in Colorado, suburban Jefferson County received $100,000 more in State school aid than Denver, which had to support 72,000 more students. In Alabama, tiny Coosa County with only 10,000 residents, few cars, and few roads to maintain receives as much from the State's gasoline-tax revenues as industrial Birmingham with its 634,000 citizens and 140,000 registered automobiles.

In an effort to force their State to obey its own constitution, eradicate malapportionment and thereby snuff out a major cause of antiurban discrimination, nine prominent Tennesseans filed suit in 1959 against their secretary of state, Joe C. Carr. Since 1901, there had been no change in Tennessee's legislative districts. Yet although the State's major cities—Memphis, Nashville, Knoxville, and Chattanooga—had grown substantially during that period, their voters could elect only 19 of the State's 99 assemblymen. The urban plaintiffs charged that malapportionment diluted the value of their votes.

After a succession of predictable lower-court defeats, the Tennesseans succeeded in bringing their suit to the U.S. Supreme Court. The High Court had heard such cases before and always rejected them, claiming it lacked jurisdiction. The Court had seemed to agree with the late Justice Felix Frankfurter, who in 1946 had warned of the dangers that might ensue if the judiciary were to enter the "political thicket" of legislative apportionment.

Yet always before, the plaintiffs in reapportionment suits had based their argument on article 4, section 4, of the U.S. Constitution—the so-called guaranty clause—which says, "The United States shall guarantee to every State * * * a republican form of government." But Charles Rhyne, the attorney for the Tennessee plaintiffs, decided on a different attack. He would base his appeal on the "equal-protection clause," the provision written into the 14th amendment which stipulates that no State "shall deny to any person * * * the equal protection of the laws." His strategy succeeded. On March 26, 1962, in deciding *Baker* v. *Carr*, a majority of the Court ruled that legislative apportionment was, after all, a legitimate judicial issue.

The Court's decision opened the lower courts of the Nation to a flood of reapportionment cases. Thirty-six separate suits were filed within a 12-month period. Yet even as these cases entered litigation, the High Court was moving to expand its own doctrine. On June 15, 1964—in what was undoubtedly the most significant judicial decision since public school desegregation—a 6-to-3 majority ruled that both houses of a State legislature had to be apportioned on the basis of population. No longer could history or social and economic considerations be given weight. The Court's pronouncement applied directly only to cases in Alabama, Virginia, Delaware, Maryland, New York, and Colorado, yet it implied that urban dwellers everywhere could attempt to gain fair representation by filing suit in lower courts. Thus it spelled upheaval for all but a handful of States.

"Legislators represent people, not trees or acres," wrote Chief Justice Earl Warren in the majority opinion. "Legislators are elected by voters, not farms or cities or economic interest * * *. To the extent that a citizen's right to vote is debased, he is that much less a citizen * * *. The weight of a citizen's vote cannot be made to depend on where he lives * * *."

Many disputed the right of the Court to make such a sweeping decision. Many more wondered whether such a broad interpretation of the equal protection clause would create more problems than it solved. Was it healthy, for example, to grant populous southern California near absolute domination over the entire State? Writing in the Harvard Law Review, Attorney Philip Kurland accused the Court of "a lack of workmanlike performance" in reaching its conclusions. And in the Saturday Evening Post, Illinois Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN charged that the Court had taken "what may prove to be the longest step toward creating a judicial dictatorship * * *."

Of the six cases decided by the Court, the one that aroused the most vehement criticism originated in Colorado. In 1961 the State legislature had devised a reapportionment plan which said that House representation should be based solely on population. But taking into account the size and diversity of the State, the plan also granted consideration to area in the shaping of senatorial districts. Placed on the ballot by popular initiative, the plan was approved overwhelmingly by Colorado's voters who—at the same time—rejected another proposal to base both houses strictly on population. Yet now the Supreme Court, with the avowed intention of protecting majority rights, was overruling Colorado's majority vote. To many critics of the Court, the legal justification for such a step was flimsy at best.

As the champion of these critics, Senator DIRKSEN began corralling support for a constitutional amendment that would allow the States to base one house of a legislature on "factors other than population." But even as his drive gained momentum, the States were struggling to meet reapportionment deadlines imposed by lower courts. And the problems the States faced in meeting those mandates seemed almost insurmountable. The High Court had ordered the States to make "an honest and good-faith effort to construct districts * * * as nearly of equal population as is practicable." But what, specifically, did "practicable" mean? How much leeway did it allow from absolute mathematical equality? The Supreme Court had handed this problem to the lower courts—and few of them could agree on a standard.

A second major obstacle was the fact that many State constitutions prohibited the crossing of county lines in the creation of legislative districts. Yet without crossing county lines it was almost impossible to conform to the High Court's "one-man, one-vote" requirement. Then, too, there were the knotty problems of personal loyalty and friendship. As one California senator put it, "How do you tell a man you've worked with, voted with, and drank with for 20 years that his services are no longer needed?"

In State after State chaos ensued. In California the senate voted to split the State in half rather than submit to a plan that would transfer power to Los Angeles County. Connecticut's legislators stalled until the last possible moment, reapportioned only after a three-judge panel ordered a Yale University computer expert to do the job. In Washington a reapportionment battle deadlocked the legislature for 47 days and stymied the passage of all but minor housekeeping bills. In Vermont one representative suggested that his colleagues chain themselves to their desks—to avoid giving up their seats. And in Florida, during one afterhours argument about the unorthodox tactics of the reapportioners, Representative Claude Wingate beat up Representative Bill Basford and, for the rest of the session, Basford wore dark glasses. "I'd rather fight than switch," he said.

Despite occasional outbursts of bellicosity, legislators across the Nation grudgingly conformed to lower court mandates. The Dirksen amendment seemed doomed; further legal appeals seemed futile. But January 1, 1966, legislatures in 39 States had apportioned themselves—with varying degrees of success—and most of the rest were beginning to follow suit.

From a political standpoint reapportionment should boost the fortunes of Republicans in the South, Southwest and West; Democrats in New England and the Middle West. Minority groups will have a new voice—as witness the election of 10 Negroes to Georgia's State legislature. And despite the dire predictions of conservatives, big-city political machines will not gain a hammerlock on State government. Says William J. D. Boyd of the National Municipal League: "The suburbs, and in the long run only the suburbs, will gain from reapportionment."

Census figures back up his analysis. Of the 15 major U.S. cities, only Houston has grown faster than its surrounding suburbs since 1950. Most major cities have lost populations. Somehow it seems ironic that a battle originally waged on behalf of the cities has been won on behalf of the suburbs. And the size of that suburban victory is already becoming apparent. Under a strict one-man, one-vote reapportionment plan in New York, for example, New York City will gain roughly a 6-percent increase in representation. Suburban Nassau and Suffolk counties, however will get a 100-percent increase. In Colorado the suburbs of Denver have already gained far more than the city itself. And in Michigan, Detroit actually lost six seats to its booming suburbs.

As one of the first States to complete a session with a reapportioned legislature, Michigan provides a hint of what urban voters can expect. Like their rural predecessors, Michigan's bright-eyed newcomers evidenced concern over "moral" issues: They turned down bills which would have given Detroit permission to sell liquor on Sunday and allow dogracing in the Motor City. But they also increased appropriations for education and mental health, hoisted workmen's and unemployment compensation by substantial amounts and provided homestead exemptions for senior citizens.

Reapportionment in Michigan not only produced a legislature more willing to grapple with urban problems, it also focused attention on some of the more obsolescent aspects of the State's government. As a result, Gov. George Romney succeeded in his effort to reduce the number of executive boards, bureaus and commissions from an unmanageable 140 to a streamlined 19.

What happened in Michigan is likely to happen elsewhere—thereby justifying a theory held by many political scientists that reapportionment's "fringe benefits" will be just as significant in the long run as the overt advantages gained from an equitable distribution of seats.

III. WHY STATES STARVE FOR DOLLARS

Obviously, reapportionment is no miracle drug. Massachusetts, for example, has been fairly apportioned for years, yet incompetence and corruption have barnacled its government. And more ails Florida than the underrepresentation of Dade County.

Among the most serious of the problems confronting the States—a problem that reapportionment alone cannot solve—is the lack of adequate financial resources. The gravity of the problem is deceptive for—on the surface at least—the States appear to have plenty of money. Since 1948 State and local government expenditures have skyrocketed from $18 billion to more than $65 billion. In 1966 these governments will spend more for goods and services than the Federal Government. And State and local expenditures are rising 8 percent a year—double the national growth rate.

Some optimists like to say that these rising revenues mirror economic health. Actually, they only parallel the population increase—an increase that has already placed incredible burdens on State and local government resources.

To cushion these burdens the Federal Government has enormously increased its aid to State and local governments. Federal law, however, has dictated where most of the money could be spent, and the States have had to raise more than 80 percent of their budget increases by themselves. The States today collect five times as much money as they did 20 years ago, yet the sum is still not enough to meet the demands of citizens for an ever-increasing variety of services. As a result, more and more States have been facing fiscal crisis.

In Ohio 3 years ago, the situation was so critical that Gov. James A. Rhodes had to fire 3,000 recently hired State employees, order all State agencies to cut back spending by 10 percent and ask State jobholders to work on Washington's and Lincoln's Birthdays. Massachusetts today is practically insolvent. The State desperately needs $200 million to balance its budget, improve education, and help its hard-pressed cities and towns. Gov. John A. Volpe has submitted six separate sales tax bills to the legislature, but all have been defeated. In Pennsylvania the outlook is equally gloomy. Today the State has a surplus. But because of future expenses already mandated by the legislature, that surplus will evaporate soon. Pennsylvania's 5-percent sales tax is the Nation's highest. Now lawmakers face a cruel decision: They must extend the sales tax to include additional items, find an entirely new source of revenue or throw up their hands and declare bankruptcy. "We're right on the edge of disaster," says Representative K. LeRoy Irvis. "This could be the final precipice."

How have the States embroiled themselves in such dilemmas? There is no single, simple answer. Fratricidal competition for industry, of course, has been a factor. All too often, State officials use tax exemptions to lure new businesses, thereby depriving States of possible revenue. Louisiana, for example, exempted $485 million worth of new plants and equipment last year.

A second factor is the natural resistance of both legislators and voters to further tax increases, a resistance that stiffened when the Federal Government began to cut its taxes. Yet probably the most important cause of the crisis is that the States are burdened by unbelievably archaic tax structures. "They're really not structures at all," says W. Brooke Graves, a courtly, white-haired specialist on State government at the Library of Congress. "They're just a crazy patchwork—an unearthly jumble of conflicting and overlapping provisions." Louisiana, for example, levies 47 different State taxes, and 12 separate agencies are needed to collect all the money.

Most State taxes produce a yield proportionate only to general economic growth, yet State expenditures are fast outpacing this economic growth. Obviously, the States need a tax that keeps pace with expenditures. The logical candidate is the income tax. But in the United States last year the personal income tax accounted for only 14 percent of total State tax collections. Seventeen States have no income tax. Of those that do use an income tax, some apply it halfheartedly, others unfairly. Unless expenditures stop rising faster than economic growth—an unlikely prospect—or unless the States enact more effective income taxes, the gap between what the States pay out and what they take in will grow. Fiscal crisis will evolve into fiscal disaster.

Most Americans find all this talk about fiscal crisis somewhat unreal. Businesses that go bankrupt often cease to exist, but for a State to stop functioning or pass out of existence—this would be impossible. So people don't worry until they discover that all those services they demand from their State governments—schools, roads, hospitals—are either inadequate or unavailable.

And this is exactly what has been happening in New Jersey. As the Nation's most urban State, New Jersey ranks first in traffic density. Yet only Hawaii spends less per capita on roads and highways. New Jersey ranks 47th in State welfare aid and 48th in per capita education expenditures. The State's health programs are in dismal shape. And so prevalent is urban blight that the nickname "Garden State" seems a macabre joke.

This rapid decline in State services was not inevitable. (New Jersey ranks seventh in per capita wealth.) It came about only because the State's leaders were unwilling to act responsibly. In 1937 the legislature did muster the courage to pass a sales tax. But later the tax was repealed, and New Jersey lurched along, confident that it could meet its needs by slapping taxes on motor fuels, car registrations, cigarettes, liquor, and parimutuel betting. The few legislators who called for a broad-based levy on income or retail sales were hooted off the floor.

So the State didn't bother to pay for schools or hospitals or roads. It merely thrust these costs on already overburdened local governments and told them to raise the money with a property tax. The local governments complied, and the result has been a shambles. In some communities the rate is 5 percent of value—or an annual tax of $500 on a $10,000 home. To retired persons or those with fixed incomes, such a rate is murderous.

Today New Jersey's per capita property taxes are among the Nation's highest. And although it has long been apparent that they have reached a ceiling beyond which they cannot reasonably go, legislators have chosen to ignore the problem. In 1963 the Senate majority leader couldn't find a single name to add to his own as cosponsor of new tax bills needed to balance the budget. Yet until new revenue sources are tapped, the State will never have the money it requires for education, welfare, highways, and public institutions. "We've had some men in key positions who just don't believe the needs of the people ought to be met," says Rutgers Prof. John Bebout. "There's been a conspiracy of silence as regards State needs."

IV. CONSTITUTIONS THAT CRIPPLE

States like New Jersey are in fiscal difficulty today primarily because of inadequate effort. In other States, legislators' attempts to streamline archaic tax structures are often stymied by constitutional restrictions. "We end up in incredible binds," complains Representative Abner Mikva, of Illinois. "We can't do anything that commonsense tells us to do because the revenue article of 1848 tells us we can't."

Some of these fiscal restrictions are quaint. California's constitution, for example, contains a clause relating to the taxing of nut-bearing trees under 4 years of age. Other restrictions, however, are tragic obstacles. The constitutions of Illinois, Florida, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Washington flatly prohibit lawmakers from ever enacting a graduated income tax. In Alabama, 87 percent of all State revenues are earmarked by the constitution for specific purposes such as hospitals or schools. In Louisiana, the figure is 85 percent; in Tennessee, 77 percent. These provisions not only usurp the legislative function; they also make it difficult for the State to allocate money for pressing needs.

Equally serious are the debt limitations imposed by many State constitutions. Wisconsin is not allowed to borrow more than $100,000; Washington not more than $400,000; Pennsylvania not more than $1 million. Most States, to be sure, have found a gimmick to circumvent such restrictions. They merely create private "authorities" that issue revenue bonds outside a State's jurisdiction. Yet this kind of financing has several drawbacks. One is that authority borrowing often encourages waste. "It's so much easier to get questionable projects okayed under an authority setup," explains Pennsylvania Budget Director Martin Brackbill. "There's no real pressure on anyone to stay within the budget." A second drawback is that authority bonds cost more than revenue bonds floated directly by the State.

In theory, at least, State constitutions should contain only fundamental provisions for the organization of government and the rights of citizens. In actuality they harbor an incredible maze of pettiness. Louisiana's constitution, for example, is 227,000 words long and has had to be amended 462 times. (The U.S. Constitution contains only 6,700 words and 24 amendments.) It devotes five pages to the financing and management of the Upper Pentalba apartment building in New Orleans; it also sets up a board of control for the New Basin Canal and Shell Road; the New Basin Canal and Shell Road no longer exists.

In Maryland the constitution contains 282 separate provisions. One clause bans hereditary titles; another details the organization of the Baltimore Parking Authority. Kentucky's celebrated document prohibits officeholders from dueling. And Idaho's constitution, according to Gov. Robert Smylie, is still "filled with the cobwebs of bigotry, suspicion and restraint."

The vast majority of State constitutions were drafted in the 18th and 19th centuries, when government was implicitly regarded as a necessary evil and not a positive instrument of society. Implicit, too, was an assumption that elected officeholders could never be trusted. Obviously their powers had to be held in check. In providing such checks these constitutional framers merely followed the principles of Andrew Jackson: demand frequent elections with lengthy ballots, stipulate short terms of office, prevent officeholders from succeeding themselves no matter how competent they prove to be. Above all, neuter the Governor's ability to govern by surrounding him with a swarm of elected assistants.

Today most Americans no longer think of government as a necessary evil. They demand, instead, that government act to solve their problems. Yet they stymie action by keeping intact the State constitutional restrictions of a century ago. In 14 States the Governor still serves a 2-year term. In another 14 States he cannot succeed himself. North Carolina's constitution deprives the Governor of his veto power. In other States the same result is achieved by different means.

"More often than not," says University of Utah law professor, John J. Flynn, "executive power is vested in a troika of elected officials or in a similar unwieldy vehicle of administration which renders the State leaderless except in such important areas of exclusive gubernatorial power as issuing proclamations declaring a State pickle week.

In Maine, for example, Gov. John H. Reed is hamstrung by an elected seven-man executive council which must consent to his appointments and give its approval before funds can be withdrawn from the treasury. Until quite recently a similar situation prevailed in Massachusetts. "When I came into office," recalls former Gov. Endicott Peabody, "I could appoint only one department head—my commissioner of administration. Everyone else had already been appointed."

According to Pennsylvania's constitution, Gov. William Scranton's appointments must be approved by a two-thirds majority of the State senate. In theory this sounds sensible. Yet because the Republicans in Harrisburg cannot claim that majority (and also because Democrats there would make the time of day a partisan issue), many of Scranton's appointments have not yet been confirmed. State boards, bureaus and commissions must limp along at reduced strength.

If archaic constitutions fragment the Governor's ability to govern, they pulverize the legislature's power to legislate. Members of Congress and most city councilmen are allowed to meet as long and often as necessary to solve their problems. Yet the constitutions of 15 States prohibit legislators from meeting in regular session any longer than 90 days every 2 years.

These mandatory-adjournment deadlines often generate confusion. During the first 2 months of Connecticut's 1963 session only five bills were passed. And then, as writer James N. Miller recalled in the National Civic Review, "they began to come through in increasing numbers—4,000 in all—droning through so fast and furiously during the final few days that many members had no idea what they were voting on and the legislature actually adjourned while forgetting to pass an essential $6.4-million education bill."

During a normal session, the average legislature will consider roughly 3,500 bills. The figure is rising rapidly. Some lawmakers don't worry about the increase (Maryland Representative John McInerney smiles as he cites a colleague's rule of thumb: "If a bill is over 2 pages, it can't be any good"). Yet those who are conscientious find the sheer physical challenge insurmountable. "You can't begin to read, let alone study all the bills," says Illinois Representative Adlai E. Stevenson III. "You don't have any idea what you're voting on, so you end up voting your faith in or distrust of the sponsor. You make all sorts of mistakes, and you have to spend most of your time correcting the mistakes of previous sessions."

Perhaps more significant than the increase in the volume of legislation is the increase in its complexity. Last March 17—a typical day—Tennessee's lawmakers were asked to vote on 26 bills and one resolution relating to: tax assessment of railroads, the soundness of Government retirement programs, the payments of health- and accident-insurance proceeds to podiatrists, the interstate nuclear compact, the time of payment of reciprocity taxes, the registration of leased automobiles, community-antenna-television services, abolition of the death penalty for rape or robbery, and detection of lung disease among firefighters. Even with staff assistance Tennessee's lawmakers would be hard-pressed to consider the merits of all these bills in one day. But individual legislators in Nashville have no staff assistants at all. And their predicament is commonplace. Although most States maintain legislative-reference bureaus or research councils, these groups are usually sadly understaffed. In New Hampshire the legislative council is supposed to recommend legislation and prepare research reports. Yet its annual budget—$2,500—is so small that it can't pay even for a single staff member.

To get around such restrictions as the mandatory-adjournment deadline, more and more legislatures have been holding special sessions. Yet even then, in 24 States, they run into constitutionally prescribed time limits. And, often they are allowed to discuss only those items placed on the Governor's "call sheet."

Also included in most State constitutions are clauses detailing the exact amount of lawmakers' compensation. Over the years the salaries of Members of Congress have increased gradually and now stand at a respectable $30,000 annually. Yet the salaries paid most State lawmakers still are based on a pinchpenny's estimate of 19th-century-boardinghouse costs.

In New Hampshire, for example, legislators receive $100 a year, often hire out as racetrack ushers to supplement their income. Rhode Island pays its capitol doorkeepers $600 a year—twice as much as it doles out to its lawmakers. (This may explain why a former senator is now a doorkeeper.) And in Oklahoma legislators earn even less than janitors in State mental institutions.

Partly because of the salary scale, the career of the average State legislator is short. Of Michigan's 110 house members, 56 were new last year. In Colorado 36 of 65 representatives were serving first terms. And in Indiana, because of the swarm of inexperienced newcomers, the press corps referred to the lower chamber as the "Greenhouse."

In State after State a visiting reporter hears stories of outstanding legislators who had to resign simply because they couldn't afford to serve any longer. "If a man wants to do a good job for his constituents," says Pennsylvania representative K. LeRoy Irvis, "he must deny his family. I think that's unfair."

Even the most nobly intentioned and earnest legislators often must feel like giving up. Everything conspires to make their task incredibly difficult. Of every $10 spent by the average State government, less than 2 cents goes to pay for legislative expenses. Only a handful of States provide offices or secretaries, so most legislators have to operate out of rented motel rooms. "Our lack of facilities is a crime," says Colorado's able Representative Mark Hogan. "Our floor desk is our one and only base. We have no place for study or quiet or personal conferences."

Why, then, do Hogan and scores of other competent men bother to serve? A crewcut Kentucky senator named Vernon McGinty put his finger on perhaps the best explanation. "After serving one term there in the capital and seeing what can happen," he said, "you feel you have to go back just to protect the people of the Commonwealth."

V. BEDLAM IN THE STATE HOUSE

Unable or unwilling to do their job, lawmakers often seek bizarre releases for their energies. Journalist Willie Morris recalls a remarkable moment during the 1961 session of the Texas Legislature: "One legislator pulled the cord out of the amplifier system; another hit him from the blind side with a tackle; there was mass pushing, hitting, clawing, and exchanges about one another's wives, mistresses, and forebears. Sweethearts and wives * * * cowered near the desk. In the middle of the brawl a barbershop quartet of legislators quickly formed at the front of the chamber and * * * sang, "I Had a Dream, Dear."

In Maryland in 1965 House Speaker Marvin Mande adjourned a drunken session by confessing, "We can't go on like this." In Alabama a few years ago, Senator Harlan Allen appeared at a Temperance Committee hearing and made speech against demon rum. Curiously, after a long lunch, he reversed his field and spoke in praise of demon rum. Then a bottle dropped from his pocket and fell to the floor where it soon became the object of a soccer game.

Drinking on the floor of the Florida Legislature has been prohibited ever since one night in 1957 when half the members became inebriated and passed a tax on soft drinks sold at dog tracks. That ruling, however, has not entirely dimmed lawmakers' enjoyment of a ripping good time. During a special reapportionment session last June, a number of legislators engaged in a free-for-all and pool-dumping spree at a posh Tallahassee motel. Senator Welborn Daniel sprayed his colleagues with a portable fire extinguisher. Former State Beverage Director L. Grant Peeples lost his shirt in the melee. The wife of one legislator, in company with a number of female motel guests, tossed a senator into the swimming pool. As if in anticipation of such high jinks, a sign had appeared in the window of the motel a few mornings earlier addressed to the Speaker of the House pro tempore Baldy Strickland, it said, "Please Go Home."

For lawmakers who want to work off their frustrations without being quite so physical, there is a second potential release. They can—and do—spend huge amounts of time deliberating matters of absolute insignificance. A kind of Parkinsons law seems to apply in such cases. The more complex an issue is, the less time is needed to dispose of it. And vice versa.

In Tennessee, for example, lawmakers passed the executive budget in 30 minutes, then spent hours debating the licensing of hairdressers. And in Louisiana, where legislators approved a $1 billion budget bill almost without a whimper, the sex life of catfish in Jefferson Parish (County) seemed to be a matter of utmost concern. During the 1964 session a measure had passed allowing cans to be used in the capture of catfish. These cans, lawmakers reasoned, would slip away from fishermen and drop to the bottom, thereby providing fine spawning places for catfish. But then someone checked and reported that catfish weren't breeding any more than usual. So last year legislators repealed the law.

Some of these inconsequential measures can be traced to legislatures refusal to grant home rule to counties, cities, and villages under their jurisdiction. In Maryland, for example, it was perfectly natural for the legislature to pass a bill last session decreasing the license fees for ice-cream vendors in Worcester County. For under the present arrangement, Worcester County—and 18 of the State's 22 other counties—must run to the legislature whenever it wants to alter minute details of its governmental structure.

Yet most of the time such trivia comes as a welcome diversion. It offers exhilarating alternatives to legislators who really don't want to worry about urban renewal, civil rights, or mass transportation. It makes them feel that they have accomplished something, and it often provides a few chuckles, as when, in North Carolina last spring, one legislator introduced a resolution to honor Cimex lectularius—the bedbug—as the official State insect. (The measure was exterminated in committee.)

VI. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Breaches of decorum and a preoccupation with trivia are relatively harmless outgrowths of legislative impotence. But the absence of adequate salaries, facilities and staffs for men who are by necessity only part-time public servants breeds other, more dangerous outgrowths: rampant conflicts of interest and the domination of the legislative process by the special-interest groups.

"The business of government," said former New York Gov. Thomas E. Dewey in 1954, "cannot and should not be separated from the day-to-day lives of the human beings who conduct it. The problem is to separate the unavoidable conflicts from the venal and the doubtful; to chart the shadowlands of conduct where men of good will may have difficulty in deciding whether a course is proper or improper." Men of good will are still having trouble deciding where to draw the line. "We're all basically against conflict of interest," says Anthony C. Beilenson, an outstanding California assemblyman, "but it's hard for an attorney. You can't have a client who doesn't have some dealing with a State agency. I don't believe I should lose clients just because I'm a legislator. Yet I do believe it's morally wrong for me to represent these people before State agencies."

Not all lawmakers share Beilenson's sensibilities. In New York last spring, it was revealed that Senator Owen Begley—a member of the ethics committee—had been "retained and employed as counsel" until 1964 by a Manhattan firm called Blauvelt Engineering. Under New York law, no public official can have an interest in a firm that does more than $25 worth of State business without public bidding. Begley owned a 40-percent interest in each of two Blauvelt affiliates. Over an 8-year period the State department of public works awarded Blauvelt more than $8 million in highway contracts. There had been no public bidding.

In Colorado last year a bill was introduced to raise the interest rates on loans from industrial banks. Two of its most fervent advocates were house Republican leaders John Vanderhoof and John Mackie. Both men are officers of industrial banks. The house passed the measure—but only after tacking on an amendment that would have required bankers to reveal the actual rates of interest that they were charging borrowers, a truth-in-lending provision. The bill then went to the senate business affairs committee. And who should appear there as a witness in a successful effort to persuade senators to strike the amendment? None other than Representative John Vanderhoof. Colorado law says legislators should refrain from voting on matters involving possible conflict of interest, but leaves the decision up to the individual's conscience. Sighs one of Vanderhoof's colleagues, "It seems there are few tender consciences around."

In Florida, where blatant conflicts of interest spring into view as frequently as palm trees, a kind of easy morality seems to pervade all levels of the State government. Under Florida law, for example, the Governor is prohibited from owning stock in a company that sells liquor. The maximum penalty prescribed for violating this statute is removal from office and 6 months in prison. Yet during his recent term in Tallahassee, Gov. Farris Bryant was a stockholder in a Titusville cafe that sold liquor by the drink—without a State license. Nobody seemed to care.

Nor did many Floridians howl when it was revealed that the State banking commissioner had helped to transfer State funds to a bank of which he had just become president; that under a special "pool" arrangement, $1.2 million a year in casualty and property-damage insurance premiums was being steered to the Governor's personal and political friends; that the State superintendent of schools was purchasing office supplies and equipment from a firm headed by his son-in-law.

Both houses of the Florida Legislature have rules prohibiting members from voting on measures that might affect their private business interests. In the last decade, however, only two members have cited these rules as an excuse for not voting.

When he is not serving in the legislature, William H. Reedy is a public relations man for the Florida Telephone Corp. Yet during the 1965 session—as Representative Reedy—he fought diligently against a bill which would have allowed the Florida Public Service Commission to consider the telephone company's quality of service in future rate hearings.

On the other side of the aisle, Senator John M. Spottswood—a sometime sleeper during debates—doubles as the president of a Key West firm called Cable-Vision, Inc. But there he was last session, introducing Senate bill 1294, "An act granting to Cable-Vision, Inc., * * * the right, privilege, license and franchise for a period of 30 years for the operation of a cable-television system throughout Monroe County." The measure passed and became law. From time to time in Florida attempts have been made to pass a meaningful code-of-ethics bill. Every effort has failed.

VII. THE LOBBIES RUN WILD

Until 1949 few Americans had ever heard of a genial, roly-poly Californian named Arthur H. Samish. And that was just the way he wanted it. Samish was a lobbyist—a great persuader for racetracks, building-and-loan companies, distilleries—and in order for him to gain his ends, he had to operate in shadows. Samish was powerful; no doubt about that. "I'm the governor of the legislature," he would say to friends. "To hell with the Governor of the State." And Samish was shrewd. "I can tell if a man wants a baked potato, a girl or money," he liked to boast. He was usually right. But then in 1949 a national magazine carried an exposé of his activities. The California Legislature launched a probe of its own. Soon Artie Samish—like Humpty-Dumpty—took a tumble, and capital observers breathed a sigh of relief. The era of lobbyist domination, they thought, had come to an end.

Their optimism was premature. Over the past 17 years, lobbying has changed only in style. "Lobbyists are more subtle today," explains California's Assemblyman Beilenson. "They don't just give you money and expect a vote."

Leaning back in his soft leather chair, his feet propped up on his desk, his face half hidden from an interviewer by a vase full of pink gladioluses, Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown decries the power of the "third house" in Sacramento. "The lobbyists will go along with you on social legislation," he says, "education, mental health, things like that. But if you want to get a truth-in-lending bill or improve insurance laws or get rid of price fixing, well, they are much stronger than the Governor. I don't think the situation has really changed since Samish. Some interests today are stronger than they were in that era, and they have a great deal more money to spend than he ever had."

It should be emphasized, of course, that lobbyists perform a legitimate, even necessary function in bringing their clients' interests to lawmakers' attention. (This is even more true in State capitals than it is in Washington, D.C., for Members of Congress have access to the staffs and research facilities the average State legislator does without.) It should be emphasized, too, that in many cases these client interests are happily synonymous with the public interest. Lobbyists for the Iowa State Education Association, for example, exerted considerable and commendable effort last session in helping legislators reach a desperately needed solution to school reorganization problems. Other legislative halls are crowded with advocates of safer highways, water-pollution control, and conservation. They, too, are lobbyists. The difficulty stems from the inability—or the unwillingness—of many lawmakers to distinguish between self-serving private interests and the public interest.

In Winter Haven, Fla., a few years ago, the Continental Beverages Corp. began to produce premixed alcoholic drinks using citrus as a base. Rum swizzles, salty dogs, screwdrivers, orange blossoms—the beverages rolled off the assembly line in 6- and 8-ounce cans. In 1963, the corporation applied for and received from the legislation an 80-percent tax break on the grounds that its product constituted a "new industry" for the State. This tax break, it was stipulated, would last for 2 years only. Last spring, an amiable, sandy-haired man named Phil Lucey showed up in Tallahassee to lobby for Continental. He was only one in a "Panzer division" of 637 registered lobbyists, yet he promptly established himself as a generous dispenser of liquid largesse. He maintained a 3-room suite at the local hostelry and gave away an estimated $1,700 worth of booze each week. In time a bill was introduced to extend Continental's tax break for another 2 years, a benefit no other beverage firm had ever won from the State. But then no one had ever labored so hard as Lucey. The bill, of course, was passed—saving Continental roughly $400,000 per year in taxes.

In Florida over the past decade business has controlled the legislature through a coalition of rural lawmakers called the Pork Chop Gang. In Texas, where oil and gas reign supreme, there is no such colorful designation for the minions of industry. Yet they dance to the same tune. Willie Morris, who covered the proceedings in Austin for the Texas Observer, recalled in a magazine article not long ago that "Sometimes, it [was] too much for one to bear, the more or less constant spectacle of legislators backed by the sanction of powerful business lobbies frustrating the few good and intelligent men who are willing to labor in the maw of small-time politics. * * * Fifty-thousand-a-year corporation lawyers flocked to committee hearings, especially on taxes and appropriations, to argue their favorite theme: 'You can't tax a corporation; a corporation is all of us.'"

Then Morris told the story of a legislator who had confided in him late one evening. "You know," the legislator said, "a politician's got to sell out to somebody; it's just a matter of pickin' the right people to sell out to. I've sold out to the truckers and to liquor. * * * The truckers aren't a bad group, and the good thing about the liquor boys is that when you vote for the truckers when you really don't want to, you can go off and get drunk about it free of charge."

At the close of Tennessee's 1963 session, Reporter Bill Kovach asked a senator if he could cite a single piece of legislation enacted solely for the benefit of the public. The senator thought for a moment and then admitted he couldn't. In 1965, Kovach didn't even bother to ask.

For the lawmakers in Nashville last session were nothing if not Pavlovian in their responsiveness to business. In rapid succession they approved measures that: eased penalties on corporations delinquent in paying their income tax; reduced fines for truckers caught hauling more weight than allowed under the law; curbed imports of foreign-grown meats to pacify the cattle industry; eased State controls of insurance-company operations, and reduced the gross-receipts taxes on soft-drink bottles.

The legislature did pass a measure regulating billboards, yet the controls were suggested—some insist drafted—by the industry itself. An effort was made to regulate strip mining of coal, yet it was crippled by amendments. And when Gov. Frank G. Clement asked for a $1.15-an-hour minimum wage, legislators mutilated the measure. "Everybody has a lobby up here but the public," sighs Representative Charles Galbreath.

Forty-three States have laws on their books that regulate lobbying. In theory these statutes are admirable. In practice they're often meaningless. Georgia, for example, has a law requiring all lobbyists to register with the secretary of state. In the past 25 years only one man has obeyed that law. The opposition a legislature encounters when it tries to strengthen its lobbying law is illustrated by an incident in Colorado last year.

During the early weeks of the session, the legislature was tied up in heated debate over a measure to ban billboards on interstate highways. One of the measure's strongest advocates was Roland Mapelli, a Denver senator who is also a partner in a wholesale meat concern. On March 5 Senator Mapelli announced to his colleagues that his meat firm had lost a $60,000-a-year contract. The reason given was his support of the billboard ban. And further boycotts were being threatened. As a result of his disclosure a bill was introduced in the house to authorize a probe of lobbyists' activities. It passed with ease.

But when the measure reached the Senate, it ran into flak. Lobbyists, explained Senator Frank Gill, "are just trying to make the wheels of Government go around." Added Senate President A. Woody Hewett: "It's none of our business what lobbyists are paid or what they spend. We should just try to get along with our good lobbyists and ignore the others." His reasoning prevailed; the bill to sanction a probe was defeated.

VIII. ONE NOTORIOUS EXAMPLE

In no State do so many of the body sores afflicting State government fester quite so appallingly as they do in Illinois. In fairness it should be noted that in Otto Kerner, Illinois has an honest and reasonably effective Governor. It should be noted, too, that many State legislators are men of exceptional integrity and ability. And finally, it should be stated that in 1965 the legislature succeeded in passing many constructive measures. It increased the State-aid-guarantee formula to public schools from $252 to $330 per pupil; it passed 14 anticrime bills; it adopted a constitutional amendment to modernize the State's tax laws and it agreed to eliminate billboards on interstate highways. In retrospect, these achievements seem remarkable, for few State governments suffer so from archaic structure and lackadaisical attitude as Illinois.

Like their colleagues elsewhere, Illinois' lawmakers lack adequate facilities and staffs. The house education committee, for example, relies on one part-time clerk. Nor do they receive adequate salaries. Their independence is further compromised by the fact that more than two dozen of them also hold jobs in the city administration of Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daley. And Daley's minions supply these members with an "idiot list," advising them how to vote on complex issues. "It's hard for a guy to be an independent thinker," admits Representative Cecil Partee, "when his second job depends on the man who dispenses patronage."

Additionally, some legislative committees are stacked with members of questionable objectivity. As Representative Abner Mikva points out, "The insurance industry runs the insurance committee, the railroads run the railroad and public utilities committee, the bankers run the banking committee. Even if it isn't outright corruption, isn't it a corruption of the process? What happens to the public interest?"

During the 1963 session a bill was introduced to decrease consumer credit interest rates from 13 percent to 9 percent. The senate banking committee, which is populated largely by bankers approved the measure—but only after attaching an amendment which increased the interest rate, in effect, to 20 percent.

Equally revealing was a bill appropriating $96,500 to study the diseases of racehorses. When the measure was introduced, Senator Paul Simon asked the sponsor how much the legislature was spending on cancer research. The sponsor didn't know. Then another senator rose to announce, "I've been betting on horses for some years now, and I'm sure they have some type of disease. I'm for the bill." It passed and became law.

Concerned citizens in the State hoped reapportionment might improve the legislature, and toward the end of the 1963 session lawmakers did pass a reapportionment plan. But it benefited rural southern Illinois while cheating Chicago's expanding suburbs. Governor Kerner vetoed the measure, and in November 1964 an unprecedented at-large election was held for all the House seats. Both parties nominated 118 candidates and both studded their tickets with "blue-ribbon" names—Adlai E. Stevenson III for the Democrats; Earl Eisenhower for the Republicans. The Johnson landside carried all 118 Democrats into office. The Illinois Senate, to be sure, remained the fief of rural Republicans, yet few of the blue-ribbon newcomers anticipated trouble in enacting a program of far-reaching reform.

"Reform," it seemed, was a word on everyone's lips during those early days in January 1965, as the legislature convened in Springfiield. Already Democrat Theodore Isaacs, a former State revenue director, had been indicted on 33 counts of conflict of interest, collusion, and conspiracy. (Nearly a year later the indictment was dismissed, but at the time it caused a great public outrage.) And then, in an article in Harper's magazine, Senator Simon had quoted a colleague's estimate that one-third of all Illinois lawmakers regularly accepted payoffs. Simon had gone even further—detailing the quaint and venerable practice by which certain lawmakers profited from "fetchers."

In Springfield, where residents usually refer to their capitol as the "steal mill," a "fetcher" is a bill that seeks to place unrealistic controls on some industry or occupation. A typical fetcher might outlaw coin vending machines. When the affected companies agreed to pay a suitable ransom, the sponsoring legislator would introduce amendments—first exempting all cigarette vending machines, then all candy and gum vending machines, then all the rest. In other State capitals such measures are known as "jingle bills," "satchel grabbers," and "Mae Wests" ("Come on up 'n see me sometime"). Yet nowhere is the state of the art more advanced than in Illinois. And this is what Simon had the courage to point out.

The outcry was predictable. Legislators screamed "foul." In their indignation they authorized the Illinois Crime Commission to launch an investigation, not only of Simon's charges, but also of other possible breaches of ethics in the State government. And when Governor Kerner mentioned the need for a conflict-of-interest law in his "state of the State" address to the legislature, he was applauded—an amazing occurrence in Illinois.

Did this mean the legislature really wanted reform? Some lawmakers were hopeful. Representative Abner Mikva, for one, introduced a bill aimed at eliminating conflicts of interest. Representative Adlai E. Stevenson III sponsored a measure tightening controls on lobbyists. And from capable House Speaker John P. Touhy came a stern warning: no more fetchers.

February passed; then March and April and May. The senate passed hundreds of "little bills" made necessary by the lack of home rule. It decided that well diggers and tree trimmers and funeral directors had to be U.S. citizens. And it showed concern over birds. At issue, specifically, was a bill to change the official State bird from the cardinal to the purple martin. The purple martin, it seemed, had many backers. Some Springfield bars began serving purple Martinis. In the middle of the debate Chicago Senator Anthony DeTolve—a relative by marriage of crime czar Sam (Mooney) Giancana—jumped up with an alternate suggestion. The official State bird, he cried, should be the stool pigeon.

Despite such moments of hilarity, a mood of uneasiness began to pervade the musty old capitol. The senate had not yet tackled any of the really important legislative questions before it. Would it ever? And what about the crime commission probe? What had its members found?

A partial answer was forthcoming in June. Ray Coffey, an able, hard-digging reporter for the Chicago Daily News, revealed that the crime commission had interrogated Secretary of State Paul Powell about the sources of his outside income. Of particular interest to the commission was an $8,000 "finder's fee" listed on Powell's income-tax return. The donor of that fee was an ex-convict named Irwin S. (Big Sam) Wiedrick who, since 1946, has been closely associated with harness racing in the State. Many observers recalled that as speaker of the house in 1961, Powell had led the fight to quash a bill increasing harness racing taxes. Was there a connection between the $8,000 and Powell's stand?

At 64, Powell is handsome, friendly, decisive, appealingly folksy. His conversation drips with colloquialisms from his southern Illinois birthplace of Vienna (pronounced Vy-enna), a land he describes as being "so poor, you can't raise an umbrella on it.

"I started out as a kid, shining shoes and hustling newspapers," he says. "I was mayor of Vienna for a spell and then after my first wife died, I came up here to Springfield." As a legislator, Powell was extremely effective. The Springfield press corps twice voted him the outstanding member. His colleagues in the house elected him speaker for three sessions. And when, after 30 years, he left that house and ran for secretary of state, he won by nearly half a million votes.

Sitting in his spacious outer office—watching a gaggle of Girl Scouts in dark-green skirts and fresh white blouses line up to receive copies of the great seal of the State of Illinois—a visitor feels apprehensive about probing Powell on conflicts of interest. It seems inconceivable that such a man could be involved in questionable deals.

"Is it true," the visitor asks, "that in 1949 you were one of several legislators who were given a chance to buy stock for 10 cents a share in a harness racing concern called Chicago Downs? And that you didn't have to pay for the stock until Chicago Downs had paid you a dividend? And didn't you also push a bill through the legislature to give the track a longer season?"

"My only mistake," Powell replies, "was that I didn't get more."

"How do you feel about conflict-of-interest laws?"

"If all the bills introduced this session regarding conflict of interest are passed, there won't be a person in Illinois who can serve in the legislature." Powell shakes his head. "No, I don't think a member should be prevented for making a living on the outside."

"According to the Chicago Daily News, you've received an $8,000 payment from Wiedrick every year for the last 9 years. What's the money for?"

"Real estate," Powell replies, "My dealings with Wiedrick are completely legal, legitimate, honest and honorable, unless making money has now been declared to be a crime. This income has kept me free from bribes or acting in any way in conflict of office."

To reporter Ray Coffey, such answers were unsatisfactory. Shortly after Powell took office, Coffee disclosed, he signed a $3,445-a-month lease for State-office space in a Springfield shopping center which had given him free office space during his campaign. Furthermore—ignoring a constitutional requirement that he maintain a residence at his own expense in Springfield—Powell was charging the State the monthly rents for hotel suites in Springfield and Chicago.

Despite such revelations Powell never lost his composure. He did, however, seem wary of reporters. And when a newsman probed too deep, he would point to a photograph on his office wall. The photograph showed a gravestone in an Illinois cemetery. On its marker was a simple inscription: He was a lifelong Democrat. "If that ain't enough to get you to heaven," Powell would sigh, "then nothing is."

On June 7 the Illinois Crime Commission released its report. "Probe of Legislature Finds Some 'Corruption' But Nothing Illegal," announced the Peoria Journal Star in a classic headline. During its long investigation the commission had interviewed more than 100 witnesses. It had discovered, as two of its members said later, "that certain allegations of conflict of interest were established by substantial evidence. The participants * * * admitted the facts giving rise to the conflicts."

Yet now the commission refused to make public any of the names or details of the cases it investigated. It insisted that the charges of corruption were "unjust and unfounded," and it hinted darkly that the real enemies of the people were the men who had asked for the probe in the first place.

Most Illinois newspapers blasted the commission's report as a whitewash, a complete waste of taxpayers' money. But the Chicago Tribune, which usually plays down corruption where Republicans are involved, was visibly relieved. "The report," it said in an editorial, "shows the unfairness of the shotgun attacks made by [Senator] Simon and [Representative Anthony] Scariano. An apology now seems to be called for * * * and the legislature may wish to enact legislation punishing malicious complaints against members."

The legislature might have done just that, had there been enough time. But on June 24, just 17 days after release of the Crime Commission's clean bill of health, Springfield was rocked by another scandal.

The scandal revolved around a seemingly innocuous bill which had been introduced a few weeks earlier. Titled S. 1034, the measure would simply have eased State restrictions on mobile check-cashing firms—companies that roll their money trucks onto factory premises and cash checks for workers. Specifically, the bill would have aided a firm called Thillens, Inc.

Such mobile check-cashing companies as Thillens, Inc., compete in Illinois with a group of currency exchanges. When the bill was introduced, the powerful currency-exchange forces persuaded the House Banking Committee to accord it a speedy funeral.

Apparently, however, these legislators weren't persuaded by logic alone. According to voices on 15 rolls of tape, legislators were offered between $200 and $1,000 for their votes. The tape recordings—made by an unknown person in a Springfield hotel and later turned over to Jack Mabley, a columnist for Chicago's American—contained the names of 61 legislators, Secretary of State Paul Powell ("He seemed to like the idea to be paid in advance") and six lobbyists. The principal voices were reported to be those of three officials of the Chicago Currency Exchange Association. Their comments provided an illuminating glimpse of the legislative process:

"Irving Gottlieb. Say, Dave [Maslowsky], you won't yell at me if I tell you who I was with last night? [He proceeded to name six able, blue-ribbon Republican legislators.]

"David Maslowsky. All the rubbish.

"Gottlieb. I said, let's get the hell out of here. Now, how did I get mixed up with all these —— Republicans? Especially the worst kind.

"Maslowsky (later). "What you might as well get used to is that every time you have a legislative session, you come prepared with about $30,000, and if you haven't got it. * * *

"Sam Kaplan. Then forget it.

"Maslowsky. And if you do have it, nobody's going to bother you either—but when they know that you're poor and decrepit, they'll jump you. * * * They cheat each other so —— much and nobody assumes responsibility. * * * I wouldn't care if they would take (the money) and divide it up the way they should, but they try to cheat each other, and we are the victims."

The legislature was stunned. Soon shock evolved into panic. Representative Abner Mikva's conflict-of-interest bill was rescued from committee where it had been facing a slow but certain death. So was Representative Adlai E. Stevenson III's lobby-control measure. With yelps of righteous indignation, the house passed both measures and sent them on to the senate.

"This is the moment of truth," cried Republican Senate Whip Robert J. Coulson. "You can begin with me the long hard road back to restore the honor and dignity of legislatures everywhere." Coulson's colleagues were unimpressed. After listening to Senator John A. Graham attack Stevenson as a "liberal do-gooder [who was] trying to convict by innuendo fellows in the senate who are doing a helluva lot better job than he is in the house or his dad is in the United Nations," they emasculated both measures.

"If there is decay in government," reasoned Senator Hudson Sours, "it is because there is also decay in the electorate." Like most of his colleagues, Sours seemed to blame all the legislature's difficulties on the man who had first pointed a finger at corruption, Senator Paul Simon. During the official senate dinner late in the session he nominated Simon for the "Benedict Arnold Award." Lawmakers applauded, then named Sours to the Illinois Crime Commission.

And there was still further irony. Despite the embarrassment they had caused their legislative friends, lobbyists Maslowsky, Gottlieb and Kaplan achieved their goal. The bill to ease State restrictions on mobile check-cashing firms was defeated.

But the legislature was really only warming up to its task. In rapid succession and with obvious relish the senate proceeded to kill six open-occupancy bills that would have guaranteed Negro housing rights, another bill that would have provided $27 million for the education of slum children, a measure requiring the registration of handguns and another bill which would have prohibited B-girls from soliciting drinks from customers of bars.

When it came time to dispose of Representative Scariano's bill to authorize a probe of inadequate insurance statutes, senators encountered more difficulty. After all, the measure had passed the house unanimously, and one had to respect the tenacity of young Phil Benefiel, its sponsor in the senate. Working frantically, Benefiel lined up just enough votes to get his measure passed. Then pressure was applied. When the senate voted, four Democrats found themselves unable to participate. The bill was defeated.

Throughout the long session Republican Leader W. Russell Arrington had refused to consider Mayor Richard J. Daley's $50-million-tax-package plan for Chicago (including salary increases for firemen and policemen). No action could be taken on this, Arrington announced, until both parties had agreed to a new reapportionment plan for the senate. Two days before adjournment, the legislatures reached an agreement. Everyone beamed.

Suddenly that compromise disintegrated. There would be no reapportionment. Democrats angrily blamed Republicans. Republicans angrily blamed Democrats. But the GOP, Arrington explained, would not be vengeful. It would consider Mayor Daley's tax program on its merits. With that, the Republicans proceeded to wash the program down the drain.

On the final night of the session, senators listened to a speech praising the dog as man's best friend. "Arf, arf," they barked when the speaker paused. Over in the house, lawmakers passed a resolution hailing the city of Dixon's annual petunia festival.

Finally the legislators buckled down to business. They didn't do anything about reapportionment—or about a fiscal crisis that left the Governor $107 million short of the requirements to finance the State for the next 2 years. They did amend an appropriations bill by mistake—thereby stripping Chicago Teachers' College of a desperately needed $5 million. They did make a second mistake, which caused 50,000 State employees to receive their paychecks late. And then there was Representative Abner Mikva's bill to increase the State police rolls from 1,100 to 1,500 men. It passed the house, but disappeared in the senate. And nobody knew where to find it. Said Senator Arrington, wearily, "We hope that was the only bill we lost."

A few days after the session ended, Arrington graciously consented to review the record in a private interview. Like Paul Powell, he is a self-made man, a millionaire who rose from humble origins to become his party's leader in the senate as well as general counsel and vice president of the W. Clement Stone insurance combine. Short, brisk, florid-faced, Arrington has had two heart attacks already. But now—sitting behind a desk in his Chicago office—he seemed relaxed.

"It was the most successful session we've ever had," he insisted, "the most productive in history. All of the Governor's substantial [tax] increases were denied. It ended up in a quarrel, but that's what legislatures are for."

"How about ethics?" he was asked. Did he expect the legislature to pass any meaningful ethics bills in its next session? For a few seconds, the senator paused. "Well," he began, "this was the session to do it. We had the Isaacs case; we had Simon's article; we had the tapes. * * *" He didn't fully answer the question, but then he didn't have to. The implication was clear.

IX. CAN THE STATES REFORM?

Until a few decades ago the average American State was an economically sound, politically progressive entity. "It is one of the happy incidents of the Federal system," wrote Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis in 1932, "that a single courageous State may * * * serve as a laboratory and try novel social and economic experiments without risk to the rest of the country."

Many States did innovate. Under Gov. Huey Long, Louisiana pioneered splendid welfare programs. For years New York spent more money on public housing than the Federal Government. From New Hampshire and Wisconsin came the Nation's first unemployment-compensation plans. Countless other "experiments"—child-labor laws, female suffrage, public-utility regulations—were initiated by the States, often before the Federal Government even recognized the problem.

A few States still innovate. North Carolina set up an excellent antipoverty program using private funds. Connecticut recently required fluoridation of water in all communities of more than 20,000 persons. Wisconsin devised a program to acquire outdoor recreational areas; nearly 145,000 acres have been set aside already.

Yet the list of pioneering efforts is short. To many critics this suggests that the States are not only unwilling but also unable to solve important problems by themselves. But in several instances—where the States mustered the will—they've found a way. California provides an example.

In 1944, the California General Assembly tried to change its name. Too many citizens, lawmakers argued, were confusing it with a factory assembly line. The attempt was unsuccessful, yet it was easy to understand the legislature's desire to improve its image. At the time, that image was terrible.

"On St. Patrick's Day of 1948," recalls author Joan Didion, "I was taken to see the legislature in action, a dismal experience. A handful of florid assemblymen wearing green hats were reading Pat and Mike jokes into the record. I still think of the legislature that way—wearing green hats and sitting on the veranda of the Senator Hotel and entertaining [lobbyist] Artie Samish's emissaries."

Miss Didion's portrait is outdated. In recent years, that legislature has shown both ability and willingness to innovate. California's freeway system, for example, was the stepchild of Senator Randolph (The Silver Fox) ,collier. The State's master plan for education was drafted by Senator George Miller Jr.; so excellent was this plan that it is now being copied in a dozen States. And from the assembly came a scheme to harness the intellectual horsepower of California's "think factories." Last spring the State hired four aerospace firms to find solutions to problems of crime and transportation that California will face in the year 2000.

A visitor to Sacramento is struck by legislators like Jerry Waldie, the trim, dark-haired, 40-year-old Democratic majority leader in the assembly. An intense man who cares deeply about the problems of mental retardation, he directed a year-long probe of the State's mental institutions, then pushed through sweeping reforms. Or consider Senator Tom Rees, a lanky, informal man who is perhaps the only lawmaker in the Nation with the intestinal courage needed to pour a jigger of gin into a glass of scotch whisky and then swallow the mixture without grimacing. Rees, recently elevated to the U.S. Congress in a special election, is concerned about urban sprawl. "One third of all our downtown areas are made up of ugly parking lots," he says, and he grins as he tells a visitor about an informal group he has organized "to give awards to the people who do the most to screw up our natural environment."

The name of this group is Los Angeles Gruesome (LAG); he hopes it will spread to the Bay Area around San Francisco (BAG) and eventually to Sacramento itself (SAG).

Men like Waldie and Rees can wrestle with complex problems primarily because they have provided themselves with adequate tools. A legislator's basic salary is just $6,000, but the State provides fringe benefits (among them: an automobile, oil- and telephone-company credit cards) which, in effect, double that amount. Furthermore, each legislator has a private office and at least one assistant—not only in Sacramento but also in his home district.

Even more significant is the amount of professional help lawmakers receive. Each of the Assembly's 23 committees, for example, has a staff director and a secretary; some committees have a dozen employees. In addition, there is a "floating" central staff of men and women who can be loaned out as the need arises. To answer general questions, assemblymen call on a six-man reference bureau. To draft bills and get legal opinions, they rely on a legislative council of 20 attorneys. And when they want to examine such matters as the Governor's budget requests, they turn to a separate staff of 16 fiscal analysts.

"We have had to develop these tools," says Assembly Speaker Jesse M. Unruh, "so we wouldn't be conned all the time either by the executive branch or by the special-interest groups." Unruh himself has played a major role in that development. Once, asked why California had such a progressive legislature, he replied, "Me." It was hardly an overstatement.

Basically Unruh is a pragmatist. Over and over again, in a somber, bullfrog voice, he reiterates his favorite theme: A legislature cannot be the expressive arm of government until it is independent. And it cannot be independent until it is adequately paid, housed, and staffed. He suggests further that "State government could profit greatly by emulating the 'result' orientation of private enterprise." And he envisions a coming era of "a new politics that is not restricted by conventional wisdom or ideological rigidity. If we cannot generate thinking in State government," he adds, "then we cannot survive."

California is not the sole repository of political virtue in the United States, nor is its virtue uniform. Like other State governments, California's is ever threatened by human fallibility and often thwarted as it gropes toward a future of awesome complexity. Yet in its demonstrated willingness to grapple with gut issues, the State can serve as a qualified example to its 49 sisters.

There are signs that the States—frightened by the specter of further Federal encroachment and mounting fiscal crisis and shaken by the rigors of reapportionment—are gaining vitality. Some States, for example, are experimenting with regional solutions to the urban problems that often spill across arbitrary boundary lines. Indiana and Illinois signed a compact on air pollution last year, and New York has joined with Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan to reverse the tide of pollution in Lake Erie. The 1965 Governors' conference adopted an interstate compact on education and set up a commission to make recommendations to the States. "We are coming to realize," says former North Carolina Governor Terry Sanford, "that education is too large and too important a subject to be left to the haphazard chance of unconnected State and local efforts. It is also too complex to be left to a single guiding national hand."

To solve their pressing fiscal problems, the States have lately been exerting tremendous efforts. Indiana, for example, faced a money crisis 2 years ago. The State desperately needed $200 million. Its level of services was abysmal. Its citizens were screaming about inadequate schools, high property taxes, and the inability of the legislature to rise above petty partisanship. Then the legislature bravely enacted a compromise tax plan. Republicans accepted a 2-percent income tax; Democrats a 2-percent sales tax. It was stipulated that poor families who paid sales taxes on such essentials as food could apply for refunds on the State's income tax.

All of this was highly unorthodox. For a while license plates blossomed with the unofficial legend, "Land of Taxes," and several legislators who voted for the plan were defeated in the 1964 elections. But the plan has worked. Over the past 24 months the State of Indiana has not only veered away from bankruptcy; it has also improved its services substantially.

In 31 States last year legislators mustered sufficient courage to increase existing taxes. Additional increases are expected this spring. There is, however, a practical and political ceiling on the amount of money the States can collect by themselves. Realizing this, most Governors and legislators have been pinning their hopes on Federal acceptance of a modified Heller plan.

Before Dr. Walter Heller resigned as Chairman of the President's Council on Economic Advisers, he proposed a plan whereby the Federal Government would return a fixed portion of income-tax funds to the States. The States could use this money in almost any way they saw fit. As Heller envisioned it, the plan would not only reduce a worrisome Federal surplus; it would also prompt the States to become more active partners in the federal system.

Organized labor howled. So did the liberal wing of the Democratic Party. If the States are handed gift packages from Washington, their argument ran, the States would simply lower taxes and forget about improving services. In addition, they claimed, the Heller plan would deflate the current pressure on the States to modernize their own archaic tax structures. President Johnson seemed impressed with such reasoning. And he seemed piqued, too, by what he considered to be a premature disclosure of the plan in the New York Times. So nothing was done about it.

Last October, New York's Senator Jacob Javits introduced a modified version of the plan in Congress. Javits' proposal would establish a trust fund of about $2.5 billion. Eighty percent of this money would be distributed on the basis of population; the remaining 20 percent would be divided among the States with the lowest per capita incomes. The money could be used only for health, education, and welfare projects.

Javits, however, is a Republican; his party is in the minority. It is unlikely that the plan will win congressional approval this year. "But sooner or later the Federal Government is bound to adopt it," insists one Washington economist. "Similar schemes have already been tried successfully in Australia and Canada." The economist pauses, then grins. "If you like this idea," he says, "you better start calling it the Johnson plan."

In an effort to disentangle themselves from a web of outmoded restrictions, at least 25 States have established constitutional-revision commissions. Almost all these commissions are recommending that many previously elective positions be made appointive; that governors be given longer terms and greater powers; that archaic borrowing and taxing provisions be thrown on the junkpile. "Not since the Southern States reentered the Union after the Civil War," says Alfred Willoughby, executive director of the National Municipal League, "has there been such a widespread examination of State constitutions. And this is only the beginning."

As a further outgrowth of these revisions, the legislative structure is also being strengthened. The number of States holding annual sessions, for example, has risen sharply in the last decade. In Pennsylvania, Maryland, Montana and other States, lawmakers' salaries are being increased. "You won't get better legislators merely by paying more money," says one lifelong student of State government, "but you won't get better legislators unless you do."

Gradually most legislatures are beginning to realize the importance of sound research. Some are taking advantage of a legislative-intern program cosponsored by the Ford Foundation; others are strengthening existing staffs. And many legislatures are even paying attention to those old bugaboos—conflict of interest and control of lobbying. New York, for example, strengthened its code of ethics last session. And in Nebraska, where lobbying activities were likened recently to "a semaphore operation on the railroad," lawmakers approved a measure providing that lobbyists can be fined and thrown into jail for 6 months if convicted of contempt of the legislature.

Such improvements, of course, are commendable. Yet many observers wonder whether they're not too few in number and too late in coming. The trend of the times seems to be running against the States. As the Nation becomes increasingly mobile, State boundaries will become even less significant. As Federal programs proliferate, State programs will shrivel. As they expect less and less from State government, Americans will show even less interest in it. Citizen loyalties will focus instead on Washington, D.C. And if the States are deprived of these loyalties, they will cease to function as meaningful units of government.

"The States today," says Pennsylvania Representative K. LeRoy Irvis, "are under the same sort of evolutionary pressure that animals are under. If they don't shape up, they'll get eaten up."

Can the States, somehow, shape up? Can they recapture the loyalty of their constituents, retain their role as active partners in the Federal system and stem the tide of sweeping centralization?

The only way in which the States can erect a barrier against the extension of national power, a distinguished American once wrote, is for the States to strengthen their governments. * * * "As this cannot be done by any change in the Federal Constitution * * * it must be done by the States themselves."

The author was Thomas Jefferson.

MILITARY EXPENDITURES FOR VIETNAM ARE NOT SERIOUS CAUSE OF PRICE INCREASES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, for the past several weeks there has been a growing stream of reference by financial columnists and economic writers to inflationary factors in our economy. This is understandable inasmuch as prices have moved up somewhat more rapidly in 1965 than in the preceding years. After increasing at an average annual rate of 1.3 percent between 1960 and 1964, the gross national product deflator, which is the best general measure of inflationary pressures in our economy, rose by 1.8 percent in 1965. Significantly, the President's Council of Economic Advisers which testified before the Joint Economic Committee last Tuesday, predicts no greater rate of price increase in 1966 than in 1965.

Nevertheless, with the submission of the 1966 budget there has been renewed concern about inflationary pressures. In particular, repeated references are made to the Vietnam war as a major factor in rising demand and inflationary pressures. Many analysts and commentators have drawn a parallel between the Korean war experience which did involve substantial price inflation and the emerging situation in Vietnam.

A closer analysis shows that the comparison may be spurious. In the course of the current hearings, it has been brought out that military expenditures are a lower percentage of the gross national product than they were in the 1950's. For the current fiscal year, total outlays for the military functions of the Department of Defense amount to $56.5 billion, which is approximately 7.7 percent of the gross national product. For 1967, the percentage is 7.9 percent, which includes $10.3 billion for the Vietnam conflict.

In the 4-year period 1956 through 1959, when our role in Vietnam was purely an advisory one and, therefore, far more limited than the present, the relationship between defense and total gross national product averaged 8.85 percent—higher than the projection for the year ahead. The following table shows the percentage relationship between Department of Defense military functions and total gross national product for each fiscal year from 1939 through 1967. Naturally, the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 are estimated.

I ask unanimous consent that the table may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Defense spending as percentage of gross national product, fiscal years 1939–67

	Percent of GNP
1939	1.2
1940	1.6
1941	5.4
1942	16.8
1943	35.1
1944	37.4
1945	36.7
1946	20.7
1947	6.2
1948	4.4
1949	4.4
1950	4.5
1951	6.4
1952	11.5
1953	12.1
1954	11.1
1955	9.4
1956	8.8
1957	8.9
1958	8.9
1959	8.8
1960	8.3
1961	8.5
1962	8.7
1963	8.5
1964	8.2
1965	7.1
1966 [1]	7.7
1967 [1]	7.8

[1] Estimates.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this percentage relationship ranged from a low of 1.2 percent in 1939 to a maximum of 37.4 at the height of World War II, and a postwar high of 12.1 percent in 1953 reflecting the Korean war.

Turning now to the expenditures for the Vietnam conflict, the sum of $10.5 billion is identifiable in the 1967 budget as required for this purpose. This comes to 1½ percent of gross national product. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the $4.3 billion in cost of our Vietnam military struggle comes to about seven-tenths of 1 percent of gross national product. Obviously, even with the expansion in 1967, the Vietnam conflict accounts for only a tiny fraction of total demands on the economy, and it is highly misleading to attribute any serious inflationary pressures to these outlays. It is true that expanding military expenditures have a multiplier effect and tend to trigger off other investments and expenditures, but obviously it is unreasonable to exaggerate the effect of current outlays for Vietnam or to draw close economic parallels with the Korean war period.

The base of military expenditures was and is much greater now than in the Korean war period. To illustrate: Total national defense outlays in 1949 were $13.3 billion and, in 1950, $14.1 billion. From that very limited base, they jumped to $33.6 billion in 1951, $45.9 billion in 1952, $48.7 billion in 1953, and $41.3 billion in 1954. Thus, in the fiscal year 1951, military expenditures were doubled and, a year later, tripled as compared with the pre-Korean war level.

By contrast, our military expenditures have been running at a $50-billion level ever since 1961. The Vietnam additions come to about 20 percent of base, as contrasted with the aforementioned doubling and tripling in the Korean war period. As a result, there should be none of the inflationary thrust that was caused by rapid acceleration in the early 1950's.

For the same reason, it is absurd to contend as our leftwing critics often do, that this Nation is dependent on military outlays to keep its vast economy going. There would be no serious problem at all in diverting any portion of military expenditures to the needs of an expanding civilian society. The President has indicated, both in his state of the Union message and his annual Economic Report, that Great Society programs have been held back in order to meet our military requirements and, at the same time, avoid undue pressures on our economic output.

Mr. President, it is clear from the testimony taken by the Joint Economic Committee that the dynamic factors in our current expansion are consumer expenditures and domestic investment. Gross national product is estimated at $722 billion for 1966—$46.5 billion over the 1965 figure. Rising consumer expenditures are expected to make up 60 percent of this increase. In the case of business investment, the annual rate of spending by business for plant and equipment in the first half of 1966 will exceed the full year 1965 level by $6 billion, and this rise is expected to continue in the second half of the year. The total of fixed investment, exclusive of residential, is expected to reach 10½ percent of gross national product.

In truth, we are maintaining a very rapid rate of expansion on all fronts and it is natural that some price pressures will be generated. At the same time, it is most important that we see these pressures in proper perspective.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "The 2-Percent War" written by J. A. Livingston.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 2-PERCENT WAR

(By J. A. Livingston)

Question. What makes a war economy or why is Vietnam different?

Answer. Quantity.

World War II never left any doubt. National defense purchases took two-fifths of the economic pie. The homefront served the war maw. Bacon, sugar, meat, coffee were rationed. Copper, steel, aluminum, and rubber were distributed by priority.

An entire system of controls—who gets what, when—was centralized in the War Production Board in Washington. Even manpower was allocated. Behind guns, butter was an also-ran.

The Korean war gave a less decisive answer. The economy had grown 16 percent bigger. So the Nation's manpower and equipment could handle a quantitatively greater war effort with less strain. And Korea was far smaller than World War II.

A month after it began, President Truman said: "This is not the time for business as usual * * * or for complete economic mobilization."

At the peak, national defense took a 15-percent wedge out of the pie.

And Vietnam is even smaller. Quantitatively, it is dwarfed by World War II. And it differs from Korea in both size and impact.

Korea caught Americans—you, me, and General Motors—with our military plants down. Promptly after the surrender of Japan, this Nation demobilized. National defense was scanted in the lunge toward peace: "Bring the boys back home."

After President Truman ordered General MacArthur to the defense of South Korea, industry had to retool and the Military Establishment, then a mere skeleton, had to be beefed up. Prices rose, shortages developed.

Reluctantly, President Truman resorted to allocations of some materials and to price and wage controls. But he never exacted a no-strike pledge from labor. He couldn't repress inflation.

The psychological acceptance of war was never all pervasive. Business continued partially as usual. The United States had plenty of butter while producing guns and sending men overseas.

Nevertheless, Korea changed the American stance. It underlined that the "ramparts we watch" are worldwide and demand instant and permanent readiness. Thus the Vietnam effort has been pretty much ingested by a national defense establishment in being. At the same time the economic pie—the capacity to meet war demands—has grown.

Today, military purchases amount to less than 10 percent of the gross national product and the Vietnam share of that is about one-fifth. Thus, in relation to the total economy—the aggregate production of goods and services—Vietnam absorbs about 2 percent.

Yet this 2 percent is an add-on. It reinforces prosperity, creates jobs, drains off manpower into the armed services and, in general, crowds an economy not too rich in leeway.

Will it generate inflation?

Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler thinks not. "Vast quantities of new industrial capacity will be coming on stream," he says enlarging the capability of the country to cope with expanding demand.

That is why President Johnson puts off asking Congress for a major tax boost which would cut down purchasing power. He'd prefer self-imposed restraint by labor and management on wages and prices to curb inflation.

Why permit a very small war—a 2-percent war—to reshape the Great Society? Should a sore tail wag a huge dog?

RENT SUPPLEMENTS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, since Congress adjourned last fall, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has studied carefully all aspects of the rent supplement program and has developed plans for its administration.

This program marks an entirely new step in providing decent housing for poor people—at rents they can afford to pay. It is designed to enlist the support and energies of private enterprise—and, I might add, the program has been given enthusiastic support by builders, realtors, lenders, private nonprofit organizations, and other private groups.

Public housing and other housing programs have accomplished much to improve housing conditions in the United States. But there are still far too many poor families and elderly persons with low incomes who are living in substandard housing. This is the group the rent supplement program will serve.

Recently the Department of Housing and Urban Development released income limits for a number of cities which will govern eligibility for rent supplements. The Department has leaned over backward to comply with the wishes expressed by the Congress at the last session.

The income ceilings are the same as public housing admission ceilings in those communities having public housing authorities. In New York City, the rent supplement ceilings are lower than public housing admission limits for families having five or more persons. In localities where there is no public housing, rent supplement income limits will be established at the same level which would have existed if there were a public housing program, based on available rental information and the income limits for public housing in a nearby community having comparable cost levels.

Similarly, rules have been formulated to limit assets, so that persons or families with savings or other assets of more than $2,000 will be not be eligible for rent supplements, except in the case of the elderly, where $5,000 will be permitted.

Mortgage limits and maximum rent limits will assure that rent supplement housing will be of modest design without luxury features. The objective will be to provide sound and sanitary housing suitable to the needs of low-income people.

I understand that many organizations and other potential sponsors have expressed interest to FHA in the form of letters and other data.

These represent a total of 424 projects and 69,750 dwelling units. Private limited dividend sponsors account for 53 percent of the proposed dwelling units, which underlines my earlier statement that the rent supplement program is enlisting private enterprise to help solve the housing problems of the poor.

These projects are widely scattered in practically every state, and I am sure as the program gets underway, every state will have its share of projects.

President Johnson described the rent supplement program as "the most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve the American city."

The widespread interest which has been expressed since the program was enacted into law last August, even though no funds have yet been appropriated, underlines the accuracy and significance of the President's statement.

THE DEATH OF DR. J. ELLIOTT SCARBOROUGH, JR.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, at Emory University Hospital in Atlanta, Ga., late last month, there died one of the great men of the medical profession, a man whose death will leave a void of massive proportions in the bridge of knowledge which will eventually lead to the conquest of cancer. Ironically, cancer is what killed R. J. Elliott Scarborough, Jr., who, at 59, was acknowledged as one of the Nation's outstanding specialists in that disease.

Mrs. Simpson and I have had a long and enduring friendship with Elliott Scarborough. Like hundreds of others throughout the Nation, we were shocked that he could be taken at so young an age by the disease that he had given his creative energy to conquer.

As the Atlanta Constitution expressed it so eloquently in an editorial February 1:

> He was the one who gave back life to so many who were dying, or who walked gently as a father with those he could not save and, out of his unbounded strength, gave them composure.
>
> No man's passing, in the medical profession of this State and region, will be more deeply mourned.

Mr. President, the death of Dr. Scarborough deprives the Nation of a great mind, a great conscience, and a great humanitarian. He was truly a national figure whose passing is felt in and out of the medical profession. I ask, Mr. President, that various obituaries and editorials pertaining to Dr. Scarborough be printed in the RECORD with my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Feb. 1, 1966]

DR. J. E. SCARBOROUGH DIES; LED FIGHT AGAINST CANCER

Dr. J. Elliott Scarborough, Jr., 59, one of the Nation's outstanding cancer specialists, died Monday afternoon in Emory University Hospital. He succumbed to the disease he spent a medical lifetime fighting.

Since coming here in 1937 to direct the Robert Winship Memorial Clinic, Dr. Scarborough had been a leader in developing

Emory's Medical Center and in expanding Emory University Clinic, of which he became director in 1957.

He held a Rockefeller Clinic Fellowship at Memorial Hospital in New York where he was invited here to head up the tumor clinic being established in the Robert Winship Memorial Clinic, one of the first for diagnosis and treatment of cancer in this area. Under Dr. Scarborough's guidance it became nationally known.

He believed an expanding teaching program should be an integral part of the treatment of private patients at the clinic, and that the clinic could grow in service by acting as a training center for physicians. Scores of associates who once worked under Dr. Scarborough's direction are now practicing in many other areas.

His continuing interest and influence in the clinical handling of patients referred by other doctors helped in expanding his concept and philosophy to other areas of medicine.

In addition to his original assignment as director of the Robert Winship Clinic, Dr. Scarborough held teaching positions in the Emory Medical School, beginning as instructor in surgery in 1937 and rising to professor of surgery in 1957. In the same year he became director of Emory University Clinic and director of professional services in Emory University Hospital.

Dr. Scarborough did much to enable the general public to understand cancer, for he had the gift to speak in terms understandable to laymen.

In 1949 he was appointed to the National Advisory Cancer Council, the Government's top policymaking scientific group in cancer research. In 1955 he was named to the national board of directors of the American Cancer Society and reelected in 1959. He also served as a member of the cancer committee of the American College of Surgeons.

In 1956 Dr. Scarborough was chosen president of the James Ewing Society, composed of doctors prominent in treatment and research of cancer and other neoplastic diseases. In the same year he received the American Cancer Society's Award for Distinguished Service in Cancer Control. He had served as chairman of the executive committee of the Georgia Division since 1952.

In 1960 he was appointed a member of the Cancer Research Training Committee of the National Cancer Institute and served until 1964.

Dr. Scarborough was a diplomate of the American College of Surgeons, and the American Board of Surgery. In addition, he was a member of the American Medical Association, the Medical Association of Georgia, and the Fulton County Medical Society.

Born July 26, 1906, in Mount Willing, Ala., he received his A.B. degree at the University of Alabama in 1926 and his M.D. degree at Harvard Medical School in 1932. He served a surgical internship at Roosevelt Hospital in New York, then continued his training at Memorial Hospital before coming here.

He was an elder in the First Presbyterian Church. He served as a director of the Great Southern Real Estate Trust.

He was a member of the Piedmont Driving Club, Capital City Club, and Kappa Alpha fraternity. Emory students recently chose him as an honorary member of ODK leadership fraternity.

Dr. and Mrs. Scarborough, the former Isabelle Wisell, of Middlebury, Vt., were married in 1935. They lived at 100 Westminster Drive NE. Their two daughters are Mrs. Nancy Cottraux, of Atlanta, and Mrs. Joseph H. Long, of Dallas, Tex. Their son, Elliott III, is a college student and another son, Evans H., attends Darlington in Rome. He is also survived by his mother, Mrs. Mattie Hinson Scarborough, and six grandchildren.

The family requests that in lieu of flowers donations be made to the Robert Winship Memorial Clinic Patient Care Fund of Emory University.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Feb. 1, 1966]

ELLIOTT SCARBOROUGH, M.D.

It does not seem quite possible that Dr. Elliott Scarborough is gone.

He was the one who gave back life to so many who were dying, or who walked gently as a father with those he could not save and, out of his unbounded strength, gave them composure.

No man's passing, in the medical profession of this State and region, will be more deeply mourned.

For his field was cancer, and all who came to him asked him for miracles. He headed the Emory University Cancer Clinic and its distinguished reputation in American medicine brought to him the highest professional esteem. Yet to the patient who entered his door—and his door was ever open—he was a warm friend, steadying counselor, calming voice, and knowing hand. No suffering human being was too humble, no frightened person ever too weak, to be outside his understanding, his concern, and his ready help.

To those who studied under him, the hippocratic oath took deeper meaning from his example—"I will impart this art by precept, by lecture, and by every mode of teaching." And so did the oath take unforgettable meaning for those patients he treated—"Whatsoever house I enter, there will I go for the benefit of the sick."

He entered innumerable houses, where he will not be forgotten.

For Elliott Scarborough was more than a brilliant doctor who advanced the art of medicine.

He was a good man.

[From the Atlanta Journal, Feb. 1, 1966]

DR. SCARBOROUGH

In the death by cancer of Dr. J. Elliott Scarborough, Jr., Atlanta lost one of her first citizens. The world lost a man long in the forefront of the battle against cancer.

Dr. Scarborough was a national leader in cancer research and education. He was a pioneer in the field of diagnosis and treatment, and for many years was with Emory University Hospital and Medical School.

His work brought cures and comfort to many, but it was his fate to die of that which he fought.

He contributed greatly to the search into the causes of cancer and its cures, and this is a search which some day will be successful.

The day of discovery will come. It will be a day of thanksgiving for the human race. It will be a day of thanks to Dr. Scarborough and those like him, who labored so long in humanity's behalf, and whose patient labors finally bore fruit.

THE COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the passage of the cold war GI bill of rights is a major public service to the Nation. The benefits to our servicemen, to our universities, to the Nation as a whole will be felt for many years.

For this achievement the primary credit must go to the senior Senator from Texas. The Senator from Texas has carried the burden of this fight for 7 years. Throughout that time he has sought to educate the Congress, the executive branch and the public on the need for this bill and the benefits to be expected from it. His wide knowledge of education, his perseverance, above all his dedication to justice for those who have guarded freedom's gate around the world—these things have been indispensable to the passage of this bill.

It has been a pleasure and a privilege to have worked with him on it during my short time in the Senate; it is an honor to vote with him for its passage.

THE BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the boxcar shortage, originally just a seasonal matter, has become a yearlong problem of serious proportions. In recent weeks there have been an increasing number of alarming reports about this shortage.

On January 27 I joined with 17 other Senators in urging the Interstate Commerce Commission to take strong steps and to utilize to the fullest its existing authority to alleviate this shortage.

I would like to call our letter, and Chairman Bush's reply, to the attention of the Senate. I respectfully ask unanimous consent that the text of these letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., January 27, 1966.

JOHN W. BUSH,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In recent weeks, there has been an increased number of alarming reports about the shortage of boxcars. In years past, this situation has been limited generally to the harvest season. However, it has now become apparent that this is a year-round problem. Reports indicate that demands for boxcars are being met only 50 percent of the time. Several of the major railroads have only 60 to 65 percent of their own boxcars operating on their lines.

There are two distinct problems in this situation which call for immediate attention. First of all, the railroads are not replacing boxcars in kind as they are taken out of service. Also, there is too much delay in the expeditious return of boxcars to their own lines. In this latter instance, orders from the Federal Government have been of little value because they are immediately tested in the courts, thus involving time-consuming delay.

In addition to these two difficulties, another situation has arisen which will complicate matters even more. The Commodity Credit Corporation has now ordered the relocation of some 85 million bushels of wheat and corn. This movement of grains from the farms to the elevators and to seaports will place heavy burdens on the railroads in the Middle West and West. This country's efforts to expand overseas shipment of agriculture commodities will continue to aggravate the situation.

We know that car service is but a small part of the activities under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, but we want to stress the importance of this work and ask that each member of the Commission give the problem every consideration. Therefore, we suggest that a greater effort be made to facilitate utilization of existing boxcars. More car-service personnel are needed to work at railroad terminals in an effort to keep the cars moving. Reports reaching us indicate that these personnel are decreasing in number and that their efforts are being diverted into other areas at a time when their services are needed at the terminals.

We ask that the Commission initiate contacts with the individual railroads discussing the need for purchasing additional boxcars and other equipment for the hauling of grain. We recognize that the railroads are making many improvements in their equipment, but there does not appear to be a sufficient stress on the need for replacing and increasing the number of the common, ordinary variety of boxcar.

The boxcar shortage, originally a seasonal matter, now a 12-month problem, can easily develop into a traffic situation of monumental proportions. Movement of products by surface transportation to points of export is continually expanding. If we are to avoid the congestion now indicated, we will have to act now. In addition to S. 1098 and S. 2816, now being actively considered by the Congress, we feel the Commission must take some initiative and utilize to the fullest existing authority. This is of grave concern to our constituents and to us as their representatives. We demand prompt action, now.

With best wishes, we are,

Sincerely,

MIKE MANSFIELD, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, MAURINE NEUBERGER, GALE W. MCGEE, QUENTIN BURDICK, MILTON R. YOUNG, LEN B. JORDAN, WALTER F. MONDALE, GEORGE MURPHY, LEE METCALF, HENRY M. JACKSON, GEORGE MCGOVERN, THOMAS H. KUCHEL, MILWARD L. SIMPSON, KARL E. MUNDT, WAYNE MORSE, FRANK CHURCH, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1966.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I want to give you an in-depth reply to your recent letter reflecting your deep concern over the boxcar shortage, rather than a perfunctory "we're doing the best we can" type of reply. I have therefore had our director, Mr. Pfahler, and his staff combine the information they have available with a considerable amount of additional information the Association of American Railroads very helpfully assembled for us. This report to you is submitted in the form of two enclosures.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. BUSH,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

REPORT ON BOXCAR SHORTAGE

The Commission has shared the alarm you have expressed concerning the shortage of boxcars. For many years the country has suffered progressively severe shortages of freight cars. Although in some of these years the supply of freight cars has had its peaks and valleys, during most of 1964 and all of 1965 there existed an unprecedented demand which far exceeded the available supply of boxcars, substantiating your statement that this is a year-round problem. The factors primarily contributing to this condition have been bumper agricultural crops, increased industrial production, and a year-round movement of grain for domestic storage and export by the Commodity Credit Corporation. It might be pointed out, however, that last year the Commodity Credit Corporation cooperated with the Commission in our efforts to alleviate shortages by scheduling their relocation program at a time when harvesting of grain would be at its lowest ebb. Other factors of primary importance have been a railroad car ownership inadequate to the level of the Nation's economy, a relatively high percentage of unserviceable cars, and some instances of injudicious utilization of existing equipment.

Your information as to the demands for boxcars being met only 50 percent of the time might very well be based on reports from scattered locations and include instances where carriers had not completely fulfilled inflated orders. I might emphasize that the average weekly reported shortages represent approximately 13 percent of the average weekly boxcar loadings during the year 1965.

Since the railroad car fleet is interchanged freely among carriers, the measure of a particular carrier's available car supply is based upon the percentage of all cars on line compared to its total ownership, rather than the percent of its own ownership on line. Using this yardstick, there have been only two major carriers which have had percentages as low as 60 to 65 percent of their boxcar ownership operating on their lines in the recent past. Most of the granger roads have not had sufficient cars to meet their loading requirements, but the percentage of boxcar ownership on these lines in December 1965 ranged from 59 to 121 percent. For January 1966, the range was 61 to 113 percent. Carriers originating traffic and having long off-line hauls to terminal elevators and port facilities normally operate at below 100 percent, but in times of high national demands for a particular type of equipment will fall below desirable operating levels, while bridge and terminating lines will have higher than normal percentages.

The first problem you have raised pertaining to the railroads not replacing boxcars in kind as they are taken out of service must be considered in the light of other equipment which has been added to service to haul the same commodities. While the plain boxcar level has fallen, there has been some increase in covered hopper cars, which are utilized in the handling of bulk materials formerly handled in boxcars, including grain. To the extent this type of equipment has been put in service, it has offset to a degree the reduction in boxcars. Also other types of equipment have been installed which handle commodities previously requiring plain boxcars.

The second problem you raise having to do with the return of cars is one with which this Commission has had considerable concern and about which we have exercised our emergency powers repeatedly in recent times. We feel that the Commission's service orders and car distribution directions have been of considerable value and generally have achieved the purposes for which they were intended. Compliance with our orders in most instances has been good. There has been only a single test of the validity of these orders in the courts in recent years, the litigation of which is still in process. For the most part the carriers have recognized the authority of the Commission and have complied with our directives. When we have found it necessary to prosecute carriers for noncompliance, usually judgment has been confessed and the cases settled without trial.

We have been aware of the Commodity Credit Corporation orders for the relocation of grain which were recently issued; and prior to the receipt of your letter, the Commission had taken action to issue a service order authorizing car distribution directions making it possible to direct additional cars to the granger roads which would initiate most of this movement. To date, a total of 15 car distribution directions has been issued naming carriers serving the area where movement will originate as beneficiaries for a total of 4,900 empty boxcars weekly. We are sure that additional orders will be issued and present orders revised to meet fluctuating conditions caused by the expanding overseas program. While this will benefit the shippers of grain, the only source of these cars is from other carriers, which are already experiencing a tight car supply. In effect, it makes a more equitable distribution of a short car supply but in no way resolves the overall problem.

The Commission recognizes the importance of its car service work, and the car supply problem has been the subject of special Commission conference, as well as a continuing concern of the chairman, vice chairman, and the members of division 3, who share the responsibility for this activity. Our departmental staff has been vigilant in the study and analysis of the car problems on a continuing basis. The efforts of our field force have been directed at current operations to assure that the Commission's orders are being fully complied with by the carriers, that car delays are kept to a minimum, and that maximum utilization is achieved from the existing fleet. Our instructions to the field force to accomplish this have been reiterated this week in the light of the Commodity Credit Corporation grain movement requirements.

There has been some reduction over the past several years in the number of our car service field personnel, which has decreased from 72 positions authorized in 1957 to 62 positions at the current time. This reduction has been necessitated by the funds available to the Commission and not by any desire on our part to depreciate the importance of this activity. If additional funds were available, we would, of course, increase the number of staff available for this work. While our field staff has other car service duties than expediting cars in and through terminals, in times of severe shortages, such as we presently face, car expediting is given primary emphasis.

My first action on receiving your letter was to seek a meeting at the Association of American Railroads to discuss the problems raised in your letter with the officers of the association. I attended that meeting personally and took with me Director Pfahler of our Bureau of Railroad Safety and Service, which is charged with the administration of the car service functions. The problem at hand was discussed in considerable detail, and we received assurance that it would be brought to the attention of their board of directors and through them handled with their membership. The AAR has added five additional men to their car service division.

The Commission has had contacts for the past several years with individual railroads to discuss their equipment requirements, especially as they related to the hauling of grain. These discussions have also included the achieving of improvements in the bad order car situation, so that more of the car ownership would be in serviceable condition and upgraded in order that it would be suitable for grain loading. I believe that the maintenance of high-level loadings of grain products during the period when the plain boxcar fleet has declined in number has reflected the improvements which have been made in repair and upgrading of cars, as well as the substitution of other types of equipment to haul commodities previously transported in plain boxcars. Some carriers have also recognized that their plain boxcar fleet was becoming inadequate, and this is reflected in some increase in the purchase of plain, unequipped boxcars. The industry now has on order over 57,000 freight cars compared to less than 40,000 at the beginning of 1965, and the carbuilding capacity of the country is presently being utilized to the fullest extent.

Well over a billion dollars were spent for new and rebuilt cars in 1965, and the forecast is for about the same amount in 1966. The general feeling of the railroad industry is that they are presently putting all of the resources possible into new and rebuilt cars in the absence of any incentive for capital investment. There were two specific incentives made available in 1962 to encourage acquisition of additional freight cars. The first was the investment credit, and the second the recognition and promulgation by the

Treasury Department of more realistic guidelines covering the useful life of freight cars. It is noteworthy that following the establishment of these incentives, the number of cars on order increased substantially. The carriers feel that the investment credit is now prevented from achieving its objective in full by reasons of the limitations contained therein. It is their belief that if the present limitations were raised from $25,000 to $100,000 and from 25 to 50 percent, with the carry-forward period extended from 5 years to 7 years, a big step would have been taken toward assuring the continuation of the highest practical level of equipment purchases in the years ahead. This would encourage increased car production capacity and permit a more rapid expansion of an adequate car fleet. Only through expansion of the car fleet can a solution to the car shortage problem be achieved. With the railroad industry now placing car orders at the rate of over $1.3 billion worth a year (1964–66), I estimate that for at least the next 5 years the carbuilding companies won't be able to fill more than half of their orders unless something in the nature of a long-range program encourages them to start now a crash program to expand their facilities.

Improvements in car utilization require the best efforts of the carriers, the shippers, receivers, loaders and unloaders, and the Federal Government. The Commission's efforts are continuing to encourage all of these to cooperate to achieve the most economic use of the available equipment. We will continue to exert every effort to make utilization more effective.

We have developed some material in connection with the matters raised in your letter which I believe will be of interest to you, and I am enclosing this staff paper herewith.

I can assure you that the Commission is alert to the boxcar problem and has been continually on the initiative to utilize to the maximum extent our existing authority and our limited personnel. We share the concern of your constituents and yourselves and assure you that we will take all actions available to us to alleviate the hardships caused by the shortages and to assure equitable distribution of the available car supply.

J. W. Bush, *Chairman.*

Enclosure.

STAFF PAPER ON CAR SUPPLY AND UTILIZATION

There is, of course, no question but that the car supply situation is serious. The railroads, too, have realized this for some time and have been engaged to the full limit of their capabilities in bringing about improvement. They are and have been short of many types of cars and recognize that the period of boxcar shortages is no longer confined to harvest seasons. The railroads have been and are carrying out an intensive program of modernizing their fleets, replacing small and obsolete cars with large, modern cars of new and specialized types. During 1964 and 1965, and continuing right up to the present, delivery of new cars has been limited only by the capacity to produce cars and their components. The number of freight cars on order increased from 39,426 at the beginning of 1965, to over 57,000 at the present.

During 1965, 59,617 new cars were installed and 11,825 cars rebuilt and modernized by the railroads. These installations include 8,472 plain boxcars, 13,767 equipped boxcars, 10,989 covered hoppers, 8,348 refrigerators, 5,615 gondola cars, 19,065 open hoppers and 4,322 flat cars. In addition, "private" owners installed 18,195 cars to make a total of 89,637 cars installed in 1965. "Private" owners include leasing companies, railroad subsidiaries and shippers.

The type of equipment in heavy demand today is the ordinary boxcar—sometimes referred to as the workhorse of the car fleet.

Comparative figures of ownership, shortages and loading of plain boxcars alone are not meaningful and must be considered along with the changes in ownership and the loading of other types of equipment which over the last several years have moved importantly into the carrying of the same commodities which the plain boxcar has traditionally carried. New marketing and transportation practices have resulted in the development of more efficient equipment for handling much of this traffic, including a significant portion of grain and other bulk commodities formerly handled in boxcars. The addition to the fleets of large and specially equipped cars and the strong growth of TOFC have changed the pattern in the hauling of nonbulk commodities that formerly moved or would have moved in plain boxcars.

In the case of TOFC (trailer or flatcar) not only has there been a large addition to the car fleet but utilization and performance is such that an individual flatcar, with its trailers or containers, performs the transportation of approximately four boxcars. This results from greater capacity, higher percentage of loaded movements and much shorter turnaround time. During the last 10 years, there has also been a large increase in the number of insulated box (RB type) of large cube now used extensively in hauling food and other products requiring protection against heat or cold, much of which was formerly boxcar traffic. In the case of boxcars for hauling grain, the replacement program has not kept pace with the retirement of the obsolete cars, but the replacement equipment has been of greater capacity. The following 10-year comparison will throw some light on this:

Boxcar ownership

	Plain		Equipped		Total	
	Cars	Average capacity (tons)	Cars	Average capacity (tons)	Cars	Average capacity (tons)
Jan. 1, 1956	664, 348	48. 62	52, 497	48. 14	716, 845	48. 59
Jan. 1, 1966	473, 798	50. 70	107, 599	57. 62	581, 397	51. 98
10-year change	−190, 550		+55, 102		+135, 448	

Covered hopper ownership

	Railroad ownership	Private ownership	Total	Average capacity (tons)
Jan. 1, 1956	41, 756	3, 883	45, 639	69. 8
Jan. 1, 1966	92, 080	15, 538	107, 618	77. 14
10-year change			+61, 979	

TOFC

	Railroad ownership	Private ownership	Total
Jan. 1, 1956	2, 900	500	3, 400
Jan. 1, 1966	5, 560	15, 978	21, 538
10-year change			+18, 138
Boxcar equivalent (factor of 4.2)			76, 179

Insulated boxcars (RB type)

	Railroad ownership	Private ownership	Total	Average capacity (tons)
Jan. 1, 1956	822	4, 580	5, 402	38. 77
Jan. 1, 1966	20, 602	15, 878	36, 480	58. 38
10-year change			+31, 078	

Multilevel automobile cars

	Railroad ownership	Private ownership[1]	Total
Jan. 1, 1966	2, 050	9, 749	11, 799

[1] Largely trailer-train (railroad owned).

Without considering the changes in capacity resulting from larger cars now being installed, but just comparing the reduction in total boxcar ownership of 135,448 with the increase in the various cars now moving the same type of traffic and taking into consideration the faster turnaround of TOFC, it should be observed that in this 10-year period the covered hoppers, the TOFC flatcars and their trailers or containers, and the RB cars have provided the equivalent addition to the boxcar fleet of 169,236 cars. This does not take into consideration the 11,799 multilevel automobile cars which carry several times the number of automobiles that could be carried, as they once were, in boxcars.

The addition of new type of equipment has freed boxcars for other uses such as moving grain. This is portrayed by the fact that in 1955, with a plain boxcar ownership of 666,238, there were 2,633,000 carloads of grain and grain products moved. In 1965, with an average ownership of 500,765 plain boxcars, and 102,735 covered hoppers, 2,657,000 carloads of grain and grain products were moved. During this same period, there was also a very great reduction in the number of cars of LCL moved. In 1955, there were 3,229,000 cars of LCL, in 1965, there were only 465,022 cars of LCL moved, resulting in the release of thousands of boxcars for other uses.

In the foregoing table, it is apparent that the tonnage capacity of the new equipment is greater than the average capacity of the cars 10 years ago. During this period, there has been a net decrease in the aggregate capacity of the boxcar fleet of 4,607,109 tons. However, there has been an increase in the aggregate capacity of the railroad-owned covered hoppers of 4,214,671 tons, and an increase in the railroad-owned refrigerators capacity of 1,791,882 tons.

It is apparent, therefore, that in the consideration of the size of the car fleet it is necessary to keep in mind these many related factors.

There are many factors affecting the utilization of cars. Railroads generally have been taking many steps to improve car use but there is much yet to be done. The increasing employment of new communication and data systems are improving car location information and distribution, but, until many more of the large railroads are making effective use of such systems, efficient distribution is hampered by lack of current, dependable information.

Until information concerning car location and requirements is available on current losses, the most efficient utilization of existing cars is impractical.

THE PRESIDENT'S SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM CUTBACK

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the health of our children is the strength of our Nation. We pride ourselves, and rightly so, about the preeminent power of the United States in the world today. There are many reasons why a nation of less than 200 million people can exercise unrivaled influence in a world of nearly 3 billion, but not the least of these reasons is the fact that we and our children are among the best fed, most wholesomely nourished nation on this earth. In a very real sense, the future security of our country depends upon the health of our children.

Over the years, we as a nation have done much to improve child health and nutrition. The Federal Government now supports crippled children's services, maternal and child health service, child welfare services, national school lunch programs, aid to dependent children, Project Headstart under the Economic Opportunity Act, the surplus commodity program and the food stamp plan. One of the cornerstones of our national effort to improve child health is the school milk program. Under this program, children in schools, child care centers, summer camps, orphanages and similar institutions received almost 3 billion half pints of milk in 1964 and 1965 and an estimated 3 billion plus in 1966.

During fiscal 1965, over 1,400 Maryland schools and summer camps participated in this milk program. An estimated 350,000 Maryland youngsters consumed some 64 million half pints of milk, to which the Federal Government contributed $2,174,000. This was in addition to the 44.7 million half pints of milk distributed to some 255,000 Maryland children under the national school lunch program.

I was therefore shocked to learn, Mr. President, that the school milk program is being cut back 10 percent in the current fiscal year and that the President's budget proposes to cut the program back to less than a quarter of its present level in fiscal 1967. The facts are that in July 1965, the Department of Agriculture notified participating institutions that their reimbursement would be cut 5 percent. Just recently the Department announced an additional 5 percent cut in reimbursements. These cuts were made at the insistence of the Bureau of the Budget which seeks to hold expenditures under this program below $100 million, notwithstanding the fact that the Congress appropriated $103 million. The effect of these cuts is certain to impose a further strain upon already overburdened local school budgets, and to raise the price of milk to schoolchildren.

These cuts for the current year are serious enough but much more threatening is the fact that the President's budget proposal would cut school milk appropriations for fiscal 1967 from its present level of $103 to $21 million. This will cripple the school milk program.

The justification of the proposed cut is that the program will be redirected by helping needy children. The idea appears to be that instead of subsidizing every 4-cent half pint of milk by an average of 3.19 cents, the program will give milk wholly without charge to schools for needy children.

The details of how this redirection of the milk program is to be accomplished have yet to be released by the Department of Agriculture, but there are a number of fundamental questions that must be answered.

First. How are needy children to be determined? Does this mean an onerous means test? Will each child have to reveal how much his father earns? Will first and second graders be divided into the haves and have nots? I find such an approach repugnant. I opposed the idea of a degrading means test on establishing medicare. If it is offensive to gear Federal assistance to elderly persons, depending upon their means, it is far more offensive to do so with programs for young children.

Second. How much will the reduction in the milk program reduce milk consumption? What effect will this have upon the health of our youth? Senator Proxmire, who has ably led the fight to retain the milk program has pointed out that a 1955 U.S. Department of Agriculture study in Madison and Milwaukee showed that a price reduction from 4 cents to 3 cents increased consumption by 41.8 percent in Madison and 10.5 percent in Milwaukee. A price reduction from 4 to 1 cents increased consumption in Madison by a whopping 158.8 percent and in Milwaukee by 82.6 percent.

It is too well known for argument that milk contains nutrients essential for health and that a well-nourished child learns better than an undernourished one. Is the money we would save worth the risk to the Nation's health? Are we being penny wise and pound foolish by curbing this highly popular and important program?

Third. How much do we actually save by cutting back the milk program? We have a dairy support program. Our Government is buying surplus milk. Are there really alternate uses for this milk that are more economic and important to our Nation than the school milk program?

Fourth. What will the effect of this reduction be upon our dairy industry in Maryland and elsewhere? It is well known that the family dairy is not a lucrative business. We have dairy support programs and programs to prevent unfair price competition. Are we jeopardizing the dairy industry by cutting down our school milk program?

Mr. President, I hope the foregoing questions will be carefully considered by the Congress and the executive branch in the months ahead. I find it hard to see how we can possibly justify cutting this important program, and I have, for that reason, joined Senator Proxmire and other Senators in cosponsoring S. 2921. This bill would make the milk program permanent and commit the Congress to providing adequate funds for future years. I hope this bill will be the subject of early hearings, so that the milk program can be studied and its future charted on a sound basis.

THE RIGHT TO DISSENT AND THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in times of national emergency, the right of dissent tends to become clouded by other considerations. Protest is then too easily labeled as disloyalty, too often interpreted as disobedience.

Some months ago, a group of University of Michigan students wanted to demonstrate their opposition to our policies in Vietnam. They sat-in at a local draft board office and refused to get out at closing time.

The law recognizes that this is the wrong thing to do and the offenders were convicted of trespass under a local ordinance. However, the Selective Service System decided to go the law one better.

Male students among the demonstrators were ruled delinquent under the Selective Service Act and local draft boards were advised to reconsider student deferments.

Understand, no court ever ruled these students had violated the Selective Service Act. That ruling was made by General Hershey, the System's Director.

As a citizen of a democracy, with its written constitutional guarantee of due process, I am disturbed when a Federal official can—without judicial process—remove from the public scene persons whose views are unpopular in official circles.

Certainly, I do not agree with the student viewpoint. But I do agree with the Justice Department's opinion—expressed to me in a letter from Assistant Attorney General Fred Vinson.

In that letter, Mr. Vinson said:

> When there is a transgression of law, then the sanctions that attach to it are all that should be applied. And until charge is filed, the accused has had his day in court, and judgment of guilty rendered, he is presumed

innocent of violation of the law—in this case, of violation of Selective Service law. The "sit in" conduct was found to be a trespass under local ordinance and the sanction attached was visited on the students. But no such charge, trial, and finding yet has been made under the Selective Service Act.

There has been a good deal of newspaper editorial comment on this matter and I ask unanimous consent that some of it be printed at the end of my remarks.

The first editorial is one that appeared in this morning's Washington Post, commenting on the case of one of the youngsters who recently lost his appeal to his local draft board.

The other editorials largely endorse my position but in fairness I think this collection of comment should include an editorial from the Detroit News entitled, "Voltaire or Decatur?" The News picks Decatur. My inclination, as the paper notes, is toward Voltaire.

Hopefully, these pieces may serve to clarify the issue for whatever colleagues have not had time to study it thoroughly.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 16, 1966]

PETTY REPRISAL

Washington Local Draft Board No. 2 has decided to punish Samuel Friedman because that young man holds some political opinions the board considers wrongheaded. The board has reclassified Friedman from 2–S status to 1–A. Since this will probably result in an interruption of the boy's studies and induction into the armed services, it may, in a sense, be said to do him an injury. But the injury done to Friedman is negligible compared to the injury done to the Selective Service System.

Evidently the draft board is without any awareness or comprehension of the outrage it has committed. Its action is a way of saying that military service is a form of penal servitude. And it is also an arrogation to itself of authority to use selective service to reward or punish young men in accordance with its own political prejudices. Congress, of course, never intended to let draft boards wield such power.

The facts are quite clear in the Friedman case. In Ann Arbor, Mich., where he is a graduate student at the University of Michigan, he participated last October in a sit-in at an Ann Arbor draft board designed to demonstrate against American policy in Vietnam. Opposition to American policy is perfectly permissible in a free society. Interfering with the normal operation of a draft board office is not; it was, in this case at most a trespass, a minor misdemeanor, however, for which the law has ordinary, and adequate remedies.

The Department of Justice has said flatly that the Selective Service Act cannot be used "to stifle constitutionally protected expressions of views." In a letter written to Senator HART last month, Assistant Attorney General Fred M. Vinson, Jr. said that "where opinion is expressed, if there is no transgression of law, then no sanctions can be imposed; if there is a transgression, then the sanctions which attach to it are all that should be applied."

This was written with the Ann Arbor demonstration precisely in mind. That the Washington draft board has intentionally sought to impose a punishment on young Friedman beyond the sanctions that attach to trespass was made altogether clear by Sylvan Reichgut, Washington Selective Service director. He said that the board acted on information that Friedman was among students who entered the Ann Arbor draft board office and "actually impeded the operation of the board."

It may be that the war in Vietnam will require the induction of graduate students. It may even become necessary to induct undergraduates. But if such demands are to be made upon youth, it is imperative that they be made equitably and equally, without favoritism on the basis of a draft board's whims. The Friedman case will be appealed, of course. The Washington board's petty reprisal will have to be upset if the reputation of the Selective Service System for integrity and impartiality is to be restored.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post Dec. 15, 1965]

DEBASING THE DRAFT

It is a monstrous pity that Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, who did so much to make the Selective Service System into a respected instrument of democracy, should now debase it into a device for punishing political dissent. Another of the young men who took part in a sit-in demonstration at Ann Arbor, Mich., against the war in Vietnam—this one a Washingtonian—has been declared delinquent and reclassified. Why? "Reclassification is quicker at stopping sit-ins than some indictment that takes effect 6 months later," General Hershey explained, "and we haven't heard of any sit-ins since the one in Ann Arbor."

Well, General Hershey ought to know better than anybody else that Congress did not enact the selective service law to stop sit-ins. The sit-in at Ann Arbor may have breached the law, as General Hershey appears to think it did; if so, the perpetrators ought to be prosecuted and punished according to law. But induction into the armed services ought not to depend upon conformity to General Hershey's standards of political orthodoxy.

The general has done something much worse than an injustice to an individual. He has impaired confidence in the fairness of the draft. And he has threatened a fundamental American freedom—freedom of expression.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 16, 1965]

DIRECT ACTION

General Hershey, who was ably running the draft before some of the American boys now in Vietnam were born, has always called the shots as he saw them—straight from the shoulder. He has done no less in arguing that several young men who invaded an Ann Arbor draft board last October to stage a protest sit-in against the Vietnam war jeopardized, by their actions, their right to enjoy the continued privilege of student draft deferments.

It is easy to imagine the approving reaction to this position among the Armed Forces in Vietnam. And for our part, on much the same grounds, we admit also to an immediate surge of emotional sympathy. The element of poetic justice is undeniable.

But as so often is the case with direct, emotional action, General Hershey this time has gone far too far. If the draft-deferred sitters-in violated the law, as Selective Service officials allege, that is a matter for the courts. The participants, however, are not criminals or "character delinquents" as those terms are usually applied by draft boards. Nor do their actions in this instance, wrong as they may be, have the slightest bearing on their performance as students—which is the primary basis, after all, for their draft-deferred status.

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen-Patriot, Dec. 21, 1965]

IS SELECTIVE SERVICE BEING USED WRONGLY?

A legal showdown is brewing over the right of draft boards to reclassify for immediate induction students who participate in sit-in demonstrations against the Vietnam war.

Involved in the case are the University of Michigan students who participated in a sit-in in the Ann Arbor Selective Service office October 15.

There is little question that the demonstration interfered with the work of the selective service office. The students finally were hauled away, charged in municipal court with—and found guilty of—trespassing, fined $50 each and sentenced to 10 days in jail. The court's action is being appealed.

The case did not end there. At least 10 of the students have had their draft classification changed from 2–S (student) to 1–A (available for induction).

The reclassification is tied to what Col. Arthur Holmes, State selective service director, refers to as actions which "broke the law and deliberately interfered with the board's operation."

The students have many defenders, including the Michigan branch of the American Civil Liberties Union, Senator PHILIP S. HART, and the president of the University of Michigan.

While not defending the actions of the students, their advocates insist the reclassification and induction would be a matter of punishment without proper trial.

The argument is that if a Federal law has been broken, the students should be charged and tried.

Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Selective Service Director, says that it always has been his view that a young man who violates the selective service law "should be given the opportunity to enter the Armed Forces rather than be prosecuted for his violation of the law."

Here is one of those cases in which the course to justice is not clear. It is greatly befogged by emotion.

To the average American who supports the war in Vietnam and appreciates the sacrifices being made by our men there, the antidraft demonstrators are a disgusting lot. Actual interference with the operation of the selective service law seems unthinkable. The glandular reaction to antics of such persons as the Ann Arbor demonstrators is: "Stick rifles in their hands."

Yet if the selective service law is to continue to fulfill its function and hold the respect of the men affected by it, its administration must be above reproach. Its impartiality must not be questioned.

Somehow, using the law to punish demonstrators casts a reflection on all the men who have heeded the "greetings" notices with a proper sense of duty and loyalty.

Moreover, we suspect that most men in Vietnam would prefer not to go into battle with men who were inducted primarily because they participated in a demonstration in a draft board office.

Now if the selective service law technically were violated by the demonstrators, the better way, it seems, would be to conduct a proper investigation and to prosecute under the law if such a course is indicated.

True, the demonstrations distress most Americans. A tough reaction is natural. Certainly Selective Service should keep a close watch over registrants who are deferred as students. Those who are not living up to the letter of their deferments should be reclassified immediately.

But reclassification in lieu of punishment through the courts just doesn't seem proper.

[From the Charlevoix (Mich.) Courier, Dec. 23, 1965]

American Rights in Jeopardy

Selective Service Director Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey has come under fire from Michigan Senator **Philip A. Hart** and others for canceling draft deferment privileges from students who participated at a sit-in at the Ann Arbor draft board office several weeks ago.

Hershey has called deferment from A–1 status "a kind of parole."

"They have violated the terms of their parole and they have no business to have deferment after that," he says flatly.

Senator **Hart** insists that only the courts should decide whether or not the draft law has been violated by a sit-in.

The old soldier in General Hershey sees duty to the U.S. Government as a kind of privilege. He claims to object as strenuously as the next fellow to the idea that serving one's country via the local draft board is some kind of grim punishment visited upon the youth of the Nation by Congress.

Therefore it is inconsistent for him to look upon deferments from service for schooling or any other reason as "a kind of parole."

We are confident that General Hershey has the best interests of the country at heart. Yet his critics have the U.S. Constitution to fall back on when they say the courts—not General Hershey—should interpret the intent of the draft law.

Whether we agree with the actions of the demonstrators, the fact remains that they are still American citizens, subject to the protection of the Constitution and the courts. To allow these rights to be waived by arbitrary legal interpretations such as General Hershey's appears to be, would be defeating our purpose in Vietnam.

[From the Battle Creek (Mich.) Enquirer & News, Dec. 27, 1965]

Action on Protests Belongs in Court

An example of the lawful and proper method of dealing with draft protesters was reported late last week.

In New York a grand jury indicted four young men on charges of burning their draft cards at an anti-Vietnam demonstration last month. Unless they plead guilty to the charge, they will go to trial in a court of law and be judged innocent or guilty on the evidence presented against them.

This is as it should be. If they have broken a law against willfully destroying draft cards, they should be held to account and pay the penalty.

The grand jury's indictments and the legal steps that follow it are in contrast to other recent action taken against young men who have protested U.S. policy in Vietnam. In Ann Arbor, several youths who staged a sitdown in the selective service board office soon found their student deferment revoked and their classification 1–A.

It became clear that this was no accident. The students were reclassified because they had protested. Thus, the Selective Service System was used as a weapon to retaliate against the protesters.

However one may view protests against official Government policy, there is no justification for bypassing legal methods of dealing with protesters if they have broken laws. We declare to the world that we are fighting for freedom and against authoritarian rule in Vietnam. We weaken our own case when we adopt the methods our adversaries use to silence unpopular opinions.

Senator **Philip Hart**, of Michigan, stated the case well in a letter to the Attorney General asking an investigation of the reclassifications. He said: "The danger here is apparent: Should a Federal official be allowed to decide when a law is broken and then proceed to punish those he has branded as lawbreakers? I think the students' opinions about Vietnam were invalid. But we can't allow our judicial system to be short-circuited in dealing with opinions that are unpopular in official circles."

The Vietnam protests are distressing and harmful, largely because they are open to misinterpretation by the peoples we are fighting. The place to handle them, when there is a violation of law, is in the courts, as is being done in New York.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Dec. 27, 1965]

As We See It: Hershey Would Do Well To Study a Predecessor

This Nation in times of danger has always had its brave volunteers, but it has also had its problems in raising troops to assure success. The bitter days at Valley Forge and George Washington's agonizing troubles in maintaining the Revolutionary Army are etched in American history.

Except in the method they chose, there was nothing new in the protest of the students at the University of Michigan against the Nation's involvement in Vietnam. They sat in at the Ann Arbor draft board.

But draft officials withdrew student deferments, reclassified some of the students 1–A, and made them vulnerable to immediate induction.

Such a course runs contrary to constitutional guarantees of free speech. It violates the rights of citizens to protest a policy they think wrong and it perverts the draft law.

An increasing number of others share this view, among them a distinguished group of law school professors, Senator **Phil Hart** and Representative **Gerald Ford**, of Michigan, and Representative **Emanuel Celler**, of New York.

Both **Hart** and **Celler** queried Lt. Gen. Lewis Hershey, Selective Service Chief, about his strained interpretation of the draft laws, and now Senator **Hart** has asked Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach for an opinion.

The Attorney General would be well advised to hold General Hershey's interpretation in error. If he doesn't, Senator **Hart** and others can be expected to raise the issue in the Halls of Congress when it convenes in January, and the sort of debate that they would ignite is the sort of debate President Johnson would undoubtedly prefer to avoid.

And if the Attorney General doesn't advise General Hershey to retreat, the courts certainly would be pressed to undertake the job. In the highly unlikely event the courts wouldn't defend the right of free speech, the people could be expected to insist that Congress draw a new draft law to do the job.

The American public, which generally supports this Nation's goals in Vietnam although there's disagreement over means to attain them, supports even more strongly the right to criticize governmental policies. And while the people may not be in sympathy with the Ann Arbor sitters-in, they will defend their rights to protest. It is a right which Americans throughout history have cherished.

For his part, General Hershey should review his position and, in the process, should visit the Arlington memorial raised to another general, and read the words inscribed there.

"When we assumed the soldier," said George Washington, "we did not lay aside the citizen."

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Dec. 29, 1965]

Off the Target

The thesis has been advanced elsewhere that "this country has come to a helpless pass if it requires a court judgment to send a man to fight"—an off-the-target pronouncement if we ever read one.

Nobody is arguing that the selective service law is invalid and that draft boards do not have the power except when armed with a writ, to induct the willing and unwilling alike.

What the argument is about is the preempting by selective service officials of the judicial process. They have been finding youths guilty of civil crimes, and making military service a punishment.

Establishing guilt and saying how the culprit will be penalized is strictly a court function. If a draft board feels that some registrant has committed an offense against it, the board's recourse is the nearest U.S. district attorney.

If he concurs as to probable guilt, and an indictment follows and the defendant loses in court, then the board can properly decide whether this is a circumstance which sacrifices the deferment privilege.

If it does, however, there has been a fast policy switch. The last we heard, a criminal conviction was usually a bar to acceptance at the recruiting office. Now, seemingly, a venture into law breaking is a special recommendation for putting a man into uniform.

It is not an image of the U.S. citizen-soldier which appeals to us.

[From the Ann Arbor (Mich.) Daily, Jan. 7, 1966]

Draft Stands Merit Praise

Two Michigan legislators are taking the lead in challenging the draft reclassifications of the 12 university students who staged a sit-in, with others, in October at the Ann Arbor draft board in protest against the war in Vietnam.

Senator **Philip Hart** sent a letter on December 23 to Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach requesting an investigation of the reclassifications—which came after National Selective Service Director Lewis Hershey wrote the students' local draft boards suggesting a review of their status—and asked Katzenbach's opinion on whether "until a change is made * * * and judgment reached, * * * these men are presumed to be innocent of trespass impending the selective service law."

Ann Arbor's Congressman **Weston Vivian** has been in continuous consultation with the American Civil Liberties Union, the ACLU has been studying the complicated legal aspects of the selective service law, which now permits local draft boards, acting autonomously, to reclassify registrants, but gives vague criteria. If a court test does not clarify the law's mention of "delinquency" as a basis for reclassification, **Vivian**—who believes that the "selective service laws should not be used to enforce conformity of expressed opinion or to punish dissent"—is prepared to consider amending the law itself.

It does not take an opponent of the war in Vietnam—both legislators generally support it—to perceive the dangers of the present situation. The Selective Service System, acting in a unique combination of judge, jury, prosecutor, and witness, apparently reclassified the students because they were "delinquent" for having "disrupted" the functioning of the system. Given the vague criteria of the selective service law and the equally indefinite boundary between punishment for unlawful activity and punishment for expression of an unpopular belief, the process of judgment, as Senator **Hart's** letter noted, should be left to the courts—not the Selective Service System.

And if "delinquency" on the basis of "disruption" of the Selective Service System, with the threat to the expression of opinion this implies, is not clarified by the courts, then changes in the law should definitely be considered, as Congressman **Vivian** believes.

The response of both legislators to such a deplorable situation is, in short, admirable.

Mark R. Killingsworth.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 12, 1966]

Penal Servitude

Assistant Attorney General Fred M. Vinson, Jr., in his letter to Senator Philip A. Hart, of Michigan, has produced a sound and sensible opinion on the use of the draft laws to coerce opinion.

In two brief and unambiguous sentences he has stated the gist of the matter: that there is no transgression of the law where only a matter of opinion is involved and that where there is transgression the sanctions which attach to it should be applied—not the reclassification powers of local draft boards.

If this were not the law, it ought to be the law. It would be a healthy thing if the Director of the Selective Service System would now acknowledge that local draft boards should not use the draft law to punish either the expression of opinion or overt acts punishable under other statutes. And if the Director cannot be persuaded to give local draft boards this guidance, he ought to be replaced with a Director who will do so. The Selective Service System must be safeguarded, by legal interpretation and by the clear expression of its officials, against the slightest inference or remotest suggestion that service in the Armed Forces of the United States is a form of penal servitude.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Jan. 12, 1966]

Time To Retreat

In military parlance there may be no such thing as a graceful retreat and Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, director of the draft, certainly seems determined not to make one.

But, clearly, this is what is called for by the Justice Department's statement concerning the reclassification of students who protest against U.S. policies in Vietnam, as they did not long ago by staging a sit-in at the Ann Arbor draft board.

In General Hershey's view the sitters-in should be punished not only for trespass but also should be found delinquent under the draft law and reclassified 1–A. Sitting-in, to him, is no different from failing to report for a physical exam when ordered to do so.

Of course there is a difference, and it has concerned this newspaper, Michigan's Senator Phil Hart, other lawmakers and much of the country. For the effect of General Hershey's heavyhanded interpretation of the draft laws is to stifle the protest movement; it is an infringement of free speech.

And, as the Justice Department pointed out in its statement, it is an inaccurate reading of the draft laws.

"As a matter of law and policy," said the Department's statement, "the sanctions of the universal military training and service act cannot be used to stifle constitutionally protected expressions of views. In short, where opinion is expressed, if there is no transgression of law, then no sanctions can be imposed. If there is a transgression, then the sanctions which attach to it are all that should be applied."

This refers to provisions for criminal prosecution which General Hershey, if he had wanted to, could have invoked. This would mean a court trial in which the accused is given an opportunity to defend himself. To reclassify students was a wrong administrative decision from which the students had little recourse. There is no provision for appeal to the courts under this procedure but, ultimately, only to General Hershey himself.

And this is what makes the general's reaction to the Justice Department's statement all the more incredible.

"I have no disagreement with the Justice Department," he said, proceeding immediately to disagree. Nobody's told me yet whether anyone's been intimidated on his beliefs, or whether there's any argument as to whether these boys have interfered with the operation of their local draft boards. The fine point * * * people say if you're reclassifying someone, you must be punishing him * * * but a classification process is administrative, not legal."

The American Civil Liberties Union intended to bring a test case of these provisions, but lawyers working on the problem confessed the difficulty of even getting into a court. Perhaps they will find a method and still bring a case; perhaps, after General Hershey reflects some more on the Justice Department statement, they will find such a case unnecessary now.

For although graceful retreat may be impossible for a crusty military man, the draft director seems required to manage some sort of withdrawal. His position has become untenable.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 24, 1966]

Bypassing the Courts

When the Justice Department finds it necessary to assert that the Selective Service Act cannot be used to stifle any "constitutionally protected expression of views," such as student protests against U.S. policy on Vietnam, the public can hardly feel overwhelming confidence in the way the draft law is being administered.

The Government's position is stated by Assistant Attorney General Vinson in a letter to Senator Hart. The Michigan Democrat had questioned the reclassification to 1–A of some University of Michigan students who had staged a sit-in at the Ann Arbor, Mich., draft board offices to protest Vietnam policy.

The students were found guilty of trespass, under a local ordinance, and were fined. Selective Service Director Hershey then declared that an existing Executive order permits the Selective Service System to reclassify anybody "found to be delinquent" under the act. He ruled that the student demonstrators were delinquent because they interfered with the local draft board's operations, such interference being a violation of the draft law.

The Justice Department, on the other hand, states that no such Executive order exists. "Where opinion is expressed, if there is no transgression of law, then no sanctions can be imposed," the Department's letter continued. "If there is a transgression, then the sanctions which attach to it"—in this case, punishment for trespass—"are all that should be applied."

Although Draft Director Hershey says he agrees that the draft law should not be used to punish people for their opinions, he has not yet retreated from his position that the students broke the draft law with their sit-in and thus were punishable. And Michigan Selective Service officials have made it clear that they won't move without fresh orders from headquarters.

Whatever the exact legal rules in this case, equity certainly demands that anyone accused of breaking a law get a fair trial. If administrators acquire the right to bypass the courts and assess arbitrary punishment, then the safety not only of draft-age youth but of all of us will be the less.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Dec. 27, 1965]

The Draft Exempt Demonstrators: Voltaire or Decatur?

Philip A. Hart, elected to speak for Michigan in the U.S. Senate, has challenged the authority of the Selective Service System. He has used his office to question publicly the right of the system to reclassify for immediate induction a group of students convicted in Ann Arbor of trespassing by staging a sit-in protest at their local draft board.

Previously, the demonstrators had enjoyed the privilege of draft deferment for the express purpose of applying themselves to completion of scholastic careers. Draft Director Lewis B. Hershey evidently figured they were not fulfilling that commitment while organizing sit-ins, milling around police stations and appearing in the courts.

In this shabby situation, Senator Hart accuses Hershey of being both prosecutor and judge and argues with a fine flavor of phrase for the rights of these demonstrators in a democracy for their "day in court." He exercises his rhetoric in a shaky cause and with extremely bad timing.

On the very day he was attracting national attention, a court-martial convicted an Army lieutenant merely of marching in a protest parade against U.S. policy in Vietnam. He was sentenced to 2 years in prison and ordered dishonorably discharged.

Here in brutal truth is illustrated the contradiction of Hart's position. Is there to be one measure of allegiance for the serviceman and another for the citizen safely home and at ease? In a democracy in time of peril are not citizens soldiers and soldiers citizens? When does a constitutional right cease to be universal?

On that same day, Hart was joined in the public prints by Representative Gerald R. Ford with an opaque statement that the Selective Service System should not be used for "punitive purposes," whatever that may mean.

And on that day, a News reporter was interviewing more than 40 men with broken bodies in the Great Lakes Naval Hospital. They got that way holding the line in Vietnam so that people at home, like truly purposeful students, may escape war.

They have an equal right to be heard with a U.S. Senator. Said Army Specialist Robert Simon, 23, torn by a grenade, of the demonstrators against the draft:

"You won't see that sort of parading outside this hospital, or there'd be a lot of broken crutches littering the decks."

The easy and fashionable way these days is to argue for the right of dissent and assume an intellectual level in the war debate. The tough way is to get in, every man together, and march in common purpose to a national goal.

There should be no prohibition against a citizen engaging in the "public dialog," as the intellectual calls it, or the GI resort to traditional griping. But this country has come to a helpless pass if it requires a court judgment to send a man to fight.

Hart says he disagrees with those who protest the Vietnam war policy but defends their right to dissent without retaliation. His is the fine phrase of the Frenchman, Voltaire: "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

That is the paraphrased version and it's wonderful, but not just now when we're being shot at. At such a time, we prefer the words of an American. Said Stephen Decatur: "Our country. In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be right; but our country, right or wrong."

We say that demonstrators and recalcitrants in times like these have a right to be heard—but not to get in the way. Draft deferments, it is universally believed, are commitments to pursue on the home front jobs essential to the Nation's well-being.

If those commitments are broken, if those deferred impede the orderly war effort, where in the name of patience are the reasons for draft deferment?

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Jan. 5, 1966]

ACLU WOULD PREFER SCHURZ TO DECATUR

To the EDITOR:

The editorial in the Detroit News on December 27, critical of Senator HART and his defense of the right to fair treatment of war protestors captioned "Voltaire or Decatur?" would more appropriately have been captioned "Lord Tennyson."

The spirit and essence of your editorial statement comports with Tennyson's lines in "The Charge of the Light Brigade"—"Theirs not to reason why; theirs but to do or die." This concept and philosophy, suitable for a totalitarian state, is hardly consistent with our American heritage and tradition.

What has been of great concern to Senator HART, Congressman GERALD FORD, the American Civil Liberties Union and many others in the reclassification of the University of Michigan students is the fact that the Selective Service officials have based their action on an alleged violation of section 12A of the Selective Service Act—the section imposing criminal penalties.

The determination of a violation of a criminal law is clearly a judicial function and not that of the Selective Service System or any other executive or administrative agency.

The News editorially expressed preference for Decatur's "Our country, right or wrong" comment as against the Voltaire philosophy at times such as we are now facing. Personally, I prefer the philosophy of Congressman Carl Schurz in response to Decatur, when he said "Our country, right or wrong, when right to be kept right; when wrong to be put right."

ERNEST MAZEY,
Executive Director,
ACLU of Michigan.

THE BUDGET OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT RESEARCH OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the Senate will shortly consider the proposed budgets of its various committees and subcommittees, as recommended by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Research of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, I want to say a few words in explanation of its modest budget in the amount of $66,000.

The Subcommittee on Government Research is the only subcommittee in the Senate which has Government-wide jurisdiction in the field of research and development being carried on by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Virtually every major agency or department in the Federal Government annually contracts for research and development. Last year the Federal Government spent a total of $15.5 billion for this purpose. The bulk of this figure, of course, was in the development field, but much of it was in basic research, both in the social and physical sciences.

Legislative committees of the Senate oversee expenditures for research in their particular fields of responsibility. The Subcommittee on Government Research was established so that we could have a comprehensive overview of all of the research activities being carried on by the Federal Government.

Some of the very serious questions for which Congress must find the answers, suggest the fields of inquiry scheduled by our subcommittee.

First. Are the large expenditures for research and development and the various component research project expenditures necessary and justified?

Second. To what extent are improved administrative procedures required to guard against or eliminate unnecessary or improper overlapping and duplication among the Federal agencies?

Third. How may we establish broad national policies for making value judgments on how much emphasis will be given to various fields of research concerned, as compared with others, and for the best use of our limited national research manpower resources?

Fourth. How may we better provide for the dissemination of research results for governmental, institutional and industrial use?

Fifth. How may we be more certain of fairness in the distribution of Government research contracts among potential research contract recipients, particularly institutions of higher education?

There are many other serious questions involved in the field of Government research, but these are some of the major ones which must be answered, and soon, if the Congress is to properly represent the interests of the citizens and taxpayers of the country. Anyone of these questions involves an enormous amount of work.

The Subcommittee on Government Research, with governmentwide jurisdiction, was established as the vehicle by which governmentwide answers might be found to these serious questions.

We have requested modest funds which will provide for one staff director, one secretary, and one minority counsel. We were able to hold down the amount of our budget and the number of subcommittee employees by the intended use of consultants in particular fields of inquiry whose technical knowledge and training would be available only as and when required, rather than full time.

The subcommittee budget has been approved by the entire membership of the subcommittee. Members of the subcommittee, in addition to myself, are the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter, dated January 25, 1966, signed by all the members of the subcommittee, explaining our projected work for this year and the need for the budget amount requested, be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I think it will be obvious from this explanation of our subcommittee's work and the attached letter that our budget for the year is small indeed in comparison to the good that we expect will come from our inquiry and study, and in comparison to the enormous amount now being spent by the Federal Government in the field of research.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
January 25, 1966.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Subcommittee on Government Operations created by you on August 20, 1965, herewith submits for the consideration of you and the Government Operations Committee a request for funds in the amount of $66,000 for this year's activities. A detailed and itemized budget request is attached.

The subcommittee as authorized and directed intends to undertake intensive studies, including hearings into the origins of research and development programs financed by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

Special emphasis will be placed on those programs now being carried out through contracts with higher educational institutions and private organizations, to determine the need for establishing national research development and manpower policies and programs, and to encourage more effective coordination of our total governmental research effort.

The subcommittee will be directly engaged in the pursuit of one of the duties of the Committee on Government Operations, the study of the operation of Government activities, with a view to determining their economy and efficiency.

The chairman of the subcommittee has devoted much of his time since the creation of the subcommittee to an intensive survey of prior congressional committee activities in the whole broad field of research. It is found that most of the areas have received passing attention but that there is a serious need for an intensive overview of Federal research policies.

Although we have been able to draw very heavily on the resources of the Science Policy Division of the Library of Congress, especially during the period of adjournment, the kind of study that this subcommittee should undertake entails the full-time work of a small staff of highly competent people.

This will enable the subcommittee to begin a review of research activity throughout the Federal structure, present its findings to the full committee, and ultimately make whatever recommendations its hearings and research seem to indicate. It will also enable the subcommittee to handle any pertinent legislation assigned to it.

We sincerely hope that this will meet with your approval and be acted upon favorably by the committee.

Sincerely yours,
FRED R. HARRIS,
Chairman.
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN.
ABRAHAM RIBICOFF.
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA.
KARL E. MUNDT.
MILWARD L. SIMPSON.

INDEPENDENT BANKERS STILL CONCERNED ABOUT FARM INCOME

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture has taken several steps recently to prevent farm prices from rising. This has included making available Commodity Credit Corporation grain stocks on the market at minimum resale price levels.

I have deplored these actions in each instance, although I have every sympathy for the President's efforts to control inflation, because I do not think pressure should be brought to maintain inequitably low prices.

The farm situation has been improving a little. But most farm prices and farm income are still too low. The time has not come for ceilings on any major agricultural commodities.

My conclusion in this regard is emphasized in a statement just now being circulated by the Independent Bankers Association of America, in which they state they are still concerned about their ability to supply agricultural credit because of the lack of earned income in rural areas. They point out also that the recent Federal Reserve Bank action increasing interest has added to farmer's costs and "suggest"—using a mild word—that the Reserve Board's action has created more problems than it solved.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to include the statement of the Independent Bankers Association in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Position on the Rural Economy

(By Agriculture-Rural America Committee, the Independent Bankers Association of America, adopted February 4, 1966)

A year ago the Agriculture-Rural American Committee of the Independent Bankers Association of America issued a statement warning that country bank loans to farmers were dangerously close to deterioration. The IBAA pointed out that since 1951 farmers have been using credit as a substitute for earned income because of depressed agircultural raw material prices. The association said that banks could not much longer supply this credit to take the place of farm income.

Today, the association is well aware of price improvements in some agricultural commodities. While collateral positions are improved by higher prices for the time being, the association cautions that without continued price improvement to where all agricultural commodities attain their rightful parity positions, farmers will continue to be hard pressed in meeting their financial obligations.

To support its contention of a year ago that improved farm prices would be in the public interest, the IBAA reasoned as follows:

Termination of credit availability to thousands of farmers would directly affect the 30 percent of the population of the United States which lives in communities of 2,500 and under and on the farms surrounding them. Collapse in the agriculture sector of the economy, involving nearly one-third of the consuming public, could only lead to total economic disaster in America.

The IBAA also demonstrated that the elimination of 2½ million farmers—a solution favored by some economists—would not solve the rural problem but would only create new probems of farmer displacement and urban crowding.

The association urged that to prevent another farm-led and farm-fed depression, farm raw material prices be brought into balance with the prices of other segments of the economy. Because agricultural raw materials represent new wealth, the IBAA said, parity of income for farmers would expand America's economy to provide full employment, full plant capacity, balance the budget and commence retirement of the national debt.

This position statement was made official association policy by the membership in a resolution adopted at the IBAA's 31st annual convention in Hollywood, Fla., last April. The paper was widely distributed and acclaimed. It was inserted in the Congressional Record no less than three times.

The association has not withdrawn from the position expressed in this paper. Still needed is a program for agriculture that will assure a continuing price structure in balance with other segments of the economy.

However, the picture appears somewhat brighter largely due to a more favorable supply and demand situation that has improved prices of some farm products.

Yet to be tested is the sweeping new Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. The new impetus being given to distributing food as a tool of foreign policy can help control agricultural surpluses. Much is hoped for in these two areas.

Today country bankers are still concerned about their ability to supply the credit needs of rural people, and continue their concern for the lack of earned income in the rural sector. While expressing great admiration for the Federal Reserve Board, the committee believes the recent action increasing the maximum permissible interest rate to 5½ percent as an anti-inflationary measure has brought higher costs to the agricultural sector.

This problem is of immediate concern to the Agriculture-Rural America Committee of the Independent Bankers Association of America. The Fed has by its action imposed a higher cost on a hard-pressed agriculture. Banks throughout the country now find it necessary to increase both interest paid and charged. We suggest that the Federal Reserve Board has apparently created more problems than it solved in raising the ceiling on interest rates.

The fact remains that there is no basic long-range program for agriculture. Let us not be lulled into complacency by the moderate price increase for some agricultural materials.

The Agriculture-Rural America Committee of the Independent Bankers Association of America reiterates its declaration of 1 year ago that our economic future has been built on a weak foundation. We have prosperity in many segments of the economy in this country. But it has been achieved at the expense of the farmers.

We have not constructed true economic wealth at all, but a will-o'-the-wisp prosperity in which some segments of the economy have been fattened by feeding upon another. Since the land represents the beginning point of our country's wealth, such prosperity can only be temporary. It will eventually fall of its own weight.

The farmer remains in a state of economic depression because he is not getting a consistently fair price for his production. That is, farm product prices, on a consistent basis, have not been in balance with the prices of other segments of the economy.

The situation has occurred not because of any immutable laws of economics, but because important political and business interests have served to gain from maintaining farm produce prices at depressed levels.

Our profit-starved rural economy has been dependent upon massive doses of credit every year since 1953. This credit will one day have to be repaid. When we do this we will deprive the market in some future years of the income necessary to consume our annual production at a profitable price level.

The farmer out of necessity has been using credit to keep his head above water. His borrowing always is in anticipation of future profits, but the sad fact remains that repayment often is made from liquidation of assets accumulated in prior years.

We are concerned with the manner in which our farm program is being administered in that the dumping of our farm commodities and lowering of farm payments have reduced instead of raised the income of farmers.

We repeat our recommendation that the Federal Government give top priority to farm prices. If farm prices are restored to relative balance with the rest of the economy, we can achieve a huge bonus of output and income by making full use of all of our resources and raw material, human and financial.

JET AIRPLANE LANDINGS AT WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the decision of the Federal Aviation Agency to permit jet landings at Washington's National Airport has aroused considerable criticism from responsible citizens of the State of Maryland.

As an opponent of this decision, I should like to call attention to a letter from Mr. Saul I. Stern, printed in the February 9 edition of the Washington Post. As chairman of the Maryland State Planning Commission, Mr. Stern has been a forceful advocate of comprehensive planning for the Baltimore-Washington area. No one knows better than he the immense pitfalls of opening National Airport to jet air traffic, especially from the standpoint of efficient regional planning. His letter to the Post contains a succinct, perceptive statement of the problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Jets for National

While your recent editorial persuasively argues the case for landing jets at National Airport, it contains, however, an underlying parochialism contrary to your general philosophy toward most regional and metropolitan affairs.

It is a clearly established fact that the Washington and Baltimore metropolitan areas are rapidly merging into one large urban region at the southern anchor of our eastern megalopolis. In a variety of ways, these two great metropolitan areas share many common problems, not the least of which is a balanced transportation system.

Over the past several years I have strongly advocated a comprehensive regional planning approach for the ever-merging Washington-Baltimore complex. Pursuant to that easily demonstrable need, I have held several conferences with some of the Washington area's leaders. Unfortunately, these failed to produce any tangible results although there was basic agreement that at least further discussions identifying and delineating the problems should be held.

The case of two underutilized airports within 40 minutes driving time of downtown Washington is one of many problems underscoring the need for regional development plans. And it is difficult to ignore in such a plan the fact that better than half of Washington's population lies closer to Friendship Airport than to Dulles Airport.

It appears that the Federal Aviation Agency has turned its back on President Johnson's call for creative federalism. Its decision to land jets at National Airport was made without regard to total regional needs and without prior consultation of any of the governments of the local communities affected or the regional bodies responsible for comprehensive planning.

I would hope that the Washington Post, which has so vigorously supported balanced transportation systems and comprehensive regional planning will recognize the pitfalls of the FAA decision and join with us in urging that Agency to undertake a study for the best usage of regional airport facilities with Washington and Baltimore's regional planning bodies and representatives of the existing airports.

SAUL I. STERN,
Chairman, Maryland State Planning Commission.

KENSINGTON.

MODERN AUDUBON HAILS FROM WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the January 23 edition of the Sunday Gazette-Mail, Charleston, W. Va., State magazine, carried an article by Mr. William C. Blizzard concerning a modern-day Audubon who hailed from the Mountain State of West Virginia. It is not surprising that the beauties of nature which surrounded this young man in his boyhood provided inspiration for his career as a naturalist and artist.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the newspaper article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By William C. Blizzard)

Every schoolboy knows that John James Audubon, who died 115 years ago, because the most famous painter of American birds and other wildlife. But few Ph. D.'s know that a man hailed as the modern Audubon (or even as his superior) was born at the foot of Mount McGowan in Randolph County, W. Va., in 1926.

The modern painter's name is Ray Harm. "I was born," he says, "across the mountains from Kerens, between Elkins and Parsons. Bickle Knob is not too far from there. When I was a boy, my father and I used to swim in the hole of water below Blackwater Falls. The place has changed. All you could hear in those days, besides the roar of the water, was the whistling of the wind through the pines."

Ray Harm's address is Coxs Creek, Ky., and he has not had a permanent address in the West Virginia hills for a long time. Harm, in fact has had few addresses of great permanency. An artistic Ishmael, he has wandered through much of the United States; the longest unbroken span of years he has resided in one place (the first 13 of his 39 years) were spent near his birthplace in West Virginia.

The artist was not a wanderer by design. It just happened that way, beginning when he ran away from home at the age of 13, after his mother and father were divorced. Ray wound up on a horse ranch in northwestern Nebraska, where he began a career which led to a rough-and-tumble youth of cowboying, rodeo riding, and a stretch with a circus.

"I rode," he said, "from the Garden in New York to the Cow Palace in San Francisco. With the rodeo, a young fellow usually starts out riding bulls and broncs. There's not so much skill involved, and a young, strong cowboy has a chance of winning. Later, I saved my money, bought a calf-roping horse, and specialized in calf roping."

Ray Harm may be, as some admirers assert, the finest wildlife artist since Audubon. He is, without doubt, a press agent's dream. His life has been more colorful than a Van Gogh landscape, and he drips with talent in several different directions.

"My father was a fine violinist," Harm told me, "who taught me the classics before I left home. During his early life, he worked as a sawyer around Davis, where he was born. But he was a sort of musical prodigy. He studied first at the Davis Conservatory of Music, and later studied somewhere in Chicago. Then he opened a music school of his own on the west coast and married one of his students."

The pair toured the country, playing violin duets, and eventually returned to West Virginia. When I asked Ray what his father did after that for a living, he replied:

"He was a herbalist. Of course, a living, quote, unquote, is a word for true mountaineers. A lot don't make a living—they just live, some right good by their own standards."

His father was an amateur naturalist of great learning, in a nonacademic way. From his father, Harm not only learned music but also the fundamentals of natural history, a field which has became the most absorbing interest of his life.

"Actually," says Harm, "I consider my interest in painting secondary to my interest in nature."

Harm, incidentally, was not born with that surname, but took it when he was legally adopted in 1943 by his mother's second husband, William M. Harm. Ray's father was Raymond K. Auville (he died in 1959 at 70).

"The name is of French origin," Ray explains. "We think it was originally Deauville. In West Virginia, a lot of the family has shortened it to 'Auvil.' I've shortened 'Raymond' to 'Ray.'"

Ray Harm, as the artist is known today, is a husky, brown-eyed, dark-haired man who likes to wear blue jeans and a tattered shirt. A bit under 6 feet, and appearing much younger than his 39 years, he would look at home perched on a corral fence under a 10-gallon Stetson.

Except for a series of improbable events, that is exactly where he would be today, just another cowboy separating cows from calves at gathering time, or a bull rider on the rodeo circuit. Old scars are reminders of that fact, for his wrists were fractured many times during his rodeo days, and his fingers have been thickened by hard work.

But Ray Harm is an unusual man. Aside from his painting and his skill with string instruments, he has a good singing and speaking voice, can do rope-spinning tricks a la the late Will Rogers, is a field naturalist respected in scientific circles, does much noncommercial taxidermy, and has earned his living as a cowboy, a rodeo rider and calf roper, and a trainer of circus, "high school" horses.

At present, as artist in residence at the University of Kentucky, he earns his living as a wildlife painter, a living he supplements as a naturalist and lecturer for Kentucky State parks, and by writing an illustrated column (soon to be syndicated) for the Louisville Times.

Until he was 23, Ray Harm had never dreamed of being a professional artist, although he had made many sketches of horses and other animals during his cowboy and circus days. The idea of studying art came to him when he learned that, as a World War II veteran, he was eligible for 4 years of schooling under the so-called GI bill of rights.

After serving for 3 years on a Navy destroyer, Harm was discharged from the service in 1946. As he had joined the Navy while on the rodeo circuit in Syracuse, N.Y., he naturally went back to cowboying, this time in New Mexico, when he got out of the Navy. He got a letter about school eligibility in late 1948, while in New Mexico.

"I didn't know what to do," Harm recalls. "I had gone only to the sixth grade in a little one-room school on the Cheat River. You don't get in any college with a background like that. But I saw an opportunity to develop my artistic talent, which I hadn't thought much about before."

Harm applied to the Cleveland Institute of Art for admittance, largely because his mother lived in that city. He was refused because of a lack of formal education, but was admitted to Cleveland's Cooper School of Commercial Art.

Harm chuckles: "I got into the institute of art by the back door. After my diploma from Cooper (he seems to have done 4 years work in 3, digging ditches and training horses at the same time), I did graduate work and took special courses at the institute."

Parenthetically, Ray warns young people that his lack of formal schooling has been and is a handicap. He is concerned that his present modest success might inspire youths with artistic learnings to mass dropouts. "Don't do it," says Ray Harm.

Ray had married while at Cooper. After graduation he built a log home with his own hands in a wooded area outside Cleveland, complete with stables for the horses he loves to have nearby. Although he drove a truck by day and painted by night, his financial situation became impossible. So he resolved to sell his home and return to New Mexico and the life of a cowboy.

Shortly before he made this decision, however, events had occurred which were drastically to shape his future. In the winter of 1962, he had mailed two bird paintings to a customer in Florida, where they were seen by Dr. Frank Dickey, then president of the University of Kentucky, and Wood Hannah, Sr., a wealthy Louisville businessman.

Both Dickey and Hannah were impressed. The latter made a trip all the way to Harm's woodland cabin in Ohio, and commissioned the wildlife artist to do 20 watercolors of Kentucky birds.

Despite this windfall, the Harms and their children (there were three by this time) could see no way to make ends meet. They decided to return to New Mexico, and Harm went to Louisville to tell Hannah that he would get his 20 bird prints, but they would have to be sent from out west.

At this point, Wood Hannah apparently decided to exert what seems to be his rather considerable influence in Kentucky. Harm was introduced to former Gov. Bert Thomas Combs, made a Kentucky colonel, and shown his first football game (University of Kentucky against the University of Tennessee).

More important, he was offered the position of artist in residence at the University of Kentucky—which he eagerly accepted—and the job of State parks naturalist and lecturer. A group of Louisville businessmen formed a corporation called Ray Harm Wildlife Art, Inc., so that the West Virginia-born artist is quite literally in business.

Ray bought himself 300 acres of forest in the Knobs region of Kentucky, in a spot so remote that he had to build his own road to his home. He designed that home with a high-vaulted, glass-enclosed living room which overlooks a steep bluff and 8-acre artificial lake.

Harm's acreage is adjacent to a 14,000-acre nature preserve called the Bernheim Forest. The artist has official access to this undisturbed tract, and takes full advantage of the opportunity. Native wildlife of all sorts (except black bear) cavorts about his home, a Walden which Thoreau would have envied.

In recent years, Harm has received as much as $2,100 for a single painting, although, as he says, this doesn't amount to so much in terms of an hourly wage. For Harm is a perfectionist. His approach and technique are realistic in the extreme, so much so that a butterfly print under glass is easily mistaken for the insect itself. This approach today, when artists often avoid painting anything a viewer might recognize in reality, is, of course, unusual.

But for Harm, with his scientific outlook, it is the only possible approach to his subject. He shrugs.

"I'm not an esthetic person," he says. He prides himself on his draftsmanship, and is an admirer of the technique of Dali before that painter became eccentric and rich.

Harm paints his plants and animals from life, shooting nothing with a camera or rifle. In this respect he differs from the famed Audubon, who liked to shoot birds and bring them back to his studio for arrangement and study.

In other respects, which are odd rather than significant, the lives of Harm and Audubon have certain parallels. Audubon was also of French descent, and started life with a different name from the one he made famous. Both artists went broke before their work was accepted. Audubon, like Harm, was a musician.

Kentucky is not likely to lose by sponsoring Ray Harm, nor is the publicity Kentucky puts out likely to overlook the Harm-Audubon comparisons. Audubon actually lived in Louisville (where he ran a business, after a fashion), and there is an Audubon State Park of 520 acres near Henderson, Ky.

As I said before Ray Harm is a press agent's dream, which is not bad in this harsh, commercial world. But it also seems a shame to connect press agentry with a man so genuine and upretentious. His story is incredible enough without puffery.

Many West Virginians will, of course, be disappointed that a Mountaineer has been recognized and honored by Kentucky instead of by his own State. In 1964, Harm was named Kentucky "Man of the Year" by Louisville TV station WHAS. Ray Harm prints decorate the office of Gov. Edward T. Breathitt, Jr., of Kentucky, and not the office of Gov. Hulett Smith, of West Virginia, although this West Virginia oversight may be corrected in time.

Often, the young Ray Harm hitchiked from the west back to his mountain home in West Virginia, often asking for handouts on the way. His story may finally parallel, like Audubon's, the situation described by Thomas Seward:

"Seven wealthy towns contend for Homer dead,
Through which the living Homer begged his bread."

RESTON PRAISED L.B.J. FOR FEED 'EM, NOT FIGHT 'EM PROPOSAL

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, no one likes war. Even a war for freedom and against Communist aggression is sure to be unpopular when the casualties start rolling in and the taxes to pay for it start rolling up.

Those who have to make the unpopular tough decisions, no matter how right, suffer the brunt of public criticism. The main target is the President.

This country has been on such a Johnny-one-note Vietnam jag recently that these have been especially rough days for the President.

And yet the President has recently initiated a great program that deserves warm public approval and support.

Listen to what James Reston, of the New York Times, wrote on February 11:

> There is a kind of Gresham's law of journalism in which the bad news drives out the good, the negative overwhelms the positive, and the warmakers drown out the peacemakers.
>
> Yet when the history of this postwar generation is written, the quiet and generous policies of the American Government are likely to stand out above its military exploits, and nothing illustrates the point better than President Johnson's new efforts to relieve world hunger.

The new, imaginative food for peace—food for a hungry world—is a conception of the President that deserves far more recognition and support than it has received in this Vietnam drenched atmosphere.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred, by James Reston, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON: FIGHT 'EM OR FEED 'EM?

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 10.—There is a kind of Gresham's law of journalism in which the bad news drives out the good, the negative overwhelms the positive, and the warmakers drown out the peacemakers.

Yet when the history of this postwar generation is written, the quiet and generous policies of the American Government are likely to stand out even above its military exploits, and nothing illustrates the point better than President Johnson's new efforts to relieve world hunger.

He is no longer thinking of the Nation's food surpluses as a problem but as an opportunity. He is not talking now about taking more acreage out of production but of putting some of the 60 million land bank acres back into production, and in the process, he is likely to prove that this is not only good agricultural policy, but good foreign policy and social policy at the same time.

ROOSEVELT'S FORESIGHT

Here is a field in which the United States has dealt consistently and generously with the causes of war—from the Marshall plan to the Johnson plan. It is just over 20 years ago that Franklin Roosevelt's Atlantic Charter pledge of "freedom from want" was given substance in the formation of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Since that time, the net total of U.S. economic aid to other countries was over $65 billion, and in the last decade U.S. aid programs have provided over 140 million tons of food for needy nations.

THREAT OF FAMINE

Nevertheless, world food shortages are greater than ever. With the human population increasing by 63 million every year, and food production not keeping up, there is a serious threat of famine in India and other developing countries, and the United Nations estimates are that in these countries total food supplies will have to increase by 103 percent by 1980 and by 261 percent by the end of the century to maintain even a minimum standard of nutrition.

President Johnson's food message this week combined a new sense of urgency and realism about his problem. He knows that peace and starvation do not go well together, but he is also emphasizing that this staggering problem cannot be met for long by the surpluses of the advanced nations but must be faced by modern agriculture in the land of the hungry nations.

Therefore, he is proposing expanded food shipments to countries where food needs are growing, and self-help efforts are underway; increased capital and technical assistance; expanded food production in this country; increased emphasis on high protein foods to combat malnutrition, and provision for adequate reserves to meet any world emergency.

Aside from the humanitarian aspects, the social and political considerations of this program at home and abroad are likely to be considerable. Even a much larger production of food in the United States will not stop the steady flow of people into the cities, but it may slow it up. Farm income is likely to increase, encouraging people to stay on the land and in the small agricultural towns, and if Mr. Jefferson was right about the character of the American farmer and the wickedness of urban societies, this will be all to the good.

Overseas, the most striking advantage of the United States in its competition with the Communist countries is on the land. The Russians have got to the moon but somehow they cannot get out of the hole on the earth. Before the war, the Soviet Union, the Communist countries of Eastern Europe and even continental China were exporters of food; now they are all importers.

The United States is now producing its vast agricultural surpluses with less than 10 percent of its people on the land while the Soviet Union cannot feed itself with over 50 percent of its people on the farm. Yield per acre has increased by 109 percent in North America in the last 25 years; by only 7 percent in Asia; and these are factors in the world agricultural and political revolution that are not likely to be overlooked by the leaders of the new and hungry nations.

THE PARADOX

All this appeals greatly to President Johnson. He has a feeling for the land and the poor—having come from both—that comes through in his food and poverty messages more clearly than any others; and in emphasizing them, both at home and abroad, he is establishing a record that may in the end be the symbol of his administration.

This in a way is one of the tragedies of Vietnam. Sometimes we give the impression that we are determined to save those people from communism if we have to kill them in the process, and the controversy over this gets in the way of the larger interests and nobler concerns of the American people.

PROPOSED GUIDELINES FOR OUTDOOR ADVERTISING

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, on February 4, the able chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Roads [Mr. RANDOLPH] commented on the proposed guidelines for control of outdoor advertising published by the Department of Commerce in the Federal Register of January 25, 1966. The senior Senator from West Virginia was joined in colloquy by other members of the Committee on Public Works, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] and the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS].

It is unfortunate that articles in the local press have interpreted the comments of these Senators as alining them with the outdoor advertising industry against the Department of Commerce and the Highway Beautification Act which the Congress passed last year. Members of the Committee on Public Works are not for or against any industry with respect to the highway beautification legislation. Members of the committee are, however, for the Department of Commerce administering this legislation in accordance with the intent of Congress. And some of us are disturbed by the prospect that this program, which was strongly advanced by President Johnson and the First Lady, with the overwhelming support of the Congress, may be unnecessarily jeopardized by an overzealous interpretation in the Department of Commerce of one section of the act.

I comment on the issue at this time because I have received—as have other Senators—queries regarding the implications of the proposed guidelines. In light of the intent of the Congress concerning outdoor advertising in industrial and commercial areas, such queries are understandable.

It would be appropriate, therefore, to review the legislative history of this section of Public Law 89–285 for the guidance of Department of Commerce officials and others who will be involved in the hearings to be held in the several States in the forthcoming months. I emphasize that my comments are concerned solely—as were those of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads on February 4—with the proposed guidelines as they affect subsection (e) of title 131, which governs outdoor advertising in industrial and commercial areas.

It will be recalled that the draft legislation originally proposed by the administration distinguished between areas zoned industrial or commercial, and unzoned areas used predominantly for industrial or commercial purposes. No controls were proposed for industrially or commercially zoned areas, while it was proposed that unzoned areas of commercial or industrial use would be "determined in accordance with national standards to be established by the Secretary."

No section of this act received more exhaustive attention by the Committee on Public Works. After 4 days of hearings on the bill and 3 days in executive session, the committee reported an amended bill which required that the unzoned areas would be determined "in accordance with provisions established by the legislatures of the several States, which shall be consistent with the purposes of this section."

The last proviso of the amendment was accepted in committee on my motion, and I believe then, as I believe now, that it would have given the Secretary of Commerce quite adequate authority to implement the act.

As the committee report stated:

> The committee has given long and deliberate consideration to this subsection. * * * The basic postulate of this provision is that outdoor advertising is an integral part of the business and marketing function and an established segment of the national economy; as a legitimate business, it should therefore be allowed to operate where other industrial and commercial activities are conducted.

The report continued with the observation:

> The committee notes the qualifying clause quoted above "which shall be consistent with the purpose of this section." The purpose of this act is to preserve and develop the recreational and esthetic values of the interstate and primary highway systems * * *. The committee is of the opinion that subsections (b) and (c) provide the Secretary with adequate authority to enforce compliance with the purpose of the act.

However, the argument was later advanced by officials of the administration, shortly before S. 2084 was brought to the Senate floor, that in the process of closing off many areas heretofore occupied by outdoor advertising, the act would tend to enhance the value of the remaining sites in industrial and commercial areas. Therefore, in order to prevent consequent clutter in these areas, the administration requested an amendment which would authorize limited controls in commercial and industrial areas, whether zoned or unzoned.

On September 15, 1965, the floor manager of the bill in the Senate [Mr. RANDOLPH] proposed the first of the administration amendments addressed to this issue. As a substitute for the committee language, the amendment read as follows:

> (e) Notwithstanding any provision of this section, signs, displays, and devices conforming to criteria determined by the States subject to concurrence by the Secretary concerning the lighting, size, number of signs, and such other requirements as may be appropriate, may be erected and maintained within six hundred and sixty feet of the nearest edge of the right-of-way within areas adjacent to the interstate and primary systems which are zoned industrial or commercial under authority of State law, or which are not zoned under authority of State law but are used for industrial or commercial activities, which unzoned areas are determined by the several States subject to the approval of the Secretary.

After rather lengthy debate and considerable opposition, the senior Senator from West Virgina requested unanimous consent temporarily to withdraw the amendment, which act was later made a permanent withdrawal.

On the following day, September 16, the Senate floor manager received a copy of a letter from Secretary of Commerce, John T. Connor, to Representative JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Public Roads, explaining the purpose of the proposed amendment. The Secretary stated, in part:

> In order to prevent an unchecked proliferation which not only results in a public eyesore but undoubtedly impedes the effectiveness of billboard advertising, reasonable standards pertaining to size, spacing, and number of billboards would be developed. * * *
>
> It is the intention of the administration that the regulations, insofar as they are consistent with the purposes of this act, shall be helpful to the advertising industry and that, for instance, standards of size which may be adopted would be insofar as possible consistent with standard size billboards in customary use.

Viewed in the context of the events at that time, Mr. President, it is quite evident that the Senate had no intention of giving authority to the Secretary of Commerce to outlaw outdoor advertising in industrial and commercial areas, whether zoned or unzoned. In his letter to Representative KLUCZYNSKI, Secretary Connor made it equally evident that he desired no such authority and that the proposed amendment would not be so interpreted by him. With this understanding in mind, the manager of the bill in the Senate, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] introduced on September 16 a modified version of the amendment which he had withdrawn on the preceding day. The substitute amendment, which was passed by the Senate with a vote of 44 to 40, read as follows:

> (e) In order to promote the reasonable, orderly and effective display of outdoor advertising while remaining consistent with the purposes of this section, signs, displays and devices whose size, lighting and spacing is to be determined by agreement between the several States and the Secretary, may be erected and maintained within six hundred and sixty feet of the nearest edge of the right-of-way within areas adjacent to the interstate and primary systems which are zoned industrial or commercial under authority of State law, or in unzoned commercial or industrial areas as may be determined by agreement between the several States and the Secretary: *Provided,* That nothing in this subsection shall apply to signs as defined in section 101(c)(2).

Mr. President, there are three significant differences between the amendment finally adopted by the Senate and the earlier one which was withdrawn. And each of these changes is important in terms of the congressional intent of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 with respect to the recently announced "guidelines." First, the declaration of purpose in the amendment acknowledged the legitimacy of outdoor advertising as a business enterprise in industrial and commercial areas. Second, it deleted the catchall phrase, "and such other requirements as may be appropriate," and limited control criteria to "size, lighting, and spacing." And, third, it required both the control criteria and the designation of unzoned areas to be "determined by agreement between the several States and the Secretary."

I would add that this subsection was further amended by the House of Representatives, in which action the Senate concurred, to provide that the criteria of size, lighting, and spacing would be consistent with customary use. In presenting the House bill to the Senate for final action, the senior Senator from West Virginia stated:

> Any regulations or criteria with respect to size, spacing, and lighting of outdoor advertising signs should, insofar as possible, be consistent with customary use in the industry. Therefore, I cannot perceive any valid objection to this particular language in the House-approved bill.

Thus, Mr. President, it is apparent from this brief summary of the genesis of subsection (d) of title I of Public Law 89–285, that both bodies of the Congress were quite deliberate in their aim to acknowledge the right of outdoor advertising to operate in commercial or industrial areas. That is not to imply that the industry should operate free of any controls. But, as the Secretary of Commerce indicated, and as the Congress affirmed, the purpose of controls would be primarily to prevent undue proliferation of signs in commercial and industrial areas and to provide for any orderly development of the industry. This is a purpose supported by a majority of the Senate, including the Senator from West Virginia and myself.

I shall not comment on the specifics of the proposed guidelines for outdoor advertising. The senior Senator from West Virginia made sufficient observations on this point in his comments on February 4. However, it does seem to me that the proposals of the Department of Commerce are at variance with the legislative intent that I have summarized. For these reasons, the Secretary may wish to consider the advisability of issuing a clarifying statement before instituting the hearings in the several States.

A DISPATCH FROM VIETNAM PUBLISHED IN THE HONOLULU ADVERTISER

Mr. INOUYE. The Honolulu Advertiser is perhaps the only metropolitan newspaper in the 50,000 to 100,000 circulation class with 2 full-time staff reporters covering the battlefronts in Vietnam—Bob Jones, chief of the Advertiser's Vietnam bureau, and Bob Krause.

Both of these men are frontline combat correspondents in the best Ernie Pyle tradition. On February 9, the U.S. military headquarters in Saigon reported that Bob Jones was wounded by mortar fragments during an operation against Vietcong forces. The 30-year-old reporter suffered wounds in one leg, his back, and both hands. S. Sgt. Robert S. Andrade, 33, of Waimanalo, Hawaii, the patrol leader, was killed in the same action, as were several other members of the patrol. Despite his wounds, Bob Jones was able to get off a final story to his newspaper. I respectfully request that his account be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I Was Bleeding, He Was Dead

(By Bob Jones)

Cu Chi, Vietnam.—The story wasn't suppose to end that way.

It was going to be a story of 2d Brigade men who lived while others were dying, or being shipped off to the hospital with the wounded.

The patrol was almost over, and I was writing the story in my mind. It was going to be in the form of a letter to Sgt. Boyd Andrade, of the Honolulu Police Department, and Lt. Sonny Andrade, of the Kailua Fire Department, and to Mrs. Robert S. Andrade, of Waimanalo, and her five kids.

"Army S. Sgt. Robert S. Andrade," the story was going in my mind, "looks to me like the kind of GI who has a sixth sense amid the confusion of battle to keep himself and his men alive."

Andrade, a former Iolani school football player, was a squad leader with C Company of the 1st Battalion, Wolfhounds. Between C and A Companies, there had been more than 50 casualties in 3 days of trying to flush the Vietcong out of a jungle enclave they call Taro Village.

I teamed up with Andrade's squad to do a profile piece on him.

He had the reputation of being one of the best in the business over here.

A few days earlier, three of his men had been hit by a grenade, but he rallied his squad and took the sniper bunker. Another of his men froze on the ground in fear, and Andrade had dragged the man 100 yards using an ammo sling wrapped around the man's arm.

"Sure, I get scared," he told me out there in the jungle, "but mostly when we are pinned down by snipers and can't see who's shooting at us."

I had taken about 15 pictures of him that day (Thursday) and he had pulled out his wallet and showed me pictures of his wife, and two of his kids under a Christmas tree in his two-story Waimanalo home.

Well, that's the way the story should have gone. As I said, the patrol was almost over. It was 2 p.m.

We were sitting waiting for the order to make the final push.

Andrade had just given me a can of fruit cocktail from his C-rations, and I was making notes on how his squad had been better than 90 percent of the units I have been with.

Then there was a dull but overpowering explosion. For a few seconds I lost my sight and hearing. But there was the familiar smell of powder choking out the rest of the air.

I was on the ground, and bleeding from the hand, back, and leg.

I crawled over to a young Army movie photographer from Fort Shafter, Hawaii. He was dead. His camera lay in the settling dirt.

Andrade, who had been sitting there with his knee touching mine, was on his back, and although I know nothing about medicine, I had the feeling there was nothing I could do for him.

If you have never heard the moans and the "Oh Gods" that come from the lips of the men who are dying, consider yourself lucky. You would never erase it from your mind.

There was a youngster who had both his legs blown off. Another lay with his body ripped open and moaned, "Oh, my God, I'm dying, I'm dying."

There weren't enough medics or bandages to go around.

A lieutenant who was the mortar forward observer came up and said it apparently was a short round from our own 2d Brigade that hit us. (The 25th Division public information office at Schofield yesterday said that the lieutenant was wrong and that Sergeant Andrade was killed "by hostile small-arms fire." The PIO said that the round of mortar fire may have been American made, but that it definitely was fired by the Vietcong.)

They covered up four bodies with rubber ponchoes there in the jungle. Those still alive crawled, or were dragged to a clearing.

A medical evacuation helicopter and armored personnel carriers came in to get us out.

The doctors in Saigon said I took seven pieces of shrapnel in the back and legs, and one fragment had fractured a finger.

I consider myself the luckiest guy on earth.

Just before I went into the operating room, they told me Sergeant Andrade had died on his way to the hospital.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S FOOD-FOR-FREEDOM PROGRAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I believe that President Johnson's recent call for a 5-year war on world hunger can become the most important single initiative of his administration.

The President has previously challenged us to eradicate poverty in our own society. Now he calls upon Americans to join with the people of other countries to eradicate the most serious enemy of mankind—human hunger.

An excellent summary of the President's challenge was carried by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association radio broadcast on Friday, February 11. M. W. Thatcher, general manager of GTA, has long been in the forefront of efforts to make greater use abroad of our agricultural abundance and know-how. Mr. Thatcher believes that the administration has "come up with the one thing that can lead the world along the shortest road to peace—food to feed the hungry."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the GTA broadcast referred to be printed at this point in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GTA Daily Radio Roundup

As you know by now, President Johnson has asked Congress to approve an American 5-year world war on hunger. Congress may give the President all that he asks—or more—or less.

This is clear: The United States of America will offer its open hand bearing bread to help the young nations and the troubled nations of the world conquer hunger. Long years of effort by dedicated national leaders in this country are bearing fruit. This is what Senator McGovern has sought and Vice President Humphrey and Senator Mondale, just to name some of the originators and strongest advocates of food for peace. On the farm front your own M. W. Thatcher, general manager of GTA, is one of the great leaders of the policy of abundance for peace from the good earth. Food for freedom, a program begun by Mr. Thatcher in the fall of 1942, was the first of its kind.

And today Mr. Thatcher said: "This is a great program, a truly magnificent contribution to peace and prosperity. I know our farmers will answer the challenge to produce more food. I know that the President and Mr. Humphrey and our other top officials in Washington are troubled by many immense problems in the world today, but here they have come up with the one thing that can lead the world along the shortest road to peace—food to feed the hungry."

Now, just what does the President's war on hunger program include?

First, he called for more food production by U.S. farmers—not all-out production, but a regulated increase. Already programs for 1966 have been adjusted to get more wheat, soybeans, rice, and malting barley.

Second, it looks like the Nation will finally get a stabilized food reserve.

Third, food aid will not be limited to merely surplus products. Commodity Credit Corporation would be authorized to buy what is needed in the open market.

Fourth, the nations that receive food aid would also be helped to increase their own food production. They will be aided and urged to help themselves.

Fifth, voluntary relief agencies, churches, and charities will continue to receive farm products for their programs.

The President said that he wants this Nation to return to production as many reserve acres as may be needed in the critical race between food and people, "but not to produce unwanted surpluses and not to supplant the efforts of other nations to develop their own agricultural economies."

Well, that's a short and fast summary of a big program, but it is the essence of what President Johnson recommended to Congress.

At the same time that President Johnson made his announcement, USDA made its move to get more soybean production. Farmers will be able this year to plant all of their feed grain base to soybeans if they so desire, but must maintain their conserving base and minimum diversion of 20 percent. For example, the corn farmer who signs up and elects to substitute soybeans for corn will still get the loan plus payment (30 cents a bushel) on projected corn yield on one-half of his base, even though he grows beans instead of corn.

These changes are coming almost too fast to keep up with, so once again sharpen your pencils, figure the best program for your farm, and be sure you check out with your county ASCS office.

UPI REPORT SHOWS U.S. AID FAILS TO REACH MOST PEASANTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President last Thursday I spoke at length on the floor of the Senate in support of a stepped-up program of school and farm aid and land reform for South Vietnam.

I contended that the facts show eloquently that we are talking a good fight in this regard but that we are doing pathetically little. I also contended that if we are to win our way to peaceful negotiations that will permit an independent decision by the people of South Vietnam that we must do more—far more.

Recently Michael Malloy, writing from Saigon for the United Press International, documented the point I made last Thursday in an excellent article that appeared in the Milwaukee Journal. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. AID FAILS TO REACH MOST PEASANTS IN VIETNAM

(By Michael T. Malloy)

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—The American aid program to South Vietnam is the biggest and most expensive in the world. But there is little evidence to show that this has done much to win the peasantry away from the Vietcong.

There is much to be proud of in the American efforts. And politicians from both America and South Vietnam have insisted for years that the war for the hearts and minds of the people is just as important as the war to kill Vietcong.

This was reaffirmed again in the Declaration of Honolulu, just adopted by President Johnson and the military rulers of South Vietnam.

But compared to the mountain of resources applied to killing the Vietcong, only a molehill of men and money goes into the silent war for the hearts and minds of the peasants.

THREE MILLION PIGS GROWING

And the resources of doctors, schoolrooms, and fatter pigs are barely enough to keep the Vietnamese standard of living from going backward under the pressures of an expanding war.

Carl Van Haeften, of Santa Cruz, Calif., is proud of the fact that about 3 million Yorkshire pigs are growing fat on Vietnamese farms, thanks to the aid mission's agriculture division, which he heads.

But the fat, new pigs cannot get to market over the mined roads and blasted bridges, so South Vietnam is importing shiploads of pigs for the first time in many years.

There is a sad repetition of these paradoxes in other fields.

Carl Winer, of Albion, N.Y., is proud of the schools he builds and the teachers he trains as the head of the aid mission's education division. But sometimes the war destroys as Winer builds.

The worst example was the year of 1963, when the aid mission built 1,320 classrooms and trained 1,260 teachers. The education ministry checked the next year and found it had fewer schools and teachers than it did in 1963.

The United States and its allies have sent teams of skilled surgeons into provinces where most of the peasants have never seen a doctor before. But surgeons like Dr. George Love, of Ogden, Utah, reports that up to 90 percent of their patients are victims of land mines, hand grenades, mortars, and bombs.

Dr. Lowe's experience is a miniature of the problem which faces the whole aid program. Most of its efforts must go to repairing the ravages of war, rather than improving the life of the people.

To begin with, the 627 American aid officials are overwhelmed by the presence of 197,000 American fighting men. The soldiers of the shooting war outnumber them by 300 to 1. Their artillery, bombs, and napalm join with Vietcong terrorists to make life miserable and dangerous in much of the countryside.

The military machine gobbles up so much money and manpower that most of the aid program is simply an attempt to catch up with inflation and food shortages brought on by the war effort.

BULK FOR IMPORTS

Out of $326.6 million spent on economic aid in the last fiscal year, for instance, only $103.8 million actually went to development programs like health and agriculture. The bulk of the money was used to import grain and goods to make up for war caused inflation and food shortages.

Military expenditures and demand for labor have created boom conditions in the cities. Prices have shot up more than 50 percent but wages have not kept pace. Urban unemployment has been wiped out and the imported goods make the city folk more prosperous than ever before. America sends cheap rice to keep food prices stable.

But three-quarters of South Vietnam's people are peasants, and only a fraction of these peasants actually get any benefit out of the American aid program. All they see of their Government is its mailed fist: Bombs, artillery, napalm, and "search and destroy" campaigns.

The contrast between the suffering farmers and the booming cities is partly intentional. Although officials do not like to talk about it publicly, American strategy is presently intended to force the peasants to take sides or suffer the consequences.

"They can come to the Government or they can go join the Vietcong, but they can't remain neutral and indifferent," a high ranking American spokesman explained.

The Province of Long An, for instance, has 585 hamlets. American aid goes only to the 76 hamlets which are considered pacified and the rest of the countryside is written off as enemy territory. Police confiscate rice, salt, sugar, and medicine bound for these villages.

This kind of economic warfare is intended to keep food and supplies away from the Vietcong. But it also means that life is going from bad to worse for at least half of the population of South Vietnam.

The benefits of American aid go first to the city people, who have always been pro-government, and second to the secure villages, which have never been pro-Vietcong. The peasants in the insecure areas are untouched by the battle for their hearts and minds.

LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD ROUTINE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I wish to reemphasize my strong support for the Teacher Corps and urge speedy passage of the appropriation bill to finance it.

The local school boards of this Nation are now finishing up plans for the 1966–67 school year. They will complete their budgets—that is, allocate money for supplies, equipment, personnel—by early spring. By late spring the school boards will be taking the 1966–67 plans to their local citizens.

Unless the school districts know—on a district-by-district, person-by-person basis—just what the National Teacher Corps is all about, its purpose, its plans, its potentialities, and in fact where on earth to write for more information, there is little chance that local school districts will be asking for the teachers they so desperately need for the 1966–67 school opening.

Prompt action on this appropriation, therefore, is urgent.

INDUSTRIAL AIR POLLUTION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, an outstanding example of the increasing attention which is being given to the problem of industrial air pollution control and abatement appeared in the October 1965 issue of Factory magazine. In a very thoughtful and most comprehensive article entitled "Industrial Air Pollution," Factory has examined four facets of the air pollution problem:

First. What is being done about it in terms of Federal, State, and local legislation and in terms of private initiative?

Second. What constitutes an industrial air pollutant, where it comes from, and what its harmful effects are?

Third. The various methods, processes, and equipment which different industries have used to clean the air.

Fourth. How industry may choose the right air pollution control system and what it will cost.

In this study Factory reaches some interesting conclusions which seem well worth pondering. It recommends research to improve control equipment with an eye to lowering costs, to disposing of collected solids, and to developing useful byproducts. Factory also suggests tougher penalties for persistent violators of pollution codes, increased financial assistance for small plants, and practical local codes for small communities as well as for big cities.

Mr. President, I would like to commend the staff of Factory magazine for its constructive approach to educating industry about the problems of and solutions to industrial air pollution. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial which accompanies this fine article be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN INDUSTRY AFFORD NOT TO BE A PUBLIC NUISANCE?

Smoke. Smell. Slop. Dust. Noise. Eyesores. This is the face that 6 out of 10 manufacturing plants show to the public. And the public is slowly building up to a big burn about it. Rightly so, we think. In this age of engineering advance, irritating or unsightly plant effluent seems technically inexcusable. Only an economic argument deserves the public ear. But industry in general hasn't been talking very persuasively.

All too often industry evades the issue. Typically, it has replied to public criticism with such banal and arrogant comments as: "That's a million-dollar smell," or "when that smoke clears up, you'll have a depression," or "if you don't like it, we'll take our payroll elsewhere." Official denials to the contrary, a plant knows when it is becoming a public nuisance. But it also knows that the cost of curtailment is, more often than not, downright prohibitive. And, regardless of what the plant might like to do, it simply can't afford to reform if others don't.

The high cost of nuisance abatement, like any other cost, is ultimately paid by the consumer. This is one fact that industry must hammer home. But in the meantime, such costs are siphoned off from a company's current profits. To expect a plant in one community to add significantly to its cost while other similar plants elsewhere do not, would create economic anarchy. On the other hand, widespread or impulsive legislation would knock many marginal companies out of the market entirely. The rich and wise companies would persevere. The poor and struggling plants would fail. This is another fact the public must be made aware of.

The ultimate solution to nuisance abatement, we believe, lies in four related measures:

1. Education of the public as to the price it must pay—directly or indirectly—for elimination of these industrial nuisances.
2. A national planning program jointly supported by industry and by Federal and State Governments.
3. Federal legislation based upon this planning and characterized by progressive intensification of restrictions.
4. Vigorous development by industry of less costly and more effective equipment for preventing or containing these nuisances.

L. R. BITTIE,
Editor in Chief.

PAINTINGS IN THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, recently the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., Inc., in cooperation with the White House, produced a color film entitled "Paintings in the White House." This program which has been shown on some television stations throughout the country describes our Nation's history through the art now exhibited in the Executive Mansion. It is a movie which has receive highly favorable comments for its artistic merit and is devoid of commercialism.

A copy of the film is being loaned to the Senate and I have made arrangements for two screenings, one at 12 noon and one at 1 p.m. on Friday, February 18, 1966, in the auditorium of the new Senate Office Building.

In behalf of the Committee on Rules and Administration, an invitation is extended to all Senators and their staffs and other Senate employees whose schedule permits to attend one of the scheduled showings of this beautiful film.

MAUI NO KA OI

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, residents of the island of Maui have a saying, "Maui No Ka Oi," which means Maui is the best, the best of all the lovely islands in the Hawaiian chain.

The mayor of Maui County, which also includes the islands of Lanai and Molokai, and two unpopulated islands, is Mr. Eddie Tam, one of Hawaii's greatest ambassadors of goodwill, 16 years mayor of Maui County and 22 years in public office. This record is unmatched in the State of Hawaii.

The Malayan Times recently published a story about Mayor Eddie Tam, a man who has carried Hawaii's message of aloha and goodwill to many nations. May I respectfully request that the article be printed in the RECORD?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DYNAMIC EDDIE TAM GOVERNS FIVE HAWAIIAN ISLES

With his neck outstretched to see over the steering wheel of his limousine, Maui County's Chinese-American Mayor Eddie Tam drove up to his personal covered parking stall at the County Building, Wailuku, Maui, county seat of five Hawaiian islands.

He didn't so much as glance at the mynah birds chirping on the lawn, or the green-clad crags of the towering West Maui mountains, as he walked from his car to his carpeted, air-conditioned office. It was Friday, and much was on his mind.

Two Fridays a month Mayor Tam calls to order the eight members of the Maui County Board of Supervisors. Three members are of Japanese ancestry, one Korean, one Puerto Rican, one Filipino, one Hawaiian-German and one Puerto Rican-Caucasian.

Three of the county's islands are populated: Maui, the Valley Isle, 36,487; Molokai, the Friendly Isle, 5,825, and Lanai, the Pineapple Island, 3,037. Maui County occupies 1,159 square miles.

For more than 22 consecutive years "Friendly Eddie" has been in public office, 16 cf them as mayor.

"I have learned and followed somewhat of a unique philosophy," Mayor Tam said. "What a man does for himself dies with him; what a man does for his community lives forever."

FARMER

The five-foot, five-inch, 152-pound mayor was born in November 25, 1899, at Makawao, Maui, the son of Tam Hong and Jeng Kiu, who emigrated to Maui in the late 1800's from Sam Chau village in China. Mayor Tam's father worked as a blacksmith, carpenter, and farmer in Makawao. His 96-year-old mother now lives in Kula Sanatorium, Maui.

Mayor Tam is the eldest of three children. His brother, William K. Tam, is assistant manager of a Honolulu branch of the First National Bank of Hawaii, and he has a sister.

He married Lily Hisae Morimoto in Wailuku on December 31, 1948, shortly after being elected to his first 2-year term as mayor. On November 4, 1964, he was reelected to his ninth consecutive term.

Mayor Tam received his early education at Makawao and Wailuku elementary schools. Upon graduation from St. Anthony Boys' School, Wailuku, in 1916, the former Maui tennis champion began his career with the Baldwin Bank in Kahului, Maui. For 10 years he served in various capacities, as clerk, collector, bookkeeper, and secretary.

RESTAURANT

Leaving the bank in 1927, Mayor Tam was employed as office manager, bookkeeper, and secretary to a Maui State senator. In addition, he was agent for a Honolulu brokerage firm. From 1945 to 1948 he operated a restaurant on Maui.

In 1942 he entered the political arena for the first time, and was elected to the board of supervisors as a Republican. He was reelected as a Democrat in 1944, and continued to serve on that body until elected mayor.

The mayor played a major role in establishing and expanding tourism as a major industry on Maui.

Three luxury hotels and the championship Kaanapali Golf Course, scene of the 1964 Canada Cup and International Golf matches now attract tourists. The hotels are liberally spaced to comply with a rigid master plan designed to preserve the esthetic beauty of the area.

The mayor of Maui was among those instrumental in attracting the Canada Cup matches to Maui.

HARMONY

"It is only fitting that golfers from all parts of the world come to compete in friendship on Maui, where several races work and play together in harmony," Mayor Tam said.

Mayor Tam's enthusiasms draw attention wherever he goes. Wayne Tanaka, sports editor of the Maui News, described Mayor Tam on the golf course, the day before the Canada Cup tournament:

" 'Friendly Eddie' Tam, who got the biggest applause at the 'meet the teams dinner,' drew as many raves as Palmer and Nicklaus on the course. You couldn't miss him in his red and yellow outfit. His backlash swing and backhanded putting were as talked about as the booming drives of the 'big boys.' "

During the summer of 1964 the mayor was invited to represent the State of Hawaii at the annual Kelowna Regetta in British Columbia.

"We in Maui County have much to be proud of," Mayor Tam said. "We have the largest dormant volcano, the largest sugar plantation, the most and best beaches, and the only roadways in the world where you can drive from sea level to 10,000-foot elevation by traversing a distance of 40 miles.

"And that's not all," Mayor Tam continued. "We have the largest stand of eucalyptus trees in the Nation, the first capital of the Sandwich Islands, and the clearest astrophysical 'window' in the world at Science City atop Haleakala.

"RANCHES

"But it doesn't end there. We have one of the finest golf courses in the world, the largest banyan tree in the Nation, probably the tallest hardwood tree. Haleakala National Park, one of the largest ranches and the principal base for the deep-sea drilling Project Mohole which will enhance our science industry.

"I may be prejudiced, but I think we have the most efficient county government in the United States, the most beautiful tropical valley in the world at Iao, the most ideal climate and variety of climate in the world, and the friendliest and most hospitable people in the world.

"But what we are more proud of than anything else is the ability of all our different races to work and live together in harmony. Here in Maui County, 'aloha' is more than just a word; it's a way of life."

RESEARCH DIRECTOR FOR U.S. FOREST SERVICE RETIRES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, retirement has caught up with one of our Nation's most able and dedicated public servants. After 38 years of devoted public service, Dr. V. L. Harper has left his position as Deputy Chief of the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture.

Dr. Harper began his career with the Forest Service in 1927 in the piney woods of north Florida. His personal interest and work on gum naval stores and on the growing and producing of southern pines is reflected in the improved economy of the southern pine country.

Dr. Harper has held a number of positions in the South, in the Northeast, and here in Washington, each increasingly complex and demanding. He served, with great distinction, as director of the

Northern Forest Experiment Station at Upper Darby, Pa., during 1945–51.

Since 1951, Dr. Harper has been Deputy Chief in Charge of Research for the Forest Service. During his years in this post, until his recent retirement, many of us brushed shoulders with this fine scientist and gentleman. Dr. Harper always demonstrated rare foresight and vision in the programs he planned and developed. His testimony before Senate committees was always outstanding in its depth and clarity; his knowledge of technical details of the Nation's forestry problems, and the Forest Service proposals to solve these problems, was always remarkable, in my opinion. His honesty, sincerity, and integrity were above reproach.

The impact which this learned and devoted man has had upon our Nation and its natural resources has been very great. Naturally, I am most intimately acquainted with accomplishments of the Forest Service research program in my own State of West Virginia. Dr. Harper early saw the need—and brought it to the attention of the Congress—to find ways to improve our Appalachian mountain timber and water resources. He played a key role in developing a laboratory and assembling a team of topnotch scientists at Princeton, W. Va., to study these problems. He visualized the need for utilization and marketing research for our valuable mountain hardwoods, and diligently sought the will of the Congress in constructing the necessary facilities, staffing with the proper specialists, and conducting efficient research at Princeton. More recently, he had a great deal to do with the development of a forest engineering research complex in cooperation with our fine University at Morgantown. I am sure that many of my colleagues here in the Senate could cite similar accomplishments that have benefited the economy and development of their own States, benefits derived from the knowledge gleaned from Forest Service Research in the management, protection, and use of forest resources.

Dr. Harper's influence and eminence have spread beyond the shores of the United States. In his forestry research field, he has long been recognized as a world leader. He has represented the United States in the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations. He chaired the executive committee for the Fifth World Forestry Congress in Seattle, Wash., in 1960. And, although he is retired from the Forest Service, he will still play a top role in the Sixth World Forestry Congress in Madrid, Spain, this coming summer.

I am happy to say that Dr. Harper's influence on forestry research at home and abroad will not be lost. He has trained a highly capable and respected staff of research administrators and scientists to carry this vital program forward. Dr. George M. Jemison, who served as Les Harper's Associate Deputy Chief for the past 8 years, has just been appointed Deputy Chief in Charge of Research for the Forest Service. I have every reason to believe that Dr. Jemison and his staff will continue to give the same fine full measure of service to the American people.

My distinguished colleague, Senator John Stennis, the junior Senator from Mississippi, expressed my feelings and, I am certain, the feelings of many of you, in his speech before this body on April 13, last year. I want to paraphrase Senator Stennis' appraisal of Dr. Harper.

This man has rendered outstanding worldwide leadership in his field. He has contributed a great deal to our forestry, to industry, and to our great Nation. Certainly, he is the personification of a truly dedicated public servant, outstanding in a great profession.

I, too, congratulate Dr. Harper on his record and excellence as a public servant. I, too, commend his entire staff and associates for their splendid work in the past. I exhort them to continue along the paths of diligence and excellence which Dr. Harper so ably exemplified and which seem to characterize the work of the Forest Service generally.

THE PURITAN ETHIC AND THE SPIRIT OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am indebted to Dr. Lowell R. Ditzen, executive secretary of the Council for the National Presbyterian Church and Center of Washington, D.C., for a copy of the book entitled "Calvinism and the Political Order," which is a compilation of essays prepared for the Woodrow Wilson Lectureship of the Washington organization which Dr. Ditzen so ably heads.

As an evidence of the value of these essays to current problems of materialism, organized crime, juvenile delinquency, and the lack of genuine patriotism among some of the younger generation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point, an excerpt from the lecture by Dr. Sydney E. Ahlstrom entitled "The Puritan Ethic and the Spirit of American Democracy."

There being no objection, the excerpt from the lecture was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Puritanism and Civic Responsibility

The first desire of the chief leaders, greatest exemplars, and most characteristic spokesmen of New England's early holy commonwealths was for true churches wherein God's word would be rightly preached and wherein his ordinances would be rightly administered to those for whom God intended them. They emigrated from England and founded governments that would foster and protect such churches. We do well, therefore, to search out the consequences for American democracy of this primary Puritan concern; and this leads us not so much to new political theories or new institutions (though life on the New World frontier would lead to innovations in both areas) as to a new kind of civic ethos or moral climate. It is upon the spirit of American democracy that puritanism worked its most direct and powerful effects; and if we look to the center of the Puritan faith, we may perceive the springs of its peculiar power to hold personal values, to gird the citizen or magistrate for his work, to arouse and maintain his sense of civic duty, to intensify his determination to live responsibly before and under the law, and to make him aware that neither individual men, nor groups of men, nor even nations were above the law or were laws unto themselves. These were the areas where puritanism made its profoundest contributions both in England and in America. In these areas, moreover, Puritan nurture continued to have powerful shaping effect on succeeding generations even after the original standards were relaxed.

The special moral or civic qualities of American democracy have been commented upon by many keen observers, though few have sought a historical explanation of what they saw. Consider first the commentary of Francis Grund (1798–1863), who emigrated from Austria to the United States in 1827. He published a very important book on "The Americans in Their Moral, Social, and Political Relations" in 1837, and his "Aristocracy in America," 2 years later. In the latter he reflects on one occasion that the bright points of the New Englander's character are best seen in his relation to the community as a citizen.

"Few people have so great respect for the law, and are so well able to govern themselves. * * * Though their State politics have generally been inclined towards Whig, and even Toryism, they are nevertheless the most thorough Radicals in principle, and, perhaps, the only people capable of enjoying so large a portion of liberty without abusing it. In addition to this they are sober, industrious, and, with the exception of a few straggling pedlars * * * just and honorable in their dealings."

Grund concludes this passage with the observation that "nature has done everything to make them calm, sober republicans." But one wonders if Puritans would not provide a more satisfactory explanation than nature.

In his other book Grund widened the scope of his generalizations:

"I consider the domestic virtue of the Americans as the principal source of all their other qualities. It acts as a promoter of industry, as a stimulus to enterprise, and as the most powerful restrainer of public vice. * * * No government could be established on the same principle as that of the United States, with a different code of morals. The American Constitution is remarkable for its simplicity; but it can only suffice a people habitually correct in their actions, and would be utterly inadequate to the wants of a different nation. Change the domestic habits of the Americans, their religious devotion, and their high respect for morality, and it will not be necessary to change a single letter of the Constitution in order to vary the whole form of their government."

The most famous of all the foreign interpreters of American democracy was Alexis de Tocqueville, who traveled in the United States in 1831–32. He, too, points to the importance of a certain kind of public virtue:

"In the United States everyone is personally interested in enforcing the obedience of the whole community to the law. * * * However irksome an enactment may be, the citizen of the United States complies with it, not only because it is the work of the majority, but because it is his own, and he regards it as a contract to which he is himself a party.

"In the United States, then, that numerous and turbulent multitude does not exist who, regarding the law as their natural enemy, look upon it with fear and distrust. It is impossible, on the contrary, not to perceive that all classes display the utmost reliance upon the legislation of their country and are attached to it by a kind of parental affection."

Some might feel that Tocqueville was too adulatory; yet it is interesting that Lord Bryce, who published his great study of the United States a half century later, still felt the prevalence of civic concern to be a major strength of American democracy:

"Feeling the law to be its own work, the people is disposed to obey the law. In a preceding chapter I have examined occasional instances of the disregard of the law. * * * Such instances [however] scarcely affect the credit which the Americans are specially eager to claim of being a law-abiding community.

"There is in the United States a sort of kindliness, a sense of human fellowship, a recognition of the duty of mutual help owed by man to man, stronger than anywhere in the Old World, and certainly stronger than in the upper or middle classes of England, France, or Germany. The natural impulse of every citizen in America is to respect every other citizen, and to feel that citizenship constitutes a certain ground of respect."

During World War II another English interpreter wrote a further variation on this theme. Speaking of the United States during the 19th century, Denis Brogan observed that "no government that had any claim to be a government at all has had less direct power over the people it ruled." Yet, he goes on to say:

"If there was a good deal of lawlessness, there was real respect for law. There was a general acceptance of the authority of the State and the Union. There was no equivalent of Spanish-American revolutions, no encouragement given to mere pronunciamentos, though a man like Andrew Jackson in a Spanish environment would have had all the talents and temperament and temptations of a dictator. But Jackson and his followers and enemies gave to the Constitution of the United States the reverence due to 'the supreme law of the land.' * * * No society could have grown so fast if the minimum basis of law had not been provided by the free choice of the people, the only effective authority."

The point made over and over again by these and many other observers of democracy in the United States is that Americans are, by and large, a law-abiding people with a strong sense of civic responsibility. And this despite a history of tumultuous expansion and change that would seem to have given every opportunity to barbarism, anarchy, and chaos. Not one of these critics, moreover, has been blind to serious American shortcomings; nor do I, in quoting their judgments, wish to appear unrealistic or self-congratulatory. We simply are face to face with a remarkable and somewhat paradoxical heritage. And I would stress the impossibility of understanding either the remarkableness or the paradoxicality of the American civic character aside from the country's essentially Puritan origins and the continuous process—secular and churchly—by which Puritan values and insistences have not only been handed down from generation to generation but have actually been built into the country's social habits and conventions. In this perspective, one sees the utter propriety of President John F. Kennedy's explicitly identifying himself as a Roman Catholic and third generation Irish-American with the Puritan spirit and legacy.

THE DIVINE SOVEREIGNTY

The proper starting place in the quest for an understanding of this dynamic fact in American history is the cardinal doctrine of the Judeo-Christian tradition: divine sovereignty. In no tradition did this tenet become more central an affirmation than in the Reformed movement that came to recognize John Calvin as its greatest spokesman. In the family of "Reformed" churches, furthermore, probably none was so determined to work out the social ethics implicit in such views as those Puritans who were the architects and leading spirits of the several colonial governments in British North America. And of these none were so articulate, so determined, and so influential on latter-day American history as the founders of New England's Holy Commonwealths. If we can reach to their deepest convictions, we can touch a dominant theme in our history.

The Puritan's most consequential conviction can be stated as follows: he had a rigorous, awe-filled concern for God's almighty will as that was revealed in Scripture. This legalism, this conviction that the Bible, through command, counsel, and historical example, provided precise divine guidance for church, state, and personal life set Puritans apart and won them their reputation for "precisionism." This concern for the law drove Puritans to repudiate centuries of "human tradition" in ordering the government and worship of the Christian church. It shaped their understanding of personal discipline and of the Christian's proper relationship to all the structures of society: the family, the marketplace, the school, and the state. Ancient Israel, moreover, became for them a veritable model in both civil and ecclesiastical matters, and in the interrelation of the two. Indeed John Cotton knit together these conceptions of ecclesiastical and civil government very early in his New England ministry (1636): "It is better that the commonwealth be fashioned to the setting forth of God's house, which is His church: than to accommodate the church frame to the civil state. Democracy, I do not conceyve that ever God did ordeyne as a fitt government eyther for church or commonwealth. If the people be governors, who shall be governed?" Christians were regarded as being under the law even when they were choosing ministers to be over them.

It was the same in civil affairs. At the very outset of Connecticut's political history such a conception also lay behind the second head of Thomas Hooker's famous sermon to the colony's lawmakers:

"The privilege of election, which belongs to the people * * * must not be exercised according to their humours, but according to the blessed will and law of God."

Gov. John Winthrop of the Massachusetts Bay Colony had a somewhat stronger view of "magistratical authority" than did Hooker, but on fundamentals the two men agreed that governors and people were under God's rule:

"There is a twofold liberty [said Winthrop to the General Court in 1645] natural * * * and civil or Federal. The first is common to man with beasts and other creatures. * * * The other kind of liberty * * * may also be termed moral, in reference to the covenant between God and man, in the moral law, and the politic covenants and constitutions, amongst men themselves. * * * This liberty is maintained and exercised in a way of subjection to authority; it is of the same kind of liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free. * * * Such is the liberty of the church under the authority of Christ, her king and husband. * * * Even so, brethren, it will be between you and your magistrates * * * if you will be satisfied to enjoy such civil and lawful liberties, such as Christ allows you, then will you quietly and cheerfully submit unto that authority which is set over you."

These various passages, taken together, also serve to emphasize the Puritan's nearly total disinclination for considering their religious task in individualistic terms. It was a "city" they were building; like Israel of old, they were involved in a corporate venture. Theirs was a commonwealth with a divine mission.

THE DIVINE CALLING

Additional impetus to an aroused civic concern came from the new conception of the calling unleashed by the Reformation generally and stressed with special intensity by the Puritans. The relation of this new ethical emphasis on the spirit and growth of capitalism was a particular scholarly concern of Max Weber, but the vast literature that has grown up in response to his provocative essays gives rise to two considerations in the present context.

First and most obviously, the Puritan doctrine of vocation was by no means restricted to the world's economic structures, for every Christian also had a vocation in the political order as a citizen or magistrate. Quite aside from the impact of economic life on the political realm, therefore, the Puritan ethic, as my quotations have suggested, also dealt with political duty directly. On this subject Increase Mather summed up 70 years of American Puritan preaching in his election sermon of 1702. Speaking on "The Excellency of a Publick Spirit," he pointed to "the great Evil which is in being a private self-seeking Spirit." "The Lord Jesus Christ [he declared] will take notice of them before all the world at the last day, who have with a sincere heart sought the Welfare of his people."

Nor was it only through such direct exhortation that a solemn view of civic duty was implanted; as in the economic realm so in the political, the importance of man's vocation was also strengthened by the overall system of doctrine and piety. My second point, in fact, emphasizes these indirect effects. Max Weber, to be sure, in his discussion of capitalism dealt with these effects very profoundly. Yet his writings on the need to understand the significance for secular pursuits of a total religious outlook were at best incomplete. Nearly all his critics, and even some of his champions, have given a very cramped and mechanistic interpretation to his ideas. We need further emphasis, therefore, on the way in which the Reformed and Puritan outlook as a whole provided a kind of inner, subjective support to faithful and serious performance of these worldly callings—whether they be in the family, the marketplace, or in the state. Such internal relationships are hardly able to be verified quantitatively; but if they are carefully explored and sensitively interpreted, they do much to illumine our historical understanding of the spirit and working of American democracy.

GOD'S HAMMER

Of all the factors that contribute to the moral impact of Puritanism, perhaps none has such vast civic implications as the way in which the manifold workings of the law—divine, natural, and civil—were applied to the Puritan's central affirmations as to God's means for ordering a sinful world and for redeeming His elect. The law was a judge—God's hammer—by which man's pride was brought low. Legal terrors, contrition, repentance, and the soul's humiliation were the steps to regeneration. And in the eyes of most Puritans it was by preparing the soul in the light of God's conditional promises that a person was made ready for saving experience.

For one who had experienced the saving work of the Holy Spirit the law continued to be a guide to holiness under the covenant of evangelical obedience. The law was thus not only a judge but a teacher, and for both saint and sinner. Christian freedom was freedom under the law as Winthrop so clearly stated; and nowhere would "antinomianism" be viewed with such violent antipathy as in the Bible Commonwealths."

The most revealing encounter of "nomianism" and "antinomianism" in early New England was precipitated by a remarkable disciple of John Cotton in the Boston church. Anne Hutchinson's charges that most of the Bay Colony's ministers were preaching a "Covenant of Works" may have reflected an overly excited piety; but there is no denying that her attack on law-centered (hence moralistic) doctrines of preparation and sanctification struck to the heart of the prevailing theology. She was, therefore, denounced by a specially convened synod, excommunicated by her congregation, and exiled by the civil authorities. She cast her lot with the Holy Spirit rather than the law; and she was clearly a subversive.

According to the view that thereafter came to be accepted as correct, a God-fearing "visible saint" was in the deepest, most thoroughgoing sense of the term a law-abiding person, even though he must also experience an internal work of grace. As the years went by, however, the accent shifted steadily away from the experience of regeneration and toward law-abidingness. "Legal terrors" became a memory—if that, with the great awakening bringing only a temporary reassertion of experientialism. Piety yielded to moralism, and the Puritan gradually became a Yankee, with Benjamin Franklin, the most brilliant exemplar of that new breed, revealing both its limitations and its excellences.

From the traditional Puritan point of view, this entire process was "declension" and a vast homiletical literature of lamentation arose. One aspect of the trend, nevertheless, could be neither lamented nor denied: in the political order men continued to be called to obedience and civic responsibility. And as the accent on law-abidingness grew, so did the optimistic conviction that even unregenerate human nature could aspire to moral perfection. This movement culminates in both the vision and the sense of civic duty exhibited in the Revolutionary epoch by many of the new nation's Founding Fathers.

THE CONTINUING INFLUENCE OF PURITANISM

It is not at all mysterious that men should move in this direction. Neither is it strange, considering the moral intensity and traditionary force of the whole Puritan ethos, that men should continue to propagate and live by the secularized principles with the same vigor and austerity. Puritanism thus can almost be said to have offered itself as a sacrifice to responsible citizenship. It declined with surprising swiftness, but was enormously influential almost because it was so readily secularized. Its "secularizability," in fact, is an important clue to the movement's long-term civic significance. Knowing this, we can share the poignant historical observation of George W. Pierson: "Just as with the philosophy of the Greeks, or the laws laid down by the Romans, the moral attitudes of New England culture persist though the people who gave them birth have long since passed away."

The disappearance of classic Puritanism did not end its influence however. The great awakening of the 18th century kept alive some dimensions of the Puritan impulse. The revolutionary generation renovated and enlivened the old sense of the country's mission in a way that was by no means utterly secular (see the several devices on our national seal on any dollar bill). And the great evangelical revivals beginning after 1790 made the entire 19th century a time of evangelical resurgence in which Puritan and enlightened notions of the national purpose were blended. Throughout this process, moreover, the idea of civic responsibility as a Christian virtue was a corollary of the American's confidence in his country's political and religious destiny and his refusal as a practical matter to separate church and state. On this subject, too, Francis Grund offered a valuable observation:

"It is with the solemnities of religion that the Declaration of Independence is yet annually read to the people from the pulpit or that Americans celebrate the anniversaries of the most important events in their history. * * * The Americans look upon religion as a promoter of civil and political liberty; and have, therefore, transferred to it a large portion of the affection which they cherish for the institutions of their country. In other countries, where religion has become the instrument of oppression, it has been the policy of the liberal party to diminish its influence; but in America its promotion is essential to the Constitution."

Americans are not now faultless paragons of dutiful citizenship and responsible governance. Sober analysts, indeed, are speaking of a moral crisis. Violence and irresponsibility in our public life have shocked the world and scarred a generation of Americans. Yet the tradition as a whole has also been a beacon—even a marvel—to the world; and there is in it profound occasion for gratitude. A portion of this gratitude, moreover, is due to the Puritan's total view of man's state under God's rules, to his explicit concern for law, duty, public spirit, and the commonweal, and to the fact that he framed his counsels in such a way that their efficacy continued long after the movement's flourishing time. In the grounds for and the fruits of that concern lies the chief political legacy of Puritanism.

NEW TREND IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the noted columnist, Richard Wilson, has written a stimulating piece, entitled, "Chance for a New Era in Farm Policies," which appeared in the Sunday Washington Star, February 13, 1966.

Mr. Wilson points out that the mounting world food crisis and the response of the Johnson administration to that crisis will call for greater production by America's farmers. He quotes a distinguished constituent of mine, Mr. Robert C. Liebenow, president of the Corn Industries Research Foundation and former president of the Chicago Board of Trade, who is calling for an increase of acreage in 1967 to meet the growing demands for U.S. food abroad. I have frequently consulted with Mr. Liebenow on farm policy and have found him to be a forward-looking, practical-minded thinker in this field.

I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Wilson's column at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANCE FOR A NEW ERA IN FARM POLICIES

(By Richard Wilson)

President Johnson calls on Congress for an act of intelligent generosity in the new food-for-freedom program to avert in relatively small degree the world's growing hunger.

But it is more than that. The program unlocks the door for the release of American food producers from the restrictions they have hated, but accepted, for 30 years. This can be the beginning of the end of regimented agriculture.

The proof will be in how this beginning is handled. If the farm politicians insist on clinging to their security blankets with both pudgy fists there will be a small relaxation of farm controls without a truly constructive advance. We will then have more of the same—billions for worldwide food distribution with America's farmers still under Washington's thumb, and the whole thing costing more than ever.

But if the minds in Washington are big enough they will see in the world hunger problem the golden opportunity to serve the highest American interests while restoring freedom of action and choice to a large sector of the population. The continuance of the heavy Federal subsidy to American farmers, which by now runs far past the $50 billion mark, will be harder and harder to justify.

What the President has done in essence is this: He has proposed expanding worldwide food distribution by about $500 million on condition that countries receiving this food aid work out really effective programs of self-help. Then, foreseeing bigger demands, controls have been relaxed, and will be relaxed further on wheat production. In addition, the President wishes to create a permanent food reserve for emergencies and to be used in stabilizing prices. Several million acres previously taken out of production are in the process of being brought back in production of wheat, soybeans, and rice.

What the future holds in the biggest food commodity of all, corn, is yet to be seen. Corn, and other feed grains, make possible the huge meat supply which America and now the whole world, wishes to consume.

Several critical things can be said about this. The expansion of acreage isn't very great yet. Most of the Nation's farm acreage will still be subject to control. Calling surpluses a reserve is to use only another name. Money will still pour out in farm subsidies. The cotton surplus remains a huge unsolved problem, and there is yet too much corn.

But when all this is said it still can be seen that agriculture is entering a new era which should be welcomed with open arms. some kind of light is beginning to appear at the end of the tunnel for that great heartland of America so rich in the American tradition. Small towns which have languished in the industrial age can take heart. Rural life, already a rich reward for the resourceful, can be better for all.

Robert C. Liebenow, president of the Corn Industries Research Foundation, Inc., with the help of a team of economists, is calling for an increase of 20 million acres of crops in 1967. He forecasts that it is entirely possible exports within a few years will increase by 50 percent.

In the North Central area of the Nation alone that might increase farmers cash receipts by $2 billion and send a stream of fresh economic lifeblood through the Midwest which could revivify the elm-lined streets of many a delightful small town.

In the largest sense, food for freedom as now projected is only beginning. The world is racing at increasing speed into a food crisis. Half the world's population already suffers chronically from lack of food. The U.N. estimates that by 1975 food supplies will have to be increased by 35 percent merely to sustain the present level of a world half in hunger.

The Aswan Dam in Egypt aptly illustrated the problem. In the 10 years which will be taken to create the dam's irrigation canals and bring in 2 million additional acres of cropland, Egypt's population will have so increased to absorb more than the production of those 2 million acres. Egypt is not running fast enough to keep up with itself.

The plain fact, as President Johnson points out, is that even the American cornucopia cannot be made to overflow enough to meet the food needs of the developing nations.

So the challenge is here and now. The transition to the new stage from the older era of unmanageable surpluses will have to be managed carefully.

But it will be a welcome change from the old days of killing little pigs, and the gentle rain of Government checks. Congress now has an opportunity to act promptly, and even more imaginatively, on the President's initiative.

WAR ON TWO FRONTS

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, President Johnson's trip to Hawaii gave new emphasis to the administration policy to hold the line against Communist aggression while at the same time building up the economic and social conditions of Vietnam.

Speaking of this policy, the Portland Oregonian in a recent editorial said that:

> The President's statement that the United States is pledged not only to defend the freedom of South Vietnam but "to build a decent society" there will be carried out in specific programs of economic aid and in support of Premier Ky's civic action program.

The editorial adds that:

> What can be done under war conditions will be done. But, of course, the imperative is to suppress the Vietcong by military action. When aggression is defeated, the main work of rehabilitation can begin.

There is much deep thought to an issue which concerns us all at this time, and because of its lucid analysis I ask that the editorial be included as a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP

President Johnson's trip to Honolulu to confer with United States and South Vietnamese diplomats and generals from the frontlines gives new emphasis to administration policy.

That policy is to defeat Communist aggression in South Vietnam, to uphold the caretaker military government in Saigon until conditions permit popular elections, to throw U.S. resources into rebuilding and strengthening the economy of South Vietnam.

To accomplish these objectives, the decisions unquestionably have been made to step up the airstrikes against military targets in North Vietnam and to increase American military power in South Vietnam to at least 400,000 troops—double those now supporting South Vietnamese troops in the mounting attacks on Vietcong strongholds and North Vietnamese regiments.

The limited and responsible employment of American power is calculated to achieve the objectives without encouraging Red China or the Soviet Union to enter the war—as one or both might do should the American methods be changed to accomplish aerial destruction of North Vietnam's industries, cities and Red River Delta farmlands. At the same time, the bombing of North Vietnam's military targets establishes the policy of denying a sanctuary to the Communist aggressor, a warning to Red China, particularly, not to send in its troops as it did in Korea.

The 37-day suspension of U.S. air strikes against North Vietnam, while the President sought aggressively but fruitlessly for an indication from Hanoi of willingness to negotiate a ceasefire and peace terms, was a setback to what public confidence there may be in South Vietnam in its military government. The President's conference with Chief of State Nguyen Van Thieu and Premier Nguyen Cao Ky will enhance their prestige by affirming American confidence in them and unaltered intention to defend South Vietnam.

The President's statement that the United States is pledged not only to defend the freedom of South Vietnam but "to build a decent society" there will be carried out in specific programs of economic aid and in support of Premier Ky's civic action program. What can be done under war conditions will be done. But, of course, the imperative is to suppress the Vietcong by military action. When aggression is defeated, the main work of rehabilitation can begin.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTARY MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay down the unfinished business from the previous day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, last August, when the President announced a series of actions that had been decided upon in an attempt to help the people of South Vietnam preserve their privilege of self-determination, the Congress was asked to approve a supplemental appropriation of $1.7 billion.

This appropriation was unanimously approved in the Senate, by a vote of 89 to 0. This action followed the earlier approval of the appropriation of $700 million, which had been earmarked for this same purpose.

During the hearings on the $1.7 billion appropriation, forthright testimony clearly indicated that the amount then sought was in the nature of a downpayment for the additional military steps then ordered and that when the total bill could be calculated the necessary authorizations and appropriations would be requested.

The rest of the check requested for this fiscal year is $12,345,719,000.

The sum of $3,417,700,000 of the additional appropriations now requested has never been authorized for appropriation. In exercising their rulemaking powers, both Houses of the Congress have adopted requirements that only appropriations authorized by law are in order. The bill before the Senate would make later enactment of the entire 1966 defense supplemental appropriation in order.

Of the appropriations that this bill would authorize, $3,417,700,000 would be used to buy aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles; $151,650,000 would be used for research and development; and $1,238,400,000 is intended to fund military construction.

I do not wish to make a disingenuous argument, but I think it important that the Senate and the Nation clearly recognize this bill for what it is: an authorization of defense appropriations. It could not properly be considered as determining foreign policy, as ratifying decisions made in the past, or as endorsing new commitments.

That ours is a Government of three equal and coordinate branches and that there are checks and balances in this system are concepts we all learn in elementary civics. Under the Constitution, the President is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. By approving or disapproving a bill of this type, Congress can neither enlarge nor diminish the President's power to command these forces; it merely can influence how many members of the Armed Forces the President has to command, and determine the nature of the equipment with which they will be provided, and how they will be cared for and protected.

Of course, I would not suggest that Congress does not have a role in the formulation of foreign policy. Under the division of legislative labor that Congress has prescribed for itself, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs are the instrumentalities specializing in foreign relations. Accordingly, I think it is important to emphasize that it would be inappropriate for this authorization to be used as a poll of congressional opinion on whether our foreign policy is sound. In my opinion, such action would tend to oust the jurisdiction of the committees charged with primary responsibility for such consideration. Instead, I prefer to think of this authorization as facilitating the arming and equipping of persons in the Armed Forces with the most effective weapons to assure their survival when they are carrying out the orders of their Commander in Chief.

For those persons who would like to rescind the support the Senate gave at the time of the Gulf of Tonkin incident, I wish to point out that the resolution adopted then provides by its own terms that it may be terminated by concurrent resolution of the Congress. As we all know, a concurrent resolution requires action only by Congress and does not require Presidential participation or approval. There is, then, a readily available means for securing a test of congressional opinion, and that is to consider a resolution rescinding the Gulf of Tonkin one. I understand that a resolution to do just this has been submitted and is pending in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia permit a question?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Am I not correct in saying that the Senator from Georgia, as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services at that time, offered an amendment to the concurrent resolution to provide that Congress would have an opportunity to exercise its responsibility.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. To my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, I may say that, as I recall, that suggestion was made at the conference we first held with Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara. I made the suggestion, and they agreed that it should be embraced and embodied in the resolution that was proposed, and that was done.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Georgia took that action as chairman of the committee, did he not?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I did, so as to preserve the prerogatives of Congress and to make the resolution comparable to the one that had been adopted in 1957, relating to the Middle East. That resolution granted broad powers to the President and contained a provision that these powers could be terminated at any time by a majority of Congress, without participation by the President.

Mr. President, an attempt to brush aside the misgivings and reservations that many Senators and members of the public hold about events in southeast Asia would be futile. This is not my purpose. I, too, am extremely unhappy and concerned about the gravity of the situation there and what our commitment portends. But, like many of my colleagues, I have had an opportunity to suggest alternative courses of action, and I have been unable to suggest one likely to lead to an honorable termination of the conflict there other than the course now being followed by the President.

In the Senate last year, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] recalled, in his remarks on the floor of the Senate, that he had visited me when he was a member of the executive branch to inform me of President Eisenhower's decision to begin assisting the South Vietnamese people and my comment that I feared this course would be costly in blood and treasure, but that when the President had made his decision and had committed the flag, I had no alternative but to support the flag.

I mention this not to engage in self praise as a prophet but because it still summarizes my view.

For any Members of the Senate who may be initially disposed to oppose this authorization because they have reservations and misgivings about whether the policies being applied in southeast Asia are wise, I strongly urge them to stay their opposition and to find some other manner in which to register it, other than by doing it in a way that will work injury to our fellow Americans who are in southeast Asia. Incidentally, there are 300,000 there instead of the 200,000 we hear about when we include all those who are in Thailand and in the waters off the coast of Vietnam.

Members of the Armed Forces are in southeast Asia under orders. From all reports, they are giving a splendid account of themselves. I am proud of them. Although many have volunteered for this duty, others are there not by choice. They nonetheless are doing their best. An unreasonable delay in approving this bill or a close vote on it is hardly the way to demonstrate appreciation for their sacrifices in our behalf. If we try to view our position on this bill through their eyes, I hope the Senate will not let itself be misunderstood.

Mr. President, I say that without implying that I wish to deny to any Senator the right to express himself on this measure and what is involved herein.

In recent weeks there have been many references to the possibility of a credibility gap. If the Senate shilly-shallies with this supplemental, it will be much harder to convince those opposing us of our determination to see this commitment through and our adversaries are much more likely to be intransigent and contemptuous toward our efforts to find peace.

I must say that I think some observers and critics have not given the President and the Secretaries of State and Defense the credit they deserve for the earnestness, the soul searching, and the vigor with which they have considered alternative courses of action, and particularly for the efforts they have put forth in an attempt to find a solution leading to peace with honor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, is it true that this authorization is to complete the total authorizations now contained on the books for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, 4½ months from now, so that the appropriation which will follow will use this authorization, together with the remaining amount on the book, to obtain the supplies that are needed at once by our fighting men in southeast Asia?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator is correct. That does not mean that it must all be spent in 1966. It is to be added to the appropriations for 1966 to make sure that there is no shortage of vital supplies for the 300,000 American boys who are in the so-called danger zone. Those supplies include everything from rations to bombs and shells.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think that that one fact will plead like angels, trumpet-tongued, for the early passage of this measure.

I believe that more good can be accomplished by this bill if we pass it quickly as something that is needed now for funds to be shortly appropriated and committed or spent during the remainder of the fiscal year.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No appropriation can be made without this authorization. It will be necessary for additional legislation to follow this legislation to appropriate the money.

We all know that even if the requirement is not spelled out in the Constitution, the position of the House makes it necessary for appropriations to originate there.

I understand that the committee in the House has already held hearings on the appropriation—all items of it—and is only awaiting the authorization to send the measure here.

Further, there was testimony in the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services that it is important that this appropriation be passed by the latter part of February. It will be exceedingly difficult to do that under the very best of conditions, because the authorization must be obtained before the appropriation can be considered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding. I hope that we shall all make it clear in discussing the bill that this is for an authorization to be followed immediately by an appropriation in a like amount and that this amount would be included with authorizations already on the book for the purpose of providing for what is actually needed to be spent or committed between now and the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I desire to comment more particularly for a few moments on what the authorization in this bill is for.

In the aircraft field, it would fund more helicopters and more aircraft of the type used by our Armed Forces, whether or not we were participating in the defense of South Vietnam. The same can be said of the missiles and the tracked combat vehicles. Much of this procurement is intended to replace losses already incurred and those that may be incurred if hostilities continue.

In research and development, the effort is concentrated on those projects that could benefit our efforts in South Vietnam. I will not enumerate them all. They include such things as better drugs to combat an unusual type of malaria, from which hundreds of our boys are suffering there at this hour, better protection for our helicopters, better medical facilities, improvements in electronic warfare equipment, weapons and ordnance of the type needed in nonnuclear warfare, and modification of aircraft to adapt them to the kinds of missions needed in southeast Asia.

The military construction that would be authorized stretches all the way from some bases in the United States through intermediate staging areas to South Vietnam. The kinds of things that will be built include new hospitals, storage facilities, runways, and port facilities to facilitate the unloading of supplies.

It was really disturbing to hear some of the difficulties encountered in unloading and landing essential supplies in South Vietnam because of the lack of harbor facilities. That condition is being remedied now as rapidly as it is possible to do.

The committee report gives more detailed information on the weapons to be procured, the research and development to be undertaken, and the construction that would be accomplished and I shall not repeat them here.

I should point out, however, that title IV of the bill could serve as a basis for provisions in the appropriations act that would permit the funding of our support for South Vietnam and the forces of free countries associated with us in her defense from appropriations available to the Department of Defense.

In ordinary circumstances, when a nation is not enduring hostilities on its own soil, the military assistance given to that country is authorized and appropriated and accounted for separately from the appropriations for our own

Armed Forces. When combat is taking place, the maintenance of records of the supplies and equipment and assistance furnished becomes most difficult and relatively irrelevant. In Korea, support for the South Korean forces and for the forces of other nations who participated with us there was included in the appropriations made to the Department of Defense and provided from those funds.

The arrangement proposed for South Vietnam by this legislation is similar to that.

The intent is that the military support for South Vietnamese forces and for the forces of Allied countries there will be added to the requirements of the U.S. forces and that support will be provided in the field as determined by our commanders without separate computation and bookkeeping for the part furnished non-U.S. forces.

As is indicated in the committee report, the committee has modified the authority sought in this instance by tightening up on what could have been considered a new transfer authority and by requiring quarterly reports of estimates of the amount of support furnished each nation participating with us in South Vietnam.

This limited merger of support for our associates in South Vietnam with the requirements for our own Armed Forces would be authorized only during the rest of fiscal year 1966 and for fiscal year 1967. The limited duration of this authority will permit the Congress to reconsider whether it should be continued. But I am sure that I voice the sentiments of every Member of this body when I say that we all hope and pray that an honorable termination of hostilities can be accomplished and that there will be no need to continue the authority.

Mr. President, in closing, I wish to leave the thought that I think every Member of the Senate, without regard to his views on the policy involved in Vietnam, can conscientiously support this assistance, this means of providing arms in self-defense to U.S. citizens, without compromising any convictions he may have about what further action should be taken to restore peace in South Vietnam. I urge approval of the bill and I shall be glad to try to answer questions about it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one who joined the chairman of our Armed Services Committee in presenting this bill to the Senate, I wholeheartedly endorse what the chairman has stated as to the purposes of the bill.

As we proceed with the consideration of this legislation, I think that it is imperative that we all remember what this legislation does and what it does not do. Senate bill 2791 provides authorizations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked vehicles for various Army, Navy, and Air Force research, development, test and evaluation programs, and for the construction of military installations. These authorizations total $4,807,750,000—the amount requested by the Department of Defense.

These authorizations provide the required authority for the necessary appropriations to support military operations in southeast Asia. The recommended authorizations totaling $4.8 billion are for the following purposes:

[In thousands]

Procurement of aircraft, missiles, and tracked vehicles	$3,417,700
Research, development, test, and evaluation programs	151,700
Military construction projects	1,238,400

Shortly we will be considering the Department of Defense supplemental appropriation bill which will involve some $12.3 billion. I ask unanimous consent to have included at this point in the RECORD a tabulation of the appropriations requested in the proposed supplemental appropriation bill and the required authorizations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The tabulation ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

Department of Defense supplemental, southeast Asia, fiscal 1966

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriation	Supplemental request	Authorization required
Military personnel:		
Military personnel, Army	833.6	
Military personnel, Navy	318.5	
Military personnel, Marine Corps	184.6	
Military personnel, Air Force	219.3	
Reserve personnel, Army	7.5	
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps	2.2	
Reserve personnel, Air Force	2.7	
National Guard personnel, Army	45.9	
National Guard personnel, Air Force	5.7	
Total, military personnel	1,620.0	
Operation and maintenance:		
Operation and maintenance, Army	1,077.2	
Operation and maintenance, Navy	506.0	
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps	102.6	
Operation and maintenance, Air Force	544.9	
Operation and maintenance, defense agencies	41.8	
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard	35.7	
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard	8.1	
Total, operation and maintenance	2,316.3	
Procurement:		
Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army	2,465.0	965.4
Aircraft	(604.7)	(604.7)
Aircraft spares and repair parts	(220.9)	(220.9
Missiles	(35.5)	(35.5)
Missiles spares and repair parts	(28.5)	(28.5)
Tracked combat vehicles	(75.8)	(75.8)
Ammunition	(671.3)	
Other	(823.3)	
Procurement of aircraft and missiles, Navy	764.5	764.5
Other procurement, Navy	607.5	
Procurement, Marine Corps	516.6	38.4
Tracked combat vehicles	(10.9)	(10.9)
Missiles	(27.5)	(27.5)
Aircraft procurement, Air Force	1,585.7	1,585.7
Missile procurement, Air Force	63.7	63.7
Other procurement, Air Force	1,016.4	
Total, procurement	7,019.4	3,417.7
Research, development, test, and evaluation:		
R.D.T. & E., Army	28.0	28.0
R.D.T. & E., Navy	52.6	52.6
R.D.T. & E., Air Force	71.1	71.1
Total, R.D.T. & E.	151.7	151.7
Military construction:		
Military construction, Army	509.7	509.7
Military construction, Navy	254.6	254.6
Military construction, Air Force	274.1	274.1
Military construction, defense agencies	200.0	200.0
Total, military construction	1,238.4	1,238.4
Total, regular military programs	12,345.7	4,807.8
Request to reimburse DOD for stocks advanced to military assistance program during fiscal years 1965 and 1966	375.0	
Grand total	12,720.7	4,807.8

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this bill does not involve an endorsement of our present policies in southeast Asia. Neither is it a repudiation of those policies. This bill authorizes the appropriation of funds to back up over 200,000 American fighting men now engaged in military operations in southeast Asia.

The distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee discussed the intent of this legislation with the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the hearings. I think this colloquy will help to keep this matter in the proper perspective during our consideration:

Senator RUSSELL stated:

> The mere fact that a Member of the Senate might heartily disapprove of everything that is going on in Vietnam wouldn't necessarily preclude him from supporting this legislation if he felt it his duty as a U.S. Senator to provide for those who may serve in the armed services of this country.

Secretary McNamara replied, "It would not."

General Wheeler replied, "I agree with you, Mr. Chairman."

Mr. President, section 401 of the bill provides that funds for the support of the South Vietnamese armed forces and other free world forces fighting in South Vietnam shall be derived from the regular appropriations for the support of our own military forces. In recent years funds for this purpose have been carried in the military assistance program. However, during the Korean war funds appropriated for the support of U.S. Forces was used to support the Korean forces and other allied forces engaged in that conflict.

The reason for this change in funding, simply stated, is to make it easier for our military commanders in southeast Asia to fight the war. Under the present system of funding, South Vietnamese troops cannot be supplied with rifles purchased with funds appropriated for the Army procurement program, nor can U.S. forces use ammunition purchased with military assistance funds. I think we can all agree that this is not a reasonable restriction to place on our military commanders who have the responsibility of fighting this war. During the balance of fiscal year 1966 it is estimated that about $200 million will be required for the support of the South Vietnamese and other free world forces, and for fiscal year 1967 the estimate is $600 million.

I call attention to subsection (b) of section 401, which provides that the Secretary of Defense shall render to the appropriate committees of the Congress quarterly reports on the estimated value of support furnished to other forces from the appropriations made for the support of U.S. forces. That is to keep us informed, during this period, of these combined funds that are used specifically for the South Vietnamese. I want to make it absolutely clear that section 401 does not expand the authority available to the Secretary of Defense to transfer funds between appropriations. We tightened that up in the committee, and I believe, now, it is clear. And, Mr. President, it does not enlarge the powers of the Department of Defense to reprogram various appropriations that the Congress has made.

Mr. President, this legislation should be supported by every Member of the Senate and I so urge. I shall join the chairman of the Armed Services Committee in opposing any amendments to the bill that are designed to constitute an endorsement or repudiation of our present policies in southeast Asia. As I have stated, that is not the purpose of this legislation.

The purpose is to provide the necessary funds for our forces and the South Vietnamese who are fighting in that country at the present time. It does not concern whether we are right or wrong in our policies in so fighting. We are supporting our boys, and that is the purpose of this authorization bill which will lead to appropriations. Mr. President, I support our chairman wholeheartedly. The committee was unanimous in making this report to the Senate at this time.

I thank the chairman of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I am now pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who, before his service in the Senate and on the Committee on Armed Services, had a distinguished career in the executive branch, including service as the first Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the able senior Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee for many years, and the authority in this body on military matters, for yielding to me.

First, I commend the Senator for this fine analysis summarizing the bill before us this afternoon.

I also congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, who, during his superb career, has always put his country above party, and who has so thoroughly endorsed the observations and conclusions of the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. President, I would nail down again the statements made by the chairman of our committee by asking two questions.

First, as I understand it, the Senator's conviction is that regardless of how one feels about this matter of Vietnam, whatever opinion one may have on that particular subject, this bill has nothing to do with agreement or disagreement with respect to our foreign policy. Rather, it is a question of whether we do or do not wish to support young Americans, men and some women, over there in the combat zones of South Vietnam.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator from Missouri has correctly stated my position and that of the entire Committee on Armed Services. This bill cannot possibly be construed as either an endorsement of or as an attack upon national policy. It involves more the throwing of a rope to a man in the water. We may have cause to question how he got there, but he is there, he is a human being, he is our friend and a member of our family and, therefore, if we have a rope and do not throw it to him to enable him to assist himself out of the water, this would be a callous and heartless attitude for us to take.

Our committee is not a policy committee in the field of international relations, but we do have a direct responsibility to bring to the Senate legislation to provide for those who are in the Armed Forces of the United States wherever they may be stationed throughout the world as a result of policy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator. My second and final question is based upon a recent trip I made in the past month to South Vietnam. After noticing the heavy buildup which resulted from the decision to move our troops in force there during 1964 some logistical shortages were noted—as there always will be in peace, in industry, and in war; and I found at least one case in which shortages resulted in additional casualties, something which was frankly recognized and every effort was made by the Department of Defense to correct the situation.

Would not the able chairman agree, however, that if we do not supply the funds he is requesting in support of this bill, and which is supported so convincingly by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], additional casualties over a period of time are bound to occur in the fighting zones because of shortages?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Of course, if a hopeless impasse were to result between the Commander in Chief who ordered these men into Vietnam, and Congress, if it refused to provide for them there, it would mean that all of them would perish eventually, either through sickness, or from the bullets of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. In a short while, they would be perfectly helpless. They would have no medical facilities, no food, ammunition, no shells, and no fuel for the airplanes and helicopters now in that area.

I cannot conceive of the Senate's tolerating such a condition for a moment, without regard to the views of any Senator on the wisdom of the policy which put our boys in South Vietnam.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from Georgia for yielding to me. And I assure him of my support, without reservations of his position with respect to the proposed legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri for his comments.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am now happy to yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who has been on the Committee on Armed Services for many years.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, as should be evident by now to everyone, we are engaged in Vietnam in a limited conflict with the limited aim to help South Vietnam preserve its independence. The adversary can have peace as soon as he gives up his efforts to impose his will on the south by force and terror.

I support the administration's bill, S. 2791, unanimously reported by our Senate Armed Services Committee, which authorizes supplemental fiscal 1966 Defense appropriations of $4.8 billion. This was the sum requested by the administration to meet additional costs in helping the people of South Vietnam defend their freedom.

I should like to comment briefly on our military effort in the Vietnamese conflict.

First. The main military effort in the future, as in the past, must be in the south. There is much to be said for increasing that effort rapidly, to confront Hanoi quickly with a buildup in the south they cannot match, and to give our side the initiative in keeping the adversary moving and off balance. The principle involved is clear: Hanoi and Peiping are less likely to think it worthwhile to increase their efforts in relation to the war if our side steps up its efforts rapidly, than if we drag out the buildup, little bit by little bit.

I am well aware that it is extremely difficult, for logistical reasons, to increase the American contribution quickly. Existing ports and airfields have limited capacities. To train, properly equip, and deploy combat-ready forces takes time. But the evidence that we are actually preparing as promptly as possible to mount a substantially larger effort would itself, I believe, have an impressive effect on the adversary.

Second. We should persuade our allies in the Pacific area to increase their contributions to the defense of South Vietnam. The Republic of Korea has sent 20,000 troops. This could be doubled to 40,000. Australia has sent 1,500 combat forces, and, at a minimum, this could increase to 5,000. New Zealand has sent small forces that could be increased. These allied forces have performed in first-rate fashion and have been a substantial asset. We can hope that certain other countries—realizing that their vital interests are also involved in the successful defense of South Vietnam—will follow the example of New Zealand, Australia, and the Republic of Korea.

Third. I believe we are not making the most effective use of our airpower in the Vietnamese conflict.

As I see it—based on the advice and counsel we have received over a long period of time in the deliberations of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, as well as directly from the professionals on the ground out in Vietnam—we are unduly and unwisely tying our hands by limiting ourselves to only tactical targets in North Vietnam. I agree that we should avoid, for the foreseeable future, targeting the cities in North Vietnam, and we should take great pains to avoid hitting civilians. But there is every good political and military reason to make a careful selection of strategic targets—like oil refineries and ports—which are not only of major economic importance to the Hanoi regime but also have a direct and important bearing on its ability to move men and material into South Vietnam.

The careful choice of such strategic targets—which would be struck only from time to time at the President's personal direction—would contribute in a major way to raising the cost of infiltration from North to South Vietnam and to slowing and reducing the movement of supplies and forces into the South. This new strategy would also deter the replenishment of North Vietnamese stocks of arms and supplies via shipping into the northern ports. If coupled with a certain reduction in bombing operations against less important tactical targets, this strategy could lessen the costs to us in risks to American pilots, and in the loss of planes over the north—which is already well over 200.

I hope the administration will review this matter again. It should be apparent that the strategy I am suggesting would constitute a restrained but significant contribution to the military pressure we must maintain on Hanoi if we expect to persuade the adversary to give up its efforts to impose its will on the South by force and terror.

In closing, I wish to commend my distinguished colleague the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for his intelligent and responsible handling of this supplemental authorization which is needed in support of the American effort to help block Communist subjugation of all of Vietnam.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, may I also express my appreciation to the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] for his dedicated support.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me for 2 minutes in order that I may read a telegram which I sent to the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the reply he sent to me. I believe that this courtesy to the majority leader should be given to him at this time.

Mr. GORE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday I sent the following telegram to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], which was delivered to the Senator's office:

> Respectfully recommend that debate and vote on supplemental military procurement and construction authorization bill, fiscal year 1966, now the pending business of the Senate, be postponed until after February 22. I consider it important that Senate and Nation have benefit of testimony given at Foreign Relations Committee hearing by Taylor and Rusk, and I hope also by McNamara and Wheeler, before Senate votes on this war appropriation bill.
>
> McNamara's testimony before Armed Services Committee is no substitute for his discussing overall issues of U.S. policy in Asia at public hearings before Foreign Relations Committee. Contrary to impression administration has tried to create with American people, neither McNamara nor Wheeler would be asked at Foreign Relations Committee hearings any question that would involve security matters. If any such question were asked, the administration knows that all its witnesses need do is to suggest that such questions be laid aside until they can be answered in executive session.
>
> I can assure you that I am far from alone in the Senate in my recommendation to you that this military authorization bill be voted on after February 22.
>
> With best wishes for a speedy recovery.
>
> Regards,
>
> WAYNE MORSE,
> *U.S. Senator.*

Today, I received the following telegram from the majority leader:

> *February 15, 1966.*
>
> Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
> *U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:*
>
> Reurtel. Senate has already laid down S. 2791 authorizing military procurement and I announced last Thursday that this bill would be pending at the return of Senate from Lincoln Day recess. In circumstances I feel that I am bound by this announcement of program which the Senate was given to understand would be the situation on reconvening. I personally have no objections to final vote coming after Washington's Birthday, but date of vote is something which Senate in its collective interests and judgments must and will decide. It is my understanding that several amendments will be offered to S. 2791. Discussion of these amendments and of the bill itself will undoubtedly take some time. I would hope that Senate can go ahead in view of announcement already made placing Members on notice as to the program on reconvening and to the end that S. 2791 will receive full discussion and every consideration. At same time Foreign Relations Committee might hear what witnesses it has scheduled and any others it decides upon.
>
> With warm regards.
>
> MIKE MANSFIELD,
> *Majority Leader, U.S. Senate.*

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for yielding.

I wish to underscore one of the points made by the Senator from Georgia with reference to the figures in this bill, which he expressed so plainly. This is really a continuation of an appropriation of last year, an item in the general appropriation bill for these identical purposes. In that appropriation we made the downpayment on the necessary military hardware. Now we must meet the second and third payments, in order to complete the order.

Supplementing what the Senator said on this point, in the procurement figure in this bill of $3,004 million, which is for the procurement of military hardware articles I have already mentioned, this sum is merely a continuation of the appropriation made last year, in order to make the second, third, and however many more payments are required with reference to the entire purchases. The due date for the debt for which we appropriated last year is here. I urged then that we appropriate more funds. I knew that much more would be required. I thought we should take a bigger bite on the necessary fund in 1965.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield, with the indulgence of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Mississippi interpret the approval of this request for supplemental appropriations as either approving or disapproving our policy in South Vietnam?

Mr. STENNIS. Frankly, I think it is neither approval nor disapproval of our policy. We are already committed. We have already gone in. We have already put the men on the ground. They must have support; $1.2 billion of the funds in the bill is for military construction items. It is to take care of the men and materiel that we already have there, that are on the way, or that are expected to be sent there.

This bill merely presents the question of supporting our men. We have already put them out front in the battleline.

As the Senator from Massachusetts has stated, this bill is neither affirmative nor negative with reference to policy matters.

Mr. AIKEN. It could not be interpreted as indicating approval of Congress for future involvement?

Mr. STENNIS. No. If we did not support the men, we would have to bring them home. We would have to tuck tail and run, so to speak.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is important to have this statement so that the act of Congress on this proposal may not be so badly misinterpreted or misconstrued as was the resolution of August 1964.

Mr. STENNIS. That is the construction our committee put on it. It is also what Secretary McNamara and General Wheeler pointed out in the hearings. I would say, with the Senator from Massachusetts, that this neither affirms nor denies the policy contained in the resolution of last year, because the bill before us is an authorization bill for appropriation for military supplies and equipment, some of which has already been used.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator for making it clear that our action on this bill can have no effect on our southeast Asian policies.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his remarks; $1,200 million in this is for military construction which is to be used in direct support of our military effort already in existence in southeast Asia. It pertains to equipment for the men, includes hospitalization, and supply depots, all to take care of what we have there.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am grateful for the statesmanlike presentation of this bill by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. He, and also, just now, the able junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], have made it perfectly clear that one can support the pending bill without having it interpreted, unless someone desires to make a misinterpretation, as an approval of the policies that have been followed or may hereafter be followed in southeast Asia.

I shall support the pending bill. I shall do so because, whether wisely or unwisely, as has been said here, our troops are committed to battle there. They are there on orders, not of their choosing, but on orders of the Commander in Chief.

American troops in an area of hostilities must be supplied the equipment and the materials necessary to enable them to accomplish the mission assigned them by their superiors with maximum effectiveness and with minimum danger to themselves.

The Secretary of Defense and Joint Chiefs of Staff have stated that additional funds are required for this purpose.

In my view it is incumbent upon the Congress to provide funds for their support. This I will do, but I wish to make it emphatically clear, however, that support of similar measures in the past and support of the pending measure now has not and does not reflect approval on my part of the policies and decisions that have led to our involvement in Vietnam in its current proportions. On the contrary, it is my view that commitment of U.S. combat forces to Vietnam was a serious mistake, and will prove to be, in my view, a historic mistake, that has increased rather than diminished the danger of a major war.

Support of our troops in battle is one thing; approval of national policies and decisions which put them there is quite another. Some may regard this as a narrow, legalistic distinction. I do not; and I am pleased the Armed Services Committee has unanimously determined that it should not be so interpreted. What has been done has been done.

I will not support an amendment to repeal the resolution of 1964. We can no more repeal what has been done than we can turn the sun back in its course. I will not support an amendment to oppose sending draftees to Vietnam. Draftees are already there. Such an amendment to prevent the sending of replacements would, in my view, be unfair to the men already serving there.

Let it be understood that I support and support strongly the pending measure. We cannot be niggardly in supplying the materiel that our forces need to accomplish their mission and to do so with minimum danger to themselves.

I voice my deep concern at this time, not with any idea that the calendar can be reversed, not for the purpose of expressing criticism, but in the hope that a review of the past and a searching public analysis and debate of the present may possibly be of some help in shaping the momentous decisions in the days and months ahead. The responsibility of a U.S. Senator and the dictates of conscience impel me to participate in this discussion and to express these views. Public discussion is essential in a free society.

Statements have been made here earlier today to the effect that this debate would be an aid to the enemy. I recall that when the previous authorization bill was before the Senate last August, the junior Senator from Mississippi, the chairman of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, and also a member of the Committee on Appropriations, invited debate. Unfortunately, in my view, the Senate did not respond to his invitation. I fault myself in that regard.

Debate is necessary for our democratic processes. A government conducted under such a system must be conducted, in the main, in public. Democracy may have its weaknesses. I believe it was the late, great Winston Churchill who said that democracy is the worst form of government except any other kind. That may not be an accurate quotation. This is a hazard that democracies always face.

An interesting observation was made to me in this regard last week when the delegation was here from the Mexican Congress on an interparliamentary exchange mission. One of them listened to the Committee on Foreign Relations. In the evening thereafter he made a significant remark to me. He said, "This could occur only in a great and free society."

Mr. President, I am pleased for the Communist world to know. I am pleased for those behind the Iron Curtain who may not be pleased with their lot to know that there is one place in the world where the most critical issues can be the subject of free debate. Yes; this is necessary in our democratic society.

It is in the interest of public understanding of the issues that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is now holding public hearings on the overall questions of policy involved in Vietnam. In my view, both these hearings and this debate are in the national interest.

I wish to advert to the question that approval of the pending bill is not tantamount to approval of the policies in southeast Asia. I do so to call attention to the fact that when Secretary Rusk was last before the Committee on Foreign Relations testifying in support of the foreign aid authorization request, he was asked, I believe by the chairman of the committee, if a vote for that bill could be or would be regarded as approval of the policies in southeast Asia. The Secretary demurred and said he would not like to answer that question "just now." I am not attempting to quote him exactly, but at any rate he deferred his answer.

So it is pertinent to make the point and to make it clear. From the RECORD it is now abundantly clear that a Senator can vote for this measure, and have it understood that he is voting for a specific bill and only that.

From the beginning I have had serious reservations about our policy in Vietnam. The publicly stated objective of our policy as being designed to secure to the people of South Vietnam the right to determine their own destiny without outside interference is, of course, fully desirable, if possible and feasible, but I have not and do not believe that the policies and programs followed offered or offer a reasonable opportunity for achieving this objective at bearable cost and without posing potentially disastrous consequences for ourselves and for the free world. It is easy to coin or repeat slogans like "victory" and "standing up to the Communists."

One can enjoy wrapping the flag about himself and enjoy a chauvinistic exercise, but it is much more difficult to devise and implement programs for application to the conditions existing in Vietnam which offer realistic hopes of converting such slogans into a workable policy that is fully consistent with our national interest.

I have repeatedly voiced my reservations about the course of events in Vietnam. When President Eisenhower undertook our initial commitment I counseled against it.

The junior Senator from Mississippi did likewise, and I joined him in debate in 1954, as the RECORD will show.

I strongly advised President Kennedy against broadening and deepening that commitment. I have frequently urged President Johnson and his Cabinet members to avoid a wider war.

Until late 1964, I confined my statements to direct communication and to sessions of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the main. I say now that I should have been speaking out publicly more than I did. I feel a share of responsibility in that regard. I followed this course in deference to the constitutional responsibility of the President and to a feeling that strident public opposition and dissent to policies already publicly proclaimed might in some degree lessen whatever chance there was for effectiveness of such policies. Upon reflection, I have concluded that this was a mistake and I am sorry I did not speak out publicly more often and sooner than I did.

Legislative support of what must be done to meet national commitments neither implies approval of unwise policies nor negates my responsibility to voice apprehension about present policy.

An analysis of the present situation and a consideration of the future require a review of the past.

Our direct involvement in Vietnam may be said to have started with the fall of Dienbienphu in 1954. Of course we were involved before then, but our role theretofore was in support of the French to whom we gave massive economic and materiel support. As I recall, our support of the French in their efforts in Vietnam amounted to some $2 billion.

After 7 years of war to which they committed hundreds of thousands of troops, and despite our logistic support, the French suffered a costly defeat. The

French learned, or at least were compelled to admit, that massive military operations conducted thousands of miles from their shores in the jungles and rice paddies of southeast Asia are not the answer to a problem that was and still is to a large degree political, ideological, cultural, economic, religious, and racial in nature.

Much is said about the necessity of meeting our national commitments, upholding our national honor, and protecting vital national interests. Of course, we must do these things, Mr. President. But having said so, we must define and understand the commitments that national honor requires us to meet, from both a legal and moral standpoint. And in determining our vital national interests we must do so in context with our many worldwide responsibilities; we must avoid becoming mesmerized by slogans and by commitments that do not exist; and we must achieve a balanced posture that recognizes our limitations as well as our strength.

Mr. President, let us examine the nature of our legal commitment in Vietnam.

Following the Geneva accords of 1954, to which we did not subscribe but which we agreed to recognize and support, the Eisenhower administration made the crucial decision to pick up the pieces dropped by the defeated, withdrawing French and to shoulder the responsibility for promoting economic and political stability and preserving order in this isolated area of the world which was teeming with turmoil.

That was our first big mistake. How foolish we were to undertake a burden which the French, who were far more knowledgeable of this area than we, had, after 7 years of war, with an army of 400,000 men, found an almost impossible undertaking.

And so, in October 1954, in a letter from President Eisenhower to the President of the Council of Ministers of Vietnam, the Government of the United States made what, along with the obligations we undertook under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, constitutes our formal commitment to Vietnam. President Eisenhower offered U.S. aid "to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion through military means."

In this letter, President Eisenhower made it clear that such aid would be conditional upon assurances by the Government of South Vietnam "as to the standards of performance it would be able to maintain in the event such aid were supplied." He added, significantly: "the Government of the United States expects that this aid will be met by performance on the part of the Government of Vietnam in undertaking needed reforms."

In addition to the unilateral commitment contained in President Eisenhower's letter, the United States incurred certain obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty and Protocol which was negotiated in September 1954, and which went into effect in February 1955. Article IV of the SEATO Treaty provides as follows:

> 1. Each Party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the Parties or against any State or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations.
>
> 2. If, in the opinion of any of the Parties, the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any Party in the treaty area or of any other State or territory to which the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article from time to time apply is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area, the Parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense.
>
> 3. It is understood that no action on the territory of any State designated by unanimous agreement under paragraph 1 of this Article or on any territory so designated shall be taken except at the invitation or with the consent of the government concerned.

It is to be noted that the parties to the treaty pledge action in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures to meet "aggression by means of armed attack" against any of the parties or certain other States in the treaty area—including South Vietnam. The Parties agree—to do what?—to consult immediately to determine such measures as should be taken to meet any threat other than by armed attack.

Pursuant to the Presidential letter of 1954, the United States proceeded to extend aid to South Vietnam. This aid consisted of economic aid and military supplies and equipment together with funds to support the Vietnamese military establishment. U.S. military personnel were limited to small numbers whose mission was to assist in training the Vietnamese army and directing administration of the aid program.

This arrangement continued for several years. From time to time, optimistic statements were issued about the solid progress being made in development of the economy and development of the Vietnam army. For example, in May 1957, a joint statement issued from the White House on the occasion of a visit by President Diem noted that:

> In less than 3 years a chaotic situation resulting from years of war had been changed into one of progress and stability. Concerned was expressed over the buildup of military forces in North Vietnam and it was agreed that aggression or subversion threatening the political independence of the Republic of Vietnam would be considered as endangering peace and stability.

That is as far as this joint statement went.

During this period which, by comparison, now appears to have been one of relative calm, however, it appeared necessary to continue to provide more and more in the way of aid to maintain the Diem regime. Statements about progress proved to be illusory. And by 1959 it was obvious that the situation was getting worse instead of better.

In April 1959, in an address at Gettysburg College, President Eisenhower reviewed the then current situation and concluded that South Vietnam was incapable of meeting unaided the threat of aggression and subversion. He reiterated the domino theory and justified the extension of military as well as economic assistance as in our own national interests. Aid was continued and increased.

But despite increased aid, the Government of South Vietnam became less stable, its economy weaker. Subversion became more widespread, with the Vietcong holding and openly controlling substantial segments of the country. Thus was the situation upon the change in administrations in January 1961.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. First, may I ask the Senator whether he would prefer not to be interrupted? If so, I shall wait until he has concluded his speech.

Mr. GORE. I have no preference; I am happy to accommodate the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I have had the opportunity to read quickly most of the Senator's address. I believe he is making an extremely important statement today, one which reflects the sentiment of many other Members of the Senate. Among other things, he has pointed out that because of his own feeling about the problems of the Commander in Chief and the administration, it was the better part of discretion not to speak out until near the end of 1964. I think that reflects the course of action that many Members of the Senate have been taking. The fact that other Senators have not yet spoken out on this issue is no reason to conclude that they do not have deep apprehensions and misgivings about the course that the United States is following.

Before the Senator leaves that part of his speech——

Mr. GORE. If I may interrupt, I should like to comment on that point briefly.

Although I hold myself culpable for reluctance to speak out, I do not wish to criticize other Senators in that regard. In extenuation, however, I should like to suggest——

Mr. McGOVERN. I do not want to imply any criticism either.

Mr. GORE. I suggest that it is the imminent threat of a third world war, as I interpret events, which has disturbed me; and, I dare say, it is the imminence of this threat which is causing more and more Senators to express their views publicly.

Unless the threat of such a catastrophe bestirs men to action, and unless men's souls are aroused by these events, what on earth could arouse them to action and impel them to take a position which for the moment may be unpopular with a great many people?

Mr. McGOVERN. I thoroughly agree with the Senator's observation. He has been speaking about the critical period after 1954, when the French effort in this same area ended in failure.

The Senator will recall that in the spring of 1954, when the French collapse appeared imminent, the late Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, felt that perhaps we ought to send American forces into that area to see if we could turn back Ho Chi Minh's forces and resolve the military decision on the side of the French against the Communist forces.

President Eisenhower believed that should not be done unless we could obtain the cooperation of the British, who were then headed by Prime Minister Churchill.

Frequently we hear people argue that we are in southeast Asia lest we repeat the errors that were made at Munich when the Western Powers failed to stand up to Hitler. The voice that sounded most clearly in 1938, at the time of the Munich crisis, in a call for firm action against Hitler was the voice of Winston Churchill. Yet, it was Prime Minister Churchill who counseled against American intervention in French Indochina in 1954.

Anthony Eden writes of this period that Winston Churchill firmly believed that the British would be doing the Americans a great injustice if they gave any encouragement whatever to the sending of American troops into that part of the world.

Does the Senator not think it significant that the one man who stands out in our mind as having been right at the time of the Munich crisis in 1938 did not see any parallel between that situation and the sending of American troops into French Indochina in 1954?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, Mr. Churchill was very knowledgeable of conditions in both Europe and southeast Asia. Those conditions are in contrast, in many respects—political conditions, governmental structures, social organization, terrain, divergence in economics, in industrialization, and political sophistication. Indeed, there has never been a nation of Vietnam. I shall not get into a description of Vietnam in reply to the Senator.

Mr. Churchill was showing his usual perspicacity when he drew a distinction rather than a parallel.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, it seems to me that one of the things that may have led us astray in southeast Asia is that we have drawn the wrong lessons and interpretations from previous historical situations. It is argued by some who most ardently defend our present position in southeast Asia that we are trying to contain the threat of Chinese communism in that part of the world in the same way that we were containing Russian Communist belligerents in Western Europe after World War II. I believe the two situations are vastly different.

Mr. GORE. Some have become so obsessed and pleased with the success of the Marshall plan in the containment of communism in Western Europe that they seek to apply that remedy worldwide, when European conditions do not prevail in southeast Asia.

Mr. McGOVERN. Is it not correct that, if we were to follow in southeast Asia the same course that we pursued in checking the spread of Soviet Russian power in Western Europe 20 years ago, it would involve the active support of the countries of Western Europe, Britain, France, West Germany, Italy, the Scandinavian countries, plus the principal countries of Asia, India, Japan, Pakistan, and others? This would parallel the collective security arrangements to check the possible threat of Chinese Communist power in that area in the same manner in which we had an airtight collective security arrangement thrown around the Soviet Union in 1945?

Is it not true that we have moved into southeast Asia largely on a unilateral basis, and that we are following a policy that has very little support, either in Asia or in Western Europe, and, in fact, has the active opposition or, at least, the grave doubt of other great countries in Asia and in Western Europe?

Mr. GORE. I agree with the Senator. As I said on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, a basic and grievous error in our policy is that, in a unilateral manner, we violate the collective security principle which we endorsed in the United Nations Charter.

Mr. President, I return now to a brief history of our commitments to South Vietnam.

The Kennedy administration embraced and expanded the policy of military and economic aid inherited from the Eisenhower administration. Secretary Rusk announced increased military assistance on May 4, 1961. On the next day then Vice President Johnson went to Vietnam and on May 13 a joint statement issued in Saigon announced additional measures "to extend and build upon existing programs of military and economic aid." Upon his return, Vice President Johnson appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and explained that no commitment had been made to send U.S. combat forces to South Vietnam.

Now, upon the return of Vice President HUMPHREY, I shall suggest to the committee that he be invited to appear before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We should know what commitments he has made—what public commitments have been made, what private commitments, if any, have been made, and the authority by which he made them.

I do not speak critically in this sense. I assume that whatever commitments he has made have been upon authorization of President Johnson. But in line with my deeply held feeling that the American people are entitled to know the facts regarding this all-important question of war or peace, Vice President HUMPHREY should appear promptly upon his return.

In October 1961, a visit by Gen. Maxwell Taylor resulted in a decision to bolster still further the military strength of Vietnam. In December 1961, in an exchange of letters with President Diem, President Kennedy pledged to "promptly increase our assistance to your defense efforts."

Please note, Mr. President, that this was an increase of our assistance to the defense efforts of the Vietnamese themselves.

Increased military and economic aid failed to halt the slippage. A "strategic hamlet" program for local pacification was very costly but ineffective. When I was in Vietnam, I visited some of these strategic villages. I came back and reported to my Government my assessment that this was a costly program that was doomed to failure. It failed miserably; but it cost heavily.

It became obvious that the Diem government did not enjoy the confidence of the Vietnamese people and that only the U.S. presence and support kept it in office at all. Religious controversy and riots brought crisis nearer and nearer. The conditions contained in President Eisenhower's letter of 1954 had clearly not been met. Reforms had not been accomplished.

President Kennedy was moved to comment on this aspect of the situation on a television interview of September 2, 1963. He stated:

> I don't think that unless a greater effort is made by the Government to win popular support that the war can be won out there. In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists. We are prepared to continue to assist them, but I don't think that the war can be won unless the people support the effort, and, in my opinion, in the last 2 months the Government has gotton out of touch with the people.

It should be noted that in this and a subsequent TV interview filmed on September 9, 1963, President Kennedy endorsed the so-called domino theory and made clear his view that we could not afford to withdraw from Vietnam, but he also made it clear that stability and order by the Vietnamese themselves were a prerequisite to victory.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to address a few remarks to the "domino theory."

I recall that when the Communist apparatus was being fastened upon Cuba, many statements were made on the floor of the Senate, on television and radio, in the press, and on the public platforms, to the effect that if Cuba fell under communism, one after another, the countries of Latin America might have the Iron Curtain folded about them. I entertained such concern myself, though I never made such statements. I wondered if it might follow. Many of us felt uncertain about it.

But what do we find now? The misery, the suffering and the want, the suppression which communism has brought to Cuba is building resistance to communism in other Latin American countries. The domino theory did not work.

The subsequent overthrow and assassination of Diem did not produce either reform or stability.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I should like to pursue a little further the Senator's analogy of the domino theory in Cuba, as he would draw an analogy to the domino theory in southeast Asia.

Mr. GORE. I am not sure that I was attempting to draw an analogy.

Mr. McGEE. The parallel; would that be better?

Mr. GORE. I am not sure that I even intended that. I had previously referred to the fact that former President Eisenhower had seemed to endorse the domino theory, and then I had referred to it again, and it came to my mind that there were instances in which the domino theory had not worked. Cuba came immediately to mind. I am not sure that it is an analogy, but I am willing to discuss it in that context.

Mr. McGEE. To begin with, the dominoes would become a little wet.

Starting with Cuba, we were able, with naval patrol and firmer economic policies on our own part, and the firming up of the backbones of some of our friends in the OAS, I think, to make it considerably more difficult for Mr. Castro to spread his doctrine. It was not a matter of merely abandoning the situation, leaving it alone, or letting the rest of the people do it themselves.

The reason I raise the point with the Senator from Tennessee is that there is a good bit of the same element present in Vietnam. If there is someone there who is in the position to take the lead, we shall find the same firming up of the willingness and the disposition not to knuckle under, not to surrender, not to roll over and play dead, under the pressures that may be coming in from the north.

Further, I think Cuba would be a better illustration of the importance of not letting this sort of disease, this falling of the first domino, knock over the rest of the elements on the board.

Mr. GORE. First, let it be understood, I believe it would be regrettable for the first domino to fall. I do not believe that communism in South Vietnam would be a disaster for the United States, but it would be most undesirable. So I join the Senator in opposition to the Communist apparatus fixing its grip on South Vietnam. But there again, as the Senator has said of the domino in Cuba, it might get a little wet tumbling to Indonesia or to the Philippines.

It seems to me that we become a little mesmerized with these terms, and that they may not always be applicable. That is perhaps one reason why I was reluctant to say I was drawing an analogy.

Mr. McGEE. I appreciate the Senator's point. If I may return to southeast Asia, however, and the domino theory, perhaps we need to think up a new name for it. "Domino theory" has become a dirty word, or an expression open to criticism. But whatever we may call it, small countries being forced to accommodate their positions and policies to an overwhelming giant near their borders, because their neighbors collapse, is what is about to happen in southeast Asia. If we want to call it the domino theory, let us deal with it as the domino theory, and then we can discuss the domino theory as applying to southeast Asia.

Mr. GORE. It might be equally, though perhaps inaccurately, described by another term with which so many people have become fascinated, namely "sphere of influence."

Mr. McGEE. I do not happen to buy the sphere of influence theory either, but I believe that there is much concern over abandoning this area because of the disproportionate capabilities in sheer power between the small independent countries in southeast Asia on the one hand and China alone on the other. It is quite unlike Cuba, in the Caribbean, where an overwhelming force still remains, that of the United States. The issue there is a comparable force which would not permit Russia, through Cuba, or China, through Cuba, to move very far on whatever theory we may wish to consider it.

But, in southeast Asia, there is no force commensurate with the great land mass potential of China. For that reason, I believe that we have to weigh the prospect that faces Cambodia, Thailand, Burma—and Indonesia. Indonesia becomes an interesting case in point, because it was a case of the Chinese Communists really overreaching many of their own dimensions too fast and too soon. We should go slow in dismissing the concept that the fall of one nation only delays momentarily the fall of the next, the next, and then the next in this part of the world. This has historically been the pattern of power politics in this area of southeast Asia.

Mr. GORE. I wonder whether the Senator from Wyoming would mind if I addressed some remarks to the Indonesian situation to which he made reference?

Mr. McGEE. No. I believe it would contribute to this dialog.

Mr. GORE. More or less parenthetically, I believe it is important to keep in mind that, as the Senator indicated, the upheaval in Indonesia may have been in consequence of the Communists overreaching themselves. That is, in my view, partly correct.

But, there was another factor. The United States continued aid to Indonesia under the most difficult and trying circumstances. One of the most difficult speeches I have been called upon to make was on the floor of the Senate in support of continuation of aid to Indonesia after Mr. Sukarno had publicly told the United States to take its aid and go to hell. But, I was advised, as other members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations were advised, that in the view of our Government, a confrontation between the local Communists in Indonesia—called, I believe, the PKI—and the military was inevitable, that although the military leaders were not particularly alined with the United States, they were anti-Communist and, therefore, it was in our national interest to maintain liaison through aid and otherwise.

Congress, fortunately, supported the administration in that policy. When the confrontation came, it came in an awkward way. The Senator has aptly described it as an overreaching by the Communists.

The Communists intended to assassinate all the military leaders. They did succeed in assassinating several, but they missed some. Out of this upheaval has come the emergence of the military leaders, many of whom received their education in the United States. They are not alined with the United States. They are, however, asserting an Indonesian independence and the kind of government suited to their own people and their purposes. But they are anti-Communist. What more can we ask? We ask no more. When I am asked, as I am frequently and critically, why I support and have supported foreign aid programs for Indonesia, I am pleased to cite this example, in which I believe our aid has been fully justified.

I hope the Senator will pardon me for this parenthetical reference to a matter to which he had alluded.

Mr. McGEE. Not at all. The fact is that I, too, stanchly supported all of our programs in Indonesia. We cannot afford to change our foreign policy because we are angry at some individual who is the head of a country. And our foreign policy must therefore be premised on that basis. He will not always be there. But the people will be. I believe there was some static raised on the floor of the Senate in respect to helping a country headed by someone like Sukarno, but I believe we see now that there is substantial evidence of making one policy and continuing that policy, and recognizing that heads of state are mortals, and will eventually pass on, but the people as a whole will still be there. I believe that Indonesia becomes another case in point in terms of our support for the kind of stance which will make it possible for the independence of Indonesia, of Vietnam, of Cambodia, of Malaysia, to take firm root.

Much as I am unhappy with the fact that there is a heavy military complexion in some of these countries, we cannot but wish to give them the opportunity to win their independence and develop along paths of their own choosing. That is what is at stake now. That is the reason why I cannot understand the misgivings which are being expressed on the floor of the Senate from time to time concerning America's position in Vietnam. Any casual glance at the vast subcontinent of Asia, it seems to me, tells its own story in history and is a contemporary fact of our time. We do not need to argue that some of the critics elsewhere and in the Senate do not read the history books. They need only to read the newspapers to see what has happened in our time.

Here we have a great land mass dominated overwhelmingly by one major power. I believe that the Senator from Tennessee shares this position because my first baptism in that part of the world was with him, and I sat at his feet, he was my professor in 1959 when we first visited India, Thailand, and Vietnam when Diem was still alive—but many of us have been hoping for many years that India would be the great "makewait" for China. Nehru, as he made it clear the day we visited him, was not of that mind, but a "squeegee" effect was beginning.

We thought that Japan might have checked China, or that Japan might have been a balancing force for China. But we have not trusted Japan. What are we confronted with now in the wake of these great, vast, deeply moving changes in the wake of World War II in the small countries such as Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, and those which stretch on out into the South Pacific? They really are at the mercy of an unbalanced, predominantly mainland Chinese continent. India is in no position, however, to move south, to try to maintain the balance, even though Nehru in his last years was beginning to talk in terms of India being like the United States in its earlier history, except as relates to aggression. Whether he should have reconstructed his thoughts in terms of some kind of balance of power in Asia, I do not follow the critics who say we have no business there, that we must get out of there, that we must have some kind of orderly withdrawal plan. What will happen to the little countries there? Does the Senator argue that they do not wish to be independent? Does the Senator argue that they would rather be under the wing of mainland China?

What is the case that can be made for pulling out of that part of the world, after we, as the victors in World War II—really the victors, Mr. President—were the only ones left, by the circumstances of a devastating war, with sufficient policing power, to try to put the pieces back together again?

France and England pulled out. The Dutch pulled out. Even the old forces that had existed there and had contributed to the stabilization of some of the elements out there, were gone. Only we were in a position to do something.

We tried to carry on with a stabilization of that line. We gave India our backing when she was put to a showdown in the crisis with China. The Chinese pulled back.

What is the article on which one can base the argument that if we were to pull out, everything will settle down, when in the face of all the evidence there has been a concerted move outward, to disturb the balance of Asia, if we may use that unfortunate expression?

Mr. GORE. The distinguished Senator has given a very able treatise on geopolitics in a vast portion of the world. He has referred to numerous situations in his eloquent statement.

He will recall the evening when he and I, in the company of our wives, were with Prime Minister Nehru in New Delhi. I wonder if he recalls that during the course of that evening, the able and great Prime Minister on three occasions made the remark: "When China is strong, China is aggressive." Does the Senator recall that statement by the Prime Minister?

Mr. McGEE. Yes; I recall it.

Mr. GORE. The emergence of China as a world power is one of the significant events of all time. The threat of China to world peace, to world stability, is felt in all quarters of the world. Indeed, I know of no nation more aware of it or which, in my opinion, is more apprehensive about it, than the Soviet Union herself. The acquisition of nuclear weapons by China is another event of monumental proportions. The degree to which the Communist apparatus is able to regiment the people is a factor in this equation. The degree to which they are able to engender hate of America in this surging mass of one-fourth of the world's humanity is something to which all thoughtful men must give apprehensive concern.

It seems to me that we must consider our obligations, our commitments, our performance, our actions, wherever the situs may be, in the context of our total global obligations, our responsibility as a world leader, and first, foremost and last, in the context of our own national security.

These must be interpreted in the light of our capacity, as well as the dangers, in the light of first priority, and degrees of priority.

I consider communism in Cuba most detestable and undesirable. But it has not been disastrous to the United States. I detest communism in its every concept. It is oppressive. It is stultifying. I oppose it wherever it shows itself, southeast Asia included.

But we must not permit our anticommunism to so blind us that we follow a policy that may bring eventual disaster for our country. It is easy to beat one's breast and say, "I am standing up to communism." This will bring applause. But how do we stand up to communism?

We found a successful procedure in collective security, NATO, the United Nations. Here we have in Vietnam an area of secondary importance. Please note, I did not say an area that is not important. All peoples are important. All countries are important, even Vietnam and Cuba. But certainly one could not, in my view, say that either Cuba or Vietnam's being out from behind the Iron Curtain, or behind it, effects a major shift in the balance of power.

During World War II, I was closely associated with one of the wisest men I have ever known, the late Bernard M. Baruch. I was author, as a young Member of Congress, of a bill to bring about wage and price controls early in that war. The late President Roosevelt was not ready to accept it. He was well aware that what I was advocating and what Mr. Baruch was advocating was paving the way for what was bound to come.

Anyway, near the end of the war, as the attacks upon Japan were reaching a crescendo, and victory, though months away, was already in sight, Mr. Baruch and I were having dinner together. He said to me, in a paternal sort of way, "Young man, after this war, which has been such a world of convulsion, there will be many upheavals in many parts of the world, in Asia, Latin America, and Africa. But keep your eye on Western Europe, because here, with her industrialization, with her traditions, her political influence and structure, lies the balance of power between the Communists and the free world."

I have remembered that admonition, and I relate it only to illustrate that as between Western Europe and Vietnam, there is a vast difference in priority of commitment, in essentiality and vitality, a difference in American interests.

I agree with Mr. Kennan, who said that Vietnam was a matter of national interest to us, but not a matter of vital national interest.

That is one part of my answer.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, would the Senator prefer to complete his statement?

Mr. GORE. Let me complete it.

Mr. McGEE. Very well.

Mr. GORE. I would treat Vietnam as a matter of importance, but of secondary importance, not as a matter of first priority.

The difficulty with our policy is that we have become mesmerized with it. We are tending to put all our eggs in this frail basket, thus endangering our commitments on a broader scale to other areas where our national interest is more vitally concerned.

An answer to all the questions which the Senator has posed would require a full afternoon of discussion. I would like to go a bit further, however, and then I shall yield again.

I have been deeply convinced from the beginning—and the records of the executive sessions of the Committee on Foreign Relations, if the Senator will read them, will so disclose—that the most important thing involved in southeast Asia was not Vietnam, north or south, or north and south, but rather it has been and is the equation between the three world powers, the United States, Russia, and China.

Shall we follow a course that is calculated to heal the breach which we have been developing between China and Russia, thus splitting the monolithic unity of the Communist world? That is a possible consequence of a war between the United States and China.

The able junior Senator from Mississippi has expressed the view that a war between the United States and China might involve nuclear weapons. I join him in that estimate because I doubt that public opinion in this country would permit her sons to be pitted man for man against the masses of China without giving to them every weapon in our arsenal. Once the nuclear weapon is used, the holocaust may have begun.

If the United States uses it first, for the second time the white man will have used nuclear weapons against the yellow race. This has portents for the future which none of us can foresee and the end of which no one could predict.

It is not certain that Russia would come to the aid of China in a war with a capitalist state. True, she has a firm treaty commitment to do so, but I do not know that we could rush to the conclusion that she would keep that treaty commitment. She might act otherwise should the United States become bogged down in an Asiatic war in this Asiatic morass.

The Soviets might rub their hands and look about themselves and start working their machinations in Latin America and in Africa. They might raise trouble in

Berlin again, or move into Manchuria. What would we do then committed to a war with one-fourth of the human race, halfway around the world, under circumstances most disadvantageous to ourselves logistically, politically, and militarily?

Hitler learned, or should have learned, that it was unwise to have a war on both his fronts.

I believe Russia has been looking over her left shoulder. Her apprehension of China may well increase her desire for rapprochement with the West. Indeed, the more China has emerged as a world power the more inclination Russia has shown to improve her relations with the West. Berlin has not been flaming with action for many months, but once we are bogged down it may be inflamed quickly.

So I conclude a partial answer to the question which the Senator has raised by saying that in my view these factors must be weighed. Vietnam must be viewed in perspective and considered in perspective not as the end and the center of the earth. It is neither. It is an area in which we have demonstrated already in a costly way our deep concern for people who wish to resist communism.

I do not believe that in order to demonstrate our sincerity in this regard we are required to leap over the precipice into an abyss that threatens a third world war and a possible nuclear holocaust.

I am sorry to have taken so long. I could have taken longer.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator need not apologize to the Senator from Wyoming for taking so long, because the Senator always approaches these questions on which we differ at such a high level that it contributes to the dialog and the better understanding of these questions.

I wish to attempt to respond in those areas where we have a basic difference on the remarks the Senator has just shared with us.

Mr. GORE. I welcome the exchange with the able Senator. I consider him to be one of the brightest lights that has come to the Senate for a long time. We are personal friends. I enjoy his contributions and welcome them.

Mr. McGEE. I thank my colleague from Tennessee for his very generous observations.

I should like to go back to two or three of the real essentials and discuss those hypotheses or fundamentals with him.

Mr. GORE. First, let me ask the Senator from Wyoming whether the type of discussion in which the Senate is engaged today is an aid to the enemy, or whether it serves the cause of democracy?

Mr. McGEE. I believe the honest answer is yes.

Mr. GORE. Which?

Mr. McGEE. Both. I believe that under our system of government and the kind of society we are trying to perpetuate, this is one of the calculated risks that we must take. We do not want to have a society of closed ideas, a society of one truth. That is one of the risks we must take. In that respect, it gives aid and comfort to the enemy.

Mr. GORE. We cannot abort our own democratic processes in order to keep certain information from our enemies.

Mr. McGEE. If we must give up a free society in order to be doing something else, what is the purpose of doing the something else?

Mr. GORE. Then we are agreed. Let us now turn to something else.

Mr. McGEE. I should like to proceed to something else. There are some essential issues which the Senator has raised, and it is those issues to which I should like to turn. They have to do with priorities.

The Senator reminds us that we should keep these things in perspective. I believe that if we put these things in historic perspective, the priorities become obvious.

It is as though someone had said in 1941, "Let us see what our priority is. Is it Hitler or is it Japan?" We would have had a debate then. We cannot do both, obviously. Many people were saying that.

Mr. President, we are living in a different world, in the wake of a war from which we emerged as one of two powers capable of shaping the form of new balances in the world in the wake of World War II.

Mr. GORE. Now there are three such powers.

Mr. McGEE. We are now discussing another fundamental hypothesis. We can no longer replan the world in Western Europe alone. There is an emerging concern from Eastern Asia, that would compete with Western Europe as an essential basic area of national interest and of the concern of the remainder of the world. What would be the use of rebalancing Western Europe, which the Senator from Tennessee and I agree we have done, notably and largely because of our presence there at the end of the war, and then losing it all through Eastern Asia? The world is round, and World War II did more to shrink the globe than anything else in our time. With the great scientific breakthroughs, and the like, we can no longer talk about Western Europe, about Versailles, or about the Congress of Vienna, and then believe we are pulling back into some kind of tenuous balance of the powers of the world, because we discovered in 1941 that what goes on in Asia as genuinely can jeopardize the security of the people of America, and, indeed, of the world, as what goes on along the Rhine River in Western Europe.

So it is no longer possible to pick and choose. It is no longer possible to say, "This is our first priority, this is our second priority." Unless and until the whole globe is brought back into some semblence of balance, we have no reason to hope for a constructive opportunity to contribute to a different world, to help to contribute to a world that would be a little better than the world that preceded World War II.

So I take issue with the Senator from Tennessee in terms of priorities. We have to take the world as it comes. We did it successfully in Europe; we did it successfully in Iran in 1946; in Turkey and Greece in 1947; in Italy in 1949; and there has been a difference.

We met the test in Korea; we are meeting the test now in Vietnam. I submit to the Senator that these tests are all cut from the same cloth. It is a many-colored cloth, but it has been put together in strange new ways, because the repetitions of history are not precise and accurate. Because it happened one way in Western Europe and happened in another in the East does not mean there is no reason why we cannot learn from the one and apply to the other. Likewise it is fundamental that in terms of monopoly of power in one place, what inhibits the right of independence of smaller neighbors is as irrevocable in Asia as it is in Europe.

The lessons we should have learned from Mr. Hitler are just as strong as the lessons we can now put into practice before the time becomes later.

The Senator from Tennessee talks about the prospect of a great nuclear war, an atomic war on the mainland of Asia. I do not know whether that will happen. God help us if it does. But I submit that if we follow the Senator's policy with respect to Vietnam, the necessity of resorting to some extreme of that sort may become more horrendous and probably more likely in the long run.

We said exactly the same things about the Soviet Union. The people who opposed our going into Berlin, the people who opposed our taking the great chance, who were afraid of what would happen if there were a blockade of Berlin, said that it would lead to a big war with Russia. Who knows? Only Moscow could answer that question. But somebody had to put the issue face up, because what happened in Berlin made a difference. As the great Winston Churchill once said, because of the American willingness to take a chance, even the chance of a big war related to Berlin, Russia is not on the Atlantic coast of Europe today.

I disagree with the Senator from Tennessee about Cuba. Cuba, with only Castro and whatever his little party has there, is no great make-weight on the balance of power in the world. But with Russia and her missiles in Cuba, the balance of power in the world was readjusted, and that was where we risked a showdown in 1962: We risked war with Russia. Who can say that we did not risk nuclear war with Russia? That depended on the decisions that were made in Moscow. But somewhere it was necessary to draw the line.

I submit that drawing the line falls upon our shoulders more than it does on the shoulders of anyone else, because we emerged from World War II with the capabilities of doing something about it.

Let me turn now to the priority of Vietnam, if I may——

Mr. GORE. Let me reply to the four points the Senator from Wyoming has made. Then we can come to the next one. If I do not reply now, I shall forget what the able Senator has said; I did not take down his remarks in shorthand.

Mr. McGEE. I have some basic differences with the Senator's very learned remarks. Following our interesting exchange, I had hoped I might go to his second priority.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator contain himself for a moment until we deal with the first one?

Mr. McGEE. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor; he has done me the courtesy of yielding.

Mr. GORE. I am delighted to do so, but the colloquy might be more meaningful to those who may read it, and I shall be better able, I think, to engage in it, if I deal with the points as they are made.

The able Senator has said a good many things. For one, he said that we must draw the line somewhere. He said we must determine where that is. But then, it seemed to me, he met himself coming back when he said it is no longer possible for us to pick and choose where to stand.

Mr. McGEE. As between Europe and Asia.

Mr. GORE. The Senator did not say that.

Mr. McGEE. Let me interpolate that now. That was obvious from the context.

Mr. GORE. To quote the Senator further, he said, "we must take them where they come." There, indeed, is a fundamental difference in our points of view. I believe we must pick and choose. We must put things in perspective.

The Senator from Wyoming says that there are no degrees of priority; that "we must take them where they come."

Mr. McGEE. If the Senator from Tennessee will yield, the Senator from Wyoming did not say any such thing as that. He said as between Western Europe, which was the area about which the Senator was speaking, and the Soviet Union, and the Far East, where we are talking about Vietnam. The Senator from Wyoming said we cannot pick and choose; they are cut from the same cloth. I was not talking about the whole globe. I am talking about the centers of power, where the real clash of power emerges, where the confrontation needs to be met. That is far different from saying there are no priorities.

Mr. GORE. What did the Senator from Wyoming mean when he said, "It is no longer possible to pick and choose; we must take them where they come"?

Mr. McGEE. That we cannot settle our differences in Western Europe. We must recognize that the world is round, and that the great forces of potential power that both the Senator from Tennessee and I have been discussing are no longer concentrated along the Rhine or at the Congress of Vienna; they happen to have moved into Eastern Asia, as well. It is no longer Moscow and the United States. Peiping has come into the picture. Many of us had hoped that India would have checked Peiping. We had hoped that Japan might do so, too, but Japan appears not to be willing. We cannot separate the restoration of the remainder of Asia from the rest of Western Europe. It is no longer "either, or," as it was not even in 1941.

Mr. GORE. I am glad to have the Senator's explanation. That was not exactly what I understood him to say.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator has to know what I mean rather than what I say; I am not so articulate as he is.

Mr. GORE. I am always glad to know what the Senator from Wyoming means, because he means well. The difference between us emerges rather clearly. Not only Vietnam, but all areas in which we are interested, as well, must be viewed in their relationship to our own vital national interest. They must be viewed in relationship to our global responsibilities. If, indeed, we have lost the capacity to pick and choose; if, indeed, we are stripped of the power of discretion, of the option to put things in perspective, and if we consider every area as all-important to our national interest, then, indeed, we are the victim of events; we are no longer the masters of our fate.

If this be true, we have become prisoners of an anti-Communist dogma and the initiative rests in the hands of our enemy who can bring us to a battlefield not of our choosing, but of his choosing. Indeed, in this context, if we are in this sad plight, it might well be that some of our military men are correct in their analysis that Vietnam is a baited trap. I have not been so convinced. I had thought it had a degree of "happenstance" about it. But, if indeed the situation is as bad as the Senator describes it, I shall have to think about it again.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I did not allude to it as a baited trap.

Mr. GORE. The Senator draws an analogy between our enemies in World War II, Germany and Japan, and our adversaries in this Vietnam war. There is a vast difference.

The United States was attacked at Pearl Harbor. This attack was described by the late President Roosevelt as a day of infamy. To a man, to a woman, to a child, with one voice, with one accord, we arose. We had a cause for which practically all men were ready and willing to fight. That is not true in this situation.

The United States is involved, and it has become involved step by step. We have inched into this Asiatic morass through three administrations. Three Presidents have assured the American people that combat forces would not be sent to Vietnam. Upon many occasions it was said that the steps being taken were not to be followed by subsequent events which some of us foresaw.

The war did not begin with an attack upon the United States which would have given the American people a clear cause for which to fight and for which they would be willing to send their sons overseas. Even the enemy is not clearly identifiable. Although we speak of bringing Hanoi to the peace table and we identify North Vietnam as the adversary—and I believe that they are the directing genius of the guerrilla war—yet a majority of the forces that have been plotting terror and brutality, with which forces we are presently fighting in South Vietnam, are South Vietnamese.

I am not prepared to dismiss this as a civil war, as an indigenous revolution. I think those elements are present. Unquestionably there is religious strife. There is ancient racial animosity between the Montagnards and the Vietnamese. The Senator and I visited together Montagnard villages. We sipped some bitter liquid through straws from a deep wine keg in a native village.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, let the RECORD show that it was liquid rice.

Mr. GORE. Religious animosities exist there. France never permitted the country to become a nation. It pitted prince against prince, duke against duke, and divided in order to exploit. There is little doubt as to just who the enemy really is.

We heard it said on the floor of the Senate today that the real enemy is the Chinese. Is it the Chinese, the North Vietnamese, or the Vietcong? Perhaps it is all three.

In any event, the situation is fraught with confusion. It is military, but it is equally political, economic, social, religious, racial, and anticolonialism.

We have the legacy of 100 years of French exploitation with which we must cope. I do not believe that the analogy between Germany and Japan as the enemy in World War II and the confusion which exists in Vietnam is an accurate one. It is contrast rather than comparison.

The Senator draws another analogy with which I disagree. He draws an analogy between South Vietnam on the one hand and Russian missiles in Cuba and the Communist conquest of Berlin on the other. I completely disagree with that.

In Berlin and in the 1962 Cuban crisis, priorities were clear. Yet the Senator says we cannot draw priorities, that we must take them as they come, that no longer can we pick and choose.

Mr. President, in Cuba the Russians were attempting atomic blackmail. They were attempting to seize and reverse the balance of power.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, if they had succeeded in Cuba, would they have upset the balance of power?

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct. Had they succeeded in placing numerous missiles with atomic warheads in Cuba, they would have achieved a great victory. They would have altered the military situation in the world.

I am not prepared to say that that would have shifted the balance of power, but we would have been under the gun.

Mr. McGEE. Then the Senator agrees with me. That is what I just got through saying.

Mr. GORE. We would have been under the gun, the trigger cocked, with a pistol at our temple, so to speak. This would surely have seriously altered the situation. Indeed, although I am not prepared to assert this, it was stated to the Committee on Foreign Relations in executive session that if the Russians should succeed in Cuba, it would shift the balance of power.

Now, with respect to Berlin, Germany is the strongest industrial and military force in Western Europe. The seizure of Berlin by the Communists would have seriously altered the military situation and the balance of forces, political, economic, and military, in Europe. It would have extinguished the ambition of all Germans, East or West, for ultimate reunification of their country.

It would have placed the largest city in central Europe under Communist domination.

Mr. President, much as I regret to disagree with the able Senator, to consider Vietnam, on one hand, as having the same priority and importance to the United States as Russian atomic missiles in Cuba or Russian seizure of Berlin, is totally in error.

Now, to come to the fourth and last point—and then I shall yield again—the Senator treats Vietnam as one of the——

Mr. McGEE. Critical areas of the world.

Mr. GORE. Critical areas, where the Communists attempt to make a gain; is that correct?

Mr. McGEE. Correct.

Mr. GORE. But he says we must treat them all alike; they all have the same priority.

I think the point is important. I wish to resist this conclusion. I think a Ho Chi Minh government of South Vietnam would be most undesirable; but I do not think that possible eventuality should be considered as a matter of top priority concern to the vital interests of the United States. I simply do not think it holds that relative importance to us.

Now I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I thank my fellow Senator for yielding again.

I address myself, first of all, to the relative roles of Japan, the Pacific, and Western Europe in our stake in Asia and Europe simultaneously, rather than to the convenience of selecting priorities as between the two.

Of course, the attack of Japan on Pearl Harbor galvanized us all. Of course, we were united. Because we had not been willing to learn in Manchuria in 1931 the lesson I trust we learned then, we paid with a gigantic war in the Pacific.

That is the reason why we would like to avoid that kind of exigency, that kind of confrontation again. That is the whole point. The Senator could not have more eloquently made the point I wish to get across: that we cannot afford to wait another time, because of nuclear capabilities, for war tension to get as far along as it had when the Japanese struck Pearl Harbor, or when Germany attacked Poland.

I trust we have learned our lessons. For the language that is universal, both in Berlin and in Tokyo, both in London and in Washington, in Saigon, in Jakarta, in Canberra, is the lesson that we should have learned by now about when to stop an aggressor.

If we had only learned that lesson, or been willing to act upon it, in 1931 in Manchuria, in 1935 in the Rhineland, in 1936 in Ethiopia, who knows what the prospects might have been for a different kind of confrontation of the aggressors? It would have been in different dimensional form than we have known since in history. We cannot say with certainty, because we do not have that kind of omniscience, but we do know what the price was for doing it the way we did it before, trying to appease a dictator, whetting his appetite by giving him somebody else's real estate. It does not work.

So I would answer the Senator, who says that there is no necessary priority connection between the Pacific and Western Europe, in response to my assertion that there is, that there is indeed; they are cut from the same cloth, they are swept by the same threat, and they are put out of balance by the same disproportionate forces that characterized the imbalance of Europe at the end of World War II.

What has happened in Asia is as much our doing or undoing as it is the next fellow's. We fought a war in Asia, simultaneously with the war it was said we could not fight in Western Europe. Many sober voices warned us against a two-front war. But in spite of the unfortunate experience of Mr. Hitler on that score, both with Russia and Western Europe, we did rather well. We discovered what we had to do, and with the great resources God has blessed us with, and the leadership we were able to command, we succeeded.

But I say to my friend from Tennessee that we are going to have to do it over the old way if we do not watch out, and that the time to stop aggression is at the beginning. I call to his mind a bit of warning and finger-wagging Lord Palmerston did 100 years ago in the British Parliament. He was speaking of the Russians—they were not Communists then, but they had great power. He said that anyone can predict the policy of an expansionist state if he reads a history book. He said that what they seek to do is press outward along their periphery; and wherever they are not stopped, they will break through and take another piece of geography, but whenever they are stopped, they go elsewhere to seek softness.

The parallel Palmerston referred to 100 years ago obtains at the present time, whether one applies it to Moscow or Peiping. The willingness to risk the use of force, or in certain instances to actually command that force, makes the difference.

Those on the other side have gambled all along that we were inhibited about using force—that somehow the Americans, because we had a different standard, and because one human life makes a difference to us—would be very reluctant to resort to the use of force.

Hitler knew our minds better than did some of the American people themselves, and he gambled. He was not a great power, as we know them today. England, France, the United States and Russia were all more powerful than Hitler on paper. But Hitler was willing to risk his power, and he capitalized on the inhibitions of the "have" nations not to risk what they had. That is how he got by with literal murder for as long as he did, until it took the holocaust of a gigantic World War II to bring him down.

That is exactly the reason for the petition I would submit to the Senate today. I say that we have a lesson to learn, and that lesson, which was written in Europe, is equally applicable in Asia.

Look at the prize at stake in Asia. Look at the prize, I say to my friend from Tennessee. Southeast Asia: 300 million people, and more. Most of the rice of the world. Oil, tin, bauxite and rubber. These would be sparkling diamonds in the resources of great powers, and particularly of a power that is only now beginning to expand its quest for new industrial capabilities.

This is an area that historically has been a great power factor. It was one of the prizes on the scales of the old-fashioned balances of the 19th century. This is one of the strategic waterways of the earth. The trade from East to West primarily goes this way, across southeast Asia.

Likewise, the area itself flanks the mainland. Here India is outflanked to the East. It thrusts, almost as a dagger, directly toward the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand. This is indeed a prize to covet.

If we tend to think otherwise, I believe it would serve us well to go back and read our history again. Japan did not attack Pearl Harbor, in order to get Hawaii. Japan started World War II in order to obtain a great empire in southeast Asia. The Japanese had read the history books. They were cognizant of the sources of great power. And I say that it behooves us, in our national self-interest, to see that we do not permit, through our own folly or indifference, this area to fall into the hands of a great power that can use it in a hostile way. That would only raise the cost of redressing the balance.

Finally, let me say to my friend that there is another great issue at stake here that was in truth at stake in Berlin. If I may draw the parallel——

Mr. GORE. Let me respond to some of the Senator's points before he makes others.

Mr. McGEE. If I am speaking to several points, only because I am attempting to answer the many points the Senator from Tennessee raised.

Mr. GORE. Very well; I yield further.

Mr. McGEE. Each time I respond to half of the Senator's points, he injects another dozen, and I am having difficulty keeping up. So I would appreciate it if I could finish the context of his suggestions just made.

The question of the uncertainties of the people in southeast Asia, it seems to me, is a very large question. In Western Europe, at the time of the Berlin crisis, we were friends of the English, the French, and many others. They knew what we stood for. But they were not sure that the great power that we were left with at the end of the war would be used to try to protect a balance in Europe. They, too, read a history book.

At the end of the first great war, we went home, and Europe was taken over by the dictators. It was forfeited. The English, the French, the Dutch, the Belgians, and the rest of them had to have the answer to that big question: Would the Americans, this time, stay as they had promised when they went to war? They did not know for sure. Would they accommodate with the Russians? Or could they afford to remain outside of this orbit, and remain free?

It took Berlin to answer that, incidentally, to resolve that question in the mind, well as they knew us. What it represented was more the breaking of the blockade. It represented the American will to risk a war in behalf of freedom and an opportunity for a better kind of peace, if that were to be our lot in our time. That is the great questionmark which hangs today over some of the small nations in southeast Asia. Of course they are different from us. They are different because their institutions are sometimes in opposition to our own. But the one thing that they have, that we have, the one thing they can talk about that we can talk about in the same language is the dignity of independence; namely their national identity. It is that identity which makes the difference.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I must interrupt the Senator there. Despite the statement of the able Senator from Wyoming, the Vietnamese people do not have, never have had, and never have known the dignity of individualism, the freedom, the sense of independence which the American people have. They have never even been a nation. They have never been independent. I do not know how the Senator arrives at that conclusion.

Mr. McGEE. May I respond to that?

Mr. GORE. Certainly.

Mr. McGEE. One of the great prizes we won in Asia for the American role there during the war was the prize of winning the complete disintegration of the old colonial empires. They had been there too long.

Mr. GORE. But they had been there 100 years.

Mr. McGEE. After the colonial empires pulled out, those people were sparked by the new and often underestimated drive for national independence, for their own identity as areas, even though those areas sometimes resulted in awkward geographic configurations imposed by colonial powers, and even though it did not always represent a basic ethnic nationalism.

The point remains, typical of most of Asia, as well as Africa and Latin America: The explosion of the nearly independent countries in a drive to further their own independence again. This is true of southeast Asia. It is that spirit of historic craving for independence to which I am referring when I draw that analogy. All I am saying is that these countries need to know where we stand. Are they going to have to live beneath the shadow of the great giant to the north, not knowing from one day to the next what the future of their own independence may be? Are they going to have to accommodate themselves in some way, economically and politically—as we have seen through the National Liberation Front movement—to the regimes in the North? They do not know. It makes a difference to them, because they would like very much to survive some way. They need to know whether it will be a shield or a wall behind which, as was the case in Western Europe, they would have a reasonable opportunity to struggle, in some tortuous way, up the scale of economic, social, and political growth.

God knows, they have a long way to go. That is another reason, it seems to me, why this question mark hangs over us, the same kind of question mark that poses the same fundamental question which was posed in a far more mature way, and in a far more elevated scale of living, in the politics of Western Europe, but it is, nonetheless, the kind of spirit that causes their hearts to beat a little faster. I am sure that they are as proud of their nationalism as we are of ours. That is why we are there. That is why we have to take over and be there. That is why we have to follow through this responsibility as well.

Let me say in conclusion to my friend the Senator from Tennessee, in response to the particular issue which has been raised—

Mr. GORE. I must interrupt the Senator. I do not believe that is the reason we are there at all. We are not in Vietnam because of the nationalism of the Vietnamese people.

Mr. McGEE. There the Senator goes again, lifting my words out of context.

Mr. GORE. The Senator just stated—

Mr. McGEE. I have been speaking for a great many minutes with the Senator. I have stressed the balance of power in southeast Asia. I have stressed the lessons learned in fighting aggression. I have stressed the element of the nationalistic ambitions of the people. Therefore, if the Senator would be willing to keep what I have said in its total context when he refers to my explanation of independence and our presence in South Vietnam, it would be appreciated.

Mr. GORE. I shall be happy to deal with the total context of the able Senator's very eloquent interjection. It is true that there are lessons to learn from history. It is true that we can draw some wisdom from the events of the past; but I, as a limited historian, have not noticed history repeating itself very often. It is much less likely to do so in the nuclear age. Never before have we had the balance of power, the means of communication, and the power of almost total destruction in the hands of a few powers as it exists today.

Mr. McGEE. Did the Senator say "never before"?

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator kindly let me proceed, please?

Mr. McGEE. Of course.

Mr. GORE. The Senator very ably cites many incidents of the past and many tragic historic occurrences. Then he makes what I believe is a grievous error in drawing an analogy between every one of those occurrences and Vietnam.

They are simply not analogies. True, we have made errors. True, we have succeeded in containing communism in the Mediterranean basin to some extent, although we have not exterminated it. The largest political party in Italy is still the Communist Party.

Once again, I suggest, that is a situation which is not analogous. But, to hasten on to my address, and to make summary comment, the Senator has again referred to Berlin and to Russian nuclear missiles on Cuba.

As one Senator, I was fully prepared to accept the risk of a third world war—a nuclear war—when the Russians attempted to put their atomic missiles in Cuba. This was a risk which I thought we should take. It happened that I was a delegate to the United Nations at the time. There, I saw the secret communication between President Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev. Never in all my life have I been so proud of an American President as I was during that dramatic episode. I shall not undertake to quote the communication except to say in essence that the President told Mr. Khrushchev that the missiles must be removed from Cuba and quickly, that if he did not take them off, we would.

This was a risk which we had to take because the stakes were high. The vital interests of America were at stake. I am not sure that the balance of power in the world was not also at stake.

At least, our freedom of action would clearly have been compromised had we allowed Russian missiles to remain in Cuba.

I was prepared, in my own mind, to support the risk of war over Berlin, because there, too, I thought the balance of power was at stake. But I am not willing to go over the brink of the abyss toward a third world war over Vietnam.

Let me repeat, it is important, but it does not, in my opinion, involve our vital interests. Communism there would be disagreeable and undesirable, but surely no more disastrous to the United States in Vietnam than it is in Cuba.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator does not really believe that, does he?

Mr. GORE. Indeed I do. I do not know why the Senator asked the question in that way.

Mr. McGEE. Will the Senator yield—

Mr. GORE. Not for the moment. Indeed, I believe it. I have been trying for the last hour to convince the Senator of the error of his way when he undertakes to draw an analogy, to establish a comparable priority, between Vietnam and Western Europe, between anything and everything in the world. He says, we can no longer pick and choose; we have to take them where they are.

Mr. McGEE. Between Western Europe and Asia. The Senator is running a little loose on this analogy. It is between Western Europe and Asia.

Mr. GORE. If I am running a little loose it is only because I am quoting the Senator.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator withdrew a statement earlier. I assume he wants to withdraw this.

Mr. GORE. No, I do not withdraw it. The Senator has made a second explanation, but he has arrived at the same conclusion he previously stated.

If I may, I would like to get back to the historical development of our escalation—

Mr. McGEE. Is the Senator terminating the colloquy? I asked him to yield a moment ago.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator wishes me to yield, I do so.

Mr. McGEE. I understood the Senator was responding to my comments that I have been making for an hour or so.

Mr. GORE. I am happy to yield further, as much as the Senator desires.

Mr. McGEE. May I say that my friend and I disagree over——

Mr. GORE. We have disagreed. Let us go to another point.

Mr. McGEE. My friend and I disagree. The central point is whether Vietnam by right is of such importance as for us to assume whatever risk may be involved in our presence there. These are risks we cannot foresee. We have to make educated guesses. I said this risk is of a high priority, in the national interest and that of the world, because I feel that what we do or fail to do in southeast Asia can well write the real future of eastern Asia in terms of the various potentials of power that are loose in that area. Therefore, our fundamental disagreement rests, if I understand the Senator correctly, upon the issue that Vietnam is only another small country, in which there may or may not be communism. If we leave the word "communism" out of the debate, we can see the issue a little more clearly. I think it is a matter of aggression. It is a matter of power that jeopardizes the balance in this critical area, where the power calculations, by offsetting the balances, bring about stability.

It is awful to talk about "balance of power." I know that. But balance of power is still the only substitute which man, in all his foolishness, has been able to find for war. That is a sorry commentary on the human race.

Mr. GORE. And does the Senator say that Communist control of Vietnam would bring about a shift of that balance of power?

Mr. McGEE. I suggest that, in the same hour to which the Senator has alluded, I have been trying to make that point.

Mr. GORE. The Senator thinks that is so?

Mr. McGEE. I do. I believe the balance of power in Asia depends on our presence there.

Mr. GORE. The Senator mentioned the numerous minerals in that area. Can the Senator name one strategic product in South Vietnam?

Mr. McGEE. I think rice itself would be a considerable inducement——

Mr. GORE. That is the first time I have heard rice described as a strategic material. I thought it was a bit starchy.

Mr. McGEE. People have happened to become a basic, indispensable resource in the modern sinews of power. Rice happens to be a part of what is necessary for those people to survive.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator name me a strategic mineral exported from South Vietnam?

Mr. McGEE. I think that is irrelevant. The Senator, with his skillful debating, is getting by the point.

Mr. GORE. No; I am trying to get the Senator on the point.

Mr. McGEE. Vietnam lies astride a vast area——

Mr. GORE. The Senator is talking about strategic materials. That is a geographic point.

Mr. McGEE. It is astride a vast area of 300 million people, and rice is necessary to them. There are bauxite, tin, rubber, oil——

Mr. GORE. The point I am trying to make is that, with respect to Vietnam, there is nothing but confusion.

Mr. McGEE. Vietnam is a symbol.

Mr. GORE. Now the Senator talks about a symbol.

Mr. McGEE. It is a symbol of the whole area, and that is at stake just as much as Manchuria, even with its remoteness, was deemed to be unrelated to the rise of Japan.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is drawing an analogy.

Mr. McGEE. Whenever the Senator finds an uncomfortable analogy, he downgrades the analogy. We can learn from the pages of the history books. Let us not do it this time. The only way not to do it is on the side of not ignoring aggression in the hope that no more will take place.

Mr. GORE. I do not find the analogy uncomfortable. I find it abstruse.

Mr. McGEE. The pattern worldwide, it seems to me, is whether we should seek to confront aggression, which had something to do with the beginning of World War II, and has something to do with the aftermath following that same conflict; that we would be mistaken in trying to confine our analysis to a single incident; and that the tactics and strategy are the same. Even though the strategy may remain the same, the tactics may differ. The fact is that the tactics of Russia in Iran were not the same tactics she took in Greece, in Turkey, or in Berlin or Korea.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is now generalizing.

Mr. McGEE. I am trying to put it in perspective, as the Senator has suggested.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has said that Vietnam would affect the balance of power. He has talked about the rich strategic minerals and products and the people of Vietnam. I have asked him to name one of those strategic materials. He has named rice.

Mr. McGEE. I wish the Senator would not——

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] feel the need of more rice?

Mr. McGEE. The Senator reduces the power concept to a ridiculous concept. He knows what the sinews of power are.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In Arkansas we are great producers of rice. A 10-percent increase in acreage has just been announced. Vietnam ought to be producing its own rice. Formerly it did.

Will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Unfortunately, I did not hear the analogies which the Senator from Wyoming mentioned. Who is the aggressor? Did the Senator indicate who he thought was the aggressor in South Vietnam?

Mr. GORE. I would rather yield to the Senator from Wyoming on that point.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the question?

Mr. McGEE. As I understand, the question is whether we had attempted to name the aggressor.

Mr. GORE. Whether the Senator from Wyoming had named the aggressor?

Mr. McGEE. I believe the record is rather replete with evidence that the aggressor that we are concerned about at this particular point is the aggression across the 17th parallel from the north, through the National Liberation Front, and through regular units which have come down.

Mr. GORE. Is that a sufficient answer for the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought that part of the discussion indicated that it was China which was the aggressor. I was not clear who the Senator thought was the aggressor.

Mr. McGEE. We were discussing China as being a major source of power.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator from Arkansas claim that the United States is the aggressor?

Mr. GORE. I yielded to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not hear the beginning of the colloquy with the Senator from Wyoming. He was drawing an analogy of various other places.

Can the Senator remember when the United States ever before stepped into the shoes of a former colonial power, as we have done in South Vietnam, in which we support a colonial power in trying to retain its power, as we did in the case of France?

Is it not true that in nearly every case that I can think of our sympathies and support have been on the side of the colony seeking freedom from the colonial master?

Mr. GORE. The statement of the Senator is certainly true, and this is consistent with our national origin.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GORE. We came into being through a revolution, through insurgency. This country has sympathetically responded to moves of independence and I do not now recall any other instance——

Mr. President, may I ask for order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. GORE. I do not recall any other instance in history when the United States has gone to the aid of a country to retain its colonial empire.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is the only one that I know of.

Mr. GORE. And we went heavily. I believe the cost was about $2 billion. The Vietnamese people did not wish France to continue her exploitation. They resisted. They fought victoriously at Dienbienphu. They fought viciously and won. We made the very great and grave mistake of undertaking this burden after the French, after fighting 7 years with an army of up to 400,000 men, with our almost unlimited aid, had failed.

I cite that as an answer to the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is what I thought. This situation is not comparable, it seems to me, to Berlin or hardly any other case that has been mentioned in the course of the colloquy in the recent exchange. There are many differences in this case from many of the other analogies referred to.

Most important is that Vietnam was seeking to recover her independence, which was taken from her by force in 1784 or 1785. Normally, in our traditional way, we would have favored that.

Instead of that, in this case, for reasons unrelated to Vietnam, we took the side of the French and did our best to retain their colonial control. This has led to many unfortunate results. I thought that should be clear for the record.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GORE. No; I do not now yield. I wish first to respond to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I know of no valid analogy that can be drawn between the predicament in Vietnam and any other instance in which we have been engaged. It is quite unique.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I feel that way. There are no similar analogies anywhere in the world.

Mr. GORE. The question on which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and I have been engaged in extended debate turns on this point.

The able Senator equates Vietnam with World War II, with Munich, with missiles in Cuba, with Berlin, and with just about every instance that he has thus far recalled in history. I do not believe they are on all fours.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe they are relevant.

Mr. GORE. There may be a certain relevancy, but in my view they are certainly not analogous.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator if I understood him to say that Vietnam, per se—and leaving for later discussion the influence of China—is not vital to the security of the United States.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator agree with me that Vietnam does not constitute the balance of power between the major powers of the world?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do agree with the Senator. It is a weak and poor country, with no industrialization to speak of. It formerly had almost a large surplus of rice. It is now importing rice due to the destruction as a result of this war. For the foreseeable future it is a very poor country that will need a great deal of assistance for its problems.

Will the Senator not agree that apparently behind the concern about Vietnam is really a concern about China in the minds of those who exaggerate, in my view, or emphasize the significance of Vietnam?

Mr. GORE. I believe in all fairness and candor that I should say that this is behind my concern also, but from a different point of view.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is from mine, too.

This is a matter one must consider; and we in the Senate should try to understand what is the significance of China, what role she has played in the past, and what she may be playing in the present.

I do not believe that it is at all clear at the moment.

Mr. GORE. I agree.

I wish now to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations for having taken the initiative to promote a better examination of the issues herein involved.

I was in my home State over the weekend, and I heard many expressions of appreciation for the committee hearings. People considered them enlightening and educational. "For the first time," they said, "we begin to understand the issues involved."

Mr. President, this is a democracy. We can follow the course of wisdom only to the extent that our people are enlightened and informed. It is only from information and enlightenment that a wise decision can be reached.

I thank the chairman.

Expressions have been made here to the effect that we are aiding communism by holding these hearings, or by engaging in the kind of debate that has been held on the floor of the Senate today.

I reject that argument. I believe that our democratic processes must operate. We lose the most precious element we have if we forgo that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. First, I wish to express my appreciation for what the Senator has said about the hearings. I understand that earlier today, before we had completed our hearings on the Asia Bank, there were some rather harsh words said about the hearings. I appreciate the Senator's comments. He has played a very important role in the hearings.

Speaking for myself, I agree that the hearings are most essential. I apologize to the Senate, and I regret that I did not initiate them and that the committee did not initiate them long ago. I can only say that I did not realize earlier how serious this commitment in southeast Asia was.

At the time of the 1964 resolution I really had no realization of what we were about to get into, or how it was about to escalate, or certainly I would have held hearings then. I regret that we did not do this earlier. However, it is better to have the hearings now than not at all.

If the Senator and his committee colleagues are agreeable, I hope we shall be able to continue to have some hearings for the education and enlightenment of the people of this country and of the Senate.

Mr. McGEE. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee recalls my earlier comments on that point.

Mr. GORE. I am pleased to say that the senior Senator from Wyoming said that although the Communists are our enemies, and might draw some encouragement and some glee from the debate, nevertheless, on balance, in his view, the debate is an essential part of the working of our democratic process. The able Senator from Wyoming and I have had some difficulty agreeing on numerous points, but we agreed on that one.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, following a very knowledgeable, although I fear too lengthy colloquy with my colleagues, I shall return to the history of our involvement in Vietnam. I shall resume with the assassination of President Diem. I had said that the subsequent overthrow and assassination of Diem did not produce either reform or stability.

Since 1963, a succession of governments, some military and some civilian, have operated one step removed from utter chaos. The pace of deterioration became more rapid. As our aid was further increased and our military advisers became more numerous, the Vietcong increased its control over the countryside both in terms of geography and people. But we continued to maintain the fiction that our role was that of providing assistance to the sovereign Government of South Vietnam in its struggle for freedom. On June 2, 1964, President Johnson, referring to the October 1954 letter from President Eisenhower, stated:

> We will keep this commitment. In the case of Vietnam, our commitment today is just the same as the commitment made by President Eisenhower to President Diem in 1954—a commitment to help these people help themselves.

Events took a significant turn on August 2 and 4 of 1964, when North Vietnamese gunboats attacked U.S. Navy ships in international waters in the Gulf of Tonkin. President Johnson ordered immediate retaliatory action against gunboat bases in North Vietnam. His action was strongly supported by the overwhelmingly majority of Congress and the American people. This included the senior Senator from Tennessee. As I recall, the President described the retaliatory action as a limited response to the attack on our ships on the high seas. Shortly thereafter, at the President's request, the Congress overwhelmingly passed a resolution supporting the determination of the President to take "all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression." The resolution has been interpreted by some as giving the President carte blanche authority to wage undeclared war.

I shall not enter into a discussion of this issue except to say that I did not so regard it. But raising legalistic questions will not solve our current problems. We must deal with the situation as it exists, whatever may be the theoretical legal arguments about how it was created. It has been suggested that Congress can rescind that action. But of what benefit would that be? What has been done cannot be repealed. We must start from where we are.

Since August of 1964 we have witnessed steady escalation of the scope of

U.S. participation in the conflict. Our military forces on the scene have been drastically increased in numbers and are now committed to combat. Beginning a year ago, planes have carried the war to North Vietnam with bombing raids almost on an around-the-clock basis. We have engaged in saturation bombing of the jungles with our B-52 bombers. All of this has been done without visible measurable progress in bringing the situation under control.

The flow of supplies and recruits from the North has continued, but the strength and manpower of the Vietcong is still predominantly indigenous to South Vietnam.

If I correctly understand the situation, the brutalities, the atrocities, and the horrible bestiality that are practiced upon the people in the villages of Vietnam are committed by the South Vietnamese Vietcong adherents.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a statement on that point?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I reject vigorously and vehemently the statement that the South Vietnamese are the perpetrators of torture and bestiality. The truth is that the Communists and the North Vietnamese are the ones that are perpetrating it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee permit me to comment on that statement?

Mr. GORE. In just a moment. I am willing to have the Senator from Ohio make his statement, but I do not believe that the facts support his statement. The overwhelming preponderance of the forces of the Vietcong and the Communist forces that have been in South Vietnam are indigenous to South Vietnam. It is true that many of them have been trained in North Vietnam; that they are supplied by the North Vietnamese; and that to a large extent they are directed by the Communist Party and officials in Hanoi. But the fact is that perhaps as much as 80 percent of the forces that we face there as enemies are South Vietnamese Communists or Vietcong forces that are augmented, supplied, directed, or abetted by the North Vietnamese. I believe that the testimony before our committee clearly supports this statement.

If the Senator from Ohio draws a distinction between the South Vietnamese, on the one hand, and Communists on the other, there might be a basis for his statement. But, as I understand, the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong fight side by side and perpetrate horrible crimes together. But it has been my impression that the Vietcong constituted the vast majority of those forces and therefore perpetrated the greater majority of the wrongs.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With that modification, there is some good reason for the Senator from Tennessee to make his statement.

Mr. GORE. In other words, we perhaps misunderstood each other.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The implication contained in the original statement was that the Communists are free from guilt of torture and atrocities, and that all the blame lies with the anti-Communists.

Mr. GORE. I am sorry that the Senator from Ohio so interpreted my statement; I surely did not so mean it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The records are replete with statements that the Communists have practiced the most violent atrocities imaginable.

Mr. GORE. I agree.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The lives of the chiefs, the mayors, and the other friends of the West have a duration of about 4 months. Within 4 months, their heads are removed from their bodies and are placed on pikes for the observation of the innocent South Vietnamese citizens.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator. Many of the victims have been the innocent teachers of little children. If the inference first drawn by the Senator from Ohio could be read from my statement, I wish it made explicit that I did not so intend.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I point out that very obviously there have been atrocities on both sides. This is the kind of war that produces atrocities.

I am fully aware of the consistent atrocities practiced by the Vietcong. As the Senator points out, there have been executions—murders—of village leaders, teachers, and others. There have been atrocities by both parties in the civil war. These people are not fighting under the kind of Marquis de Queensbury rules which we should like to see applied. One atrocity breeds another.

While the atrocity of planting bombs in buses and restaurants is horrible, I think there is not a vast distinction to be drawn between dropping bombs from the air, supposedly on strategic targets—which bombs kill many innocent people—and any other kind of bombing.

It is a matter of record that in the bombing of South Vietnam, with napalm and other high explosives, our bombs have killed many innocent peasants. It is a part of the whole atrocity of that war itself.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I know of no war in history that better illustrates the accuracy of the old statement that war is hell than this war in Vietnam. The atrocities committed by the Communists in this war are really unbelievable in their viciousness.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I do not believe that we can justifiably and in fairness to our country place the atrocities admittedly proved to be committed by the Communists on an equal basis with our action and say that our country is following a similar course. We are not doing that.

Mr. GORE. The Senator did not understand me to say that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator did not say that. However, the fact is that we have been most charitable. We have been enduring the brutality of the Communists. It is not true that when the people of the United States are told that, with our entire ethnical background, our acts parallel the acts of the Communists.

Mr. GORE. I know of no one who has said that. And if anyone does say it, I shall join the Senator in denouncing him.

Mr. President, last summer, with further rapid deterioration in South Vietnam, President Johnson and his advisers undertook a full-scale review of our military commitments and our military operations. There was much public speculation about a major escalation of the war. It was widely reported that the military leaders had recommended that some 400,000 troops be committed to Vietnam.

When the President announced his decision after much public speculation about what that decision would be—in a July 28, 1965, statement, however, it appeared that he had resisted the massive escalation that has been urged upon him. It was announced that 50,000 additional troops would be sent to Vietnam. In commenting on the President's statement, I said on the floor of the Senate:

> I took some heart and found some encouragement in President Johnson's statement today for the following reasons:
>
> First, the President has apparently resisted the far greater degree of escalation that has been urged upon him.
>
> Second, the President stopped short of accepting, or treating this as an American war. He showed an awareness of the fact that our policy has been, and, I think should be, to assist the Vietnamese to win their own war. I believe the President showed a keen awareness of the danger of permitting the struggle to become an American war, a white man's war against Asia.

According to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services in a statement earlier today, our troop strength in that area is now in the neighborhood of 300,000—and our "highest military authorities" are talking of 600,000 men being sent there.

I was heartened by references in the July 28, 1965, pronouncement to the possibility that the good offices of the United Nations might be utilized in an effort to find a solution. I read from my July 28, 1965, remarks in the Senate:

> Third, by his increased emphasis upon the United Nations through his letter delivered today by Ambassador Goldberg to Mr. U Thant, the President demonstrated, it seemed to me, an awareness of the danger of isolating the United States in a land war in Asia and the danger of unifying the Communist world into monolithic unity by the landing of a major American expeditionary force in Asia.
>
> Should this happen it might well be that we would not be permitted the luxury of concentrating most of our forces in Vietnam.

I had earlier applauded the President's Johns Hopkins University speech in which he announced clearly our willingness to negotiate with interested nations without preconditions. More recently, the pause in the bombing of North Vietnam and the widely publicized peace offensive conducted by President Johnson have served to improve our posture in the eyes of world opinion. The President is to be commended for having made this effort, and again I commend him.

But the fact remains that this effort did not succeed in bringing the controversy to the bargaining table. Moreover, the further effort to utilize the United Nations which was begun when bombing of North Vietnam was resumed has thus far not been particularly fruitful.

And so, Mr. President, all our prior actions having failed to resolve the controversy, or even to have brought a solution nearer, another major escalation has been under consideration.

There are important differences, I think, between our situation now and what it was last summer. Another escalation must be considered in the light of the fact that our military effort has already been substantially escalated over what it was last summer. Each time our policy has been reviewed over the years, the result has been that our involvement has been deepened and the level of our military effort has been escalated. At each step we have become more heavily committed, the problem has become more complex, solutions have become more elusive, and the potential consequences of any course of action have become more serious.

Thus has our commitment evolved, step by step until what many now regard as our obligation in Vietnam bears no resemblance to the obligation we actually incurred under the Eisenhower letter of 1954 and the SEATO Treaty. The pattern of step-by-step escalation of our commitment, accompanied with repeated assurances that we seek no wider war, concerns me greatly and I am apprehensive that this pattern may be continued. And that is the purpose of this speech.

We have been told repeatedly that we are in Vietnam only to help the Vietnamese help themselves. This was not to become an American war. But we have gone by successive stages from the extension of economic aid, to military aid, to military "advisers" and technicians, to troops to protect vital American installations, and finally to full-scale offensive commitment of U.S. ground forces and the bombing of North Vietnam. It has become an American war.

If we had insisted upon the terms and conditions contained in President Eisenhower's 1954 letter, we would have long since had to terminate any assistance at all in Vietnam. But we did not insist.

From a review of the record it seems clear to me that we have no binding legal commitment that requires us to expend the effort we have undertaken in Vietnam. What commitment we have, we have managed to create for ourselves. It is as if, by saying over and over publicly that we are committed to restore order and tranquillity in South Vietnam, we have somehow convinced ourselves that we are legally bound to do so, whatever the cost.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have before me the SEATO Treaty. Article 4 of that treaty reads:

> ARTICLE IV
>
> 1. Each Party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the Parties or against any State or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations.
>
> 2. If, in the opinion of any of the Parties, the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any Party in the treaty area or of any other State or territory to which the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article from time to time apply is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area, the Parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense.
>
> 3. It is understood that no action on the territory of any State designated by unanimous agreement under paragraph 1 of this Article or on any territory so designated shall be taken except at the invitation or with the consent of the government concerned.

This is the protocol, which provides:

> The Parties to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty unanimously designate for the purposes of Article IV of the Treaty the States of Cambodia and Laos and the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam.

Mr. President, I interpret that as a commitment to help these people defend and hold their territorial sovereignty and integrity, and that that is a binding agreement that we made.

If, in our judgment, this agreement for the benefit of a third party means we are going to help them maintain the "inviolability and integrity of their territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any party in the treaty area" when threatened by any means, whether by armed attack or by means other than armed attack, it seems to me that we have a treaty which compels us to act to help these people maintain their own territorial integrity and sovereignty against Communist enslavement.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the Senator's reference to the SEATO treaty. For his information, I have previously dealt with that and have given reasons why I think this treaty does not amount to a binding commitment to do what we are doing or what is contemplated in Vietnam. I should be glad to discuss it again, but I have already done so.

Does the Senator from South Dakota wish me to yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes, I wish to make a brief observation. I know the Senator has been on his feet for a long time, but I was particularly grateful for the point he has made, that we must beware of the danger of making this an American war. I think the Senator is absolutely correct; this is a struggle which, in the last analysis, must be decided primarily by the people of Vietnam themselves.

Frequently, people draw the wrong parallels with other situations.

We are in South Vietnam with over 200,000 American forces and billions of dollars in American aid. The government there has not been able to put together an indigenous army capable of providing the kind of resistance and successful effort that we saw, for instance, in Greece at the end of World War II.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator very much. As I see it, the Communists have us committed to war in an area where we face the greatest possible disadvantages. Second, they have us committed there all alone. Third, if what some of my colleagues have said today be true, we must treat this commitment with the same degree of priority that we should treat an attempt to enslave Western Europe, or to put Russian nuclear missiles on Cuba.

I do not believe the situation is quite that bad, but I appreciate the relevancy of the Senator's remarks.

I recognize that, in addition to whatever formal legal commitment we have in Vietnam, there is also what is called our moral commitment to assist a people in quest of freedom. I do not subscribe to the view that the Vietcong movement is simply a popular indigenous uprising against the remnants of despotic colonialism. Evidence of Vietcong terrorism, of direction and support from Hanoi is clear. The Vietcong, if they could do so, would in my opinion doubtless establish a repressive Communist regime.

But, Mr. President, there are many other communist regimes, including the one in Cuba. Our moral commitment to liberate Cuba should be at least equally strong. Even so, it does not necessarily follow that we should launch a major military effort to overthrow Castro.

These indefinite "moral commitments" have their limitations. They must be measured by our national interest.

In reality, our present commitment in Vietnam has evolved from the fact of our presence. Each time we have increased our presence we have enlarged our commitment. Each time we have escalated our presence and effort our dilemma has become magnified.

The distinguished former Ambassador, Mr. George F. Kennan, in his recent forceful testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee, stated as follows:

> The first point I would like to make is that if we were not already involved as we are today in Vietnam, I would know of no reason why we should wish to become so involved, and I can think of several reasons why we should wish not to.

In this statement I concur completely.

In the final analysis we should be guided by our own vital national interests. It is my view that our national interests are not served by a major military operation in southeast Asia.

First, even if we accept the inevitability of military solutions to cold war problems—which I do not necessarily do—it is difficult to imagine more disadvantageous conditions under which to wage war than those which prevail in South Vietnam.

Second, we stand virtually alone in the struggle. We have received only token support from a few of our allies. Other free world nations do not even agree with what we are doing in this unhappy area. They find it difficult to understand why we are there. It is not that our Government has failed to explain our position. It is simply that they do not believe that either their interests or ours are served by the conflict. On the contrary, they think the free world's position is endangered. In going it alone we violate the principle of collective security to which we committed ourselves when we subscribed to the United Nations Charter. We cannot, standing alone, remake the world, and it does not serve our national interests to try on the scale and under the conditions which prevail in Vietnam.

Third, we must, as I stated earlier, be guided by our position and our posture on a global basis, with recognition of the fact that our strength, though greater than that ever enjoyed by any nation, is not limitless. We have responsibilities around the world. We must meet our commitments in NATO. We still have two divisions in Korea. We have problems and responsibilities within our own hemisphere. Our military and economic substance is committed in varying degrees to many nations.

Vietnam is not the only area of the world in turmoil or the only area facing the threat of Communist subversion. As we become increasingly committed in Vietnam, other pastures look correspondingly greener to our major adversaries. The Soviets, or not inconceivably the Chinese, may become sorely tempted to launch or promote other adventures in Latin America, in Berlin, in Africa, or elsewhere in Asia. If so, our heavy commitment in Vietnam lessens our capability to respond quickly and effectively, or at least the Communists may think so.

Fourth, the present conflict poses great danger of escalation into nuclear war, a tragedy that would surely be contrary to our vital interests as well as those of every nation. We cannot afford to overlook the equation among the three major world powers—the United States, Soviet Russia, and Communist China—either from the standpoint of the effect of this equation on preservation of peace, or how the equation would be altered by hostilities between either two of them.

One of the more encouraging developments of the last decade has been the break in the monolithic structure of international communism as reflected by the growing schism between Russia and Red China. Meanwhile, there has been an improvement in relations between the United States and Russia. As of today, however, should armed conflict erupt between the United States and Red China, we must assume the Russians would be on the side of China.

The present conflict poses inherent danger of intervention by the Chinese. Every time the war is escalated this danger increases. If we continue to escalate, such a conflict may well become inevitable. With or without initial Soviet intervention in a United States-China war, such a conflict would almost certainly degenerate into a nuclear war. We could hardly fight the hordes of Chinese on their home grounds without resort at least to tactical nuclear weapons. And when nuclear weapons are used, the very existence of civilization is in jeopardy.

Mr. President, these are some of the dangers and difficulties we face. From the standpoint of our national interest, the basic question is whether the stakes are sufficiently high to warrant the risks we assume or are about to assume. In my view, they are not.

From a strategic standpoint, considering the means of communication and transportation of today, South Vietnam does not appear to be of great importance. It has little industrial capability. It has no strategic resources that we require. Indeed, it might well be considered a liability of any major power of which it becomes a ward. It has surely been a liability to us, both in terms of cost and in terms of world opinion.

Some express the point of view that we might better fight now, in Vietnam, than later somewhere else. As I said earlier, if indeed we must fight, we surely could pick a better place, if not a better time.

Some say it would be easier to knock China out now than 10 years from now. I reject the preventive war philosophy. When the cold war began, strident voices urged that we make war on Russia while we had what amounted to a practical nuclear monopoly. I am glad that these voices were not heeded. Many of these same voices now urge preventive war on Red China, urging that we should welcome a confrontation before China becomes a major nuclear power. I hope that these voices will likewise be rejected. There is scant hope for mankind if we accept the view that nuclear war can solve our problems.

It seems to me conclusive that our vital national interests are not served by our involvement in Vietnam. But that does not change the fact that we are there. We must of course consider our future course of action in the light of the facts as they exist rather than as we would like them to be.

A review of how we got where we are, however, does have a bearing upon what we should do in the future. It is for this reason that I have undertaken this rather lengthy, but still not detailed, review of the history of our Vietnam involvement. The record of the last 12 years has demonstrated a pattern of escalation that has been singularly ineffective. If step by step escalation is a policy, it is a poor one. And each additional major step of escalation will compound our problems and pose increasingly disastrous possible consequences.

Mr. President, I wish I could offer a solution that would be in our national interest and at the same time assure attainment of all our objectives in Vietnam. The truth is that no satisfactory solution is now foreseeable, given the present circumstances. It is a question of selecting a course of action that is least unsatisfactory under all the circumstances. Further escalation, with its cost in life and with the risks inherent therein, is surely not prudent, as I see it.

The President has said repeatedly, and he said again last Friday, that he is against escalation, and I am confident that he is. But the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], chairman of the Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee, has spoken of a possible commitment of 600,000 troops in southeast Asia and the possible use of nuclear weapons if necessary. I have had the privilege of discussing his speech with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. He says that he did not advocate, and I did not understand that he advocated, use of nuclear weapons, but, rather, he expressed the view, in which I have today earlier joined, that a war between the United States and China would make use of nuclear weapons highly likely for the reason, as I have stated—and as I understand the Senator from Mississippi to state—that the American people would not permit their sons to be matched man to man with the masses of Chinese in Asia without using whatever weapons might be at hand.

The able senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], a member of both the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, stated last week that this troop estimate of 600,000 did not originate with the junior Senator from Mississippi, that it came from "highest military authority." The Senator from Missouri referred to this estimate in the Foreign Relations Committee hearings when he addressed Ambassador Kennan, as follows:

> Mr. Kennan, there has been mention of a figure of 600,000 people in South Vietnam by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee. That figure did not originate with him. It came from the highest military authority in a hearing before the Armed Services Committee.

The American people have been told over the years that an Asian war should be fought by Asians, that we would confine our efforts to helping the South Vietnamese to help themselves, that we should not send American boys to do the job that Asians should do for themselves. Yet, step by step, escalation by escalation, our country has been brought into a predicament which the American people were assured would not occur.

I am profoundly apprehensive that we are fast approaching the point at which no options will be left; a point beyond which our actions will be dictated by events over which we have no control. If we do in fact send 600,000 troops to the jungles and rice paddies of Vietnam—or 400,000—we should contemplate and prepare for a military confrontation with Red China. A distinguished military expert said on a television program on Sunday that he did not think the Chinese would come in because it was not in their interest to do so. Another distinguished military expert said they would not come into Korea, but they did.

We still, I hope and believe, have some flexibility in determining our course of action. I do not believe the American people would support—if asked—a decision to send 600,000 American boys to fight a land war in southeast Asia, with all the consequences that would entail. But if we inch up, to 300,000, then to 400,000, then to 500,000, then to 600,000, we will find ourselves with that many troops there, even though the administration had no intention of going that far when the first additional increment was ordered into the combat area. We ought to pause now and contemplate where the program of escalation has taken us and where such a program will lead if it is continued.

National prestige is important. It is more important to the weak than to the strong. This Nation has proved its dedication to the cause of freedom and its determination to resist aggression, in Greece and Turkey, in Korea, in Berlin, and in the 1962 Cuban missile crisis. We do not have to prove it again by sending half a million men to Asia.

I advise that this war be kept within bounds which appear manageable, with limited goals and limited commitments, that goal being a tolerable political arrangement that would permit honorable disengagement of U.S. combat forces at the earliest feasible time. Once again, I advise against a wider war, against a commitment to total victory in a major war in Asia. Here, it seems to me, is the great issue now under debate.

I do not advocate precipitate withdrawal of our forces from Vietnam. The presence of more than 200,000 American fighting men there precludes such action. I do urge, as strongly as I know how, that we do not further escalate the scope and intensity of the conflict by substantially increasing our forces in the combat area. Admittedly, the current level of our military effort will probably not achieve total victory. Neither, in my opinion would the presence in Vietnam of twice as many U.S. soldiers.

We should accept the fact that total military victory in the normal sense is not achievable in Vietnam, short of action that would obliterate the country and solve nothing. This is not that kind of war. Eventually we shall have to settle for less than total victory, and the sooner this is recognized, the better.

Our military experts can best decide the most appropriate use of our forces in the area and the manner of their replacement. They are formidable, and they are giving a good account of themselves. We can, I beleive, sustain them indefinitely if need be, and surely we can do so while further efforts are made to find a solution whereby we can extricate ourselves honorably from a most unfortunate involvement.

Meanwhile, we must continue and intensify our efforts to bring about negotiations, under the auspices of the United Nations or in any acceptable forum, in Geneva or in any other acceptable place. In this connection we should recognize that it is unlikely that we can attain a complete political victory in negotiations, just as it is impossible for us to achieve total military victory by force of arms.

If our adversaries do not already so understand they should stand forewarned that though there may be strong division of opinion over policy, they can never run us out of Vietnam or any other place for want of appropriations from Congress to pay for whatever munitions, equipment, and supplies may be required to sustain our forces.

If our adversaries can take some comfort from the debate, let them have it; but let them know that Congress will not be niggardly in providing whatever our forces need to complete their mission, and with the least possible danger to them.

But Mr. President, I urge the President and the advisers upon whom he relies to consider most carefully our own national interest in its broadest terms and to analyze most carefully the pitfalls of further escalation. We must not pass the point of no return.

Mr. President, it is my intention to vote for the supplemental Vietnam authorization now before the Senate. I do so because it provides funds for American men fighting in Vietnam. They have been committed to action at a time and in a place of which I do not approve. But they are there. And as long as they are there, we must, and we will, support them with everything they need.

I do not want my vote for this supplemental authorization to be construed, however, as a vote for an indefinite and open-ended commitment of American forces to land war in southeast Asia.

The time has not yet come when that course of action would be essential to protection of the vital interests of the United States. For what other or lesser cause should America go to war?

Indeed, it is my view that further substantial escalation—creeping or galloping—of U.S. men and materiel in Vietnam would be damaging, if not disastrous, to far more important and more vital interests of the United States elsewhere.

By my vote for this bill, I want to make it clear that I will support, and do support, the men and materiel we now have in southeast Asia, but I want no one in doubt that my vote does not go beyond that. This is not a vote for further escalation. We have had enough of that.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I highly commend the Senator from Tennessee for a very valuable, constructive speech. He and I do not agree on some vital points as reflected in his speech, but the speech was well prepared, well documented, and was historically accurate in the consecutive steps we have taken. His views were set forth in eloquent fashion. He sincerely and emphatically argues well for the points which he makes. The way he has presented this matter is highly commendable. As a Member of this body, I believe he has made a significant contribution to this debate. Debates like the one of the Senator from Tennessee, as it reflects on this subject, vital as it is, do not divide. They enlighten. They give meat for thought, the way the Senator has presented it. I hope the remainder of the debate will be along those lines.

As the Senator pointed out, the one vote we are asked to make is not on how it all started, but to start from where we are. The bill should receive a unanimous vote. It would be a boon for our boys over there and a warning for our adversaries.

Mr. GORE. The trite phrase "I am deeply grateful" is not sufficient under the circumstances. I am moved by the generosity of my friend, my neighbor, and my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Mississippi.

I had no intention whatsoever of speaking as long as I have held the floor. When I started, I estimated to one of my colleagues that I would speak for an hour or an hour and a half, but, as the junior Senator from Mississippi knows, there have been numerous requests for me to yield. I felt the issue was of such import that the freest possible exchange of views would be in the public interest.

I close by again saying to my dear friend, "I thank you."

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I should like to join in the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi in thanking our distinguished colleague from Tennessee for his very candid and frank statement. It has been free of the vitriol which sometimes enters into arguments. He has presented his argument in a rational way, although I am constrained to disagree with him on many points.

I should also like to commend the tolerance of the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi in presenting dissenting points of view that have been raised on this vexing issue. It is wise that we should act as rational men in presenting our varying points of view on this issue.

WHY WE ARE THERE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the fact that the entire Nation is sorely troubled over the present conflict in Vietnam is evidenced here today by the debate on the administration's request for authorization to spend a portion of the extra funds requested for our military efforts there. I support the position of the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], that a vote here is neither an endorsement or a criticism of our policies in Vietnam but merely an affirmation of the fact that wherever American boys are sent by their Commander in Chief they should be supplied with the best possible weapons and with the best logistical support that their Nation can give them. However, this action of increasing expenditures to provide these necessary supplies has again focused national attention on Vietnam.

A debate in whatever context on a course of action which may well determine the future course of the entire world is not only fitting, it is indispensable. But it serves no interest, least of all our own, if that debate skirts the hard-core reasons for our presence in Vietnam. Yet in recent weeks, it has seemed to me that we have strayed further and further from the central issue at hand—the "gut issue"—why we are there. Too many dialogs of late seem to center around irrelevant questions, wishes, hopes, and superficial issues. As we turn more intensely now to this national dialog, it is imperative that we put first things first. Let us strip from the verbiage and the oratory of discussion the questions that do not go to the heart of the matter. Let me illustrate.

The question of resuming the bombing in North Vietnam was often discussed as though it were an end in itself, and it was easy to make a case against resumption if it were to be assumed that the top priority was the destruction of North Vietnam by the best available means. If, however, the question was cast in the context of our presence in South Vietnam, the bombing of the north had to be weighed against the needs of attaining our objectives in the south; namely, that of holding a line against the forces of aggression from Hanoi. It becomes a tactical measure then rather than a strategic one.

Bombardment that would interdict supplies of material and men from the north would be difficult to deny. Bombardment aimed only at the scorched earth policy for cities and settled areas would be open to question. It is in the former category that the President was compelled to order the resumption of the air attacks north of the 17th parallel.

Another of the relatively superficial areas of controversy in the public forum is the question of whether we agree to recognize the National Liberation Front and the Vietcong at a mythical conference table. A few days ago I detailed to this body how the record is replete with evidence that the National Liberation Front is nothing more nor less than the instrument of Hanoi. It was created in Hanoi, by Hanoi, for Hanoi as a sham and a front behind which to cloak their aggressive operations across the borders in the neighboring country of South Vietnam.

Still another illustration of a superficial issue is the argument raised this week by some Members of the Senate that we are not getting enough help from our allies to warrant our position in Vietnam. It seems to me that this is completely irrelevant. The real question is, Does our national interest require our presence there? If it does, what our allies do or don't do is beside the point. If our chances for a better future depend upon doing what we are doing in Vietnam, we must go it alone if necessary—regardless of the rest of the world. Anyone who chooses to join us in the endeavor—as New Zealand, Australia, and South Korea have with men and as have other nations in other ways—all the better.

Or even the question of what mainland China may or may not do is really of secondary importance until we resolve the question of primary concern. Do we have a rational alternative to Vietnam? If we have no alternative, and I believe that to be the case, we dare not back out of there because China threatens. In our role as leader of the free world, we dare not knuckle under to that kind of international blackmail. Similar threats were posed by the Soviets during the Berlin blockade and in Cuba.

Needless to say, we would hope that our policy would be sufficiently wise and restrained to meet the needs of achieving our objectives without deliberately provoking the extremes of other powers. But that's the kind of imponderable that only the other side can answer. We cannot live in fear of what that answer might be else all is lost before we start.

Let me hasten to add at this time, Mr. President, that I have no sympathy for those reckless and irresponsible voices in our midst now being raised in behalf of a so-called preventive war against China. You do not prevent a war by starting one. And, as history records, there are many more wars talked about than fought. But when a retired general dares to express the thought that he is afraid that Red China will not attack us, thus creating an excuse to strike back, he casts discredit on the image of a great nation such as our own. Such a senseless observation should confirm us in our determinations to make sure that such spokesmen remain retired.

No one wants war with mainland China if it can be avoided. No one wants war of any sort. But the shape of the world in which we hope to live will be measured in considerable degree by our willingness to risk conflict in behalf of our larger causes. This is a hard lesson from the history of our time.

Another superficial question is that of the alleged peace feelers from Hanoi. Even as I speak now, there are rumors afoot that yet another so-called peace gesture has come from North Vietnam. The strange thing about these gestures is that there has been to date not a single expression directly or through secondhand sources, in any form whatsoever, from any official sources in North Vietnam and Peiping to the Government of the United States. Yet many critics of our policy in Asia ascribe to the Communists all the virtues of good intent and to our own Government all the vices of deceit and warmongering.

The President of the United States has pursued over 300 overtures and contacts all around the world in pursuit of the possibility for some less violent confrontation in Asia but to no avail. And once again, may I suggest that the question of these peace feelers is still not the central issue but only a surface manifestation of the desperate hopes of millions of people.

Mr. President, as we look back over these several cases in point which I have just cited as either secondary issues at best or superficial questions at worst, what the answers to them ought to be can only be determined in the context of the basis for our presence there. If the assumption of the critics is that we must withdraw from South Vietnam, this would suggest an answer to each of these questions quite different from the answer that would stem from the opposite assumption, that is, that our being there is indispensable to the stability of the world. Once this divergence is resolved, these surface issues take on an entirely different meaning. That's why it is so important that we discipline our public dialogs, our Senate hearings, our letters to the President, to go to the heart of the matter in Vietnam; namely, why we are there.

For the next few minutes, I would like to discuss why I think we are there and why we have no rational alternative but to remain indefinitely. To understand our presence in Vietnam, we must see it as an inseparable part of what we have been striving to do for 20 years in the wake of World War II. In this endeavor, we have sought to reestablish our favorable balance among the contesting power centers on the globe both in Europe and in the Far East. We have also sought to honor the tenuous, if unhappy, division of the spoils of war agreed upon as part of the transition to a more peaceful future.

Further, as a result of the lessons preceding World War II, we have sought this time to arrest aggression wherever it was undertaken around the world and at the same time to arrive at a balance of the hopes of newly independent and restless peoples everywhere. Let us examine each of these objectives in America's postwar policy.

First, the new balance of the world. Balance of power is a dirty phrase. In the philosophy of some, it is immoral and wrong. For others, it is wishfully relegated to another century. But the hard fact of our time is that it remains the only substitute for war that so-called civilized man has been willing to produce.

To be sure, it is a sorry commentary on an advanced society such as Western civilization which has begun to conquer outer space, to score new breakthroughs in other scientific wonders, and to solve many of the persistent mysteries of medicine to note that we are no further advanced in the science of international law and order than the balance of power. This does not make it less true, however. It is important that we begin where we are with what we have, and it should be obvious that we cannot stop where we wish we were or where we ought to be. This brings us back to the imperative requisites of establishing a favorable balance of power in the wake of the disastrous discombobulations of World War II.

That war was especially violent and dislocating on the balance of the world. Not only were three great powers destroyed—Germany, Italy, and Japan—but even two of the victorious powers were left so strapped that they could no longer sustain their historic roles in the delicate balancing process. In fact, only two nations were left in the wake of the war sufficiently strong to contend for the shape of the new balance of the world—obviously, the Soviet Union and the United States.

The requirements of victory at the end of the war were more novel to the United States than to the Soviets. In our own case, we pursued two lines of policy. First, placing a trust in international cooperation, disarmament, and even the sharing with our adversary of atomic secrets when we had a monopoly of them. This direction of policy was more in accord with the idealism of our national history.

The other line of policy was far more difficult, frightening, and—in the short run—even more important, to wit, that of being willing to risk war in order to stop the expanding efforts of the Russians. Without the second of these lines of policy, the first would have no chance. Thus, it became a question of putting first things first.

It was frightening to a nation that had just emerged from the cocoon of idealism; for until that moment in modern history, the United States had looked upon the wars of the world as secondary considerations. Up until then, whenever war broke out in Europe, the Americans had been able to study the two sides and choose the one most in the line with their own national interest. But now it was all changed. The United States, for the first time in history, was one of those two sides. There was no longer the luxury of choice.

Likewise in the past as the world waged its wars, the Americans always had a ring of friendly nations out in front in Europe and behind which they themselves could hesitate, dawdle, and delay until they could make up their minds if or when to join the battle. Now after World War II this was no longer possible. For the first time in our history, we in America found ourselves strangely on the front line of the world. In fact, we ourselves were the ring behind whom others hoped to win time and the chance to determine their national destinies. In short, the force of history imposed upon us the heavy responsibilities for waging what in earlier centuries the British, or the French, or the Spanish, or the Portuguese had waged before—the contest for rebalancing a world as much in their favor as their power would command. It was new, costly, dangerous, but nonetheless indispensable.

For the Soviet Union, on the other hand, the requirements of victory in the war were less novel and untried. The Soviets, in fact, pursued a historic policy that was Russian long before it was Communist. Lord Palmerston in London put it best more than 100 years ago when he described Russian policy as one constantly pressing outward along the periphery of their own boundaries probing for weakness and soft spots that would permit new conquests short of war. In this competition for the new balance of the world, the Soviets had a measurable advantage—they operated from a contiguous area outward in many directions, whereas the Americans had to operate in several areas far flung around the fringes of those peripheral interests.

The obvious first step by Moscow was to seize and hold the fringe of countries in Eastern Europe already occupied by Soviet armies when the war ended. Their next step was to try to overthrow neighboring governments torn by civil war and dissension but not directly occupied by Russian troops. The first step was a fait accompli when the guns stopped firing. But the second step could still be stopped, and it was here that the United States first stepped in with an overt policy of containing Soviet expansion. The answer to the Reds was the commitment to Iran in 1946 and the Truman Doctrine sealing off Greece and Turkey in 1947.

The parallel which it is important we keep in mind in Vietnam may be seen best in Greece in 1946 and 1947. There we were asked to rally behind a corrupt government headed by a king and a questionable royal family with an administration filled with black marketeers and characters of other shady types against what was apparently a genuine people's revolution demanding democracy and freedom. The catch in Greece was that this Greek civil war was being seized upon by organized, trained Communist leaders just over the border in the Balkan countries to the north of Greece as an effort to grab control of the Greek Government. Those leaders were ordered and directed, as we know now, by Moscow. They were not unlike the National Liberation Front in Indochina.

So our decision under the Truman Doctrine was one of sustaining a government of the status quo to prevent a Communist takeover from the north on the one hand or staying out of Greece and surrendering the whole country to an aggressive force from the outside. Our answer is now a matter of the judgment of history. If we had not intervened in Greece, the good people of that country would never have had a chance under Communist domination which was imminent to develop self-government or to achieve freedom of any sort. But even though we had to back some unsavory characters in the Government, we won for the people of Greece both the time and the chance to win a greater measure of freedom and to grow up to a higher standard of self-government than they had ever known before.

Greece is an excellent parallel to Vietnam. In Vietnam with all of the need that there is for land reform, social opportunity, and political freedom, none of these things will have any chance at all of taking root if the territory is seized by the forces of the aggressor from the north. Those hopes are then dashed. It is imperative that we establish a line and hold it against the invaders from the outside. In effect we must erect a wall behind which South Vietnam will have the chance to do all of the things for which you and I hope.

As a climax to the test between the victors soon after World War II, there was the showdown in Berlin in 1948. And it was there the Americans dramatically and publicly revealed their determination to risk all-out war if necessary to thwart the blockade of that beleaguered former capital of Germany.

In the restoration of Western Europe, this was the high point. And in the language of the great Churchill, this incident was the turning of the tide in the postwar testing of nerves and flexing of muscles between the two sides. It was the highwater mark of what we have since come to call the cold war. As Winston Churchill aptly assessed it:

> If the United States had acted in 1948 like she did in 1918, Russia would be on the Atlantic coast of Europe today.

That the competing forces of great power in Western Europe have in fact been brought into balance is best attested to by the easing of the severity of the crises in that part of the world. It can be illustrated by drawing with a piece of chalk a white line on a globe of the world—a line that would begin in Finland to the far north and stretch down across Eastern Europe above Greece and Turkey. That line is so firmly drawn as a result of the competition of forces on either side that neither Moscow nor Washington dares to cross the line with impugnity or recklessly. It is in truth a tenuous balancing between the two worlds. That line, though less firm, even extends part way across Asia, along Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, and India, almost—but not quite—to the China Sea. Only in the Far East has the balance not been struck. And thereby hangs the story of the second objective of American policy in seeking to restore stability in the postwar world, specifically, the balance of Asia.

In the past it was possible to restore stability in the world after great wars by a simple meeting of the great powers at Vienna or Versailles. The long tentacles of control from London, Paris, and Berlin stretched clear around the world. But in the wake of World War II, the disintegration of colonial powers changes all of this very drastically. The balance of Asia remained, nonetheless, inseparable from the balance of the world and with it the chance for a more stable peace. But the new disruptive forces let loose in Asia jeopardized the new balance of the Far East. The defeat of Japan, the retreat of the colonial powers, the emerging drive for independence—particularly in south Asia, and the growing strains between Moscow and Peiping combined to bring about a vast rearrangement of the traditional power structure of the Far East.

Even as the uncertainties of the new balance teetered between India and China, southeast Asia remained—as it always had in history—a significant makeweight in the balance of forces. With its 300 millions of people, its vast natural resources of tin, rubber, oil, and rice, its possession had been throughout history one of the sinews of power on the far side of the globe. Its strategic location, moreover, has always accentuated its role in the fortunes of the old great powers of another century. The area still lies athwart the main commercial arteries between east and west. It outflanks India to its west and thrusts toward the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand to the east and south. For the control of this area, Japan started World War II. Under the influence of Peiping, it would measurably disadvantage any other groups seeking to contain China.

Southeast Asia is composed of small entities—Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam, Malaysia, Indochina—that are clustered in awe before the giant shadow cast from Peiping to their north. They are but pygmies by comparison with the new China. Neither singly nor together could they successfully defy the historic ambitions of the Chinese to dominate them.

At the end of the war, many of us had desperately hoped that India, in her newly won independence, would become the great counterweight to China. But Nehru thought otherwise too late. Japan might have become a counterforce, but we were not sure she could be trusted. So that once again the hard fact is that only the United States is capable of balancing the awesome potentials of the new China. We alone provide an alternative to the little nations of south Asia. Either they must accommodate to China under the threat of force or continue their independent ways behind a wall capable of restraining the expansion of Peiping. It is the second alternative that we alone can provide. That also is why we must remain in Vietnam.

A third thread of American policy since the war is woven around the tacit, if unhappy, arrangements for divided authority in disputed areas between the United States and her allies on the one hand and the Soviet Union and later China on the other. By these terms, the defining of the limits of conflicting interest was speeded up and clarified. They hastened the day when the world in fact would be rebalanced and restabilized in the wake of the havoc wrought by World War II. Thus, the division of Germany; two Berlins; the two Chinas astride the Formosa Straits; two Koreas along the 38th parallel; and, with the withdrawal of the French from Indochina at the Geneva Conference in 1954, the two Vietnams along the 17th parallel. Unhappy as we were with this kind of divided territory, it at least was an accommodation to achieve the transition from military victory to postwar stability. Whatever else, American policy was committed to holding those lines of division and not permitting pressures from the east to erode them.

At the risk of total war, we lived up to that determination in Berlin in 1948. At the risk of the big war with China, we sustained that line along the Formosa Straits in 1949 and the 38th parallel in 1950. And today we are demanding that the line drawn along the 17th parallel be equally respected. The line separating the two Vietnams is thus cut from the same cloth as Berlin, and Germany, and Formosa, and Korea.

But the restoration of an equilibrium of forces around the world is only the beginning of the policy goals of the United States. It is not the end which we seek but rather the beginning.

A restabilized world is the starting point, not the stopping point of our policy. Above and beyond it is our ever-constant dedication to all peoples of their right to national independence and to freedom from the fear of force from outside their borders. This means that, out of the events that produced World War II, we should have learned that we cannot ransom our own freedom or security with somebody else's territory; that we cannot barter a neighbor's real estate for our own survival. We should have learned in Manchuria in 1931, along the Rhineland in 1935, in Ethiopia in 1936, and at Munich in 1938, moreover, that the appetite of an aggressor cannot be appeased with someone else's land. To knuckle under to the threat of force only whets the appetite of the tyrants of power. The price for appeasing the aggressors in the 1930's was World War II in the 1940's. Likewise, the cost of appeasing the Chinese now in the 1960's would most likely mean World War III within a decade. The time is now for determining our priorities in Vietnam.

In these remarks, Mr. President, I have tried to suggest that we have no rational alternatives but to stand firm and to remain in Vietnam indefinitely. To dare to predict when we may withdraw presumes altogether too much. But the President has already done the next best thing. He had made it clear that we will not forfeit southeast Asia to aggression; but he has made it clear that we covet no part of North Vietnam; that we have no designs on China.

Nonetheless, the times and the continuity of our postwar policy responsibilities demand that we remain there as long as the threat of aggression continues. After all, we still have 50,000 troops in Korea 15 years after the start of the conflict there. Our Navy still patrols the Straits of Formosa. We still have thousands of troops in Berlin and more thousands in Eastern Europe over 20 years after the end of World War II. The real point is that we cannot know with certainty when withdrawal may be a reality. But we can know with certainty the consequences if we withdraw too soon. Our choice must be to live up to the responsibilities of the leadership which history has imposed upon us.

Having made that determination about our presence in Vietnam, all other questions there must be judged in relation to how we can best achieve those objectives. The resumption of bombing in the north, what kind of bombing, the terms of negotiation, with whom we negotiate, the prospects of a larger role with China, the role of our allies—all must be recast in the context of the necessities of our presence there. The point is that our public dialog must focus on the heart of the problem—why we are there.

To be sure, our task is made no easier by the fact that the war is being waged on TV screens. Nor is it to be unexpected that, with the blood of our young men being spilled on every TV channel in every living room in the land, political blood within committees of the Congress should be shed on those same screens. One can raise serious doubts as to whether either of these spectacles is wise or necessary or even whether we can afford them in times like these. The fact remains, however, that they are a part of the social order which we seek to preserve.

Unhappy and unsatisfying as the attributes of this kind of conflict in southeast Asia may be, it is probably the only kind of war that either we or the rest of the world can afford. And it is likely not the last of these bloody confrontations around the peripheries of power. In seeking to stabilize the expressions of uncertainty and criticism here at home, some critics have demanded a formal declaration of war. But even this would be too great a price to pay for unity and conformity. It would freeze the conditions in south Asia against alternative settlements and would positively close the door to any chance for a less violent balancing of power.

It behooves us to assume a more sophisticated stature as we live up to the demands of world leadership. In our new role in the world, we ought to think twice about indulging the luxury of warfare by committee, or by public letters to the President, or by congressional hindsight after the fact. The consequences of personal pique or constituent appeal warping or blocking our foreign policy we can ill afford. To indulge them, moreover, not only makes us look ridiculous in the eyes of those who depend upon us for freedom, but it also prejudices our own chances for achieving the goals toward which we have been working for the past 20 years.

Nor dare we let up in our constant probing for conceivable breakthroughs to a peaceable settlement, however remote it may seem in fact. Given our own national principles and the idealism of a free people, we dare not risk ever being haled before the bar of history at some future date, there to be condemned for having missed a chance to end this conflict short of the battlefield.

Let us not delude ourselves, however, about the prospect of the leaders on the other side ever sitting down at a conference table on Vietnam. In some ways they cannot afford to do so. In some ways it would seem to be political suicide for them. Thus, what may finally take place in Vietnam is a gradual subsidence of the conflict without agreement, without negotiations. In such a case, however, the result would be the establishment in fact of a fine line of balance between the contending forces—in short, two Vietnams.

In conclusion, Mr. President, the time has come to go to the root of the American position in Vietnam. If it does not serve the best interests of the world for us to be there, let those among the critics who believe this now say so instead of concealing their case behind the facade of superficial excuses and arguments. However, if our own security and that of the other independent nations of the world and the hopes of mankind in general rest upon the success of our efforts there, as I believe they do, let us resolve to do all within our capabilities to make it so.

GREECE AND VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, since many of the advocates of our present involvement in Vietnam have cited the experience of the Greek civil war as a precedent for today's conflict in southeast Asia, I think it would be well for all of us to consider whether the parallel has been properly drawn.

Dr. D. George Kousoulas, professor of government at Howard University, who served in the Greek Army during the guerrilla war, has written an excellent article for the Washington Post of February 13, 1966, on this subject. Professor Kousoulas makes a most significant point when he states that the Greek Army won its war against the guerrillas largely through its own efforts, with very little support from the outside.

Considering the enormous amount of aid and the huge American force now fighting in South Vietnam, one wonders if there is any longer any parallel between the victory of an indigenous Greek Army over guerrillas backed from the outside and the growing tendency to turn the Vietnamese struggle into an American war fought with American forces.

I ask unanimous consent that the piece by Professor Kousoulas be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREECE HAS LESSON TO OFFER VIETNAM

(By D. George Kousoulas)

Last Sunday, the Washington Post published a speech delivered earlier by Under Secretary of State George W. Ball. Ball suggested that in terms of tactics on the ground, Greece is a closer analogy to Vietnam than Korea. This was an encouraging observation. In Greece, the Communist-led guerrillas suffered a crushing military debacle, and there is no reason why we should not benefit as much from our successes as we are presumably expected to profit from our failures.

In terms of guerrilla tactics, there is little difference in what happened in Greece 20 years ago and what has been taking place in South Vietnam for 5 years.

In Greece on March 30, 1946, a group of what we may call Communist technicians of revolution launched a guerrilla operation, with the moral and material support of Greece's three northern neighbors, Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, with an attack on the small village of Litochoron on the eastern slopes of Mount Olympus.

It left in its wake corpses and charred ruins. In the months that followed, several exposed villages met a similar fate. The guerrilla tactics were simple but effective: concentration of forces against an exposed village; attack; destruction of the gendarmerie station; execution of government officials; forceful recruitment of young villagers; pillaging of foodstuffs and then retreat to mountain hideouts.

THE HIT AND RUN

Throughout the summer of 1946, the Communist-led guerrilla bands continued hit-and-run strikes while the Greek Government and its British advisers viewed the attacks as a matter for the police forces. Only after October 1946, did the Greek Army replace the gendarmerie units, which were hopelessly inadequate for this type of warfare. In the meantime, the guerrilla bands had grown in number and gained control of several mountain villages.

For more than a year, the small Greek Army, unprepared for this challenge, employed tactics of static defense and search-and-destroy operations. Under the concept of static defense, nearby troops were not permitted to leave their assigned posts and rush to the rescue of a village under attack for fear that they might be ambushed or that another guerrilla force might attack their village. Many small towns and villages paid a heavy toll.

The search-and-destroy operations were no more fruitful. The guerrillas, as a rule, avoided engagement with the army, but were ready to return as soon as the army had departed. Needless to say, no villager in his right mind—regardless of his personal feelings or political views—was willing to cooperate with a visiting army and bring upon himself the iron fist of the returning guerrillas.

The tactics of search and destroy actually played into the hands of the guerrillas. The villagers suffered heavily because bombs and bullets made no distinction between guerrillas and civilians. In the end, the army inadvertently became the best recruiting agency for the guerrillas.

At the same time, the aimless sweeps through the countryside, yielding meager results after many days of sweat and toil, caused fatigue and frustration among the troops, while the civilian population began to doubt the competence and effectiveness of the military leadership. To many, it seemed as though someone was trying to catch fish in a pond with his bare hands.

With the enunciation of the Truman doctrine in March 1947, the hopes for a successful end of the fight against the Communist-led guerrillas brightened. But the inadequacies of the past could not be eradicated with one swift strike. The Greek Army had to be expanded, retrained, and its strategy and tactics reshaped. At no time was there any serious consideration of the use of American troops or of the bombing of the supply routes in Yugoslavia, Albania, or Bulgaria.

It was clearly understood that the fight could only be won on the ground by an army led and inspired by a truly national leadership. Throughout 1947, the process of cooperation among the political parties went forward.

The Communists were politically isolated and the lines clearly drawn.

In the military sector, most of the erroneous practices of the past were discarded. A new strategy of "seize and hold" gradually evolved. The army systematically began to expand its control over well-defined areas. This involved the selection of a target area, the concentration of regular and special antiguerrilla forces, continuous offensive operations, the extermination or capture of the guerrilla force in the area, mopping-up operations by auxiliary units, the establishment of local units for static self-defense, the extension of permanent government control over the cleared area and measures to prevent reinfiltration.

A good example of this strategy was Operation Dawn in Roumeli. It started on April 15, 1948. The army high command augmented the 1st Army Corps to the level of 27 infantry battalions, 16 National Guard battalions, 6 gendarmerie battalions, 2 LOK battalions, 48 pieces of artillery, and a regiment of armored cars.

The corps completely surrounded the area of Roumeli, establishing three or four successive and overlapping lines of interception, while the main infantry and LOK forces carried the thrust against a force of approximately 2,500 guerrillas.

The tactic of establishing several lines of interception deprived the guerrillas of their usual advantage of being able to slip through the army lines into their safe areas. The 1st Army Corps did not end the operation until almost the entire guerrilla force was for all practical purposes destroyed.

After 1 month of continuous pursuit, 2,000 guerrillas were either dead or taken prisoner. At the same time, the 1st Army Corps broke up the underground organization in the villages, removing both agents of intimidation and sources of information and supply. After that, intelligence started to flow in freely.

The remnants of the Roumeli guerrilla force, hunted constantly, with their sources of food and supply cut off, were gradually eliminated by the battalions of the National Guard, the gendarmerie and the militia which was formed in every village. The entire operation lasted approximately 3 months.

A similar operation in the Peloponnesus proved equally successful. Faced with this new strategy, the Communist leaders soon realized that by withdrawing in guerrilla fashion in front of the army they could eventually withdraw themselves to extinction. Zachariades, the leader of KKE, advocated the passing from the subconventional (guerrilla) to a conventional type of warfare, holding ground and even making an effort to capture and hold major provincial centers. Markos, the military leader, argued that the guerrilla forces were not strong enough to fight the Greek Army in a conventional war. He was right but he lost the argument.

Zachariades also had a point. A guerrilla operation may serve a practical purpose if it is used to prepare the ground for the time when intervention by regular military forces becomes feasible, or the morale of the loyal troops is undermined to the point that they become apathetic or even shift their allegiance, or the leadership of the target country is discredited, or a compromise is reached and Communists and sympathizers join in a coalition government as a first step toward ultimate control of the country.

When foreign intervention is not in the cards, nor collapse of the homefront imminent, the guerrilla operation cannot be consummated unless the guerrillas pass into conventional warfare and replace their hit-and-run tactics with a strategy of seize and hold. Zachariades, of course, overlooked the fact that this is the soft point of every guerrilla operation. The moment a guerrilla force transforms itself into a more or less regular army, it faces its opponent on equal terms. The well-known 10-to-1 ratio ceases to be operative. If the loyal troops are ready for this moment of transition, the guerrillas are doomed.

The Greek troops were ready. The curtain came down in August 1949, when the Greek Army attacked the last Communist stronghold of Gramos-Vitsi along the Albanian frontier. The Communist army was destroyed after a monthlong offensive. Contrary to popular belief, the guerrillas were not defeated because they ran out of ammunition.

To claim that our experience in Greece can give us all the guidelines we need to carry the war in Vietnam to a successful end would be somewhat unrealistic. The Greek Communists were supported by three foreign governments, which made them appear, in the eyes of most patriotic Greeks, as foreign agents.

Besides, they were never allowed to extend their control over three-fourths of the country—as the Vietcong are reported to have done. In Greece the national leadership included all the familiar, respected political personalities representing almost all political groups. And at no time during the fighting was there any talk about a negotiated 'settlement that could leave the country divided.

Still, there is a great deal to be learned from our experience in Greece. President Johnson's program for social reform and economic development in South Vietnam, however attractive, is largely irrelevant at this point. It will become extremely important if and when we switch to a seize and hold strategy.

The Vietnamese villagers who are under the control of the Vietcong can do very little—even if they accepted our message in toto—as long as we continue our strategy of search and destroy.

In a recent study in this newspaper, reported by Jack Foisie of the Los Angeles Times, South Vietnamese villagers and captured Vietcong expressed their bewilderment with, if not scorn for, this strategy.

General Gavin's somewhat undefined suggestion for holding coastal enclaves could make sense if these enclaves were to become actually our jumpoff points for a gradual, well-planned, determined expansion of control over clearly defined areas. Some of our military experts contend that we need greater forces to put such a strategy into effect. Maybe so.

The Greeks did it with no more than 250,000 to 300,000 troops. In Vietnam, together with the Vietnamese, we have more than 830,000, and South Vietnam is not much bigger than Greece.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR STENNIS ON THURSDAY MORNING

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that im-

mediately after the morning hour tomorrow the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] be recognized for such time as he may require to express his views on the Vietnam situation and the measure now before the Senate.

It is estimated that his speech will require about 25 to 30 minutes, but he is not to be limited to that amount of time because I well realize how these matters become extended.

After the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] launched on his well prepared address today, I thought I would go to speak with some constituents and discuss other business. After 3½ hours I found that the Senator from Tennessee had worked his way through five pages.

I hope that when the Senator from Mississippi concludes his speech there will not be too much colloquy so that we may consider the money matters for these committees.

I believe the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] plans to oppose some of the resolution, as he has done in the past. I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Mississippi be recognized tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I should like to ask whether we will come in at noon tomorrow, and whether there will be a routine morning hour, and then the Senator from Mississippi will proceed?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

SUPPLEMENTARY MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as this debate commences, I believe it is well to keep in mind the fundamentals which are involved.

First, it should be kept in mind that we are not fighting to maintain our position as a colonial power in southeast Asia. We seek no aggrandizement of territory.

We do seek to help people who seek to be independent to maintain and preserve their own freedom and independence. If they choose, as most people do, not to live under Communist slavery, we propose to help them achieve that result.

In some instances we are bound to that resolve by treaty obligation. In other cases we think it good policy to help people to have or hope that they may enjoy freedom as we have known it in this country.

We are not seeking, as the French did, to build a colonial empire. This problem is not unique. All over the world there are former colonies of Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, and others, who have been acquiring freedom.

It is important that these people, who previously lived under colonial government, should not be subjected to Communist slavery for their lives, which would be far worse than the colonial government to which they have been accustomed in years gone by.

It was always the impression of this Senator that the British treated their colonials better than the French treated their colonials. Whether that is correct, there is no doubt in anyone's mind that it would be far better for a person to live under British or French colonialism than Communist tyranny which we have witnessed in some parts of this planet.

The aggression started. A nation fighting against the French obtained a victory. There were many of those people who fought the French wanting a free independent country that seeks and works for the kind of freedom that we know here.

At the end of the war, there was a struggle between the Communist element and the anti-Communist element. I read from a paper prepared by the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

> The present political struggle in South Vietnam had its origin soon after the Geneva accords of 1954. By 1955 the Communists had initiated a program of calculated assassinations of political leaders which reached astounding proportions; in the year 1957 alone, 452 village chiefs were assassinated. This political vacuum was soon filled by the Communists.

The North Vietnamese Communist government proceeded to organize the so-called National Liberation Front. Those who controlled it were North Vietnamese. It was controlled and directed by Hanoi. Many of the Vietcong who were captured did not even know the names of the leaders of their movement. Finally, some persons who had not been known particularly as combatants—lawyers and doctors—were selected and given some sort of name in the movement. But all the intelligence proves beyond any doubt, so far as we are concerned, that this was a case of North Vietnam trying to capture the independent nation of South Vietnam.

The United States has sought to help people who desired to have freedom and maintain that freedom. We signed a treaty for collective defense. It is known as the SEATO Treaty. Officially it is known as the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty and Protocol thereto, and is dated September 8, 1954. I read from article IV of the treaty.

ARTICLE IV

> 1. Each Party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the Parties or against any State or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations.
>
> 2. If, in the opinion of any of the Parties, the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any Party in the treaty area or of any other State or territory to which the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article from time to time apply is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area, the Parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense.

The United States signed the protocol, or amendment, to that treaty, which includes the area we now have in mind. This is what it provides:

PROTOCOL TO THE SOUTHEAST ASIA COLLECTIVE DEFENSE TREATY

> *Designation of states and territory as to which provisions of article IV and article III are to be applicable*
>
> The Parties to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty unanimously designate for the purposes of Article IV of the Treaty the States of Cambodia and Laos and the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam.
>
> The Parties further agree that the above mentioned states and territory shall be eligible in respect of the economic measures contemplated by Article III.
>
> This Protocol shall enter into force simultaneously with the coming into force of the Treaty.
>
> IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed this Protocol to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty.
>
> Done at Manila, this eighth day of September, 1954.

Under the Geneva accords, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia became fully independent states. Accordingly, this communique announced agreement by France and the United States to channel assistance directly to those countries in accordance with article 3, rather than to have it go through the French.

So this is a treaty that was signed by the United States. It was signed by Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Republic of the Philippines, the Kingdom of Thailand, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States.

For the United States, that treaty was signed by John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State; H. Alexander Smith, a distinguished former Member of this body; and by MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD, our distinguished present majority leader.

Under that treaty, we agreed with our friends in the area that we would seek to help the people of the countries named to maintain their freedom and independence. The Geneva accords were signed, but the Communists never kept them for a moment. They broke them from the moment they started to negotiate and have continued to break them to this very day. The Communists have never kept them for a moment.

It has been suggested by some that perhaps in some respects the United States might be in violation of the Geneva accords, because something in them, to which we were not a signatory, but which we still recognize and which we propose to abide by, has not been kept by us. Our position has been that if two parties sign a contract, and one party does not keep his word for a moment, but breaks it from the day he signs it, then the other party to the contract is not bound. If it were possible to get the violators before the World Court or a body of that sort, or even before the United Nations, on the basis of the provisions of the Geneva accords, and they could be persuaded to keep their word, as we would keep ours, that would be fine; I am sure that we would be happy to settle with them. But that is not possible because those people perform as Communists have historically performed. They do not keep their word; they break it whenever it is to their advantage.

In other words, if a Communist looked at this white sheet of paper and said it was white, and that failed to advance the cause of communism and placed his nation at a disadvantage in any respect whatsoever for the spread of communism, he would have told a lie, by the definition of the Communists, and accordingly he would be subject to prosecution for having told a state secret or for having told a falsehood, by the definition of the Communists.

It has been suggested—and I regret to say this—that a U.S. Senator, both on the floor of the Senate and on a nationwide television program, accused his Nation of being an international outlaw. That is harsh language to use with respect to any nation, particularly one's own.

I understand that when the junior Senator from Louisiana spoke of his love for his country today, a statement was made to the effect that that was flag waving of the worst sort. Perhaps it is old fashioned, but there is no law against holding high the flag of one's country. There is no law against waving the flag. There is a law against pulling the flag down and putting one's foot on it, dragging it in the muck, mud, and mire. That sort of contemptuous regard for the flag of one's country indicates contempt for one's nation. Every nation, every tribe, every element of organized humanity regards one crime as universal—that is, treason. The giving of aid and comfort to the enemy of one's people seems to be a more universal crime than murder.

I do not accuse any Senator of being guilty of such a thing, but I do say that, in a sense, when a Senator accuses his Nation, and accuses it falsely of being an international criminal, an international outlaw, of conducting an illegal, immoral war, he is showing disrespect for his Nation. In a sense, it is as though he were treating the flag of his Nation with comtempt, which today, by modern vogue, seems to be the acceptable thing. But as I was raised as a boy, it was not acceptable at all.

In fact, it was not regarded as being improper or wrong to put a flag in front of one's home on George Washington's Birthday or on the Fourth of July. Perhaps I am still old fashioned enough to regard that sort of love of country and patriotism as being a very fine thing. It is so regarded by people who are not even citizens of this country.

The argument that we are an international criminal, as I understand, relates to the United Nations Charter which, in its early chapters, says that we are a peace-loving nation. We are now at war as the means of settling international problems. We have sought to abide by this Charter in good faith. It is too bad that the other fellow did not abide by it. However, when we read through it, we come to one article which clearly exonerates the United States from any of the so-called crimes with which a Senator, and perhaps more, have charged our Nation.

I refer to Article 51, of the United Nations Charter, which reads:

> ARTICLE 51
>
> Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

Mr. President, this Nation has tried time and again to bring the Security Council up to its responsibility and to cause the Security Council to maintain international peace as we had hoped it would be maintained in the United Nations Charter.

We have been frustrated over a hundred times by Russian vetoes and have found that smaller nations have no stomach or heart for a confrontation with nations as big and strong as the Soviet Union or Communist China. If a nation borders on either of those nations, or if any of its neighbor nations border on either of those nations, it trembles at the thought of a confrontation with such a power.

We are the only country big enough to confront such a nation. While it is fine to talk about what the United Nations can do, when they adopt the resolution, somebody has to back the resolution up if it is to be meaningful.

There is no other nation strong enough, courageous enough, to take the lead and to do what is necessary, as does the United States.

We obtained aid from some friends and allies and, compared with the size of their nations, their sacrifices may be very substantial. However, when we look at the overall effort, it has been proved before, and it is being proved now, that the contribution they can make is relatively small.

Let us review how we got into this present situation. We made this commitment. These people were trying to save and preserve their independence. The Communists were determined that that should not be the case. So, by brutality, murder, and assassination, they proceeded to kill off every person they could who did not want to be a Communist and who did not want to live under the government of Hanoi.

This Nation provided economic help, advice, and military equipment for the peace-loving people of South Vietnam who wanted to be free. We also provided military intelligence.

I do not know as a certainty, but I believe that history will show, that our ships were in the Gulf of Tonkin in August of last year for the reason that we were providing military information.

Our ships were using their radar to help the South Vietnamese watch their own coastline. Our ships were attacked. When they were attacked by the Hanoi torpedo boats, that was an act of war.

In line with all previous precedents, we fought back. We not only fought back at the attacking vessels, but we proceeded then to attack the bases from which those vessels came.

The President of the United States asked Members of Congress—and I was in the Senate Chamber that night because I was the Senator in charge of a bill, and there were only approximately four Senators present here—to come to the White House and discuss the matter with him. The President announced that we would strike back. He asked Congress for a resolution, and the resolution started by stating, in the first instance that we would resist aggression and that we approved of the President's striking back when we were attacked.

The resolution then went on to state, as we should well have anticipated, that this would not be the end of it. When the Communists from North Vietnam attacked us, we struck back. We knew that the Communists would not take it lying down. There would be a reaction.

The resolution stated that the President was authorized to take whatever steps he found necessary in order to resist aggression in that area.

There have been a number of suggestions. When the going got a little rough, different people had different ideas. The first thing that happened, of course, was that the North Vietnamese began to send their troops into South Vietnam in regular army units. We reacted by sending our troops into South Vietnam in regular Army units. As they stepped up their efforts, we stepped up ours.

We are making a very great effort in Vietnam today. We have more than 200,000 men there carrying out that resolution, which states that the President should take whatever steps he deems necessary to resist aggression.

If we are going to tell the President that he cannot increase the number of troops in Vietnam and that he cannot draft American boys to fight there, we should reconsider this resolution. The resolution said that the President should take whatever steps might be necessary to resist aggression in Vietnam

If we want to win the struggle there, we shall have to unite as a Nation and make it clear to the whole wide world that we are going to make whatever sacrifices are necessary and pay whatever price may be necessary to defeat aggression in Vietnam.

I regret to say it, but I think it is true, that if we say that all we are going to do is to try to see this thing through with 200,000 men, then the Government of North Vietnam, which has an army of approximately 1,200,000 men, need only send 600,000 people down to annihilate and decimate our people in South Vietnam.

They will know that that is our troop limit, and they will have a written order on all that it will take to defeat this great country.

It has been said that the French lost to the Communists in Vietnam, not at Dienbienphu, but at Paris. I am told that that is a familiar quotation among Communists. They say that they defeated France at Paris. They say that the French lost the Battle of Indochina at Paris. The French lost that battle when the French Chamber of Deputies voted that they would no longer draft any Frenchmen to fight in Vietnam. Having so voted, it left only the courageous Frenchmen who fought so loyally for their country and for the glory of France—those who insisted on staying there and fighting and dying for their country. No mother's son from that day on was expected to volunteer to fight for his country.

The Communist victory over the French occurred not at Dienbienphu, but at Paris. Those courageous Frenchmen at Dienbienphu were overwhelmed by superior forces. I did not see it, but I was told that there was a moat that the French had dug in front of their fortifications. The Frenchmen stayed behind that moat and fought and killed so many of the attacking Communists that the remaining Communists marched across the moat on the bodies of their dead comrades.

If no Frenchman were to come to their aid, and only those few courageous Frenchmen were to fight for their country, there was certainly very little chance of victory for the French.

So indeed it may be said that the battle for Indochina was not won at Dienbienphu, but at Paris, when the French Chamber of Deputies made the decision that no one else would go to the aid of the brave men who were already in Indochina.

So we are being told, and we will be told again, that no mother's son should be drafted to help the boys who are already in Vietnam.

That is not the way this Nation has performed in days gone by. In days gone by, when anyone attacked the United States, he knew that he had indeed attacked a hornets' nest. Everyone was expected to do his part.

It will be interesting to observe the vote on the amendment that I have heard will be offered. It is the so-called surrender at Washington resolution. If we adopt it, we shall lose the war, because we shall draft no one to fight over there to help the brave men who are now fighting in Vietnam. It would be foolish for anyone to go over there to confront this horde of Communists if he knew that he would be surrounded and cut off, with no help coming. I would say it would be wiser to surrender now.

The story is told concerning a Confederate general—I suspect perhaps it was General Hood—who was a courageous fighting man who was wounded many times, and was placed in charge of the defense of Atlanta.

His predecessor had found himself outnumbered and kept maneuvering for position, waiting for the right time to give battle; but General Hood threw his troops into battle at every opportunity, and suffered disastrous losses.

Finally, after he had succeeded in facing the part of Sherman's troops that went north until they decided it was time to turn and give battle to him, and imposed on him an ignominious defeat—which was about the last defeat he could sustain and still hope to carry out any operations—this sweet old one-legged general, strapped to his horse because he could not walk, finally was forced to say to his orderly, "I regret to say you must go forward and sound the retreat; and inasmuch as I have but one leg, I will start now."

If we agree to the proposed amendment, and thus tell our courageous young men over there that no more help is coming, we might as well pull our troops out now and sue for some kind of settlement of the overall problem which exists in the cold war between this Nation, the Soviet Union, and Communist China—some arrangement under which they will perhaps permit us to live.

But if we look at the tremendous power this Nation has, it is beyond imagination. I remind Senators that the effort we are making over there does not exceed the military effort we made on the Anzio beachhead, which in World War II was regarded as a relatively small operation for the forces that we had available. In that war we had over 14 million men in the United States, trained, armed, each one ready to do his part.

Mr. President, it has been my privilege to observe the training of some of the fine young men who are preparing themselves to fight for their country, knowing that they are on their way to Vietnam. I must report that the enthusiasm, the morale, the courage, and the training of those young men is absolutely marvelous. They are as fine as any troops that ever wore the American uniform. I say with great confidence, if we approach this matter the same way we have approached other difficult problems in the past, we shall prevail, we shall win, and we shall continue to be a great military power that seeks nothing but peace, a country that keeps its word, a country that honors its commitments; and we will continue to be the hope of all free people for peace and freedom throughout the world.

In my judgment, that is the course to peace. If we look at this situation as a part of the overall picture, we decided quite a while back that if we let the Communists take first one nation and then another by aggression, by subversion, by brutality, by murder, by assassination, there would be no stopping point, and eventually we would be compelled to fight a desperate and very big war for our own survival. We decided it would be cheap, by comparison, to pay the cost of stopping aggression when it starts; and we have been engaged in that task.

There is no doubt that the Communist aggressors are going to probe and test our courage. They are going to test our will. If they can defeat us by intimidating or scaring us, that, of course, will be the method they will use. If they cannot succeed in that way, they will try something stronger.

But let us not make this mistake, Mr. President. Let us not make the mistake of thinking Red China wants an all-out war with the United States. They are not that foolish. Let us not make the mistake of thinking that the Soviet Union wants that, either. They are not that foolish. And we do not want such a war. We are not that foolish.

But we know very well that if we must eventually confront Red China, we would be better off doing it now than having them confront us 5 years from now.

We do not seek any confrontation with them. All we seek is peace. All we seek is an honorable settlement. And I predict that within 1 year of the time we muster our national courage, gather our national unity, agree as we have in every confrontation, in every struggle in which this Nation has been involved, that we are going to see this thing through, we are going to make whatever sacrifice is necessary to achieve an honorable settlement of this fight, within 1 year it will be all over.

But until we do that, this struggle will drag on and on. And every time a Senator makes a speech suggesting that we should withdraw, quit tomorrow, or limit our effort to what we are doing at this moment, all he is doing is encouraging the Communists to continue the war.

They are paying a very heavy price, Mr. President. The Communist aggressors are losing about a thousand men a week. That is about 10 times the number we are losing; perhaps more than that. And while our troops are inflicting 10 times the casualties on them that they are inflicting on us, we are a nation that outnumbers their nation by more than 10 to 1; and the South Vietnamese are working on them, too, with their army, which is a good army of 450,000 courageous men, and they are taking their toll of the Vietcong aggressors.

Considering the size of that country, that would be just as though we here in the United States were suffering 10,000 casualties a week, 45,000 deaths a month. Think of the impact that would have on us. If we were suffering those kind of casualties, while the other fellow was not losing 1 man for every 10 that we were losing, obviously it would be a very demoralizing thing; especially if our adversary had the airpower to keep blasting away, knocking our bridges down, and destroying our communications.

So the biggest problem we have is to assure those who lack faith in America that this is the same America that has been equal to any challenge imposed upon it, and that we propose to be worthy of those who have gone before, those who captured this land from the savages and those who endured all the hardships that can be conjured by the mind of man; that we are still the greatest nation on the face of the earth, and that we are still the same kind of people that our fathers and grandfathers were.

When we convince them of that, Mr. President, we shall find that this struggle will become fairly simple, and we will win it a lot faster than people are inclined to think.

I wanted to make one more point about the nature of our enemy. It is not this Nation that is the international criminal; it is the enemy. It is he who has broken his word every step of the way. It is our enemy who has refused to negotiate. It has amazed me, as a Senator, to hear Senators make speeches downgrading their own courageous American fighting men, and say nothing whatever about the murderous assassinations, about these people coming into towns and taking innocent people, men, women, and children, and slaughtering them, and taking our soldiers, captured in battle, and killing them without permitting them any rights under the Geneva Treaty or anything else. This inhuman conduct of the enemy seems to escape reproach by some Senators.

On the other hand, I read in the press today of a captured Vietnamese woman, suspected of trying to kill American boys, who was being walked in as a prisoner with her hands tied behind her, and a Senator was saying what atrocious conduct that was on the part of our American boys for tying the lady's hands. All she was trying to do was kill them, but courtly gentlemen that they were, they tied her hands behind her, I suppose to keep her from scratching their eyeballs out.

It was terrible conduct on the part of our American boys to tie the woman's hands so that she could not kill them. They did not kill her. When our boys are taken prisoner, the Communists sometimes take them out and shoot them in complete violation of all the rules of war. They call them international war criminals, incidentally, saying the same thing some Senators have been known to say on the floor about our own country.

I plead my country not guilty. We are not a bunch of international war criminals. The other fellow is an international war criminal. He started the fight. We responded to that fight in compliance with article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, which states that there is nothing which in anywise infringes on our right of collective self-defense to come to the defense of South Vietnam. Here is a treaty that we agreed to abide by as a collective defense treaty.

All the downgrading of America gives support and heart to the Communist cause. It gives heart to the Communists when they take a pilot who has been shot down and shoot him through the head without regard to his rights, and then call him an international war criminal and hope to get by with it. They support their criminal activity by saying "Here is a speech made by a U.S. Senator to prove our contention that Americans are international criminals, a Senator who happens to have some understanding of law.

What I cannot understand is why those Senators who make such arguments do not look at article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. They urge us to hold to the Geneva accords. Why do they not look at the many violations which the other fellow has committed, which means that to them the Geneva accord means nothing until they, the enemy, are ready to abide by it.

Mr. President, there is only one way to win a war, and that is by fighting it. We do not win wars by dividing ourselves in the face of the enemy. We win wars by standing together behind our officers and men. We win wars by standing behind our President, our Commander in Chief.

Mr. President, it is time that Senators and Representatives begin to limit themselves in the amount of surplus advice they can give to one of the greatest men who ever served in Washington, a man who will be regarded as one of our greatest Presidents—possibly the greatest.

It is time that those who are giving this surplus advice join in a more important need; that is, support for the President, support for the boys fighting in Vietnam, support for the United States of America, support for law and order. That is what we need.

So far as I am concerned, I am proud to be an American.

I am proud of this Nation's honor. I am proud of its record and proud of its fighting men. I am very happy to support the resolution, and I hope very much that it will be supported unanimously.

I have considered that perhaps we should reaffirm the resolution that we passed, wherein we authorized the President to do whatever was necessary to resist aggression in southeast Asia. If, as a result of this debate, it appears that such a resolution may be necessary, I may do so. However, until that time, I am content that the resolution we gave the President in August last year not only authorizes the strong effort we are making in Vietnam but it also compels it.

To do anything less than what the President has done would be to dishonor the instructions which Congress gave to him, when Congress required him to do whatever was necessary to resist aggression in that area.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON FINANCE TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be permitted until midnight tonight to file its reports on sundry bills together with minority, supplemental, or individual views if desired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVENTION ON SETTLEMENT OF INVESTMENT DISPUTES BETWEEN STATES AND NATIONALS OF OTHER STATES—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive A, 89th Congress, 2d session, the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States, transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States, and that the convention, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's messages be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States which was approved on March 18, 1965, by the Executive Directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and which is open for signature at the Bank's headquarters in Washington.

The convention was signed for the United States of America by Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the convention and also a copy of Resolution No. 65-14 adopted by the Executive Directors of the Bank on March 18, 1965, a copy of the accompanying report of the Executive Directors, and a summary containing further explanatory comments concerning the Convention.

The purpose of the convention is to provide facilities for settlement or adjudication of international disputes relating to international private investments and thereby to encourage a larger flow of such investments. The convention would establish an International Center for Settlement of Investment Disputes, the seat of which would be at the principal office of the Bank. The Center would provide facilities, rules of procedure, and panels for conciliation and arbitration of investment disputes directly between private citizens or corporations of one country and the government of another country.

The convention would not establish any substantive rules of international law. Moreover, by becoming a party to the convention a country would not obligate itself to submit any given dispute or contract to the mechanisms of the convention. Both conciliation and arbitration would be based on consent, to be given either ad hoc or as part of an investment agreement. Once a consent to resort to either conciliation or arbitration under the convention has been given with respect to a particular matter, that consent would be irrevocable. The arbitration mechanism provided by the convention is such that refusal by one party to name its arbitrator would not prevent arbitration proceedings from going forward. Arbitral awards are stated to be binding on the parties and not subject to any appeal except as provided in the convention. Where applicable, and unless otherwise provided, the convention would provide for settlement through the mechanisms of the Center, without requirement of prior exhaustion of local remedies.

As indicated in the enclosed report by the Secretary of State, the U.S. Director of the Bank, pursuant to action 65–39 of February 12, 1965, of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, voted in favor of the resolution by which the Executive Directors of the Bank approved the text of the convention.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the convention and to its ratification.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 16, 1996.*

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE ALBERT THOMAS, OF TEXAS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it is my unhappy position to offer a resolution on behalf of myself and my distinguished senior colleague from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], regarding the death of Representative ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator permit the Chair to lay a resolution of the House before the Senate?

Mr. TOWER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be stated by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 730), as follows:

H. RES. 730

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That a committee of fifty Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect, the House do now adjourn.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, for some 29 years, Representative THOMAS served all of the people of the country, and of Texas, not just those of his district.

Despite his influence and interest in national affairs, however, he always remembered best his own constituency, laboring long and hard in behalf of the Houston, Tex., area, its people, and their interests.

For 21 of his 29 years here, he represented all of Harris County. The interests of this district were probably as diverse as those of any congressional district in the country, but support for Congressman THOMAS came from all quarters—labor, industry, business, banking, shipping, farming, ranching, and many others. And despite redistricting several years ago, his interest in behalf of all of the Houston area continued.

The people of our country can be thankful for Congressman THOMAS' scrutiny of the budget requests of the independent Government agencies. As ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Agencies for a number of years, he did all he could to see that the taxpayer's money was spent as judiciously as possible.

Representative THOMAS, primarily through amendment and skillful and shrewd debate, left his mark on much legislation that was passed during his many years in Washington. He demonstrated time and again his masterfulness as a working politician and public official.

Houston, the State of Texas, and the country are indeed better off as a result of Congressman THOMAS' service. His constituents, his State, and his country will all miss him. Senator YARBOROUGH and myself, and I know all of my Senate colleagues, extend the deepest of sympathies to members of the family.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was a distinct privilege to serve in the same Congress with Representative ALBERT THOMAS.

We enjoyed his oratory, brilliance, wit, and friendship. We in Louisiana sometimes felt we wished we could have had him because, as a Representative from Texas, on occasion we had to compete with Texas for projects that could have gone to Louisiana or Texas.

Representative THOMAS, with his position on key committees in the House of Representatives had a way of laying his long Texan hands on things that we thought should go to Louisiana, and getting them for his district in Texas.

He was a representative of his people in the best tradition of the Constitution, which assures that each State shall have two Senators, and each congressional district will have one Representative.

It has been said in this body many times that each Senator is equal, but that some are more equal than others. That is more true in the House of Representatives, where each Representative is equal but some are more equal than other Representatives.

ALBERT THOMAS was one of the most equal of them all, because he had a way of representing his State and representing his district in the most effective way.

One thing that concerned Louisianians, and sometimes gave us great concern, was the weekly meetings of Texans, when they would get their heads together to see whether or not there was anything of advantage for Texas. While we did not have such an arrangement in Louisiana, we sometimes thought it was necessary.

Representative THOMAS very effectively helped his colleagues in other districts throughout the great State of Texas, but above all he was a great American, and his interest for his country was first and above all other matters.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and myself, I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 225), as follows:

S. RES. 225

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ALBERT THOMAS, late a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the first resolving clause, the Chair appoints the Senators from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH and Mr. TOWER] to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, Representative ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas, the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 17, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 16, 1966:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Elmer Boyd Staats, of Kansas, to be Comptroller General of the United States for a term of 15 years.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Dixon Donnelley, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Lee C. White, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1970.

THE JUDICIARY

Frederick J. R. Heebe, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana, vice Frank B. Ellis, retired.

Russell E. Smith, of Montana, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Montana vice William D. Murray, retired.

U.S. MARSHAL

Joseph W. Keene, of Louisiana, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Louisiana for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

FARM CREDIT BOARD, FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The following-named persons to be members of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for terms expiring March 31, 1972:

R. D. Pennewell, of Missouri, vice Lester Clyde Carter.

A. Lars Nelson, of Washington, vice Robert T. Lister.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Timothy J. May, of Colorado, to be General Counsel of the Post Office Department.

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Ray M. Smith, Chunchula, Ala., in place of M. M. Davis, retired.

ALASKA

Nina A. Lie, Kotzebue, Alaska, in place of H. B. Lie, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Janet L. Apple, Harrell, Ark., in place of Z. M. Parker, retired.

COLORADO

Byron M. Jacobsen, Ault, Colo., in place of D. B. Venable, retired.

Rallin R. Gibson, Collbran, Colo., in place of E. N. Adams, retired.

Harry N. Pearson, Ignacio, Colo., in place of N. B. Marker, retired.

Barbara M. Spencer, Ouray, Colo., in place of M. H. McCullough, retired.

Frank A. Batman, Jr., Pierce, Colo., in place of E. F. Huitt, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Anne C. Freeman, Lebanon, Conn., in place of V. P. Kelley, retired.

Edward W. Gray, Riverton, Conn., in place of E. G. Jordan, deceased.

GEORGIA

Lee T. Everett, Vienna, Ga., in place of R. D. Power, retired.

IDAHO

Phillip N. Hathaway, Driggs, Idaho, in place of S. H. Huff, retired.

Charles J. Orr, Hazelton, Idaho, in place of J. H. Christopherson, transferred.

ILLINOIS

James C. Stanley, Fairfield, Ill., in place of J. C. Stanley, removed.

Robert D. Yordy, Flanagan, Ill., in place of M. D. O'Brien, retired.

John C. Wenger, Rock City, Ill., in place of R. J. Hofmeister, retired.

Norman A. Rutter, Saint Libory, Ill., in place of C. S. Rutter, retired.

Charles H. Gunier, Sheridan, Ill., in place of M. L. Abbott, retired.

INDIANA

Richard P. Gerhard, Kokomo, Ind., in place of W. W. Workman, retired.

IOWA

William H. Merkle, Fayette, Iowa, in place of E. A. Billings, retired.

Clarita F. Witham, Truesdale, Iowa, in place of L. B. Cave, resigned.

KANSAS

Durward E. Smith, Admire, Kans., in place of D. W. Fowler, transferred.

Wayne A. Wray, Barnes, Kans., in place of J. T. Poland, retired.

Florence W. Kelley, Chanute, Kans., in place of L. R. Nelson, retired.

Orval M. Siefers, Dorrance, Kans., in place of E. L. Betts, retired.

Louise L. Atwell, Kismet, Kans., in place of Ethel Prater, retired.

Effie M. Dunn, Meriden, Kans., in place of R. E. Deveney, retired.

Evelyn M. Caldwell, Preston, Kans., in place of E. R. Silvers, retired.

Earl K. Pennington, Rantoul, Kans., in place of E. D. Medlen, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Mae B. Runyon, Pinsonfork, Ky., in place of Gertrude Scott, retired.

Victor D. Headrick, Tompkinsville, Ky., in place of B. L. Hope, retired.

LOUISIANA

August M. Hofmann, Jr., Reserve, La., in place of M. J. Donaldson, resigned.

Juliette W. Chabaud, Saint Gabriel, La., in place of J. L. Richard, retired.

MAINE

Gertraut H. Walsh, Levant, Maine, in place of M. N. Bemis, retired.

MARYLAND

Ralph W. Hutchins, Prince Frederick, Md., in place of R. C. Williams, retired.

Donald L. Derr, Walkersville, Md., in place of N. M. Jamison, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Bernice E. Walker, East Wareham, Mass., in place of V. W. Humphrey, retired.

John F. Landry, Halifax, Mass., in place of R. O. Case, retired.

James H. Malonson, Jr., Sudbury, Mass., in place of F. D. Bradshaw, retired.

MICHIGAN

Elmer A. Behrend, Powers, Mich., in place of E. J. Shannon, retired.

MINNESOTA

Lawrence M. Fogarty, International Falls, Minn., in place of R. B. Sullivan, retired.

Alton E. Davis, Oakland, Minn., in place of M. W. Cole, transferred.

Stanley J. Hill, Tower, Minn., in place of I. M. Sovde, retired.

MISSOURI

Robert E. Sheets, Eagleville, Mo., in place of O. G. Moore, retired.

J. Walter Jones, Sweet Springs, Mo., in place of C. R. Muller, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Howard D. Clements, Hay Springs, Nebr., in place of H. M. Gilmore, retired.

Theodore R. Gaedke, Wellfleet, Nebr., in place of P. D. Coder, transferred.

NEVADA

Ronald F. Gandolfo, Austin, Nev., in place of B. J. Nurmi, resigned.

Vivian A. Cranmer, Pahrump, Nev., in place of F. L. Turner, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

G. Nelson Lambert, Center Harbor, N.H., in place of H. F. Smith, retired.

Ralph J. Lavalee, Goffstown, N.H., in place of L. H. Watt, deceased.

Victor J. Dean, New London, N.H., in place of J. E. Shepard, retired.

Paul E. Sanborn, Wilmot Flat, N.H., in place of W. F. Haskell, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Alfred W. Conrads, Andover, N.J., in place of E. D. Hill, retired.

Geraldine B. Nyce, Califon, N.J., in place of M. H. Pill, retired.

Philip J. Leary, Sr., Egg Harbor City, N.J., in place of M. R. Stone, deceased.

Thomas F. Flynn, Emerson, N.J., in place of W. J. Pricolo, removed.

Alice E. Taylor, Malaga, N.J., in place of P. S. Richman, retired.

Edward Klimowich, Montville, N.J., in place of Floyd Smith, retired.

Donald H. J. Donovan, Moorestown, N.J., in place of R. G. Shreve, deceased.

James L. Doyle, New Lisbon, N.J., in place of F. S. Doyle, retired.

Edna M. Coursen, Oak Ridge, N.J., in place of Peter Klapmuts, deceased.

Clarence P. Kinsley, Pemberton, N.J., in place of B. M. Lippincott, retired.

Vincent J. Sindone, River Edge, N.J., in place of W. H. Beekman, deceased.

Clair J. Nenno, Riverside, N.J., in place of Herbert Schneider, retired.

Daniel J. Jordan, Rosenhayn, N.J., in place of Angelo Daurio, resigned.

Leonard F. Errico, Stockton, N.J., in place of W. J. Ledger, retired.

Gerald L. Halpin, Vineland, N.J., in place of J. E. Lyons, retired.

Patricia A. Caul, Wallpack Center, N.J., in place of E. B. Rosenkrans, resigned.

NEW YORK

Harry H. Emmons, Interlaken, N.Y., in place of J. V. Kellogg, retired.

Barbara A. Alkinburgh, Nelliston, N.Y., in place of J. W. Van Alstine, retired.

OHIO

James J. McCoy, Jr., Niles, Ohio, in place of P. J. Ragazzo, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

Albert L. Rogers, Canute, Okla., in place of F. J. Kamphaus, deceased.

OREGON

Donald E. Tomlin, Mount Hood, Oreg., in place of G. J. Hanel, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Nicholas Lalich, Duquesne, Pa., in place of P. S. McDermott, retired.

Michael A. Hrehocik, Glassport, Pa., in place of W. J. Hlavats, retired.

Andrew P. Stallsmith, Hadley, Pa., in place of R. S. Feather, deceased.

Thomas F. Collins, Jr., Linesville, Pa., in place of H. D. Akens, retired.

Harry W. Stark, Manchester, Pa., in place of H. E. Bixler, retired.

William R. Ewing, Saegertown, Pa., in place of M. E. Byers, retired.

Lyman A. Stambaugh, York, Pa., in place of E. S. Glatfelter, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Robert S. Kuni, Huron, S. Dak., in place of G. W. Chitty, retired.

TENNESSEE

Malcolm A. Fults, Altamont, Tenn., in place of A. A. Scruggs, retired.

TEXAS

Orveta D. Generaux, Addison, Tex., in place of E. B. Lewis, retired.

Harold A. Doane, Jr., Haslet, Tex., in place of H. M. George, Jr., removed.

Frank N. Simpson, McLean, Tex., in place of B. R. Reeves, transferred.

Loralee J. Simmons, Magnolia, Tex., in place of Wilora Damuth, retired.

Jack P. Meredith, Teague, Tex., in place of H. W. Hawker, retired.

Wynell C. Watson, Troy, Tex., in place of H. E. Weir, deceased.

Margaret L. Cooke, Waskom, Tex., in place of P. P. Pollard, retired.

UTAH

Gertrude B. Turner, Jensen, Utah, in place of R. P. Haslem, retired.

Warren L. Marble, Monroe, Utah, in place of Elliott Larsen, retired.

VIRGINIA

Patsy T. Johnson, Baskerville, Va., in place of B. F. Gayle, retired.

Allie O. Tuck, Natural Bridge, Va., in place of L. P. Fainter, retired.

Virginia B. Bruce, Woodford, Va., in place of W. A. Duke, transferred.

WASHINGTON

Irma S. Nordquist, Lakebay, Wash., in place of A. J. Middlesworth, retired.

John H. D. Smith, Orondo, Wash., in place of R. T. Gaston, retired.

David L. Gray, Reardan, Wash., in place of L. A. Schultz, retired.

Robert A. Leadon, Yakima, Wash., in place of Thomas Stave, retired.

WISCONSIN

Clifton R. Barber, Plum City, Wis., in place of G. M. Suter, retired.

Harold A. Kuehl, Reeseville, Wis., in place of Merle Cain, retired.

WYOMING

Theodore E. Anderson, Greybull, Wyo., in place of O. O. Harvey, deceased.

Richard Hays, Riverton, Wyo., in place of L. A. Millard, retired.

Verne S. Parman, Sinclair, Wyo., in place of C. H. Massey, retired.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. For appointment:

To be surgeon

Eugene J. Gangarosa

To be senior assistant surgeons

Spencer Foreman
Hugh F. Walker
Francis X. Urbanski
Jack T. Ellis
Edward A. Oppenheimer
Earl V. Gear, Jr.
Gerald Allen
James M. Andre
Theodore R. Stoner, Jr.
John M. Easton
Frederick C. Hoesly
Charles Y. C. Pak
Franklin D. Curl

To be dental surgeons

William A. Gibson
Julius D. Robertson
James R. Nixon

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Gordon L. Byrd
John P. Short
Roy H. Blomquist
George T. Ward
James H. Hornberger
John T. Mayhall

To be senior sanitary engineer

Earl V. Porter

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

Robert G. Raymond

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Edward F. Bradley
Walter N. Thomasson
Robert E. Hatten
John S. Henderson
John L. Russell
Frederick J. Roland
Joel P. Kollin
Richard S. Kramkowski
Chester L. Tate, Jr.

To be senior assistant pharmacists

George E. Conley
Michael J. Kovach

To be assistant pharmacists

John G. Beauregard
Stephen T. Werelus
William H. Peterson, Jr.
James E. Farr
Richard M. Gallant

To be scientist

William J. Campbell

To be senior assistant scientist

Alfred Hellman

To be sanitarian

John E. La Plante

To be senior assistant sanitarians

John L. Kreimeyer
Richard W. Gillespie

To be senior assistant veterinary officer

William T. Hubbert

To be nurse officers

Mary L. Lane
Agnes Malec
Margaret M. Ahern
Eileen G. Jones
Mary B. Twiner
Jane A. Lee
Marian E. Haij
Betty J. Klingenhagen
E. Arline Heath
Mary T. Shea

To be senior assistant nurse officers

Barbara J. Bowman
Eleanor J. Collard
Marjorie A. Greene
Virginia S. Giovinco

To be junior assistant dietitian

Arlene M. M. Lawrence

To be senior assistant health services officers

Richard L. Varner
James E. Davis
Donald E. Gardner

II. For permanent promotion:

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

James E. Thompson

To be senior assistant dietitian

Webb D. Evans

To be senior assistant therapist

William W. Murray

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Carville, Elaine T.
Dowler, Essie L.

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Donohoe, Katharine M.
Lee, Barbara J.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Adamczuk, Russell W.
*Bischoff, Joseph J.
Candea, George A.
*Carlisle, Robert L.
*Cates, Leroy R.
*Gerber, Donald R.
*Grey, Clarence B.
Marushok, Andrew G.
*McAlexander, Donald E.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Alger, Richard J.
Allanson, William A.
*Anderson, Arthur R., Jr.
Andrew, Thomas C., Jr.
*Andrews, Roi E.
*Archbold, John C.
Armstrong, Richard F.
*Badeker, Roger W.
Bailey, George N., Jr.
Bailey, George L.
*Bainbridge, Robert L.
Bair, Harry H.
*Baker, Ray L.
*Baker, Terrance P.
Barry, John A.
*Barstow, Charles A.
*Batt, Karlton L.
*Baughman, Robert C.
*Baumwart, Eldon L.
Becker, William L.
Beers, Thomas G.
*Begnaud, Pierre H.
Benn, Daniel T.
*Benstead, Daryl E.
Bergman, Arthur A.
*Bergstrom, Carl F., Jr.
Berry, Fred H., Jr.
Bieger, Donald C.
*Biegler, James L.
Birzer, Edward A.
*Bishop, Daniel G.
*Bittner, Barry N.
Black, Carl E. R.
Black, James O.
*Blanc, Richard J.
Bloomer, William A.
*Boalch, Dennis F.
Boemerman, George F.
Bollard, George J.
*Bond, Henry J.
Bond, Royce L.
Boone, William
*Boozman, Paul G.
*Borlan, Albert G.
*Bosbonis, Stephen
*Bowen, Donald P.
*Bradshaw, Harvey D.
Brandenhorst, John D.
*Brandon, Jack A.
Breslauer, Charles K.
Brewer, Clyde W., Jr.
*Brookshire, Phil E.
Brown, Earl E.
*Brown, Jerome W.
*Brown, Walter R.
Brubaker, Ralph E.
*Buckner, Gordon H., II
*Buehl, Louis H., III
*Burt, Wayne F.
*Buschhaus, Ernest W.
*Bustos, Robert G.
*Buttolph, Richard D.
*Cacace, Pasquale L.
Cady, Michael P.
Cardwell, Ronald E.
*Carey, Charles A.
*Carlson, Gary L.
*Carr, Gerald P.
*Carr, John R., Jr.
*Carroll, Daniel I.
*Carter, Sterling W.
Cassidy, Brendan J.
Chapman, Edward J., Jr.
Chapman, Ralph L.
Chapman, Richard B.
*Charlton, Albert K.
*Chester, John W., Jr.
*Christensen, Keith L.
*Clark, Ronald A.
*Clayson, Holly
*Clewes, John E.
*Cochran, James R. W.
*Coit, Francis E.
Cole, Jack L.
*Conway, Richard C.
*Coogan, Richard J.
*Cooney, Thomas D.
*Cope, John F.
*Cote, Normand A.
*Courson, Eugene S.
Cox, James M.
*Crandell, John E.
*Crews, Duane D., Jr.
Crittenden, Jerry J. S.
*Crumback, Willard I.
*Cummins, Billy R.
Cunningham, Ernest C., Jr.
*Curry, Kenneth D., Jr.
*Czubai, Stanley J.
*Dale, Denver T., III
Dalrymple, Donald A.
*Daniels, Charles E.
Daugherty, Ben D.
*Day, Charles J.
*Dean, Clyde D.
*Decota, Walter J.
*Delaney, James J., II
*Derickson, Neal L.
*Deutschlander, Herman C.
*Diaz, Odilio M.
*Dilley, Donald E.
*Dillow, Walter R.
*Dilworth, Clarence W.
*Dinnage, Merritt W.
*Dittmeier, Arthur A.
*Dixon, John C.
Dodds, William E.
*Donnelly, Joseph A.
Doub, Jay A.
*Draayer, Lloyd J.
*Driefer, John L.
*Dunn, George H., II
*Dunn, John D.
*Dunn, Russell M., Jr.
Dupont, James A.
*Earles, Marcie J.
*Ebbitt, George F., Jr.
*Edmondson, Orville R.
*Edwards, Thomas L.
Edwards, Myrddyn E.
*Egan, Martin J., Jr.
*Eisenhauer, Stephen S.
*Eldridge, Robert B.
*Elliott, Philip L.
*Emberton, Bruce W.
*Emery, Gordon P.
Erickson, Eldon L.
*Ertlmeier, George J.
Etnyre, William R.
*Evans, Ernest E., Jr.
Evans, George G., Jr.
Evans, Richard L.
*Everett, John W.
*Falls, William R.
*Felter, Joseph L.
*Fillmore, Walter D.
Finn, Robert J.
*Fogo, Wallace E.
*Folks, Tommy I.
*Forhan, James F.
*Foster, David L.
*Fowner, Robert D.
*Frank, William C.
*Frey, Francis X.
*Friedrichs, Phillip B.
*Furstenberg, Lawrence
Gagnon, Louis F.
Gahagan, James S.
*Gallagher, Gerald F.
*Garrison, Marvin T.
*Gash, William J.
*Gasparine, Louis, Jr.
Gerding, Edward E.
*Gibson, Robert E.
*Gillon, Robert A.
*Godby, Lawrence J.
*Godfrey, Edwin J.
*Golden, Joseph F.
*Goller, Winston O.
Gonzalez, John C.
*Goodwine, Lloyd E.
*Gowdy, Richard J.
*Graham, Frank E.
*Grattan, Roland N.
*Graves, Arthur L.
Green, James R.
*Green, Robert P.
*Greer, Jesse R.
Gregorcyk, Joe L.
*Griggs, Charles E.
*Guinee, Vincent J., Jr.
Guttormson, Darold L.
*Habgood, Charles R.
Hagan, Robert D.
*Hagerty, Roger C.
*Haislip, Richard E.
*Hallett, Robert F.
*Hamlin, Thomas M.
*Harding, Floyd L.
Harney, Edward A.
Harrell, James T., III
Harrison, James B., Jr.
*Hart, Franklin A., Jr.
*Hart, Vincent P., Jr.
*Haskins, Jack
Hasler, Frederick R.
*Hedges, Manuel H. L.
*Hedrick, Joseph C.
*Heflin, James R.
*Heim, Donald C.
*Heise, Edward J.
*Henderson, Ted R.
Henry, Charles A.
Henry, Howard B.
*Herther, Herbert M.
*Hickle, Arthur R.
Hintz, Gary W.
*Hitz, James C.
Holcomb, Charles E.
*Holles, David V. V.
*Holmes, Lyell H.
*Holstead, George N.
Hooper, John G.
*Hopkins, Joseph E.
Horn, Denis R.
Huckle, Richard A.
*Hull, Robert R.
Humphrey, Donald L.
*Hutchinson, Franklin G., Jr.
*Ingraham, John D.
Isbell, Will D.
*Jacobs, Phillip M.
James, John H.
Jamison, Russell E.
*Janz, Edward P.
Jarnot, Fidelas W.
*Jaross, James
*Jensen, Arthur E.
*Johnson, Leroy E.
Johnson, Robert A.
Johnson, Richard J.
Jones, Homer P.
*Jones, Paul R., Jr.
*Jones, Robert C.
*Jones, Thomas W.
*Jorgenson, Conrad A.
Jupp, Walter A.
*Keenan, John J.
*Kehrle, Jerry E.
*Keller, Donald E.
Kelly, Edwin F.
*Kettering, Alvah J.
*Keyes, Edwin R.
*Kimbrell, Harrison W.
*King, Homer Lee P.
*Kirby, Robert W.
*Koch, John R.
*Kramer, Russell I.
Kraxberger, Billy D.
*Kress, Herbert W.
*Kress, Peter N.
Kuhn, Harold F.
*Lacey, Fred E., Jr.
Lafser, Raymond C.
*Lamb, Allan W.
*Larsen, Erik
*Lawson, Curtis G.
*Layton, Willard T., III
Leavitt, James E. C., Jr.
*Ledbetter, Walter R., Jr.
*Lerps, David A.
*Lewis, Stanley P.
Light, William H., Jr.
Livingstone, John A.
*Loehe, Robert E.
Lorzing, John E.
*Lottsfeldt, Peter F.
Louder, Joseph J.
*Loughry, Arthur S.
*Lowe, Willie L., Jr.
*Lukeman, Anthony
*Lyttle, Dan J. C.
*Maag, Eddie R.
MacFarlan, Cornelius W.
*MacLaren, Bruce M.
*MacPherson, Robert T.
Magaldi, Joseph M., Jr.
Malone, Gordon E.
Manrod, Frank M.
*Manzione, John A. J.
*Marfia, Samuel J.
*Markwitz, Leonard R.
*Martin, Gene H.
*Martinez, Manuel O.

*Mathews, Frederick A.
*Maxwell, Jack L.
*McCaffrey, William F.
McCarty, Howard J.
*McCluskey, Charles A.
*McCoury, Melvin W., Jr.
McDonald, Charles J., Jr.
*McFerren, Kent A.
*McGuire, William D.
*McKenna, George X.
*McKinstry, William E.
McMahon, George F., Jr.
*McNelis, James F.
*Medina, Thomas J.
*Melcher, Paul F.
*Michael, Stanley J., Jr.
*Miller, Henry G., Jr.
*Miller, James E.
*Miller, Nicholas J., Jr.
*Mills, Harry L.
*Modjeski, Robert L.
Monteau, Hubert A.
*Moody, James D.
*Moore, Jacob W.
*Moore, Richard G.
Moore, Robert H.
*Morgan, Jimmie G.
*Morgan, William S., Jr.
*Mura, Michael
*Murphy, Dennis J.
*Murphy, Edmond J.
*Mutch, Bryce A., Jr.
*Myers, Louis B.
*Nalle, Thomas A.
*Nelbach, Arthur A., Jr.
*Nelson, Herbert E.
*Nelson, Thomas W., Jr.
Nichols, John T.
*Nieland, Paul F.
*Norris, Donald J.
*Norton, Jerome L.
Nulty, William H.
*Oliver, John P.
*Olsen, Carl B., Jr.
Ondrako, Stephen Jr.
*Ortman, Thomas J.
Oseguera, Alfonso
Overcash, Bobbie G.
*Owens, James L.
*Pafford, Billy E.
*Page, James C.
*Paige, Eddie C., Jr.
*Parker, Charles E.
*Parsons, James R.
*Patterson, Kenneth G.
*Peacock, Marvin E.
*Pentecost, Thomas J.
*Peterka, Bert W.
*Peterson, Perry M.
Petroff, Richard
Phifer, David W.
*Phillips, Charles L.
*Piantadosi, Louis J.
*Pierce, Edward R.
*Pierce, James D.
Pishock, Stephen J.
Pitman, Charles H.
*Pitts, Charles O., Jr.
*Plant, Robert
Potenza, Alphonse G.
Powell, Raymond R.
*Prather, Richard L.
*Pratt, George E.
*Preston, Leonard T.
*Proctor, Ralph D.
*Prudhomme, Daniel
Purcilly, Joseph C., Jr.
Radabaugh, Harold V.
Ramsey, Lonnie E.
*Ready, Bobby J.
*Reap, Thomas S.
*Redelfs, John E.
*Reichert, John P.
Reid, Herbert J. L.
*Reid, Robert D.
Reid, Robert J.
*Rhymer, Roy H.
*Riddell, William R., Jr.
*Riney, Francis
*Ritchie, Richard G.
*Ritts, Robert O.
*Roberts, James A.
Roberts, John W.
*Robinson, Charles D.
Robson, Jon R.
Rocha, Anthony V.
*Rodgers, Charles L.
Rogers, George F., Jr.
*Rose, Robert P.
*Rosenthal, Joseph S.
Rothwell, Jack D.
*Rowe, Donald L.
*Ryan, Patrick J.
*Ryan, Paul M.
*Ryder, James N.
Ryhanych, George W.
*Sanders, Albert L.
*Sanford, Glen
*Sardo, Americo A.
*Saxton, Patrick J.
*Scaglione, Peter C., Jr.
Scarborough, Kenneth L.
Schilhab, Eugene E.
*Schofield, Harold
*Schreiner, Charles W., Jr.
*Seabrook, Charles C.
Seal, Robert E.
*Sellers, Jay G.
*Sells, Jimmy D.
*Service, Walter C., III
Sharff, Karl E.
*Shiffler, George M., Jr.
*Short, Leonard O., Jr.
Shubert, James D.
Silard, Con D., Jr.
*Siler, Joseph A.
Slack, Paul D.
*Slade, George P.
*Slepicka, Alois A.
*Smith, Donald G.
Smith, Frank R.
*Smith, Harry E., Jr.
*Smith, Lloyd W., Jr.
*Smith, Roland E.
*Smith, William R.
*Snider, Howard L.
*Spencer, Noel W., Jr.
*Spreier, Richard P.
*Spreitzer, Richard L.
*Sprott, David N.
*Stapleton, Cleo P., Jr.
*Stark, Alfred E.
*Stauch, Victor D., Jr.
*Stendahl, Walter R., Jr.
*Stephens, Arthur C., Jr.
*Stephens, Willard M.
Stevens, Joseph W., Jr.
Stevens, Jerome E.
Stewart, Arthur L., Jr.
*Stoddart, Edgar R., Jr.
*Stokes, Thomas M., Jr.
*Stratford, William K.
*Sullivan, Francis T.
*Summers, Bennie W.
*Sweeney, Robert M.
*Swigert, William G.
Symm, Bernace M.
*Sypniewski, William A.
Taylor, Jack R.
*Terwilliger, John W.
*Thomley, Robert R.
*Thompson, Charles E.
Throgmorton, James R.
*Tipshus, Edward C.
*Tirk, Eugene R.
*Todd, Larrance M.
*Townsend, Thomas A.
*Toyeas, George E.
*Turner, Leon B.
Tye, Charles
*Vanmanen, Charles M.
Verdon, Donald J.
Walker, Ralph V., Jr.
*Wallace, Hobart M., Jr.
Warczakowski, Alphonse
*Ward, Charles
*Waunch, Donald S.
*Weatherford, Edwin G.
*Webb, Donald E.
Weiland, Gerald A.
*Weiss, Robert J.
*Wells, James A., Jr.
*Whipple, Earl F., Jr.
*Widick, Lester D., Jr.
*Wieland, Richard A.
*Williams, Clifton C., Jr.
*Williams, Martin J.
*Williams, Charles P.
*Willkomm, James W.
*Wilson, Paul A., Jr.
*Wilson, Willis E., Jr.
*Wise, Robert C.
*Witter, Henry F.
*Woeckener, Robert J.
*Woodrow, Fitz W. M., Jr.
Woody, Larry D.
*Worden, Peter R.
*Yadlowsky, Peter
*Yanochik, Walter N.
*Yates, John R., Jr.
*Zangas, Charles L.
*Ziemann, James R.
*Zimmerman, Karl A., II.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Angil, John F.
*Arnold, Mordecai R.
*Ayer, Williard F.
*Beitel, Richard T.
*Bourgeois, Kenneth L.
*Brady, Frank D.
Brentlinger, Richard A.
*Bridges, Charles R.
*Briggs, James H.
*Cahaskie, Charles S.
*Connell, James J.
Cox, Edward V.
*Dickson, Ted O.
*Drummond, John F.
*East, James T.
*Eastman, James E.
*Eckert, James D.
*Erwin, Harold A.
*Fallon, John J., Jr.
*Ferrante, Frank
*Filo, William R.
*Geddes, Roland T.
*Gill, Gerald L.
*Glass, Eugene M.
*Goehring, John A.
*Griffin, James P.
*Grisier, Darcy E.
*Guenther, John J.
*Hadley, John A.
*Hardaway, James D.
*Harrington, Robert F.
*Havel, John H.
*Hickok, James B.
*Higgins, Howard W.
*Hoffman, George F.
*Holbrook, James H., Jr.
*Jenkins, John L.
*Jensen, Harold B., Jr.
*Johnston, Donald W.
*Kennedy, Thomas J.
*Kerrigan, Richard T.
Kolb, James G.
Kratcoski, Eugene L.
*Lakin, William P.
*Lamb, Charles T.
*Lingenfelter, Theodore P.
Link, Louis A.
*Lippmann, Robert E.
*Livezey, James W.
*Lorch, Robert E.
*Mann, Frank, Jr.
*Martin, Arville D.
*McClellan, William O., Jr.
*McDermott, Patrick L.
*McNutt, Paul V.
*McVay, Kenneth A.
*Mears, Charles J., Jr.
*Meece, Donald O.
*Miller, Richard P.
*Mulford, Charles G.
*Muncie, Donald R.
*Nelms, Ralph.
*Noland, Kenneth E.
Obert, Carroll K.
*Odell, Donald O.
*Oss, Merton J.
*Perz, Vernon J.
*Roberson, Willie G.
*Sanchez, Herbert M.
*Schlotzhauer, William P.
*Schreck, Edwin E.
*Schulz, Richard W.
Selwitschka, William, J.
*Sherzer, Russell R.
*Smyth, James P.
*Still, Leo J., Jr.
*Stumpf, William W.
*Truax, Thomas M.
Valentine, Igor R.
Varn, Forest N.
Vick, Dellie A., Jr.
*Wells, James E.
*Wilkinson, Morgan L.
*Yale, Carl R.

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Beauchamp, Sara R.
Bednar, Carla H.
Blume, Mary C.
Botwright, Jeanne A.
Canal, Jo Ann
Hammond, Joan
Heigel, Mary L.
Hoermann, Anna L.
Howard, Mary S. L.
Jones, Vera M.
Lajiness, Yvonne C.
Lund, Judith K.
McKee, Kay E.
McKenna, Nona D.
Pollack, Carol L.
Ray, Carol A.
Reals, Gail M.
Silvey, Wanda R.
Stevens, Mary S.
Wallace, Marilyn E.
Wauch, Gail A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Abele, John F.
Ablowich, Ronald E.
Acree, William R.
Adams, David H.
Adams, Frank H.
*Adams, Gene A., Jr.
*Adams, James S.
*Adams, Merrell F., Jr.
Adams, Richard G.
Adkinson, John L., Jr.
*Ainsley, William S., III
Allega, Alfred J.
*Allen, Bryan K.
*Allen, James S.
Alton, Thomas R. H.
Alvord, William W.
*Amelse, Lawrence T.
Anderson, David L.
*Anderson, Robert R.
*Anderst, James L.
Archie, Arrington W.
Arick, John C.
*Ariola, Carl R.
*Ariss, David W.
Armstrong, Raymond L.
Arnold, Thomas W., Jr.
Austin, Lowell E., Jr.
Austin, Stephen W.
Ayala, Isaac
Badiner, Samuel
Baer, Herbert P.
*Baggette, John C.
Bagley, Thomas B., Jr.
Baker, Doyle D.
*Baker, Larry L.
*Balthis, Joseph R.
*Banks, Henry D.
Banning, Maurice R.
*Barber, Frederic C.
Barner, Wayne A.
Barnum, Harvey C., Jr.
*Barraclough, Harold T.
*Barre, Ole
*Barrett, Thomas V.
*Bartel, Roger A.
Bartels, William C.
Barth, David R.
Bartlett, Gilbert A.
*Barton, Thomas Y., Jr.
Bassett, Delbert M.
*Basso, Francis J., Jr.
Baxa, Ernest G., Jr.
Beale, Robert B.
Beatty, James P.
*Becker, James H.
Beckley, James F.
Bednar, William C., Jr.
Beekman, Frederick W., III
*Bell, William H.
Bell, William F.
*Bellows, Bruce A.
*Bendrick, Frank A.
*Benner, William D.
*Benson, Dean E.
Berthelson, George
*Berthusen, Norman T.
Bethea, William L., Jr.
Beyer, Malcolm K., Jr.
Beyma, Dennis C.
Bieberbach, Leonard C.
Bierman, James W.
Binch, William B.
*Blanks, Charlton H.
*Bledsoe, Carl R.
Blot, Harold W.
Bolster, Robert W., Jr.
Borowicz, Ronald R.
Bour, Joseph A.
Brabham, James A., Jr.
Bracy, Robert A.
*Brady, Philip O.
*Brahms, David M.
*Branum, Marx H.
Braun, Gary R.
*Breeding, Earle G., Jr.
Bremer, Darwin E.
Brennan, George D., II
*Brickley, John P.
*Briseno, Francisco P.
Britt, James R.
Brockett, William H., Jr.
*Brodeur, Gerald P.
Brooks, Robert C.
*Brophy, Richard T.
Brown, Gene A.
Brown, James E.
*Brown, John M., Jr.
*Bruner, Robert T.
Bryan, George H.
*Bryan, James R.
Bryant, Franklin O.
Buch, Alan D.
Buchanan, William L.
*Burke, John G.
Burkhardt, Joseph T.
Burkman, Robert W.
*Burks, LaGrand
*Burns, Orval L.
*Burns, Ralph D., Jr.
*Butchko, John, Jr.
*Butler, John C.
*Butler, John A., III
*Butler, Alton L.
*Butsko, Frank
*Byrne, Peter E.
*Cadwalader, George
Calkin, James F.
*Calta, Ronald F.
*Campbell, Bruce J.
Campbell, Harold J., Jr.
Campbell, Jack R., Jr.
*Campbell, Thomas E.
*Campbell, William R.
*Canaday, Michael C.
*Capek, Ronald A.
Capitanio, David A.
*Care, James D.
*Carlon, Kenneth C.
*Carlson, Keith E.
*Carney, James F.
Carpenter, Thomas M.
Carr, Henry S., III
*Carr, John D.
Carroll, James O.
Carroll, John J.

*Carroll, Michael M.
*Carroll, Ronald J.
*Carroll, Theodore D.
*Carter, David A.
Carter, Marshall N.
Carter, Richard H.
Carter, Thomas L.
Caskey, Robert D.
*Cassidy, James A., Jr.
Castagnetti, Gene E.
Cates, Allen E.
*Cavin, Robert C.
Celmer, Lawrence J.
Chamberlin, Henry B., III
Chambers, John A.
Chambers, Russell, A.
Champion, James H.
Chang, Melvyn H.
Chapin, Sidney P.
Chapman, Arthur C.
*Chapman, Jack A.
*Chapman, Paul W.
Chesson, John W.
Chilcote, David L.
Chipman, Sydney E.
Chittenden, Thomas J.
Choate, Thomas W.
*Chowen, Wesley J.
Christmas, George R.
Christy, Donald E.
*Ciancimino, James A.
Clanton, Charley J.
*Clapp, Robert G.
Clark, Gary D.
Climo, William H., Jr.
*Cloud, David F.
Cluff, Michael L.
*Coates, Sterling K.
*Cobb, Charles W., Jr.
Cobb, Daniel J., III
*Cody, Ernest L., Jr.
Cody, Richard L.
Coker, Lee D.
*Coleman, Bobby L.
*Coleman, Ronald W.
Collins, Eldridge R., Jr.
*Collins, Emmett B., II
Collins, Melville W., Jr.
Collins, Randy J.
Conley, William J.
*Connell, Terence P.
Connor, Charles R.
*Conoley, Robert O.
*Conrad, John E., Jr.
*Conway, Jack L.
Cook, Frederic W.
Cook, Roger K.
*Coolican, James J.
Cooper, Thomas M.
*Copeland, Randolph G.
Cossaboon, Everett E.
*Coulter, Wayne F.
*Coyle, Edward L.
Crain, Richard W.
*Crane, Roy L.
*Craney, Dennis W.
*Cregan, John C.
*Crusing, John R.
Cullen, William E., Jr.
*Cunningham, James I.
Curchin, John F.
Currie, Herbert L.
*Curtis, Charles B.
*Cusick, Thomas L.
*Dadisman, Donald W.
Da Grosa, John B.
*Daley, Roderic S.
*Damon, Dennis E.
*Davenport, Paul G.
Davenport, Roy L.
*Davidson, Douglas M.
*Davis, Charles E.
*Davis, James M.
Davis, Robert P.
Davis, Sheridan
Dawson, Robert G.
*Dean, Dale D.
*De Bona, Andrew D.

*Decker, Richard A.
*De Forest, Roy E.
De Hart, Earl R., Jr.
*Delaney, Richard A.
*Dempsey, Daniel G.
Dennis, Chadwick H.
Dennison, Raymond E.
*De Pretoro, Thomas W.
*De Walt, Donald H.
*Dicke, Gary D.
*Dickey, Clarence D.
Dickinson, Ralph A.
Diehl, James R., Jr.
*Diehl, Richard F.
*Dietz, Harry L.
*Divelbliss, Charles F.
Donile, Vincent D.
*Dorsett, Earl H., Jr.
Doty, Leonidas, III
Douglas, David J.
Douglas, Francis H.
*Dove, Thomas R.
*Dow, Charles W.
Dowd, William J.
*Downard, Ronald E.
*Downs, Michael P.
Doxsee, Donald T.
Draude, Thomas V.
Drez, Ronald J.
*Driscoll, Steven J.
Du Bose, William W., Jr.
Duerden, Dennis W.
*Duffy, Edward W.
Duffy, Peter A.
*Duke, Leiland M., Jr.
Dumont, Thomas J., Jr.
Dunlavy, Kenneth P.
*Dunlevy, Raymond R.
*Dunn, Bernard
*Dunning, Clifford R.
Dunphy, William W.
*Durrant, Stephen C.
*Dyer, Brooks C.
*Eddy, Dale D.
Edwards, Roy T.
Egan, Francis X.
*Egger, Walter J.
Ehlert, Norman E.
Eiff, Ralph T.
*Eklund, Richard M.
Ellis, Daniel J.
*Ellis, Richmond K., Jr.
Emanuel, Roy N.
Emerson, Russell A.
*Emery, David G.
*Endert, Roger F.
Engstrom, James K.
Enockson, John O.
*Eustis, Peter
*Evans, Donald L.
*Evans, Donnie C.
*Evans, Frank W.
*Evans, Thomas J., Jr.
Everroad, John D.
Eyre, James L.
Fairfield, Rupert E., Jr.
Falkenbach, Robert W.
Falkenberg, Ken
Farley, Thomas A.
*Farmer, Paul K., Jr.
Farrell, Patrick G.
Farrell, William F., III
Fetzer, James H.
File, Gerald B.
Fiorillo, Michael, Jr.
Fish, Fredric L.
*Fish, William D.
*Fisher, Robert J., Jr.
*Fisher, Thomas V.
*Fitts, William W., Jr.
*Flaherty, Richard A.
Fleming, Walter J.
*Flint, Jon T.
*Flowers, Walter E.
Focht, George A.
Foley, James J., Jr.

*Follett, John F.
Foltz, Gary E.
Ford, Michael E.
*Foreman, Ronald D.
Forlano, Anthony J.
Fort, George E.
Foster, James F.
*Foster, Joel R.
*Fowler, Michael D.
*Fowles, Robert G.
*Fox, Kim E.
Fraim, Jackie W.
*Frakes, Bernard E.
*Franchs, Martin E.
*Franklin, George E.
*Franzwa, Robert E.
Frazier, Marvin F.
French, Guy B.
*French, James H.
Frese, Frederick J., III
*Frey, Charles D.
*Fritz, David H.
Furleigh, James R.
Fye, Carl R.
*Gacusana, Jose M.
Gadwill, Robert J.
Gage, William R.
Galbraith, Willard F., Jr.
*Galizio, Joseph A.
*Gallagher, Dennis O.
Gallagher, William T.
Gallagher, Thomas D.
Gallaway, James W.
*Gardner, Dayne G.
*Gardner, Jackie R.
Garner, Robert E.
*Garten, Ronald C.
Garwick, Gerald G.
Gast, Warren A.
*Gatchel, Theodore L.
Gattis, Bobbie L.
Gay, George R.
Gedris, Joseph R.
Gentry, John R.
*Gibson, Jon R.
Gibson, Robert F.
Gibson, William H.
*Giddings, Joseph A.
Gill, George K.
Gilmore, Michael J.
*Gilsrud, Gary C.
Glad, Andrew D.
*Gloskowski, Edward P.
*Gonyea, Darrel E.
Goodale, Lawrence A.
*Gordon, Charles R.
Gorman, James
*Gorski, Allan A.
*Grant, Donald E.
Graves, Melvin T.
Gray, William B.
*Greeley, Brendan M., Jr.
Green, Jerry M.
*Green, Larry S.
*Green, Thomas W.
Greene, Lyndol G.
Greenfield, Howard E.
*Greenough, Robert K.
Greer, Jan P.
*Griffin, Harold M.
Griffin, William R.
*Griggs, William R.
Grinstead, David P.
Groot, Roger D.
Grosz, Nicholas H., Jr.
*Gruhler, Jean A., Jr.
Guidry, Norman R.
*Guinn, Richard L.
*Guinn, Robert L.
Haag, Myron L.
Hacker, Larry W.
Hadden, Lon D.
Hafner, Arnold N.
Hahn, Joseph J., Jr.
Hall, Lynn B.
*Hall, William A.
Halliday, Bartholomew G.
*Halprin, Bernard R.

*Halvorsen, John P.
*Hamilton, Francis X., Jr.
*Hamlon, John S., Jr.
Hammer, Noel L.
Hammond, Benjamin G.
*Hampton, Glen L.
*Hancock, David
*Hand, Donald L.
Harbaugh, Thomas E., Jr.
Harborth, William M.
*Hardiman, David W.
*Haring, Joseph A.
*Harman, Milton L.
Harrell, Roger P.
*Harrington, Phillip L.
*Harrington, Myron C. Jr.
*Harris, Andrew D.
*Harris, Ernest A., Jr.
*Harris, Robert E.
*Hart, James A.
*Hart, William R.
Hassinger, Edward J.
*Hassler, John R.
Hayden, James B.
Hayes, Leonard C.
Hearney, Richard D.
Hehnen, Mark T.
*Heller, Kim F.
Helm, Hugh H.
*Hemingway, Thomas E.
*Hempel, Edward S.
Hemphill, Frederick H., Jr.
*Henderson, David G.
Henderson, James C.
Henderson, Porter K.
Hendricks, John B.
Hendrickson, Gene D.
Hennessy, John M.
Henry, Billy C.
Henry, Robert L., Jr.
Hernandez, Enrique
*Herring, George F.
Hesser, William A.
Hester, Willard H.
Hewitt, Thomas E.
Hicks, Gerard R.
Hill, Solomon P.
Hillis, Claude D.
*Hines, Ralph E.
Hinman, Marlin N.
Hinz, David W.
*Hippner, Richard C.
*Hock, Kemper L.
Hoesch, Martin A.
Hogg, John S.
*Hogue, Byron H.
*Holder, Kenneth M.
*Holifield, Claude M., Jr.
Holleran, Martin P., Jr.
Holman, John A.
Holmes, Curtis E.
Honeywell, James A.
Hooker, Glenn E., Jr.
*Hooper, Richard W.
Hopkins, Thomas E.
*Horn, Carl J.
*Horn, Thomas R.
Howatt, Franklyn J.
Howe, Richard G.
*Howell, Jefferson D., Jr.
*Howle, George P.
Howo, John Y. S.
*Hubbard, Donald E.
Hubbell, Thomas S.
*Huckelbery, Charles T.
*Hughes, Edward J., Jr.
*Huml, Gerald F.
Hunter, James B., III
*Hunter, Abram J., Jr.
Hurdle, Patrick M.

Hurlbut, Floyd W.
*Hurley, William F.
*Hyde, Wilton H., Jr.
Huebner, Ray E.
Inderrieden, Richard L.
Irons, Jerrold T.
Irvine, Edmund J., Jr.
*Isbell, Charles M.
Jackman, Richard B.
Jacobson, Kenneth R.
Jacoby, Jimmy K.
*James, Jack J.
James, Jack C.
*James, Orville E., Jr.
Jarboe, Robert L.
Jardine, Theodore J.
*Jellander, Herbert R.
*Jenkins, Charles S.
*Jennings, Fernandez, Jr.
*Jennings, Harry E., Jr.
*Jessee, Robert G.
*Johnson, Gerald W.
*Johnson, Gene F.
*Johnson, Harry N.
Johnson, Jimmy L.
*Johnson, Kenneth D.
Johnson, Ken H.
*Johnson, Philip L.
*Johnson, Richard F.
*Johnson, Robert E.
Johnson, Weston L. V.
*Johnson, William D., Jr.
Johnson, William E.
*Johnston, Robert B.
Jolley, John N., Jr.
*Jones, Carroll F.
Jones, Douglas A.
*Jones, Edwin A.
*Jones, Lloyd C.
Jones, Patrick J.
Jones, Philip T.
*Jones, Thomas E.
Joos, Walter C.
Jordan, David M.
*Joyner, Alfred R.
Jurney, William F.
*Kaff, Robert N.
*Kane, Thomas F.
Kangas, John K.
Kase, George R.
Keller, Gerald J.
Kelly, Gerard H.
*Kelly, Gordon K.
*Kenny, James P.
*Kenworthy, David M.
*Kerney, James L.
Kerr, Wendell H., Jr.
Key, David H.
*Kievit, Richard J.
Kilb, Roger E.
*Kilbane, Robert H.
Kind, John B.
Kirchner, Francis J.
*Klages, William B.
*Kleiboeker, Ronald W.
*Kline, Joseph F.
*Knibbs, James R.
*Knouse, Paul G., Jr.
*Knowles, Grover C.
*Kolakowski, Henry, Jr.
Koletty, Dietrich F.
Kosciw, Thomas L.
Kott, Stephen J.
Kowalewski, Anthony J., Jr.
*Kretzschmar, William
Krulak, William M.
*Kruse, Philip R.
Kszystyniak, John E., Jr.
Kuchinskas, Richard J.
Kummeth, Eugene P.
Kunkel, Donald J.

*Kuran, Paul M.
Kuzela, Edward V.
La Duca, Nicholas J., Jr.
*Lambert, Clark S.
Langenfeld, Richard H.
*Lanphier, Roger F.
*Larson, George H.
Lau, James
La Voo, John A.
*Lawrence, George D., Jr.
*Lawseth, Raymond M.
Lawty, Glenn C.
*Lea, James O.
Leaird, Charles H.
*Learnard, Robert P.
*Lecornu, John
*Lee, Gregory W.
Lehr, Antone D.
*Lehrack, Otto J., III
*Lenzini, Martin J.
Le Roy, Edward O.
Lesher, Charles E.
Levasseur, James H.
*Levine, David C.
Levine, Michael D.
*Lewis, Frederick E.
Lindberg, Perry C.
Lindstrom, William A.
Linkonis, Bertram L.
List, Raymond A.
Livingston, James E.
Lloyd, Calvin A., II
*Long, Edward D.
*Long, Joseph T.
*Long, Melvin H.
*Lowe, Darrell M.
*Lucas, Albert F., Jr.
*Lucas, Richard J.
Lucci, Michael J.
Luebke, William R.
Luster, Dale A.
Luttrell, Howard L.
Luzadder, Haymond R.
*Lyman, Thomas J., Jr.
*Lytch, William D., Jr.
*Mack, Peter M.
Mackie, Kenneth H.
Madalo, Michael
Maddox, Robert W.
*Madison, Gerald M.
Madonna, Raymond C.
Mahady, Frederick J., Jr.
*Maiden, Joseph C., Jr.
*Makowski, Stanley S., Jr.
Manchester, Kaye K.
Mangham, James M.
*Mannila, Richard R.
Manning, Anthony E.
*Manz, John W., Jr.
Maples, Johnnie W., Jr.
*Marcani, Paul S.
Marcantel, William E.
*Marchand, David M.
*Maresco, Richard E.
Marks, David E.
*Marshall, Joseph W.
*Marshall, Norman
Marshall, Robert C.
Marshall, Willard D.
Martin, Eugene J.
*Martin, Billie C.
*Martin, James E.
*Martin, Joseph E. C.
Martinsen, Richard C.
*Massey, Daniel J.
*Massman, Edward G.
*Mastrion, Robert J.
*Matteson, David M.
*Mathews, Brian M.

*Matthews, Frederick R., Jr.
Matthews, James M., Jr.
*Mattiace, John M.
*Mayian. Stephen M.
McAdams, Gregory A.
*McAdams, William R.
McAllister, Thomas C., Jr.
*McAlpin, Gary T.
McAninch, William S.
McBride, James D.
*McCain, Charles M.
McCarter, James W., Jr.
*McCarthy, Anthony J.
*McCarthy, John W.
*McCaughan, Frederick A.
McCollom, Robert M.
McCoy, Charles B.
*McDanal, Charles E.
*McDonald, Lawrence J.
*McDonough, James G.
*McDonough, Edward J.
McEwen, John W.
*McGaha, Dayle O.
*McGee, James L.
McGee, John W.
*McGehe, John D.
*McGill, George M.
McGovern, Paul V.
*McGowan, James D., Jr.
McGowan, Michael J.
*McGuire, Carol R.
*McHenry, James P.
McKee, Roger G.
*McKeown, Thomas K.
McKnight, Arthur D.
McLaughlin, Paul D.
*McMillan, Bruce F.
McMillan, Paul U., Jr.
McNamara, John J.
McNeal, Robert J.
McPherson, Richard G.
*Meadows, Charles L.
Meanza, Robert A.
Mecham, Steven G.
Mecom, Jimmie H.
Merrell, Thomas H., Jr.
*Meydag, Richard H.
*Meyer, Harold H.
*Miecznikowski, Robert S.
Mikkelson, John L.
*Miller, David F.
Miller, David R.
Miller, Donald G.
Miller, Jerry L.
Miller, Jon
*Miller, William A.
*Mills, Harry R.
Mirtz, Phillip J.
Mitchell, Christopher R., Jr.
Mitchell, Hubert
*Mitchell, Neil F.
*Mitchell, Robert W.
Mixon, Aaron M. III.
*Mize, Robert G.
Moeller, Paul A., Jr.
*Moffett, James H.
*Moody, Joe D.
*Mooney, William B.
*Moore, Alfred H.
Moore, Allen R.
Moore, Ned A.
*Moore, Raymond R.
Moorhead, William W., Jr.
*Morgan, Harmon S., Jr.
*Morgan, James E.
*Morgan, Jerry L.
*Morgan, Patrick J.
*Moriarty, John B.
Morin, James J.
Morris, Carroll W.
Morris, Donald
*Morris, John C., Jr.
*Morris, Philip R.
Morrissey, Richard T.
Morrow, Russell E.
Mossey, Thomas E.
Muir, David W.
*Mullen, John J., Jr.
Mulligan, Dennis K.
*Mulqueen, Michael P.
*Murphy, Thomas F.
Murray, John A.
*Mustapich, Anthony P.
Myers, Darwin W.
*Myers, Donald J.
*Nance, Herbert T., Jr.
*Nargele, Dominik G.
*Nargi, Robert A.
*Needham, James S.
*Neeley, Ives W., Jr.
*Negron, William P.
Neill, John E. III
*Nelson, Arnold R.
Nelson, Jimmie C.
*Nelson, Lyle K.
Nelson, Thomas D.
*Newell, Donald E., Jr.
*Newman, Robert J.
*Neyman, James L.
*Niotis, John, D.
Nissenson, Leonard
Nordquist, Myron H.
*Norman, Jay R.
*Norred, Caldwell V., III
*Norris, Richard L.
North, Bruce A.
Novak, Paul D.
*Nunn, Albert N.
Oberndorfer, Gerald J.
*O'Connell, John M.
*O'Connor, John R.
*O'Connor, Martin H., Jr.
*O'Connor, William J.
*Ogle, Larry R.
*Ogline, Fred E.
Oliver, Charles W.
*O'Neill, Robert R.
Orfanedes, George C.
Ortiz, Naval A.
Overstreet, Richard C.
Owens, Sammy L.
*Pace, Ray T.
*Pacello, Francis D.
Pacula, Norman, Jr.
*Padgett, Robert L.
Palka, Fred
Palmer, Richard K.
*Palumbo, Fred J.
Pappas, Robert L.
Parker, David R.
*Parker, Gary W.
Parker, Richard F., Jr.
Pastino, Carmen N.
*Paterson, Robert J.
Patneau, Robert A.
*Patrick, Rabun N., Jr.
Paul, Dwight A., Jr.
Pearson, James O., Jr.
*Peet, Alva E., Jr.
Pelner, Joseph J., Jr.
*Pelott, Robert O.
*Perez, Cleofas, Jr.
*Perryman, Webb E.
Peters, Eric G.
*Peterson, Joel N.
Pettengill, Harold D
*Pettis, Ronald E.
Pfalzgraf, John R.
*Phaneuf, Joseph R.
Phelan, Harold J.
*Phelps, Fred A.
*Phillips, Richard L.
Pierce, John W.
*Pierpan, Herbert E.
*Pipes, Kenneth W.
Pleva, James F.
*Plowman, Floyd C.
Polhamus, Richard M.
*Pope, John C.
*Porterfield, Charles W.
Posey, Franklin H.
*Pospisil, David L.
*Poss, Willard B.
Pound, David G.
Preuss, Charles F.
Prevost, Albert M.
*Price, Donald L.
*Price, Ronald K.
*Prichard, John L.
Pyle, Charles J.
*Raab, Robert L.
Rachford, Jon N.
*Radack, William J., Jr.
Rahm, Bruce M.
*Rainville, Eugene E.
*Rakow, William M., Jr.
Ramsey, Leon C.
Ray, John P.
*Ray, Revedy C., III
*Raymond, John W.
Read, John J.
Reardon, John E.
Reed, Lawrence E.
Reed, Thomas J.
Reese, Thomas D., Jr.
*Regal, John E.
*Reilly, Edmund W.
*Rengel, Gregory A.
Retoske, Denis W.
*Rich, Michael E.
Richardson, David G.
Rick, Clifton H.
Rideout, Albert R., III
*Rider, Kenneth L.
Rieker, Thomas J.
*Rigby, Charles S., III
Riley, Edward F.
*Riley, Kirk I.
Riley, Michael B.
*Rintye, Edward D.
Ripley, John W.
*Rischar, Ernest L.
*Risler, Eugene S., III
Roane, Everette S.
*Robb, Charles S., II
*Roberton, James C.
Roberts, Joseph T., III
Robertson, Munro V.
Robinson, Jerry C.
*Rock, Ronald C.
Roe, Thomas E.
*Rogers, Milton B.
*Rolfe, Brian W.
Roll, William R.
*Roller, Robert F., Jr.
Roman, Joseph G.
Romero, Joseph M. A.
Romine, Richard A.
*Rose, John M.
*Rose, Robert M.
Ross, Dale C.
*Ross, Daniel C.
Ross, Harvey W.
*Ross, James M.
Roth, Charles F., Jr.
Rothgaber, Dennis E.
*Rothwell, Richard B.
Rouleau, Eugene J.
Roulier, Mike H.
*Rountree, Neal T.
*Rowe, Peter J.
Rupertus, Patrick H.
*Russell, Leo K.
*Russell, William E.
Ruth, George W.
Rutledge, Earl R.
Rutledge, Gerald F.
*Ryan, John A., Jr.
*Ryan, Justin M.
Saenz, Oscar
Sage, Henry J.
*Salisbury, Robert E.
*Sambito, William J.
*Samouce, John W.
Sams, Dennis M.
Sarsfield, Patrick J.
*Saunders, James A., Jr.
*Saunders, Nicholas E.
*Sayer, Donald L.
*Scanlon, Michael F.
Schaeffer, Jack D.
Schara, Earl M., Jr.
*Schara, Frederick S.
Scheib, Thomas A.
Schlitz, Gordon M.
Schmidt, Arthur J., Jr.
Schnell, Durwood K.
Schoen, Dennis A.
Schreiber, John J.
*Schue, Ronald R.
*Schultz, Virgil L.
Schwartz, John R.
Schwendler, Carl G.
*Scott, Denver D.
Severance, David E.
*Severson, Glen L.
Sewell, Steven J.
Seymore, Noah M., Jr.
Seymour, Jack T.
Shadburne, Brooke M.
Shafer, Francis L., Jr.
Shallene, Frank M.
Shane, Harry J.
Shanklin, Edward E., Jr.
*Shapiro, Bruce L.
Sharp, Harry F., Jr.
Shaw, Charles T.
*Shaw, James L.
*Sheary, Thomas D.
Shebel, Jon L.
*Sheehan, John J.
*Sheehan, Robert J.
*Shelton, Charles H.
Shepherd, James A.
Sherman, John B.
*Sherretz, Lundie L.
Shimek, Martin
*Shirley, Jerry C.
*Shirley, Troy T.
Shockey, Donald K., Jr
Shoemaker, Harry S.
Short, John C., Jr.
Sikes, David C.
Simons, Gary F.
Sims, James M.
*Sims, Samuel R.
*Sinclair, Cloyce E.
Sketoe, James G.
*Skierkowski, Walter H.
*Slack, Willard E.
*Slahucka, Ronald F.
Slater, Albert C., Jr.
*Sloan, Todd M.
Smart, Raymond F.
*Smith, Charles R., Jr.
Smith, Herman A., III
Smith, Loring E.
Smith, Phillip R.
Smith, Willie A.
Smith, William R.
*Snow, Claude K.
*Snow, Denman T., II
Snowden, Robert J.
*Snyder, William F.
*Soderstrom, Frank R.
Sommers, Alfred E., Jr.
*Soper, Donald W., Jr.
Sorensen, Charles R.
*Sower, James E., Jr.
*Spaith, James A.
Sparks, James D.
*Speicher, John A.
*Spencer, John F.
*Sperry, Burton P., III
*Spivey, Bayliss L., Jr.
*Springer, David A.
Sranek, John S., Jr.
Stack, Richard P.
Stanat, Christopher W. J.
*Stanford, Ronald
Stansfield, Floyd F.
Staples, Robert D.
Starke, Robert B., Jr.
Stephan, Gerald F.
Stevenson, Robert R.
Steward, Robert E.
*Stewart, Richard L.
Stimson, Harry E.
Stiven, James F.
St. Marie, Michael A.
Stocking, Roy J., Jr.
*Stone, Alan C.
*Stone, David T.
Stowell, David W.
*Straumanis, Eric R.
Stringer, J. K., Jr.
*Stroup, William C.
Strow, Walter E., III
Stults, Laurence A.
Suber, Eddie J., Jr.
*Sucha, Joseph J., Jr.
Sullivan, John P. T.
Sullivan, Michael V.
*Sullivan, Thomas C.
*Sumler, Lamar
Suttle, Walter G.
*Swann, Crawford P.
*Swart, Arnold R.
*Sykes, Waverly E., Jr
Szalankiewicz, Victor M., Jr.
*Tait, Glenn S.
Tarnopilsky, Walter
Tatum, Reiss P.
*Tavis, Augustus T.
*Taylor, Kenneth T.
Taylor, Thomas G.
*Templeton, Donald L.
*Terrell, Thomas C.
Terry, David C., Jr.
Tetser, Robert E.
Thomas, Russell L.
*Thomas, Sidney E.
Thompson, David E.
Thompson, George C.
Thompson, Gary D.
*Thompson, Orville M.
*Thoreson, Bruce D.
Tinsley, Richard C.
Toohey, James A.
Toomey, Cornelius R., II
Topken, Peter W.
Torrey, Philip H., III
*Tripp, Alfred L.
*Trudeau, James L.
*Trumpfheller, Robert C.
*Tuckwiller, Frank W.
Turbak, Charles D.
Turner, Frank K.
Turner, Samuel D., Jr.
*Tuttle, Ronald B.
Underwood, Joseph E.
Updegrove, Kenneth R.
*Urban, Luke J.
Usher, David P.
*Uyeda, Theodore Y.
*Vanderberg, Paul A.
Van Horne, Charles W.
*Vann, Hugh M., III
*Vanorden, George M.
Vardell, William W.
*Vargas, Manuel S., Jr.
Vay, Leslie R.
*Vazquez, Amilcar
Venator, Raymond L.
Ver Eecke, Richard W.
*Vermilyea, Clyde L.
Vielhauer, Carlton C., Jr.
Waddell, Bill D.
Walker, David L.
Walsh, Edward P.
*Walsh, James E.
Walsh, Philip J.
*Warman, David A.
*Warren, William R.
*Washburn, Dean L.
Wastila, George M., Jr.
Watt, Lewis C.
*Wattles, James R., Jr.
*Weare, John C.
*Weaver, Robert F., Jr.
*Webber, Frederick L.
Weber, Dwight D.
*Weede, Richard D.
*Wehrung, Malcolm W.
*Weingarten, Julian A.
West, Richard A.
*West, William H. Jr.
Westbrook, Dan
*Westhoff, William H.
*Wheeler, Carl B.
*White, Thomas A.
*White, William H.
*Whitfield, George A.
*Whittelsey, Arnold G.
Widman, Billy J.
Wilder, Charles L.
Wilkenloh, William C.
*Williams, Daniel B.
Williams, Guy N.
Williams, Henry G., Jr.
*Williams, John A.
*Williams, John A.
Williams, Leslie A.
Williams, Russell D.
Williams, Robert D.
Williams, Thomas Jr.
Williamson, Bobby J.
*Wills, Duane A.
*Wilson, Mathus G., Jr.
*Wilson, Ronald N.
*Wilson, William B.
Wilson, William L.
Windham, Dale D. M.
*Winer, Peter D.
*Winkelbrandt, Ehrhard K. A.
*Winn, Paul C.
*Winterle, David D.
*Wold, Thomas H.
Wood, Walter E.
Woolley, Dennis R.
Wright, Regan R.
Wrinkle, Fred H., Jr.
Wroblewski, Edwin A.
*Wyly, Michael D.
Wyrick, Peter B.
Wyserpratte, Guy P.
*Yarbrough, George E.
*Yarnell, James H.
Yost, James L.
*Young, Hoyt, W.
Yraguen, Francisco J.
Yung, Carl H.
*Zappone, Francis L., Jr.
*Zimmerle, Harvey L.
*Zimmerman, Ralph A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–4, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Bourbeau, Richard T.
Chapin, Charles H., Jr
Cumiskey, Francis P.
Davis, Harold R.
Edmunds, Merritt S.
Giovingo, Salvador
Hall, Willis P., Jr.
Huber, Walter L.
Huntley, William R.
Kuchler, Lester W.
Kulakowski, Frank A.
Madore, Norman C.
Mills, Harmon V.
Servis, Charles W.
Slavin, Patrick L.
Stephens, Howard S.
Ward, Robert I.
Wilkinson, Henry E.
Vickery, Wallace E.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-4, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Albert, Robert H.
*Anderson, Frederick A.
*Antoine, George E.
*Boston, Kenneth C.
*Brenton, Perry S.
*Burks, Billy
*Buron, John J.
*Burrell, William C.
*Cabral, Louis A.
*Carter, Edward W., Jr.
*Chapin, Charles H. Jr.
Ciampa, Angelo P.
*Clapsadl, Samuel R.
*Cochran, Amos C., Jr.
*Comeau, Joseph L.
*Crawford, Thomas C.
Deatrick, Curtis L.
*Duncan, David N.
*Franks, Frederick E.
*Herrero, Henry A.
*Hill, Robert F.
*Hollingsworth, James R.
*Huber, Walter L.
*Huntley, William R.
*Jackson, Lauris W.
*Jackson, Ralph K.
*Judson, Franklin F.
Kennicutt, Orlis E.
*Koontz, William O.
*Kuchler, Lester W.
*Kulakowski, Frank A.
*Lachow, Martin
*Long, Wellington, B., Jr.
*Lynn, Clyde C.
*Martin, Lawrence T.
McMaster, Bingham A.
*McVeigh, LeRoy J.
*Meek, Wendell A.
*Mercer, William R.
*Miller, Nicholas J., Jr.
*Mills, Harmon V.
*Morgan, Lloyd H.
*Morgan, Max M.
*Murphy, Chilton
*Nalisnik, Anthony J.
*New, John E.
*Novobilski, Joseph A.
*Okonek, Mark V.
*Peters, Benjamin F.
Purdy, Stephen J.
*Rae, Ernest J.
*Reynolds, Leo E.
Rhymer, Roy H.
*Rogers, John L.
*Ruskewitch, Alexander P.
*Rypar, Joseph
*Servis, Charles W.
*Shaw, Stewart J., Jr.
*Shul, Victor
*Slavin, Patrick L.
*Stephens, Howard S.
*Sullivan, William J.
*Sutterley, Joseph H.
*Tabb, James C.
*Tusa, Joe N.
*Van Over, Thomas C.
*Waller, Thomas G.
*Ward, Robert I.
*Waugh, Clinton C.
*Wickstrom, Elmer C.
*Wood, Ruth L.
*Wyzykowski, Joseph A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-3, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Adams, John A.
Black, Robert M.
Block, Robert E.
Clark, Talmadge
Clay, Robert L.
Costlow, Walter E.
Davis, Kenneth L.
Duer, Arthur M., Jr.
Duerr, Edward J.
Fields, John, Jr.
Harris, Roy K.
Healey, Philip N., Jr.
Hill, William J.
Ruffaker, Lionel
Jenkins, Clarence E.
Johnson, Robert W.
Johnson, Stephen J., Jr.
Jones, Samuel J.
Jordan, Thomas E.
Magrath, Eric
McIntyre, Alice
Mihalak, Stephen J.
Myorski, Stephen M.
Nestor, George R.
Noonkester, Henry E.
Owens, William C.
Parker, George R., Jr.
Parretti, Lawrence
Ponstingel, August J.
Powell, Richard T., Jr.
Smith, Albert J.
Smith, Arnold H.
Swearengen, Thomas F.
Watson, James O.
Zimmerman, Norbert A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-3, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Adams, John A.
Andre, John W.
Bernier, Richard J.
*Black, Robert M.
*Bowen, Myron J.
*Cain, John T.
*Clark, Talmadge
*Clay, Robert L.
*Condon, Raymond W.
*Costlow, Walter E.
Cotten, Cecil R.
Cox, Gordon H.
*Crenshaw, John O.
Currier, Burton D.
Darrow, Marvin L.
Ditty, Guy L.
Dowling, Charles H.
*Duerr, Edward J.
*Durfee, Norman E.
Eoff, Harold
Farkas, Julius
*Fields, John, Jr.
Fletcher, Cecil H.
Flynn, Robert F.
*Freeman, Elaine G.
Garrett, Carl, Jr.
Garris, Berle
*Gracey, Doyle D., Jr.
*Griggs, Clarence F., Jr.
*Groom, Robert W.
*Hammons, William V., Jr.
*Harris, Roy K.
Harris, Walter R.
*Healey, Philip N., Jr.
*Hill, William J.
Holden, William H.
Holdridge, Forrest B.
Houser, John J.
*Huffaker, Lionel
*Hunt, Robert T.
*Ivey, Billy D.
Johnson, Robert W.
*Johnson, Stephen J., Jr.
*Jones, Samuel J.
*Kerr, Richard A.
*Kilborn, Charles R.
*Kozain, Lawrence E.
Kramer, Vernon S.
*McGrath, Eric
*Massarotti, Dante A.
Maximin, William K.
McCarthy, William J.
*McGrory, John F.
McGuire, Terrence W., Jr.
McIntyre, Alice
Meshke, George E.
*Mihalak, Stephen J.
Millang, Harvey B.
*Myorski, Stephen M.
Nagy, Conrad
Nagy, William
*Nestor, George R.
*Norris, William B.
Norton, John J.
*Owens, William C.
Parretti, Lawrence
*Pluger, Edwin A.
*Ponstingel, August J.
*Pope, Hal E.
*Powell, Richard T., Jr.
Sheppard, William F., Jr.
Smiley, Pierce L.
*Smith, Albert J.
*Smith, Arnold H.
*Smith, Vernon E.
*Smithwick, Robert E.
*Stergiou, Chris G.
Sutton, Joe R.
*Swearengen, Thomas F.
Thompson, Mary E.
Tinsley, Hubert
Vaughn, Edwin R.
*Waller, Henry J.
*Watson, James O.
Wells, Glenn T.
Whelchel, Leonard A.
*Wilder, Raymond C.
Wildfang, Henry
*Woodson, Duane L.
Work, Robert G.
*Zimmerman, Norbert A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-2, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Anderson, Kleve L.
Armitage, George L.
Atiles, Louis C., Jr.
Ball, Frank V.
Barnes, James M.
Bell, Timothy C.
Berdine, Virgil M.
Biggers, William A.
Book, Paul R.
Booze, Delmar G.
Braden, Norman D.
Bray, Sheila R., Jr.
Bridges, Lionel H.
Brown, Edwin J.
Buck, William L., III
Burris, Kenneth F.
Cameron, Donald R.
Carlson, Wilbur M.
Castonguay, James J.
Chavers, Wayland D.
Church, Ernest L.
Clancy, William J., Jr.
Clow, Jack N.
Collier, Donald E.
Combs, Roger J.
Crosier, Allen D.
Deaver, Ralph W.
Denison, Charles F., Jr.
Desjarlais, Roland A.
Di Leva, Robert F.
Divis, James H.
Dobon, Peter, Jr.
Donley, Paul J.
Doyle, John
Duke, William E.
Ellis, Billie R.
Ellis, John P.
Essi, Roger A.
Evans, Thomas E.
Fabricius, Gerald D.
Fleming, James P.
Florence, Harry A., Jr.
Frakes, Lee W.
Freeman, Billy R.
Glinka, Bernard C.
Gregory, Donald W.
Hammond, Glenn R.
Hanevik, Robert H.
Hardy, James W.
Hase, Herbert G.
Henderson, Charles H.
Hill, Thomas A.
Howard, Guy M.
Hoy, Jack R.
Jacobson, Theodore R.
Johnson, Andrew R.
Johnston, Bobby M.
Jones, Henderson B.
Karr, James E.
Kasten, William
Katz, Robert E.
Keeler, Doris M.
Kendall, Ronald R.
Knocke, James J.
Lanson, Donald C.
Latham, Julian S.
Lepore, William P., Jr.
Levengood, Joseph C.
Lewis, Willard R.
Lord, Robert L.
Lunn, Carl K.
Machado, Enrique L.
Malnicof, Harry B.
Marlow, Donald R.
Mazzei, Edmund J.
McAvoy, Paul O., Jr.
McIntosh, Roger A.
Meyers, Gary G.
Meyers, John L.
Miller, Jacques L.
Millis, Dorne A.
Moony, Robert J.
Moran, Richard C.
Morrow, Charles L.
Muirhead, William E.
Mullen, Francis
Murry, Joseph A.
Nailor, Richard A.
Nelson, Monte V.
Nimmow, Donald D.
Owens, Billy W.
Pallett, Porter G.
Parker, Charles D.
Parry, Fred R.
Patchin, Leonard J.
Pedlar, Dean C.
Pelletier, George A.
Perry, Billy E.
Pontillas, Robert G.
Porter, Richard L.
Raymond, Joseph C.
Redmond, Donald D.
Riley, Carroll J.
Rogers, Robert D.
Romano, Robert J.
Runkle, Roger L.
Scheidemantel, John L.
Snellings, Sidney L.
Swanson, Arthur I., Jr.
Thompson, Gary R.
True, Charles G.
Vaserberg, Morton
Wickens, Alan E.
Wilder, Jack A.
Wilson, Douglas E., II
Wire, Sydney M.
Wright, William C.
Yoder, Robert H.
Zeferjohn, David A.
Zimmerman, James H.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Abajian, Michael C.
Ables, Charles K.
Adinolfi, John F.
Ambort, Ernest G.
Ambrose, Raymond H.
Anderson, Gerard
Anderson, Lee H.
Anderson, Terrence E.
Andrews, William R., Jr.
Angelo, Nickolas J.
Armstrong, Clifford H.
Armstrong, James H.
Asher, James P.
Auld, David D.
Avery, Frederick S., III
Aymond, John P., Jr.
Bailey, John W.
Bailey, Leslie W., Jr.
Bailey, Ross E.
Baird, Bradley R.
Ballenger, Glen A.
Barrios, James V.
Battista, Anthony J.
Bell, Michael C.
Bergquist, Jon R.
Bethards, Leonard G.
Bishop, John E.
Blanchfiel, John J.
Blatter, William A.
Blichfeldt, Joseph H., III
Bloxom, Edward L.
Bokelman, Robert U.
Bonsper, Donald E.
Brennan, Charles J.
Brooks, Robert K.
Brown, Donald P.
Brown, James C.
Brown, Robert M.
Browne, Paul C.
Brunnelle, Ronald J.
Buckner, David N.
Burch, James M.
Burchette, Bernard V.
Burdette, Rodney E.
Burke, John J.
Burns, John G.
Burns, Raymond M.
Burrow, Edward B., Jr.
Butler, James H.
Butterfield, Robert R.
Caldwell, William J.
Calhoun, Bert V.
Campbell, Wallace L.
Campbell, William B.
Campbell, William S.
Carpenter, James R.
Carroll, John L.
Carter, Thomas A.
Caswell, Paul E.
Cawley, James P.
Chapman, John T.
Chastant, Rodney R.
Clarendon, Kenneth P.
Clark, Jack L.
Clark, Lawrence D.
Cline, Maurice G.
Cochran, Charles P.
Cole, Forrest L.
Conklin, Leslie R.
Conroy, Dennis A.
Cook, Kenneth E.
Cooksey, Charles D.
Corbett, Arnold B.
Corriher, Charles R.
Cowart, Jerry J.
Craig, Thomas P., Jr.
Cravets, Arthur O.
Creal, Stephen M.
Croney, James K.
Dahart, Reid E.
*D'Amura, Ronald M.
Danchak, Michael, Jr.
Davenport, Terry S.
Davidson, William A., III
Davis, Donald E.
Davis, Henry D.
Davis, Ray Y.
Day, Stephen M.
De Angelis, Leo R.
De Fries, William C.
Delarue, Earl G.
Denton, James R.
Dereberry, Gerald L.
De Saussure, Edward C.
Doberstein, Daniel A.
Doherty, John B.
Donegan, Frederick J.
Downs, Thomas C.
Dowson, Stanley L.
Dryzga, Reginald W.
Dullaghan, John F.
Dunagan, Dennis M.
Earley, Gordon E.
Eaton, Russell W.
Eck, Christian J., Jr.
Ege, Karl J.
Eggen, Edwin
Eklund, Barry A.
Erickson, Stephen J.
Ernest, John F., Jr.
Fehr, Kenneth A.
Ferguson, Earl W.
Fichthorn, Donald G.
Fluet, Joseph E., Jr.
Forehand, Gerald T.
Forter, John D.
Friedrick, Robert S.
Friese, Laurence V.
Fry, Gary A.
Fryrear, Dennis B.
Furr, Kenneth R.
Gartman, Jerald B.
Gartner, Robert L.
Gaugush, Jeffrey A.
Gause, Frederick L.
Geisel, John R., Jr.
German, Jerry R.
German, Terry G.
Gillespie, David D.
Gleason, John S., III
Gnazzo, Richard
Gollatz, Frank J., Jr.
Grabill, James S.
Graham, David P.
Grammar, William M.
Grant, John H.
Gray, Courtland P., III
Griffith, Thomas H., Jr.
Grimshaw, Frederick A., Jr.
Gurrola, Michael A.
Gustafson, Lyal V.
Haase, Harold C.
Hackett, David S.
Hadd, Harry A., Jr.
Hager, Donald J.
Haines, Peter D.
Hainsworth, John J.
Hansen, Harold D., Jr.
Harbison, Bobby L.

Harding, Robert L.
Harding, Francis W., Jr.
Harkless, Ronald I.
Harshman, Richard L.
Hart, James G.
Harvey, Ellis R., Jr.
Hawley, Jack E.
Heikel, Harvey A.
Hein, Edward C., Jr.
Henry, Michael C.
Henshaw, James E.
Herman, Leslie B.
Hershley, Francis G.
Hester, Milton J.
Hester, Mendle R.
Hoffner, "I," D.
Holbein, Richard E., Jr.
Hoof, Allen W.
Hopgood, Marvin T., Jr.
Horvatich, John T.
Hubbard, Albert A.
Hudock, John C., Jr.
Hunter, David R.
Hurlbert, Derald D.
Idema, Thomas H.
Indest, Carlos J., III
Ingram, Leonard "L."
Innerarity, Vernon E.
Irvine, Thomas R.
Jealous, Bradford, Jr.
Jesse, Clyde A.
Johnson, Kenneth E.
Jones, Joseph W., III
Kahl, Thomas A.
Kahler, Patrick J.
Keeley, Robert M.
Keker, John W.
Kelly, Charles W.
Kelly, William E.
Kemple, William G.
Kennedy, Laurance J.
Kicklighter, Rodney C.
Kimball, Lynn J.
Kirkman, Timothy R.
Kline, Roy C.
Klocek, Joseph J.
Knight, Robert W.
Knop, David E.
Knox, James H.
Kollar, Joseph J.
Kowalski, David M.
Krone, Melvin P.
Krusinger, Alan E.
Laidig, Scott R.
Lancaster, Alexander E., Jr.
Lancaster, James E.
Lane, Malcolm V.
Laney, James L.
Lau, Raymond R.
Laux, Peter E.
Lawrence, Stephen P.
Leach, Steven R.
Lee, Harry E., III
Legge, Glenn F.
Le May, Granville T.
Libey, George S.
Liesegang, Robert B.
Lindeman, Allen A.
Lindsey, Jimmy L.
Littler, James L. M., III
Livingston, John C.
Loveridge, Gary F.
Lucas, John R.
Lulfs, Gary K.
Mabley, Christopher T.
MacLeod, Gary W.
Malone, Michael G., II
Maloney, John C.
Manion, Robert G.
Martin, David P.
Mattingly, Robert E.
Max, William J.
Maynard, Robert W.
McCoy, Paul
McDermott, John R.
McDowell, Gary W.
McEvoy, James R.
McHugh, Jack D.
McInturff, David L.
McKay, Thomas J.
McQuigg, Frederick C.
Meehan, Thomas J.
Meeker, Thomas H.
Meints, Ronald R.
Meinertz, David T.
Meints, Ronald R.
Meissner, Robert B.
Meyer, Ronald W.
Miksad, John R.
Mills, William F.
Mitchell, Frank D., Jr.
Moore, Jack M.
Moore, John R.
Morrison, Charles H., III
Mosley, Donald H.
Mueller, Richard A.
Mulherin, Byron J., Jr.
Murphy, James W.
Nagazyna, John K.
Nelson, John J., Jr.
Neubauer, John W.
Neubauer, Ronald S.
Norman, Geoffrey W.
O'Neill, Gene P.
Pace, Simone J.
Parker, Allen D.
Parker, William A.
Parr, Walter O., Jr.
Parra, Lionel, Jr.
Pellecchia, Donald E.
Peterson, Frank K.
Petroski, Richard M.
Pfeltz, Albert R., III
Piatt, Richard W.
Pierce, Charles G., Sr.
Pritchard, Charles L.
Reber, Joseph M.
Richman, Dean J.
Richwine, David A.
Riggs, Robert K.
Rivers, Frederick M., Jr.
Roach, Jerry N.
Robertson, Jerry L.
Rumbley, James A., Jr.
Saldarini, Charles A.
Sanchack, James J.
Sandberg, William J.
Schultz, Donald D.
Schwartz, Peter A.
Sharkey, John E.
Shearer, Robert C.
Shepherd, Robert C.
Shirley, Michael S.
Skultety, Edward S.
Sligar, Howard B., Jr.
Smith, Gordon W., Jr.
Smith, John J.
Steele, Gregory C.
Stegich, Steve R., III
Stillman, Edward W.
Storey, Stanford I.
Stout, David M.
Stoy, James M.
Sullivan, Robert J.
Summa, John A.
Swain, Howard L.
Swantkowski, Ronald E.
Szabo, Steven F.
Taber, Edward A., III
Taylor, Arthur J.
Taylor, Charles L.
Taylor, Donald G.
Teasdale, Harold W.
Terpstra, Jesse H., Jr.
Thomas, Raymond A.
Thompson, Ky L.
Thomson, Terry L.
Timm, Frederick M.
Timmons, Herschel M.
Trachta, Stanley J.
Trader, William A.
Upton, Herbert S.
Urbanski, Victor R.
Van Dervoort, Dennis R.
Vandiver, Del R.
Van Gysel, Gary R.
Vincent, William T.
Vogel, Frederick J.
Vogt, Richard J.
Voigt, Richard H.
Walsh, Matthew F., Jr.
Ward, George F., Jr.
Warfield, Jimmie A.
Warren, Robert T.
Waters, Francis A.
Waters, Richard E.
Weaver, Charles L.
Wecht, Ronald H.
Wellbrook, Roger V.
Williams, Gary L.
Wilsmann, William K.
Winters, John W., Jr.
Woodhead, John A., III
Woods, Clyde E.
Wroten, John W., Jr.
Yanger, Thomas R.
Young, Earl W., II
Zadel, Charles W.
Zohlen, Paul J.

(Note.—Asterisk (*) indicates ad interim appointment issued.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend John Kuzinskas, of the St. George Church, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, who created all men equal, give us the insight to honor the rights of individuals.

You have blessed our country with abundant riches, let us extend a friendly hand to the less fortunate. In our struggles for freedom, we have emerged as the mightiest of nations and as a leader in the quest for peace. Upon our President and our Congress you have placed a heavy burden of negotiating for peace so that every nation can enjoy the freedom of speech, worship, and action. Let our country be an example for harmony which can exist in a nation of many nationalities and for satisfaction which can be found in a two-party system. Our hopes of the day are to fight common fears so that some day in the near future we may pray and work with one accord toward a new and better world in which all nations can live together in love and peace.

Today, we commemorate the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's brief independence. For many years she, too, fought many battles to overcome the yoke of oppression. Her countryside is drenched with the blood of countless heroic men and women. What once was a glowing amber light along the Baltic seacoast, has now become a total blackout behind a curtain. Today, Lithuanians, as other oppressed countries, place their trust in You; do not forsake them. Teach us, their American descendants, to cherish freedom and to oppose any threat to our freedom.

And with the proposals for peace of Pope Paul, let us unite in our efforts and pray together as he says, "Again we ask you this day to pray for the great interests of the world, which are mainly the interests of peace, of internal peace of nations and peace among nations." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

February 16, 1966.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: It is with considerable regret that I submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, effective today.

It has been a privilege and an honor for me to work with the many fine members of this committee during the 89th Congress. My association and participation in the deliberations of this group will always remain a pleasant and rewarding experience.

Sincerely yours,
Henry P. Smith III,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 735

Resolved, That Henry P. Smith III, of New York, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Judiciary.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE TO ATTEND FUNERAL OF THE LATE HONORABLE ALBERT THOMAS

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee to attend the funeral of our late colleague, Albert Thomas, the following Members of the House: Mr. Patman, Mr. Mahon, Mr. Kirwan, Mr. Poage, Mr. Whitten, Mr. Fisher, Mr. Holifield, Mr. Rooney of New York, Mr. Fogarty, Mr. Price, Mr. Teague of Texas, Mr. Burleson, Mr. Evins, Mr. Passman, Mr. Thompson of Texas, Mr. Steed, Mr. Bow, Mr. Rogers of Texas, Mr. Dowdy, Mr. Boland, Mr. Brooks, Mr. Hosmer, Mr. Jonas, Mr. Laird, Mr. Rhodes of Arizona, Mr. Flood, Mr. Denton, Mr. Minshall, Mr. Wright, Mr. Beckworth, Mr. Young, Mr. Casey, Mr. Giaimo, Mr. Morris, Mr. Shipley, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Purcell, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Pool, Mr. Pickle, Mr. Cabell, Mr. de la Garza, and Mr. White of Texas.

RESTRAINT URGED IN VIETNAM POLICY ATTACKS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I saw in the papers yesterday that eight more

Members of this House have just come out with another bitter attack on the established policy of our Government in Vietnam, and have proposed their own individual plan for ending the fighting in that troubled area.

Far be it from me to suggest what any Member of this House—or of the other body—ought to do or say. But I do think we ought to admit, whether we like it or not, that this country is in a shooting war in Vietnam. Our Nation has decided to resist Communist aggression in that area, and to implement that decision 200,000 men are fighting on the front line out there and some of them are dying.

In those circumstances I for one think it is about time we here in Congress exercised some restraint in constantly attacking and harassing the established decision of our country. I think it is time we considered forgoing the luxury of trying to come up with 535 separate, individual policies for dealing with Vietnam. No matter how hard we try, we are not going to run this war from Congress, nor from any particular study group, nor even from any standing committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that now is the time for us in Congress to demonstrate a little good old-fashioned national unity in adversity. The decision has been made. It has been supported by the Congress and overwhelmingly supported by the American people.

So let us get on with the job of implementing that national decision. Let us show the Communists and the world that we are united here in America, and that we do support our Government's policy to resist Communist aggression in Vietnam, and that we are determined to back up, not undercut with our repeated doubts and fears and agonizing personal reappraisals, our fighting men on the combat fronts.

THE LATE ALEXANDER F. "CASEY" JONES

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, last night, Syracuse, N.Y., lost one of its most distinguished citizens and the world of journalism lost one of its leading lights. Alexander F. "Casey" Jones was for many years the managing editor of the Washington Post and, since 1949, executive editor of the Syracuse Herald-Journal.

America has lost a great citizen. It seems such a short time ago that this dynamic man was at the helm of the Herald-Journal, always pushing for the betterment of the city he adopted and came to love. On many occasions I sought his counsel and advice, and if his exterior was gruff it was part show. Those who were fortunate to know him realized how kind and generous he really was.

The stories and legends of Casey Jones are far too numerous to cite today. Suffice it to say that his name was one of the greatest in the world of journalism. In all the roles he played—civic leader, crusader, husband, father, and newspaperman—he dedicated himself to the best. Casey was a reporter's reporter and in his profession he was both respected and admired.

I extend my deepest condolences to his wife and family.

REGULATION OF CATV SYSTEMS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Federal Communications Commission announced a plan for the regulation of all CATV systems. The manner in which this was done and the information contained in it was in direct contradiction of assurances that had been given me by the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, that when they had reached a conclusion as to what should be done, they would come back and discuss this with the proper committees of the Congress.

I conveyed this information to my colleagues in this House in good faith—this information which was given to me by the Chairman.

He told me that the rules would be worked out, refined by the staff, and that it would take approximately three weeks. They would then again discuss them with the committees of the House before any final action was taken.

That was not done.

I want to say to the Members of the House here, those of you who wrote letters to your constituents on this very vital issue, that the information that I gave you was given to you in absolute good faith, and I am deeply distressed if the time has come when a Member of the Congress of the United States cannot seek and acquire information in good faith from the agencies downtown and convey that to his colleagues without the assurance that it is going to be adhered to.

THE 1966 MAID OF COTTON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, Miss Nancy Bernard, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Bernard, who live in my hometown of Lubbock, Tex., is the 1966 Maid of Cotton. Nancy left Washington on Monday for Tampa, Fla., after a successful 5-day stay in the Nation's Capital, during which time she engaged in a whirlwind round of activities. In Tampa, Nancy will resume her tour of the United States and Europe as the cotton industry's "Fashion and Goodwill Ambassadress." While in Washington the Maid of Cotton warmed the hearts of all of us who came in contact with her. She possesses poise, beauty, and intelligence comparable to the most gracious women of our country.

Mrs. Mahon and I had the privilege of joining with officials of the National Cotton Council in meeting Nancy at the airport on the night she arrived. During her stay here, she visited with members of the House Agriculture Committee while they were holding hearings on cotton legislation. She also met with officials of the Department of Agriculture and made a short film for the Department which will be used in promoting the sale and utilization of cotton.

She met and charmed many distinguished Members of the House and Senate during a luncheon which Mrs. Mahon and I gave for her in the Speaker's Dining Room here in the Capitol. The President found time to relax from his busy schedule to visit with Nancy and give her a brief tour of the White House. In addition, Nancy appeared in several fashion shows, modeling the all-cotton wardrobe which was created for her by some of America's leading designers, and which she will model throughout 35 American cities, as well as in Canada and Europe during the 7 months of her tour.

The Maid of Cotton is more than a beauty queen. She is a beautiful girl with a purpose. She is contributing to the stature of cotton and the cotton industry.

Her tour takes her to the largest cities in the United States, where most of our cotton products are bought, and she reaches millions of people by appearing in hundreds of fashion shows, on television, in newspapers and in motion pictures. Her purpose is to show people all over the world how cotton can serve them in beautiful and comfortable wearing apparel.

Cotton is one of the world's most vital crops. Cotton production is America's greatest agricultural industry. This year's Maid of Cotton comes from the largest cotton-producing Congressional District in the United States. The farmers of the 19th District produce more cotton than any State in the Union, with the exception of the State of Texas itself. We produce annually about 2 million bales of cotton—about one-half of the total production of Texas. The cotton economy affects the entire United States. Cotton is also a vital commodity in world trade, and a great benefit to this Nation's balance of payments.

It is an industry indelibly woven into American history. Early America virtually was built upon cotton, our principal export commodity. By 1837 more than 1 million bales of cotton a year were exported, bringing to the fledgling nation more than $72 million in that year. This money was used to foster our industrial revolution. It was used as well to build the railroads, which, of course, allowed the migration West. One could go on and on recounting the influence that cotton has had upon American history.

Nancy Bernard is an important representative of this great and historic industry, and I want to wish her good traveling and high accomplishment as she continues her tour.

TRIBUTE TO THE PEOPLE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my fellow Congressmen in paying tribute to the gallant and heroic people of Lithuania on this day which marks the 48th anniversary of the declaration of independence by Lithuania. This day is a day of sad remembrance, a day that surely recalls to the memory of all freedom-loving people the sad and melancholy contrast that captive Lithuania and her suffering under Communist domination presents with the free world and the free people elsewhere. The history of the brave Lithuanian people is a history marked with challenge to tyranny and oppression. When in 1918, at the close of World War I, this Baltic State freed itself from the shackles of czarist Russian domination, it was only a brief spell of hardly two decades before the ominous approach of Soviet communism imposed itself. This day marks not only the anniversary of Lithuania's independence but also marks the determination of a brave people in its continuing search for lasting independence.

On this day let us reaffirm our responsibility to the gallant people of Lithuania and convey our message of hope to them and to all those held in bondage. Let us assure them that their struggle is our struggle and the struggle of all freedom-loving people all over the world. It is an irony of fate, that while the Americans of Lithuanian descent and the other free people are observing the anniversary of independence of Lithuania, the Lithuanians themselves under the Soviets cannot observe this great day of their national life.

STRONGER STEPS NEEDED TO HALT ALLIES SHIPPING TO VIETCONG

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Maritime Administration yesterday released the first in a series of blacklists of free world ships trading with the Vietcong. Vessels included in this blacklist will henceforth be denied carrying U.S. Government cargoes.

Since the Congress reconvened this January there has been much recent criticism voiced in the House and Senate over this problem.

Free world shipping to the Vietcong was much more a problem last February 18, 1965, when I first brought this matter to the attention of the Congress, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 3, page 2958. At that time 32 ships from 9 Allied nations had called in North Vietnam since the beginning of 1965. The approximate number of free world ship calls to Communist Vietcong ports for the same period this year comes to 8—so this year's figure is 25 percent of the free world trade carried on with North Vietnam as of this time last year.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that some official action has been taken to curb these free world traders. However, in order to be effective, the Maritime Administration blacklist ought to deny U.S. Government cargoes to all ships from nations trading with the Vietcong.

On March 11, 1965, I introduced H.R. 6154, which would bar ships from such nations from coming into U.S. ports. I urge that this legislation be passed.

While this free world sea trade with the Communists has dropped nearly 75 percent over the same period last year, as long as Americans are dying in battle against the Reds one free world ship calling in North Vietnam is one too many.

REDUCTION IN THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH AND SPECIAL MILK PROGRAMS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised that the 1967 budget recommended drastic reductions in the national school lunch and special milk programs. These are two of the Nation's most important programs affecting the health and welfare of our children and it is disturbing that they should be sought out as a place to save money.

I have received hundreds of letters from parents, schoolchildren, and school authorities protesting the action.

More than 900,000 children are included in these programs in North Carolina alone. The cost involved is not great in this multibillion-dollar era of Federal spending.

It is not the money, however, that concerns me most. It is the health of our children that is at stake. It is the teeth and bodies and general good health of our boys and girls that the budget-cutters are putting on the chopping block.

How can we be consistent in supporting new and untried antipoverty campaigns on one hand and slashing the school milk appropriation and school lunch appropriation on the other hand? The lowest income families which often have the most children would be hardest hit. In many cases, we would be sacrificing the nutritional needs of schoolchildren.

Congress should reject this cutback and look elsewhere for ways to save money.

PROTECTION OF ANIMALS INTENDED FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the growing demand for dogs, cats, and other animals for vital medical research has led to a tremendous increase in the unscrupulous and scandalous transportation, sale, and handling of these animals.

A recent article in Life magazine illustrated the horror and callousness of the dealers who steal, buy, or auction animals for eventual medical research and experimentation.

I believe that it is imperative that Congress call a halt to this practice.

So I am today introducing legislation to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended for medical research and experimentation.

I want to stress, however, that my bill is in no way intended to curtail or outlaw scientific research. Rather, it is intended to prohibit the acquisition of animals for research and experimentation from anyone other than licensed dealers.

Scientific research is absolutely essential to continue the search for solutions of medical problems. The Federal Government is a major supporter of medical research. There is no reason why Government should not be a supporter also of humane and legal means of acquisition of animals for this research.

Mr. Speaker, this is a disgraceful situation that now exists in our country, and I believe that it must be curtailed as quickly as possible.

SUSPENSION OF ECONOMIC AND MILITARY AID TO NATIONS WHO MAINTAIN DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS AND TRADE WITH NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a concurrent resolution which will notify the President and the American people that Congress is opposed to helping those who help our enemies. My resolution expresses the sense of Congress that we should suspend all economic and military aid to any nation maintaining diplomatic relations and trade with North Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the sense of the American people. The mothers, fathers, sons, daughters, and wives of men who are now fighting and dying in Vietnam, simply cannot understand why we should use the money of the American people to subsidize countries who, in turn, help strengthen an enemy which is killing Americans.

We know, of course, that the conduct of foreign policy is the full responsibility of the Chief Executive, but it is our responsibility as representatives of the people, to let the President know when we feel the course he is following is wrong. In this instance where we permit unlimited shipping to North Vietnam, I believe the policy is wrong.

Recent figures indicate that more goods and materiel has been shipped into Haiphong Harbor and up the Mekong River to the North Vietnamese enemy by ships of nations supposed to be friendly to us and to whom we are giving billions of dollars in economic and military aid, than by the Communist nations who are openly on the side of North Vietnam. To permit such a situation to continue is not only ridiculous, but when it results in killing and wounding Americans, it is criminal.

I hope Congress will unanimously support my resolution so that the people we represent will know that we are on their side and on the side of the men who have been sent to stop Communist aggression in Vietnam.

THE 48TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, the people of Lithuania have lived, all too long, under the heel of one foreign oppressor or another. In my State of Illinois, many of them gathered last Sunday in observance of the 48th anniversary of their independence—in observance of this day, February 16, 1918.

Although their freedom has been taken from them throughout most—indeed, almost all—of this century, they still have the desire for freedom. To these people of Lithuanian ancestry who live here in the land of the free, let us all extend an encouraging handclasp of greeting, a handclasp to fortify their vision of importing freedom to their homeland on the Baltic Sea.

GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM GOING WELL IN KANSAS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, there is evidence in Kansas that after 10 years of operations the Great Plains conservation program is equal to the task for which it was conceived—to minimize the hazards of climate by converting unsuitable land from continuous cultivation to permanent vegetation.

To my mind the progress in Kansas alone justifies the budgetary increase which Congress voted last year for this activity.

The Great Plains conservation program is supplementary to other activities. It does not replace them. A fundamental principle in the program is the requirement that the landowners develop a complete plan of conservation operations.

Were it not for the Soil Conservation Service this might have been a limiting factor in the program's expansion. As it is, the landowner gets professional help from SCS technicians in the formulation of a plan which then becomes the basis for application of conservation practices under a contract with the Federal Government.

This Great Plains conservation program has proved to be an excellent tool for the Soil Conservation Service, providing technical assistance to cooperating farmers and ranchers through soil conservation districts in an area of special agricultural problems.

Measures of the program's worth are its effectiveness and its acceptance. Of the latter there can be no doubt in view of the increasing number of applications.

Between June 30, 1964, and June 30, 1965, there was an increase of 3,835 contracts in the 10 Great Plains States with some 4,300 unserviced applications at the end of fiscal 1965.

In Kansas, 436 landowners received Great Plains contracts in fiscal 1965 for a total of 2,101 involving 1,660,000 acres of land, and 349 farmers and ranchers have fully applied the required land-use and treatment measures, and completed their contracts.

District cooperators in Kansas also are utilizing other tools offered by the Federal Government such as the small watershed program.

The cooperation of Kansas landowners and their wisdom in relying on services provided by the Congress for the common good are contributions to a national effort worthy of commendation.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The **SPEAKER.** This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

ENZO PEROTTI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4926) for the relief of Enzo (Enzio) Perotti.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

OSMUNDO CABIGAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5838) for the relief of Osmundo Cabigas.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MARY F. MORSE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 577) for the relief of Mary F. Morse.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 577

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Mary F. Morse, an employee of the Department of the Army, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $7,301.36, representing the amount of overpayments of salary received by the said Mary F. Morse for the period from July 2, 1963, through October 20, 1964, as a result of administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Mary F. Morse, referred to in the first section of this Act, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from her on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, after "Act.", insert the following language:

"No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any persons violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdeameanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

M. SGT. BERNARD L. LAMOUNTAIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 851) for the relief of M. Sgt. Bernard L. LaMountain, U.S. Air Force (retired).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 851

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembed, That Master Sergeant Bernard L. LaMountain, United States Air Force (retired), is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $4,067.16, representing the amount of overpayments of longevity pay received by the said Master Sergeant Bernard L. LaMountain (retired), for the period from

October 24, 1951, through October 2, 1963, as a result of administrative error in the computation of his creditable service for pay purposes. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Bernard L. LaMountain referred to in the first section of this Act, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, after "Act.", insert the following language:

"No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. EARL HARWELL HOGAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1520) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Earl Harwell Hogan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1520

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Earl Harwell Hogan, of Pine Bluff, Arkansas, the sum of $120, in full satisfaction of all their claims against the United States for reimbursement of the cost of transportation of the privately owned automobile of their son, the late Lowell S. Hogan, specialist, United States Army, from Bremen, Germany, his last duty station, to Pine Bluff, Arkansas, the said Mr. and Mrs. Earl Harwell Hogan having transported such automobile at their own expense in reliance upon the erroneous advice of agents of the United States, who misinterpreted United States Army regulations pursuant to which transportation was authorized to be made at the expense of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 6 and 7, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARLEY L. BEEM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5007) for the relief of Arley L. Beem, aviation electrician's mate chief, U.S. Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5007

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $614.62 to Arley L. Beem, aviation electrician's mate chief, United States Navy (service number 6339195), in settlement of his claim against the United States for reimbursement for medical expenses incurred by him in February of 1964 on behalf of his dependent mother as a result of administrative error on the part of naval personnel. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11, strike "in".

Page 2, line 1, strike "excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RONALD WHELAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7141) for the relief of Ronald Whelan.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MRS. SADIE Y. SIMMONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1903) for the relief of Mrs. Sadie Y. Simmons.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1903

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Sadie Y. Simmons, of Ogallah, Kansas, the sum of $1,236.66. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Sadie Y. Simmons against the United States for hospital and medical costs incurred in connection with the last illness of her husband, Chester T. Simmons, as a result of an administrative error of the Veterans' Administration which prevented the hospitalization of the said Chester T. Simmons in a Veterans' Administration hospital. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sadie Y. Simmons and James R. Simmons."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after "Mrs. Sadie Y. Simmons", insert "and James R. Simmons".

Page 1, line 8, after "Mrs. Sadie Y. Simmons", insert "and James R. Simmons".

Page 1, line 9, strike "her husband,".

Page 2, line 3, strike "in excess of 10 per centum".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASHMORE

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASHMORE: Page 2, line 4, strike the word "thereof".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, many, many months ago I was contacted by Mrs. Sadie Y. Simmons of Ogallah, Kans., concerning a claim against the Veterans' Administration which resulted from an administrative error. This error prevented the hospitalization of her late husband, Chester T. Simmons, in a Veterans' Administration hospital.

The report of the Judiciary Committee accompanying H.R. 1903 clearly sets forth the facts and includes a statement from W. J. Driver, Administrator, Veterans' Administration, indicating the Veterans' Administration does not object to favorable consideration of H.R. 1903, which I introduced on January 6, 1965.

Under the present rules and regulations governing Veterans' Administration procedure, there is no legal authority whereby the Veterans' Administration can pay the amount justly due Mrs. Simmons and, therefore, she will be denied relief unless this bill is passed. I am satisfied the claim made by Mrs. Simmons is fair, accurate, and a just one and am, therefore, confident the House will pass H.R. 1903.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sadie Y. Simmons and James R. Simmons."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES T. DAVIS, JR., SALLIE M. DAVIS, AND NORA D. WHITE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10994) for the relief of Charles T. Davis, Jr., Sallie M. Davis, and Nora D. White.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10994

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Represenatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles T. Davis, Junior, Sallie M. Davis, and Nora D. White, of Eureka, North Carolina, the sum of $15,200 in full settlement of their claims against the United States for damage to real property owned by them as the result of an air crash on January 23, 1961, of a United States Air Force aircraft. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike "$15,200" and insert "$14,398".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN EMPLOYEES AT GRANITE CITY DEFENSE DEPOT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11271) for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of Defense at the Granite City Defense Depot, Granite City, Ill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11271

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That each individual named in section 3 of this Act is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the amount set forth opposite his name, which amount represents an erroneous payment of compensation received by him during the period from July 1964 through June 1965 as a civilian employee of the Department of Defense at the Granite City Defense Depot, in Granite City, Illinois, and was erroneously paid to him due to administrative error.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each individual named in section 3 of this Act, the sum certified to him by the Secretary of Defense as the aggregate of amounts paid by such individual to the United States, or withheld from amounts due him from the United States, on account of the liability for which relief is granted by the first section of the Act.

SEC. 3. The individuals referred to in the first section of this Act, and the amount of the liability of each of them, are as follows:

Name:	*Amount of overpayment*
Atkins, Cleveland	$106.22
Bobo, Ernest	157.14
Boyd, James W	79.26
Brandon, Clifford	406.37
Brower, William B	352.73
Burr, Richard A	117.81
Carter, Robert H	$109.79
Chlopek, John J	159.23
Clay, George F	335.83
Enoch, Herbert W	608.38
Fernandez, Manuel	170.20
Fitzmaurice, Thomas P	458.45
Garrett, John	470.43
Hickman, Joe E	87.52
Jackson, Troy	64.30
Jowers, Clarence E	191.90
Kindell, Glen H	60.67
King, Jesse L	222.07
Meagher, James H	215.39
Miller, Lewis L	169.17
Sharpe, Vedral	138.78
Smith, George E	86.44
Still, Franklin P	309.58
Swindal, Raymond D	80.73
Thomas, Eddie	161.46
Upp, John E	641.94
Williams, Victor D	407.46
Yarber, Owen L	72.54

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 8, after "Act.", insert:

"No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Page 2, following line 11, strike—

"Brandon, Clifford 406.37"

and insert—

"Brandon, Clifford 221.90"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID B. GLIDDEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5552) for the relief of David B. Glidden.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5552

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That David B. Glidden, a former member of the United States Army (service number RA11393462), is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $750, the amount of an overpayment to him of Army proficiency pay in the period beginning October 1, 1963, and ending July 31, 1964, because of an administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to said David B. Glidden, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEAN P. BARTELT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6663) for the relief of Dean P. Bartelt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6663

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Dean P. Bartelt, of Madison, Wisconsin, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $102.36, representing an overpayment of travel allowance paid to him by the United States Army through administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dean P. Bartelt an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section.

SEC. 3. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RONALD POIRIER, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8865) for the relief of Ronald Poirier, a minor.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CHARLES A. TURNER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8937) for the relief of Charles A. Turner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8937

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles A. Turner, the sum of $2,637.68 in full settlement of all his claims against the United States incurred as the result of his being required to remain outside the United States after completion of service with the United States Government, and in excess of that time period during which he would have received settlement of such claim, because of the debilitating and terminal illness of his wife which resulted in her death outside of the United States.

SEC. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike "$2,637.68" and insert "$2,551.18".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, this measure—H.R. 8937, for the relief of Charles A. Turner—is a classic example of where private legislation is not only the sole recourse available to an American citizen, but where it is a completely warranted action as well.

Mr. Turner resigned his civilian post with the U.S. Air Force on December 24, 1960. Prior to his separation, Mr. Turner requested, on the basis of earned entitlement, that he be authorized delayed return travel and transportation to the United States because his wife was seriously ill and unable to travel.

Mr. Turner's wife died 2 years and 3 days after his date of resignation and very shortly thereafter he applied for return travel. He was informed, however, that a 2-year time limitation on reimbursable travel is prescribed and that neither the Air Force nor the Comptroller General had the authority to waive this limitation.

Mr. Turner subsequently paid for the transportation of himself and his household goods to the United States. It was only after he had exhausted every possible administrative recourse that I introduced private legislation in his behalf.

Mr. Speaker, both the Air Force and the Comptroller General's Office have now reviewed this legislation. Both have recommended the passage of this legislation, as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

I think it is well to note the reasons for their approval. The Air Force, in its report states:

> The physical condition of Mr. Turner's wife, which prohibited travel during the period of travel entitlement, and Mr. Turner's action to apply for return travel within a reasonable time after his wife's death, constitute extenuating circumstances. The Department of the Air Force favors H.R. 8937.

And the Comptroller General's Office has stated:

> Ordinarily, we do not favor relief legislation which is preferential in nature such as here. However, in view of the unusual circumstances of Mr. Turner's case, we would have no objection to the enactment of H.R. 8937, provided that the bill be amended to authorize reimbursement to Mr. Turner in an amount no greater than the total expenses—which our computation shows to be $2,551.18—which would have been allowable for travel as an employee under the applicable provisions of law assuming the nonavailability of American ships for the travel and transportation in question.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, as amended by the committee, meets this test. It takes into account those personal and human factors that cannot be foreseen. It is fair, equitable and reasonable and I believe it would be a matter of justice and compassion if the House were to approve it today.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

MANDATORY REPORTING BY PHYSICIANS AND INSTITUTIONS OF PHYSICAL ABUSE OF CHILDREN

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10304) to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physical abuse of children, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MULTER, ABERNETHY, SMITH of Virginia, SPRINGER, and NELSEN.

MANDATORY REPORTING BY PHYSICIANS AND INSTITUTIONS OF INJURIES CAUSED BY FIREARMS OR OTHER DANGEROUS WEAPONS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9985) to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and hospitals or similar institutions in the District of Columbia of injuries caused by firearms or other dangerous weapons, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ABERNETHY, MULTER, and HARSHA.

APPOINTMENT OF TRUSTEES IN DEEDS OF TRUST

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 647) to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MULTER, ABERNETHY, SMITH of Virginia, SPRINGER, and NELSEN.

PREMARITAL EXAMINATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3314) to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WHITENER, WILLIAMS, HORTON, and ROUDEBUSH.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Judiciary Committee be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the Members of the House that, at the request of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the bill S. 1666 to provide for the appointment of Federal circuit and district judges will not be called up tomorrow, as previously announced, but will be called up later.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would the distinguished majority leader state whether it is proposed to bring the bill up next week?

Mr. ALBERT. It probably will be.

WIND RIVER IRRIGATION PROJECT, WYOMING

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 733, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 733

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 343) to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.J. Res. 343, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 9), and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the resolving clause of said Senate joint resolution and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.J. Res. 343 as passed.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and, pending that, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 733 provides for consideration of House Joint Resolution 343, a joint resolution to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate. After passage of House Joint Resolution 343, it shall be in order to discharge Interior and Insular Affairs Committee from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 9, strike all after the resolving clause and insert the House-passed language.

The purpose of House Joint Resolution 343 is to cancel unpaid construction charges now outstanding against certain non-Indian landowners on the project, and thereby to compromise a longstanding dispute between them and the Government.

There is now and has been for many years a dispute between the Federal Government and certain non-Indian landowners served by the Wind River project over the applicability to them of earlier enactments of the Congress which, on their face, impose an obligation to pay charges arising out of construction of Indian irrigation projects and make these charges a lien on the land if they are not paid. The lands involved all passed out of Indian ownership prior to March 7, 1928, the date of the act imposing or purporting to impose this lien. It is the position of the disputants that they or their predecessor in interest bought their land free of any such charges, have never agreed to their imposition, and are not and will not be subject to them. Enactment of House Joint Resolution 343 is needed to help solve this dispute.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 733.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are considering House Resolution 733, which would grant a 1-hour open rule for House Joint Resolution 343—a measure to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands, thereby to compromise a longstanding dispute between the landowners and the Government.

House Joint Resolution 343 provides that all project construction charges will be distributed among all lands served; that previously accrued charges to these landowners will be canceled if their title patents do not show such an encumbrance, and said landowners agree to pay future assessed charges as must all other served landowners, which charges will be a lien on the land if unpaid; and lands which have such an encumbrance on them must pay the accrued charges.

The canceled charges total about $765,000. There will be no Federal expenditure.

There is no minority report.

Mr. Speaker, there is no objection that a rule be granted. I reserve the balance of my time, and I have no further requests for time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUILLEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I am intrigued by the language in the report that the gentleman referred to a moment ago:

> No expenditure of Federal funds is involved in this legislation but the canceled charges will probably total about $765,000.

Is this not playing around with semantics to some extent?

Mr. QUILLEN. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman, it was pointed out in the Committee on Rules that these moneys made up a certain obligation that was made many years ago and actually the Government has been unable to collect. This would be just one way to even up the books, so to speak.

Mr. GROSS. I am not quarreling with the legislation, but it seems to me that if there has been an expenditure, to cancel the charges would mean that the Federal Treasury would be out $765,000; would it not?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me so that I may answer the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. QUILLEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. If it was possible, or even probable, that the money would be paid, my friend from Iowa is correct. But there is a big question as to whether or not this money will ever be paid inasmuch as only $1,320 has been paid to date. So we did not intend to mislead the members of the committee but I do believe that under the circumstances we have stated the situation as it exists.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I have no quarrel with the legislation, as I said, but I would like the record to show that there is a situation where the taxpayers of this country are out of pocket a certain amount.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct when he says that this is a bookkeeping transaction that shows a cancellation of this amount and a debit to the Federal Treasury. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY A JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF THE OTOE AND MISSOURIA TRIBE OF INDIANS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 732), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 732

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10674) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The committee, in the resolution, made clear the purpose of the bill. The bill would merely provide for the disposition of funds already appropriated to satisfy an award made by the Indian Claims Commission. I know of no opposition to either the resolution or the bill. Therefore I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, we are considering House Resolution 732, which would grant a 1-hour open rule for H.R. 10674, waiving points of order—a bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Otoe and Missouri Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to provide for the disposition of a judgment to the tribe of $1,750,000 made by the Indian Claims Commission. The judgment was made in recognition of the fact that the tribe was inadequately paid for lands in Iowa and Missouri which it ceded to the United States by treaties in 1836 and 1854.

Funds to satisfy the judgment were appropriated in June 1964, and are on deposit at the Treasury, earning 4 percent interest. The appropriation is subject to attorneys' fees of about $166,000 and an additional $150,000 pending a decision on a conflicting claim of the Yankton Sioux Tribe to part of the same lands.

No Federal funds are authorized by the bill. There are no minority views.

Mr. Speaker, there is no objection that a rule be granted. I reserve the balance of my time, and I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPE LOOKOUT NATIONAL SEASHORE, N.C.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 731, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 731

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1784) to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendments recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now printed in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 1784, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 251), and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 1784 as passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 731 provides for consideration of H.R. 1784, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule, waiving points of order, with 1 hour of general debate. After passage of H.R. 1784, it shall be in order to take S. 251, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the House-passed language.

H.R. 1784 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a donation of between 17,600 and 18,300 acres of land and marshland from the State of North Carolina, to supplement the donated area with between 1,700 and 2,400 acres to be acquired by the United States, and to establish on these 20,000 acres and the water areas immediately surrounding them a new unit of the national park system to be known as the Cape Lookout National Seashore.

Cape Lookout National Seashore will be an addition to the series of national seashores that have already been established or authorized to be established along the Atlantic coast—Cape Cod, Fire Island, Assateague, Cape Hatteras—and will make and keep available for generations to come an area which has prime public outdoor recreational potentials. It is located off the North Carolina coast between Ocracoke Inlet on the north and Beaufort Inlet on the south, a distance of about 58 miles, with a width varying between one-quarter and three-quarters of a mile. The most outstanding natural feature of the area is what has been described as its "wild, unspoiled beaches."

H.R. 1784, as amended, limits the amount authorized to be appropriated for land acquisition and development to $3,200,000. This includes an amount sufficient to finance both land acquisition and the developments planned for the first 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 731.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak out of order, and that my remarks be placed in the RECORD after the adoption of the rule.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, we are considering H. Res. 731, which would grant a 1 hour open rule of general debate for H.R. 1784, waiving points of order—a bill to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to establish a national seashore of some 20,000 acres of land and marshland in North Carolina. Under this measure, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept a donation of approximately 18,000 acres, and to supplement it with some 1,700 to 2,400 acres acquired by the Government to form the park.

The plan is to retain the wild, unspoiled beaches of the area. Most of the recreational activities intended, swimming, fishing, hunting, and camping, will require little development. The National Park Service intends to build a park headquarters, roads, parking areas, camping and picnic areas, a marina, and a visitors center.

The Corps of Engineers will do some shore protection and erosion control work, which, however, as stated by the Secretary of the Interior, will not curtail the development of the park. The Secretary noted in a letter to the committee:

> Most of these developments * * * could be prudently undertaken without awaiting execution of the Corps of Engineers program.

H.R. 1784 limits the amount authorized to be appropriated for land acquisition and development of the Cape Lookout National Seashore to $3 million. This amount includes an amount sufficient to finance both land acquisition and the developments planned for the first 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend that a rule be granted. I reserve the balance of my time, and I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, some people have questioned this rule because it waives points of order. If any of my colleagues are interested, I would ask them to turn to page 4 of the bill, where you will find the reason for the waiving points of order which was because the Secretary of the Interior is given the authority to exchange Federal land for non-Federal land for as near equal value as possible.

And if he cannot effectuate an exchange of property of approximately equal fair market value, the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the value of the property. That is the reason for the waiving of the points of order.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATTACK ON MISSISSIPPI IS COMMUNIST-INSPIRED

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the people of Mississippi are no different from the people of other States of the Union; but like the people of all other States they are subject to the frailties of human nature. Some are good; some are bad; and some are indifferent. But like all others they are mostly good people. I am proud to be one of them.

Mr. Speaker, I am now in my 34th year as a Member of this House. During the time that I have had the privilege of serving in this honorable body, I have tried to conduct myself in a manner that would merit the confidence and respect of the membership. While it is true that I have opposed, with what ability I may have, many of the ultraliberal programs proposed by this and preceding administrations, I entertain the hope that those who differed with me credited me with doing so upon what I conceived to be constitutional grounds and devotion to this Republic. But I realize that as a result of the propaganda attacking my section of the country and particularly my State of Mississippi over the past several years, anything that I may say here today will be suspect. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I cannot as a Mississippian and above all as an American, devoted to the perpetuation of the ideals and institutions of our great common country, remain silent. There are some things going on that are not only injurious to my State of Mississippi, but that might well prove fatal to America itself, and they should be candidly and honestly exposed.

Therefore, I now propose to show by sequence and documentary evidence that the abortive effort by the miscalled Democratic Freedom Party to deny Mississippi, one of the 50 States of the Union, representation in this House, the current attack now being waged on this floor on my great State by a few Members, and the attempt to sabotage our war efforts in Vietnam, are all part of a Communist-inspired conspiracy.

Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 89th Congress a determined, well-organized, and well-financed effort was made to deny the people of the State of Mississippi representation in the U.S. House of Representatives. As is usual in such Communist movements, the Communists as such manipulated in the background using leftwing organizations and misguided and sometimes naive individuals to front for them. The movement was carried on under the guise of civil rights. Specifically, the charge was that discrimination was practiced against potential Negro voters. Although none of the protestants participated in the general election, there was a straw vote taken in a mock election, without any authorized legal sanction, in various Negro churches throughout the State. Every Member of the House was propagandized by these leftwing organizations as well as by many misguided churchmen and other citizens under the popular slogan of civil rights. The Committee on House Administration, charged with the investigation of elections of House Members, after hearing the facts involved, promptly dismissed the so-called contest and reported its findings to the House. In turn, the House upheld the committee's action and finally seated Mississippi's five duly elected Members.

Thwarted in this effort to subvert representative government, these subversive leaders showed their true objective on a large scale, the "divide and conquer" technique. These same leftwing organizations have now embarked upon a more ambitious undertaking—to discredit the foreign policy of the United States, thereby undermining the security of the Nation and jeopardizing the lives of our fighting men in Vietnam.

It can be verified now conclusively that the leftwing organizations and motley individuals who are engaged in the deplorable if not treasonable acts of encouraging draft dodging and disunity in this hour of crisis are, by and large, the same as those who have fostered civil disobedience in connection with so-called civil rights causes.

The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, which attempted to deprive the white and colored people of my State of all representation in the Congress, is one example of a group which is playing a leading role in the "draft dodging" conspiracy. Lawrence Guyot, chairman of the party, actually admits that draft dodging techniques have been taught in some "freedom schools" which the group operates in the State. A freedom school instructor, Ranier Selig, of Chicago, disclosed that while teaching at McComb, Miss., he instructed about 50 students in "the evils of the bomb and what we can do to stop this war in Vietnam." "I explained," he continued, "how they drop the bombs on colored people instead of white."

It is not surprising that such a revolutionary doctrine would be taught at the freedom schools in Mississippi considering the fact that their founder was Staughton Lynd, a Yale professor who illegally visited Hanoi last month to "negotiate" with Ho Chi Minh. Lynd was one of the chief organizers of the anti-Vietnam war march on Washington last April and later wrote that "nothing could have stopped that crowd from taking possession of its government. Perhaps next time we should keep going." Lynd was accompanied to Hanoi by Thomas Hayden, a founder of Students for a Democratic Society, who was also active in the civil rights movement in Mississippi. This is the same Lynd, who is almost daily appearing on TV and in the press attempting to bring about disunity in our war efforts. He is also the same Lynd whose passport has just been belatedly revoked by the State Department on his return from London on another trip of sabotage.

The relationship between the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, the peacenik demonstrations and the Communist conspiracy is conclusively confirmed in an article written by Anne Braden, an identified Communist. The article appeared in the September 13, 1965, issue of Peace and Freedom News, which is a publication of the National Coordinating Committee To End the War in Vietnam. Her husband, Carl Braden, also a hard-core Communist, was a guiding light in the formation of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. She wrote:

> In a real sense, this movement (anti-Vietnam policy) is a child of the southern civil rights movement. Many who are most active worked first in Mississippi. Their songs are freedom songs—with new words. This reflects a concept that is capturing the imagination of many young people—"parallel institution" that people set up when society's existing institutions do not meet their needs. The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party first gave them the idea.

Mr. Speaker, it must be assumed that Mrs. Braden's "parallel institutions" are such as the National Liberation Front—Vietcong—in Vietnam, the FLN in Algeria, and Castroites in Cuba. Using this Communist technique in Mississippi, the Freedom Democratic Party set up parallel schools—the so-called freedom schools—a parallel union—the Freedom Union which attempted to strike against plantation owners in the Mississippi Delta—a parallel delegation to the National Democratic Convention in Atlantic City, and a parallel delegation to Congress which it attempted to have recognized as the legitimate representatives of the people of Mississippi.

It was this same group, now calling itself the Poor People's Conference, that recently invaded the deactivated Greenville, Miss., Air Force Base, sounding once again Mrs. Braden's theme of "parallel institution." One of the leaders of these trespassers was quoted in a news story in the Washington Post of February 6, 1966, as follows:

> The Government hasn't done anything for us so why should we recognize it?
>
> Seceding from the Union, PPC proposes to ask for recognition for its government from foreign nations, including several in Africa. It seeks no geographic boundaries but instead a government of individuals.
>
> We might have 5 acres here, a few more acres in another place, and an acre somewhere else—anywhere people who wanted to join the government happened to be.

Pulitzer Prize-winning editor Hodding Carter, a Mississippian noted for his liberal views, called the invasion of the base "a shocking and shameful performance."

John R. Lewis, national chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, which played a key role in the formation of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, recently revealed SNCC involvement in the campaign to encourage draft dodging. Lewis, who is encouraging civil rights workers to avoid military service, admitted that SNCC official policy was that, "Vietnamese are murdered because the United States is pursuing an aggressive policy in violation of international law."

It was Julian Bond's endorsement of this SNCC policy that led to his being barred from taking the oath of office as a member of the Georgia Legislature. Incidentally, it is ironic that the very people who support his claim to a seat in that body were attempting last year on the flimsiest of excuses to bar the duly elected Representatives of Mississippi from taking their seats in the Congress.

The fact that the Freedom Democratic Party and some other so-called civil rights groups are now aiding the Communist conspiracy to enslave the world by attempts to discredit our national policy is no mere coincidence. A summary of the backgrounds of the Freedom Democratic Party attorneys who sought to unseat the Mississippi congressional delegation should establish, for even the most skeptical, the alarming relationship between the movements.

The brief filed by the contestants lists the following as attorneys for contestants: Arthur Kinoy, William M. Kunstler, Benjamin E. Smith, Morton Stavis, and William L. Higgs.

The public records reveal the following concerning each:

Arthur Kinoy, New York City: Member of National Lawyers Guild, vice president in 1954; member of executive committee for the American Student Union which has been cited as Communist by five investigating committees; attorney for Communist-controlled United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers Union; attorney for Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, executed spies; attorney for Steve Nelson, the international Communist leader; member of law firm which received payments from various Communist groups including the Committee for Justice for Morton Sobell, and the Labor Youth League—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 2, page 1950.

William M. Kunstler, New York City: Featured speaker at rally sponsored by the Communist-front group; Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties; has appeared on platform with identified Communists Carl Braden, Frank Wilkinson, and Henry Winston; counsel for Southern Conference Educational Fund—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 2, page 1950.

Benjamin E. Smith, New Orleans: Member of National Lawyers Guild; associate of Communist organizer Hunter Pitts Odell; in 1964, registered agent for Castro's Republic of Cuba—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 2, page 1951.

Morton Stavis, Newark, N.J.: Born Moses Isaac Stavisky; member of the Communist Party in New York and New Jersey during 1945 and 1946; member of Union County, N.J., Communist Party unit in 1950; active in numerous Communist groups and causes—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 2, page 1945.

William L. Higgs, Washington, D.C.: Disbarred lawyer following conviction on a morals charges. Not a member of District of Columbia Bar Association; legal adviser to SNCC.

The brief further lists as "of counsel," in addition to the above, Bruce C. Waltzer and Daniel Crystal, and the public records reveal the following concerning them:

Bruce C. Waltzer, New Orleans: Partner of Benjamin E. Smith; member of National Lawyers Guild; registered in 1964 under the Foreign Agents Registration Act as an agent of the Republic of Cuba—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 2, page 1951.

Daniel Crystal: Identified as a member of the Communist Political Association, the name for the Communist Party from May 1944, until July 1945, in Washington, D.C.

So of the seven lawyers listed in the brief of the contestants as attorneys for contestants and of counsel, two have been identified as Communists, two were registered as agents of Castro's Cuba, two have long histories of active support of Communist causes and as attorneys for Communist fronts, for individual Communists, and for convicted spies, and the seventh was disbarred following conviction on a morals charge.

The brief of the contestants further lists 152 additional lawyers as attorneys of counsel on the taking of depositions.

Of these, 12 have been identified as Communists: William T. Belcher, Oakland, Calif.; Benjamin Dreyfus, San Francisco, Calif.; David M. Freedman, New York, N.Y.; Samuel Gruber, Stanford, Conn.; Harry Levitan, Philadelphia, Pa.; David Lubell, New York, N.Y.; Jonathan Lubell, New York, N.Y.; Ben Margolis, Los Angeles, Calif.; Hugh B. Miller, San Francisco, Calif.; Isadore Needleman, New York, N.Y.; Frank S. Pestana, Hollywood, Calif.; David Scribner, New York, N.Y.

Three others of these attorneys took the fifth amendment when asked about their membership in the Communist Party.

Five others have defended various Communist leaders, in addition to belonging to numerous Communist fronts.

One of them has engaged in pro-Castro propaganda through travel to Cuba, raising money for medicine, et cetera.

One registered as an agent of Castro's Cuba.

In summary, of the 159 lawyers listed in the brief of the contestants, 14 are identified Communists. A total of 63, or over one-third, have some kind of Communist or Communist front record.

What is alarming to me, Mr. Speaker, is that despite these undeniable facts, some Members of this body have been misled into supporting the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. The poison of communism, of black nationalism, of racism, has been labeled "civil rights," and some well-intentioned Members of this House have looked no further than the label.

The leaders of the Negro community in my State have not been so misled. The State conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People recently issued a statement saying the group "is unalterably opposed to the position taken by the members of the Freedom Democratic Party" in regards to Vietnam. The NAACP said:

> In times of peril it is the duty of every American to give unstinted support to the fight for freedom abroad. We strongly urge all citizens, Negroes and whites, to support our country in this major crisis.

Last week still another attack upon my State was mounted by a handful of Members here in the House and extensively covered by the press. Again, some Members of this House, well-intentioned no doubt but, in my opinion, uninformed and misguided, participated in accusing the State of Mississippi of waging "a carefully calculated conspiracy" against some of its citizens, a rather serious charge to level against any State.

This accusation was ironic for several reasons:

First, the delay in launching an expanded Operation Help to provide free food to low income persons was due largely to obstructionism of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, its affiliates, and its sponsors in insisting that they control the distribution of these foods. This group is not interested in progress but only in what is exploitable.

Second, the rate of unemployment in Mississippi is much below the national unemployment figure. In December, 1965, unemployment in Mississippi stood at 3.4 percent as against the latest national figure of 4 percent in January. The national rate was higher in December.

Three, the same well-intentioned but misinformed Members of the House who blamed Mississippi for the plight of farm workers displaced by mechanization voted last year for a farm bill further reducing the planting of cotton.

Mr. Speaker, we in Mississippi have learned to our sorrow not to dismiss as simply ludicrous the weird antics and wild rantings of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party and its sponsors—not so long as they can wrap themselves in the cloak of civil rights and fool even Members of Congress into accepting them as knights in shining armor embarked on a holy crusade.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as an American citizen who is gravely concerned lest the security of this Nation be placed in jeopardy, I say to you, it is time to recognize the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and its other affiliates for what they are—a group of weird and dangerous extremists of the Left bent on dissension, revolution, and national disaster.

WIND RIVER IRRIGATION PROJECT, WYOMING

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H.J. Res. 343) to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 343, with Mr. STRATTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, these bills which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House bring to you today may not be the most important bills nationally or internationally that could be brought before this body, but nevertheless I wish to say that they are important bills as far as certain areas of our Nation are concerned and as far as certain Members of this body are concerned.

House Joint Resolution 343 deals with a Bureau of Indian Affairs matter. It does not deal with a Bureau of Reclamation matter. In other words, this is an Indian irrigation project and not one of the regular projects that comes out from the Bureau of Reclamation.

The purpose of House Joint Resolution 343 is, in effect, to compromise a dispute between certain non-Indian landowners on the Wind River irrigation project and the United States. Many of these landowners purchased their land prior to March 7, 1928, without knowledge of construction charges. But in 1928 the Congress passed an act imposing liens against lands on which construction charges were not paid. What the thinking of Congress was at that time I do not know but I know that the landowners see this as an injustice.

This resolution, with the committee amendment, provides that those charges which have already accrued but remain unpaid and which are allocated to the disputants' land shall be canceled if the patent to the land contained no recital to the effect that it is subject to such charges and if they agree to pay all further charges of this sort. It also provides that if the land went to patent with notice in the patent that it is subject to construction charges it shall continue to be subject to such charges. In both cases the charges will be a lien if they remain unpaid.

I may say, in answer to the question which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] asked during the debate on the rule that in the neighborhood of $750,000 of construction charges may be canceled under this legislation, it will be a debit against the General Treasury, of course.

As far as I am aware, there is no objection to the legislation. The project was authorized by secretarial authorization in 1905. The provision at that time was that the construction charges for this project would be paid for by the proceeds from sales of Indian lands to non-Indians, sales located on this particular reservation or within the boundaries of the project.

No question was apparent until shortly before 1928 when an effort was made to collect some of the construction charges from non-Indian owners. They referred to the fact that they were not liable under the patents which they had received and under the agreement which had been made at the time of their purchase. However, the House did pass an act in 1928 which placed a lien upon their lands for unpaid construction charges.

Now there are 131 non-Indians who are involved in this particular legislation. There is a total of 55,000 acres of land involved. Of this amount of land, there are about 11,000 acres, or 28 percent of the land, which belongs to the non-Indian owners.

It would appear to the committee, and the committee acted upon the theory, that equity in this matter should provide for the cancellation of this amount, whatever it may be. The committee saw fit to place an amendment in the legislation to the effect that those taking advantage of the legislation would have to accept their share of the construction charges from the time the act was passed.

I know of no opposition, as I said before.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 343 seeks to cancel unpaid reimbursable construction costs on non-Indian land located on the Wind River irrigation project, Wyoming, by the purchaser of the land bought prior to March 7, 1928, and without knowledge of construction charges. Most of the land in the project passed out of Indian ownership before 1928 when liens were placed against lands on which construction charges were not paid.

This resolution provides, first, that all project construction charges will be distributed among all lands served by the project; second, that those charges which have already accrued and which are properly allocable to the disputant's land shall be canceled if the patent to the land contained no recital to the effect that it is subject to such charges; and third, that land which went to patent with notice in the patent that it is subject to construction charges shall continue to be subject to such charges and that if they remain unpaid shall be a lien against the land.

A committee amendment requires that persons whose charges may be canceled must execute agreements on behalf of themselves, heirs, or assigns to pay construction charges which are incurred after the date of the enactment of this act.

It is possible that in the neighborhood of $750,000 in construction charges will be canceled under the act.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. RONCALIO], author of the resolution.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, I cannot add to the substance of the very excellent description and presentation given by the chairman of the full committee. I do, however, feel that I should augment the information with the fact that the reimbursable construction costs which we are talking about canceling here have similarly been canceled on all Indian lands owned by Indians on this Indian reservation. They were never canceled against the non-Indian owners, and this is the facet of equity to which I believe the chairman [Mr. ASPINALL] referred.

The charges accrued from the year 1903 to 1914 on most of these lands.

Mr. Chairman, these lands cannot get a marketable title through any attorney nor can the United States foreclose a so-called lien because they will not permit that. This is the only way to restore these 50,000 acres or more of land back to the tax rolls of the counties of Wyoming where they will be used for the good of everyone.

Mr. ASPINALL. I think the most important result is that this legislation would provide for the development of this land and placing the land back on the tax roll, which would benefit the counties of the State of Wyoming.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 343. The purpose of this joint resolution is to cancel unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project in Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands.

In more simple terms, House Joint Resolution 343 is a legislative solution to a very complex situation. I shall attempt a synopsis of the history beyond this legislation.

In 1905 or 1906, the Wind River or Shoshone Indians by agreement ceded part of their Indian lands to the United States, in trust to be sold by the Government and the proceeds of the sale placed to their credit. Pursuant to that agreement $150,000 from the proceeds of the sale, or so much thereof as may be necessary, was to be expended by the Secretary of the Interior for the construction and extension of an irrigation system within the reservation.

The act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1016) ratified this agreement with the Wind River or Shoshone Indians and appropriated $25,000 to be used in the construction and extension of an irrigation system on the reservation, the same to be reimbursed from the proceeds of the sale of the lands. Thereafter various sums were appropriated by the Federal Government.

At this point I emphasize that the U.S. Government was to be reimbursed from the sale of the ceded lands and no statutory assessment of the construction costs against the lands to be benefited by the irrigation system had been promulgated.

In 1914, the Appropriation Act (38 Stat. 582), provided that the Secretary of the Interior was to apportion the cost of any irrigation project constructed for Indians and made reimbursable out of tribal funds, in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior. No such regulations or collections were made.

In 1920, the Appropriation Act again directed the Secretary of the Interior to begin collection of reimbursable construction costs under any irrigation system, the payments to be credited on a per-acre basis and deducted from the total per-acre charge assessable against the lands. After 1920, attempts were made to collect these irrigation construction charges.

However, during the period from 1905 to 1920 these Indian lands were sold under bid invitations to non-Indian owners, the sale to include a water right and paid up irrigation construction charges. None of the patents issued contained a recital to that effect. Thereafter on the advice of the Attorney General, certificates were issued to the non-Indian purchasers referring to paid-up construction charges.

In 1928, by the act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 210), a lien was placed against the land in Indian irrigation projects for the repayment of reimbursable construction costs where reimbursement was required by law.

Since 1928, a dispute has existed between the non-Indian landowners served by the Wind River Indian irrigation project and the Federal Government. On the one hand, the Federal Government insists that the non-Indian landowners are liable for the unpaid reimbursable construction charges as set forth by congressional enactments, while on the other hand, the non-Indian landowners deny such liability.

House Joint Resolution 343, seeks to resolve this situation by providing that all reimbursable construction costs previously incurred at the Wind River Indian irrigation project is to be in accordance to these land classifications: First, costs allocated to lands sold to non-Indian owners prior to March 7, 1928, shall be canceled if the patent contains no recital that the land is subject to irrigation construction charges and no contract to pay such charges has been signed by the purchaser. But such cancellation is to take effect only when the individual owner obligates himself, his heirs and assigns, by contract to pay all reasonable construction charges incurred after the date of this act, which are allocated to his land and if not paid, shall be a lien against the land.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I will be happy to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. This does not establish a precedent, as I understand it, because we have done that in certain instances with like charges with respect to non-Indians, especially in the Navajo case.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. Our committee several years ago thought we had taken care of all of the irrigation projects under the Bureau of Reclamation that were delinquent and had charges that could not be collected.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman means the Bureau of Indian Affairs?

Mr. SAYLOR. No. The Bureau of Reclamation. And we did not get this project at that time because this is a Bureau of Indian Affairs project. That is the reason why this was not taken care of at the same time as we took care of the others.

Now continuing on: Second, lands sold to non-Indian owners prior to March 7, 1928, and the patent contains a recital to the effect that the land is subject to irrigation construction charges, past or future, shall be subject to a lien for such charges.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the enactment of House Joint Resolution 343. Its passage will assist in removing the cloud on the title held by these non-Indian landowners and permit them to obtain a marketable title to their lands.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The **CHAIRMAN.** There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. Res. 343

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) all reimbursable construction costs heretofore incurred at the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, shall be allocated against the total irrigable acreage in the project according to the present land classifications.

(b) The costs so allocated to land that passed out of Indian ownership prior to March 7, 1928, shall be canceled by the Secretary of the Interior if the patent from the United States contained no recital to the effect that the land is subject to irrigation construction charges, and the purchaser did not sign a contract to pay construction charges.

(c) Land that passed out of Indian ownership prior to March 7, 1928, shall, if the patent from the United States contains a recital to the effect that the land is subject to irrigation construction charges, either past or future, be subject to a lien in favor of the United States for such charges.

(d) Reimbursable construction charges hereafter incurred at the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, shall be allocated against all irrigable acreage in the project according to land classifications then in effect, shall be a lien against the land, and shall not be subject to cancellation on the ground that the land was conveyed with a paid-up construction charge. Any such paid-up construction charge shall be deemed to mean a construction charge incurred prior to the date of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, add a new sentence to read: "Such cancellation, however, shall take effect with respect to any individual landowner when and only when the said owner obligates himself, his heirs, and assigns by contract satisfactory in form and substance to the Secretary that he will pay all reasonable construction charges incurred after the date of this Act in connection with the Wind River Indian irrigation project which are allocated to his land as provided in this Act and that such charges, if not paid, shall be a lien against the land."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. STRATTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.J. Res. 343) to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands, pursuant to House Resolution 733, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 733, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from the further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 9, and the Clerk will report the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. Res. 9

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) all reimbursable construction costs heretofore incurred at the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, shall be allocated against the total irrigable acreage in the project according to the present land classifications.

(b) The costs so allocated to land that passed out of Indian ownership prior to March 7, 1928, shall be canceled by the Secretary of the Interior if the patent from the United States contained no recital to the effect that the land is subject to irrigation construction charges, and the purchaser did not sign a contract to pay construction charges.

(c) Land that passed out of Indian ownership prior to March 7, 1928, shall, if the patent from the United States contains a recital to the effect that the land is subject to irrigation construction charges, either past or future, be subject to a lien in favor of the United States for such charges.

(d) Reimbursable construction charges hereafter incurred at the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, shall be allocated against all irrigable acreage in the project according to land classifications then in effect, shall be a lien against the land, and shall not be subject to cancellation on the ground that the land was conveyed with a paid-up construction charge. Any such paid-up construction charge shall be deemed to mean a construction charge incurred prior to the date of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL, of Colorado: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S.J. Res. 9, and insert in lieu thereof the text of H.J. Res. 343, as passed:

That (a) all reimbursable construction costs heretofore incurred at the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, shall be allocated against the total irrigable acreage in the project according to the present land classifications.

(b) The costs so allocated to land that passed out of Indian ownership prior to March 7, 1928, shall be canceled by the Secretary of the Interior if the patent from the United States contained no recital to the effect that the land is subject to irrigation construction charges, and the purchaser did not sign a contract to pay construction charges. Such cancellation, however, shall take effect with respect to any individual landowner when and only when the said owner obligates himself, his heirs, and assigns by contract satisfactory in form and substance to the Secretary that he will pay all reasonable construction charges incurred after the date of this Act in connection with the Wind River Indian irrigation project which are allocated to his land as provided in this Act and that such charges, if not paid, shall be a lien against the land.

(c) Land that passed out of Indian ownership prior to March 7, 1928, shall, if the patent from the United States contains a recital to the effect that the land is subject to irrigation construction charges, either past or future, be subject to a lien in favor of the United States for such charges.

(d) Reimbursable construction charges hereafter incurred at the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, shall be allocated against all irrigable acreage in the project according to land classifications then in effect, shall be a lien against the land, and shall not be subject to cancellation on the ground that the land was conveyed with a paid-up construction charge. Any such paid-up construction charge shall be deemed to mean a construction charge incurred prior to the date of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 343) was laid on the table.

DISPOSITION OF FUNDS OF OTOE AND MISSOURIA TRIBE OF INDIANS

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10674) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10674, with Mr. STRATTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, Representative BELCHER's bill, H.R. 10674, provides for the distribution of a $1,750,000 judgment fund awarded to the Otoe and Missouria Tribes in 1964 by the Indian Claims Commission. The Commission found that the Federal Government had paid the Indians an unconscionably low amount for lands in Iowa and Missouri taken from them over a century ago. Funds to pay the judgment were appropriated in 1964 and are presently in the U.S. Treasury drawing 4-percent interest.

It is not known how many Indians will share in the award but there will probably be 1,200 or more. In a previous award, docket No. 11, money was distributed to descendants of the Otoe and Missouria Indians. These descendants include a large number of persons who were not eligible for membership in the Otoe and Missouria Tribe as recognized in 1958 and 1959. At that time the requirements for tribal membership were stricter than the requirements set forth in the legislation.

Since 1958 the U.S. Court of Claims has held that questions pertaining to beneficiaries of Indian claims awards are to be decided by the legislative and executive branches and not by the Indian Claims Commission. Consequently some recipients in the case of the earlier award may not be eligible to share in this award. Mr. BELCHER's bill vests ownership of the present award in the existing Otoe and Missouria Tribe as the successor in interest to the parent group who signed the 1836 and 1854 treaties. The tribal councils have passed resolutions favoring the method of distribution although they understand there will be objections raised by persons who will not share in the award.

Since the tribe has only limited land holdings, it is probable that most of the award will be distributed in per capita payments.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 10674 provides that the award to satisfy the judgment will be reduced by $150,000 pending a decision in the Indian Claims Commission on docket No. 332–A which involves a conflicting claim of the Yankton Sioux Tribe.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommends enactment of H.R. 10674.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HALEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, there may be some question among the Members as to why this legislation, and other bills which will follow, have to come before the House for its approval or disapproval, as the case may be.

The gentleman from Florida referred to a certain statement made by the Court of Claims which effects the procedures to be followed.

In addition it must be noted that of recent years the Appropriations Committee has placed the following limitation in the appropriating bill:

> *Provided further*, That funds derived from appropriations in satisfaction of awards of the Indian Claims Commission and the Court of Claims shall not be available for advances, except for such amounts as may be necessary to pay attorney fees, expenses of litigation, and expenses of program planning, until after legislation has been enacted that sets forth the purposes for which said funds will be used.

The legislation which is brought before the committee at this time provides that the funds shall be used as is authorized by the tribal governing body and this will be in accord with the practices that we have had heretofore and also will be in harmony with the language of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill and urge its speedy approval by the House.

I hope there will be no further delay in the other body in completing action on this legislation. The judgment that was awarded in 1964 is long overdue to the people of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians. I think they are entitled to receive the benefits of that judgment without any further delay.

I have just reconfirmed my impression with the committee counsel that the committee did not receive any requests to be heard on this bill by any person who opposed the provisions of the bill. So I think the committee is following precedents of long standing in relying upon the representations that have been made to the committee on behalf of the governing body of the tribe in favorably reporting this bill. I think it represents the best possible approach to legislation to assure speedy distribution of this long due payment to the Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] has consumed 6 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10674, a bill providing for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians.

H.R. 10674 is an attempt on behalf of the United States to make recompense, in a small way, and to redress a wrong committed against the Indian people of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe. The Indian Claims Commission—docket No. 11–A—awarded judgment in favor of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians, in the sum of $1,750,000, as inadequate compensation for lands in western Iowa and northwestern Missouri which were ceded to the United States.

Funds were appropriated by the act of June 9, 1964, to satisfy this judgment. These funds are on deposit in the U.S. Treasury to the credit of these Indians and draws interest at 4 percent. Of the $1,750,000 appropriated, H.R. 10674 provides that the sum of $150,000 and any accrued interest on that amount shall be withheld from distribution pending final determination of the Yankton Sioux claim.

A tribal enrollment of approximately 1,100 to 1,200 Indians will share in the disposition of these judgment funds. H.R. 10674 provides that the unexpended balance of funds may be advanced or expended for any purpose authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The tribal governing body has not approved any formal proposal of programing these funds. In the event no program is approved by the tribal governing body, all or most of the funds will be distributed on a per capita basis.

Mr. Chairman, I support the passage of H.R. 10674 and urge its enactment.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, the author of this legislation.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I want to express appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania especially and to the entire committee on behalf of the Otoe and Missouria Indians for the manner in which this bill has been handled. It has been expedited by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY]. I also express my appreciation to my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], who has helped to push this legislation through. I want to express my sincere appreciation also to the full committee for bringing this legislation to the floor at this time.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 3 minutes.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 10674

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the unexpended balance of funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians that were appropriated by the Act of June 9, 1964, to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket numbered 11–A, and the interest thereon, less payment of attorney fees and expenses, may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Any part of such funds that may be distributed to the members of the tribe shall not be subject to Federal or State income taxes. The sum of $150,000, and any accrued interest, shall be held in the United States Treasury pending final determination of the Yankton Sioux claim in docket numbered 332–A. Any portion of such sum that is determined to belong to the Otoe and Missouria Tribe shall thereupon become subject to the foregoing provisions of this Act.

Mr. SAYLOR (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read the committee amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "interest," and insert "interest thereon,".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having assumed the chair, Mr. STRATTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10674) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 732, he reported the bill back to the House with a committee amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the adoption of the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPE LOOKOUT NATIONAL SEASHORE, N.C.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1784) to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1784, with Mr. STRATTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, we have for consideration today H.R. 1784 which, when enacted, will authorize the creation of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in North Carolina.

This is the first of a series of national park and recreation area bills which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs hopes to bring to the floor this session. This is a particularly good one to start with, for the State of North Carolina is once again demonstrating its happy ability to combine good will toward the National Park Service and the United States at large with a sense of responsibility for the economic and recreational welfare of its own people. Here, as in other cases in the past—the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, for instance—it is proposing to donate a large part of the land area which will be included in the Cape Lookout National Seashore. It does so knowing full well what this will mean for the State in terms of increasing the attraction for tourists that it already has in such large measure.

The Cape Lookout area will be an admirable addition to the chain of national seashores that we are gradually building up along the coasts of our country. Beginning in the Northeast, we have the Cape Cod National Seashore, then Fire Island, then Assateague, then Cape Hatteras, and now Cape Lookout on the Atlantic coast. On the Gulf of Mexico we have Padre Island, and around on the Pacific coast Point Reyes. In addition, our committee has been studying and is nearly ready to come to a conclusion on several others that will help to fill in the gaps—Oregon Dunes on the Pacific coast and several proposals involving the Great Lake Area.

The Cape Lookout area, as I said, lies just south of Cape Hatteras. It stretches 58 miles from Ocracoke Island to Beaufort Inlet and involves 30,000 acres of land and water. Twenty thousand of these acres are land and marshland, and the remainder of the area is submerged land and water. Of the 20,000 acres in the land area, nearly 90 percent is to be donated by the State of North Carolina. The remaining 10 percent, which the United States will acquire, will cost about $265,000, it is estimated. The development costs, except for shore protection and beach erosion control work which will continue to be under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers, are estimated at a little over $2,900,000.

Considering its location and its easy accessibility to the 5 million or more people who live within 250 airline miles of it, we can all agree, I hope, that the Cape Lookout National Seashore will indeed be a great asset to the American people.

I have touched on only a few of the details concerning the seashore proposal. My colleagues on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and Members of the North Carolina delegation will undoubtedly wish to supply more. Let me, then, merely conclude by again congratulating the State of North Carolina on its foresight and generosity and by recommending that the House pass H.R. 1784 with the amendments recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

May I say that the two gentlemen from North Carolina, the author of the bill and Mr. TAYLOR, a member of our committee, are to be commended for the diligence which they have displayed in pursuing this objective.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1784, a bill to establish the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina.

In doing so, I commend the State of North Carolina for donating to the United States almost all of the 30,000 acres of land to be included in the proposed national seashore, and for its perception in seeking to preserve this 58-mile stretch of ocean shore for the recreation and enjoyment of future generations.

The area proposed by H.R. 1784 as a national seashore is located on the Outer Banks of North Carolina between Ocracoke Inlet on the north and Beaufort

Inlet on the south. Just to the north of Ocracoke Inlet lies the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Cape Lookout National Seashore will be a valuable segment in the series of national seashores already established or authorized by the Congress.

This 58 miles of ocean shore constitutes one of the longest stretches of undeveloped ocean beach along the eastern seaboard of the United States. It comprises three principal bodies of land; Portsmouth Island, Core Banks and Shackleford Banks. The area is practically uninhabited except for a few people living within the boundaries of the proposed national seashore. H.R. 1784 provides for the protection of these few inhabitants by providing that an owner may reserve a right of use and occupancy of his noncommercial residential property—not to exceed 3 acres—for life or a term of 25 years at his election. An area of 250 acres at Cape Lookout containing a number of summer cottages is not included within the boundaries of the proposed seashore.

Mr. Chairman, a population of over 5 million people live within a 250-mile radius of the proposed national seashore. The principal features and recreational activities to be enjoyed will be swimming, surfing, sailing, boating, waterfowl hunting and fishing, camping, and picnicking. In addition, this area is rich in history with its shipwrecked remains, sites and scenes of the 18th century piracy activities of the famous "Blackbeard," Captain Drummond, and Spanish pirates, and some military remnants of the Revolution and French and Indian Wars. The projected attendance figures indicate that attendance will increase from 250,000 during the first full year of operation to 1 million visitors during the 5th year of operation.

H.R. 1784 authorizes the appropriation of $3,200,000 for land acquisition and development of the Cape Lookout National Seashore. Annual operating expenses are estimated at $90,000 to $370,000 over the first 5-year period.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the enactment of H.R. 1784 as not only a valuable addition to our series of national seashores, but moreover, as a natural resource of recreational opportunity for the future.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1784 introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman HENDERSON, provides for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina. A similar bill has been approved in the Senate. The legislation has been favorably recommended by the Department of the Interior, the National Parks Advisory Committee, and by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with a unanimous vote. Those of us who went down to view the area were impressed by it. The bill authorizes the establishment of a land and water area of approximately 30,000 acres on North Carolina's chain of outer banks. The State has been buying up this land over a period of years. The first State appropriation to purchase this land was back in 1959, and the State is now in a position and willing to donate all of the land to the Government without cost except for 1,700 acres which will have to be acquired.

The Secretary of the Interior stated:

> This is in keeping with the State's fine tradition of donating land for inclusion in national parks and seashores.

This bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to purchase additional land needed. Approximately 58 miles of ocean seashore will be included in this area, and it will constitute one of the longest stretches of undeveloped ocean beach on the eastern seaboard. Water based activities available include swimming, fishing, waterfowl hunting, and boating. Also, the land offers a base for picnicking, camping, nature study, photography and painting, and a wild area for visitors who seek solitude. The boundary excludes a tract of 250 acres located just north of Cape Lookout which contains a number of vacation residences which have been subdivided into multiple ownership.

A study has been made by the Corps of Engineers concerning immediate shore erosion control and beach protection.

This area was subjected to some very violent storms in recent years. Erosion control work has been recommended by the Corps of Engineers. The next step would be for this project to be included in the public works omnibus bill. Presumably, this erosion control program will be carried out regardless of what action we take on this legislation.

I quote from a statement made by the Honorable Dan K. Moore, the Governor of North Carolina, as presented to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by the Director of the North Carolina Department of Conservation and Development, Dan E. Stewart. The Governor says:

> Today North Carolina is prepared again to offer resources, including land, cooperation, and every assistance possible.

He further says:

> We make these contributions in the hope that our natural resources might be more wisely used to conserve our human resources.

That points out a good objective for conservation. The Governor described the area as "sunswept, windswept, unsurpassed vistas of unusual natural beauty; vast stretches of beaches far removed from the sounds, the sights, the scents of civilization."

The cost of this project for acquisition of additional land is $161,000; for a 40-acre park headquarters site on the mainland, $104,000; for development and construction costs during the first 5 years of operation, estimated at $2,908,700, making a total of $3,173,710.

No one appeared before the House committee in opposition to the bill, and I know of no opposition to it.

I appreciate the statements made by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] in regard to North Carolina's contribution to the national park development. Our State has realized the value of national parks and our people have been conservation-minded. We realize more can be accomplished by cooperating with the Federal Government.

The Hatteras seashore area was donated entirely by the State, just as this land is being donated now.

We have been proud to see this become the first of the national seashore areas and proud that last year it had practically 1 million visitors.

As to the Smoky Mountains National Park, the first $1 million of cost was raised back in the 1920's by local donations of interested citizens. The States of North Carolina and Tennessee, aided by these citizens and the Rockefeller Foundation, purchased the land that made up the park and gave it to the Federal Government.

We are proud to see it become the most visited park in the Nation, with 6 million visitors last year.

The States of North Carolina and Virginia donated the right-of-way for the Blue Ridge Parkway, and we have been proud to see it become the most visited and most traveled scenic road in America, with nearly 8 million visitors last year.

The States of North Carolina and Georgia plan to donate the right-of-way for the extension of the Blue Ridge Parkway to the Atlanta area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, our people have been anxious to join hands with the Federal Government in park development. We feel more can be accomplished by working together.

Mr. Chairman, let me say just one word in regard to the amendments that will be offered later. The amendments are not controversial, and in the main they are clarifying amendments. They were unanimously adopted by the subcommittee. The only amendment which, if adopted, would make any material change in the bill appears on page 2, line 25. This amendment proposes to strike from the bill, on the recommendation of the Interior Department, the language relating to the purchase of the Core Banks Gun Club property. This amendment was recommended because this property is now being donated by the State of North Carolina, along with other property, and will become a part of the park.

Mr. Chairman, this has been worked out by agreement with the owners of the property, and it is not necessary for the Interior Department to be authorized to purchase the property.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Alaska, the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] for his able handling of this legislation and particularly for his work during the hearings on this legislation which occurred while I was weatherbound down in the State of Texas because the airports were not open in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation which we have before us today, H.R. 1784, authorizes the establishment of Cape Lookout National Seashore as our seventh national seashore area. During the first session of this Congress, the Members of this Chamber approved the legislation which authorized the sixth—Assateague Island National Seashore.

Cape Lookout is located just to the south of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. It is located off the coast of North Carolina between Ocracoke Inlet and Beaufort Inlet—about 350 miles south of this city. It is even nearer to several principal population centers like Columbia, S.C.; Richmond, Va.; and, of course, Raleigh and Charlotte, N.C. As nearly as we can estimate, according to the 1960 population figures, some 5 million people live within relatively easy access of the proposed new seashore area if we use as our standard those persons living within 250 airline miles of the area.

As most of the Members are probably aware, Mr. Chairman, Cape Hatteras has already demonstrated the great attraction of these recreation magnets. The testimony before your committee by the Secretary of the Interior reflected the growth of public interest in these outdoor recreation areas. In just the last 5 years, the number of visitations at Cape Hatteras National Seashore has doubled—over 1 million visits were on record in 1965.

Cape Hatteras is, as I have mentioned, to the north of the area now proposed for inclusion in the national park system. It is most easily accessible to the residents of the North Atlantic. It is expected that Cape Lookout National Seashore would be of greatest attraction to the people from the Piedmont Plateau—residents of the Carolinas, Alabama, Georgia, and southern Virginia. Use of this area, like that of Cape Hatteras, is expected to increase rapidly. It is likely that this new area will have more than a million visits during its fifth full year of operation.

Perhaps most impressive, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that this new addition to the national park system comes to us at a relatively low cost to the Federal Government.

Most of this 58-mile barrier reef—in all about 30,000 acres—will be donated by the State of North Carolina. Depending on how the State's money holds out, between 1,700 and 2,400 acres are to be contributed so that the Federal outlays for land acquisition will remain relatively small.

Because of the acquisition of most of the land area by the State, most of the moneys which are recommended for authorization in this bill are for development purposes. H.R. 1784, as amended by your committee, authorizes $3,200,000 to be appropriated for land acquisition and development—but about 90 percent of this would be used for development purposes.

The moneys authorized do not include authorization for shore protection and erosion control work which is to be undertaken by the Corps of Engineers pursuant to other authority granted them. That work, if authorized, would be done regardless of the creation of this national seashore.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1784 offers us an outstanding opportunity to add to the national park system one of the few remaining long stretches of wild, unspoiled beaches on the Atlantic coast. It is practically uninhabited and adequate provision is made for the few dwellings which are found in the area.

Having visited the area on an inspection trip last year, I can testify personally as to the attractiveness of this proposed new addition to the National Park Service. It has the endorsement of the Department of the Interior and there is virtually unanimous approval of its creation among the local citizens. Similar legislation—S. 251—has been approved in the other Chamber.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Morton].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my congratulations to the delegation from North Carolina, and particularly to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Taylor], a member of our committee, as well as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Henderson] in whose district this national seashore lies.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this represents another step forward in the preservation of the integrity of our shoreline. This move in my opinion is a part of the trusteeship, which we in this generation must exercise with diligence in order to provide those who come in the generation that follows a continent of the same dimension, and the same environment, as the continent which we inherited.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress, in my opinion, is blessed with the chairman and leadership that we have on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs because the members of that committee do recognize the responsibility that we have in these confused times and in this explosive world to conserve and preserve the natural beauties that exist in this land, from sea to sea.

Mr. Chairman, the fast-growing east has perhaps fallen behind in the establishment of open space recreational areas, national parks, national monuments, and national seashores. However, I believe this gap has been closing and that recognition for the need of the establishment of such areas in the east is uppermost in the minds of members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, the manner in which the State of North Carolina has gone about working with the Federal Government, as mentioned by the gentleman from Colorado, [Mr. Aspinall], has set an outstanding example. It is my hope that we can find other States that are as forward-looking and as desirous of working with the Federal Government, to provide for the next generation—many places where millions of people can enjoy the beauties of our country, where land meets sea and where mountains touch the sky. This, to me, is another milestone in the history of conservation in these United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the author of the bill, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Henderson].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1784 authorizing the establishment of Cape Lookout National Seashore. The area which is proposed to be included lies entirely within the Third Congressional District of North Carolina, which I have the honor to represent, and consequently I can speak with firsthand knowledge—not only of the geographical area and its suitability for being made into a national seashore, but also of the overwhelming support for this proposal in North Carolina from the office of the Governor, the General Assembly, to the county commissioners of Carteret County within which the lands are situated.

There are only very minor differences between H.R. 1784, as reported, and S. 251, which passed the Senate July 27, 1965, and favorable action by this body today will clear the way for quick final approval.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I certainly would want to join with others of my colleagues in complimenting our colleague from North Carolina for his authorship of this important legislation. He has in his usual manner been somewhat reluctant to take the credit that all of us know he deserves and the foresight that he has had as well as the energy he has displayed in advancing this legislation which will mean so much not only to North Carolina but to the entire Nation.

The gentleman has properly paid tribute to the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and particularly to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall], as well as to the outstanding staff of the committee. But I suppose it would not be incorrect to say that the zeal that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Henderson] has had for this program has been infectious and has brought about a great deal of support for this great project. I look forward not just to having 16 million people visit our national parks in North Carolina in the future as we had in 1965, but I would rather suspect that with this addition to our fine park system we can expect many more millions of people to come to variety vacationland.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thank the gentleman for his most kind and gracious remarks. Before I yield to my other colleague from North Carolina, let me say, Mr. Chairman, I think the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener] demonstrate the fine support that the North Carolina delegation has given to this legislation.

Congressman Taylor, who lives farther west in North Carolina than our colleague [Mr. Whitener], has been vitally interested in the seashore area although it is a long way from the district he represents. I imagine we are closer to our homes here in Washington than we are to each other when we are in North Carolina.

Now I am delighted to yield to our distinguished colleague who has been so helpful in the progress of this legislation, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be associated with the remarks just made by my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER]. I know of no Member of the Congress who has been more diligent and who has been more effective in promoting a piece of legislation than our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON], has in connection with this legislation.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thank the gentleman. I think the gentleman would agree with me that the atmosphere in which we are legislating at this time in this session of the Congress is much more favorable than the atmosphere might have been in the late days of the last session.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud that in the consideration of this proposal from beginning to end, there has been little of the controversy which has marked the effort to create national seashores in other areas. This has largely resulted from the foresight of the State of North Carolina. Back in 1959, our general assembly appropriated $600,000 for the purpose of enabling the State to acquire title to the lands to be included in the proposed park area. The lands have been acquired, or are now being acquired, by the State and the great majority of the lands to be included in the park are being offered to the Federal Government without cost to it.

One has to see the wild, unspoiled beauty of North Carolina's legendary outer banks to appreciate fully their value and their appropriateness for inclusion in a national seashore.

Standing on Core Banks, one can readily visualize the fact that before this island string was settled, Coree Indians hunted on the long barrier strip and gave Core Banks its name.

"Blackbeard" the pirate, operated in these waters and for a long time prevented colonists from moving onto the islands. But after 1718 the island chain opened to settlement. That was the year Lt. Robert Maynard's expeditionary force slew the famous bearded pirate aboard his own ship, *Adventure*.

After his death, the islands were settled by New England whalers and by local fishermen who used Lookout Bight as a seasonal base for their operations.

The little villages which rose on the banks during the 18th and 19th centuries have virtually all died away, with the exception of the tiny historic village of Portsmouth at the northern tip of the proposed park area.

Thus the area is rich in history as well as the type of unspoiled natural scenic beauty which will soon disappear forever from the American scene except where it is preserved as public park areas.

I want my grandchildren and their grandchildren to see a long strand of ocean surf and nearby sand dunes without neon signs and beer cans dominating the scene. I want them to be able to see at least a little bit of historic America as our ancestors knew and loved it.

For this reason I introduced and have consistently supported H.R. 1784 establishing this area as a national seashore.

I personally visited the area with Director George Hartzog, of the Park Service, and with a delegation from the Parks Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Without exception those who visited the area with a critical eye and with no ax to grind have come away enthusiastic in their praise of its potential as a national seashore.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely urge approval by this body of H.R. 1784 as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I note our distinguished colleague, the newest Member of the House, from North Carolina, who succeeded our beloved Herbert Bonner, is on the floor. He represents the district in which the great Cape Hatteras Park has been developed. It is my pleasure to yield to the distinguished and honorable gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WALTER B. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from North Carolina. I wish to observe, as a new Member, that I am greatly impressed with the diligence and the dedication with which you have approached this problem, and to compliment you and the other members of the committee for your foresightedness in creating the national park Cape Lookout National Seashore. I am sure that with the contiguous shorelines we both represent, we have much in common. If I can be of assistance in any way, I shall be glad to help.

Again my compliments to you for a job well done.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thank the gentleman very much for his remarks. It is interesting to note, as stated in the committee report, that consideration will be given to the joint administration of the two parks.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1784

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve for public use and enjoyment an area in the State of North Carolina possessing outstanding natural and recreational values, there is hereby authorized to be established the Cape Lookout National Seashore (hereinafter referred to as "seashore"), which shall comprise the lands and adjoining marshlands and waters on the outer banks of Carteret County, North Carolina, between Ocracoke Inlet and Beaufort Inlet, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Proposed Boundaries—Proposed Cape Lookout National Seashore", dated April 1964, and numbered NS–CL–7101–B, which is on file in the Office of the National Park Service Department of the Interior: *Provided, however,* That such seashore shall not include those lands and interests in lands which are bounded on the north by the Cape Lookout lighthouse property, on the east by a line located seven hundred and fifty feet inland from the mean high water line of the Atlantic Ocean, on the south by property owned or leased by the United States Coast Guard and other Federal agencies, and on the west by the easterly boundary of property of the Thomas Gold heirs and the waters of Lookout Bight.

SEC. 2. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Federal property located within the boundaries of the Cape Lookout National Seashore may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for the purposes of the seashore. Non-Federal lands, marshlands, waters, or interests therein located within the authorized seashore may be acquired by the Secretary of the Interior only through donation, except that he may purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or may acquire by exchange, the lands, marshlands, and waters or interests therein comprising the Shackelford Banks; and he may acquire by exchange or by purchase with appropriated or donated funds the property held by the Core Banks Gun Club on July 1, 1963, which lies westerly of a line located one thousand feet inland from the mean high waterline of the Atlantic Ocean if there is a change of ownership of such property or if it ceases to be used for the purposes of hunting and fishing.

(b) When acquiring lands by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the boundaries of the seashore and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction not required for other Federal purposes which he classifies as proper for exchange or other disposition. Property so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value, but the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

(c) Owners of property which on July 1, 1963, was developed and used for noncommercial residential purposes may reserve for themselves and their assigns, as a condition to the purchase or acquisition by exchange of such property by the Secretary, a right of use and occupancy of the residence and not in excess of three acres of land on which the residence is situated, for noncommercial residential purposes for a term ending at the death of the owner, or the death of his spouse, or the death of either of them, or in lieu thereof, for a definite term not to exceed twenty-five years: *Provided,* That the Secretary may exclude from such reserved property any marsh, beach, or waters, together with so much of the land adjoining such marsh, beach, or waters as he deems necessary for public access thereto. The owner shall elect the term of the right to be reserved. The Secretary is authorized to accept donations of property for purposes of the seashore in which a right of use and occupancy for noncommercial residential purposes is reserved for the period stated in this subsection if the land on which the residence is situated and to which the right attaches is not in excess of three acres and there is excluded from the reserved property such marsh, beach, or waters and adjoining land as the Secretary deems necessary for public use and access thereto.

(d) A right of use and occupancy reserved in lands that are donated or otherwise acquired pursuant to this section shall be subject to termination by the Secretary upon his determination that such use and occupancy is being exercised in a manner not consistent with the purposes of this Act and upon tender to the holder of the right of an amount equal to the fair market value of that portion of the right which remains unexpired on the date of termination.

(e) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or acquire by exchange, not to exceed one hundred acres of lands or interests in lands at or near Beaufort, North Carolina, as an administrative site, and for a landing dock and related facilities that may be used to provide a suitable approach or access to the seashore.

Sec. 3. When title to the lands and interests in lands which under section 2(a) of this Act may be acquired for the purposes of the seashore by donation only is vested in the United States, the Secretary shall declare the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register. Such notice shall contain a refined description or map of the boundaries of the seashore as the Secretary may find desirable and such exterior boundaries shall encompass, as nearly as possible, the area generally described in section 1 of this Act. Following such establishment, and subject to the limitations and conditions prescribed in this Act, the Secretary may, subject to the provisions of section 2 hereof, acquire the remainder of the lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of the seashore.

Sec. 4. The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing, including shellfishing, on lands under his jurisdiction within the Cape Lookout National Seashore in accordance with the appropriate laws of the State of North Carolina, to the extent applicable, except that the Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting or fishing shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish or wildlife management, or public use and enjoyment. Except in emergencies, any rules and regulations of the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be put into effect only after consultation with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission and the North Carolina Department of Conservation and Development.

Sec. 5. The Secretary shall administer the Cape Lookout National Seashore for the general purposes of public outdoor recreation, including conservation of natural features contributing to public enjoyment. In the administration of the seashore and the administrative site, the Secretary may utilize such statutory authorities relating to areas administered and supervised by the Secretary through the National Park Service and such statutory authorities otherwise available to him for the conservation and management of natural resources as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 6. The authority of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, to undertake or contribute to shore erosion control or beach protection measures on lands within the Cape Lookout National Seashore shall be exercised in accordance with a plan that is mutually acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army, and that is consistent with the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. TAYLOR (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as having been read, that it be printed in the Record, and be open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, lines 4 to 13, inclusive, strike out all of the proviso and insert the following language in lieu thereof: "*Provided, however,* That such seashore shall not include those lands and interests in lands which are bounded on the north by the southerly boundary of the Cape lookout lighthouse property, on the east by a line located seven hundred and fifty feet inland from the mean high water line of the Atlantic Ocean, on the south by the northerly boundary of property now owned or leased by the United States Coast Guard and other Federal agencies, and on the west by the easterly boundary of property of the Thomas Gold heirs (as shown on a map prepared by J. G. Hassell in October 1961 and recorded at page 4 of map book numbered 6 in the office of the register of deeds, Carteret County, North Carolina) and the waters of Lookout Bight."

Page 2, lines 17 and 18, strike out "without consideration".

Page 2, line 19, after "seashore.", insert a new sentence reading as follows: "Such transfer shall be made without transfer of funds."

Page 2, line 25, through page 3, line 7, strike out the following language: "Shackelford Banks; and he may acquire by exchange or by purchase with appropriated or donated funds the property held by the Core Banks Gun Club on July 1, 1963, which lies westerly of a line located one thousand feet inland from the mean high water line of the Atlantic Ocean if there is a change of ownership of such property or if it ceases to be used for the purposes of hunting and fishing." and insert in lieu thereof "Shackleford Banks."

Page 3, lines 8 through 17 inclusive, strike out all of paragraph (b) and insert in lieu thereof:

"(b) When acquiring lands by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the boundaries of the seashore and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property in the State of North Carolina under his jurisdiction which he classifies as proper for exchange or other disposition. Failing to effectuate an exchange of properties of approximately equal fair market value, the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged."

Page 3, lines 18, 19, and 20, strike out "Owners of property which on July 1, 1963, was developed and used for noncommercial residential purposes may reserve for themselves and their" and insert in lieu thereof: "Any person who on January 1, 1966, owned property which on July 1, 1963, was developed and used for noncommercial residential purposes may reserve for himself and his".

Page 5, line 16, after "Act.", insert the following sentence: "Copies of said description or map shall be furnished to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate not less than thirty days prior to publication in the Federal Register."

Page 5, line 23 through page 6, line 1 strike out "under his jurisdiction within the Cape Lookout National Seashore in accordance with the appropriate laws of the State of North Carolina," and insert in lieu thereof: "marshlands, and waters under his jurisdiction within the Cape Lookout National Seashore in accordance with the laws of the State of North Carolina and the United States,".

Page 6, line 24, strike out "on lands".

Page 7, lines 4, 5 and 6, strike out all of section 7 and insert in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $3,200,000 for the acquisition and development of the seashore in accordance with the purposes of this Act."

Mr. ASPINALL (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered as having been read in full and be printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Aspinall: On page 7, line 4, after the word "lands" insert a comma.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having assumed the chair, Mr. Stratton, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1784) to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 731, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 731, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from further consideration of the bill S. 251, to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 251

An act to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve for public use and enjoyment an area in the State of North Carolina possessing outstanding natural and recreational values, there is hereby authorized to be established the Cape Lookout National Seashore (hereinafter referred to as "seashore"), which shall comprise the lands and adjoining marshlands and waters on the outer banks of Carteret County, North Carolina, between Ocracoke Inlet and Beaufort Inlet, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Proposed Boundaries—Proposed Cape Lookout National Seashore", dated April 1964, and numbered NS–CL–7101–B, which is on file in the Office of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior: *Provided, however,* That such seashore shall not include those lands and interests in lands which are bounded on the north by the Cape Lookout lighthouse property, on the east by a line located seven hundred and fifty feet inland from the mean high waterline of the Atlantic Ocean, on the south by property owned or leased by the United States Coast Guard and other Federal agencies, and on the west by the easterly boundary of property of the Thomas Gold heirs and the waters of Lookout Bight.

SEC. 2. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Federal property located within the boundaries of the Cape Lookout National Seashore may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for the purposes of the seashore. Non-Federal lands, marshlands, waters, or interests therein located within the authorized seashore may be acquired by the Secretary of the Interior only through donation, except that he may purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or may acquire by exchange, the lands, marshlands, and waters or interests therein comprising the Shackleford Banks. Land donated by the State of North Carolina pursuant to this subsection shall constitute consideration for the transfer by the United States of 1.5 acres of land that is to be used as a site for a public health facility in the village of Hatteras, Dare County, North Carolina, and such a transfer is hereby authorized.

(b) When acquiring lands by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the boundaries of the seashore and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction which he classifies as proper for exchange or other disposition. Property so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value, but the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

(c) Owners of property which on July 1, 1963, was developed and used for noncommercial residential purposes may reserve for themselves and their assigns, as a condition to the purchase or acquisition by exchange of such property by the Secretary, a right of use and occupancy of the residence and not in excess of three acres of land on which the residence is situated, for noncommercial residential purposes for a term ending at the death of the owner, or the death of his spouse, or the death of either of them, or, in lieu thereof, for a definite term not to exceed twenty-five years: *Provided,* That the Secretary may exclude from such reserved property any marsh, beach, or waters, together with so much of the land adjoining such marsh, beach, or waters as he deems necessary for public access thereto. The owner shall elect the term of the right to be reserved. The Secretary is authorized to accept donations of property for purposes of the seashore in which a right of use and occupancy for noncommercial residential purposes is reserved for the period stated in this subsection if the land on which the residence is situated and to which the right attaches is not in excess of three acres and there is excluded from the reserved property such marsh, beach, or waters and adjoining land as the Secretary deems necessary for public use and access thereto.

(d) A right of use and occupancy reserved in lands that are donated or otherwise acquired pursuant to this section shall be subject to termination by the Secretary upon his determination that such use and occupancy is being exercised in a manner not consistent with the purposes of this Act and upon tender to the holder of the right of an amount equal to the fair market value of that portion of the right which remains unexpired on the date of termination.

(e) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or acquire by exchange, not to exceed one hundred acres of lands or interests in lands at or near Beaufort, North Carolina, as an administrative site, and for a landing dock and related facilities that may be used to provide a suitable approach or access to the seashore.

SEC. 3. When title to the lands and interests in lands which under section 2(a) of this Act may be acquired for the purposes of the seashore by donation only is vested in the United States, the Secretary shall declare the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register. Such notice shall contain a refined description or map of the boundaries of the seashore as the Secretary may find desirable and such exterior boundaries shall encompass, as nearly as possible, the area generally described in section 1 of this Act. Following such establishment, and subject to the limitations and conditions prescribed in this Act, the Secretary may, subject to the provisions of section 2 hereof, acquire the remainder of the lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of the seashore.

SEC. 4. The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing, including shellfishing, on lands under his jurisdiction within the Cape Lookout National Seashore in accordance with the appropriate laws of the State of North Carolina, to the extent applicable, except that the Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting or fishing shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish and wildlife management, or public use and enjoyment. Except in emergencies, any rules and regulations of the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be put into effect only after consultation with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission and the North Carolina Department of Conservation and Development.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall administer the Cape Lookout National Seashore for the general purposes of public outdoor recreation, including conservation of natural features contributing to public enjoyment. In the administration of the seashore and the administrative site, the Secretary may utilize such statutory authorities relating to areas administered and supervised by the Secretary through the National Park Service and such statutory authorities otherwise available to him for the conservation and management of natural resources as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 6. The authority of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, to undertake or contribute to shore erosion control or beach protection measures on lands within the Cape Lookout National Seashore shall be exercised in accordance with a plan that is mutually acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army, and that is consistent with the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $3,200,000 for the acquisition and development of the seashore in accordance with the purposes of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill (S. 251) and insert in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 1784 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read as a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 1784) was laid upon the table.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order, scheduled for today, may be transferred to the 23d of February.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTIVE BALANCE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the sending of Vice President HUMPHREY to South Vietnam means that this administration is dedicated to the proposition that "progress on the civilian front, even in wartime, is equally as important as progress on the military front," Columnist Keyes Beech believes.

Writing from Saigon, Beech said the visits there by the Vice President and Agriculture Secretary Freeman appeared "as though Mr. Johnson had personally declared war on poverty and disease in South Vietnam as well as in the United States."

Beech believes that "the Honolulu talks, combined with HUMPHREY's presence here (in Vietnam), has given a constructive balance to the American role in South Vietnam."

Because I found this column informative on a subject of such great interest to us all, I am making it available to the RECORD where others may read it in its entirety:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Feb. 12, 1966]

HUBERT CITES "OTHER" VIET WAR

(By Keyes Beech)

SAIGON.—The shooting war in South Vietnam took a back seat to good works Saturday.

Picking up where President Johnson left off in Honolulu earlier this week, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY plunged into a whirlybird tour of the Saigon area in the cause of democracy and social revolution for 14,500,000 South Vietnamese.

HUMPHREY said "tremendous" progress has been made on the military front, but "only a beginning," on the social front.

Militarily allied forces are "on the ascendancy and on the offensive," he said. "That momentum must be maintained," he told newsmen after a busy day visiting United States, Korean, Australian, and New Zealand military units here and in the field.

But he said there is much to be done in the fight against poverty, illiteracy, hunger, and disease.

Humphrey said it should be clear that the "social and economic revolution does not belong to the Vietcong" but that "we are the ones who can achieve it."

While Humphrey stayed close to Saigon, Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman and a team of farm experts were off to look at the Mekong Delta, one of southeast Asia's greatest rice bowls.

They were only the advance guard of a swarm of specialists in economics, agriculture, health, and education who will descend on South Vietnam in coming weeks. It was as though Mr. Johnson had personally declared war on poverty and disease in South Vietnam as well as the United States.

As Humphrey swung into action with characteristic vigor, there was a growing awareness of what emerged from the historic Honolulu conference between Mr. Johnson and the young generals who run this country.

Not only did Mr. Johnson risk his political future on the political survival of Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, the 36-year-old fighter pilot who became Prime Minister of his country 8 months ago.

He committed the United States to underwriting nothing less than the remaking of South Vietnam, politically, socially, and economically, from the rice paddies up. He was already committed to winning the military side of the war against Communist aggression.

Humphrey's visit to South Vietnam was dedicated to the proposition that progress on the civilian front, even in wartime, is equally as important as progress on the military front.

This may very well be the case. And the Honolulu talks, combined with Humphrey's presence here, has given a constructive balance to the American role in South Vietnam. Yet while the high-sounding words and noble declarations voiced at Honolulu set the stage for change, they changed nothing.

Out in the villages of South Vietnam, where nobody ever heard of Ky, much less Hubert Humphrey, people will be convinced by what they see, not what they hear.

LEGISLATION TO AMEND TITLE 39, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PROHIBIT MAILING OF UNSOLICITED SAMPLE DRUG PRODUCTS AND OTHER POTENTIALLY HARMFUL DRUG ITEMS

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include four newspaper clippings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have today dropped in the hopper legislation to amend title 39 of the United States Code to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited sample drug products and other potentially harmful drug items.

There is in my neighborhood of Cambridge, Mass., an unusual young woman by the name of Mrs. Keith Thompson of 4 Putnam Gardens. She has recently become concerned about the number of accidental poisonings of small children who open sample packages of drugs that are potentially harmful and that have been sent through the mail.

According to Mrs. Thompson, these samples arrive as fourth-class mail and are often stacked in the halls of residential apartments or dropped into door mail chutes. During the last few weeks she has enlisted the aid of over 100 mothers who are holding meetings and soliciting support for Mrs. Thompson's recommendations.

I congratulate Mrs. Keith Thompson and under unanimous consent, I place various newspaper articles concerning the free samples of drugs in the Record at this point:

[From the Cambridge (Mass.) Chronicle Sun, Dec. 16, 1965]

Mother Leads War on Delivery of Articles Dangerous to Children

(By Kay Shreve)

"Now where's that sample I got in the mail?" a pretty young mother asks in a recent television commercial.

These may not sound like fighting words to you, but they do to Mrs. Keith Thompson of 4 Putnam Gardens.

CITES POISONINGS

Mrs. Thompson, wife of an MIT graduate student and the mother of two, recently became concerned about the number of accidental poisonings of small children who opened sample packages of cough medicine, cold tablets, hair tonics, and detergents, sent through the mails.

According to Mrs. Thompson, these samples arrive as fourth-class mail and are often stacked in the halls of residential apartment buildings, or sent into homes through door mail chutes—within the reach of children.

"I think people should know how many tragedies can and have resulted from this practice," she says.

ORGANIZES MOTHERS

During the past 6 weeks she has made every effort to inform them, including enlisting the support of over 100 mothers in Cambridge, Arlington, Stoneham, Newton, Belmont, and Watertown, and gaining the endorsement of several local doctors.

Perhaps even more important, Mrs. Thompson has received assistance from Dr. Joel Alpert, executive secretary of the Boston Poison Center, and from the Boston Association for Child Birth Education.

FOUR-POINT PROGRAM

She hopes her efforts will eventually lead to legislation on the practice and has compiled a four-point program of her aims which include:

1. To prevent fourth-class mail delivery of sample drugs or any other products that may be harmful to children.
2. To prevent free distribution of these products in homes or residential buildings and to prevent them from being left on door steps, door knobs, in hallways, or any other place to which children might have access.
3. To encourage distribution of such free samples in supermarkets or drug stores where adults may be able to receive them directly and use them if they desire.
4. To make it mandatory to label all drugs and any other product that could be harmful to an infant or child in any way.

Mrs. Thompson asks anyone who is interested in giving support to this program to call her at TR 6–0028.

[From the Health Bulletin]

Mailing of Drug Samples to Homes Opposed

A Massachusetts housewife has spotted a possible health hazard which up to now has escaped detection by public health officials and even the Food and Drug Administration. According to Mr. Keith Thompson, of Cambridge, sample drugs and toxic products including mouth washes and detergents sent or delivered to consumers present a potential danger to children. Pointing out that children usually find these products before parents do, she explained that a child's natural curiosity may lead to accidental poisoning. "I, myself, have learned of close calls of poisoning among children in our neighborhood," Mrs. Thompson told Health Bulletin. "Parents who already have a hard time protecting their children against toxic products in the home now have to look out for mailmen and other outsiders bringing poisons within easy reach of children," she added.

In a telephone interview, Mrs. Thompson told Health Bulletin that her interest in the problem reached the boiling point when she was mailed a sample of a new orange-flavored children's cold capsule. Discovering that neither the Food and Drug Administration nor the Post Office Department has regulations controlling the delivery or mailing of such products to homes, the Massachusetts housewife decided to start her own campaign to prevent this practice. With the aid of other mothers in the area and the support of the Boston Poison Center she set up a platform calling for legislation to ban "third- or fourth-class mail delivery of sample drugs or any other products harmful to children." She is also campaigning for a ban on the hand delivery of these items to homes and apartment buildings.

Using a series of letters and phone calls, the mother of two children has succeeded in gaining the support of individuals and groups ranging from local pharmacists to State senators and even the U.S. Post Office Department. She has raised such a storm that representatives of the Post Office, Cambridge Department of Health and the State food and drug administration have decided to sit down in a public meeting to discuss what should be done about the problem. The meeting is scheduled for January 25 at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. However, even more important is the fact that her campaign has reached the State lawmakers. According to Mrs. Thompson, there is a good chance that a bill controlling the distribution of sample products to consumers may be introduced in the next session of the State legislature.

A similar stand against some of the promotional campaigns of drug companies was taken recently by President Johnson's Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs. In an address to the National Educational Conference last month, Esther Peterson criticized the mass mailing of the same cold capsule which sparked Mrs. Thompson's campaign. Even though warnings that children under 3 should not be given the tablet were included on the drug's packet, "all parents know how small children can get into things, and everyone knows that unsolicited mail is generally not stored away," she said. "It most often is left lying where children can easily get into it. In the eyes of small children, the colored tablets, I am sure, look appealingly like candy," Mrs. Peterson concluded.

[From the Boston Globe, Dec. 8, 1965]

One Poisoned Child Is One Too Many

(By Jean Dietz)

Never underestimate the power of a woman to fight for the safety of her young.

Mrs. Keith Thompson, of 4 Putnam Gardens, Cambridge, is mobilizing other mothers to prevent accidental poisoning of children from sample drugs and detergents.

"The possibility of even one poisoned child is one too many," she says.

Mrs. Thompson thinks legislation will be needed at the State and National level to do the job.

The rash of free samples of cough medicines, cold remedies, mouthwashes, and detergents being left in hallways of city apartment houses and suburban front doors set Mrs. Thompson on her campaign.

Small children can't read the labels which state that some of these items should not be taken internally.

At the suggestion of Dr. Joel Alpert, of the Boston Poison Center, Mrs. Thompson has enlisted the interest of almost 100 women to plan a legislative campaign.

The group has designed a four-point platform of measures to prevent child poisoning. They seek to:

Prevent fourth-class mail delivery of any samples containing chemicals or materials toxic to children;

Prevent hand delivery of these items to homes and apartment buildings;

Encourage distribution of sample drugs and detergents in supermarkets where adults may try new products if they wish;

Warn parents not to give any drug to an infant or child without checking with a doctor or clinic, so that allergic reactions can be identified and treated if they occur.

Some of the new detergents contain bleach and ammonia, Mrs. Thompson points out, potentially as dangerous to a child as lye.

POSTMAN, KEEP THOSE FREE SAMPLES AWAY FROM OUR DOOR!

(By Thomas McNiff, Jr.)

"What will not woman, gentle woman, dare, when strong affection stirs her heart up?"

Mrs. Keith Thompson, 26, of 4 Putnam Gardens, Cambridge, has taken Southey's quotation to heart in her "legislative campaign" to combat the delivery of product samples by mail, which she says are left in apartment house hallways where children can get at their often dangerous contents.

In a campaign begun 6 weeks ago, Mrs. Thompson has enlisted the aid of State Senators Francis X. McCann and Oliver F. Ames, as well as almost 100 mothers from Newton, Cambridge, Lynn, and Belmont.

The object of Mrs. Thompson's campaign are the detergent, mouthwash, drug, and other samples delivered as advertisements by fourth-class mail.

She does not object so much to their being available as to their being left at the doorways of apartment buildings where children playing beyond their mothers' supervision can get at their contents, which she says are often harmful, if not poisonous.

A U.S. Post Office spokesman said that all such article samples must be labeled, but Mrs. Thompson pointed out that a child of 3 or 4 isn't going to read a label.

"You can't blame the postman," she said. "Those guys have enough junk to carry."

Senator McCann said he has recommended that legislation be proposed by the State public health department's food and drug division.

"I think it's very creditable," he said. "It's needed doing for a long time."

Dr. George A. Michaels, director of the Food and Drug Division, said, "Kids can get at these samples, and it can be a hazard."

He added that any State legislation could regulate the distribution of samples by firms acting on a contract for advertisers.

But he also said that the Federal Government would have to enact any legislation to control mail delivery.

Mrs. Thompson said she is mainly interested in the State level of legislation because "I felt we should do something as fast as we could."

She said that the problem has been brought to the attention of national medical officials by a Boston doctor, but added that "the going is slow there."

Mrs. Thompson said that the word of her campaign is spreading fast, and that she is receiving reports of instances where the ideas she speaks of have become reality.

She cites the case of a Newton woman who found her pair of 2-year-old twins ready to swallow a sample of mouthwash clearly labeled, "do not take internally."

Besides her political support, Mrs. Thompson is getting endorsements for her campaign from local druggists and doctors.

She has also received aid from the Boston Poison Center and the Boston Association for Child Birth Education.

Mrs. Thompson hopes for four major accomplishments from her hours on the telephone and writing letters.

To prevent fourth-class mail delivery of products that could be harmful to children; to prevent free distribution of these products in homes or residential buildings, particularly where children could get at them.

To encourage the distribution of such products in stores where adults could get them if they wished; and to make it mandatory to label all drugs and any other product that could be harmful to children in any way.

Asked what her husband thinks of her new "interest," Mrs. Thompson replied, "Oh, he's been great support." Mr. Thompson is a Ph. D. candidate in geochemistry at MIT.

And of the campaign itself, she said she hopes to have an organizational meeting in January, at a yet unspecified date.

She said she will not name any organization that comes out of the meeting because "we will be stuck with the name.

"I think mothers as individuals can do an awful lot," she said.

TIMELY REMINDER

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, where do we draw the line—and how do we hold it?

The answers to both questions were stated with clarity by President Johnson in his statement at the Honolulu conference.

The San Francisco Examiner and News Call Bulletin on February 11 said that the President's major statement in Hawaii "provides a fitting rebuff to opponents of his Vietnam policy who, regardless of their motivation, invariably fail to offer a logical and honorable alternative."

Comparing the strong comparison of the Vietnam situation to American foreign policy decisions of the 1940's and 1950's, the San Francisco paper made sense when it said:

> The Hawaii speech was a reemphasis of the "so far and no farther" outlook which has been a cornerstone of American foreign policy in the post-World War II years. The policy has worked, and to depart from it would court disaster, shame, and inevitably world war III.

It seems to me that the comparison to which this editorial refers should be studied and restudied, and in order that my colleagues may do so I place this article in the RECORD at this point:

TIMELY REMINDER FROM JOHNSON

Speaking in Hawaii earlier this week, President Johnson emphatically restated the unassailable case for the American presence in Vietnam. It provides a fitting rebuff to opponents of his Vietnam policy who, regardless of their motivation, invariably fail to offer a logical and honorable alternative.

Perhaps the most striking point made by the President was his comparison of the Vietnam war to American foreign policy decisions of the forties and fifties when "we took our stand in Europe to protect the freedom of those threatened by aggression."

The firmness of such stands—for example, in Greece and during the Berlin airlift—has apparently convinced Soviet Russia that America means business when it says it will not stand idly by and watch communism prey on small relatively defenseless regions. This determination was, of course, also strikingly and grimly illustrated during the Korean war, at great cost in American life and treasure.

The taking of such a stand moreover evokes sad memories of the pre-World War II era when democracy allowed Adolf Hitler to prey in precisely the same fashion on his neighbors. It took a great world conflict to stop him, or don't the administration's Vietnam opponents recall this?

The Hawaii speech was a reemphasis of the "so far and no farther" outlook which has been a cornerstone of American foreign policy in the post-World War II years. The policy has worked, and to depart from it would court disaster, shame, and inevitably world war III.

OUR AMERICAN SOLDIERS ARE ENTITLED TO OUR FULL SUPPORT

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, the United States now has some 200,000 young Americans in combat with communism, and as the President has said:

> They are entitled to the full support of American strength and American determination.

In this, the majority of American people fully concur. As the Dallas Times-Herald has pointed out:

> The President could have followed no other course than to order resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam.

Although Hanoi shows no signs of turning toward peace, "the President has assured this Nation and the world that the determined pursuit of a peaceful settlement in Vietnam will continue," the Herald said.

It added that the President spoke with a determination and conviction, "that must be ours also."

Because this is an issue on which we all are so vitally committed, I believe that my colleagues will want to read this editorial, and I offer it herewith for publication in the RECORD:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald, Feb. 1, 1966]

BOMB MESSAGE CONVINCING

The President could have followed no other course than to order resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam. Mr. Johnson's talk to the Nation Monday should have convinced even the most reluctant of that fact.

With his statement it should have become absolutely apparent, too, that the determined peace efforts by the United States were no mere surface show, displayed for political and diplomatic purposes only. The peace offensive was conducted by every possible means that the President and his advisers could employ.

Moreover, the determined efforts to get some small encouraging response from Hanoi—meanwhile holding back the bombers from the skies of North Vietnam as guarantee of sincerity—went far beyond, and lasted far longer, than even the most stubborn critic could logically expect.

But in spite of this pervasive and long-continued campaign, the President told his listeners: "Our effort has met with understanding and support throughout most of the world—but not in Hanoi and Peiping. From those two capitals have come only denunciation and rejection. The answer of Hanoi to all (the peace efforts) is * * * that they persist in aggression and they insist on the surrender of South Vietnam to the Communists. It is plain there is no readiness for peace in that regime today."

The President's description of the situation was emphasized later by Secretary of State Dean Rusk who disclosed that the United States offered to extend the bombing pause if Hanoi would make a responsive peace gesture. Hanoi's response, he said, had been "negative, harsh, and unyielding."

Though this rock-hard attitude of the Hanoi regime shows no sign of cracking, the President has assured this Nation and the world that the determined pursuit of a peaceful settlement in Vietnam will continue. And he immediately supported his promise with action. This is certainly as it should be. The peace offensive must be prosecuted just as ardently as the military offensive.

But meanwhile, there is no peace, and Americans and allies and South Vietnamese are dying at the hands of the Vietcong. "They are entitled to the full support of American strength and American determination. We will give both," President Johnson declared with the conviction that must be ours also.

PACIFIC ISLANDS HAVE NO COMMUNIST WOES

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include for insertion in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written for the Honolulu Star Bulletin by the Honorable Carlton Skinner, Governor of Guam from 1949 to 1953 and presently senior Commissioner for the United States on the South Pacific Commission.

Commissioner Skinner points out that the Communists have made no progress in planting or propagating their philosophy in the Pacific Islands where "Western nations have in the last 20 years established very substantial institutions of self-government in all Pacific territories." He contends that "it is these institutions which have kept the islands and their inhabitants friendly to the administering powers. The people of the islands recognize that with universal suffrage, the secret ballot, legislatures of their own choosing and independent judiciaries, they have more true self-government than half of the members of the United Nations. The result is that the people of the islands are following democratic educational systems, democratic political systems, and capitalist economic systems."

It is refreshing to know the efforts of the free world are recognized and admired by the Pacific islanders and that there appears to be no evidence that communistic concepts are being welcomed. I commend the reading of Mr. Skinner's article to my colleagues:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin,
Dec. 24, 1965]

PACIFIC ISLANDS HAVE NO COMMUNIST WOES

(By Carlton Skinner, Senior Commissioner for the United States on the South Pacific Commission)

Is there a major geographical area of the world which has not yet afforded the Communists a foothold? Certainly not Europe, or Africa, or North or South America. Yes, there is one left—and only one. It is the Pacific Islands area which only a score of years ago was the bloody battleground for the war to save democracy from totalitarianism.

This soil in which communism has been unable to flourish embraces 20 percent of the earth's surface, 13 million square miles of land and water, and has a population of but 3 million spread out among 17 island territories.

The people of these territories were closer to the great war of 1941–45 than any others in the world. They live in Guadalcanal, Tarawa, New Georgia, Truk, Saipan, Guam, and a hundred other tropical islands well known to the American forces and their allies from the devastations of the sea, air, and ground battles for their liberation.

For these very reasons, the Pacific Islands area is politically and militarily the most strategic area of the world today. It is the one section of the world where the democratic nations of the world, sometimes called the Western Alliance, can move freely, install, establish airlines, shipping lines and other businesses, create military installations, assign fleets and troops, and man observation posts with the complete cooperation of friendly inhabitants.

The cooperation comes from the very fact that the Western nations which originally established colonies in this part of the world have, particularly in recent years, been generally fair, honest and helpful in their dealings with the indigenous people. While the early European settlements in the islands were the scenes of many cruelties and injustices, the Polynesian and Melanesian peoples retaliated vigorously and frequently gave as good as they got. At the same time missionaries, Protestant and Catholic, came in large numbers and were successful to a high degree in spreading Christianity, Christian ethics and respect for the rights of others.

SELF-GOVERNMENT

In the crucial field which has led to the proliferation of new nations in Africa, that of the right of people to govern themselves, the Western nations have in the last 20 years established very substantial institutions of self-government in all Pacific territories.

It is these institutions of self-government which have kept the islands and their inhabitants friendly to the administering powers. The people of the islands recognize that with universal suffrage, the secret ballot, legislatures of their own choosing, and independent judiciaries, they have more true self-government than half of the members of the United Nations. The result is that the people of the islands are following democratic educational systems, democratic political systems, and democratic and capitalist economic systems.

The U.S. territory of Guam has an elected legislature with full legislative powers on all territorial matters and a judiciary which is part of the U.S. court system, from which appeals can be made to the U.S. Supreme Court. Samoa has a freely elected legislature and similar institutions. The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, an American administration, inaugurated its Congress of Micronesia in July, this year.

The French territories of Tahiti and New Caledonia have elected legislatures, universal suffrage, and secret ballot and are officially part of Metropolitan France, with elected representatives in the Senate and House of Deputies in Paris. The New Zealand territory of the Cook Islands has just achieved autonomy with elected legislators and ministers for its local government.

The Australian territories of Papua and New Guinea have established a house of assembly in which elected local residents make up two-thirds of the members. The newly independent state of Western Samoa has an elected legislature, ministers, prime minister, and head of state. The British territory of Fiji has an elected legislature with ministers chosen from its membership and this spring will hold consultations with the Government in London on further measures of self-government within the framework of the British Commonwealth.

OTHER HELP

These developments have proved to the inhabitants of the island territories that they can have the personal liberty and social and economic freedoms of Western democracy and also can decide their problems in their own way. In addition, the metropolitan governments are all aiding their Pacific territories with grants, construction projects, educational assistance and technical help. They are putting the equivalent of several hundred million dollars a year into the area to help it help itself.

The rapacious leaders of communism are bitter and furious at their failure in the Pacific islands. They have tried to infiltrate Tahiti, Fiji and Western Samoa, with notable lack of success. The active political life of these two territories and independent state have not developed a Communist or Communist-oriented political party. There is not an established Communist movement anywhere in the Pacific Island area.

There have been strikes in which attempts have been made, with little success, to introduce symbols of the class struggle. A few journalists have started weekly papers with leftwing sentiments, which tended to fold up quickly. Even the few political parties made up exclusively of indigenous inhabitants have concentrated on economic issues and plumped for autonomy or complete self-government instead of "independence" of the type the Communists advocate.

In New Guinea, two members of the United Nations Committee on Decolonization, Mr. Natwar Singh of India and D. Mohied-Din Nabavi of Iran toured the territory recently and approached members of the newly elected House of Assembly to get them to agitate for immediate independence. The members told them to get out of town in a hurry and then all the indigenous members of the House joined in introducing a resolution stating that they wanted no advice from outside on what their future political status would be; they were perfectly capable of deciding it themselves. The resolution was passed unanimously.

REDS FRUSTRATED

Frustrated as they have been by these political reactions, the Communists have resorted to infiltration and subversion by naval patrols and cultural methods. For months, the Russian Navy's Hydrographic Service has stationed the 125 foot survey ship *Ampermetr* off the entrance to Apra Harbor, the large and powerful U.S. Naval base and commercial Port of Guam. The ship cruises back and forth along the breakwater but never crosses the 3-mile limit. The *Ampermetr* is a fishing trawler type with no fishing gear in sight. Neither are there elaborate antennas and other communications gear obviously on deck.

It is clear, however, that the *Ampermetr* knows everything that goes in and out of Guam and is listening to everything it can on the radios. Other Russian trawlers cruise the Pacific, but none have taken up such a blatant patrol station.

In the cultural field, the Russian Embassy in New Zealand is sending a monthly supply of Russian propaganda films to the newly independent State of Western Samoa. Half of them go to the main library in Apia for free showing to the public. The other half go as a personal gift to Malietoa, the Head of State, who is a moving buff, and gives big dinner parties followed by movies. A recent movie which he showed was a Czech production entitled, "Island of Freedom," which gives a syrupy version of life in Cuba today.

The Russian Communist interest in the Pacific island area has only recently developed. The first sign was an article in Mirovaya Ekonomika I Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosmeniya in 1960 which said, "The Soviet Union demands that 1965 should become the year of the establishment of liberty and independence for all the peoples in colonial slavery.

"The struggle against colonialism in Oceania has a protracted and stubborn character. Apart from their political and economic interests, a large part in the policies of the colonizers is played by strategic ideas; the numerous islands spread out over huge expanses of the greatest ocean on the globe are marvelous natural sites for nuclear rocket bases. * * * The territories have various masters, but the situation of their peoples is similar—they suffer from lack of political rights, illiteracy, poverty, and mass epidemics."

FIJI STRIKE

In Aziya I Afrika Segodnya in 1964, a writer said the British in Fiji were trying to cover the rusty nails of exploitation with the figleaf of talk about the civilizing role of the European. He found little comfort for communism except that the first strike in the history of the islands took place in Fiji a few years ago. He concluded that "the fight is not yet over. The islands of Fiji have suffered too long under the colonial yoke. The time of liberation is approaching."

The Russian expert on trusteeship territories, Malakhovskiy, has written a book on the alleged iniquities of colonial administration of Pacific islands people. He has searched the literature on each island in an effort to find some sign of revolt and has had to settle for accounts of religious movements, such as the 1964 cargo cult in New Guinea which wanted Lyndon Johnson as its leader, of local political campaigns, and of public meetings which supported measures of self-government.

He even complains that the 160 descendants of the *Bounty* mutineers on Pitcairn have certain governmental, educational, postal, and similar matters handled for them by the Governor of Fiji. This had its echo recently in the U.N. Committee on Decolonization which solemnly reported that the British did not keep an administrator on Pitcairn and therefore the committee couldn't complain about him. (The Pitcairners elect their own magistrates.)

The Communist Chinese have not shown their hand yet in the Pacific Islands but they are keenly aware of the great value of this area to Western democracies and will certainly step up their attention and attacks. They have propaganda broadcasts aimed at the region and are reported to have used them to invite applications for scholarships for study in Red China.

The value of the Pacific Islands area to the Western powers is partly military. Guam, as America's part of the Far East is and must be a major U.S. military base. The overseas navy of France is headquartered in New Caledonia and shows itself frequently in Pacific Island ports.

There are five jet airstrips in the Pacific Islands. There is now a Polaris submarine base in Guam. The Pacific Missile Range runs through the center of the area. When further military or naval action by Western powers is wished it will encounter no political obstacles in the area.

MAJOR VALUE

However, the major value to the Western democratic powers is political. Here, in the Pacific, it has been proven that economically underdeveloped regions can get technical assistance and support from democracies to develop into self-reliant economies and self-governing political units, with education and opportunity for their young men and women.

The new nations of Africa and southeast Asia can look at this success and compare it with the economic cataclysms which they have endured when with independence, the technicians from the industrial countries left and the economy ground to a halt.

They can compare the Pacific's free political climate of secret ballot, multiple political parties, and independent court systems with Communist-dominated new nations in which voters are herded to the polls by soldiers and given a ballot with a single party or slate of candidates, and where judges are jailed by the head of the state when they hand down a decision he dislikes.

As long as economic and social progress continue in the Pacific Islands and once-backward people continue to attain and maintain a freedom, dignity and a decent life, these islands are a threat to the Communists. They demonstrate to non-Western peoples that the Communist route is degrading, decadent and destructive of their true goals of personal liberty and self-government.

One very simple example of the value of the resulting freedom of movement which immeasurably assists the United States and her allies is to be found in an American scientific program for observation of a solar eclipse in the South Pacific on May 30, this year. The eclipse was visible along a narrow, 8,000-mile corridor. A dozen U.S. scientific teams observed from the islands Aitutaki, Manuae and Rarotonga, in the Cook Islands, which are New Zealand territories. The observers used a Nike rocket, a balloon and four jet aircraft.

In spite of the professed love for pure science of the Russians, arrangements for our military and atomic energy scientists to operate from their influenced areas range from the difficult to the impossible.

THE CATALYST

The catalyst in achieving this level of democratic political institutions and social and economic progress has been the South Pacific Commission—a small, relatively little known international body which has no connection with the United Nations. The members are Australia, France, Great Britain, New Zealand, the United States and Western Samoa.

It has responsibility for advancing the economic and social welfare of the territories in the Pacific region. Its geographical jurisdiction stretches from the Northern Marianas, less than a thousand miles from Japan in the north, to New Guinea off the coast of Australia in the south and from the Palau Islands some 500 miles from the Philippines in the west to Pitcairn Island, some 6,000 miles to the east.

The Commission provides the 17 territories with technical help in such fields as health, education, boatbuilding, library development, language teaching, plant and animal quarantine, community development, establishment of cooperatives, food and nutrition, banana and copra marketing, fisheries development, and research in problems, diseases and resources peculiar to the Pacific Islands.

It does this on a budget which would be laughed out of a United Nations committee room—less than $1 million a year. It does not pass out any of these funds as foreign aid or as grants or gifts. It provides expert technical help to teach the people of the territories to help themselves. From the standpoint of the United States alone, the South Pacific Commission, sets a pattern which can be admired as a financial model for international organizations.

The United States pay 20 percent of the total, compared with more than 50 percent in international bodies spending many hundreds of times the South Pacific Commission budget.

Through the South Pacific Commission, the people of the Pacific islands are deciding what kind of social and economic and health developments they want. They are engaging in a type of international self-government which matches their national self-government within the framework of their affiliation with metropolitan democratic nations of the Western Alliance. In so doing, they are frustrating Communist political and military aims. The Western Powers can be grateful that among these people the sincerity, honesty, and good will of the democratic nations are recognized and appreciated.

LETTER TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE ABOUT THE UNIVERSITY OF HAVANA

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, because I am sure it will have interest for the Members, I am going to read to the House a letter which I wrote a week ago to the Secretary of State.

The letter reads as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 8, 1966.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am greatly concerned by a news story published by the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on January 24, 1966, under the byline of Mr. Edward O'Brien, the Globe's Washington bureau chief, reporting a proposal that the U.S. Government shall subsidize the Castro-Communist University of Havana, through the United Nations.

The story states that an agency of the United Nations contemplates giving Cuba $3,100,000, of which $2 million will go to the technological faculty of Havana University. This agency of Communist higher education is reported to be headed by Russian and Cuban military personnel. The article states that students eligible for training must be either Communist Party members or members of the Cuban militia. The training to be subsidized is in the field of computers, electronics, radar, and military communications.

The story also noted that representatives of 82 Communist Parties in 3 continents met in Havana recently to organize a more unified effort for the subversion of the Western Hemisphere, Asia, and Africa. Contributions to this U.N. fund are strictly voluntary and two of the designated primary targets for the proposed subversion—Brazil and Paraguay—have already objected to this U.N. program for aid to Communist Cuba.

I would greatly appreciate a statement of what efforts, if any, the Department of State is making to block the use of U.S. taxpayers' funds for this purpose, in line with our national policy on Cuba. This is of particular interest in my district. Your prompt and full reply on this matter will be very much appreciated.

Very truly yours,

WM. L. DICKINSON.

Mr. Speaker, as of today, I have received no reply whatsoever to this letter. I think this matter is so important to the American people—and the action of the United Nations so contrary to our declared foreign policy with respect to Cuba—that strong action by the State Department is imperative.

I do not think this is a partisan matter and I bespeak the support of members of both parties in getting needed action from the Department of State.

URBAN RENEWAL LACKS COMPASSION

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, compassion should be a basic ingredient of any agency or association dealing with human beings.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government is so large, so remote, so complex, so centralized, so compartmentalized, that it seldom recognizes or appreciates the needs or wishes of the individual citizen. If the Federal Government were to get into the clothing business, and it might, it would probably fashion and fabricate a suit of clothes which would fit everyone. No individual would want to wear such a suit.

The Urban Renewal Agency, a bureau of the Federal Government, has again demonstrated that it lacks consideration, understanding, and compassion. Although Urban Renewal may provide a necessary vehicle for slum clearance in deteriorating metropolitan areas, it should try to remember that it is dealing with human beings and not just with derelict buildings or slums.

Under unanimous consent I include an editorial by F. K. "Pete" Arthur, of the Monterey Peninsula Herald, a newspaper in Monterey, Calif., which tells a pathetic story and points up the tragic failure of federally controlled agencies to have compassion for people whom they are paid to serve.

The spectacle of legally removing an elderly couple from their home of 42 years, practically in straitjackets, and forcibly detaining them until their home could be demolished is not the only way this could have been handled. It may be the bureaucratic way; it is not the compassionate way; it is not my kind of American way.

CALLOUSNESS IN URBAN RENEWAL—TIME FOR CHANGE

The latest chapter in the sad history of urban renewal in Monterey reflects credit on no one—least of all on the Urban Renewal Agency itself.

We have seen, in the past week, the perfectly legal dispossession of an elderly couple who had fought the good fight and lost. When they tried to get back into their home of 42 years, illegally, they were thrown out again, legally.

We can only presume that it also was quite legal for urban renewal to bulldoze the home into rubble immediately, so that there could be no further show of sentimentality or defiance of big Government on the part of its longtime owners.

Legally, we are sure that everything is in order. The rule book of urban renewal obviously has no subsection on human values, at least as such values were applied to the Patanias.

This may be all right for the big slum clearance projects in the big cities, although human values should be the same everywhere. But Monterey's urban renewal will force only a relatively few families into lodgings elsewhere. It primarily is designed to clear out a lot of old, falling-down buildings, too few of which have yet felt the bulldozer's gentle touch, and then build anew.

That seems, in fact, to be the chief fault of our particular version of urban renewal. It has been around for 8 years or more, and what has happened constructively?

Well, there's a restaurant and shop which might even win an award in a Tokyo edition of Sunset magazine, but which hardly fits the concept of Old Monterey.

Otherwise, what? Otherwise nothing except vacant lots and parking lots, with more to come.

We've heard a lot of whistling in the dark about how wonderful it all will be. The plain fact is that the original dream of a strong commercial complex which would anchor the redevelopment to a major department store—and thus return to the tax rolls some of the long-deteriorated business base—is a bubble long since pricked.

But this, we submit, is not the main point.

Monterey has lived with this sort of growing frustration for many months. In fact, we now face still another switch in financing for the remote control developers by still another merger and, presumably, still more months of nothing happening.

What concerns us most is that urban renewal doesn't need the Patania property today, tomorrow, or in the foreseeable future. Throwing them out and then—in a fit of pique—bulldozing down their house is symptomatic of the callous, highhanded approach of urban renewal to human and public relations.

We think it time for the good citizens who comprise the urban renewal agency to rid themselves of a staff with no more feeling for basic ethics than it has demonstrated, no more ability to construct rather than to destroy, and no more willingness to try to understand the importance of human values.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ODIN LANGEN

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable ODIN LANGEN, recently appeared in Fargo, N. Dak., before that city's annual Farm Forum. What he had to say is of significance and interest to all Americans in general and to our rural population in particular.

The distinguished gentleman from Minnesota has a long and solid background in agriculture that started when he was an active and successful farmer in the northwestern corner of his State. ODIN LANGEN was associated with the national farm program in his home county for 15 years and served as local chairman for the Production and Marketing Administration. During his years in the Minnesota State Legislature he served on the agriculture committee.

His background, knowledge, and interest in agriculture has served him well since coming to Washington, and he now renders yeoman service on the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture. The minority members of this body also recognized his leadership qualities by choosing him as chairman of the Republican task force on agriculture, a group that has developed many new ideas and concepts in the struggle to maintain rural America as a potent force in our society. The task force proposal to set up a U.S. World Food Study Commission added a new dimension in world food planning that recognizes the key role that the American farmer plays in this Nation's position as an international power, and of including him as a full partner in the plans. But, I would like you to have the benefit of the words of ODIN LANGEN on the subject, and therefore I insert his address to the annual Fargo Farm Forum as a part of the RECORD:

TALK BY CONGRESSMAN ODIN LANGEN, SEVENTH DISTRICT, MINNESOTA, AT FARGO FARM FORUM, FEBRUARY 4, 1966

It is with a real sense of pride and satisfaction that I attempt to share a few humble observations with this most distinguished audience this afternoon. I am sure my pride and satisfaction has been greatly generated by, first, the number of very distinguished participants who have preceded me on the program during the past 2 days. But probably more important is the significance of the subject that has been assigned to me, namely, food and the Agricultural Act of 1965. Permit me to compliment the Fargo Forum and all of those who have been instrumental in arranging for this most important meeting as well as all those who are in attendance. I know that it takes a great deal of doing on the part of everyone to make a meeting such as this a success.

In my humble opinion, outside of the war in Vietnam, there probably is no subject presently being considered in Washington that is of greater significance to the Red River Valley and every farming community in this Nation, than that of our Nation's ability to produce food and its relation to the economic future of agriculture. As we shall see during this brief discussion, even the conflict in Vietnam and the war clouds that threaten the future of every nation around the world might well be substantially affected by the policies practiced in connection with meeting food needs and agricultural problems that confront not only this Nation but every food-producing area throughout the world.

Frankly, the American farmer holds the key to this Nation's strength that can unlock the doors that hide hunger, poverty, and political strife around the world. The major economic and political advantage the United States enjoys over the major world powers is our ability to produce food in ample supply.

An ample supply of food is a persuasive tool in the pursuit of peace. It is a major weapon in deterring aggression and maintaining our superior defensive posture. By contrast, the weakest link in the Communist chain for controlling the world is their lack of ability to produce adequate supplies of food and the knowledge that American agriculture can and will out-produce them at any given time. So let me very hurriedly get to the subject, namely, food and the Agricultural Act of 1965.

I should take a few brief moments to talk about the Agricultural Act of 1965 to begin with. And this in itself is no small assignment, because this act was a major piece of legislation during last session, and I hold in my hand a copy of the bill, which indicates that it is a bill that is 45 pages long and deals with 8 different titles, namely, dairy, wool, feed grains, cotton, wheat, cropland adjustment, and other miscellaneous items. I hold in my hand another document published by the Department of Agriculture, and I note that it takes 38 pages to properly identify the regulations of the ACP section of our program alone. Consequently, it can be seen that were I to take the time to describe in detail each one of these sections of the bill and related regulations, we might well be here far into the night. Many of them have already been identified for you, and many of you are well acquainted with the various provisions, and so I shall, in the interest of time and convenience, identify the program at this point only briefly.

First of all, the farmer will plant and harvest under the confines of the Food and Agricultural Act of 1965, passed last year. That means he faces a 4-year program which continues the feed grains program essentially as it was; he will grow cotton under a one-price program and raise wool under a continuation of the National Wool Act, with a 2-cent increase in the support price; will produce milk for fluid consumption without having to produce surplus milk in order to preserve his individual participation in the market. The leasing of tobacco acreages will be continued. A new soil bank type of program is available and he will grow wheat under a certificate program * * * the wheat grower will find full parity for wheat that is used here at home, about 45 percent of the crop, with the next 35 percent of his crop under export certificates of an unknown value, and the remaining 20 percent of his crop at a price of about $1.25 a bushel. In other words, the farmer will continue business as usual under essentially the same programs he has had in recent years. The farmer will further find that his income and his plans will be fully controlled by the Department of Agriculture for at least 4 more years. No matter what the needs of the Nation may be, or the food requirements of the rest of the world, the American farmer will have to wait until Washington gives him permission to change the procedures under which he is currently held by farm legislation.

The Secretary of Agriculture, while testifying last year before the House Agriculture Committee, said the new farm legislation had as one of its main purposes "to strengthen farm income, which, in this most prosperous time is far from adequate." This, of course, should indeed be the purpose of any good farm program. It is interesting to note that the Secretary should make this point, since the wording of the present farm bill is such that he controls to a great extent just how much the farmer will receive for his commodities.

Again, let me refer to the copy of the bill that I have here in my hand. I find 108 instances in which the determination has been left to the Secretary, of how the program shall be administered. Language like "such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines" appears consistently throughout every section of the bill.

If our feed grain farmers do a little calculating, for instance, on their prospects for the coming year, they will come up with some startling and disheartening figures. The elimination of his privilege to receive a diversion payment for the first 20 percent of his diverted acreage results in a reduction of almost $4 an acre, when compared to last year. Should he decide to divert 50 percent of his crop, he still ends up with a reduction of over a dollar an acre from last year's income. According to the latest editions of the Farmer-Stockman publication, farmers can expect to lose an average of $3 per base acre under the 1965 feed grains program. Quoting figures provided by the Grain Sorghum Producers Association, the Farmer-Stockman says that some farmers with proven high yields may lose up to $10 an acre.

However, there are other ways your Government controls income. During the past few months we've seen numerous announcements from the Department of Agriculture telling us about future sales of such commodities as wheat, corn and other feed grains by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Secretary has said the sales are made to hold down prices. Now, I'm a bit puzzled by these sales announcements of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Remember that the Commodity Credit Corporation was set up by the Congress as a tool to stabilize, support and protect farm income.

Just how far the Department has gone in flouting the will of Congress is reflected by the Secretary's testimony last year before the House Agriculture Committee, when he admitted that the Commodity Credit purposely sold stocks in order to move prices down in order to make the programs work. I have always been of the opinion, when prices went up, the programs had worked. This action by the Corporation is further puzzling and almost ridiculous from the standpoint of their own dealings. I can't ever recall hearing of a grain dealer who telegraphed his future sales by stating in advance that they're going to sell several million bushels of a certain commodity, thereby making sure that the price drops prior to the sale, and assuring themselves of a lower price. Each announcement of such sales in advance has resulted in substantial drops in the market. It's my feeling that if the Department had done nothing more but quit talking about their proposed CCC sales, prices would have been affected to a much lesser degree.

I was interested in a note in the Wall Street Journal last year, in which that publication stated that grain merchants figure the price of corn would have hit $1.60 a bushel last spring instead of $1.39, but for big Government sales. That's a 21-cent-a-bushel difference. Our House Minority Task Force on Agriculture, of which I have the privilege of serving as chairman, did some research into the effects on income caused by the sale of CCC stock at the wrong times. For instance, we discovered that in the 1961–62 marketing year, the income from the sales of corn would have been $370 million higher, had it not been for CCC sales of nearly a billion bushels. Spring wheat producers have certainly experienced the very same results during recent months and weeks, and a good many million dollars might well have accrued to them, had it not been for these Commodity Credit sales.

Of course, agriculture isn't alone in the price-fixing affairs of this Government. Aluminum, copper, and steel companies have also felt the hot breath of Government in flooding markets with surplus stocks to control prices. Uncle Sam has displayed a tragic willingness to whip you into line if you attempt to operate on a sound business basis. The effects of such Government actions as CCC sales, restrictive regulations, have had the effect of weakening the marketplace and reducing market prices. Further, USDA economists estimate that a further weakening will take place in 1966. And while they point to an increased farm income, this fact has resulted from larger Government payments.

It is good to note that market prices for livestock are at a level to discourage the Government from meddling in that industry. It could have been different, of course, if past meat import policies had been continued. As my colleague in Congress from a meat-producing State, the Honorable BOB DOLE, of Kansas, said recently: "In view of efforts to control wheat prices, one can well imagine what administrative leaders might be doing today if they had an inventory of beef and pork in their food stockpile. Hogs have been bringing 124 percent of parity. What a target this would be for price controllers."

Let us take a bold look over what has happened over the past number of years to the farm income picture. For purposes of comparison, let us consider the last 10 years, between 1955 and 1965. The average market prices for wheat dropped 65 cents a bushel and for corn dropped 26 cents a bushel during the last 10 years. With such drops in the marketplace, just how does income increase at all?

You get a clue when you look at Government payments. During the same 10-year period, Government payments increased by $1.9 billion while net farm income went up $1.65 billion or $250 million less than Government payments increased. It's a revelation that indicates that any increase in farm income is due to Government payments. Under existing farm laws and the Agriculture Department practices, this seems to be the only way that farm income can rise. Every action taken recently relating to grain has been for the purpose of lowering market prices.

Using the same 10 years for comparison, we also learn that farm production expenses have increased over 35 percent while cash receipts increased only 26 percent. Now, you don't have to be a mathematician to realize that the farmer's income was less spendable income. While this was going on, the American consumer was paying the lowest percent of his income for food of any nation in the world. Following World War II, Americans spent 26 percent of their incomes on food, but in 1964 only 19 percent. If it had remained 26 percent in 1964, American farmers would have realized an extra $30 billion in income. The farm share of the food dollar continues to decrease as well. Ten years ago, the share was 41 percent. It has now dropped a nickel to about 36 percent, while food costs themselves kept rising, due to increases in the cost of processing and selling on the retail level.

I was interested in the set of statistics submitted to the Congress last summer by the worthy speaker before me, Congressman PURCELL. Using figures from a study on "Food Costs and Farm Prices" conducted by the House Committee on Agriculture, he noted that every economic index in the United States has gone up, except farm prices and farm income. As Mr. PURCELL pointed out, the gross national product, factory and professional wages, personal income, every other price index there is, all went up. My colleague explained how the farmer kept his head above water by going further into debt. Farm mortgages having gone up by more than $9 billion in the last 10 years.

I enjoyed Mr. PURCELL's analysis of the farmer's realized net income. While it showed a total of 12.9 billion in 1964, it shrinks to only 3.2 billion if you give the farmer a 5-percent return on the value of his farm assets, as is done for utilities and other businesses. What we've learned from all of this is that total farm income has remained almost constant for the past 10 years, while every other segment of the population registered significant gains.

About the only way any kind of increase can be shown is on a per farm basis. This is because there are 1,300,000 fewer farmers than there were 10 years ago, with 670,000 less than 5 years ago. There are those who would encourage an even faster reduction in the number of farms. This can mean only further economic distress for every community and business endeavor in a rural area, and should be slowed down, not promoted, by Government price fixing.

I have recited these rather discouraging income figures because of their relationship to American agriculture in the future—and so now, what about the future?

It seems that we are approaching a period of time when we shall certainly see the U.S. farmer asked to increase his production through various means in order to help feed a hungry world and an expanding population at home. On the surface, this should mean that the American farmer will be the first to benefit when that call goes out for more food. But unfortunately, the farmer may be written out of the whole deal by the fine print and the controls that are inherent in present programs, and, as we have seen carried out during the past several years. Therefore, the immediate future is one of uncertainty due to a number of reasons.

The effects of the Vietnam war, uncertain as they are, must obviously be contemplated. History has told us that war has the effect of increasing the domestic use of food. This is exemplified by World War II when we saw a dramatic 72-percent increase in the disappearance of wheat between 1942 and 1944. This I can personally attest to, having been the county chairman of a PMA committee at that time. I can readily recall that in 1940 and 1941 we were struggling almost desperately trying to find room in which to store surplus wheat and feed grains. In the summer of 1944, we were conducting meetings around the county offering a 30-cent-a-bushel bonus for all wheat that might be delivered, even if it involved sweeping out the granaries. This was after all restrictions had been removed, prices had gone up substantially, and American agriculture was geared to full production. Many of you remember this as I do, I am sure.

The situation today is, of course, much different, and we are not contemplating a global war. However, it is interesting to project these figures and learn the surprising fact that if we were to see a similar disappearance in our supplies today we would find that by August of 1968 we would have exhausted completely our supply of wheat and feed grains, including the necessary reserves. This is pure speculation, of course.

Experts tell us that some of the future demand for American foodstuffs is coming now, not later. India, for example, is expected to need an extra 5 to 6 million tons of wheat, and to supply it the United States would completely wipe out its surplus and dip into precious reserves. So American agriculture takes the center stage in a political, economic, and strategic worldwide struggle.

While his greatest efforts may not be required until later, the American farmer literally finds himself in the spotlight right now. There is one sure fact, accepted by almost every authority on the subject—a world food shortage is coming, and the United States must play an important role in alleviating it. But from that point on, even experts are groping in the dark for answers to questions and indications of directions we must take.

So the first order of business is to determine the American farmer's role in the planning and execution of a realistic world food plan. To accomplish this, there has been established a Minority Task Force on Agriculture. They have submitted a proposal for a World Food Study Commission that specifically includes the farmer as an integral part of all planning activity. Our plan which is now before the Congress in the form of a bill, considers American agriculture as a full partner, and not merely an industry which will be told what and when to produce. Our purpose is to make sure that rural America enjoys a needed economic vitality as a result of its ability and efforts to feed a hungry nation and world.

The theory of solving a world food crisis in the light of also improving the economic outlook for U.S. agriculture is unique in some circles of our Government, but I believe it is the only sound course of action. There is a glimmer of hope, however, because a few of the people who will be influential in world food studies are beginning to hear our message. The reason they are beginning to hear it is because the American farmer himself has started to ask questions.

The suggested commission would give the farmer and all segments of the economy a voice, including bipartisan representation from government, plus representatives from industry, agribusiness, farm organizations, teachers, and specialists from land-grant colleges and universities, farm production organizations and shipping interests. We are hopeful that such an organization can be put into operation in the very near future while there is still adequate time to formulate a comprehensive plan and provide answers to the myriads of questions regarding world food needs.

Some of these questions are, and I shall mention but a few—for instance, we need to know just what the world food needs actually are. It would be folly to send millions of bushels of wheat to a country where the population doesn't normally eat wheat. In other words, we need a close look at the eating habits of the various nations and the nutritional needs. We need to know about the storage and refrigeration problems. It would be useless to send beef to a nation that has no means of modern refrigeration.

We need to know how the food is to be transported, what effects diverting U.S. shipping to world food needs would have on normal trade. We need to know how our commodities are to be processed and where; if flour is what is needed, it accomplishes little to ship grain to a nation that cannot process it. Will the recipient nation have needed docking, port and transportation facilities? We must explore the question of just how much food the United States can provide and what other nations can provide.

We need to explore the plans to develop agriculture in other nations, so that this does not become a permanent program of supplying the world with food while exhausting our own supplies here at home. The crisis will get worse, if a plan to develop agriculture in other nations isn't an integral part of our effort.

In this respect, Mr. William Hewitt, chairman of the Deere Co., noted last December that in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, increases in farm production have come largely through expansion of cultivated land areas. However, in the last decade, Asia has become one of the most land-scarce regions with India one of the most vulnerable. India, Pakistan, and China, with well over one-third of the world's population, have little new land that can be brought under cultivation readily. Africa and Latin America also are beginning to face productive land limits.

Ultimately, the less-developed countries must raise their agricultural yields per acre, but it will be done with difficulty, and will take lots of time, which the world does not have in the face of the rising population. Thus the key agricultural areas, particularly North America and Western Europe, must provide an increasing proportion of the world's food supplies in the critical periods of the 1970's. As Hewitt points out, the world has reached a turning point in land availability and use. He points out that the United States harvested an almost constant 350 million acres between 1920 and 1955. But increased yields and other production adjustments have resulted in a reduction of 50 to 60 million acres in the total lands harvested in the years since 1955.

It is significant, however, that U.S. production cannot indefinitely keep up with world and domestic demands, so other plans must be formulated. So in the very near future we will be called upon to produce more food. Now, this may seem like a rather strange statement, in view of the fact that the 1965 farm bill provides for a land retirement program with estimates that would retire some additional 40 million acres of productive farmland.

We also need to know whether our production and distribution of food to some nations may cause them to neglect their own agriculture. Some claim that our shipments under Public Law 480 have tended to cause that very condition. The Public Law 480 sales and giveaway program is expiring, and the U.S. World Food Study Commission we suggest could well provide the answers we need about that program, concerning its value, the methods of using foreign currencies and the like. If some of the charges that shipments under Public Law 480 often ate up the cash markets for foodstuffs are correct, we should know, so that a repetition can be avoided in the expanding world food plans. We need to know something about the effect that sales and larger distribution of food throughout the world would have on the world market, because to a very large degree agriculture would become more dependent upon a world market for its income.

We need to know where the Communist nations fit into the world food plans. Are we to ship foodstuffs to Communist nations, only to discover later that the same nation takes our food and passes it on to another country, taking full credit for the benevolent transaction? It is most imperative that we exercise caution in the shipment of foodstuffs to Communist nations, lest we strengthen their military posture and their aggressive desires that today threaten the world. I could go on and on, as there are hundreds of these questions that need answering.

Congress, the American producer and the consumer need to have these answers, but I still haven't raised the most important question; namely, what is going to happen to farm income in the fulfillment of such programs? Recognizing that we have already established a precedent in the wheat program of selling agricultural commodities to foreign countries at something less than one-half of what we consider to be parity prices, if the attitude of the Federal Government is going to be one of attempting to hold prices down to the lowest possible level as has been evidenced by the continuation of Commodity Credit sales * * * even more disturbing is the fact that the present budget just presented to the Congress again effects a larger reduction in the appropriation for agriculture than any one of the other departments, and in some very essential fields when related to the potential future farm income.

On Monday of this week, I had occasion to hear and interrogate the Secretary of the Treasury as well as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, while they explained to us how they expected that the food-for-peace program was going to be greatly expanded during the coming fiscal year, and at the same time cost less money. Now, quite obviously, this can mean only one thing, and that is that the American farmer is going to receive less money for the product that he has produced. If it doesn't, then this, of course, becomes a pretty fancy mathematical gimmick designed for budget purposes only which isn't unique as far as this year's budget is concerned.

But there are even more disturbing reflections relating to this subject.

In the January 14 Kiplinger Agricultural Newsletter, reference is made that the President's state of the Union message mentioned nothing for farmers but did make a play for a worldwide attack on hunger. The Kiplinger Letter goes on to say that there will be no farm message from the White House to Congress this year, but that the foreign aid message will take its place.

Just as significant was an article I noted in a Minneapolis paper of last week, which indicated that Senator MONDALE, of Minnesota, was ready to introduce legislation that America's food-for-peace program be patterned to the needs of hungry nations and not to those of surplus-plagued U.S. farmers. The conclusion is that there is a definite shift to a world food policy and away from farm policy. The feeling is that farm programs will not be run in relation to what the farmer needs but in relation to world food plans.

While I believe that solving of world food problems is of tremendous importance, I cannot subscribe to the theory that U.S. agriculture should merely follow along behind, or that we can accomplish this goal by continuous suggestions that would pay the farmer less for production.

Doesn't it seem kind of strange that American agriculture is now being asked to produce food for foreign nations at one-half price, which is the case in wheat? Now, I don't imagine anybody would even suggest that processors ought to cut their price, or that the transportation industry should cut its rates in order to help feed the world.

I doubt very much that the manufacturers would look with much favor on a plan to produce for less cost the products that the farmer needs, such as machinery or fertilizer or any of the many other items that go into the operation of a farm, in order that we might be able to produce cheaper food for the world. By the same token, can we expect that the American consumer is going to pay a price so high for the percentage of the product that he purchases that he will carry all of the profit and most of the expense that's involved in producing this much greater volume of food, such as the wheat program now does?

It is already a known fact that most of the nations where the greatest food needs are being experienced today do not have the money with which to buy these food products from the United States at prices that prevail here. And so, quite obviously, either these extra moneys are going to have to come out of the pockets of the American consumers or taxpayers, or else the farmers will lose the additional income. I for one believe that the American farmer is deserving of better income considerations. And unless we do, we are merely designing a blueprint for the complete extinction of rural areas such as the Red River Valley.

It is for this reason that the American farmer must be a full partner in these future plans. He must share the economic gains to be experienced through the production of more food, or the plans to feed a hungry world could well fail for lack of vision.

I submit that the proposed U.S. World Food Study Commission can supply the answer to some of these questions, and offer a ray of hope to the American agriculture of tomorrow.

American agriculture doesn't ask any special favors. All they ask is to be treated like one of the boys, a chance to share in America's abundance on par with the rest of the Nation. In fact, the future can be bright indeed if we chart the course properly. To this end, the Commission is essential in determining how best food can serve the cause of peace, by relieving misery, strife, and the international dangers of a sick and hungry world. The willingness and the ability of American agriculture to do so should bring rewards of economic security, not only to them, but to the consumers, the taxpayers, and the Nation as well.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter and telegrams.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill for the purpose of making the special milk program for children permanent legislation. It is also for the purpose of assuring the school systems of the Nation and other appropriate users of milk that there will be sufficient funds to carry out the purposes of the program.

The special milk program for children is being used by approximately 92,000 schools and other outlets throughout the United States as a means of improving the nutrition of approximately 16 million children. Further than this, the program provides a market of approximately 1.6 billion pounds of fluid milk for dairy farmers.

In terms of the importance of this program to the schoolchildren of Minnesota, I wish to point out that the number of schools and other milk outlets participating has risen from 1,360 in 1955 to 2,841 in 1965. Milk consumption has risen from 21.8 million half pints in 1955 to 77.3 million in 1965. These figures in themselves attest to the need for and acceptance of this program.

In terms of its economic importance to the dairy industry, I would like to point out that in my Second Congressional District, where there are nearly 32,000 farms, a healthy dairy industry is particularly important. Better than 70 percent of cash farm income in Minnesota, for example, is derived from the sale of livestock and livestock products.

Dairying alone in 1959 contributed $259,077,000 to the economy of Minnesota and $52,123,000 to the economy of the Second Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, the special milk program has been in operation since 1954. It has been highly successful. It represents a very small but important investment in our children.

I do not like to question the motives of this administration or the Bureau of the Budget, but I cannot believe that the proposed budget cut for this program from $103 to $21 million for the next fiscal year is sound or responsible.

We are dealing with a budget of nearly $113 billion and it will probably run many billions more, judging from the experience of the past 5 years. In this budget, funds are allocated for the Great Society almost as though money were of no consequence.

If the administration is seeking to save money, there are many obvious areas where slashes can be made without curtailing programs which have proved their worth to the American people. If the administration is looking for economy, the Congress can and should react in kind, but we should be selective where we make our cuts. Certainly, we should not feed the appetite of the Great Society at the expense of our children.

I think the Congress should tell the American people that we are interested in the youth of this country; that we intend to make the special milk program permanent, and that we intend to provide sufficient funds so that the program can grow with its needs.

It is important we make our intentions known to the American people at this time, and that they be assured the special milk program will not be wiped off the books as indicated by the proposed budget for the 1966–67 fiscal year.

The special milk program for children, unless extended, is scheduled to expire June 30, 1967. My bill, therefore, is designed to assure the American people that the special milk program for children will receive sufficient appropriations now and in the future, and that the program will be continued beyond June 30, 1967.

There is further reason why it is important for Congress to act now. Mr. Duane J. Mattheis, Commissioner of Education in the State of Minnesota, has just written me to protest the planned cutbacks in both the school lunch and special milk programs in our State. Mr. Mattheis pointed out, however, that these cutbacks are not only being planned for the next fiscal year, they are being carried out now on funds Congress has already made available for the special milk program.

While Congress has appropriated $103 million for the special milk program for this year, the Bureau of the Budget has instructed that expenditures for the year be held to $100 million. In order to comply, schools in Minnesota are finding their repayment claims reduced by an extra 5 percent.

Such cutbacks were obviously not intended by Congress, nor should they be condoned as a necessity because of the war in Vietnam when all the money supposedly saved is simply being spent for other more questionable domestic programs. There is plenty of fat that this administration could cut out of its Great Society spending without damaging an existing, worthwhile program for which Congress has already appropriated money.

I wish to include the correspondence of Mr. Mattheis at this point in my remarks, along with two telegrams and a letter from the U.S. Department of Agriculture outlining the cutbacks. I also insert in the RECORD statistical matter relating to the special milk program in the State of Minnesota:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
St. Paul, Minn., February 7, 1966.

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NELSEN: During the last number of weeks we have received two telegrams and a letter from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, copies of which are enclosed.

Because of the many benefits that are provided to our school children under these programs and because of their contribution to the education, welfare, and health of the participants, I feel the lowering of payments to the schools will have a great detrimental effect on the school lunch and special milk programs in our State.

There is also a discriminatory feature in the cutback of funds as outlined in the second telegram that I feel worthy of mention. I would be concerned about the administrative arrangements for programs in Minnesota public schools in which special emphasis and direction were placed upon providing milk for needy children and children in schools without a food service program that would be above and beyond the efforts now being made by local school boards in taking care of these needs.

In view of the significant appropriations of money for recently developed and new programs, it is difficult for me to understand why programs such as school lunch and special milk which have proven to be so worthwhile in the schools of our State and the Nation and for which the needs are definitely known be curtailed in their appropriations.

Because of the substantially worthwhile contributions of these two programs and the increased participation in them by school children, I urge you to do everything possible to reinstate the funds to their present level and increase them accordingly each year to provide for the improvement and expansion of these excellent programs.

Sincerely,

DUANE J. MATTHEIS,
Commissioner of Education.

CHICAGO, ILL.

C. E. HOLT,
School Lunch Section,
Department of Education,
St. Paul, Minn.:

For your information the President's budget for 1967 requests total of $183 million for school lunch with breakdown as follows: Cash payments, $129,415,000; Section 11, special assistance, $6,500,000; Section 6, $45 million; Administration, $2,085,000.

Request of $21 million for special milk program to be redirected to provide milk for needy children and children in schools without a food service. We will give you further details as quickly as they are available.

DENNIS M. DOYLE,
Food Distribution, USDA Chicago.

CHICAGO, ILL.

CARL HOLT,
Director, School Lunch Section,
State Department of Education,
St. Paul, Minn.:

In accordance with instructions from the Bureau of Budget to hold expenditures under the special milk program to $1 billion inclusive of administrative costs for this fiscal year you are hereby advised that the current deduction of 5 percent will be increased to 10 percent beginning with claims for the month of February. Schools and child care institutions should be notified as promptly as possible. As provided in section 215.7(E) of the special milk regulations no deductions will be made in reimbursements to needy schools.

DENNIS M. DOYLE,
Director, Midwest Area,
U.S. Department of Agriculture.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE,
Chicago, Ill., December 28, 1965.

Mr. C. E. HOLT,
Director, School Lunch Section, State Department of Education, St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR MR. HOLT: This will supplement my wire of December 23 on the special milk program fund situation for the remainder of the fiscal year.

As you know, Congress appropriated $103 million for the special milk program this year. Based on preliminary estimates of expenditures for the year, however, we would need at least $102 million obligating authority in fiscal year 1966 if the present 5 percent reduction is continued through the full year. In order to hold expenditures to $100 million as instructed by the Bureau of the Budget, it has become necessary to reduce obligations for the last half of the year by $2 million.

Because the school year generally begins in September, about 40 percent of program obligations occur from February 1 to the end of the fiscal year. Thus, in order to reduce obligations by $2 million during the remaining 40 percent of the year, an additional 5 percent reduction in claims is necessary beginning with claims for the month of February.

No restoration of funds which may be saved by the percentage reduction method will be made after the end of the fiscal year.

Although the wording of section 215.7(e) of the special milk program regulations, effective December 1, 1965, is not spelled out as thoroughly as it was in the former section 215.8(e) of the prior regulations, the intent is the same. No percentage reduction of reimbursement shall be applied to any part of claims submitted by needy schools approved for special assistance under the special milk program.

We hope the overall impact of this action will not adversely affect program operations.

Sincerely yours,

DENNIS M. DOYLE,
Director, Midwest Area.

Special milk program—Minnesota

	½ pints reimbursed (percent)	Number of outlets participating	Program expenditures
1955	21.8	1,360	$843,977
1956	44.0	2,156	1,543,455
1957	49.0	2,436	1,795,267
1958	51.7	2,541	1,870,208
1959	58.0	2,691	2,098,830
1960	64.7	2,720	2,322,374
1961	66.4	2,748	2,436,590
1962	76.0	2,807	2,527,683
1963	71.8	2,765	2,612,897
1964	76.5	2,779	2,768,304
1965	77.3	2,841	2,677,705

PROPHETS OF GLOOM AND DOOM FEAR JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION PROSPERITY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gloom and doom boys are with us again.

Like a voice out of the past, Arthur F. Burns appeared in Washington this week to deliver what the Washington Post described as a "bitter, slashing attack" on the economic policies of the Johnson administration. With great fear and trembling, Mr. Burns, as he has for so many years, once again sees that ugly bugaboo inflation under every bed.

Mr. Burns has made a substantial career out of these perennial cries of gloom and doom. Apparently picturing himself as a modern-day Paul Revere, Mr. Burns rides off in all directions warning that the country is about to be engulfed by inflation.

Arthur F. Burns' theory seems to be, "Things are good today, but that only means that they will be bad tomorrow."

A look at Mr. Burns' background might help to put his dire predictions into proper perspective. He is, of course, the former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers in the last Republican Administration and one of the chief architects of the Eisenhower economic policies. He was guiding economic policy during a period in which the country dropped into two serious recessions and started on a third.

With this kind of background, it is not surprising that Mr. Burns is somewhat confused by the economic policies of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations which have brought the country five solid years of progress and prosperity. Undoubtedly, it is a little embarrassing to Mr. Burns that this wave of prosperity started soon after the voters were able to sweep out the Eisenhower team and policies in 1960.

Mr. Burns comes from the school of economics which believes that the worst thing that could happen to the economy is full employment. This Eisenhower adviser seems to regard putting people to work as a dangerous trend.

Here again, Mr. Burns' experiences with the Republican administration in the 1950's may indeed be embarrassing. Through much of this period the country had unemployment rates of 5, 6, and in one period almost 7 percent. During much of this period, we had rising unemployment—something which the Burns school of economics apparently regards as a virtue.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that putting people to work is a sign of a strong nation and an indicator of wise economic policies being carried out by the Johnson administration. I am happy that unemployment has dropped to record lows in this administration. I hope it continues to drop and that people who want to work have jobs.

Both political parties should be proud of the Nation's record of prosperity. Our ability to maintain high production and high employment is one of our great strengths throughout the world. It is the answer to the Communist leaders who have consistently argued, just as Mr. Burns contends, that the United States could not have high employment, high production, and stable prices. The Johnson administration is disproving this theory of gloom and doom which is consistently voiced by the far left and the far right.

Arthur F. Burns sounds suspiciously like another gentleman of the gloom and doom school, Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin. Like Mr. Burns, Mr. Martin constantly issues dire warnings of impending economic disaster. Last June, Mr. Martin journeyed to New York to issue his famous speech which attempted to show a similarity between the economic policies of 1929 and the policies of the Johnson administration. No sooner had this doomsday speech been discredited than Mr. Martin was back with a new theory that inflation was about to overtake us. Of course, this became his excuse for raising interest rates on December 6 as high as 37½ percent.

It is not surprising that we find such great similarity in the public pronouncements of Mr. Martin and Mr. Burns. Both were coconspirators in leading the country down the road to recessions in the Eisenhower administration. Both have been coconspirators in the financial community's efforts to impose tight money, high interest, and high unemployment on the country.

In our deep concern over inflation, Mr. Burns seems to have completely ignored the role of the Federal Reserve Board and the banks in feeding the fires of cost increases. No mention is made of the fact that the Federal Reserve Board's order of December 6 raised the discount rate—the wholesale cost of money—by 12½ percent—considerably above all wage-price guidelines. No mention is made of the fact that as part of the same action the Federal Reserve gave the banks permission to raise the interest rates they pay on time deposits by 22.2 percent and 37½ percent. Again these percentages are much higher than any wage or any price demands that I have heard about. For some strange reason, price rises in this banker's area of the economy do not seem to worry economists like Arthur F. Burns; he just fails to mention them.

The Burns and the Martins have always made a good thing out of the scare word inflation. This word has covered a multitude of economic sins in which the Federal Reserve Board and the bankers have participated.

Of course, Mr. Burns and Mr. Martin are clever. They know that no one is in favor of inflation. But they would like to have the American people believe that they have some sort of monopoly on concern about inflationary trends. This is simply not true. Democrats and Republicans alike have no desire to plunge the country into inflation.

President Johnson is fully cognizant of the dangers. His advisers are extremely competent men and they, like the President, are keeping a close watch on the economy. These advisers have appeared in recent days before the Joint Economic Committee and their testimony fully bears out the validity of the Nation's current economic policies and clearly establishes that the Johnson administration is keeping a very close eye on any trends which might be inflationary.

The administration, of course, has many effective tools which it can use to combat any inflation. For example, if inflation becomes a problem, the President can always raise taxes, particularly those on excess profits. Most economists agree that tax policy is a prime weapon and defense against all forms of inflation. Certainly, it is much superior and much more effective than the bludgeonlike methods employed by the Federal Reserve Board in raising interest rates. The President has the power to combat inflation and, if necessary, I am sure he will not hesitate to use it.

But President Johnson and his advisers, unlike the Burns-Martin school, do not believe that we should sit in fear and trembling at the sight of prosperity. They, unlike Martin and Burns, do not believe that this is the time for learned economists to bandy about scare words such as inflation.

Arthur F. Burns appeared in Washington under the auspices of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, probably the chief gloom and doom organization in the Nation. As reported in the papers, Mr. Burns' speech unfortunately has the sound of political demagoguery rather than the ring of economic truth.

It is regrettable that such unsubstantiated attacks are leveled on the President at a time when he is attempting to rally the country behind our efforts in Vietnam. We are in a grave time, and it ill serves our national purposes to have spokesmen running around the country with unfounded predictions of gloom and doom.

In these times of national emergency, I hope the U.S. Chamber of Commerce will use its forums to promote the country and not to divide the people and to create doubt in the land.

NEW DECISIONS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Roscoe Drummond reports that the conflict in Vietnam is a "people's war," and that the decisions at Honolulu "go to the heart of winning."

> They were primarily social, economic, and political decisions. They come at a malleable and, perhaps, decisive turn in the war—

His column of February 14 said.

Drummond reported that the Honolulu decisions centered on "how to help Saigon show the Vietnamese peasant that it is his own government, not the Communists', which can and will protect him, help him, and secure him better against the worst hardships of the fighting."

The problem—and the opportunity—is to get people who are now either willingly or unwillingly living in Vietcong-controlled areas to seek the shelter of the Government.

The end of the war, Drummond believes, "will come when the Vietnamese peasants make this choice."

This column spells out the challenge before us and our allies in Vietnam, and in the belief that others may find the column illuminating, I offer it to the RECORD for publication:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 14, 1966]

DECISIVE TURN IN VIET? WINNING A PEOPLE'S WAR—VITAL STEPS AT HONOLULU

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—General Giap, the supreme commander of the Communist forces in North Vietnam, has labeled it a "people's war." He's right.

This is why the decisions taken at Honolulu by President Johnson and Premier Ky go to the heart of winning. They were primarily social, economic, and political decisions. They come at a malleable and, perhaps, decisive turn in the war.

For a long time the larger part of the 16 million South Vietnamese people, mostly peasant farmers, has tried hard to stay neutral in the seesaw conflict between the Vietcong and the government troops.

They did so not because they wanted to be ruled by the Communists; there is ample proof they don't. But for one main reason: neither side could give them security. Neutrality seemed the only way to survive.

The situation is now being radically altered. The mounting South Vietnamese and U.S. forces, the steady B–52 raids against VC strongholds keeping the Communists ever on the move with fewer places to hide, the new ability to take the battle to where the enemy is and not let him rest—these are the new factors which are changing the face of the conflict.

They are making it impossible for the peasant farmers to avoid much longer having to choose sides and either help the government to win or to cast their lot and lives with the Communists.

Before the escalation of fighting and the search-and-destroy strategy of the expanded Vietnamese and U.S. forces, it was understandable that the peasant should feel he could best avoid trouble by not choosing sides.

Now the moment of decision is at hand when the farmers and villagers will have to decide whether:

To stay on their farms or in their hamlets and take risks of noncombatants in war.

To move to areas under government control where the Vietcong is not drawing the fire of defending forces.

To put their fate and future into the hands of the Vietcong.

The Honolulu decisions centered on this very matter: How to help Saigon show the Vietnamese peasant that it is his own government, not the Communists', which can and will protect him, help him and secure him better against the worst hardships of the fighting.

Saigon has given the peasant food when the Vietcong have taken it away from him. It has given him medicine, helped him repair the village schools and employed him to repair roads, whereas the Vietcong have forced the peasants to dig their trenches.

But after a decade of fighting, the Saigon government cannot alone meet this problem which will soon become more acute. More is needed and the United States proposes to provide it.

One of the wisest young generals in the Pentagon, Brig. Gen. Edwin F. Black, who has just returned from a special mission in Vietnam, puts the problem—and the opportunity—in these words:

"This new combination, of relentless pressure on the ground and ceaseless attack from the air, is making the Vietcong and their supporters steadily more miserable * * * sooner or later these pressures will probably cause many more of the people, who are now either willingly or unwillingly living in Vietcong controlled areas, to seek the shelter of the government."

The end of what General Giap calls the "people's war" will come when the Vietnamese peasants make this choice. It is a choice which is coming nearer.

WTOP EDITORIAL COMMENT ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S VIETNAM POLICY EXPOUNDS SOME MUCH NEEDED COMMONSENSE ON A COMPLEX ISSUE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have followed the progress of the fighting in Vietnam, and of the developments of our policy in connection with that conflict, as we have been privileged to follow them in the Committee on Armed Services, are well aware that the facts and issues in the Vietnam conflict are highly complex. Because of this complexity it is not always possible to make a contribution to a thorough understanding of what is involved in Vietnam simply by resort to easy slogans or passing headlines or hastily conceived proposals.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, it is especially encouraging to run across now and then a comment on the matter of our Nation's policy in Vietnam that has been carefully thought out, that demonstrates a full awareness of the complexity of the issues involved, and that is marked with a high measure of sound commonsense.

Two such comments I am happy to say, have recently appeared on WTOP radio and television in editorials prepared and presented by Jack Jurey of WTOP. Because of their soundness and commonsense I commend these two editorials to my colleagues and to the American people.

The editorials follows:

VIETNAM—I

(This editorial was broadcast on February 14 and 15, 1966, over WTOP Radio and Television.)

This is a WTOP editorial.

The hardest work that men ever do is to think; to define their terms; to sit down and, putting aside preconceptions as much as possible, try to arrive at a rational definition of a problem and a rational approach to its solution.

In the case of Vietnam, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has now heard from two men with exceptional credentials: Gen. James Gavin and former Ambassador George Kennan. In prolonged testimony, they appeared to say much the same thing. Both men, and Professor Kennan in particular, criticize the policy decisions of the last dozen years which led to the present warfare, both are extremely apprehensive of the perils of continued escalation; both consider our Vietnam commitment to be a distortion of American foreign policy objectives; both warn that the United States cannot be all things to all men throughout the world.

But when it comes to the situation as it is, Professor Kennan and General Gavin agree that continued resistance is necessary. Kennan made this statement: "I think it should be our Government's aim to liquidate this involvement just as soon as this can be done without inordinate damage to our own prestige or to the stability of conditions in that area." The involvement, he said, "is today a fact * * * a precipitate and disorderly withdrawal could represent in present circumstances a disservice to our own interests."

President Johnson has responded to this by saying that he can see little difference between what Kennan and Gavin recommend and what the Government is doing. Neither can we. If all the people who are concerned about Vietnam will stick to the relevant issues—which is how the present problem can be dealt with—a good part of the fog ought to lift. It is vital to debate strategy not in retrospect but in terms of the immediate crisis. Provided this is done, it could very well turn out that there is not nearly so much disagreement about Vietnam as appears in the headlines.

This was a WTOP editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP.

VIETNAM—II

(This editorial was broadcast on February 15 and 16, 1966, over WTOP Radio and Television)

This is a WTOP editorial, the second in a series on Vietnam.

At the root of much of the discord and dissent about Vietnam is the fear of continuing escalation the fear that if American military power is applied in ever-greater measure we will drift into conflict with Communist China and, perhaps, the Soviet Union.

This is not an unreasonable anxiety. But if we are trying to deal with the Vietnam problem rationally—which seems to be the principal need of the moment—escalation can be controlled and kept within rational limits.

Military power is not an end in itself, it is an instrument of policy; which means that the escalation of such power can be severely limited to the achievement of policy objectives.

These include, first and foremost, persuading the other side to come to the conference table to negotiate what would be—for us and them—an acceptable formula for ending the fighting.

We do not seek to harm Red China, although one of our purposes is to contain an extension of Chinese power in southeast Asia. We do not seek to destroy North Vietnam. And we probably are prepared to concede the existence of the National Liberation Front—the Vietcong—and deal with it as a political entity in one way or another.

These limited objectives imply a limit to escalation. They argue against the bombing of Hanoi. They argue against a vastly greater commitment of American troops. Our aim is to establish an unshakable American military presence in South Vietnam, but not to undertake an unending build-up of men and material.

In other words, in terms of escalation, we must control the situation—not let the situation control us. Here again we suggest the President and his critics are closer to agreement than the headlines indicate. Because we can see nothing significant in the record to indicate that Mr. Johnson is not fully aware of the need for restraint and caution in South Vietnam.

This was a WTOP Editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP.

DECEPTION BY VARIOUS FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed at the lack of cooperation and the secretiveness, even the willful deception that is currently practiced by various Federal agencies.

It is conceded, I believe, that one of the most effective bulwarks of freedom in the United States has been our historic resistance to government in secret. Yet there is evidence, today, that secretiveness has become in some instances an instrument of departmental policy.

No one questions that our national security requires certain critical information to remain classified. There are official documents whose general circulation is not in the national interest. There are important decisions, we all agree, which must be made behind closed doors.

In order to preserve the freedom of our intellectual marketplace, however, the number of items designated to be withheld should be kept at an absolute minimum. The tendency is for departments of government to classify everything which might prove to be embarrassing to anyone within that department. Loyalty to the establishment rather than the dissemination of truth, becomes the important factor in determining whether governmental information should be released to the public, or kept under lock and key. Secrecy is to be deplored, and should be justified only in situations where national security is clearly at stake.

Now that the Government is spending billions of dollars in basic research—which amount represents over 60 percent of all basic research conducted in this country—it is mandatory that this information be made freely available to the public. People are entitled to this dearly paid for information, not as a matter of grace, but as a matter of right, subject only to the considerations of national security.

Errors in judgment, incompetence, neglect, and maladministration should be exposed. The concealment of truth, or, worse yet, the dissemination of error, should be repudiated as an instrument of governmental policy.

Over the past 8 months I have had a most frustrating experience with the Food and Drug Administration. Personnel in that agency have followed a policy of official deafness and calculated obtuseness that defies credibility.

The full story began a long time ago, but a convenient beginning point for my narrative is October 25, 1963, when the FDA released a progress report on its "Campaign Against Nutritional Quackery" in connection with the Second National Congress on Medical Quackery held in Washington, D.C., under joint sponsorship of the FDA and the American Medical Association.

Among other things, this report warned against what the FDA still calls the soil depletion myth. One statement in the report seemed to me and to many of my well-informed friends to be difficult to defend:

> The facts are that research has demonstrated that the nutritional values of our crops are not significantly affected by the soil or the kind of fertilizer used. Only the yield is affected. Lack of iodine in soil or water, of course, has been shown to cause goiter, but this is the only disease definitely associated with soil deficiency.

May I say, in passing, that any proven relationship between soil composition and the nutritional value of food becomes a matter of great significance. The food industry, considered collectively, is the largest single industry in the United States. Gross annual food sales are approximately $65 billion. That industry has done an excellent job of making America the best-fed Nation in the world, but the question has been seriously asked, by experts, whether this industry may not have spent a disproportionate amount of time and effort in improving eye-appeal, convenience, storability, and packaging, at the expense of effort which might have been spent in improving the nutritional quality of food. We are not splitting hairs, or magnifying molehills. We are raising a question which might determine the direction in which the largest industry in this Nation will travel for generations to come. The FDA, by use of the above and other similar language, has indicated one clear course for the food industry to follow. The facts which I am about to discuss raise the serious question whether the FDA, in so doing, has acted with complete candor.

I willingly concede that there is a sharp divergence of opinion among the experts on the question whether depleted or contaminated soils may produce food deficient in nutritional value. In my discussion, I do not take sides in that controversy. I assert only that the paramount importance of the subject requires that all persons concerned act with complete candor. The public interest requires nothing less.

In an attempt to resolve this conflict, I sought a conference with the FDA personnel when I returned to Congress last year to discuss the aforesaid statement.

On May 5, 1965, Dr. Phillip L. Harris, Director of the Division of Nutrition of the Food and Drug Administration, along with Dr. Homer Hopkins of the division staff, joined the members of my staff, and me, in a conference. Dr. Harris and Dr. Hopkins, both of whom are distinguished men in the field of nutrition, listened respectfully and sympathetically to my objections to the categorical nature of the aforesaid FDA statement. Without making any commitment, they agreed to review the problem to see if the FDA might reconsider its official view of the matter.

I was later told, unofficially, that on or about June 11, 1965, Dr. Hopkins, at the request of Dr. Harris, had prepared an interoffice scientific memorandum, which held that the FDA position could not be defended. I was also told that an official report would be sent to me within a few days.

A few days became a few weeks; and on July 9, I wrote to Dr. Harris asking for information about the progress of their review of the interrelationship between soil quality and nutritive value of food.

Another month of silence elapsed.

Finally on August 12, I wrote and asked when I might expect a reply to my letter of July 9. When I still received no acknowledgment, I instructed one of my staff to call the Assistant Commissioner's office on the telephone.

The Assistant Commissioner said that a reply by Dr. Harris to my July 9 letter had been sent on July 28. I had never received that letter in my office, so I asked for another copy. When it arrived, I was disappointed to find it devoid of substance. In it, Dr. Harris said:

> We in the Division of Nutrition are actively reviewing and evaluating literature, much of it very recent, on this subject. We hope to complete the review shortly and will be glad to let you hear further from us at that time.

I confess that I was taken aback by the fact that over 3 months had elapsed since my conference with Dr. Harris and Dr. Hopkins, and over 2 months since Dr. Hopkins had drafted an interoffice memo covering the subject in question.

When one of my staff questioned the delay by phone on August 18, the Assistant Commissioner assured him that a definite decision on the subject could be expected within about 10 days after then, that is, by August 28. When I had received no word from anyone by September 8, I wrote again, this time to the Assistant Commissioner. A copy of my letter follows:

SEPTEMBER 8, 1965.

Mr. WINTON B. RANKIN,
Assistant Commissioner for Planning,
Food and Drug Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RANKIN: As I understand it, Dr. Homer Hopkins, staff assistant to Dr. Phillip Harris, Director of the Division of Nutrition of the Food and Drug Administration, prepared a report on or about June 1 relating to the subject of the influence of soil upon the nutritional quality of food.

As I further understand it, this report purported to conflict with a previous statement of the Food and Drug Administration to the effect that the quality of soil affected the quantity but not the quality of food grown thereon.

As a result of this apparent conflict, the Food and Drug Administration decided to review its statement of policy, in the light of the aforesaid report of Dr. Hopkins.

On August 18, you were kind enough to discuss this matter with my administrative assistant, Mr. Frank Mensel, at which time you indicated to him that a report would be forthcoming within 10 days.

It is possible that the report has already issued, without my being aware of it. This letter is to indicate to you my great interest in this subject. I would appreciate a copy of your report or, if it has not yet issued, then a statement from you as to when you believe it will be forthcoming. To me, this is a matter of the greatest possible public concern.

Very sincerely yours,
DAVID S. KING,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, again the curtain of silence fell.

About a month later I felt that I must press for some resolution of the affair. An article entitled "The Bunk About Health Foods" in the AMA publication Today's Health, which appeared about that time, reasserted the old line that there was no relationship between soil composition and the nutritional value of foods. So—I wrote to Mr. Rankin again, on October 5, and cited that article. In my letter I pointed out that the very premise of the article was under review by the FDA. I concluded with the following paragraph:

> I hope you share my concern over what appears to be an alarming inconsistency between the positions taken by nutritional authors. The American people, it would seem to me, are entitled to have this inconsistency resolved immediately. It has been approximately 4 months, as I understand, since Dr. Hopkins completed his report. I understand that reviewing matters of this magnitude consumes time. I would hope, however, that the importance of this subject matter would entitle it to more than routine consideration. I would be grateful if you would let me know the date on which you feel this matter might reasonably be expected to be resolved.

The very afternoon that the above letter was mailed, I received the following letter in the mail which I quote in full:

OCTOBER 1, 1965.

Hon. DAVID S. KING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KING: This replies to your letter of September 8, 1965, about the effect of soil quality upon the quality of food grown on the soil.

We are reviewing this matter but have not yet found any basis for revising the Food and Drug Administration's position. There was obviously a misunderstanding between Mr. Mensel, of your office, and Mr. Smart, of mine, when they discussed this matter by telephone. Mr. Smart did not intend to convey the impression that we would have a report within 10 days.

The study mentioned in our letter of July 28, 1965, to you is still underway. We will be glad to advise your office as soon as it is completed.

Sincerely yours,
W. B. RANKIN,
Assistant Commissioner for Planning.

Mr. Speaker, I immediately sent the following reply:

OCTOBER 6, 1965.

Mr. WINTON B. RANKIN,
Assistant Commissioner for Planning, Food and Drug Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RANKIN: Since writing to you on October 5 about the article in the October edition of Today's Health and asking again for some indication of when the report of Dr. Homer Hopkins, assistant to Dr. Phillip Harris, would be considered and its results promulgated by the Food and Drug Administration, I received your letter, stamped October 1, but otherwise undated, which is a reply to my letter of September 8.

Among other things, you mention that there was "obviously" a misunderstanding between Mr. Mensel of my office and Mr. Smart of yours when they discussed the matter by telephone. In the interim, a member of my staff also had a conversation with Mr. Maurice Kinslow about this matter. Mr. Kinslow was vague and indefinite in his comments about the forthcoming report, as was your letter. May I respectfully suggest that 4 months seems an adequate time for a thorough review of the implications of Dr. Hopkins' report. I should very much like more definite assurance of when the study will be completed. Could you please answer immediately what your plans are in this matter?

Very sincerely yours,

David S. King,
Member of Congress.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, on October 20 after several additional telephone calls, the answer I had anticipated for so long arrived:

Hon. David S. King,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman King: This in in response to your letters of October 5, 1965, and October 6, 1965, and our telephone conversation this morning.

We have been reviewing the available scientific literature regarding the relationship between the nutritive qualities of foods and the chemical composition of the soil upon which these foods are grown. We have found no scientific evidence to indicate that there is any significant effect on the nutritive level of the U.S. dietary which can be related to the nutritive value of crops grown upon different soils. The iodine content of some foods is influenced by soil composition but this is of no practical significance at this time.

This reaffirms our present position on this entire matter. This position is in agreement with the views of our Dr. Homer Hopkins.

Sincerely yours,

W. B. Rankin,
Assistant Commissioner for Planning.

I am sure you understand my disappointment and vexation. Why had it taken 4 months to arrive at such a conclusion? Why did the Assistant Commissioner conclude that the official position of the FDA is "in agreement with the views of Dr. Homer Hopkins?" It had been my understanding that Dr. Hopkins' report was at variance with the FDA statement.

Accordingly, I immediately dispatched the following letter:

October 21, 1965.

Mr. Winton B. Rankin,
Assistant Commissioner for Planning,
Food and Drug Administration,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Rankin: I have just received your letter of October 20.

Would you please send me by return messenger a copy of the Interoffice Scientific Memorandum by Dr. Homer Hopkins, dated about June 11, 1965, so that I can determine for myself whether or not your most recent letter accurately reflects Dr. Hopkins' views.

Sincerely yours,

David S. King,
Member of Congress.

Again the curtain of silence fell.

When 2 more weeks passed without even the courtesy of an acknowledgement, I decided more drastic action was necessary.

On November 9, I sent the following wire to the Assistant Commissioner:

Mr. Winton B. Rankin,
Assistant Commissioner for Planning,
Food and Drug Administration,
Washington, D.C.

On October 21 I sent you, by messenger, a request for a copy of the interoffice scientific memorandum by Dr. Homer Hopkins dated June 11, 1965. So far I have not even had the courtesy of an acknowledgement of my letter. Would you please send a copy of the memorandum as soon as possible.

On November 10 I followed up with this telegram:

Mr. Winton B. Rankin,
Assistant Commissioner for Planning,
Food and Drug Administration,
Washington, D.C.

I am still waiting for acknowledgement of my letter for a copy of the June 11 interoffice scientific memorandum by Dr. Homer Hopkins. Would you please respond?

On November 12, my patience was wearing thin, and I sent the following by Western Union:

Mr. Winton B. Rankin,
Assistant Commissioner for Planning,
Food and Drug Administration,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Rankin: Are you alive? I still have not received acknowledgement of my communications with you regarding the interoffice scientific memorandum of June 11 written by Dr. Homer Hopkins.

I wrote you a letter on October 21 and have sent wires on November 9 and 10. Today I renew my request for a copy of Dr. Hopkins' memo. Would you please send the memo to me at once.

On November 15, I directed my appeal to Commissioner Larrick:

Commissioner George P. Larrick,
Food and Drug Administration,
Washington, D.C.:

In a letter delivered by special messenger on October 21 and in telegrams sent on November 9, 10, and 12, I requested Mr. Rankin to furnish me a copy of the interoffice scientific memorandum written by Dr. Homer Hopkins on or about June 11.

I have not received the memo, nor have my communications been acknowledged. Would you be so kind as to send the memo to me or to advise me at once why your office cannot comply with my request.

Finally on November 23, I directed a wire to Secretary John W. Gardner:

Hon. John W. Gardner,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: On five different occasions since October 21, I have requested through the mail and by wire that the office of the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration supply me with a copy of an interoffice scientific memorandum dated approximately June 11 and written by Dr. Homer Hopkins regarding the relationship of soil fertility and nutritional values of food. To this date I have not even had the courtesy of an acknowledgment.

I would be grateful if you would ask the Commissioner to send me the memo or to inform my office of the reason that it cannot be made available to me.

Sincerely,

David S. King,
Member of Congress.

Within a week the following letter from then Acting Commissioner Rankin was hand delivered to my office, along with a copy of Dr. Hopkins' memo and a copy of another memo from Dr. William H. Summerson, Director of the Bureau of Scientific Research of the FDA, to Dr. Harris, Director of the Division of Nutrition:

November 30, 1965.

Hon. David S. King,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. King: In accordance with your recent requests, we enclose a copy of the interoffice memorandum dated June 11, 1965, from Dr. H. Hopkins to Dr. Phillip Harris, Director of FDA's Division of Nutrition, on the subject "Report on the Question of Soils and Fertilizers in Relation to the Quantity and Chemical Composition of Foods of Plant Origin and Other Questions." Attached to the copy of Dr. Hopkins' memorandum is a memorandum dated November 2, 1965, from Dr. W. H. Summerson, Director of the Bureau of Scientific Research, FDA, addressed to Dr. Harris, which calls attention to the fact that Dr. Hopkins' memorandum is not an adequate summary of the topic and contains errors of interpretation. Since Dr. Hopkins' memorandum is not an adequate presentation, and does not reflect FDA views we have not released it publicly.

We have delayed the reply to your requests in the hope that we would be able to supply a review of the subject that is suitable for public release. Since this is not available now, we are forwarding the Hopkins memorandum as requested even though it does not reflect FDA's position.

The attached copy of a recent report by the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture entitled, "The Effect of Soils and Fertilizers on the Nutritional Quality of Plants," will be of interest. On page 2 of the report there is the statement: "As far as the people of the United States are concerned, our varied diet, composed of animal products, fish, plants, and plant products, originating in different parts of the country, makes it very unlikely that the deficiencies of any one kind of soil will have an adverse effect on human nutrition." You will find that not only this quoted statement, but also the entire document are in harmony with the views FDA has held and does hold.

Sincerely yours,

W. B. Rankin.

I am incorporating the text of the Hopkins and the Summerson memorandums into my own remarks, at the end.

Though I will not take time here to read these documents in full, I should like to call your attention to at least one passage in Dr. Hopkins' memo and to recall the concluding sentence of Mr. Rankin's letter of October 21.

Dr. Hopkins' memo begins:

REPORT ON THE QUESTION OF SOILS AND FERTILIZERS IN RELATIONS TO THE QUANTITY AND CHEMICAL COMPOSITION OF FOODS OF PLANT ORIGIN, AND OTHER QUESTIONS

This report is submitted in compliance with your request.

Because of the paucity of information dealing with soils and fertilizers in relation to human health and nutrition, I have interpreted the term "nutritional values of our crops," given in the FDA Progress Report entitled "FDA's Campaign Against Nutritional Quackery," dated October 1963 [Food and Drug Administration, DHEW, Second National Congress on Medical Quackery, Washington, D.C., Oct. 25–26, 1963, p. 11], to mean "chemical composition of our crops." Viewed in these terms, the statement that "the nutritional values of our crops are not significantly affected by either the soil or kind of fertilizer used" [ibid.], cannot be defended.

Too few well designed, all-encompassing experiments in human nutrition have been conducted in the United States, over sufficiently long periods of time, to fully document the generalization that "the nutritional values of our crops are not significantly affected by either the soil or kind of fertilizer used" [ibid.]. The catch phrase in this statement, by all odds, appears to be "significantly affected," because it connotes that the author has knowledge of a sufficient number of experiments so carefully designed as to measure not only the amounts of all the essential nutrients in both staple and protective food items of the human diet, but also, to evaluate the nutritional adequacy of the nutritive and nonnutritive components of that diet, as well as the nutritional status of the test subjects being fed that diet. Furthermore, the statement appears to connote that each analytical observation has been evaluated statistically, permitting one to generalize within well-defined confidence limits. Encompassing experiments of such magnitude have not been published, as far as I can determine.

Let me repeat three points made earlier. Before I received a copy of Dr. Hopkins' memo, the Assistant Commissioner wrote on October 20:

> We have found no scientific evidence to indicate that there is any significant effect on the nutritive value of the U.S. dietary which can be related to the nutritive value of crops group upon different soils. * * * This affirms our present position on this entire matter. This position [FDA position] is in agreement with the views of our Dr. Homer Hopkins.

The Hopkins memo, part of which I quoted above said:

> The statement that "the nutritional values of our crops are not significantly affected by either the soil or kind of fertilizer used" cannot be defended.

In the November 30 letter of transmittal accompanying the memo, the Assistant Commissioner reversed himself by claiming that Dr. Hopkins' memo does not reflect FDA views." In fact, he makes the point twice in that letter of transmittal.

I do not intend to let the matter stand.

My reason for speaking out today, Mr. Speaker, is not to establish a particular point of view on the relationship of soil fertility and the nutritive value of food—though I believe firmly that such a relationship does exist and that meaningful and valid research demonstrating that relationship has been conducted and reported. I believe also, as Dr. Hopkins stated in his memo, that further research in this area should be encouraged; but, I repeat, to promote that view is not my reason for speaking out today.

I rise today to protest as vigorously as I can, evasion and deception by Federal agencies. I am afraid my experience with the Food and Drug Administration is all too typical.

I do not wish to single out the Food and Drug Administration for criticism. Above all, I do not wish to impugn any individuals in the FDA. I believe that differences of opinion which exist between people in the FDA and others are honest differences.

I share with all Americans gratitude for the great work done by FDA officials in protecting our citizens from impure foods and dangerous drugs.

But I do not think the FDA is infallible. I would like to think that persons in that agency—and in all public agencies—are reasonable human beings who can adjust to changing conditions. I would like to think that they would dare admit that a difference of opinion could exist between their own personnel.

I am happy to note the appointment of a new Commissioner for FDA. I am hopeful that his tenure will be marked by a continuation of the great work for which they are justly famous. But I am more hopeful that there will be added a new policy of candor and cooperation.

Report on the Question of Soils and Fertilizers in Relation to the Quantity and Chemical Composition of Foods of Plant Origin, and Other Questions

June 11, 1965.

Dr. Philip L. Harris,
Director, Division of Nutrition, BSR.
Dr. Edwin L. Hove,
Chief, Nutrition Research Branch, DON.
Dr. Homer Hopkins,
Nutrition Research Branch, DON.

This report is submitted in compliance with your request.

Because of the paucity of information dealing with soils and fertilizers in relation to human health and nutrition, I have interpreted the term "nutritional values of our crops," given in the FDA progress report entitled "FDA's Campaign Against Nutritional Quackery," dated October 1963,[1] to mean "chemical composition of our crops." Viewed in these terms, the statement that "the nutritional values of our crops are not significantly affected by either the soil or kind of fertilizer used," [1] cannot be defended.

Too few well designed, all encompassing experiments in human nutrition have been conducted in the United States, over sufficiently long periods of time, to fully document the generalization that "the nutritional values of our crops are not significantly affected by either the soil or kind of fertilizer used." [1] The "catch-phrase" in this statement, by all odds, appears to be "significantly affected," because it connotes that the author has knowledge of a sufficient number of experiments so carefully designed as to measure not only the amounts of all the essential nutrients in both staple and protective food items of the human diet, but also, to evaluate the nutritional adequacy of the nutritive and nonnutritive components of that diet, as well as the nutritional status of the test subjects being fed that diet. Furthermore, the statement appears to connote that each analytical observation has been evaluated statistically, permitting one to generalize within well-defined confidence limits. Encompassing experiments of such magnitude have not been published, as far as I can determine.

Quotations from a number of references concerning soils and fertilizers in relation to quantity and chemical composition of foods of plant origin have been paraphased as follows: (No attempt has been made at completeness of documentation, since this effort would involve the expenditure of excessive time.) * * *

Addition of gypsum (calcium sulfate) to the soil had no effect on the calcium content of turnip greens grown at three different soil locations in Mississippi. Application of nitrogen fertilizers to these soils, however, significantly lowered the calcium content of turnip greens.[2]

A highly significant positive relationship was found between soil organic matter and iron content of turnip greens.[3]

Additions of calcium carbonate to North Carolina soils resulted in marked increases in the calcium content of crops grown there. In a very deficient soil, application of a plant nutrient will result in an increase in yield of a crop. As the supply of the deficient element in the soil was increased, a point was reached, ultimately, where both the yield of the crop and the concentration of the element in the crop increased. Finally, a point was reached where further increases in the supply of an element did not bring about further increases in yield. The element in question then continued to increase inside the plant tissues, until the element became toxic to the crop. Application of large amounts of cobalt to a soil produced a lower manganese content of timothy plants growing on that soil. Addition of nitrogen fertilizer to a soil corrected an iron deficiency of crops growing thereon, and gave a higher carotene content in the leaves. Applications of boron to boron deficient soils resulted in an increase in chlorophyll and carotene content of alfalfa plants. Any fertilizer practice resulting in optimum yields will probably result in an optimum vitamin content of a crop, depending upon the variety and environmental conditions existing during the growth period. Fertilization of corn with nitrogen fertilizers will increase the concentration of the protein Zein in the grain. Application of phosphate fertilizer to soils deficient in phosphorus, increased the phosphorus content of soybean plants. Application of calcium to soils in which lespedeza was growing, resulted in increased calcium and phosphorus contents of the hay. Application of 40 tons of barnyard manure to potato soils on Long Island, N.Y., resulted in doubling the iron content of potatoes grown there.[4]

Composition of roughages may be affected greatly by the amount of plant food in the soil.[5]

The average molybdenum content of grass associated with "teart" diarrhea was 33 ppm. and in "nonteart" localities, 5 ppm.[6]

Thiamine content of oats and millet was approximately doubled by application of nitrogen and potassium fertilizers on poor soils.[7]

Methionine and cystine content of two alfalfa strains may be approximately doubled by increasing the sulfate content of the rooting medium in which the alfalfa is grown.[8]

Environmental factors of soil and climate affected pantothenate content of wheat grain; genetic factors were of little consequence in altering pantothenate content.[9]

A large number of reports are available on the relationship between soils and the health and nutrition of animals. Findings from several of the more carefully designed experiments are reported here, because, even though not strictly applicable to humans, nevertheless, the information is thought provoking. Emphasis in reports cited here is placed on the nutritional adequacy of dietary components produced under well defined soil conditions, and then incorporated into the animal diet. In general, these findings suggest that the nutritional adequacy of animal feeds is profoundly influenced by the soil in which it is grown. May I emphasize again, however, that the complexity of this problem area is also very great. For one thing, it is oftentimes difficult to sharply separate bonafide soil differences from climatic factors impinging upon a given soil.

Growth of rats fed turnip greens grown on a cobalt deficient soil in Georgia was depressed. Cobalt deficiency in the soil was associated with the absence of vitamin B_{12} in turnip greens grown on these soils. Lambs gained little weight when fed hay grown on soils low in available phosphorus. Rabbits fed this same hay developed weak bones. In New England, when timothy hay harvested from a soil that had received heavy applications of fertilizer was fed to calves, a goiter-like enlargement of the thyroid occurred. The calves failed to gain weight normally until other hay was substituted. Similar results were obtained with rabbits fed timothy hay grown on soils treated with heavy applications of commercial fertilizer. Significantly better growth of rabbits was obtained when these animals were fed lespedeza hay grown on soils receiving the highest lime application rates. Analysis of the lespedeza hay grown on unlimed soils from the same area was high and not a factor limiting the growth of rabbits. The conclusion from this work was that liming of the soil altered the composition of other nutrients in the hay, which in turn, enhanced the growth of rabbits in comparison to controls.[10]

---

[1] Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 2d National Congress on Medical Quackery, Washington, D.C., Oct. 25–26, 1963, p. 11.

[2] Sheets, O. A., et al., Journal, Agricultural Research, 68: 1945 (1944).

[3] Speirs, M., et al., Southern Cooperative Series Bulletin 2 (1944).

[4] Beeson, Kenneth C., Michigan State University Centennial Symposium on Nutrition of Plants, Animals, Man (1955).

[5] Morrison, F. B., "Feeds and Feeding," 21st ed. (1951).

[6] Ferguson, W. S., et al., Journal, Agricultural Science, 38; 44 (1943).

[7] Scharrer, K., et al., Z. fur Pflanzenernahrung, 67: 166 (1954).

[8] Tiedale, S. L., et al., Agron Journal, 42: 221 (1950).

[9] Topley, L. J., et al. Journal Nutrition, 24: 167 (1942).

Hypomagnesemia, or grass tetany occurred in animals fed on grasslands heavily fertilized with potassium fertilizer.[11]

Barley grain containing low, medium and high protein levels was obtained by application of 20, 40, and 60 pounds nitrogen fertilizer per acre. Rat growth and feed efficiency improved with increases in protein levels in barley.[12]

Application of potassium fertilizers at practical rates on sheep pastures had no effect on sheep plasma magnesium levels.[13]

In a study on six grassland farms, nitrogen fertilizer applied at the rate of 200 kilograms/hectare resulted in high production per animal and improved animal health.[14]

The chemical composition of forages may be altered by fertilization of soil. Application of a plant nutrient to soils, in quantities greater than those required for maximum yield response usually resulted in luxury consumption of the nutrient by the plant. Biological assays showed that forages grown on sandy soils when fed to guinea pigs, had lower biological value than forages grown on clayey soils.[15]

One reference dealing with dental caries in humans was found, as follows: Lower incidence of dental caries was observed in areas containing soils lifted above sea level by an earthquake in 1931. This difference in caries incidence was apparently due to higher intakes of molybdenum contained in vegetables grown on these soils as compared to soils normal to the region.[16]

REPORT ON RELATIONSHIP OF SOIL AND PLANT COMPOSITION, BY DR. H. HOPKINS, JUNE 11, 1965

NOVEMBER 2, 1965.

DR. PHILIP L. HARRIS,
Director, Division of Nutrition.
WILLIAM H. SUMMERSON, PH. D.,
Director, Bureau of Scientific Research:

In accordance with your request of October 19, 1965, I have reviewed Dr. Hopkins' memorandum dated June 11, 1965, subject "Report on the Question of Soils and Fertilizers in Relation to the Quantity and Chemical Composition of Foods of Plant Origin, and Other Questions."

In my opinion, Dr. Hopkins has missed several important points in this matter. His interpretation of the term "nutritional values of our crops" to mean "chemical composition of our crops" has led him into a relatively narrow field of nutrition and one in which there have been no real differences of scientific opinion for at least 20 years. It has been generally well recognized that measurable differences in the content of specific nutrients in plants can be associated with local variations in soil chemistry. As you know, a number of important nutritional discoveries have resulted directly from the study of the incidence of a dietary disease in relation to its occurrence in specific local areas. Dr. Hopkins' review therefore is essentially a summary of information on one aspect of nutrition which is already well established. As to the quality of Dr. Hopkins' review, I do not know what guidelines you set for the review. As I read the review, I find that it is quite informal in style, I question the completeness of the survey, and I can detect no signs of critical evaluation of the validity of the evidence cited. I feel therefore that Dr. Hopkins' memorandum in its present form is not an adequate summary of the topic he is considering and I recommend that a more comprehensive and critical review be prepared if it is intended to summarize for publication the present state of knowledge regarding the relation between the chemical composition of crops and the chemical nature of the soil upon which these crops are grown.

I also wish to take issue with the second paragraph of Dr. Hopkins' memorandum in which he gives his interpretation of the meaning of the term "significantly affected" in the sentence. "The nutritional values of our crops are not significantly affected by either the soil or kind of fertilizer used." Dr. Hopkins is interpreting the term significant in its strict statistical sense, as most scientists do. However, the sentence in question was not published as part of a technical article on the subject but rather in material intended for the lay public. In this context, the significance of variations in the nutritive qualities of foods is related to any impact on the general health rather than to a specific evaluation of technical data. I feel therefore that Dr. Hopkins has misinterpreted the sentence in question and that his comments are incorrect.

In view of the above, I am returning Dr. Hopkins' memorandum to you with the recommendation that no further attempt be made to prepare this material in a form suitable for publication, since such a publication would cover too restricted a technical area to justify the effort, and would represent essentially a confirmation of facts already known and accepted. What is needed, I believe, is a more comprehensive evaluation of the present state of knowledge regarding the effect on the nutritional level of the present U.S. dietary which is or can be associated with known variations in the nutritive values of foods grown on different soils, and the practical significance of such effects.

I understand that you plan such a review. I trust that it can be completed as soon as possible consistent with completeness, accuracy, and scientific objectivity.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE BUDGET ACT

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, today I have again introduced House Joint Resolution 836, which would require the President to update his January budget each year in May. This updating would be one means of assisting Congress to more intelligently act on appropriation requests and on legislative proposals which would either revise or expand existing programs or initiate new ones.

More than ever before, it seems to me, the need for updating the budget along about midway of the session is a pressing one. As I said here on January 24 when the 1967 budget was submitted to Congress, it contains a number of revenue assumptions and proposed expenditure reductions that are as iffy as any I have ever seen presented to Congress.

Several special one-shot proposals help to forecast a relatively modest budget deficit of $1.8 billion for 1967.

For example, on the receipts side the deficit is reduced by the $3.6 billion speedup in the collection of corporation and individual income taxes. It is further reduced by the $1.2 billion above-normal seigniorage receipts from the minting of new coins which was authorized last year. Without these one-shot deals the deficit would be $6.6 billion.

On the expenditure side, the above-normal sales of loan assets held by Federal agencies will have the effect of reducing spending and the deficit by $2.8 billion.

It follows that without the one-shot receipts of $4.8 billion and the above-normal sales of $2.8 billion of loan assets, the budget deficit would be a whopping $9.4 billion in 1967.

Even that does not tell the whole story with respect to the possible budget deficit next year. It does not, because the administration is relying on Congress to reimpose certain automobile and telephone excises and to impose additional transportation excises and user charges. It is also relying on Congress to help effect certain expenditure reductions that may or may not be accomplished.

To the extent that Congress does not approve these recommendations and the administration is unable to market its loan assets and effect other planned economies, the budget deficit in 1967 will be increased. Thus, updating the budget in May would provide Congress with current information that would be of inestimable guidance value with respect to subsequent decisions that we would be called upon to render.

As concerned as I am over the tenuous revenue and expenditure assumptions in the 1967 budget, I am even more concerned over the obvious budget plans for substantial growth in Federal expenditures in the years immediately following fiscal 1967.

In fiscal 1964 new obligational authority provided, obligations incurred, and actual expenditures did not differ greatly in amount. For that year, Congress provided $101 billion of new obligational authority, the administration committed $98.7 billion for expenditure, and they actually spent $97.7 billion. This would indicate no great change in 1965 expenditures as compared to 1964, and the actual result was an expenditure reduction of $1.2 billion in 1965.

---

[10] Beeson, Kenneth C., Agricultural Research, 4: 3 (1955).

[11] T'Hart, M. L., Proceedings, 7th International Grasslands Congress (1956).

[12] McDeath, D. K., et al., Canadian Journal Animal Science, 40: 57 (1960).

[13] Hemingway, R. G., et al., Journal Agricultural Science, 60: 307 (1963).

[14] Maley, H. van der, Journal British Grasslands Society, 18: 235 (1964).

[15] Ward, George M., Journal Dairy Science, 42: 277 (1959). (176 references.)

[16] Healy, W. B., et al. Soil Science (New Zealand), 92: 359 (1961).

But what is the situation with respect to the years 1965 through 1967? I can tell you that it shows marked differences between the provision and commitment of funds and their actual expenditure. The following table details the situation:

[In billions]

Fiscal year	New obligational authority	Obligations incurred	Expenditures
1965 actual	$106.6	$104.6	$96.5
1966 estimate	126.0	125.3	106.4
1967 estimate	121.9	124.4	112.8
Total	354.5	354.3	315.7

These figures indicate that the new obligational authority provided in the 3 years 1965 through 1967 is to be largely committed for expenditure in the years for which it has been requested. Both the new obligational authority and the obligations incurred total $354 billion. Because of the leadtime from contract commitment to delivery, expenditures for the 3 years total only $316 billion, or $38 billion less.

Further support of this conclusion is the fact that for the 6 years 1960–65, the unobligated funds carried forward each year averaged more than 44 percent of the new obligational authority provided. For the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, the carryover of unobligated funds is estimated to equal only 36 percent of new spending authority provided. Thus, the commitment of new spending authority in 1966 and 1967, respectively, will rise to about two-thirds of the funds provided in those years.

It is quite clear from these facts that, if Congress approves the spending plans in the 1967 budget, expenditures in 1968 will far exceed the $112.8 billion scheduled for 1967. Moreover, there will be further increases in 1969 that may very well carry budget expenditures to a level of more than $120 billion.

Spending of this magnitude makes it imperative that we in Congress be kept fully and currently informed by the administration on the condition of the economy and on changes in revenue assumptions and proposed expenditures, as well as program revisions that may be made subsequent to submission of the budget in January.

A graphic illustration of the value of the midsession budget review is the situation which developed with respect to the budget for this year. When the budget for fiscal 1966 was submitted to Congress a year ago in January, the administration estimated it would spend $99.7 billion during the year. Since then the estimate has been raised to $106.4 billion, of which $4.7 billion is attributed to the war in Vietnam and $2 billion is for other spending. If Congress had been informed midway in its last session that nonwar spending was expected to increase by $2 billion, it would have been in a position to alter its course of legislative activity to the end that deficit spending could have been held to a level much lower than the $6.4 billion that is forecast for this year.

In a letter dated April 26, 1963, to the distinguished chairman of the Government Operations Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], the Director of the Budget Bureau analyzed my midsession budget review proposal. At that time the Budget Bureau suggested that the proposal be revised to provide for the review between May 1 and June 1 rather than between May 1 and 20 of each year. It was felt that the additional 10 days in May would facilitate the compilation of budget receipts following the April 15 deadline for filing calendar year tax returns. I am happy to acquiesce in the Budget Bureau's suggestion and have so amended the provisions of the resolution.

During the hearings held last year by the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, our distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], testified with respect to appropriations matters. I am happy to say that he included my proposal in his recommendations for improving the appropriations process. At the hearing on August 17 he said:

> In contrast to the comprehensive spending plan in the President's annual budget, coordinated as it is with the revenue outlook and related to the economy of the country, the spending side of the budget, while processed in light of the overall budget guidelines and recommendations, is, as we know, nonetheless considered by the Congress on a piecemeal basis in many bills over a period of several months. Being thus fractionalized, there are no regulated, periodic updatings or status-up-to-now readings on the overall situation. It is in the area of overview that I think some study of informational improvements might usefully be made. You may remember Lincoln's observation: "If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it."
>
> I suggest study be given to the merit of some formally prescribed requirement that the President along about midsession, or a little later, update his earlier annual budget outlook for the further guidance of the Congress. Underlying economic assumptions may change; expenditure estimates are seldom static; appropriations are moving through the mill; significant decisions on new legislation with budget impact may have been taken; revenues may be lagging or otherwise. There have been times when such an updating—and it could be in highly summarized form—would have been significantly revealing in terms of changed outlook for whatever guidance it might be to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, my proposal will provide Congress with a much needed tool to aid us in discharging our responsibilities to the American taxpayers and I urge its prompt adoption.

SUPPORT OUR LAW OFFICERS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, increasing crime is one of the greatest problems facing the people of the United States today. Virtually every category of crime is on the increase. We are in the midst of a crime wave which has reached major proportions. In some of our large cities law-abiding citizens constantly live in fear of their lives and property. Doors are bolted and barred at sundown. People are afraid to walk the public streets and attend public functions. People have been robbed here in the shadow of the Nation's Capitol. Congressional employees have been the victims of robbery and attempted rape—one while praying in church in broad daylight during her lunch hour.

The United States has the worst crime rate of any major country in the world. It is a growing problem and, if permitted to continue, can undermine the stability, security, and prestige of our country. It is serious and deserves the immediate attention of Congress, the States, and local governments throughout this Nation.

Congress will at this session consider the problem of firearms being sent across State lines to minors, the mentally ill, convicted criminals and subversive organizations. Congress will consider further legislation to provide technical training and work camps for school dropouts. The Congress may even consider Federal aid to local and State law-enforcement agencies.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation is a model for law enforcement. The FBI, under the dynamic leadership of J. Edgar Hoover, is prepared for any Communist, Fascist, or terrorist plot to subvert our American way of life. The FBI works closely with local and State law-enforcement agencies. It is pursuing a relentless campaign against crime. The FBI will continue to receive the enthusiastic support of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we profess to be for law and order. Now is the time to prove we are for law and order. We can prove it throughout the United States by doubling the salary of our policemen and highway patrolmen. We can prove it by increasing the salary of our deputy sheriffs and members of State law-enforcement agencies. We can prove it by furnishing better equipment. We can prove it by providing better training.

We must encourage our best men to remain in law enforcement by providing adequate retirement and survivor benefits. Law officers are entitled to a career of dignity. They deserve the respect and gratitude of every loyal citizen. Their families deserve at least some measure of security and assurance for the future.

An investment in law enforcement is one of the greatest investments we can make. It is an investment in the future. It is an investment in security. It is an investment in freedom. It is an investment in moral, educational, and spiritual advancement.

The first line of American defense against communism, nazism, fascism, and subversion is law enforcement at the local and State level. Law enforcement is the first line of defense to protect our security when threatened by mobs, beatniks, peaceniks, and so-called peace demonstrators who would create chaos and aid the enemy while our country is in war.

The best insurance against accidents on the highways is adequate law enforcement. Accidents are taking the lives of thousands and crippling millions annually.

Law enforcement is being hampered by those who plead the fifth amendment. Communist, Nazi, and related organizations cover up their activities by pleading the fifth. They have something to hide. Any loyal American will tell the truth about Communist or Nazist subversion or about terrorist organizations when called upon by committees of Congress or our law enforcement officers. Crime syndicates are being protected by fifth amendment Americans. Communist hideouts and subversives are being covered up by fifth amendment Americans. Night riders and terrorist organizations are aided by those who plead the fifth.

Crime is as dangerous to the welfare of this Nation as communism, terrorism, or nazism. The time has arrived to launch a nationwide campaign to support our law officers. The future and independence of our country will depend upon the strength of our Armed Forces throughout the world and upon law and order at home.

Mr. Speaker, every American should honor our law enforcement officers during this National Crime Prevention Week. Mr. Speaker, we must honor, cooperate, and support them throughout the year.

SOCIAL SERVICE PROGRAMS

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, at the reconvening of this Congress, I was concerned that those who seek to diminish social service programs would seize upon increased costs of the Vietnam conflict as an excuse to move backward here at home. Accordingly, I was greatly heartened by the President's state of the Union message in which he said:

> This Nation is mighty enough, its society is healthy enough, its people are strong enough to pursue our goals in the rest of the world while still building a Great Society here at home.

He was never more eloquent than when he asked of those who would decrease social services:

> Are they going to sacrifice the children who seek the learning, or the sick who need medical care, or the families who dwell in squalor that are now brightened by the hope of home? Will they sacrifice opportunity for the distressed, the beauty of our land, the hope of our poor?

And then when he said:

> In the name of justice let them call for the contribution of those who live in the fullness of our blessing.

The vast majority of those who I am privileged to represent do not exist in squalor, but they do not live in the fullness of our blessing either. Rather, they are the industrious, hard-pressed wage earners of the city. They live in the households where family income is high enough to ward off the tragedy of poverty but where promise of affluence is far beyond their reach. They are, in fact, the families who possess the strength and desire to be self-supporting but lack the resources to withstand undue financial pressure. The rise in the cost of living presents economic hardships for which they have no resources.

I am sorely troubled by the realization that it is these people who are being asked to bear the brunt of the cost of our international responsibilities.

For example, the projected cut in the school milk program places upon these people the burden of an increase in the cost of the milk their children need. For those in the poverty group, the price of milk will remain the same; for those who do live in the richness of our blessing, the rise in the price of milk will not be noticed and the increased value of their economic holdings will more than offset the increased burden. It is symbolic, and tragically so, that a portion of the cost of the Vietnam conflict should be added to the cost of milk for the children of hard-pressed families.

The same observations can be made with regard to the projected decrease in the Federal program in the field of school lunches. For the people I represent, this is a rise in the cost of survival. It makes the burden of economic self-sufficiency just that much more onerous.

In a similar vein, I have learned that it is probable that the Congress will be asked to reduce Federal aid to public schools in our big cities starting in July 1966. For too many years our major cities have been the victims of discrimination in the Federal program of assisting with the cost of educating the children whose parents live and/or work on Federal property. For the small school districts such assistance is both generous and easily accessible. When the number of such children amounted to 3 or more percent of the total enrollment in a small school district, Federal assistance has been given at a rate high in proportion to the local funds allocated. For the big city school districts, no assistance could be secured because help was not available until the children of federally connected parents totaled 6 percent of the school population—double the rate applicable to the rural schools.

Last year I was happy to support, by voice and vote, the elimination of this source of discrimination against the major cities. For New York City, this was to mean approximately $8 million per year to help with the task of providing adequate public education for the youngsters in the city school system.

I fervently hope that the President will not, as I am informed, ask the Congress to reverse the action it took last year and, once again, to deny to New York and other large cities with 3 percent or more of their schoolchildren from federally connected families the assistance that rural communities receive. As I understand it, the amendment that is expected to be offered would not remove New York and other similarly situated cities from the eligible list for this type of aid but would as of June 30, 1966, effectively reduce the aid they would receive to zero. Under the amendment, New York and other such cities would receive aid under this program only if the percentage of federally connected children in the school system rose to 9 percent, which is of course wholly out of the question.

In my view, large cities such as New York have specially difficult problems to meet which would justify the receipt of special Federal funds, and I introduced legislation last year calling for such special aid. This kind of extra aid had also been recommended by a task force on education appointed by President Kennedy just after his election. All the more reason, then, why the large cities should not be discriminated against in the receipt of Federal funds for education.

I am fearful that there will be other cuts and alterations in domestic programs which will increase the burdens on the wage earners in the major cities. I agree with President Johnson in his judgment that, if sacrifices must be made, they should be made by those who are best able to do so. I submit that the wage earners of New York City and other major metropolitan centers are not in a position where they may reasonably be asked to sacrifice at this stage in our Nation's history.

I would hope that, in the formulation of our domestic programs during this session of the Congress, we will bear in mind that it is not enough to protect the poverty stricken against bearing the burdens of our international responsibilities. It is equally important that we not further depress the living standards of those who, by tremendous personal effort, have barely managed to escape the clutches of poverty. If this happens hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of our fellow citizens may be deprived of their self-respect and of their economic integrity. This would destroy the substance of the Great Society.

STATEMENT BY HON. JOHN B. DUNCAN, DISTINGUISHED COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO THE ARTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RECREATION BOARD

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include as part of my remarks, and to commend to the attention of the Members of this House, the following statement by the Honorable John B. Duncan, the able and distinguished Commissioner of the District of Columbia, to the newly formed Arts Advisory Committee of the District of Columbia Recreation Board, on February 16, 1965.

Commissioner Duncan said that:

> Despite the earnest and continuing efforts of your Commissioners, it was not until recently that we were able to secure congressional approval of an amount specifically earmarked for the arts in the appropriation of the Recreation Department. The amount was modest. Gradually it has been increased. In the current year it is $51,000, and next year, if Congress approves this item in the President's budget, it will be $76,000. Of course, we recognize that even this larger amount is wholly inadequate for the needs, and is completely disproportionate to the great services your organizations provide for our community.
>
> It is this thought which prompts me to say that the work you will be doing with the Recreation Board is of far greater importance than would be suggested by the limited amount of dollars available to you. The success of your program, which is certain to receive wide publicity and public comment, might very well be a key factor in the shaping of congressional attitudes towards appropriations for the arts, both at the District of Columbia and the national level.
>
> In the spirit of close and harmonious association between Government and the arts, I thank you for the service which you have volunteered to our community and I wish Godspeed to your efforts.

Commissioner Duncan is to be complimented for this forthright statement, and he deserves, and I know he has, the united support of the citizens of the District of Columbia, as well as majority support in the Congress, for his position. His views parallel the views expressed by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY in a speech in the Senate on January 13, 1960, when he introduced S. 2796, a bill of great interest to the citizens of the District of Columbia and one which should be revived.

The bill introduced by Vice President HUMPHREY provided:

> There shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury of the United States, to the credit of the Board, 1 mill out of each $1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Board each fiscal year an amount equal to the amount deposited in such special fund during the preceding fiscal year out of such tax revenue. Such appropriated amounts shall also be deposited in such special fund.
>
> All money in the special fund authorized by (this) section shall be available to the Board to defray in part the expense of the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, and other nonprofit art programs of the District of Columbia.

I include at this point excerpts from the significant speech made by Vice President HUMPHREY in 1960 calling for greatly increased aid to the District's own art programs through the District of Columbia Recreation Board.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 13, 1960]

CULTURAL ACTIVITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide that 1 mill out of each $1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia be set aside in a special fund to be used by the Recreation Board for the District of Columbia to defray in part the expenses of the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, and other nonprofit art and cultural programs of the District.

There can be no doubt that the city of Washington is truly one of the most beautiful in the entire world. All who come here are impressed by the city's lovely tree-lined streets, beautiful parks, and its public buildings.

Throughout my service in the Senate, I have consistently supported measures to improve the city of Washington and to make it an even more beautiful and pleasant city in which to live. I shall continue to support such programs because I believe it is in the best interest not only of the city of Washington but the United States itself. After all, Washington is a picture window through which the people of other nations look and draw their judgments about America. Washington should represent the artistic and cultural aspirations of the American people.

Unfortunately, all too little has been done to promote the arts in the Nation's Capital. I was most interested in the study prepared last year by the Library of Congress for Representative HARRIS B. McDOWELL, of Delaware, which revealed that Washington's budget has allotted for civic cultural events only $16,000—of which about $10,000 helps to support the Watergate concerts. As compared with Washington, New York spends $2,600,000, Philadelphia $824,000, and Baltimore $448,000. The small city of Hagerstown, Md., only a short distance from the Nation's Capital, gives its Museum of Fine Arts $12,500 out of its regular annual budget—only $3,500 less than the entire amount that Washington spends out of its more than $200 million budget.

To date, the promotion and financing of opera, ballet, orchestras, and theaters has been left primarily up to the citizens of Washington itself. Precious little has been given by the District government to promote the arts. If any city in the United States should be spending money to promote the arts, it should certainly be Washington, the Capital of the United States. I, therefore, believe it is time that Washington join with other cities of our great country to promote the arts by providing that at least a small portion of tax revenue go for such programs.

Under my bill, 1 mill out of every dollar of tax revenue of the District of Columbia, would be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury of the United States. The money in such fund would be made available to the Recreation Board for the District of Columbia to help in defraying at least in part the expenses of the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, and other nonprofit art programs.

We can be proud of our fine National Symphony Orchestra and of the Corcoran Gallery of Art, but we in the Congress can take little pride in the fact that we as the City Council of Washington have done precious little to promote these institutions and other cultural programs of the District. We have an obligation to join with the citizens of the District to give financial support for the fine arts of Washington.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the study made by the Library of Congress at the request of Representative McDOWELL, to which I have referred, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

Municipal financial support of certain artistic and cultural activities in selected U.S. cities, a compilation of answers to a questionnaire

City	Amount of municipal financial support	Source of municipal financial support	Type of activity supported
Akron, Ohio	$36,000	General fund (indirect support in lieu of tax for facility).	Art museum.
	$5,000,000	Direct tax construction cost	Plans for the construction of a municipal auditorium and "cultural grouping for arts, library and arena."
Atlanta, Ga	1 or 3 parts of a $100,000 recreation program	General fund (part of "recreation program")	Band concerts.
	$7,500	General fund	Atlanta Symphony Guild.
	$6,000	do	Atlanta Pops Concert.
	$5,000	do	Municipal Theater Under-the-Stars.
	$10,000	do	Atlanta Art Association for Benefit High Museum and School of Art.
Baltimore, Md	1959 appropriations:		
	$25,594	do	Municipal Museum.
	$119,994	do	Bureau of Music.
	$288,000	Endowment funds (estimated income)	Walters Art Gallery.
	$15,000	General funds (pensions)	
Birmingham, Ala	$90,000 (this year's appropriation)	General funds	Birmingham Museum of Art.
Buffalo, N.Y	Appropriated in 1958-59:		
	$73,430	Real estate tax and other current revenues	Albright Art Gallery.
	$30,000	do	Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra Society, Inc.
	$27,300	do	Kleinhans Music Hall.
Chicago, Ill	Calendar year 1958:		
	$232,405.87	Payments from Chicago Park District, an independent municipal corporation in the city of Chicago.	Art Institute of Chicago.
	$232.309.11	do	Museum of Science and Industry.
	$232,405.92	do	Chicago Natural History Museum (field museum).
Dallas, Tex	$80,000	General revenues, "the major part of which is ad valorem tax."	Fine Arts Museum.
Detroit, Mich	1959-60 gross appropriation, $543,081	Local taxes, grants and gifts, and revenues	Arts Commission.

EXHIBIT A—Continued

Municipal financial support of certain artistic and cultural activities in selected U.S. cities, a compilation of answers to a questionnaire—Continued

City	Amount of municipal financial support	Source of municipal financial support	Type of activity supported
Evansville, Ind	1959 contribution, $9,200	Civil City of Evansville	Evansville Museum of Arts and Sciences.
	Proposed budget for 1960, $18,400		
	1959 Contribution, $9,200	School City of Evansville [1]	Do.
	Proposed budget for 1960, $18,400		
Hagerstown, Md	$12,500 (provided for in annual budget)	General revenues	Washington County Museum of Fine Arts.
Houston, Tex	$19,500	do	Museum of Natural History.
	$20,000	do	Museum of Fine Arts
	$3,000	do	Civic Theatre.
	$25,000	do	Houston Symphony.
Kansas City, Mo	For fiscal year ended Apr. 30, 1959:		
	$21,211	General fund; park funds	Nelson Art Gallery (buildings and ground maintenance).
	$9,925	General fund	Philharmonic Orchestra (free rent).
	$42,830	General debt and interest fund	Starlight Theater (debt service for facility developed by park department).
	$48,231	General fund	Museum (buildings and ground maintenance).
	$33,502	do	Liberty Memorial (operation and maintenance).
Los Angeles, Calif	Appropriation for fiscal 1959–60: $196,998	General revenues	Department of municipal art; bureau of music.
Newark, N.J	1959 appropriation: $525,426	Tax and general revenues	Newark Museum.
New Orleans, La	$40,000 annually	Appropriated by city	Delgado Museum of Art.
	Appropriated "this year":		
	$5,000	do	New Orleans Philharmonic Society.
	$2,500	do	New Orleans Opera House Association.
	$875	do	Crescent City Concerts.
New York, N.Y	$944,525 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960).	Tax levy and general fund revenues	Metropolitan Museum of Art.
	$904,989 (capital budget, Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959).	Capital allocations	Do.
	$1,329,559 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960).	Tax levy and general fund revenues	American Museum of Natural History.
	$1,071,985 (capital budget, Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959).	Capital allocations	
	$125,140 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960).	Tax levy and general fund revenues	Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Children's Museum.
	$95,866 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960).	do	Brooklyn Institute of Brooklyn Academy of Music.
	$69,510 (capital budget, Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959).	Capital allocations	Do.
	$127,000 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960).	Tax levy and general fund revenues	Museum of the City of New York.
	$50,250 (capital budget, Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959).	Capital allocations	
Norfolk, Va	$2,000	General revenue	Norfolk Symphony Orchestra.
	$69,083	do	Norfolk Museum of Arts and Sciences.
Oakland, Calif	1958–59:		
	Salaries for a professional staff of 6 plus $2,000 allowance for books and $500 for pictures.	Annual appropriations by city council to library department from which library and museums commission adopts an operating budget.	Art and pictures department of main library.
	$70,377	do	Oakland Public Museum.
	$57,212	do	Art Museum.
	$31,577	do	Snow Museum.
Philadelphia, Pa	$25,000	General revenues	Academy of Fine Arts.
	$75,000	do	Robin Hood Dell.
	$25,000	do	Philadelphia Grand Opera.
	$624,760	do	Philadelphia Art Museum and Rodin Museum.
	$30,000	do	Johnson paintings.
	$10,000	do	Philadelphia Art Festival (every 2 years).
Pittsburgh, Pa	$35,000 (1959)	General revenues (through specific appropriations each year).	Pittsburgh Symphony.
	$20,000 to $30,000 (annually)	do	Free summer band concerts.
	$25,000 (approximate cost to city annually)	do	Arts and Crafts Center.
Providence, R.I	Current appropriations:		
	$24,877	General revenue	Museum in Roger William Park.
	$1,500	do	Band concerts.
Reading, Pa	$140,000 (approximate expenditures for 1959)	General revenues (budgeted annually according to estimated needs).	Recreation Bureau (sponsors orchestra, Nature Museum, etc.).
	$3,028 (1959)	do	Bureau of parks weekly band concerts.
Richmond, Va	$5,000	Direct appropriation	Valentine Museum.
Rochester, N.Y	1959–60 expenditures:		
	$10,000	General revenues or real estate taxes	Civic Music Association.
	$20,000	do	"Opera Under the Stars."
	Not indicated	Not indicated	Museum.
Sacramento, Calif	1959–60 budget amounts:		
	$4,500	General ad valorem taxes	Philharmonic Orchestra.
	$4,000	do	Park band concerts.
	$66,866	do	Crocker Art Gallery (city-owned).
	$17,000	do	Children's art and dancing classes (city recreation department).
St. Louis, Mo	1958 Revenue: $320,007.53	Permanent levy of $0.02 per $100 valuation on all real and personal property (established under State law in 1907).	St. Louis Art Museum.
St. Paul, Minn	1959 city budget appropriations:		
	$13,500	Appropriations "financed as part of the overall city budget."	St. Paul Gallery and School of Art.
	$10,000	do	St. Paul Civic Opera.
San Antonio, Tex	$81,000 (approximate budget for ensuing year)	Supported primarily by general fund	Witte Museum.
	$81,000	do	2 municipal auditoriums.
	$1,500	do	San Pedro Playhouse (auditorium devoted primarily to theatrical productions).
San Diego, Calif	1959–60 city budget:		
	$57,159	General revenues	Fine Arts Gallery.
	$19,289	do	Serra Museum (local history).
	$48,715	do	Natural History Museum.
	$45,949	do	Museum of Man (anthropology).
	$10,000	do	San Diego Symphony.
San Francisco, Calif	1958–59 budget:		
	$158,365 (taxes, $120,665; other, $37,700)	Budget of the city and county of San Francisco	Art commission.
	$35,493 (taxes)	do	War Memorial Art Museum.
	$255,456 (taxes, $254,856; other, $600)	do	California Palace of the Legion of Honor (art museum).
	$367,942 (taxes, $367,692; other, $250)	do	De Young (art) Museum.
Scranton, Pa	An average of about $28,740 per annum over the past 10 years.	General funds	Everhart Museum.

See footnotes at end of table.

EXHIBIT A—Continued

*Municipal financial support of certain artistic and cultural activities in selected U.S. cities, a compilation of answers to a questionnaire—*Continued

City	Amount of municipal financial support	Source of municipal financial support	Type of activity supported
Seattle, Wash	$233.37	City's annual budget funds without regard to income source.	Art commission.
	$34,097.55	do	Art museum.
	$18,000	do	Public music.
	$62,743.57	do	Art division of the library department.
Springfield, Mass [2]	$33,127.93	General tax revenues	Museum of Natural History.
	$31,092.45	do	George Walter Vincent Smith Museum.
	$18,161.40	do	William Pynchon Memorial (Connecticut Valley Historical Museum).
	$1,267	do	Springfield Museum of Fine Arts.
	Not indicated	do	Fine arts department of library.
Syracuse, N.Y	$25,000 appropriation annually	General tax levy	Syracuse Museum of Fine Arts (privately chartered institution).

[1] City budget for 1960 based on 1 cent per $100 valuation of the city. Funds provided by taxes earmarked for this specific purpose.

[2] Included in the library budget is the position of musical adviser, which is the way in which the city contributes to the salary of the conductor of the Springfield Symphony Orchestra.

Compiled by Anne M. Finnegan and Helen A. Miller, Education and Public Welfare Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, July 29, 1959.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2796) to provide for the adoption in the Nation's Capital of the practice common to many other cities in the United States with regard to cultural activities by depositing in a special fund 1 mill out of each $1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia to be used for the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, and other nonprofit art programs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, by amending the act of April 29, 1942, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The names of the members of the newly formed District of Columbia Recreation Board Arts Advisory Committee are included at this point in my remarks:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RECREATION BOARD ARTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

HONORARY MEMBERS

Mrs. Robert Low Bacon, Mr. Milton Berliner, Mrs. Robert Woods Bliss, Mrs. Morris Cafritz, Mrs. Norris Dodson, Jr., Mr. Charles C. Glover III, the Honorable Charles A. Horsky, Mr. David Lloyd Kreeger, Mrs. Cazenove Lee, Mrs. John A. Logan, Mr. Walter C. Louchheim, Jr., Mrs. Robert R. McCormick, Mrs. Robert G. McGuire, Jr., Mrs. John H. Morrison, Jr., Miss Flaxie M. Pinkett, Mrs. Merriweather Post, Mrs. Richard Riddell, Mr. Nelson C. Roots, Mrs. Jouett Shouse, Mrs. C. Haskell Small, Mr. Hobart A. Spalding.

VISUAL ARTS PANEL

Mr. Carter Brown, Mr. Melvin D. Buckner, Mr. Robert Gates, Mr. Henry H. Hecht, Jr., Mr. Gerald Nordland, Mrs. Duncan Phillips, Mr. David Scott, and Mr. Hermann Warner Williams, Jr.

DANCE PANEL

Miss Pia Berndt, Mr. G. Bowdoin Craighill, Jr., Miss Mary Day, Miss Claire H. Haywood, Mrs. Helen Moore, Mr. Igor Schwezoff.

DRAMA PANEL

Miss Ellie Chamberlain, Mr. Thomas C. Fichandler, Mr. Jack Golodner, Rev. Gilbert V. Hartke, Mr. Scott L. Kirkpatrick, Mrs. Edwin W. Semans.

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC PANEL

Mr. Richard Bales, Mr. Patrick Hayes, Mrs. Paul F. Koehn, Mr. Irving Lowens, Mr. Emerson Meyers, Mr. M. Robert Rogers.

VOCAL MUSIC PANEL

Mr. Paul Callaway, Mr. Todd Duncan, Dr. Frederick Fall, Mr. Lewis D. Resseguie, Mr. Toby Tate, Mr. Day Thorpe.

LIAISON PANEL

Mrs. San Juan W. Barnes, Dr. Joseph M. Carroll, Mrs. Jack Coopersmith, Mr. J. George Frain, Mr. Charles B. Lipsen, Mr. Robert E. McCord, Mr. Maurice Tobin.

PROGRAM ALLOCATION PANEL

Dr. Henry Goldstein, Mr. Armiger Jagoe, Mr. James L. Kunen, Dean Warner Lawson, Mr. Robert Richman, Mr. S. Dillon Ripley, Mrs. Charles H. Roberts, Dr. Arthur W. Sloan, Mr. John S. Thacher; ex officio, chairman, Recreation Board, and chairman, Recreation Board's Committee on the Arts.

I include newspaper reports on the new Arts Advisory Committee of the District of Columbia Recreation Board; also a memorandum of the new "Ad Hoc Committee on Arts and Crafts in the District of Columbia" which is concerned with the problem of providing all citizens of the District of Columbia, particularly its low- and moderate-income families, equal access to and participation in the arts and crafts by establishing neighborhood art centers and supporting neighborhood advisory and working art groups, and by providing greater financial support for the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, the Children's Theater, and other nonprofit art programs of the District of Columbia.

The proposal of the new Ad Hoc Committee on Arts and Crafts in the District of Columbia strongly supports the position of Commissioner John B. Duncan, and would provide the funds needed to advance the growth and development of the District's cultural life.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1966]

SEVENTY-MEMBER UNIT NAMED AS ARTS ADVISERS HERE

(By Leroy F. Aarons)

The District of Columbia Recreation Board yesterday announced formation of a 70-member Arts Advisory Committee—the first step in qualifying the city for $50,000 in Federal matching funds for the arts.

Created under the impetus of the State grants provision of the National Arts and Humanities Foundation Act, the new committee represents the first effort to coordinate the city's diffused cultural resources with a broad-based central organization.

INCLUDES SEVEN PANELS

The Advisory Committee is divided into seven panels and an honorary board of prominent citizens. The main unit is the 11-member Program Allocation Panel, whose job it will be to sort out the recommendations of the other panels and come up with a workable program by May 1, the deadline for applying for the $50,000 award.

The six advisory panels—visual arts, dance, drama, instrumental music, vocal music, and liaison—are composed of specialists in each field. The Program Panel, however, is broadly based, drawing on foundations, education, business, labor, government, and arts administration for its membership.

Gerson Nordlinger, chairman of the Recreation Board's Culture Committee and organizer of the panels, said that because of limited funds only dance, drama, music, and the visual arts will be stressed during the first year of the arts program.

Also, instead of grants to individual artists, priority will be given to programs in arts education, creating new audiences, especially among the poor, and aid to established nonprofit arts organizations.

MANY ALREADY ACTIVE

Many of the panel members are associated with organizations already active in the arts. Anticipating this, Nordlinger told the panelists at an announcement session at the arts clubs yesterday to "please bear constantly in mind that your recommendations should be based on what is best for the community rather than what is most advantageous for your particular organization."

Nordlinger also stressed that because of matching requirements in the Federal act, organizations that have matching funds for their projects will have an advantage. Priority will also be given to cooperative programs between Washington and neighboring States and those sponsored jointly by the Recreation Board and the Board of Education or the Office of Economic Opportunity.

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 16, 1966]

$50,000 IS FIRST YEAR'S POT—70 EXPERTS TO DIVVY ART GRANTS IN DISTRICT

Chairman Gerson Nordlinger of the District of Columbia Recreation Board's Committee on the Arts yesterday named 70 persons to the Arts Advisory Committee and said, "Never has so much talent been assembled for such a modest program."

The members, active in local visual and performing arts fields, were chosen to develop an arts program for the District under the National Foundation Act.

They will receive and distribute $50,000 appropriated under the act.

A Program Allocation Panel will assign funds after recommendations are made by the five individual panels on the visual arts, dance, drama, instrumental music, and vocal music.

Mr. Nordlinger said financial limitations prevented forming panels on photography, architecture and crafts, and other fields, but these would be considered later on.

In the case of the District, programs receiving priority will be educational ones;

ones creating new audiences for the arts (particularly among the poor), and those involving established nonprofit organizations; organizations which can provide matching funds for their projects; those that involve cooperative planning and funding by the District and neighboring States and those sponsored by the Recreation Board, the Board of Education of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 16, 1966]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PICKS 48 TO GUIDE SPENDING OF ARTS FUNDS

(By Roberta Hornig)

The District's Recreation Board has appointed 48 Washington leaders in the arts to a committee which will figure out how Federal funds for the arts should be spent here.

An additional 22 honorary members were named to the Arts Advisory Committee at a kickoff meeting yesterday.

District Commissioner John B. Duncan said the committee appointment "marks the beginning of a broadly based alliance between art and the Government."

Congress has given the city $50,000 under the "National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act" passed last summer. The Recreation Board was named the administrative agency for the District.

The District is asking $76,000 in the fiscal 1967 budget.

The Recreation Board yesterday said that for the first year in the arts program, funds will be used only for the dance, drama, music, and the visual arts.

No grants will be given to individual artists, and priority will go to art projects of an educational nature, particularly those geared to underprivileged persons.

Gerson Nordlinger Jr., of the Recreation Board, said the new committee should submit its program recommendations by April 16 so they can be sent on for final approval to the National Endowment for the Arts by May 1.

FEBRUARY 16, 1966.

MEMORANDUM

To: District of Columbia Recreation Board; Arts Advisory Committee; Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia; Board of Education, District of Columbia; Members of Congress; District Art Groups, including; National Symphony Orchestra; Corcoran Gallery of Art; and the Children's Theater of the District of Columbia Recreation Department.

From: Ad Hoc Committee on Arts and Crafts in the District of Columbia.

Following is a draft measure designed to carry out the excellent and timely call, made on February 15, 1965, by Commissioner John B. Duncan for adequate financial support of the District's artistic and cultural life; and to update the splendid bill, S. 2796, introduced by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY in 1960 to provide financial support for the District's nonprofit art programs, 89th Congress, 2d session:

"A bill to provide all citizens of the District of Columbia, particularly its low- and moderate-income families, equal access to and participation in the arts by establishing neighborhood art centers and supporting neighborhood advisory and working art groups, and by providing greater support for the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, the Children's Theater, and other nonprofit art programs of the District of Columbia

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 4 of the Act entitled 'An Act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes', approved April 29, 1942, as amended, is amended by inserting '(a)' immediately after 'Sec. 4.' and by adding at the end thereof the following:

" '(b) In addition to the trust fund authorized by subsection (a) of this section, there is authorized to be appropriated to a special art fund in the Treasury of the United States, to the credit of the Board, for any fiscal year for art purposes, an amount equal to four times the amount expended by the District of Columbia Recreation Board out of District of Columbia tax revenues for art purposes in the previous fiscal year (which is comparable to the ratio of aid to local communities provided in other Federal grant-in-aid funds such as urban renewal and highway funds, where the contribution runs up to $9 supplied by the Federal Government to $1 supplied by the locality in the Federal-aid highway program; and up to $9 supplied by the Federal Government to each $1 supplied by the locality in the "Demonstration Cities Act of 1966" sent to the Congress recently by President Johnson.

" '(c) All money in the special fund authorized by subsection (b) of this section shall be available to the Board to defray in part the expense of the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, and other nonprofit art programs of the District of Columbia, and programs in arts and crafts, music, drama, speech, ballet, lectures, forums for informal discussions, and other creative opportunities for participation, as authorized in section 3 of article II of this Act, and part of the expense of carrying out the programs authorized by paragraph 3 of section 4 of Public Law 85–874 (72 Stat. 1698) as amended (The John F. Kennedy Center Act—which provides that the Chairman of the District of Columbia Recreation Board shall be an ex officio member of the Board of Trustees of the Kennedy Center, and which also provides, as noted by Dr. S. Dillon Ripley recently, that the trustees shall "develop programs for children and youth and the elderly (and for other age groups as well) in such arts designed for their participation, education, and recreation." Dr. Ripley noted that at the Kennedy Center "Only the most limited provisions has been made for rehearsal rooms, workshops, studios, and the other facilities required for the creation of works of art. This refusal to make any commitment to local performing groups seems virtually to eliminate all possibility of repertory companies and of wide popular participation in the artistic work of the Center"); Public Law 89–209 (the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965—which made the District of Columbia Recreation Board the State Arts Agency for the District of Columbia); and other provisions of law specifically related to the District of Columbia Recreation Board and the arts and crafts of the District of Columbia, as well as the provisions contained in subsections (d), (e), and (f) of this Act.

" '(d) The District of Columbia Recreation Board shall prepare and present to the Congress and the President by June 30, 1966, an inventory of the art and craft needs, including suitable neighborhood, and other facilities, and supporting neighborhood advisory and working art groups (the Guy Mason art and recreation center in the Georgetown area of high-income families is one type of neighborhood center which could be cited, as could Karamu House in Cleveland—a particularly famous and noteworthy example of what is needed in Washington's low- and moderate-income neighborhoods), of all of the citizens of the District of Columbia, particularly the low- and moderate-income families, in order that the Congress may be able to deal intelligently and effectively with the present widely recognized cultural and art imbalance and lag in the District of Columbia (which is being ignored by the District's schools, the UPO, the District's civic and citizen federations, the civil rights organizations, etc., etc.) (the District lags far behind other cities here and abroad according to such publications as the New York Times, and such observers as W. H. Kiplinger in his book "Washington Is Like That") by providing for intercultural experience by District citizens, and fostering communications between citizens on the basis of common creative activities and experiences, by providing for maximum participation by District citizens in art and craft programs and projects designed specifically for their recreation, training, and creativity (free programs by the District's cultural institutions, such as the National Symphony Orchestra, and special classes in the arts by competent artists such as the Corcoran Art Gallery could organize are examples, as are programs by the major groups sponsored by the District of Columbia Recreation Board and Department). (President Johnson's new recreation budget, sent to Congress on January 26, provides only $76,600 for the National Symphony Orchestra and other performing arts groups in the District of Columbia, while providing $6,363,400 for other activities of the District of Columbia Recreation Department, principally sports, playgrounds, swimming pools, etc.) In preparing such inventory the District of Columbia Recreation Board shall give due weight to the best practices and programs in other cities here and abroad for providing maximum participation in art and craft programs and for achieving a high level of cultural, artistic, and creative development.

" '(e) The Board shall appoint an "Advisory Committee on the Arts and Crafts", the members of which shall be persons who are recognized for their knowledge of, or experience or interest in, one or more of the arts and crafts, or who have demonstrated their interest in fostering the arts and crafts, and who have actively worked to advance local, non-Federal, citywide neighborhood art and craft groups, organizations, workshop centers, or institutions. The Board shall take care to see to it that neighborhood advisory and working art groups are represented on the "Advisory Committee on the Arts and Crafts" provided by this subsection. The Chairman of the Board shall be chairman of the "Advisory Committee on the Arts and Crafts", and may appoint any other member of the Board as his alternate on such "Advisory Committee on the Arts and Crafts". The "Advisory Committee on the Arts and Crafts" shall advise and consult with the Board and make recommendations to the Board regarding its existing or prospective art and craft activities, and may advise the Board in all other art and craft matters.

" '(f) The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall transfer to the District of Columbia Recreation Board without charge, and the District of Columbia Recreation Board shall rehabilitate, maintain, and operate as a neighborhood art and craft workshop center, Children's Theater workshop, and community center, the old fire department repair shop, and the northern part of the Eastern Market, both of which are located near Seventh Street and North Carolina Avenue Southeast, in the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia Board of Education, and the Board of Commissioners are hereby authorized and directed to provide whatever assistance they can in making this pilot project a success.' "

HEW, HUD APPRAISE THE ABE LINCOLN FAMILY

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, now that HUD has joined HEW in the American lexicon, and we have just celebrated Lincoln's birthday, I am sure that many of us enjoyed James J. Kilpatrick's article entitled, "HEW, HUD Appraise the Abe Lincoln Family." Written in a light and humorous vein, the serious truths and implications are obvious. We can well speculate whether the boy Abe would ever have developed those qualities of leadership which made him President Lincoln had the managers of the Great Society been there to coach him.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the article which appeared in the Washington Star for February 13, 1966.

HEW, HUD Appraise the Abe Lincoln Family

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The boy was out in back, playing around the woodpile, when the strange flying machine landed in the deer glade down by Little Pigeon Creek. He started to run for the woods, but curiosity got the better of him, and he stuck around while the visitors pushed their way to the cabin.

There were two of them, a fussy little man with a round plump face, and a kind of pigeon-breasted woman with a pocketbook half the size of a saddle bag. Her slip showed. They were polite enough, but you could tell they were used to giving orders and making people jump. You know the kind.

The boy's father came out to meet them, and Nancy—that was his mother—stood in the door looking on. They weren't excited. It was like a dream, but it was colder than any dream, so cold that when the little man spoke, his breath came in tiny puffs.

"I say," said the stranger, looking at a large watch on his wrist, "could you tell me where and when we are? I am from HUD and she is from HEW, and we thought we were headed for Louisville in 1967. What a nuisance!"

The stranger glanced over at the boy, and his nose wiggled like a rabbit's nose.

"Well, sir," said the boy's father, "this is 1817 and you're in what will be Spencer County, Ind.; you're on the north bank of the Ohio, something east of Evansville and something west of Louisville. It's February, and who is HEW and how is HUD?"

"Missed by a 150 years," snapped the little man. "It's these dratted time machines. Always out of order. I punched reverse 17 and what do I get? Reverse 167. Back to the shop with it. What's your name, my good man?"

The boy's father told him.

"Well, Mr. Tom Linton," said the fussy little fellow, "HEW is the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and HUD is the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Miss Spencer and I are engaged in a survey of the oppressed, the depressed, and the repressed, and it certainly looks as if you qualify." He took out a yellow tablet and a ballpoint pen.

"It ain't 'Linton,'" said the boy's father. "You got it wrong."

"No matter," said the visitor. "The computer will give you a 10-digit number. And one for you, too, ma'am." This last was to Nancy. "And one for that long-legged boy there. How many of you occupy this dwelling unit?"

"Well," said the boy's father, counting on his fingers, "there's me and Nancy, that's two; and Tom and Betsy Sparrow, they're Nancy's aunt and uncle, that's four; and young Dennis Hanks—he's my foster son—and the girl Sarah, and the boy there. Seven, you might say."

"Seven, I certainly will say," said the man from HUD. "Definitely overcrowded."

"Substandard," said Miss Spencer. It was the first word she had spoken. "Definitely substandard. But I daresay 97.7 percent of the Little Pigeon housing is equally substandard. They are somewhat below their peer group."

"No floor," said the little man, making notes on his tablet. "Inadequate ventilation. The roof leaks. No windows. No door. Bad air. Inadequate illumination." He was checking one thing after another.

"What about these children?" asked the lady from HEW. "Schooling?"

The boy's father shook his head.

"Dropouts," said the lady, making tch-tch noises. "Every one a dropout, indicating that boy on the woodpile. He's old enough to qualify for operation Headstart."

The man from HUD and the lady from HEW conferred together. After a minute or two they came back to the boy's father.

"Mr. Linton," said the little fellow, "I am pleased to inform you that you and your hapless family score 982.2 on the disadvantaged scale. You are ill housed, ill fed, and ill clothed. You definitely qualify for—"

"Ain't 'Linton,'" said the boy's father, stubbornly. "It's—"

"No matter. You definitely qualify for soil bank, food stamps, supplemental rent, and the upgrading of your obsolete manual skills. You qualify for the MPTP, extension service, 52 weeks of home economics, a seven-room house, two siloes, and an inscribed color portrait of the President. We will dam up Little Pigeon Creek and stock you a pond. The men will be in to string the lights tomorrow. Telephone on Thursday. Plumbing Friday. You definitely qualify for 16 different loans, giving you a debt of $11,000, 40 years not to pay. Without these indispensable upgradings in your total environment, Miss Spencer and I are agreed that you are doomed to live forever in the shadows of an otherwise affluent land, and that long-legged boy will amount to nothing at all. Sign here."

"I reckon I'd better get the boy to look at these papers," said Tom. "I can't read at all, but he reads some already. Come over here, boy, and meet these folks."

"He turned to the man from HUD and the lady from HEW, just as they and their funny machine were fading into nothing-at-all.

"This is my boy, Abe," cried Tom Lincoln after them. "He's 8 years old today."

CELEBRATE FREEDOM DAY

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, every year citizens of Taipei, Taiwan, commemorate Freedom Day to dramatize the decision by thousands of Chinese prisoners of war to choose freedom in Nationalist China rather than return to Communist tyranny after the Korean war. This past January, the Freedom Day Rally was highlighted by an address by our distinguished colleague, William Jennings Bryan Dorn of South Carolina. I insert into the Record at this point the program.

Program for the Taipei Rally in Celebration of the 12th Anniversary of Anti-Communist Freedom Day

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Chairman assuming chairmanship.
3. Audience standing up.
4. Peal of freedom bell.
5. National anthem.
6. Salute to national flag and the portrait of the late Dr. Sun Yat-sen.
7. Read messages from President Chiang and others.
8. Report by Chairman Ku Cheng-kang.
9. Speech by Premier Yen.
10. Speech by Hon. William J. B. Dorn, Member of U.S. Congress.
11. Speech by Rev. Priest Dries Van Coillie, of Belgium.
12. Speech by Mr. Young Myoung Lee, an anti-Communist escapee from North Korea.
13. Speech by Mr. Tran Quang Chan, an anti-Communist escapee from North Vietnam.
14. Speech by Mr. Eric Chou, an anti-Communist writer who escaped from the Chinese mainland for freedom 4 years ago.
15. Speech by Prof. Hsu Wei-sheung, a recent anti-Communist escapee from the Chinese mainland.
16. Speech by Mr. Li Hsien-ping who recently defected to Taiwan from the Chinese mainland aboard an IL–28 jet bomber.
17. Speech by Mr. Liang Kou-shin, a recent escapee from the Chinese mainland to Taiwan to seek freedom.
18. Presentation of freedom medals to representatives of U.S. freedom fighters in Vietnam now taking rest and recreation in Taiwan.
19. Adoption of declaration and messages.
20. Sing anti-Communist freedom song.
21. Chant slogans.
22. Band play.
23. End of the meeting.

In addition to the speakers who participated, messages poured into this rally from all over the world, since the rally represents the unquenchable desire of the Chinese people to see freedom and true peace restored to their entire Nation. I include at this point as a continuation of my remarks the message list.

Message List

1. His Excellency Chiang Kai-Shek, Republic of China.
2. His Excellency President Lyndon B. Johnson, United States.
3. His Excellency President Ferdinand E. Marcos, Philippines.
4. His Excellency President Park Chung Hee, Republic of Korea.
5. His Excellency Chief of State Nguyen-Van-Thieu, chairman of the National Leadership Committee, Vietnam.
6. His Excellency President Julio Adalberto Rivera, Republic of El Salvador.
7. His Excellency Prime Minister Thanom Kittikachorn, Thailand.
8. His Excellency Secretary Robert S. McNamara, United States.
9. Dr. Fethi Tevetoglu, senator and chairman of the JP Senate Group.
10. Hon. Congressman Vernon W. Thomson.
11. Senator George Howard Branson, chairman of APACI Australian Chapter.
12. Hon. Charles Edison, chairman of the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the U.N.
13. Mr. Howland H. Sargeant, Radio Liberty Committee.
14. Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of National Captive Nations Committee.
15. Admiral Carlos Penna Botto, chairman of Brazilian Anti-Communist Crusade.

16. Mr. John S. Arvidson, field director of American Veterans Against Communism.

17. Mr. Donald L. Miller, executive secretary, Friends of Free Asia, United States.

18. Dr. Paul de Auer, honorary general secretary, League for the Self-Determination.

19. Prince Niko Nakashidze, ABN.

20. Dr. Fritz Cramer, president of the International Committee for Information and Social Activity, German committee.

21. Madam Suzanne Labin, responsible person of Conference Internationale sur La Guerre Politique des Soviets.

22. Hon. Dahyabhai V. Patel, APACL India chapter.

23. Messrs. Tetsuzo Watanabe, president and Juitsu Kitaoka, secretary general of Japan Chapter of APACL.

24. Dr. M. G. Lowman, American author.

25. Prof. Leo Magnino, Italy.

26. Mr. Alfred Korn, Jr., president of Americans to Free Captive Nations, Inc.

27. Capt. John Shimchik, chairman of the Byelorussian Liberation Front.

28. Mr. Nobuhiko Jimbo, Japan.

29. Mr. Arturs Berztise, chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations Delegation in Australia.

30. Dr. Roman Malaschuk, president of Canadian League for Ukraine's Liberation.

31. Mr. Sun Bong Hong, acting chairman of APACL Korea chapter.

32. Mr. Pham Huu Cheong, secretary general of APACL Vietnam chapter.

33. Mr. Brutus Coste, former secretary general of ACEN.

34. Mr. Ibrahim Soekahmed Afrah, President of Somali African Union.

35. Mr. Prochazka Push, chairman, Christian Democratic Union of Central Eastern Europe.

36. Mr. Hnat Billinsky, Secretary general, Friend of Ukraine Association, USA.

37. Mr. M. L. Peers, chairman of the Anti-Communist League, Auckland, New Zealand.

38. Mr. C. M. Vella Gatt, secretary general, Lega Anti-Communist Malta.

39. Maj. Gen. Bela K. Kiraly, Hungarian freedom fighter.

40. Mr. Ferenc Nagy, former Prime Minister of Hungary.

41. H. E. Karl Theodor Von Guttenberg, Member of Parliament of Federal Republic of Germany.

42. Mr. Frederick C. Stinson, Member of Parliament, Canada.

43. Mr. Andre Resampa, secretary general, Social Democratic Party, of Madagascar.

44. Congressman Ramon D. Bagatsing, president, Philippine Anti-Communist Movement; president, APACL Philippines chapter.

45. Mr. Vibul Thamavit, president, APACL Thailand chapter.

46. Prof. Mahmud Brelvi, APACL Pakistan chapter.

47. Mr. Edmud Gaspar, secretary general, ACEN.

48. Dr. Apeles E. Marquez, president of FAEDA.

49. Dr. Jorge Prieto Laurens, secretary general of Inter-American Confederation of Continental Defense.

50. Hon. John Henry Okwanyo, Member of Parliament, Kenya.

51. Mr. Chevalier De Roover, president du Comite Belge du CIAS, Belgium.

One of the highlights of the Freedom Day rally was a message from President Chiang Kai-shek, which carries special significance in this time of great crisis in the Far East. I insert in the RECORD President Chiang's message.

PRESIDENT CHIANG KAI-SHEK'S FREEDOM DAY MESSAGE

It is of the greatest significance that people from all walks of life in the country are enthusiastically celebrating today this historic 12th Freedom Day in ardent support of the anti-Communist revolution on the Chinese mainland and the movement to restore freedom to all the people there.

Twelve years ago today, more than 14,000 Chinese Communist prisoners of war, who had been deceived by the Peiping regime and forced to fight in Korea, reached Taiwan and freedom. Defying all difficulties and dangers, they lived up to their resolution of "freedom or death." Their heroic choice of coming to the Republic of China is another testimonial that man's struggle against slavery and for freedom represents the strongest and most fundamental human will and desire. The more severe the oppression, the stronger will be man's stand against tyranny. We can rest assured that Peiping's tyrannical rule and ruthless oppression will be destroyed and that our mainland compatriots will eventually regain their freedom. The Chinese people are unyielding in their struggle against communism and in their determination to overthrow tyranny.

The conflict between Moscow and Peiping has intensified in the past year. Their schism has become deeper and deeper. New trends in Soviet Russia's economic policy admitting the existence of profit motive and changing the system of distribution has pushed Communist theories farther down the road to bankruptcy. They also have brought increased ideological confusion into the Communist camp. This situation not only shows the gloomy prospect of communism but also creates conditions favorable to a free world effort to tear down the Iron Curtain and rescue those enslaved behind it.

Last year the Peiping regime also suffered severe setbacks in its diplomatic and "united front" maneuvers. Economic conditions on the mainland further deteriorated and there has been widespread dissatisfaction among the people. As a matter of fact, the regime now finds itself surrounded by enemies. Two recent cases of defection—that of Communist air force pilot Li Hsien-pin and two others who flew their plane to Taiwan, and that of Wu Wen-hsien and six others who came to Matsu aboard a naval vessel—dramatically attest to Peiping's difficulty in controlling the situation. Really it is already on the point of collapse.

The benevolent are invincible. Tyrants inevitably meet with an ignoble end. As I pointed out in my New Year's message for 1966, this will be a decisive year for our revolutionary tasks of national recovery and reconstruction, for the removal of the evils of communism and the building of a better future for mankind. Both the domestic and international situations are turning in our favor. On the eve of our counteroffensive, all the people should be alert to opportunities, work harder, and call upon our compatriots both overseas and on the mainland to take part in a crusade against the Communist tyranny and to win freedom for all. Meanwhile, we must unite with all nations who are on the side of justice and righteousness, and ask for their moral and material support so that we can accomplish at an early date our sacred mission of recovering the mainland, freeing our compatriots, removing the Red scourge from Asia, bringing down the Iron Curtain in both East and West, and attaining the lofty goal of world peace.

The chairman of this great rally, Mr. Ku Cheng-Kang, president of the Asian People's Anti-Communist League, Republic of China, also addressed the assemblage, and I insert his inspiring address into the RECORD at this point.

ADDRESS BY MR. KU CHENG-KANG, CHAIRMAN OF THE RALLY

Excellencies, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: This is the 12th observance of the Freedom Day. We of all walks of life in the Republic of China are gathered here, as many other freedom-loving people elsewhere in the free world are, to mark this important occasion that represents the world's common fight for freedom. That we are all doing so indicates the confluence of the strength of the free, and demonstrates that the Freedom Day movement has become a global campaign to support the enslaved people's fight for freedom and to safeguard freedom for all mankind.

Development in the past 12 years has shown us the ebbing of international communism. The conflict between the Chinese Communists and Soviet Russia in scheming for leadership in the Communist bloc has caused ideological confusion and internal rifts. Most significant has been the change in the economic policy in Soviet Russia which is no less than an announced surrender of controlled economy to free economy, thus admitting that communism has destroyed itself in its essence. In the meanwhile the insane raving of the Chinese Communists in taking on the whole world as their enemies has completely exposed their militarist nature, frustrating their united front designs in many places in the world and causing their further isolation. These developments, portending a brighter future, are helpful to our effort in combating enslavement and protecting freedom.

There are, however, a number of countries and people who have not realized the aggressive nature of the Chinese Communists, nor their designs to subjugate all Asia and eventually the whole world under communism, thus vainly hoping for peace with the Communists and advocating policies of appeasement. Take, for instance, the fight against the Communists in Vietnam. Under the support of the firm policy of President Johnson's, the free camp has already halted the deterioration of the situation there. But the ill-advised forces of appeasement have forced the United States to negotiate with the Communists in North Vietnam. In the last 4 weeks the United States has proposed a 14-point peace plan, dispatched important officials to some 40 nations in the attempt for negotiations, and halted the bombing of North Vietnam. And what are the gains for the effort? Stern refusal of negotiations and continued clamour for fighting on the part of the Chinese and North Vietnamese Communists. Moreover, a good opportunity has been given to the Vietnamese Communists to make active preparation for war and to send more regular forces into South Vietnam; equally, if not more seriously disastrous has been the demoralizing effect on the people and the troops of the Republic of Vietnam, and on the American, Korean, Australian, and New Zealand armed forces fighting in Vietnam. And we can hardly overemphasize the damage done to the Asia's confidence in the United States.

We have always believed that the attempt of the Chinese Communists to seize Vietnam and thence all southeast Asia are the major elements of their "world revolution" program, and their unchangeable objective. Efforts to negotiate with the Chinese and Vietnamese Communists for peace will be fruitless, and will lead only to abusive insults. Peace will be possible only if victory is won by the free world. While the Chinese Communists and Soviet Russia are actively fighting for controlling influence over the Vietnamese Communists, the Chinese Communists are sure to maintain the conflict in order to keep their control over the Vietnamese Communists.

The people and the armed forces of Vietnam are fighting bravely for their existence and freedom while the air is filled with the talks of appeasement and peace negotiations. We fully sympathize with the difficulties experienced by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam and warmly support the demands made by the leaders of Vietnam that the people of Vietnam should be allowed their own destiny.

The Vietnam situation will fatefully decide the life of 12 million Vietnamese people and have a most direct bearing on the freedom of and peace for all the peoples of Asia. We are counting on the continued solidarity of all the people in Vietnam to carry on the fight. And we appeal to the United States to deal with the Vietnam situation from the viewpoint of the lasting interest of Asia and the whole world, respect the will of the Government and people of Vietnam.

Let me point out that the war now fought in Vietnam is not only a war of defense conducted by the Vietnamese people for their own freedom, but also a war of defense of the freedom of all mankind. It will decide the outcome of the struggle between freedom and enslavement. If the United States, leader of the free world, retreats from Vietnam, she is then in fact forced out of all Asia, and will be thence forced to conduct her own defense in her own land.

The Vietnam war, in the final analysis, may be described as an extension of the Korean war, in which the Chinese Communists did not get the rightly deserved punishment and have thus been encouraged to take up this new conflict. Therefore there should not be a second Panmunjom to repeat all the mistakes of the past. We are convinced that for the United States to obtain an early peace the only way is to adopt more active actions in Vietnam, resume the strikes against North Vietnam, blockade Haiphong, interdict Hanoi, sever the routes of reinforcement and supplies from China to North Vietnam, to thoroughly destroy the capability of the Vietnamese Communists in conducting aggression.

The United States has to change its policy of not seeking victory and give up all illusions of peace with the Communists. This is the only way to force the Chinese and Vietnamese Communists to sue for peace, the only type of peace to be realized in Vietnam.

The center of the troubles of the world is in Asia. To maintain the security of the Asian countries we must bring out the combined strength of the Asian countries. Today, Communist aggression and American policy are closely tied in with the security and destiny of Asia. At this historic juncture, we free peoples of Asia must express our will, and we free countries of Asia must unite to show our strength. Therefore we urgently appeal to all free nations in Asia, specially to the leaders of the anti-Communist nations in eastern Asia as Korea, Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam, to quickly adopt effective measures to support Vietnam and to establish an anti-Communist alliance of Asian nations. This way we will be able to assume the duty of protecting the freedom and security of Asia, with U.S. support, by our collective will and concerted strength.

As the source of the Vietnam war and other troubles of war in Asia has been the Chinese Communist regime, the real solution of the difficulties in Asia is to destroy the regime and pull down the iron curtain of Asia. The Republics of China, Korea, and Vietnam are already in possession of firm and strong forces to fight communism. We have further the confidence and determination to reunify our respective countries and liberate the enslaved peoples. We ask that the free world, and especially the United States as leader of the free world, to understand, sympathize, and support us in our mission of protecting the freedom and security of our countries and of all Asia.

In fine, we stress that peace cannot be cheaply procured. The price is hard work and sacrifices. If we of the Republic of China unify our efforts with those of all the freedom loving peoples of the free world, we shall finally see the Iron Curtain disintegrating before the torrents of freedom. The torch of Freedom Day has shone over the whole world and penetrated into the Iron Curtain. Under its light we will strive for the liberation of the 1 billion enslaved people and fight to protect the freedom of all mankind.

The rally was also addressed by the very distinguished Prime Minister of Nationalist China, Mr. C. K. Yen. Mr. Yen, a stanch friend of freedom and of the United States, delivered a most appropriate address and message of great significance which I herewith insert in the RECORD.

TRANSLATION OF A SPEECH DELIVERED BY PRIME MINISTER C. K. YEN, ON FREEDOM DAY, JANUARY 23, 1966

Mr. Chairman, honorable guests, ladies and gentlemen, 12 years ago, 14,000 prisoners of the Korean war have defied both the threats and seduction of the Chinese Communists, and returned to the bosom of their fatherland. In order to do so, they have risked their own lives and endured hardships beyond description. Their daring decision for freedom have unmistakably manifested to the whole world that human nature does prefer liberty to slavery and that the China mainland under the Communist dictatorship is nothing but a slave camp, hated and rejected by all the people.

In view of the victory of these 14,000 brave men having such an important significance, it has been decided to designate January 23 as the Freedom Day, and the Freedom Day Movement has since been aimed at two targets; namely, to unite the Chinese people in a joint effort to topple the puppet regime of the Chinese Communists in order to free their enslaved brethren on the mainland, and to consolidate the forces of righteousness all over the world to rip the Iron Curtain so as to liberate all the peoples under the Communist yoke.

Today, 12 years after that memorial day, let us ask ourselves in what way we should continue our efforts to reach these two targets.

First of all, it should be pointed out that what the Chinese Communists have done during 12 years, especially their recent militant pronouncements and actions, clearly attest to the absolute correctness of our targets. I am going to mention the following four facts to emphasize this viewpoint.

In the first place, the fetters on the bodies of the people on the mainland are becoming heavier day after day. Not only are they denied the freedom of expression and thought, but also they are not allowed to make their own decisions concerning their residences and vocations. Even their daily living is always watched upon and not infrequently interfered. This kind of unmitigated slavery has been seldom seen in history and certainly should not be repeated in the 20th century. We cannot tolerate even for 1 minute such insult to human dignity and total suppression of the basic human desires.

Second, the infiltrative and subversive activities instigated by the Chinese Communists in many countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America have made peace and prosperity out of reach in this world of ours. It is quite evident that the overall motive of the Chinese Communists is to make all kinds of troubles for the whole world, because they are able to widen the Iron Curtain and to entrap more people into bondage only through global agitation and turbulence. We are therefore positive that to liberate the enslaved Chinese people on the mainland and the other peoples in bondage all over the world are actually one and the same task, for which all efforts should be integrated.

Third, in complete disregard of the people's fundamental right of survival, the Chinese Communists appropriate all the available resources of the people's livelihood in order to manufacture atomic bombs. Their wicked intention is of course to exact nuclear blackmail from the free world. But we can also see that as soon as they have actually developed their nuclear capability, world peace would be in constant danger. This simple logic testifies the truth that to topple the Communist regime on the mainland would serve the double purpose of setting free the enslaved Chinese and keeping the peace of the world.

Fourth, the Chinese Communists have repeatedly proclaimed in past months that they would launch the so-called "people's warfare," using Asia, Africa, and Latin America as bases to conquer North America and Europe. Although such nonsensical boasting is preposterous, it does reveal their boundless ambition as well as their dangerous and extremely inhumane strategical thinking. I am sure that the peoples of the world should by now be convinced that the Chinese Communists are preparing to start a war of colossal proportions, the purpose of which is simply genocide. That should be a tragedy unprecedented in history and unlikely to be repeated in the future. In order to prevent such a tragedy, the only thing to do is to defeat the Chinese Communists before it is too late.

These facts conclusively prove that the two targets of the Freedom Day movement are very much in order today. Now, let me ask what would be the best way to reach these targets. In my way of thinking, we should exert our efforts along the following two directions:

First, we should fortify our confidence in final victory. Not only should we have unshakable trust in our ability to liberate our brethren by eliminating communism in our homeland, but also we should help assure other peace-loving peoples that the cause of righteousness would eventually triumph over the advocates of wickedness. We should use both logic and facts to show that the Chinese Communists are increasingly repudiated and rejected by the people under their domination and by other countries abroad.

On November 11 of last year, three Communist air force officers, Li Shien-Ping, Li Tsai-Huang, and Lin Pao-Shen, defected to Taiwan in their jet bomber. Then 2 weeks ago, on January 9 of this year, another landing craft of the Communist navy fought their way to freedom through the determination and heroism of seven brave young men, including Wu Wen-Hsien, Wu Chen-Chia, and Wu Chun-Fu. Are these two defection cases, taking place within a short period of 2 months, not enough to prove that the morale of the armed forces of the Chinese Communists is beginning to crumble down? Are these two cases not strong enough to indicate that whenever the armed forces of the Republic of China launch their counterattack they would immediately be joined by the 600 million people there to wipe out the Communist regime and therefore to eliminate the root of all the troubles for Asia as well as for the free world?

Second, we should build up Taiwan. Taiwan is the bastion to defeat the Chinese Communists, as well as the castle to protect freedom. To make Taiwan strong and prosperous is to increase our power so that we will reach our targets earlier. More significantly, in making Taiwan a model province we will be provided with a useful blueprint of national reconstruction on the mainland according to Dr. Sun Yat-sen's "Three Principles of the People." At the same time, if we make the people on this island enjoy freedom and abundance, our brethren on the mainland will see clearly the sharp contrast between slavery and liberty and therefore fortify their determination to fight against their Communist overlords. We sincerely believe that this kind of political warfare can be very effective and should be a decisive factor in our struggle against communism.

Finally, I would like to appeal to the free and peace-loving peoples all over the world and ask them to join hands in the common cause of assisting our brother country of Vietnam, defeating our common enemy the Communists, tearing down the Iron Curtain, and liberating all the enslaved peoples. Time is running out very fast; we have to make up our mind without delay in order to eliminate the root of all troubles today which are threatening the liberty and peace of the whole world.

May I wish all of you good health and thank you for your kindness.

Mr. Speaker, the rally also adopted a declaration which carried a ringing denunciation of Communist oppression of China and the other countries behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

As a very practical gesture, the rally sent cables to leading world figures and I insert them as a continuation of my remarks.

CABLE TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON, OF THE UNITED STATES

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: At a time when the Chinese and Vietnamese Communists are engaged in expansionist aggression in utter disregard for the peace overtures of your country in an effort to subvert South Vietnam, we sincerely hope that you will switch over to a different policy having as its ultimate aim complete victory over the Communists and, for that purpose, will bomb more and wider areas of industrial and communication centers in North Vietnam in order to completely destroy the aggressive power of the Hanoi regime and insure the independence and freedom of South Vietnam. We also hope that you will give moral and material support to the Republic of China to open a new front on the Chinese mainland so as to destroy the Peiping regime and thus to remove once and for all the troublemaker behind the Vietnamese war and preserve the peace in Asia and the world at large.

On this 12th anniversary of Freedom Day, we recall with gratitude the just support your country gave to over 22,000 anti-Communist Chinese and Korean prisoners of war which made it possible for them to regain their freedom. For this we wish to convey to you our heartfelt thanks.

CABLE TO PRESIDENT PARK CHUNG HEE, OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

DEAR PRESIDENT PARK: Thanks to the wholehearted support of your country, over 14,000 anti-Communist Chinese prisoners of war who were in Korea 12 years ago regained their freedom. In recalling this event today, we wish to convey to you our sincere thanks.

Now that the enslaved peoples both in North Korea and the Chinese mainland are intensifying their resistance against their Communist oppressors and that the Communist regimes are on the verge of collapse, it is our hope that our two countries can close ranks and cooperate more closely with each other for the destruction of our common foe and in the struggle for rescuing our compatriots.

CABLE TO THE GOVERNMENT AND PEOPLE OF THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

DEAR PRESIDENT NGUYEN VAN THIEU, PREMIER NGUYEN CAO KY: At a time when the Vietnamese Communists with the full backing of the Chinese Communists are intensifying the war in Vietnam for southward expansion, you are leading the armed forces and people of your country to put up a hard struggle against communism. You pledge that you would not cease your struggle until you have thoroughly eliminated the Vietnamese Communists. Your indomitable spirit for the preservation of the cause of freedom merit our very high admiration and respect.

The people of all walks of life of the Republic of China are observing the 12th anniversary of the Freedom Day today and are assembled here in a mass rally. The meeting has unanimously passed a resolution to back your country up and to exert every effort in support of your country so as to hasten the date for the victory in the anti-Communist war in Vietnam.

CABLE TO THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES, AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND, AND THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA, WHO ARE FIGHTING IN VIETNAM

DEAR GENERAL WESTMORELAND: Now that the Vietnamese Communists at the instigation of the Chinese Communists have flatly turned down all overtures for peace talks and are escalating the war in Vietnam, thanks to the heroic struggle put up by the Armed Forces of the United States, Australia, New Zealand, and the Republic of Korea, the sinister designs of the Communists to take over Vietnam and to enslave the Vietnamese people have been thwarted. Your spirit of struggle for the cause of justice and your valiant action for the preservation of freedom have not only won high praise of the whole population of the Republic of China but also the admiration of all freedom-loving peoples the world over.

We, people of all walks of life of the Republic of China, are assembled here in Taipei in a mass rally to commemorate the 12th anniversary of the Freedom Day. Aside from adopting a resolution to give you our all-out backing, we are ready to strive with you to the bitter end for the independence and freedom of South Vietnam so as to win the victory in the anti-Communist war in Vietnam. We wish you every success.

CABLE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

DEAR SECRETARY GENERAL U THANT: Now that the Chinese Communists are giving encouragement to the Vietnamese Communists to escalate the war in Vietnam to subvert and launch aggression against it in complete disregard to the peace proposal of the United Nations, thus seriously threatening the freedom of mankind and peace of the world, we, people of all walks of life of the Republic of China, are assembled here in Taipei in commemoration of the 12th anniversary of the Freedom Day which falls on January 23, 1966. It should be recalled that 12 years ago today, over 22,000 anti-Communist Chinese and Korean prisoners of war regained their freedom, thanks to the United Nations which insisted on the principle of voluntary repatriation. For this, we specially cable you today to convey to you our heartfelt thanks. May we express our hope that you will not only bar the admission of but also impose effective sanctions upon the Chinese Communist regime which is the source of all troubles that threatens the freedom of people and the peace of the world. It is also our hope that you will give just support to all enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain in their struggle against slavery and for freedom so that they will win their freedom again.

Finally, a dramatic message was an open letter to the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain, expressing the sentiments and determination of the thousands of dedicated people who participated in this rally. I conclude my remarks with the insertion of this letter.

LETTER TO THE ENSLAVED PEOPLES BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Where there is poisoned by the spread of communism, the Iron Curtain inevitably lowers and the "slave system" is the end result. For many years, you have been living in the hell on earth, suffering from Communist persecution and enslavement. Over the intolerable plight you are in, we have always been deeply concerned.

Twelve years ago today, over 22,000 Chinese and Korean prisoners of war on the battlefield of Korea, to free themselves from the shackles of Communist tyranny, finally regained their freedom in spite of Communist threats and inducements. This action for justice in the choice of freedom has not only stiffened the determination of the peoples shut behind the Iron Curtain but also set a shining example to them for the struggle of freedom. It was primarily for this reason that we, people of all walks of life of the Republic of China together with all freedom-loving peoples the world over designated this day as "Freedom Day" to celebrate their regaining of freedom on the one hand and to expand the scope of the Freedom Day movement on the other so as to unite all forces of justice of the whole world to give you support for the regaining of freedom.

Right at the present moment, struggle for the position of leadership between the Chinese Communist regime and the Soviet Union has been sharpening and the Soviet satellite states have been striving for more independence in their relations with the Soviet Union, thereby plunging the whole Communist bloc into a state of disintegration. Furthermore, ideological dispute over dogmatism and revisionism between Peiping and Moscow has caused divergence of views as to whether to enter into Communist economy and whether to achieve the end of "world revolution" by means of "peaceful coexistence" line or "liberation war" line. All this clearly indicates confusion within the ranks of the Communist bloc, theoretical bankruptcy and the decline of Communism, as a doctrine which is generally detested. It also shows that the Communist regimes have begun to waver and the whole Iron Curtain is on the verge of collapse.

For all that, we should know that our enemy will not sit idly by, waiting for its extinction. Nor will the Iron Curtain disintegrate by itself. On the contrary, all freedom-loving peoples on both sides of the Iron Curtain should unite in their common effort to destroy it. That being the case, it is our sincere hope that all our friends behind the Iron Curtain, while celebrating the Freedom Day today, will glorify the spirit of struggle against slavery and for freedom, as exemplified by over 22,000 anti-Communist Chinese and Korean POW's 12 years ago. They should concert their efforts to fight against Communist regimes and stir up an overall anti-Communist revolutionary movement so that liberation of one part of the Iron Curtain will lead to the outbreak of the revolution of another part of it until the anti-Communist forces behind the Iron Curtain in Asia and Europe will be combined into a strong current of anti-Communist tide for the destruction of the Iron Curtain in Asia as well as in Europe and thus to free mankind once and for all from the threat of Communist slavery.

The Government and people of the Republic of China are exerting their effort for the destruction of the Iron Curtain on the Chinese mainland and salvation of their enslaved compatriots. We are confident that we shall accomplish this sacred mission in the foreseeable future. We are also convinced that once a corner of the Iron Curtain is broken, it will have far-reaching repercussion throughout the whole Iron Curtain. Because of this reason, when the Chinese mainland is recovered, it will be the day when the Iron Curtain in Asia will be liberated. Likewise, it will also mark the beginning of the final liberation of the Iron Curtains both in Europe and Cuba. In view of this fact, we may each exert our effort in different areas of the world, but our objective is one and the same. In paying our respects to you today, we wish to assure you that we shall exert our utmost in our support to your regaining of freedom.

COSSACKIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House to the 48th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the Don Cossacks, which we commemorate today. Unfortunately, the Cossacks are now captives of communism, and this great holiday is forbidden by their present Red tyrants.

Therefore, on this great historic day for the Don Cossacks, we must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to these brave people and all the other captives of communism.

The February 16 declaration of independence by the Don Cossacks was followed by a similar proclamation by the Kuban Cossacks on May 5 of 1918, but these valiant people were subjugated by the Red armies. The Cossacks still maintain, however, a defiant attitude toward Communist attempts to absorb them into the Soviet Union because of their strong tradition of self-government and nationalism.

In addition to commemorating national days such as this, Mr. Speaker, we must take practical steps to show our interest in the restoration of freedom to the captive peoples of communism. Therefore, I reiterate my plea for the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

I also believe it is necessary for the Voice of America to provide lengthier and more effective broadcasts to the Soviet Union to pierce the wall of Communist propaganda and deliver the truth to the Cossack people. As we know, Mr. Speaker, in recent years the Voice of America has been cutting back both its hours of broadcast and the nature of these broadcasts, giving straight news because of the policy of the administration not to offend the Soviet Union. The Voice of America should be a vehicle for countering Communist propaganda and strengthening the resistance of the freedom-loving people of Cossackia and the other captive peoples of communism.

CLEVELAND OPPOSES PRESIDENT'S PLAN TO CUT FUNDS FOR SCHOOL LUNCH AND SCHOOL MILK PROGRAMS

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, although the new Federal budget submitted by the President proposes the highest level of spending in the history of the United States, it also proposes sharp reductions in the school milk and school lunch programs.

In my opinion, these are ridiculous places in which to make economies. I shall fight to restore these funds.

The President's request flies in the face of the avowed objectives of his poverty program. We have seen such contradictions before, however. Last year, the Great Society sought to cut out the soil conservation program, which is so important to the small farmers and landowners. This year, the ax is aimed at schoolchildren.

An excellent editorial on this subject was recently published by the Washington Post and I offer it at this point in the RECORD. I strongly believe that if this country is going to pour out billions in public welfare programs, it can afford to continue two relatively small programs, which provide and promote good nutrition for our schoolchildren:

HEALTHY, WEALTHY, AND UNWISE

"The school lunch and special milk programs will focus more on needy children," the President said in his budget message. He intends to accomplish this laudable purpose by cutting the subsidies for milk and lunches heavily, and then giving a minor fraction of the savings to special help for poor children.

The Federal Government currently is spending $100 million a year to subsidize more than 3 billion half-pint bottles of milk for schoolchildren. The new budget proposes to cut this investment back to $21 million. There is still to be milk for those schools with no other food service, according to the budget, and free milk for children who need it. The prickly task of defining need is to be left to the local school authorities.

About 18 million children now get federally subsidized school lunches daily. The new budget would cut the subsidy for most children by about one cent per lunch, and use some of the savings to increase the help for the meals in "needy schools." The net reduction would be $19 million.

One reason for these cuts is the recent change in the market for dairy products. Previously the subsidies merely bought milk that the Government would otherwise have had to buy under the price support program. But market demand has risen while dairy production has dropped significantly and the subsidies are emerging, for the first time, as a real cost to the Government. But the milk and the lunches served a better purpose, all these years, than merely keeping up farm prices. They were good for children, and the children continue to need them. The talk of "needy" children and "needy" schools merely veils a whole new apparatus of means tests. There is a category of subsidies, in which the unit costs are low and the benefits broad, which are properly distributed without means tests. This country can afford to encourage nourishing diets for its schoolchildren, even in a year when dairy prices no longer require that support.

NEEDIEST SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE ON SHORT END OF FEDERAL SCHOOL PROGRAM AID

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, last month Mr. Richard E. Howard, editor of the Hillsboro Messenger reported his extraordinary findings that 12 of the 20 school districts in New Hampshire which the State legislature has declared to be the neediest in the State are receiving very little or nothing at all under the allocation formulas of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Who is right? Are we to conclude from this that the State legislature does not know what it is doing? Or is the Federal formula wrong? In any case, it is apparent that the Federal authorities have not even consulted the State educational authorities and have relied instead solely on their slide rules and computers, grinding out figures far from the scene where their programs are being applied.

I ask now that this article be reprinted at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I urge my colleagues to read it. They may wish to examine the way these funds are being distributed in their own States. I also wish to congratulate Mr. Howard on his research and for bringing this matter to public attention.

FEDERAL FORMULA CALLED FARCE—NO AID TO NEEDIEST SCHOOLS—OPPOSITION VIEW GIVEN BY EDITOR IN SWANZEY TALK

SWANZEY.—Twelve of the twenty school districts in New Hampshire declared by the State legislature to be the "neediest" and the most educationally deprived, are receiving either very little or nothing at all from the Federal-aid-to-education program (title I) designed specifically to help needy and deprived schoolchildren.

This was disclosed by Publisher Richard E. Howard of the Hillsboro Messenger during a talk last Friday at the Monadnock Regional High School here.

Howard was guest speaker at a senior seminar program on education and government. He was introduced by Edward F. Bourassa, Jr., former Hillsboro principal and now chairman of the social studies department at Monadnock.

Speaking on "Federal Aid To Local Education—The Other Side," the Hillsboro editor outlined the basic philosophy underlying opposition to Federal aid programs. He summarized the current distribution to title I funds in New Hampshire, and described as "a farce" the Federal formula under which schools that need the most help, get the least.

Howard told the Monadnock seniors:

"The State legislature, in its last two sessions, appropriated a total of more than $200,000 in special State aid funds for the 20 neediest school districts in New Hampshire.

"Currently, the Federal Government is in the process of distributing more than $1.4 million in special Federal aid funds, also to the neediest or most poverty-stricken schools in the State.

"Forty-six of New Hampshire's 199 school districts do not qualify for any part of these Federal funds because the Federal Government has determined there are no educationally deprived children in any of these districts. Another 45 districts are entitled to receive only token amounts, ranging from $200 to less than $2,500.

"Now get this.

"Twelve of the twenty school districts declared by the State legislature to be the neediest and the most educationally deprived, are among the 91 districts receiving little or no funds under the Federal program designed specifically to aid needy and deprived schoolchildren.

"Four of the State's neediest districts—Benton, Stark, Stewartstown, and Unity—get absolutely nothing from title I of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Eight other needy New Hampshire school districts—Loudon, Chichester, Langdon, Fremont, Candia, Goshen-Lempster, Grantham, and Merrimack—are eligible only for the relatively small amounts.

"To be sure, the criteria used to determine the degree of poverty or educational deprivation is different. The State based its aid on low property values; the Federal aid is figured on the basis of low family incomes.

"However, wouldn't it be logical to assume that if a local school district is poor, it's poor? If it's needy, it's needy? If its schoolchildren are educationally deprived, they're educationally deprived, regardless of what kind of a yardstick is used to measure the degree of poverty, need or deprivation?

"Otherwise, the Federal Government's distribution formula—at least here in New Hampshire—would indicate Washington's belief that many families with decent incomes live in shacks while families that live in decent homes earn poverty wages.

"One of two conclusions could be drawn here—either the State legislature didn't know what it was doing when it appropriated special funds for New Hampshire's 20 neediest school districts, or, the Federal aid-to-education program is, in fact, the farce that a lot of people claim it to be.

"Inasmuch as one would concede that our local legislators know considerably more about our local schools than do the educational planners in Washington, the latter would seem more likely."

NO MORE AMERICAN MONEY TO TRAIN CUBAN ARMY

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement that the United States would spend $1.2 million through the United Nations to help the University of Havana train young Communists and Cuban Regulars in electronics, radar, and military communications has shocked me beyond words to describe and it is apparent that we cannot leave our big giveaway show entirely in the care of the State Department's master of ceremonies.

I am today introducing legislation to prevent this money from going to Cuba and to protect the American taxpayer, in the future, from having his money spent to finance Communist projects.

The taxpayers have suffered in relative silence at supporting the U.N. while other members sat back and left the bill paying to us. They listened in resignation when the President told them that a chunk of the butter in the guns-and-butter budget would be used to expand the Great Society social welfare programs to the rest of the world.

But even the taxpayer's patience and generosity has its bounds and he draws the line at extending the Great Society to include financing the technical and military training of young Communist Party members only 90 miles from our own coastline.

Shocked disbelief characterized the reaction of many Americans when they first heard of the $1,240,000 that the United States would contribute to the total of $3,100,000 that the U.N. is giving to the technical branch of the University of Havana. The branch is headed by Russian and Cuban military personnel and the money will be used for training in radar, electronics, computers, and military communications. All students attending this branch must be Communist Party members or in the Cuban military.

Ambassador Roosevelt has stated that the United States will neither demand rejection of the plan nor withhold any of the U.S. contribution, although this is strictly voluntary and we are under no obligation.

Mr. Speaker, are we so short of memory that we cannot remember the meeting just this year in Havana of representatives of 82 Communist Parties in 3 continents? Their purpose was to organize a more unified effort to subvert Asia, Africa, and the Americas.

What Mr. Roosevelt is doing with the blessing of the State Department and the White House, is spending our money to train young men to assist in this conspiracy against America and every other free nation of the world. Perhaps the next step will be to loan the Communists our top scientists and technologists to show them the latest methods.

I protest this action in the name of the American taxpayer who must sign the check and in the name of our national security. The administration should explain this action to the American boys who are fighting and dying in Vietnam to protect the world from this very communism which our tax dollars will be used to train in Cuba.

It is obvious that our only course is to leave our foreign policy people less leeway and write into the language of our aid program that no U.S. money shall be given for projects aiding any Communist-dominated country. We have left the diplomats too free too long.

Action such as I propose today would slam the door firmly on the open hands of those who reach for our money while they are making plans to stab us in the back.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY OF ADAMS, MASS.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 146th anniversary of the birth of Miss Susan B. Anthony, the great and tireless crusader for women's suffrage in this country. Appropriate commemorative ceremonies were held under joint sponsorship of the Daughters of the American Revolution and the National Woman's Party in the crypt of the Capitol near the famous statue of Miss Anthony and her colleagues.

We in the First Congressional District of Massachusetts have always taken special pride in our ancestral constituent who was born in the Berkshire town of Adams, in 1820. I have, in fact, introduced a bill in the Congress authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Anthony birthplace as a national historic site.

Susan Brownell Anthony was, of course, not only a citizen of Massachusetts and later of New York. She was a citizen of the world in the tradition of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln who each had a similar dream and a similar struggle on behalf of all mankind, not merely their country or their neighborhood.

The Susan B. Anthony story is a familiar one to most Americans. Her name has come to be synonymous with courage, vision, freedom, and democracy. It is entirely appropriate that we take note of the anniversary of this great woman's birthdate each year.

It is also to the great credit of the DAR and the National Woman's Party that the annual commemoration is so well organized and so fittingly conducted; and that the memory of this woman is so graciously perpetrated.

The February issue of the Daughters of the American Revolution magazine contains an article dealing with the life of Miss Anthony. It was written by Mrs. Ada Crebs Trigger of the DuBois chapter in Pennsylvania, who contributed so much to the commemorative ceremony yesterday in the crypt. The article captures much of the spirit of Susan B. Anthony's life and crusade; a life which contains many valuable lessons for all of us, men and women, who would seek to safeguard the rights of free people and uphold the lamp of democracy. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the article appear at this point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

SUSAN B. ANTHONY

(By Ada Crebs Trigger, DuBois chapter, Pennsylvania)

February 15 is the birthday anniversary of Susan B. Anthony. Efforts have been made for years by the Susan B. Anthony Memorial Committee of the National Woman's Party to increase the celebration of Susan B. Anthony's birthday, and to have greater recognition given to her place in American history by public schools and libraries and other public places. This is part of a general effort for recognition of the contributions made by women to the building up of our Nation—contributions that have had but little notice and little appreciation.

Ida Husted Harper writes in her "Life of Susan B. Anthony":

"Every girl who now enjoys a college education, every woman who has a chance of earning an honest living in whatever sphere she chooses, every wife who is protected by any law in the possession of her person and property, every mother who is blessed with the custody and control of her own children, owes these sacred privileges to Susan B. Anthony. We do not underestimate the splendid services of other pioneers or their successors, but it is Susan B. Anthony's name that stands, and always will stand, as the everlasting symbol of women's emancipation."

Susan Brownell Anthony was born February 15, 1820, in Adams, Mass., where her father, Daniel Anthony, owned a cotton mill. Later, the family moved to Rochester, N.Y., and their home there has now been acquired and restored by a committee of women as a museum, containing the records of Susan B. Anthony's great work for women. It is now known as "Susan B. Anthony's House."

Susan B. Anthony was given an unusually good education, compared to that given most girls in those days. When she was 17, her father lost his property in the panic of 1837, and, because teaching was then almost the only paid occupation open to women, Susan became a teacher to help with the family income. Her first personal experience of the degraded position of women came when she found that she had to accept $2.50 per week for work for which a man teacher was paid $10.

She also discovered that the little money she earned would not be her own if her father chose to keep it—which, happily, Mr. Anthony did not do. She looked about her and found that until a girl married, she was under the legal control of her father, and from the day she married, until she died or was widowed, she was under the legal control of her husband. A married woman could own no property; she had no control over her children, since they belonged by law to the father, she could not testify in a court of law, could not sue or be sued. No woman, married or unmarried, had any way of protesting against such injustices, for women were barred by custom from public platforms, and women who wrote on the subject were practically ostracized.

Susan B. Anthony broke this first taboo by daring to speak at a convention of the New York State Teachers Association. No woman had ever before asked to be heard, but the men, by a majority of one, voted that she might speak. After that, she made many speeches—advocating modern ideas of education, women's rights and the abolition of slavery.

As the years passed, women by the thousands became supporters of woman's claim to vote. Girls went to college, studied medicine, law and science. Practically all trades and professions, were invaded—but not at equal pay. The invention of the typewriter and the telephone increased the importance of women in the world of business.

Miss Anthony worked for 50 years for equal rights for women, especially for the voting privilege. She appeared before every session of Congress for many years. Her slogan was: "Principle, not policy; justice, not favor; men, their rights and nothing more; women, their rights and nothing less."

During Miss Anthony's later years votes for women was no longer laughed at. But few people believed it would ever be attained. Miss Anthony knew that it would be. She saw how the world had changed since her girlhood, and she knew that the mind of the Nation would one day be changed on this question. She, who in her youth had been insulted, abused, pelted with rotten eggs, and decayed vegetables for daring to advocate votes for women, in her ripening years was one of the most famous and respected women in the United States.

In Washington, she was an honored guest at the White House, though no President would then ask Congress to pass the suffrage amendment. She was a life member of the Daughters of the American Revolution (No. 26155), and for several years was invited to sit on the platform at the National DAR Congress as a guest of honor and to address the assembly.

When she traveled abroad, she was shown great respect. Queen Victoria received her at Buckingham Palace. In Berlin, the Kaiser and his family honored her. To women all over the world her name became a symbol of hope and encouragement.

She never grew weary, never lost faith, near stopped working. At 70, 75, and 80 years, and beyond, she continued to travel over the United States, lecturing and organizing. At 83 years of age, she was in Berlin, helping to organize the International Woman Suffrage Alliance. At 86, she attended a convention of the National American Woman Suffrage Association in Baltimore.

A banquet in her honor was given in Washington when she was 86 years old. The invitations were accepted by leading statesmen, writers, and other public persons. She planned, for this occasion, to put aside her little red shawl which had so often covered her shoulders as she trudged up the steps of the Capitol seeking equal rights for women. She wore, instead, a new white silk shawl. Below her sat the gentlemen of the press. They took one glance and sent a note to her, saying, "No red shawl, no publicity." She sent for the shawl, which had become a symbol of heroism. The little red shawl is now a treasured possession in the collection of the National Museum in Washington.

The day of Susan B. Anthony's funeral in 1906, in Rochester, N.Y., a blizzard swept the city. Shrieking wind and snow heaped the streets with drifts. Yet thousands of people stood in the bitter cold outside the church where she lay in flag-draped coffin. Beside it, all day, stood a guard of honor of girls from Rochester University. The flags of the city were at half-mast as she was carried through the driving storm to her resting place beside her father and mother in Mount Hope Cemetery. In newspaper offices throughout the country, obituaries were rushed into type. A great woman had passed. Hundreds of columns in her praise were written.

Fourteen years after Miss Anthony's death, the women's suffrage amendment to the Constitution, for which she had worked so long, was finally adopted and became the law of the land August 26, 1920. It was popularly known as the Susan B. Anthony amendment in Miss Anthony's honor.

The adoption of the suffrage amendment came 272 years after the presentation of the first suffrage petition on this continent. This first petition was presented in 1648 by Margaret Brent to the Maryland House of Delegates at the statehouse at St. Marys, Md., then the capital of the colony. The petition was rejected.

Miss Anthony had worked in her earlier years for school suffrage for women, municipal suffrage for women, and especially for State suffrage for women. No one thought then of attempting to amend the Constitution to give nationwide suffrage to women. But after the Civil War, when the 15th amendment to the Constitution was adopted, in 1870, giving the vote to the Negro throughout the country, Miss Anthony and her coworkers urged that this amendment should give nationwide voting rights to women, as well as to the Negro. However, the women were pushed aside and told to wait—that this was "the Negro's hour."

After the failure to have women included in the 15th amendment, Miss Anthony and her fellow crusaders then sought to establish the right of women to vote under the 14th amendment, adopted in 1868, which read in part:

"No State shall * * * deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Claiming for themselves the right to vote under the 14th amendment, Miss Anthony and a number of other women actually succeeded in casting their ballots at one election voting place. They were promptly arrested, tried, and convicted of illegal voting, although not imprisoned.

The question of the right of women to vote under the 14th amendment was then carried to the Supreme Court of the United States, in a famous case, *Minor* v. *Happersett*. The Court held that the 14th amendment did not give women the right to vote. The leaders of the suffrage movement, especially Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Miss Anthony, then proceeded to have introduced in Congress an amendment of their own, an amendment expressly giving the vote to women. This amendment was first introduced in Congress in 1878. It was the amendment that was finally adopted in 1920, and is the amendment under which American women are voting today.

On the 114th anniversary of Susan B. Anthony's birthday, in 1934, in an address before the U.S. Senate, Senator Arthur Capper, of Kansas, said:

"This month of February has furnished this Nation with three of the greatest warriors for liberty in its history, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Susan B. Anthony; and may I express the hope that somewhere in this National Capital a fitting memorial, in keeping with the memorials erected for George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, may be erected to that other great American—Susan B. Anthony."

Today, in the Capitol at Washington, down in the crypt, standing alone, far beneath the dome, is a glorious monument to Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Susan B. Anthony, the three great pioneers of the movement for equality of rights for women. It was made by Adelaide Johnson, sculptress. The monument was presented to Congress by the National Women's Party on Susan B. Anthony's birthday anniversary in 1921 after the suffrage victory. The monument was formally received on behalf of Congress by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Throughout the world this is the only monument of women, to women, sculptured by a woman, presented by women, standing in any national capitol.

The Susan B. Anthony Memorial Committee of the National Women's Party has labored to have Susan B. Anthony's fame perpetuated. The committee was also instrumental in having a Susan B. Anthony postage stamp issued, marking the 16th anniversary of the adoption of the suffrage amendment to the Constitution. Over 200 million stamps were printed. It proved to be one of the most popular of the special stamps. Later, in 1955, another Susan B. Anthony stamp was issued, a 50-cent regular series and is still available. The Women's Party also worked to have a giant sequoia redwood tree in California named in her honor. The Women's Party, along with the

DAR, gave particularly active support to the effort to have a statue of Miss Anthony placed in the New York University Hall of Fame in 1950. Susan B. Anthony was 1 of 6 from a listing of 186 to receive this recognition from New York University at that time. The other five Americans elected to the hall of fame at the same time were: Dr. William C. Gorgas, Surgeon General of the Army, who rid Havana and Panama of yellow fever; Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, Presidents of the United States; Alexander Graham Bell, inventor of the telephone; Josiah William Gibbs, discoverer and interpreter of laws of chemical equilibrium.

These honors that have been given Miss Anthony since her death are an indication that she is gradually winning recognition as an emancipator of women, and will have a place in history with those other great American emancipators, George Washington and Abraham Lincoln.

THE NEW ECONOMICS

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that many leading economists are beginning to speak out about what has been loosely dubbed the "New Economics."

Henry Wallich, who writes an excellent column for Newsweek magazine, starts a recent essay as follows:

> There is much that is good about the new economics, and much that is new, and what is good is by no means new, and what is new is by no means all good.

It is important for those of us in politics to follow the dialog more closely, otherwise we can make some major errors of judgment, if we have not done so already, in establishing fiscal policy. I understand that President Johnson has now put aside what he probably identifies as his "puritan conscience" which insisted upon balanced budgets over the business cycle and is now trying to convert others to the new and more convenient religion which oversimplified, says "Don't worry about Federal deficits, we owe it to ourselves in the long run."

There are two points I wish to make. First. That condoning continued deficit financing on the basis that as far as the society is concerned we owe the Federal debt to ourselves, ignores the major structural aspects of the society. To those who wish to change the basic structural aspects or who care little whether these structural aspects are changed, this ignorance is understandable. But to those of us who believe that the success of our economic system is derived to a large degree from these basic structures, a dismantling of them, particularly through ignorance, is the height of folly.

Second. That tax rate cuts must relate to the rates that prevailed and cannot be considered in a vacuum. If the tax rates have been relatively low, a tax rate cut can mean merely a loss of revenue. However, if the tax rates have been relatively high, beyond or approaching the point of diminishing returns as it were, then tax rates cuts can mean a gain in tax revenue through an increase in the tax base impeded in its normal expansion, as it was, by the high rates.

There is little question that we start tax rate cuts with very high tax rates, not low tax rates. The use of fiscal policy by the Federal Government to achieve economic results must be considered in this context. The new economists ignore this basic point of departure in their discussions of how tax rate cuts can "stimulate" the economy. All that has happened in the recent tax rate cuts of 1948, 1954, and 1964, is that tax rates which have been high and so impeding economic growth have been cut so that taxes are less of an impediment to increasing the tax base.

The tax cut of 1964 was in context of Federal governmental expenditure restraint, as were the rate cuts of 1948 and 1954, not in context of the ease which the new economists intent upon increasing total purchasing power within the society were arguing for. The Republican motion to amend the tax bill stated that expenditures be held to $97 billion for fiscal 1964 and $98 billion for fiscal 1965. The Democratic leaders of the Congress defeated the Republican motion at the insistence of President Johnson only to have the President go the Republicans one better on expenditure restraint. Fiscal 1964 Federal expenditures were $97.7 billion: $0.7 billion in excess, but fiscal 1965 expenditures were $96.5, $1.5 below the mark, giving a total for the 2 years of $0.8 billion below the mark. Fiscal 1966 started out on a happy note of expenditure restraint, at the annual average of $97.3 for the first 2 months, July and August 1965.

The real President Johnson stood up in September 1965 when the expenditure rate jumped to what would be $114 billion a year. This increase was not just for the war in Vietnam, in included the "war" in poverty land. It is only now that the real claim of the new economists to newness is being tested—namely, deficit financing in a period of high economic activity through massive Federal expenditure increases.

Here follows the essay of Mr. Wallich to which I referred.

HENRY C. WALLICH ON THE NEW ECONOMICS

There is much that is good about the new economics, and much that is new, but what is good is by no means new, and what is new is by no means all good. As preached and practiced in the Economic Report of the President, the new economics uses the Federal budget to stabilize the economy. Its most spectacular manifestation has been the tax cut of 1964. Confidence that we can surely avoid major recessions and, not quite so surely, keep minor ones very minor is a real national asset.

So far, so good, but hardly so new. The basic doctrine of the new economics, the use of deficit spending in depressions, was enunciated by Maynard Keynes in 1936 and even earlier. It was then called fiscal policy and almost immediately gained wide acceptance among economists in the United States. In the late 1930's, it was deliberately practiced by the Roosevelt administration. Its unspectacular results must be attributed largely to the New Deal's hostile attitude toward business, which undid the expansive effects of fiscal policy.

After the war, the Nation adopted the Employment Act, through which the Federal Government accepted responsibility for stabilizing the economy at high levels. The principal instrument for stabilization obviously was fiscal policy.

EARLIER TAX CUTS

Fiscal policy was used repeatedly thereafter. In 1948 taxes were cut, while the economy was expanding, an operation resembling in some respects, as Prof. Alvin Hansen of Harvard has pointed out, the tax cut of 1964. Taxes were raised to stem inflation during the Korean war, then cut in the recession of 1954. In the recession of 1958 they might have been cut once more, but instead, a similar expansionary effect was achieved by stepping up Federal expenditures some $11 billion to produce a record peacetime deficit.

The originality of the new economics thus in good part is of the kind that derives from a short memory. That it should have acquired a reputation for great novelty is all the more amazing because virtually every textbook of economics contains a chapter on fiscal policy and how it should be used. Professors of economics must wonder whether they are the sort of lecturers of whom it is said that they talk in other people's sleep.

What is new about the new economics is principally the wide public acceptance it has achieved. Obsessive concern with deficits and a rising public debt, based on misplaced analogies with personal and business finances, seems to be on the wane. This is a great step forward. Only with full public support will we get smooth and flexible handling of an instrument that the Government until now has employed rather creakingly.

FALSE IDENTIFICATION

This new public acceptance has been purchased, however, by identifying deficit financing largely with tax cuts rather than with expenditure increases. Expectations of future "fiscal dividends" have been raised. A tax cut was the right approach in 1964, but need not always be. Occasions may arise when an expansion of public programs should have priority over tax cuts, even though in a free economy it is generally desirable to limit the size of the public sector. Identification with tax cuts is one of the innovations of the new economics that is not necessarily good. It may become a real threat very soon if it should keep the administration from proposing higher taxes if and when the Vietnam situation demands it.

New but far from good is also the unconcern with inflation that the new economists have evinced. Inflation is by no means a necessary result of deficit spending. It is the result of pushing a good thing too far, or of doing it at the wrong time. The economic courage to run deficits in times of unemployment must be matched by the political courage to cut back, balance the budget, and if necessary run surpluses when employment becomes overfull. If this year we should suffer inflation, we may expect fiscal prohibitionists who want to outlaw all deficits to blame the new economics, and the new economists to blame Vietnam. Both will be wrong. The new economics is old enough for economists to know how it should be handled. If it backfires, the blame is not on the instrument, but on the handlers.

NEW YORK SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS FOCUS ON RURAL AND URBAN NEEDS

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CONABLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, a number of soil and water conservation districts in New York State celebrated 25 years of service to landowners during the past year, and at the same time five new conservation districts were created in counties not known for their agriculture. We now have 52 conservation districts in New York, encompassing more than 28 million acres.

Farmland in New York is disappearing rapidly in the wake of rapid urban expansion. Nonetheless, agriculture is still a big industry in the State. Its products were valued at $900 million last year. In my own congressional district there was great production of milk, livestock products, and specialty fruits and vegetables, as well as traditional crops.

Today, of course, more and more rural land is expected to provide more homesites for people working in the larger centers of business and industry, locations for factories and offices, larger airports, improved roads, and other facilities. The new soil and water conservation districts in New York are being designed for just such purposes—to assist urban homeowners and residents as well as suburbanites and rural landowners, to make better use of natural resources, to accommodate increasing demands on soil and water. All members of the New York Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts have also modernized their existing soil and water programs for these purposes, the fifth State in the Nation to do so.

The Department of Agriculture advises me that the Soil Conservation Service literally is being swamped by requests from conservation districts in New York for soils information usable by town and city planning boards. The soil and water conservation districts in the congressional district which I represent have over 3,000 cooperators—landowners who have requested help in preparing conservation plans and in installing conservation practices. To date almost 2,500 cooperators in my district have completed preparation of their conservation plans, and SCS assisted over 1,500 of them in the past fiscal year, providing almost 6,000 services. Over 100 consultative services were furnished to additional people and organizations.

In addition County Boards of Supervisors of Monroe County and Wyoming County in my district have appropriated $41,250 to conservation districts to reimburse SCS for employing additional soil scientists to accelerate the soil survey already in progress.

In the face of currently widespread concern about water shortage as well as land use, the conservation leadership provided by New York's soil and water conservation districts, on the land where water falls, contributes encouraging evidence that with adequate planning and Federal-State-local cooperation, we can meet the constantly growing demands on our basic resources.

THE WET WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS], is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the terms "cold war" and "space race" are common household words today. However, too few of our citizens, I fear, are aware of an equally decisive competition being waged in inner space—the "wet war."

By this I mean the erosion of American seapower in the face of a very real challenge presented to us by the Soviet Union.

Seapower is a total concept. It is the vehicle by which both national power in war and national sovereignty in peace are projected into the world ocean: a world ocean which comprises three-fourths of the earth's surface.

Seapower requires not only naval power in the military sense; it also requires a strong merchant marine, a viable fishing industry, a national capability in oceanography and marine sciences, and a shipbuilding capacity to furnish the instruments of these various efforts.

It is one of the primary functions of naval power to protect these related elements of seapower. In the words of Adm. Alfred T. Mahan, famed naval strategist and historian, and I quote:

> Seapower not only includes the arms by which the sea or any part of it is ruled, but also the peaceful commerce and shipping from which alone a military fleet naturally and healthfully springs, and on which it securely rests.

There is, therefore, a substantial interdependence between the maritime industry and the Navy.

The role of the maritime industry, and particularly of the merchant marine, in a national economy is not of recent discovery. The pages of history are filled with evidence of this role. Every nation achieving commercial supremacy and national security in a major way has done so by developing a dependable merchant marine, and by protecting its trade routes. Witness, for example, the ascendency of Great Britain to world influence. It was directly related to control of the seas. It was built on the cornerstone of seapower.

Today we have the added element of airpower. But the role of merchant shipping retains its vital position as a significant factor in international relationships. In the Cuban crisis of 1962 the critical showdown came not in the air, not on the ground, but at sea. And President Kennedy clearly acknowledged the significance of this when he said, and I quote:

> Events of October 1962, indicated that control of the seas can mean security and peace. The United States must control the seas if it is to protect our security.

Today in southeast Asia the sound of anchor chain in the hawsepipe is drowning out the roar of aircraft engines, at least so far as logistics is concerned. Two out of every three soldiers fighting in Vietnam have been moved there by ship. Ninety-eight percent of the supplies to support American troops in Vietnam have been transported by ship. This, to me, is proof of the fallacy of those who would disparage the vital role to be played by the American merchant marine.

In 1936 the Congress passed the Merchant Marine Act, and through all these 30 years since then, that legislation has provided the foundation for the Government's action in seagoing trade activities.

That act included a declaration of policy which clearly stated that the merchant marine must be a partner in our national defense structure; that we must have the best and safest ships; they must be built in this country, and be operated by Americans; so that the U.S. merchant fleet can carry out normal U.S. shipping needs, and also, in a time of national emergency, serve as a naval and military auxiliary.

But what has happened?

It is not an exaggeration to say that instead of having a merchant marine today that is reasonably healthy, we have one that is extremely sick.

True, the liner segment of our merchant marine receiving Federal assistance is reasonably healthy. It has made progress under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. But the other sectors comprised largely of tankers and bulk carriers are withering away.

The cold fact is that we are allowing our once-proud merchant marine to sink in a sea of confusion, neglect, lack of leadership, and bureaucratic twaddle. What is worse, we don't even have a Government policy to deal with the problem. Our merchant marine is drifting aimlessly without a compass and without a rudder.

The Federal Government pays something like $340 to $400 million a year supposedly to make sure that our U.S.-built and U.S.-flag merchant marine serves the 1936 policy as an important cog in our national economy and military structure.

Yet, when it became vitally important to get military cargoes to Vietnam over the past several months the Government ran into difficulties. Last summer the Department of Defense found that at the moment of great need for shipping capacity, our ships were tied up in port by a maritime labor strike.

Fortunately, and to be commended, labor released the needed vessels from the strike. But this experience underscores the need to improve labor-management grievance procedures in the maritime industry.

PROBLEMS COMPOUNDED

And other problems have developed. Shipping requirements for Vietnam have increased steadily since last summer. To meet the demand we have been required to augment modern merchant vessels with older ships broken out from our National Defense Reserve Fleet.

As I understand it, the performance of some of these older vessels has given rise to serious questions concerning the responsive capability of our Reserve Fleet. It is this fleet that is maintained specifically to meet contingencies such as Vietnam. Yet there have been reports of some of these vessels experiencing breakdowns at sea due to equipment failures.

In addition to these two difficulties in meeting the need of a genuine national emergency, there was another. We have been required to charter foreign-flag ships in order to transport vital cargoes to Vietnam. In several instances these foreign-flag ships have refused to do the job: the crews would not agree to man ships carrying American cargoes to Vietnam.

But this was of little concern to operators of these foreign-flag ships. They were able to get "two bites at the apple." American flag, subsidized operators already furnishing vessels to the Vietnam effort commenced to charter these foreign-flag ships, and used them to meet the normal commercial shipping requirements on the subsidized trade routes which the American ships had served before moving to the Vietnam effort.

Aside from the obvious disadvantages in having to rely on foreign-flag ships in a time of international crisis, and aside from the sheer incongruity of seeing a supposed leading sea power having to ask to use foreign ships, this practice also contributes to our balance-of-payments problem. Every time a foreign ship is chartered by a U.S. Government agency or private company it means that gold must be paid out, adding to our international payments deficit.

These events demonstate how badly we have fallen away from that Merchant Marine Act of 1936—legislation which was supposed to insure us a healthy merchant fleet. But they indicate only part of the problem.

Some weeks ago the United States acted with great speed to cooperate with Great Britain in its embargo against Rhodesia. Yet, British shipping is still engaged in transporting cargoes both to Cuba and to North Vietnam. So while the ships of some friendly nations refuse to carry American cargoes to South Vietnam, and at the same time continue to trade with our adversaries we evidently can do nothing about it, at least partly because of the deterioration in our merchant shipping capabilities. The situation is both ridiculous and appalling.

THE 12TH RANKING NATION

In 1946 U.S. ships carried 68.4 percent of U.S. commerce on the seas. The figure is now down to less than 9 percent. Norwegian ships carry twice as much American foreign trade as do our own ships. And ships under the Liberian flag carry three times more.

We rank only fourth in the number of ships afloat. And since World War II our coastal and intercoastal merchant fleets have virtually disappeared.

It is in the matter of shipbuilding that our problem is perhaps best dramatized. At the end of 1965 we ranked ninth in the world in the tonnage of ships built in our country. Only ninth.

But at the end of 1965 we fell to 12th place. Our tonnage under construction in the 12-month period actually declined, and three nations passed us up.

And this condition may be even more embarrassing than it shows. The ranking system, as determined by Lloyd's Register of Shipping, does not even include the shipbuilding activities of Russia and East Germany, nor Communist China. These countries do not make their figures available.

But our tonnage under construction in 1965 totaled approximately 340,000 tons. And reliable estimates indicate that Russia is adding to her merchant shipping by about 1 million tons annually. Not all of Russia's new ships are being built in Soviet yards. Many are provided by East Germany. So our ranking as 12th among the shipbuilding nations of the world may be looking at the bright side of the picture when we consider that either the construction activities of the Soviet Union or East Germany, or both, may well place them ahead of us also.

Who are the nations building more ships than we? Three of them are nations we defeated in World War II: Japan, West Germany, and Italy rank first, third, and fifth respectively. Two others are Communist countries with scant reputations as seagoing nations: these are Poland and Yugoslavia. The others are the United Kingdom, Sweden, Spain, France, Norway, and the Netherlands.

If we lived in a utopian world in which men had only good thoughts, and there were no aggressor nations seeking to expand influence and power, these deteriorating conditions of our merchant marine would be of only slight concern.

But the fact is that today we are engaged in a serious struggle with international communism for world dominance. The contest is none of our doing; we did not invent it, and do not want it.

But international communism has dedicated itself to the eradication of non-Communist systems. And there is no center of resistance to that effort except that which exists in this country. We are the only ones who can do anything of significance, as the current conflict in Vietnam indicates.

And no matter how we look at it, and no matter how much we would prefer to ignore it in hopes that it would go away, it is a fact that the Soviet Union considers merchant shipping to be a major weapon at its command. Russia is busy building its merchant marine strength while we are allowing ours to wither away. The challenge is not really new, only our discovery of it is.

The fact is that we are in the middle of a "wet war" with communism for control of the world's sealanes. Nearly three-fourths of the earth's surface is open water. It is up for grabs, and so far, at least, we are not paying any attention. We are losing the "wet war."

THE SOVIET UNION

There can be no doubt whatsoever that the vital role of seapower in history has not eluded the Soviet Union. That nation is bending every effort to build and maintain a topflight merchant marine, with all its related activities including commercial fishing.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], recently made a trip to Russia to examine maritime activities there. On his return he said, and I quote:

> As of October 31, 1965, the U.S.S.R. had 464 merchant ships of 1,000 gross tons or over under construction or on order. By comparison, the United States had only 39 merchant ships under construction or on order as of last October.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] also went to Russia with Mr. ROGERS and in the Boston Sunday Herald of February 6, 1966, there appears an article by the gentleman from Massachusetts concerning this trip entitled "How Russia Is Beating Us for Mastery of the Seas."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Boston Herald be included immediately following my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend from Alabama, who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, for his very interesting and informative statement. I would be compelled to say to my friend that from what I have heard of his statement thus far, I find myself in agreement.

As a matter of fact, I can venture the assertion that the preponderant majority of the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries are in total agreement with what the gentleman has just stated to the House with respect to the continuing deterioration of our merchant marine.

It is rather confusing and perplexing, Mr. Speaker, to follow the sequence of events in these past few years concerning the constant diminishing of the power of our merchant marine. We have a task force headed up by Cabinet members and their designees who made a report to the American public, which was made public just before the end of this last year, which in simple words stated that we do not have the capability, Mr. Speaker, to build in the shipyards of America a strong merchant marine.

They are suggesting in that report that we seek out the shipyards of other countries to build our own American ships—and for what reason? Because of the wage differential and the construction costs. They are recommending to the American people also that we should not man our American-flag ships, as we know them today, with American seamen because the cost is too high and that we ought to go to other countries for the manpower to man our own American-flag ships.

They say we should go to other countries to have our ships built in foreign shipyards and that is not only for our merchant marine ships, but the recommendation has come now that we build in foreign shipyards our own U.S. Navy vessels. Perhaps before you know it, they will be suggesting that we man our own U.S. Navy ships with foreign crews.

The President's Advisory Committee, which I believe took a very fair and objective approach to this matter, took an entirely different viewpoint from this so-called task force. I am delighted to find that they recognized the need that we must build up our merchant marine if we are ever to be in a position to face a situation such as we faced late this fall with respect to shipments to southeast Asia.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, there is a Member of this body who does not recognize not only the possibility but the very strong probability that before the end of the calendar year we will very likely have in southeast Asia—and not necessarily in South Vietnam, but certainly in southeast Asia—perhaps a military complement exceeding 400,000 men. As a matter of fact, the news media just the day before yesterday in Washington mentioned that very figure—and I see it as a reality.

We do not want the time to come, and it looks as if it is fast approaching, that we cannot meet whatever crisis and emergency may rise with respect to putting materials and men wherever the cause of freedom requires that those materials and those men be placed.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, for his very fine statement and for securing this time. I would express the hope that those Members who were not here today to hear him will have the opportunity to read his statement in the Congressional Record. I commend this very fine statement to all of my colleagues.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his contribution. The gentleman is a dedicated and a very able member of our committee and it is my pleasure to be associated with him. I know of his concern in this area and certainly share that concern with him.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, any who remember the dark days of World War II remember with pride the heroic achievements of the U.S. merchant marine. Indeed, without the dedicated service of the men who manned our merchant ships and the fact that we had a virile and capable merchant marine industry to keep the supply lines open, the story of World War II may have had an entirely different ending.

History will long record the valiant tales of men and of ships on the Murmansk run which made it possible to get supplies and war materiel to our then Russian ally. Fighting winter storms, frozen wastes, and endless attack from beneath the sea by German U-boats and from overhead by the Luftwaffe, the U.S. merchant marine kept the lines open until both the menace from the skies and from under the sea was broken and victory was ours.

In spite of such recent history, our handling of the merchant marine since the end of World War II has been nothing less than shameful. We have, in fact, decimated the power of our merchant fleet to the point where we may be endangering our national safety. It is imperative that we remain masters of the sea if we are to retain our role of leadership in the world. The way we are going we are becoming and will remain the last on the sea.

During the recess of Congress it was my privilege to visit Vietnam and to view at firsthand some of the problems our military faces in logistics. We now have some 200,000 Americans in the Armed Forces in Vietnam. The supply problem for so many troops fighting a war more than 8,000 miles from our own shores, and at the same time to continue the flow of civilian goods to Vietnam and other Asian countries, is staggering beyond imagination. Basically we must rely on our own ships. It is foolhardy to depend upon ships flying foreign flags to supply our war needs, especially in a war like this one where even our friends and allies are using their ships to supply the enemy. The demand for increased shipping to Vietnam will continue. We need more ships and more men in our merchant marine. And we need them now to break the bottleneck in shipping goods and supplies to our troops.

On my trip to Asia I went to Calcutta and boarded an English ship which had been loaded with American wheat at Houston, Tex., and was discharging its cargo in India. Lined up in the harbor at Calcutta were a number of additional ships loaded with American wheat, none of them flying the American flag, but all under the registry of other countries. This at a time when we have unemployed seaman in America and when American prestige in foreign lands is at its lowest point in history.

Our merchant marine is a vital part of the struggle in the world today. The underdeveloped nations, wavering in their allegiance between the East and West, will go to the nation which demonstrates that it is strong and that it is riding the wave of the future. What do the natives of India think about the power and prestige of the United States when the harbor at Calcutta is filled with English ships, Swedish ships, Russian ships, but no American ships not even to carry American goods?

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the views of my able colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, Jack Edwards, in calling for a reevaluation of our policy toward the merchant marine. I think we could cut some of the unnecessary Federal spending and use these savings to revitalize our merchant marine so that once again American ships and American seamen will be the masters of the sea, demonstrating to the whole world our strength of purpose and the capacity of a free society to lead.

I thank my colleague from Alabama for giving me this opportunity.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank my colleague from Alabama for his contribution. I might say that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Martin], has recently been to Vietnam and India and many other countries, and it is a wholesome thing that he went at his own expense and not at the expense of the Government. I thank the gentleman for his participation.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MORTON. I wish to say that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Edwards], has made a significant contribution on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, on which I have had the privilege to serve. The question of the merchant marine as an asset to the United States has been dramatically brought out as a result of the conflict in Vietnam. Its reserve capacity as a logistic support in time of military activity and its capacity for doing the everyday job is being challenged very significantly. I think the whole reserve fleet concept bears looking into.

I hope my colleagues on this committee, the gentleman from Alabama in particular, will help us evaluate the reserve fleet concept. The question is, Are we dealing with a reserve fleet of ships or a pile of scrap iron? This question should be answered for the good of the country. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his contribution. He is a distinguished member of our committee and I am proud to serve with him.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DOWNING. I, too, wish to compliment the gentleman from Alabama for bringing this subject up at this time. We do have a critical shortage in American-flag shipping, and it is showing up in the Vietnam crisis. It is necessary for us to promote the merchant marine and to build enough ships to take care of the country during this crisis. If

America has any soft underbelly in its national defense, it is the merchant marine.

I dislike comparing our assets with Russia, but it is true that Russia is trying to be the No. 1 maritime nation of the world and will be in 1975 if she continues at the present pace. We cannot afford to lose that position on the high seas, not only for reasons of commerce, but also for reasons of prestige. So again I thank the gentleman for bringing this subject to the attention of our colleagues in the Congress and the general public. I think he has contributed a great deal to this situation.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his comments. It is my pleasure to serve on the committee with him and I find him to be a very able and thorough member of the committee.

As others have noted, the Federal budget for fiscal 1967 as presented by President Johnson, provides for the construction of only 11 to 13 new merchant ships for the year.

In his report, which deserves wide attention, Mr. ROGERS also discusses the disparity in commercial fishing activities. He shows that Russian fishing increases by about 500,000 tons a year while U.S. fishing tonnage is actually declining.

He says that we import more than 62 percent of our fish products, worth more than $600 million a year. He indicates that this is money which should be going to American fishermen.

In other ways, the "wet war" challenge is clear. While we let our long-established passenger liner service dwindle away the Soviet Union is now off to a healthy start in getting into the passenger liner business. A new 20,000-ton liner, the *Alexander Pushkin*, built in East Germany, was recently displayed to the public in London. It is scheduled to go into service between Leningrad and Montreal this spring.

Other Soviet liners are already in business, not just in the Atlantic trade but in the Mediterranean and elsewhere.

In most Western nations, certainly in the United States, we have been oblivious to the growth of Soviet seapower, as though it could not happen, or if it could, it would not be significant. But now we must realize that the fact is upon us.

Russia carries nearly 75 percent of its foreign trade in its own vessels, while we carry only 9 percent of ours, or less. Surprisingly, at the busy port of Gibraltar, the Russians are the second heaviest users of the port, after the British themselves.

Russia is not alone in the Soviet bloc in building up its fleets and shipbuilding activity. Poland, East Germany, Rumania, and Yugoslavia are also actively building their shipping strength. Even Hungary and Czechoslovakia, landlocked nations, are showing their flags increasingly in the world's sealanes.

The political significance of the Soviet Union's emergence as a leading seapower, coupled with our decline, should be regarded as second in importance only to Russian space programs. There can be no doubt that Russia's ultimate goal is domination of the world's seagoing trade.

Surely, one of the great unanswered riddles of world history will be that while Russia has struggled for years to gain access to warm water ports as outlets to the sea, she has, in the relatively short time since World War II, created a major merchant shipping strength. And the United States throughout its history has had, not one or two warm water ports but three whole coastlines full of warm water ports, facing the two largest and busiest oceans of the world, and during these same few years we have allowed a major seagoing merchant fleet to dwindle away to its present state of inadequacy.

Experts estimate that before 1970 Russia will be building more than 600 merchant ships a year.

It is no secret that Russia thinks of her merchant marine as a virtual arm of her navy. In fact, international experts now use the term "Soviet Navy" to embrace all ship types, both military and merchant. The misfortune is that this concept is not sufficiently appreciated by many in this country. If there be any question whatever, one need only witness the activities of Russian fishing vessels off our own coasts.

In further support of this proposition, the latest edition of "Jane's Fighting Ships," which is a recognized authority on the subject of shipping, contains the following observation, and I quote:

> There is no doubt that the U.S.S.R. regards her merchant shipping fleet not only as an essential element of the national economy at all times, but as a vital fourth arm of defense in emergencies. Moreover, the Soviet Navy draws freely from the mercantile pool whenever it is in the interests of the fighting services, either absorbing merchant ships as naval auxiliaries or building naval vessels on mercantile lines.

Jane's concludes from its observations that the Russian effort is, and I again quote, "undoubtedly a challenge for naval and mercantile supremacy at sea."

Today there are approximately 1,000 active merchant ships flying the U.S. flag. This compares with more than 3,000 afloat at the close of World War II. Our relatively small fleet is declining by about 4 percent each year, but the rate of decline may well grow in the future unless remedial action is taken.

But we have it on the authority of our own Secretary of Commerce, speaking in San Francisco on December 8, that the Department of Defense considers our own merchant marine fleet to be adequate. The Secretary of Defense, again, on January 28 of this year, stated in writing that the merchant fleet appears "adequate to our need."

Yes, we are in the middle of a "wet war"—a war that could become the most vital of all in the final analysis. But we do not yet seem to recognize that we are in this war. We are doing nothing about it. It seems to me, and I am not alone in this regard, that we have a serious problem on our hands, and we had better start moving toward a solution.

YEARS OF DRIFTING

I want to discuss here some positive steps that we should consider. But first it would be sensible to review briefly some of the events that have brought us to the present state of affairs. We do not want to repeat mistakes of the past, but rather, we want to benefit from experience and use it as a base on which to build progress from this point on.

The most basic fact of our past behavior seems to be that we simply have had no policy—no continuing and consistent program by which the Government has sought to keep faith with the objectives outlined in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

The Federal Government's neglect of effective action with which to implement the 1936 policy has probably been going on for quite a long time. But the serious problems began to develop with the so-called Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961. Under this plan all functions of the Maritime Administration were put under the Department of Commerce.

The effect of the plan of 1961 was to relegate the merchant marine to an inferior status in the bureaucratic structure. It took away the independent position of the merchant fleet and buried it far down in the bureaucratic jungles of Washington.

And surprisingly enough, the same plan of 1961 took just the reverse action with regard to the Government's aviation interest. The aviation office was taken out of the Commerce Department and given independent status as the newly created Federal Aviation Agency.

Under the existing organization the Maritime Administration, which is charged with the full responsibility of formulating a merchant marine policy, is merely one of many other Commerce Department offices, all of which must compete with one another for budget considerations and attention within the Department itself.

What are some of the other Commerce Department bureaus? They include the Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, the Census Bureau, the Patent Office, the Area Redevelopment Administration, the Bureau of Public Roads, and others.

The importance of these functions cannot be denied. But I think it is vital that we grasp the perspective which emerges when we consider the way the Soviet Union thinks of its merchant fleet and compare it with our Government organization picture. In Russia the merchant fleet is a vital arm of the navy; indeed, it is very nearly indistinguishable from the navy. On the other hand, our maritime interests compete for Government attention with the Patent Office and many other interests of varying kinds.

Under these conditions it is not at all surprising that we lack an effective merchant marine policy. And there can be no doubt that we do lack such a policy, even at this late date.

The Secretary of Commerce, John T. Connor, was quoted in February 1965 as saying with regard to the merchant marine, "there isn't any Administration program at the moment."

Secretary Connor is quoted as saying on January 25, 1966, that if the Government had been fulfilling its obligations toward building up the merchant marine over the years, the balance-of-payments problem would be resolved because there would be adequate American-flag bottoms to haul U.S. commerce.

On December 8, 1965, the Under Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Alan S. Boyd, was quoted as saying that there was no policy, and he said efforts to resolve disputes appeared to be at a standstill.

Mr. Boyd, as Under Secretary for Transportation, carries the line of responsibility for merchant marine activities down from the Secretary. Mr. Boyd's experience has been in the field of aviation.

Coming next in line is the head of the Maritime Administration itself, Mr. Nicholas Johnson, who, along with Mr. Boyd, has been the center of controversy among merchant shipping people. Leading management and labor officials in the industry have called for his resignation, saying that Johnson actually opposes efforts to maintain a strong merchant marine.

Senator **Daniel Brewster**, of Maryland, took the floor of the Senate in July of 1965 in defense of Mr. Johnson. What he said was this, and I quote:

> While I do not believe Mr. Johnson is opposed to the continued maintenance of a strong U.S. merchant marine, I am concerned with his failure to commit himself to the policies necessary to insure such strength.

But controversies surrounding top officials in charge of merchant shipping policy are only part of the problem. All this time since 1961 there has been a series of high level reports and recommendations resulting from studies conducted with a view toward the development of a policy, all to no avail.

In April of 1961, at the same time the Reorganization Plan No. 7 was advanced, there was also created a group called the Maritime Evaluation Committee which was supposed to study the problem and come up with a plan. And it did, in July of 1963, submit a report. But nothing more has been heard of it.

Meanwhile there was set up another group, called the Maritime Advisory Committee, made up of representatives of the industry, labor, and Government. The purpose for this group evidently was to present suggestions to the policymakers, again looking to the establishment of a working policy. This group still exists.

In January 1965, President Johnson included in his state of the Union message a pledge to find "a new policy for our merchant marine."

And apparently to implement that pledge he organized in June of that year a group of Government people into what he called the Inter-Agency Maritime Task Force. The task force was headed by Under Secretary Boyd, and its members were Mr. Nicholas Johnson and representatives of nine Federal agencies including the Department of State, Bureau of the Budget, Department of Defense, and the Department of Labor.

The task force made its study, and then in October submitted its report. To say that the report fell like a bomb is no exaggeration. The Maritime Advisory Committee refused even to accept it as a serious contribution. Instead, the Committee prepared a set of its own recommendations, and made these public at the beginning of December.

Leading officials of the maritime industry and of organized labor have all denounced the task force report almost totally. The Maritime Trades Department of AFL–CIO said in December that the U.S. merchant marine is threatened with "virtual extinction." In November the ship construction and repair industry said in a statement that the report represents a "creeping defeatism" with regard to merchant marine policy.

What did the report recommend?

First, the Interagency task force rejected the idea that peacetime shipping needs were sufficient to merit Federal assistance. Accordingly, it called for an overhaul of the present subsidy system with a view to making cuts.

Second, it called for a complete phasing out of our passenger fleet on the theory that it is no longer useful to make an effort to retain U.S. passenger liners in the sealanes of the world.

Third, it urged the construction of more bulk carriers to meet the changing patterns of trade. This proposal probably is the best one in the report, and it makes sense. But before giving legislative consideration to this aspect we should determine if the administration does not already have the authority it needs to implement this recommendation.

Fourth, the report proposes that U.S. shipowners buy ships made abroad, and bring these ships into operation under the same regulations governing American-made ships.

An interesting sidelight developed at the time the Interagency task force report was announced. It is a fact that the Maritime Administration sought to promote the report by means of a recorded telephone message.

Anyone calling DU 6–5550 in Washington would be greeted with a voice saying:

> The future of the American merchant marine has never been brighter as a result of the Interagency task force report.

When some Congressmen questioned this kind of promotional activity at the taxpayers' expense, the Maritime Administration said the message was intended only for the use of its own employees.

Whatever the intention of the telephone message may have been, we are left with the fact that despite the continued studies and reports over the past 5 years, and despite the President's pledge of January 1965 that a merchant marine policy would be found, we came into 1966 still lacking a workable set of programs or policy with which to rebuild the U.S. merchant marine.

With that in mind, the merchant marine industry, labor, and many of us in Congress looked with anticipation last month to the President's state of the Union address for an indication of plans for moving ahead toward a policy. But to our dismay there was not a single word of mention of the merchant marine in that otherwise comprehensive speech.

The budget presentation of a few days ago was even more dismaying. The budget allocation indicated for the Maritime Administration is not only the lowest in the past 7 years, but provides funds for the construction of only 13 new merchant ships.

Mr. Joseph Curran, chairman of the AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, says that this budget treatment "reflects an adoption of the interagency maritime task force report"—the report that has been so soundly rejected by industry and labor alike.

And Chairman **Garmatz** of our House Merchane Marine and Fisheries Committee wisely has posed some serious questions to the administration and to the Nation regarding this budget treatment. He asks if we, as a nation, are ever going to face up to the pressing needs of the American merchant marine.

Last week the chairman and the committee began a series of hearings which we can hope will contribute to progress toward formulation of a policy, or at least some legislative remedies to existing problems. It is imperative that we rise to the challenge which confronts us.

In the face of the most obvious needs, in the face of 5 years of studies and recommendations, the American people have a right to expect that now, finally, the administration would give us leadership in this matter.

And yet all the signs point to continued drift. An anonymous White House staff assistant was quoted on February 10 in the Baltimore Sun as saying that the White House would recommend no new maritime policy this year. It was said that the issue is too controversial for the President to handle, and that the forthcoming transportation message to Congress would include nothing regarding new maritime policy.

The prediction was made that the message will recommend inclusion of the Maritime Administration in the new proposed Department of Transportation, but nothing toward development of a policy.

If these events come to pass, we evidently then face at least another year without administration leadership in merchant shipping matters. And if this is so then we will be neglecting a situation which not only has domestic significance but is a vital element of our international posture as well.

COURSES OF ACTION

As a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries I will want to work with others to find new courses of action which may serve to help solve these problems. We have a good committee made up of men on both sides of the aisle who have a great deal of knowledge in this field and who have a deep dedication to the need for a strong merchant fleet.

It is my position that we should proceed soon and proceed firmly to consider new proposals along with whatever existing ideas may seem useful. In this work we should not be limited by any restrictions on our thinking. We should be imaginative, and must retain completely open minds in order that we don't shut ourselves off from any reasonable actions which could help.

There are, no doubt, many ideas which will flow from this kind of effort. As a start, I would like to mention some which I believe merit at least some early attention. Let others also make contributions, and then perhaps a workable policy can be devised.

Here are 12 proposals which I believe merit consideration.

First. As a short-term solution to the problem of getting supplies to Vietnam we must do everything needed to make maximum use of the National Defense Reserve Fleet. If the Reserve Fleet is not usable or not adequate, then let us find out now. Let us also take whatever action is needed to solve the problems presented by dock facilities shortages at the other end of the supply line, in Vietnam.

In this connection it has been gratifying to see in recent weeks that some action is being taken. But we should ask why it has taken until now when the crisis or near crisis is upon us. Perhaps the Reserve Fleet adequacy and the need for docking capabilities should have been determined long before this. We knew as early as 1964, or earlier, that our needs for shipping capacity to Vietnam were to become much greater than before.

The chairman of our committee, I understand, has asked the Defense Department for a full accounting of the condition of the reserve fleet. In November 1965, I understand, he said he could see no evidence that the Defense Department had a concise maritime logistics plan with which to support our Armed Forces. I believe we should proceed with this effort to determine if the Defense Department has a plan for future logistics action, and to determine just what the status of the reserve fleet is from the standpoint of future needs.

Second. As a second step in providing early help to our effort in Vietnam, Congress should take steps to penalize the ships flying flags of friendly nations and which are doing business with North Vietnam. Several proposals to do this are presently before the Congress. They should be given active consideration.

There is no reason why this should be a partisan issue, since Members of Congress of both parties have advocated this action. Senator BIRCH BAYH said in September, for example, that no freedom loving nation should seek to profit from trade which could result in the death of young men seeking to defend freedom.

And he rightly said it is inconceivable that the United States should open its ports to vessels which have hauled cargoes to North Vietnam or may be heading there after calling at U.S. ports.

According to Senator BAYH's statistics, in the 18-month period ending in June 1965, a total of 476 cargoes sailed into North Vietnam ports in ships flying the flags of nations friendly to us. And 24 of these ships involved in this trade called at American ports a total of 75 times in the same 18-month period.

A sensible proposal would be to bar the use of American ports to the ships of any company which is doing business with North Vietnam. We should probably make the same prohibition apply to ships dealing with Cuba since the Government of this country is dedicated to economic pressures against the Castro regime.

Third. Going now into longer range actions: we should give the Maritime Administration the strength it needs within the bureaucracy to do its job effectively. We should take it out of the Commerce Department and give it independent status, or at least give it substantially greater standing.

Ordinarily I tend not to favor actions which add to the number of Government agencies. Certainly there must be groupings of agencies under coordinated direction as a general pattern of Government organization.

But the merchant marine problem, as great as it is, requires that we have a Maritime Administration with the tools it needs to do a job. And in this case part of the equipment it needs is status within the Government.

The President, we are told, is about to recommend establishment of a new Cabinet Department for Transportation. And the Maritime Administration would be made a part of that Department. This move would carry the weight of logic. But the question we should ask ourselves is with regard to the expected results in achieving a workable merchant marine policy. Would it actually help?

The formulation of a working scheme for the new Department will require a considerable time, whatever may be the specific actions which would be a part of the proposal. It is my position that the Maritime Administration should be taken out of the Commerce Department and be given independent status as an early action, in any case. This initial action would complement whatever later action may be taken. And meanwhile we will at least have moved ahead in a positive manner to improve the effectiveness of that agency.

Fourth. The labor situation in merchant fleet affairs has been chaotic, doing much damage to the objectives we all seek. The country has a right to expect some stability in merchant marine labor-management conditions. As a possible solution, it may be that the Government should require that in all labor contracts involving the construction or operation of subsidized merchant fleet activities there be included a no-strike clause.

In no way would this infringe upon the collective bargaining principle. It would not be compulsory arbitration. It would simply provide recognition that the Government's interest in stable operation of the merchant marine in terms of substantial subsidies and in terms of the national well-being, requires that a no-strike clause should be a part of any labor-management contract reached by the two parties through the normal bargaining process.

I do not know whether this is the answer, but when I see a sick industry made more ill by strikes that tie up our passenger ships at the peak of the traveling season, or strikes that slow up ship construction and repair when these ships are needed in Vietnam, then I know we have a problem and I know that a solution must be found.

Fifth. We should study very thoroughly the interagency task force recommendations having to do with phasing out our passenger liner ships before we take such action. We should look for alternatives.

For example, we could make a major effort to improve the personal services and general comfort of the passenger facilities on U.S. passenger liners. Graciousness becomes an even more important part of sea travel environment as persons choosing to travel by sea are more interested than ever in comfort rather than speed. We should embark on a program of providing excellent and comfortable service on these ships, and of creating a shipboard atmosphere of graciousness, friendliness, tasteful relaxation, and comfortable surroundings.

We should continue the existing Government participation in the costs of building new passenger ships until alternatives are carefully studied. And we should agree to give up this important part of world sea trade only when remedies to existing problems have been exhausted.

Sixth. The task force report recommended new attention to bulk carriers, and I agree with this position. A fleet of 250 dry bulk carriers by 1985 has been suggested, with the Government paying about half the cost. This would be an ambitious program, but it may well be worth it, especially when we consider that these ships would have an excellent chance to operate in such a way as to help pay for themselves.

It is my understanding that the administration already has the authority it needs to carry out this aspect of its own task force recommendations.

Seventh. We already have in existence a cargo-preference policy whereby at least 50 percent of Government-generated cargo is to be carried in U.S.-flag vessels if they are available at "fair and reasonable" rates.

And even though President Kennedy reaffirmed support for this policy 3 years ago there have been frequent cases of evasion. There evidently is a tendency in Government agencies to want to ship in foreign vessels.

Congress should provide for the continuation of the existing requirements and for the closer supervision of its application. Also, close attention should be given to the proposal that the requirement be increased from 50 to 75 percent.

Eighth. We must reject the notion that U.S. shipowners be encouraged to buy ships in other countries. The foreign building scheme can only do further damage to our merchant shipping situation.

Ninth. Care must be taken that U.S. shipyards retain at least the 35 percent of U.S. Navy ship repair work that until recently has been required by law. The provision identified as the 65–35 provision was formerly a part of Defense Department appropriation legislation annually. It should probably be a part of the law again, though it is my understanding that the private yards will continue to get that 35 percent of the work as in the past.

Tenth. The financing of our merchant ship construction has proceeded on about the same basis over the past many years, and perhaps it is time now that we take a good look at it to see if any changes might be made.

A competent firm of finance research specialists has proposed a plan which would involve a system of deferred financing. It would provide for lower annual Government expenditures but would help bring about an increase in construction of new ships.

The proposal involves considerable detail. Suffice it for me to say here that it provides for the Government share of ship construction costs to be spread out over the 25 years of the ship's economic life, instead of the whole cost to be handled at the date of delivery.

This amortization approach might well be a constructive program which would be useful. Many of our ships are fast becoming obsolete just now, and some kind of effective improvement in the financing procedures is needed if we are to have any hope of replacing these ships satisfactorily.

Eleventh. New and larger emphasis must be given to the promotion programs designed to encourage utilization of our merchant ships. Some of these, conducted by the Maritime Administration, should be enlarged in full cooperation with private groups such as the Shipbuilders Council and the Committee of American Steamship Lines.

Twelfth. And finally, we must bend every effort to apply American technical genius and vigor to the task of developing new engineering techniques in the building and operation of our merchant ships.

The Maritime Administration is operating the nuclear ship *Savannah* in a fine demonstration of what nuclear energy can mean in merchant shipping.

But it has now been 10 years since the Eisenhower administration proposed that we build this first atom-powered merchant vessel. It has been more than 5 years since the ship was launched. The experiment has been an imaginative and worthwhile one, and I believe it is time now that we proceed at a greater pace to build on this experiment and take steps to expand the use of nuclear power in merchant shipping.

And another development in ship propulsion shows a great potential, also. A leading naval architect said in November that gas turbine engines may hold a big future for the merchant marine. This engine is a marine adaptation of the type of engines which drive jet aircraft.

They can produce terrific power at low weight. And although more developments in this direction are forthcoming, enough actual use of this engine has already been made to assure the significance of this progress. Our Government policy must provide all possible encouragement to this kind of technical progress in the merchant marine industry.

SHIPPING PHILOSOPHY

Yes, we are in a "wet war" with the Soviet Union for mastery of the seas. While Soviet planning has been geared since World War II to the objective of taking control of the seas away from the free world, we have done little or nothing to counter the threat. Instead, we have preferred to look away and to pretend the problem would go away by itself.

We need even more than a shipping policy. We need a shipping philosophy which relates long-term economic, psychological and political considerations to the health and capacity of our merchant fleet and related activities.

Just at this time in history it lies within our grasp to create that shipping philosophy and to give it the emphasis it deserves in our national planning.

To achieve this sizable task the combined awareness and effort of the public and of Congress will be required.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point the entire article from which I quoted previously:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald,
Feb. 6, 1966]

AN EXCLUSIVE REPORT FROM BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN—HOW RUSSIA IS BEATING US FOR MASTERY OF SEAS

(By Representative HASTINGS KEITH, 12th District of Massachusetts)

How does the United States compare with the Soviet Union in its efforts to master the sea?

Recently I was one of two Congressmen directed by the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to go behind the Iron Curtain to seek an answer to this important question.

Our visit was prompted by a growing concern in Congress over reports that Soviet maritime strength is surpassing our own. This same concern has been reflected in many of the letters I have received and conversations I have had with my constituents in southeastern Massachusetts.

My constituents have asked me to explain the presence of the armada of Soviet fishing vessels operating off our coasts. They have questioned the political and economic implications of rapidly expanding Soviet merchant fleet.

In addition, oceanographers at Woods Hole have advised me of the tremendous strides the Soviets have made—not only in the marine sciences but in applying basic knowledge of the ocean to achieve their national objectives.

Against this background, Congressman PAUL ROGERS of Florida and I—accompanied by Dr. Allyn Vine of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution—arrived in Moscow one cold Friday afternoon last month on the first leg of our inspection trip.

There we were briefed by key officials of the powerful Committee for Science and Technology. We were particularly interested to learn that this committee has primary jurisdiction for the research and development programs of the entire Soviet Union—including the massive space, atomic energy, and oceanographic efforts. (It was a matter of some interest, too, that the late Oleg Penkovsky, the intelligence colonel who reportedly was shot as a suspected informer to the West, was an official of this committee.)

We were told that the committee had recently created a high-level working group, the National Council for the Utilization of the Resources of the Sea. Its function is to establish requirements for stepped-up application of basic oceanographic research for the economic and political exploitation of the ocean. This is in sharp contrast to the fractured approach that the U.S. Government makes in the field of oceanography—presently handled by 18 different agencies.

We were amazed to learn the scope of this group's activities. For example, the U.S.S.R. is building hydroelectric power stations which harness the ocean's tides.

They are recovering minerals, petroleum and natural gas from their submerged continental shelves, and finding new ways to process and use fish products.

We were also interested to learn at first hand how extensively the Soviet fishing fleet—while still at sea—manufactures fish meal in their so-called factory ships. And we learned further that, on inland waterways—most dramatically at the site of a tremendous hydroelectric plant and dam on the Volga River—in order to make spawning grounds still available for sturgeon they have furnished elevators to transport fish from one level to another.

The Soviets are also aggressively developing methods to forecast ocean conditions for more efficient and safe routing of their merchant fleet. Our conversations with officials of the Committee for Science and Technology thus provided a useful perspective for comparing Soviet oceanic progress with our own.

Later, at the Institute of Oceanology we were apprised of the spectacular growth of scientific and engineering manpower and facilities. According to the institute's director, 8,000 to 9,000 Soviet men and women are working full time in ocean science and technology. The United States has fewer than 3,000 people in this field. Further, the Soviet fleet of 230 ocean research vessels is twice the size of the U.S. fleet.

As guests of the Soviet Ministry of Fisheries we were able to compare our respective fishing efforts. We learned that during 1965 the Soviet fishing fleet landed 5.6 million tons of fish—a half million ton increase over the 1964 catch. The U.S. catch for 1965, although a slight increase over 1964, amounted to 2.33 million tons—nearly 22 percent less than the Soviet catch.

Not only is the U.S.S.R. ahead of the United States in tonnage of fish caught, but also in the field of experimental fish breeding. Large numbers of salmon and king crab and other species have been transplanted from the waters of the Pacific to the Atlantic.

While the size and the advanced design of the Soviet fishing fleet seemed impressive, we were especially anxious to learn more about the Red merchant marine. We were not permitted to visit the shipyards in Leningrad. But the delegation did have a unique opportunity to inspect two shipyards in Poland which build many merchant and fishing vessels for the Soviet Union.

One of these yards alone launched more ships last year than all the yards in the United States constructing similar type vessels. During 1965 the Soviets accepted delivery of 100 merchant ships, while the United States took delivery of only 16. U.S. shipyards began 1966 with 41 merchant vessels of more than 1,000 gross tons on order; the Soviet Union has a total of 464 merchant ships presently on order.

As representative of a district with a long maritime tradition, I was particularly impressed by the vigorous Soviet and Polish efforts to recruit, train, and make an attractive career of the seagoing occupations. Regretfully, in the United States it is becoming more difficult to encourage young people to follow the sea as a means of livelihood. Our poverty program could take notice.

Although the Soviet Government failed to approve the delegation's proposed itinerary (which would have permitted a more extensive study of their entire oceanographic effort)—and we were undoubtedly shown only what the Government wanted us to see—I have every reason to believe that the comparisons above warrant our close attention and concern.

As Congressman ROGERS and I returned to Washington to report on our visit, I know we both had come to the realization that the emergence of the Soviet Union as a major maritime power is no accident of history.

All indications point to the fact that since World War II, and especially since the Korean conflict, the Soviet Union has made a carefully planned thrust into the ocean to achieve its long-range political and economic objectives.

The Soviets have extended their seapower, including their navy, second only to ours, into all the oceans of the world and they are effectively exploiting its resources.

They are using their strengthened maritime position to further their strategic objectives, particularly with respect to the lesser developed nations of Africa and Asia.

With the population explosion making continuous inroads on the world's food supply, the sea will soon become a vitally needed source of available protein, especially these newly emerging nations.

The results of heavy Soviet exploitation of the oceans can be expected to be offered to these young countries in exchange perhaps for sympathy and support in the international forums, especially the United Nations.

We can expect even further efforts as Soviet ocean-ranging fleets move into the waters off South America, where the world population growth there may soon explode into political and economic upheaval.

What can the United States do to meet this challenge? The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and its subcommittee on oceanography are anxious for this urgent problem to be debated more fully in the Congress. In this way we intend to promote wider discussion of the fundamental issues and increase the Nation's awareness of our need to regain supremacy at sea. Both Houses of Congress know that political action is needed to meet the challenge.

Our committee is considering a number of approaches to better coordinate and manage our national efforts with respect to oceanography, fisheries, and the merchant marine. We seek for the ocean a national program that will command the attention, the interest, and the support which our present space effort enjoys.

It is hoped that our recent visit will give greater impetus and a sense of urgency to the legislation needed to reestablish the United States as the number one maritime nation of the world.

Shortly before his untimely death, our late President Kennedy concluded a formal address with this statement, which I know came from his heart:

> "The sea is all around us. It is part of our lives. We must know about it. We must master it. I am glad the United States is committed to this great effort."

We need now only bear witness to this commitment.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I am happy to yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] very highly for this very thorough thinking in regard to the merchant marine. This demonstrates a real knowledge of the subject and a deep concern for a problem which is a most serious one for our country and even very crucial. As one Member of this Congress I appreciate his bringing this matter to our attention today, and I urge every Member to read his statement.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from California. I know of his concern for this problem and appreciate his interest and his contribution.

U.S. CONGRESSMAN BURT L. TALCOTT'S TAX-SHARING PLAN TO IMPROVE EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, next to the protection of our children, their education is our most important mission—whether we be parents, teachers, or public officials. Until everyone is educated and trained to the extent of his abilities and desires, every citizen has a goal to accomplish and a job to perform.

Legally, the responsibility for, and the control over, education is a power not delegated to the Federal Government, but reserved to the States or to the people in accordance with the 10th amendment to the Constitution.

Practically, the local communities and school districts, have the talent, experience, background, training, concern, responsiveness, and scrutiny to provide best for the kind and quality of education that the people want and need.

But, realistically, if the local school board members were to impose the necessary taxes upon retail sales or real property to provide the education which the people want for their children, they would be run out of town at the next election.

On August 26, 1965, during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, I introduced H.R. 10717, a bill to strengthen State and local governments, to provide States with additional financial resources and, particularly, to improve elementary and secondary education by returning a portion of the Federal revenues to the States.

This bill was conceived and drafted to improve education, but it was assigned, under the rules of the House, to the Committee on Ways and Means because it involves taxation and would require an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code.

EDUCATION NEEDS ARE ESCALATING

Educational requirements and demands are escalating rapidly. All costs of education—property, physical plant, equipment and maintenance—are rising; teacher and administrative salaries are increasing; society is becoming more complex; our total store of knowledge will double in the next 6 years; there are more children requiring more education in more subjects and disciplines. At the same time, there are many additional legal and desirable demands being made upon other agencies of local government to provide more and more services, of higher quality and cost, for more and more persons.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES ARE INCREASING

Between 1955 and 1964, total government expenditures—Federal, State, and local—increased nearly $78 billion, about 80 percent, while net national product was increasing by 56 percent. Domestic needs, primarily, have provided the thrust behind the growth of government. The main responsibility for domestic government activity falls, not upon the Federal Government, but upon the States and their subdivisions, which last year spent nearly $68 billion.

Education is by far the most important domestic governmental program. In fiscal 1963, direct education expenditures were nearly $25 billion, with over 95 percent accounted for by State and local governments. Total education expenditures increased at an average annual rate of 8.7 percent over the 8 years from 1955 to 1963. No other major expenditure category, except Federal space research and technology—which amounts to less than 3 percent of the total Government expenditures—has risen so rapidly.

Owing primarily to education needs, overall State and local expenditures increased by an annual average of 8.4 percent from 1955 to 1964, whereas the total direct Federal expenditures increased at only 5.7 percent per year.

Many of us would approve a trend toward increasing the importance of State and local government and diminishing the role of the Federal Establishment. Even in the urban complex, there is a keen appreciation of the benefits from good local government, not only from high quality public education and from the security that comes from adequate police and fire protection, but from the general enhancement of the good life provided by sensible investment in transportation and sanitary facilities, orderly development, and adequate social welfare programs.

If the facts—that the State and local functions, including education, are going to grow faster—and the philosophy—that they should—are agreed upon, there remains the question of finance.

FINANCING ALTERNATIVES FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The major alternatives are: First, increased State and local taxation; second, increased special purpose or categorical grants from the Federal Government; third, income tax credit devices; and fourth, the new program of unrestricted grants, or tax sharing, proposed by my bill, H.R. 10717.

The tax sources of local government are practically restricted to real and personal property, retail sales or income from within the local jurisdiction.

State and local government tax rates have risen rapidly. This fact, apparent enough to most actual taxpayers, can be appreciated by observing aggregate tax collection figures. From 1955 to 1963, an 8-year period, collections from all major categories of State and local taxes approximately doubled. Property tax collections rose from $10.7 billion to $20.1 billion. State and local sales tax collections rose from $7.6 billion to $14.5 billion. Individual income taxes collected by State and local jurisdictions rose from $1.2 billion to $3.3 billion. State and local taxes on corporation net income rose from $700 million to $1.5 billion.

Total State taxes have gone from $4.9 billion in 1946 to $24.2 billion in 1964—an average increase of over $1 billion a year.

Experience demonstrates that the basis of most sales and excise taxes, and also of the property tax, rise relatively sluggishly as population and income increase. Since collections from these sources nearly doubled over the 8 years from 1955 to 1963, while the net national product increased by less than 50 percent, it is evident that the rates and coverage have been forced to increase markedly.

No revolutionary increase in State and local income taxes is in prospect under the present regimes. Therefore, increased sales and property tax rates offer the only practical solution available to these levels of government if they are to rely on their own tax sources. These taxes are distinctly inferior to taxes on income in terms of their economic effects.

PROPERTY TAX SOURCES SATURATED

Real and personal property are becoming saturated as tax sources in most school jurisdictions. Schools bond elections are becoming more and more difficult to pass. Taxpayer rebellions are not directed against education itself, but against the imposition of taxes upon the overburdened property base.

For far too long, education and other local services have been required to depend primarily upon the property tax, simply because the property was easy to locate, simple to assess, values were relatively stable, and the collecting procedures were simple to administer. The advantages of simplicity have become a dragging detriment to education and an intolerable burden upon real property. More than 45 percent of State and local revenues is derived from property taxes. This is practically the limit.

Real property is an unfair and inequitable tax source in many instances. Property taxes are not universally administered effectively; they are laced with imperfections which render them both unjust and inimical to economic growth and efficient business operation.

A public service so enormous in scope and size as education should not depend to a great extent upon a limited source of revenue. Obversely, it is inequitable for a limited form of wealth to be required to support public services from which everyone benefits.

So desperate are local taxing agencies for revenues that individual property owners are not even permitted to claim any adjustment or reduction for unpaid mortgages or other debt against their properties. Yet many forms of wealth now escape taxation.

TAXES UPON HOMES OFTEN CONFISCATORY

Taxes upon homes are often regressive and confiscatory, especially when the property itself produces little or no income and the owner has a limited or fixed income. This condition is common and particularly burdensome for homeowners who are retired, widowed, pensioned, or unemployed. A family's home is so essential to health, emotional stability, and good citizenship that the property tax on homes is often more detrimental than beneficial to the community.

Real property is not distributed in the same places where the children reside. Therefore the relationship between the property taxed and the children taught is seldom proportional or equitable.

CONSUMPTION TAXES REACHING LIMIT ALSO

Local sales, use, and gross receipts taxes are approaching economic and social, as well as practical, limits in many States. Although sales taxes can and do serve useful purposes, even small increases are likely to result in taxpayer rebellions in this arena, also.

Sales tax statutes are riddled with exemptions for various consumer goods and rarely cover any substantial portion of consumer service expenditures. Spotty coverage often means that prices charged to the consumer are distorted and are not proportional to the value of the goods purchased, thereby impairing the efficiency of our market pricing system. Most State sales taxes are especially aimed at large amounts of business purchases, including machinery and equipment, and thereby penalize and deter growth and modernization.

Even with exemptions on food, drugs, rent, and other family necessaries, the sales tax is especially burdensome upon the poor with large families.

PROPERTY AND SALES TAXES ARE REGRESSIVE

Both property and sales taxes above minimum levels are regressive in that they impose higher percentage burdens on persons with lower incomes. An aggravation of this situation should be avoided.

Although total agreement on tax policy is unattainable, there is near consensus among students of the problem that income taxes are the strongest element of our revenue system. A policy which forces obnoxious State and local sales and property taxes to replace the income tax as a dominant government revenue source would be an unfortunate step backward. Such policy would work against needed increases in State and local expenditure by forcing the worst taxes to bear the load.

Although the income tax appears to be the most appropriate for State and local purposes, State legislators are unwilling to raise State income taxes. This reluctance is partly because the Federal Government has preempted, to a large measure, the income tax.

HIGH CORRELATION BETWEEN INCOME AND EDUCATION

In my opinion, there is a higher correlation between income and education than between any other asset and its tax purpose. There is practically no correlation between one's education and his property ownership or retail purchases. However, the higher one's education, the higher his income is likely to be; and the greater one's income, the better the education his children are likely to receive.

For these and other reasons, I believe it is appropriate to devote a larger portion of our income tax to educational purposes.

STATE TAX REFORM PROSPECTS ARE DISMAL

Many State governments are groping with various proposals for tax reform. My State of California is making all sorts of resounding noises about State tax reform. Unfortunately, no amount of State tax reform will help education unless the States, local subdivisions, and school districts are permitted to share directly in the revenues derived from the Federal income tax. Otherwise State tax reform will be only a shifting of the tax burdens from one form of property to another. Taxes from property are more properly used to protect and improve property.

LOCAL EDUCATORS BEST

I firmly believe that local educators and officials who are on the scene, who are subject to the closest scrutiny of the taxpayer, and who hold the most direct responsibility to the student, can best determine the education needs of their children and can best manage our education system. The Federal Government, on the other hand, lacks the experience, talent, concern, and responsibility to provide adequate education, especially at the elementary and secondary levels. Federal control of education would guarantee mediocrity. Few nonpolitical ideas originate in Washington. An education idea promulgated from Washington would be required to apply evenly to every school district in the United States. Few of us would care to wear a suit designed or fashioned to fit everyone.

My bill, H.R. 10717, seeks to utilize the best attributes and capabilities of all levels of government. Each level of government is involved, has a stake, and a large measure of responsibility. The Federal, State, and local governments, the school districts, the private foundations, the business community, and individual citizen—student, teacher, parent, and official—must all cooperate in the manner of a working partnership. The several agencies, governments, businesses, and citizens are not mutually exclusive operations.

COMBINE SUPERIOR FACILITIES OF ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

I propose to combine the superior talents, abilities, and concern of the local school interests with the superior tax resources of the Federal Government. Cooperation and utilization of talent are maximized; controls are minimized. The States and local school districts would exercise no control over the collection of the Federal income taxes; the Federal Government would exercise no control over the education processes. My bill gives the Comptroller General authority only to review State plans to determine that the funds will be used for education purposes, and to audit annually the plans to verify compliance.

FEDERAL CATEGORICAL AIDS ARE INEQUITABLE AND MEDIOCRE

I have opposed numerous Federal categorical aids to education. A grant here for one special purpose; a grant there to a particular community or project; or another grant to a special category of school, student, or district is discriminatory, unequal and often extravagant. The Federal Government can seldom do specially for one what it does not do for another without being unfair, mediocre, wasteful, and discriminatory. The Federal Government with all its arms, agencies, bureaus, and departments cannot devise and manage a system of education programs which will suit or be fair to all school districts. The school board of Salinas does not want its schools constructed exactly the same as schools in Bismarck or Miami—or vice versa; nor would any of these school districts be satisfied with the same curriculums, textbooks, and teacher qualifications of the others.

SCHOOLS NEED FINANCING URGENTLY

The urgent need of the local school districts is not talent, supervision, direction, or control, but solely adequate financing. My bill favors an unrestricted grant to the State governments for elementary and secondary education purposes. This permits the flexibility and competition of State-local autonomy as opposed to the certain inequity and mediocrity of a detailed program of specific grants from the central Federal Government.

SPECIFIED PERCENTAGE OF FEDERAL REVENUES RETURNED TO STATES

My bill provides that 1 percent of the individual and corporate income, inheritance, gift, and estate taxes paid under the Internal Revenue Code be returned to the States the first year, 2 percent the second year, 3 percent the third year, 4 percent the fourth year, and 5 percent the fifth year, and thereafter. These funds are to be deposited in a trust fund administered by the Secretary of the Treasury who is charged with the responsibility of returning the money to the States.

Half of the funds would be returned to the States on a straight per-student basis.

The remaining half would be returned to the States on the basis of the amount of effort each State puts into its public elementary and secondary education system.

Effort is defined as the percentage of gross personal and corporate income spent on public and elementary education. The mathematical formula for computing effort is as follows: The percent of gross personal and corporation income spent on public elementary and secondary education is multiplied by the number of legally enrolled students in public elementary and secondary schools. This is the State product. Under this formula, a State's share would be the percent its State product is of the total State products.

MINIMUM FEDERAL CONTROLS

To guarantee that the funds being shared with the States are spent for educational purposes, each Governor must submit an outline of how his State plans to spend the money to the Comptroller General of the United States. The Comptroller General must determine within 60 days whether or not the plan fully complies with the intent of Congress. If the plan is not disapproved within 60 days, it will be considered approved. If disapproved, the Governor of the State will have the right to appeal the decision to the U.S. court of appeals in his district.

Additionally, each State must submit an audit each year to the Comptroller General detailing how the funds were actually spent.

TAX SHARING CONCEPT GAINING SUPPORT RAPIDLY

This new concept of Federal-State cooperation is rapidly gaining support from professional educators, governmental officials, reputable economists, and taxpayers. The California Teachers Association Committee on Federal Legislation and the State Council of Education, at its meeting in Los Angeles in December 1965, endorsed the principles of Federal aid embodied in H.R. 10717. Other school districts, State superintendents of schools, Governors, and economists have endorsed the tax sharing principle of H.R. 10717.

The report of the Task Force on Intergovernmental Relations headed by Joseph A. Pechman, although not broadly publicized, suggests that the Federal Government should establish a new program of unrestricted grants to the States, the grants to be specified portions of Federal income tax revenues. The reasoning of the President's Task Force appears to be that State and local government expenditures have grown rapidly and will continue to grow—in response to challenges—but these jurisdictions continue to find it difficult to meet their bills. The limited tax bases—property and sales—have not grown in pace with government expenditures. This condition jeopardizes State and local governments. On the other hand, income tax receipts have risen faster than Federal expenditures. This trend causes fiscal drag. The deleterious fiscal drag and the State-local fiscal plight can be solved simultaneously by returning income tax revenue to the States.

Some political scientists and economists may argue that my proposal tends to redistribute, in a modest way, tax moneys—from rich to poor individuals and from rich to poor States. It does. This device seems to be more desirable than the tax credit scheme which would simply permit State and local income taxes to be credited against Federal income tax liabilities. The tax credit scheme would simply transfer part of the Federal income back to the States from which the tax came.

REDISTRIBUTION OF INCOME IS MODEST

The per capita grant is redistributive, because States with high per capita incomes receive no more than States with low per capita incomes, even though their residents pay more income taxes. I cannot defend the position that the quality of education should be lower in poor regions than in wealthy ones. Yet there is little doubt that this is now the case, even though some low-income States may devote a higher percentage of their incomes to public education than do more prosperous States.

It seems to me that many States, including California, are plagued by the inferior educations of immigrants from other States, and are required to expend great sums for remedial education, extraordinary retraining programs, and welfare to assist the untrained and undereducated who make their way to a new State. California, for instance, might just as well contribute some funds to educate the future immigrants in the first instance when the education is most successful and least expensive, rather than postpone the agony to a time when the ignorance and lack of training are so devastating, and when education, retraining, and welfare are so expensive and difficult.

There is another side of the same coin. All States benefit from the superior education of some immigrants and even from the education of persons who may not immigrate physically, but whose ideas and contributions do. Only one State, for instance, can claim to have educated John Steinbeck, but we all share the fruits of his education. None of the U.S. astronauts received their elementary or secondary education in California, yet every Californian shares the benefits of their fine educations. In all fairness, Californians should not object too strenuously because a small part of their Federal income tax moneys is redistributed to provide better education for youths in other States. This would seem especially true in view of the fundamental premise of H.R. 10717, which leaves the control, supervision, management, and responsibility of the education with the individual States and local school districts.

Some proponents of income tax sharing plans have suggested that more emphasis should be placed on need. Of course, all of us want to fulfill need and educate where it is needed. The plan must be as simple as practicable for understanding and successful administration. "Need" is difficult to define—and definitions will always vary.

Need is considered in my formula in the 50 percent which is returned to the States on the basis of student population. The need is where the children are.

INCENTIVES MUST BE MAINTAINED

Nevertheless, incentive is extremely important. There should be a strong built-in incentive for the individual States to devote more and more of their own resources to education. Reliance on the mendicancy of neighboring States or the Federal Government should be discouraged. If a State is rewarded for spending more of its own revenues, its education programs are likely to prosper and excel more than if it were encouraged to justify a need.

My proposal embodies the legitimate and appropriate Federal responsibility in the field of elementary and secondary education. My proposal utilizes to the maximum extent the attributes and facilities of the Federal, State and local governments.

H.R. 10717 will permit us to meet the needs of education and to discharge the obligations and responsibilities of Government in the most effective and expeditious way.

Mr. Speaker, I have included several tables following my remarks, which show in more graphic form what can be expected by the various States upon the enactment of H.R. 10717.

I trust that every Member of Congress will give immediate and conscientious consideration to this new concept of improving elementary and secondary education through income tax sharing. I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to schedule hearings on H.R. 10717, and other related bills, at its earliest convenience. As I have said, next to the protection of our children, their education is our most important mission in life.

Fifth and all succeeding years (5 percent distribution) assuming that 5 percent of the Federal revenue to be distributed under the formula amounts to $5 billion:

State	Col. 1 [1]	Col. 2 [1]	Col. 3 [1]	Col. 4 [1]	Col. 5 [1]
Utah	$17,059,607	$24,600,000	$87.03	$41,659,607	$147.39
Montana	9,955,959	14,075,000	85.33	24,030,959	145.69
New Mexico	15,707,482	22,050,000	84.73	37,757,482	145.09
Alaska	3,392,111	4,725,000	84.07	8,117,111	144.43
Wyoming	5,313,249	6,875,000	78.10	12,188,249	138.46
Arizona	22,073,350	28,275,000	77.31	50,348,350	137.67
South Dakota	9,901,756	12,575,000	76.65	23,476,756	137.01
Nevada	6,024,169	7,500,000	75.14	13,524,169	135.50
Minnesota	47,565,007	58,725,000	74.52	106,290,007	134.88
Washington	43,373,126	53,325,000	74.20	96,698,126	134.56
North Dakota	8,910,765	10,825,000	73.32	19,735,765	133.68
Oregon	26,610,973	32,125,000	72.86	58,735,973	133.22
California	249,914,544	298,675,000	72.13	548,589,544	132.49
Louisiana	47,457,265	55,725,000	70.87	103,182,265	131.23
Colorado	28,727,014	32,350,000	67.97	61,077,014	128.33
Mississippi	34,939,627	39,100,000	67.54	74,039,627	127.90
Michigan	115,807,903	128,200,000	66.81	244,007,903	127.17
Kansas	30,569,985	33,325,000	65.79	63,894,985	126.15
Wisconsin	50,184,209	51,550,000	62.00	101,734,209	122.36
Florida	71,487,969	73,000,000	61.63	144,487,969	121.99
Arkansas	27,064,458	27,625,000	61.61	54,689,458	121,97
Idaho	10,412,401	10,600,000	61,44	21,012,401	121.80
Indiana	66,406,864	67,675,000	61.51	134,086,864	121.87
New York	188,896,620	191,250,000	61.11	380,146,620	121.47
Iowa	37,449,215	37,500,000	60.44	74,949,215	120.80
Vermont	4,947,226	4,950,000	60.39	9,897,226	120.75
Texas	$148,743,759	$148,375,000	$60.25	$297,218,759	$120.61
South Carolina	37,640,978	37,225,000	58.84	74,865,978	119.20
Oklahoma	36,216,000	35,075,000	58.45	71,291,000	118.81
Hawaii	9,154,727	9,125,000	57.88	18,279,727	118.24
Maryland	44,411,197	42,650,000	57.96	87,061,197	118.32
Nebraska	18,725,422	18,350,000	57.82	37,075,422	118.18
Ohio	134,610,284	127,625,000	57.22	262,235,284	117.58
Alabama	49,539,806	46,850,000	57.08	96,389,806	117.44
North Carolina	71,134,923	66,975,000	56.83	138,109,923	117.19
New Hampshire	7,567,333	6,975,000	55.63	14,542,333	115.99
Maine	13,167,292	12,075,000	55.28	25,232,292	115.64
Virginia	58,486,123	53,350,000	55.05	111,836,123	115.42
New Jersey	75,766,588	69,125,000	55.06	144,891,588	115.42
Georgia	62,893,973	56,725,000	54.43	119,668,973	114.79
West Virginia	26,313,821	23,680,000	54.31	49,993,821	114.67
Tennessee	52,177,055	46,400,000	53.67	98,577,055	114.03
Delaware	6,317,217	5,600,000	53.50	11,917,217	113.86
Kentucky	40,048,158	33,850,000	51.01	73,898,158	111.37
Illinois	123,336,183	102,475,000	50.15	225,817,183	110.51
Connecticut	33,806,368	27,375,000	48.87	61,181,368	109.23
Missouri	57,240,112	45,625,000	48.11	102,865,112	108.47
Rhode Island	9,096,312	7,075,000	46.94	16,171,312	107.30
Pennsylvania	133,533,824	102,000,000	46.10	235,533,824	106.46
Massachusetts	59,941,644	42,650,000	42.94	102,591,644	103.30
District of Columbia	8,534,662	4,800,000	33.94	13,334,662	94.30

[1] Explanation of columns:

Col. 1: $2,500,000,000 divided upon a straight per student basis, $60.36 multiplied by number of enrolled students in the State.

Col. 2: Total dollar sum each State receives on EFFORT formula ($2,500,000,000).

Col. 3: Amount per student each State receives on EFFORT formula.

Col. 4: Total amount State receives; addition of cols. 1 and 2.

Col. 5: Amount overall that each State receives on a per student basis.

NOTES

1. The figures in col. 1 come from "Fall 1964 Statistics of Public Schools," U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Number of enrolled students for fall 1964 divided into $2,500,000,000.

2. EFFORT is defined as the amount of gross personal income of each State spent on public elementary and secondary education. This is taken from "Digest of Educational Statistics," 1965 edition. Mathematics involved: EFFORT × enrolled students equals a "State product." Each State's percent of sum total of all "State products" multiplied by $2,500,000,000 (or amount being authorized under this section) equals total dollars the State receives.

Assuming that 1 percent of the Federal revenues to be distributed under the formula would equal $1 billion, the following chart, based on 1964 figures, shows the projected allocation for California throughout the first 5 years of operation:

	Per pupil basis	Effort basis	Total
1st year	$49,982,908	$59,735,000	$109,717,908
2d year	99,965,817	119,470,000	219,435,817
3d year	149,848,726	179,205,000	329,153,726
4th year	199,931,635	238,940,000	438,871,635
5th year	249,914,544	298,675,000	548,589,544

Rankings of the States in terms of percentage of gross personal income spent on elementary and secondary education, 1964–65

	Percent
Utah	6.89
Montana	6.76
New Mexico	6.71
Alaska	6.68
Wyoming	6.16
Arizona	6.12

Rankings of the States in terms of percentage of gross personal income spent on elementary and secondary education, 1964–65—Continued

	Percent
South Dakota	6.07
Nevada	5.95
Minnesota	5.90
Washington	5.88
North Dakota	5.81
Oregon	5.77
California	5.71
Louisiana	5.61
Colorado	5.38
Mississippi	5.34
Michigan	5.29
Kansas	5.21
Wisconsin	4.91
Florida	4.88
Arkansas	4.88
Idaho	4.87
Indiana	4.87
New York	4.84
Iowa	4.80
Vermont	4.80
Texas	4.77
National average	4.74
South Carolina	4.66
Oklahoma	4.63
Hawaii	4.59

Rankings of the States in terms of percentage of gross personal income spent on elementary and secondary education, 1964–65—Continued

	Percent
Maryland	4.59
Nebraska	4.58
Ohio	4.53
Alabama	4.52
North Carolina	4.50
New Hampshire	4.41
Maine	4.39
Virginia	4.36
New Jersey	4.36
Georgia	4.31
West Virginia	4.30
Tennessee	4.25
Delaware	4.24
Kentucky	4.04
Illinois	3.97
Connecticut	3.87
Missouri	3.81
Rhode Island	3.72
Pennsylvania	3.65
Massachusetts	3.40
District of Columbia	2.87

Source: Digest of Educational Statistics, 1965 edition, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

Personal income, 1964, related to estimated expenditures for public elementary and secondary education, by region and State, 1964-65

Region and State	Personal income		Estimated expenditures for public elementary and secondary education	
	Total (in millions)	Per capita	Total (in thousands) [1]	As a percent of personal income
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
United States	487,881	2,550	23,106,854	4.74
North Atlantic	151,345		6,434,659	4.25
Connecticut	8,989	3,250	348,150	3.87
Delaware	1,682	3,426	71,343	4.24
Maine	2,107	2,130	92,525	4.39
Maryland	9,913	2,888	454,848	4.59
Massachusetts	15,598	2,922	530,000	3.40
New Hampshire	1,532	2,343	67,540	4.41
New Jersey	19,792	2,962	863,600	4.36
New York	56,240	3,139	2,722,000	4.84
Pennsylvania	29,509	2,575	1,067,823	3.65
Rhode Island	2,266	2,479	84,275	3.72
Vermont	877	2,144	42,096	4.80
District of Columbia	2,840	3,515	81,458	2.87
Great Lakes and Plains	140,043		6,538,511	4.67
Illinois	31,495	3,003	1,249,396	3.97
Indiana	12,201	2,529	594,470	4.87
Iowa	6,533	2,370	313,853	4.80
Kansas	5,141	2,311	263,000	5.21
Michigan	22,135	2,733	1,170,000	5.29
Minnesota	8,356	2,373	492,736	5.90
Missouri	11,441	2,595	435,500	3.81
Nebraska	3,407	2,302	156,100	4.58
North Dakota	1,298	2,012	75,450	5.81
Ohio	26,490	2,623	1,201,300	4.53
South Dakota	1,310	1,832	79,506	6.07
Wisconsin	10,236	2,492	502,200	4.91
Southeast	79,630		3,672,558	4.61
Alabama	5,918	1,737	267,533	4.52
Arkansas	3,157	1,633	153,952	4.88
Florida	13,008	2,280	635,222	4.88
Georgia	8,299	1,933	357,519	4.31
Kentucky	5,720	1,811	230,933	4.04
Louisiana	6,463	1,864	362,500	5.61
Mississippi	3,341	1,444	178,500	5.34
North Carolina	9,217	1,900	414,877	4.50
South Carolina	4,209	1,647	196,072	4.66
Tennessee	7,035	1,852	299,360	4.25
Virginia	9,738	2,224	424,500	4.36
West Virginia	3,525	1,962	151,650	4.30
West and Southwest	116,863		6,461,126	5.53
Alaska	782	3,128	52,253	6.68
Arizona	3,506	2,218	214,467	6.12
California	55,912	3,092	3,190,000	5.71
Colorado	5,093	2,591	274,205	5.38
Hawaii	1,777	2,579	81,541	4.59
Idaho	1,392	2,612	67,754	4.87
Montana	1,539	2,183	104,000	6.76
Nevada	1,325	2,248	78,861	5.95
New Mexico	2,026	2,010	135,985	6.71
Oklahoma	5,165	2,095	239,160	4.63
Oregon	4,868	2,602	280,800	5.77
Texas	22,611	2,175	1,079,000	4.77
Utah	2,157	2,174	148,600	6.89
Washington	7,861	2,634	462,200	5.88
Wyoming	849	2,475	52,300	6.16

[1] Includes current expenditures, capital outlay, and interest.

NOTE.—Detail will not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.

Sources: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, "Fall 1964 Statistics of Public Schools"; and U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics, "Survey of Current Business," April 1965.

(Source: A copy of page proof taken from U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education: "Digest of Educational Statistics," 1965 edition.)

FREE LITHUANIA RECALLED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therewith a letter from the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, to the Chargé d'Affaires of the Lithuanian legation here in Washington and also a memorandum from the Lithuanian-American Council of Chicago, Ill., dated February 16, 1966.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleagues be permitted to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter in the cases specified and have these remarks appended following my remarks here today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the same subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, again this year I take pride in being able to join with my colleagues in this Chamber in commemorating the independence of once-free Lithuania. It is with pride beyond all measure that we in this country are able to stand as freemen in this great public forum and speak without fear of rebuke or retaliation. This pride is mixed with sorrow when we remember that so many friends and families of American citizens behind the Iron Curtain do not share this great privilege with us.

On this 48th anniversary date, I should like to recall two aspects of Lithuania relative to this commemoration: namely, free Lithuania, and Lithuanians in my own State of Pennsylvania.

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people broke a long period of Soviet domination—1795-1915—followed by a short period of German domination, and declared themselves an independent nation. Just 21 short years later, the Lithuanian people were again brought under Russian domination, and on August 3, 1940, Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the Soviet Union—a cruel joke this country has never recognized. Briefly occupied by the Nazi troops during World War II, the Soviets reoccupied the little country in 1944 with the help of the Red army, and to this day the Lithuanian Republic is a ward of the Kremlin colonists.

World War I cost the Lithuanian people a great deal, for in 1915 they traded Russian oppression for German persecution. The Russians were finally gone, but the Lithuanian people were not free. However, within 2 years two events, as important as any in this century, led to the eventual and long-awaited freedom and independence of the Lithuanian people: the Russian Revolution and the defeat of Kaiser Germany.

With independence on the horizon, 200 Lithuanian delegates formed a congress laying the groundwork for an independent Lithuania based on ethnological frontiers. Finally on February 16, 1918, Lithuania declared itself an independent state in the family of independent nations. As we all know, a declaration of any kind does not establish a condition in fact. For example, our own American Declaration of Independence was made in 1776, but we were not free from the British until the War for Independence ended in 1783, and we did not become the country we know today until 1789. Before the first year of independence had run its course, the German army left the country, and immediately on their heels, the Soviet army reentered the country. There obviously is more to being independent than merely saying so, for it was not until the following year the Russian Red army was forced out of the country under the leadership of the Polish army.

Besieged with problems at home and with that infinite patience that Communist governments seem to have, Russia decided to sign a peace treaty with Lithuania on July 12, 1920. We know that Russia made a sham of that treaty within 20 years, but we do not know the extent of that deception until we realize exactly what the treaty included. That treaty made it clear that the Soviet Union recognized "without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania," and "voluntarily and forever renounced" all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory. That would have been a treaty of splendor and hope if only the Russians had not intended it to be a farce and the most degenerate of jokes.

Following the treaty of peace with Russia, the struggling, newly independent nation immediately had a dispute of long standing with Poland on its hands, involving the fate of Vilnius, the designated capital of Lithuania. When the issue reached the League of Nations, the city of Vilnius was awarded to Poland due mainly to the fact that Poles were in the majority of the city's population. This dispute wrecked Lithuanian-Polish relations until 1938.

Lithuania, which was recognized by the United States on May 31, 1921, joined the League of Nations on September 22, 1921, and thus began Lithuania's brave attempt as a free and equal independent nation in the world community. As is the case with all new states who are not prepared by their colonial masters to assume self-government, there was some internal disruption and political discord. However, one cannot discount the great advances the country made during its brief tenure of independence in industrialization, farming and agriculture, social legislation, and in cultural pursuits. While the country struggled with itself, it did so with a dignity of which we can all be proud.

When war again engulfed Europe, little Lithuania was squeezed by both Germany and Russia, and during that conflict, was occupied by both countries, suffering terrible human and material losses. Since the end of World War II, Lithuania has been a colony of the Soviet Union.

I am especially proud, Mr. Speaker, that so many of these fine people who have left Lithuania for one reason or another to come to the United States, have elected to settle in my own State of Pennsylvania. In the last century railroads and mining drew many to Pennsylvania, especially to Shamokin, Danville, Sunbury and Mount Carmel. Schuylkill, Luzerne, Lackawanna County and the Wyoming Valley in the anthracite regions also received a great many Lithuanian families, as well as the steel centers around Pittsburgh, and the great oil regions in the Allegheníes in northwestern Pennsylvania.

Today we find many Lithuanians and their descendants living in Wilkes-Barre, Scranton, Shenandoah, Shamokin, Mahanoy City, and Mount Carmel. I deeply and sincerely wish along with these Americans that someday Lithuania will once again have the opportunity to govern its own affairs with dignity and human justice.

As part of my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a copy of the letter sent by Secretary of State Dean Rusk to Mr. Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of Lithuania, Lithuanian Legation, Washington, D.C.

The letter follows:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, February 11, 1966.
Mr. JOSEPH KAJECKAS,
Chargé d'Affaires ad Interim of Lithuania.

DEAR MR. CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES: On the occasion of the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, it is my pleasure to extend to you the good wishes of the Government and people of the United States.

Our country has consistently espoused the principle that all peoples have the right to determine the form of their national existence. In Lithuania's case, we have applied this principle by refusing to recognize the forcible incorporation of that country into the Soviet Union. We fully support your continuing efforts to marshal world public opinion and to bring it to bear on the issue of self-determination for the people of Lithuania.

In view of the courage and fortitude shown by the Lithuanian people during these years of foreign domination, I am confident that their just aspirations for freedom and national independence will ultimately be realized.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC.,
Chicago, Ill.

FOR A FREE AND INDEPENDENT LITHUANIA

On February 16, 48 years ago in Vilnius, the capital of Lithuania, the Constituent Assembly of Lithuania proclaimed the restoration of Lithuania's independence. This proclamation became a living reality through the dedicated efforts of a solidly united people, even in the face of obdurate opposition from neighboring states and at the cost of many lives.

Lithuanian-Americans in the United States were outraged by the cynical travesty of justice perpetrated on hapless Lithuania in 1940, when together with the Baltic Republics, Latvia and Estonia, Lithuania was treacherously and ruthlessly occupied, enslaved and incorporated into the Soviet Union. Their spontaneous reaction to this brazen, forced annexation was the formation of the Lithuanian American Council, representing all Lithuanian-Americans and their patriotic and cultural organizations in the United States, dedicated to the restoration of freedom to Lithuania.

In 1965 Lithuanians throughout the free world solemnly observed Lithuania's 25 years of enslavement. By the extreme Communist methods of self-defense and vituperative denigration of their opposition in the free world, the genocidal tyrants of Lithuania were compelled to admit the telling effectiveness of the unremitting activity of the Lithuanian-American Council.

In order to defuse this growing menace of politically and culturally organized Lithuanians in the United States, who are embarrassing the Communists by alerting the attention of the free world forums to the new Communist brand of world colonialization, the Communist government of Lithuania is seeking to woo Lithuanian-Americans into some arrangement of mutual cultural exchange, with the hope of sowing discord and division among them, thus to neutralize the effectiveness of their anti-Communist activity.

It is the duty of the Lithuanian American Council to issue this grave warning. Sly reconnoitering has taken place in the Communist pattern. Do not be misled by new Communist guiles. Their aim is the same—only the tactics have changed. Remain firm and resolute in your struggle for human rights.

Any manner of cultural exchange between Lithuanian-Americans and Soviet Lithuania would be exploited by the Soviets and interpreted to their enslaved people, as an intelligent acceptance by Lithuanian-Americans of the political annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union.

Actually, it is a contradiction in terms to speak of a cultural exchange between a free and an enslaved and regimented people. Properly speaking, culture, without freedom of at least thought and its expression, is a metaphysical impossibility. Human beings differ specifically from brute animals by their capacity of thinking and choosing and doing freely. Deprive them of this specific difference and you dehumanize them and render them incapable of creating freely, if at all. Cultural exchange between anyone but free people is a myth, and for the unwary, a trap.

There is no true cultural freedom in Lithuania today any more than there are truly free Lithuanians there. Any collaboration with Communist "cultural puppets" would be at the very least a mark of colossal stupidity on our part, if not a downright act of treason to all that man prizes highest in life.

On the occasion of this observance of February 16, we urge you to take action with the U.S. Government to reject the Soviet consular treaty. As past history of other nations shows, such consulates would be nerve centers of spy networks and nests of subversion. There is an insignificant Russian population in the United States who have need of consular services. Under the present restrictions of trade with Russia, there is no need for validation of commercial documents.

Unjustifiable concessions must not be made to the Soviets. They are the same who murdered thousands of Lithuanians and who are now helping to kill our American soldiers in Vietnam. Express your protests to the President of the United States and to the Senate, by demanding that the Senate reject the consular treaty with the Soviets.

The Lithuanian American Council invites all Lithuanians, and especially our fine youth, to join the sacred and honorable struggle for the restoration of Lithuania's freedom. Let us all, regardless of political affiliations, join in the cause of liberty and justice for Lithuania, without sparing our efforts, funds, and devotion for this noble purpose.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC.
CHICAGO, ILL., *February 16, 1966.*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on this 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, we would do well to recall that Lithuania did not achieve independence for the first time in 1918. During the late Middle Ages, Lithuania was a flourishing and independent nation. Lithuanian culture was advanced by comparison with that of neighboring countries, and showed in many ways the strong Western orientation of Lithuania. The glorious reign of Vytautas the Great from 1392 to 1430 is especially celebrated in Lithuanian history as marking a high point in the social, economic, and cultural achievements of the nation.

In the 16th century, however, Lithuania began to feel increasingly threatened by the Russians to the east. She reluctantly decided to conclude a political union with Poland to strengthen her security, although she retained a separate administration and her own armed forces. Ultimately, however, the union failed to protect Lithuania from Russian aggrandizement. In the late 18th century the final blows came as Poland was partitioned by the European powers and Lithuania absorbed by the Russian Empire.

For over a century Lithuanian energies were devoted to seeking freedom from Russian enslavement and to resisting Russian attempts to suppress Lithuanian language and culture and to force Lithuanians to follow the rites of the Eastern Orthodox Church rather than those of Roman Catholicism. One uprising would be cruelly repressed, only to be followed by another. A printing press would be seized in one area, only to be replaced shortly by one in another area.

Only in 1918 did the Lithuanians see their dream of regaining independence realized. During the next 22 years, they were able to devote their energies to building their nation rather than to resisting a foreign oppressor. The results were remarkable. The achievements of the earlier period of independence were in every way matched. Political stability was established; agricultural reform was carried out; industry was given new attention; an educational system to serve all the people was successfully launched.

The second period of independence came to an end in 1940, when the Communist regime of Soviet Russia showed that it was in every way as greedy and cynical as its czarist predecessors. During World War II, Lithuania suffered occupation by both Soviet Communists and Nazis. Following World War II, an oppressive and imperalistic Soviet Union reoccupied Lithuania, and subsequently made Lithuania a republic of the Soviet socialist state.

The repressive means available to 20th century totalitarian regimes in order to crush recalcitrant peoples are far superior to those possessed by their 19th century predecessors. Lithuanian attempts to resist absorption by the Soviet Union have been ruthlessly suppressed, with thousands deported, and many thousands more killed. Suppression has taken time, however. And it was only recently that Lithuanian freedom forces were compelled to abandon active resistance.

On this 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, we should, therefore, recall that Lithuania has not only had two glorious periods of independence, but also two glorious periods of resistance. It is my conviction that Lithuanian heroes have not died in vain. It is my belief that the spirit of resistance remains. It is my hope that the Lithuanian people will soon regain the freedom for which they have struggled so long and which they cherish so dearly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I note that February 16 is the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day. I regret exceedingly that the people of this little nation cannot celebrate this day in freedom and independence, in accord with the wishes of its people; instead the country continues in subjugation by a foreign power—the Soviet Union.

It is only fitting and proper, however, to observe this anniversary because it helps to maintain the essential aspirations of the Lithuanian people and to demonstrate that their hopes for liberation and independence are not forgotten by the people of America and the free world.

We deplore the conditions which keep this country under the domination of a foreign power, against the wishes of its people.

We join with them in the determination that the day of deliverance will come, not only for Lithuania, but for all the people of the other captive nations as well.

May the Almighty God speed that great day.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on this date Lithuania does not mourn the loss of her freedom in 1940; she celebrates the independence she won in 1918. She holds no memorials to tyranny; she perpetuates the anniversary date of the liberation of her people at the end of World War I.

It is an irony of fate that this ancient Eastern member of the Indo-European family, organized as a political entity some 800 years ago, whose medieval kings ruled most of what is now Russia, should be caught in the Soviets' chains.

Yet Lithuania's search for freedom, like her celebration of it, continues. Her geographic outlines are blurred by the mighty shadow of Soviet Russia. If freedom in fact is lost, the desire for it is not; it continues to flame in the hearts and souls of her people. Lithuania takes a place of honor among the ranks of those who continue their struggles for self-determination.

It is fitting that Americans who fought to win freedom, to maintain it and defend it, on our own soil and elsewhere, should pay tribute to the courage and dedication of those who share in these ideals. I commend the brave and honorable Lithuanian people upon their determined march toward the recovery of their independence.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, 1966, freedom-loving people throughout the world will mark the anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day which, 48 years ago, ushered in two decades of great strides in economy and culture for the nation on the eastern shore of the Baltic Sea.

While under Russian rule for the 120 years from 1795 to 1915, Lithuanians kept alive the hope they would regain their independence. Then the tiny nation of 25,000 square miles was under German occupation until 1918, when Lithuania proclaimed her independence. Russia invaded but was repulsed by the Lithuanian Volunteer Army. In 1920, a peace treaty was signed between Lithuania and Soviet Russia in Moscow, article I of which reads:

> In conformity with the right declared by the Russian Socialist Federated Republic of all people to free self-determination, including the right of full secession from the state of which they have been part, Russia recognizes without any reserve sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition, and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory.

The fact that Lithuania was ever under Russian sovereignty does not place the Lithuanian people and their territory under any obligation to Russia.

For the next 20 years, Lithuania was prosperous, progressive, and had faith in the future. But secret Nazi-Russian agreements in 1939 were followed by Soviet invasion of Lithuania, enslaving the people and incorporating their nation into the Soviet Union. The Nazis occupied Lithuania during World War II and the Russians regained control in 1944.

Today, the world is reminded that the hope for freedom and independence still exists in the hearts of the 3 million Lithuanians in the captive nation.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, we who value our priceless heritage of American freedom and who are so deeply grateful for the gift of personal liberty have special reason today to commemorate the 48th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

We owe it to the brave people of that small Baltic nation—who, despite the brutal occupation of their homeland by Nazi and Communist oppressors, have never forsaken their determination to regain their freedom—to take fresh notice of their plight and make new efforts to alert the freedom-loving world to the injustice under which they have been forced to live. We must not forget their courage. We must not weaken in our resolve never to recognize their illegal subjugation. And we must never weary of seeking effective ways of helping to restore their independence and liberty.

On the other hand, we owe it to ourselves—to those among us of Lithuanian descent and to all who take their freedom seriously—to make this anniversary an occasion for renewed devotion to our national ideals, so like the ideals of once-free Lithuanians, for deeper understanding of the responsibilities which freedom imposes upon us, and for a strengthened determination to use our power and resources in pursuit of justice and freedom.

It is my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to include as a part of my remarks the text of resolutions unanimously adopted on February 6, 1966, by the Lithuanian-Americans of Linden, N.J., and a resolution adopted at a mass meeting on February 13 sponsored by the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey and held in Newark.

Resolutions Unanimously Adopted on February 6, 1966, by the Lithuanian Americans of Linden, N.J., Gathered Under Auspices of Lithuanian American Council, Linden Branch, for Commemoration of Lithuania's Independence

Whereas February 16, 1966, marks the 48th anniversary of the formation of a free and independent Lithuania, an act strongly supported by President Woodrow Wilson's Declaration of 14 Points, which expressed the principles of national self-determination; and

Whereas Lithuania has been occupied and its people subjugated by the Soviet Union since 1940, yet the will and the spirit of the enslaved population to this date has not been overcome; and

Whereas Americans of Lithuanian descent on the occasion of this anniversary pledge to continue all efforts toward the restoration of a free and independent status for the Baltic countries, and on this day repeat to those behind the Iron Curtain—we have not forgotten; and

Whereas the U.S. policy of nonrecognition of the forcible incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union remains a symbol of our Government's consistent good faith in the performance of her foreign relations as presently demonstrated by the strong commitment taken regarding the critical southeast Asian situation, where freedom is also under attack: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we Lithuanian Americans are determined to support all efforts toward the restoration of freedom in Lithuania; and

Resolved, That the current U.S. policy and commitment in the Asiatic area offers renewed encouragement that the 26-year status of the Baltic nations may be reappraised consistent with U.S. determination to support and maintain freedom in other forcibly dominated areas of the world; further be it

Resolved, That we hereby reaffirm our earnest hope that the power and prestige of our great Nation, the United States of America, can be effectively exercised for the ultimate liberation of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania; and be it

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Lyndon B. Johnson; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk; to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg; to the U.S. Senators of New Jersey, the Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE and the Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS; to the Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey, the Honorable FLORENCE P. DWYER, and to the Governor of New Jersey, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes.

VLADAS TURSA,
President.
STASYS VAICIUNAS,
Secretary.
MARGARITA SAMATAS,
Chairman of Resolution Committee.
FEBRUARY 6, 1966.

We Americans of Lithuanian ancestry, having called a mass meeting on the 13th day of February 1966 at St. George's Hall, 180 New York Avenue, Newark, N.J., to observe the anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence 48 years ago, on February 16, 1918, and mindful of the sad fact that the homeland of our forefathers is still oppressed and suffering under the cruel yoke of Soviet Communist enslavement illegally and treacherously imposed by the Soviet Union in 1940, unanimously adopted the following:

Whereas the United Nations and the United States have been instrumental in freeing many formerly foreign colonial lands and bringing them into the community of free nations; and

Whereas the Soviet Union, a member of the United Nations and vociferous in demanding that an end be put to all foreign colonialism, in fact and in deed has made the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into modern-day European colonies in the Soviet empire; and

Whereas the Soviet Union is striving by any and all means to win recognition of its illegal seizure and incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we thank our Government for its just and firm stand in denouncing and refusing to recognize the Soviet aggression and occupation, and ask the administration to continue, whenever and wherever possible, to demand that the Soviets end their colonialism, withdraw their administration and forces from Lithuania and the other two Baltic States and allow them to restore their independence, sovereignty, and self-rule; also be it

Resolved, That we urge the administration not to ratify the Consular Convention under discussion with U.S.S.R., inasmuch as this would only serve to increase the number of Communist espionage centers in our country: Also be it

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; to the Secretary of State; to the Senators and Congressmen from our State, and the press.

Done at Newark, N.J., the 13th day of February 1966.

LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF NEW JERSEY,
VALENTINAS MELINIS, *Chairman.*
ALBIN S. TRECIOKAS, *Secretary.*

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, February 16 is Lithuanian Independence Day. It is so named because on that day in 1918 the proud and courageous nation of Lithuania was proclaimed by her own people to once again be an independent country. Lithuania had been independent in the past, but for more than a century before that memorable day in 1918 it had been denied the right of sovereignty by the Russian Empire and its successors. In 1795 the great powers of eastern and central Europe had completed the shameful partition of Poland, of which Lithuania had been a part. However, during those long decades of bondage to foreign masters the people of Lithuania had not forgotten their long history as an independent country. They had a great heritage of common achievements, national language, and national culture to recall and to remind them that they should not be just one small province of another country.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, when the opportunity to reassert their independence appeared in the collapse of the Russian state which had overpowered them, they took advantage of the God-given chance and struck a blow for their traditional liberty. It is a sad chapter in the history of that part of the world that peace and progress were not long permitted the peoples. The dictators in Berlin and Moscow assaulted them from 1939 on and divided the small nations such as Lithuania among themselves. Then the terrible holocaust of the Second World War on the eastern front engulfed them. After the horrors of the Nazi occupation the Lithuanians were subjected to a reimposition of the Soviet regime which destroyed by death and deportation all independent native opposition.

Today Lithuania is still one of those nations locked by the brute force of the Red army within the prison of the Soviet state. But we can be certain that the spirit of freedom which burned so long during a previous Russian occupation has not now been put out. It is thus with deep sincerity that I congratulate the gallant people of Lithuania and their countrymen everywhere on the anniversary of the moment in history when this small nation proclaimed its freedom and extend to them my hopes that this shall soon be returned to them.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege for me to join with my colleagues in solemn commemoration of the independence day of Lithuania, a beautiful land which today stands as a tragic reminder to free men that their blessings of liberty do not belong to all peoples. Yet on this day it is a happier time in the rich history of Lithuania that we remember, the day when centuries of heartfelt longings for freedom were realized—February 16, 1918.

The thrilling declaration of independence signaled the beginning of 20 years of freedom, during which time great progress marked all the phases of life of the young Republic. Lithuanian economists began a large-scale program to improve agriculture, the primary occupation of the Lithuanian people. Leaders instituted a great land reform program to give the hitherto landless peasants an opportunity to own their plots of land. Before World War I only 450 families had owned 22 percent of the land, with a minimum ownership estimated at 2,000 acres. By 1939 Lithuania could boast 335,720 farming units, raising a variety of grains, potatoes, sugarbeets, livestock, and poultry. At the same time, economists pressed the industrialization of the land. In 1913 Lithuania had only 151 industrial establishments with 6,603 employees, while in 1939 there were 16,131 enterprises, giving work to more than 33,000 workers.

On the social front, the Lithuanians made great strides. In 1922 a democratic constitution was adopted. Education was free, and all children were required by law to attend school. Other outstanding achievements were passage of a labor control law and the introduction of the 8-hour working day.

Along with economic and social strides came a vigorous cultural rebirth. Artists, freed at last from centuries of suppression by the Russians, began a campaign to revive the history, colorful folklore, and great literature of their beloved homeland.

But then came the scourge of war, and no country was affected more tragically than beautiful Lithuania. The nation emerged from the Second World War to find itself once again enslaved by the Soviet Union. The fleeting, wonderful, productive era of independence had ended.

More than 20 years since engulfment by the Soviet Union, Lithuania still chafes under the heavy yoke of oppression. The will to be free continues to burn in the hearts of the courageous Lithuanians. On this day we join with all of our Lithuanian friends, not only in my own great State of New York but also throughout this great land, in extending warmest greetings to the gallant Lithuanians behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, this 48th anniversary of Lithuanian national independence serves to remind us of our heritage as the historic source of the national independence movement and as well the tragedy which has befallen the Lithuanian nation in the loss of its independence and freedom in 1939, by Russian Communist deceit, treachery, armed aggression, and military occupation.

In our time we, as freemen, are confronted with the same threat, the same peril which crushed the independence of Lithuania some 26 years ago. Since the end of active hostilities of World War II we have been called upon to stand by and defend the independence of free nations from the shores of Western Europe eastward to the Pacific Ocean. The same forces of Communist aggression and military conquest which overran Lithuania a quarter of a century ago moved us to build the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Central Treaty Organization, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organzation, and here in the Western Hemisphere, the Alliance for Progress.

Today, at this very moment, we are engaged as partners of free Vietnam in a common effort to turn back that same Communist aggression which seeks to destroy the independence of Vietnam.

Those who may have doubts about why we are in Vietnam today would profit by a review of Lithuanian affairs over the past half century. They would find that this gallant nation on the Baltic Sea broke the chains of Russian imperialism in 1917 after a long period of national enslavement. They would also find that Lithuania between the great wars enjoyed an unprecedented era of freedom, progress, and peace; and the warmest relations with the Government and people of the United States. They would also find that freedom in Lithuania was crushed by the same tactics, the same evil forces which have unleashed the cruel war in Vietnam. Hopefully they would come to understand that what we are fighting for in Vietnam is not only to defend a young and small nation but as well the future of human freedom for every nation on earth.

It serves no useful purpose to wish that freemen had been organized to stand up to Communist aggression in 1939. Had they been so organized Lithuania would not now be deprived of its freedom and national independence. But freemen are now organized to defend their cause and we as leaders of that cause are contributing to that defense in Vietnam today. If we stand firm in that conflict, if we refuse to bargain with aggressive tyrants on the future of human freedom, if we stand up for human rights and the natural rights of nations large and small, we can have hope that Lithuania and all the other captive nations of the world will regain their freedom and national independence.

Mr. Speaker, no people have fought harder or struggled longer for the birthright of freedom than have the people of Lithuania. Their spirit and their courage have sustained them in the darkest days of their long history. They will never give up the fight for a free and independent Lithuania. I join with my colleagues in the House in this salute to Lithuania—may she soon regain her rightful place in the community of free nations.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, located on the northeastern coast of Europe and nitted between three other states and the Baltic Sea there lies an ancient, though presently imprisoned land: Lithuania. I consider it a distinct sign of respect and devotion for millions of American citizens to commemorate February 16, the date of Lithuanian independence. [illegible]

uanian history is one factor which gives continued courage to the millions of Lithuanians held captive by the Russian Communists.

But enduring and somehow overcoming Russian rule is not a new phenomenon to the Lithuanian people. Their country was annexed by Russia as early as the "third partition" of Poland in 1795. Russian rule assumed an air of semilegitimacy when the Congress of Vienna accorded the czar the title of grand duke of Lithuania.

Russian czars treated the "territory of the Northwest"—as historic Lithuania was called after 1832—as an integral part of Russia. From 1864 to 1905 an intense policy of russification was carried into every facet of Lithuanian life. Printed materials could be issued only if the Russian alphabet was used. Russian was the only language to be used in the schools and the Catholic religion was severely restricted. The russification policy continues today.

However, due to the faith of the Lithuanian people in their ancient language and traditions, they fiercely resisted the russification policy. It is remarkable that Lithuanian resistance continues today. Their ties to their past rich cultural heritage have managed to endure the difficulties and hardships imposed by the Russians.

Though one of the captive nations held by the Soviet Union, Lithuanians can take comfort in the fact that millions of free men and women remain vitally concerned and dedicated to their return to the status of a free people. I am firmly convinced that the day will soon come when the walls of Russian enslavement will come tumbling down. On that day Lithuanian liberty will once again become a reality. Let us on this anniversary of her independence rededicate ourselves to continue to carry on the work necessary to help Lithuania once again be free.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. On that day in 1918 the Lithuanian people were finally freed from a long period of Russian rule, which had begun in 1795. Lithuania enjoyed two decades of independence and prospered greatly as a free society. But in 1940 Lithuania was occupied by the Red army. On August 3, 1940, it was forced to become a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. Since that time the Lithuanian people have suffered greatly from Communist tyranny, but they have never lost their love of freedom.

Lithuania has been a united and cohesive nationality for hundreds of years. Lithuania was first mentioned in historical texts dating from the 11th century. At that time Lithuania was divided into numerous principalities, but threats from abroad were instrumental in creating a united state. In 1253 Mindaugas was crowned king of a united Lithuania by a representative of Pope Innocent IV. In the 14th century [illegible]

and strengthened Lithuania's ties with Western Europe.

One scholar has written the following:

> The Lithuanians had established a powerful and independent state in Europe during the Middle Ages. They were able to check the German drive to the east for centuries. They protected Europe against the Mongols and the Tartars. They furnished a power and a government behind which the eastern Slavs could live in peace and safety with a freedom that was unknown in Muscovite Russia. They blessed their subjects with more human freedoms than in the neighboring countries. They encouraged education and toleration, and they played their part in the general development of European civilization.

What a tragedy it is that the Lithuanians enjoyed such a brief period of freedom after more than a century of domination. Yet the Lithuanian people continue to work and pray for their eventual liberation. Let us do all we can to support their desire for freedom and their longing for national self-determination. In this connection, I should like to call our colleagues' attention to the following resolution which was adopted by the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey at a meeting at St. George's Hall, Newark, N.J., on February 13, 1966:

> We, Americans of Lithuanian ancestry, having called a mass meeting on the 13th day of February 1966 at St. George's Hall, 180 New York Avenue, Newark, N.J., to observe the anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence 48 years ago, on February 16, 1918, and mindful of the sad fact that the homeland of our forefathers is still oppressed and suffering under the cruel yoke of Soviet Communist enslavement illegally and treacherously imposed by the Soviet Union in 1940, unanimously adopted the following:
>
> Whereas, the United Nations and the United States have been instrumental in freeing many formerly foreign colonial lands and bringing them into the community of free nations, and
>
> Whereas, the Soviet Union, a member of the United Nations and vociferous in demanding that an end be put to all foreign colonialism, in fact and in deed has made the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into modern-day European colonies in the Soviet empire, and
>
> Whereas, the Soviet Union is striving by any and all means to win recognition of its illegal seizure and incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That we thank our Government for its just and firm stand in denouncing and refusing to recognize the Soviet aggression and occupation, and ask the administration to continue, whenever and wherever possible, to demand that the Soviets end their colonialism, withdraw their administration and forces from Lithuania and the other two Baltic States and allow them to restore their independence, sovereignty and self-rule; also be it
>
> *Resolved*, That we urge the administration not to ratify the Consular Convention under discussion with U.S.S.R. inasmuch as this would only serve to increase the number of Communist espionage centers in our country; also be it
>
> *Resolved*, That this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; to the Secretary of State; to the Senators and Congressmen from our State and the press.

Done at Newark, N.J., the 13th day of February 1966.

LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF NEW JERSEY,
VALENTINAS MELINIS, *Chairman.*
ALBIN S. TRECIOKAS, *Secretary.*

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, 48 years ago, on February 16, 1918, the people of Lithuania proclaimed their independence after living for more than a century under the yoke of Russian tsardom. Today we commemorate this occasion with a mixture of sorrow and admiration.

Our sorrow is profound because the once great Lithuanian nation of the Middle Ages and the proud and progressive Republic of the period between the two World Wars lies under a new yoke—that of Soviet communism. In the 19th century, the Russian masters of Lithuania made an attempt to crush the spirit of the Lithuanian people, to stamp out their distinct culture and language, and to impose the established church of the Russian empire on the Roman Catholic Lithuanians.

The new Soviet masters of Lithuania have picked up where their tsarist predecessors left off. Their methods, however, have been even more cruel. Their means have been those of 20th century totalitarianism. Lithuanians seeking to practice their faith have been constantly persecuted. Those who have sought to resist have been summarily executed or deported. Great pressure has been placed on teachers, officials, and judges to propagate the Soviet creed. Farmers resisting collectivization have been forcibly ejected from their lands.

Our admiration for the Lithuanian people is also great. For on this occasion we cannot help but be reminded of the achievements of the Lithuanian people throughout history, and especially of the contribution that thousands of Lithuanian-Americans have made to the life of our country. Lithuanians have always been renowned for their self-reliance and individualism. It is these traits that account in large part for the remarkable history of their country during its periods of independence. It is also these traits that have enabled them to remain proud and hopeful despite great suffering under the yoke of oppression. On this day which holds so much meaning for Lithuanians everywhere, I would like to express my deep respect for the people of Lithuania, my great sorrow for their current plight, and my hope that one day they will regain their independence.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, today we mark the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, and though she is not free, we pause to pay tribute to the spirit of her gallant people which has remained free through a quarter of a century of domination by the Soviet Union.

The history of this tiny, heroic nation needs no introduction here in the Congress, for the story of the Cossack fight for freedom after over a hundred years of Russian intimidation is as well known as are her achievements in industry, farming, literature, and music during the brief 22 years of independence before she fell victim to the designs of her ambitious neighbors in Russia and Germany.

It is difficult for Americans to imagine a life of total collectivism, with schools, newspapers, hospitals, and churches subject to the state, yet these industrious, religious people on the eastern shores of the Baltic have not given way to despair.

To them, and to the Lithuanian-American groups who have contributed greatly to our own culture, while keeping alive the hopes of their brothers behind the Iron Curtain, let us once more salute their stout resistance, and with gratitude for our own liberty, remind ourselves that, "no one can be perfectly free 'til all are free."

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that on this date, February 16, 1966, we are merely able to pay verbal tribute to the Lithuanian people. Surely a people which has suffered so much at the hands of various aggressors throughout nearly a millennium of history deserves something better than simply tributes. From a divided nation of many principalities in the early 11th century, the Lithuanians fought against overwhelming odds to establish their own independent state, in order to be able to live in the peace and freedom to which all peoples are entitled.

From 1795 until 1915, the Lithuanians endured an almost incredible 120 years of domination at the hands of the troops and administrators of the Russian czar. Each generation attempted to throw off the Russian yoke, and each generation was cruelly crushed. In 1831, after the third revolt, the Russian Government had the audacity to attempt to replace the Lithuanian language and culture with the Russian one. Revolt succeeded revolt, and the repressive measures of the czar's government intensified; eventually, the determination and courage of the Lithuanians overcame the attempts at russification, for the czar was finally forced to abandon the policy in 1905.

Ten years later, when Lithuania was overrun by the German armies, Russian domination came to an end. Despite the fact that the rapacity of the two armies had cost the Lithuanians dearly, the revolution in Russia combined with the German defeat enabled the Lithuanians to proclaim an independent state on February 16, 1918.

Less than 1 year later, however the Red army entered the country and installed a Communist government. With the assistance of the Polish Army, the Lithuanians were nevertheless able to force the Soviet Union to sign a peace treaty and recognize Lithuania's independence, on July 12, 1920. For nearly 20 years, the Lithuanians were able to live in the peace and prosperity to which their centuries of oppression entitled them. Then, with the outbreak of the Second World War and the contest in Eastern Europe between the German and Soviet Armies, the cities and towns of Lithuania once again echoed the jackboots of foreign troops. In a series of cruelly cynical agreements, forced upon a defenseless people, the Soviet Union quietly resumed the mantle formerly worn by the czars: On August 3, 1940, Lithuania was made a constituent Republic of the U.S.S.R.

Despite the deportation of the flower of its youth and intelligentsia, the death of more than 45,000 people, the execution of thousands of additional political prisoners during the war, and the deportation of another 265,000 Lithuanians after the war, the will and courage of this brave people remains strong. In the face of such bravery, we are forced to stand idly by and simply praise it, rather than reacting to its call, and demonstrating our own mettle in the face of adversity. When the yoke which presently binds the Lithuanians is once again discarded, it is my fervent hope that we shall be there to assist in every possible way, in order to insure that this people will be able to enjoy the fruits of a peaceful democratic society.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on this 48th anniversary of Lithuania's most recent Independence Day, February 16, 1918, it is a pleasure to speak for that country of indomitable courage and undying devotion to freedom. When the Lithuanian people proclaimed independence for their country in 1918 it was not the first time in their history that they had known political freedom and independence. Indeed, in commemorating that day we are honoring Lithuania ancient and modern.

For Lithuania, even in the Middle Ages, was not only an independent country; it was large, proud, powerful—extending into what is now Byelorussia and the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic itself.

Then from the late 14th century to the end of the 16th, though in personal union with Poland through the marriage of their monarchs, Lithuania was known as a great, independent Christian nation. In official union with Poland for the following two centuries, Lithuania was to fall victim, with Poland, to the growing, powerful Russian Empire, through the great Partition of 1795. From then until World War I and the Russian Revolution of 1917 it was in the grip of czarist Russia.

The declaration of its independence that day in February 1918 was, therefore, a rebirth of freedom, an upsurgence of that spirit of independence, never dead, which manifests itself today in spite of all discouragement. For, although political independence was to be relatively shortlived, the independence of spirit of the Lithuanian people is enduring.

The Soviet Union, itself independent from the czarist regime of imperial Russia only since the World War I era, was not content to "live and let live." With the upheaval of World War II it seized the Baltic States, claiming Lithuania and its sister republics as component parts of the young Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

A new, more intense, more ruthless program of russification, which was instituted by the Soviets, was not, however, sufficient to crush the undying devotion to freedom in the Lithuanian heart. At home and abroad it has persisted. The Lithuanians who escaped when their homeland was again subjected to Russian domination have never ceased to look to the day of future liberation.

The United States has never officially recognized the claim of Soviet domination. We in America respect the principle of the self-determination of peoples. We applaud the day the Lithuanians declared their independence. And we honor the perseverance of the spirit of freedom of Lithuanians wherever they may be.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the struggle for freedom has never been easy. Once a nation achieves independence its struggle to retain it becomes more difficult. Unless that nation is given the opportunity to establish itself economically, socially, and militarily, its future as a free nation can never be secure for the opponents to freedom will leave no stone unturned to suppress the desires of a self-governing people. Deceit, cunningness, and, if need be, forceful aggression are the rules of thumb by which despots live and flourish. And tyranny has been identified by different titles in the years gone by, such as Nazism and Fascism, and now it is called communism. But in each instance, the means employed to gain the end result are no different today than they were yesterday with the goal of the aggressor the same—domination of the world. So in order for freedom to win the battle against tyranny, the free people of the world must be ever vigilant and meet the challenges of tyrants by faith in themselves, and encouragement to those suppressed by dictators, to seek their independence so they can enjoy the full meaning of life.

Today marks the 48th anniversary that the Constituent Assembly of Lithuania proclaimed the restoration of Lithuania's independence. This proclamation was the voice of a united people for a cause. A cause to choose their way of life, seek their own fortunes, and enjoy the comforts and pleasures that can only be achieved by independence. A cause that continues to flicker in their hearts and stand resolute in the minds of all Lithuanians throughout the world, for their brothers and sisters trapped behind the Iron Curtain. A continuous effort being made in the struggle for the restoration of Lithuania's freedom.

Some say, "Why should we concern ourselves over this tiny nation whose population is less than 3 million and whose area encompasses only 25,167 square miles?" But that nation as all other nations overrun by communism, through the might of arms and numbers, are the cradles of democracy in the old world, just as we are the cradle of democracy in the New World. If we, in this generation, hope to see a free world for the generations to come, we must look to the people of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Poland, and all other oppressed nations to oppose their enemies within their borders and work toward their independence. We must provide them with courage to seek out their place in a world of human rights and not give in to their invaders.

Lithuanians are a strong people. But their strength is not designed to dominate their neighbors but to live with them in peace and harmony seeking a common goal. It is ironic that their philosophy of self-determination rather than domination has made them the victims of domination by the enemies of self-determination. Their history is dominated by their struggles against these enemies. Their thirst for liberty has never been daunted but it has seldom been quenched, for every time Lithuania has gained independence a new menace would arise to crush it. In 1940 it was the forces of nazism and today it is the forces of communism.

We are now engaged in a bitter conflict in the small nation of Vietnam seeking to maintain the independence gained by the South Vietnamese. We are meeting Communist forceful aggression head on and we shall be the victors. But the victory independence and the free world will achieve there will be meaningless until the victory of independence is complete throughout the world. The encouragement we give to the people of Lithuania today, for them to continue to work for their independence, is as important to the cause of freedom as is force in those areas of the world where Communist forceful aggression seeks to destroy this cause. Therefore, I join with all Lithuanians on this day, the anniversary of their proclamation for restoration of Lithuania's independence, in their strong desire for liberty and justice for their oppressed people in Europe.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our Lithuanian friends on this the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

At the end of 119 years of Russian oppression, Lithuania became a battlefield in the war for supremacy in Europe. The economy was shattered. All of life was disrupted. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians were forcibly taken from their homes and out of their country. Russian and German Armies devastated the fields, looted homes, plundered stores and banks.

That, Mr. Speaker, is how Lithuania began its final fight for independence.

The war in Europe raged, and little Lithuania lay at the feet of the Germans who defeated the Russians in 1915. The malevolence, the incompassion, the brutality, the maliciousness of war could clearly be seen in the consequences of war in Lithuania.

It was under conditions such as these that the Lithuanian people began seriously to consider the possibility of independence—dream of their fathers, and their fathers' fathers. The cost of World War I on Lithuania was frightful, but it set the stage for the long-sought and often-dreamed independence. From this devastation and slaughter rose a free and independent people.

Germany was defeated, and Russia was rent apart from the Communist revolution. The time was ripe. In 1917, the Germans, after great pressure by the Lithuanian people, granted permission for the convening of a 200-delegate Congress. On February 16, 1918, just 48 years ago, the bells of liberty rang out across the world. Lithuania had declared itself an independent nation.

Of course independence is not gained by its mere declaration. No sooner had the Germans left the country in January of 1919 than the Red armies entered the country, to again sack, plunder, and exploit this war-weary little nation. The Russians remained until they were driven out of the country by Marshal Joseph Pilsudski and the Polish Army. On July 12, 1928, the Russians signed a treaty of peace promising to respect the sovereignty of Lithuania. On May 31, 1921, the United States recognized the independence of Lithuania, and on September 22 of the same year, Lithuania became a member of the League of Nations.

For almost 20 years the Lithuanian peoples struggled with their newly gained freedom and independence, only to be once again strangled by fascism and communism, and since 1944 it has been a colony of the Kremlin.

What a terrible price these proud peoples paid for approximately 20 years of independence. Let us tell them on the 48th anniversary of their independence that we in America have not forgotten that freedom is priceless.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, 48 years ago, on February 16, 1918, the Republic of Lithuania was proclaimed. Out of the tragedies of the First World War had sprung some blessings, among them the great opportunity for this great Baltic nation to determine its destiny once again, an opportunity which had long been denied by their Russian masters. I am sure that independence was never more welcome than it was to the heroic Lithuanians who had suffered under forced annexation to their aggressive neighbor since 1795.

For over a century the Russian rulers had carried out a policy of "Russification" by which they attempted to extinguish the Lithuanian culture just as they had its national identity. By this cruel policy the language was outlawed and the beautiful name of "Lithuania" was officially abolished. More than once the courageous people of Lithuania rebelled in an effort to throw off the oppressive yoke. The failures they met did not discourage them, but instead strengthened their determination to be free.

Finally on that day in February which we are commemorating now, the goal of freedom was achieved and Lithuanian independence was declared. The next 20 years constituted the happiest years in Lithuania's recent history. Outstanding achievements were made in the fields of economics and government, and the Lithuanian culture flourished as a plant seeing the sun after years of darkness.

Unhappily, Lithuania has been deprived of its cherished freedom by the evil forces of communism against which we have mobilized ourselves with the rest of the free world. Its years of freedom are now a precious memory. But more than that, they are an inspiration, for true Lithuanians everywhere have faith that some day freedom will be theirs once again.

In the meantime, there is hope to be derived from the comparison of Lithuania's present-day captivity with the captivity of the 19th and early 20th century. Just as the earlier attempts at russification did not succeed, the current attempts at communization will not succeed. Although Lithuanian patriots are killed, although worship is suppressed, although freedom is denied, the spirit of Lithuania can never be crushed. In their hearts the Lithuanians will maintain their religious faith and their love of liberty. Just as Lithuanians rebelled against their conquerors in 1830, 1863, and 1905, they will continue their heroic resistance to Communist tyranny.

Here in the United States, Americans of Lithuanian origin, who have contributed so much to their new homeland, are performing a great service to all who love freedom, as well as to the country of their forefathers. They are keeping alive the spirit of 1918 when the forces of democracy triumphed and Lithuania attained its rightful stature as a sovereign state. They are reminding all Americans of every national origin of the dangers of communism. They are sending hope and encouragement to a very gallant people.

The undaunted courage and faith of the Lithuanian people and their kinsmen in the United States deserves every tribute it will receive today. Because their kind of spirit cannot long be kept in shackles, we can be sure that some day this anniversary of independence will once again be celebrated in an independent Lithuania by a free people. I am proud to join with them in commemorating this 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, after nearly 1,000 years of oppression and occupation by foreign armies, the people of Lithuania were able on February 16, 1918, to finally issue their own declaration of independence. With great hope, they took their place in the family of nations. Yet, a little more than two decades later, in 1940, they were swallowed up by the Soviet monolith, the successor to the Russian Empire which had in previous centuries also sought to erase the existence of a Lithuanian language, religion, and culture from that great panorama which is the history of mankind.

It is, I think, a great tragedy that more emphasis has not been placed upon the momentous achievements of the Lithuanians in the field of music, the theater, and other arts. Rather than reiterate the pathetic tale of the fate of the Lithuanian state and its sufferings at the hands of the Russians, the Germans, and the Poles, it would be far greater tribute to acknowledge some of the talents and skills of those Lithuanians who, as a result of the misfortunes which their country was forced to endure, came to the United States in an effort to keep alive the traditions and greatness of Lithuanian culture.

Permit me to mention just one of the great names of Lithuanian music, the composer Mikas Petrauskas. Born in 1873, he studied in the major music centers of Europe, and undertook extensive concert tours through these same countries. In the early years of the 20th century, he came to the United States; when his fatherland became free at the end of the First World War, he returned there to continue his career, and it was there that he died in 1937, just a few short years before his country was once again absorbed by its giant neighbor, Russia.

Mikas Petrauskas was the composer of an incredibly large number of popular Lithuanian songs, and undertook the herculean task of composing about 20 operettas with Lithuanian themes and his great opera, Eglē-Žalciu Karalienē, while at the same time organizing singing groups, choirs, and popularizing the delightfully charming Lithuanian folk dances. With the exception of his opera, presented in Boston, his compositions were of a light and popular character. They made extensive use of the themes of the Lithuanian people, as expressed in their folk songs, dances, and popular tunes. Unlike so many moody and uncommunicative composers, Mikas Petrauskas had a pleasing personality, remarkable teaching talents, and unlimited energy which combined to make him extremely popular, and contributed to making him by far the best known and universally regarded Lithuanian composer.

Mikas Petrauskas is just one example of the kind of talent and ability which has so often manifested itself among the Lithuanian people. The names of their musicians, actors, artists, men of letters, athletes, and others are an important part of the roster of individuals from other lands who have contributed so unselfishly and extensively to the culture of this country and of the whole world. It is my fervent hope that we may soon see the day when these talents may be permitted to flower in their own homeland, free from the suppression and censorship which the Soviet state has imposed upon this gifted people.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, throughout history the fate of small nations has often been a sad one. They have had to frequently live within the shadow of larger, more powerful neighbors. All too often the greater powers have shown little or no solicitude for the welfare and even the freedom of the small countries. Whether inspired by dreams of universal domination, fear of other great powers, or simple greed they have abused and even destroyed the independence of their weaker neighbors. The countries of Europe, especially in the eastern part of that continent, have experienced the violent movements and interplay of power politics over the centuries.

The 16th of February provides us with a reminder of the terrible experiences which can befall a small nation. On that day hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians and their many friends and admirers throughout the world will mark the 48th anniversary of the day in 1918 when the small Lithuanian nation bravely proclaimed that it was returning to its rightful place as an independent member of the family of nations. That country on the Baltic Sea had been an unwilling part of the Russian Empire for 123 years. Ever since it, as part of Poland, had been ruthlessly conquered by the Muscovite czars in the third and last partition of Poland by the powers of Central and Eastern Europe in 1795, the people of Lithuania had never given up the desire to be a free nation. Throughout the long years of domination by a foreign power which sought to destroy the national identity of the historic Lithuanian nation, the people had resisted the machinations of the Russians. The defeat and collapse of the Romanov's empire gave them a chance to declare that they were no longer a captive appendage of the Russian state.

In the years following this declaration, the people of Lithuania showed that they could master the problems of becoming a proud and progressive modern nation. While the search for a full political democracy was still being carried on, the Lithuanians showed that they were in tune with the progressive movements for social justice which were sweeping the world at the time. One outstanding example was an agrarian reform law which helped to make Lithuania a country of small independent farmers. This was especially important for a nation which is predominantly agricultural. Lithuania became a member of the League of Nations. She only sought to take her place in a peaceful community of nations.

However, her great neighbors, Germany and the Soviet Union, did not wish to see such a community develop. At the first opportunity, when the two powers had marked out their spheres of influence in Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union reoccupied Lithuania. Thus, in 1940, the Communist rulers of Russia showed their contempt for written agreements by violating their nonaggression pact with Lithuania. They moved quickly to destroy by all means the leadership groups in Lithuania. They incorporated the country into the Soviet Union. Later, in 1944, after the unfortunate small nation had undergone the ravages of Nazi occupation the Red army returned and reimposed the brutal Soviet dictatorship. Since then thousands of Lithuanians have perished or been deported in one of history's most gruesome examples of an attempt to eradicate the national identity of a people.

However, we can be sure that this is being resisted by the people of Lithuania. It behooves us to try to strengthen their resolve to again be free by bringing to the attention of our people and the whole world the reminder of their independence day. By publicly marking this anniversary, we may hope that the courageous Lithuanians still in foreign bondage will realize that freedom-loving people everywhere know of and sympathize with their plight. I wish to extend my best wishes to the proud and ancient nation of Lithuania on this great anniversary in their history.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, February 16 is the anniversary of an event which should command the attention of all people who love freedom and hate tyranny. On that day in 1918, the ancient Baltic nation of Lithuania, which had been an unwilling member of the Russian Empire since 1795, proclaimed its independence from the Soviet state, the successor to the defunct empire of the czars.

Within a little more than two decades, the exaltation and hope inspired by that historic day of independence suffered a terrible blow when, in 1940, the "long night of barbarism" descended as the Red army occupied this unfortunate nation. Almost immediately, a Communist puppet regime was installed, and Lithuania was incorporated into the Soviet Empire.

Since that time, the Soviets have attempted to eradicate the idea of a distinct and separate Lithuanian nationality and culture. But, Mr. Speaker, we who cherish freedom, can be assured that the captive nationalities will never forsake their aspirations, because the spirit of freedom and independence can never be destroyed by the armed might of an alien power. Today, as for centuries past, the Lithuanian people remain steadfast in their fervent desire to be a sovereign member of the world community.

It is, therefore, with great pleasure and high hope that I commend the people of Lithuania on the 48th anniversary of their declaration of independence, and express my sincere wish that some day soon they will once again assume their rightful place as a free people in a free world.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my colleagues on the floor of the House of Representatives today in commemorating the 48th anniversary of the rebirth of the Lithuanian independent state. After centuries of domination by her respective neighbors, Lithuania, in 1918, declared herself independent from the old czarist empire. In doing this, she courageously defied the Communist regime of Lenin, which was unable to cause her capitulation until the eve of the Second World War. This small and heroic country retained its freedom against a formidable adversary for 22 years. How many other countries, small or large, have a record of such resistance?

Lithuania has also had an illustrious social and cultural history. In the 14th and 15th centuries Lithuania was the greatest and most advanced state in the Baltic area, bringing unity and direction to what is now western Russia. At one time the country stretched from its present location to the Black Sea. When Lithuania became part of czarist Russia, she still played an important part in the life of the country, acting as a part of Peter the Great's scheme for westernizing Russia through a "window on the Baltic." But Lithuania wanted to be free, and when the chance came in 1918 her people took it and retained it for 22 years.

Just prior to World War II, however, the U.S.S.R. sent troops into the area on the pretext of opening bases on the Baltic Sea to fight the Germans. Once the Red army was in the country, it forced the Parliament to vote for incorporation into the U.S.S.R. The loss of freedom and the oppression suffered by the Lithuanian people is now a matter of historical fact. In recognition of the unhappy situation existing there today, the United States, with good reason, has refused to recognize the legality of the Communist takeover of the Baltic States. It can be cited as a perfect example of Communist aggression and imperialism which is still occurring elsewhere in the world today. Our memories of the past, as in the case of Luthuania, cannot be allowed to fade if we are to truly understand the challenge facing freemen today.

I conclude my remarks by calling to the attention of my colleagues a resolution from the New Jersey Lithuanian Council, summarizing the views of this organization. It deserves our serious consideration. The resolution follows:

> We, Americans of Lithuanian ancestry, having called a mass meeting on February 13, 1966, at St. George's Hall, 180 New York Avenue, Newark, N.J., to observe the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, from February 16, 1918, and mindfull of the sad fact that the homeland of our forefathers is still oppressed and suffering under the cruel yoke of Soviet Communist enslavement illegally and treacherously imposed by the Soviet Union in 1940, unanimously adopted the following:
>
> Whereas the United Nations and the United States have been instrumental in freeing many formerly foreign colonial lands and bringing them into the community of free nations; and
>
> Whereas the Soviet Union, a member of the United Nations and vociferous in demanding that an end be put to all foreign colonialism, in fact and in deed has made the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into modern-day European colonies in the Soviet empire; and
>
> Whereas the Soviet Union is striving by any and all means to win recognition of its illegal seizure and incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That we thank our Government for its just and firm stand in denouncing and refusing to recognize the Soviet aggression and occupation, and ask the administration to continue, whenever and wherever possible, to demand that the Soviets end their colonialism, withdraw their administration and forces from Lithuania and the other two Baltic States and allow them to restore their independence, sovereignty, and self-rule; also be it
>
> *Resolved*, That we urge the administration not to ratify the Consular Convention under discussion with the U.S.S.R., inasmuch as this would only serve to increase the number of Communist espionage and sabotage centers in our country; also be it
>
> *Resolved*, That this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; to the Secretary of State; to the Senators and Congressmen of our State, and to the press.
>
> Done at Newark, N.J., the 13th day of February 1966.
>
> LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF NEW JERSEY,
> VALENTINAS MELINIS, *President.*
> ALBIN S. TRECICKAS, *Secretary.*

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, the people of the free world view February 16 with both joy and sadness. On this date in 1918, after over 125 years of slavery and oppression, the country of Lithuania achieved its independence. That was a happy occasion. Unfortunately, this independence was short lived. In August of 1940, after only 22 years of freedom, Lithuania once again suffered the loss of its independence and came under foreign domination. She fell first to the armies of Hitler and later to the troops of Soviet Russia.

Lithuania is a small country whose people only wish to live in peace and freedom. The Soviets have completely destroyed all independent Lithuanian governmental and cultural organizations. This was done through force and aggression completely against the will of the Lithuanian people.

Mr. Speaker, the hearts of all free people go out to the enslaved citizens of Lithuania. I sincerely hope that in the near future the brave people of Lithuania will escape from the yoke of Soviet oppression and rejoin the free world as a prosperous and independent nation.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, it is our unfortunate and yet necessary task on this day, February 16, to once again call attention to the fact that an indomitable people, possessed of an ancient and glorious past, is still in chains. It was on this memorable date, 48 years ago, that the Lithuanian people for a brief moment were able to cast off the shackles which had bound them—first to their neighbors the Poles, then to the Russian bear, and finally to the jackboots of the German Army.

After less than 20 years, the independent state of Lithuania was, as we all know, made what is euphemistically called a constituent republic of the Soviet Union. In the process, thousands upon thousands of innocent human beings lost their lives or were deported as a vigorous new attempt to eradicate them as a national group was undertaken by the successors to the Russian czars in the chain of power in Moscow. We may only draw inspiration from the fact that when the czars attempted russification in the 19th century, they failed dismally. Although we know that a similar program has been undertaken since 1940, and reporters tell us that Russian is the major language now spoken in this proud people's capital of Vilnius, we may rest assured that this new attempt is similarly doomed to failure.

Throughout history, almost every attempt of this nature to root out a national culture has failed, and the experience of Lithuania is no different. In the face of the most brutal punishments which the mind of man can devise, the attachment of the Lithuanian people to their language, religion, and culture has, if anything, grown. In the few brief years of independence which the Lithuanians enjoyed between the two world wars, a cultural renaissance of incredible proportions took place. New talents in music, art, theater, and letters sprouted and achieved wide renown.

Perhaps it should be pointed out to the leaders of the Soviet Union that this is the inevitable result of attempting to remake a people or their culture. We may rest assured, however, that dictators, whether in suits or jackboots, never learn the lessons of history. The Lithuanian people will become a craw in the throat of the Russian bear again, just as they have once before. During that time, the well-springs of creativity and artistic expression may be damped for fear of bringing on new means of repression. In a people as courageous and as talented as the Lithuanians, however, we may be certain that once they are permitted to live in peace and freedom we shall see a cultural flowering which will make the work of other peoples pale in comparison.

Mr. Speaker, we can at this time unfortunately only pay our respects to this brave people. I know that I speak for many besides myself, however, when I express the hope that the near future will see them living in freedom, and once again able to devote their time and energies to the peaceful pursuits which have been their first love throughout history.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with many of my colleagues in the 48th anniversary observance of Lithuanian Independence Day today. It was on February 16, 1918, that the Republic of Lithuania was founded, and it thrived as a democratic and independent state until June 15, 1940, when it was seized by the Soviet Union and Lithuania's 3 million people became a captive nation under Communist control.

To this date, for more than a quarter of a century, the U.S. Government maintains the official position of refusing to recognize the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union and the enslavement of the Lithuanian people by the Kremlin. This is a just and righteous position on the part of our Government, for the United States can never agree to the unlawful occupation of a country and the subjugation of its people by force as was done in Lithuania in 1940.

The aspirations for freedom and national independence on the part of the Lithuanian people have not been subdued. They and their kinsmen who live in the United States and in other free countries have not given up their hope for the reestablishment of Lithuania's independence.

As Lithuanians everywhere observe this anniversary, the people of America and freedom-loving people elsewhere join with them in the conviction of their righteous cause and the eventual attainment of their cherished hopes for a free Lithuania. I extend my sincere wishes to all Americans of Lithuanian origin to maintain courage in the face of adversity and I join with them in prayer for early liberation of their ancestral homeland from the yoke of Communist imperialism.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the peoples of the free world have been in the last few days once again reminded of the true mind of Soviet communism. Two Soviet writers have been convicted and sentenced to hard labor for writing articles which the Soviet Government considers critical of its methods. This denial of free speech, which is a basic tenet of any free and independent nation, is a clear indication and ample evidence that the Russians have never yielded their obsession with tyranny and oppression. Another striking example is the Communist conquest of free Lithuania.

Today, we celebrate Lithuanian Independence Day. Today, we commemorate the bold and heroic leaders of Lithuania, such as Antanas Smetona, who proclaimed Lithuania a free and sovereign nation in 1918. From 1918 until the Soviets crushingly took over Lithuania some 20 years later the people of Lithuania enjoyed liberty, free government, and social reform seldom known during those times.

The Lithuanian quest for independence stretches back to the 11th century. During the period when the United States was gaining independence, Lithuania was annexed to Russia to be ruthlessly governed until 1918 and their declaration of independence.

There is perhaps no more cruel or sad fate than a people who have gained freedom at great sacrifice and cost, only to lose it after a fleeting glance. Such has been the fate of modern Lithuania. Almost 3 million Lithuanians and over a million Americans of Lithuanian descent preciously guard the knowledge of what it meant to be free, and guard the hope that one day that knowledge will bear fruit.

Today, we observe the anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence. This occasion can only be a sobering event. Lithuania was once independent; it is now enslaved. We can only be reminded that the cause of freedom is far from being won. We can only rededicate ourselves, that until Lithuania and other captive nations in Eastern Europe have regained their freedom, that cause will not have triumphed.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, today I join with others of my colleagues to pay tribute to a brave country and people. Lithuanian desire for freedom continues strong in spite of the oppressor's efforts at enforced assimilation. It is appropriate that we in the United States—who indeed have not forgotten Lithuania's plight—pause to renew our support for their cause on this the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

One can only admire the sturdy and unyielding spirit of a people and a nation brutally occupied by Nazi and Communist aggressors. Since the initial occupation in 1940, the Soviets have tried unsuccessfully to crush the hope of the Lithuanian people. Through the years following the second Soviet "liberation" the oppressors tried to blot out all outward signs of Lithuanian national character and traditions. However, the people went underground to maintain signs of their national culture.

Russian occupation forces have not softened. Forceable "sovietization" continues relentlessly. Since Lithuania is predominantly Roman Catholic, the Soviets have made a full scale effort to end the remaining vestiges of religion. All monasteries have been closed; all private schools, kindergartens, orphanages, hospitals, and charitable institutions have been confiscated. The Soviet campaign against religion is aimed at the youth. Services in Lithuanian churches are now attended mainly by the middle-aged or the elderly. No stone is being unturned to replace the people's belief in the Christian principles which have served them so well with athestic communism.

Similarly the language of Lithuania has been attacked. Only Russian is the official language and is used in schools and courts.

These attempts at sovietization have not altered the less sophisticated methods to break the Lithuanian spirit. Lithuanians are still exiled to frontier areas of Russia and Russians resettled in Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, these brave and strong people have suffered much and long. We in this greatest of free countries must keep an unflagging interest in the fate of Lithuania and other enslaved nations. In the end, free men everywhere must believe that Russian domination and subjugation will cease and Lithuanian people will once again join other free men on earth to find a life of peace and mutual respect.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, at this critical time in world history when our Nation is vigorously engaged in the struggle for freedom, it is appropriate to remember the anniversary of Lithuania's independence day. This little nation, whose proud traditions of courage and liberty have shone so brightly, is today a nation enslaved by Communist force. Yet we have ample evidence that the spirit of freedom still lives in the hearts of the Lithuanian people. Even the tightly controlled Soviet press is time and again forced to reveal a strong anti-Soviet underground.

Prior to World War II, the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were fully independent and sovereign nations; proud members of the League of Nations. After suffering the scourge of Nazi occupation during World War II, these nations were again overrun by Soviet forces in 1944 and 1945, and have been ruled by the Soviet Union as provinces since that time. The Baltic peoples have been exploited, and their countries' natural resources devastated in a rule that was marked by a complete disregard for these peoples' cultural and spiritual values and their fundamental human rights.

Mr. Speaker, the principles of freedom and democracy that our American people love and cherish apply not only in our country, but for the people of captive nations as well. On this 48th anniversary of Lithuania's independence day, I want to lend my support along with the support of my fellow Members of Congress, and our Nation as a whole, to the cause of this enslaved people. I look forward to the day when they may again breathe the air of freedom.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy today to offer my congratulations to the many thousands of American citizens who are commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day. Last Sunday I had the high honor of addressing the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey which met in anticipation of the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence today. And under unanimous consent I place in the RECORD my address to the council on that occasion, together with a proclamation by the Governor of New Jersey, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes; a proclamation by the mayor of Newark, the Honorable Hugh J. Addonizio; and a resolution adopted by the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN PETER W. RODINO, JR., MEETING OF LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF NEW JERSEY, ST. GEORGES HALL, NEWARK, N.J., FEBRUARY 13, 1966

I consider it an honor and a privilege to have been chosen as your main speaker for this important meeting this afternoon.

Planning an event like this is always a challenging job. The officers of the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey and all of those who worked on the arrangements are certainly to be congratulated for getting a difficult task done well.

Three days from now, on February 16, the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence will be observed. It has been my good fortune to be with you on similar occasions in the past. And, as at previous gatherings, the approaching anniversary evokes mixed feelings in each of us.

We are proud to recall Lithuania's many important and valuable contributions to civilization and world culture through the long centuries of her existence.

And we are saddened that this nation—with her deep love of independence and her high esteem for personal freedom—finds herself at this late hour still struggling in the cruel shackles of Communist bondage.

The lamp of liberty burns low in Lithuania today.

But I need not remind you that Lithuania has triumphed over subjugation many times before.

During the last generation she survived the truculence and tyranny of Hitler's goose-stepping Nazi troopers. And just as surely she will survive the ruthless oppression of Communist totalitarianism.

The dim glow of liberty's lamp, faint and flickering though it be, will never be extinguished.

History tells us that Lithuania had already emerged as a nation of small principalities more than 900 years ago.

By the Middle Ages, the Lithuanians had established a powerful and independent state in Europe.

For centuries, these brave people were able to check German drives to the east, and they protected Europe against Mongols and other would-be invaders.

Yes, in the long ago of the Middle Ages, history informs us, the Lithuanians provided the power and the government behind which the Eastern Slavs could live in peace and safety, with a freedom that was unknown in next-door Russia.

One scholar, summarizing the contributions of the Lithuanian people during the Middle Ages, wrote, and this is a direct quote:

"They blessed their subjects with more human freedoms than in the neighboring countries. They encouraged education and toleration, and they played their part in the general development of European civilization."

And just as the Lithuanian people contributed to the rise of civilization in Europe, so too have they played an important role in the growth and development of the United States.

The first Lithuanians arrived in this country of ours in 1688. They brought with them a rich heritage of culture and tradition, not the least of which was their strong love of freedom.

They endured the hardships and dangers of day-to-day living in early colonial America. And their roots were firmly entwined to this Nation's destiny of greatness long before the Declaration of Independence proclaimed to the world the official birth of the United States.

As a New Jerseyite, I am pleased that Americans of Lithuanian descent favored this State as a choice place in which to settle down and make their homes, to raise their families, and enrich the community with civic pride and responsible citizenship.

And as the son of an immigrant, I can also appreciate your sadness and sorrow because the land of your forefathers, the land of near and dear relatives, is once again choked off from freedom and gagging in the iron grip of foreign tyranny.

History, however, is on the side of freedom. The story of mankind is a stirring saga of civilization's irresistible march toward greater individual liberty for all. This is the undeniable direction. This is the unalterable goal. Aggression and chains can halt the pursuit of freedom, but only temporarily, and the march resumes.

Man is born to be free, yet no man can be completely free while others who people this earth remain unfree.

Behind the iron and bamboo curtains of communism, torture and terror debase the dignity of man and deny to him his right to political, religious, and cultural freedom.

But in short time, iron curtains rust to nothingness and bamboo curtains bend and break.

Totalitarianism cannot crush man's faith in the future.

Dictatorship cannot snuff out the candle of hope, for hope's candle is an eternal light that will continue to glow as long as man with soul inhabits earth.

It is true the lamp of liberty burns low in Lithuania today, and this darkens our joy.

But let us not despair.

Let us, instead, commemorate this anniversary of Lithuanian independence, with an affirmation of undying hope.

Let us reaffirm our faith in a better, brighter tomorrow—a better tomorrow in which Lithuania will take her rightful place among the independent, freedom-loving nations of the world—and a brighter tomorrow in which the good people of Lithuania can glory once more in the joy of individual freedom.

From: Office of the Governor.
Release: January 25, 1966.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas on February 16, 1966, many Americans of Lithuanian descent will commemorate the 48th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania; and

Whereas between 1918 and 1940, when the Republic of Lithuania was dominated by the forces of Communist Soviet Russia, the people of that country carefully nurtured their devotion to the principles of freedom so familiar to our people in these United States of America; and

Whereas during the said period of independence, the people of the Republic of Lithuania tried to emulate the people of this great nation of ours and did constantly express their great friendship for the people of the United States of America and its institutions; and

Whereas in spite of terrible oppression and forced exile of hundreds of thousands of their farmers, intellectuals, teachers, lawyers, priests and ministers, the love of freedom and spirit of independence still exists in the hearts and minds of the people;

Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Hughes, Governor of the State of New Jersey, being mindful of the great respect and sympathy of our citizens for the people of Lithuania, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1966, as Republic of Lithuania Day in New Jersey, and I do hereby request our people to observe this occasion by appropriate ceremonies.

Given, under my hand and the great seal of the State of New Jersey, this 25th day of January in the year of our Lord 1966 and in the Independence of the United States the 190th.

[SEAL] RICHARD J. HUGHES,
Governor.

By the Governor:
ROBERT J. BURKHARDT,
Secretary of State.

Whereas 48 years ago, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania became an independent republic; and

Whereas despite valiant and continued efforts the freedom and independence then obtained by the Lithuanian people has long since been lost beyond the Iron Curtain; and

Whereas Lithuania, proud of her traditions, proud of her language and customs, through many centuries has resisted any assimilation with other nations; and

Whereas we Americans have a warm and natural understanding of the hopes of freedom-loving and freedom-seeking peoples; and

Whereas it is fitting that we direct the attention of our American people to the aspirations of the Lithuanian people and to the importance of these aspirations in the efforts of all free people to establish a lasting peace; and

Whereas we in Newark hold in high regard the part which our citizens of Lithuanian heritage play in our community and national life;

Now, therefore, I, Hugh J. Addonizio, mayor of the city of Newark, N.J., do hereby proclaim February 13, 1966, as Lithuanian Independence Day and do urge all of the citizens of Newark to cooperate with their fellow Americans of Lithuanian extraction in the celebration of this day.

HUGH J. ADDONIZIO,
Mayor.

Having met on February 13, 1966, at 180 New York Avenue, in Newark, N.J., to commemorate the 48th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania proclaimed at Vilnius on February 16, 1918, patriotic Americans of Lithuanian birth or descent of the New Jersey area;

After hearing the latest reports from and about the Soviet-occupied land of our forefathers and the homeland of many of us, which is still suffering under harsh Communist repression and exploitation, and our brothers and sisters in Lithuania are undergoing gradual denationalization and annihilation;

Appreciating our country's firm and steadfast policy of nonrecognition of the illegal seizure and military occupation of Lithuania, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the United States of America has been in the forefront of the United Nations activities ending foreign colonialism in numerous Asiatic, African, and European countries; and

"Whereas the Soviet Union has been and still is striving in many devious ways to win official recognition by the free world of its rapacious and illegal occupation of Lithuania and the other two Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia; and

"Whereas despite the fact that many former colonial territories have been liberated and admitted into the United Nations as sovereign states in the last 20 years, the Soviet Union, while speaking out strongly for the abolition of all colonialism, has in actuality made Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the newest colonies in the Soviet Russian empire: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we again express our gratitude to our Government for the firm and unwavering policy of nonrecognition of the illegal Soviet occupation of Lithuania and the other two Baltic States, and request our Government to use every opportunity to raise the question of the liberation of these nations; and

"That our Government refuse to ratify the Consular Convention with the U.S.S.R., which would only be the means for the Soviet Communist to establish more espionage centers for subversive activities in our country; and

"That this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Senators and Members of Congress from our States, and to the press."

LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF NEW JERSEY,
VALENTINAS MELINIS, *President.*
ALBIN S. TRECIOKAS, *Secretary.*

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day is a means by which we in the United States demonstrate to the people of Lithuania, and to all people living in subjection to the Soviet Union, that their plight has not been forgotten by the United States. We know that they live under Communist rule not by choice, but by reason of the geographic propinquity of the Soviet Union. We know that they long to live in freedom and enjoy the independence they once knew, but are prevented from doing so by the military power of the Soviet Union.

Lithuanian Independence Day is celebrated on February 16 because it was on that day in 1918 that Lithuania declared its independence after more than a century of Russian domination. A powerful nation in the Middle Ages, Lithuania had been annexed by Russia in 1795. Despite many attempts to replace the Lithuanian language and traditions, however, the Russians during this period failed to erase the Lithuanian sense of nationhood. The Lithuanians made many attempts to throw off Russian rule, and finally the First World War provided them with the opportunity for success.

In 1915 Lithuania was overrun by German armies who drove out the Russians, and on February 16, 1918, a council elected by a congress of 200 Lithuanian delegates proclaimed an independent Lithuanian state. Although the Red army reentered Lithuania for a brief period after the defeat of Germany, it was driven out by Lithuanian fighting units and the Polish Army. Russia recognized Lithuania as an independent nation in a peace treaty signed July 12, 1920.

The next years, the years between the two World Wars, were a fulfillment of the hopes for independence which the Lithuanian people had nutured during the long period under Russian rule. The Lithuanian culture flourished in the regained freedom. Unfortunately, the Second World War reversed the freedom for Lithuania which had resulted from the First World War. In spite of a Soviet-Lithuanian treaty of nonagression signed in 1926, on June 15, 1940, the Soviets occupied the country.

Thus 25 years ago the Lithuanian people lost the independence which had been proclaimed on February 16, 1918. On the anniversary of this occasion, let us reassure the Lithuanian people that they are remembered in the free world. May they draw hope from the memory that earlier in their history they suffered under Russian domination for a long period, but were finally enabled to regain their independence. May this be a case in which history repeats itself.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, while the world's attention has been increasingly focused on the war in Vietnam, the millions of friends of Lithuania, a country which is still held in captivity by the Russian Communist tyranny, have once again shown their affinity for their enslaved brethren by celebrating the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence. That much herald event took place on February 16, 1918, despite the protestations of Poland and Russia. Lithuania was able to proclaim her independence even though under German occupation. As was to be expected, no sooner had the Germans evacuated the country than did the Russian forces invade Vilnius, the capital, and install a Communist Lithuanian Government in December 1918. Postwar problems in the field of international relations centered around Poland and disputes over boundaries. But the advent of World War II saw threats coming from Nazi Germany as well as Communist Russia.

Lithuania fell to the German Army only a few days after the Nazi's had declared war on Russia. In July 1941, Hitler announced his plan for the creation of the "Ostland" province including the three Baltic States and Byelorussia. A German colonization program was begun and by July 1943 more than 4,700 German families had settled in Lithuania.

Russian soldiers captured Vilnius in July 1944 and by the year's end, the entire country was under Russian control. It has remained so to the present. The Lithuanian people resisted the occupation and Russification of their country which was attempted through both economics and culture. But through such means as terror, executions, mass arrests, and deportations, the Russians were able to prevail. Realizing the deep convictions and strong attachment of the Lithuanian people to their own cultural heritage, the Russians transported large numbers of Russians and Communist agents into the country in an attempt to more thoroughly Russify the people. They have attempted to placate the Lithuanian people through the policy of selecting handpicked Lithuanians to represent Lithuanian interests in the Supreme Soviet in Moscow.

Lithuania's resistance to the Russian occupation and misrepresentation is still a factor which Moscow is forced to continually evaluate. Considering the historical roots from which so many brave and gallant people have emerged, it is understandable why the Russians have been forced to hold such a heavy hand on this captive nation.

As an American citizen, I am very proud to witness and partake in the many programs and events which serve to commemorate that momentous date in Lithuanian history. I eagerly await the day when Lithuania's people will be able to join us in celebrating the anniversary of that nation of brave and unselfish people.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, freemen of the world commemorate on February 16 Lithuanian Independence Day. It was 48 years ago that a courageous people in Vilnius proclaimed their independence after more than a century of Russian domination and enslavement.

On this occasion, I join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives to pay tribute to the Lithuanian people. Their determination and will, under the weight of Communist oppression, exemplify the indestructible spirit of mankind for liberty.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for his interest in helping to keep alive the hopes of the Lithuanian people that their land may once again know the blessings of liberty. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has been a champion of liberty second to none in this body ever since the people of Luzerne County in their wisdom sent him to represent them in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, 48 years ago today in the city of Vilnius the Constituent Assembly of Lithuania proclaimed the independence of Lithuania after 120 years of occupation by Russia. Shortly after this Lithuania was attacked by the new Soviet Government.

The tenacious defense of their homeland against invasion by the Red army in 1919 and 1920 is a proud page in the history of the people of this gallant little nation. On July 12, 1920, the Soviet Government conceded defeat and recognized the independence of the Lithuanian nation.

In 1921, Lithuania took its place among the nations of the world when it was admitted to the League of Nations in Geneva.

Lithuania's fate was sealed when Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Communist tyranny reached an agreement on August 23, 1939. The net effect of the Hitler-Stalin pact was to mean the destruction of Poland and the Baltic States and, as we all remember too well, the beginning of the Second World War.

On June 15, 1940, Soviet forces again invaded the three Baltic States, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and the light of freedom was extinguished for these ancient nations. Today a quarter century later, the Baltic States are still part of the Soviet slave empire.

On this 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, let all Members of the Congress pause to remember that we cannot rest until all the people of the Soviet satellite empire enjoy the freedom which is their due.

I salute the people of Lithuania for their indomitable courage and their tenacious preservation of their national traditions. And I know that their spirit can never be crushed.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD a resolution which was adopted at a mass meeting on February 13, 1966, at St. George's Hall, Newark, N.J., commemorating the 48th anniversary of Lithuania independence.

The resolution follows:

We, Americans of Lithuanian ancestry, having called a mass meeting on the 13th day of February 1966 at St. George's Hall, 180–2 New York Avenue, Newark, N.J., to observe the anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence 48 years ago, on February 16, 1918, and mindful of the sad fact that the homeland of our forefathers is still oppressed and suffering under the cruel yoke of Soviet Communist enslavement illegally and treacherously imposed by the Soviet Union in 1940, unanimously adopted the following:

"Whereas the United Nations and the United States have been instrumental in freeing many formerly foreign colonial lands and bringing them into the community of free nations, and

"Whereas the Soviet Union, a member of the United Nations and vociferous in demanding that an end be put to all foreign colonialism, in fact and in deed has made the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into modern day European colonies in the Soviet Empire, and

"Whereas the Soviet Union is striving by any and all means to win recognition of its illegal seizure and incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union now: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we thank our Government for its just and firm stand in denouncing and refusing to recognize the Soviet aggression and occupation, and ask the administration to continue, whenever and wherever possible, to demand that the Soviets end their colonialism, withdraw their administration and forces from Lithuania and the other two Baltic States and allow them to restore their independence, sovereignty and self-rule; Also be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge the administration not to ratify the Consular Convention under discussion with U.S.S.R., inasmuch as this would only serve to increase the number of Communist espionage and sabotage centers in our country; Also be it

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; to the Secretary of State; to the Senators and Congressmen from our State, and the press.

"Done at Newark, N.J., this 13th day of February, 1966.

"LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF
NEW JERSEY,
"VALENTINAS MELINIS,
"Chairman.
"ALBIN S. TRECIOKAS,
"Secretary."

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the brave Lithuanian people in the observance of their independence, a momentous occasion in their history. Today they dwell behind the curtain of communism sharing the fate of their neighbors—captives in their own homeland.

This once powerful part of Eastern Europe, a proud nation, has historically been divided by the hands of foreign aggressors. For more than a hundred years, Lithuanians vigorously worked to overcome czarist oppression. During the First World War, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania proclaimed her independence. For two decades this nation grew and rapidly increased her production. It was during this period that Lithuanians expanded their cultural horizons. For in freedom a people can create, in slavery they become static.

Tragically, during the Second World War, Lithuania found herself geographically between Communist Russia and Nazi Germany. Soviet occupation led to the absorption of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

Today, as we pay tribute to those held in bondage in Lithuania, let us also recommit ourselves to the sacredness of freedom and liberty for all people in our world—the freedom of choice.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join other Members of the House today in paying tribute to the brave people of Lithuania. We commemorate today the 48th anniversary of their declaration of independence. Unfortunately, the Lithuanian people are now captives of communism, and this great holiday is forbidden by their present Red tyrants. Therefore, on this great historic day for Lithuanians, we must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to these brave people and all the other captives of communism.

After 123 long years of Tsarist Russian occupation, the Lithuanians declared their independence on February 16, 1918, and instituted a democratic republic. This government flourished for 22 years, but Lithuania was forcibly seized by the Soviet Union in 1940 and has been under Communist rule since that time.

In addition to commemorating these national days, Mr. Speaker, we must take practical steps to show our interest in the restoration of freedom to the captive peoples of communism. I again urge that a Special House Committee on Captive Nations be established.

I also believe it is necessary that the Voice of America provide lengthier and more effective broadcasts to pierce the wall of Communist propaganda and deliver the truth to the people of Lithuania. As we know, Mr. Speaker, in recent years the Voice of America has been cutting back both its hours of broadcast in the Lithuanian language and in the nature of these broadcasts. The Voice of America gives daily straight news and is fearful of offending the Soviet Union under present administration policy. However, the brave people of Lithuania deserve the truth. The Voice of America should be a vehicle for delivering the message of truth to them so that they would not be brainwashed and their resistance weakened by the constant propaganda from their tyrannical Moscow oppressors.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, 48 years ago, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people realized a heartfelt desire that had been theirs for two centuries—freedom from Russian tyranny. On that glorious day in Lithuanian history, the ruling council of the land signed the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, an action based on the idea of President Woodrow Wilson of the "recognized right of nations to self-determination."

By this declaration Lithuania proclaimed to the world its determination to stand as a free and sovereign state. Every citizen of the little nation must have felt at that time the proud thought expressed by Daniel Webster:

> It is my living sentiment, and by the blessing of God, it shall be my dying sentiment, independence now and independence forever!

Lithuanians plunged fearlessly into the task of achieving economic, political, and social progress. Magnificent achievements were made in land reform, industrialization, education, and the arts. In little more than 20 years the nation proved its mettle in the ranks of free nations. Lithuania had earned the right to the responsibility and privilege of national sovereignty.

Yet the descent of World War II presaged the end of the fleeting era of independence. One of the greatest tragedies of the long and terrible war was that Lithuania emerged from the conflict once again chained to Russia. Domination of Lithuania, as well as of Latvia and Estonia, was carried much farther than that of such nations as Czechoslovakia, for they were actually incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, the victimization of the Baltic States is a blot upon the conscience of mankind. Our great American land was founded upon the belief that every human being is entitled to the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These blessings have been denied to the courageous Lithuanian people for the past 22 years. Yet through their hardships the Lithuanians have never lost their indomitable will to be free. Their perseverance and strength of character inspire us all and bid us never forget that the blessings of freedom do not belong to all people.

On this, Lithuanian Independence Day, we salute the outstanding courage of our Lithuanian friends and extend to them our warmest greetings and best wishes.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and happy to join my colleagues in observance of the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

I strongly believe that eventually the courageous Lithuanian people will regain their independence and once again enjoy the fruits and blessings of freedom. I know that all Americans share that fervent hope.

Americans of Lithuanian extraction are great assets to the United States. They are intelligent, industrious, and patriotic. They are outstanding.

I insert in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the resolution passed at a mass meeting held on February 13, 1966, when the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey observed the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence.

We, Americans of Lithuanian ancestry, having called a mass meeting on the 13th day of February 1966 at St. George's Hall, 180–182 New York Avenue, Newark, N.J., to observe the anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence 48 years ago, on February 16, 1918, and mindful of the sad fact that the homeland of our forefathers is still oppressed and suffering under the cruel yoke of Soviet Communist enslavement illegally and treacherously imposed by the Soviet Union in 1940, unanimously adopted the following:

"Whereas the United Nations and the United States have been instrumental in freeing many formerly foreign colonial lands and bringing them into the community of free nations, and

"Whereas the Soviet Union, a member of the United Nations and vociferous in demanding that an end be put to all foreign colonialism, in fact and in deed has made the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into modern-day European colonies in the Soviet Empire, and

"Whereas the Soviet Union is striving by any and all means to win recognition of its illegal seizure and incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we thank our Government for its just and firm stand in denouncing and refusing to recognize the Soviet aggression and occupation, and ask the administration to continue, whenever and wherever possible, to demand that the Soviets end their colonialism, withdraw their administration and forces from Lithuania and the other two Baltic States and allow them to restore their independence, sovereignty, and self-rule; also be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge the administration not to ratify the Consular Convention under discussion with U.S.S.R. inasmuch as this would only serve to increase the number of Communist espionage and sabotage centers in our country; also be it

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; to the Secretary of State; to the Senators and Congressmen from our State, and the press.

"Done at Newark, N.J., this 13th day of February, 1966.

"LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF NEW JERSEY,
"VALENTINAS MELINIS,
"*Chairman*.
"ALBIN S. TRECIOKAS,
"*Secretary*."

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join with my colleagues in commemoration of an outstanding event in the rich history of Lithuania. Forty-eight years ago today, February 16, 1918, a courageous people proclaimed to the world its right to stand proudly among free countries.

The path to independence was a long and difficult one, filled with tears, death, and anguish. From 1795 to 1915 Russia dominated the country in a hold broken only when the German Army overran Lithuania during the First World War. Under pressure from Lithuanians, Germany in 1917 authorized a congress of 200 Lithuanian delegates. The conference, presided over by Dr. Jonas Basanavicius, declared Lithuania's determination to set up an independent state with a democratic and representative form of government. The delegates to the congress elected 20 of their number to a ruling council.

On February 16, 1918, the council signed the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, a glorious event in the history of this proud land. Among the first duties of the council was the adoption of a national flag for the new state. The new national flag of three horizontal bars symbolized the natural beauty of the Lithuanian countryside as well as the courage of its people. At the top shone a bar of deep yellow, symbolic of the golden rye fields and agricultural wealth of the land. In the middle came a rich green stripe, a reminder of the abundant forests and natural resources of Lithuania. The deep red bar at the bottom of the flag symbolized the blood shed by Lithuania's sons in the defense of freedom.

During the period of independence, Lithuanians made great strides toward development of the economy, culture, and educational system. The Second World War, however, ended Lithuania's brief period as a sovereign state and ushered in an era of Russian rule that has lasted until the present day. Thus, Mr. Speaker, we see that the Lithuanian people have enjoyed few years as freemen. Little wonder, then, that Lithuanians have a proverb that says, "There is justice in the world but it is blind." In a just world the beautiful land of Lithuania would stand in the ranks of the free world, and her courageous people would enjoy the blessings of liberty.

In recognition of the injustice done to Lithuania, I introduced in March of last year a resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 363—by which the U.S. Congress would request the President of the United States to bring up the question of the enslaved Baltic States before the United Nations. The United States would ask that the world body request the Soviets to withdraw all troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, and to return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave-labor camps. When the captive nations had been cleared of all foreign oppression, the United Nations would conduct free elections there under its supervision.

Mr. Speaker, nearly a year later we gather to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day, an event that happened 48 long years ago. It is time to act. I rise today to urge my colleagues to act immediately and decisively upon my resolution so that the dreams of freedom will become a reality and truth will reign. Today we share with Lithuanians everywhere the fervent prayer that their bravery and strength of character will soon be rewarded, that right will triumph over injustice, and that Lithuania will be free once more. With this hope we join in extending to our Lithuanian friends everywhere our warmest good wishes on their independence day.

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker, today we join with freedom-loving people everywhere in commemorating the 48th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. On February 16, 1918, Lithuania was able to proclaim its independence following more than a century of subjugation by czarist Russia. Unfortunately, their freedom was short-lived, and after an all-to-brief 22 years of independence, the country of Lithuania again fell under the yoke of Soviet oppression.

The Lithuanian people, however, fervently remember the glorious period when they were masters of their own fate and able to breathe deep of the fresh air of freedom. Although they remain oppressed by the totalitarianism of Soviet communism the Lithuanian people are silently resolute and determined to regain their independence no matter how difficult or long the struggle may be.

Having engaged in a similar struggle to gain our independence, we have a common bond with the Lithuanians and on this symbolic occasion we voice our hope that this small but valiant country will once more be victorious in the battle for self-determination and independence. It of course, will not be easy, but there have been victories against longer odds in the pages of history.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, we hear much talk today about the liberalization which is supposed to be taking place in the East European satellites. It is said that Soviet Russia's empire is breaking up. What we do not hear about is the continuation of the absolute domination of certain small Baltic nationalities by the Communist movement centered in Moscow. We do not often hear mentioned today that there are millions of people behind the borders of the Soviet Union itself who are denied the sacred right of national self-determination and independence.

Lithuania is one of these unfortunate nations. She is currently called a "republic" within the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This is not so. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania has a very long and proud history of independence. But, fate was unkind to her in putting her between powerful and greedy neighbors. Hence, she lost her freedom in 1795 to the empire of the czars in Moscow. Then, when that state came crumbling down, she again became independent. This was done by a declaration by the Lithuanians themselves on February 16, 1918 that they would from that time on again be a sovereign nation.

This joyous event was meant to mark the beginning of a new era of peace and prosperity for the long-suffering people. Unfortunately, this experiment in modern nationhood was unscrupulously ended in 1940 when the Soviet Union, in disregard for a nonaggressive pact with Lithuania, occupied the helpless country. After the Second World War, with all its horrors for people in that part of Europe, the Soviet tyrants returned to power. Let us be clear about this. The Soviet regime which rules Lithuania is a puppet creation of the foreign masters in the old seat of the czars and Lenin and Stalin. Lithuania is not just a geographical expression—it is a nationality which deserves only that which all nations deserve—freedom to make their own fates. Thus, Mr. Speaker, the 48th anniversary of the great day in 1918 when the Lithuanian nation reappeared, independent after years of bondage, should make us stop and realize that freedom and justice are still missing in many lands, not the least of which is Lithuania.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, for the Lithuanian people, February 16 marks the anniversary of a never-to-be-forgotten day in their history. On that glorious day, in 1918, Lithuania proudly proclaimed to the world its right to stand as a free and sovereign nation.

The history of Lithuania is a rich and colorful one, filled with tales of the heroism and achievements of its people. As early as the 13th century Lithuanians were etching an independent state upon the face of Europe. The excellent statecraft of its rulers welded the many principalities into a unified, strong kingdom. In 1386 came an important event when the Grand Duke Jagiello married the Polish Princess Jadwiga, thus forming a personal bond between Poland and Lithuania. Two centuries later, by parliamentary action, the personal union became a legal one, which lasted until 1795.

Yet in 1795 came the third partition of Poland, bringing Lithuania into Russian hands and causing the disappearance of the little land as a national unit. Even though their country had been engulfed by Russia, the Lithuanian people continued to nurture their strong national feelings. Studies of Lithuania's history, folklore, and language abounded. Rebellions flared against Russian rule. The First World War ended Russian domination of Lithuania, and for the next 20 years the land relished the blessings of sovereignty and made magnificent strides in the economic, social, and political spheres. But the tragedy of the Second World War brought Lithuania again under hated Soviet rule.

Mr. Speaker, we Americans understand with all our hearts how important freedom is to a people. Our boys fighting in Vietnam today are a visible expression of how much we believe in liberty for all peoples. On this day, so revered by our Lithuanian friends, we extend warmest best wishes to Lithuanians everywhere and pledge once more our dedication to the great ideal of freedom for all.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with the celebration of the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day we are again reminded of the lesson of Lithuania—a lesson in perseverance, endurance, and independence. Throughout the long history of the Lithuanian people we find the preservation of their identity despite countless inroads on their civilization; we find them enduring as an entity despite repeated efforts at subjugation on the part of their neighbors; we find, like an unbroken thread through centuries of vicissitudes, a national and an individual spirit of independence.

Except for the Basques, there are no people in Europe with a record such as that of the Lithuanians stretching back into antiquity. Mentioned by Tacitus as a people already established in their separate culture, the Lithuanian people appear in the Middle Ages as a nation. Early in the 1200's we find them with a government stable enough to withstand the bloody wars of the Teutonic Knights on the one hand and the invading Russian hordes on the other.

History was to repeat itself many times in the struggle of the Lithuanians to resist the onslaughts of their enemies from east, west, and south. Yet for several centuries Lithuania dominated an area greatly extended beyond what is now the homeland. Stretching beyond its present boundaries well to eastward and westward, it also embraced territory to the south as far as Kiev which was to become Russia.

Not only was it a politically independent nation. Its culture was also separate and apart; and a high degree of civilization flourished in contrast to the undeveloped regions of much of Europe. And this was to endure.

Though politically Lithuania was to fall into the hands of its enemies with the great partition of 1795, and again, and again, culturally it survived all victimization. Despite the domination of the czars of Russia, all efforts at Russification failed; as they were to fail later under Soviet tyranny. The Lithuanian culture endured. The Lithuanian people endured as one. Their independence of mind and of spirit was inviolable.

When Lithuania emerged again as a nation, on the day in February 1918 which today we celebrate, it was fully equipped to become an independent, democratic republic. That emergence was, in fact, but a return.

It is not strange, therefore, that Lithuanians the world over look upon that day not only as the glory of things past, but as a portent of the future. We in America hail that Lithuanian perseverance, endurance, and, above all, that unfailing spirit of independence.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished chairman of the committee, my esteemed colleague from Pennsylvania has said, the anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day is a time for pride, sorrow, and renewed hope.

When the Soviet Union occupied Lithuania following its ultimatum of June 16, 1940, Lithuania was an independent republic. There was no justifiable reason for such action. Clearly it was a case of might, not right. The secret protocol of the Soviet-German frontier treaty of September 28, 1939, which assigned the greater part of Lithuania to the Soviet sphere of influence, was a manifestation of the century-old forces of might against which Lithuania had to struggle over and over again. Not in combination but always as rival forces the Russians and the Germans had, in the course of hundreds of years, first one and then the other, made repeated efforts to bring Lithuania under their more powerful tutelage.

That Russia under the czars had succeeded for a period of nearly a century and a quarter—from 1795 until 1917—was an argument for resumed Russian domination by the Soviets in 1940. It was, however, an argument that could be countered by the fact that the independent republic of Lithuania which the Soviets annexed by aggression was no fledgling state with a life history only of the period between World Wars I and II.

That period of its history from its independence day in February 1918 until its deplored engulfment by the Soviet Union in 1940 was but a relatively brief period in its life as an independent state. For hundreds of years before the Russian takeover in 1795, Lithuania had flourished either as a nation coequal with Poland in an arranged partnership or as a completely independent country unrivaled in eastern Europe in its advanced culture and political development. When, therefore, it emerged from the havoc of the Russian revolution of 1917, as a free and politically independent state, it was not a new country wavering in infancy. Nor was there any doubt about its taking its place among the countries of the world, firmly established on the international scene as an autonomous republic. Nor was there during the decades of its independence between World Wars I and II any reason for alteration of this independent status.

When, therefore, the Soviet Union and Germany, with their large armies poised on the very doorstep of Lithuania, in their mighty greed for territory, bargained between themselves for the body of this small neighbor, they did not reckon with its soul. When Germany agreed to Russian domination of Lithuania, Lithuanians at home resisted. Lithuanians abroad protested. To what avail against such odds?

Internationally their protests were heeded. In spite of the sore need of accord between the "big three" of the Allies in World War II for the war effort, the United States and, for a long time, Britain also, refused to recognize the seizure by the Soviet Union of the Baltic States.

In an account of that turbulent period published by the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London, the comment is made:

> The events which accompanied that incorporation were the source of the difference in attitude between America and the U.S.S.R. in regard to the Baltic States, and the breadth of the gulf became steadily more apparent.

The official attitude of the U.S. Government was expressed by Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles, on July 23, 1940, when he firmly declared the opposition of the American people to the illegal occupation of the territory of these republics. He said:

> The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force.

Not only did the Soviet Union by its illegal seizure of Lithuania violate the principle of international law of respect for the sovereignty of one state by another, it deliberately violated its own treaty with Lithuania. As the honorable Member from Pennsylvania has pointed out, in the treaty of peace which the U.S.S.R. signed with Lithuania on July 12, 1920, the Soviet Union not only recognized "without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the state of Lithuania," it also in its own words "voluntarily and forever" renounced all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory.

Within a short 20 years the Soviets were to abandon this treaty as though it had never been written. What more flagrant violation of law could be found than their illegal occupation of Lithuania?

We in the United States continue to deplore such acts. They do violence to any concept of the international order, besides the infinite havoc that they wreck upon generations of Lithuanian people.

With my fellow Members of this House I bemoan the fate of the sovereign state of Lithuania, at the same time applauding the Lithuanian people in their steadfast faith in freedom wherever they may be.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to take part in this special commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day. Certainly, there is a special message of national pride which is reflected in this occasion. In my tribute to Lithuania and her brave sons and daughters, I want to call my colleagues' attention to the fine Lithuanian community we have in the Rochester, N.Y., area which I am privileged to represent in Congress. The spirit which characterizes these people is exemplified in the method by which they will observe the 48th anniversary of their nation's independence: On Sunday, February 20, the Lithuanians in the Rochester area will participate in a rally to pay tribute to the valor of their people. Dr. Backis from the Lithuanian Legation in Washington, who is honored and respected and holds a love of liberty representative of that which burns in the hearts and souls of all Lithuanian people, will address the rally. It will be a great privilege for me to attend this celebration.

My interest and respect for the Lithuanian people in my district and the world occasioned my introduction of House Concurrent Resolution 290, to put the U.S. Congress on record as requesting the President to take the Baltic States question to the United Nations. This horrible enslavement of millions of free people should be called up for U.N. consideration and the Russian treachery exposed and punished. I think this is just as important as our taking the Vietnam question to the U.N.

There is no goal of mine in Congress that stands higher than the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 290. The reasons for this measure certainly are apparent to all of us familiar with the Baltic States genocide, but for the benefit of others, I would like to briefly trace the background of this Russian capture and relate these tragic events to the celebration of independence day which we are observing:

In the valiant history of the Lithuanian people, February 16 shines forth as the beginning of a glorious period of independence. For on that day, in 1918, Lithuania broke the iron yoke of foreign oppression and became at last a free and independent nation.

As we Americans know so well, national independence is a precious possession, and in the case of Lithuania the price of freedom was high and the prize hard won. The two centuries of Russian domination, which had begun in 1795, ended when German Armies overran the beautiful land of Lithuania in 1915. In 1917, however, under pressure from the Lithuanians, Germany was forced to authorize the gathering of a congress of 200 Lithuanian delegates. The conference declared Lithuania's determination to reconstitute an independent state with a democratic and representative government. A 20-member council was elected.

On February 16, 1918, the council signed the declaration of independence of Lithuania, basing their courageous action on the belief of President Woodrow Wilson that every nation has a "recognized right" of self-determination. This declaration thus broke forever the pact of 1569, which had tied Lithuania to Poland, and the annexation by Russia in 1795. For the proud new nation the council adopted the state coat of arms, the national flag, the state banner, and ratified the use of the generally accepted national anthem.

For the coat of arms and the national banner, Lithuanians harked back to a glorious era of their past—the late Middle Ages, a time when Lithuanians had, as one scholar has written, "blessed their subjects with more human freedoms than in the neighboring countries." For the coat of arms they chose the ancient symbol of Lithuania, the white mounted knight racing westward with an upraised sword and bearing a shield with a cross of two bars. The state banner, too, depicted the noble white knight. The new national flag symbolized the natural beauty of Lithuania as well as the spiritual beauty of its people. For the national anthem the council officially adopted the stirring and powerful "Lithuania, our Fatherland."

From February 16 until the beginning of World War II Lithuania enjoyed independence. Yet the descent of the Second World War heralded the end of Lithuanian freedom. As the world emerged from the conflict, Lithuania stood chained once more to the Soviet Union. The brave cry of self-determination seemed only a 20-year-old echo. Oppression had supplanted freedom. Lithuania stood trapped by tyranny which has lasted until the present day.

On this solemn occasion we join with the 3 million Lithuanians behind the Iron Curtain and with the 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent in this country in the fervent hope that Lithuania soon will be able to take its rightful place among the free nations of the earth. We salute our Lithuanian friends on their independence day and send them our warmest greetings and I, in turn, salute the Lithuanian-Americans in the 36th Congressional District of New York and pledge to continue my efforts for a free Lithuania, which can once again take its place among the free countries of the world.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, once again I wish to join with my colleagues in the Congress in paying tribute to the gallant people of Lithuania, who today are observing another anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. Forty-eight years ago, on February 16, these courageous people won their independence and for 22 years enjoyed a happy, free, and democratic way of life.

Independence day should be a joyous occasion in any nation, and I am sure it was for the Lithuanians until that fateful day of June 15, 1940, when this small but proud country was forced behind the Iron Curtain. This year the anniversary is another of sadness, but it also still remains one of hope. As long as freedom exists anywhere in the world, and as long as we in the free world continue to give them encouragement to persevere, I am confident that the dedicated people of Lithuania will not abandon their dream of liberation.

Last year I sponsored House Concurrent Resolution 293, urging that the United States exert every effort through the United Nations to win the right of self-determination for the captive nations of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. This goal is no less urgent in 1966. On behalf of the people of my district, many of whom are of Lithuanian ancestry, I wish to salute the good people of Lithuania and to express the hope that soon, February 16 will once more be truly a day of independence for them and for all captive nations of the Baltic.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for his foresight in reserving time for the observation of the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day.

This valiant country has had a glorious but tragic history, even marked by the sad and solemn occasion of the 25th anniversary of the loss of freedom, by aggression and forceful occupation by Soviet Russia.

The history of Lithuania can be divided into five divisions, namely; first, as a Grand Duchy 1225 to 1572; second, union of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania under one sovereign from 1572 to 1795 when Poland and Lithuania were partitioned by Austria, Hungary, Germany, and Russia; third, occupied by Germany and Russia from 1795 to 1915; fourth, as a republic from 1918 to 1940; and fifth, from 1940 to date as an integral part of the Soviet Union.

I would like to point out that the United States emphatically and openly denounced the Soviet takeover of Lithuania, and on July 23, 1940, Acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles issued a statement in behalf of the U.S. Government condemning the deliberate suppression of the Baltic States independence. The United States and other free nations of the West have always refused to recognize the Soviet regime in the Baltic, and have continued diplomatic relations with the legal representatives of the Baltic countries; thus the Lithuanian diplomatic and consular officers continue to function in many countries of Europe and North and South America, and are supported by the income from funds located in the West from prewar days. Every U.S. administration since the occupation has explicitly and emphatically restated the policy of nonrecognition of the puppet regimes and has continued to support the just aspirations of the Lithuanian people for freedom and independence.

This pledge made by the U.S. Government is one that is not violated. We stand by this pledge just as we stand by the pledges made to other small nations throughout the world. Secretary of State Dean Rusk, mentioned only last week in Atlanta, Ga., that our pledge was given to the Vietnamese people, and that we gave them our word that we would help them maintain a free and democratic form of government.

I want to commend the Lithuanian American Council's policy of nonalinement with communism, and to also commend past president Mr. Leonard Simutis for his leadership in the council's endeavor.

I extend to my very dear friend the new president of the council, Mr. Anthony Rudis, success in his leadership of the Lithuanian American Council.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, the nation of Lithuania declared its independence after a long period of Russian domination followed by German occupation. The people of this valiant nation were destined to enjoy their independence for only 22 short years. In 1940 Lithuania was forced to succumb to Communist control. Once again, the ruthless and vicious methods of suppression so characteristic of Communist activity were revealed.

Today it falls to us to commemorate the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence for all the freedom-loving people silenced by Communist rule in Lithuania. I am privileged to join my colleagues today in observance of this occasion.

Lithuania's accomplishments during her 22 short years of freedom, are adequate testimony to what can be wrought in an atmosphere of independence; 1918 to 1940 was a period of outstanding accomplishment for Lithuania. In the field of education, the number of her primary schools nearly quadrupled; over 100 secondary schools were built; over 4,000 advanced students enrolled in the university. Great emphasis was placed on improvements in the field of agriculture; a land reform program was instituted; nearly everyone with any ambition owned his own farm if he wished by the end of the period of independence. Industry and commerce soared. Great progress was made in the field of social legislation; the period saw a labor control law established, the introduction of an 8-hour day and other social measures. Culture, too, flourished. Great achievements were made in literature, opera, and music. This was a good time for our Lithuanian friends.

Since 1940, news from the Lithuanian state has been sparse. The borders of Lithuania, as well as Latvia and Estonia, her sister Baltic States, have been shut against the outside world and each other. Those who have escaped report a lack of freedom and the imposition of the same detestable Communist methods existing throughout the Communist world.

America has benefited as a result of Lithuanian immigration to the United States since as far back as 1688 when it is recorded that they landed at New Amsterdam. Following her subjection to Soviet rule in the 1940's many more Lithuanians entered our country. It is estimated that there are now approximately 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent.

Western civilization is certainly the richer for Lithuania. Our own country is richer for having received this truly gifted and hard-working people. Certainly my own State of Illinois is grateful for the rich and meaningful contributions we have received as a result of our citizens of Lithuanian descent.

The United States recognized the independent Lithuanian Government in 1922, and it has never recognized the nation's incorporation into the Soviet Union. The ruthless and vicious means by which Lithuania was incorporated into the Soviet Union are an outrage. The aggression and tyranny of which Lithuania has been a victim is the direct opposite of the freedom for which we in the United States stand.

It is well for us to remind ourselves of the hundreds of millions of people enslaved behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains on this occasion, as so many of us were reminded last July in commemorating Captive Nations Week. It is well known, Mr. Speaker, that the great majority of these enslaved millions still yearn for the return of their freedom.

This day must serve, as did Captive Nations Week last summer, as a reminder to all Americans that love of freedom and desire for liberty still burn in the hearts of those enslaved by communism around the world. It is fitting that we rededicate ourselves today to the support of the people of Lithuania and the other captive nations, in their quest for the human rights and dignity of which they have been so mercilessly deprived. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to repeat the words I spoke last summer renewing the pledge of our Government to work toward and for the liberation of these brave people, and by so doing, to obtain a meaningful and lasting peace.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, once again the time has come when we take time out from our legislative and other domestic affairs to pay tribute to the independence anniversary of a long-suffering yet proud people, the Lithuanians. It is fitting that various national groups in this country have sponsored programs and activities to commemorate the brave stand taken by Lithuanian patriots on February 16, 1918, when, against overwhelming odds, they proclaimed their homeland a sovereign nation.

Prior to the outbreak of World War II, the Russians successfully masked their true feelings of greed and jealousy against the new country through numerous nonaggression and mutual assistance pacts.

But in October 1939 the facade was thrown off as the Communists forced Lithuania to accept a new mutual assistance agreement that in reality amounted to Russian occupation. On June 15, 1940, Russia presented an ultimatum demanding immediate formation of a friendly government. Obviously this meant a government amenable to Moscow.

Following a Russian-sponsored election of July 14–15, the Government of Lithuania unanimously requested incorporation into the Soviet Union. The Soviets wasted little time in approving the request, and on August 5, 1940, Lithuania became a corporate member of the Soviet Union.

A clearer example of interference into domestic affairs of another state and aggression is difficult to find.

Communist occupation of Lithuania brought much hardship and suffering upon the people, and it is estimated that more than 45,000 Lithuanians lost their lives or were deported between June 15 and the time when Russian troops fled the onslaught of German forces in Lithuania around June 21.

By the end of 1944 Russian troops were once again in control of the country after having driven the Nazi forces out. The brutal and arrogant oppression by the Communists has continued unabated since 1944. This means that for at least 22 consecutive years Lithuanian citizens have had to endure hardships and deprivation that have been doubly difficult as a result of Russian occupation. By virtue of the rigged election of 1940 and the ever present threat of its military might and Lithuanian Communists, Russia has been able to maintain its illegal and immoral occupation of Lithuania.

It is a certainty that although Lithuanian patriots have been obliged to endure Soviet occupation and incorporation, they do not accept it as being perpetual. Their pride in the sacrifices of previous generations has sustained them and will continue to do so in the hope of one day seeing their country free once again.

As we observe the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's independence declaration, let each rededicate himself to the high principles and ideals to which the Lithuanian patriots of 1918 so unselfishly dedicated themselves.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence. Although Lithuania was conquered by brutal Soviet tyranny in 1940, the spirit of 1918 lives on in the hearts of the Lithuanian people.

To illustrate the plight of Lithuania today, I should like to discuss the status of religion in Lithuania. In 1937, 80.5 percent of the population was Roman Catholic, 9.5 percent was Lutheran, 7.3 percent was Jewish, and 2.5 percent was Greek Orthodox. The concordat of 1927 defined Lithuania's relationship with the Holy See. Religion was an important aspect of life in Lithuania.

In contrast, under Communist domination Lithuanians have suffered from repeated religious persecution. In fact, religious persecution has been a key tactic of the Soviets in their unsuccessful struggle to erase the Lithuanian national identity. The 1962 meeting of the all-Union Communist Party Central Committee was devoted to finding new ways of doing away with the "survivals of the past." As a result of that meeting, special efforts are being made in all of the Baltic States to use cultural, social, and economic pressures to weaken religion. Although Catholicism is the principal religion in Lithuania, other religions have also been marked for extinction. In the words of one witness who appeared before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs last year:

> The churches in the Baltic States have entered a period of great danger for their very existence. Communism may never succeed in extinguishing religious feelings in the minds and hearts of the people. Yet, by the use of terror and violence, communism may well achieve its aim of eliminating the church organizations, the outward embodiments of religion. Indeed, communism has come dangerously close to that dark hour when the high steeples of churches, if permitted to stand at all, will be merely strange monuments of bygone days in the Baltic States.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot now afford to forget, even for a moment, our dedication to the cause of Lithuanian freedom. The witness that I have just cited may sound like a prophet of doom. But where human liberty is at stake, in the political as well as the religious area, we must listen to those who speak frankly. We must become inspired by a hope for freedom which has never been lost by the Lithuanian people.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, first achieved on February 16, 1918, is a recurring reminder of man's inhumanity to man and a disquieting monument to the failure of the free nations of the world to come to the rescue of the enslaved Baltic peoples.

Today the United States is undertaking to discharge an agonizing commitment in southeast Asia without any clear-cut mandate from our people as to the extent to which we should go to liberate a newly found republic that was lost in the mists of Indochina long after Lithuania had reached statehood. Here are a Christian people—the Lithuanians—and their compatriots among us attest to their stanch commitment to our way of life. Here are a people who have known freedom and stability, and that experience has only served to compound the distress of their current enslavement.

Incumbent upon us, as we review our responsibilities on the world scene, is acceptance of the fact that we do have an obligation to the Lithuanian people. Let us then in pledging them our continuing help make very sure that the assistance we render is material as well as spiritual and at the same time assure them that we shall work unceasingly to remove the shackles of their aggressors.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today the people of Lithuanian descent proudly commemorate the 48th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. It is with great pleasure that I join my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives in extending greetings and warm best wishes to all persons of Lithuanian descent, not only to those living here in the United States but also to all Lithuanians everywhere who have not given up their fondest hope; namely, that one day Lithuania will rid itself of the yoke of Soviet colonial imperialism and join the other nations in the free world.

It is our task who live in freedom, to nurture that spark of hope that continues to burn in the bosoms of the oppressed and to give them encouragement so that time will not destroy these valiant peoples' determination and longing to win once more for themselves the right of self-determination.

As I speak to you today, the cancer which has attacked the world continues to inflict its slavery upon the unwilling in Europe and southeast Asia.

We have but to look at the Baltic States to realize all too well the ugly realities of Russian imperial colonialism which lie behind the facade of the Soviet Union's so-called peaceful coexistence pronouncements.

To put an end to such aggression and bring about the return to freedom for those subjugated peoples must be a continuing part of our foreign policy goals.

The fond aspirations for freedom that Lithuanians have are shared by millions of Americans. We can continue to give them hope, purpose and a sense of direction through our actions such as those we engage in today in commemorating this event. We must let them know that we have not forgotten them and that we share their fondest wish.

Indeed, I am pleased to join with my colleagues today in recognizing the important role Lithuanians have played in shaping civilization and expressing the hope that they will make further important contributions to a free society once they have been freed from the shackles of Communist oppression.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the 16th of February marks the 48th anniversary of the achievement of Lithuanian independence. Unfortunately, it is not a happy occasion. After having suffered as a vassalage of imperial Russia since 1795, the independence achieved by the Lithuanians in 1918 lasted only two decades before it was swallowed up by the Communists.

Stalin had already met with the Nazi foreign minister, Ribbentrop, in late August of 1939 to sign a cynical pact for aggression that would seal the fate of the small Baltic nations, including Lithuania. Originally, the fate of Lithuania would lie in the hands of the Nazis, but then Stalin changed his mind. By September he had decided that he was willing to give up a larger slice of Poland in order to bring Lithuania into the Russian sphere of influence. Hitler's agreement was secured and by the middle of October 1939, Lithuania was forced into signing a mutual assistance treaty with the Soviet Union which would prepare the way for occupation by the Red army next spring. Lithuanian independence officially came to an end on August 3, 1940, when she was incorporated into the Soviet Union as a republic of the U.S.S.R.

Since that day Lithuanians have suffered a great deal. The Soviet Union has spared no effort to destroy the national consciousness of the Lithuanian people. Every aspect of the Lithuanian national culture, from its language and religion to its national songs and literature, has been subjected to brutal oppression and an intensive campaign of sovietization.

Needless to say, the United States does not recognize the fruits of Stalin's pact with Hitler. I am also happy to add, on this 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, that neither do the Lithuanian people. Despite the concerted efforts of a quarter of a century of Soviet rule, their national unity and the spirit of independence has not died. It is an honor for me to take this moment to express my admiration of the spirit of the Lithuanian people and renew my support of their just cause.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, many nations of the world celebrate annually a day which commemorates the anniversary of their independence. Being dedicated to the principle of sovereign independence for all peoples throughout the world, we in the United States frequently send our felicitations to these nations on their day of glory. But, what are we to do if a nation is not now free and independent? When can we say to a people who are forbidden by an alien dictatorship to celebrate that which the dictatorship has taken from them?

Lithuania presents us with a case in which we can answer these questions. Today this small nation of about 3 million people is under the rule of the puppets of the Soviet Communists in Moscow. It is an unwilling part of the Soviet empire. Moreover, it is a terrible fact of history that this is not a new condition for the proud Lithuanian people.

The country of Lithuania was incorporated into the empire of the czars in the last partition of Poland near the end of the 18th century. From that time until the First World War, Lithuania was a part of the empire. Then, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania proclaimed herself independent. For more than two decades she was able to show that she could be a peaceful, successful nation in the modern world.

The record is an encouraging one. She joined the League of Nations and attempted to fulfill her obligations to the charter. She instituted notable domestic reforms, especially in distributing the land to the mass of her people who became independent small farmers. This promising beginning was ended by the power plays of Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Soviet Union. They agreed to the conquest of the lands between them, with the Soviet Union being free, in 1940, to occupy Lithuania and then incorporate it into the Soviet Union. This was done in violation of a nonaggressive pact between the two countries.

The story goes from bad to worse as the Second World War saw the Germans and Russians fight across the small Baltic States. After the Red army returned and installed a Communist regime the Lithuanians were the victims of large-scale deportation and executions. Today many people in the country are immigrants from other parts of the Soviet state who have taken the place of native Lithuanians who have disappeared from their homeland.

But despite this terrible history we can be certain that the desire for an independent national identity has not died in the hearts of the Lithuanians. It is therefore fitting that we should congratulate the Lithuanian people on the 48th anniversary of their declaration of independence, knowing full well that the people of that nation are encouraged by and silently echo our wishes for their eventual national freedom.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in observing this 48th anniversary of Lithuania's independence day, we are continuing to underscore our belief in the right of every human being to be free.

All over the free world this week, freemen will gather to observe this occasion and to express their sympathy with those brave people of the Baltic States who struggle against their Communist regimes.

Many words will be said, written, and read about the terrors of Communist control and the indignities suffered by subjugated nations. Each speaker, author, and reader will yearn to offer hope and relief to those who are so enslaved and so subjugated.

I would call your attention to words spoken by our Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, which may be repeated as the aim and objective of every American to whom freedom is a right to be shared with his fellow man. To our friends and relatives in Lithuania we repeat, as a pledge and as a sacrament, the words spoken at Madison, Wis., on March 6, 1964:

> We are working to attain:
>
> A world free of aggression—aggression by whatever means;
>
> A world of independent nations, each with the institutions of its own choice by cooperating with one another to their mutual advantage;
>
> A world of economic and social advance for all peoples;
>
> A world which provides sure and equitable means for the peaceful settlement of disputes and which moves steadily toward a rule of law;
>
> A world in which the powers of the state over the individual are limited by law and custom, in which the personal freedoms essential to the dignity of man are secure;
>
> A world free of hate and discrimination based on race, or nationality, or color, or economic or social status, or religious beliefs; and a world of equal rights and equal opportunities for the entire human race.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, in the great confrontation between the big powers of East and West, the world tends to forget the many small entities of peoples, of languages, and of cultures which have ceased to have their rightful place on the world scene.

A victim in 1940 of Soviet Communist disregard for the national integrity and inviolability of other states, Lithuania lost its freedom under the boots of the Red army. Though it has remained under the oppressive Russian yoke, the proud people of Lithuania have not given up hope that someday their independence shall be restored.

Today we commemorate the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day. It is an occasion to pause and reflect on the brutal facts of past Soviet acts of wanton aggression. It is a moment in which we can give our thoughts to the hopes of these brave people. It is a moment to remind us, once again, as forcefully as ever before, that the Iron Curtain is quite real indeed. While we have tended to mellow as rapport becomes increasingly easier with the Russian satellites, we should be jolted back into reality when we pause to realize that whole nations, such as Lithuania, remain enslaved and thus deprived of their rightful self-determination. Let us not be distracted by the overt Asian crisis nor by the Soviet apparent concession to compromise—distracted to where we become prone to forget the whole picture, the true state of the captivity of nations such as Lithuania.

Here we speak of a cultural enclave—in every respect a well-integrated people whose history and traditions span centuries of development. We are not speaking of a nation born of the convenience of treaties nor of a disputed former province linked in the past to Mother Russia by ties other than political. No, here we speak of the nation of Lithuania formed by the volition of the people and having existed as a sovereign state among the world's family of nations.

Officially, the United States has refused to recognize the Soviet extirpation of Lithuania and its corporation into the Soviet Union. This inflexible stand is the only course for us to pursue. And it holds out to those held in bondage the precious belief in hope—hope of eventual freedom. It makes its eventual attainment a reality and not a myth. This is exactly contrary to what the Communists would want the brave Lithuanian people to believe. For once the Communists convince them that hope is a myth, then the process of total extinction can be fulfilled.

We are proud to say that not only here among those of Lithuanian origin or descent but among those held captive in their own land have the ideals of liberty and the craving for independence been diminished. Rather, they have courageously kept them alive, nurtured by the inner spirit of the Lithuanian people.

While we commemorate today with reminders in words, let us renew our pledge of faith in the ultimate freedom of Lithuania and, above all, in our determination that we shall continue to seek ways in which we can translate our convictions into action to hasten that moment for which the Lithuanian people have waited so long and for which they have endured so much. May it be recorded that we know this independence day shall, eventually, be celebrated properly in the atmosphere of Lithuania as a full and sovereign partner of the other free nations on our globe.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad once again to have the opportunity to join with my colleagues in marking the anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

It is disturbing to realize that another full year has passed during which the cruel tyranny of the Soviet Government has denied to these courageous people the freedom which they had restored to them in 1918, only to lose it 22 years later. It is hard to accept the fact that some of the relatives of our American-Lithuanian friends have already passed on from this turbulent world never to have the opportunity to enjoy life once again in a free society. Yet this fact makes even more impressive the further fact that neither the people of Lithuania nor those Americans of Lithuanian descent have lost their hope during all these years. They still hold fast to their determination that Lithuania shall again be free.

This determination should inspire all Americans, regardless of our ancestry, to dedicate themselves to the goal that this new generation of Lithuanians who have never yet had the chance to live and grow in an independent nation should not perish from this earth having existed here only as slaves of Russian masters.

It is evidence of man's resiliency that the people of Lithuania have not permitted the spark of their freedom to be extinguished. If we here in Congress can help in any small way to keep that spark alive, it may well become the greatest contribution to which any of us will ever make as Members of this body.

But we must not be content merely to voice our concern or merely to recognize the unparalleled injustice which still exists. It would be inconsistent indeed for us to call upon our young men to risk their lives in the cause of freedom and national self-determination on the battlefields of Vietnam and at the same time not also realize that the very same condition which we seek to prevent in Vietnam has existed for the past 26 years now in the country of Lithuania.

I believe we must take action, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I have introduced legislation urging the President to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations, legislation which passed this House last year. I have also introduced legislation calling for the establishment of a Committee on the Captive Nations here in Congress. These are steps I firmly believe should be taken without any further delay.

We must not resist Communist aggression only in Vietnam. We must also continue our efforts to restore independence to captive nations like Lithuania.

Perhaps if those critics of our efforts in Vietnam could see what is happening in Lithuania today or could have experienced life in Lithuania during the past 26 years of Soviet domination they might realize what our Vietnam policy is all about.

Neither the people of the nation of Lithuania nor their relatives here in the United States are fooled by so-called "wars of national liberation." After all, they lost their freedom by a "mutual assistance" pact imposed on them in 1939. Lithuanians realize that slogans like these are only disguises for Communist aggression and expansion.

We in the United States have not and must not recognize such Communist actions as being legal or moral. We cannot in good faith enjoy our own freedom and not also recognize the rights of others to obtain or retain their own.

It is to the everlasting credit of Lithuanian-American organizations of the United States that they have kept intact the bonds of common devotion to liberty and independence which exists between our two nations. These bonds will not be broken by Communist deceptions or by the frustration of years of the denial of freedom to our Lithuanian friends. To the contrary this denial will strenghen the determination of our two peoples that one day every man will be the master of his own destiny and every government will be the servant of its own people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for also taking time again so that all Members of the House might once more voice our continued concern and admiration for the Lithuanian people. I am glad to join with him in paying a justly deserved tribute to the people of Lithuania and to all Americans of Lithuanian descent.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, we are again commemorating the day in which the people of Lithuania launched independence by proclaiming freedom and self-government. Today is the 48th anniversary of that occasion. For centuries past, Lithuania has at different intervals enjoyed liberty and self-government. This nation has been unfortunate by reason of its geographical location and close proximity to powerful neighbor nations who at various times in history subjected Lithuania to aggression and enslavement.

For over 120 years during Lithuania's existence, it has been under the tyrannical yoke of Russian tyranny. The spirit of freedom and self-government for Lithuania has at no time during its long history disappeared from the minds and hearts of its people. During the century and one-quarter of Russian tyranny against terrific odds, the Lithuanian people launched five major revolts against their conqueror.

On February 16, 1918, the Council of Lithuania Patriots formally declared Lithuania a free and independent republic. Beginning on that day, the people of Lithuania started to build and create a modern democracy with the hope that its citizens would, for all time to come, enjoy the privilege of its own free and independent government. No nation has ever demonstrated its capacity and ability for self-government more than Lithuania. Its civic leaders brought about long-needed land reformation, created and expanded its industry and manufacturing, established an adequate and modern transportation system, enacted social legislation and an educational policy which could well be copied by other nations throughout the world. This great progress as a free nation continued up until World War II when Lithuania again became the victim of a powerful aggressor nation who succeeded in enslaving its people. Communist Soviet Russia disregarded all former treaties and agreements with Lithuania, suppressed and forcibly violated the political and territorial liberties of Lithuania. Lithuania and her neighbors were attacked and destroyed by murder, exile, and imprisonment in concentration camps. The true Lithuanian who lives within the borders of the motherland or in the free United States or other lands throughout the globe will never allow his national heritage to be forgotten but will continue to fight and pray that someday, and we hope in not the far distant future, Lithuania will again become a free and independent nation.

In 1953, during the 83d Congress, I was selected by the Speaker of the House as a member of the special congressional committee to investigate Communist aggression in Lithuania along with other Baltic States. Our committee held hearings in Washington, New York, Chicago, and also in Europe. The committee took the testimony of over 200 witnesses and recorded several hundred exhibits at these hearings. We did a major service in aiding slave nations by exposing to the world the unlawful methods used by Stalin and Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders in enslaving Lithuania and other nations surrounding its borders. The Soviet Pravda and its satellite newspapers, radio, and television denounced our committee many times during our hearings in Europe. It was the first time the Communist propaganda machine was placed on the defensive. They were without an answer to the exposition of the malicious criminal methods they used to enslave free people. Our Nation, as the leader of the free world, has made great contributions through financial sacrifice and also on the battlefield to stop the aggressive march of the Communist tyrants in their conspiracy to enslave other free nations throughout the world. If it had not been for these sacrifices during the last 20 years since World War II, three-fourths of the world might be under Communist enslavement today. The Soviet and Chinese Communist economy has been a failure. Discontent is rampant among many unemployed and starving people in these Communist nations. The Communist power has been weakening year by year since the United States has spearheaded the free world drive to curtail its aggressions. There is no question in my mind that this fight by the nations of free world to curtail communism will end in victory. This victory will restore freedom and self-government to enslaved nations and Lithuania will eventually enjoy freedom, independence, and self-government.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from yesterday's Hammond Times sets out factual thoughts regarding the continuing fight made by all patriotic Lithuanians that some day, and we hope in the not too distant future, Lithuania will again have her free and independent self-government restored to her liberty-loving people:

They Don't Quit

They are an old people who long ago, back in the reaches of time before recorded history, settled in the eastern shore of the Baltic. They are descendants of the old Indo-European stock, and they still speak a language closely akin to Sanskrit, the tongue that was the ancestor of Greek and Latin.

These people are the Lithuanians. There are many of their descendants living today in the Calumet region. Tomorrow is an important day in their year: the 48th anniversary of the declaration of independence that constituted Lithuania a modern republic.

For 25 years, Lithuania has been a captive republic, since annexation by the Soviets, then occupation by the Germans, and then the reimposition of Soviet rule. For 12 years or more they fought a guerrilla action in which 30,000 people died. More than 350,000 (about 11 percent of the population) were deported to Siberia and other uninviting parts of the U.S.S.R. to break the resistance movement.

Yet there are indications that the spirit of freedom is not dead, but only resting, in Lithuania and the other two captive Baltic republics, Latvia and Estonia. Lithuania, a great state in its own right and later in a dynastic union with Poland, was under the despotism of the Russian czars for nearly 125 years before its declaration of independence 48 years ago tomorrow.

Then the curtain of foreign domination slammed down once more on Lithuania, and has remained down for a longer period than the 22 years the republic enjoyed freedom after World War I.

In such circumstances, many of the people descended from such a small country would lose interest in restoring its independence. It says a great deal for the spirit of the Lithuanians that they have not given up the fight to sway world public opinion to restoring their freedom. The world changes, as a study of history shows, and the Lithuanians believe history is on their side.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who have a profound love for the civilization of Europe, it will always be impossible to forget the cynical and brutal attack on the nation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, when Stalin and Hitler formed their evil partnership to occupy Eastern Europe. This is a nation that goes back into the dim recesses of history to those days when a country was founded on the shores of the Baltic, a country where peace prevailed, not only internally, but with their neighbors the Estonians and Latvians.

In the 14th century, the Kingdom of Lithuania was united with the Kingdom of Poland through marriage, and this union endured through the last years of the 18th century.

For over 120 years after this Lithuania came under the tyranny of the czars, but on a glorious day in 1918 the bells of freedom sounded for Lithuania, and she became the member of the family of free nations once more. In June 1940 that freedom came to a dismal end when the troops of Stalin marched across the land. Today Lithuania is still under the heel of Soviet tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, this is the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. But for 26 years Lithuania has not been free. Too often America has remained silent in the face of charges of imperialism leveled at her by the Soviet Union and her satellites. I want to be one voice calling out to all of the nations of the world to look again at the Soviet Union to ask themselves the question: Who is the true imperialist of our day? The Soviet Union holds Lithuania as a captive nation. She holds other nations in captivity. She does so by her tanks which she has already loosed in Eastern Germany and in Hungary when the threat of freedom arose in these sections of Europe. This is cruel tyranny and blatant imperialism at its worst. If the new emerging nations of Africa, if the nations of Asia, if the nations of South America, are truly concerned with imperialism, let them look to the Soviet Union, the cruelest imperial power of the world today and let them denounce her imperialism as we denounce it in this great Chamber.

There are 3 million Lithuanians suffering today in Communist captivity under Soviet tyranny. I am proud to stand here in this Chamber of freedom to tell these people we have not forgotten them nor their suffering, and to tell them that we will do all in our power to bring freedom to them once again, just as they found freedom on February 16, 1918.

If I may express a final thought, Mr. Speaker, I would point out a serious failure which can be laid on the doorstep of the Congress. From my first days in this House, I have joined with many of my colleagues calling for the establishment of a Captive Nations Committee in the Congress. We have no such committee today. If we were to create such a committee, then the highest legislative body in this land could call to the attention of all the world the evils of Soviet imperialism. I plead once again for the establishment of such a committee. I am well aware of the fact that our State Department and this administration oppose the establishment of a Captive Nations Committee; but I believe that the Congress should assert its own authority in the creation of such a committee, and

I believe that we should do so this year. I can think of nothing which the Voice of America could broadcast to the people that would warm their hearts more than a statement that this Congress has finally faced up to the issue of Soviet imperialism willingly, and that through a Captive Nations Committee, the voice of the American Congress would be heard throughout the world.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, once again it is time for Americans to pause and reflect on the tragic fate of our Lithuanian friends. This year, February 16 marks the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, the day when the Lithuanian people finally threw off the shackles of foreign domination at the close of World War I. Ironically, it is also the 26th year of Lithuanian occupation by the Soviet Union.

During the past 25 years, the Lithuanians have suffered a great deal at the hands of their Communist masters. From the earliest days of the Soviet rule in Lithuania, every outward sign of Lithuanian culture has been repressed and replaced by the meretricious trappings of an alien culture. The beautiful national songs and dances of the Lithuanian people have been smothered by the dissonant blare of propaganda speeches and the formless dance of the faceless society.

This process which, the Communists have rather candidly admitted aims at the "Sovietization" of Lithuanian culture, extends to every possible level of society. As recently as 1962, a meeting of the All-Union Communist Party Central Committee gave special attention to the eradication of religion, which it had the audacity to term as a mere "survival of the past." To do this the Soviet commissars have not hesitated to employ terror and violence. They have aimed their campaign specifically at youth, the people who must build the future of Lithuanian society. Today the churches in Lithuania are still nearly filled but the vast majority of those in attendance are middle-aged or elderly citizens.

To increase the Sovietization of Lithuanian society, the Soviets have not hesitated to transport large numbers of Lithuanians to the so-called "frontier areas," and to transport Russians to Lithuania to replace them. Today the pivotal positions of power and influence in Lithuanian society are almost all held by Russians. To make sure that the Russian language takes precedence over the Lithuanian, the courts accept only Russian as the legal language; schools teach only Russian, and even the clerks in Lithuanian shops are Russians who are instructed to speak and respond only to Russian.

Lithuanian history books have been rewritten to fit the Communists' warped version of Lithuanian and world history. And now even the streets in old Vilna are marked in Russian.

The one encouraging sign in this whole picture is, not unexpectedly, the unflattering national pride and determination of the Lithuanian people themselves. Twenty-five years of stultifying Soviet rule has not succeeded in dimming the national spirit of Lithuania. It never will. That is why the United States will not recognize the artificial republic which has been created by the Soviets. As long as the national pride of Lithuanians survives, this distortion of reality cannot survive.

Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure for me to take this moment to renew my personal support of Lithuania's struggle for true independence.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join my colleagues in commemoration of February 16, 1918, the day Lithuania regained, after centuries of foreign rule, the freedom it had had for years.

Regretfully, this freedom was to be brief. The approach of the Second World War began the end of Lithuanian independence. Lithuania was one of the first countries to be subjected to the aggression of Hitler and the Soviet Union. Although Lithuania attempted to maintain a policy of neutrality when war appeared imminent, her efforts were in vain.

On March 22, 1939, in the face of an ultimatum, Klaipeda—Memel—was yielded to the Germans. A mutual assistance treaty was forced upon Lithuania by the Soviet Union on October 10, 1939. Lithuania was compelled to yield air bases to the Russians and to admit their garrisons in spite of a Soviet-Lithuanian treaty of nonaggression, signed on September 20, 1926.

On June 15, 1940, Russia demanded immediate formation of a "friendly" government and occupied the country. A rigged election soon produced a congress which requested the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union, and on August 3, 1940, the Supreme Soviet declared Lithuania a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R.

Lithuania then suffered an estimated loss of 45,000 of her people. Many Lithuanians fled, others were arrested, or deported. About 30,000 Lithuanian intelligentsia were deported to Siberia on the night of June 14, 1941. Over 5,000 were executed when the Soviet forces were routed by the Germans.

A second phase of terror began when the German occupation replaced the Soviet on June 27, 1941. The Germans, in an attempt to colonize Lithuania, sent several thousand German families to settle there. Almost all Lithuanian Jews were executed by the Nazis.

German defeat did not mean freedom for Lithuania—only the exchange of occupation powers. Vilnius, the beautiful capital city, was retaken by the Soviet army on July 13, 1944. Soon the rest of Lithuania lay under the shadow of the hammer and sickle.

Since 1944, the outside world has been allowed few glimpses into the lives of Lithuanians. Communist domination has kept the Baltic States sealed off from the outside world. The few who have escaped, however, report the suppression of freedom and the imposition of Communist rule, including the destruction of religion. For example: All the physicians of the republic must actively join in the dissemination of atheistic propaganda.

Because of Soviet policies the composition of the population of Lithuania has changed considerably. When the Soviets commenced their reoccupation of the country in 1944, about 80,000 Lithuanians fled to Western Germany. Another 60,000, found in Eastern Germany, were deported to Siberia. During 1945 and 1946, an additional 145,000 Lithuanians were deported. Still another massive deportation occurred when about 60,000 were deported in March 1949 in answer to passive resistance of the farming population in protest against collectivization of agriculture.

For the past 22 years, Lithuanians have endured oppression by Russia. Yet through these long years, the valiant Lithuanian people have lost neither their courage nor their perseverance through hardship. Their spirit and their fight for liberty inspire all peoples of the world.

It is an honor to join our Lithuanian friends in celebration of a proud day in their history. Congratulations to a great people.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in behalf of the Lithuanian people, who 48 years ago, at Vilnius, the capital of Lithuania, proclaimed their independence after over a century of Russian rule and went forward as a free nation, achieving a high level of economic and social prosperity. Tragically, this taste of freedom was brief. It was only a little over two decades after the establishment of independence that Lithuania once more became the victim of her overpowering neighbor. The totalitarian might of the Soviet Union has since been used to exterminate any sense of Lithuanian nationhood. Despite oppression, the Lithuanian people continue to resist tyranny and attempt to preserve their heritage of freedom.

Today, our prayer and hope is that this proud nation of people dedicated to the cause of liberty throughout their history will once again join the family of free nations. We honor these people on this 48th anniversary of their independence and join with all Americans of Lithuanian descent in renewing our devotion to the cause of freedom and justice.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, nations like individuals, wish to be free to order their affairs as they see fit. How tragic it thus is when a nation is deprived of its independence through no fault of its own. Certain great states were deprived of their freedom for a few years recently because they had shown complete disregard for the rights of other peoples. But when a nation is subjugated to the will of a foreign power simply because it was too small and weak to resist the brute force of its neighbors, then we are faced with a situation which is wrong and which assaults all the instincts for fairplay and decency which we profess.

Lithuania is one such case of a nation held captive by a stronger, rapacious neighbor. The Lithuanian people have an identifiable history dating back to the Dark Ages. They have a proud history as one of the great nations of Eastern Europe. They have a culture and language which has set them apart from their neighbors. They certainly have as much right to an independent national existence as any people. Yet, this is not today the case. Since 1940 Lithuania has not been an independent country. While it is right that our Government has not recognized the destruction of the Lithuanian state and still has diplomatic relations with representatives of independent Lithuania, the unpleasant fact is that more than 2½ million people live under the yoke of Soviet Russian domination in their own homeland.

The last two and a half decades have been especially hard years for the people of Lithuania. Their country was a battleground in one of the most merciless of conflicts—the Eastern Front of the Second World War. After the Soviet armies returned in 1944 the infamous methods of Stalinist repression increased the suffering of the people. Opposition was quickly blotted out. Sovietization of all forms of living was imposed. The population declined. Russian immigrants appeared to fill the places left empty by the deaths and deportation of tens of thousands of the native populace.

But what is especially terrible about these events is that they began by the destruction of the independent Lithuanian nation. When the Soviets reimposed the rule of Russian czars, they ended 22 years of Lithuanian freedom. Lithuania had become independent on February 16, 1918. In the years which followed, a great deal of progress was made, especially in social matters, which indicated that Lithuania would be a peaceful, developing nation. It is particularly sad that this renaissance was so viciously ended and the freedom and progress of Lithuania transformed into the sterile slavery of a Communist satrapy. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is thus especially appropriate that we take note of the 48th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania. Let me extend to the people of captive Lithuania my deepest wishes that the great hope for the future embodied in the anniversary of their independence may soon be fulfilled.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is both right and necessary that we devote a few minutes today, the 16th of February, to pay homage and tribute to a nation whose people deserve the highest accolades it is possible to give. The nation of which I speak is, of course, Lithuania, which today celebrates the 48th anniversary of its declaration of independence on this date in 1918.

Despite the fact that it has been nearly one-half century since the Lithuanian people were able to throw off the yoke of their oppressors, the idea and goal of an independent state wherein they could enjoy the fruits of peace, freedom, and prosperity has not for a moment been abandoned. Indeed, the devotion and ardor with which the Lithuanians for many centuries sought to rid themselves of the tyrannical rule imposed upon them by a series of conquerors, invaders, and occupiers is a magnificent and moving tale.

Against the most incredible odds, the Lithuanian people maintained their national identity, their language, their religion, and their culture. Despite the attempts of the Russian czars, the Polish Army, and German occupiers of all political hues to root out this brave people, the Lithuanian national consciousness continued to flourish. In the few years of liberty which Lithuania enjoyed enjoyed between the two world wars, a great flowering of the arts took place. Musicians, actors, athletes, writers, poets, and artists made their homeland famous all over the United States and Europe. There are few, if any, musicians among us who have not heard of Mikas Petrauskas and Anna Kaska; those interested in the theater know Ivan Lebedeff and Shirley White; followers of sport know Jack Sharkey and Billie Burke, while names such as V. D. Brenner, Louis Rosenthal, Basanavičius, and J. Maciulius-Maironis have also made their names bywords in their own field of artistic endeavor.

This is, I think, the highest tribute of all: the efforts and achievements of a people despite all the adversities which a cruel fate has heaped upon them. When the Lithuanians are once again permitted to live in peace, and follow their own pursuits, we may look forward to a new renaissance from this embattled people.

Mr. Speaker, I await that day with pleasure, and wish the Lithuanians nothing but the best until that glorious day arrives.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, although February 16 marked the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, Lithuania has not been truly independent since 1940 when that gallant nation was again taken over by Russian force of arms. Her actual independence lasted only a little over 20 years, but her spirit of independence is as high and brave as ever. Her people, both home and abroad, continue to resist the tyranny and oppression of Communist domination. I salute the courageous people of Lithuania, and look forward to the day when they will all be able to celebrate in truth her independence.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, again we pause to join with Lithuanian people everywhere in commemorating the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day, February 16. Today, while we do not recognize the incorporation of this valiant country into the Soviet Union, the brave people of this nation are enslaved by their Commmuist oppressors. Lithuanian Americans deserve much credit for the vigorous work they have done and are continuing to do in behalf of freedom for their native country. We must stand firm in our support for the rise of this nation to be free and independent again. I join my colleagues in rededication to the fight for self-determination for Lithuania and all forcibly enslaved nations.

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker, today we join with freedom-loving people everywhere in commemorating the 48th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. On February 16, 1918, Lithuania was able to proclaim its independence following more than a century of subjugation by czarist Russia. Unfortunately, their freedom was short lived, and after an all-too-brief 22 years of independence, the country of Lithuania again fell under the yoke of Soviet oppression.

The Lithuanian people, however, fervently remember the glorious period when they were masters of their own fate and able to breathe deep of the fresh air of freedom. Although they remain oppressed by the totalitarianism of Soviet communism the Lithuanian people are silently resolute and determined to regain their independence no matter how difficult or long the struggle may be.

Having engaged in a similar struggle to gain our independence, we have a common bond with the Lithuanians and on this symbolic occasion we voice our hope that this small but valiant country will once more be victorious in the battle for self-determination and independence. It, of course, will not be easy, but there have been victories against longer odds in the pages of history.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, we in the United States know Independence Day as a happy occasion, a holiday filled with picnics and parades. By contrast, there are less fortunate peoples for whom the anniversary of independence evokes only a poignant memory. Such a nation is Lithuania.

Forty-eight years ago this month, Lithuania gained independence after more than 120 years under first Russian then German domination. That fragile state of freedom lasted but a few years. The country suffered as a battleground during World War II, was for 3 years under German occupation, and in 1944 was occupied by the Soviet Union, which to this day exercises oppressive dominion over the 3 million inhabitants of Lithuania.

The United States properly refuses to recognize the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. And we citizens who so cherish our own freedom hope the days will be short until that same freedom can be enjoyed again on the eastern shore of the Baltic Sea. We join Erwin Cahman, of the Christian Science Monitor, in declaring, "The Baltic peoples—an ancient, culturally rich folk with proud national traditions—deserve a better fate, and one day may achieve it."

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in commemorating the independence of Lithuania. This little nation was once free, but is now suffering under the yoke of Communist dictatorship. On this 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I should like to pay my respects to those Lithuanians behind the Iron Curtain and to those who share our freedom in Pennsylvania and other States of the Union. Many residents of the Sixth District of Pennsylvania, which I have the honor to represent, have relatives in unhappy Lithuania. Although this courageous nation lives under the shadow of the Soviet Union, her people's desire for freedom remains undaunted.

As Americans we can understand and support this desire. We owe it to ourselves and those among us of Lithuanian descent to make this anniversary an occasion to honor this brave nation for its determination to recover her independence.

Once before on February 16, 1918, Lithuania succeeded in breaking Soviet domination. After World War II, independence was again on the horizon and a Congress was formed to lay the groundwork for independent nationhood. This moment was thwarted by the force of Soviet arms. Force, however, cannot dim the aspiration of Lithuanians to be free.

Let us on this 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence rededicate ourselves to continue to carry on the work necessary to help Lithuania once again be free.

THE CRISIS IN MASS TRANSIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to discuss the crisis in mass transportation which has been talked about for years and has grown more acute with each passing day.

Only recently, Vice President HUMPHREY, speaking before a panel of eminent scientists assembled by our House Committee on Science and Astronautics said that an enemy could wreak havoc not by dropping bombs on us but by threatening and terrifying us, secure in the belief that our chaotic transportation system could deliver the fatal blow by breaking down completely in a time of stress causing total national paralysis.

Vice President HUMPHREY made it clear that he was not speaking facetiously, so chaotic is the state of public transportation.

Fresh recognition of the crisis in transportation was revealed recently in Pittsburgh with the convention of 1,300 city transit officials, engineers, and industry leaders for the First International Urban Transportation Conference, which addressed itself to the question of how technology can ease the crisis.

The participants were optimistic that in a generation vast improvements can be anticipated in the area of public transportation.

Mr. Speaker, but for the here and now, the Regional Plan Association, a nonprofit organization of planners from 22 counties of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut which comprise the New York metropolitan area, last week issued a report calling for the expenditure of some $2.5 billion in the next decade to bring about immediate improvements in public transportation in that great metropolitan center.

The essence of the transportation crisis is that the automobile population is multiplying at a frightening rate—there will be 100 million cars by 1970—multiplying faster than the human population, while simultaneously public transit facilities—buses, subways, commuter trains and ferries—are withering and dying because of lack of patronage.

The proliferation in the number of private cars creates new pressures for bigger and better highways and freeways, which once provided, encourage more and more people to rely on private cars for their daily trip to work or to the store. The inevitable result is that mass transit facilities continue to deteriorate, only at an accelerated rate.

However, producing more cars and paving more acres for freeways and parking lots does not provide orderly, pleasant and economical transportation into and out of our cities. Quite the contrary. These new highways become Frankensteins, strangling our cities and fouling the air as bumper-to-bumper traffic pours forth clouds of carbon monoxide. Valuable city property is rendered worthless as buildings are torn down for the new roads and grass is blacktopped for more parking space.

As the Regional Plan Association reported, traffic in midtown and downtown Manhattan creeps at an average speed of 8.5 miles an hour, while expressway traffic during rush hours in New York moves at the only slightly higher rate of 13 miles an hour.

These are the realities of the current transportation crisis. We are facing the situation of a monumental coast-to-coast traffic jam at a cost of $6 to $8 billion a year in lost time and wages, in business losses and in highway accident costs.

It may be there will be important technological breakthroughs in transit in the years ahead, as suggested at the International Urban Transportation Conference. But today in all important metropolitan areas in this country the state of transportation can only be described as bleak if not disastrous.

Within the framework of this dreary picture, where do we go from here? It is obvious that at the National State, and local levels a basic policy choice must be made as to whether, in search of solutions to the transit crisis, we will continue to expand facilities that will bring more private cars into our cities or whether we will take concrete steps to strengthen public transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that our decision must be for improved mass transit and at the same time deferring those projects that would induce more private cars to enter the central business districts of our major cities.

This can be done in two ways. One approach is to provide Federal funds for mass transit on a scale comparable to the lavish subsidies that have been poured into ambitious highway programs. A second way is to divert some of these highway funds to other forms of urban mass transportation. A combination of these two approaches, I believe, has the potential for achieving some order out of our chaotic transportation situation.

In the first instance, it is obvious that there has never been any kind of balance in the allocation of Federal resources to transportation. The keystone of the Government's policy has been "billions for highways, peanuts for mass transit," as one official at the Department of Housing and Urban Development put it.

States have been offered a choice of 90 percent Federal funds for huge interstate highway projects or no funds for mass transit. The choice was never a difficult one.

With the passage of the Mass Transit Act in 1964 the Federal Government did begin, at long last, to recognize its very important obligation to strengthen mass transportation. But recognition came only after financial disaster had brought to their knees some of the most essential commuter systems in key urban complexes.

Even with the Mass Transit Act, however, the Federal Government took only the first halting steps toward bolstering public transportation so that it could compete with the private car. For the first 3 fiscal years only a trifling $320 million was authorized by the act and this was limited to improvement grants exclusively.

In the last 3 calendar years the Federal Government has allocated more than $11 billion to highway construction. It staggers the imagination.

In 1963 the State of New York received $174 million for highways; in 1964 the figure was $185 million and it could top $190 million for 1965. Significantly, the maximum the State could receive, because of the limitation of 12.5 percent on the amount of assistance to be provided any one State for mass transit, was $46 million over 3 years.

The New York metropolitan area has received more than $100 million a year in Federal funds for highways since 1955 but only $15 million a year for the support of public transportation for the last 3 years, the Regional Plan Association reports. It is apparent by any yardstick we employ that we are lavish, if not profligate, in our highway subsidies.

If the Federal Government can subsidize a massive highway program—and the figures cited above indicate massive is hardly the word to describe the scale of Government support for new highway projects—then it can devote a correspondingly meaningful amount of financial assistance to other forms of mass transit.

We must never forget the importance of maintaining viable mass transit facilities. The recent transit strike in New York City illustrates in vivid terms the terror that can visit a large city if its transit system breaks down completely. New York was brought to a standstill; business sustained huge losses; essential services dealing with the health and welfare of all citizens were curtailed; and the highways and roads became nightmares.

The New York transit strike established beyond any reasonable doubt that the very life of the city depends on mass transit, not on highways and freeways and expressways.

Yet many commuter lines—whether publicly owned subways such as in Boston or New York, or privately owned railroads like the New Haven and Reading or bus systems—simply cannot finance their operations out of fares or revenues.

They need direct cash grants merely to continue operating, and it is critical to keep these commuter systems afloat. Furthermore, it is painfully obvious that cities and States by themselves cannot continue to absorb the mounting costs of subsidizing or operating these essential rapid transit or commuter systems.

Certainly New York City is not able to absorb alone the deficits piled up each year by the transit authority. I might ask: who will pick up the $30 million operating losses that other commuter systems in the New York metropolitan systems incur each year?

In recognition of this situation and with the firm belief that only through revitalized mass transit can our cities thrive, I am happy to join with Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey in introducing legislation that will allow the Federal Government to underwrite a major portion of the operating losses of any transportation facility which provides commuter services in a metropolitan, urban area.

Mr. Speaker, the aim of this bill, very simply, is to keep essential commuter systems in business, while parallel steps can be taken to put these lines on a self-sustaining basis. The grant, which would be on a two-third, one-third matching basis, would go to the public transportation authority which has broad responsibilities for maintenance of commuter transportation. There are no objective reasons why Federal aid for mass transit should be limited only to subsidizing capital improvements. It is very artificial to draw clear-cut lines between Federal responsibility to aid in financing the purchase of new equipment and Federal assistance in underwriting operating deficits. Operating expenses are all part of the costs of running a commuter system, and the system has to be preserved, regardless of cost. How can a line that is about to fold take advantage of Federal funds for capital improvements if it cannot meet its payroll or continue to sustain even the most marginal kind of service?

This bill provides help to our ailing transit systems so that there can be some reasonable prospects that ultimately permanent cures can be determined.

Those who oppose the entry of the Federal Government into this area of subsidy, current expenses, make an argument that goes something like this: That once the Federal Government takes this step, it automatically follows that the Federal Government will have to set fares and establish service schedules and finally run the commuter line completely. But this is specious reasoning, an argument by those who are too timid to move ahead in a new frontal attack on this problem. Basically what we propose is that our transit network be subsidized on a broad public basis rather than through the fare box which, history has shown, is an inadequate source of revenue for the magnitude of the financial woes which plague mass transit.

At the same time a long-range capital improvement program must be put into effect so that the deficits are reduced to a manageable level or are entirely eliminated.

Only systems which develop long-range plans for modernizing and updating their operations will be eligible for grants to cover operating losses.

It is within the framework of a comprehensive master plan for capital improvements that the Mass Transit Act of 1964 can best be implemented. Under that act, the Federal Government provides grants covering up to two-thirds of the costs of capital improvement projects. These grants for capital improvements will be incalculably more effective if they are tailored to meet the needs of a careful, well thought out, long-range transit plan in a particular community.

In this connection I would like to note that I have also introduced legislation H.R. 12823 to eliminate a major inequity in the Mass Transit Act of 1964—that is the provision which limits to 12.5 percent the amount of capital improvement aid to which any one State is entitled. This arbitrary limit has no objective relationship to the actual transit needs of any single State. For that reason alone it should be repealed.

I believe that my bill to permit the Federal Government to underwrite some of the operating losses incurred by commuter transportation systems has the potential for infusing into mass transit the dollar volume of money that is so necessary if new life is to be breathed into nonhighway transportation. But let us also recognize that this program to put Federal aid to public transportation on a parity with that allocated for highway construction can be implemented only over a period of 10 to 15 years. Therefore, it is a long-range attempt to put our commuter systems and rapid transit facilities on their feet.

Mr. Speaker, can we wait?

More immediate, short-term steps must be taken to bridge the dollar gap between what is spent for highways and what is spent on mass transit.

I agree completely with the Regional Plan Association that one way to narrow this gap is to allow a metropolitan area or State to decide for itself whether Federal funds should go for roads or for mass transit.

In its report released last week, the Association said:

> The region should be allowed to spend Federal highway and public transportation grants in the way that would bring greatest transportation benefit.

In this way communities will be encouraged to devise their own transit plans based on factors of special relevance to their areas. This principle of flexibility in transportation planning and design has been ignored for far too long.

I am also introducing today a bill to pave the way for flexibility in transportation planning. It would permit a State to use revenues from the highway trust fund for mass transit purposes other than highways.

I regard the bill as a stop-gap measure, but it is an important step in the direction of assuring that some degree of balance is achieved in dealing with the mounting problems of transportation.

I would prefer to structure the program so that the city rather than the State would have the dominant role in determining the use of the highway funds. The most serious problems of transportation are centered in our cities. Unfortunately, State capitols, usually dominated by rural interests, are often not sufficiently aware of the need. However, since Federal highway funds under present law are apportioned through the State government, not to the individual municipalities, the State will have to be the agent to decide between funds for highways or funds for mass transit. I would expect, however, that the responsible State officials would consult with and be responsible to our urban spokesmen in making a decision on how the highway funds will be used.

Obviously, a program of diverting highway funds to nonhighway purposes will encounter formidable political obstacles. The highway interests will cry foul, arguing that the revenue for highways is raised through taxes on gasoline, tires, and on the users of the highways and, therefore, should be spent only on highway construction.

I might point out that it is not just the actual users of a highway who pay for the cost of constructing the road. Studies show that up to 66 percent of the cost of an interstate highway is met by taxes paid by automotive users who do not use the subsidized road. In other words, the overwhelming majority of automotive users pay for roads they never use.

Furthermore, many roads are constructed with funds not just from the highway trust fund but from other sources of public money.

And finally, there is no divine rule that requires that the Government earmark tax revenue for projects that will benefit those who paid the specific taxes. The Government has not allocated revenue realized from entertainment taxes to programs benefiting the arts which would seem consistent with the idea of using tax receipts for expenditures only for the benefit of those who originally paid the taxes.

Reducing highway construction and allocating highway funds to other transportation purposes would counter the present inordinately heavy investment in highways which only compounds existing deficiencies in mass transit.

In its report the Regional Plan Association appealed for a moratorium on several new highway projects that are currently being contemplated for New York City. Among projects which it recommended be deferred, if not abandoned altogether, are a third tube for the Queens-Midtown Tunnel, the Bushwick Expressway in Brooklyn, the widening of the Henry Hudson Parkway, adding another deck to the Long Island Expressway, and doubling the width of the New Jersey Turnpike. If these projects are postponed or jettisoned entirely, vast sums of money might be freed for the purposes of strengthening public transportation.

The authorities most intimately involved in the transportation dilemma of a given community should make the decisions about the allocation of resources.

Mr. Speaker, in 1965, nearly $4 billion was available for highway construction, while only a tiny fraction of that figure went into aid for mass transit.

Now that more than half of the interstate highway program is completed—20,000 miles—the time has come to divert some of our ample resources to providing safe, clean, efficient public transportation which will provide a means of access into and out of our major urban centers.

Until public expenditures for public transportation begin to approach the vast investment in highways, both programs will be self-defeating. Billions of dollars have been spent for highways, and yet the goal of sound, orderly, pleasant, and economical transportation is further from attainment than ever.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to break free of all the tradition-encrusted approaches. It is time to revolt against a policy of building new roads, widening existing ones, and providing more parking space that only results in a nightmare of passenger cars clogging the major arteries of our cities.

I believe that the legislation I have introduced today represents an important effort to redirect our energies and resources in seeking solutions to the dilemmas which confront us in the area of mass transit.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT FACES DOUBLE DANGER

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. STRATTON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, every American who is interested in the full development of our Nation's water resources—and especially every American who is interested in the continued development and improvement of our rivers and inland waterways—should be alerted at once to a double danger now confronting these programs.

The proposals now being advanced in Washington to change the basic criteria long used to evaluate the benefits of navigation projects, and to impose waterway tolls for the first time in our Nation's history, are the double danger now before us.

I am opposed to both of these proposals.

The Congress should examine both of them, critically and closely, without further delay.

The new criteria now being employed by the Army Corps of Engineers will most certainly operate to block some of our finest proposed navigation improvements, if the reasoning and methods inherent in these criteria should be accepted by the Congress.

Waterway tolls or special taxes, rejected by our Founding Fathers as inherently undesirable and against the best interest of our Nation's commerce and agriculture, will just as certainly operate to discourage new navigation projects. They will also stifle or destroy the growth rate now present on America's inland waterways, create a new competitive disadvantage for domestic industry, and set us back a generation or more in waterway development.

The story of the proposal for new criteria on our navigation projects was fully developed before the Senate Committee on Public Works in hearings held last year.

I hope that every Member of the House will examine the testimony which was taken before Senator RANDOLPH's ad hoc committee, concerning the directive of the Chief of Engineers dated November 20, 1964. Representatives of the outstanding water resources development organizations of the country presented testimony at that hearing, and all of them joined in the judgment that the November 20, 1964, directive contained policy standards which are both unsound and unworkable.

Basically and fundamentally, the 1964 directive will require a reduction of waterborne traffic projections on all proposed navigation projects, based on anticipated competitive rate reductions. This is a complete departure from longstanding practice of the Corps of Engineers, under which all prospective railroad rate reductions have been disregarded in estimating waterborne traffic, and this traffic has been projected on the basis of competitive rates and charges prevailing at the time of the study.

Advocates of the new policy have no difficulty in establishing that competitive rate reductions always follow when navigation is developed. They do have a great deal of difficulty, however, in predicting a pattern for these reductions, and in predicting the effect of these uncertain reductions upon waterborne freight.

I have already assembled data conclusively demonstrating the great variation which is present in rail freight rates where the competition of navigation has compelled reductions, and will make this evidence available in future remarks to the House.

There can be no question about the fact that the new criteria will introduce highly unreliable and unpredictable elements into the evaluation process, and change the rules in the middle of the game for water resource development across the Nation.

I am quite sure the Committee on Public Works of both the House and the other body will be going into this proposition in great depth in the future.

I have described the present standards for evaluating the benefits of navigation projects as criteria of long standing.

Far more fundamental and time honored in the policy of our country, however, has been the policy of complete freedom on the waterways of the country.

George Washington himself, in the early days of the Republic, was a strong champion of inland navigation and of removal of all obstacles to navigation.

The enabling acts which provided for the admission of many of the States specifically provided that no tolls of any kind could be established on our Nation's inland waterways.

Throughout the 19th century and on into the century in which we live today, one Chief Executive after another has reemphasized the importance of freedom of the waterways.

In his first annual message to Congress in 1829, President Andrew Jackson declared that improvement of inland navigaton will benefit "every member of the Union in peace and in war."

One year later, in his second annual message, Jackson declared his belief that "all improvements effected by the funds of the Nation for general use should be open to the enjoyment of all our fellow citizens, exempt from payment of tolls or any imposition of that character."

The veto message of President Tyler, on June 11, 1844, expressed this principle in the following terms:

> The Mississippi River belongs to no particular State or States, but of common right, by express reservation, to all the States. It is reserved as a great common highway for the commerce of the whole country. To have conceded to Louisiana or to any other State admitted as a new State into the Union, the exclusive jurisdiction, and consequently the right to make improvements and to levy tolls on the segments of the river embraced within its territorial limits, would have been to have disappointed the chief object in the purchase of Louisiana, which was to secure the free use of the Mississippi River to all the people of the United States.
>
> Whether levies on commerce were made by a foreign or domestic government would have been equally burdensome and objectionable.

Abraham Lincoln, as a Member of the House of Representatives, was another champion of full development of our rivers and freedom of the Nation's waterways.

In 1882, the Congress declared the policy of our country in clear and unmistakable language with these words:

> That no tools or operating charges whatsoever shall be levied or collected upon any vessels, boats, dredges, craft or other water craft passing through any canal or other

work for the improvement of navigation belonging to the United States.

Ever since the 1882 act, the Congress of the United States has consistently followed the policy stated in that legislation, and has acted to safeguard the freedom of transportation on the rivers and inland waterways of America. In the recent memory of many who sit today in this House that principle was restated for the House Committee on Public Works in its report on the St. Lawrence Seaway bill. The committee report stated:

> In approving the imposition of tolls as part of this project, the committee wants it understood that by such action it is not digressing from the firm and long-standing toll-free policy established with respect to inland waterways. The approval herein given is not intended to be interpreted as a precedent varying the toll-free policy since this project, being international, is clearly distinguishable from purely inland waterway facilities in the United States.

Even more recently, in the passage of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, both the House and the other body insisted upon language which restated the principle of freedom on our inland waters.

Today, that longstanding and time honored principle is threatened by the administration's proposal for imposition of a tax of 2 cents per gallon on the fuel now being used by vessels navigating the inland waterways.

In future remarks to this House, I will conclusively demonstrate that imposition of this tax could operate to destroy many of the smaller carriers now operating on our rivers and canals, and will further demonstrate that the approval of such a tax will undoubtedly have the effect of curtailing needed river development across the country.

I am confident that Members of this body who serve on the Committee on Ways and Means will deliberate for a long, long time upon the merits of this proposal—the entering wedge for even higher taxes and outright tolls upon the free waterways of America.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I am against both of these proposals. I am convinced that neither of them is needed. I am convinced that both of them contain the seeds of great harm to the orderly development of our Nation's resources, and the economy of our country as well.

We have come a long way in the development of our water resources, and in the construction of an inland water system which is making a great contribution to the strength of our economy and the Nation.

Let us continue to go forward under the sound and progressive policies which have made our country great, and its economy a model for all the world.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to compliment the gentleman on his excellent speech and associate myself with him and concur in everything that he has said.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank my colleague.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the comments having been made by the gentleman from Oklahoma and wish to commend him for the energetic manner in which he has expressed his concern on a matter which is of interest to all of us who come from the middle section of this Nation.

Frankly, I was shocked to learn of the recommendation made by the Corps of Engineers for a change in the formula for calculating the cost-benefit ratio on inland water projects. The application of these new criteria will, in my judgment, only serve to hamstring necessary development in this field.

If it was important to link the two coasts of this Nation at the time of Abraham Lincoln, it is now just as important to continue pushing for the development of adequate inland navigation through the central belt of this Nation.

The effect of the proposed change could be so far-reaching that I hope our concern will effect a reconsideration on the part of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget.

In the Midwest, we are just now getting a good start in the development of our river channels for traffic. The volume will undoubtedly increase as we continue this development. This is as it should be. As we look to the future, we are aware that the relationship of all types of development in the Midwest to the full potential of our Nation cannot be overlooked. What we have to offer in the way of resources and opportunities will be sorely needed for the social and economic well-being of this Nation. This is becoming more evident as our population increases. This means there will be a need for additional job opportunities, living space and recreational advantages. The rest of the Nation can ill afford to run the risk of inadequate transportation causing excessive costs on the foodstuffs that are moved to our great cities from the fields of the great Midwest area that is the home of the Mississippi-Missouri River system.

A balance must be had in all things. This is especially true in transportation. I trust that the concern that is being expressed here today will be understood. We want not only to continue our present program of the development of our navigable rivers and streams, but we want an acceleration toward the full employment of this great resource.

I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to highly commend my good friend, the able gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] for taking this time to express deep concern over the new waterway improvement justification standards being used by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. I want to join him and others of our colleagues who share this concern. Putting this matter simply, these new proposals, if allowed to stand, will kill the orderly development of new water navigation projects—projects that are vital to the development of this country and vital to the need for providing alternate methods of transportation in this great country. I am appalled that any agency of our Government would propose to use such stringent criteria in figuring justification for water transportation when other methods of transportation are not required to meet such tests. For example, when we build a new interstate highway with 90 percent Federal funds we do not compare the number of people who will drive their cars or haul goods on the roads with the number of people or goods who can reach that same destination by rail or truck. Even though the highway may run parallel with the railway for hundreds of miles, we do not ask the shippers how many tons could they ship by rail, thereby showing less need for highways. Then why should we continue to ask the water user to justify savings by water before we can provide this important method of transportation? I am for the railroads and have supported all legislation in their behalf for 12 years; however, I think it is high time we stop letting the railroads of this country dictate transportation policy.

All the railroads need do under the new policy we have described here today is contend they are going to lower their rates, kill a navigation project, and when the water project funeral is over, raise their rates back up or curtail their so-called improved service. You say this cannot happen? It did happen on the proposed Big Muddy River project in southern Illinois and almost killed the Kaskaskia Canal project in my congressional district. These two navigation projects alone would open up 20 billion tons of land-locked coal deposits and make the Midwest another Ruhr Valley of America.

Mr. Speaker, this was done at a time when railroads were unable to supply 1/10 of our requirements for railroad cars to haul grain and other commodities. I have dozens of wires in my office pleading for grain cars and I spent hundreds of dollars in 1965 calling railroad executives and railroad associations trying to get more cars. Yet our Corps of Engineers is continuing to give the railroads a monopoly on freight business by these stringent regulations and cost to benefit criteria. As an example, the railroads hauled approximately 46 percent of all freight last year. Trucks hauled 23 percent, pipelines 17 percent and get this 14 percent by inland waterway traffic. More dollar volume of traffic moved by pipeline last year than by inland waterways. Also I would like to remind my colleagues of the House that we will spend more money this year, 1966, on highway construction, about 4 billion Federal dollars, than we have spent on our inland waterway system in the entire history of our country.

I think it is past time to liberalize the criterion on navigation projects, not tighten up. Let us take the inland waterway stepchild and turn it into a full-grown partner of progress in this great country. Let us all convince the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, the President and all others who advocate these stringent criterion and the 2-cent proposed waterway tolls that this is holding back our development, not improving it.

Thank you.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank my good friend from Illinois, who has long been one of the most effective and articulate champions of the full development of our rivers and our water resources, and whose leadership has meant such a great deal in that cause in the Committee on Public Works, of which he is one of the ranking members and serves today.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I am in full agreement with my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson]. It is my firm belief that the Congress itself should be the final judge of the proper criteria to justify river development projects of all kinds. And as a member of the Public Works Committee, I do not see why we should follow these new criteria.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A NEW HOOVER COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, twice since World War II, Congress has directed the conduct of comprehensive reviews of Federal executive operations. These two Hoover Commissions of 1947–49 and 1953–55 demonstrated—dramatically in terms of governmental economy and efficiency—the contribution which can be made in reforming and improving public administration.

However, if waste, duplication, and bureaucratic conflicts are to be overcome, Government operations need constant scrutiny. Procedures must be revised regularly to incorporate the most progressive methods and technology. Structures of the administrative management of Government should be adjusted periodically to reflect the changing emphasis of public policy and the changing relationships among programs and personnel.

In recognition of these imperatives, I have introduced legislation to create a Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch. My bill would authorize the appointment of a special body that would undertake a 2-year study and recommend reforms based on its examinations and evaluations.

Among the specific studies which this measure identifies and the areas to which it directs the activities of the Commission are—

The location of waste, duplication, and inefficiency that weaken the quality of public service;

The cause of jurisdictional conflicts, inconsistencies, and bureaucratic confusion;

The coordination of programs and policies in urban affairs, natural resources and transportation;

The problems of intragovernmental communication, and

The redefinition of responsibilities in the bureaucracy.

The Commission would have 14 members: 2 Congressmen, 2 Senators, 2 State Governors, 2 members from the executive branch, and 6 from outside Government. I regard as especially essential the participation by the Governors, since many of today's Federal programs are carried on through State agencies, because more and more problems once common only to certain States or regions are becoming national in character, and also for the reason that there are being voiced various legislative proposals for tax sharing by the States.

I call attention to the difficulty Congress faces in accurately appraising administrative activities. As the Federal executive has grown in size, complexity, and momentum, it has become increasingly difficult—yet obviously more important—for the 535 Congressmen and Senators, their staffs and committees to oversee all that is carried on by some 2½ million civil servants.

In the past, the Hoover Commission generated great public and private support. The authority and prestige of their members and their task forces accomplished much in modernizing and reforming the Federal Government.

This is the kind of benefit I believe we can expect from the Commission I have proposed.

A YEAR OF TRANSITION—1965

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past year one of the most ironic and inequitable situations in the economic and social history of our country finally reached resolution. That situation was the annual practice of importing thousands of foreign laborers to work in American fields while thousands of Americans, capable of performing agricultural chores, went unemployed.

In 1965 a new and long-overdue pattern was established. As a result of the action taken by Congress in terminating Public Law 78, and as a result of the practices followed by the Department of Labor, those American growers who had been using foreign workers as a crutch and a subsidy found they could no longer offer wretched working conditions and stoop wages and then turn around and claim that domestic workers were not available.

The result, as I have pointed out several times this year, was not the disaster predicted by some. Rather, the record shows quite clearly that while isolated problems existed, and should be expected in a year of transition, employment of American farmworkers was up, farm income was up, and prices—while showing normal fluctuations basically related to weather—remained steady.

Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz recently released a report which comments in depth on what actually went on during the year of 1965. It reviews in detail the entire migrant farm labor problem, it outlines the changes in employment practices and it comments on the problems, the progress, and the improvements that were made.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when distortions and half-truths continue to persist, I include this report in its entirety at this point in the Record for the information and attention of our colleagues:

Year of Transition—Seasonal Farm Labor, 1965

(Report from the Secretary of Labor)

The practice of importing foreign laborers to harvest America's fruit and vegetable crops persisted for most of a century. They came, during different periods, from Asia, Europe, and Latin America. Sometimes—as recently as 1959—as many as 400,000 were brought in during a single year.

There were various reasons. The practice was stepped up when there were labor shortages in the United States, but persisted when there was domestic unemployment. Sometimes there was politics in it, and often exploitation. The fact that some crops peak so suddenly and for so short a period made it hard to get enough domestic labor.

As seasonal farm labor wage rates fell further and further below those for other comparable work, and conditions in the migrant labor camps worsened, the reasons for importing workers from countries with lower wage levels and standards of living seemed to become plainer; but these wages and living conditions were as much a result of the importation practice as a reason for it. The false notion that "Americans won't do stoop labor" was carefully nurtured from the truer fact that they won't work for stoop wages.

In 1965, this century-old practice came virtually to an end.

The reasons for its termination were only a little less various than those for its previous survival.

The more basic reasons were that the economic paradox of it all became increasingly apparent, and the misery of American migrant labor heavier on the national conscience.

It is much more than coincidence that Congress terminated Public Law 78—under which the hundreds of thousands of Mexican farm laborers (braceros) had been brought in—just at the time when the Nation was writing the dictates of decency into the Civil Rights Act and declaring war on poverty and ignorance in this country. The drastic reduction in the use of foreign farm labor in 1965 reflected the recognition that continuation of the previous practice would have been totally inconsistent with the contemporary national decision to perfect the American social and economic order.

Appreciation of the real reasons this happened is important. For it marks 1965, so far as the performance of seasonal agriculture labor is concerned, as only a year of transition, not of fulfillment of ultimate purpose. The turning of work previously performed by braceros over to domestic workers was in itself no great gain. Its real significance is that it was a necessary step toward cleansing the whole "migrant worker" sore on the American body politic.

There still lies ahead the establishment for migrant farm labor of the standards of both decency and efficiency which are characteristic of other employment in this country.

It is appropriate to make an accounting of just what was done in 1965, and with what results.

A summary of the year's developments centers on these facts.

There was an 83-percent reduction in the use of foreign farm labor—from 634,000 man-months in 1964 down to 110,000 man-months in 1965.

Tens of thousands of additional jobs were created for American workers, and there were significant improvements in the terms and conditions of employment.

There were bumper harvests in 1965, and significant labor shortages developed only in three or four crops in as many different areas.

Market prices for fruits and vegetables were, on the whole, less in 1965 than in 1964—although prices for most other things went up during the year.

One other preliminary note is important: The part played in this transition by government—Congress, the Department of Labor, and the State employment services—was limited to taking away crutches which had been leaned on too long and too heavily. The 1965 record is essentially one of resourceful and effective meeting of new necessities by American growers. Behind the protest and indignation which marked the year's transition there were the earnest and successful efforts which made it work—and which assure the future.

The details of the 1965 record are set out in the appendixes to this report. The report of the California Farm Labor Panel puts the 1965 story in its most significant context. (See App. I.) Only the highlights of the broader record are noted here.

CHANGES IN THE SEASONAL FARM LABOR FORCE

The U.S. farm labor force includes two elements: those workers who are employed the year round by the same employer; and those who work for short periods or move from one crop to another, and typically from one area to another, to meet special seasonal cultivation and harvesting needs.

In 1964, there were approximately 664,000 "permanent" farm wage workers, virtually all domestics. Although the figures for seasonal workers are less reliable, there were, by the most accurate measures available, about 2,700,000 of them in 1964. Some 2,500,000 of these were domestic workers. (This includes Mexican and Canadian nationals in this country, working as free agents, on a "green card" or "visa" basis.) The other 200,000 were foreign farmworkers who were brought in temporarily in 1964, on a contract basis, under Public Law 414 or Public Law 78.

Approximately 178,000 of these temporary foreign workers were Mexican nationals (braceros) who came in under Public Law 78. The others included 14,000 British West Indies workers, 8,000 Canadians, 1,200 Japanese, and 100 Filipinos who were here under Public Law 414.

Public Law 78 terminated on December 31, 1964. All temporary farmworkers who were brought in during 1965, came in under Public Law 414 authorization.

The major change in 1965 was the greatly reduced importation of Mexican workers:

The number of braceros (178,000) who were employed here at one time or another and for varying periods of time in 1964 was reduced to 20,300 in 1965.

In 1964, braceros were used in 17 States; in 1965, they were used in only one (California). The reductions in the 16 other States were to zero in 1965 from, in 1964:

Texas	18,171
Arizona	16,768
Michigan	12,800
Colorado	8,615
Arkansas	4,572
Nebraska	1,781
Montana	1,481
New Mexico	1,437
Wyoming	1,389
Wisconsin	584
Utah	339
Kansas	300
Oregon	187
South Dakota	52
Indiana	35
Minnesota	14

The total man-months of bracero employment in 1964 was 508,000; in 1965, it was 27,000—a reduction of 95 percent.

In addition to the 20,300 braceros admitted under Public Law 414 during 1965, farmworkers from the British West Indies, Canada, Japan, and the Philippines were also employed.[1] In each case, the number of workers employed in 1965 was significantly lower than in 1964.

In Florida, 14,100 British West Indies nationals were used in the sugar fields, the citrus groves (but only during the early months of the year), and in the harvesting of other field crops. The total man-months (estimated) dropped from 81,000 in 1964 to 64,000 in 1965 (app. A).

In Maine, 3,627 Canadians came in for 6 weeks to work in the potato harvest in Aroostock County (compared with 6,614 workers in 1964).

About 1,080 Japanese and 110 Filipinos, who were in California at the start of the year under Public Law 414, remained for part of the year. By year's end, only 200 Japanese (and no Filipinos) remained.

About 800 workers from Jamaica and the Barbados were engaged in shade tobacco operations in Connecticut and Massachusetts. This arrangement was terminated in October.

About 1,340 British West Indies nationals (compared with 2,000 in 1964) worked during the apple harvest in Virginia (760), West Virginia (270), New York (280), and Vermont (30); and 857 Canadians (compared with 1,175 in 1964) during the apple harvest in New Hampshire (294), Maine (299), Massachusetts (219), Vermont (20), and Rhode Island (25).

The overall result was a reduction of approximately 83 percent in the use of foreign labor in U.S. agriculture in 1965 (as compared with 1964). This is measured most reliably in the man-months of labor involved. They totaled 634,000 in 1964 (the equivalent of 52,800 full-time yearly jobs), and 110,000 in 1965 (or 9,200 full-time jobs).

Even this striking nationwide total conceals, however, the degree of impact of change in particular areas, during certain key periods of the year, and with respect to certain crops:

In mid-August of 1965, employment of seasonal farmworkers in the Nation as a whole reached its peak of 1,137,600 workers. Of these, 1,136,400 were domestic workers. Only 1,200 were foreign workers—a reduction of 98 percent from the 68,700 who were here in mid-August of 1964. In California, the August-to-August drop was from 36,700 foreign workers in 1964 to 600 in 1965.

The peak number of foreign farm workers here at any one time in 1965 came in September (when 17,600 braceros were brought in to work in the California tomato harvest) and was 24,000 workers. This was one-fourth as large as the 1964 peak.

Approximately 12,800 braceros were used in Michigan in the cucumber harvest in 1964; none in 1965.

Texas growers used braceros throughout 1964, with a peak of 15,600 in November; none in 1965.

Sugarbeet growers in 7 States (Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Nebraska, Kansas, Utah, and South Dakota) used approximately 10,000 braceros to thin the beets in 1964; none in 1965.

Eighteen crops accounted for 88 percent of foreign worker employment in August 1964; a year later, foreign labor employment had been eliminated from 14 of these crops.

It is harder to determine the increase in the number of domestic workers resulting from this change. It was smaller than the reduction in the number of foreign workers. More of the work was done this year by machines, and available domestic workers were employed more efficiently than in former years. The figures for seasonal farmwork (which increased between 1964 and 1965) are hard to separate from those for all farmwork (which went down). But the increase in domestic employment in seasonal farmwork was substantial.

At the peak of the season (in August), there were approximately 86,200 more U.S. workers in seasonal jobs in the fields and groves in 1965 than in 1964.

In August 1965, domestic seasonal farm employment in California was up by 21,000 (or 17 percent) over August 1964; up 20,000 (40 percent) in Michigan; up 10,000 (7 percent) in Texas.

The most careful possible estimate shows an average monthly increase in 1965 of about 20,000 domestic workers in the crops where foreign labor was concentrated in the past. This represents a 12-percent increase in domestic employment in these crops over 1964.

Careful appraisal of available data and information indicates that as a result of this change of labor policy over 100,000 U.S. workers had employment this year which they would not otherwise have had. (Almost all of this was for less than the full year.)

Between 15,000 and 25,000 high school and college students had work last summer which had previously been given to braceros.

The attention attracted by Congress termination of Public Law 78 and the establishment by the Secretary of Labor of firmer policies for administering Public Law 414 has concealed this central fact: the reduced use of foreign labor was brought about primarily by the decision of American growers to improve wages and working conditions and by the operation of employment and technological forces.

Even before the termination of Public Law 78 the use of foreign labor in American agriculture had started to drop sharply. It reached an all-time high of 459,850 workers brought into this country in 1956; dropped to 334,729 in 1960; to 217,010 in 1962; and to about 200,000 in 1964.

The unquestionably depressing effect of foreign labor importation on the terms and conditions of seasonal farm labor employment had created an increasingly intolerable contrast. In 1951, when Public Law 78 was enacted, the average hourly rate in manufacturing occupations in the United States was $1.56; for farm labor, it was $.77. This 79-cent difference had increased by 1964 to $1.46, the average for manufacturing having risen to $2.54 an hour and the average for seasonal farmwork to $1.08.

---

[1] Approximately 1,400 Basque sheepherders are working in the United States, having been admitted under Public Law 414. Because their work is completely different from that of other foreign farmworkers, they are not included in either this report or the appendixes.

This disparity could not last. The national conscience was being awakened across a broad front. Unemployment was being recognized, increasingly, as something that could and should not be met—because of both its human and its economic cost.

The termination of Public Law 78 and the new attention by the Department of Labor to this situation hastened its improvement, but history will note these developments in footnotes.

The time had come for decency.

So the governmental programs which were instituted to help speed the transition can be most appropriately noted only in such summary as suggests relevance to the future.

The State and Federal employment service programs were stepped up in 1965 with respect to local, intrastate, and interstate recruitment (appendix B). Greater coordination of recruitment programs and greater cooperation between Federal officials, State officials, and agricultural employers in the coming years can insure even more efficient and timely placement of domestic workers in the harvest areas.

Three special youth recruitment programs were conducted by the Department of Labor in 1965. The A-team program was designed for high school boys. The college summer recruitment program was for college students of any age. Project Growth was for young men aged 17 to 21, out of school and unemployed.

During the year, 3,225 A-team members had been placed on farms. On the whole, this program worked well where there was grower cooperation, and poorly where there was not. It had a strong catalytic effect on the exercise of grower initiative in recruiting domestic workers even where the A-teams were not used.

The college summer recruitment program placed approximately 5,000 students in farm labor jobs in 1965. This represented a substantial increase in number of placements over 1964, the first year of the program.

Project Growth was an experiment to determine whether opportunities for seasonal agricultural employment could be utilized in the rehabilitation of disadvantaged youth. The young men were provided with 2 to 4 weeks of prejob orientation, 6 to 8 weeks of agricultural work experience, and up to 4 weeks of counseling, testing and referral to other manpower development activities. Project Growth did not result in significant additions to the agricultural labor force. There had not been sufficient time for the proper planning and staffing of the project, recruitment of the youth, or provision of the kind of a working environment necessary to the success of so complex a project. In individual cases, however, the project showed promise as a vehicle for individual rehabilitation.

The summer youth employment program conducted by the California Department of Labor offers an example of a more successful effort (paralleled in several other States) to increase substantially the opportunities and contributions of young people in the labor force. In the summer months of 1965, 128,600 California youths registered for jobs and 7,500 personal contacts were made with employers on behalf of the youth program; the result was 74,996 placements in nonagricultural jobs in California and 25,292 agricultural placements. The success of this program was significant for youth and grower alike.

Several Manpower Development and Training Act projects to train men for harvest work were developed. To date, they have not been very successful. In the experimental programs which were adopted early in the year, opposition was met from growers in some cases and from labor organizations in others.

Most of the increased domestic employment came from improvements by the growers in wages and in working and living conditions, and from the realization by workers that they were no longer required to compete with foreign labor willing to accept jobs at the lowest pay and with the poorest working conditions.

EFFECTS OF THE TRANSITION ON GROWERS

In 1965, as in every year, there were bumper harvests of some fruit and vegetable crops in some areas, reduced harvests in others. The principal factors accounting for the size of the harvests were, as always, two: the acreage planted (or the number of trees of bearing age), and the weather. The yield was also, as is always true, affected somewhat in certain crops in some areas by the availability of labor at the exact time it was needed. To put this aspect of the matter in proper perspective it should be clearly noted that the total of even the claimed losses due to labor shortage in 1965 is estimated at less than one-half of 1 percent of the value this year of crops which foreign labor worked on in 1964.

It is likely but by no means clear that labor availability was a somewhat larger factor in determining the overall size of the net fruit and vegetable harvest in 1965 than it had been in the immediately preceding years. The termination of Public Law 78 meant that the growers had to go out and get labor, and even bid for it, where before they had only to put in an order, knowing the foreign workers would be there on the date set. It was inevitable, furthermore, that the strains and stresses which unfortunately developed between grower and Government representatives during the first part of the transition period would result in some misjudgments—probably on the part of both groups.

Any fairminded appraisal of the year's experience would require recognition of both the fact that some labor shortages developed which would not have occurred if Public Law 78 had not been repealed (or Public Law 414 had been more loosely administered) and the fact that these shortages were substantially less serious than anyone could have predicted in advance.

Among the crops which used a substantial number of foreign workers in 1964 and either no foreign workers or a much smaller number in 1965, there were larger harvests in 1965 in some of these crops (lettuce, celery, shade tobacco, potatoes, grapes, oranges, and grapefruit) and smaller harvests in others (strawberries, processing tomatoes, asparagus, cotton, sugarbeets, dates, and melons). There was a wider variety of changes in particular harvests in particular areas, most notably a large reduction in the pickling cucumber harvest in Michigan (although 1965 production for the Nation as a whole was very near the 1964 figure).

It is significant that in areas where most growers experienced comparatively little difficulty in shifting to domestic labor, a few ran into real trouble; conversely, in situations where a large number of growers had trouble making the shift some others had none at all.

The crop losses most clearly attributable in special part to labor shortages were in asparagus in the Stockton, Calif., area, strawberries in the Salinas, Calif., area, and pickling cucumbers in Michigan. The final report of the Michigan Farm Labor Panel (see app. J) describes in careful detail the most serious of these situations. The report notes the difficulty of determining whether the shortages would have occurred if there had been earlier and fuller acceptance by the growers of the fact of the termination of Public Law 78, or whether they were attributable to the administration of Public Law 414—or whether (as the panel strongly suggests) it was a combination of these two.

Sales and profit figures for the year are not yet available in complete form. Countrywide (but not always area) crop values are up from 1964, however, with respect to most crops and most areas. This is true even in those crops in which there was a reduced harvest this year and those in which the most serious labor supply problems developed:

Fresh market asparagus: up $1,441,000.
Processing asparagus: up $2,444,000.
Fresh market tomatoes: up $10,816,000.
Processing tomatoes: up $19,558,000.
Cucumbers for pickles: up $4,380,000.
Lettuce: up $17,872,000.

EFFECTS OF THE TRANSITION ON WORKERS

The availability of additional tens of thousands of jobs was itself a matter of signal importance among a group of workers whose unemployment is higher than that for any other occupation in the country. (Even last August, at the height of the season, the unemployment rate among agricultural laborers was 4.8 percent. The August 1964 rate was 6.5 percent.)

The terms and conditions of employment are of almost equal importance.

Only partial figures are available so far regarding the effect of the 1965 developments on agricultural wages.

A U.S. Department of Agriculture survey shows that wages for agricultural labor averaged 6 cents an hour more in 1965 than in 1964—up from $1.08 to $1.14 (figured without room and board). This is the largest recorded 1-year increase since the Korean war period.

Reported farm labor hourly wage rates for the Nation as a whole were $1.19 on January 1, 1965; $1.18 on April 1; $1.17 on July 1; $1.09 on October 1 and $1.24 on January 1, 1966. Eleven States reported an average of less than $1 an hour for January 1, 1965; and 26 States below $1.25. The reported range is from 71 cents an hour in South Carolina to $1.47 in California and $1.50 in Massachusetts. The reported January 1966 average for Florida was $1.05 an hour.

But these figures cannot be considered definitive. The averaging covers broad ranges from crop to crop and season to season. The figures do not include anything for whatever room (and occasionally board) may be included.

There have been some improvements in other aspects of employment and living conditions.

Last year marked the start of increased activity in providing improved housing for seasonal farmworkers. Some barracks were converted by growers for use as much-needed family housing. The Office of Economic Opportunity led the way in large investment for experimentation and development of new housing with a $2 million grant to California for the design and construction of short-occupancy, demountable housing units. In addition, money is now available for farm labor housing from the Farmers Home Administration.

Improved day care, education, housing and sanitation for migrant and other seasonally employed farmworkers was the purpose of 65 projects funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity during the last 9 months of 1965. Grants for these projects, including reception and information centers in New Mexico and Arizona and day care and adult and family education programs in Texas, California, Oregon, Washington, and Michigan, totaled $26 million and included 20 States.

It is perhaps more than a symbol of the year's progress that 1965 marked the passage of the country's first adequate State law establishing standards for field sanitation. (Earlier legislation had been limited to situations involving women and children.) This pioneering California legislation set standards for the provision of toilet and handwashing facilities, and for the maintenance and location of the required equipment. Also during 1965, Michigan and Indiana passed important legislation giving State health departments the authority to set sanitation standards for farm labor camps.

A beginning was made in improving employer-employee relations in several States where greater attention was given to the selection and training of field supervisors.

These are, however, only beginnings. The ultimate purposes of decency, equity, and efficiency remain to be served.

EFFECTS OF THE TRANSITION ON THE PUBLIC

It is reasonable to expect that the raising of wage levels and the improvement of working and living conditions for seasonal farmworkers will result in some increases in the prices of fruits and vegetables.

It is equally reasonable to insist that these price increases be limited to the actual increases in labor costs. In general, the wages paid to field labor (which is what was involved in the shift from foreign to domestic workers) represent a very small part of the cost to the consumer.

The bracero who used to pick lettuce in the Imperial Valley in California got a penny a head for his labors; in 1965, his domestic replacement got a cent and a third or sometimes a cent and a half. There was ample labor available; no foreign workers were requested; and the attempt to attribute 1965 increases in lettuce prices to the use of American labor made a plaything of the truth.

If, however, there is to be a general improvement in the working and living condition of migrant farmworkers—including, especially, the improvement of housing—there will be a bill for it. It is a necessary part of any national decision to clean up the migrant labor situation that there will be acceptance of a fair passing on to consumers of the costs of the cleanup.

As far as fruit and vegetable prices in 1965 were concerned, most of them went down. That year, as always, the principal influences on consumer prices were things other than labor costs. It was a good year for most crops, and the result of larger supplies was lower prices.

Fresh fruits and vegetables represented one of the few categories of consumer items for which prices went down in 1965 (by 4.5 percent comparing November 1965 to November 1964), while the overall Consumer Price Index was going up by 1.7 percent for the same period.

So far as bracero crops (those on which substantial numbers of braceros were used in 1964) were concerned, the prices of some increased in 1965; the prices of others decreased. Again the controlling factors were the size of the harvest and the marketing decisions which were made. Only in the case of asparagus and strawberries was any appreciable price increase partially indentifiable with the shift from foreign to domestic labor.

Wholesale prices of fresh asparagus in 1965 were 2 percent below 1964 prices. In contrast, retail prices increased by 9.1 percent over the same period and wholesale prices for canned asparagus rose 6.2 percent. The only area in which a significant number of braceros had been used in 1964 (the San Joaquin, Calif., area) produced 46 percent of the country's asparagus.

Strawberry prices were higher in 1965. Retail prices of fresh strawberries were up 8.8 percent over 1964. Wholesale prices for fresh strawberries in November 1965 were 5.7 percent above November 1964, and wholesale prices for frozen strawberries increased 14.2 percent during the same period. But only 32 percent of the Nation's strawberries had come, in 1964, from the California and Florida areas in which foreign workers had been used, and substantial numbers of foreign workers were brought into these areas to work on strawberries in 1965. A significant factor in strawberry prices which must be considered is the 40-percent crop loss brought about by bad weather in Washington and Oregon, the Nation's second largest strawberry-producing area.

Still to be determined is the pricing of cucumber pickles. Michigan producers and processors were clearly affected adversely by the change in labor supply sources. (Eighty percent of the 16,000 workers who picked cucumbers in Michigan in 1964 were braceros; no foreign workers were used in 1965.) The 1965 Michigan harvest was 15 to 25 percent below the 1964 figure. Michigan production was 27 percent of the total 1964 production. This crop was harvested by domestic workers in almost all other parts of the country in 1964.

It is important to note, however, that the total nationwide pickling cucumber harvest was about the same for 1965 as 1964.

In general, it is evident that reliance on domestic labor to produce America's fruits and vegetables will not require or warrant any substantial increase in food costs. What increase does fairly result from the raising of seasonal farm labor to levels of decency and comparability will be recognized as a proper part of the cost not only of foodstuff but of membership in a more perfect society.

CONCLUSION

The decision embodied in Congress' termination of Public Law 78 was accepted, in 1965, by the vast majority of American growers.

It remains, in 1966, to develop fully the procedures for assuring the effective use of Public Law 414 in those very few situations, and only in those situations, covered by its terms.

The final reports of the California and Michigan Farm Labor Panels anticipate no use of braceros in those two States this year. Florida sugarcane and Maine potatoes appear to present situations in which, at least for the time being, some dependence will have to be placed at certain times of the year (several months in Florida; several weeks in Maine) on foreign labor. The situation which develops in Florida citrus and New England and Mid-Atlantic State apple picking seasons has to be carefully watched. A few other harvest situations may present close questions.

In general, however, the period of any large scale use of foreign labor is ended.

What remains—and what makes 1965 only a year of transition—is the domestic migrant worker problem.

This problem is not a simple one. The economics of it are out of kilter, and not easily corrected. The logistics of a labor-supply that must follow the seasons are hard to work out. If there are exploitive habits of some growers to be recognized for what they are and to be broken, there is equally the necessity of stern realization that generations of poverty have reduced some migrant workers to a state of inefficiency and lack of pride which must be changed—especially among the children.

Hard problems of effective and responsible representation of migrant workers must be met. The lesson of national experience is that in a highly organized and pluralistic society any group which lacks the means of collective action drops back to what eventually becomes an intolerable disadvantage.

Unilateral decisionmaking by the users of labor—especially unskilled labor—emerges now in the living history of this country less as a question of right or wrong than as a question of time until it is changed. The record is that where an imbalance of bargaining power exists either it is corrected privately or the results of the imbalance bring the inferior consequence of Government protection.

The most promising prospect today is for a fuller coordination of private and public effort to see to it that the migrant worker becomes a full member of a Great Society, bearing his share of its responsibilities in return for receiving his share in its promise.

(NOTE.—This report has been virtually sterilized in order to insure against the infection of predilection. The only loss from this is in its inadequate recognition of the credit due so many who made this transition work. There were hundreds of them, probably thousands—and 15 or 20 in particular. To name even one would be to deal unfairly with the rest. All will have to find their satisfaction in the realization that there is rarely such an opportunity as this experience has afforded to improve the course of human events at least a little bit by personal endeavor. There was a law to be administered as fairly as individual capacity permitted—and it was. There were economic and human values to be responsibly balanced—and they were. There was a flaw in the system of things to be remedied—and a start was made on that.—W.W.W.)

APPENDIX A

Foreign agricultural worker employment in the United States, 1964 and 1965

MAN-MONTHS OF FOREIGN-WORKER EMPLOYMENT IN THE UNITED STATES, 1964 AND 1965

By nationality	Man-months (thousands)	
	1964	1965
All nationalities	634	110
Mexican	508	27
British West Indians	101	73
Canadian	9	5
Japanese and Filipinos	16	5

Selected States	Man-months (thousands)	
	1964	1965
California	335	32
Texas	83	0
Florida	81	64
Arizona	44	0
Michigan	18	0
Colorado	18	0
Connecticut	12	5
Maine	8	5
Massachusetts	4	2
Virginia-West Virginia	2	1
New York	1	1
Louisiana	1	(1)
All other States	27	(1)

[1] Less than 500 man-months.

APPENDIX B

Monthly domestic agricultural worker employment by origin, 1964 and 1965

UNITED STATES

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign	Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate				Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964							*1965*						
January	278,700	249,300	212,200	20,700	16,400	29,400	January	295,700	279,800	237,600	22,700	19,500	15,900
February	275,300	248,600	215,300	18,000	15,500	26,500	February	293,200	278,800	238,200	21,100	19,500	14,400
March	294,000	267,300	235,300	15,800	16,300	26,700	March	300,800	290,400	250,800	19,100	20,500	10,400
April	380,500	342,500	298,000	21,900	22,700	38,000	April	381,600	372,900	317,000	25,900	30,000	8,600
May	748,000	696,100	592,700	36,800	66,700	51,900	May	733,100	726,500	603,900	48,100	74,500	6,700
June	1,068,600	998,700	798,800	48,900	151,000	69,900	June	1,084,700	1,080,300	857,600	64,424	158,300	4,400
July	1,290,900	1,236,500	972,400	77,800	186,300	54,400	July	1,149,300	1,148,000	905,900	82,800	159,300	1,300
August	1,118,900	1,050,200	820,900	70,800	158,400	68,700	August	1,137,600	1,136,400	865,700	87,500	183,200	1,200
September	1,061,100	968,300	766,400	61,300	140,600	92,800	September	977,100	961,400	748,000	64,000	149,500	15,700
October	1,025,200	944,500	783,600	60,300	100,600	80,800	October	931,900	913,300	749,000	62,800	101,500	18,600
November	571,400	517,900	458,800	33,800	25,300	53,600	November	477,200	470,300	397,600	46,400	26,300	6,900
December	352,400	312,100	266,400	26,200	19,500	40,300	December	341,300	331,800	270,200	39,300	22,300	9,500

NOTE.—On this table, as well as on the other tables in this appendix, figures may not add to totals due to rounding.

APPENDIX C

Labor-force statistics on farm and nonfarm labor, June–September, 1964 and 1965

Item	June		July		August		September	
	1964	1965	1964	1965	1964	1965	1964	1965
Employment (thousands of workers), farm employment, total [1]	7,469	6,840	7,500	6,804	7,174	6,644	7,208	6,660
Hired	2,412	2,253	2,542	2,338	2,268	2,053	2,136	1,982
Family	5,057	4,587	4,958	4,466	4,906	4,591	5,072	4,678
Seasonal hired farmworkers, total [2]	1,069	1,085	1,293	1,149	1,119	1,138	1,061	977
Domestic	999	1,080	1,239	1,148	1,050	1,136	968	961
Foreign	70	4	54	1	69	1	93	16
Unemployment rate [3] (percent):								
Agricultural wage and salary workers	8.8	6.4	6.5	5.0	6.5	4.8	5.7	4.8
All workers	6.1	5.5	5.0	4.6	4.8	4.2	4.5	3.8
Long-term [4] unemployment [3] as percent of total unemployment:								
Agricultural wage and salary workers	4.1	8.5	5.4	5.6	10.4	INA	12.4	9.4
All workers	11.1	8.8	14.0	9.4	13.5	9.7	12.4	10.9
Part-time employment for economic reasons [5] as percent of total employment in category: [3]								
Agriculture	6.0	5.4	7.4	7.3	7.8	7.4	5.9	4.4
Nonagricultural industries	3.8	3.3	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.1	2.5

[1] "Farm Labor," U.S. Department of Agriculture.

[2] In-season farm labor reports received by the Bureau of Employment Security for major agricultural areas.

[3] Monthly Report on the Labor Force, U.S. Department of Labor.

[4] Current spell of unemployment has lasted 27 or more weeks.

[5] Could find only part-time work or temporarily on part time due to slack work.

Source: Farm Labor Developments, U.S. Department of Labor, July 1965, August 1965, September 1965, October 1965.

APPENDIX D

Seasonal farm employment (domestic and foreign) by States, 1964 and 1965—State seasonal farm employment by major crop activity and type of worker, with acreage, production, and value for selected crops, 1964 and 1965

ARIZONA

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign	Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate				Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964							*1965*						
January	17,200	14,200	11,600	1,000	1,600	3,100	January	16,000	16,000	12,600	1,300	2,000	0
February	14,500	12,300	10,500	800	1,000	2,300	February	15,500	15,500	12,000	1,800	1,800	0
March	15,000	12,200	10,700	700	800	2,800	March	15,000	15,000	11,800	1,600	1,700	0
April	19,900	13,500	11,700	900	1,000	6,400	April	16,500	16,500	12,800	1,300	2,400	0
May	20,000	15,400	13,600	900	1,000	4,600	May	18,000	18,000	15,800	1,200	1,100	0
June	21,900	17,200	15,300	700	1,100	4,800	June	20,000	20,000	16,000	2,300	1,700	0
July	14,900	13,900	12,600	700	700	1,000	July	14,600	14,600	13,300	800	500	0
August	11,900	11,400	10,400	500	500	500	August	10,500	10,500	9,600	600	300	0
September	12,700	10,500	9,500	400	600	2,200	September	12,500	12,500	11,400	500	500	0
October	18,500	14,000	11,800	800	1,400	4,500	October	16,100	16,100	13,200	1,400	1,400	0
November	23,700	16,500	13,800	900	1,900	7,200	November	21,100	21,000	17,700	1,400	1,900	0
December	23,700	18,200	14,400	1,400	2,500	5,500	December	19,700	19,700	15,300	1,900	2,500	0

APPENDIX D—Continued

ARIZONA—Continued

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED FARMWORKERS, BY MAJOR CROP ACTIVITY AND TYPE OF WORKER, 1964–65

Date	Lettuce cultivation		Lettuce harvest		Onion ph & h		Melon ph & h	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964								
January	700	800	1,300	1,400	1,200	0	0	0
February	900	500	700	1,200	1,400	0	300	(1)
March	900	600	900	1,400	1,900	0	200	500
April	500	300	1,400	4,400	1,500	(1)	800	1,200
May	100	100	1,000	2,200	1,400	200	800	1,100
June	0	0	100	400	1,600	300	900	3,100
July	100	0	(1)	(1)	0	0	400	700
August	100	200	0	0	100	0	200	0
September	900	1,300	0	0	100	0	0	0
October	1,700	1,900	400	800	500	0	(1)	(1)
November	1,000	1,200	1,700	3,800	800	0	(1)	(1)
December	400	1,200	2,900	2,800	1,500	(1)	0	0
1965								
January	1,400	0	1,900	0	1,300	0	0	0
February	1,500	0	1,800	0	1,300	0	0	0
March	1,000	0	2,300	0	1,700	0	400	0
April	400	0	4,200	0	1,200	0	800	0
May	(1)	0	1,200	0	1,900	0	1,400	0
June	0	0	600	0	1,200	0	4,200	0
July	0	0	0	0	200	0	1,000	0
August	200	0	0	0	100	0	100	0
September	2,300	0	0	0	300	0	0	0
October	3,300	0	600	0	600	0	(1)	0
November	900	0	5,400	0	1,100	0	0	0
December	1,100	0	4,900	0	1,200	0	0	0

[1] Less than 50.

Date	Citrus harvest		Cotton cultivation		Irrigation	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964						
January	600	400	0	0	1,700	300
February	600	(1)	0	0	2,100	300
March	700	100	0	0	2,500	200
April	700	100	300	(1)	2,500	500
May	500	100	3,100	300	2,600	500
June	200	100	4,200	300	2,900	300
July	100	0	4,500	100	3,200	200
August	0	0	3,700	100	3,100	200
September	100	400	1,000	100	2,600	400
October	200	1,000	(1)	0	1,800	500
November	800	1,400	0	0	2,100	400
December	1,100	700	0	0	2,200	400
1965						
January	1,000	0	0	0	2,400	0
February	800	0	0	0	2,600	0
March	1,000	0	0	0	2,900	0
April	1,400	0	0	0	2,800	0
May	1,400	0	2,700	0	3,200	0
June	1,400	0	2,700	0	3,300	0
July	500	0	2,900	0	3,600	0
August	200	0	2,600	0	3,100	0
September	300	0	700	0	3,100	0
October	900	0	0	0	2,200	0
November	1,700	0	0	0	900	0
December	2,400	0	0	0	1,600	0

[1] Less than 50 workers.

Source: In-season farm labor reports as of midmonth.

ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, AND CROP VALUE, 1964–65

Crop and year	Acreage	Production	Crop value
Lettuce:			
1964	58,100	479,750 tons	$47,302,000
1965	56,000	505,750 tons	54,782,000
Onions:			
1964	1,600	22,000 tons	1,144,000
1965	1,500	35,600 tons	3,916,000
Melons:			
1964	20,250	101,950 tons	15,189,000
1965	16,700	87,800 tons	13,826,000
Citrus:			
1963–64	INA	7,150,000 boxes	17,775,000
1964–65	INA	6,430,000 boxes	14,720,000
Cotton (lint):			
1964	375,000	799,000 bales	118,900,000
1965	339,000	775,000 bales	118,012,000

APPENDIX D—Continued

ARKANSAS

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
May	13,200	12,800	8,200	2,700	2,000	400
June	41,700	37,800	37,000	300	500	3,900
July	34,400	30,700	30,100	300	300	3,700
August	9,000	8,800	8,700	100	100	100
September	31,700	31,400	31,000	200	200	300
October	42,000	40,600	39,900	100	500	1,400
November	24,700	24,000	23,600	0	400	700
1965						
May	10,800	10,800	7,200	1,900	1,700	0
June	37,600	37,600	37,100	300	300	0
July	34,800	34,800	34,100	400	300	0
August	8,200	8,200	8,100	100	(1)	0
September	18,500	18,500	18,500	0	0	0
October	33,600	33,600	33,100	200	300	0
November	6,600	6,600	6,600	0	0	0
December	1,400	1,400	1,400	0	0	0

[1] Less than 50.

CALIFORNIA

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
January	98,000	87,600	69,100	13,600	4,900	10,300
February	85,200	74,500	59,300	11,000	4,200	10,600
March	76,500	65,200	53,000	8,100	4,200	11,200
April	97,100	78,000	61,400	10,600	6,000	19,000
May	150,200	120,400	93,500	17,900	9,000	29,800
June	165,600	127,800	94,100	21,000	12,700	37,800
July	156,600	122,600	87,800	23,900	10,900	33,900
August	161,300	124,600	86,700	25,400	12,500	36,700
September	225,200	161,200	110,000	33,600	17,700	63,900
October	175,900	124,400	93,000	20,900	10,400	51,600
November	89,000	70,000	55,700	8,500	5,800	19,000
December	93,400	80,700	64,800	11,000	4,800	12,700
1965						
January	90,200	89,300	70,100	13,900	5,300	900
February	83,000	83,000	63,800	13,700	5,500	0
March	73,800	73,200	55,800	12,000	5,400	600
April	84,800	84,600	63,000	14,700	7,000	100
May	140,200	139,400	100,200	25,500	13,600	800
June	166,200	162,800	114,700	30,400	17,800	3,400
July	142,000	141,300	96,400	26,900	18,000	700
August	146,100	145,500	100,000	29,200	16,300	600
September	178,000	166,600	113,100	34,600	18,900	11,400
October	161,600	148,200	108,600	27,600	11,900	13,400
November	102,100	100,180	78,200	15,100	6,900	1,900
December	90,100	89,700	69,500	14,200	6,000	400

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED FARMWORKERS, BY MAJOR CROP ACTIVITY AND TYPE OF WORKER, 1964–65

Date	Tomato ph & h		Asparagus ph & h		Strawberry ph & h		Melon ph & h	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964								
January	400	200	0	0	300	0	0	0
February	0	0	0	0	200	0	200	200
March	0	0	1,800	0	400	600	300	400
April	1,000	0	4,500	3,500	2,000	2,800	800	0
May	2,600	1,000	4,300	3,700	2,900	8,500	2,400	100
June	1,800	1,200	1,400	4,200	2,100	10,400	3,200	200
July	6,600	3,200	0	0	2,000	6,200	1,100	3,200
August	5,800	11,200	0	0	1,200	4,500	1,200	2,800
September	6,400	38,000	0	0	800	3,600	500	1,600
October	4,600	26,600	0	0	400	2,200	0	0
November	1,600	1,600	0	0	500	0	0	0
December	1,000	1,000	0	0	100	0	0	0

APPENDIX D—Continued

CALIFORNIA—Continued

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED FARMWORKERS, BY MAJOR CROP ACTIVITY AND TYPE OF WORKER, 1964-65—Continued

Date	Tomato ph & h		Asparagus ph & h		Strawberry ph & h		Melon ph & h	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1965								
January	800	0	0	0	100	0	0	0
February	400	0	500	0	400	0	0	0
March	400	0	2,400	0	100	0	700	0
April	0	0	3,400	0	3,000	0	0	0
May	2,000	100	3,700	400	5,400	300	1,800	0
June	3,200	0	3,800	1,000	5,500	2,200	2,800	0
July	8,000	0	0	0	5,900	200	4,400	0
August	9,600	400	0	0	3,300	0	4,400	0
September	18,700	10,800	0	0	1,800	400	1,400	0
October	13,000	11,200	0	0	600	600	200	0
November	5,900	900	0	0	400	500	400	0
December	1,800	0	0	0	200	0	0	0

Date	Grape ph & h		Lemon h		Orange h		Lettuce		Sugarbeets	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964										
January	16,700	200	600	2,800	4,200	400	1,400	2,000	300	700
February	11,000	0	1,000	3,400	3,600	1,000	1,200	1,800	800	600
March	1,800	0	1,000	3,800	3,300	1,200	2,200	1,500	3,300	400
April	100	0	1,000	4,600	2,600	1,200	2,000	2,000	6,300	800
May	5,400	200	800	4,500	3,800	1,200	1,800	3,300	4,500	1,400
June	7,300	400	600	3,600	600	2,200	1,700	4,200	1,600	2,000
July	1,300	900	400	2,000	800	3,000	1,800	3,700	2,100	2,500
August	12,500	0	200	900	600	3,000	1,600	3,500	1,400	900
September	51,200	1,200	200	1,000	600	2,700	800	4,600	800	0
October	32,600	2,500	200	1,100	200	1,400	1,400	6,400	1,200	1,200
November	3,400	100	200	900	0	0	700	3,900	2,400	2,600
December	6,200	0	400	2,000	7,200	100	1,000	2,200	1,200	1,000
1965										
January	18,100	0	1,500	0	5,700	0	2,400	100	0	0
February	14,800	0	3,600	0	5,500	0	2,000	0	1,300	0
March	3,200	0	4,100	600	5,400	0	2,800	0	3,200	0
April	600	0	4,000	0	3,700	0	2,400	0	5,400	0
May	4,800	0	3,600	0	4,000	0	4,600	0	5,200	0
June	9,600	0	3,800	0	5,300	0	4,500	200	2,500	0
July	3,600	0	3,600	0	2,800	0	3,900	0	3,000	0
August	12,400	0	2,500	0	3,000	0	3,700	0	1,200	0
September	55,200	0	1,200	0	2,700	0	3,000	0	600	0
October	33,600	600	1,200	0	2,400	0	3,700	0	2,100	0
November	9,800	0	1,600	0	2,200	0	4,400	0	2,800	0
December	10,050	0	2,300	0	6,400	0	2,600	0	1,200	0

Source: In-season farm labor reports as of midmonth.

ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, AND VALUE OF CROP, 1964-65

Crop and year	Acreage	Production		Value of crop
		Unit	Quantity	
Tomatoes:				
1964	178,300	Tons	3,321,600	$152,322,000
1965	147,600	do	2,743,200	[1] 163,983,000
Asparagus:				
1964	65,400	do	91,550	22,867,000
1965	54,900	do	76,350	24,056,000
Strawberries:				
1964	9,000	do	114,300	46,853,000
1965	8,300	do	87,830	39,211,000
Cantaloupes:				
1964	47,300	do	338,500	28,682,000
1965	42,800	do	303,500	30,330,000
Grapes:				
1964		do	3,155,000	175,903,000
1965		do	3,960,000	162,000,000
Lemons:				
1964		Boxes	17,300,000	46,364,000
1965		do	13,500,000	41,580,000
Oranges:				
1964		do	32,000,000	130,444,000
1965		do	31,600,000	100,468,000
Sugarbeets:				
1964	[2] 364,300	Tons	7,439,000	84,061,000
1965	[2] 292,000	do	6,497,000	INA
Lettuce:				
1964	115,100	do	1,150,250	92,876,000
1965	115,600	do	1,192,550	96,443,000

[1] The value of the processing crop was $101,086,000 in 1965, compared with $93,994,000 in 1964.

[2] Planted acreage.

APPENDIX D—Continued

COLORADO

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1954						
May	8,700	6,200	3,300	500	2,400	2,500
June	15,900	9,900	4,800	700	4,400	6,000
July	14,100	11,400	6,600	800	4,100	2,600
August	13,900	10,400	6,200	1,000	3,200	3,500
September	13,200	10,400	5,400	1,400	3,600	2,900
October	9,300	8,400	4,900	1,100	2,400	900
November	1,200	1,200	1,000	100	100	(1)
1965						
May	8,000	8,000	3,400	300	4,200	0
June	14,100	14,100	5,000	600	8,400	0
July	12,800	12,800	6,100	900	5,800	0
August	12,300	12,300	5,600	1,200	5,400	0
September	12,900	12,900	5,800	1,400	5,800	0
October	10,900	10,900	5,200	900	4,900	0
November	2,500	2,500	1,500	200	800	0
December	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)

[1] Less than 50.

[2] No activity.

CONNECTICUT

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
January	5,200	4,600	4,500	0	100	600
February	4,900	4,300	4,200	0	100	600
March	4,800	4,200	4,200	0	100	600
April	5,000	4,300	4,000	0	300	700
May	4,700	3,400	2,700	0	700	1,300
June	5,400	4,000	3,100	0	900	1,400
July	13,700	12,300	8,800	0	3,400	1,400
August	16,900	15,500	12,100	(1)	3,400	1,400
September	6,300	4,900	3,900	0	1,000	1,400
October	7,200	6,000	5,500	0	600	1,200
November	5,700	5,000	4,700	0	300	700
December	6,100	5,500	5,400	0	100	600
1965						
January	6,000	5,400	5,400	0	100	600
February	5,600	5,000	4,900	0	100	600
March	5,400	4,900	4,800	0	100	600
April	5,800	5,200	4,400	0	800	600
May	4,800	4,300	3,000	0	1,400	500
June	5,200	4,800	3,400	0	1,400	400
July	14,500	14,100	9,600	(1)	4,500	400
August	17,000	16,600	12,300	100	4,200	400
September	6,600	6,200	4,600	0	1,600	400
October	6,300	5,900	4,800	0	1,000	400
November	3,800	3,800	3,100	0	600	0
December	3,500	3,500	3,200	0	300	0

[1] Less than 50.

FLORIDA

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
January	66,500	54,200	40,000	5,000	9,100	12,300
February	69,300	58,100	43,000	5,500	9,600	11,200
March	70,200	59,700	44,600	6,000	9,200	10,400
April	66,600	57,900	48,200	5,000	4,600	8,800
May	61,000	54,200	47,100	3,300	3,800	6,800
June	38,800	36,100	33,900	1,600	700	2,600
July	36,800	36,000	35,800	100	100	800
August	19,900	19,200	18,800	100	400	600
September	23,100	22,200	20,700	600	900	900
October	33,300	31,600	28,000	1,800	1,900	1,600
November	57,900	47,600	39,400	3,000	5,200	10,300
December	73,800	60,500	45,600	5,700	9,200	13,300
1965						
January	83,600	69,500	51,700	6,400	11,400	14,100
February	84,400	70,700	53,800	5,100	11,800	13,700
March	76,000	66,900	51,900	3,900	11,100	9,100
April	78,000	70,200	56,500	4,800	8,900	7,800
May	83,100	77,900	65,500	7,500	5,000	5,200
June	48,500	48,200	46,400	1,300	500	300
July	23,900	23,900	23,400	400	100	0
August	20,300	20,300	19,700	400	200	0

APPENDIX D—Continued

FLORIDA—Continued

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965—Continued

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
September	23,100	22,500	21,900	400	300	600
October	31,100	30,600	27,000	1,200	2,400	500
November	53,800	49,000	40,300	2,900	2,900	4,700
December	71,500	62,500	47,500	4,700	10,300	9,100

SEASONAL HIRED FARMWORKERS, BY MAJOR CROP ACTIVITY AND TYPE OF WORKER. 1964–65

Date	Tomato ph and h		Celery ph and h		Strawberry ph and h		Citrus ph	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964								
January	10,900	600	1,800	600	1,000	300	7,700	0
February	11,700	700	2,400	600	1,500	300	8,000	0
March	13,300	1,000	2,500	600	2,100	1,300	9,900	0
April	8,000	900	3,000	600	1,700	1,300	9,500	0
May	8,200	400	2,700	600	400	(1)	8,300	0
June	2,600	0	1,300	100	0	0	9,500	0
July	400	0	500	0	0	0	10,700	0
August	700	0	700	0	0	0	10,300	0
September	1,400	0	900	0	200	0	9,600	0
October	3,100	0	1,100	0	500	0	9,300	0
November	5,900	0	1,300	300	900	0	8,700	0
December	9,100	100	1,800	500	1,800	100	8,600	0
1965								
January	10,400	200	2,300	500	2,000	400	7,800	0
February	9,400	200	2,500	500	2,400	400	7,600	0
March	8,500	200	2,200	500	3,300	700	8,900	0
April	10,100	0	2,300	500	1,000	1,000	9,300	0
May	8,200	0	2,600	500	400	0	9,500	0
June	1,500	0	2,200	0	(1)	0	10,800	0
July	300	0	500	0	(1)	0	11,200	0
August	600	0	600	0	(1)	0	10,600	0
September	1,400	0	1,100	0	(1)	0	9,800	0
October	3,800	0	1,100	0	300	0	8,400	0
November	5,700	0	2,100	0	700	0	8,000	0
December	8,300	0	2,100	0	800	0	8,300	0

Date	Citrus h		Sugarcane ph		Sugarcane h	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964						
January	10,200	2,800	1,100	300	800	7,400
February	9,600	2,600	1,900	100	800	6,600
March	5,200	1,500	2,200	800	1,300	5,000
April	7,800	2,000	2,900	2,800	0	700
May	7,000	2,900	1,900	2,200	0	0
June	3,500	600	2,400	1,200	0	0
July	100	0	2,200	700	0	0
August	(1)	0	2,600	500	0	0
September	0	0	2,200	800	0	0
October	2,800	0	2,500	1,500	0	0
November	8,000	1,400	1,600	100	1,500	8,300
December	10,800	2,800	700	(1)	2,000	9,500
1965						
January	13,200	3,500	400	(1)	1,200	9,400
February	14,400	3,500	700	0	2,600	9,100
March	11,600	[2] 0	600	0	3,000	7,800
April	11,800	3,200	1,300	3,100	0	0
May	10,000	3,500	2,900	1,300	0	0
June	2,400	0	3,400	300	0	0
July	200	0	3,100	0	0	0
August	0	0	2,900	0	0	0
September	0	0	1,800	600	0	0
October	4,000	0	900	500	0	0
November	8,700	0	200	0	3,800	4,200
December	16,300	0	200	0	900	9,100

[1] Less than 50 workers.

[2] Foreign workers were furloughed during the lull between the midseason and Valencia orange harvests.

APPENDIX D—Continued

FLORIDA—Continued

ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, AND VALUE OF SELECTED CROPS, 1964–65

Crop and year	Harvested acreage	Production	Value of crop
Celery (tons):			
1964	11,100	221,150	$20,861,000
1965	[1] 11,600	[1] 227,200	18,686,000
Tomatoes (tons):			
1964	46,300	418,600	66,099,000
1965	[1] 48,200	[2] 403,500	70,151,000
Strawberries (tons):			
1964	2,800	10,800	7,455,000
1965	[1] 3,400	[2] 11,619	7,678,000
Citrus (boxes):			
1963–64		89,550,000	380,808,000
1964–65		123,560,000	345,303,000
Sugarcane (tons):			
1963–64	150,500	4,696,000	43,354,000
1964–65	219,800	6,439,000	48,322,000

[1] For harvest.

[2] Indicated production.

IDAHO

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
April	3,900	3,900	2,800	100	1,000	0
May	7,200	7,200	4,300	200	2,700	0
June	15,300	15,300	5,900	400	9,000	0
July	15,000	15,000	6,900	700	7,400	0
August	9,800	9,800	5,500	400	4,000	0
September	9,100	9,100	4,600	600	3,900	0
October	17,500	17,500	10,500	1,500	5,400	0
November	1,500	1,500	1,300	100	100	0
1965						
April	4,900	4,900	3,500	200	1,200	0
May	9,400	9,400	5,100	300	3,900	0
June	15,000	15,000	6,200	600	8,200	0
July	11,200	11,200	6,600	500	4,100	0
August	10,600	10,600	6,400	600	3,700	0
September	9,800	9,800	5,000	600	4,100	0
October	14,300	14,300	9,100	900	4,300	0
November	500	500	500	(1)	(1)	0
December	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)

[1] Less than 50.

[2] No activity.

ILLINOIS

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
May	5,200	5,200	2,000	100	3,000	0
June	7,500	7,500	3,000	200	4,400	0
July	6,100	6,100	3,600	100	2,400	0
August	7,200	7,200	2,600	100	4,600	0
September	7,800	7,800	2,400	100	5,300	0
October	1,800	1,800	1,100	0	700	0
1965						
May	4,300	4,300	1,200	0	3,100	0
June	7,600	7,600	2,500	(1)	5,000	0
July	5,400	5,400	2,500	300	2,600	0
August	7,500	7,500	2,100	200	5,300	0
September	7,700	7,700	2,200	(1)	5,500	0
October	2,500	2,500	1,400	(1)	1,100	0
November	0	0	0	0	0	0
December	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)

[1] Less than 50.

[2] No activity.

Appendix D—Continued

INDIANA

Number of Seasonal Hired Workers, by Origin, 1964 and 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
April	500	500	300	0	200	0
May	1,400	1,400	600	0	800	0
June	2,500	2,500	1,000	0	1,600	0
July	4,000	3,900	2,400	0	1,500	100
August	4,900	4,700	1,300	0	3,300	300
September	10,100	10,100	1,600	0	8,500	(1)
October	1,700	1,700	1,100	0	600	(1)
1965						
April	400	400	200	0	200	0
May	2,000	2,000	1,100	0	900	0
June	2,900	2,900	900	0	1,900	0
July	5,100	5,100	2,900	0	2,200	0
August	7,300	7,300	1,600	0	5,700	0
September	9,900	9,900	1,600	0	8,300	0
October	1,700	1,700	700	0	1,000	0
November	0	0	0	0	0	0
December	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)

---

[1] Less than 50.
[2] No activity.

KANSAS

Number of Seasonal Hired Workers, by Origin, 1964 and 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
May	6,000	5,900	4,500	800	600	100
June	17,600	17,300	10,600	1,900	4,800	300
July	26,500	26,400	17,900	3,400	5,100	100
August	22,700	22,700	15,200	3,200	4,300	0
September	17,000	17,000	13,200	1,800	2,000	0
October	10,900	10,900	8,800	1,300	800	0
November	4,400	4,400	3,600	500	400	0
1965						
May	8,100	8,100	6,100	1,000	1,000	0
June	16,500	16,500	11,100	1,900	3,500	0
July	29,500	29,500	19,400	4,300	5,800	0
August	22,300	22,300	15,600	3,000	3,800	0
September	13,100	13,100	10,200	1,400	1,500	0
October	10,800	8,000	2,800	1,500	0	0
November	5,000	5,000	3,400	800	800	0
December	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

---

[1] No activity.

LOUISIANA

Number of Seasonal Hired Workers, by Origin, 1964 and 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
January	2,900	2,900	2,400	300	300	0
February	1,400	1,400	1,400	0	0	0
March	1,400	1,400	1,400	0	0	0
April	9,500	9,500	5,400	1,600,	2,500	0
May	11,400	11,400	9,900	900	700	0
June	16,900	16,900	16,900	0	0	0
July	6,400	6,400	6,400	0	0	0
August	3,600	3,600	3,600	0	0	0
September	17,600	17,600	17,300	200	200	0
October	18,400	18,400	16,500	1,300	600	100
November	16,600	16,400	13,400	2,100	900	300
December	11,400	11,100	8,000	2,200	1,000	300
1965						
January	3,200	3,000	2,800	200	(1)	100
February	1,600	1,600	1,600	0	0	0
March	1,700	1,700	1,700	0	0	0
April	9,000	9,000	5,400	1,600	2,000	0
May	8,300	8,300	6,700	1,600	100	0
June	13,500	13,500	13,500	0	100	0
July	9,300	9,300	9,300	0	0	0
August	4,700	4,700	4,700	0	0	0
September	12,200	12,200	11,800	200	100	0
October	15,600	15,600	14,500	900	200	0
November	12,400	12,400	10,800	1,100	400	0
December	8,500	8,500	7,100	1,000	400	0

---

[1] Less than 50.

Appendix D—Continued

MAINE

Number of Seasonal Hired Workers, by Origin, 1964 and 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
May	6,900	6,400	6,400	0	(1)	500
June	7,000	6,600	6,500	0	(1)	500
July	8,700	8,400	8,400	0	(1)	300
August	10,100	9,800	9,800	0	(1)	300
September	13,700	9,100	9,100	0	(1)	4,600
October	5,300	3,300	3,300	0	(1)	2,000
1965						
May	5,000	5,000	5,000	(1)	(1)	0
June	3,700	3,700	3,700	0	(1)	0
July	5,400	5,400	5,400	0	(1)	0
August	5,900	5,900	5,900	(1)	(1)	0
September	19,000	16,300	16,200	0	(1)	2,700
October	22,100	19,500	19,500	100	(1)	2,600
November	0	0	0	0	0	0
December	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)

---

[1] Less than 50.
[2] No activity.

MASSACHUSETTS

Number of Seasonal Hired Workers, by Origin, 1964 and 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
January	100	0	0	0	0	100
February	100	0	0	0	0	100
March	100	0	0	0	0	100
April	400	200	200	0	(1)	100
May	5,600	5,200	4,600	0	600	300
June	7,300	6,900	5,900	0	900	400
July	14,000	13,500	11,800	0	1,700	500
August	14,600	14,200	12,300	(1)	1,900	500
September	10,500	9,500	8,500	(1)	1,100	900
October	9,700	9,000	8,300	0	800	700
November	3,700	3,500	3,100	100	200	300
December	1,200	1,100	1,100	0	0	100
1965						
January	100	(1)	(1)	0	0	100
February	100	(1)	(1)	0	0	100
March	100	(1)	(1)	0	0	100
April	1,300	1,100	900	0	200	200
May	5,700	5,600	4,700	0	900	100
June	7,400	7,300	5,900	0	1,300	100
July	13,800	13,700	11,600	0	2,100	100
August	15,100	15,000	12,700	(1)	2,300	100
September	11,900	11,600	10,000	100	1,500	300
October	9,300	9,000	7,900	200	900	300
November	3,500	3,400	3,100	(1)	300	100
December	1,100	1,100	1,100	0	(1)	

---

[1] Less than 50.

MICHIGAN

Number of Seasonal Hired Workers, by Origin, 1964 and 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
April	5,800	5,800	5,100	100	600	0
May	16,000	16,000	11,700	400	3,900	0
June	43,700	43,700	14,500	1,700	27,600	0
July	74,400	74,300	23,000	5,300	46,000	100
August	63,100	50,200	25,200	2,700	22,300	12,800
September	35,300	32,900	17,400	1,800	13,700	2,400
October	25,500	25,100	14,500	1,200	9,400	300
November	6,600	6,600	5,600	200	800	(1)
December	400	400	400	0	0	(1)
1965						
April	3,500	3,500	2,800	100	500	0
May	13,700	13,700	10,000	300	3,500	0
June	44,400	44,400	13,900	1,200	29,200	0
July	49,500	49,500	20,400	2,900	26,200	0
August	70,700	70,700	28,200	7,400	35,100	0
September	35,300	35,300	17,600	1,200	16,500	0
October	27,100	27,100	14,600	1,000	11,400	0
November	6,900	6,900	5,500	200	1,200	0
December	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)

---

[1] Less than 50.
[2] No activity.

APPENDIX D—Continued

MICHIGAN—Continued

SEASONAL HIRED WORKER EMPLOYMENT IN PICKLE HARVEST, JULY TO SEPTEMBER, 1964 AND 1965

	Domestic	Foreign
1964		
July 15	900	100
July 31	2,600	9,300
August 15	3,400	12,800
August 31	2,600	11,300
September 15	500	2,000
1965		
July 15	900	0
July 31	8,300	0
August 15	10,800	0
August 31	11,600	0
September 15	2,600	0

ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, AND VALUE OF CUCUMBERS FOR PICKLES CROP

Year	Harvested acreage	Production (tons)	Value
1964	23,000	116,150	$7,736,000
1965	[1] 16,300	[2] 79,280	7,325,000

[1] For harvest.
[2] Indicated production. Another 13,660 tons were produced but not marketed.

MISSOURI

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
May	6,200	6,200	6,000	0	200	0
June	15,700	15,700	14,400	300	1,000	0
July	8,100	8,100	8,100	0	0	0
August	200	200	200	0	0	0
September	16,300	16,300	15,700	200	500	0
October	19,300	19,300	18,300	300	800	0
November	5,100	5,100	5,000	0	200	0
December	500	500	500	0	0	0
1965						
January	200	200	200	0	0	0
June	16,800	16,800	15,300	800	600	0
July	13,300	13,300	12,800	200	300	0
August	1,000	1,000	800	0	200	0
September	8,900	8,900	8,600	100	100	0
October	15,100	15,100	13,700	300	1,100	0
November	3,400	3,400	3,400	100	0	0
December	800	800	800	0	0	0

MONTANA

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
January	1,300	1,300	1,000	200	100	0
February	1,400	1,400	1,100	200	100	0
March	2,100	2,100	1,500	300	300	0
April	3,800	3,800	2,300	800	700	0
May	5,600	5,600	2,800	900	1,900	0
June	10,000	8,300	2,700	1,200	4,400	1,700
July	10,000	9,800	4,100	1,700	4,000	200
August	9,000	9,000	4,000	2,000	3,000	0
September	6,300	6,300	3,200	1,700	1,400	0
October	5,500	5,500	3,100	1,500	900	0
November	2,400	2,400	1,600	400	300	0
December	2,000	2,000	1,400	300	300	0
1965						
January	1,900	1,900	1,300	300	200	0
February	1,600	1,600	1,300	200	100	0
March	2,200	2,200	1,700	300	200	0
April	3,400	3,400	2,400	600	400	0
May	5,000	5,000	3,000	800	1,200	0
June	9,400	9,400	3,300	1,300	4,900	0
July	9,900	9,900	4,200	2,100	3,500	0
August	9,400	9,400	4,500	2,200	2,700	0
September	7,100	7,100	3,400	2,000	1,800	0
October	5,600	5,600	3,200	1,400	1,000	0
November	2,900	2,900	2,000	500	400	0
December	2,100	2,100	1,500	300	200	0

APPENDIX D—Continued

NEW HAMPSHIRE

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
June	1,000	1,000	1,000	0	(1)	0
July	1,200	1,200	1,200	0	100	0
August	1,600	1,600	1,500	0	100	0
September	2,400	2,200	2,100	0	200	100
October	800	800	700	0	(1)	100
1965						
June	1,000	1,000	900	0	(1)	0
July	1,200	1,200	1,100	0	100	0
August	1,400	1,400	1,400	0	100	0
September	1,800	1,700	1,700	0	(1)	100
October	800	800	700	0	100	100
November	0	0	0	0	0	0
December	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)

(1) Less than 50.
(2) No activity.

NEW JERSEY

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
April	2,000	2,000	1,200	0	800	0
May	10,900	10,900	3,400	0	7,500	0
June	18,100	18,100	6,500	100	11,500	0
July	24,000	24,000	13,400	100	10,600	0
August	24,900	24,900	11,300	100	13,500	0
September	16,900	16,900	8,100	100	8,700	(1)
October	11,100	10,300	5,800	(1)	4,500	800
November	2,200	2,000	1,100	(1)	800	200
1965						
April	1,900	1,900	1,000	0	900	0
May	10,800	10,800	3,500	0	7,300	0
June	17,400	17,400	5,700	100	11,600	0
July	23,600	23,600	12,500	100	11,000	0
August	24,600	24,600	12,100	100	12,400	0
September	16,100	16,100	7,200	100	8,800	0
October	11,400	11,400	5,900	100	5,400	0
November	800	800	500	0	400	0
December	(2)					

(1) Less than 50.
(2) No activity.

NEW MEXICO

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
January	700	700	600	(1)	(1)	(1)
February	700	700	700	(1)	(1)	(1)
March	900	900	800	(1)	100	(1)
April	1,000	900	800	(1)	(1)	100
May	1,200	1,000	900	(1)	(1)	200
June	3,100	2,700	1,900	100	700	400
July	2,800	2,200	1,900	100	200	600
August	3,000	2,400	1,900	100	500	600
September	2,300	1,500	1,300	100	100	800
October	3,800	2,500	1,800	300	400	1,300
November	3,100	2,100	1,700	100	300	1,000
December	1,400	1,100	1,000	(1)	100	300
1965						
January	900	900	800	(1)	(1)	0
June	1,700	1,700	1,100	(1)	600	0
July	1,600	1,600	1,300	(1)	200	0
August	2,600	2,600	2,100	200	300	0
September	3,200	3,200	1,800	1,200	200	0
October	2,500	2,500	1,900	300	300	0
November	2,100	2,100	1,700	100	300	0
December	800	800	800	(1)	(1)	0

(1) Less than 50.

APPENDIX D—Continued

NEW YORK

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
May	7,100	7,100	4,600	200	2,200	0
June	12,700	12,700	7,200	600	4,900	0
July	24,900	24,900	12,300	1,000	11,600	0
August	25,600	25,600	10,500	1,200	13,900	0
September	31,700	31,400	9,800	1,200	20,400	400
October	31,200	30,800	10,500	800	19,500	400
November	400	200	(1)	(1)	200	200
1965						
May	7,100	7,100	4,800	300	1,900	0
June	12,100	12,100	6,900	400	4,800	0
July	23,000	23,000	12,400	900	9,700	0
August	25,200	25,200	11,400	1,000	12,800	0
September	30,500	30,300	10,800	1,200	18,200	200
October	29,400	29,100	11,100	900	17,100	300
November	300	200	100	0	100	100
December	100	100	(1)	0	100	0

[1] Less than 50.

NORTH CAROLINA

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
January	12,700	12,700	12,600	100	100	0
February	19,600	19,600	19,400	100	100	0
March	23,800	23,800	23,600	100	100	0
April	33,800	33,800	33,200	400	200	0
May	85,500	85,500	83,600	1,300	600	0
June	113,300	113,300	106,900	1,500	4,900	0
July	229,900	229,900	217,700	4,900	7,300	0
August	249,800	249,800	236,300	7,000	6,500	0
September	118,900	118,900	110,800	3,800	4,300	0
October	158,300	158,300	153,500	2,100	2,600	0
November	86,200	86,200	84,100	1,000	1,100	0
December	24,900	24,900	24,800	100	100	0
1965						
January	17,700	17,700	17,700	0	0	0
February	22,000	22,000	21,900	100	100	0
March	25,800	25,800	25,600	100	100	0
April	42,000	42,000	41,700	200	200	0
May	82,100	82,100	81,000	400	700	0
June	117,700	117,700	112,800	1,000	3,900	0
July	192,300	192,300	181,500	4,100	6,700	0
August	260,900	260,900	248,000	6,900	6,000	0
September	141,600	141,600	136,800	1,700	3,200	0
October	128,800	128,800	125,000	1,800	1,900	0
November	52,900	52,900	51,800	600	500	0
December	20,600	20,600	20,600	0	0	0

SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS[1] IN CUCUMBER HARVEST, 1964-65

Date	1964	1965
June 15	18,100	16,300
June 31	30,200	26,000
July 15	14,400	14,300
July 31	400	400
Aug. 15	100	400
Aug. 31	100	400
Sept. 15	800	800
Sept. 30	600	3,500
Oct. 15	0	3,000
Oct. 31	0	0
Nov. 15	0	0
Nov. 30		0
Dec. 15		
Dec. 31		

[1] All workers are domestic workers.

ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, AND VALUE OF CUCUMBERS FOR PICKLES

Crop	Harvested acreage	Production (tons)	Value
Cucumbers for pickles:			
1964	20,100	50,250	$3,518,000
1965	[1] 21,300	59,850	4,405,000

[1] For harvest.

APPENDIX D—Continued

OHIO

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
May	16,500	16,500	14,700	200	1,700	0
June	25,100	25,100	20,700	300	4,200	0
July	23,300	23,300	18,100	400	4,800	0
August	25,700	25,700	15,700	300	9,800	0
September	28,500	28,500	16,400	400	11,800	0
October	17,400	17,400	15,100	300	2,000	0
1965						
May	17,200	17,200	15,100	400	1,800	0
June	24,400	24,400	20,100	400	4,000	0
July	24,600	24,600	19,100	400	5,000	0
August	32,500	32,500	17,000	500	15,000	0
September	33,500	33,500	17,300	600	15,600	0
October	18,500	18,500	16,300	400	1,700	0
November	0	0	0	0	0	0
December	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

[1] No activity.

OREGON

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
March	700	700	500	0	200	0
April	3,400	3,400	2,700	100	700	0
May	7,700	7,700	4,100	200	3,400	0
June	31,600	31,600	25,000	800	5,800	0
July	57,600	57,600	42,400	2,100	13,100	0
August	61,200	62,200	45,600	2,600	13,000	0
September	20,900	20,700	13,400	1,000	6,300	200
October	9,900	9,900	6,800	800	2,300	0
November	2,600	2,600	2,500	100	100	0
1965						
March	2,400	2,400	1,600	400	400	0
April	4,200	4,200	3,400	200	600	0
May	8,700	8,700	5,000	300	3,400	0
June	59,200	59,200	46,500	2,300	10,500	0
July	33,200	33,200	23,300	2,400	7,500	0
August	63,400	63,400	48,000	2,000	13,400	0
September	17,600	17,600	10,100	1,100	6,400	0
October	7,400	7,400	5,600	200	1,500	0
November	1,700	1,700	1,600	(1)	100	0

[1] Less than 50.

PENNSYLVANIA

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
May	8,100	8,100	7,600	300	100	0
June	11,600	11,600	10,500	500	700	0
July	19,200	19,200	16,600	1,000	1,700	0
August	16,000	16,000	11,100	600	4,400	0
September	20,400	20,400	14,600	1,000	4,800	0
October	17,300	17,300	12,700	900	3,700	0
November	5,800	5,800	5,300	200	300	0
1965						
May	9,100	9,100	8,600	200	300	0
June	12,400	12,400	11,600	300	500	0
July	18,600	18,600	16,400	800	1,400	0
August	16,500	16,500	12,000	900	3,600	0
September	20,300	20,300	14,100	1,000	5,200	0
October	18,200	18,200	12,400	1,300	4,600	0
November	6,800	6,800	5,700	400	700	0

APPENDIX D—Continued

RHODE ISLAND

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
September	400	300	300	0	0	100
October	200	100	100	0	0	(1)
November	100	100	100	0	0	(1)
1965						
September	400	300	300	0	0	(1)
October	100	100	100	0	0	(1)
November	100	100	100	0	0	(1)

(1) Less than 50.

TEXAS

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
January	70,100	67,000	66,900	100	100	3,000
February	71,500	69,900	69,800	0	100	1,600
March	85,900	84,300	84,100	200	100	1,500
April	105,800	103,000	102,500	500	(1)	2,800
May	129,400	124,200	121,700	2,300	200	5,200
June	156,400	149,400	140,500	7,900	1,000	7,000
July	156,800	149,000	127,500	20,000	1,400	7,900
August	144,800	134,400	117,600	15,800	1,100	10,400
September	113,800	103,800	97,900	5,600	300	10,100
October	129,000	116,800	101,300	14,200	1,200	12,200
November	131,100	117,700	101,200	15,100	1,300	13,500
December	99,500	91,900	86,200	5,300	400	7,500
1965						
January	69,300	69,300	68,700	400	200	0
February	72,300	72,300	72,200	100	0	0
March	85,700	85,700	85,500	200	0	0
April	102,200	102,200	101,400	700	100	0
May	125,100	125,100	122,400	2,500	300	0
June	153,200	153,200	142,800	9,600	800	0
July	146,200	146,200	121,700	23,000	1,600	0
August	143,800	143,800	121,100	21,600	1,200	0
September	108,300	108,300	101,100	6,600	700	0
October	117,800	117,800	101,700	14,000	2,200	0
November	125,300	125,300	101,500	21,600	2,200	0
December	106,300	106,300	88,000	16,700	1,600	0

(1) Less than 50.

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED FARMWORKERS, BY MAJOR CROP ACTIVITY AND TYPE OF WORKER, 1964–65

Date	Cucumber		Cotton ph		Cotton h	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964						
January	200	0	10,600	500	3,000	1,200
February	200	0	14,400	600	(1)	(1)
March	400	0	19,800	700	0	0
April	600	0	30,300	1,800	0	0
May	900	300	42,600	2,200	0	0
June	700	100	54,300	2,900	0	0
July	800	600	52,400	4,600	11,000	0
August	1,300	2,700	28,000	5,000	37,800	0
September	700	2,100	8,500	3,200	31,000	1,800
October	500	100	3,400	200	42,500	8,500
November	600	(1)	3,200	0	42,300	10,700
December	200	0	5,700	0	27,700	6,300
1965						
January	200	0	10,400	0	2,000	0
February	200	0	14,500	0	(1)	0
March	400	0	20,400	0	0	0
April	600	0	30,600	0	0	0
May	1,300	0	43,800	0	0	0
June	1,500	0	54,800	0	0	0
July	1,100	0	53,600	0	6,800	0
August	3,200	0	32,000	0	36,300	0
September	2,000	0	13,200	0	25,500	0
October	1,700	0	3,300	0	38,800	0
November	1,800	0	3,100	0	48,900	0
December	200	0	6,800	0	14,400	0

(1) Less than 50 workers.

APPENDIX D—Continued

UTAH

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
May	1,900	1,900	1,700	(1)	100	(1)
June	6,200	6,000	3,700	200	2,000	200
July	10,400	9,900	7,700	100	2,100	500
August	7,200	6,900	5,100	100	1,700	300
September	6,900	6,400	4,700	100	1,700	400
October	6,700	6,400	5,200	100	1,200	200
November	700	700	600	(1)	(1)	0
1965						
May	2,500	2,500	1,300	(1)	1,200	0
June	4,200	4,200	2,800	100	1,200	0
July	5,100	5,100	3,300	300	1,400	0
August	7,000	7,000	5,300	200	1,600	0
September	4,800	4,800	3,300	200	1,300	0
October	3,100	3,100	2,600	100	400	0

(1) Less than 50.

VERMONT

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
June	500	500	500	0	(1)	0
July	700	700	600	0	100	0
August	500	500	500	0	100	0
September	1,500	1,400	1,300	0	200	100
October	1,100	1,100	1,000	0	200	0
1965						
June	500	500	400	0	(1)	0
July	600	600	600	0	(1)	0
August	500	500	500	0	(1)	0
September	1,200	1,200	1,100	0	100	0
October	700	700	700	0	(1)	(1)

(1) Less than 50.

WASHINGTON

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
January	1,700	1,700	1,700	0	(1)	0
February	4,100	4,100	3,800	100	200	0
March	9,900	9,900	8,200	400	1,300	0
April	11,600	11,600	8,100	900	2,500	0
May	22,100	22,100	12,600	1,300	8,200	0
June	25,400	25,400	14,800	1,900	8,800	0
July	78,200	78,200	62,400	4,600	11,200	0
August	40,300	40,300	33,700	2,500	4,100	0
September	27,200	27,200	18,200	2,600	6,300	0
October	29,300	29,300	14,600	4,400	10,300	0
November	3,000	3,000	22,000	200	600	0
December	1,400	1,400	1,300	(1)	(1)	0
1965						
January	1,300	1,300	1,300	0	0	0
February	4,200	4,200	4,000	100	200	0
March	9,200	9,200	7,400	600	1,100	0
April	12,500	12,500	8,500	800	3,200	0
May	19,900	19.900	11,700	1,400	6,800	0
June	34,300	34,400	22,900	3,300	8,100	0
July	56,100	56,100	43,000	4.600	8,400	0
August	32,400	32,400	26,000	2,600	3,800	0
September	28,500	28,500	16,700	2,800	9,000	0
October	21,300	21,300	11,400	2,900	7,000	0
November	4,000	4,000	3,200	300	600	0
December	2,100	2,100	2,000	0	100	0

(1) Less than 50.

APPENDIX D—Continued

WISCONSIN

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
May	1,400	1,400	1,000	0	500	0
June	2,500	2,500	1,400	0	1,100	0
July	10,500	10,400	4,900	300	5,300	100
August	10,500	9,800	2,700	100	7,000	700
September	5,600	5,200	3,300	(1)	1,800	400
October	3,300	3,300	2,100	100	1,100	(1)
1965						
May	1,400	1,400	1,000	0	400	0
June	2,600	2,600	1,800	0	800	0
July	7,900	7,900	4,400	(1)	3,500	0
August	9,500	9,500	2,500	200	6,900	0
September	5,300	5,300	3,300	100	1,900	0
October	3,500	3,500	2,400	100	1,000	0
November	0	0	0	0	0	0
December	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)

[1] Less than 50.
[2] No activity.

WYOMING

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
May	2,600	2,600	2,000	(1)	600	0
June	5,200	3,800	1,900	100	1,800	1,400
July	3,800	3,400	2,300	100	1,200	400
August	1,800	1,800	1,500	100	200	(1)
1965						
May	3,400	3,400	1,900	100	1,500	0
June	5,100	5,100	1,900	100	3,100	0
July	3,500	3,500	1,900	100	1,500	0
August	1,600	1,600	1,400	(1)	200	0

[1] Less than 50.

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS EMPLOYED IN APPLE HARVESTING, SELECTED STATES, 1964-65

Date	New York		Maine		Massachusetts		New Hampshire	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964								
Aug. 31	1,765	0	60	0	501	0	200	0
Sept. 15	5,872	350	245	81	1,643	408	1,097	103
Sept. 30	10,441	521	880	370	2,417	408	1,250	350
Oct. 15	9,375	356	262	187	1,262	314	454	46
Oct. 31	2,050	0	48	0	333	4	199	1
Nov. 15	0	0	0	0	47	0	0	0
1965								
Aug. 31	1,575	0	73	0	0	0	200	0
Sept. 15	5,135	250	347	0	2,433	171	715	85
Sept. 30	9,475	250	797	271	2,388	161	1,561	239
Oct. 15	7,860	280	336	125	1,376	141	535	65
Oct. 31	4,010	280	177	15	295	0	100	0
Nov. 15	0	0	0	0	27	0	0	0

Date	Rhode Island		Vermont		Virginia-West Virginia[1]	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964						
Aug. 31	0	0	10	0	92	0
Sept. 15	INA	19	1,159	81	1,594	672
Sept. 30	INA	19	1,124	76	1,824	1,178
Oct. 15	0	0	960	0	1,853	1,347
Oct. 31	0	0	120	0	1,799	1,283
Nov. 15	0	0	0	0	784	0
1965						
Aug. 31	0	0	0	0	158	0
Sept. 15	INA	25	925	15	1,619	0
Sept. 30	INA	25	1,098	50	1,787	970
Oct. 15	INA	3	580	30	1,718	1,029
Oct. 31	INA	0	150	0	1,150	828
Nov. 15	INA	0	0	0	65	0

[1] Includes only Winchester, Va.-Martinsburg, W.Va., area.

Source: Inseason farm labor reports.

APPENDIX D—Continued

WYOMING—Continued

PRODUCTION AND CROP VALUE IN APPLE-PRODUCING STATES, 1964 AND 1965

State and year	Production	Crop value
	Thousand bushels	
New York:		
1964	21,500	$40,723,000
1965	23,500	45,120,000
Maine:		
1964	1,950	5,168,000
1965	2,200	5,375,000
Massachusetts:		
1964	2,800	7,140,000
1965	3,150	8,138,000
New Hampshire:		
1964	1,180	3,068,000
1965	1,370	3,440,000
Rhode Island:		
1964	180	477,000
1965	200	540,000
Vermont:		
1964	920	2,438,000
1965	900	2,045,000
Virginia:		
1964	9,800	15,035,000
1965	10,500	16,640,000
West Virginia:		
1964	5,700	9,489,000
1965	5,100	9,246,000

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED FARMWORKERS IN SUGARBEET CULTIVATION, SELECTED STATES, 1964-65

Date	Colorado		Montana		Nebraska	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964						
May	2,400	2,200	700	0	900	100
June	4,600	5,200	3,600	1,700	2,100	1,300
July	2,300	1,300	2,600	200	1,000	200
August	700	200	200	0	400	0
1965						
May	4,700	0	200	0	0	0
June	9,200	0	4,000	0	4,600	0
July	4,200	0	2,400	0	1,300	0
August	500	0	200	0	300	0

Date	Wyoming		Kansas		Utah	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964						
May	500	0	100	100	100	(1)
June	2,700	1,400	1,100	300	3,400	100
July	1,800	400	400	100	2,200	(1)
August	200	(1)	0	0	700	(1)
September	0	0	0	0	100	(1)
1965						
May	400	0	300	0	1,200	0
June	3,100	0	1,200	0	2,300	0
July	1,900	0	500	0	1,300	0
August	200	0	0	0	400	0

[1] Less than 50 workers.

Source: In-season farm labor reports as of midmonth.

SUGARBEET ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, AND VALUE IN SELECTED STATES, 1964 AND 1965

State and year	Acreage harvested	Production	Crop value
	1,000 acres	*1,000 tons*	
Colorado:			
1964	177.4	2,783	$34,509,000
1965	137.3	2,101	INA
Kansas:			
1964	23.5	364	4,368,000
1965	19.4	312	INA
Montana:			
1964	69.6	973	12,552,000
1965	60.6	745	INA
Nebraska:			
1964	86.5	1,407	18,150,000
1965	66.5	898	INA
Utah:			
1964	32.8	427	5,338,000
1965	32.0	522	INA
Wyoming:			
1964	64.0	864	10,886,000
1965	53.2	665	INA

APPENDIX D—Continued

WYOMING—Continued

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS IN TOBACCO ACTIVITIES IN CONNECTICUT AND MASSACHUSETTS, 1964-65

Date	Connecticut		Massachusetts	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964				
January	4,600	600	0	100
February	4,300	600	0	100
March	4,200	600	0	100
April	4,300	700	200	100
May	3,400	1,300	900	300
June	3,800	1,400	1,500	400
July	12,300	1,400	6,400	500
August	15,500	1,400	6,500	500
September	4,500	1,300	1,500	500
October	4,700	1,200	800	400
November	5,000	700	600	300
December	5,500	600	(1)	100
1965				
January	5,400	600	0	100
February	5,000	600	0	100
March	5,000	600	0	100
April	5,200	600	900	200
May	4,300	500	1,300	100
June	4,600	400	1,900	100
July	14,100	400	6,400	100
August	16,600	400	6,800	100
September	5,800	400	2,700	100
October	4,600	400	1,200	100
November	3,800	87	700	0
December	3,500	0	0	0

[1] Less than 50 workers.

APPENDIX D—Continued

WYOMING—Continued

ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, AND VALUE OF SHADE TOBACCO IN CONNECTICUT AND MASSACHUSETTS

Year	Harvested acreage	Production	Value
Connecticut:			
1964	8,100	6,892 tons	$26,525,000
1965	[1] 8,700	7,208 tons [2]	26,448,000
Massachusetts:			
1964	3,100	2,676 tons	9,880,000
1965	[1] 3,200	2,682 tons	9,582,000

[1] For harvest.
[2] Indicated production.

APPENDIX E

Average farm wage rates by States, 1963, 1964, and 1965

HOURLY FARM WAGE RATE (WITHOUT ROOM OR BOARD), 1963-65

	1963				1964				1965			
	January	April	July	October	January	April	July	October	January	April	July	October
Alabama	$0.66	$0.66	$0.62	$0.66	$0.68	$0.70	$0.67	$0.69	$0.72	$0.74	$0.70	$0.77
Arizona	1.04	1.02	1.00	1.01	1.05	1.05	1.03	1.08	1.10	1.11	1.17	1.14
Arkansas	.77	.80	.77	.84	.83	.83	.80	.85	.87	.88	.91	.93
California	1.30	1.33	1.32	1.33	1.32	1.34	1.35	1.36	1.36	1.39	1.40	1.45
Colorado	1.17	1.15	1.16	1.19	1.22	1.18	1.19	1.24	1.25	1.25	1.22	1.28
Connecticut	1.35	1.38	1.38	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.40	1.39	1.40	1.42	1.47	1.42
Delaware	1.05	1.05	1.07	1.04	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.10	1.09	1.10	1.15	1.16
Florida	.90	.89	.85	.82	.89	.93	.95	.93	1.00	.97	1.00	.96
Georgia	.73	.71	.72	.74	.76	.75	.72	.76	.79	.81	.79	.82
Idaho	1.28	1.27	1.27	1.31	1.31	1.27	1.31	1.31	1.30	1.32	1.33	1.35
Illinois	1.15	1.17	1.18	1.17	1.18	1.19	1.21	1.21	1.20	1.24	1.26	1.25
Indiana	1.11	1.12	1.12	1.15	1.15	1.14	1.14	1.17	1.17	1.15	1.19	1.20
Iowa	1.19	1.21	1.22	1.23	1.22	1.22	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.26	1.27	1.28
Kansas	1.16	1.17	1.21	1.21	1.19	1.20	1.24	1.23	1.22	1.24	1.27	1.27
Kentucky	.84	.80	.84	.96	.87	.84	.87	.95	.87	.91	.91	1.00
Louisiana	.70	.73	.68	.74	.74	.75	.74	.74	.86	.81	.77	.82
Maine	1.14	1.12	1.14	1.20	1.15	1.18	1.21	1.21	1.20	1.23	1.22	1.25
Maryland	1.06	1.04	1.08	1.07	1.08	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.10	1.10	1.15	1.16
Massachusetts	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.32	1.35	1.35	1.33	1.32	1.37	1.38	1.40	1.46
Michigan	1.11	1.11	1.12	1.12	1.14	1.12	1.12	1.15	1.16	1.18	1.20	1.21
Minnesota	1.14	1.16	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.19	1.20	1.18	1.19	1.22	1.23
Mississippi	.59	.59	.55	.59	.61	.59	.62	.64	.66	.66	.65	.70
Missouri	1.05	1.04	1.07	1.09	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.14	1.15
Montana	1.23	1.15	1.20	1.24	1.25	1.19	1.20	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.27	1.29
Nebraska	1.18	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.19	1.19	1.20	1.22	1.23	1.22	1.24	1.26
Nevada	1.30	1.35	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.36	1.34	1.34	1.37	1.40
New Hampshire	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.25	1.26	1.27	1.26	1.25	1.28
New Jersey	1.17	1.19	1.20	1.23	1.16	1.24	1.26	1.25	1.30	1.30	1.37	1.38
New Mexico	.94	.92	.93	.90	.95	.94	.92	.91	1.00	.98	.98	1.00
New York	1.17	1.19	1.21	1.19	1.21	1.22	1.22	1.24	1.22	1.24	1.25	1.26
North Carolina	.78	.79	.76	.79	.79	.80	.80		.83	.84	.84	.88
North Dakota	1.04	1.08	1.12	1.12	1.05	1.09	1.13	1.16	1.11	1.12	1.17	1.20
Ohio	1.11	1.12	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.12	1.14	1.13	1.13	1.16	1.17	1.17
Oklahoma	1.04	1.05	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.08	1.09	1.10	1.12	1.11
Oregon	1.26	1.28	1.28	1.32	1.30	1.32	1.31	1.33	1.32	1.29	1.35	1.36
Pennsylvania	1.09	1.10	1.10	1.11	1.11	1.13	1.12	1.14	1.14	1.15	1.17	1.19
Rhode Island	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.38	1.37	1.38	1.40	1.42
South Carolina	.59	.58	.54	.57	.60	.60	.59	.60	.61	.62	.65	.65
South Dakota	1.07	1.10	1.11	1.10	1.10	1.11	1.13	1.13	1.10	1.14	1.17	1.16
Tennessee	.67	.68	.68	.74	.73	.72	.73	.78	.76	.76	.77	.83
Texas	.89	.86	.87	.88	.91	.91	.88	.92	.95	.85	.93	1.00
Utah	1.25	1.30	1.34	1.32	1.35	1.32	1.33	1.35	1.31	1.34	1.34	1.37
Vermont	1.19	1.17	1.17	1.19	1.23	1.23	1.24	1.27	1.24	1.27	1.30	1.25
Virginia	.87	.89	.90	.87	.88	.90	.88	.92	.93	.93	.91	.97
Washington	1.35	1.35	1.84	1.37	1.39	1.43	1.40	1.38	1.39	1.38	1.42	1.43
West Virginia	.79	.79	.81	.84	.80	.83	.83	.83	.86	.86	.88	.89
Wisconsin	1.12	1.13	1.17	1.16	1.16	1.17	1.25	1.19	1.17	1.20	1.23	1.25
Wyoming	1.28	1.16	1.21	1.18	1.20	1.17	1.21	1.20	1.21	1.19	1.20	1.22
U.S. total	1.13	1.11	1.09	.99	1.14	1.14	1.13	1.01	1.19	1.18	1.17	1.09

Source: Farm Labor, Monthly Publication of the Statistical Reporting Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

APPENDIX F

Gross and net farm income by quarters, seasonally adjusted at annual rates, 1961–65

[In billions of dollars]

	I	II	III	IV	Year
1961					
Cash receipts from farm marketings	35.5	34.5	34.6	35.1	34.9
Nonmoney income and Government payments	3.9	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.7
Realized gross farm income	39.4	39.4	39.5	40.1	39.6
Farm production expenses	26.9	26.9	27.1	27.2	27.0
Realized net income	12.5	12.5	12.4	12.9	12.6
Net change in farm inventories	.3	.3	.4	.4	.3
Total net income	12.8	12.8	12.8	13.3	12.9
1962					
Cash receipts from farm marketings	36.3	36.3	35.9	36.2	36.2
Nonmoney income and Government payments	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8
Realized gross farm income	41.1	41.2	40.8	41.1	41.0
Farm production expenses	28.0	28.4	28.6	29.1	28.5
Realized net income	13.1	12.8	12.2	12.0	12.5
Net change in farm inventories	.5	.6	.6	.7	.6
Total net income	13.6	13.4	12.8	12.7	13.1
1963					
Cash receipts from farm marketings	37.4	37.1	37.3	37.2	37.3
Nonmoney income and Government payments	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8
Realized gross farm income	42.2	41.9	42.1	42.1	42.1
Farm production expenses	29.6	29.6	29.6	29.5	29.6
Realized net income	12.6	12.3	12.5	12.6	12.5
Net change in farm inventories	.7	.7	.6	.5	.6
Total net income	13.3	13.0	13.1	13.1	13.1

APPENDIX F—Continued

Gross and net farm income by quarters, seasonally adjusted at annual rates, 1961–65—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	I	II	III	IV	Year
1964					
Cash receipts from farm marketings	36.9	37.0	37.0	36.7	36.9
Nonmoney income and Government payments	5.2	5.3	5.3	5.4	5.3
Realized gross farm income	42.1	42.3	42.3	42.1	42.2
Farm production expenses	29.5	29.3	29.2	29.0	29.3
Realized net income	12.6	13.0	13.1	13.1	12.9
Net change in farm inventories	−.6	−.9	−1.0	−.8	−.8
Total net income	12.0	12.1	12.1	12.3	12.1
1965					
Cash receipts from farm marketings	36.7	39.5	39.3	(1)	-------
Nonmoney income and Government payments	5.5	5.5	5.5	(1)	-------
Realized gross farm income	42.2	45.0	44.8	(1)	-------
Farm production expenses	29.7	30.2	30.3	(1)	-------
Realized net income	12.5	14.8	14.5	(1)	-------
Net change in farm inventories	−.4	+.2	+.6	(1)	-------
Total net income	12.1	14.6	15.1	(1)	-------

[1] Not available.

NOTE.—Alaska and Hawaii not included. Also, details may not add to totals because of rounding.

APPENDIX G

Consumer Price Index, selected series, 1961–65—All items; all food; meat, fish, and poultry; fruits and vegetables; fresh fruits and vegetables; processed fruits and vegetables

CONSUMER PRICE INDEX—U.S. INDEX OF RETAIL PRICES, SELECTED SERIES

[1957–59—100]

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Average
All items:													
1961	103.8	103.9	103.9	103.9	103.8	104.0	104.4	104.3	104.6	104.6	104.6	104.5	104.2
1962	104.5	104.8	105.0	105.2	105.2	105.3	105.5	105.5	106.1	106.0	106.0	105.8	105.4
1963	106.0	106.1	106.2	106.2	106.2	106.6	107.1	107.1	107.1	107.2	107.4	107.6	106.7
1964	107.7	107.6	107.7	107.8	107.8	108.0	108.3	108.2	108.4	108.5	108.7	108.8	108.1
1965	108.9	108.9	109.0	109.3	109.6	110.1	110.2	110.0	110.2	110.4	110.6	--------	--------
All food:													
1961	102.8	102.9	102.7	102.7	102.3	102.5	103.4	102.7	102.6	102.5	101.9	102.0	102.6
1962	102.5	103.1	103.2	103.4	103.2	103.5	103.8	103.8	104.8	104.3	104.1	103.5	103.6
1963	104.7	105.0	104.6	104.3	104.2	105.0	106.2	106.0	105.4	104.9	105.1	105.4	105.1
1964	105.8	106.0	105.7	105.7	105.5	106.2	107.2	106.9	107.2	106.9	106.8	106.9	106.4
1965	106.6	106.6	106.9	107.3	107.9	110.1	110.9	110.1	109.7	109.7	109.7	--------	--------
Meats, poultry, and fish:													
1961	101.2	101.4	101.0	100.2	98.5	97.4	97.7	98.3	99.2	99.5	98.5	98.5	99.3
1962	99.8	100.6	100.6	100.1	99.6	99.7	100.8	102.6	106.3	104.1	103.5	102.5	101.7
1963	102.5	102.1	100.7	98.3	98.0	98.4	100.2	101.4	101.5	100.4	99.7	99.2	100.2
1964	98.3	98.3	97.2	97.0	96.6	96.8	98.9	99.2	101.4	100.6	99.5	99.0	98.6
1965	99.2	99.5	99.6	99.8	100.3	106.4	109.2	109.8	109.8	108.9	108.5	--------	--------
Fruits and vegetables:													
1961	102.0	102.9	103.4	106.3	107.0	109.5	111.8	107.1	102.3	99.4	98.4	99.8	104.2
1962	100.6	102.9	104.4	108.6	109.4	111.9	109.9	105.2	102.2	102.0	102.1	100.2	105.0
1963	106.4	109.4	109.6	112.0	113.9	115.6	118.7	114.2	108.1	106.3	108.2	109.8	111.0
1964	112.4	113.9	115.1	115.7	115.7	120.2	122.3	117.3	112.2	111.7	113.0	114.5	115.3
1965	112.4	113.3	115.3	117.6	121.4	125.9	124.3	114.6	108.5	108.5	109.9	--------	--------
Fresh fruits and vegetables:													
1961	101.0	101.6	101.9	106.3	107.5	111.5	115.1	107.8	100.5	96.2	94.7	96.9	103.5
1962	98.3	102.2	104.7	111.8	113.2	117.2	114.1	106.9	102.6	102.3	102.6	99.6	106.3
1963	108.3	111.9	111.8	115.1	117.4	119.7	124.1	116.6	107.0	104.0	106.7	109.0	112.6
1964	113.2	115.6	117.7	118.6	119.0	127.4	131.4	123.0	114.5	114.1	116.4	119.4	119.2
1965	115.7	118.2	122.2	126.4	133.5	141.6	138.6	121.2	110.2	109.7	111.2	--------	--------
Processed fruits and vegetables:													
1961	103.9	105.4	106.2	106.4	106.1	106.0	106.0	105.9	105.5	105.3	105.1	105.0	105.6
1962	104.6	104.2	103.9	103.1	102.7	102.6	102.6	102.3	101.7	101.5	101.3	101.2	102.6
1963	103.2	105.2	105.8	106.5	107.7	108.5	109.3	110.0	110.2	110.4	111.1	111.4	108.3
1964	112.0	112.2	112.2	112.5	111.9	111.4	111.0	110.3	109.6	109.1	109.0	108.6	110.8
1965	108.6	107.5	106.9	106.7	106.2	105.8	106.1	106.4	106.7	107.4	108.8	--------	--------

APPENDIX H—STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF LABOR, W. WILLARD WIRTZ, ON THE TERMINATION OF PUBLIC LAW 78; AND REGULATION GOVERNING APPLICATIONS FOR FOREIGN WORKERS FOR TEMPORARY AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT IN THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The 88th Congress was a humanitarian Congress. It passed the Civil Rights Act, ending a century of racial discrimination. It passed the antipoverty bill, declaring war on mankind's oldest enemy. Quietly, with little public attention at the time, it also decided to stop the Mexico bracero program, ending 14 years of a system that had too often disregarded human values.

Public Law No. 78 was adopted in 1951, and was amended from time to time after that. This law provided for the importation of Mexican nationals to work on agricultural crops in this country. A series of treaties between the Governments of the United States and Mexico completed these arrangements.

Under these statutory and treaty provisions, hundreds of thousands of Mexicans have come into this country. They have been employed, from time to time, in over half the States. This year, some 180,000 braceros were brought in, for average stays of about 3 months. The largest number of these have been used in California, and most of the others in Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas.

The explanation given for this program has been that the work the braceros do won't be done by U.S. workers. It includes stoop labor in vegetable, sugarbeet, and cotton fields; the picking of citrus fruits, and other agricultural labor.

A good deal of this work is unquestionably hard and unpleasant. But this is only part of the story. The rest of it is that the wage rates which have been paid for these jobs have been less than the rates paid for other kinds of work which are just as hard and just as objectionable. And the working conditions maintained by some of the growers have been so bad that church and civic groups and labor organizations have protested bitterly.

There has been increasing complaint against the importation of these hundreds of thousands of foreign workers—being paid wage rates as low as 60 cents an hour—while about 4 million U.S. men and women are unemployed.

There has also been accumulating evidence that U.S. workers will be available to do this work if decent working conditions are provided and if it is paid for on terms in line with those for other work that is equally hard and unpleasant.

The 88th Congress, taking these factors into account, decided to terminate Public Law 78. The users of braceros were put on notice that this supply of foreign labor was, by Congress decision, to be cut off. All braceros who entered the United States under that law will leave when it expires on December 31.

It has subsequently been proposed, however, that alternative arrangements be made to continue the Mexican bracero program in practical effect by other devices.

The various proposals to extend Public Law 78 by administrative action of one kind or another fly squarely in the face of the decision made by Congress. These proposals must be, and they are, rejected.

All that is warranted is that there be responsible action—by all agencies concerned, public as well as private—to effect an orderly transition to the use of U.S. workers in these areas where reliance has previously been placed on foreign workers.

Account is properly and necessarily taken, in this connection, of the fact that there are presently about 15,000 other foreign workers (not Mexican) in this country. Most of them are from the British West Indies, and are working in Florida. There are also some 1,200 Japanese nationals in California, and 125 Filipinos. These workers have been admitted under another statute—Public Law 414—which is the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. They are here today under 6-month (or longer) permits, which still have some time to run.

In this situation, and on the basis of the public hearings held within the past 3 weeks, I have adopted this program under the authority conferred on the Secretary of Labor:

First, there will be no administrative extension of the situation existing under Public Law No. 78.

Second, the responsibilities of the Secretary of Labor under Public Law 414 will be strictly administered in accordance with the regulations which are being issued today.

These regulations specify the terms and conditions which must be offered to domestic workers before certification will be made for the admission of foreign workers under Public Law 414.

These terms and conditions are set after due consideration of the evidence introduced at the hearings which were held at Washington, D.C., on November 30, 1964; Miami, Fla., on December 2; Dallas, Tex., on December 4; and San Francisco, Calif., on December 7, 8, and 9.

The key elements in these regulations is the specifying of wage levels which are consistent with the principles of Public Law 414: that foreign workers will not be admitted where unemployed domestic workers are available, or under circumstances which would have an adverse effect upon domestic wage levels.

The specified wage levels vary from State to State. The range, for the period starting April 1, 1965, is between $1.15 per hour and $1.40 per hour.

Account has been taken, in specifying these rates, of the different history and the different present levels of wages in the various States. Consideration has been given the evidence of the past and present effect of the use of foreign labor on prevailing wage levels.

These regulations do not require the payment of the specified rates to any workers. They simply provide that before a grower will be permitted to bring in foreign labor he must offer these rates to domestic workers.

The rate specifications are based solely on the application of the statute which is involved here. It is also properly noted that no lower rates would be consistent with the national policy of affording the fullest practicable employment opportunity to U.S. citizens. Our commitment to ourselves to end poverty in this country would not permit a decision that we will bring in workers at wage rates below the $1.15 to $1.40 range (about $2,500 for a full year's work) before offering at least that amount to domestic workers.

The regulations also recognize, by limiting certifications to 120 days, that the only justification for bringing in labor is to meet special peak conditions in the highly seasonal agricultural industry.

There is also recognition in the regulations that terms and conditions of employment other than wages are important in the maintenance of decent working conditions.

Special provisions, including lower specified wage levels (90 cents to $1.25) are made for the period between January 1, 1965 and March 31, 1965. These take account of the practical necessity of an orderly and equitable transition here. By using what are substantially the prevailing wage levels for this period, in those States where there are peak demands during the next 3 months, these interim provisions eliminate what might otherwise be prejudicial differences between the effect of the new regulations on growers in various States.

It is recognized that the use of any foreign nationals under the terms of these regulations is subject to the approval of their governments. Consultation with the Government of Mexico regarding measures for the protection of the rights of Mexican nationals under these regulations will be carried out.

Third, an active domestic labor recruitment program has been instituted and must be continued.

The issuance of the new regulations is essential to the orderly administration of Public Law 414, but it does not imply that there will be any large scale use of foreign workers in the future. To the contrary. It is expected that such use will be very greatly reduced, and hopefully eliminated.

The dimensions of this manpower change are, at the same time, fully recognized. It will require the complete cooperation of the growers, the interested labor organizations, and the employment service offices to effectuate this change. The full competence of the U.S. Employment Service, and of the various State services, is pledged to this purpose.

The stakes here are high: tens of thousands of jobs for otherwise unemployed men and women; the survival of a great many business enterprises; the winning of a fight for human decency.

REGULATIONS GOVERNING APPLICATIONS FOR FOREIGN WORKERS FOR TEMPORARY AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT IN THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(2)(ii), I hereby amend 20 C.F.R. 602.10 to read as follows:

"(a) Any agricultural employer with a foreseeable labor shortage remaining after reasonable efforts utilizing all sources of available domestic workers, including the interstate clearance process, may request through the appropriate State agency the certification of need for foreign labor. Before such certification will be made by the appropriate Regional Office of the Bureau of Employment Security, it must be shown that:

"(1) Reasonable efforts have been made and will continue to be made to obtain domestic workers for the period for which these workers are requested. 'Reasonable efforts' will include full use of (i) day-haul operations in accordance with the general practices of other employers in the area, or, in the absence of local day-haul operations, day-haul operations in accordance with the general practices within the State; (ii) other appropriate recruitment efforts; and (iii) the interstate clearance process for recruitment in areas within a reasonable distance, including use of the annual worker plan, where practical. (In order to recruit workers from out of the State, a minimum period of 15 days prior to the date of need will be required by the labor-supply State agency for positive recruitment. In addition, the offer for local workers must be at the same rate which is specified on the date of need in the clearance order, or a request for foreign workers will be denied.)

"(2) Employment of such labor will not adversely affect the wages or working conditions of domestic workers similarly employed.

"(b) On and after January 1, 1965, the State agency will not process a request for workers more than 60 days nor less than 30 days prior to the date of need; and such request shall be reviewed by the State agency not more than 15 days prior to the date of need and the State agency will advise the appropriate Bureau of Employment Security regional office whether the conditions necessitating foreign workers previously certified to by the State agency still prevail, or whether the request should be canceled or revised.

"(c) No certification shall be made for the admission of foreign workers under section 214 of the Immigration and Nationality Act for agricultural employment in the United States unless the following criteria have been followed and adhered to:

"(1) Effective January 1, 1965, and through March 31, 1965:

"(A) Employment offered to domestic workers must provide for wage payment rates which are no less than the applicable amount listed on schedule A for the State in which the work is being performed, except that where the prevailing rate for the crop activity in the area is higher, the higher rate shall be paid. Piece rates shall be designed to produce hourly earnings at least equivalent to the prescribed hourly rates and in no event shall the worker be paid less than the prescribed hourly rate.

"(B) Except as otherwise specifically provided, domestic workers must be offered, as a minimum, all the terms and conditions of employment that are offered to Mexican workers under the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951, as amended, including a written contract embodying those conditions.

"(C) Family housing must be provided where feasible and necessary.

"(2) Effective April 1, 1965:

"(A) Employment offered to domestic workers must provide for wage payment rates which are no less than the applicable amount listed on schedule B for the State in which the work is being performed, except that where the prevailing rate for the crop activity in the area is higher, the higher rate shall be paid. Piece rates shall be designed to produce hourly earnings at least equivalent to the prescribed hourly rates and in no event shall the worker be paid less than the prescribed hourly rate.

"(B) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this section, domestic workers must be offered, as a minimum, all the terms and conditions of employment that are offered to Mexican workers under the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951, as amended, including a written contract embodying those conditions.

"(C) Family housing must be provided where feasible and necessary.

"(3) Effective January 1, 1965:

"(A) Reasonable costs of transportation to and from the place of employment must be borne by the employer.

"(B) No certification shall be made permitting the employment of any foreign worker for a period exceeding 120 days; nor shall certification be made with respect to any petition of any employer which would result in the employment of foreign workers by such employer for more than 120 days in any calendar year, except in specific cases, when necessary to avoid undue hardship, in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Department of Labor.

"(C) No certification shall be made with respect to the petition of any employer who has been found by the Secretary of Labor or his designated representative to have failed, without good cause, to comply with the work contracts entered into with any domestic or foreign agricultural workers, or who has in his employ or is found to have had in his employ after the effective date of these regulations, any alien when such employer knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such foreign worker is not lawfully within the United States.

"(D) When domestic workers become available for jobs in which foreign workers are employed, the domestic workers must be given preference.

"(E) No foreign workers shall be assigned to fill any job to which referral of U.S. workers would be prohibited under regulations or policies of the U.S. Department of Labor governing the referral of workers to jobs involved in strikes or other labor disputes.

"(F) These criteria shall not be applicable to Basque sheepherders."

Schedule A	*Wage rate*
Arizona	$1.05
California	1.25
Connecticut	1.25
Florida	.95
Massachusetts	1.25
New Mexico	.90
Texas	.90

Schedule B	*Wage rate*
Arizona	$1.25
Arkansas	1.15
California	1.40
Colorado	1.30
Connecticut	1.40
Florida	1.15
Indiana	1.25
Kansas	1.40
Maine	1.25
Massachusetts	1.30
Michigan	1.25
Minnesota	1.40
Montana	1.40
Nebraska	1.40
New Hampshire	1.30
New Jersey	1.30
New Mexico	1.15
New York	1.30
Oregon	1.30
Rhode Island	1.30
South Dakota	1.40
Texas	1.15
Utah	1.40
Vermont	1.30
Virginia	1.15
West Virginia	1.15
Wisconsin	1.30
Wyoming	1.25

APPENDIX I—FINAL REPORT OF THE CALIFORNIA FARM LABOR PANEL TO THE SECRETARY OF LABOR, DECEMBER 1, 1965

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF LABOR W. WILLARD WIRTZ ON THE CALIFORNIA FARM LABOR PANEL REPORT, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., DECEMBER 1, 1965

The California Farm Labor Panel reports a highly successful year for California agriculture and American farmworkers.

Agricultural income has remained generally good.

Domestic employment is up substantially.

Prices of California's fresh fruits and vegetables have remained generally steady.

The replacement of "braceros" with domestic workers has been a boon to the economy of the State and the Nation.

Predictions that California's agricultural industry could not function without the massive importation of foreign farm labor proved inaccurate.

The year has been a successful transitional period for all concerned—farmworkers, growers, and consumers.

During the summer and fall of 1965, there were about 20,000 more Americans working on California farms than at the same time a year ago. Their wages were higher, their working conditions somewhat improved. Most of the money they earned was spent in California.

Many of the State's crops, including lettuce, oranges, and cantaloups, were harvested without braceros.

Farm income has been good this year. Governor Brown has estimated that California agricultural income will be about $3.6 billion in 1965—slightly higher than in 1964.

Some loss from labor shortages occurred in strawberries and asparagus. Wages in both crops were the lowest paid in the State and well below the average for all crops. Despite the losses, California strawberry growers grossed 5 percent more than in 1959–64 average, and asparagus growers grossed nearly $1 million more than in 1964, but slightly below the 1959–64 average.

The processing tomato crop was valued 32 percent higher than the 1959–64 average despite a sharp reduction in acreage in response to supply and demand pressures.

The prices American consumers have paid for California agricultural products have, for the most part, remained fairly steady. Some have gone up; others have dropped.

The Consumer Price Index for October shows fresh fruit and vegetable prices 3.9 percent lower than a year earlier. The national average prices of 12 of 26 fresh and processed fruits and vegetables in season were lower in October than during the same month in 1964.

Prices of most crops that formerly relied heavily on foreign labor have fallen, although there have been exceptions. Lettuce, for example, soared for a few weeks in June to 20 cents a head above its normal price when abnormal weather conditions caused a shortage. The price then dropped back to normal and has remained there ever since.

The end of the mass importation of foreign workers in California has also figured in the Nation's balance-of-payments picture. The Farm Labor Panel estimates that $50 million will remain in the country as a result of the new farm labor policy.

While recounting the accomplishments made on the California farm labor front this year, the Panel's report charts a course for further progress.

I fully agree and endorse its recommendations that call for—

Improving the Department of Labor's data gathering and placement operations.

Increasing efforts in both the public and private sectors of the Nation to improve housing for farmworkers.

Extending coverage of labor legislation, such as minimum wage and unemployment insurance laws, to farmworkers.

Payment of more adequate wages to workers and the development by employers of better personnel practices, training, and supervision.

Agriculture's labor-management relations and manpower policies, like those of other industries, are adequate and effective only if they attract and retain a labor force sufficient to meet its needs.

In conclusion, I want to recognize the contribution of some of those who played prominent and helpful roles during this historic year of transition.

The majority of California's farmers who cooperated in the changeover to the use of domestic farmworkers.

The American workers who appeared in California fields in record numbers.

Constructive critics, such as Governor Brown and those members of the California delegation in Congress who protested strongly and properly and effectively when particular problems arose, but who respected the action of Congress in terminating the bracero program.

Panel Members Benjamin Aaron, Daniel Aldrich, and Arthur Ross, who tackled a difficult assignment and performed it in an admirable way.

The Mexican Government for its totally understanding attitude in an extremely difficult situation, proving once again that it is a good neighbor.

FINAL REPORT OF THE CALIFORNIA FARM LABOR PANEL

During 1965, California agriculture has been undergoing a change of such magnitude that it may properly be characterized as revolutionary. This change has been in the employment of farm labor. It has resulted in a transition from heavy reliance upon foreign contract laborers (of whom nearly all have been Mexican braceros) in the cultivation and harvesting of many major crops to the recruitment and use of a domestic force of farmworkers for those purposes. Despite the magnitude of the changes this transition is not yet complete. Moreover, it has been accompanied by a variety of problems of adjustment. Nevertheless in our judgment, the program initiated by the Secretary of Labor to substitute American residents for foreign contract workers in the California farm labor force has been a substantial success.

The purpose of this report is fourfold: First, to review briefly the origins and development of the use of foreign contract laborers in California agriculture, together with the reasons which led the Congress to allow legislation permitting that system to lapse; second, to describe the program developed by the Secretary of Labor to carry out his understanding of the congressional intent; third, to set forth, fully and frankly, the successes and failures of the Secretary's program as we view them at this time; and finally, to present a series of recommendations which would, we believe, not only secure for California growers and processors a wholly domestic labor force adequate for their needs, but also raise farm occupations to a level of dignity and economic viability they have not yet achieved.

History of foreign farm labor in California

California agriculture has been characterized throughout its history by crop specialization, large-scale landownership, and reliance on hired farm labor, rather than on the family farm which shaped the structure of so much of the Nation's agriculture. These characteristics were evident almost 100 years ago and persist today. The nature of specialty crops has changed, the average size of farms has increased here as elsewhere, and the sources of hired farm labor have been varied and many. But the essential nature of this structure has not been altered.

When California agriculture changed in the last century from an extensive system relying largely on cattle and sheep to an intensive one of crop cultivation, its dependence on seasonally hired farmworkers increased. Its needs were met in a variety of ways by a succession of different immigrant groups.

Originally, the industry relied primarily upon Chinese labor. With the exclusion of the Chinese in 1882, it turned to Japanese workers. These in turn were shut out in 1906, to be followed by the Hindustani and later the Filipinos, of whom the majority in this country were farm laborers as late as 1930. At one period or another, laborers of European origin have figured prominently in this history: Italians, Spaniards, Portuguese, Russians, Germans, Armenians, and others. And virtually all Californians of Mexican descent who were engaged in agriculture were employed as farm laborers, as were those Mexicans who immigrated here. The latter have been an ever-present source of labor for much of the State, whether or not there existed a formal legal immigration policy to arrange their entry.

During the depression years, the State received great waves of domestic immigrants: the "Okies," "Arkies," and Texans who were refugees from the failing farm economy. They more than filled the need for hired laborers until the war years of the 1940's. The loss of workers to service industries in the cities and the need for increased food and fiber production aroused concern over possible shortages in labor supply. The number of migrant farm workers from other States dwindled, the Japanese farmers and family workers were relocated, and the growers urged the Government to import more Mexican workers.

Beginning with a group of 1,500 in September 1942, Mexican nationals were admitted for temporary agricultural employment in California and other States under various authority. Early in 1943, Public Law 45, the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, was enacted to increase the number. This was not done without controversy. Some groups argued that there was no need for additional labor and that just as the worker had to face the risk of shorter periods of employment and the competition of foreign workers, so the farmer should assume the risks of a tight labor market and the hazards of weather.

Public Law 45 was superseded by Public Law 229 in 1944, the peak wartime year for Mexican workers. Public Law 229 was followed by Public Law 893 in 1948, and in 1951, during the Korean conflict, Public Law 78 was enacted. All of these laws were designed to make additional seasonal workers from Mexico available. However, the number of Mexican entrants into California under these programs was far less than the number of such workers in its fields. From 1942 to 1956, when more vigorous enforcement of immigration policies commenced, the number of illegal entrants, or wetbacks, added significantly to the total used.

Since 1956 the number of Mexican national workers, while fluctuating, has generally declined in California agriculture. Public Law 78 was scheduled to expire originally on December 1, 1953. It was extended, however, from time to time until Congress decided that on balance the law's undesirable economic and social effects outweighed its value to the growers, and on December 31, 1964, the law was allowed to expire.

In his statement on the termination of Public Law 78, issued December 19, 1964, the Secretary of Labor commented in part:

"The explanation given for this program has been that the work the braceros do won't be done by U.S. workers. It includes 'stoop labor' in vegetable, sugarbeet, and cottonfields, the picking of citrus fruits, and other agricultural labor.

"A good deal of this work is unquestionably hard and unpleasant. But this is only part of the story. The rest of it is that the wage rates which have been paid for these jobs have been less than the rates paid for other kinds of work which are just as hard and just as objectionable. And the working conditions maintained by some of the growers have been so bad that church and civic groups and labor organizations have protested bitterly.

"There has been increasing complaint against the importation of these hundreds of thousands of foreign workers being paid wage rates as low as 60 cents an hour while about 4 million U.S. men and women are unemployed.

"There has also been accumulating evidence that U.S. workers will be available to do this work if decent working conditions are provided and if it is paid for on terms in line with those for other work that is equally hard and unpleasant."

The Secretary's program

The guiding purposes of the Secretary's program for transition to a wholly domestic farm labor force have been to carry out the will of Congress and at the same time to allow for the harvesting of crops without undue loss to growers and processors.

During the spring, Secretary Wirtz moved to assist agricultural employers in making the transition by permitting a limited importation of Mexican workers under Public Law 414. He made it plain that chronic or large-scale importation of braceros through this device would subvert the intent of Congress and could not be countenanced. He also emphasized that farm employers would be eligible for supplementary foreign labor only if they had made full use of domestic labor available and had cooperated fully with Federal and State agencies in domestic recruitment. To provide a meaningful test of recruitment possibilities, criteria wage rates were established. The minimum hourly rate in California was $1.40, and the Secretary stipulated that piecework rates would have to provide at least that amount in hourly earnings before an application for Mexican labor could be considered. Additional criteria included provision for transportation, adequate free housing, meals at cost, and written contracts.

On April 15, 1965, Secretary Wirtz appointed the California farm labor panel, charging it to assist him in carrying out these policies by determining facts and making specific recommendations to him regarding applications and arrangements for supplemental labor. The panel was further charged to "make recommendations for any further procedures which will effectuate the purpose of serving fully all agricultural labor needs, of relying on domestic workers for this so far as they are available, and of maintaining adequate agricultural wages and working and living conditions."

In response to the Secretary's instructions, the panel has held hearings, gathered facts, and made recommendations regarding needs for additional agricultural labor; it has engaged in informal efforts with all parties concerned to gain acceptance of the Secretary's policy and to encourage and assist in its implementation; and from its experience, it has formulated certain recommendations that appear at the end of this report.

The California farm labor experience, 1965

Although there have been localized difficulties, 1965 has been an excellent year for California agriculture. The crops have been brought in with much less recourse to braceros than last year, and at the same time, grower gross revenues have generally been higher. Net figures are not yet available, but they will undoubtedly reflect increased costs of wages, recruitment, machinery, and other items.

Manpower

Tens of thousands of additional jobs have been made available for domestic workers, who in 1965 accounted for 97.3 percent of the man-years of labor in California's seasonal hired agricultural employment.[1] Contract foreign labor provided only 2.7 percent of the total. The significance of these figures becomes apparent when they are compared to the 1959–64 averages, which show that domestic labor[2] accounted for 73.7 percent of total seasonal man-years, with foreign labor providing 26.3 percent. As shown by table I, seasonal domestic man-years increased from an average of 100,500 in 1959–64 to 115,000 in 1965, while foreign man-years dropped from 35,780 to 3,200.

---

[1] The source of labor data is the State of California Department of Employment, "Seasonal Employment in California Agriculture, Man-Years of Foreign and Domestic Labor, 1959–65," Oct. 1, 1965, and data subsequently available from the same source.

[2] A substantial number of domestic farmworkers in California this year, as in the past, are Mexican green carders, that is, Mexican nationals who have been accorded the status of permanent resident aliens under our immigration laws and who therefore have the right to work in this country in any pursuit. The number of Mexican permanent resident aliens in California on Jan. 1, 1965, was approximately 300,000, slightly more than the number who registered on that date in 1964. There are no figures on how many of this total were engaged in agricultural work. Unlike the braceros, however, green carders are legal residents of the United States, and those who work in agriculture are hired in the same way as are native domestic workers.

The table shows a considerable drop in total seasonal man-years during the period. Several factors are responsible, including increased mechanization and reduced acreage in a number of crops, as well as a generally more stable use of labor, with a larger proportion of people getting steadier work for longer periods.

Table II shows that the increase in domestic seasonal employment in 1965, as compared with the 1959–64 average, has varied from month to month. It amounted to approximately 18,000 in March, 37,000 in June, and 21,000 in October.

The changeover from foreign to domestic labor appears most strikingly in the composition of the seasonal work force in specific localities at comparable dates for this year and last. For example, on June 27, 1964, there were 3,970 seasonal domestic workers in Salinas and 10,000 braceros. A year later the work force was composed of 8,230 domestic workers and only 1,660 foreign workers.

The data in table III suggest that most of the additional seasonal domestic workers were local[3] workers. This is particularly true of the peak months of June, July, and August. In June, 1965, there were 20,000 more local domestic workers than the average for June 1959–64.

Although monthly comparisons of this year and the 1959–64 average employment of local domestic farm labor show little pattern, the increase averaged 10,300 more local workers a month this year. A peak of 115,600 local seasonal workers were in the fields this June as compared with a peak average of 94,900 for June the previous 5 years.

There was a fairly steady increase of intrastate migratory workers in each month of this year as compared to the 1959–64 average. The average monthly increase was 5,200 workers, with the peak in September, when there were 34,900 intrastate workers in the fields.

The increase of interstate migratory workers, although steady, was not as marked as that of local and intrastate workers. The average monthly increase over 1959–64 was 3,700 with the peak again in September, when approximately 19,000 interstate workers were in California.

It appears that the most important factor in attracting additional domestic workers to farm labor this year was a higher wage level. Data in the State of California Department of Employment, DE 881–A report, "California Weekly Farm Labor Report," indicate that in general wages tended to approach, and in some cases exceeded, the Secretary's criteria of $1.40 an hour minimum, through either hourly wages or piece rates, particularly in those areas where growers requested foreign workers or have contemplated requests.

Undoubtedly, a second factor bringing more domestic workers into harvest labor was their understanding, gained from local and national publicity, that they were no longer competing with Mexican labor for agricultural jobs because the bracero program had been terminated.

The decrease in foreign workers and the rise in domestic employment has undoubtedly had significant economic ramifications for the balance-of-payments problem. Average bracero earnings for 1959–63 were approximately $81 million, of which a large portion certainly ended up in Mexico. In 1964, the figure was $78 million, while in 1965, bracero earnings dropped to an estimated $12 million.[4]

On the reasonable assumption that approximately 75 percent of bracero earnings in the United States returns to Mexico, we can estimate that from 1964 to 1965 the outflow of money from this country has been reduced by about $50 million. At the same time we should note that earnings of domestic workers have been augmented by tens of millions of dollars. The multiplier effect of the spending of these wages in the community makes the economic impact of keeping these wages at home even more important, and should particularly be borne in mind in appraising export losses suffered by growers through inability to harvest all of their crops.

TABLE I.—*Seasonal employment in California agriculture*

[Man-years of foreign and domestic labor, 1959–65 [1]]

Average	Total seasonal man-years	Seasonal domestic man-years	Domestic as percent of total	Contract foreign man-years	Foreign as percent of total
1959–64	136,280	100,500	73.7	35,780	26.3
1965	118,200	115,000	97.3	3,200	2.7

[1] 1965 data are based on employment through mid-September and on projections for the rest of the year.

Source: State of California, Department of Employment, Research and Statistics Report 851, No. 2, "Seasonal Employment in California Agriculture, 1959–65," prepared Oct. 1, 1965.

TABLE II.—*Employment of seasonal agricultural workers in California by nationality, 1959–65* [1]

	Total seasonal workers		Domestic workers		Contract foreign workers	
	Average 1959–64	1965	Average 1959–64	1965	Average 1959–64	1965
Jan. 15	99,400	90,500	79,600	89,600	19,800	900
Feb. 15	86,100	83,400	66,300	83,400	19,800	0
Mar. 15	76,500	74,800	56,100	74,200	20,400	600
Apr. 15	95,800	85,800	70,100	85,700	25,700	100
May 15	156,300	141,200	114,000	140,400	42,300	800
June 15	173,000	167,300	126,700	163,900	46,300	3,400
July 15	163,100	143,000	123,400	142,700	39,600	300
Aug. 15	173,500	147,800	130,600	147,200	42,900	600
Sept. 15	226,300	179,300	158,500	167,900	67,800	11,400
Oct. 15	187,900	163,000	126,500	147,600	61,300	13,400
Nov. 15	102,400		77,400		25,000	
Dec. 15	96,100		77,700		18,400	

[1] Based on midmonth estimates—employment as reported during the midweek of each month (the week containing the 12th).

Source: State of California, Department of Employment, Research and Statistics Section, Report 851 No. 1, table I, prepared Sept. 21, 1965, and data subsequently available from the same source.

TABLE III.—*Employment of seasonal domestic agricultural workers in California by type of worker, 1959–65* [1]

	Total domestic seasonal workers		Local workers		Intrastate migratory workers		Interstate migratory workers	
	Average 1959–64	1965	Average 1959–64	1965	Average 1959–64	1965	Average 1959–64	1965
January	79,600	89,600	63,800	70,300	11,500	13,900	4,300	5,400
February	66,300	83,400	53,600	64,100	9,000	13,800	3,700	5,500
March	56,100	74,200	45,100	56,700	7,400	12,100	3,500	5,500
April	70,100	85,700	55,700	63,900	9,500	14,800	4,800	7,000
May	114,000	140,400	88,200	101,200	17,900	25,600	7,900	13,600
June	126,700	163,900	94,900	115,600	21,500	30,500	10,300	17,800
July	123,400	142,700	91,000	97,500	21,700	27,100	10,800	18,100
August	130,600	147,200	92,700	101,200	25,500	29,400	12,400	16,600
September	158,500	167,900	111,600	114,000	31,500	34,900	15,400	19,000
October	126,500	149,600	94,000	109,800	22,700	27,900	9,800	11,900
November	77,400		63,000		9,500		4,800	
December	77,700		63,600		10,100		4,000	

[1] Based on midmonth estimates, employment as reported during the midweek of each month (week containing the 12th).

---

[3] "Locals" are those recruited from the immediate crop area.

[4] Bracero earnings data supplied by State of California Department of Employment Research and Statistics Section.

Crops

The analysis of the farm labor experience in California this year would not be complete without a consideration of trends in individual crop production and values. Data for the major crops traditionally relying on bracero labor are given below for 1959–64 and 1965.[5]

For the majority of crops surveyed, acreage was down this year. In some instances this was because of concern over the availability of harvest labor, in others because of market factors, and in still others because of informal quotas imposed by processors. Changes in total value were not uniform, and varied by crop. Where crop value increased over previous years, it did so despite substantial reductions in harvested acreage. Although in all cases total man-years of labor were down, the decrease in contract foreign man-years ranged from 70 to 100 percent and the increase in domestic man-years went as high as 297 percent over the 1961–64 average.

Tomatoes for processing: This has been an excellent year for processing tomatoes. The harvest is well on its way to a new record in per-acre yields, and despite over 26,000 fewer acres this year compared with the 1959–64 average, production has exceeded expectations, with estimated total crop value up by more than $10 million over last year and $20 million over the 1959–64 average.

Specifically, harvested acreage was 18.7 percent below the 1959–64 average, with a yield 18 percent higher. The higher yield has to some extent offset the cutbacks in acreage, and total production was only 3.6 percent below the average for the previous 5 years. Some of the decrease in acreage this year was necessitated by the processors' stock carryover from last year and their predicted inability to handle more than about 110,000 acres of production in 1965. It is also apparent that some decrease was due to uncertainty on the part of growers and processors as to the availability of an adequate labor supply.

Total man-years in the harvest decreased 27.8 percent from the 1961–64 average, with contract foreign man-years dropping 70.2 percent and domestic man-years increasing 131 percent.

Braceros were admitted to the State in significant numbers for only one crop—the tomato harvest. An analysis of how these braceros were used is appended to this report. The data indicate that the requests for bracero labor substantially exceeded the actual need, a conclusion that also applies to a number of other crops.

With this year's experience in mind, a spokesman for the California Tomato Growers Association recently announced that his association "will never again ask for braceros." The spokesman cited three factors that influenced the growers' new position: Success in harvesting crops with a greatly increased number of U.S. workers and only half the Mexican nationals they had claimed to need to avoid disastrous losses; the development of mechanical harvesters; and a desire to be free of Government regulations.[6] Governor Brown has recently expressed the conviction that next year "the tomato harvest will be accomplished entirely by domestic labor in combination with mechanized harvesters."[7]

Table IV shows the data for the processing tomato harvest.

TABLE IV.—*Tomatoes for processing*

A. ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, YIELD, AND CROP VALUE, 1959–64 AND 1965

	Average 1959–64	1965	Change (average 1959–64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Harvested acreage	142,617	116,000	−26,617	−18.7
Production (tons)	2,541,000	2,450,000	−91,000	−3.6
Average yield (tons/acre)	17.8	21.0	+3.2	+18.0
Total value	$65,558,000	$86,000,000	+$20,442,000	+31.2

B. MAN-YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT 1961–64[1] AND 1965

	Average 1961–64	1965	Change (average 1961–64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Total man-years:				
Domestic	[1] 1,749.3	4,041.7	+2,292.4	+131.0
Foreign	[1] 6,557.1	1,956.0	−4,601.1	−70.2
Total	[1] 8,306.4	5,997.7	−2,308.7	+27.8

[1] A breakdown between domestic and foreign labor usage by crop activity was not maintained prior to 1961 by the California Department of Employment.

Strawberries: As with tomatoes, a marked change in the strawberry harvest occurred this year. There was a 100.5 percent increase in domestic man-years and an 89.5 percent decrease in foreign man-years. Total man-years for the harvest dropped 40.9 percent.

Harvested acreage and production were down this year, but average yield rose 13.1 percent above 1959–64. Total value of the crop was 5 percent above the 6-year average.

There was some crop loss in strawberries and in asparagus this year. Some of the loss may be attributed to a scarcity of workers, which in turn was partly the result of poor weather at the beginning of the harvest. Many of the workers who were prepared to work the strawberry and asparagus harvests were unwilling to stand by during the harvesting delay caused by rain. A second factor in the labor shortage at the critical harvest-time was the long delay between the authorization for bracero labor and its arrival—a delay caused by the lengthy negotiations between the growers and the Mexican Government. Poor housing and inadequate piece rates contributed to the difficulties.

The detailed data for strawberries are in table V.

TABLE V.—*Strawberries*

A. ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, YIELD, AND CROP VALUE, 1959–64 AND 1965

	Average, 1959–64	1965	Change (average 1959–64)	
			Absolute	Percent
A-1. All strawberries:				
Harvested acreage	10,950	8,300	−2,650	−24.2
Production (pounds)	202,991,000	174,000,000	−28,991,000	−14.3
Average yield (pounds per acre)	18,538	20,964	+2,426	+13.1
Total value	$38,413,000	$40,349,000	+$1,936,000	+5.0
A-2. Fresh market strawberries:				
Production (pounds)	125,525,000	103,000,000	−22,525,000	−17.9
Total value	$28,478,000	$28,634,000	+$156,000	+.5
A-3. Processing strawberries:				
Production (pounds)	77,466,000	71,000,000	−6,466,000	−8.3
Total value	$9,935,000	$11,715,000	+$1,780,000	+17.9

B. MAN-YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT, 1961–64[1] AND 1965

	Average, 1961–64	1965	Change (average, 1961–64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
All strawberries:				
Total man-years:				
Domestic	[1] 1,166.7	2,399.0	+1,172.3	+100.5
Foreign	[1] 3,396.7	357.5	−3,039.2	−89.5
Total	[1] 4,563.4	2,696.5	−1,866.9	−40.9

[1] A breakdown between domestic and foreign labor usage by crop activity was not maintained prior to 1961 by the California Department of Employment.

---

[5] Crop data in this section are based on California Crop and Livestock Reporting Service, "Harvested Acreage, Production, Price, and Value for Selected California Crops by Labor Use, 1959–63 Average and 1964–65," Sept. 22, 1965, and 1965 data subsequently available from the reporting service.

[6] "Tomato Growers' Switch * * * 'No need for Mexicans,'" San Francisco Chronicle, Friday, Oct. 8, 1965, p. 6.

[7] Press release, LCH, No. 966, Oct. 15, 1965, p. 1.

Lettuce: A 9.6-percent increase in harvested acreage of winter lettuce, coupled with a 1.7-percent increase in average yield, resulted to an 11.2-percent increase in production this year compared with 1959–64. The total value of the crop, however, was down 10.6 percent.

With harvested acreage in spring lettuce dropping 5.4 percent below the 1959–64 average, and average yield rising 4.7 percent, production came out 1.2 percent below the 5-year average. In contrast to the winter crop, total value of spring lettuce was 96.1 percent above 1959–64.

Detailed crop value figures for summer and fall lettuce are not yet available.

So far as the panel is aware, there was no labor shortage in the harvesting of winter and spring lettuce. Fluctuations in price and production must, therefore, have been caused by other factors.

The change in the composition of the labor force is as marked in lettuce as in other crops. Domestic man-years increased 126.8 percent above the 1961–64 average, and foreign man-years were down 98.4 percent, with total man years for the harvest down 33.3 percent.

Table VI contains the detailed figures for the lettuce harvest.

TABLE VI.—*Lettuce*

A. WINTER AND SPRING LETTUCE—ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, YIELD, AND CROP VALUE, 1959-64 AND 1965

	Average 1959–64	1965	Change (average 1959–64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Winter lettuce:				
Harvested acreage	42,617	46,700	+4,083	+9.6
Production (hundredweight)	7,561,670	8,406,000	+844,300	+11.2
Average yield (hundredweight per acre)	177	180	+3	+1.7
Total value	$29,635,000	$26,479,000	−$3,156,000	−10.6
Spring lettuce:				
Harvested acreage	17,120	16,200	−920	−5.4
Production (hundredweight)	2,950,000	2,916,000	−34,000	−1.2
Average yield (hundredweight per acre)	172	180	+8	+4.7
Total value	$9,962,800	$19,537,000	+$9,574,200	+96.1

B. MAN-YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT, 1961-64[1] AND 1965 FOR ALL LETTUCE (WINTER, SPRING, SUMMER, AND FALL)

	Average, 1961–64	1965	Change (average 1961–64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Total man-years:				
Domestic	[1] 1,464.5	3,322.1	+1,857.6	+126.8
Foreign	[1] 3,600.3	58.5	−3,541.8	−98.4
Total	[1] 5,064.8	3,380.6	−1,684.2	−33.3

[1] A breakdown between domestic and foreign labor usage by crop activity was not maintained prior to 1961 by the California Department of Employment.

Citrus: There was a considerable change in the composition of the labor force in all citrus corps this year. This was due to the voluntary action of the citrus growers, who, because they felt unable to pay a guaranteed minimum of $1.40 per hour to all workers, elected to pay piece rates with no minimum hourly guarantee. This decision automatically made them ineligible to apply for bracero labor. Domestic man-years increased 156.8 percent over the 1961–64 average in valencia oranges, 50.8 percent in navel oranges, 297.3 percent in lemons, and 171.1 percent in grapefruit. Foreign labor was almost eliminated, disappearing entirely in valencia oranges and grapefruit, and decreasing by 99.6 percent in navel oranges and 97.8 percent in lemons. This transition was not accomplished without substantial cost to the growers. For example, the southern California valencia orangegrowers were unable, because of labor shortages, to satisfy more than 60 percent of the market demand.

Harvested acreage in valencia oranges was 16.6 percent below the 1959–64 average, but because of an increase in average yield of 33 boxes per acre, or 14.3 percent over the 5-year average, production fell only 4.7 percent. Total crop value was down 32.6 percent.

The situation was somewhat different in navel oranges, where harvested acreage was 8 percent above the 1959–64 average. With an increase in average yield of 15.9 percent, total production increased by 25 percent. Total crop value this year was 10.4 percent above the 5-year average.

There was a 16.8 percent decrease from the 1959–64 average in harvested acreage of lemons, a 4.4-percent increase in average yield, and a consequent 12.9-percent decrease in production. The value of this year's crop, however, is 14.5 percent above the 5-year average.

TABLE VII-A.—*Citrus—Valencia oranges*

A. ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, YIELD, AND CROP VALUE, 1959-64 AND 1965

	Average 1959–64	1965	Change (average 1959–64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Harvested acreage	74,365	62,000	−12,365	−16.6
Production (boxes)	17,100,000	16,300,000	−800,000	−4.7
Average yield (boxes/acre)	230	263	+33	+14.3
Total value	$61,514,000	$41,472,000	−$20,042,000	−32.6

B. MAN YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT, 1961-64[1] AND 1965

	Average 1961–64	1965	Change (average 1961–64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Total man-years:				
Domestic	[1] 631.8	1,622.7	+990.9	+156.8
Foreign	[1] 1,254.1	0	−1,254.1	−100.0
Total	[1] 1,885.9	1,622.7	−263.2	−14.0

[1] A breakdown between domestic and foreign labor usage by crop activity was not maintained prior to 1961 by the California Department of Employment.

TABLE VII-B.—*Citrus—Navel oranges*

A. ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, YIELD, AND CROP VALUE, 1959-64 AND 1965

	Average 1959–64	1965	Change (average 1959–64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Harvested acreage	60,182	65,000	+4,818	+8.0
Production (boxes)	12,483,000	15,600,000	+3,117,000	+25.0
Average yield (boxes) per acre	207	240	+33	+15.9
Total value	$51,264,000	$56,610,000	+$5,346,000	+10.4

B. MAN-YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT, 1961-64[1] AND 1965

	Average 1961–64	1965	Change (average 1961–64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Total man-years:				
Domestic	[1] 1,448.9	2,185.2	+736.3	+50.8
Foreign	[1] 331.6	1.3	−330.3	−99.6
Total	[1] 1,780.6	2,186.5	+405.9	+22.8

[1] A breakdown between domestic and foreign labor usage by crop activity was not maintained prior to 1961 by the California Department of Employment.

TABLE VII-C.—*Citrus—Lemons*

A. ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, YIELD AND CROP VALUE, 1959-64 AND 1965

	Average, 1959-64	1965	Change (average, 1959-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Harvested acreage	49,279	41,000	−8,279	−16.8
Production (boxes)	15,500,000	13,500,000	−2,000,000	−12.9
Average yield	315	329	+14	+4.4
Total value	$37,149,000	$42,525,000	+$5,376,000	+14.5

B. MAN-YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT, 1961-64 [1] AND 1965

	Average, 1961-64	1965	Change (average, 1961-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Total man-years:				
Domestic	[1] 687.5	2,731.5	+2,044.0	+297.3
Foreign	[1] 2,816.7	63.1	−2,753.6	−97.8
Total	[1] 3,504.2	2,794.6	−709.6	−20.2

[1] A breakdown between domestic and foreign labor usage by crop activity was not maintained prior to 1961 by the California Department of Employment.

TABLE VII-D.—*Citrus—Grapefruit*

A. ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, YIELD, AND CROP VALUE, 1959-64 AND 1965

	Average 1959-64	1965	Change (average 1959-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Harvested acreage	9,217	12,900	+3,683	+40.0
Production	2,918,000	4,100,000	+1,182,000	+40.5
Average yield (boxes/acre)	317	318	+1	+.3
Total value	$6,208,000	$7,599,000	+$1,391,000	+22.4

B. MAN-YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT, 1961-64 [1] AND 1965

	Average 1961-64	1965	Change (average 1961-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Total man-years:				
Domestic	[1] 79.0	214.2	+135.2	+171.1
Foreign	[1] 86.8	0	−86.8	−100.0
Total	[1] 165.7	214.2	+48.5	+29.3

[1] A breakdown between domestic and foreign labor usage by crop activity was not maintained prior to 1961 by the California Department of Employment.

In the grapefruit crop this year, an increase of 0.3 percent in average yield and a 40-percent increase in harvested acreage resulted in a 40.5-percent increase in production over the 1959–64 average. Total crop value rose 22.4 percent.

Detailed data for the four citrus crops are in table VII.

Summer melons: This was a low yield year in summer melons. Harvested acreage was 15.4 percent below the 1959–64 average, production was down 18.7 percent, and average yield fell 3.7 percent. Crop value was 2.6 percent below the 5-year average.

The harvest was completed with 16.3 percent fewer man-years than the 1961–64 average. Harvesting was completed with 76.7 percent more domestic workers and with no foreign labor.

Detailed data for melons appear in table VIII.

Asparagus: Harvested acreage in asparagus this year was 20.7 percent below the 1959–64 average. As average yield remained about the same, total production fell off by 20.8 percent. The total value of the crop was 5 percent below the 6-year average.

This harvest was achieved with a 40.1-percent decrease in man-years, including an 88.7-percent drop in foreign man-years and a 6.1-percent rise in domestic man-years.

There was a major loss in production of white asparagus, due to the lack of sufficient farmworkers to harvest the crop. The primary reason for this shortage is that the work is arduous and unpleasant, and the piece rates offered were insufficient to attract the necessary number of workers.

Detailed data for the asparagus harvest, along with breakdown of production and total value for fresh market and all processing, including a cannery green and white and freezer asparagus, are found in table IX.

TABLE VIII.—*Melons—Summer*

A. ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, YIELD, AND CROP VALUE, 1959-64 AND 1965

	Average 1959-64	1965	Change (average 1959-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Harvested acreage	42,533	36,000	−6,533	−15.4
Production (hundredweight)	5,757,000	4,680,000	−1,077,000	−18.7
Average yield (hundredweight/acre)	135	130	−5	−3.7
Total value	$24,028,000	$23,400,000	−$628,000	−2.6

B. MAN-YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT, 1961-64 [1] AND 1965

	Average 1961-64	1965	Change (average 1961-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
Total man-years:				
Domestic	[1] 587.3	1,037.9	+450.6	+76.7
Foreign	[1] 652.6	0	−652.6	−100.0
Total	[1] 1,239.9	1,037.9	−202.0	−16.3

[1] A breakdown between domestic and foreign labor usage by crop activity was not maintained prior to 1961 by the California Department of Employment.

TABLE IX.—*Asparagus*

A. ACREAGE, PRODUCTION, YIELD, AND CROP VALUE, 1959-64 AND 1965

	Average 1959-64	1965	Change (average 1959-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
A-1. All asparagus:				
Harvested acreage	69,200	54,900	−14,300	−20.7
Production (hundredweight)	1,928,000	1,527,000	−401,000	−20.8
Average yield (hundredweight per acre)	28	28	0	0.0
Total value	$24,724,000	$23,496,000	−$1,228,000	−5.0
A-2. Fresh market asparagus:				
Production (hundred weight)	599,000	624,000	+25,000	+4.2
Total value	$9,300,000	$9,861,000	+$561,000	+6.0
A-3. Processed asparagus:				
Production (tons)	66,450	45,150	−21,300	−32.0
Total value	$15,424,000	$13,635,000	−$1,789,000	−11.6
A-3(a). Processed asparagus, cannery white;				
Production (tons)	29,835	15,214	−14,621	−49.0
Total value	$7,489,500	$5,294,000	−$2,195,500	−29.3
A-3(b). Processed asparagus, cannery green:				
Production (tons)	23,071	17,586	−5,485	−23.8
Total value	$5,260,000	$5,266,000	+$6,000	+0.1
A-3(c). Processed asparagus, freezing:				
Production (tons)	13,544	12,350	−1,194	−8.8
Total value	$2,674,500	$3,075,000	+$400,500	+15.0

B. MAN-YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT, 1961-64 [1] and 1965

	Average 1961-64	1965	Change (average 1961-64 to 1965)	
			Absolute	Percent
All asparagus—total man-years:				
Domestic	[1] 1,156.9	1,227.1	+70.2	+6.1
Foreign	[1] 1,097.7	124.2	−973.5	−88.7
Total	[1] 2,254.6	1,351.3	−903.3	−40.1

[1] A breakdown between domestic and foreign labor usage by crop activity was not maintained prior to 1961 by the California Department of Employment.

Summary of experience

This year's record shows that great progress has been made toward a wholly domestic (i.e., nonbracero) farm labor force. In addition, those who argued that no Americans would do stoop labor, or could climb trees or work in high temperatures, have been proven wrong.

The fact remains, however, that agriculture is still not competitive with other industries for domestic labor. Although wage rates have risen, they are below the levels prevalent in other industries. Little has been done to augment family housing facilities, to provide more stable employment throughout the harvest season, or to disseminate more reliable information on employment, earnings, and manpower.

The following section examines the functioning of some of the programs designed to increase the availability, use, and competence of domestic farm labor. The achievement of an adequate domestic farm labor force depends upon the acceptance and support of these programs by workers and growers alike.

Progress and evaluation of relevant domestic farm labor programs

A number of existing programs to build an able and adequate domestic farm labor force have been intensified and a number of new policies and programs have been initiated over the last year. The knowledge and experience we have gained as these policies and programs developed have been crucial in implementing the transition to a wholly domestic farm labor force. We wish to set out here what has been done and what we have learned.

Intensified intrastate recruitment: California initiated intensive efforts this year to reach hereofore untapped sources of farmworkers and to make better use of workers already in the farm work force. In mid-December of 1964, Federal-State mobile recruitment teams were organized to fan out from Stockton, Oakland-San Francisco, Bakersfield, and Los Angeles. A Federal-State mobile followup team was organized to meet new recruits on arrival in the work areas and to assist in orienting and training the new workers. They also were available to assist in the adjustment of complaints.

From December 24, 1964, to April 30, 1965, 25,380 workers were contacted and over 10,000 were placed through intrastate positive recruitment.[8]

In May 1965, leaders of the Mexican-American community suggested that from 3,000 to 10,000 Mexican-American workers available in the central coastal area were not being reached by the regular State department of employment recruitment. A pilot program was started in San Jose to reach these workers. A special office was set up to operate during June, with provisions for extension if it should prove successful. Twelve Mexican-American leaders from the San Jose area were hired by the department of employment to recruit in the Mexican-American community. The growers provided money to hire three Mexican-American community leaders to work in cooperation with the temporary department staff. Growers provided day-haul transportation from San Jose to the Salinas area strawberry fields. Recruiters met with community groups, and prepared and distributed handbills and pamphlets. News releases and paid advertising were used. Door-to-door canvasses were conducted. The results, however, were disappointing.

A total of 1,849 workers, of whom 976 had Spanish surnames, were hired from the new Community Recruitment Center list. Of these, 63 percent worked only 1 day. The special office was closed at the end of June, and the San Jose farm labor office assumed supervision of the day-haul operation.

Because this was the first time Mexican-American recruiters were used by the State department of employment, it is possible that the lack of success can be attributed to the newness of this program. It is also possible that the reluctance of the Mexican-Americans to do what has traditionally been considered bracero work was a strong factor in their lack of response, particularly because braceros were already working in the area.

In mid-July, farm labor supervisors and local office managers from tomato-producing areas met with office staff to evolve a plan of action for more widespread recruitment of tomato pickers than ever before attempted. The State office of the department prepared and distributed some 40 TV slides in English and Spanish. News releases were prepared for all local offices. Some 35,000 tomato recruitment pamphlets were distributed in addition to the hundreds of recruitment flyers prepared by local offices. Signs were posted on bulletin boards, in labor camps, and in businesses frequented by workers. Some theaters used spot announcements to publicize the need for tomato pickers. Sound equipment broadcasts and house-to-house canvasses were employed. Day-hauls were conducted from as many as 90 supervised and unsupervised points before school opened, and subsequently from about 75 points. Military bases were contacted to recruit off-duty military personnel and their families. Up to seven busloads of youths were hauled daily from a point near Mather Air Force Base near Sacramento.

The department of employment central and local farm placement staffs cooperated fully with the California Department of Social Welfare central and local staffs in assuring that all social welfare recipients who could be channeled into farmwork knew about and were assisted in securing farm jobs. Their occupational codes of unemployment insurance claimants were examined and possible employees were channeled into farmwork.

About the time the department of employment began its recruitment for the tomato harvest, the Mexican-American leaders again offered to help recruit the Mexican-Americans who, they believed, were not being reached by the department's efforts. The Federal Bureau of Employment Security then hired 4 Mexican-American leaders as consultants, and the State department of employment hired some 25 indigenous community leaders recommended by the BES consultants. These Mexican-American community leaders were hired to contact their people and urge them to take jobs and to help meet the labor shortage in the tomato harvest.

From August 18 to September 20, over 14,000 domestic workers were referred to tomato growers by local offices in the Interior Valley and Central Coast districts. Through the efforts of the industry and the department, an estimated 18,700 man-weeks of work were performed by domestic workers hand harvesting cannery tomatoes during the week of highest domestic employment in these districts. This compares with the 1964 statewide peak of 5,250 domestic man-weeks of employment in both hand and machine harvest of cannery tomatoes.

Interstate recruitment

Historically, the State department of employment and growers have been reluctant to conduct interstate recruitment. State officials have contended that recruitment in other States with foreign workers would merely create a shortage that would have to be filled in those States by the importation of additional foreign workers. Growers and community leaders have been fearful of the impact of an influx of out-of-State labor upon welfare programs, the educational system, the police, and other community agencies and facilities. Growers also argued that labor alleged to be available through interstate recruitment was neither qualified nor reliable and that the recruitment process itself was too costly.

This year, under the necessity of entering the competitive market for domestic labor as required by the Secretary of Labor's recruitment criteria of December 19, 1964, and with the strong encouragement of the Labor Department's Bureau of Employment Security, the California Department of Employment and the growers who wanted to remain eligible to receive foreign workers joined in recruiting in 11 States and 2 territories.

This program was a dismal failure. Of the 50,000 workers requested by California under the Federal-State interstate clearance system from January 1 through September 13, only 3,173 workers were actually recruited. Examination of the program suggests that substantial administrative problems exist in the interstate recruitment system, and that there are aspects of California agricultural working conditions that are not now sufficiently attractive to bring in out-of-State workers. Certainly, substantially higher wages would be an immediate competitive advantage that should be exploited to the fullest if a productive and willing work force is to be recruited and retained for California agriculture. It should be pointed out, however, that, excluding Hawaii, California growers already pay the highest wages in the country for agricultural work. It is unrealistic to assume, therefore, that they will continue to raise wages unless similar action is taken by their counterparts in other States.

The importance and potential of interstate recruitment cannot be overestimated. Had the interstate recruitment program achieved only a minimal success, it is likely that the number of braceros admitted to California this year could have been cut in half. Moreover, it is apparent that with the virtual elimination of foreign labor, California growers will continue to need out-of-State workers during the peak harvest season.

A-teams

To meet some of the demand for domestic farmworkers during the summer, the Secretary of Labor established a youth farm employment program for high school athletes. The program, known as A-team (athletes in temporary employment as agricultural manpower), provided for the recruitment of teams of 20 to 30 boys to work on farms. Each team was to be supervised by a coach or teacher, with recruitment and work assignments to be handled by the State employment service.

The availability of A-teams was a factor in considering requests for additional foreign workers, and growers requesting or receiving certification to use foreign workers in the course of the summer were reminded by the panel and by the Regional Administrator of the Bureau of Employment Security that they would be required to use any available workers west of the Mississippi, including A-teams, before being certified as eligible to use foreign labor. In particular, the panel relied on its understanding that A-team labor was available when on May 29 it recommended against an application for foreign workers in the Blythe area.

The A-team program in California provided jobs for 51 teams and 1,679 students. The teams came from 10 States (New Mexico, Nebraska, Idaho, Kansas, Iowa, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, Texas, and California). Forty-one teams and 1,471 students were employed in the 3 areas of Salinas, Blythe, and Stockton, where foreign workers were used or requested. The following comments apply to these three areas.

---

[8] "Positive" intrastate recruitment occurs when a prospective employer sends his recruiter to a local employment office or recruiting center with authority to hire applicants and provide them with transportation to the worksite. This is in contrast to "normal" recruitment, where the local employment office refers a worker to a harvest area where hiring will be done on the spot.

The best record of contract completion by the students was in the cantaloup harvest in Blythe, where average hourly earnings ($1.85) were highest. Of 486 students, A-team and informal high school groups, 419 remained to complete the season—evidence that high earnings can be a factor in attracting reliable workers in agriculture, as elsewhere. The success of the program in Blythe, an area specifically denied certification for foreign workers because of the availability of A-teams, can also be attributed in large part to the growers' fine cooperation in providing good housing, food, and recreational facilities.

The overall record of A-team performance was mixed. Some teams stayed on for their full contract, others for as little as 3 days. Some were praised by their employers, others were discharged almost on arrival. Some had the responsible adult leadership of their coaches, others had only indifferent supervision from older students. While some found the work too arduous, others complained they were not given enough work. The earnings record shows average hourly earnings for some teams as low as 81 cents and for others as high as $1.94.

Although the program obviously suffered because of hurried programing, inadequate communications and understanding among all the parties, and lack of coordination with the existing youth employment program in California, a major reason for the relatively low use of A-teams was the reluctance of many growers to accept them, and the tendency of some growers to make the work relationship unpleasant.

The record indicates that there is merit in the A-team, just as there is merit in the regular summer youth employment program of the California Department of Employment. This regular overall youth program placed about 25,000 youths in 1964, and double that number in 1965. The California program is especially to be commended. If it continues to expand, the need for A-team workers in this State will be sharply reduced.

However, the value of the A-teams cannot be estimated from their production records alone. The publicity surrounding the program undoubtedly alerted many adults to opportunities in harvest work. Growers who, for reasons of their own preferred not to employ youths, were also stimulated to exert extra effort in recruiting adults. This was a consequence of the regulation that no certification of foreign workers would be considered so long as available youths wanted to work. Another result operating in favor of continuing the program is that it affords an opportunity for youths who might otherwise spend their summers in idleness to work, to earn money, and to contribute to the welfare of society.

Manpower Development and Training Act programs

The Manpower Development and Training Act contains provisions that could be applied profitably to manpower for the field harvest. As developed in California, however, these opportunities have not been realized.

From January 1 to September 14, 1965, 1,020 trainees started training in 23 agricultural projects. Three of these, with approximately 300 beginning trainees, were directed to field harvest activity.[9] The largest field harvest project involved 236 trainees in tomato picking at Davis. A generous estimate indicates that a maximum of 40 of the 209 trainees completing the course actually entered employment as tomato pickers. This poor showing can be attributed to inadequate time for planning and recruitment and unsatisfactory arrangements during the training period. In particular, complaints about the food, training allowances, crew bosses, extended separation from families, and unfavorable publicity contributed to trainee discontent and disaffection.

The paucity of Manpower Development and Training Act programs in harvest labor is the result of strong opposition to such programs by organized agricultural labor in one part of the State and to the disinterest of the growers in another area.

Work simplification devices and mechanization

Significant labor saving and work simplification have been achieved this year through the improvement of experimental models, the transition from the experimental model to limited operational use of some devices, and the greater employment of previously developed techniques and machines.

Tomatoes: In the tomato harvest the return to an old technique has simplified the picker's task and thus made the job more attractive to women and youth. In recent years pickers have used lug boxes that hold 50 pounds of tomatoes. This year buckets were returned to use, eliminating the need to haul the 50-pound lug box. Couples and families were hired, so that a family could pick into the buckets and the adult male could then carry all the boxes picked by the group. In some instances the pickers were instructed to leave the boxes in the rows, and loading crews with trucks came through later. In Gilroy, one employer paying 17 cents a box for picking only—with swampers hired separately—reported that the pickers had doubled their output upon being relieved of the lugs.

Last year, 70 tomato-picking machines were estimated to have picked about 3.5 percent of the 3 million ton canning tomato crop. About 260 machines were expected to be available in 1965. In mid-September it was too soon to determine how many were available and being used, and what percent of the final production might be machine picked. However, early estimates were around 25 percent, and it is certain that the industry will rely increasingly on machine picking in the future. Estimates of the number of such machines to be used in next year's harvest have gone as high as 800.

Melons: In 1964, the Blythe area used about 12 conveyors in the melon harvest; this year it used 40. In addition, an experimental device may eliminate the need for the picker to lift the melon from the furrow to the conveyor belt. The worker would pick the melons and place them in furrows, with the machine then picking them up. If successful, this would eliminate 30 percent of the present labor need.

Four or five times as many conveyors in the melon districts from Kern to Stanislaus Counties are believed to have been used in 1965 as in 1964. These machines did not reduce labor requirements but did make the job easier and encouraged employment of women and youths in the cantaloup harvest.

Lettuce: A lettuce harvesting machine developed by University of California agricultural engineers has been devised to replace the older lettuce machines, which were largely conveyors and field packing platforms expediting the harvest of hand cutters. Operated by one man, the new machine feels the heads, testing for maturity, and cuts those which are ready for harvest. A 4-row model may permit the machine and operator to replace 10 to 15 hand cutters. The machine is being developed and used experimentally in the Salinas area. It is judged to be nearly operational and there is expectation that 10 machines may be in use by 1966.

Similar advances in machinery and labor-saving innovation are being made in a number of other crops, including sugarbeets, cotton, brussels sprouts, carrots, prunes, peaches, and apricots.

Housing: The dearth of migrant family housing in California is one of the factors that precludes full use of both interstate and intrastate migrant workers. Growers and State and Federal authorities have been well aware of this lack, but as long as sufficient single domestic workers and braceros were available to meet seasonal needs, growers were reluctant to invest in family housing. This year marked a small beginning in the provision of more family housing.

The impetus for housing has come from three sources: growers and community groups, title III (B) of the Economic Opportunity Act, and the California Department of Finance demonstration program (with funds granted from the Housing and Home Finance Agency).

From the private sector have come some proposals and some action. Proposals have been advanced for mobile homes for migrant workers and for mobile-home migrant caravans to follow the crops. In Yolo County, one grower converted half of a single-man camp to 52 motel-type family units, and two other growers built floored tent units for families. The Blythe Growers Farm Labor Association has planned 70 apartment-type family units, which they hope to have financed by Farmers Home Administration funds.

Also in the Blythe area, individual growers have provided the land on which family units will be built. Workers employed by growers in the area are being assisted in preparing applications for FHA loans. Seven units have been started, 19 more are being processed, and an additional 50 are being planned. It is hoped locally that in 5 years about 200 family units and 200–300 low-cost apartment-type units will be built.

Under title III(B) of the Economic Opportunity Act and in conformity with the California migrant master plan, $1,926,000 has been made available for Flash Peak housing. A number of different designs for demountable housing have been proposed and reviewed. In addition, several hundred units are being planned in five of the counties designated to accommodate migrant centers under the migrant master plan.

The demonstration program of the California Department of Finance involves a grant from the Housing and Home Finance Agency to construct 48 prototype units at $4,000 each. It is expected that such construction grants will spur the housing industry to find new ways to meet the need for low-cost migrant family housing. That this represents the smallest of beginnings is evident when the program is placed in the context of the estimate of the finance department's consultant on housing and community development that the need for low-cost farmworker family housing units in California will be between 10,000 and 30,000 units within the next 5 to 10 years.

Most existing housing for migrant workers is unsuitable for family occupancy. Living conditions are sometimes primitive in the extreme. It is a particularly unhappy fact that municipal and other public authorities are responsible for the conditions and maintenance of a number of these squalid camps. This is a situation that demands remedial action.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Now that Public Law 78 has been terminated, California farmers must look to the domestic labor force to meet their labor requirements. The task thus becomes one of making wages and working conditions sufficiently desirable to attract an adequate number of productive domestic workers. Above all else, what is required is a change in the expectations and attitudes of the growers. Employer resistance to the Secretary, Labor's program to switch to an all-domestic supply of farmworkers was a major, though by no means the exclusive, cause of some of the difficulties encountered this year. Specifically, a refusal to accept the full implications of the congressional decision not to renew Public Law 78 has led some growers to keep wages unrealistically low, to delay in providing adequate housing, and to cooperate halfheartedly or not at all with various efforts to recruit domestic farm labor.

---

[9] State of California, Department of Employment, Farm Labor Service, "Approved Agricultural Manpower Development and Training Act Courses—California—for the period Nov. 27, 1962 to Sept. 13, 1965."

On the other hand, we are gratified by the efforts of a number of major growers and processors to accommodate to the new situation. Although exercising their rights to disagree with the substance or the timing of some of the Secretary of Labor's program to eliminate bracero labor, they have, nevertheless, accepted the objectives of that program and have taken substantial steps toward making it a reality.

The current trend appears to be in the direction of a more intensive cultivation of reduced acreage for many crops, much greater use of harvesting machines, and the employment of a smaller but more productive labor force under improved working conditions and at substantially higher wages. Growers and processors have the right to expect aid and guidance from appropriate Federal and State agencies in the recruitment of their employees; they have no right, however, to continue to claim competitive advantages and special protection not available to others.

Recognition of these facts by all elements in the California agricultural industry will make completion of the transition referred to at the outset of this report easier and quicker.

The panel also wishes to make the following recommendation:

Wages: We urge the adoption of a wage policy by the growers of California which will make California agriculture competitive with other industries for labor. At the same time, we urge the Federal Government to take the necessary steps to raise farm labor wages throughout the country.

We believe that hourly rates should not fall below those prescribed by Federal or State minimum wage laws not otherwise applicable to farm labor, and we urge flexible piecework rates that will insure substantially higher average hourly earnings for productive workers.

Nothing that has occurred in California agriculture this year supports the repeated charge—which we now assert to be a myth—that no American workers will perform stoop labor. On the contrary, there is ample evidence that Americans will perform even more onerous work, provided that the wages are fair and the working conditions are decent. Adequate wages and attractive working conditions will produce not only sufficient numbers of workers, but also a more productive and responsible work force.

With people of varying skills working at their own pace, harvest labor lends itself to a piece rate system of payment. Indeed, in most instances such a system is essential to attract adequate workers because of the relatively low prevailing hourly rates. This year the Secretary of Labor's criteria for eligibility to employ foreign contract labor included a minimum hourly rate of $1.40. Although this was substantially above the prevailing hourly rate in previous years, and that being paid in most other States, it is clearly inadequate to sustain a worker above the poverty level on an annual basis, even assuming (contrary to the fact) that he obtains as much as 2,000 hours of employment at that rate. What is needed, therefore, is a system of piece rates high enough to attract farmworkers and also adequately compensate the superior workers for their increased productivity. These observations are meaningless, however, unless enough workers sufficiently skilled to take advantage of such piece rates can be recruited.

Housing: Adequate housing must be provided for farmworkers and their families. Existing facilities and programs should be used to the fullest extent possible; if these prove insufficient, further legislative and administrative aid should be secured.

Where economically feasible and structurally possible, existing barracks housing should be converted to family units.

There should be tighter regulation and stricter enforcement of farm labor housing codes.

There should be fuller funding of existing federally sponsored farm housing programs, such as those administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Farmers Home Administration. We urge the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, which has the authority and money to be of substantial assistance, to do more in this field.

There should be more experimentation by all concerned with building techniques and arrangements, as well as with financing plans, so that the maximum amount of housing can be built at the minimum cost. This is particularly needed for flash peak housing, where the relatively short period of usage makes normal housing arrangements extremely expensive.

If existing facilities and programs prove insufficient or too restrictive to rapid progress, we urge new legislation which will make it possible for growers, assisted by the State and Federal Governments, to build new family housing.

Recruitment: We urge a complete reexamination of the present interstate recruitment system.

The U.S. Department of Labor should convene a conference of leading grower and labor representatives, the highest officials of the State and Federal agencies involved, and members of the California Farm Labor Panel to initiate this review. The conference should deal specifically with the roles and responsibilities of government and growers in recruitment.

An effective recruitment program should be undertaken by the growers. Recruitment teams should be sent to other States well in advance of the harvest season to interview and screen farmworkers and enter into firm contracts with them for employment for fixed periods during the harvest season. Such contracts should include commitments regarding transportation, compensation, housing, and food. Some growers are already carrying out programs of this type for next year's harvests. We urge others to follow their example.

Protection: We believe that the farmworker should be protected by the same social legislation as are his counterparts in industry.

Specifically, this means unemployment compensation for agricultural labor, as well as coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and improved Social Security Act coverage.

Statistical reporting: Better information about labor requirements, hours worked, and wages earned must be collected and made available. The Panel recommends that Federal and State agencies collaborate to solve the technical problems and effect an appropriate division of labor. Four areas in particular need attention.

1. Worker requirements must be stated more accurately. Although it is difficult, because of weather and other unpredictable factors, for growers to be precise about their labor needs, studies of some crops have shown that reliable estimates of labor requirements can be developed.

2. There must be more accurate statistics on employment in specific crops and areas and on the available supply of agricultural workers.

3. Wages, hours, and earnings must be reported. It is surprising, but nonetheless true, that no comprehensive or accurate data are available for the wages, hours, and earnings of domestic farmworkers.

4. Data on the duration of employment of individual workers are also necessary for the effective recruitment of an adequate domestic farm labor force.

Miscellaneous recommendations: More and improved training programs should be developed, especially for farm labor supervision. Present supervision is notoriously inadequate and is itself a product of the bracero system. From now on, California agriculture must rely heavily on newly developed training and supervisory skills if it wishes to attract and hold the kind of workers it seeks. We believe these workers are available and will respond to offers of higher wages and better conditions. These attractions will be further enhanced as growers develop an improved supervisory force; for it is apparent that field supervisors whose experience has been limited largely to overseeing the work of braceros also need training in dealing with American workers.

Higher and more rigidly enforced standards of field sanitation are essential to decent working conditions and should be provided. At the very least, all farmworkers, including adult males, should be provided with the field sanitary facilities specified in the California Industrial Welfare Commission's Order No. 14–65, effective September 15, 1965, applicable to women and minors employed in agricultural occupations. These facilities include adequately screened and properly ventilated toilets and adequate working facilities, which are readily accessible to employees. Evidence indicates that these regulations have been widely ignored, even in respect to women and minors. The same is true of the requirement that each place of employment shall be supplied with potable drinking water, suitably cool, and convenient to employees.

Facilities such as these are not frills; they are absolutely essential to maintain minimum standards of health and decency. We regreat the necessity, in the year 1965, to make so elementary a consideration the subject of a specific recommendation.

By phasing out the use of braceros, the first long step has been taken toward eliminating the special disadvantages of wage-earners in California agriculture. But it is only the first step. Much remains to be done before farmworkers will have the same status as those in other industries and before agricultural employers will have built and maintained a reliable and efficient domestic labor supply.

OFFICIAL ACTIONS OF CALIFORNIA FARM LABOR PANEL [1]

Appointment. Secretary Wirtz appointed the California Farm Labor Panel by Secretary's Order 11–65, dated April 15, 1965. The members of the panel as appointed by Secretary Wirtz were Benjamin Aaron, professor of law and director, Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California at Los Angeles, chairman; Dr. Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr., chancellor, University of California at Irvine; and Dr. Arthur M. Ross, professor of industrial relations, University of California at Berkeley. Dr. Ross has since been named commissioner of labor statistics.

---

[1] The following chronology does not include numerous informal contacts by individual members of the panel with representatives of grower organizations, labor unions, and other interested groups throughout the State which have occurred almost continuously from the time the panel was appointed to the present.

Hearings, meetings, and consultations of the Farm Labor Panel.

Organization meeting: The three members of the panel met at Professor Aaron's offices at UCLA on April 17, held an organization meeting, and announced a schedule of hearings at Stockton and Salinas on April 20.

April 19: Meeting with Jesse Tapp, president, State board of agriculture, San Francisco. Meeting with State personnel from the Governor's office, department of agriculture and department of employment, Sacramento. Meeting with San Joaquin County farm adviser, University of California Agricultural Extension Service, Stockton.

April 20: 8 a.m., public hearing in Stockton to consider evidence of pending requests for foreign workers to work in asparagus harvest; 2 p.m., public hearing in Salinas to consider evidence on pending requests for foreign workers for Monterey County, primarily for the strawberry harvest.

April 21: Meeting with headquarters and regional department of labor staff concerned with farm labor problems, office of Dr. Ross, Berkeley.

April 23: Meeting of panel at offices of Chairman Aaron, UCLA, to prepare and issue panel's interim report of that date. (The panel recommended 1,000 foreign workers for asparagus harvest and 1,500 foreign workers for the strawberry harvest, and Secretary Wirtz adopted the recommendation on April 26.)

May 7: Public hearing in Santa Maria by panel's hearing officer to take evidence on request of Santa Maria Farmers Association for 100 foreign workers for the strawberry harvest in Santa Barbara County. (This request was subsequently withdrawn, and no action thereon was taken by the panel.)

May 11: Public hearing by panel's hearing officer at Stockton to hear witnesses who could not be heard at panel's earlier hearing of April 20. (No new foreign labor requests were pending before the panel on the date this hearing was held.)

May 12: Public hearing in Salinas to consider a new request for foreign workers submitted by the strawberry industry and the vegetable row crop industry for a total of 2,150 workers.

May 19: Meeting of panel at offices of Chairman Aaron, UCLA, to consider record of hearings by panel's hearing officer and to act upon new request from the strawberry and vegetable industries of Salinas. (The panel recommended an additional 1,000 workers for these crops, and Secretary Wirtz immediately accepted this recommendation.)

May 20: Public hearing in Blythe, Calif., by panel's hearing officer to consider evidence on request of Blythe Growers, Inc., for 949 foreign workers for Blythe melon harvest.

May 29: Panel met at offices of Chairman Aaron, UCLA, to consider new requests for foreign workers requested by the Salinas growers and the melon request from Blythe Growers, Inc. A late request for 500 additional foreign workers for the asparagus harvest had been withdrawn by the date of the May 29 meeting. (The panel recommended denial of all pending requests in its report to the Secretary of May 29.)

June 9: Chairman Aaron and Dr. Ross held meetings in Fresno with growers, State officials and the association manager of agricultural labor bureau to obtain information on pending request for foreign workers for the San Joaquin Valley melon harvest. (This request was not certified to the panel by the State, and no action thereon was taken by the panel.)

June 16: Meeting of panel members, Aldrich and Ross, with the tomato industry in Stockton to receive general labor demand information concerning the canning-tomato harvest to begin the middle of August.

June 17: Meeting of Panel Member Aldrich with Canners League of California and officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, State department of agriculture and University of California concerning general farm labor problems, with particular emphasis on forthcoming canning-tomato harvest.

July 30: Meeting of panel at Department of Labor offices, San Francisco, with officials from State department of agriculture, State department of employment, and University of California concerning labor needs for canning-tomato harvest and announcement of further meeting on August 10.

August 10: Meeting of panel in Department of Labor offices, San Francisco, on canning-tomato requests and announcement of recommendations to authorize 8,000 foreign workers for the canning-tomato harvest. (This authorization was subsequently increased by 900 for another crop area, and the recommendations were immediately adopted by Secretary Wirtz.)

August 18: Field investigation trip by Panel Member Ross at Merced and surrounding area in connection with early stages of tomato harvest.

August 19: Additional field trip by Panel Member Ross to Patterson and surrounding area in connection with tomato harvest.

August 26: Meeting of panel in Department of Labor offices, San Francisco, and announcement of recommendation for additional authorization of 9,500 foreign workers for tomato harvest, for a grand total of 18,400. (Recommendation was adopted that day by Secretary Wirtz.)

October 5: Meeting of Panel Member Aldrich with Council of California Growers at Los Angeles to discuss current labor problems and prospects for 1966.

Disposition of Mexican Nationals Authorized for Tomato Harvest

The number of foreign contract workers for tomato harvest requested by growers, certified by the California Deparment of Employment, and approved by the Secretary of Labor is shown below. Also shown is the number of calendar man-days represented by those requests and approvals.

	Workers	*Calendar man-days represented*
Requested by grower associations	29, 859	2, 059, 372
Certified by California Department of Employment	18, 785	1, 335, 599
Approved by Secretary of Labor	18, 400	1, 159, 176

Of the total of 18,400 workers approved by the Secretary of Labor, all had starting dates ranging from August 27 to September 5, 1965, and initially terminated October 31, 1965. Later extensions were authorized for 1,072 from October 31, 1965 to November 7, 1965, and an additional 1,395 from October 31, 1965 to November 15, 1965. Some of the initial requests for the original 18,400 were cancelled by employers resulting in only 17,597 foreign workers actually arriving, representing 895,933 man-days, if all had stayed in tomatoes through their termination dates as finally authorized above.

Of the 17,597 braceros who arrived, not all calendar man-days represented by the authorizations involved were used in tomato harvest. There were two reasons for this: some were authorized for use in other activities at the request of growers, and some of the workers voluntarily returned to Mexico prior to their authorized termination date. Of the 17,597 braceros who arrived, 2,971 were reallocated at the request of grower associations for use in other activities. If all of these braceros had remained for the periods authorized (and requested) and had been used in the activities for which they were authorized, these reallocations from tomato harvest would represent a total of 120,519 calendar man-days. Of the 17,597 braceros who arrived, the following were not available for tomato harvest because they had terminated.

These amounted to: 2,034 by October 7, 1965; 4,343 by October 14, 1965; 8,839 by October 21, 1965; 11,918 by October 29, 1965.

Cumulative terminations through later dates are: 15,011 by November 4, 1965; 16,213 by November 12, 1965; 17,074 by November 17, 1965.

These terminations represent a further loss of at least 139,187 calendar man-days from the total authorized by the Secretary for tomato harvest.

The following summary table indicates the disposition of requests and the allocation of braceros in the tomato harvest. For purposes of compiling the table, the assumption has been made that all braceros authorized for reallocation to other activities were used in those activities for the balance of their contract and that no more than 11,918 braceros terminated before October 31, 1965.

	Calendar man-days
Requested by grower associations	2, 059, 372
Certified by the California Department of Employment	1, 335, 599
Approved by the Secretary of Labor	1, 159, 176
Braceros who actually arrived	895, 933
Not used in tomato harvest because:	
Reallocated to other activities	120, 519
Terminated	139, 187
Total	259, 706
Net calendar man-days actually available for tomato harvest	[1] 607, 798

[1] Less than one-third of those requested and a little over half of those approved by the Secretary of Labor.

Appendix J—Final Report of the Michigan Farm Labor Panel to the Secretary of Labor, December 30, 1965

FINAL REPORT OF MICHIGAN FARM LABOR PANEL

I. Background

Michigan agriculture is a major employer of seasonal hired workers, and in the years before 1965 it was one of the principal users of foreign workers. During 1964, at the height of activity in July, more than 93,000 seasonal hired workers were employed in the harvest. The peak employment of Mexican nationals came in August 1964, and 12,800 were at work. Later in the year, about 200 British West Indians picked apples.

The Mexican nationals, commonly known as braceros, were employed almost exclusively in the pickling cucumber harvest. Up to 10 years ago, a majority of the harvest workers in that crop had been domestic migrants, most of whom were also employed (before and after the pickle harvest) in sugarbeets. With the mechanization of the sugarbeet harvest, the proportion of braceros employed in the pickle harvest expanded greatly. In recent years, an estimated 85 to 90 percent of the pickle crop has been picked by braceros. Thus, the termination (on December 31, 1964) of Public Law 78, under which braceros had been employed in the United States, posed a major problem of adjustment for pickle growers and processors. It was still possible for braceros to be admitted to the United States under another statute (Public Law 414). The Secretary of Labor, however, announced in December 1964, that the authority delegated to him under that law to certify the need for foreign workers to meet labor shortages would be "strictly administered." At the same time, he recognized the necessity for "responsible action * * * to effect an orderly transition to the use of U.S. workers in these areas where reliance has previously been placed on foreign workers." Accordingly, the Secretary appointed the Michigan Farm Labor Panel[1] in May to investigate and to make recommendations to him concerning the need for supplementary foreign labor in Michigan during the 1965 harvest season. On May 17, the panel reported to the Secretary its finding that there was a prospective need for 5,000 foreign workers in the pickle harvest. The Secretary accepted this finding.

Despite this finding and its acceptance, no foreign workers were authorized for the 1965 pickle harvest. It can be said that the reason for the lack of foreign workers was the fact that by harvest time the great majority of the employers of pickle harvest labor had become ineligible for certification of need for such workers. It can also be said that the reason why these employers lost their eligibility was their refusal or failure to accept all of the domestic workers that had been referred to them by the Employment Service. To say only that much, however, is to ignore a sharp dispute concerning the reasonableness of the terms and the administration of the Department of Labor's eligibility standards. Although there appears to be little doubt that there was a serious shortage of harvest labor in Michigan in 1965, especially toward the end of the season, there is another dispute concerning the extent to which this shortage rather than other factors caused crop losses.

The Secretary of Labor has asked this panel to undertake a full investigation of this year's experiences with seasonal farm labor. As we interpret our assignment, the purpose is not to point the finger of blame at individuals and organizations. If that were the purpose, we doubt that it could be fairly and reasonably achieved. We can frankly state that there is evidence of human fallibility among all of the principal participants in harvest labor recruitment and utilization—processors, growers and Government agencies.

With the inestimable advantage of hindsight, it is not difficult to find examples of misjudgment, inaction where action was needed, and actions of questionable appropriateness. And we can also state that, in our judgment, none of the principal participants can be held entirely blameless for the labor difficulties that developed in the pickle harvest. Having said that, we wish to emphasize our belief that no useful purpose would be served by any effort on our part to assign degrees of blame to these participants. As we interpret our assignment, our principal purpose should be the constructive one of analyzing the principal sources of difficulty in harvest labor recruitment and utilization in 1965 in order to suggest better courses of action for the 1966 harvest.

In the sections that follow, we describe briefly the organization of the pickle industry in Michigan and the allocation of responsibility within the industry for recruitment and utilization of harvest labor, because some understanding of these subjects is necessary for an understanding of the harvest labor problems of 1965. We then describe the crop experience in 1965, to the extent that available data permit. Next we analyze the main aspects of the recruitment program aimed at finding replacements for braceros. Finally, we offer two general recommendations pertaining to the supply and utilization of seasonal farm labor for the pickle harvest which we believe emerge from our analysis of the 1965 experience.

II. Organization of the pickle industry

Cucumbers for pickles are produced almost exclusively as a contract crop in Michigan. Under this arrangement the farmer agrees to plant a specified acreage to be sold to the contracting processor. The processor contracts to buy the cucumbers under a specified price schedule which provides for payment according to the size of the product delivered. For instance, the 1965 contract of one company paid $9 per hundredweight for cucumbers up to thirteen-sixteenths of an inch, $4 per hundredweight for those thirteenth-sixteenths of an inch to $1\frac{1}{16}$ inches, and only $1 per hundredweight for those from 1½ inches to 1¾ inches in size. While individual companies use different size gradients, all pay sharply lower prices for the larger cucumbers, effecting the lower retail value of the end product that is made from the large cucumber. Farmers typically receive one-half the value of the crop for their efforts and the processors retain the other half in return for providing harvest labor. Thus, the processors and the farmers are interested in harvesting the crop to maximize the value return per acre rather than the physical volume of cucumbers per acre.

Under the terms of the usual contracts, the processor rather than the grower assumes primary responsibility for recruiting, transporting, supervising, and paying harvest labor. These functions are usually performed by a growers association which acts in behalf of the growers for an individual company or group of companies. This association charges a fee for these labor services (usually 3 percent of the value of the crop), and the farmers it serves have little control over its activities in actual practice.

Historically, harvest labor received half the value of the crop for its services. When this arrangement came to yield inadequate earnings for the workers, the U.S. Department of Labor specified a worker-return formula to guarantee that the earnings of foreign harvest laborers would reach a prescribed level; and the users of foreign workers were required to offer the same payment terms to domestic workers. Subsequently, the Department of Labor specified an hourly wage rate which had to be offered to foreign nationals to avoid an adverse effect on the wages of domestic workers. From 1962 through 1964, the adverse effect rate in Michigan was $1 per hour. In 1965 it was raised to $1.25 per hour. Since half the value of the crop would no longer cover these higher rates for most workers, most of the contracting companies agreed to pay the makeup rates necessary to pay that part of the wage costs that exceeded one-half of the value of the crop. Thus, the processors undertook to bear the burden of the higher labor costs resulting from the changed labor market conditions.

III. Crop experience, 1965

The harvest labor situation was a factor creating substantial uncertainty for the entire pickle industry in Michigan through the 1965 crop year. Many farmers were reluctant to contract to produce cucumbers in the face of this uncertainty. The prospective acreage report of the U.S. Department of Agriculture issued April 20, 1965, indicated a planted acreage in Michigan of 16,000 acres, down 35 percent from the 1964 plantings. Some witnesses before this panel in mid-May predicted an even larger drop in planted acreage. Declines were also indicated in most other areas of the United States which previously had employed foreign nationals in the harvest. Total expected acreage was down only 6 percent for the entire United States, however, because processors were increasing their contracted acreage in Southern States where family labor is used to harvest smaller acreages.

Final acreage planted in Michigan was 17,600 acres, 10 percent above preseason predictions, perhaps because planting decisions were influenced by the May 17, 1965, finding and recommendations of the Michigan Farm Labor Panel regarding the prospective need for foreign labor. It now appears that many farmers in Michigan were induced to plant cucumbers in 1965 by promises by the contracting processors that foreign nationals would be available for harvest labor. Indeed, it was reported to the panel that such promises were made to growers by at least one processor well after the date when the processor had become ineligible for certification for foreign nationals by the Department of Labor.

The crop harvest season in some parts of Michigan was later than normal because of dry weather during the early growing season. There apparently was some unused harvest labor at the time the harvest normally begins. Rain and warm weather then matured the crop rapidly. Harvest labor shortages developed and became most serious near the end of the harvest season, which extended well into September.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that 16,300 acres of cucumbers were available for harvest in 1965. The abandoned acreage (that never harvested at all) thus was about normal for this crop. Farmers generally reported to the panel that at the beginning of harvest the crop prospects were average or better.

The USDA estimates that the total tonnage available for harvest in Michigan in 1965 was 92,910, down from 116,150 a year earlier. However, the USDA also estimates that 13,630 tons of the available production was not marketed, so that the 1965 marketings in Michigan declined by 36,870 tons or about one-third from the previous year. The failure to harvest a substantial part of the available product is unusual for a contract crop where output is adjusted to the market demand by varying the contracted acreage. Although the marketed tonnage in Michigan declined sharply, for the United States as a whole the marketings were down only slightly, because contracted acreage was increased in other States which had not been dependent upon foreign labor to harvest the crop.

In addition to the substantial portion of the Michigan crop which was grown but not marketed, all of the available evidence indicates a large shift in the size distribution of the cucumbers marketed. If cucumbers are allowed to remain on the vine too long, they increase in size and weight and decrease rapidly in market value. Thus, the bushel yield per acre may rise if inadequate harvest labor is available, but the value of the product per acre will fall. Moreover, the plants are susceptible to damage during harvest, which reduces subsequent product growth and yield. Virtually every company reported a marked decline in the proportion of smaller, high-valued cucumbers and an increase in the proportion of larger sizes. Data collected by the Michigan Employment Security Commission indicate that only 8 percent of the 1965 crop in Michigan was under $1\frac{1}{16}$ inches in size in 1965, compared to 18 percent in each of the previous 2 years. Conversely, 62 percent of the 1965 crop was over 1½ inches compared to 48 percent in this lower value size in the 2 preceding years.

Contract prices for the 1965 crop suggest the possibility that the processors desired a size mix containing a somewhat higher proportion of the medium sizes inasmuch as most of the price schedules for 1965 slightly lowered the price for smaller sizes and raised the relative price of the intermediate sizes. Even taking into account the effect of the minor changes in the 1965 price schedules, it is clear that the size distribution of the portion of the 1965 crop that was marketed resulted in a significant decline in the average price per hundredweight received by growers. The exact magnitude of this decline cannot be determined from official statistics on value of the crop, but individual farmers reported declines in the value of their crop of as much as one-half due to a preponderance of large, low-valued pickles picked by the available labor force.

---

[1] Details concerning the appointment of the panel, its instructions and its activities are set forth in app. A.

It seems probable that most of the shift in the size distribution of cucumber marketings was due to inadequate quantity or quality of harvest labor plus the lack of a system to induce the workers to pick small sizes. There can be little question, moreover, that the substantial portion of the production grown but not marketed was due to inadequate labor at prevailing wages. Both presented a major financial loss to many Michigan farmers.

The available statistics indicate that the harvest labor used in 1965 was not as productive as that used in 1964. The bushels picked per man-hour declined slightly despite the sharp rise in average size, which should have increased the bushels picked per hour. This decline in man-hour productivity, together with the rise in the hourly wage rate, increased sharply the per bushel cost of harvesting cucumbers in Michigan in 1965. The cost increase probably exceeded 25 percent. This additional cost was borne largely by the processors in the form of makeup payments to the workers to bring their wages to the specified minimum.

No reliable evidence is available regarding the impact of the change in size distribution of the crop upon the potential value of the processed product. In total, processors throughout the country received about the same tonnage of cucumbers in 1965 as in 1964. Michigan processors paid much more than in 1964 to obtain their tonnage (including labor costs), and their payments per ton increased by much more than the increase elsewhere. The USDA reports that in 1964 processors in Michigan paid $66.60 per ton of processing product, compared to a U.S. average of $65.90. This year it reports that Michigan processors paid $92.40 per ton, compared to a U.S. average of $75.50. It also appears, however, that the impact upon Michigan processors differed substantially, with some more affected than others. Since most of the 1965 crop has not yet moved into retail markets, it is too soon to assess the ultimate effect upon consumer prices and processors' returns from this year's crop.

Indications at this time are that farm producers in Michigan bore the major financial burden of adjustment to the new labor market conditions. Some of them planted alternative crops offering lower returns, others suffered substantial declines in income as a result of the sharply lower value of their cucumber marketings, and others experienced even greater financial losses due to their inability to harvest their entire crop. A few farmers reported in our hearings that they did about as well on their cucumbers as in previous years; most of these had, by one means or another, provided their own harvest labor supply instead of relying on the efforts of a processor or growers' association.

In the panel hearings several farmers mentioned labor shortages in other crops that are dependent upon seasonal hired labor for harvest. This labor shortage appears to have been most noticeable late in the season and in the celery, tomato, and apple harvests. Only a few foreign workers have been employed in these crops in the past; therefore, the labor difficulties experienced in these crops cannot be tied directly to the elimination of foreign workers, except to the limited extent that it contributed to a general tightening of the labor supply at a time of heavy need. Moreover, generally adverse weather conditions hampered the harvest of many late fall crops in Michigan and thus made the tight labor situation more of a problem to Michigan growers than it might otherwise have been.

IV. Harvest labor recruitment, 1965

General

Prior to 1965, efforts to recruit domestic workers for the pickle harvest were quite limited. As stated in a preceding section of this report, before the mid-1950's, pickle harvest labor was drawn mainly from workers brought into the State to cultivate and harvest sugarbeets. After the sugarbeet harvest was mechanized, pickle growers and processors quickly turned to braceros as the principal source of labor for their harvest. Government regulations required some showing of efforts to recruit domestic labor as a condition of eligibility to import foreign labor. Nevertheless, by 1964 only about 3,500 domestic workers were employed in the pickle harvest at the mid-August peak, when 12,800 braceros were harvesting pickles.

Heavy reliance on bracero labor for the pickle harvest had effectively excluded this crop from the established flow patterns of the domestic migrant labor stream. A few thousand migrants come into the State in late spring to harvest strawberries and smaller crops. Then large numbers of migrants arrive for the cherry harvest, which begins before the pickle harvest and reaches its peak after the pickle harvest has begun. As the cherry harvest tapers off, the migrants that it has employed mostly move into the tomato harvest in Michigan and adjoining States. A large proportion of these migrants return to the same farms year after year. Consequently, there was little prospect of drawing large numbers of domestic migrants from the regular stream to work in the pickle harvest. New sources of supply had to be sought within the State and thousands of new workers had to be induced to come to Michigan to meet the needs of the pickle growers.

It is our impression that the 1965 recruitment effort for pickles was rather slow and uncertain at the beginning. Initially there was much uncertainty about the prospects for obtaining substantial numbers of braceros, and it was also difficult to foresee how many acres of pickles would be planted. As the dimensions of the crop and of the need for workers became clearer, an intensive and large-scale recruitment effort was developed. Processors and the growers' associations affiliated with them greatly increased the numbers of people assigned to recruitment and sent them to many new areas. Processors reported very large increases in the number of advances made to crew leaders and even to families to insure their participation in the pickle harvest. Substantial expenditures were made for advertising. The State, regional, and national offices of the Employment Service also greatly increased the personnel and time devoted to recruitment specifically for the Michigan pickle harvest. Especially at the State and regional levels, there was excellent cooperation between Employment Service personnel and the representatives of pickle processors and growers. Another active participant in the recruitment program was the National Pickle Growers Association. Special mention should be made of a "crash" recruitment effort undertaken by the Michigan Employment Security Commission late in the season when it became apparent that there was a serious shortage of labor in this harvest. Although there were some disappointment at the quality of the labor obtained by this special late-season effort, there is no doubt that the effort itself was extraordinary.

We doubt that any of those involved would claim that the 1965 recruitment effort, even though far exceeding any previous effort in this industry, was as well organized or as effective as it might have been under more favorable circumstances. We believe that the experience gained in 1965 will result in an earlier start in 1966, greater concentration of effort in the areas and among the groups that are most likely to yield satisfactory workers, and improved coordination of the efforts of all of the participants in recruitment. We offer some specific suggestions below, after briefly examining the results of the 1965 effort.

The Employment Service reports that 14,587 workers were hired through its facilities for the pickle harvest in 1965. Of these, 9,175 came from within Michigan; 4,798 came from other States; and 614 came from Puerto Rico under a contract arrangement which is discussed below. In addition, there were other harvest workers recruited independently who do not appear in the foregoing totals, but we cannot estimate how many.

The total of almost 15,000 workers reported hired for the pickle harvest is only a little under the peak employment of 16,300 workers in the 1964 harvest season, and the planted acreage was down substantially in 1965 as compared to 1964. Thus there is perhaps a superficial impression of adequacy of the 1965 labor supply. The impression is misleading because the average time worked per worker hired apparently fell off greatly. There are no figures available as this report is written which show directly the average amount of time worked. But we do have some estimates prepared by the MESC from a questionnaire survey which permit comparison of bushels picked per man-hour and per worker for the season in 1963, 1964, and 1965. The bushels picked per man-hour worked showed little change in 1965 from the 2 preceding years. But the bushels picked by the average worker for the season dropped sharply. In 1963 and 1964, this average was 332 and 320 bushels, respectively; the 1965 average was 193 bushels. (It should be noted, of course, that any measure of bushels picked is not an entirely adequate measure of worker performance; a larger proportion of the less-valuable large pickles, such as was obtained in 1965, should raise the bushels-picked figures.) The 1965 decline in bushels picked per worker hired appears to be attributable to several factors: Fewer hours of work per day, fewer days of work per week, high labor turnover throughout the season, and the early departure of some groups such as the A-teams and interstate migrants.

We have heard many complaints about the quality of labor during the 1965 season. The most common grower complaints are summarized in appendix B. Of course, these complaints were not equally applicable to all types of workers. There seemed to be general agreement that the workers who seemed most satisfactory from many standpoints was the Puerto Rican. Equally satisfactory in most ways were Texas-Mexican families; but their productivity was somewhat lower because of the substantial portion of women, children, and young adults in the pickers drawn from these family groups.

One of the lessons of the 1965 experience is that a great deal of effort was devoted to programs which showed small results. A commendable effort was made to recruit labor from the Appalachian area, but the numbers of workers available were less than anticipated; and many of those recruited never reached Michigan, mainly because the lateness of the harvest threw pickup schedules badly out of kilter. Other programs attempted to find sources of labor among the mentally retarded, prisoners awaiting parole, disadvantaged workers, and out-of-work youth. These experimental and pilot programs had varying degrees of success, but in total made a very small contribution to the harvest as a whole. As experiments they showed some promise of expansion in the future, but most of these special programs cannot be expected to provide substantial amounts of harvest labor.

A second lesson was that candidates for the pickle harvest must be screened carefully for physical fitness. Some of the workers recruited this year simply lacked the physical stamina to put in a reasonable day's work.

A third lesson is that increased efforts should be made to fit the pickle harvest into the flow patterns of the regular migrant labor stream. The few farmers who reported on labor difficulties in 1965 were those who had long been established in that flow pattern, almost without exception because they had other crops such as cherries which permitted them to offer a longer working season than is possible from the cucumber crop alone. We recognize that not many farmers can hope to achieve this result solely by their own efforts; among other difficulties, most pickle growers in Michigan today produce no other crops which require substantial numbers of harvest workers. But experience clearly shows that the better workers are likely to prefer those areas and crops or groups of crops that can provide reasonably steady employment for an extended period. (There is another interesting aspect of the matter. One successful farmer told us that his harvest workers, after reaching up all morning to pick cherries, were delighted to have the chance to spend the afternoon bending down to pick cucumbers.) The pickle industry should carefully explore the possibilities of joint recruitment and utilization programs with representatives of the producers of other crops, not only in Michigan but in adjacent States. We understand that such an exploration is planned with regard to Puerto Rican recruitment; we believe that it should be undertaken in connection with the recruitment of other groups of domestic workers as well.

Finally, we note that the laws (and perhaps administrative policies) of some States impede the recruitment of migratory labor. We refer to such things as highly restrictive licensing requirements for recruiters and the reported refusal to give credit to the children of migrants for classes attended in Michigan schools. We believe that part of the national effort to improve the conditions of migrant labor might well be some exploration by appropriate officials of the possibility of easing these impediments to mobility.

Puerto Rican Recruitment

More than 600 Puerto Rican workers were employed as harvest labor in Michigan in 1965. All of them worked in the pickle harvest. Experience with them was good. Their productivity was about equal to that of the better domestic migrants, and employers indicated that they hope to expand considerably the employment of Puerto Ricans in 1966. As American citizens, Puerto Ricans may be employed without regard to the restrictions of Public Law 414.

There was initially some reluctance on the part of the Commonwealth government to allow Puerto Ricans to work in Michigan agriculture in 1965 because of the bad experience of some workers who were left stranded by the failure of a pickle company in 1964. This incident helps to explain why so few Puerto Ricans worked in the 1965 harvest. But the Commonwealth government appears to be encouraged by the 1965 experience and with the special contract provisions designed to prevent repetition of the 1964 incident.

Recruitment of farm labor in Puerto Rico for employment on the mainland is well organized. The Puerto Rican workers are provided with a contract which is supervised by the secretary of labor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Contract provisions are reviewed each year and where necessary, appropriate revisions are made. Terms are generally as favorable as those provided in the past to Mexican and British West Indian workers. The contract is enforced by the Migration Division Office in New York, and complaints are investigated and settled by this office through its field representatives. Each year employers using Puerto Rican farm labor are invited to Puerto Rico for contract discussions and wage negotiations that will be applicable for the coming year's recruitment. The New York regional office of the Farm Labor Service of the U.S. Employment Service acts as the clearinghouse for recruitment. Contracts are signed directly with the employers.

Prospects for expanded use of Puerto Rican workers in Michigan agriculture are good. Employers would welcome them, particularly because Puerto Rican workers would be available to complete the harvest after other workers have returned to school or to their home areas. The Commonwealth government now appears to be satisfied that the Michigan growers are responsible employers. The mechanics of recruitment are well established. There will be sharp competition for limited numbers of workers in 1966, however, from growers in all parts of the country. The Michigan pickle industry hopes to obtain from 2,000 to 4,000 Puerto Rican workers for 1966. The possibility of attaining this goal should be ascertained as early in the season as possible.

V. The A-team program

One of the key factors in the developing harvest labor situation in Michigan in 1965 was the A-team program. Unfortunately, a great deal of acrimony has grown out of this program. In our hearings and in materials submitted to us concerning the program, the representatives of processors and growers and Government representatives have repeatedly traded charges of bad faith and unreasonable actions. This panel has no desire to contribute to the acrimony that has developed. We see no need to analyze in detail all of the charges and countercharges that we have heard concerning the A-team program. The panel remains convinced, as it was in May, that this program could and should have made a "modest" contribution to the harvest labor supply in Michigan. Actually, however, its contribution was extremely small. We believe that it is desirable to analyze the way in which this program developed in Michigan for the purpose of identifying sources of major difficulty which might be eliminated or greatly minimized in a youth employment program in 1966.

In early June, some Department of Labor representatives concerned with the A-team program appear to have believed, and to have stated to interested parties, that more than 10,000 team members would be available for the Michigan pickle harvest. This was the approximate number of boys who had indicated willingness to accept such employment. The Michigan Employment Security Commission estimates that, after the elimination of duplications and verification of interest in the program, about 4,500 boys remained available for employment in Michigan. Only about 10 percent of this total, or 486, were actually brought to the fields for work. Most of the large difference between availability and utilization is attributable to the unwillingness of processors and growers to accept this type of labor. This unwillingness is attributable in some measure to the way in which the A-team program developed.

The A-team program was officially announced on May 4, 1965, by the Secretary of Labor. The original orientation is shown by the derivation of the name of the program. "A-team" was the acronym for "Athletes in Temporary Employment as Agricultural Manpower." The initial concept of the program was that boys who had actively participated in high school athletics would be in excellent physical condition and would also have learned the values of discipline and teamwork—and thus should be a prime source of agricultural labor. Furthermore, heavy teenage unemployment was anticipated during the summer of 1965; it seemed highly desirable to place as many teenagers as possible in harvest jobs that might otherwise be filled by foreign workers.

Participating schools were initially urged to form a team or teams of from 20 to 31 boys, preferably athletes, and to appoint a supervisor for each team who would preferably be an athletic coach. Employers of A-teams were to guarantee the boys not less than the applicable minimum rate for criteria employees ($1.25 per hour in Michigan) and other terms and conditions of work no less favorable than those offered to other workers. Employers were also to pay A-team supervisors on the basis of $4 per week per boy employed. Meals were to be provided by the employer, with the boys paying for them at the rate of no more than $2.25 per day. Housing and transportation were also to be provided by the employer. In the original design of the program, the teams were to be offered to employers who were no more than 350 miles from the boys' homes.

The original design of this program was substantially modified in the weeks following the first announcement. (We are advised that, since this was a "crash" program, no systematic record of the changes made in it was kept; hence, we cannot state the exact timing of some of the changes.) One of the significant modifications was a decision to accept "any physically qualified high school youth" instead of concentrating on athletes. A related change was the acceptance of a considerable number of men other than athletic coaches as supervisors, and in some cases men who had no connection with the school from which the team came. In the first part of June, a decision was made to assign to Michigan employers A-teams from points as distant as Kansas, Florida, and the New England States. This decision apparently provided the basis for the estimate mentioned above that more than 10,000 A-team members could be made available for the Michigan pickle harvest.

Sometime in late May or early June, the Department of Labor issued the standard contract which employers of A-teams would be required to execute with the boys and their parents. Some employers considered that the terms of the contract were excessively complicated and imposed onerous and in some respects ambiguous legal responsibilities on the employer. Employers also reacted adversely to the "recommended" menus for A-teams, not only on the ground of cost but also on the ground that the recommended meals would be hard to prepare. (Actually, the feeding of A-team members turned out to be only a minor problem for most of those who employed them.)

Three weeks after the A-team program was announced, the MESC sent letters concerning it to all processors, growers' associations and growers who were believed to wish to observe the criteria established for eligibility for consideration for foreign workers. These letters stated with considerable emphasis that acceptance of all A-team members referred would be a condition of continued eligibility for foreign labor. Between the time that this letter was sent to 33 employers and associations and the time that the first A-team assignments were made, only one grower (with 12 acres under cultivation) withdrew from the program. Six employers effectively withdrew from the program following the initial assignment of only one A-team to them. With one exception, these employers had used only small numbers of braceros in 1964 (a combined total of less than 800); the exception was a large user who had reduced contracted acreage by more than 50 percent in 1965. Hence, by mid-June the great majority of employers and virtually all of the large-scale users of braceros in 1964 had accepted multiple referrals of A-teams. However, between June 15 and June 30, nearly half of those remaining in the program refused further referrals and thus lost their eligibility for foreign labor. Most of the employers who withdrew at this time not only refused additional referrals; they also refused to employ the A-teams that had already been referred to them. Therefore some of these teams were subsequently referred to three or four different employers in succession.[2]

As of July 9, six employers still had not refused any A-team referrals. On that date, a representative of the MESC notified each of these remaining employers that it was his understanding from a meeting that he had attended in Washington on the preceding day that the Department of Labor saw no need to certify any foreign workers for employment in Michigan in 1965. Thereafter no further referrals of A-teams were made, and more of the teams that had previously been referred were refused by employers. However, all but one of the 13 A-teams that were actually utilized in Michigan were employed by the growers and processors who were continuing to accept such teams as of July 9.

Why was there a massive withdrawal of employer acceptance of the A-team program in the latter half of June? We have sought with some care to find an answer to that question that will be consistent with the facts of the matter. In our judgment, there were two important factors which produced the numerous withdrawals of June 15–30. The first was the spreading conviction among growers and processors after June 15 that the Department of Labor did not intend to certify any braceros for employment in Michigan. The second was the changing character of the program, especially the broad extension of the recruitment area, which made the program even less palatable to Michigan employers than it had been at the outset.

It is quite clear that the A-team program was presented to Michigan employers from the outset as a unilateral, compulsory undertaking of the Department of Labor. Employers were not asked how many A-team members they would be willing to accept, nor does it appear that they were consulted concerning the terms and conditions that would govern their employment.

Instead, they were directed to accept all A-teams referred to them on terms and conditions determined by the Department of Labor, if they wished to remain eligible for foreign labor. During our hearings last May, even before all of the detailed regulations covering the program were known, many employers expressed reservations concerning the program while stating their willingness to accept it despite those reservations because it was the price of getting a supply of braceros. Many of them stated that their previous experience with teenage pickers had led them to expect that their productivity would be about half that of adults; at the same time, many employers stated that braceros were far more productive than domestic adult migrants.

Although no one stated the point explicitly, the clear implication was that the employers could afford the high-cost A-team program only if they had the offset of the high productivity of the braceros. Another serious reservation pointed out to us in May was that the A-team members would leave the pickle fields during the latter part of August, even though the harvest was expected to continue for another 2 to 4 weeks thereafter in most parts of the State.

Again, the employers appear to have anticipated that a supplementary supply of braceros would remedy this deficiency of the A-teams. The contracts for bracero labor could be written to assure that this type of labor would remain available until the harvest was completed. No such assurance could be had from domestic migrants, because a large percentage of them leave the State to pick other crops or to place their children in school before the pickle harvest is finished.

To the extent that there was a specific basis for the spreading belief among employers in the latter part of June that they were to get no braceros, it appears to be a press release that was issued on June 15 by the Department of Labor. The heading on the release read as follows: "California and Michigan Growers Meet Farm Labor Needs With Domestic Workers." Most of the release dealt with California matters, but the concluding paragraph quoted a representative of the National Pickle Growers Association to the effect that it would probably be able to satisfy its members' labor needs with domestic workers. (The association representative later said that the release misquoted him.) This press release was widely publicized in pickle-growing areas of Michigan.

It appears to have been interpreted as a statement made by the Department of Labor that no foreign labor would be allowed in Michigan, despite the fact that a growers' association rather than the Secretary of Labor was given as the source of the statement concerning the adequacy of the supply of domestic workers. When they became convinced that no braceros would be available, many employers apparently decided that taking their chances on further recruitment of domestic adult migrants would involve less risk than continued reliance on A-teams as a major source of harvest labor.

The second development in the latter half of June which apparently made A-team even less acceptable to employers was, as already noted, the extension of the geographical area of recruitment. Up to mid-June, virtually all of the A-teams referred to Michigan employers had come from Michigan or adjacent States; of those referred after mid-June, a substantial number came from places as distant as Kansas, New England, and Florida.

Thus, even an employer who had already accepted a substantial number of A-teams could find his eligibility for foreign labor terminated if he refused the distant addition. Many employers felt that it was essential to interview the boys before hiring them, and most were unwilling to send a representative as much as 1,000 miles away to interview as few as 20 boys.

As we have emphasized before, we see no useful purpose to be served by our attempting to pass judgment on all of the decisions made and the actions taken concerning A-teams by employers and Government officials. Our efforts to understand and to explain the decisions and actions are not intended either as justification or criticism. Our purpose is to draw lessons from the 1965 experience which may contribute to the development of a more successful youth employment program for 1966. Before we state what we think these lessons are, however, it is important to consider the performance of those A-teams that were ultimately employed in the pickle fields.

Since so few boys worked in A-teams, our generalizations must be guarded and tentative. (We noted with some astonishment the readiness of a few people who spoke at our hearings to characterize all present-day teenagers on the basis of a few days or weeks of experience with 20 A-team members.) Nevertheless, we believe that the following observations are pertinent. Of the 13 A-teams that were actually utilized, 7 had 75 percent or more of their original members at work when their season ended, and 1 of the 7 had been substantially increased in size at the request of the employer. On the other hand, four teams had less than half of their original number at the end of their season, including two teams that were sent home for disciplinary reasons after only a few days of work. This impression of rather extreme variation is reinforced by testimony at our hearings. The largest user of A-teams in the State said that they varied from "reasonably satisfactory" to "very poor." We also have the impression that those A-teams that conformed most closely to the original design of the program—athletes supervised by coaches—were most successful. Most of the boys who came from farm backgrounds also seem to have done an acceptable job. The nonathletes from towns and cities and the boys with no previous work experience and a resistance to discipline generally turned in a poor or unsatisfactory performance. Some supervisors proved to be much more effective than others in keeping the boys at work.[3]

These observations suggest the great importance of more careful screening of both team members and supervisors in the future. Picking pickles requires no great skill. It does not follow—as some seem to assume—that anyone without an obvious physical disability is fully qualified to perform this work. Pickle picking is hard physical labor. Motivation and a high degree of physical fitness are essential for adequate performance. We dismiss as an absurdity the claim that only foreign workers have these requisites in sufficient degree to perform this arduous work. We think that it is equally absurd to assume that any boy who is not obviously disabled can and will do this work satisfactorily. We believe that the increased (or, more accurately, renewed) reliance on incentive methods of payment which we suggest below can provide much of the motivation needed by teenage workers, as well as others. But the careful screening of inexperienced boys for the requisite physical fitness and willingness to do the work will still be essential.

It is obvious that one of the major sources of difficulty in the A-team program was that it began on the basis of compulsion. When the source of compulsion—the expectation of braceros—was eliminated, the program virtually collapsed. We believe that a more viable program can and should be developed for the coming year on a voluntary basis. The necessary implication of voluntarism is that the design of the program—its size, its screening standards, the recruitment area, terms and conditions of employment, and so on—must be determined by consultation between the representatives of growers and processors and the representatives of Government. We will not try to specify in detail what these parties should agree upon. We do emphasize the point, which we hope is obvious, that such consultations should be started immediately. Another problem which will require solution if a youth employment program is to succeed is the end-of-the-season need for labor, after teenage boys have returned to school. As stated in the preceding section, we believe that if a substantial number of Puerto Rican workers can be recruited for the Michigan harvest, their contracts could be drawn in such a way as to give reasonable assurance that they would largely fulfill the end-of-the-season labor requirements.

---

[2] Most of the teams were finally disbanded, to the dismay of most of the boys and their parents. The Department of Labor made strenuous efforts to find other summer employment for these boys. We do not know how many (if any) remained unemployed who might have found other jobs if they had not counted on the A-team program.

[3] No reliable figures are available concerning the man-hour productivity of the A-teams. The MESC has developed an estimate (based on data provided by a sample of processors) of average bushels picked per worker for the season. The average for A-team members was 160 bushels, compared to 193 bushels for all workers in 1965. The season average per worker in 1964 was 320 bushels and in 1963 it was 332 bushels.

VI. General recommendations

In the preceding sections of this report, we have offered a number of specific recommendations relating to future recruitment. We will not attempt to summarize those specific recommendations, because we believe that each of them should be considered in the context in which it is offered. Two other recommendations of a more general nature have emerged from our study, and we present those in this concluding section.

First, however, we wish to explain why one important subject is not covered in this report. We have chosen not to discuss here the adequacy of present provisions in Michigan for the general welfare of migrant workers—health and education services, sanitation, housing, and various kinds of protective legislation. Our reason is that these matters have been under study by the Governor's commission on migrant labor for some time. This commission submitted a report with numerous recommendations on April 1, 1965. Some of the recommendations have been acted upon by the State legislature; others remain under active consideration; and the Commission is continuing its studies. We have not intruded into its assigned field because we believe that it speaks with much greater knowledge of the general conditions of migrant labor in Michigan than we could hope to acquire in our necessarily brief study with its primary focus on the pickle industry. We can say, however, that in our opinion substantial progress is presently being made in Michigan in this important area of provisions for the general welfare of migrant workers.

Improving the Utilization of Harvest Labor

One pickle grower reported to us in a letter that this year's Texans were much harder to handle than the braceros; the Texans all had cars, the growers said, and if you spoke sharply to them they just drove away. This complaint suggests that past reliance on braceros may have impeded or made unnecessary in this industry the development of supervisory practices that are appropriate for dealing with American citizens.

The braceros were supervised by crew leaders and to some extent by field men employed by growers' associations. Perhaps more important is the fact that the braceros were forbidden by law to perform any work other than that for which they were brought into the country. Thus, their mobility and their alternatives were sharply limited, and individual growers had little need to engage in the usual tasks of supervision.

The transition to exclusive reliance on domestic labor has suddenly created a need for more and better supervision. There has also been a sudden realization that adequate supervision of seasonal labor is a complex and demanding task. The ability to give training to inexperienced workers, a reasonable understanding of the feelings and attitudes of the workers being supervised, and the knack of encouraging good workmanship by persuasion are almost universal requirements of supervisors.

The harvest labor supervisor must also deal with problems growing out of the heterogeneity of the labor force and frequent changes in its size, weather changes, housing, feeding, transportation, and so on. The National Pickle Growers Association is already planning a series of training sessions on effective supervision.

We add our voices to those already raised to emphasize the new importance of supervision in the effective utilization of the available labor.

One of the major problems of this industry, which might have been a source of difficulty even if braceros had been available, is that it has an obsolete incentive payment system. As was stated above, the traditional basis of payment has been for harvest labor to receive half the value of the crop. Under this system, of course, not only the physical volume but also the product mix determined labor's return; a high proportion of the more valuable, smaller pickles meant more money both for the grower and for the picker. The establishment of a minimum hourly rate of $1 seems to have weakened somewhat the incentive aspect of the traditional payment system, and the 1965 minimum of $1.25 apparently submerged it completely. It is a widely accepted rule of thumb in industry that an incentive rate, to be effective, should make it possible for the average worker to earn from 25 to 35 percent above the minimum guarantee; the prospect of a smaller incentive gain usually does not call forth the extra effort that an incentive system should stimulate. Given the schedule of contract prices for cucumbers in effect in 1965, half of the value of the picked crop would have been very far below the hourly minimum for the great majority of workers, and picking at an incentive pace probably would have done no more than to raise their piece-rate earnings somewhat closer to the minimum hourly rate. Hence, there was no real motivation to work any harder, or to pick any more carefully, than was necessary to avoid supervisory reprimands or outright discharge. Thus, we suggest that one of the important problems of 1965 was that virtually all of the harvest labor was performing at what is commonly called a "day-work pace" instead of the incentive pace which has prevailed in some earlier years. Experience not only in agriculture but in many other industries shows that the difference in results is often dramatic.

We believe, therefore, that a redesigned incentive payment system could be quite effective in increasing the value of the crop picked per man-hour of harvest labor, and perhaps also in actually reducing the unit labor cost. A flat increase in incentive payments may not suffice to produce this result. It is also important to devise a way to motivate the worker to do a proper picking job, and to make it possible for him to know as he works how much he is earning. The pickle industry may find it helpful to draw upon the considerable body of technical knowledge that other industries have developed on this subject if it should decide to undertake the redesign and modernization of its incentive system which we think is desirable.

Foreign Labor

The panel recommends that no foreign labor should be authorized for the 1966 harvest season in Michigan. If this recommendation is accepted, the panel urges that an official pronouncement should be made on this point at the earliest possible time.

As we have pointed out, the development of an adequate recruiting effort in 1965 was delayed and impeded by the lingering hope that large numbers of braceros would ultimately be available. Elimination of all uncertainty on that point now will, we believe, result in earlier and more effective planning and action by all participants in the recruitment process. Furthermore, if there are growers who are genuinely unwilling to grow pickles without braceros to harvest them, such growers should have ample time to plan to shift to other crops. Both processors and growers should also have sufficient time to make informed decisions concerning the number of acres of pickles that they wish to contract for and to plant, in the light of the best information that can be developed concerning the availability of harvest labor in 1966.

There was a serious shortage of labor for the pickle harvest in 1965 and this labor shortage caused substantial losses for many, though not all, growers of this crop. We understand and share the regret of growers and processors that the transition from heavy reliance on foreign labor to exclusive reliance on domestic labor had to be accomplished so abruptly that substantial losses did occur. But we do not believe that the reintroduction of foreign labor into this harvest in 1966 would serve the best interests of the industry either in 1966 or in the years ahead in view of the national policy to end heavy reliance on foreign labor for work for which domestic labor can be recruited. While it is too soon to attempt any specific forecast of the availability of domestic labor for the 1966 harvest, we see some indications which suggest that a repetition of the 1965 experience is unlikely. This year, a negligible part of the crop was machine harvested; next year, it seems likely that at least 15 percent will be machine harvested. This year, special circumstances prevented numerically significant contributions to the labor supply by Puerto Rican and youth recruitment; both programs can probably be considerably expanded and improved in 1966. The lessons learned and the contacts made in this year's intrastate and interstate recruitment campaigns can increase the effectiveness of similar efforts next year. Finally, improved supervisory practices and a more effective incentive system can contribute to better retention and higher productivity of harvest labor in 1966.

Implied throughout our discussion, we believe, is a point that we want to make explicit and to emphasize: Despite serious difficulties, this industry made very substantial progress toward the development of a reasonably adequate domestic harvest labor force in 1965. It would be a disservice to the industry to impair or to reverse that progress by renewing the dependence of growers on foreign labor in 1966.

Respectfully submitted:

MICHIGAN FARM LABOR PANEL.
CHARLES C. KILLINGSWORTH,
Chairman.

DANIEL R. FUSFELD,
DALE E. HATHAWAY,
ANSON L. LOVELLETTE,
Rev. HUGH C. WHITE, Jr.

DECEMBER 30, 1965.

APPOINTMENT, INSTRUCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE PANEL

On May 7, 1965, the Secretary of Labor established the Michigan Farm Labor Panel to assist him in carrying out responsibilities delegated to him under Public Law 414. Appointed to the panel were: Daniel R. Fusfeld, professor of economics, the University of Michigan; Dale E. Hathaway, professor of agricultural economics, Michigan State University; Anson L. Lovellette, director of industrial relations, lakeshore division, the Bendix Corp.; the Reverend Hugh C. White, Jr., executive director, Detroit Industrial Mission; and Charles C. Killingsworth, university professor of labor and industrial relations, Michigan State University (chairman).

The panel was initially directed to make findings of fact and recommendations with regard to anticipated applications by Michigan growers for certification of foreign workers under Public Law 414, based on the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act and the Department of Labor regulations of December 19, 1964 (20 CFR Sec. 602.10). The panel was also directed to make further recommendations for "serving fully all agricultural labor needs, of relying on domestic workers for this so far as they are available, and of maintaining adequate agricultural wages and working and living conditions," and for "any appropriate arrangements in connection with the hiring of any supplemental laborers certified under Public Law 414."

Public Law 414 is the Immigration and Nationality Act. This act is administered by the Attorney General through the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Rules and regulations issued by I. & N.S. require that an employer requesting foreign workers must obtain a certification from the Secretary of

Labor that domestic workers are not available for the jobs for which foreign workers have been requested and that the admission of such workers will not adversely affect wages or working conditions of domestic workers similarly employed.

Regulations were issued December 19, 1964, by the Secretary of Labor setting forth the standards that must be observed by employers before consideration can be given to their request for foreign workers. These criteria included: Making reasonable efforts to recruit domestic workers; offering an hourly rate of no less than $1.25; offering terms and conditions of employment to domestic workers no less favorable than those that had previously been provided to foreign workers under Public Law 78.

Hearings and conferences were conducted by the Michigan Farm Labor Panel from May 8 through May 15 to obtain information about the prospective size of the 1965 Michigan pickle crop and the anticipated need for harvest labor. After consideration of the testimony and data presented at these hearings, the panel on May 17 presented an interim report to the Secretary of Labor. Its principal finding was "that there is a prospective shortage of domestic labor for the pickling cucumber harvest and that there is a prospective need for the authorization of a supplementary labor supply of 5,000 foreign workers." It was the judgment of the panel that the employment of this number of foreign workers would have no adverse effect upon the standards and employment of domestic labor. The panel also stated that it would review its preliminary estimate "shortly prior to the time that specific certification requests must be acted upon." This interim finding and recommendation of the panel was accepted by the Secretary of Labor. As noted in the body of this final report, no requests for certification were filed and no foreign workers were authorized for employment in the 1965 pickle harvest.

By letter dated October 11, 1965, the Secretary of Labor requested the panel to reconvene for the purpose of making a study which "should present in the fullest detail the results of this year's experience with seasonal farm labor in Michigan so that we may plan for next year's efforts in the State." To carry out this assignment, the panel held hearings in East Lansing on October 21–22, in Saginaw on December 9 and in Muskegon on December 10. Pickle growers, processors, representatives of the Michigan Employment Security Commission, and Federal personnel from the Cleveland Regional Office of the Bureau of Employment Security and the national office of the Farm Labor Service participated in these hearings, as did others with an interest in improving the working and living conditions of migrant labor generally. In addition, the panel has received a number of letters from growers and helpful reports from State and Federal Government agencies.

EVALUATION OF THE 1965 EXPERIENCE BY INTERESTED PARTIES

There was general agreement among growers, processors, and Government representatives that difficulties arose in harvesting the pickling cucumber crop in 1965 in Michigan. But there were differences of opinion about the severity of the difficulties and their causes.

GROWERS

The feeling among growers was that the harvest difficulties were serious, although not all reported severe losses and a few had no difficulty. Where losses were incurred, however, the blame was almost unanimously placed on inadequate labor and the failure of the U.S. Department of Labor to admit Mexican nationals.

Typically, acreage planted was reduced from 1964 levels, although the reduction varied from farmer to farmer and some retained the same acreage. In a few cases there were increases in acreage planted. The cause of the reduction was, generally, uncertainty about availability of harvest labor.

Many growers claimed that the potential crop was one of the best in recent years. In some areas the crop was late, because of lack of rainfall, but late in the season there was ample rain. The crop then came on with a rust, requiring intensive picking if it was to be fully harvested. One reason for the dismay of the farmers is undoubtedly the belief that they could have had an unusually profitable season if the crop had been adequately harvested.

Farmers were generally quite appreciative of the recruitment efforts of the Employment Service, but they were dissatisfied with the labor recruited to replace the Mexican nationals. Their complaints centered on the following points:

1. Most of this year's workers were inexperienced in harvesting pickles.
2. Labor productivity was generally low, so that large numbers of workers were required for work formerly done by relatively few Mexican nationals.
3. Supervision was more difficult than in the past, largely because this year's workers were generally less amenable to direction than the Mexican nationals had been.
4. The higher minimum hourly rate made the old incentive payment system largely ineffective.
5. Many of the workers, especially A-team members, were unwilling or unable to work a full day or a full week.
6. Crops were not fully or properly picked; many workers failed to pick the smaller, more valuable cucumbers, thus increasing the proportion of larger, less desirable sizes and reducing the yield of the vines.

PROCESSORS

The pickle processing and packing companies reported greatly expanded recruiting efforts in 1965, and plans to extend those efforts even more in 1966. They expressed the hope that the uncertainties and difficulties of 1965 would not be repeated. They stated their willingness to experiment with pilot programs designed to introduce new types of labor, but they also stressed the need to assure growers that adequate supplies of competent labor would be available.

Although the Michigan crop ran into difficulties, the national harvest was about the same as in 1964 and the Michigan acreage was largely replaced by increased production elsewhere.

Processors testified that costs of production were higher in Michigan in 1965 than in 1964, due largely to higher wage rates and lower productivity of harvest labor in Michigan, and to the cost of shipping cucumbers from other States to processing plants in Michigan. These higher costs may be compensated for to some degree by higher prices in 1966. But since the 1965 pack has yet to be fully marketed, it is probably impossible at this time for even the processors to assess the full impact on their earnings of the unsettled conditions of 1965.

The processors reported satisfactory trial use of mechanical cucumber pickers in 1965. They expect perhaps 20 machines to be used in the 1966 Michigan cucumber harvest, to pick about 15 percent of the normal (pre-1965) crop. Large-scale mechanization now appears to be about 5 years off, however.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Government representatives conversant with the 1965 labor situation in Michigan are generally agreed that there were losses in the cucumber harvest. Judgments about the extent and causes of the losses vary, however.

Representatives of the Michigan Employment Security Commission, which did much of the recruitment of labor to replace the Mexican nationals, recognize that the labor supply was inadequate and that the pickle industry in Michigan cannot continue even at the reduced level of 1965 unless significant improvement is made. In the view of MESC, the 1965 experience showed the following:

1. "Day-haul" labor is an effective emergency source of labor, provided it has reasonable incentives and its use is properly planned and supervised.
2. The adverse employer reaction to the A-teams was due primarily to the fact that the program was not fully voluntary: "the teams were not sold on their merits but were forced upon the employers as a condition for maintaining eligibility" for Mexican nationals.
3. The A-team program had high costs for only a short period of availability for an unsure and untried source of labor. Nevertheless, further development of the program to employ youth as harvest labor is warranted.
4. The program using contract workers from Puerto Rico was successful and should be continued.
5. Interstate recruitment of labor in new territories was not fully successful, and improved methods will have to be developed.

The regional office of the U.S. Employment Service (Cleveland) was also heavily involved in labor recruitment for Michigan. The regional director and his staff were in close touch with the situation throughout the year. He felt that insufficient and inexperienced labor was an important cause of the crop loss, but also pointed to the reduction in acreage and the late harvest due to unusual weather as contributing factors. He also called attention to poor supervision of the harvest labor and inadequate planning on the part of growers and processors as important causes of the harvest difficulties: the processors, continuing to expect certification of Mexican nationals until well after the crop was planted, did not recruit labor for their growers as vigorously as they might have done. Finally, the regional office pointed to the effects on labor productivity and motivation of an "adverse effect" wage rate of $1.25 per hour. By effectively eliminating customary piece rate wage systems it "had the effect of destroying initiative and encouraging sloth."

Officials of the U.S. Department of Labor connected with the A-team program who reported to us were generally satisfied with the effort, although they recognize some of its faults. They tended, however, to blame the growers and processors for failure of the A-teams to fully satisfy the demand for harvest labor.

Failure to use all of the A-teams was blamed on the growers: "Many growers had assumed that A-teams would never be formed. When they were assigned a team, they withdrew from the program. Other growers waited almost until contract-signing time before announcing that the students' home cities were too far away and that they could not spare the time to go and recruit them. (Seventy percent of the A-team students were from Michigan or contiguous States.) Some cancellations were so late that it was impossible to reassign the teams involved. Some growers actually signed contracts but then refused to bring the boys to Michigan, claiming that sufficient housing was not available. Some teams were assigned to three or four employers before they were placed or they were disbanded."

Failure of the A-teams to finish picking the crop was blamed on the weather: "This year's pickle crop was delayed 2 to 3 weeks due to a succession of cool nights and dry weather. The harvest usually begins around mid-July and reaches a peak in mid-August. In early September, migrant workers are generally available to complete the harvest. This year the harvest did not begin until the first week in August. Thus the harvest was at its height when the boys returned to their homes and to school. Under normal conditions, the boys would have been in Michigan long enough to finish the bulk of the work."

Low productivity of the A-teams was blamed on poor management on the part of the growers: "In some cases * * * the boys were put in fields where the yield was sparse due to weather conditions or where other workers had already completed—inadequately—the first picking. Productivity in these cases tended to be low because the A-team members had to pull weeds and roll vines, jobs that should have been done by the first pickers. Transferring the teams from field to field lowered their productivity."

The report to us concluded that most of the difficulties would disappear if growers finally accepted the fact that they must rely completely on domestic labor.

OVERTIME PAY FOR SUBSTITUTE POSTAL WORKERS

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to carry out the intent of this House when it passed last September 30 H.R. 10281—the Government Employees Salary Comparability Act of 1965—by a vote of 370 to 7. This was an important and worthwhile bill, providing a much-needed and justified pay increase for Government workers, including those in the postal service.

Unfortunately, the Senate in passing this legislation limited overtime pay for substitute postal workers to work in excess of 40 hours a week. The bill passed by the House provided overtime pay for substitute postal workers "(A) in excess of 8 hours a day or (B) in excess of 40 hours a week."

The bill I have introduced today restores this latter provision. This is both fair and in the interests of postal service efficiency. Regular postal employees already receive overtime pay for work in excess of 8 hours in any 1 day. Substitute employees, on whom the postal service relies heavily, should not receive less. Without the protection of this legislation, these employees can be called upon to work 12 consecutive hours in a single day and again on 2 more days during the same week without getting overtime pay.

I am pleased to join my colleague from New York [Mr. HORTON] in introducing legislation to put substitute postal employees on the same footing as regular hourly employees. I hope these bills will receive prompt and favorable consideration.

A RIVER FIT FOR SWIMMING

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last week I received a letter from a very important constituent about a subject close to my heart, the fight to restore the Hudson River. This letter, from John W. Schmelke, age 10, moved me greatly and I think that perhaps he was writing also to the hundreds of other busy men who may have forgotten how important it is to be able to swim and fish in our American rivers. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter John Schmelke's letter in the RECORD and ask my colleagues to pause for just a moment to consider what a tremendous thing it is that he has asked for and what terrible shame to this Nation it is that we have so squandered our natural wealth that a boy, age 10, has to make such a simple request:

> DEAR REPRESENTATIVE OTTINGER: I saw the television program about the Hudson River on the "20th Century." I am 10 years old and I wondered if there was anything I could do to help. Thank you.
>
> Yours truly,
>
> JOHN W. SCHMELKE.
>
> P.S.—My father swam in the Hudson River when he was a boy and I would like to swim in it too. I would also like it so the fish wouldn't die.

LET'S PAY TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY ON HIS BIRTHDAY—MAY 29

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy has suggested that the special day for honoring President Kennedy should be his birthday, May 29, instead of the anniversary of his assassination, November 22.

Her desire for the May 29 observance has been expressed privately to close friends. Since it is unlikely that she will undertake any public effort to change the day of tribute to her late husband, we have decided to do it.

In the last 2 years more than 11 million persons in every walk of life have visited Kennedy's grave in Arlington Cemetery—a phenomenon unequaled in the history of Washington landmarks. Kennedy has become a symbol around the world and people visit his grave from dusk to dawn every day of the year.

Mrs. Kennedy's personal feelings are correct—that it would be much better if the country would shift the day of remembrance to her husband's birthday, May 29.

This would be in keeping with the already established tradition of honoring national heroes on the days of their birth. George Washington is remembered on February 22. Abraham Lincoln is honored on his birthday, February 12, not on the date of his death. Most Americans do not even recall the day, following that fatal shot in Ford's Theater. It was April 15, 1865.

Mrs. Kennedy's wish is not affected by precedent alone. The chief reason for wanting her husband remembered on the day of his birth in May is that this season of the year represents promise and hope rather than the bleak finality of November.

The one time of year that epitomizes the Kennedy era is the springtime. President Kennedy was the youngest man ever elected to the White House and he was also the youngest to die. By personality and spirit, Kennedy was springtime's child.

What is more, May 29 comes but a day before Memorial Day, the annual day of tribute in 45 States to those who died in the Nation's service.

Yes, by all means, let us change the day we pay tribute to President Kennedy to his birthday, May 29. The November 22 observance overemphasizes death, hardly in keeping with the Kennedy symbol of promise and hope for people in every land.

CONSTRUCTION MAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCARTHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in New York City's Hotel Pierre, Engineering News Record is honoring our esteemed colleague, JOHN A. BLATNIK, at its annual construction man-of-the-year banquet. He is the only man from our body to be cited for achievement of significance to the construction industry in 1965. The honor is the direct result of Chairman BLATNIK's untiring efforts in authorizing and in piloting the Water Quality Act of 1965 through the House by an impressive, unprecedented unanimous victory. Certainly we in the House join in this well deserved salute to the able and conscientious dean of the delegation from Minnesota. Congressman BLATNIK is the only Member of either body to be twice honored by this distinguished engineering publication.

NATIONAL SENIOR SERVICE CORPS

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, in 1900, life expectancy in the United States at time of birth was 47 years. Today it is a little over 70 years. In 1900 there were approximately 3 million Americans over 65 years of age. Today there are over 16 million in that age group, and by 1970 there will be about 20 million.

In earlier times, the pattern of life was that people worked until they died, but today retirement comes at 70, 65, 62, or 60, and there are several years remaining before death.

The transition from active life to retired status is satisfactorily met by some, but for many it is a traumatic experience that is most difficult to overcome. To be suddenly faced with enforced idleness, to have to break with past associations involving the isolation from friends of long standing without new friends to fill the vacuum, especially to be overtaken by a feeling of uselessness—these are conditions which we must do everything possible to avoid.

It is one thing for the pace of activity to be slowed down; it is quite another thing for activity to come to a sudden halt. Many elderly persons desire to be of service to their community, but there are too few means by which their services can be rendered.

By the Older Americans Act of 1965, a fine beginning was made toward the objective of a better life for our senior citizens, and I am particularly happy that the State of Maryland Commission on the Aging has been successful in obtaining one of the first grants under title III of the act for the purpose of helping to maintain the Metropolitan Senior Center in Baltimore City. I have recently received a letter from the Maryland Commission on the Aging which indicates how important the Older Americans Act is to the State of Maryland, and I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

STATE OF MARYLAND,
COMMISSION ON THE AGING,
Baltimore, Md., January 26, 1966.

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CARLTON: I am delighted to inform you that on January 20, the State Commission of the Aging acted favorably on the first project under the Older Americans Act in Maryland. Indeed, if not the first, among the first in the Nation.

Under this project a grant of $10,000 for the first year will go to the Metropolitan Senior Center in Baltimore City. This center has become increasingly effective in the city and has previously depended largely on private financing plus some additional appropriation from the city itself. There was a possibility that without this grant, their activities for the coming year would have been much restricted or even abandoned at the very time when it was becoming most useful to the older citizens of the city.

This project represents the first "bite" into the $67,000 Maryland may use during this fiscal year for grants on a matching basis of 75 percent Federal, 25 percent local money, under title III of the act.

I know you will share our own sense of accomplishment that we were able so speedily to assist such a meaningful operation on behalf of the enrichment of the lives of so many older citizens.

Sincerely,

MARGARET C. SCHWEINHAUT,
Chairman.

Such centers as the senior center in Baltimore City are of great importance in providing informational, counseling, referral, and similar services. I believe we must go further, however, by the establishment of a National Senior Service Corps to enable senior citizens to work in their own communities up to 20 hours per week for compensation not to exceed $125 per month. Such a Senior Service Corps should be administered on a cooperative Federal-State basis. The details regarding the proposed Senior Service Corps are contained in a bill I introduce today to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965. I wish to emphasize that the bill provides that members of the Senior Service Corps would be used in programs that would contribute to an undertaking or service in the public interest that would not otherwise be provided, and that such programs will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services.

I hope this bill will receive favorable consideration by the Congress, Mr. Speaker. It will help to bring the elderly back into the community in the twilight of their years, allow the community to profit from the time and talent and wisdom of our senior citizens, and enable all of us to see that the retired life is one that is well worth living.

LEGISLATIVE APPORTIONMENT

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleague's attention to a statement on the subject of legislative reapportionment which was adopted by the national board of the League of Women Voters of the United States, and which has been approved by the League of Women Voters of Frederick County, Md. The statement was as follows:

STATEMENT OF POSITION ON APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES AS ANNOUNCED BY THE NATIONAL BOARD OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY 12, 1966

The members of the League of Women Voters of the United States believe that both houses of State legislatures should be apportioned substantially on population. The league is convinced that this standard, established by recent apportionment decisions of the Supreme Court, should be maintained and that the U.S. Constitution should not be amended to allow for consideration of factors other than population in apportioning either or both houses of State legislatures.

Of overriding importance to the league in coming to this decision is the conviction that a population standard is the fairest and most equitable way of assuring that each man's vote is of equal value in a democratic and representative system of government. Other considerations influencing league decisions are that the U.S. Constitution should not be amended hastily or without due consideration because of an unpopular Court decision, and that individual rights now protected by the Constitution should not be weakened or abridged.

Against the background of its longstanding interest in State government, the league also hopes that by maintaining a population standard State government may be strengthened by insuring that State legislatures are more representative of people wherever they live. Finally, the league feels certain that the term "substantially" used in Supreme Court decisions allows adequate leeway for districting to provide for any necessary local diversities.

DECLINE IN UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the decline in the Nation's unemployment rate has been hailed editorially by the Baltimore Sun—and other newspapers—as "an economic milestone."

Referring to the report from the Labor Department that the Nation's unemployment rate declined to just under 4 percent in January, the newspaper recalled that this was "a goal set by President Kennedy in 1962 and reaffirmed by President Johnson."

Stating that this does not mean that a condition of literal full employment has been reached, because many unskilled workers do not have jobs, "it does mean that the country is close to a condition of statistical full employment," the paper states.

I offer this editorial, on a subject of general interest to us all, for the RECORD with the request that it be reprinted there.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Feb. 11, 1966]

FOUR PERCENT

The report from the Labor Department in Washington that the Nation's unemployment rate declined to just under 4 percent in January is an economic milestone. It was a goal set by President Kennedy in 1962 and reaffirmed by President Johnson. It obviously does not mean that a condition of literal full employment has been reached, because we know that many unskilled workers do not have jobs, but it does mean that the country is close to a condition of statistical full employment.

We can understand this when we note that, while there still is unemployment among the unskilled, there are labor shortages in many of the skilled categories. Labor Secretary Wirtz predicted that the unemployment figure will go down to 3.5 percent or lower this year. The figure for December was 4.1 percent. As we have said before, the declining unemployment total, together with the scarcity of qualified jobseekers in many fields, points up the importance of training programs to develop skills for the jobs available. Declining unemployment also points up the importance of restraints on wages and prices to check the inflationary effect of nearly full employment.

THE BOEING 727 SHOULD BE GROUNDED

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Boeing 727 jet should be ordered grounded pending a full investigation into its airworthiness and crashworthiness.

Last week on the floor of this House I spoke on the subject of aerial garbage and aviation safety. That speech mainly concerned near-collisions. Today I want to talk about real collisions.

There have been four crashes of Boeing 727 jet airliners in the past 6 months A United Air Lines 727 crashed in Chicago on August 16, 1965, killing 35 persons. An American Air Lines 727 crashed in Cincinnati on November 8, 1965, killing 59 persons. Another United Air Lines 727 crashed 3 days later in Salt Lake City, killing 42 persons. And most recently, a Japanese 727 crashed into Tokyo Bay killing 133 persons. A total of 264 persons were killed in these 4 crashes.

These facts alone, in my opinion should have moved the Federal Government to order all 727's grounded pending a complete investigation. The additional fact that each of the four fatal crashes occurred under similar circumstances, as the planes were preparing to land, makes it even more imperative that the Government act immediately before additional lives have been lost.

Problems of construction have already been found in the Boeing 727. A study recently completed by the FAA disclosed a number of deficiencies in the materials presently being installed in the interiors of the planes. Further, the CAB has pointed out that the manner in which the fuel line is installed could have had something to do with the Salt Lake City crash.

Each of the four crashes are currently under investigation by the CAB. A CAB team has even been dispatched to Japan to act as technical adviser to the Japanese Government in its investigation of the Tokyo crash. But these investigations consume a great deal of time. Ordinarily, CAB investigations of major accidents take as much as a year, sometimes longer.

Meanwhile, more than 220 727's are in service with 17 airlines in 7 nations and whether 1 of them is getting ready to crash the next time it prepares to land because of some structural defect or other deficiency is something we may not know for many months.

Mr. Speaker, this is really an intolerable situation. The Government is on notice that something may be wrong with the way the 727's are put together. There have been 4 crashes in the past 6 months in which 264 persons met horrible and undeserved deaths. Each crash occurred under similar circumstances. Yet they continue to fly. There is no excuse for this. Surely, the great commercial air lines would be willing to endure the temporary inconvenience of utilizing the planes that were in service before the 727's for a few months while the CAB completed its investigations. I fail to see why the Government has not yet acted.

An editorial in the New Republic, February 19, 1966, discusses this problem. I invite my colleagues' attention to this article. With unanimous consent I am inserting it at this point in the RECORD.

SAFETY IN THE AIR

The crash early this month in Tokyo Bay of yet another Boeing 727 jet—the fourth in 6 months—has still not moved the Civil Aeronautics Board to recommend grounding the planes. All four crashes occurred as the planes were preparing to land, but the CAB has seen no pattern in the accidents to suggest that the 727 is unsafe. The CAB has yet to complete any investigation of the domestic 727 crashes; it has yet to hold a hearing on any of them.

It takes a distressingly long time for the Board to investigate accidents—often as long as a year—and once it has made a finding more time may elapse before corrective action is taken. The limited recommendations the CAB has already made to improve the crashworthiness of the Boeing plane will take time to implement. Meanwhile nearly 200 727's are flying.

Last November 11, 43 persons died in the crash landing of a United Air Lines Boeing 727 in Salt Lake City (hearings on that crash open this week). According to a preliminary report by the CAB, the interior furnishings of the plane helped spread the fire that broke out on impact and gave off a heavy black smoke which "contributed to the fatalities." The Federal Aviation Agency has just completed a study, says the CAB, which "disclosed a number of deficiencies in the materials presently being installed in aircraft interiors. Materials are available," the report continued, "which would be far superior to those being used today." But no planes have been grounded as a result of that finding, and so far the FAA has not ordered the airlines or manufacturer to refit plane interiors. Until the FAA completes its flammability studies and hands down new standards, a repeat of the Salt Lake City disaster is possible at any time. (FAA spokesmen don't know yet whether new standards will apply just to planes coming off the assembly line or to planes now in service as well.) Officials mysteriously distinguish between "airworthiness" and "crashworthiness"; they see no reason to ground a plane simply because it doesn't crash well (43 persons died in Salt Lake because the plane was not crashworthy).

The CAB has identified other problems with the Boeing 727. Its fuel line passes through the fuselage of the plane and runs close to generator wires which can spark a fire in a belly landing. In the Salt Lake crash the "ignition of spilled fuel could have been caused by sparks from runway contact or by a broken and shorted generator lead or both." It would help, the CAB noted, to move the wires away from the fuel line and strengthen insulating and tubing materials to withstand the shock of a crash landing. This Boeing plans to do—in 4 months.

THE HONOLULU CONFERENCE

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the San Antonio Light, February 11, carried an editorial on the much-discussed Honolulu Conference. In this editorial the Light quotes from the statement of the South Vietnam leaders that to win the military war "we shall strive as we fight to bring about a true social revolution."

In order to share this editorial with my colleagues, I include it in the RECORD:

DECISION AT HAWAII

In the "Declaration of Honolulu" the United States and South Vietnamese Governments have effectively dispelled any doubts that may have been entertained about allied resolve in pursuing the Vietnam war to victory.

Victory in Vietnam means, of course, success in both the political and military spheres and it was on this double aspect of the conflict that the declaration placed its greatest emphasis.

The mission of Vice President HUMPHREY to Saigon, moreover, is added evidence of this emphasis.

As the leaders of South Vietnam stated, the struggle is "a military war, a war for the hearts of the people. We cannot win one without the other. But the war for the hearts of the people is more than a military tactic. It is a moral principle. For this we shall strive as we fight to bring about a true social revolution."

President Johnson could not have demonstrated his awareness of this better than by his inclusion in the U.S. conference delegation of his Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and his Secretary of Agriculture.

In other words, the conference placed an appropriately equal emphasis on the future as it did on the present.

A "DECLARATION OF FREEDOM" ADOPTED BY 1,500 CUBAN EXILES

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1966, 1,500 Cubans, living in exile, adopted a "declaration of freedom" at a rally held in Key West, Fla.

This established another date to be placed in the history and in the hearts of all freedom-loving Cubans.

It is altogether fitting that this was done at the San Carlos Club from the same balcony where in 1898 the great Cuban patriot, Jose Marti, turned the course of history by proclaiming the ideological basic of a free Cuba from Spanish colonialism.

Mr. Speaker, this "declaration of freedom" is submitted for the attention of my colleagues and should be read by all freedom-loving people throughout the world:

DECLARATION OF FREEDOM

In the city of Key West, Monroe County, State of Florida, United States of America, we, the Cuban exiles in the United States, in the name of God Almighty, and speaking both for ourselves and the oppressed people in Cuba, the martyr island, do say:

That on January 1, 1959, the slavery yoke that came from Europe and was extinguished in Cuba at the end of the 19th century, was resumed.

That those responsible for this high treason to our fatherland and to our people are just a score of traitors who, usurpating the government of the country have been acting as mercenary agents for the Sino-Soviet imperialism, and have surrendered to that imperialism our freedom and our dignity, also betraying the American hemisphere.

That as a consequence of this high treason, those who are usurpating the power in Cuba (as they were never elected by the people), are imposing a regime of bloodshed, terror and hate without any respect or consideration to the dignity of the human being or the most elementary human rights.

That in their hunger for power, these traitors, following the pattern of totalitarian regimes, are trying, within Cuba, to separate the family, which is the cornerstone of actual society, and at the same time, are poisoning the minds of the Cuban children and youth in their hope of extending the length of time for this abominable system.

That the rule of the law has been wiped out in Cuba, and it has been replaced by the evil will of this score of traitors, who are acting under orders from their masters, the Sino-Soviet imperialists.

In view of the aforegoing, we declare:

First, That the actual Cuban regime is guilty of high treason to our fatherland and to the ideals of the freedom revolution which was started on October 10, 1868.

Second. That this score of traitors who have committed treason against our fatherland, in case they survive the downfall of their regime, will have to respond, even with their lives before the ordinary courts of justice of Cuba.

Third. That as the noble Cuban people will not ever surrender, because that nation was not born to be slave, we, the Cuban people, hereby make the present declaration of freedom.

We hereby swear before God Almighty to fight constantly, until death comes to us, to free Cuba from communism.

The fundamentals of this resolution for freedom are:

First. God Almighty, above all things, in whom we believe as the essence of life.

Second. The fatherland, with all of its laws, traditions, customs, and history as a spiritual value, only surpassed by the concept of God.

Third. The family, as the cornerstone of the human society.

Fourth. Human rights, for each and every citizen, regardless of race or creed.

Fifth. The law, as the foundation for the proper development of the human society.

Sixth. Democratic government, with its three independent branches: Legislative, executive, and judicial.

Seventh. Representative democracy, through the exercise of universal suffrage, periodically, free, and secretive, as the expression of popular sovereignty.

Eighth. Freedom of worship, freedom of teaching, freedom of the press and free enterprise.

Ninth. Private property and ownership, as the basic expression of liberty.

Tenth. The improvement of living conditions for both rural and city working masses, with the just and necessary measures, keeping in mind the legitimate interests of both labor and capital.

Eleventh. The derogation and eradication of anything which is opposed to the political and religious fundamentals aforementioned, and specifically, the abolition of communism and any other form of totalitarian manifestation.

Signed and sealed in Key West, Fla., on the 23d day of January, 1966.

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF NORTH MIAMI

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, 1966, I had the honor and extreme pleasure to be the principal speaker at a luncheon of the First Annual North Miami Conference of Mayors which was held during the 40th anniversary celebration of the city of North Miami.

The city of North Miami is in my district which, I might add, is the finest anywhere in the United States, and is the gateway to Interama. North Miami is at the crossroads of commerce and culture with a natural geographic location which merges productive industry with art, music and sports—year-round, ideal outdoor living climate, good government, excellent transportation, and a highly diversified labor supply. North Miami is one of industry's choice locations.

Mr. Speaker, North Miami, with an average of 75° daily temperature, is a city of "comfortable living." You can avail yourself of many active pleasures, such as golf, tennis, superb game fishing, safe beaches, municipal swimming pools, and country club activities. Here you will also find splendid facilities for shuffleboard, bowling, football, baseball, sailing, water skiing and motor boating. Important, too, are the modern shopping centers, fine restaurants and the numerous service and women's clubs. In short, North Miami offers you unlimited opportunitites in a locality richly endowed with natural and man-made resources—truly a wonderful place to live, bring up your children, play—and to do business.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my remarks at that luncheon at this point in the RECORD:

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN CLAUDE PEPPER AT LUNCHEON OF THE FIRST ANNUAL NORTH MIAMI CONFERENCE OF MAYORS DURING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF NORTH MIAMI, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1966

What was 40 years ago a tomato patch has become today a beautiful, thriving, thoroughly modern city of some 35,000 population, North Miami. Still a dedicated and devoted employee of the city of North Miami is Mr. J. H. Gribble, whose father donated the land upon which the first North Miami city hall was built. Also, one of those who has helped to build this great city and has been its clerk since 1926, is a grand and gracious lady, Miss May Avil. The small community, originally named Miami Shores, now North Miami, had the usual growing pains and problems. It suffered from the depression and hurricanes. But one of the hurricanes proved to be something of a blessing because the high ground upon which North Miami is located attracted the attention of many whose homes had been flooded in the hurricane and North Miami grew.

In the early days, as now, the leaders of North Miami had the vision and courage and the will to do the things necessary to the building of a city. The first great step forward for North Miami was a comprehensive and efficient sewerage system so that today, I am told, there is not a septic tank in North Miami. Step by step the leaders of North Miami added the utilities and the facilities to make North Miami a splendid, modern city.

So that today as one travels through a progressive, clean, and attractive business district and through masses of spacious and beautiful homes, one finds a thoroughly modern water treatment plant; a spacious armory with adequate recreation grounds; numerous well-designed and fully equipped schools; the most up-to-date fire department and police station; a city hall which is a suitable symbol of this progressive city.

Now, a new industry has been brought into the area and is the foundation of a large movie industry centered upon 63 acres of land where already several buildings, adapted in every way for the making of motion picture and television films with the most up-to-date processing equipment for the films, are already in being—a meaningful event to commemorate the 40th anniversary of North Miami.

And now, the greatest of all, comes Interama which the government and the people of North Miami have helped to bring into being. The city and the people of North Miami, quite awhile ago, pledged to the Interama Authority to provide all the necessary sewerage facilities which Interama will require. This was another example of the vision and the courage of the municipal authorities and the people of North Miami.

Interama will soon be under construction. 40,000 to 50,000 new jobs will be provided while it is being built and when it comes into its glorious maturity some 2 years from now, 80,000 people will be permanently employed at Interama, with another 20,000 indirectly employed. Interama will represent a total investment of $500 million. Here will be centered industrial, educational, historic, and cultural exhibits.

At Interama you will see the most splendid achievements of the Western Hemisphere depicted in suitable exhibits, with all the free nations of our hemisphere exhibiting to the world what we have accomplished and what our dreams are for the decades and the centuries ahead. Here will be symbolized in reality the theme of Interama, "Progress With Freedom."

As one drives along Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington past the Archives Building, he sees on one side of the steps leading up into this noble edifice, a statue of a female figure, and underneath this figure is the legend, "The Past Is Prologue." On the other side of the steps is a statue of a male figure deep in thought, and beneath this statue is the legend, "Study the Past."

If the past 40 years of birth and growth and maturity of the city of North Miami is the prolog of the future, as we know it is, then all may take assurance that this great city is only at the threshold of its greatest days. The spacious vision, the sound judgment, the courage, and the dreams of beauty and progress which have enabled its government and its people to bring it to this proud day will carry it forward into still greater and grander days for North Miami and for this beautiful part of the earth which North Miami adorns.

MISS JACKIE MARTIN HONORED BY THE BRAZILIAN AIR FORCE

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it was my happy privilege on Thursday, January 20, 1966, at the kind and gracious invitation of Mrs. Pepper's and my longtime friend, Miss Jackie Martin, to be present at a most stirring and significant occasion when Miss Martin and two other Washington women, Mrs. Alice Rogers Hager and Mrs. Blanche Noyes, were decorated by decree of Brazilian President Castello-Branco by the Brazilian Air Force on its 25th anniversary at the Brazilian Embassy.

The story behind the awarding of Brazil's medal of "Merit of Santos Dumont" is a meaningful and momentous one of the strengthening of understanding and friendship between the United States and Brazil during World War II and I would like to have the honor of having it recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in recognition of this further evidence of the friendship of our Latin American neighbor, Brazil, in awarding to these three great American women its highest air medal.

Three Washington Women Honored by the Brazilian Air Force

In a ceremony Thursday, January 20, marking the 25th anniversary of the Brazilian Air Force, three Washington women were decorated at the Brazilian Embassy with the Medal of Merit of Santos Dumont. This honor was awarded them by decree of the President of Brazil, Castello Branco.

The women, Mrs. Alice Rogers Tager, Miss Jackie Martin and, Mrs. Blanche Noyes, received the medals from Brig. Gen. Ary Presser Bello, air attaché of the Embassy.

Unfortunately, the recently named Ambassador to the United States of America, Vasco Leitao da Cunha had not yet arrived in Washington to present his credentials. However, as the former Foreign Minister of Brazil, he was a member of the Council which elected the women to this distinguished order.

General Bello's letter carrying word of the official action, came as a delightful surprise to the recipients, as follows:

"It gives me great pleasure to inform you that the President of the Republic of the United States of Brazil, by a decree of December 10, 1965, has awarded you with the medal of Merit of Santos Dumont, in silver, for your outstanding and meritorious services given to the Aeronautics of Brazil.

"His excellency, the Minister of Aeronautics, Air Marshal Eduardo Gomez, has requested that the medal should be bestowed upon you on an occasion of great significance for the Ministry of Aeronautics, that is January 20, 1966, the commemoration of its 25th—silver—anniversary.

"Consequently, we would like to request your presence here at the Embassy on Thursday, January 20, 1966, at 5 p.m., to receive the above-mentioned medal."

Mrs. Blanche Noyes, dean of women pilots of the United States of America, is chief of the air marking staff of the Federal Aviation Agency. She has a long history of "firsts," awards, and national and international recognitions, which include flying the U.S. airmail, being commissioned in the Texas National Guard, and winning the Bendix Air Race from New York to Los Angeles in which the world's finest men racing pilots also competed.

Mrs. Noyes gave up an early career in the theater and movies as a dramatic leading lady to marry Dewey L. Noyes, an airmail pilot. He taught her to fly and she soloed in 1928, later becoming one of the first women transport pilots. She has logged more solo hours than any other woman, a record few men can equal.

The only woman Federal executive whose position demands the flying of Government aircraft, Mrs. Noyes designed the heliport landing marker, and has supervised the placing of 75,000 airmarkers throughout the country. She was the first woman to receive the gold medal award of the Department of Commerce, a tribute of major significance. And she received the coveted Federal women's award in 1963, 1 of 6 to win the honor from a group of 25,000 eligible top executives.

Mrs. Alice Rogers Hager, famed reporter of pioneer aviation, former Director of Information of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and Washington editor of Skyways magazine, was an accredited Air Force war correspondent to the China, Burma, and India theater of operations in World War II. Her book, "Wings for the Dragon," based on that experience, was published by Dodd, Mead.

Mother and mother-in-law of pilots, Mrs. Hager, former president of the Women's National Press Club, and winner of countless awards, was appointed Public Affairs Officer of our Embassy in Brussels. After serving there 4 years she returned to the States as a policy officer of USIA. Since her retirement several years ago, Mrs. Hager has continued to write, having just this week completed her 14th book. It will be published by Messner.

Of all the honors she has had, Mrs. Hager is most proud of six—her grandchildren—one of whom is now in his second year at the Air Force Academy.

Miss Jackie Martin, news photographer, writer and editor, was the first woman member of the White House News Photographers Association, and her career includes both creative and administrative work in the field of newspapers, magazines, books, exhibits, and documentary motion pictures.

A war correspondent in Italy and France for 6 months, Miss Martin returned to the States to lecture throughout the country for several seasons, using some of the 3,000 photos made from the invasion beaches to the Rhine, and stories cleared from the zone of combat.

Later, as one of the highest rated visual specialists in the Government, Miss Martin established and administered for 5 years in Paris the European 18-country regional photo service of the Marshall plan information operation. Two additional years were spent working primarily to insure that the great Edward Steichen "Family of Man" exhibit was seen by as many millions throughout the world as possible.

An associate of the Royal Photographic Society, Jackie Martin has received the George Arents Medal from Syracuse University and the Rose Award from Delta Gamma. She illustrated "Washington, City of Destiny" (Macmillan) and directed and illustrated "Bars on Her Shoulders" (Dodd, Mead). Miss Martin's War Department citation carries the signatures of General of the Army Omar Bradley, and Gen. Jacob L. Devers, commanding general of the 6th Army Group (French and U.S. 7th Army forces) to which she was accredited.

The Brazilian Government awarded the Order of the Southern Cross to Mrs. Hager and Miss Martin in 1961. At the invitation of President Vargas, they were the first foreign writer and photographer to make a definitive study of the potential and progress of aviation in Brazil, and of the then 6-month-old Brazilian Air Force.

For 3 months they flew from one end of the tremendous country to the other, sometimes flying for hours over deep, impenetrable jungle. These trips were made in a 12-year-old Bellanca, the same type being used by the air force which was flying the young and dangerous airmail. The plane, piloted by an air force officer, and carrying the two journalists, the Government escort and a mechanic, boasted one Wright whirlwind engine, two wings, a compass, and an altimeter. That was it.

The performance of the plane continued to be both remarkable and hair raising until a dense and sudden red fog on the edge of the jungle left the old crate no place to go but down. Although it crashed, the little fabric-covered job was handled so skillfully by the young Brazilian that no one was injured.

This was the hour in history when Europe was already inflamed by World War II, and its black smoke hung ominously over the Western Hemisphere. And every action, word, and photograph that could strengthen the bridge of friendship and understanding between the United States of Brazil and the United States of America was important.

Immediately upon their return and just before Pearl Harbor, Mrs. Hager and Miss Martin placed illustrated stories in more than 32 leading magazines of this country. Shortly after, two books by the writing-shooting team, "Frontier by Air or Brazil Takes the Skyroad" and "Brazil, Giant to the South" were published by Macmillan.

It is warming to the journalists to know that Brazil did not forget, and that, on its 25th anniversary, the Brazilian Air Force is taking time to look back with wonder and remember when, in its eager youth a little 12-year-old ship was the best it could offer its guests * * * guests who have always remembered with affection the warmth of hospitality and the depth of integrity they found in Brazil and the Brazilians.

At the ceremony, the three ladies stood together in the center of the lovely small salon at the Embassy, immediately facing the Chargé d'Affaires of the Embassy, Minister Counselor Jorge de Carvalho e Silva; the military attaché, Brig. Gen. Edson de Figueiredo; and the air attaché, Brig. Gen. Ary Presser Bello. In back of the three Embassy officials the entire Brazilian Air Force contingent assigned to Washington, all in uniform, stood straight and tall in a semicircle.

In back of the three recipients were grouped the distinguished guests including General of the Army Omar Bradley; Gen. Jacob L. Devers; Representative Claude Pepper of Florida; Deputy Director of the Federal Aviation Administration, Mr. David D. Thomas; Director for Program Planning for NASA, Mr. Harold Goodwin; and Anesia Pinheiro Machado, dean of all women flyers of the world. In private life the wife of Air Marshall Anthony Appel Neto, Miss Machado has long been Brazil's greatest single force in aviation, and as such, has been decorated by 25 countries.

Other distinguished guests included the former Minister to Luxembourg, Mrs. Perle Mesta; Mrs. Roscoe Drummond; the former Under Secretary of Defense for Atomic Energy and Mrs. Robert LeBaron; Mrs. Henry F. Grady; Mr. and Mrs. W. F. P. Reid, Jr.; Mr. Harry W. Frantz; Mr. and Mrs. John Craft; Mr. J. B. Hartranf, Jr., president of the Aircraft Pilots and Owners Association; and Mr. Max Karant, vice president of the A.O.P.A. Others included Mrs. Jean Ross Howard representing the Whirley Girls and the 99 International, Mr. Christopher Lample representing the Airways Pioneers, and the following distinguished officials of FAA: Mr. Joseph D. Blatt, Mr. J. B. Hogan, Mr. Chas. O. Cary, Mr. Chas. G. Warnick, Mr. C. E. Mayhall, Mr. Chester C. Spurgeon, and Col. A. B. McMullen, vice president of the National Association of State Aviation Officials.

After gracious introductory remarks by General Bello, Minister Carvalho e Silva pinned the decoration on Mrs. Hager; Miss Martin received her Medal of Merit of Santos Dumont from General Figueiredo, and Mrs. Noyes was given her silver, blue-ribboned award from General Bello. First Secretary Jorge de SA Almeida presented the diplomas.

Champagne, with toasts to Castello Branco, President of the United States of Brazil; Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States of America, and to the continuing friendship of the two countries, concluded the ceremony.

Following are the introductory remarks by the Air Attaché, Brig. Gen. Ary Presser Bello:

Honored guests, representatives of the Federal Aviation Agency, my brother officers of the U.S. Armed Forces, ladies and gentlemen and the press, and my fellow countrymen:

We are gathered here today to perform what is for me a very important and very pleasant task—to honor three U.S. citizens by presenting them with the Merit Santos Dumont Medal. It is perhaps in keeping with the long-deserved recognition that women are now beginning to receive, that those receiving this medal today are all women. These ladies are joining the select group of 30 U.S. citizens who have previously been granted this award.

As many of you know, this medal is granted only on two occasions, on Santos Dumont's birthday, and on the anniversary of the establishment of the Ministry of Aeronautics. This year, the awards are of special significance because we are celebrating the Ministry's 25th anniversary.

The Merit Santos Dumont Medal was established in 1956—the year that Brazil commemorated the 50th anniversary of man's first self-powered flight in a heavier-than-air craft. This historic flight was accomplished by the Brazilian Aviator Alberto Santos Dumont at Paris, France, on October 23, 1906.

May I add—with what I hope is pardonable pride—that we consider Santos Dumont to be the true father of aviation, as well as the father of Brazilian aeronautics.

The Merit Santos Dumont Medal, is granted only to Brazilians and citizens of other countries who have rendered outstanding services to the field of Brazilian or international aeronautics, and who merit the recognition and gratitude of Brazil's Air Force and Ministry of Aeronautics.

Two of these ladies—Mrs. Alice Rogers Hager, and Miss Jackie Martin, are authors who are well known not only in Brazil but also in the United States for their highly interesting book "Brazil—Giant to the South," by which they greatly increased the world's knowledge of our country through their vivid and accurate descriptions of its various regions, customs, national resources, virtues, and the characteristics of our people. The Government of Brazil has already expressed its appreciation and gratitude for this literary accomplishment by presenting them with the Order of the Southern Cross—the highest Brazilian decoration awarded to citizens of other nations. The Brazilian Air Force and Ministry of Aeronautics feels a close association with this book, since in some small way it stimulated Mrs. Hager and Miss Martin to write it. We also recognize that we owe these ladies a debt of 25 years standing for their outstanding book on Brazilian aviation "Frontier by Air," which they wrote in 1941. It is in recognition of our appreciation for both books that the Government of Brazil is presenting Mrs. Hager and Miss Martin with the Merit Santos Dumont Medal today.

The third lady—Mrs. Blanche Noyes—is internationally known to aviators. She won her wings in 1928, when comparatively few men—let alone women—had the courage to fly. She is one of a small and select company of female pioneers in aviation. In the 37 years which have passed since that date, her enthusiasm, courage, calmness, and resolution have caused her to establish records in aeronautical competition which are too numerous to mention.

However, I do wish to mention one of Mrs. Noyes' contributions to aviation, since it is one for which aviators of all countries honor her, and for which the Government of Brazil is presenting her with the Merit Santos Dumont Medal today. This is her internationally famous work on aircraft navigation in general and specifically on the development of ground-aircraft navigational signals. The Brazilian Air Force and Ministry of Aeronautics are very grateful to Mrs. Noyes for the fact that, because of her work, hundreds of Brazilian Air Force pilots—particularly during the period of World War II—were able to safely and efficiently complete flights over U.S. territory.

The Government of Brazil is honored to have the opportunity to award the Merit Santos Dumont Medal to Mrs. Hager, Miss Martin, and Mrs. Noyes today.

"TOWARD NEW GREATNESS," AN ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN, OF SPRINGFIELD, MASS., BEFORE JOINT LEGISLATIVE SESSION OF THE GREAT AND GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS IN THE STATEHOUSE, BOSTON, FEBRUARY 9, 1966

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on February 9 last, a distinguished son of Massachusetts who has loyally served our late beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and President Lyndon B. Johnson, Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien, addressed a joint legislative session of the Great and General Court of Massachusetts in the statehouse, Boston, on the topic "Toward New Greatness." The Postmaster General's stirring message was warmly received by the members of the house and senate and recalled to memory an equally stirring and brilliant message to a joint session of the Massachusetts Legislature by President-elect Kennedy in January 1961. Under unanimous consent I insert Postmaster General O'Brien's address at this point in the RECORD:

TOWARD NEW GREATNESS

(Address by Lawrence F. O'Brien, Postmaster General, before a joint session of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, statehouse, Boston, Mass., Feb. 9, 1966)

I am deeply moved to be here with you in this historic chamber where decisions have been made through generations that have affected the very lives and futures of our fellow citizens.

And I am grateful for this opportunity to acknowledge in person the official congratulations I received from this body on my appointment to President Johnson's Cabinet. I appreciated the support you expressed of my continuing opportunity to serve the President and the Nation.

As I stand here, I am both proud and sad. My late parents arrived as strangers to our shores and found opportunity to build a life for themselves and a future for their children. This has been a common occurrence in our State and my presence here today not only is a reaffirmation of their hope—but symbolizes that here the roads to fulfillment are open roads—unblocked by prejudice.

But I feel a measure of sadness as well, because my parents cannot be here to share this honor with me.

A little more than 5 years ago another son of Massachusetts stood here as I do today. He was a young vibrant leader—full of confidence in the future of his State and his country.

Those who observed him in those days—those days that somehow seem only yesterday and yet seem a lifetime ago—sensed his eagerness to move forward to seize the responsibilities and challenges of the Nation's highest office. But every ticking second brought him that much closer to his last smile and his last wave—on a street in Dallas.

I have some thoughts I wish to convey to you today—but before I do let me recall something that John Fitzgerald Kennedy said to you that January day in 1961. He said then that all his life—wherever he was—"this has been my home; and God willing, wherever I serve, it will always remain my home." I want you to know that I have fully shared and will always share those sentiments.

Today I want to talk to you about a Great Society—possibly the most remarkable society since ancient Athens during the glory that was Greece. The Great Society of which I speak was born in a State without important natural resources; small in area; with less people than some of our present middle-size cities. Yet this Great Society produced more, gave more, invented more, contemplated more, dared more, than any other section—large or small, in this Republic.

The Great Society I have in mind excelled in almost every field of human activity. Among its people were outstanding philosophers, poets, educators, novelists, lawyers, preachers, statesmen, moralists, and orators.

It was a society that put a premium on individual courage and so it also produced more than its share of rebels. And I might add that there was something in the cold air and rocky soil that brought forth some of the outstanding women of America—women of strong mind and great heart.

It was a society that fired a musket ball that not only was once heard around the world—but which continues to ever circle—awakening other men of courage to join the surge for freedom.

It was a society that produced ideas so broad in scope that they still seem new. One of its philosopher-rebels—who stated that by thinking alone he had traveled the world without leaving his hometown—developed an idea called passive resistance. A century later a man named Gandhi read his book and soon there was created the second largest democracy in the world. And still later this idea was rediscovered in Birmingham and Selma. And let us not forget that in this society I refer to—the first Negro died together with his white brethren in the cause of freedom.

This was a society so great that its pattern was followed throughout the country—its traits of hard work, inventiveness, courage, willingness to protest, commitment to education, strong religious and moral beliefs have become American traits.

Of course the name of this—America's first Great Society—is known to you and to every American.

It is the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

But you don't need me to remind you of those great figures who established the Bay State as the original Great Society—you need but raise your eyes and see 51 of their names carved on the frieze.

You don't need me to remind you of our heroic past. You simply recall the powerful words of its greatest orator: "I shall enter on no encomium upon Massachusetts; she needs none. There she is. Behold her, and judge for yourself. There is her history; the world knows it by heart. The past, at least, is secure. There is Boston and Concord and Lexington and Bunker Hill; and they will remain forever."

And of course Daniel Webster was right. The past is secure. The greatness is undeniable. But when President-elect Kennedy spoke to you 5 years ago his concern was with the future.

He knew as we know that at some point in our past, greatness began to drain away from our State. At some point there were no more great names to add to those above us in this hall.

Perhaps it was complacency. Perhaps it was a failure of imagination. Perhaps it was the gradual loss of some of our best young talent who moved west to enrich other States and other regions. Or perhaps it was the expansion of the Nation itself and the birth of new heroes.

It was in part all of these things and something else too.

High ideals and strong motivations seemed to become blurred as personalities came to dominate principles and purpose was lost in old feuds, old hatreds, and old ties. Thus our economy and our influence slowly declined; as industry after industry left us, as trade shriveled, and as some of our finest sons felt compelled to seek opportunity elsewhere.

But my friends, even as this took place there were signs of new movement.

New faces appeared—renewed vigor emerged—it flowed into Massachusetts from throughout the world—from Canada, from Poland, from Germany, from Greece, from Italy, from dozens of other countries and yes even a few from the Old Sod. This influx combined with a native Yankee stubbornness that did not accept defeat—gradually turned the tide.

Just as the first flourishing of the Bay State was symbolized by a forest of ship masts in Salem Harbor and by men of genius, there were also two symbols—one material and one human—of the new flowering, the reawakening. The material symbol was the vast industrial complex along Route 128.

Early in its history Massachusetts committed itself to quality education. There were free libraries in every town and hamlet. Now we were to reap the benefit—for the Bay State has become a world leader in research and manufacturing facilities.

The human symbol of reawakening was the recognition that we had been blessed with an extraordinary person in our midst—John Fitzgerald Kennedy. We gave him our trust, our votes, our respect and our affection—and he repaid us with his strength and his dedication in reversing our national downward course. He led us to a new greatness.

For 13 years in intimate association, I observed him in moments of stress and at times of great decision. These were the finest years of my life. I treasure them not only for my association with greatness—but also because with President John F. Kennedy and now with President Lyndon B. Johnson I have been closely associated with political statesmanship.

I have learned that, above all, the problems we face today both domestically and internationally are so vast and so complex that they cannot be resolved by isolated effort.

To insure progress—indeed, to prevent the loss of gains already made—we simply must work together.

We must work as a team.

We must work as a team among the States—and between the States and the Federal Government.

I have learned, too, in my association with these two great Presidents that the constitutional separation of powers between legislative and executive branches of Government does not bar cooperative effort—but rather we have worked together in the Nation's interest.

During these years we have seen a great outpouring of progressive legislation—capped by last year's historic legislative session. This has occurred in many areas—medicare, aid to education, immigration, health and scientific research, urban affairs, civil rights, atomic testing, protection of our natural resources, and our vital supply of clean air and water.

I can tell you from direct experience, that if it had not been for concerted, continual, and indeed historic efforts by President Kennedy and President Johnson to bridge the gap between the White House and Congress—and if Congress had not reacted in kind—much of this program would never have come to pass.

And in this effort, great credit is due to still another son of Massachusetts who has contributed so much in leadership to the Congress—Speaker of the House JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Now we can point with pride to the enactment of John Fitzgerald Kennedy's New Frontier program. His program is now the law of the land—and I can't envision a greater monument that could be erected to his memory.

But there is still much to be done. The domestic struggle goes on—a struggle in both country and in Commonwealth, a struggle to rise together toward further greatness. There are many arenas, but perhaps closest to the heart of President Johnson is the one that laid the foundation for our progress in Massachusetts: education. And the President's accomplishments in this area will be a landmark of his administration.

The struggle for freedom around the world continues as well. As we concern ourselves with solving our problems at home, we must never forget that the people of the Commonwealth are only as secure as the people of Vietnam. As President Johnson has said, "We did not choose to be the guardians at the gate, but there is no one else."

Finally, let us recall a giant figure in the history of our State, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and his essay entitled "Self Reliance." In his day, individual self-reliance was the core of wisdom. In our day the State or the city that relies on itself alone is doomed to frustration and failure. Self-reliance today must include a larger entity than the individual. It must have the ability to reconcile varying interests.

President Johnson has said that "the challenge of the next half century is whether we have the wisdom to use (our) wealth to enrich and enliven our Nation and our lives and to advance the quality of our American civilization."

Politics as usual, strife as usual, conflict as usual, were demonstrations in the past that we did not possess such wisdom.

Of course, much of what I have been saying is well known to this body, for in large measure you are responsible for the turning of this Commonwealth toward new greatness.

Your progress in recent years reminds me of the story oft repeated by John F. Kennedy during that great national election campaign of 1960 which you know well. It concerned a State legislature. The State was neighboring Connecticut. The time 1780. One midday in that still superstitious period, the skies turned black. Many members of that legislature clamored for immediate adjournment. The speaker of the house, one Colonel Davenport, jumped to his feet and silenced the din with these words: "The day of judgment is either approaching or it is not. If it is not, there is no cause for adjournment. If it is, I choose to be found doing my duty. I wish, therefore, that candles may be brought."

Let us in this our beloved and historic Commonwealth light the candles that will lead us to a new era of cooperation—of progress and of greatness.

Let us be found doing our duty.

Let us determine self-reliance through cooperative effort.

Let us become fully involved in the new, the creative federalism that promises to raise our Nation to the level that once was ours in Massachusetts alone—truly a Great Society.

LOSING OUR LIFEBLOOD

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, a perusal of the current economic report of the President makes interesting reading. It is impressive to see the statistics of the economy of the United States set forth in orderly fashion. At times, however, these statistics are shocking and give one ample food for thought and concern about the future.

One area of acute concern is the matter of our international reserves. While it is true that there is some discussion of balance of payments in the body of the report, nevertheless, the true declining state of our international reserves only comes forth in full strength when one examines the appropriate tables.

For example, table C–81 shows that while the international reserves of all countries increased from $45.5 billion to $68.9 billion between 1949 and 1964 and those of developed areas from $37.2 billion to $59 billion, in the same period those of the United States decreased from $26 billion to $16.6 billion, a drop of 36 percent.

Even the reserves of less developed areas during the same period increased from $8.2 billion to $9.8 billion.

During this period Spanish reserves increased from 0 to $1.5 billion, Italian from 0 to $3.8 billion, German from $0.196 billion to $7.8 billion and French from $0.580 billion to $5.7 billion.

At the same time, table C–82 shows that the U.S. gold stock dropped from $24.5 billion in 1949 to $14.5 billion in 1965.

There is no country in the table, outside the United States, whose reserves have not increased during the stated period and even areas of underdevelopment including Latin America and the Middle East show some increase.

These figures are indeed disquieting and emphasize strongly the need for a policy to stop this downward trend and to strengthen our position vis-a-vis the other nations of the world. We want revival and we want strong and healthy economies in other nations but we don't want to transfuse our lifeblood to them and end up a bloodless and lifeless corpse.

TABLE C–81.—*International reserves, 1949, 1953, and 1960–65* [1]

[Millions of dollars; end of period]

Area and country	1949	1953	1960 [2]	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	
								September	December
All countries	45,515	51,780	60,665	62,695	63,070	66,510	68,905	[3] 68,865	-------
Developed areas	37,240	41,390	50,940	53,705	54,275	56,715	59,015	58,205	-------
United States	26,024	23,458	19,359	18,753	17,220	16,843	16,672	[4] 15,721	[4] 15,447
United Kingdom	1,752	2,670	3,719	3,318	3,308	3,147	2,316	2,755	3,004
Other Western Europe	6,455	10,515	22,555	25,820	26,975	29,280	32,315	32,490	-------
Austria	92	325	716	845	1,081	1,229	1,317	1,339	1,311
Belgium	978	1,144	1,506	1,813	1,753	1,940	2,192	2,327	2,304

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE C-81.—*International reserves, 1949, 1953, and 1960–65* [1]—Continued

[Millions of dollars; end of period]

Area and country	1949	1953	1960 [2]	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	
								September	December
Developed areas—Con.									
Other etc.—Con.									
France	580	829	2,272	3,365	4,049	4,908	5,724	6,248	6,343
Germany	196	1,773	7,032	7,163	6,956	7,650	7,882	7,364	7,428
Italy	(5)	768	3,251	3,799	3,818	3,406	3,824	4,156	4,414
Netherlands	434	1,232	1,863	1,958	1,946	2,102	2,349	2,423	2,416
Scandinavian countries (Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden)	537	1,026	1,402	1,607	1,610	1,875	2,380	2,219	2,328
Spain	(5)	150	547	894	1,055	1,152	1,518	1,523	1,409
Switzerland	1,692	1,768	2,324	2,759	2,872	3,078	3,123	2,876	3,247
Other [6]	1,343	1,500	1,643	1,615	1,836	1,940	2,004	2,013	-------
Canada	1,197	1,902	1,989	2,276	2,547	2,603	2,881	3,025	3,027
Japan	(5)	892	1,949	1,666	2,022	2,058	2,019	2,014	2,152
Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa	1,582	1,952	1,369	1,875	2,203	2,786	2,814	2,197	-------
Less developed areas [7]	8,280	10,390	9,725	8,985	8,795	9,790	9,885	[3] 10,665	-------
Latin America	2,775	3,400	2,920	2,665	2,290	2,790	2,930	3,180	-------
Middle East	1,475	1,200	1,410	1,470	1,735	2,205	2,260	-------	-------
Other Asia	3,395	3,840	3,395	3,215	3,160	3,415	3,295	-------	-------
Other Africa	[4] 290	1,800	1,865	1,505	1,500	1,290	1,255	1,380	-------

---

[1] Includes gold holdings, reserve position in the International Monetary Fund, and foreign exchange of all countries except U.S.S.R., other Eastern European countries, and Communist China.

[2] Beginning 1959, when most of the major currencies of the world became convertible, data exclude known holdings of inconvertible currencies, balances under payments agreements, and the bilateral claims arising from liquidation of the European Payments Union.

[3] Estimate.

[4] Includes U.S. gold subscription payments made in anticipation of increases in Fund quotas.

[5] Not available separately.

[6] In addition to other Western European countries, includes unpublished gold reserves of Greece and an estimate of gold to be distributed by the Tripartite Commission for the Restitution of Monetary Gold.

[7] Includes unpublished gold holdings not allocable by area.

Source: International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics.

C-82.—*U.S. gold stock and holdings of convertible foreign currencies by U.S. monetary authorities, 1949–65*

[Millions of dollars]

End of year or month	Total	Gold stock [1]		Foreign currency holdings
		Total [2]	Treasury	
1949	24,563	24,563	24,427	-------
1950	22,820	22,820	22,706	-------
1951	22,873	22,873	22,695	-------
1952	23,252	23,252	23,187	-------
1953	22,091	22,091	22,030	-------
1954	21,793	21,793	21,713	-------
1955	21,753	21,753	21,690	-------
1956	22,058	22,058	21,949	-------
1957	22,857	22,857	22,781	-------
1958	20,582	20,582	20,534	-------
1959	19,507	19,507	19,456	-------
1960	17,804	17,804	17,767	-------
1961	17,063	16,947	16,889	116
1962	16,156	16,057	15,978	99
1963	15,808	15,596	15,513	212
1964	15,903	15,471	15,388	432
1965 [3]	14,584	[4] 13,807	[4] 13,733	777
1964—January	15,847	15,540	15,512	307
February	15,865	15,518	15,462	347
March	15,990	15,550	15,461	440
April	15,991	15,727	15,462	264
May	15,946	15,693	15,463	253
June	15,805	15,623	15,461	182
July	15,840	15,629	15,462	211
August	15,890	15,657	15,460	233
September	15,870	15,643	15,463	227
October	15,702	15,606	15,461	96
November	16,324	15,566	15,386	758
December	15,903	15,471	15,388	432
1965—January	15,572	15,208	15,185	364
February	15,220	14,993	14,937	227
March	15,129	14,639	14,563	490
April	14,884	14,480	14,410	404
May	14,511	14,362	14,290	149
June	14,595	14,049	13,934	546
July	14,697	13,969	13,857	728
August	14,953	13,916	13,857	1,037
September	14,884	[4] 13,925	[4] 13,858	959
October	14,795	[4] 13,937	[4] 13,857	858
November	14,686	[4] 13,879	[4] 13,805	807
December [3]	14,584	[4] 13,807	[4] 13,733	777

---

[1] Includes gold sold to the United States by the International Monetary Fund with the right of repurchase, which amounted to $800,000,000 on Dec. 31, 1965. Also includes gold deposit of IMF, see footnote 4.

[2] Includes gold in Exchange Stabilization Fund.

[3] Preliminary.

[4] Includes gold deposited by the IMF ($8,000,000 as of Sept. 30, $9,000,000 as of Oct. 31 and $34,000,000 as of Nov. 30 and Dec. 31, 1965) to mitigate the impact on the U.S. gold stock of purchases by foreign countries for gold subscriptions on increased IMF quotas. The United States has a corresponding gold liability to the IMF.

NOTE.—Gold held under earmark at Federal Reserve banks for foreign and international accounts is not included in the gold stock of the United States.

Sources: Treasury Department and Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

SURPLUS PROPERTY BILL TO AID STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which has great potential benefits for State and local governments throughout the country, as well as volunteer firefighting and rescue units and Indian tribes. This bill, H.R. 12865, would, subsequent to its availability to the donable program, permit these groups to purchase Federal surplus personal property at 50 percent of its estimated fair market value. Existing law now provides that State and local governments may purchase such property at full fair market value before it is placed on sale to dealers and others. Frankly, this is no bargain because most items are eventually sold to dealers for prices considerably below fair market value.

There is now no real incentive for our State and local governments to seek purchases of Federal surplus personal property. The existing provision of the law was utilized only five times in the 1965 fiscal year, according to the records of the General Services Administration. As a result, much useful personal property went on sale to surplus dealers and others at a price which averaged only 6 cents on the dollar of its original acquisition cost.

My bill would change that situation. By permitting State and local governments to buy at 50 percent of the estimated fair market value, this would give them a major price break and at the same time increase Federal revenues from the sale of surplus property. Volunteer firefighting and rescue units and Indian tribes would be offered the same opportunity for negotiated sales.

This bill is the result of hearings held last year by the Special Subcommittee on Donable Property of the House Committee on Government Operations. The subcommittee considered a number of legislative proposals at that time to open up the donation program to State and local governments, volunteer firefighting and rescue units and Indian tribes. These bills were tabled by the subcommittee because any expansion of the donation program list of eligibles would greatly reduce the amount of badly needed poverty going to schools and hospitals throughout the Nation. I believe the bill I am introducing today is a workable compromise and deserves the full support of all of those Members who sponsored the legislation to which I referred.

My bill would not create any new machinery because the machinery to conduct negotiated sales is already in the law. It simply makes available to State and local governments at half price a priority on obtaining surplus Federal property which they already have at full price. Volunteer firefighting and rescue units were added because they perform the same functions as city fire departments, which are already eligible for negotiated sales. Indian tribes were added because they perform the same functions in many respects as local governments.

It would be my expectation that the Federal Government would stand to gain also by this legislation because the sale of property at 50 percent of estimated fair market value would bring prices higher than the prices obtained through public auctions. If this should prove to be so, and we can help hard-pressed State and local governments obtain needed items at reasonable prices without hurting the donation program, then Congress ought to act favorably on this measure now.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION REGULATION OF GAS PRODUCERS

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Waggonner] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, examples are legion of the waste and the ridiculousness often produced by unbridled Federal interference in private business affairs and Federal meddling in the operation of the regulated industries. A recent one has come to my attention that may well become a classic and I would like to bring it to the attention of the Members by inserting it in today's Record.

It is in the form of an editorial from the February 7 issue of the Oil & Gas Journal, "Framed" and details the costly nonsense involved in the Federal Power Commission's recent rate case involving the Humble Oil Co.

The story is so bizarre it may require two readings to fully appreciate the ridiculousness of this situation, so I will leave the article without further comment:

Framed

At long last Phillips Petroleum Co. can see some benefits in Federal Power Commission regulation of gas producers.

FPC has been saying for years that regulation of producers was good for everybody, including producers. But Phillips remained hard to convince.

Phillips, you recall, was the original target when FPC set out to crack down on producers' prices. It was the Phillips case in the Supreme Court that started the whole bloody mess of Federal control of the price of a competitive commodity. And Phillips has been the No. 1 whipping boy ever since.

Now Phillips has some recompense. It's not much, but small favors are gratefully received.

It seems that back in 1962 Phillips bought some gas to operate an oil lease in Louisiana. The gas was furnished by United Gas Pipe Line Co., which in turn purchased it from Humble Oil & Refining Co. The gas was used and paid for at the agreed price, the contract expired, and everybody concerned forgot about it and went on with his business.

But FPC didn't forget about it. Its mill grinds slowly, but it grinds exceeding small. It is determined that no gas consumer pays a cent more than it considers the just and reasonable price.

So FPC audited Humble's books, made its own determination of Humble's costs of producing gas, conducted an elaborate formal rate case, and decreed that Humble had overcharged United. It ordered Humble to make a refund to United, and ordered United to make refunds to all its customers.

So Phillips now has a refund on its 1962 gas bill—a check for exactly 1 cent.

Phillips is having the check framed. If it were framed in gold to the value of what Phillips has spent defending itself against FPC, that check would have a price tag equal to the most treasured objet d'art in the Metropolitan Museum.

We wonder how much it cost Humble—and the taxpayers who finance FPC—to handle the case that resulted in the refund.

We also wonder how many 1-cent refunds United has made, and what it costs to compute the refunds, write the letters, make out the checks, and buy stamps to mail them.

Of course United doesn't have to worry too much about that. Such costs are added to its operating expenses, and FPC permits a pipeline to include all operating expenses in the price it charges its customers for gas.

So the consumers of gas pay the cost of all this refund business of which FPC is so proud.

Consumers are being told by FPC that they will be getting millions of dollars in refunds of overcharges made by gas producers. The newspapers and the politicians play up these announcements big to show what a good job FPC is doing.

But if the average gas consumer gets a refund of the magnitude of the one Phillips got, he ought to frame it also—as a reminder of how he's been framed.

For it is the consumer who is really being framed by the FPC nonsense.

There aren't any figures to prove it, but we'll make a bet that the cost to taxpayers and participants of all the litigation involved in FPC's campaign to force down producers' prices is equal to all the rate reductions and refunds that have been ordered.

It might even be established that gas prices would be lower without FPC's type of regulation, because then the industry wouldn't have to add on the cost of all the expensive rigmarole the FPC puts it through.

And of course FPC never tells the consumers that the field price of gas is only about 20 percent of the delivered price, and that a reduction may mean millions to producers but only pennies to any consumer.

We hope the consumers enjoy their little refund checks. They've cost the Nation plenty.

Henry D. Ralph.

RETIREMENT OF SAM PRYOR, VICE PRESIDENT OF PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Friedel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have been a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for the past 12 years. As a member, and now chairman, of the very important Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics it has been my pleasure to meet most of the outstanding executives of our excellent airlines, both domestic and international.

Therefore, it was with mixed feelings last fall that I read of the retirement of my good friend, Sam Pryor, as vice president of Pan American World Airways. Much of the present stature of Pan American can be traced to the collective and individual activities of Mr. Juan T. Trippe, founder and former president of Pan Am and now chairman of its board, and his old friend, Sam Pryor. We in Maryland properly regard Mr. Trippe as a native son because it was our soil that he left to go on to Yale, a distinguished career as a naval aviator, and the creation of Pan American.

The fact that he has retired from active participation in the management of Pan Am does not mean that Sam Pryor has purchased himself a rocking chair and a whittling knife. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, if such a thing is possible, Sam Pryor is more active today than he has been in more than 20 years because he is now finding time to do the things he has always wanted to do and to give additional vent to his boundless energies.

Mr. Pryor recently made a hazardous trip through the battle areas of Vietnam. He did this in company with the commander in chief of our Air Force in the Pacific, Gen. Hunter Harris, Jr. Sam did not have to make this trip, but he had heard so much pro and con about our national interests in southeast Asia that he wanted to see what was going on for himself.

Mr. Speaker, last Sunday's Baltimore News American carried a most interesting article by Ruth Montgomery on Sam Pryor's tour through the treachous battlefields on the South China Seas.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include Mrs. Montgomery's newspaper article at this point in the Record:

Aviation Expert Backs Johnson on Viet Policy

(By Ruth Montgomery)

Washington, February 12.—A nongovernmental aviation expert who directed the development of 50 overseas military airfields during World War II has just returned from a comprehensive tour of all U.S. bases in southeast Asia. His conclusion: President Johnson has been right every step of the way in his Vietnam policy.

Samuel F. Pryor, longtime executive of Pan American World Airways, made the trip in company with our Air Force Pacific commander in chief, Gen. Hunter Harris, Jr.

Having convinced himself of the rightness of our policy—both the lull and the resumed bombing—Pryor reserves his scorn for those who say that America should pull out of the area. He has this word of warning for the doves, and for the fence-sitting nations of the world:

"Add together our guided missile program, our IBM's and nuclear capacity, our Air Force, Polaris submarines, Navy, Marines, artillery and Army, and you have the greatest military strength in the history of mankind. Couple this with our productive capacity, which is half of the entire world's, and imagine what would happen if the Red Chinese possessed this strength.

> "They'd be in Moscow and Paris, Africa and South America right now, and half of our American cities would be bombed out. Let's face facts. Do we want this to happen to our children, or do we want to stop the Red Chinese now? Do we want them to overrun southeast Asia and Thailand, and then pick off sparsely settled Australia? That's our choice."
>
> Pryor visited every U.S. base in South Vietnam, Taiwan and Okinawa, plus all the "military assistance places" in Thailand. From long experience he says that no war is kind, but that we are "Fighting a kind war in Vietnam." He explains that during the recent bombing lull, the President was in effect saying to the Vietcong: "Now you see what's happening. Please stop. We don't want to hurt you."
>
> When the Reds refused to listen to the voice of reason, Pryor thinks the President had "no alternative but to give them another taste of our strength." He also assures the hawks that the lull was by no means wasted on our side.
>
> We were using that period, he says, to buildup "tremendous strength," and through intelligence and flyovers to gage the capability of the enemy in rebuilding its bombed-out bridges and supply roads.
>
> As a narcotics expert, Pryor looked into the smuggling problem during the Asian tour. The contraband drugs are moving out of Red China into the black markets of the world, and Pryor says: "Heroin is the stuff you would only want your enemies to use. Red China has a strict ban on its use by its own people, but it is moving out for sale in the free world."

JUSTICE FRANCIS VALENTE

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 11, 1966, the New York State Judiciary lost one of its most learned and respected colleagues when Justice Francis L. Valente died.

Justice Valente served in the appellate division of the State supreme court from 1956 to the time of his death. Appointed to the appellate division by Governor Averell Harriman, he was reappointed in 1961 by Governor Rockefeller. A native New Yorker, the justice was the liaison between the appellate division and the New York City criminal courts.

Although he did not live within the confines of my congressional district, his residence was on its border. We had many mutual friends. I know he was very well respected by the community, as was his uncle, Supreme Court Justice Louis A. Valente.

I feel that the Italian community of which he was a very prominent part and which honored and respected him and his family has suffered a great loss.

I extend my heartfelt condolences to his wife and their two sons on their deep personal loss.

GEORGIA DAY—FEBRUARY 12

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 12, the Nation observed the birthday of one of our greatest Presidents, Abraham Lincoln. This day also marked another historic occasion which I would like to call to the attention of the House.

On February 12, 1733, Gen. James Edward Oglethorpe and a band of settlers went ashore at Savannah to establish the 13th colony, which was to become the State of Georgia.

The descendants of those industrious settlers, and the many others who joined them through the years, have brought many distinctions to Georgia during the past 233 years.

Georgia, the largest State east of the Mississippi River, was the fourth State to ratify the Constitution and the third State to do so unanimously. The SS *Savannah*, bearing the name of Georgia's great port city, was the first steamship to cross the Atlantic ocean. Today, another great vessel bears the name of the Savannah, the world's first nuclear-powered ship, the NS *Savannah*.

America's first Protestant Sunday School and first orphan's home were organized in Savannah. The Girl Scouts of America was founded in Savannah by Juliette Gordon Low.

The University of Georgia was the first State chartered university and Wesleyan College of Georgia was the world's first chartered college for women.

Today, Georgia is experiencing rapid growth in the field of industry, but leadership in this field is nothing new to one of the original States.

The first railroad in America was built on a Georgia plantation near Savannah. The cotton gin was invented in Georgia by Eli Whitney and the first ice manufacturing machine began operation in Georgia in 1844.

Georgians are justly proud of their many contributions to our Nation and to the world. February 12 marked the 233d birthday of Georgia and all America can be proud of this great State.

B'NAI ZION'S BILL OF RIGHTS AWARD PRESENTED TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged today to participate in the presentation by B'nai Zion of its Bill of Rights Award to our distinguished President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

B'nai Zion, established in 1908, and with 112 chapters throughout the country with a membership of more than 25,000, is dedicated to the ideals of Americanism, frateralism, and Zionism. Last year at its 56th annual convention, B'nai Zion unanimously voted to present its first Bill of Rights Gold Medal Award to President Lyndon B. Johnson, as a tribute to his inspiring leadership in the furtherance of the letter and the spirit of the Bill of Rights.

The presentation was made by Edward Sharf, national president of B'nai Zion, and the delegation included its junior past president, Norman G. Levine, Raymond Patt, a national vice president, and Herman Z. Quittman, its national secretary.

President Johnson, then the Vice President, was the guest of honor at B'nai Zion's 53d annual dinner in New York in 1961. At that time Dr. Harris J. Levine, chairman of the B'nai Zion Foundation, announced the planting of a forest in Jerusalem bearing the name of Lyndon B. Johnson in recognition of his steadfast friendship for Israel.

When President Johnson was selected as the first recipient of the Bill of Rights Award, Zalman Shazar, president of the State of Israel, cabled:

> On behalf of the people of Israel, may I express our profound admiration and deep respect for your President, whose ideals and work are an inspiration to all lovers of peace, freedom, and the dignity of man.

B'nai Zion's president, Edward Sharf, made the following remarks when presenting the gold medal to the President at the White House :

> Mr. President, as national president of B'nai Zion, the American fraternal Zionist organization, with a nationwide membership of 25,000 members throughout the United States, I am honored to lead a delegation of our national officers who are privileged to visit with you at the White House today to perform a most pleasant duty.
>
> We recall fondly your visit with us as guest of honor in 1961 at our 53d annual Order Day dinner, the most eloquent plea that you made for friendly relations and understanding between our country and Israel, and how deeply touched you were by the project that we adopted to plant a forest in your name in the American Freedom Forest in Jerusalem. In the several years that have passed, the constant growth of the evergreens in the Lyndon B. Johnson Forest has been matched graphically with the increased intensity of your efforts to promote peace in a free world.
>
> Now, B'nai Zion once again recognizes your sterling accomplishments in the field of human rights and your deep sense of commitment to the beliefs that form the foundation of our freedom in America * * * those that are secured by and derived through the fundamental principles of liberty embraced in our Constitution.
>
> We are grateful for your gracious acceptance of the B'nai Zion first Bill of Rights Award. It consists of a gold medal suitably inscribed as a fitting tribute to your inspiring leadership in the furtherance of the letter and spirit of the Bill of Rights.
>
> May I take this occasion to assure you again of our devotion and deep appreciation for your incessant efforts to build a better world for the people in all countries. Your constant vigilance by declining to take freedom for granted and protecting and advancing the rights of the individual citizen has been an inspiration to us all.

President Johnson responded with an expression of his warm appreciation for the award and its significance.

FORT WASHINGTON, PA., FIRE COMPANY OUTSTANDING

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Schweiker] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, there are now pending before committees of this House two bills which I have introduced to assist the Nation's volunteer fire companies in their exceedingly difficult fundraising chores.

H.R. 6941 would give volunteer fire companies and volunteer ambulance and rescue companies the same reduced postage rates for bulk mailings as are now available to religious, educational, scientific, labor, fraternal, and veterans groups.

The second Schweiker bill, H.R. 6942, would exempt fundraising and social activities of the volunteer fire companies from Federal income taxation when the proceeds from such activities are used exclusively in connection with the group's firefighting purpose. This measure also exempts such activities from Federal admission and cabaret taxes.

The essential contribution made to the welfare of our communities by thousands of selfless volunteer firemen saves the taxpayers millions of dollars annually. The two bills which I have introduced would provide an equitable means of easing the increasingly difficult fundraising problems faced by these volunteer firefighters.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this administration is opposing enactment of H.R. 6941 and has failed to support H.R. 6942.

In connection with this legislation which I have proposed, I call to the attention of my colleagues today the outstanding achievements of Fort Washington Fire Company No. 1, Upper Dublin Township, in my district. The Fort Washington Fire Company, composed entirely of volunteers, has had an extensive fire prevention program for over 11 years which has consistently placed first in Pennsylvania communities with populations between 5,000 and 19,999 in the annual international NFPA fire prevention contest.

In this year's judging, however, the Fort Washington Fire Company was ranked eighth in the entire Nation in the NFPA municipal division regardless of size. The winners in the first seven places were all fully paid fire companies with a paid fire prevention program. Thus the Fort Washington Fire Company volunteers were judged to have the best fire prevention program of any volunteer company—municipal division—in all the Nation. In addition, the Fort Washington Fire Company placed first in the Nation in competition with companies serving populations of between 5,000 and 20,000. I congratulate the Fort Washington Fire Company and offer its performance to my colleagues as a demonstration of the excellent services which our volunteer fire companies are performing.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Michel, for 30 minutes on Thursday, February 17; and to devise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Kluczynski, for 60 minutes, on Tuesday, May 3, Polish Constitution Day.

Mr. Quie (at the request of Mr. Talcott), for 15 minutes, on Thursday, February 17; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Talcott), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. Cohelan (at the request of Mr. Rees), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables.

Mr. Waggonner (at the request of Mr. Rees), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Hungate (at the request of Mr. Rees), for 60 minutes, on Thursday, February 17; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Horton.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Talcott) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Fino.
Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Dole.
Mr. Dague.
Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. McClory.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Rees) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Ottinger.
Mr. Celler.
Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Reuss.
Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Rosenthal.
Mr. Macdonald.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 9. An act to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; and

S. 1407. An act for the relief of Frank E. Lipp.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 17, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2048. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report describing the efforts of five Federal departments and agencies to assist in the recovery of Alaska following the earthquake of March 27, 1964, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88–451; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2049. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting the Annual Report of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 11, 1878, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2050. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a supplemental report on positions in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18, for the calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2051. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to dockets Nos. 264, 264–A, and 264–B, *The Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Petitioner*, v. *The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to the provisions of 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2052. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a report covering school desegregation in the southern and border States during the 1965–66 school year, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–315, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9302. A bill for the relief of Lt. Charles W. Pittman, Jr., U.S. Navy; with amendments (Rept. No. 1290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 12831. A bill to prescribe the measure of damages for timber trespass on lands and certain other interests in lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, and on lands under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12832. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 12833. A bill relating to marketing quotas and price supports for flue-cured tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 12834. A bill to clarify the act of 1960 which amended the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to extend the life of certain vessels under the provisions of such act from 20 to 25 years; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 12835. A bill to provide that the United States shall make no payments or contributions to the United Nations for furnishing assistance to Communist countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12836. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12837. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 12838. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 12839. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 12840. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the courts to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 12841. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act to establish a program under which assistance may be furnished for the construction of standby electrical systems in existing or proposed hospitals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 12842. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 12843. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 12844. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 12845. A bill providing for jury selection in Federal and State courts, prosecution and removal to Federal courts, civil preventive relief, civil indemnification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 12846. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12847. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited sample drug products and other potentially harmful items, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 12848. A bill to provide overtime pay for substitute postal employees for hours worked in excess of 8 hours in any single day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN (by request):

H.R. 12849. A bill to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of savings and loan holding companies and subsidiary companies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 12850. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12851. A bill to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to the discontinuance or change of certain operations or services of common carriers by rail, in order to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to give full consideration to all financial assistance available before permitting any such discontinuance or change; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12852. A bill to permit a State to elect to use funds from the highway trust fund for purposes of urban mass transportation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 12853. A bill to achieve the fullest cooperation and coordination of activities among the levels of government in order to improve the operation of our Federal system in an increasingly complex society, to improve the administration of grants-in-aid, to the States, to provide for congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid, to permit provision of reimbursable technical services to State and local governments, to establish coordinated intergovernmental policy and administration of grants and loans for urban development, to provide for the acquisition, use, and disposition of land within urban areas by Federal agencies in conformity with local government programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 12854. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 12855. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to allow the planting of soybeans on acreage diverted from cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 12856. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that nationals of the United States and citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may be enlisted in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R.12857. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that nationals of the United States and citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may be enlisted in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRALEY:

H.R. 12858. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that nationals of the United States and citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may be enlisted in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 12859. A bill to determine the rights and interests of the Navajo Tribe and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation in and to certain lands in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 12860. A bill to prohibit the introduction of merchandise into interstate commerce if a guarantee is made with respect to such merchandise unless the merchandise bears certain detailed information with respect to the guarantee; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 12861. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to acquire, construct, operate, and maintain certain parking facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 12862. A bill to require the Commodity Credit Corporation to give priority to existing terminal facilities for the storage of the Corporation's grain; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 12863. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 12864. A bill to extend for a temporary period the existing provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 12865. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of surplus personal property to State and local governments, Indian groups under Federal supervision, and volunteer firefighting and rescue organizations at 50 percent of the estimated fair market value; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 12866. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that nationals of the United States and citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may be enlisted in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 12867. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that nationals of the United States and citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may be enlisted in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 12868. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, to prohibit feeding of livestock by certain packers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 12869. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration cemetery at Houston, Tex., as the Albert Thomas Veterans' Memorial Cemetery; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOW:

H.J. Res. 836. Joint resolution amending the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.J. Res. 837. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning

April 17, 1966, as State and Municipal Bond Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.J. Res. 838. Joint resolution to require that reports on imports into the United States include the landed value of articles imported, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.J. Res. 839. Joint resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Alabama:

H. Con. Res. 594. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all foreign aid be suspended to countries maintaining diplomatic or trade relations with North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

398. By Mr. HATHAWAY: Joint resolution of the special session of the 102d Maine Legislature in support of U.S. policy in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

399. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Delaware transmitting a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 22, adopted on December 2, 1965, relative to ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Presidential succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 12870. A bill for the relief of Vera Mustur-Milinovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 12871. A bill for the relief of Eduardo Yerro Cabindol and his wife, Edith Legaspi Cabindol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12872. A bill for the relief of Hector Guerrero Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12873. A bill for the relief of Antonia Tobias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALLAWAY:

H.R. 12874. A bill for the relief of Woodrow Chatham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12875. A bill for the relief of Harley Gaultney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 12876. A bill for the relief of Dr. Iluminada C. De Luna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 12877. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Anselm C. Griffith and children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 12878. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hai-In Tong Knopf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12879. A bill for the relief of Luigi Aielo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12880. A bill for the relief of Frances Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 12881. A bill for the relief of Peter Goldson, his wife, Merva Hedy Goldson, and child, Brian Goldson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 12882. A bill for the relief of Caroline Elizabeth Adora Rebitt and Doris Elenore Davey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 12883. A bill for the relief of Aureliano Belo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 12884. A bill for the relief of John R. Sylvia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 12885. A bill for the relief of Radouan G. Dakki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 12886. A bill for the relief of Paraskevas Shinas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 12887. A bill for the relief of Giovanni and Francesco Urga-Ferraro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

School Milk Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to serve notice that I am very much opposed to the administration plans to slash funds for the school milk program. During the last fiscal year this program benefited more than 90,000 schools and child care institutions. The amount appropriated for the special milk program during the current fiscal year was $103 million. According to the Milk Industry Foundation, the school milk program and the national school lunch program accounted for the usage of nearly 3 billion pounds of milk.

If the milk had not been used it would probably have been acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation where at present support prices it would have cost the taxpayers exactly the same amount of money as was required to finance this program which is so highly beneficial to the nourishment and health of American schoolchildren.

Mr. Speaker, it makes very little sense to fund new expenditures and untried programs which cost many millions of dollars more and then penalize a tried and true program like the special milk program or the school lunch program.

I am amazed that an administration which professes to be so interested in fighting the war against poverty and in doing something about school dropouts is so shortsighted in its approach to these problems. Furthermore, as a Representative from an area where dairying constitutes an important part of the farmers' cash income, I am distressed that the Government's false economy will result in a curtailment of the consumption of milk. There are so many other areas in which savings could be accomplished without sacrificing the health and welfare of the schoolchildren of America.

National Community Senior Citizens Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide for a National Community Senior Citizens Corps.

The bill would authorize grants to States which establish part-time employment programs for senior citizens over the age of 60 in projects of value to the community. Small salaries of up to $125 a month could be paid, and these salaries would not interfere with social security benefits. Ideally, most of the participants would be volunteers who would need only out-of-pocket expenses.

I can think of a million things that our senior citizens can do to brighten the lives of the people of their communities. They can work in handicraft centers, in hospitals, day-care centers, career-counseling centers, and other places where they would supplement and not displace regular members of the work force.

Just as important as the aid that would be rendered to others is the self-respect and sense of accomplishment that participation in this program would give our senior citizens. Perhaps this is really the most important aspect of this legislation. It would be a program of Federal investment in the age-old tradition of human self-respect.

Albert Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives stands bereft of one of its stalwarts and all of the colleagues of Albert Thomas are immeasurably saddened by his passing.

Albert Thomas distinguished himself as an able and conscientious legislator and the American taxpayer is in his debt because of his wise and prudent scanning of appropriations. We recognized his outstanding leadership in the field of governmental economics, but our hearts yearn for him today and we mourn his absence, largely because of his charm and sweetness of character.

Albert Thomas was a kindly man and his ever-present smile, even when his body was racked with pain, left an indelible mark on all our hearts. All of us are a bit better for having known him, and we shall keep his memory forever green. May Almighty God bring rest to his gentle soul.

Mrs. Dague joins with me in extending our heartfelt condolences to his sorrowing family, and it is our prayerful hope that they may be given added strength as they travel through the dark valley.

Horton Marks 220th Birthday of Thaddeus Kosciuszko—Universal Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, February 12 marked the 220th anniversary of the birth of a man who stands in the foremost ranks of great patriots—Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Polish statesman and soldier. His valor on the field of battle, his courage in the face of tyranny, and his struggle for the national independence of Poland are as relevant to the 20th century as in the age of George Washington and Napoleon Bonaparte.

The struggles of the valiant American colonists against the British fired the imagination of Kosciuszko, and in 1776 he left Poland for the American Continent. While awaiting the decision of the Board of War upon his application, he found work at Philadelphia in the construction of fortifications against the expected attack across the Delaware. His expert service gained him his commission from Congress on October 18, 1776, as an engineer in the Continental service. His military career in the service of American independence was a brilliantly distinguished one. In recognition of his merit Gen. George Washington promoted Kosciuszko to the rank of colonel of artillery and made him his adjutant.

In 1783 a grateful and proud United States of America rewarded the Polish patriot for his 6 years of service and devotion to the cause of American independence by extending to him the thanks of Congress, the privilege of American citizenship, and the rank of brigadier general.

America was freed of foreign oppression, but beloved Poland, his homeland, still languished in the grip of tyranny. Thus did Kosciuszko hasten to his country, and following the proclamation of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, took a leading part in the ensuing campaigns against Russia. When the King, Stanislas II, accepted the second partition of Poland, Kosciuszko and many other Polish generals gave up their commissions and hastened to Leipzig, which soon became the center of Polish emigration.

The Polish insurgents invited General Kosciuszko to head the rebellion against Russia and offered him command of the Polish national armies. With the news of the insurrection and Russian determination to crush it, he hastened to Cracow, where he summoned his people to arm and proclaimed new decrees in favor of the peasants.

The Polish patriots led by Kosciuszko defeated the Russians at Raclawice and ably defended Warsaw but were at last overcome by the superior numbers of the enemy. On October 10, 1794, the gallant Polish force of 7,000 was almost annihilated by a Russian force over twice as large. General Kosciuszko's valor and heroism in this battle were unsurpassed. Three horses were killed under him as he rode again and again into the thickest of the battle. Finally, seriously wounded and insensible, the heroic general was taken prisoner. As the poet, Campbell, has written, "Freedom shrieked when Kosciuszko fell."

Freed by the Russians 2 years later, the Polish patriot traveled to the United States for a brief period and then returned to Europe where until his death in 1817 he continued his unceasing efforts for the liberation of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, Americans and Poles alike revere the memory of General Kosciuszko for his service to the independence of our countries. His name is synonymous with one of the noblest causes of all—freedom. His heroism transcends dimensions of time and manmade national boundaries. He is the universal patriot, and to him we pay tribute and from him we gain inspiration and strength for our own hard fight for freedom.

Father Shea Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Francis J. Shea, P.R., has been appointed pastor emeritus of the Immaculate Conception Church, Waukegan, Ill., as of February 15, 1966. This climaxes more than 50 years of service as a priest in Waukegan and Chicago.

The golden jubilee celebration honoring Father Shea was held last May 30, 1965. Many of the events which have been identified with Father Shea's life were recalled and this great man of God was appropriately honored at that time.

Father Shea came to Waukegan from Chicago in 1926 to become the pastor of the Immaculate Conception Church. He was among those who officiated at the laying of the cornerstone of the new edifice in 1928. Indeed, this great structure will always be associated with Father Shea's life of devotion and service to his parishioners, his church and his community. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because Father Shea was primarily responsible for the relocation of Immaculate Conception Church, the parish school, rectory, and convent which now stand as a great center of religious and educational activity at Grand Avenue and West Street in Waukegan. The Immaculate Conception Parochial School, erected at a cost of more than $900,000, was opened for classes in 1955.

Father Shea's service spread to other areas of useful activity. He was one of those responsible for the location of St. Therese Hospital in Waukegan and of the Ascension Catholic Cemetery near Libertyville. He has served many other needs over the years.

During World War II, Father Shea arranged for the purchase and directed the activities of a Catholic United Service Organization Center in Waukegan. Here was provided hospitality for thousands of servicemen, particularly from the Great Lakes Naval Training Center nearby.

In assuming his new duties as pastor of Immaculate Conception Church, Father Paul J. Cull has made public acknowledgment of his heritage gained through close association with Father Shea. Public figures and religious leaders from all denominations are united in their tributes of respect and honor to Father Shea on the occasion of his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that Father Shea's leadership as pastor of the Immaculate Conception Church and the spiritual and moral direction which he has provided within his own parish and within the community have brought precious gifts from which residents of Waukegan and all citizens of the 12th Illinois District have benefited. I join today, in behalf of all of those whom I have the privilege of representing, in honoring and paying tribute to Father Francis J. Shea, pastor emeritus of Immaculate Conception Church, Waukegan, Ill.

Wakefield Item Garners Prizes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege and pleasure to inform my colleagues here in the House of the recent recognition given to the Wakefield Item of Wakefield, Mass., at the recently held annual meeting of the New England Newspaper Association. With some 600 entries entered in 13 different categories, the Item won first place for general excellence among the New England dailies. The same paper also took a second-place award for the best individual news story of 1965 for papers in its circulation classification. The story which garnered this latter prize was composed by the very well known and capable reporter of the Item, Mr. Dick Baker.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring these achievements to the attention of the Congress. I need not stress to this body the very great role which responsible journalism plays in the democratic tradition of this country. This Nation was founded upon the belief that an informed citizenry is an essential ingredient of effective, responsible government.

I have been privileged to learn firsthand, Mr. Speaker, the dedication to these principles that is shared by the president of the Wakefield Item Co. and his very able and talented staff. They have maintained a constant, high standard of excellence despite the frequency of their publication, for which I am sure my colleagues here in the House share my very great and genuine admiration.

I want to take this opportunity to publicly congratulate the Item and its president and his staff and to extend them my best wishes for continued success.

New York City's Water Supply and Cornwall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, we recall the excitement and dismay this past year when New York City faced the dreaded and dreadful water shortage. The crisis is still with us, although the worry and fear are not quite so vocal.

The recent heavy rains and snow have greatly helped, but the reservoirs are still far from full and the danger of a water shortage has not passed. Nor will it pass unless nature is helped by man's ingenuity.

I have noted with interest the announcement of the possibility of New York using Consolidated Edison's proposed pumped storage hydroelectric plant at Cornwall, N.Y., to help supplement the city's water supply in dry years. From the information I have, it seems obvious that long-range solution to the city's water requirements is the Hudson River. There is no need for the city to have water shortages when hundreds of billions of gallons of fresh water flow down the Hudson each year and are wasted in the ocean. This resource must be conserved for public use.

Any plan for using Hudson River water on a large scale is going to require huge pumping facilities to get the water from the river into the water system. While the engineering and economic feasibility of the plan to use the Cornwall facilities for this purpose have yet to be determined, the proposal would seem to have merit in that it would make available to the city at minimum capital cost the largest pumping facilities anywhere. This proposal to combine power and water supply in one major project indicates an intelligent approach to the development of our Nation's water resources. It would, in a sense, help the natural supply of water Metropolitan New York City now possesses. Thus, man's ingenuity becomes the handmaiden of nature.

For some time now the city has been carefully studying all practical means of augmenting its water supply. From the information available, it seems apparent the long-range answer lies with the Hudson River. The passage on November 2, of the $1 billion clean water bill by the voters of New York State brings the use of the Hudson River for part of New York City's water supply much closer to realization.

Indications are that New York City's present system of water supply reservoirs is adequate for many years to come. The problem is not one of more reservoir capacity, but rather how to have the reservoirs full at the end of each annual spring runoff period. During years of normal rainfall this is not a problem and even with 2 or 3 dry years in a row the system seems to be adequate to meet the city's needs. However, with a more prolonged dry period, as recently existed, the situation becomes calamitous.

Since late last summer the city has been studying a method of using Hudson River water to fill the reservoirs in the springtime during dry years. This involves the use of the planned pumped storage plant at Cornwall, N.Y.

During the late winter and early spring months, the volume of fresh water flowing down the Hudson averages up to 20 billion gallons a day. During this period, I am informed, the water flowing past Cornwall is fresh, and the quality of the water even now is such that normal treatment practices can make it potable. Furthermore, the condition of this water should markedly improve as the antipollution program takes effect during the next 3 or 4 years.

The problem, then, is how to conserve a portion of the huge volumes of fresh water that flow during the early months of the year for subsequent use during the dry season. The planned Cornwall pumped storage project can provide an ideal solution. It will be the largest pumping station in the world, and more than adequate to handle the large quantities of water involved.

The project will have a reservoir with a capacity of 8 billion gallons located at an elevation of some 1,100 feet. This reservoir will be at a higher elevation than several of the reservoirs in both the Catskill and Delaware watersheds. Thus, by gravity flow, it will be possible to fill reservoirs in these systems with Hudson River water from the Cornwall reservoir. As an example, it would take only the equivalent of 12 fills of the Cornwall reservoir to add nearly 100 billion gallons of water to the city's supply. This arrangement should make it possible for New York City to have its reservoirs completely filled at the beginning of summer each year.

Methods of connecting the Cornwall project to the city's reservoir system are being explored. One of these being considered would require the construction of about 8 miles of aqueduct to integrate the new source of supply. Preliminary estimates indicate that the cost of providing this additional water will be only a fraction of the average cost of the city's water supply at present, which is 15 cents per thousand gallons.

It must be recognized that some 9 million people, all citizens of the Metropolitan New York area, are to be served by this Cornwall project.

The Cornwall plant has been attacked as an invasion of the scenic beauty of the Hudson. We are all naturally interested in preserving beauty, but from what I have been able to gather, I have grave doubts as to whether or not there will be any invasion of the beauty of the Hudson. Nor is scenic beauty a sacred cow to be worshipped at all and any cost. Remember, 9 million persons are presently involved. The future will usher in millions more to be affected. I am informed that when this project was first proposed, even Governor Rockefeller refused to intervene against it. He wrote to a New York State senator that he felt the project's benefits would outweigh any damage to the scenery. Even the Governor's distinguished brother, Laurance S. Rockefeller, chairman of the Hudson River Valley Commission, said that if no alternative can be found, Con Edison should go ahead with Cornwall. I doubt whether a substitute can be found. Thus, scenic beauty is not an absolute, although highly important.

The company claims that this project will add to rather than subtract from the scenic beauty, that it will add to recreational facilities and contribute substantially to the aims of conservationists, and that there will be cleared out at Cornwall demolished buildings, abandoned factories, and protruding rotten barges as well as a burned-out pier. There will be constructed a waterfront recreational park and many acres will be added to the forest parkland on Storm King. Furthermore, I am informed that more than 80 percent of the waterfront plant will be underground and what will be visible will be low buildings along the waterfront. There will be no stacks.

I believe both demands can be satisfied, namely, the need to preserve the beauty of the Hudson scenery with a minimum of impairment and the need for fresh water and other advantages.

"Not To Doubt," by Richard Chaput—A Saga of Spiritual Conquest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, I paid tribute in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—page 151—to Mr. Richard R. Chaput of Nashua, N.H., who was named one of 10 outstanding young men in America by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce.

On January 20, I paid further tribute to Mr. Chaput and inserted a wonderful editorial from his hometown paper, the

Nashua Telegraph—daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A260.

Mr. Chaput achieved his distinctions in spite of the fact that he is nearly totally paralyzed as the result of childhood polio. His accomplishments include the authorship of his autobiography "Not to Doubt," which contains a foreword by Richard Cardinal Cushing.

Since my remarks appeared in the RECORD, a number of my colleagues have inquired about the book and I am taking this opportunity to repeat the name of it and to recommend it as an honest, gripping, moving story of a man's conquest over pain, fear, depression, loss of faith, and frustration at what appeared to be a hopeless life.

I have sent a copy to the President in the belief he would find the story of a man whom trouble could not conquer inspiring in this time of our country's troubles. I wish it were possible for me to send a copy to each of my colleagues in the Congress, who also bear great burdens in these days of strife and uncertainty.

Again, I am pleased to recommend "Not to Doubt," an inspiring story of spiritual conquest by a brave man.

U.S. Broiler Industry Comes of Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to share with my colleagues my distinct impression that the U.S. broiler industry has come of age. I want also to review some of the work of the National Broiler Council which has borne a large responsibility in the growth of this industry.

Broilers today are a billion dollar business, an industry producing 7½ billion pounds of chicken meat annually. My own State of North Carolina ranked fourth among the broiler-producing States last year, producing over 200 million broilers for a gross income of about $100 million. Chatham County, which is in the Fourth Congressional District of North Carolina which I am privileged to serve in the Congress, is one of the leading broiler-producing areas in the world.

I remember when broilers were little more than a backyard business. The industry has changed significantly in the last decade, and today broiler production is an organized business. Vertical integration—or the contract system—has brought many efficiencies into the broiler business. As the system develops, I trust that the broiler grower will always realize a fair return for the capital and labor he invests in his end of the business. I think the trend is in this direction.

Mr. Speaker, anyone would agree with my statement that the American broiler industry has come of age, if he had been privileged to attend—as I was—the National Broiler Council's Annual Conference in Atlanta last fall.

Mr. C. W. Paris, then president of the council said in his address to the conference:

> I feel in a very strong sense that the National Broiler Council, like the broiler industry itself, has now moved from adolescence to maturity—that, by and large, we've quit flying by the seat of our pants. Management decisions are now being made based on facts.

Mr. Paris commended the council's executive vice president and his staff for the orderly manner in which the headquarters office was moved from Richmond to Washington in early 1965, with "literally no interruption of service."

It was my privilege to address the conference and, as near as I can recall my exact words, I said:

> I want to pause here to compliment the National Broiler Council upon all the help that they have provided for us on our Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives, which it is my honor to serve as chairman, and I want to compliment the board of directors for arranging to transfer your headquarters to the city of Washington which, after all, is not only the Capital of our country, but, for all intents and purposes, is the capital of the free world. There we are in constant communication with each other. When you are in trouble, we can call in people who represent you. It isn't possible for all of you to come to Washington; it isn't necessary for all of you to come to Washington. We can always count on Frank Frazier (NBC executive vice president), who is held in high esteem by Members of both Houses of Congress, to bring forth the facts and information which will be helpful and valuable to us.
>
> I want to assure you that you will always be welcome in the House Committee on Agriculture.

Those of you in the House who are familiar with my work on this committee over the past 30 years know that I have maintained the position that our farmers have been subsidizing the consumers of this Nation for many, many years. Certainly, in like manner, the American broiler industry today is giving unparalleled value to the consumers of the Nation. Broiler prices to the consumer have been coming down in recent years, while many other consumer prices have been rising.

I have championed Federal farm programs for certain commodities. I am proud of these programs. I think they have brought rightly deserved benefits to American farmers over the years, beginning with the depression-ridden 1930's. I said to the Broiler Council Conference:

> We hear a lot of people say, "Keep the Government out of agriculture." That's all right, if you want to stay out. We must give up these (Government) programs at some time in the future, but we cannot abandon them all at once. We must work together. You are a vital part of agriculture. You may not need a program now, you may not want a program now, and certainly it will not be our purpose in our committee to force any sort of a program on you. We've only tried to provide the tools which would enable farmers to control production and keep production in line with consumer demand.

During the annual conference, I was impressed to hear Frank Frazier report that, in the National Broiler Council's program of consumer education, features on chicken reached 936 million readers in the first 10 months of 1965, compared to 700 million for the same period in 1964, an increase of 34 percent. He reported on the excellent work the Broiler Council is doing in educating journalists in the taste appeal and nutritive values of chicken.

In 1965, NBC conducted an industry tour of Arkansas for leading food editors, a tour of the Delmarva producing area for farm editors, and a refresher course in New York City for top food editors. The Council also distributed to more than 1,600 food experts an attractive publication called "Chicken Little." Mr. Frazier reported that, according to figures from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, between 1956 and 1964 homemakers serving chicken at least once a week increased from 50 percent to 64 percent.

With the aggressive marketing and public affairs programs being conducted by the Broiler Council, I foresee broiler consumption rising at an even more rapid rate in the years ahead.

Speaking of public affairs, the National Broiler Council, in cooperation with other poultry organizations, conducted a well-planned and vigorous campaign during 1965 aimed at defeating proposed Government loans for establishment of a huge integrated broiler complex in New Castle, Pa.

I was pleased to cooperate with the Broiler Council in fighting these loans because, to me, they would do nothing but shift poverty from one area to another. This would happen because Government-subsidized production in Pennsylvania would compete with already established, privately financed production in broiler areas such as my own State of North Carolina. I scheduled a public hearing on the matter in the Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee last fall, and many Members of both Houses of Congress came and testified, most of them in opposition to the proposed loans. It is a tribute to fine work by many Members of Congress that the Economic Development Administration finally rejected the New Castle loan applications.

The National Broiler Council was also most active last year in fighting the proposal to shift the $20 million annual cost of poultry inspection from public funds to the poultry industry. I oppose the proposed transfer because poultry inspection is primarily a consumer protection service; therefore, the cost should not be saddled on the industry. The issue is before us again this year, and I am sure than the Broiler Council is ready, willing, and able to do battle again.

Among the many public affairs programs of the National Broiler Council last year was their work in connection with activities of the National Commission on Food Marketing. As Mr. Frazier reported to the annual conference:

> NBC cooperated with the Food Commission in arranging for witnesses to appear at a hearing in Atlanta last May. NBC presented a brief at this hearing, describing the industry and its organization structure. NBC representatives conferred with the Food Commission on the development of the questionnaire that was sent to processors. NBC arranged for Dr. Paul Farris from the Food

Commission to meet with members of the NBC Grower Advisory Committee.

Three Members of Congress participated in the Broiler Council's annual conference. Senator THRUSTON MORTON, of Kentucky, addressed the conference as did Representative PRENTISS WALKER, of Mississippi, a member of the House Committee on Agriculture and, I believe, the only member of our committee who is a poultryman himself.

Mr. Paris concluded his address at the annual conference with these remarks:

> When I reflect on the predicted population explosion to take place in the years ahead, and when I consider that we are in better shape to feed the extra population than most other segments of our agri-business economy, I can only conclude that our future is very bright indeed.

Frank Frazier likes to say of the industry he represents that broiler production today is a system of coordinated economic efficiency. At the annual conference he called it the world's most advanced system of food production—a system that can result in upgrading diets of millions around the globe.

Mr. Paris and Mr. Frazier have their eyes on the larger food problems that are confronting us as a Nation blessed with what we used to call food abundance. In the light of world food needs, we do not have an abundance of food at all. Rather, there is a shortage. That is why I have—this week—convened public hearings on extension of—and possibly new directions for—our food-for-peace program or, as the President called it last week, food-for-freedom.

Yes, the broiler industry has come of age. But we are now moving into an age in which we must fight—in the words of legislation I have introduced—"A World War on Hunger."

I note that next month Mr. Frazier, along with Mr. Ted Cameron, of Little Rock, Ark., president of the National Broiler Council, will go to Japan to participate with representatives of the U.S. Feed Grains Council in a trade seminar where world food problems will be among the topics under discussion.

It is quite evident that America's broiler industry is preparing to join the agricultural rollcall of commodities and commodity groups and go to work on the larger challenges ahead.

Operation Trading Stamps: Community Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call our colleague's attention to the wonderful community service which has been performed by one of my constituents, Mr. Al Reid, of Yonkers, N.Y.

Mr. Reid is the publisher of the Illustrated News, a weekly newspaper in Yonkers and for more than 2 years he has collected over 400,000 trading stamps. He has redeemed these stamps and has distributed more than 2,000 toys, games, and other comforting items to hospitals, convalescent centers, children's homes, homes for the aged and other deserving institutions. Recently the Peoples Savings Bank of Yonkers contributed 10,000 trading stamps to Mr. Reid's project. These stamps, in turn, were translated into a dozen toys and games which were presented to the children's ward at St. John's Riverside Hospital.

It is with great pleasure that I join with Al Reid's friends and neighbors in honoring his outstanding service to the community.

The Food and Agriculture Organization—A Report on the 13th Session of the Conference, U.S. Assistance in Skopje, Yugoslavia, the Food-for-Peace Program in Greece and American Cemeteries in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the past session of the 89th Congress, it was my privilege to be selected to serve, together with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OLSON], as a congressional adviser to the U.S. delegation at the 20th anniversary session of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations held in Rome, Italy.

During my participation in the FAO Conference, I also had an opportunity to briefly visit Greece in regard to a pending title IV, Public Law 480 agreement, and spend 1 day in Skopje, Yugoslavia. While in Italy, I also visited American cemeteries for servicemen killed in action in World War II.

Upon the convening of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, a report of my activities and observations was submitted to Speaker MCCORMACK, who suggested a report along the lines contained in my correspondence to him be inserted in the RECORD. The Speaker's letter is as follows:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 24, 1966.

HON. BOB DOLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: I am in receipt of your letter of January 21, giving me full information in relation to your attendance at the 13th session of the Conference of Food and Agriculture in Rome, Italy, which very informative letter I have read with special interest. I appreciate very much your thoughtfulness in sending the same to me. It would seem to me that you ought to insert a statement or report of some kind in the RECORD along the lines outlined in your letter to me. Such an insertion would be very informative to the Members of the House and to countless of persons who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Accordingly, there follows my observations and report on the FAO Conference, the results of U.S. assistance to Skopje, Yugoslavia, the food-for-peace program in Greece, and comments on my visit to American cemeteries in Italy:

THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION CONFERENCE

A short distance from the ancient Colosseum in Rome, Italy, stands the very modern, white marble and glass complex of buildings known to the modern Romans as "fow," the Food and Agriculture Organization. Here 112 nations of the world gathered for the 13th Session of the Conference which is the primary governing body of the FAO.

BACKGROUND OF FAO

In May and early June of 1943, a 44-nation Conference on Food and Agriculture was held in Hot Springs, Va. Here the groundwork was laid for the organization which resulted in the signing of a constitution by 34 nations in Quebec, Canada, in October of 1945, and the first meeting of the conference. Before the conference had ended, 8 additional nations had joined, bringing the membership to 42. Temporary headquarters were established in Washington from 1945 to early 1951 when permanent headquarters were located in Rome.

During the two decades of its existence the membership has increased over 250 percent to its present strength of 112 nations. Many new nations have become members and some of the older ones have withdrawn. At one time China, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary were members. Now the only Communist-bloc country members are Cuba, Poland, and Yugoslavia.

The Conference, the primary governing body of FAO, holds regular sessions biennially. Special sessions may be called to deal with emergency or other special problems. Each member government may send one delegate to the Conference and has one vote. The delegates may be accompanied by alternates, associates, and advisers in accord with the desires of the respective governments. The Conference acts on application for membership in the organization, elects member governments to the council which is the governing body between sessions of the Conference, decides the level of the budget, sets the scale of contributions, reviews and approves the program of work, reviews the state of food and agriculture, makes decisions on administrative and constitutional questions, discusses any special topics that it may include in its agenda, and appoints the Director General and the Independent Chairman of the Council.

THE 13TH SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE

The rather large American delegation to the Conference, which met from November 20, to December 10, 1965, was led by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, accompanied by the official U.S. delegate, Assistant Secretary Dorothy Jacobson, and representatives of many other branches of the Government, including the State Department, Agriculture Department, and AID. The House of Representatives was officially represented by the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. OLSON, and myself, accompanied by Mr. Hyde Murray and Mr. George Misslbeck, staff members of the House Committee on Agriculture. While in Rome, two Members of Congress from Texas, Mr. POAGE and Mr. PURCELL, also attended the staff meetings and plenary sessions of the FAO. Some of the leading farm organizations were also represented; notably the American Farm Bureau, the Farmers Union, the National Grange, and the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. At 8 a.m. on each morning of the Conference, the U.S. delegation held a staff meeting to discuss the previous day's activities and the day's agenda. We found these meetings both interesting and useful.

The first 7 days of the meeting were devoted to addresses by the delegates. Each delegate was allotted 20 minutes, and the majority used this time fully. Simultaneous translations in English, Spanish, French, and German were carried through headphones throughout the large auditorium.

Many of the delegates spent much of their time describing the accomplishments of agriculture in their respective countries, giving long lists of statistics. Some were critical of the accomplishments of FAO and the quality of technicians sent to the developing countries. The Cuban delegate subjected the membership to a 43-minute screaming harangue toward the end of which the Director General walked out after twice warning the Cuban that his time was up. The Cuban delegate made many comparisons between the conditions of agriculture before and after the revolution, painting a glowing picture of their tremendous successes, making one wonder why the Cuban people were standing in line waiting to leave the country. He also made numerous references to the North American capitalists, the neocolonialists, and the imperialists across the Straits of Florida.

During the balance of the Conference, three commissions met (often simultaneously) on the subjects within their jurisdiction. These meetings were more or less the sessions at which most of the work of the Conference was accomplished.

WORLD FOOD CRISIS

The general thought seemed to pervade the entire Conference and the various social gatherings that the world is at the doorstep of an enormous calamity. The population explosion, particularly in the underdeveloped nations, is fast outstripping the supplies of food. Unless some drastic measures are taken and more emphasis placed on food production rather than industrial production, the famine which now faces India will spread elsewhere in Asia, Africa, and Latin America in the next couple of decades. Nearly two-thirds of the people living in poor nations do not get enough to eat, yet their food supply must double in the next 30 years if they are to maintain their same miserable level of existence. Population control was discussed as an eventual solution, but not as one of immediate practical impact. Expanded food output by both developed and underdeveloped nations were generally conceded to be the most practical step available in the next decade to close the mounting "food gap" on this planet. One could not escape the implication that unless something concrete is done, and soon, on this question facing the world, the possibility of a world famine will eclipse in importance contemporary issues of war or peace in the nuclear age.

CONCERN ABOUT U.S. FARM LEGISLATION

Another thought that one heard frequently, when talking to the various delegates, was the fear that the recent passage of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 would reduce the surplus of agricultural commodities in the United States to the point where we could no longer provide any aid even in emergencies. Secretary Freeman assured the meeting that this was not so and pointed out that the United States could put millions of acres back into production should any emergency be impending.

FAO BUDGET

The budget was approved and each country's contribution was assessed. The U.S. contribution is about one-third of the $49.9 million 2-year administrative budget and about 40 percent of the financial obligations under the special programs which are budgeted at $82 million during the period 1966–67.

The congressional advisers were in agreement that the American delegation effectively represented this country, both in the official functions and in the many social gatherings where political discussions were also carried on. I personally feel that Mrs. Jacobson did an excellent job in representing our country.

MEETING WITH DIRECTOR GENERAL

In a private half-hour meeting with the Director General, Dr. B. R. Sen of India, Mr. Murray and I were told of the famine now facing India. He said that unless the United States or some country can supply about 12 million tons of wheat during 1966, some 8 to 10 million people will die of starvation. India has been troubled with a shortage of water and severe drought conditions, so that even if they could under normal circumstances feed their own people, it would be impossible at this time. Dr. Sen also reflected the general concern expressed at the Conference over U.S. policies which might result in a reduction of American farm output. He also indicated his strong support for the concept that U.S. aid should be conditioned on action by recipient countries to increase their own agricultural production.

VISIT TO SKOPJE, YUGOSLAVIA

Background—Skopje disaster, July 26, 1963

On Friday the 26th of July, an earthquake of disaster proportions struck the city of Skopje, Yugoslavia. Reports there indicated almost the entire population was left homeless and that approximately 80 percent of the city's buildings were destroyed or rendered unfit for use. Over 1,000 people were killed. When the news of this disaster was flashed around the world, the response was immediate. During the first 7 days, while the men and women of Skopje were still searching the ruins for possible survivors, some 43 countries and voluntary agencies responded immediately with cash and material assistance.

Beyond meeting the immediate needs of the Skopje victims the U.S. Government took further measures. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman visited Skopje on August 9 and reported in part as follows:

"It was dramatically clear to me that the brave and resourceful people of Skopje already are beginning the difficult task of rebuilding their fine city. I was glad therefore to be able to inform President Tito that following urgent consultation with my colleagues in Washington, I have been authorized to offer Yugoslavia additional financial resources to the value of $50 million toward relieving the economic burden of the disaster. The additional resources are derived from dinar funds owned by the United States as a result of sales during recent years to Yugoslavia of our surplus agricultural commodities under our food-for-peace program (Public Law 480). These dinars originally had been set aside under sales agreements for the exclusive use of the United States. They will be made available on this basis: $25 million (equivalent) as a grant and $25 million (equivalent) as a long-term loan. These funds will be used for the relief and rehabilitation and reconstruction of Skopje.

"The United States has dinar holdings in Yugoslavia well in excess of U.S. needs for the foreseeable future. These local currencies are not dollars and they can be used only with Yugoslavia."

CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION VISIT IN 1963

At about the same time as the visit of Secretary Freeman, members of the House Committee on Agriculture also visited Skopje, accompanied by other Members of the House. This delegation consisted of Representatives Harold D. Cooley, chairman; W. R. Poage, vice chairman and chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Agricultural Operations; Charles B. Hoeven, ranking minority Member; Alexander Pirnie, Armed Services Committee; Gerald R. Ford, Appropriaions Committee; and Edward J. Derwinski, Foreign Affairs Committee.

On Sepember 26, 1963, the House Committee on Agriculture held a hearing on the Skopje earthquake tragedy and a lengthy discussion was held on the amount and type of aid given and projected. During the discussion Mr. Cooley said: "I saw a lot of devastation in Europe and the Pacific during World War I and World War II, but I think this devastation is utterly complete and indefinable."

Mr. Cooley also said concerning the $50 million: "We didn't see any sign of it over there. As Mr. Poage says, there was a lot of talk about it. Now, has the money actually been made available, and if so, to whom and when?"

OBSERVATIONS ON SKOPJE

This question was not completely answered and with this in mind Committee staff members Hyde Murray and George Misslbeck and myself made arrangements to visit Skopje, some 2 years and 4 months after the tragedy. Transportation arrangements were made through the Embassy in Rome for the Naval Attaché at the American Embassy in Greece to supply an aircraft, an amphibious land-sea rescue craft, to fly from Athens to Skopje, although some doubt was cast as to how soon this could be accomplished as the Yugoslavs usually require that a flight plan be filed 7 to 10 days before the flight. Here was the first indication of their cooperativeness when the flight plan was approved within 24 hours. However, the Ambassador in Belgrade filed a flight plan to fly to Skopje to be with us and this was refused.

We left Athens about 8:30 a.m. on November 24, 1965, and after a flight through sleet, rain, and snow, landed on the grass and gravel runway of the Skopje airport. Here we were met by an aid to the vice president of the city council, Mr. Antonie Sazdovski, and a woman interpreter, Mrs. Dannce Sazdovski (no relation). There was a delay of about a half hour while waiting for an indifferent customs official. When he did arrive he said he couldn't stamp the passports as he did not have the rubber stamps which were in someone else's custody. After much discussion between the two escorts and the customs official, it was finally agreed that the passports would be stamped when the group left the airport in the afternoon. He was the only one who created any difficulty; everyone else was very hospitable and courteous.

Two cars were supplied for our group and they proceeded to the heart of the city. All rubble has been cleared, but many buildings still have large cracks and will eventually have to be demolished. The railroad station is still a shambles and may be left in that condition as a monument to the victims of the earthquake. The clock on the outer wall of the station still stands where it stopped at 5:16 on the morning of July 26, 1963.

The next stop was the temporary home of the city council where the delegation was greeted by the vice president of the council, Mr. Dragaljub Starrev, and another woman interpreter, Miss Illinka Drakolevaska. She spoke excellent English and had recently returned from a year of study in England. She was an employee of the protocol office.

A short meeting was held in the office of the vice president, and he recounted a short history of the earthquake. His first mention was of the American field hospital which arrived only 24 hours after the disaster. The hospital was turned over to the local authorities when the Americans left and is now in storage to be used for emergencies.

Eventually the question came up as to what has been done with the $50 million worth of dinars given and loaned by the United States to the city—very little that we could determine. A very small amount had been used for clearing expenses, but what was really needed in the initial phases of reconstruction was hard currencies to purchase supplies in other countries. However, we were told that the money will be used, particularly for roadbuilding. City officials said that only 10 days before we visited the city, a master plan for the complete rebuilding of the central part had been approved with great plans for wide avenues and boulevards, one of which will be named Kennedy Boulevard. Apparently here is where a good portion of the money will be expended. Mr. Starrev expressed the gratitude of the local citizens for all the aid they had received from many foreign governments and from the United States. He then suggested that the delegation tour some of the rebuilt sections of the city.

The first place visited was a fully equipped, four-story clinic, a gift of the Rumanian Government. One department was especially designed for ailments of athletes and featured special exercising equipment, therapeutic baths, and massage tables. Another department was a rather modern-looking X-ray facility. Hospital officials said that all people who work are entitled to free medical care. Outside the dental department was a large waiting room filled with people, and in the office were two dentists and another half-dozen people waiting their turn in the chairs.

Rumania also contributed three modern styled apartment buildings with 110 flats. The Czechoslovakian Government built a small community of steep-roofed houses completely furnished. Other bloc countries made their contributions of housing and this was pointed out. The Russians had contributed a steelmill. The Swedes and Norwegians were building a 250-bed hospital for children, specializing in TB cases. This was on a hillside overlooking the city and was a very attractive building. Inside it was completely equipped with modern kitchens, cribs, small tables and chairs, and medical rooms. It was to be turned over to the Yugoslavs in a few days.

THE AMERICAN CONTRIBUTION

Then our group was driven a short distance out of town to see the American contribution. It was a rather disturbing sight. Here were a large group of dirty quonset huts set in a muddy field. Concrete walks covered with corrugated plastic did connect the various buildings within a group, but the streets connecting the groups were deep in mud. Gypsies were quartered in these buildings, one of which had been set aside as a school. Heating was supplied by GI pot-bellied stoves. We understood one interpreter to say that these buildings had been used for the American Army units stationed there for rescue work and then turned over to the city. The other interpreter said that these units had been built specifically as a gift and had been occupied for about a year. They looked to be 10 years old.

Mr. Starrev insisted that we have lunch with him at the local hotel and it turned out to be a rather elaborate dinner. Relations were very cordial and the dinner was enjoyed by all. Unfortunately we had to return to the airport immediately after eating to be able to take off before dark. There were no landing lights or any navigational aids at this airport serving this city of a quarter million people.

On the return flight we encountered strong headwinds, heavy icing conditions, and limited visibility, but the skies cleared as we approached Athens and a good landing was made at about 9 p.m.

TITLE IV 480 AGREEMENT WITH GREECE

During our 2 days in Athens, I had an opportunity to discuss with our agricultural attaché, Mr. Motz, and Ambassador Phillips Talbot, a pending title IV long-term dollar credit agreement involving the sale of feed grains to Greece under Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program.

Without going into all of the details, this proposal involved the question of exporting feed grains to Greece at a time she held a modest surplus of wheat. The reasoning in support of such an arrangement was impressive and I expressed this sentiment to Secretary Freeman in Rome, and to Agriculture Department officials in Washington, upon my return. Recently our Government announced the new title IV agreements, which call for the eventual repayment of the entire proceeds in dollars.

We also toured agricultural areas surrounding Athens and saw vast areas devoted to wheat farming. The Lake Kopais reclamation area was of considerable interest. We were informed some 60,000 hectares of land had been reclaimed and used for irrigated farming. Although the farms were small, modern farm equipment was being used. As in our country, Greek farmers have a problem in acquiring sufficient farm labor. Many Greeks have emigrated to Western Europe for better paying industrial jobs.

In Greece, as in many other countries, cattle are tripurpose animals: work, milk, and meat. Beef-feeding operations are almost unknown. The largest beef-feeder is feeding about 300 head, which is mainly for the hotel trade. Most of the beef is slaughtered one day and sold fresh the next day. There is little or no refrigeration in the majority of the shops visited.

Poultry is still a delicacy and generally costs more than lamb, mutton, or beef. When frozen American poultry was first introduced, it gained wide acceptance. The trade name of the first frozen birds is still synonymous with all frozen poultry and commands the highest price.

Poultry raising is a farmyard operation, but we were told, about 20 integrators are now in operation. The largest is growing about 500,000 birds. He produces his own feed, processes it, feeds it, slaughters, and distributes through about 50 retail outlets in Athens. We visited one retail shop in a residential area, and the chickens being sold were very similar to our white broilers of 3 to 3½ pounds, and were about 52 cents a pound. The only other product handled in these outlets was fresh eggs.

Later we visited the Greek Parliament which, in appearance, is very much like the U.S. House Chamber. The Speaker is in the center, and the Members' seats are arranged in a semicircle. The galleries for spectators are the same except that there are two levels. The king sits where our press gallery is located. The conservatives sit on the right of the Speaker, the majority party in the center, and the leftists on the left.

I also visited with two Athens families related to some Kansas constituents. They were most hospitable and we enjoyed visiting about Kansas and Greece.

Upon our return to Rome from Greece and Yugoslavia, I attended the American delegation staff meeting and conferred with Secretary Freeman in regard to a pending Public Law 480 title IV agreement with the Government of Greece.

NORTHERN ITALY

Over the weekend of November 28, 1965, I visited the area in northern Italy, around Castel D'Aiano, where I had been wounded in World War II while serving as a platoon leader in the 10th Mountain Infantry Division. It was indeed a strange feeling to return to the spot of foreign soil which had such a profound effect on my life.

There has been little change in this mountainous area, but I was more than a little surprised to find the trenches and foxholes much as they were over 20 years ago. It was from this general area the American forces launched their last major push in Italy which carried them across the Po Valley. The return to the Appenines was an interesting personal experience I shall long remember. Needless to say, the pro-American attitude of the Italians there was impressive and encouraging.

AMERICAN CEMETERIES

Nearby, in Florence, the U.S. Battle Monuments Commission maintains a truly beautiful memorial cemetery for American troops killed in World War II. Together with the cemetery at Anzio-Nettuno (which we later visited) some 12,000 of the 35,000 Americans killed in the Battle of Italy are interred. These cemeteries are both well managed and well maintained as fitting memorials to those Americans who made the supreme sacrifice for their country. At each cemetery I presented the officials in charge an American flag which had flown over the U.S. Capitol. Every American who visits Italy should take time to visit an American cemetery if at all possible. You feel proud of your country and thankful, beyond description, to those who have given their lives to preserve our precious freedoms.

In conclusion, I again thank Speaker McCormack and the minority leader, Mr. Ford, for this assignment as it was interesting and gratifying to have such an opportunity. I feel certain this assignment will be invaluable in the days ahead as new challenges are faced at home and abroad.

Ad Hoc Congressional Conference on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I am inserting below the report of an ad hoc congressional conference on Vietnam, held in Washington on January 21 and 22. The conference was sponsored by eight Members of Congress, listed in the report.

The report represents the views of a group of experts particularly qualified to discuss American diplomacy. The conclusions were reached by that group, rather than by the congressional sponsors. The sponsors believe the report merits careful consideration by their colleagues, the executive branch, and the American people.

The report follows:

REPORT OF THE AD HOC CONGRESSIONAL CONFERENCE ON VIETNAM, HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 21 AND 22, 1966

CONGESSIONAL SPONSORS

Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Democrat, of New York, chairman.

Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Democrat, of Michigan.

Don Edwards, Democrat, of California.

Leonard Farbstein, Democrat, of New York.

Donald M. Fraser, Democrat, of Minnesota.

ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

WILLIAM F. RYAN, Democrat, of New York.

Foreword

On January 21 and 22, 1966, a group of experts and scholars met in Washington at the invitation of eight Members of the House of Representatives to analyze the current situation in Vietnam and prepare realistic proposals to help end the war and facilitate a negotiated settlement.

The sponsoring Congressmen have felt unsatisfied with the recent role of Congress in foreign affairs. They believe their office requires a more fundamental examination of foreign policy than that allowed by even the most careful consideration of specific legislation. The sponsors are convinced that the level of congressional analysis can be raised through greater intimacy between the legislative branch and the intellectual and university community. It was with this in mind that they invited to Washington a group of experts particularly qualified to discuss with them Vietnam and its implications for American diplomacy.

Some of the participants have spent considerable time in Vietnam, and have obtained intimate association with conditions there. Others offered the important perspectives of experience in negotiation, study of economics, diplomacy or international law, or expert knowledge of relevant geographical areas.

Participants were requested not to dwell on episodes or errors of the past. Instead, they were asked to discuss present policies and possible alternatives to them; to analyze the problems involved in reaching and enforcing a settlement in Vietnam; and to project the outlines of a creative American policy toward Asia.

Certain conclusions and recommendations by the participants emerged in the discussions and these are stated explicitly at the beginning of the report. The subsequent summary of the discussions also includes some individual points which contributed to the analysis, although they were not unanimously endorsed.

The sponsors regard the proposals made by the conference as important contributions to their own thinking about Vietnam and the formulation of American foreign policy. They feel the report deserves the attention of their congressional colleagues, members of the executive branch, and the American people. Finally, they view the conference as having set an important precedent for future congressional initiatives in foreign affairs.

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Arthur Larson, Chairman; director, Rule of Law Research Center, Duke University; former director of the U.S. Information Agency; and Special Assistant to President Eisenhower.

Mr. Richard Barnet, codirector, Institute for Policy Studies; former Deputy Director, Office of Political Research, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Prof. Robert Browne, professor of economics, Fairleigh-Dickinson University; former A.I.D. official in Vietnam.

Mr. Benjamin V. Cohen, former counsellor to the Department of State.

Prof. Richard Falk, associate professor of international law, Princeton University; editor, American Journal of International Law.

Prof. Bernard Fall, professor of international relations, Howard University; author of "The Two Vietnams."

Mr. Arnold Fraleigh, lecturer in political science, George Washington University; former Foreign Service officer.

Dean Edmund Gullion, dean, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy; former Counsellor of American Legation in Saigon; former Ambassador to the Congo.

Prof. George McT. Kahin, director, Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University.

Prof. John Lewis, professor of government, Cornell University.

Mr. Robert Nathan, economic consultant.

Mr. Marcus Raskin, codirector, Institute for Policy Studies; former member of the special staff of the National Security Council.

Prof. Louis Sohn, Bemis Professor of International Law, Harvard Law School.

Mr. James Warburg, writer on foreign policy.

Dr. Betty Goetz Lall, Rapporteur; research associate, School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University.

Paul T. Gorman; executive assistant.

Mr. Nathan attended that part of the conference dealing with economic aid but did not participate in the preparation of the report.

Dean Gullion is not in agreement with a majority of the findings and recommendations.

CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATIONS

The conference reached the recommendations and conclusions set out below. A summary of the discussions from which they were developed follows:

Present strategies

1. There are diplomatic alternatives, not yet fully explored, to continued military escalation of the war in Vietnam.

2. Continued bombing of North Vietnam is not in the American interest either in shortening the war or in improving prospects for a negotiated settlement.

3. There should be no further escalation of American troop commitment. There are serious risks of inviting greater North Vietnamese and Chinese activity.

4. Unilateral withdrawal of all American troops prior to a cease fire or peace conference is not in our national interest.

New policy initiatives

5. The most productive course for the future is a deescalation of military activity and commitment.

6. The National Liberation Front must be recognized as a principal belligerent in the war, and as a necessary party to any peace conference and settlement.

7. To improve the likelihood of negotiations, the Saigon government should be broadened to include representatives less hostile to negotiations.

8. The United States must help promote greater contact between all South Vietnamese factions—representatives of the National Liberation Front, the Saigon government, and influential private citizens.

Negotiations and the convening of a conference

9. The differences between the several negotiating positions are not insurmountable. The United States might agree to Hanoi's four points, treating them as one interpretation of the 1954 agreement and thus an appropriate basis for negotiations. The controversial point 3 of the Hanoi program would then be a subject for subsequent discussion rather than prior approval.

10. The 1954 Geneva Conference should be reconvened with all parties to the hostilities represented.

11. A procedure for reconvening the Geneva Conference would be to have the three nations on the International Control Commission (Canada, India, Poland) request a conference to receive new instructions on enforcement of the 1954 agreements.

12. The inability of the United Nations thus far to use its good offices to help end the Vietnam war dramatizes the urgency of including China as a full member of that institution. Despite the difficulties of involving the United Nations in a settlement of the war, all parties should seek opportunities to utilize the United Nations in appropriate ways.

Terms of a settlement

13. A cease-fire must be secured. Given the dispersed nature of the conflict, such a cease-fire might be more easily reached at a conference, though the possibility of a prior cessation of hostilities should be explored carefully.

14. Agreements must be reached on a provisional government in South Vietnam and procedures for the holding of elections to form a constituent assembly. A provisional government might be established on the basis of geographical areas controlled, with contested areas to be administered temporarily by the International Control Commission. Alternatively, decisions regarding such a government could be reached by prior negotiations between all parties in the South.

15. All parties must firmly adhere to the results of free elections.

16. Amnesty must be granted for all parties in the conflict.

17. Guarantees of the cease-fire, the provisional government, free elections, troop withdrawals, amnesty, and neutralization must be enforced by an effective International Control Commission. The International Control Commission must therefore be significantly strengthened. United Nations participation in this process might reduce administrative difficulties and set precedent for future United Nations participation in the solution of other civil conflicts threatening world peace.

18. A settlement should assure the neutralization of the two zones of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Arms control agreements must be reached applying to other nations of the area, prescribing their nonparticipation in military alliances, the freedom of their territory for foreign military bases, and their protection from outside arms, material, and armed personnel infiltration.

CONFERENCE SUMMARY

I. The current situation in Vietnam

In discussing the present situation in Vietnam, the conference concentrated on two major issues: the status and relations of the several Vietnamese parties in conflict and the political effect of various military tactics and strategies.

The Vietnamese Antagonists

There is little information about the National Liberation Front and its military arm, the Vietcong. Their top leaders are not easily contacted; below the top leadership few of their personnel have been adequately identified by Americans. Many of the participants felt this lack of knowedge itself obstructed needed initiatives in the diplomatic sphere. Several participants acquainted with politics in South Vietnam reminded the conference that the Vietcong had grown out of the resistance movement when all of Vietnam was struggling against the French. The National Liberation Front is clearly dominated by the Communists, although several experts pointed out that the Front does consist of various factions, some of them more nationalist than Communist. It was felt that attempts must be made to learn more about the structure of the Front, constituting as it does, such a significant force in the south.

There were varying viewpoints regarding the strength of the South Vietnamese government, and the conference was aware of the extreme mutability of circumstances in Saigon. Some participants believed there was no organic non-Communist political structure left in South Vietnam, and that the military government was simply an extension of the American presence. Others argued that there was considerable structure intact. The conference agreed that the stability and prestige of the government was largely a function of the degree of American support.

Many participants were deeply disturbed by the Ky government's insistence that talk of negotiations jeopardizes its life and threatens to dissolve its army's will to fight. All agreed that this position should not be allowed to prevail. In fact, it was felt that a broadening of the South Vietnamese government would be a prerequisite for moves toward a negotiated settlement.

Relations Between Saigon and the National Liberation Front

Given the above evaluation, the participants were deeply convinced that steps must be taken to promote greater contact between the National Liberation Front, members of the Saigon government, and influential South Vietnamese citizens. American policy, in its insistence that the war is a simple case of external aggression, may be undercutting this goal. While many noted the intransigence of Saigon on stimulating contacts, several of the participants pointed out that some South Vietnamese officials, Buddhists, independent political figures, and non-Communist intellectuals are undoubtedly acquainted with the National Liberation Front agents and officials. The United States, through local aid and intelligence officials, should actively seek to promote these relations. The participants thought that the United States must persuade the Ky government not to obstruct this process and inflict punishment on citizens engaged in promoting contact between presently hostile groups. If, as all parties to the conflict agree, a future South Vietnam must be autonomous and free from foreign interference, then attempts at reconciliation within the country must be made.

Relations Between the National Liberation Front and Hanoi

Many in the group believed there are differences between the National Liberation Front and the North Vietnamese government regarding the conduct of the war. Some argued that those fighting in the South are likely to feel less inclined to compromise for a settlement. An example of this difference was the variation in interpretation given by the National Liberation Front and North Vietnam to the statement first issued by the Front on March 17, 1965. The North Vietnamese version, broadcast 3 days after the National Liberation Front account, was much toned down.

The difference in outlook between the Front and North Vietnam was cited as another reason why the United States should encourage the government in South Vietnam to make contact with the National Liberation Front. We could be committing serious errors if we assumed that Hanoi had such complete authority over the National Liberation Front that it could speak for it on all issues of stopping the war and negotiating a settlement. We do not know definitely that the National Liberation Front would accept Hanoi's terms for a settlement. In fact, it was felt that one of the reasons why reunification of North and South Vietnam is no longer an issue of priority was the recognition by Hanoi that even with a Vietcong victory, reunification would involve a complicated process of bargaining between Hanoi and whoever formed a South Vietnamese government.

The Political Effects of Military Tactics: Bombings in the North

The conference participants were in agreement that the bombings in the North were of little military value, while the diplomatic disadvantages were very serious. It was agreed that the bombings had helped bolster South Vietnamese morale; but it was believed this factor did not outweigh harmful diplomatic effects. Further escalation of the bombings, it was felt, could not be expected to improve the situation.

The Political Effects of Military Tactics: Operations in the South

The conference expressed extreme anxiety over the prospect of increased American troop commitments in the South. Echoing the conclusion of the recent Mansfield report, the participants argued that an escalation of troop commitment would likely result in stalemates on yet higher levels of engagement. There was profound awareness of the risks of provoking greater North Vietnamese and possible Chinese ground participation. No member of the group believed the United States should withdraw all its forces from Vietnam prior to a settlement. But the group agreed that the most desirable future course would be a deescalation of military activity and involvement. Many held that American initiatives on staged withdrawals would be more in the United States interest than a continued enlargement of our involvement.

The conference also noted that bombings in the South and ground clear-and-hold operations were creating a serious refugee problem. The number of refugees, estimated at 1 million in 1965, was growing beyond the capacity of pacification programs to absorb them. The problem was thought to be of increasing importance to the stability of the South Vietnamese government.

Throughout the discussion there was concern expressed that the more the United States makes the war our war, the less chance we have of building attitudes congenial to a settlement. With respect to United States economic efforts, for example, it was argued that without the willingness of the South Vietnamese government to commit itself to improving conditions in the countryside, large increases of United States economic aid and personnel are not likely to achieve intended political results.

II. Negotiations and a peace conference

The conference discussed in some detail the present bargaining positions of the parties in conflict. From here, it turned to an examination of the problems involved in initiating negotiations and convening a peace conference.

Current Negotiating Positions

On the surface it appears that both sides in the war are agreed on what should constitute the basis for negotiations and a peace conference. The United States and North Vietnam have said that the 1954 Geneva Agreement should form the foundation of a settlement; the United States has presented 14 points as representing its own position. The North Vietnamese position is represented by the four points announced on April 8, 1965. Of these, point three has been the principal obstacle to agreement. This point reads: "The internal affairs of South Vietnam must be settled by the South Vietnamese people themselves, in accordance with the program of the NFLSV (the South Vietnam National Liberation Front) without any foreign interference." The United States has indicated that all points, 4 or 14, could be dealt with in negotiation. Yet there is still considerable controversy regarding the true nature of Hanoi's point three. One view was that point three meant that Hanoi would settle for nothing less than a settlement based entirely on the program of the Front. Many, however, disputed this interpretation, arguing that the four points are but an elaboration of Hanoi's understanding of the 1954 agreement. Cited as documenting this contention were the preamble and postscript to the four points. The preamble states that it is the intention of the North Vietnamese government "to strictly respect the 1954 Geneva agreements on Vietnam and to correctly implement their basic provisions as embodied in the following four points:"

A significant number of participants felt that the negotiating positions of the parties were not so irreconcilable. It was then proposed that the United States should accept the four points of Hanoi, treating them as one interpretation of the Geneva accords, and thus an appropriate basis for negotiations. The controversial point three would then become a subject for discussion at a conference rather than prior to it. This American diplomatic initiative would give Hanoi less reason to oppose negotiations.

There was some belief that Hanoi was not disposed to negotiate now since it felt that the United States could be worn down psychologically.

If, however, the above view is not entirely the case, and if the positions of the several parties are not so opposed, what then is holding up the convening of negotiations and a conference? There appears to be the lack of conviction on each side that the other side does in fact accept the conditions proclaimed for a settlement. There may also be conviction that military success is still possible. And clearly there is ambiguity regardng the role of the National Liberation Front, in addition to other procedural difficulties regarding the convening of a conference.

Dealing With the National Liberation Front

A main stumbling block to negotiations has been the refusal of the United States to accept the presence of the National Liberation Front as one of the necessary parties to the negotiations and settlement. The U.S. position has been, in the words of the President: "The Vietcong would not have difficulty being represented and having their views represented if for a moment Hanoi decided she wanted to cease aggression. I don't think that would be an insurmountable problem." This has appeared to be insufficient recognition to satisfy the Front and North Vietnam. And Hanoi has sometimes seemed to take the extreme view that the Front is the only group from South Vietnam that should be dealt with.

The group felt strongly that the United States should be clearer about its willingness to deal with the Front at the negotiating table. While the United States should consult fully with the South Vietnamese government on its view, the Ky government should not be permitted to exercise a veto over United States policy in this respect. One approach to dealing with the Front might be an American decision to grant the Front belligerent status.

Reconvening of the 1954 Geneva Conference

The reconvening of the 1954 Geneva Conference is almost a certain prerequisite to negotiating an end to the war. There is, however, a procedural problem as to which government or body should request the reconvening of this conference.

While there are considerable uncertainties regarding future developments, the participants thought it important to discuss likely alternative procedures for convening a conference.

The cochairmen of the 1954 conference—the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union—are unlikely to issue a conference call because the Soviet Union might not wish to expose itself to further denunciations by China or complicate its good relations with North Vietnam. So this avenue was therefore considered unpromising.

Another possibility is that the United Nations might request the reconvening of the conference. The principal problem here is that neither North nor South Vietnam nor China are members of the United Nations; and North Vietnam and China may continue to regard any United Nations action as likely to be partisan and therefore unacceptable.

A third possibility, now unlikely, is to act on a former (1964) Cambodian request to reconvene the conference to guarantee its neutrality and borders, which Cambodia charged were threatened by the Vietnam war. This conference might then be used by the parties to discuss a settlement of the war in South Vietnam.

There is a fourth possibility, as yet untried, which might be most acceptable to all parties. The three countries of the International Control Commission (India, Canada, and Poland) could request that the Geneva Conference be reconvened in order that they receive further instructions on the implementation of the 1954 agreement. At this conference, the terms of a settlement to the present war could be considered.

In requesting such a conference, the International Control Commission members might propose that representation be determined along the lines of the 1961–62 Laos Conference, which allowed each of the warring factions to participate in discussion. One of the major functions of that Conference was to provide a channel through which leaders of the three groups met and eventually agreed on the formation of a government. The Laos accord was then intended to be a guarantor of the settlement.

III. Terms of a settlement

Cease-Fire

A cease-fire will have to be a precondition for elections to form a government for South Vietnam. Yet given the dispersed nature of the conflict, there would have to be prior negotiations.

The United States position is that it will accept a cease-fire before a conference or will agree to a cease-fire as the subject of a conference. The group agreed that either sequence could be tried. But given the complexities of such matters, a cease-fire would probably have to be worked out at preconference or conference negotiations.

The United States is accepting some risk in being willing to have a cease-fire before a conference. It is one thing to call upon major military forces to stop fighting, and quite another to rely on the observance of a cease-fire by guerrilla forces. Yet, the United States side would gain politically as a result of a cease-fire. Participants noted that there are many recent examples where negotiations were convened while fighting continued. This was the case in Indonesia, Cyprus, Yemen, Algeria, and, in 1954, Indochina. What is desirable is that the belligerents agree, at least tacitly, that they will engage in a maximum amount of deescalation so as to permit a conference to meet in the most relaxed possible atmosphere.

Provisional Government

One of the most difficult questions for a reconvened peace conference to settle is the nature of any provisional government pending the holding of elections. Some believed that this question is so difficult for outside parties to decide that elections to form a constituent assembly for South Vietnam should take place as soon as they could be organized. Others thought that elections immediately following a cease-fire would present serious problems.

Two principal ways of forming a provisional government pending elections were discussed. At the national level, an all South Vietnamese government would be composed of representatives drawn from geographical areas. Although many details would have to be worked out in conference, the essential functions of government would be divided among the major South Vietnamese groups and the International Control Commission. At the local level the Saigon government would continue to exercise authority over areas controlled by it, and the same would be true for the National Liberation Front as well as such largely autonomous groups as the Cao Dai, Hoa Hao, and some of the Montagnard groups. As to those geographical areas which are contested, the International Control Commission would need to exercise temporary control. (It was noted that there is some precedent for this in the agreement which gave the United Nations temporary administrative control in West Irian.) In this connection, members of the group again stressed the importance of promoting closer contacts by the different groups in South Vietnam.

A second way of forming a provisional government is the more traditional one of having the parties decide on a cabinet where portfolios would be divided among them. Within this context the International Control Commission could be given special responsibilities. Some expressed anxiety that this form of provisional government has provided Communists with a means of staging a coup d'etat. It was pointed out by others that whether such a provisional government can function until elections are held depends in large measure on the political orientation of the population. In such countries as France and Italy, Communists were included in the cabinet of the immediate post-World War II governments with no subsequent Communist takeover. In the Laos Agreement of 1961–62, a coalition government that was formed at the time subsequently broke down when the Communist faction withdrew its support and refused to participate, leaving the centrist and right-wing groups to run that part of the country they controlled.

Elections

There was unanimity that elections should be held for the purpose of creating a government of South Vietnam and that the United States and all other parties to a negotiated settlement should be absolutely firm in their willingness to accept the results of them. The United States, among its 14 points for a settlement, includes the "support of free elections in South Vietnam to give the South Vietnamese a government of their own choice." Most of the group felt that the United States government would honor this commitment.

Finding acceptable means by which elections can be held will be a difficult task. The International Control Commission was commissioned at Geneva to supervise elections for the reunification of the two zones of Vietnam. The group assumed that the International Control Commission could also be given the duty of supervising elections for the formation of a constituent assembly among whose responsibilities would be the formation of a government.

Amnesty

The Geneva Agreement of 1954 provided that the representative authorities of the northern and southern zones of Vietnam "must not permit any individual or collective reprisals against persons who have collaborated in any way with one of the parties during the war, or against members of such persons' families." This amnesty will need to be reinforced in a peace settlement. If necessary, the International Control Commission must be given special authority to see that amnesty is being observed, and to consider reports of violations and recommend action in their event.

Unification With North Vietnam

The Geneva Agreement of 1954 provided that elections would be held in July 1956, for the purpose of reunifying the northern and southern zones of Vietnam. Among the members of the group who have had close contacts in Vietnam there was agreement that North Vietnam would not demand early reunification of the country. Since the United States is on record as supporting any free decision of the people of Vietnam on reunification, this issue no longer appears to be among those causing great controversy. A constituent assembly could be given responsibility for achieving reunification. On this point it was noted that in January 1957, 6 months after the failure to hold elections in Vietnam for reunification, the Soviet Union proposed that North and South Vietnam be admitted to the United Nations as separate states. The United States rejected the proposal at the time.

Neutralization of North and South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia

The Geneva Agreement of 1954, by providing that North and South Vietnam could not accept foreign military personnel and bases or participate in military alliances, set the stage for a military neutralization of the four areas comprising Indochina. It was recognized by the group that such neutralization does not preclude governments in these countries headed or controlled by Communists, but that insofar as military matters are concerned, Communist or non-Communist governments could not be aligned with other countries. It was the conviction of the group that neutralization of North and South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos would not jeopardize the security interests of America or the non-Communist states of Asia.

Withdrawal of Troops

Informally and unofficially, many Communist spokesmen have stated that it would not be necessary for the United States to withdraw its troops in advance of a negotiated settlement in Vietnam. There is, however, some uncertainty whether Hanoi and the Front are in accord on this point.

The United States position is that we "want no U.S. bases in southeast Asia," and that "we do not desire to retain U.S. troops in South Vietnam after peace is assured." Assuming flexibility on the part of both sides on this issue, the group did not think that the withdrawal of troops per se would constitute a major issue in the negotiations. The exact staging of the withdrawal of troops on the part of both the United States and North Vietnam, of course, would need to be the subject of rather detailed discussions.

Enforcement Provisions of a Settlement

The International Control Commission, under the terms of the 1954 Geneva Agreement, is made responsible for implementing the terms of the agreement. However, in the 1954 agreements it was expected that the French Army would provide the necessary logistic support and that financial support would be given by the French government. When the French withdrew from South Vietnam in August 1956, the Commission was left without any means of support. The need for a reinforced International Control Commission, therefore, was strongly felt by all members of the group. If the International Control Commission is to perform the tasks assigned to it in 1954, plus any additional ones designated by a new peace conference, there must be agreement on a new financing formula. The Laos Agreement of 1961–62 bolstered the International Control Commission in its operations in that country; this included a financing formula whereby the United States, the Soviet Union, China, France, and the United Kingdom each agreed to pay 17.6 percent of the costs. The other parties agreed to pay lesser percentages.

Some of the group felt that the International Control Commission by itself did not have the kind of administrative structure needed to perform its duties. It was therefore suggested that the United Nations could provide administrative support to strengthen the implementation of a settlement. Whether the Chinese would agree to such administrative support was not known, but some participants thought that a United Nations decision to support strict observance of the Geneva Agreement would be evidence to the Chinese of the United Nations impartiality regarding a settlement.

IV. Related aspects of a Vietnamese settlement

China

At a number of points in the conference China was discussed. These discussions covered China's view of the Vietnamese conflict, and the relation of its domestic affairs to foreign policy. Thought to be particularly important were the problems of providing sufficient food for its expanding population, the succession question, and the adaptation of the army to political rather than professional military purposes. Chinese food needs cannot be met by extending control over small states in the area. Only in the Loess region of north China can total food production be substantially raised, something in the order of 40 percent. As to the question of succession, the older leadership has attempted—with only moderate success—to instill revolutionary and anti-American attitudes in those younger men likely to replace them. American policies, however, can affect the degree of success the older leadership has with this indoctrination process.

It was also noted that the Maoist leadership fears that the United States may attack the mainland soon and that China must be prepared to meet this attack by various forms of defense encompassing guerrilla-type operations. There are signs, however, that army leaders may be seriously resisting the role assigned them by the party in the defense of China.

On Chinese foreign policy, the specialists in the group noted the gross misinterpretation given by many to the September 1965 statement of the Chinese Defense Minister, Lin Piao. This statement, contrary to popular and some official beliefs, advocated scaling-down of overt Chinese action and those militant policies which increased the risk to China itself. The Chinese espoused the view that revolutions and wars of liberation could not be imported, and that conditions within a country had to be ripe in order for such revolutions to succeed. This did not mean that China would not send out agents and propaganda to foment revolution. Yet such tactics should be differentiated from the likelihood of repeated large-scale Chinese aggression and the sending of Chinese troops and arms to local Communist groups in the developing areas of the world. Notable too in the Lin statement was the absence of threats to the United States in Vietnam, even though China had issued many such threats in the earlier months of 1965.

Thus in Vietnam, China has exercised caution. Yet in assessing future Chinese intentions it was stressed that there undoubtedly was a threshold for China's active participation in the war. At some point in a continued United States escalation the Chinese would doubtless feel compelled to enter.

Many believed that since 1963 Chinese foreign policy had suffered a series of significant setbacks in the developing areas primarily because of the hostile reactions of indigenous populations and leaders.

Wars of Liberation

The group considered the above evaluation as having particular relevance to Communist policy on wars of liberation. Given Chinese inability or reluctance to commit military force to support wars of liberation, and what some felt was a growing uneasiness on the part of the Soviet Union unilaterally to promote these conflicts, the participants felt it important that the United States revise its conception of Communist aggression.

American response to Communist agitation for conflict in developing areas must not be to react unilaterally with military forces. United States aid to certain governments with antidemocratic features appears to have pressed the Soviet Union into increasing its agitation for disorder. Yet Soviet and Chinese exhortations to developing countries have met with little success. Those nations which are in their post-colonial stage are anxious for periods of sustained economic growth which increased revolution and violence would only disturb. There are still some nations, nevertheless, in which revolution is, or may soon be ripe. This must be anticipated by the United States. It was felt that our own particular revolutionary tradition was not appropriate to guiding these revolutions. But our interests are most likely to be served by a sympathetic rather than a hostile response when these events finally occur.

In discussion of possible responses to revolutions in the developing nations, the conference emphasized the need for discovering new roles for international organizations. Likewise, the participants thought the United States should seek to explore new avenues of cooperation with the Soviet Union within the United Nations.

In discussing the role of major powers in local conflicts of the future, many favored stress on developing procedure within international law rather than emphasis on securing agreement on general principles.

There was some discussion of whether Communist-inspired violence was likely to break out in Thailand. The topic was considered to be highly speculative, though several experts expressed the view that a major outbreak of hostility was unlikely. Local tension and increased terror, on the other hand, were thought to be a distinct possibility. Some thought was given, therefore, to the possibility of multilateral action to anticipate strife and prevent a crisis analogous to that in Vietnam.

The group also noted the need for arms control agreements in Thailand and possibly other areas. Such agreements might prohibit the import of arms or armed personnel, the establishment of foreign military bases, and the joining of military alliances. These steps could be incorporated into a general conference on Vietnam, or as an adjunct to a Vietnamese settlement. Our greatest interest, finally, should lie in insulating these conflicts from outside interference.

On the relationship of Vietnam to other countries in southeast Asia, including Thailand, it was pointed out that Vietnam was the only case in southeast Asia where the Communists effectively identified themselves with the country's nationalists. Elsewhere in southeast Asia, nationalism has not been forced into fusion with communism. Indeed, the failure of Communist insurrections in Burma, Indonesia, Malaya, and the Philippines testifies to the positive contribution of Asian nationalism. In each of these cases, the inability of Communist insurgents to secure nationalist backing defeated their ultimate goals.

The Ombudsman: Tribune of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, since early in 1963, I have been working for the adoption of an Americanized version of the ombudsman, a remarkable Swedish bred institution.

During the first session of this Congress, my bill to establish an Administrative Counsel of the Congress as an American ombudsman was accorded a hearing in the Committee on House Administration. In addition, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress has the proposal under consideration.

In the last several months, interest in the ombudsman has increased sharply, spurred in part by the announcement of the British Government last October that it would ask the current session of Parliament to create a Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration or British ombudsman. The British White Paper outlined an institution which would be similar in many ways to the proposed American ombudsman. A bill to establish a British ombudsman was introduced in the House of Commons on Monday.

Last month, Senator EDWARD LONG, chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure in the other body, announced his intention to hold hearings on the ombudsman.

In view of this interest, I should like to call Members attention to the current issue of the annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. It contains an article by Prof. Stanley Anderson and me which describes the American ombudsman proposal in the context of problems which are common to modern governments throughout the world.

Professor Anderson is a lawyer and an assistant professor of political science at the University of California at Santa Barbara. He is an honorary fellow of the American-Scandinavian Foundation and an expert on the ombudsman. During 1964, he was associated with me as an American Political Science Association fellow.

I include the article from the Annals:

THE OMBUDSMAN: TRIBUNE OF THE PEOPLE

(By HENRY S. REUSS and Stanley V. Anderson)

Abstract: The ombudsman is an agent of Parliament who receives and may investigate citizens' grievances against bureaucracy. His powers are to recommend, to publicize, and to report to Parliament. The institution began in Sweden and has been adopted or considered by many other countries. There is widespread interest in the ombudsman because the institution meets a general need in modern, industrialized nations for a means of resolving citizens' unique, individual problems with a depersonalized administration. The courts, which are slow and costly, do not provide adequate means of redressing citizens' personal grievances. In the United States, Congressmen have an ombudsmanlike role in investigating and trying to solve constituents' problems. But this job—called "casework" on Capitol Hill—is so burdensome that it interferes with Congressmen's more important legislative and policymaking functions. Congressman REUSS has proposed establishing an administrative counsel, inspired by the ombudsman, to take over a part of the "casework," thereby lightening the burden on Congressmen and aiding citizens more effectively. The chairman of the administrative conference may also function as a kind of ombudsman. California and other States and cities are considering establishment of ombudsmen.

We promised another freedom to our people at election time, that we would set up a citizens' appeal authority, an ombudsman, to which any aggrieved citizen——

Honorable Members: "Ha-ha."[1]

Such was the response which Prime Minister Keith Holyoake received from the New Zealand House of Representatives in June 1961, when he referred to the ombudsman plank contained in the National Party's platform for the 1960 general elections.

The members' outburst was directed at the name "ombudsman," rather than at the concept. But when the debate was completed and the measure finally adopted in September 1962, the members agreed that "there shall be appointed, as an officer of Parliament, a commissioner of investigations, to be called the ombudsman." And the man chosen by Parliament to fill the office, Sir Guy Powles, a distinguished jurist, diplomat, and administrator, styles himself ombudsman rather than commissioner. New Zealand's adoption not only of the institution but of its outlandish title was symbolic of the great prestige the ombudsman has won as a defender of individual rights.

ORIGIN IN SWEDEN

The institution originated in Sweden 155 years ago. In Swedish, "ombudsman" means "agent" or "representative." Similar offices were set up in Finland (1919), Denmark (1955), and Norway (1963).[2] Separate ombudsmen for military affairs were created in Sweden (1915), Norway (1952), and West Germany (1956). (In 1965, the Swedish military ombudsman was merged again with the office of civil ombudsman.) Related institutions exist in India, Japan, Nepal, and the Philippines.

Ombudsman proposals are currently under consideration in Australia, Canada, Great Britain, Ireland, Holland, and the United States. In 1965, ombudsman bills were introduced in the legislatures of California, Connecticut, Illinois, New York, and Utah, as well as in the New York City Council, and companion bills were dropped into the hoppers of the U.S. Congress by Congressman HENRY S. REUSS (H.R. 4273) and Senator CLAIBORNE PELL (S. 984), proposing the establishment of an administrative counsel of Congress, modeled after the ombudsman.

The literature on the ombudsman is extensive. A bibliography of English-language materials alone fills seven typewritten pages.[3] Articles have appeared in such widely read publications as the New York Times magazine,[4] the New Yorker,[5] and the Reader's Digest.[6]

What is this ombudsman?

Drawing a composite picture, the ombudsman is appointed by the legislature for the term of office of that body. He is eligible for reappointment, and may be discharged by Parliament, though Parliament may not interfere in his handling of individual cases. The ombudsman has great discretion in deciding what matters to investigate. He receives citizens' complaints and makes announced and unannounced inspection tours. He may take matters up of his own volition. Finally, the ombudsman may compel testimony and the production of evidence.

THE OMBUDSMAN'S POWER

While the ombudsman has no power to alter the results of an administrative decision, changes are sometimes made when he commences an investigation or upon his final recommendation. The only sanction which the ombudsman can impose is censure. The ombudsman must extend an opportunity to be heard to anyone whom he intends to reprimand. The ombudsman may suggest that disciplinary action be taken by an agency, following established procedures of notice and hearing, or he may recommend that the regular prosecuting authorities institute criminal charges.

The ombudsman is free to suggest changes in rules and regulations to the administrative agencies, and may also propose remedial legislation to the Parliament, usually in his annual report. He makes available to the press the results of his investigations when he deems its advisable.

The office of ombudsman is quite small, composed of half a dozen attorneys and a corresponding number of secretaries. It would not do to create a parabureaucracy; this would merely superimpose a new layer of officials on top of those we already have. The ombudsman is alerted by squeaking wheels—citizens' grievances and newspaper reports—and must rely in the first instance on the agencies under investigation to supply the facts he needs to judge the merits of the complaints he receives. The New Zealand ombudsman has stated that he could not function without the cooperation of the bureaucracy.

Fortunately, this cooperation is almost invariably forthcoming as civil servants welcome the opportunity to have unfounded complaints identified as such. The majority of the complaints which the ombudsman receives are without merit. Often, the complainant is laboring under a mistake of fact or law, which the ombudsman's reply can clarify for him. Furthermore, government employees are among those who may complain to the ombudsman when they have grievances about working conditions. At the top, supervisory officials welcome the information which the ombudsman may supply on the operation of the lower echelons.

THE NEED FOR THE OMBUDSMAN

Why all this interest in the ombudsman?

The organization of the modern, positive state requires depersonalized administration. Government can be accomplished only through directives laid down by rulemakers who are several layers removed from the people ruled.

The citizen is faced with a vast, and often bewildering, panoply of statutes, regulations, and ordinances applied by an overlapping array of judges and bureaucrats.

All the industrialized nations are confronted with the conflict between the demands of society and the desires of individuals, between the need for general rules and practices of administration and the peculiarities of particular cases.

Totalitarian government resolves the problem by endeavoring to crush individuals who stand in the way of the state and the arbitrary application of its ukases. Indifference to the individual is justified by reference to a millennial future, in which "each will receive according to his needs."

In democratic societies, there must be unceasing adjustment of the relation between individuals and society.

Through representative government, the society's highest legislative and administrative authorities are responsible to the people. The President of the United States, Governors, Congressmen, State legislators, county supervisors, city councilmen, district attorneys—these are all elected officials. Individuals have their vote to make their interests and desires felt in legislation and administration.

Powerful nongovernmental organizations have arisen which represent individuals by classes—as industrial workers, as bankers, as gun-club members, or whatever. Trade unions, large corporations, interest-group associations—these are the bodies who have the weight to influence the policies of government.

DEALING WITH INDIVIDUAL PROBLEMS

But neither the ultimate control of public officials through the electoral process nor widespread participation by citizens in influential nongovernmental organizations meets fully the need of individuals with unique, personal problems with the government.

When the great nongovernmental organizations deal with the government, it is usually over general problems and broad questions of public policy. But what of the man in the street? "When two elephants fight, it is the grass that suffers."[7]

Moveover, the officials with whom the public most frequently comes into contact are not elected. They are administrators who have the tenure in office which is needed to operate a merit civil service and to provide the expertise required to run a modern government.

The citizen with an individual problem has recourse to the courts. The courts are the final guardians of the Bill of Rights, protecting the individual's freedom of speech, privacy, movement, and assembly. Judges can pass also on the legality of administrative action. But judicial remedies are slow and costly. They can be applied to the multifarious activities of the positive state only at the cost of swamping the courts and paralyzing the bureaucracy.

COUNTERWEIGHTS TO BUREAUCRATIC POWER

Bureaucratic ills may be susceptible to bureaucratic solutions—a bit of the hair of the dog that bites. Attempts to provide such solutions are many. In 1964, for example, liaison officers for consumer affairs were set up in a number of Federal departments and agencies.[8] California has a consumer counsel, to represent "the public interest at legislative, regulatory, and administrative proceedings to balance against the highly paid spokesmen of industry."[9]

Civilian police review boards have been established in Rochester, N.Y., and Philadelphia, Pa. Last March, an alleged official misconduct section[10] was set up in the Los Angeles district attorney's office.

Examples could be multiplied: legal-aid societies, public defender systems, Better Business Bureaus—all of these are governmental or quasi-governmental operations, designed to equalize the weight of the individual against the organized forces of society.

Because the individual carries little weight against the vast power of the bureaucracy, the Government must lend its weight to him, using the force of Government to restrain and humanize government.

Clearly, what is needed is an institution responsive to citizens' problems which can control bureaucracy without stifling bureaucracy, allow necessary discretion without permitting capriciousness, reward promptness, courtesy, and efficiency by singling out delay, rudeness and bumbling, and insure fairness by uncovering bias and error.

---

[1] "Parliamentary Debates," N.Z. (1961), p. 96.

[2] See Stanley V. Anderson, "The Scandinavian Ombudsman," 12 The American-Scandinavian Review, No. 4 (December 1964), pp. 403–409. Upon request, the author will supply reprints of this survey article.

[3] "The Ombudsman: A Bibliography," published by the Northern California Friends Committee on Legislation, San Francisco, February 1965.

[4] HENRY S. REUSS, "An 'Ombudsman' for America." The New York Times magazine, Sept. 13, 1964, pp. 30, 134–135, reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 17, pages 22538–39, and in Joseph S. Clark (ed.), "Congressional Reform: Problems and Prospects" (New York: Crowell, 1965), pp. 292–297.

[5] John Bainbridge, "A Civilized Thing," the New Yorker, Feb. 13, 1965, pp. 136–151.

[6] George Kent, "Where You Can Fight 'City Hall,'" 103 the Rotarian (July 1963), pp. 38–40, condensed as "Watchdog for the Common Man," Reader's Digest (August 1963), pp. 82–85.

[7] An African proverb, taken from Cecil V. Crabb, Jr., "The Elephants and the Grass: A Study of Nonalinement" (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965).

[8] "Government Aids to Consumers," Consumer Reports (December 1964), pp. 259–265.

[9] Ibid., p. 264.

[10] A name which surely would warrant another "ha-ha" if it had been presented to the New Zealand Parliament.

THE SUCCESS OF THE OMBUDSMAN

Judging by the experience of the Scandinavian states and New Zealand, the ombudsman is extraordinarily well suited to foster these ends.

Primary responsibility for good government must rest with honest and intelligent officials. But even the very best of bureaucracies administering the best laws will suffer the flaws which arise from sheer size and human foible. A successful ombudsman will reduce malfunction by his very presence and through the reforms which he inspires. But he will not put himself out of business until administrators become philosopher kings.

Under the American system of separation of powers, State and Federal legislatures make laws, or delegate the power to do so, and executive officers carry them out. To complete the circle, the legislators are supposed to check on the executive in order to insure that the laws are enforced properly. The vastness and variety of modern bureaucracies make this an extremely demanding task.

THE IMPORTANCE OF CASE WORK

Individual legislators are striving to fulfill this role, not least in the U.S. Congress. On the basis of extensive interviews and round-table discussions with nearly a score of Representatives from each political party, the author of a Brookings Institution study notes:

"Probably the most important mail (received by a Congressman) is the 'case' mail. * * * Denied a favorable ruling by the bureaucracy on a matter of direct concern to him, puzzled or irked by delays in obtaining a decision, confused by the administrative maze through which he is directed to proceed, or ignorant of whom to write, a constituent may turn to his Congressman for help. * * * A person who has a reasonable complaint or query is regarded as providing an opportunity rather than as adding an extra burden to an already busy office. The party affiliation of the individual even when known to be different from that of the Congressman does not normally act as a deterrent to action." [11]

No systematic study has been made of the number and kind of constituent complaints. During the first 9 months of 1961, Senator VANCE HARTKE reports that he "had 300 inquiries from people from Indiana who work for the Federal Government and wanted assistance with something pertaining to their jobs * * * handled 709 (service and veteran) problems * * * assisted 261 Hoosiers with social security problems, 27 with draft board problems, 18 with railroad retirements, and * * * 61 immigration cases who could be helped within the framework of the present law." [12]

"HUMANIZING THE BUREAUCRACY"

To handle this casework, as it is called on Capitol Hill, and to do the other work of a congressional office, House Members have approximately 10 staff members and Senators have 30 or more. Lawmakers throughout the world undoubtedly perform a similar function—in Great Britain it is referred to as "constituency surgery"—but probably nowhere is the volume as great as in Washington, D.C. "Write your Congressman," is a byword of the American political vocabulary.

As one of the authors has pointed out elsewhere:

"Thousands of citizens' complaints and problems flow into congressional offices every year. * * * Legislators and their staffs spend a large part of their time investigating such problems, urging correction of apparent injustices and errors and explaining to the citizens a bureaucracy that is often too wrapped up in jargon to explain itself. * * * This congressional role has been important in humanizing the bureaucracy and in making it responsible. * * * It helps to have [the actions of civil servants] watched by a Member of Congress who has to answer to the people every 2 or 6 years; he is sure to prod them toward the best possible administration of the laws. * * * So the United States in a sense, already has not only one but 535 ombudsmen in its 100 Senators and 435 Representatives.[13]

CONGRESSMEN'S TIME

This would all be well and good if it were not for one major drawback: casework distracts the Congressman and his staff from their primary legislative function. While still a Member of the House of Representatives, the late Senator Estes Kefauver described a sample workday of 15 hours, in which actual sessions of the House and his two committees lasted about 7 hours. After taking care of constituent visits and requests, time for studying pending legislation had to be squeezed in between 7 and 8:45 a.m., during lunchtime, and after midnight.[14]

Recognition of these conflicting demands on the legislators' time underlies the previously cited Reuss-Pell bill which is now before the Congress. It reads, in part, as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the increasing complexity of the Federal Government has created difficulties on the part of private citizens in dealing with the Government, that there is a clear need for the Congress to be informed of the nature of such difficulties, particularly those of a recurrent nature, in order that remedial legislative action may be taken, and that, under existing procedures, such information is only sporadically available and frequently is inadequately developed or fails entirely to reach the appropriate legislative committees. The Congress further finds that the necessary and proper efforts of its individual Members to deal with these problems have increasingly become so burdensome as to constitute a serious impediment to the discharge of their other legislative duties."

THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNSEL

Consequently, the bill provides for the establishment of an Administrative Counsel of the Congress, to be appointed for the 2-year term of a given Congress by the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate. Under the Reuss bill, the Counsel is to receive the same pay as a Congressman, and is given the investigatory powers of a congressional committee, excluding the right to issue subpenas.

The duties to be assumed by this new office are specified in section 4 of the bill:

"Upon the request of any Member of either House of Congress, the Administrative Counsel shall review the case of any person who alleges that he believes that he has been subjected to any improper penalty, or that he has been denied any right or benefit to which he is entitled, under the laws of the United States, or that the determination or award of any such right or benefit has been, is being, or will be unreasonably delayed, as a result of any action or failure to act on the part of any officer or employee of the United States other than [the President, Congressman, judicial officers, and officials of the District of Columbia]. * * * Upon the completion of his review, he shall report his conclusions and recommendations, if any, to the Member or committee by whom the claim was referred."

Finally, the Counsel is authorized in section 7 to make interim reports to Congress "on any occasion when he deems such action appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act," and is directed to submit an annual report to Congress:

"Such report shall summarize his activities, shall include reviews of those individual cases which, in his judgment, should be brought to the attention of the Congress, and shall set forth such recommendations for legislation or further investigation as he may deem appropriate."

ADVANTAGES AND ORIGINS

The Counsel would have other advantages besides that of allowing Members of Congress to devote more time to legislative and policy matters.

With a small staff of experts, the Counsel could do a better job than Members of Congress in protecting citizens' rights. As it is now, Members of Congress and the men-of-all-work on their staffs must be generalists who find themselves at a distinct disadvantage in dealing with the administration's experts. Centralizing congressional "casework" in the Counsel would be far more efficient and less costly than indefinite expansion of the 535 individual congressional office staffs.

While the ombudsman idea inspired the proposal for an Administrative Counsel, the Counsel also parallels existing American institutions. In the Offices of the Legislative Counsel and in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, Congress has given itself the advantages of expert, centralized assistance in legislative drafting and research, respectively. During 1964, for example, the Legislative Reference Service's 150 experts responded to 105,000 congressional inquiries.

Congressional oversight does not, of course, relieve the executive branch of the responsibility to keep its own house clean. A new broom was created on the executive side in 1964, through the establishment by Congress of an Administrative Conference of the United States, composed of the head or deputy of each executive department and independent regulatory board or commission, as well as of lawyers and scholars appointed by the President or the Chairman of the Conference.

The Chairman of the Administrative Conference might function as a kind of ombudsman himself. He is empowered "to make inquiries into matters he deems important for conference consideration, including matters proposed by persons inside or outside the Federal Government." The grievances of private citizens would fall under this blanket, as would the information and recommendations supplied as public documents by an Administrative Counsel of the Congress.

---

[11] Charles L. Clapp, "The Congressman: His Work as He Sees It" (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1954), p. 84. The title of this excellent work calls to mind the jibe of Adlai Stevenson at a reunion with a prominent classmate: "Well," he said, "we have both gone out to do the Lord's work, you in your way, and I in His."

[12] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 16, page 21766, excerpted in Norman C. Thomas and Karl A. Lamb, "Congress: Politics and Practice" (New York: Random House, 1964), pp. 42–43.

[13] HENRY S. REUSS, "We Need an American Ombudsman," Christian Century, Mar. 3, 1965, pp. 269–271, reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 4, page 5072.

[14] Estes Kefauver and Jack Levin, "A Twentieth-Century Congress" (New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1947), p. 194, excerpted in John P. Roche and Leonard W. Levy (eds.), The Congress: Documents in American Government (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964), pp. 204–208.

STATE PROPOSALS

Meanwhile, at the State level, the more manageable size of populations would seem to permit a more direct implementation of the ombudsman concept. Three of the largest States and two of the smallest are working in that direction.[15] In the 1965 session of the California Legislature, for example, Speaker Jesse M. Unruh introduced assembly bill No. 2956, providing for the establishment of an office of ombudsman. Speaker Unruh has also called for the creation of a nine-man Citizens' Advisory Committee "to investigate the feasibility of incorporating into the structure of the State government an official similar to the ombudsman."

All of these proposals—State and Federal—are signs of widespread concern with individuals' rights and individual justice in administration. This concern is a wholesome sign. It should not exhaust itself, however, in righteous indignation or hopeless resignation. Rather, concern should lead to continuing appraisal of the adequacy of our political institutions to the needs of man in an increasingly depersonalized society. Appraisal, in turn, should lead to carefully tailored proposals for specific reform.

Article I of the Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution directs:

"Congress shall make no law * * * abridging * * * the right of the people * * * to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

If this guarantee is to be meaningful, we must insure that the channels of communication are kept open and effective. The voice of the ordinary citizen must be selectively amplified in the Halls of Congress and the State legislatures. Adaptations of the ombudsman give promise of high fidelity.[16]

Water Pollution in Michigan—A Way to Its Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to commend to my colleagues the very excellent speech delivered by our good friend JOHN DINGELL at the Clean Water Conference of the Michigan State Association of Supervisors on the subject of water pollution:

WATER POLLUTION IN MICHIGAN—A WAY TO ITS SOLUTION

(Address of Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat, 16th Congressional District of Michigan, to the Michigan State Association of Supervisors, on January 18, 1966, at their Clean Water Conference in Lansing, Mich.)

My dear friends, I want to express my gratitude to you for the privilege of being here today and for the opportunity of discussing one of the most pressing resource problems of our day. I want to commend both my valued friend, Ed Connor, one of our outstanding public officials, for his expression of confidence in me, and the association for its interest in this desperate problem of water pollution.

The title assigned to me was, "Water Pollution in Michigan." I would like to take the liberty of adding to that title the words, "A Way to Its Solution." Briefly that solution is Federal, State, and local cooperation, large expenditures of funds, and vigorous enforcement of our antipollution laws.

Before I observe any of you going to sleep, I want to make it very clear that it is not my purpose to commence a doleful recitation of contamination of our State's once pristine waters. Nor do I intend to descend to a lugubrious recital of the effects of this contamination on health, welfare, and recreational opportunities of our people. Neither will I go into its devastating effects upon fish and wildlife and on the attracting of new industry to our State.

Certain of my comments will necessarily touch on these matters but only as incidental to a calm discussion of our water problems.

Michigan, like all other States, has been a bit like the farmer who was approached by the county agent and offered new advice on the latest and best ways to farm. The farmer replied, "Thank you very much for your help, but I am not farming right now as well as I know how." I say this with due deference to Mr. Loring F. Oeming, the executive secretary, and to the other members of our Michigan Water Resources Commission, who over the years have done one of the best jobs in the United States of managing water resources.

I can well recall that for a long time I used to receive a visit during just about every Congress from either Milt Adams, former executive secretary of the Michigan Water Resources Commission, or from our able assistant attorney general, Nick Olds, two of my very dear friends. Both of these men are among the most able officials and public-interest oriented individuals anywhere, and I think that all three of us looked forward to these visits. They initiated a regular tilt dealing with legislation sponsored by me which each of these good gentlemen sincerely felt would put our State agencies out of business, a calamity desired by none of us.

Our contacts started back in 1956 when Congressman JOHN BLATNIK first began the fight for meaningful water pollution control with the introduction of what was to become Public Law 660, the fundamental Federal water pollution law. This was enacted after the opposition of the States, some communities, and most industries, as well as the dedicated opposition of the Eisenhower administration, was overcome. All of the opponents of this legislation; industrial groups, State agencies, and the administration, stressed what to them were valid reasons for opposition. Industry pleaded the problems of compliance and cost increase; State agencies feared that the proposed legislation impinged upon their treasured jurisdiction; and the Eisenhower administration argued that "water pollution was a uniquely local blight," and of course worried that the legislation would provide $50 million a year to assist communities in construction of desperately needed sewage abatement works.

Ultimately the differences with the State administrators were resolved by limiting the Federal activity to areas of pollution originating in one State and affecting health, life, and welfare in other States. The objections of the polluters and of the executive branch were simply battered aside, or compromises were made which resulted in garnering of a vote here or there, sufficient unto the need for passage of the legislation.

To their great credit, the Michigan Water Resources Commission, and my old friend, Milt Adams, recognized the wisdom of that legislation and fought valiantly for it at the end.

I saw my two beloved friends at the time I introduced a draft of the bill permitting communities to request the assistance of the Federal Government in the abatement of pollution coming from their upstream neighbors. This bill was changed to provide that the Governor of the State could request the Public Health Service to commence proceedings for the abatement of intrastate pollution. It then became law and was supported by my two friends and Michigan's State agencies. Parenthetically, it was this legislation which was utilized to initiate the Federal cleanup now taking place on the Detroit River at the request of former Governor Swainson.

I was again visited by my two old friends when I introduced legislation to establish Federal standards for the abatement of pollution of interstate and navigable waters and to establish a Federal agency to handle pollution of our waters.

It has been a remarkable experience to me to observe the continuing opposition of State agencies to the upgrading of Federal water pollution control endeavors on grounds that it is not needed, it costs too much, and it impinges upon State responsibilities.

Happily, this legislation also became law. The Water Quality Act of 1965 is applauded even by its former critics, one of the most active of whom now seeks to run the new agency he so vigorously opposed. Through this law, a Federal Water Pollution Control Agency has been established, and provision has been made for workable Federal standards to abate pollution of our interstate waters. More importantly, these several legislative fights have brought about an increase in the level of Federal expenditures to States and communities for abatement of water pollution from $50 million to a figure today in excess of $280 million, with the possibility of an expenditure of $300 million in the next fiscal year, commencing July 1.

Since these Federal expenditures have generated local expenditures at the rate of about 4 to 1, we can reasonably anticipate that total expenditures in the field of water pollution in the coming year may be increased from $1.2 to $1.6 billion.

The best indication of national need is shown by the vast number of new plants which must be constructed and obsolete plants which must be upgraded.

The cost of cleanup can be conservatively estimated at anywhere from $20 to $40 billion.

We recently had opportunity to observe the attitude of the Michigan Water Resources Commission in connection with two Federal proceedings, the first on the Menominee, an interstate proceeding, and the second on the Detroit River, an intrastate abatement action.

Essentially the reaction was the same—opposition to Federal cleanup; although in the second case the opposition was muted by the fact that the Federal proceeding was begun at the request of the then Governor of our State, the Honorable John Swainson.

What opposition was lacking on the part of the State government to clean up the Detroit River, its tributaries, and the Michigan waters of Lake Erie, was certainly abundantly supplied by the general manager of the Detroit Board of Water Commissioners, who characterized Federal cleanup of the Detroit River as unnecessary and an act of gross intrusion into the affairs of the State and the Detroit Water Board.

It would be fair to point out to you that the Detroit River is recognized by all who dwell near it or who use it, as a greatly defiled body of water. Succinctly put, some

---

[15] See Stanley V. Anderson "The Ombudsman: Public Defender Against Maladministration," 6 Public Affairs Report, No. 2 (April 1965). This is the bulletin of the Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley. The institute is carrying out a study of the suitability of ombudsman institution for adaptation in California.

[16] A lengthy symposium on the ombudsman appeared in Canada after this article was written. It is Donald C. Rowat (ed.), "The Ombudsman: Citizen's Defender" (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965).

540 million gallons of municipal waste containing an oxygen-consuming capacity equal to the raw sewage from a population of over 3 million, innumerable coliform bacteria, over 25,000 pounds of iron, 600,000 pounds of suspended solids, almost 300,000 pounds of settleable solids, some 16,000 gallons of oil, 1,200 pounds of phenolic substances and many thousands of pounds of ammonia, phosphates, and chlorides are deposited there daily. In addition to this, a total industrial waste volume of 1.1 billion gallons is discharged daily into the Detroit River containing among other things, wastes that have an oxygen-consuming capacity equal to raw sewage from a population of over 1 million, 3,000 gallons of oil, 800,000 pounds of suspended solids, 1,400 pounds of phenol, 80,000 pounds of iron, 8,000 pounds of ammonia, 200,000 pounds of acid and over two million pounds of chlorides. My friends, I repeat, these are daily discharges.

An ancient combined sewer system permits raw sewage discharges about 45 times a year, and Detroit's main sewage treatment plant contributes 95 percent of the municipal wastes going into the Detroit River.

Without reading them to you by name, other streams in Michigan have reports of fish kills, phenol and cyanide escapes, and similar spectacular examples of pollution. We constantly read complaints in the newspapers of rivers like the Rouge, the Huron, the Grand, the Red Cedar, and of course the Kalamazoo, which like the fabled western river are too thick with pollutants to drink but too thin to plow.

It is passing strange that we who live in a State whose auto license plates, by State statute, bear the motto "Water-Winter Wonderland" are faced with a Public Health Service report which indicates Detroit and Michigan hold unchallenged last place in regard to water pollution control in the Lake Erie abatement proceedings.

Primary treatment systems remove from 30 to 35 percent of the solids involved in the waster, and secondary treatment systems remove from 80 to 85 percent of the oxygen-consuming organisms present in the solid components of the waste.

One hundred percent of Indiana's and Pennsylvania's drainage into Lake Erie is served by secondary treatment plants. Cleveland has switched all its waste treatment to secondary plants, and 60 percent of Ohio's drainage into Lake Erie will have secondary treatment. The figure for secondary treatment in the whole State of Michigan is only 15 percent. Still the general manager of the Detroit Water Board protests that Detroit does not need to go to secondary treatment, and that the Detroit River is not polluted.

If all the communities in these other States have been able to finance and build the plants, why can't Detroit? If the other States have been willing to insure that their cities and communities abate pollution, why has not Michigan done so?

Our society, our economy, and the unique productivity of our area, are based upon the Great Lakes, their tributaries, and in a very large measure, upon our inland lakes.

The beneficent presence of the Great Lakes moderates the temperature extremes. This magnificent supply of fresh water, the largest in the world, and our splendid climate and scenery make our tourist industry. Our industries are dependent upon our waters for cooling, washing, and other purposes. From Lake Erie alone industries take 4.7 billion gallons of water a day, including 3.85 billion used for power production. Municipalities along Lake Erie shore draw another 619 million gallons of water per day.

By using these figures to project water usage on the other lakes, the enormity of the dependence of our people on the Great Lakes takes on its proper and unbelieveable proportions. The abundance of our water resources has created an economy of incredible productivity.

Prospects for continued expansion of industry and prosperity of the Great Lakes region are bright. Production in our Detroit area alone, measured in value added by manufacture, could increase from about $5.8 billion in 1960 to something over $13 billion in 1980. Population in the Detroit area will probably approach 5.5 million by 1980.

Yet with population and industry growth come ugly results. Every species of game fish that thrived in Lake Erie had declined greatly, and Detroit and other Michigan communities and industries are major contributors to the contamination of Lake Erie.

The clear blue water of that lake is steadily being transferred into something thick and ugly. The shores are lined with debris of all types; decaying organic matter, and waste from ships, cities, and industries. The same situation is found at the south end of Lake Michigan.

Hardly a mail delivery comes to my office that I do not find a complaint about the condition of our Great Lakes or our inland lakes. Our people complain of declining water levels and filth and contamination that result in noxious odors, and ruin swimming, fishing, and water skiing opportunities.

The manager of the Wyandotte waterworks complained to me that he was being forced to run a waste treatment plant, not a municipal water distribution system. The Detroit Water Board suggested Wyandotte place its intakes on the Canadian side of the river, outside the "Water-Winter Wonderland."

A warning of new wastes appeared in the Michigan Municipal Review. In an excellent article in that publication, Donald M. Pierce, chief, Waste Water Section, Division of Engineering, Michigan Department of Health, points out "new wastes create new hazards," and continuing the quote, "technological developments of industry in recent years have produced many new substances whose characteristics have introduced new and complex problems in water treatment and in waste water treatment and disposal. At the same time, medical science has raised new questions yet unanswered on the public health significance of many of these products.

"The toxicologist has gone just far enough in practical research to begin to recognize the long-range toxic potential on man, animal, fish, and birdlife of the thousands of known toxic substances manufactured today and in common use by the public. A wide array of these substances reach our streams, flowing through waters used for recreation and entering water supply intakes. These include synthetic detergents, organo-insecticides, fungicides, herbicides, certain classes of both inorganic and organic substances, and even radioactive substances. Many of these may also reach the ground water resource, through percolation from industrial waste lagoons, sewage lagoons and oxidation ponds, and even solid absorption systems from septic tanks and cesspools."

Twenty-five years ago water pollution was a problem of the heavily populated areas of the northeastern United States.

Today it is a crisis in all parts of our country.

An editorial in one of the major Maryland newspapers described one of the principal recreation areas of that great State as being a peninsula surrounded by silt and sewage.

A Federal official brought two jugs of water along with him into a congressional hearing recently, one of which was a sample of the drinking water supply of a community and the other treated waste water. He pointed out to the committee that there was no earthly way to tell the difference by taste, odor, or color.

At low water, the bacteria count in the Cuyahoga River flowing into Lake Erie from Akron and Cleveland is four times as high as in a stream of raw sewage. The central portion of the Delaware Bay estuary has been ruined by refuse of cities and plants on the Delaware. Its oxygen content has fallen almost to zero and present are scum, black sludge, dead fish, noxious odors, gas bubbles, and floating debris.

Recently, the Willamette River near Portland, Oreg., was turned into a giant septic tank and to flush it the Secretary of the Interior had to order release of water from Federal dams. When water is low, rivers such as those in New Jersey consist largely of undiluted sewage, and the Connecticut, Merrimack, and areas of the Potomac have been unsafe for as long as 50 years.

Dr. Luther L. Terry, recently retired head of the Public Health Service, declared not long ago, "We are by no means sure that at least some viruses are not slipping through our present water purification and disinfection processes and entering our water mains. Hepatitis may be an example." Dr. Terry cited in connection with this the rather noticeable increase in hepatitis cases in many parts of the United States.

In 1900 waste from our cities and towns was the equivalent of raw sewage from 24 million people, and organic waste from industry equaled the raw sewage of 15 million people. City-born wastes flowing into streams in 1960 equaled the raw sewage from 75 million people, and industrial waste the raw sewage of 160 million persons. In 1970, just a few short years hence, municipal wastes will equal the raw sewage of 85 million people, and industrial waste will equal the raw sewage of 210 million people.

The population growth in Michigan, projected by the Census Bureau through 1985, gives an idea of the increase in water demands which can be anticipated by our people. In 1960 the population was 7.8 million. In 1970 our population will be 8.6 million. By 1985 Michigan's population will be 10.5 million people, using prodigious amounts of water for industrial and municipal purposes.

The problem is spread across the continent. It will get worse, in Michigan and elsewhere, unless most vigorous action is taken. While Michigan has performed better than most States, and while much has been done, vastly more remains for us to do.

On a statewide basis there are only two municipalities with populations in excess of 5,000 without treatment works. But many of these treatment works are not now adequate for the demands upon them, and are still less adequate for future requirements.

Only a few of Michigan's communities have secondary treatment systems. Many small towns and communities in our State lack any treatment facilities at all.

It would be fair to say that many Michigan industries have established treatment plants. It would, however, be equally fair to say that there are others which need treatment plants or which have inadequate or even hopelessly obsolete treatment plants. Many which do have treatment plants, fail to properly operate those plants, or have been found not to operate them at all for substantial periods from time to time.

Michigan's legislature is to be praised for its enactment of good water quality legislation. The statute enacted by this legislature during its last session offers more promise than anything Michigan has yet seen, and more promise than the legislature of almost any other State. It shows that our great State is beginning to move forward.

From the foregoing we can arrive at some conclusions. Michigan has become increasingly aware of its responsibilities. Although the citizenry of Michigan have not been sufficiently aware of the needs of abatement of pollution, they have been ahead of their officials. In like manner, our people have not been aware of the need to make their will known to their public servants. Our officials on all levels need new awareness of the need, and the enormous pool of latent support, which exists for cleanup.

A striking comparison is New York, whose fiscally responsible Governor rammed through a water quality program, probably better than that possessed by any other State in the Union, involving substantial State funding by loans and grants of municipal projects, and involving remarkable expansion of State enforcement powers. These programs passed the legislature unanimously and were adopted by the people of the State when presented to them by referendum with better than a 4 to 1 margin.

Certainly this shows the willingness of people to support proper action by States and municipalities for cleanup of our waters.

More immediately, a program of cooperation based upon mutual trust and common purpose between State, local and Federal Government is required.

Substantial expenditure of funds by State and local agencies will be required.

Increased funding on the Federal level is required. The $280 million for matching grants to States and communities for water pollution abatement works is less than half the amount needed. For this reason, last session I introduced legislation to increase Federal expenditures under Public Law 660 to $500 million and to increase fourfold the size of grants to communities.

The State of Michigan should be prepared to participate in the funding of local endeavors, and active consideration should be given to tax benefits for industrial waste treatment works by the State.

Secondary treatment plants should be regarded as mandatory for all municipal systems, except for the very small and isolated communities. High standards of treatment on a local and State level for septic tanks and similar private treatment works are a must.

Disinfection of municipal waste effluent must be practiced to reduce coliform densities to below 5,000 organisms per 100 milliliters. Combined storm and sanitary sewers must be prohibited in newly developed urban areas and eliminated in existing areas wherever possible. Urban renewal must be used as a vehicle for accomplishing this purpose. Alternative methods, less complicated and more economical than actual physical separation, are now being developed and should be applied as soon as they are successfully demonstrated.

State, county, and city officials should determinedly embark on a course of action to encourage combined treatment of municipal and industrial wastes in the same treatment plant. This spells economy of operation and savings for both the public and industry. Where industry locates on the city's environs, it will still pay the community to install an interceptor sewer to bring that industry's wastes to the city plant for treatment.

All new sewage facilities must be designed to prevent the necessity of bypassing untreated waters, something which is a major contributor to the pollution of the Detroit River.

The operation of waste treatment plants should be entrusted only to trained and skilled operators, who should be required to obtain state certification of their competency.

Great emphasis must be given to prevention of accidental spills of waste materials into Michigan's waters. Inplant surveys to prevent accidents should be utilized by State and local officials.

An appropriate system of reporting of unusual increases in waste output and accidental spills to the appropriate State and local agencies must be instituted. Use of waters of the State for disposal of trash, garbage, and other noxious refuse must be prohibited.

Existing dumps along the waters of our State must be eliminated. Industrial plants must be required to improve practices for segregation and treatment of waste to effect maximum reductions of acids, alkalies, tarry substances, oils, phenols, ammonia and nitrogen compounds, phosphorous compounds, and all other wastes with a special emphasis on oxygen-demanding substances.

Federal agencies must be forced to conform to high standards in the discharge of their wastes. The President has issued an Executive order which squarely places this requirement on all Federal installations. Federal water quality standards under the Federal statute just passed under sponsorship of Congressman BLATNIK, Senator MUSKIE and myself must be fixed at the highest feasible levels.

More adequate funding of State programs, and indeed of local programs, must take place to provide for an adequate ability to analyze, trace and prevent sources of pollution. More enforcement personnel on the State and local level must be available to combat pollution.

Since 1956 the Federal Government has increased its expenditures in all areas of water pollution almost sixfold and has assisted generously State programs for prevention of pollution and abatement of this terrible hazard. Communities have bettered this record, yet an enormous construction backlog remains. There is, as New York has shown, reason for State participation in funding projects.

Michigan and other States must have a more realistic system for appraising and reporting needed waste treatment facilities. For example, Michigan's three largest cities report needs for $98 million for construction; Detroit indicating needs of $45,300,000. On the other hand, the Conference of State Sanitary Engineers came up with a figure for the whole State of $4.7 million. The Public Health Service Conference on cleanup of the Detroit River estimates Detroit's needs for secondary treatment to be on the order of $500 million; whereas, the Detroit Water Board says that secondary treatment alone, which is badly needed on the Detroit River, will cost $750 million. It appears that some better way of reporting present and future needs must be devised.

A Senate committee study will shortly show National and State needs and expenditures are vastly larger than any present source indicates.

Local officials must insist on this adequate reporting to enable enactment of adequate State and Federal aid programs.

All State and municipal agencies must require sewerage or water use charges sufficient to finance construction and operation of adequate collection and treatment works.

The Federal Government has been drawn into water pollution abatement by failure of the States to preserve our waters and to abate pollution. If the several States, Michigan included, intend to preserve their ancient right and responsibility in water quality control they must display new vigor and effectiveness.

There must be a full understanding that there is place for Federal, State, and local activity in pollution abatement. The Federal Government neither desires nor has the ability to handle every single source of pollution and every improperly managed and operated cesspool and industrial or municipal treatment works. If the States and communities will accept the invaluable skills and tremendous resources of the Federal Government; if they will support Federal activities to abate pollution by understanding it is a cooperative endeavor; and if they will carry out their own great responsibilities in this area; prospects are good that when we see "water wonderland" it will mean just that, not only for Michigan, but for all America.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. James P. Wesberry, D.D., pastor, Morningside Baptist Church, Atlanta, Ga., offered the following prayer, prefacing it with these words of Scripture: *God is our refuge and strength. Therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea.*—Psalms 46: 1–2.

O God, our Father, in this day when earth's foundations shake, help us to put our trust in Thee. Forbid that the stress and strain of life should break our spirits. Grant us, we pray, the forgiveness of sin and renewal of faith we need to be more than conquerors over the evils of the world. In all of life's frustrations restore to us the confidence that Thou art ever at work seeking to bring this world to the glorious fulfillment of Thine eternal purpose.

We bring to Thee, our Father, those who hold high the banners of our Nation. We remember the President of the United States, those who work faithfully by his side, the distinguished Speaker, the beloved Chaplain, the gracious Doorkeeper, each and every Member of this illustrious body, the Members of the Senate, all who serve in the military, and all others who share in the responsibility of guiding our national affairs. Give, we humbly ask, wisdom, insight, and courage to our statesmen. May all that makes life nobler and finer inspire their counsels and govern their decisions.

We commend to Thy gracious care all who fight for the freedom and peace of the world on the battlefields of Vietnam. Overshadow, keep, and give them confidence that Thou, Eternal God, art their refuge and strength.

Bless, we beseech Thee, all who out of the bitter memories of war, are captured by a vision of world peace. May Thy Holy Spirit work among the leaders of the nations that they may find with all possible speed the way of peace without the shedding of blood and the horrors of war. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a resolution, as follows:

S. Res. 225

Resolved, That the Senate had heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. Albert Thomas, late a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the Part of the Senate for the Disposition of Executive Papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 66-11.

CELEBRATE 48TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, we are celebrating here today the 48th anniversary of the day, after the end of World War I in 1918, when the ancient and proud people of Lithuania reclaimed and declared again their independence as a nation.

It was a time of the breaking of obsolete empires and of the rearranging and reasserting of sovereignty under the principle of self-determination. Four new nations—but nations that were also old in the sense of prior history—found the path of liberation open and declared themselves free and independent during this period when Austria-Hungary was breaking up and when the Communist heirs of the czars were first making deals with Germany and then making war against the treaties reflected in the deals.

The other nations of northeastern Europe that found a new birth of freedom were Poland, Latvia, and Estonia. The fourth was Lithuania, which adequately proclaimed its independence on February 16, 1918.

Lithuania had centuries of freedom behind her, and then experienced generations of occupation and captivity, before her new proud moment in 1918.

The independence of Lithuania—the rebirth—did not exist permanently, but merely for a short span. Another war, another jousting between the Soviets and Hitler's Nazis, trapped Poland and the Baltic States between great powers. The Hitler-Stalin pact divided Poland, and the Red army moved into the Baltic States.

The Red army is still there.

It is perfectly natural, however, that those of Lithuanian birth or ancestry in this country take the time and the trouble to recall that during this 20th century, troubled though it has been, their own native land had a fleeting experience again with the pleasures of total independence. It was only between wars—but while it was there, they drank the wine of freedom.

They hope to drink the wine of freedom again. They hope to see the land of their fathers independent and sovereign again. And so do we all, I am sure, wish to see independence and sovereignty in Lithuania, the other Baltic States, and all the other captive nations of Eastern Europe.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order, scheduled for Friday, February 18, be transferred to Monday, February 21.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

A HEARTY LAUGH FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Washington Post on Tuesday, February 8, which was in exploitation of one of the facets of its leftist philosophy, provided me such a good laugh, that I would like to insert it here in the RECORD for everyone to enjoy.

The title of the editorial was "Experiment in Housing," and it propounds the need for public housing here in Washington. As we all know, the Post is in favor of any project that is paid for by the Federal Government and given to the public. This is true to their belief in the welfare state as being the utopian life.

The amusement in the editorial is found in their admission that private enterprise can build these welfare houses at a cost of $2,000 per unit less than the Federal Government can. They say also that private enterprise can do the job in 14 months whereas it would take the Federal Government 4 years. If there has ever been two better arguments for getting the Federal Government out of this business and turning it over to private enterprise and to the people, I have never heard them.

Until I hear that this bewildered editorial writer has been forgiven this slippage in logic and I am assured that he will not be out of a job because of it, I will worry about him.

Here is the editorial in question:

EXPERIMENT IN HOUSING

This city cannot afford the traditional procedures for building public housing. They are too slow and too costly; the demand for these homes is urgent. The National Capital Housing Authority has once again shown itself ready to experiment, and once again the city will benefit from its initiative.

A new block of public housing for the elderly is to be built at 12th and M Streets NW. To follow the usual administrative routes would consume about 4 years. But the Authority can get the project within perhaps 14 months if it lets a private builder do the work, and then buys the finished building from him. The Authority also expects to save perhaps $2,000 per unit by this method. This innovation deserves the wholehearted encouragement of the city.

The Authority cannot, of course, stop there. Housing the elderly is the least difficult of its many responsibilities; the most difficult is to help the families with many children. Apartments for large families are expensive to build, and wise policy does not permit them to be built in large concentrations. The families who inhabit them usually require other social services as well. Housing for the elderly is needed in Washington, but other kinds of housing are needed even more desperately. The Housing Authority's latest departure will be particularly welcome if it leads to similar ventures in providing homes for families with children.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on a supplemental authorization for the Department of Defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

BOYCOTTING RHODESIA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the friendly Government of Rhodesia has been made the victim of an outrageous boycott by the Government of the United States. It is an action taken jointly with the leeching British Government which seeks to destroy the existing Rhodesian Government because it has declared its independence.

Last summer, Congress amended the Export Control Act of 1949, and among the amendments was this:

> The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States (A) to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States and (B) to encourage and request domestic concerns engaged in the export of articles, materials, supplies, or information, to refuse to take any action, including the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements, which has the effect of furthering or supporting the restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against another country friendly to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's boycott of Rhodesia is a moral, if not legal, violation of the Export Control Act, and it is clearly a slap in the face to Congress.

How much longer will Congress spinelessly permit itself to be trampled upon by the President and his stooges in the State Department? When do the proper committees and Members of Congress intend to meet this challenge?

Contrast this to the lack of action in stopping British shipments to Communist Vietnam and to Communist Cuba.

IN SUPPORT OF THEIR COUNTRY

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks it has been my pleasure to bring to the attention of Congress the deeds and acts of patriotic men and women in support of their country. I have done this, because I am concerned by the fact that while anti-American demonstrations receive wide publicity, those who truly offer their support and service to our Nation go virtually unnoticed.

In recent weeks I have told of such patriotic Georgia projects as Affirmation Vietnam, Vietnam Mail Call, and have presented various petitions that have been sent to me in support of our efforts against communism in Asia. Today I insert in the RECORD a statement from American Legion, Capitol View Post No. 161, as well as a statement from the Fourth Ward Improvement Council, both of Atlanta, Ga., and both of which show—better than I—the true feelings of Americans in support of their country.

RESOLUTION BY AMERICAN LEGION, CAPITOL VIEW POST NO. 161

Whereas the United States of America and the people thereof are engaged in conflict with Communist forces in Vietnam; and

Whereas the members of the Armed Forces of our Nation are giving their lives in said conflict to protect their homeland; and

Whereas it is the duty of every citizen of every political opinion to avoid giving aid and comfort to the forces in conflict with our Nation; and

Whereas the giving of aid and comfort to the enemy forces has in recent events been dramatized by such activities as draft-card burning, so-called Vietnam peace demonstrations, attempts to block troop trains, statements placing the blame for the conflict on the United States of America, and statements in support of those seeking to avoid military service; and

Whereas this activity not only gives aid and comfort to the enemy but also causes lowering of morale of the members of the Armed Forces who are fighting for our freedom and the freedom of the people of Vietnam: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Capitol View Post No. 161, in meeting assembled at Atlanta, Ga., do deplore this lack of patriotism on the part of a small element in this Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That we believe that this lack of patriotism is evidence of communistic influence over the groups and individuals engaging in these activities; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully request a complete investigation by appropriate committees of the Congress of the United States into the probable communistic influence over these individuals and groups, for the purpose of determining the extent of Communist leadership and source of financing; and be it further

Resolved, That the participants in these activities should not be allowed to hold Federal or State office either through employment, appointment, or election; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully request legislation by the Congress of the United States and the General Assembly of Georgia to prevent these individuals from holding any Federal or State office, however obtained; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread on the minutes of this meeting, with a copy going to each Member of the Congress from the State of Georgia and to each member of the General Assembly of Georgia, and to the news media, and to the fifth district, the American Legion, Department of Georgia.

Approved this 11th day of January 1966.

JOHN D. BARRETT,
Commander.
GEORGE D. COLEMAN, Jr.,
Adjutant.

RESOLUTION OF FOURTH WARD IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL

Whereas it is the duty of every American to give loyal support to the forces of his Nation when they are engaged in armed conflict with foreign forces; and

Whereas this duty crosses all lines of political opinion; and

Whereas the members of this association are dedicated to good citizenship: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the members of the Fourth Ward Improvement Council, in meeting assembled, do hereby go on record as pledging our loyal support to our Nation in its conflict with the Communist outlaws of Vietnam, and to further urge all our fellow citizens of the area we seek to serve to do likewise; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be signed by the officers of this council, and copies sent to the Members of Congress from Georgia and to the news media.

A. S. ADAMS,
President.
W. E. KING.
JOHN L. NORMAN.
DAVID C. WILBANKS.
ROWENA W. PHILPOT.
MARY M. STEPHENS.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ACTION TO REVITALIZE OUR GREAT CITIES

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has called for a concerted, massive, national effort against blight, poverty, and physical decay in our great metropolitan cities. He has proposed a bold plan to uproot the causes of physical decay and human degradation and to help our great cities realize their full potential of a decent and wholesome life for all the people who reside therein.

Yesterday, I had the pleasure of hearing Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Honorable Robert C. Weaver, outline the administration's plan of attack to realize those goals. It calls for the harnessing of public and private resources and programs, Federal, State, and local, to the concerted effort which must be initiated by local authorities but which the Federal Government will support and stimulate to a successful conclusion. To launch this new effort on the solid foundation it merits, requires new legislation.

Today I have introduced a bill, H.R. 12888, in support of this effort to restore and revitalize our great cities.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND FOR THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 21

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader as to the schedule for the remainder of this week and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we have no further business for this week. It will be our purpose to ask to go over until Monday when I have announced the program for next week.

The program for Monday is as follows: Monday is Consent Calendar day. We have no suspensions.

Tuesday there will be a reading of George Washington's Farewell Address.

Wednesday and the balance of the week: H.R. 12752, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, and following that act the supplemental defense authorization for fiscal year 1966 and the supplemental foreign aid authorization for fiscal year 1966. The reports on these bills have not been filed, and I make this announcement subject to that contingency and subject to the further contingency, of course, that rules are granted in time to have them called up next week.

Also, next week, S. 1666, to provide for additional circuit and district judges and for other purposes, will be considered under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program may be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is it true that the Committee on Rules has reported out a rule granting 4 hours of general debate on the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is correct. I believe the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer] has just received permission to have until midnight tonight to file a report from the Committee on Rules, and I anticipate no difficulty in having that matter considered as the first order of business on Wednesday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The other two bills, the supplemental defense authorization for fiscal year 1966, and the Supplemental Foreign Aid Authorization Act for fiscal year 1966, have been reported out of the legislative committees. Do we understand that a rule will be sought in each case and that the legislation will be programed, if the Committee on Rules does grant the rule in each instance?

Mr. ALBERT. May I say that the gentleman is correct. However, the reports have not been filed on those bills. Of course, the granting of the rule will be contingent upon the reports getting to the Committee on Rules on time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is anticipated, then, that we will meet Wednesday, Thursday and probably Friday, of next week in order to carry out the schedule which has just been set forth?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy] advises me—and I did not hear the request—that he does have permission to file the report on the defense supplemental bill until tomorrow night. So we anticipate no problem in having that bill ready to go to the Committee on Rules next week.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with next week.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION POSITION ON REGULATION OF ALL CATV SYSTEMS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, no doubt in recent weeks the Members of the House of Representatives have received numerous letters, telegrams, and personal visits from community antenna television—CATV—system operators, their subscribers, and their trade association representatives, and also from broadcasters and their trade association representatives with regard to impending regulatory actions by the Federal Communications Commission involving the imposition of limitations on the carrying of television programs by CATV systems.

Most likely the CATV representatives have argued that the Commission at present has no statutory authority to impose these limitations and that their imposition will deprive CATV subscribers of free choice of television programs which they have enjoyed heretofore. Broadcasters, on the other hand, are likely to have argued that the Commission does have the necessary statutory authority and that unless the contemplated regulatory steps are taken by the Commission, the present pattern of local broadcast stations serving their respective communities will be replaced by a system under which the programs of a few metropolitan stations will be made available by cable to listeners who will have to pay for the privilege of seeing these programs. Rural television viewers would then be left without any television service.

The committee has been following closely the vigorous competitive struggle that is now being waged by CATV operators, broadcasters, and their respective national trade organizations. The committee is aware that as seen by CATV and broadcast interests, the impending regulatory actions of the Commission will greatly affect the competitive positions and economic prospects of CATV operators and broadcasters.

Last Monday, February 15, the Commission announced that after meetings held February 10, 11, and 14, it had reached agreement on a broad plan for the regulation of community antenna television systems, including a legislative program. The details of the plan are contained in a public notice which I am inserting in the Record following my remarks so that Members of the House will be fully apprised of what the Commission contemplates.

On Monday the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had before it the Commission for a 3-hour discussion of what the Commission is proposing to do in this field. In addition to Chairman Henry, all other members of the Commission with one exception were present as well as a number of the Commission staff.

It is clear from the discussion had at this meeting that in spite of the representations which may have been made generally and specifically to Members of the House in the past few weeks, the Commission has no intention to cut out service anywhere and fully intends that existing programs on which customers of antenna systems have come to rely fully should be retained. There is only one possible exception to this and that is the system must carry a local television station where the station is truly local but this would not seem generally to have any effect on the ability of the system to continue existing programs. Other than this possible exception there will be no disruption.

The Commission order in this area has not yet been drafted and it will be some days before an order can be promulgated and published in the Federal Register. It could not then become effective in a period less than 30 days. At the very best then it would be some days before the Commission's proposal can go into effect.

In the meantime the Commission, in accordance with its discussion with the committee, will have prepared and transmitted to Congress its legislative recommendations to carry out this program, which it has undertaken to do within 2 weeks. Following receipt of these recommendations this committee promptly will schedule hearings so that there will be adequate opportunity for all to be heard and for the committee to review all aspects of the problem.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission is sending to the Congress proposed legislation within the next 2 weeks, and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will immediately hold hearings on this proposed legislation. The entire subject will be fully aired, and then appropriate action will be taken.

The public notice referred to is as follows:

FCC ANNOUNCES PLAN FOR REGULATION OF ALL CATV SYSTEMS

(Federal Communications Commission Public Notice G, February 15, 1966)

Following meetings held February 10, 11, and 14, the Commission has reached agreement on a broad plan for the regulation of community antenna television systems, including a legislative program. To insure the effective integration of CATV with a fully developed television service, the new regulations will apply equally to all CATV systems, including those which require microwave licenses, and those which receive their signal off the air. Excluded from these rules will be those CATV systems which serve less than 50 customers, or which serve only as an apartment house master antenna. The CATV rules concurrently in effect for microwave-fed systems will be revised to reflect the new rules adopted for all systems.

Coupled with the new CATV rules, to be incorporated in a report and order shortly to be issued, the Commission will send recommended legislation to Congress to codify and supplement its regulatory program in this important area.

The Commission's new CATV program includes eight major points:

Carriage of local stations: A CATV system will be required to carry without material degradation the signals of all local television stations within whose Grade B contours the CATV system is located. The carriage requirements thus made applicable to all CATV systems will be substantially the same as those applied to microwave-served systems by the Commission's first report and order in Dockets 14895 and 15233, adopted in April 1965.

2. Same-day nonduplication: A CATV system will be required to avoid duplication

of the programs of local television stations during the same day that such programs are broadcast by the local stations. This nonduplication protection, as under existing rules, will apply to prime-time network programs only if such programs are presented by the local station entirely within what is locally considered to be prime time. It will also give the CATV subscribers access to network programs on the same day that they are presented on the network. Nonduplication protection will not be afforded to programs which are carred in black and white by the local station and are available in color from a more distant station on the CATV system.

The new nonduplication rules thus embody two substantial changes from those adopted in the first report and order. First, the time period during which nonduplication protection must be afforded has been reduced from 15 days before and after local broadcast to the single day of local broadcast. Second, a new exemption from the nonduplication requirement has been added as to color programs not carried in color by local stations.

3. Private agreements and ad hoc procedures: The Commission will continue to give full effect to private agreements between CATV operators and local television stations which provide for a different type of degree of protection for the local station than do the Commission's rules. Moreover, the Commission will give ad hoc consideration to petitions from local television stations seeking a greater degree of protection than provided by the rules, or from CATV operators seeking a waiver of the rules.

4. Distant City Signals—New CATV systems in the top 100 television markets: Parties who obtain State or local franchises to operate CATV systems in the 100 highest ranked television markets (according to American Research Bureau (ARB) net weekly circulation figures), which propose to extend the signals of television broadcast stations beyond their grade B contours, will be required to obtain FCC approval before CATV service to subscribers may be commenced. This aspect of the Commission's decision is effective immediately, and will be applicable to all CATV operation commenced after February 15, 1966.

An evidentiary hearing will be held as to all such requests for FCC approval, subject of course, to the general waiver provisions of the Commission's rules. These hearings will be concerned primarily with (a) the potential effects of the proposed CATV operation on the full development of off-the-air television outlets (particularly UHF) for that market, and (b) the relationship, if any, of proposed CATV operations and the development of pay television in that market. The hearing requirement will apply to all CATV operations proposed to communities lying within the predicted grade A service contour of all existing television stations in that market.

Service presently being rendered to CATV subscribers will be unaffected. However, the Commission will entertain petitions objecting to the geographical extension to new areas of CATV systems already in operation in the top 100 television markets.

5. Distant City Signals—New CATV systems in smaller television markets: The Commission's prior approval after an evidentiary hearing will not be required by rule for proposed CATV systems or operations in markets below 100 in the ARB rankings. However, the Commission will entertain, on an ad hoc basis, petitions from interested parties concerning the carriage of distant signals by CATV systems located in such smaller markets.

6. Information to be filed by CATV owners: Pursuant to its authority under section 403 of the Communications Act, the Commission will, within an appropriate time to be prescribed, require all CATV operations to submit the following data with respect to each of their CATV systems: (a) The names, addresses and business interests of all officers, directors, and persons having substantial ownership interests in each system; (b) the number of subscribers to each system; (c) the television stations carried on each system; and (d) the extent of any existing or proposed program origination by each CATV system.

7. Assertion of jurisdiction: To the extent necessary to carry out the regulatory program set forth above, the Commission asserts its present jurisdiction over all CATV systems, whether or not served by microwave relay.

8. Legislation to be recommended to Congress: The Commission will recommend, with specific proposals where appropriate, that Congress consider and enact legislation designed to express basic national policy in the CATV field. Such legislation would include those matters over which the Commission has exercised its jurisdiction, as well as those matters which are still under consideration.

Included in these recommendations will be the following:

(a) Clarification and confirmation of FCC jurisdiction over CATV systems generally, along with such specific provisions as are deemed appropriate.

(b) Prohibition of the origination of program or other material by a CATV system with such limitations or exceptions, if any, as are deemed appropriate.

(c) Consideration of whether, to what extent, and under what circumstances CATV systems should be required to obtain the consent of the originating broadcast station for the retransmission of the signal by the CATV system.

(d) Consideration of whether CATV systems should or should not be deemed public utilities. In this connection, Congress will be asked to consider the appropriate relationship of Federal to State-local jurisdiction in the CATV field, with particular reference to initial franchising, rate regulation, and extension of service.

The Commission, of course, stands ready to discuss all of the above matters with the appropriate congressional committees at any time.

STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER ROBERT T. BARTLEY

I cannot agree that the Communications Act confers jurisdiction over CATV; however, I endorse legislation which would prohibit a CATV system from originating program matter.

SEPARATE STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER KENNETH A. COX

I concur fully in those portions of the Commission's action in which it (1) asserts jurisdiction over all CATV operations, (2) requires carriage of local stations on CATV systems, (3) provides for expedited ad hoc procedures for the consideration of special relief requested either by broadcasters or CATV operators, (4) requires disclosure of information as to ownership of CATV systems and certain other matters, and (5) calls on Congress to give prompt consideration to the problem of integrating CATV operations into our overall television system, with particular attention to the questions of program origination by CATV systems, possible extension of the principle of rebroadcast consent, and overlapping jurisdiction with the States.

As to the balance of the action taken. I agree with what is done but believe it falls far short of protecting the public interest in an expanding television service. I agree that local stations should not have their programs duplicated, but believe that the protection afforded them is totally inadequate. As to network programs, they should be accorded exclusivity—that is, should not be duplicated—as to all programs which they propose to present in a comparable time period within 15 days.[1] This Commission found in the first report that, for cogent reasons, delayed nonduplication served the public interest. (See pars. 101–127, 38 FCC at 721–731.) But the majority new cuts back on such delayed nonduplication to a single day. This 1 day protection is patently inadequate as to network programing (see first report, par. 125, 38 FCC at 730, where it is pointed out that only 10.2 percent of local stations' delayed broadcasts are delayed less than 1 day, with roughly 79 percent being delayed between 1 and 15 days). As to nonnetwork programs, the majority previously pointed out that such material was not distributed on a simultaneous nationwide basis and that, therefore, a 15-day protection was "clearly a minimal measure of protection against the duplication of syndicated or feature film programs, considering the extended periods—up to and exceeding 5 years—for which stations now bargain and obtain exclusivity in relation to such programs."

As to feature film, syndicated series, and other filmed or taped programing for which they have acquired local exhibition rights, they should be assured the right of first run—which is only one of the rights normally bargained for, but certainly the most important one. I realize that this is more protection than was proposed in this proceeding, but since I feel this would be necessary to assure the station of the most important of the program rights it has acquired as against prior exhibition by an entity which has acquired no rights at all, I certainly cannot agree with the majority's refusal to recognize any rights as to such programing. Some nonsimultaneous nonduplication is necessary to afford local stations sufficient flexibility to provide the best possible service to those viewers who do not subscribe to the cable service.

Similarly, I agree that some measures are needed to curb the indiscriminate extension of television signals by CATV systems. Section 303(h) of the Communications Act gives us clear authority to establish zones or areas of service for broadcast stations. In television, I think we have undertaken to do this by establishing a carefully designed channel allocation and by fixing maximum limits on heights and powers. While there are many situations in which deficiencies of service can and should be corrected by supplemental means such as CATV, satellites, and translators, I do not believe that any of these auxiliary services should be permitted to disrupt the basic television system that Congress, the Commission, and the broadcasters have worked so hard to establish.

The majority contents itself with saying that it will carefully examine proposals to provide CATV service in the top 100 television markets. I would greatly prefer an approach which would bar new systems—for a specified period—from extending a station's signal beyond its grade B contour, except upon authorization by the Commission in certain carefully defined situations. I believe this is necessary to stem the current proliferation of CATV systems in areas already receiving substantial television service. Without such action, I am afraid that CATV—a supplemental and derivative service—will stunt the future growth of our free television system, and perhaps even impair the viability of some of the service which the public is now receiving.

It is all very well to study the problems posed by CATV's threatened invasion of the major markets. It is true that the most immediate hopes for expanded UHF service are centered there, and that the risk of

---

[1] I agree that as to network color programs the local station should not be protected unless it will present them in color.

CATV operators' building a pay television system on the basis of signals appropriated from the broadcasters who now provide our free service is greatest there. But if we turn our backs on the smaller markets by assuring cable operators that they can pump in multiple competing signals from New York and Los Angeles unless a local broadcaster can prove that he will be driven out of business, I think we are on the way to substituting a shrinking for an expanding system, with an artificial ceiling on network and local service alike—all in the name of a multiplicity, if no real diversity, of service for a part of the public. I am afraid we may end up with a shrunken, substantially wired pay service for the majority of the public, and a really vestigial system for those who cannot afford, or cannot be provided, this service.

I am not comforted by the majority's confidence that it would reverse such a trend if it really became a clear threat. The Commission does not have a good record for taking such drastic measures—in fact, I think much of my colleagues' reluctance to take more meaningful action now stems from fear of disrupting the existing service of a rather small number of CATV subscribers who have been galvanized into pressuring Congress and the Commission by a campaign of outright misrepresentation by the CATV industry. If this bothers them, what likelihood is there that they will ever roll back any part of the greatly expanded CATV operations which I think their actions will bring into being? New York City signals have already been carried to points near the Ohio border, and service from Los Angeles is proposed for Oklahoma and Texas. Once such service is instituted, I am afraid it is impossible to roll it back. I think the majority itself recognizes this problem, as is indicated by the fact that in the release announcing their action they twice very carefully point out that service now being rendered to CATV subscribers will be unaffected by what they are doing.

I do not mean to suggest that I know or can prove that the consequences I fear will actually result—though I think my concerns are shared by many leaders of the broadcast industry, by certain organizations which represent elements of the public who stand to be disadvantaged by increased reliance on wired television, and by other interested and informed parties. But on the other hand, my colleagues cannot prove that my fears are groundless. My approach would not impair the viability of existing cable systems and would not bar all further extension of CATV service. But it would confine such service to its proper supplemental role in areas which receive substandard over-the-air television for a limited period—say 5 years. That would give Congress and the Commission time to study the whole problem further, would permit continued UHF development, and would, hopefully, permit resolution of the copyright questions which are basic to the future of CATV.

By not taking the admittedly more rigorous course which I favor, the majority has, I believe, invited developments which may make further study futile, may stifle UHF development which otherwise would have occurred, and may make it politically difficult, or even impossible, to adhere to normal copyright principles. I do not think that the benefits it is claimed CATV will bring are worth the hazards to our television system created by the limited action here taken by the majority. If there is one thing that even critics of the Commission concede it is that this agency was created for the purpose of allocating communications facilities. Both sections 307(b) and 303(h) of the Communications Act make this clear. I think the majority is simply refusing to discharge this responsibility. Now is the time to take hold of the problems posed by the explosive development of the CATV industry and to fit cable operations into an appropriate place in the overall television structure. I think we are at a real turning point as far as the development of American television is concerned—and I think the majority has taken the wrong direction.

STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER LEE LOEVINGER REGARDING FCC CATV PLAN

The analysis of jurisdiction set forth in my prior opinion in this proceeding (38 FCC 683, 746 (1965)) still represents my view. The significance of that analysis and its divergence from the course now adopted by the Commission need no elaboration. On the other hand, the substantive position now adopted by the Commission seems to me to be a moderate and reasonable compromise of conflicting views and positions, and the Commission now recognizes the desirability, if not necessity, of requesting Congress to legislate on jurisdiction and other important aspects of this subject. In these circumstances I think it is more constructive and useful to support affirmative action by the Commission, leaving the jurisdictional issue to be decided by Congress and the courts, rather than stand on legalistic grounds or inflexibly insist on complete adoption of my own ideas. Accordingly, with a dubitante recorded as to jurisdiction, I concur in the plan now approved by a majority of the Commission for regulating community antenna television systems.

REA LOANS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, my remarks here today concern an unconscionable, illegal act by a Government agency.

In our proper concern with the difficulties that beset our Nation in Vietnam, we must not permit our attention to be diverted from the domestic scene. If we are to maximize our effort against the Vietcong, at one and the same time we must sharpen our vigilance at home.

I realize, too, that our President carries arduous burdens. One would think that the least he could expect from his official family is scrupulous adherence to the law at all times. Nevertheless, a member of his administrative family has committed a clearly illegal act involving the expenditure of $22,800,000 of the taxpayers' money.

The man who is guilty of this act is the REA Administrator.

I realize that anything said about REA may evoke a partisan response. If so, it has no place in the discussion which follows, for I address myself to the stanchest supporter of the Rural Electrification Administration on whatever side of the aisle he may sit. The more any person supports REA, the stronger must be his condemnation of the Administrator's action, for to support the Administrator in this instance is to support an act of illegality.

On Monday, February 14, the Supreme Court of Colorado handed down a decision of great importance to the Nation's taxpayers and to those of us who are concerned about any disrespect for and failure to adhere to the law. The court of last resort of Colorado held, in effect, that the REA loan of $22,876,000 to the Colorado-Ute Electric Association was illegal. The REA had made this loan to this generation and transmission cooperative in 1962 to build a 150,000 kilowatt steamplant and extensive transmission lines. The output of these facilities was to be sold to the member cooperatives of Colorado-Ute and to the Salt River district in Arizona. Some of its output would, in effect, be used by the Bureau of Reclamation to firm up the power of the Colorado River storage project produced at dams in Utah, Arizona, and Colorado.

The full background on the granting of this highly controversial and legally questionable loan will be found in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations for Department of Agriculture requests for 1963 and 1964.

I fought this loan at that time because, in my opinion, it was clearly, patently illegal.

Section 4 of the REA Act of 1936 provides, among other things that:

> No loan for the construction, operation or enlargement of any generating plant shall be made unless the consent of the State authority having jurisdiction in the premises is first obtained.

Obviously, as this decision demonstrates, "the consent of the State authority having jurisdiction" could not be "first obtained" as long as there was litigation unresolved in the courts concerning the consent of the State. Only on February 14, 1966, did the Supreme Court of Colorado—which, under the constitution and law of that State, has the last word—issue its opinion on the legality of the loan, and accordingly, on whether the State had in fact actually given consent. It held that the loan was illegal; the State of Colorado has refused to give its consent to this loan. As a result, the money advanced by the administrator has been advanced illegally. It has been spent illegally in violation of Federal law.

This is just one example of how the Administrator has flaunted the will of Congress, whether that will be expressed in statute or in instructions and guidance contained in reports of committees of Congress. The motivation for this illegal act was the strength of his desire to be free of all restraints imposed by Congress or by the courts. Like the irresponsible driver, he finally ran afoul of the law and the court caught up with him.

The Administrator is now in the process of making the same mistake in releasing funds to a G. & T. co-op in Indiana. A $60,225,000 loan was made on June 18, 1961, to Hoosier Cooperative, Inc., to be used to build a 198,000-kilowatt steamplant and more than 1,500 miles of transmission lines. The Administrator has already begun releasing these funds, even though the Indiana Supreme Court has not as yet finally passed on the legal issues involved. The Administrator certainly should not release any more of this money until the Indiana courts have finally decided this case. He should heed the lesson of his Colorado experience and not make the same mistake twice.

Mr. Speaker, this decision reveals the REA Administrator as lacking good judgment and understanding of legal processes and knowledge of the very act he is in charge of administering.

Right now, we are being treated to a barrage of propaganda emanating from Las Vegas, Nev., to the effect that the REA needs a substantial increase in its funds over and above the $220 million recommended by the President in the current budget. We have here in this decision of the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado a classic illustration of why this agency continually demands more funds; and precisely why it does not need them. We know now that REA has made an illegal loan in Colorado involving millions of dollars. We also know that REA has made other loans in recent weeks for generation and transmission purposes in Kentucky, in Indiana, and in my State, Illinois, that are directly contrary to the directives outlined by the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, directly contrary to the provisions of the basic REA Act, and in conflict with policy guidelines established by the President in the budget for fiscal years 1966 and 1967. Obviously, any agency that feels itself above the law and the dictates of Congress can use unlimited funds.

Because of the tremendous importance of this case, I will insert at this point in the Record excerpts of the decision of the Colorado Supreme Court in the case of Western Colorado Power Co., against Public Utilities Commission.

Excerpts From Opinion of Supreme Court of State of Colorado Re: the Western Power Co., a Colorado Corporation, and Public Service Co. of Colorado, a Colorado Corporation, Versus the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Colorado, Henry E. Zarlengo, Ralph C. Horton, and Howard S. Bjelland, the Individual Members of Said Commission, and Colorado-Ute Electric Association, Inc., a Cooperative Association

We will refer to the parties as follows: to the Western Colorado Power Co. as "Western," the Public Service Co. of Colorado as "Public Service," the Public Utilities Commission as the "commission," and the Colorado-Ute Electric Association, Inc., as "Colorado-Ute."

On May 11, 1962, Colorado-Ute filed an application with the commission for a certificate of convenience and necessity. The object of the application was to permit Colorado-Ute to construct near Hayden, Colo., a steam electric generating plant with a nominal rating of 150,000 kilowatts, together with associated transmission lines and related facilities necessary to deliver power to certain new customers it sought to serve at wholesale. On June 14, 1962, Colorado-Ute filed a petition for an order of the commission authorizing it to execute notes payable to the United States of America in an amount not to exceed $22,876,000 and mortgages to secure the notes in order to finance the project.

Public Service and Western filed protests in opposition to Colorado-Ute's requests and the matters were consolidated for hearing. Protests to those applications which were filed by Public Service and Western generally alleged that each was a public utility subject to the jurisdiction of this commission engaged, among other things, in the generation, transmission and distribution of electric power and energy at wholesale and otherwise throughout various areas of the State of Colorado; that all or a portion of the lines, plant, and facilities proposed to be constructed by Colorado-Ute would cause physical and uneconomical duplication of the lines, plants, and systems of the companies which had been lawfully constructed and dedicated to the public use; that the companies then, and for many years past, had maintained electric generating facilities and transmission lines and related facilities adequate and sufficient to meet all present and future needs of their customers and service areas, and hold themselves out as ready, willing, and able to render wholesale electric service to Colorado-Ute or any of its members; that there did not exist any need nor necessity for the construction of the proposed plant and facilities of Colorado-Ute and that if such construction was authorized by the commission it would result in substantial damage to the companies and their electric consumers.

Subsequent to hearing, the commission entered its order authorizing the construction of the Hayden plant and the financing thereof, but denying authority to construct certain of the facilities originally requested. Western and Public Service thereafter commenced certiorari proceedings in the district court, and from the judgment therein entered, affirming the commission's decision, they bring writ of error here.

Colorado-Ute is an incorporated rural electric cooperative association engaged in generating and transmitting electric energy as a wholesaler. It proposes to sell electric energy to various customers, it denominates member as well as to the Bureau of Reclamation, a nonmember. It further proposes to dedicate its facilities to whatever use the public convenience and necessity require, including the wheeling of power to protestants Public Service and Western. It is federally financed by the Rural Electrification Administration under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (VII, U.S.C.A. 901). Eleven of its members are distribution members and distribute electrical energy directly to their users. Of the two other members, the Arkansas Valley G. & T. generates and transmits energy for its three distribution members, and the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District provides both electric and water service in the area surrounding Phoenix, Ariz. Salt River is not a cooperative but is a quasi-governmental organization incorporated under the laws of the State of Arizona.

* * * * *

On this writ of error, contentions of Western and Public Service fell into three general categories: (1) That Colorado-Ute did not prove the need, demand, or necessity required by the law of public convenience and necessity for power to be provided by the Hayden plant; (2) that the financial arrangements of Colorado-Ute with the Rural Electrification Administration are illegal; and (3) that numerous errors of an evidentiary, procedural, and administrative nature were committed by the commission, all to the prejudice of Western and Public Service.

The first category consisted of six subcategories, each of which, it is said, points to error because the action of the commission, and the trial court in affirming the commission, contravened the fundamental concept of public utility law relating to public convenience and necessity. In this respect it is asserted: (1) That the evidence established that proposed new customers of Colorado-Ute already had an adequate power supply and that these customers would merely change their source and commence taking their power from Colorado-Ute; (2) that the construction of the plant would duplicate service made available by Western and Public Service as well as other electric suppliers presently rendering such service; (3) that the estimates of power costs submitted by Colorado-Ute found no support in the evidence; (4) that the generation and transmission of energy at less cost, assuming the record established such fact, is not a factor in establishing public convenience and necessity where reliance upon cheaper energy as basis for certification would be destructive of the concept of regulated monopoly; (5) that it would not be in the public interest to permit the construction of the plant where it would put Colorado-Ute in a debt position of more than 100 percent; (6) that the commission erred in receiving evidence concerning alleged benefits which would accrue to the Colorado River Basin fund as a result of the construction of the plant where the reception of such evidence was based upon the construction of a 600,000-kilowatt plant and basing its decision thereon when the application was for a plant of only 150,000 kilowatts.

* * * * *

The record discloses that the Colorado-Ute was organized in 1941 by a group of rural electric distribution associations on the western slope, but remained inactive for some years. In 1952 Colorado-Ute was reorganized, and it obtained a loan from the Rural Electrification Administration to construct transmission lines and a generating plant to supply the electric requirements of its then members. Upon the completion of the construction of this plant, known as the Nucla plant, Colorado-Ute commenced serving, on a wholesale basis, four distribution cooperatives located in the southwestern portion of the State. At the time of the hearing before the commission there was then pending an application by Colorado-Ute to commence serving a fifth member located near Grand Junction, Colo.

The alleged purpose to be served by the construction of the Hayden plant is to supply the electric requirements not of its 5 members but of 13 members. This would have the effect of making Colorado-Ute the wholesale supplier of electric energy to a large portion of the State of Colorado, as well as to a small portion of the State of Wyoming and the State of Utah, and a large supplier to the Salt River project in Arizona. Each of these eight potential new customers of Colorado-Ute is now receiving service from other sources, and the existing Nucla plant of Colorado-Ute is adequate to serve the requirements of the five earlier members. It is thus apparent that Colorado-Ute seeks to commence rendering electric service on an expanded basis in areas it has not heretofore served, to customers it has never before served, and to customers and in areas where electric service is being supplied and is available from other existing sources.

Wholesale electric service to many of the proposed new distribution cooperative customers of Colorado-Ute was for many years supplied by other utilities in the area, and later by the Bureau of Reclamation, and all parties to this proceeding are distinctly in the wholesale electric business. Arkansas G. & T. is an organization similar to Colorado-Ute and supplies wholesale electric service to three distribution cooperatives. Arkansas Valley obtains its power by purchase from municipal electric plants and from its own generating plant located near Canon City. This, in turn, it wholesales. The effect of the commission's decision is to substitute Colorado-Ute as the source of supply for all of these proposed new members.

For instance, those receiving wholesale service from the Bureau of Reclamation will terminate such purchases; those proposed new customers which have generating plants will dispose of those plants by one means or another; and those new customers which purchased from municipalities will no longer do so. Arkansas G. & T. which only recently completed the construction of its Canon City generating plant, will no longer obtain any power from its own plant but instead will purchase from Colorado-Ute.

Although there was much conflicting testimony with respect to the ability of the Bureau of Reclamation to continue meeting the wholesale requirements of the proposed new members of Colorado-Ute, all three commissioners concurred in a finding that Bureau power—the existing source of supply of many of these cooperatives—was adequate for the foreseeable future. In addition the record clearly reflects that the Arkansas G. & T. plant is more than adequate to most the anticipated demands of its customers for a considerable period of time. It is also shown by the record that Public Service and Western have adequate generating facilities with which to meet the demands of any wholesale requirements in their respective areas should existing sources prove insufficient.

Under these circumstances, it is apparent that the generating capabilities of existing electric suppliers in the State of Colorado are more than adequate to supply increased electrical needs without the addition of the Hayden plant, which was to be constructed only for the purpose of providing service to substitute for that already being rendered.

* * * * *

QUESTIONS TO BE DETERMINED

First. Does public convenience and necessity require the construction and operation of the Hayden plant in view of the acknowledged adequacy of existing service?

We answer this question in the negative. The State of Colorado has long been dedicated to the principle of regulated monopolies in the conduct of public utility operations. This principle has been the public policy of this State since the year 1913 when the Public Utilities Act of the State of Colorado was first adopted. The concept has never varied in a long line of decisions of this court.

* * * * *

The statute which is determinative of the basic issue in this case is C.R.S. 1963, 115-5-1, which provides as follows:

"115-5-1. New construction—extension.—(1) No public utility shall begin the construction of a new facility, plant, or system, or of any extension of its facility, plant, or system, without first having obtained from the commission a certificate that the present or future public convenience and necessity require or will require such construction. Sections 115-5-1 to 115-5-4 shall not be construed to require any corporation to secure such certificate for an extension within any city and county or city or town within which it shall have theretofore lawfully commenced operations, or for an extension into territory, either within or without a city and county or city or town, contiguous to its facility, or line, plant, or system, and not theretofore served by a public utility providing the same commodity or service, or for an extension within or to territory already served by it, necessary in the ordinary course of its business."

The above statute makes mandatory proof of public convenience and necessity prior to the construction of any new plant or system, subject to certain exceptions. It is obvious that none of the exceptions are applicable in this case, and Colorado-Ute has never contended to the contrary. This statute is the foundation of the regulated monopoly principle and as this court has observed on many occasions it was designed to prevent duplication of facilities and competition between utilities, and to authorize new utilities in a field only when existing ones are found to be inadequate.

* * * * *

We agree with Commissioner Zarlengo when he points out in his dissenting opinion the lack of evidence of public convenience and necessity:

"It appears that the applicant has founded its case, in the main, on the premises that if the Hayden plant and facilities be authorized, the power and energy produced will find a market, all the while ignoring substantial proof and competent evidence as to the availability (58) or nonavailability of power and energy from existing sources and the reasonableness of its cost to the consumers. To say the least, it has glossed over this phase, or, at most, tendered evidence which is vague, indefinite and uncertain."

To affirm the decision of the commission authorizing the construction of the Hayden plant where existing service was already adequate, would require a complete departure by this court from its previous decisions. The fundamental misconception of Colorado-Ute is its failure to recognize that, under regulation, existing suppliers are entitled to serve all desiring service, whether they be existing or potential customers.

* * * * *

In summarizing the factual situation presented by the record, it is apparent that—

1. Adequate electric service is already available in the State of Colorado for the needs and necessities of the proposed new customers of Colorado-Ute; therefore

2. The construction of the Hayden plant, requiring an investment of approximately thiry million dollars, is not necessary to supply any present or foreseeable future electric requirements, and Colorado ratepayers should not be required to support it; and

3. Affirmance of the district court's judgment and the decisions of the commission would sanction a duplication of existing electric facilities which are adequate to supply the needs of the public; and

4. The affirmance of the district court and commission decisions by this court would be inconsistent with the doctrine of regulated monopoly and would, as we stated in *Public Utilities Commission* v. *Verl Harvey, supra,* render regulation "wholly ineffective and meaningless."

Having discussed the Colorado law of public convenience and necessity as a crucial point upon which the decision in this case turns, we must inquire whether there are any other considerations which should, for reasons special to this case, absolve Colorado-Ute from the necessity of proving that the public convenience and necessity requires construction of the Hayden plant. If such considerations exist it must be admitted at the outset that the result would emaculate the concept of regulated monopoly and the entire Colorado structure of public utility law.

Second. Does Colorado Session Laws 1961, chapter 198, 115–1–3(2), which generally conferred jurisdiction over cooperatives in the public utilities commission, violate the constitution of Colorado or of the United States?

This question is answered in the negative. At the commencement of its consideration of this case, the court requested and received an additional oral argument from counsel, upon questions concerning the constitutionality of the 1961 amendments (particularly session laws of Colorado 1961, ch. 198, 115–1–3(2)) to the public utilitiy law, and the consequent investiture of the public utilities commission with jurisdiction of cooperatives.

* * * * *

The 1961 amendments to the public utilities law of the State of Colorado are valid, enforcible, and constitutional, C.R.S. 1963, 115–1–3(2) provides:

"Every cooperative electric association, or nonprofit electric corporation or association, and every other supplier of electrical energy, whether supplying electric energy for the use of the public or for the use of its own members, is hereby declared to be affected with a public interest and to be a public utility and to be subject to the jurisdiction, control, and regulation of the commission and to the provisions of articles 1 to 7 of this chapter."

This statute is couched in clear and cogent terms. It makes no exceptions. "Every cooperative electric association" is a public utility, as well as all other electric suppliers.

No issue has been raised in this case that Colorado-Ute is not a "cooperative electric association." By the terms of the statute, therefore, it is subject to the jurisdiction, control, and regulation of the public utilities commission, and we so hold.

Colorado-Ute in its application before the public utilities commission readily admits that it is a public utility. The application contains the following:

"Applicant is a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Colorado subject to the jurisdiction of this commission under the provisions of H.R. No. 245 passed by the Colorado Legislature and signed by the Governor on April 23, 1961.

"The public convenience and necessity requires the construction of said generating plant, transmission lines, and related facilities, and the interconnections herein described."

These allegations are consistent only with the concept that Colorado-Ute is a public utility, and are inconsistent with any idea that it is concerned only with the needs and requirements of its cooperative members.

Western and Public Service admit that Colorado-Ute is a public utility. The legislature has declared in no uncertain terms that it is a public utility. It furnishes electrical energy which is used by countless consumers in a very large segment of this State. The widespread interest of the public is clearly shown, and this court should not declare the legislative act to be void, especially when the parties themselves admit that it is valid and enforceable.

There is an abundance of authority to support the classification of a wholesaler of energy to distributors as a public utility. (*North Carolina Public Service Co. et al.* v. *Southern Power Co.*, 282 Fed. 837; *Boone County Rural Electric Membership Corporation et al.* v. *Public Service Company of Indiana, et al.*, 239 Ind. 525, 159 N.E. 2d 121; *Orndoff* v. *Public Utilities Commission,* 135 Ohio State 438, 21 N.E. 2d 334; *Industrial Gas Company* v. *Public Utilities Commission of Ohio,* 135 Ohio St. 408, 21 N.E. 2d 166; *Wisconsin Traction Company* v. *Green Bay & Miss. Canal Co.*, 188 Wis. 54, 205 N.W. 551.)

The cooperative form of organization obviously has nothing to do with the question of what constitutes the public convenience and necessity, or with the obligation of any utility to prove public convenience and necessity in accordance with the theory of regulated monopoly as expressed by the statutes of the State of Colorado and the decisions of this court. These statutes were enacted for the benefit of the public as a whole, and result in the granting of regulated status to a supplier of a commodity essential to the public interest. Under regulation, an electric consumer need not be a member of a cooperative to secure its service. Likewise a consumer located in an area exclusively served by such cooperative must take its service if indeed service is to be received at all. The form of organization delivering service makes no difference whatever to these consumers and the legislature recognizes reality when it specifically places the cooperatives under the regulatory arm of the State.

* * * * *

Third. Does the fact that Colorado-Ute, a cooperative, has but 13 members who are also cooperatives, warrant treatment of a different kind than that which would be applicable to any other kind of membership?

This question is answered in the negative. We find no merit to the argument that as a cooperative whose members are other cooperatives, Colorado-Ute is merely an extension or adjunct of these member cooperatives so that its act is the act of its members, and for that reason Colorado-Ute is not subject to regulation.

We observe first that Colorado-Ute is in all respects a separate legal entity; it has its own distinct corporate organization, including directors and officers; and it deals with its customers, whether cooperatives or not, by means of long-term power supply contracts. It is obvious that the decision to construct the Hayden plant was the decision of Colorado-Ute itself rather than its members as of the time the decision was made to build the Hayden plant. At that time it had no more than five members. Many of its new members did not become members or agree to power purchase contracts until shortly before the commission hearing commenced, which was long after the decision to construct the plant was made. It is, therefore, apparent that Colorado-Ute, instead of being the alter ego of its members, is the complete master of its own destiny. Thus the concept of it as a mere extension or adjunct of the distribution cooperative members has no legal or factual basis and is a forced and artificial one. But even if we accepted the artificial idea of the nature of Colorado-Ute as an alter ego, so to speak, of its members, no different application of the legal principles here involved would result. There is no contention in this case that those customers of Colorado-Ute that are themselves cooperatives are not public utilities and are not subject to the jurisdiction of the public utilities commission.

Any such cooperative, which had not theretofore generated its own electricity, would be required to secure Commission approval if it proposed to construct such a plant (C.R.S. 1963, 115–5–1), and, of course, if it came before the Commission with such purpose it, like any other utility, would be required to prove that the public convenience and necessity demanded such construction because it would then be engaging in a wholly new and distinct type of utility service (generation) theretofore supplied by a public utility providing the same commodity or service.

* * * * *

It is thus clearly apparent that the business of Colorado-Ute is affected with a special interest far beyond that of its 11 distributive cooperatives and therefore is not immune from regulation.

Fourth. Does that fact that the Hayden plant has already been completed require an affirmance of the judgment of the trial court?

The answer is "No." The court is aware that the Hayden plant is now constructed. This fact, however, cannot subvert the legal principles upon which our decision is based nor be allowed to defeat the doctrine of regulated monopoly to which Colorado subscribes. It is clear that both Colorado-Ute and the REA, its financing associate (who was not before the commission) recognized that construction of the Hayden plant during litigation was attended with substantial risk, and they engaged in such activity with full knowledge of the possible consequences.

For good reason, no contention is made that the construction precludes decisions by this court. It is the law that when the interest of the public is concerned it is not only the right but the duty of an appellate court to determine the issues, regardless of interim construction.

* * * * *

Colorado-Ute solemnly assured the commission and district court that in the event of the reversal of the commission order, Colorado-Ute and its Colorado consumers would escape scatheless from adverse economic consequences because Salt River of Arizona would then assume the obligation for the Hayden plant. The record discloses that counsel for Colorado-Ute wrote the commission under date of March 21, 1963, specifically stating that Salt River had agreed to take the Hayden plant off the hands of Colorado-Ute at no loss to Ute in the event that some court subsequently ruled that the certificate should not be issued.

* * * * *

When litigation in accordance with the statutes and procedures of the State in question is in progress, it needs no citation of authority to establish that consent of the State authority to the construction has not been obtained, nor could any reasonable person believe that security for the proposed loan is adequate and that the loan will be repaid in due course when the very right to construct the plant is still in litigation.

* * * * *

The judgment of the trial court is reversed and the cause remanded with directions that it vacate its judgment and thereafter direct the commission to vacate and set aside its decision No. 60156.

Mr. Justice Sutton concurs in the result.

Mr. Justice Frantz dissents.

OPTICAL ILLUSION OF GUNS AND BUTTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Great Society has done it again. Once again, it is attempting to create an optical illusion of both guns and butter by seeking to transfer funds from time-tested and successful programs to its own controversial and politically motivated Great Society schemes.

I have heard many people say that the administration knows Congress will reinstate many of the programs cut in the budget, thus taking upon itself the responsibility for exceeding the record $112.8 billion budget figure.

I believe that, while this may be good politics, it is terrible statesmanship, especially when the so-called Great Society callously runs the risk of literally destroying as basic and successful a program as the Land Grant Act of 1862.

Mr. Speaker, the so-called Great Society budget for 1967 calls for a cut of nearly $12 million of instructional funds for the 68 land-grant colleges and universities. This is a cut of 80 percent, leaving only $2.5 million to be divided equally among the 50 States and Puerto Rico—about $50,000 to a State. In 17 States, the $50,000 must be subdivided between two institutions.

The budget also calls for a cut of $8.5 million in agricultural research funds, within the experiment stations conducted by the land-grant institutions. This is at a time when the President sends Congress a special message on the seriousness of the world food crisis.

The budget, in addition, calls for the transfer of $9.6 million from the cooperative extension program, also administered by the land-grant institutions, to Federal allocation for use in the rural antipoverty program. Yet, for decades, the cooperative extension service has had experience fighting poverty and if given the challenge would make great headway again as evidence has come to me recently.

No program in history has been more successful in fighting rural poverty than the cooperative extension program. For decades, county extension agents have raised the standards of rural America.

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked, amazed, astounded, and dismayed by these proposed budget cuts. Is this a Great Society or an ungrateful administration?

I am grateful and proud that in 1862 Senator J. S. Morrill, of Vermont, a Republican, sponsored the Land Grant College Act.

I am grateful and proud that a Republican Congress passed it into law.

I am grateful and proud that Abraham Lincoln, a Republican President, signed it into law.

I know from personal experience that the so-called Great Society has no ear for constructive Republican proposals, but it would seem to me that it might have some small bit of admiration for this Republican program which has worked so well for the past 104 years.

For a century, educators, Congressmen, and the public at large have hailed the Land Grant Act as the keystone of Federal participation in higher education. In 1951—under the Truman administration—the U.S. Office of Education bulletin summarized the feeling of many decades in these words:

> The whole realm of higher education in this country and to a lesser degree even in some other countries, has been profoundly influenced by the developments of the land-grant colleges and universities in popularizing higher education. They have demonstrated the partnership of the Federal and State Governments in the maintenance of a system of higher education which is designed to fulfill Federal, State, and local needs. They have spread widely the concept that higher education is something in which all people have a stake. They have, therefore, a place of deep affection in the hearts of the people. They are growing in strength and influence with each passing year.

Mr. Speaker, in 1967 is an ungrateful administration to move so far toward destruction of the Land Grant Act?

There are no other Federal programs to replace the instructional funds. State legislatures are virtually the only source of replacement revenue. Not only are they already overburdened in many cases, but most of them are not meeting this year.

College administrators must make their instructional arrangements for next fall within 2 or 3 months.

Where are they to get the money?

Mr. Speaker, 16 of the land-grant institutions are predominantly attended by Negroes and all of the 68 are fully integrated. Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical College of Mississippi is a predominantly Negro institution. It depends on the land-grant funds for 25 percent of its entire instructional budget. Fort Valley State College of Georgia is a predominantly Negro college. It depends on these funds for 14 percent of its instructional budget and South Carolina State College is dependent to the extent of 13 percent. Where are they and the other 13 predominantly Negro institutions to find the money?

In fact, where are any of the 68 land-grant institutions to find the needed money if this budget cut is allowed?

In 1960, Congress took into account inflation and rising enrollments and unanimously increased the instructional funds of the land-grant colleges and universities from $5 million annually to $14.5 million. Now the Johnson administration wants them cut from $14.5 million to $2.5 million. Yet between 1960 and 1965 enrollments in these institutions increased 67 percent—from 639,489 to 1,027,498. The figure will be even higher next fall, for total college enrollment has been increasing at rates between 7 and 15 percent since World War II, with no end in sight. The land-grant college enrollments have grown more rapidly than any other type of college except junior colleges.

The proposed cut in both instructional and research funds of more than $20 million represents more than 2,000 faculty members and if put in terms of endowment represents a capital of $400 million.

Where are the 68 land-grant institutions to get the money?

Mr. Speaker, let us carefully examine the following chart, which shows how much would be lost to each of the land-grant institutions:

Funds for instruction and facilities (Morrill-Nelson, and Bankhead-Jones funds)

LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS

All land-grant institutions	$14,500,000
Alabama:	
Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College	95,170
Auburn University	182,477
Alaska: University of Alaska	205,376
Arizona: University of Arizona	230,951
Arkansas:	
Agricultural, Mechanical, and Normal College	66,125
University of Arkansas	176,333
California: University of California	573,580
Colorado: Colorado State University	241,689
Connecticut: University of Connecticut	260,260
Delaware:	
Delaware State College	42,122
University of Delaware	168,486
Florida:	
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University	103,307
University of Florida	214,386
Georgia:	
Fort Valley State College	83,507
University of Georgia	210,216
Hawaii: University of Hawaii	215,040
Idaho: University of Idaho	215,858
Illinois: University of Illinois	439,618
Indiana: Purdue University	310,822
Iowa: Iowa State University of Science and Technology	265,544
Kansas: Kansas State University of Agricultural and Applied Science	251,783
Kentucky:	
Kentucky State College	$39,471
University of Kentucky	232,743
Louisiana:	
Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College	188,920
Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College	88,496
Maine: University of Maine	223,038
Maryland:	
Maryland State College, Division of the University of Maryland	32,844
University of Maryland	240,856
Massachusetts:	
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	16,667
University of Massachusetts	305,709
Michigan: Michigan State University	385,949
Minnesota: University of Minnesota	281,144
Mississippi:	
Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical College	127,519
Mississippi State University	124,253
Missouri:	
Lincoln University	18,917
University of Missouri	283,760
Montana: Montana State College	216,038
Nebraska: University of Nebraska	233,546
Nevada: University of Nevada	206,781
New Hampshire: University of New Hampshire	214,426
New Jersey: Rutgers, the State University	344,201
New Mexico: New Mexico State University	222,605
New York: Cornell University	598,897
North Carolina:	
Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina	101,737
State College of Agriculture and Engineering, University of North Carolina	206,557
North Dakota: North Dakota State University	215,032
Ohio: Ohio State University	430,710
Oklahoma:	
Langston University	25,534
Oklahoma State University of Agriculture and Applied Science	229,807
Oregon: Oregon State University	242,040
Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University	469,049
Puerto Rico: University of Puerto Rico	255,846
Rhode Island: University of Rhode Island	220,429
South Carolina:	
Clemson Agricultural College	128,316
South Carolina State College	128,316
South Dakota: South Dakota State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts	216,175
Tennessee:	
Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University	51,599
University of Tennessee	233,187
Texas:	
Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College	106,924
Texas Agricultural and Mechanical University	320,774
Utah: Utah State University of Agriculture and Applied Science	221,169
Vermont: University of Vermont and State Agricultural College	209,267
Virginia:	
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	$196,193
Virginia State College	98,097
Washington: Washington State University	267,818
West Virginia: West Virginia University	244,220
Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin	293,929
Wyoming: University of Wyoming	207,845

Mr. Speaker, equally serious to my mind is the proposed cut of some $8.5 million in agricultural research funds. I have said many times that we need to export our technology as well as our surpluses, so that the rest of the world can better learn to feed itself and help to meet the increasing food crisis.

How important is that crisis? On January 18, 1966, speaking before the U.N. World Food Program Conference, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman said:

> The problem is staggering. Unquestionably, there is a serious race between population and the food supply * * *. It will take an unprecedented effort to break the chain of hunger and despair in the developing nations of the world. No single nation and no single technique is powerful enough to solve a problem so vast in scope and complex in nature. It will take the combined resources of many nations and a broad application of the entire spectrum of agricultural knowledge in undeveloped nations to conquer such an adversary.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States, on February 10, 1966, sent to the Congress a special message in which he said:

> One new element in today's world is the threat of mass hunger and starvation. Populations are exploding under the impact of sharp cuts in the death rate. Successful public health measures have saved millions of lives. But these lives are now threatened by hunger because food production has not kept pace.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial entitled "The War on Hunger," in the October 1965 edition of the Farm Journal says:

> What can be done to step up crop yields? Not much can happen without such basics as stable government, education, and a system of incentives that lets a man keep enough of what he earns.
>
> Farmers anywhere need good seed, fertilizer, pesticides, machinery, experiment stations, extension service, good farm magazines and farm radio, good roads, farm credit and a system of markets that lets them sell something, rather than just feed themselves.
>
> We've done quite a bit about some of these, but this is the area where we need to step up our efforts sharply. Sending food is a necessary aid. Helping build agriculture on the spot is the only real solution.

Mr. Speaker, who has engineered the vast portion of American progress in agriculture which has led to our vast surplus productive capacity from the standpoint of domestic need? It has been the research facilities of the land-grant colleges.

Who has made the findings of the land-grant researchers generally known to farmers as a group? The land-grant cooperative extension program.

Does the Johnson administration really believe that it holds the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in the field of agricultural technology? Does it feel that no further knowledge is needed?

Coupled with slashes in the budget for the Agriculture Department's own research funds, the actual reduction in federally supported research in this area amounts to more than 20 percent, since research costs increase at the rate of 5 or 6 percent a year. This comes at the same time that the Secretary of Agriculture joins the President of the United States in pointing out the world food crisis. This is indeed, an optical illusion.

The Johnson administration likewise proposes to shift away from the cooperative extension service, which pioneered the fight against rural poverty, $10 million, and to use it in—you guessed it—a rural war on poverty. This is, indeed, an optical illusion.

Mr. Speaker, the following chart shows the loss to individual agricultural experiment stations under the proposed cut, excluding regional research funds:

Effect of reduction on Hatch formula funds

Alabama	−$154, 803
Alaska	−39, 276
Arizona	−54, 246
Arkansas	−125, 614
California	−170, 852
Colorado	−71, 560
Connecticut	−59, 084
Delaware	−42, 568
Florida	−101, 213
Georgia	−166, 981
Hawaii	−40, 973
Idaho	−67, 937
Illinois	−198, 255
Indiana	−178, 709
Iowa	−187, 918
Kansas	−117, 055
Kentucky	−185, 706
Louisiana	−117, 313
Maine	−59, 662
Maryland	−84, 252
Massachusetts	−72, 620
Michigan	−185, 031
Minnesota	−176, 166
Mississippi	−171, 854
Missouri	−174, 967
Montana	−63, 165
Nebraska	−107, 063
Nevada	−38, 280
New Hampshire	−46, 324
New Jersey	−68, 952
New Mexico	−55, 340
New York	−181, 601
North Carolina	−268, 872
North Dakota	−81, 446
Ohio	−217, 165
Oklahoma	−108, 035
Oregon	−81, 508
Pennsylvania	−217, 112
Puerto Rico	−207, 080
Rhode Island	−38, 602
South Carolina	−143, 824
South Dakota	−81, 790
Tennessee	−192, 444
Texas	−236, 724
Utah	−48, 998
Vermont	−50, 502
Virginia	−165, 377
Washington	−95, 018
West Virginia	−98, 001
Wisconsin	−176, 452
Wyoming	−45, 710
Subtotal	−6, 120, 000

Mr. Speaker, why are these cuts asked? I quote from a February 4 statement by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges:

> Relationships between the Federal Government and the land-grant institutions, in which for more than a century desirable national objectives have been accomplished with a maximum of institutional independence and decisionmaking, have long been hailed as a model of Federal-State relationships in education. An across-the-board modification of these institutional related programs, at a time when Federal support of higher education is being increased in federally selected categories, may be viewed as raising fundamental philosophic issues. We were of the opinion that these were not fully understood or considered under the unusual conditions which surrounded preparation of the 1967 budget.

TRIBUTES TO WARREN ABNER SEAVEY AND EDMUND M. MORGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose at this time to pay tribute to two giants of the law who have recently passed away.

At this time, when we are all concerned with the establishment of world peace and the movement to establish world peace through world law, I think the contributions of such men deserve our consideration, and their memory deserves our attention.

These men were Warren A. Seavey, a professor who taught at Harvard Law School, among other places, and was most noted for his contribution in the field of torts and agency, and also Edmund M. Morgan, who taught the law of evidence there and was also a law professor at Texas and other schools throughout the country.

Professor Seavey was a gentleman who employed the Socratic form of teaching in its highest form. He taught solely by questions, and thereby sought to teach young men and would-be lawyers to think—the most important job, after all, that any citizen can have. Professor Seavey instilled the idea that if we are ever, in our lives or in our world, to obtain the right answers to our problems, we must learn first to ask the right questions.

In the beginning, as he would greet a new class of students, none of whom were acquainted with the mysteries of the law, he would tell them absolutely nothing but ask questions for hour on hour. Frequently it was stated that while he was a man who caused you the most discomfort while you were in the law school, his memory was one that you would treasure more highly than any other as the years went by. I know, in my own case, I found that statement to be eminently correct.

During the period of World War II, Professor Seavey served as acting dean of the Harvard Law School, and during that time he wrote law students and young lawyers all around the world. Anyone who wrote to Professor Seavey was certain to get a response from him. Toward the end of the war the letters came from all parts of the world, and Professor Seavey was designated an adviser to the veterans.

To illustrate the manner in which he wrote, I quote from a sample of his writing furnished by Dean Griswold, of Harvard. When he received a letter from a veteran, he would answer:

> I am glad you want to come to law school. You are just the sort of man we want. When you are released from the service, come to Cambridge and we will be glad to take you in no matter when you come.

These letters were kept by the men to whom they were sent, and they turned up after the war when, indeed, there were thousands and thousands of men seeking admission to law schools all around the country, and the problem of being admitted was most difficult. They were treated by the law school at Cambridge as estoppels by the admission committee, and many men owe their legal education to this kind and tender spot that Professor Seavey had for those who served their country in World War II.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I desire to have printed a statement prepared by Dean Erwin Griswold of the Harvard Law School:

WARREN ABNER SEAVEY, 1880–1966

(Statement of Erwin N. Griswold)

A mighty oak has fallen, but his strength will long contribute to this community and to the law. We are met this afternoon of an old fashioned New England winter day to pay our respect and tribute to Warren Seavey who was a son of New England and shared its many virtues. This is not a time of sadness, for Warren Seavey lived a full and productive life. It is, rather, a time of recognition, a time for us to recall one more great career of the sort whose intertwinings here have given to this university its life, its color, and much of its significance.

Warren Seavey was born in Charlestown, only a few miles from here, in 1880. He came to Harvard College, receiving the A.B. degree in 1902, and then to the law school where he received the LL.B. degree in 1904, with an A average which would today mean a magna cum laude. He then practiced law for 2 years in Boston. But he was at heart a teacher, and in 1906 he started his work as a teacher which lasted for more than 50 years. His first assignment was in China, at the Imperial Pei Yang University, where he established and operated a law school. It was also rumored that he was quite influential with the Old Empress in the closing days of the dynasty. He was decorated with the Order of the Double Dragon, and he kept mementos of his China days in his office all through his active life.

In 1911, Seavey returned to Cambridge for 1 year as a lecturer on law. He then became a professor at Oklahoma State University, where he stayed for 2 years, then at Tulane University Law School, where he stayed for 2 more years, from 1914 to 1916, and then at Indiana University Law School where he was a member of the faculty from 1916 to 1920. But his work at Indiana was interrupted by the First World War. He was commissioned a captain in the infantry in August 1917, and was assigned to active duty in France. After the close of the war in 1918, he became director of the college of law of the AEF University which was established near Dijon in France. He took on this assignment with enthusiasm and energy, and soon had a large and flourishing law school in full operation under great difficulties. He used to tell with relish how he commandeered mimeograph machines and other items in order to put together case books for use in his school. He was usually just one jump ahead of a court martial, but he claimed, I think rightly, that he was dean of the largest law school then teaching American law. Many members of the Army of the United States must have got their legal start as a result of his devoted work. But, as I have said, he was at heart a teacher. He loved every minute of it.

In 1920, Seavey became the dean of the College of Law at the University of Nebraska. That was a time and place when a dean had to be a man, and Seavey showed on various occasions that he was capable of filling the post. After 6 years there, he started his move east. In 1926, he went to the University of Pennsylvania Law School as a professor of law. In 1927, he came back to Harvard, where he remained a member of the faculty of the law school until his retirement in 1955. For the last 17 years of his tenure, he was Bussey professor of law.

As a teacher Seavey was the acknowledged master of the Socratic method. He questioned, questioned, questioned; and he dissected the students' ideas, and occasionally the students themselves. Though always vigorous in the classroom, he was on the whole a kindly teacher. He liked the students, and he loved to teach. While some faculty members mutter about a teaching load of 6 hours a week, Seavey used to ask the dean to assign him 8 or 9 hours. Naturally there was no opposition to this since he handled the classes so well, and he so greatly enjoyed his teaching.

Seavey's principal fields were agency and torts, and he made substantial and lasting contributions to both areas, as well as to the fields of judgments and restitution. He wrote books and articles in agency and torts, and he played an important part in the writing of the American Law Institute's restatements of agency and of torts, and was primarily responsible for the restatements of judgments and of restitution.

Seavey was not a smooth or polished man. But he was not really gruff, either. He had a measure of reserve; but with that was great loyalty to men and institutions, and devotion to his profession and his students. On many occasions he helped students with loans, always in a quiet and kindly way. Perhaps I may be pardoned a personal reference when I say that when I bought my house in Belmont in 1936 I extended myself to the limit through borrowing at the bank. Just weeks after the mortgage was signed, the lot next door became available. I wanted to have that lot, and it has proved to be a very attractive and useful addition to the house. But I had no money at all. So I went to Warren Seavey, told him my tale, and he immediately reached for his checkbook and advanced the money to me. This was typical of his interest in his associates and his generous spirit.

Seavey was not a warmonger, but he saw sooner than some the way events were developing for the United States in 1939–41. About 1940, he was the principal mover in organizing what was called American Defense—Harvard Group. Many of the participants were members of the law school faculty. The group held regular meetings, and many members made speeches, wrote pamphlets, letters to the newspapers, and so on. Seavey was at the heart of the organization, which played an active role in opposing America First and other isolationist groups of the time.

Then war came, late in 1941. I well remember a meeting of students held in the courtroom shortly after Pearl Harbor. Warren Seavey was one of the speakers. I well remember the occasion. He was calm. He was in no sense exhilarated by the thought of war, but he did tell the students that this was a job that had to be done, that most of them would find it a stimulating and valuable experience. He told them, too, that of course there was some risk, but that most of them would come back—as they had in 1919, and as they did in 1945. It was a very balanced, sober, and extremely useful presentation, and I know it was so received by many of the young men then facing the unknown which he himself had faced in 1917–18.

While the war was on, Seavey wrote to many law students and young lawyers all over the world. Anyone who wrote to him was sure to get a response, a thoughtful, helpful, fatherly answer to the questions which he raised. Toward the end of the war, many of these letters came from people in Tarawa or in Okinawa or in Germany asking about admission to the law school, for Seavey was designated as adviser to veterans. I am sure that the letters he sent were a great comfort to the recipients, for he had a way of writing: "I am glad that you want to come to law school. You are just the sort of man we want. When you are released from service, come to Cambridge and we will be glad to take you in, no matter when you come." Many of these letters turned up, carefully treasured by the men to whom they were sent. Of course we took them in. They were called estoppels by the admissions committee. It would be hard to tell now how many men owed their legal education to the kind and tender spot which Warren Seavey had in his heart for the men who risked themselves in the service of our country in the great war of 1941–45.

In the immediate postwar period, Seavey was a stalwart of the faculty. In 1947, he was chosen by his fellow law teachers to be president of the Association of American Law Schools. He stayed on as a teacher here until he was 75, retiring in 1955. But he then continued to teach—at Boston College Law School, at New York University, at Hastings College of the Law, at the University of Texas, at Vanderbilt University, at Washington University in St. Louis, and for several years at the Wake Forest College of Law. Here he continued his great contributions as a gifted teacher.

I would not say that Warren Seavey did not grow old gracefully. But he did not grow old easily. He was an activist at heart, and he resented the physical impairments which came to him in his later years. But he never gave in. He never surrendered. He was working right up to the day of his death, though he had been in much pain for many years.

In 1914, he married Stella, his devoted wife for more than 50 years, to whom he was devoted, in sickness and in health. They had three children, of whom two survive. They also had many satisfactions, the result of great accomplishments.

Some people have the quality of being great sources of strength for other people. Warren Seavey was such a person. It is fitting that we should pay him tribute. And all of us who knew him, and were influenced by him, owe him our deep and heartfelt thanks.

JANUARY 24, 1966.

Professor Morgan was a giant in the field of evidence. He was a perfect gentleman at all times in his consideration of his students outside the classroom as well as in. Although he treated them with a kind and courteous manner, he had no soft spot toward any particular students and he had no soft spot as to anyone who was misinformed as to the state and existence of the law.

It seems to me the field in which he labored and contributed much toward the establishment of a model code of evidence is one of great importance today, because the terms "due process of law" and the "fair hearing" are not to have their greatest meaning unless we understand the rules of evidence, the rights of confrontation, the rights of cross-examination, and are able to protect and expand the rights of citizens which fully exist only as they are fully exercised.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, during my years at Harvard Law School it was my pleasure to get to know Professor Seavey both in the classroom and to a limited extent socially.

In the classroom my first reaction to this master of the Socratic method of teaching was not a favorable one, as I suppose was the reaction of most first-year students to such a seemingly diabolical method of instruction. But, I came to appreciate after several months of listening to Seavey's famous "Because?" and after getting used to the fact that he was not going to give us any pat answers, that learning, especially in the field of law, was not to be adequately gained by reading treatises or textbooks but by being forced to go through the same or similar mental process which plagued those who were responsible for generating the underlying concepts of the law. Seavey's teaching method, which was not his alone, but I give him credit for it because he was the master of it, served also to make us realize that the law was an ever-changing process designed to meet the exigencies of the day and not a mathematical formula that could be applied forever.

I learned from him socially, the social occasions being too infrequent visits to his office both when I was a student and afterward and from an occasional informal talk at a social gathering, that a lawyer had more than just an obligation to meet his material needs. He instilled in me as I am sure he did in others a greater feeling of obligation to make the world a better place to inhabit. In fact the late professor made it crystal clear that it was a lawyer's highest calling to enter the political arena and thereby help fulfill his obligation to mankind by attempting to innovate and improve the rules men live by.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] wished me to add that he had not had the privilege of personally studying under Professor Morgan but had enjoyed the benefits of his works and wanted me to explain his great respect for Professor Morgan as a teacher.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EULOGY TO THE LATE PROFESSOR WARREN A. SEAVEY OF THE HARVARD LAW SCHOOL

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE] to pay tribute to the memory of a great scholar and educator, the late Prof. Warren A. Seavey, of the Harvard Law School, who recently passed away.

It was my privilege, as a Harvard law student, to study under this great man of the law and thereby come in contact with his vast store of knowledge, his remarkable perceptivity, and his overall humanity.

Professor Seavey was himself a Harvard man, obtaining his law degree in 1904, and entering the practice of law in his native Boston that same year. From 1906 through 1911 he served in the capacity of professor and acting head of the law school at the Imperial Pei-Yeng University in China, where he was awarded the Order of the Double Dragon, by the imperial government. Returning stateside in 1912 Professor Seavey lectured on law at Harvard, and served as a professor at the Universities of Oklahoma, Tulane, and Indiana, before obtaining a captain's commission in the AEF in 1919. As director of the law school at the American Expeditionary Forces University, at Beaune, France, in 1919, he was decorated with the Palmes Academiques, by the French Government. Back in the United States again, in 1920, Professor Seavey was named dean of the law college at the University of Nebraska, where he stayed through 1926. After that, a year at the University of Pennsylvania was followed by appointment to the staff at Harvard Law School where Professor Seavey remained until his retirement in 1955.

Although he was professor emeritus of the Harvard Law School, Professor Seavey continued his distinguished career as an active legal scholar and teacher at the Washington Square College of Law in New York City for several years prior to his death.

Professor Seavey was general editor of the American Case Book series. He personally edited famous casebooks in his special fields of torts, agency, and restitution. His vast erudition in the law made possible his brilliant editorship of the "Restatements of Torts and Agency" for the American Law Institute.

It was, indeed, a pleasure and an honor to study under this great lawyer and educator, whose memory shall linger so long as law prevails.

EULOGY TO THE LATE EDMUND M. MORGAN, FORMERLY OF THE HARVARD LAW SCHOOL

Mr. Speaker, the death of Edmund M. Morgan, for 52 years an outstanding professor of law in some of our greatest universities, is not only a blow to the academic profession, but also to everyone who ever knew, admired, and studied under this most remarkable man.

As a student at Harvard Law School I was privileged to study under him, and came away from the experience convinced that here, indeed, was a man of great distinction.

Born in Mineral Ridge, Ohio, in 1878, Mr. Morgan obtained his law degree at Harvard and practiced law in Duluth, Minn., for a number of years and was elected assistant city attorney of Duluth in 1909, and served in that office for 2 years. Joining the U.S. Army in 1917 Professor Morgan rose to the rank of lieutenant colonel and held the post of Assistant to the Judge Advocate General of the U.S. Army prior to being honorably discharged.

As a law professor Mr. Morgan worked at the University of Minnesota, Yale, Harvard, and Vanderbilt. At the close of World War II he was named principle chairman of a committee which drafted a code of military justice for the Department of Defense. He also served for a time as a member of a U.S. Supreme Court advisory committee on Federal rules of civil service procedure.

Professor Morgan was a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Bar Association, and the American Law Institute. He also was the author of several major books on legal matters, including: "An Introduction to the Study of Law," "Cases of Common Law Pleading," "Cases on Evidence," "The Legacy of Sacco and Vanzetti," "Some Problems of Proof Under the Anglo-American System," and "Basic Problems of Evidence," the last of which works was published as recently as 1963.

A man of brilliance, clarity, and great heart—a man of great talent as a teacher, Professor Morgan won the respect and affection of all who knew him as both a professor and a man.

Mr. HUNGATE. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would simply state that over the doors of the main entrance to the Harvard Law School, inscribed in Latin, are the words which I understand are translated: "Not under man but under God and law." I think all of us revere this country for those principles. I would say that while we live in a land not under man, but under God and law, men such as Professor Seavey and Professor Morgan are essential men if we are fully to understand our obligations and responsibilities under the law and to our God.

COMMUNISM AND THE COLLEGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, a man for whom my admiration is without limit, stated that the Communist Party of the United States is seizing on the current "insurrectionary climate" on American college campuses to serve the Moscow cause.

This statement was written in his monthly letter to U.S. law enforcement officers. In it, he continued by stating that the college student today is "being subjected to a bewildering and dangerous conspiracy" through "a feigned concern for the vital rights of free speech, dissent, and petition."

> On many campuses he faces a turbulence built on unrestrained individualism, repulsive dress and speech, outright obscenity, disdain for moral and spiritual values, and disrespect for law and order.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the House must react to this statement of Mr. Hoover's in one of two ways.

We can ignore it, first of all.

We can say to the people of this country that what Mr. Hoover has said is entirely untrue, that he is mistaken, that there is no harm that can come to this country from the situation he describes.

That is the first thing we can do.

The second is to say, first to ourselves and then to the people, that Mr. Hoover's statement is true in all essential parts.

The difference between these two positions is the difference between the poles. If we take the first position then we have to do nothing. If, however, we take the second position that he has correctly described the condition which exists, then we cannot pass over it and do nothing.

I, for one, see no possible way we can take this first position.

To deny that the turmoil on the Berkeley campus in California is not Communist instigated is simply impossible.

To say that there has not been a decline in moral and spiritual values at the same time there has been an increase in obscenity and, as Mr. Hoover describes it, unrestrained individualism, would be to refute practically every theologian, every social observer in the Nation.

To say that there is no evidence that this strife has not been fomented, agitated, and perpetuated by the Communists would be sheer foolishness.

To hold that the W. E. B. Dubois Clubs which are springing up like mushrooms on campuses from coast to coast are not Communist-supported organizations, would be to deny the accuracy of practically every written report on their activities.

And so, Mr. Speaker, where do we find ourselves? We find ourselves with only one decision inevitable, not two; one position we can take, not two.

We must acknowledge the accuracy of what the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has said and once we have acknowledged it we must take action. We could not call ourselves representatives of the people if we did not. We could not pretend that we are upholding the oath each of us swore when we took office if we know this condition to exist and do nothing about it.

In his monthly letter, Mr. Hoover reports that the Communist Party's spring convention this year will concentrate on plans to win support from this group of students. He suggested that the public oppose the movement by supporting the "millions of youth who refuse to swallow the Communist bait" and by making it clear, "we do not intend to stand idly by and let demagogs make a mockery of our laws."

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, do not intend to sit idly by.

These statements of the Director of the FBI are official pronouncements. They are not rumors, idly conceived. They are facts arrived at through the resources of the Bureau. The head of this Federal agency is reporting to his officers and, indirectly, to this Congress and the people. We cannot turn our backs on him and refuse to hear his warning.

I am, today, introducing a resolution which says:

> That the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the organizations known as Students for a Democratic Society, the W. E. B. Dubois Clubs, the American Youth Peace Crusade, the American Youth for Democracy, Progressive Youth Organizing Committee, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Labor Youth League, and the Black Muslims and to study and report upon their involvement in protests relating to official U.S. policy in Vietnam and for the purpose of aiding the Congress in the consideration of any remedial legislation.

I am prompted to do what I can to support Mr. Hoover for a number of reasons: because I revere this Nation, because I loath communism, because the students who have not "swallowed the Communist bait" need our recognition and support, to name but three reasons.

Each is sufficient; I need not mention others.

I have lent my support to an investigation of the Ku Klux Klan on the premise that un-Americanism should be rooted out of any organization no matter where it exists or what its name is. By the same token and for exactly the same reason, I intend to press for an investigation of these organizations named in my bill. The Director of the FBI has, himself, stated that at least one of them, the W. E. B. Dubois Clubs of America are Communist. His word is good enough for me. It should be enough for any Member to, at least, prompt him to join in a demand for a congressional investigation of it and organizations like it. The House Committee on Un-American Activities will have shirked its duty to the people if it does not conduct these investigations. This is where communism is.

I pray that this body has not reached a point where the Federal Bureau of Investigation can tell us that an organization is Communist and we sit on our hands and do nothing about it.

I think the time has come, instead, that any Member who has any reservation about the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the FBI, or Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, subordinate them all and put the safety, security, and welfare of this Nation first.

I would not have any idea how to tell the people of the Fourth District of Louisiana that I was opposed to an investigation of a known Communist organization dedicated to corrupting the youth of America. I pray that you would have the same difficulty and join me in urging passage of this resolution.

THE 100TH CUBAN REFUGEE FLIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cuban refugee program, which President Johnson inaugurated in a speech at the foot of the Statue of Liberty on October 3, 1965, has passed an important milestone.

With the completion of the 100th flight on Monday, February 14, 1966, more than 8,700 Cubans, including hundreds of families, have been given a haven from Communist tyranny through the help and generosity of the American people.

While Dictator Castro is bent on the destruction of the family as the foundation of Cuban society, the people of this country have extended a helping hand to these Cuban refugees by uniting their families so that they can return to their homeland when that country is again free.

Of the 8,700 Cubans arriving in the United States since the new exodus began on December 1, 1965, approximately 5,300 or 61 percent of the refugees have been resettled in communities throughout the United States, while an estimated 3,400 or 39 percent have been reunited with families and relatives in the Miami area.

A preliminary survey of the operations of the program by the legislative assistant of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality reveals that the refugees are being forced to leave Cuba with only 44 pounds of luggage.

Castro is stripping these refugees of all their worldly possessions. By seizing their belongings, Castro is banking hundreds of millions of dollars in an effort to bolster his shaky economy.

Because of the national and internal significance of the Cuban refugee program, the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, of which I am chairman, is making a full-scale study of the program—its benefits and problems.

From time to time, as the study progresses, I will make regular reports—both formal and informal—to the Congress outlining the information gathered by the subcommittee.

NATIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker 2 weeks ago today the National Traffic Safety Act was introduced in this House and in the Senate. The bill would establish a National Traffic Safety Agency.

Thirty-eight Members of the House and Senate from 27 States have already joined as sponsors of this important legislation. These sponsors come from Hawaii to Maine and from Washington and California to Florida. There has been a significant national response to this mounting national problem.

I call upon Members of the House and Senate to join with us in an effective attack on what has been called the national problem second only to national defense.

The urgency for public hearings, enactment of the bill, and swift executive action has been pointed up by recent development.

On February 11, the National Safety Council released casualty figures for 1965. These statistics show that 4,940 American citizens were killed last December—the worst single month on record. They report 49,000 men, women, and children killed during 1965. An estimated 1,800,000 individuals suffered disabling injuries.

Economic losses continue to mount. The council says direct financial loss totaled $8.5 billion, of which $3 billion came from damaged and destroyed property. The remainder of the cost resulted from wage loss, medical expense, and overhead cost of insurance.

Second, the inadequacy and ineffectiveness of present public and private efforts is apparent. Existing Federal activities are fragmented and incomplete and all other proposals introduced or rumored are fragmented and incomplete. State legislatures and local legislative bodies are floundering and failing because there is no national leadership in our Government to which well-intentioned legislators and local officials can turn to find accurate answers as to what constitutes "uniform" legislation in the field of traffic safety and to many other questions. A National Traffic Safety Agency offers our best hope for vigorous and effective leadership.

The declared purpose of our bill is to reduce the extent of death, injury, and loss of property resulting from traffic accidents by providing the means for a concerted attack on the problem through the establishment of a National Traffic Safety Agency headed by a highly qualified Administrator; the establishment of a National Traffic Safety Center which would bring together public and private information and research; and a national program for traffic safety which shall seek to achieve a uniform national traffic safety environment by means of vigorous application of knowledge as to the principal causes of traffic accidents, death, and injuries.

The following 23 Members of the House are sponsors of the bill: JAMES A. MACKAY, Democrat, of Georgia; JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of California; JOHN HANSEN, Democrat, of Iowa; RODNEY M. LOVE, Democrat, of Ohio; WILLIAM ST. ONGE, Democrat, of Connecticut; ROBERT T. ASHMORE, Democrat, of South Carolina; WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Democrat, of Maine; RUSSELL TUTEN, Democrat, of Georgia; HAROLD D. DONOHUE, Democrat, of Massachusetts; GEORGE W. GRIDER, Democrat, of Tennessee; JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, Democrat, of Washington, HERVEY G. MACHEN, Democrat, of Maryland; SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Democrat, of Hawaii; EDWIN REINECKE, Republican, of California; CHARLES L. WELTNER, Democrat, of Georgia; SAM M. GIBBONS, Democrat, of Florida; Fernand J. St Germain, Democrat, of Rhode Island; John C. Culver, Democrat, of Iowa; James C. Corman, Democrat, of California; J. Irving Whalley, Republican, of Pennsylvania; Abraham J. Multer, Democrat, of New York; Richard D. McCarthy, Democrat, of New York; and Charles P. Farnsley, Democrat, of Kentucky.

Senator Hartke, who introduced the bill in the Senate, has been joined by 14 of his colleagues. They are: Gordon Allott, Republican, of Colorado; E. L. Bartlett, Democrat, of Alaska; Birch Bayh, Democrat, of Indiana; Alan Bible, Democrat, of Nevada; Joseph S. Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; Paul H. Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois; Ernest Gruening, Democrat, of Alaska; Daniel K. Inouye, Democrat, of Hawaii; Gale W. McGee, Democrat, of Wyoming; Lee Metcalf, Democrat, of Montana; A. S. Mike Monroney, Democrat, of Oklahoma; Joseph M. Montoya, Democrat, of New Mexico; Frank E. Moss, Democrat, of Utah; and Claiborne Pell, Democrat, of Rhode Island.

THE SPECTER OF A NUCLEAR HOLOCAUST

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, in the press of our routine duties, I fear we are sometimes prone to give only perfunctory attention to the transcendent issues over which we can exert little individual influence.

It is entirely proper that we should concern ourselves with the affairs of our own constituents, our district, our State, and our country. But we must not overlook what is today the paramount concern of all mankind—the specter of a nuclear holocaust which could destroy in one searing moment all of the accomplishments of man since the dawn of civilization.

That is the dread prospect which we must live with day by day. There is not much that any one of us can do to dispell it. But we must each do what we can. It is for that reason that I wish to associate myself with numerous of my colleagues in submitting the accompanying resolution, supporting the President in his continuing efforts to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

It goes without saying that the malignant nuclear growth is only a symptom of a deep-rooted disease that has afflicted mankind since its primeval beginnings—a deadly fear that is nurtured by distrust, suspicion, and hatred. In the long run we can only eliminate the symptom by wiping out the sickness.

As the most powerful Nation in the world it is up to us to reassure our neighbors that they need not join in the nuclear scramble; that the road to peace and security leads through the valley of understanding. Let us point the way.

WILL THERE BE A SUBWAY STATION TO SERVE LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME FAMILIES AT THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS SUCH AS THE ADMINISTRATION PROVIDED AT THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STADIUM?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I include in the Congressional Record a report to the Congress by the National Capital Transportation Agency concerning the feasibility of providing a subway station at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. The report states, among other things, that:

> Increased construction costs would result from the longer subway construction (1,360 feet), the additional Cultural Center station, and more difficult engineering problems relating to curves, grades, and geological conditions. The increased cost of this realinement is estimated at $12.3 million, but this added cost will be even greater if:
>
> 1. The George Washington University and others insist upon compensation for easements on a "highest and best use" or other expensive basis;
>
> 2. Buildings in the Columbia Plaza development currently under construction must be underpinned;
>
> 3. Detailed soils investigation of the difficult geological site of a Cultural Center station disclose further problems in addition to those currently assumed.

This NCTA report makes clear that in addition to a minimum cost of $12.3 million, major problems and difficulties will be encountered in placing a subway station at the Kennedy Center. The trustees of the Kennedy Center, as well as Roger L. Stevens, chairman of the Board of Trustees, have repeatedly declared that a subway station will be provided at the Kennedy Center but have not lifted a finger to provide one. Rather, the strategy of the Center's chairman, Roger L. Stevens, and its Board of Trustees, is to have the Kennedy Center "constructed and completed," and thus foreclose forever any reconsideration of its manifold problems, "by the time the NCTA commences design of the line to Rosslyn." This plan of battle was first outlined October 15, 1965, by Roger L. Stevens in a 14-page memorandum he privately circulated to 144 signers of a petition relating to the location of the Kennedy Center.

In this memorandum Roger Stevens said:

> We hope that by the time the NCTA commences design of the line to Rosslyn, the Center will have been constructed and completed. There is every reason to believe that NCTA and its engineers and experts will take into consideration the Center and the adjacent housing facilities and locate the station as near the Center as feasible. With these facts in mind, there is no merit to the statement that there will be "no station near the Center."

In my statement in the Congressional Record on October 1, 1965, I said, with regard to locating a subway station at the Kennedy Center, such as the administration has provided at the District of Columbia Stadium, that:

> The rapid transit route recently approved by Congress will not serve the riverfront site now designated by the Kennedy Center.
>
> I am sending this information to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark]. Yesterday, recognizing the need for accessibility, he recommended that the subway route be altered to provide a station at the Center. This should have been brought up at the time the subway bill was voted a couple of weeks ago. The route of the subway, which does not serve the Center, is part and parcel of the act as passed by the Senate and House and signed by President Johnson. If the Senator's solution is a practical one, that too would require immediate hearings on an amendment of the Rapid Transit Act. Certainly Senator Clark, who was once the mayor of the great city of Philadelphia, should know that many thousands of Philadelphia Orchestra subscribers travel to the centrally located Academy of Music via the municipal subway which conveniently serves it.

Many competent and concerned observers have repeatedly questioned whether the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and the trustees of the Kennedy Center have really given the same quality of sustained thought and planning to the many problems of the Kennedy Center including a subway, jet plane noise, and its location, which the Smithsonian Regents have given to the location of the other art branches of the Smithsonian Institution such as the National Gallery of Art, the National Portrait Gallery, and the National Collection of Fine Arts—not to mention the National Air and Space Museum—which, significantly, are all located in the very heart of Washington for easy and ready access by constituents from all over the Nation. The very same logic which justifies the location of these great institutions in the heart of the Nation's Capital rather than at its periphery, calls for the location of the Kennedy Center in the heart of the city also for it must have public patronage if it is not to become a white elephant and be a continuing financial drain on the public purse in the years ahead.

It is most significant that growing criticism is at last being made of Kennedy Center planning. Both of the trustees from the District of Columbia, where the Center is located, Walter N. Tobriner, President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and William H. Waters, Jr., chairman of the District of Columbia Recreation Board, have joined in supporting Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, in his justified criticism of the planning that has been carried on at the Kennedy Center under Roger L. Stevens. In a letter to Roger L. Stevens under date of November 22, 1965, Dr. Ripley pointed to the views of President Kennedy regarding the role of the Center, a reminder that was certainly long overdue:

> Writing of the Center, President Kennedy said: "It was not conceived as a group of halls and theaters to benefit Washington audiences alone * * *. The Center will, I hope, become in the broadest sense an educational as well as a cultural institution." It was in the spirit of this mandate and of this hope that the Regents of the Smithsonian welcomed the decision to establish the Center as a bureau of the Institution. They stood ready, as they do today, to offer all possible assistance to the Board and officers of the Center in the furtherance of these high objectives. I am writing now in the conviction that, unless positive steps are taken immediately, we will fail to take full advantage of the magnificent opportunities implicit in the Center.

Recently Dr. S. Dillon Ripley advised me that he had brought my bill, H.R. 11785, to provide a subway station at the Kennedy Center, to the attention of Chairman Roger L. Stevens "for any comment he may have on H.R. 11785." Perhaps, now that the report of the National Capital Transportation Agency on the excessive cost of such a subway station has been made public, Mr. Stevens may wish to make his views publicly known on this matter.

President Johnson on February 14, 1966, sent Congress the annual report of the National Capital Transportation Agency, but he did not mention the little matter of a subway station at the Kennedy Center which is essential if it is to be readily accessible to the millions of Americans from all parts of the Nation, and their families, who will wish to attend the Kennedy Center when they visit the Nation's Capital—and 7 million Americans do visit the Nation's Capital each year. Obviously, Chairman Roger L. Stevens has not mentioned the matter of a subway station to the President, for, in his letter transmitting to Congress the annual report of the National Capital Transportation Agency, President Johnson said:

> The Congress can be assured, however, that all of these problems are being given the fullest and most diligent consideration, and that none of them will be allowed to stand in the way of an uninterrupted schedule of construction.

I feel that my own concern about the location of the Kennedy Center is fully supported by the report of Walter J. McCarter, Administrator, National Capital Transportation Agency, and by the letter Dr. S. Dillon Ripley sent to Roger L. Stevens last November.

The Congress and the trustees of the Kennedy Center should review the present plans. We are told it would be costly to do so—yes, it would be at some cost, but it would save millions of dollars in an effort to bail out an economically infeasible location as experience dictates.

I include as part of my remarks the following items:

NATIONAL CAPITAL
TRANSPORTATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1966.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIDNALL: Because of the questions which you and others have raised concerning the nature of rail rapid transit service to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and more particularly concerning the feasibility of including in rapid transit plans a station within or contiguous to the Center, this Agency has again considered the matter and we are now able to report on the results of our efforts.

The transit system authorized by Congress will provide the Center with service from the station authorized by Congress at 23d and H Streets NW. Service to the Center will be in keeping with the objective standards by which the Agency designed the downtown distribution pattern which appears in the Agency's report of November 1, 1962. Then and now we feel it would be inconsistent to design the system to render specialized service.

Rapid transit serves best when it serves the greatest number of people daily and in the usual course of community affairs. To obtain maximum revenues for the heavy investment required for the system—and to render maximum service to the community—a system was designed primarily to serve commuters and shoppers having downtown as their destinations. These will be constantly recurring trips; on an annual basis the time saved by the public will be immense.

Certain anchor points for the system were selected; one of them the Capitol. Another anchor point is Rosslyn, Va., an impressive center of employment and development only 4 minutes from downtown Washington by transit and an ideal base point for transit lines to be extended ultimately throughout northern Virginia. It is the line from downtown to Rosslyn which will serve the Cultural Center and provide service according to the standards adopted for the entire system.

In the 1962 plan the station locations in the center city were selected on the basis of circumstances expected to obtain in the year 1980, using National Capital Regional Planning Council, Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Study and local planning agency projections concerning the extent and location of employment. Upon reference to the 1962 report it will be seen that 68 percent of downtown jobs in 1980 would be within a 5-minute walk (1,250 feet) of a transit station, and 92 percent of those jobs within an 8-minute walk (2,000 feet). We find a walk of approximately 6 minutes required for a distance of somewhat under 1,500 feet from our 23d and H Street station to the Cultural Center. Thus, although not situated immediately adjacent to a station of the system, the Center will be well within the normal service area of a station already authorized by Congress. The distance of the Center from the nearest station is consistent with the distance of various other attractions in the city from other center city stations.

In their own interests, the Center may wish to enhance the relationship to the station by constructing a pleasant above-ground walkway from the station to the Center along the principal avenue of approach. Such a walk would afford patrons arriving by transit a stimulating view of the building and its riverside setting. It may be worth mention that a very handsome approach for pedestrians has been planned by the staff of the National Capital Planning Commission.

In contrast, if the station were adjacent to or under the Center, the approach for patrons would be through the basement of the building with no opportunity for them to experience and to respond to the beauty of the Center and to the meaning of the Center as a memorial to President Kennedy.

In the planning activities of the agency it has been contemplated—and it remains so—that the Rosslyn line is to be placed in operation in 1972, with construction to begin in 1970. Design of the Rosslyn line and its stations will be initiated about 2 years before construction begins. As with stations on other lines, the exact location of the station proposed at 23d and H Streets has not been finally determined upon and location will be fixed as engineering and other details affecting location are more precisely determined.

The determination of these details is, of course, a continuing process and decisions thus far have been based upon matters already ascertained. Present station locations and system alinement have been selected on the basis of objective standards as to service, prudence in investment, and feasibility and efficiency of engineering and operations. Any change in the proposals must take into account the effect upon investment, the effect upon operating costs, and the nature of the service which might be accomplished by the change. To provide specialized transportation service to the center would be very costly in terms of initial construction and would increase operating and maintenance costs throughout the years.

In our reexamination of the alinement of the Rosslyn line and its stations we continue to feel that the physical task and the costs which would be involved in rerouting the authorized system to serve a station in the basement of the Cultural Center would be of formidable dimension. It would be necessary to reroute the line to proceed southwesterly from the presently authorized station at 18th and H Streets NW., under approximately 41 parcels of property (including 20 parcels owned by the George Washington University) and to enter the alinement of F Street at 21st Street. A new station would be required in the vicinity of 22d Street and F Street to replace the station lost at 23d and H Streets. The route would then continue underground to the Cultural Center station and thence under the Potomac River to the presently authorized station beneath Rosslyn.

This change in the system would increase construction, operating, maintenance, and land acquisition costs. Revenues would not be increased to compensate for those added costs. The quality of service rendered to 30 million riders each year on the presently authorized line would be impaired to serve the modest additional number of Cultural Center patrons who might ride rail transit if a station were in the basement of the center instead of at nearby 23d and H Streets.

Increased construction costs would result from the longer subway construction (1,360 feet), the additional Cultural Center station, and more difficult engineering problems relating to curves, grades, and geological conditions. The increased cost of this realinement is estimated at $12.3 million, but this added cost will be even greater if:

1. The George Washington University and others insist upon compensation for easements on a "highest and best use" or other expensive basis;

2. Buildings in the Columbia Plaza development currently under construction must be underpinned;

3. Detailed soils investigation of the difficult geological site of a Cultural Center station disclose further problems in addition to those currently assumed.

Increased operating and maintenance costs would result from the added stop and the longer run. Service would be slowed approximately 1¾ minutes between the 18th and H Streets station and northern Virginia due to the increased running time and additional stopping time. Slower service invariably decreases patronage and hence decreases revenues, all other factors being equal.

In our view, no increase in transit patronage can be expected for realinement. The number of new passengers picked up on the realined route would be offset by an approximately equal number of passengers lost from the 23d and H Streets community and those lost due to slower travel times, while the intermittent rail transit volume from Cultural Center patrons would be speculative since attendance at the center would vary with the box office success of the various attractions. And, whatever degree of success the Center might enjoy, with rail transit available at the 23d and H Streets station within reasonable walking distance of the Center, rail patrons will be assured of service without the expense which realinement would entail.

It is my sincere hope that this discussion provides you with helpful information. The Agency is at your disposal for any additional information or assistance you may require.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER J. MCCARTER, *Administrator*.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
Washington, D.C., November 22, 1965.

Mr. ROGER L. STEVENS,
Chairman of the Board, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ROGER: I am writing to raise with you once again issues of the most fundamental importance for the John F. Kennedy Center.

Public Law 85-874, which established the National Cultural Center, instructs the Board to: (1) present classical and contemporary music, opera, drama, dance, and poetry from this and other countries; (2) present lectures and other programs; (3) develop programs for children and youth and the elderly (and for other age groups as well) in such arts designed specifically for their participation, education, and recreation; and (4) provide facilities for other civil activities at the Cultural Center.

Writing of the Center, President Kennedy said: "It was not conceived as a group of halls and theaters to benefit Washington audiences alone * * *. The Center will, I hope, become in the broadest sense an educational as well as a cultural institution." It was in the spirit of this mandate and of this hope that the Regents of the Smithsonian welcomed the decision to establish the Center as a bureau of the Institution. They stood ready, as they do today, to offer all possible assistance to the Board and officers of the Center in the furtherance of these high objectives. I am writing now in the conviction that, unless positive steps are taken immediately, we will fail to take full advantage of the magnificent opportunities implicit in the Center.

In March 1964, I wrote to you as President of the Board to call attention to some of the educational possibilities of the Center and to record the Smithsonian's special interest in assisting in the realization of these possibilities. In the intervening months I have continued my efforts to focus attention on this aspect of planning for the Center. In April of this year, for example, I wrote to you:

> I would like to reemphasize at this time the interest which we at the Smithsonian have in plans for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.
>
> The Smithsonian is particularly interested in cooperating with the Kennedy Center in "off-hour" and "off-season" programing of an educational nature to supplement the normal programing at the Center.

At that time I forwarded an eight-page memorandum outlining possible educational activities.

Again in May I wrote, "As you know, the Smithsonian Institution is much interested in the possibilities of the Center's educational potential." At that time I suggested the possibilities of the appointment of an assistant or associate director responsible "for educational programs, for lectures, and similar public events providing for contact with the visitors." Now that we seem to be nearing the time for the appointment of the Center's artistic director, and now that physical construction of the Center is about to begin, I feel that I must once again raise the general question of the objectives and programs of the Center.

I cannot emphasize too strongly my conviction that what is at stake here is not the question of whether some educational activities will be included here and there in the Center's program, but rather the question of what the Center itself is all about. Unless all of our actions—the formulation of the program, the choice of director, the design of the physical facilities—are informed by an imaginative regard for creativity and a deep sense of social responsibility, I very much fear that all our energies and expenditures will produce nothing but a lifeless marble shell.

An examination of the plans for the building and of the program committee's guidelines suggests very strongly that the Center is now coming to be viewed primarily as a showcase for works created somewhere else and brought here briefly for the pleasure or edification of local audiences. Only the most limited provision has been made for rehearsal rooms, workshops, studios, and the other facilities required for the creation of works of art, rather than simply for their performance. This impression that the Center is thought of as a passive receptacle for shows from elsewhere, rather than as an active generator of new works and new productions, is confirmed by the guidelines:

> The Center * * * should seek out and sponsor the best in American music, theater, opera, dance, and film; it should provide a sendoff for American performing groups sent abroad * * * it should open its facilities to foreign governments * * * etc.

None of these is in any way an unworthy or inappropriate activity, but what is striking is that the guidelines leave so little room for anything more positive or creative.

Accepting for the moment the notion that the Center should be devoted to the display rather than the creation of works of performing art, we may ask to whom these works will be displayed. Do the guidelines offer any clues as to the nature of the proposed audience? The seventh guideline states, in rather equivocal language, that the Center: Should make available a fair amount of seats in the performing halls at low prices for students, young people, and those in straitened circumstances.

Does fair mean equitable, and, if so, what is an equitable amount of seats? Or, does fair mean just passable? And do we propose to administer a means test at our ticket windows? Taken together, the architecture and the guidelines give the impression of a grudging acceptance of the necessity of doing something for some of those who cannot or do not normally frequent our centers of culture. What is totally absent is an emphatic statement of a determination to do something for this, the great majority of our city and our country. And something in this context must mean more than merely reducing prices.

What, then, of the legislative mandate to develop programs "designed specifically for participation, education, and recreation"? Here again the guidelines are almost completely silent. Apart from passing references to "exhibits relating to the performing arts," and "educational programs in the arts," nothing is said of any of the possible programs that might be used to involve large numbers of people in the Center's activities. On the contrary, the guidelines explicitly state that:

> The Center, while recognizing its responsibility to welcome and encourage Washington-based performing groups, should not give these groups permanent prerogatives or facilities.

Although the precise meaning of these words is unclear, the tone again is one of acceptance of a minimal responsibility. This refusal to make any commitment to local performing groups seems virtually to eliminate all possibility of repertory companies and of wide popular participation in the artistic work of the Center.

Taken together, the impression of the proposed activities of the Center deviates widely from objectives of the Smithsonian Institution in its concern for all the people. The concept of providing a splendid showcase for the very best performances is certainly not a contemptible one. By all means let some of the 52 weeks of the year be devoted to this objective. But if all we are doing is creating a more lavish setting for what already goes on in Washington, of saving people the trouble of traveling to New York to go to the theater or the opera, surely we are neglecting the great opportunity that has been given us to do something that will really make a difference in the life of the Capital and of the Nation.

It is possible here only to suggest a few of the things that might be done to meet the responsibilities implicit in the direction of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

One thinks, for example, of the imaginative Theater National Populaire of Jean Vilar. Here, in a single weekend, at a cost of about $4, one may attend a concert, have a cold dinner and see a play on Saturday, and on Sunday take part in a discussion involving actors and audience, attend a matinee, an evening performance and a dance. Here special school matinees, including discussions of the play to be performed, are regularly held; here the building and snackbar are opened at 6:30 and there is an early curtain so that theatergoers may get home on public transportation, and in time to work the next day; here ordinary performances cost from 20 cents to $1. Here, in short, a deliberate and imaginative effort has been made to involve the poor, and the rest of the nontheatergoing population. Now a similar Theater Lyrique Populaire, also under Vilar's direction, is being built for opera performances.

While Vilar's scheme is not something to be slavishly imitated, it does show an awareness of public needs and an imaginative determination to meet these needs which would be welcome in the current planning for the Kennedy Center.

Surely some program of this kind could be developed for the people of Washington and, particularly in the summertime, for the hundreds of thousands of tourists who come here to visit—often from parts of the country in which performances of high quality are simply not available. Attractive "packages" of artistic performances, educational events and recreation could be devised; tickets could be made readily available throughout the country—perhaps at post offices—at modest prices; other cultural, educational and recreational attractions of the Washington area could be included in these "packages."

As another example, one thinks of the extraordinary success of New York City's Shakespeare in the Park and Philharmonic in the Park programs, which have attracted huge audiences by making free performances available. Should not the magnificent facilities of the Kennedy Center be used, at least occasionally, in the same way?

The French-American Festival under the direction of Lukas Foss at the Lincoln Center last summer attracted a new kind of audience to Philharmonic Hall. Washington is surely a natural setting for events of this sort.

Again, one thinks of the almost unlimited educational opportunities at all levels that might be offered by the Center. Playwrights and composers-in-residence, performances by and for children, exhibits, classes, lectures, apprenticeships—all these should be viewed not as ancillary activities to be reluctantly fitted in among the "important" events of the year, but rather as the very heart of the Center's program.

The direction of a center for the performing arts raises choices strikingly similar to those that are faced by every museum director: choices between passive display and active education, between mere curatorship and creative scholarship, between stylish exclusiveness and broad inclusiveness. It is vitally important, I repeat, that the Kennedy Center, like the Smithsonian itself, should make its choices in a mood of imaginative creativity and with a deep sense of its responsibility to the local community and to the Nation.

Sincerely yours,

S. DILLON RIPLEY, *Secretary*.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 19, 1965]

BROADER AUDIENCE ASKED OF PLANNERS FOR KENNEDY CENTER

S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, has urged planners of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts to give greater consideration to the educational and recreational needs of tourists and Washington residents.

In a letter to Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the Center's Board of Trustees, Ripley, an ex officio member of the Board, expressed concern that in planning the Center more attention be given to creation of works of art, providing low prices for students and poor people, and making use of the hall for educational and recreational events.

Ripley said yesterday the letter was intended as a guide to the Trustees in choosing an artistic director for the Center, which is expected to occur within the next month. Copies of the letter, dated November 22, were distributed to the press by Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, who obtained it from one of the Trustees. WIDNALL has been a vocal critic of both the Center's plans and location.

The Kennedy Center is technically a branch of the Smithsonian.

Ripley's letter said that "unless all of our actions—the formulation of the program, the choice of director, the design of the physical facilities—are informed by an imaginative regard for creativity and a deep sense of social responsibility, I very much fear that all our energies and expenditures will produce nothing but a lifeless marble shell."

Ripley said yesterday he wrote Stevens after seeing the building plans and a set of preliminary guidelines circulated among the Trustees by the Center's Program Committee, the body that is now sifting names for an artistic director.

"I got the feeling that it was being planned for a snappy kind of people coming up in mink coats," he said. "With a 12-month situation there are going to be plenty of everyday occasions when something can be done for the rest of the population."

Ripley made these points in his letter:

An examination of building plans and the guidelines "suggests very strongly that the Center is now coming to be viewed primarily as a showcase for works created somewhere else and brought here briefly for the pleasure and edification of local audiences. Only the most limited provision has been made for rehearsal rooms, workshops, studios."

Not enough attention is being given to encourage a broad range of audience for Center activities. "What is totally absent is an emphatic statement of a determination to do something for this, the great majority of our city and country."

Ripley offered as model the Theater National Populaire in France which offers weekend "packages" for a minimal rate. These include, at a cost of about $4, several performances, meals, and discussions involving actors and audience.

"But if all we are doing is creating a more lavish setting for what already goes on in Washington * * * surely we are neglecting the great opportunity that has been given to us" he said.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 22, 1966]

NATIONAL COMMUNITY USE URGED FOR KENNEDY CENTER

(By Leroy F. Aarons)

Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner said yesterday the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts cannot be allowed to become "a marble palace," but must be a "national community house for all the people in the city and the country."

Tobriner thus joined the growing argument over how "democratic" the Center should be, lending his strong endorsement to a November 22 letter from S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, to Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the Center's Board of Trustees.

FEARS EXCLUSION

Ripley in his letter expressed a fear that the Kennedy Center would cater exclusively to those who can afford high-priced artistic events at the expense of students and the poor. He urged that provision be made for low-priced tickets and off-season cultural and recreational activities involving local residents and tourists.

Tobriner, who with Ripley is an ex officio member of the Center Board, said he is concerned that the Center's planners may be going off in the wrong direction. In a letter this week to George Frain, legislative aid to Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Tobriner said he envisions the Center "as a settlement house for the arts."

Tobriner told a reporter yesterday he intends to bring the matter up at the Board's next meeting on February 7.

Support for Ripley's position also came yesterday from William H. Waters, president of the District of Columbia Recreation Board. Waters, too, is an ex officio member of the Center Board.

AMEND GUIDELINES

In a letter to Stevens, Waters proposed that the Center amend its guidelines to provide time and space for present Recreation Board-sponsored activities, such as the Children's Theater, the Shakespeare Summer Festival, the Washington Ballet, and others.

He also suggested that "at an appropriate time" the Center seek funds to build an annex to house rehearsal, storage, and workshop facilities for Washington-based performing groups.

Waters cited Congress' decision to make the President of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners and the Recreation Board chief members of the Center Board in the basic legislation as evidence that "Washington does have a special interest in and a special claim upon the Center's facilities, perhaps even a priority in access to them and in arrangements, financial and other, under which these facilities are made available."

Waters noted that many Recreation Board-sponsored activities are off season "and can be scheduled at a time when there would be a minimum conflict in bookings with the high budget, imported attractions which the Center will quite properly accommodate."

He added that with the Center's limited funds, additional appropriation or endowment money would be needed to accommodate the local program, and urged that steps be taken in that direction "at the earliest appropriate time."

Stevens, reached in New York, said he had not read the Waters letter and could not comment.

Ripley's letter to Stevens was a private communication, but a copy was obtained by Representative WIDNALL. WIDNALL has been a vocal critic of the Center's site and program plans.

Ripley later said that the strongly worded letter was designed as a guideline to the Center's trustees in choosing an artistic director. It was learned this week that selection of a director is still distant.

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Dec. 19, 1965]

KENNEDY CENTER OUTLOOK CALLED "LIFELESS" BY RIPLEY

(By Betty James)

The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts is in danger of becoming "a lifeless marble shell" and "a passive receptacle for shows from elsewhere," Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, believes.

Dr. Ripley sounded his warning in a letter to Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Center.

The letter was made public yesterday by the office of Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey. WIDNALL's office said it was made available to the Congressman by a member of the Board of the Center, who told WIDNALL the letter is being circulated by Ripley to the trustees for comment.

WIDNALL has introduced a bill to relocate the Center, scheduled to be built along the Potomac River, to near Pennsylvania Avenue, which he says has "a vital and identifiable relationship to President Kennedy. Such a location also would be readily accessible to several million more citizens a year," he said.

RECALLS KENNEDY'S WISH

Ripley addressed himself to the way in which the Center would be used. President Kennedy himself, he noted, said it should become an educational as well as a cultural institution. And it was in the spirit of this mandate that the regents of the Smithsonian welcomed the decision to establish the Center as a bureau of the Institution, Ripley wrote Stevens.

Ripley is an ex officio member of the Center Board.

"I am writing now in the conviction that, unless positive steps are taken immediately, we will fail to take full advantage of the magnificent opportunities implicit in the Center," he said.

An examination of the plans for the building and of the program committee's guidelines suggests very strongly that the Center now is coming to be viewed primarily "as a showcase for works created somewhere else and brought here briefly for the pleasure or edification of local audiences," Ripley said.

SEES PROVISIONS LIMITED

"Only the most limited provision has been made for rehearsal rooms, workshops, studios, and the other facilities required for the creation of works of art, rather than simply for their performance," he added.

The guidelines are almost completely silent on any of the possible programs that might be used to involve large numbers of people in the Center's activities, although the legislative mandate calls for developing programs "designed specifically for * * * participation, education, and recreation," he said.

Ripley also complained about references in the guidelines to providing "a fair amount of seats * * * at low prices for students, young people, and those in straitened circumstances."

He asked, "Does 'fair' mean 'equitable'? and if so, what is an equitable amount of seats? Or, does fair mean just 'passable'? And do we propose to administer a means test at our ticket windows?"

Ripley declared, "Taken together, the impression of the proposed activities of the Center deviates widely from objectives of the Smithsonian Institution in its concern for all the people.

"The concept of providing a splendid showcase for the very best performances is certainly not a contemptible one. By all means let some of the 52 weeks of the year be devoted to this objective.

NEGLECTING OPPORTUNITY

"But if all we are doing is creating a more lavish setting for what already goes on in Washington, or saving people the trouble of traveling to New York to go to the theater or the opera, surely we are neglecting the great opportunity that has been given us to do something that will really make a difference in the life of the Capital and of the Nation."

As an example of the kind of thing the Center should be considering, Ripley cited the Theater National Populaire of Jean Vilar.

"Here, in a single weekend, at a cost of about $4, one may attend a concert, have a cold dinner, and see a play on Saturday, and on Sunday take part in a discussion involving actors and audience, attend a matinee, and evening performance and a dance," he said.

The building and snack bar are opened at 6:30 and there is an early curtain so theater goers may get home on public transportation, and in time to work the next day; ordinary performances cost from 20 cents to $1, he said.

"Here, in short, a deliberate and imaginative effort has been made to involve the poor, and the rest of the nontheatergoing population," Ripley said.

FAVORS WIDE SALE

This kind of program could be developed by the Center, and the hundreds of thousands of tourists planning visits to Washington could be given a chance to buy tickets at home, perhaps at post offices, at modest prices, he said.

Playwrights and composers in residence, performances by and for children, lectures, apprenticeships, all should be viewed "not as ancillary activities to be reluctantly fitted in among the 'important' events of the year, but rather as the very hearts of the Center's program," Ripley said.

HOUSE FOLDING ROOM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, someone needs to update the old saying that "haste makes waste." With the situation facing the House folding room, a more appropriate statement would be that "waiting is a worse waste." Of what use is it to a Member of Congress to mail an end of the session report, if it is not mailed until mid-February?

This is no laughing matter. Yesterday on a visit to the folding room I found just this very situation. For myself I was checking to see how the folding and inserting of my annual questionnaire was proceeding. These operations are no small concern. Let me stress that this was not a taxpayer's expense. But it is a waste of the taxpayer's time and a Congressman's money if this correspondence is not mailed until it becomes outdated.

Let me hasten to stress that this is not the fault of the hard-working employees in the folding room or their chief, Mr. Eli Bjellos. These people are working 12- and 14-hour shifts with no extra pay for overtime. Instead of providing funds for extra shifts and overtime as our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol do, Members of the House are frugal with their appropriations and lavish with their demands.

To meet this need it has been necessary to resort to forcing crews to work overtime without pay and to even impose on the already overburdened Government Printing Office to help fold, stuff, and seal correspondence from Members of Congress.

For lack of storage space the folding room has been forced to store thousands upon thousands of envelopes, newsletters, questionnaires and other correspondence in the halls adjoining the House folding room, thus creating a fire and health hazard.

I want to compliment the folding room and suggest a more realistic appropriation be considered next year.

ARMENIAN REVOLT AGAINST THE SOVIETS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow Armenians and their friends throughout the world will commemorate the 45th anniversary of the Armenian people's revolt against the Soviet Union. Unfortunately, despite their heroism, the brave Armenians were overcome by force of arms and remain to this day captives of communism. Of course, they are forbidden to celebrate this great day in their history by their present Red tyrants.

We must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to the brave Armenian people and all the other captives of communism. One effective method of calling the world's attention to the captivity of millions of Armenians and other peoples would be for the House to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and I have been urging the establishment of such a committee for years, but so far have met with the resistance of the administration and Democrat congressional leaders to this proposal.

The uprising of the Armenian people in 1921 was especially tragic since the Soviets had seized their land only 2 months earlier under the guise of protecting it. Freedom-loving people everywhere share the desire of the Armenians to be free and independent, and we must take practical steps to keep up their courage and determination.

The Voice of America should provide lengthier and more effective broadcasts to pierce the wall of Communist propaganda and deliver the truth to the people of Armenia. As we know, Mr. Speaker, in recent years the Voice of America has been cutting back both its hours of broadcast in the Armenian language and in the nature of these broadcasts. The Voice of America gives daily straight news and is fearful of offending the Soviet Union under present administration policy. However, the brave people of Armenia deserve the truth. The Voice of America should be a vehicle for delivering the message of truth to them so that they would not be brainwashed and their resistance weakened by the constant propaganda from their tyrannical Moscow oppressors.

CONCENTRATION CAMP FOR DOGS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the devotion of a dog to his master is scarcely greater than the average American's devotion to the family dog or cat. It is certainly evident in the volume of mail I am receiving in the wake of Life magazine's February 4 article, "Concentration Camp for Dogs." Like so many of my constituents I am saddened and outraged by the inhumanity exposed in this excellent picture story.

The Minshall family has always had household pets, the usual gamut of dogs, cats, rabbits, and the like. We currently are the proud owners of Chessie, a Chesapeake Bay Retriever, and of Fritz, a cat of dubious ancestry. We would not want to part with either of them.

None of the conditions exposed in the Life article is new. Ever since I first came to Congress in 1955 we have had legislation pending to enact strong penalties for the theft and inhumane treatment of animals. I have answered literally thousands of letters from concerned pet owners over the years, assuring them of my interest in seeing such laws enacted. Yet the bills have stayed in committee.

I am today introducing identical legislation and urge other interested colleagues to do likewise, in the hope that this will spur remedial action by the Congress this year.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program under which States may be assisted in developing programs for the detection of the illegal use of drugs by students.

The best way to get to the problem of narcotics addiction is to get to the root of the problem. The legislation I am introducing would provide for Federal grants to States in order that the States may set up programs for the examination of schoolchildren for narcotics addiction. The State programs would have two facets—they would concentrate on periodic examinations of those schoolchildren who voluntarily submitted to examination and they would underwrite educational work in the schools in connection with narcotics addiction and what it can do.

The question of compulsory examination of students is complicated by possible constitutional difficulties, although that is clearly the best way to catch addiction or keep it from ever starting. The next best thing to this would be State programs which would be compulsory except on production of a note from the student's parents. This would satisfy any constitutional problems and it would expose any student in high schools and elementary schools to a choice between examination or a note from his parents. This two-sided pressure would, I am sure, cut down on narcotics addiction.

I am hopeful that Congress will view these proposed programs favorably. I think that they would make inroads on our Nation's growing dope addiction problem.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, the House Republican Task Force on Agriculture recommended two steps aimed at simplifying and streamlining the present maze of farm laws and regulations.

The first part of our recommendation is that titles 7 and 16 of the United States Code should be codified into permanent law. In the process, various obsolete provisions should be dropped, confusing verbiage should be clarified, and a logical streamlining of this statutory material should be made.

Second, the Office of the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture should prepare and distribute a concise and accurate digest of agricultural laws, explaining how and to whom they apply, the functions of the appropriate agency in the Government which administers each law, the procedures for appearance and appeal within the Department, together with other pertinent information which would be useful to farmers, the general public, the press, the legal profession, the universities, and Members of Congress.

The task force report on this subject lists several examples of confusing, illogical, and obsolete provisions that now appear in the agricultural law books.

One curious provision of agricultural law mentions "corn" eight separate times—then a footnote explains that the word "corn" really means "wheat."

It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that many farmers—as well as city people—get lost in this jungle of legal mumbo-jumbo. Certainly the law can speak plainer than that.

With a 4-year farm program presently in effect, now would be an ideal time for Congress to act promptly to get our farm laws in order. Clarity is a prime requisite to an understanding of any law. With the complexities and great economic significance of farm laws these days, it is essential that they be clearly understood by everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the full text of the minority agriculture task force report be included in the RECORD at this point.

A HOUSE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE REPORT: LET'S SIMPLIFY OUR FARM LAWS

An indignant farmer reportedly wrote to his Congressman recently and said: "I just visited the ASC committee and some ninny down there told me that oats wasn't a feed grain, would you please explain that to my mule, I sure can't."

Of course, oats are a feed grain in the everyday world that farmers live in, but under the Government's farm program "feed grains" are defined as follows:

"The term 'feed grains' means corn, grain sorghums, and if designated by the Secretary, barley, and if for any crop the producer so requests for purposes of having acreage devoted to the production of wheat considered as devoted to the production of feed grains, pursuant to the provisions of section 328 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, the term 'feed grains' shall include oats and rye and barley if not designated by the Secretary as provided above: *Provided*, That acreages of corn, grain sorghums, and if designated by the Secretary, barley, shall not be planted in lieu of acreages of oats and rye and barley if not designated by the Secretary as provided above: *Provided further*, That the acreage devoted to the production of wheat shall not be considered as an acreage of feed grains for purposes of establishing the feed grain base acreage for the farm for subsequent crops."[1]

It's no wonder that the farmer and his mule were confused. They aren't alone. Other farmers as well as lawyers, Members of Congress, college professors, lobbyists, Department of Agriculture employees, and the public often have a great deal of difficulty in trying to understand and interpret our maze of farm laws and regulations.

The noted public opinion analyst and writer, Mr. Samuel Lubell, has commented on this lack of understanding as follows:

"For most of the urban population the farm problem doesn't come into focus. It's just one blurred image after another. Mainly, I believe, this can be traced to two things—a general feeling of futility that anything effective can be done about the farm problem and second, that urban people find it extremely difficult to identify personally with the farm problem. * * * Today it is relatively rare to meet someone who even knows anyone who does any farming. Many agricultural phrases sound like a foreign language."[2]

We recognize, of course, that our whole way of life is becoming more complex and intricate and that those good old simple days are gone forever. But that doesn't mean we should allow our agricultural programs to become so confusing that their terminology sounds like a foreign language.

Certainly we must have some degree of complexity and technicality in a body of law as large and far-reaching as is that which is administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Complexity cannot be avoided, but our laws and programs can and should be logically organized, simplified, and where possible streamlined.

The need for better understanding and clearer communication is obvious. If farmers specifically and the public generally do not understand the programs which are in effect, these programs are simply going to be ineffective.

While there are many examples of confusing and inarticulate provisions in our various farm laws, the most flagrant and repeated offenders are obsolete provisions, confusing verbiage, and illogical organization.

OBSOLETE PROVISIONS

Our farm laws are full of obsolete provisions that not only occupy space and require unnecessary printing but also cause avoidable confusion.

In the latest edition of the United States Code (1964) there are some six pages of text dealing with the 1961 through 1965 feed grain programs. While some of these provisions are still of legal significance, most of this material is now obsolete and is only of historical interest at best.[3]

Normally one would expect to find the statutory reference to feed grains somewhere in title 7 of the United States Code (which is devoted to agriculture). Not so, however, in this case. The feed grain program, for some inexplicable reason, is carried in title 16—Conservation. Other commodity programs, however, appear in title 7.

CONFUSING VERBIAGE

A classic example of a provision containing confusing verbiage is found in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. When one reads section 326 of that statute, he gets the distinct impression that it has something to do with corn. It reads as follows.

"SEC. 326. (a) Whenever in any county or other area the Secretary finds that the actual production of corn plus the amount of corn stored under seal in such county or other area is less than the normal production of the marketing percentage of the farm acreage allotments in such county or other area the Secretary shall terminate farm marketing quotas for corn in such county or other area.

"(b) Whenever, upon any farm, the actual production of the acreage of corn is less than the normal production of the marketing percentage of the farm acreage allotment, there may be marketed, without penalty, from such farm an amount of corn from the corn stored under seal pursuant to section 324 which, together with the actual production of the then current crop, will equal the normal production of the marketing percentage of the farm acreage allotment.

"(c) Whenever, in any marketing year, marketing quotas are not in effect with respect to the crop of corn produced in the calendar year in which such marketing year begins, all marketing quotas applicable to previous crops of corn shall be terminated."

As things turn out, however, this section has nothing whatsoever to do with corn. The Agricultural Act of 1954 repealed its application to corn, but still another farm bill came along to make paragraphs (b) and (c) applicable to wheat.

Thus in a section of law which mentions the word "corn" eight separate times, the reader is advised by a footnote that "corn" for the purposes of this section really means "wheat."[4]

---

[1] Sec. 16(i) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended by Public Law 89–321, approved Nov. 3, 1965.

[2] Remarks of Samuel Lubell, "Third Annual Farm Policy Review Conference, December 1962," Ames, Iowa, CAEA report 16, p. 138.

[3] 16 U.S.C. 590(p)(c), 590(p)(d), 590(p)(e), 590(p)(f), 590(p)(g), 590(p)(h).

ILLOGICAL ORGANIZATION

If you are really interested in decoding puzzles, take a look at section 8C(2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, reenacted and supplemented by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended. Then try to decide whether or not this section, which lists the commodities that are covered by marketing orders, really applies to apples produced in Minnesota for canning or freezing. (No cheating now, only 10 readings allowed.)

Here is what it says:

COMMODITIES TO WHICH APPLICABLE

"(2) Orders issued pursuant to this section shall be applicable only to (A) the following agricultural commodities and the products thereof (except canned or frozen grapefruit, cherries, apples, or cranberries, the products of naval stores, and the products of honeybees), or to any regional, or market classification of any such commodity or product: Milk, fruits (including filberts, almonds, pecans and walnuts but not including apples, other than apples produced in the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, New York, Michigan, Maryland, New Jersey, Indiana, California, Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, and not including fruits for canning or freezing other than olives, grapefruit, cherries, cranberries, and apples produced in the States named above except Washington, Oregon, and Idaho), tobacco, vegetables (not including vegetables, other than asparagus, for canning or freezing), hops, honeybees and naval stores as included in the Naval Stores Act and standards established thereunder (including refined or partially refined oleoresin): *Provided,* That no order issued pursuant to this section shall be effective as to any grapefruit for canning or freezing unless the Secretary of Agriculture determines, in addition to other findings and determinations required by this Act, that the issuance of such order is approved or favored by the processors who, during a representative period determined by the Secretary, have been engaged in canning or freezing such commodity for market and have canned or frozen for market more than 50 per centum of the total volume of such commodity canned or frozen for market during such representative period; and (B) any agricultural commodity (except honey, cotton, rice, wheat, corn, grain sorghums, oats, barley, rye, sugarcane, sugarbeets, wool, mohair, livestock, soybeans, cottonseed, flaxseed, poultry (but not excepting turkeys), eggs (but not excepting turkey hatching eggs), fruits and vegetables for canning or freezing, and apples), or any regional or market classification thereof, not subject to orders under (A) of this paragraph, but not the products (including canned or frozen commodities or products) thereof. No order issued pursuant to this section shall be effective as to cherries, apples, or cranberries for canning or freezing unless the Secretary of Agriculture determines, in addition to other required findings and determinations, that the issuance of such order is approved or favored by processors who, during a representative period determined by the Secretary, have engaged in canning or freezing such commodity for market and have frozen or canned more than 50 per centum of the total volume of the commodity to be regulated which was canned or frozen within the production area, or marketed within the marketing area, defined in such order, during such representative period. No order issued pursuant to this section shall be applicable to peanuts produced in more than one of the following production areas: the Virginia-Carolina production area, the Southeast production area, and the Southwest production area. If the Secretary determines that the declared policy of the title will be better achieved, thereby (i) the commodities of the same general class and used wholly or in part for the same purposes may be combined and treated as a single commodity and (ii) the portion of an agricultural commodity devoted to or marketed for a particular use or combination of uses, may be treated as a separate agricultural commodity. All agricultural commodities and products covered hereby shall be deemed specified herein for the purposes of section 8c(6) and (7) of this title."[5]

Now you know, apples produced in Minnesota for canning or freezing are not covered by marketing orders.

Wouldn't this section be improved if it were rewritten? Wouldn't it be more clear and logical to say:

> Orders shall apply only to the following agricultural commodities and the products thereof:
>
> 1. Milk.
> 2. Fruits (except certain ones).
> 3. Turkeys.
> 4. Etc.

WHAT TO DO

While we could belabor other plentiful examples of poor legislative language and delve into all the reasons why our various farm laws got into their present sad state of affairs, we feel this would be of little benefit in correcting the problem. The time has come to do something about the situation.

We therefore make two recommendations.

First, we recommend that titles 7 and 16 be codified into permanent law during this session of the 89th Congress. As every lawyer knows, most titles of the United States Code are only prima facie evidence of the positive law. Only those titles which have been specifically enacted by Congress into positive law are really the law of the land. At present 17 of the 50 titles of the United States Code have been enacted into positive law.[6]

In addition, bills relating to other titles are also being prepared for introduction. When the whole code is finally codified, it will be legal evidence of the general and permanent law and recourse to the numerous volumes of the Statutes at Large, and various public laws will no longer be necessary.[7]

With the passage of a 4-year omnibus farm bill and a 5-year sugar act during the past session, we recommend that Congress deem it both convenient and timely to consider the codification, simplification, and streamlining of all the laws applying to agriculture.

Second, we recommend that the Office of General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture prepare and distribute to the public a digest of our major agricultural laws. This booklet should not be a definitive and precise legal instrument, but, rather, a general description in plain and nonlegalistic language describing the various statutes, how and to whom they apply, the functions of the appropriate agency in the Government which administers each law, the procedures for appearance and appeal within the Department of Agriculture, and other pertinent information which would be of use to practicing attorneys who are not specialized in agricultural law and to interested Members of Congress and the general public.

These two actions—codifying and streamlining titles 7 and 16, together with publishing a concise and accurate digest of agricultural laws, would go a long way toward dispelling the feeling of many people that Mr. Lubell described when he said: "The writing of farm legislation has become a conspiracy against public understanding."[8]

TIME TO STOP OUR ALLIES FROM AIDING OUR ENEMIES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gurney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to prohibit any vessel or shipping line doing business with the Communists in North Vietnam from carrying U.S. cargoes. The shocking fact that in 1965 there were more free world ships than Communist ships engaging in trade with North Vietnam, makes the legislation which I propose today of vital concern to every American.

The bill I propose today amends the Merchant Marine Act by providing that no article shall be transported aboard vessels of any shipping interest which allows vessels under its control to be used in trade with North Vietnam.

The exact figures for free world shipping into Haiphong are classified information which the State Department will not release to the American people. Ho Chi Minh, Mao Tse-tung, and Kosygin all know, but it is top secret information to be kept from the American people. But through the fog that surrounds the issue, it is clear that our allies are giving invaluable aid to the Vietcong—107 of the 119 allied ships known to have entered the port of Haiphong in 1965 flew flags of NATO countries.

The State Department claims that because much of the material traded is not strategic, this doubledealing by our allies is somehow all right. It seems to me that one does not have to be a trained diplomat to see beyond that argument. The more nonwar goods that are carried on free world ships, the more Communist ships are freed for war materials. It seems equally obvious that to a war economy such as North Vietnam's, the provision of any goods, whether they are war supplies or domestic necessities, is giving them aid and comfort.

Those shipping lines which pick up cargoes in American ports would either have to give up their Vietcong business or ours. Great Britain, probably the worst offender, claims that it has no control over its private shipping lines except in wartime. They have made no move to comply with the official requests of our Government that they cease their

---

[4] 7 U.S.C. 1326(a), 1326(b), 1326(c), and footnote.

[5] 7 U.S.C. 608(c)(2).

[6] Vol. 1, U.S.C. (1964) p. V (these are: Title 1—General Provisions: Title 3—The President; Title 4—The Flag, The Government, etc.; Title 6—Official and Penal Bonds; Title 9—Arbitration; Title 10—Armed Forces; Title 13—Census; Title 14—Coast Guard; Title 17—Copyrights; Title 18—Crimes and Criminal Procedure; Title 23—Highways; Title 28—Judiciary and Judicial Power: Title 32—National Guard; Title 35—Patents; Title 37—Pay and Allowances of the Uniformed Services; Title 38—Veterans Benefits; and Title 39—The Postal Service).

[7] Ibid. 6, p. IX.

[8] Ibid. 2, p. 140.

North Vietnam trade. My bill would take the problem out of the hands of the diplomats and the British Government and let us deal directly with the offending shippers.

It is no wonder that Hanoi thinks it can scare the United States out of Vietnam. Although we fight on land, we make no effort to blockade or otherwise prevent our own allies from loading and unloading merchandise in Haiphong. If this would not convince Ho Chi Minh that our involvement there is a half-hearted one, nothing would.

We already have a similar cargo ban on those ships trading with Cuba, and we are not at war with them. Why should we not operate such a blacklist against ships aiding a regime that is daily killing our American boys?

I call upon the Johnson administration for immediate passage of this bill. We are engaged in a major war. We should take the necessary actions to conclude this war. This action is simple, easy, and long overdue. Let us do it.

THE REASON WHY THE UNITED STATES IS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President of the United States addressed the school administrators convention in Atlantic City and put into its proper perspective the whole question of why the United States is in Vietnam. He also stated unequivocally that the United States will not be driven out of Vietnam.

It is my hope that those who have been carrying on the vendetta against America's participation in the struggle for freedom in Vietnam will heed what the President said yesterday and will study carefully the testimony presented by General Taylor today before the other body.

The President quite properly pointed out that the issue in Vietnam is not a struggle over a piece of real estate known as South Vietnam but, rather, a struggle in support of a fundamental question as to whether we will give the Communists an opportunity to develop this entirely new type of warfare all over the world.

In order to understand our involvement in Vietnam we must understand several other things. This country has built up an awesome Defense Establishment, so awesome that it has made major war totally unthinkable for the world. There is no question that our fleet of Polaris submarines and our Strategic Air Command with its B–52's and our guided missiles, which are capable of sending nuclear warheads across continents and oceans, have certainly helped us finally to reach that point in the world's crossroad when the major powers realize that any major military confrontation will be too costly and too devastating for all sides involved. We have made world holocaust too costly for anyone to seriously consider a major nuclear third world war. There can be no question that our vast Military Establishment is today proving itself the very deterrent it was designed to be against a third world war. The fact that neither the Soviet Union nor China have joined Hanoi on a major scale proves conclusively that major war would appear to be out of the question at this time.

So the Communists have now gone the other way. They have developed a new technique, a technique which they call wars of liberation but which are nothing more than wars of subversion and terrorism against the established order in nation after nation; small, dirty wars, but no less devastating to the institutions of freedom where they are not stopped.

Two weeks ago I described here on this floor—and my remarks appear in the RECORD of January 20, on page 869—the blueprint that the Communists have spelled out for similar wars such as they are waging in Vietnam today to be waged on three major continents of the world, that is, in Asia, in Africa, and in South America. The Communists spelled out their blueprint for world conquest through terrorism and subversion during their Tricontinental Congress which was held in Havana, Cuba, from January 1 through January 15.

Now, how foolish could we be to walk away from South Vietnam today when the Communists have publicly announced that they intend to proliferate this new concept of terror and subversion in every single nation on three continents if they get away with such subversion in South Vietnam?

How can anyone fail to see what devastating plans the Communists have for a whole series of "Vietnams," when they have boldly, brazenly, and arrogantly told us—in public—of their new attacks on the institutions of freedom on three continents?

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to compliment the gentleman on the floor for the fine statement he is making.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the commendation of the gentleman from Illinois with just this one additional comment. We are getting quite a bit of mail now about pulling out of Vietnam and saying it is a grave mistake that we are there, because they want peace.

If I may contribute this much to the gentleman's remarks, I would say that I always write back and say, "Yes, we are yearning for peace, and I do not think that there is a Member of this body that does not want peace as much as you do, but we have to ask ourselves immediately two questions: The first is what kind of peace? And the second question is, for how long?"

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois for the fine statement he is making to the House here today. The President is eminently correct when he brings forcibly to the attention of the educators, the administrators of education in this country, the fact that there is more than a piece of real estate at stake in Vietnam; that there is a principle involved and that this issue is a phony one with the Communists. These so-called wars of liberation must not be allowed to succeed because they are subversive in nature and they do not serve the best interests of mankind either in this land of freedom or anywhere else on the face of the earth. Therefore, I congratulate the President and I commend him for his steadfast attitude. In turn, I congratulate the gentleman from Illinois for reminding the House again of a position from which we cannot depart.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. I think every single American and every single person in this world who wants peace and freedom ought to offer a prayer of thanksgiving that we have a President who has the courage and the wisdom to understand the global aspects of Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I belong to that school which sincerely believes that the Communists are in more trouble in Vietnam today than we are. We are winning in Vietnam. Our American troops are scoring impressive victories every day. Those who have been imploring the President to pull out, to give in, to walk away are obviously blind completely to the fact that while we have had difficulty in fighting this very unusual war, we are still winning. We have never had a war like this to fight before. Here you do not know who the enemy is. You cannot find them. They work in the fields during the day and then engage in their terrorism and subversion at night. You cannot identify whose forces they are. So, admittedly, there are serious problems for our side in meeting this enemy, but our troops and the Korean troops and the Australian and South Vietnamese and other troops of all our other allies—and we do have allies in Vietnam—have finally found the winning combination.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the Communists who are in trouble in Vietnam. I believe one has the right to believe, without arousing too much optimism, that China is losing its effort to set itself up as the great spokesman of all of the Communists of the world.

I believe that the psychological and the diplomatic defeats which China has suffered in Africa and in Asia—and is now suffering in South America—gives all of us hope that perhaps the war situation could change very suddenly.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say that we can be proud of the American people. The American people want to see this war ended. But, I am certain, they want it ended with victory for freedom.

Earlier today we heard testimony before one of our committees by General Hershey, discussing the draft and what it is doing to the young people of this country. Of course, all of us are concerned about this. We all pray fervently that we can bring the entire Vietnam situation to the negotiating table, but pulling away some from North Vietnam, would only whet the appetite of the Communists and would only open the door for more Communist aggression, as the President so eloquently stated yesterday.

Retreat from South Vietnam would represent an open invitation to Communists over all this world to engage in similar subversion, and similar terrorism, in every country into which they can get.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that standing with the President is the only way to proceed. I believe Mr. Johnson has charted a sound course.

The President has held out the olive twig in one hand, but has not abandoned our responsibilities, from a military standpoint, on the other hand.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope and honest belief that with the victories which our troops are scoring in Vietnam today we have at least more reason to hope today than ever before that the war in Vietnam can take a very sudden turn and victory could be ours.

I should like to include at this point an editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times which points out China's setbacks. I believe this is an extremely important editorial and fortifies my belief that with all of her setbacks, China might very well stop coercing Hanoi to continue its aggression in Vietnam. We pray to God this might be so and the conflict in Vietnam terminated soon.

The Chicago Sun-Times editorial follows:

Paper Dragon?

Red Chinese plots for subversion and revolt have recently been uncovered in the Middle East and in Africa, where a number of nations have broken off diplomatic relations with Peiping. Similar plots have been uncovered or smashed in other areas.

In Indonesia, a Red Chinese attempt to take over that government was met with force and destroyed. In Cuba, Premier Fidel Castro denounced Peiping as an aggressor after uncovering a Chinese Communist plot to subvert his army.

Russia is moving toward an open break with Chinese communism and even Albania, long Peiping stalwart in Eastern Europe, is now reported to be turning to Moscow.

It adds up to acute embarrassment for Peiping diplomats—and it raises a doubt that Red China's dragon is as fierce as it has been advertised.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman speaks of the help we are receiving in Vietnam, and the draft call upon Americans.

I want to say that outside of South Vietnam, the Australians—a token force of Australians—and a very few New Zealanders, as well as the South Koreans and the United States, who else is shedding any blood? Who else is getting killed in Vietnam?

Mr. PUCINSKI. May I say to my very distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], who is a member on the Committee on Foreign Affairs—and I respect him for his good and sound judgment—I know that the gentleman knows perhaps better than most Members of Congress, by virtue of the fact that he is on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and is privy to many things that perhaps the rest of us do not have—that this is a troubled world. There are many trouble spots. Our allies are making their contributions in various parts of the world. Perhaps they cannot be with us in Vietnam to the extent we would like to have them participate. Take the British, for instance. They are holding Malaysia. Also there are other places around the world in similar situations.

Mr. GROSS. I did not know there was a war going on in Malaysia.

Mr. PUCINSKI. There is not, but there certainly would be war if we did not have the forces over there to maintain peace. Take, for instance, the Middle East, and take many other parts of the world. We have a peacekeeping force now in the Middle East. The gentleman from Iowa knows the situation is not that simple. One cannot say that we have a problem in Vietnam and, therefore, that we must concentrate every effort there on the part of our allies, because that in itself would be an invitation to other aggressors, other aggressions, and other upheavals which would only confront us to a greater degree at other places.

Mr. Speaker, the pattern is very clear. I certainly would like to see more of our allies assist us in Vietnam. I join the gentleman from Iowa in that expression, if that is what the gentleman is suggesting. I join him in that hope.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman well knows that from 139 nations in the world we are receiving no assistance, no help at all with reference to the war which is going on in North Vietnam. This is what requires the drafting of the youth of this country. I do not like it a bit.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois will come to my office I will show the gentleman a complete rundown compiled by the Department of State in the last few days, showing just how little the rest of the world is helping us in North Vietnam.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa, and the gentleman knows that I have taken the floor many times urging that our allies give us greater support. But, having said this, I am sure the gentleman is not suggesting that because we are not receiving any help we should walk away from North Vietnam?

Mr. GROSS. Not at all.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Of course not.

Mr. GROSS. Of course not. But I certainly think that the rest of the world, the so-called free world friends of ours, should be making some contribution in the form of manpower to the effort in North Vietnam, and I hope that the gentleman believes that, far more than they are making today.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I should like to assure the gentleman I share his views. It is my hope that sooner or later many of our allies are going to understand the global aspect of Vietnam. But I hope the Vietnam conflict does not last that long. It is my firm and honest conviction that by standing firmly behind our President and behind the people of this country who today are overwhelmingly supporting the President in his determination to stand firm in Vietnam, we can look forward to victory with confidence. There was some doubt some time ago about our ability to win in Vietnam, but I think today there is no doubt. As the President yesterday quite properly pointed out, they are not going to drive us out of Vietnam. With the victories our soldiers have scored in the last few weeks, the Vietcong, Hanoi, and Peiping itself is going to understand finally that we are in Vietnam to stay until victory is ours. It is the Communists who now must make the decision, and I have every hope they will realize victory can no longer be theirs—and let us intelligently and peacefully negotiate a settlement.

DR. RALPH S. LLOYD RETIRES

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Krebs). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House the retirement on February 1 of Dr. Ralph S. Lloyd, Chief Dental Officer of the Public Health Service.

Dr. Lloyd has devoted the whole of his professional life to the Public Health Service. His distinguished career, spanning more than 30 years, has left an indelible stamp on the quality and vitality of the Dental Corps.

As Chief Dental Officer, a post that he held for the past 4 years, Dr. Lloyd strengthened recruitment procedures and formalized a dental career development program. In this position of leadership, he gave full expression to the concern for career development that had occupied him since an early date.

Always interested in enriching the professional experiences of those with whom he served, Dr. Lloyd made it possible for young officers to draw on his exceptional knowledge and clinical skills, particularly in the field of maxillofacial prosthetics in which he is an acknowledged authority. As Chief of the Dental Department of the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital in Baltimore during 1948–53, he established a prototype dental internship program. This program has been used since not only in the Service but also in many civilian hospitals.

Dr. Lloyd was the first dentist assigned to the Clinical Center of the National Institutes of Health. During the 9 years that he served as Chief of the Dental Department, he introduced many innovations, contributing to improved research techniques and patient care.

Never content with current procedures in dental materials and equipment, Dr. Lloyd developed ingenious solutions to technical problems in clinical dentistry. For example, he recognized at an early date the potential advantages of the use of the water spray technique, experimented with several spray devices first available, and made recommendations for improvement of the equipment. In addition, by the modification of thermocouples, he studied the heat production of cutting instruments in relation to pulpal trauma.

Recognizing the tremendous advances that could be made in dental materials and technology, Dr. Lloyd in 1963 established the intramural Dental Materials Committee of the Service. Under his leadership, the research effort of the Service in this field has been greatly expanded.

In 1964, Dr. Lloyd served as adviser to the Expert Committee on Health Statistics of the World Health Organization on the Review of the International Classification of Dental Diseases. That same year, he helped to successfully resolve the problem of Cuban refugee dentists in the Miami area by arranging for the assignment of a Public Health Service dental officer to supervise the refugee clinic, by encouraging the development of short-term refresher for the Cuban dentists, and by coordinating these activities with those of the American Dental Association.

There are few areas in dentistry in the Public Health Service that have not felt the impact of Dr. Lloyd's able leadership and contributions. The Public Health Service is richer not only for the 30-odd years that Dr. Lloyd has devoted to it but also for his many innovations that will remain a lasting heritage. We all wish him well in his retirement.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce, for appropriate reference, the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1966, a bill to encourage greater cooperation and coordination among Federal, State, and local governments and to improve their effectiveness in dealing with the many problems which face our Nation. This bill would, I believe, go far toward establishing a full partnership among these levels of government, and strengthening our great federal system of government. The challenges which face this Nation will demand that duplication and friction among these levels be minimized and that cooperative efforts be exploited to the fullest. This bill is a part of the President's program to develop a "creative federalism." To quote his budget message delivered to the Congress on January 24:

> Favorable action should be taken on the proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act, already before the Congress. This act would improve the administration and facilitate congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid. It would also provide a means for coordinating intergovernmental policy in the administration of grants for urban development.

Mr. Speaker, we have responded to a host of pressing national problems, each of which needed the efforts of all levels of government for their solution. Neither the executive nor the legislative branch has had an opportunity until now to develop a comprehensive framework for Federal-State-local relationships, especially as they arise in grant-in-aid programs. The number of such programs has been rapidly increasing in the last decade and there are now more than 120 grants on the books. The 1st session of the 89th Congress alone enacted approximately 25 new Federal grant programs or major expansions of existing programs.

To demonstrate the many ways in which this bill would make a positive contribution to our federal system, let me briefly outline its provisions. It consists of six major substantive titles: Improved administration of grants-in-aid to the States; congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to States and to local units of government; permitting Federal departments and agencies to provide specialized or technical services to State and local units of government; coordinated intergovernmental policy and administration of grants for urban development; acquisition, use, and disposition of land within urban areas by Federal agencies in conformity with land utilization programs of affected local government; and establishing uniform Federal relocation practices.

The impact of these titles on present relationships can be summarized as follows:

First, assure that Governors could obtain full information on grant programs in their States for budgetary purposes. This title, prepared by Bureau of the Budget staff, also provides a uniform method of handling grant funds and scheduling Federal transfers to the States; and allows the waiving of the single State agency provision and use of other suitable administrative arrangements, subject to Federal approval.

Second, establish a congressional policy to study new grant programs after 5 years.

Third, authorize Federal departments and agencies to render technical assistance and training services to State and local governments on a reimbursable basis. This will enable State and local governments to avoid the expense of unnecessary duplication of specialized or technical services, and permit more economical use of Federal facilities.

Fourth, establish a coordinated intergovernmental urban assistance policy. It grants priority to general local governments in eligibility for Federal aids, and requires that applications for Federal loans or grants affecting urban development be reviewed by general local governments and metropolitan area planning agencies for consistency with existing plans and objectives.

Fifth, prescribe a uniform policy and procedure for urban land use transactions undertaken by the General Services Administration. Acquisition, use, disposal of land in urban areas by this agency shall be consistent, to the extent possible, with local zoning regulations and development objectives.

Finally, the bill would establish a uniform Federal policy of relocation payments and assistance for all persons, businesses, and farm operations displaced by direct Federal programs and programs conducted through Federal grants-in-aid. It requires that all such grant-in-aid programs assure that standard housing is provided or being provided to those displaced and authorizes Federal participation in the cost of relocation payments.

Intergovernmental relations, especially in Federal grant-in-aid programs, has been the subject of considerable attention in both Houses of the Congress. During the last session, the Senate passed the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act by a unanimous vote. It was cosponsored by 43 Senators from both sides of the aisle, from all parts of the country and including those representing predominantly rural as well as predominantly urban States.

Also during the last session, a number of my colleagues in the House sponsored companion measures including the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Fountain], the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Mackay], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow]. These measures are currently before the House Committee on Government Operations along with the Senate-passed bill, S. 561.

I think it is important to call attention to the fact that this proposal has not only the full support of President Johnson, but also that of a number of bodies and organizations whose primary concern is improving intergovernmental relations. For example, it is based on the findings and recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, established by Congress to provide for a continuing study of ways to improve our Federal partnership. Representatives of all levels of government, including three Members each from the House and the Senate, sit on that Commission. The proposed act also has the backing of the four organizations which represent State and local officials—the Council of State Governments, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, and the National Association of Counties. Last fall, these four groups wrote a joint letter to the President, the Vice President, and other officials of the executive branch formally indicating their support for the measure and urging the President to make it a part of his program. I would suggest that a bill which represents the consensus of all levels of government can only lead to the improvement of the system within which they operate.

This review of the provisions of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1966 makes clear why it has been passed by the Senate, supported by the President, and why this body should act without delay. The enactment of this legislation will be an important step toward achieving that "more perfect union" which we all seek.

SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the millions of Americans who help finance about $50 billion of the public debt by investment in U.S. savings bonds were gratified by the announcement by President Johnson yesterday of the raising of the interest rate from 3¾ to 4.15 percent.

Although the increased rate was announced yesterday, it is retroactive to December 1, 1965, and applies not only to new buyers of bonds but also to bonds in existence as of December 1, 1965. On Series E bonds the increased rate is made effective by reducing the maturity time to 7 years, from 7 years and 9 months, so that a buyer who now pays $18.75 for the lowest denomination of Series E bonds will be entitled to receive $25 at the end of 7 years.

The interest increase provides a real opportunity for Americans to help themselves by embarking on a guaranteed savings program while at the same time helping their country. The benefits of the safety and security of savings bonds are well known. The safety of the investment is guaranteed, and if savings bonds are lost or stolen they are freely replaced.

For those buyers who may wish to defer their income taxes on investments until some later time, such as their retirement, the purchase of bonds provides them with an effective investment yield which is often difficult to obtain any place else.

The President, in making the savings bonds more attractive from the investment standpoint, fulfilled an earlier commitment to do so. The President has noted that a successful savings bonds program is of particular urgency in the face of our defense of freedom in Vietnam and as a deterrent to inflation.

The operations of the U.S. savings bonds program have been of interest to me as chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations for some time, and particularly in the light of the increasing rates available on private investment opportunities.

I am delighted that the assurances which Secretary of the Treasury Fowler had given me that the matter of changing the return rate on savings bonds was under constant Treasury scrutiny, have been proven to be accurate. I commend the President and the Secretary of the Treasury for this action in the interest of the American people.

I urge all those who already are participating in the savings bonds program to give consideration to increasing their participations, and all those who do not buy U.S. savings bonds to embark on a worthwhile savings plan which will be helpful to them individually, and their country.

DISCRIMINATION IN ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a proposed Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966 dealing with discrimination in the administration of justice. This bill was drafted by the Civil Rights Leadership Conference, a coordinating committee of religious, civic, and labor organizations dedicated to elimination of discrimination under law. Through the years the leadership conference has proved itself to be a careful, responsible organization that has sponsored or endorsed legislation only after careful evaluation of its legal and social validity. This current proposal reveals that same degree of care and skill.

The need for Federal legislation to protect Negroes and civil rights workers from intimidation and violence was dramatically shown last year by a disgraceful series of acquittals in southern State courts. In November, I pointed to the need for Federal legislation which would:

First. Make a Federal crime of violence and threats of violence against civil rights workers and Negroes who seek to assert their federally guaranteed rights; and

Second. Establish a procedure for transfer of such cases from State courts to Federal courts where the Attorney General concludes that a fair trial cannot be held in the State court.

Title II of the leadership conference bill covers both these points in what appears to me to be exemplary fashion.

I trust that under the leadership of its great chairman, the dean of the House [Mr. CELLER], the Judiciary Committee will soon hold hearings on this and other bills that may be introduced to deal with racial discrimination in the administration of justice. In the course of such study, the present bill could be perfected to make it more effective and to resolve any legal problems it presents. I offer it for the consideration of our colleagues with the hope that it may stimulate creative thinking in an area of vital need.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SPEECH AT ATLANTIC CITY

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCGRATH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to note that last night, President Johnson came to Atlantic City, in New Jersey's Second District, which I have the honor to represent, to deliver an important address concerning the Vietnamese war and topics of domestic urgency before the convention of the American Association of School Administrators.

Accompanying President Johnson on his trip to Atlantic City were New Jersey Senators CASE and WILLIAMS, New Jersey Congressmen RODINO, CAHILL, FRELINGHUYSEN, GALLAGHER, HELSTOSKI, HOWARD, JOELSON, KREBS, MINISH, PATTEN, and myself, and the Reverend Billy Graham.

The fervor with which the President was greeted at the Atlantic City airport, despite darkness and heavy fog, was, I feel, an indication of the support which his southeast Asian policies find throughout the Nation and certainly in New Jersey's Second District.

Because of the importance of the message he delivered to the school administrators, Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues would find his remarks make worthwhile reading and, therefore, I am placing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. President Johnson's text follows:

> I am honored to accept your award and happy to be here with the big brass of American education. I might have been with you tonight under other auspices—except that 30 years ago I left teaching for a different pursuit.
>
> Tonight, our professions differ, but we have the same task: to build a society worthy of freemen. Two hundred years ago, our fathers laid the foundations. Two years ago, I challenged my fellow citizens to get on with the job. I said that we must build the Great Society in our cities, in our countryside—and in our classrooms.
>
> Tonight our work is underway. Much of the needed legislation has been enacted: more than a score of landmark measures in the field of education alone.
>
> It is a thrill to me to read the rollcall of these historic acts: the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the civil rights laws of 1964 and 1965, medicare, the Natural Beauty Act, the Higher Education Act of 1965, and—not last and not least—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
>
> Laws are only designs for achievement. The barriers we must overcome do not yield merely because Congress takes a vote or the President signs a bill. Two barriers are the most unyielding, each reinforcing the other in blocking our progress.
>
> The first is poverty. We who have worked in schools know what it means for someone who starts life as a victim of poverty. It is hard to teach a hungry child. Poverty breeds handicaps of mind and body which cripple him before he has a chance to get ahead. And we have learned all too well that

poverty passes on its curse generation to generation.

The second barrier is racial discrimination. Because of it, children grow up aliens in their native land. For a ghetto—whether white or black or brown—is less than half a world. No child can be fully educated unless his life is opened up to the wonderful variety this world affords.

Two weeks ago, I called for the International Education Act of 1966 to promote the worldwide commerce of knowledge, to declare that learning is not a commodity which can be confined at the water's edge. Yet within our own country there are still racial walls against hope and opportunity. Between the slums of the inner cities and their spreading suburbs, there are gulfs as deep and wide as any ocean.

If education is to be worthy of its good name, we must find ways to span these gulfs. I pledge to you that the Federal Government will not be a silent partner in this enterprise.

I am sending Congress five top priority requests:

To enlarge each one of the programs in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—and to make them run through 1970;

To double funds for our imaginative and precedent-breaking Operation Head Start which will next year help more than 700,000 youngsters from poor homes get ready for the rigors of learning;

To fund the new National Teachers Corps so that our best college graduates can be recruited to work in our worst schools;

To pass the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to help pay for school lunches for those who really need them, without subsidizing those who can afford to buy their own. We also want school breakfasts for children who would otherwise start the day with empty stomachs.

Finally—and this summarizes reams of recommendations in a single sentence—my budget this year proposes a $10 billion Federal investment in education and training. In 1960 the Government was spending only a third this much. The Office of Education alone will spend on programs six times as much as it did 6 years ago. And I promise you that this is only the beginning.

Almost 200 years ago, James Madison declared that Federal and State governments "are in fact but different agents and trustees of the people, constituted with different powers, and designed for different purposes." They are not "mutual rivals and enemies." They are partners. Madison's definition has not changed, though the partnership grows closer and more creative.

If education is to achieve its promise in America, it cannot be done in Washington alone. Each State and each community must fashion its own design and shape its own institutions. But we will need a common vision to build schools to match our common hopes for the future.

Every school will be different, but the differences will not range as they do today between satisfactory and shocking. We will have instead a diversity of excellence.

Tomorrow's school will be a school without walls—a school built of doors which open to the entire community.

Tomorrow's school will reach out to the places that enrich the human spirit: to the museums, the theaters, the art galleries, to the parks and rivers and mountains.

It will ally itself with the city—its busy streets and factories, its assembly lines and laboratories—so that the world of work does not seem an alien place for the student.

It will be the center of community life, for grownups as well as children: "a shopping center of human services." It might have a community health clinic, a public library, a theater and recreation facilities.

It will provide formal education for all citizens—and it will not close its doors at 3 o'clock. It will employ its buildings round the clock and its teachers round the year. We cannot afford to have an $85 billion plant in this country open less than 30 percent of the time.

In every past age, leisure has been a privilege enjoyed by the few at the expense of the many. But in the age waiting to be born, leisure will belong to the many at the expense of none. Our people must learn to use this gift of time, and that means one more challenge for tomorrow's schools.

I am not describing a distant Utopia, but the kind of education which must be the great and urgent work of our time. By the end of this decade, unless the work is well along, our opportunity will have slipped away.

Many people, as William James once said, shed tears for justice, generosity, and beauty—but never recognize those virtues when they meet them in the street. Some people are this way about rebuilding our society. They love the idea. But in the heat and grime, somehow they lose their zeal. They discover that progress is a battle, not a parade, and they fall away from the line of march.

You know that the job of building a better school and a better Nation is hard, often thankless work. Someone must take on the perilous task of leadership. Someone in shirtsleeves must turn ideas into actions, dollars into programs. Someone must fight the lonely battles in each community—make the accommodations, win the supporters, get the results.

Many of you have endured this hard journey from hope to reality—when the applause died, the crowd thinned out, and you were alone with the dull administrative details still to be done.

But this is how a Great Society must be built: brick by brick, and in the toil and noise of each day.

We have so little reason to be discouraged. Others face tasks so much more difficult than ours. Only last week I sat across the table from the very young leader of South Vietnam and heard him say of his country: "We were deluding ourselves with the idea that our weaknesses could not be remedied while we were fighting a war. * * * We will not completely drive out the aggressor until we make a start at eliminating these political and social defects."

The work of his Government will not be easy. But these are not timid men. They have learned that Government must meet the outreach of its people's hopes. There at Honolulu, I pledged support to their plans for education in their country. This year alone we will help them build 2,800 classrooms, nearly three times the average for the last 10 years. We will help them train 13,400 teachers, eight times the yearly average of the last decade. We will help them distribute nearly 6 million textbooks. And we will help them educate almost a fourth as many doctors as the total number they now have.

This little country maintains 700,000 men in its armed forces, over two and a half times as many for its size as we have. Yet, these leaders voiced no weariness before the task of getting on with reforms in education and health and agriculture. If they keep their commitment, they will be the real revolutionaries of Asia. For the real revolution is to build schools, and through them, to build a nation.

What they are committed to do, with our help, must be done under the most brutal conditions imaginable. Their civilian population lives in constant danger of terror and death at the hands of the Vietcong.

Last year over 12,000 civilians were kidnaped or killed by Communist terrorists. There were more than 36,000 incidents of terror—an increase of 10,000 over 1964. Two days ago, the Vietcong killed 39 civilians and wounded 7 others as they rode on buses.

Terrorism—deliberately planned and coldly carried out—continues to be the chief instrument of Vietcong aggression in South Vietnam. It is not just a byproduct of their military action; it is the way they hope to win the war.

Who, and what, are their targets? Schoolteachers and school administrators, health officials, village leaders, schools, hospitals, research stations, medical clinics—all of those people and places essential to the growth of a healthy, free society.

This is the terrible scarred face of the war too seldom seen and too little understood. Often it is not even reported by our journals most concerned about the war in Vietnam. These incidents usually happen in rural areas remote from the camera's eye. Observers are not invited when the Vietcong murder the mother of an officer in the Army of Vietnam as reprisal against her son—or torture and dismember the master of a local school. But people who hate war ought not ignore this strategy of terror.

What is its purpose? It is through fear and death to force the people of South Vietnam into submission. It is as simple, and as grim, as that. And it must not succeed.

If these tactics prevail in Vietnam, they will prevail elsewhere. If the takeover of Vietnam can be achieved by a highly organized Communist force employing violence against a civilian population, it can be achieved in another country, at another time, with an even greater cost to freedom.

If this war of liberation triumphs, who will be liberated next? There is a job of liberation in South Vietnam. It is liberation from terror, liberation from disease, liberation from hunger, and liberation from ignorance.

Unless this job is done, a military victory in South Vietnam would be no victory at all—only a brief delay until the aggressor returns to feed on the continuing misery of the people.

We have the military strength to convince the Communists they cannot achieve the conquest of South Vietnam by force.

But the building of a better society is the main test of our strength—our basic purpose. Until the people of the villages and farms of that unhappy country know that they personally count, that they are cared about, that their future is their own, only then will we know that real victory is possible.

I came away from Honolulu filled with new hope and energy. I came away convinced that we cannot raise a double standard to the world. We cannot hold freedom less dear in Asia than in Europe or be less willing to sacrifice for men whose skin is a different color.

If this young nation—ridden with danger can show such determination, we, with all our wealth and promise, must be no less determined.

Our time is filled with peril. So it has been every time freedom has been tested.

Our tasks are enormous. But so are our resources.

Our burdens are heavy and will grow heavier. But the Bible counsels that we "be no weary in well-doing." The house of freedom may never be completed, but it will never fall so long as you and I and those who share our commitment keep this vision of what we seek to build.

NATIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY AGENCY TO FIGHT DEATH AND MAYHEM ON OUR HIGHWAYS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined my colleague, the honorable gentleman from Georgia, Congressman JAMES A. MACKAY, in his effort to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency by introducing a bill identical to the one introduced by him for this purpose.

The number of deaths on our highways amounts to a national scandal; 47,000 of our fellow Americans met their deaths in 1965 on the highways, a new record for 1 year and 13,000 more than the battlefield total in 3 years of the Korean war. This carnage on our highways must be brought under control.

We recognize the need for such control in the case of air travel but continue to view highway travel myopically. We have a Federal Aviation Agency which employs 47,000 people to regulate air travel when only 12 percent of our people fly each year and only 40 percent have ever been in an airplane. It just does not make sense for us to ignore the problems of highway travel at the national level.

My bill would establish a National Traffic Safety Agency in the Department of Commerce. Its purpose would be to provide national leadership to reduce the death, injury, and loss of property on our highways by intensive research into the problem and vigorous application of remedies. It would provide the means for a concerted attack on the problem of death and mayhem on our highways.

The National Traffic Safety Agency would be headed by an Administrator appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate and would contain a National Traffic Safety Center that would engage in research and issue its findings on the problem. Such findings will be used to establish national traffic safety standards.

A national traffic safety program would be established that would conduct research and engineering studies, establish national traffic safety standards, collect and publish statistics, maintain library references and public information services, publish consumer traffic safety bulletins, promote uniform State traffic and driver-licensing laws, employ experts and consultants, negotiate contracts and make grants to outside firms to assist in the center's research and to act in concert with the States, local governments and nonpublic organizations.

Under my bill, motor vehicle manufacturers would be permitted to certify for labeling or advertising purposes that their products meet U.S. safety standards, if they submit adequate proof of compliance to the Secretary of Commerce. Grants could be made to the States under the bill up to 30 percent of the cost of traffic safety programs established by them, provided the programs meet certain standards. State programs eligible for aid would include improvement of driver education and licensing, motor vehicle inspection, accident reporting, highway design and construction, and highway signs, signals and controls.

The need for national leadership in this area is apparent. Individual States cannot legislate safety features into automobiles without creating chaos in the industry. Nor can States be sure that their highways are part of a uniform system of highways unless we establish national standards. It is not the purpose of my bill to supplant existing public and private agencies in this field, rather it seeks to provide aggressive leadership at the national level so that uniformity of action can be achieved by all the agencies of State and local governments, members of industry, and other public or private organizations that are properly concerned with the problem.

We must either travel together in safety on the highway through national leadership and common effort or we must travel separately on the highway, each in his own way to face, as best he can, the death and mayhem that lurks on the highway.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR., WORKS FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL AMERICANS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, America was born in the fierce struggle of men determined to be free—free of tyranny, free to practice their religion according to their conscience, free to live decent and industrious lives, free to retain and enjoy the fruits of their labor, free to assemble, and to speak out on the issues of the day, and free to share in the opportunities of our land and its promise of the good life.

In 1964 America took a giant step forward toward fulfilling the dream of its heritage. In that year the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was born. The dream that all Americans could share in the opportunities of our land and its promise of the good life was written into title VII of the act.

It sets up the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission which is charged with responsibility to insure that all Americans will be considered for hiring, firing, and promotion on the basis of their ability without regard to race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

When the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission began operations last July it was predicted that 1,500 complaints of employment discrimination might be received by it during its first year. The fact is that after only 6 months of operation, 3,263 complaints were received by the Commission—many more than all State antidiscrimination complaints combined. That is some measure of the interest and confidence our people have in the Commission.

I am happy to learn that the Commission under its able Chairman, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., despite severe limitation of funds accomplished much through conciliation and voluntary compliance and often obtained benefits for the cause of equal opportunity over and above the resolution of individual complaints.

The story of the Commission's success and of its problems deserves wide circulation and should be known in every part of our country. It is a heartening story that should make us all happy to be Americans. It is the story of an agency that embarked on the unchartered and stormy sea of controversy involving equal opportunity. It soon demonstrated its seaworthiness by steering a true course through the dangerous waters.

The Commission has received complaints charging employers, labor unions and employment agencies with discrimination in employment practices. In spite of shortage of staff and funds the Commission has completed the long process of investigation in 704 cases—and the even longer process of conciliation has been brought to a successful conclusion in 20 cases.

Mr. Roosevelt reports that the Commission's efforts at conciliation has tapped a reservoir of good will, cooperation, and willingness by all interested parties to comply with the law. Significantly, of the 700 complaints investigated to date, all but 2 of the companies involved were willing to cooperate. In addition other employers who were not involved in complaints have voluntarily sat down with the Commission staff to work out problems encountered by them under the law.

Mr. Roosevelt tells us that in all instances the Commission's investigators have been received courteously and in a spirit of cooperation—whether the investigator was colored or white.

In many instances employers have initiated positive action to achieve equal opportunity, even though a specific complaint made against them proved to be without merit. The Commission files contain many instances where its conciliation effort resulted in voluntary action on the part of the employer above and beyond the complaints under consideration. Those were purely voluntary acts on the part of the employer and demonstrate the spirit of the American employer to comply with the law. I am sure that this spirit of cooperation on the part of industry is in large part engendered in response to the reasonable and courteous manner in which Mr. Roosevelt is carrying out his task.

I commend the fine work of the Commission and its Chairman to the attention of our colleagues and to all people of good will. It is a living example of democracy in action and serves as a shining beacon of hope to all of us that reasonable men, working honestly, diligently, and in good faith can solve the corrupting problems of bias and prejudice in a democracy.

THE 48TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last, at the Washington Hotel here in the District of Columbia, I had the privilege of attending a luncheon and ceremony of the American Lithuanian Society commemorating the 48th anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuania's Independence.

The following is the program on that occasion, as well as my remarks:

Program on Commemoration of the 48th Anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuania's Independence, February 13, 1966

American National Anthem.

Invocation: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Peter Silvinskas.

Introduction of guests.

LUNCHEON

Introductory remarks by the vice president of the American Lithuanian Society, Mr. Joseph Zamites.

Address by Hon. Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires, Lithuanian Legation.

Address by Hon. John J. Rooney, Democrat, 14th District, Brooklyn, N.Y., House of Representatives.

Lithuanian songs: Miss Elena Jurgela.

Poems: Miss Vakare Aistis.

Greetings by the presidents of the Latvian and Estonian Societies.

Reading of resolution.

Benediction: Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate.

Lithuanian National Anthem.

Remarks of Congressman John J. Rooney

Chairman Zamites, Right Reverend Monsignor Silvinskas, Reverend Dr. Harris, Chargé d'Affaires Kajeckas, Mrs. Darlys, president of your organization, Commissioner Farrell, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Cieplinski, the officers and members of the American Lithuanian Society, ladies, and gentlemen, one of the great traditions of American colleges and universities is the annual homecoming which allows old friends to get together and relive the events of previous years. I feel today as if I am attending a homecoming because I am meeting many warm friends again—friends whose patriotism I admire and friends whose devotion to the cause of their still enslaved kinsmen and friends in Lithuania I applaud.

I am deeply gratified to be invited to share with you the celebration of the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. To you of Lithuanian birth or parentage this day is almost sacred. It is not an event that calls for parades and noise and funmaking such as an independence day normally entails; rather it is a day filled with sadness and regrets. For on this day our hearts turn to those who now live in the shadows of a foreign oppression.

How wonderful it would be if we here today could be celebrating this occasion with joy and mirth. How wonderful it would be to join the reverend fathers here today in prayers and songs of thanksgiving that at long last the shackles of Soivet domination have been removed and the liberty-loving peoples of Lithuania, of Estonia, and of Latvia once more free and independent.

My friends, this is a goal for the attainment of which many of my colleagues in the Congress are deeply devoted. It is a goal which I shall personally pursue with vigor, for I am convinced that the freedom of all of us here and in fact the independence of the free world cannot be assured as long as these valiant people are denied the right of self-determination.

We as Americans must never become complacent and ignore the brutal act of Communist Russia when it illegally incorporated Lithuania into the Soviet Union as its 14th republic. We must remember always the joy we shared with the Lithuanian people when they gained their independence in February 1918. We must remember how we shared the pride of the young nation's achievements and gloried in its progress and growth. We must never forget that this golden era lasted but a brief score of years; then these fine people, our relatives and our friends, became the unwilling subjects of a larger and more powerful atheistic nation.

But it is not enough just to remember no matter how vivid and disconcerting those memories are. It is the responsibility of all who enjoy freedom and the bountiful blessings of liberty to do their utmost to restore independence to those from whom it has been stolen. This responsibility demands that we strive without ceasing to summon adequate international unity to force the Soviet Union to revise its own ruthless colonial policy instead of condemning the more benign policies of other governments. It is our responsibility, too, to see that the Communists are prevented from following the same course of illegal annexation with respect to other countries whether it be in Vietnam, in Africa, or in any part of the world.

Today as we look back with pride to the creation of Lithuanian independence and to the truly remarkable progress of that young nation, I am reminded that this country of ours was indeed blessed in being permitted to grow and expand. We can be thankful that our strength was such even by the year 1812 that we could successfully defend our shores. We can be grateful that our strong national interest was sufficient to weather the storm-tossed years of war between our own States. In succeeding years as we sent our men into action at San Juan, at Belleau Wood, at "the Bulge," at Corregidor, in Korea and now in Vietnam we can be thankful that our strength has matched the awful demands which have been made upon us. If only little Lithuania could have had a few more years of freedom, I am sure that the courage, the wisdom, and the outstanding ability of its people would have developed a strength kindred to our own. Given even a measure of such strength the Soviets might find their inhuman acts of 1940 much more difficult to duplicate today.

My friends, I realize that with each passing year in which your loved ones are still held in virtual bondage, it becomes increasingly difficult to generate enthusiasm and maintain interest in the great cause to which you are so deeply dedicated. I, too, become discouraged at times in that we are not making discernible progress in finding answers to this sad and frustrating problem. But sad as is the situation and discouraging as have been the results of our efforts thus far, we cannot lessen our devotion to this all-important cause.

All of us here must dedicate ourselves anew to the task of trying to find a solution to the grim problems our loved ones in Lithuania still face.

Each of us must seek to enlist more and more Americans in this cause. Each of us must do his utmost privately and through Government channels to have this issue raised and considered by the United Nations. Each of us must help to increase the gifts of food, clothing, and medicines to those for whom such gifts mean life itself.

Finally, my friends, we must constantly consider all these efforts as a part of the broader responsibilities which we must assume to obtain a reasonable assurance of world peace, a task to which His Holiness Pope Paul is devoting so much of his time and energy. This task to which our own great President, Lyndon B. Johnson, has demonstrated such passion and leadership in recent months includes such problems as the freedom of captive nations. So, as Americans of whatever birth or lineage, we must unite with our leaders to obtain and preserve a peace which recognizes the individual rights of men and of nations for self-determination and the four freedoms.

This country has long demonstrated its dedication to these principles. Our men have fought and bled that these freedoms could be preserved and hopefully extended to all mankind. Today, as we celebrate the Independent Day of Lithuania, may we do so by rededicating ourselves to the task of not only bringing those freedoms to the stouthearted people in your ancestral homeland, but preserving those freedoms for mankind universally.

Mr. Speaker, following is the translation of the Lithuanian address delivered on this occasion by Mr. J. Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of Lithuania:

Address by Mr. Kajeckas

Although Lithuania is a very ancient nation, her true place in contemporary history begins on February 16, 1918, for it was on that date that our homeland, after 123 years of Russian czarist oppression, declared her independence and joined the family of free nations. Because, however, of the genocidal agression which the Soviet Union perpetrated against Lithuania and the Baltic States in 1940, and which continues to this day, any commemoration of February 16 behind the Iron Curtain is considered by the Soviets to be a criminal act.

But whether the Lithuanian sky is sunny or dark, February 16 remains our great day, whether in the wilds of Siberia, or in our beloved homeland, but especially in the free world. If all the Lithuanian heroes and martyrs and partisans could speak forth from their cold tombs, they would declare also that "today is our day. Our sacrifices have been made in order that Lithuania might remain forever alive, free, and independent."

This day is formally observed only in the free world. In occupied Lithuania, this day is one of solemn and secret reflection and remembrance of lost blessings. February 16 is, in the homeland, a day of secret tears.

After 123 years of night without a dawn, Lithuania rose again on February 16, because the occupant had not been able to shackel the free soul of our country. According to Schiller, "man is created free, and he remains free even in chains." On the first possible opportunity, those chains of slavery were shattered.

Today we remember with pride the participants in the battle for independence, and we remember their sacrifices. It is from their sacrifices that we receive the strength and inspiration to continue our struggle for our national inheritance, and we vow to continue that struggle until the second resurrection of Lithuania.

Since the criminal aggression of the Soviet Union in the Baltic States, the whole world has had the opportunity to realize the hypocritical nature of Kremlin policies. The whole world knows that the Soviets are the alltime champions of deception and greed. Today, the Red claws extend even into Vietnam. We sympathize with the people of Vietnam in their struggle for true freedom and independence. A month ago, in the Disarmament Conference at Geneva, the Soviet delegate attacked the United States for what he called a shameful and criminal attack upon the small and heroic nation of Vietnam. The Baltic nations are small countries also, but this did not keep the Soviets from shamefully and criminally crushing the freedom of these heroic nations. The Baltic countries are not threatened by nazism or fascism. The only thing that threatens them is bolshevism and Soviet imperialistic colonialism.

The Soviets are very fond of paying lipservice to freedom, independence, and coexistence for the purpose of waging so-called wars of liberation against other states, but the right of nations to self-determination is not practiced by the Kremlin in its own sphere of influence. For the Soviet Union, the principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat is higher than the right of any nation to self-determination. All the oppressive tactics of Russia against Lithuania in czarist times pale almost into insignificance before the nefarious and inhuman methods used by the Soviets. They are trying to destroy the Lithuanian nation as an ethnic group by the cruelest means available. This purpose was clearly expressed in the Communist Party program of 1962, in which one clear objective is the Russification of non-Russian countries within the Soviet sphere. This is, within that program, considered one of the indispensable conditions for the fulfilling of Communist objectives. In this same program, Communists are encouraged not to tolerate any kind of nationalistic motivations or expressions, and to struggle firmly against such expression and any kind of national self-consciousness. They are encouraged to fight against the idealization of a country's past, and against national customs which disturb the process of Sovietization. This objective of Sovietization is one which is to be fulfilled by the end of the next few decades, with the entire governmental machinery enlisted in the propagation of this cause. The first attacks, according to the program, must be made against the sense of national identity and culture of nations such as Lithuania.

Thus is a spiritual destruction being carried on against the whole Lithuanian nation. Scholarship, art, and literature are strictly governed by Moscow principles and according to strictly Communist practice. In this kind of pattern, there is no room left for the Lithuanian nation. She is sacrificed completely to the Muscovite, to the outsider, to the Russian. And Lithuanians are forced to participate in the destruction of their country. They are forced to deny history, to praise and exalt the Russian nation, the Russian language, to praise Russian leaders, and finally, to thank Russia for the slavery it has wrought upon Lithuania.

It is with especial sharpness that Soviet activity in Lithuania has been directed against all religions. In the Soviet sphere of belief, freedom is expressed in the propagation of atheism. Anatole Lunarcharsky, the former Russian commissar of education, recently said: "We hate Christianity and Christians; even the best of them must be regarded as our worst enemies. They preach love of one's neighbor and mercy, which is contrary to our principles. Christian love is an obstacle to the development of the revolution. Down with love of one's neighbor's. What we need is hatred. We must know how to hate; only thus shall we conquer the universe." I need not comment on that statement; it speaks for itself.

The Lithuanian language is more and more excluded from public affairs, in spite of the fact that it is still regarded formally as the official language of the territory. Since increasingly great numbers of Russians are introduced into the country on various pretexts, the citizenry are also forced to adapt increasingly to the Russian language. An American Lithuanian visiting Vilnius is in many places unable to communicate in the language of his fathers. The absolute control of Moscow in non-Russian republics through the party and centralized government institutions assures Russian domination and the rapid growth of the Russian population.

The Lithuanian youth are encouraged in various ways to go to Russia and the wilds of Siberia for scholastic and professional advantage. This creates the further opportunity for outsiders to be introduced into Lithuania.

In the face of this kind of sad situation, we must cry our sorrow aloud, in order to turn world public opinion against the process of Russification in our country. At the same time we must make certain that the true colonialistic and imperialistic purpose of our Soviet oppressors is made perfectly clear to the world. That is (1) that Lithuania was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union; (2) that the Soviet occupants of Lithuania have forcibly inflicted their will upon the inhabitants of that territory; (3) that the Russians are systematically carrying out the colonization of the Lithuanian territory; and (4) that the Russians are exploiting the land, its inhabitants, and its resources. The Lithuanian resources and land are run according to Moscow's agricultural and technological principles, and the people of the country are turned into slaves.

That is a summary of the sadness that we have borne for over 20 years. But there is a brighter side that we must remember on this occasion.

You had the opportunity today to hear the statement by Secretary of State Dean Rusk on the occasion of February 16. Over a number of years now, his similar statements on these occasions have helped to revive anew the hope and determination of Lithuanians everywhere. We are greatly appreciative of the Secretary's encouragement and his words of hope, as we are grateful to the Government and people of the United States for refusing to recognize the illegal absorption of our homeland by the Red hydra. One particular example of American support of the Lithuanian cause is to be seen each year in the numerous proclamations issued on February 16 by the Governors of States and the mayors of principal cities. Also, this year, as in previous years, we will be gladdened by the speeches and statements of support by U.S. Senators and Congressmen. In their remarks on the floor of the Congress, the crime committed against Lithuania will again become clear in the public mind, together with the justice of Lithuanian aspirations to her rightful freedom and independence. We are very privileged to have in our midst today Congressman John J. Rooney, just as, last November, we were greatly pleased to hear his talk delivered at the great Baltic Freedom Rally in New York's Madison Square Garden.

Last year, when Lithuanians in the homeland were forced by their Soviet captors to commemorate the 25th anniversary of Soviet occupation of Lithuania, we Lithuanians living in freedom made certain that the world knew how we felt about those same Soviet captors. In numerous demonstrations throughout the free world, especially in such vast demonstrations as took place in New York, the true face of the Soviet barbarians was uncovered. It is a sign of hope that on such a sad anniversary as has taken place during the past year, the free world saw a renewal of Lithuanian determination to be free again. As long as our commitment to freedom remains strong, the Soviet criminals who have enslaved Lithuania are bound to learn that freedom always buries its own undertakers.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to include a letter written under date February 11, 1966, by the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, to Mr. Kajeckas:

The Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1966.

Mr. Joseph Kajeckas,
Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of Lithuania.

Dear Mr. Chargé d'Affaires: On the occasion of the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, it is my pleasure to extend to you the good wishes of the Government and people of the United States.

Our country has consistently espoused the principle that all peoples have the right to determine the form of their national existence. In Lithuania's case, we have applied this principle by refusing to recognize the forcible incorporation of that country into the Soviet Union. We fully support your continuing efforts to marshal world public opinion and to bring it to bear on the issue of self-determination for the people of Lithuania.

In view of the courage and fortitude shown by the Lithuanian people during these years of foreign domination, I am confident that their just aspirations for freedom and national independence will ultimately be realized.

Sincerely yours,

Dean Rusk.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was unanimously adopted on this occasion:

Resolution by Lithuanian American Society

Citizens of the Metropolitan Washington area gathered February 13, 1966, under the auspices of the Lithuanian American Society at the Washington Hotel, extend their friendly greetings to the people of Lithuania on the occasion of the 48th anniversary of the restitution of independence of their country. They urge the President of the United States to concern himself, in dealing with the Soviet Government, with the urgent problem of removing the major obstacle to peace in Europe by counseling and promoting the restoration of sovereignty of the people of Lithuania and other similarly situated peoples. They also urge that conditions be created enabling those peoples to choose their own governments without the presence of the occupying troops which, in the instance of the Baltic States, had entered those countries in consequence of the Hitler-Stalin connivance at aggression, in violation of the treaties of peace and nonaggression freely negotiated by the Government of the Soviet Union and Governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

The assembled citizens also vote their gratification at the steadfast adherence of every administration since 1940 to the policy of nonrecognition of the fruits of Nazi-Soviet aggression, and their thanks to Members of Congress of the United States for their faithful dedication to the principles of freedom and self-determination so often urged by them to be offered to the people of the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Officers of this gathering are directed to transmit copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Members of Congress, and to the press.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Monagan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked our annual observance of Lithuanian Independence Day. The tragic irony of this event has been with us for more than a quarter of a century, for since 1939 there has been no independence in Lithuania. Fortunately, owing to the courage and determination of this great nation's leaders in exile the celebration of the historic establishment of the Republic of Lithuania does not go unnoticed in the free world in spite of the fact that Lithuania's Communist captors have suppressed any observance of this great day in that country. The dedication of this spirited people to regain their hard won and deeply cherished freedom has won them countless friends and admirers here in the United States and the rest of the free world, and we may take great pride in joining with them in their commemoration of this event.

With each passing year, as we encourage the continuing efforts of our Lithuanian friends, we can derive great hope from the realization that the tyrannical Soviet regime which dominates Lithuania will ever be reminded of the Lithuanian's implacable resolution never to succumb to Communist enslavement. Although their country has been stripped of its national identity, their properties have been confiscated, and their fundamental freedoms abolished, the will of this people has not been broken. In the past we have shown the people of Lithuania and their Soviet tormentors that we are vitally concerned with the restoration of Lithuania's autonomy, and today on the 48th anniversary of this country's independence, we may state with pride and confidence that we intend to remain a part of this critical movement until independence day can mean to Lithuanians what the Fourth of July means to all Americans.

FAA ADMITS MAJOR PROBLEMS WITH THE BOEING 727

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, February 15, I made a speech in which I stated that the Boeing 727 jet should be grounded pending a full investigation into its airworthiness and crashworthiness. The events and revelations that have transpired since I made that speech have deepened my conviction that the Boeing 727 should be ordered grounded now, while the CAB and other investigations are in progress.

Within a few hours of the speech I made Tuesday the FAA vigorously denied that it knew of any reason to ground the airplane "at this time." But later, on the same day, the FAA summoned every airline that uses the 727, domestic and foreign, as well as CAB Bureau of Safety representatives, to a meeting in Washington, D.C., to "discuss service and operating experience and exchange views" on the airliner. Most significant in FAA's announcement was the revelation that it is concerned with "the high sink rate" of the 727.

The sink rate of an airplane is the rate at which it descends as it approaches to land. The characteristic high sink rate of the 727 apparently causes it to sink rapidly, at a more than average rate, in the final stages of its approach. I would like to point out two things with respect to the high sink rate of the 727:

First. In my Tuesday's speech I stated that each of the four crashes of the 727 in the past 6 months, in which 264 persons were killed, occurred under similar circumstances—as the planes prepared to land. The FAA admission of the high sink rate of this plane completely substantiates my statement.

Second. The admission of the high sink rate gives even greater urgency to the need for grounding the 727.

We know that several other deficiencies have already been identified in this plane. For example, defects have been noted in the fuel lines, generator electrical leads, and landing gear. In fact, the Boeing Co. has produced three modification kits to correct these deficiencies. But, the modifications are not scheduled to be made until May and June.

I find this fact alone to be amazing and deplorable. When a commercial passenger airliner is defective by the admission of the manufacturer and the Government, how is it that several months are allowed to go by before the defects are corrected? In other words, this plane is admittedly defective, yet it is allowed to continue flying and carrying passengers for 3 or 4 months before corrective measures are scheduled to be taken.

We also know that the FAA has not yet agreed to the strong recommendation of the CAB that the materials used in the cabins of the 727's have greater fire resistance than those presently installed.

Thus, the Boeing 727 now is flying with a number of deficiencies which the FAA has instructed the manufacturer to correct—in 3 or 4 months—and with one deficiency which it has not yet agreed to correct.

On top of all this, we now learn by virtue of a very hastily called meeting of 14 domestic and foreign airlines that the 727 has a high sink rate. The attitude of the FAA, the Federal Agency responsible for air safety, is reflected in the statement attributed by the New York Times yesterday to a Washington spokesman:

> Our exhaustive analysis has uncovered nothing that would indicate this aircraft is not airworthy.

Mr. Speaker, the CAB, which is responsible for investigating air collisions, has already uncovered what the FAA has failed to uncover, namely, numerous deficiencies in the construction of the Boeing 727. In addition, the FAA admits that this plane has a higher than average sink rate.

Characteristically, the FAA has implied in its releases to the press since my Tuesday speech that "pilot technique" may be the common factor in all four crashes. It is very easy to blame the pilots for airplane mishaps because the pilot is usually killed and he cannot speak for himself. But the FAA is now indicating that new training procedures may need to be adopted in order to assure proper adjustment to the high sink rate. The question to be asked is, if this plane has an abnormally high sink rate, why did the FAA certify it as airworthy before pilots and other personnel were completely trained to adjust to this characteristic?

Mr. Speaker, investigations into the four crashes of the 727's have only begun. Before they are completed additional defects in this plane may be found. The flying public should be protected from aircraft about which so many doubts and questions have been raised. If this plane can be modified and made airworthy it should be done so at the earliest possible time. But the public should not be exposed to whatever dangers exist in flying the Boeing 727 until the investigations have been completed and all modifications made.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AGAIN URGED TO VETO THE BANK MERGER ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on February 10 I sent a letter to President Lyndon B. Johnson urging him to veto the Bank Merger Act Amendments, S. 1698. Today, I have written a second letter to the President again urging him to veto this abominable bill.

With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD copies of each of my letters urging the President to veto S. 1698.

I also ask unanimous consent at this time to insert in the RECORD a copy of an article entitled "Lobbying by Bankers," from the Congressional Quarterly, February 11, 1966.

FEBRUARY 10, 1966.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This letter is to request that you veto the Bank Merger Act amendments, S. 1698, cleared by Congress for Presidential action yesterday.

My opposition to this bill today rests on the same grounds on which I based my dissenting views to the House report accompanying the bill and the statements I made while the bill was being debated on the floor. Briefly, these grounds are as follows:

First. The language of the bill with respect to the antitrust laws and the guidelines for evaluating proposed mergers is vague and uncertain and will result in confusion within the banking industry. Several of the proponents of the bill themselves agreed that these provisions were vague and that the courts will probably have to make a determination as to what they mean. Such uncertainty is bad for the public and bad for the banks.

Second. Under this bill the banking industry will be less subject to the antitrust laws than any other industry. I oppose the weakening of the antitrust laws in principle.

Third. The "forgiveness" provisions of the bill constitute favored treatment for a few large banks whose mergers have already been held to be in violation of the antitrust laws by the Supreme Court. The Federal Government should not play favorites. This aspect of the bill smacks of special legislation and should not be allowed to become law under the guise of a general bill.

Fourth. The bill permits any Federal banking agency approving a merger to intervene, as a matter of right, in a suit instituted by the Attorney General. This will result in the unique situation of Federal Government attorneys appearing on both sides of a suit involving a bank merger. We thus regress into the 19th century when the legal business of the Government instead of being handled by the Department of Justice was scattered among different public officers, departments and branches. Under this bill the Attorney General is demoted to the rank of lieutenant with no more legal authority to represent the interests of the Federal Government than any of the other attorneys employed by several Federal agencies.

For all of these reasons, I again urge you to veto the Bank Merger Act amendments.

With every good wish, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

FEBRUARY 17, 1966.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On February 10 I wrote to urge you to veto the Bank Merger Act amendments, S. 1968. This letter is to again urge you to veto this bill.

I remain opposed to S. 1698 for the same basic reasons stated in my dissenting views to the House report and in the statements I made during the floor debate. However, I would like at this time to emphasize one aspect of the bill which is particularly objectionable and which, in my opinion, will ultimately detract from the authority of the President of the United States. I refer to section 7(D) of the bill.

As you know 7(D) provides that any Federal banking agency approving a merger may intervene, as a matter of right, as a party and as an attorney of record, in a suit brought under the antitrust laws by the Attorney General. In my earlier letter to you I stated my objection to this section. I am sure you are aware that I do not stand alone with regard to this matter. For example, during the floor debate in the House, February 8, Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, who otherwise supported the bill, said of section 7(D):

"I do not know why that was put in except I think it was one of the pet projects of my good friend Jim Saxon. * * * But why do you permit the dragging in of the U.S. agencies is beyond my comprehension because it is going to prove as irritating as a hangnail.

"This is very much like putting a second story on a ranch house. You simply do not do that. For that reason I again say I do not understand why it was put in. I am not going to offer an amendment, but I do hope, Mr. Chairman, you will take that out in conference, because it has no place in this legislation. I believe there is very little justification for anything like this. It is going to create confusion."

The following day, during the floor debate of the bill on the Senate floor, Senator HART said with respect to this same provision, section 7(D):

"Whatever the attitude is with respect to what we shall do with the bill, I think it will be agreed by all of us as a unique way to 'run a railroad' intelligently. Visualize, if you will, the scramble on court of representatives of the Department of Justice, the State banking commissioners, and the Comptroller of the Currency. The court would have to have a program with names and numbers to figure out who is representing the public with respect to the principal issues in litigation.

* * * * *

"No indepenent expert witness has ever had an opportunity to comment on the bill which passed the House on February 2."

Mr. President, these statements by two of the foremost authorities in Congress on the subject of antitrust legislation express well-founded and well-informed doubts and fears as to section 7(D).

I would like to add to the arguments of Chairman CELLER and Senator HART the following points:

First. The income of the office of the Comptroller of the Currency is derived from assessments levied on the national banks and from examination fees paid by the national banks. Any appearance, therefore, of the Comptroller of the Currency as a party or attorney of record in a bank merger suit brought under the antitrust laws would be actually financed by the national banks and in part by the defendant banks in the suit. Thus, the Comptroller of the Currency on one hand would appear as a representative of the U.S. Government, while on the other hand his appearance would in fact be financed by the very banks whom the United States, through the Attorney General, has brought an action against.

Second. In all antitrust suits the Attorney General appears and brings the suit on behalf of the United States and as counsel for the President. If one of the Federal agencies intervenes under 7(D), who represents the United States and who represents the President?

Third. Section 7(D) will have the effect of fracturing the authority of the Attorney General and scattering among several other agencies. As I stated in my first letter, it reduces the Attorney General to the rank of lieutenant. This result tends toward proliferation in the Federal Government, contrary to the stated goals of this administration, and is a regression to the 19th century.

Once again, I urge you to veto S. 1698.

With every good wish, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

[From the Congressional Quarterly, Feb. 11, 1966]

LOBBYING BY BANKERS

The American Bankers Association, representing 98.5 percent of the 14,000 main offices of U.S. banks and most of their branches, conducted a mass campaign for S. 1698. Three of the merged banks affected by the bill directly or indirectly engaged lobbyists in 1965 to work for passage of the bill. One of the banks' registered lobbyists was ex-Representative Albert Rains, Democrat, of Alabama, 1945–65, who had been the second-ranking Democrat on the House Banking and Currency Committee until 1965.

American Bankers Association President Reno Odlin, in answer to a query by Representative PATMAN, wrote August 31, 1965, that the ABA had made a mass effort for passage of S. 1698 by the House. Odlin said it was the first piece of legislation since the 1962 Revenue Act on which ABA used a mass communication technique asking all its member banks "to get in touch with their Member of the House of Representatives on S. 1698." Odlin added, "Passage of S. 1698 was deemed to be so important to the future of banking that the broadest possible indication of banking's views was sought."

ABA is not registered under the 1964 Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act but it employed in 1965 six individuals who did register with Congress.

Law firms representing two of the merged banks exempted from antitrust prosecution under S. 1698 hired lobbyists to work for the bill. Manufacturers-Hanover Trust of New York employed the New York law firm of Simpson, Thatcher & Bartlett and Continental-Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago employed the Chicago firm of Mayer, Friedlich, Spiess, Tierney, Brown & Platt of Chicago. The two law firms jointly hired two lobbyists to work for them on the bill—ex-Representative Rains and Laurence G. Henderson, a Senate committee aid in 1952–54.

The Mercantile Trust Co. of St. Louis, which S. 1698 would permit to be tried under the new bank merger standards set forth in the bill, hired the Washington, D.C., law firm of Miller & Chevalier to work for the legislation.

The St. Louis bank and its law firm, as well as Rains and Henderson, registered as lobbyists in 1965.

APPLAUDING RECENT ACTIONS BY BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed timely and fitting that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Hon. Charles Schultze, and his Deputy, Hon. Elmer Staats, be complimented on recent manpower management improvement actions by these able administrators.

I have been advised by Mr. Staats that the budget for the Department of Defense provides for 58,000 additional civilian spaces for the military services to replace able-bodied military men now in such support jobs as: chauffeurs, carpenters, painters, office equipment operators, and budget analysts with civil service personnel. These military-trained men, by returning to their combat units, will not only bolster our defense posture but also in time this program will save the Government several million dollars annually. This action by Bureau of the Budget officials is in accord with a request of the Manpower Subcommittee last August to the Secretary of Defense and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Staats also indicated that the Bureau's personnel ceiling control policy has been revised so that temporary, part-time, and intermittent employment are no longer under a specific numerical ceiling. This change will give the Government's managers some greater flexibility in handling their personnel problems. In a request to the Director of the Budget last April, I indicated that a change in personnel ceiling controls would also save the Government money. Several departments and agencies have so indicated this to the Manpower Subcommittee.

The Deputy Director of the Budget stated that action has also been taken in Defense, Post Office, and the General Services Administration to use Federal employees in lieu of contracting out for personal services. The subcommittee has determined from the experience of several Government activities that the use of contractors to perform work normally handled by civil service workers is often more costly than in-house operations, but also the Government loses a definite control over the work. Frequently the subcommittee has been told by management officials of departments and agencies that limited civilian personnel ceilings have in the past been a major reason for contracting for work normally done by Government employees.

I applaud these progressive and realistic manpower moves by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

THE 37TH ANNIVERSARY OF LULAC

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, the organization popularly known as LULAC, the League of United Latin American Citizens, observes its 37th anniversary. Organized in Corpus Christi, Tex., February 17, 1929, the league has become one of the outstanding groups of our Nation for the fostering of good citizenship.

Because the national headquarters of the League of United Latin American Citizens is located in my city, El Paso, Tex.; because five of its past national presidents have been residents of my district; and because I have personally seen the results of this organization's many contributions toward good citizenship, I would like to call the attention of the House to LULAC's outstanding record.

The league carries on a constant program of citizenship classes, to aid prospective citizens of Latin American birth to become well grounded in fundamental principles of our Government before becoming naturalized. It conducts annual campaigns of voter registration and voter qualification.

In the field of education, the League of United Latin American Citizens did some important pioneering from which the whole Nation is today reaping rewards. In 1956, the LULAC's initiated what was called "The Little School of the 400"—to teach a basic 400 English words to 5-year-old children whose native language was other than English. The Texas State Legislature made the program statewide and appropriated funds for its financing. Today, a similar program, nationwide in its scope, is known as Project Headstart.

In the 1950's, the LULAC's also launched their nationwide campaign against the high school dropout problem. Coupled with this, they initiated an impressive program of college scholarships for promising youth of Latin American ancestry. The roll of young men and women who have completed college under this program is long and growing.

The LULAC's, through their many cultural events, fiestas, concerts, and folk dances, have taught all of us the graceful charm of Spanish America; and in doing so, have enriched our own culture to the benefit of all.

Mr. Speaker, the League of United Latin American Citizens, through its actions, has proved that racial prejudice disappears as education and good citizenship advance. For 37 years of solid progress in promoting these worthy aims, the League of United Latin American Citizens deserves the gratitude and respect of this great Nation.

HOWARD K. SMITH'S COMMENTARY ON THE WAR IN VITENAM

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent commentary on the war in Vietnam and the role of the United States in this war. Howard K. Smith, internationally noted news commentator, reporter, and author, substituted for ABC Commentator Edward P. Morgan on February 11, 1966, and gave one of the finest interpretations I have yet to read in cogent form of the role of our country in Vietnam—why we are there, and why we must be there for our own good and that of the free world. It is truly a superb presentation, and I am pleased to offer it to my colleagues.

Mr. Smith, a native of my State of Louisiana and a fellow student at Tulane University 30 years ago, takes up the oft-quoted cliches of the opponent's of our policy and actions in Vietnam, and refutes them with logical clear analysis—analysis based on the experience of history.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert into the RECORD this fine news commentary by my good friend, Howard K. Smith. The commentary, broadcast on February 11, 1966, follows:

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS, FEBRUARY 11, 1966

(Howard K. Smith substituting for Edward P. Morgan)

The chief event in Washington this week has been the hearings on Vietnam in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The committee, and the public, have heard two witnesses fairly critical of what we are actually doing in Vietnam. Next week, Secretary of State Rusk and Gen. Maxwell Taylor will appear before the committee and refute some of the points made this week by Gavin and Kennan. But a long weekend will have passed. The North Vietnamese will have time to nourish a little more the only belief sustaining them—that America is seriously split; and the administration has no answers to critics' points. As many of the points made by critics are extremely doubtful, I beg to suggest the case against them.

One statement, made so often in the hearings, that it is becoming an accepted cliche is: America is trying to police the whole world, and we can't do it. The truth is, America's actions have been highly selective. There was for some years a war in the Congo. We took no part. There was a severe crisis in Cyprus that nearly sent our allies Greece and Turkey, to war. We took no leading part in it. The Rhodesian crisis is being left to Britain, though as a loyal ally we give moral support. There is a threatened crisis between Israel and Jordan over use of Jordan river waters. We have said no word and are in no way planning to intercede. The list could be lengthened. There is simply no evidence whatever for the cliche that we are being the universal policeman.

Another proposition stated so often that people are tired questioning it is—It was a tragic blunder to get committed in South Vietnam in the first place. Well, take your mind back to when we did, 1954, and think about it. A war by a minority of Communist guerrillas was raging in Malaya, south of Vietnam. Nearby in Burma guerrilla raids from China were being made. Had we refused to intercede and give South Vietnam help, Malaya might might well have gone Communist, Burma as well—and the small, weaker countries in Asia. India would be in much greater peril and the world situation much more unstable and dangerous than it is. And, incidentally, an American administration that refused to face up to a responsibility that important would have had a hard time from the American voters.

Both General Gavin and Mr. Kennan questioned that South Vietnam is an important commitment at all. They are certainly right that it does not rank with, say, Japan, or with Berlin. The loss of either of those would truly carry the cold war to dangerous new dimensions. But South Vietnam remains very important indeed. The struggle going on is actually for all the southeast Asian peninsula, which is of great importance.

Next to South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia are both riddled with guerrilla bands, passive, waiting for victory in South Vietnam before they take over those countries. In Thailand, south of them, the Vietcong are not hiding their preparation. Peiping radio announces once a week its plans to secure the takeover of Thailand. If we were not resisting in Vietnam, we would certainly soon have to fight in those other places, deep inland, with long supply routes, and at every disadvantage. By resisting where we are we have the 7th U.S. Fleet, the world's strongest, able to give constant artillery and air support to troops—which it could not do inland—and we have short and well-protected supply routes from the coast. There is no doubt that we have chosen the, for us, most advantageous, least costly, place to make the stand. So, Vietnam is a very important commitment indeed.

Both witnesses have vigorously disagreed with the domino theory—the idea that if one nation falls, the others topple in a long line. But nobody has refuted the facts of political life: Success at conquest is infectious among greedy dictators. They need foreign success to divert attention from the fact that they do very badly at home. There is no doubt that a triumph in one place stimulates the urge to try it elsewhere, and if we leave Vietnam to them, it can lead to setbacks nearly as great as China turning Communist in the first place.

One of the strongest myths of the time is—Let South Vietnam go to the Communists. It will not be China's puppet. It will be as independent of China as Russia's satellites are of Russia. The answer to that is—do not overestimate the independence of Russia's satellites. Hardly one of them can fire 10 rounds without ammunition from Russia, or fix a tank or plane without parts from Russia. What independence they have is very modest and very limited.

In the one important case where a satellite flouted Russia outright—Tito—the prime condition for success was—America was nearby, dominating the Mediterranean and would equip Tito for a mountain war of infinite duration. Those who assure us if we let Vietnam go it will be independent, also insist that we eliminate the one condition that makes a degree of independence possible—American resistance.

Senator **Fulbright**'s office announced today he had received 5,000 letters due to last week's hearings. He interpreted that to mean a vote of confidence in him. In a nation of 195 million, there is a different way of interpreting that. It may mean there are 194 million plus votes that he isn't getting.

This is Howard K. Smith in Washington.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. **Patman**, for 1 hour, on February 23; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. **Patman**, for 1 hour, on February 24; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. **Vanik** (at the request of Mr. **Patman**), for 1 hour, on February 23; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter, immediately following Mr. **Patman**.

Mr. **Vanik** (at the request of Mr. **Patman**), for 1 hour, on February 24; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter immediately following Mr. **Patman**.

Mr. **Waggonner**, for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. **Gross**, for 30 minutes, on Monday, February 21.

Mr. **Feighan**, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. **Pucinski**, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. **Quie** (at the request of Mr. **Gross**) for 5 minutes, February 21; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. **Fogarty** (at the request of Mr. **de la Garza**), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the **Congressional Record**, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. **Howard**.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. **Gross**) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. **Rumsfeld**.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. **de la Garza**) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. **Morrison** in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. **de la GARZA**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 21, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2053. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report showing quantities of commodities on hand, sales and disposition methods used, and quantities of CCC commodities moved into consumption channels, pursuant to section 201(b), Public Law 540, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2054. A letter from the Assistant Chief of Navy Material (Procurement), transmitting the semiannual report of research and development procurement actions of $50,000 and over, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2055. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of proposed amendments extending the concession contracts of several applicants, pursuant to section 5, Public Law 89–249; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2056. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved, according certain beneficiaries of such petitions third preference and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2057. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the restrictions on charges for certain narcotic order forms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER: Committee on Science and Astronautics. S. 774. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a study to determine the advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system in the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 736. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12752, a bill to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1292). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 12888. A bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 12889. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 12890. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 12891. A bill designed to prevent crimes of intimidation, violence, and murder against Negroes and civil rights workers lawfully seeking to enforce the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 12892. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12893. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a national system of minimum retirement payments for all aged, blind, and disabled individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 12894. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 12895. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 12896. A bill to strengthen intergovernmental relations by improving cooperation and the coordination of federally aided activities between the Federal, State, and local levels of government; to provide for uniform and equitable relocation procedures under Federal and Federal grant-in-aid programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12897. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program under which States may be assisted in developing programs for the detection of the illegal use of drugs by students; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 12898. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 12899. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 12900. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 12901. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction from gross income for certain nonreimbursable expenses incurred by volunteer firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 12902. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 12903. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 12904. A bill to provide that the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall consist of three appointive members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12905. A bill to amend Pulbic Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 12906. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide interest on certain amounts withheld from wages and certain estimated payments of tax for purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 12907. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 12908. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 12909. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the purchase by the United States of arms and ammunition from foreign firms which have used slave labor, unless compensation has been made to the individuals involved or their heirs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12910. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 12911. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12912. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall acquire additional land for the Beverly National Cemetery, N.J.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12913. A bill to require mailing list brokers to register with the Postmaster General, and suppliers and buyers of mailing lists to furnish information to the Postmaster General with respect to their identity and transactions involving the sale or exchange of mailing lists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 12914. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from exercising jurisdiction over the reception of radio signals, communications, and transmissions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 12915. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1949 to remove the 12.5 percentage limit on the amount of assistance which may be provided thereunder for urban renewal in any one State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 12916. A bill to amend section 208(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide that certificates issued in the future to motor common carriers of passengers shall not confer, as an incident to the grant of regular route authority, the right to engage in special or charter operations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 12917. A bill to extend the period within which certain consolidated corporate income tax returns may be filed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 12918. A bill to authorize grants under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to encourage regional solutions to transportation problems which transcend State boundaries, to authorize grants under the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 on a temporary basis to help defray operating deficits incurred in commuter service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McVICKER:

H. Res. 737. Resolution relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H. Res. 738. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Un-American Activities to conduct certain investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 12919. A bill for the relief of Daniel Pernas Beceiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 12920. A bill for the relief of Alexander Francis Saker, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

327. By the SPEAKER: Petition of chairman, Young Democratic Southeastern Alaska District Committee, box 1125, Ketchikan, Alaska, relative to salmon canneries in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

328. Also, petition of Fak, Chom Sun, No. 7–78 Yongchon-dong, Sodaemun Ku, Seoul, Korea, relative to compensation for the death of her husband; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

329. Also, petition of Charles E. Murphy, 5128½ North Muscatel Avenue, San Gabriel, Calif., and others, relative to awarding a pension to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE

Thursday, February 17, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Haskell R. Deal, D.D., minister, Eldbrooke Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, we come before Thee with humility and gratitude, as we look to Thee from this dedicated memorial of Thy great mercy and guidance; Thy power, guidance, and grace have sustained us in all our history.

Make us sensitive to Thy great providence upon our great land, and to our sacred trust in entering the great tradition of those before us, into whose labors we are entered. Let the light of the honor and sacredness of this place shine throughout our land, keeping alive, in all our people, faith in our dedication to the honor and dignity of human life everywhere.

Great God of wisdom and truth, bless the memory of those who have given themselves in service and honor at this altar of service to our Nation, and have made these walls sacred by their patriotism and devotions. Give to us, we beseech Thee, in these challenging days, that same wisdom and strength manifested in those who have gone before us. Sustain us by Thy wisdom, grace, and truth, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Metcalf, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 16, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting a nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Rear Adm. Willard J. Smith, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard with the rank of admiral, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 251. An act to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes;

S. 577. An act for the relief of Mary F. Morse;

S. 851. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Bernard L. LaMountain, U.S. Air Force (retired);

S. 1520. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Earl Harwell Hogan; and

S.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1903. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sadie Y. Simmons and James R. Simmons;

H.R. 5007. An act for the relief of Arley L. Beem, aviation electrician's mate chief, U.S. Navy;

H.R. 5552. An act for the relief of David B. Glidden;

H.R. 6663. An act for the relief of Dean P. Bartelt;

H.R. 8937. An act for the relief of Charles A. Turner;

H.R. 10674. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10994. An act for the relief of Charles T. Davis, Jr., Sallie M. Davis, and Nora D. White; and

H.R. 11271. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of Defense at the Granite City Defense Depot, Granite City, Ill.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1903. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sadie Y. Simmons and James R. Simmons;

H.R. 5007. An act for the relief of Arley L. Beem, aviation electrician's mate chief, U.S. Navy;

H.R. 5552. An act for the relief of David B. Glidden;

H.R. 6663. An act for the relief of Dean P. Bartelt;

H.R. 8937. An act for the relief of Charles A. Turner;

H.R. 10994. An act for the relief of Charles T. Davis, Jr., Sallie M. Davis, and Nora D. White; and

H.R. 11271. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of Defense at the Granite City Defense Depot, Granite City, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10674. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. METCALF, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. METCALF, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today. This request has been cleared with the minority.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, February 17, 1966, he had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 1407. An act for the relief of Frank E. Lipp; and

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass., in 1969.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 4599. An act to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel of Denver, Colo. (Rept. No. 1005).

By Mr. MOSS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 265. A bill to confirm in the State of Utah title to lands lying below the meander line of the Great Salt Lake in such State (Rept. No. 1006).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Nathan M. Koffsky, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2931. A bill for the relief of Nicolae Calinescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 2932. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish and maintain reserves of agricultural commodities to protect consumers and for other purposes; and

S. 2933. A bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. BASS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina):

S. 2934. A bill to provide needed additional means for the residents of rural America to achieve equality of opportunity by authorizing the making of grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in Community Development Districts designated by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2935. A bill to authorize grants under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to encourage regional solutions to transportation problems which transcend State boundaries, to authorize grants under the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 on a temporary basis to help defray operating deficits incurred in commuter service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCGEE:

S. 2936. A bill for the relief of Maria Becerra Gestal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2937. A bill for the relief of Norman A. Sargent; and

S. 2938. A bill for the relief of Mary Louise Pierce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS:

S. 2939. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to prohibit State and local taxation of electric power produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. BASS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 2940. A bill to coordinate and improve the waste management activities of the Federal Government and of other Government and private organizations; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. NELSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESERVE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES TO PROTECT CONSUMERS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish and maintain reserves of agricultural commodities to protect consumers, and for other purposes. I also send to the desk a short analysis of the bill, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

I wish to announce that hearings on this bill will be held at the same time as those on the bill for food for freedom.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGEE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2932) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish and maintain reserves of agricultural commodities to protect consumers and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The analysis presented by Mr. ELLENDER is as follows:

SHORT ANALYSIS OF BILL AUTHORIZING COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION TO ESTABLISH AND MAINTAIN RESERVES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES TO PROTECT CONSUMERS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Section 201(a) of the Agricultural Act of 1956 requires the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of all stocks of agricultural commodities held by it, as rapidly as possible consistent with its existing authority, the operation of the price support program, and orderly marketing.

The attached bill would authorize the establishment and maintenance of reserves of agricultural commodities primarily to assure a continuous, adequate, and stable supply to meet domestic requirements at fair and reasonable prices, and also to meet the requirements of commercial exports, the food for freedom program, and domestic feeding.

The Commodity Credit Corporation would be authorized to reserve such commodities acquired under price support operations and to procure such commodities for the purpose of the reserve as the Secretary may direct.

The commodities to be reserved and the reserve quantities for each marketing year would be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture after consultation with other interested agencies and would be announced in advance of the marketing year.

The Secretary would be authorized to adjust support prices, acreage allotments and marketing quotas to achieve the production necessary to establish and maintain reserves.

Commodities in the reserve would be available for disposal through sales, barter, donations, and redemption of payment-in-kind certificates. Sales would be made under the price restrictions of existing law. Sales for foreign currencies or upon long-term conditions would be made subject to provisions of the Food for Freedom Act of 1966.

The domestic donations which may be made are those in which can be made under current authority. Foreign donations would be made pursuant to the provisions of other law with respect to such donations. Disposal through barter would be pursuant to other authority available to the Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to such transactions.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes.

I wish to give notice that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which will have this bill, will begin hearings on the bill on March 1, 1966. I send to the desk a short explanation of the purposes of the bill, and ask that it be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2933) to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Ellender, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The explanation presented by Mr. Ellender is as follows:

Short Explanation of Bill

The bill authorizes a 5-year program for furnishing food aid abroad to replace Public Law 480 when it expires on December 31, 1966.

It eliminates the surplus requirement, providing that commodities to be furnished would be those determined to be available by the Secretary of Agriculture, taking into account productive capacity, domestic requirements, farm and consumer price levels, commercial exports, and adequate carryover.

Programs of assistance undertaken pursuant to the new legislation would be directed toward attaining self-help on the part of the recipient countries particularly with respect to meeting needs for food.

Emphasis is placed on the development of markets for American farm products.

The program would continue to be financed under the Commodity Credit Corporation.

TITLE I

This title authorizes the sale of agricultural commodities both for foreign currencies and for dollars on credit terms. The bill enunciates a policy of shifting from foreign currency sales to dollar credit sales at a progressive rate in order that the transition to dollar sales can be completed by December 31, 1971, except for U.S. requirements.

The bill limits agreements under this title during any year to $2.5 billion plus unused authorizations from prior years.

TITLE II

This title authorizes the donation of agricultural commodities for such purposes as to meet emergency food needs for victims of disasters, to provide food-for-work community development programs, and to carry out the U.S. pledge to the world food program.

The policy of furnishing this type of aid through nonprofit voluntary relief agencies to the maximum extent practicable is reemphasized.

Programs of assistance under this title during any year are limited to $800 million plus unused authorizations from prior years.

TITLE III

This title provides that currencies which accrue from foreign currency sales shall be deposited to the credit of the United States and shall be used for specified purposes. Among the purposes authorized are: to finance U.S. expenses abroad, to develop new markets for U.S. agricultural commodities, to procure military equipment for common defense, to promote economic development, to finance educational exchange programs, to make loans to U.S. firms for business development and trade expansion, and to finance research.

RURAL POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, in behalf of myself, Mr. Bass, Mr. Cooper, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Russell of South Carolina, a bill to provide needed additional means for the residents of rural America to achieve equality of opportunity, by authorizing the making of grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in community development districts designated by the Secretary of Agriculture. Hearings on this bill will begin on March 9 of this year.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for a period of 1 week, so that others who may desire to join as cosponsors may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2934) to provide needed additional means for the residents of rural America to achieve equality of opportunity by authorizing the making of grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in community development districts designated by the Secretary of Agriculture, introduced by Mr. Ellender (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the President's message on the subject, as well as a staff explanation, and an analysis of the bill.

There being no objection, the message from the President, explanation and analysis presented by Mr. Ellender are as follows:

Rural Poverty Program—Message From the President of the United States Transmitting the Rural Poverty Program

To the Congress of the United States:

Last year in my message on agriculture I described poverty's grip on rural America:

Nearly half of the poor in the United States live in rural areas.

Almost one in every two rural families has a cash income under $3,000.

One-fourth of rural nonfarm homes are without running water.

Rural people lag almost 2 years behind urban residents in educational attainment.

Health facilities in rural areas are so inadequate that rural children receive one-third less medical attention than urban children.

These deficiencies persist in 1966. Their effect is grievous on urban America—the recipient of millions of unskilled migrants from rural areas in the past two decades. It is tragic on the rundown farms and impoverished communities that still house 4.4 million poor rural families.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

Last year I directed—

Each department and agency administering a program that could benefit rural people, to assure that its benefits were distributed equitably between urban and rural areas.

The Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Budget to review the administrative obstacles that might stand in the way of such a distribution.

The Secretary of Agriculture to put his field offices to the task of assisting other Federal agencies in making their programs effective in rural areas.

As a result, the Rural Community Development Service was created and charged with assuring that the Department made that assistance available.

This mission of the Department is now firmly established in practice. Its field personnel are active in informing rural people of their eligibility for medicare, and of its requirements. They work with the Economic Development Administration in planning and encouraging new rural industrial developments. In several pilot counties, concerted projects are underway. The Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Agriculture are joined in a common effort to bring social services to poor rural communities. The water and sewer facilities program has been simplified. They have been made more responsive to the needs of small towns and communities.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has increased its efforts in rural areas. Community action programs are underway in a number of rural counties—supporting community action planning; providing remedial reading courses, vocational instruction, and adult education; and assisting small cooperatives to acquire farm machinery.

These programs have inspired a new sense of hope among the rural Americans who have experienced them.

More—much more—needs to be done if their effects are to reach the dispersed but very real pockets of rural poverty throughout America.

THE NEED FOR PLANNING

Legislation enacted by the first session of this Congress, and in prior years, provides the means for a massive attack on poverty in America.

But—even with the help of these great new programs—too few rural communities are able to marshal sufficient physical, human, and financial resources to achieve a satisfactory level of social and economic development.

The central advantage of the city has been a large and concentrated population to provide the leadership and technical capability. This leadership can achieve economies of scale in operations, to provide adequate public services and facilities for its people.

On the other hand, it is difficult, if not impossible, for every small hamlet to offer its own complete set of public services. Nor is it economic for the small city to try to achieve metropolitan standards of service, opportunity, and culture, without relation to its rural environs.

The related interests of each need to be taken into account in planning for the public services and economic development of the wider community. In this way the benefits of creative federalism can be brought to our rural citizens—in small cities as well as its rural neighbors.

WHAT MIGHT BE DONE

The base exists for such coordinated planning.

New communities are coming into being—stimulated by advanced means of travel and communications. Because of these it is possible to extend to people in the outlying rural areas a richer variety of public services, and of economic and cultural opportunities.

Resources must be combined—in larger areas, as well as rural and small urban communities. In a population base large enough to support a full range of efficient and high-quality public services and facilities, we can achieve the conditions necessary for economic and social advance.

THE DIMENSIONS OF THE COMMUNITIES

The dimensions of an area within which residents should join to carry out integrated planning are likely to be already marked by the trading or commuting patterns.

In most such communities, the total population will be large enough, with enough potential users of each essential service, to justify employing competent full-time resident specialists in medical services, schools, and the like. In some such communities, where towns of even 10,000 are scarce, it may be more practical to provide major services to people at the outer limits through mobile facilities.

BENEFITS OF PLANNING

Coordinated planning can stimulate economic growth.

It can provide the economies of efficient public services—which attract business and industry.

It can make possible adequate vocational training. Rural workers who lack present job opportunities can become qualified for work in new and expanding industries within reach of their homes or farms.

It can provide the schools to spare young children the fate of their fathers. Seventy-two percent of all poor rural families today are headed by persons who have finished only 8 years of schooling or less.

It can greatly enlarge the effectiveness of public and private resources.

It can insure that programs will comprise a logical and comprehensive effort to solve the community's interrelated problems at minimum cost.

It can bring us closer to achieve a more beautiful, more livable rural America. An increasing combination of local, State, and Federal resources is already beginning to transform the countryside. This cooperation is making multiple uses possible—for production, for outdoor recreation, and for the restoration of natural beauty. Planning can help make this beneficence a part of the lives of millions of urban Americans.

Above all, planning is an affirmative act. It signifies the willingness of rural men and women to make their part of America a place of hope. Rural America need not be a wasteland from which the young, however ill prepared, flee to the cities. It does not have to be a place where live only those too old, too poor, too defeated to seek other horizons.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS

I propose that we show how broad-based planning can inspire the people of rural America to unite the resources of their rural governments and small cities.

I propose this union to improve the quality of life for the citizens of both.

I propose that we assist in the establishment of a number of community development districts to carry out, under local initiative, such comprehensive planning.

The boundaries of community development districts will correspond to the normal commuting or trading patterns of the rural and city residents.

Planning activities for the district will be performed under the direction of representatives selected by each of the participating county or municipal governments. They will be responsible for planning the coordination of all governmental development and service functions within the district.

Federal grants would be provided:

(1) For districtwide planning of public services and governmental functions where other Federal planning assistance is not available; and

(2) For districtwide coordination of local planning activities with Federal programs and private initiatives, in a comprehensive attack on rural community problems.

The Secretary of Agriculture will certify that the area has met the requirements for designation as a community development district. Selection of the pilot districts will be made to afford experience in a representative variety of geographic, economic, and social conditions. Funds will be requested to augment those presently available for planning grants.

Federal assistance would help to support coordinated and comprehensive planning for all public services, development programs, and governmental functions within the district; a continuing liaison with Federal and State agencies; and a comprehensive survey of resources and needs within the district, such as labor skills, industrial sites, land and water resources, health care, education, cultural opportunities, and public services.

Thus the scope of planning to be supported would extend beyond physical development. It would encompass as well the social and economic needs of the area, and its potential for growth.

Each agency of the Government charged with administering a program relevant to these needs will be requested to cooperate with the community development districts. For example, a comprehensive survey of medical conditions in the area would be undertaken by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Teacher Corps—which I again urge the Congress to support at a level commensurate with its promise—would be asked to make teams available for the districts. The Department of Agriculture will offer a concerted emphasis in its resource development programs within the pilot districts.

The purpose of the planning effort I recommend is to assist these districts to achieve significant economies of scale and rational use of resources. This achievement can lift them, and their peoples, above their present level of development.

Our purpose is to demonstrate how a common effort can provide the needed district vocational school in one county, the hospital in another, the police training in a third, industry or an adequate library in a fourth. This effort can avoid the waste of duplication—or worse still, the total lack of such facilities or services because of a failure to pool common resources.

Our purpose is not to supplant present efforts of local, State, or Federal governments. Our purpose is to supplement them. Then we do not forsake the small community, but help to avoid underrepresentation in decisions that affect its life.

MEDICAL NEEDS

Rural families share with the urban poor a greater need for modern medical services. Infant mortality and infectious-disease rates are higher, life expectancy is lower, and the need for chronic-illness care is just as prevalent. Yet rural families have had less access to physicians, with rural States averaging only a third the number of physicians per person as the heavily populated urban States. The continuing decline in the per capita number of physicians, therefore, strikes harder at rural families.

The beneficial effects of recent legislation, providing for more extensive professional relationship between rural hospitals and urban medical centers; the improved schooling that will soon be available in rural areas; improved roads and transportation—all will reduce the difficulty in recruiting physicians for rural areas by increasing the professional and educational opportunities available to them.

Nevertheless, we are not recruiting sufficient numbers of medical students from the families of the urban poor and rural areas. We need a financial incentive that will make it possible for children of these families to undertake a medical career. At the same time we need to draw upon medical students from other areas to settle in rural medical practice.

I shall soon propose, therefore, that a loan forgiveness program modeled upon the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1965 be applied to medical students who choose to practice in poor rural areas.

RURAL POVERTY

The efforts of five administrations have provided some relief for hundreds of thousands of poor families who remain on small farms and in rural communities. Yet the old task remains undone: to end the travail of unemployed and underemployed men; to teach their children the skills they must have to prosper in a competitive society; to provide enough food, adequate shelter, and decent medical care for their families; and to help them achieve freedom from want and fear in their later years.

I do not believe we should stand idly by and permit our rural citizens to be ground into poverty—exposing them, unassisted and unencouraged, to the neglect of a changing society. Few other elements of our population are so treated by our humane and progressive people.

Yet I believe we need the counsel of those best qualified by experience and understanding of rural America's problems, to help us chart our course of assistance to her poor.

Consequently, I shall soon appoint a Commission on Rural Poverty, whose task it will be to make recommendations to me, within 1 year of its appointment, on the most efficient and promising means of sharing America's abundance with those who have too often been her forgotten people.

Rural poverty has proved an almost intractable problem in past decades. Its abolition may require a journey of a thousand miles.

But the first step in that journey is the pooling of the common resources of rural Americans—joining them in a common planning effort that will magnify the resources of each.

In the program I propose, I ask the Congress to take that step with me today.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 25, 1966*.

S. 2934

A bill to provide needed additional means for the residents of rural America to achieve equality of opportunity by authorizing the making of grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in designated community development districts designated by the Secretary of Agriculture

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Community Development District Act of 1966".

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act (1) to provide the means for more equitable participation by rural residents in coordinated planning activities and decisions; (2) to increase efficiency in the use of resources; (3) to provide full representation of smaller governmental units in the planning activities and decisions which affect their residents, so that existing and future programs can be made more effective in providing in rural America equality of opportunity; (4) to improve the relationships between and the welfare of both ubran and rural people; and (5) to facilitate the cooperation among all Federal, State, and local agencies in establishing multi-county community development districts to better coordinate the planning of programs to improve rural life.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture, after consulting with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, may designate as a community development district (hereafter called "district") any area that has been so delineated by the State agency specified by the Governor or legislature of the State, or any other area if such designation is not in conflict with the action of such State agency, where he finds that the area encompassed within the district includes a county or municipal government having jurisdiction over a commuting center, or two or more centers within convenient daily commuting distance of each other, and the surrounding territory within convenient daily commuting distance of such centers. The district may include such other territory beyond convenient daily commuting distance of such centers within which the residents are dependent upon such centers as their usual source of some or all of the goods and services generally secured by daily commuting. "Convenient daily commuting distance" means such distance and direction as residents normally commute for their day-to-day commercial, vocational, public service, social, and cultural pursuits.

SEC. 4. (a) Upon designation of a district by the Secretary of Agriculture, a community development district planning agency (hereafter called "agency") may be established in the district. The agency shall be established and governed by a board or commission (hereafter called "board") whose members are appointed by and responsible to the participating county or municipal governments having jurisdiction within the district. Representation on the board shall be reasonably related to the populations of the participating governmental jurisdictions, and the eligibility of county or municipal governments to participate shall be so established as to enable all citizens residing within the district to be represented on the board by the appointee of an elected government.

(b) "Participating" governments as used in this Act means those counties and municipalities which have authorized by official action of their governing bodies representation on the board and participation in the functions of the board.

SEC. 5. (a) Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding thereto the following:

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section grants may be made by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to the planning agency of any community development district designated by the Secretary of Agriculture under the Community Development District Act of 1966 for comprehensive planning as defined in this section and in accordance with purposes of that Act. Such grants shall be in the amounts certified by the Secretary of Agriculture, as follows:

"(1) Not to exceed 75 per centum of the costs of salaries and expenses of the professional staff required for community development district program development planning, and for other planning of public services and other functions of the participating governments for which Federal planning grants are not otherwise available.

"(2) Planning incentive grants in an amount not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount of other Federal grants for planning purposes extended within the district.

"Grants provided under this subsection to the planning agency may be paid in whole or in part to participating governments for the use of the planning agency where this will facilitate the purposes of the Community Development District Act of 1966.

"For purposes of this subsection comprehensive planning may also include the undertaking of coordinated planning for public services and for all other governmental functions."

SEC. 6. The Administrator of any Federal assistance program having a requirement for planning as a condition of loan or grant assistance shall, before approval of such assistance, give consideration to the plans for the applicable district.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture shall require, as a condition of extending planning assistance, that the board agree to give consideration to all other planning requirements under any other Federal program.

SEC. 8. Any agencies of the United States authorized to make grants, loans, or other assistance shall accord due and appropriate consideration to requests for assistance to carry out plans of districts. Upon request of a board, the Secretary of Agriculture may provide technical advice to applicants for such assistance in the development and implementation of plans provided for in this Act.

SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to delegate to the heads of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government such of his functions, powers, and duties under this Act as he may deem appropriate, and to authorize the redelegation of such functions, powers, and duties by the heads of such departments and agencies.

(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will, to the maximum extent permitted by other applicable laws, assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act.

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SHORT STAFF EXPLANATION OF RURAL POVERTY BILL

The bill requested by the President in his message transmitting the rural poverty program provides for planning assistance to local areas. It would be called the Community Development District Act of 1966. Under it the Secretary of Agriculture, after consulting with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, could designate community development districts (generally within daily commuting distance of a center), if such action did not conflict with State action. A planning agency would be established for each district by a board consisting of representatives of county and municipal governments in the district.

Grants could then be made by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to the planning agency in amounts certified by the Secretary of Agriculture for—

1. Up to 75 percent of the professional staff cost required for development planning and planning of public services and functions for which Federal planning grants are not otherwise available; and
2. Planning incentive grants in an amount up to 10 percent of the amount of other Federal planning grants made within the district.

An analysis prepared by the Department of Agriculture is attached.

ANALYSIS OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT ACT OF 1966

Sections 1 and 2: The purpose of this act is to help raise the quality of life and the level of opportunity in rural America to a par with our continually rising expectations of urban life by—

1. Providing the means for more equitable participation by rural residents in coordinated planning activities and decisions;
2. Increasing efficiency in the use of resources;
3. Providing full representation of smaller governmental units in the planning activities and decisions which affect their residents, so that existing and future programs can be made more effective in providing in rural America equality of opportunity;
4. Improving the relationships between and the welfare of both urban and rural people; and
5. Facilitating the cooperation among all Federal, State and local agencies in establishing multicounty community development districts to better coordinate the planning of programs to improve rural life.

Section 3: The Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized, after consulting with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, to designate community development districts. The boundaries of districts would be those delineated by the appropriate State planning agency, or not in conflict with action taken by such State agency.

This will have the important advantage of enabling the State planning agency to develop a pattern for planning organization within the State that can be followed uniformly in planning for all State, local, and Federal governmental programs.

The guidelines for determining the boundaries of districts, in accordance with the standards specified in this bill, are likely to be already marked with considerable precision by the commuting patterns that have been drawn by rural and urban residents together as they drive to work, to shop, to college, to visit, and to medical, educational, vocational training, recreational, and cultural facilities. The commuting center is likely to be within 1 hour's driving time of most or all residents.

In such districts the total population will be large enough to insure enough users of each essential service to justify employing competent, full-time resident specialists to provide concerted medical and educational services. In some regions where towns of even 10,000 people are scarce, it is more practical to provide major services to people at the outer limits through mobile facilities rather than for them to commute.

No two districts, of course, will be identical. But a typical district can be thought of as having a small- or medium-sized city at the center, together with a circle of primarily rural counties within commuting range around it. Some districts might contain two or more urban centers. The rural counties will invariably contain several county-seat towns and smaller settlements. The distinguishing feature is that residents of the district normally and spontaneously carry on most of their resident-type activities within its limits.

Section 4: Upon designation of a district by the Secretary of Agriculture, a community development district planning agency may be established. It shall be governed by a board or commission whose members are appointed by the participating county or municipal governments. Representation on the board is to be reasonably related to population of the governmental jurisdictions participating. The eligibility of participating governments is to be established so that all residents within the district can be represented on the board, if an elected government having jurisdiction over them takes the necessary official action to participate in the functions of the planning agency. A participating government is defined as one that has taken official action to appoint a representative on the board and to participate in its functions.

Section 5: Section 5 would amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, relating to community planning, by adding an additional subsection "h". The grants' program would be administered by the Department of Agriculture, but the funds granted are to be disbursed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development would make grants in the amounts and to district planning agencies certified by the Secretary of Agriculture, for funds authorized under the proposed legislation.

Grants would cover part of the cost of salaries and expenses of professional staffs needed to carry out comprehensive planning, as defined in section 701, as it would be amended by the Community Development District Act. Such grants would be available to cover—

1. Up to 75 percent of the professional staff cost for developing the district planning program, and for planning of other governmental functions and public services for which Federal planning grants are not otherwise available; and

2. Planning incentive grants in an amount up to 10 percent of other Federal planning grants made within the district.

Grants could be paid to the participating governments for use by the planning agency, if this would facilitate district planning. This would enable district planning agencies to function in some States which may not now have legislative authority for county municipal governments to undertake such planning jointly.

For the purposes of this new provision, the term "comprehensive planning" under section 701 is broadened to include the undertaking of coordinated planning for public services and for all other governmental functions.

The regular section 701 planning grants, and the special planning grants under the proposed Community Development District Act of 1966, would be distinct and separate, but related, planning grant programs.

The present urban planning assistance program authorized by section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, provides Federal grants to supplement State and local funds for the purpose of financing comprehensive and coordinated urban planning activities. This main thrust is to develop plans that would more adequately deal with the problems of smaller communities and related metropolitan areas arising from the expansion of urban and urbanizing areas, which in many instances, transcend political boundaries. The planning purposes are concerned with the pattern and intensity of land use and the provision of public facilities, including transportation, open space and recreation, housing, health, educational facilities, community development and urban renewal, and long-range fiscal plans for such development. These grants require the intergovernmental coordination of all related planning activities among the State and local governmental agencies concerned.

The present urban planning assistance program provides a maximum grant of two-thirds of the total cost of the urban planning project. If the locality is situated in Economic Development Administration redevelopment areas, or in areas in which there has occurred a substantial reduction in employment as a result of a decline in government employment or purchases, grants may amount to as much as 75 percent of the project cost, which is the amount that would be authorized under the Community Development District Act for districts designated by the Secretary of Agriculture. In addition, community development districts may get up to a maximum of a 10-percent of the amount of other grants within the district as an additional incentive grant.

Under the present section 701 authorities, counties (without regard to population) and multicounty agencies may receive planning grants. However, such grants are limited to use for plans for the development of public facilities, including transportation, land use, open space, recreation, etc., in the population centers.

The planning and development of public facilities in the main population centers of metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas will contribute importantly to rural opportunities in the area. However, there is needed also an efficient means for the planning of programs for improved public services and governmental functions in predominantly rural areas. The broader scope of comprehensive planning for community development districts that would be provided by the proposed amendment to section 701 will permit predominantly rural local governments to participate in planning for the improvement and development of the natural resources, public facilities, and public services, with the commuting center cities upon which rural people must depend to an important extent.

Section 6: The bill would require the administrator of any Federal assistance program, having a requirement for planning as a condition of loan or grant assistance, to give consideration to the plans of the applicable district before approving such aid. This would help to insure that federally aided projects within a district will conform to the districtwide plan.

Section 7: Requires the Secretary of Agriculture to condition planning assistance to districts upon the boards agreement to give consideration to the planning requirements of other Federal programs.

Section 8: Any Federal agency making grants, loans, or other assistance would be required to give consideration to requests for assistance needed to carry out a district's plan. Upon request of a district board, the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to give technical advice to applicants for such assistance, in the development and carrying out of projects conforming to the district's plans.

Section 9: The Secretary of Agriculture would receive the conventional authority to delegate his functions under this act to other Federal agencies. All Federal agencies would be required to exercise their functions, to the maximum extent permitted by other law, in such a manner as to assist in carrying out the objectives of this act.

Section 10: The bill would authorize appropriations needed for administering the provisions of this act.

REGIONAL SOLUTIONS TO CERTAIN TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to encourage regional solutions to mass transportation problems which transcend State boundaries, and to provide expanded Federal assistance to hard-pressed commuter services.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the bill seeks to encourage the regional approach in solving mass transit commuter problems, by doing the following:

First. Authorizing the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants of up to three-fourths of the estimated cost of surveys, studies, and development plans undertaken by regional transportation authorities. Only authorities duly created by individual States or through interstate compact and empowered to own or lease and to operate transportation facilities would qualify for these grants.

Second. Authorizing the Secretary to provide technical assistance with respect to the establishment of these transportation authorities.

The bill would also—

Third. Increasing the authorization under the Mass Transit Act to $300 million a year through fiscal 1970.

Fourth. Authorizing the Secretary, for a maximum of 3 years, to make grants of up to 50 percent of the operating deficits of any mass transportation company running commuter service in one or more urban areas.

Such grants would be conditioned on the submission to the secretary of a commuter service improvement plan providing for a more efficient and economical commuter service. This portion of the legislation differs from S. 2804, recently introduced by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], in that it limits the duration of such aid to any one company to 3 years—rather than 10 years—and sets a maximum grant at one-half—rather than two-thirds—of the actual operating deficit.

Fifth. Increase the limit of what any one State may receive under the capital grant program of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 from 12½ to 15 percent under certain conditions.

Mr. President, I firmly believe it is the role of the Federal Government to meet the operating costs of essential commuter service just as the Federal Government spends millions of dollars to give aid to other means of transportation such as the subsidies to airlines and the merchant marine and, of course, the enormous Federal highway program. Under present law, States may receive up to 90 percent of the cost for highway construction from the Federal Government for interstate highway systems. The intention of increased Federal aid in the case of commuter railroads is only to provide temporary assistance—the bill limits Federal grants to 50 percent of the annual net operating loss for a 3-year period. It is my hope that within that period of time, the commuter service either through private or State aid may no longer need Federal support.

I have previously introduced legislation to create an interstate rail authority to operate financially hard-pressed commuter services. That legislation, S. 1234, was recently the subject of hearings by the Senate Commerce Committee. This present proposal would increase incentives for the establishment of such regional transportation authorities on a national basis.

Failure to maintain commuter service would bring about not only intolerable restrictions on the flow of commuter traffic in heavily urbanized areas, but also would result in increasing the burdens of already crowded highways and the need for added Federal and State expenditures for highway construction. The loss of 4 tracks of 1 commuter railroad would, according to a recent survey, require the construction of 80 highway lanes at prohibitive cost.

I have for a long time been aware of the necessity for regional solutions to the transportation needs of many areas of this Nation. I am hopeful that this legislation will stimulate establishment of new regional transportation authorities and, in addition, further strengthen those already in existence, such as the Tri-State Transportation Commission, and the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority.

It is time that we join together where necessary to devise a system of rapid transportation which will work efficiently, economically, comfortably, and safely. Each year we become more aware that although we are building spacecraft which may reach the moon, we are yet unable to provide the citizen with a modern rapid transit system.

I believe that in the development and improvement of commuter services, the Federal Government can help by increasing the amount of funds available to finance expenditures for capital equipment. President Johnson in his budget message requested legislation authorizing $150 million for the programs under the Mass Transit Act for fiscal 1968—this amounts to a 1-year extension of the program at the same figure authorized for fiscal 1966 and 1967. I believe that neither the amount to be authorized nor the 1-year extension requested is actually enough. I am informed that demand for funds has exceeded the amount available in each year since the program was begun. The 1-year extension does not give State and localities a long enough commitment of Federal support to enable them to make comprehensive plans for the future. Accordingly, my proposal would amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize appropriations through fiscal year 1970 and at the same time the amount authorized would be increased to $300 million through fiscal 1970. This amount would include the operating deficits program. A gradual increase to $50 million for fiscal 1969 is authorized for research, development, and demonstration projects.

I am informed that at least three States—New York, California, and Pennsylvania—are certain to make requests for funds amounting to more than the 12½-percent limitation which any one State may receive under the present law. I intend to increase the limitation to 15 percent in the case of any State in which more than two-thirds of the maximum grants have been made or obligated for projects and where the Secretary determines that there is a substantial need for such an increase in order to carry out existing programs. This language is similar to that used in the urban renewal section of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended—section 106(e).

Those who would see the transportation problem—in particular the commuter situation—as strictly a problem confronting the northeastern section of the Nation fail to see what I believe to be the significant national ramifications of this problem. For many, the commuter problem at this time is only a distant din, but as this Nation continues to grow, I can tell you most assuredly that the problem will reach all sections of the Nation. You may be sure this problem of urban transit will arise in Atlanta or in San Francisco or in other metropolitan areas in the future. This is the time for the legislators of all States to join with those of us who are presently immersed in this problem to enact legislation which will not only rid us of these recurrent urban transportation crises but will also prevent such problems from arising in the growing metropolitan areas.

We must stay ahead of the growth of our urban transit needs by developing a farsighted comprehensive plan for urban mass transit through the setting up of regional mass transportation authorities. I believe the Federal Government, with one hand, must temporarily help the commuter railroads to stay alive, while with the other hand, it must give long-term aid so that these railroads may establish a more secure economic position through a capitalization program designed to modernize their facilities.

I urge my colleagues to study the problem and to join with me in supporting this important legislation. I hope that this bill will be the subject of hearings along with a bill of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] (S. 2804) which is now before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2935) to authorize grants under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to encourage regional solutions to transportation problems which transcend State boundaries, to authorize grants under the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 on a temporary basis to help defray operating deficits incurred in commuter service, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2935

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(h) In order to encourage regional solutions to those transportation needs and problems which transcend the boundaries of any one State or its political subdivisions, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is authorized—

"(1) to make grants to regional transportation authorities, designated by the Governors of the States involved and acceptable to the Secretary, which are empowered under State laws or interstate compact to own or lease and to operate transportation facilities, and to perform planning functions with respect to transportation, on a regional basis; and

"(2) to provide technical assistance to States or political subdivisions of States with respect to the establishment of transportation authorities to meet regional transportation needs.

A grant under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not exceed three-fourths of the estimated cost to any such authority for undertaking surveys and studies, and developing plans and programs, for meeting effectively regional transportation requirements. Assistance under paragraph (2) of this subsection shall include studies evaluating the need for the establishment of regional transportation authorities in meeting the transportation requirements of metropolitan or other areas in the United States, and such assistance may be provided by the Secretary through members of his staff, or by contract with public or private institutions or firms."

Sec. 2. (a) The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by redesignating sections 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 as sections 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, respectively, and by adding after section 5 a new section as follows:

"GRANTS TO MEET COMMUTER SERVICE DEFICITS

"Sec. 6. (a) The Secretary may make grants on a temporary basis to any State or local public body for the purpose of enabling such State or public body to assist any mass transportation company which maintains commuter service in one or more urban areas within the jurisdiction of such State or public body to defray operating deficits incurred as the result of providing such service. The amount of any grant made under this section to any State or local public body to assist any such company shall not exceed one-half of the annual net operating deficit of such company, as certified by such State or public body and approved by the Secretary. Any grant under this section to any State or local public body to assist any mass transportation company to defray operating deficits incurred as the result of providing commuter service in one or more urban areas within the jurisdiction of such State or public body shall be conditioned on the joint submission by such State or local public body and such company of a commuter service improvement plan, meeting criteria established by the Secretary and approved by him, for providing more efficient, economical, and convenient commuter service in such area or areas, and for placing the commuter operations of such company on a sound fiscal basis. No grant shall be made under this section to assist any such company unless (1) the Secretary is satisfied that such company has the requisite ability and authority to carry out an approved commuter service improvement plan, (2) the State or local public body and the company submitting such approved plan agree to provide such joint or separate reports to the Secretary as he may require, and (3) such company agrees to permit the Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, during any period in which it is receiving assistance under this section, to have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any of its books, documents, papers, and records that are pertinent to the purposes for which such assistance is granted. No such company shall receive assistance provided under this section for a period in excess of three years, except that the Secretary may authorize such assistance for an additional period, not exceeding two years, if he determines that an extension is necessary in order to enable such company to carry out its commuter service improvement plan.

"(b) In providing assistance under this Act for the benefit of any mass transportation company, the Secretary shall, insofar as practicable, coordinate such assistance with any other assistance which is reasonably available to such company from public or private sources."

(b) Section 10(c) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (a)) is amended—

(1) by striking out the semicolon at the end of clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof ", and the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;";

(2) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (4);

(3) by striking out the period at the end of clause (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(4) by adding at the end there a new clause as follows:

"(6) the term 'annual net operating deficit' means that part of the annual operating costs of a mass transportation company which could reasonably have been avoided by the elimination of commuter service in an urban area, less the annual revenues derived by such company from the provision of such service."

Sec. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 4(b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows: "In addition to amounts heretofore appropriated to finance grants under this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated for that purpose not to exceed $300,000,000 for fiscal year 1967; $300,000,000 for fiscal year 1968; $300,000,000 for fiscal year 1969; and $300,000,000 for fiscal year 1970."

(b) The first sentence of section 7(b) of such Act (as redesignated by section 2(a) of this Act) is amended to read as follows: "In addition to amounts heretofore made available to finance projects under this section, the Administrator may make available for that purpose from the mass transportation grant authorization provided in section 4(b) not to exceed $35,000,000, which limit shall be increased to $40,000,000 on July 1, 1967, to $45,000,000 on July 1, 1968, and to $50,000,000 on July 1, 1969."

Sec. 4. Section 13 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (as redesignated by section 2(a) of this Act) is amended—

(1) by striking out "section 7(b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 8(b)"; and

(2) by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That such limitation shall be increased to 15 per centum in the case of any State, if (1) more than two-thirds of the maximum grants permitted under the foregoing limitation have been made or obligated for projects in such State, and (2) the Secretary determines that there is a substantial need for such increase in order to carry out existing programs meeting the requirements of section 4(a)."

PROHIBITION OF STATES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FROM TAXING TVA PRODUCED ELECTRIC POWER

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to prohibit State and local taxation of electric power produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

One of the principal motivating factors behind the enactment of the law creating the TVA was reasonably priced electric power for consumers. The success in this area is so remarkable that today the rates of TVA produced power are used as a guideline or a yardstick for the price of power throughout our Nation.

Yet, Mr. President, there are forces at work today that would undermine this economical concept. It is indeed ironic that, after the potential of a State has been developed to such a great degree by an agency, this same State would turn and attack one of the basic concepts of the developing agency. But this is what is being done to the consumer by applying sales taxes to the sale of electric power produced by TVA. The temptation to cash in at the expense of, not only the TVA, but the citizen-consumer proved too great.

Most States which have sales taxes provide exemptions for basic necessities. Certainly, after the recent experience of the blackout in New York City, no one can question that electric power is essential. In the TVA area this is doubly true. With the advent of reasonably priced electric power, the people of this region have utilized electricity on a much wider scale than other areas of the country. For instance, more people heat their homes electrically in this section than in any other area of our Nation.

However, certain State governments, and I must regretably report that my own is the chief transgressor, have seen fit to attempt to tap this source of blessing to their people by applying sales taxes.

This practice, Mr. President, is not only in obvious disregard of the State government's responsibility to insure the essentials of life to its own people, but is an attack on the principles and concepts of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2939) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to prohibit State and local taxation of electric power produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority, introduced by Mr. Bass, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

WASTE MANAGEMENT RESEARCH ACT OF 1966

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am introducing today the first in a series of bills which will comprise a comprehensive package of antipollution legislation for consideration by the U.S. Congress.

These bills will be a sharp departure from what we have done in the past. They will revolutionize America's approach to water pollution. They will involve considerable costs. They will undoubtedly be controversial.

But they also are inescapable. They accept the hard reality that pollution has all but destroyed our rivers, that it is on its way to destroying our lakes, and that it is threatening our supply of fresh water. They recognize that our cities, States, private industries and the Federal Government are presently unable to check pollution. And they provide a solution to this mounting crisis which we can ignore no longer.

My judgment tells me that the people of America are ready at long last for this kind of legislation. It may take a while for such a broad program to be fully understood. It may require some budgeting skill to make the necessary funds available. But if the public and its elected representatives really want to save their threatened waters, then we have no real alternative but to adopt this comprehensive approach. Pollution itself is costly and controversial. If we are not willing to pay the price to save our fresh blue waters, we will pay a far more terrible price in their destruction.

During the past 3 years, I have discussed this subject in speeches in some 23 States from coast to coast. It is my conclusion that it will cost us anywhere from $50 to $100 billion over the next decade and a half to save our fresh waters from complete destruction. This is a large amount of money. However, it amounts to about 1 or 2 years' budget for the Department of Defense. This certainly is a reasonable amount to invest to enhance the environment in which we live. Everywhere I have gone I have found the public willing to undertake an attack on pollution of such magnitude. The public, in fact, is far ahead of the Congress in its concern over this issue.

Last fall, I was asked by the Milwaukee Journal to write a detailed series of articles on the nationwide pollution problem and to propose some solutions. These articles were inserted in the Congressional Record by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] on January 19.

Since that time, these proposals have been translated into bill form with the assistance of the Department of the Interior, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Senate legislative counsel.

Many others, of course, share my concern about this national pollution problem. The Senate Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee, on which I was privileged to serve in the last session of Congress, has announced its intention to introduce legislation in this field.

Last Sunday the New York Times published a story expressing the President's deep concern on this issue and speculating on the legislative proposals which he might make to meet the problem.

Because I feel a personal obligation to propose a comprehensive program to meet the pollution crisis, I will offer these bills for the consideration of the Congress. It is my hope that after considering these bills, along with those recommended by the President and the Senate Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee, the Congress will go on this year to enact a truly comprehensive program to check and eradicate water pollution.

THE POLLUTION CRISIS

Never before in history has our Nation become so aware of the growing crisis of water pollution. In the past 12 months, it has drawn the urgent attention of the President of the United States, has dominated the covers of our national news magazines, has filled the front pages of American newspapers, and has been dramatically portrayed in television documentaries.

The grim facts have shocked the Nation:

Every major river system in America is polluted.

Almost all our lakes face possible ruin, from the smallest pool in the woods to the mighty Great Lakes chain.

Experts warn that vast Lake Erie may already be too far gone to save, as it suffocates from a surge of pollution which has consumed all the oxygen in the 2,500 square mile heart of the lake and set off a cancerlike explosion of weeds and algae.

Southern Lake Michigan's pollution has been labeled "practically irreversible," with the grim report that even if all pollution stopped today it might take 100 years for it to be clean again.

Cities are now discharging the equivalent of the untreated sewage from 75 million people.

Industries are now discharging the equivalent of the untreated sewage from 165 million people.

Poisonous pesticides which do not decompose are being used at the rate of 700 million pounds a year, and their use will increase tenfold in the next 20 years.

Ships, yachts, marinas, and lakeshore cottages are polluting many of our choicest lakes and rivers.

A New York woman reviewed these facts recently and summed up the situation in these words:

> We Americans are standing ankle deep in sewage, shooting rockets to the moon.

The problem has been clearly documented, by the President, by the U.S. Public Health Service, by State and local health officers, and by conservation groups all across the Nation. The question is, What do we propose to do about it?

Surely we cannot build a Great Society while standing ankle deep in sewage.

WHAT IS BEING DONE?

It is true, of course, that many dedicated people have done many admirable things in an effort to protect our Nation from the hazards of water pollution.

Our cities have built costly sewage treatment plants, often burdening their property taxpayers by doing so. Many industries have also installed costly waste treatment facilities and spent great sums of money on imaginative research. State and local enforcement officials, usually understaffed and underfinanced, have worked valiantly to protect the public interest.

The Federal Government has moved steadily forward, beginning with the enactment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in 1956, and the strengthening of that act which took place in 1961 and 1965.

But the tragedy of our time is that all this effort has been too little and too late.

The harsh truth is that we cannot control the present level of pollution pouring out of our cities and our industries today. There is no likelihood whatever that present programs will be able to cope with the coming surge of pollution.

Everything we have done, everything we are now doing in an effort to control pollution, is inadequate to meet the threat we face.

WHAT IS WRONG?

Pollution control programs are complicated. But it is possible to state in a few simple words what is wrong with our existing programs at the local, State and Federal level:

Many cities cannot or will not spend the money needed to build adequate sewage treatment plants. The same is true for industries.

Enforcement of antipollution laws is weak. But even tough enforcement will not solve the problem at present. You cannot purify city or industrial wastes with a court order.

We need to know more about the wastes pouring into our waters and how to purify them.

We are trying to dispose of sewage and dangerous new chemical wastes with the same methods used for more than 100 years.

These methods will work no longer. We have got to use our American scientific genius to find more efficient and more effective treatment. You might summarize these conclusions by saying:

We need more knowledge, more money and a new method of enforcement.

That is what is proposed in the package of antipollution bills which will be introduced in the next few days.

Briefly described, the bills in the package will do the following:

First. Greatly increase Federal grants to cities for sewage plant construction. The Federal share of construction costs would be increased from about 30 to 90 percent.

Second. Authorize direct Federal grants to qualifying industries for waste treatment plant construction.

Third. Establish a Federal "pollution tax" for those industries which continue to pollute public waters.

Fourth. Greatly increase federally financed research into waste management and disposal.

Fifth. Strengthen Federal authority to move against pollution when local enforcement fails.

Sixth. Control the kinds of pesticides and other chemicals which may be used, in order to prevent water supplies from becoming permanently poisoned.

Seventh. Require ships and marine terminals on our lakes, rivers and harbors to install approved sewage treatment equipment.

Eighth. Authorize a rejuvenation program once pollution has been checked on a given body of water—to clean up the filth left behind and begin restoration of the quality of the water.

Each of these bills and the problems and existing programs with which they deal will be discussed in detail as they are introduced.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a news story from the Cleveland Plain-Dealer of January 13, 1966, a news story from the Milwaukee Journal of February 3, 1966, and an article from my January 1966 Newsletter, which described these legislative proposals to control pollution. I also ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill to coordinate and improve the waste management activities of the Federal Government and of other government and private organizations, the Waste Management Research Act of 1966, be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, news stories, and articles will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2940) to coordinate and improve the waste management activities of the Federal Government and of other government and private organizations, introduced by Mr. Nelson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2940

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "Waste Management Research Act of 1966."

FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

Sec. 2. (a) The Congress finds—

(1) that the air, water and soil of the Nation are being polluted by the discard and discharge of wastes, seriously impairing the suitability of these resources for other uses and threatening the health and welfare of the people;

(2) that this pollution will become more severe because of great increases in the quantity of wastes and the continuing appearance of new kinds of wastes;

(3) that the present methods and processes for collecting, treating, reclaiming, and disposing of wastes are inadequate now and will be useless in the future for preventing further severe pollution of air, water, and soil;

(4) that research and development in waste management by government and private agencies are not now organized and financed to the extent, nor conducted with the urgency, necessary to solve the problems of waste management in time to avert what will soon be a national pollution crisis; and

(5) that research and development in waste management by government and private agencies should therefore be greatly expanded and accelerated.

(b) The purposes of this Act therefore are—

(1) to provide centralized organization and direction, and adequate financial resources, for expanded and accelerated research and development in waste management by the Federal Government;

(2) to provide guidance and information to State and local governments, and to industrial and other private agencies, for expanded and accelerated waste management research and development;

(3) to insure that the advanced engineering and scientific capabilities developed by government and industry for the defense and space programs are exploited for waste management research and development; and

(4) to direct the development of a comprehensive national waste management program.

COMPREHENSIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT RESEARCH PROGRAM

Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary shall organize the research and related activities authorized by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Clean Air Act, and the Solid Waste Disposal Act, into a comprehensive program for research in waste management. The Secretary shall insure that the program is organized, planned, and conducted with singleness of purpose and maximum effectiveness, and for this purpose the most advanced management and research methods and techniques, including systems analysis and systems engineering, shall be employed.

(b) The Secretary shall also establish within the Department an office to collect from appropriate sources and to disseminate actively to the general public, to agricultural, industrial, and commercial groups and their representatives, and to Federal, State, and local government agencies and their representatives, such information as is available regarding all aspects of air, water, and soil pollution, including in particular the extent and dangers of such pollution, and the financial and technical assistance available from the Federal Government for research on, and prevention and abatement of, such pollution.

(c) As a foundation for the work of the waste management research program established by subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall have compiled a national inventory of waste management needs and problems, and of present waste management methods, including the costs of these methods. He shall then develop and recommend to the Congress a comprehensive national waste management program, including therein alternative waste management systems and a comparative analysis of the cost of such systems, which will meet present and future national waste management needs.

INTERAGENCY COOPERATION

Sec. 4. (a) The Secretary shall encourage and arrange for full and complete cooperation between the waste management research program established under section 3(a), and those programs of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government engaged in research and development work on any aspect of waste management.

(b) The Secretary is hereby authorized to request, and such departments and agencies are directed to grant, the use of the waste disposal installations and facilities of any Federal Government department or agency for the purpose of testing and evaluating new methods, procedures, and equipment for waste management: *Provided,* That in the judgment of the department or agency concerned such test and evaluation work will not disrupt, disorganize, or in any way interfere with the normal activity, operations, and functioning of such agency or department: *Provided further,* That any expense incurred in such test and evaluation work above and beyond the normal and usual expense of operating the waste disposal installations and facilities of the agency or department concerned shall be borne by the Department.

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION

Sec. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1966, and for each of 5 succeeding fiscal years, such amounts as may be necessary for the puropses of this Act.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 6. When used in this Act—

(a) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(b) the term "Department" means the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(c) the term "waste" means the unwanted solid, liquid, and gaseous materials from agricultural, industrial, commercial, domestic, and community production and consumption activities, discarded or discharged into or onto the atmosphere, water courses, or the ground;

(d) the term "waste management" means the planned, organized, and efficient collection, treatment, reclamation, and disposal of waste to minimize or prevent air, water, and soil pollution; and

(e) the term "research" means (1) studies, investigations, and experiments for the development of basic and applied knowledge bearing on waste management in the physical, biological, social and earth sciences; and (2) the design, development, and testing of equipment, methods, and processes for waste management.

The news stories and articles presented by Mr. NELSON are as follows:

[From the Plain Dealer, Jan. 13, 1966]

ONE BILLION DOLLARS TO FIGHT POLLUTION ASKED

(By Thomas R. Guthrie)

WASHINGTON.—U.S. Senator GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, who has described Lake Erie as "a primeval swamp," told the Plain Dealer yesterday he intends to introduce legislation in the present session of Congress to provide $1 billion a year in Federal funds for the war against water pollution.

The Plain Dealer reported Tuesday that NELSON will urge 90-percent Federal financing for sewers and sewage treatment facilities, as proposed by Cleveland Mayor Ralph S. Locher in a recent letter to the 16 Senators in 8 States bordering the Great Lakes.

In response to an inquiry by this reporter, the Wisconsin Democrat yesterday outlined for the Plain Dealer a sweeping pollution abatement program which he will propose:

Direct grants to industrial companies to build sewage treatment facilities.

A pollution tax to be levied against certain industrial companies in proportion to the amount of pollutants they discharge into the waters.

A major expansion of Federal, State, and private research programs in an attempt to find creative new solutions to our waste disposal problems.

Stronger enforcement procedures to carry out our existing Federal antipollution laws.

Legislation to require all ships and marine terminals to install approved sewage treatment facilities, combined with improved enforcement of laws against pollution from vessels and marine terminals.

A lake "rejuvenation program," to clean up waters and beaches and restock fish once pollution has been checked.

Along with this package of legislation the Wisconsin Democrat will put before Congress a bill to establish a Great Lakes water authority which would exercise jurisdiction over the water resources of the eight-State lakes region.

"I am delighted," NELSON said, "that Mayor Locher and the Plain Dealer are providing the public leadership in your area which is so vital if we are to attack the mounting nationwide crisis of water pollution."

He said he had already found Senators FRANK J. LAUSCHE and STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio, to be interested and helpful.

Today, LAUSCHE will meet with officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to discuss problems relating to new legislation in the war against pollution.

LAUSCHE already has indicated he intends to call a meeting of the lakes Senators to consider a crash program to clean up the lakes and streams of the Nation.

Locher proposed in his letter a 90-5-5 formula for Federal-State-local financing of sewerage programs. NELSON pointed out that at present the Federal Government pays only about 30 percent of such costs.

Other Senators commenting on Mayor Locher's proposal were WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, PAT MCNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, and BIRCH BAYH, Democrat, of Indiana. Their comments:

Mr. PROXMIRE. "Under the present system of cost sharing, more sewer construction per Federal dollar is undertaken than would be the case under the 90-5-5 system. Consequently, it would be necesasry to increase Federal appropriations if the formula is changed."

Mr. MCNAMARA. "I will keep (Mayor Locher's) views in mind should water pollution legislation come before the Senate."

Mr. BAYH. "Obviously we must increase the quantity of our expenditures and quality of our programs if we are to abate and prevent the poisoning of our lakes, rivers, and streams. (Locher's) suggestions strongly merit consideration."

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Feb. 3, 1966]

NELSON MAPS MASSIVE DRIVE TO CLEAN UP LAKES, STREAMS

(By John W. Kole)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The most comprehensive package of water pollution bills ever introduced in Congress is being prepared by Senator NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

The Senator disclosed Thursday that he planned to introduce the sweeping legislation before the end of the month.

The bills will call for billions of dollars in expenditures to spearhead the $100 billion Federal program NELSON believes is necessary during the next 15 years to clean up the Nation's rivers, streams, and lakes.

Among the revolutionary concepts in the package:

Federal grants to finance 90 percent of the cost of sewage treatment facilities built by local governments.

A "carrot and stick" approach of helping industries to build waste treatment plants with direct Federal grants, perhaps up to 20 percent of the cost, fast tax depreciation writeoffs and penalties for dumping untreated wastes in waterways.

An unprecedented expansion of Federal support for Government and university research programs to find new methods to deal with the huge pollution problem.

A massive national study which would use the newest computer techniques to draw up a comprehensive waste management program for the Federal Government.

NELSON said in an interview that he realized that any legislation which called for billions of dollars in new Federal aid faced rough sledding in Congress this year because of the sharply rising costs of the war in Vietnam.

But he said he was convinced the problem had been mishandled for so long that the Federal Government had to direct a huge program if the problem ever was to be solved.

AID FOR INDUSTRY

The most revolutionary item in the package is the 90 percent Federal financing for local sewage disposal facilities. That item alone could cost billions of dollars a year.

At present, NELSON said, the Federal Government pays only about 30 percent of the costs of sewage plants.

The Senator said he realized that there was an inherent penalty in such a program for communities which had spent large sums to upgrade their sewage treatment plants. But he said he knew of no way to make such a program retroactive.

About two-thirds of the pollution volume comes from American industries with the other third coming from municipal sewage systems.

Nelson's proposal to combine incentives and penalties to deal with industrial pollution would go a long way toward meeting the demands of industrialists who contend that waste treatment should be a "social cost."

While the Senator believes that industry generally has been shamefully negligent in dealing with the problem, he recognizes that the public probably will pay the bill no matter what approach is taken—either through higher taxes or increased prices.

The incentives of Federal grants and tax write-offs for industry would be balanced with "effluent charges" which would be levied against corporations according to the volume of pollution they contributed.

Such a program has been used successfully on Germany's Ruhr River.

NELSON noted that many States for years had relied on the "punish the polluter" concept in dealings with industry.

"But this simply hasn't worked because the laws haven't been enforced," he said. "In Wisconsin, for example, there are orders against industries to stop polluting which are 10 years old."

NELSON said he hoped that he could work out a retroactive feature for this part of his bill to help industries which had built adequate disposal facilities in recent years.

He cited Wisconsin's Kimberly-Clark Corp., which spent $5 million or 10 percent of the cost of a new paper mill at Anderson, Calif., for waste treatment facilities.

THE NELSON NEWSLETTER

(By Senator GAYLORD NELSON)

POLLUTION PACKAGE: SENATOR OFFERS COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Nation has become alarmed at the mounting pollution of its lakes and streams. The threat to our waters has won the attention of newspapers, magazines, television, and book publishers. Public officials, right up to the President of the United States, have recognized it as a crisis deserving emergency action.

Yet for all that has been accomplished in recognizing the crisis, the Nation does not now have a program to meet it. Pollution is being fought by local, State, and Federal Government, but at each level the fight is hopelessly inadequate.

As Senator NELSON said last fall in a Milwaukee Journal series of articles: "We have 175 Federal pollution experts at work—conducting autopsies on dead or dying waters. It will be 25 or 50 years before they can get to the waters which are still clean, and by that time those waters will be ruined, too."

Convinced that urgent action is necessary, and that the public is ready for the bold new programs necessary to fight pollution, Senator NELSON announced this month that he would offer a comprehensive package of antipollution legislation to the 1966 Congress.

The NELSON package would revolutionize the Nation's approach to pollution. Instead of accepting the inevitability of grossly polluted rivers and slowly dying lakes; instead of seeking just a slight advance each year in antipollution efforts which might not even offset population and industrial growth, the NELSON package aims directly at pollution prevention, followed by a new program to rejuvenate waters now ruined.

The heart of the Nelson pollution plan is the acceptance of the fact that neither cities nor industries can now afford to build necessary sewage treatment facilities.

Cities rely on overburdened property taxes, plus a small Federal aid program for 30 percent of the cost—but requests exceed approved projects by a margin of about 3 to 1.

Industries, whose pollution load is now about double that from cities, face stiff competition and see no profits in costly waste treatment works. The Nelson package of legislation will tackle that problem this way:

A vast increase in Federal grants to cities, from the present $150 million to about $1 billion a year, and a boost in the Federal share of costs from 30 percent to 90 percent.

Industrial grants and fast tax writeoffs to build treatment facilities.

A pollution tax on industries which continue to pollute.

Greatly expanded research to find new, more efficient waste disposal methods to avoid the tremendous costs now expected.

Other Nelson bills will strengthen enforcement, fight pollution from ships and detergents, and rejuvenate waters after pollution is checked.

The package will be offered just as the Federal Government begins organizing a Great Lakes River Basin Commission, urged by Senator NELSON as a way to coordinate State-Federal efforts in this crucial region. NELSON also will offer legislation to create a strong new Great Lakes Water Authority to follow up on the water resource plans to be drawn by the new Commission.

WASTE MANAGEMENT RESEARCH ACT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the first bill which I offer today is the Waste Management Research Act of 1966.

This bill will enable us to explore new frontiers of knowledge, in search of imaginative solutions to our presently overpowering pollution problems.

The bill would establish, under the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a comprehensive waste management research program, coordinating all such research now done under a number of different Federal programs. This research program would employ the most advanced management and research methods and techniques, including systems analysis.

In addition, the bill would establish a new information office, which would gather information on pollution and waste disposal and make it available to business, industry, municipalities, and the general public. This would be a valuable new storehouse of information and an effective way of spreading the facts on the pollution threat and how it can be met.

Most important of all, the bill would direct the Secretary to compile a national inventory of waste management needs and problems. and it directs him to recommend to the Congress a comprehensive national waste management program, including alternatives and an analysis of comparative costs and benefits.

This bill is broadly drawn so as to give maximum freedom of action to the imaginative administrators and researchers who will implement it.

But the simple goal of the bill is to give a competent Federal agency the funds and staff necessary to take a look at our antiquated waste treatment methods—and then propose the most efficient new methods which modern science can devise.

We do have Federal research programs into water pollution and sewage disposal today. But as in the case of our other antipollution programs, it is too limited both in scope and in financing. It is not adequately coordinated. It is not aimed squarely at coming up with a new waste management system for America.

Our present antiquated disposal system relies upon our waters to absorb the waste of modern society. Modern science and technology have never been brought fully to bear upon the problem.

Substantial research grants should be made to private industry and universities to develop new methods and devices to refine, use, neutralize, or destroy pollutants. We muset evaluate chemical pesticides and their effect upon the environment. Those which threaten to destroy our environment should be outlawed.

We need to develop programs that take into consideration the total problems of air, water, and soil pollution. Research contracts should be made with private industry to inventory and evaluate the whole waste management problem and to compute waste management costs and propose alternative management plans to meet the problem.

It is helpful to discuss this problem in terms of examples.

At the southern tip of Lake Michigan, we have one of the most tremendous concentrations of pollution problems anywhere in the world. We have several dozen independent municipalities, hundreds of industrial plants, hundreds of ships, and a number of grossly polluted rivers.

Most of these units have individual programs for waste treatment on which they are spending sizable amounts of money.

But despite millions of dollars in spending, despite all the governmental authority and the scientific genius clustered together in this area, the sum total of all their antipollution efforts is overwhelming, disastrous, almost irrevocable pollution.

What a great opportunity such an area presents for a really imaginative study of broad scale waste management.

Think of the challenging questions which confront us here:

Could the waste treatment systems of this area be made more efficient by combining or coordinating them?

Could the industrial byproducts now being dumped into the rivers and Lake Michigan be recovered and reused?

Would a really imaginative new program of waste treatment for this area be economically feasible if you considered the cost to the public now resulting from air and water pollution?

We know that everything we do costs money. But in the field of pollution, we do not know enough about comparative costs to make intelligent decisions. We do not know whether our present inadequate methods are more costly than the most advanced and effective new techniques.

THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Another outstanding example of a special problem which would benefit from advanced waste management research is the Mississippi River. Throughout its length, it is soiled by pollution, even though along its shores taxpayers and stockholders are investing millions of dollars in waste treatment facilities.

Imagine the frustration of a small city on the Mississippi, trying to devise a treatment system which will protect this great commercial and recreational waterway, knowing full well that it cannot control what is done along the other 2,300 miles of this river.

An imaginative Federal waste management study of the Mississippi—or key sections of it—could lead to a great breakthrough in our pollution fight. What is the present cost of waste treatment for communities along this river? What would it cost to do it right?

These are just a few examples of what might be done under the Waste Management Research Act.

It could open the door to solving our nationwide pollution crisis. Combined with the other bills which I will offer it could provide the knowledge, the scientific technique, the funds, and the governmental leadership needed to meet one of our gravest public problems.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor of S. 2815 which I introduced on January 24, 1966, to establish a joint congressional committee to make a continuing study and investigation of the activities and operations of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] may be added as a cosponsor of S. 2797, a bill to give the President new emergency strike powers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MAINTENANCE OF SCHOOL MILK AND SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I add my name today as cosponsor of two very important bills concerning the maintenance of the school milk program and also the availability of dairy products for the school lunch program. As I stated last week on the floor of the Senate, I strongly oppose the administration's proposed budget cut for the school milk program.

I note with interest that the President in his message on food for freedom sent to the Congress on February 10 stated:

> We must have adequate supplies of dairy products for commercial markets, and to meet high priority domestic and foreign program needs. Milk from U.S. farms is the only milk available to millions of poor children abroad.

I agree with the President as to the great need to help the needy children of the world, but I believe that we should spare nothing in taking care of our own. I therefore join with the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) in his bill (S. 2921) to make the school milk program permanent, and also to gradually increase funds available under the program over the next several years.

Also, I wish to add my active support to the bill (S. 2888) of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] which would provide that milk and dairy products in the store of the Commodity Credit Corporation may be used in nonprofit school lunch programs without regard to priorities set up in other laws. Due to certain of these priorities, when the surpluses of the CCC have been low, the Secretary of Agriculture has in the past determined that stocks on hand should be sold domestically or exported before used for the school lunch program

This Nation cannot afford to play with the nutritional development of our children merely to balance the administration's budget. I feel certain, as I have said before, that my constituents would rather increase their taxes than restrict either the school milk or the school lunch program.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 17, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1407) for the relief of Frank E. Lipp.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 2722

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce that hearings on S. 2722 will be held on March 1, 1966, at 11:30 a.m., and on March 2, 1966, at 9:30 a.m. in room 6226 of the New Senate Office Building.

S. 2722 provides for the appellate review of sentences imposed in criminal cases arising in the district courts of the United States. The bill would give every defendant sentenced to imprisonment for more than 1 year the right to appeal on the ground that the sentence, although lawful, is excessive. On review, the court of appeals would be empowered to reduce, increase or otherwise modify the sentence imposed by the district court. The bill would also allow the court of appeals to make rules providing for the availability on appeal of any presentence reports or other evaluations made of the defendant prior to the imposition of the sentence.

Any person who wishes to testify on March 1 and 2, or who desires to submit a statement for inclusion in the record, should communicate as soon as possible with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, room 6308, New Senate Office Building.

SUPPOSE—OUR RESPONSIBILITIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there has come to me from Mr. Tedis Zierins, of Chicago, Ill., a copy of a poem written by Pfc. Robert E. Blankenship 3 days before he was killed in action in Vietnam. The poem was sent to the Chicago American by someone in the 1st Marine Aircraft Wing in Da Nang in Vietnam. It will certainly give anyone who will take time to read it pause to think about our responsibilities.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the poem be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPOSE

(By Pfc. Robert E. Blankenship)

Suppose this Sunday morning
The church bell didn't ring,
And as you paused upon the step,
The choir didn't sing.
Suppose the door was padlocked
Or maybe nailed up tight.
Suppose a guard was standing
There to stop you day or night.
Suppose you saw Old Glory,
A dirty, tattered rag.
And floating high above your town
Another country's flag.
Suppose the only sound you heard
Was soldiers' marching feet
Suppose the army near your home
Was of some foreign power
Sent to march along your streets
Instead of boys of ours.
Suppose your friends were carried
Off to prisons or their deaths
And all their pleading for a trial
Was just a waste of breath;
You say this couldn't happen here,
We'll pray to God it can't
For if everyone prays earnestly,
We must believe it shan't.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM COMBATS MALNUTRITION IN THE YOUNG

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the administration's recent decision to cut the school milk program by 80 percent is going to have a serious effect on teenage America. The morning and afternoon milk breaks which are so common in schools across the Nation will largely be a thing of the past.

Many of my colleagues may say that malnutrition among teenagers is not a serious problem in this, the most prosperous Nation in the world. Yet an article published in 1960 in the New York Times indicated that "6 of every 10 teenage daughters suffer serious diet deficiencies." Research showed at that time that more than 5 million girls between the ages of 13 and 19 exist mainly on snacks, soft drinks, French fries, pizza, candy, hamburgers, and waffles. I seriously doubt that this problem has solved itself in the interim.

This is the principal reason for the existence of the school milk program. The Federal Government encourages young men and women to drink milk—nature's perfect food—by helping them to pay the costs of morning and afternoon half-pints. But now the administration has decided that this school milk program is not necessary for young people unless they are selected by the school administrator as charity cases.

The Times article goes on to point out:

> Starving teenagers come from rich, poor, and middle-class homes. At a junior high school here [Washington], morning hunger headaches are common and valuable class time is lost when youngsters are sent to the nurse. At a senior high school, when breakfastless boys fainted at early-morning cadet drill, authorities began a better breakfast campaign.

Mr. President, that morning milk break under the school milk program is a way to combat this malnutrition. However, unless Congress decides to reject the 80-percent cut proposal put forth by the administration, morning milk breaks will be the exception, not the rule.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTHS SUFFERING FROM POOR DIETS—SCIENTISTS FIND MOST ARE MALNOURISHED AND NEED ADVICE IN EATING HABITS

WASHINGTON, March 26.—While Mom and Dad are setting the world's best table and running up a $78 billion annual food bill, 6 of every 10 teenage daughters suffer serious diet deficiencies.

Most of the future wives and mothers in the United States are so poorly fed that scientists call them malnourished.

Teenage boys are close behind in this deficiency. But nutritionists worry mostly about 9 million girls between the ages of 13 and 19. More than 5 million exist mainly on snacks, soft drinks, french fries, pizza, candy, hamburgers, and waffles, research shows.

Americans are taller, live longer and eat 15 percent more than they did a half a century ago. But unless the younger generation learns about nutrition and fills dangerous diet gaps with milk, meat, fruits, and vegetables the pendulum could swing backward.

BENSON CITES NEEDS

"Never have young people been more in need of wise advice and guidance on food," Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson said this week.

"Replacing their present faulty food habits with good ones will take the full cooperation of parents, teachers, and teenagers themselves."

Schoolwork and alertness suffer when the teenage body is lacking in vital food elements. It shows up in bad temper, acne or loss of stamina. Too often pimples are borne patiently as "part of growing up," when they are a sign of poor diet.

A teenage girl, obsessed by beauty, may cut her intake so drastically that her authentic long-range glamour is undercut.

"In her concern for a slim figure," a nutritionist said, "a girl may gamble with her health by making total war on calories. She plunges into a hippo-to-slimmo routine, inventing her own reducing diet.

"Too often she skips valuable potatoes, bread, and milk, bypassing entire meals, then cancels it out with gooey sweets. A low-calorie diet, if properly planned can include every nutrient. If it doesn't, it's dangerous."

CRITICAL YEARS

The long-term results are impaired health and a weakening of future generations. Malnutrition is sometimes connected with juvenile delinquency.

At about 11, a girl's growth spurts, and for the next 9 years her body burns a lifetime high in food energy. By 16, she should reach her maximum height. By 18, her weight probaby will level off as nature turns to firming muscle, bones, and tissues—in short, building an adult body.

The food she eats must fuel this growth, at the same time providing teenage energy for jitterbugging, softball, hockey, and a hectic school calendar.

But at the time her body demands a peak intake of calories, vitamins and minerals, her parents relax discipline over her food habits. Even if they did not, the young lady, proudly wearing her first pair of 2-inch heels, would issue her declaration of diet independence.

"No time," she shouts sprinting past the breakfast table, or "not hungry."

The starving teenagers come from rich-, poor-, and middle-class homes. At a junior high school here, morning hunger headaches are common and valuable classtime is lost when youngsters are sent to the nurse.

At a senior high school, when breakfastless boys, fainted at early morning cadet drill, authorities began a "better breakfast" campaign.

The food habits of these youngsters mirror a nationwide teenage famine amid plenty. For lunch a girl selects a luscious wedge of pie from the cafeteria line. Watching the trays go by, dietitians who plan balanced hot meals see many nutritious, energy-packed dishes ignored.

"They'd eat three desserts if we didn't have a rule against it," one commented.

Arresting this trend which is rooted in ignorance, indifference, or poverty, will take a shift in food habits. In the average home a nutritious diet may be had for much less than the family spends, but it takes know-how.

FEDERAL ON-THE-JOB TRAINING PROGRAM EXCELLENT TAXPAYER INVESTMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have been one of those Members of the Senate who has criticized wasteful Government spending. I have introduced amendments to reduce proposed spending programs in the past. I intend to do so in the future.

But when the Government can show that its programs not only achieve social results in improving human welfare, but also save money for the taxpayer, they deserve our audible and enthusiastic support.

Yesterday, the Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz appeared before a subcommittee of the Senate Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. Wirtz proved that the Government's on-the-job manpower development training program has helped do a superb job of putting unemployed, unskilled workers back to work. By itself this is a worthy goal; but the program has also succeeded in paying back to the Government and the taxpayer its total cost in full within 2 years—simply based on the Federal income taxes paid by the newly employed workers.

Of course free enterprises which employs these workers in partnership with the Government program deserves great credit too.

Here is an example of Government and business working together through training unskilled workers to achieve three mighty important goals: First, to put unemployed unskilled men and women to work in skilled jobs that pay well; second, to reduce the inflation threat by hitting the toughest inflationary problem—our shortage of skilled workers; and, third, to return to the Government the full cost of the program within 2 years with the taxpayer reaping rich dividends in subsequent years.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief excerpt from Secretary Wirtz' testimony be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In my considered judgment now, however, the controlling consideration is that the on-the-job training program has supplied us—as a lesson of proven experience—with the answer we were looking for.

It puts the training almost entirely in the employer's hands.

It has become an effective instrument for implementing national policies which employers share with the entire community.

And it is proving to be an almost historically economic program.

Let us look at this program in hard-headed, dollars, and cents terms—in terms of who the trainees are, what it costs to train them, what their earning power becomes, and what the Government (which is the country) gets back on its investment.

Here are some of the key facts:

Most of the OJT trainees (about two-thirds) were unemployed before they joined the program.

We estimate that the average Manpower Development and Training Act on-the-job trainee earns $59 a week during 19 weeks of training, and $80 a week as a full-time worker after his training. Thus the average trainee earns $3,761 the first year.

The cost to the Government of on-the-job training averaged about $495 a trainee in 1965. Some cost more, some less.

According to the Internal Revenue Service the average Federal income tax for married workers with one child who earn $3,761 a year is $211.

Thus, in the first year, a typical on-the-job trainee repays the Federal Government about 43 percent of its total investment in him. Before the second year is over, the Government has been repaid in full.

It is difficult, of course, to find the "average" illustration. Programs vary from the most expensive, during which 52 weeks of training is provided, to those lasting only 8 weeks.

Those trainees already approved will earn almost $392 million during their first year of training and work. Their training will cost the Federal Government $51 million, of which about $20 million will be repaid in taxes during the first year, and the remainder the second year.

On-the-job training programs are a sound investment.

These programs have been warmly received by American employers, who, in the long run, must provide the jobs for American workers. The business community, along with American labor, has cooperated in making Manpower Development and Training Act on-the-job training an exciting and successful program.

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS WOULD ELIMINATE TEACHER SHORTAGE IN LOW-INCOME AREAS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, few appropriation requests will come before us, during this session, of greater importance than the President's recent request for funds to support the National Teacher Corps.

Today, our national shortage of elementary and high school teachers is estimated at 100,000 a year, and there are about 80,000 teachers in the Nation's school systems with substandard credentials.

In the Nation's poverty pockets, where there are 5 million schoolchildren whose families earn under $2,000 a year, the teacher situation is even more grave. School budgets in these poverty areas cannot be stretched to attract or hold enough talented, or even qualified, teachers. Competing with the wealthier school districts for the limited number of new and replacement teachers available each year, the poverty schools inevitably lose out. Each fall, slum schools open with too few good teachers, too many substitute teachers, too many temporary teachers, and too many teachers whose qualifications are far below minimum standards.

The very youngsters who are culturally handicapped to begin with—those who come from families where parents, brothers, and sisters make up the one-fifth of America that has not finished elementary school—are being educated today by some of our least gifted teachers. No wonder that, after 6 or 8 years of listless schooling, these boys and girls join the ranks of the undereducated unemployables—the underprivileged of our Nation—who contribute little to our society or our economy.

Teaching children of the poor takes dedication, talent, and training. To reach a child whose concept of books is limited to the comic strips, whose ear is attuned only to the simplest verbal exchange, requires a very different approach from that used in our schools today, where every child, regardless of his background and abilities, is taught according to standards suitable only for the middle-class child whose home is comfortably furnished with books and art and conversation. The need, then, is not simply one of numbers, but also of kind.

To break out of the tradition of poverty, disadvantaged youngsters must receive the best—not the least—in education. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is a giant stride. But although it provided over a billion dollars in aid to low-income areas, it does not provide the means to attract the thousands of men and women with the enthusiasm, the dedication, the understanding, and the talent that are essential to make effective use of the newly available Federal funds.

The National Teacher Corps will do this.

If we had to single out the most important available tool in combating poverty, it would have to be education.

This program is perhaps not nearly as dramatic as Vietnam, but it is equally essential to the well being of the country.

Our survival in this world depends heavily on how well our citizenry flourishes. And this, clearly, is one of the most effective devices we can employ toward the conservation of this Nation's human resources.

AMERICAN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS LIBERALIZATION AND EXPANSION OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, a distinguished member of the economics department of Michigan State University and a noted scholar in the field of antitrust and monopoly, Dr. Walter Adams, has called to my attention a petition signed by 100 members of the American Economic Association.

These gentlemen used the petition as a means of making known to Congress their concern over the pending Herlong-Hartke bill (H.R. 8510 and S. 2045).

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Adams' remarks on this petition, as expressed in a letter to the presidents of both Houses of Congress, be printed at this point in the RECORD in order that Senators may be aware of them.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY,
January 24, 1966.

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: At the national convention of the American Economic Association, held in New York City on December 27–30, 1965, a group of leading economists decided to make known to the Congress its concern and alarm over the pending Herlong-Hartke bill (H.R. 8510 and S. 2045).

The following petition, addressed to you and the Speaker of the House, was circulated informally and initially signed by some 100 members of the association:

"As members of the American Economic Association, we support the liberalization and expansion of international trade and endorse the recent congressional action toward that goal, embodied in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

"By the same token, we oppose such measures as the Herlong-Hartke bill (H.R. 8510 and S. 2045, 89th Cong.) which would erode our national commitment to trade expansion and liberalization. The Herlong-Hartke bill, while intended to prevent unfair import competition, would have the effect of suppressing any import competition. As such, it represents as great a threat to the international trade of the United States as some of the most onerous tariff acts of the past."

The signatories include Prof. Fritz Machlup (Princeton), the current president of the American Economic Association; Prof. Milton Friedman (Chicago), the president-elect of the association; and the following ex-presidents of the association: Prof. Alvin Hansen (Harvard), Prof. Edward S. Mason (Harvard), Prof. Joseph J. Spengler (Duke), and Prof. George Stocking (Vanderbilt).

The following officers and former officers of the association also signed the petition: Profs. William Baumol (Princeton), Kenneth Boulding (Michigan), Lester V. Chandler (Princeton), Frank W. Fetter (Northwestern), Harry G. Johnson (Chicago), Ben W. Lewis (Oberlin), Richard Musgrave (Harvard), Lloyd G. Reynolds (Yale), and Clair Wilcox (Swarthmore).

The current secretary-treasurer of the association, Prof. Harold F. Williamson (Northwestern), as well as his predecessor in that post from 1936 to 1961, Prof. James Washington Bell (Northwestern), signed the petition.

So also did Profs. Alfred E. Kahn (Cornell) and Oswald H. Brownlee (Minnesota) who are ex-members of the editorial board of the American Economic Review, the Association's publication.

Other distinguished signatories include, inter alia, Dean Richard Lindholm (Oregon), Dean Arthur E. Warner (Tennessee), Dean William S. Devino (Maine), and Professors Jesse Markham (Princeton), Richard Heflebower (Northwestern), Joel B. Dirlam (Rhode Island), M. E. Kreinin (Michigan State), Warren L. Smith (Michigan), Alexander Eckstein (Michigan), Robert F. Lanzillotti (Michigan State), Forest Hill (Texas), John Letiche (California, Berkeley), Thomas Mayer (California, Davis), Karl Brunner (UCLA), Samuel M. Loescher (Indiana), Caleb Smith (Brown), Melvin Eggers (Syracuse), Charles M. Tiebout (U. of Washington), Nathan Rosenberg (Purdue), Robert F. Wallace (Montana), and many others.

In view of the enthusiastic response to the informal, initial circulation of this petition, it has been decided to solicit an expression of opinion on a more systematic basis from most of the major universities and colleges in the country. Once this effort is completed, we shall take the liberty of forwarding to you and to the Speaker of the House a complete list of the signatories—in the hope that this might in some small measure contribute to the defeat of the Herlong-Hartke bill which is so utterly incongruous with our national commitment to trade expansion and trade liberalization.

I need not point out that the signatories to the petition are expressing only their own views and do not presume to speak either for the association or the universities with which they are affiliated.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Senator DOUGLAS, a past president of our association, as well as to Senator LONG, chairman of the Finance Committee, and to Congressman MILLS, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Respectfully yours,

WALTER ADAMS,
Professor of Economics.

DEATH OF WILLIAM L. CLAYTON, FORMER UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it was with great sadness that I learned of the passing on February 8 of William L. Clayton, a longtime friend and a man I very much respected.

Will Clayton's quiet but highly effective role in the liberalization of U.S. foreign economic policies at once combined belief in the ideal of economic internationalism with high courage and toughness of mind.

As Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Will Clayton carried on and developed the reciprocal trade policies inaugurated by Cordell Hull. He was one of the chief architects of the postwar foreign economic policy of the United States, and was one of those responsible for the Marshall plan. The policies he stood for continue to serve us well as the guidelines for the step by step and essential liberalization of our trade policies. In the past 20 years, our international trade has expanded from $18.5 to $47 billion.

Will Clayton strongly urged the United States to seek a closer relationship with the Common Market as a means to strengthen our ability to meet the growing demands of developing nations and to meet the economic competition caused by the Soviet Union and its allies.

Two years ago, in order to assist the economic development of Latin America, he proposed before the Joint Economic Committee the creation of a Western Hemisphere free trade area limited to raw materials, but also involving free trade in industrial products among Latin American nations within the next 10 years. I have espoused this initiative and I am indebted to Will Clayton for his inspiration.

Will Clayton's life is evidence that the American dream can, and does, still exist; from a position of stenographer at the age of 16, he rose to leading American businessman as a cotton broker at the age of 63. Clayton combined his skill as a diplomat and his determination as a businessman to serve his country as it created a new and viable means of continuing as world economic leader in the crucial transition period of the postwar years.

It is with regret and a deep sense of loss that I join my fellow Americans in this tribute to Will Clayton.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a Washington Post editorial of February 13 and a New York Times article of February 10 on Mr. Clayton be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL CLAYTON

"Economic nationalism," Will Clayton used to say, "just won't mix with political and military internationalism." In his quiet, courtly way, Clayton fought with a ruthless missionary determination for his creed, and it was Clayton as much as anyone who made economic internationalism come alive during the crucial transition period spanning the war and postwar years. He picked up where Cordell Hull left off in the newly created role of Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. Economic expertise found a place within Foreign Service sanctums for the first time in the heady early days of the Clayton regime at the State Department when the Marshall plan was born. Later, as an elder statesman peering down on Washington from retirement in Houston, he became one of the first to see the interrelationship between trade and aid in the western approach to the developing countries.

The personal charm which gave Will Clayton his special finesse as a negotiator and bureaucrat was a blend of warmth and commanding dignity. His manner and style instantly conveyed the story of the self-made man who could go from a sharecropper's cabin in Mississippi to the cotton brokerage houses of Manhattan and then, at 63, to fulfillment in a new career as one of our exemplary public servants.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1966]

WILLIAM L. CLAYTON DEAD AT 86; ONCE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE—ROOSEVELT AID WAS FORMER NEW DEAL FOE—FOUNDED GIANT COTTON COMPANY

HOUSTON, February 8.—William Lockhart Clayton, a cofounder of what is believed to be the world's largest cotton company and a former Under Secretary of State, died of a heart attack in Methodist Hospital here Tuesday afternoon. The tall, stooped, white-haired, 86-year-old Mississippian died at 4 p.m. after he was stricken in his Houston home.

STARTED AS STENOGRAPHER

Will Clayton, who became stenographer to a cotton broker at 16 and an economic diplomat at 63, was a cofounder in 1904 of Anderson, Clayton & Co., at Oklahoma City. The firm today buys and sells a large part of the country's cotton crop and operates cotton-producing and marketing subsidiaries in Mexico, Peru, Argentina, Paraguay, Brazil, and Egypt.

It was estimated a few years ago that, with his family, Mr. Clayton held over 40 percent of the $50 million capital, surplus, and undivided profits of the cotton company.

Mr. Clayton retired from administrative duties for the cotton company in 1951 but remained a director and worked in his Houston office 6 days a week.

The Texan-by-adoption, who looked like a polished cowboy and wore bushy white sideburns, has been recognized by many as the idea man behind the Marshall plan after World War II.

He was a financial backer of the Liberty League that fought the New Deal in the 1930's. But in 1940 he joined the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs under Nelson A. Rockefeller, and later became a deputy to Jesse Jones, then Federal Loan Administrator. He was named Assistant Secretary of Commerce in charge of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's foreign activities and, as such, headed several of its wartime subsidiaries and was vice president of the Export-Import Bank.

Early in 1944 he resigned his Commerce post to become War Surplus Administrator, to handle disposal of Government plants and surplus material after the war. He resigned as Administrator 8 months later after Congress repudiated his ideas on the sale of Federal real estate.

OPINION OF CARTELS

During hearings on his appointment as Assistant Secretary of State, Congress made clear it had not forgotten the dispute that preceded his withdrawal as Surplus Administrator. He was asked:

"How do you feel about cartels?" and "What are your business connections?" On cartels, Mr. Clayton shot back: "A cartel smells the same to me by whatever name it may be called." To the other, often-asked question, he replied that he received daily reports of the total sales and transactions of Anderson, Clayton & Co., which "are thrown in the wastebasket." His frankness impressed the Senators and they approved his nomination.

When diplomacy became inextricably interwoven with economics in the final months of World War II, Mr. Clayton was appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt as Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs in December 1944, to keep the diplomatic and economic fields coordinated within the State Department.

Twenty months later he was elevated to the higher post of Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. Although a neophyte diplomat at the start of his State Department days, Mr. Clayton carried on and developed the reciprocal trade policies inaugurated by Cordell Hull. In reply to Congressional criticism of his big business background and trading policies, Mr. Clayton always contended that he was laboring for the good of his country, not for any private business interests.

As a cotton merchant, Mr. Clayton traveled in many countries and acquired early the international viewpoint that made him one of the chief architects of the postwar foreign policy of the United States. His observations in Europe and as his country's representative at the Geneva Trade Conference in 1945–46 produced the memorandum to Secretary of State George C. Marshall that was one of the principal bases of the Marshall plan—a plan for the economic recovery of wartorn Europe.

WORKED FOR COURT CLERK

Will Clayton was born in Tupelo, Miss. He moved with his family to Jackson, Tenn., and at 13 he left school and went to work in a local court clerk's office. He became a deputy clerk at 15, studied shorthand and became a court reporter. Among his clients was William Jennings Bryan.

Still in his teens, he became stenographer to a cotton broker. He went to New York seeking advancement, and got a job with the American Cotton Co. and rose in that company to the post of assistant general manager.

In 1904, with his brothers-in-law, Frank D. and M. E. Anderson, he formed Anderson, Clayton & Co., which moved its operations to Houston in 1917 so that it would have available the facilities of a deepwater port. Mr. Clayton temporarily withdrew from the company in 1918 to become a member of the Committee of Cotton Distribution for the War Industries Board.

In 1961, Mr. Clayton agreed with Secretary of State Dean Acheson, in discussion before a Senate-House economic subcommittee, that the United States should make some arrangement with the European Common Market or split the non-Communist world and vastly strengthen the Soviet Union and its allies. "Together," they agreed, "Western Europe and North America can forge a free world economic system which nothing can equal and the power of which nothing can threaten."

With Christian A. Herter, who succeeded John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State in the Eisenhower administration, Mr. Clayton was named in 1962 as cochairman of a congressionally appointed Citizens Commission on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The creation of a permanent high council and a high court of justice for the nations of the organization were subsequently among the chief recommendations submitted to Congress by the group.

In the same year, Mr. Clayton was one of 21 American business leaders who, in full-page newspaper advertisements, appealed for a ban on the testing of nuclear weapons.

Until close to the end of his life, Mr. Clayton kept himself in good physical condition. He was a proficient horseman, and he worked regularly with Indian clubs in a home gymnasium. During his years in Washington he customarily walked from his home in Rock Creek Park to the State Department Building.

In 1903, Mr. Clayton married a Kentucky girl, Susan Vaughan. She died in 1960. Four daughters survive.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is once again my privilege to mark and honor the declaration of Lithuanian Independence Day. This declaration was made 48 years ago, and the great Lithuanian people have never ceased to courageously fight for their freedom. Despite these long years of Communist rule, the Lithuanian people have not lost their strong sense of what liberty means. Their struggle still stands as a symbol to other nations yearning to be free.

After years of subjugation by Russia, and after the German occupation of World War I, the Lithuanian people declared the establishment of an independent Lithuania on February 16, 1918. Russia again moved in by the end of that year, only to discover once again that the Lithuanian people would fight. Because of this, the Soviet Union was forced to recognize Lithuania as a sovereign state in 1920.

But this brief respite was too short lived. In 1940, Soviet troops once again occupied the country and annexed it. And history further repeated itself with another German occupation until 1944. In 1944, Soviet troops again crushed Lithuanian uprisings.

For more than 7 years during and after the war, the Lithuanian people fought for their own country. Thirty thousand Lithuanian people died in this cause, and many more were deported to the Soviet Union only to die in Soviet concentration camps.

The Lithuanian people should never abandon hope for a truly independent state. We, in the United States, who know what freedom is, commemorate their courage and the principle for which they stand: Freedom and self-determination.

IN SUPPORT OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE TO OVERSEE THE CIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the time has come for the Congress to exercise legislative oversight on the intelligence community generally and the CIA in particular in a consistent, formal, continuing, and responsible way. Since the CIA was instituted in 1947 as a part of the National Security Council, the Congress has proscribed itself by statute from checking the activities of the CIA to the extent that Congress normally oversees governmental policy. As a result, the activities of the CIA are monitored by the Congress only in a limited way and this monitoring is done by a number of congressional committees, but mainly in the appropriations process.

Before elaborating on the need for a Joint Congressional Committee on the Central Intelligence Agency as proposed by Senator YOUNG, from Ohio, I should like to review the statutory background and congressional committee responsibility as regard the CIA.

In the National Security Act of 1947, Congress made the Director of the CIA responsible for "protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure." In the CIA Act of 1949, Congress specifically exempted the CIA from existing statutes which required all governmental agencies to publish "the organization, functions, names, official titles, salaries, or numbers of personnel" which they employed. The act also forbade the Director of the Budget from issuing the usual reports to Congress.

In 1956, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] moved to establish a joint committee, but his bill was defeated on the floor of the Senate by 59 to 27. Subsequent bills have been introduced, but they have all died in committee. Recognizing the necessity and importance of intelligence activities, Congress has deliberately tied its own hands in an attempt to maintain the security and integrity of the CIA.

Rather than establish a joint committee, Congress has decided to oversee the CIA through a variety of separate committees. There are, at least, six different committees in both Houses of Congress which monitor the CIA to greater and lesser degrees: the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, and the Senate Foreign Relations and the House Foreign Affairs Committees. None of these committees has the time or the inclination to probe the CIA carefully and deeply, except in cases of sensational events such as the U-2 flights and the Cuban missile crisis.

Most Americans recognize the need for intelligence agencies in a dangerous world; most Americans also recognize the need for security in these matters. We in Congress also appreciate the fine job now being done with the CIA by the various congressional committees. But there is a need for line authority and responsibility in exercising the legislative oversight function of the Congress. The joint committee proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] seems to fit the bill, for the following reasons:

First. Intelligence gathering is a major operation in foreign policy and national security affairs, involving the expenditure of vast amount of funds.

Second. Intelligence agencies sometimes find themselves making policy rather than simply executing it. This sometimes occurs without conscious design on the part of the intelligence agency either because policy directives from above do not exist in certain areas or because the CIA has people on the scene when the action happens who are not responsible to the local ambassadors. By force of circumstance, then, the work of the CIA sometimes in effect creates the policy where the President has not acted or even had a chance to act. There must be accountability to Congress for these on-the-spot decisions.

Third. The intelligence field is broad and complicated. Congress needs expertise on these matters, and the staff of the joint committee would be a step in that direction.

Congress has demonstrated restraint and reliability in past cooperation with the executive branch in respect of intelligence. The Joint Atomic Energy Committee is a good example of this. There is little reason for the executive branch to fear that Congress through the joint committee would now abuse this privilege. Congress has the responsibility to exercise legislative oversight over future intelligence operations and activities on a closer, continuing, and formal basis. For these reasons, I join with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] in cosponsoring S. 2815, a bill to establish a Joint Committee on the Central Intelligence Agency.

PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a forthcoming meeting in the Philippines which will have significant effect on our relations with the Philippines. Philippine-American friendship from time to time is taken for granted, or even overlooked. This relationship, forged before Philippine independence, has survived a war and has been strengthened through the years. I do not mean to suggest that there have been no irritants in our relationship, nor that there are none now. Innumerable differences have arisen which could have weakened the bonds between our two countries. Nevertheless, the benefits of the friendship and the mutuality of interest have caused us to work just a little harder to resolve these disagreements before they reached the danger point.

There are probably many explanations for the strong bonds of friendship that exist between our two peoples—so unlike each other in culture, history, and temperament. They are all probably correct. How they were forged is not so important as how they are kept strong. Filipinos and Americans, both, have continued this friendship on the government level, through the trade that flows between our two countries, and in the cultural exchange that draws us closer together. We all owe a debt of gratitude to these people, for without their determination, the traditional ties might have weakened.

Less than 3 years ago, prominent citizens of both countries established the American-Philippine Society, a nonprofit and nonpolitical organization devoted to clarifying and elevating United States-Philippine understanding.

The first honorary chairman of the society was Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Mr. MacArthur has succeeded her husband and shares his desire to perpetuate the good will between the two countries. Other prominent Americans and Filipinos—Howard Cullman, chairman of the New York Port Authority; George S. Moore, president of the First National City Bank; Miss Helena Benitez, Philippine educator and diplomat; and Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Secretary of Education, are among the society's officers.

The society was organized for the purpose of promoting intercultural relations between the peoples of the two nations through the mutual exchange of persons, groups, exhibits, and publications and through the presentation of lectures, forums, and similar media with respect to education and the humanities; namely, music, dance, language, and other art forms. It also seeks the clarification and elevation of United States-Philippine understanding through conferences by leaders of both countries.

The society's first major project is such a conference on the future of United States-Philippine relations soon to take place in Davao, in the Philippines, on February 23 to 26. The conference will be under the direction of the American Assembly, an affiliate of Columbia University established in 1950 by Dwight D. Eisenhower when he was president of the university.

The assembly at Davao, the first binational meeting of its kind under the American Assembly, will bring together a group of distinguished Filipinos and Americans to discuss social, political, military, and economic ties between the two countries.

In small discussion groups these Filipino and American representatives of government, industry, finance, labor, the humanities, science, and the press will consider the full range of problems of United States-Philippine relations. They will hear formal addresses by three persons of stature. On the fourth day, in plenary session, the participants will draw upon their own experiences and knowledge to review a final report of conclusions and recommendations for the improvement of Philippine and United States relations. As is the practice for these assemblies, the statement will be issued immediately to the press and then printed for distribution in both nations. It is expected that this consideration of questions such as military bases and mutual security, foreign policy, and the Laurel-Langley agreement will be repeated in subsequent regional assemblies in both nations.

I hope that their conclusions and recommendations will receive the most serious consideration by both our governments. We would be negligent if we did not listen to this distinguished group of Filipinos and Americans. I shall await their report eagerly and hope that my colleagues in these Chambers and in the Philippine Congress will accept the report as the judgments of responsible men seeking to perpetuate a friendship which has been mutually advantageous. I also hope that by giving this dialog the importance it deserves, we will encourage the organizations of other binational assemblies.

RESOLUTION RELATING TO PURCHASE OF SURPLUS OR USED EQUIPMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD three resolutions adopted by the three counties of Delaware, Ontario, and Essex, in my State, dealing with the purchase of surplus or used equipment.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Briggs offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

"RESOLUTION NO. 24—RESOLUTION RELATING TO PURCHASE OF SURPLUS OR USED EQUIPMENT

"Whereas counties and towns frequently have need for certain types of machinery and equipment, the use of which will be for a limited time and surplus machinery and equipment or used machinery and equipment would be adequate and the ability of a county or town to purchase at reduced prices would result in considerable savings to taxpayers; and

"Whereas the State finance law permits the office of general services to sell surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment and it has been the experience that much of such machinery and equipment is sold to dealers who then offer the same items for sale to counties and towns at a large increase in price; and

"Whereas the Federal Government from time to time disposes of surplus machinery and equipment and about the only way a municipality is permitted to make purchase of particular items is through the local office of civil defense; and

"Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of this board that such surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment should be made available to counties, towns, cities, and villages at a fair price before being sold to dealers: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the board of supervisors of the county of Delaware hereby urges the legislature to amend the State finance law, the general municipal law and other applicable statutes to require the several departments of the State having surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment for sale to prepare an inventory of the major items, such as trucks, power shovels, bulldozers, cranes, and other highway equipment, and the price established for each item, and that copies of such inventories be furnished to each county, town, city, and village and that such municipalities be given a limited time in which to purchase such items at the price indicated on the inventory and that any items not sold to municipalities then be sold at public sale; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That Congress be urged to enact legislation which will permit municipalities to purchase surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment at appraised value before the same are sold to the public; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the board of supervisors be and he hereby is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Supervisors' Association, Association of Towns, the County Officers Association, county superintendent of Highways Association, Town Highway Superintendents Association, Senator Niles, Assemblyman Mason, Congressman Dow, Senator JAVITS, and Senator KENNEDY."

The resolution was seconded by Mr. Eckhardt and adopted by the following vote: Ayes, 19; Noes, 0.

I, Edward McCandlish, clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Delaware County, do hereby certify that the above is a true copy of a resolution passed by the board of supervisors at regular meeting held February 2, 1966.

EDWARD MCCANDLISH,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

RESOLUTION 43—PURCHASE OF SURPLUS OR USED EQUIPMENT

Whereas counties and towns of New York State frequently have need for certain types of machinery and equipment, the use of which will be for a limited time, and surplus machinery and equipment, or used machinery and equipment, would be adequate, and the ability of a county or town to purchase such machinery and equipment at reduced prices would result in considerable saving to taxpayers; and

Whereas the State finance law permits the Office of General Services to sell surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment; and it has been the experience that much of such machinery and equipment is sold to dealers, who then offer much of such machinery for sale to counties and towns at a large increase in price; and

Whereas the Federal Government from time to time disposes of surplus machinery and equipment, and about the only way a municipality is permitted to make purchase of such particular items is through the local office of civil defense; and

Whereas it is the consensus of this board that such surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment should be made available to counties, towns, cities, and villages at a fair price before being sold to dealers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of supervisors of the county of Ontario hereby urges the State legislature to pass legislation to require the several departments of the State having surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment for sale, to prepare an inventory of the major items, such as trucks, power shovels, bulldozers, cranes, and other highway equipment, with prices established for the items, that copies of such inventories be furnished to each county, town, city, and village, that such municipalities be given a limited time in which to purchase such items at the prices indicated on the inventory, and that any items not sold to municipalities then be sold at public sale; and be it further

Resolved, That the U.S. Congress be urged to enact legislation which will permit municipalities of the United States to purchase surplus, obsolete, or used machinery and equipment at appraised value before the same are sold to the public; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of this board be, and she hereby is, directed to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the senator and assemblyman representing Ontario County in the State legislature and the U.S. Congressman and the U.S. Senators representing the people of Ontario County, and all other county boards of supervisors of the State of New York, to the supervisors' association, the association of towns, the county officers' association, the county superintendent of highways' association, and the town highway superintendents' association.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
County of Ontario.

I do hereby certify that I have compared the preceding with the original thereof, on file in the office of the clerk of the board of supervisors at Canandaigua, N.Y., and that the same is a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole of said original; and that said original was duly adopted at a meeting of the board of supervisors of Ontario County held at Canandaigua, N.Y., on the 27th day of January 1966.

Given under my hand and official seal at Canandaigua, in said county, this 2d day of February 1966.

RUTH G. KAVENY,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Ontario County, N.Y.

RESOLUTION RE PURCHASE OF SURPLUS OR USED EQUIPMENT

Whereas counties and towns frequently have need for certain types of machinery and equipment, the use of which will be used for a limited time and surplus machinery and equipment or used machinery and equipment would be adequate and the ability of a county or town to purchase at reduced prices would result in considerable savings to taxpayers, and

Whereas the State finance law permits the office of general services to sell surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment and it has been the experience that much of such machinery and equipment is sold to dealers who then offer the same items for sale to counties and towns at a large increase in price, and

Whereas the Federal Government from time to time dispose of surplus machinery and equipment and about the only way a municipality is permitted to make purchase of particular items is through the local office of civil defense, and

Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of this board that such surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment should be made available to counties, towns, cities, and villages at a fair price before being sold to dealers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of supervisors of the county of Essex hereby urges the legislature to amend the State finance law, the general municipal law and other applicable statutes to require the several departments of the State having surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment for sale to prepare an inventory of the major items, such as truck, power shovels, bulldozers, cranes, and other highway equipment, and the price established for each item, and that copies of such inventories be furnished to each county, town, city, and village and that such municipalities be given a limited time in which to purchase such items at the price indicated on the inventory and that any items not sold to municipalities then be sold at public sale; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be urged to enact legislation which will permit municipalities to purchase surplus, obsolete or used machinery and equipment at appraised value before the same are sold to the public; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of this board of supervisors be and he hereby is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Supervisors' Association, Association of Towns, the County Officers Association, County Superintendent of Highways Association, Town Highway Superintendents Association, Senator Ronald B. Stafford, and Assemblyman Richard Bartlett, Congressman Carleton J. King, Senator Jacob Javits, Senator Robert Kennedy, and all other county boards of supervisors of the State of New York.

State of New York,
County of Essex, ss:

I, Zelma A. Cook, clerk of Essex County Board of Supervisors, do hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing copy with the original resolution filed in this office on the 1st day of February 1966, and that it is a correct and true copy thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal this 4th day of February 1966.

Zelma A. Cook,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Essex County.

DEATH OF ALEXANDER "CASEY" JONES, INFLUENTIAL AND FIERY EDITOR

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the death of Alexander "Casey" Jones, an influential and what the press calls, a fiery editor of one of the leading newspapers in the State of New York, the Syracuse Herald-Journal.

Mr. President, Casey was a great reporter and a great newspaperman and a man greatly responsible—through his hard-hitting editorials—for much that is good and true in the politics and public policy of our State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record two obituary notices on Mr. Jones.

There being no objection, the obituaries were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

Alexander "Casey Jones, Influential, Fiery Editor

Orlando, Fla.—Alexander F. Jones, 74, former president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, died here yesterday, apparently of a heart attack.

Former managing editor of the Washington Post, Mr. Jones once fought the admission of Tass (the Soviet news agency) representatives to the Senate press gallery on the grounds that they were not newsmen, but government representatives.

Later in his career, he successfully fought an order by President Truman that put severe curbs on information made available by Federal departments. He urged the Nation's newspaper editors to investigate the possibility of Federal legislation that would break down governmental news barriers.

Mr. Jones, who retired after 53 years in the newspaper business last April, became executive editor of the Syracuse Herald-Journal in 1950.

Surviving are his wife, Edna, two sons, and a daughter.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post]

Alexander Jones Rites Set at Arlington Monday

(By Edward T. Folliard)

Alexander F. (Casey) Jones, managing editor of the Washington Post from 1935 to 1947 and executive editor of the Syracuse Herald-Journal and Herald-American from 1950 to 1965, will be buried in Arlington Cemetery at 10 a.m. Monday.

Jones, one of the most colorful figures in American journalism, died after a heart attack Tuesday night in the Florida Sanitarium and Hospital in Orlando, Fla. He was 74.

A native of Wisconsin Rapids, Wis., Alexander Francis Jones attended the University of Wisconsin from 1911 to 1914, and began his newspaper career as a reporter on the Madison State Journal. One of his early assignments was to travel with Senator Robert (Fighting Bob) La Follette, the elder. He joined the staff of the Minneapolis Journal in 1916.

Casey volunteered for service in World War I and was an Army stretcher bearer in France.

STAR UP REPORTER

After the war, he was a star reporter for the "night side" of the old United Press. He covered the Black Sox scandal that shook organized baseball in 1919, and he used to recall writing about the little boy who approached Shoeless Joe Jackson, the great outfielder, and pleaded "Say it ain't so, Joe."

In 1923 Casey returned to the Minneapolis Journal, where he served as sales and promotion manager and city editor.

The late Eugene Meyer, who bought the Washington Post at auction in 1933, hired Casey as managing editor in 1935. The paper, although bearing a famous name in journalism, had gone into a serious decline. Jones pitched in to help publisher Meyer rescue and rehabilitate it.

"UPHILL YEARS"

When Jones left to go to Syracuse in 1950 after 15 years with the Washington Post—12 as managing editor and three as assistant to the publisher—the paper said in an editorial:

"It is hard for us to lose the services of a man who has endured the heart and burden associated with the creation of an institution out of a bankrupt property. Most of his 15 years were uphill years. His devotion to his responsibilities was catching, his interest in his work unflagging."

When Casey first came to Washington in 1935, he was introduced to the late Sir Willmott Lewis, distinguished correspondent of the London Times. Lewis, on being told that Casey was the new managing editor of the Post, shook his head and said: "Don't you know, old boy, that Pennsylvania Avenue is paved with the bones of former managing editors of the Post?"

"JUST A GYPSY"

But Casey stayed around a long time. His brown hair turned gray, and then white, as he guided the news department in the Washington Post's great comeback period. When he left, after 15 years, he said he guessed he was "just a gypsy."

He was managing editor throughout World War II, and many stories were told about him in that tumultuous period. On the day the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, Sunday, he rushed from his Wesley Heights home to his office, and began rounding up reporters, desk men, printers, and pressmen so that the Washington Post could get out an extra.

The extra was about to go to press when Robert Tate Allen, then the paper's church editor and known to the staff as "Bishop," burst into Casey's office.

"Hold it, hold it, Mr. Jones," Allen cried, "The Reverend * * *, pastor of the Georgetown * * * Church has resigned."

MURROW "SCOOP"

Later that night Casey dropped in on a party at the home of Harry Butcher, who was to become an aid to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower in the war. Among others at the party was Edward R. Murrow, the radio commentator for the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Murrow had been a dinner guest of the Roosevelts at the White House earlier in the evening. He had heard of the terrible damage done at Pearl Harbor—the sinking of the *Arizona* and the *Oklahoma* and all the rest—but he couldn't use it in a broadcast. He had been a guest, and therefore he felt that he was "sewed up."

Casey Jones was under no such inhibition, and he saw to it that what Murrow picked up at the dinner table got into the Post's news columns next morning. Murrow used to carry the clipping of the story in his wallet. It was a sad reminder of how he got the biggest story of his career and could do nothing about it.

FLAG-WAVING PATRIOT

Fortune magazine once described Casey as "cyclonic, convivial, incurably romantic about his profession."

He was all these, and also an unabashed patriot—the flag-waving kind. In 1942 he became impatient with what was being called the "war effort," especially with what the Government was doing or not doing.

In 1943 Casey was elected to membership in the Gridiron Club, made up of 50 Washington newspapermen. He became one of the club's most accomplished performers, being possessed of the necessary ham quality.

Some of his reporters who never saw him in a Gridiron skit agreed that he had great ability as an actor. He used to put on his most dramatic performance when a reporter hit him up for a pay raise. He would slump in his chair and a look of pain would appear on his face, causing the reporter to feel that he had landed a foul blow.

Jones is survived by his wife, the former Edna Schultz, a daughter, Mary Will of West Palm Beach, and two sons—Richard, of Orlando, Fla., and Compton, of Bethesda, Md.

RITES IN SYRACUSE

A funeral service will be held in the Park Central Presbyterian Church of Syracuse at 11 a.m. Saturday, after which the body will come to Arlington Cemetery.

Katharine Graham, president of the Washington Post Co., said yesterday that Jones was "a valued friend and colleague," and added:

"For 15 years he shaped the news policies of the Washington Post under my father and, later, my husband in an original, aggressive and exciting manner. He was the model of the tough reporter with a heart of gold."

Senator Robert F. Kennedy, Democrat of New York, said that Jones represented "the quest for excellence in American journalism," and added that his "imprint will long survive."

J. R. Wiggins, editor of the Washington Post and president of the Gridiron Club, asked the club members to form a committee to be at the chapel in Arlington Cemetery at 10 a.m. Monday.

VIETNAM REPORT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in a February 9, 1966, column published in the New York Times, C. L. Sulzberger supports a point which I made in my Vietnam report. He argues that American liberals have been much more inclined to make concessions to the Communists in Europe than in Asia, without realizing that the main thrust of the Communist threat today is in Asia and that this threat must be met where it is posed.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Sulzberger's article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 9, 1966]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: ROOTS OF BEFUDDLEMENT

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS.—International opinion is quite as bewildered as American opinion concerning U.S. policy in Vietnam. This is as true for adversaries of the United States as for friends. Senator FULBRIGHT was referring only to Americans when he said he had never seen "such dissent, reservation, groping and concern." But he might just as well have been referring to the outer world, choosing Russia and China for a start.

The Chinese proclaim our Vietnamese policy is part of a Russo-American global conspiracy to encircle China. Moscow's friend Castro throws the ball back into China's court, likening Peiping's actions to those of "Yankee imperialism." No wonder the average American gets mixed; Uncle Sam can't win.

NUCLEAR ESCALATION

The southeast Asian conflict is the first since 1945 that contains an implicit danger of nuclear escalation—which was never a serious threat in Korea. This implicit danger adds a muddled element to political thinking on Vietnam.

Since Hiroshima many U.S. liberals and intellectuals have been increasingly reluctant to endorse Washington's diplomatic actions, especially if they are tough. Such groups have unconsciously developed a mood of appeasement especially in Asia, that contrasts with the attitude of liberals and intellectuals toward Europe before World War II.

This pattern is confused by the traditional U.S. policy conflict between "Asia first" and "Europe first" schools. Broadly speaking, American liberals have always tended to belong to the latter group. Following World War II, U.S. foreign policy focused primarily on European matters; Korea being an exception.

The "Europe first" school has never been happy about accepting risks in the East. It took dramatic aggressions like Pearl Harbor or the invasion of South Korea to produce a consensus on our foreign policy between liberal "Europe first" and conservative "Asia first" groupings. The gradual intensifying of the Vietnam crisis by disguised aggression never achieved the same result.

Foreign opinion is bewildered for different reasons by American involvement in Vietnam. When the United States was firmly wedded to a "Europe first" policy it spurned General de Gaulle's request for a three-power committee, the United States, Britain, and France, to coordinate global strategy. This request, made in 1958, was never seriously pondered in Washington although De Gaulle made it clear that if no such arrangement were devised he would reduce French participation in NATO.

We have come full circle. The United States now urges its allies to help us in Vietnam but Europe, stripped of its Asian colonial possessions, is content to pursue its own version of a "Europe first" policy. Europeans want to avoid taking sides in communism's intramural dispute between Peiping and Moscow. They are more concerned with the problems of German unification than that of Vietnam; the present emotional atmosphere of the United States is not felt here.

DOUBLE SWITCH

Many Europeans, led by the French, were once extremely eager to attract Washington into Far Eastern commitments and an "Asia first" policy, a prospect then welcomed by American conservatives and opposed by liberals. But now that Washington has moved in the direction formerly desired by such Europeans, they in turn have shifted to our own previous position.

The "dissent, reservations, groping, and concern" noted by FULBRIGHT can thus be detected abroad also—but for entirely different reasons. The odd thing is that when American policy shifted from "Europe first" to "Asia first," those Europeans who originally wished to bring us into the East objected most.

Both Americans and Europeans who now criticize us have been on the same side of the policy fence—in fact on both sides—but at different times. Each has managed the strange feat of simultaneously reversing its position.

AMERICAN LIBERALS

For a third of a century American liberals and intellectuals have been more inclined to endorse appeasement in Asia than in Europe. The nuclear danger in Asia has only reinforced this traditional position. But the U.S. Government has shifted the emphasis of its policy interests from West to East.

Some 20 years of hegemony in world power politics have apparently persuaded Washington that its views always represent the general interest—even when such views are switched. Trouble comes when some Americans can't get used to the switch and some foreigners can't get used to its timing.

THE PEOPLE'S WAR LAND REFORM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a series of four articles which were published in the Washington Star, written by Richard Critchfield, explaining the war for land reform and the problems of pacification.

Critchfield details the Saigon land reform program, its failures, and most importantly its importance for the masses for Vietnamese peasants. Critchfield also argues convincingly that the key to future reelections in Vietnam and the success of democratic institutions hinges upon land reform and the need for a pacification program that educates and cares for the people and gives them a sense of participation as well as protects them. Mr. Critchfield's analyses in these respects confirm my own observations from my recent trip to Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Critchfield's articles printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star]

THE PEOPLE'S WAR: PEASANTS TOIL FOR THE EARTH, NOT FOR A GOVERNMENT

(By Richard Critchfield)

(NOTE.—This is the first of four articles on the Mekong Delta, South Vietnam's rice bowl. Critchfield recently completed an extensive tour there.)

TAN AN, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"This earth which formed their home and fed their bodies and made their gods * * *"

The Asian peasant's deep attachment to the soil he tills and in which his ancestors are buried, described in Pearl Buck's "The Good Earth," is strongly evident here in the Mekong Delta rice bowl of South Vietnam.

It is harvest time now. The golden fields of the great fertile plain between the Mekong, Bassac, and Saigon rivers are dotted with men and women winnowing the precious rice against tall, curved shelters of plaited bamboo so as not to lose a grain.

In black pajams and pointed strawhats, barefoot, bronzed by the January sun, the peasants have the sturdy look of men and women who can endure disease, natural disaster, and war so long as they have some land to farm.

But very few have land of their own. In Long An, one of Vietnam's most fertile provinces, more than 85 percent of the peasant population are tenants.

This landownership pattern may help explain why, despite a tremendous cost in lives and material, the war in Long An is no closer to being won than it was several years ago.

Last year, the heaviest fighting raged in the jungles and rubber plantations north of Saigon, the rain forests and grasslands of the high plateau and in the swamps and rice paddies of the narrow central coastal plain.

But if the main theater of war lay elsewhere, the rice-rich heartland of the Saigon region and the upper Mekong Delta, linked together by Long An, remains the prize for which the war is being fought.

Here, in less than 14 provinces, live almost two-thirds of the 15 million South Vietnamese.

In June 1964, the summer before the Vietcong began massing multibattalion forces for pitched battles, Long An was held up as the showplace of how a combined Vietnamese-American military and economic pacification effort could defeat a Communist insurrection.

Visitors went to Long An if they wanted to see how the protracted, guerrilla war was going on in the countryside.

But now, 18 months later, little has changed.

There has been no dramatic turn in the guerrilla fighting; the government has won some villages and lost some.

There are no signs of any serious deterioration. But there has been no real improvement either; since it is primarily a war of subversion in Long An, the creeping Communist initiative simply has crept further.

Other peasants have replaced the hundreds of Vietcong killed in battle, and American military and civilian advisers agree there are many more Vietcong than a year ago.

OPPOSING SIDES

Most important in Long An, however, the government and the mass of peasantry still seem to be on the opposing sides of the fight.

None of the successive Saigon governments has succeeded in analyzing the peasants' grievances and then tried to right these wrongs, though there are signs Premier Nguyen Cao Ky's regime is moving in this direction.

Land is of such paramount importance here that the Vietcong allow only the landless or very poor farmers in the delta to command guerrilla units or qualify as party members.

The provincial government's social order is the exact reverse. Most of the military officers, civil servants and community leaders come from the landowning gentry.

The same is true in Saigon, here only 1 of the 10 generals now sharing power has any rapport with the masses. He is Central Vietnam's erratic Maj. Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi, who also is the only one of peasant origin.

The traditional Mandarin ruling class fell from power with Ngo Dinh Diem, but their political heirs are the nonpeasant urban middle classes and their relatives.

LODGE PUSHES REFORM

Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and his top aids have made it clear that the United States regards major land redistribution as essential in successfully prosecuting the war.

Ky recently announced a land reform program that will initially convey 700,000 acres to 180,000 peasants.

Eventually, the program will be expanded to encompass over 500,000 acres of land formerly owned by the French, 660,000 acres now farmed by "squatters" and 300,000 acres where free titles will be awarded in resettlement areas.

The crux of the problem, however, has yet to be tackled. This is the redistribution from big to small owners of more than 2 million acres in the Mekong Delta.

Good delta land is worth about $50 an acre; it is roughly estimated by the South Vietnamese generals that it would cost between $150 and $200 million to carry out equitable reform programs here.

Land reform under Diem left a bitter aftermath, since 2,279 dispossessed landlords were paid only 10 percent in cash as compensation and given low-interest, nontransferable, 12-year bonds for the rest. The bonds since have plummeted in value.

U.S. GENERATING MONEY

The United States could solve this problem by generating $150 million in local currencies so that an outright compensation could be made.

It already is generating piasters to pay for the Vietnamese share in the war—to the tune of $350 million this year—by giving the Saigon Government imported commodities to sell to local merchants.

Both North Vietnam's Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap and the U.S. commander Gen. William C. Westmoreland describe the Vietnam conflict as "a people's war," and not "a war of attrition."

Since the emphasis, first, is on converting and, second, on killing, the investment of $150 million in land reform to undermine the Vietcong's peasant support would seem like a bargain in a war that is costing $16.5 million a week.

During the early days of the Diem regime, the United States spent $4 million on land reform. From 1961 through 1965 nothing was spent. And $1.1 million is budgeted for the current fiscal year.

PROBLEM NOT UNIFORM

The problem is not uniform throughout the country. With the exception of the Saigon area, the upper Mekong Delta and a thin, populated strip along the coastline, South Vietnam is mostly empty terrain. More than 85 percent of the land total is covered with jungle, swampland, or dense foliage.

Along the overpopulated coastal fringe, now heavily burdened with refugees, most farms are small and owner operated and there is real land hunger.

In the highlands, the problem could be solved simply by giving the Montegnard tribes clear title to land they have farmed for centuries.

The real problem is in the delta.

Out of 1.2 million farms, only 260,000 are owner operated; 520,000 are rented and 330,000 more are partly rented.

There are 71 farms of more than 250 acres and 85,000 more over 12 acres (though all one peasant family can reasonably handle is 5 to 7 acres).

Some 3,000 rich Saigon families still are the big landlords.

In Long An, the pattern is even more lopsided. According to one official U.S. survey made last July, 65 rich landlords, 3,000 farmer-owners and 28,000 tenant families comprise the population.

COULD INFLUENCE ELECTION

The landownership pattern probably would significantly influence the outcome of a free election, such as envisaged in the 1954 Geneva agreements.

Lodge has observed the Communist promises of land to the tiller is "perhaps the greatest appeal the Vietcong have."

Why there is so much opposition to sweeping land reform among some Saigonese is suggested by the tremendous wealth of a delta Province like Long An.

In a good year, such as 1963–64, Long An produced 320,000 tons of rice (Saigon's annual requirement is only 600,000 tons.) It also sold that year 10,000 tons of pineapple, 70,000 tons of sugarcane, plus chickens, ducks, pigs, and other cash earners.

The legal land ceiling is 220 acres. Even so, a Saigon landlord who charges double the legal rental rate of 25 percent, as he can do if the land is fertile enough, stands to profit as much as $40,000 in a single-year on 220 acres.

This compares with a Vietnamese policeman's monthly wage of $25, or the monthly cash allotment of a Vietcong guerrilla, which is 40 cents.

POLITICAL ATTITUDES AFFECTED

More important, perhaps, is how this unequal distribution of land affects these political attitudes of the Vietnamese.

What seems to be absent here is the kind of political code that Theodore H. White has described as President Johnson's "grassroots liberalism":

"You get yours and he gets his and we all share what there is to share."

In Long An, this gets no further than "you get yours" and he, the peasant, can either lump it or try to get his by joining the Vietcong.

But most of the peasants have learned by now that under the Vietcong nobody keeps his.

This has created the kind of political vacuum where many Vietnamese peasants regard the war as a pointless slaughter. They still feel they stand to be the losers no matter who wins.

CAUGHT IN VISE

Caught between bloodsucking landlords, many of whom charge double the legal rents, and pitiless Vietcong tax collectors, who shoot first and talk later, the peasants appear ready to call a plague on both sides of this indecisive struggle.

Yet there is an appeal to the Vietcong's three main propaganda themes: "Land to the tiller," "The soldier helps the peasant," and "The government exists for the people."

These are novel and explosive ideas to a man who works knee deep in mud 14 hours a day, growing half his rice for somebody else, whose idea of government may be a venal local tax collector, and whose chickens and ducks may have disappeared when the last militia patrol passed through his village.

If his home has been destroyed or relatives killed by ill-directed bombs and shells, he might make a ready Vietcong convert without knowing what for.

U.S. MILITARY FRUSTRATED

Within the American military command in Saigon, there is widespread frustration over the failure of pacification efforts in the delta provinces like Long An.

One hears talk that the only way the Vietcong fish can be deprived of the water in which they swim is to make things so hot in Communist-held zones that the peasants will come over to the government side as refugees.

Others argue there is no substitute for thoroughgoing land reform.

One veteran American adviser in Long An said:

"These people have country that doesn't need a government. They could go back 2,000 years and they'd be happy, fish in every pond, crabs in every paddy, bananas, coconut, and ducks. All they need is a little land of their own to be happy. Five percent of the Vietnamese in this province are honestly pro-government by their own personal beliefs and ideology, 5 percent are with the Vietcong for the same reason and the other 90 percent are right."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Jan. 25, 1966]

THE PEOPLE'S WAR: MILITARY ACTION VERSUS LAND REFORM

(NOTE—This is the second of four articles on the Mekong Delta, South Vietnam's rice bowl. Critchfield recently completed an extensive tour there.)

(By Richard Critchfield)

TANAN, SOUTH VIETNAM.—A respected Vietnamese journalist, when asked why Saigon's generals temporized on enacting the kind of land reform that most people agree is needed to win the war, replied:

"They're still convinced it's winnable their way, and if not, it's not worth winning."

This harsh judgment may have more than a grain of truth in it.

Here in Long An Province, in the rice-rich heavily populated upper Mekong Delta, the Vietnamese officials and Army officers seem as fiercely determined as ever to defect the Vietcong eventually.

The Vietnamese still are fighting their own war here.

But local leaders become curt and evasive when questioned about land reform or other innovations to improve the peasant's lot.

"All the land we can distribute in secure areas, we have distributed already," said one senior Vietnamese official.

Most of these local leaders are reserved, sensitive, French-educated men, generally respected by their American advisers as "very competent" and "fine people." All have lived amidst war and violence since 1939.

Yet most of the higher ranking ones see South Vietnam's salvation in terms of military action rather than political remedies.

A typical response on how to win the war came from a civilian administrator in his midthirties:

"We don't have enough troops. If the free world would go to war with China, then OK. The unique way to win is to attack North Vietnam and China. If not, the war of subversion will last another 5 years."

Asked about the fate of the 3,000 Vietcong of South Vietnamese origin in Long An in the event of a cease-fire, the official said, "They all must go back to Hanoi."

His opinion was seconded by a Vietnamese officer, "Once the fighting stops, it will take us another 2 years to pacify Long An. We must throw the Vietcong forces out and destroy the Communist infrastructure."

A year ago, the U.S. mission in Saigon agreed to finance grievance committees in each of Long An's six districts in an attempt to analyze and then to right the wrongs that turn the peasants into Communist guerrillas.

One Vietnamese officer explained how the committees were working out:

"Each cadre has a small room. Everybody must come in for 5 minutes so as to keep security for the man who seeks to tell something. The cadre asks, 'How is your family? How is your life?' In this way, we get information on the Vietcong political organization and make our intelligence net. The grievance committees are the eyes of the Province chief."

Other officials praised the committees as a good way of learning the peasantry's education needs, getting military intelligence, controlling the population's movements and detecting secret Vietcong cells.

No one mentioned the genuine grievances that the peasants presumably voiced.

ATTITUDES DIFFERENT

Going down the ladder one rung to the district officials, however, there seems to be a distinct difference in attitudes.

While most senior Provincial officials are from Saigon and make no secret of their personal ambition to be transferred back there some day, the district officials seem to identify themselves much more closely with the local peasantry.

Typical of this group is Nguyen Van Dhien, in Long An's most pacified district, Thu Thua. A goateed former Vietnamese ranger with a reputation as a tough fighter, Dhien writes poetry and has let his fingernails grow half-an-inch long to show he has risen above manual labor.

Dhien does not think that an invasion of North Vietnam would solve anything—and he is a strong advocate of land reform.

Asked what might happen if there were a free election contested by the Communists and the Saigon regime in Thu Thua, he said that if the Communists promised land reform, they might get the votes of 85 percent of the 45,000 who are landless peasants. In contrast, he said, the 8,000 refugees who have poured into Thu Thua in recent weeks from Vietcong-held territory probably would vote for Saigon since most are bitterly anti-Vietcong after experiencing Communist rule.

Twenty percent of Thu Thua's land, he said, is owned by rich absentee landlords who live in Saigon and Tan An.

Unlike the provincial leaders, Thien does not think the protracted guerrilla war will last long. "There is a big flame in the lamp just before it goes out," he said.

A third distinct Vietnamese attitude is moral indifference to the war, typically expressed by the bonze superior of Tan An's towering Nguyen Thuy Pagoda.

During a conversation marked by long silences, distant gongs, and burning incense, the bonze, a shaven-haired intelligent-looking man in his midthirties, had no opinion on land or any other concrete reform to help the peasantry.

"The Buddhist doctrine is tolerance, not violence," he said. "People move to town because they are afraid of bombing and artillery. I hope it is possible you can cease the bombing and shelling. Even where there is no engagement made with the Communist forces, the Americas still bomb, causing much harm to the people."

Most of the refugees, however, do not associate airstrikes with the Americans since they have seen few foreigners.

One refugee, Mau, a 49-year-old tenant farmer who fled to Tan An with his wife and five children a month ago, said his hamlet, An Nhut Tan, had long been under Vietcong control.

"At home I rented a hectare of rice land from a landlord who lived in Lac Tan village. The VC promised to give us land; they called the village chiefs together last year to make a land reform plan, but they didn't do anything."

Asked what he thought of the Vietcong, Mua stuck his tongue out and made a face as if he had bitten into a sour pickle.

"They usually shoot artillery around my house so I must move. Too much bombing also since November."

Since he had no identity papers, he said, he could not qualify for refugee relief and instead was earning 50 cents a day as a construction laborer in Tan An. "It's easy to get work now; many rich men building houses."

Asked what he thought of Americans, he had to ask the interpreter what Americans were.

After a pause, he shrugged, "The Government used to help more with rice and money. Why doesn't Mr. Diem come back? When he was there we got bank loans."

A 25-year-old Vietcong defector, who used to lead a 37-man guerrilla platoon, explained why peasants like Mua were turning against the Vietcong.

In his area, he said, the Vietcong initially redistributed land. But now they have raised taxes 300 percent.

"The more air strikes, the more people moved away and the heavier taxes became," he said. "The National Liberation Front (the Vietcong's political arm) failed to solve anything. There was no security to work in your field. An F-105 jet got there too fast, there was no time to run for cover. Those and 250-pound bombs were most feared."

He said if he were directing the war in Saigon he would intensify air and artillery attacks on the Vietcong villages, and then would offer the peasants amnesty and safe harbor elsewhere.

He suggested the offers be broadcast via heliborne loudspeakers by people who previously had left the Vietcong held villages.

He said he had joined the Communist Party 2 years ago.

"Everyone wants to join because it is an honor. You are known everywhere."

His platoon, he said, was assigned the military mission of "destroying strategic hamlets, building roadblocks, and encircling and inflicting casualties on the enemy" and the political task of "visiting farmers to inquire about their poverty and ask about their sufferings."

He said the Vietcong's motto was "Eat together, live together, and work together," meaning the soldiers and peasantry.

"The people liked us until our presence began to attract bombs and artillery to their villages," he said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 26, 1966]

THE PEOPLE'S WAR: THE BATTLE TO WIN PEASANT'S LOYALTY

(NOTE.—This is the third of four articles on the Mekong Delta, South Vietnam's rice bowl. Critchfield recently completed an extensive tour there.)

(By Richard Critchfield)

TAN AN, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"Vietcong?" said the teenage American corporal, shoving a magazine into his carbine. "Hell, half the people walking by could be Vietcong. How you gonna tell Charlie from the friendlies?"

Here in Long An Province in the densely populated Mekong Delta, as most everywhere else in Vietnam, it is impossible to tell "our side" from "their side." A grin or a wave means nothing at all.

The corporal is one of about 60 Americans who are spending a year in the province, advising its military officers and civil servants on how to destroy Vietcong units, counter political subversion, and win over the loyalty of the peasantry.

It is no easy task, since an unrecognizable minority of the people the advisers are trying to befriend are trying to kill them.

And unless they befriend and convert more people than they kill, the fighting accomplishes nothing.

This is the basic difference between the "people's war" in Vietnam and more familiar "wars of attrition" elsewhere.

AWAKENED BY MORTARS

That night the Americans at Tan An were awakened at 1:30 a.m. by incoming mortar bursts. For some minutes the night was full of whirring, shrieking explosions.

Then the Vietcong firing stopped as abruptly as it had begun.

Out along a fence where men in pajamas and underwear and others in full combat fatigues had taken their positions, everyone listened.

When the night stayed quiet, someone muttered, "Well, I'll live to see another day."

A garrison radio crackled to life and a voice reported two 30-man Vietnamese militia posts had been attacked, one less than 2 miles away.

Flareships and "razorback" armed helicopters were soon circling the northern horizon; the tracer bullets looked like a man on a rooftop sprinkling firewater from a hose.

The commanding officer sent word from the province command post, telling everyone to go back to bed and get some sleep. They would need it in the days and weeks ahead.

SUSPECT BIG ASSAULT

The night mortar barrages have become a routine in Long An Province. Either Tan An or one of the six district capitals gets hit at least once a week.

And many of the American advisers, airmen, and technicians suspect a big assault on one of the district towns sometime this winter. Most are convinced such an assault can be turned back with Saigon's armed hueys, jets, flareships, and Long An's artillery.

It is rough for the five-man American advisory teams stationed in the six district towns.

One major said that everytime his garrison has been mortared, he has gone out and found the outside gate open, unlatched from inside the compound.

"If the Vietcong ever get inside that gate there's no place to go but down. At that point, I take off my flak vest, 'cause if they're going to get me, I don't want it to be alive."

A captain in Tan Tru, Long An's hottest district since it straddles the main Vietcong supply route between the South China Sea and base camps along the Cambodian border, says the morale of the Vietnamese militia he advises is "the damndest thing I've ever seen. I don't see how they can continue to smile and joke all the time; but they do."

He said his 2 months at Tan Tru has felt "like a lifetime; something happens every night."

He added, "We also have to keep the 12-mile road to Tan An open three times a week and it seems like every time we go to clear it we lose one man, either killed or wounded."

One major described a recent daylight operation to clear a Vietcong roadblock off Highway 4. He said his driver, while waiting in the jeep, was shot between the eyes by a sniper.

HARASSMENT RISING

After nearly a year of comparative peace and quiet in Long An, the Vietcong moved a second main force battalion into the province in November and the pace of ambushes, attacks, and mortar harassment has risen steadily ever since.

This climaxed at 1:30 a.m. on December 26 when the Vietcong chose to break the United States-South Vietnamese Christmas truce by firing 40 mortar shells into Tan An, while simultaneously laying down mortar barrages on all six district towns.

They inflicted heavy casualties and eventually overran two company-sized outposts and beheaded one Vietnamese soldier's wife.

Twenty-five militiamen were missing after the attack; an American captain speculated they "either bugged out, were carried off or directly hit by a mortar shell and blown to bits."

Many of the ill-equipped militia, or popular forces, as they are officially called, fight with only carbines and shotguns while wearing floppy hats, swimming trunks, pajamas or a scrounged uniform.

Recently a four-man outpost held off a company-sized Vietcong attack for 6 hours; when morning came two militiamen were dead and two were wounded, but the post had not fallen and they had managed to capture six Vietcong weapons.

One hamlet of 300 people, deep within Vietcong territory, recently pacified itself by erecting fortifications and passing the hat to buy a 60-mm. mortar to scare off the Vietcong. So far the Communist guerrillas have let the village alone.

Many of the American advisers believe the pattern of Vietcong attacks on isolated outposts and newly fortified hamlets along Saigon's defensive perimeter and Long An's northern boundary suggests that the Communists may be trying to sever Highway No.

4, and cut off Saigon from the rice-rich Mekong Delta.

COUNTER STRATEGY

To counter this strategy, Long An's Government forces, composed of two South Vietnamese regular army regiments and several thousand more locally recruited militiamen and police, have tried to fix the two Vietcong battalions with ground action and destroy them with heavy artillery and airstrikes.

Long An is so short of troops, however, that most operations must be stopped at sunset so the militia and police can return to guard their homes and families.

Despite this troop shortage, both the American advisers and Vietnamese commanders oppose bringing American combat units into the delta where the war is still almost entirely a Vietnamese fight, except for U.S. air support.

The Americans seem to feel that moving more U.S. troops into the delta would lead to a put-down-tools attitude among the Vietnamese forces. Vietnamese officers emphasize that the local economy would be disrupted and that the Vietcong could exploit a foreign invasion propaganda campaign among the local peasantry.

American combat soldiers in Vietnam are always amazed to hear the U.S. advisory teams live in scattered groups of four and five, wholly defended by Vietnamese troops.

The advisers themselves often wouldn't have it any other way.

Says Capt. Maurice H. Krause, 31, of Wahpeton, N. Dak., Long An's pacification adviser:

"This is an extremely nice country. What happens if you get assigned to a big unit is that you're close to a conventional war environment, moving with the troops. Down here in Long An we see people getting schools and medicine, see the spontaneous expressions of loyalty to this side and dissatisfaction with the Vietcong."

Two enlisted men in Long An have extended their tours for a second year and one will marry a local Vietnamese girl next month.

The biggest problem for the advisory team, as the fighting intensifies in Long An, is how to avoid inflicting casualties on the civilian population.

"HAVE TO GET CALLOUS"

Half of the patients at Tan An's new 155-bed hospital are civilians wounded in the fighting.

"Usually you can count on receiving at least a couple a day," says an American doctor on the hospital staff. "They mostly step on grenades or mines or get shot by stray bullets. But we do get some bombing and napalm victims. You have to get callous or you'd drive yourself crazy worrying about it."

A U.S. Air Force forward air observer, one of a team who flys reconnaissance and combat support missions over Long An every day and knows its terrain by heart, says, "If I go over a village and see women and kids, I flatly refuse to call in an airstrike."

Another American, after many months in Long An, says, "No one who goes to indemnification meetings where they pay war victims can be morally callous. No one can say a 2-year-old child or a 90-year-old grandmother is a Vietcong. But I think we should and must continue the bombing.

"It's effective. It kills Vietcong and interdicts their movements. I think care is taken. There are instances where American forward air controllers have refused to call in strikes or when the province chief has ordered helicopters back home that were ordered out.

"What you've always got to remember, though, is that the people are the key to winning the war. There's no reason to go out in the woods and kill lots of people unless it helps in pacifications."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 27, 1966]

THE PEOPLE'S WAR: AND NOW ANOTHER TRY AT PACIFYING LONG AN

(NOTE.—This is the last of four articles on the Mekong Delta, South Vietnam's rice bowl. Critchfield recently completed an extensive tour there.)

(By Richard Critchfield)

TAN AN, SOUTH VIETNAM.—After months of reappraisal and careful preparation, South Vietnam has launched its fourth pacification plan since 1961 to win back the loyalty of the Vietnamese peasantry.

It differs hardly at all from the old plans on the two key issues involved—land reform and military against civilian rule in the countryside.

As a result, many observers fear it will be no more successful than former President Ngo Dinh Diem's Operation Sunrise, Gen. Nguyen Khanh's Chien Thang plan or Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor's Hop Tac plan.

Nor is anybody predicting spectacular success.

After a brief tour of Vietnam recently, David Bell, Director of the Agency for International Development, said, "We don't except large areas to be cleared, but they will be significant."

It has never been so much a question of devising a successful pacification program as applying it and redressing the genuine political grievances of the peasantry.

In essence, all the programs have been derived from the tache d'huile or "oil slick" or "ink blot" theory, first developed by the French Foreign Legion in Morocco in the 1920's. It was a method of securing some solidly held, key centers from which "pacification" forces could spread out in an ever-widening perimeter against rebellious natives.

PHILIPPINE SUCCESS

After being humanized and refined with civic action, most notably land reform, the method worked against Communist insurgents in the Philippines. And by added emphasis on promises of independence, police methods, strict population control, and fortified villages, the British made it work in Malaya.

Land reform or the promise of independence, however, provided the psychological impetus in both of these successful efforts.

As U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge puts it, the people "must adhere to the government because they like it before it can win."

It was not until March 1962 that Diem, with the help of Malayan-experienced British advisers, launched the first attempt at Vietnamese pacification, Operation Sunrise.

Diem misused the program by making it an instrument of his personal rule. But even so, it was far more successful than any of the efforts that followed it.

For instance, here in Long An Province, Diem succeeded—in just a little over 1 year—in regrouping 1,000 hamlets into 220 strategic hamlets and isolating the Vietcong into the remaining 35.

Diem had three things his successors lacked—a functioning countrywide rural administrative system, an efficient, tightly controlled political apparatus, and a civilian chief in each Province whose authority was absoluete and who superimposed a political judgment over military actions in his Province.

DIEM AIDS PURGED

The wholesale purge of public servants and other Diem appointees, whatever their personal record or reputation, and the destruction of his Can Lao Party left the Vietnamese Army as the only countrywide organization.

Colonels and captains took over the job of running South Vietnam's 43 Provinces and 240 districts.

It soon become apparent, however, that these men were not subject to Saigon's direct administrative control; rather they were responsible to the commander of the nearest Vietnamese Army division and through him to the local corps commander.

Seen in retrospect, the three successive military coups of Minh, Khanh and the Young Turks were in large part supported by the officer corps to enable them to consolidate the administration in the countryside.

Thus, beginning with Diem's fall, government was made incidental to waging the war.

On the Provincial level, meanwhile, the army, jealous of its powers, exempted Vietnamese soldiers from the civilian penal code, even in crimes involving civilians.

Since the army lacked the judicial apparatus and military police to control its troops, the net effect was to turn loose in the countryside 550,000 young soldiers who had little reason to fear being arrested or prosecuted for crimes such as rape or petty theft.

The Vietcong leaders, meanwhile, were concentrating on getting their men to "eat, live and work" with the peasants. The Vietcong helped the peasants till their ricefields and sweep their houses, while through terrorism, they were eroding law and order in Government-controlled areas.

Two months after Diem's overthrow, an American-Vietnamese factfinding team, was sent to Long An Province.

The team uncovered an alarming Communist advance. By then the Vietcong had overrun and burnt down all but 6 of Diem's 220 strategic hamlets.

After interviewing 1,500 peasant families, the team concluded the war against the Vietcong "cannot ever be won" unless Saigon carried out drastic reforms at the village level.

Its conclusions were:

Land must be distributed. The local militia must be paid regularly. The use of artillery and bombs against villages must be limited.

Forced labor had to be stopped. Army extortion and food thefts must be prevented.

Corruption and bribery must be eliminated among local officials. District and Provincial forces must send reinforcements when they were sought by village outposts under attack.

These conclusions were pretty basic, yet today most of the troubles remain largely unremedied.

Local militia are a little better paid and housed, but still not adequately. Forced labor has been eliminated in most of the country. The introduction of more armed helicopters, flareships, high-speed jets and more artillery has reduced the need for ground reinforcements.

But there has been no serious land reform. Bombing and shelling of villages has multiplied tenfold or twelvefold. Army extortion and food thefts are as common as ever and corruption is still endemic.

LODGE SHOCKED

When the report on Long An was originally published in early 1964, it had the impact of a bombshell in Saigon. Lodge, shocked at the seriousness of the situation, urged General Khanh to launch a crash pilot pacification program in the Province. If the Communists could be turned back in Long An, Lodge argued, it would be shown they could be turned back everywhere.

Khanh agreed. Economic aid was stepped up, U.S. heliborne flights deployed for stop attacks, the military advisory team was expanded and more men were assigned to district and mobile units operating in the Province.

A Vietnamese airborne brigade was flown in to start operations to clear lost territory.

Maj. Gen. Richard Stilwell, now U.S. Commander in Thailand, told newsmen Long An would be "pacified" and cleared of Communists within 6 months.

But the following July, 6 months later, the Government held only 25 hamlets, mostly clustered around Tan An and the six district towns. Khanh's "Chien Thang" plan had been a fiasco.

Partly, this was because Khanh's heart was never in pacification. He weakened pacification efforts from the start by leaving it up to his Province chiefs to proceed as best they saw fit in their own bailiwicks.

After Maxwell Taylor arrived in Saigon that summer as Ambassador and surveyed the wreckage of years of costly trial and error, he developed a pacification philosophy calling for giving the peasants military security while demonstrating to them the revolutionary idea in Vietnam, that Government exists for the people.

By then, one of the main Vietcong slogans had already become: "The Government exists for the people."

URGES CONCENTRATION

Taylor pushed for concentrating the Government's resources on a small area, the seven Provinces encircling Saigon, hoping for visible results. This was the "Hop Tac" plan (which roughly means "togetherness.")

Taylor also urged a return to civilian government. This was not simply to have Vietnam's leader a man in mufti instead of uniform, but because Taylor saw it was the way to restore a workable administration and law and order in the countryside.

Lodge's strong advocacy for a return to civilian rule, no matter who the man on top is, is based on the same reasoning.

Yet now, almost 18 months since Hop Tac got underway, Long An still has only 76 of its 252 hamlets anywhere near pacified.

The cost of men and material has been heavy; four of the young American officers who pointed out shortcomings in the pacification effort to me on previous visits since have been killed in action.

Since June 1964, there have been four different American province advisers and eight different American pacification advisers in Long An, although the Vietnamese Provincial officials have stayed the same.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. MAY CRAIG

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, at the time of her retirement last December 31, May Craig was one of the most widely known women in America.

As a journalist for more than 30 years, Mrs. Craig gained the confidence of five Presidents.

As a panelist on more than 250 televised broadcasts of "Meet the Press" and other public affairs programs, she became a national personality.

As a columnist for the Guy Gannett Publishing Co., she gave Maine newspapers a refreshing and perceptive view of Washington and the world.

As a correspondent, she circled the world in war and peace. She witnessed the most exciting and trying events of our times. She spoke with the wisdom of experience and the optimism of youth.

Throughout her unparalleled career, she was a voice of decency.

To the Maine congressional delegation and to two generations of official Washington spokesmen, May Craig was a tireless and impartial reporter. She also was a lady whose charm and character won our hearts. We will carry our respect and affection for her always.

Earlier this week, President Johnson and 400 other friends honored her at a reception at the National Press Club.

When May Craig's retirement was announced, her newspapers in Maine outlined the highlights of her career and reported the many tributes she received.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post story on her National Press Club reception, and the Guy Gannett Publishing Co. stories on her retirement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland (Maine) Press-Herald, Dec. 4, 1965]

NEWSWOMAN MAY CRAIG SLATED TO RETIRE DECEMBER 31

WASHINGTON.—May Craig, one of America's most famous newspaperwomen and for more than 30 years the capital correspondent for the Guy Gannett newspapers of Maine, will retire at the end of the year.

Mrs. Craig, who combined penetrating questions with pert hats, for more than 3 decades has been the most widely read columnist in Maine. She covered Washington and the world for Guy Gannett newspapers in Portland, Augusta, and Waterville.

For thousands of Maine families her daily column "Inside in Washington" was must morning breakfast table reading. Although little read outside Maine, Mrs. Craig became nationally famous as a panelist on the radio and television program "Meet the Press."

Millions of Americans came to know her as the Washington reporter who could be counted upon to enliven Presidential press conferences with the pointed question, the incisive query.

Yet, though her questions occasionally rankled the famous, she was a close friend of every President from Franklin D. Roosevelt to Lyndon Baines Johnson.

And, though she asked literally thousands of questions, "I never asked a question I later regretted," she noted as her retirement neared.

Her column reflected the same penetrating quality that punctuated her questions. One column in 1964, "Decline of the United States—And Fall" attracted nationwide attention, was reprinted in U.S. News & World Report as well as newspapers throughout America.

Her travels in search of the news took Elizabeth May Craig around the world, as a war correspondent in World War II, as the first woman to fly the Berlin airlift, as a correspondent during the Korean war, and to Africa as the continent merged during the early 1960's.

Maine readers followed her byline around the world as she reported the great events of more than 3 decades.

Yet May Craig also kept a close finger on the pulse of the Maine delegation in Washington as she furnished readers with the news that most closely affected them.

Mrs. Craig said that, when she retires at the end of the year, "I'm going to take a little time off to do nothing," but few readers will believe that she'll remain inactive long. She's been under contract for some time to write a book, so there's the strong likelihood that the typewriter, which for a third of a century had recorded the events that shaped the world, will not long be stilled.

Millions of Americans who have seen Mrs. Craig on "Meet the Press" and at Presidential press conferences, have come to think of her as a Maine native. It comes as a shock to learn that she's a native of Coosaw, N.C., who moved to Washington as a young girl.

No matter. She remains Maine in Washington to many. She knows Maine intimately and news of a postmaster's appointment in Waterville received the same close attention as a Washington national story.

Now in her seventies (although she maintains that she'll be 50 until she dies), Mrs. Craig never slowed down. Her columns from the beginning reflected her intense interest in almost everything and anything, from renovations of the White House to the war in Vietnam.

For years she was up and on the go at 6 a.m., and Maine Senators and Congressmen quickly learned to become accustomed to a telephone call from May Craig long before they had risen from bed.

She became in time almost as famous as some of the officials she covered; more famous than most.

Married to a newspaperman, the late Donald Alexander Craig, the Washington bureau chief for the New York Herald, as well as for the Guy Gannett newspapers, Mrs. Craig became the Washington correspondent for these newspapers in the early 1930's after the death of her husband. She has two children, a son and a daughter, and several grandchildren.

She maintains a home in Washington close to the Capitol.

During her career Mrs. Craig covered the V-bomb raids in London during World War II, the Normandy campaign, the liberation of Paris, and the Korean war. Her travels for these newspapers have taken her to almost every point on the globe.

She was made a doctor of human letters by the University of Maine in 1946. She is a member of the Women's National Press Club, the Overseas Press of America, and Theta Sigma Phi.

PRAISE FROM L.B.J.

President Johnson, learning in Texas of May Craig's retirement, sent her the following telegram Friday:

"It's a long time from May to September, but May will always be May to me."

[From the Portland (Maine) Evening Express, Dec. 3, 1965]

TRIBUTE FROM PUBLISHER

Mrs. Jean Gannett Arnzen, president and publisher of the Guy Gannett Publishing Co., issued this statement of tribute to May Craig:

"May Craig has for many years been as inseparable from our papers as their nameplates. She has made them known, not only in Maine but in the Nation. Competing in an environment of top talent and strong personalities, she has had the vigor and the ability to be outstanding.

"Obviously her retirement, so richly deserved cannot be treated casually. It will leave a lonesome place in our columns. Her departure is too close to me, personally, to be dismissed in the course of business.

"She was employed by our papers by my father, the late Guy P. Gannett, when he was establishing them and laying the foundations for their success. He always believed that one of his most important contributions was employing May Craig to represent his papers in Washington.

"I shall always remember my father's great pride in his Washington correspondent and the delight he had in her success."

[From the Portland, Maine, Sunday Telegram, Dec. 19, 1965]

"NATION IS BETTER FOR THIS OUTSTANDING WOMAN"—FROM PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S TRIBUTE TO MAY CRAIG

(By Donald E. Hanson)

To imagine a Presidential press conference without May Craig is like imagining the Capital without the Washington Monument.

For May Craig, to thousands of Maine newspaper readers, is Washington. For more than three decades she's been an indelible fixture on the Washington scene.

Presidents came and went. Elections changed the faces in the city and altered the complexion of the Nation. May Craig remained.

Now that too changes, for May Craig, who with pert hat and pointed question became one of America's most famous newspaperwomen, retires at the end of the year.

Presidents from Franklin Delano Roosevelt to Lyndon Baines Johnson came to know and respect—and occasionally chafe at one of her barbed questions—the little and unquestionable First Lady of the Washington press corps.

Although for thousands of Maine readers her column "Inside in Washington" has been daily must reading for years at the breakfast table, Elizabeth May Craig was comparatively unread outside the State, except on occasions when her comments were reprinted in other newspapers and magazines.

Her face, however, became almost as famous as those of the personages she covered.

Visitors to Washington have, after viewing the landmarks of the city, often inquired of their host: "All this is fine, but where's May Craig?" And a Sunday Telegram reporter, traveling in California, had only to mention that he worked for the Portland papers to receive the reply, "Oh, you mean May Craig's papers."

To millions of Americans she became famous as a fixture on the radio and television program "Meet the Press." She once made President Jim Carey, of the Electrical Workers Union, gulp visibly by asking: "Don't you think it un-American for a man to have to belong to a union to earn a living?"

NO ONE IMMUNE

No President was immune from the sharp May Craig question. President Roosevelt, after fielding a sharp one on three hops, asked May if she stayed awake all night thinking it up. "As a matter of fact," shot back May, "I did."

Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson all came to expect the unexpected from May. President Kennedy was wise enough to realize that when a press conference began to take a dull turn that it was probably time to recognize Mrs. Craig.

Yet, if Presidents occasionally rankled at a May Craig question, none was ever able to harbor a grudge.

She was often a visitor at the Hyde Park home of President and Mrs. Roosevelt. President Johnson, perhaps better than most, came to realize the many facets of May Craig. In 1956, when the then Senator Johnson suffered a severe heart attack, each day to his hospital room was delivered a private letter from May, cheering him and informing him of the activities in the Senate.

If the pointed questions, the unusual hats or the familiar features made May Craig a celebrity, they may also to some extent have obscured her real ability as a member of the Washington press corps.

Eisenhower's press secretary, Jim Hagerty, ranked her equal to any reporter he knew, man or woman. Pierre Salinger, George Reedy, and Bill Moyers also learned she was a press correspondent to be reckoned with.

May seemed to have a knack for knowing where a story was; if she didn't intuitively know, her apparently insatiable curiosity about nearly everything and everybody led her to it.

She wrote for more than 30 years with an unmistakable crisp style that occasionally crackled with brilliance. A 1964 column on the "Decline of the United States—And Fall" became an overnight sensation, was reprinted in U.S. News & World Report and many newspapers. Thousands of readers throughout the United States sought reprints.

After an early interview with Cuba's Fidel Castro, May rightly presaged that "Pistol packin' Fidel Castro will have to lay this pistol down if he is going to do the administrative job that lies before him. He is apt to find being a statesman is more difficult than fighting."

WITH THE TROOPS

Although based for most of her newspaper career in Washington, May Craig's byline appeared over datelines from throughout the world.

She was a tenacious war correspondent in World War II, heard the deadly buzz of the V-bombs over London, later was present at the allied liberation of Paris and became the first woman ever to fly the Berlin airlift.

She was in Korea during that war; in the early 1960's toured Africa as that continent emerged.

She went where the news took her, and diplomatic doors around the world opened to let her in.

Most readers think of May Craig, who incidentally is 77 years old today, as a Maine native, yet she was born in Coosaw, S.C., one of a family of nine children.

She moved to Washington, D.C., as a youngster and high school officialdom was the first to quail before her pen. She was suspended from high school for 3 days after a piece she wrote for the school paper was judged to be disrespectful of the faculty.

She later married Donald Alexander Craig, himself a topdrawer newsman who was the Washington representative of the New York Herald in addition to the Maine newspapers.

May's Maine newspaper career was launched when she began substituting for her husband, who was ill for a time before his death. In the early 1930's after her husband's death she agreed to continue as the Guy Gannett correspondent in Washington.

Since then May's working day has begun at 6:30 a.m. and Washington officials long ago became accustomed to being awakened by an early query from May. By 8:30 a.m. she was heading toward the Capitol, the White House, or some other Government agency in search of news.

"Miss May," as President Truman called her, for years wrote her personal column "Inside in Washington" six times a week, a chore in itself. In addition, she daily covered the major breaking news as well as the more local stories from Maine's delegation at the Capitol.

Although she is retiring, she's reluctant to decide whether to retain her red brick home close to the Capitol she is so much a part of, or move nearer her son and daughter who live in Maryland.

As a woman reporter, May fought hard for the same privileges as her male colleagues, but never used her sex as a plea for special consideration. She's long argued that women should be accepted for membership in the National Press Club in Washington.

In 1947, while accompanying President Truman on a trip to Brazil, the press corps was scheduled to return to the United States with the Chief Executive aboard the battleship *Missouri*. May, barred because the Navy argued they had no facilities aboard for ladies, gave the Navy something to ponder and 2 years later was its guest on a cruise.

Once dubbed "Dynamite in the blue dress" by a fellow journalist (she customarily wears blue), it's a description that somehow doesn't quite fit. For if May Craig's questions could be sharp or her battles with officialdom blistering, her underlying personality is far more pixie-ish than vindictive.

"It hurts me," she once confessed, "to be thought of as a wisecracker. Actually, I never ask a question for any other purpose than to bring out something important."

And only recently she declared that she'd never asked a question that she'd later regretted. May has always taken time phrasing her questions, mentally closing loopholes through which the answerer might escape.

Although she has described herself as 75 percent in favor of the New Deal, May Craig has always prided that she belongs to no political party. No matter who was in office, May was after the news.

She clashed occasionally with public officials that she covered; most recently with Maine's other famous lady in Washington, GOP U.S. Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH. But such clashes are usually short lived.

Her century-old Washington home is crammed with mementoes of a rich Washington life and frequently she hosts intimate dinner parties for a small group of friends and dignitaries.

The menu is invariably the same, half a broiled chicken, sliced peaches soaked in brandy and a green vegetable for color contrast. And the after dinner conversation, like May's writing, is never dull.

Few Washington correspondents have traveled as widely or interviewed more foreign officials than has May Craig. From Germany's Adenauer to the Congo's Kasavubu, to Cuba's Castro, May Craig has talked to them all. Thirty articles on her tour of Africa were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the request of U.S. Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

She's been behind the Iron Curtain into Russia twice, has toured Latin America, flown over the North Pole, has been to Korea and South America.

Yet, Washington remained her beat and her home and to many Americans she and the capital became inexorably entwined.

To these, a Washington without May Craig just won't be the same.

TRIBUTES

Since the announcement of May Craig's retirement, letters of tribute have been pouring in. In addition to the President Johnson tribute, others have been received from: Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, former President Harry S. Truman, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, Thomas E. Dewey, Barry Goldwater, Senate President CARL HAYDEN, Senate Minority Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, House Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD, U.S. Senators MARGARET CHASE SMITH and EDMUND S. MUSKIE, U.S. Representatives STANLEY R. TUPPER and WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, former U.S. Representatives Robert Hale and Clifford G. McIntyre, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor, and Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., December 4, 1965.

May Craig was not only one of the first women reporters in Washington, but from the first she was one of the best.

As Congressman, Senator, Vice President, and President, I have always found May Craig to be a help and an inspiration to me.

She knows the world. More importantly, she seems to hold a stethoscope to the heart of mankind. I think she does so because she cares deeply for people and she is concerned with decency and justice.

The Nation is better for having had this outstanding woman on the scene to help chronicle the events of our day.

Her friends will not forget her, and her influence will remain.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

[From the Portland (Maine) Sunday Telegram, Dec. 5, 1965]

L.B.J. LEADS IN HONORING MAY CRAIG

Tributes from some of the Nation's leading citizens were pouring in Sunday for May Craig, Washington correspondent for the Guy Gannett Publishing Co. for more than 30 years.

Mrs. Craig announced Friday she will retire at the end of the year.

President Johnson led those honoring the veteran newswoman in a cryptic message from his Texas ranch: "It's a long time from May to September, but May will always be May to me."

The President's press aids said L.B.J. who is at his Texas ranch, would have more to say about May's retirement later.

U.S. Senator Margaret Chase Smith flatly predicted that "history will record her as one of the truly great women of America."

Pinpointing one of Mrs. Craig's best known qualities, Senator Smith said, "She has been a shining symbol of journalistic independence and known throughout the world as the dedicated and persistent reporter who never tolerated an evasive answer—even from Presidents.

"Journalism has never had the equal of May Craig and the Washington scene will not be the same after her departure," Senator Smith said.

Former President Harry S. Truman hailed Mrs. Craig "after a long and colorful career as Washington correspondent for the Portland Press Herald-Evening Express and Sunday Telegram."

"May was not only well thought of by those in Washington, but throughout the Nation as well, and she made an excellent correspondent. I hope the Portland newspaper will be able to find someone to fill May's place—but that is not going to be easy," President Truman said.

He said he hoped "the years ahead will be the best and happiest of her life."

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall said, "We hate to see May Craig go—and wonder in dismay who will ever replace her."

He added, "Despite the modern conspiracy against individualism, May Craig has been a sturdy, colorful individualist who has added an extra dimension to the Washington scene.

"Possessed of a perceptive reporter's eye, she has always gone right to the heart of the real issue—and I suspect that it was this quality plus her inherent character that made her so respected and beloved in the Nation's Capital."

Barry Goldwater called her a "highly competent newswoman * * * with the gracious qualities of a lady."

He said, "One of my sweetest and fondest memories of my 12 years in Washington will always be May Craig."

Senator Edmund S. Muskie, in a statement from Vietnam, said "May Craig has earned a unique niche among the elite of Washington's press corps. Her writing and her television appearances have brought honor to the people of Maine and to the Guy Gannett Publishing Co.

"Her dispatches have given Maine people an eye witness perspective on the most exciting and challenging developments in the history of our Nation.

"I will miss her daily inquiries. I will miss her charm and wisdom. And with her many readers, I will miss her voice of decency and experience.

"As a news correspondent, May Craig won the confidence of Presidents. As a lady, she won the respect of all of us. As a friend, she won our hearts," Senator Muskie concluded.

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey said, "The Nation's Capital just won't seem the same without May Craig at her customary front-row seat, asking searching questions of Government officials and informing the American public.

"I am exceedingly sorry to hear that she is retiring."

U.S. Representative Stanley R. Tupper called Mrs. Craig a "delightful, sparkling, and ageless woman.

"In every trade, profession, or calling, there are men and women who tower above their contemporaries. By a combination of talent, drive, and sagacity these people climb to the top and stay there. Such a person is May Craig—a reporter, war correspondent, and television personality without peer," Tupper said.

"Our friendship grew slowly but solidly on the basis of mutual respect. At all occasions when I have been her guest at Washington functions, I have been immensely proud at the recognition she always received.

"The Guy Gannett Publishing Co. should be commended for affording its readers such an intimate view of the Washington scene and the political life of our Capital over a long period of years.

"I understand that May will be working on her autobiography in the months to come. It would be my prediction that it will be a 'bestseller,'" Tupper said.

U.S. Representative William D. Hathaway called her "the first lady of the press," and a "genuine celebrity."

"A no-nonsense lady, May has never let her fame go to her head," Hathaway said. "She has retained her keen wit and sense of humor, and has devoted herself to her profession ethically and skillfully.

"More importantly, she has reported the happenings in Washington with honesty and accuracy, mincing no words," he said.

"She has been invulnerable to sham and phoniness, and has never been one to sweep the dust of truth under the rug of pretense.

"We will miss her pink and blue bonnets, her pleasant voice on our telephones, the personal encounters in the Press Gallery, the Speaker's Lobby, and at meetings of the Maine delegation.

"May has been a most distinguished ambassador to Washington from our State," Hathaway concluded.

John W. McCormack, Democrat, of Massachusetts, Speaker of the House of Representatives, expressed sorrow at "her retirement, because May Craig has for many years been an institution in Washington, and in the national life of our country.

"I admire and respect May very much, and I extend to her every future happiness and success," he said.

Robert Hale, former Maine First District Congressman, said he was "sorry to learn that May Craig is retiring as Washington correspondent for the Gannett papers in Maine.

"My wife and I are among May's most devoted and consistent readers," he said.

House Minority Leader Gerald R. Ford, Republican of Michigan, expressed his "gratitude to her for a job well done," and extended his "very best wishes."

Secretary of Commerce John Connor said he "shares the consternation of all of official Washington that May Craig would contemplate retirement," and conveyed his "warmest good wishes."

Also paying tribute to Mrs. Craig were Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz; Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, Democrat of Montana; former Vice President Richard M. Nixon; and two-time Republican presidential candidate Thomas E. Dewey.

President Johnson also praised Mrs. Craig September 28 last year, when he made a campaign appearance in Portland.

After a tumultous welcome on the steps of Portland city hall, Johnson said, "I think this is the most wonderful welcome May Craig has ever received."

He went on to say, "When I was sick in 1955 I did not know whether I would see the sunrise the next day * * *. But every single day, without exception, May Craig wrote me a letter and made me want to live and get well."

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald, Feb. 15, 1966]

PRESIDENT SALUTES MAY CRAIG AT RETIREMENT PARTY

(By Donald Larrabee)

Washington.—The Nation's No. 1 man was among those who honored May Craig Monday night.

President Lyndon B. Johnson brought tears to Mrs. Craig's eyes when he showed up unexpectedly at a Valentine's Day party honoring her retirement as correspondent for the Guy Gannett newspapers of Maine.

The party was held in the National Press Club ballroom. Some 400 persons, including Government officials and men and women of the press corps, paid tribute to Mrs. Craig.

The President gave Mrs. Craig a gold bracelet carrying the seal of the United States on one side.

As Senator Edmund S. Muskie walked by, the Chief Executive quipped: "It's my New England friend. She'll have to have her initials engraved on it herself."

Mrs. Craig retired December 31 after 35 years as correspondent for the Maine newspapers.

The President arrived at the Press Club, about 2 blocks from the White House, with Press Secretary Bill Moyers and Harold Pachios. The latter is of Cape Elizabeth, Maine.

Pachios said that the President told him in the limousine on the way over about Mrs. Craig's daily letters to him while he was hospitalized after a heart attack in 1955. He added:

"She remembered me and I am going to remember her."

The President remained for about 10 minutes, spoke briefly with Mrs. Jean Gannett Arnzen, president and publisher of the Guy Gannett Publishing Co., of Maine, and her husband, J. Richard Arnzen, and Senator and Mrs. Muskie.

The President earlier had sent an orchid to Mrs. Craig. She wore it in the receiving line.

In formal ceremonies, Mrs. Craig was presented a dozen red roses from Mrs. Arnzen, and a new chapeau from U.S. Representative Edna Kelly, of New York. She was introduced by Windsor Booth, president of the National Press Club as "everybody's sweetheart."

Mrs. Craig responded to the tributes by saying the evening was "the loveliest thing that ever happened to me."

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., remembered Mrs. Craig from his father's years in the White House.

He told Mrs. Arnzen:

"She has been a part of my family, I feel I've been a part of hers for as long as I can remember. I trust this Valentine's party is just the first of many happy occasions for her."

The party was jointly sponsored by the National Press Club—which once barred women at its doors—and the Women's National Press Club which, under Mrs. Craig's leadership, fought an unending battle for the rights of women reporters in the Nation's Capital.

Mrs. Arnzen flew in to supervise the festivities. The White House—including several press secretaries of past years—was represented, as well as almost every Federal agency from the CIA to Capitol Hill.

Senator and Mrs. Muskie represented the Maine congressional delegation. Senator Margaret Chase Smith telegraphed her regrets to Mrs. Arnzen, having left over the weekend for Santo Domingo where she will confer Tuesday morning with U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker and officials of the Organization of American States.

Senator Smith called the party "deserved tribute to America's first lady of journalism" and asked Mrs. Arnzen to convey her best wishes.

The guests enjoyed a lavish buffet from a table which featured Mrs. Craig's famed hats in a symbolic centerpiece. Topping a floral arrangement was a huge hat made of shredded newspapers and teletype tape. Lifesize photographic portraits of Mrs. Craig in familiar press conference poses, including a famous Life magazine action picture last year, were on display.

The entertainment feature was a 10-minute film, prepared by NBC, highlighting some of Mrs. Craig's appearances on the "Meet the Press" television show. Veteran United Press International White House correspondent, Merriman Smith, narrated and the show's producer, Larry Spivak, added his own tribute.

President Johnson's former press secretary, George Reedy, was there; also, Jim Hagerty, a vice president of ABC, who was President Eisenhower's press chief; Mrs. Elizabeth Carpenter, press secretary to Mrs. Lyndon Johnson; and assistant to the President, Douglas Cater, and Mrs. Cater.

From Capitol Hill came Senator and Mrs. Ernest Gruening, of Alaska; Senator Joseph Tydings, of Maryland; Senator and Mrs. Stuart Symington, of Missouri; Senator and Mrs. Frank Carlson, of Kansas; Senator Eugene McCarthy, of Minnesota; Representative and Mrs. Howard Smith, of Virginia; and Mr. and Mrs. Ed Hudon. Mrs. Hudon, the former Blanche Bernier, has served for many years as secretary to Senator Smith.

Representative William D. Hathaway was unable to attend. His office said he is under doctor's orders to restrict his social activities because of a recent leg injury. Representative Stanley Tupper is in Las Vegas, Nev., on a speaking engagement and also sent his regrets.

Other longtime friends from officialdom who attended included Adm. and Mrs. W. A. Raborn (he heads the CIA); Roosevelt, Director of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity; Prof. Albert Abrahamson, of Bowdoin College; Mr. and Mrs. Edgar A. Comee (he is a former Gannett papers editorial writer, now with the Agency for International Development); Maritime Commissioner and Mrs. James V. Day, of Kennebunk; former Maine U.S. Representative Clifford G. McIntire, and Mrs. McIntire; and Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Leo. Leo is a former political writer for the Gannett newspapers and former Government official, now in private business here.

U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, who couldn't come, sent May warm greetings and said he was going to "miss you and your extremely able and discerning reporting—as well as your unfailing sense of humor and other fine qualities. We treasure our association with you on the Washington scene."

He said he'd been trying out "the muse" and sent a long poem dedicated "To May" written by Mrs. Steven Goldstein of New York, who was not further identified.

It went:

"To May—who's retiring much too young,
I join the chorus of praises sung.
Since first you started back with Hoover,
You've been the press corps' primest-est mover.
You've livened Presidential chats.
You've made us buy our wives new hats.
You've caught us blushing, you've caught us wincing,
You've caught us when we're not convincing.
But on each story that you file,
You never fail to make us smile.
Oh, don't leave future press conferences waiting.
They depend on you for their Neilsen rating.
For you've made the toughest hem and haw—
Thank God you didn't take up the law."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Feb. 15, 1966]

Winter Tributes Are Warm for May

(By Dorothy McCardle)

For years Washington newspaperwoman May Craig was famous for two things—her flowery hats and her prickly words. Millions of Americans laughed or gasped at the words and gawked at the hats on TV's "Meet the Press" and on televised Presidential press conferences.

Last night at a reception in honor of Mrs. Craig, she wore one of her famous hats, but she hadn't a single astringent word left in her. She was so touched by all the tributes paid her that she was close to tears.

The first moment of emotion came when President Johnson arrived unexpectedly during the reception given jointly by the National Press Club and the Women's National Press Club.

As he entered the clubrooms of the NPC, he embraced Mrs. Craig and whispered at length into her ear. She was already wearing a white orchid corsage which he and Mrs. Johnson had sent her.

"What did he say to you?" she was asked.

"It was just for me," she said, and her voice quivered.

A White House aid revealed how the President had spoken warmly of Mrs. Craig on his drive over from the White House. The President told his associates that he would never forget how thoughtful she had been to him when he had his heart attack in 1955.

"She wrote to me or sent me a poem or a book every single day," the President recalled.

May said later, "I have known him for 30 years, first as a Congressman and a Senator and Vice President. I never thought of him as the President. I worried about him when he had that heart attack, just lying there."

The President produced an even more tangible gift as he walked with Mrs. Craig among the 400 guests in the crowded club ballroom. He reached into his pocket for a small gold-wrapped box. "I brought you this," he said.

Mrs. Craig was so undone as the crowd surged about her and the President that she handed it back to him to open for her.

The President fished in his pocket for his glasses so he could see to unwrap a gold bracelet, bearing a single charm embossed with the Presidential Seal. The opposite side was blank, and the President noted that it should be engraved with the date. "You'll have to pay for the date," he quipped to her.

After a 10-minute round of the ballroom with Mrs. Craig on his arm, the President left before the formal tributes began. They came in the shape of roses and hats presented by Mary Gallagher, president of the Women's National Press Club, Windson Booth, president of the National Press Club, and Jean Gannett Arnzen, president of the Guy Gannett Publishing Co. of Maine, for which Mrs. Craig was a correspondent for 35 years before she retired in December. A poetic tribute was read from U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur J. Goldberg.

Called upon for a speech, Mrs. Craig, wearing a Valentine red lace dress with matching hat of red velvet bows, said, "This is the loveliest thing that ever happened to me."

But there was more fun to come with a 12-minute film put together by Lawrence Spivak, producer of "Meet the Press," and selected from Mrs. Craig's more than 250 appearances on that TV show. Her hats and her hatpin sharp questions were on parade again, and she laughed as heartily as everyone else at her reruns.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE ALBERT THOMAS OF TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I regret that an engagement in Illinois prevented my being present yesterday on the floor of the Senate when the Senate agreed to a resolution concerning the late Congressman Albert Thomas, offered by my distinguished colleague from Texas, on behalf of himself and me.

Representative Thomas was a close friend of mine and I have always held the highest respect for his abilities, accomplishments, and character. It was with great regret that I learned of the death of this distinguished Texas Congressman who honorably served the best interest of his district and his country. Texas has never had a better Congressman in Washington.

His positions on powerful House committees allowed him to use his capabilities to further the progress of this Nation, and with strong devotion and sincere dedication he served with distinction for more than 29 years.

It is with great sorrow and deep sympathy for Albert Thomas' family that I assume the honor of being a representative of Congress at the funeral of this great man.

HIGH-RISK AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE COMPANY INSOLVENCIES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I have become increasingly disturbed by the intrusion of a highly corrosive element into the insurance industry, an industry which has always been a glowing example of integrity and stability in our Nation's business community.

The high incidence of insolvencies among high-risk automobile insurance companies gives me reason to be concerned over the insurance industry's continued command of the public's confidence as well as the welfare of the individual insurance buyer.

During the hearings conducted by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee last May, we probed quite extensively into the question of high-risk insurance insolvencies. At that time we did not have a complete tabulation of the number of failures, but our investigation has continued and now the full scope of the problem is known.

Since 1960 a total of 58 companies doing business in high-risk automobile insurance have failed, leaving well over a million persons without insurance.

In 1964 and 1965 alone, 31 companies failed.

Our research indicates that perhaps as many as 350 companies are engaged in the business of high-risk automobile insurance throughout the country. In just 2 years 31 out of a group of 350 companies have collapsed.

In percentage terms that amounts to an appalling 8.9 percent.

On November 15, 1965, the senior Senator from Nebraska placed in the Congressional Record a statement in favor of continued control of the insurance industry by the States. Among other points, he maintained that the number of failures among high-risk automobile insurance companies was not disproportionately high.

My very distinguished colleague, of course, was not aware of these figures at that time for certainly no one could argue that a 2-year, 8.9 percent failure rate is other than a problem of the highest order, particularly when we consider that this involves more than half a million persons left without insurance.

According to Dun & Bradstreet, businesses are currently failing at the rate of approximately 1.2 percent every 2 years. The failure of insurance companies should be at a far lower rate for they, unlike businesses in general, are the custodians of funds entrusted to them by the public. Yet the rate for high-risk insurance is over seven times higher.

These statistics trouble me deeply, and have moved me to reflect at length upon the consequent economic hardships thrust upon the American public. It is difficult to fully appreciate the grave injustices flowing from so many insurance company failures.

The failure of an ordinary business has little effect on the average man, but the failure of an insurance company leaves policyholders unprotected, and accident victims uncompensated. In addition, sued policyholders stand to lose their homes and their life savings, not to mention the possibility that they may secure for themselves the frightening prospect of a life of debt.

It is true that Congress, in enacting into law the McCarran-Ferguson Act, carefully determined that insurance should be regulated by the States. However, the legislative history of this act clearly indicates that Congress was making only a conditional delegation of authority to the States, to be reconsidered if the States should demonstrate an inability to properly serve the public interest.

Is it not difficult to imagine a greater disservice to the public interest than one insurance company failure after another?

I hasten to point out that there are many insurance departments whose record of regulation is excellent and whose service to the community has been in the highest traditions of public duty. But there are others whose record is less enviable, and it is to those departments and the legislatures behind them that I am addressing myself.

It is argued that the States are adequately doing their job of regulating insurance.

But, can a form of regulation be adequate which allows virtually 9 percent of the high-risk automobile insurance companies in the Nation to fail over a 2-year period, leaving considerably more than half a million persons without insurance?

Can a form of regulation be adequate which generally does not maintain examiners sufficient in number to carefully analyze the financial standing of thousands of insurance companies?

Can a form of regulation be adequate in which at least six of the States have three or less examiners and at least nine States have no examiners at all?

Can a form of regulation be adequate which is operated on a marginal budget of usually less than 4 percent of the premium taxes and fees collected from insurance companies by the States?

One cannot help but wonder about the adequacy of State regulation when the unregulated businesses fare better than the regulated ones.

It is my conviction that these weaknesses strike at the very core of a regulation instituted for the protection of the American consumer who pours 9 cents out of every dollar spent into insurance.

I do not entertain naive hopes that the difficult job of insurance regulation can be conducted in a near-perfect manner, but what we are getting now is not even within shouting distance of this ideal, and in my judgment the American insurance buyer deserves something better.

It is contended that even a system of complete Federal control would not be a perfect one, and that failures would continue to occur, as in the case of banks subject to some degree of Federal control.

This, of course, must be conceded. No system of supervision controlled by human hands could hope to achieve perfection, but at the same time we know that no type of Federal control would tolerate a failure rate of the magnitude of that presently occurring in high-risk automobile insurance.

The collapse of so many of our banks in recent years should be a cause of real concern. Since 1960 there have been 30 failures. The highest 2-year rate occurred in the last 2 years, during which period 14 banks failed.

Of course, these failures cut across the entire banking industry of 14,281 institutions, and result in a failure rate of one-tenth of 1 percent. This is, as it should be, just a fraction of the general business failure rate of 1.2 percent.

But a comparison with the high-risk insurance rate literally staggers the imagination when we calculate that the insurance failure percentage is 89 times higher than the banking failure rate.

If there was so much excitement and concern raised last year over the number of failures in the banking industry, how much greater our concern should be with this astronomically higher failure rate in high-risk insurance.

The failure problem in the banking industry does not even approach the tragedy of the wholesale insolvencies in high-risk automobile insurance, particularly when we consider that the vast majority of the banking public is completely insured by the Federal Government against bank insolvencies.

The impact upon the public by the financial demise of banks and insurance companies is virtually the same since both are trustees of the public's funds. Consequently, the Federal Government has a profound interest in both of these vital areas of our national economy.

Long ago we saw fit to step into a troubled banking industry. Is it not time to seriously reconsider the Federal Government's relationship to a now-troubled insurance industry?

I, personally, find the arguments against Federal control to be quite persuasive. Federal control of the insurance industry would be to me a rather distasteful alternative. It is my belief that insurance can be regulated best at the level most aware of the local and regional needs of the consumer.

But the simple fact is that State regulation is not adequately protecting the consumer, and at all costs, he must be protected.

I doubt that I could ever philosophically favor complete Federal regulation of insurance, but we have a critical problem in the high-risk automobile insurance area today, one which needs serious attention.

If the States do not immediately and sufficiently respond, the Federal Government will be left with no alternative but to itself respond.

There are alternatives not amounting to outright Federal control which would protect the public from these many insolvencies.

An approach similar to that of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in banking or a Federal guaranty fund are possibilities which have merit.

The time may be at hand to begin exploring the feasibility of these and other possible legislative solutions to this very serious problem before the American public suffers any further injustices.

PROPOSED PURCHASE OF WEST GERMAN GUN

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the subject of the proposed purchase of a West German gun be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY

I wish to bring before the attention of the Senate a very serious situation regarding the ability of this country to provide for its military needs in the field of small arms.

The Army is considering a contract with the firm, Rheinmetall in the Republic of Germany, for the purchase of a 20-millimeter gun, the Hispano-Suizsia HS820, to be mounted on armored vehicles. The gun will be used to give adequate protection to personnel being transported in dangerous territory. The cost of the contract according to the information I have received is between $50 and $75 million.

According to a statement of former Secretary of the Army Ailes, the reason the Army is procuring this gun abroad instead of in the United States is because there is an urgent need for a weapon of this type and because no source in this country could provide a weapon with the necessary characteristics within the time in which it must be delivered. I would note that Mr. Ailes made this statement over 14 months ago and that no delivery has yet been made.

At the same time that the Army is considering going abroad for needed small arms, it is phasing out the Springfield Armory, one of its most important arsenals for the research, production, and development of small arms. It is thus cutting down on its own capabilities to anticipate the needs for new weapons and to supply them to our troops.

I need not remind Senators of the dangers in going abroad in weapon procurement. When we depend upon foreign sources for vital weapons we run the risk that in time of emergency they may not be available. We put ourselves in the hands of foreign countries and foreign governments which, friendly as they may be, cannot be guaranteed as to their reliability for the reason that they must look first to their own needs. This is the philosophy behind the entire concept of having a domestic mobilization base for the production of weapons, as well as one of the principles behind our arsenal system. I doubt if any other country purchases weapons abroad that it can, within the limits of its economy and technology, manufacture at home.

The Army has embarked upon a dangerous business—one that raises many questions which the Senate should explore:

The first and fundamental question is why the Army let a situation develop in its own arsenal system and in private industry in which no research and development was done on a gun which the Army states is now urgently needed? Was this need foreseen? If so, why was nothing done to develop a domestic production source?

Second, what new development work is being done now, in the arsenal system, leading to the anticipation of future needs and the development of new items in the small arms field?

Third, why, in view of this failure, is the Army continuing to reduce its inhouse research and development capability, as evidenced by the closing of the research and development facility at the Springfield Armory and the breaking up of the Springfield research and development team?

As regards this procurement, it was listed as urgently required by the Army over 14 months ago. If the reasons for this delay in filling our need has to do with the testing and verification of the weapon, why did we not take advantage of this time period to negotiate purchase of the proprietary rights for the weapon for manufacture in our own country? Had this been done in time, the 20 millimeter gun could be in production in the United States today.

Finally, if we have been able to wait 14 months for this "urgently needed" item, could we not wait several months longer until such rights are purchased so that production could still begin in the United States?

These are the questions that should be answered and the issues that should be explored. The Preparedness Subcommittee will soon begin hearings on the Army's policy toward small arms research, development, and procurement, especially as it relates to the justification for maintaining the Springfield Armory. I would hope this hearing would seek as well answers to these questions. And I would hope that the contract negotiations with the German producers might be held up until the questions were answered to the satisfaction of the Congress, with whose appropriations the weapon is being purchased.

For this is an issue that goes beyond any one weapon or any one facility. It goes to the entire rationale of the arsenal system. One of its main functions in recent years has been to look at future needs and develop prototypes of the kind of weapons that private industry would not be included to develop. The dismantling of our armory system, facility by facility, and the stripping of its traditional functions of research, engineering, technological data processing, and pilot line production point to a future in which this case may not be an isolated incident. We may be faced consistently with urgent needs for weapons for which we have no domestic capabilities because we have given up that capability by reducing the functions of our armories. This would be a sorry situation for the Army and for the country. The time to take preventive measures is now. I hope the Preparedness Subcommittee can begin the effort in that direction.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM, MEDICARE, AND THE PROPOSED RESTORATION OF CUTS IN CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a great many people in my own State of New Hampshire have come to realize that the social security program—including its new stepchild, medicare—is not all that it could or should be. I rather suspect that this same awakening is taking place among thoughtful people throughout the country. In this regard, I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate a short, but pointed editorial observation contained in the Coos County Democrat for Wednesday, February 2, published in Lancaster, N.H., and ask that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN OUR OPINION

Finally people are beginning to realize that social security and medicare programs giving benefits neither in relation to need or to amounts paid in are unfair. Can they understand yet that Goldwater wasn't out to end social security but to strengthen it? That wasn't indifferent to needs of elderly but more concerned that they be well met rather than deceiving people by false promises. It's the politicians who have done the latter, not the social security personnel.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, this same editorial column turns to another subject of equal interest to the Senate, that of the proposed restoration of excise taxes on automobiles and telephones, and I ask that this, too, be printed in the RECORD. As the writer points out, automobile use and telephone service are necessities and anything but luxuries to a huge segment of our population. I most certainly concur in the opinion that every effort should be made to find other means of obtaining revenue in lieu of these onerous and unfair taxes.

There being no objection, the remainder of the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Some of the excise taxes were imposed during the war because of shortages or to discourage luxury buying. Now the President proposes restoring cut in excise taxes on toll calls and automobiles that became effective just last month.

Cars are getting to be more and more a necessity and there is no shortage of them.

Toll calls are a business necessity, and often a personal necessity. The telephone industry has never been better equipped to handle them.

We believe that these taxes should have been entirely eliminated long ago and that any need for new revenue should be met from some other source.

CAREFUL CANVASS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Washington Post believes that President Johnson's latest appointments "reflect the careful canvass of available candidates and the energetic search for talent that has become standard in the personnel policies of the administration."

The Post editorially commended the appointment of Elmer B. Staats to Comptroller General; Lee C. White to become Federal Power Commission Chairman; Harry C. McPherson as Special Counsel, and Robert H. Fleming and Dixon Donnelley in the field of press relations.

The appointments "seem to indicate a disposition on the part of this administration, greater than that in recent governments, to seek appointees at higher levels from within the establishment," the Post said.

This is a trend of which we can all be proud, and with the consent of my colleagues I offer the editorial to be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Feb. 13, 1966]

PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

The Federal appointments announced by President Johnson Friday elevate to new positions several remarkable career public servants who have demonstrated ability in previous posts in this and other administrations. They seem to indicate a disposition on the part of this administration, greater than that in recent governments, to seek appointees at higher levels from within the establishment. Such a policy, long pursued, no doubt would endow the Federal service with a more professional complexion. It would, at the same time, put a premium on the recruitment of the best young men at the opening of their careers. And it ought to be accompanied, at the same time, by refreshment from nongovernmental life on occasion.

The high caliber of the men the President has named commends his choice, these general principles apart. Elmer B. Staats, because of his long and distinguished career in the Budget Bureau, probably knows as much about the whole Federal establishment as any individual in the country. It is doubtful that the President could have found a man better qualified by training, experience, and understanding to carry out the kind of postaudit that is the Comptroller General's responsibility.

Lee C. White's appointment ends the long search for a qualified successor to the retiring chairman of the Federal Power Commission, Joseph Swidler. He seems to satisfy the President's anxiety to find a man with Swidler's consumer orientation and with the same facility for persuading the industry that what is good for the public is good for it.

Harry C. McPherson's governmental experience and legal training alike fit him ideally for the post of Special Counsel to the President. He has the Chief Executive's confidence gained in legislative work and he has demonstrated his usefulness on the White House staff and in the Defense Establishment and the State Department.

The changes in press appointments advance men well known and long known in their fields. Robert H. Fleming has a good background in all media and possesses the confidence of his colleagues. Dixon Donnelley succeeds an extremely able and well qualified professional, James L. Greenfield, as Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. His experience in government and knowledge of the gallery will help him on his new job.

Johnson appointments, in these cases, reflect the careful canvass of available candidates and the energetic search for talent that has become standard in the personnel policies of the administration.

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT KASTENMEIER, OF WISCONSIN, BEFORE AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION, MADISON, WIS.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, Wisconsin's Representative Robert Kastenmeier has urged the American Automobile Association to commit itself to a consumer research program designed to increase consumer demand for safer cars.

In a speech at the dedication of the new American Automobile Association, Wisconsin division, headquarters in Madison, Wis., on February 11, Mr. Kastenmeier pointed to the success of present AAA safety programs as evidence of its effectiveness in promoting safety on this Nation's streets and highways. He specifically mentions the school safety patrol, the pedestrian control program, and its driver education program.

Safety experts agree that a vehicle can be designed which would cut drastically the causes of death and injury once a traffic accident has occurred. I agree with Mr. Kastenmeier that the AAA could perform a valuable service by committing its imagination and resources to increase consumer demand for such a car—the safest car that can possibly be produced.

I commend Mr. Kastenmeier for his excellent suggestion, and ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AAA Speech by Representative Robert Kastenmeier, February 11, 1966

I am pleased to be with you here today and to participate in the dedication of your new headquarters building. I was delighted to be offered this opportunity to talk about a subject that has been of great concern to me for a number of years and one which now is receiving ever greater attention in Congress. That subject, of course, is death on the highway.

Here in the figurative, if not literal, shadow of your new building, it would be inappropriate to fail to pay tribute to the many efforts which have made AAA and particularly the Wisconsin branch so eminently successful.

And AAA has much to be proud of both here in Wisconsin and across the Nation. Not only has it become and maintained its position as the country's largest travel organization, it also has made a determined effort on behalf of highway, driver and pedestrian safety. Let me detail just a few of these for you.

The school safety patrol is an outstanding example. It was conceived around 1916 and formally established by the Chicago Motor Club. It then was pioneered on a national scale by the American Automobile Association. Since the inception of this program, the traffic death rate of schoolchildren has dropped nearly one-half, while the death rate of other age groups has doubled.

What started as a local idea in Chicago has spread throughout the world. In the United States today over 900,000 boys and girls are serving in 40,000 school areas, protecting 19 million schoolchildren, and some 156,000 patrol members are serving in foreign countries. The school safety patrol program is a fine example of cooperation by school authorities, police departments and the Triple A motor clubs.

The lifesaving results of this program are worthy of great tribute. Each year the AAA presents gold lifesaver medals to those young patrol heroes who have actually saved the life of a schoolmate in traffic danger. Last year these awards were presented by President Johnson at a White House ceremony and I point with great pride to three young Wisconsin citizens so honored.

Bruce Pauls, of Madison, and John Ahrens and Stuart Meyer, of Prairie Du Chien. Bruce saved the life of a 3½-year-old boy near his Atwood Avenue duty station here in Madison by rushing into the street and pulling the confused youngster out of the way of oncoming traffic. John and Stuart pulled a 6-year-old out of the way of a train near their patrol station in Prairie Du Chien. The boy had wandered onto the tracks and became paralyzed as the train approached.

This type of courage and devotion to duty is typical of the youth who are members of the school safety patrol. Mobilizing these efforts for the safety of students walking to school is a fine example of AAA efforts.

Another campaign the AAA is primarily responsible for is the pedestrian control program. When we speak of the number of highway deaths, many of us fail to realize that of the total number of people killed, almost 20 percent are pedestrians, and in urban areas this figure is 40 percent.

The pedestrian control program was instituted in 1937 by the American Automobile Association and today there are 1,865 cities in 43 States actively participating in a nationwide effort to appraise and improve local pedestrian safety programs.

The latest available figures show that 8,900 pedestrians lost their lives in 1964 as compared with 8,300 in 1963. In spite of this rise, however, the 1964 total represents a 42-percent drop from the 15,500 fatalities recorded in 1937, while all other traffic fatalities have increased 61 percent.

In Wisconsin the statistics follow the same pattern: While traffic fatalities go up each year, pedestrian fatalities have decreased. In 1940, 752 people died on our highways. Of these, 255 were pedestrians. In subsequent years, as the death toll has risen—in 1960 it reached 927—the pedestrian toll has steadily declined, down to 240. A very disquieting fact is that in 1964 the decline was reversed and 154 pedestrians were killed in traffic mishaps. It is a grim reminder that our efforts to reduce pedestrian deaths cannot be relaxed. The school safety patrol and the pedestrian control programs must receive increased attention now and in the years ahead.

These are just two examples of the very successful efforts of the American Automobile Association. The catalog of AAA programs include:

An extensive driver education program. In fact, statistics show that the AAA driver education program in combination with other driver education efforts has saved nearly 11,000 lives and nearly 381,000 personal injuries.

Other efforts aimed at the improving of highways we drive on have also been impressive. Back in 1955 and 1956, when the Interstate Highway System had been beaten once and looked like it could not be passed in Congress, AAA stepped in and in 1 year's time persuaded Congress to reverse its decision.

And so the list could run to include the preparation of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control devices, support for a national uniform vehicle code, uniform school bus stop laws, air pollution control programs, and others, including a growing concern with auto safety itself.

Yet, I think you would agree, much remains to be done, particularly in the field of auto safety. The handwriting is clearly on the wall for all to see. In the next decade, 1 out of every 5 Americans will be killed or injured in traffic accidents unless we do something more about it. At the current rate of increase over previous years, traffic accidents will claim the lives of 100,000 Americans annually by the year 1975—just 10 short years away.

Many Members of Congress have been stirred up by this issue. I am happy to say that Senator Gaylord Nelson has done more than any other Member of Congress to force action from Congress on this critical subject. I am pleased to note, incidentally, that recent AAA policy statements have begun to emphasize the natural Federal interest in this subject.

What is Congress considering at this time? Let me list a few of the bills for you.

Three of them should be well known to all of us since they have been drafted and sponsored by Senator Nelson. They include his tire standards bill, the motor vehicle standards bill, and safe-car prototype bill.

The tire standards bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe (1) minimum tire performance standards, and (2) a grading and labeling system for motor vehicle tires. Several days of hearings have already been held and additional hearings will be held in the future. Testimony at the hearings emphasized the difficulties the purchasers have in obtaining safe tires.

The motor vehicle standards bill would require all new automobiles to incorporate certain safety features which the Federal Government now requires on cars bought by the Government.

The third Nelson bill calls for the design and construction of a fully operational passenger motor vehicle as a prototype of a safe car—a crash-worthy vehicle, so to speak. A bill AAA also supports.

One other major proposal is under consideration in Congress. It is the National Highway Traffic Safety Act, originally sponsored by Senator Ribicoff. It calls for the establishment of a Traffic Safety Center in the Department of Commerce. It would provide authority for the Secretary of Commerce to conduct programs of highway safety research and development. It has been the subject of continuing hearings in Washington this year already.

One of the most exciting developments in the field of auto and highway safety is the proposal now under consideration at the University of Wisconsin. Dean Bob Marshall and his people of the engineering school have developed plans for a highway safety test center at the university. The plans include an 800-acre tract site with a 3.3-mile test track capable of handling vehicles at speeds up to 100 miles per hour, a crash-test pad, skid-test areas, a multiple vehicle driver education course and many other features.

It will be the first test center of its kind in the United States other than the test tracks owned by the auto manufacturers, and holds the promise of a concerted attack on automobile accidents. The breadth and depth of the attack is indicated by the high interest in the project at the Medical School, the Music School, and other university departments.

As I said earlier, I was delighted with this opportunity to speak on this subject, but it wasn't just to commend you for past efforts or to regale you with the efforts of Congress or the university. I do have a suggestion to make to you.

Throughout all the efforts of the AAA runs a common thread. Whether it is in the safety patrol program, closing of speed traps set up to soak the stranger, or in supporting the Interstate Highway System. This common thread is the underlying theme of the AAA—to make smooth the way for the traveler.

But, in the face of the mounting highway accident statistics, is that enough?

I would like to suggest to you that Triple A can play a much larger and more important role in the field of auto safety. The role I have in mind for your organization would draw heavily on the very aspects of your organization which have been responsible for your success to date. Furthermore, it seems such a logical extension of your program that you may even now be considering it yourself.

Simply stated, I respectfully urge your organization to commit its imagination, resources, and membership to a program of consumer research and information leading toward the goal of safer automobiles.

As an illustration, let me take the Nelson motor vehicle standards bill I was speaking of a moment ago. The bill would require new automobiles to incorporate certain features the Federal Government now requires on the cars it buys. The list includes 17 separate safety devices, many of which I thought I had on my car, some of which I don't. It now appears clear that only the threat of this legislation will force the auto industry to take even these moderate safety steps. As I go through the list, I want you to ask yourself why it should take Federal legislation to get these features built into cars. I also believe you will see from the list that an organization like AAA, by focusing attention on these matters through simple consumer research and information techniques similar to those developed by Consumer's Report, could have forced the auto industry to include them as standard equipment long ago.

I won't read the whole list, but here are a few examples:

Padded instrument panels and visors.

Recessed instrument panel instruments and control devices.

Impact absorbing steering wheel and column displacement.

Safety door latches and hinges.

Anchorage for seats.

Four-way flashers.

Dual operation brake system.

Windshield washers.

Glare reduction surfaces, instrument panel, and windshield wipers.

Exhaust emission control system, air pollution control.

Safety tire rims.

Backup lights.

Outside rearview mirror.

Some of these are on many of your cars—all of them should be on all cars as minimum safety equipment. A consumer research and information program by AAA would have assured their presence on automobiles long ago. An AAA effort would also have served to educate the public on the need for these safety features and as well as for safe driving.

The announcement just yesterday that 1967 cars will have certain safety features incorporated in the steering wheel and steering column emphasizes the point I seek to make here. The industry has responded in this way to pressure for increased safety features in automobiles coming from Congress and the public. The AAA can stimulate and focus this opinion and I am sure the automotive industry will continue to respond with more lifesaving devices in their new automobiles.

The inclusion of this bare minimum safety equipment will not end the battle. There is a continuing need for AAA to play a useful role in assessing the value of new devices and then in promoting their addition to automobiles as standard equipment.

These further pieces of equipment could include such things as a hydraulic bumper system to absorb more of the shock of vehicle collisions, square frames instead of X-frames to add protection to passengers against side collisions, energy absorbing door and panel materials, and others. On auto tires, AAA consumer research and information could be most helpful to tire buyers.

It is interesting to see the increased attention given safety by manufacturers, especially in Ford advertising, yet I do believe the auto industry is subject to criticism for its attitude that its business is business and not safety. There is much that can be done by you and Congress to lessen the chances of death or injury from deficiencies in automotive construction and design. The notorious design defects in the suspension system of a recent model car should be made fully known to your membership and the general public. Vehicles with such design flaws should not be manufactured, but if they are, they should not be purchased. You can play an important role in seeing to it that your members are aware of these defects and that the auto industry, rather than the traveling public, is held to account for their mistakes.

A consumer research and information service within AAA is needed on a continuing basis to evaluate new models from a safety standpoint and to create consumer pressure for more attention to safety by automobile manufacturers.

A major effort by the American Automobile Association in the field of automotive safety is badly needed to generate the support needed not only to get American car manufacturers to build safer cars, but to provide support for congressional efforts to obtain a reduction in highway deaths which result from unsafe automobiles.

Finally, let me also point out that the Wisconsin Division is in an enviable position to begin this effort. Its proximity to the Traffic Safety Center now being planned at the university will provide you here in Madison with ready access to the engineer, and other talents needed to make specific auto safety studies. The university in turn can benefit from your efforts to put to immediate use the theory and knowledge they develop at the center. Such cooperation is what will be needed in the years ahead as increasing numbers of vehicles appear on our highways giving rise to ever-increasing risks of accidents.

Again, thanks for letting me participate in your ceremonies dedicating your new building. I hope that I have contributed something to your thinking about auto safety and that your organization will seriously consider the proposal I have made. Your organization has much to be proud of and it has as large a role as it desires in the continuing struggle for highway, driver, pedestrian, and auto safety. Your efforts in these fields will have the appreciation of your members and the general public alike.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, yesterday, February 16, 1966, was the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, yet Lithuania regretfully has been under Communist enslavement for 26 years, due to the ruthless Soviet action of enforced corporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union.

The consequences of the aggression by communism against this Baltic state are shocking, from the tremendous loss of life in that ruthless action to the serious decline of Lithuanian agricultural production due to the coercive collectivization of land and the pauperization of Lithuanian farmers.

On their Independence Day Lithuanians all have the heartfelt sympathies of the American people and their support in the hope that Lithuania will soon enjoy the joys and liberties of a country free from Communist domination and control.

THE OHIO TURNPIKE—THE WORLD'S SAFEST HIGHWAY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues that Ohio's 241-mile toll road known as the Ohio Turnpike has been declared the world's safest highway. At appropriate ceremonies on February 8, 1966, the Ohio Turnpike Commission was the recipient of special recognition for outstanding safety records on the Ohio Turnpike for 1965.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news release relative to this subject be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEREA, OHIO.—The Ohio Turnpike Commission on February 8 received special recognition for an outstanding safety record on the Ohio Turnpike during 1965.

Col. Robert M. Chiaramonte, superintendent of the State Highway Patrol, presented a superintendent's citation to the commission during a reception held for Chiaramonte at the Berea Turnpike Headquarters. Mr. J. W. Shocknessy is chairman of the Ohio Turnpike Commission.

Colonel Chiaramonte pointed out that outstanding administrative practices, combined with engineering excellence, unusually good maintenance, and strong traffic supervision have produced the world's safest highway. He expressed great appreciation for the commission's full cooperation with the highway patrol which polices the turnpike and is responsible for traffic enforcement on the 241-mile toll road.

The turnpike traffic safety record for 1965, according to provisional figures, is 2.6 deaths per 100 million miles of vehicular travel. This is an enviable record compared to a death rate of 7.3 on Ohio's rural State highways, 4.0 on the Interstate System and a Statewide death rate of 5.0.

"The policies of the Ohio Turnpike Commission have always been directed toward making it one of the safest highways of its type in the world. This status has been reached and the commission is to be proud of its accomplishments," Colonel Chiaramonte stated.

The award was one of the highlights of the reception held in honor of Colonel Chiaramonte and Lt. Col. Clifford E. Reich, assistant superintendent. Colonel Chiaramonte has headed the patrol since November 1, 1965.

The reception was attended by highway patrolmen and their wives, civic leaders, public officials, judges, and friends from the Cleveland area.

A news conference preceded the reception, which was held at the Berea Turnpike Commission Headquarters located at 682 Prospect Street.

PROPOSED FOOD-FOR-FREEDOM PROGRAM

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I enthusiastically support President Johnson's proposed food-for-freedom program, which was presented to the Congress last week. In his message on the world hunger crisis, the President pledged this Nation's leadership in the war against hunger throughout the world. As the President pointed out, this is a war in which all nations can be victors, and in which all nations must take part.

The President's program makes several much-needed changes in our approach to the world hunger crisis. First and foremost, it eliminates the surplus concept in food aid and looks forward deliberate use of America's tremendous agricultural capacity to meet world food needs. Current farm programs, including the food-for-peace program, are eliminating the surpluses in our warehouses. If we are to lead in the fight against hunger in the developing countries while meeting our domestic needs, we will need to gear farm production to produce what can be used constructively.

The food-for-freedom program proposed by the President also places increased emphasis on the self-help efforts of recipient countries in increasing their agricultural production. Increased food shipments and capital and technical assistance will be provided to those countries that give a high priority to improving and modernizing their own production and distribution of food. That the need for self-help is vital can be seen in the President's warning that "the time is not far off when all the combined production, on all of the acres, of all of the agriculturally productive nations, will not meet the food needs of the developing nations—unless present trends are changed."

The American farmer is one of the chief beneficiaries of the new direction in our food-aid program. Much of the 60 million idle acres on American farms will be needed in the years ahead as our Nation joins with others in the critical race between food and population. These acres will be brought back into production as needed, without, however, creating unwanted surpluses or undercutting farm prices.

I am especially gratified by the President's authorization of purchases of dairy products to meet high priority domestic and foreign program needs. In 1965, I introduced an amendment which became part of the omnibus farm bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase dairy products at market prices to meet the needs of foreign and domestic food programs. This provision eliminated the requirement that only surplus products be used to meet these needs. In the new food-aid program, the President has now applied the principle underlying this authorization to all farm products.

I think James Reston of the New York Times has summed up most eloquently the long-range implications of the President's food-for-freedom program. In an article published on February 11, 1966, he observed:

> When the history of this postwar generation is written, the quiet and generous policies of the American Government are likely to stand out even above its military exploits, and nothing illustrates the point better than President Johnson's new efforts to relieve world hunger.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Reston's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON: FIGHT 'EM OR FEED 'EM?

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 10.—There is a kind of Gresham's law of journalism in which the bad news drives out the good, the negative overwhelms the positive, and the warmakers drown out the peacemakers.

Yet when the history of this postwar generation is written, the quiet and generous policies of the American Government are likely to stand out even above its military exploits, and nothing illustrates the point better than President Johnson's new efforts to relieve world hunger.

He is no longer thinking of the Nation's food surpluses as a problem but as an opportunity. He is not talking now about taking more acreage out of production but of putting some of the 60 million land bank acres back into production, and in the process, he is likely to prove that this is not only good agricultural policy, but good foreign policy and social policy at the same time.

ROOSEVELT'S FORESIGHT

Here is a field in which the United States has dealt consistently and generously with the causes of war—from the Marshall plan to the Johnson plan. It is just over 20 years ago that Franklin Roosevelt's Atlantic Charter pledge of "freedom from want" was given substance in the formation of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Since that time, the net total of U.S. economic aid to other countries was over $65 billion, and in the last decade U.S. aid programs have provided over 140 million tons of food for needy nations.

THREAT OF FAMINE

Nevertheless, world food shortages are greater than ever. With the human population increasing by 63 million every year, and food production not keeping up, there is a serious threat of famine in India and other developing countries, and the United Nations estimates are that in these countries total food supplies will have to increase by 103 percent by 1980 and by 261 percent by the end of the century to maintain even a minimum standard of nutrition.

President Johnson's food message this week combined a new sense of urgency and realism about his problem. He knows that peace and starvation do not go well together, but he is also emphasizing that this staggering problem cannot be met for long by the surpluses of the advanced nations but must be faced by modern agriculture in the land of the hungry nations.

Therefore, he is proposing expanded food shipments to countries where food needs are growing, and self-help efforts are underway; increased capital and technical assistance; expanded food production in this country; increased emphasis on high protein foods to combat malnutrition, and provision for adequate reserves to meet any world emergency.

Aside from the humanitarian aspects, the social and political considerations of this program at home and abroad are likely to be considerable. Even a much larger production of food in the United States will not stop the steady flow of people into the cities, but it may slow it up. Farm income is likely to increase, encouraging people to stay on the land and in the small agricultural towns, and if Mr. Jefferson was right about the character of the American farmer and the wickedness of urban societies, this will be all to the good.

Overseas, the most striking advantage of the United States in its competition with the Communist countries is on the land. The Russians have got to the moon but somehow they cannot get out of the hole on the earth. Before the war, the Soviet Union, the Communist countries of Eastern Europe, and even continental China were exporters of food; now they are all importers.

The United States is now producing its vast agricultural surpluses with less than 10 percent of its people on the land while the Soviet Union cannot feed itself with over 50 percent of its people on the farm. Yield per acre has increased by 109 percent in North America in the last 25 years; by only 7 percent in Asia; and these are factors in the world agricultural and political revolution that are not likely to be overlooked by the leaders of the new and hungry nations.

THE PARADOX

All this appeals greatly to President Johnson. He has a feeling for the land and the poor—having come from both—that comes through in his food and poverty messages more clearly than any others; and in emphasizing them, both at home and abroad, he is establishing a record that may in the end be the symbol of his administration.

This in a way is one of the tragedies of Vietnam. Sometimes we give the impression that we are determined to save those people from communism if we have to kill them in the process, and the controversy over this gets in the way of the larger interests and nobler concerns of the American people.

STATEMENT BY LAWRENCE CARDINAL SHEHAN BEFORE THE BALTIMORE CITY COUNCIL HEARING ON OPEN-OCCUPANCY BILL

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, like every major city, Baltimore, Md., has been gripped in a great struggle between the short-term concerns of the pocketbook and the long-term issues of right and wrong.

Recently legislation was introduced by City Council President Thomas D'Alesandro III to achieve the laudable goal of fair housing. The issue was hotly debated, too often with more heat than light. Passions ran high in the city council and throughout the city.

As we are all aware, this is no simple issue, but one bound up in the prejudices which lie deep in every community. I wish I could say to you that the Baltimore City Council rose above these passions and conquered fear, hate, prejudice, and ignorance, but this is not so.

Last month in the midst of this hotly debated issue, His Eminence Lawrence Cardinal Shehan made an unprecedented appearance before the city council to request passage of the fair housing ordinance. Despite threats of bodily harm the night before his appearance, Cardinal Shehan made a strong and eloquent plea for passage of the fair housing ordinance being considered by the council.

Mr. President, Cardinal Shehan's appearance before the council was typical of his record as a defender of human dignity, charity, and decency. His leadership in the quest for fulfillment of human rights has been an inspiration to all Marylanders since he returned to Maryland several years ago as coadjustor bishop for the diocese of Baltimore.

Cardinal Shehan's remarks before the council were another milestone in the life of a man utterly and totally dedicated to the rights of all people to live in freedom, peace, and brotherhood.

His Eminence could well have stayed home as some so-called "leaders" do when just, but unpopular, causes need a champion. No criticism would have arisen. Indeed, the Cardinal's absence would not have been noticed since his appearance was unprecedented. Instead, Cardinal Shehan came forward to lead other distinguished Baltimore clergymen to give witness to the proposition that our Nation must meet its moral and legal obligations to all humanity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record Cardinal Shehan's moving statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of His Eminence, Lawrence Cardinal Shehan, at the City Council Hearing on Open-Occupancy Bill, January 13, 1966

I joined with leaders of other religious faiths, of labor, of business, and of civil rights groups in urging the support of the Baltimore City Council for the proposed fair housing ordinance now pending before this honorable body.

On previous occasions since I have become archibishop of Baltimore I have expressed my concern about the plight of the Negro community in its search for decent housing. It would be a matter of overwhelming regret to our entire community should the explosive potentialities of the ghetto produce tragedies such as have torn asunder other major American urban communities.

The dignity of the individual requires that no prohibition be placed against any person with respect to his place of habitation simply because of his race, religion, or ancestry. The overwhelming persuasive moral argument which calls for statutory relief is one which cannot be postponed or crippled.

I have expressed my views to the Maryland congressional delegation to the effect that a national statute is the most desirable method of approaching a solution to discrimination in housing. Realizing, of course, that the sense of urgency which exists in our large cities does not weigh as heavily upon rural legislators, I would be less than realistic to assume that this ideal national goal is within immediately striking distance.

I have also requested the General Assembly of Maryland to pass statewide legislation prohibiting discrimination in housing, and I have given my support to such legislation as House bill 332, introduced in the last session of the general assembly, as well as its counterpart in the State senate.

I am aware that the Baltimore metropolitan community includes more than the geographical confines of Baltimore City. I understand full well that the political subdivisions surrounding Baltimore City should act in a timely fashion to adopt open occupancy legislation such as that which is pending before you, but I cannot be unmindful of the fact that the percentage of the Negro population in these surrounding political subdivisions is so small as to forestall prompt passage of such legislation.

The legislative remedy must be applied in the areas where the social sickness is most apparent. This means, of course, that Baltimore City must take the leadership in providing metropolitan-wide open occupancy legislation. If each political subdivision were to await the action of the other, the mounting tensions brought about by crowded conditions may possibly explode before a common consensus is arrived at. Accordingly, I call upon this body to enact into law the Fair Housing Ordinance before you. I am mindful of the pressures under which you find yourselves. I know that there exists within your body a desire for statesmanlike leadership.

I pledge you my support and the support of the Archdiocese of Baltimore in assisting and encouraging the passage of similar legislation in the political subdivisions surrounding our beloved city. I am aware of the arguments that are made about the possibilities of a population which may desert our city, and I am equally aware of the inequity that may be visited upon some of those developers who have made their commitment to build within Baltimore City and who may find themselves placed at a great economic disadvantage in the event that some of the dire predictions about urban flight to the suburbs should come to pass.

The heart of the race problem is a moral issue. Even if the percentage of the Negro population in Baltimore City were extremely small, rather than in excess of the one-third figure, the justice of the proposal before you would be unaffected. The argument for justice, however, coupled with the practical consideration of tensions, uneasiness, and potential massive resort to lawbreaking, give added impetus to the critical nature of the proposal before you.

I pledge you that this fight for social justice will not be placed upon your shoulders alone, but that the teaching and pastoral capacities of the Catholic Church will support you in what I ask you to do.

I call upon you, then, to make this a matter of civic and social responsibility so as to render to the minorities their rights, and to assist Baltimore in the growth which we mutually desire to see.

ALASKA THANKS MR. SHRIVER

Mr. **BARTLETT**. Mr. President, about 5 years ago, the American foreign relations took on a new image. Beginning in the West African Republic of Ghana, then spreading to East Africa in Tanzania, and outward to Latin America, Asia and the Far East, the finest concept of the New Frontier has taken American educational and technological know-how to 46 countries of the world.

I am speaking, of course, about the Peace Corps, now more than 10,000 strong—the grassroots diplomats perhaps closest to American hearts.

I say they are the diplomats closest to American hearts because there is an inherent remoteness about the fellow who wears a frock-tailed coat and striped pants. But the Peace Corps volunteer in Ecuador, in his jeans and sweatshirt, is a fellow with whom we all can identify. Last year, he may have gassed your car at the corner service station.

Now, all of this may sound like apple pie, and the Peace Corps may have some of that too, but the U.S. Senate has to be concerned with hard-nosed results. Well, the Peace Corps, in my estimation, has delivered those results. And my State of Alaska also is getting a return from the Peace Corps budget.

Alaska is getting a direct dividend from the Peace Corps because three returned volunteers, two young men who served in Ecuador and one who was a beekeeper in Guatemala, are key people in the Alaska poverty program. Mr. President, I rise today to salute these young people, Mike Valentine of Ogden, Utah, and Gerald Miller of Ceresco, Nebr., who did rural community action work in Ecuador; and Don Johnson, also of Ceresco, who served the Peace Corps in Guatemala.

Alaska Gov. William A. Egan recently paid tribute to the trio when he said:

> These Peace Corps returnees have made the most constructive impact upon poverty in Alaska in its 100 years under the American flag.

Gerald, Mike, and Don are working out of Fairbanks, Anchorage, and Bethel. Ninety percent of their time is spent living with Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians in remote villages. These men are using Peace Corps skills and the Peace Corps concept of self-help to give Alaska's native people a new sense of personal dignity and value as human beings.

For instance, Gerald Miller, who was a horse trader in Nebraska before he entered the Peace Corps, is working with VISTA volunteers to establish a preschool program in the Eskimo village of Hooper Bay, whose population of 560 includes only 5 persons with salaried jobs. Gerald also has organized adult education classes at Hooper Bay, community action programs at Barrow, Fort Yukon, and Arctic Village.

Don Johnson, working with the Eskimos of Emmonak, has developed a sawmill industry there which will provide paying jobs for people who historically have eked out a subsistence living by hunting and fishing and trapping.

Mike Valentine is working on a program to electrify the Kodiak Island village of Old Harbor. Electrification of the village may help attract a canning plant.

Alaska's 48,200 native people want to pull their share of the load in developing our abundant resources. But in order to fulfill this responsibility, the Eskimos, the Aleuts and the Indians need technical know-how, not how-to lectures from a remote podium. They need demonstrations and examples from people such as our returned Peace Corps volunteers who live in the villages with the people.

That is what Alaska is reaping from the Peace Corps. Now, the real fruits of Sargent Shriver's inspired overseas organization are being harvested in my State, although the seeds were planted in Guatemala and Ecuador.

I want to take this opportunity to thank Sargent Shriver for developing the U.S. Peace Corps into one of America's most effective agencies for international aid, and wish him well in his new full-time assignment as head of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

To Jack Vaughn, the Peace Corps director-designate, I say, I hope that more of your returned volunteers will journey to Alaska, where there is great opportunity for those who want to serve their fellow man.

DEATH OF ALEXANDER F. "CASEY" JONES

Mr. **KENNEDY** of New York. Mr. President, the death of Alexander F. "Casey" Jones in Florida on February 15 was a great loss not only to American newspapers but also to his many friends and admirers. "Casey" Jones represented the quest for excellence in American journalism. Both the newspapers he managed—the Washington Post and the Syracuse Herald Journal—and their readers benefited from his forthright and fearless direction. He was properly insistent on the people's right to know about the operation of their government whether Federal, State, or local. His sure and distinctive touch will be missed. His imprint, however, will long survive. For many years I was pleased to be counted among his friends and therefore I feel a personal loss.

THE BASE FOR VIETNAM'S GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the declaration of Honolulu has placed the economic resources of this Nation behind what may well be called a great society program for South Vietnam.

Public attention has been almost exclusively focused in the past year or more on the military situation we face in South Vietnam, and continues to pay little attention to developments within the economy of that country and its internal government structure and operations. The truth is that even though there have been no recent coups it is reported the local nonmilitary situation has continually deteriorated.

Two articles appeared in this morning's Washington Post, written by two of that paper's skilled and experienced foreign service reporters, on the spot in Saigon, under a joint headline: "Vietnamese Skeptical of Pledges; Economic Situation Is Worsening." They deserve universal and careful reading. Some may say these analyses are frightening, and they are. But they are also realistic, and we must be realists in the approach we make to our Vietnam involvement.

Our own Great Society is starting to build upon a stable, steady base of growing prosperity over the past 5 years, prosperity which is unprecedented. We are not trying to overlay it on a society shot through and through with inefficiency, corruption, and apathy toward the Central Government. We are doing it by our own efforts, from the inside, not by a largess stultifying to initiative and involvement imposed from the outside.

But here are some of the conditions reported by the Post reporters.

First, they say that South Vietnam has not as yet established any effective policies of its own to fight the war on the homefront. Writes Ward Just:

> There is no incomes policy, no price policy, only the bare beginnings of import policy, very little control over hoarding.

Yet we, who are talking of taking on what amounts to the major responsibility for South Vietnam's domestic economy as well as for its war, are beginning to think in terms of the rearranging of our own domestic policies, in order that we may shoulder this tremendous and dubious burden. We are told that we are threatened with inflation, and we are rightly concerned by the possibility that the economy of the United States may creep upward in that direction by as much as 2 or 3 percent. But there, where the Government is not controlling inflation, and where we are feeding it daily with our massive injections of funds, prices rose 10 percent last month alone, and nearly 50 percent in the last year. The prediction is that the rise will be another 35 or 40 percent in the next year. This means that by 1967 it will cost us $2 for each dollar it was costing us a year ago.

Think of it—10 percent in 1 month. Do we have any assurance at all, any commitment, from the Government of General Ky that measures will be taken to halt such terrible economic erosion? And even if we get such assurances, will there be any possibility that they can be carried out?

Second, it is very dubious whether controls will be accepted in South Vietnam. It is quite possible that attempts to achieve them will merely result in bringing down the Government. Far too many people in South Vietnam are caught up in making a good thing of this war. Here is Mr. Just's account:

> But there is no enthusiasm for the war in this dazed and weary country, and the population is in no mood to accept stiff controls. While ARVN privates die in the swamps of Haunghia Province, well-off Vietnamese sun themselves at the swimming pool at the Cercle Sportif.
>
> While Americans struggle through the rice fields of Binhdinh, landlords refuse to sell land to the U.S. Government on which to build tent cities to relieve the acute housing shortage in Saigon.
>
> "There is no patriotism here," said one official. "I am not being negative. I am being realistic."

Third, they report that the black market is running away, and a major ingredient in that occurrence is the vast amount of cash, of U.S. dollars, with which we are now flooding the country. Black markets mean corruption, and I raise the question, what assurance have we that we will not spread and compound the corruption now existing as we pour into South Vietnam not only the 27 percent of the fiscal 1967 AID budget earmarked for Vietnam, but further sums—much as they may be needed—for education, health, schools, farm development? Says Mr. Just:

> It is understood that the United States itself will undertake to increase imports of consumer goods like radios, bikes, and television sets. But complicating that problem is an antique import licensing law.

The report by Mr. Just's colleague, Stanley Karnow, elaborates and points up more clearly what this means:

> Economic disruption is naturally accompanied by corruption, which is regarded here as almost as great an enemy to the country as the Communists. Nearly everything, from construction contracts to the delivery of motor scooters, which are rationed by the Government, is said to require a payoff.
>
> Import licenses are being bought and sold, and it is feared that when the U.S. commercial import program is accelerated—in order to absorb the surplus currency in circulation—the traffic in licenses will boom.

We are not without guilt in this situation. It is obvious that we have not required rigorous preconditions of economic controls and reforms from the Saigon government before committing our own funds, without which that government could not exist.

Further, the impact of the "massive infusion of U.S. funds, estimated to total $600 million in 1966" has aggravated the black market in money and contributed to the runaway inflation. We have evidently not put restrictions on ourselves, have not used the kind of self-restraint which the situation demands. Mr. Karnow, for example, cites the case of the landlady wife of a prominent Vietnamese general who is turning out a Vietnamese civil servant in order to rent her property to an American who is willing to pay $600 per month. A barmaid, it is reported, can earn more in a day than a longshore worker in a month, more in a year than a Cabinet official on American money tossed her way. Our employment of 100,000 Vietnamese at high rates has further thrown the local economy into dire straits.

A construction program at $400 million a year is making an impact of $100 million on the Vietnamese economy. With a total population of 15 million at a generous outside figure, this is equivalent to an impact about equal to that of our own poverty program—$1.3 billion. Even 10-year-old boys are getting into the act as construction workers.

Finally, there is the very serious matter which Mr. Karnow raises of skepticism in Vietnam over our Great Society program for them:

> By and large, the promise of new social and economic programs has not aroused discernible enthusiasm, largely because the history of recent years is crowded with unfulfilled plans.

"We've heard it all before," said a prominent trade union leader yesterday. "We are weary of words."

This skepticism seems to permeate the local view of the Honolulu meeting of President Johnson and Premier Ky, which is seen "as primarily an American exercise in bulwarking the local government. And it is believed that another Honolulu meeting this summer, as announced by the President, will repeat that exercise.

"It's like doping horses," commented an irreverent young Vietnamese Army officer the other day. "They run for awhile, and then you've got to give them another shot."

In what I have said, I am not decrying our aims and our good intentions. But if it is essential that we move into a Great Society program in Vietnam, it is essential also that we secure the active cooperation and participation of the Saigon Government. It is futile and self-destructive if we go through the pangs of wrenching our own economy into line for these great efforts, at the expense of serious wounds to our own Great Society program, only to have it fail. Failure is inevitable, however, if we do not take into account the total situation and look realistically at the shaky structure and the limited possibilities of the South Vietnam Government to command the wholehearted cooperative support of those now fattening from the situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles to which I have referred may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Saigon Boom Causes Problems: Vietnamese Skeptical of Pledges; Economic Situation Is Worsening

(By Stanley Karnow)

Saigon, February 16.—President Johnson's meeting with South Vietnam's leaders in Honolulu last week, followed by visits to Saigon by Vice President Humphrey, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, and assorted other American dignitaries dramatized the U.S. commitment to South Vietnam.

Now that the fanfare has faded away, however, Vietnamese are feeling somewhat bewildered and more than a little dubious about the administration's dazzling performance. Their opinions vary, of course, according to their social backgrounds.

Predictably, the educated, articulate civil servants, lawyers, schoolteachers, and other "intellectuals" here in the capital seem to take a skeptical view toward Washington's hopes of helping to build a Great Society in Vietnam.

Some of them were comforted to hear Humphrey speak of satisfying popular aspirations and rising expectations—a refreshing antidote to much of the military jargon heard here. Many others were pleased to hear, through the local grapevine, that Freeman had intervened to save one of the country's leading agronomists from being drafted into the army.

By and large, however, the promise of new social and economic programs has not aroused discernible enthusiasm, largely because the history of recent years is crowded with unfulfilled plans.

"We've heard it all before," said a prominent trade union leader yesterday. "We are weary of words."

Doubts about the future are reinforced, moreover, by a fairly pervasive lack of faith in the ability of the South Vietnamese Government headed by Premier Nguyen Cao Ky.

In his speeches and statements, Ky projects an image of himself as an honest, simple soldier dedicated to promoting "social revolution." That image has reportedly captivated the White House, where Ky's statements are said to be on the required reading list.

But to Vietnamese here in Saigon—and to many American officials, too—Ky is far from the hero he is made out to be by his publicists.

The Ky government is stable largely because it is immobile, explain Vietnamese. In fact, they add, it is not really Ky's government but a junta of generals who, for the sake of their own survival, have tacitly agreed not to disagree—at least for the present.

In the view of Vietnamese here, moreover, the Saigon government hangs together because it is supported by the United States, which would not tolerate another succession of coup d'etats and uprisings such as followed the downfall of the Ngo Dinh Diem regime in November 1963.

ANOTHER MEETING

Thus President Johnson's personal identification with the Saigon leaders in Honolulu last week has been seen here as primarily an American exercise in bulwarking the local government. And it is believed that another Honolulu meeting this summer, as announced by the President, will repeat that exercise.

"It's like doping horses," commented an irreverent young Vietnamese army officer the other day. "They run for awhile and then you've got to give them another shot."

Much of this criticism reflects uneasiness with the degenerating economic situation here. Tremendous infusions of American money have simply unhinged and disrupted the local society to the point at which a bargirl can earn in a day what a longshoreman makes in a month.

Soaring prices have especially affected fixed-income groups—civil servants, army officers, schoolteachers and other professionals—who are the intelligentsia of any underdeveloped country.

TENANT BEING EVICTED

A middle-level civil servant is being evicted from his house this week, for example, because his landlady can find an American tenant willing to pay $600 per month rent. The landlady, incidentally, is the wife of a prominent Vietnamese general.

Economic disruption is naturally accompanied by corruption, which is regarded here as almost as great an enemy to the country as the Communists. Nearly everything, from construction contracts to the delivery of motor scooters, which are rationed by the government, is said to require a payoff.

Import licenses are being bought and sold, and it is feared that when the U.S. commercial import program is accelerated—in order to absorb the surplus currency in circulation—the traffic in licenses will boom.

Characteristically, most of the critics of conditions here can offer little in the way of constructive suggestions for handling the situation more effectively. It can be recalled that several of those in positions of authority today were themselves last year's critics, fulminating against the regime then in office and vowing to perform honestly and efficiently if they took power.

FEAR OF ABANDONMENT

Underlying this every-man-for-himself approach, however, is perhaps the one feeling that touches nearly every Vietnamese. It is a fear of being abandoned, forgotten, sold out.

Over the past generation, Vietnamese hopes were buoyed up and then betrayed by the French, the Japanese, the Communists and by successive Saigon leaders.

Despite the gallant words uttered at Honolulu, the Vietnamese are not at all sure how much trust they can place in the United States—which in turn prompts some Americans here to wonder how much trust can be placed in the Vietnamese.

(By Ward Just)

Saigon, February 16.—Saigon's economic situation, serious for the past year, is becoming critical, and diplomatic sources rate it as second only to the Vietcong as "the most important political problem we have."

According to Government figures released yesterday, prices rose 10 percent last month over December and nearly 50 percent over the year 1965. There is an acute shortage of skilled labor, imports, and consumer goods. A flourishing black market and official corruption add to the difficulties.

Overhanging all is the massive infusion of U.S. funds, estimated to total $600 million in 1966.

The problem is shot through with paradox. Vietnam, a country at war, has a booming economy—but, informed economists say, it is an almost classic example of a sellers' market run riot.

U.S. officials have made it clear to the Government that they regard the situation with the utmost seriousness, and President Johnson himself reportedly told Premier Nguyen Cao Ky at the Honolulu conference last week that even if the military struggle is won, the gain would go up in smoke if the economic situation deteriorates further.

The Government, preoccupied with the war and lacking the competence to deal with economic complexities, has not been quick to confront the crisis.

The black market, in money and in goods, has swollen. There is no incomes policy, no price policy, only the bare beginnings of an import policy, very little control over hoarding.

One key suggestion has been to increase taxes on "the winners" here—bar owners, landlords, hotel keepers.

What the boom has done is throw the economy out of proportion, creating an economic problem first, but bringing social and political problems along with it.

This is a country where a bar girl can make more than a Cabinet minister, where a cyclo driver in Saigon can make a killing a day if he caters to the Americans, where the labor shortage is so acute that the gigantic U.S. construction company, RMK, recently pirated a Vietnamese driver employed by the U.S. Embassy.

Not all these effects are bad. The boom has tended to get money into the hands of the urban poor, where it is most needed (as well as into the hands of the Chinese businessmen, where it is not). Farm income rose by an estimated 25 percent last year.

But the pressure has been on prices: Milk, rice, and cloth have all gone up dramatically. Pork has risen, by one estimate, 200 percent in a year.

Many of the goods people want can be produced locally, but because of the war effort it is practically impossible to increase production. The United States employs 100,000 Vietnamese, for example.

MORE CONSUMER GOODS

It is understood that the United States itself will undertake to increase imports of consumer goods like radios, bikes, and television sets. But complicating that problem is an antic import licensing law and the difficulty of moving goods into Vietnamese ports.

Officials here are frantically trying to open up the port of Saigon (where turn-around time for a vessel is frequently 2 to 3 weeks) to imports, to turn the sellers' market into a buyers' market. But the heavy importation of military hardware makes it a difficult task, despite the improvements to the harbors of Danang and Quinhon and the Brobdingnagian effort at Camranh Bay.

Rippling beneath the surface is the Government's refusal—or inability—to do anything about the black money market, to which many prices are tied. The official rate is 73 piastres to the dollar. The black market rate was 135 piastres to the dollar in August and 170 last week.

Sources here say that the gigantic U.S. construction effort must also be cut back. The U.S. investment in construction is now estimated at $400 million a year, $100 million of which has a direct effect on the economy.

AIRPORTS BEING BUILT

The United States is building everything from airports to billets, with a resulting pressure on iron, steel, and cement. As one example of the social and political implications, 10-year-old boys are becoming construction workers.

The best that can be hoped for this year, economists say, is that the inflation rate will be held to 35 or 40 percent.

Experts say that by the adroit use of a fiscal and monetary policy, a savings-bond campaign, for example, and a conscious effort at belt-tightening, the crisis might be averted.

But there is no enthusiasm for the war in this dazed and weary country, and the population is in no mood to accept stiff controls.

While ARVN privates die in the swamps of Haunghia Province, well-off Vietnamese sun themselves at the swimming pool at the Cercle Sportif.

While Americans struggle through the rice fields of Binhdinh, landlords refuse to sell land to the U.S. Government on which to build tent cities to relieve the acute housing shortage in Saigon.

"There is no patriotism here," said one official. "I am not being negative. I am being realistic."

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, yesterday was a day of remembrance for Lithuanians around the world. On February 16, 1918, this small but heroic country located on the rim of the Baltic Sea declared its independence from the great Russian State. But the taste of freedom was short-lived for during the chaotic turmoil of World War II, this Baltic nation was absorbed into the vast Soviet empire. Since that time the Lithuanians have experienced the cold, driving demands of Communist control. Independent Lithuanian organizations around the world, however, have tried to keep alive the fire of freedom and independence which burned so brightly during the 1920's and 1930's.

And the spirit of the Lithuanian people has not been dominated. For several years following World War II, a courageous Lithuanian freedom army actively resisted Soviet authorities. Today, Lithuanians everywhere look to a time when their people will be once more able to follow their daily pursuits in freedom. Thus Lithuanian Independence Day has become an occasion not only for anguished remembrance but also for renewed hope. The people of this country share the ideals of the people of Lithuania. It is only appropriate that now and throughout the year we recall and record our admiration for the indomitable spirit of the Lithuanian people.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTAL MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 2791.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

In accordance with the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

WE MUST START FROM WHERE WE ARE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on yesterday, following the remarks by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I made a few remarks on the pending bill, with reference to the money figures in it.

This is an authorization bill, but it is certainly a money bill, and almost the same as an appropriation bill. In a few days after this bill passes, we shall have an appropriation bill before us.

I point out, in addition to the points I made about the money yesterday, that a substantial part—at least 30 percent, perhaps—of the funds provided in this bill has actually already been spent because of the war in Vietnam. At least that much will be used, after we appropriate it, to replace the funds that have been used during the first, second, and third quarters of the current fiscal year, expenditures that have been made as part of the expenses of that war. The money provided by this bill will replace those funds for the fourth quarter.

There is nothing illegal about that. It was authorized by the bill. However, the fact that it was necessary is one of the main reasons why I called attention last year, when we were considering the bill, and I was handling it at that time, to the fact that the Defense Department should have requested more money than was being requested at that time.

At that time only $1,700 million was expressly earmarked for southeast Asia. It was generally known that it would require much more money than that. It has taken money out of the "hide" of the military budget. As I have said, we are spending fourth quarter money because we are running out of items for the first, second, and third quarter. This money will be used to replace the money that has been used for that purpose.

February 28 is about the critical date when these funds should be available to keep the accounts in the Defense Department from being embarrassed.

Mr. President, I wish to give a special title to the remarks I shall make today on the bill as a whole and the questions involved. That title is that we must start from where we are with reference to the war in Vietnam. This question is not one of how we got there. That question has long since passed. We have been in Vietnam since 1954. The question is not why we went over there. We can argue that question endlessly. It may be relevant, but it is not in issue now, because we have been there all this time. So the title of my remarks is, "We Must Start From Where We Are."

I said yesterday, and I repeat today, that I shall not vote for any amendment to the bill, unless error should be shown in the figures, even though such amendment may sustain my policy views on the question of the war and what should be done about it. I would certainly vote against any that was drawn to endorse an opposing policy. Such a proposal or argument can be made later, in a proper manner. The real point is that our men are fighting, bleeding, and dying. The war goes on. The ships, planes, carriers, and everything else must move. The money must be appropriated for those purposes. Our men must have more than they need; not the minimum of what they may need.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Virginia, a member of our subcommittee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to be associated with the fine patriotic sentiments which have been expressed so well by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, who has for years handled the military construction authorization bill, and for 1 or 2 years handled the total appropriation bill.

This bill provides an authorization for war material, where needed, by those who are committed to the war. As the Senator has said, this is not the time for an argument about how we got there or why we got there, or to put in this particular bill policy statements. I assure him that I share those sentiments, and I shall so vote.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Virginia for his remarks and for his solid support, which is always forthcoming. He is a member of our appropriations subcommittee, and is unusually well informed. I repeat, we must start from where we are.

Mr. President, I wholeheartedly support S. 2791 and the $4.8 billion of supplemental military authorizations for southeast Asia which it provides. Senators may recall that during consideration of the southeast Asia $1.7 billion addendum to the fiscal year 1966 military budget last August, I predicted that a much greater amount would be requested of the Congress in January. It was clear to me then that the appropriations requested were entirely inadequate to fund our expanding operations in Vietnam.

No one has a greater or more sincere desire than I for halting the war in Vietnam and ending the sacrifice of valuable American lives. I have supported and will continue to support every constructive effort seeking an honorable solution to this tragic problem and an honorable end to our involvement. Bringing this tragic war to an honorable conclusion is the first order of business with me and should be the first order of business with all patriotic and thoughtful Americans.

That means to me that this takes a high and top priority over any domestic program; both the old ones and the new ones, call them Great Society or whatever they may be called.

The first order of business of Congress is to try to bring this war to an honorable conclusion with the least possible loss of life and expenditure of funds.

The American people, both in and out of the Congress, are rightfully concerned about our involvement in South Vietnam and about its implications for the future. They want to know and are entitled to know just what our policy is and where we are headed.

This is as it should be.

That is why I believe these bills should be considered now on a first priority basis.

However, devisive criticism which gives to the world and our troops in the field the impression the United States is a divided Nation working at cross purposes and lacking in unity is an entirely different question. This serves to reenforce the belief of the Asiatic Communists that we are lacking in national purpose, determination, and moral strength, and lowers the morale of our troops in the field.

There are those who insist that we should undertake meaningful negotiations at the conference table to bring this war to an end. They overlook the very clear fact that we have made every effort to achieve this result and that the recent unprecedented diplomatic effort to open the door to negotiations was unproductive.

There are those who say that the entire matter should be turned over to the United Nations to work out a just settlement. We have now gone to the United Nations with this problem and there appears to be no evidence that the United Nations is capable of achieving any significant or dramatic results.

There are those who insist that we limit the war as much as possible and make every effort to avoid a wider war. This has been our policy and purpose. No right thinking person in America desires an escalation of this war or the loss of American lives. However, we have been compelled to meet aggressive force with the force which is necessary to contain and repel it. To do otherwise would put victory in doubt and raise the possibility that we might be driven into the sea. At best, it would mean a long and bloody stalemate of 10 to 15 years or more, which, in the long run, would be the most costly in blood and money.

Mr. President, that is a very substantial point in my mind. I hope that we are not at the point where we must engage in a long and bloody stalemate year after year. This has been the policy of other nations in Asia in decades past but it certainly must not become our policy.

I do not believe the American people wish to approach it in that way. I do not believe that they would endorse such a policy.

Debate, of course, is useful and should not be curtailed. I do believe, however, that in this difficult time debate should be helpful, constructive, and positive, rather than negative and divisive. We had a very good debate here yesterday afternoon. However, in all of the recent debate and criticism, so far as I can see, there has not been presented any suggestion or recommendation which offers a feasible, desirable, and effective alternative to the course that we have followed recently and propose to follow in the future.

Although I opposed our original involvement in South Vietnam, one reason being that I believed it to be unwise for us to undertake this commitment alone, I believe it is now too late for disagreement as to whether we should be in South Vietnam. The time has come for Americans everywhere to close ranks and give both the President and our fightingmen in the field the support and backing they need and deserve.

When I say that I opposed our original commitment in South Vietnam, I mean that I opposed it on the floor of the Senate in three Senate debates. I am not bringing that up to say, "I told you so." I do not feel that way about it. I mention that only to show that I am not a fanatic on this subject. I am not warminded. My position is based on the fact that we are already there. We have to make the best of it and have honorable terms before we leave.

Just as I supported the recent peace offensive and the efforts to open a door to the conference table, so do I support the decision to stand firm in the face of aggression and to meet aggressive military force with the necessary military might of our own.

I think that the pause or lull in the air war against North Vietnam lasted too long, but I am sure that those who made the decisions were doing their best under the circumstances.

The world should know that we are not the aggressors. We are not there for business reasons, territorial reasons, colonialism, or any other reason except our originally announced purpose.

The entire history of the Communist movement should teach us that we are more likely to achieve a just and honorable peace in South Vietnam through strength rather than weakness. The Communists have drawn the line in South Vietnam and have determined to make this war a test of our power and our strength of national purpose and determination.

That is a distinct and major fact. I believe that it has been going on so long—and they have been successful in comparative terms—that they have decided now to make this a test to see how long they can bleed us and how much it can cost us in manpower, money, delay, and everything else.

I doubt very seriously that they will be convinced of the folly of their course and be impelled to the conference table unless and until they come face to face with either the prospect or the actuality of military defeat.

We know what they are going to do if we weaken and if we pull out. We know what they are going to do. They will move in. My real surprise is that they have not already moved into other areas of Asia.

For the same reasons I support what I know was a painful and agonizing decision to resume the air war against North Vietnam. I recognize, of course, that air strikes alone cannot and will not completely stop the flow of supplies from the north to the south. However, they will unquestionably slow down and hamper the movement of men and material and, therefore, the resumption and continuance of the bombing in North Vietnam is essential to give maximum support and assistance to our fighting men in South Vietnam and thereby to reduce the number of American casualties.

I reiterate my desire for a just and honorable peace through diplomatic channels. However, if this is impossible, as it appears to be at this time, it is imperative that we be prepared with all necessary military equipment, supplies, ammunition, material, and manpower which are necessary to enable our fighting men in the field to perform their missions with maximum efficiency. It is vital and essential that there be no shortages of the tools and sinews of war.

As I said when the battle started, the only way to insure having enough is to have too much.

To insure that there will be no such shortages is the purpose of the bill which we are now considering and the supplemental appropriation bill which is now in committee. The passage of these bills is indispensable to our military posture and preparedness. Their passage by a unanimous or near unanimous vote will give needed assurance to the troops in the field that we are standing solidly and four-square behind them.

Bringing an end to the war and stopping the bloodshed is the first order of business with me, and it should be the first order of business with Congress and all loyal Americans. If this cannot be accomplished through diplomatic channels, then we must be prepared to face up to the situation and take other necessary steps. First and foremost, we must make a national decision that it is our purpose to win.

I have never talked about a so-called no-win policy. I did not suggest that such a policy existed during the Korean war, and I do not suggest it now. I do not accuse anyone of having a no-win policy. But I know that we have already drifted dangerously near to a situation which could be so interpreted. If we cannot do this, we must either turn tail and withdraw or resign ourselves to the prospect of a long and unhappy stalemate which will be costly both in blood, money, and national resources.

This means—assuming that an honorable negotiated peace is impossible—that we must be prepared, if necessary, to increase our combat troops so as to be able to take the war effectively to the Vietcong and their allies and to beat them on the field of battle. We must and should be prepared to fight to win and not just to keep from losing. We cannot achieve our objectives if we are content to fight only what amounts to a holding action in South Vietnam.

As everyone knows, I am not a military man and have no expert military judgment; but I cannot help believing that when we are really ready to strike and carry out a policy of action in the field, tremendous results will be achieved, and fairly rapidly. I could be mistaken, but I believe that this will make a tremendous difference.

In short, we must be ready, willing, and able to hit the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese as hard, and as often, and wherever necessary from a military standpoint to make them realize that our purpose is to win if we are compelled to continue to fight, and that we will not be content only to defend our positions in the south.

We should face up to the hard realities of the situation. The present indications give no cause for optimism that the way ahead will be easy or that there will be a quick and easy solution to the problem. The war and demands associated with it will directly affect the lives of the American people in many ways and will demand many and increasing sacrifices.

I have slept with this problem, particularly for the past 2 years. While the Subcommittee on Preparedness was looking into the question of the readiness of the Armed Forces and making many kindred and related inquiries, many members of the committee and of our staff visited Vietnam, although I myself have not been there. However, I have heard the sworn testimony of a great number of men who have been there, on the actual field of battle, at the time when we were led to believe, more or less, that our men were not taking any part in the fighting, unless they happened to be shot at.

Many of the young men in the service who returned told us, under oath, the extent to which they had been engaged in battle. We received briefings about the various developments there, although most of it was classified.

So these are not conclusions that I jumped to as a result of reading articles in the newspapers. I have lived with this subject to that extent, and even before that I was interested in it. I visited the wounded men as they returned to hospitals in the United States. I visited many of them at Walter Reed Hospital, where many of the more difficult cases were sent. I have visited them in Honolulu and at other places as they arrived from the battlefields.

With the increase in military forces there will come a further and added increase in draft calls.

At least a partial callup of National Guardsmen and Reservists is probable, particularly of units with specialized skills.

We will be required to appropriate increasing amounts of money to support our military operations in Vietnam and to maintain our other forces around the world at a high level of combat readiness.

If the war continues, increased taxes in large proportions are certain.

We may ultimately be forced to a choice between guns and butter. This might entail economic controls and rationing of goods and materials and at least a partial disruption of normal business operations.

I am not predicting that these events are just around the corner, or 30, 90, or 60 days or 6 months away; but if we have to continue our action and go deeper and deeper, we shall certainly be confronted with the problem of controls.

Tragically, the toll of American casualties will go even higher, and additional thousands of American fighting men may be called upon to lay down their lives in defense of their country and the cause of freedom.

After soul-searching and conscientious analysis of the entire situation and its implications for our future, I have come to the conclusion that the one course that we should and must follow is that of bringing sufficient military might to bear to force our Communist enemies to the conference table or, failing that, to defeat them on the field of battle. Only this alternative, in my judgment, offers us a chance to peace with honor. I believe that the sooner we undertake this and get about doing the job, the less will be the cost in lives, time, and money.

Where I have use the term "war" in this speech, I have done so advisedly. We all known that we have been carrying a major part of fighting the bloody war in South Vietnam for many months. That does not discredit in the least the South Vietnamese soldier. Under our training and with our equipment—and they themselves have many good officers—they have developed into excellent soldiers. But the push, the aggressiveness, and the offensive part of the battle, and much of the manpower, of course, is provided by the United States. We are having to carry a great part of the load.

We have put our men and our flag on the field of battle and both have been fired upon. We now have more than 200,000 fightingmen actually deployed in South Vietnam and many thousands more directly support them in southeast Asia. When I say "many thousands more," I mean perhaps 40,000 or 50,000 more, at the very least; including our naval forces and carriers and more members of the Air Force, in addition to the 200,000 who are on the mainland of Vietnam itself. More than 2,000 young Americans have already been called upon to make the final and greatest sacrifice for their country.

I am making this enumeration to place before the people what I believe will be the cost of this policy; but I believe it is necessary, and the quicker we face it, the better.

Our commitment in South Vietnam is constantly growing in terms of men, material, and money. Barring a completely unexpected and unforeseen development, it will grow even more before we reach the end of the road.

Informed sources tell me—and they are speculating—that we may very well have 350,000 to 400,000 troops in the field before the end of this year. Those are not my figures. I do not know; those who tell me do not know either. But informed sources give this as their speculative judgment.

Let me give one further word of warning before I conclude. Today, we very properly concentrate our attention on southeast Asia. However, in so doing we must not overlook the very real possibility that our Communist enemies may undertake additional adventure and aggressions at other places around the world where our vital interests are involved. Therefore, we must be certain that we do not let the drain which Vietnam imposes upon our manpower, material, and resources impair the readiness of our remaining forces to meet aggression at other potential hotspots around the world. We must spend the necessary money to supply the shortages which the requirements of Vietnam have created.

We must face the fact that until recently we have been trying to operate on a peacetime budget in fighting what was a very expensive and growing war exactly halfway around the world.

Some of the funds involved in the pending bill will be used to replenish the materiel, the military hardware, and like supplies which have been burned up and used up from the regular resources of our armed services. We must procure the necessary arms and equipment, supplies, and ammunition. We must recruit and train the necessary manpower.

Our manpower has been drained from other units in order to meet the demands of the situation in Vietnam.

We must not be found wanting or be unready to respond to aggression in other areas in which our vital interests are involved, if it should occur.

I do not believe I am an alarmist, but if we should let this war drag on, on just a holding basis, and fight it as a kind of diplomatic war, I believe we would be inviting smaller wars to break out by this or another aggressor, in one form or another, in other places.

The only reason why they have not broken out in other places, such as in Central and South America, is that there is our growing power.

I close this statement by paying a special tribute to our brave men who fight and sometimes die in Vietnam. They are doing a tremendous job under very difficult circumstances. They fight for the cause of freedom with the same high morale, courage, valor, and skill which have distinguished the American soldier, sailor, airman, and marine in all past battles and wars of our history.

I believe it has already been demonstrated that we have sent much of the cream of the manpower crop to Vietnam. That is not to speak disparagingly of any man who has not been sent there. However, the corporals, sergeants, and specialists in certain fields are among the best men in our military forces. We have also sent our best lieutenants, captains, and majors, and right up the line in rank. That is true of our Army, our Naval Forces, of the Marine Corps, and of the Air Force.

These men prove again that a properly motivated American is the finest fighting man the world has ever known. They deserve the gratitude and unstinting support of all Americans and freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

Let us pass this bill with dispatch. Debate and discussion are a part of our system of government. But with men fighting, bleeding, and even dying on the battlefields, it is time to act in voting funds to insure the equipment, the supplies, the military hardware, and other tools of war necessary to enable them to carry out their missions, protect themselves, and insure a positive victory.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Mississippi upon the very able address he has just delivered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator from Mississippi is familiar with every aspect of this matter, particularly the military one, in view of the fact that he presides over the very important Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I well remember that when the question first arose of sending men to Vietnam, it was proposed that we send some 200 men to assist the French to prepare and maintain and keep in the air the planes that the French had in Vietnam. Most of the planes there were American planes. I believe we gave the French approximately $3 billion to support them in their abortive effort to hold on in Vietnam.

The distinguished Senator from Mississippi is entitled to great praise as a prophet. I remember that the Senator from Mississippi made one or more speeches at that time in opposition to sending men into Vietnam, because of the lack of congressional approval and also because of the geographic disadvantages.

I discussed this subject with the Senator from Mississippi on many occasions in 1954. On one occasion when we had a conference at the highest echelons of the executive branch we were informed of a proposal to send 200 men to Vietnam. I made a serious understatement by predicting, "If we send 200 men there now, it will not be long until we will have 20,000 men there." Today we find that we have closer to 300,000 men in Vietnam, and the waters and lands adjacent thereto. We hardly could have let the Communists euchre us into a more difficult position. It is one of the most difficult and unlikely spots in the world in which to fight a war.

I have had many reasons to think about that position.

In Vietnam there are the valleys of the Mekong and the highlands of the north. As a rule, we associate malaria with the lowlands, but it so happens that in Vietnam malaria is found in the highlands. The malaria found there is of a type for which we now have no completely satisfactory medications.

I have almost concluded that perhaps the only other area of the world in which it would be more difficult to engage in a war would be Afghanistan or in the mountains of Tibet. It would be more difficult to get to those areas, and there would also be the matter of logistics.

I am particularly impressed by the cogent reasoning of the Senator from Mississippi that, if this war were not going on in Vietnam, we might have a military confrontation somewhere else.

The Communist world has never deviated from its purpose, its drive, and its determination to achieve world domination. It will be probing everywhere on earth for weak spots. If the Communists are unable to find weak spots in Asia or in Europe, they will then come to this hemisphere, and we shall have rash of wars of national liberation or wars of some other nomenclature, and we shall have some slogan other than the one now being used in Vietnam.

I am glad that from his knowledge of military affairs the Senator has pointed out that we are spread rather thin all over the world today.

We have highly trained and well-equipped forces in Germany and Korea. A part of the force we had held in reserve in the continental United States has had to be moved to Vietnam and to Santo Domingo.

Ours is a rather farflung battleline, Mr. President, when we consider the widely separated areas where our troops are stationed. It certainly behooves us to be more insistent than ever before that our allies, for whom we have done so much, make a larger contribution to the defense of freedom throughout the world.

There is no parallel in all human history to what this country did at the end of World War II. We not only bound up the wounds and rebuilt the edifices and the homes of our allies; we went to those with whom we had been only recently engaged in mortal combat, the Germans and the Japanese, and expended billions of dollars to revive their economies and enable them to stand on their own feet again.

Countries like these, which have received benefits that are without parallel in all of history, should be willing to make a larger military contribution to preserving the cause of peace.

We shall not have complete peace in this troubled world any time soon, but we can at least contain this Communist problem. Would that we had cleaned up Cuba of Castro and the Communists there at the time we discovered that missiles had been placed in Cuba. As Senators will recall, we had passed a joint resolution, approved by the President of the United States, which said in essence that any offensive weapon in Cuba would be considered an act of aggression against the United States.

We had the means to destroy the enemy in Cuba, and to eliminate Castro and communism. We had marines at sea, just out of sight of land. We had the necessary air support at bases in Florida. We had moved an armored division from Fort Hood, Tex., to Camp Stewart, Ga., ready to load on ships so that it could follow the marines in.

But we settled for something less than that; and it may well develop in the future that we settled for a great deal less. The Russians did not comply with the original assurances they gave President Kennedy when he wrote them that famous message demanding that they pull out of Cuba and give us the right to inspect, to see that they had removed those weapons. That was a right that was promised us; but was later denied and refused.

We shall continue to be troubled, as the Senator from Mississippi has so well indicated, by the threat of communism. I think we can handle it better than it has been handled, in many instances. We can achieve more of our objectives by methods other than engagement of armed forces and the loss of blood that is occurring this very moment in Vietnam. But there will be no time, I fear, in my life, or even in the life of my friend from Mississippi—who is much younger and stronger than I—when the threat of Communist aggression will be absolutely allayed and destroyed all over the world. We shall be compelled to bear a heavy burden to maintain a force for freedom—which is an insurance policy. The huge amount that we spend is the premium on the insurance policy which insures the most valuable thing on earth: the American way of life, and the individual rights, liberties, and dignities of the citizen in this land of ours.

I feel better when men who are as dedicated as the Senator from Mississippi are willing to apply themselves to this very onerous task.

Senators who have not served on the Preparedness Subcommittee can hardly imagine the extent of the efforts by that subcommittee on the Senate Armed Services Committee, in our attempts to keep America strong. Despite the very best we can do, and despite the most efficient administration of the Department of Defense, there will be some oversights; there will be something lacking. The Senator from Mississippi, as chairman of that subcommittee, has done a fine job in pointing out such deficiencies and correcting them. He stands here today making his statement in the great tradition of American freedom and American statesmanship, and I commend him for his remarks.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Georgia very much for his most generous remarks. In all the years I have been in the Senate, the wise counsel of the Senator from Georgia and his advice on military matters and other matters has been of great value. He has always been up at the front where the decisions were made. I think he has given as little consideration to himself personally, in his advice and counsel, as any person I have ever known.

I remember the occasion in 1954 when the Senator from Georgia helped turn the balance against a proposal that would have gone a great deal further than the involvement of 200 Air Force mechanics in Vietnam. I remember well how President Eisenhower sent for him time and again. He and the present President of the United States were both opposed to our involvement in the situation as it stood then.

I am delighted to have been associated with the Senator from Georgia in the matters to which he has referred. He taught me all I know on the subject; and I thank him for that.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, to the Senator's very generous observations, I wish only to add that when someone brings forward some alternative to the present program, some proposal of a method for our disengaging ourselves in Vietnam in an honorable fashion, without turning tail and running like a whipped puppy, I shall be happy to support such a proposal, because I deplore what is going on in Vietnam today, with the loss of human lives, as much as anyone possibly can. In the absence of such an honorable solution, I have no alternative to supporting the President.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad that the Senator from Georgia referred to our stretched-out position. He is as qualified to speak as any living person on the subject of our extended efforts all around the world, and how the time of peril and trouble in which we are living will continue for awhile.

I am sure that in his references to our allies, the Senator does not wish to discredit any of them. I know he is not quick to "pop off," if I may use that term, on such matters. But what he says is very timely and very true. Our allies have, in effect, turned their backs upon us in this distressing situation. Many of them, for whom we have done so much, could help with manpower; and even those who could not help us with manpower could stand up for us in the diplomatic circles of the world, take our side, and let it be known that this is a matter of first priority with them. Instead of that, some of them are actively opposed to our position.

I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for clarifying many of the issues involved in this bill.

I marched with the 1st Army, in the 9th Infantry Division. I served under General Westmoreland, who was then a lieutenant colonel, my regimental commander. I have great confidence in him. I have watched his career since that time as an artilleryman, as an infantryman, as the superintendent of West Point, and as a paratroop officer. In my judgment he is the finest commander in the American Army. He has one of the hardest jobs that any American general ever faced. I feel that, even as I had confidence in him when I marched with the 9th Division, the men who are fighting under him in Vietnam today have confidence in him.

The point that the Senator from Mississippi has made is that we must give to him, his staff, his junior officers, his noncommissioned officers, and every man who is serving in Vietnam, as well as every one of the Vietnamese and every one of our allies, all the materials of war that they need. If they need a missile, if they need a helicopter, if they need additional artillery, if they need more ammunition, we must give it to them; and that is what the pending bill would do.

As was pointed out yesterday by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], this bill does not determine foreign policy. It does not ratify decisions made in the past. It does not endorse new commitments. It merely provides that whatever we do, we are going to give our boys who have volunteered out of a sense of patriotism, as well as boys who went into the Army as a result of the Selective Service System and were compelled to go over there, the fullest kind of support, the kind of weapons, the kind of tanks, and the kind of materiel which they need.

Mr. President, I intend to vote for the bill wholeheartedly because I feel that we are committed to a war that is one of the most difficult ever to be fought, as has been pointed out by the Senator from Georgia. We must wholeheartedly support every one of the soldiers whom we have sent over there. That is what this bill would do. If we are to debate policy on Vietnam, if we are to debate what we are to do in Vietnam, let us debate it on the kind of issue which does not mean denying our troops over there, or General Westmoreland and his fine staff, the kind of support which they need.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Montana very much for his fine remarks.

I yield now to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore].

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I join in the sentiments expressed with respect to the character of service and leadership provided, and the wisdom exemplified by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell].

I recall that as a junior Senator I, along with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], and other Senators, awaited the return of the Senator from Georgia and the then Democratic leader, Senator Lyndon Johnson, from a conference which was called at the White House prior to the tragedy of Dienbienphu for the French.

I believe that I correctly recall the report we received from the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, and Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and perhaps others, urging President Eisenhower to send American troops to Vietnam to assist the French.

I recall that upon the return of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Texas, we were advised that they had strongly advised against it. I do not believe that we got the report from them as to what President Eisenhower's decision was, but later the President followed that advice.

I recall one further point, that when the question of the 200 men to whom the Senator from Mississippi had made reference—the first American military men sent there—was under consideration, the Senator from Georgia advised that if we sent 200 men, they would be followed by 200,000. Let me ask the Senator from Georgia whether that statement is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator gives me too much credit. I believe I said that if we sent 200 troops over there, 20,000 would have to follow in the very near future. I believe that was my prediction at that time.

Mr. GORE. Perhaps that is typical of the creeping escalation we have experienced on this issue, but 20,000 still makes the point. The case of the military forces was the event from which have flowed many other problems. I invite the attention of the Senate to this point, because of the pertinent remarks which the junior Senator from Mississippi has made.

I wish to say to him that I am grateful for the candor which he has displayed on this bill. Not from his lips have come denunciation of Senators who have questions in their minds, who are troubled by the vexatious predicament in which we find ourselves. Instead, the Senator from Mississippi has invited debate.

It seems to me that our aim must be to contribute to the formulation of policy for the enlightenment of the people with respect to that policy in a manner which will bring unity to the people, which is so badly needed.

As the war has been widened, the gap between the President and Congress seems also to have widened. Unrest among the people has increased.

This morning, I thought that General Taylor did an excellent job in presenting to the Committee on Foreign Relations the administration's policy in this regard.

There are many questions left to be asked, of course. But, if, out of all this debate and an examination of policy can come enlightenment of the people and Congress, and perhaps a modification of policy on the part of the administration and some limitations of objectives which the people can understand and support, then perhaps we shall have achieved a degree of unity which I believe is badly needed.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Tennessee very much for his very fine comments.

I am now glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening].

Mr. GRUENING. First, let me congratulate both the chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee for their great wisdom—when the issue of first invading Vietnam militarily by our forces came up—in opposing it, and for saying that it would be unwise policy, that it would lead to a much deeper involvement than appeared to be contemplated at that time, and that they joined in their counsels to the President and others in opposing this involvement.

I believe that their wisdom was prophetic and very great. It is to be regretted that their wisdom at that time did not prevail, because I believe we might have put across the thought which would have prevented many things which have happened since that time and which are leading us down a tragic path, the end of which no one can foresee.

I find myself in thorough agreement with some of the very fine sentiments which the Senator from Mississippi has expressed, and which the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] has also expressed, when he said a few moments ago that he would join in supporting any solution which would give us an honorable way out and stop the needless slaughter, not only of our own boys but also of all others. I know of no Member of Congress who would not share that view. Although there may be differences of opinion as to how that way should be found, no one in Congress and no one in the United States would dissent from that statement, and I applaud it most heartily.

The Senator from Mississippi says:

> No one has a greater or more sincere desire than I for halting the war in Vietnam and ending the sacrifices of American lives.

I applaud that sentiment, and I share it. I believe that we must all work together to that end, although some of us may differ in details, and some of us will differ on the future.

It is extremely important and fortunate that this debate has at last come to pass. Out of the discussions more wisdom may emerge, and we may be able to arrive at a better solution than that which we are now embarked upon.

We do not know where this debate is going to lead, but certainly we shall find agreement on the desire to find an honorable way out of the situation at the earliest possible moment. I support that view 100 percent.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Alaska very much.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee].

Mr. McGEE. Let me add my voice to those of my colleagues in commending the Senator from Mississippi, as well as the Senator from Georgia for the hard, bedrock stand which they have taken on this difficult question. What we tend to do, sometimes, is to reduce the question to overly simple terms, as though we had decided we were going to risk a war or live in peace, when that really is not the alternative which faces this country. We are living in a troubled world in which almost every day the risk of war is imminent. When the Senator titles his comments the way he did, he puts his finger on the nub of the question; namely, that we have to begin where we are at present.

It is water over the dam. We cannot do it over. History does not afford us the luxury of waiting 5 years before we make up our minds. We have to decide these issues now. When the Senator reminds us that here is a beginning, here is where we must start, he is rendering a great service to the dialog.

I should like to refer to the suggestions that have repeatedly occurred here on the part of my colleagues about our having to carry a disproportionate share of the burden in South Vietnam. I think occasionally we forget that a great power is not usually loved, and we sometimes tend to think, in affairs around the world, that we can put love on a priority. We have to put necessity, our own needs, the need to rise to our commitments and the demands of those commitments, on a priority. If someone will love us in the process, that is merely a fringe benefit.

Nobody loved the British when they kept the peace of the world for almost 100 years. In fact, the perfidious Albion was the object of much attack. So we must not judge of our actions on whether or not we shall be loved for them. We may hope that those we help will be grateful, but we may also be kicked in the face for our efforts.

We must keep the situation in perspective as to what is happening in various parts of the world.

The French and the British are committed in other areas of the world. Germany is committed in other areas of the world. The presence of the British, for example, around Singapore has had a stabilizing effect in the local disturbances that have taken place there.

The presence of French, German, and British troops in Western Europe means that this country can have a smaller complement of American troops there. The fact that hundreds of thousands of Korean troops are in Korea below the 38th parallel means that we have a much smaller commitment in that part of the world. We must also remember the fact that there are some 25,000 Korean troops in South Vietnam. It was announced the other day that Korea is sending 20,000 additional troops.

People tend to focus their eyes where our country is committed, and block out of view the fact that there are parts of the world where the French and the British are involved in commitments which have not involved a single member of our military forces.

The world being round and being smaller as a result of the modern genius of science, it behooves us to take cognizance of this kind of help. So we should recognize that there are numbers of Koreans and some Australians and New Zealanders in South Vietnam. The hard fact remains that we are there not in a club of friendship or in order to have group companionship. We are there because we have to be there. The times demand that we be there. We must assess our presence and its costs in those terms. When we do that, we should not go off on a tangent or an irrelevant issue as to whether we are getting sufficient help from our allies, and whether our allies are doing as much as they should. I do not believe that should be the criterion in determining what we should do.

The Senator from Mississippi was correct when he said that our commitment is there; we have to take it from there. We should not penalize ourselves, no matter what our feelings may be about other countries or what they are doing in other parts of the world.

I did not want the dialog to close without the reminder that there are commitments of other troops in the world. The bulk of the commitments are ours, as a result of trying to restore stability in the wake of World War II. And so while we risk a great deal in what we hope will eventually be successful, we must try to achieve it.

I conclude by commending the Senator from Mississippi for his wonderful statement this afternoon.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. He has made a forceful statement. The point he discusses has merit. I certainly did not mean to ignore the help we have, for example, from the very fine Korean troops. They mean exactly what they say in what they are doing. We have our own divisions on their battleline, as the Senator knows. But outside of the Koreans, there are very few other troops in there with rifles, and we want more. I feel that we deserve more, but I do not wish to pursue the argument further at this point. I am glad the Senator brought up the point and stated his view on it. He has made a very fine contribution by so doing.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, one of the concomitants of our military engagement in southeast Asia is the far-reaching effect it is already having and will continue to have on our domestic programs.

We have already seen the far-reaching cuts in education, in resource development, in housing, in aviation, and in virtually every other field. That is one of the consequences of our involvement that those of us who opposed this involvement from the start foresaw and forecast.

It is to be hoped that the President's indication that we could have both things, that we could both develop the domestic programs, the programs at home, many of them overdue, and continue to conduct the war, may be fulfilled.

But the actions taken to date indicate that the actions are not always in accord with the hopeful words.

It seems to me that for economy reasons, if none other, if we are to be strong, if we are to meet our alleged commitments in southeast Asia and other parts of the world—and it was brought out only a few minutes ago by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] in discussing the war, that we are stretched very thin—it is important that we maintain our economy at home and not allow it to be eroded by what is taking place overseas.

An example of one of the many of these cuts came to me this morning in a communication from the capital of my State, Juneau, where the decision of the administration, which Alaskans fervently hope will be reversed, to eliminate substantial funds for public works in the 1967 budget, has demonstrated another example of the bitter fruits resulting from what I, for one, consider the inexcusable folly we have exhibited in choosing to fight an undeclared land war in southeast Asia.

This view has been shared by many eminent military leaders—views now coming into public knowledge—by such leaders as the late and great General MacArthur, General Ridgway, indeed, President Eisenhower, as well as the late President Kennedy.

In my State of Alaska one of the projects that was eliminated from the budget was the so-called Snettisham Dam in southeastern Alaska, to supply power badly needed right now. However, this dam, even if not eliminated by the action of the Bureau of the Budget, would not have brought that power into use until 1970.

But recently, and before the dam was planned to meet the immediate needs, a vast tract of timber was sold to the St. Regis Paper Co. of New York, to be used in the manufacture of wood pulp. It is the largest timber sale in the history of the Forest Service, a great economic event utilizing a great natural resource which has long been unutilized. It is timber going to waste because it is dying on the stump from old age. It would be exhibiting the most basic principle of conservation by cutting this overripe timber and allowing a regrowth of a much larger quantity of prime forest resources, Sitka spruce and hemlock.

One of the terms of the contract of sale was that the St. Regis Paper Co., of New York, would construct a huge pulpmill; and one of the prime inducements for the sale of that tract of timber was that power would be provided by the Snettisham Dam, which was programed for construction at the beginning of this spring. Yet the Snettisham project was not included in this year's budget, although preliminary planning had been completed at a cost of $1,205,000. In other words, this dam was ready to go; and the Corps of Engineers had informed me that if the excision of this project stands, not only will there be great economic damage to this section and loss of payrolls in an area that needs them, but also that some of the experts, engineers, and planners who have been working there will be lost by being sent to other parts of the world, and their abilities will no longer be available.

What does the Snettisham project mean to southeastern Alaska? In quantitative terms, it means that the construction of the dam and pulpmill would provide upward of 1,100 new jobs. The size of the city of Juneau, the State capital, would approximately double. New State and Federal taxes would amount to $4,500,000. These estimates do not include increases in employment and revenues by related industries that would be attracted by this new industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Greater Juneau Borough be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"Resolution 55

"Whereas funds for the Snettisham hydroelectric project were eliminated from the Federal budget for fiscal year 1967; and

"Whereas the decision to eliminate these funds was apparently made before the Juneau timber sale of 8.75 billion board feet of timber by the Forest Service which requires that a pulpmill be established in the sale area to process the timber; and

"Whereas the demand for power in the Greater Juneau Borough is presently at the peak which can be generated by local power sources without the development of additional generation capability; and

"Whereas very substantial normal growth in the demand for power in the Greater Juneau Borough is projected; and

"Whereas the power which Snettisham will provide is particularly needed in order to supply the pulp industry which will develop as a result of the timber sale in addition to being needed to meet the normal growth of power demand; and

"Whereas as a result of representations made to the Bureau of the Budget by Senator E. L. Bartlett, Senator Ernest Gruening, and Representative Ralph J. Rivers, the Alaska congressional delegation, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget has agreed to reconsider the elimination of Snettisham funds from the fiscal 1967 Federal budget; be it

"*Resolved*, That the assembly of the Greater Juneau Borough urges the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to consider the vital effect that the Snettisham hydroelectric project will have on the economic future of the area both in relation to the Juneau timber sale and to the normal economic growth of the area and to recommend that appropriation be made for this project this year."

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable Carl Hayden, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee; the Honorable George H. Mahon, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee; the Honorable Charles L. Schultze, Director, Bureau of the Budget; and to the Honorable E. L. Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

Adopted February 2, 1966.

——— ———, *President.*

Attest:

——— ———, *Clerk.*

——— ———, *Chairman.*

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the loss in taxes alone should rivet our attention. We should realize that the costly war in southeast Asia is likely to mean, as it already has, a reversal of the widely applauded, sound policy of the administration in reducing excise taxes and income taxes. This already has resulted, in the past few weeks, in proposals for the restoration of taxes which were so cheerfully and hopefully eliminated in the 1st session of the 89th Congress. This reduction in taxes was a great achievement, perhaps the greatest achievement in the history of Congress, accomplished with the cooperation of the President and Members of this body and the other body. It was a program that was far reaching, that in many respects was overdue, that covered the entire gamut of our economic and social front, and that did the many things that were sorely needed. It is tragic that now, in the 2d session of the 89th Congress, having marched up the hill, we seem compelled to march down again. This great program of benefit to the American people is being eroded for the benefit of our so-called commitment in southeast Asia, where vast sums, in addition to the military sums which we are being asked to approve now, and which apparently are only a beginning, will be supplemented by vast economic contributions, the end of which we cannot foresee.

The amount required to begin construction of the Snettisham Dam this year is not large—somewhere between $1.5 and $2.5 million. Surely in a budget calling for the expenditure of more than $112 billion, we should be able to find this amount.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, would the Senator from Alaska care to yield now for a discussion of the point he is raising, or would he prefer to wait until the end of his speech?

Mr. GRUENING. I should be very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. Knowing of his interest not merely in a successful conclusion of our engagement in Vietnam, but also of his interest in keeping our economy moving, I am sure that anything that he would say would be pertinent and welcome.

Mr. McGEE. I share with the Senator from Alaska the strong feeling that we have to keep the well-thought-out domestic programs going. It is my fear that some individuals who opposed those programs are now using Vietnam as an excuse to try to cut those programs back. In the first place, that is hypocrisy; in the second place, it is dangerous to cut the programs back on that score. Even with all the pressures that are upon us throughout the world, we cannot afford to forfeit equally significant efforts at home. I wonder whether the Senator from Alaska agrees with that general observation.

Mr. GRUENING. I could not agree more completely. This is one of the most vital issues now before us. It was foreseeable, but it was still an unpleasant surprise when, at the opening of this session of Congress, we examined the budget and noticed some of the far-reaching and drastic slashes which had been made.

We had been hopeful that the President's declarations that we could both continue the war in southeast Asia and maintain our economy at home would be carried out in the budget; but such is not the case. Some of these matters are just being discussed now.

In addition to the budget cuts, there is the depressing possibility that in some cases in which the amount requested in the budget is appropriated, the appropriation will be withheld from expenditure. This has been done before. I sincerely hope that that will not be the case, and that, although people may differ in their reasons for our becoming involved in southeast Asia and on the future conduct of operations there, whether to escalate or to hold firm, nevertheless we shall continue, certainly for the time being, in this first year of our heavy military commitment, not to let the domestic program erode.

Are we going to penalize the poor? Are we going to diminish the foresightedly conceived and hopefully entered into war on poverty? Are we going to stop vocational training, so that the unemployed may have an opportunity to obtain jobs? Are we going to cut into education, which, with our democracy, is one and inseparable? Are we going to stop research and development? Are we going to make the kind of cuts, which I just mentioned, which actually can be demonstrated to be detrimental in terms of income? We shall need to carry on our commitments, both at home and abroad.

I welcome the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. I believe that much of what is being said about our ability to finance these programs is being said as a ruse to attack programs that were fought by these same people so vigorously at the time they were adopted by this body.

I do not believe that people ought to be fooled by that kind of tactic. The Senator from Alaska knows that he and I disagree on our presence in Vietnam, on why we are there, on the need for being there, and on what our presence there may do to our economy.

We were told these same things 30 years ago and 25 years ago when we were facing the great question of the barter system necessitated by Hitler in Europe and the great inroads being made at that time in the Pacific by Japan. We were told then that we could not afford to involve ourselves in both areas. Fortunately, history did not give us an opportunity to choose. We were forced into both areas at the same time.

One war is being fought now in southeast Asia and another war is being fought here at home. We should not sell ourselves short. We are capable of waging both wars. We must rise to the occasion. It would do us little good if, by our attempt to win peace around the world, we were to forfeit the opportunity for peace and security and a better standard of living at home. I do not believe that we dare to split these challenges as though we are able to choose one in preference to the other. I believe that we must have both.

If I may draw a parallel for a moment, in 1939 and 1940, when Mr. Hitler was reaching his peak, and in late 1941, when Pearl Harbor got us involved, I believe the Senator will recall the many things that were being suggested in those days.

I can recall being involved then in debate in the public schools, in which I was teaching, on the question of whether we ought to amend our Constitution to limit the national debt of the United States to $45 billion, because otherwise we would be broke and go down the drain and be lost. This was the argument that was being used to remind us that we could not afford to arm ourselves to slow down Mr. Hitler.

Mr. GRUENING. I recall it very well.

Mr. McGEE. The upshot was that Mr. Hitler and Mr. Mussolini did listen to the arguments that the American forces could not afford to do anything. The events in Pearl Harbor, the Rhineland, Munich, Hungary, Poland, and Ethiopia, triggered by Hitler and Mussolini, compelled us to go to war.

We then took the wraps off our great economy and discovered to our great shock that we had been operating part time for many years in our economy with at least one hand behind our back.

When the war began, we did things that we had been told we were not capable of doing in terms of economics. We unleashed American capitalism. By the end of the war, our national debt had jumped from approximately $40 to $263 billion, and we were still going strong at the end of the war.

We were guilty of underselling our great capabilities. Then, because we had to, we expanded our productivity. We began to tool up our great industry and create more jobs. Many people in our country made fun of an American Vice President because he said that some day we would have 60 million jobs. Many thought he was crazy. Today we have close to 75 million jobs, and we shall have more.

One great weakness, ofttimes repeated in our history, has been the tendency to underestimate ourselves and to sell ourselves short.

With all due respect to the position of my friend, the Senator from Alaska, with which position I disagree so strongly, I say that we must afford both. It would not do us well to reward aggression or to let an aggressor get by with tactics that would build up the kind of tension and head of steam that built up when we thought we could buy time in the thirties when dealing with an aggressor. Aggression is aggression. In time, we had to fight a major world conflict which did, indeed, slow down the great social programs of the thirties, though we recovered quickly as a result of the expansion of our production capabilities.

I believe that it would be far more damaging to the great programs at home if we were to pull back and reward an aggressor with the excuse that we had to protect our programs at home. I do not believe that history gives us that much choice.

We have to do both and we dare not forfeit one in favor of the other. Both programs are called for and both must be carried forward. We have the capability to rise to the demand. However, we do not like to do that. We have not set our personal priorities in the right order. We still like our Cadillacs. I guess that is the wrong term, because they are so common. However, whatever the term might be, we have not really laid our top objectives on the line—education, the battle against poverty, the battle for health and adequate medical care, the battle for individual economic security in the Great Society. These things must be laid alongside of the demand for power politics. Our country is one of the greatest powers available today to do something about the present situation. I believe that the time is at hand when we must make our decision. Let us quit kidding ourselves. We must do it. We can do it, and I hope, in the course of the deliberations of this great body, that we will do it.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I know that the reaction among my constituents—and I have no doubt that the same is true with the constituents of the Senator from Wyoming and others—when we learned that, under the school lunch program, the supply of milk for children was to be drastically reduced, was one of profound shock.

Mr. McGEE. It is ridiculous.

Mr. GRUENING. We can afford to give milk to our children and also engage in a billion-dollar program in the Mekong Delta. The American people will not stand for any other course.

Mr. McGEE. I agree. We can and must do both.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his very helpful contribution.

Mr. President, I am planning, sometime in the course of this discussion, to propose an amendment to the pending legislation, Senate bill 2791, which would provide, that in order for draftees to be sent involuntarily to the war in southeast Asia, Congress must first give its consent.

I have discussed this subject before. The history of my purpose for this amendment should be further explained. It seemed to me that there was a great lack of approval on the part of Congress for our performance in southeast Asia. While I am fully aware that the administration considers that the resolution which was drafted a year ago last August, after the Tonkin Gulf incident, gave the President a blank check to use the Armed Forces of the United States anywhere in southeast Asia that he saw fit. The language of the resolution covered, "Vietnam and the protocol states," which would include Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam. The administration considered that to be ample authorization to escalate the war to the point that we now have 200,000 men engaged in combat in South and North Vietnam.

A number of Senators now feel, and have so expressed themselves, that they had no idea how far this commitment would carry our intervention and escalation.

I say for myself and for my colleague the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that we did not have this feeling. We felt that this was a blank check and that, under the Constitution, this was not the proper way for Congress to delegate its authority to the President.

In any event, the language was plain, it was not in fine print; it was spelled out in the plainest of print. It gave the authority to the President, as he saw fit, to use the Armed Forces of the United States.

Nevertheless, there is a growing feeling, which has been expressed by Senators on both sides of the aisle, that a further expression of congressional intent should be sought and obtained.

My amendment would furnish that opportunity. If agreed to, it would give the Congress the opportunity to determine whether the taking of young draftees from their homes and sending them to southeast Asia to be slaughtered shall be approved or disapproved.

I feel, as I have stated before, that there is a certain difference between these young men and those who have made military service, whether in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Air Force, a part of their career, either permanently or temporarily, and who therefore are bound to follow the orders of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. I feel that they are in a different category from young men who are pursuing their education at home, many of whom now are married but no longer exempt from the draft. I feel that they should not be snatched by the draft and sent into jungle warfare in southeast Asia. Congress should face that problem, and should be on record by voting whether we shall send these boys to Vietnam, or not send them.

This is an important issue. Such a vote would bring the Congress closer to the war. It would enable us to share responsibility with the Executive, who so far, except for the Tonkin Gulf resolution, has been conducting the war merely as an Executive activity.

I discussed this matter with the President last August. It happened that I had an appointment with him, which came about in this manner: I had inserted an item in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD highly praising the President's achievement in securing, through the Congress, his great, unprecedented domestic program. The eulogy which I placed in the RECORD—fully deserved, I felt then and do now—caused him to telephone me at home and thank me for it.

However, to make sure that there was no misunderstanding—although I am sure he was aware of what my attitude had been—I told him that while I sincerely and enthusiastically applauded his domestic program, I was in complete disagreement with his military program in southeast Asia, a disagreement which was not of recent origin, but which began nearly 2 years ago, shortly after President Johnson was inaugurated after campaigning on a platform somewhat more pacifistic than that of his Republican opponent. I felt then that it would have been very easy, at that time, when no men had been sent into combat, when no bombing of North Vietnam had taken place, when the American people were basking in the happy contentment of a pacific way of settling this problem, for that to take place; and in anticipation that the situation might be changed. When the President congratulated me on my statements in praise of the domestic program, I told him that I disagreed with him on the foreign program in southeast Asia, and that I hoped that I would have the opportunity to discuss it with him.

He agreed; and a few days later I received an appointment at the White House. I was given an opportunity to present my views on the conduct of the war—the feeling that we should never have been committed to a ground war on the continent of Asia; that our security was in no wise jeopardized by whatever happened in southeast Asia; that we had not been attacked; that we were engaging in an enterprise without the approval of Congress; and that it could lead only to disaster.

I elaborated on those views, and after I had finished, I told the President that I was preparing, on that very afternoon, to offer an amendment to the military pay bill which was about to come before the Congress to provide precisely that the Congress should approve or disapprove the question of whether draftees should be sent into combat in southeast Asia involuntarily.

The President very emphatically urged me not to do it, pleaded with me not to do it; and when I argued that it was important, and that I felt it desirable that the Congress be on record, he said to me, "If we are not out of there by January, you can do anything you please." He indicated that he thought it unlikely that the draftees would be sent to southeast Asia before January.

On the basis of his urgent plea—and it is very difficult to refuse any urgent request of the President of the United States, not merely for a Member of the House of Representatives or the Senate, but for any member of his party—I agreed that I would not offer the amendment at that time; and I returned to my office and sent him immediately a letter in which I included the text of the amendment that I had proposed to submit that very day and the text of the speech that I had planned to make in support of that amendment, telling him that because of his request and his hope that we would be out of Vietnam by January, I would not submit it.

January has passed, and most of February, and we are not out. We are in, deeper and deeper and deeper. I believe it is desirable, whether or not one may agree with my views on this war, that the Congress be on record on this issue. There are a number of reasons. For one thing, I believe as a matter of good military practice—although I am not a military expert—that some of those 340,000 trained troops which are now stationed in Europe should have priority. They have not been sent to southeast Asia. They, at least, should be sent first, before we take these young draftees from their families and the process of education. We should use those troops, which we have been supporting over in Europe now for many years, who are trained in combat and fully equipped. They should go first.

That is one of the reasons why I have introduced this amendment, and why I think it should be debated when I bring it up, as I hope to in the course of the present dialog.

My position is strongly suported by a member of the Armed Services Committee who recently made a visit to South Vietnam, one of our most enlightened colleagues, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], who incidentally had not taken a very strong position on the situation theretofore, although indicating at various times that he had grave doubts. But upon returning from South Vietnam, he stated that he had reached a very vital and important conclusion, that this was a civil war. Mr. President, that is one of the really important aspects of the situation.

A couple of weeks ago, the Under Secretary of State, Mr. George Ball, made a speech in Chicago, which was reprinted in full in the Washington Post on Sunday, February 6, in which he stated that if this were a civil war, we had no business taking sides in it.

That is precisely the position that I have maintained for more than 2 years. It is a civil war. President Kennedy, who certainly was in a position to know, who was elected to the House of Representatives in 1946 and to the Senate in 1952, and was on the Foreign Relations Committee during all those years of our steadily edging into the present situation, declared it to be a civil war. It is a civil war; and that is one of the many reasons for this debate which is now taking place, and which is so greatly assisted by the wisdom of the Foreign Relations Committee in holding open hearings, so that for the first time the American people may find out what is going on, what are the motivations that brought us in there, and what the prospects are for the future.

I believe, for this reason, that this is an important issue.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). Does the Senator from Alaska yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. GRUENING. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. In all fairness to Secretary Ball, the context in which he made his statement, in the speech to which the Senator from Alaska has referred, was that he was discussing many issues present in Vietnam, that if a civil war were the only issue, it would then be open to question whether we would have any right to be there. But, if I recall the article—and I have not had an opportunity to look at it now for over a week or 10 days—because there were other factors operating on the Vietnamese question, such as that of aggression over the 17th parallel, and interference in whatever civil war characteristics were present there, they had overtones which had to condition our presence there, and it was not a matter of isolating the civil war characteristics in order to make the decision easier for us.

The parallel has also been drawn, if I may suggest to the Senator from Alaska, that we had the same kind of harsh decision—even though in another setting—to make in Greece where a genuine civil war was underway in 1945 and 1946. The "good guys," as the Senator from Alaska refers to them, were located in the rural populations in Greece. They were being used, as the record is now clear in showing, by the forces that were coming across the border from a neighboring Balkan State, with leadership and supplies, and with doctrinaire solutions to capitalize on the division going on within Greece. Yet, President Truman rose to the occasion and backed the established Government, not because they were the "best guys" but because we had to win a position of stability before the voice of democracy, if we will, in Greece, would ever have an opportunity to practice democracy in their civil war.

Critics of the American policy toward Greece asserted that we were supporting their royalty, black marketeers, and embarrassing kinds of public personalities at the expense of the good people in the rural areas who really wanted freedom and democracy. Again, in Greece, the first issue was to erect a wall to seal off the border that would prevent this outside meddling with Greece's internal affairs, because if outsiders had succeeded in meddling, Greece would have had no opportunity to practice democracy, no opportunity for social growth, or economic expansion in the years ahead.

That is the reason we face the requisites in Vietnam at the same time. There are other considerations. But we must keep them in the right order if we are to have an opportunity to rise above the very confused and overlapping, complex, cross currents of the issues which are there, and which were likewise present in Greece.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his helpful contribution. Let me read him presently exactly what Secretary Ball said; but first I should like to say in connection with his remarks that we have supported all kinds of bad eggs. History shows we have frequently supported dictators, crooks, and scoundrels of the worst stripe merely because they surrendered to the idea that they were anti-Communist. That was their passport, that was the "open Sesame" to receive our lavish support. "We are anti-Communist," they would say, no matter what kind of scoundrels they were.

Mr. McGEE. We have been doing that at home, locally.

Mr. GRUENING. The most ruthless dictator in history in Latin America was a man who murdered many people in cold blood, who enriched himself, wrecked his country, and created the existing situation down there. There have been many other such men. I believe it is important that henceforth we consider whom we are supporting, and why.

Mr. McGEE. Is the Senator from Alaska suggesting that perhaps we were unwise in supporting——

Mr. GRUENING. I refer to Trujillo.

Mr. McGEE. The Government in Greece?

Mr. GRUENING. No. I am not. I have no comment on that.

Mr. McGEE. The parallel is a striking one because it had many of the same attributes that make us unhappy today in Vietnam. There was a preponderant military control in Greece. The control centered largely in the capital city, as it does in Saigon in Vietnam. The Greek rural population had no communication with or respect for the Central Government, which is true in Vietnam. Greece was in open rebellion. But, they were also about to be seized by a foreign power. They were being used by groups which the Soviets had trained, educated, and planted across the borders in the Balkan States. Thus, it had all the earmarks of a front takeover, not unlike the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam.

We might learn from those parallels, even though they were not precisely the same, because one involves the Soviet Union and the other involves the overwhelming presence of China farther to the north. These are considerations with respect to which we must make educated guesses. That is one of the reasons for the differences the Senator from Alaska and I share, but which, nonetheless, contribute to this dialog to resolve this very tough question.

Mr. GRUENING. One of the regimes which has come to power by a series of coups, without any democratic practice, has been particularly "perfumed" in that way. We have to keep on insisting on the overly long due reforms which President Eisenhower made conditional in his dealings with Diem—and which he never carried out. Diem was finally "removed"—I will not say with the assistance but certainly with the awareness of our Ambassador down there—after his tyranny, lack of cooperativeness, and lack of public spiritedness became manifest, and when the war was going from bad to worse. Diem's successors have apparently been no different, including the present incumbent, Ky, who, when interviewed on who were his heroes said, "I have only one: Adolf Hitler."

If that is the kind of man we are going to entrust with a reform program and with the inculcation of freedom which we allegedly are fighting for, the outlook is rather bleak.

Mr. McGEE. Let me say to the Senator from Alaska that I deplore such a statement as that attributed to Ky as much as my colleague from Alaska does; but I say that some time, farther down the list of our priorities, Mr. Ky may not be there tomorrow; he may be gone week after next. The point is that Vietnam will still be there, the problem of power will still be there, and the problem of priorities will still stare us in the face. There has been an act of aggression, openly and flagrantly practiced across the line. The suggestion is correct that that kind of aggression should not be rewarded, that once the line can be firmed up, there is then the opportunity to do things the right way—whatever they may be or seem to be—for the people of Vietnam.

Mr. GRUENING. Does not the Senator from Wyoming agree that if Mr. Ky is the best we can produce down there, he being the ninth incumbent after Diem was bumped off, we had better stop trying to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, which, unfortunately, has been the situation down there in trying to get a public spirited and honest executive?

After all, we control the situation. We hold the purse strings. We should be able to achieve that.

Mr. McGEE. I should think so; and I would hope that we would. I would hope that the people of Vietnam and not the United States would be responsible for that, but I have not seen a word to the effect that there would be any opportunity for anyone to try to make something better out of the situation presented by the issues. If we allow the aggressors from the north to take over, it will be gone, and we shall not have an opportunity to reconsider.

Mr. GRUENING. Let me go back to the statement which Secretary Ball made. I hold in my hand a page from the Washington Post of Sunday, February 6, 1966, section E–3. This is what he declared:

> Is the war in South Vietnam an external aggression from the north, or is it an indigenous revolt? This is a question that Americans quite properly ask—and one to which they deserve a satisfactory answer. It is a question which we who have official responsibilities have necessarily probed in great depth. For if the Vietnam war were merely what the Communists say it is—an indigenous rebellion—then the United States would have no business taking sides in the conflict and helping one side to defeat the other by force of arms.

Mr. President, that is a clear statement.

Mr. McGEE. Is that not precisely what I suggested that Secretary Ball said to us? He then goes on to say that it was not what the Communists said it was, but it was an indigenous civil war, does he not?

Mr. GRUENING. But, on the other hand, let me say that a recent observer, one of our colleagues, a member of the Armed Services Committee, who spent considerable time in South Vietnam, reports his views as follows—and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, 1966——

Mr. McGEE. Is the Senator referring to our friend from Ohio?

Mr. GRUENING. Yes. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. He is a most knowledgeable person. He served in the other body. He was elected to this body in the last election. He states as follows:

> This is a civil war going on in Vietnam. Before I visited southeast Asia, it had been my belief that all of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were Communists and infiltrators from the north. But I had not been in Vietnam for more than 4 days—and during that period of time, I was in every area of Vietnam—when almost immediately I observed very definitely that we were involved in a miserable civil war in the steaming jungles and rice paddies of South Vietnam. I learned from General Westmoreland that the bulk of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were born and reared in South Vietnam. I learned from General Stillwell and other generals that 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting the Americans and the South Vietnamese in the Mekong Delta south and west of Saigon were born and reared in that Mekong Delta area. This is a civil war in which we are involved. The fighting has been going on there since 1945. Very definitely, Vietnam is of no strategic importance to the defense of the United States.

The point is that he got this same information from our military authorities, General Westmoreland and General Stillwell. Would the Senator challenge that? Is that not correct?

Mr. McGEE. I would challenge the Senator's interpretation of what he has quoted, because they were responding to the percentage of the Vietcong born in South Vietnam. I was there in 1959, with the Senator from Tennessee. I was there 2 or 3 years later, and then still later. That still does not make me an expert. But we can give an educated guess about what Secretary Ball means.

There are, indeed, dissident forces loose in South Vietnam, but I do not believe that is the preponderant factor that should concern us in our action. We have only to remember that the forces to the north seek to split the country. To permit that would have the same effect that would have taken place in Greece, and that took place in Austria and Czechoslovakia. There should have been action then. There was not. We are not going to get by it by doing nothing. If it is not stopped now, there will be another nation, and then another, that will fall. Then the aggression will have to be stopped at a much greater cost. So now is the time and this is the place.

Is it not significant that of all the dissidents in South Vietnam, not a single sect—neither the Buddhists, the liberals, the students, the militarists, nor the Catholics—has embraced the Vietcong? Not one of them has pointed to the Vietcong and said, "There is our cause. Lead us to a better tomorrow."

With all the divergencies in Vietnam, they have not gone over to the Vietcong. So I say we should look at the Vietcong in proper perspective, the leadership of which is in the National Liberation Front, or Hanoi. This has been established not only by ourselves, but by the International Control Commission, which has been there since 1956. It has established that the real front, the head of this animal, the National Liberation Front, was conceived and born in Hanoi, to serve the cause of Hanoi.

We should have learned enough from the lessons of history to know enough about the operations of a front and a deceptive propaganda wing, not to fall for it.

As to the views of the people, I suppose that one would find a divergence of views anywhere. The boys in the hills are down on capitalists. This is true in my own State of Wyoming. I would assume it to be true in Alaska. What is different in this situation and the reason for our commitment is that it has been clearly demonstrated that the intercession has been from the north.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator and I differ on the view that Hanoi is the villain, that Hanoi started the infiltration. My reading leads me to a different conclusion. It shows that this movement took place because of the violation and our persuasion of Diem to violate the 1954 Geneva agreements to hold elections; it was the tyrannical suppression and jailing of hundreds of people, the suppression of freedoms, which caused the civil war to break out. As we added to our arsenal, infiltration began from the north.

The hearings now being conducted by the Foreign Relations Committee may bring it out. It is important and crucial that it be brought out. I go back to the categorical statement on the part of Secretary Ball which seems to contain the entire issue, namely, that if it were merely an indigenous rebellion, the United States would have no business taking sides in the conflict. I have maintained from the beginning that we had no business taking sides.

I am glad to see that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] is now present and presiding. I say to him that I have just quoted from his address to the Senate on February 8, when he said categorically that:

> This is a civil war going on in Vietnam.

He then stated further that before his visit to southeast Asia:

> It had been my belief that all of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were Communists and infiltrators from the north.

That is the propaganda which the administration has put out.

The Senator from Ohio further said:

> But I had not been in Vietnam for more than 4 days * * * when almost immediately I observed very definitely that we were involved in a miserable civil war in the steaming jungles and rice paddies of South Vietnam. I learned from General Westmoreland that the bulk of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were born and reared in South Vietnam.

General Stilwell said the same thing. That shows that, if we take Secretary Ball's word, we have no business being there. That is the same thing I have maintained from the start.

Mr. McGEE. May I reply to that point? When the Senator refers to the Vietcong and what has been sought to be done through the peasants in South Vietnam, I think the Senator evades the issue and still misconstrues what was said. There again, in terms of powers of leadership, the head of the animal itself is Hanoi. The International Control Commission has documented this fact down to the last comma. Our own intelligence agencies have documented that fact. I do not believe it can be denied. It is a matter of record. It is evident to any rational person that the purpose is to take over South Vietnam. We have a commitment, and we must see it through.

At the end of World War II there was an unhappy division of territories with the Russians. It was done in order to expedite agreements with Russia. There was a division of Germany. There was a division of Berlin. Nobody wanted to see two Berlins, but it seemed to be the easiest way to come to an agreement. Korea was separated at the 38th parallel. Nobody wanted Korea to be separated, but that was the way to come to an agreement. Now we move to Vietnam, to the area which the French once controlled and then left. When the agreement was made to divide, there was a division which was not based on any ethnic division. It was a geographic division. North Vietnam would be north of the 17th parallel, and South Vietnam would be south of it.

Mr. GRUENING. Temporarily only.

Mr. McGEE. Temporarily, just as Korea was temporary, just as Berlin was temporary, and just as Germany was temporary. But the hard fact remains that this was the starting place and the original election to which we have committed ourselves. It has been the one fundamental conviction that we are not going to permit forces on the other side to nibble away in these commitments if there is any status quo on which we could build a better world. If they can get by with nibbling at it, we are rewarding the aggressor, and we shall pay a much heavier penalty at a later date.

That is what we did in Germany, and that is what we did in Berlin. That is what we took on in honoring the agreement in 1956 on the 17th parallel in Vietnam. We did not retreat from those temporary arrangements, temporary arrangements that some day will fade away. They are not designed to be permanent. They are the starting point. We do not dare forfeit them. At this date, it would be more suicidal than if we suggested that in the beginning.

Mr. GRUENING. Is the Senator aware that the United States made a unilateral declaration with respect to the agreement at Geneva that there would be elections; that we stated that as national policy; that we then went back on that declaration and violated that agreement; and that we encourged Diem not to hold those elections? That is the basis on which we have not pulled out.

Mr. McGEE. I do not agree with the Senator. If the Senator will read the RECORD, he will discover that by 1956 one of the two Vietnams had been divided. Ho Chi Minh had already outlawed the political opposition. In North Vietnam there was already but one political group, and that was the Vietminh. That was his group, and it was on that basis that he was going to hold free elections.

What would the Senator have done, even as a dictator in Vietnam?

It has already been stated how free elections were defeated, how they were a mockery, and could not have been and should not have been held. They still may be a long way off in a country as badly torn as Vietnam.

We have a great temptation to project the American image. It is assumed that they know what it is about when they have to face up to responsibilities of any kind in self-expression. I believe we have to understand that we cannot expect the impossible from them. It would destroy them.

There was a case in point when a vote in 1956 would have been like a free election in East Berlin. What kind of election is that? We have to be realistic on this matter and quit hiding behind nice-sounding words.

We must live with the facts of our time. This is difficult for us because we are idealistic. I hope that we apply what we learned in Vietnam, as well as we did in Korea, Berlin, Greece, and elsewhere.

Mr. GRUENING. What kind of democratic, fine American principle is it when it is agreed to go to an election, but when it is found that one is going to lose the election it is called off? It could not happen in the United States, and yet we are projecting that image in other countries. Is it an example of freedom, democracy, and adherence to law?

That election should have been held, but it was not.

Eighty percent of the people in North Vietnam favored Ho Chi Minh. He was their hero and would have been elected.

Mr. McGEE. That was 1954, but in 1956 it was a different kettle of fish when he had abolished the political opposition. We could not lend ourselves to condoning that kind of principle.

Mr. GRUENING. Just as Diem had abolished his opposition in South Vietnam.

Mr. McGEE. It is all the more ridiculous to say that free elections are to be held. There were none of the makings for a free election. We would have to live with the agreement until there was economic growth and expansion that would permit rising to a more sophisticated state.

Mr. GRUENING. The provision was that the elections would be supervised.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is so wrong.

Mr. GRUENING. They were to be supervised.

Mr. McGEE. I have a group waiting for me for lunch. I thank my friend for this dialog.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. General Taylor just finished explaining that the Communists would not agree to any kind of international supervision. They were going to give us a Communist election there.

What would they do? They would go ahead and stuff more ballots in the ballot box than there was population, and at the same time they would hold the other side to an honest count in South Vietnam.

When the Communists had North Vietnam and the anti-Communists had

South Vietnam, 1 million people moved from North Vietnam to South Vietnam to live under a form of government that is other than communism.

It is said that it is not good government. I challenge the Senator to tell me of any government on earth that is worse than government by communism. I would like to know.

The Communists were in the position to stuff the ballot box until it outnumbered the population, while holding the people of South Vietnam to an honest count. The ideas of free election are not ended. We are asking now and are ready now to have a free election.

That is one thing that the Communists would never agree to. They will never agree. Do not think they will make that mistake.

Mr. GRUENING. I would like to know if the question of the Senator is whether there is any government worse than communism.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would like to ask which government, if any, is worse than communism?

Mr. GRUENING. The United States invested $2 million in supporting a Communist dictator in Yugoslavia, Mr. Tito. The State Department and the administration think that that is a good investment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As among Communists, he is the better of a bad lot.

Mr. GRUENING. I do not believe that it follows that the point is logical, when the administration supported a Communist dictator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have been voting against Tito receiving aid from this country.

Mr. GRUENING. So have I.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is a Communist government.

The Senator has yet to name a government worse than the Communist government. He finds fault with our friends. Perhaps some are corrupt. We have even had some dishonest people in our own Government. The Communists do not have to worry about somebody stealing money out of the till because the Communist government owns everything, the houses, and even the eyeballs, and nobody can steal anything because no one is permitted to own anything. Corruption in government is one thing that they do not have to worry about.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. A few minutes ago Gen. Maxwell Taylor was adverted to for the reason that he testified this morning before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The junior Senator from Ohio will not, today or tomorrow morning, pass up other important things to read what Gen. Maxwell Taylor had to say because of an incident that occurred the last time General Taylor testified before a joint meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services. At that time I asked General Taylor that assuming that the civilian Prime Minister of South Vietnam at the time would be overthrown and that the next Prime Minister would step in and announce, "We want the United States to withdraw its forces from South Vietnam," what would be our position keeping in mind that we are there at the invitation of the Government of South Vietnam?

Instead of answering the question, General Taylor said:

> There is no possibility that the present Prime Minister will be overthrown.

That statement is in the record. Within 48 hours after General Taylor had said that there was no possibility that the civilian administration could be overthrown, and before General Taylor could leave the United States, he was proven wrong. Whether the Central Intelligence Agency was to blame for having given him bad intelligence is something that the junior Senator from Ohio does not know. But the stark fact is that within 48 hours of General Taylor's making his positive statement, of General Taylor's posing as an authority because he had been in Vietnam, he was proven wrong. The Senator from Alaska may recall that 10 generals overthrew the civilian government of Prime Minister Quat and shortly afterward installed Air Marshal Ky as Prime Minister; and Ky has been Prime Minister ever since.

I say that although General Taylor was adverted to as an authority, to me he is a poor authority indeed. I do not pay any attention to his statements, and his testimony would not impress me.

But let us return to the facts. Much has been said about the Geneva accords of 1954. Historically, as the Senator from Alaska knows, there are no such countries and there have been no such countries over the years, as North Vietnam and South Vietnam.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, as the Senator from Alaska knows that the Geneva accords of 1954, which the United States agreed to in effect, but which our representatives failed to sign, stated:

> The military demarcation line at the 17th parallel is provisional and should not in any way be considered as constituting a political or territorial boundary.

Then, an International Control Commission was created with representatives from India, Canada, and Poland.

Under the Geneva agreements, an election in Vietnam was scheduled for 1956. That election was never held, and the United States was a party to this failure. President Eisenhower believed that Ho Chi Minh, who was regarded as the George Washington of Vietnam—not the George Washington of North Vietnam and of South Vietnam, but as the hero, the George Washington of Vietnam—would have been elected President had that election been held. Of course, the election was not held because the Central Intelligence Agency and Secretary of State Dulles intervened.

It is true that neither the Senator from Alaska nor the junior Senator from Ohio pretends or presumes to be an expert on southeast Asia. However, I made some trips to southeast Asia. From last September 28 to October 18, I was in Vietnam, Thailand, Korea, the Philippine Republic, Guam, and Hong Kong. The junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and the junior Senator from Ohio were in those countries on an official mission.

We had gone to Korea as guests of the Korean Government, and at the expense of the Korean Government. Although the Senator from Alaska is likely to say that since American taxpayers' money is spent so lavishly all over the world, even though the Government of Korea paid our expenses, the money, in effect, came from the pockets of American taxpayers.

While I was in Vietnam, I did not spend much time in Saigon. I visited every Air Force base in what is called South Vietnam. I visited the camps and the hospitals; I spoke with many Ohio boys. I spoke with one boy from Cuyahoga County, the area where I live, within 3 hours after his leg had been amputated. I obtained the names and addresses of 180 Ohio GI's. Wherever I went in Vietnam, I spoke with soldiers, whenever I could, in the absence of officers. I would say to the young men from Ohio, "I served for 37 months in World War II. I want you to know that I have been an officer and I have been a private. In time of war, it is much harder to be a private than it is to be an officer. Now I am speaking with you in the absence of any officers. What are your problems? Are there any shortages?" With very few exceptions the answer invariably was, "no problems, sir."

The Senator from Alaska will agree with me, I feel certain, that the cream of our crop of American young men is in Vietnam right now. The 200,000 or more GI's who are fighting in the steaming jungles and rice paddies of South Vietnam are the finest of the youth of America. In addition, 50,000 men are attached to the 7th Fleet, offshore. I was in Thailand for 4 or 5 days, a country where we have 30,000 fine soldiers. I also traveled throughout Korea, as far up as Panmunjom, at the line of demarcation. Fifty-three thousand of our soldiers are committed in Korea.

It is said that we are likely to have 500,000 boys in Vietnam by next October. If we do, I will state publicly, anywhere, that the next 300,000 will not be any better than the 200,000-plus who are over there now. They are fine Americans. It is a great misfortune that we have involved these fine young men in a civil war in southeast Asia.

When I was over there, in late September and early October, it had been my belief that the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were all Communists, that they were all infiltrators from the north. I also had been told that Vietnam was of strategic importance to the defense of the United States.

Mr. GRUENING. May I ask the Senator whether he found that that was not true; that they were not all infiltrators?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Of course it was not true. That is not only my observation. General Westmoreland, the commanding officer in Vietnam, on one of the evenings when I was in Saigon, said that the bulk of the Vietcong fighting us in

South Vietnam was born and reared in South Vietnam. Directly after that, when I was in Thailand, Gen. Richard Stilwell, the second in command said—and I remember his exact words:

> Senator, 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting us in the Mekong Delta were born and reared in South Vietnam.

As the Senator knows, the Mekong Delta is west and south of Saigon.

Mr. GRUENING. Demonstrating, as the Senator has pointed out, that this is a civil war.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. This is very definitely a civil war in which we are involved. Futhermore, Vietnam is of no strategic importance whatever to the defense of the United States.

Mr. GRUENING. While the Senator from Ohio was occupying the chair as Presiding Officer I quoted, in my colloquy with the Senator from Wyoming, the statement of Under Secretary of State Ball, to the effect that if the Vietnam war were merely an indigenous rebellion, the United States would have no business taking sides in the conflict and helping one side to defeat the other by force of arms. We are engaged in a civil war. We are taking sides in a civil war.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. To emphasize this fact further, the leader of the National Liberation Front, Nguyen Huu Tho, the leader of the VC's, was born and reared in South Vietnam. It is said that he is not a Communist. He was a lawyer in Saigon.

On the other hand, Prime Minister Ky, who was installed as Prime Minister by the 10 generals who overthrew the civilian government, was born in North Vietnam. He talks about democracy. He does not know what democracy is. The fact is that he was born in the suburbs of Hanoi. He was reared in North Vietnam. Some cabinet members of the Saigon or South Vietnamese Government were born and reared in what is called North Vietnam. In addition, the commanding officers of two of the army corps of the South Vietnamese Army were born in North Vietnam. This is ample evidence that a civil war is being waged there.

We hear many patriotic speeches about our commitments in Vietnam. It was stated on the floor of the Senate that, "We are over there because of the commitments made by three Presidents."

However, the late great President John F. Kennedy said on September 3, shortly before his assassination:

> I don't think that, unless a greater effort is made by the Government to win popular support, the war can be won out there. In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists. We are prepared to continue to assist them, but I don't think that the war can be won unless the people support the effort, and, in my opinion, in the last 2 months the Government has gotten out of touch with the people.

The President was then referring to the Government of Saigon.

On another occasion, President Kennedy said:

> Transforming Vietnam into a western redoubt is ridiculous.

The President was saying, in other words, that Saigon is not a bastion to protect Seattle or Alaska.

The junior Senator from Ohio is not a great admirer of the 8-year administration of President Eisenhower. However, President Eisenhower did not commit us to South Vietnam. President Eisenhower said in 1954 in a letter to the President of South Vietnam:

> I am instructing the American Ambassador to examine with you how an intelligent program of American aid can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial.
>
> He added: The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. * * * The U.S. Government hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government.

Can it really be claimed that Marshal Ky heads a strong, viable state? Throughout the entire time that General Eisenhower was President, the United States military advisory group to Vietnam was increased from 327 in 1953 to a total of 685 on January 20, 1961. What President Eisenhower said and what he did throughout his 8 years as President proves he did not make a commitment of American soldiers to combat in Vietnam.

It is not a truthful statement to say that three Presidents have committed our American forces to fight over there.

I congratulate the Senator from Alaska on the statements he has made here.

It will be recalled that our President said on several occasions that he would go anywhere in the quest of peace and sit down and talk with anyone. However, when Secretary of State Dean Rusk while recently testifying before the Committee on Foreign Relations was asked:

> Would you be agreeable to having the U.S. delegates sit down at a peace conference with representatives of the National Liberation Front or the Vietcong?

He replied:

> I would have to consider that.

There can be no peace anywhere; there can be no cease-fire; and there can be no armistice unless the representatives of those who are doing the fighting, the National Liberation Front, so called, are permitted to participate in the conference.

The Secretary of State is not being honest with the American people when he makes that reservation at the same time that our President is telling the world that we will participate in a peace conference at Geneva or any other place without any conditions whatever.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator not think, in view of the various conflicting statements made by the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense, that the opposition cannot have very much confidence that we can be on the level when and if we reach the peace table? Must we not have a policy firmly enunciated by the President of the United States that this is what we will do, and not have such a policy nullified by a statement from the Secretary of State?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. It would be more encouraging to the American people, and more particularly to the mothers and fathers of youngsters who are likely to be drafted, if an agreement were reached so that our President would not make one statement and then have our warhawk Secretary of State make a contrary statement at almost the same time.

Mr. GRUENING. Is it not a fact that repeatedly through recent months when statements have been issued from our supposedly responsible officials, they have said on the one hand: "We must insist on an independent South Vietnam," and have said on the other hand: "We must adhere to the Geneva accords." The Geneva accords provide for a reunited Vietnam and for an election.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Geneva accords provide for a free election throughout the entire country of Vietnam.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator from Alaska and I would not like it if a Communist were to be elected President of Vietnam.

Mr. GRUENING. Of course not.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. However, it is for the Vietnamese people to determine that by free elections supervised by the International Control Commission. I believe the Senator from Alaska will agree with my statement that the United States does not have a mandate from Almighty God to police the entire world.

The United States is supposed to be the most revolutionary nation on earth. Our Founding Fathers made it that way. Let us hope that we have not become complacent, wealthy, and easygoing to the point that we are now the most unrevolutionary nation in the entire world.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator.

I hope that this colloquy may continue as debate proceeds, but we are under obligation now to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] to take up other business.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF CERTAIN MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of certain measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 929, that the items be considered in sequence, and that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] be granted such additional time as he may need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first measure.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

The resolution (S. Res. 187) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to delay the Senate in its due consideration of these resolutions. I know how useless it is to make any effort to eliminate or even reduce the moneys to be appropriated for the various subcommittees. I expect to make a general statement, and most of the resolutions will probably go unchallenged as far as I am concerned, except where there appears to be an increase in the number of employees.

As I shall demonstrate in a moment, the number of employees on the special committees has increased from 359 to 401. I have a list of the increases, and I shall ask the chairmen of the committees to justify those increases in personnel.

Mr. President, I regret to contest again some of these special resolutions, as I have been doing from year to year. This is a task which I neither look forward to nor enjoy performing. I have stuck with it year after year in the hope that one voice raised in protest would sooner or later have the effect of returning the Senate to a position of giving to the taxpayers respect rather than mere lipservice.

After a battle of 10 years or more, it is my hope every year to find that my efforts have borne fruit. It is my hope to examine the annual list of special resolutions and find that some of these subcommittees of highly questionable value have been dispensed with. It is my continued hope that the expenditures authorized by these annual resolutions will be below last year's total. Unfortunately, these hopes of mine are rarely, if ever, realized.

It sometimes seems to that these subcommittees resemble the hundred-headed hydra—every time one is cut off and done away with, two more jump up to take its place.

This year, for instance, I am glad to see that a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which had as its duty reviewing the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, has passed from existence. It would appear that by this action, a sum of approximately $60,000 will be saved each year. However, such is not the case, as I will point out in a moment.

I could not understand how one of these temporary subcommittees had come to an end for, as we all know, such events rarely take place. Once they are created, the so-called temporary subcommittees have a tendency to go on and on, no matter whether a useful purpose is served or not, or whether the original need for its creation is still to be found. It was my thought to congratulate the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the chairman of the Trading With the Enemy Act Subcommittee on their action in abolishing this subcommittee. However, I found that the subcommittee had been headed by my late friend and distinguished colleague, the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. Olin Johnston.

But even though the Trading With the Enemy Act Subcommittee has passed from existence, we do not find that the authorization request for judiciary subcommittees has been decreased. On the contrary, the requests have been increased from $2,302,800 in the last session to $2,484,800 in this, the second session. The increase amounts to $182,000. I will note in passing that a new subcommittee has been created to take the place of the old, namely, a subcommittee to deal with our criminal laws and procedures to be headed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. I note that this subcommittee was created late last year and funded with $30,000. It is today requesting Senate approval of $120,000 for its operations this year.

My old friend, the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, has also increased once again, as is the case every year, from an authorization of $240,000 last year to a request for $260,000 this year. I note these only in passing, and it is my hope to return to these specific subcommittees in more detail as each chairman speaks to justify his request.

Let us return for a moment to the totals which these resolutions provide. Let us go back 10 years ago to the 84th Congress. A search of the records reveals that in the years 1955 and 1956, the Senate authorized $6,578,859 for special inquiries and investigations and the expenditure of $315,000 for routine purposes for a grand total of $6,893,859. I want to emphasize to the Senate that all but $160,000 of this amount was authorized through special resolutions. As is well known, each committee receives $10,000 per Congress for its operating expenditures under the Reorganization Act of 1946. Some committees, and I am proud to say that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is one of these, make every effort to live within the bounds of this expenditure.

But to return to the record, the total authorized expenditure for committee operations during the 84th Congress was $6,893,859 as I said. The total authorized expenditure for committee operations, including both special inquiries and investigations and routine expenditures on a projected basis will amount to the grand total of $12,138,800 for this 89th Congress; $5,783,000 was authorized for special inquiries and investigations in the last session. Requests before us today amount to $5,733,800. If we include the $230,000 already authorized for routine expenditures, and an estimate of an additional $392,000 which will be included in the legislative appropriations bill to carry on the functions of the Appropriations Committee, we come up with the grand total, as I said, of $12,138,800. This is $5,244,941 above the authorized amount approved by both sessions of the 84th Congress. As a matter of fact, we can see that the authorizations have very nearly doubled over the 10-year period.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the committee authorizations and expenditures for inquiries and investigations from the 84th through the 89th Congress.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT I

Summary of committee authorizations and expenditures for inquiries and investigations, 84th through 89th Congresses

	Authorized	Expended
84th Cong. (1955–56):		
Inquiries and investigations	$6,578,859.94	$4,530,074.67
Routine	315,000.00	239,523.35
Total	6,893,859.94	4,769,598.02
85th Cong. (1956–58):		
Inquiries and investigations	7,958,780.14	5,696,275.34
Routine	320,000.00	210,445.89
Total	8,278,780.14	5,906,721.23
86th Cong. (1959–60):		
Inquiries and investigations	10,458,231.37	7,619,895.65
Routine	300,000.00	214,326.52
Total	10,758,231.37	7,834,222.17
87th Cong. (1961–62):		
Inquiries and investigations	9,458,700.00	7,308,844.72
Routine	283,300.00	215,888.67
Total	9,742,000.00	7,524,733.39
88th Cong. (1963–64):		
Inquiries and investigations	9,802,933.00	7,716,828.20
Routine	280,000.00	202,089.85
Total	10,082,933.00	7,918,918.05
89th Cong.:		
1st sess.: Inquiries and investigations	5,783,000.00	4,361,956.41
2d sess. (projected):		
Inquiries and investigations	[1] 6,125,800.00	----------
Routine	230,000.00	----------
Total	12,138,800.00	----------

[1] Includes additional $392,000 for Senate Appropriations Committee in fiscal year 1967.

NOTE.—Authorization increase over a 10-year period: $5,244,941. Authorization increase over the last Congress: $2,055,867.

Mr. ELLENDER. Even more important, Mr. President, is the fact that the total committee authorizations for the 89th Congress are more than $2 million above those authorized for the 88th Congress—$2,055,867 to be exact.

In other words, the trend goes up and up and it does so in leaps and bounds. We sometimes speak of creeping inflation in the economy. I say that the subcommittee expenditures in the Senate are subject to jumping inflation. It is all the more a pity because we have within our power the means to curb and control this jumping inflation if we but had the will to do so.

The creation of these subcommittees brings problems of both increased staffing, and of where to put all of these extra employees. Last year, for example, Senate passage of a batch of special resolutions provided funds for 359 well-paying positions. This year, the total of resolution employees has jumped to 401—an increase of 42 in less than a year.

Mr. President, heretofore I have confined my remarks to dollars and cents and the material facets of this problem. It is also of great concern to me that the establishing and constant upkeep and maintenance of these highly questionable subcommittees also present a very great policy question as to the Senate's functions.

In short, the creation of these subcommittees represents a way of negating the value of the Reorganization Act of 1946. As is well known, the act of 1946 has as its purpose the streamlining of the Congress and particularly the committee system. It reduced the number of major Senate committees from 33 to 15, but the attempt to consolidate the committees' functions has not been successful, for as Douglass Cater, one of the President's closest advisers and the author of "Power in Washington" points out, the Reorganization Act "has not prevented the spawning of subcommittees." I would like to quote at this point two passages from "Power in Washington," written by Mr. Cater in 1964. These passages are taken from pages 156 and 158:

> The reform of 1946 was intended, among other things, to bring order to the increasingly disintegrate committee system. The number of committees was drastically reduced—from 48 to 19 in the House, 33 to 15 in the Senate—and their jurisdictions carefully specified. To formalize committee procedures, requirements were set governing meeting days, quorums for transacting business, and maintenance of written records.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The Reorganization Act's attempt to reduce the fragmentation of the committee system has had quite a contrary effect. For it has not prevented the spawning of subcommittees. Numbering 180 before the 1946 reform, they now total, by latest count, more than 250. They constitute a locus of legislative action still further removed from the surveillance and the control of Congress and its elected leadership. For the committee member, they present demands on his time and attention that can be dizzying. Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, a member of 15 subcommittees, has described his predicament frankly: "I would not dare say to the people of Illinois that I knew all about all things that go on * * *. To do so I would really need roller skates to get from one subcommittee to another * * *.

Mr. President, these subcommittees raise a problem in economics, a problem in providing adequate space for committee staffs which grow larger each year, and a problem of Senate policy. I will hope to go into some of these problems in greater detail with each committee chairman.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point a résumé of all of the extra employees that are provided for the 34 subcommittees with which we are dealing. As I pointed out previously, the number of extra employees provided by the special resolutions has increased in number from 359 to 401. I ask unanimous consent to have the table placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION EMPLOYEES

	1965	*1966*
1. Aeronautics and Space	5	4
2. Armed Services	12	10
3. Banking and Currency	6	6
4. Federal Housing	8	8
5. Commerce	30	30
6. Foreign Policy	9	16
7. Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations	25	24
8. Executive Reorganization	6	11
9. Foreign Aid Expenditures	4	12
10. Research and Development Programs	--	4
11. Intergovernmental Relations	9	9
12. National Security	9	9
13. Interior	6	6
14. Administrative Practice and Procedure	11	12
15. Antitrust and Monopoly	35	35
16. Constitutional Rights	16	16
17. Criminal Laws and Procedure	--	7
18. Federal Charters	1	1
19. Immigration	10	10
20. Internal Security	28	32
21. Juvenile Delinquency	18	21
22. Patents	8	7
23. Refugees and Escapees	6	7
24. Statute Revision and Codification	3	3
25. Labor and Public Welfare	17	17
26. Post Office and Civil Service	6	9
27. Public Works	4	5
28. Privileges and Elections	8	8
29. Standing Rules of the Senate	5	5
30. Small Business	10	12
31. Aging	14	14
32. Constitutional Amendments	5	9
33. Judicial System	7	15
34. Migratory Labor	8	7
Total	359	401

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that until June 30 of last year, each standing committee was permitted to spend, without resolution, $168,432. That was the case up to June 30 of 1965.

Since that time, because of the increase in salaries voted by this Congress, every standing committee can spend at the rate of $174,495. That is to employ and pay the regular staff of each committee.

As all of us know, under the Reorganization Act of 1946, each committee was permitted to select four specialists and six clericals. However, in the course of time, many of the standing committees have been able to have additional help provided through resolutions. For example, the Foreign Relations Committee has a few extra employees.

The same goes for the Government Operations Committee. The same goes for the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, counting the amount I have just mentioned, $174,495, which is made available to every Senate committee, has in the past and up to now raised the ante to $355,400. This has been generally true of the special resolutions. In addition to the four specialists and the six clericals allowed to each committee, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has provided an additional staff of 17 persons.

Mr. President, I am calling this matter to the attention of the Senate to indicate the extent to which the costs of operating the Senate have increased.

I would like to say a few words in respect to my old friend, the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

Before I do so, I yield to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator. I commend him for what he is saying. What I am about to say does not pertain to the particular resolution that is before the Senate. It should be adopted. I do not make any criticism of any Senator or committee or staff member. I know that in many instances they work long and hard and do a good job. I believe we must turn to what has been a practice which is leading in the wrong direction. The Senator from Louisiana has put his finger on it—too many of them.

By the creation of additional subcommittees, the whole intent and purpose of the Reorganization Act has been thwarted. Also, as the committees increase and the staffs become larger, even more staffs are needed. So we have more layers of staffs in committees and subcommittees to keep checking on. So instead of Congress solving the problem, it is creating problems.

I hope the commission studying the reorganization of the Congress can deal with this problem.

Senators and Representatives who are elected by the people should be making the detailed decisions, and not adopting the policy decisions which are being made by staffs. Because so much is going on, that is happening. The staff members may be competent and patriotic but they are not responsible to the electorate.

I point the finger of accusation at no one. I am talking about a system and practice. In the past some of those who have controlled committees have not operated through subcommittees.

I believe that we ought to turn our attention to a few of the problems that subcommittees cause. In the first place, a Member is called upon to serve on many subcommittees. His time is scattered and his duties are multiplied. But after the subcommittee and the staff of the subcommittee have mastered a subject, still it must go to the full committee. The full committee must again master it if they are going to have an intelligent idea of what is presented to the Senate.

As a result, instead of saving time of Members of Congress, more time of the Member is taken. Instead of enabling him to do a better job, the various layers of committees, the multiplicity of staff, and the amount of staff required to keep track of what the staffs are doing, keeps us in a vicious circle.

I believe that this problem ought to be approached in an objective way. I hope that the current committee studying reorganization can deal with it.

I wish to stress the point that I am not critical of any Senator or any committee, because I know how hard they work. I know how hard many members of the staff work.

I am raising my voice against a system and a practice that has caused too many subcommittees that are really operating as full committees, and too much staff around those committees, so that there are too many layers to go through. They add to the work of the members, lessening efficiency instead of increasing it because of many decisions to be made by individuals who cannot be reached.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. I am not naming anybody.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not trying to point the finger of scorn in the direction of anybody. I know that all Senators work hard, but they seem to want to multiply these efforts.

To me it seems ridiculous for us to have provided under the 1946 Reorganization Act a total of 160 employees to work on the 16 standing committees, and then to find out that we have 401 employees on the subcommittees.

In other words, there are about 2½ times more employees on the subcommittees than on the regular committees.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 187.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 187

Resolved, That the Committee on Aeronautical and Spaces Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized, from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable, (2) employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency of the Government concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

(b) The minority is authorized to select one person for appointment as an assistant or consultant, and the person so selected shall be appointed. No assistant or consultant may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $2,200 the annual gross rate of compensation of any person so selected by the minority.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I commend the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. In 1965, the committee requested $95,000. Five persons were employed. In 1966, the request is for $50,000. I shall not attempt to find out why those persons are necessary. I tried to do so last year but did not get far.

As I stated in my opening remarks, it is not my intention to question the requests of any committees unless there has been an increase in the number of employees.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, before taking up the next resolution, I wish to speak in defense of the resolutions that are coming before the Senate. There are 34 of them. I might add that I wish to speak in defense of the entire committee system. There is one other committee, and that is the Committee on Penitentiaries. But it does not have a staff, so we cannot count one that does not have a staff. I do not believe that that committee has a room, either.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then why not drop it? Why is $5,000 provided for this year? Why not get rid of the subcommittee?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The subcommittee spent only $1,200.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not care if it spent only "2-bits." Even if it did not spend 5 cents, why spend more?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The Federal penitentiaries of the United States come under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Senate. It is necessary that they be visited occasionally. Occasions arise which need the attention of the Senate. When such occasions arise, it is necessary to send someone to check what is happening. It is necessary to investigate riots, prison conditions, health, doctors, and so forth. On such occasions, it is necessary to spend money. So the subcommittee is necessary, although it spends little money and has no staff.

The Committee on Rules and Administration creates no committees whatsoever. We have nothing to do with the number of committees that exist, the number of persons employed on the staffs, or anything else of that kind.

We have some problems about providing rooms. I wish to say for the benefit of all Senators that no rooms are available, so that any questions on their part might be headed off.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is now engaged in a study of reorganization. I presume that his Joint Committee on Reorganization will make recommendations as to committees and subcommittees, as was done several years ago. But the Committee on Rules and Administration is not the committee that reduces the number of committees, adds to them, subtracts from them, or anything else. We have no authority whatsoever in that direction.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then why do these resolutions go before the Committee on Rules and Administration before they are reported to the Senate? I understood that the Rules Committee had a perfect right to approve or reject requests for increases or decreases; but if its approval is automatic and the committee has to approve them without regard to its own opinion, why not abolish the Rules Committee and let the resolutions come directly to the Senate?

Does the committee not exercise its own opinions in reporting these resolutions?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I believe it is well known by most Senators that the chairman of every committee submits a request on behalf of the majority and the minority of the committee. He states the number of employees of the committee, the amount of money he seeks for the year, the amount he used in the previous year; the appropriation or authorization, and the amount he turned back or did not use. That information is shown together with other information before the committee. It is contained in the reports.

So far as I and the other members of the committee are concerned, we hear the chairmen of the committees and the chairmen of the subcommittees justify their requests. But I am in no position to tell the chairman of any committee the number of employees or the size of the staff he should have.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could not the Senator perhaps obtain that information by ascertaining the kind of duty that is performed by a subcommittee and where the subcommittee employees work?

I understand it is within the province of the Committee on Rules and Administration to ascertain where the employees work and what they do. Next year something should be done. It is too late this year. If the Senator were to call in the chairmen and the persons who work on the subcommittees and ask what they have been doing, he would perhaps be enlightened. I have heard it said that some of the employees work out on the hustings for some of the bosses, though I cannot prove it.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I should be glad to answer that question right now.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I observe in the Chamber many chairmen of committees who have appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration to justify what they are seeking. The committee does inquire as to the number of employees on a subcommittee's staff and what they are doing. But I personally cannot sit in every hearing on every subcommittee to see the number of people who are employed and then report back. That is a little beyond the scope of my endurance. The Senator from Louisiana can make his own check of committees, one by one, and question the chairmen and satisfy himself as to whether the employees are needed or not. I have done the only thing I know the Committee on Rules and Administration is supposed to do. We have asked for a justification of the number of employees, the amount of salaries paid, and the increase in the number of employees over last year and the year before.

There was not a dissenting vote from the nine members on the Committee on Rules and Administration on any of the resolutions presented the other day. This is not a matter of one, two, or three men passing on all these resolutions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from North Carolina made the point that he had no alternative except to report these resolutions. The report states:

> The Committee on Rules and Administration, to which the resolution was referred, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the resolution be agreed to.

This is expressing an opinion.

The Senator may be correct in recommending these increases. However, the point is that the Senator claims he did examine, approve, and recommend these items. Certainly the committee did not have to make the recommendation. It could have reported that it recommended the requests unfavorably, and that they not be approved.

I disagree with the Senator from North Carolina when he states that the Committee on Rules and Administration has no responsibility to examine these requests and make recommendations to the Senate. The committee does have a responsibility. That is the very reason why the requests were sent to the committee. However, in discharging its responsibility the committee has approved these requests each year and recommended that they be increased.

The committee may not have exercised its authority or discharged its responsibilities but that does not excuse it.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, these requests were examined. No committee member recommended that the amounts be reduced.

I announced on the Senate floor some time ago that these meetings were open and that any Senator could attend and object or make recommendations or do anything that he wanted to do. I do not see anything else that our committee could have done. In each case the ranking minority member of the committee who requested the amount recommended that it be granted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In the event that the ranking minority member of a committee were to disagree would the request have been rejected?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I do not know. I suppose that the request would not come from his committee in that event. Such action does not take place in our committee. The ranking member of the committee has acted on the measure in committee before the request comes to our committee. We have letters to that effect.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the ranking minority member of the committee were to disagree with the recommendation, would his position be honored by the Committee on Rules and Administration and would the request for an increase be rejected?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I can answer that better by saying to the Senator that if the ranking minority member of a subcommittee or a full committee were to appear at our committee meeting when the request was brought up and if he were heard, our committee would consider the matter. I do not say that we would reject the entire authorization. The majority of the entire committee would have a say about that.

Mr. President, I point out that the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences had an authorization last year of $95,000. It used approximately $38,000 through yesterday. All these authorizations are through yesterday. The authorization last year was for February 1. It was not acted on. So these figures are up to date, as of yesterday.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The resolution (S. Res. 212) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Armed Services for making certain studies was considered and agreed to as follows:

S. Res. 212

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) common defense generally;

(2) the Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force generally;

(3) soldiers' and sailors' homes;

(4) pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;

(5) selective service;

(6) size and composition of the Army, Navy, and Air Force;

(7) forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards;

(8) ammunition depots;

(9) maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone;

(10) conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves;

(11) strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense; and

(12) aeronautical and space activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $175,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO MAKE CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS AND PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDS THEREFOR

The resolution (S. Res. 173) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations, and to provide additional funds therefor was considered and agreed to as follows:

S. Res. 173

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) banking and currency generally;

(2) financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) deposit insurance;

(4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;

(5) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;

(6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

(7) prices of commodities, rents, and services;

(8) securities and exchange regulations;

(9) credit problems of small business; and

(10) international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $110,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The resolution (S. Res. 172) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Banking and Currency was considered and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 172

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $138,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORITY FOR THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO MAKE CERTAIN STUDIES

The resolution (S. Res. 213) to authorize the Committee on Commerce to make certain studies, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 213

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) interstate commerce generally;

(2) foreign commerce generally;

(3) maritime matters;

(4) interoceanic canals;

(5) transportation policy;

(6) domestic surface transportation, including pipelines and highway safety;

(7) communications, including a complete review of national and international telecommunications and the use of communications satellites;

(8) Federal power matters;

(9) civil aeronautics;

(10) fisheries and wildlife;

(11) marine sciences; and

(12) weather services and modification, including the use of weather satellites.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid of any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $450,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO MAKE CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 183) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of Government was considered and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 183

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government, including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corrupt or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government; and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public: *Provided,* That, in carrying out the duties herein set forth, the inquiries of this committee or any subcommittee thereof shall not be deemed limited to the records, functions, and operations of the particular branch of the Government under inquiry, and may extend to the records and activities of persons, corporations, or other entities dealing with or affecting that particular branch of the Government.

SEC. 2. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been engaged in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 3. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized and directed from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, to make a full and complete study and investigation of syndicated or organized crime which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, what facilities, devices, method, techniques, and technicalities are being used or employed, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the law of the United States or the laws of any State and, further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activities have infiltrated into lawful business enterprise; and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce; and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against the occurrences of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on the Judiciary or by the Committee on Commerce of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 4. The Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1967, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include in its report specific legislative recommendations.

SEC. 5. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized, as it deems necessary and appropriate, to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) administer such oaths; (5) take such testimony, either orally or by sworn statement; (6) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (7) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable; and, further, with the consent of other committees or subcommittees to work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee: *Provided further,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

(b) For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, or its chairman, or any other member of the committee or subcommittee designated by the chairman, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized, in its or his or their discretion, as may be deemed advisable, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents.

SEC. 6. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $435,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY AND EVALUATION OF EFFECTS OF LAWS PERTAINING TO PROPOSED REORGANIZATION IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The resolution (S. Res. 186) to provide funds to study and evaluate the effects of laws pertaining to proposed reorganization in the executive branch of the Government was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, last year this subcommittee spent $57,500, and had six employees. There is now a request for $120,000 for an increase of five employees.

I should like to ask why this is necessary.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] has asked the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] to handle this matter for him.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I recall that last year there was a split subcommittee. There was money provided for a subcommittee and later the committee was split. Instead of having one subcommittee, we now have two. The executive reorganization, as I have just indicated, called for six employees and a total of $57,500. This year, the committee has asked for 11 employees and $120,000.

I believe that the Senate ought to know why it is that this subcommittee has been recreated and why there should be an additional number of employees.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I am delighted that my friend the Senator from Louisiana has asked that question. I shall do my best to try to answer it.

This subcommittee has the responsibility for the reorganization plans that take place within the executive branch of the Government.

As the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out today, and so frequently in the past, the Government must be modernized and economy must take place within the executive branch of the Government.

No committee has a greater responsibility than this subcommittee.

President Johnson told the Congress in his state of the Union message:

> I propose we take steps to modernize and streamline the executive branch and to modernize the relations between city, State, and Nation. A new Department of Transportation is needed to bring together our transportation activities.

The subcommittee expects to hold lengthy and complete hearings on the bill to create a Department of Transportation. It will also hold hearings on an estimated 20 reorganization plans which the President has indicated he will send to the Congress this year. The first of these plans, a controversial proposal to transfer the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice, has already been forwarded from the White House and will receive early consideration.

The subcommittee will also continue to exercise its oversight responsibilities in such fields as traffic safety, pesticides, and urban development.

Mr. President, the 89th Congress has already compiled an excellent record in promoting greater efficiency and economy in Government. In addition to creating a new Department of Housing and Urban Development, and extending the President's authority to submit reorganization plans to Congress, five such plans were submitted at the first session and went into effect.

Economy, efficiency, and effective management in the Federal Establishment can only be achieved through a constant review of the structure and functioning procedures of Government departments and bureaus. Congress shares responsibility for this review and need not wait for the executive branch to suggest reform. The Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, with its small staff and modest budget, is in a position to take the initiative in matters of governmental management and achieve important savings to the taypayer.

As I stated in the beginning, the Senator from Louisiana has led the fight on the floor of the Senate and publicly for the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government and for economy in the Government and a streamlined Government. This subcommittee has a major responsibility in this area.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought the Government Operations Committee, headed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], attended to that.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. This is a subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. How was it done before the creation of this subcommittee?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. While we have had subcommittees to do the work at different times, we have never before had an anticipated flood of 20 reorganization plans in a year. I do not believe this subcommittee will be able to do all of them. If these plans all come up at once, it will mean that other subcommittees will have to do some of the work. This subcommittee cannot handle 20 reorganization plans during 1 year, particularly if they all come up at one time. Other subcommittees or the full committee will have to handle some of them.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I think that is true, without any question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it unusual to have this many reorganizations?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Most unusual.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I might point out that last year there were five.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. As my friend knows those plans have to be processed, because within 60 days' time they go into effect and become law. Unless they are processed and unless there is developed a record upon which the Senate or the House, as the case may be, acts affirmatively to reject the plan, it becomes law.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are these 20 reorganization plans before this subcommittee now?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. No, they have not been sent up.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. One has been sent so far, but we have been advised——

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. There will be approximately 20.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. There will be approximately 20. I have been so advised by the Bureau of the Budget. I am sure the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] has likewise been so advised.

As I have stated, at the moment I have doubts that that one subcommittee would be able to process all of them; certainly not if they come up here 6 or 8 or 10 at a time. I do not believe they can do it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I probably agree with the Senator, but the subcommittee was formed last year, and I wonder how many reorganization plans it had before it then.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. That is not the only function it performs. It handles other bills. Senator RIBICOFF has been holding extended hearings, as I recall, on the problem of traffic safety and the legislation contemplated thereon. Mr. President, I have an editorial from the Washington Evening Star, heartily commending him for the work he has done so far.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIBICOFF ROAD SAFETY BILL HAILED

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Well, sir, it sounds an awful lot like heresy in the ranks of the States rights religion, but the avowal has to be made. Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF's bill to create a National Highway Traffic Safety Center ranks among the finest pieces of domestic legislation now pending in the Congress. The bill offered by the Connecticut Democrat should be passed.

It may seem incredible for a card-carrying conservative to speak in this unseemly fashion of the Ribicoff bill. After all, the measure numbers among its sponsors such certified liberals as CLARK, DOUGLAS, GRUENING, MCGEE, MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and KENNEDY of New York. The bill would create one more program of Federal grants in aid, to be added to the 120 such programs already channeling $13 billion a year back to the subservient States. One section of the proposed act would involve an educational frill. On the face of it, the bill bears all the aspects of legislation we could get along without.

Yet in point of fact, the wonder is that Congress has waited so long to tackle the prodigious problems of highway safety; and the puzzling thing is that the people themselves have applied no pressure for congressional action.

Surely, if there had been any disposition in the Congress to act, a solid constitutional basis could have been laid long ago for Federal action in the field. The power to regulate commerce among the States plainly could be invoked to justify sweeping Federal regulation of our highways. Yet the Congress seldom has concerned itself with highway safety as such. A House committee conducted certain hearings in 1959, issued a largely unread report in 1961, and came up 2 years ago with Public Law 88–515, prescribing certain safety standards for motor vehicles purchased by the Government. Apart from a few small grants for research, that has been the size of the Federal interest.

A stoic and indifferent public has not asked for anything more. The American character, strange to say, seems almost averse to safety regulations. When the automobile comes in, reason departs; and the otherwise rational fellow succumbs to the automotive obsession. His mind blots out the unlovely aspects of his love—the cost, the fumes, the accident statistics. As an abstract proposition, highway safety may have some appeal. In terms of specifics, highway safety is a bore. The subject leaves him numb. He is deaf to the grisly facts.

Just a few days ago, while RIBICOFF was holding hearings on his bill, the annual report for 1965 came in from the National Safety Council. Highway accidents last year killed 49,000 persons, seriously injured 1.8 million more, and caused economic losses of $8.5 billion. These are staggering figures. But who is staggered by them? To judge from congressional mail, the public is far more concerned about the slaughter of steers. It is page one news when three soldiers die of meningitis, but it is ho-hum when nearly a thousand human beings are brought home dead off the highways every week.

RIBICOFF is determined to break through this stone wall of indifference. As one of Connecticut's most able governors, he made highway safety a personal crusade. Through research, education, stringent laws and firm enforcement, he got spectacular results. Some of these same approaches are embodied in his bill.

One part of the bill would create a National Highway Traffic Safety Center, equipped to conduct major programs of research and engineering. Out of these studies would come certain national minimum standards for highway traffic safety. The assumption is that eventually these standards would be applied to the design of automobiles, the engineering of highways, the fixing of speed limits, and the training and licensing of drivers.

A second part of the bill would provide incentive grants to the States, amounting to perhaps $105 million a year, to finance new or expanded programs of vehicle inspection and of driver training in the schools. It is not out of the question to imagine a day of Federal standards for operator's permits. Speeding on a Federal-aid highway may yet become a Federal offense, subject to trial in Federal courts. Convictions may be federally recorded as a factor in the fixing of punishment or the suspension of permits across the Nation.

Nothing so drastic may develop, for much can be accomplished by the auto manufacturers and by the States. Significantly, General Motors will make collapsible steering wheels a standard feature on its 1967 models. Other design changes, aimed solely at safety, doubtless can be achieved by indirect means instead of by compulsion. RIBICOFF's bill is a moderate bill, limited in scope but of vast potential value. It merits more favorable attention than it has received from motorists thus far.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Senator RIBICOFF led the fight for traffic safety while Governor of the State of Connecticut, and is now continuing his efforts.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And other bills are referred to that subcommittee from time to time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the transportation problems of the Nation will come before this subcommittee? I thought the Commerce Committee had to do with that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Under the Reorganization Act, the reorganization plan conferring that power upon the President comes before the Government Operations Committee. That committee has jurisdiction.

Mr. ELLENDER. But as to traffic safety, what is involved in the way of reorganization?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know what will be involved in it.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Committee on Commerce has obtained, for such investigations, almost half a million dollars. We just agreed to it a minute ago. I wonder why it is——

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I can tell the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why should the traffic safety problem now come before this subcommittee? It is something new.

I wonder if the Senator from Arkansas would agree that if the reorganization plans remain at four or five per year, his committee can handle them; and if so——

Mr. McCLELLAN. I would think it could handle that number.

Mr. ELLENDER. Because this year 20 are anticipated, with only 1 having come thus far, why did the committee see fit to organize this special subcommittee?

Mr. McCLELLAN. This is not a special subcommittee organized for that purpose only. This subcommittee has other jurisdictions; other legislation is referred to it.

I point out that under the rules of the Senate, subsection (b) of section (j) of rule XXV provides, among other things, that reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations. The Senate has placed the jurisdiction there; that is why it goes there.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can understand that, if reorganization is involved.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It involves a reorganization plan.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean for transportation?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Department of Transportation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why does not that go before the Commerce Committee?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I cannot answer that. The Senate has provided that these reorganization plans shall go before the Committee on Government Operations. That is the only answer I can give.

Mr. ELLENDER. With only one before the committee now——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, there is only one thing before the Senate now, but we know that many things will come up before the session is over. We have already been advised.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 186) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 186

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study for the purpose of evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the executive branch of the Government, and to consider reorganizations proposed therein.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $120,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF FOREIGN AID EXPENDITURES

The resolution (S. Res. 182) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of all matters pertaining to foreign assistance operations by the Federal Government was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this is another branch of the subcommittee which split last year, as to the amount given to each of these, executive reorganization received $57,500, and is now asking for $120,000, as I have indicated.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. $115,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. $120,000.

Mr. GRUENING. $115,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am talking about the resolution just passed on executive reorganization.

Mr. GRUENING. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. ELLENDER. This committee, which until last year was combined with the other committee concerning which the resolution was just passed, also received last year $57,500, and it had four employees. This year, there is a request for $115,000, with an additional eight employees.

I should like to find out from whoever is chairman of this subcommittee the reason for the increase from 4 employees to 12.

Mr. GRUENING. Is the Senator speaking of Senator Ribicoff's subcommittee?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; foreign aid expenditures.

Mr. GRUENING. Our subcommittee has had 8 employees, and will be increased to 12. The reason for that is that we are conducting a number of very important investigations, which will result in saving the Government a great deal of money. One of these is an investigation of the disposal of surplus property, which has become a $6½ billion annual affair.

The property is scattered all over the world. It includes, we have discovered, items that will enable us to save the Government many times the total cost of this appropriation. Moreover, that is only one of our functions.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of what surplus property is the Senator speaking?

Mr. GRUENING. All the surplus property given away each year, largely by the Department of Defense. It includes everything: buildings and real estate, ships, planes, automotive machinery, refrigerators—everything one can possibly think of.

Much of that property is being disposed of at a negligible figure; and we believe we can find ways of saving the Government millions of dollars a year by a proper reorganization of the system. We have already found out a good deal about it.

That is only one of about six programs we are investigating. Another is foreign aid. We are conducting an investigation of foreign aid in five Latin American countries, similar to the investigation made 3 years ago, when we investigated aid in 10 foreign countries, as a result of which amendments to the foreign aid bill were obtained which saved substantial money. We obtained an increase in the loan interest rate from three-quarters of 1 percent to 2 percent. In Latin American countries where we find substantial waste and extravagance, and projects which have no justification, I think we can save very large amounts of money for the taxpayers.

We can demonstrate great savings to the Government. This is not a very large appropriation for the amount of work we will do. Those are two of the subjects we are investigating.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator stated that in 1965 he employed eight workers, and he used the sum of $57,500 to employ them; and now he wishes to add four more employees, which is doubling the appropriation. Why is that necessary?

Mr. GRUENING. Because this is a much larger investigation, for one thing. Of the 12 employees, 2 are part time. Last year's authorization came to a total of $91,000. I believe that these are all investigations toward which I know the Senator from Louisiana has been sympathetic. They will result in substantial savings.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, I, myself, have conducted many investigations.

Mr. GRUENING. And very competent investigations, too.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not have a staff of 8, 12, or even 2 employees. I went out alone and did it. I made my own notes and came back and made my own reports. I am therefore wondering how much more effective the Senator's investigations are going to be than many of those which have been conducted in the past.

Mr. GRUENING. I assure the Senator that the investigations which deal with surplus property that no one man could possibly investigate, even one so able as the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. This investigation involves Army surplus; does it not?

Mr. GRUENING. Largely. The greatest amount is generated from the armed services. We get rid of the materiel. It is first repaired and then easily disposed of. Then we take it over as foreign aid, which is given to foreign countries, when it could very well be sold at a profit to the United States, or it could be repaired and continue to be used.

We have evidence of that already. I believe the Senator will find that the subcommittee, as much as any, will be amply justified both by economies and greater efficiency which its investigations will bring to light.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume that a committee of this kind will mushroom if it ever starts. I predict that next year it will come in asking for more money; but, since this program deals with the armed services, I wonder why it does not remain with the armed services?

Mr. GRUENING. That deals only with one aspect, which is really not an aspect exclusively connected with the armed services, although the armed services have generated a great amount of surplus. We have evidence of surplus, of practically new material not even being uncrated which is taken over into the foreign aid program. It then becomes another spigot of foreign aid, when it could be saved and sold, bringing a return to the U.S. Treasury. It could also go to some of the States. The States could buy it and make good use of it. We find that domestic needs are frequently neglected in this program. We have requests from States such as the Senator's, which wish desperately to obtain some of the materials which are being disposed of and going to foreign countries. We believe that is a point which should be carefully examined.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Mondale in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 182) was agreed to as follows:

S. Res. 182

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction, specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the operation of foreign assistance activities by the Federal Government, with a view to determining the economy and efficiency of such activities.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $115,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, let me add the justification for that. Last year $91,500 was authorized. Only $51,000 was spent.

We asked all these committees whether they could not try to cut down the amounts asked for. Each one pledged its best efforts to reduce them and to turn back every cent possible. We hope that they will do so.

AUTHORIZATION TO COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO STUDY ORIGIN OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FINANCED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 218) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to study the origin of research and development programs financed by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I notice that this is a new undertaking. The request is for $66,000 and for four employees. I wonder what is being done in this connection?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I believe that the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] can speak on this subject.

Mr. MUSKIE. I am not a member of the subcommittee, but I am a member of the full committee.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris], who is unavoidably absent from the Senate today, asked me to handle this matter for him.

The subcommittee was created by the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] last August 20.

His statement appears in the Record of August 20, 1965, together with a justification by the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris].

Yesterday, according to the Record at page 3124, the chairman of the subcommittee inserted in the Record a justification of this subcommittee. I read briefly from that statement, as follows:

> The Subcommittee on Government Research is the only subcommittee in the Senate which has Government-wide jurisdiction in the field of research and development being carried on by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Virtually every major agency or department in the Federal Government annually contracts for research and development. Last year the Federal Government spent a total of $15.5 billion for this purpose. The bulk of this figure, of course, was in the development field, but much of it was in basic research, both in the social and physical sciences.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Some of the very serious questions for which Congress must find the answers, suggest the fields of inquiry scheduled by our subcommittee.
>
> First. Are the large expenditures for research and development and the various component research project expenditures necessary and justified?
>
> Second. To what extent are improved administrative procedures required to guard against or eliminate unnecessary or improper overlapping and duplication among the Federal agencies?
>
> Third. How may we establish broad national policies for making value judgments on how much emphasis will be given to various fields of research concerned, as compared with others, and for the best use of our limited national research manpower resources?
>
> Fourth. How may we better provide for the dissemination of research results for governmental, institutional, and industrial use?
>
> Fifth. How may we be more certain of fairness in the distribution of Government research contracts among potential research contract recipients, particularly institutions of higher education?

I may add to what the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee said in his remarks in the Record yesterday by saying that the full Committee on Government Operations has the responsibility for continuing oversight of all operations of the Government, from the point of view of efficiency and economy.

This is an activity of Government research and development which has vastly grown, especially in the post-World War II period.

The chairman of the full committee decided to look into what is being done, in depth, and to determine whether too little or too much is being done, and whether it can be done much better.

Therefore, this is consistent with the continuing responsibility of the Committee on Government Operations. It is important that the activity should be delegated to the subcommittee at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has this not been done before by the full committee?

Mr. MUSKIE. The full committee has worked in this field, in a limited sense, in connection with hearings on these activities, from the point of view of both labor contracts and management. Therefore, from time to time the full committee has devoted its attention to this problem.

Former Senator Humphrey, when he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, looked into the question of research in the field of health and international organizations.

Therefore, from time to time, the full committee has devoted its attention to one aspect or another of the research and development activities of the Government. An across-the-board study in depth is proposed. I know that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris] could respond more specifically to the Senator's questions, but this is my impression of what has been proposed.

The full committee was convinced of the justification of this activity when it was suggested by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan]. I really believe that this is a worthwhile inquiry.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume, from what the Senator has said, that this will be a permanent subcommittee.

Mr. MUSKIE. If the problem continued, the work of the subcommittee could continue. I am not in a position to promise its discontinuance. I am not the chairman of the committee or a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure it will not be discontinued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 218) was agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 218

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:

(1) the operations of research and development programs financed by departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including research in such fields as economics and social science, as well as basic science, research, and technology;

(2) review those programs now being carried out through contracts with higher educational institutions and private organizations, corporations, and individuals to determine the need for the establishment of national research, development, and manpower policies and programs, in order to bring about Government-wide coordination and elimination of overlapping and duplication of scientific and research activities; and

(3) examine existing research information operations, the impact of Federal research and development programs on institutions of higher learning, and to recommend the establishment of programs to insure equitable distribution of research and development contracts among such institutions and other contractors.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized—

(1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable;

(2) to employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority of the committee is authorized at its discretion to select one employee for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and

(3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize on a reimbursable basis the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $66,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION OF STUDY OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES

The resolution (S. Res. 205) authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 205

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by subsection 1(g)(2)(D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, including an evaluation of studies, reports, and recommendations made thereon and submitted to the Congress by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86–380, approved by the President on September 24, 1959.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $137,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORITY TO STUDY CERTAIN ASPECTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 181) to study certain aspects of national security and international operations was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 181

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:

(1) the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(2) the capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge, talents, and skills;

(3) the adequacy of present intergovernmental relationships between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member; and

(4) legislative and other proposals or means to improve these methods, processes, and relationships.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized—

(1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable;

(2) to employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority of the committee is authorized at its discretion to select one employee for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and

(3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize on a reimbursable basis the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

The resolution (S. Res. 171) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 171

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to Indian affairs; irrigation and reclamation; minerals, materials, and fuels; public lands; and territories and insular affairs.

SEC. 2. Pursuant to its authority under section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, the committee is authorized to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, documents and to take such testimony on matters within its jurisdiction as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $105,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 190) to study administrative practice and procedure, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that here the ante has been increased from $150,000 last year to $175,000 this year, with one more employee. I wonder what is the justification for this additional sum.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The information is not up to date. The subcommittee received $175,000 last year. It received a second appropriation. It spent only $146,621.

Mr. ELLENDER. How many employees did the subcommittee have working last year?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It had 10 full-time employees and 1 part-time employee.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much did it spend?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. $146,621.15.

Mr. ELLENDER. The subcommittee wants one more employee?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It is asking for the same amount of money that it requested last year, with the understanding that it will hold the expenditures down as low as possible and return whatever funds are left over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 190) was agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 190

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation of administrative practices and procedures within the departments and agencies of the United States in the exercise of their rulemaking, licensing, investigatory, law enforcement, and adjudicatory functions, including a study of the effectiveness of the Administrative Procedure Act, with a view to determining whether additional legislation is required to provide for the fair, impartial, and effective performance of such functions.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $175,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

The resolution (S. Res. 191) to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 191

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete, comprehensive, and continuing study and investigation of unlawful restraints and monopolies, and of the antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine and from time to time redetermine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable for—

(1) clarification of existing law to eliminate conflicts and uncertainties where necessary;

(2) improvement of the administration and enforcement of existing laws; and

(3) supplementation of existing law to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of the laws and efficient administration and enforcement thereof.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $561,700 shall be paid from the contingent fund for the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

The resolution (S. Res. 194) to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $195,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF CRIMINAL LAWS AND PROCEDURES

The resolution (S. Res. 195) to investigate criminal laws and procedures was considered and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 195

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of criminal laws and procedures.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $120,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, did the Senate consider Calendar No. 945, Senate Resolution 195?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Calendar Nos. 944 and 945 have been agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is Calendar No. 945, Senate Resolution 195, before the Senate?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** No; it has been agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the resolution was agreed to be reconsidered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

There being no objection, the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was reconsidered.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to ask a few questions. This subcommittee is a brand new one. It was created in the latter part of the first session, last year, with a funding of $30,000. I notice that the request is for $120,000 and for seven employees. I wonder what the purpose of it is.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this subcommittee was created in September or October of last year to process a number of bills being introduced that dealt with crime problems. I think three have been referred to the committee up to the present. I am advised that three more will be sent to Congress by the administration in a very short time, and will be before the subcommittee. There will possibly be two or three before the end of the year.

Last year, in order to try to get a staff—and it is to be a technical staff—and get the work going, I asked for $30,000 for the remainder of last year. We spent less than $500 of that amount. The money was returned. My other commitments made it impossible for me to be present to give the attention required to get the program started this year.

I have asked for a staff of seven. Up to the moment I have employed only two. There are others already employed. Hearings are scheduled to begin the latter part of March.

While I have the floor, let me say that I am responsible for the termination of the Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act. The subcommittee is still in existence, but it is asking for no money. I have sought no funds because I felt its work could be done by my own staff and other staff members. Therefore, that one is eliminated.

Let me also say, while we are on the subject of increasing staffs, that when I took over the Patents and Trademarks Subcommittee, it had nine staff members. I reduced the number to six.

Last year the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee returned $32,000. I have reduced its staff by two this year. So in those committees I am undertaking to reduce the staffs.

The funds I am asking for as chairman of the committee are equaled or more than made up by those reductions. The committee staff is necessary for a solution that is absolutely imperative. There is a crime menace in this country which is actually creating a danger to our society.

There are many causes for the problem and for the rapid increase in crime. I think some new tools are needed. Obviously, the Justice Department thinks so. The President thinks so. Soon there will be another message from the President on the subject, recommending legislation. So we are undertaking to report from the committee some measures that I believe should be enacted into law to strengthen law enforcement and combat the menace which is endangering the safety of our Nation.

I hope there will be no objection to this request. I assure my friend the Senator from Louisiana that it will be operated with the ultimate of responsibility with respect to economy and efficiency, as I try to operate the other subcommittees.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am wondering what the regular staff of the Judiciary Committee does. Here is a committee that has $174,000 and more for its regular staff of four specialists and six clericals. In addition, as I pointed out in my statement a while ago, that committee will spend over $2,284,000. I am wondering why it is necessary.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I cannot give a full answer to the question at the moment, but we must keep in mind that the committee processes more legislation than all the other committees of the Senate combined. So there is much work for the staff to do. Of course, it could not be expected that the same sized staff which might be authorized for other regular standing committees would be adequate to do the tremendous volume of work that falls into the responsibility of the Judiciary Committee.

In order to save money, instead of spending the money that was authorized last year, in the amount of $30,000, I used the regular staff members to begin to develop and build up for the subcommittee to get started. In the meantime we have sent out somewhere between 300 and 500 letters to distinguished jurists, attorneys general, and heads of crime commissions throughout the country, sending them copies of these measures, asking them to study them and give us reports thereon, with their views.

I used the staff of the regular committee to do that instead of spending the $30,000 we were authorized to spend last year. I used every approach I could to achieve economy in the handling of committee work.

I am sure that we could have spent it, but instead I used the regular staff to do it during the session when Congress was in recess.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I pointed out a moment ago, the Judiciary Committee has as many subcommittees as it has members, or thereabouts.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It reports more bills.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct in saying that the Judiciary Committee reports more bills than the rest of the committees put together.

Before the reorganization I recall that I was chairman of a small Committee on Claims. That work is being done now by the Judiciary Committee.

That single committee which I headed before 1946 reported more bills than the rest of the committees put together.

Today the Judiciary Committee is reporting more bills than the rest of the committees put together, but it has a large staff to do that.

There are immigration bills being reported every day and also private claims bills which were formerly handled by the Claims Committee. Those are insignificant bills insofar as the work concerned, because I can well remember when the Claims Committee handled the work. The Senators did the work. The Senators contacted or got reports from the Post Office Department, Commerce Department, and other Departments where there might have been claims. These claims were looked into very carefully by each Senator who served on the Claims Committee. We reported anywhere from 52 to 54 percent of all bills considered by the Senate.

Added to that is the large number of immigration bills. But I point out that as to all of the small claims bills, as well as the Immigration Committees, there is a battery of specialists, lawyers, and others receiving good salaries on the subcommittees to perform that work.

In addition to the two subcommittees that report the many bills to which my good friend from Arkansas has referred, and in addition to the large number of employees who serve on the Judiciary Committee, there has been created in the Department of Justice a large battery of lawyers in order to assist this subcommittee. As I understand, there is also an Immigration Service, where many people are employed who do a great deal of work that should properly be done by subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee.

If we were to add the cost to the Government of all the small claims, it would be many times more costly than the cost was prior to reorganization. I attribute that to the fact that prior to reorganization there was a special committee to handle this work. As chairman of that committee I had all Senators on the committee, including myself, take so many bills each week or each 2 weeks. We would report the bills and do most of the work ourselves. Now this work is being done at a very high cost by many lawyers on the Judiciary Committee and many lawyers in the Department of Justice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 195) was agreed to.

FEDERAL CHARTERS, HOLIDAYS, AND CELEBRATIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 192) to consider matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 192

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to consider all matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $7,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORITY TO STUDY MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The resolution (S. Res. 196) to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 196

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $170,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION, AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 197) to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this is a committee that has been in existence for quite some time. In 1965, it employed 28 people. Now a request is being made for four additional employees. I notice that the amount requested is not increased. I am wondering if the distinguished chairman of this committee can account for the discrepancy that seems to appear here.

There were 28 employees last year when $431,000 was provided by the Senate. The request is made for additional employees with the same amount of money, $431,000. Are we to understand that some of those funds were returned to the Treasury?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, there is an error there.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much of that amount was actually expended?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. $375,232.13 was actually expended. I cannot keep all these things in my head, but a great many times the subcommittees, as well as the full committees, have employees on a part-time basis. They anticipate that if they have some work to do, it will require certain specialists, such as lawyers or technical employees, on a good many things depending on the work they have to do. The money is included, but they do not need it. They do not spend it.

Incidentally, I have been advised since the meeting that they do not need four more. It is three. That was a mistake on their part.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will it be 29 instead of 32?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. No. It will be 31 instead of 32.

Mr. ELLENDER. They are receiving the same amount of money?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. They are asking for the same amount of money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 197) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 197

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its territories and possessions, including, but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $431,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 199) to investigate juvenile delinquency.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senate knows about the criticism I have lodged from year to year on the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee. This committee is requesting authorization of $260,000 to carry on its operation during the current year, an increase of $20,000 above the authorization received last year. Its budget provides for 21 employees, an increase of 3 over last year.

As I recall, at one time, my good friend from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan] and I had a great deal of difficulty in finding a room to add to the Agricultural Committee. The Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee was short of space last year with the employees it then had. Yet it is now asking for three more employees.

The total funding which this subcommittee will receive during the 89th Congress amounts to $500,000. For the 88th Congress a total authorization of $384,300 was received. In the 87th Congress the total authoried by the subcommittee amounted to $411,000.

So we see in the span of 6 years and three Congresses an expenditure of $1,295,300 has been authorized for its fight to control juvenile crime. I might add that most of the early authorizations have been actually expended by the subcommittee and its staff.

For all its efforts and all its expenditures the problem of juvenile delinquency seems to be worse now than it was when this so-called temporary committee was brought into existence many years ago. I can only wonder what this expenditure of $1.3 million over a 6-year period has accomplished.

Mr. President, I have often said that juvenile delinquency should be combated at the local level if any real good is to be done. This struggle must be waged in the home, in the school, and in the church. As necessary from time to time it should be waged in the woodshed.

At this time I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate the effort to control juvenile crime that has been conducted over the past 10 years by Sheriff F. O. Didier, Jr., of Avoyelles Parish in Louisiana. I would like to bring the results of his efforts to the attention of the Senate as an example of what might be done to control juvenile crime when local officials take a real interest in our young people.

To begin with, I point out that Sheriff Didier's campaign has not been funded at the exorbitant level of approximately $400,000 a year. A sheriff has under Louisiana law the right to use 10 percent of the parish salary fund, not to exceed $10,000, for youth programs each year. I daresay that Sheriff Didler's program has shown more real and tangible results from this modest expenditure over the years than can be found from the expenditures of well over a million dollars the last 6 years by this Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

Avoyelles is one of the larger parishes of Louisiana. Delinqency has been on a steady decline in the parish since the sheriff's program was instituted. In 1957, the year the program got into full swing, there were 65 active cases of juvenile delinquency with a carryover of the last year of 39 cases. In 1960 there were only 15 active cases and as of August 1962 only 5 active cases of juvenile delinquency were recorded in the parish. Of these five, three were repeaters and as the sheriff points out with pride, not one of his juvenile delinquency cases from 1956 to 1962 had ever actively participated in his program.

In brief, Sheriff Didier has instigated in Avoyelles Parish an organization of junior deputy sheriffs. He and his men properly feel that the problem of juvenile delinquency, as with most other crimes, is a problem of prevention more than it is one of detection and detention.

He and his men regularly visit and lecture in the classrooms of the Avoyelles Parish school system. They acquaint the youngsters not only with the administration and operation of the sheriff's department but all of the departments of the parish government—the government which concerns them most closely. I have discussed his program at length with him and at this time I would like to submit for the record materials which indicate this organization's scope. I believe the Senate will find them interesting.

I shall not stand here and read it; but this pamphlet contains the rules and regulations of the Junior Deputy Sheriffs' League of Avoyelles Parish, La.

I have before me a memorandum explaining the full operation of this method of dealing with child delinquency.

As I have frequently said, the subject of child delinquency cannot be treated from the Capital City of the Nation; it must be done on the local level.

I hope that Senators will read the memorandum, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record, so that it may serve as a guide to what should be done in the respective States.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Avoyelles Parish Junior Deputy Sheriffs

I. INTRODUCTION

When I assumed the office of sheriff of Avoyelles Parish, La., in 1956, I felt the necessity of instituting a program whereby the sheriff's department and the citizenry of the parish could come together on a common ground to promote better law enforcement. Knowing this would be quite an undertaking and also a long-range program, it was decided to adopt a program of crime prevention rather than one of crime cure. To successfully put this program into motion, I realized that I would have to enlist the aid of the teenagers and their parents without discrimination as to race, color, or creed. With this thought in mind I visited sheriff's departments throughout the State reviewing and studying junior deputy programs instituted by other sheriffs. Their programs were found to be successful with the exception that the percentage of participation was too small due to the fact the participant was invited to meet at designated times and places and to overcome this, it was concluded, rather than have the student come to take part in the junior deputy program, the program would be taken to the junior deputy. The only means by which this could be accomplished would be to sell the public schools the idea of adopting this program as part of their class work.

II. PURPOSE OF THIS PROGRAM

A. To aid in reducing juvenile delinquence. It brings these children face to face with officers from different branches of law enforcement. They learn what a peace officer is and that these officers are really friends.

B. These junior deputies are educated in the field of law enforcement.

C. It elevates, in their eyes, the profession of law enforcement and they readily see that an officer would rather help out than to condemn.

D. The aid to schools and communities is a reality, as traffic deputies, schoolbus deputies, and civic organization can call on these children for special assignments.

III. ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION

A. Institution of the first class was made in September 1956, and graduated in May 1957.

B. To be a successful organization, the approval and cooperation of the Avoyelles Parish School Board was a "must," so I appeared before this body and outlined my entire program, and after discussion, the board agreed to give it a trial and after one school term (9 months) if it proved satisfactory it would be adopted as part of the 10th grade civic classroom work. At the end of the first school year, the school board then met and adopted this program to be a permanent curriculum of the schools of Avoyelles Parish.

C. Every high school in Avoyelles Parish is very active in this program. There are 12 white high schools with 22 classes, and because of consolidation there are only 3 colored high schools with 5 classes. With the participation of these 15 schools in the 1962–63 term, there were 27 classes. Schools have from one to five civic classes.

D. Junior deputy studies work in perfectly, as the 10th grade civic class is a study of government. The ages of the children are 14 years and up. At this age a child is very vulnerable. We feel that this program will steer them in the right direction. The junior deputies meet once a month in their respective classrooms, where a different phase of law enforcement is presented each month.

E. This department was the first in Louisiana to have girls in the organization. Why not girls? Girls can be delinquent as well as boys. And it is a fact that every branch of law enforcement known has women officers. The girls, as do the boys, learn what a delinquent is and to prevent being one. There are boys and girls in this organization who are at the present time making plans to be law enforcement officers. A junior deputy sheriff graduates while in the 10th grade but they are junior deputies until they have completed their high school education.

F. Utilize all agents of law enforcement; and these officers are of the best in their respective fields. The consent of the child's parents must be given in writing to me or my aids before this child can be a junior deputy. The parents receive from me in writing the complete outline of the program. After consent of the parents the child must sign a pledge card whereby he or she promises that he or she will observe all rules of the organization. A State police officer from the Louisiana Department of Public Safety, division of the State police, lectures on all traffic laws of our State. A juvenile officer lectures on delinquency and the functions of his office. Instructors in fingerprinting, casting, investigation, and narcotics are brought before these children. These officers are the best in their respective fields. The district judge, district attorney, clerk of court, and assessor explain the functions of their office and how they tie in with the sheriff's department. The end of classroom work is with a first aid instructor, guns, boating, etc.

G. A field day is one of the highlights of the organization. On this day, which is a schoolday, each class is taken on a tour of the Louisiana State Penitentiary. On this tour the junior deputies see firsthand the way the convicts are required to work in the cane, cotton, and corn fields, under the gun, which leaves these children with a picture that they do not easily forget. They also visit the Louisiana State Industrial School for Girls, and Louisiana State Colony and Training School. This is a school and rehabilitation center for the mentally retarded, with ages ranging from 6 months to 70 years. This is very enlightening to most normal children, as it gives them an inside picture of different phases of retardation and what can be done to train and rehabilitate these people toward having a place in society. They are also made aware of the desperate need for legislation to enlarge and expand these facilities.

H. The first Saturday in May is always set aside for graduation day. It is always held in one of the cities where both white and colored high schools are located. The reason for this is to eliminate many miles of travel from one city to another and to cut down time for the participants of the program. A full day (9 a.m. to 4 p.m.) of entertainment is provided for both schools.

The program usually consists of distinguished guest speakers such as, the attorney general, superintendent of education, register of State lands, and etc. Other entertainment includes expert judo teams, aerial rescue operations (helicopter), tear gas and flare and safety in firearms demonstrations. They are also shown our trained police dogs and bloodhounds. In addition to this we also have professionals in lighter entertainment, such as tumbling acts, marionettes, and local talented students from each school. At the end of the day, the sheriff presents each junior deputy with a diploma. This concludes the years program for that particular class.

The sheriff's department furnishes free lunch, cold drinks, and transportation from all high schools to the junior deputies to and from graduation.

IV. FUNDS, PERSONNEL, AND EQUIPMENT

A Louisiana law permits the sheriff to use 10 percent of the salary fund, not to exceed $10,000 for youth programs. The personnel required to handle this program (outside of instructors) is the sheriff and two assistants. Equipment used to conduct this program are, projector, film, narcotic board, fingerprint and casting equipment, guns, tear gas, shells, flares, and junior deputy badges insignia and complete uniform.

V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the organization of the Junior Deputy Sheriffs' of Avoyelles Parish has indeed played a big part in reducing delinquency. Delinquency has been on a steady decline in this parish since this organization was instituted. In 1957, there were 65 active cases, with a carryover of 39 cases; in 1960 15 active cases, petitions were filed. To August 22, 1962, five active cases, petitions were filed, and of these five cases, three were repeaters and not one of all these cases from 1956 to 1962 ever wore the junior deputy sheriff's uniform.

F. O. Didier, Jr.,
Sheriff, Avoyelles Parish.

The Junior Deputy Sheriff's League, Avoyelles Parish, F. O. Didier, Jr., Sheriff

The junior deputy sheriff's league will be a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization. It aspires to give youth a wholesome and attractive program of activities with these main objectives:

To achieve a constant decrease of the juvenile delinquency rate.

To prevent accidents in traffic, on the water, and with firearms.

To acquaint youth with the functions of local government and law enforcement.

To demonstrate that law enforcement officers are not enemies, but friends.

To enlist the help of youth itself to keep others of their own age out of trouble, criminal files, courts, reformatories, and jails.

To render valuable services to the community through juvenile police work, training for general emergencies, assistance in the protection of life and property.

To stimulate an interest for the choice of a later career, possibly in one of the law enforcement branches, as highly qualified young men, and young ladies.

This program is no duplication of effort on the part of other youth movements. A great portion of its activities is novel, in its psychological approach as well as its execution.

It appeals to that majority of the boys and girls who do not belong to any organization whatsoever. It appeals to those boys and girls—among them many a born leader—with a vivid imagination and a strong urge for a change and thrills who cannot be attracted by the naturally limited scope of many boys' clubs activities.

It offers an opportunity to every adolescent boy and girl between 12 and 17 years of age to find recognition, encouragement, confidence, a new sense of security and worthiness, a constructive outlet for his pent-up energies, in learning to perform a practical task with real responsibility.

Junior Deputy Sheriffs, Avoyelles Parish, F. O. Didier, Jr., Sheriff

UNIFORM INSTRUCTIONS

All junior deputy sheriffs must provide themselves with, and posess at all times the uniform listed below:

Boys: Khaki caps with patch properly sewed thereto. Khaki long-sleeved shirts with patch properly sewed thereto. Khaki pants. Black tie.

Girls: Khaki caps with patch properly sewed thereto. White blouse with patch properly sewed thereto. Khaki skirt. Black tie.

Junior deputy sheriff's badge is worn on the left-hand pocket of the shirt.

Shirts are to have the "junior deputy sheriff" patches sewed on the left-hand sleeve, 1 inch from the shoulder seam.

Caps are to have "junior deputy sheriff" patches sewed on the left-hand side 1 inch from the center front fold. This is the side that is solid. Names are to be permanently marked on the inside of the caps for purposes of identification.

The badge and "junior deputy sheriff" patches will be issued to you by the sheriff and shall remain your property as long as you are an active member of the league. At any time you are removed from the rolls of the league, all equipment issued you shall be returned. All other articles of clothing shall be furnished by you.

Junior deputies shall wear the full uniform specified when attending regular stated meetings, special meetings, or on special assignment. No distinguishable part of the uniform, which would identify the wearer as a junior deputy sheriff, will be worn in conjunction with civilian clothes.

Junior Deputy, Avoyelles Parish, La., Sheriffs' League

PLEDGE

I, * * * on my honor, do promise to respect and defend the Constitution of the United States, the Bill of Rights, and the constitution and the laws of the State of Louisiana.

I promise to be regular in my attendance at school or in fulfilling the duties of my job.

I promise that I will always conduct myself in such a manner that my actions will reflect credit on me and the junior deputy sheriffs' league of which I am a member.

I promise that I will always strive, by my example of right living and right action, to lead others to do right and to assist those who are in trouble and deserve help.

I promise always to be faithful to the league in the execution of my duties, and to attend all meetings if it is within my power to do so.

I promise to use my influence to help maintain law and order in this community and to aid all law enforcement officers in the discharge of their duties.

I promise not to aid any criminal by keeping from law enforcement officers any information or evidence that I might have against any person charged with a crime and who might be under investigation.

I promise always to be fair to the accused and that I will not through ill will give any false testimony against any person accused of crime.

I promise to obey the orders of the chief, and the officers of the junior deputy sheriffs' league, and to respect the rules.

——— ———.

Application for Membership in the Junior Deputy Sheriffs' League of Avoyelles Parish

Name______________________________
Address____________________________
Telephone No_______________________
Age:
Date of birth: Month, day, year__________
School_____________________________
Grade______________________________
Church_____________________________
Boy or girl's organization, if any__________
Parent or guardian____________________
Date_______________________________
To Sheriff F. O. Didier, Jr.:

I hereby consent to my son, daughter (name), (age), (address), (telephone No.), being a member of the Junior Deputy Sheriff's League of Avoyelles Parish, La.

Signature of parent or guardian__________
Date_______________________________
Cap size____________________________

RULES AND REGULATIONS JUNIOR DEPUTY SHERIFFS' LEAGUE

ADMINISTRATION

I

The Junior Deputy Sheriffs' League of Avoyelles Parish will be under the personal direction and supervision of Sheriff F. O. Didier, Jr., who will be assisted by a staff of well-known and well-qualified instructors and advisory board, and a committee of sponsors.

II

All activities will originate from the junior deputy sheriff's headquarters located in the sheriff's office at Avoyelles Parish courthouse. This club room was designed and dedicated to the junior deputy sheriffs' league by the sheriff.

1. The primary purpose of organizing and maintaining a Junior Deputy Sheriffs' League of Avoyelles Parish shall be to preserve the peace, protect life and property, prevent the commission of crime, to build character, and promote good fellowship.

2. It shall be the duty of all members of the junior deputy sheriffs' league to promote good conduct, good sportsmanship, traffic safety, and good morals in their community.

3. Upon the zeal, loyalty, good judgment, and good conduct of each member will depend the success of the junior deputy sheriffs' league.

4. You have been appointed and have assumed the responsibility of an office; do not forget your character is your capital. Deal honestly with all persons and hold your word sacred, no matter where, when, or to whom given. Make yourself useful and aid all citizens in their lawful pursuits, and try at all times to merit the good will of all citizens.

5. Be prompt and courteous at all times, and endeavor to make yourself a leader in your community.

6. All members of the junior deputy league will be required to cooperate to the fullest extent with his superior officers, the sheriff, sponsors committee.

7. All members of the junior deputy sheriffs' league must be willing at all times to assume any and all responsibilities assigned to them by their superior officers.

8. Members shall be subject to dismissal for any violation of the following rules: (a) Willful disobedience of any order issued to him by any superior officer in the junior deputy sheriffs' league; (b) for willfully neglecting to attend regular meetings; (c) for persistent truancy from home or school and (d) for conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman; (e) for conduct tending to cause disorder in the junior deputy sheriffs' league.

9. All members of the junior deputy sheriffs' league must endeavor to attain some special skill or goal in one of the activities of the league.

10. All members of the junior deputy sheriffs' league will be responsible for the upkeep and cleanliness of the junior deputy headquarters.

11. All members of the junior deputy sheriffs' league will be required to keep their persons and any equipment which may be issued to them in a strictly neat condition and in perfect order and repair.

12. Badges will be awarded at the end of the 60-day term on the following basis: (a) regular attendance; (b) special skill for goal attained; (c) general attitude toward being a junior deputy sheriff; (d) good behavior; (e) interest; (f) cooperation; (g) responsibility; (h) loyalty; (i) honesty; (j) discretion; and (k) dependability.

13. All junior deputies when attending meetings or on duty shall wear the official badge on the outside of the outermost garment over the left breast.

14. All junior deputies will be furnished with a copy of the rules, regulations and instructions, and shall make themselves perfectly familiar with its contents.

15. Respect to superior officers, courtesy and fairplay is absolutely necessary to the discipline and the efficiency of the junior deputy sheriffs' league and must be maintained at all times.

16. Any complaint by any member of the junior deputy sheriffs' league, or any charge against any members placed by a superior officer shall be presented in writing to the sheriff. The full name, rank, and badge shall accompany such reports.

17. Any member of the junior deputy sheriffs' league upon dismissal or resignation from the league will immediately turn over to the officer in charge all equipment issued to him by the junior deputy sheriffs' league.

18. No member at any time shall wear his badge except at regular stated meetings or except when he is called out on a special meeting or special assignment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will say to my good friend from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] that I am very hopeful that he will take time out to look at the memorandum which I placed in the RECORD with regard to the sheriff of Avoyelles Parish to note how this problem was handled at the parish level.

Note the story that I placed in the RECORD. I spoke at length with the sheriff last year and asked his permission to use the information. I was much interested in it. It all goes back to the proposition I have been stating all along: That this problem can be handled at the local level, rather than the national level.

Going back a little bit, why is it necessary to have, or why did the Senator ask for, more employees?

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. DODD. First, I say to my good friend from Louisiana that I shall, of course, read what the sheriff said.

The three additional employees include two minority appointees at the request of the minority members of the subcommittee, and one new stenographer necessary to carry on the work. This also accounts for the additional money.

Mr. ELLENDER. Two minority members?

Mr. DODD. Two staff employees for the minority members of the subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could not the subcommittee handle its work with the staff it now has?

Mr. DODD. We feel that it could not. I felt that this was a reasonable, intelligent request. The minority employees are helpful and are doing a good job.

Mr. ELLENDER. How many minority employees will the subcommittee have?

Mr. DODD. Three.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why cannot the subcommittee dispense with some of the employees the majority has and let the minority use them? This practice has been followed right along. It has been used as a method of increasing the number of employees.

Mr. DODD. I assure the Senator from Louisiana that I am not trying to increase the number of employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is, though.

Mr. DODD. The work is increasing. Juvenile delinquency is a growing problem across the country. I wish it could all be handled locally. I would be happy if it could be. But I do not know how some of these problems can be handled locally, especially the narcotics problem. In that field, only the Federal Government can make a difference.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree that it is a problem, but the subcommittee is not doing too much to curb the problem.

Mr. DODD. We are doing the best we can. The Senate passed the 1965 drug control amendments.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was away back.

Mr. DODD. Oh, no; that was last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought that when the justification was made last year, that was one of the reasons for asking for the money. What has been done in addition to the report of last year?

Mr. DODD. On the drug problem?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; everything. How many days of hearings did the subcommittee hold, and where were they held?

Mr. DODD. A great many days of hearings were held. For example, consider the firearms bill alone. I do not have the figure at my finger tips, but the subcommittee held many days of hearings, in various parts of the country.

Many days of hearings were held on the drug bill, the narcotics rehabilitation bill, and the interstate adoption legislation. I can assure the Senator that the subcommittee has not been inactive.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree to that; it keeps busy.

Mr. DODD. We do the best we can. I do not say we are going to cure all delinquency. I never said so. I like to believe that our work contributes to a considerable degree toward helping to cure these problems. I believe that the passage of the National Juvenile Delinquency Act, the drug control amendments, and the interstate adoption legislation is indicative of that. We now have before us the Narcotics Rehabilitation Act. I do not know what more we could do.

Mr. ELLENDER. With all due respect, it is my belief that these additional jobs are provided merely to raise the ante, so far as the minority is concerned.

Mr. DODD. No; that is not so.

Mr. ELLENDER. The work could easily have been done with the number of persons that have been employed up to now.

Mr. DODD. I assure the Senator that the minority members of the subcommittee are hard-working.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that; but it is merely patronage they are securing. Let us make that plain.

Mr. DODD. That just is not so. The minority members spend a great deal of time on the work. They attend the hearings and follow the proceedings carefully. Without their help, I do not believe we could do the work.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. First, I agree with the Senator from Louisiana that it is time the Senate began to raise a question about the expansion of all these subcommittees. Perhaps we should investigate not only the expansion of the executive branch, but also the Senate itself to determine why we are overexpanding our committee staffs.

In line with the question about the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, I observe that the subcommittee was established about 10 years ago and was supposed to be temporary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Twelve years ago.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Still the committee is expanding. I notice that the language provides:

> The committee shall report findings together with recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

A similar proposal has been in each of these resolutions for the past several years.

I ask the Senator from Connecticut: What legislative proposals has the subcommittee ever recommended to Congress?

Mr. DODD. Congress passed the Juvenile Delinquency Act, the drug control amendments, and is now considering the interstate adoption legislation, and the national firearms control amendment. The subcommittee is currently holding hearings on the narcotics rehabilitation amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Did all of those bills come from the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, or from the Committee on the Judiciary as a whole?

Mr. DODD. No; all those to which I have referred came from the subcommittee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What legislative proposals is the subcommittee considering now?

Mr. DODD. The Narcotics Rehabilitation Act of 1965.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thought that had been included.

Mr. DODD. No; that was the drug amendment bill, which was passed last year. The narcotics rehabilitation bill is new and altogether different.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Are the proposed additional employees to take care of the needs of the minority members?

Mr. DODD. Two of them are.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I join the Senator from Louisiana in asking why the subcommittee cannot take care of the minority from the existing authority; or is it merely patronage?

Mr. DODD. No, it is not merely patronage. The Senators have asked for this type of staff assistance. I felt, and feel now, that this help is necessary. There is a tremendous amount of work to be done on this subcommittee. I feel that the help is needed. The additional employees will help us.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I feel that at a time when we are spending nationally about $600 million a month more than we are taking in—living beyond our income—and when we are going to have to call upon the executive branch to curtail some of its expenditures, we in Congress should start to trim the requests of some of the subcommittees.

I commend the Senator from Louisiana for what he is trying to do, and I join him in the effort, although I recognize, as he does, that we are fighting a losing battle. If the Senate continues to expand its expenditures year after year, we do not stand in a good position to call upon the executive branch to reduce its expenditures. We should start in the Senate. There is plenty of room to begin reducing here at home. For years, ever since I first came to Congress—and I think the Senator from Louisiana will agree with me—there has been expansion, year after year, of the number of staff members. It has almost reached the point where members of committees do not even know who the employees are.

After all we have our own office staffs to help us in our work, and much of this work could best be done by the Senators themselves.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have the greatest esteem and admiration for the distinguished Senator from Delaware. But the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is very modest. I serve on the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency. One part of its activities, which extended over a period of almost 3 months, was the preparation of legislation that is vital to effective State and local law enforcement in the United States; namely, the bill introduced by the Senator from Connecticut to protect State firearm registration controls. It would prohibit the mail-order purchase of pistols and certain other types of firearms, contrary to State laws, and the sale to persons having criminal records and known to have a dangerous background in the use of such firearms.

This is a very controversial area. It requires a great deal of work. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] was working on this problem even before I was elected to the Senate.

I know that the hearings held last year were highly educational. Only last year the American Bar Association changed its position primarily because of the educational effect of the hearings conducted by the Senator from Connecticut, in which there was testimony by law enforcement officers from all over the United States, which pointed out that the bill would not prohibit hunters or shooters from acquiring firearms, but would protect and assist States in having adequate protection for their citizens.

This involved a tremendous amount of work by the subcommittee. The Senator from Connecticut did not mention it, and I thought I would add it to the Record.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I wish to add to what the Senator from Maryland has said. I have only recently been made a member of the subcommittee, whose activities are being reviewed, and about which questions are being asked.

A question has been raised as to the members of the staff, and whether certain appointments involve patronage.

In the brief time that I have been a member of the subcommittee, I have been deeply impressed by the competence and high caliber of the individuals who serve the subcommittee.

I believe that any adverse reflection upon the qualifications and dedication of the staff is unwarranted.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have a report and a statement printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Summary Report of Legislation Acted on by the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee During 1965

1. Year 1965 Drug Control Amendments (Public Law 89–74): The subcommittee devoted much effort to the final passage on July 8, 1965 of the 1965 Drug Control Amendments—a law that was developed by the subcommittee after several years of investigation into the uncontrolled and indiscriminate manufacture, sale, and distribution of dangerous drugs.

2. Exclusion of peyote from the 1965 Drug Amendments: Further investigations were conducted with respect to the widespread smuggling of narcotics and dangerous drugs into this country from abroad with a new emphasis on the developing traffic in hallucinogenic drugs. As a result of this investigation the 1965 Drug Control Act was amended to include peyote under its provisions. Further legislation is being drafted to cover new drugs of addiction which are not included in the present Federal law.

3. Interstate adoption legislation: The Senate passed subcommittee bill S. 624, the black-market baby bill on March 22, 1965, and it is now pending House action.

4. State Firearms Control Assistance Amendments of 1965: The subcommittee held extensive hearings regarding the administration's bill S. 1592 which proposes sweeping revisions of the Federal Firearms Act. Hearings lasted 11 days during which 48 witnesses presented testimony before the subcommittee. Because of the pointed opposition to this measure its consideration involved a large amount of research, travel, preparation, and handling of correspondence by the staff of the subcommittee.

5. The Narcotics Rehabilitation Act of 1965: During the latter part of the year the subcommittee undertook preparation for the hearings with respect to S. 2152, the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1965, introduced by the chairman on behalf of the administration. These hearings were commenced on January 25, 1966, and will continue for several months.

Floor Statement on Senate Resolution 199—Proposed Activities on the Subcommittee in 1966—February 16, 1966

1. Legislative hearings on the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1965:

The subcommittee is conducting a thorough inquiry into the various State civil commitment programs to find the most efficient methods for handling Federal narcotic addicts. We are presently surveying rehabilitation programs in high addiction centers and consulting with the best technicians in the field. We have already started hearings which will last several months and I intend to report out a bill which will not only resolve the problem of institutional handling but will include adequate provisions for aftercare and postinstitutional adjustment.

The Federal Government has historically been assigned the task of policing the international narcotic traffic. In view of the fact that we are still faced with a gigantic smuggling problem I feel it is time for a full review of our enforcement policies and an outline of our present posture in our fight against the narcotic, marihuana, and dangerous drug traffickers.

I will, therefore, include in these hearings expert witnesses from the fields of law enforcement and the judiciary with the view toward additional Federal legislation based on recent developments in the narcotic-dangerous drug traffic.

2. Amending and reporting S. 1592, the State firearms control assistance amendments of 1965, which would control the indiscriminate sale of firearms to juveniles and adult criminals.

This is an extremely controversial piece of legislation and one that will take a great deal of the subcommittee's time and effort in the first months of 1966. I am confident that we will report out an amended bill that will be acceptable to the Nation's sportsmen and hunters. Law enforcement officials from all over the Nation are eager to see this bill passed into law as they feel it will be a major weapon in our war on crime and delinquency.

3. Programs of rehabilitation and treatment.

Information has come to the subcommittee that inexcusably deplorable conditions exist in many parts of the country in State institutions for juveniles and in foster homes and detention centers. As I have stated previously, I feel that it is wise to put a great deal of emphasis on the prevention of juvenile delinquency. However, we should also concern ourselves with the problem of those children who are already delinquent and who have been committed by the Nation's juvenile courts to training schools, jails, foster homes and detention centers. In 1966 the committee will thoroughly explore the methods with which committed delinquents are handled. Furthermore, we will seek a legislative solution to the problem of inadequate facilities with the goal of a more humane and intelligent handling of these unfortunate youngsters.

4. An investigation of the use of hallucinogenic drugs by juveniles and youthful offenders.

We have found that with the reduction in the traffic in heroin in certain areas and increased penalties for the use of other dangerous drugs, large numbers of the Nation's youth are becoming involved with a whole new family of drugs referred to as the hallucinogenic drugs. Because of the bizarre nature of the effects of these stimulants, I feel they may be more dangerous to our young people than the traditional drugs of abuse.

The subcommittee has already begun a survey of this problem to determine the extent of the abuse of these drugs and the need for additional legislation to control their production and distribution. Prolonged use of such drugs as LSD-25 and mescaline has already caused serious crimes, aggravated antisocial behavior, and other eccentric behavior problems among large numbers of our Nation's youth. We must move quickly in this area in order to prevent an epidemic to spread among our young people as happened with the dangerous drugs.

5. In keeping with the subcommittee's interest in the crime problem in the Nation's Capital, we are conducting a survey of the Durham rule which is applied in cases where the defendant has entered an insanity plea.

We have preliminary results on this survey and I feel our final report on this subject will be a major contribution to the fields of criminology and jurisprudence. It will certainly make more efficient our efforts to handle certain types of offenders and dispel many of the accusations that have been made against this enlightened far-reaching court decision.

6. The interstate traffic in pornography and obscene material.

Mr. President, as you know, we have been involved in this investigation for several years. While this is a very difficult problem that does not readily lend itself to legislative solution, I feel that the subcommittee's experience in this area has been invaluable to local, State and Federal authorities charged with the task of keeping this traffic under control. We maintain frequent liaison with the Post Office Department and with the legal authorities of those cities throughout the country where pornography poses a sizable problem. We continuously refer to the Post Office Department information that we obtain on this traffic from concerned parents and responsible citizens throughout the country. I am still hopeful of arriving at reasonable legislative proposals that will permit the Federal Government to put a sizable dent in this multimillion dollar racket.

In addition to what I have just outlined, Mr. President, the subcommittee is working closely with the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, and with the Departments of Justice, Treasury, and Health, Education, and Welfare, to develop new proposals and approaches to the delinquency problem as new findings become available particularly from crime control programs developed under the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act and the President's antipoverty legislation. During the coming year I expect to have referred to the committee other administration proposals which will require subcommittee investigation and hearings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 199) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts; and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation, as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $260,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

The resolution (S. Res. 200) to investigate national penitentiaries was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and inspect national penitentiaries.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PATENT OFFICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 201) to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I observe with respect to this resolution that when I became chairman of the committee in 1961, the committee had nine employees. We reduced that number to six. Last year, we had an allotment of $120,000. We only spent $83,000 and returned $37,000 of that amount.

Last year we had 28 bills referred to us. We processed four of them to the point that they were enacted into law. Five of them were considered and indefinitely postponed. Hearings were held. There were three or four bills on the same subject. The hearings are completed and we are now ready to mark the measure up. We have undertaken to economize, and we have had some measure of success in doing it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution, S. Res. 201, was agreed to as follows:

S. Res. 201

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $110,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS CREATED BY THE FLOW OF REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES FROM COMMUNISTIC TYRANNY

The resolution (S. Res. 202) to investigate problems created by the flow of refugees and escapees from communistic tyranny was considered and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 202

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems created by the flow of refugees and escapees from Communist tyranny.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall reports its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $105,400, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

The resolution (S. Res. 203) to study revision and codification of the Statutes of the United States was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 203

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200, than the highest rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $42,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL STAFF FOR THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

The resolution (S. Res. 215) to authorize additional staff for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 215

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, to employ one additional assistant chief clerk, seven additional professional staff members, and nine additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 180) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for continuation of certain studies.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I note that there is an increase of three employees and $50,000 in funds. I wonder if we could have an explanation as to the increased number of employees and the request for increased funds.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, we have asked that our funds, which were appropriated in the amount of $100,000 last year, be increased to $150,000.

I point out that on January 31, 1966, the committee returned $31,000-plus from last year's authorization. We have tried to economize in every way possible. Instead of having nine employees, as we had last year, we now have eight staff employees on the regular staff. Last year we had 10 employees on the resolution payroll. We now have seven. This number needs to be increased. The increase will largely be for additional clerical help and some additional professional help.

We deal with the confirmation of every postmaster appointed in the United States, excepting the fourth-class post offices. We deal with the health insurance of all Federal employees. We deal with their retirement benefits and with all aspects of the civil service, as well as the $5.5 billion operations of the Post Office Department.

We should like very much to be able to employ one of the outside accounting firms of national reputation to give us a study of the cost ascertainment so that we can have expert information when asked to increase the postage rates, particularly on second-, third-, and fourth-class matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much does the Senator expect to spend on the contract?

Mr. MONRONEY. The last time we contracted, in the 83d Congress, $50,000 was authorized. Not all of it was spent. This is one of the reasons that we have asked for $50,000 additional money. We hope by the economies we are making to employ some skilled technical staff members to help us on these postal problems.

This is the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and its five subcommittees. We are not asking for any money for subcommittees, as most of the committees have done. We feel that this is a modest request to equip this important committee that has broad jurisdiction over all civil service and post office matters. We must keep abreast with all that the law requires us to do. We must provide for comparability of Federal pay with the pay of outside businesses.

The committee is required each year to make a study of that matter. I certainly feel that we need this additional professional assistance to do the very important job which I am sure the Senate and the American people expect of us.

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I to understand that this is the only money that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is requesting, aside from the regular allocation made for the standing committee?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct. We had been asking for $100,000. Last year we did not spend the entire amount and returned $31,000. We are proud of that.

The Senate has our assurance that prudence and economy will continue to be characteristic of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 180) was agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 180

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and conduct such studies as may be deemed necessary with respect to any and all aspects of—

(1) the postal service, including determinations of the desirability and feasibility of utilizing to a greater degree modernized equipment and processing techniques in order to improve and perfect the basic functions of the postal delivery service;

(2) postal rates, including ascertainment of the costs of postal service, adjustments in fourth-class postal rates in order to maintain a proper balance between costs and revenue, and further study into the area of parcel post service as provided by Public Laws 82–199 and 88–51;

(3) the Federal civil service, including basic compensation adjustments in compliance with the policy of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, fringe-benefit compensation, particularly in the areas of health and life insurance and retirement annuities, and careful consideration of proposals to improve the overall quality of Federal civilian employment policies, practices, and personnel administration; and

(4) committee jurisdiction extending into the census and the collection of statistics generally.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, until January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments and agencies concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $150,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The resolution (S. Res. 206) authorizing the Committee on Public Works to make a study of any and all matters pertaining to flood control, navigation, rivers and harbors, water and air pollution, public buildings and all features of resources development and economic growth was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I notice that a request is made for an additional employee. The same amount of money is requested as was requested last year.

Am I to understand that the committee did not have a full complement last year?

Mr. MUSKIE. This request does not involve any additional employee. We have the same number of employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Four employees?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. No additional employees?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 206) was agreed to as follows:

S. Res. 206

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to flood control, navigation, rivers and harbors, roads and highways, water pollution, air pollution, public buildings, and all features of water resource development and economic growth.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $110,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

FUNDS FOR THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 209) to provide funds for the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 209

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;

(2) corrupt practices;

(3) contested elections;

(4) credentials and qualifications;

(5) Federal elections generally, and

(6) Presidential succession.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $150,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The resolution (S. Res. 211) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Rules and Administration was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the Standing Rules of the United States Senate.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $67,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The resolution (S. Res. 178) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Small Business was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, may I say that the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] expected to handle this resolution. He is absent attending the Foreign Relations Committee hearing. I could handle it, but I am not as well prepared as he.

Senator LONG will be here in a moment, and I would like very much if the Senate would pass the resolution over until he arrives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

CONTINUATION AND ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The resolution (S. Res. 189) to continue and to provide additional funds for the Special Committee on Aging was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 189

Resolved, That the Special Committee on Aging, established by S. Res. 33, Eighty-seventh Congress, agreed to on February 13, 1961, as amended and supplemented, is hereby extended through January 31, 1967.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters pertaining to problems and opportunities of older people, including but not limited to, problems and opportunities of maintaining health, of assuring adequate income, of finding employment, of engaging in productive and rewarding activity, of securing proper housing, and, when necessary, of obtaining care or assistance. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee, and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

SEC. 3. The said committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

SEC. 4. A majority of the members of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 5. For purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized (1) to employ on a temporary basis from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, such technical, clerical, or other assistants, experts, and consultants as it deems advisable: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (2) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $221,000 from February 1, 1966, through January 31, 1967, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 7. The committee shall report the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967. The committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on January 31, 1967.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 193) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 2, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$117,685.00" and insert "$117,700"; so as to make the resolution read:

S. RES 193

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its activities and findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $117,700, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, did I understand that the committee increased the amount provided, or permitted it to be increased?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Just to even money, instead of 15 cents or something of that nature.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment, as I understood, increased the amount from $91,000 to $117,000.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. No. The amount requested——

Mr. ELLENDER. What was that request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will re-read the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$117,685,000", and insert "$117,700";.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I can answer the Senator's question very easily. The disbursing officer has stated that it requires a great deal of additional bookkeeping to account for odd dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, why the additional employees?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if I may respond in the absence of the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. BAYH], who is unavoidably absent today, first of all, there will be an additional workload. The President has already suggested two constitutional amendments, one of them relating to the electoral college and the other relating to the 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives.

In addition, there are other amendments or resolutions of a constitutional nature which go to that committee. In fact, I have had a few on that score myself, and I fancy that I shall have a few more before we are through. So that is going to be a busy committee, and obviously, they will have to have staff. When matters of this kind are delved into, it ramifies not only all over the country, but back into history.

Then, of course, we must have in mind the prospective results or the impact of a constitutional amendment. These matters have great appeal to professors of political science and to lawyers in the constitutional field, and the amount of testimony that is taken and the amount of spadework which must be done, I suggest, merits good staff.

I believe that the additional staff requested is thoroughly justified, and I say that notwithstanding the fact that the subcommittee does not always agree with me.

Mr. ELLENDER. What does the regular staff of the Judiciary Committee do, if all of these bills are considered by special subcommittees?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I suggest to my friend that in volume, the Judiciary Committee——

Mr. ELLENDER. I have heard that before.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the Senator heard it?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then the Senator may listen again: In volume, that committee handles more resolutions——

Mr. ELLENDER. More bills than all——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Than all other committees of the Senate put together.

Mr. ELLENDER. Right; I have heard that before.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me add one thing. The Senator should see the mail that comes in to that committee. Of course, all that mail must be answered, and we have to give the people a reasoned answer.

In addition, all these special items are separate and independent, and quite distinctly independent, one from the other. We cannot do it any other way.

I happen to serve on eight subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee. How in the world to get around to all that work is more than I know. If anything, we should be a little more liberal with staff. If I had it to do, I would double it.

They spend money like sailors down in the executive branch, and yet when we add two or three people, or add ten or fifteen or twenty thousand dollars, the old missile goes up. I am not so niggardly as all that.

In proportion as we are staffed, and in proportion as the facts and the data are developed and made clear, the Senate does a better job, and likewise the committees, before legislation is ever brought to this floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for further recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to say to my friend from Louisiana that I tried once to get $5 million for the House Appropriations Committee, when I was a member, because I knew what staff can do.

If, over the recess period, when Congress adjourns, we send staff members into the departments, and tell the Secretary of the Department to give ear to what the staff man wishes, and let them supply him with the information, when the time comes for the procession of witnesses before the committee, here is someone who has labored for months in the departments, whose loyalties are to the chairman of the committee, and, Mr. President, you would be surprised at the difference it makes.

I wish to say for the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, that he has one of the best staffs on the Hill, by far, and I think he does a monumental job. The Senator himself does a monumental job because, when he sits there on civil functions and takes testimony day after day and week after week, he knows more about the little and big water courses of this country than any man I have ever known in my 33 years in the House and Senate, with one possible exception: That was Representative Mansfield, of Texas, who had come in in a wheelchair. But my friend from Louisiana has done an equally superb job.

Staff will do it. I do not know of any other answer. I would multiply the proposed appropriation twofold, if it were up to me, and yet I am not a loose-handed spender.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I say to my good friend from Illinois, if he will listen to me for just a minute——

Mr. DIRKSEN. With pleasure.

Mr. ELLENDER. I used to handle claims bills in the Senate. I can remember when I succeeded the late Senator Josiah Bailey as chairman of that committee. I am not trying to be critical of anybody, but there was a time when claims bills were introduced year after year and no action was taken.

When I became chairman, the Claims Committee actually went to work and passed on every bill that was introduced and referred to that committee. And when the committee made its report, the number of bills reported were about 54 percent of the total bills enacted in Congress.

Now all of that has been transferred to the Committee on the Judiciary. In addition, immigration bills go to Judiciary. That is why that committee has so many bills to consider.

But let us not forget that the work is being done by staff members which used to be done by Senators; and in addition to the committee staff members, we have created quite a large staff in the Attorney General's department to deal with problems with which we alone used to deal before the 1946 act.

I agree that it is nice to have staffs. I do not say this boastfully but I do not suppose there is a committee which has handled more important legislation, in recent years, than the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senator is familiar with what happened last year. We had many bills before us. We have many bills now.

It is my belief that those better capable of handling that work are the members on the committee with the committee sitting as a whole.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They could not, if the Senator will permit——

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been able to do all of that, not with four specialists, which I could employ, but only two. The more employees we use on committees the more they pass the buck to each other. That has been my experience since I became a Senator. If there are three or four economists or three or four lawyers on a committee, they will soon find themselves at loggerheads. If we employ one good economist and one good lawyer, they are going to do the work and will do it better than employing four or five on each side. At least, that has been my experience in the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But my good friend from Louisiana forgets that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry deals with a compact package, with bureaus that are all related in a single department of government. Here, there are so many unrelated factors, such as immigration, refugees, escapees, the National Code, the Criminal Code, prisons, and judicial machinery—and goodness knows what all. I should have the list here to read to the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have the list before me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is good.

Mr. ELLENDER. I point out further that each committee is allocated about $170,000 for its staffing, but in addition to that the Committee on the Judiciary spends $2,484,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, but it has a professional staff complete with secretaries——

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It works constantly upon general matters such as claims, and upon the mail which comes in. They are constantly at work. Let me point out to my good friend that I am the only Republican chairman of that subcommittee. I have a committee of two—that is, myself and the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. I hope the Senator from Louisiana will take note of that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes. And one employee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, one employee, at $7,500 a year. We have made a great record. Last year, I believe, we reported 40 bills—that is, the Committee on Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations. Give us time, and we shall have something for every day, every week, and every month on the calendar.

Mr. ELLENDER. With so many subcommittees, I am wondering what the regular staff of the committee does, because we seem to create subcommittees for each subject to be dealt with. I am wondering what the regular staff of four specialists and six clericals does.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me ask the Senator, how can a staff member give time, for instance, to the question of immigration, and then flop around and work on the mess we call title VIII of the Criminal Code? Of all the messy things in the statutes, that is the worst. The Senator is lucky that we have not come in and asked for perhaps several hundred thousand dollars to get that job done. It will defy analogy by any criminal lawyer in the country. We have not asked for that money yet. I hope that the charity in my friend's heart will carry over when we come back for the rest of the money.

STUDY AND EXAMINATION OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 198) to study and examine the Federal judicial system which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, line 21, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$184,020" and insert "$184,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

S. RES. 198

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a study and examination of the administration, practice, and procedures of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislation, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to improve the operations of the Federal courts in the just and expeditious adjudication of the cases, controversies, and other matters which may be brought before them.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis professional, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of departments and agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $184,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in 1965, $100,000 was asked to pay for seven employees. In 1966, they are now asking for $184,000, with eight additional employees. I wonder whether an explanation could be forthcoming on this point.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] can answer that question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the reasons for the substantial increase in the appropriation are as follows:

In the past, this committee has primarily handled regular matters pertaining to improvements in judicial machinery; but since last August or September, the committee has begun a study in three vital areas to improve the judicial machinery of the federal system particularly in the area of the efficiency of the Federal courts, and the great caseload problem. I was the Senator in charge of the bill last year on the omnibus judgeships, which required the addition of 31 Federal judges at the district level, and 10 at the circuit level. This was in addition. I believe that twice that many had been added only 4 years before.

The area which this committee is looking into is very important for the effective operation of the Federal judiciary.

First, we are going into extensive study as to the feasibility of revising the entire U.S. Commissioner system of the Federal judiciary, upgrading it to magisterial level and taking away some of the great caseload in the district courts.

We have been holding hearings continuously on this subject since before the first of the year. We are going to continue them and, hopefully will have proposed legislation in draft form ready by the end of this year.

This study, incidentally, has been requested by the Judicial Conference on at least three different occasions during the past 30 years.

Second, we are looking into the area of judicial fitness and the problem of the removal of judges by reason of senility, alcoholism, incompetence, laziness, or mental or physical disability, for which they cannot be impeached. Congressman Randolph, of Virginia, first requested legislation in this field in 1807. Thomas Jefferson, in 1819, stated that the impeachment system for the removal of unfit judges was merely a scarecrow. In the history of this Government, we have had only eight impeachments and four convictions therefor.

Hopefully, if we have this great caseload problem and an unfit judge on the bench, he will complicate it and immeasurably increase the problems already in existence.

These are the areas we are going to study. We need the best talent we can get to help with this study. We have fine lawyers and staff members on the subcommittee, as well as Senators, but they cannot be there continuously. We need the staff to do the job and, hopefully, we will do the job.

That is the reason for the increase in the budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE FOR FURTHER STUDY OF MIGRATORY LABOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 188) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for further study of migratory labor reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments and then from the Committee on Rules and Administration without additional amendment which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are, as follows:

On page 2, line 5, after the word "workers", to insert "and", and in the same line, after the letter "(c)", to strike out "the effectiveness of pertinent programs established by the Economic Opportunity Act, and (d)"; so as to make the resolution read:

"S. RES. 188

"*Resolved,* That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to migratory labor including, but not limited to, such matters as (a) the wages of migratory workers, their working conditions, transportation facilities, housing, health, and educational opportunities for migrants and their children, (b) the nature of and the relationships between the programs of the Federal Government and the programs of State and local governments and the activities of private organizations dealing with the problems of migratory workers, and (c) the degree of additional Federal action necessary in this area.

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

"SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1967.

"SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR MAKING CERTAIN STUDIES

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 214.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 214) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Foreign Relations for making certain studies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 214) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 214

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make complete studies of any and all matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; (3) to hold such hearings, to take such testimony, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; and (4) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government, as the committee deems advisable.

SEC. 3. In the conduct of its studies the committee may use the experience, knowledge, and advice of private organizations, schools, institutions, and individuals in its discretion, and it is authorized to divide the work of the studies among such individuals, groups, and institutions as it may deem appropriate, and may enter into contracts for this purpose.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $200,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 178.

The resolution (S. Res. 178) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 178

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by S. Res. 58, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, as amended and supplemented, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1966, to January 31, 1967, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $145,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARING ON S. 4, 89TH CONGRESS

The resolution (S. Res. 207) to authorize printing additional copies of hearing on S. 4, 89th Congress, for the Committee on Public Works was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 207

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works one thousand additional copies of the hearings helding during the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, by its Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, on S. 4, the Water Quality Act of 1965.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARING ON S. 3, 89TH CONGRESS

The resolution (S. Res. 208) to authorize printing additional copies of hearing on S. 3, 89th Congress, for the Committee on Public Works was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 208

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works one thousand additional copies of the hearings held during the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, by the Committee on Public Works, on S. 3, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "REPORT ON THE 5-YEAR RECORD OF THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS"

The resolution (S. Res. 219) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report entitled "Report on the 5-Year Record of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 219

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "Report on the Five-Year Record of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and Its Future Role", issued by the Committee on Government Operations during the Eighty-ninth Congress, second session, be printed as a Senate document, and that three thousand five hundred additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

WILFRED C. ROBERTSON

The resolution (S. Res. 222) to pay a gratuity to Wilfred C. Robertson was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 222

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Wilfred C. Robertson, widower of Elizabeth Bond Robertson, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

FRED W. FRAY, SR.

The resolution (S. Res. 223) to pay a gratuity to Fred W. Fray, Sr., was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 223

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Fred W. Fray, Senior, widower of Iva L. Fray, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death (a sum equal to seven months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider, en bloc, the votes by which certain resolutions were agreed to during the calendar call today.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 18, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 17, 1966:

U.S. Coast Guard

Rear Adm. Willard J. Smith, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard with the rank of admiral.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Surge for Clean Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation will be forever indebted to the man who has made the need for clean water a topic of conversation on every one's lips. I refer to our distinguished colleague, the dean of the Minnesota delegation, Mr. John Blatnik.

It would be an endless task to list the accolades that have poured in across the country in honor of the chief sponsor of such laws as the Water Quality Act of 1965. In appreciation of his great contribution to his Nation, our colleague has well earned the name, "Mr. Water Pollution Control."

Today John Blatnik is delivering an important talk before the Midwest Governors' Conference in Lexington, Ky., as part of his relentless campaign to clean up our rivers and streams.

I urge every Member of this House to read and digest this talk:

The Surge for Clean Water

(Remarks of the Honorable John A. Blatnik at Midwest Governors' Conference, Lexington, Ky., February 17, 1966)

I am privileged and certainly honored to be invited to address this distinguished group of Midwest Governors. I convey the best wishes of your respective congressional delegations for a successful conference. It is indeed an inspiration to see successful leaders like yourselves turn so much attention to the enormous task of cleaning up our water. This is the kind of team effort we have fought for since the first water pollution control bill back in 1956. If we are to overturn pollution as the boss of our waterways, our joint effort must be a total all-out commitment.

During the decade since 1956 the Federal Government has spent approximately $200 million for treatment plant construction right here in the Midwestern States that are represented here today. This is not even a down payment on what should be done. This kind of pace in 1966 is like using the same tools today to cross the ocean that Columbus used. As you know, it took him 70 days to cross the Atlantic. Lindbergh crossed it in 33 hours. A B–58 can do it in a little over 3 hours, and 2 months ago our Gemini spacecraft covered that distance in just about 10 minutes.

Why is it then, with this fantistic advance of science, that we are still in the era of

Columbus when it comes to rolling back the tide of pollution? This, gentlemen, is the immediate and enormous task that we must set about. We need your leadership, your help. There is a big gap between 70 days and 10 minutes. But we are going to close it.

The surge for clean water soared to an all-time high in the 89th Congress. To help make up for lost time Congress directed five separate cabinet level agencies to zero in on what has been called the No. 1 domestic problem—that of cleaning up our waters. These bold, realistic steps are more in keeping with 20th century living. This all-out legislative effort will push us forward at least to the Lindbergh era. But the fact still remains that we have allowed pollution's poisoning power to become the absolute master of our waterways before we launched this fivefold 89th congressional attack for clean water.

Let's look briefly at the highlights of these major efforts:

Water Quality Act of 1965: This powerful instrument is the result of just plain hard work. We met with conservationists, with industrialists, with State and Federal officials, civic groups and many others to come up with a cross section representation of the needs of this vast program. I must admit some of these meetings were not too pleasant, but we called a spade a spade and so did our opposition. Finally, after 5 months in conference and about eight drafts of statutory language, we emerged with a strong workable bill that was a major, significant surge forward in our pollution abatement program.

Frankly, the States' role in the stepped-up program for clean water put us to the wall. Many said the States "have obviously failed—we cannot depend on them." But fortunately the majority of the conferees agreed—and I led that point of view—that the States should be given a chance to establish their own water quality criteria. If they comply, then this can be the basis for Federal standards. This is consistent with the team effort of having governments at every level work hand in hand to accomplish this task.

In addition to upgrading the whole program, this act also doubles the amount of the grants available for single and joint projects. It also makes $20 million a year available the next 4 years for waste-water research and development. I have summarized the contents of the act in the handout that you should have at your tables. Now let's move on briefly to other 89th Congress legislation that fortifies our all-out effort for clean water.

HHFA (Public Law 89-117): Now under new Cabinet head, Robert C. Weaver. This act includes authorization for 50 percent of project cost to local governing bodies to build public water and sewer facilities. The purpose of this act is to promote orderly urban development, especially in needed community facilities for low income families. As of this date $100 million was appropriated under this act for this fiscal year ending June 30, 1966.

Farmers Home Administration Amendments of 1965: Administered by the Department of Agriculture, grants for the construction of rural water and waste disposal systems will be available on a 50-percent matching grant basis. The grants are authorized to total $50 million annually for water and sewer facilities. It is expected that over 30,000 rural communities (less than 5,500 population) will qualify for this 50-percent matching grants. These grants are designed to serve a rural area and as such take up where other programs leave off, so as not to leave a gap between urban and rural programs. No grant will be made unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare certifies that the waste water carried by the proposed facility meets the appropriate water quality standards.

Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965: I was privileged to manage this act on the House side, and I am proud to say that we got the Federal share up to 80 percent in the neediest areas for water and sewer facilities. Basic criteria for eligibility for substantial unemployment and/or low family income. As you know, this program combines the best features of accelerated public works and ARA and authorizes $500 million annually for 4 years for public works and development facility grants.

Water Resources Planning Act: This act establishes a water resources council made up of the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, Interior, Agriculture, Army, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The purpose of it is for maximum development of water resources by the coordinated planning of water supply needs by region. The act authorizes $5 million per year for 10 years to States for water resource planning, with emphasis on comprehensive development.

Encouraging as this legislation seems, it is but an idle paper entry unless we are able to harness the State leaders right here in this room in an all-out unprecedented "pull together" effort to meet the challenge at hand. One only need glance at the overpowering reality of the 20th century to appreciate the urgency of maintaining clean water. Look at the population explosion alone.

Keep in mind that our supply of water is more or less constant, but think that at the beginning of the Christian era—at the time of the first Christmas—there were only about 250 million people in the whole world.

In another 10 years there'll be that many right here in the United States. And we live on only 7 percent of the earth's surface. So it's time we take bold action commensurate with the era in which we live.

We have no choice but to manage and conserve this precious item called water. The same amount of water must be made to serve more and more people. This mandate is made clear by the fact that it took the human race over 2,000 years to develop a population of 3 billion people, and we are going to double that figure in less than 30 years. Right here in America we are growing so rapidly that we have almost the numerical equivalent of a new State of Kentucky every year. This is just people increase, not to mention the vast new technological, chemical, and scientific changes that correspond to such a growth.

Imagine the impact these changes have on our supply of water. One of the best yardsticks to demonstrate this impact of our changing times is the fact that our old processes are becoming obsolete so fast today that the average American industrial worker changes jobs 15 times and has to be retrained 3 times in the course of his career. So just as our highly retrained industrial worker gives his product the 1966 treatment, let's do the same for our Nation's water. Let us stop pretending that the ancient aqueducts that carry our combined sewer and storm runoff are sufficient. Like the up-to-date industrial worker, let's attack the backlog of unbuilt treatment plants. Let us prod our State pollution officers into firm action. Some of our States have been real laggards in this effort. Once we get a full, all-out commitment, then you prod us into increasing the Federal share of the cost of this national problem. The success of this joint effort stems largely from your initiative. Your cooperation made the highway program work. It will also make this program work.

A good example of strong, bold, realistic State action is the billion-dollar bond issue passed by New York State. The worst drought in two centuries has forced public action in that State. It's not hard to talk about clean usable water to New Yorkers. The lack of usable water has made it the number one topic of conversation. Restaurants were forbidden to serve water unless the customer specifically asked for it. This is a real paradox when the Hudson flows right by their doorstep, but severe pollution has put the Hudson water off limits. Even if it took the drought to bring the message home to New York, they responded, and in 6 years they hope to again have clean usable water. I salute New York's commitment and I hope other States will follow suit.

As we enter our 60th month of continuous economic expansion—the longest period of unbroken economic growth in the history of our Nation—I hope all of us here make a firm commitment to provide enough clean useable water to allow this economic trend to continue. Water is the lifeblood of our economy, yet through misuse and mismanagement we enter 1966 with torrents of pollution and a trickle of clean water. With your forceful help in the months ahead, we will reverse this.

We can count on help from others too. The Presidential Science Advisory Committee has just released its pollution panel report with over 100 recommendations ranging from assessing taxes on those who pollute to suggested enforcing procedures. This is not the only panel of experts channeling their efforts to restore clean water. With the fivefold increase of water in the United States, just in the last 50 years industry too is tooling up to meet this challenge—the industrially supported National Council for Stream Improvement has established five regional research centers, the soap and detergent industry spent over a million dollars last year to minimize the role of detergents as pollutants. We can also count on technical and scientific data to start flowing from the two national water quality labs that are staffing up now to join the surge for clean water. So you can see, many hands are at work in our common effort to unseat pollution as the king of our waterways.

The most helpful of these cooperative hands has been in the form of Federal incentive grants. From 1956 through 1965 the 13 midwestern States represented here today have received over $200 million in grants under the Federal Water Pollution Control and Accelerated Public Works Acts. This construction assistance for these 2,325 projects represents a total cost of $835.5 million. Your larger cities alone need a staggering $660 million worth of construction at present. By 1972 they must provide an additional $747 million worth of facilities.

Now I do not want to sound too critical, but the one area where we have failed the greatest and received the least amount of support is at the State level. Though the States have the primary responsibility for water pollution control, the 13 States represented here today have not put up $1 toward the over $835 million construction cost of these waste treatment plants just mentioned. The communities or municipalities have had to come up with over $635 million and the Federal Government came up with over $200 million in grants. So I urge you to go to your legislatures and bring the States into this program. Surely if the local communities can raise over $600 million and the Federal Government can put in over $200 million, then the State can come up with some financial grants. If one city like St. Louis can commit itself to a $95 million program, the State should be able to come up with as much, and more. One of the States here provides loans for treatment construction plants, but I was horrified to learn that none of our 13 States provide construction grants. I hope you will join the all-out effort and urge your legislatures to correct this. The alternative, and you would not wish to countenance it, is having your cities bypass the State entirely and deal directly with the Federal Government in Washington.

If these States would authorize construction grants like some of their sister States do, we on a Federal level would have a much easier job. As you know, the Federal construction grants program expires June 30, 1967. How do you expect us to renew this program if we have to report that blocks of States like this group meeting here today do not put one 1 cent for construction grants. This is the same kind of inactivity that forced the Federal Government to go in and set standards. The States failed to act and the Federal Government was forced to step in.

Stepped-up State activity in all aspects of water pollution prevention, control, and abatement is now urgently necessary. Your universities are training and turning out scientific minds eager for the challenge. Put them to work for you in developing effective solutions to your complex problems. In your efforts to further your State's economic growth and progress, keep the long-range interest in view. Insist that the new industries attracted to your States abide by your conditions for waste disposal. They would be the first to leave if their supply of acceptable water should run out. Enforce these conditions, as well on all water users in your State. A modern treatment plant is a considerable investment. It would be better protected if the State provided for certification of those entrusted with its operation and maintenance. These are only some of the measures to be taken. Most important, of course, is the effective administration and implementation of the laws you already have for controlling water pollution.

I hope we can have more meetings like this one in order to better understand our mutual problem of cleaning up our water.

In closing then I just want to remind you of President Johnson's closing remarks at the signing of this Water Quality Act of 1956: "The ultimate victory of cleaning up our waters really rests in the hands of all the people of America, not just the Government in Washington. Much of the money, imagination, and effort must be generated at the local level."

Thanks again for your indulgence, and I firmly believe with your help and cooperation water pollution can be conquered in this century.

The People of Louisiana Are Grateful to the Corps of Engineers for Their Assistance Following Hurricane Betsy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, it would be difficult for the average person to imagine the tremendous amount of devastation wrought by Hurricane Betsy when it hit Louisiana last fall—only if you had personally witnessed this tragedy would you comprehend the magnitude of the task undertaken by the Corps of Engineers to repair and rebuild facilities necessary to the health and safety of the people of Louisiana, and to assist them in debris clearance. The Corps of Engineers rose to the challenge and are accomplishing this herculean task in a remarkable manner.

To commend the Engineers for this magnificent job, I have written the following letters to the Chief of Engineers, Lt. Gen. William F. Cassidy, and the district engineer in Louisiana, Col. Thomas J. Bowen:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1966.

Lt. Gen. William F. Cassidy,
Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

Dear General Cassidy: Now that the shock of the disastrous Hurricane Betsy, which struck Louisiana with such fury last fall, has passed and reconstruction is underway, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Corps of Engineers for the magnificent role which they played in aiding and assisting our stricken State.

Without the capable help of the engineers, Louisiana could not have so rapidly made strides toward recovery from the devastating effects of this storm, perhaps the worst hurricane ever to hit our shores. Naturally, much remains to be done to obtain further protection from future storms of a similar nature, however progress is being made toward this goal, which is encouraging.

You can be assured that the people of Louisiana will long remember the helping hand of the Corps of Engineers which was extended at the time of their greatest need.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely,
James H. Morrison,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1966.

Col. Thomas J. Bowen,
District Engineer, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans, La.

Dear Colonel Bowen: The people of Louisiana owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to you for the wonderful job that the Corps of Engineers did in aiding and assisting the State in recovering from the devastating effects of Hurricane Betsy.

Only those who personally witnessed the awesome damage will know to the fullest extent the magnificence of this accomplishment. The capable and willing help of the corps will always be remembered and appreciated by a grateful State.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely,
James H. Morrison,
Member of Congress.

The 56th Anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, this month the Boy Scouts of America are celebrating their 56th anniversary.

The history of this outstanding organization is one of which all Boy Scouts—past and present—can be tremendously proud. The Boy Scouts were chartered by Congress in 1916. In the past 56 years, more than 37 million Americans have been members of the Boy Scouts; the Scouts have more than 5½ million members today. Many of our Nation's leaders were Boy Scouts in their youth.

The Boy Scouts work to develop honorable young men of initiative and good character. Good citizenship and good sense is stressed.

I join with millions of other Americans in saluting the Boy Scouts of America and in wishing them continued success.

The Office of Emergency Planning Rendered Magnificent Service to Louisiana in Aiding and Assisting the State To Recover From the Effects of the Disastrous Hurricane Betsy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, Hurricane Betsy was one of the most disastrous storms ever to hit this hemisphere in all history, and at the time that the Louisiana people so desperately needed help, and needed it quickly, the Office of Emergency Planning arrived—hardly before the wind stopped blowing. In fact, President Lyndon Johnson literally put them off the Presidential plane when it arrived in New Orleans with instructions to "get going and get the job done" and they did just that. They set up headquarters immediately and did an amazing job in the weeks that followed.

In view of this tremendous accomplishment, I have written the following letter of commendation to the Honorable Franklin B. Dryden, Acting Director of the Office of Emergency Planning:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1966.

Hon. Franklin B. Dryden,
Acting Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Dryden: There is an old adage which goes "a friend in need, is a friend indeed," and I would like to take this opportunity to thank your agency for being such a magnificent friend to the people of Louisiana in their hours of deepest need following the devastating Hurricane Betsy.

The fine assistance of your agency in organizing, coordinating, and directing Federal emergency relief held the tragic effects of this storm to a minimum by helping to prevent further loss of life and human suffering, and by aiding and assisting our State in overcoming this tragedy.

Louisiana will be forever grateful to your agency, and to your capable, hardworking representatives, who went far beyond the call of duty to come to the aid of our stricken State.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely,
James H. Morrison,
Member of Congress.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Clair M. Cook, Th. D., Methodist clergyman and legislative assistant to Senator VANCE HARTKE, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord of time and timelessness, lift us above this little day to the perspective of forever.

O God of east and west, whose love encompasses both Communist and Christian, let our horizons of good will extend without limit, even to the jungles of Vietnam.

Give us concern for the safety of our own and compassion for those whom we oppose. Grant us wisdom to grasp the confusing threads of conflicting policy, to sort them out with patience, and to weave of them a pattern of wholeness for the comfort of all people.

Encourage the men of this body, to whom their fellows look with trust, in their determination for the right, that they may debate with vigor but without acrimony; that their vision may pierce beyond political advantage to courageous willingness to suffer for the right if need be; and that their service may be not alone to State and Nation, but to Thee and all Thy farflung world.

For we recall the last words of King David: *When one rules justly over men, ruling in the fear of God, He dawns on them like the morning light, like the sun shining forth upon a cloudless morning, like rain that makes grass to sprout from the earth.* Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. METCALF, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 17, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON WEATHER MODIFICATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on weather modification. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD without being read, and appropriately referred.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting, for the consideration of the Congress, the Seventh Annual Report on Weather Modification (for fiscal year 1965) submitted to me by the Director of the National Science Foundation.

Highly encouraging steps are being taken toward establishing safe and effective programs for modifying the weather. We can now begin to see the day when such programs may become operationally feasible. This is an exciting and encouraging development—not only for Americans, but for men everywhere.

Last year, in transmitting to the Congress the sixth annual report, I indicated the need for a larger effort in basic research and in the development of means to put the knowledge we have to work.

That increased effort is noted in this report. It describes not only the vigorous pursuit of weather modification programs by agencies of the executive branch, but also the valuable stimulus afforded by committees of the Congress and the significant activities of nongovernmental groups.

RECENT STUDIES

The list of recent activities in this field is heartening. For example, on January 1, 1966, the first Federal regulation on weather modification became effective. The National Science Foundation issued rules providing that advance notice of intention to modify the weather must be given to the Foundation.

More recently, two significant reports by advisory groups have been issued. A two-volume study by a National Academy of Sciences panel, released January 14, reviewed in detail the physical science aspects of weather and climate modification. Five days later the National Science Foundation's Special Commission on Weather Modification issued a broad report covering the biological and social aspects, statistical problems, problems of law and organization, and international implications, as well as physical science aspects. Additional reports by the Special Commission will soon be forthcoming.

Congress, too, has indicated its interest in scheduling additional hearings on weather and climate modification during this session.

It is striking that separate groups dealing seriously with this problem have, after long study, arrived at similar and significant conclusions.

The National Academy of Sciences report, for example, says:

> In a sense, weather modification today is a reality. Man can and does interfere with the atmosphere in a number of ways. His ability to produce deliberate beneficial changes is still very limited and uncertain, but it is no longer economically or politically trivial.

The report of the Special Commission, in a markedly similar passage, says:

> Weather and climate modification is becoming a reality. The daily activities of man influence the atmosphere in a number of ways and his ability to induce deliberate changes in measurable magnitude by artificial means is progressing.

The report I submit today says it another way:

> In 1965, key words are no longer "whether" and "when." They are "what" and "how" and "who."

PROBLEMS AND PROGRESS

Two sets of problems face us and both are difficult. One consists of finding out how to modify the weather and climate. The second consists of determining how best to utilize this knowledge for the benefit of mankind once it is achieved.

The scientists and engineers inside and outside the Government must address themselves particularly to the first set of problems. All of us, as concerned citizens, must seriously consider the second.

At present it appears feasible, under appropriate conditions, to seed some kinds of clouds and achieve increased precipitation. It is also possible, under certain conditions, to dissipate some types of fog. Partial success has been reported from abroad in reducing hail damage.

As our understanding of atmospheric processes increases, our ability to do more will also increase. Even now, men are dreaming and planning of projects that will someday enable us to mitigate the awesome and terrible forces of hurricanes and tornadoes. Such a time is still far off, but perhaps not so far off as we thought only a few years ago.

That so much is being done now is a credit not only to the men of science working in the field, but also to the understanding and support of the Congress which has expressed its interest in and support of this field of great national interest. I commend to your continuing interest this report and the important efforts that it describes.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 18, 1966.*

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. METCALF, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. METCALF, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to query the acting majority leader concerning possible sessions tomorrow, Monday, or Tuesday.

Mr. METCALF. I am informed that the Senate will adjourn today and meet at noon on Monday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Monday?

Mr. METCALF. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Since the 22d is on Tuesday, I do not know whether it is contemplated that we have any heavy business other than the pending resolution.

Mr. METCALF. There will be further consideration of the pending business on

Monday, and there will be no business after the reading of Washington's Farewell Address on Tuesday.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 2941. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require that information returns made with respect to payments under programs administered by the Department of Agriculture be filed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 2942. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to limit the maximum rate of percentage depletion to a rate of 20 percent; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2943. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend for an additional year the eligibility of certain areas of substantial unemployment; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 2944. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2945. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jaime E. Condom Valera; and

S. 2946. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mario V. Machado Espinosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. MOSS, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. BAYH, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. HART, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. HARTKE):

S. 2947. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUSKIE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, two bills and ask that they be properly referred.

At the same time, I give notice to the Senate that these two bills dealing with amendments to the revenue code will be offered as an amendment to H.R. 12752 when it comes over from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). Without objection, the two bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 2941. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require that information returns made with respect to payments under programs administered by the Department of Agriculture be filed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 2942. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to limit the maximum rate of percentage depletion to a rate of 20 percent.

AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act to extend for an additional year the eligibility of certain areas of our Nation to receive assistance for public works and development projects deemed essential to accelerate their future growth. If this extension is not granted many areas of the Nation which have been qualified for development aid under title I of the act for the past year will end up without having received any Federal assistance, not through any negligence on the part of the local communities or their officials, but because of delays encountered in establishing procedures within the Economic Development Agency in Washington.

As passed, the act of 1965 contained an amendment allowing that areas having a history of substantial unemployment during the preceding calendar year would be eligible for benefits under title I. This section allows Federal assistance to be given to nearly 100 areas of the country including Utica-Rome, Batavia, Oneonta, Sidney, and Watertown in New York State, which though not seriously depressed, are nevertheless in need of Federal assistance in order to redevelop their areas. The act further provides that the Department of Labor conduct an annual review to determine if the areas covered continue to meet the substantial unemployment requirement for title I assistance. If the unemployment figures for the past year show that a certain area no longer remains in the qualified category, that area will immediately lose its title I eligibility.

It was determined soon after the act became law that applications for assistance would not be accepted until an overall economic development program in accordance with yet-to-be-defined EDA regulations was approved and on file. It seems, however, that the EDA was burdened with the usual administrative delays which occur upon the establishment of a new agency. Consequently, there was an understandable delay in the issuance of guidelines to be used in drawing up an overall economic development program. These guidelines were made available only recently. Thus, many of the qualified title I areas must now tackle this difficult problem of drawing up such a program. As of February 3 the Economic Development Administration reported that no title I grants have yet been made. The time for the first annual review to determine eligibility is likely to take place sometime in June, and it appears that the processing of applications for aid for many title I locations will not yet be completed.

Thus, many areas all across the Nation stand to lose this very valuable Federal assistance if the Labor Department statistics show that they have made sufficient gains in their annual unemployment rates. I am quite concerned about these areas. I do not believe that any of them should be penalized due to administrative delay. Even though they are moving ahead, it seems to me, we should support them for a while longer to make certain they do not fall back.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues' support in giving these areas an extra year of eligibility under the Economic Development Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2943) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend for an additional year the eligibility of certain areas of substantial unemployment, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for introduction and appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and Senators COOPER, PROUTY, and RANDOLPH, the Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966.

This proposed legislation will provide Federal matching funds to bolster library facilities for the inmates of State institutions, including orphanages, prisons, reformatories, and hospitals for the mentally ill and the retarded. It would also provide for Federal grants to develop cooperative library services within States, and extend the present Federal library program for 5 years.

Specifically, the bill would amend the Library Services and Construction Act of 1964, to—

First. Provide a Federal-State matching fund program, first, to strengthen library services to persons in State-operated institutions, including prisons, reformatories, mental hospitals, and institutions for the retarded, training schools, and orphanages; and second, to expand library services to State Governments in such specialized fields as law, history, archives, and legislative reference. Both programs would be for 5-year periods, and each would be authorized $5 million the first year, $7.5 million the second, $10 million the third, $12.5 million the fourth, and $15 million in fiscal year 1971, the final year covered.

Second. Provide a 5-year State-Federal matching fund program to State library agencies to develop cooperative library services, and joint use of facilities involving public, research, college, and secondary school libraries. The authorizations would be the same as noted above.

Third. Extend the provisions of the Library Services and Construction Act. The law is scheduled to expire June 30, 1966.

Mr. President, the total amount authorized under all parts of the bill for the next 5 fiscal years aggregates $1,180 million.

The bill follows the recommendations—and this is very important—developed by the Association of State Libraries, the organization composed of the professionals responsible for the administration of the present law. The bill is an expansion of the 1956, 1960, and 1964 library aid laws enacted during the Eisenhower and Johnson administrations.

While the current law has been most helpful, public libraries throughout the Nation are still lacking the necessary financial resources to provide the services that are necessary. More than 15 million Americans still have no public library service and more than 100 million have service inadequate to their needs.

Title I of the Library Services and Construction Act provides funds to the States for library services. This money may be used for books and other library materials, library equipment, salaries and other operating expenses. The law expires June 30, 1966. The bill introduced today provides new authorizations as follows: Fiscal year 1967, $60 million; fiscal year 1968, $80 million; fiscal year 1969, $100 million; fiscal year 1970, $120 million, and $150 million annually thereafter.

Library construction still falls far short of our national needs. Some $400 million is required just to meet the backlog of needed public library construction, for example. Title II of the Library Services and Construction Act provides funds to the States for construction of new public library buildings and the expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings for public libraries and the initial equipment of such buildings. My bill provides new authorizations as follows: Fiscal year 1967, $75 million; fiscal year 1968, $100 million; fiscal year 1969, $125 million; fiscal year 1970, $125 million; and fiscal year 1971, $100 million.

Among public libraries, there is a trend toward greater interlibrary cooperation to maximize the use of available resources and services and to effect maximum economies. For example, a locally based library cooperative system is now being organized under an interstate compact authority in Iowa and Illinois. Title III of the bill would encourage and enhance similar such efforts.

Title IV, specialized State library services, deals with a growing need. State library agencies are falling farther behind in their efforts to respond to increasing demands for books, technical reports and other library materials, and for technical, advisory, and planning services to libraries of State agencies and institutions.

An indication of the present deficiency in services is provided by reports from 150 State-supported correctional institutions for persons aged 16 years and over. In fiscal year 1964 the total inmate population of these institutions was 206,822. Only about 1 million books, most of them worn, obsolete, or poorly chosen, are available for this inmate population. By applying professional standards for adequacy, this figure should be about 2.1 million volumes of currently useful, professionally selected material.

The library service programs maintained in State institutions need strengthening in order to fulfill their role as an integral part of treatment and rehabilitation programs. The institutional library is more than a marginal adjunct to the institution. It must serve as a scientific and technical collection for the professional staff that operates the facility. And it must contribute to educational, vocational, recreational and cultural programs for the direct benefit of the institutionalized.

The American Correctional Association and the Association of Hospital and Institution Libraries describe the existing condition of library services to State institutions as clearly and completely inadequate. Services to the staff and inmates of State institutions such as hospitals, correctional facilities, and homes for the retarded are undersupplied and understaffed or altogether lacking. In only 28 States have the State library agencies undertaken to any degree the responsibility of servicing the libraries of these State institutions. While in some locations library needs are met partially through local community public libraries, for the isolated institutions this need is intensified.

The Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966 will, I hope, serve as a standard for Federal library legislation to which all who support an adequate library system throughout the Nation can rally.

Mr. President, in view of the critical importance of education in our country, I urge early action and consideration of this really historic measure, to bring our Library Services and Construction Act abreast of the times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2944) to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

NEED IS INTENSE FOR EXPANDED AND IMPROVED LIBRARY FACILITIES—ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION CAN AID

Mr. RANDOPH. Mr. President, it is a privilege to join with the able senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and my distinguished colleagues, Senators COOPER and PROUTY, in cosponsoring the bill, S. 2944, presented to the Senate today which would amend and extend the provisions of the Library Services and Construction Act of 1964. These legislators have been in the forefront of our efforts to improve and enhance this Nation's vital library facilities.

The 89th Congress, Mr. President, is cataloging its mark in history with dedication to the increasingly important task of assuring that our citizens have educational institutions at all levels which are not merely adequate, but, indeed, excellent.

There is no sense in buttressing our educational institutions if we are going to leave our research facilities, such as our libraries, lagging far behind in a stagnant, unsatisfactory condition. The public uses its libraries. That these libraries are lacking in materials the public could well use is evident. In West Virginia, figures strikingly illustrate the minimal services available to our dedicated librarians and the public. The maximum use is made of these services by the citizens of West Virginia.

Our State public library system is divided into regions. In region 4, which comprises Calhoun, Doddridge, Jackson, Ritchie, and Roane Counties, the population served by the libraries is 60,056. The total number of volumes available is only 58,821—less than 1 book per person. And yet the total circulation, demonstrating interested use of even this minimum number of volumes, is 181,766—or, compared to the total population, over 300 percent. In region II, Harrison, Lewis, and Upshur Counties, there are 115,859 persons served, just about 1 book per person, and a total circulation of roughly 200 percent. For Marshall and Wetzel Counties, there are over 57,000 people served by the libraries, with only a little more than 55,000 books, and here the interest displayed by the public has led to a use of almost 500 percent—a total volume circulation of 275,737.

Yes, it is proven that the reading public uses our libraries. It is clear that this use is intense and extensive, and it is also obvious that the degree of circulation—200 to 500 percent—reflects a keen interest on the part of our citizens in the library facilities available to them.

Mr. President, not too long ago, the Soviets bragged that they would win the cold war by beating us in the classroom. We have long recognized that our classrooms, producing as they do future generations of Americans, are our first line of defense. I submit that our libraries are a part of this first line, that they indeed are the supply columns on which our academic troops depend. And any military strategist can testify to the importance of providing only the best supplies, in the most effective manner, to soldiers in combat service.

It was my privilege to call to the attention of this body, on February 7, the merited recognition received by the Hardy County Public Library in Moorefield, W. Va. This facility is one of only six in our Nation which received the 1966 Book-of-the-Month Club Library Award of $2,500, for its excellence in serving its community. I stated:

> Just as vital is the role of the public library in providing a source of knowledge, new ideas, and intellectual stimuli to the community at large.

This role is vital, Mr. President, and so also are the roles of our secondary school libraries and the library facilities of our academic institutions. In 1964, when signing the Library Services and Construction Act, President Johnson declared:

> This Nation needs a larger and more diversified collection of books * * *. The

central fact of our times is this: books and ideas are the most effective weapons against intolerance and ignorance.

Truly, they are our supplies, our most vital lifeline, in our war, our battle, for the minds and hearts of men and women who must understand freedom and justice and responsibility to really serve in solving the problems of a complex society.

Sensing this—and sensing the needs and the purposes of all our many types of library facilities—librarians, State officials, Federal officials, and farsighted citizens have cooperated in an effort to make this legislation a measure responsive to the needs of our States, directed toward the achievement of excellence in service, and reflective of the public interest.

This proposal, while fortifying present programs under titles I and II, expands our areas of activity in two new titles. I shall discuss these two new titles briefly.

Title III of our measure provides for assistance to the several States in establishing and maintaining local, interlocal, regional, State, or interstate cooperative networks of libraries.

Cooperative networks of libraries, whether they be composed of small, neighboring local communities, or regional, interstate units, would effectively increase the effectiveness of making much-needed material available to larger groups of our citizens than is now possible. Particularly with reference to professional and research materials is this plan a sound one. Many expensive and important documents which could well be utilized by hospital libraries, schools, and other special facilities could be shared under a network system. There are many instances of certain editions of important specialized documents being out of print, or available only in limited quantities. A cooperative system would help to overcome the handicap suffered by many who are now, at worst, completely unable to obtain access to such works, or who must, at best, either rely on secondhand information or take valuable time away from other important activities to reach the publication they need.

To this end, the bill calls for interlibrary cooperation plans to provide policies and objectives for coordination which must be both systematic and effective to improve supplementary services to special clienteles served by library centers. It also provides for the resources of schools, of public, academic, and special libraries to achieve this goal.

In an era such as ours, we must also assist, in every feasible way, our States in their tasks of providing services to certain institutionalized citizens and to professional employees of State departments and agencies. Title IV of our bill is directed toward this problem. Part A of this title gives assistance in the improvement of State institutional library facilities, such as those serving inmates, patients, or residents of penal institutions, reformatories, hospitals—including those for the aged and mentally ill—training schools and orphanages, operated by the State.

We cannot neglect those persons whom we are preparing for positive roles in our society. If we do not do all within our power to rehabilitate those who are preparing now, and particularly to educate those who, such as our orphans, have become our wards through little fault of their own, we cannot say to the next generation, "We did our job."

Neither can we say to our State governments that we will cooperate with them at all levels, except the level of State government itself; that we will help them meet all their needs, except the needs of their own professional employees; and that we will assist with any library anywhere, except in our own State offices. Therefore, part B of this title is designed to provide assistance to our State governments for those library services so desperately needed by our splendid State employees.

Mr. President, this is a necessary measure. The American Library Association has estimated that the shortage in the number of volumes necessary for our public school, academic, and public libraries is 390 million volumes. The national shortage in professional library personnel is approximately 100,000. These are frightening figures, when we remember that we are discussing not an isolated, unimportant phenomenon, but the plight of a vital national resource. It is my sincere hope that this legislation will receive favorable consideration, and that we will meet, in a frontal attack, the Russian threat to "beat us in the classrooms" by actively improving the supplies with which our classroom war is waged and, I trust, waged successfully.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am very glad to join today with Senators JAVITS, PROUTY, and RANDOLPH, who are members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in sponsoring a bill to extend the Library Services and Construction Act. For several years I was a member of the committee, which has jurisdiction in this field, and have been a sponsor of previous extensions of the act. While I was not in the Senate when the original act was introduced by Senator HILL, I have appeared before his appropriations subcommittee nearly every year in support of funds for the library services program, and know the strong leadership he has given year after year with the support of many of us to build the program which is proving so valuable today.

I understand that Congressman PERKINS, of Kentucky, chairman of the General Subcommittee on Education, has introduced a somewhat similar bill in the House of Representatives, and believe that these bills have the approval and represent the recommendations of the American Library Association.

The bill would authorize increased amounts for the library services and library construction programs, and also includes new titles to assist in the development of cooperative library services, and specialized and State government library services. I know the committees will give serious consideration to these proposals and will review the level of authorizations and specific proposals which have been made. At this point, I affirm my continued support for the program, which must be extended this year.

Mr. President, I recently received from Miss Margaret Willis, our very able State librarian, a summary of library activities in Kentucky, and ask unanimous consent that her letter and the summary be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LIBRARIES,
Frankfort, Ky., January 12, 1966.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR COOPER: Enclosed is a brief report of what has been accomplished with Library Services Act and Library Services and Construction Act funds by the department of libraries, in cooperation with local library boards.

We have worked hard, and much has been accomplished, we think. We have a good library plan, which works well in the counties. One of the advantages of both bills has been that each State may decide what is best for that State. There has been no control exercised by the Federal Government other than to make sure that funds have been spent the way each State has said they would be spent. Kentucky has made use of all Federal funds, thank goodness. The amounts have been small, but the impact has been far beyond the actual dollars spent by the Federal Government.

As you can see, we are working toward the development of permanent programs, rather than merely providing temporary, palliative measures.

We have always received wonderful help from you, and the counties know this.

We sincerely hope and pray you will help Kentucky to get an extended and improved Library Services and Construction Act, so that Kentucky's libraries and bookmobiles can continue to expand, improve, and go forward permanently—for the benefit of all the people, rich and poor, young and old. We are confident that you will.

Most gratefully,

MARGARET WILLIS.

Enclosures.

RÉSUMÉ OF WHAT HAS BEEN DONE UNDER THE LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

In round figures the Library Services Act and the subsequent Library Services and Construction Act have provided for Kentucky the following:

Library Services Act

1956–57	$40,000
1957–58	137,000
1958–59	171,000
1959–60	221,000
1960–61	221,000
1961–62	205,000
1962–63	205,000
1963–64	205,000

Library Services and Construction Act

In 1964–65, $429,000 (services); $510,000 (construction); plus $93,000 from other States.

In 1965–66, $429,000 (services); $510,000 (construction).

The Federal bill's effect on the State income: In 1956–57 the State budget[1] was $180,000; in 1965–66 the State budget was $885,000 (more than a 400-percent increase).

The effect of both on local income: In 1956–57 local income was slightly more than $1 million; in 1965–66 local income is well over $2 million (an increase of 100 percent).

Additional local action to assure permanent library and bookmobile programs: Since 1960, when a new State law was passed, permittting a county or counties to vote for a library tax, 16 counties have voted to tax themselves for a library and bookmobile program.

---

[1] Department of libraries.

Since 1964, when a second State law was passed, permitting a county or counties to petition for a library tax, 10 counties have petitioned successfully for a library and bookmobile program.

Therefore a total of 26 counties have taxed themselves for library service.

At the present time many more counties are preparing to vote or petition for a library tax.

This progress in State and local support has been a direct result of the comparatively modest Federal help. It is not nearly enough, but without the impact of Federal help, Kentucky's library and bookmobile program would most probably have remained static.

REGIONAL LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT

Fourteen library regions are developing in 81 libraries in 71 counties with Federal and State funds. Headquarters for two additional regions have been designated; both counties qualified by passing a local library tax. They are receiving regular shipments of cataloged and processed new books, records, films and other materials. A third county has recently qualified as a headquarters for a new region.

Sixteen trained regional librarians and 44 clerical assistants, paid with Federal and State funds are now working in these regions—organizing and reorganizing libraries, aiding in improving bookmobile service, leading workshops for in-service training of local librarians and bookmobile librarians, planning and leading adult and children's programs in libraries, upgrading reference and informational services, publicizing new materials and services offered, and coordinating service in each area.

Up to July 1, 1955, the following regional materials have been provided with Federal and State funds for libraries in regions: Books, 538,809; records, 18,000 (approximately); films, 518 (film circuit) plus rental of films from the University of Kentucky film collection (paid by the department of libraries); American Lending Library Service (a rotating collection of current books), 150 books for small counties, 300–450 books for large counties; periodicals, approximately 15 subscriptions for each county; framed paintings, 2,500, rotated regularly among libraries; athletic equipment, in 1964–65 (for loan), $3,200 (cost).

BOOKMOBILES

Ninety-six new large bookmobiles have been purchased since 1960—with Federal and State funds to replace small, worn out bookmobiles and to provide bookmobile service to 10 counties for the first time.

BOOKMOBILE BOOKS

Total annual funds for bookmobile books to counties giving bookmobile service have increased from $40,000 in 1956–57 to $133,000 in 1964–65 (a great improvement, but not nearly enough).

CIRCULATION OF BOOKS

Circulation of books in the State has increased 200 percent in 11 years. But circulation of books in counties participating in regions has increased over 800 percent in the same period.

NEW NONBOOK MATERIALS

The new educational films, and the new language, literature, classical music and folk music recordings have stimulated many new interests in each county. They have been used constantly—in the libraries, and with clubs and organizations, or in homes. Athletic equipment has brought many users to libraries, who borrow the equipment and start reading books on related subjects.

EXAMPLES OF COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES

The department of libraries has cooperated with the Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs by providing the study program for their ESO reading program and by providing all the books included in the program—for each library.

The department is participating in the Jaycees good reading program.

The department selects the annual reading list for the Kentucky homemakers and places all books listed on bookmobiles.

The department is cooperating with the national fitness program by making athletic equipment available to clubs and families.

The department has purchased professional books for child welfare workers and is providing a revolving collection for each local office.

The department cooperated with the Department of Natural Resources in a program of distribution of tree seedlings to make Kentucky a greener land. Distribution was from libraries and bookmobiles.

The department has cataloged and processed library collections for a school library, the Department of Safety Library, the Child Welfare Library, the National Guard Library, and others free of charge.

State and Federal agency publications are distributed regularly to libraries participating in regions. Among them are the University of Kentucky Agricultural Extension Department's farm bulletins.

Regional librarians have aided Appalachian volunteers in their work by helping to cull donated books to one-room schools and by providing books, records, and films for them.

All libraries aid college students in their search and research.

All libraries train schoolchildren in the use of libraries, and give hours each day to helping hordes of elementary and secondary school students.

Regional and local librarians work together to provide regular story hours for preschool children—in the libraries, in schools, and in small communities reached only by bookmobiles.

Libraries are using VISTA volunteers, students in the Federal work-study program, and unemployed fathers, whenever possible.

WORKSHOPS

Ten 2-week summer workshops for untrained local librarians and bookmobile librarians have been held at Kentucky State College.

Over 250 1-day workshops have been held by regional librarians for local librarians, bookmobile librarians and library board members.

Three Governor's conferences for library board members and librarians have been held.

THE STATE LIBRARY

A 10,000-square-foot processing center has been constructed as an annex to the old State Library Building. It makes possible faster and more efficient cataloging, processing, and distribution of regional and bookmobile books and materials. The entire space in the old building is now used by the library collection of books, pamphlets, and periodicals. These are used mainly to supplement local library collections and school libraries by special requests, which are received by telephone and by mail daily.

A microfilm reader-printer and microfilmed copies of 250 periodicals have been purchased—to facilitate serving local public and school library requests for up-to-date information in periodicals.

Funds for books for the State library have increased from $2,828 in 1956–57 to $44,170 in 1964–65.

Service to the blind is made possible by a contract with the Cincinnati Public Library, a regional center of the Federal Government, for free braille books, talking books and talking-book machines for Kentucky's blind; the department of libraries paid $12,000 to the Cincinnati Public Library for this service. Materials and machines are provided free by the Federal Government.

Professional personnel has been increased by two additional librarians for the reference and loan department and two additional catalogers in the processing center. An administrator of construction projects has been hired.

SCHOLARSHIPS

One $2,000 scholarship was paid to a graduate student in library science; he is now regional librarian of the Green River library region, with headquarters in Ohio County.

Two additional graduate students are currently receiving library science scholarships of $2,000 each to attend the Department of Library Science at the University of Kentucky.

Many small scholarships are provided by the Friends of Kentucky Libraries to help local librarians obtain additional training.

FISH IN THE FOOD-FOR-FREEDOM PROGRAM

AMENDMENT NO. 485

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, for myself and the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I submit for appropriate reference, an amendment to S. 2933, a bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes. This bill adds domestic fishery products to the President's food-for-freedom program.

This is an amendment similar to one Congress enacted several years ago adding fishery products to the food-for-peace program. I understand that the failure to include fishery products in the present bill was not a deliberate act of omission and that the administration recognizes the significant contributions that could be made to our food-for-freedom program by high protein fishery products. I am particularly pleased to note that the new program is no longer dependent upon offering to needy, friendly nations only our surplus production which cannot otherwise be used. This restriction prevented any fishery products from being sold under the food-for-peace program simply because the Secretary of the Interior never determined that any domestic fishery product was in surplus. The new program is focused not on disposing of surplus but on the human problem of feeding hungry people, particularly children who are suffering from malnutrition. This is a much more noble venture and one toward which high protein fishery products can make a substantial contribution.

Under the amendment the financing of fishery products would be the same as under the present law; namely, CCC funds would be available.

As pointed out on the floor of the Senate when the amendment to the present law was adopted, CCC funds should be made available for the purchase of fishery products as well as agricultural products because these are public funds. I would like to emphasize that fish protein concentrate which will be available, we hope in the near future, is already included in the legislation since authority is in the bill to use CCC funds for the acquisition of additives and for the cost of enrichment and fortification which would, of course, include fish protein concentrate.

Mr. President, I request that this amendment be printed at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 485) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

> At the appropriate place, amend section 302 to add after the word "commodity" and before the period the phrase "or any domestic fishery product".

Mr. McGOVERN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an amendment to S. 2933, submitted earlier today by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], for himself and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], be held at the desk for 10 days for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced two bills, S. 2932 and S. 2933. The first bill was to create a reserve of food to protect consumers, and the second was the food-for-freedom bill.

I had announced that the hearings would start on March 1, 1966. I now find that we have to postpone them to March 2, 1966.

I announce that the hearings on both bills will start on March 2, 1966.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 2704, A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE REGULATION OF BANK COLLECTIVE INVESTMENT FUNDS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold a hearing on S. 2704, a bill to provide for the regulations of bank collective investment funds.

The hearing will begin on Tuesday, March 8, 1966, at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify in connection with this bill are requested to notify Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225-3921.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON BANK HOLDING COMPANY BILLS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold hearings on three bills to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956: H.R. 7371, which passed the House on September 23, 1965; S. 2353, a bill which I introduced at the request of the Federal Reserve Board; and S. 2418, introduced by Senator MORSE and other Senators.

The hearings will begin on Wednesday, March 16, 1966, at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

The hearings will open with representatives of the Federal Reserve Board, which has for several years recommended the enactment of legislation to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, and which is the author of S. 2353.

The Banking and Currency Committee has issued two committee prints which may be helpful in connection with the consideration of these bills: the first committee print, issued November 1965, contains analyses of the three bills and an explanation of the provisions of S. 2353; and the second committee print, issued February 1966, contains lists of bank holding companies and of the organizations that would apparently be covered by the amendments to the Bank Holding Company Act incorporated in S. 2353—the one-bank holding company exemption and the various other exemptions which would be eliminated by that bill.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify in connection with these bills are requested to notify Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225-3921, as soon as practicable.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 10, 1966, the names of Mr. HARTKE, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. MCNAMARA, and Mr. PASTORE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2923) providing for jury selection in Federal and State courts, prosecution and removal to Federal courts, civil preventive relief, civil indemnification, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators) on February 10, 1966.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLLAND BEFORE THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on February 10, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] inserted in the RECORD an address made by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] before the Mississippi Valley Association.

Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for the public service he has performed in bringing to the attention of the Mississippi Valley Association and the Nation the disastrous effects the new criteria, if continued in effect, would have, and not only on the development of our natural resources.

The application of these criteria would have resulted in an unfavorable recommendation for the Kaskaskia River in Illinois. Fortunately, the specific law requiring that review required the use of existing freight rates. The result: the project was authorized; the vast coal resources of the area will now be developed; new industry is preparing to move into the area to take advantage of the resources of the area; a labor-depressed area will be revitalized. We should not prevent the development of other areas by embracing a shortsighted policy on evaluation of benefits from the development of our water resources.

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR SAYS MEANS TEST FOR SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM IS IMPOSSIBLE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in order to slash $81 million from the special milk program for schoolchildren the Department of Agriculture has decided to give the milk only to those children who cannot afford to pay for it. I call this a means test. The Department prefers to think of it as an exercise in administrative discretion. The school administrators themselves are to be put on the spot. They will have to decide which child is eligible to receive the Government handout and which is not.

Imagine the pressures that will be placed on administrators who have to make these decisions. They will be criticized by parents whose pride has been deeply wounded by a decision that their children are poverty stricken. On the other hand, undoubtedly some parents will feel that they have been unjustly discriminated against because their children cannot receive free milk.

Here is what one school business administrator—Donald Leach of the Rice Lake, Wis., area schools—says about the means test:

> Newspaper accounts state that this amount is to be administered only to students who can't afford to purchase milk—in other words, poverty students. It is an impossible task to determine these students.

Mr. President, this experienced administrator represents schools in one of the largest dairy producing sections of the country, an area in which school milk would be possible for many, many reasons. I think his judgment that even in such a district it would be impossible to administer the program under these circumstances goes to the very heart of the new method which the Department of Agriculture says it intends to employ.

Mr. Leach goes on to point out:

> We in Rice Lake have lost money each year on our entire school lunch operation, and this will mean an additional burden to the taxpayer.

Furthermore, Mr. President, this increased local tax burden will not be offset by an actual reduction in Federal expenditures. Milk not purchased with Federal dollars for the school milk program will undoubtedly be purchased and stored at Government expense under the price support laws.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Leach's letter be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Rice Lake Area Schools,
Rice Lake, Wis., January 26, 1966.

Hon. William Proxmire,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Proxmire: I read with great alarm the fact that the President's budget allocated only $37 million for the operation of the special milk program for the year beginning July 1, 1966. I also know that it was because of your efforts that the present program was increased from $100 to $103 million. However, I fail to understand why the Bureau of the Budget has the arbitrary authority to release only $100 million. Although this is a small reduction compared to the total amount, it means quite a reduction in aid over the period of a year to school districts operating special milk programs. It would appear to me that if $103 million was made available for this program, it should be used.

Secondly, a reduction to $37 million virtually wipes out the special milk program. The cost of operation would have to be forced upon the taxpayer, either by increased cost directly to the student or by increased school taxes to support the program.

Newspaper accounts state that this amount is to be administered only to students who can't afford to purchase milk—in other words, poverty students. It is an impossible task to determine these students. Under the present program, the small cost of a half pint of milk makes it available to these students and at the same time does not penalize the taxpayer. I firmly believe that previous action of the Senate in allocating $108 million is more closely associated with our needs.

It is also noted that the school lunch program is to be cut from $186 to $168 million. This again is bound to come back to us as reduced aid—in some instances as much as one cent per lunch.

We in Rice Lake have lost money each year on our entire school lunch operations, and this will mean an additional burden to the taxpayer.

If these reductions must come, I would suggest that moneys presently used to purchase section 6 commodities be made available directly to school districts to supplement their school lunch programs. In this manner, we could continue to operate programs as we have in the past without additional cost to the taxpayer.

Any support you can give the aforementioned items will be greatly appreciated by the citizens of our school district.

Sincerely yours,
Donald L. Leach,
Business Administrator.

THE AMERICAN CIRCUS—COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, In the name of Westchester County, N.Y., and the town of Somers, the birthplace of the American circus, the proposal announced by the Post Office Department to issue a commemorative stamp in May designating Delavan, Wis., as the "cradle of the American circus" urgently requires that the record be made clear and straight.

The town of Somers in northern Westchester County, N.Y., is almost universally accepted as the birthplace of the American circus. I understand from officials of the county of Westchester and the Post Office Department that Delavan is claimed to be the birthplace of the circus in the year 1847. But, in the year 1824, the famed Elephant Hotel was erected in Somers, Westchester County, N.Y. Hackeliar Bailey, of the Barnum and Bailey circus fame, originally lived in Somers and he acquired the first elephant in America. This aroused the people of Somers and thus "Old Bet," America's first elephant, led to the founding of the great American tradition, the circus. There is a statue of "Old Bet" in Somers on the village green. This statue was erected 20 years before Delavan was claimed as the cradle of the American circus. The insignia on athletic uniforms in Somers schools display an elephant and the word "Tuskers"; an elephant insignia is on the firefighting equipment in Somers, N.Y.; also an effigy of an elephant as a mark of identification appears on the highway department vehicles in Somers.

Somers, N.Y.—the birthplace of the American circus—should be the place where the Post Office Department should issue the American circus commemorative stamp.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an exchange of correspondence between the Post Office Department and the Somers Historical Society and Somers Circus Museum.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New York City, N.Y.,
December 29, 1965.

Hon. Lawrence F. O'Brien,
Postmaster General,
Washington, D.C.:

This communication is on behalf of Somers Circus Museum and Somers Historical Society, Westchester County, N.Y. We understand a commemorative stamp may be issued indicating Delavan, Wis., as the cradle of the American circus in 1847.

It is almost universally accepted that Somers, N.Y., is the birthplace of the American circus. There the Elephant Hotel was erected in 1824 by Bailey, who exhibited one of the first elephants brought into this country prior to that date. The building is an imposing one marked for historic preservation by the Department of the Interior. An effigy of Old Bet, the first elephant exhibited in this country, rests atop a granite shaft on a greensward in front of the hotel building which is now the seat of the township government and the headquarters of the societies above mentioned. There, on January 14, 1835, was organized the Zoological Institute, capitalized at $329,325, and joined in by most all of the principal menagerie proprietors of the country, nearly a hundred of them. Barnum lived in nearby Danbury, and with a foster son of Bailey, established his circus. The most important collection of circusiana is at Somers, including the celebrated collection of the late Dr. Hugh Grant Rowell, of Harvard and Columbia. The local town clerk's offices evidence the recording of many assignments of circus animals and interests in them many years before Wisconsin was even a territory, much less a State. This commemorative stamp will, if we are correctly informed, be a perversion of history, and we submit that it should not be issued without further investigation.

On behalf of Somers Historical Society and Somers Circus Museum.

Otto E. Koegel.

Reply From Mr. Ira Kapenstein, Special Assistant to the Postmaster General

Office of the Postmaster General,
Washington, D.C., December 30, 1965.

Mr. Otto E. Koegel,
Royall, Koegel & Rogers,
New York, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Koegel: Thank you for your telegram of December 29 concerning the designation of Delavan, Wis., as the first day sales site for the 5-cent American circus stamp.

The circus stamp was announced on October 22, 1965, and several cities have since expressed an interest in having the first day sale because of some historic connection with the American circus. Such a request was never received from Somers, N.Y.

All of the factors were carefully weighed and it was decided that Delavan was the most logical place for the release of the stamp because of its early connection with the circus. In addition, many of the circus greats are buried in Delavan.

Sincerely yours,
Ira Kapenstein,
Special Assistant to the Postmaster General.

FEDERAL GRANTS FOR COMMUTER SERVICE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article published in the Wall Street Journal of Wednesday, February 16. The article points out that "unlike other forms of government encroachment the growing public involvement in eastern commuter transportation is as welcome to the carriers as it is to its everyday passengers." I submit this as further evidence of the need for greater Federal participation in commuter transportation. Yesterday, I introduced a bill, S. 2935, to encourage regional solutions to mass transportation problems which transcend State boundaries, and to provide expanded Federal assistance to hard-pressed commuter services. I am pleased to announce that Representative John W. Wydler, of New York, yesterday introduced identical legislation in the House.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Commuter Railroads in East Welcome Trend to More Government Aid To Offset Losses

(By John D. Williams)

New York.—The East's deficit-ridden commuter rail business is rapidly becoming a quasi-governmental function.

Unlike other forms of government encroachment, the growing public involvement in eastern commuter transportation is as welcome to the carriers as it is to their everyday passengers. In two highly significant events last Friday, for example, the giant Pennsylvania Railroad signed over one of its major properties to a State agency and gratefully accepted a sharply increased handout from another.

The Pennsy's management may well have sighed with relief when New York State's Metropolitan Commuter Transportation Authority (MCTA) formally paid $65 million for the Pennsy's unprofitable subsidiary, the Long Island Railroad, the most heavily traveled commuter line in the United States. Meanwhile, the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority (SEPTA), representing the State, the city of Philadelphia, and four surrounding counties, agreed to pay the Pennsy $4,163,000 between now and June 30, 1967, to help offset the cost of serving 40,000 daily riders on 450 trains; the previous SEPTA subsidy of $1,545,000 covered 20,000 riders on 168 trains a day.

Although in some other parts of the country commuter service is relatively healthy, the business in the East has become so unprofitable that even the roads with overall profits are clamoring for aid from local, State, and Federal agencies. Direct cash aid to commuter lines from governmental sources already equals about a quarter of the revenues from commuter service, and the proportion will surely grow this year, as public officials act to avert the threat of two railroads to stop service for 60,000 daily riders.

Round after round of fare increases have kept total commuter revenues high—last year they reached a record $135 million, up 77 percent from 1929. But use of the services has declined. Last year the Nation's railroads hauled 193 million commuters, down 22 percent in 10 years and less than half the record 457.6 million passengers carried in 1929.

Despite the fare increases, railroads continue to sustain losses on commuters. The Pennsy estimates its 1965 commuter loss at $14 million after receipt of Government cash aid; little changed from 1964. New Jersey's Erie Lackawanna Railroad, which wants to abandon commuter service, figures that, including subsidies, it lost $12 million last year on passenger traffic, up a little from 1964; most of the loss represented commuter service. Likewise, the bankrupt New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad attributes almost all of its $10.5 million net loss on passenger service last year to unprofitable commuter traffic; the loss was about the same as in the previous year.

Although the ranks of commuters have thinned, the service remains vital to a still-large number of suburbanites who must journey every day to downtown offices. But because of the growing deficits, the problem of preserving service is increasingly left to public agencies.

"It isn't a business," argues William White, chairman of the Erie, "it's a public service."

The Erie is seeking State permission to abandon its commuter service by May 5. It contends it can't afford to absorb the huge commuter service losses any more, and claims it can't justify the $80 million capital spending needed to refurbish its facilities and replace 451 cars, all between 32 and 45 years old.

The railroad wants New Jersey to buy the new equipment it needs, but offers to run the commuter service for the State. New Jersey may have to form a transportation authority of its own this year to take over the Erie's commuter service.

The State's expenditures to shore up commuter lines already have grown sharply. In the present fiscal year ending June 30, New Jersey's aid will total $8.2 million, up from $4.6 million in 1961, when the State's subsidy program began. Its current aid spending is $1 million above fiscal 1965, despite the Erie's withdrawal from the program on December 31, to press this year for full abandonment of commuter service.

The other railroad that wants to drop commuter service is the debt-riddled New Haven, which seeks to end service for 24,000 commuters into New York City. Hearings on the road's bid ended last week before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

New York's MCTA and the Connecticut Transportation Authority currently are negotiating with the New York Central Railroad—the Pennsy's imminent merger partner—to manage the New Haven's commuter service for a fee. Whatever the solution to the New Haven's commuter woes, the cost to public agencies is expected to rise. In the current fiscal year ending June 30, the New Haven's direct subsidies from three States and the Federal Government will total $5.4 million, over 10 times more than 4 years ago.

The Federal contribution to the New Haven this fiscal year is about $3 million. There isn't any neat breakdown of the Government's total support of eastern commuter roads, as Federal funds also are doled out to bus and subway systems, but one unofficial estimate puts the figure at $28 million over the past 2 years. Overall, the fiscal 1967 Federal budget allots $68 million to urban transportation, including commuter railroads, over six times as much as in fiscal 1965.

On the State level, the heavy involvement of State agencies in commuter travel is a fairly recent development. Pennsylvania's SEPTA grew out of the first payment by Philadelphia of a $160,000 subsidy to Reading Co. and the Pennsy in 1958. In the coming 18 months, SEPTA will spend $8 million in various forms of transportation aid.

Another agency with a swelling commitment to support commuter railroads is the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority, which last year started paying the $4 million net cost of sustaining commuter service by the New Haven and the Boston & Maine Railroad. The authority also is seeking $27.3 million in Federal funds as part of a $41 million project to restore long-abandoned rail service on the Old Colony Line, purchased from the New Haven last November.

Even the New York Central—one of the few eastern roads that hasn't asked for operating subsidies—is looking for governmental support. The company is seeking $57.7 million in State and Federal assistance for long-term rehabilitation of its commuter facilities. The Central currently is spending $1.6 million of its own money to refurbish 40 coaches. But it claims commuter service doesn't earn a return on such investment, and looks to governments for future major outlays.

UNITED STATES APPOINTS OVERALL AID COORDINATOR

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as stated in my report to the Senate on my trip to Vietnam, I have been convinced of one overriding and vital necessity in our policy there; namely, the need for an overall head to supervise the variety of nonmilitary programs we are carrying out in that country.

While in Vietnam, I was struck by the fact that not only was our economic and social aid inadequate but that there was also no overall direction and coordination in nonmilitary efforts. The problems of pacification, care of refugees, and improvement of the health, education, and welfare of the Vietnamese people were handled by diverse agencies.

I am pleased today to see that the President of the United States has moved to rectify the situation by the appointment of a deputy U.S. envoy "to take full charge" of nonmilitary aspects of the struggle in Vietnam. This important job has been given to Deputy Ambassador William Porter who, I hope, will be given powers commensurate with his responsibilities.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Ward Just which was published in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPUTY U.S. ENVOY TO ASSIST SAIGON IN RURAL PACIFICATION

(By Ward Just)

SAIGON, February 17.—Deputy Ambassador William Porter was named today to take full charge of the proliferating nonmilitary aspects of the U.S. effort in the war in Vietnam.

In a statement released today, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge said that Porter, 51, would handle all aspects of the work of the United States in support of the Vietnamese Government's program of rural construction as defined at the Honolulu conference.

The Lodge statement said that "this includes helping the Government of Vietnam in its task of overcoming by police methods the criminal, as distinct from the military, aspect of Vietcong violence, and the training and installation of health, education, and agricultural workers and of community organizers."

In the past, critics have contended that the American effort here has been complicated and made more difficult by what has seemed to be an overabundance of agencies, some of which appear to have overlapping functions.

On paper, the appointment makes Porter the boss of what has come to be known here as the pacification program, and reflects the Johnson administration's strong effort to make the struggle in Vietnam a "two-front" war.

Officials emphasized, however, that although Porter will have a small staff and will be released from the routine duties of Deputy Ambassador (he will retain the title), the new job has as yet "no bones."

What is expected is that Porter will become a chief of staff, coordinating the pacification effort. This has tended to become entangled over the years with a number of agencies taking a hand in funding, programing and directing the various economics, political, social, and psychological warfare efforts. Porter's job, a U.S. mission spokesman said, "is to pull the effort together."

Officials said that Porter will work closely with Maj. Gen. Nguyen Duc Thang, Minister of Rural Construction, and the key Vietnamese official in the pacification effort.

The Lodge statement emphasized that Maj. Gen. Edward Lansdale, an influential proponent of pacification, would continue as senior liaison officer and adviser to the Vietnamese Government.

"We are determined that this program for peace and progress shall be carried forward with all the energy and skill of a fully coordinated mission effort, always with full recognition that the basic task of nation building here belongs to the people of Vietnam and to their Government," the Lodge statement said.

Porter, who replaced U. Alexis Johnson as Deputy Ambassador here last September, is a former Ambassador to Algeria.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Timothy J. May, of Colorado, to be General Counsel of the Post Office Department; and

Robert L. Sumwalt, of South Carolina, and Victor Bussie, of Louisiana, to be members of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nathan M. Koffsky, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion by Mr. METCALF, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

A FIRSTHAND REPORT ON VIETNAM

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, we always welcome the comments and views of our men in Vietnam. One of my young constituents from Livingston, Mont., has just returned after a tour of duty as a seaman construction mechanic with Mobile Construction Battalion 9 of the Seabees.

While home on leave, the publisher of the Park County News, Mr. Fred Martin, interviewed the young man, Thad Gibson. In providing me with a copy of that interview, Mr. Martin described Thad as "having the typical American spirit, the kind which is making friends for us all over the world."

I was impressed with Thad's ideas and his views. He demonstrates remarkable insight in what we all realize is a very complex problem. He believes the average friendliness of our men in Vietnam will be the determining factor as to whether or not the sacrifice we are making in lives and billions of dollars will be worthwhile.

In his own words:

> The war will be won by average Americans, who have the same feeling for a suffering Vietnamese old person or youngster that they would have right here in America.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert the article in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Park County News, Feb. 10, 1966]

THAD GIBSON'S FIRSTHAND REPORT ON VIETNAM

The average friendliness of the American Joe in Vietnam will be the determining factor as to whether or not the sacrifice of lives and the expenditure of billions of dollars will be fruitful, Thad Gibson, seaman construction mechanic with Mobile Construction Battalion 9 of the Seabees, declares.

Thad, just back from the Vietnam conflict, is spending a short leave in Livingston with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. William G. Gibson, 121 South Yellowstone. He will report for duty at Port Hueneme, Calif., where he will be assigned for from 6 to 9 months before another Vietnam assignment. Thad, who has been in the Seabees for 2 years, completed his high school course, after enlisting by taking special courses at Oxnard City High, California, and while at Port Hueneme plans to enroll in Ventura College, Ventura, Calif., to take mechanical or architectural courses, which he hopes to continue by correspondence in Vietnam and after completing his service requirements.

Thad has been under fire and recently was quoted in an Associated Press dispatch (reported in Park County News January 27) which told of the death of a marine pal and the serious wounding of another Seabee friend at Da Nang East, Vietnam. Thad considers himself mighty lucky to be back, but he has no qualms about returning to Vietnam.

"Those of us who are in the service and assigned there figure we have a job to do, want to do it and get it over with. We can understand how some people in the States who do not know what it's all about get so confused. After coming home it is easy to realize how folks here, who can't imagine what we go through, fail to understand what this Vietnam conflict is all about.

"In the first place, the French were in Vietnam for more than 40 years. They were out to exploit the country, get what they could out of it, and the Vietnamese are just now beginning to realize, after 12 years, that the Americans are there to help them, not to squeeze profits out of them.

"The war will be won by average Americans, who have the same feeling for a suffering Vietnamese old person or a youngster that they would right here in America. It is hard for us to understand how elder people are the dominant ruling class in Vietnam. The Vietcong hold the elders as hostages, kill them or threaten them. But, gradually the elders and the ordinary Vietnamese are finding that the Americans are sincerely charitable, helpful, and friendly.

"It is not unusual for an American serviceman to buy clothing and shoes for youngsters. Our Seabee outfit, through a pay deduction plan, finances the operation of an orphanage for 1,500 children, all orphaned by the conflict. The orphanage is operated by Catholic nuns.

"We hear stories of political manipulation, struggles for power to control the native government and graft, but the average American serviceman sincerely recognizes the suffering and hardships of the native people and does his best to be a good neighbor. We have been taught that we are guests of the people, not overlords, and we try to treat them just as we would Americans at home. That is beginning to be understood by the Vietnamese and more and more they are coming over to our side and divorcing themselves from the Vietcong.

"The Army has a people-to-people program and the Seabees have a Seabee technical assistance team, known as STAT, to help the people. They take machinery to build roads, build schools and churches, rebuild homes, drill wells, show how advanced techniques in farming can increase production, provide medical care, schooling and how to develop better government. Then, the South Vietnamese have organized a militia which is becoming more and more effective in policing the areas after the Vietcong have been driven out.

"The difficulty for Americans has been that whether you're on duty or not you're in real danger. You do not know when a Vietcong will toss a grenade, take a shot, fire a missile, or generally terrorize the area. For instance, our camp at Da Nang was hit on three different times. The first time on October 2,793 men were wounded and flown to the Philippines and Japan to hospitals.

"Two days later we were hit again and then again on January 24. Then, on January 27, a patrol of 9 men on a search and destroy mission uncovered a Vietcong ambush 1,500 meters from our base and killed 17, captured 5, and destroyed 11 Russian-made 120 millimeter mortar tubes. The first two times we were hit with American-made 60- and 81-millimeter mortars. On the first two times there were more than 120 Vietcong, members of suicide squads, who had come into the area with the objective of taking our base with explosives strapped on their backs. Their bodies were found the next morning.

"But, the Vietcong's main objective is to harass troops, make them jittery and make Americans rebel. But, now they are not capturing the equipment that they did from Vietnamese, they are coming face to face with well-trained Americans and the shoe is on the other foot. The Americans are quite superior, have better techniques and equipment and are not about to be scared off.

"Folks at home shouldn't have any false notions about what Americans have to go through. For the first 4 months we were there we got a 4-hour leave every 10th Sunday. On those days we usually went into Da Nang, bought a few souvenirs, consumed a bit of alcohol, and came back. In Da Nang the Vietcong oftentimes would put acid in Coke bottles or put glass in ice cubes. The acid would eat the top off a Coke bottle in 10 seconds.

"But, times are changing as more and more Americans are taking the fight into the area, cleaning out pockets and driving them north. The biggest problems are guerrilla bands resulting from the split of larger forces. But, as the South Vietnamese become more friendly and we cut off supplies from the north the guerillas are finding it more difficult to operate. Americans are developing their own guerilla warfare to cut off supply lines and combat the guerillas on their own terms.

"After 4 months we now have 6-hour leaves every 4th Sunday instead of every 10th Sunday. Then too, some men get rest and relaxation leaves of 3 to 7 days to Hong Kong Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines.

"A big factor in upholding the morale of the servicemen has been the mail from home—folks who send a word of encouragement, cookies, books, magazines, and newspapers. This more than offsets the screwy protest marches and draft card burnings. The mailman makes us understand folks at home recognize what we are trying to do, that we are just trying to help people, as we did in previous wars, without any efforts to gain territory or special privilege.

"If Americans are to enjoy freedom they better help folks like the Vietnamese, who are now beginning to be real friends. We are beginning to earn the respect of the elder folks, who in turn appreciate what they are coming to find is the American desire just to help them. The real dividends will not be conquest, but freedom for human beings and their friendship. That's why we think our mission to Vietnam is worth while."

A YANK IN VIETNAM

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from a Navy medical corpsman from Maine who is serving in Vietnam. I quote from his letter:

> Realizing that at any moment that my life could be ended with a Vietcong sniper bullet, or a hidden mine or boobytrap, I am nonetheless very proud and feel privileged to serve the State of Maine and my country over here. Although no one likes to live like an "animal" such as we are doing, most of use realize that it must be done.

This young man is Doug Guinard, of Shapleigh, Maine, serving at Da Nang, Vietnam. In his service he is even doing a great public service by writing a column entitled "A Yank in Vietnam" for one of Maine's finest papers, the Sanford Tribune. I ask unanimous consent that his excellent and fascinating column published in the February 3, 1966, issue of that newspaper be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD. I recommend it as "must" reading to all Members of Congress and to Americans at large.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANOI HANNAH—LOTUS BLOSSOM OR HAG?

(By Doug Guinard)

Communist North Vietnam's answer to World War II's Tokyo Rose has been dubbed "Hanoi Hannah" by American GI's in war-torn South Vietnam.

The North Vietnam radio celebrity has been envisioned by some of the troops as an eye-appealing luscious lotus blossom; others say she's an old hazzled hag with a wart on her nose and stringy hair.

Regardless of what her physical appearance is, she gives the boys some kicks with her nightly broadcasts to U.S. troops, which provoke howls of glee. Unfortunately for Hannah, she's trying to be serious.

"Hey, guys," a marine will cry, "I'm getting that broad Hannah on the short wave."

"Crazy, turn it up so we can all hear it," someone shouts back.

"Maybe she'll play that Communist love song again."

"You mean the one about the militiaman and his plowhorse?"

"Yeah, yeah. Ain't it wild?"

"Hey, knock it off, will ya?"

The radio's oriental music fades. "Good evening friends," Hannah says stiffly. "A very warm hello from Radio Hanoi."

Laughter and wise comments come from her American audience.

"Talk to me, sweetheart," says a trooper, slapping his knee.

"What a dizzy broad," sighs another.

"Here I am, Hannah baby."

"Hey, shaddup so's I can hear."

Unlike Tokyo Rose in World War II, Hannah is all business. No sex and sensuality. No reminders of mom's apple pie or mental sniffs of the perfume on the girls every GI leaves behind in the States.

She comes on like a WAC sergeant. News first with commie coloring. Fiction and fishy fact. Hannah can really throw the bull, literally speaking, of course.

"The latest war tabulations on American casualties since July," she says precisely, "indicate more than 10,000 have been killed" (actual U.S. tabulation is about 1,200). "In addition, over 800 U.S. jet fighters have been shot down over North Vietnam" (actually about 175).

"Despite the continued aggression of U.S. imperialism, however, the people's liberation armies (Vietcong) are at all times vigilant and are ready to bring down more planes and kill more of these invading Yankee troops."

"Ain't that chick something?" a GI groans.

"What a mixed-up cat she is," another adds.

"She ain't too sharp on figures, is she?"

"Say, speaking of figures, is she?"

"What kind of talk is that?"

"Man, that's 3 months away from woman talk."

Hannah's shows are invariably the same. After the news comes an editorial denouncing U.S. escalation of the war, then a recording by an Asian soprano who sounds as if she's having her ears pierced. Then mailbag time ("write us for the truth, friends").

There is no small talk, no intimacies, and no nonsense. This is just propaganda. Just another part of this weary war—and the only part, unfortunately, that one can just turn off.

A NIGHT ON THE FRONT

Dust settles over the Vietnam countryside and it becomes a different world. The wind rises and sends an eerie sound through the trees. Crickets and frogs start their nightly song. Darkness blacks out the familiar sights of the day leaving only treetops visible against the horizon.

And so begins another night of vigilance in Vietnam on the front. To the pros here it is just another sleepless night. To a new man it is an experience he will never forget.

Sandbagged bunkers surround the camp which houses the well-armed marines. Each bunker is covered with a small tent for protection against the elements, but rain always seems to find a hole. Some of the bunk floors are covered with several inches of water, adding to the discomfort.

Nerves are taut. A stick snaps. Was that a Vietcong or just a night animal on the prowl for food? Alert eyes strain to detect movement in the darkness.

A quick pop shatters the air as a flare bursts overhead giving everything a white frosted appearance. Moving shadows are cast on the ground as the parachute flare drifts downward and sputters leaving the night black and quiet again.

A lieutenant stops by a bunker and tells the marines a patrol is moving out through the woods to check Vietcong activity and will be returning at 3:30 a.m.

A drum sounds somewhere in the jungle, and is answered from across a rice paddy—the Vietcong are signaling each other.

Everyone in the bunkers waits. Hours drag by. Nearly every half hour a flare bursts in the sky illuminating everything below. Still, nothing unusual is seen.

The sound of a crying baby drifts across the rice paddy from one of the villages. Then a noise.

The word is passed. The patrol has returned. Now anything spotted outside the perimeter is the enemy.

A rustling in front of the perimeter prompts another flare. It illuminates a lone Vietcong moving toward the area. A machinegun shatters the night and the figure drops from sight. Another less dirty commie to worry about.

And as the early morning sun rises over the mountains, the men know that the same thing will happen again tonight when the same sun goes down.

Another night of hell will be here in a few hours.

INCREASED FEDERAL PER CAPITA AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Syracuse, N.Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to establish a tax-sharing formula to distribute to local governments a portion of Federal tax revenues.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the city of Syracuse is approaching its constitutional taxing limit for real property; and

Whereas per capita aid from the State of New York, although increasing, has not kept pace with the increased costs of operation of the city of Syracuse; and

Whereas extensive rent properties have been removed from assessment rolls of the city of Syracuse for the construction of State and Federal highway systems and other construction activities; and

Whereas various proposals are now before the Congress of the United States which would authorize a return to local governments of a portion of Federal tax revenues on a tax-sharing-formula basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the common council hereby approves the concept of increased Federal per capita aid to local governments and urges the Congress of the United States to immediately enact the necessary legislation to establish a tax-sharing formula to distribute to local governments a portion of Federal tax revenues; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by the city clerk to the minority and majority leadership in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the people of Onondaga County.

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION TO COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, concern has been expressed recently with respect to the current status and operation of the Small Business Administration. It would appear that this concern has arisen as a result of the failure of the President to appoint an Administrator for the Small Business Administration. This has led to much speculation that this agency will not continue as an independent entity but rather will be dissolved and absorbed by the Department of Commerce. This morning I read of a report that the President has decided against such a transfer of functions to the Commerce Department. I hope this report is true. However, until a decision to appoint a new Administrator is officially made by the President, I must consider the present independent status of the Small Business Administration in jeopardy, and do whatever I can to insure its continued independence. Furthermore, I am quite concerned over the agency's decision of last October to establish a moratorium on its direct business loan program, provided for under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act.

I know my colleagues share my anxiety over the failure of the President to appoint an Administrator for the Small

Business Administration. This post has been officially vacant since September 13, 1965, a period in excess of 4 months. Logic and sound judgment require that this post be filled. The vital programs administered by the Small Business Administration are essential to the growth and development of small business; thus, they are crucial to the economic well-being of this Nation. These programs, however, can be carried on with effectiveness only if there is leadership within the agency to afford direction and purpose to its activity. In the absence of such leadership, these programs would deteriorate, morale within the agency suffers and the small business community will feel frustrated in its attempt to secure proper aid and assistance which, under statutory authority, the Small Business Administration has a responsibility to render. I urge strongly that the President soon appoint an Administrator for the Small Business Administration.

It is my sincere hope that the failure to appoint an Administrator is not indicative of any plan or purpose to revise the status of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency. To afford maximum assistance to this Nation's small business community, it is essential that an independent agency exist, unfettered by other responsibilities not altogether compatible within, which is attuned to the character and interest of small business as well as sympathetic to its needs.

The small business community is a vital and important force within the social and economic fiber of this Nation. Small business not only deserves but requires the complete attention which only an independent agency can provide. This, of course, is not a new idea. The necessity for an independent agency was recognized at the time legislation was passed creating the Small Business Administration. There was an alternative bill before the Senate which would establish a Small Business Agency within the Departments of Treasury and Commerce. The President of the United States, then senior Senator from Texas, stated:

> This bill would place the Small Business activities of the Government under two major Departments—Treasury and Commerce, and yet, practically all of us subscribe to the principle that a Small Business Agency cannot be effective unless it is independent.

Serving as junior Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the late President Kennedy confirmed these views. This view was expressed by our distinguished Vice President, then Senator HUMPHREY, as well as the chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, Senator SPARKMAN, the ranking minority member of the committee, Senator SALTONSTALL, and other distinguished Senators.

The logical, compelling arguments advanced and accepted when the legislation was enacted are even more valid today for we have had the experience of time to confirm the wisdom of these views. The Small Business Administration revolving fund authorization for fiscal year 1966 is $1,841 million. It has requested a fiscal year 1967 authorization for this fund of $1,966 million. There are six major programs of loan assistance administered today by the Small Business Administration, including the direct business loan program, title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act, displaced business and disaster loans and natural and economic disaster loans. That these programs have had an important impact and beneficial effect not only for small business, but for the general public as well, is evident; that these results are due in large measure to the status of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency is also clear.

As I stated on the floor of the Senate last month, I am very concerned over the lapse of the direct business loan program occasioned by the moratorium imposed on October 15, 1965. There is perhaps no program administered by the Small Business Administration which is more important to the welfare and vitality of small business.

These loans have enabled the creation of new business and the expansion of old. Their benefits have been far reaching beyond economic assistance to loan recipients; they have resulted in economic improvement through expansion of employment and increased purchasing power. We are all witnesses to their impact. The Small Business Administration gave recognition to this as recently as February 7, 1966, in its press release No. 1733. This statement cited the considerable advantages and benefits realized under the direct loan program. The basis of this statement was a sampling which showed that Small Business Administration loans totaled $14.2 million, enabling 145 small firms to hire 2,740 additional employees and nearly to double their sales. The release cited statistics to illustrate that these firms increased their employment 40 percent, and their gross sales 43 percent to a total of $132 million annually. They have already paid back, with interest, $6.2 million of the $14.2 million borrowed. The release stated:

> While the sample is, of course, too small to give an accurate and total measure of the economic benefits resulting from SBA loans, it does provide proof that Small Business Administration loans have a measurable impact in the community where they are made.

In spite of these benefits, the Small Business Administration has seen fit to suspend its direct loan program.

The support and sympathy of the Congress for the business loan program as well as other programs of the Small Business Administration are a matter of historical record. There is perhaps no other department or agency of the Government which has enjoyed a better reception in the Congress than does the Small Business Administration in its requests for funds to conduct it activities. Evidence of this is shown in the favorable response to the two requests of the Small Business Administration in calendar year 1965, for supplemental appropriations. These became Public Law 89-16 on April 30, 1965, for $100 million and Public Law 89-309 on October 31, 1965, for $160 million. However, neither of these supplemental appropriations contained funds for the direct loan program since in both cases no request therefor was made by the Small Business Administration.

I hope earnestly that appropriate and needed action will be taken soon to restore the Small Business Administration as an effective agency for rendering necessary and proper assistance to the small business community.

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR MUNDT BY SOUTH DAKOTA KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have been singularly honored by a group of dedicated men from my home State of South Dakota. I have just received word from the State Secretary of the Knights of Columbus in South Dakota that a resolution was adopted in the recent convention of that organization commending me for my efforts to curb the flow of obscene and lewd materials which threaten the moral fiber of our country.

This resolution refers, of course, to the legislation which I have introduced to create a Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials. In this session of Congress, the bill is S. 309. In the 86th and 87th Congresses an identical bill was approved by the Senate Committee on Government Operations, and in both those Congresses the bill passed the Senate. However, no action was taken in the House.

I am happy to report that the Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor has held hearings and has reported an identical bill in this session of Congress. I am very hopeful that the bill will receive full committee approval and that it will pass the House of Representatives. If it does, I believe the Senate will again act expeditiously to give the bill the green light.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the notification which I have received from my good friend Ed Gebhart in which he reports the resolution which was adopted by the South Dakota Knights of Columbus.

There being no objection, the notification and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COUNCIL,
KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS,
Orient, S. Dak., February 9, 1966.

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: The following resolution was adopted at the State Convention of Knights of Columbus of the State of South Dakota:

"RESOLUTION 10

"Whereas the Knights of Columbus as an Order of Catholic Men is deeply concerned with the future of America; and

"Whereas that future is being seriously threatened by increased sales and distribution of lewd, obscene and pornographic magazines, pictures and other materials, leading to the perversion of many of the peoples of our great country and especially our youth; and

"Whereas the Honorable KARL E. MUNDT, senior Senator to Congress from the State of South Dakota, has for many years made an intense and devoted effort to bring this to the attention of the Congress of the United States and to the people of our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the South Dakota State Council of the Knights of Columbus, in convention assembled at the city of Pierre, S. Dak., this 24th day of April 1965, Do hereby commend Senator MUNDT for his great efforts on behalf of the citizens of our Nation and to pledge our full support to his untiring efforts in this regard."

Please be assured that all the great efforts you have made and are still making in combating obscene literature is being greatly appreciated by our organization.

Sincerely yours,

E. J. GEBHART,
State Secretary.

VISTA IN ALASKA—AN OPPORTUNITY TO SERVE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in remarks presented to this body yesterday I paid tribute to the contribution being made to war on poverty in my State by three VISTA volunteers formally with the Peace Corps.

I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to pay tribute to the more than 45 other VISTA volunteers working in Alaska.

The volunteers are working with Alaska native people. Many of them live in native villages. Unless a person is acquainted with living conditions in many of our native villages he will not appreciate the trying conditions under which these volunteers work.

Conditions in some villages are worse than conditions in the worst big city slums without taking into consideration the subzero winter climate.

Despite these hardships the volunteers are carrying on programs of health, education, and community development. They are helping to build sawmills, to develop water supplies, and to educate village residents. Most encouraging of all, the volunteers are being accepted by the villagers, who are anxious to improve their lot.

I am happy to report that now a group of VISTA volunteers is in training in Alaska. There is a need for a great many more.

Mr. President, I would say to prospective VISTA volunteers that while service in Alaska offers a great challenge, it also offers great opportunities to serve your fellow man. The opportunities are extremely varied.

Dennis Schmitt, serving the almost isolated area of Anaktuvuk Pass, has developed an easier system for natives to obtain fuel for heat. He is now teaching English by learning Eskimo from the natives.

Barbara and Fred Beaver, former schoolteachers, have helped change the attitude and morale of patients at the Anchorage public health center which treats poor Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts.

Patrick Fitzgerald arrived in an arctic village in September 1965. He spent his early days in the village building his own living quarters and cutting wood, which he shared with a native who hauled it by dogsled to neighboring villages. He feels his daily association and service will enhance the possibility of his acceptance by the community, while also sharing and learning of their daily village problems. It appears to be a sound approach. Recently the village requested that he help develop Headstart and adult education programs.

Bethel's variable population, 400 new residents last year alone in a town of 1,600, has made the task of its three VISTA volunteers difficult. John Shively works with villagers on a levee to keep back the spring's floods. Gay White and Julie Davis teach kindergarten and developing community relations programs.

At Chalkyitsik, a town of about 70, Steve Greenwold has tutored seventh and eighth graders, instructed adult education classes, helped return the post office to the town and secured a loan to start a sawmill.

Volunteers in Emmonak have organized activities ranging from a Headstart program to plans for a fish cannery. The ice was literally broken by Don Annotti, whose fishing expeditions won friends and support for the VISTA volunteers and their programs. Don and Carl Berger work in a sawmill, which they helped establish to provide timber for the village. Mary Seville and Pat Schultz, working as nurses' aids, have started a new wheat program. Community legal problems are now being solved by Mr. Berger.

Frank Warpeha is the lone VISTA volunteer at Fort Yukon, a community of about 700 Indians and 100 whites. Early he established an effective working relationship with the town's city council and has since become the only non-Indian to serve on that body. He has helped develop a preschool program, has begun adult education classes and visits every Indian family at least once a week.

Mary Coner and Betsy Reeve, working in Hooper Bay, have gotten their former college sororities to contribute school supplies for the village's first preschool program. Gary Barclay has organized a special school for village students who are hindered by language barriers. He also conducts adult education classes which are so popular they often last until 1 a.m.

In Hughes, James Weidner has an adult education program underway. At the request of the city council, he is providing an advisory service, helping develop programs of social reform.

Lennie Kamerling, on a year's leave of absence from Franconia College, has developed a unique program along with residents of Kasigluk. In order to teach English, Kamerling and the villagers have compiled an anthology of poetry. As a result of their efforts, this community project will soon be published. Kamerling is doing the photography, but the writing—in English—and illustrations are the work of the Eskimos.

Linda Keen and Sheryl Mark have opened up the first public library in Kiana after collecting 2,000 books. They conduct medical self-help classes, an adult education program and a Headstart program.

As a result of Ted Zachara's efforts, an after-school study hall and a recreation program have been established at Nome.

Judith and Harold Bruce, working along parallel lines, have begun scouting programs in Noorvik. Judith is also teaching in a Headstart program, while Harold has developed projects focusing upon the recreational needs of the area's youth.

Kenneth Pletter is teaching a full schedule at remote Point Hope. He supplements daily tasks by giving his free time to serve as advisor and legal counsel to the villagers. All these volunteers began working in Alaska this fall. Twenty-seven additional volunteers have been serving in 12 Alaska villages since December. Already these efforts have brought results.

William Engelke and James Miller have been conducting adult education classes and a youth recreation program at Akhiok.

Florence Wagner, a practical nurse, has begun a health program at Dillingham. This project will undertake the training of inhabitants to employ the basic rules of personal and home hygiene. Margaret Bracken has instituted a community action program and helped to create a volunteer fire department.

Paul Hoxie and Robert Mandell have developed plans for a Headstart program for Hydaburg.

Kathleen Goggin, R.N., is busy treating seasonal upper respiratory problems at Kwethluk. In less hectic moments, she visits homes spreading practices of good hygiene. Steve Gage and Chris Fisher are teaching adult education courses.

Judy Anderson, Chattye Cornelius, and Howard Smith have been conducting Headstart classes and adult education programs at Kwigillingok. Thirty children attend the Headstart program.

Doug Wolf, working alone, has begun to develop community action projects in Manakotak.

Twenty adult residents of Mekoryok are attending basic education classes, conducted by Jeffrey Keahon and Eric Hager. The two volunteers have plans to organize a cooperative through which the indigenous poor could sell mink for cash income.

Charles Hofheimer has been tutoring a Headstart program which 23 children are attending at New Stuyahok.

Registered Nurse Barbara Feeny has been fighting a hepatitis epidemic since arriving at Nondalton. Cherie Guy and David Walker have worked with the healthy in adult education and youth recreation programs.

Bonnie Archbold, Robert Shuler and Teresa Wolfenbarger have opened a child-development center and have begun a community action program at Nunapitchuk.

In Old Harbor, which was desperately in need of a nurse, Helen Dietz, R.N., has made tremendous strides. Diana Bunker and Robert Danielenko have filled another void. They are presently teaching English to preschoolers as part of a new Headstart program.

Barbara and John O'Hara in Togiak are carrying out a full schedule as VISTA volunteers. A typical day includes holding morning classes for adults, afternoon child-development programs and an evening devoted to tutoring high school students.

Mr. President, Gov. William A. Egan gave an excellent address at graduation ceremonies for the volunteers in December. In the speech Governor Egan described what the volunteers would find in our native villages. I ask unanimous consent that the Governor's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY GOV. WILLIAM A. EGAN, GRADUATION OF VISTA VOLUNTEERS, JUNEAU, ALASKA, DECEMBER 10, 1965

It is a pleasure to be with you tonight on this important occasion—important with respect to your own lives and to the State of Alaska. You soon will be embarking on a great adventure of service to your fellow man, and there cannot be a more meaningful adventure than this.

I am sure the year of your life you will be giving to assist fellow Americans who desperately need a helping hand will be one you will never forget. You are assured of a rewarding experience—in personal gratification, not material terms—and you will have a keener sense of human value when your year comes to an end.

You have undergone 2 weeks of intensive training in the art of existing and traveling in rural Alaska. You have read about the people who inhabit these areas. During your 3 weeks of residence in villages of southeastern Alaska you gained some understanding of the needs of these Alaskans. This is only the beginning, however. In the next year you will gain an education that could never be acquired in a formal institution of learning.

Most of you, I understand, will be assigned to areas of western and southeastern Alaska. Here you will face a great challenge, perhaps the greatest of your life. Much remains to be done to assist the native peoples of southeastern Alaska make better lives for themselves. But in other areas of the State this task is so staggering that only through the combined efforts of the Federal Government, State and local communities can it be successfully accomplished.

Poverty is poverty no matter where it is found. In certain remote areas of Alaska it is unusually acute. You volunteers will have your work cut out for you. I am sure some of you wonder precisely what you will be doing in the villages to which you will be assigned—and I am equally sure that after you have arrived you will find yourselves extremely busy. If you did no more than articulate the special, pressing needs of these villages, you would be performing a great service. But with your education and training—and your desire to lend a helping hand—you will be able to do much more. In no other situation would you have such an opportunity to use your own judgment and implement ideas. It should be kept in mind the villages in which you will serve have asked for you. And always remember that the fine Alaskans with whom you will be working are able, intelligent citizens.

Living conditions in the villages of western and southeastern Alaska will undoubtedly shock some of you. Housing is woefully inadequate. Mrs. Marie McGuire, Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration, commented after touring this area last month that she had never seen worse conditions.

Mrs. McGuire had come to Alaska to participate in the Alaska Native Housing Conference, the first such conference ever held. Its purpose was to consider ways and means of providing adequate housing for those Alaskans who, with one foot in the past and the other in the present, lack the means to acquire such housing themselves.

It is all too true that a large segment of our population lives under conditions which are not conducive to health and happiness. Too many of these Alaskans only subsist. Many dare not abandon the traditional ways of living in the rural areas because they know they do not have the education or skills which would allow them to live the better life of their fellow Alaskans in urban areas. And the old ways of eking out a living—trapping, fishing and hunting—are often uncertain today.

Many of our native Alaskans are indeed living between two worlds and enjoying the maximum benefits of neither. In damp, cramped, poorly ventilated dwellings, tuberculosis and other diseases take their hold, and a sickly person is little concerned with anything other than survival. Tuberculosis, that great ravager of our native people in years past, is still a threat to health and life in remote areas of Alaska. The tuberculosis death rate among Alaska natives, while down substantially from past years, is still five or six times higher than the rate for the general population of the Nation.

While this is basically a medical problem, better hygienic practices could bring about a reduction in the incidence of disease. Here is another area in which you can assist—educating villagers in such practices.

The 24 VISTA volunteers who have preceded you into rural Alaska are already playing a significant role in the effort to upgrade village life. Some villages never heard from are now part of the Alaskan community of the whole because of the efforts of VISTA volunteers. For example, results of a recent election in one such village were brought to the attention of interior Alaska residents through a letter written to a major newspaper by a volunteer living there.

VISTA volunteers are now conducting adult basic education and/or preschool education courses in 10 northern and western Alaska villages. Such educational programs are vitally needed if our village people are to be brought into the mid-20th century.

At no other time in our history have conditions for improving the lot of our people been as good as they are today. We are indeed fortunate to have in the White House a sensitive, compassionate man who sees poverty as a degrading blight and is waging total war against it through such programs as the one in which you have enlisted.

Your very presence in the 49th State is evidence in itself of the dedicated concern and desire of individual Americans to exert every effort to constructively approach the task that will be done. The citizens of Alaska's capital city and of Alaska itself are proud that you are here. We are somewhat humbled that each of you is willing to make such personal sacrifice in behalf of helping your fellow human beings.

In concluding, I want to congratulate you on completing your training and thank you for the effort you will soon be making on behalf of fellow Americans who desperately need help. We cannot consider ourselves a truly prosperous nation until all of our people are leading healthy, productive lives. You realize this and are doing something about it, which is to your everlasting credit. As you prepare to leave for assignments far from your homes, I want to wish you success and a merry Christmas and happy New Year.

BASIC DISAGREEMENT ON VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Roscoe Drummond has, in his column published this morning in the Washington Post and other newspapers, put his finger on the essential difference between the parties to debate over this Nation's Vietnam policy. And he has, with lucid brevity, summed up the argument and the lack of proof on the side of the critics that the United States really is committed to an unlimited war, as they contend.

Mr. Drummond's thoughts, Mr. President, deserve attention from all. I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSENSUS GAP: BASIC DISAGREEMENT ON VIETNAM

(By Roscoe Drummond)

It is all to the good to debate the administration's purposes and policies in Vietnam. But such debate brings some loose statements and misstatements which pass each other on the front pages and never seem to meet. They need to be sorted out to see where we all stand.

The central theme of the critics is that the United States is committed to a policy which leads to bringing Red China into the conflict.

These were the views expounded before the Fulbright hearings, principally by former Ambassador George F. Kennan and retired Lt. Gen. James Gavin. At this point, President Johnson countered by saying that he failed to see a great deal of difference between the Kennan-Gavin views and what the Government is doing. The retort to that soft answer was not long in coming. It was that the President was so sorely defeated in the argument that, being unable to debate with them, he had to say he agreed with them.

Obviously, Mr. Johnson did not in this instance add much to the debate. What is needed is to see where the administration agrees and disagrees with the Kennan-Gavin thesis.

They agree at several points: The United States has a vital stake in the peace and freedom of southeast Asia, should not quit fighting, should not pull out of Vietnam.

They disagree on strategy. The Kennan-Gavin view is that we ought to stay closer to safe enclaves, quit trying to find and destroy the Vietcong, and hang on until the Communists agree to negotiate.

Here you have your choice as to which strategy is more desirable: for the United States and South Vietnamese forces to take the war to the enemy or to let the enemy occupy more of the country and take the war to us.

But whichever side of this coin you prefer, there remains a crucial difference between the administration and the critics.

Are we involved in an unlimited war in Vietnam which can only lead to Peiping's entering it?

The President's position is that we are not conducting an unlimited war and that events even more than argument, prove it. It is shown in the fact that the United States is not using its vast power to attack the North Vietnamese people, is not trying to bring down the Hanoi government but to bring it to the peace table, and is keeping a careful checkrein on the bombing.

Why aren't these facts conclusive? To many they are, but some critics still contend that, while we may not be conducting unlimited war, we are committed to it because of our goal to secure self-determination for the people of South Vietnam by ending the aggression one way or another.

In judging this argument, which is central, I think you have to find against the critics. They offer no proof that we are committed to unlimited war. We are conducting a limited war for a limited objective—to secure for the people of South Vietnam the right to choose their own form of government.

This may well mean a long war, as Gen. Earle Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has frankly said. But its purpose is to win our objective in a way that will not put us at war with Red China.

I suspect this makes sense to most Americans.

WHAT LOOMS AHEAD IN VIETNAM?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, next Monday noon I am scheduled to deliver an address before the Cosmopolitan Club of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., in which I am to deal with our American foreign policy, the war in Vietnam, and what is now emerging from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings in ever-increasing clarity as the outlines and guideposts of our policies.

To be sure that my views and observations are available to the President and to those charged with the responsibility of making the day-to-day tactical and diplomatic decisions in the delicate areas of our military maneuvers and our quest for peace, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts of my address to be made in Sioux Falls be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT LOOMS AHEAD IN VIETNAM?

(Excerpts of address by Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, before the Cosmopolitan Club of Sioux Falls, S. Dak.)

With regard to Vietnam, the present mood in Washington reflects a growing conviction that no quick and easy peace terms are likely to evolve out of recent efforts to bring our Communist adversaries to the peace table or through the approaches being made through the U.N.

On the brighter side of the ledger, administration spokesmen appear confident that no sharp or serious escalation of the war in Vietnam appears likely on the basis of current information.

Out of the general floor debate in the Senate and the continuing public hearings being held by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, certain guidelines to our present and developing plans for Vietnam are becoming increasingly clear.

It is anticipated that President Johnson will take some early opportunity to summarize in a public statement the whys, wherefores, and wheretos of our American position and plans in Vietnam There is also a growing possibility that a declaration of policy updating and redefining our national policies in that area of the world may be coming from the President to Congress for debate and action.

Patience, punishment of the enemy, and pressures of accelerated intensity on both friend and foe appear to be the key factors in the administration's program as it is now being disclosed to public view in our committee hearing room by Government witnesses and the flow of information coming out of the questions and answers involved in the sessions of our Committee on Foreign Relations.

Patience is to be practiced in avoiding precipitous actions and in continuing the quest for peace through negotiations or U.N. actions. The enemy is to be subjected to steadily increasing punishment both in South and North Vietnam in the hope such punishment will convince the Communist aggressors that their hope for conquest is futile and that a long war will prove devastating to their unholy plans.

Pressures are to be mounted on our friends and allies to cease delivery of supplies to Vietnam; to join us in our defense of freedom in southeast Asia, and to use their good influences and economic pressure to help convince the Communist leaders of Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow that the era of winning new territory and subjecting free people to tyranny by military conquest is over and that today's world will no longer countenance the promotion of area wars of aggression which might lead to global conflict.

It is to be hoped that an early clarification and crystallization of our American position and policies in Vietnam will help produce a national unity of purpose in this cruel war which will help convince our Communist foes that neither dissention in the ranks of our public officials nor a division among our people will cause our Nation to accept defeat and to surrender another large area of the free world to the grasping tyranny of godless communism.

Intelligence reports indicate that our adversaries read into our differences of opinion far more than is intended so that the net result is to discourage the aggressors from coming to the peace table and to encourage them to continue fighting even after commonsense begins to tell them military victory has become impossible.

MR. CLEAN WATER

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I read with interest a story in the supplement of the February 6 Sunday Washington Star.

Written by Orr Kelly, and entitled "Mr. Clean Water," it is about Mr. Murray Stein, chief enforcement officer of the Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Public Health Service.

It is always gratifying for me to see public officials given due recognition, particularly Mr. Stein. He has worked with the water pollution control program since its inception. His was the key role in the development of that program.

From 1948 to 1955 in the General Counsel's Office, and since that time as chief of enforcement, he has developed policies in all aspects of the attack on pollution contained in the new Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Mr. Stein was a key man in establishing the program of Federal grants to municipalities for the construction of waste treatment facilities. He led the development of a suggested design for State pollution control laws, as a result of which more than half the States have improved their pollution control legislation since 1948.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. CLEAN WATER

(By Orr Kelly)

It is not true that everybody hates Murray Stein.

Why, there are people who don't even know him.

But the hate level is high among those he has dealt with.

Psychologists tell us that hate is actually a projection of our own feelings of guilt and inadequacy onto someone else and Murray Stein has made himself a prime target for those who have reason to feel guilty about polluting the Nation's rivers, lakes, and streams.

"Unless you've been on this spot," he said the other day, "you just can't imagine the pressures and the vilification we're subjected to."

His official title is Chief Enforcement Officer of the Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Public Health Service.

He is sometimes known more simply as Mr. Clean Water.

He speaks with an accent that betrays his Brooklyn background and almost always uses the plural pronoun "we" so that, from one sentence to another, it is difficult to know whether he means "I" or "Peter Kuh (his assistant) and me" or all the 300 people in his branch.

Murray Stein is a short man with a round, almost cherubic face and a round belly that rolls out over his belt, the result of countless luncheons, banquets, and excessively nourishing hotel, and restaurant meals eaten at odd hours as he whips back and forth across the country in a single-minded and unremitting battle against pollution.

"We'll go anywhere, do anything to clean up the water," he says. "We'll talk to a Congressman * * * we'll make a speech * * * we'll do anything to get people moving.

"We're always pleading * * * pushing * * * needling * * * threatening."

Over the last decade, this pleading and threatening has resulted in the cleanup—or specific, enforcible plans for the cleanup—of 8,000 miles of American waterways. But in the process, Stein has come into bitter conflict with a virtual who's who of American industry and with the politicians of some of the Nation's major crisis—whose inadequate sewage treatment plants are among the major sources of pollution.

Through formal enforcement conferences—usually called by a State Governor—Stein has managed to cut the level of radiation in the Colorado River, convince the city of Detroit to stop dirtying the Detroit River, set in motion a cleanup of Lake Erie, get New York and New Jersey moving on the problem of the filthy Hudson, clamp down on the release of pesticides into the Mississippi, and get the cities and industries around Lake Michigan working together to keep the lake from becoming a cesspool.

Stein has conducted 38 conferences, concerning 1,200 cities and an equal number of industries, from United States Steel to a small, family-owned rendering plant. Almost every conference has involved "a real tough situation * * * a long-festering sore."

The formal agreement that usually comes out of such enforcement conferences is just the beginning.

"We're not interested in what's on paper," Stein says. "We're not interested in a semantic cleanup. You can't fool any of the people any of the time that way anymore."

Stein demands a program of action—and he demands that it be carried out.

"As long as a guy goes along, we'll do anything to help," Stein insists. "We'll put a staff at his disposal, we'll meet with him any time or any place. We'll be on the phone any time he needs us.

"But if he says he's going to do something by the 18th and it isn't done, there'll be a letter on his desk on the 19th asking why not.

"If he balks, we put on constant pressure. We're always leaning."

Stein and his staff can also be sympathetic when polluters run into tough technical or financial problems.

In Chicago, representatives of the Federal Government, the States of Illinois and Indiana, the city of Chicago, and industry have been meeting for more than 6 months to try and work out some difficult technical problems.

"We've met 26 times in the last 6 months—an average of 3 working days every 2 weeks. They thought they could do it in 6 months but they strove mightily and failed. So we've extended the time."

Stein tries to be in his office in Washington on Mondays and Fridays, keeping the middle days of the week free for travel. In his office, he makes it a practice to take the papers out of his in-basket in the order they come, taking the tough decisions right along with the easy ones.

When he's out of town, he is almost automatically somewhere west of Washington and thus has the advantage of the time difference. He rises religiously at 6 a.m.—although he is seldom in bed before midnight—and frequently spends a half hour on the phone to his Washington office making the decisions that will keep his staff busy for the day. Except when he's flying—about 100,000 miles a year—he's usually close to a phone. Once, when he was driving in Hawaii, a highway patrolman pulled him over to tell him Washington wanted him on the phone.

His staff thus feels the Stein presence even when he is far away. Some of them hate it and go so far as to call it meddling. Others "try to butter me up," he says. The rest are indifferent.

"We don't care," he says. "If a man produces and is interested in clean water, we can adapt to wide extremes in character."

Stein, who was at the top of his class at George Washington University Law School, has managed to surround himself with bright people.

"Smart," he exclaims. "We don't have anything else but smart guys. What we're looking for is production. We've got some real hot shots and we let them go full speed. We'll give a guy as much delegation as he can swallow. We'll keep him busy as long as he wants to work."

A sizable amount of Stein's time outside Washington is spent with members of his field staff.

"I'm in Washington. I can talk to other people," he explains. "But the guys out in the field are alone. They've got the loneliest, hardest job in the world. Our first function is to keep them going, to back them up. They're subjected to rigorous pressure—personally, technically, professionally."

Stein's home, which he manages to visit once in a while, is at 4116 Elizabeth Lane, Fairfax. He has a wife, Anne, and two daughters, Toby Jean, 19, an American University student, and Judith, 14, a freshman and a cheerleader at Woodson High School.

At $16 a day, Stein's Government per diem allowance doesn't come close to covering his costs away from home. His loss, he figures, is about $1,200 a year.

"I complain about pollution," he said during a recent interview in his $14-a-day motel room in Atlanta. "You know what my wife complains about? She says: 'You're not only away from home all the time, but it costs you money, too.'"

"I AM A TIRED AMERICAN" ROLLS ON

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, out in Luverne, Minn., a great and widely read editor, Alan C. McIntosh, editor-publisher of the Rock County Star-Herald, sat down some weeks ago and batted out on his typewriter his inner-most reactions and frank observations concerning this great country of ours and some of its deviations from the concepts which have made it great and kept it strong. He expressed himself under the heading: "I Am a Tired American."

Since that editorial appeared it has been printed and reprinted in many areas of the country. In last week's highly regarded and widely circulated news magazine, U.S. News & World Report, it was the featured piece on the page usually reserved for the observations of the great and good David Lawrence, himself.

In last Sunday's issue of the Daily Argus Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., the largest newspaper in a five-State area, Bob Renshaw, the roving reporter for the Argus, wrote a fascinating feature article about Al McIntosh and his unusual editorial. I ask unanimous consent to have that feature printed at this point in my remarks, together with the editorial itself, for the benefit of those who may not have read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Luverne Publisher Gets Nationwide Response

(By Bob Renshaw)

Luverne, Minn.—Pent-up frustration over changing attitudes toward America and Americans led Alan C. McIntosh, publisher of the Rock County Star-Herald, to write an editorial, "A Tired American Gets Angry." In the latest issue of U.S. News & World Report magazine, it appears on David Lawrence's editorial page.

"I doubt if I could write it again and sometimes wonder if I really did write it," he said in telling of the huge amount of correspondence it has generated. He said he doesn't know how many hundreds of newspapers, including a small weekly in Cordova, Alaska, have reprinted the editorial. It has also been used in Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic publications.

McIntosh pointed out that he is older than the average father of a 17-year-old daughter and that since she was 4, the family has done considerable traveling, including several trips abroad. During these trips he has observed a changing attitude toward Americans and an arrogance which has built up in many foreigners with whom he came in contact.

References heard overseas and at home to "Ugly Americans," reflections on trying to share a measure of good things we have as Americans with the rest of the world and finding ourselves practically friendless, and frustrations over some of America's policies led McIntosh to write the editorial in haste.

It was set into type and lay around for several weeks, coming close to being thrown into the hellbox before extra type was needed on the editorial page one day last May. Representative Ancher Nelson, Republican, of Minnesota, had it inserted in the Congressional Record and newspapers reprinted it.

Letters began arriving from people of all walks of life, including the beatniks. But 98 percent of them, McIntosh said, "were beautiful—almost beyond belief." He indicated that for an editor who is accustomed to being damned for what he writes, it is a pleasant change of pace to have 7 out of 10 letters say "God bless you."

"The letters are repayment enough for handling the aftermath of The Tired American," he continued. Six or seven letters a day began arriving and McIntosh answered each one with a personal reply. Then the New York American reprinted the editorial and "the roof fell in," he said. By mid-November it was necessary to resort to a form letter in answering correspondence.

He referred to demonstrations against our Government and the American way of life. "If anyone thinks these pickets are representative of majority opinion in America, they are wrong," he continued. "There are, thank God, plenty of 'squares' still around. There is a spark of patriotism running down deep in more hearts than you can imagine and these letters prove it."

McIntosh looks on anti-American demonstrators as scum on the water. "It could pollute us, but I doubt that it will," he concluded.

A TIRED AMERICAN GETS ANGRY

"I am a tired American.

"I'm tired of being called the ugly American.

"I'm tired of having the world panhandlers use my country as a whipping boy 365 days a year.

"I am a tired American—weary of having American embassies and information centers stoned, burned, and sacked by mobs operating under orders from dictators who preach peace and breed conflict.

"I am a tired American, wearied of being lectured by General de Gaulle (who never won a battle) who poses as a second Jehovah in righteousness and wisdom.

"I am a tired American, weary of Nasser and all the other bloodsucking leeches who bleed Uncle Sam white and who kick him on the shins and yank his beard if the flow falters.

"I am a tired American * * * choked up to here on this business of trying to intimidate our Government by placard, picket line and sit-in by the hordes of the dirty, unwashed who rush to man the barricades against the forces of law, order, and decency.

"I am a tired American, weary of the beatniks who say they should have the right to determine what laws of the land they are willing to obey.

"I am a tired American—fed up with the mobs of scabby-faced, long-haired youths and short-haired girls who claim they represent the 'new wave' of America, and who sneer at the old-fashioned virtues of honesty, integrity, and morality on which America grew to greatness.

"I am a tired American, weary unto death of having my tax dollars go to dictators who play both sides against the middle with threats of what will happen if we cut off the golden stream of dollars.

"I am a tired American * * * nauseated by the lazy do-nothings who wouldn't take a job if you drove them to and from work in a Rolls Royce.

"I am a tired American—who is tired of supporting families who haven't known any other source of income other than government relief checks for three generations.

"I am a tired American who is getting madder by the minute at the filth peddlers who have launched America in an obscenity race * * * who try to foist on us the belief that filth is an integral part of culture * * * in the arts, the movies, literature, the stage (and the mobs who see Lenny Bruce as brightly amusing and Norman Mailer as compelling). I'm tired of these artists who scavenge in the cesspools for inspiration and who refuse to look up at the stars.

"I am a tired American—weary of the bearded bums who tramp the picket lines and the sit-ins—who prefer Chinese communism to capitalism—who see no evil in Castro, but sneer at President Johnson as a threat to peace.

"I am a tired American—who has lost all patience with that civil rights group which is showing propaganda movies on college campuses from coast to coast. Movies denouncing the United States. Movies made in Communist China.

"I am a tired American, who is angered by the self-righteous breast-beater critics of America, at home and abroad, who set impossible yardsticks for the United States but never apply the same standards to the French, the British, the Russians, the Chinese.

"I am a tired American who resents the pimply faced beatniks who try to represent Americans as the bad guys on the black horses.

"I am a tired American who is weary of some Negro leaders who, for shock purposes, scream four letter words in church meetings.

"I am a tired American—sickened by the slack-jawed bigots who wrap themselves in bedsheets in the dead of night and roam the countryside looking for innocent victims.

"I am a tired American who dislikes clergymen who have made a career out of integration causes, yet send their own children to private schools.

"I am a tired American who resents those who try to peddle the belief in schools and colleges that capitalism is a dirty word and that free enterprise and private initiative are only synonyms for greed.

"They say they hate capitalism, but they are always right in the head of the line demanding their share of the American way of life.

"I am a tired American who gets more than a little bit weary of the claque in our State Department who choose to regard a policy of timidity as prudent * * * the same group who subscribe to a 'no win' policy in Vietnam.

"I am a tired American—real tired of those who are trying to sell me the belief that America is not the greatest nation in all the world—a generous-hearted nation—a nation dedicated to the policy of trying to help the have-nots achieve some of the good things that our system of free enterprise brought about.

"I am an American who gets a lump in his throat when he hears the 'Star Spangled Banner' and who holds back tears when he hears those chilling high notes of the brassy trumpets when Old Glory reaches the top of the flagpole.

"I am a tired American * * * who wants to start snapping at those phoney high priests who want us to bow down and worship their false idols and who seek to destroy the belief that America is the land of the free and the home of the brave.

"I am a tired American who thanks a merciful Lord that he was so lucky to be born an American citizen—a nation under God with truly mercy and justice for all."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a long time ago an editor by the name of William Allen White made quite a reputation for himself writing an editorial entitled, I believe, "What's Wrong With the State of Kansas?" Writing as he does about a far larger and more important subject, it appears probable that Al McIntosh is about to attract to himself national attention even beyond that which attached itself on that occasion to Mr. White.

THE BRAVE PEOPLE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, February 16 is a day that should be remembered by all of us. On this day, 48 years ago, the brave people of Lithuania declared their independence from Russia, after having been dominated by this powerful country for more than 120 years. Great progress was made in this Balkan nation in education, social welfare, and transportation, and after so many years of subjugation its people knew the taste of democracy. The spirit of the Lithuanian people earned the admiration of the world.

After 22 years of peace and prosperity, however, the citizens of Lithuania became the victims of ruthless invasion and oppression. In World War II the Soviet Empire engulfed this defenseless country, and the chains of slavery once again bound the Lithuanians. Since that time they have lived under the tyranny of Russia. However, their spirit of freedom has not been crushed. Harsh repression cannot quench the hope of a people who have the spirit of freedom so deeply rooted in their hearts and minds.

We cannot for one moment forget these victims of communism. The burning hope of the brave Lithuanians to once again live in peace cannot be allowed to dim. Lithuanian Independence Day is a day not only for recalling the bravery and spirit of the Lithuanian people, but for remembering also the millions of people under the iron hand of slavery in other parts of the world. We salute Lithuania on this day, knowing that their desire for freedom has not faded.

SENATOR TOWER SPEAKS OUT ON VIETNAM

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, many of our distinguished colleagues have been joining in recent days in the increasing dialog about Vietnam. It has come to my attention that the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] has presented his views to his State in a special public service television appearance.

In order that other Senators may have an opportunity to share his views, based on his recent, extensive tour of the combat area, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of that program be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR JOHN TOWER SPEAKS OUT ON VIETNAM

ANNOUNCER. This is Vietnam. Why are we there? What kind of war are we fighting? When will it end? Although thousands upon thousands of words have been written about this distant, tormented land, many of us here at home remain troubled about what we're doing there—where we're heading—what we can do to end the fighting.

Texas' U.S. Senator, JOHN TOWER, is intimately acquainted with the problems of Vietnam. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator TOWER has been to southeast Asia. He has talked with and worked with all the top American officials involved in this frontline struggle against Communist aggression. He has been in the field. He has learned from the American men and officers on the scene their assessment of the war. Senator TOWER has recently returned from this tour-in-depth of the explosive southeast Asian region. Back in Washington, he reported what he saw and heard to fellow members of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Capitol press.

Senator TOWER. The most impressive thing is the fighting quality of the American soldier. I think this is by far the best generation of fighting men we've produced. They're hard chargers, they'll go day in and day out. They don't gripe. They have high morale. And, they're doing a good job for the American people * * * there's a general feeling that we should close the harbor at Haiphong. They feel that there are a lot of supplies coming through there. The SAM's—surface to air missiles—are being brought in through Haiphong. They feel that we should interdict the northeastern railway spur into China. There's a feeling that some of the targets that we are now expending tons of ordnance on and risking the lives of American flyers are of questionable value. And I think we should go after targets that will really hurt these people * * * that really will reduce their capacity to wage war and their willingness to fight a war out of North Vietnam.

ANNOUNCER. With his intimate knowledge of the situation which exists in southeast Asia, Senator TOWER has been asked by the Texas Congressional Report Committee to bring to the people of our State the story behind the story * * * blunt, plain talk that will help each of us to better understand the significance of a war that's being fought half a world away.

Senator TOWER. Vietnam is, indeed, a troubled and troubling land. It is not easy to trace the history of how we got there. Now we're there, it's not easy to understand why we're there. Nor is it easy to predict what lies ahead. Communism does not choose battlegrounds that will be easy for the defenders of freedom. We have today in Vietnam some 200,000 of the bravest, most talented, best trained American soldiers who ever have defended the interests of the United States. They are spread the length and breadth of South Vietnam—in the jungles, the swamps, the mountains and the coastal sands.

Our 1st Infantry Division—the Big Red 1—and our 101st Airborne Division—the Screaming Eagles—face the Communists around Saigon. In the strategically vital midsection of the country we have committed our new, powerful, helicopter-equipped 1st Air Cavalry Division and jungle-trained troops from the Hawaii-based 25th Infantry Division. They operate from such bases as Pleiku and Ankhe. To the north, hard by the 17th parallel, the 3d Marine Division is dug in defending Chu Lai and Da Nang. Throughout the central highlands and along the borders with Laos and Cambodia are stretched the dozens of fortified camps manned by our elite special forces troops * * * bastions of liberty in a sea of Red guerrilla activity * * * the fighting specialists of green beret fame.

I inspected the advance camp of the U.S. special forces at Buon Ea Yang near the Laotian border. These troops, often called America's fierce frontline guerrillas, live up to their reputations. One of the interesting twists to my tour of this camp came when I was shown a new elementary school which was completed last fall. The special forces unit supervised the construction and paid for all the nails and the chains used for swings. One hundred and seventy-five children are being taught by four teachers in this remote Rhade tribe village; a side of the story rarely told of our participation in this war.

Besides these major ground units, the U.S. Air Force has men and planes operating from such bases as Bien Hoa, Tan Son Nhut, Cam Ranh Bay, and Nha Trang. In addition, there are air support bases in Thailand—only a few miles away across the narrow reach of Laos. Off the coast lie the ships of the U.S. 7th Fleet. Small river craft and coastal patrol boats play relentlessly back and forth interdicting the Red's sea supply lines.

From the decks of the carriers, Navy pilots contribute their strength. And from the support ships comes covering gunfire to back up our land artillery. And, behind this massive commitment of U.S. force—some 10 times more than we had in Vietnam a year ago—lie the support facilities of the Philippines * * * Subic Bay Naval Base and Clark Airfield at Manila. Beyond, in the Pacific, are the Guam base of the Strategic Air Command and the headquarters and supply facilities of Hawaii * * * where only a few days ago President Johnson met with leaders of South Vietnam to pledge whatever is necessary to contain the spread of communism in southeast Asia.

So, this is the present U.S. commitment to Vietnam. It approaches the manpower we placed in Korea a decade ago, and it vastly outstrips Korea in terms of firepower and maneuver capability. This is not a commitment to be lightly regarded. It was placed in southeast Asia because we mean business * * * and we mean for the Communists to understand that. I was tremendously impressed by the American men who are helping defend the independence of South Vietnam. These men are hard fighters.

Texas—I should add here—is well represented among the dedicated men of our historic 101st Airborne Division. As well as in other units such as the 3d Marine Division in combat areas around Da Nang—up near the big pressure point around the 17th parallel dividing North and South Vietnam. We toured this area with Maj. Marc Moore from Dallas.

At the Da Nang hospital, I talked with casualties of a hundred nameless but bloody skirmishes. We stopped in the village of Le My which is renowned for Vietcong raids and ambushes and saw firsthand the war's impact on civilians. I was briefed by one of our Navy doctors on the worsening health conditions which pose a threat worse than the guerrillas.

Fighting men like these are doing a magnificent job for the free world. They're stopping communism in its tracks, and they believe it's worth the effort. America wants peace. We want nations left alone by their neighbors to grow and prosper as they will. Last April, President Johnson accurately defined our position in this struggle when he spoke in Baltimore.

President JOHNSON. Our goal is to guarantee the independence of South Vietnam.

Senator TOWER. We want a peace lesson to be learned by the Asian Communists today—in this small country—just as it was learned by the Russians in Europe and Latin America. By standing firm today, we are avoiding a bigger battle later. By standing firm today, we are doing all we can do to guarantee peace for the world's future.

Vietnam cannot be divorced from the long-term, main-event struggle against communism. This confrontation with the Reds has been going on throughout the 20 years since the end of World War II. Vietnam is but an episode in a drama that previously involved Berlin, Iran, Turkey, Greece, Italy, Malaysia, the Philippines, Korea, Cuba, Lebanon, and the Dominican Republic.

This drama began in 1949 when a land blockade of Berlin's Allied sectors was started April 1 by the Soviet military government, which refused to permit United States and British supply trains to pass through the Soviet zone of Germany. This blockade and a Western counterblockade were lifted September 30, after British and United States planes had airlifted over 2 million tons of food and coal into western Berlin.

We were put to the test again in Korea early in the 1950's. And later when attempts by several factions to undermine the pro-Western administration of Lebanon led to open revolt in May 1958. President Dwight Eisenhower sent marines in reply to Lebanon's call for help and Great Britain supported the American position. The revolt dwindled and American forces were withdrawn in October 1958.

And then the showdown in Cuba * * * when the Soviet offensive buildup was revealed to the American people by President Kennedy, who ordered a naval and air quarantine on shipment of offensive military equipment to the island—the showdown which saw Soviet Premier Khrushchev order the missile bases in Cuba dismantled.

We continue to have such episodes because first the Soviet Communists and now the even more aggressive Chinese Communists have thought they can eventually have their way by fighting. They are wrong, but they certainly will not be convicted of that if we abandon Vietnam.

The United States is not at fault in this battle, as some of the peaceniks and beatniks would have us believe. The United States did not attack across a sovereign boundary in Korea. The United States did not blockade Berlin nor build a wall. The United States did not crush Hungarian freedom with the weight of tanks. The United States did not subjugate the Cuban people. The United States did not send guerrilla terrorists into Venezuela or Colombia or the Dominican Republic. The United States did not break the Geneva accords by terrorist attacks in Laos and South Vietnam.

America has been on the right side of these events. Communism has been in the wrong. It is communism which continues to endanger world peace and world order. It is America which defends world order and strives for world peace.

I'm sure no loyal American believes we should stand by indifferently while communism takes over the rest of the world. I take it for granted that every intelligent person realizes America could not long survive as a free nation in a world that was completely communistic outside of America. And, I believe everyone agrees that somewhere, somehow, we must draw the line against further Communist expansion in Asia, just as we have drawn it in Europe.

The question that has troubled some Americans, therefore, is not whether such a line should be drawn, but where such a line should be drawn. I think we have been right in drawing the line in Vietnam. Because, if this line falls, it will be infinitely difficult, perhaps impossible, to draw any realistic line of defense any place short of Hawaii.

We need but look at the map to see the strategic geographic position of southeast Asia. Here, of course, are the Vietnams, Laos, and Cambodia. The area we used to call Indochina. All this area is being actively threatened by the Reds. Right next door in Thailand, the beginnings of Red guerrilla terrorism has been detected. Should Indochina and Thailand fall to aggressive Asian communism the Reds would have opened new doors for the export of subversion, not only across the South China Sea toward the Philippines, Malaya, Indonesia, Australia, and New Zealand; but even more importantly, across the vast Indian Ocean which washes India and Pakistan the vital and always volatile Middle East; and no less than eight nations of Africa.

If South Vietnam falls to communism, there is virtually no hope Laos and Cambodia can hold out. Thailand, Burma, Malaya, and Indonesia would feel strong pressures to seek an accommodation with the Communists. Should the Reds then gain a foothold in Burma, the coastal invasion route into India and East Pakistan would lie exposed to Communist exploitation. India's flank would be turned. Should the Reds gain a dependable foothold in the islands of Malaysia and Indonesia, the Philippines would be threatened from three sides, and the unprotected northern coast of Australia would invite infiltration.

And, should the Reds gain control of the crucial sealane at Singapore—the Straits of Malacca—all free world shipping could be forced into long, and more dangerous detours perhaps clear around the underbelly of Australia. Therefore, the interests of our Nation and of the entire free world are involved in preventing communism's capture of such a key area of the world.

We are in Vietnam, also, because it is in our national interest to assist every nation, large and small, which is seeking to defend itself against Communist subversion, infiltration, and aggression. There is nothing new about this particular policy. It is a policy, in fact, to which America has been committed since the Marshall plan of the 1940's. When this policy was adopted some 20 years ago, the free world was just beginning to learn about the methods of Communist conquest.

In the years just after World War II, we saw those nations which were occupied by Soviet armies deliberately remolded into Red regimes. This liquidation of opposition occurred throughout Eastern Europe. Outside the nations occupied by Soviet troops, there lay a tier of nations left in confusion and poverty by the ravages of World War II. In these nations, the Reds mounted internal subversion controlled from the outside by Communist masters. Eventually, the Communists made armed bids to overthrow existing governments. This was the aggression we confronted and defeated in Iran, Greece, and Turkey.

Next, the Communists did away with pretense and openly invade the Republic of South Korea with Red units supplied from bases outside the attacked country. Allied armed forces came to the aid of South Korea, and remain on guard there.

Having seen their previous tactics of conquest thwarted, the Communists now have shifted to what they call wars of national liberation. This method combines internal subversion with an elaborate and reprehensible reign of terrorism and with eventual introduction into a nation of Communist troops from outside. That's what we are up against in South Vietnam today. The fate of the people of South Vietnam is of the same vital concern to Americans as was the fate of others we have helped.

Today, we face an aggressive Communist China which adheres to the militant Red philosophy displayed by Russia two decades ago in Europe. The Chinese Communists have made it clear that Vietnam is another test of their strategy for conquest.

However, the Chinese Reds have shown an understanding of free world power. There is no place in the world the Chinese Reds would rather have than the island of Formosa. But, they recognize the massive force America can and will bring to bear to prevent their invasion of that island. This same appreciation of U.S. power has prevented the Chinese Reds from directly confronting the United States in South Vietnam.

Quite bluntly, Red China has too much to lose at home. If she were to intervene in Vietnam, American jets could easily reduce her budding nuclear industry to ruin and virtually wipe out all her other limited industrial capacity.

We should say something here about this word "sanctuary." All Americans recall that in the Korean war, our Nation granted the Red Chinese sanctuary behind their own borders. That is, despite the Chinese intervention into the Korean war, we never bombed the supply lines and troop concentration points just across the Yalu River in Chinese Manchuria. We have indicated to the Communists that this time there will be no sanctuary. Indeed, our selective bombing of pinpoint military targets in North Vietnam illustrates that we will not allow the aggressor nation safe sanctuary in which to build, regroup, and support attacks.

Knowing she cannot expect sanctuary, Red China must weigh what she has to lose at home against what little she could realistically hope to gain by intervening directly in South Vietnam.

In addition, Red China faces formidable supply problems in any anticipated intervention into South Vietnam. The part of China bordering North Vietnam, Laos, and Burma is not a major industrial area as was the Manchurian border with North Korea. It has only poorly developed transportation facilities and is in most cases mountainous, difficult terrain. Supporting an army across such a region would be extremely difficult for Red China. Our air power could destroy bridges and railroads in short order. Therefore, our military strategists frankly estimate that Red China could not put enough troops into southeast Asia to turn the tide of war against a determined effort by the United States, South Vietnam, and our allies.

Thus, Red China's threat to world order and liberty can be effectively halted in this place and at this time in world history. It can be blunted today at far less cost to the free world than would be needed in a confrontation a few years hence. We must remember that by the 1970's, the Red Chinese will have a limited nuclear weapon capability, and that within the decade of the 1970's, they will have some medium-range missiles with nuclear warheads. Any attempt to achieve order in southeast Asia at that time would be fraught with far more danger and difficulty than we face in confronting today a nonnuclear Red China.

Therefore, we are in Vietnam not merely to help the 14 million South Vietnamese defend themselves against communism, but because also at stake are the independence and freedom of 240 million people in southeast Asia, and the future of freedom throughout the Western Pacific, India, and Africa. We are also in Vietnam because we have pledged to assure the independence of South Vietnam, and America stands by her word.

The record of Communist aggression in South Vietnam is conclusive. Beyond question, North Vietnam is carrying out a carefully conceived plan of aggression against the south. This aggression violates the United Nations Charter. It is directly contrary to the Geneva accords of 1954 and of 1962 to which North Vietnam is a party. That Geneva agreement came after the French were driven out of southeast Asia by anticolonialistic forces. Geneva accords set up both North Vietnam and South Vietnam and carefully provided that neither was to attack or attempt to subvert the Government of the other.

North Vietnam promptly ignored the Geneva accords and began its systematic terrorism in the south. The people of South Vietnam have chosen to resist this threat. They have taken thousands of casualties doing it. At their request, the United States has taken its place beside them. So have South Korea, Australia, and New Zealand.

The United States seeks no territory from this war, no military bases, no favored treaty positions. If peace can be restored in South Vietnam, the United States will be ready at once to reduce its military involvement. But, we will not abandon friends who want to remain free.

Our first national priority is and must ever be the survival of our country and the survival of a world climate of freedom in which our country can grow and prosper. And, if the 20th century has taught man anything, it is that survival and freedom cannot be purchased cheaply, in a discount store or bargain basement.

Since World War II America has preserved freedom and national independence in more than half the earth. We have prevented nuclear holocaust. We have restored Western Europe and Japan. We have helped friend and former foe to achieve prosperity, liberty, and stability. We have launched the United Nations, and we have kept it alive. We have offered the hand of friendship to the less fortunate in this world, if they will but take our hand. It may be said of America today, as of no other nation in history, that whenever people are willing to stand up in defense of their liberty, Americans will stand with them.

This is the historical road that has led us to Vietnam and this is the road which will lead us to world peace. The United States cannot, then, retreat from these heavy tasks assigned to us by history and liberty.

We must do what is necessary to assure independence for South Vietnam and stability for the Western Pacific. We can win in Vietnam, and by winning we will be going a long way toward establishing world order and world peace for the future.

How then, are we doing? What lies ahead? Our recent efforts to bring the North Vietnamese to the conference table failed. We have bent over backward and walked the extra mile in presenting our peace proposals throughout the world. We must continue these peace efforts. However, since the Communists have refused these approaches and are continuing their terrorism and aggression in South Vietnam, we must now intensify our military efforts until we convince them that we are serious and that they can neither win nor afford to continue the conflict.

Looking at the situation in South Vietnam now, I believe it is correct—as Defense Secretary McNamara has said—that we have stopped losing the war. However, we have not yet taken decisive steps to start winning it. Until we do, it is not likely the Reds will accept peace talks.

Both the American troops and officers I saw in Vietnam and Thailand indicated to me that they believe additional steps are necessary if the fighting is to be ended promptly with no unnecessary loss of life. These men also said they were willing to do their part. Our military efforts must, therefore, continue.

The President may find it necessary to increase the American manpower on the ground in South Vietnam and to interdict the Ho Chi Minh trail. If this is militarily necessary to speed the end of the war * * * then I will support him and I hope all Americans will support him.

It may become necessary to destroy certain North Vietnamese industrial plants by bombing—perhaps plants near Hanoi. If this is militarily necessary to speed the end of the war, I hope all Americans will support the effort.

It may become necessary to close the port of Haiphong. This is the port through which most of the Red's military supplies are received. Through Haiphong come the antiaircraft missiles that have been shooting down American pilots.

It should be pointed out that it is possible to close this harbor and to deny these supplies to the north without resorting to a formal ship blockade. Mines can be placed across the harbor closing it to shipping without any U.S. ship being stationed on the scene. There need be no danger of a naval confrontation over this harbor closing.

If this Haiphong harbor closing becomes militarily necessary in order to speed an end to the war, I hope all Americans will support the move.

There are other steps we can take to assist our men in Vietnam. We can, and we should, provide them with the new lightweight M–16 jungle rifle. This M–16 rifle is particularly well suited to the type of combat they face. It is being built in increasingly large numbers, and should be furnished to our men.

These are just a few of the things we can do and may need to do to bring this war to a close and to bring the North Vietnamese to the peace conference table.

I think it should be pointed out that our soldiers, airmen, and marines are involved in far more than combat in South Vietnam. They are doing far more to contribute to eventual peace and stability than meeting the enemy on the battlefields. They are building schools, roads, and ports. They are teaching local leaders how to govern. They are teaching about sanitation, giving out soap and food, tending sores and wounds and tropical diseases—all in marked contrast to the terror of the Vietcong, who close schools and even force children and women into combat situations.

I believe Americans can be particularly proud of the way our men are responding to the challenge of defeating communism and simultaneously building an intelligent, orderly, free society for South Vietnam. I believe Americans can be proud of our Nation's continuing dedication to the cause of liberty.

Sometimes it seems that every generation of Americans is called upon to make sacrifices in blood and treasure to preserve freedom. As I visited the hospitals, I saw sights no American could soon forget. And yet, the wounded men I saw understood—just as the American people must understand—that we are making our stand in Vietnam today to preclude a fight on a much broader front at much greater cost later on.

We can keep this conflict from spreading. We can bring it to the conference table. We can guarantee the independence of South Vietnam. We can do our part to preserve world order. We can do our part in achieving a lasting peace for mankind.

The opposing of tyranny always is hard, but never is useless. The quest for peace never is easy, but always is worth the effort.

Announcer. Thank you, Senator Tower. This special program has been brought to you as a public service. Senator John Tower, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, who has recently completed an extensive trip throughout the combat zone and who has talked and worked with all the top American officials involved, was asked to speak bluntly on the current situation in South Vietnam and the prospects for the future. If you would like to have a printed transcript of this plain talk on Vietnam by U.S. Senator John Tower, please send your name and address on a card or letter to Senator John Tower, Federal Building, Austin, Tex.

A CRUCIAL SITUATION IN THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on the 27th of January of this year I expressed my concern to my colleagues in the Senate in regard to the fact that since October 11 the Small Business Administration has been unable to even entertain applications for assistance under their loan program. Since that time this crucial situation has become more aggravated.

In my own State of Rhode Island there are approximately 25,500 small businesses which employ about 122,000 employees. Rhode Island is without question a State whose economy is made up primarily of small business. In fact 94.8 percent of our industry is considered small business by the SBA. As a Senator from Rhode Island I am impelled to speak out about the future of our small businessmen.

In our desire in this administration to create a Great Society, we should not create a society that would allow the small businessman to disappear, like the Whooping Crane. In saying this I recognize that Rhode Island small businessmen are an extremely hardy lot; and congratulate them on their hardiness. They have survived the exodus of major textile industries to the south, an extremely complex and sometimes arbitrary tax structure, and the increasing lack of skilled labor.

But, as you know, Mr. President, the two main reasons for failures of small businesses are first, lack of management capabilities and second, lack of sufficient capital. Rhode Island small businessmen have proved by their very survival that they have first-rate management capabilities. However, before a small business can grow and prosper, it must have sufficient capital.

Mr. President, when I spoke on this problem on January 27, I made reference to a telegram that I addressed to Ross D. Davis, Executive Administrator of the Small Business Administration, in which I expressed the plight of a small businessman in Rhode Island. I should like to ask unanimous consent at this time to insert into the RECORD the reply I received from Mr. Davis on December 28, 1965.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PELL: This will reply to your telegram of December 23 regarding our moratorium on the acceptance of loan applications.

I very much regret that the financial condition of the agency necessitated this action. A number of factors contributed to this unsatisfactory condition, as explained in the enclosed statement I made on December 15, 1965, before the Senate Select Committee on Small Business.

For several months we have been devoting a major portion of our resources to the processing of over 25,000 disaster loan applications resulting from Hurricane Betsy, as well as to the backlog of business loan applications. These two problem areas, to a considerable extent, now have been resolved and we are approaching the position where we can estimate how much money will be available for regular business loans during the remainder of the fiscal year. We presently are considering how our lending programs will be adjusted and to what extent loan applications again can be accepted consistent with our remaining financial resources. We hope this determination can be made in the near future.

Please let me know if I can be of further service to you.

Sincerely,

ROSS D. DAVIS,
Executive Administrator.

Enclosure.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, since that time my office has received urgent telephone calls about this crisis; for example, one Rhode Island small businessman has received blanket orders for his product from two major corporations who are working on high priority defense contracts. This businessman does not have enough capital to purchase the necessary supplies to meet these requirements. The SBA refused to even accept an application from him for a direct loan and the local banks categorically refused to participate in the SBA loan guarantee program. I can assure you, Mr. President, that this small businessman is not alone. There are many others like him who are in a similar predicament. This, of course, is not a Rhode Island problem alone. It is a national problem, but because of the large ratio of small businesses in my State, it is of more acute concern to Rhode Island than it is in many other areas of the country.

I have noticed several articles in the past few weeks on this very subject. At this point, Mr. President, I would like unanimous consent to insert these into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washintgon Post, Dec. 16, 1965]

SPARKMAN CHARGES SBA HALTS SMALL BUSINESS LOANS

(By William J. Raspberry)

The Small Business Administration has virtually stopped making loans to small businessmen, "the very thing for which it was founded," Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, charged yesterday.

SPARKMAN, chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, said it was deplorable that the SBA has frozen applications for business loans except those in which banks participate.

Ross D. Davis, SBA executive administrator and sole witness at yesterday's hearing on what SPARKMAN has called "the virtual collapse" of the agency's loan program, said the freeze, in effect since October 11, was temporary and had been made necessary by a shortage of funds.

"Temporary or not, the effect was to cut off loans to small businessmen," SPARKMAN asserted. He noted that Congress was in session at the time the loans were cut off, and said the SBA could have asked for an additional appropriation.

Under SPARKMAN'S questioning, Davis acknowledged that Congress had appropriated "everything we asked for," including a supplemental appropriation of $160 million to cover loans to Louisiana businessmen hit by Hurricane Betsy last September.

SBA officials have blamed the hurricane for depleting the agency's money supply.

Yesterday, Davis made only passing reference to the hurricane, pointing out instead that "SBA must compete with all other agencies for its share of the Federal dollar." He noted that "Federal agencies all over Washington" are having budget difficulties because of escalation of U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

Davis also said SBA is receiving a record number of loan applications because of a tight-money situation triggered by the generally high loan-to-deposit ratio of banks and the recent action of the Federal Reserve Board in raising its bank discount rate from 4 to 4½ percent.

The SBA traditionally has made business loans to persons or firms unable to borrow through normal commercial channels.

Asked about the SBA's lending program under the Economic Opportunity Act, Davis said his agency has "enough money to carry this out, despite reports in the press."

There has been some criticism that SBA no longer is accepting loan applications from firms that would hire the poor, but is limiting its antipoverty loans to persons certified as poor on the basis of income.

The hire-the-poor loans had constituted the bulk of the SBA antipoverty effort and their curtailment has "cut the heart right out" of the agency's role in the war on poverty, critics contend.

Following the hearing, Davis told a reporter that the curtailment was designed to "stretch" the agency's $25 million loan fund and that there was not enough money to handle both the "poor" and "hire the poor" loans.

SMALL BUSINESS LOSING U.S. LOANS—AGENCY REFUSING NEW BIDS FOR ITS CREDIT PROGRAM UNTIL FURTHER NOTICE—LACK OF FUNDS IS CITED—MONEY STILL BEING PROVIDED FOR DISASTER RELIEF AND ANTIPOVERTY PROJECTS

WASHINGTON, November 2.—Small Business Administration is refusing to accept applications for its ordinary small business loan program until further notice.

A spokesman confirmed today that the cutoff in applications began October 12, though no announcement was made at the time. The reason is a lack of funds.

The agency will continue its antipoverty program of very small loans, running up to $15,000. It will also continue its program of guarantees of private bank loans, which can run as high as $350,000.

The Small Business Administration asked Congress for $450 million for its loan program for the present fiscal year, based on a recent record-high loan level of about $100 million a quarter.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS APPROPRIATED

Congress, however, approved only $150 million in new funds plus the right of the SBA to relend funds it receives in repayment of past loans, making an estimated total of $291 million in all.

Contrary to reports, the agency's difficulty has not come about because it has used up its funds making disaster loans. Congress approved a last-minute appropriation of $160 million for disaster loans, which should cover the present heavy lending activity, chiefly in Louisiana.

However, officials said today that much of the agency's manpower is occupied with the Louisiana situation, following the hurricane designated as Betsy. Thus, a backlog of some 3,000 business loans, applied for before the current freeze, has piled up awaiting final approval.

BACKLOG TO BE CLEARED

The first order of business after the Louisiana situation is in hand, officials said, will be to clean up this backlog. Then at some point applications will again be received for new loans, though there will probably have to be some restrictions.

Demand for SBA loans has been exceptionally high in part because of the booming economy and a resulting generally strong demand for credit.

It may also reflect some tightening of lending policy by private banks, which are more nearly "loaned up" than at any time in recent years, as measured by the ratio of loans to deposits.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 21, 1965]

DISASTER LOANS DRY UP SBA AID TO NEGROES

(By Leonard Downie, Jr.)

Emergency disaster loans to Louisiana businessmen hit by Hurricane Betsy in September have dried up funds for the Small Business Administration's regular loan programs throughout the Nation.

Hardest hit by the SBA loan drought are the Nation's small businessmen—many of them Negroes—who had applied for loans through the new Small Business Development Centers in 28 U.S. cities.

Applications are no longer being accepted at the centers for regular SBA loans. A backlog of applications for special easy-to-get Economic Opportunity Act loans has built up. And many applicants who have actually received letters approving their loans have not received their money during the past 2 months.

NEEDED: $160 MILLION

Little of the money is expected to be disbursed, and few new loan applications will be considered, SBA officials say, until Congress approves $160 million in supplemental appropriations to foot the bill for Hurricane Betsy and cover the backlog of other applications.

Negro businessmen, meanwhile, are growing restive, as what seemed a promising program to help them enter the economic mainstream has come to a virtual standstill.

They especially had been counting on receiving from the SBA the Economic Opportunity Act loans that require little or no collateral; collateral has been a major stumbling block in their efforts to obtain loans before.

"I know there are some Negro businessmen in Washington who were already budgeting money they expected through the program," James S. Stanback, Jr., president of the District of Columbia Chamber of Commerce said. "Now, with no money coming, they don't know what they are going to do."

CENTERED ON NEGROES

The Small Business Development Centers were set up by the Office of Economic Opportunity in 14 cities last July to provide business training and assistance in obtaining SBA loans for needy small businessmen, especially Negroes.

In Washington, only six Negro businessmen had obtained SBA loans in 13 years before last summer. More than half of the 145 loans approved through the local center since then have gone to Negroes.

Nationwide, the number of cities served by the centers quickly doubled, with dozens of requests for them coming from other towns, as the public response exceeded all official expectations.

But now the loan money has suddenly stopped coming. Samuel Harris, director of the Washington center, reported that the SBA stopped accepting applications for regular loans some time ago.

He also estimated that 40 local applications for poverty program loans, budgeted separately by the SBA, are still awaiting SBA approval and that more than a dozen local businessmen who have received letters approving their applications still have not gotten any money.

Berkeley Burrell, president of the National Business League, said the situation is much the same at centers all over the country. Representatives of the league's chapters in cities with Small Business Development Centers "are calling every day to complain about the sudden lack of loan money," he said.

NEW CENTERS CURBED

The SBA also is not allowing new centers to open up in cities asking for them, he added, and Washington's center has two new branches, both staffed and already open for business, that cannot be announced to the public.

Burrell believes that the special effort to help Negro businessmen was never expected to cost as much as it has. "Now that it is adding to the Government's money problems," he said, "I'm afraid they will curtail it sharply or cut it off."

SBA officials insist that Hurricane Betsy is the only reason for the loan embargo. Emergency disaster loans needed in Louisiana, which get top SBA priority, are expected to exceed the $88 million loaned to businessmen in Alaska after the earthquake there in March 1964.

Diversion of large amounts of loan money for the Louisiana emergency has created a backlog of more than 4,000 unfilled loan applications in other parts of the country, one spokesman said.

"As I understand it," another SBA official said, "we are nearly flat broke."

"I realize the anxiety of other people counting on money from us," Randall Tyus, the SBA's special assistant to the Administrator for minority group affairs, said, "But we must help these people in the South first."

At one point earlier this month, the entire SBA loan machinery ground to a halt as officials surveyed the application backlog to decide what programs to curtail for now and how much money to request from Congress.

Now the disaster loan program is running smoothly, SBA spokesmen say, and "some money is expected to trickle back down through the poverty loan program, although progress will be slow."

Officials of both the SBA and the Office of Economic Opportunity, which pays for the office expenses and management training programs at the Small Business Development Centers, promise that everything will be back to normal soon.

But Negro business leaders, who believe enough money should have been set aside for the poverty loan program in the first place so that it would not have been affected by the Louisiana emergency, are not so optimistic.

"We need a deeper commitment to the Negro businessman from the Administration," Burrell said.

[From the Washington Star, Aug. 12, 1965]

SBA MOVES TO LIMIT LOANS TO THE NEEDY

(By Lyle Denniston)

Federal lenders to small business moved today to make sure that only firms that are really needy get Government loans.

One effect of the action, however, will be to raise the interest cost that many small borrowers will pay.

The Small Business Administration put into immediate effect today a rule that allows private lenders to raise the rate of interest on SBA loans that are taken over by those lenders.

Because this action will reduce or cut down the chance that SBA loan rates are below private money market rates, it is supposed to cause small borrowers whose credit is good to stay away from the loan office.

Thus, only small firms who cannot get money elsewhere would be left to borrow from SBA. For those who get SBA loans that are later sold off to private lenders, the cost probably would be higher than under past practice.

Presumably, more SBA loans will now wind up in private portfolios, since the higher interest would make these loans more attractive as investments.

SBA has been trying to turn over more of its loan portfolio to private lenders, in line with a general Government policy of turning its credit responsibility back to normal financial channels.

Eugene P. Foley, SBA Administrator, said that the new policy on interest follows the Agency's recent discovery that about one in three of the firms borrowing at SBA "could have obtained the loan from a bank on reasonable terms." That is "not in keeping" with the law governing SBA lending, he said.

The new policy alters a practice that had held interest rates on loans sold to private lenders at the level fixed at the time the loans were made. This is 4 percent or at most 5½ percent on loans made out of SBA funds.

If a private bank put up some money for these loans, it could charge up to 8 percent on its share. Even so, the combined rate of a joint SBA-bank loan often was low enough to put it below market rates.

Beginning today, a buyer of an SBA loan need no longer observe the original interest figure. He may charge up to the normal interest rate prevailing in his area, but in no case more than 7½ percent. SBA will set the specific rate a loan buyer may charge. "In most cases," the Agency said, the permitted rates will be less than 7½ percent.

The new policy applies generally to loans for normal business purposes—opening a business, adding new lines, expanding the plant, and so on.

It does not apply to SBA loans made under the antipoverty program, loans made to firms in disaster-hit areas, loans made by private lenders but guaranteed by SBA, or loans to local business-development companies.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 3, 1965]

SBA TO CURTAIL LOANS BECAUSE OF LOW FUNDS

Government loans to small businesses probably will be curtailed until mid-1966, a spokesman for the Small Business Administration said yesterday.

The agency now has a backlog of applications and it is not accepting applications for direct Government loans.

The agency's funds have been running low because of heavy loan disbursements under the antipoverty program and outlays for disaster loans to victims of hurricanes, floods, and other disasters.

Congress voted a supplemental appropriation of $160 million shortly before it adjourned for the year but the money was earmarked for loans to victims of Hurricane Betsy.

The SBA is still making loans under the antipoverty program—which usually runs $15,000 or less—and it is continuing to make disbursements for community development loans.

The spokesman said he did not know whether the $160 million appropriation would cover all the requests for loans and Louisiana victims of Hurricane Betsy. The agency has approved loans in that area at the rate of 200 per day and has been receiving applications at the rate of 400 per day.

About $14.7 million has been disbursed to 4,401 victims whose homes were damaged or destroyed by Hurricane Betsy. The agency also has approved 396 loans totaling $6.6 million in that area.

For the current fiscal year, the SBA received an appropriation of $150 million and it expects to receive another $141 million in loan repayments during the year. The agency has estimated that about $480 million would have been needed for the year if it had continued to approve loans at the unusually high rate of a few months ago.

The spokesman said, "We are trying to finish the hurricane program as soon as possible. Then we will try to clean up our backlog and see where we stand."

He said the SBA has been urging banks to make loans to small businesses under a bank guarantee plan. Under this program, the bank makes the loan and the agency guarantees up to 90 percent repayment in case of default.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 7, 1965]

CUTBACK IN SBA LOANS PROTESTED

(By William J. Rasberry)

A decision to bar antipoverty business loans to any except the certified poor has cut the heart out of the Small Business Administration's antipoverty program, it was charged here this week.

SBA officials, most of whom refuse to be quoted, deny there is any attempt to scuttle the overall program. They say the cutback in part of it was made necessary because disaster loans to Louisiana victims of Hurricane Betsy created a heavy drain on SBA funds.

But critics insist the hurricane is just a coverup for a decision to downgrade the SBA's antipoverty role.

Previously, the SBA had been lending antipoverty money at the rate of $400 to $425 million a year. As a result of the cutbacks, the rate is now about $291 million.

According to Berkeley G. Burrell, president of the National Business League, an organization of Negro businessmen, the cutback "has the effect of bringing the SBA program to a halt as far as fighting poverty is concerned."

Basically, it's a matter of money. What is unclear is whether the Johnson administration is trying to limit the new Federal budget or curtail the antipoverty effort itself.

There already have been substantial cutbacks in Project Headstart, the preschool program for underprivileged children; Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), the Job Corps, Community Action Programs, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps, whose local program has been reduced from 3,200 participants to 1,900.

Under terms of the Economic Opportunity Act that established the War on Poverty, the Small Business Administration has been making loans in two basic categories.

The first is made up of persons who are themselves certified as poor on the basis of income and number of dependents. The second category covers small businesses which as part of their contract agree to hire poor persons.

That second part, which had constituted the bulk of the SBA's antipoverty effort, has been eliminated.

Observers both within and outside the United Planning Organization, the local poverty coordinator, have estimated that as much as 90 percent of the SBA's antipoverty loan money had gone to the latter category before it was cut out.

For months, SBA officials have been blaming Hurricane Betsy for the lack of money for the antipoverty effort. There is no question that emergency disaster loans to Louisiana businessmen hit by the hurricane in September have drained SBA funds.

But the SBA asked for and was granted a supplemental appropriation of $160 million to cover Hurricane Betsy aid.

As assistant SBA administrator, Keith L. Hanna, insists that the business loan cutback is temporary and that the program will be reinstituted "as soon as we can get from under the backlog we have."

Hanna said that 400 to 500 SBA employees are in Louisiana to administer the Hurricane Betsy disaster program. He said no more hire-the-poor borrowers, the SBA has cut the cause they are outdated by the time anyone gets to them.

In addition to barring applications from hire-the-poor borrowers, the SBA has cut the maximum amount of its antipoverty loans to $15,000, well below the $25,000 maximum called for in the Economic Opportunity Act.

Still another, though relatively minor cutback in the number of SBA antipoverty loans has resulted from a change in interest rates. Initially, SBA could make loans to businesses in certified hardcore unemployment areas at 4 percent. Now the rate is 5½ percent across the board.

Oscar Ornati, SBA's chief of economic development and manpower, was quick to add that the program itself is essentially an experiment.

"The most important thing is not the specific number of loans," Ornati said. "The program does make it possible for some individual poor people to enter the mainstream of American business, and this is extremely valuable in showing other poor persons that such possibilities do exist."

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I have also received a communication from the Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc., of Boston, concerning the possibility of the Small Business Association merging with the Department of Commerce and I should like to ask unanimous consent to insert this into the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Smaller Business Association
of New England Inc.,
Boston, Mass., February 2, 1966.

Hon. Claiborne Pell,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: Many members of the Smaller Business Association of New England have heard disturbing rumors during the past few days that plans are now being discussed in Washington to strip the Small Business Administration of its independence and place it within the Department of Commerce.

Our association strongly believes such a move would seriously weaken the effective role the SBA has performed since 1953. There is no organization for small business in the country that has been more closely associated with the SBA than ours. SBANE worked closely with the House and Senate Small Business Committees in the years preceding the Small Business Act of 1953 and many of its proposals were incorporated in this legislation. During the past years we have continued to give close attention and constant official liaison to the SBA and know of the extensive assistance this agency has given the small business community of the Nation since it became an independent agency.

For years before the SBA was created, agencies for small business existed within the Department of Commerce but their capabilities were never realized in a department long preoccupied with large business affairs. SBANE is alarmed that small business problems will again be relegated to second place within a department more attuned to big business.

Since 1953 Congress has recognized, through the SBA, the difference between big and small business and has served well its obligation to assist the small business community. SBANE respectfully urges that you use the influence of your office in opposition to any plans that would dilute the aims and programs of the Small Business Administration.

Sincerely,

Ernest H. Osgood, Jr.,
President.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it is my belief that the best way this administration can serve the small businessman is to provide him with capital through the SBA direct loan program. It is interesting to note that in the fastest growing sectors of our national economy, specialty retailing, services, finance, transportation, and construction, the small businessman has shown great survivability. The average small business is frequently self-initiated, self-financing, and self-managed. But these businesses, in order to continue, must successfully compete against the industrial giants. In order to do this they must have easier access to long-term equity financing. I would hope that this administration would reserve a significant place in our Great Society for small business and the small businessman of our country. They unquestionably represent the strength and imagination of our economy. It would seem to me that the Bureau of the Budget should give serious consideration to expanding the loan limit of the Small Business Administration in order that the SBA regular business loan program might resume and help insure the survival of small business.

THE NEW METHOD OF LISTING FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the other day I was going through the most recent Foreign Service list and was struck by the lack of information given concerning the individuals listed.

I must say that I prefer the old listings, where a good deal more information was given concerning the composition of the posts, where one could delineate who does what, how many people were in diplomatic, economic, consular, administrative, and other kinds of work and which gives the peruser of the register considerably more information than is presently the case.

I for one prefer this older variation and in this connection ask unanimous consent to insert a letter former Ambassador Ellis O. Briggs recently wrote the Foreign Service Journal.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Topsfield, Maine,
July 26, 1965.

To the Editor of the Foreign Service Journal,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: The new Foreign Service list no longer lists the personnel of the Foreign Service.

Time was—as recently as the January 1965 issue—when this useful compendium described with reasonable accuracy the composition of an Embassy, and indicated within bounds of discretion who was doing what within the diplomatic premises, as well as the rank and title of each person.

You could tell whether the chief of mission was a professional by noting the presence, or absence, of the FSO symbol. You could identify the officers of the establishment and determine their functions. You could even count up, if you had the desire and the durability, how many analysts, cartographers, computers, coordinators, entomologists, horticulturalists, hydrologists, inspectors, maintenance mechanics, managers, polytechnicians, screening specialists, superintendents, supervisors, rural youth rehabilitators, veterinarians and Voice of America relay stations there were at any given post, all busy helping the Ambassador to enrich foreign policy.

In terms of the public interest it was a handy thing to have each Embassy divided into its component political, economic, consular, administrative, and public affairs sections, with an enumeration of the personnel serving in each. The old Foreign Service List furnished that information. If it was not stimulating to know how many Peace Corps chaperones in Africa were receiving upward to $20,000 per annum to teach austerity to the volunteers, it was always comforting to note that in the American Embassy in Athens (for example) there were three Americans performing housekeeping functions to every one American performing substantive tasks in the political and economic sections.

Now, this valuable information is hidden, and possibly declared classified by the home office administrators. No longer is it possible to tell whether Sam Smith, a Foreign Service officer with 12 years of experience behind him, is a second secretary or an artificial inseminator, or whether Joe Jones, 20 years after passing the Foreign Service examinations, is serving as an economist or an instructor in yodeling for peace in Upper Volta.

No longer is there any visible consular section; the very vice consuls themselves have vanished.

There is not even an executive section, to indicate the refuge of a hard-pressed ambassador.

Like George Orwell's pigs, everyone is apparently declared to be equal—except for a tiny group at the head of each list, certified to be more equal than others.

In one particular only do I observe a motive for pride with respect to the June 1965 Foreign Service list. In this I doubtless anticipate a triumphant article in the newsletter of the Department of State, complete with self-congratulatory prose and photographs of beaming Potomac personnel accepting an award for superior performance.

Whereas last January's list ran to 117 numbered pages, the June edition (not counting a handsome colored map, suitable for framing) has been condensed to a mere 97.

That has not, alas, been achieved by a reduction in personnel of 20 percent to match the reduction in pages. On the contrary, the personnel are apparently more numerous than ever. The reduction in pages has been accomplished by the substitution of type so tiny that few subscribers lacking magnifying glasses are likely to get much beyond the table of contents or the preface.

All in all, the June Foreign Service list, which fails to list the personnel of the American Foreign Service, is not one of the most inspired efforts since management was enthroned and administration helped itself to tiaras and scepters and cymbals.

Sincerely yours,

ELLIS BRIGGS,
Career Ambassador (Retired).

INTERSTATE 90 IN SOUTH DAKOTA—RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY SOUTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD House Concurrent Resolution 9, adopted by the South Dakota Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to direct the Bureau of Public Roads to adjust certain administrative policies immediately so that the planning and construction of Interstate 90 Highway in South Dakota may be completed with a minimum of permanent economic hardship to the land area and the adjacent land area severed.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9

(Introduced by Mr. Renning)

A concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States to direct the Bureau of Public Roads of the U.S. Department of Commerce to adjust certain administrative policies immediately so that the planning and construction of Interstate 90 highway in South Dakota, may be completed with a minimum of permanent economic hardship to the land area and the adjacent land area severed

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein):

Whereas administrative policies of the Bureau of Public Roads have not considered the economic impact of Interstate 90 on the agricultural businesses and livestock operations in the semiarid country of South Dakota; and

Whereas under present administrative policy of the Bureau of Public Roads a sufficient number of practical sized land service facilities cannot be included in the design of Interstate 90; and

Whereas cattle and equipment passes should be justified on the basis of need rather than the Bureau of Public Roads present policy that these access facilities must be justified on the basis of the monetary value of severance damages minus the cost of the structure; and

Whereas there is a need for the Bureau of Public Roads to establish administrative flexibility in recent national policies for land service access facilities for cattle and agricultural pursuits which will not force South Dakota operators to sell their units and not make agricultural units unworkable and impossible to manage; and

Whereas proposed changes have been submitted to the Bureau of Public Roads for approval by the South Dakota Department of Highways which represent a sincere attempt to minimize the detrimental impact the Interstate has on certain land holdings which have incorporated sound engineering practices and resulted in a reduction in cost of federal expenditures and these proposals have been rejected; and

Whereas Interstate 90 construction from Cactus Flat to Chamberlain must be accomplished recognizing it is in the public interest to construct an adequate number of cattle and equipment underpasses even though the reduction in right-of-way damages of an individual severed is insufficient to offset the cost. Policy must consider multiple owner use and the area economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 41st Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and is memorialized to direct the Bureau of Public Roads of the United States Department of Commerce to make administrative policy changes in regard to access structures included in Interstate 90 which will allow these facilities at reasonable intervals based on need considering the land use of the area and the economy of the area; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States, the members of the congressional delegation from South Dakota, the administrator of the Bureau of Public Roads of the U.S. Department of Commerce, and to the South Dakota Department of Highways, Pierre, S. Dak.

Adopted by the house of representatives January 28, 1966.

Concurred in by the senate February 2, 1966.

LEM OVERPECK,
Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.

CHARLES DROZ,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

Attest:

PAUL INMAN.
Chief Clerk.

VIETNAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the question of just who is the Vietcong is apparently a riddle to many. An editorial in the February 16, issue of the Baltimore Sun illuminates the issue.

The Sun editorial asserts that "the evidence available suggests the National Liberation Front and the Vietcong are creations of North Vietnam, as fronts for that government rather than for the people of South Vietnam."

The Sun believes that "President Ho Chi Minh is being unrealistic as well as unreasonable when he says, as he has been saying in his letters to heads of state around the world, that 'if the United States really wants peace, it must recognize the National Front for the liberation of South Vietnam as the sole genuine representative of the people of South Vietnam, and engage in negotiations with it.' "

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sun editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Feb. 16, 1966]

FRONT FOR HANOI

One of the questions which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee could usefully take up, as part of its inquiry into the war in Vietnam, is the status of the National Liberation Front and the Vietcong. The evidence available suggests that the National Liberation Front and the Vietcong are creations of North Vietnam, in the familiar authoritarian pattern of Communist-sponsored fronts and "people's democracies," and hence are controlled by North Vietnam as fronts for that Government rather than for the people of South Vietnam.

Thus, President Ho Chi Minh is being unrealistic as well as unreasonable when he says, as he has been saying in his letters to heads of state around the world, that "if the United States really wants peace, it must recognize the National Front for the liberation of South Vietnam as the sole genuine representative of the people of South Vietnam, and engage in negotiations with it." From the American viewpoint, negotiations with the National Liberation Front under such conditions would be nonsense. We would be negotiating with a puppet, talking to mouthpieces manipulated by others. The United States has made the point that the Vietcong-Liberation Front could be represented along with North Vietnam in any peace negotiations.

Senator MCGEE, of Wyoming, discussed the role of the Vietcong-Liberation Front in a Senate speech February 1, citing the book by Prof. Bernard Fall as an authority. Much the same evidence was covered in press dispatches yesterday from Washington, referring to an analysis made for President Johnson. Senator MCGEE urged Americans to disabuse themselves of the idea that the Vietcong-Liberation Front is "some endemic development within the borders of South Vietnam, some sort of peasant rebellion against Saigon." No non-Communist political group in South Vietnam—students, Buddhists, Catholics, liberals, or military—has embraced or endorsed the Vietcong, he noted. None has acknowledged the validity of the Liberation Front as a grassroots or native-controlled South Vietnamese political group. At the most, Senator MCGEE said, it is no more than "one of the smaller of the (special) interest groups" in South Vietnam. For example, he said, the Hoa Hao and the Cao Dai are minority political groups which are larger than the Liberation Front.

Senator MCGEE did not have a very large audience in the Senate. He is not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, but some of its members would serve the cause of public enlightenment if they would help to amplify our knowledge of just what the Vietcong-Liberation Front is, and is not. This could enlarge the public understanding which President Johnson needs as a foundation for support of his position on peace negotiations.

WEST VIRGINIA AVENUE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the February 13 issue of the Sunday Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail State magazine carried an article by Mr. Harry W. Ernst, Washington correspondent for the Charleston Gazette, regarding West Virginia Avenue, here in the District of Columbia. His remarks provide for the folks back home a verbal panorama of the sights to be viewed by traveling the length of this broad avenue.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR STREET IN WASHINGTON

(By Harry W. Ernst)

WASHINGTON.—There aren't any hills along the avenue named for West Virginia here, which is somewhat seedy and obscure without its namesake's redeeming natural beauty.

Few West Virginians among the thousands who have visited or moved to the Nation's Capital probably know where West Virginia Avenue is. And understandably so. It's off the marble monument circuit.

Dedicated in 1909, West Virginia Avenue begins at K Street about a dozen blocks northwest of the Capitol. Rose & Jake Market ("meat, poultry, fish, and beer") and a hedge-filled island guards its entrance.

About 20 blocks later after a confusing encounter with Montana Avenue, West Virginia Avenue fades away just beyond the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks.

An old car with a flat tire parked in a backyard and trash-littered sidewalks remind the visitor of a typical West Virginia hollow. West Virginia Avenue also looks rundown and almost forgotten.

But it has two claims to fame—the 100-acre campus of federally financed Gallaudet College, the world's only college for the deaf, and one of two District of Columbia auto inspection stations that anger and help protect motorists.

In West Virginia all you do to get an inspection sticker is drive in to see your friendly neighborhood mechanic. It's not that easy in Washington. The police operate the two inspection staitons, which are equipped with imposing machines that check your machine. And what human dares argue if the police machines insist that his machine is sick and needs treatment?

Those who don't like to leave home could stick around and even be buried along West Virginia Avenue, which Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, recalls visiting as a boy on a patriotic pilgrimage with his father.

Along the avenue are row houses, a Roman Catholic school, service stations and garages (including Washington's "Little Detroit"), used car lots, restaurants, a liquor store, warehouses (eggs, coffee, liquor, and furniture), and Mount Olivet Cemetery.

A narrow four lanes and partially lined with sycamore trees, West Virginia Avenue fails to live up to the beauty of its namesake. At its intersection with Florida Avenue, for instance, there is a small plot of ground bearing a sign that reads "No ball playing on this park, U.S. Park Service," although it's difficult to imagine anyone but ants playing ball there.

West Virginians might want to set an example for other States with Washington avenues named for them by sending contributions to beautify West Virginia Avenue. For those with States rights sentiments, such a gesture would symbolize their ambition to reverse the flow of handouts from Washington.

More than $800,000 already has been donated by citizens from throughout the Nation to help Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson make the Nation's Capital a more beautiful city. Some elementary school children in California even contributed $1.21 to the cause.

The District of Columbia government is seeking Federal funds to replace and repair deteriorating housing in a half square mile area bordering on West Virginia Avenue.

But that's peanuts compared to the millions which Federal officials hope to spend rebuilding Pennsylvania Avenue, the Nation's ceremonial boulevard that links the White House and the Capitol.

West Virginians will have to settle for a more attractive West Virginia Avenue. They can do their share by sending contributions to the National Park Service. Trees, shrubs, and flowers—perhaps some native to West Virginia—would perk up the old avenue in the image of its namesake, especially if the old car is left in the backyard.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTAL MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 2791.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

THE MEANING OF VIETNAM

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the subject of our foreign policy in southeast Asia. I believe that in Vietnam we face a momentous decision—one which may well determine the world position of the United States, for good or ill, now and in the years to come.

It was my privilege to serve in the Department of State during World War II and in the postwar period. Those were the years when the fateful crises which have since matured first came into being. That was the time when we rejected a "heathen trust" in the atomic equivalent of the "reeking tube and iron shard" as the means for imposing a Pax Americana on a prostrate world.

We chose instead the path of peace. Peace through international understanding and cooperation. We placed our trust in the good will of mankind and what we believed was an indomitable human instinct for survival in the post-Hiroshima age.

We laboriously set up an elaborate international machinery for keeping world peace. We did so not with any utopian or messianic vision of what it could accomplish. We merely hoped that our handiwork would be strong enough and flexible enough in future years to control, or at least contain, the crises which were even then foreseeable if and when they were triggered by a new type of aggression and a new breed of aggressors.

We found that even this modest hope was illusory. We learned 20 years ago that U.S. power and the unflinching will to use it was the only effective deterrent to Communist aggression.

It is my hope that the insights and experience gained in those years may prove to be a useful resource to the Senate in its discussions of our course in Vietnam and in assessing its implications for the future of our Nation.

THE SOUTHEAST ASIA RESOLUTION OF 1964

I was not a Member of the Senate when it passed the southeast Asia resolution in 1964. I have, however, read carefully the resolution itself and the legislative history connected with its adoption. In submitting that resolution to the Senate for its overwhelming approval, the floor manager for the legislation made it clear:

> The resolution now before the Senate is designed to shatter whatever illusions our adversaries may harbor about the determination of the United States to act promptly and vigorously against aggression.

When asked by the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky whether the resolution gave the President authority "which could lead us into war," the chairman replied:

> That is the way I would interpret it. If a situation later developed in which we thought the approval should be withdrawn, it could be withdrawn by concurrent resolution."

I agree with the purpose of the resolution and the interpretation of its possible implications as expressed by the distinguished chairman. I believe the resolution was a dramatic endorsement by the Congress of the solemn pledge made by the late President Kennedy in his inaugural address, where he said:

> Let every nation * * * know that we shall pay any price, bear any burden * * * support any friend, oppose any foe to ensure the survival of liberty.

The menace of trigger happiness to world peace was an issue in the presidential election of 1964. Yet the people of the United States endorsed by overwhelming majority the confidence of the Congress in the President's ability and determination to preserve world peace while acting to deter international aggression.

What then is the record of the President's efforts to keep peace in southeast Asia?

As Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, he has ordered military action to preserve the independence of South Vietnam. I believe that action is a responsible, necessary, and restrained use of the minimal force required to deter the present level of aggression in Vietnam and to honor our national commitments.

As Chief of State he has brought home to the leadership of very nation on earth and to all the people of the free world two messages:

First. Our desire for an honorable and peaceful settlement which will insure the independence of South Vietnam.

Second. Our determination—if no honorable settlement is possible—to protect the liberty of the gallant people of South Vietnam "as long as aggression commands us to battle."

In his search for a peaceful and honorable settlement he has shown a combination of patience, resourcefulness, and initiative which I believe to be without precedent in the annals of the Presidency.

He has enlisted the assistance of every relevant organ of the machinery for international cooperation established since World War II.

He has even sought and obtained the assistance of the Soviet Union and of other Communist and nonalined powers of Europe, Africa, and Asia to use their influence with Hanoi to open the door to negotiations.

He sought and enlisted the great moral influence of His Holiness, Pope Paul, who has urged arbitration of the Vietnam controversy under the aegis of the United Nations.

In an age of instant global communications he has combined the prestige of Presidential diplomacy with the power of the mass media to communicate to the world at large the sincerity of our Nation's desire for peace with honor.

At considerable risk, he ordered a suspension of bombing of strategic targets in North Vietnam to convince the aggressor that our purpose was not to destroy him but merely to deter his aggression.

He has appealed to Hanoi directly, only to have his appeal spurned on the ground that the United States would not be permitted to gain at the conference table what it was unable to win on the field of battle.

This record is the eloquent evidence by deeds, not words, of the patience and skill with which the President has discharged his pledge to seek every road to peace in South Vietnam. But the Peiping-Hanoi aggressors have spurned his every effort. Their brinksmanship has compelled him to resume the use of military forces to deter their mounting aggression.

The calculated risks which this course entails are minor when compared to the disaster the Nation invites if it fails to pursue it. For we face an enemy whose primary technique of conquest is not by military victory on the field of battle, but by the psychological exhaustion of his adversary.

At this time what could better serve our adversary's purpose than undermining the President's leadership by destroying the faith of our people in the justice of the cause for which we fight in Vietnam and of its vital importance to the United States?

In the present supercharged and emotional setting, a deliberate and thoughtful approach by the Congress to its constitutional responsibility in the Vietnam crisis would be enormously difficult, if not impossible. The Nation's confidence in its free institutions to function at a time of clear and present danger would be eroded—perhaps beyond repair. The mutual trust and confidence now existing between the President and the Congress would be impaired.

The best possible preventive of any such occurrence is to build an informal national resolve as the lifeline of our national purpose in Vietnam.

I profoundly believe it is the Senate's constitutional responsibility to contribute to this process. In the best interests of the Nation—and to strengthen the hands of the President in the days to come—I respectfully submit that the Senate's contribution must be informed and responsible.

THE NEED FOR SENATE DISCUSSION

The New York Times for January 29, 1966, carried an account of the questioning of Secretary of State Rusk by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It quotes the chairman as saying:

> In my long career in Congress I've never seen so much apprehension over a military involvement. I've never encountered such a complex issue. This is a subtle thing—unlike the invasion of South Korea by Communist forces from the north or the bombing of Pearl Harbor * * * there is a lack of understanding of the situation in Vietnam.

I agree with these remarks of the distinguished chairman. There is great apprehension about our military involvement. The Peiping-Hanoi aggression is, as he says, a "subtle thing." Nothing like the traumatic shock of the Japanese assault on Pearl Harbor or the sudden Communist invasion of South Korea.

But it is not unique. Twenty years ago the United States was confronted with an early model of the Communist technique of externally controlled conquest designed to take over small nations from within, masquerading as a "civil war of national liberation."

That was during my tour of duty as Assistant Secretary under then Secretary of State Byrnes. At that time the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was the late and beloved Tom Connally and the distinguished leader of the minority was the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg.

Then the names of the arenas were Iran, Greece, and Turkey—the early harbingers of our present confrontation in Vietnam. Let me repeat. We learned then that there was only one deterrent the Communist aggressor respected. It was not the moral influence of the United Nations. Or what is known as world opinion. It was American power backed by the will to apply it.

The present lack of understanding of the Vietnam situation, in my opinion, is due primarily to the fact that the people have been confused as to what the war really involves.

Millions of words on the Vietnam war have been printed by our enterprising mass media. Our pundits and nationally syndicated columnists have maintained a steady stream of pontification. Radio and television have outdone themselves in spectacular on-the-spot reporting and have gone in for daily indepth interpretation of the news.

This plethora of information and opinion is difficult to digest even for the most sophisticated and reflective American. For many, it just is not assimilable. They are simply bewildered.

Moreover, the inherent complexities of the situation have been distorted and confused almost beyond recognition by an uncontrolled and seemingly uncontrollable force in our national life known as public diplomacy. This phenomenon has all but usurped the Senate's advise and consent role in the field of foreign affairs.

Many of those who oppose our policy in Vietnam are articulate, emotionally compulsive and highly vocal. Most of them are politically motivated. Collectively, they have established themselves as the self-anointed priesthood of the new profession of public diplomacy.

Numerically the various pressure-groups comprising the public diplomacy network are insignificant. But their ability to confuse the public mind on the crucial issues involved in Vietnam is great.

Indeed, the cumulative impact of the raging torrent of contradictory publicity has produced dismay and bewilderment among many of our most distinguished and experienced analysts of international affairs. They have called on the Congress—and particularly the Senate—for clarification. I mention a few recent examples.

Walter Lippmann thinks that what is needed is a "thorough debate" in the Senate of what he calls the "surreptitious war" in Vietnam.

James Reston believes that the Senate has failed to discuss the issue in Vietnam with any perception. In a column entitled "What Great Debate?"—New York Times, January 21, 1966—he complains:

> If all this is to confuse the enemy, it must be a success—for the so-called debate is certainly confusing everybody else.

Eric Sevareid, in a remarkably perceptive column, says we have reached "a watershed in our history which will require the understanding of this and many Congresses to come." That Vietnam is merely the shock which "completes the process of dissolving the American illusions."

Has this distinguished body indeed been derelict in its duties and responsibilities?

Tom Wicker—Washington correspondent of the New York Times, in a column on "The Role of Congress in the 20th Century" written as far back as August of 1965—notes that the Senate has all but abandoned its traditional role as the watchdog of our foreign policy.

He urged that great foreign policy issues should be the subject of Senate discussion—not only this year but in the years to come—as a vital constitutional responsibility. These are his words:

> What Congress ought to develop is effective means of shaping and influencing Presidential power, directing it to new concerns * * * nitpicking at executive prerogatives is no substitute for a vital representative function.

Let me repeat.

Now is the time for the Senate, in the discharge of its constitutional responsibility, to help build the informed national resolve which must be the lifeline of our national purpose in Vietnam.

Surely, this Chamber dare not abdicate its advise and consent responsibility to the vicissitudes of electronic public diplomacy. Nor to sacrifice what the late President Kennedy called our greatest asset. I quote:

> The willingness of a free and determined people, through their elected officials, to face all problems and meet all dangers free from panic and fear.

Let us, then, discuss in this Chamber the painful and momentous subject of

Vietnam. In all humility, I suggest a few caveats.

Let our discussion be free of the ideological cliches and stereotypes which are endemic to the practice of public diplomacy as I have described it.

Let us remember that it is not the mission of the Senate to second guess or outguess the President in his day-to-day foreign policymaking.

Let us bear in mind that, unlike the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Senate is poorly equipped to coach the Commander in Chief on the abatement or stepping-up of the bombing of strategic targets in Vietnam.

Let us be cautious in expressing geopolitical judgments or strategic opinions as to whether or not any proposed or even rumored military action will embroil us in a nuclear exchange with Russia; or in a protracted land war with mainland China.

Let us not be stampeded, one way or another, by claim as to whether world opinion will or will not approve the President's course in Vietnam. As former Secretary of State Dean Acheson said:

> Any country half slave or all slave to foreign criticism cannot stand except as a mental institution.

Let us not forget the symbolic importance of foreign policy, particularly in Western dealings with the Communist world.

Let us not forget that in our dealings with this Communist adversary the thrust of his aggression will invariably be directed at the weak points of our psychological armor.

Finally, let us never forget that a power—even as great a power as the United States—can survive only if it is willing to fight for its interpretation of justice and its conception of vital interest.

The issues which will come up for discussion are many. Some of them of so delicate a nature that they can be considered only in executive session.

But what the American people will expect to get from their Senate are informed and honest answers to two overriding questions:

Just what are our country's stakes in Vietnam?

And are they worth fighting for?

THE INTELLIGENT MANAGEMENT OF RISK

There are no easy answers to these questions. And any responsible answers will involve value judgments on which reasonable men may honestly differ. But what we must remember is that we face a condition, not a theory. We are heavily involved in southeast Asia.

Nor can we forget that as the lynchpin of free world security and stability, the United States cannot avoid risk in the conduct of its foreign affairs. Its objective must be the intelligent management of risk. Accordingly, the potential risks which, it is claimed our present course involves—such as the danger of a war with Red China—should be coolly assessed and balanced against the hazards entailed in any alternative which the critics of our present course propose.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently heard the views of Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, now retired, and former Ambassador George F. Kennan, two distinguished critics of our Vietnam policy. Now, I have great respect for both General Gavin and Mr. Kennan. Indeed it was in February of 1946—during my tour of duty as Assistant Secretary of State—that George Kennan, then our Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow, cabled the Department the original version of his now celebrated and widely published anaylsis of Soviet behavior.

In their televised testimony before the committee, both General Gavin and Ambassador Kennan agreed they had nothing but praise for the military performance of our commanders and troops in Vietnam. But they insisted that escalation of the conflict might involve us in a war with Red China.

General Gavin was of the opinion that a substantial American troop buildup beyond present levels might provoke Chinese intervention in Vietnam. Ambassador Kennan stated that such intervention "almost certainly" would occur if we were "to attempt to crush North Vietnam strength to a point where Hanoi could no longer give any support to Vietcong political activity in the south."

While the possibility of such intervention by Peiping should not be ignored, the risk must be calculated on the basis of probabilities. It is one which only the President is in a position to evaluate and manage in the light of indispensable secret intelligence and the counsel of his responsible military and political advisers.

General Gavin made it clear that since his retirement from the Army in 1958 he has had no access to classified military information. Ambassador Kennan made a similar disclaimer, adding that he had no specialized knowledge of southeast Asia.

The nub of the testimony of both men is this. Our stakes in Vietnam do not justify the costs of the conflict or the risk of war with China which they believe it might provoke. Indeed Ambassador Kennan feels that our involvement is one our Government should liquidate "just as soon as this can be done without inordinate damage to our own prestige or to the stability of conditions in that area."

If our stakes in Vietnam were as negligible as General Gavin and Ambassador Kennan apparently believe them to be, our position there would have been liquidated long ago. But are they negligible? And can they be liquidated without "inordinate damage to our prestige" and to our international position? Here we come face to face with the question I posed originally, which the Gavin-Kennan testimony largely ignores and which the administration has discussed mainly in generalities.

Just what are our country's stakes in Vietnam?

OUR STAKES IN VIETNAM

As I see them, our stakes in Vietnam are political, moral, psychological, and military. In that order. I believe they are mountain high.

OUR SYSTEM OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY

At the end of World War II we were prepared to entrust our national survival to a system of collective security under the Security Council of the United Nations. When that failed, we sought to salvage the system through a network of regional alliances of mutual defense under the United Nations Charter.

Thus we have the Inter-American Treaty for the Western Hemisphere, NATO for Europe, the Baghdad Pact for the Middle East, SEATO for southeast Asia and ANZUS for Australia and New Zealand. In addition to these multilateral pacts, we have bilateral mutual defense treaties with Japan, Nationalist China, South Korea, and the Phillipines.

The fundamental purpose of these treaties is to keep our allies from falling under Communist influence or domination. For, should that ever occur, the scales of world power would be tipped against the free world.

The primary function of these pacts is to draw a line across which an aggressor cannot move without risk of war and, should aggression occur, to legitimize U.S. intervention.

But without the ability, willingness, and determination of the United States to use its power to carry out its treaty obligations, these mutual defense pacts are mere scraps of paper.

This is why Communist politico-military strategy presses a never-ending effort to diminish American power and influence on the Eurasian Continent and in the Western Hemisphere.

What would happen if the United States failed to redeem its pledge under the SEATO Treaty to defend the independence of South Vietnam. A chain reaction—even now foreseeable would be triggered.

The confidence of the free people of Asia in the value of the U.S. commitment to deter Communist aggression would be undermined. They would rush to make their pathetic deals with one or the other of the two great Communist powers of Asia.

The long shadow of impending catastrophe would lengthen. For South Vietnam would provide the blueprint for the takeover of Latin America and Africa by a variety of indigenous Ho Chi Minhs.

Our influence in the world—the influence of the great power that is the United States—would be bankrupt.

Penned up in the Western Hemisphere, with our foreign markets and supplies of essential raw materials dependent on the mercy of the Communists, our full-employment economy would be shattered.

The alternatives would be grim. National pacifism combined with unilateral disarmament. Or isolationism in fortress America—beleaguered in a Communist world.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yesterday the Committee on Foreign Relations was privileged to hear Gen. Maxwell Taylor testify. Gen. Maxwell Taylor was the commander of the 101st Airborne Division that dropped in by parachute on Normandy several hours before the first boat hit the beach on D-day in France. He is perhaps the greatest fighting officer still alive in this country. General Taylor's son is at present serving as a captain of infantry.

General Taylor testified that that same old division, the 101st Airborne, today is composed of boys who are just as good as those who dropped in on the Germans in Normandy on D-day. He testified that the boys in the 1st Marines are just as good as the boys who served in that division in earlier years. The same is true of the 25th Division. The same is true of all the other fine units in Vietnam. The same is true of the qualifications of the fine Special Service Forces. Their morale is magnificent.

I checked the records of the 1st Infantry, which marched behind George Washington. I checked the records of all the units. Not one of them has ever been defeated by the enemy on a field of battle.

General Taylor said, in effect, that if this Nation suffers defeat and national dishonor, and if these fine young men are compelled to pull Old Glory down from the flagpole and run up the white flag of surrender, it will not be because they did not fight; it will be because we did not let them fight and because we failed to support them. If they are defeated, defeat will have resulted from orders from Washington, from erroneous instructions from Congress. But they will not be defeated because they failed to fight for their country.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. It will be because we lacked moral stature and fiber here.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They will be defeated because we were not made of the stern stuff that characterized the men who sat in the Senate in years gone by. They will not be defeated because they were not worthy of their fathers or grandfathers.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. It will not be because the junior Senator from Louisiana has not stood up for them. I commend the Senator. He has stood fast in support of our fighting men in Vietnam and of our policy there. He is one of the strong voices in the Senate on this subject. I commend him for that. The American people have gratitude to him for it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I deeply appreciate the fine statement that the Senator from South Carolina is making.

If I had been asked whether we should send men over there, I do not know what I would have advised. Probably I would have advised against sending them. But if I had been shown the treaty we had made and had been aware of the sacrifices being made by the people of Vietnam in trying to defend their liberty against communism, I might have been persuaded that we should send our men there.

But if I had agreed to send them, I would have said, "Please send our boys who are there all the things that they need to fight with. If they are likely to be cut off and might have to surrender, send reinforcements. Do not send them there to surrender and be decimated with no help coming, as happened at the time of Dienbienphu."

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. I certainly agree with the Senator from Louisiana.

NATIONAL HONOR AND NATIONAL PURPOSE

The Geneva agreement of 1962 to which we were signatory was supposed to guarantee the neutrality of Laos. We signed in good faith. It was immediately violated by the Communists. Laos became a corridor for the conquest of South Vietnam. Today, among the nations of southeast Asia, Geneva has already become a symbol of American lack of power to deter Communist aggression. Or worse—the lack of our Nation's will to use its military power in the discharge of its national commitments.

When we signed the agreement to insure the neutrality of Laos we had not begun the conversion of our military posture from one of nuclear massive retaliation to the present one of flexible response. In South Vietnam we can now be flexible and firm.

We must be firm in our resolve to fight until a self-enforcing, subversion-proof settlement which secures the independence of South Vietnam is reached. A settlement which will eliminate the Vietcong as an internal force for the Communist conquest of South Vietnam by terror, assassination, and subversion.

This is the only kind of settlement which can justify the sacrifice of American lives in Vietnam. But let us be realistic. Such a settlement is a vain hope within the framework of the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962.

But if we fail to achieve such a settlement, all our sacrifices in Vietnam will have been in vain. Peiping's hard line communism will have proved to the world its paper tiger theory of American power.

THE SYMBOLIC VALUE OF SOUTH VIETNAM

In the world of Communist propaganda, where symbols are all important, we have an enormous stake in South Vietnam.

If we stand fast in our purpose, we can make South Vietnam a sanctuary of freedom. Saigon can become to Asia what West Berlin is to Europe—a living symbol of American resolve in the defense of human liberty.

We cannot permit a situation which would make it possible for the Communists to propagandize South Vietnam throughout the world as the living symbol of the political and military defeat of America in Asia. Dienbienphu has been immortalized by Communist propaganda as the living symbol of the total liquidation of decadent French colonialism in southeast Asia.

Peiping's great stake in South Vietnam is not its rice or its real estate. The real target is psychological—the dramatic and enduring humiliation of the United States as a significant influence on the continent of Asia.

Should this occur, our heavy investment in a policy of cooperation with Russia will be lost. For the easy success of Peiping's hard-line communism against the United States will make it extremely difficult for the Soviet leadership to continue its present moderate policy of peaceful coexistence with the free world. Our lack of a firm national purpose will have united the two great Communist powers in a common and frightening design for world conquest.

THE CREDIBILITY OF OUR MILITARY DETERRENT

It is not enough to stand and fight for our stakes in South Vietnam. The way in which we do it is of enormous military, political, and psychological import. For this is the heyday of the cheapest form of Communist conquest—the so-called civil wars of national liberation externally controlled.

The late President Kennedy told the Congress 5 years ago that, since 1945, limited or guerrilla wars of purported national liberation constituted "the most active and constant threat to free world security."

At that time he declared to the world at large that our response to such aggression in the future would be "suitable, selective, swift, and determined." But an undeclared limited war in which the objective is not the defeat of the adversary, is difficult for the American people to understand. They believe that, as Gen. Douglas MacArthur put it:

> In war there is no substitute for victory.

The fact that there has been no declaration of war by the Congress has inclined many people to doubt the serious nature of the war.

The President's zealous efforts to reach an honorable settlement in Vietnam have been interpreted as a sign of weakness by the enemy and by many Americans. I urge we make it clear that there is no uncertainty now, either as to our national determination or our military capability.

The aggression must be liquidated. It must be dealt with in a way that will effectively deter any future aggressions of similar character.

We have the physical power to do exactly that. But our adversaries are the acknowledged masters of the political and psychological weapons of protracted guerrilla warfare.

They know we have the power. But they are confident that we do not have the national will to use it.

As Hanoi's famous strategist Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap put it:

> The enemy [the United States] will be caught in a dilemma. He has to drag out the war in order to win it and does not possess, on the other hand, the psychological and political means to fight a long drawn out war.

For the United States, Vietnam is the moment of truth. We have now had 5 years of intensive experience in southeast Asia, with the most subtle form of Communist aggression. If we prove our ability to deal with it in Vietnam, we will deter the spread of this menace to other areas where we are committed to resist it.

In my humble opinion, we must establish in Vietnam—for the years to come—a credible deterrent to Communist wars of liberation of the Vietnam type.

This means that our capability to deter such Communist aggression by appropriate military doctrine and weapons systems and our national will to use that capability must be believable and believed by the aggressors.

Our vast stockpile of international ballistic missiles with nuclear war heads is no deterrent to guerrilla wars of national liberation. Defeating the purposes of such a war in Vietnam will establish a truly credible deterrent.

CONCLUSION

I profoundly believe that our stakes in Vietnam involve not our interpretation of justice, but also our conception of the vital interests of the United States. These stakes are, in my judgment, worth fighting for.

The conduct of foreign policy under conditions of limited war is not an exact science. The contribution of expertise is limited. After the "objective analysis and research of a situation" is complete, there still remains uncertainty about the meaning of events and the balancing of the risks which they entail and the opportunities they offer.

But there is no certainty. Conjecture to some extent is unavoidable. Yet in foreign policy—as our Communist adversaries should have taught us by now—certainty comes as much from political philosophy and insight as it does from computerized facts. Above all, it derives from the imposition of purpose on events.

Tested by these criteria, the President's course in Vietnam has been admirable and presents the Congress with a unique opportunity for moral leadership. By moral leadership I mean an affirmation of the shared values that make America a society rather than a population or a bewildered crowd.

The kind of leadership I have in mind was defined by our distinguished Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, when he was President of the Carnegie Corp. Mr. Gardner said:

> Leaders worthy of the name whether they are university presidents or Senators have a significant role in creating the state of mind that is the society. They can serve as symbols of the moral unity of the society. They can express the values that hold the society together.

I respectfully submit that we in the Senate bear a heavy responsibility at this critical time for demonstrating to the world at large that we share the values which our fighting men are asked to defend on the field of battle.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS TO 1:30 P.M.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, under the present circumstances, with no speaker readily available, it would occur to me to be the better part of wisdom that the Senate take a brief recess; and if it is in order, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 1:30 p.m. today.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection (at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until 1:30 o'clock p.m. the same day.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BASS in the chair).

SUPPLEMENTARY MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. **RUSSELL** of Georgia. Mr. President, I ask that the business coming over from the previous day may be laid before the Senate.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The unfinished business has already been laid down.

Mr. **RUSSELL** of Georgia. It has been. I merely wish to express the hope that we may reach a determination somewhere along the line on this authorization. I am not fundamentally opposed to filibusters if they have a definite objective. As a matter of fact, I have been accused of participating in them myself on one or more occasions. I might say on more than one occasion. But as a rule, a filibuster has some objective.

In this case I cannot see what the objective can possibly be. After the authorization is passed here, it must go to the House of Representatives and be passed before the appropriation can be made to fulfill the purposes of this authorization.

We now have some 300,000 members of our Armed Forces in Vietnam or in the lands or on the waters about that strifetorn land.

There have been extensive committee hearings and I have no objection to that. If Senators wish to have televised hearings that go into the living rooms of their constituencies, and if they wish to ask long, complicated questions, I understand that thoroughly. I have been around here a good while. I understand those things. There is nothing mysterious about them to me.

But I would like at least to have some alternative to our present policy brought forward from these hearings. If members of the committee wish to bring an alternative forward, they will have ample opportunity to do so, because the House Appropriations Committee will not act on the appropriations bill until this authorization bill is enacted; and when the appropriation does come from the House, by that time even the most determined critic of our present policy should have his alternative ready.

The only one I have heard mentioned up to now is a proposal by one Member of the Senate that we just get out of Vietnam; that we just call the whole thing off and come home, and leave South Vietnam to the Communists. That is the only real alternative I have heard suggested.

If the objectors will just get their alternatives ready and bring them to the Senate, the Senate can consider them.

But as it is, they are only holding up consideration of this authorization, without which appropriations cannot possibly be made.

It seems to me, that after a reasonable period there should be some alternative proposed. I know the committee has examined witnesses. It has heard General Taylor and General Gavin and Ambassador Kennan, and I understand the Secretary of State is there today. The members have engaged in a great verbal debate with these witnesses who, of course, are among the most outstanding men in their fields. But they have not brought forward their alternatives.

I say, Mr. President, that it is not proper to hold up a mere authorization for appropriation unless there is going to be some alternative proposed.

So I say to these gentlemen: Let us vote on this authorization. If Senators wish to vote against it, vote against it. But if Senators continue this delay interminably, we risk losing the war in Vietnam by a process of attrition and a lack of ammunition which our forces must have to defend themselves.

I submit, Mr. President, it would be a sorry spectacle for a country as wealthy as ours, and as powerful as ours, to lose a war for any such reason. I hope we may at least proceed to vote on this authorization bill. We have had a number of speeches on both sides of it. I do not know of a single citizen of the United States who is happy about our being engaged in this war in southeast Asia, but the stern, undeniable fact is that we are there and there are 300,000 American boys in that tortured land, or on the waters around it, or the lands adjacent to it.

If we do not propose to authorize food, clothing, and hospitals for them, we should let it be known now by voting down this authorization and giving the Defense Department a chance to bring our forces home, even though that would be like coming home as a whipped puppy with its tail between its legs. It is not fair to these men. They did not order themselves out there. They are there on orders from higher authority.

As long as they are there, I think it is the duty of the Senate of the United States to maintain them without regard to what the views individual Senators may be on the policies involved and on the international ramifications of the entire southeast Asian question.

I, therefore, hope we will not, by the subterfuge of filibustering this authorization, seek to bring our Vietnam effort to a close by abandonment.

If there are those who wish to bring it to a close by not feeding, and clothing, and arming the men, let them stand up on this floor and vote this resolution down and defeat it.

Mr. **McGOVERN**. Mr. President, in the light of what the Senator from

Georgia, the distinguished manager of the bill now before us said, I wish to make it perfectly clear, speaking just as one Member of the Senate who has had some questions from time to time about our policy in southeast Asia, that I do not believe any filibuster has taken place or that anyone, to my knowledge, intends a filibuster on this bill.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Was the Senator here the day the bill was made the unfinished business and the statement was made that there would be no agreement to vote this week on this bill in any event? If that does not bear the earmarks of a filibuster, I do not know what does. It indicates an intention to delay. That, in the last analysis, is what a filibuster is. They did not say when everybody made a speech; they said, "We want to serve notice there is not going to be any vote." If that is not a filibuster or the threat of a filibuster, then I, who have been accused of filibustering a great deal, and might plead guilty in certain instances, do not know what a filibuster is.

Mr. McGOVERN. I cannot speak for the Senators that the Senator from Georgia is referring to. I can speak only for myself.

But I think a few days' discussion of an authorization of nearly $5 billion should not quite so quickly be labeled a "filibuster."

We have just completed a discussion of some weeks' duration on the question of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which is doubtless an important issue, but which I know the Senator from Georgia would agree is not any more important and probably not so significant as the conflict in which we are involved in southeast Asia.

This would seem to be an appropriate time to raise some questions about where we are headed. For my own part, I intend to vote for every bit of the authorization in the bill before the Senate. I have never felt that the financial cost of the war was the issue. I do believe there are some serious questions that we probably should have asked, even at an earlier date, about the assumption that sent our troops to Vietnam in the first place.

But I quite agree with the Senator from Georgia that our forces are committed and, therefore, must be adequately equipped. I was in Vietnam and visited some of them in November and December. They are the finest group of military men we have ever sent overseas. There is no question in my mind about their competence, their dedication, and their capacity. In every sense of the word, they are a superb group of men, and I personally want to see them have all the equipment they need for the defense of their lives.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. If the men we have sent to Vietnam are not soldiers, the United States of America does not have any soldiers. They are the cream of the crop.

Mr. McGOVERN. I wholly agree with that statement. The Senator is absolutely correct. This country has perhaps never before assembled quite so superb a group of men as those we now have fighting in southeast Asia. I feel certain that every Member of the Senate shares the conviction of the Senator from Georgia that we need to do everything we can to see to it that they are adequately equipped and provided with the resources they need to fulfill the mission to which they have been assigned.

Having said that, I also believe it is perfectly proper for us to have had several days of discussion on this subject, and perhaps some additional time, to examine the question of what our commitment is in Vietnam; to what extent the bill now before the Senate might commit us to some new ventures in that part of the world; and to make certain that we know where the course we are now on is leading.

I am one of a group of Senators who thought seriously of submitting an amendment to this authorization bill that would in some way try to limit the impact of the bill to sustaining the forces already in being in Vietnam, but also in some fashion to reflect the opposition or at least the concern of a number of Members of the Senate about the dangers of any larger war in Vietnam.

I personally hold to the conviction that the late President Kennedy expressed in 1963 that we should not make this an American war. He said he felt it was perfectly proper for us to send aid to the people of South Vietnam; that he thought it was perfectly proper for us to give them the benefit of our best military advice and some limited amount of assistance; but that in the last analysis only the people of South Vietnam, their Government, and their military forces could decide the outcome of the war.

So there was a feeling on the part of a number of Senators that perhaps the particular bill now before the Senate might be a good vehicle to express our conviction that we have reached the point where we need to consider whether to extend the commitment of American forces beyond their present level. At the time the late President Kennedy implied that we should not commit further American troops to Vietnam, we had about 15,000 or 20,000 men there. We now have something over 200,000 men in Vietnam, and another 75,000 to 100,000 in Naval units offshore and in nearby areas.

I have felt that the reason why some Senators are disturbed about this authorization bill or about the course we are on in Vietnam is that each time our policy planners have told us that such-and-such a commitment would be enough to do the job, they have been proved wrong. We were told some years ago that the strategic hamlet program was the answer to the problem. A considerable amount of money was invested in that program, but it proved to be a disastrous failure. We were told that limited bombing attacks would bring the other side to the negotiating table, or at least would interrupt the flow of troops moving into South Vietnam from the north. Instead, it is reported that nine regiments of North Vietnamese regulars have come into the fighting during the time the bombing attacks were in progress.

The same kind of predictions have been made about the commitments of American forces on the ground. It has been said that if we committed X number of American men to the conflict, they would be enough to do the job. But always the predictions have been wrong.

Personally, I have much more confidence in the judgment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] than I do in the judgment of some of the policymakers in the Department of Defense and the Department of State, who have been calling for more and more commitments of American forces.

So I believe the Senate is acting within its best traditions and within its area of responsibility when it takes a few days to raise some questions about the course we are following in Vietnam. I hope a filibuster will not develop. I certainly do not intend to participate in anything that I think could properly be described as a filibuster on this measure. I do intend to continue to raise questions, so long as those questions are in my mind and in the minds of my constituents, about the commitments we have made in Vietnam.

I commend the Senator from Georgia for the very clear assurance that he gave us in his excellent presentation of the bill when it was first laid before the Senate. He said:

> Nothing in this legislation can properly be considered as determining foreign policy, as ratifying decisions made in the past or as endorsing new commitments.

It was because the distinguished Senator from Georgia gave that kind of assurance on the floor of the Senate that I, at least, decided that no rider or no amendment was necessary to limit the scope of the proposed legislation.

The Senator from Georgia has made it perfectly clear that we are not making any policy declarations or declarations of support for the decisions that have been made in the past 12 years, which have involved us in Vietnam. I know that the Senator from Georgia has had some serious questions about some of our past commitments. He has made it perfectly clear that we are not committing ourselves to or are not endorsing any new ventures either in South Vietnam or anywhere else in southeast Asia, but that all we are doing by the bill is to provide the necessary authorization, and subsequent appropriation, to take care of the needs of the troops that have been sent there and whose lives are at stake.

With that purpose I am in complete agreement with the Senator from Georgia. I wish to make it clear that it is on that basis that I personally see no need for any further amendments or qualifications on the authorization bill.

I did not intend to speak on the subject of Vietnam today. We have some serious problems to deal with at home. One of them is the problem of the agricultural sectors of the country. There is no more acute problem in that sector than the problem of our dairy farmers.

Before I offer my remarks on that subject, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I was pleased, and I know many other Senators were, by the message from the President which stated that the Secretary of Agriculture was being directed to buy dairy products under section 709 of the Agricultural Act of 1965—the section which I was privileged to sponsor as an amendment to the very important farm bill that was passed by Congress last year.

I was delighted that the message stressed the need for adequate supplies of dairy products for commercial markets and also for the high priority demands of our feeding programs here at home and overseas.

The message stated that milk from American farmers is the only milk available to millions of poor children abroad.

Mr. President, we are now participating in overseas child-feeding programs that reach almost 50 million children through school lunch programs of one kind or another. The real backbone of those programs is the milk supply that we send abroad.

To many of these youngsters, it is the only adequate meal they received during the day. Of course, the same thing is true, although perhaps not to quite as acute a degree, in our own milk programs at home, which contribute so much to the health and strength of our own children.

If we are to fulfill the aspirations of the President, to say nothing of commercial market requirements, it is essential that the national dairy herd be maintained and that our farmers have adequate encouragement to supply the necessary quantities of milk for all purposes—for commercial purposes as well as for our feeding program.

I believe every Senator is fully aware that milk prices to farmers are supported by the Agricultural Act of 1949, and that for several years the rate of price support has been either at the minimum or near the minimum required by law.

As a result of price support levels being too low, dairy herds are now being liquidated by many farmers, just at the time when more milk, not less, is needed for the commercial market and for distribution programs here at home and abroad.

One such program which is of interest to most of us concerns special milk for children on which program the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has done so much work. We cannot let this program lapse by default. We must provide sufficient money for the program and then see that there is a supply of milk to meet the needs of our children.

Mr. President, I believe that no other program has resulted in greater dividends in terms of health and the strength of children for so little cost as has this special milk program.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I believe my colleague has brought to the attention of the Senate the very genuine problem that confronts initially the milk producers of the United States, and, in the final analysis, confronts even more seriously the general public and the schoolchildren of America.

I certainly associate myself with his statement that it was a disastrous bit of news for schoolchildren and for their parents around the country when the President's Bureau of the Budget recommended a 79-percent cut in the money available for the school milk program.

On the Appropriations Committee on which I serve, and on which serves also the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin to whom my colleague has just alluded, I recall the very fervid, effective, and persuasive pleas the Senator makes every year for an increase over the recommendations which come down from the White House and the Bureau of the Budget.

We felt rather proud of the fact that we did provide $103 million in the budget for the current fiscal year. However, we are now confronted with the President's proposed reduction of 79 percent for next year and also a reclaimer of $3 million of the amount of money which was added largely because of the persistence and insistance and persuasiveness, fortified with facts as he was, of the Senator from Wisconsin.

I am glad that my colleague points out also that this attack on the school milk program is just one facet of the overall program. We need greater production of milk and larger dairy herds, and the way to get that is to increase the price support made available to producers of milk.

I should like to address a question to my colleague, who serves as an important member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I am a reluctant alumnus. Is not my memory correct that this increase in price support can be provided expeditiously by action of the Secretary of Agriculture under prevailing legislation and will not require new legislation or the delay occasioned by new legislation?

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator is correct. As he knows, as a senior member of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee, and one who has been very actively involved on behalf of dairy farmers for a good many years, the Secretary does have such authority.

I have discussed this matter with the Secretary and with other officials at the Department of Agriculture. I am hopeful that we can arrange for a meeting with him of the Senators who are now on the floor and others who are interested in this problem, so we can sit down with the Secretary and tell him about some of the problems our dairy farmers are having: the financial squeeze that faces a good many of them, the disappearance of some of our dairy herds, and the liquidation of those herds at a time when they are increasingly needed. I hope on the basis of such conversations we can persuade the Secretary to act very quickly, and use the authority that Congress has given him to lift the price support level. It does not really require any further action on the part of the Congress; that authority, as the Senator says, rests with the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. MUNDT. Does my colleague share my concern that with prevailing meat prices as high as they are, and the production of milk as unprofitable as it is, that unless some action is taken, we are likely to see a decrease in dairy herds, by drawing them off to the market, rather than maintaining even the status quo?

Mr. McGOVERN. There is no question about continued liquidation of dairy herds. The Senator is absolutely correct. We are all very grateful for the somewhat improved situation in cattle and hogs today; but that only further points up the need to do something about one of the forgotten men in American agriculture, the dairy farmer. What the Senator describes is happening. The farmers are liquidating their dairy herds and moving into other more profitable lines of production. They are doing it just at a time when the President has called upon Congress to authorize a mass attack upon hunger abroad, and to do even more than food for peace has heretofore been authorized to undertake. The President's food-for-freedom program, which I vigorously applaud, comes at a time when commercial demands on dairy farmers are increasing.

Mr. MUNDT. I have one comment, Mr. President, to which I shall not ask my colleague to reply. This astonishing request on the part of the President to reduce the school milk program by 79 percent causes me to have some curiosity about who is writing the speeches down at the White House. We hear of changes in speechwriters and the shortage of speechwriters, and so forth. I believe they have too many speechwriters down there. I do not believe the very fine speechwriter who helped the President with his state of the Union address, wherein he said we could have both guns and butter at the same time, and carry the war in Vietnam to a successful conclusion without sacrifices of other programs, who can tell us where economies can be made, is the same one who says to take it away from the homeless, the poverty stricken, the schoolchildren. This other speechwriter who talked about cutting back the milk program 79 percent must not be related to the fellow who helped the President with his state of the Union speech.

I challenge the administration here and now, Mr. President, to show any place else in the total existing program of the executive branch where there has been as sharp a cut proposed as the 79 percent they propose to take out of the school milk program.

I think that is a great disaster; and I hope we can get to the President, back behind his facade of speechwriters, and help him realize, No. 1, the inconsistency of this approach; No. 2, its devastating effect on the schoolchildren of America; and No. 3, its lack of overall wisdom.

My colleague has had an illustrious career as food-for-peace Director, and knows something about the programs abroad; but I believe he would agree that, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, no program we have set in motion has done more for American children than this milk program. So I hope, as my colleague has suggested, we can get through to the President and straighten out this situation, because, while surely there are places in this great big budget the White House has sent down where we should be economizing, I do not thing it is wise to accept this attack of a 79-percent cut in the school lunch program.

One way to let the program move forward is to provide a continuous expansion of the supply of milk. That can be done, as my colleague has suggested, by action of the Secretary of Agriculture in providing a more adequate and equitable price support for milk products in America.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator for his very helpful contribution. I am certainly happy to respond to his suggestion about the rich dividends that we receive, not only in this country but in the countries we have tried to assist overseas, with such efforts as school milk and school lunch programs. I have thought for a good many years that, taking into consideration the entire foreign aid program, the overseas aid of all kinds, there is no part of that whole program that has returned such great dividends as the programs that have been aimed at improving the health of schoolchildren and preschool children through the milk programs.

That has been true here in our own country. Some years ago, when I served as Director of the food-for-peace program under the late President Kennedy, I received a very thoughtful letter from the dean of the University of Georgia, who said that in his best judgment, there was no single Federal program that had done so much to improve the lives of the people of the South in the last 30 years as the school lunch and school milk programs. He said that many of the youngsters had suffered from an inadequate diet over the years, and he thought it had held down both the physical growth and the educational growth of millions of people in the South, and that the school milk and school lunch programs had done more to correct that situation than anything else.

I applaud the Senator's high priority on these programs, and I hope that we will be successful in restoring the funds to an adequate level. That is one thing the Congress can do something about. It is quite true that the Secretary has authority to set the price support levels on milk, but Congress has the authority to restore the funds that are needed for our school milk and school lunch programs; and I hope we will be able to restore them to an adequate level.

In terms of our national defense, we can present a better picture to the world, and a stronger defense position, if our young people are healthy and strong.

It has always disturbed me that such a high percentage of our young people are rejected as unqualified for military service because of health deficiencies. One of the ways to correct that in terms of the future defense needs of the country is to make sure that we have an adequate supply of high protein foods, and that we do not exercise a penny-wise, pound-foolish program with reference to those items.

I thank the Senator for his excellent contribution to the discussion.

Mr. President, the number of milk cows in the dairy herds here in the United States has reached an alltime low as of January 1 of this year. The number of cattle reported stood at 16.6 million head on January 1, which is a decline of 5.6 percent from a year ago.

The total milk production for 1965 stood at 125 billion pounds, which is a drop of 1½ percentage points from the previous year. In January, national milk production was off 5.3 percent from the previous year.

This decline has been continuing for several months. The greatest decline in milk production is in the heart of the dairy country of the United States—in my part of the country—Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, and the surrounding States. The decreases for January were 14 percent in Minnesota, one of the great dairy States.

Mr. President, I pause at this point to say that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mondale], who is necessarily away from the Senate on official business, has asked me to insert in the Record a brief statement on the dairy situation. He feels strongly that steps are needed to arrest the decline in dairy production. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that his statement be included in the Record at this point, before I continue my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Mondale

There are many reasons why we must maintain and support a dairy industry—in fact, our entire agricultural industry—which is capable of meeting the needs of the American consumer, as well as our commitments abroad.

Population is rising. Youngsters will need milk as they grow up, to supply the needed nutrition.

The President has called for a war on hunger, pointing out that "hunger poisons the mind, saps the body, and destroys hope, and is the natural enemy of mankind."

He added that "we must have adequate supplies of dairy products for commercial markets, and to meet high priority domestic and foreign program needs. Milk from U.S. farms is the only milk available to millions of poor children abroad."

These are some of the reasons why we must take steps necessary to stop the decline in dairy production.

I think the time has come to raise the support price for milk so that farmers can be encouraged to maintain their herds.

Now is the time to act, before more dairy farmers get out of the dairy business. Unless we stop this decrease in milk production, we may wake up and find that we cannot supply the milk needs of the American consumer, much less meet our foreign commitments.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, production is down some 7 percent in Wisconsin and 15 percent in Iowa, as compared to January 1965. The drop in the State of South Dakota for this same period of time is 9 percent. The situation is such that when milk prices and returns from dairying are compared to such alternative farming enterprises as hogs, beef cattle, and soybeans, dairy farming comes out second best.

This point was made very well a few moments ago by my colleague [Mr. Mundt]. Many farmers, therefore, are relieving themselves of the 7 days a week confinement necessary to dairy operations. We know that the upper Midwest is a reservoir for the dairy industry. It is this area that most fluid milk markets depend upon for their reserve supplies. It produces a great deal of our butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk. I hasten to add, however, that virtually every State in the Union is involved in the dairy industry in one way or another.

If we are to have an adequate supply of milk and dairy products in 1966 and 1967, it is imperative that the exodus of dairy farmers be stopped. This can only be done by giving dairy farmers assurance that they will be rewarded fairly for their efforts. We are not talking about some kind of unwarranted subsidy or financing, but merely the assurance of a fair return is for the hard labor which is involved in dairy farming.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield at that point?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that the Agricultural Act of 1949 specifies as a criteria for the price-support level—one of the important criteria—that the Secretary shall establish price supports at a level which will assure an adequate supply?

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The whole thrust of what both Senators from South Dakota have stated in their extremely able speeches is that the supply will not be adequate unless the Secretary recognizes this criteria and gives weight to it, that we will have shortages which could result in a temporary bonanza for dairy farmers. There is no question that if the prices rise severely and sharply, it would be very temporary indeed. Some farmers might take a shortsighted view of this and be very happy.

The point is, it would be bad for the dairy industry as well as for the consumer. It would also be bad for the stability of prices generally. The upward surge in prices would be temporary, but our experience indicates that whereas an appropriate, steady increase in the price support level by the Secretary of Agriculture could assure adequate supplies, the law of supply and demand would come into adjustment at an appropriate level—say 85 percent of parity, or some reasonable, moderate level—and thus the dairy farmers of the country could continue to maintain their herds. They could and would make their plans accordingly. They would be able to stay in the dairy industry. The result would be, in the long run, a healthier picture for the dairy farmers as well as a better picture for the consumers and for price stability generally.

Mr. McGOVERN. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin. As I understand his point, the consumers have just as great an interest in stabilization of dairy prices and supplies of dairy commodities as does the producer. This is not a one-way street. We are not talking here about the problem of the dairy farmer alone. We are talking about insuring an adequate supply at fair prices for families all across the country. Thus, it is really a double problem, of concern to the consumer, as well as to the producer.

The Senator is correct, that in the long run a price support level adequate to assure necessary supplies of dairy commodities is in the interests of both the taxpayer and the consumer.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say to the Senator from South Dakota who, along with his colleague [Mr. MUNDT], represents the most agricultural State in the Union, or at least the one State in the Union in which agriculture represents the largest proportion of total income, and who are, therefore, deeply aware of the problems, that the No. 1 economic injustice in America is low farm income.

There is no question about that—in terms of the investment made, the amount of work they put in, their efficiency, and in terms of the risks taken. Farm income is much too low for all farmers. We can make a convincing case of economic injustice for virtually every farmer. But it is particularly severe for the dairy farmers. The Secretary of Agriculture has won appropriate respect for the honesty and accuracy of his statistics which show that in my State—the No. 1 dairy-producing State in the country—farmers receive an income, if you allow them only a 4-percent return on invested capital, of less than 50 cents an hour.

This is right now. That is not a few months ago when the farmer's income was even lower. He is receiving less than 50 cents an hour, when the minimum wage is $1.25 an hour. As I say, our farmers are among the most skilled workers in America.

It seems to me that this adds another dimension to the very strong argument which the Senator from South Dakota is making, that the Secretary of Agriculture should give careful consideration to increasing price supports for dairy products from 75 percent of parity to a level which will assure an adequate supply, which will bring the dairy farmer a little closer to the kind of income he so richly deserves.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his keen observations. I, of course, agree with him wholeheartedly. I agree that agriculture is the one major sector which has not generally shared in the rising economic prosperity of the country as a whole. For almost 5 years now, this country has enjoyed an unbroken economic advance—taking the economy as a whole—but the farm families of the Nation have not shared fairly in that economic advance. They are grateful for what Congress has done, particularly in the passage of a general 4-year farm bill in 1965, which does provide some degree of stability. But the fact remains that even with the 1965 program and other steps which have been taken by the Department of Agriculture, and by Congress, the per capita income level of farm families is still far below the national average. Thus, we do have an imbalance in this country in rural America, and particularly, as the Senator has said, with reference to dairy producers.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I wish to support the position taken by the Senator from South Dakota and join him in urging action to increase dairy price supports.

I used to be both in wheat farming and in the dairy business. Therefore, I believe I know a little bit about the operations involved in both.

Probably the most difficult type of farming operation is that of the dairy business which keeps you on the job all day long, 7 days a week.

When farmers start losing money in the dairy business, they quickly go into some other kind of farm operation.

We are in the situation now where if the price supports are not increased and milk marketing orders are tied to price supports, we may face severe shortages in the years to come. The consumer would be far better off to have a little increase in price now and be assured more adequate supplies, rather than face severe shortages in the future.

The time of that shortage may not be very far off. We hear a lot of talk about increased exports of wheat and other grains. We are now experiencing exports three times as high as they were only 4 or 5 years ago. If worldwide demand continues, many dairy producers will shift to grain production, as grains will be in great demand if we can continue to increase exports.

I join the Senator in requesting higher price supports. They should have been increased before. There has been no increase for many years. The dairy farmers are in the most difficult financial straits of all agricultural producers.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator for his observation. I think there is no question about the fact that the American farmer has contributed greatly to the strength of the country as a whole, and has done it without an adequate compensation to himself. There is no country on the face of the earth today, and there has never been a country in the history of the world, which is provided with an adequate food supply for its people at such a small cost to the consumer.

As the Senator has said, in spite of the price support program, which some people see as a device to increase the cost of food, the fact is that food is a bargain. Food takes only 18 percent of the income of the American consumer. In some countries it takes as high as 50 percent of the family budget to buy food. So we are in an unusually favorable position as far as food consumers are concerned. What we are pleading for is an adequate and fair compensation for the farmers who provide us with the most wholesome supply of food in the world at the lowest real cost.

The kind of price support we are asking for can be supplied under present law simply by increasing the support level. This increase can be directed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Under the pricing criteria of the Agricultural Act of 1949, the support price to farmers must be increased to assure even a semblance of an adequate supply.

As I said earlier in our discussion, this matter is being taken up with the Secretary. I hope a number of us can sit down with the Secretary of Agriculture soon and make our case. I think we have a Secretary who has the interests of American agriculture at heart. I have faith that when the case is made to him, in a face-to-face discussion, he will do whatever is within his authority to deal with this problem in a fair manner.

If the present trends continue in the dairy industry, we are going to be faced with acute shortages of milk and dairy products for years to come. A cow can be slaughtered in an instant, but it takes a minimum of 2 years to replace a dairy cow, and then she can be replaced only if there is a mother around to give birth, which will not be the case if dairy herds are liquidated.

Severe shortages of milk and dairy products will immediately result in inflationary prices at the consumer level, and this is what we want to prevent. If the herds continue to be liquidated, a future shortage will result. That means uncontrolled price increases. An increase in the dairy supports will not cause an inflationary spiral. The best assurance against inflation is production, and the only assurance that milk will be produced is by giving the producer a fair price.

The present status of the industry concerns many people very deeply, not only because of farmers, but from the viewpoint of consumers and the viewpoint of many of our communities. In many of the Northern States the milk plant is the biggest industry in town. I can think of many towns in my own home State where the dairy plant is the backbone of that particular community. I am informed that many of the milk plants which make butter and nonfat dry milk are in grave danger of being closed.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Apropos of what the Senator has said, in my own home county, we have had two creameries for 25 or 30 years, affiliated with the Land-O-Lakes' Creamery organization, probably the best run operation in the United States. One of them was closed down about 3 months ago. It will never be opened again. This is a good example of how the dairy industry is being liquidated. Something has to be done to correct this.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator. These plants are being liquidated not only because of a lack of milk supplies but because they have tried to maintain prices to farmers that are beyond their capabilities.

A great number of them are paying prices to farmers that are not adequately provided for by the price support structure. Many of the plants—in fact, most of them in my State—are cooperatively owned by the farmers themselves. So they have a great stake in the industry. They have a stake in it both as farmers and operators of these cooperatively owned plants. But they cannot continue to pay themselves money that they cannot collect when they sell their products as nonfat dry milk to the Government.

The present price support level is $3.24 per hundredweight. The Government pays prices for products used in its distribution programs which are geared to that support level.

Many of the manufacturing plants, hoping against hope for improvement in the market, have been paying their member producers substantially more than the $3.24 level. But unless the market itself is corrected through adjustment of the price support level, many of these plants will be forced to close and the employees dismissed. That would have an adverse impact on rural America, and would obviously be totally inconsistent with the economic opportunity programs approved by the Congress at the request of the administration.

The problems of the dairy industry which I have been discussing have been visible ahead for some time. It was for this reason that I introduced legislation authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to go into the open market and purchase dairy products for distribution here at home and for programs we are operating abroad at market prices.

The new authority can be helpful, but the status of the industry has now declined to the point where an adjustment in the price support level is the only way to adjust dairy returns properly enough to assure an adequate supply of dairy products.

While the dairy industry is shrinking at an alarming rate, and the needs for dairy products are greater in overseas and domestic programs, the needs of the commercial market are growing as well.

The population of this country continues to increase. It was something over 195 million at the beginning of this year. The Nation is growing at a rate of 3 million people a year, or a market for milk and dairy products equivalent to a new city the size of Los Angeles.

If our growing population is to be fed, we must have steadily increased milk production to match the growth.

We all know the results when we come up too late with too little. I hope the Secretary of Agriculture will act now. If he does, I know he will have the support of the American people and of the Congress.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from South Dakota for his very thoughtful speech, and I wish to commend my senior colleague [Mr. PROXMIRE] for his contribution on the dialog about this very serious matter involving our dairy farmers.

Mr. President, I am pleased that the revamped food-for-peace program proposed by the administration stresses the need for adequate supplies of dairy products for commercial markets and to meet high priority domestic and foreign program needs.

I am concerned, however, that this need for adequate supplies may not be reflected in prices to dairy farmers that will assure it.

If present inadequate price levels continue in the important north central dairy States, for example, it is certain that this important area will not be able to provide these needed supplies. The reserve supplies that have been available in this area in the past are disappearing and may no longer be available to fluid milk markets.

This milk shortage already is a serious problem for the important manufacturing sector of the dairy industry in these States. This industry, built around the making of cheese, butter and nonfat dry milk, already is having difficulty obtaining sufficient milk to keep plants running efficiently.

The answer, of course, is higher price supports. These higher prices are needed both to provide adequate income for farmers committed to staying in dairying and as a vote of confidence for those who are wavering.

Even without the anticipated stepping up of foreign demands for dairy products—both in food aid and commercial sales—the need for ample domestic production is growing.

The fluid milk and cream report, issued yesterday by the Department of Agriculture, shows the extent of these consumption changes in State and Federal milk marketing areas.

Whole milk sales in November were up 4 percent from a year earlier in these areas. Skim milk sales were up 12 percent from November a year earlier. Fluid cream sales were up 2 percent.

To summarize, total fluid sales in November in 76 marketing areas were up 6 percent from the same month in 1964. Yet the milk receipts from milk producers have been going down.

One indication of the economic problems in this area is the sharp drop in the number of producers in some of these State and Federal marketing areas. In 3 Illinois areas, for example, the number is down in 1 year from 18,186 producers to 16,453. In 3 Michigan areas, 13,887 down to 12,911. In 3 Wisconsin areas 4,197 to 4,137. In 2 Minnesota areas, 4,102 to 3,971. This drastic reduction in producers is the direct result of low prices. Many of our finest dairy farmers are being literally driven from the farm.

Two other related indicators reported by the Department of Agriculture are average daily receipts of milk from producers in these State and Federal milk marketing areas and average daily receipts per producer. Both show sharp drops in nearly all the midwest dairy States, undoubtedly reflecting discontent with milk prices.

Average daily receipts from two Minnesota areas are down from 3,417 million pounds in December of 1964 to 3,133 million pounds in the same month in 1965; five Iowa areas down from 3,317 million to 3,015 million; two South Dakota areas down from 622 million to 581 million; three Wisconsin areas down from 4,509 million to 4,324 million, and two Illinois areas down from 17,524 million to 14,893 million.

Sharp drops in average daily receipts per producer are shown in the current reports for these same States. These reductions reflect culling of dairy herds, poor quality feed due to drought and early frost, and unwillingness to buy feed concentrates that will not pay out at present dairy prices.

The Government now supports dairy products at 75 percent of parity or $3.24 a hundred for milk going into manufacturing uses. This price has led to fewer cows being milked and fewer farmers remaining in dairying.

The incentive simply is not there at this price, especially for younger farmers who have the option of switching to feeding cattle or raising hogs, or some other type of farming. It has led to the alarming situation in Wisconsin in which it now is estimated that an average of 12 farmers a day stopped dairying in 1965.

The Secretary has reported that he is considering the many requests for raising support prices for the coming marketing year. My request is among them. I hope the alarming drop in milk production in the Midwest, which is without a doubt tied to the serious economic situation caused by continued low milk prices, will result in his setting dairy support prices at a realistic level without delay.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Wisconsin for the excellent statement he has just made on the dairy problem. Inasmuch as he comes from perhaps the greatest dairy State in the Union he knows this problem thoroughly. As the former Governor of that State he has been equally involved serving the dairy farmers for a good many years.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I share the concern which has been so well expressed on the Senate floor today concerning the proposed reductions contained in the fiscal year 1967 budget for the national school lunch and special milk programs. I am of the opinion, as are a majority of the Members of this body, that we must reduce nonessential Federal expenditures in view of our military commitments in southeast Asia. There are innumerable areas where the administration and Congress can cut back on financial outlays without jeopardizing the health of our children or in any way impeding the well-being of any of our citizens.

The school lunch program and the special milk program are, however, in my view very important and successful programs, and they deserve to be continued at least at the level of recent years.

I intend to vote and do all I can to restore the proposed cuts. The health and physical welfare of our school children is an essential matter, and the funds devoted to this cause should not be reduced while other much less essential programs continue in full force or are even increased.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I want to commend the junior Senator from South Dakota for his leadership and his fine presentation of our serious dairy problem and associate myself with him. In his recent message on food-for-freedom, President Johnson called for the Government purchase of limited amounts of dairy products under the new open market purchase authority in the Agricultural Act of 1965. The President said:

> We must have adequate supplies of dairy products for commercial markets, and to meet the high priority domestic and foreign program needs. Milk from U.S. farms is the only milk available to millions of poor children abroad. The Secretary of Agriculture will use authority in the 1965 act whenever necessary to meet our needs for dairy products.

The need for dairy products comes pointedly at the time of a shrinking dairy industry. It comes at a time when surpluses have been curtailed and when supplies for commercial markets are decreasing. The high priority domestic and foreign program needs of which the President speaks are endangered by the downward trend in production.

The level of prices to farmers is discouraging to the continued production of milk. The primary dairy States are reporting cuts in production from a year ago as my colleagues have pointed out. It is my hope the Secretary of Agriculture will continue to review the support program for dairy products in light of what is required to stabilize dairy production on a firm basis and provide for milk we will need for fullest growth of both domestic and international needs.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] for their perceptive remarks and their contribution to this discussion.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAULTY CONSTRUCTION OF POST OFFICE BUILDINGS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, recently a situation came to my attention concerning the Post Office Department which caused me a great deal of concern.

I think the Senate and the public should be aware of the situation; therefore, I shall outline briefly a series of events involving the construction and leasing of certain post offices.

I should like to say at the outset that Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien performed an outstanding public service by taking immediate corrective action when I called this matter to his attention.

The matter to which I am referring involves the operations of an organization known as the Schur-Lee Realty Corp., Hackensack, N.J., whose principal officer is Mr. Aaron Schurman.

Mr. Schurman has been a principal in several different corporations which have obtained contracts to build and lease 12 U.S. post office buildings since 1958 in cities in the States of New Jersey, New York, and North Carolina.

The Schur-Lee Corp. has obtained contracts to build and lease 4 of the 12 post offices in North Carolina, in the cities of Goldsboro, Asheboro, Sanford, and Shelby.

An intolerable situation came to my attention when I learned that the city of Sanford had revoked the corporation's license to do business in that city when it was found that the construction of the foundation of the new post office in Sanford did not meet local building codes and was not in accordance with the specifications drawn by the Post Office Department.

On January 25, 1966, I sent a telegram concerning the matter to the Postmaster General, which is as follows:

> In strongest possible terms I respectfully recommend immediate investigation of performance by contractor on post office building at Sanford, N.C., now under construction. Sanford municipal government has revoked contractor's license to operate in Sanford, and all work has been stopped. Complaints of most serious nature have repeatedly been made by responsible citizens and officials of Sanford in recent weeks, and I have repeatedly called them to attention of proper postal authorities who made it clear they share my concern, but seem to be hampered by legal considerations relating to contractual relationship between the contractor and the Government. Similar problems arose when same contractor was working on Asheboro post office project. Understand he was low bidder on several other North Carolina post office projects. I believe in being fair and there may be extenuating circumstances about which I do not know, but it appears to me that there is urgent need for prompt action to correct an intolerable situation.

Upon receiving the telegram the Postmaster General took immediate steps to have a complete investigation made. The Postmaster General informed me on February 14, 1966, that the contract between the Post Office Department and the Schur-Lee Realty Corp. for the Sanford post office building had been canceled.

Furthermore, the Postmaster General has assured me that his Department is continuing its investigation of all of the contracts it has in the 12 cities in New Jersey, New York, and North Carolina, to determine if any other defaults have occurred.

I have a file of information on what has occurred in connection with the proposed post office building in Sanford, and I have passed on all of the information I have obtained to the Postmaster General.

Of course, I am not familiar with all of the details of the contracts in the 11 other cities, but what happened in Sanford is a good example of a private corporation trying to get by with shoddy construction and a completely unacceptable building to house a post office.

There are strong indications that this same corporation has made a practice of trying to give the Government the runaround in meeting its contractual obligations through delay and slowness in correcting sloppy work.

I hope that the Post Office Department, as a result of the experience it has had with the Schur-Lee Corp., will make a broad review of all of the construction-lease agreements it has made. There is an urgent need to find out if other attemps are being made to do what was done in Sanford before it was corrected.

The private contractors who lease facilities to the Post Office Department are paid, and they are paid well, for their services. In turn they should be required not only to provide facilities of superior quality, but to keep them serviced and in first-class condition without delays and constant prodding. We cannot tolerate anything less, and we will not tolerate anything less.

I think it would also be proper for the Post Office Department, in reviewing its contract-lease agreements, to give serious study to this method of building postal facilities, and I hope that the Postmaster General will recommend to Congress any changes in the existing contract-lease procedure that he feels will bring better postal service to the public.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, half a decade or so ago a great leader in the U.S. Senate wrote:

> I am a free man, an American, a U.S. Senator, and a Democrat in that order.
>
> I am also a liberal, a conservative, a Texan, a taxpayer, a rancher, a businessman, a consumer, a parent, a voter, not as young as I used to be nor as old as I expect to be. And I am all these things in no fixed order.
>
> I am unaware of any descriptive word in the second paragraph which qualifies, modifies, amends or is related by hyphenation to the first paragraph. In consequence, I am not able—not even the least interested in trying—to define my political philosophy by the choice of a one-word or two-word label. This may be against the tide, but, if so, the choice is deliberate.

The words are brilliant words of the man whom destiny and the American people have chosen as our leader in difficult days. They are the words of then-Senator Lyndon B. Johnson.

The beginning of an eloquent statement of political precepts, these words are the ones I borrow today to bring before the Senate some of my thoughts on the most vexing of this generation—Vietnam and the consequences of the war there, in the rest of southeast Asia, on the entire Asian Continent and, indeed, on the world.

There are those who would categorize Senators—indeed, all Americans—into neat pigeonholes marked "The Hawks" and "The Doves." Or, even less appropriately, "those who support the President" and "those who oppose the President."

As a Senator, Lyndon B. Johnson told us:

> At the heart of my own beliefs is a rebellion against this very process, labeling and filing Americans under headings.

Mr. President, this is the position in which I find myself today. Indeed, I suspect many of us find ourselves today in this same position.

We are neither hawks nor doves. We desire to be neither.

We are pro-Americans, profreedom. We are anti-Communist, antislave.

We believe in meeting our commitments. We believe in peace with honor.

We know from a personal standpoint, many of us having served in the Armed Forces in wartime.

We are at once freemen, Americans, Senators, liberals, conservatives, businessmen, professional men, consumers, workers, parents, and voters. All of us are not as young as we used to be nor, hopefully, as old as we expect to be.

Yet, many are, as I am, the fathers of young sons who may be asked to march off to battle in a war that is undeclared and, indeed, not understood by the vast majority of Americans.

As we are loyal, sincere, and dedicated—that is, those of us in the Senate who feel this way—so are nearly all the 200 million Americans. They—and we—back our President. We applaud his patience and his perceptiveness. We applaud his efforts at peace, and, equally, his efforts to find a way to reconcile a belief in and a love of peace with the commitments to freedom and self-determination.

Yet, we have questions, questions that weigh heavily on the shoulders of our fighting men in Vietnam and their parents in Texas, in Indiana, and in all our 50 States.

In finding the answers to these questions—both those which are being asked and those which remain within others—I believe we must first come to certain factual conclusions.

First, Mr. President, there is the inescapable conclusion that America is today the single strongest Nation in the world, the strongest ever to grace the face of this globe in recorded history. This very strength, capable of destruction of any combination of enemies, is capable of maintaining a peace—albeit in the twilight zone of a cold war or lukewarm war.

The fact that we can lick anyone is hardly disputed even by our adversaries and potential adversaries. Do we, therefore, unleash this awesome power and, thus, begin a nuclear war from which there will be no winner?

The answer is an obvious and clear "No."

Therefore, we must conclude from this that we also oppose rightfully so-called preventative war, that we will refrain from dropping the bomb without provocation.

Second, I believe that nearly all thinking Americans recognize that we should not become involved in a land war against the mass of Asians.

Third, it is only rational to state that use of any nuclear device in this or any other conflict is merely a prelude to all-out nuclear war. There simply is no such thing as a limited nuclear conflict any more than there is anything like being partially pregnant.

These yardsticks must be applied, then, to the struggle in Vietnam.

It is my conviction—and that of many of my colleagues—that we are becoming embroiled in a land conflict on the continent of Asia whether we sought it, or desire it, or not.

I suggest that one reason that this is so is that the position of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has not been rotated in recent years. Rather, the Chairman has been an Army man.

I have no quarrel with the Army or with the able representatives it has given to the chairmanship—Lemnitzer, Taylor, and Wheeler. Yet, these great leaders are, by their training, experience, and orientation, ground fighters.

I cannot help wondering whether an Air Force or a Navy Chairman would not today guide the Secretary of Defense and the President to a course different from that which we seem to be pursuing in the war.

A punishing, body-to-body confrontation in Asia lets the enemy decide how, when, and where we shall pit the forces of freedom against those of tyranny. It is in no way compatible with our clear superiority in nuclear strength, in air power, and in sea power.

In Vietnam we are not even fighting another Korea. A decade and a half ago our men fought in Korea side by side with Asians from Korea and from outside of Korea. We fought with European allies. We fought under the banner of the United Nations. And we fought with and beside the troops of a stable government—one so stable and so committed to freedom that her troops today are joined in the fight in Vietnam.

To be sure, there are today facts available in this country only to the President. To be sure, the ultimate decision of quo vadis—where to go—rests with our friend and leader, the President.

Yet, many of us would counsel him to beware of the hawks and the doves and, above all, those who would neatly categorize all of us.

We would counsel him that we believe in neither immediate withdrawal nor in escalation, but in exploration of other courses which would defend our interests and those of any legitimate and popular Government of South Vietnam.

We urge restraint while developing a long-range, strategic position which would recognize not only the contingencies of the battlefield, but also the great goals of our Nation in guaranteeing freedom and self-determination for those peoples who want them and will nurture them.

Of what avail to commit additional hundreds of thousands of our best young men in a land war against Asians?

Of what avail winning a war—even without atomic devices—if we were to lose the peace and the support of our allies all around the globe?

The solution to Vietnam is elusive. If we lack anything at this moment, it is a positive solution or an alternative.

But it seems to me—and to many of the rest of us—that there are certain things we should not do. Among them are:

Long and extended ground action in Asia.

Nuclear warfare.

Abandonment of dedication to peace and freedom.

It is my hope that, in setting aside what we do not want and in focusing some attention on the need for long-range goals, perhaps we can together find what we do want without categorizing each other as patriots or traitors or hawks or doves.

There is no question of what I intend to do on the measure now before us. I intend to vote for it. I intend to support our troops there. I have so stated repeatedly. There was concern among some of us that there was an intention by those who sponsor this measure to consider the vote on this measure as a policy determination, a determination that would bind this Congress and bar it from discussing, debating, or questioning what is going on.

I believe that the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] voluntarily put at rest most of the fears of many of us when, in his opening statement, he said that the vote on this measure is meant for neither an endorsement of past policies nor a commitment to any future policy.

The Senator from Georgia went further and stated that the vote on this measure would not be considered as being the views of Senators with regard to the foreign policy of the United States.

Other remarks have been made. Some remarks concern how long this debate will continue.

I shall make some further observations than the short ones which I have made today. I plan to do so on Monday. Other Senators plan to do likewise. However, this is not a filibuster.

This measure was laid down before the Senate only a few days ago. Certainly if the administration were interested in bringing the matter to a quicker vote than will probably occur, the measure could have been considered earlier. I see no reason that the measure cannot be voted on next week.

The Senate debated the repeal of section 14(b) for many weeks. That debate was finally brought to a conclusion. If the administration had wanted to do so, they could have temporarily laid the repeal of section 14(b) aside and brought the pending measure up at an earlier date.

The Senate adjourned from Thursday, February 10, 1966, until Wednesday, February 16, 1966, in order that members of the opposition party could return to their homes and make political speeches. I do not deny anyone that right. However, if it were urgent that this measure be voted on this week, that certainly could have been done. An opportunity could have been afforded to those of us who want to express our thoughts and prayers. Certainly we should not be denied that right.

I believe one thing that has been accomplished by the present course of action is that this question has been finally removed from the cloakrooms and the corridors of Capitol Hill, and that some questions that many of us have been asking are now in the minds of the American people. The American people have a right to ask those questions. The American people are now receiving some answers, even if the answers consist of further questions. They are entitled to receive this information.

We do not live in a totalitarian society in which the voice of opposition should be stilled. I do not believe that the President would want this to occur. That was my reason for calling to the attention of the Senate the words of the President when he was a U.S. Senator.

I believe that if the President were here as a Senator at the present time, he would say:

> Let us proceed with our business in an orderly fashion. Let us debate the issues and not personalities. Let us concern ourselves with the future of our country and with the future of our young people, rather than with words which will be hard to strike from the minds of some people if these words are repeated too often.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS TO WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1965

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BAYH, BOGGS, GRUENING, HARRIS, HART, INOUYE, JAVITS, HARTKE, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, MCNAMARA, MONTOYA, MOSS, NELSON, RIBICOFF, RANDOLPH, TYDINGS, and YOUNG, of Ohio, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, in order to improve and to make more effective the operations of that act.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for 10 days, to give other Senators an opportunity to join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, last year the Congress enacted the Water Quality Act of 1965. That legislation, which resulted from several years of work, debate, and deliberation, marked a major change in the direction and emphasis of the water pollution control and abatement program.

Its two key provisions, dealing with the establishment of a new Water Pollution Control Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the program for water quality standards on interstate streams, made possible new and more effective attacks on the problem of providing the right quality of water in the right place at the right time.

The response to the Water Quality Act has been particularly gratifying in view of the strong opposition we had to overcome to obtain passage. As Senators may recall, it originated in the Senate as S. 649 in the 88th Congress. The Senate passed it in that Congress, but it did not receive concurrence in the House. We introduced the legislation in the 89th Congress as S. 4. As in the earlier Congress the reaction was mixed. The Senate acted quickly, and after several months the House passed a differing version. Protracted negotiations and a conference led to final agreement on the act which President Johnson signed October 2, 1965.

In the months since final enactment, I have been encouraged by the growing interest among public officials and industrial leaders in the comprehensive water improvement program initiated by the Water Quality Act. I believe that a fundamental change has occurred in the national attitude toward the water pollution problem. The discussion has shifted from the issue of whether or not we should improve the quality of our water to the issue of how best to accomplish our objectives.

The one disturbing factor in these months has been the delay in effectively establishing the new Water Pollution Control Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by the appointment of a Water Pollution Control Administrator, as authorized by the Water Quality Act. Quite frankly, we cannot afford to lose momentum at this time as a result of delays occasioned by administrative uncertainty.

The new Administration was authorized by the Congress to upgrade the status of our water pollution control and abatement program and to broaden the emphasis of our water program to include more than health considerations. The States are now making plans to work with the Administration in the development of water quality standards. Delay and confusion about the Administration and its status can only succeed in frustrating the intention of Congress in enacting the Water Quality Act of 1965.

The Water Quality Act was not the end of our efforts. It represented a new beginning. As President Johnson said when he signed that act:

> This bill that you have passed, that will become law as a result of a responsive Congress, will not completely assure us of absolute success. Additional bolder legislation will be needed in the years ahead. But we have begun. And we have begun in the best American tradition—with a program of joint Federal, State and local action.

The proposed legislation we are introducing today is bolder legislation. It is the product of last year's field hearings by the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Public Works Committee. It is designed to implement the findings published in our report, "Steps Toward Clean Water." It will form the basis for hearings and the development of legislative recommendations which the Committee on Public Works plans to report to the Senate later in the session.

Briefly, Mr. President, this legislation would provide for a 6-year, $6 billion program of grants to municipalities for sewage treatment construction, with the Federal Government paying 30 percent of the total construction cost. It would remove the present limits on individual project grants. If enacted, it would help us meet the estimated $20 billion cost of municipal sewage treatment construction needed to meet our national needs between now and 1972.

In addition, the bill provides for incentives to the States to participate in the program by offering a 10-percent bonus on those grants in cases where the State matches the Federal contribution. We provide for a long-term, low-interest loan program to assist those communities in States where State funds and local resources are not adequate to meet the local share. We also include a provision for States to anticipate their allotments to help accelerate the construction program.

In order to assist the States in improving their own programs, we have provided for an increase from $5 million to $10 million in the grants for State programs.

Finally, Mr. President, we would authorize a $25 million a year program of grants for the demonstration of advanced waste treatment and water purification methods or new or improved methods of compatible joint treatment systems for municipal and industrial wastes.

This program is designed to enable us to meet our primary and secondary sewage treatment construction needs, to upgrade State programs, and to launch us into the new and highly important systems approach to water pollution abatement and control and improved water quality development. This approach is adaptable to different conditions in all parts of the country. It is designed to take advantage of technological developments and the advantages of regional planning.

We do not pretend that this proposed legislation is the last word in water pollution control, Mr. President, but we do believe it offers a bold approach on which we can build.

Mr. President, let me spell out in just a word or two the reason for the urgency of this program. I believe that the public is aware of this urgency. I believe that Congress is also increasingly aware of it. I am sure that the President is; but, nevertheless, it is useful from time to time to point out that unless we step up, and greatly step up, the present program to deal with the problem of water pollution, by 1980 our water supplies will not be sufficient to meet our water requirements in this greatly expanding technological and industrial society.

As our standards of living rise, this date could be advanced; therefore, this problem is an urgent one.

The program which I am presenting, although it seems to involve a great deal of money, is no more than the minimum needs required for the next 5 years to do an effective job.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Maine.

The bill (S. 2947) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2947

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended in subsection (d) by striking out "(1)" after "(d)" and by striking out all of paragraph (2) of such subsection.

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended to read as follows:

"GRANTS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

"SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the purpose of—

"(1) assisting in the development of any project which will demonstrate a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any waters of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other wastes from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes, or

"(2) assisting in the development of any project which will demonstrate advanced waste treatment and water purification methods or new or improved methods of compatible joint treatment systems for municipal and industrial wastes,

and for the purpose of reports, plans and specifications in connection therewith. The Secretary is authorized to provide for the conduct of research and demonstrations relating to the purpose set forth in clause (1) or (2) by contract with public or private agencies and institutions and with individuals without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes; except that not to exceed 25 per centum of the total amount appropriated under authority of this section for any fiscal year may be expended under authority of this sentence during such fiscal year.

"(b) Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations:

"(1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary;

"(2) No grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 50 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary; and

"(3) No grant shall be made for any project under this section unless the Secretary determines that such project will serve as a useful demonstration for the purpose set forth in clause (1) or (2) of subsection (a).

"(c) For the purposes of this section there are authorized to be appropriated—

"(1) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the next three succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $20,000,000 per fiscal year for the purpose set forth in clause (1) of subsection (a), including contracts pursuant to such subsection for such purpose; and

"(2) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for each of the next four succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $25,000,000 per fiscal year for the purpose set forth in clause (2) of subsection (a), including contracts pursuant to such subsection for such purpose.

Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended. No grant or contract for the purpose of either such clause (1) or (2) shall be made for any project in any fiscal year in an amount exceeding 5 per centum of the total amount authorized for the purpose of such clause in such fiscal year."

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 7 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by striking out "and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $5,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $5,000,000, and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $10,000,000".

SEC. 4. Effective after June 30, 1967, subsection (b) of section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary and unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this Act; (2) except as otherwise provided in this clause, no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 30 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary, or in an amount exceeding 40 per centum of such reasonable cost if the State agrees to match equally not less than 30 per centum of such estimated reasonable cost of each project in such State approved under this section: *Provided,* That the grantee agrees to pay the remaining cost: *Provided further,* That, in the case of a project which will serve more than one municipality the Secretary shall, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable, allocate to each municipality to be served by such project its share of the estimate reasonable cost of such project; (3) no grant shall be made for any project under this section until the applicant has made provision satisfactory to the Secretary for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the treatment works after completion of the construction thereof; and (4) no grant shall be made for any project under this section unless such project is in conformity with the State water pollution control plan submitted pursuant to the provisions of section 7 and has been certified by the State water pollution control agency as entitled to priority over other eligible projects on the basis of financial as well as water pollution control needs. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection, in any case where the State is not matching at least 30 per centum of the cost of a project pursuant to an agreement described in clause (2) the requirements in clause (1) relating to approval by the State water pollution control agency and clause (4) relating to certification by such agency shall not apply.

SEC. 5. Subsection (c) of section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by inserting after "The allotments of a State under the second, third, and fourth sentences of this subsection shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this section, for payments with respect to projects in such State which have been approved under this section" a comma and the following: "except that in the case of any project on which construction was initiated in such State after June 30, 1966, and which meets the requirements for assistance under this section but was constructed without such assistance, such allotments shall also be available for payments in reimbursement of State or local funds used for such project to the extent that assistance could have been provided under this section if such project had been approved pursuant to this section and adequate funds had been available. In the case of any project on which construction was initiated in such State after June 30, 1966, and which was constructed with assistance pursuant to this section but the amount of such assistance was a lesser per centum of the cost of construction than was allowable pursuant to this section, such allotments shall also be available for payments in reimbursement of State or local funds used for such project to the extent that assistance could have been provided under this section if adequate funds had been available".

SEC. 6. Effective after June 30, 1966, subsection (d) of section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by striking out all beginning with "and $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967" through the end of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "$150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $1,250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972."

SEC. 7. Section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(h)(1) Upon application the Secretary may make a loan to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency which he has agreed to make a grant to pursuant to this section, for the purpose of helping to finance its share of the cost of construction for which such grant is to be made. Any such loan shall be made only (A) after the Secretary determines that such State, municipality, or agency has made satisfactory provision for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the treatment works being constructed after completion of such construction, and (B) if such State, municipality, or agency shows it is unable to secure such funds from non-Federal sources upon terms and conditions which the Secretary determines to be reasonable and consistent with the purposes of this section. Loans pursuant to this subsection shall bear interest at a rate which the Secretary determines to be adequate to cover the cost of the funds to the Treasury as determined by the

Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the maturities of loans made pursuant to this subsection. Such loans may not be used for the State's share of the cost of a project pursuant to a matching agreement entered into under section 8(b)(2).

"(2) Loans pursuant to this subsection shall mature within such period as may be determined by the Secretary to be appropriate but not exceeding forty years.

"(3) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of his subsection but not to exceed a total of $250,000,000. No loan or loans pursuant to this subsection with respect to any one project shall exceed an amount equal to 10 per centum of such total."

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 21, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 18, 1966:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of com-

David Gershowitz
Robert J. Carson
Hugh C. McCaffrey
Merle L. Harbourt
John D. Roberts
Allen E. Armstrong
Charles D. Budd
Donby J. Mathieu
Fredrick H. Raumer
Robert L. Lawlis
George D. Winstein
William H. St. George
Joseph W. Finnegan
Robert D. Johnson
Paul R. Peak, Jr.
James A. Hodgman
Robert C. Phillips
Wesley M. Thorsson
Peter S. Branson
Robert C. Boardman
Parker O. Chapman
William H. Brinkmeyer
George H. Weller
David A. Webb
Richard W. Goode
James L. Harrison
William E. Murphy
John D. McCann
Sumner R. Dolber
James H. Durfee

The following-named officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of commander:

Alvin T. Durgin, Jr.
Walter F. Bartlett
Milo A. Jordan
Frederick O. Wooley
John A. Flynn
Nicholas Ivanovsky
Andrew F. Nixon
William J. Spinella
Norman C. Venzke
David C. Klingensmith
Gilbert L. Kraine
Hubert E. Russell
Charles J. Glass
Richard M. Morse
James P. Marsh
Benedict L. Stabile
Robert E. Fletcher
Horace G. Holmgren
Claude R. Thompson
Raymond H. Wood
John C. Guthrie, Jr.
Robert C. Stancliff
Ferney M. McKibben
Sidney B. Vaughn, Jr.
Eugene A. Delaney
James L. Fleishell
Robert K. Adams
Clifford F. DeWolf
Royal E. Grover, Jr.
William G. Dick
Harry J. Hayes
Allan B. Rose
Charles F. Juechter, Jr.
John C. Fuechsel
Warren W. Waggett
Leo V. Donohoe
Adrian L. Lonsdale
Alva L. Carbonette
Robert A. Seufert
Berry L. Meaux
Harold W. Parker, Jr.
John P. Mihlbauer
Clarence C. Hobdy, Jr.
William D. Harvey
James L. Brewer
John W. Leadbetter, Jr.
Victor Koll
John D. Franks
Henry J. Burness
Raymond C. Hertica
Arthur G. Taylor
Talmadge H. Sivils
Kermit R. Meade
Paul A. Yost, Jr.
Henry H. Bell
Philip C. Lutzi
Richard F. Malm
Cortland G. Pohle, Jr.
John L. Klenk
George E. Cote
Swain L. Wilson
Phillip B. Moberg
Lawrence A. White
Wilfred R. Bleakley, Jr.
John S. Phillips
James P. Randle
John H. Fournier
Richard L. Jacobs
Louis L. Zumstein
Alfred P. Manning, Jr.
George J. Roy, Jr.
Robert W. Witter
John G. Martinez
Ted L. Gannaway
Robert A. Moss
Richard M. Thomas
Daniel L. Muir
Graham Hall
John L. Steinmetz, Jr.
Joseph P. Hratko
Hugh C. Wyatt
Robert C. Powell
George E. Maloney
Richard J. Knapp
Robert Russell
Frederick P. Schubert
Robert B. Grant
Norman S. Morrill
Byron W. Jordan
David M. Kaetzel

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant commander:

John R. MacDonald
Edward L. Bailey
John P. Sanken
Donald L. Sherman
Frank E. Braman
John V. A. Thompson

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant:

Dick G. Taylor
Warren J. Frederick
Weymond Davis
Dale R. Huff
Gordan D. Crandall
Maurice V. Goodroe
Bruno A. Forsterer
Milton J. Thompson
Jack O'Donnell
Herman G. Pinter
Walter H. Riddle, Jr.
Floyd A. Rice
Edward V. Dempsey, Jr.
Charles H. Denmark
Charles B. Morrison
Russell D. Edens
Benjamin S. Beach, Jr.
James J. Gaughan
Albert D. Grantham
George T. Kulick
Roy E. Nichols, Jr.
Thomas D. Keith
Russell E. Sawyer
Richard N. Westcott
Richard J. Briggs
Wallace A. Herrington
Sanford H. Pierpoint
Samuel A. McDowell, Jr.
Vern R. Potter
Paul E. Peterson
Rea F. Fetzer
Aaron W. Rogers
Robert S. Cutler
Ronald G. Eastman
Robert O. Slade
Herbert D. McQuarrie, Jr.
Noel G. Ballinger
Mark W. Byrd
Robert H. Elkins
Donald P. Nachtwey
Theottis Wood
Duane P. Gatto
Jack W. Dunn
Luther "L" Barr
Ralph T. Martin
John R. Bosk
Alfred H. F. Marchant
Robert E. Hynds
Kenneth R. Rider
Bruce E. Timmerman
Dorwin W. Newman
James D. Lombard
Franklin E. Thrall
James G. Lang
John J. Janda, Jr.
William H. Dotson
Hugh T. Williams, Jr.
Philip R. Spiker
Thomas M. Smith
John L. LaFlamme
William L. Broadwell
James C. Carpenter
Derrill R. Kramer
Ruloff W. Whiteman
Kenneth L. Lambertson
John W. Keith
Frederick H. O. Mayr
Ralph E. Knorr
Jack A. Eckert
Francis W. J. Nicely
Hal M. Floyd
Leeland N. Gregg, Jr.
Roger T. Ostrom
Donald F. Kemner
David I. Tomlinson
George H. Martin
Joseph B. Donaldson
Jerald L. Rendall
Stanley E. Wood, Jr.
John L. Bailey
Ward A. Lewis
Ronald C. Addison
Patrick H. Cannon, Jr.
Frank R. Peasley
James K. Woodle
Edward R. Pusey, Jr.
Pat Murray
James R. Shontell
Richard E. Van Ry
Franklin E. Taylor
Donald C. Addison
Gene N. Cooper

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Robert V. Raftovich
Chester R. Wawrzynski
James F. Sanders
Hugh W. Nabors
Francis J. Stadnicki
Bly R. Elder
Roger W. Bing

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned warrant officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of chief warrant officer, W-3:

Charles R. Polly
Charles T. Silk

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3290, and 3292:

To be captain, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Comeau, Robert F. (Armor), O75539.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Cappadona, Louis A. (Infantry), O94515.
Greenberg, Harold (MPC), O93180.
Shulman, Carl D. (Armor), O96621.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Sheek, Alton J. (Artillery), O92010.

To be first lieutenant

Frickey, Norman G. (MSC), O96968.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be majors

Ahrens, Walter A., O2266327.
Andersen, Thomas E., O1881857.
Bobinski, Chester J., O2028338.
Brinkman, Paul A., O997596.
Burns, Peter J., Jr., O1695173.
Carney, Robert I., Jr., O1889687.
Carroll, Anthony, O1882162.
Carson, Ray M., O1886382.
Cothern, Paul D., Jr., O1879019.
Drake, Ralph R., O1925392.
Dresch, Denny D., O1925303.
Evans, Stewart M., O1885206.
Gilbert, Floyd M., O1924526.
Hoar, William J., O2200449.
Hooper, Walter E., O2265444.
Hupe, Howard M., O1881917.
Johnson, James L., O2266307.
Krogh, Richard V., O2263619.
Lang, William F., Jr., O1889839.
Malone, Albert W., O1925204.
Odom, Rupert E., O1919390.
Poteat, Albert, O2004090.
Sarnowski, Francis A., O1886231.
Strobridge, William F., O2263190.
Terry, Vaughn L. ,O1882248.
Weber, Jack, W., O2021132.

To be captains

Aldif, Thomas H., O5405646.
Alt, Richard M., O5506481.
Batts, John H., O4058486.
Bethlenfalvay, Gabor J., O4010257.
Bice, Burton C., O5405303.
Bolam, Paul F., O4046537.
Bozeman, Wallace B., O4007163.
Brasuell, Perry T., O1881029.
Breen, James H., O4068481.
Bresette, Allen A., O5304414.
Brooke, Arthur L., III, O5305754.
Brooks, Lyle G., O5304301.
Brown, George P., O5301838.
Bryson, Jack M., O4006082.
Call, Thomas J., O1915888.
Campbell, Luther U., O5300951.
Caudill, James E., O4036557.
Chapman, John B., O4032299.
Chavis, Langley J., O5304099.
Chilcote, Don L., O1885958.
Claiborne, Max R., O5402757.
Corliss, William D., O5001035.
Costello, Donald F., O4003342.
Danis, Stephen J., O4016709.
Davis, Carol D., O4071242.
Deely, John R., O2311461.
Demorest, Edward H., O4040766.
Dill, Clark D., O5306047.
Dowdy, Harry K., Jr., O4024091.
Dunn, Earl N., O5000227.
Eichelberger, Charlie B., O4074679.
Evans, Francis T., O4084656.
Feist, Robert J., O1928049.
Floore, Billy H., O4010452.
Galford, William W., O5206418.
Gay, Raymond D., O5402910.

George, Thomas F., O4037908.
Givler, Leon J., O4074691.
Gravette, Thomas R., O5200671.
Gray, Thomas A., Sr., O4064484.
Greene, Gerald R., O5405343.
Greene, Robert A., O5002098.
Griffin, Turner D., Jr., O2316963.
Grimes, Charles T., O5002537.
Harris, Jimmy R., O4048968.
Hawes, Richard W., O4014811.
Hernandez, Victor M., Jr., O5402984.
Herrmann, Richard A., O5305650.
Hinds, William H., O5203982.
Jarvis, William H., O4035043.
Johnson, Percy G., O4071813.
Jones, Billy B., O5305929.
Kaine, Thomas P., O5504499.
Kelley, James L., Jr., O4036674.
Landgraf, James A., O5405250.
Lauve, Louis L., III, O5201061.
Manley, Claude E., O4024824.
Marnon, Donald J., O5304128.
Martin, Harold R., O5405175.
Matthews, Ralph A., Jr., O4006435.
McCormack, Donald M., O4074723.
McCoy, James C., O4034190.
McDonald, Malcolm G., O4027294.
McKnight, Don A., O4005917.
Michel, Robert W., O4009828.
Mize, Ola L., O2284193.
Mock, Richard W., O1922996.
Moore, Bobby L., O5305130.
Mullins, Raiford F., O4042961.
Murphy, Edward J., Jr., O5002225.
Napoli, Joseph F., O4010472.
Olson, Ronald D., O4009973.
Peterson, Ronald N., O5507062.
Phillips, Herbert C., O4045150.
Porcella, Stephen R., O5202986.
Potter, William R., O1937446.
Pyle, James E., O4029483.
Rackley, Robert L., O5305422.
Richardson, William J., Jr., O4074746.
Ross, Ernest E., O4012052.
Routt, Randell G., O5207138.
Salerno, Raymond F., O5206239.
Samarkos, Anthony C., O4044601.
Sanders, Rabun C., Jr., O5304694.
Santos, Edwin, O4038101.
Scott, Eugene, O5303940.
Shiro, Marvin L., O1937286.
Sprowls, Leigh R., O5506887.
Stewart, Robert C., O4063248.
Sutton, Bryan J., O4030844.
Takacs, Steve P., Jr., O5206517.
Tolcher, James A., O5204026.
Wallis, Thomas W., O5506362.
Walls, Gregg P., O4074864.
White, Zinerva, Jr., O5304832.
Williams, Joshua O., Jr., O5207106.
Wratislaw, Roy E., O4025946.

To be first lieutenants

Adam, John A., O5515899.
Arnold, John H., O5315055.
Aschbacher, Arthur L., O5413021.
Babb, Lawrence R., O2311782.
Bahm, John F., Jr., O5219684.
Bass, Walter E., O5311736.
Bell, Jerry L., O5413369.
Biddinger, Dennis C., O5217521.
Bond, Gregg S., O5410906.
Bowersox, Gary W., O5517020.
Boyce, Harry L., O5218605.
Bridwell, Charles E., O5412668.
Britton, Johnnie W., Jr., O5310850.
Brown, David R., O5314818.
Bryan, Leland W., O5706866.
Byerley, Byron E., O5530057.
Cansler, Joe C., O5309739.
Carey, William R., O5214547.
Carpenter, Harold D., O5411859.
Chiminiello, John L., Jr., O5009579.
Cohen, James M., O5515772.
Crask, Garnett E., O5218256.
Cumings, Thayer, O5511570.
Darling, Dean H., O2317337.
Davis, Bruce D., O5409479.
Demey, John, O5219574.
Duke, Walter B., Jr., O5406008.
Edwards, Richard C., O5213822.
Elmore, Robert E. ,Jr., O5310090.
Errickson, Andrew, Jr., O5209807.
Ervin, James R., O5314252.
Feuerbacher, Charles E., O5412398.
Filion, Joffre W., II, O5530289.
Foltz, John F., O5215194.
Forest, Ronald P., O5316575.
Frachiseur, Ray G., O5412565.
Fringer, John W., Jr., O5213265.
Gardner, Gary M., O5412621.
Garven, Jack T., Jr., O2306294.
Geoffrion, David L., O5008339.
Gilbreath, John C., O5309066.
Goldberg, Edward B., O5212746.
Gonsalves, George, Jr., O4031305.
Graham, James D., O5313551.
Greene, William E., O5213392.
Gregory, Gary A., O5515755.
Grieshop, David S., O5009206.
Gross, Joseph C., III, O5410855.
Hahn, Donald F., O5516945.
Hand, Eugene T., O5315049.
Heath, Roger A., O5006200.
Herold, John M., O5219660.
Hicks, Harold J., O5317363.
Hogan, Dean M., O5006144.
Howe, Michael B., O5413421.
Hylan, Bruce H., O5517085.
Indreland, Richard L., O5707427.
Isom, William G., O5310405.
Jones, Donald G., O2309494.
Jordan, James G., O4047188.
Keenan, Robert E., O5315227.
Keller, Paul D., O5011797.
Kelly, Larry G., O5218518.
Kemper, Clarence B., Jr., O5410599.
Kempster, John E., O5014008.
King, Burnell, O5410990.
King, David, O5218000.
Kinsley, William A., O5514077.
Knight, Kenneth E., O5404995.
Koon, Richard D., O5310467.
Laughinghouse, Warren K., O5214925.
Lehrman, Larry D., O2305585.
Lewis, Harry C., Jr., O5317297.
MacDonald, James H., O5508242.
Mack, Oscar C., O5313362.
McClain, Charles W., Jr., O5414114.
McDermott, Richard B., O5517697.
Meehan, William J., II, O5007594.
Miller, Dratie A., Jr., O5410849.
Mohr, Donnell S., O5512167.
Moore, Donald M., O5213329.
Myers, Ralph E., O5218664.
Narvarte, Peter E., Jr., O5413720.
Neal, Donald M., O4045396.
Nelson, George W., Jr., O5309919.
Nickum, Richard G., O5516546.
Nitzsche, Ronald E., O5213533.
Page, Richard R., O5011489.
Partain, Rufus J., O5309831.
Polis, Anthony A., O5206974.
Rabush, Donald R., O5219590.
Raines, John A., O5515905.
Rebello, Ramile R., O5013516.
Reilly, James, O5212503.
Rimbey, Charles F., O2304685.
Rose, John C., Jr., O5517063.
Rozelle, H. Joseph, O2304639.
Sabin, Charles B., Jr., O5413548.
Sampson, Richard E., O5212048.
Sarakaitis, Joseph F., O5406072.
Scallan, Joseph H., O5410506.
Schmidt, John C., Jr., O5411802.
Schmiedekamp, Ronald J., O5314572.
Seamon, Frederic W., III, O5511186.
Sellers, Thomas H., O5312344.
Shehorn, Henry W., O2287285.
Sifrit, Roger W., O5007293.
Sikora, Thomas F., O5516105.
Snipes, Grover E., O5316369.
Sodol, Petro R., O5315152.
Spear, Walter W., O5210410.
Stevenson, Julian L., O5312348.
Stroud, Carl M., Jr., O4075462.
Talley, John W., O5217783.
Taylor, Daniel E., O5413625.
Taylor, Thomas L., O5318275.
Templeton, Allen E., O5216433.
Thompson, Robert A., O5316840.
Tilson, Charles E., O5706593.
Troth, Robert S., O5007560.
Trupp, Leroy R., O5706657.
Turner, Joseph E., O5214137.
Vaughn, Thomas B., O5315171.
Veal, Monte R., O5314913.
Vickers, George F. D., O5312078.
Viles, Ronald J., O5516798.
Wake, William E., III, O5312355.
Walker, Harvey J., Jr., O5513338.
Ward, William F., O5009508.
Warner, Lawrence E., O5516996.
Warnock, William H., O5011319.
Warren, Wayne S., O2296013.
Wilson, Fred N., Jr., O5412269.
Wood, Merrill F., O5000835.

To be second lieutenants

Abercrombie, Thomas V., III, O5323117.
Allen, Dean O., O5417651.
Alt, Emile A., Jr., O5415204.
Armistead, Joseph D., O5406423.
Askew, Arthur M., III, O5321322.
Bacheldor, Ned W., O5533742.
Beiler, George W., O5222750.
Benefield, Phillip D., O5322863.
Bergeron, Daniel N., O5018539.
Boen, Boyd R., O5414551.
Brammer, Craig W., O2319072.
Brierly, William F., O5318828.
Bright, Willard R., O5318829.
Brominski, Emil J., O5531515.
Brown, Thomas E., O5406203.
Brown, William H., O5406588.
Burgett, Robert C., O5406873.
Charbonneau, Maurice E., O5406449.
Chavez, Juan I., O5326378.
Cook, William H., O5406760.
Copes, Ronald A., O5532138.
Critchfield, John B., O5320957.
Danley, John A., Jr., O5406761.
Dethorn, John R., O5320607.
Dobbs, John R., O5406591.
Doerfler, Donald W., O5412936.
Drexler, Michael M., O5409903.
Drinkard, Thomas R., O5320961.
Duffy, George G., O5013588.
Dunn, Thomas D., Jr., O5530017.
Eliades, Milton L., O5321009.
England, William L., Jr., O5323017.
Fitzenz, David G., O5531461.
Gamble, Stephen J., O5017052.
Garcia, Michael A., O5406550.
Garris, Jack R., O5320461.
Gordon, Terry A., O5322521.
Guenther, Otto J., O5220897.
Hanko, Thomas M., O5221059.
Hardison, John R., Jr., O5322401.
Hawkes, Allen W., O5530735.
Hazen, David W., O5012418.
Jenks, Melvin C., O5709663.
Jennings, David R., O5531209.
Johnston, Sidney K., O5415773.
Jordan, Don R., O5416787.
Kellerhals, Paul W., O5501673.
King, Cary S., O5320814.
King, William H., III, O5322550.
Kujawa, John A., O5216448.
Leclair, Bryan V., O5018002.
Lowe, Carl T., O5875371.
Luneau, Gary L., O5019604.
Mace, Walter R., O5533614.
Mangrum, Jerry W., O5415552.
Marine, Lawrence H., Jr., O5418736.
Marler, Bobby H., O5324964.
McCarron, James P., O5221086.
McCranie, Von S., O5319141.
Miller, Freddy L., O5318384.
Miller, Karl J., O5415918.
Minton, Roger O., O5222264.
Morgan, Paul F., O5016346.
Morrison, Billy W., O5321398.
Mouw, John D., O2308913.
Newman, Jerrol M., O5415368.
Newman, Ray D., O5415795.
Nicholson, David L., O5532570.
Nolan, William K., O5415936.
Nosker, James F., O5222469.
Parker, Thomas C., O2318580.
Purrington, Peter R., O5406391.
Rausin, Ronald W., O5416219.
Rayburn, James L., O5317970.
Rhodes, Charles E., O5324994.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Ring, Dennis A.
Rogan, Donald M., O5320516.
Saffold, Albert W., O5223196.
Schucker, David R., O5220820.
Sparkman, Ira H., O5318890.
Stanton, James W., O5011263.
Stawski, Edmund J., Jr., O5406745.
Stewart, George D., O5406234.
Stunkard, Larry E., O5406395.
Sweet, Worth A., Jr., O5322194.
Szymanski, Ronald F., O5016082.
Usrey, Elgan H., O5318892.
Vance, Gary W., O5408679.
Villasenor, Antonio R., O5320407.
Walker, Lyman J., II, O5517056.
Wallace, Richard W., O5017332.
Wamsher, Richard C., O5709342.
Watson, Wyckliffe T., O5320101.
Wauford, Raymond J., O5320725.
Wayne, James A., O5406162.
Weisman, Donald E., O5532408.
Wells, James V., O5530023.
Welte, Ronald F., O5709288.
White, Eddie J., O5317825.
Wresche, Dee V., O5415555.
York, Thomas A., O5406943.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and branches specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293, 3294, and 3311:

To be majors, Medical Corps

Bzik, Karl D., O5014573.
Gimesh, John S., O5012767.
McDowell, Frank, Jr., O1341807.

To be captain, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Von Prince, Kilulu M. P., J2296080.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Baker, Gertrude E., N5407145.
Whitmire, Betty A., N5407154.

To be captains, chaplain

Foreman, William E., O5206138.
Pember, Marion D., O2307880.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Blaho, Daniel M., Jr., O5319954
Coe, Clyde A., O5213675.
Crombie, John N., O5214092.
Dukes, Richard D., O5319956.
Pompura, John P., O5214115.
Ruff, James M., O5301467.
Russell, John T., O5501581.
Schreck, Gerald G., O5525948.
Wampold, Mervin H.

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Newbern, William D., O5412084.
Noble, James E., O2218749.
Yelton, James M., Jr., O2307859.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Fauver, Howard E., Jr., O5207619.
Hawryluk, Orest, O5501023.
Hefter, Thomas G., O2311310.
Holman, Melvin R., O5525410.
Kent, James J., O5408761.
Kimbrell, Robert A., O5316011.
McKillop, James A., O5012858.
McMillin, Theodore R., Jr., O2318627.
Morales, Hernan, O5826480.
Morgan, William P., O5315851.
Mounger, Emerson J., O5711606.
Perry, Roger W., Jr., O5206852.
Piggott, James A., O5200423.
Roeser, Waldomar M., O5518527.
Stojic, Borislav, O5014678.
Varela, Gilberto E., O5826387.
White, Richard H., O4044679.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Bukowski, Robert V., O4064580.
Gilchrist, Alexander K., O2297790.
Gutin, Howard D., O2264207.
Temperilli, John, Jr., O4006075.

To be captains, Women's Army Corps

Steinbach, Edna M., L1020656.
Wolcott, Jeane M., L1020060.

To be first lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Richard, Ida, R5411453.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Gray, Helen V., N2296893.
Johnson, Wilhelmina T., N5411498.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Atkins, Thomas H., O2313852.
Friedler, Sydney, O2319769.
Merrill, Robert D., O5706697.
Pauley, Earl A., O5223386.
Pope, William A., O2315595.
Rarden, Michael A., O5706308.
Thompson, Edward, Jr., O5010629.
Wosepka, James L., O5516078.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Carson, Gordon C., III, O5312658.
Ganakis, Emanuel J.
McMeekin, Robert R., Jr.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Brouillette, Robert F., O2293687.
Forrester, James K., O2309627.
McGarry, Joseph J., O5010324.
Yohman, Joseph F., O5217862.

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Devin, Kathleen, N5709045.
Maddocks, Carmen F., N5411669.
McGrath Jo Ann, N5417311.
Peterson, Mary L., N5422013.
Staggs, Jewell D., N2317439.
Zahm, Karen E., N5021555.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Goodspeed, Paul A., O2317452.
Jones, Douglas E., O5214655.

To be second lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Monahan, Carole, L5322604.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3292:

Mallard, Wade V., O5321021.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Badgett, Arthur L.
Bell, William H., Jr.
Bodenbender, David G.
Boyd, Willie H.
Burt, John M.
Catanzaro, Thomas E.
Feeney, Donald E.
Ford, Thomas M., Jr.
Gallego, Lawrence
Galt, John E.
Gaston, Gary W.
Grubbs, John M.
Harding, Richard A.
Hickey, Daniel J.
Horn, Timothy B.
Kerins, James J.
Krupka, Thaddeus A.
LaChey, Terrence L.
Lamb, Gregory N.
Land, Henry W., II
MacKay, Pierce B.
Martin, Andrew S.
McKinstry, Earl R.
Morris, Arnold E.
Mundy, Mark J.
O'Connell, John E.
Ortiz, Teofilo
Ostrander, James H.
Owen, John T.
Rodman, Terral L.
Schnabel, Godfrey
Serrani, William P.
Sherwood, John M.
Staples, David C.
Tinkler, Duane R.
Tuomi, Jay A.
Ungemach, Frederick K., II
Weed, Roger I.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287 and 3288:

Abrams, Alan D., Jr.
Ackroyd-Kelly, Ian H.
Adair, Kenyon R.
Adams, James C.
Addison, William C.
Alexander, James P.
Allcut, Gregory L.
Ames, Marshall A., Jr.
Amos, William B.
Anderson, David B.
Anderson, John D.
Anderson, Leonard G., Jr.
Anderson, Melvyn L., II
Andrade, Eliseo A.
Andrews, Paul W.
Antoniuc, Robert P.
Armstrong, Elmo G., Jr.
Arndt, Thomas E.
Arnold, Charles J.
Ashjian, John P.
Atkinson, James R.
Austin, Glenn A., Jr.
Bailey, Paul K.
Barker, Paul E.
Barron, William A., Jr.
Barton, George L., IV
Baumgartner, Glenn W.
Bausch, James M.
Beechinor, Robert L.
Belch, Peter P., Jr.
Bell, Edwin D.
Belz, George D., Jr.
Benefield, Johnie H., Jr.
Bennett, Kelley E.
Berkey, Richard O.
Bero, John F.
Binkoski, Vincent A., Jr.
Black, Jerry M.
Blackwell, Russell R.
Blanchette, Joel G.
Bland, William R.
Blazier, John C.
Bloomfield, Roger B.
Bloyd, John R.
Bock, William P.
Boland, Thomas L.
Bond, Peter A.
Bonnell, Kenneth L.
Borton, John R.
Bowdoin, Charles D.
Bowling, John S.
Boyd, Arthur R., Jr.
Boyd, Michael F.
Brackney, Stuart R.
Bradshaw, Marvin R.
Braun, Thomas H.
Bremer, Charles A.
Bresett, Harold P.
Brewer, Charles E.
Brewster, William A.
Brisbine, Glen E.
Brister, Douglas W.
Broman, James E.
Broscha, Donald E., Jr.
Brown, Danny L.
Brown, George L.
Brown, Jerry A.
Brown, Laurence C., Jr.
Brownell, Richard P.
Bruton, James K., Jr.
Burne, Alan R.
Burson, George S., Jr.
Burton, Michael D.
Cabral, Bernardo J.
Caine, Bruce T.
Caldwell, Craig D.
Camardese, Zachary
Campbell, James B., Jr.
Capozzi, Roy M.
Capps, James H.
Carden, Albert P.
Carpenter, John F.
Casaletto, James J.
Cascio, Joseph
Castner, Harvey R.
Chandler, William A.
Channel, Warren W.
Chester, James M.
Chester, Lloyd L.
Clegg, Ronald W.
Cleveland, Floyd T.
Coates, Robert E., Jr.
Cobb, Robert G.
Coffey, Robert S.
Coffin, John F.
Coffman, Jimmy N.
Cole, William P.
Coletti, Francis E.
Colley, Ralph C., Jr.
Colliander, Douglas C.
Combs, John C.
Conner, Albert Z., Jr.
Conte, Dominick
Coolidge, John G.
Cooper, Roger C.
Coords, Robert H.
Corcoran, William F.
Cork, Stephen D.
Cornell, David R.
Cortes, Michael J.
Cosper, Ronnie G.
Coveney, Kenneth G.
Cox, George R.
Craft, Winfred O., Jr.
Cramblett, Alva D.
Cravens, James J., Jr.
Crook, Dennis B.
Cross, Reese W., Jr.
Crunkleton, Jon R.
Cundiff, Robert E.
Cunningham, Donald E.
Curington, Calvin F.
Cushing, John R.
Daggy, David N.
Darby, Leon H.
Daulton, Jack A.
Davis, Homer L., III
Davis, Robert H.
Davis, Thaddeus J., III
Dawson, Lester P.
DeMeo, Lawrence J., Jr.
Denny, Frederick I.
Detlefsen, George D.
Deusebio, Frank C.
Devenish, David F.
Devlin, Donald L., Jr.
Dickson, Richard G.
Dillard, Toney W.
Dion, Henry F.
Divita, Joseph M.
Doles, Steven M.
Dombrowsky, Thomas S.
Donarum, Frederick R.
Donovan, James J.
Dorsey, Mercer M., Jr.
Dowling, Matthew J.
Downie, Terry C.
Dowse, Richard K., II
Dreher, Richard E.
Duderstadt, Eugene W
du Fief, Thomas A.
Dugan, William R.
Easterly, Lewis A., III
Echeverria, Robert L.
Eckert, Edward K.
Ecuyer, Lawrence J.
Edstrom, David G.
Ehart, Stephen H.
Elkins, Estel E., Jr.
Eller, Thomas H., Jr.
Eslick, Jesse A.

Esmay, Jerry D.
Estabrook, George L.
Evans, Mickey S.
Evans, Thomas M.
Fairhead, Michael P.
Farwell, James D.
Faulkner, Charles E.
Fayssoux, James E., Jr.
Fenner, Hubert E.
Ferguson, Richard E.
Fernandez, Bruce R.
Ferrari, Bernard D.
Feurer, Michael H.
Filipiak, Robert P.
Filson, James C.
Finley, Earl W.
Fischer, Raymond C.
Fitzgerald, Nicholas E.
Flanagan, Edward J., Jr.
Fletcher, Douglas M.
Flowers, Kenneth F.
Foster, Michael R.
Fowler, Robert F., II
Foy, Thomas W.
Francisco, William P., III
Franzoni, Agostino
Frederick, James L.
French, Terry R.
Frey, Douglas J.
Fry, Fred L.
Funk, Donald J.
Gan, Keith R.
Garnett, Craig H.
Garrett, Stacy F., III
Garrison, James L., Jr.
Garst, Robert E., Jr.
Gaspard, Milbon J., Jr.
Gaudet, Robert F.
Gaudette, William F., III
Gaynor, John S., Jr.
Gehr, George W.
Gerwing, Theodore P.
Gesker, Joseph M.
Gilbert, Robert L.
Gilfus, Jay E.
Gillespie, George A., II, O5536522.
Glasrud, David E.
Gleason, Patrick T.
Gollwitzer, Gerald E.
Gorczyca, Thomas E.
Gordon, Maurice K., II
Grant, Francis R.
Grass, Stephen A.
Grau, Lester W.
Green, James H.
Gregoire, Marvin G.
Griffing, Thomas T.
Grisham, William G.
Griswold, Wilburn C.
Gross, Jimmie G.
Grunewald, Robert E., Jr.
Grunte, Peter L.
Gunter, Robert E., Jr.
Gustafson, James H.
Hagen, Hugh E.
Hahn, Frank R.
Hall, Roland C., Jr.
Hall, William R., Jr.
Halliday, Robert W., II
Hamilton, Gary E.
Hammerstone, Thomas R.
Hampl, Joseph J., Jr.
Hankey, John R., Jr.
Hardister, James C.
Hardy, James T.
Hardy, John W.
Harman, William R.
Harper, Joe L.
Harper, Paul R., Jr.
Harris, Carl A.
Harris, Hubert E., Jr.
Harris, Richard H.
Hassett, James P.
Haugen, Robert M., Jr.
Hawfield, William D., Jr.
Hawkins, James O.
Heath, Donald C.
Hemenway, John P., Jr.
Hemphill, Robert F., Jr.
Hemsley, James M.
Henry, Myles D.
Herbaugh, Marvin O., Jr.
Hernandez, Raul R.
Herndon, Clarence W., Jr.
Hester, Kenneth R.
Hightower, Edward H., Jr.
Hmara, Jeffrey L.
Hoch, Robert B.
Hogue, Peter W.
Hollis, Wardell, Jr.
Holmes, Donald L.
Holmes, William E.
Honerkamp, Frederick W., III
Hood, John E. R.
Hoose, Frederick R.
Hopkins, Cornell
Hopkins, Frederick T., Jr.
Horan, John J.
Horne, Thomas A.
Howell, Briley W., Jr.
Hoysa, Matthew J., Jr.
Hrdlicka, Douglas L.
Huchingson, Frank M., Jr.
Hudkins, Michael L.
Hudson, Cornelius M.
Hunt, William A.
Hurley, James P.
Hutchins, Andrew C.
Hyngstrom, Thomas R.
Imamura, Robert M.
Immordino, Vincent J.
Irvin, Robert R., Jr.
Jablonski, James J.
Jacques, Donald M., Jr.
Javaras, Angelo N.
Jeanblanc, Donald R.
Johnson, Dean A.
Johnson, George P.
Johnson, Roger L.
Johnson, Willis S., III
Jones, Harry M.
Jones, Leland B.
Jones, Paul D.
Jones, Willis L.
Jordan, Daniel W.
Kacerguis, Peter A.
Kaneshiro, Arthur T.
Kaufman, Kenneth M.
Keane, John M.
Keel, Jarvis A., Jr.
Keener, Richard K.
Kelleher, Thomas J., Jr.
Kemp, Richard N.
Kesler, Dickson E.
Ketzis, Sandor I.
Kimery, Bruce F.
Kirkey, Charles D.
Kirkland, Travis P.
Kitchens, Clarence W., Jr.
Kitts, Charles W.
Kluender, Richard A.
Knedler, Charles M., Jr.
Knight, Richard D.
Knowles, Bruce R.
Knowlton, David L.
Koprowski, Michael P.
Kotrlik, John J.
Kramer, Peter N., Jr.
Kresge, John A.
Krizman, Matthew A.
Krupey, Robert L.
Kuykendall, Joseph L.
Lagattuta, Frank C.
Lambert, Michael O.
Lambeth, Carl L.
Lance, Harold V.
Landry, Robert H.
Lanman, Donald E.
Lanpher, Patrick C.
Lantz, William P.
LaPosta, Robert H.
LaPrise, William A., Jr.
Larkin, Robert M.
Lattin, John H., Jr.
Lauffer, George W.
Lawrence, John T., II
Lawrence, Michael B.
Lawson, Clifford T., Jr.
Leczo, Theodore J.
Lee, Charles S. K.
Leech, Lloyd L., III
Leger, Richard E.
Leidwanger, Wayne G.
Lennon, Leo A.
Leonard, John W., III
Lepore, Frank C., Jr.
L'Esperance, David F.
Levering, William D.
Libby, John W.
Lindsay, James G.
Linke, Howard T.
Lippert, Lloyd E.
Littell, George S.
Livecchi, Samuel G.
Lloyd, Howard M., Jr.
Lockard, Winston P.
Long, Marion G., Jr.
Louthan, Frank G., III
Loveland, Daniel J.
Lowe, John R.
Lowry, Stephen R.
MacKenzie, Stephen A.
Magnusson, John A.
Magruder, Douglas G.
Mahoney, Stephen W.
Maloy, Richard E., Jr.
Marchetti, Edward M.
Marino, John E.
Marques, Steven J.
Martin, William F., II
Mathews, James C.
Matsumoto, Claude C.
Matthews, David F.
Matthews, John W.
Mayer, Carl H.
McBeth, Robert E.
McConnell, Donald H., Jr.
McDonald, Carroll W.
McDonald, Robert C.
McDuff, Charles R.
McFarland, Robert A.
McGarvey, William R.
McGavock, Donald F.
McGinness, Harry J., III
McGrath, Eugene T.
McGuirl, John P.
McIntosh, William A.
McKee, Stephen F.
McKenna, Robert E.
McLeod, Glenn A.
McRae, George J.
Measels, Michael L.
Meecha, John R.
Menig, Robert W.
Menser, Kent D.
Merle, Bruce H.
Metcalfe, Jerry F.
Metz, John M., Jr.
Meyer, Thomas P.
Mezs, Maris
Michael, Danny R.
Middleton, George S.
Miggins, Michael D.
Mihata, Kevin K.
Miles, Peter H., O5024220
Millard, James R.
Miller, Christian S.
Miller, David F.
Miller, Elwood M.
Miller, Henry S., Jr.
Miller, John M.
Mitchell, Robert W., O5713470
Monroe, Richard W.
Monteverde, Miguel E.
Mooney, John F.
Moore, Archie L.
Moore, Bruce E.
Moore, Jack M.
Moran, Ancil F. B.
Moren, Jan W.
Mrachek, William J.
Mullans, John R.
Muller, Kenneth L.
Mundy, Rodney D.
Murff, Robert H.
Murphy, Leonard K., Jr.
Murty, Monty R.
Muth, Richard A.
Myers, Don W.
Nacy, Charles T.
Nanto, Howard N.
Navas, William A.
Nemetz, Donald A.
Nichols, Buddy R.
Norman, Lucious J., Jr.
Nowosadko, John, Jr.
O'Beirne, James H.
O'Brien, Alfred H.
Ohl, Arthur W.
Okimoto, Alexander M.
Olean, Stephen A., Jr.
Oliver, Edward L., III
Olson, David V.
Omasta, Robert J.
Omsberg, James R.
Osteen, Wilson M., Jr.
Otis, John A.
Oursler, Robert C., Jr.
Packard, John A., Jr.
Packwood, Jan B.
Palm, David C.
Pardee, Jonathan H.
Parent, David S.
Parker, Buddy L.
Parker, Frederick C., III
Parrish, Robert D.
Paschall, Charles H.
Pasquale, Thomas L., Jr.
Paylor, John W.
Payne, Mack W.
Pelzmann, Gerald F.
Perkins, Joe C.
Perkins, John E.
Perry, Frederick C., Jr.
Perry, Ronnie L.
Peters, Curtis A.
Petkewitz, Thomas G.
Pfeil, Jimmy E.
Pickles, Richard W.
Pieri, Steven K.
Pinkus, David R.
Pittman, Paul M., Jr.
Pohl, Peter W.
Poirier, Robert G.
Ponder, Charles A.
Poole, James L.
Poore, Randolph T.
Port, Robert R.
Porter, William R.
Powell, Charles E.
Powers, George W.
Price, Dale R., O5022678
Pritchard, Paul C.
Proffitt, Robert W.
Purdy, William A., Jr.
Quinn, Dennis J.
Raburn, Henry L., Jr.
Ramirez, Rene
Ramsburg, Charles L.
Raney, Jerry F.
Reeves, Ronald G.
Regan, Timothy D.
Reid, Theodore W.
Rhodes, Jeter E., Jr.
Rich, Jimmie H.
Richardson, Sterling R.
Riley, Harold E., Jr.
Rimer, James R., Jr.
Ritchie, Robin P.
Ritter, Gary G.
Rivera, Erotido
Robblee, Paul A., Jr.
Robertson, Henry D.
Robertson, Richard P.
Robinson, David M. II.
Robinson, Kenneth W.
Robison, Charles L., Jr.
Rogers, James L.
Rogerson, William A.
Romine, Philo M.
Roming, Peter P.
Rominsky, Stephen A., Jr.
Rosecrans, Richard G.
Rosser, Lawrence B.
Rowe, John L., Jr.
Rubino, Lawrence F.
Ruble, Ray C.
Rugg, Stephen K.
Rush, Bobby G.
Russ, Joseph R., Jr.
Russell, Van B. III
Rutherford, Wilson R. III
Ryland, Charles M.
Sabo, Thomas W.
Saikowski, John J., Jr.
Saville, Dale W.
Sawyer, Philip A.
Schlatter, Joseph A., Jr.
Schmedeman, John R.
Schmidt, Keith A.
Schrader, Gregg M.
Schwabenbauer, James R.
Schweigert, Peter, Jr.
Schwoerke, Roland J
Scofield, Eugene L.
Seekins, Larry I.
Segar, Floyd L.
Serrem, Mark M.
Seward, Douglas J.
Shamlin, Gary E.
Sharkey, Vincent J., Jr.
Sharkey, William T.
Sharp, Gregory L.
Shea, Kerry H.
Sheldahl, Baron C.
Shipp, Charles A.
Shuford, Richard J.
Shyloski, Edward J.
Sides, Richard G.
Silva, Thomas E.
Simons, John E.
Sims, Joe A., Jr.
Singleton, Royce A., Jr.
Sisti, Francis J.
Skirvin, Glen D., Jr.
Slagle, Billy S.
Slaughter, James B.
Sloane, Medwyn D., III
Smidt, Orville B.
Smith, Earl F.
Smith, Edgar L., III
Smith, James E.
Smith, Larry G.
Smith, Mason E.
Smith, Roger B.
Smith, Walter A.
Smyth, Dennis L.
Snyder, Charles J., III
Spollen, John W.
Sporkmann, Carl H.
Stafford, Edward P., Jr.
Stanhope, Michael A.
Stark, Leroy W., Jr.
Staudte, Gerald K.
Steffy, Dean M.
Stephens, Jack R.
Stirling, James Y.
Stowell, Walter O.
Strand, Bruce G., O5536574
Strohm, Gary C.
Sullivan, Cavin F.
Swartz, Fred S.
Swenson, Francis B., Jr.
Taylor, David R.
Taylor, John C.
Taylor, Kenneth H., Jr.
Taylor, Michael E.
Taylor, Richard H.
Teixeira, Edward T.
Terrell, Richard D.
Theriault, Raymond J.
Thompson, Charles W.
Thompson, John A.
Thorne, Charles E., Jr.
Thornton, Michael D.
Thorpe, William C.
Timmes, Thomas A.
Tingley, Jack E.
Tison, Joseph T.
Tomoyasu, Wayne R.
Trbovich, Stephen M., II
Tualla, Larry G.
Tucker, Thomas A.
Turner, Courtney K
Turner, Edward W.
Turner, Lonnie C.
Ulisse, Peter
Upton, Joseph F.
Valencia, Samuel H.
Van Helsland, Marshall C., Jr.
Van Meter, Terry
Van Teslaar, David A.
Vaughan, Gerald P.
View, James E.
Vogler, Robert J.
Wallace, George R., III
Walsh, Robert M.
Walter, Thomas M.
Walters, John A.
Waltz, John B., III
Warren, Dennis J.
Warshawsky, Arnold S.
Watkins, John M., Jr.
Watson, Robert W., Jr.
Watson, Sherman E.
Webb, Stan L.
Weddle, Randall J.
Wegelin, Victor
Welch, Emmett A., II
Wells, John W., III
Whitaker, Gary D.
Whitehair, Charles A.
Whitehurst, James L., Jr.
Whiteside, Albert, III
Whitton, Robert W.
Wicker, Shelton B., Jr.
Williams, Duane E.
Williams, Lewis R., Jr.
Willison, Gary S.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Willman, Charles E.
Wills, Mark A.
Wilson, Daniel E.
Wilson, David E.
Wilson, Frank E.
Wilson, Haldon D., Jr.
Wilson, Woodrow O., Jr.
Winget, Harold W.
Wise, Lawrence F., Jr.
Witt, Sherrill A.
Woollever, Robert A.
Worthen, Dale L.
Yamaura, Lawrence
Yates, William E., Jr.
Yim, Gordon T. K. K. S.
Youmans, Tommy B.
Young, Earl W., Jr.
Zaehringer, Theodore A.
Zahn, Sylvan A., Jr.
Ziehler, Paul M.
Ziemann, Cornelius M.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 18, 1966:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Nathan M. Koffsky, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will read the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEBRUARY 21, 1966.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Rabbi Norman Zdanowitz, of the Congregation Beth Abraham, Auburn, Maine, offered the following prayer:

O Heavenly Father, inoculate with the radiance of Thy divine spirit those who are charged with the great responsibility of directing the affairs of our glorious and beloved country. Endow them with insight and foresight in this crucial period to champion and to safeguard mankind's inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Protect and sustain, strengthen and inspire our illustrious President, Vice President, and these distinguished leaders of this great Republic.

May the patriotism, wisdom, and courageous spirit of George Washington, whose birthday we reverently pause to celebrate tomorrow, ever serve as a lantern to illumine their path, to maintain a Government "which gives to bigotry no sanction and to persecution no assistance."

Vouchsafe Thy blessings upon the gallant men of our Armed Forces who have gone forth to arrest the reckless wave of unprovoked aggression and bloodshed on distant shores. Crown their efforts with triumph and enable them to achieve the suppression of tyranny and lawlessness.

May the United States remain a citadel of freedom and a watchtower from which rays of light and hope shall be beamed to those who are now living in darkness, poverty, and despair. Hasten the day when the millennial hope of justice, peace, and brotherly love shall be established and will prevail throughout the world. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 17, 1966, was read and approved.

DEATH OF ADM. CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Mr. **BOGGS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, another of the great heroes of World War II has disappeared with the death yesterday of Admiral of the Fleet Chester W. Nimitz.

Admiral Nimitz had spent all but 15 of his 81 years in the service of the U.S. Navy. In World War I he served in the Atlantic Fleet with a submarine division in a day when submarines were regarded as strange military instruments. In World War II he assumed command of our shattered forces at Pearl Harbor and 2 years later led the Pacific Fleet to victory in the battles of the Coral Sea, Midway, Tarawa, and the Marianas. His name is synonymous with many of the historic sea engagements of World War II.

Admiral Nimitz was a superb leader and a highly knowledgeable technician. He was the builder of the Navy's first diesel engine, the designer and builder of the first naval forward repair stations and maintenance squadrons which overcame a prime weakness in the naval fleet in the Pacific and contributed enormously to naval victories in that area.

Admiral Nimitz commanded a thousand ships and 2 million men and saw the successful culmination of the efforts of the Pacific Fleet from the deck of the U.S.S. *Missouri* when the Japanese capitulation was signed on September 2, 1945.

Throughout his long career he was five times awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for wartime exploits, received most of the Navy's highest decorations, and wide recognition for his outstanding service. While honors were showered upon him, he was no less honored and loved for his poise under fire, his tact and understanding, and his down-to-earth attitude.

All Americans mourn the passing of this great naval hero who defended our country so long and well.

I extend my sympathy to his family and loved ones.

Mr. **BOGGS**. Mr. Speaker, I should like my statement to follow the remarks which will appear in the RECORD by the distinguished majority leader relative to the death on yesterday of one of the great leaders of our country in World War II.

The name of Admiral Nimitz became as famous and as well known as any hero in the history of our Nation during World War II, when he commanded the greatest fleet ever assembled—over 1,000 fighting ships and well over a million fighting men—which conquered island after island in the Pacific, and which led to our victory over the Japanese Empire.

Our Nation has lost one of its greatest heroes.

Mr. **LAIRD**. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana on the passing of the great Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz.

All Americans have cause to mourn the passing of this great American who served his country so well in war and peace.

Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 20, 1966, marked the passing of one of our Nation's most famous admirals who died at his home on Yerba Buena Island, Calif.

Admiral Nimitz commanded the most powerful fleet the world has ever known in driving the Japanese Navy from the Pacific Ocean in World War II. He took over the shattered U.S. fleet shortly after the attack on Pearl Harbor and nurtured its recovery and growth into a force of 16,000 aircraft, 5,000 ships, and 2 million men—the mightest armada ever assembled.

It was a distinct honor for me to have served in the Pacific Fleet under Admiral Nimitz during this crucial period of time in our history.

On September 1, 1945, Fleet Admiral Nimitz was one of the signers of the United States when Japan formally signed the surrender terms aboard the battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay.

On October 5, 1945, which had been officially designated as "Nimitz Day" in Washington, D.C., Admiral Nimitz was personally presented a Gold Star in lieu of the third Distinguished Service Medal by the President of the United States "For exceptionally meritorious service as commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas, from June 1944 to August 1945."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the text of the citation which accompanied the Gold Star presentation on October 5, 1945, at this point in the RECORD.

The citation follows:

Initiating the final phase in the battle for victory in the Pacific, [he] attacked the Marianas, invading Saipan, inflicting a decisive defeat in the Japanese Fleet in the first battle of the Philippines and capturing Guam and Tinian. In vital continuing operations, his Fleet Forces isolated the enemy-held bastions of the Central and Eastern Carolines and secured in quick succession Peleliu, Angaur, and Ulithi. With reconnaissance of the main beaches on Leyte effected, approach channels cleared and opposition neutralized in joint operations to reoccupy the Philippines, the challenge by powerful task forces of the Japanese Fleet resulted in a historic victory in the three-phased battle for Leyte Gulf, October 24 to 26, 1944. * * * Fleet Admiral Nimitz culminated long-range strategy by successful amphibious assault on Iwo Jima and Okinawa * * * finally placed representative forces of the U.S. Navy in the harbor of Tokyo for the formal capitulation of the Japanese Empire. * * * He demonstrated the highest qualities of a naval officer and rendered services of the greatest distinction to his country.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the text of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy to all naval personnel at this point in the RECORD.

The message of the Secretary of the Navy dated February 21, 1966, follows:

From: The Secretary of the Navy.
To: ALNAV.
Unclas.

The Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and I join with all Navy and Marine Corps uniformed and civilian personnel in mourning the death of Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, U.S. Navy, in San Francisco, on Sunday, February 20.

During his lifetime, marked by many significant accomplishments in the naval service, he was an inspiration to all of us. He graduated with distinction in the Naval Academy class of 1905 and served in various ships, and commanded two, before undergoing submarine training. After many more commands and duties, he laid one of the cornerstones in the foundation of the Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps program when he installed and instructed in one of the first units at the University of California at Berkeley.

He was designated commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet, on December 17, 1941, and led U.S. forces in the Pacific Ocean area to victory, culminating in the signing of the surrender documents on U.S.S. *Missouri* on September 1, 1945, in Tokyo Bay. He relieved Fleet Adm. Ernest J. King as chief of naval operations in December 1945 and served in that capacity for 2 years. He was then assigned as Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy with offices in San Francisco. There he continued to serve his country in many ways, always with distinction. His passing is a great loss to the U.S. Navy and to the Nation, but his deeds and character will be an inspiration and standard for us all in the years to come. Typical of Fleet Admiral Nimitz, he requested simple ceremonies incident to his burial at the Golden Gate National Cemetery, a final resting place close to the service personnel who died in the Pacific. Fleet Admiral Nimitz will be buried on Thursday, February 24.

PAUL H. NITZE,
Secretary of the Navy.

ADM. CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to join in paying tribute to the memory of Adm. Chester W. Nimitz. He was truly a great American, a hero of the highest tradition.

I will leave it to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] and others to speak more extensively of this great man but I wanted to be recorded among those who cherished him as a friend and held him in highest esteem as a patriot to whom all Americans owe a debt of gratitude.

FLEET ADM. CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, with the death of Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, which occurred on yesterday, this Nation has lost the last of its five-star sailors who directed America's triumphant naval operations in the Pacific during World War II. Admiral Nimitz, as commander in chief, Pacific Fleet, masterminded some of the greatest and most decisive victories in naval history. History will undoubtedly recognize him as one of the great naval strategists of all time.

Admiral Nimitz was born at Fredericksburg, Tex., in the district I represent, on February 24, 1885, in a pioneer home, built of native stone. That old home is still occupied by members of his mother's family.

The admiral's paternal relatives lived a block away in the famous old Nimitz Hotel. That landmark was erected by the admiral's grandfather, Charles H. Nimitz, in 1852. The latter had been a merchant mariner and when he had been unable to return to his briny deep, he built the Nimitz in the shape of a ship. Gen. Robert E. Lee, on a frontier inspection trip, once signed the register at the Nimitz.

The admiral was the son of Chester Bernhard and Anna (Henke) Nimitz. His paternal great-grandparents, Charles Henrich and Meta (Meirrotte) Nimitz, came from Bremen, Germany, in 1843, and settled in Charleston, S.C. Shortly after that they resettled at Fredericksburg. There he grew up, and graduated from nearby Kerrville High School.

After graduating from the U.S. Naval Academy, seventh in his 1905 class, Nimitz progressed steadily and was promoted to rear admiral on June 23, 1938.

Following that, he distinguished himself with many assignments, and was well prepared for the great challenge that faced him on December 17, 1941, when he took over as commander in chief, Pacific Fleet.

Building from a navy that was in shambles, Admiral Nimitz lost no time. By August of 1945, when Japan surrendered, Nimitz had under his command what has been described as the greatest armada under one flag in history—6,256 ships of all types, and 14,847 combat aircraft. In addition to the regular Navy personnel, he also commanded six divisions of marines.

Faced with a formidable task, upon assumption of command of the Pacific Fleet Admiral Nimitz regrouped and reorganized his forces, and laid plans for new ships and a war plan to cope with the powerful Japanese naval fleet, bolstered by the infamous and disastrous attack at Pearl Harbor.

The first major clash occurred on May 4, 1942, in the Battle of the Coral Sea, a 5-day engagement. A spectacular victory resulted, and the threat to New Zealand and Australia was averted.

A month later came the Battle of Midway, and again the Nimitz strategy brought another great naval victory. After these two victories the admiral was later quoted as saying the eventual defeat of the Japanese was just a question of time. And he was right.

I last saw Admiral Nimitz at Fredericksburg on the occasion of the visit of German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, who was entertained at the nearby LBJ Ranch by the then Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson. The admiral flew in from San Francisco to join in the great public reception that was accorded the distinguished German visitor.

The admiral numbered his relatives who make their home in his native county by the hundreds. And his friends and admirers there could be counted in the thousands. He loved his old home, his relatives, and his friends who make their homes in Gillespie, Kerr, and surrounding counties.

Mr. Speaker, history has recorded in detail the blow-by-blow triumphs of the U.S. Navy and the Marines in the Pacific, under the brilliant command of the admiral whose death we mourn today. This Nation, and all men who cherish freedom, are forever indebted to this great American patriot.

HEALTH INSTRUCTION AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION: CONGRESS SHOULD AMEND THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, as we Americans increase our standard of living, the many modern conveniences that make our lives easier and more pleasant lead us toward physical inertia. We sit more and walk less. We are spectators more and participants less. We use power brakes, power steering, and power golf carts. We are now blessed with electric can openers, electric carving knives, and electric toothbrushes. It would not surprise me someday to see even our push buttons equipped with power assists.

Yet, modern life moves with an increasingly faster pace. The demands on our energies are growing. We have more work and less time in which to complete it. We face more pressure and feel greater strain. Even the activities of our leisure time are pursued with frenzy.

Confronted by these strenuous demands, we must not allow the benefits of progress to sap our vitality.

I am today introducing a bill to amend title III and title XI of the National Defense Education Act. These amendments will help encourage health and physical

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

education, just as the National Defense Education Act has stimulated academic progress.

The Congress has been urged to "amend the present national defense educational law so as to provide long needed assistance to the States to foster excellence in physical education." Vice President HUMPHREY recommended this in 1962, and I am pleased to sponsor legislation that seeks to make this suggestion a reality.

Just as it is important that our Nation meet its obligation to the development and training of childrens' intellectual capacities, it is also our obligation to assure their proper health and physical development. The eminent physician and heart specialist, Dr. Paul Dudley White, has said that "it is little short of criminal to educate our young people mentally, to have them die early of heart attacks and strokes; for example, at 40, because of neglect of their physical health."

The more we learn about the interrelationship of mind and body, the more it becomes clear that the ability to learn depends a great deal upon physical well-being. Yet, a hard look at the physical condition of many Americans is alarming.

On an average day, 1½ million Americans cannot get to work because of illness. Over a million are out of work for a week or more.

One out of five children cannot pass a simple test of physical performance.

Nearly 28 million Americans have some degree of physical disability. More than one-half of the population is significantly overweight. One-third of all American young men are judged to be unfit for duty in the Armed Forces for health reasons.

Like so many human problems, this pattern of physical neglect begins early in life. The place to correct it is with our young. For example, obesity begins early, and over one-third of American children are overweight. Poor dietary habits in adults are not so surprising when one recognizes that boys and girls in the 13 to 15 age bracket are the least likely of any age group to be eating proper foods. The worst offenders are teenage girls, tomorrow's homemakers and meal planners.

We should concentrate on adequate health and physical education programs in our public schools. Congress has rightfully established and supported a number of programs to strengthen the academic, vocational, and technical efforts of the Nation's public schools. Now we must recognize the need to do the same for the health and physical education departments. The bill I am introducing is designed to do just that.

The legislation I am sponsoring has two features. The first would amend title III of the National Defense Education Act to provide financial encouragement for classroom instruction in health and physical education. The second provision would amend title XI. This section would be revised so that regular session or short-term instruction would be available to those now teaching or planning to teach school health physical education. No Federal money would be spent for athletic equipment.

By amending titles III and XI of the National Defense Education Act, we can promote this needed health education and can move forward to attune our physical capabilities to the strenuous requirements of the 1960's. We can follow the example set and the goal urged by President Kennedy when he resolved that "by keeping physical fitness in the forefront of the Nation's concerns, the Federal Government can make a substantial contribution toward improving the health and vigor of our citizens."

BIRTHDAY SALUTE TO THE GAMBIA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am privileged and happy to announce that on Friday last, when we were not in session, the newest of the emerging nations of Africa, The Gambia, celebrated its first anniversary of independence.

I treasure as one of the rich memories of my service as a delegate to the 20th General Assembly of the United Nations all the details of that day last September when I, with many others, from many lands, stood with bared heads as the flag of The Gambia, just admitted as the 115th member of the United Nations, for the first time was proudly raised in appropriate ceremonies in front of the United Nations headquarters.

The Gambia is a former British colony and protectorate comprising a narrow strip of land along the lower 288 miles of the Gambia River in west Africa and stretching inland to a point 200 miles from the sea.

The territory is closely bound up with the river, which gives unequaled access to the interior of west Africa, for it is navigable by oceangoing vessels at all seasons for more than 200 miles from its mouth.

Under the new constitution, which entered into effect on April 27, 1962, The Gambia has achieved a considerable degree of self-government.

During World War II, The Gambia contributed soldiers for the Burmese campaign and served as an air stop and port of call for naval convoys.

The Gambia is naturally situated to handle the overseas trade of a large hinterland. The river, which steamers ply regularly, is the country's principal means of communication. There are about 30 river stations in the country. The only seaport is Bathurst.

The output of The Gambia is primarily agricultural. Some subsistence crops are raised, chiefly grain sorghum, but not enough to feed the inhabitants. Nearly all suitable land is planted with peanuts grown for export. Peanuts normally comprise 95 percent of total annual exports by value. The customs duty on these exports provides most of The Gambia's revenue. Other exports are palm kernals, hides, and beeswax. Cash crops pay for most of the inhabitants' requirements, including rice, a staple of their diet, and kola nuts. The leading imports are cotton cloth, foodstuffs, and hardware.

Local industries are limited to cotton weaving, garmentmaking, and fishing. Most of the overseas trade is carried in British ships. There is a British preferential tariff on imports. The monetary unit is the West African pound, at par with sterling.

While The Gambia follows a formal policy of nonalinement, it maintains particularly close and friendly relations with the United Kingdom, Senegal, and other African Commonwealth states. Although its representation abroad and its participation in international conferences is limited, The Gambia takes an active interest in international and particularly African affairs. It became a member of the Organization of African Unity in March 1965, and was admitted to the United Nations as that organization's 115th member in September of the same year.

The United States favors the expansion and strengthening of friendly ties with the people of The Gambia, and their orderly and progressive development in the political, social, and economic spheres and in friendly cooperation with their neighbors.

For the subcommittee on Africa, and for myself, I extend sincere and warm congratulations to the Prime Minister of The Gambia, the Honorable Dawda Kairaba Jawara, and to all the people of the proud land of the The Gambia on the occasion of the first anniversary of the independence of their nation.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the 18th of February marked the 1st anniversary of the independence of The Gambia. Although belatedly, we take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Dawda Kairaba Jawara, The Gambian Prime Minister, and to the wonderful people of this African country.

On February 18, 1965, the Union Jack of Great Britain was replaced by The Gambia's red, blue, green, and white flag in Bathurst, the capital of The Gambia. Situated on the west coast of Africa, this small country is bisected by the Gambia River and bordered on three sides by Senegal. Gambia has been a separate entity in Africa since 1888 when it became a British Crown Colony. Under its 1962 Constitution The Gambia received full internal self-government in October of 1963. The political structure is a traditional British one, with a unicameral legislature, elected by universal adult suffrage, and a cabinet led by Prime Minister David K. Jawara.

The Gambia's economy is almost exclusively agricultural, peanuts being the main cash crop and accounting for about 95 percent of the country's exports. There is some local industry, including peanut oil refining, cotton weaving, garmentmaking, and fishing. During the past year The Gambia has continued to look for ways of diversifying its agriculture and increasing output. The

Government is utilizing swamplands along the Gambia River for rice production. Gambia is to be commended for the economic success it has achieved, in view of the lack of mineral resources and the inadequacy of its agricultural resources—very poor, sandy soil in the uplands and swamps along the river which are often flooded in the wet season.

Great Britain and The Gambia continue to benefit from the close relationship begun in 1888. The Gambia has actively undertaken to improve her relations with Senegal during this past year.

Moreover, this African country has entered the world community through acceptance into the United Nations on September 22, 1965. Prime Minister Jawara visited New York City this past fall to acknowledge his country's entry into the United Nations.

It gives me great pleasure to congratulate Prime Minister Jawara and the people of The Gambia on their first anniversary of independence. We know they will continue to enjoy the blessings of steady economic progress and political stability in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members so desiring may have 5 legislative days in which to join me in a birthday salute to The Gambia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EYE CARE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the act which regulates the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia. This act was approved on May 28, 1924, and has not been amended during the more than 40 years which have intervened. Prior to its enactment, all of the 48 States which then constituted our Union, had enacted laws to regulate the practice of optometry. Every one of those laws has since 1924 been amended; most of them several times.

The Washington Daily News, the past few days, has reported that men who are not required to meet any educational or technical standards are now fitting customers with contact lenses. These men are not licensed, regulated, or supervised in any manner. From the News report, it is apparent that some of the work they are doing may be inadequate and unsanitary. In at least one case, a woman lost the sight of an eye.

Two men have been arrested and charged with violating the District's 42-year-old optometry law. According to the News, one of their reporters who sought to secure contact lenses did not have a doctor's prescription and was not even sent to a doctor to secure one. The salesman attempted to figure out the prescription from the glasses the reporter was wearing. This is highly dangerous, as not everyone can be fitted with contact lenses and those that can wear them generally need a different prescription from the one given them for their spectacles. The contact lenses may cause an abrasion of the eyeball, which, if infected, may result in the total loss of the eye.

Even if the accused are convicted, the existing law does not adequately protect the public from those operators who, according to the News report, are at best bilking the public out of its money, and at the worst, damaging their customer's eyesight. The News reports that frequently the unsuspecting public believes it is being served by licensed and well regulated vision specialists.

High-powered advertisements and fancy but expensive installment plans that conceal high rates of interest are being used to sell a health device which, when properly prescribed and fitted, can be highly beneficial to the user; but, on the other hand, it may be, and often is, highly dangerous.

President Johnson is well aware of the importance of vision. Pursuant to a joint resolution of the Congress, approved December 30, 1963, the President, on January 28 of this year, issued his Save Your Vision Week proclamation. He began it with a quotation from Shakespeare:

> He that is stricken blind cannot forget the precious treasure of his eyesight lost.

He went on to say:

> Those words of Shakespeare are relevant to us today as we proclaim Save Your Vision Week, 1966. They remind us that the gift of sight is one of the glories of life. To the child it is a red balloon—a mother's smile—a form in a passing cloud—a tree with autumn leaves.
>
> Those words of Shakespeare remind us, too, that the eyesight which most of us take for granted in our daily lives can be snatched from any of us, almost without warning.

He then listed the optometric profession as one concerned with programs for the improvement and preservation of vision. As a matter of fact, optometry is the first line of defense against blindness and is dedicated to improving and conserving the vision of our entire population.

The members of this profession were the first to volunteer their services in the war on poverty. Last summer through their organization called Volunteers for Vision, they made an outstanding contribution to Project Headstart for preschool children. The honorary chairman of Volunteers for Vision is Miss Luci Baines Johnson.

This Congress and the preceding Congress have wisely included schools and colleges of optometry and optometry students in the health education legislation authorizing the expenditure of Federal funds for the expansion and improvement of the health professions by providing more and better educational and library facilities.

Most of you will recall the battle which medicine and dentistry fought to eliminate fraudulent and deceptive advertising from their profession. Today optometry is fighting the same battle and has succeeded in most of the States of the Union. But, unfortunately, this is not true in our Nation's Capital.

As far back as 1955, the U.S. Supreme Court, in the case of Williams against Lee Optical, sustained the Oklahoma law which contained provisions similar to provisions in the bill just introduced. The Court held that "State regulation of advertising relating to eye examinations was a matter reasonably and rationally related to the health and welfare of the people." The Court went further and reversed the lower court, which struck down the provision of the Oklahoma law relating to the sale of eyeglass frames. In sustaining the statute the Supreme Court said:

> If the advertisement of lenses is to be abolished or controlled, the advertising of frames must come under the same restraints; or so the legislature might think. We see no constitutional reason why a State may not treat all who deal with the human eye as members of a profession who should use no merchandising methods for obtaining customers.

That is one of the purposes of the bill which I have introduced.

Last year the Senate Subcommittee on Frauds and Misrepresentations Affecting the Elderly included among its many recommendations the following statement:

> Testimony taken by this subcommittee reveals that the last congressional action in this field (eye care) within the District dates back to 1924. Testimony taken by this subcommittee suggests that new merchandising methods have occurred since that action, and it is recommended that the Senate District of Columbia Committee examine the adequacy of present District laws on—
>
> (a) Widespread fixed-price advertising for regular glasses and contact lenses;
>
> (b) Sale of over-the-counter nonprescription glasses;
>
> (c) Possible need for greater authority to the District Commissioners for regulation of the corporate practice of optometry.

My proposal contains appropriately worded sections to correct the problems uncovered by this Senate subcommittee.

Under date of January 7, 1966, Dr. Zachary Ephraim, president of the Board of Optometry of the District of Columbia, addressed a letter to the President of the District Board of Commissioners, in which he transmitted a draft of a bill which had been prepared by the Board of Optometry in cooperation with the District of Columbia Department of Occupations and Professions, the Optometric Society of the District of Columbia, and the American Optometric Association. It was designed to improve the District law as it pertains to the practice of optometry. The bill I have proposed contains all of the essential provisions of the Board's draft. As pointed out in Dr. Ephraim's letter, there is nothing in it that is not now contained in the laws of one or more of the States. The purpose of the revision is to bring the standards of practice in the city of Washington up to a level which exists in most of our States and it will provide adequate protection for the visual needs of persons seeking vision care within the District of Columbia.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

As the Nation's Capital, we have visitors from all over the world and from every part of our country. They are entitled to the same high standards for the practice of optometry which prevail in their home communities. Mr. Speaker, that is the purpose of the bill which I have introduced. I hope that it will receive prompt and favorable action by the House District Committee and the House of Representatives itself.

THOSE WHO COUNT

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker—

> America has the courage, the will, and the resources to defend the frontlines of freedom against the tide of Communist aggression.

These words appeared recently in an editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer, which properly believes that America's purpose and commitment in Vietnam were made a matter of formal public record in the historic Hawaii meeting.

Meanwhile, the newspaper states:

> With Vice President HUMPHREY accompanying the South Vietnamese leaders back to Saigon on the first leg of an extensive diplomatic mission to rally the forces of freedom in Asia, the implementation of policies agreed upon at Honolulu is underway.

Even as the war goes on, the Inquirer believes:

> There will be an acceleration of cooperative programs by American and South Vietnamese officials to improve the economy of South Vietnam, raise the living standards, fight hunger and disease and build the foundations of a democratic, self-governing society.

The Inquirer is convinced that:

> The United States, in alliance with South Vietnam, holds the trump cards—in military power, in economic resources, and in the moral issue of self-determination versus Communist enslavement.

This is an impressive, forthright summation of the situation and I would like to make it available to others by having it printed in the RECORD.

THE DECLARATION OF HONOLULU

> America's purpose in Vietnam, and America's commitment to the South Vietnamese Government and people, have been made a matter of formal public record in the historic conference at Honolulu.
>
> With the return of President Johnson and his advisers to Washington, and with Vice President HUMPHREY accompanying the South Vietnamese leaders back to Saigon on the first leg of an extensive diplomatic mission to rally the forces of freedom in Asia, the implementation of policies agreed upon at Honolulu is underway.
>
> What, precisely, are these policies proclaimed jointly by the United States and South Vietnam?
>
> Essentially, they are a mutual resolve to frustrate Communist attempts to conquer the territory and people of South Vietnam by armed aggression and terrorism.
>
> The Red assaults will be countered by defensive military action, of whatever intensity is required and for as long as necessary.
>
> Tireless efforts to achieve a negotiated peace will continue.
>
> Meanwhile, even as the war goes on, there will be an acceleration of cooperative programs by American and South Vietnamese officials to improve the economy of South Vietnam, raise the living standards, fight hunger and disease, and build the foundations of a democratic, self-governing society.
>
> How, it is being asked in some quarters, are these noble goals of freedom and peace and democracy—so solemnly proclaimed in the Declaration of Honolulu—to be achieved when the Communist North Vietnamese refuse to negotiate and when the South Vietnamese vow never to recognize the Red Vietcong?
>
> There is no clear answer because, in our judgment, it is the wrong question. The wailing voices of woe, who call constantly for an American surrender in Vietnam, manage always and very conventiently to overlook the problems confronting the Communists.
>
> The United States, in alliance with South Vietnam, holds the trump cards—in military power, in economic resources, and in the moral issue of self-determination versus Communist enslavement.
>
> We believe that Ho Chi Minh and his comrades in Hanoi are the ones who ought to be worrying the most about escalation of the war—and we suspect they are.
>
> America has the courage, the will, and the resources to defend the frontlines of freedom against the tide of Communist aggression. Let this be the message Vice President HUMPHREY conveys.

ALLOWANCE OF TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR MOVING EXPENSES

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, today it is my pleasure to introduce a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to avoid tax discrimination against the construction worker.

These builders of America have been truly the forgotten and neglected people of our generation. Too often their needs have been given a back seat to the less meritorious demands of more entrenched groups.

Specifically, the inequity which I hope to correct is in the allowance of deductions for moving expenses for workers of the trades and crafts of the construction industry.

The Internal Revenue Code provides a general rule that:

> There shall be allowed as a deduction moving expenses * * * in connection with the commencement of work by the taxpayer as an employee at a new principal place of work. (Internal Revenue Code 217.)

This is a good principle, Mr. Speaker, and it has general application for almost everyone except those who need it most—the construction worker.

The code goes on, in its conditions for allowance of the deduction, to provide time limitations and other requirements which virtually eliminate the construction worker. In short, the effect is that the worse a construction worker needs this deduction, and the more he really deserves it—the less his actual chances are of obtaining it—Internal Revenue Code, section 217(c) (2).

This, Mr. Speaker, is the inequity my bill is designed to correct and it is my sincere hope that my colleagues will see its merit and offer their active support for this amendment.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson said in his food-for-freedom message:

> A balance between agricultural productivity and population is necessary to prevent the shadow of hunger from becoming a nightmare of famine.

This last week, at the gracious invitation of Chairman COOLEY of the House Committee on Agriculture, I was privileged to hear 10 distinguished experts submit their predictions and then offer their recommendations as to how this "nightmare of famine" might be avoided.

Their recommendations fell into two broad categories, as I understood them:

First. Make every effort to reduce rates of population growth.

Second. Make every effort to increase agricultural productivity in these same lands faced with the blight of famine closing in over them.

Every witness emphasized that there was no apparent means of providing adequate food for those who have joined the banquet of life while the population explosion becomes more violent. The last witness, Prof. Theodore Schultz, of the University of Chicago, urged that adequate American agricultural resources be devoted to providing food for those now starving; that we follow the recommendations of the President in assisting our friends to modernize their agriculture; and that we allocate a portion of the funds received from the sale of food for freedom to family planning and birth control activities.

I offered this last idea to the House in a speech made following the President's message. Since then, I have explored it more fully, and considered it in the light of the remarks of these outstanding experts which have appeared before the distinguished Committee on Agriculture. I should like to offer it in more detail today, so that it may be further discussed and improved.

On February 14, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] introduced the food-for-freedom bill, H.R. 12785. Section 103(b) of title I includes a provision that the President may determine that foreign currencies may be received as payment for food for freedom in order to implement certain purposes defined by subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of section 304. I suggest that section 103 (b) be extended to include a new subsection (l) of section 304.

I suggest that to section 304 be added a new subsection (1), which might read as follows:

> For financing programs emphasizing maternal, child health and nutrition, and family planning services, and research activities related to the problems of population growth, for which purpose not less than fifteen per centum of the currencies received pursuant to title I shall be available, through and under the procedures established by the President upon request of the country with which the agreement is made: *Provided*, That the President is authorized to carry out the foregoing provisions of this subsection through any agency of the United States, or any international agency and/or organization of which the United States is a member, and which he determines is qualified to administer such activities.

This would mean that food for freedom would be used twice: once, to help fill empty stomachs now; and twice, to avoid empty stomachs in the future. This is the basic merit of the idea.

Now let us explore the idea in somewhat more detail. It suggests providing a total family service—to the mother, to her children, and to the entire family group. It is directed to the health, wellbeing, and happiness of all of them. And if the program were implemented as a unit—directed to the mother, father, and the children, it would achieve its greatest effectiveness at the least cost.

Dr. W. H. Sebrell, Jr., director of the School of Nutrition Sciences at Columbia University, testified before the committee:

> Protein calorie malnutrition is actually one of the largest causes of the death of children. It is estimated that 70 percent of the children in developing areas suffer from malnutrition and upward of 3 million children die annually from malnutrition, largely of this type. This fact is hidden because these deaths often are recorded as being from diarrhea, parasites, and infectious diseases. If these children were well nourished, they would not die of the intercurrent diseases. In those millions it does not kill, malnutrition permanently impairs their growth and probably causes irreversible mental and emotional damage. The mother's ignorance is of the greatest importance to the nutrition of the small child in that she does not recognize that the child is suffering from malnutrition.

My provision would look to this child health and nutrition problem. It would look to the health of the mother. And it would provide her, if she wished, information on family planning and birth control, so that she and her husband might space and number their family in the manner in which they feel they could best support it. Therefore, this provision would assist the parents, and offer them personal help.

It would assist the children, now being, and those unborn, to better realize their potentials, and it would move to eliminate the social and political instability which accompanies hunger and frustration.

What of the other part of the problem—providing more food for the total increases in population which will occur, even if family planning programs are given a great push. In his message, President Johnson said:

> Many of the developing countries urgently need to give a higher priority to improving and modernizing their own production and distribution of food.

Section 103 of title I of the bill introduced by Chairman COOLEY says "take into account efforts of countries to help themselves toward a greater degree of self-reliance, especially in providing enough food to meet the needs of their people, and the resources required to attain that objective." The bill is intended to help increase the agriculture productivity of nations as rapidly as possible—which is the other side of the coin.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe the addition of the section I have suggested would round out this important legislation, and make it a total attack on hunger, deprivation, and the terror of famine. Today, unlimited population growth is on a collision course with limited food supply. Only total attack will avert disaster.

OUR FRIENDS, THE FEDS

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, my friend Opie L. Shelton, executive vice president and general manager of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, has long since established himself as a man of unusual clarity and vision. One of his many services to Atlanta and the State of Georgia is his continuing attempt to effect a realistic attitude toward the Federal Government. I laud his most recent effort, an article in the February issue of Atlanta magazine. It is a forceful presentation, and I include it at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Atlanta Magazine, February 1966]

OUR FRIENDS, THE FEDS

(By Opie L. Shelton)

The reason Atlanta has become partners with the Federal Government in so many projects is that Georgia's State government has failed to enter the world of reality where her cities are concerned.

The old county unit system, one of the greatest calamities any State ever experienced, was the prime villain. It placed the absolute control of State government in the hands of people who were openly antagonistic to the cities. Atlanta was their favorite whipping boy.

Today Atlanta receives less financial assistance from the State than any of the largest 25 cities of the Nation. Even though the county unit has been abolished (courtesy of the Federal Government) many of the people who run the State still think in county unit fashion. They still don't understand the problem, nor do many of them seem to want to understand.

Georgia has moved from a rural to an urban society, but so far as the State government's reaction to urban needs are concerned one might think we were still living in a cotton-dominated economy.

The State highway department is a good example. If it had not been for the Federal Government we wouldn't have even the pitifully few major thoroughfares we have today. That department's philosophy has been so politically-oriented that the cities have been systematically shunted aside when the highway tax dollar has been divided.

State government that isn't responsive to the needs of its cities is soon going to find itself * * * useless * * *. America will double its population by the year 2000, we are told, and better than 90 percent of that growth is going to be in urban areas.

The Federal Government appears to understand these simple facts of life. And that is why Atlanta and every other growing city is forced to beat a path to Washington. A city that is treated as an unwanted child must, of necessity, seek a foster parent.

Most of the people who yell loudest about States' rights and cry havoc about big Federal Government are those who have done the least to exercise the responsibilities that go along with States' rights. They are phonies and frauds to the core.

If State governments are to survive they had better take inventory and begin to exercise better judgment in their treatment of their cities.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AGENCIES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies of the Select Committee on Small Business have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate; and I make the same request for Wednesday and Thursday of this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WATCH THE TROJAN HORSE

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Senator KENNEDY and others would have us welcome the Vietcong into the process of settling the fighting in Vietnam by inviting them to be a part of any future government there.

History indicates that this course would be full of danger.

In this connection, it is appropriate to quote the words of the distinguished historian, Samuel Eliot Morison, in his recently published "Oxford History of the American People." Writing about the Iron Curtain and the diplomatic mistakes which the Allies made at the close of the war, he says:

> The final mistake was the assumption that a joint regime, Communist and non-Communist, would work in defeated or liberated countries, like the "popular front" governments before the war.

Later, he says:

> The event proved that no popular front with Communists could have any other result but a Communist Party takeover.

It is clear that we must proceed carefully in this respect. This does not mean that Vietcong, as individual South Vietnamese, would not be listened to along with Buddhists, Catholics, Montagnards, North Vietnamese exiles, and others. It would mean, however, that they would not be given an opportunity to move into sensitive government departments and take over by indirection as was done in Eastern Europe.

It is also educational to recall President Kennedy's statement in Berlin, in 1963, when he said:

> I am not impressed by the opportunities open to popular fronts throughout the world. I do not believe that any democrat can successfully ride that tiger.

Recent dispatches from Peiping and Hanoi have suggested growing doubts about the conduct of their military effort, the strain on the economy, and the resulting emergence of a peace element.

Now is the time to emphasize firmness rather then vacillation.

TELEVISING OF HOUSE PROCEEDINGS

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the eyes of the Nation last week were focused on the South Vietnam hearings conducted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Most of the appraisals of the hearings that I have heard on this side of the Congress have been very unfavorable, but I submit to the Speaker—and I speak primarily to the House majority floor leader and the Speaker of the House—that there is one thing we should have learned from these hearings: Under no circumstances should we ever permit House proceedings to be televised. The televising of House proceedings, Mr. Speaker, is the most effective way I know to convert serious deliberative proceedings into a first-class comedy.

RADIO FREE ASIA

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have this morning sent a letter to Mr. Crawford H. Greenewalt, chairman of the board of directors of Radio Free Europe, urging that his organization investigate the feasibility of establishing a Radio Free Asia in an effort to counteract the relentless barrage of hate propaganda now being disseminated by the Communist Chinese throughout southeast Asia.

My admiration and respect for Radio Free Europe is boundless. It has been, and continues to be, one of the most effective private means of disseminating truth to the captive nations of Eastern Europe ever devised in modern society. It is my hope that a similar effort can and will be made in the strife-ridden areas of Asia.

With your permission I should like to read the text of my letter to Mr. Greenewalt and urge my distinguished colleagues to associate themselves with it if they share my belief that a Radio Free Asia can be an important ally in our struggle for the minds of Asia's peoples:

> DEAR MR. GREENEWALT: It is imperative that our Nation, through its private citizens as well as through its Government, do everything possible to offset the fantastic volume of vicious propaganda now being drummed into the minds of the Asian peoples by the Red Chinese.
>
> Since World War II, few organizations have done a more effective job of presenting the truth to captive nations and their people than Radio Free Europe. Most of the time the only access the peoples of Eastern Europe have to the truth is through our own Government's agency, the Voice of America and through Radio Free Europe.
>
> It becomes increasingly apparent, in these perilous times in Asia, that there is a grave and pressing need for an operation similar to Radio Free Europe in this part of the world. Communist propagandists are expending millions of dollars and thousands of hours of air time in an unceasing barrage of hatred against America and the free world.
>
> We must counteract this relentless campaign through every effective channel available to us as a free country.
>
> I therefore strongly urge that you and the members of the board of your organization give serious consideration to the formation of a Radio Free Asia. Such action, I am convinced, will assist the official agencies of our own Government and those of other free nations in this world in their effort to win the minds of millions away from the seductive and totalitarian influence of Red China.
>
> The bulk of the world's population lives in this troubled and terror-stricken region. There is no doubt, whatever, that the Chinese Communist regime recognizes the pivotal role the commitment of these millions of human beings will play in their quest for world domination.
>
> Our American Government and its people stand firmly against the encroachment of communism in southeast Asia. We have made our stand known through economic assistance and through the commitment of men and arms to aid South Vietnam in its heroic fight against aggression from the North.
>
> We must seek to win the propaganda war as well. And in that war there is no greater weapon than truth.
>
> The American people should be given the opportunity to enlist in that struggle through a voluntary, nonprofit, nongovernmental agency in addition to all the official effort new being made. Radio Free Asia can become a reality. I pray that you, the members of your board and the expert advisers you have working with you may be able to make it so.

"LOVE-INS"

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, according to U.S. News & World Report of February 28, 1966, the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County has ordered an inquiry into what one of the supervisors terms "love-ins," permitted under the welfare progam in Los Angeles.

At issue is a rule which permits aid to a family with dependent children, even though the man who lives in the house is neither married to the mother nor is the father of the children.

Said Supervisor Frank G. Bonelli:

> We have had sit-ins and lie-ins, and now we have love-ins. This places a stigma and indictment upon supervisors unless we actively challenge this phase of the welfare program.
>
> Taxpayers must not be forced to subsidize any welfare program that has the inherent danger of promoting illegitimacy, to say nothing about apparent outright immorality.

RESOLUTION TO BAR DISCRIMINATION AGAINST U.S. EMPLOYEES

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution calling for an end to discrimination in the assignment of U.S. employees to overseas posts.

The administration has been practicing religious discrimination in its assignment of employees abroad, thereby preventing assignment of qualified Jewish employees to U.S. posts in Arab-bloc countries.

The resolution which I am introducing today expresses the sense of the Congress that the President should take such steps as may be necessary to assure that the assignment of U.S. employees in the United States and at posts abroad shall be made without regard to race, religion, color, or national origin.

By its demonstrated willingness to go along with the anti-Semitism practiced by these Arab-bloc countries when assigning U.S. personnel abroad, the administration is guilty of following a double standard, properly outlawing discrimination by private employers at home, but improperly discriminating in assigning its own employees abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I would welcome the support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for this important measure.

A TRIBUTE TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD RESERVE ON ITS 25TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, on February 19, 1941, a new Reserve component of our Armed Forces was born, and it is with great pleasure that I take this opportunity to pay tribute to this fine organization, the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve.

From my personal experience and long association with the Coast Guard Reserve, both as a commissioned officer and a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I can state with a great deal of conviction that its members, whatever their individual backgrounds may be, reflect one thing in common—devotion, extreme pride, and an intense feeling of national responsibility.

Prior to the outbreak of World War II, the Coast Guard had no organized reserve, and its entire strength numbered less than 20,000 officers and men. With ever-increasing duties as the approaching war threatened this Nation, the Coast Guard found it necessary to expand as rapidly as possible, and thus the Coast Guard Reserve came into being.

With the outbreak of war in Europe in September 1939, Coast Guard ships, planes, and stations were ordered to carry out extensive patrols to insure that merchant ships in our waters did not violate the neutrality proclaimed by President Roosevelt. The next summer the Coast Guard began its port security operations under the revised Espionage Act of 1917 and the newly enacted Dangerous Cargo Act.

On November 1, 1941, the Coast Guard was ordered to operate as part of the Navy. The next month Pearl Harbor was bombed, and we were in the war. As in World War I, a big part of the Coast Guard's task was antisubmarine warfare. Coast Guard cruising cutters and convoy escorts helped with the battle of the Atlantic as they sank 11 U-boats. At the same time, more than 4,000 survivors of torpedoings and other enemy action were rescued from the Atlantic and Mediterranean by Coast Guardsmen.

But there were losses too. The cutter *Hamilton* went down while in tow after being torpedoed off Iceland. The *Acacia* was sunk in the Caribbean; *Escanaba, Leopold, Muskeget,* and *Natsek* in the Atlantic; *Serpens* in the Pacific. Only two of the crew survived *Escanaba*—no one, on board *Muskeget, Serpens,* or *Natsek.* More than 90 percent of those who went down with these vessels were members of the newly established Reserve component of the Coast Guard.

When she was desperately needed for convoy duty in the North Atlantic and was thrown into the breach to help stem the mounting losses to German submarines, the *Escanaba* was based at Grand Haven, Mich. The members of her crew and their families were a valued and highly respected part of that small community. The tragic loss of the *Escanaba* with all but two of her crew was a deep and personal tragedy to that entire region. Today, those men are still mourned in Grand Haven. Each year, memorial exercises are conducted there, in memory of the *Escanaba* and the gallant men who perished when that vessel went down.

Many more reservists manned landing craft that hit the invasion beaches with assault troops at Guadalcanal, Anzio, Tarawa, Attu, north Africa, Salerno, Makin, Kwajalein, Eniwetok, Normandy, southern France, Luzon, Guam, Saipan, Iwo Jima, Okinawa—the Coast Guard Reserve made all those stops and a lot in between. At the conclusion of the war the Coast Guard had 802 vessels of its own and in addition was manning 351 Navy and 288 Army craft.

Total personnel had reached a peak of approximately 174,000 and of that number more than 150,000 were Coast Guard reservists who had entered the service for wartime duty. Many of that number formed the nucleus for the establishment of our regular peacetime Reserve and are still serving with Reserve components. Others have completed their 20 or more years of satisfactory service and, having reached the age of 60, are now retired under the Reserve Retirement Act.

Through its intensive and well-organized training program the Coast Guard Reserve is today a highly trained and efficient organization which, I am confident, that if called to the defense of this Nation, would prove to be both ready and reliable and once again would serve with honor and distinction. I am extremely proud to be a member of this organization and honor it here on its 25th anniversary.

BOYCOTTING SHIPS OF NATIONS SUPPLYING NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the action taken on February 18, 1966, by the Maritime Trades Department of the AFL–CIO in proposing a boycott of ships of nations which permit any of its flag vessels to carry or supply goods to North Vietnam clearly reflects a deep concern about this intolerable situation.

It is indeed tragic that the administration has remained so indifferent that it has become necessary that individual efforts be undertaken to pressure our Government into halting this aid and comfort to our enemy.

The recent administration action prohibiting vessels which engage in trade with the Hanoi regime from carrying U.S. Government financed cargoes, while certainly necessary, is clearly insufficient to bring about an end to free world traffic into the harbor of Haiphong.

If the administration is not sufficiently concerned to stop this trade then it is clearly the responsibility of the Congress to do so. Legislation to close our ports to those helping to supply North Vietnam is now pending before the Congress and should receive our early and favorable consideration.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple issue, and I predict that if the administration continues to abdicate its responsibility of leadership it will continue to be shoved into doing whatever necessary to stop this trade.

POSTSCRIPT ON A SOLDIER

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, on October 6 of last year I rose on the floor of this House to express my regret and deep concern over a soldier from the 1st Cavalry Division—Airmobile—who had gone on a self-imposed hunger strike protesting his assignment to Vietnam on the grounds that he disagreed with our policy there. On that day, Mr. Speaker, the world had heard a great deal about this soldier, Pvt. Winstel Belton, and relatively little about the newly formed 1st Air Cavalry. But how things have changed since October 6. Over the past months the world has learned about the 1st Cavalry. Its victories, its bravery, and its sacrifices are well known and are now a matter of record; while the story of Private Belton has been out of the news entirely. But, Mr. Speaker, while he has been out of the news, a great change has come over this soldier. He has distinguished himself in the service of his country, he has won honor on the battlefield, and has earned a promotion to private, first class. Therefore, I think it only fitting that I insert in the RECORD the very gratifying postscript to the story of Winstel Belton, as reported last week in an article from the Atlanta Journal:

SOLDIER WHO WENT ON STRIKE WINS HONOR ON BATTLEFIELD

(By Peter Arnett)

BEN CAT, SOUTH VIETNAM.—Six months ago a university graduate named Winstel R. Belton staged a 7-day hunger strike at Fort Benning, Ga., to dramatize his distaste for being drafted and his refusal to fight in Vietnam.

Thursday a big, proud smile flashed across Belton's face as he was promoted to private, first class, on a battlefield in South Vietnam.

Looking just as proud was his company commander, Capt. R. E. Spriggs of Mexico, N.Y., a professional soldier who hated everything Belton's hunger strike had stood for.

Spriggs was furious last November when he returned to his unit after recovering from a bullet wound to find Belton assigned there.

Spriggs said Thursday he would take the 26-year-old Winslow, Ariz., soldier into combat with him anytime, anywhere.

Belton arrived in Vietnam with a 12-month suspended jail sentence hanging over his head because of his hunger strike in mid-August. A court-martial had given him a bad conduct discharge, total forfeiture of pay and the jail sentence.

But he was also given a chance.

Belton, a Negro, was told that if he went to Vietnam and proved himself, he would not have to serve his jail sentence. If he failed, he would serve it.

His old unit, the U.S. Army's 1st Cavalry Airmobile Division, wouldn't take him back. The 1st Infantry Division accepted him.

Spriggs was the only man in A company of the 2d Battalion, 28th Regiment, who knew that the new radio-telephone operator was the hunger striker Belton.

Lt. Gus Berzines, a weapons platoon commander from Kalamazoo, Mich., recalled talking with Belton one day about various things and finally saying, "You mean you're that Belton?"

More and more men in the unit began realizing that Belton had publicly protested what they themselves had accepted as a patriotic duty. None of them brought up the subject with him except the company commander, and few ever discussed it among themselves.

"That was his business," said Sgt. Frederick Range of Dallas, Tex. "We treated him like any other soldier."

Belton, holder of a bachelor of science degree in education, was initially cold and reserved with his buddies. But the heat of battles in December and January melted his attitude and forged ever-tightening bonds with Spriggs and the other men in the company.

Initially given the job of laying wires between the company headquarters and the platoons, he began carrying Spriggs' radio.

Early in January, he proved he had what it takes.

Sp5c. Larry Kabriel of Summerfield, Kans., recalls that the company was under heavy fire near Trung Lap and an urgent call came over the radio for Captain Spriggs.

The radioman shouted back: "The captain's not here. He's up front. There's heavy fire, I can't reach him."

Kabriel said Belton shouted out, "It's your duty to get up to the captain," crawled over to the reluctant radioman, grabbed the apparatus and moved up under fire to his captain.

Spriggs has used him as his radioman ever since.

"Belton in his conduct and bearing has been above average as a soldier and a valuable asset," Sprigg said. "He has worked in very well socially and he has got along with the men.

"I am personally satisfied that he now honestly believes his actions in the past have not been consistent with being a soldier or a man.

"I personally wrote to the commanding general recommending that he be promoted and his sentence remitted. Belton has seen men fight and die for his country, and he has felt the honor that comes when you do fight."

Spriggs tried to promote Belton 2 months ago. but the Army wanted to wait longer. Spriggs was told he must be absolutely sure Belton had changed his ways.

"I told Belton he deserved to be promoted," Spriggs said. I knew he was happy. I knew he felt he had made it."

MOUNT VERNON

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, with the celebration of George Washington's birthday, I must call the attention of the Congress to a series of recent editorials emphasizing the imminent danger to the view from Mount Vernon if Congress does not act during this session.

These excellent editorials testify to the efforts of my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, Hervey Machen, to prod the administration and the Congress into fulfilling the commitment made in the early 1960's with the passage of Public Law 87-362, to save the view from Mount Vernon. This law was introduced by Senator Clinton Anderson in the Senate and by the gentleman from Colorado, Chairman Wayne Aspinall, and myself in the House.

With the passage of that law—without a dissenting vote—the Accokeek Foundation under the presidency of our beloved colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio, Frances Bolton, along with the Alice Ferguson Foundation, agreed to donate to the Federal Government, without cost, about half the land needed to protect the view.

Beyond that, over 130 private landowners have, without cost, donated scenic easements to the Department of the Interior to further this effort to save the view from Mount Vernon.

The State of Maryland has passed pioneering tax reform legislation recognizing the public purpose of these donations, and the Prince Georges County has passed the first local scenic space laws in the land, giving tax credits to the donors.

This is the greatest joining together of private, foundation, county, State, and Federal efforts to preserve our heritage for the people of this Nation.

Here is the one shining example of a project where everyone has done his part—except the Federal Government.

Unless the Federal Government acts now—at this session of Congress—this great pilot project will dismally fail. Other States, counties, organizations, and individuals throughout the Nation, who have watched the development of this unique project, may well be discouraged in their efforts.

Fortunately, my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, Hervey Machen, who took office in January 1965, and who represents the area in Maryland opposite Mount Vernon, has placed before us a bill to get the Federal Government moving again. This bill provides for the increases in land prices due to the Government procrastination in purchasing the remaining acreage needed.

We have been constantly reminding the Congress and the executive that further delays and procrastination will be the death knell of this project to which so many have devoted so much. Congressman Machen deserves our full support in this campaign to complete this task so well begun.

To lose all that has been accomplished would be a real tragedy. The loss would be not only of the millions of dollars worth of lands and rights in lands being patriotically donated without cost, but also the loss of the pilot project in which Federal funds are outweighed by foundation and private donations, and the protection of natural beauty of a large area is accomplished without increased expense, dislocation of families, and attendant problems.

Congressman Machen has thoughtfully said:

> If we can show the country how we can carry out an experiment in cooperative and coordinated scenic protection such as this program at Piscataway Park opposite Mount Vernon, we are setting the stage for a great movement across the country.

If the Congress does not act on Congressman Machen's bill this session, we will have failed. We cannot wait longer for the Department of the Interior to make up its mind whether or not to support the President's year-old program to make the Potomac a "model river of scenic and recreation values for the country."

Let us move quickly to do our part, as indicated in these recent editorials:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 15, 1965]

THREAT AT PISCATAWAY

Back in 1961 Congress leaped at a rare opportunity to preserve forever, at moderate Federal cost, more than 1,100 acres of choice shoreline property along the Potomac near Maryland's Piscataway Creek—directly across the river from historic Mount Vernon.

In brief, this remarkable deal provided that the Federal Government need buy only about half the newly authorized Piscataway Park. The remainder, it was understood, would be acquired entirely by private donation. And the 1961 law also authorized the Park Service to seek scenic easements—also free—restricting obtrusive development in a vast area of an additional 2,596 acres contiguous to the park.

Well, the private part of the bargain has progressed with phenomenal success. Thus far, private foundations have actually donated or committed themselves to donate some 499 acres for the park. Scenic easements have been contributed by more than 120 landowners, involving about 900 acres of land. These generous donations are conditioned, however, as might be expected, on the firm understanding that the Government meet its obligation. And the sad fact is that the time when these donations may begin to revert from Federal control is rapidly approaching.

For the Government has not held up its end. Thus far, only 97 acres have been bought—largely because the figure authorized for expenditure by Congress in the 1961 act has proved to be grossly inadequate. Before further funds will be appropriated, the authorization needs to be increased some $2.5 million. Representative Hervey Machen is leading the sensible legislative fight for the increase, and seems to have met a stone wall.

The latest frustration surprisingly came from the conservation-minded Interior Department itself, which the other day recommended to Congress that the Machen bill be "deferred" pending the outcome of "a broad study" of all of Interior's land-acquisition programs. The presumption is that the study will wind up early next year. But there is no assurance of that, and, even if there were, any loss of time at this stage of the Piscataway project constitutes a threat.

It is a needless threat. Instead of his wishy-washy approach, Secretary Udall should be beating the drums for the Machen bill. With assurance that the Federal Government intends to carry out its agreement, there is every reason to believe that other donations of land, and many more donations of easements, would materialize. Without that assurance, the public might wind up with the 97 acres the Government now owns and nothing more.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 27, 1965]

NOW OR NEVER

The broad stretch of wooded land across the Potomac from Mount Vernon has been marked on the maps for some years as a future Federal park. But unless Congress and the Interior Department act swiftly, the opportunity to preserve that landscape will be lost forever.

The Government now unconditionally owns only 97 acres of more than 1,100 acres envisioned for this future Piscataway Park. Another 151 acres has been donated, but with the agreement that it reverts to its former owner in August 1967, if the park has not been substantially completed by then. Other owners have committed themselves to donate an additional 345 acres, but with similar qualifications. If the Interior Department does not buy the remaining 520 acres promptly, then, the titles to the donated land will fall out of its hands and the concept of a riverbank park there will evaporate.

The Piscataway Park is becoming a national model of the use of easements to protect parklands in rapidly expanding cities. Some 120 owners have donated development easements covering 888 acres in a broad band around the park itself; but these easements are also conditioned on prompt completion of the park.

It is inexplicable, then, that the Interior Department should be delaying the decision to proceed with this park. It has a clear duty to support warmly and actively Congressman MACHEN'S bill to authorize the money for the land that must be purchased. This river shore's importance to the view from Mount Vernon gives it a unique claim upon the attention of the Department and of Congress. It cannot be ignored by an administration that prides itself upon its regard for natural beauty.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 15, 1966]

Udall Promises Full Speed on Piscataway Park—Praises Prince Georges' Scenic Easement Law

(By Maurine Hoffman)

Responding to recent criticism, Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall promised yesterday that the Johnson administration will acquire park land to preserve the view from Mount Vernon of the Potomac River shore.

He made the announcement at Mount Vernon during a ceremonial signing of the Nation's first local law giving tax credit for scenic easements.

The law, passed by the Prince Georges County Board of Commissioners, was praised by Udall as a "new conservation tool of national significance."

Udall assured about 50 persons gathered at the mansion that the "door is now open up to the Hill" for approval of a bill asking funds to purchase land on the Maryland shore of the Potomac.

The hostess for the ceremony was Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio, vice regent of the Mount Vernon Ladies Association, which operates the mansion, and president of the Accokeek Foundation, which has donated land for the proposed park.

Other dignitaries present included MACHEN, Representative CARLTON D. SICKLES, Democrat, of Maryland, and two Prince Georges delegates to the General Assembly, Dr. Arthur Gorman and Ray McDonough, who sponsored State legislation enabling the ordinance.

INDIFFERENCE CHARGED

Representative HERVEY G. MACHEN, Democrat, of Maryland, sponsor of the bill, charged this week that the administration has blocked the proposal with a "wall of indifference" in spite of its pledge to make the Potomac "a model of conservation."

The legislation would make possible the proposed 1100-acre Piscataway Park that would include the Maryland shore of the Potomac across from Mount Vernon. About half of the 7½-acre river front opposite the mansion has been donated to the Government by two foundations. In addition, 130 owners of adjacent property have granted 900 acres of scenic easement for the park.

The scenic easements will revert to their owners by 1967 unless the Federal Government buys the remaining land. Legislation to set up the park was originally passed in 1961 but has not been implemented.

The Prince Georges ordinance permits the county to grant a tax credit up to half the total real estate tax levied against property if the owner grants a perpetual scenic easement to Federal, State, or county governments.

The ordinance will attract national attention and "will be noted with interest by those trying to find solutions to conservation problems that seem insolvable," Udall said. He also applauded it on the grounds that it "will save the view from Mount Vernon, the first house in the country."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 17, 1966]

Hope for Piscataway Park

It appears that the efforts to preserve the Potomac shoreline across the river from Mount Vernon are at long last going to succeed. Without explaining the curious inaction of his Department regarding the Piscataway Park project over the past 5 years, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall raised the hopes of preservationists the other day when he announced that Congress will be requested to authorize purchase of the 520 acres needed to complete the project this session.

The Secretary's action comes none too soon. Nearly 500 acres of the proposed 1,100-acre Federal park have been donated or promised by private owners, but the gifts are conditioned on the Government purchasing the remainder of the land by August 1967. Another 900 acres around the park have been pledged as development easements with a similar stipulation.

The years of toll and anguish expended by those who would preserve unmarred the vista from President Washington's home and at the same time create a splendid riverside park for the residents of the National Capital area will be wasted in all probability unless Representative MACHEN'S bill is acted upon.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News American, Jan. 23, 1966]

Now or Maybe Never

Piscataway Park should be of concern and interest to every Marylander, Virginian, and other U.S. citizens.

It is in Maryland's Prince Georges County, but the important thing is that the broad stretch of woodland along the Potomac River, 15 miles south of the Nation's Capital, lies opposite Mount Vernon, the stately home of George Washington, a yearly attraction to 1,332,000 visitors.

For a time this view as George and Martha Washington saw it was threatened with high-rise apartments, television towers, gasoline storage tanks, and even, at one period, a sewage treatment plant.

To prevent this, the Department of the Interior purchased 97 acres of more than 1,100 envisioned for the future Piscataway Park.

Another 151 acres has been donated, but with the agreement that it reverts to its former owner in August 1967, if the park has not been substantially completed by then.

Other owners have committed themselves to donate an additional 345 acres, but with similar qualifications.

In addition, 120 homeowners in a broad belt around the proposed park area have given scenic easements for 888 acres. An easement, for which this park has become a national model, leaves title in the owner's hands but commits him to restrict its use, such as cutting trees.

But all of this effort may be lost—and the park, too—unless the Department of the Interior acts now to acquire the remaining 520 acres.

Representative HERVEY G. MACHEN, Democrat, of Maryland, has introduced a bill to authorize the money for the land purchase. But the Interior Department has done nothing to endorse the bill, and the reason seems unexplainable.

It appears that a prodding from an administration that has pledged itself to natural beauty and cleaning up the Potomac River would be appropriate at this time.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 29, 1966]

Top Priority Parks

After the most depressing sort of inactivity, the prospects suddenly have brightened perceptibly for two vital Federal park projects along the Potomac in Prince Georges County.

President Johnson's request for $2.9 million to finish building the George Washington Memorial Parkway from the District line to Fort Washington would meet a goal set by Congress 35 years ago. Even more encouraging, the agreement between Federal, State, and county officials on a new compromise route for the road along the river is by far the best of several possibilities.

The second gain, no less important, involves Secretary Udall's new pledge to put his Department's full weight this year behind Representative MACHEN'S bill to expand the Government's authority to buy shorefront land across the Potomac from Mount Vernon for the proposed Piscataway Park.

The Secretary's top priority label for this bill is fully deserved. The land, near Maryland's Piscataway Creek, is to be part of a huge natural park, authorized by Congress 5 years ago as a joint Federal-private venture. The efforts of conservationists already have produced commitments to donate nearly 500 acres of land at no public cost. Private citizens also have promised to grant the Government scenic easements on a much larger acreage. All this is contingent, however, on the Government's purchase of some 520 acres, as it agreed to do in 1961.

While the completion of Piscataway Park will be a notable gain in itself, even larger stakes are involved. For with its use of the techniques of scenic easements and land donations on such a broad scale, the machinery of the Piscataway project could well become a model for future use elsewhere. Its failure, on the other hand, for want of Federal participation, could deal a severe blow to the ambitious conservation plans for the Potomac Basin.

NATIONAL HOCKEY LEAGUE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as most of my colleagues are aware, the National Hockey League recently granted six additional franchises. My own city of Baltimore was an applicant for one of those franchises and, I am advised, had complied with all the league requirements for such a franchise.

Much to everyone's surprise, however, Baltimore was not one of those awarded a franchise. Instead, one of the cities granted a franchise had dropped out of contention and did not even send a representative to the National Hockey League's expansion meeting; another has no arena and will ask the voters of that city to approve the erection of one at a later date. In fact, the whole story as set out in the following article from the

February 11, 1966, edition of the Baltimore News American is a shocking one and merits investigation.

Mr. Speaker, in keeping with that thought I have asked the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to investigate the allegations set forth in the newspaper article. I commend the article to all my colleagues for their reading:

Swami Says: NHL Expansion Retained the Inbred Line

(By N. F. Clarke)

For many years the National Hockey League has enjoyed, if that is the word, a reputation for being the tightest, most inviolate clique in sports. And that, of course, means anywhere because Washington contains congressional watchdogs who see to it that monopolistic tendencies are discouraged in other lines of business.

Anyone who imagined that the expansion of the NHL now being undertaken represented a breach in the solid front at last now has the events of this week to disillusion him. There still could be aspects of the approval of new franchises that possibly could bear investigation by antitrust authorities.

A Maryland Senator might undertake introduction of the matter in proper places, since Baltimore was turned down on a legitimate bid, while others of less or no validity according to the NHL's own requisites for application were accepted.

The paradox, which badly shocked this town when its representatives were spurned, loses its perplexity in the face of certain interesting facts.

Of what were supposed to be six new franchises open to bidders who could meet requirements as laid down by the NHL, actually one only was at all available to Baltimore, in the light of the final expansion. It went to Philadelphia, a last-minute entry which has not even the first requisite—a place in which to play.

The other five cities accepted turned out to have been foregone conclusions. Los Angeles and San Francisco were absolute musts, an inescapable fact which everyone knew in advance. No national television sponsor could be sold without proper exposure of his message on the west coast, and the only reason the NHL ever considered dilating its cozy little coterie in the first place was to latch onto a share of TV's lush millions.

THEY COULDN'T MISS

What was not known in advance, but perhaps should have been if the matter were given study, was that three other locations could have been equally predictable.

St. Louis, Minneapolis-St. Paul and Pittsburgh were not rated among contenders as prime as, for instance, Baltimore, Vancouver, and Buffalo. St. Louis, in fact, dropped out when the original group there reported difficulties and did not even send representatives to the NHL's New York expansion meeting.

But, with no one bidding—which after all is an essential even more basic than a playing arena—the NHL nabobs still saw their way clear to admitting St. Louis to the fold.

Naturally, that was not as miraculous, or as idiotic, as it seems. It happens that James Norris, owner of the Chicago Black Hawks of the NHL, also owns the St. Louis club of the minor central league as well as the rink in which it plays.

Though that arena is rumored about to be condemned to permit expansion of Washington University and there seems a certain reluctance among potential angels about putting up the necessary millions for a venture that appears so shaky, Norris is said to have assured his colleagues he will have somebody, or somebodies, hooked by the April 5 deadline given him to produce. If he doesn't—well, that time limit can always be extended, according to the way the NHL seems to do business.

ST. LOUIS OR BUST

It must be done that way because Norris is supposed to have made his vote for league expansion conditional upon the inclusion of St. Louis. Without being a financial genuis, a fellow could guess that a certain amount of profit could be shown on both ends of such a transaction.

Norris is not exactly a stranger to tying things up advantageously in all directions. He had his difficulties once before with the anti-trust bloodhounds, when his International Boxing Club was forced to disband because it was adjudged a constrictive monopoly.

Why was Pittsburgh included in the NHL expansion, when its arena does not even come as close as Balitimore's to suiting the major league's seating specifications and must have considerable reconstruction to comply? Pittsburgh and Philadelphia are both in Pennsylvania and their joint inclusion would not seem to provide TV as comprehensive exposure across the map as it might like.

That's an easy answer, too, it seems. The Pittsburgh franchise in the AHL which must be bought out—though in this case not the city-owned arena—belongs to Bruce Norris. The name is not a coincidence. Bruce is Jim's brother. How clannish can things get?

Last is the case of Minneapolis-St. Paul. These cities have no arena close to NHL specifications and the group which bid in the franchise appears to have no intentions to build one. This need was reported to rest in the capricious laps of Minnesota voters who will be asked later to approve a civic structure.

RANGERS WEREN'T HELPING

But as in St. Louis and Pittsburgh, the Twin Cities couldn't miss. The St. Paul minor league team, as it happens, is the property of the owners of the New York Rangers, who by this move also are keeping everything in the family.

The Rangers were reported to be backing the Baltimore bid—but not, as has been shown, until their Minnesota property was taken care of. You can pay no serious attention to statements by Ranger official William Jennings that he urged Clipper officials to get the stage ripped out of the Civic Center. There is no relevancy.

Philadelphia has no building out of which a stage could be ripped. It hasn't in fact, anything but an idea that it can first find the money and then get a $20 million palace built, all in a year and a half.

It also has as principal owner William Putnam. A source close to the Clippers insists that Putnam has been a business associate of Canadian promoter and sports entrepreneur Jack Kent Cooke. It was Cooke, owner of the NBA Los Angeles Lakers and part owner of the NFL Washington Redskins, who was awarded the Los Angeles franchise in the NHL over four competitors, one of whom was Dan Reeves, the NFL Rams' owner who brought ice hockey to that city as owner of the Western League Blades.

The whole thing at this stage appears to be an untidy, ill-conceived wheels-within-wheels mess. And the inbred tangle might never get off the ground, especially if Washington should cast a critical eye at its seeming ramifications. Baltimore's hopes might not be dead yet.

AUTHORIZATION TO INCLUDE VOICE RECORDINGS UNDER FREE AIRMAIL PRIVILEGES FOR SERVICEMEN SHOULD BE ADOPTED

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would authorize the mailing of voice recordings under the free mailing privileges which we extend to our men in service.

Recently, I learned from a newspaper friend of mine, Bill Colvin, editor of the Manhattan, Kans., Mercury, who visited Vietnam at the end of last year and did a series of articles for his paper, that instead of writing letters, many of our men in Vietnam are using tape recorders and sending messages home in their own voices on tape. In turn, they are receiving tapes back in the mail from their families and friends.

Mr. Colvin's observation was substantiated by a USO survey which revealed that voice recordings are the one thing the boys a long way from home really want. The tape centers at the USO's are the most popular spots for off-duty servicemen. There they play the live letters from home and record others to send back.

During the last session, we approved legislation to provide free airmail service for letters, post cards, and postal cards mailed by members of the Armed Forces who are engaged in combat or are hospitalized due to disease or injury suffered in an overseas area. We also made it possible to send parcel post to and from overseas military posts by airmail at reduced rates.

At the time this legislation was passed, it was pointed out that changes should be considered early in the present session so that these same mailing privileges could be extended to our Armed Forces anywhere in the world. Legislation to authorize these extensions as been the subject of hearings by the Postal Operations Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

It is expected that a bill will be reported out in the near future for debate in the House. I would hope that any new legislation which the Congress approves can carry authority to transmit the tapes on the same basis as letters, post cards, and postal cards. It is easy to see why a voice recording would be preferable to an ordinary letter, and how hearing the voice of the serviceman would lift the spirits of the family back home, and how hearing the voices of the wife and children would be a tremendous morale booster for the serviceman in either a hot or cold war situation. It makes good sense, in my judgment, to extend the free mailing privileges to include these voice letters.

BLUEPRINT FOR THE FUTURE UNITED STATES

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during the past week, I read an article, entitled "Blueprint for the Future United States." Had the article not appeared in the U.S. News & World Report—February 21 issue, page 60—which in my opinion is the most reliable of the news magazines, I would have discounted the projected forecast of things to come as being some kind of fantasy. However, coordinating some of the recommendations which have been made, with the possibilities that can emerge from the recommendations of the do-gooders, the predictions in this article are nothing short of frightening.

Take for instance this one statement:

> All past ideas about limits on what a government can do, or what a government can afford, are being junked in the plan for the future.

Already we have seen the accuracy of another statement:

> The role of the individual States will dwindle and their power will fade.

Mr. Speaker, I think the U.S. News & World Report has performed a most valuable service in alerting the public to some of the dangers which lie ahead. The question is, Will this Congress face up to its responsibilities in trying to maintain some semblance of commonsense, and fiscal responsibility, in the face of the drive which is now underway to convert this Nation into the most socialistic state that this world has ever known?

When I read that in the America of the future "every citizen is supposed to be guaranteed a minimum income, and a college education if he wants one," I cannot help but wonder what would be the criteria, if any, to be used. Should we require those individuals to put forth any effort, or are we going to abandon the age-old precept that man must live by the sweat of his brow. Do we intend to abandon the idea that ambition is no longer a virtue, and that incentive has no place in our way of life?

More disturbing is the statement, which I know is true; namely, that "the President's Council of Economic Advisers in late January first officially recognized the concept of a negative income tax—a concept that calls for mailing checks from the U.S. Treasury to poor people to assure everybody a guaranteed minimum income," even though the President's special commission recognizes that such a program could cost anywhere from $2 to $20 billion a year.

The question naturally arises, "Where is the money coming from?" if everybody is to get a minimum income without working—and Mr. Speaker, I still maintain that there are some people who just do not want to work.

But, Mr. Speaker, the most surprising suggestion, and the one which violates every principle of those great liberals who have been pleading against discrimination wherever it exists, is the idea that the President's Council, as a supplement to the negative income tax, proposes special checks to be mailed to Negroes because they are Negroes. And the reasoning behind this? It is supposed to be a part payment for what is referred to as "300 years of systematic denial" of equal opportunity in this country. The article goes on to say that Negro leaders who have suggested this idea which apparently has been embraced by the President's Council in its ever-expanding appeasement policy, have mentioned $10 billion a year as a reasonable amount.

Because this article is readily accessible to anyone who is interested I am not requesting permission to include the article as a part of my remarks, for certainly if my leftwing friends keep thinking up more ways to spend our hard-earned tax dollars, even if they have to go further in debt, I am going to have to continue to find more ways to save money.

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT ON WEATHER MODIFICATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 385)

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting, for the consideration of the Congress, the Seventh Annual Report on Weather Modification (for fiscal year 1965) submitted to me by the Director of the National Science Foundation.

Highly encouraging steps are being taken toward establishing safe and effective programs for modifying the weather. We can now begin to see the day when such programs may become operationally feasible. This is an exciting and encouraging development—not only for Americans, but for men everywhere.

Last year, in transmitting to the Congress the sixth annual report, I indicated the need for a larger effort in basic research and in the development of means to put the knowledge we have to work.

That increased effort is noted in this report. It describes not only the vigorous pursuit of weather modification programs by agencies of the executive branch—but also the valuable stimulus afforded by committees of the Congress, and the significant activities of nongovernmental groups.

RECENT STUDIES

The list of recent activities in this field is heartening. For example, on January 1, 1966, the first Federal regulation on weather modification became effective. The National Science Foundation issued rules providing that advance notice of intention to modify the weather must be given to the Foundation.

More recently, two significant reports by advisory groups have been issued. A two-volume study by a National Academy of Sciences panel, released January 14, reviewed in detail the physical science aspects of weather and climate modification. Five days later the National Science Foundation's Special Commission on Weather Modification issued a broad report covering the biological and social aspects, statistical problems, problems of law and organization, and international implications, as well as physical science aspects. Additional reports by the Special Commission will soon be forthcoming.

Congress, too, has indicated its interest in scheduling additional hearings on weather and climate modification during this session.

It is striking that separate groups dealing seriously with this problem have, after long study, arrived at similar and significant conclusions.

The National Academy of Sciences report, for example, says:

> In a sense, weather modification today is a reality. Man can and does interfere with the atmosphere in a number of ways. His ability to produce deliberate beneficial changes is still very limited and uncertain, but it is no longer economically or politically trivial.

The report of the Special Commission, in a markedly similar passage, says:

> Weather and climate modification is becoming a reality. The daily activities of man influence the atmosphere in a number of ways and his ability to induce deliberate changes in measurable magnitude by artificial means is progressing.

The report I submit today says it another way:

> In 1965, key words are no longer "whether" and "when." They are "what" and "how" and "who."

PROBLEMS—AND PROGRESS

Two sets of problems face us and both are difficult. One consists of finding out how to modify the weather and climate. The second consists of determining how best to utilize this knowledge for the benefit of mankind once it is achieved.

The scientists and engineers inside and outside the Government must address themselves particularly to the first set of problems. All of us, as concerned citizens, must seriously consider the second.

At present it appears feasible, under appropriate conditions, to seed some kinds of clouds and achieve increased precipitation. It is also possible, under certain conditions, to dissipate some types of fog. Partial success has been reported from abroad in reducing hail damage.

As our understanding of atmospheric processes increases, our ability to do more will also increase. Even now, men are dreaming and planning of projects that will some day enable us to mitigate the awesome and terrible forces of hurricanes and tornadoes. Such a time is still far off, but perhaps not so far off as we thought only a few years ago.

That so much is being done now is a credit not only to the men of science working in the field, but also to the understanding and support of the Congress which has expressed its interest in and support of this field of great national interest. I commend to your continuing interest this report and the important efforts that it describes.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 18, 1966*.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PROVIDING FOR ADMISSIBILITY IN EVIDENCE OF SLIP LAWS AND THE TREATIES AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ACTS SERIES (TIAS)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12232) to amend title 1 of the United States Code to provide for the admissibility in evidence of the slip laws and the Treaties and Other International Acts series, and for other purposes.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman from Colorado could tell me whether this bill will in any way put a restriction upon the multiplicity of executive branch people who are running around the world making commitments which seem to have the validity of treaties. Would this put any restrictions upon these people?

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, of course.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. This has nothing to do with treaties or what the State Department or the Senate may confirm or agree with. What it does is make it possible in courts of law to have the so-called Little and Brown editions of laws and treaties declared to be competent legal evidence.

This bill would extend the statutory declaration to include slip laws issued by the Administrator of General Services and TIAS issued by the Secretary of State.

This bill should enhance economy and efficiency by making it unnecessary in the future to certify or authenticate photostatic copies of originals of laws or of treaties. The bill was recommended by the Department of State and has the approval of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Department of Justice and the Administrator of General Services.

This measure is a clean bill incorporating certain technical amendments made to its predecessor, H.R. 9240.

Mr. **GROSS**. I will say to the gentleman that I am glad to have the assurance there will perhaps be some economy as a result of this bill. However, I wish the committee could have added something in the bill to circumscribe those people who are slipping around the world committing the Government and the taxpayers of this country to the spending of a lot of money, and committing them perhaps to sending troops over the world.

Mr. Speaker, since this bill does not deal with that, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12232

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 113 of title 1, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"§ 113. 'Little and Brown's' edition of laws and treaties; slip laws; Treaties and Other International Acts Series; admissibility in evidence.

"The edition of the laws and treaties of the United States, published by Little and Brown, and the publications in slip or pamphlet form of the laws of the United States issued under the authority of the Administrator of General Services, and the Treaties and Other International Acts Series issued under the authority of the Secretary of State shall be competent evidence of the several public and private Acts of Congress, and of the treaties, international agreements other than treaties, and proclamations by the President of such treaties and international agreements other than treaties, as the case may be, therein contained, in all the courts of law and equity and of maritime jurisdiction, and in all the tribunals and public offices of the United States, and of the several States, without any further proof or authentication thereof."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 2 of title 1, United States Code, preceding section 101, is amended by striking out—

"113. 'Little and Brown's' edition of laws and treaties; admissibility in evidence."

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"113. 'Little and Brown's' edition of laws and treaties; slip laws; Treaties and Other International Acts Series; admissibility in evidence."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROHIBITING REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY FROM ACTING AS TRUSTEES OR RECEIVERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1924) to amend section 39b of the Bankruptcy Act so as to prohibit a part-time referee from acting as trustee or receiver in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if my friend, the gentleman from Colorado, could tell me how we are doing in the matter of bankruptcies in this country these days?

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. May I say, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has access to as many of these reports on the bills as I have. This bill only deals with a limitation to the effect that the judge cannot appoint some referee or part-time referee to a position as a receiver.

Mr. **GROSS**. Somewhere I believe I read recently that last year we had an all-time record of bankruptcies in this country. That may be a little bit strong—I do not know. It is hard to conceive that in these days when we are supposedly wallowing—according to the gentleman over in the White House—in prosperity that we would be running a record number of bankruptcies.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. It is true that this is an administrative bill.

Mr. **GROSS**. Does it not seem strange to the gentleman from Colorado that we are having all these bankruptcies when we are supposed to be wallowing in prosperity and there are those in high places who say we can afford to spend money for anything and everything under the sun.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Colorado. That would have nothing to do with this bill.

Mr. **GROSS**. I see.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1924

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last sentence of paragraph b of section 39 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 67b) is amended to read as follows:

"Active part-time referees, and referees receiving benefits under paragraph (1) of subdivision d of section 40 of this Act, shall not practice as counsel or attorney or act as trustee or receiver in any proceeding under this Act."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend section 39b of the Bankruptcy Act so as to prohibit referees from acting as trustees or receivers in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act."

With the following committee amendment:

No. 1. Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the second and third sentences of paragraph b of section 39 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 67b) are amended to read as follows: 'Active full-time referees shall not exercise the profession or employment of counsel or attorney, or be engaged in the practice of law; nor act as trustee or receiver in any proceeding under this Act. Active part-time referees, and referees receiving benefits under paragraph (1) of subdivision d of section 40 of this Act, shall not practice as counsel or attorney nor act as trustee or receiver in any proceeding under this Act.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 39b of the Bankruptcy Act so as to prohibit referees from acting as trustees or receivers in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHARTERING BY ACT OF CONGRESS OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 552) recognizing the 50th anniversary of the chartering by act of Congress of the Boy Scouts of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Colorado, referring to the amendment striking out all the "whereas" clauses in the resolution, whether that is the result of the unanimous action of the House Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I cannot say definitely whether it was or not.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include the report on H. Con. Res. 552.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the programs and activities of the Boy Scouts of America have been of tremendous value to the people of the United States in fostering habits, practices, and attitudes conducive to good character, citizenship, and health in the youth of this Nation.

On June 15, 1916, a Federal charter was conferred on the Boy Scouts of America by act of Congress.

The Boy Scouts of America was the first youth organization to be granted a charter by act of Congress and the Congress has been kept informed of the programs and activities of the Boy Scouts of America through the annual reports made to it each year in accordance with its charter.

In recognition of the outstanding public service performed by this youth organization, I have the great pleasure to sponsor House Concurrent Resolution 552 which pays tribute to the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of their Federal incorporation.

Mr. Speaker, having been involved in the scouting movement for a long time, I am naturally proud and take pride in the growth of the scouting movement not only in my home district but in our Nation and indeed in the whole free world. I take additional pride, therefore, in urging my colleagues to adopt this resolution.

The Committee on the Judiciary submitted the following report:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 552) recognizing the 50th anniversary of the chartering by act of Congress of the Boy Scouts of America, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendment and recommend that the concurrent resolution do pass.

The amendment is as follows: On pages 1 and 2, strike all "Whereas" clauses.

STATEMENT

The programs and activities of the Boy Scouts of America have been of great value to the people of the United States in fostering habits, practices, and attitudes conducive to good character, citizenship, and health in the youth of this Nation.

On June 15, 1916, a Federal charter was conferred on the Boy Scouts of America by act of Congress (39 Stat. 227; 36 U.S.C. 21).

In recognition of the outstanding public service performed by this youth organization, this concurrent resolution pays tribute to the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of their Federal incorporation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 552

Whereas June 15, 1966, will mark the fiftieth anniversary of the granting by Act of Congress of the charter of the Boy Scouts of America;

Whereas the Boy Scouts of America was the first youth organization to be granted a charter by Act of Congress;

Whereas the Congress has been kept informed of the programs and activities of the Boy Scouts of America through the annual reports made to it each year by this organization in accordance with such charter.

Whereas these programs and activities have been designed to instill in boys the moral and ethical principles, and the habits, practices, and attitudes, which are conducive to good character, citizenship, and health; and

Whereas, by fostering in the youth of the Nation those qualities upon which our strength as a Nation is dependent, the Boy Scouts of America has made a contribution of inestimable value to the welfare of the entire Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby pay tribute to the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the granting by Act of Congress of the charter of the Boy Scouts of America, and expresses its recognition of and appreciation for the public service performed by this organization through its contributions to the lives of the Nation's youth.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The following committee amendment was agreed to:

On pages 1 and 2, strike all "Whereas" clauses.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 68, which is similar to House Concurrent Resolution 552.

The Clerk called the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution?

There was no objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 68

Whereas June 15, 1966, will mark the fiftieth anniversary of the granting by Act of Congress of the charter of the Boy Scouts of America;

Whereas the Boy Scouts of America was the first youth organization to be granted a charter by Act of Congress;

Whereas the Congress has been kept informed of the programs and activities of the Boy Scouts of America through the annual reports made to it each year by this organization in accordance with such charter;

Whereas these programs and activities have been designed to instill in boys the moral and ethical principles, and the habits, practices, and attitudes, which are conducive to good character, citizenship, and health; and

Whereas, by fostering in the youth of the Nation those qualities upon which our strength as a Nation is dependent, the Boy Scouts of America has made a contribution of inestimable value to the welfare of the entire Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby pays tribute to the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the granting by Act of Congress of the charter of the Boy Scouts of America, and expresses its recognition of and appreciation for the public service performed by this organization through its contributions to the lives of the Nation's youth.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOORE

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 552 as passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the purpose of the gentleman from West Virginia to strike out the preamble?

Mr. MOORE. My amendment would strike out the language of the Senate concurrent resolution and substitute in lieu thereof the language of the concurrent resolution just passed by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia strike out the preamble or all after the enacting clause and substitute the language of the House concurrent resolution just passed?

Mr. MOORE. It would strike out all after the enacting clause.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That would not eliminate the preamble.

Mr. MOORE. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the preamble.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MOORE moves to strike out the preamble.

The amendment was agreed to.

A similar House concurrent resolution was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks with respect to the action just taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LAND IN TRUST FOR MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10431) to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **JOHNSON** of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to interrogate the chief handler of this bill.

I notice in these bills, which have to do with the title to Indian lands, there is a thread that seems to go all through them that the land will be used for redevelopment purposes, and so forth. I also note that title to these lands is being put in trust in the United States. In the event that the Indian tribes want to convey these lands with title in trust to the United States, who would sign the conveyance? Is there a method by which these lands can be conveyed once they are placed in trust in the United States?

Mr. **ASPINALL**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **JOHNSON** of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. **ASPINALL**. Title would have to be transferred then by the Secretary on the authority given by Congress. These are reservation lands. The gentleman is correct in noting that in some instances we have transferred the land in fee to the Indians and then they can alienate the title themselves, but in most of these operations in the small areas, like the three bills on today's Calendar, we did not think it was quite appropriate to place the title in fee so far as the Indians are concerned, because then they would have to assume the responsibilities of paying taxes, and so forth, and in these particular areas they should not assume that responsibility.

Mr. **JOHNSON** of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as placing title to these lands in the United States will save these tribes from becoming a victim of designing persons, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10431

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all right, title, and interest of the United States in land heretofore used in connection with the White Earth Indian Boarding School described as the southwest quarter northeast quarter section 23, township 142 north, range 41 west, fifth principal meridian, Becker County, Minnesota, comprising 40 acres, excepting all improvements thereon that are the property of individual tribal members, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND FOR THE APACHE TRIBE, MESCALERO RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12264) to declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administrative purposes is held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12264

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of land situated in sections 27 and 28, township 13 south, range 12 east, New Mexico principal meridian, and improvements thereon, formerly used for Indian administrative purposes, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of Mescalero Reservation, New Mexico, subject to valid existing rights, and subject to the right of the United States to use any of said land and improvements for governmental purposes for the benefit of the Indians. The land is within the Mescalero Reservation and is commonly known as small holding claim numbered 485, United States Land Office serial numbered Las Cruces 07366, containing approximately 99.84 acres. It is identified on supplemental plats of survey of sections 27 and 28, township 13 south, range 12 east, New Mexico principal meridian, New Mexico, accepted April 30, 1936, as "Private Claim 485".

SEC. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

Mr. **HALEY**. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 12264 is to transfer the beneficial title to a 99.84 acre tract of land and improvements thereon now owned by the United States to the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Indian Reservation in New Mexico in order to provide the land needed on which to build low-rent housing for these Indians. I have long supported legislation that is intended to expedite the assimilation of the American Indian into the mainstream of our society. Transfer of title for this land to the Mescalero Apache Tribe will be, in my estimation, another step forward in this direction.

The purpose of H.R. 12265 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to declare that the United States holds in trust for the New Mexico pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia certain lands and improvements now owned by the United States if and when they are no longer needed by the Government. The approximate total of acreage involved here is some 435 acres of land previously set aside by the Government for school and administrative use. The total value of the land and improvements thereon is approximately $31,000. In my considered opinion the aforementioned New Mexico pueblos will be able to make good use of this land by erecting community centers or for agricultural and grazing purposes. Passage of H.R. 12265 will relieve the Federal Government of responsibility for maintaining the buildings on the land and the Indians will assume the responsibility for maintaining both the lands and the buildings. They can then begin a program designed to enhance their economic and social well-being.

Mr. **MORRIS**. Mr. Speaker, a bill to declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administrative purposes is held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation.

The Mescalero tribe of Apache Indians is making a strong bid for improved housing for its members. In order to provide needed land on which to build low-rent housing for these Indians, this land should be held in trust by the United States for them. Already existing facilities will thus be protected, such items as water and sewage systems, sewage treatment facilities, and telephone and powerlines. The desperate need for adequate homes is readily apparent when one considers that of the resident population, 97 percent of the homes lack refrigeration, sanitation facilities are inadequate in 95 percent of the homes, the current average four-room home contains 6.5 persons, and 94 percent of all homes are classed as substandard. Using the Office of Economic Opportunity poverty-level standard—family income of $3,000 or less annually—one finds that 75.8 percent of Mescalero families have incomes below the poverty level.

There is a scarcity of tribal land suitable for contemplated Indian housing. The tribe in the 10-year planning report for the Secretary of the Interior, stated that 156 low-rent housing units were needed. A portion of the tract involved in the present bill is ideally situated for this purpose, but before an agreement can be reached with the Public Housing Administration, title to the land must be in the tribe.

The land of this 99.84 acre tract lies entirely within the bounds of the Mescalero Indian Reservation as set apart by Executive Order 25861 of May 29, 1873. However, it developed that this property had been settled prior to the Executive order by a non-Indian. The rights of the non-Indian were not determined until 1915 by which time buildings and other facilities of the Mescalero Indian school and agency had been constructed on the land. This non-Indian's interest was purchased by the Government for $10,000 in 1918.

The Government discontinued use of this property about 1953 for agency and school purposes and since that time the area has been used beneficially by the tribe for agriculture on a permit basis.

A parcel of 12.49 acres of the tract is now used by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in connection with a lease made with the tribe for the use of 18.15 acres of tribal land adjoining the land in question, for the Mescalero National Fish Hatchery. The tribe has agreed by resolution to execute a new lease to continue making this tract available to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries if this bill is enacted into law.

In view of the urgent needs of the Mescalero tribe for improvements in its economic and housing conditions I feel that this bill will, if enacted, make possible a long step forward for this tribe.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO GIVE TO THE INDIANS OF THE PUEBLOS OF ACOMA, SANDIA, SANTA ANA, AND ZIA THE BENEFICIAL INTEREST IN CERTAIN FEDERALLY OWNED LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12265) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, again I would like to interrogate one of the chief handlers of this bill. I notice that this bill is a little different from the others which would give title to Indian lands in that the Secretary of the Interior would at some future time decide when, as, and if he wants to place the title in trust to these tribes.

In other words, other bills that we have passed placed the title in trust in the United States, or, as you said, give title in fee to the Indian. Here is a little different situation where we might be establishing a precedent, in that we are reposing the power to vest title in trust in the Secretary of the Interior. Have you noticed that in this bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I have not noticed any major difference. As far as this legislation is concerned, the transfer is purely an administrative act, and inasmuch as we give to the Secretary this authority to transfer these lands to the Indians themselves, in trust, then the Secretary will do it as soon as he understands that the Indians are ready to go ahead and take over the administration of this additional area.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Then the gentleman feels that the Secretary of the Interior can repose a trust in lands over and above the right of Congress?

Mr. ASPINALL. No. As I understand it, in this respect this is an action of Congress which places these lands in the ownership of the Indians in trust. The trust—estate—is still the same in this instance as in the other. The presence of mineral rights may make a minor difference. It is a question of procedure, if I understand what my friend is talking about.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman is right, and I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 1904, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1904

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That when the following identified lands (other than the mineral interests specifically excluded in the identification), which were set aside for school or administrative purposes, are no longer needed by the United States for the administration of Indian Affairs, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to declare, by publication of a notice in the Federal Register, that the title of the United States to such lands and improvements shall thereafter be held in trust for the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia as follows:

(1) Acomita day school site comprising three and five-tenths acres, more or less, to the Indians of the Pueblo of Acoma;

(2) Sandia school site comprising sixty-three one-hundredths of an acre, more or less, to the Indians of the Pueblo of Sandia;

(3) Santa Ana school site comprising two and eighty-one one-hundredths acres, more or less, excluding mineral interests therein, located within the El Ranchito grant, to the Indians of the Pueblo of Santa Ana; and

(4) Administrative site in the Borrego grant, comprising four hundred and twenty-eight acres, more or less, excluding minerals therein, to the Indians of the Pueblo of Zia.

SEC. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of lands and improvements placed in a trust status under the authority of this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for schools or administrative purposes.

The purpose of H.R. 12265 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give in trust to the pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia in New Mexico the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands and improvements when they are no longer needed. The lands total 435 acres and were set aside for school or administrative use. The value of the lands and their improvements is approximately $31,000.

Each one of the four pueblos has its own distinctive needs for economic betterment which, through the acquisition of these lands, will be met in part, at least, through present planning of the pueblos themselves. The first to be considered is the Acoma Pueblo.

The Acomita day school site comprises a tract of 3.5 acres located within the Acoma Pueblo grant. It was acquired by the Federal Government through condemnation proceedings in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Mexico in 1920 at a cost of $350 for the construction of a school building. The tract, however, was never used for school purposes, and a revocable permit was given to the pueblo of Acoma, which authorized the pueblo to use the tract for agricultural purposes. The present value of the land is $560.

As the development of agricultural resources and irrigable land is part of the Acoma Pueblo present plans of economic betterment the acquisition of this site will be beneficial to the pueblo—population 1,674 in 1962. The location of the tract is shown on the accompanying map. The total acreage of tribal land is 245,801 and there are 370 acres of allotted land but most of this is nonagricultural grazing land.

Turning now to the Sandia Pueblo we have a day school site comprising 0.63 acre, more or less, which was acquired by the United States in 1930 at a cost of $126 through condemnation proceedings. The tract was acquired as a site on which to erect Government buildings for the use and training of the Indians attending the day school at the Sandia Pueblo. On July 1, 1960, the operation of an Indian day school at this pueblo was discontinued and the Sandia children now attend public school.

The present estimated value of this tract at Sandia Pueblo, including improvements, is estimated at $14,227. The improvements consist of one school building and teacher's quarters, pumphouse, storage building, warehouse, building for bathhouse, garage, dispensary, plus sewer and water system.

Under a revocable permit the Sandia Pueblo Indians use the buildings on this site as a meeting place for the tribal council and for other community gatherings as the need arises. A portion of the school site is used for a health clinic and as a school for U.S. Public Health Indian sanitarian aids. No conveyance of land or buildings used for health purposes will be made to the tribe without the approval of the U.S. Public Health Service.

The Sandia Pueblo has a small population of 124 people and presently plans to develop a community center providing facilities for library study and youth recreation by securing necessary funds through the Community Facilities Act or other appropriations at an estimated cost of $75,000. The area in question would be well adapted to serve the purpose of a Sandia Pueblo Community Center.

The third pueblo is Santa Ana and a parcel of 2.81 acres was acquired by the United States in 1920 at a cost of $140.50 through condemnation proceedings. The purpose of its acquisition was to provide a site for the construction of a school for Santa Ana Pueblo.

Since July 1, 1960, when the Santa Ana Day School was discontinued, the Indian children have been attending public school.

The present estimated value of this land, with improvements is $13,747 and the improvements consist of a school and quarters building, storage building, bath and storage building, a pumphouse, a water and sewer system.

Under a revocable permit covering the use of all buildings and facilities at the site issued on August 28, 1960, the pueblo Santa Ana plans to use the school site as a meeting place for the tribal council and for community gatherings as the need arises. A portion of the site is being used by the U.S. Public Health Service as a location for an Indian clinic and no conveyance of land or clinic buildings will be made to the tribe without the approval of the U.S. Public Health Service.

The United States holds title to the minerals of the El Ranchito grant and since this site is part of the grant it is not proposed to convey mineral rights of the said parcel to the tribe.

Santa Ana Pueblo has a relatively small population of 366 and badly needs a community center of its own with adequate sanitary facilities under present planning programs. This need would be served by the pueblo acquisition of this site.

The fourth and last pueblo is that of Zia which has an administrative site of 428 acres more or less within the Borrego grant, which was purchased by the United States in the submarginal land purchase project. There is a bit of legislative and administrative history involved in the case of the Borrego grant.

Jurisdiction of the Borrego grant was transferred to the Department of the Interior from the Department of Agriculture by Executive Order No. 7792, dated January 18, 1938. Then some 11 years later the act of August 13, 1949 (63 Stat. 604), all of the Borrego grant, excluding minerals and excepting this administrative site of 428 acres became trust land of the Zia Pueblo. Since the entire Borrego grant was originally purchased by the Federal Government for $68,239.40, or at an average per acre cost of $3, this would make the cost of the administrative site $1,284.

There are no improvements on the administrative site. The Borrego grant is used by the pueblo of Zia for livestock grazing purposes and the administrative site would likewise be used for livestock grazing. The present estimate fair market value of this administrative site is $2,568 and the site is not currently being used by the Government nor does it have any plans for its future use. The interior of the Borrego grant which includes an administrative site does not have a sectional survey hence no present description is possible. The United States holds title to the minerals in the remainder of the Borrego grant and it is proposed to retain the minerals in the administrative site.

Plans to develop the economy of Zia Pueblo would be expedited by the acquisition of the administrative site by the Indians.

In summary, all of the lands relating to the four pueblos involved in this bill, are in excess of the needs of the Department of the Interior and it is considered that the pueblos involved can make effective use of these lands for community centers or for agricultural and grazing purposes. Through this transfer the Government will be relieved of further responsibility for maintaining the buildings no longer needed and the Indians will receive trust title and assume responsibility for lands and buildings which can be used to their own economic and social advantage.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 12265) was laid on the table.

WINNING THE PEACE

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Deseret News of Salt Lake City puts it quite plainly when it says:

> As we go about winning the war in Vietnam, let's make sure we lay the groundwork for winning the peace, too.

It hails the President's pledge to help achieve political and economic reforms in South Vietnam, stating that "the more that is done to give the people of South Vietnam a greater voice in their government, the more incentive they will have to make the sacrifices necessary to win the war."

Speaking of the woes which the people there are suffering, the paper says:

> Simple common sense dictates that everything possible be done to alleviate such suffering, not only for humanitarian reasons but also to expedite the war effort.

We all know that we are now facing conflict on two fronts, and because this article sheds light on the subject I am offering it to the RECORD, where others may want to read it.

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Deseret News, Feb. 10, 1966]

WIN THE PEACE, TOO

Since an end to the war in Vietnam seems to be nowhere near in sight, President Johnson's pledge to help achieve political and economic reforms in South Vietnam might seem premature.

On the contrary, the more that is done to give the people of South Vietnam a greater voice in their government, the more incentive they will have to make the sacrifices necessary to win the war.

One of the major problems in South Vietnam has been the rapid turnover in the governments at Saigon. While the more democratic constitution and the elections that have been promised are no automatic guarantee of stability, particularly in a country with virtually no experience with democracy, they at least represent a chance for improvement.

Then there is the drag on the war effort that is being exerted by the 1 million refugees in South Vietnam and by the inflation for which America's presence is at least partly responsible. Simple commonsense dictates that everything possible be done to alleviate such suffering, not only for humanitarian reasons but also to expedite the war effort.

Moreover, once the war is over, peace with freedom will be insecure as long as people are hungry, homeless, and jobless.

As a case in point, remember how tired, disillusioned, and skeptical we all were after World War II, particularly the people of war-ravaged Europe? Remember how close an economically as well as spiritually sick Western Europe came to succumbing to communism?

What saved the day was, of course, the Marshall plan. It got the recipients on their feet psychologically as well as economically, and won the U.S. allies and markets we might otherwise have lost.

The situations in South Vietnam and in postwar Europe are not, of course, parallel. Europe was already highly industrialized; Vietnam is not. Europe had plenty of highly skilled workers and businessmen; Vietnam does not.

But after a decade or more of war, South Vietnam is sapped and in need of help as Europe was after 4 years. Moreover, if we were to wash our hands of Vietnam after having won victory on the battlefield or at the conference table, it might not be long before war flared up again there just as it did after the Geneva Conference supposedly settled things in 1954.

Nor is there any good reason the United States should be expected to shoulder the burden alone. Even those who oppose what we are currently doing in Vietnam cannot reasonably object to making sure it does not long persist as a potential tinderbox for world conflict.

As we go about winning the war in Vietnam, let's make sure we lay the groundwork for winning the peace, too.

FOR BETTER LIFE

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Honolulu Declaration, the Salt Lake Tribune points out, stressed "a resolve to win the war against the Vietcong through both counterinsurgency tactics and civic reform programs.

"Experts have long contended that the only way to defeat the Communist insurgency is to attack the social, economic, and political defects which helped create the insurgency, while the military struggle against the guerrillas continues."

The paper believes that "from a long-range standpoint a U.S.-backed program to improve Vietnam's agriculture and education is of paramount importance."

As I read the editorial I thought: here is a summary of the task which lies ahead, and in the belief that others might find the article illuminating I request that it be made available in the RECORD.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Feb. 10, 1966]

BETTER LIFE PLUS VICTORY?

The greatest immediate achievement of the Honolulu talks of President Johnson with Prime Minister Nguyen Cao Ky and others of South Vietnam may stem from the first face-to-face confrontation of chiefs of state of the two countries.

In practical terms, the greatest longer term direct benefit may be action to curb ruinous inflation which is sweeping the war-torn little country. The communique at the close of the meeting pledged "further concrete steps" in this direction. These might include new efforts to keep U.S. military construction from creating pressures on the supply of Vietnamese labor and commodities and reexamination of the monetary exchange rate for American military personnel.

The "declaration of Honolulu" stressed a resolve to win the war against the Vietcong through both counterinsurgency tactics and civic reform programs. Experts have long contended that the only way to defeat the Communist insurgency is to attack the social, economic, and political defects which helped create the insurgency, even while the military struggle against the guerrillas continues. It is surprising that it has taken so long to give real meaning to this part of the program.

From a long-range standpoint a U.S.-backed program to improve Vietnam's agriculture and education is of paramount importance. Agriculture Secretary Freeman is taking 20 specialists to Vietnam to look at the Mekong Delta area, one of the great rice bowls of southeast Asia. Freeman is one of several high-level officials accompanying Vice President Humphrey to southeast Asia. The purpose of the Humphrey trip is believed mainly—physchological—"to continue the momentum" of the Honolulu talks.

If communications between Washington and Saigon are improved and social and political improvement are given real meaning and impetus, then the spectacular conference at Hawaii will prove useful. This is, after all, the first time that a South Vietnamese government has definitely promised to create a better life for its people.

IMPORTANCE OF THE OFFICE OF VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the office of the Vice President has been increasing steadily over the past several years. At the present time, the United States does not own or maintain a permanent residence for the Vice President. Such a residence is badly needed. The Vice President is called upon to entertain diplomats, various officials from this country and abroad very frequently.

Accordingly, I have introduced today, a bill authorizing the General Services Administration to plan, design, and construct an official residence for the Vice President of the United States on a 10-acre site at the U.S. Naval Observatory on Massachusetts Avenue NW. We propose a three-story brick and stone structure, three-car garage, grounds to be properly landscaped and fenced. The bill calls for a maximum of $750,000, including the furnishings.

The Senate passed a bill last year providing for an authorization of $1 million.

Public hearings have been scheduled for 10 a.m., on Thursday, February 24 in the Full Public Works Committee Hearing Room 2167, the Rayburn Building.

Congressman George Fallon, Full Committee Chairman on Public Works and I, invite all interested colleagues or their constituents to appear before the committee or submit a written statement concerning this important matter.

We also welcome cosponsorship of the bill.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE GAMBIA ON ITS INDEPENDENCE DAY ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, The Gambia, which achieved independence on February 18, 1965, as a constitutional monarchy within the British Commonwealth, has just completed its first year of independence.

My warmest congratulations are extended to Prime Minister Dawda Kairaba Jawara and the people of this young but important member of the family of African independent nations.

The estimated 325,000 population of The Gambia live on a stretch of land, from 7 to 20 miles wide, that extends from the west coast of Africa to a point 200 miles inland. The country's economy is almost entirely agricultural, with peanuts normally comprising about 95 percent of the total value of annual exports.

This young African nation became a member of the Organization of African Unity in March 1965 and was admitted to the United Nations as that organization's 115th member in September of the same year.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere wish, as The Gambia enters upon its second year of independence, that the friendly ties existing between the United States and this young African nation will be expanded and strengthened.

LINCOLN, OF SPRINGFIELD

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, the 157th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, the Governor of Pennsylvania, the Honorable William W. Scranton, spoke at a dinner in Springfield, Ill., sponsored by the Abraham Lincoln Association.

It was my privilege to hear this excellent address. I was struck by the parallel drawn by the speaker between present-day national circumstances and those that prevailed during the period when Lincoln was a citizen of Springfield. In my view, the speech points the way of opportunity for the Republican Party, and for our country.

Here is the text:

I do not possess profound scholarly knowledge of the life of Abraham Lincoln, but, as apparently with you, the example of his life among all Americans has always held first place for me. In one critical moment of my own life, I found myself asking, "What would Lincoln have done?" And Lincoln's answer led me to the right decision.

Lincoln's life is probably more familiar to the average person than that of any other American—more familiar even than those of Washington or Jefferson.

We know of him as a young man in the small village of New Salem. The tales of the early life of Abe Lincoln, the railsplitter, still inspire and entertain each succeeding generation of Americans.

And we know him of course for his unmatched accomplishments in the Presidency from 1861 to 1865—the Saviour of the Union, the Great Emancipator, the first successful national leader and virtual founder of the Republican Party.

But it is about neither of these Lincolns that I will talk tonight—neither the New Salem Lincoln, the struggling and humorous youth; nor the Civil War Lincoln, the leader who "belongs to the ages."

Rather it is about the Lincoln who dwelt in this very city of Springfield from the time that he began a law practice in 1837 until he left for Washington in February of 1861—a period of almost 25 years.

These were the prime years of Lincoln's own life. During this time he married, raised children, bought a home, entered politics as a Whig—formed the views and confirmed the character to which he later was to give such magnificent expression.

They are the least well-known years of Lincoln's career. Nevertheless, they should have particular interest and significance for us today.

It was in many ways a time very like our own.

During most of this period, the Nation was governed by a Democratic combination bent on achieving consensus that offered something to everybody—something to farmers, something to bankers, something to southern slaveowners, something to northern factory hands—and something, of course, to the politicians themselves. The minority party, the Whigs, were chiefly negative in outlook and captured the Presidency only when led by a military hero. An extremist group broke and for a time seemed about to take over the minority party. Discrimination was debated as a great national issue. The country became involved in an international war which was severely criticized by many of the leading intellectuals of the day. And while all this was happening, unprecedented economic growth and expansion were taking place.

All of these factors find echoes in our own time.

At first glance, there does seem to be one major difference between the two periods. During the era that culminated in the Civil War, the great moral issue of slavery infected and colored and finally overwhelmed every other subject of political debate. Look where you will at the issues of the time—national expansion, monetary policy, States rights, the tariff, even construction of a transcontinental railroad. In the end each of them comes down to one question: What effect will it have on slavery?

Slavery was indeed the irrepressible issue. Beside it, all other questions sank into at least momentary inconsequence.

There is nothing quite like it today. And yet there is a moral issue that today confronts every one of us and pervades the entire political and intellectual firmament.

That is the question of peace or war. We can no longer define war simply as a more forceful extension of diplomacy. Either war is going to cease or the human race will.

It is the issue that comes back to us, either in a whisper or a roar, from every discussion of politics or economics or culture or indeed existence itself.

So even in this respect our own time is not so very different from those critical decades of the forties and the fifties in which Abraham Lincoln passed most of his mature years.

Consider some of the problems of political principle and national morality with which Lincoln dealt in those years.

This is of interest for what they tell us of Lincoln, the man. Of interest, too, for what they tell us of ourselves, and of the problems that now confront us.

There was first of all the issue of the Mexican War.

President Polk and his administration defended the invasion of Mexican territory, on the ground of national interest—then known as manifest destiny. Our presence in Mexico, they claimed, was dictated by our national interest. To leave would be to imperil our strategic position in the Western Hemisphere.

Most of the intellectuals of the day left little doubt as to what they thought of that argument. Henry David Thoreau, in his customary outspoken way, declared. "The people must cease to make war on Mexico, though it cost them their existence as a people." If Thoreau had been living today, he probably would have burned his draft card. As it was, he simply refused to pay taxes.

Lincoln did not support this position. As a Whig Member of Congress, he questioned the wisdom and even the constitutionality of the war. But once it had begun, he supported its vigorous prosecution.

He did not, however, believe that the minority party in time of war should abdicate its responsibility to criticize.

Again and again, he questioned the assumptions on which the war was being carried on. He rejected the doctrine of national interest, at least in its simple form.

He insisted that the Nation's aims be defined in moral as well as in military terms.

During his own Presidency, Lincoln said it was not so important that God be on our side, as that we be on God's side. This conviction found its roots in his observation of the confused maneuvering of the Polk administration during the Mexican War.

Second, there was the issue of extremism on Lincoln's own side of the political spectrum.

The Whig Party never really got off the ground as an instrument of government in the United States. Although it elected two Presidents, it never captured the imagination of the American people and was unable to achieve a record of stable continuity in office.

By the 1850's, it was evident that something new was needed. The people were crying out for change, and the Whigs were unable to offer attractive or exciting change. For a few years, it seemed that know-nothingism might provide the answer.

The know-nothings were formed as a response to the growing tide of immigration from non-Anglo-Saxon countries to the United States. They had a very simple creed: If you are not like us in race and religion and national origin, we don't want you here.

They fed on fear—the fear of those who had achieved some measure of security toward those who were still struggling upward from the bottom of the ladder. They offered deceptively simple and brutal solutions to difficult social and economic problems.

They were, as we would now say, extremists.

Know-nothingism was a particularly difficult problem for Lincoln. He found many of his closest friends and political allies in the know-nothing movement. When he ran for the State legislature in 1854, he was offered the know-nothing endorsement. At first he hesitated to make his views known.

But he could not hesitate long. He was, after all, Lincoln.

The know-nothing party, he said, was "wrong in principle."

He wrote to his friend, Josh Speed:

"I am not a know-nothing; that is certain. How could I be? How can anyone who abhors the oppression of Negroes be in favor of degrading classes of white people? * * * When it comes to this, I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty—to Russia, for instance, where despotism can be taken pure, and without the base alloy of hypocrisy."

Lincoln dealt forthrightly with extremism. He said that it had no legitimate connection with true conservatism. He warned that conservatives who lent it a sympathetic ear would do ultimate damage to their cause.

Lincoln was proven right. Within a few years, the fever of know-nothingism had passed. If it had not been stubbornly opposed by men like Lincoln, the birth of the new Republican Party might have been long delayed or might never have taken place. Slavery would have dug itself ever more deeply into the national fabric. Conservatism would have been discredited, and would have been unable to play its necessary role in the development of our country.

The final great national problem with which Lincoln had to deal during his Springfield years was the formation of a new political combination to take the place of the Democrats as the governing party.

The Democratic Party was wrecked by the issue of slavery. Constructed on the twin pillars of patronage and compromise, it failed to evade the moral issue.

Slavery would have to go, or the Nation would be torn asunder. The Democrats were unable to accept either alternative, and therefore collapsed.

The question remained: Who would take their place?

During the long period of Democratic supremacy, the minority party had two great leaders: Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts, and Henry Clay, of Kentucky.

Both had an overpowering itch to become President, but neither ever made it. Both made many valuable contributions to our national development, but neither provided a satisfactory response to the fundamental moral issue of the time.

These two great leaders held different views on how the minority party should be converted into a stable governing combination.

Webster believed that his party should adhere to the business interest, and that it would eventually come to power as surely as day follows night. He is reputed to have said: "Let Congress take care of the rich, and the rich will take care of the poor."

The United States, he reasoned, was inevitably becoming a business civilization, and the party of business was sure to be the governing party within a very short time.

Henry Clay did not share his colleague's certainty on this point. Clay believed in the art of political maneuver.

"All legislation, all government, all society," he declared, "are founded upon the principle of mutual concession." In short: If you want to get along, go along.

Lincoln, although he admired both of the old Whig leaders, particularly Clay, in the end could agree with neither.

To Webster's contention that the conservative party should rest its cause on the business interest, Lincoln replied, "Republicans are for both the man and the dollar, but in case of conflict the man before the dollar."

Clay's argument he found more compelling. Henry Clay had been Lincoln's particular hero since the time of his first entrance into politics. Lincoln himself had spent his share of time in the political back rooms, and he knew that a man who is unwilling at the proper time to compromise is unable to govern.

But Lincoln did not believe that compromise alone could be made the basis for a political party.

In 1859, Lincoln said, "If we shall adopt a platform that fails to recognize or express our purpose * * * we not only take nothing by our success, but we tacitly admit that we act upon no other principle than a desire to have 'the loaves and fishes.' "

Lincoln knew that no successful political leader can afford to neglect "the loaves and fishes." In a democracy, they supply the indispensable motivation to command the loyalty of the party shock troops on election day. At the same time he knew that a party that relies on tangible rewards alone may win an election or two, but it will never win a generation.

With Emerson, Lincoln saw that the conservative party of his time "contained the best men." But with Emerson, too, he realized that the conservative party could never become the governing party so long as it was merely defensive, merely negative, untransformed by any overriding spirit of idealism.

It was just this act of transformation which Lincoln achieved within the new Republican Party.

For the first time since the days of the Founding Fathers, it was the conservative party that looked confidently toward the future. It was the conservative party that spoke up for the rights of man. It was the conservative party that offered land to the dispossessed, liberty to those who were in chains, and the prospect of economic fulfillment to all.

The result of course is history. A new political party came to power and for the next 70 years remained the principal instrument of government in the United States.

It is entirely in the spirit of Lincoln that I conclude tonight with the suggestion that once again our country is in need of such an act of transformation.

The party that Lincoln helped to create is, now as then, the only available substitute for the current majority party.

I cannot, in all candor, tell you that an act of transformation has as yet taken place within the Republican Party.

But I believe that it will.

It will because it must.

The problems are too grave—the issues too serious—the prospect too glorious—for merely partisan maneuvering in 1966.

The minority will become the majority when it has seized the spirit of idealism that is latent within our people—when it has divested itself of any association with extremism—when it was offered real solutions to the real problems of our country.

I am a Republican—and I believe that is going to happen.

But more than that I am an American—and I believe that it has got to happen.

And if it does not, we will not have America.

WHO WILL HE SACRIFICE?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent administration announcement that $190.6 million would be cut from the aid to schools in federally impacted areas is a severe blow to education. The President tells us in one breath that he will spread our high standards of education to the world by the new worldwide war on poverty. Then with the next breath he says that he will cut a vitally important educational program here at home in half.

There was concern expressed for educational excellence in the state of the Union message, and grand new programs promised. But actions speak louder than all the speeches and the ringing phrases. I recall one phrase vividly—the President asked of those of us who believe in fiscal responsibility "Who will they sacrifice?"

I think it has become very clear who the President will sacrifice. He is asking us to sacrifice the schoolchildren who seek a good education to prepare them for a complex world. He is asking us to sacrifice education standards of the many towns and counties of this Nation where Federal installations have brought in a great influx of workers and their families. These people work, and often live on tax-exempt land, for which the local government receives none of the taxes that other citizens must pay.

The Federal Government has a clear and well-established responsibility here for they are the cause of both the increase in schoolchildren and the loss of tax sources.

Two of the counties I represent in Florida are good examples of the problem. Under the present entitlements of Public Law 874, Brevard County would receive $2,524,706 in aid. If the administration's plan is accepted they will receive less than half that, $1,111,011. In other words they will have $1,413,695 less than they were promised.

Orange County was to have received $834,520. Under this new slash they will get only $136,205—a loss of $698,315. That is less than one-sixth of the amount they were promised.

Brevard County with its constant influx of Federal families and their children has a difficult enough job trying to determine in advance how much money it will need for its next term. Now it cannot even depend on how much it can get.

I ask you, How can local school boards operate and function under this sort of Federal handicap? They have to make plans and budgets in advance. After investing in the beginnings of a new building program, they suddenly learn that several hundred thousand dollars they had been promised from the Government will not be coming in.

Let me quote from two letters I have received just this week from Florida school administrators, telling of the extreme hardships that this unexpected reversal of Federal policy will bring.

One states:

> During the past 15 years, the smaller counties of the State have had considerable impact of federally connected children and have also suffered a reduction in the local tax base due to the acquisition of property by the Federal Government. In many instances the moneys provided by Public Law 874 have meant the difference between an adequate school program for all the pupils in these systems and a program which would not meet our standards.
>
> To reduce the moneys in these counties would result in such a forced curtailment of educational advantages now offered that the accreditation of schools, loss of personnel, and general loss of moral would result in an educational crisis from which recovery would be next to impossible.

The other reads:

> I believe that failure to receive this expected amount would mean that our receipts would not equal our expenditures, and we would have a deficit for this school year because of the Federal Government's failure to meet its commitment.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an idle giveaway program. It is a responsibility of the Federal Government to assist those localities which are hard pressed to educate the tremendous number of students brought suddenly into the area by a Government installation. There are 1,000 school districts in the United States that will suffer from this cut.

Impact aid to education was sound when it began many years ago. It was sound when it was continued year after year by Congress after Congress. Why, at a time when the Federal Government is committing itself, more than in any period of history, in interest and dollars to education, is President Johnson saying this vital program has become unsound and unnecessary?

Why is the President saying, despite all his supposed concern for the quality of education that a long-recognized responsibility of the Federal Government is no longer a responsibility—or at least that it will no longer be treated as one?

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked that the President would propose the sacrifice of the education of our children in order to help finance his expanded spending programs of the Great Society. I urge the Congress to reject this budget-juggling at the expense of schoolchildren to his something-for-everybody budget plans.

MIZE PROPOSED TO EXTEND SIGNUP DEADLINE FOR HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM UNDER MEDICARE UNTIL SEPTEMBER 30, 1966

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, as the March 31 deadline for signing up for the voluntary health insurance program under medicare draws closer, it is evident that there is still a great deal of misunderstanding about this particular program. It is a matter of record that millions of older citizens who are eligible for the program have not signed up to participate. In order to get these millions signed, a last-minute drive has been organized by the Office of Economic Opportunity. It is known as Medicare Alert and apparently teams of OEO workers will go from family to family to explain the program and get the names on the dotted lines.

Because of the confusion and misunderstanding, I believe that many of these older citizens should have more time in which to decide whether or not they want to participate. I am suggesting that the deadline be extended until September 30. This will give those who are considering the value of the program an additional 6 months to consider all of the factors involved before making the decision. Three of the months will be after the program goes into effect on July 1. During these 3 months they will be able to study the program in actual operation and will be in a better position to judge its merits and to determine whether it is needed in order to provide the necessary coverage for them.

Accordingly, I have introduced legislation which will authorize the extension of the deadline until September 30 for all of those who were 65 on January 1 this year and eligible to start receiving coverage under the program on July 1. If any senior citizen has already signed up and is not certain about the program, he would be permitted to delay making the decision until September 30.

Six months appears to be the appropriate period of time for the extension. Under the terms of the program as it is now set up, those who become 65 after January 1 this year actually have a 7-month period in which they can sign-up—3 months before the month of their birthday and 3 months after their birthday. During this initial enrolling period, the additional time would be of value not only to the undecided enrollees, but to the officials operating the program as well.

Because time is short, I am urging that immediate hearings be held on this legislation so that the extension can be approved before the March 31 deadline. I am confident that we will be performing a valuable service at this moment of indecision in the minds of a great many of our deserving senior citizens who need assistance but hesitate to obligate themselves for this additional charge if they already have similar coverage or do not have all the facts about the program.

I would hope that many of my colleagues would join in this effort to get an extension of the deadline.

PROFITS AND FREEDOM

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on January 25 Mr. Ben H. Wooten, chairman of the board of the Dallas Federal Savings and Loan Association addressed the East Texas Chapter of the Texas Manufacturers Association at Longview, Tex., relative to the lack of establishing priorities on the part of the Federal Government.

This address develops some excellent ideas by a very knowledgeable person as to Government services. Mr. Wooten has served as president and chairman of the board of the First National Bank of Dallas and formerly was president of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Little Rock, Ark. As a result of his experiences he can speak with authority on Government operations.

The address follows:

PROFITS AND FREEDOM

(By Ben H. Wooten, chairman of the board, Dallas Federal Savings and Loan Association)

I trust more of our people will appreciate the fact that manufacturing is a major business lifestream of America. Appreciation is a wonderful word, a powerful word; yet, often, a neglected word. If one knows he is appreciated by his family, his friends, his associates, and his neighbors, he can ward off any blow life has to offer, and one of the major purposes of my visit with you this evening is to express to you my abiding gratitude for the development you have brought about and will continue to bring about in this area.

Each of your companies is a corporate citizen entitled to the same privileges, treatment, and protection from the Government as accorded any other type citizen or organization—no more, no less. I am thoroughly convinced that the principle of equal consideration under law of all citizens, personal and corporate, is a must if our economic freedom is to survive. Any type of equitable price control must take into consideration all the component costs that are incurred in the manufacturing of a product.

I, of course, do not know the detailed operations of your various industries but I feel safe in saying that you have left nothing undone to be fair to your employees, just to your customers and liberal with your community and church. It is fine to give fringe benefits as well as good wages but we all, of course, must insist that employees work. Work opens the door to opportunity and work is the creator of wealth.

Longfellow said:

"The heights by great men reached and kept,
  Were not attained by sudden flight,
But they, while their companions slept,
  Were toiling upward in the night."

The successful manufacturing executive of today in his youth did not watch the clock.

Your economic importance to every community is exceedingly great. The wages you pay make possible the sales of suits of clothes, dresses, automobiles, food, and other necessities of life. The purchase of raw products by your industries enables tremendous employment extending into the rural areas, thus underpinning local economy.

We cannot estimate precisely just what would happen if and when the Vietnam war should close, but regardless of this, we have every reason to believe this will be a very fine year for business. I think everyone is justified in making ambitious plans for the year. It has been forecast that during this year American business will spend in the range of $55 billion in new plant and equipment. This will improve what is already the world's greatest industrial system. Let's have an affirmative approach to operation 1966, keeping in mind that those who have a negative approach to the problems of life receive only the leavings of life, the crumbs from life's banquet table.

I am not inferring that we shall have a perfect year; surely, we will have some disappointments. It has been said that into every life some rain must fall. If we did not have some ugliness, we could not appreciate beauty. If we did not have the valleys, the mountains would not be attractive. Regardless of efficiency, we will always have some disappointments but that is no reason to lose our independent status and ask for a governmental handout. When one stands in the sunshine, his body reflects a shadow, but if he faces the sun, the shadow falls behind. A positive approach to problems bring satisfactory solutions.

A study of the biographies of men and women who have left worthy footprints on the sands of time show that the decisive factors in their achievements were internal. The outstanding manufacturer possesses something in his heart and mind that cannot be found in any particular chapter on any special page in a book, and no governmental regulation can ever eradicate it. A Government regulation cannot take the place of sound judgment.

The purpose of your business and mine is to make a profit for those who invest their capital with us; otherwise, they will not invest. In many sections of the world, the profit motive seems to be outlawed; however, we still think it is in the inner recesses of the hearts of all men. The desire to have and to own is deeply imbedded in human nature. I am reminded of the parody:

"Count that day lost,
  Whose low descending sun,
Sees bids put in at cost
  And business done for fun."

The hope of a free America lies in the vigor and enterprise of its citizens, personal and corporate, coupled with the right to make a profit and keep a part of it. Mr. Webster defines profit as "the excess of returns over expenditures in a given transaction." Let's remember that meager profits over a long period of time indicate meager management over the same period of time, and it is through profits that we are able to support our families, pay the heavy burden of taxes, maintain churches, schools, etc. Let's ever be ready to defend the profit system—it is the basis of our economic stability and freedom.

There are some people that seem to feel that all big business is subject to criticism, and they do not know why they feel that way. I am inclined to believe that the people who hold such criticism are uninformed as to the services and the living standard made possible by business performance; therefore, business in general needs to inform more completely the public as to its role in our economy. Business needs to:

1. Tell the facts about the role of profits in providing our present level of employment.

2. Explain how profits and profits only determine how much a business can expand employment in the future.

3. Show in indisputable figures the small share of the gross national product that is finally distributed as profits.

4. Have people understand that everybody profits from profits—worker, owner, consumer alike, for business is strong only when profits are reasonable, and strong business, and strong business only, can insure high levels of employment.

When a company does not make a profit, it pays no taxes, it does not help support the Government, and provides fewer and fewer jobs because it cannot afford money for new products and new markets. It cannot increase wages and finally the jobs play out. Therefore, profit without exploitation either directly or indirectly benefits everyone, and any organization which hampers the making of a reasonable profit is working to its own disadvantage. In fact, profit is the workman's best friend because no company can continue to exist if it continues not to make a profit. When an organization attacks the profit system, it is attacking the permanency of the jobs of its own members.

If I should want to make a slave out of you, I would try to relieve you of the responsibility of your own welfare and to make you dependent upon me for food, clothing, housing, and other necessities of life. After a few years of such dependence, you would be helpless, subject to my every command. You could do only my bidding.

Our most precious American heritage is freedom. Freedom is easily lost. It is lost just as surely when people lack self-reliance and put too much dependence on Government. It is lost when the individual is deprived of his right to speak up, to work at a job of his own choosing, to take risks, to compete in business, to earn a profit, and to keep as his own a fair share of what he earns. Freedom remains only when men, in their daily lives, practice it, apply it, and protect it.

It has been said that the most vital spot to concentrate is not where laws are made but where lawmakers are made. Lawmakers usually heed the voice of the people they believe are responsible for getting them elected. Therefore, a change in any trend must come from the bottom up and not from the top down.

Let's remember we can't vote ourselves security; we have to produce it and protect it. For many years unwise leaders have, in effect, proclaimed, "Give me your support and I will care for you. I will take from others and give you a living for which you don't have to work." Over the years men have drugged themselves into that dreaming and have waken up as virtual slaves.

In the year 1960 Charles R. Slight, Jr., president of the National Association of Manufacturers, said the following: "The National Association of Manufacturers therefore stands squarely for the preservation of our system of individual opportunity and personal freedom. By this, NAM does not maintain that the American system, as it now exists, is perfect. It fully recognizes that the performance of the manufacturing industry can be improved, and it intends to do everything within its power to promote such improvement. But NAM holds firmly to the belief that the American economic system and individual freedom are inseparable. There can be no compromise between a free economy and a total-state economy because any such compromise will endanger political and personal as well as economic freedom."

Our major job, it seems to me, is reselling Americans on Americanism. If we turn further toward socialism, it will not be the result of any Russian propaganda economic or military movements. It will be our doing—or may I say our own undoing.

For too many years, farmers, business and professional men have sat on the sidelines in the great game of politics. Lobbyists and business associates are no substitute for those who personally take an interest in any problem. Democracy for the individual is not a spectator sport. It demands participation because people are the muscles of a democracy. Every citizen should exercise his prerogatives in order to give the kind of performance required of free people.

The United States with its high standard of living is an example of a country that placed opportunity ahead of handouts, and it is with aching hearts that we see trends now placing the welfare state ahead of individual freedom. We know there should be no subsidy for laziness, incompetence or lack of will to perform. The free way of life is somewhat rugged and painful at times, but it has paid the biggest dividends on earth and is worthy of whatever it takes to maintain it. Freedom appeals to man's strength; the welfare state appeals to man's weakness. Freedom teaches a man to stand independently on his own feet; the welfare state teaches him to lose himself in the protective herd.

Freedom is lost when the demands of the state take over the rights of the individual. It is lost when the individual is deprived of his right to earn a profit and to keep as his own a fair share of what he earns. Freedom is lost when currency loses its value; therefore, our country needs fiscal heroism, dollar defense, including soldiers in the battle against inflation. In national finances, we have been drifting for a number of years, and let's remember that drifting articles (dollars) always go downstream.

We are reminded that Ella Wheeler Wilcox once wrote:

> "One ship drives east,
>   another west,
> With the self-same gale
>   that blows;
> 'Tis the set of the sail
>   and not the gale
> That determines the way we go."

It is certainly time for us to examine the setting of our financial sails and steer our ship of government into the harbor of personal responsibility and there permanently drop anchor. If we do not change the trend, we will, I fear, trade our freedom for an ultimate withering subsidy and become a subject rather than a citizen.

Kipling once wrote:

> "God of our fathers, known of old,
> Lord of our farflung battle lines,
> Beneath whose awful hand we hold,
> Dominion over palm and pine.
> Lord, God of Hosts, be with us yet,
> Lest we forget, lest we forget."

Let's never forget what? History reveals that every nation that has followed the primrose path of the welfare state has lost the value of its currency and the individual has lost his economic freedom.

We are firmly of the opinion that in the afternoon of life when the gold of the sunset has been driven away by the gray of the twilight, there will be more dignity, joy, and freedom in living off the profits that we have created for ourselves rather than in wondering for whom to vote in order to keep a political stipend from being cut.

There is a poem I like very much:

> "Truth forever on the scaffold,
> Wrong forever on the throne,
> Yet the scaffold sways the future,
> And behind the dim unknown
> Standeth God, within the shadow,
> Keeping watch above His own."

I know you join me in the prayer that tonight God is somewhere out there watching over America, and that in some way, some how He will give us the courage to retain the principles that have made our country the most blessed place this side of Heaven.

FAIR TRIAL AND FREE PRESS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Raymond L. Spangler, publisher of the Redwood City, Calif., Tribune, and national president of Sigma Delta Chi, has been active in journalism and public affairs for some 41 years, and he has an unusually keen ability to analyze the news. Following is an address entitled, "Fair Trial and Free Press," which was given by Mr. Spangler as the second annual Carlos McClatchy Memorial Lecture at Stanford University on Monday, February 14. The Carlos McClatchy Memorial Lecture was established in 1964 to bring to the university newspapermen who have distinguished themselves in public life.

FAIR TRIAL AND FREE PRESS

(By Raymond L. Spangler, at the Carlos McClatchy Memorial Lecture, Stanford University, February 14, 1966)

When Mr. Weigle and I discussed the topic for this lecture we decided on fair trial and free press in order to explore again the thesis that this is not a matter of choice; rather that you can't have one without the other. This has been a popular theme with lecturing editors. J. Russell Wiggins, editor of the Washington Post, did it for the Nieman report in March of 1964. Angelus T. Burch, then associate editor of the Chicago Daily News, told the bar association of the State of Kansas about the same thing in 1955. Vermont Royster, editor of the Wall Street Journal, used the same title in February 1965, for the North Carolina Law Review. Yet things are happening so rapidly in this national conflict between the press and the bar in 1966 that I'm no longer certain that our dialog is amicable or that it is leading to mutual understanding.

The average person, if there is any such, probably could not care less except in two points of contact: When a crime is committed by someone else, he wants to know all about it. That's free press. But if the crime involves him, he wants it kept out of the paper. That's fair trial.

In the Bill of Rights we have article I: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press."

Then we have article VI: "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense."

At first blush there doesn't seem to be any conflict between these two; but there is, and the discussions between the press and the bar have been going on for decades. We—the press—are accused of poisoning the font of justice before it begins to flow by publishing prejudicial material.

These discussions have been heating up to the point that in January of this year the Freedom of Information Center at the University of Missouri felt it necessary to issue a special situation paper discussing the chronology of curbs, suggested and enforced, on the release of information concerning and the coverage of crime in criminal proceedings 1963 through 1965. It was prompted by a series of exceptional judicial actions barring pretrial and trial coverage which erupted in November and December of last year in several Western States.

One of the most interesting of these cases occurred in Tucson, Ariz.

Gretchen and Wendy Fritz, teenage daughters of Dr. and Mrs. William Fritz of Tucson, disappeared last August 16. Their bodies were found in the desert north of the city on November 10. Alleen Rowe, 15, disappeared May 31. Her body has not been found.

Charles Howard Schmid, Jr., 23, Tucson, is charged with the murder of all three in two separate actions. Two other defendants were charged in the Rowe case. They have entered pleas of guilty, have been sentenced and have offered to testify against Schmid.

The attorney for Schmid requested the court to restrain the district attorney, the sheriff and the chief of police from making any comment, written, oral or visual in the Schmid case to the press.

The judge issued the order but he crossed out the words "to the press." He thus muzzled the officers completely except in preparation of the case to court trial, or further investigation related to law enforcement. The order was issued November 23. The press and the public were barred from the preliminary hearing.

George Rosenberg, managing editor of the Tucson Daily Citizen, went down fighting. He called upon the spokesmen for the press throughout the country to issue statements. They complied. Most of them denounced the judge.

The issue was at a stalemate until a college editor on the University of Arizona campus, a bright young man named Sotomayor, printed a fiery editorial demanding to know where are the fighting editors of Arizona today.

Sigma Delta Chi, the professional journalism society of which I happen to be president, got into the act through its Southern Arizona Professional Chapter at Tucson. It voted to fight the judge's order all the way to the Supreme Court.

There is no unanimity of opinion on this matter among the press. William Matthews, editor of the Star in Tucson, said the judge was right and we who protest are fools.

Parenthetically, those of you who are worried about the editorial integrity of the two San Francisco newspapers which merged recently into a common printing operation, may take some heart from the Tucson incident. The two Tucson newspapers are in court on an antitrust matter. They, too, are printed in a common plant, and now have common ownership. However confusing, the difference of opinion between Mr. Rosenberg and Mr. Matthews is exemplary in this situation. It demonstrates editorial independence in two sides of the same house.

However, we have not been able to persuade Mr. Rosenberg's paper to become an aggrieved party in the Schmid matter and to appeal the judge's order, even though the judge himself suggested that his order, since it is without precedent, be tested. This fight may be lost not for want of valor, but because we lack a legally constituted champion.

The danger of the Tucson order—unlimited in either time or scope—is that it establishes a precedent.

By way of illustration, let me read you a recent Associated Press story from Bastrop, Tex.: "District Judge Leslie D. Williams warned officers of his court from the sheriff up or down against saying anything about any case, any crime, anything until it comes into this court. The judge told news reporters they could use what they heard coming from the witness stand in open court, but that was all."

This is the judge's interpretation of the new Texas law which went into effect January 1. This law says in part: "It is the duty of the trial court, the attorney representing the State, the attorney representing the accused and all officers of the law to so conduct themselves as to insure the defendant of a fair trial upon the presumption of innocence and at the same time afford the public the benefit of a free press"—a masterful restatement of the problem, but with no solution.

Obviously, the Texas judge believes that the free press has a right to print news, but no right to gather it.

Many members of the bar openly advocate the English system.

In England newspapers have been held in contempt and have been punished for discussing evidence which was later ruled inadmissible; for doing their own detective work and publishing that; for revealing facts not brought out in open court, or for publishing pictures of the accused.

Only by limiting its accounts to a fair and accurate report of trial proceedings as they progress can a newspaper man in England feel safe from judicial retaliation. The law is also entirely judge made and judge controlled, and I believe this is what we now see evolving in the United States despite the first amendment. The English newspapers, however, sat on the Christine Keeler-John Profumo case for 6 months. In this country that conspiracy of silence would have made us partners in the crime.

If England, Texas and Arizona are a bit remote, let us take a look at California.

Here we have the judicial council with certain delegated authorities in the administration of our State courts.

This council met in San Francisco November 26 and voted to prohibit newspaper photography, recording for broadcast, and broadcasting within a courtroom while the court is in session or during any midmorning or midafternoon recess, except for ceremonials. The vote was 17 to 1.

That single no vote was cast by Assemblyman George Willson of Huntington Park, who is chairman of the assembly judiciary committee. This committee is conducting hearings throughout the State on the very issue of fair trial and free press, and before the committee could complete its hearings, the judicial council acted with the force of law.

This judicial council rule went into effect January 1 of this year. There was no great change in the reporting of criminal trials in California.

This is because of canon 35 of the American Bar Association. It was adopted September 30, 1937, and amended in 1952. While it is advisory only, it is an ethic and it has prevented photography, broadcasting and telecasting in the courtrooms almost entirely.

It originated because one of the great sins of the press, the coverage of the trial of Bruno Hauptman for the kidnap-murder of the Lindbergh baby.

Eye witnesses have described the trial as a roman holiday. Photographers climbed on counsel's tables and shoved their flash bulbs in the faces of witnesses. The judge lost control of his courtroom and the press photographers lost control of their senses.

For 30 years the press has been fighting canon 35. We in Redwood City on rare occasions have succeeded in taking pictures of criminal trials, with permission of the judge, and without disrupting the trial or poisoning the font of justice.

There intervened, meanwhile, another famous trial which involves a fellow journalist. He was Billy Sol Estes.

In 1962 Mr. Estes was president of the Pecos Printing Co. of Pecos, Tex., publishers of the Pecos News, issued mornings except Monday. Circulation figures were not available.

The rival newspaper was the Pecos Independent. The editor was Oscar Griffin, who subsequently was hired by the Houston Chronicle as a general assignment reporter.

Mr. Griffin was 28 years old at the time. He is a native of Liberty, Tex., and prior to becoming editor in Pecos he had been editor of the Canyon Texas News, the Fort Bliss News, and served as public relations director for his hometown. The Pecos Independent was founded in 1887, at last report had a circulation of 3,191, and publishes on Mondays and Thursdays.

In 1963 Sigma Delta Chi presented Mr. Griffin a citation which read as follows: "Mr. Griffin is cited for his initiative, persistence, and courage in first disclosing and then diligently reporting the illegal activities which have since become known as the Billie Sol Estes case; for conducting and reporting his investigations with thoroughness, clarity, and a high sense of civic and journalistic responsibility, and for demonstrating memorably the benefits of a free and independent press."

In 1963 Billie Sol Estes was sentenced to 15 years in prison for mail fraud and conspiracy in manipulating worthless fertilizer tank mortgages worth $24 million. U.S. District Judge R. E. Thomason described the onetime millionaire financier as the most gigantic swindler in history. This was the Federal case.

In 1962, a State trial jury convicted the promoter on a charge of swindling and set his sentence at 8 years in the State penitentiary. The Federal and State terms were to run concurrently.

The State conviction was appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court. A decision was handed down June 7, 1965. The State conviction was reversed by a vote of 5 to 4.

Mr. Justice Stewart, Mr. Justice Black, Mr. Justice Brennan, and Mr. Justice White dissented.

Mr. Justice Clark delivered the opinion of the court. The Chief Justice gave some views of his own, and Mr. Justice Harlan cast the deciding vote in an opinion which concurred in a limited area.

The entire issue was the televising and broadcasting of a 2-day pretrial session of the trial court in Tyler, Tex. The conviction was reversed because this pretrial session, where no evidence was introduced, was televised. Now here were nine men, and I doubt that any one of them has had any experience with a televised or broadcast trial. Lacking that experience, the majority Supreme Court opinion reflected a great deal of speculation.

The following quotations indicate the court's confessed lack of knowledge in the critical points involved: The influence of television and newspaper cameras and radio microphones on the jury, the witnesses, and the court.

Said the court and I quote: "Still one cannot put his finger on its specific mischief and prove with particularity wherein he was prejudiced. * * * The conscious or unconscious effect that this may have on the juror's judgment cannot be evaluated * * *. The impact upon a witness of the knowledge that he is being viewed by a vast audience is simply incalculable * * * . And even in the absence of sound, the influences of such viewing upon the attitude of the witness toward testifying his frame of mind upon taking the stand or his apprehension of withering cross-examination defy objective assessment."

Mr. Chief Justice Warren apprehended this speculative weakness in the majority opinion and submitted his own opinion with which Mr. Justice Douglas and Mr. Justice Goldberg joined.

In this the Chief Justice said: "I wish to emphasize that our condemnation of televised criminal trial is not based on generalities or abstract fears * * *", and then in what may be the Freudian judicial slip of the century, in a decision denying pictorial description of a criminal trial, he appended seven photographs taken in the criminal courtroom of Texas where Billie Sol Estes was convicted.

A great (in my opinion) dissent was written by Mr. Justice Stewart when he said: "What ultimately emerges from this record, therefore, is one bald question—whether the 14th amendment of the U.S. Constitution prohibits all television cameras from a State courtroom whenever a criminal trial is in progress. In the light of this record and what we now know about the impact of television on a criminal trial, I can find no such prohibition in the 14th amendment or in any other provision of the Constitution.

"While no first amendment claim is made in this case, there are intimations in the opinions filed by the brethren in the majority which strike me as disturbingly alien to the 1st and 14th amendments' guarantees against Federal or State interference with the free communication of information and ideas. The suggestion that there are limits upon the public's right to know what goes on in the courts causes me deep concern. The idea of imposing upon any medium of communications the burden of justifying its presence is contrary to where I had always thought the presumption must lie in the area of first amendment freedoms—and the proposition that nonparticipants in a trial might get the wrong impression from unfettered reporting and commentary contains an invitation to censorship which I cannot accept."

No doubt the California Judicial Council was influenced by this decision. There is nothing specific in its report indicating why it was necessary to strengthen canon 35 with the Council Rule 980 on January 1. But it was done and canon 35 now has the force of law. Assemblyman Willson's committee continues its work. I had the pleasure of appearing before the committee in San Diego January 31 in the city council hearing chambers.

This is a room on the 12th floor of the city hall with special balcony rooms for still and television cameras.

Although Assemblyman Willson announced at the start of the hearing that the proceedings were being televised and taped for radio, none of us witnesses was aware of any special equipment except the peculiarly shaped microphone at the press table which picked up the sounds of the proceedings.

Contrary to the Hauptmann trial, the broadcasting, picture taking and sound recording of this hearing were entirely unobtrusive.

But even more important was the testimony of Roberta Butzbach, judge of the municipal court in Bellflower, Calif., who testified that prior to the effective date of rule 980, she had had an ordinary criminal trial televised in her court. Her testimony was as follows:

"The universal comment was that once the trial began, the presence of the news media was forgotten. All the dire predictions and suppositions as to the manner in which people would behave in such a situation simply did not happen. There were no attempts to play Hamlet or to outdo Bob Hope.

"If there was any effect at all, and I'm not certain there was, it was in the direction of a slightly greater restraint and dignity. If this was the effect, it was not only contrary to prediction, it was salutory."

And she added this philosophical note: "None now says: Let us conduct trials in secret. They merely say: Let us protect accused persons from excessive publicity.

"None now says: Let us remove society from participation in the judicial process. They merely say: We doubt the ability of society to understand the judicial process.

"Without publicity there can be no understanding. Without understanding there can be no intelligent participation. Ultimately there can be no informed electorate."

An attempt will be made to repeal or suspend Judicial Council Rule 980, but not in any hope that television of criminal trials will spring full grown from the present void. No television referee will jump from the press table, tap the top of his cap, and call for an interlude of 2 minutes while the sponsor gives his message.

We will still have canon 35.

I believe that the press will suggest an investigative committee made up of members of the Judicial Council, journalists and educators to initiate studies and evaluations to examine the rights and scopes of a free press as applied to electronic journalism and newspaper courtroom photography, the psychological effects of television, newspaper, and motion picture cameras on court personnel, witnesses and others, and possible formulation of ground rules for use of the modern tools of journalism in courtrooms.

Just as the Scopes trial challenged the theory of evolution in Tennessee, so have the judicial council and the Supreme Court challenged the evolution of communications between the courts and the public. The bar says the pad and pencil are the last word. We disagree.

Of the more recent developments in this free press and fair trial controversy, perhaps the most serious is the U.S. Supreme Court's decision to review the Dr. Sam Sheppard case—Cleveland, 1954.

Five volumes of newspaper clippings will be submitted to determine whether pretrial publicity was so prejudicial that no impartial jury could have been impanelled. These clippings may not now display the professional excellence they may appear to have had in 1954.

To refresh my mind about the newspaper side of the Sheppard case I called on an old friend and former staff member, Ellis H. Sprunger, Jr., who edited most of the Associated Press copy out of Cleveland during the trial. He is now with the San Francisco AP bureau and favored me with this letter:

"Mrs. Sam was killed July 4, 1954, at Bay Village. Police later testified in court that after her killing somebody had carefully cleaned up evidence, but not carefully enough so that blood stains would not show when detected with modern police methods. No weapon was ever found.

"Dr. Sam was not available for questioning after the slaying. His brother took him to a hospital the family owned and said he had an injured neck and could not be questioned. There apparently was not a lot of police work going on. Just why I cannot say, but it is a fact that Dr. Sam was the surgeon for the Bay Village Police Department and the friend of the mayor, who lived on the same block.

"No public physician was able to examine Dr. Sam to determine whether he actually was injured.

"There was a coroner's inquest which, as I recall, did not turn up much of anything.

"Meanwhile, pressure was building up. It all looked too pat. And at this time the Cleveland Press took a strong hand. One bit I'm sure is in the files you mention as being before the Supreme Court was a cartoon which appeared on page 1. It showed a number of civic officials and others holding up a sheet and the caption said that somebody was hiding something. The top of the head of a man showed above the sheet and it certainly looked to me like the top of Dr. Sam's head.

"At about this time the Cleveland police were called into the case. They worked carefully and energetically but apparently too late and I don't recall that they turned up any really clinching evidence.

"Finally, the city attorney at Bay Village, the son of an Ohio Supreme Court justice, signed the charge himself and Dr. Sam was arrested and taken to jail in Cleveland. Police there were unable to question him at any great length because his attorney kept requesting to see him, hinting third degree.

"In the end the jury found Dr. Sam guilty of second degree murder.

"Certainly, the trial was a Roman holiday."

The book of clippings won a reversal and freedom for Dr. Sam last year, but the reversal was itself reversed by the U.S. Court of Appeals in Ohio when it said: "Our jury system cannot survive if it is now proper to presume that jurors selected with the care taken in this case, are without intelligence, courage, and integrity necessary to their obedience to the law's command that they ignore the kind of publicity here involved."

Four Supreme Court Judges believe that a constitutional question is involved—and this may intensify the press-bar conflict particularly if it disturbs the status quo on contempt.

The landmark cases protecting both individual and press, from punishment for contempt, have thus far concerned prejudicial publication as it concerned judges only. The Pennekamp, Bridges, Los Angeles Times-Mirror cases and others brought about the "clear and present danger" concept—that a constructive contempt, away from the immediate presence of the court, would not be punished unless it could be shown that a clear and present danger existed to the administration of justice. The theory is that judges would not be so endangered because, forsooth, they are judges.

Yet, judges have been throwing newspapermen in jail for generations.

Ralph Conley is a 53-year-old reporter for the Wheeling, W. Va., Intelligencer. He is a 10-year veteran with that paper, and a 25-year senior in newspaper work. He was assigned to cover the New Martinsville area.

On Saturday, January 15 of this year he wrote a story listing five civil actions which had been set for trial on Tuesday, January 18 in the Wetzel County Circuit Court by Judge Lloyd Arnold. After listing them he wrote this:

"Probably the most interesting case is that of Mrs. Frances Ripley versus the city of Paden City.

"Mrs. Ripley, a resident of Paden City, and wife of Leo Ripley, fell into an open sidewalk grating on January 22, 1965, and seeks recovery of damages for $24,000.

"In her petition, she claims permanent injury and that the fall resulted in a compound fracture of her left leg, and other injuries.

"The city carries a $100,000 liability insurance policy and the city council acknowledged fault and recommended in a letter to the insurance carrier that the claim be paid. However, no payment has been received and the suit followed.

"Attorney Jack Hawkins represents the plaintiff, and Hassig & Sndyer are attorneys for the defendant."

On Monday, January 17 Judge Arnold sent an officer to ask Conley to come to his office. At the conclusion of the interview and after Conley left, the judge prepared a rule of contempt directed to Conley. It was served on Conley that morning.

A courtroom hearing before Judge Arnold was scheduled at 2 p.m. the same day.

Judge Arnold concluded the hearing by finding that publication of the news story obstructed and impeded the operation of his court and that accordingly Conley was in contempt. The judge sentenced him to 5 days in jail, fined him $10 and ordered the sheriff to place him in jail immediately.

Attorneys for Conley appeared before Judge Arnold the next morning and orally moved that the judgment of contempt be set aside, that a new hearing be awarded, and that Conley be discharged from jail. Arguments on these motions were heard at 1 p.m. Tuesday. The attorneys submitted four grounds for the motion, including the first amendment, and the judge overruled the motions. Thereon the attorneys for Conley moved for a stay of the proceedings in order that they might appeal the judge's decision to the Supreme Court of Appeals. The judge granted a 60-day stay, setting bond in the amount of $50. Conley was subsequently released after 24 hours in jail, and went back to work.

The case is pending.

The city council action was a matter of record.

Then there was the 1964 case of Will Harrison, a 50-year-old columnist for the New Mexican, 14,000 circulation, published at Santa Fe. He presumed to make an adverse comparison of two drunk driving cases before a Santa Fe judge.

In one case, a Mexican-American boy filled up on wine, had an auto accident and killed three persons. He was sentenced to the penitentiary for 1 to 5 years.

In the other case, a former assistant district attorney wiped out a family of five while driving under the influence, but was given a $500 fine, the fine was suspended and the judge announced that at the end of the year he would pronounce further sentence. Will Harrison cried "outrage" and was convicted for contempt of court on the grounds that the lawyer defendant was still on probation, thus the case was still before the court.

Will Harrison died a couple of months ago, and he was, in my opinion, an unsung hero. He had been vindicated by the State Supreme Court October 4, 1965, on the grounds that no clear and present danger to the administration of justice had been shown.

But when you study constructive contempt, think about this one: In December, 1965, in Montgomery, Ala., three Ku Klu Klansmen were convicted of criminal conspiracy charges in the death of a civil rights worker. She was Viola Liuzzo, a Detroit housewife.

The judge held the jury in deliberation for 11 hours over the protest of the defense attorney, and the defense attorney announced that an appeal would be filed and bond for three men was set at $10,000 cash.

Whereupon the President of the United States said: "The whole Nation can take heart from the fact that there are those in the South who believe in justice in racial matters and were determined not to stand for acts of violence."

Many of us joined him in cheering that verdict in a great national example of constructive contempt of court for commenting on a case still in the process of adjudication.

Where was the voice of the bar when that transpired?

And where was the self-restraint of the press?

Both were lacking, and both must be supplied before we know whether we should be talking about fair trial and free press or fair trial versus free press.

Wiggins said it in 1964: "Newspapers, judges, and lawyers alike ought to try to improve the reporting of criminal trials. What is needed is more and better crime reporting, not less of it."

Burch said it in 1955: "It is the newspaper's duty to print the facts not to try them. That is the duty of the courts. We want every defendant to have the benefit of due process—the whole treatment, with all the trimmings. But we see too much of the undue processes that help armies of dangerous malefactors to escape conviction, indictment, or even arrest."

Vermont Royster said it in 1965: "Here the lesson experience, a thousand years of experience, was that the judicial process must be open to inspection from its beginning to its end, to the purpose that all should lie under the public gaze so that if error could not be obviated it could at least not be hidden. One instrument for this was the open court with the accused and the accusers openly confronted. Another instrument was the open press, so that nothing could be hidden from the first accusation to final judgment. The lesson of the common law was that the two were not irreconcilable, they were mutually dependent."

Today it is necessary to recognize that the hunt for the uninformed juror is fruitless, and that our reliance on the integrity of our peers is not misplaced. That is the nub of the problem, and it will not be solved by speculation; rather by careful research.

TRAFFIC SAFETY—ACTION NEEDED NOW

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the National Trial Lawyers Association predicted recently that unless the Federal Government does something soon, deaths from motor vehicle accidents will reach 100,000 a year by 1975—double the present auto death rate.

The report of this same group of lawyers noted that while 605,000 Americans have died in all wars from the Revolution to Vietnam, road deaths in the United States have totaled 1,500,000 in only 25 years. The study revealed that the number of persons injured in highway accidents in 1964 is the same number as the total beds in all hospitals in the United States—1,700,000. These are shocking figures.

I have thought for some time that we should take steps at the national level to standardize highway signs, speeds, and so forth, in an effort to cut this needless death, injury, and destruction on our highways. Although the Federal Government has spent millions building interstate highways, we have done little or nothing at the national level to prescribe and enforce safety standards. Several years ago, when we became alarmed at the increase in accidents involving airliners, we established the Federal Aviation Agency to coordinate and improve safety in the air. Now we should establish an agency to improve safety on the ground—for automobile drivers and passengers, as well as trucks and buses.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Mackay], a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, has gone into this problem very thoroughly and has proposed legislation to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses. I am introducing a similar bill.

The National Traffic Safety Agency, which would be headed by an Administrator comparable to the Federal Aviation Administrator, would do the following:

Establish a National Safety Research and Testing Center.

Provide leadership to achieve a more uniform traffic environment, including more uniform rules of the road, more adequate standards of safety in the manufacture of new vehicles and inspection of vehicles in use, better definition of fitness to drive, and a more uniform physical driving environment.

The proposed new Agency should not seek to supplant existing public and private agencies, but it should provide aggressive leadership to achieve a concert of action.

It is my hope that the legislation will be enacted promptly so we can begin a real effort to reduce wanton destruction on our highways.

HAVANA TRI-CONTINENT CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Selden] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation in recent weeks has watched with great interest and concern the hearings conducted by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in regard to our policy in southeast Asia.

Last week both Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Gen. Maxwell Taylor presented excellent arguments for a policy of firmness in dealing with the threat of communism in Vietnam. In view of the persistent carping of foreign policy soft liners, who would have this country retreat in the face of Communist aggression, it was most refreshing to hear the statements of experienced and knowledgeable spokesmen such as Secretary Rusk and General Taylor.

With regard to the recent Senate Foreign Relations hearings, I read with interest the accounts of testimony given to the committee by Mr. George Kennan. Mr. Kennan seems to argue that the U.S. commitment to South Vietnam has assumed exaggerated proportions and that this country should, therefore, limit or curb our efforts there.

Mr. Kennan, as we know, is credited as the creator of the original policy of containment which this country followed in its dealings with Soviet communism in Europe during the period immediately following World War II. Now it would appear that Mr. Kennan has evolved a latter-day policy of containment regarding the U.S. commitment to defend southeast Asia from the threat of aggressive communism. But, unlike his first containment policy, the general thrust of his current advice is that in 1966 we should contain our own efforts in meeting Communist expansionism in southeast Asia.

Needless to say, Mr. Kennan's remarks received wide attention in the press and on television. It is unfortunate that the American public has not been given as great exposure to the facts, circumstances, and results of a meeting held in Havana last month—the so-called Tri-Continent Conference—which spelled out the future course of Communist aggression in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The recommendations and policy statements coming out of this Havana Conference represents a veritable "Mein Kampf" of international Communist designs and aims throughout the world in the 1960's and 1970's. And although the Soviet Union was represented by a 40-member delegation, it is well to note that the chief result of the January Havana Conference was to implement and foster the Chinese Communist thesis for eventual Communist seizure of power in countries alined to the free world.

Critics of present U.S. policy in South Vietnam, such as Mr. Kennan, make much of the ideological split between the Soviet Union and China. It is, in fact, currently fashionable in some U.S. foreign policy circles to accuse those of us who speak of the threat of communism as being simplistic in our approach. We are told that we should differentiate between the so-called various forms of communism—whether we refer to Soviet or Chinese or even North Vietnamese communism.

Yet the unanimity which the delegates of the Havana Tri-Continent Conference demonstrated on the matter of waging Chinese-style wars of liberation throughout the world points up the futility—if not the real danger—of this polemic fragmentizing of communism in the world today.

It may be true that communism is no longer monolithic as it was in the immediate post-World War II era. But the threat of Communist expansion—and the Communist design for subversion and domination of countries of the free world—is monolithic and universal in every Communist capital.

Thus it was that the basic theme of the so-called Tri-Continent Conference in Havana—a theme repeated by Soviet and Chinese Communist spokesmen alike—was a strident call for war on all fronts against the free world.

As the Soviet delegate to the Conference, Sharif P. Rashidor, stated:

> We are participating in a major event in the history of the national-liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The anti-imperialist struggle, with its demands for the unshakable unity of its fighting forces, has brought the peoples of our continents to a realization of the urgent necessity for an even greater consolidation, and an even greater coordination, of our struggle against our common enemy—imperialism and, first and foremost, U.S. imperialism.
>
> The Soviet delegation earnestly appeals to all the national organizations and their movements represented at this Conference to unite in the struggle for this great goal. Let our Conference be a new stage on this road. Let it multiply and strengthen the unity of our ranks, and impart new force to the liberation struggle throughout the world.

The resolutions approved by the Conference are in the same aggressive and militaristic vein. They call for an intensified campaign of subversion and political warfare against democratic regimes of the free world.

But the larger significance of the Tri-Continent Conference in Havana does not lie in the unified pronouncement of revolutionary aims among Communist nations. For only a fatuous self-delusion has ever persuaded the soft-line Kremlinologists of the free world that the Soviets and the Chinese alike seek

Communist world domination, and by violent revolutionary means. They are as one, differing only on tactics, and timetable, and those who doubt this fact should be furnished the record of the Havana Conference as required reading.

No, the truly alarming significance of the Havana Conference last month stems from the scope and nature of participation by nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America—many of which, while purporting to be "neutralist" as between Communist and the free world, in fact are providing political and other support to the revolutionary and subversive aims of Communist bloc nations.

Indeed, all the speeches, resolutions, and actions of the delegates of the 82 nations represented at the Conference were geared to the propaganda needs and aims of agressive international communism. In fact, the Tri-Continent Conference went much further than any similar meeting in recent years in spelling out the aggressive designs of world Communist leadership toward nations of the free world.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs I am especially concerned with the serious implications of the Conference as regards our vital national interests and commitments to the defense of the hemisphere.

The Organization of American States expressed its alarm regarding the Havana Conference in a resolution of condemnation, approved February 2, 18–0, with Mexico and Chile abstaining.

The OAS resolution reflects hemispheric concern regarding the possibility of new attempts of Communist takeovers in a number of countries, including Venezuela, Guatemala, Colombia, and Uruguay. And the Tri-Continent Conference itself serves to reemphasize the appropriateness of House Resolution 560, which only last year expressed the sense of the House regarding the need for firm U.S. policy to meet the threat of Communist intervention in the Western Hemisphere. In the light of last month's meeting in Havana, that resolution is even more pertinent today than when it was passed by an overwhelming majority of the House in September 1965.

So-called neutral, unalined countries, with delegates participating at the Havana meeting, would do well to ponder the significance of this House resolution. It must be made abundantly clear, not only to Communist nations, but to others which seek to advance their own interest by lending themselves to Communist aims, that the United States does not intend to remain inactive in the face of any external threat to the security of the Americas.

While I am reasonably certain few, if any, nations will admit that participants at the Havana meeting were official delegates of their governments, the fact that some of the delegates even at this moment hold official positions in their respective governments is shocking indeed.

For example, the Syrian delegation included Mohammad Ali Al Khatib, Secretary General of that country's Ministry of Information. Attending as an invited guest was Mohamed Fayed from the United Arab Republic who is Director of the African Affairs at the Presidency.

African countries were well represented by official members of their governments. Tanzania sent Salim Said Rasuid, the Deputy Finance Minister. The head of Guinea's delegation was Abdoulaye Diallo, Director of Political Affairs in the Foreign Ministry, and also included the Guinean Ambassador to the United Arab Republic, Fode Cisse. Ghana was represented by Ofory Bah-Emmanuel, Director of that country's Bureau of African Affairs; and Pauline Mirande Clerk, Office of the President of Ghana. Lakhdar Brahimi, representing Algeria, is that country's Ambassador to the United Arab Republic.

Since many of the nations which were represented at the Havana Conference have been and are now receiving hundreds of millions of dollars of U.S. aid, I have written to the Secretary of State with the request that he determine the status of the delegations to the Havana meeting. I also asked the Secretary to give consideration to the termination of U.S. assistance to those nations who participated with official or semi-official delegations in accordance with section 620(i) of the Foreign Assistance Act. This provision of that act prohibits assistance under this or any other act, including sales under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any countries which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against the United States or to any countries receiving assistance from the United States.

The proceedings at last month's Tri-Continent Conference made a prima facie case regarding preparations for such aggression.

It would seem, therefore, that a State Department investigation is in order to determine, at the very least, whether U.S. economic aid should not be terminated to certain nations which were represented at the Havana meeting.

Immediately following my statement, I am attaching a full list of delegates in attendance at the January Havana meeting, as reported by the Cuban press.

Mr. Speaker, the Tri-Continent Conference clearly established that what is occurring in Vietnam is not simply localized Communist aggression, but is merely one front in a worldwide campaign against the free world.

American defeat, withdrawal or abandonment of Vietnam would not simply, as some have phrased it, roll back our Pacific front line to Wakiki. The rollback would be to the Andes, and beyond, for Ho Chi Minh's battle plan in Vietnam is a blueprint, approved both in Moscow and Peiping, for subversive wars of aggression in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Once again we have been warned by our enemy. The United States and the free world will overlook or dismiss the Communist "Mein Kampf," as spelled out at the recent Havana Tri-Continent Conference, at its peril and the peril of future generations.

The following schedule shows in detail the delegates, observers, guests, and foreign press from the various countries. The data was compiled by Cuban authorities from the actual registration sheets. Delegates from 63 countries and 19 protectorates, commonwealths or colonies were in attendance.

List of accredited participants up to Jan. 10, 1966, "Year of Solidarity," 1st Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America

	Countries, protectorates, and colonies	Organizations	Accredited
Delegates:			
Africa	28	29	150
Asia	27	27	197
Latin America	27	27	165
Total	82	83	512
Observers:			
International organizations		5	24
Afro-Asiatic organizations		3	7
African organizations		3	8
Asiatic organizations		3	5
Socialist countries		7	20
Total		21	64
Guests:			
Foreign	23		50
Cubans	1		27
Total	24		77
Foreign press	38	95	129
Total accredited participants			782

DELEGATES TO THE FIRST SOLIDARITY CONFERENCE OF THE PEOPLES OF AFRICA, ASIA, AND LATIN AMERICA, JANUARY 1966

Raúl Roa Garcia, President.
Youssef El Sebai, Secretary-General.
John Kofitettegah, Vice President.
Pedro Medina Silva, Vice President.
Tien Nguyen Van, Vice President.

SOUTH AFRICA

South African National Congress (9): Alfred Diliza Kgokong (Presidente), Reginald September, Yusuf Mohamed Dadoo, Mzimkulu Ambrose Makiwane (SP), Thomas Titus Nkobi, Robert Resha, Joyce Judith Mbonwa (S.F.), Marie Muthoo Prágalathan Naicker, Meinrad Hsimang.

SOUTH WEST AFRICA

South West Africa National Union (2): Jariretundu Kozonguizi (President), Moses K. Katjiuongua.

ANGOLA

Angolan Popular Liberation Movement (8):

Luiz Andrade de Acevedo (President), Miguel Baya Antonio (S.P.), Luis de Almeida, Paulo Teixeira Jorge, Spencer Nicolau, José César Augusto, Daniel Da Costa García, Mario de Andrade.

ALGERIA

Algerian Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity (7):

Lakhdar Brahimi (President), Hamid Bencherchali, Adda Benguettat, Mohamed Harieche, Ahmed Zemirline, Mohamed Meghraoui, Abdelkrim Ghoraib.

ARGENTINA

National Committee for the Peoples Conference of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (7):

John William Cooke (President), Alcira de la Peña, Carlos Alberto Lafforgue, Jorge Ruben Queijo, Juan Antonio Sander, Abel Alexis Latendokf, José Gabdiel Vazeilles Ullua.

BASUTOLAND

Basutoland Congress Party (3): Gerd Ramoreboli (President), Koenyama Chakela, Ramagele Tsinyana.

BECHUANALAND

Bechuanaland Peoples Party (2): Peter Dick Marciping (President), Bobby Mack.

BOLIVIA

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (3): Mario Miranda Pacheco (President), Gabriel Porcel Salazar, Mario Monje.

BRAZIL

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (7): Alvizio Palhano Pedreira Ferreira (President), Marcos Santos, Carlos Tavares, Celso Ridan Barcelos, Iván Ramos Ribeiro, Francisco Santilli, Alexina Lins Crespo de Paula.

BURUNDI

Burundi Workers Federation (1): Nicodeme Bigirama (President).

CAMBODIA

Cambodian Afro-Asian Solidarity (5): Hout Sambath (President), Un Samuth, Vutthi Thoutch, Kiv Moeng, Suncheng Sunthor.

COLOMBIA

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (6): Diego Montaña Cuellar (President), Inés Pinto Escobar, Santiago Solarte, Camilo Losada Campos, Baltasar Fernández Alvarez, Teodosio Varela Acosta.

CONGO (BRAZZAVILLE)

National Revolutionary Committee of the Congo (4): Julien Boukambou (President), Gustavo Aba Gandzion, Henriette Yimbou, Dominique Ntamba.

CONGO (LÉOPOLDVILLE)

Congo National Liberation Council (11): Gabriel Yumbu (President), Nkumu Camile, Kaputula Bernabette, Kitungo Placide, Ramazani Sebastian, Malanda Henriette, Mongali Michel, Eduard Marcel Sambu, Buka Masaku, Martin Brobey, John Ali.

KOREA

Korean Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity (8): Wal Lyong Kim (Presidente), Zi Sun Jon, Cheng Nam Kim, Ryon Yui Kim, Yu Yui Li, Yung Kun Kim, Te Jion Chon, and Ryung Chul Jun.

COSTA RICA

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (3): Arnoldo Ferreto (President), Hernán Monterrosa López, and Luisa González Gutiérrez.

CUBA

Communist Party of Cuba (41): Osmany Cienfuegos (President), Raúl Roa, Manuel Piñeiro, Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, Miguel Martín, José Alberto Naranjo, Leonel Soto, Haydeé Santamaría, Jesús Montané Oropesa, Lázaro Peña, José Matar, José Ramírez, Carlos Lechuga, Pelegrín Torras, Arnol Rodriguez, Juan Mier Febles, Melba Hernández, Giraldo Mazola, Eugenio R. Balari, Joaquín Más, Lázaro Mora, Eduardo Delgado, Ramón Sánchez Parodi, Carlos Alfara, Ricardo Alarcón, Fernando Alvarez Tabio, Mario García Incháustegui, Raúl Valdés Vivó, Antonio Carrillo, Jorge Serguera, Armando Entralgo, Luis García Guitar, Oscar Oramas, José Venegas, Rafael Fernández Moya, Luis García Peraza, Francisco Valdês, Arquimides Columbié, Silvio Rivera, Roberto Valdés, and Alfredo Guevara.

CHILE

CHILE (FRAP)

Popular Action Front (9): Salvador Allende (President), Waldo Atías Martín, Clodomiro Alméyda Medina, Elena Pedraza, Luis Figueroá, Manuel Rojas, Walterio Fierro, Jorge Monte Morago, Oscar Núñez Bravo.

CHINA

Chinese Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity (34): Wu Hsueh Tsien (President), Tien Min Kuo, Su Tien Yang, Ming Sin Tang, Chan An You, Yao Yao Ching Jung, So Yang (S.P.), Keng Liang (S.P.), Ta Nei Tsien, Rui Jua Hsu, Wu Hasu Shang, Yi Cheng Jung, Ning Chuan Tung, Tien Hui Chen, Yuan Hung Tao, Yang Pai Ping, Tsien Li Jen, Wuan Chen Sheng, Chen Tze Yin, Chang Chieh Hsun, Chen Yu, Chen Chuan Liao, Chu Tzu Chi, Run Ho Niem, Chang Lin Yu, Tang Hai Yeh, Yu Ying Liu, Fei Yi Li, Chi Fan Wuang, Shen Yi, Chen Sheng Huang, Shou Pae Li, Yun Chun Li, Chen Lo Min.

CYPRUS

Cyprus Solidarity Committee (3): Christoforos Christofides (President), Joseph Yamakis, Georgios Savyides.

ECUADOR

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (2): Carlos Ramírez Ortiz (President), Teodule Aray.

EL SALVADOR

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (2): Sergio Pérez (President), Pedro Martínez.

GHANA

Convention of the Peoples Party (15): John Kofitettegah (President), Nathaniel Azarco Welbeck, Winfre Asare Brown, Yan Manu, Kon Bondzie Brown, Pauline Miranda Clerk, George Awonor Williams, Ofory-Bah Emmanuel, Patrick Ofei Henaicu, Kefi Batsa, Charles L. Patterson, Dr. Ekow Daniels, Kwamina Arku-Nelson (S.P.), Cecil Mc. Hardy, Anthony Korsah Dick.

GUADALUPE

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (4): Gerard Olivier (President), Guy Daninthe, Aude Daniel Rene, Michel Numa.

GUATEMALA

Rebel Armed Forces (5): Luis Augusto Turcios Lima (President), Gustavo Solares Ortiz, René Cordon, Orlando Fernández Ruiz, Francisco Marroquih.

BRITISH GUIANA

Popular Progressive Party (3): Cheddi Jagan (President), Lall Bahadur, Joseph Rodríguez.

FRENCH GUIANA

Guianan Committee of Solidarity to the First Tri-Continental Conference (3): Regine Prevot (President), Jean Marie Robo, Georges Giffard.

GUINEA

Democratic Party of Guinea (7): Abdoulaye Diallo (President), Fodé Cissé (S.P.), Mamady Mohamed Sakho, Mami Kouyate, Ibrahima Kourouma, Fanta Conde, Jean Baptiste Deen.

PORTUGUESE GUINEA

African Independence Party (5): Amilcar Cabral (President), Vasco Cabral, Pedro Pires, Domingo Ramos, Joaquín Pedro Da Silva.

HAITI

Unified Democratic Front of National Liberation (5): Paul Lantimo (President), Jacques Lacour, Pigeon Volage, Leslie Jean, Edmond Pierre.

HONDURAS

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (3): Ricardo Moncada Zavala (President), Raul Parra, Longino Vidal Becerra.

INDIA

Indian Association for Afro-Asian Solidarity (14): Aruna Asaf Ali (President), Nalam Narasinha Rao, Homi F. Daji Homi, Prabhakar Menon, Jagannath Sharma, Ladli Saran Shinha, Sat Tandon, Harbans Singh, Balrat Mehta, Chatur Nadain Malviya (SP), Avioor Shiriniwas Chari, Mohammad Kelimullah, Noor Mohamed, Chandra Shekhar.

INDONESIA

Solidarity Association of the Afro-Asian Peoples (9): Ibrahim Isa (President) (SP), Francisca Fanggidaej, Willy Hariandia, Umar Said, Suhardjo, Soedhartono, Edy Soenardji, Sugiri, Margono.

IRAN

Iranian Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity (2): Amir Halamou Amir Dibadj Torkestani (President), Rahaman Nader Zehtab.

IRAQ

Iraqi Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity (1): Aboul Wahab Sallom (President) (SP).

MAURITIUS

Progressive Party of the Mauritian People (1): Teckaram Sibsurun (President).

ST. THOMAS AND PRINCE ISLANDS

Committee for the Liberation of St. Thomas and Prince (1): Antonio Barreto Pires Dos Santos (President).

JAMAICA

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (2): Dennis Daly (President), Roy Jeffrey Adaiphus.

JAPAN

Japanese Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity (10): Shizuma Kai (President), Hiroshi Ide, Toshio Tanaka, Mitsuhiro Kaneke, Masae Kitazawa (SP), Susumu Ozaki, Shesaku Itai, Yoro Ohno, Akira Nishina, Yoko Kitazawa (SF).

JORDAN

Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee of Jordan (1): Shafik Shafik (President).

NORTH KALIMATAN

Organization of North Kalimatan for the Solidarity of the People of Afro-Asian, Indonesia (5): Ahmad Zaidi Adruce (President), Muhammad Jais Abbas, Mohamad Kasin, Dus Tan Chon, Ahmad Mohtar.

KENYA

Kenya African National Union (3): John Mobiyo Njonjo (President), James Robaro Heuwallan, Ernest Gitu Muni.

LAOS

New Lao Hak Sat (5): Phoumi Vongvichit (President), Soulivong Phrasithideth, Phouthasack Khanleck, Thammavongsay Boun Nhum, Khamphay Boupha.

LEBANON

Socialist Progressive Party (4): Farid Gebrane (President), George Salim Batal, Mouhamed Kechli, Georges Haoui.

MALAYA

People's Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee for Malaya (3): Lee Siew Choh (President), Abdul Rahim Karim, Chia Thye Poh.

MARTINIQUE

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (2): Edouard De Lepine (President), Marcel Manville.

MOROCCO

National Union of Popular Forces (3): Hamid Barrada (President), Mohamed Habib Sinaceur, Mohamed Horma Bahi.

MEXICO

National Liberation Movement (6): Heberto Castillo (President), Armando Castillejos Ortiz, Manuel Mesa Andraca, María Antonieta

Rascón Córdoba, Antonio Tenorio Adame, Salvador Bojorquez.

MONGOLIA

Mongolian Afro-Asiatic Committee for Solidarity (7): Chadraval Lodoidamba (President), Nauzad Bayarju, Damba Dulamyn, Pountsag Berentsoodol, Narhoo Tsogtyn, Namsarain Sodnon, Badamtar B. Baldo.

MOZAMBIQUE

Mozambique Liberation Front (6): Marcelino Dos Santos (President), Eugenio Machado, Mariano Natsinha, Pascoal Nhapulo, Josina Abiatar Muthemba, Madalena Jingo Juvangire.

NEPAL

Afro-Asiatic Solidarity Committee (1): Poorna Bahadur (President).

NICARAGUA

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America (3): Pedro Ruiz (President), José Pedro Rivera, José López Rivera.

NIGER

Sawaba Party (1): Abdoulaye Mamami (President).

NIGERIA

Congress of Youth of Nigeria. Socialist Peasants and Workers Party of Nigeria (4): Wahab Omorilewa Goodluck (President), Salomón Olaleye Fagbo, Elías Dupe Fadipe, Johnson Ebohom.

OMAN

Oficina de Omán (Oman Office) (1): Faisal Faisal (President).

PAKISTAN

Committee for Solidarity of the Afro-Asian Peoples (7): Maulana Aboul Hamid Khan Bhasani (President), Itaz Husain, Arif Iftirhar, Qamaruz Saman Shah, Shauka Khan, A. T. M. Mustafa, Miraj Khalio.

PALESTINE

Organization for the Liberation of Palestine (5): Ibrahim Abu Sitta (President), Husni Khuffash Saleh, Zuhair Rayyis, Abdul Karim Al Karmi, Sala Heddin Dabbagh.

PANAMA

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (4): Jorge Turner Morales (President), Francisco Guitérrez, Roberto Madariaga Montes, Floyd Britton.

PARAGUAY

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (5); Carlos Valenzuela (President), Héctor Gutiérrez, Jacinto Correa, Juan Carlos Arza, Angel Gómez.

ARABIAN PENINSULA

Socialist Front for the Liberation of the Arabian Peninsula (1): Ahmad Jamaluddin Abdulla (President).

PERU

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (8): Roberto García Urrutía (President), Jesús Masa Paredes, Alberto Ramírez, Jaime Venegas Romero, Armanal Pérez Carlo, Elizardo Sánchez Lomba, Freddy Eyzaguirre Luque, Jorge Altoriaga Campos.

PUERTO RICO

Pro-Independence Movement (4): Norman Pietri Castellon (President), Ana Livia Cordero, José Luis González Coiscoo, Narciso Rabell Martínez.

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Youssef El Sebai (SG OSPAA), Mohamed Kaml Bahaa Eddin (ASG OSPAA), Morsi Saad Eddin (ASG, OSPAA).

AFRO ASIAN

Solidarity Committee (Arab Socialist Union) (21): Khaled Mohiedlin (President), Sohair El Calamawy, Amina Ahmed El Said, Ezz El Din Ali Moustafa, Rifaat El Mahgoub, Bahia Karam, Mohamed Diab, Sekina Sadat, Ahmed Mukhtar Kobt, Ragua Rami El Kholy, Samiha Taher Mustafa, Ahmed Reda Mohamed Khalifa, Shebl Hefez Mohame Shalaby, Mohamed Wafaey Shulkamy, Mohamed Owda, Hoda Tawfik, Louis Grace, Anis Mansour, Edward K. F. El Kharrat, Salah El Sayed, Hussain Rizk.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (5): Guido Rafael Gil Díaz (President), Asdrubal Dominguez Guerrero, Euclides Gutiérrez Félix, Ceyetano A. Rodriguez del Prado, Carlos M. Amiama Martínez.

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF NORTH VIETNAM

Solidarity Committee for Afro Asiatic (10): Tuyen Tran Danh (President), Nguyen Duy Tinh, Tuong Tran Cong, Le Nguyen Than, Con Nguyen La, Bun Le Quang, Thang Dang Thi, Phan Truong Si, Doan Dinh Ca, Nguyen Dinnh Bin.

RUANDA

National Union Ruanda Burundi (2): Francois Rubeka (President), Nelson Rwgasore.

SENEGAL

African Independence Party (3): Mamadou Keita (President), Thierno Amath Dansoko, N'Diongue Babacar.

SYRIA

Afro-Asiatic Solidarity Committee (8): Moudaf Haffar (President), Morris Salibi, Mohammad Ali Al Khatib, Moustapha Amine, Rifai Nouri Mohamed, Mohammad Zouhdi Nashashibi, Ali El Khalil, Joubran Majdalani.

FRENCH SOMALILAND

Popular Movement Party (1): Ahmed Mobarak Mobarak.

SWAZILAND

Swaziland Progressive Party (2): Dingame Dominic Cain Nxumalo (President), Ephrain Mbhele.

SUDAN

Democratic Peoples Party (5): Aly Abdel Rahman (President), Yousif Bushara, Billghies Ahmed, Ali Osman, Shazali Amin Shazali.

THAILAND

Thailand Patriotic Front (3): Bhayome Chulanond (President), Suchart Bhumimorirak, Sid Hichai Songkaraksa.

TANZANIA

Tanganyika African National Union (6): Salim Rasuid (President), Amanas Swai (S.P.), Muhammad Ali Foum, Lugo Taguaba, Ali Hahfudh, Abdulla Said Netepe.

TRINIDAD-TOBAGO

National Committee for the Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (2): George Weekes (President), George Bowrin.

UGANDA

Uganda Peoples Congress (5): Yomasani Kanyomozi (President), Ally Muwabe Kirunda Kivejinja, Raiti Omongin, Khahid Younis Kinene, Henry Nyakairu.

U.S.S.R.

Soviet Committee for Afro-Asiatic Solidarity (40): Sharaf Rashidov (President), Anatoli Sofronov, Dimitri Gorbachev, Boris Gorbachev, Vladimir Judintsev, Rodolfo Chliapnikov, Yans Vladimirski, Timur Gaidar, Natalia Berejnaia, Alexey Mayevsky, Latif Maksoudov (S.P.), Bahadur Abduzazakov, Chakhan Tiouleoubekov, Vladimir Yarovoi, Mirzo Tursun Zade, Zinaida Federova, Rasul Gamsatov, Fikriat Tabeiv, Dmitri Shevliagin, Mikhail Kossykh, Karan Gousseinov, Bijamai Ramazanova, Tchengis Aitmatov, Zouleikha Gousseinova, Grigori Lovchine, Vladimir Kokkontai, Tchermychev Viatcheslav, Sima Panich, Nikolai Basanov, Veniamin Midtsev, Spartak Tsissanov, Richat Koudachev, Jouri Bochkarev, Riourik Beleroutchev, Victor Boukharkov, Valeri Soukhine, Arnold Dobkine, Mikhail Kovalev, Valeri Jikharev, Petr Nicolaev.

URUGUAY

Leftist Liberation Front (6): Luis Pedro Bonavita Saiguero (President), Cesar Reyes Daglio, Blanca Silva Collazo Odriozola, Edmundo Soares Netto, Rodney Arismendi, and Luis Echave Zas.

VENEZUELA

National Liberation Front (15): Pedro Medina Silva (President), Gilberto López, Rosendo Menéndez Luz, Ciro Rodríguez, Atencio Manrique, Jerónimo Carrera, José Vicente Abreu, Héctor Marcano Coello, Héctor Pérez Marcáno, Omar Cárdenas, Moisés Moleiro, Oswaldo Barreto, Jorge Rubio, Ali González, Adolfo Gañango.

SOUTH VIETNAM

Afro-Asiatic Solidarity Committee (7): Tien Nguyen Van (President), Tran Van Tu, Kin Nguyen H Dang, Van Sau Ly, Cao Le Thi, Anh Trinn Van, Ba Nguyen Ngoc.

YEMEN

Afro-Asiatic Solidarity Committee of Yemen (1): Abdullah Al-Alawi (President).

SOUTH YEMEN (ADEN)

National Liberation Front of Occupied South Yemen (2): Saif A. S. Dhalee (President), Jaffer Ali Awadh.

ZIMBABWE

Zimbabwe African Peoples Union (9): Edward Nodlovu (President), Ethan Allen Dube, David Mpongo, Charles Tarehwa Madondo, Amos Nguenya, Arthur Musuka, Charles Chikerema, Nolada Moshe Noko, Nelson T. C. Samkange.

Total number of delegates from 82 countries is 512.

OBSERVERS TO CONFERENCE (ORGANIZATION AND NAMES OF OBSERVERS)

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

World Peace Council (9): Enrique Lister, Alfredo M. P. Valera, Omprakash Paliwal, Francis Boaten, Juan Marinello, Angel Domínguez Santamaría, William Gollan, Oldrich Belic, Lucio Mario Luzzatto.

International Federation of Democratic Women (3): Florence Mephoshe, Helga Dickell, Vilma Espín.

World Federation of Democratic Youth (3): Eulogio Rodríguez Millares, Ctibor Citek, Rodolfo Mecnini.

International Student Union (5): Tran Van An, Kwamena Ocran, Zbynek Vokrovhlicky, Félix Rodríguez, Cándido Domínguez García.

World Syndacal Federation (4): Satish Chaterjee, Mark Shope, José Bustos, Renato Bitossi.

SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

Albania

Albanian Committee of Solidarity With the People of Africa and Asia (4): Foto Cami, Sotir Kambori, Faik Zaneli, Sezai Shyti.

Bulgaria

Committee of Afro-Asiatic Solidarity (2): Zidravke Mitovski, Elena Gavrilova.

Czechoslovakia

Czechoslovakian Committee of Solidarity With the People of Africa and Asia (2): Antonin Vavrus, Vladimir Simek.

Hungary

Hungarian Solidarity Committee With All the Peoples which Fight for Independence (2): Andras Tardos, Eva Koltai.

Poland

Solidarity Committee With the People of Africa and Asia (2): Wladyslaw Sliwka, Josef Kulesza.

German Domestic Republic

Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee of the German Democratic Republic (7): Horst Max Brash, Edmund Rodner, Heinrich Eggebrecht, Heinz Joswig, Siglinde Arkerman, Freidel Trappan, Heinz Schmidt.

Rumania

Rumanian League of Friendship With the Peoples of Asia and Africa (1): Mircea Radulescu.

AFRO-ASIAN ORGANIZATIONS

Conference of Afro-Asian Jurists (4): Shih Sheng Chao, Hsien Wang, Fadiala Keita, Wijanto.

Permanent Bureau of Afro-Asian Writers (2): Nihal Lakshaman Rathapala, Karunasena Jayalath.

Afro-Asian Journalists Conference (1): Dharmasena Manuweera.

AFRICAN ORGANIZATIONS

South West Africa Peoples Organization (4): Peter Mueshihange, Andreas Shipanga, Ewald Katjivena, Emil Appolus.

Zimbabrine African National Union (3): King David Mutasa, Simpson Victor Mtambanengwe, Agustine Monbeshora.

African Syndical Federation (1): Prosper Akanni.

ASIATIC ORGANIZATIONS

Council Against the Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs (1): Masahuru Hatanaka.

Asian Economic Bureau (3): Samuel Díaz Bandaranaike, Theja Gunawardhana, Packeer Mohideen.

Peace Commission of Asia and the Pacific (1): Victor James.

Those Invited to the Conference

Argentina: Miguel Angel Rubinich.

Bolivia: Juan Carlos Lazcano.

Brazil: Félix Athayde.

Cambodia: Helene Thoutch Vuttni.

Colombia: Marco Tulio Rodríguez Martínez, Jorge Zalamea Borda.

Congo (Brazzaville): Auguste Mahoungou, Alice Mahoungou.

Cuba: Antero Regalado Fallón, Zenén Buergo, Reinaldo Calviac, Pedro Montalván, Asela de los Santos, Radamés Mancebo, Aleida March, Juan José León, Dora Calcaño, Francisco Dorticós Baler, Orlando Rosabal Llanes, Oscar Domenoch, Lupe Véliz, Leopoldo Ariza, Enrique Velazco López, Félix Sautié Mederos, Roberto Ogando Faz, Gloria Aguilera, Calixto Morales, Alejo Carpentier, Antonio Núñez Jiménez, Rolando Cubelas, Nicolás Guillén, Salvador Vilaseca, Jaime Crombet, Justo Guerra, Agapito Figueroa.

Czechoslovakia: Jiri Meisner.

Chile: Juliana Rojas, Luis Eduardo Labarca Goddard, Gonzalo Rojas Pizarrón.

Dahomey: Codjo Azodogbehov.

United States of America: Robert Williams, Rick Rhoads.

France: León Feix, Josephine Baker, Ives Fernand Moreau, Regis Jules Debray, Madam Voisin.

Guatemala: Aurora Benitez.

England: Osmon Blackburn, Jack Woddis.

Italy: Alberto Moravia, Dacia Maraini, Joyce Lussu.

Mexico: Rafael Estrada Villa, Blanca Muñoz Cota de Tenorie, Adalberto Pliego Galicia, Alberto Orduña Culebro, Louis T. Córdova Alvelais, Gilberto Ramón Gallarde, Manuel Stephens García, Manuel Marcué Pardiñas, Arturo Orona, Manuel Terrazas Guerrero.

Paraguay: José Asunción Flores, Elvio Romero.

Peru: Hilda Gadea Acosta, Mario Vargas Llosa, Patricia Llosa de Vargas.

Puerto Rico: Halina Linger de Rabell.

United Arab Republic: Mohamed Fayed, Nadia Sulficar Salvi.

Tanzania: Lidia Foun.

U.S.S.R.: Jursand Rashidova.

Uruguay: Aida De'Matteis Ventura, Maria Victoria Espinola Gabreta.

Venezuela: Eleana Sánchez, Elizabeth Burgos.

FOREIGN PRESS

Publicity organs and names of journalists

Alemania Federal

Das Andere Deutsehland: Lenor Velfort.

Argentina

Diario El Mundo: Juan Lefcovich.

Belgium

Boletín Informativo de Cuba: Hugo Bency.

Le Drapeau Rouge: Hubert Jacob.

Magazine Europeo: Gabriel F. Dannau, Marie Noelle Cloes, Alphonse A. Roosens.

Bulgaria

Agencia BTA: Todor Stoianov.

Canada

Canadian Tribune: Francis Williams Park, Libbie Campbell Park.

Korea

Agencia Central de Corea: Choun Tak Zi.

Costa Rica

Semanario Libertad: Francisco Gamboa Guzmán.

Czechoslovakia

Chech Broadcasting

Radio-Difusión Checoslovaca: David Leff.

Agencia CTK: Jaroslav Boucek.

Lyternarny Noviny: Mrtha Dodd.

Radio Difusión Prage: Vera Stocickova.

Chile

Radio Minería: Ibar Aibar Varas.

Las Noticias de Ultima Hora: Frida Modak Schatz.

Periódico El Siglo: Adriana Serle.

China

Agencia Sinjua: Chiu Ling, Ho Ching Kuang Jen Mu, Chi Chen, Ming Fu Ming, Yi Lun Shu, Shei Chong Hsu, Liu Chowg Yang, Sun Shon Guia.

Denmark

Land Og Folk: Jan Stago.

CBS News: Carl Sorensen.

Scotland

The Week: Alexander Scott.

Spain

Oficina Actualidades Argelinas: Daniel Ortiz.

Revista Triunfo: Eduardo Garcia Rico.

Radial Press: Alfonso Sobrado Palomares.

United States of America

Agencia A.P.: Antonio Ortega, Isaac Flores.

Agencia U.P.I.: Gabriel Badia Diaz, Pedro Bonetti.

Mid-Week and Weekly Worker: William Allan.

The Worker: Beatrice Johnson.

Jewish Daily Freiheit: Joseph North.

Finland

Televisión Finlandesa: Antti Kovanen, Esko Haapaniemi, Pekka Makinen.

France

Argencia Intermande Presse: Pierre Rondiere.

Nouvel Observateur: Claude Estier.

Radio Europeo: Francois Philipe Fetjo.

Agencia A.F.P.: Sergio Mendez, Ives Doude, Robert N. Katz.

Reveu Democratic Nouvelle: Albert Paúl Lentin.

L'Entincelle: Henri Herve.

Le Monde: Marcel Niedergang.

L'Express: Edouard Bailby.

Le Partisans: Francois Masperd.

Guinea

Prensa de la República de Guinea: Bob Sow.

Great Britain

Agencia Reuters: Michael Arkus, Maria Isabel Arostegui.

Sunday Telegraph: Charles Iam Lumsden.

Evening Standard London: Peter Kingsley.

Holland

Algemeen Dagblad: Leo Klatser.

Hungary

Radio y TV Budapest: Lazlo D'Salgo.

Nepszabadsag Daily: George Kalmar.

Agencia Telegráfica Húngara: Havel Jozsef.

Iran

Shahbay: Rahim Hamyar.

Italy

L'Unita: Saverio Tutino, Gaetano Pagano.

El Mundo Nuevo, L'Astrolabie, Il Ponte: Mario Lana.

Foto Reporter: Antonio Sansone.

Giornale D'Italia: Giuseppe Dall'Oncaro.

Japan

NHK Radio Televisora del Japón: Hiroshi Shiohozaki, Kyoichi Hoshino, Kentaro Hirayana.

Asahi Shimbun: Bin Watanabe.

Periódico Yomiuri: Takeshi Ogaws.

Morocco

Diario Alkifah: Abdallah Layachi.

Diarie L'Avant Garde: Tibary Moussador.

México

Cuadernos Americanos: Sol Arguedas.

Revista Siempre: Marta Solís, Alberto Gutiérrez Sánchez, Eduardo del Río García.

Revista Política: Raquel Rabinovich, Carlos Perzabal Marcué.

Norway

Orientering: Oysteith Pettersen.

Poland

Zicie Warsawy: Aniela Krupinska.

Agencia PAP: Miroslav Iconowicz.

Dookols Swiata: Andrzej Binkowski.

Editory Office Gromada: Henryk Borzecki.

Polish Presse Panorama Weekly: Maciej Szczepanski.

Chtopsha Droga: Lesack Mackow.

Tribuna Ludu: Ludwuik Krassvcki.

German Democratic Republic

Agencia A.D.N.: Dieter Coburger, Wolfang Mayer, Peter Neinz Junge.

Televisión R.D.A.: Erich Friedlander, Peter Goeschke, Hannelore Coburger.

Deutscher Demokratischer RunFunk: Manfred Schroeder.

Neues Deutschland: Lore Peter.

Democratic Republic of Vietnam

Agencia Noticiosa de Vietnam: Au Vu San.

Fafilm: Cuong Ly, Cuong Nguyen Duy, Nguyen Nhu Ai.

Rumania

Ager Press: Victor Stonate.

Sweden

Nydag: Karl Staff.

Switzerland

L'Illustre: Luc Bernard Chesex.

Tanzania

Uhuru: Dadu Hamdum Mansur.

Unión Nacional Africana de Tanganyka: James Gilbert Markham.

Tunisia

Periódico Les Temps Moderns: Rachid Cheriff.

U.S.S.R.

Periódico de "Trud": Gueorgui Tikhonov.

Tass: Alexsi Stoujine, Mikhail Artiuchenkov, Valery Laskariov, Ruslan Kniasev.

Radio y TV U.S.S.R.: Sergio Pokin, Vladimir Pugachev.

Pravda: Yuri Pogosov.

Izvestia: Vladimir Silatiev.

Novosti: Valentin Mashkin, Yuri Paporovo, Mijail Roy.

Konsomolskaia Pravda: Alexandre Krivopalov.

Maladai Comunist: Lev Kornechov.

Literoturnaya Gazeta: Rimma Kazanora.

Uruguay

El Popular: Ricardo Saxlund.

Semanario Marcha: Carlos Nuñez.

Diario Epoca: Manrique Salbarrey.

South Vietnam

Agencia del Frente de Liberación Nacional Vo Son Ca.

Yugoslavia

Agencia de Prensa Tanjug: Boza Rafajlovic.

Total foreign press and news media representatives from 37 countries: 129.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama on the statement that he is making and also on the record that he has made as chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I am referring particularly to the work that he has done in bringing out some of the facts about this recent Havana Conference, because such a meeting and the attitude and identity of the participants have great significance for us in determining the path that we should follow in the pursuit of our foreign policy.

I believe that the gentleman from Alabama will agree that a study of the Conference proceedings show that this was a Russian-organized meeting, that the facade of universal action was pretty thin.

At the same time there was one significant result of this heavy-handed Conference that I should like to mention, and that was the reaction to its subversive activities and pronouncements of the countries of Latin America themselves. When the members of the Organization of American States heard of the action which had taken place, without any dissenting vote, they proceeded to take prompt action to deplore the revolutionary policies that were set forth and the stated interventionist objectives of this conference.

Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that subsequent to this Latin American action, whether for publicity purposes or otherwise, there was a very prompt verbal backtracking on the part of the Russians themselves perhaps because they did not appreciate completely the depth of the reaction in the Latin American countries to this conference. At any rate, the avowed sponsorship of subversion and intervention accords ill with the oft-stated Soviet objective of building bridges to the Western world.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the gentleman from Alabama should be complimented and commended for the work that he and the committee have done on this subject.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, who is a very able member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] in complimenting the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] on the presentation that he is making here this afternoon, and to say further that it is a pleasure to serve on the Inter-American Subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. Speaker, the Tri-Continental Conference held only recently in Havana, Cuba, means that there has been set up in Cuba now a headquarters for the subversion, if possible, of the entire Latin American area. This, of course, poses some real problems—and growing problems—for the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] is doing all that he can to bring forth, as he has in hearings dealing with this Tri-Continental Conference, the making aware—making the public aware—of what is taking place, what has taken place, and what may very well take place throughout the entire Latin American area.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman further, and to the Members of the House, that it is a sad and sorry situation when the taxpayers' money—approximately $1 million of the taxpayers' money of this country—is being used through the United Nations to support a technological college in Havana, Cuba, for the purpose—ostensible purpose—of further training those who would subvert the rest of Latin America.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Inter-American Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will take further action to denounce this use of American funds for this purpose.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. SELDEN. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, who also is an extremely able member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. I, too, am concerned in connection with the announcement that American taxpayers' dollars are to be used to support a technological college in Havana, Cuba. I have called this announcement to the attention of the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, which has jurisdiction over this subject, with the request that the subcommittee look into it. Since the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is a member of that particular subcommittee also, I feel certain he will want to make a similar request.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], for an enlightening and most helpful speech. I am pleased to associate myself with his remarks, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly hope that debate in the Congress this past week will not weaken in any conceivable way our determination to act unilaterally and ex parte if necessary to meet totalitarian aggression in our hemisphere.

When the President took the bold and decisive action he did, nearly a year ago, to put down the Santo Domingo rebellion, I believe I was one of the first voices in Congress to laud his leadership. I also voted for H.R. 560—with a vast majority of my colleagues in this House and in the Senate—to support his leadership in meeting totalitarian aggression anywhere in the world.

If the Santo Domingo incident were to have happened next week, and the President respond as he did, I would again hail his action and again vote my confidence in his leadership.

I firmly believe that the last thing our fighting men in Vietnam need today, Mr. Speaker, are 535 commanders in chief holding forth in the Congress.

THE FEUD AMONG FEDERAL JUDGES IN OKLAHOMA CITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on file in the U.S. Supreme Court, ignored and gathering dust for nearly 4 years, is an official transcript that sets forth in detail the shocking story of a bitter feud among Federal judges in Oklahoma City, Okla.

The transcript is the verbatim statement of Federal Judge Stephen S. Chandler in which he accuses Federal Judges Alfred P. Murrah and Luther Bohanon of persecution.

Chandler's testimony was given before the Judicial Council of the 10th Circuit Court, sitting in Wichita, Kans., on April 25, 1962, after Chandler had been disqualified by the Judicial Council from presiding in a bankruptcy proceeding.

Federal Judge Chandler asserts in the transcript that Federal Judge Murrah sometimes cursed him, once tried to get him to alter his estimate of property values in a certain case; that his telephone was tapped, and he was afraid of being poisoned.

He accused Federal Judge Bohanon of spying on him, circulating rumors about him, and soliciting a bribe. Chandler said that in 1942, Bohanon offered to get him appointed as a Federal judge for $25,000. Bohanon was a lawyer at that time. It was on January 30, 1962, said Chandler, that Bohanon's attitude toward him changed from warm friendship to bitter hatred.

Murrah is the chief judge of the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals. It was the judges of this circuit, sitting as the judicial council, that disqualified Chandler from further jurisdiction in the bankruptcy case and, on December 13, 1965, stripped him of all judicial power and authority, leaving him only his title and $30,000 a year salary.

For all practical purposes this amounted to impeachment—an action which, under the Constitution of the United States, is vested only in the Congress, and Judge Chandler describes this action as a usurpation of power.

Subsequently, in February of this year—1966—and because of protests both in and out of Congress, the same judicial council of the 10th circuit restored to Judge Chandler some 160 of the cases which had previously been taken from him. This simply compounded the deliberate assumption of power implicit in the original action.

Throughout the 57-page transcript on file in the Supreme Court, the heart of Chandler's testimony is that he has been the victim of Murrah's bitter hatred for 19 years.

Pointing to his disqualification in the bankruptcy case, Chandler said:

> This whole proceeding is actuated by malice and aided and abetted and assisted and really engineered by Judge Murrah and Judge Bohanon.

In the bankruptcy case, Parker Petroleum Co. was the debtor. It filed a petition for reorganization in U.S. district court in Oklahoma City on May 6, 1958. Since outside financing was necessary, Occidental Petroleum, of Los Angeles, holder of 40,000 shares of Parker stock, filed a reorganization plan for Parker Petroleum on August 14, 1959.

There followed months of litigation. Occidental tried to withdraw but Chandler held it could not legally do so. He was reversed by the 10th circuit but the liability of Occidental for damages was left open and the case returned to Chandler.

Occidential then requested Chandler to disqualify himself but before he could rule on that request Occidental took the litigation to the 10th circuit. Chandler was promptly ordered out of the case.

He fought back because, he said, he had unwittingly caused Parker Petroleum to have confidence in Occidental Petroleum mainly because Bert Barefoot, Jr., former law partner of Judge Bohanon, and a lawyer for Occidental, had made unconditional pledges of financial support.

He charged Barefoot with a conflict of interest on the grounds that he represented two parties in the litigation. Barefoot, Chandler said, became "menacing," adding that "he began spitting in my face and he took charge of the court and entered orders and it was pretty bad."

In the case in which he fixed the value of some property, Judge Chandler testified that Judge Murrah called him into his chambers and said:

> Now you have got to change that * * *. You are going to delay our building here.

Chandler said he replied that his appraisal was right, and he refused to change it whereupon, said Chandler:

> He [Murrah] jumped up and said "You (so-and-so) yellow son of a (so-and-so). I have worked for 7 years on this building and here you do that and we don't get it."

Chandler testified that on another occasion Murrah asked him to set aside an order in a jury case. He refused and Murrah then said according to Chandler:

> Well, every other judge of the circuit does what I tell them to. I don't know what the hell is wrong with you that you won't.

Mr. Speaker, I have never met a single one of the principals involved in this situation. I have in no way communicated with any of them nor have they communicated with me. I have no personal knowledge of the character or qualifications of these jurists, all of whom are now holding places of the highest trust and responsibility.

I do know that when a Federal district judge sits before a tribunal of four Federal circuit judges and makes the charges contained in this transcript—and for almost 4 long years little or nothing is done to prove or disprove those charges—that it is a travesty in the name of the courts and justice in this country.

As a citizen and a Member of Congress, I cannot sit idly by and watch while the respect and confidence in the Federal judiciary is undermined in Oklahoma or any other area of the Nation. And I submit that there are other areas that need attention.

I urge in the strongest terms at my command that the proper committees of Congress launch an immediate investigation.

THE CHILDREN'S SPECIAL MILK ACT OF 1966

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, to supplement my earlier protest over the budgetary cut in the school milk and lunch program, I have introduced a bill, which I should like to have printed in full at this point in the body of the RECORD:

H.R. 12907

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Children's Special Milk Act of 1966."

LEGISLATIVE FINDING

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that the increased consumption of fluid milk by a maximum number of American children is in the public interest in order to promote public health and nutrition; to create and develop markets for dairy products produced by American farmers; and to effectively and efficiently supplement the dairy price support activities of the United States Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. The Act of July 1, 1958, as amended (72 Stat. 276; 74 Stat. 84; 75 Stat. 147; 75 Stat. 319), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Agriculture shall, under such rules and regulations as he may deem in the public interest, encourage the consumption of fluid milk by children in the United States in (1) nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, and (2) nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children. For the purposes of this Act "United States" means the fifty States and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. All sums appropriated under this Act, less such amounts as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable and necessary for his administrative costs and reserves, shall be allocated at the earliest possible date for the use of nonprofit schools and other nonprofit institutions desiring to participate in the program and shall be used to reimburse such nonprofit schools and other nonprofit institutions for fluid milk served to children. Any such allocation, or portion thereof, which the Secretary shall determine will not be fully utilized by any such nonprofit school or other nonprofit institution as then allocated, shall be reallocated by the Secretary so as to accomplish maximum use of such funds.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, not to exceed $105,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, not to exceed $110,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, not to exceed $115,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and each succeeding fiscal year thereafter, not to exceed $120,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to explain the intent of this bill, and some of the reasoning behind it. This bill would in effect make the present milk program permanent, and would continue to make the program available to children on the broadest practical scale. Known as the Children's Special Milk Act of 1966, my bill is explicit as to the intent of Congress both now and when the program was inaugurated in 1954.

Dairy farmers often refer to the "dual purpose cow." They mean, of course, that the cow can be used for milk during her life and that she and her offspring carry more meat than the dairy breeds. The beauty of the present special milk program is that it creates a tripurpose cow. Those three purposes constitute the three justifications for passage of my bill. They are:

First. Beneficial effects on the health and nutrition of American children.

Second. The creation of an additional market and the development of new and future markets for U.S.-produced dairy products.

Third. A better way to support the price of dairy products through greater consumption of fluid milk, rather than the subsequent purchase of manufactured dairy products by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The biggest advantage of these three purposes is that they are never at odds with one another. We can have the best elements of each. Under the administration proposal to cut the present milk program to 20 percent of its present size, you have only one purpose: distribution of milk to needy children. Market formation and support benefits are forgotten. It is purely a matter of speculation on the part of the Department of Agriculture that children now being subsidized for milk will go ahead and pay full price for it; in fact, Department projections show that present milk consumption under school programs would drop by one-third, or half a billion pounds of milk. At a time when the dairy industry continues to need the support of every available market, this seems totally unjustified.

My bill repeals the present statutory authority for the special milk program. This will remove an obsolete provision from the law when the present statute expires. It also avoids any problem of legal interpretation between the time of enactment of this bill and the scheduled termination of the present statute on June 30, 1967.

The bill further recodifies without change the provisions in the present law dealing with the eligibility of schools and other institutions for the benefits of this program. This section (4) also retains the definition of the "United States" as it appears in present law to include the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

Another section sets forth the procedures to be followed by the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of the program. Except for necessary administrative expenses and reserves, all available funds shall be allocated promptly and unused amounts shall be reallocated in a manner designed to accomplish the maximum effectiveness of the program.

Appropriations will be $105 million in fiscal year 1966, $110 million for fiscal year 1967, $115 million for fiscal year 1968, and $120 million for fiscal year 1969 and subsequenut years on a permanent basis.

Mr. Speaker, the school milk program was used in approximately 92,000 schools in 1965, or 22,000 more schools than used the school lunch program. The usage of milk in both programs aggregated nearly 3 billion pounds. If the milk had not been so used, it would undoubtedly have been bought by the CCC, at a direct cost of about $103 million, or exactly the present appropriation for the milk program. Congress was aware of the Nation's fiscal situation when it voted $103 million for the special milk program, but it seems that the President's concern for inflation and the cost of the war has already forced cutbacks in the program that have been passed on to schoolchildren and school districts in the form of higher milk costs to them. Let me explain:

When President Johnson requested all his agencies to cut back on existing programs wherever possible in light of the war in Vietnam and the high employment level, the Administrator of the school milk and lunch programs directed that $10 million be spent on the milk program instead of the $103 million earmarked by Congress in its 1966 appropriation for that purpose. If this economy could have been achieved without changing the nature of the program, I doubt whether any Member of Congress would have legitimate grounds for complaint. As it is, however, the cutback forced the Administrator to reduce the reimbursement rate by 10 percent. This results in increased costs to the school district, and in most cases it forces them to raise the price of the milk to the children themselves. At that point, the intent of Congress is violated; the Congress was fully aware of the economic conditions in this country at the time it appropriated $103 million for the milk program—and it fully expected that sum of money to be used to bring milk to children at the lowest possible cost to them. That cost would have remained at its previous low level had not the Department of Agriculture arbitrarily decided that this was a good place to relieve the pressure on the economy. I vehemently oppose this cutback, not only on the grounds that the intent of Congress was violated, but because it represents blatent false economy. What is more, the President's programs under the costly and badly mismanaged war on poverty are largely responsible for the pressure that brings the need for cutbacks in the first place. So we see efficient, valuable programs being cut to the bone to make room for speculative and unproven programs at the expense of schoolchildren, who can neither afford this nor defend against it.

Mr. Speaker, this is false economy because it results in decreased consumption; it is false because we are dealing with nutrition and health here; it is false because unfavorable conditions in the dairy industry will combine with this cutback to increase the necessary support payments to dairy producers, which cost the Nation $13 million last year as it was.

But this is only the beginning. The administration's suggested appropriation for fiscal 1967 for the two programs amounts to only two-thirds of the present total, with the largest cutback coming in the milk program, which would be diminished to less than one-third its present size. Supposedly, these two programs are going to be redirected in order to aim only at the most needy children of the country. They will, in effect, join the war on poverty. While cutting back their appropriations considerably, they will, according to the budget, require more employees than they now have in order to administer the more careful screening process. That, of course, is nothing new on the poverty front: Fewer people helped, more people administering.

Whether the consumption of milk will decrease as a result of the program cutbacks is, as I have said, still a matter of speculation. To be sure, many schools will try to offer the present milk supply to schoolchildren at cost, or no profit to themselves. At present that cost is somewhere in the neighborhood of 6 cents per half pint, but is considerably lower to schoolchildren as a result of the Federal milk program. If price setting is left up to individual school districts, that cost will in many instances be raised to 10 cents per half pint, in order to recoup costs. Needy children will be allowed to receive the milk at the present low cost, but will they now be required to bring a note from home saying that they are too poor to pay for the milk like the other children? Can we assume that all the children presently enjoying school milk will continue to do so after the price increase? We cannot. This could do serious damage to the milk intake and the health benefits of the children.

This cutback may be a savings to the Federal Government, but the money means a great deal to the parents, children, and dairy farmers who presently depend on them. A total of $101 million is being cut from the milk and lunch budget, and who or what is being saved? Surely not the cost of the Department of Agriculture, which will increase as it becomes necessary to give more support to our dairy farmers; surely not the farmers, who will have lost part of an important sustaining market; surely not the schoolchildren, some of whom will have to stop drinking milk at school. No one gains except the final figure of the budget, which is proud to be $101 million trimmer. Like many other aspects of the so-called Great Society, this has been revealed as an optical illusion which pretends to be that which it is not, which gives the illusion of thrift when the cost is actually very high.

I urge every Member of Congress to give his serious consideration to the refunding of the well-established milk program. I urge every Member to consider the futility of this exercise in false economy, and to compare the good that has been done by this program with the incredibly mediocre results of several more expensive programs aimed at the welfare of the poor. It is hard to believe that Congress can allow this program of obvious results and acceptances to die in order that wildly speculative programs on the domestic front be born. It is discouraging to see that once a domestic program has indeed proven itself in the marketplace of public acceptance, it is no longer worthy of administration support. I sincerely hope that many of my colleagues will join me in demonstrating to the administration that it is a mistake to curtail these programs and in refunding the school milk program to its present effective levels.

At this point I should like to introduce into the body of the Record a letter I received from the district supervisor of food services in a Minnesota school district. The letter is self-explanatory, and reflects the same concern that is being expressed across the Nation:

Independent School District No. 281,
Robbinsdale, Minn., February 9, 1966.

Hon. Albert H. Quie,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We are concerned to learn of the additional cut in the Federal appropriation for the special milk program and of the fact that the budget request for the next year will be cut by about two-thirds for the milk program. In addition to this cut, our great concern is the cut in the school lunch appropriation for next year and the probable offering of fewer commodities for use in the lunch program.

We feel we have an excellent lunch program in our district, which is the third largest in the State of Minnesota. We have between 60 and 70 percent participation in our lunch program. While we are not in an economically depressed area, we still feel this program fills a need for our students. They do learn to eat a good balanced meal and often learn to eat foods they do not have at home.

Since President Johnson said in his budget message to the Nation that he "wished to improve the nutrition of the Nation's children," we strongly feel that these budget cuts are contradictory to his message.

We urge you to consider these facts and do what you can to prevent this reduction of school lunch funds.

Sincerely yours,
Joyce Bradley,
District Supervisor of Food Services.

EDUCATION: CONGRESS IS FACED WITH SOME TRYING ALTERNATIVES

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the 89th Congress has during the 1st session already compiled an extraordinary record of achievement in the field of education. Members of Congress will therefore study with particular care President Johnson's proposals for implementing the education measures passed during 1965 and also during the 88th Congress as well as his proposals for the year ahead.

One of the most thoughtful discussions I have seen of the President's education proposals for fiscal year 1967 is an article by John Walsh in the February 4, 1966, issue of Science magazine, a publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Under unanimous consent I insert this article, "Education: Congress Is Faced With Some Trying Alternatives," at this point in the Record.

Education: Congress Is Faced With Some Trying Alternatives

When the Federal budget is revealed to public view its general features are obvious, but details are not. At first, it is difficult to see the trees for the wood. Second thoughts often follow a second look.

As the President said in his budget message, "A budget is not simply a schedule of financial accounts.

"It is a program for action."

A budget is also a political document and can be compared, not unreasonably, to the opening bet in a hand of poker.

The budget for fiscal 1967 calls for record expenditures ($112.8 billion) and forecasts what, under the circumstances, is a remarkably small deficit ($1.8 billion). In order to finance the Vietnam war and a number of new programs without resorting to higher expenditures and a bigger deficit, a number of existing programs have been put to the budgetary knife (Science, Jan. 28).

The budget of the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare offers an illustration of how this has been done. Total funds administered by the Office of Education would rise by some $174 million to a total $3.5 billion in the coming fiscal year. This $174 million, however, is a net figure. Increases totaling $561 million would be strongly off-set by cuts amounting to $387 million.

The most conspicuous cuts in education programs would be (i) $191 million in assistance to school districts with sizable numbers of children of Federal employees enrolled; (ii) $12 million in special appropriations for land grant institutions; and (iii) merger of the National Defense Education Act loan program for undergraduates and graduate students with the loan insurance program which was part of the Higher Education Act passed last year. A system of private loans to students would be substituted for the present program of Federal loans to students made through colleges and universities. The result would be a cut of $149 million in Federal expenditures.

The administration argues that these cuts would be compensated for by funds available under new or expanded programs. But with enrollments and costs increasing in education, cuts, or changes that can be interpreted as cuts, are likely to be opposed. And in the case of the funds for federally impacted schools and for land-grant institutions, it is—to mix a metaphor—sacred oxen which would be gored.

Resistance is likely to rally most quickly against the proposed cut of $11,950,000 out of a total of $14,500,000 in annual appropriations for "resident instruction" in land-grant institutions.

The Federal Government, under the proposal, would continue to pay the $2,550,000 in permanent appropriations which the land-grant colleges and universities have been receiving since the late 19th century. The cut would affect the so-called special appropriations which have been increased from time to time as enrollment and the cost of higher education has risen.

Administration spokesmen have observed that the funds for the land grants are no longer needed because of the advent of other types of Federal aid. The reply to this from land-grant partisans is that these Federal appropriations are among the most useful funds these institutions receive, since they can be used where they are needed most, while other Federal programs are categorical in the sense that funds are earmarked for specific uses. Most of the land-grant funds are used to pay faculty salaries and are regarded as replacing income for endowments, which most land-grant institutions have in comparatively meager amounts.

Each of the land-grant institutions would continue to receive a flat $50,000 a year. But the reduction in appropriations for individual institutions would probably fall most heavily on institutions with predominantly Negro enrollments in Southern States. Many of these were originally "separate but equal" facilities which have been underfinanced and still depends on Federal land-grant funds for very significant parts of their budgets. In bigger, richer institutions, losses would be proportionally smaller, but they would have considerable impact. Cornell University, for example, has been receiving nearly $600,000 a year in land-grant funds, and if it lost all but $50,000 a year, the equivalent endowment needed to replace these funds, at a return of 5 percent a year on investments, would be some $11 million.

The land-grant colleges and universities have considered themselves, on fairly strong evidence to be enjoying a kind of most-favored-institutions status in their relations with the Federal Government, and the administration proposal is sure to kindle recriminations, whether Congress follows the recommendations or not.

The proposal to reduce funds to school districts also would affect a program which has grown familiar and acquired flavor in a large number of school districts (some 4,100). Impacted-area funds are now counted on by the budget makers in most of these school districts, and reductions would doubtless raise an alarm which would be echoed in Congress.

The main effect of the new and fairly complicated proposal would be to require school districts to "absorb" more of the cost of educating children of Federal employees, especially those who work, but do not live, on Federal property.

Funds in the two programs which make up impacted aid would be cut to a total $206.3 million, as compared with some $397 million in the current fiscal year.

The number of school districts receiving aid would be reduced by about 1,000, to around 3,100. By coincidence or something else, $191 million to be saved under the proposed cuts in impacted school aid equals the $191 million which would be added to appropriations for the new elementary and secondary education bill passed last year. Much of this new money would benefit children from low-income families. Ironically, many of the school districts which stand to lose eligibility for impacted-area aid are big-city districts with serious slum school problems. Loss of impacted-aid funds, the argument goes, would reduce the effectiveness of the money to be received for the education of the economically and socially deprived.

More uncertainties and much money are involved in the proposed merger of the program of direct Federal loans with the new loan insurance program for students in higher education. The new program is really a troika arrangement. Private lending institutions, such as banks, would provide loan funds. State and nonprofit private student loan programs would guarantee the loans. The Federal Government would pay interest while the student was pursuing his studies, and 3 percentage points of interest afterward for students from families with annual incomes below $15,000. Interest on these loans is not to exceed 6 percent or, in exceptional cases, 7 percent.

A parallel program of "educational opportunity grants" would provide $70 million a year for 3 years for grants of from $200 to $800 a year for "exceptionally needy" students. Financial need is now a factor in award of NDEA loans, and students with serious financial needs would presumably be taken care of by the new opportunity grants if the NDEA loan system were merged with the bigger loan insurance program.

The administration has said the change to private financing will result in a big increase in the number of student borrowers. NDEA funds this year are going to about 319,000 students. The budget message predicted that some 775,000 will participate under the recast loan program.

Critics of the merger point out that the new loan guarantee program is untried and developments are to some extent unpredictable. In many States, no State agency designed or empowered to undertake the guarantee of such loans exists. Many legislatures doubtless will remedy this deficiency, but the question of what happens if they do not hangs in the air.

The legislation has a provision for authorizing a Federal program of insured loans for students who do not have reasonable access to equivalent State or private loan programs and authorizes $17.5 million for advances to State and private nonprofit programs. But how all this will work is not yet clear.

Expenditures for NDEA loans would be cut by $149 million in fiscal 1967, leaving some $30 million which apparently is intended to finance the transition.

Doubts have been raised that the private money market will be able to provide funds for such an expansion of student loans, particularly if another $150 million in loans now financed by the Treasury is thrown in.

Banks and some other private lending institutions have experience with college loans, but not, obviously, on the scale contemplated. In banking circles there is clearly a sense of gratification at seeing the Federal Government withdrawing their direct action in the loan business. Universities and colleges may also be relieved at giving up some of their activity as lending and collection agencies, particularly since, as the rate of late payment and defaults on NDEA loans indicate, some of them have not been very good at it.

The recent increase in the interest rate and, consequently, in the price of money to lending institutions certainly does not make the 6-percent loans any more attractive to the banks. The fact that the loans are relatively long-term ones is perhaps even more discouraging for the banks. It is generally acknowledged among bankers that student loans under the new program would be more a public service and long-range public-relations effort than a profitmaking proposition.

Another matter which remains in doubt is what will happen to the students whose families are not in the exceptionally needy category yet do not rank as very attractive credit risks.

Representative Edith Green, Democrat, of Oregon, chairman of the House Higher Education Subcommittee, has been quoted as saying she is not opposed to insured loans but would like to see how they work before seeing direct Federal loans abandoned completely.

While the administration's public explanations of its choices in making cuts in education programs are plausible enough if you accept the administration's assumptions, these three cuts are, in practical terms, almost certain to provoke stiff opposition. And the curious thing is that probably nobody knows this better than the President and his legislative advisers. For administration education proposals since the beginning of the Johnson administration have been framed with an almost unerring sense of what was wanted in the education community and what Congress would accept.

It would not take too daring a forecaster to prophesy that the three programs listed here will, when the session is over, be in a condition closer to their present one than to the reduced state the budget projects.

Congress could make compensating cuts elsewhere in the education budget to bring total expenditures close to what the President requests. But most of the programs in question call for levels of spending already authorized by Congress in earlier legislation.

An alternative, of course, would be for Congress to appropriate a larger total. This would imply bigger expenditures, a bigger deficit, and, as a possible consequence, increases in taxes. The President, with his small deficit achieved by cutting fairly close to the quick on some programs and counting on hefty increases in revenues, has moved to avoid bringing up such increases. The next move in the game is up to Congress.

At any rate, it appears that there will be brisker interaction between the Executive and Congress than has occurred since President Johnson took office. Outside the defense budget, requests for major increases are likely to be accompanied by recommendations for offsetting cuts in related programs. And the difficult options in the education budget may well presage a similar fate for funds for science.—John Walsh.

PRODUCTS OF PROGRESS EXPOSITION

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, last year my home community of South Bend was the site of a new kind of fair. As distinguished from the livestock and baked goods of the traditional fair, this one featured the most advanced achievements of engineering and technology—instruments used and products manufactured by the industries of northern Indiana.

That Products of Progress Exposition of last year was a major success and will be duplicated this year with an even larger show in the University of Notre Dame's modern Stepan Center March 25 through 27. This unusual exposition is sponsored by an unusual group, the Council of Engineering and Technical Societies. That organization brings together the representatives of local branches of 15 engineering and technical societies. The 2,500 engineers, scientists, and technical people, who comprise the membership of those groups meet regularly to keep themselves up to date in their professions. They represent a great store of know-how for local industry, and the Products of Progress Exposition gives the entire community a chance to see their latest handiwork.

I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the Council of Engineering and Technical Societies, and to urge my neighbors throughout the St. Joseph Valley to take advantage of this excellent display of the technological advancements upon which so much of our prosperity depends.

MANDATORY LIFE TERMS FOR NARCOTIC PEDDLERS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Helstoski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the first session of this Congress we have undertaken a vast project which could be of lasting benefit to the youth of this Nation and to the advancement of our national resources. I speak of the expansion of educational programs which were adopted by the Congress and enacted into law. However, all this can go for naught if we tolerate the rising use of marihuana and narcotic drugs among the college students, as evidenced through various newspaper articles throughout the country.

As we try to improve the quality of education, the illegal narcotic pusher demoralizes our youth through the easy access to marihuana and other illegal stimulant or depressive drugs. Thus, we pay doubly once to promote education and secondly to curtail the illegal practice of drug peddling on the campuses of our Nation's schools.

The problem of peddling narcotics, to me, seems one that we should cope with at all times, and because of this fact I am today presenting legislation which would provide for a mandatory life sentence to persons convicted of peddling narcotics through illegal channels.

The present laws are permissive in nature as to the penalty which may be given out by the courts in hearing these cases. They leave it up to individual judges as to the terms of imprisonment, parole, and fines which may be levied against a convicted narcotic peddler or pusher. The legislation I propose today will make it mandatory upon the sentencing jurist to impose a life term upon such peddlers, with no chance for parole at some future date. A strict adherence to the law would go far in curtailing the spread of drug addiction among the people of our Nation.

The recent raid upon the campus of Penn State University netted, if I recall correctly, 37 students who were in possession of marihuana. The Washington, D.C., newspaper columns recently told of area college students openly meeting in certain places and openly discussing their use of marihuana at parties which are organized on the spur of the moment.

If, through the passage of the Lindbergh law, we curtailed the crime of kidnaping; which did not exist to the extent to which narcotic peddling exists, we can vastly cut down upon the peddling of illegal drugs if we take action to impose mandatory life sentences to the individuals convicted of these illegal transactions.

Strict adherence to the law which I propose today, and hope that Congress will take action upon it without delay, will permit us to use the money we would spend in the rehabilitation of the addicts for programs which would be used to better advantage by this country. Our rehabilitation centers could be used to provide services which would enhance the economy of our Nation.

The ever-present threat of a life term without parole, would make an illegal peddler or pusher of narcotics think twice before setting himself up in this vicious business. I know that we are fully cognizant of the fact that these conditions prevail and it is up to us to take immediate remedial steps and declare a war on these illegal narcotic dealers.

Our path in this endeavor is clearly defined and we must not veer from it now, just to be sorry at a later date.

WICHITA FALLS RECORD NEWS OF FEBRUARY 7, 1966

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Purcell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, writing in the Wichita Falls, Tex., Record News, states quite plainly that "President Johnson deserves our thanks for warning the recipients of American foreign aid that they must help themselves intelligently if they wish to continue to receive it."

Recipients must, be points out, invest the money in agriculture and really needed industries, "must make land reforms and collect taxes even from the rich; they must practice some sort of birth control; and above all, they must neither discourage nor confiscate foreign investment."

Of all the President's conditions, "the last is the most important," Mr. Mowrer believes. "Another improvement, in my eyes," he states, "is the separation between military and economic aid. Military aid should go to firm allies, not to wobbly neutrals."

His analysis is forthright and illuminating, and in the belief that others will find it informative and of value, I offer it for the Record.

Favor for Friends

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Washington.—President Johnson deserves our thanks for warning the recipients of American foreign aid that they must help themselves intelligently if they wish to continue to receive it. They must, that is, invest the money in agriculture and really needed industries (instead of in Rolls Royces, golden bedsteads and steel mills); they must make land reforms and collect taxes even from the rich; they must practice some sort of birth control; and above all, they must neither discourage nor confiscate foreign investment.

Of all L.B.J.'s conditions, the last is the most important. The United States was largely developed by foreign capital. So was Canada. So, before 1914, was Russia. No primitive country has the means of rapid industrial development. Such countries must either welcome foreign investment, or remain undeveloped. To the extent that the President stands firm on this, he will help everybody concerned.

Another improvement, in my eyes, is the separation between military and economic aid. Military aid should go to firm allies, not to wobbly neutrals. Let the latter get arms from Russia or China—if they are ready to face the consequences. Unhappily our President has not yet accepted this bit of commonsense. Perhaps with time, he will.

NO CALL FOR SERMONS

What really irks me about the President's aid message to Congress is, however, his sermonizing. Such talk gives the United States a reputation for hypocrisy throughout the world. Over the past 21 years of foreign aid, our chief motive has never been "devotion to the works of peace" or "vision of a world free from fear and ripe with opportunity." Not because most Americans would not welcome these things, but because we had a more immediate goal.

The chief motive of the American Congress in voting a hundred odd billions of foreign aid has been to halt the spread of communism—in short, to achieve at least a draw in the cold war. Any citizen who disagrees should ask himself whether, without the Russo-American and Sino-American competitions for the minds and favor of the undeveloped peoples and governments, the American people would never have approved giving away such astronomic sums.

To be sure, we have achieved much less than we could have. This is because we have allowed people with no practical experience of world politics to persuade us to give "aid without strings." Governments and individuals are properly suspicious of "something for nothing." Moreover, our foolishness has offered shrewd governments in underdeveloped countries a marvelous opportunity to practice "double blackmail" saying to Washington and to Moscow, "Gimme, gimme, or I'll get it from the other place." Even George Kennan, now a champion peacenik, wrote a few years ago that when a chief of state with an itchy palm threatened to go to Moscow unless Washington came across with the dough, a wise American President would have answered, "Go."

Paying and blackmail has two defects. In the first place, the recipient can do what he pleases with the money. Much of it is still being wasted.

And in the second place, by giving aid only for specific purposes, the canny Bolsheviks (not the Chinese) pursued Lenin's great goal—Communist encirclement of capitalism.

REDS SEEK SOURCE OF RAW MATERIAL

For the time being, Moscow, though not Peiping, seeks not so much to install Communist regimes as to cut the capitalist countries off from their sources of raw materials in the undeveloped countries. This explains Moscow's interest in fomenting any kind of revolt or disorder in underdeveloped Asia, Africa and Latin America. Hunger in India, civil strife in Africa, putsches in Latin America—these are steps toward the eventual Communist encirclement of capitalism upon which Moscow is counting to buy the West.

To counter this offensive Washington needs to make clear to each undeveloped country that the condition of our aid is a permanently friendly attitude on its part—take it or leave it.

Instead, we give trade and aid without strings not only to unfriendly neutrals but to overt enemies, thus allowing the latter to step up their aid and hide their economic failures. Small wonder that the West is slowly losing the cold war.

Nothing but a reversal of our aid policy in this respect and a public admission that we favor only those who share our values can make our aid fully effective.

The rest, as the French poet Verlaine wrote, is "literature."

FEBRUARY 25, WORLD DAY OF PRAYER

Mr. **KREBS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 25, millions of Americans will once again participate in the World Day of Prayer.

There will be an opportunity for Members of Congress and their staffs to participate by joining others in a quiet service of meditation in room S. 120 in the Capitol on February 25.

The flexible hours of 11 a.m. to 2 p.m. will give each a choice as to a convenient time. A brief meditation will be brought by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris at 12:30 p.m. and one by Dr. Bernard Braskamp at 1:30 p.m. There will be quiet music the remainder of the time and opportunity for individual meditation and prayer for a troubled world.

The World Day of Prayer is sponsored by the United Church Women, and is observed in every continent on the first Friday in Lent. Though begun 80 years ago, it has a realistic, contemporary appeal and need for Christians throughout the world to pray and to witness for Christ in this day of ferment and tension among nations, and especially for the success of our Nation's peace efforts.

I invite each of you and the members of your staffs to share in this experience.

SEARCH FOR PEACE

Mr. **KREBS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, fateful decisions often are forced on Presidents. We recall the decision that Harry Truman had to make when he had faced up to the senseless resistance of the Japanese.

Fateful decisions, such as to resume bombing raids over North Vietnam, are not easy for Presidents to make.

The Nashville Tennessean has pointed out that advisers to the President "told him that if continued immunity were given to those who support Vietnamese aggression the cost in American lives would be greatly increased."

The paper adds that it is clear that the 37-day period "in which Mr. Johnson sought unsuccessfully in many places for a way to end the fighting in Vietnam—has exposed the Communists before the world as the aggressors in southeast Asia."

According to the Tennessean:

> The resumption of the bombing is consistent with the President's policy of impressing upon the North Vietnamese this country's determination to remain in southeast Asia, while pursuing every path that might lead to peace.

The editorial is thought provoking and because many of my colleagues will want to read it through, I suggest that it be included in the RECORD:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean,
Feb. 1, 1966]

THE SEARCH FOR PEACE MUST STILL BE PUSHED

President Johnson has sent American bombers back over North Vietnam, ending a 37-day lull during which he pushed peace talks around the world. The peace talks will continue—will perhaps be intensified—but the President has decided that the situation can no longer remain static while the Communists build up new stocks of men and material in South Vietnam.

Mr. Johnson coupled his order to resume bombing with instructions to Ambassador Arthur Goldberg to act as quickly as possible to promote peace through the United Nations.

The President's appeal to the U.N. represents a departure from past policy, and indicates that this country will now give more emphasis to convincing the U.N. that Communist aggression in southeast Asia is a world problem, and not one just for the United States alone to deal with.

Heretofore, the administration has welcomed the U.N.'s concern over the Vietnamese war, but it has appeared cool to any suggestion that the U.N. be given a major hand in settling the dispute. Yesterday, however, Mr. Johnson called for an immediate meeting of the U.N. Security Council in an effort to bring the Vietnam conflict to the conference table.

It is uncertain what role the U.N. can play. It seems unlikely that a peace-keeping force could be the answer. But there is no doubt that the problem should be before the U.N. for discussion and for the purpose of engendering whatever pressure the free nations may be able to bring to bear upon the Communist aggressors.

It is widely regretted that the 37-day lull found no favorable Communist response to the President's peace efforts and that he found it necessary to resume the bombing.

However, according to Mr. Johnson, his advisers had told him that if continued immunity were given to those who support Vietnamese aggression the cost in American lives would be greatly increased.

"In the light of the words and actions of the government in Hanoi," he said, "it is our clear duty to do what we can to limit these costs."

Although it is regrettable to see the lull in the bombing come to an end, it is clear that the 37-day period—in which Mr. Johnson sought unsuccessfully in many places for a way to end the fighting in Vietnam—has exposed the Communists before the world as the aggressors in southeast Asia.

Their refusal even to talk about peace, and their denunciations of Mr. Johnson's efforts, have left most people with the impression that peace is the last thing the Communists want.

The resumption of the bombing is consistent with the President's policy of impressing upon the North Vietnamese this country's determination to remain in southeast Asia, while pursuing every path that might lead to peace.

It is not an easy choice in Vietnam for Mr. Johnson—or for the Nation. It is hoped a way will soon be found to end the fighting, but in view of the latest developments it seems the Nation must be prepared to see the situation get worse before it gets better.

ADAM YARMOLINSKY: A FINE AMERICAN AND PUBLIC SERVANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, on January 25, one of our colleagues saw fit to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Washington Observer containing an unprincipled and totally unwarranted attack on a fine public servant, Adam Yarmolinsky. This kind of attack on Mr. Yarmolinsky has become all too frequent. The constant repetition of this type of falsehood, and the consequent injury to Mr. Yarmolinsky's reputation and career, require that the record be set straight.

I am quite familar with Adam Yarmolinsky's background, with his record of devoted public service, and with his high professional standards. I know from personal acquaintance, and from a review of the documented facts about his past activities, that he has been a consistent and effective opponent of communism and Communist influence since his early youth.

The various innuendoes contained in the article from the Washington Observer, and in similar scurrilous attacks, will not survive objective analysis of Mr. Yarmolinsky's career, both private and public. The statements of purported fact as to his associations and pasc activities are demonstrably false.

For example, Mr. Speaker, the Washington Observer article states that while at Harvard Mr. Yarmolinsky was head of the campus Marxist Club. This charge is completely baseless. The fact is that, while at Harvard, Mr. Yarmolinsky and a group of his friends withdrew from the Harvard Student Union because of its developing pro-Communist bias. They then founded the Harvard Liberal Union, which strongly supported American assistance to the British war effort at a time when the Nazi-Soviet Pact was in effect. Its positions were not Marxist, but actively anti-Communist.

The article also asserts that Mr. Yarmolinsky was a founding member and on the editorial staff of the "campus Marxist magazine Yardling, which presented to students the viewpoint of the Young Communist League." Again, the statement is completely erroneous. While at Harvard, Mr. Yarmolinsky was instrumental in founding a freshman newspaper known as the Harvard Yardling. This publication lasted for six issues. Not one of these issues contained any material whatsoever of a pro-Communist or fellow traveler nature. The Yardling was completely nonpolitical. It concentrated on matters of interest to Harvard freshmen, and emphasized sports and social activities. This distorted description of the nature of the Harvard Yardling appears to have originated in the notorious anti-Semitic hate sheet, Common Sense. It is without factual foundation.

The Observer articles states further, Mr. Speaker, that, in 1941 while a student at Harvard, Mr. Yarmolinsky attended the Communist-controlled American Youth Congress. What it fails to state is that he was present at this meeting of the American Youth Congress as a hostile observer to see how that organization would try to get out of its previous anti-intervention position following Russian's entry into the war the month before. Mr. Yarmolinsky prepared a report on this meeting, published by the Clearinghouse for Youth Groups, in which he commented on the AYC "flip-flop" and observed that this showed that the Youth Congress was "completely under the domination of the Communists." His report warned of the likelihood of attempts by the Youth Congress to infiltrate non-Communist student groups.

With regard to the article's charges of affiliation with the Young Communist League, these too are arrant falsehoods. Mr. Yarmolinsky was never a member of or sympathetic with the Young Communist League. Instead, his record shows constant opposition to Communist attempts to infiltrate the organizations with which he has been associated. As a result of his efforts to combat Communist attempts to take over the American Veterans Committee in 1946, Mr. Yarmolinsky was attacked as a "Red baiter" in columns of the New York Daily Worker.

Mr. Speaker, other misrepresentations of this article relate to Mr. Yarmolinsky's parents and to his work on a study of the Federal personnel security system. Insofar as his parents are concerned, both Dr. and Mrs. Yarmolinsky are distinguished scholars and writers. Neither has been active politically. Dr. Yarmolinsky, furthermore, has come under attack in Communist publications because of his unfavorable comments about the status of Russian literature under the Soviet regime. Mrs. Yarmolinsky, a well-known poet under her pen name, "Babette Deutsch," was among the first to call attention to the importance of Boris Pasternak's "Dr. Zhivago," in an article in Harper's magazine in September of 1958, shortly after the Pasternak manuscript was smuggled out of the Soviet Union.

Insofar as the study of the Federal personnel security system is concerned, this was an objective analysis of 50 loyalty-security cases, which was designed to provide factual material which might lead to procedural improvements in that program. The study in no sense constituted an attack on efforts to achieve personnel security and, in his published comments at the time of the study, Mr. Yarmolinsky recorded his view that a security program was "needed in these days when there is a danger of Communist subversion."

Mr. Yarmolinsky has had a distinguished career both as a private lawyer and as a public servant. The baseless charges that have been made against him in a number of radical hate sheets merit only the contempt of this body and the American public.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that when they know the facts, none of our colleagues, and indeed no responsible individuals, will associate themselves with this kind of unprincipled attack on an able and loyal American.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE DELAWARE CHAPTER OF THE UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was adopted by the Delaware chapter of the United World Federalists at a chapter meeting held February 8, 1966:

RESOLUTIONS ON U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM ADOPTED AT THE MEETING, FEBRUARY 8, 1966, OF THE DELAWARE CHAPTER OF THE UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS

We believe that these resolutions describe the kind of constructive policy the United States ought to emphasize rather than one of escalation.

1. The United States should continue vigorously to seek negotiations with the North Vietnamese Government. We approve the recent offer to include the National Liberation Front in the negotiations. Meanwhile we urge restraint to prevent widening the conflict.

2. We approve of the steps the United States has taken in bringing this crisis to the United Nations and believe that fullest use should be made of the United Nations and of the good offices of nations near Vietnam in the search for peace and in guaranteeing any agreement.

3. We commend the U.S. Government's recognition of the validity of the 1954 Geneva accord.

4. Initiatives should be taken to bring mainland China into increased contact with the United States and the world community.

5. In cooperation with other governments, the U.S. Government should prepare concrete proposals to strengthen the United Nations to give it authority and means to cope with future crises.

We proudly commend our Representative HARRIS B. McDOWELL for his efforts to bring the problem of the Vietnam war before the United Nations.

We proudly commend our Senator J. CALEB BOGGS for his part in providing the people of the United States with the report, "The Vietnam Conflict: The Substance and the Shadow," a vitally important document.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT T. MURPHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years the tremendous growth in air traffic as well as air cargo and air freight has been a remarkable factor in our national economy. The air transportation industry has reached a period of its highest prosperity and stability under a regulatory climate provided by the Civil Aeronautics Board in which it has been encouraged to grow and develop to the fullest extent of its ability. Today we have the best air transportation system in the world, both domestically and internationally. Puerto Rico and the Carribbean region constitutes a very significant part of our overseas and international trade and commerce.

In this connection, a recent speech by the Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Robert T. Murphy, of Rhode Island, to the Chamber of Commerce of Puerto Rico in San Juan on February 12 appropriately touches upon some of these significant considerations.

As Mr. Murphy points out, it has been air transportation which has forged the links which permit the flow of our trade and commerce to and from Puerto Rico in a matter of a few hours at a level of very reasonable cost. Today, as we know, Puerto Rico is the crossroads of Caribbean air traffic and will continue to play a very important part in the future development of the entire Caribbean region.

Under previous unanimous consent I insert his timely statement in the body of the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT T. MURPHY, VICE CHAIRMAN, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, BEFORE THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF PUERTO RICO IN SAN JUAN, FEBRUARY 12, 1966

I am honored to be here in the company of the Puerto Rico Chamber of Commerce this evening. Your invitation to join with you in emphasizing the essential importance of our national air transportation system in the advancement of your economic and social welfare has afforded me the first opportunity to visit this great Commonwealth. As I told your President, Mr. Justo Pastor Rivera, in Washington a few weeks ago, I have come not primarily to speak but rather, to listen; not to lecture, but to learn. I want to acquire a greater familiarity with your problems, to understand them the better and to consider them as they relate on the larger scene of America's national interest.

This is not to say that I have no previous acquaintance with the needs and aspirations of Puerto Rico—its record of progressive self-development and its impressive achievements. In frequent cases and conferences during the past 5 years—in which the Commonwealth has often participated—I have acquired a keen appreciation of the special importance of this Commonwealth in the present and future development of our American way of life in this offshore Caribbean area. The ever-unfolding economic drama of Operation Bootstrap with which so many of you here tonight are personally identified, is an inspirational example of self-reliance and self-development with which all men in all parts of the world interested in the cause of freedom and human dignity, are and should be acquainted.

And we know that Puerto Ricans have initiated another operation—Operation Serenidad—to lend the proper cultural and spiritual framework to the material advancement sought by your quickened trade and commerce. Coming from a part of the United States which takes special pride in its colonial history, I cannot help but be impressed with the antiquity of your culture and institutions. This island had been colonized for more than a century before my native city was founded by Roger Williams in 1636; the hostile incursions of the British and Dutch had long been repulsed from the battlements of Morro Castle before the colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations received its charter from King Charles II in 1663. Certainly, no other area under the American flag can boast of a more ancient and impressive heritage than the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Nor, indeed, is any other more noted for its natural beauty and the kind hospitality of its people. It is a pleasure, indeed, to be here at last.

But our interest, in this convocation, is not so much in what is past; rather, our concern is what the attendant fortunes of our modern industrial world hold in store for Puerto Rico in the days ahead and how air transportation can be relied upon to play a continuing role of service in that respect.

For generations, as an insular community, Puerto Rico was completely dependent upon maritime transport for its association with the outside world. Trading ships which have traversed these waters since the days of Columbus and, more recently, cruise ships have played a vital part in your economic development. Without any intention of suggesting that air transport could supplant the continuing importance of maritime transport to the Commonwealth, which must be relied upon for the chief carriage of bulk and heavy goods, I think we can truly say that it is air transportation which has facilitated, in recent years, the astounding increases in your trade and commerce. It has been the aircraft which forged the vital links which now permit the swift flow of persons and goods to and from your principal mainland markets in a matter of a few hours at reasonable costs. It has been air transportation which has joined you to all the Caribbean basic communities with ease and swiftness and brought to you ready transport communication with the major communities of Europe and South America. It is air transportation which is helping to banish the fear of isolation and the sense of division which, in the past, has gripped so many of the Caribbean basin peoples.

By virtue of air transportation, the resplendent charms of this island have been made immediately available, at prices reasonably related to costs, to literally hundreds of thousands of people in the United States and elsewhere. Here, at San Juan's International Airport, multiple carriers vie with one another in providing an excellence of service with the most modern aircraft at a variety of price levels.

Last year, while maritime transport afforded you 55 sailings each month to 18 ports, you enjoyed some 156 direct flights each week to U.S. markets, plus Latin America and Europe. Eleven airlines transported more than 100 tons of air cargo daily—and the growth and development of economically priced air freight the air cargo will figure more and more in your commercial future. Certainly, the contributions of civil air transport technology and of progressive air carrier management can find no better proving ground than in the pattern of air services available at your International Airport. They have made you the crossroads of Caribbean air traffic.

But while your present air transportation facilities are excellent we, at the Civil Aeronautics Board, fully appreciate that your service requirements continue to expand; that as your needs grow, so too must your air transport horizons be enlarged. We have full confidence in the responsiveness of the authorized carriers to meet the increased demands for services. We know that industry, which has supplanted agriculture as the prime factor in the Puerto Rican economy, requires rapid and reasonably priced air transportation in order to maintain its position in the swiftly evolving economy of the modern-day world. Likewise, we are aware of the special dependence of tourism—now the third-ranking contributor to your economy—upon the continued development and enlargement of convenient and reasonably priced air transportation services.

The dramatic growth in air travel is nowhere better illustrated than in the New York-San Juan market which has expanded threefold in the past decade and which we can expect to total almost 1.3 million passengers in 1966. In a sense, the variety in the classes of service made available to you by the carriers has been both a cause and an effect of your great traffic growth both in this and other markets. The price range and choice of services, surely a function of the competitive route awards made by the CAB, have been a stimulus in this development. It is well to note that the lowest round-trip New York-San Juan fare today is less than half the figure in 1946—and the New York-San Juan thrift fare is one of the lowest mileage fares in the entire world.

An equally striking demonstration of the impact of air travel on Caribbean economies can be found in the San Juan-Virgin Island markets so ably served by your home-based Caribair (Lineas Aereas de Puerto Rico). Between 1952 and 1964, Caribair's traffic between San Juan and St. Thomas rose from 59,000 to 433,000 and from San Juan to St. Croix from 9,000 to 69,000—an eightfold increase.

Now, as you doubtless know, an extensive review of all present United States-Caribbean-South American air services is proceeding before our Board. Detailed evidence relating to your present and future needs for air service has been submitted in this quasi-judicial proceeding. I cannot comment on that pending case except to say that you may be assured that it will be fully and carefully considered and evaluated in keeping with our Board responsibility to develop an adequate national air transport system capable of meeting the needs of our present and future domestic and international trade and commerce.

I deem it fortunate that so much of your future will be identified with air transportation which, in my judgment, is our most progressive and dynamic mode of transportation. I say that for several reasons:

First, in aviation technology, including aircraft design and production, we are unquestionably world leaders. U.S. aircraft are in use, in increasing numbers, under the flags of all of the free world, over air routes in every corner of the globle. Yet, our search for even better aircraft products continues at an accelerated pace.

Second, our air carrier industry has built the most extensive, the soundest, and most economically viable air transportation system in the world. In terms of service to the public it has no peer elsewhere. In profitability to investors it has no counterpart. Our airline managements have courageously committed billions of dollars to making the jet age a reality for the millions of travelers and shippers now regularly utilizing their safe and reliable services.

And. finally, we can say with some pardonable pride, that a regulatory climate and attitude has been provided by the CAB in which air transportation has been encouraged to grow and develop at a maximized pace relatively free from discouraging regulatory burdens or undue restrictions.

As you contemplate the future, therefore, you can confidently conclude that the air transport industry is not afflicted with any serious ills. Its problems, fortunately, are chiefly those associated with growth, of burgeoning expansion and, indeed, affluence. This past year, our carriers, both domestic and international, set new traffic record highs in every category of market indexes—and, at the same time achieved the most favorable profit returns in many years. This trend continues. The latest figures available show, for example, that December 1965 trunkline traffic was up 6.2 percent over November 1965 and up 22 percent over December 1964. Load factors are continuing to hold steady even as the number of seats made available for sale continues to rise.

Our air transport industry, then, stands fully able and ever willing to join with you in lifting your economy to new heights.

Airline managements are devoting an increasing proportion of their attention and resources to improvement of their services as well as innovations in the promotion of resort and tourist travel. You cannot help but profit from all of this.

There can be no reasonable doubt that the years ahead are destined to be years of great promise and dramatic growth in all modes of air transportation. According to reliable forecasts, the record levels of 1965 will be exceeded this year—and the totals of passengers and passenger-miles will double within the next 5 years. In my judgment, air cargo and air freight will grow at a relatively higher pace than passenger traffic. New containerization methods will greatly facilitate its handling and its intermodal transfer thus reducing costs appreciably. More and more of our traffic will be carried in jet aircraft. Here in the Caribbean area, for example, you can soon expect marked service improvements with advent of the three-engine B–727's and twin-engine DC–9's by Pan Am and your own Caribbean-Atlantic respectively.

Time does not permit a glimpse of what the future may hold for us in terms of supersonic transportation or in terms of the projected mammoth, subsonic cargo and passenger aircraft of the C–5A type. Nor can we discuss, at this point, the great transport breakthroughs which may result from the advancing technology in V/STOL aircraft—both fixed and tilt wing—or in the special research in ballistic transport which accompanies our space efforts. Right now, on the drawing boards and in the laboratories of our world-famed aircraft manufacturing industry, revolutionary new advances in equipment are presently in the making. Suffice it to say that even with the present tools at hand our basic air transportation system will expand beyond present markets. Air carrier progress will stimulate the development of new markets. As businessmen, you appreciate that the growth and development of other travel markets need not adversely affect Puerto Rico's prime tourist position. Experience has shown that the great expansion of Caribbean air travel has been accompanied by a healthy growth in the Florida market; vacation travel to the southwestern States has rapidly grown concomitantly with the dramatic increases in tourist traffic to Hawaii. There are benefits for all of us in the expansion of additional travel markets.

In this connection let me compliment you on the establishment of the Caribbean Economic Development Corporation whose activities recognize that the continuing prosperity of Puerto Rico is necessarily associated with that of the other islands in the Caribbean region. Just as the Island of Oahu in our new State of Hawaii perceived that its destiny was inevitably linked to the development of the "outer islands," so, too, have you recognized that the promotion of the neighboring islands as tourist attractions will redound to your own benefit. An upsurge in their economy will have a favorable effect upon that of Puerto Rico.

I cannot conclude these remarks without adverting to the unique position which the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the neighboring Virgin Islands enjoy in our efforts to promote and advance the Visit U.S.A. program. Here, the favorable virtues of climate, geographic location, cultural background, scenic beauty, and historic lore combine to make the Commonwealth and its environs a highly attractive center of vacation travel. The principal instrument of its development along these lines will continue to be air transportation. In the Caribbean basin, we can find all the charms and allure of the multinational civilization of Europe, and find them literally on our own doorstep, thanks to convenient airline services. Not only are more and more of our fellow citizens discovering this pleasurable fact but, likewise, more and more Europeans. The work of this chamber, then, in the development of a strong tourist economy in the Commonwealth is a significant contribution to our balance-of-payments problem. You are to be commended for your efforts in this direction.

In conclusion then, let me say that the future for Puerto Rico is indeed bright and that developing future will continue to be enhanced by progressive and reliable air transportation services. In your effort to improve your self-governing capacity by expanding your economy and opening new vistas of spiritual and cultural values to your people, you may count our flag carriers as your strong, faithful allies. I am sure that all of us who are privileged to have some responsibility for U.S. air transportation shall regard our obligations to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico as a responsibility of great trust—a trust which I assure you will be discharged with fidelity and continued success.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Schmidhauser (at the request of Mr. Boggs), on February 21 and 22, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Cohelan (at the request of Mr. Krebs), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDowell (at the request of Mr. Krebs), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Fogarty (at the request of Mr. Krebs), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. Weltner.

Mr. Philbin.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Hutchinson) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Del Clawson.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Krebs) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Hays.

Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Kornegay in two instances.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass., in 1969.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 22, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2058. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for various agencies for fiscal year 1966 (H. Doc. No. 383); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2059. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of audit of Farm Credit Administration, fiscal year 1965 (H. Doc. No. 384); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

2060. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the provisions of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2061. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2062. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2063. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, during the period July 1 through December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 203(o) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2064. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need to reexamine planned replacement and augmentation of high-endurance vessels, western area, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2065. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of information relating to local employment created by the accelerated public works program, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2066. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of actions being taken to achieve greater utilization of limited-life and long-supply items in civil defense medical stockpile managed by Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2067. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of pricing of recorders purchased from Midwestern Instruments, Inc., Tulsa, Okla., Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2068. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of cost-sharing arrangements with the State of Oregon for the operation of fish hatcheries, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2069. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need to strengthen supervision over city delivery carriers, Post Office Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2070. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of allocation of school facility costs to five federally assisted urban renewal projects in New Jersey and Illinois, Urban Renewal Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2071. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need to consider storing processed commodities on a daily-rate basis, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2072. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of inclusion of balconies and use of high-cost brick in constructing low-rent public housing projects, Public Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2073. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of the approval of mortgage insurance for a housing project for the elderly located near Fort Worth, Tex., Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2074. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 248, *The Seminole Nation, Plaintiff* v. *The United States of America*, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2075. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to give the Federal Communications Commission certain additional regulatory authority over communication common carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2076. A letter from the Secretary, Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide incentives to planned metropolitan development and to otherwise assist urban development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 1966, the following bill was reported on February 18, 1966:

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 12889. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 12921. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 12922. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 12923. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 12924. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12925. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the millennium of the Polish nation in the calendar year 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 12926. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove certain limitations on the amount of the deduction for contributions to pension and profit-sharing plans made on behalf of self-employed individuals and to change the definition of "earned income" applicable with respect to such plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 12927. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall acquire additional land for the Beverly National Cemetery, N.J.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 12928. A bill to amend titles III and XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to strengthen instruction in school health and physical education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 12929. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 12930. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, to extend such mailing privileges to voice recordings of personal messages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 12931. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide increased authorization for the lending programs of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12932. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 12933. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12934. A bill to permit a State to elect to use funds from the highway trust fund for purposes of urban mass transportation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 12935. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that construction workers shall be allowed the deduction for moving expenses without regard to the length of time they are employed at their new location; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 12936. A bill relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 12937. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1924, to revise existing law relating to the examination, licensure, registration, and regulation of optometrists and the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 12938. A bill relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 12939. A bill to provide incentives to planned metropolitan development and to otherwise assist urban development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 12940. A bill relating to the establishment of parking facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 12941. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 12942. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CRALEY:

H.R. 12943. A bill to extend the administrative compensation retention provisions of the Department of the Navy for its wage board employees to wage board employees of the former Naval Ordnance Plant, York, Pa.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 12944. A bill authorizing the planting, design, construction, furnishing, and maintenance of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 12945. A bill to provide that certain persons convicted of peddling narcotics must be sentenced to life imprisonment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 12946. A bill to provide incentives to planned metropolitan development and to otherwise assist urban development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 840. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation for the commemoration and observance of the millennium of the Polish nation in the calendar year 1966; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.J. Res. 841. Joint resolution to designate Monday, October 4, 1965, as Free Enterprise Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H. Con. Res. 595. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to discrimination in the assignment of U.S. employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.:

H.R. 12947. A bill for the relief of John A. Goodwin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12948. A bill for the relief of Mary Seferian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 12949. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko Ishizawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 12950. A bill for the relief of Kazimierz (Casimer) Krzykowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 12951. A bill for the relief of Dr. Syed Akram Ali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12952. A bill for the relief of Wlodzimierz Kwolek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12953. A bill for the relief of Jozef Misiuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 12954. A bill for the relief of Vukosava Nikcevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 12955. A bill for the relief of Arlene W. Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 12956. A bill for the relief of Chana Stupinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12957. A bill for the relief of Stanislav Jackowski, Joanna Jackowski, Stefan Jackowski, Waclaw Jackowski, and Tomasz Jackowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

330. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to Federal aid in certain areas and cutting of school lunch funds, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God of the ages, we come to Thee in this day and age conscious of a serious world situation. We give Thee thanks for citizenship in a free nation where difference of opinion sincerely and fervently debated gives opportunity for solemn thought of men's actions and persuasions throughout the world. We thank Thee that within this company of leaders there is a deep desire to find a solution.

Thou art the God of Peace for all people. Move, therefore, with Thy guiding presence upon this body in their deliberations. Create through them ways of peace. Give them courage to dare to take guided steps. Reward them with inner strength and security.

Direct the President, the Congress, and other world leaders that this day will not be remembered as a prelude to war but a day and age of seeking and developing a lasting peace. We pray in the Master's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HART, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 18, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH UNDER TITLE II OF DUAL COMPENSATION ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

As provided by section 205 of title II of the Dual Compensation Act (Public Law 88-448, approved Aug. 19, 1964), I am transmitting a comprehensive report of the operations under that title of the departments and agencies in the executive branch.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 21, 1966.*

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. HART, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, February 21, 1966, the President pro tempore signed the enrolled bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

REPORT OF AUDIT OF NATIONAL FUND FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the executive vice president, National Fund for Medical Education, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of audit of that fund, for the calendar year 1965, which, with the accompanying report was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM—RESOLUTION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution of the senate and house education committees of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

This resolution strongly protests the recommendations of the administration for drastic cuts in the school milk and school lunch programs, holding that such an action would not be in the best interests of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF VERMONT

Whereas the national school lunch program and the special school milk program are two of the most valuable programs provided by the Federal Government for the children of America; and

Whereas the well-being and the learning rate of children are greatly improved by the availability of these programs with adequate Federal support; and

Whereas the programs have a salutary effect on the agricultural economy of the country; and

Whereas since the programs are available to children whether or not the parents have the ability to pay, that this is a service provided to all without discrimination; and

Whereas these programs help to build healthy minds and healthy bodies in children and develop in them good nutritional habits that will be with them through their lives; and

Whereas the future of the United States depends on the well-being of the children in the schools today and a continuance of this well-being into adulthood; and

Whereas the senate and house education committees are certain that the drastic cuts in the financial support for the national school lunch program and special milk program for fiscal 1967 is not in the best interests of the country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house education committees, That the President of the United States and the Congress take steps to reevaluate the values of the national school lunch program and the special milk program and take the necessary steps not only to restore the proposed cuts in the budget in fiscal 1967 for these programs, but to increase the appropriations made in fiscal 1966 to a level which recognizes the substantial growth in these programs and the increased cost in operating them; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the members of the Vermont delegation in the Congress.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. Mansfield):

S. 2948. A bill to set aside certain lands in Montana for the Indians of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2949. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, by inserting a new title X to authorize aid in developing, constructing, and operating privately owned nuclear-powered merchant ships; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Cotton when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia (for himself and Mr. Saltonstall) (by request):

S. 2950. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Russell of Georgia when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE (for Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Morse):

S. 2951. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to provide a grant-in-aid program to assist the States in furnishing aid and services with respect to children under foster care; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Inouye when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2952. A bill to authorize suits in the courts of the District of Columbia for collection of taxes owed to States, territories, or possessions, or political subdivisions thereof, when the reciprocal right is accorded to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 2953. A bill to revise and modernize procedures relating to the licensing by the District of Columbia of persons engaged in certain occupations, professions, businesses, trades, and callings, and for other purposes; and

S. 2954. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, as amended, so as to bring within the provisions of such Acts any person operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of a drug rendering such person incapable of operating the motor vehicle safely; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2955. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Pigford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 2956. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to discriminate on account of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dominick when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

TO AUTHORIZE PRINTING OF REMARKS OF SENATORS ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEATH OF FLEET ADM. CHESTER W. NIMITZ AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. TOWER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 226) authorizing the printing of remarks of Senators on the occasion of the death of Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz as a Senate document, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Tower, which appears under a separate heading.)

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION SHOULD REMAIN AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PROUTY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 227) expressing the sense of the Senate that the Small Business Administration should remain an independent agency of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Prouty, which appears under a separate heading.)

CONSTRUCTION OF NUCLEAR-POWERED MERCHANT SHIPS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize special assistance in the development, construction, and operation of nuclear-powered merchant ships.

There is no hiding the problems of the American merchant marine. High capital, construction, and operating costs have made U.S.-flag ships noncompetitive with foreign ships. Despite the use of Federal subsidies to maintain a parity between U.S. and foreign costs for some essential ship operations, the industry has continued to decline. Our ships today carry less than 10 percent of the commerce of the United States. Norwegian ships, to name just one example, carry twice as many cargoes to and from the United States as do all American-flag ships.

Unfortunately, as the war in Vietnam has forcibly demonstrated, our need for an adequate American fleet of modern merchant ships has not declined—it has expanded, and it will continue to expand as our economy grows.

While American construction and operating costs are higher than those of our foreign competitors, there is one area of merchant marine technology where the United States has a clear and still unchallenged lead—and that is nuclear ship propulsion. American engineers and shipbuilders have built scores of nuclear-powered submarines and many nuclear-powered surface ships for the Navy, and the world's only atomic-powered merchant ship, the NS *Savannah.*

I believe the time has come for us to take advantage of our undenied lead in nuclear propulsion, and put our unique capabilities in this area to work for the improvement of the American merchant marine. We have a golden opportunity, through nuclear energy, to regain the lead in maritime matters and put our merchant marine back on its feet. Nuclear power offers American ships a chance to overcome the disadvantages of high construction and operating costs.

Properly utilized, new nuclear-powered passenger ships might put an ocean trip to the United States within the economic reach of millions in Europe who cannot now afford such a trip. Nuclear-powered bulk carriers, designed to take advantage of the unique capabilities of nuclear propulsion, could also help usher in a new and better era for the U.S. merchant marine. Nuclear-powered ships can surpass foreign fleets in speed, cargo capacity, and operating costs, if they are well designed and effectively utilized.

But none of these potentials can ever be realized unless we start. The initial cost of putting nuclear-powered merchant vessels into operation will be high, at least for the near future—and for this reason some additional Federal assistance will be necessary. That is the purpose of the legislation I am introducing.

Although the bill I am introducing is the result of much thought and careful consideration, I must hasten to say that it is not a polished, final version. The point is we have had enough studies and enough reviews. The time has come to get this problem squarely before the Congress so that our committees can consider and revamp it and the Congress can work its will on it.

My bill represents only one effective way to move ahead toward the solution of the problems which must be met before nuclear-powered merchant ships can fulfill their potential. It would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to furnish aid to private industry in the development, construction, and operation of such ships. Such assistance would be based on the additional costs of designing, building, and operating a nuclear ship, as compared to a conventional ship. The general framework of the current law would be used to carry this out.

This proposal would cost the taxpayers some money. But only in the short run. I am confident that the development of a nuclear-powered merchant fleet will ultimately result in an expanded industry—and a marked reduction in the amount of Federal subsidies. Frankly, I doubt if a second generation of nuclear-powered ships, such as those contemplated by my bill, will provide all the right answers. But by the third or fourth generation, where each builds on the advances and the experience of those before it, will significantly improve the American merchant marine.

Obviously, by that time other nations will be producing nuclear-powered ships and competing, but if we start now, when we are far ahead of them on the know-how, they will be in the first generation stage when we are in the fourth.

This is one clear route to a significant, substantial improvement in the American merchant marine, and in our national defense, balance of payments, and international commerce.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2949) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, by inserting a new title X to authorize aid in developing, constructing, and operating privately owned nuclear-powered merchant ships, introduced by Mr. COTTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROCUREMENT BY THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, for myself, and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I introduce, by request, a bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal requesting introduction of this bill and explaining its purpose be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of the bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2950) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The letter presented by Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, January 24, 1966.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of proposed legislation "to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces and for other purposes." This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 89th Congress, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of the proposal would be in accord with the program of the President.

While this proposal is identical in form to the provisions of Public Law 89-37, approved June 11, 1965, providing authorizations for appropriations as required pursuant to section 412(b), Public Law 86-149, as amended, it also includes authorization for appropriations for tracked combat vehicles and for use as an emergency fund for research, development, test, and evaluation, or procurement or production, as required by sections 304 and 305 of the act, respectively.

This proposal would provide for authorization of appropriations as needed in each of the categories of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles for each of the military departments in the amount of the new obligational authority being requested for such purposes in the President's budget for fiscal year 1967. In addition, the proposal would provide fund authorization in amounts equal to the new obligational authority included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1967 in total for each of the research, development, test, and evaluation appropriations for the military departments and the defense agencies and for use as an emergency fund for research, development, test, and evaluation or procurement or production for the Department of Defense. Where applicable, the amounts requested for fund authorization reflect the amounts included in the budget estimates for the support of Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam.

The Committees on Armed Services will be furnished, as in the past, information with respect to the program for which fund authorization is being requested in a form identical to that submitted in explanation and justification of the budget request. Additionally, the Department of Defense will be prepared to submit any other data required by the committees or their staffs.

It is expected that the Armed Services Committees will desire that top civilian and military officials of the Department of Defense be prepared to make presentations explaining and justifying their respective programs as in the past.

For ready reference, there are attached tables showing the results of previous congressional action on applicable budget requests, together with the amounts of new obligational authority being requested in the supplemental estimate.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

Enclosures, tables, two.

Table of amounts requested for aircraft, missiles, ships, and tracked combat vehicle procurement authorization in fiscal year 1967 request as compared with fiscal year 1966 budget

[In thousands]

Aircraft	Authorized, fiscal year 1966 [1]	Appropriated, fiscal year 1966 [2]	Requested, fiscal year 1967
Army	$1,311,000	$1,311,000	$592,500
Navy and Marine Corps	2,838,700	2,842,800	1,422,200
Air Force	5,294,700	5,261,500	3,961,300
Missiles:			
Army	317,700	341,000	356,500
Navy	395,800	384,400	367,700
Marine Corps	42,700	42,700	17,700
Air Force	863,800	863,800	1,189,500
Naval vessels: Navy	1,721,000	1,590,500	1,751,300
Tracked combat vehicles:			
Army	75,800	75,800	359,200
Marine Corps	10,900	10,900	3,700
Total	12,872,100	12,724,400	10,021,600

[1] Includes amounts totaling $496,100,000 provided through "Emergency fund, southeast Asia" Public Law 89-213 and $3,417,700,000 requested in fiscal year 1966 supplemental authorization request.

[2] Includes amounts totaling $496,100,000 provided through "Emergency fund, southeast Asia" Public Law 89-213 and $3,417,700,000 requested in fiscal year 1966 supplemental budget estimate request.

Table of acounts requested for R.D.T. & E. authorization in fiscal year 1967 request as compared with fiscal year 1966 budget

[In thousands]

Research, development, test, and evaluation	Authorized fiscal year year 1966 [1]	Appropriated fiscal year 1966 [2]	Requested fiscal year 1967
Army	$1,434,395	$1,434,395	$1,518,900
Navy (including the Marine Corps)	1,491,770	1,491,770	1,748,600
Air Force	3,174,985	3,174,985	3,053,800
Defense agencies	495,000	495,000	459,059
Emergency fund	([3])	125,000	125,000
Total	6,596,150	6,721,150	6,905,359

[1] Includes $151,650,000 in fiscal year 1966 supplemental authorization request.

[2] Includes $151,650,000 in fiscal year 1966 supplemental budget estimate request.

[3] Not available.

AID TO CHILDREN UNDER FOSTER CARE

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to provide a grant-in-aid program to assist the States in furnishing aid and services with respect to children under foster care.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table through the close of business on Friday, March 4, so that other Senators may add their names as cosponsors.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Hawaii.

The bill (S. 2951) to amend title V of the Social Security Act to provide a grant-in-aid program to assist the States in furnishing aid and services with respect to children under foster care, introduced by Mr. INOUYE (for Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LABOR BILL OF RIGHTS—DISCRIMINATION

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to discriminate on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.

The great majority of unions do not discriminate in their membership practices. But, unfortunately, discrimination does occur in some instances. It is these few exceptions against which my bill is directed.

We have, of course, passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which prohibits discrimination by labor organizations. But the enforcement machinery is very cumbersome and has yet to be proved effective. The present machinery is set in motion by a complaint signed under oath by an aggrieved party or by a member of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission. The Commission must then undertake a secret investigation to determine whether there is "reasonable cause" to believe that the charge is true. Then the Commission must seek voluntary compliance of the party responsible for the discrimination. Then there may be further waiting periods to allow agencies of the State to take action or in order to again try to get voluntary compliance with the aggrieved party. And only then can the party who is unemployed because of union bigotry go into a court of the United States in order to seek an end to the discrimination.

So in fact, we see that this enforcement machinery of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 causes a long and serious delay before the aggrieved party can seek relief.

My bill would provide effective enforcement against union discrimination. By making this an unfair labor practice, we can make use of the existing machinery of the National Labor Relations Board to bear down upon discriminatory practices. The National Labor Relations Board could itself petition a U.S. Court of Appeals for enforcement if a union disregarded the Board's own order. The result would be more rapid and cheaper enforcement of a national policy by an organization which would be more conversant with unions and their hiring practices.

Mr. President, the Republican Party has traditionally upheld the concept of "individualism," and this bill, in my opinion, fits within this great tradition. We can talk about various theories of government, but in the end, it is the individual man that counts. Any government, any society, fulfills its function only if it serves the individual man. If we are to have a truly "Great Society," we must assure every individual the opportunity to further his individual goals, to improve himself, to move up according to his individual abilities. We must protect the individual citizen against the potential abuses of excessive power, be it big business, labor, or government. My bill would do just that. It would insure that no man would be denied opportunity because of his race, color, religion, or national origin.

At a time when our society is locked in a worldwide struggle with a collectivist government which holds the right of an individual in contempt, I think we can do no less than let the world know that our Nation is second to none in its effective protection of the individual. I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will give this bill their support.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be on the table until February 28 for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection the bill will lie on the desk until February 28 as requested.

The bill (S. 2956) to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to discriminate on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT REMARKS MADE ON THE DEATH OF ADM. CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it is my sad duty as a member of the Armed Service Committee and as a Senator from the State of Texas, to call to the attention of the Senate the death of Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz.

Admiral Nimitiz was one of Texas' most talented sons. His military career long will be studied by our sailors and naval officers. He had a unique ability to turn adversity into triumph. Given command of the fleet after Pearl Harbor, he led it to victory.

Chester William Nimitz was born February 24, 1885, in a gingerbread hotel in Fredericksburg, in Gillespie County, Tex. Those were frontier days in the territory west of San Antonio, and the hotel built by Chester Nimitz' grandfather, Charles Nimitz, was one of the first in the area.

The grandfather was a retired sea captain, and his hotel—although more than 200 miles from the gulf coast—was equipped with a ship's bridge and a pilot house from which he and his grandson could scan the hills and prairies.

The people of Fredericksburg never have forgotten Chester Nimitz. In recent years they honored his birthday with special festivities. He was a man to be proud of.

Chester Nimitz left Fredericksburg for the Naval Academy even before he had completed high school. During World War I, he served on and commanded several ships in the Far East and became an expert in submarine and diesel engines.

After World War I, he commanded a submarine division, attended the Naval War College and directed one of the first Naval Reserve Officer's Training Corps at the University of California. By 1939 he was a rear admiral.

On December 17, 1941, Nimitz was named commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet with the rank of admiral. He began to rebuild the U.S. fleet and to plan a campaign with other allied navies in the Pacific. His Pacific Fleet took part in the battles of Midway, the Solomons, the Gilbert Islands, the Marshalls, the Marianas, the Philippines, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa. Victories in these naval confrontations led to the defeat of Japanese aggression.

In 1941, Nimitz became a five-star fleet admiral, the first to reach this new and highest naval rank. He was one of the signers for the United States when Japan surrendered aboard the battleship Missouri in Tokyo Bay, September 2, 1945.

Admiral Nimitz served as Chief of Naval Operations until he retired from active duty in 1947. He next served his Nation as special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy. Later he was named a United Nations commissioner and chairman of the Presidential Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights.

America has had many notable naval heroes, Mr. President, and Chester Nimitz is one of the greatest. It was my privilege to serve under Admiral Nimitz during World War II as a seaman on one of the vessels of the Pacific Fleet. I know first hand of the spirit and devotion which he engendered in the entire Pacific naval force.

Mr. President, I know I speak for all Texans and for all Americans mourning the passing of this eminent naval gentleman. America was indeed fortunate to have such men when world war struck. His example has inspired thousands of subsequent naval officers and men. I believe we have a better navy and a more secure Nation today because Chester Nimitz showed men how to get a job done, effectively and in great good humor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD his obituary published in this morning's New York Times.

There being no objection, the obituary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMIRAL NIMITZ DIES—LED PACIFIC FLEET

SAN FRANCISCO, February 20.—Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz died today in his home here. He was 80 years old.

During World War II, he was in charge of assembling the Pacific force of 2 million men and 5,000 ships that drove the Japanese back to their homeland.

The former commander in chief of the U.S. Pacific Fleet suffered a cerebral thrombosis, or stroke, early last month.

He was released from the Oak Knoll Naval Hospital in Oakland February 1, but he was reported in serious condition again Friday and was placed under the care of naval doctors at his white frame home on the Yerba Buena Island naval reservation overlooking San Francisco Bay.

He would have been 81 years old on Thursday.

CHOSEN AFTER DISASTER

When Admiral Nimitz took over the Pacific Fleet on December 31, 1941, many of its ships lay at the bottom of Pearl Harbor, sunk by the Japanese in the surprise attack on December 7 on Hawaii.

Without haste—Admiral Nimitz always proceeded with care—he directed the deployment of such carriers and cruisers as were left, to hold the line until that moment, perhaps 2 years away, when new battleships could be ready.

With Adm. Ernest King, Chief of Naval Operations, President Roosevelt, and the Navy's other strategy planners, Admiral Nimitz had to undergo the anguish of being unable to answer the cry of soldiers trapped on Bataan:

"Where's the fleet?"

When the new battleships, cruisers, carriers, and destroyers did arrive, Admiral Nimitz and the Navy cleared the seas of Japanese warships in a series of spectacular naval battles.

VICTORY PROPHECY FULFILLED

Eight months after announcing on New Year's Day that 1945 would be a sad year for the Japanese, Admiral Nimitz sat at a table on the deck of the U.S.S. *Missouri* on September 2 to sign the Japanese capitulation.

Chester William Nimitz was born on February 24, 1885 in a gingerbread hotel in Fredericksburg, Tex., built by his grandfather, Charles Nimitz, a retired sea captain. The captain had equipped his hotel with a ship's bridge and a pilothouse from which he could scan the hills and prairies.

Young Chester's father died 5 months before he was born. In his young years, while staying on occasions with his grandfather, the future admiral heard many tall tales about the sea.

ANNAPOLIS SECOND CHOICE

But he dreamed of being a soldier, not a sailor, and while in high school tried for an appointment to West Point. When none was available he took a competitive examination for Annapolis, and was accepted when he was only 15 years old.

He left high school to enter the Naval Academy and was not awarded his high school diploma until many years later, when he had retired from active Navy duty. He probably was the only person ever to graduate from high school in the uniform of a fleet admiral.

At the Naval Academy, Chester Nimitz excelled in mathematics and in physical exercise. He was nicknamed "Matty" because his proficiency in setting up exercises was second only to that of Matty Strohm, the Academy's physical instructor.

Chester Nimitz stroked the crew in 1905, the year he graduated. In the "Lucky Bag," the Academy yearbook, he was described as a man "of cheerful yesterdays and confident tomorrows."

DISILLUSIONED AT START

After the 2 years' sea duty required by law, he became an ensign. He said later that he was not overly enthusiastic at his first experience with the sea.

"I got frightfully seasick, and must confess to some chilling of enthusiasm for the sea," he said.

Ensign Nimitz was a handsome, self-assured young officer, who saw to it that he knew the technical phases of his profession. In his early days in the Navy he commanded an assortment of obsolete minor vesesls, and was much pleased when he received command of the old destroyer *Stephen Decatur*. During a storm, the engineer of the destroyer telephoned from the engineroom that the vessel was taking on water rapidly and soon would sink. Lieutenant Nimitz replied soothingly:

"Just look on page 84 of 'Barton's Engineering Manual.' It will tell you what to do." The vessel was saved.

WON LIFESAVING MEDAL

In 1912, Lieutenant Nimitz was awarded the Navy's Silver Lifesaving Medal for saving a shipmate from drowning. He wore this medal throughout the remainder of his career, along with the five Distinguished Service Medal awards for wartime exploits.

In 1913, Lieutenant Nimitz wrote a friend: "On April 9, I had the good sense to marry Catherine Vance Freeman of Wollaston, Mass."

Miss Freeman was the daughter of a shipping broker. By way of a honeymoon, the young officer was assigned to study diesel engines in Germany and Belgium for a year. On his return to the United States, he built the Navy's first diesel engine at the New York Naval Shipyard in Brooklyn. While he was demonstrating the engine his left hand was caught in the mechanism, and one of his fingers was severed.

During World War I, Lieutenant Commander Nimitz served as chief of staff to Rear Adm. Samuel S. Robison, commander of the submarine division of the Atlantic Fleet. He saw no battle action. Submarines at that time, he said, were still regarded "as a cross between a Jules Verne fantasy and a whale."

ESTABLISHED RESERVE UNIT

From 1926 to 1929, he was assigned to the University of California to establish the first Naval Reserve Officers' training unit. The between-wars period included service on battleships and as a cruiser commander as well as study at various advanced naval schools. By 1938 he was a rear admiral.

In 1940, Admiral Nimitz's name was one of two submitted for the post of commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet. The other was that of Adm. Husband E. Kimmel, who got the assignment.

Admiral Nimitz was in his home in Washington listening to a symphony on the radio when he heard the news that Pearl Harbor had been attacked. He picked up his hat and went down to the office of the Chief of Naval Operations for orders. A few days later, Admiral Kimmel was relieved and Admiral Nimitz was on his way to Pearl Harbor.

WENT TO POST AS CIVILIAN

Admiral Nimitz made the train trip to the west coast in civilian clothes under an assumed name. Mrs. Nimitz missed her sewing bag, and it was not until many months later that she learned that her husband had used it to carry secret documents dealing with the extent of damage to the fleet in the Pearl Harbor attack.

The 65 million square miles of the Pacific became well known to Admiral Nimitz as he contemplated the operations charts that were to carry the story of defeat and victory in the next few years. While waiting for U.S. yards to turn out the ships he needed, Admiral Nimitz built up his combat teams. These were commanded by Admirals William F. Halsey, Marc A. Mitschner, Richmond K. Turner, Raymond A. Spruance, and Thomas C. Kincaid.

Admiral Nimitz handled these complex men with skill and insight, as he did everyone.

AVOIDED PROTOCOL TROUBLE

He flew to Australia to call on General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, to avoid any protocol friction. Once when a sailor from Texas dropped in on him at Pacific Fleet headquarters to chat, Admiral Nimitz sent for a Navy photographer to take a picture.

"It seems that his shipmates bet him $20 he wouldn't get to see me," the admiral explained. "I wanted him to have the evidence."

When he took over command of the Pacific Fleet, Admiral Nimitz was quick to see that a great weakness lay in the lack of forward repair stations and maintenance squadrons. When those squadrons came into being at his insistence, the Navy was prepared to take the fight to the Japanese.

The first major Pacific naval battle after Pearl Harbor came on May 8, 1942, in the Coral Sea. This was the world's first naval battle fought entirely in the air, without the carriers even sighting each other or a shot being exchanged between surface vessels. It was adjudged an American success, although the Japanese shot down many U.S. planes.

BATTLE SAVED AUSTRALIA

The aircraft carrier *Lexington* was lost to Japanese bombs, but the Coral Sea victory saved Australia and New Zealand from invasion. A later victory at Midway removed the Japanese Navy as an immediate threat to Hawaii, the Panama Canal, and the United States.

During the first half of 1944, Admiral Nimitz employed the main fighting strength of the Pacific Navy in the central Pacific. The bloody victory at Tarawa was followed by the "great turkey shoot" in the Marianas, where U.S. aviators downed 402 out of 545 Japanese planes sighted.

At his headquarters at Pearl Harbor, Admiral Nimitz set an example to his staff by keeping in the peak of physical condition.

He swam and took long walks, his pet schnauzer dog trotting along with him. Sometimes at night, he took a drink of bourbon whisky to relax.

MADE JELLY FOR STAFF

While waiting for news of a Navy engagement, he would go to the firing range and grimly fire his pistol, or stand in his kitchen and make jelly from prickly pears he grew outside his quarters. Subordinates dutifully tasted the jelly, which he made by a recipe from his boyhood days.

In November 1945, with the war over, Admiral Nimitz became one of the senior naval officers elevated to the newly created rank of Admiral of the Fleet, a rank equivalent to that of General of the Army, or Field Marshal in the service of other countries.

HONORED BY MANY NATIONS

After the war, Admiral Nimitz continued to be honored for his brilliant wartime service. He received major decorations from 11 foreign countries, including the British Grand Cross of the Order of the Bath. Fifteen universities and colleges awarded him honorary degrees.

In 1949, Admiral Nimitz was named by the United Nations Secretariat to supervise a proposed plebiscite to determine whether Kashmir should become part of India or should be linked to Pakistan. International complications kept the plebiscite commission from functioning.

President Harry S. Truman appointed Admiral Nimitz to head a Committee on Internal Security and Individual Rights. Because of opposition in Congress the committee never functioned.

REFUSED TO WRITE MEMOIRS

Although he had commanded 1,000 ships and 2 million men in World War II, Admiral Nimitz refused to write memoirs. He allowed others to organize birthday parties for him in his later years, but not without grumbling. On his 75th birthday, he was asked if he were looking forward to the celebration.

"I'm looking forward to the end of it," he said. "I feel the same way about it as the man who bought himself a small boat. His two happiest days were when he bought it and when he sold it."

Admiral and Mrs. Nimitz had three daughters and a son. They were Catherine Vance Nimitz, who was married to James T. Lay, a naval officer; Anne Elizabeth and Mary Monson Nimitz, and Chester William Nimitz, Jr., who followed his father into the Navy. In his later years, Admiral Nimitz made his home in Berkeley, Calif.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution asking that there be printed as a Senate document a compilation of speeches about him here, along with a brief sketch of his life of service to the United States, and ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. TOWER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Texas. The Senator has stated that he spoke for many Americans in saying that Admiral Nimitz was a great hero. He certainly spoke for me. I was privileged to know Admiral Nimitz. He was a great man. He was one of this country's greatest sea captains.

The Senator from Texas also stated he was speaking for those who mourn his passing. I, too, share those sentiments.

America has lost a great sea leader and a great citizen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquires of the Senator from Texas whether he wishes the resolution read for immediate consideration.

Mr. TOWER. Let me advise the Chair that I will not ask that it be immediately considered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 226) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res 226

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation of the remarks of Senators upon the occasion of the death of Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz on February 20, 1966, at the age of eighty, after long and distinguished service to his Nation.

EXPRESSION OF THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION SHOULD REMAIN AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a resolution which expresses the sense of the Senate "that the congressional declaration in section 4(a) of the Small Business Act, that the Small Business Administration should not 'be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government,' is an eminently sound policy from which there should be no deviation."

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution remain at the desk for 5 days for additional cosponsors and that it be printed in the Record at the end of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will remain at the desk as requested, and the resolution will be printed in the Record.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the need for the adoption of this resolution was made clear in my remarks to the Senate on February 9.

It was then I disclosed that the administration is contacting private groups in an effort to gain enough support to put forward its plan to destroy the Small Business Administration as an independent agency and to bury it in some obscure corner in the Department of Commerce.

In its attempt to garner backing for this questionable proposal, the administration has resorted to stratagems that are something less than wholesome.

Hints, perhaps promises, have been given to the effect that if SBA is transferred to the Department of Commerce, there will be an Under Secretary for Small Business. This might truly be called the laurel technique. There is honor in the leaves and poison in the extract. And that poison is meant for small business.

It has been common knowledge for years that the Department of Commerce reflects on many occasions the views of the gigantic enterprises of the country. Is it then reasonable to assume that this Department, influenced by the large chains, would look with favor upon low-interest loans to the independent grocer?

Would the officers of the Department, who have had longstanding dealings with the big rubber companies, have tender sympathies for the independent tire dealer?

The questions themselves provide the answers.

The administration has not sent to the Congress a reorganization plan to transfer the SBA to Commerce, because it is still trying to gain support for the idea.

The time to tell the administration to stop all this nonsense is now, and we can do this by adopting the resolution I have introduced.

When he was a U.S. Senator, the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy highlighted the need for SBA to have independent status when he said:

> Such an agency must be truly independent and not subject to the veto power of the Commerce and Treasury Departments. Experience has shown that such independence is necessary to give small business an effective voice in the Government.

These remarks of the late President state very well the necessity of keeping SBA away from the thumb of any other department and that is the real purpose of my resolution.

Through the years the Small Business Administration has received strong bipartisan support. It needs that kind of support more now than ever, and I have confidence that it will be forthcoming from the Congress.

In closing my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the weekly staff report to the Senate Small Business Committee dated February 5, 1966, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the weekly staff report to the Senate Small Business Committee, Feb. 5, 1966]

SENATOR SPARKMAN AMAZED AT RUMORS OF SBA MERGER INTO DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

In a statement inserted in the Congressional Record, the chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee stated: "I would be amazed if serious consideration is being given to allowing the Department of Commerce to absorb the Small Business Administration. When this agency was first created, there was considerable debate in Congress on this very question. * * * Among those who stood up for a Small Business Administration independent of the policies and influence of other departments of the executive branch * * * was the then senior Senator from Texas, now President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson. President Johnson had long been a champion of the small business firms of this country and, during that debate, the President said, and I quote:

" This bill would place the small business activities of the Government under two major departments—Treasury and Commerce, and yet, practically all of us subscribe to the principle that a Small Business Agency cannot be effective unless it is independent.' "

Senator Sparkman also reminded the Senate that Vice President Humphrey, as a member of the Senate Small Business Committee from June 1950 until December 1964, had stated on the same subject:

"I say we are not going to have the friendship of small business if we allow the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury to have too much to say about the definite standards to be set with respect to small business, because I do not believe either one of them is particularly noteworthy as a champion of small-business enterprise. That is not their record. They have competence in other fields, but not in this one.

"I am delighted that the committee has come forward with a bill that gives the Administrator of the Small Business Administration powers unto himself. * * * "

Senator Sparkman also reminded the Senate that on July 30, 1963, when Eugene P. Foley's nomination for SBA Administrator was before the Banking and Currency Committee, he had asked Mr. Foley whether "You subscribe to this idea * * * of an independent agency?" and Mr. Foley replied:

"I do wholeheartedly, Senator. I assure you that as far as it is within my power there will be no change."

Alluding to a newspaper article that said the administration has under active consideration a move to merge SBA into the Commerce Department, Senator Sparkman stated: "I have been concerned about these rumors * * * and my concern has deepened to the extent that I feel it necessary * * * that I speak out on this subject. * * * I cannot believe that the report which appeared in the Washington Post this morning is accurate in saying that a proposal to place the SBA within the Department of Commerce is being seriously considered by the administration. I certainly hope that it is not accurate, because I do not believe that this controversy should again be a subject of lengthy debate before the Congress."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, this report brings to light the fact that Lyndon B. Johnson, when a Senator from Texas, opposed all efforts to place the small business activities of the Federal Government under the Department of Commerce.

He was right then. He should be kept right on this question.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the February 14, 1966, issue of the Vending Line.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dear Sir: The U.S. Small Business Administration here has been in the center of a curious tug-of-war that defies logical analysis for all but the most sophisticated observers who have studied the ins and outs of national politics, as played in the United States, for many, many years.

Senator Winston L. Prouty, Republican of Vermont, told the Senate recently that "I have learned that the Johnson administration is electioneering among private groups to gain support for its plan to destroy the Small Business Administration as an independent agency. * * *

"This explains why the President has failed to appoint a new Administrator of SBA. This explains why the funds of the agency have been so dried up that hundreds, perhaps thousands, of small business loan applications are gathering dust in the regional offices of the SBA.

"This explains why Eugene P. Foley, former Administrator of the Small Business Administration, has been transferred to the Department of Commerce.

"Perhaps we are seeing a new trend in politics that first became manifest when the Democratic leadership in the Senate opposed the efforts of Republicans to give the Senate Small Business Committee legislative authority. This 'small business be damned' attitude which destroyed the attempt to give the Senate committee the power it should have, has now been unleashed again and may bring about the undoing of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency.

"Yes; we are witnessing a strange development in American politics—a development that will see the President embrace big business with his right arm while clasping big labor with his left. And woe unto any force that stands in the way of this great triumvirate.

"One wonders what will happen to the small entrepreneurs of America if they must come as supplicants to the Department of Commerce.

"Will a department long accustomed to dealing with corporate giants care much or know much about the problems of the small firm? Can such a department understand how difficult it is for a small businessman to stand up to the competition of his powerful competitors?"

Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business, apparently has not been a party to the various moves being made by Eugene Foley, the former SBA Administrator, to add to his bureaucratic empire in the Department of Commerce; Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who long posed as a champion of small business in his march to power but now is anxious to create a different kind of image; and President Lyndon B. Johnson, whose disdain for small businessmen should come as no surprise to those who have known him for decades. As majority leader, L.B.J. not only was involved with Robert G. (Bobby) Baker, now under indictment for stealing, in striving to get special privileges by which to enrich themselves (always legally, or so they thought, until Mr. Baker was caught redhanded throwing his weight around too promiscuously), he long was close to the late Senator Robert Kerr, the millionaire oilman from Oklahoma who never made any bones about the fact that he used the Democratic Party as a vehicle by which to enrich himself and then used his wealth to corrupt Senators, if necessary, to become the most powerful man on Capitol Hill until his death. The last bit of choice news about the tieup between L.B.J., Bobby Baker, and Senator Robert Kerr has not been aired yet. But it will bob to the surface in time in Washington just as surely as truth will come out in any situation.

Senator SPARKMAN inserted a statement into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the other day saying that he would be "amazed if serious consideration is being given to allowing the Department of Commerce to absorb the Small Business Administration."

"When this agency was first created, there was considerable debate in Congress on this very question," Senator SPARKMAN asserted. "Among those who stood up for a Small Business Administration independent of the policies and influence of other departments of the executive branch * * * was the then senior Senator from Texas, now President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson. During that debate, the President said, and I quote:

"This bill would place the small business activities of the Government under two major departments—Treasury and Commerce, and yet, practically all of us subscribe to the principle that a small business agency cannot be effective unless it is independent.

"I say we are not going to have the friendship of small business if we allow the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury to have too much to say about the definite standards to be set with respect to small business, because I do not believe either one of them is particularly noteworthy as a champion of small business enterprise. That is not their record. They have competence in other fields, but not in this one."

Senator SPARKMAN also reminded the Senate that on July 30, 1963, when Eugene P. Foley's nomination for SBA Administrator was before the Banking and Currency Committee, he had asked Mr. Foley whether "you subscribe to this idea * * * of an independent agency." He reported that the transcript shows Mr. Foley replied: "I do wholeheartedly, Senator. I assure you that as far as it is within my power there will be no change."

Referring to the newspaper articles and other reports that the White House has under active consideration a move to merge SBA into the Commerce Department, Senator SPARKMAN declared: "I have been concerned about these rumors, and my concern has deepened to the extent that I feel it necessary that I speak out.

"I cannot believe * * * that a proposal to place the SBA within the Department of Commerce is being seriously considered. I certainly hope that it is not accurate, because I do not believe that this controversy should again be a subject of lengthy debate before the Congress."

Various groups—no doubt stimulated by Mr. Foley and the White House—operated for private businessmen have begun to take stands on the issue here. The U.S. Wholesale Grocers' Association, of which Harold O. Smith, Jr., is executive vice president, has announced that it is giving "strong encouragement" to the idea.

"This contemplated action is most encouraging," Mr. Smith said. "We are hopeful that transfer of SBA to the Department of Commerce, in a way that will better serve small business, will receive congressional approval."

Those who are closest to Lyndon B. Johnson and to HUBERT H. HUMPHREY long have realized that their solicitude for small businessmen, or for any other groups in the society, was designed to furnish them the basis for advancements in politics. As Senators, they played one political game publicly and another game privately—taking advanced stands in speeches and otherwise, but personally cultivating the richest men in the Democratic Party. They have found it expeditious, in recent years, to cultivate the bigger businessmen, for they realize that private capital spending, and other factors involving decisions made by the biggest businessmen, are vital to them in retaining political power. Now that they have seen the country bursting at the seams with profits and prosperity, they believe they can get away with quietly burying the SBA by transferring it to the Department of Commerce. The thought—of the U.S. Wholesale Grocers' Association executive—that transfer of the SBA to Commerce would increase its effectiveness for small businesses has an extremely hollow ring to those who know Washington. Such a transfer, as Senator PROUTY, Senator SPARKMAN and other knowledgeable men know, would represent a bureaucratic victory for Mr. Foley (who only 10 years ago was a mere attorney on the Senate Small Business Committee) but would represent a distinct defeat for small businessmen who might need credit help, such as SBA has supplied through the years.

The Republicans, for the first time in many years, in latching onto this prospective reorganization of the SBA, are scenting a real issue. They long since lost the small business vote, although it is one of the most powerful and decisive in modern politics. If Mr. Foley has his way and the transfer is made, there is no doubt that the Republicans, if they hit hard on the issue, could make plenty of political hay by the cutoff of loan funds to small businessmen and the eminent demise of the SBA as an effective agency. It is not generally realized, but the shrewder politicians long have known that the small businessman holds the key to victory in many a congressional district. Beginning in 1960, this small businessman (for many reasons, mostly tied in with credit and its availability) began to vote Democratic, although polls before that had shown most of them to be in the Republican corner. Now, if L.B.J. and H.H.H. go through with their plans to accommodate Mr. Foley's bureaucratic grab, they may find that small businessmen can be more flexible than the interest rates which are supposed to flex up and down, but seem to go in only one direction—up—whether the Republicans or Democrats are in power. In time, small businessmen will become disillusioned with men who first led them up the hill to see a vision and then, figuratively, led them over a precipice to dash their hopes.

BOBBY BAKER'S VENDING EMPIRE TOTTERS

The vending empire of Robert G. (Bobby) Baker, former protege of President Lyndon B. Johnson, has become virtually a shell, with only a small gross business that apparently will get smaller.

Officials of Northrop Aviation Co. have told reporters here that when 1965 ended, so did the contract with Mr. Baker's Serv-U Corp. Serv-U had been serving the company at its Ventura and Anaheim (Calif.) plants, while Automatic Canteen had the bulk of the business at the main Northrop plant at Hawthorne, Calif. Bids were let for the business for 1966 and in the future, and Serv-U was not the low bidder and was dropped.

Within the past 2 months, North American Aviation Co. had stopped doing business with Serv-U. This was, in fact, the first major blow to Mr. Baker's hitherto lucrative food vending business with big defense contractors. The North American contract grossed more than $2,500,000 a year for the company, while the Northrop contract was understood to bring in something over $500,000 a year. Together, these two made up "the backbone of Baker's financial empire," according to the Republican minority report on the Senate probe into the gross improprieties of Mr. Baker when he was the close confidant of L.B.J., then majority leader of the U.S. Senate and later Vice President (at the time Mr. Baker's acts came to public light and attention).

"Until such time as defense contractors such as North American Aviation and Northrop decide they no longer want to do business with Baker, his complete financial empire may continue," the minority report added. Apparently, that time has come.

FOOD PRICES EXPECTED TO GO UP AS MUCH IN 1966 AS IN 1965

Food expenditures in 1965 totaled $85 billion, up $5 billion from 1964 (not counting expenditures for alcoholic beverages), while civilian per capita consumption declined about 1 percent, the Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, has reported here in the February National Food Situation, a quarterly.

The food expenditure gain reflected a 6-percent increase in total sales by retail stores and a 10-percent increase in sales by eating and drinking places. The increase in total food expenditures was unusually large in 1965, but disposable income rose even more, so the percentage of income spent on food declined slightly. Total food expenditures averaged $436 per capita last year, 18.2 percent of disposable income of $2,391 per capita (that which is left after taxes and certain other unavoidable costs on the part of citizens).

There was a 2.3-percent increase in retail food prices, higher military purchases, and greater marketing charges in 1965. Total civilian food use increased only slightly.

Food expenditures, according to USDA economists, are expected to increase again this year, about as last year (depending on many factors). Per capita food consumption is expected to remain about the same as last year, so total civilian use again will rise slightly due to the 1.1-percent increases in population expected.

Sources of strength in the demand for food in 1965 were listed as (1) a rapidly expanding general economy, coupled with an increased level of employment; (2) further growth in population; (3) expanded domestic food assistance programs, and (4) increased food procurement by the Armed Forces.

Price increases for meat led the advance in food prices in 1965. Pork prices went up spectacularly—advancing 14 percent for 1965 over 1964 as a whole, and, in the last quarter, being up 23 percent over average prices for the same period a year earlier. Beef prices went up, but only about 5 percent, and, despite substantially increased broiler supplies, retail prices averaged 3 percent higher in 1965. Prices for fishery products also joined in the general advance, going up 3 percent.

VENDING LINES FROM ALL OVER THE LOT

Food and Drug Administration Publication No. 25, "A Message for Food Warehousemen," is available free of charge from the Special Programs Branch, Food and Drug Administration, Washington, D.C. It contains guidelines designed to prevent rodent defilement and insect infestation of stored food products and should be useful to some in the vending field.

Larston D. Farrar.

The resolution (S. Res. 227) was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Exhibit 1

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the congressional declaration in section 4(a) of the Small Business Act, that the Small Business Administration should not "be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government", is an eminently sound policy from which there should be no deviation.

REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 486

Mr. BIBLE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 11487) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which were ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 2646 and Senate Joint Resolution 117 the name of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan] be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 622, the Appalachian Trail bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of February 10, 1966, the names of Mr. Allott, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Church, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Holland, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Morton, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Pell, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of North Dakota were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2914) to extend for 2 years Public Law 815, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance for school construction in federally impacted areas, introduced by Mr. Montoya on February 10, 1966.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 21, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE RESOLUTION 220, TO REJECT REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1966 PROVIDING FOR REORGANIZATION OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS FUNCTIONS IN CIVIL RIGHTS AREA

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Senate Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations will conduct hearings on Senate Resolution 220 introduced by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] to reject Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966 providing for reorganization of the community relations functions in the area of civil rights.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966 was transmitted to the Congress by the President on February 10, 1966. It has been reprinted as House Document No. 379 and appears in the Congressional Record for February 10 on page 2848.

The hearings will be held March 3–4, 1966, commencing at 10 a.m. in room 3304 of the New Senate Office Building. Such persons who would like to testify should contact Mr. Jerry Sonosky, staff director, Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, room 162, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225–2308.

PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the prayer breakfast movement had its origin in Seattle, Wash., some 35 years ago. Prayer breakfasts are now being held in every State in the Union and in many foreign countries.

Last Thursday morning, the 14th annual Presidential prayer breakfast was held, with an attendance of over 1,500 of our Nation's leaders and representatives from over the Nation, as well as representatives of many foreign countries.

David Lawrence, the nationally known columnist and editor and publisher of the U.S. News, wrote an excellent article published in the Washington Evening Star on the Presidential prayer breakfast and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Presidential Prayer Breakfast

(By David Lawrence)

With all that is going on in the National Capital these days, it is noteworthy that the President, the Speaker of the House and prominent members of all branches of the Government sat down together for an hour and a half at a prayer breakfast yesterday to ask God's help in meeting the challenges of the times.

It is not often that the leaders in government sit down with 1,000 other persons to engage in prayer. This annual event is an outgrowth of the prayer breakfast movement that started more than 20 years ago with weekly meetings of Members of the House and the Senate, respectively. These now are paralleled by prayer breakfasts held regularly throughout the year by Governors and mayors in many parts of the United States.

Unquestionably, the seriousness of the world situation was in the minds of everyone present at the Presidential breakfast. There is a growing realization throughout the world that peace treaties themselves do not always bring peoples together but often perpetuate resentments for decades afterward.

The emphasis, therefore, at the prayer breakfast was on the need for manifestations of human love and fellowship. In every country, people, irrespective of religious sect or race or nationality, feel a common obligation to be more and more concerned about human welfare.

Government itself cannot, of course, recognize any established religion, but there is no barrier to the gathering of members of the Government in private meetings to pray for divine guidance. While many public functions begin with a brief prayer, the breakfast groups themselves are devoted entirely to the spiritual lesson. They are attended by many persons in the Federal, State and city governments as well as by groups of men from the ranks of business and labor and other fields. Incidentally, the prayer breakfast groups are nonsectarian and are not conducted by clergymen but led by laymen.

The purpose of these meetings is to accentuate the spiritual side of life. The hope is that individuals who are in positions of leadership not only will be able to perform their own duties in obedience to conscience but will be inspired to find ways and means of solving the national and international disputes that affect the American people today.

The annual Presidential prayer breakfasts began during the administration of President Eisenhower and were attended subsequently by President Kennedy. This week's meeting was presided over by Senator Frank Carlson, Republican of Kansas. The invocation was pronounced by Lt. Gen. M. H. Silverthorn, retired from the Marine Corps. Portions of the Old Testament were read by Associate Justice Tom Clark of the Supreme Court of the United States, while parts of the New Testament were read by Henry C. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury. There were brief comments by Representative Albert H. Quie, Republican of Minnesota, who spoke for the breakfast group of the House of Representatives, and by Senator John Stennis, Democrat of Mississippi, who represented the breakfast group of the Senate.

President Johnson in his brief remarks talked about the spiritual strength of our Nation and the importance of prayer. He said that in these troublous times he is sustained daily not only by his own prayers but by those of "hundreds of other Americans who daily take the time." Dr. Richard C. Halverson delivered a prayer for national leaders, and then Dr. Billy Graham made the principal address, as he contrasted the spiritual with the material things of life. Benediction was given by Dr. Abraham Vereide, who founded the prayer-breakfast movement.

There were in the audience many Senators and Representatives as well as officials from other parts of the Government. Also present were some high-ranking officers from the armed services.

In another room at the Shoreham Hotel, where the Presidential breakfast was held, were the wives of Members of Congress and of Government officials attending a similar meeting. Johnson and Dr. Graham later attended this session, too, and delivered the same addresses. Altogether, it was a rather unusual day in the life of the National Capital.

FHA CARELESS IN GUARANTEEING MORTGAGES FOR MULTIFAMILY HOUSING PROJECTS

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, on previous occasions I have outlined specific examples of the careless practice of the FHA in guaranteeing mortgages for multifamily housing projects that at the time of approval were obviously uneconomic and not feasible.

In reality many of these boondoggle projects were merely speculative ventures conceived by weak and oftimes irresponsible sponsors and designed for a quick profit for the builders and owners of the land.

Yesterday the Comptroller General called our attention to another $4,462,000 blunder, the Lake Worth Estates or Christian Homes in Fort Worth, Tex.

This project advanced as a home for the elderly was built with a 100-percent Government-guaranteed mortgage, and it was bankrupt before its doors were ever opened and the taxpayers are faced with a $2¼ million loss.

I realize that the FHA will reply by claiming that the taxpayers do not lose this money, but rather it is paid from an insurance fund that is built up as the result of an assessment on the home buyers using FHA mortgages to finance their homes.

But these home buyers are taxpayers, and the rates on their mortgages are raised in proportion to the losses incurred. Furthermore, if this reserve fund is depleted, as it may well be under such loose practices, then the American taxpayers as a whole are responsible because the Government has insured these mortgages against default.

Furthermore this Texas project was approved on orders from the Washington bureau and over the strong objection of the local appraisers, the chief underwriters, and valuators, all of whom had warned that the project was not economically feasible, that its sponsors were weak and not financially responsible, and that if built it would be bankrupt before its doors ever opened.

The fact that the wife of a prominent public official was a partner in the construction firm pushing the project cannot be overlooked even though the record shows that she sold her interest on March 31, 1962. This was 2 months after the Government's approval of the loan guarantee.

What explanation is there for this $4,462,000 mortgage ever having been approved in the face of such strong recommendations as to its weakness and infeasibility?

Why did the Washington office insist on recognizing this project as nonprofit and thereby fully tax-exempt when they were officially warned by their local underwriters that there was grave doubt as to whether it would qualify as a tax-exempt organization? The local underwriters were right; it did not qualify.

Why did the Washington office override all their local appraisers and underwriters and order its approval unless there was strong political pressure?

The explanation that Washington considered the sponsors reliable is not acceptable.

Government records show that the FHA had written statements from prominent officials of the church charging that questionable payments had been made to some of the local individuals who signed as sponsors and further alerting the FHA that the church itself would accept no responsibility for the project. This warning was received in time to stop the project; yet nothing was done.

Government records show that the construction firm expecting to get the lucrative $4½-million contract—financed with Government money—actually advanced the necessary $89,000 working capital and later tried to include this item as a part of the construction costs.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. All of these warnings were ignored. The project was continued, financed with a $4,462,000 Government-guaranteed mortgage. As predicted, it was bankrupt before construction was complete, and the loss is estimated at $2.2 million.

The same officials who approved this fantastic scheme are still holding office, and all we get is a promise of trying to do better.

The time has arrived when officials in the FHA who are approving these boondoggle projects be fired. To excuse them from being politically pressured into giving approval to such obviously uneconomical projects is only to suggest that they are stupid and incompetent.

I urge that the Members of the Senate and in particular, members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, read the Comptroller General's report of February 17, 1966, outlining the details of the project.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the GAO report which outlines their conclusions and recommendations as well as the Milquetoast response of the Commissioner of the FHA.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCLUSIONS AND AGENCY ACTIONS

As a result of placing undue reliance on the ability and intentions of a national church organization, about which it knew very little, to assist a housing project sponsored by small member church groups, FHA insured a $4.5 million mortgage for a project which was considered economically unfeasible by officials of the Fort Worth insuring office. In approving this project, FHA officials of the Office of the Assistant Commissioner for Multifamily Housing, at both the Washington and the regional level, appear to have given inadequate consideration to the findings of regional and insuring office underwriting personnel concerning the need for the project and the marketability of the units at the proposed rentals. Further, FHA permitted the builder to donate funds to the sponsors of the project to meet FHA's requirement for working capital, which at that time could not be provided from mortgage proceeds, thus eliminating the need for the sponsoring groups to demonstrate any independent fund-raising ability. These actions, in our opinion, unnecessarily increased the risk of loss inherent in insurance of mortgages equal to 100 percent of project cost.

Although many factors contributed to the failure of this project, it appears that the principal factors were FHA's failure to assure itself that the project's sponsors had sufficient ability to provide the mortgagor corporation with the necessary funds and competent management needed to successfully complete the project and FHA's assumption that the interest of a national organization would insure enough tenants from other parts of the country to offset the lack of local demand. A nonprofit sponsor can have the best of intentions; however, lack of experience in managing complex affairs of this nature and the difficulty of accurately assessing the market for proposed housing can, we believe, result in the problems encountered by this project.

In our opinion, the approval of projects by central or national organizations does not necessarily insure a project's success, as we believe it is unrealistic, in most cases, to assume, as FHA did in this case, that endorsement by central organizations will induce elderly people to leave their homes and families and move to other parts of the country. Although current FHA instructions require insuring offices to carefully analyze the potential market for housing projects for the elderly, they also permit insuring office personnel to consider as prospective tenants persons not residing in the immediate locality. In our opinion, FHA should not consider as prospective tenants persons not residing in the immediate locality, who are expected to be attracted to the project because of a central organization's endorsement, unless the central organization can adequately demonstrate that it can furnish the required numbers of occupants from other areas. One possibility would be for FHA to require assurance similar to that provided to the agency by sponsors of one type of cooperative housing projects, which are required to show that they have sold 90 percent of the proposed residential units before starting construction.

FHA issued instructions in December 1964 to insuring offices, authorizing loans and donations under certain circumstances to non-profit mortgagors by builders, landowners, or others having an interest in the project. We believe that these loans and donations may seriously impair the independence of the nonprofit mortgagors in their negotiations with these parties and also may induce well-meaning nonprofit groups to sponsor projects of questionable feasibility under the assumption that there will be no financial risk of any sort on their part. It is not inconceivable that promoters who stand to benefit financially from the project will emphasize this lack of risk to promote projects, thereby minimizing the consideration of all aspects of the project by the local nonprofit organization.

To minimize the insurance and sponsorship by FHA and well-meaning nonprofit groups of housing projects of questionable feasibility, for elderly citizens, we proposed that the Commissioner, FHA, revise the regulations and procedures to prohibit contributions or loans from parties who stand to benefit financially from the construction or operation of housing projects financed by 100-percent insured mortgages. We further proposed that the Commissioner revise agency procedures to require reasonably firm commitments from central or national organizations before insuring offices are permitted to consider as prospective tenants persons not residing in the locality in which the project is to be constructed.

The Commissioner, in commenting on our findings and proposals stated that the Lake Crest Estates project was one of the earliest projects insured under the program providing for insurance of mortgages equal to 100 percent of actual cost incurred by a nonprofit mortgagor and that the lessons learned and the experience gained from this project and from a successful project backed by the same national church organization have been and will be very valuable in FHA's operations. He informed us that the instruction letter issued in September 1961 (see p. 10) [not shown in RECORD] was revised and clarified when FHA discovered it was causing confusion and was open to misinterpretation. He also stated that FHA now required nonprofit sponsors to provide a legal and enforceable guarantee in cases requiring subsidies.

With respect to our proposals, he stated: "* * * gifts or donations to a nonprofit sponsor from the general contractor or any other parties furnishing supplies or services must be deducted by the mortgagor in cost certification. This provision is a form of control of the type that you recommend. However, this procedure is under review to determine whether a prohibition against any contributions, gifts, or loans to a nonprofit sponsor from anyone standing to profit from the construction of a project would be a practical and feasible step.

"With respect to your second recommendation, our current instructions require the determination that a market exists before an application is invited in the 231 program. However, we recognize that certain organizations can and do quite successfully obtain occupancy from outside the immediate market area.

"We also have this matter under consideration to determine whether a policy such as you recommend should be adopted."

Since the matters discussed in this report are currently under review by FHA, we are not making any recommendations at the present time. We plan to follow up on any action taken by the agency in regard to these matters.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall next ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me under date of February 17, 1966, signed by Mr. Frank H. Weitzel, the Acting Comptroller General, further commenting on this project. I quote one sentence of this letter:

> We are of the opinion that, in approving mortgage insurance in January 1962 equal to 100 percent of the cost of the project, the agency did not take reasonable precautions to assure itself that the project's sponsors had the ability, or were aware of their responsibility, to fully subsidize the operations of the project with the agency recognized might incur large operating deficits.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter of the Acting Comptroller General be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., February 17, 1966.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Herewith is a report to the Congress on our review of certain aspects of the approval by the Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, of the $4.5 million mortgage on Lake Crest Estates—a housing project for the elderly near Fort Worth, Tex. This is the project of which Christian Homes, Inc., is the mortgagor and in which you expressed an interest in your letter to us dated February 24, 1964.

We are of the opinion that, in approving mortgage insurance in January 1962 equal to 100 percent of the cost of the project, the agency did not take reasonable precautions to assure itself that the project's sponsors had the ability, or were aware of their responsibility, to fully subsidize the operations of the project which the agency recognized might incur large operating deficits. We believe that the agency placed undue reliance on the national religious organization to which the sponsors belonged for insuring the financial success of the project. Further, the agency unrealistically assumed that the endorsement by the national organization alone would induce elderly people to move to the project from other parts of the country. In addition, the Federal Housing Administration permitted the builder to contribute to the sponsors the working capital which the agency required the sponsors to provide as a condition of its approving the mortgage insurance. As a result, the sponsors were not required to demonstrate any independent fund-raising ability. This fact may have been influential in the sponsors' decision to endorse the project.

Inasmuch as the mortgagor corporation, formed by the sponsors to build and manage the project, did not make required interest payments on the construction loan and was unwilling or unable to raise the funds necessary to effect final closing of the mortgage, the agency has taken action to acquire the property and the project is being managed by a court-appointed receiver. The agency has informed us that it is considering a disposal plan which it estimates should recoup about $3.6 million of the Government's initial investment of about $4.5 million in the project.

The Federal Housing Administration has revised its procedures with respect to projects which it estimates will require operating subsidies and now requires agreements binding sponsors to underwrite the estimated operating deficits. However, because of the deficiencies noted in our review of this project, we believe that these procedures do not go far enough and we proposed to the Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, that the agency's procedures be revised (1) to require reasonably firm assurance from central or national organizations of sponsoring groups before permitting insuring offices to consider as prospective tenants persons who are not residents of the locality in which the project is to be constructed and (2) to require nonprofit sponsors to raise necessary funds from persons or organizations which do not stand to profit from the approval of mortgage insurance for the project. The Commissioner has informed us that these matters are currently under consideration by the agency. Therefore, we are not making any recommendations on these matters at the present time.

In our opinion, insurance of mortgages equal to 100 percent of the cost of projects involves a greater degree of risk than insurance of mortgages for a lesser percentage of project cost, because the nonprofit sponsors of the former projects have little or no equity invested in such projects. Further, legislation enacted in 1965 providing for rent subsidies will expand the agency's insurance activities involving nonprofit sponsors because the rent-subsidy program involves this type of mortgagor. Accordingly, we are issuing this report to the Congress to illustrate the need for careful scrutiny by the Federal Housing Administration of all aspects of projects whose mortgages are insured under programs with an inherently high degree of risk.

With respect to your question as to whether or not there were any windfall profits accruing to the participants in this project as the result of inflated appraisals and excessive loans, our review did not disclose such occurrence.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK H. WEITZEL,
Acting Comptroller General of the United States.

Enclosure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Before concluding, I wish to compliment the General Accounting Office upon the excellent job it is doing in examining these projects, and I only wish that more attention would be paid to its reports.

WALL STREET JOURNAL WARNS AGAINST HITTING ANTI-INFLATION BRAKES TOO HARD

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning, the able George Shea, front page columnist for the Wall Street Journal, offers a surprising warning on Government action to stop inflation. It is essential.

Mr. Shea concludes:

> There seems to be real danger that if the administration acts to dampen down activity after further price and wage boosts come to hand, it will be doing so just at the time when the most stimulating effects of new military ordering are about to wear off. The genius of governments for mistiming economic measures may be in for another demonstration.

Mr. Shea invites attention to our Korean war experience with wholesale and commodity prices. Prices rose sharply the first year of the war, and then dropped just as spectacularly, although war spending continued to rise.

Mr. Shea shows that it seems to be governmental obligational authority, not actually spending, which is most stimulating to the economy. Obligational authority is reaching its peak now. It is actually scheduled and programed to turn down in the coming fiscal year.

This means that with the feverish attempts of business to build more and more capacity, with the heavy emphasis of business and government on training a bigger and more productive labor force, with well over a million and a half additional workers coming into the labor market, we may, indeed, face a downturn in prices and economic activity, not the inflationary eruption virtually every economist and business forecaster expects and predicts.

Here is another reason why Congress should stay loose, easy, and uncommitted, just as long as possible. Our minds should be open and alert to the damage that a tighter monetary policy, or a sharper tax hike might bring.

The stock market has never been a perfect forecaster of business trends, but it has sometimes tended to be a rough guide for the country's economic future. Lately, it has been moving erratically and trending a little down. This is hardly a harbinger of the kind of terrible inflation of which we have been so frequently warned in recent days.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Shea article from this morning's Wall Street Journal printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OUTLOOK: APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

(By George Shea)

The great economic question being debated these days is whether the Vietnam escalation which has already been budgeted, coming on top of a near-capacity business boom, is going to cause general inflationary price advances. Yet one method of analysis suggests that the major effect of this escalation is already here and that the next stage may well be a letdown.

This idea is that of Murray L. Weidenbaum, an associate professor of economics at Washington University in St. Louis. He compares today's situation with what happened during the Korean war.

That war began in mid-June 1950, just before the start of the 1951 fiscal year of the Federal Government, and the effect on Federal spending was mild the first year and sharp after that. From $39.5 billion in both fiscal 1949 and 1950, Federal budget outlays grew only to $44 billion in fiscal 1951. Then they jumped to $63 billion in fiscal 1952 and expanded further to $74.1 billion in fiscal 1953.

Also, taxes were raised very quickly and there was actually a budget surplus of $3.5 billion in fiscal 1951. The deficits came afterward—one of $4 billion in fiscal 1952 and a much larger one of $9.5 billion the following year.

On the basis of these figures one would expect economic activity, and especially prices, to show their sharpest gains, not in the first year of the war but in the next two. Actually, industrial production rose 9 percent from June 1950 to June 1951, but didn't show any further gain in the following 12 months. It did rise 15 percent in the year after that, the 12 months to June 1953.

The course of prices was even more peculiar. The wholesale index for all commodities climbed from 84.4 in June 1950 to 96.9 a year later. But by June 1952 it was back down a bit to 93.6 and by June 1953 it had slipped another notch to 92.2.

Even more spectacularly contrary to what might be expected was the behavior of an index of prices of 22 commodities that are particularly sensitive to inflationary and deflationary forces. From 103.1 in June 1950 this index soared to 155.6 in February 1951, after which it started down. By June it was at 142.5, a year later down to 111.3, and in June 1953 it was down to 100.5 or lower than when the war started.

The explanation for these unexpected fluctuations, Professor Weidenbaum shows, is that the primary effect of military procurement on productive activity "occurs in advance of actual Government expenditures. Under most circumstances, the placing of orders induces production on Government account and such production remains in the private sector and does not show up as Government expenditures until it is completed and the goods involved delivered to the public sector.

"It is at the order stage that the Government action normally will have its initial and often major impact on the markets for labor, raw materials, and financial resources. The contribution to economic activity is made during the production period prior to the actual Government purchase. Indeed, the recording of the Government purchase may coincide in time with a reduction in governmental impact on total demand."

In support of this point, Professor Wiedenbaum shows that while Federal expenditures rose only mildly—about 11 percent—in fiscal 1951 over 1950, appropriations and other new obligational authority granted by Congress were up 68 percent. And contracts let and other obligations entered into by the Federal agencies almost doubled in that year.

A similar situation has arisen today, Professor Wiedenbaum shows. Increases in the Government's spending projections are spread over both this fiscal year and next, but new obligational authority is soaring this year and is scheduled to fall off in the 1967 fiscal period. The spending totals in the administrative budget are $106.4 billion in the current fiscal year, up from $96.5 billion in fiscal 1965, with a further increase in fiscal 1967 to $112.8 billion.

In contrast, obligational authority in the current fiscal year jumps to $126.6 billion from $106.6 billion in fiscal 1965. Then it turns down, in the projections of the budget for fiscal 1967 as announced by the administration in January, to $121.9 billion.

The effect of the sharp rise during the current fiscal year is apparent in monthly statistics on military prime-contract awards to U.S. business firms. For 8 months through November, the latest available, these averaged an annual rate of $31 billion, up 36 percent from the rate of the preceding 8 months.

In turn, these figures help explain why business and prices have been so strong in recent months. Industrial production has mounted in the face of reduced steel production following last September's wage settlement. Also, in the face of steel inventory cutting the total of business inventories grew in the final 1965 quarter at an annual rate of over $10 billion, faster than since the Korean war. And the price index of 22 commodities which soared during the early stages of that war, has jumped from under 106 in November to above 114 currently.

Of course, much depends on whether Vietnam escalates further or diminishes. But, given the Government's own figures based on present assumptions, it looks as if the inflation the administration says it will guard against in case of need, has been and is taking place right now.

Not only that, but there seems to be real danger that if the administration acts to dampen down activity after further price and wage boosts came to hand, it will be doing so just at the time when the most stimulating effects of new military ordering are about to wear off. The genius of governments for mistiming economic measures may be in for another demonstration.

SCHOOL MILK MEANS TEST MAKES LITTLE SENSE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the administration's plans to cut back the special school milk program by 80 percent include redirection of the program to the needy only. This will require a means test to determine which children are poor enough to receive free milk.

The Department states that such a procedure is now followed in the school lunch program. It feels that applying a means test to the school milk program will present no formidable problems. However, the facts will show that many school administrators are dissatisfied with the school lunch means test, and with good reason. There are several ways the test can be applied because the type of means test used is left to the discretion of the local school administrator.

A look at some of the ways it has been applied in the school lunch program will show how unsatisfactory it is.

In some jurisdictions children can receive free school lunches if their family is on the relief rolls. This is an easy way to choose the children who are to receive a free hot lunch. However, it overlooks the great number of poor families who manage to squeeze out a living but are unable to provide for their children, especially if they have a number of children in school at the same time, with substantial lunch and milk money. These people depend on Federal support for the school milk program. Their children would have to stop drinking milk in school if the proposed cut is pushed through.

Other schools require the parents to write a letter to the school authorities indicating the reasons why their children need free lunches. The letter would normally include information on the family's income, expenses, et cetera. In my estimation, this sort of procedure is, on the face of it, repugnant. This, in itself, would prevent many needy families from applying. In addition, we must remember that this kind of procedure requires the kind of initiative that many poor families simply do not have. Furthermore, it automatically rules out the illiterates among our population who are unable to write a coherent letter—the very group whose children most need Federal assistance.

Finally, some schools require the parent to appear before a hearing board to justify a free lunch request orally. It does not take much of an imagination to visualize how reluctant a parent would be to confess his poverty in a public hearing.

Perhaps I can best sum up the objections to a means test by quoting a paragraph from a letter I recently received from a fifth grade teacher in my State:

> If I had to pick out one or two children who could have milk and the rest go without or pay for it, I would not give out any. People who try to maintain their family and be independent need encouraging; not making it an advantage to go on relief.

FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT BENEFITS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] is unable to be in the Chamber at this time. At his request, I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement he has prepared on the subject of Federal unemployment adjustment benefits, together with a letter he wishes printed in the RECORD, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LAUSCHE

It is my belief that certain sections of H.R. 8282, to provide for the establishment of a program of Federal unemployment adjustment benefits, et cetera, will do irreparable damage to private colleges and universities of our Nation.

The effect the bill will have on private colleges and universities in Ohio is well pointed out in a recent letter I have received from the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education.

The same amount of unemployment compensation and the same conditions under which the unemployment compensation may be received should only apply in the event that the economic conditions in the 50 States are identical. Admittedly, such identity does not exist. Economic conditions vary in the different States, thus requiring variance in the amount of unemployment compensation and even in the conditions under which unemployment compensation shall be granted.

In view of the difference of the economies in the 50 different States of the Union, there is no justification for federalizing the unemployment compensation law.

I will not support H.R. 8282.

CLEVELAND COMMISSION
ON HIGHER EDUCATION,
Cleveland Ohio, February 11, 1966.

Hon. FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Senior Senator from Ohio,
Bethesda, Md.

DEAR SENATOR LAUSCHE: The Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, representing nine colleges and universities in and about Cleveland, has learned of H.R. 8282. This bill has had hearings before the Ways and Means Committee and it is our understanding that voting on the bill has been scheduled for February 17, 1966.

The bill has to do with the extension of unemployment compensation insurance taxes to nonprofit corporations, and will vitally affect the private colleges and universities of the country.

We believe it is not only unnecessary, but that the cost would be destructive to most of our private educational institutions in Ohio. Estimates have been made that the cost, for example in one midwest university, would run over $500,000 a year—and that in one college here in Cleveland it will cost approximately $150,000 per year. Another Cleveland college estimates it will be necessary to increase its tuition charges at least $200 per student per year. California and Illinois private college groups have advised their member institutions to oppose this legislation.

We wish to make it known to our Senators and Representatives in Ohio that we, too, are in opposition to this measure as it is now written. There are several reasons for our position.

Nonprofit organizations vary widely in their functions. The independent voluntary colleges and universities are performing an essential function that would otherwise be a burden on Ohio taxpayers. These institutions save the taxpayers of Ohio many millions of dollars per year in operating costs alone. Such a tax might foreseeably require that some independent colleges and universities close their doors. The resultant burden upon the State would far outweigh the benefits to be derived from such a piece of legislation.

Furthermore, the colleges and universities of the State are stable employers without cycles in their employment practices and, because of their unusual growth in recent years, have a constantly expanding need for all types of employees.

It is also a fact that any additional operating costs resulting from this legislation must be added to already heavy tuition charges or deducted from the voluntary gift receipts of our independent institutions.

In any event, the effect of this bill on the financial resources of the independent institutions will be to incur an unwarranted burden either upon the students and their parents or on the endowments of the institutions which have taken many, many years to accumulate.

For these reasons, the members of the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education are opposed to H.R. 8282 as it is now written and we wish you to know our position.

Sincerely,

EVAN B. LLOYD.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Lincoln Gordon, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of State; and

Jack Hood Vaughn, of Virginia, to be Director of the Peace Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert L. Sumwalt, of South Carolina, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Victor Bussie, of Louisiana, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Timothy J. May, of Colorado, to be General Counsel of the Post Office Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Withour objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion by Mr. HART, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs of the Committee on the District of Columbia be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AND FROM TOMORROW UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the completion of business today the Senate stand in adjournment until noon tomorrow; and that immediately after the prayer tomorrow the Senate commence immediately with the reading of Washington's Farewell Address by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]; and that immediately upon the completion of the reading of the Farewell Address, the Senate stand in adjournment until noon Wednesday, February 23, 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, starting with Calendar No. 974, the calendar be called in sequence through Calendar No. 979.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the various measures in order.

FREE ENTRY OF CERTAIN STAINED GLASS AND CEMENT WINDOWS

The bill (H.R. 5831) to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass and cement windows for Our Lady of the Angels Seminary, of Glenmont, N.Y., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1000), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 5831, as passed by the House and approved by the Committee on Finance, is to permit the refund of duties paid on certain stained glass which were imported for the use of Our Lady of the Angels Seminary, of Glenmont, N.Y.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The glass covered by the bill consisted of colored glass in panels imported for the use of Our Lady of Angels Seminary, Glenmont, N.Y. The imports were entered under Albany, N.Y., consumption entries A–046 (October 16, 1961) and A–096 (February 2, 1962). They were claimed to be duty free under the provision in paragraph 1810 of the original rate schedules of the Tariff Act of 1930 for "stained or painted window glass or stained or painted windows which are works of art, when imported to be used in houses of worship, and valued at $15 or more per square foot." However, free entry was denied by the customs collector and the entries were liquidated with assessment of duty at the rate of 30 percent ad valorem. Protests against the duty assessment were filed and the matter is pending before the U.S. Customs Court.

The principal issue involved in the litigation is whether panels of stained glass formed from pieces of stained glass set in concrete were excluded from classification under the above-quoted provision of paragraph 1810 because the pieces were set in concrete rather than in lead or other metal cames. This very issue was resolved in favor of an importer in a 1960 decision of the U.S. Customs Court (C.D. 2171), but the Bureau of Customs did not follow that decision, with a view to retrial of the issue (Treasury Decision 55181, dated July 18, 1960). Representatives of the Treasury Department have advised your committee that if the principle of C.D. 2171 had been applied to the glass panels covered by H.R. 5831, the merchandise would have been admitted duty free under paragraph 1810.

On August 31, 1963, the new Tariff Schedules of the United States became effective pursuant to the Tariff Classification Act of 1962. Item 850.30, of the new schedules is derived from the aforementioned provision of paragraph 1810 of the old schedules, although stated in different terms in some respects. In December 1963, the Bureau of Customs ruled (T.D. 56102(58)) that stained glass windows for churches in which the pieces of glass are joined together by, or set in, lead or cement and otherwise meeting the requirements specified in item 850.30, may be classifiable free of duty under such item 850.30. Representatives of the Treasury Department have advised that glass panels such as those to which H.R. 5831 relates, entered on or after the effective date of the revised tariff schedules, would be eligible for duty-free treatment under item 850.30.

In view of the fact that, under the principle of C.D. 2171, which involved similar glass, the glass panels in question could have been accorded free entry by the customs authorities under the old tariff schedules, and since the Customs Bureau concedes that the panels would be entitled to duty-free treatment under the revised tariff schedules, your committee feels that in equity the importer of the glass in question should be absolved from duty liability, notwithstanding the pending litigation. The glass has been used for the purpose for which it was imported, and any competitive impact on similar domestic products that might have been involved has long since passed. Also, it might be noted that legislation passed in the 87th Congress (Public Law 87-572) exempted from duty similar stained glass imported under the old tariff schedules for three different houses of worship.

Your committee agrees with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, that in the circumstances the bill merits favorable action, and the bill is accordingly favorably reported.

EXTENSION OF STATUTORY BURIAL ALLOWANCE TO CERTAIN VETERANS

The bill (H.R. 11006) to extend the statutory burial allowance to certain veterans whose deaths occur as a result of a service-connected disability was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1001), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Under existing law, a burial allowance of $250 is paid to survivors of peacetime veterans who were discharged from active service for a service-connected disability, or who were in receipt of, or but for the receipt of retirement pay would have been entitled to, disability compensation. In the case of a veteran who has service during a period of war, the allowance is paid regardless of whether or not he had a service-connected disability.

The immediate effect of the proposed legislation would be to authorize the burial allowance where a veteran has not applied for disability compensation but who nevertheless died of a service-connected death.

The formal Veterans' Administration request for this legislation was based upon an individual case where the veteran died the day following his separation from service, while en route from his place of separation to his home. He was not a wartime veteran and was not discharged for a service-connected disability. Had he lived long enough to file a claim for disability compensation, his survivors would have been eligible for the $250 burial allowance inasmuch as his death was attributable to a period deemed to be active service, since an individual is considered to be on active service after his discharge and until he reaches his home if he is traveling by the most direct route. Under the circumstances, however, the burial allowance could not be paid.

This proposal, as passed by the House of Representatives and approved by the Committee on Finance, will correct the inequity described above.

The increase in costs resulting from enactment of this proposal would be minimal.

ADDITIONAL DUTIES FOR DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The bill (H.R. 11007) to provide statutory authority for the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to assume the duties of Administrator during the absence or disability of the Administrator or during a vacancy in that office, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1002), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

This bill, as passed by the House of Representatives and approved by the Committee on Finance, would provide statutory authority for the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to assume the duties of the Administrator during the latter's absence or disability or during a vacancy in that office. It would also authorize the Administrator to permit the redelegation of authority he may now delegate under existing law.

This proposal was formally requested by the Veterans' Administration and past experience has demonstrated the need for its enactment.

There would be no additional expenditure of public funds resulting from the enactment of this proposal.

BENEFITS DURING HOSPITALIZATION

The bill (H.R. 11747) to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an except from the report (No. 1003), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Under existing law, the monthly compensation or retirement pay payable to a veteran without dependents, who is being furnished hospitalization or domiciliary or nursing home care by the Veterans' Administration, is reduced by one-half but not below $30 a month beginning the first day of the seventh calendar month following the date of admission. The same requirement applies to pension received by those veterans who are receiving this non-service-connected benefit under laws in effect prior to the enactment of Public Law 86-211, the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959.

When the veteran is discharged from the hospital, the amount withheld is paid to him in a lump sum in most instances. If the veteran leaves the hospital against medical advice or as a result of disciplinary action, the amount withheld from him may not be paid until 6 months after his departure.

The law also provides that where the patient is readmitted following a discharge against medical advice or as a result of disciplinary action, reduction shall be effective immediately upon his being readmitted from the date of readmission regardless of the time between episodes of hospitalization.

Aid and attendance allowances for severely disabled veterans receiving compensation or pension are discontinued during VA institutional care from the first day of the second calendar month following admission and are not repaid on discharge. If the veteran leaves against medical advice, this allowance is discontinued on the date of readmission regardless of the length of time the veteran has been out of the VA hospital.

The bill, as passed by the House of Representatives and approved by the Committee on Finance, would provide that the immediate reduction of withheld benefits following discharge against medical advice or as a result of disciplinary action shall apply only when the readmission occurs within 6 months following prior termination of the hospitalization or institutional care. Section 2 of the proposal would extend the same limitation with regard to the aid and attendance allowance. Thus, in either situation a readmission after 6 month would be treated like an original admission in determining the time when reduction or discontinuance of benefits will commence. The reasons for these amendments are fully explained in the report of the Veterans' Administration.

The measure was introduced at the formal request of the Veterans' Administration, and that agency advises that the additional cost to the Government will be small.

TAX TREATMENT OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS PAID TO CERTAIN MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES AND TO THEIR SURVIVORS

The bill (H.R. 10625) relating to the tax treatment of certain amounts paid to certain members and former members of the uniformed services and to their survivors was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1004), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. SUMMARY

This bill, as passed by the House and agreed to by the Committee on Finance, makes a series of amendments to the Internal Revenue Code designed to provide essentially the same tax treatment under the retired serviceman's family protection plan where provision is made for annuities for surviving spouses or certain child beneficiaries as already is provided in the case of the civil service retirement program and other qualified pension plans. Thus where reduced retirement pay is accepted by servicemen (or former servicemen) in order to provide annuities for their survivors, the amount of the reduction will no longer be taxed to the retired servicemen and such reductions which have been included in retired servicemen's retirement income in the past may be offset against otherwise taxable retirement pay in the future. The exclusion of up to $5,000 paid to a survivor of a decedent which is available where an employer makes the payment to a beneficiary on account of the death of an employee also is to be available to survivors of deceased servicemen who retired because of disability and died before attaining normal retirement age. In addition the estate and gift tax exclusions available under present law for the value of survivor annuities in the case of civil service annuities and those under other qualified pension plans are also to be made available in the case of annuities provided for survivors under the retired serviceman's family protection plan.

The income tax amendments generally apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 1965, or in the case of the death benefit exclusion to those who die after that date. The estate tax amendment applies to decedents dying after December 31, 1965, and the gift tax amendments to gifts made after the calendar year 1965.

The bill is favored by both the Treasury Department and the Defense Department.

FREE ENTRY FOR CERTAIN STAINED GLASS FOR THE CONGREGATION EMANUEL OF DENVER, COLO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 4599) to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel of Denver, Colo., which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, on page 1, after line 9, to insert:

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty the chipped colored glass windows set in cement imported before the enactment of this Act for the use of Saint Ann's Church, Las Vegas, Nev.

On page 2, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)"; and in line 5, after "(a)", to insert "or (b)".

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, this bill, H.R. 4599, provides for the free entry in the United States of colored glass in panels for use in the construction of a new synagogue and auxiliary buildings for the Congregation Emanuel in Denver.

The glass was imported during the summer of 1960. During the same year the U.S. Customs Court handed down a decision, which would have effectively allowed such glass to be imported duty free. The Bureau of Customs did not follow the decision, with a view to retrial. On August 31, 1963, new tariff schedules came into effect; and, under the new tariff, the glass in question would be allowed to enter duty free only if it entered the country after such date.

I think that the situation is inequitable and should be corrected. I might note that during the 87th Congress similar legislation was passed which exempted the same type of glass for three different houses of worship. I urge passage of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel, Denver, Colo., and of certain chipped colored glass windows for Saint Ann's Church, Las Vegas, Nev."

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1005), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE HOUSE PROVISION

The purpose of H.R. 4599, as passed by the House, is to permit the refund of duties paid on certain stained glass which were imported for the use of the Congregation Emanuel of Denver, Colo.

EXPLANATION OF COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The Committee on Finance amended the House-passed bill to include provisions extending duty-free treatment to chipped colored glass windows imported for the use of St. Ann's Church, Las Vegas, Nev. Glass covered by this amendment was entered at Los Angeles apparently under consumption entry No. 04016 in January 1963. It was claimed to be duty free under paragraph 1810 of the Tariff Act of 1930. However, free entry was denied by the customs collector and duty was assessed at the rate of 30 percent ad valorem. The glass windows imported for St. Ann's Church, like those provided for in the House bill, were valued at more than $15 per square foot and the glass bits were bonded or joined together by cement. For the same reasons which justify the House provision, and which prompted the Customs Court to hold that duty-free treatment applied in the situation litigated in 1960, the committee concluded that this amendment for St. Ann's Church merits favorable consideration.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The glass covered by the House bill consisted of colored glass in panels imported for use in the construction of a new synagogue and auxiliary buildings for the Congregation Emanuel, Denver, Colo. The imports were entered under Denver consumption entries 1339 (June 29, 1960), 222 (Aug. 11, 1960), 257 (Aug. 18, 1960), and 319 (Aug. 31, 1960). They were claimed to be duty free under the provision in paragraph 1810 of the original rate schedules of the Tariff Act of 1930 for "stained or painted window glass or stained or painted windows which are works of art, when imported to be used in houses of worship, and valued at $15 or more per square foot." However, free entry was denied by the customs collector and the entries were liquidated with assessment of duty at the rate of 30 percent ad valorem. Protests against the duty assessment were filed and the matter is pending before the U.S. Customs Court.

The principal issue involved in the litigation is whether panels of stained glass formed from pieces of stained glass set in concrete were excluded from classification under the above-quoted provision of paragraph 1810 because the pieces were set in concrete rather than in lead or other metal cames. This very issue was resolved in favor of an importer in a 1960 decision of the U.S. Customs Court (C.D. 2171), but the Bureau of Customs did not follow that decision, with a view to retrial of the issue (T.D. 55181, dated July 18, 1960). Representatives of the Treasury Department have advised your committee that if the principle of C.D. 2171 had been applied to the glass panels covered by H.R. 4599, the merchandise would have been admitted duty free under paragraph 1810.

On August 31, 1963, the new Tariff Schedules of the United States became effective pursuant to the Tariff Classification Act of 1962. Item 850.30 of the new schedules is derived from the aforementioned provision of paragraph 1810 of the old schedules, although stated in different terms in some respects. In December 1963, the Bureau of Customs ruled (T.D. 56102(58)) that stained glass windows for churches in which the pieces of glass are joined together by, or set in, lead or cement and otherwise meeting the requirements specified in item 850.30, may be classifiable free of duty under such item 850.30. Representatives of the Treasury Department have advised that glass panels such as those to which H.R. 4599 relates, entered after the effective date of the revised tariff schedules, would be eligible for duty-free treatment under item 850.30.

In view of the fact that under the principle of C.D. 2171, which involved similar glass, the glass panels in question could have been accorded free entry by the customs authorities under the old tariff schedules, and since the Customs Bureau concedes that the panels would be entitled to duty-free treatment under the revised tariff schedules, your committee feels that in equity the importer of the glass in question should be absolved from duty liability, notwithstanding the pending litigation. The glass has been used for the purpose for which it was imported, and any competitive impact on similar domestic products that might have been involved has long since passed. Also, it might be noted that legislation passed in the 87th Congress (Public Law 87–572) exempted from duty similar stained glass imported under the old tariff schedules for three different houses of worship.

Your committee agrees with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House that in the circumstances the bill together with the amendment made by the committee, merits favorable action.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN ESTATE TAX PROVISIONS OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 928, H.R. 10185.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10185) amending certain estate tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 956), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. SUMMARY OF BILL

H.R. 10185 amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that if any part of a deficiency with respect to estate tax liability is due to fraud with intent to evade tax, the penalty to be imposed is 50 percent of the total amount of the deficiency, rather than 50 percent of the total tax liability. This conforms the rule under the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to the rule now applicable in the case of estate tax deficiencies under the 1954 code.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it does not object to this bill.

II. REASONS FOR THE BILL

The attention of your committee has been called to the recent case of *Commissioner of Internal Revenue* v. *Estate of H. S. Leyman* ((Mar. 29, 1965) 344 F. 2d 763), in which a circuit court of appeals, reversing a decision of the Tax Court, held that under the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 the penalty, in the case of a fraudulent estate tax return, is 50 percent of the entire estate tax. The Tax Court had held that the penalty was the same as under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—50 percent of the deficiency (the underpayment) in the estate tax.

In the Leyman case, the decedent died on May 24, 1954. If he had died on or after August 17, 1954, the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 would have been applicable to his estate and it would have been clear that the penalty, in the case of a false of fraudulent return, is 50 percent of the deficiency and not 50 percent of the tax. The decedent's son was the executor of the estate, and he filed an estate tax return which showed a tax due in an amount slightly in excess of $2,056,000, and that tax was paid in full. Thereafter, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue asserted a large deficiency in the estate tax and claimed that part of the deficiency was due to fraud. The Tax Court held that there was a deficiency in the estate tax of $1,240,242, most of which was attributable to a change in the valuation of an unlisted stock owned by the decedent and no fraud was involved on this issue. However, the Tax Court also held that part of the deficiency was attributable to fraud; that the executor had fraudulently omitted from the estate tax return the sum of $613,000 in cash owned by the decedent at the time of his death. Since part of the deficiency was attributable to fraud, the Tax Court added a penalty of $620,121 (50 percent of the deficiency of $1,240,242).

The Commissioner contended that the fraud penalty should include, in addition to the $620,121, 50 percent of the $2,056,000 in tax paid when the original estate tax return was filed. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit agreed with the Commissioner and held that under the 1939 code the penalty for a fraudulent estate tax return was 50 percent of the entire tax and not just 50 percent of the underpayment.

In its decision the court of appeals stated that it was presented with a case of first impression for which it could find "no guiding casebook authority." Although the issue had not been previously litigated, it can be noted that the decision is contrary to the understanding your committee had of the 1939 code provision at the time of the enactment of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. At that time the 1939 code provided a fraud penalty, in the case of excise taxes, of 50 percent of the entire tax. Your committee then believed that the fraud penalty should be limited in all cases to only 50 percent of the deficiency or underpayment, which was clearly the rule under the 1939 code in the case of the income and gift taxes and also, so your committee thought, in the case of the estate tax.

In reporting the bill which became the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and which provided that the fraud penalty in all cases should be only 50 percent of the deficiency or underpayment, your committee reported to the Senate language identical to that which had been reported to the House:

"Existing law imposes a 50-percent addition in the case of fraud applicable to all taxes, but in the case of taxes other than income, estate, and gift, that addition is based on the total amount of tax imposed." (S. Rept. 1622, p. 591, 83d Cong.).

Your committee, like the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, believes that the type of decision reached in the Leyman case produces a harsh result which cannot be justified, particularly in view of the fact that the burden of the penalty may fall in part on innocent beneficiaries of an estate who had nothing at all to do with the filing of the false estate tax return.

III. GENERAL EXPLANATION

The bill amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that if any part of a deficiency in the estate tax is due to fraud with intent to evade tax, then 50 percent of the total amount of the deficiency (in addition to the deficiency) is to be assessed and collected—in lieu of 50 percent of the entire tax.

The amendment is applicable with respect to any estate of a decedent subject to the estate tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, but the bill does not open up the statute of limitations if a refund is barred by the statute of limitations. Your committee is informed that there are only a few cases in which the Service has collected a fraud penalty based upon 50 percent of the entire tax. In those cases (if refunds are not barred by the statute of limitations or by any other law or rule of law, such as res adjudicata) the bill provides that no interest is to be paid or allowed on any refund resulting from the bill.

CAPITOL STATUES OF WEST VIRGINIANS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Sunday, February 20, issue of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail State magazine carried an article by Mr. Harry W. Ernst, Washington correspondent for the Charleston Gazette, on the statues of the two West Virginians standing in the U.S. Capitol.

West Virginia is proud of its two famous sons, Francis Harrison Pierpont and John Edward Kenna, who are, deservedly, so honored.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON'S MOUNTAINEERS IN MARBLE

(Each State allowed statues of two sons in the U.S. Capitol. Here are the choices of West Virginians.)

(By Harry W. Ernst)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—One championed the Union and helped create the State of West Virginia. A Methodist and Republican, he was too uncompromising to be a successful politician. He was descended from an early American family.

The other, son of an Irish immigrant, helped carve out of the Missouri wilderness a farm when he was a boy. When he was only 16, he was wounded fighting for the Confederacy. His congeniality made him a successful politician. A Roman Catholic and Democrat, he was the youngest Member when he served in the House (29) and U.S. Senate (35).

They were Francis Harrison Pierpont, "the father of West Virginia" who was Governor of the restored (loyal to the Union) State of Virginia from 1861 through 1868, and John Edward Kenna of Charleston, who served in the House and Senate from 1877 until his death in 1893.

West Virginia has honored both men by placing marble statues of them in the U.S. Capitol where each State is permitted to remember two of its prominent citizens in statuary.

Selection of two men of such contrasting background and achievement perhaps reveals a facet of West Virginia's character that isn't fully appreciated.

Although a rural, somewhat provincial State, West Virginia generally practices what its State motto preaches—"Mountaineers are always free." Without self-conscious ideology, West Virginians for the most part believe in equal rights and the right to dissent. They don't preach about such fundamentals of democracy, but simply live comfortably with them.

None of the other 17 border and Southern States has made as much progress as West Virginia in moving to end the barbaric humiliation of the Negro. And McCarthyism, which equates dissent with treason, never flourished in the State where a small number of right- and left-wingers have little difficulty being heard.

The reason may be that West Virginians are basically uninterested in ideology—whether it enslaves men because of their race or because of their politics. Their fellow citizens can seek truth by handling snakes or protesting against the war in Vietnam as long as they respect the rights of others to disagree or to be left alone.

In his novel, "Absalom, Absalom," William Faulkner discusses the cultural shock to a man who migrated from the West Virginia mountains to Mississippi in the early 19th Century. In West Virginia "the land belonged to anybody and everybody"; in Mississippi the land and the people were neatly divided and "a certain few men * * * had the power of life and death and barter and sale over others * * *"

The selection of Pierpont and Kenna to represent West Virginia in Capitol statuary indicates the State's passion for diversity and tolerance. How could a State honor both a lover of the Union and a fighter for the Confederacy during the same period?

Perhaps the answer lies in the character of the two men, who their fellow citizens obviously respected although they may have hotly disagreed with them on some issues.

The statue of Pierpont is really a monument to the State he helped establish during the Civil War, as Senator Jonathan P. Dolliver, of Iowa, a West Virginia native, pointed out when it was unveiled at the Capitol in 1910.

"It is a monument to times that we hardly yet understand," Senator Dolliver observed. "It is a sort of a memorial of our heroic age."

With his reputation as the father of West Virginia, Pierpont could hardly be ignored by his fellow citizens. Shortly after his death in 1899, the State Society of the Grand Army of the Republic persuaded the legislature to place his statue in Statuary Hall.

Franklin Simmons, an American sculptor living in Rome, completed it in 1904. But it wasn't formally unveiled until 6 years later because of the maneuvering of several State politicians who disliked Pierpont and because of the illness of his only grandchild, Mrs. Frances Pierpont Siviter, who unveiled it.

Pierpont's life and character are well known to students of West Virginia history. Prof. Charles H. Ambler, of West Virginia University, wrote a biography of Pierpont that was published by the University of North Carolina Press in 1937.

But few West Virginians probably know who their second marble representative in the Capitol was.

Born in Valcoulon, Kanawha County, on April 10, 1848, Kenna was 8 years old when his father died and left his family practically penniless.

His mother, a great-granddaughter of Frontier Fighter Gen. Andrew Lewis, took Kenna and his two sisters to live with her brother on a Missouri farm.

After the Civil War, Kenna joined his family who had returned to Kanawha County. He studied at St. Vincent's Academy in Wheeling for 2½ years and then entered the law office of Miller & Quarrier in Charleston.

Kenna had to wait 6 months before he could be admitted to the bar until the lawyers' test oath, which forbid Confederate sympathizers to practice law, was repealed. In 1872 when he was 24, he was elected prosecuting attorney of Kanawha County and became a circuit court judge 3 years later.

His campaign style was strikingly similar to that of John F. Kennedy. Kenna was tall, handsome, and glamorous because of his war record. He was also a powerful speaker who shunned vituperative attacks on his opponents.

Like Kennedy, he appealed to younger members of his party. And Kenna tried new ways of stirring up voters. In 1877, he campaigned with a circus to help persuade West Virginians that they should make Charleston the permanent location of their capitol.

Instead of a game of touch football, however, Kenna and his youthful lieutenants celebrated his election as prosecuting attorney by playing marbles in the backyard of a friend's house.

Kenna was defeated in his first try for the House of Representatives in 1874. But 2 years later he overcame the opposition of influential Democrats and upset the incumbent, Representative Frank Hereford, of Union, Monroe County, who was chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

He served three terms in the House and was chosen in 1883 to succeed Henry G. Davis, who declined to seek reelection, in the U.S. Senate.

Kenna's popularity in southern West Virginia partly resulted from his successful efforts in obtaining Federal aid for a slackwater system that made the Kanawha River navigable, which helped open the region's natural resources for development.

A personal friend of President Grover Cleveland and one of the strongest defenders of his administration, Kenna was considered a liberal Democrat who championed Federal regulation of the railroads—the dominant economic power of his era.

During Kenna's second term in the House, the West Virginia Legislature instructed the State's Congressmen to support the Texas Pacific Railroad bill. But Kenna declined, explaining:

"I have not denounced subsidies to come here and support them. I have not raised my voice in opposition to class legislation against the interests and rights of the masses to come here and lend my voice to the consummation of that very work.

"I have not joined in the indignation of my people at the stupendous power and corruption of the American lobby to come here and surrender myself helplessly into his hands."

A fellow Congressman described Kenna's position as "a bold stand for a young man * * * to take against the unanimous action of the legislature of his own State." But Kenna was persuasive. The West Virginia Legislature reversed its action.

Kenna also was ahead of his times in advocating a stronger Presidency more independent of Congress. He emerged as a leader of the Democratic minority in the Senate when he argued for 3 hours and 20 minutes that President Cleveland was right in refusing to detail his reasons for dismissing certain officials who had been appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate, whose Republican majority was attacking Cleveland for his action.

At 45, Kenna died from heart disease at his home in Washington near the Capitol on January 11, 1893. A service was held in the Senate Chamber and another one at Charleston in the small Catholic church that Kenna had designed when he was 25.

In a memorial address, a New York Congressman described Kenna as believing "in the fullest possible freedom of thought and action * * * he was a bigot only in his hatred of bigotry."

"Most men live too long," observed Senator Blackburn, of Kentucky. "This man died too soon." There was general agreement that Kenna's death cut short a promising career.

Less than a month after his death, the West Virginia Legislature authorized a statue of Kenna to be placed in the U.S. Capitol—the first West Virginian to be so honored, which indicated his unusual popularity in a State known for rough treatment of its politicians.

Kenna's statue, which was sculptured by Alexander Doyle, now stands in the Capitol's Hall of Columns under the House Chamber. On the floor above is Pierpont's statue in Statuary Hall, where the House of Representatives originally met.

The 1864 act, which authorized the Capitol to also serve as a museum dedicated to the Nation's history, permitted each State to donate two statues that are Federal property and can't be removed from the building without the permission of Congress.

By 1932, the weight of the statues had become too much for the floor of the old hall. One from each State was left in the hall and the others were dispersed throughout the Capitol, perhaps indicating that the weight of history is even too much for buildings to bear.

Some of history's strains, however, were lifted last month when a ceremony in Statuary Hall offered hope that the Civil War has finally ended. The United Daughters of the Confederacy, in remembering Robert E. Lee's birthday, also laid a single red rose at the base of statues of both Confederate and Union heroes, including Pierpont of West Virginia.

DESCENDANTS OF JOHN E. KENNA

Although all of Senator John Edward Kenna's children now are deceased, several of his grandchildren still make their homes in West Virginia.

Senator Kenna's first wife died. Their only child was a daughter, who became a Catholic nun and died in a New York convent many years ago. He had four sons and a daughter by his second wife.

One son, the late Jo N. Kenna, was judge of the State supreme court. Judge Kenna was the father of Lee M. Kenna, a Charleston attorney; and Nancy Kenna Ivison, who now lives in Connecticut.

Another son, the late Edward B. Kenna, who died at the age of 32, was listed as editor of the Gazette in R. L. Polk & Co.'s Charleston Directory of 1911. Edward's only child is Capt. William E. Kenna, U.S. Navy, retired, who now lives in Connecticut, also.

The third son, the late Arthur Kenna, was a Charleston photographer, who had five children. They are Mrs. Gertrude Kenna Thomas of Pittsburgh; Mrs. Louise K. Henderson of St. Albans; Mrs. Ann Kenna Moore of Vienna, Wood County; Alexander P. Kenna of St. Albans; and John E. Kenna III, of Charleston.

The fourth son of Senator Kenna was the late John E. (Jack) Kenna II, who was a salesman and pitched semipro baseball for the old Charleston Senators. He never married.

Senator Kenna's only daughter by his second wife was the late Mary Kenna Elkins, who married Blaine, one of the sons of the late Stephen Benton Elkins. Their only child is Stephen Blaine Elkins, a Washington real estate developer.

West Virginia still is honoring the name of Senator John Edward Kenna. Kenna, Jackson County, is named after him, as is Kenna Homes in South Charleston. And, one of the new elementary schools that will be built in Kanawha County under the most recent bond issue, will be the John Edward Kenna School in North Charleston.

THE 43D INFANTRY DIVISION

Mrs. SMITH. On behalf of my colleague [Mr. MUSKIE] and myself I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine memorializing the annual convention of the 43d Infantry Division of World War II.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE 43D INFANTRY DIVISION OF WORLD WAR II

Whereas the military unit of World War II in which the State of Maine had the largest representation by reason of the 103d Infantry Regiment, the 152d Field Artillery Regiment and other special forces was the 43d Infantry Division; and

Whereas this legislature at its regular session memorialized this combat division by designating the main east-west highway from Bethel to Houlton as the 43d Infantry Division Memorial Highway; and

Whereas the State has by reason of such designation erected highway markers thereon; and

Whereas every member of this legislature represents areas within the State which contributed manpower to this division; and

Whereas during the period of Federal service of this division every State in the Union was represented therein; and

Whereas the 43d Infantry Division holds its annual convention in Portland, Maine, September 9, 10, and 11, 1966; and

Whereas a member of this honorable house is national chairman for this convention; and

Whereas a member of the honorable senate served with distinction as a member of said division; and

Whereas the highlight of the 1966 convention will be the official dedication of Route 2 as the 43d Infantry Division Memorial Highway; and

Whereas our sister State of Rhode Island has similarly memorialized this division and our sister States of Vermont and Connecticut are now considering such memorialization; and

Whereas said annual convention will host veterans and their families not only from the sister States of Vermont, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, but from the national area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*the Senate concurring*), That all agencies of the State dealing with business and recreational development be enjoined to take advantage of the presence of these guests to promote the development of our State in all areas, and that the said agencies be, and hereby are, urged to cooperate with the convention committee to the fullest extent in that behalf; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this joint resolution attest by the secretary of state be forthwith forwarded to the agencies mentioned above and such others as may be designated by His Excellency the Governor of this State, the honorable president of the senate, the honorable speaker of the house, and the sponsor of this joint resolution.

House of representatives: Read and adopted, sent up for concurrence, February 2, 1966.

Jerome G. Plante,
Clerk.

In senate chamber: Read and adopted in concurrence, February 9, 1966.

Edwin H. Pert,
Secretary.

TRIBUTE TO BILLY BOWLEGS III AT THE DEDICATION OF MONUMENT TO HIM

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, last Saturday, February 19, I had the honor of making the dedicatory address at the unveiling of the monument to the late Indian Chief Billy Bowlegs III at the tiny Indian cemetery at Ortona between Moore Haven and LaBelle, Fla. The occasion was a notable one, largely attended by citizens of Florida and by a substantial number of outstanding Seminole Indians, joined by several Indian women and children. This memorable affair was arranged through the joint sponsorship of the Polk County Historical Commission and the Peace River Valley Historical Society who had done much careful planning for the affair which was handled in the most appropriate and dignified fashion.

The Honorable Doyle E. Carlton, distinguished former Governor of Florida, presided as Master of Ceremonies. The unveiling of the granite monument was accomplished by a little Seminole girl, Gloria Jean Wilson, a great-great-niece of the late Billy Bowlegs III. A memorial poem, which had been delivered as a tribute to the late chieftain on his 101st birthday, was read by its author, Mrs. J. W. Thrailkill of Wauchula. Incidentally, this venerable Indian was almost 103 years old when he passed away last year.

Because I feel that Billy Bowlegs III did more than any other Seminole toward harmoniously adjusting the life of his people to the customs of what he called the "white Americans," I feel that this whole affair should be preserved in the Congressional Record as a historical item. I ask, therefore, unanimous consent that there may be copied into the Record as a part of my remarks the poem by Mrs. Geraldine Thrailkill, entitled "Tribute to Billy Bowlegs III on his 101st birthday" and my dedicatory address on that occasion.

There being no objection, the address and poem were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dedicatory Address by the Honorable Spessard L. Holland, U.S. Senator, Dedication of Monument to Billy Bowlegs III, Ortona Cemetery Near Moore Haven, Fla., February 19, 1966

We the people of the present great State of Florida owe much of the color and attractiveness of our State and a substantial part of our historic background to that portion of our people whom we call the Seminoles of Florida. We call them all the Seminoles though they come from more than one tribe and family of the Florida Indians. It is most appropriate that the Polk County Historical Commission and the Peace River Valley Historical Society should join today with other Floridians who are interested in our history and who appreciate the Seminoles in paying this tribute of high respect to a Seminole who was a great Floridian and a great American, whom we knew as Billy Bowlegs III.

I do not have to speak in any detail of the fact that so many of our musical and colorful place names are Indian names. We are here near the banks of the Caloosahatchee which, through structures created by modern Americans, runs out of the great Lake Okeechobee which in turn is fed in large part by the River Kissimmee. All of us know of the place names of such important bodies of water as Lake Hicpochee which is near here, Lake Istokpoga and Lake Tohopekaliga. We could mention dozens of other Indian place names but the ones I have chosen have close relation to Billy Bowlegs III.

Suffice it to say for my first point that the Seminoles have contributed greatly to the place names of our State and thus will have always a very real part in the history of our State. I might add that Seminoles in the three Seminole wars played a distinct part in the military history of our entire Nation for there is no other record of such a long and fierce struggle for independence which was made by any Indian group of such a limited number. I wish that I had time to do much more than to note that they contributed, through the utterance of their Chief Coacoochee (or Wildcat), the most famous toast of our military men wherever they may be in all parts of the earth. He it was who originated at Fort Brooke—now part of Tampa—the toast "Here's Hough."

Billy Bowlegs III was the third of the great Indian leaders who bore the name Billy Bowlegs. The first two were noted for their warlike qualities and for their leadership of their people in the field of armed conflict. This last of the trio, Billy Bowlegs III, who I understand was not related to either of the others, was the outstanding advocate of peace, progress and adoption by his people of as many of the ways and customs of the white people as he felt could be adapted to the Indians. And so we do honor to him today as a great leader who, by both precept and example, led the Seminoles of Florida far along the path of adjustment to the entirely changed circumstances in which they found themselves as the small remnant of a proud people, the main body of whom had been transplanted to new homes in the West.

Our Billy Bowlegs was born over 100 years ago, in February 1862, on Arbuckle Creek near where it flows into Lake Istokpoga. He passed away on February 14, 1965, just 3 days before his 103d birthday. Much of the earlier history concerning him centers at Kissimmee City or on these lakes which I have mentioned which are parts of the Kissimmee River basin. The history of his later years relates frequently to Lake Okeechobee or to the river which is so close to us here or to other parts of the southern end of the peninsula.

Billy Bowlegs was born during the terrible Civil War and his young manhood was spent in Florida at a time when the earlier founders and developers of Florida were receiving thousands of new settlers who came from the north. He had the chance to see how our State was being developed by a combination of citizens who had been on the southern side and new citizens who had been on the northern side of the great conflict which split our Nation asunder. He realized that harmony was being restored between white Americans of different background and convictions and that the task of his people, the small remainder of the Florida Indians who stayed here, was to learn how to live in peace with what he called the "white Americans."

I did not know Billy Bowlegs personally when I was a youngster, but I did know much about him and his reputation for fairness, decency, justice, and progressive leadership of his people. I heard about him through my father who had come to Bartow in 1882 and who for a while worked in the store of Capt. David Hughes which served both as a source of supply for the settlers in Polk County and as a trading post for the Indians who then lived in the ridge and eastern portion of Polk County. Through my father I heard most about an old chief named Tallahassee, whose camp was near the site of Lake Wales but I also heard about Billy Bowlegs, about his fame as a hunter and about the steadying influence which he exercised among the Indians. In later years I came to know Mrs. Minnie Moore-Willson, of Kissimmee, and I note from my book shelf that in June 1935 she presented me a copy of her first book, "The Seminoles of Florida," published in 1896, which included much information about Billy Bowlegs and other leading Seminoles of the 1890's.

Both from that book and Mrs. Willson's later books I learned much about Billy Bowlegs and his successful efforts to foster better relationships between his Seminole brethren and white Americans. His friendship toward red men and white men alike gave him a unique position to press this good work. As to his physical appearance in 1896 she says: "As a specimen of manhood he is far above the average. Although 6 feet 2 inches tall, he is so symmetrically proportioned that one loses sight of his height. His features are good, his hands and feet remarkably small, his voice soft and low—a characteristic of every Seminole." She makes it clear that his reputation as a very great hunter was generally recognized and I suppose, not without a degree of envy of my own, that his hunting ability was something that came as naturally to him as our wending our way to work each day comes to us. His honesty was of the legendary Seminole variety which was famed in song, story, and practice. Incidentally, my father told me that this high degree of honesty was a notable quality of most of the Seminoles with whom he traded while he worked in the Hughes store during his early years at Bartow.

Mrs. Willson, in her fascinating way, tells of an incident that demonstrates the great lengths Billy would go to preserve his honor.

"In 1896 Billy Bowlegs and Tommy Doctor paid an unexpected visit to Kissimmee. They walked from their camp at Okeechobee Marsh, a distance of 125 miles to tell their white friend that 'Indian no lie.' This was all. They apparently had no other business in town, and after a few hours visit left as quietly as they had come. Their mission was completed—their white brother believed them—their honor was clear—they could now dance at the green corn dance with merry hearts.

"A few months prior to this, these Indians had promised their white friend to act as guide on a bear hunt in the Everglades. All arrangements had been made for the hunt, except to fix the time and place of meeting. This was to be done through a white settler. Later, plans for the hunt were perfected and word was sent to the Indian village. According to their promise the Indians came to the settler's home on the day specified, but found that the white man [the settler] had left his house early in the morning with no message as to how or where the Indians should follow. The Indians, not knowing which way to go to find the party, could do nothing but return to their camp—a distance of 50 miles. Subsequent developments proved that the white man [the settler] wished to act as guide, and thereby earn for himself the remuneration the Indians expected to receive."

An incident of several years ago clearly shows the courtesy and respect which Billy Bowlegs always showed to U.S. officials of high rank, as well as the genuine friendliness of the man.

In 1961 we were giving the name "Hoover Dike" to the levee around Lake Okeechobee which was begun during the administrations of the late President Hoover and our beloved former Gov. Doyle Carlton, our able master of ceremonies, today. In this project, the President, as an expert engineer, had taken an active interest. President Hoover, then a man of great age, came down to Clewiston to the dedication which was attended by a great and enthusiastic crowd. Shortly before the actual dedicatory ceremonies took place, Billy Bowlegs walked up to the official crowd dressed in the regalia of a Seminole chieftain, standing straight as an arrow—though he was then 99 years old. He greeted President Hoover cordially and made it clear that he had come to the affair to do honor to the former President. The whole occasion was a most dignified and unforgettable one and I well remember that President Hoover, before leaving the area after the ceremony had been concluded, stated to me that he had rarely appreciated anything so much as he did the unexpected coming of Chief Billy Bowlegs to pay his respects. I think that courteous act of Billy Bowlegs was performed in the finest tradition of the Seminoles. I could never forget the sight of those two splendid old gentlemen standing together with clasped hands and beaming countenances, each enjoying the presence of the other and showing every possible evidence of high mutual respect.

Later I occupied the speakers platform with Chief Billy Bowlegs at two other public functions in the State, first at the dedication of a portion of completed work at a structure of the Central and South Florida Flood Control District a few miles southwest of Okeechobee City, and later at the dedication of the historical marker at Fort Fraser between Bartow and Highland City. I have beautiful photographs of all three of these occasions in my Washington office and I prize them highly.

While I deeply appreciated the presence of Billy Bowlegs at the first two occasions mentioned, I thought it was particularly typical of him to show up at the Fort Fraser dedication. You will recall that Fort Fraser, just as Fort Gardiner and Fort Basinger, and for that matter all of the forts named during the Zachary Taylor campaign which culminated at the Battle of Lake Okeechobee, were named for officers who had lost their lives in the Dade massacre. Taylor's army regarded itself as an avenging army and their every effort was bent upon vengeance. Probably the most bitter campaign of the whole second Seminole war was the Taylor campaign which followed closely after the Dade massacre. Nevertheless, Billy Bowlegs showed up at the occasion when both the campaign and the location of Fort Fraser were being memorialized and sat on the platform with me. Without his saying so I felt he was trying to make it clear that his presence indicated that the Seminole Indian had overcome his bitterness of those far-off days just as our Governor Carlton's presence here today indicates so clearly the same thing. We all know that Governor Carlton's grandfather was killed by the Indians in the third Seminole war in an engagement south of Fort Meade. I feel that the active participation of such men as he and our late friend Billy Bowlegs in the various friendly affairs which show that the original American people, the Seminoles, and ourselves, have grown closer together and are becoming more and more one people are decidedly in the finest traditions and best interests of our country.

There are many other good and kindly things which have been done by other Seminoles which I would be glad to relate on this occasion, except that I feel we should confine ourselves as much as possible to the discussion of the good qualities, kindly traits, and worthwhile accomplishments of Billy Bowlegs.

May I recite one rather light incident from Mrs. Minnie Moore-Willson's book which may throw some additional light on him?

"When the coast towns of Florida were still primitive, a storekeeper had purchased in New York, an old-fashioned organette, that played five tunes. The Seminoles at that time frequently came on purchasing expeditions to these trading villages. Cho-fee-hatch-o [Billy Bowlegs], progressive and musical, listened to the 'box of music' as it played in the little store, and was entranced with the melodies.

"Soon after, the organette refused to 'go' and the trader told his friends that unless he could 'stick it on the Indians, he would be out thirty-five dollars.' A few days later the Chief, with another Indian, came back to the store bringing produce to sell. The white trader wanted the Indian's goods and suggested to the Chief that he exchange for the music box, telling the innocent Seminole that 'music box no more play, wake up by and by and play good, him tired now.' The Seminole with his mechanical knowledge, looked the organette over, and making the trade, proudly left with the 'tired out' music box under his arm.

"The next day, the two Indians returned, bringing with them the music box to show to the storekeeper. 'That box, him no more tired,' and winding up the machine which the ingenious Seminole had put into working order, played the whole five tunes to the astonishment and chagrin of the trader. 'Him play good at Green Corn Dance, down Okee-cho-bee.' "

I think it is very clear from this little incident that while the white traders may have out-traded the Indians on many occasions, if not most occasions, this was one time when the opposite was the case and I am glad that Billy Bowlegs III was the very person who, in good humor, out-traded that particular white storekeeper.

I am happy that this occasion has brought out so many good citizens, both from among the Seminoles and among the rest of us who are latecomers, as compared to them, to this good peninsula. I hope that this occasion will bring even closer together all groups of citizens who now are proud to call themselves Floridians and that we will make the story of Billy Bowlegs III our common heritage of which all people in this State may be justly proud.

And so, speaking for the entire Florida delegation in Congress, as well as for the State and local officials of Florida and the citizens of Florida, generally, I now dedicate this marker in memory of a very fine man whose friendship I shall always cherish. A little Seminole girl who I understand is his grandniece, will unveil the marker which, just as Billy Bowlegs would have wished it, is a modest, though dignified monument. In concluding my part in the program I merely want to say that I feel greatly honored at having been asked to make this talk and to speak of a man for whose high character and worthwhile accomplishments I have the utmost respect. Speaking particularly for the Polk County Historical Commission and the Peace River Valley Historical Society, I dedicate this marker to the memory of our late, great friend, Billy Bowlegs III, one of the finest leaders ever produced from among the Seminoles of Florida.

TRIBUTE TO BILLY BOWLEGS III ON HIS 101ST BIRTHDAY

Long, long ago February's cold little moon
Dropped her baby boy on the lap of a hunter
Resting from a hard, bold chase of the Lo-ko-see.[1]
For brave chief, "Billy Bowlegs," the babe was named soon.

Strong he grew and walked in the grass like the wind.
Deft and cunning, he tracked the Florida wolf;
Feared not the panther nor the alapata,[2]
Knew the River of Grass for his steadfast friend.

Yet, young Billy feared the pits, so dark and hot
His mother dug and therein hid him by day
From the cruel paleface, evermore on the prowl;
Who ruined crops and chickees[3] and killed on the spot.

Hoping to alter the fate of all his clan
Old chief Billy Bowlegs drank the "Black Drink"—and
Sent one of his twin souls to the Milky Way—
Where dwells the Great Spirit, god of the Redman.

"Thy trouble is no more," the Great Spirit roared
Before the plea was worded by the old chief.
"Unite thy souls," the Indian god continued,
"Thy foe will meet defeat from his brother's sword."

The third Billy Bowlegs birthright was denied—
All his daring dreams sleep in his heart unborn—
At time he views yesterdays that have failed him
And down through the long years peace has paced his stride.

Now ancient, Billy Bowlegs, grand to the end,
Beloved by his tribesmen and palefaces alike,
Has lived life to the hilt with ill will toward none—
Walks in the grass like the wind, the world his friend.

—GERALDINE THRAILKILL.

"I AM AN AMERICAN"—FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AWARD LETTER

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, every year the Freedoms Foundation at Valley

---

[1] Lo-ko-see—bear.
[2] Alapata—alligator.
[3] Chickees—Indian dwellings.

Forge has a contest and offers awards for letters from Armed Forces personnel which typify some aspect of Americanism.

One of the winners of the 1965 contest is a young man from my State, Gary Arlaud, from Des Moines, Iowa. I ask unanimous consent that his excellent letter entitled "I Am an American" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS AND GEORGE WASHINGTON HONOR MEDAL AWARD—"I AM AN AMERICAN"

(A hypothetical letter from an imaginary Russian student)

(Gary M. Arlaud, V–6 Division, U.S.S. LPH 7, FPO, New York)

Now if only I could say that. But I am sorry to say that I can't for I am a Russian student of the U.S.S.R. I am here in your country on tour with a group from my own country and I have had a chance to see what your country is really like and study what it's really like. In the evenings I have crept from my hotel room and my comrades to go to the library and find out a myrid of things including one of the most illustrious histories of any country in the world or in its history. I find the attitude of the average citizen to be one of taking their freedoms for granted, and I feel sorry for them, for they don't know how free they really are. They have the chance to find out what the rest of the world is really doing and not just what the state allows them to hear. This to me was a privilege—to have the choice of some twenty newspapers to buy and read and get different viewpoints on the same subject. In my country there is Pravda and one other state-controlled newspaper. As I browsed through the newspapers in the library I read several articles which completely contradict what I had read in my country's news media, and I find truth in your papers and statements of great bearing by noted leaders of the world, which I had not the slighest idea were ever made, or that the leaders had a different attitude than what I read. We are taught from birth and childhood that America is an agressor, warmonger type, world power, and that we are the under-privileged, suppressed ones who are being done so wrongly in the U.N. I find this to be a lie. I find that Americans don't really want war in Vietnam and are trying to stop it, and not that they are sending in thousands of troops trying to invade Communist China. This is a common fact in my country.

I find the standards of living to be much higher here than we are taught. We thought that all Americans lived in slums. I see the many colors, kinds and types of cars that almost any American can own. In my country there is only one type and only those in the nigher presidium are allowed the luxury of an automobile. I stopped a man on the street and asked what kind of work he did? He gave me a rather strange look and said, "I am a salesman." I asked how much the Government allowed him in wages? Well, he looked even more dumfounded and said the Government had no say-so in his financial status and that whatever he made was up to his own initiative. Then I asked how he was picked to be the holder of such a marvelous job with so much freedom, and he informed me he wasn't picked by anyone. It was what he wanted so he went looking for a job and was hired by a representative of the company and not the Government. I could not believe my ears.

I also found out that an American can move throughout his country and be completely free about it. I saw absolutely no one spot checked for their identification. There were no troops walking the streets. I saw a parade which bore no arms or showing of strength, only peace and beauty. It was a demonstration by a local college concerning their athletic program. There was much joy and laughter; such a demonstration in my country wouldn't have even gotten a chance to start, regardless of its purpose, unless it was of some military significance.

I see people who are allowed to worship their God in any manner they choose. In my country there is no Supreme Being but the state, and worship of any other form is a crime against the state and punishable by death. On our way to this beautiful city I saw farmers using new, modern equipment and with bountiful crops and hundreds of head of cattle. I see one man tilling hundreds of acres by himself and by his own choice—not a collective farm where the workers are people of lower education and placed there without a chance to show what they can really do.

No, I am not an American, but after I mail this letter I am going to seek refuge in this wonderful country and political asylum. I am glad that I have no relatives now living, for what I am about to do would bring great hardships on them for an offense they had nothing to do with.

Soon, I, too will be an American.

STATEMENTS MADE BY SECRETARY RUSK AND GENERAL TAYLOR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon I had the experience, along with several friends—and I am sure a great portion of America—of watching a television report on the recent Vietnam hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In watching the various exchanges portrayed on that program I found myself tremendously impressed with the grasp of the realities of this complex situation exhibited by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor.

From these exchanges there emerged a very clear delineation of the difference between the specific criticism of our Vietnam policies and the requirements of responsibility for making the actual divisions involved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statements of Secretary Rusk and General Taylor, before the Foreign Relations Committee be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY RUSK'S STATEMENT BEFORE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 18, 1966

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, the immediate occasion for these hearings is a request by the President for a supplemental appropriation to the AID Administration of $415 million, of which $275 million are intended for South Vietnam. Mr. David Bell, the Administrator of AID, and I have both already testified on this particular request. These hearings as the chairman has pointed out, have also entered into the largest and most far-reaching aspects of our interests and involvements in southeast Asia. For my part, I welcome this opportunity to appear again before the committee to discuss with you these larger issues.

Since World War II, which projected the United States into the role of major world power, we Americans have had to face a series of difficult tasks and trials. On the whole, we have faced them very well. Today, we are facing another ordeal in southeast Asia which again is costing us both lives and treasure.

South Vietnam is a long way from the United States and the issues posed may seem remote from our daily experience and our immediate interests. It is essential, therefore, that we clearly understand—and so far as possible agree—on our mission and purpose in that far away land.

Why are we in Vietnam? Certainly we are not there merely because we have power and like to use it. We do not regard ourselves as the policeman of the universe. We do not go around the world looking for quarrels in which we can intervene. Quite the contrary. We have recognized that, just as we are not gendarmes of the universe, neither are we the magistrate of the universe. If other governments, other institutions or other regional organizations can find solutions to the quarrels which disturb the present scene, we are anxious to have this occur. But we are in Vietnam because the issues posed there are deeply intertwined with our own security and because the outcome of the struggle can profoundly affect the nature of the world in which we and our children will live. The situation we face in southeast Asia is obviously complex but, in my view, the underlying issues are relatively simple and are utterly fundamental. I am confident that Americans, who have a deep and mature understanding of world responsibility, are fully capable of cutting through the underbrush of complexity and finding the simple issues which involve our largest interests and deepest purposes. I regard it, therefore, as a privilege to be able to discuss these problems with the committee this morning—to consult with you—and at the same time to try to clarify for the American people the issues we must squarely face.

I do not approach this task on the assumption that anyone, anywhere, has all the answers or that all wisdom belongs to the executive branch of the Government, or even to the Government itself. The questions at issue affect the well-being of all Americans and I am confident that all Americans will make up their own minds in the tradition of a free and independent people. Yet those of us who have special responsibilities for the conduct of our foreign policy have had to think hard and deeply about these problems for a very long time. The President, his Cabinet colleagues, and the Congress, who share the weightiest responsibilities under our constitutional system, have come to certain conclusions that form the basis for the policies we are now pursuing. Perhaps it is worth pointing out that those who are officially responsible for the conduct of our public affairs must make decisions—and must make decisions among existing alternatives. None of us in the executive or the legislative branch has fulfilled our responsibilities merely by formulating an opinion—we are required to decide what this Nation shall do and shall not do and are required to accept the consequences of our determinations.

What are our world security interests involved in the struggle in Vietnam?

They cannot be seen clearly in terms of southeast Asia only or merely in terms of the events of the past few months. We must view the problem in perspective. We must recognize that what we are seeking to achieve in South Vietnam is part of a process that has continued for a long time—a process of preventing the expansion and extension of Communist domination by the use of force against the weaker nations on the perimeter of Communist power.

This is the problem as it looks to us. Nor do the Communists themselves see the problem in isolation. They see the struggle in South Vietnam as part of a larger design for the steady extension of Communist power through force and threat.

I have observed in the course of your hearings that some objection has been raised to the use of the term "Communist aggression." It seems to me that we should not confuse ourselves or our people by turning our eyes away from what that phrase means. The underlying crisis of this postwar period turns about a major struggle over the very nature of the political structure of the world. Before the guns were silent in World War II, many governments sat down and thought long and hard about the structure of international life, the kind of world which we ought to try to build, and wrote those ideas into the United Nations Charter. That charter establishes an international society of independent states, large and small, entitled to their own national existence, entitled to be free from aggression, cooperating freely across national frontiers in their common interests, and resolving their disputes by peaceful means. But the Communist world has returned to its demand for what it calls a world revolution, a world of coercion in direct contradiction to the Charter of the United Nations. There may be differences within the Communist world about methods, and techniques, and leadership within the Communist world itself, but they share a common attachment to their world revolution and to its support through what they call wars of liberation.

So what we face in Vietnam is what we have faced on many occasions before—the need to check the extension of Communist power in order to maintain a reasonable stability in a precarious world. That stability was achieved in the years after the war by the valor of free nations in defending the integrity of postwar territorial arrangements. And we have achieved a certain stability for the last decade and a half. It must not be overthrown now.

Like so many of our problems today the struggle in South Vietnam stems from the disruption of two world wars. The Second World War completed a process begun by the first. It ripped apart a structure of power that had existed for 100 years. It set in train new forces and energies that have remade the map of the world. Not only did it weaken the nations actively engaged in the fighting, but it had far-reaching secondary effects. It undermined the foundations of the colonial structures through which a handful of powers controlled one-third of the world's population. And the winds of change and progress that have blown fiercely during the last 20 years have toppled those structures almost completely.

Meanwhile, the Communist nations have exploited the turmoil of a time of transition in an effort to extend Communist control into other areas of the world.

The United States first faced the menace of Communist ambition in Europe when one after another of the nations on the boundaries of the Soviet Union fell under the dominion of Moscow through the presence of the Red army.

To check this tidal wave the United States provided the Marshall plan to strengthen the nations of Western Europe and then moved to organize with those nations a collective security system through NATO. As a result, the advance of Soviet Communist power was stopped and the Soviet Union gradually adjusted its policies to this situation.

But within a year after the establishment of NATO, the Communists took over China. This posed a new and serious threat, particularly to those weak new nations of the Far East that had been formed out of colonial empires. The problems in Asia were, of course, different from those in Europe. But the result was much the same—instability, uncertainty, and vulnerability to both the bully and the aggressor. Western Europe, with its established governmental and traditional social institutions recovered quickly. But certain of the new nations of Asia—particularly those that had not known self-government for a century or more—continued to face a far more formidable problem which they still face.

The first test in Asia came in Korea when the United Nations forces—predominantly American—stopped the drive of Communist North Korea supported by material aid from the Soviet Union. It stopped the Chinese Army that followed. It brought to a halt the Communist effort to push out the line that had been drawn and to establish Communist control over the Korean peninsula.

We fought the Korean war—which like the struggle in Vietnam occurred in a remote area thousands of miles away—to sustain a principle vital to the freedom and security of America—the principle that the Communist world should not be permitted to expand by overrunning one after another of the arrangements built during and since the war to mark the outer limits of Communist expansion by force.

Before the Korean war had ended, the United States, under President Truman, moved to settle and consolidate the situation in the Pacific through a peace treaty with Japan and through bilateral security treaties with Japan and the Philippines and through the ANZUS treaty with Australia and New Zealand. Hardly had the Korean war been finished when France, which had been fighting a protracted struggle in Indochina, decided to relinquish its political presence in southeast Asia. After a brief negotiation it came to terms with the Communist forces that had captured the nationalist movement. The result was the division of Indochina into four parts; a Kingdom of Cambodia, a Kingdom of Laos, and Vietnam divided at the 17th parallel between the Communist forces in the north and a non-Communist Vietnamese Government in the south.

Recognizing that the Communists had not abandoned their ambitions, the U.S. Government under President Eisenhower, took steps to secure the situation by further alliances. Bilateral treaties were concluded with the Republic of Korea and the Republic of China on Formosa. In the Middle East the so-called northern tier of countries lying to the south of the Soviet Union entered into the Baghdad Pact which established what is now known as CENTO—the Central Treaty Organization.

The United States did not become a formal member of this alliance which is composed of Great Britain, Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan. But we are closely associated with CENTO and have bilateral military assistance agreements with its regional members, concluded by the Eisenhower administration.

In order to give support to the nations of southeast Asia, the United States took the lead in the creation of an alliance embodied in a treaty and reinforced by a collective security system known as SEATO—the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. In this alliance, the United States joined with Great Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, Pakistan, and the Philippines to guarantee the security not only of the member nations but also to come to the aid of certain protocol states and territories if they so requested.

South Vietnam was included in this protocol. The United States had not been a party to the agreements made in Geneva in 1954, which France had concluded with the Communist Vietnamese forces known as the Viet Minh. But the Under Secretary of State, Walter Bedell Smith, stated under instructions that the United States would not disturb the agreements and "would view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the * * * agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security."

Under Secretary Smith's statement was only a unilateral declaration, but in joining SEATO the United States took a solemn treaty engagement of far-reaching effect. Article IV, paragraph 1, provides that "each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack * * * would endanger its own peace and safely, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes."

It is this fundamental SEATO obligation that has from the outset guided our actions in South Vietnam.

The language of this treaty is worth careful attention. The obligation it imposes is not only joint but several. The finding that an armed attack has occurred does not have to be made by a collective determination before the obligation of each member becomes operative. Nor does the treaty require a collective decision on actions to be taken to meet the common danger. If the United States determines that an armed attack has occurred against any nation to whom the protection of the treaty applies, then it is obligated "to act to meet the common danger" without regard to the views or actions of any other treaty member.

The far-reaching implications of this commitment were well understood by this committee when it recommended, with only the late Senator Langer dissenting, that the Senate consent to the ratification of the treaty. The committee's report states:

"The committee is not impervious to the risks which this treaty entails. It fully appreciates that acceptance of these additional obligations commits the United States to a course of action over a vast expanse of the Pacific. Yet these risks are consistent with our own highest interests. There are greater hazards in not advising a potential enemy of what he can expect of us, and in failing to disabuse him of assumptions which might lead to a miscalculation of our intentions."

Following this committee's recommendation, the Senate gave its advice and consent to the treaty by a vote of 82 to 1, the late Senator Langer dissenting. All members of this distinguished committee who were then Senators voted for that treaty.

Our multilateral engagement under the SEATO Treaty had been reinforced and amplified by a series of bilateral commitments and assurances directly to the Government of South Vietnam. On October 1, 1954, President Eisenhower wrote to President Diem offering "to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." In 1957, President Eisenhower and President Diem issued a joint statement which called attention to "the large buildup of Vietnamese Communist military forces in North Vietnam" and stated:

"Noting that the Republic of Vietnam is covered by article IV of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, President Eisenhower and President Ngo Dinh Diem agreed that aggression or subversion threatening the political independence of the Republic of Vietnam would be considered as endangering peace and stability."

On August 2, 1961, President Kennedy declared that "the United States is determined that the Republic of Vietnam shall not be lost to the Communists for lack of any support which the United States can render."

On December 14, 1961, President Kennedy wrote to President Diem, recalling the U.S. declaration made at the end of the Geneva Conference in 1954. The President once again stated that the United States was "prepared to help the Republic of Vietnam to protect its people and to preserve its independence." This commitment has been reaffirmed many times since.

These then are the commitments we have taken to protect South Vietnam as a part of protecting our own "peace and security." We have sent American forces to fight in the jungles of that beleaguered country because South Vietnam has, under the language of the SEATO Treaty, been the victim of "aggression by means of armed attack."

There can be no serious question as to the existence and nature of this aggression. The war is clearly an "armed attack," cynically and systematically mounted by the Hanoi regime against the people of South Vietnam.

The North Vietnamese regime has sought deliberately to confuse the issue by seeking to make its aggression appear an as indigenous revolt. But we should not be deceived by this subterfuge. It is a familiar Communist practice. Impeded in their efforts to extend their power by the use of classical forms of force such as the invasion of Korea, the Communists have, over many years, developed an elaborate doctrine for so-called "wars of national liberation" to cloak their aggressions in ambiguity.

A "war of national liberation," in the Communist lexicon, depends on the tactics of terror and sabotage, of stealth and subversion. It has a particular utility for them since it gives an advantage to a disciplined and ruthless minority, particularly in countries where the physical terrain makes clandestine infiltration relatively easy.

At the same time the Communists have a more subtle reason for favoring this type of aggression. It creates in any situation a sense of ambiguity that they can exploit to their own advantage.

Yet, in spite of Communist efforts to confuse the issue, the nature of the conflict in South Vietnam is very clear.

Let me review the facts.

With the benefit of hindsight no one can doubt that in agreeing to the 1954 accords, the regime in Hanoi fully expected that within a relatively short period the South Vietnamese would fall under their control. The south seemed overburdened with troubles. Its formidable economic problems were complicated by the need to absorb almost 1 million North Vietnamese, who—having seen the true face of communism—fled south after the 1954 accords. The north moreover had concealed resources in the south. At the time of the accords in 1954, many Communists fighting with the Vietminh had been directed by the Lao Dong Party in Hanoi to stay in the south, to hide their arms, and to devote their efforts to undermining the South Vietnamese Government. These efforts of subversion were in the initial years quite unsuccessful. Much to the dismay of the Hanoi regime South Vietnam made substantial progress in spite of the extraordinary problems it faced, while North Vietnam lagged far behind. As a consequence the Communist leaders in North Vietnam were forced to conclude that more active measures were necessary if the subversion of South Vietnam were to succeed.

During the 5 years following the Geneva Conference the Hanoi regime developed a secret political-military organization in South Vietnam based on the cadres who had been ordered to stay in the south. Many of the activities of this organization were directed toward the assassination of selected South Vietnamese civilians. More than 1,000 civilians were murdered or kidnaped from 1957 to 1959. In 1960 alone, terrorists assassinated 1,400 local government officials and kidnapped 700 others, while armed guerrillas killed 2,200 military and security personnel.

In September 1960, the Lao Dong Party—the Communist Party in North Vietnam—held its third party congress in Hanoi. That Congress called for the creation of a front organization to undertake the subversion of South Vietnam. Three months thereafter, the National Liberation Front was established to provide a political facade for the conduct of an active guerrilla war. Beginning in 1960 the Hanoi regime began to infiltrate into South Vietnam the disciplined adherents whom the party had ordered north at the time of the settlement. In the intervening period since 1954, these men had been trained in the arts of sabotage and subversion. Now they were ordered to conscript young men from the villages by force or persuasion and to form cadres around which guerrilla units could be built.

All of this was documented by the Legal Committee of the International Commission for Supervision and Control. That body, established to supervise the performance of the Vietnam cease-fire, is composed of Indian, Polish, and Canadian members. The Legal Committee, with Poland objecting, reported in 1962:

"There is evidence to show that arms, muntions, and other supplies have been sent from the zone in the north to the zone in the south with the objective of supporting, organizing, and carrying out hostile activities, including armed attacks, against the armed forces and administration of the zone in the south.

"There is evidence that the PAVN (i.e., the North Vietnamese Army), has allowed the zone in the north to be used for inciting, encouraging and supporting hostile activities in the zone in the south, aimed at the overthrow of the administration in the south."

In the 3-year period from 1959 to 1961, the North Vietnam regime infiltrated 10,000 men into the south. In 1962, 13,000 additional personnel were infiltrated. And by the end of 1964, North Vietnam may well have moved over 40,000 armed and unarmed guerrillas into South Vietnam.

Beginning over a year ago, the Communists apparently exhausted their reservoir of southerners who had gone north. Since then the greater number of men infiltrated into the south have been native-born North Vietnamese. Most recently, Hanoi has begun to infiltrate elements of the North Vietnamese Army in increasingly larger numbers. Today, there is evidence that nine regiments of regular North Vietnamese forces are fighting in organized units in the south.

I have reviewed these facts—which are familiar enough to most of you—because, it seems to me, they demonstrate beyond question that the war in Vietnam is as much an act of outside aggression as though the Hanoi regime had sent an army across the 17th parallel rather than infiltrating armed forces by stealth. This point is important since it goes to the heart of our own involvement. Much of the confusion about the struggle in South Vietnam has arisen over a failure to understand the nature of the conflict.

For if the war in South Vietnam were—as the Communists try to make it appear—merely an indigeonous revolt, then the United States would not have its own combat troops in South Vietnam. But the evidence is overwhelming that it is, in fact, something quite different—a systematic aggression by Hanoi against the people of South Vietnam. It is one further effort by a Communist regime in one-half of a divided country to take over the people of the other half at the point of a gun and against their will.

Up to this point I have tried to describe the nature of our commitments in South Vietnam and why we have made them. I have sought to put those commitments within the framework of our larger effort to prevent the Communists from upsetting the arrangements which have been the basis for our security. These policies have sometimes been attacked as static and sterile. It has been argued that they do not take account of the vast changes which have occurred in the world and are still in train.

These contentions seem to me to miss the point. The line of policy we are following involves far more than a defense of the status quo. It seeks rather to insure that degree of security which is necessary if change and progress are to take place through consent and not through coercion. Certainly—as has been frequently pointed out—the world of the mid-20th century is not standing still. Movement is occurring on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Communism today is no longer monolithic; it no longer wears one face but many, and the deep schism between the two great power centers of the Communist world—Moscow and Peiping—is clearly one of the major political facts of our time.

There has been substantial change and movement within the Soviet Union as well—and perhaps even more among the countries of Eastern Europe. These changes have not been inhibited because of our efforts to maintain our postwar arrangements by organizing the Western Alliance. They have taken place because of internal developments as well as because the Communist regime in Moscow has recognized that the Western Alliance cannot permit it to extend its dominion by force.

Over time the same processes hopefully will work in the Far East. Peiping—and the Communist states living under its shadow—must learn that they cannot redraw the boundaries of the world by force.

What we are pursuing, therefore, is not a static concept.

For unlike the Communists we really believe in social revolution and not merely in power cloaked as revolution. We believe in constructive change and encourage it. That was the meaning of President Johnson's initiatives at the Honolulu Conference—to encourage the efforts of the South Vietnamese Government to transform the country in a way that will correct ancient injustices and bring about a better life for all the people.

In meeting our commitments in South Vietnam we are using substantial military forces. At the same time, we are making it quite clear to North Vietnam and to the world that our forces are being employed for a limited and well-defined objective.

What we seek in South Vietnam is to bring about a restoration of the conditions contemplated by the accords of 1954. We seek, in other words, to restore the integrity of the settlement made between the French Government and the Communist forces under Ho Chi Minh—a settlement which was joined in by the United Kingdom, Communist China, the Soviet Union, Laos, and Cambodia. This settlement forms a part of the structure of arrangements that are the key to stability in the present-day world.

Unfortunately, the limited nature of our purpose is foreign to the philosophy of the Communist world.

It may be hard, therefore, for them to realize that the United States seeks no territorial aggrandizement in South Vietnam or anywhere in southeast Asia. We do not wish to maintain our troops in that area any longer than is necessary to secure the freedom of the South Vietnamese people. We want no permanent military bases, no trade advantages. We are not asking that the Government of South Vietnam ally itself with us or be in any way beholden to us. We wish only that the people of South Vietnam should have the right and the opportunity to determine their future in freedom without coercion or threat.

For months now we have done everything possible to make clear to the regime in Hanoi that a political solution is the proper course. If that regime were prepared to call off the aggression in the south, peace would come in almost in a matter of hours. When that occurred the people of North Vietnam could safely go about their business. For we do not seek to destroy the Hanoi regime or to force the people of North Vietnam to accept any other form of government. And—under conditions of peace—we would be quite prepared for the North Vietnamese people to share with the other peoples of southeast Asia in the economic and technical help that we and other nations are extending to that area.

This is the simple message that we have tried to convey to Hanoi through many channels. We have sought in every way to impress upon the Communist world the ease with which peace could be attained if only Hanoi were willing.

We have used every resource of diplomacy. I know of no occasion in history where so much effort has been devoted—not only on the part of the United States but of many other nations—in an effort to bring about a political solution to a costly and dangerous war. I know you are generally familiar with the record.

But to this point the sounds from the other side have been harsh and negative. The regime in Hanoi has been unwilling to accept any of the possibilities open to it for discussion. All we have heard is the constant insistence that they will not negotiate unless we accept in advance their four points. Yet, the effect of those four points, as propounded by Hanoi, would be to give away the very purposes for which we are fighting and to deliver the people of South Vietnam against their will to the domination of a Communist regime.

To understand the situation realistically, we should not underestimate the harshness of the Communist side or overestimate the ease of a political solution.

From time to time we have heard it suggested that we should seek a Geneva Conference or enlist the good offices of the Conference Cochairmen or take the problem to the United Nations or invite the mediation efforts of neutral nations.

Well, we have done all of these things, and in most cases we have done them repeatedly—with no result.

We heard it suggested also, by governments and individuals on both sides of the Iron Curtain, that no peace was possible so long as American planes were flying bombing missions over North Vietnam, but that negotiations might be possible if the bombing were discontinued.

We did that also—not once but twice. The last pause, as this committee will recall, lasted 37 days. And again with no response.

Certainly, we shall do everything consistent with our national objectives to seek a solution through diplomacy. There is no doubt as to the elements for an honorable peace as we see it. We have made them clear again and again. Most recently we have summarized them in the form of 14 points:

1. The Geneva Agreements of 1954 and 1962 are an adequate basis for peace in southeast Asia;
2. We would welcome a conference on southeast Asia or on any part thereof;
3. We would welcome "negotiations without preconditions" as the 17 nations put it;
4. We would welcome unconditional discussions as President Johnson put it;
5. A cessation of hostilities could be the first order of business at a conference or could be the subject of preliminary discussions;
6. Hanoi's four points could be discussed along with other points which others might wish to propose;
7. We want no U.S. bases in southeast Asia;
8. We do not desire to retain U.S. troops in South Vietnam after peace is assured;
9. We support free elections in South Vietnam to give the South Vietnamese a government of their own choice;
10. The question of reunification of Vietnam should be determined by the Vietnamese through their own free decision;
11. The countries of southeast Asia can be nonalined or neutral if that be their option;
12. We would much prefer to use our resources for the economic reconstruction of southeast Asia than in war. If there is peace, North Vietnam could participate in a regional effort to which we would be prepared to contribute at least $1 billion;
13. The President has said "the Vietcong would not have difficulty being represented and having their views represented if for a moment Hanoi decided she wanted to cease aggression. I don't think that would be an insurmountable problem";
14. We have said publicly and privately that we could stop the bombing of North Vietnam as a step toward peace although there has not been the slightest hint or suggestion from the other side as to what they would do if the bombing stopped.

These 14 points are on the public record. Our Government has made quite clear what kind of peace we are prepared to accept—a peace that will guarantee the security of South Vietnam, a peace that will stop armed aggression in violation of international agreements and international law.

This is the position that we have made known to the other side both directly and through intermediaries. How does this compare with the position of the Hanoi regime?

Both Hanoi and Peiping have repeatedly rejected our proposal for unconditional discussions. They have insisted instead that before any discussions can take place our side must agree in advance to the four points of Hanoi's program. The words that they have used have differed from formulation to formulation. Sometimes they have said their points are the "sole basis" for negotiations, sometimes "the most correct basis." But the effect is the same. What they are insisting upon is that we accept in advance their substantive position and then discuss only the ways in which it shall be given effect. The technique of demanding such substantive agreement in advance is a familiar Communist negotiating tactic. It does not mean that the basic points are open for discussion or that they can be loosely interpreted. It means just what it says.

We have subjected these four points to the most careful scrutiny. What do they reveal?

The first point calls for "recognition of the fundamental national rights of the Vietnamese people: sovereignty, independence, unity, and territorial integrity." This point also calls for the withdrawal of U.S. forces, dismantling of our military bases, and abolition of our military alliance with the Government of South Vietnam, "in strict conformity with the Geneva agreements."

The United States has made clear that we too are prepared to support a restoration of the provisions of the Geneva agreements and that we are prepared to withdraw our troops and dismantle military bases once there is compliance with the accords by all parties. We have said also that we would not expect or require a military alliance with a free South Vietnam.

The second point relates to the military clauses of the Geneva agreements, and these too, we could agree to under the conditions I have indicated.

The fourth point provides that the issue of peaceful reunification should be settled by the Vietnamese people without foreign intervention. This also we could accept if it be clearly understood that conditions must first be created both in the North and South that will make it possible for truly free elections to be held.

It is in the third point that the core of the Communist position is disclosed. That point provides that "The internal affairs of South Vietnam must be settled by the South Vietnamese people themselves in accordance with the program of the National Liberation Front."

To understand the significance of this point, it is necessary not only to examine what is meant by the "program of the National Liberation Front" but to explore somewhat further the character of the front itself and the purposes it serves in the tactics of the North Vietnamese regime.

Let us turn first to the front itself. Both Hanoi and Peiping have made clear again and again—and they have been joined in this by other Communist powers—that negotiations will be possible only when the United States recognizes the National Liberation Front as the "sole genuine representative of the entire South Vietnamese people."

What are the implications of this proposal and why are the Communists urging it so insistently?

The evidence is overwhelming that the National Liberation Front is exactly what its name implies—a Communist-front organization intended to give support to the deliberate fiction that the war in Vietnam is an indigenous revolt. The front is, as the facts make clear, an invention of the Communist Party of North Vietnam, to serve as a political cloak for its activities in the south.

As I have noted earlier, the front was created by the North Vietnamese Communist Party—the Lao Dong Party—in 1960, soon after North Viet Nam's military leader, General Giap, announced: "The north is the revolutionary base for the whole country." The individuals proclaimed as leaders of the front are not personalties widely known to the Vietnamese people, either in the north or in the south. To suggest that they represent the aspirations of the Vietnamese people is absurd. The significant fact is that at no time has any single individual of political significance in South Vietnam adhered to the front or to its policies. While some Vietnamese leaders and groups may differ among themselves on how the country is to be led, none of them differs on the fact that the front does not speak for them.

In 1961 Hanoi sought to strengthen the fiction of the front's indigenous origins by creating a seemingly independent Communist Party as the principal element of the front. It therefore established the People's Revolutionary Party. A secret Lao Dong circular dated December 7, 1961, advised party members that "The People's Revolutionary Party has only the appearance of an independent existence. Actually our party is nothing but the Lao Dong Party of Vietnam unified from north to south under the central executive committee of the party, the chief of which is President Ho * * * during these explanations, take care to keep this strictly secret, especially in South Vietnam, so that the enemy does not perceive our purpose."

The People's Revolutionary Party has not concealed its role in the front. It has frankly stated that it is the dominant element. On February 15, 1961, the Vietcong Committee for the South went even further, stating that in time the Communist Party would "act overtly to lead the revolution in South Vietnam." In other words, the Communists have told their followers that, at the proper moment, they would emerge from cover and cast off the disguise of the National Liberation Front.

And so the Communists have a clear purpose in insisting that we recognize the National Liberation Front as the sole representative of the South Vietnamese people. For them this is not a procedural question but a major question of substance. They insist on our recognition of the front as the sole spokesman for the people of South Vietnam since our acceptance of the front in that capacity would in effect mean our acceptance of the Communist position as to the indigenous nature of the conflict and thus our acceptance of a settlement on Hanoi's terms—which would mean delivering South Vietnam into the control of the Communist north.

In spite of these clear realities, we have not asserted nor do we assert an unreasoning attiude with regard to the front. The President said in his state of the Union message, "We will meet at any conference table, we will discuss any proposals—4 points, or 14, or 40—and we will consider the views of any group"—and that, of course, includes the front along with other groups.

To the extent then that the front has any validity as a representative of a group, the views of that group can be heard and the issue of the Liberation Front should, as the President has said, not prove "an insurmountable problem."

It remains a problem only because Hanoi insists on using it to establish its own substantive position—that the front represents the hopes and aspirations of the South Vietnamese people—and hence should control them.

The significance of this issue is clearly seen when one examines the so-called program of the National Liberation Front, as it was announced from Hanoi on January 29, 1961, and revised and amplified in a second publication on February 11 that same year. The first point of this program discloses the full Communist intention. It calls for the overthrow of the South Vietnamese Government in Saigon and the establishment of a coalition government from which the government in Saigon would be totally excluded.

In other words the Hanoi regime is demanding the following preconditions to which the United States must agree before the Communists will even condescend to negotiate:

First, that the South Vietnamese Government be overthrown;

Second, that the Liberation Front, the creature and agent of Hanoi, be accepted as the sole bargaining representative for the South Vietnamese people;

Third, that South Vietnam be put under the control of a coalition government formed by the Communists and from which the South Vietnamese Government would be excluded.

May I conclude, therefore, Mr. Chairman, with certain simple points which are at heart of the problem and at the heart of U.S. policy in South Vietnam.

1. The elementary fact is that there is an aggression in the form of an armed attack by North Vietnam against South Vietnam.
2. The United States has commitments to assist South Vietnam to repel this aggression.
3. Our commitments to South Vietnam were not taken in isolation but are a part of a systematic effort in the postwar period to assure a stable peace.
4. The issue in southeast Asia becomes worldwide because we must make clear that the United States keeps its word wherever it is pledged.
5. No nation is more interested in peace in southeast Asia or elsewhere than is the United States. If the armed attack against South Vietnam is brought to an end, peace can come very quickly. Every channel or forum for contact, discussion, or negotiation will remain active in order that no possibility for peace will be overlooked.

Statement of Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Retired

General Taylor. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the committee for your willingness to hear my views on the situation in South Vietnam. I am afraid that they will not be new to many of you since you have often heard me express them in the days when I was an official of the Government. I agree thoroughly with the motivating purposes of these hearings; namely, to analyze the reasons why we are involved in South Vietnam, the importance of this involvement and the effectiveness with which we are dealing with the resultant problems. If my personal views can assist in clarifying these points, I shall be most happy to present them.

For the purpose of providing a basis for our subsequent discussion, with your permission I would like to make a continuous statement which will undertake to answer three basic questions.

First, what are we doing in South Vietnam?

Secondly, how are we doing it?

And, finally, can we improve upon what we are doing?

A simple statement of what we are doing in South Vietnam is to say that we are engaged in a clash of purpose and interest with the militant wing of the Communist movement represented by Hanoi, the Vietcong, and Peiping. Opposing these Communist forces, in the front rank stand the Government and people of South Vietnam supported primarily by the United States but assisted in varying degree by some 30 other nations.

The purpose of the Hanoi camp is perfectly clear and has been since 1954. It is to absorb the 15,000,000 people of South Vietnam into a single Communist state under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh and his associates in Hanoi. In the course of accomplishing this basic purpose, the Communist leaders expect to undermine the position of the United States in Asia and to demonstrate the efficacy of the so-called war of liberation as a cheap, safe, and disavowable technique for the future expansion of militant Communism.

Our purpose is equally clear and easily defined. In his Baltimore speech of April 7, 1965, President Johnson did so in the following terms: "Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam and its freedom from attack. We want nothing for ourselves—only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way." This has been our basic objective since 1954. It has been pursued by three successive administrations and remains our basic objective today.

Like the Communists, we have secondary objectives derived from the basic one. We intend to show that the war of liberation, far from being cheap, safe, and disavowable is costly, dangerous, and doomed to failure. We must destroy the myth of its invincibility in order to protect the independence of many weak nations which are vulnerable targets for subversive aggression—to use the proper term for the war of liberation. We cannot leave while force and violence threaten them.

The question has been raised as to whether this clash of interests is really important to us. An easy and incomplete answer would be that it must be important to us since it is considered so important by the other side. Their leadership has made it quite clear that they regard South Vietnam as the testing ground for the war of liberation and that after its anticipated success there, it will be used widely about the world. Kosygin told Mr. Reston in his interview last December: "We believe that national liberation wars are just wars and they will continue as long as there is national oppression by imperialist powers." Before him, Khrushchev in January 1961, had the following to say: "Now a word about national liberation wars. The armed struggle by the Vietnamese people or the war of the Algerian people serve as the latest example of such wars. These are revolutionary wars. Such wars are not only admissible but inevitable. Can such wars flare up in the future? They can. The Communists fully support such just wars and march in the front rank with peoples waging liberation struggles." General Giap, the commander in chief of the North Vietnamese forces, has made the following comment: "South Vietnam is the model of the national liberation movement of our time. If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, then it can be defeated anywhere in the world." The Minister of Defense of Communist China, Marshal Lin Piao, in a long statement of policy in September 1965, described in detail how Mao Tse-tung expects to utilize the war of liberation to expand communism in Latin America, Africa, and Asia.

These testimonials show that, apart from the goal of imposing communism on 15 million South Vietnamese, the success of the war of liberation is in itself an important objective of the Communist leadership, on our side, we can understand the grave consequences of such a success for us. President Eisenhower in 1959 stressed the military importance of defending southeast Asia in the following terms. He said: "Strategically, South Vietnam's capture by the Communists would bring their power several hundred miles into a hitherto free region. The remaining countries of southeast Asia would be menaced by a great flanking movement. The loss of South Vietnam would set in motion a crumbling process which could as it progresses have grave consequences for the forces of freedom."

Now, this view has often been referred to as the "domino theory." I personally do not believe in such a theory if it means belief in a law of nature which requires the collapse of each neighboring state in an inevitable sequence, following a Communist victory in South Vietnam. However, I am deeply impressed with the probable effects worldwide, not necessarily in areas contiguous to South Vietnam, if the war of liberation scores a significant victory there. President Kennedy commented on this danger with moving eloquence: "The great battleground for the defense and expansion of freedom today is the southern half of the globe—Asia, Latin America, Africa and the Middle East—the lands of the people who harbor the greatest hopes. The enemies of freedom think they can destroy the hopes of the newer nations and they aim to do it before the end of this decade. This is a struggle of will and determination as much as one of force and violence. It is a battle for the conquest of the minds and souls as much as for the conquest of lives and territory. In such a struggle, we cannot fail to take sides."

Gentlemen, I think a simple answer to the question, what are we doing in South Vietnam, is to say that for more than a decade we have been taking sides in a cause in which we have a vital stake.

My second question was, How are we doing in the pursuit of our objectives in South Vietnam? Both sides in the struggle have over the years developed the current strategies which are now in confrontation.

During 1964 and 1965, the Hanoi leadership attempted to exploit the political turbulence which followed the fall of President Diem in November 1963. Greatly encouraged by the disorder which marked the political scene in Saigon, the Communist leadership made a massive effort to press on to victory. To meet the growing needs in military manpower, they began the infiltration of personnel of the North Vietnamese Army, first as individual replacements, later as formed tactical units. Utilizing this new strength, they intended to make the monsoon offensive of 1965 a major drive for significant military victories.

Concurrently, they increased the sabotage directed at the land communication system in South Vietnam for the purpose of hampering the distribution of commodities and thus adding to the economic stresses in the south.

Terrorism was stepped up and directed with added frequency at U.S. personnel and installations. They apparently hoped to be able to seize and hold politically important localities such as district and provincial capitals, to demoralize the Vietnamese people and Government, and to demonstrate to the United States that we were backing a cause which must inevitably fail.

Faced with this growing threat, the Vietnamese Government and our American officials were obliged to develop a counterstrategy to blunt and defeat the intensified efforts of our adversaries. It evolved out of the experience of the preceding months and years and assumed its full form with the critical decisions in 1965 to introduce U.S. ground forces and to initiate the bombing campaign against military targets in the north. Both of these courses of action had been under consideration at least since November 1961, when I presented my report to President Kennedy following a visit to Saigon to appraise the growing criticality of the situation there.

We did not take either action at that time but my report contained the following comment with regard to the possible necessity of using airpower against the source of the Vietcong support in North Vietnam. I quote: "While we feel that the program recommended represents those measures which should be taken now, I would not suggest that it is the final word. If the Hanoi decision is to continue the irregular war declared on South Vietnam in 1959 with continued infiltration and covert support of guerrilla bands in the territory of our ally, we will then have to decide whether to accept as legitimate the continued guidance, training, and support of a guerrilla war across an international boundary.

"Can we admit the establishment of the common law that the party attacked and his friends are denied the right to strike the source of the aggression after the fact that external aggression is clearly established?" By February 1965, it became clear that we could no longer tolerate this clandestine support from the immune sanctuary in North Vietnam which served as the external base for the Vietcong insurgency.

In brief, the strategy which we have been and are pursuing consists of four components. The first includes the many activities directed at increasing the effectiveness of our ground combat against the Vietcong and North Vietnamese units in South Vietnam. For this purpose, we have made the utmost efforts to increase the indigenous forces of South Vietnam always mindful that this is a Vietnamese war in which we should do only those things which the Vietnamese cannot do for themselves or cannot do in time to avert defeat.

From July 1964 to July 1965 the armed forces and police of South Vietnam were increased by some 140,000 trained men, a very creditable effort on the part of this small country where military leadership and administrative experience are inevitably in short supply. As of today, the overall military strength in South Vietnam is approaching 700,000, the largest military force in being among all of our allies, worldwide.

Encouraging though the results have been in increasing the Vietnamese strength, during the year cited, our intelligence authorities believed that the Vietcong increased their total strength by some 60,000. In other words, we are advancing at a rate only a little better than 2 to 1 in our favor.

Since history has shown that the Government forces successfully opposing a guerrilla insurgency in the past have required a much greater preponderance of strength, 10 to 1 or 12 to 1 for example, it was quite clear the Vietnamese could not raise forces fast enough to keep pace with the growing threat of the Vietcong in time. It was this sobering conclusion that led to the decision to introduce American ground forces with their unique mobility and massive firepower to compensate for the deficiency in Vietnamese strength. With such forces available, it was felt that the ratios of required strength cited above would lose much of their validity.

I am thoroughly, Mr. Chairman, aware of the concern of this committee over the growing requirement for American troops in South Vietnam. Is this an endless requirement in an open-ended war? I do not believe that anyone can give a completely satisfactory reply to this question but I can suggest the consideration of certain limiting factors which have a bearing on the matter.

First, on our side, we are not setting as an objective for our ground forces the occupation of all South Vietnam or the hunting down of the last armed guerrilla. We are in Vietnam to safeguard the people who are the real target of the enemy. Terrain has little meaning except insofar as it supports people. Thus the extent of control and protection of population is the true measure of progress rather than control of territory. By the former indicator we are not doing too badly.

Senator MANSFIELD estimates in his recent report that the Government controls about 60 percent of the population, the Vietcong about 22 percent, leaving 18 percent contested. When I left Saigon last July, those figures were 53, 25, 22 percent.

The point I wish to make is that when one expresses our military objective in terms of securing a high proportion of the population, the troop requirement loses some of its impression of open-endedness. Under this concept, the prime target of our U.S. forces becomes the mainline enemy units which constitute the greatest threat to population—not the entire guerrilla force wherever found.

Another limiting factor is the logistic difficulty of the Vietcong in supporting increased numbers of troops in combat. The combination of air attacks on their lines of supply and of increasing ground attacks on their units which must then consume supplies at an increased rate places some kind of ceiling on the forces they can maintain in South Vietnam.

I wish I knew exactly where that ceiling is but our basic data on Vietcong logistics are too uncertain to permit precision. But the point is that there are factors which tend to keep our troop requirement finite and limit the capability of Hanoi to support large numbers of additional forces in the south.

The second component of our strategy relates to the use of air power against military targets in North Vietnam. It is well to remind ourselves the reasons which impelled us to this decision. There were three which we recognized perfectly at the time of the decision and which remain valid today. The first was to give the people of South Vietnam the assurance for the first time of imposing a direct penalty on the source of the aggression. For 11 years they had suffered the depredations of the Vietcong without exacting any price from the country which provided the direction and support. The morale of the people and that of the armed forces in Vietnam received an inestimable lift from the decision to use the air forces of both our countries against military targets in the homeland of the enemy—a lift which has certainly contributed to sustaining their will to continue the fight.

The second reason for the decision was to use air power, insofar as it could be effective, to limit and render more difficult the infiltration of the men and supplies from North Vietnam to South Vietnam. It was perfectly clear from the start as it is clear today that air power would not be able to stop infiltration. We were quite sure, however, that it could impose a ceiling on the forces which could be sustained in combat in South Vietnam. I do not believe that anyone who has reflected on the effect of the destruction of bridges, ports, railyards, and similar facilities, and on the effect of the limitation of daylight movement on the roads throughout a large part of North Vietnam can avoid the conclusion that the air campaign has had an important effect in slowing down infiltration and in raising its price. A testimonial to its effectiveness was the feverish activity in North Vietnam during the bombing pause to repair bomb damage and to move transport in daylight.

The third reason for the decision to use our airpower was to provide a sobering reminder to the leaders in Hanoi that progressively they must pay a mounting price for the continuation of their support of the Vietcong insurgency.

In spite of their defiant statements of determination to endure these attacks forever, I for one know from experience that no one derives any enjoyment from receiving incoming shells and bombs day after day and I have no doubt that the warning message is getting through to the leadership of Hanoi. In a very real sense, the objective of our air campaign is to change the will of the enemy leadership.

We hope that, in due course, the combination of the Vietcong failure to win victory on the ground in South Vietnam and the effect of continued air attacks will present to the Hanoi leadership a situation so disadvantageous that they will decide that it is in their interest to halt their aggression, redefine their aims, and join with us in discussing ways and means of improving the lot of all Vietnam.

The third component of our current strategy includes all of those nonmilitary activities which are so important but which receive too little public attention. It is not that our leaders have been unaware of the importance of better government, better living conditions, and the promise of a better future for the people of this country. Unfortunately, lack of insecurity and governmental instability were for a long time factors limiting the effectiveness of the many programs for development and reconstruction. But now, with the growing military effectiveness of our forces on the ground and the slowly developing maturity of the civil leadership in Saigon and in the provinces, I hope that conditions will permit much greater progress than in the past in bringing the benefits of a comparatively normal life to this war-weary people.

As you know, the recent Honolulu Conference devoted most of its time to a consideration of these nonmilitary activities. If we are to leave a viable country after the end of the Vietcong insurgency, it is essential that we make progress even under the conditions of war in stabilizing the Government, the society, and the economy.

The fourth component of our strategy is that which relates to our political and diplomatic efforts to initiate the discussion of a peaceful settlement of this conflict.

The so-called peace offensive is so well known as to require no discussion at this time, as is also the discouraging lack of response from the other side.

I am obliged to feel that the Hanoi leadership is not yet convinced that it must mend its ways. Perhaps they still hope for some kind of military victory in the south. Certainly, they are not convinced that in some way the United States cannot be detached from the support of South Vietnam. They hope against hope that through international or domestic pressures our Government can be forced off course.

They have not forgotten that the Viet Minh won more in Paris than in Dienbienphu and believe that the Vietcong may be as fortunate in Washington. They doubt the will of the American public to continue the conflict indefinitely. In a contest of patience, they expect to win even though North Vietnam like the south has been constantly at war for over 20 years. Until it becomes perfectly clear to them that we are going to stay on course regardless of anything they can do, I am afraid we are not likely to see them at a conference table. Or if they come unconvinced of the inevitability of the failure of their present course, we can expect them to stall, delay, and maneuver just as they did at Panmunjom in Korea for over 2 years.

In summary, then, our four-point strategy consists of a complex but coherent package of measures designed to improve the effectiveness of our forces on the ground in South Vietnam, to exploit our air superiority by attacking military targets in North Vietnam, to stabilize the political, social and economic systems in South Vietnam and to seek an honorable negotiated settlement of the conflict.

It is limited as to objective, as to geographical scope, as to weapons and forces employed, and as to targets attacked.

All parts of it are interrelated; all parts are indispensable; we must be successful on all fronts. The key, I believe, is inexorable pressure at all points, directed at the will, the ability and the means of the Communist aggressors.

It is a fair question to ask, whether this is the best strategy to attain our basic objectives. I am the first to concede that we can and must do better in all four categories of our efforts and, unhappily, progress toward peaceful negotiations is a bilateral affair which can progress only with some cooperation from Hanoi. As you know, thus far that cooperation has been withheld.

Having conceded the need and possibility for improvement within the components of our current strategy, I must add in honesty that I know of no new strategic proposal which would serve as a better alternative to the one which I have described—that is, provided we do not sacrifice our basic objective. There are, of course, the two alternatives which we have always rejected and I hope will continue to reject—to withdraw and give up our basic objective or to widen the war by massive air attacks on the North Vietnamese or even on Chinese targets. These two courses of action appear so to contravene our national and international interests that I shall not take the time of the committee to discuss them here.

The only new proposal of which I am aware is the so-called holding strategy which, in its least extreme form, calls for a cessation of U.S. reinforcements and a limitation of military operations to those necessary for the security of our forces and for the maintenance of our military presence. On several occasions, I have expressed myself in opposition to such a course of action. To button up our troops in defensive positions and thus to the sacrifice of their unique attributes of mobility and fire power would constitute the abandonment of our allies on the battlefield and would assign a most inglorious mission to our troops who, for the present, have high morale and complete confidence in their ability to cope with the Vietcong in the field. The effect of such behavior on our Vietnamese allies could be disastrous. At a minimum, it would destroy all confidence in Vietnam in ultimate success and would encourage the timid and the wavering to turn to the Vietcong for protection and to the Liberation Front for political accommodation. Another serious result of such passivity would be the impossibility of obtaining honorable terms at any peace table.

The Communists are tough enough to deal with when one has the upper hand. They would never give us acceptable terms if the military situation reflected weakness on our part and a readiness to withdraw. Our only alternative would be to accept dishonorable terms or to continue to sit out the war indefinitely on a supine defensive. I can hardly see the American public or this Congress long supporting such a course of action. Thus, I am obliged to conclude that the so-called holding strategy is really not an alternative way of reaching our objective of an independent South Vietnam free from attack. We could never reach it on such a course. Rather than being a true alternative, it amounts to the modification and erosion of our basic objective and hence appears to me to be unacceptable.

In conclusion, I feel that our present strategy is the best that has been suggested and that it is important that we adhere to it, always striving to improve our performance within the confines of its general concept. Certainly, it is not without risks—but little of value in this world is accomplished without risk. It seems to me that the risks entailed are warranted by the importance of our stake in southeast Asia. Congress recognized this importance in the wording of the joint resolution of August 1964: "The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia." I subscribe to these words and believe that we should live by them and by the words of President Johnson when he said in regard to our commitment in South Vietnam: "We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, General Taylor.

IN TRIBUTE TO JAMES P. POPE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the late James P. Pope is remembered as a fine U.S. Senator from Idaho. But many do not realize that this public-spirited man went on to help to direct the Tennessee Valley Authority for many years, following his service in the Senate. Three newspapers of the Tennessee Valley paid editorial tribute to his work as TVA Administrator last month. I ask unanimous consent that the three editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean, Jan. 26, 1966]

HE LEAVENED THE TVA LOAF

The death of James P. Pope, for 14 years a member of the Tennessee Valley Authority Board, will recall for many in the Tennessee Valley the period in TVA's history when most of its great decisions were made.

The former U.S. Senator from Idaho was appointed to the TVA Board only a few months before the sale of Commonwealth & Southern properties to a partnership of Tennessee cities and the TVA.

Many thought after the Pope appointment that the late President Roosevelt simply was reserving a TVA Board seat as a sinecure for a lameduck Senator. But Mr. Pope proved to be an active, able Board member.

He played a sizable role in all the decisions, from buying out the power companies to planning the steam plants and obtaining congressional approval for them.

At a time when half a dozen bright young innovators were calling the signals, making the scores and grabbing TVA headlines, he was the quiet, effective linebacker who worked with the staff and made sure smaller chores were handled so well.

Most of the men who are running TVA today will recall with some tender feeling how Mr. Pope managed always to obtain spectacular achievements.

In an organization as large as TVA it is always the Jim Popes who provide the sound judgment and inspiration that leads to success. His stewardship as a TVA Board member is one of the big answers for those always asking how TVA manages to retain so many capable young men to fill top jobs as senior administrators retire and leave the Agency.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel, Jan. 25, 1966]

JAMES P. POPE

A cotton-picking champion in Louisiana who was elected U.S. Senator from Idaho, an advocate of the liberal money policies of the New Deal who was also an ardent conservationist, a youth who bicycled over Europe and later become a director of TVA—these are but some of the facets of the life of James Pinckney Pope.

Death has come to him at 81 and he will be remembered. For in this age of conformity few who follow him will live as varied a life or take part in as many civic and socially uplifting enterprises.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Jan. 28, 1966]

JAMES P. POPE

None in areas near or in Tennessee Valley Authority service districts should let pass the death of James P. Pope—not without saying a thank you in obituary.

Mr. Pope, a former Idaho Senator, was a member of the TVA Board of Directors from 1939 to 1953 by appointment of Franklin D. Roosevelt. That was a period when TVA did a very great deal to improve its operations and directly to benefit the peoples of Alabama's Tennessee Valley and other areas.

Mr. Pope had had a distinguished and even a brilliant career before such appointment. But in the TVA area generally he will be remembered as one who understood the authority and sought earnestly to benefit people through it.

WEATHER MODIFICATION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the State of South Dakota is not the most arid State in the Nation, nor does its economic development and population growth threaten it with serious water crisis as early as some other States with greater average rainfall.

South Dakotans have always lived with water stringency and with a consciousness that water limits our agricultural development and our economic growth. We have never had so much water that we regarded it as a free and inexhaustible resource as air was once universally regarded.

As a consequence of living always with "just enough," and often less than that, the recent scientific reports on weather modification have been of major interest in my State, as was the introduction of the weather modification bill, S. 2875, on which I joined with Senator CLINTON ANDERSON and other Senators.

Indicative of the interest in South Dakota in the proposal is the lead editorial which appeared in the Aberdeen, S. Dak., American-News on February 8. I ask unanimous consent that it appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPROVED WEATHER WOULD AID SOUTH DAKOTA

South Dakotans, who remember the pioneering work accomplished by the late Senator Francis Case, of this State, in weather modification, are happy that Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN is active in the same field.

Senator MCGOVERN and Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, have introduced a bill to encourage weather modification research. They were both reared in South Dakota where rainfall is sometimes short and hail storms are a threat to crops and property.

The Anderson-McGovern proposal is a congressional response to 2 top scientific panel reports recommending accelerated weather modification studies, one by a group of 11 top atmospheric scientists for the National Science Foundation and the other by a similar panel of 14 scientists for the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council.

Although some scientists have in the past disputed the scientific validity of weather modification efforts, the two panels, in their separate reports, unanimously agree that there is now valid and significant scientific basis for claims to increased rainfall and had suppression resulting from cloud seeding. The Science Foundation panel said these results included indication that rainfall had been increased as much as 10 to 20 percent over an area as large as 1,000 square miles.

The two panels recommended a sixfold to tenfold increase in the Federal Government's present $5 million annual expenditures on weather modification studies.

The Anderson-McGovern bill is based on recommendations made to the two Senators by a panel of seven scientists, who assembled at their request, a specific research program. The group's study of equipment necessary to conduct adequate weather modification studies, including specially equipped airplanes, special radar installations, and a computer several times larger than any yet built, are the basis for the first 3-year funding estimates.

The bill puts direction of the program, in which many governmental agencies will participate, in the Department of Interior.

The Bureau of Reclamation, which is under the supervision of Assistant Interior Secretary Kenneth Holum, of South Dakota, is now supporting weather modification research in the upper Great Plains area at South Dakota School of Mines in Rapid City.

SENATOR LEE METCALF—"LIBERAL IN A DISTINGUISHED TRADITION"

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the December 1965 issue of Agenda, published by the AFL–CIO contains a penetrating analysis of one of our outstanding colleagues, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf].

It gives me much pleasure to bring this article to the attention of the Senate. Lee Metcalf deserves overwhelming support in his home State because he has a remarkably fine record of work, not only on behalf of Montana, but of the entire Nation.

His record in the fields of education, conservation, and the wise management and highest possible use of our natural resources, is superb. Lee Metcalf has indicated on many occasions that one of our greatest natural resources is the youth of our Nation. I certainly endorse and reaffirm what is said in the Agenda article to the effect that he can aptly be described as "Mr. Education."

It is with much satisfaction and pleasure that I ask unanimous consent that the Agenda article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Among the 34 Senate seats at stake in 1966 is that of Senator Lee Metcalf, of Montana, a State where political campaigns are hard fought and where the real issues are sometimes obscured in personal mudslinging.

Even after the Goldwater debacle of 1964, Montana ultraconservatives are well heeled and firmly entrenched in the Republican Party and preparing for a last ditch stand. They are after Lee Metcalf's Senate seat.

Despite the emotionalism of its political contests, Montana has a history of outstanding liberal Senators. Montanans have elected such giants of the present as Majority Leader Mike Mansfield and such giants of the past as Thomas J. Walsh, hero of the Teapot Dome and Elk Hills oil exposés; Burton K. Wheeler, father of the Public Utility Holding Company Act, which helped smash the Insull empire, a perfect piece of legislation, which has never been amended since it was passed in 1935; and the late James E. Murray, the dynamic early sponsor of such milestone legislation as medicare and general Federal aid to education.

Murray died in 1961. He left his work in the hands of his colleague, Senator Metcalf, whose persistence was rewarded by the final passage of medicare and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act this year.

Political campaigning in Montana presents some purely physical problems because of the distances involved. The State's 705,000 inhabitants are scattered over 146,000 square miles. But Metcalf is an enthusiastic and experienced campaigner.

Except for his years in private law practice and in the armed service during World War II, he has spent his entire life in public service in all three branches of Government—legislative, executive, and judicial.

The same year he was graduated from law school, he was elected to the State legislature. Montana's attorney general was impressed by the young legislator and persuaded him to accept a position in the attorney general's office. After distinguished military service, first as a combat soldier and then in helping set up a provisional government for Germany after the surrender, Metcalf returned home to Montana.

He served 6 years on Montana's Supreme Court, where he wrote some opinions which have become models for law students and are included in standard case books in many law schools. He was elected to the House of Representatives for four terms before his election in 1960 to the Senate.

Metcalf will have the help of two able assistants during this campaign.

The first is his charming wife Donna, who has always shared the Senator's political life as well as his private life.

The second is Montana's senior Senator, Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, who intends to cover Montana working for Metcalf's reelection.

Mansfield, whose gentle persuasion and political know-how guided the 89th Congress to a remarkable record of achievement this year, recently told an interviewer, "I feel fortunate to have as a colleague a man of the caliber, the integrity, and the ability of Lee Metcalf, who has done so much for the people of our State and Nation."

Born in a State rich in natural resources and beauty. Senator Metcalf has fought long and effectively for conservation. He has been cited for his service to the cause by the five national conservation groups: the National Wildlife Federation, National Parks Association, Izaak Walton League of America, Wilderness Society, and the Wild Life Management Institute.

He is a member of the U.S. Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, which includes three Cabinet officers: the Secretaries of Interior, Commerce, and Agriculture.

The commission passes on proposed additions to our national water fowl refuge system, financed by sale of duck stamps to duck hunters. He has introduced and supported legislation to clean up our air and water, and to set aside certain areas to be maintained as wilderness for this and future generations.

But it is America's children which Senator Metcalf considers our "most precious natural resource." Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon, chairman of the Senate Education Subcommittee, has dubbed Metcalf "Mr. Education," a nickname the Senator wears with pride.

"Education," he has said, "is a national problem. The National Government must act to meet it. We must permit every American child to receive the kind of education which will produce the skills a growing America desperately needs."

The Murray-Metcalf bill of the 1950s was a milestone proposal for general Federal aid to education. Its successor was enacted this year in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. By a happy coincidence, the honor of signing the historic legislation went to Senator Metcalf as Acting President pro tempore.

The voters of Montana will consider the Senator's record when they go to the polls, but Metcalf himself is more interested in the unfinished business which still lies ahead.

This year the Senator launched an all-out attack on abuses in the electric power industry. Although the cost of furnishing electricity is declining rapidly, the price paid by consumers is not.

"Many of the big companies make a return on common stock of more than 15 percent a year, some more than 20 percent," Metcalf points out. "Stock option plans—under which company officials can buy stock for as little as one-fourth its price to ordinary stockholders—are quietly spreading throughout the industry."

Metcalf notes that one company official has made a windfall profit of $370,000 in one transaction and others have done almost as well. This September Metcalf introduced legislation to provide Federal, as well as State, regulation of utility stock option plans to try to close the loophole through which these tremendous profits flow. The fight has begun and the Senator is eager to see it through.

Metcalf is a member of four Senate committees—Interior and Insular Affairs, Public Works, Government Operations, and the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. He serves on 11 subcommittees, 2 of which he chairs. The joint committee was added to his assignments this year in a field long of interest to Metcalf.

All of organized labor has been keenly interested in the proposal to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits States to prohibit management and labor from freely negotiating a union shop contract. Such a contract requires membership in the union, chosen by a majority of the employees to speak for them, as a condition of continued employment. On repeal, Senator Metcalf takes this position:

"Repeal of 14(b) will not, in itself, create a single new union shop agreement. Repeal will mean less compulsion, not more compulsion. It will permit workers and employers to agree on what degree of union security is appropriate for their establishment. It will do away with the compulsory open shop; it will not create a compulsory union shop."

Metcalf bills include those to increase unemployment compensation and to increase the minimum wage and extend its coverage. Companion legislation to that introduced by Senator Metcalf and enacted into law includes measures to stabilize the domestic mining industry and to study our Nation's fuel resources and needs.

Our farm problems provide another continuing source of interest to the Senator who has made agriculture one of his specialties. Metcalf feels strongly that "we should use our God-given resources to feed all the hungry people we can—to end want in the world. I hope to see America's export markets grow. * * *"

Any listing of Senator Metcalf's interests must lead back to his first and most basic interest—his concern for people. It is for the people of America that he believes our Government must concern itself with the conservation, wise management, orderly development and highest possible use of our natural resources; with education so that our children may learn the skills they will need; with utility regulation so that all the people may benefit from our national inventiveness.

As he has so many times in the past, Senator METCALF stands ready to accept the challenge of another rugged campaign—and continued service to his State and Nation.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE SYSTEM

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, last May I introduced in the Senate S. 1991, the administration's proposals for updating and improving the unemployment insurance system. A number of Democratic and Republican Senators joined as sponsors of the measure, which has been referred to the Committee on Finance. At the same time a companion bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

The Social Security Act of 1935 provided the authority for the Federal-State system of unemployment insurance. During the past 30 years the Congress has made a number of significant adjustments in other social security programs, but there has been no substantial change in the Federal unemployment insurance program. The individual States, of course, have adjusted their supplemental programs somewhat; nevertheless, the need exists to bring the Federal law into line with current economic conditions.

In 1958, as a Member of the House of Representatives, I introduced a companion bill to one proposed in the Senate by the then Senator John F. Kennedy, providing for a constructive revision and improvement of the unemployment insurance system. In each succeeding Congress, similar legislation has been proposed.

The inadequacies of the existing program are reflected by the fact that on two occasions, in 1958 and again in 1961, the Congress has had to provide temporary unemployment compensation to provide benefits for the long-term unemployed and to otherwise assist the State systems.

In part unemployment is a national problem, and there is a national responsibility to provide some protection for the long-term unemployed whose difficulties are related to national policies and trends. Today, under the Federal unemployment insurance law the wage base subject to the Federal tax remains at $3,000. If that was a realistic base in the 1930's, it certainly is not adequate today. The proposal in S. 1991 and H.R. 8282 is to raise the wage base subject to tax to $6,600.

Unfortunately, some States have low unemployment insurance taxes as an incentive to new business to locate in the State. This means that the amount and duration of benefits to workers in these States are limited. The proposed legislation will provide a floor for such benefits which, while still recognizing differences in the economy from State to State, would prevent competitive pressures from depriving employees of minimum insurance protection.

Many Americans are still working in occupations which are not covered by the unemployment insurance system. They need and deserve this protection which is available to the majority of employees in the economy. S. 1991 and H.R. 8282 would extend coverage to an additional 4.5 million employees.

The Ways and Means Committee has not as yet reported a bill for consideration by the House. The Senate Finance Committee has not held hearings. Undoubtedly we will make some changes and adjustments in the administration proposal in the light of the testimony given. But in my opinion there is no question about the urgent need for revision and improvement of the existing law or about the Federal responsibility to take some action to meet the problems of the long-term unemployed.

Because this is true, I should like to make a few comments about an article which appeared in the February issue of the Reader's Digest, "New Grab for Federal Power: Unemployment Benefits," by Earl and Ann Selby.

The Reader's Digest article is highly critical of the bill which Representative Mills and I have introduced.

The article contains a number of inaccuracies and misstatements about the bill. In the interest of a fair appraisal of the bill these mistakes should be pointed out.

I have taken a number of examples—and I should like to mention that I have consulted with Department of Labor officials on the facts and data—and would like to comment briefly on them at this time.

First. The article characterizes the bill as "a shocking grab for Federal power" and "nothing less than total revolution in our system for giving benefits to the unemployed." It continues:

> Historically we have always let each State lay down its own rules for dispensing such compensation. H.R. 8282 invests this vast power in the Federal Government; Washington would set the standards * * * although the new bill does not say that the States must adopt its standards, certain tax penalties would be imposed on employers in any State that did not meet every standard in 8282.

Mr. President, this bill is not a grab for Federal power. It might better be called a reluctant and long-overdue response to Federal obligations in this area. In any case the unemployment insurance system was not created by the States but by the taxing power of Congress when it passed the Social Security Act of 1935. The same taxing authority would be used under the bill to secure needed improvements in State laws.

There have always been certain standards in the Federal law which the States must meet if employers in that State are to receive a 90-percent credit against the Federal tax. The bill would provide some additional standards that State laws must meet to qualify in the future for the full 90-percent credit. Technically, the bill imposes no penalties; rather, it contains provisions for eligibility for tax credits.

Second. The article would lead the reader to believe that State administration of the program would be undermined by the bill and that persons would improperly receive benefits. It states:

> H.R. 8282, if adopted, would be an open invitation to flagrant cheating * * * it could make it easier for people to cheat in collecting benefits, and more difficult to punish the cheaters.

The bill in no way limits a State's ability to detect, prosecute, and obtain criminal convictions for fraud, nor does it affect in any way such provisions in existing State laws. In addition, H.R. 8282 allows for a benefit disqualification for fraud up to 3 years, which is a more severe penalty than most States now impose.

On the positive side, the bill would strengthen administration of the system by providing for training State personnel so they will be better equipped to prevent fraud, to more properly apply eligibility and disqualification provisions of State laws, and to insure that payments go only to qualified and eligible unemployed workers.

Third. The authors imply that States would not be able to determine who would be entitled to benefits. They state specifically that—

> H.R. 8282 would relax many of the present laws on the eligibility requirements.

And that—

> The bill would put pressure on the States to surrender their traditional rights to determine who should get jobless pay.

Further:

> In addition, H.R. 8282 would liberalize the ground rules for determining who's in or out of this benefit bonanza. It would open the floodgates for untold thousands of claims now outlawed by State statutes.

Under the bill all decisions as to whether a claimant gets benefits will be made, as at present, by State authorities. It is not true that H.R. 8282 would "relax many of the State laws on eligibility requirements." Each State would be free to decide what amount of time a person has to work in order to get benefits, with an overall maximum of 20 weeks, which only two States now exceed. Many States now require substantially less, and most States would have ample room to tighten their present provision if they chose to do so.

Fourth. The article claims that—

> Many abuses would get the sanction of law if the bill is adopted. For instance:
>
> Workers who voluntarily quit their jobs for any reason, including just plain laziness, could still get benefits.
>
> Even most employees dismissed for outright misconduct could get compensation.
>
> Any jobless person offered a new job with both suitable wages and working conditions could turn it down—and still get compensation.

H.R. 8282 does not require any State to pay benefits to any individual worker unless he is available for work, seeking work and willing to work, and further:

It provides that workers who quit jobs without good cause could be denied benefits for 7 weeks, a longer period than many States now provide;

it provides that employees dismissed for misconduct could be denied benefits for 7 weeks, a longer period than many State laws now provide;

it provides that claimants refusing suitable jobs without good cause could be denied benefits for 7 weeks, a longer period than many State laws now provide. Even after 7 weeks, the disqualified worker will not receive benefits unless he is available for and seeking work, is willing to accept suitable work, and is eligible in all other respects.

Fifth. The authors state:

> Millions of workers would be able to take a year's "vacation" by quitting their jobs and collecting benefits at half their pay. After that, with just one more day's work, the job shirker could be eligible for a further 26-week round of benefits at half pay.

The bill does not require or contemplate the payment of benefits to any worker on "vacation." It requires payment only to workers with substantial past employment, and it contains no provision that "1 day's work" qualifies an individual for benefits.

Sixth. The articles states:

> In some States, certain older workers could actually make more money—for a time—by retiring early and adding tax-free unemployment compensation to their company pensions and social security benefits.

H.R. 8282 contains no proposal relating to older workers or those receiving pensions. Whatever effect there would be on the eligibility and benefits of older workers would be attributable only to provisions in State laws.

Seventh. The article attempts to discredit the proposed legislation by suggesting that certain persons could be entitled to benefits on the basis of very limited work history. The article states:

> To be eligible for the first 26 weeks of benefits, the new bill says a claimant must have worked 20 weeks "or the equivalent." Here is where the fancy footwork comes in.

It is true that the present provisions of State laws can be met occasionally by a person with an unusual work record of limited duration.

In establishing the qualifying requirements in State laws, State legislatures obviously have discounted the likelihood or frequency of such unusual situations, and similar standards in H.R. 8282 are merely adapted to existing State statutes. The bill is drafted in terms of equivalents in order to accommodate the States basic types of systems for determining benefit entitlement. It is an effort to avoid trying to substitute a uniform Federal formula for the individual State approaches.

The article goes on to cite three examples:

First—

> In 36 States a claimant being paid the statewide weekly average could satisfy the definition of equivalency by working only 5 weeks in a year, provided no more than 3 were in one quarter.

Under present laws in 21 States, he could now meet the qualifying requirements for benefits and in 39 States he could do so by working 5 weeks for somewhat higher than average wages.

Second. The article cites another example:

> Many part-time workers could satisfy the requirement by working only 2 days a week for 20 weeks.

This would satisfy present qualifying requirements in 12 States, 6 of which require less than 20 weeks.

Third. The authors state:

> A well-paid entertainer could satisfy all the requirements by working 1 day in one quarter of the year and 1 day in another.

This could meet present qualifying requirements in 40 States. For example, under the present Illinois law to be eligible a person must earn a total of $800 in his base period, with $175 in a quarter other than his high quarter. The entertainer could meet this requirement by earning $600 for 1 day's work and $200 for another day in a different quarter.

The point is that these are theoretical or at best most unlikely possibilities. The individual States all have separate laws, and H.R. 8282 is designed to respect their differences. If any real abuses exist or develop on eligibility requirements of this kind, it is the responsibility of the State legislatures to make appropriate adjustments.

Eighth. The authors think the benefits would be too liberal:

> Weekly compensation checks for many unemployed would double or more.

Under the bill there would no immediate doubling of any claimant's weekly payment. By 1971 when the new maximum of two-thirds the statewide average weekly wage becomes effective, it could happen for some claimants in two States—Alaska and Oklahoma—where the present basic maximum is as low as one-third of the average weekly wage for all workers. However, in no circumstances would a claimant receive compensation of more than half his own weekly wage as a result of H.R. 8282.

Ninth. The article implies the proposed bill would provide too large a payment:

> At present, all States put a ceiling on weekly benefit checks. Alaska's top, for example, is $45. Under the new bill that State, by 1971, would have a maximum of $110 weekly, by the Labor Department estimate.

The fact is that the bill does not require that any worker in Alaska or in any other State receive more than half-pay. It would not require that any individual be paid the $110 maximum unless his own regular weekly pay was $220 or more.

Tenth. Another misleading generalization in the article is this:

> Such largess could further encourage a growing class in America—the voluntarily unemployed. Why keep on working, when it would be so easy to collect pay for not working?

The right to receive unemployment insurance benefits, of course, can only be earned by working. Eligibility to continue to receive benefits can be maintained by an unemployed person only if he is seeking work. The benefits are actually one-half or less of what the individual earned while working.

Eleventh. The authors worry that "the benefit provisions involved would probably cost billions of dollars more" and that this would be "on top of the billions we are already spending on unemployment compensation."

This statement creates a false impression about both the present and the prospective costs. The benefits under State laws in 1965 totaled about $2.2 billion. The proposed improvements would have added less than another half billion dollars. Of course the state of the economy influences the extent to which unemployment benefits are paid. In recent months about 1 million persons filed claims weekly, but in 1961 more than 2¼ million did so. However, only in 1958 and 1961 have benefits costs reached the $3 billion level.

Twelfth. The article states:

> Employers * * * would be saddled with an estimated increase of 60 percent or more in payroll taxes.

The article continues by saying that the Federal portion would "skyrocket" and the State taxes jump "astronomically."

The possible additional costs are very much overstated. Through the years unemployment compensation protection has been provided at bargain rates. In 1964 and in 1965 the combination of State and Federal taxes averaged about 1½ cents per payroll dollar. If H.R. 8282 had been in full effect, the cost would have been about 2 cents per payroll dollar.

Thirteenth. Finally the authors, having deplored the Federal assumption of authority, raise a question about the provision of H.R. 8282 which would return to the States the authority to set employer tax rates.

The article states:

> All States now have a system for a sliding scale of taxes on employers. In most States an "experience rating" is kept for each company, to record how many compensation claims are filed by its former employees.

The article continues:

> H.R. 8282 does not go the whole way. * * * It would not abolish the experience-rating system, but it would make it possible to abolish experience rating with considerable ease. Under the provisions of the new bill, employers with a high labor turnover doubtless would join with the unions in pressuring their legislatures for uniform taxation of all employers.

H.R. 8282 does return to State legislatures full control of their right to regulate State taxation and it does remove an existing Federal restriction in this area. The provision permits each State to retain its present experience-rating system if the State legislature wishes to do so or to make such adjustment as it believes desirable to meet the conditions of the State. The desirability of extending this freedom to the States can be debated, but the intention is to remove, not extend, Federal restrictions.

Mr. President, the committees and the Congress will give careful attention to all of the proposed changes and also to alternatives. We may make adjustments and compromises. Whatever action we take in this session—and I am hopeful that in the 89th Congress we will deal with this long-neglected area—will be based on facts about existing law, the needs for change, and careful estimates on the effects of changes.

INTEGRATION NOT SEGREGATION OF OUR ALASKAN NATIVES SHOULD BE OUR POLICY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in the education of our youth in Alaska, we face some unique problems. The very size of our State, the vast distances between our cities and towns, the isolation of some of our villages, compounds the difficulties normally met in the educative process and makes the operation of our schools vastly more expensive than in other States. About one fourth of our citizens are Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts, who for the most part, occupy the undeveloped portions of Alaska. When Alaska was purchased from Russia, relatively little attention was given to the education of our Alaskan natives by the United States. Late in the 19th century, the Bureau of Indian Affairs began building and operating schools to educate our aboriginal inhabitants and continues to do so to this day.

The BIA in Alaska is in this business of education in a big way. It operates some 83 schools in the villages of Alaska. Twenty-two other village schools operated by the State of Alaska receive financial and technical assistance from the BIA. These village schools are normally elementary schools. As the cost of operating high schools in these sites would be prohibitive, how then do our native youth achieve a high school education? Many of them do not. Following the war, the BIA took over a naval facility at Sitka and converted it into Mount Edgecumbe High School. The children seeking secondary education must apply for and be accepted at Mount Edgecumbe. In the fall, an airlift is conducted throughout the State, flying our native youth down to Mount Edgecumbe where the children remain for the academic year. In the spring, the process is reversed and the children return to their villages for the summer. Unfortunately, Mount Edgecumbe is not large enough to accommodate all of our native youth seeking a secondary education.

In 1961, arrangements were made to transport part of this overflow to the Indian school at Chemawa, Oreg. Around 700 of our youth are attending that school now. In addition, 800 children do not attend high school simply because there is no place for them to go. This is not right, and it is grossly unfair to our native youth. How many American families would tolerate such an arrangement for the education of their children? How many of us would be willing to send our 12- or 13-year-old youngsters 2,000 miles away for 9 months of the year? But within this situation, incredible as it may seem to those of us who are more accustomed to sending our children to a high school only a few blocks away, lies a deeper and more profound problem. This school system operated by the BIA is largely a segregated system. In many instances, this de facto segregation will continue for many years to come, largely because the population of many a village is all native. But in other instances, and I speak now of boarding school children of high school age, there is no excuse for continuing the de facto segregation.

Last July, I wrote Commissioner Philleo Nash asserting that these schools were segregated and that the situation must be remedied as soon as possible. In his reply to me, which was 5 months in coming, he went to great lengths to point out that the Bureau was operating in this manner to fulfill the unique needs of our native youth. He spoke of cultural differences and cited the high rate of failure when native youths were thrust into normal comprehensive high schools. He ignored completely the obvious premise that in this paternalistic approach to fulfill unique educational needs, the Bureau is perpetuating the dependence of the natives on the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

For the most part, the BIA has done a good job in Alaska. Its personnel are preponderantly dedicated public servants. I know many who work long hours unstintingly. It undertook the difficult task of educating the natives when no other agency could or would assume this responsibility. Its attitude has been one of benevolence and paternalism. It has protected the natives from exploitation by those who would have taken advantage of them. This is as it should be. But in its actions, it demonstrates its fundamental belief that only the Bureau can do the job. One of the stated objectives of the Bureau is the development "of programs leading toward full-fledged Indian responsibility for the management of their own property and affairs and the gradual transfer of public service responsibilities from the BIA to agencies which normally provide these services." In meeting this objective, the Bureau has failed miserably. Its program of turning over a few of its schools to the State of Alaska is an excellent example, but it has not gone far enough. In some 80 years of operation, only 22 schools have been turned over to the State. The Bureau still operates 83 and continues to construct others. This whole process of Indian education is inherently wrong because of the de facto segregation practiced by the Bureau. The native should be educated in the public schools and mix with his culturally different brothers. Integration should be the objective.

Paternalism and benevolence were the arguments advanced by the South in holding the Negro in subjugation for a century. These arguments claimed that the Negro was lacking in ability and that to thrust him into an equal status would set him up for exploitation—that the Southerners were the only ones that understood the unique problems of the Negro and that they could best meet his needs by keeping him in segregated facilities where he would be able to achieve success by competing with other Negroes.

There is and has always been, of course, a profound difference in the general attitudes of whites in the South toward the Negro—the long-time slave. Racial prejudice there against the colored with some praiseworthy exceptions has been constant and bitter. Current events in certain Southern States have demonstrated that tragically and conclusively. That has never been the attitude of Alaskan whites toward the natives in Alaska, although there long was a degree of racial prejudice and social discrimination among some Alaskans. It was described in fiction form in Rex Beach's novel "The Barrier." It was demonstrable when I came to Alaska as Governor in 1939 by occasional signs in public places, such as "No Natives Allowed" or "We Do Not Cater to Native Trade." These were abolished, at my instance, when I was Governor, by the 1945 legislature, after such necessary legislation had been defeated on my first attempt to rectify this situation legislatively by a tie vote in the 1943 Territorial House of Representatives. The legislation made such discrimination illegal and punishable. Since that time there has been no such discrimination and if it were to show itself the remedy by law is available. I was able to induce Indians and Eskimos to run for the Alaska Legislature. They have done so—been elected and have served admirably. But there still is an economic and social gap between the whites and natives which must be closed. Education—the training of native youngsters so as to equip them for equality of opportunity—is essential. That is the issue now before us.

The argument long advanced by the Bureau of Indian Affairs clearly implied its view of a degree of inability or lack of capacity in the native people. The Bureau has taken the position, hitherto, that it is the only agency that understands and knows how to deal with the unique needs of our Eskimo and Indian youth.

The Supreme Court has ruled that separate facilities are inherently unequal. This is as true in Alaska as it is in the Deep South or wherever segregated facilities might exist.

Recently, citizens of Alaska have attempted to solve some of these problems. Because high schools cannot be established in every village, it has been suggested that regional dormitories be constructed in the large cities and towns so our native children would have the opportunity to receive a public education at a place reasonably close to their home. This should be done.

The Secretary of the Interior has informed me that a new Commissioner will soon be appointed for the Bureau, a man I know personally and for whom I have high regard. We have discussed this and related problems. The new Commissioner will be a man who is deeply interested in the welfare and education of our Alaskan youth. He is aware of the difficulties involved and his task will not be easy, partly because he will be dealing with an entrenched bureaucracy that has not followed its stated objectives but continues to grow and perpetuate itself. A change of policy and performance is overdue.

Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Juneau Alaska Empire be printed in the RECORD. This editorial spells out in detail the need for dormitories at regional high schools for the housing of our native youth, and other children who may be located in an area without a high school. It also reviews in detail the problems of segregation in Alaska education.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Juneau (Alaska) Empire, Feb. 14, 1966]

BIA AND SCHOOLS

The Bureau of Indian Affairs, it seems, is balking on putting up dormitories at projected regional high schools as a means of housing children from the bush.

The reason, we are told, is that the BIA doesn't want to have the white children live with the Eskimo and Indian children.

We see nothing wrong with white children and native children mingling. They do in our schools. Why not in dormitory life?

If schools are desegregated, then why not the dormitories?

The dormitory problem seems to be the principal stumbling block in the way of the regional schools. We are sure that if the BIA would drop some of its stuffy ways, this program which would offer education to all the children could go ahead quickly.

But the BIA appears to be interested in keeping the children apart, rather than giving them the benefit of better understanding of each other's culture.

White children of teachers at Mount Edgecumbe attend classes with the native children. And that's a BIA program.

It appears to us that the BIA really hasn't a foot to stand on.

What really worries the BIA, according to our informants, is that it would lose the full control of the children and therefore some of its growing powers over the lives of native Alaskans.

What the BIA ought to do is get out of the school business and allow the State to take over entirely. To do this would be to give each child an equal educational opportunity.

The BIA could then turn over to the State the huge amounts of funds it has to spend on schooling. The State is in a better position to expend these funds properly.

But the BIA is a bureaucratic monster. Its tentacles reach into almost every area of Alaskan life. The BIA is about as good for modern Alaska as a model T Ford. In short, it is outdated, it is shortsighted, it is a fumbling, bureaucratic bear, at least as far as its school program is concerned.

Alaska needs the regional high schools so that all children from remote areas may have a proper education closer to their homes. But Alaska cannot carry the full burden that construction of dormitories would require.

Alaska needs the financial aid of the BIA but it doesn't need its interference.

Granted there are areas where the BIA can be a useful arm of the Federal Government. It has done well in schools back over the years. But it is no longer needed in the Alaska school picture.

The BIA should turn its bundle of "green" over to the State, then silently roll up its collective tent and hurriedly steal away.

THE COMING STRUGGLE FOR AUTO SAFETY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President:

The Federal Government's delay of decades in facing up to basic initiatives in vehicle safety is not without its price, for now the solution of the highway safety problem is fragmented and scattered among numerous Federal agencies, each jealously guarding its presumed prerogatives and all either stanchly supporting or frightfully cowed by the automobile industry.

So writes Ralph Nader—lawyer, author and well-known safety expert—in "The Coming Struggle for Auto Safety" in the February issue of Consumer Reports. In this article, which is an excerpt from Nader's recent book entitled "Unsafe at Any Speed," the author traces the Federal Government's role in auto safety and presents the alternatives now available to it. As the Congress prepares to reevaluate its responsibilities in traffic safety and chart a new course to solve this terrible problem, I would commend Mr. Nader's comments to each Member.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORCES OPPOSING MEANINGFUL NEW SAFETY STANDARDS FOR AUTOS ARE ENTRENCHED, BUT SOMEDAY SOON THEY MAY FACE A REAL FIGHT IN THE COMING STRUGGLE FOR AUTO SAFETY

(By Ralph Nader)

(NOTE.—Nothing confounds our Nation's high esteem for human life any more than the ever-rising and seemingly irreversible death rate on the highways. Unable up to now to cope with this vast onslaught on the public safety, Americans have periodically undergone a seizure of guilt, self-castigation, and renewed dedication to the proposition that an antitoxin can be found for the epidemic. Never was there a year when this seizure took us more urgently than in 1965.

(It manifested itself in Washington, D.C., at hearings of the Federal Trade Commission, the congressional committees and the General Services Administration. It motivated press conferences called by safety groups, auto manufacturers, tire manufacturers, and medical societies. But, in the long run, perhaps the most formative action that it produced will prove to have taken place in the private study of a lawyer named Ralph Nader.

(Mr. Nader, a graduate of Princeton and of Harvard Law School, attended many of the hearings and served as an adviser to the Senate Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, which conducted the year's most sensational inquiry. Previously, he had been consultant to the U.S. Department of Labor's Office of Policy Planning and Research, and other Government bodies. Out of all this experience, and a long immersion in attendant legal and political implications, he wrote a book, "Unsafe at Any Speed. The Designed-in Dangers of the American Automobile," Grossman Publishers, Inc., New York City; $5.95.

(Written with strong emotional conviction, this book is an impressively documented indictment of the automobile manufacturers. The people have been misled for 40 years, Mr. Nader says, into the delusion that they, as drivers and as pedestrians, are to blame for almost all the carnage and that the vehicle itself is blameless. To preface his thesis, Mr. Nader quotes the late Robert H. Jackson, Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court: "Where experiment or research is necessary to determine the presence or the degree of danger, the product must not be tried on the public, nor must the public be expected to possess the facilities or the technical knowledge to learn for itself of inherent but latent dangers. The claim that a hazard was not foreseen is not available to one who did not use foresight appropriate to his enterprise."

(The book is an exploration, in considerable detail, of what Mr. Nader regards as Detroit's failure to live by this rule of law. Many pieces of evidence will sound familiar to readers of Consumer Reports—distorted vision through the windshield, potentially lethal instrument panels, overloaded tires, poorly placed controls, etc. There are chapters on the history and progress of vehicle safety research, the disregard for this research on the part of manufacturers, and the behind the scenes influence of the industry on recognized safety organizations (the National Safety Council, the Automotive Safety Foundation, and others) in diverting attention away from the design of the car itself.

(Judging from the enthusiastic reviews in a good many publications, "Unsafe at Any Speed" may enjoy wide sales and even wider influence. Its appearance comes timed to affect the course of several important bills now before Congress, including S. 2231, the Ribicoff bill proposing a National Highway Traffic Safety Center as a clearinghouse and standards setting body; S. 2162 and 1643, the Nelson bills, proposing, respectively, a Federal prototype safety car project and compulsory application of GSA safety standards to all cars on the U.S. market; and S. 2669, the Magnuson bill to establish Federal safety standards and grades for automobile tires.

(Although "Unsafe at Any Speed" doesn't address itself to the interrelationship of road, car, and driver to highway safety, in our opinion it does lay to rest, better than anything else ever written, the Detroit propagated notion that today's cars are as safe as they can be. Excerpts from the last chapter, "The Coming Struggle for Safety," are presented here, as particularly valuable background against which to judge the claims and counterclaims in the coming legislative debates. For a still fuller background, we heartily recommend that you read the whole book.)

On July 16, 1956, Congressman Kenneth Roberts opened the first session of the new House Subcommittee on Traffic Safety by proceeding immediately to the subject of automobile design hazards. It was the first public forum for presentations on the vehicle-safety issue by industry representatives and by physicians, engineers, and other specialists in crash-injury research. These presentations have a continuing significance. The automobile makers' testimony, for example, reveals how little their present attitude, performance, and excuses have changed from a decade ago. They offered the jaded themes of their supposed concern with safety; their past progress; the necessity of high-horsepower engines; the industry's thorough methods of quality control; the reasons why safety devices must begin on an optional, extra-cost basis; and the usual tributes to the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators and the Society of Automotive Engineers.

The subcommittee heard from numerous physicians, from engineers, and from representatives of the American Public Health Association, the American College of Surgeons, and the American Medical Association. All of those representatives, a decade ago, underlined the ability of the auto makers to make the inevitable accident safer.

Roberts found it very difficult to get information from Federal agencies that dealt with highway safety matters. What particularly incensed Roberts was the attitude of the Department of Commerce. In a rare flush of anger, he made known his displeasure during testimony on H.R. 2446—a bill providing that hydraulic brake fluid meet safety standards set by the Secretary of Commerce.

THE RELUCTANT REGULATOR

The official reaction from the Commerce Department was: "This Department is certainly sympathetic with the safety objectives contemplated by H.R. 2446. However, we would also emphasize that the several States have traditionally exercised regulatory authority over motor vehicle safety features; and it would seem that the entry of the Federal Government into the field of brake fluid standards regulation presents the basic question of the proper role of the Federal Government generally in the regulation of motor vehicle equipment.

Roberts told the Department's spokesman: "This is certainly not a far-reaching bill. But it is a bill that can save a lot of lives. And when the Department continually comes up here and recommends against a very small step in the direction of the safety of our people, * * * it seems to me that certainly we ought to investigate what is wrong with the Department of Commerce."

Roberts never carried through on what would have been a significant inquiry. But he did modify another bill, H.R. 1341, authorizing the Federal Government to establish safety standards for the motor vehicles it purchases, so that the General Services Administration got the job.

The clear legislative intent behind the law, now Public Law 88–515, was for the GSA to emphasize vehicle safety in its purchase standards so as to get the industry moving faster in the engineering of all its vehicles for accident and injury prevention. GSA's administration during the first year failed to carry out this mission.

The task of developing the standards fell initially to Willis MacLeod of GSA's standardization division, and to his deputy, John Scott. Congress did not make their job any easier. No special appropriations were made available to facilitate the hiring of expert consultants by GSA.

MacLeod and Scott did begin their work with a determination to explore available knowledge from a variety of sources—industry, government, universities, independent specialists, and physicians. Two advisory committees were created, one from other Federal departments and the other composed of the automobile companies, standards groups, and trade associations. The first standards had to be published by the summer of 1965 to apply to 1965 cars.

The synchronized performance of the four automobile companies, the Automobile Manufacturers Association, and the Society of Automotive Engineers was to point out what they could not do to insure greater safety, never to offer suggestions about what they could do. No data were volunteered to back up their restrictive assertions, nor was any information released about their work on safety. They advised the GSA to adhere to the "proven" safety features available as optional equipment.

THE GSA FIASCO

GSA published 17 preliminary safety standards in January 1965 and invited comments. These included anchorages for seat belt assemblies; padded dashboard and visors; recessed dashboard instruments and control devices; impact-absorbing steering wheel and column displacement; safety door latches and hinges; anchorage of seats; four-way flasher; safety glass; dual operation of braking system; standard gear quadrant P R N D L automatic transmission; sweep design of windshield wipers-washers; glare-reduction surfaces; exhaust emission control system; tires and tire safety rims; backup lights; an outside rearview mirror. Pedestrian protection was not considered by GSA, though its general counsel interpreted the law as permitting it to do so. The industry expressed approval of the standards that adhered to SAE or ASA standards or simply detailed optional equipment that they were currently selling, and pressed recommendations for lowering or altogether dismissing other standards. Comments from independent specialists and government agencies recommended strengthening many of the proposed standards.

A final specification-development conference was held on May 19 and 20, 1965. There was little indication then that the final standards which came out on June 30 would be even weaker than the draft standards. For example, the standards for padded instrument panels were reduced to the point of uselessness. A GSA proposed standard regarding the decelerative force of the head upon impact was reduced from a required 44 feet per second and 40 g.'s in 40 milliseconds in May to a required 22 feet per second and 80 g.'s in 60 milliseconds in June. This standard was such that out of a group of 16 automobile makes built between 1953 and 1959 that were tested by John Swearingen of the Federal Aviation Agency, nine would have met or exceeded the present GSA requirement without padding. Swearingen considers all 16 excessively dangerous. Another illustration relates to the instrument panel control devices, which, according to the preliminary standard, were to be designed so as to be flush with the panel surface or be detached by a force not exceeding 40 pounds; this was weakened to 90 pounds. The steering column standard had provided for a permissible rearward displacement not exceeding 5 inches during a collision at 30 miles per hour; it was changed to 5 inches at 20 miles per hour. The glare-reduction standards were weaker to the extent that many 1964 and 1965 glare-ridden models meet the GSA requirements.

Comments by two top industry executives illustrate the extent to which the GSA officials fulfilled the law's intent to exert influence on the manufacturers to engineer higher safety levels into their 1967 models. Arjay Miller, president of Ford Motor Co., said, "Although some reports may lead the public to believe that the GSA standards will be new, in most instances they are similar to or stem from our current engineering practice." The president of General Motors made note of six GSA standards that covered optional equipment long offered by GM. Then he added, "With respect to other GSA specifications, I would like to point out that General Motors cars already have a standard gear quadrant, safety glass, standard height bumpers, as well as door latches, hinges, and anchorages for seats and seat belts—all of which meet or exceed the standards established. Our current steering wheels more than satisfy these GSA requirements." General Motors even claimed that its door hinges, which a Cornell study showed to have failed in collisions at a rate many times higher than competing vehicle hinges, "for all of these years from 1959 through 1965 more than satisfy the 1967 GSA requirements."

ANCIENT HISTORY

Less than 2 weeks after the GSA standards were published, Senator Abraham Ribicoff's Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization opened its hearings on the vehicle safety issue. Each of the four domestic manufacturers was invited to testify.

General Motors started off with its chairman, Frederic Donner, and President James Roche. Roche spoke about the progress of the past, beginning with the 1910 models. It was just after that date, he reminded his audience, that "all driver compartments were equipped with doors to keep the occupants from falling out." After devoting a quarter of his testimony to cataloging past advances, he went on to discuss the company proving grounds, the rigorous company testing, the need for better vehicle maintenance by car owners, the support General Motors gives to driver education, and other financial support the company gives to the private safety movement. Then Roche told the Senators that the proper role for the Federal Government was to encourage and assist the States and local communities.

Donner's testimony reaffirmed the optional approach to safety which goes back to the days when headlamps and bumpers were options. He said that the "decision to offer an item as optional equipment recognizes what I believe is the basic freedom of the customer to pay the cost of tailoring a car to his own specifications or rejecting whatever he may not want." He neglected to explain why costly styling features were nonoptional, and he also ignored the obligation of a manufacturer to make safety features standard equipment.

SAFETY AS AN OPTION

What prompts automobile makers to refer in testimony or speeches to safety devices instead of the far more important structural advances in safety engineering is the ease with which devices can help shift attention to the area of consumer acceptance and extra-cost options instead of the manufacturers' responsibility.

Donner did have an olive branch for Ribicoff's subcommittee. Just the week before the hearings, General Motors had arranged to give the Massachusetts Institute of Technology a $1 million grant to be spread over 4 years for a "long-range, in-depth, quantitative analysis of all facets of the safety problem—the car, the road, the driver, and their various interactions." This grant breaks down to $250,000 a year, less than a third of Donner's annual earnings from General Motors. Donner and Roche refused to tell the subcommittee how much their company spends on collision safety research, claiming it was impossible to segregate it from their other engineering and development.

After one berating by Ribicoff, Donner and Harry Barr, GM's engineering vice president, inadvertently burst forth defensively with replies that indicated how remote General Motors' top management has been from the subject of vehicle safety. Donner said, "We got very concerned as we dug into this and found that we had nowhere to go." That is why "we wanted to see if we could get an institution like MIT to make a really in-depth study." Barr said that Dr. Donald Huelke's investigations of 114 fatal accidents (financed by a grant of $15,000 from the U.S. Public Health Service) had given General Motors more useful information on second collision passenger impacts in General Motors cars than the company had accumulated in the preceding 10 years.

Senator Robert F. Kennedy pressed to find out whether General Motors had similar investigative arrangements elsewhere in the country. Barr said, "We have not found another dedicated doctor that is doing this type of work." Kennedy asked whether he had tried to find people in other areas. After much evasiveness, Barr simply stated: "No, I have not." Kennedy was visibly nettled:

"Kennedy. What was the profit of General Motors last year?

"Roche. I don't think that has anything to do——

"Kennedy. I think I am entitled to know that figure. * * * You spend a million and a quarter dollars, as I understand it, on this aspect of safety. I would like to know what the profit is.

"Donner. The one aspect we are talking about is safety.

"Kennedy. What was the profit of General Motors last year?

"Roche. $1,700 million.

"Kennedy. What?

"Donner. About a billion and a half, I think. * * *

"Kennedy. * * * You made $1.7 billion last year?

"Donner. That is correct.

"KENNEDY. And you spent $1 million on this?

"DONNER. In this particular facet we are talking about——

"KENNEDY. If you just gave 1 percent of your profits, that is $17 million."

This tug of war sent the Ford and Chrysler representatives in the audience rushing back to their typewriters. Both companies were more specific than General Motors in the role they visualized for the Federal Government. The industry, of course, would take care of the vehicle. Chrysler urged the establishment of a federally financed center to look into accident causation, to study the "sociological and psychological factors" involved in operating automobiles, and to educate consumers to buy and use proven safety devices offered by the industry. Ford recommended a similar long-range program, sponsored by the Department of Commerce and contracted to private researchers.

During the 2-hour hearing, Ford President Arjay Miller put on a long presentation which left little time for questioning. Learning of the no-nonsense treatment accorded General Motors, he prepared a three-page addendum outlining 10 areas of increased activity by Ford in fulfilling "our responsibilities in the safety field." RIBICOFF was intrigued by the way the automobile companies suddenly began pledging more attention to safety because of a brief public exposure at a congressional hearing.

TURMOIL OVER TIRES

The question now is how far the Ribicoff subcommittee will go to get at the roots of the problem and propose genuine solutions to it. An idea of the difficulties that any such effort will be likely to encounter can be imagined from knowing the continuing struggle to establish the first public tire safety standards in this country. In 1959 the Wall Street Journal published a front-page article which told of the tire industry's concern about the hazards of overloaded original-equipment tires. The tire industry, it said, had been trying to get the motor companies to buy larger tires to avoid this overloading, which leads to shorter tire life and blowouts long before the tread wears down.

Two years later, Karl Richards of the Automobile Manufacturers Association told the Roberts subcommittee that "tire problems today are mainly concerned with improper use, maintenance, and replacement" Again it was the motorist's responsibility.

About this time, New York State Senator Speno began to receive letters complaining of new tires on new cars that mysteriously blew out after a few hundred or few thousand miles. The more Speno looked into the matter the more he learned of the inability of the tire buyer to know what he is buying. Speno's legislative committee visited Akron, Ohio, home of four of the big five tire companies, on September 23 and 24, 1963. At a dinner given in the committee's honor by tire company leaders, Speno proposed the establishment of minimum safety performance standards for new automobile tires. Stunned silence greeted the end of his speech. But the tire industry decided to cooperate with Speno in order to have a voice in the tire bill to be drafted. Late in 1963, however, the automobile industry told the tire companies crisply that there was to be total opposition to any tire legislation. There followed what veteran observers at Albany called some of the most intensive and improper lobbying ever seen on those legislative battlegrounds. The Senate passed the bill, but the lobbying paid off in the assembly where the bill was never brought to a floor vote.

On July 1, 1964, the Rubber Manufacturers Association announced voluntary agreement to adhere to minimum tire standards promulgated by the RMA. The objective was to take the steam out of any further legislative drives. The RMA standards were so obviously incomplete, weak, and unenforceable that both tire and automobile industries turned to another of their controlled agencies, the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission (VESC) to write slightly more stringent standards that would have an official facade. The notorious background, purpose, and structure of the VESC as a tool of the automotive industry and as a palpable undermining of State legislative initiative is fully documented by the minutes of its meetings and its performance to date.

Interest in tire hazards began in Washington after Senator GAYLORD NELSON filed a bill in the Senate to establish tire safety standards. Complaints from motorists, automobile clubs, and tire dealers poured into NELSON's office. They applauded his statement of the need. One California tire dealer wired "You are right—many motorists are riding on a time bomb."

Similar complaints were coming into the Federal Trade Commission, which finally decided to hold hearings in January 1965. These hearings visibly shocked some of the FTC commissioners. FTC Chairman, Paul Rand Dixon, told the Senate Commerce Committee (which began hearings in May): "Our hearing contains substantial testimony as to the inadequacy of these Rubber Manufacturers Association standards. * * * The specific safety problems * * * related principally to the matters of tire size and the so-called practice of overloading, which are interrelated. Overload is the situation which exists when the curb weight of a vehicle plus the designed load capacity in terms of passengers and luggage exceeds the load carrying capacity of the tires with which the vehicle is equipped. * * * One tire manufacturer stated that 'over the years, vehicle manufacturers, in an attempt to cut costs, have cut down the amount of tire they are designing onto their vehicles, and that some vehicles are overloaded when they are empty.'"

Repeatedly the problem of overload was traced back to the automobile manufacturers, who chose not to present themselves before the FFTC. Commissioner Philip Elman wondered aloud whether the absence of the automobile companies hadn't turned the hearing into a performance comparable to "Hamlet" without the Danish prince.

Chairman Dixon later told the Senate Commerce Committee that the replacement tire market provided a great deal of consumer confusion and deception. "We believe confusion and deception are * * * inherent in the existing situation where * * * tires may be designated as to quality, i.e., premium, first line, second line, etc., regardless of the tire's inherent quality or safety; where the price of the tire has no discernible relation to its quality or safety level; and where many of the descriptive terms employed, such as ply rating, 100 level, and other grade designations, have no real meaning or definitive value in the absence of uniform standards.

John Floberg, secretary and general counsel of the Firestore Tire & Rubber Co., offered this steely assurance at the end of the hearings: "I submit that the best standard, the time-tested and proved standard, and the appropriate free enterprise standard of quality should be the one that has in the case of tires, as in the case of other consumer products, worked most satisfactorily; namely, the discriminating and sophisticated taste of the American consumer." A leading National Bureau of Standards tire expert has said that he could not compare tires reliably for his own private purchase from the information available on the marketplace. Yet Mr. Floberg would impute such discernment to the average consumer.

THE HOUSE OF BUSINESS

The Senate tire hearings were significant for future legislative thinking on vehicle safety. The attitude toward public and public safety prevailing at the Department of Commerce was clearly stated by the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, J. Herbert Holloman. There was no doubt about the strong need for tire standards, he stated, but the Department of Commerce preferred the voluntary, cooperative approach. "However," Holloman said, "the Department would not object to legislation placing discretionary authority in the Secretary of Commerce to issue mandatory standards if in his discretion he determines that voluntary tire standards do not provide adequate safety requirements for the motoring public." The Secretary of Commerce, John Connor, a member of the General Motors board of directors until his appointment to the Cabinet post in January 1965, was categorical in his statement to Senator RIBICOFF. Regarding safety features, he said, "There is no lack of emphasis on the part of the manufacturers."

The Commerce Department's primary and overriding statutory mission is to "foster, promote, and develop" commerce and industry. It is the house of business in government. Given such a purpose, the Department is generically unsuited to handle consumer protection laws. This is the reason why manufacturing interests always try to steer what consumer legislation they cannot defeat over to the Commerce Department.

The automobile industry finally appeared on the scene of the tire controversy at the Senate Commerce Committee tire hearings in August 1965. A single statement was read for the industry by Harry Barr of General Motors. The critical issues of undersized, overloaded tires, the consequence for safety of cost-cutting and that "soft, squishy ride" were dodged. Barr's testimony consisted principally of emphasizing tire inspection and maintenance and the full capability of the States in handling tire matters under the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission. Barr conceded that much more had to be done to inform the car owner about proper tire inflation pressures. He urged the committee not to look into past practice but to concentrate on improvements the industry was about to make.

A PRIVILEGED INDUSTRY

The automobile industry is in a particularly strategic position to force the subordination of vehicle safety in the overall hierarchy of legislative and executive programs. The industry knows that the political success of any administration more and more is being measured by its success in promoting economic growth. Automobile production utilizes 21 percent of all steel, 49 percent of all lead, 61 percent of all rubber, 32 percent of all zinc, 13 percent of all aluminum and 58 percent of all upholstery leather sold in this country. One business in every six is classified as automotive; one worker out of every seven is employed directly or indirectly in producing, supplying, servicing, financing or transporting the automobile. Automobile spokesmen never fail to cite these figures whenever they want something from government, or want to block government action.

As a privileged institution, the automobile industry has made an impressive record in Washington. Hearings reveal abuses, but legislation almost never follows. The industry's power is felt in the administration and enforcement of existing laws, as well. In the antitrust area there is sound doctrinal basis for taking action against one or more of the automobile companies, but it is not considered politically practical to do so. The FTC, which has known about odometer rigging for over three decades, never took action against the manufacturers for this deceptive practice. The Bureau of Labor Statistics is not all satisfied with the evidence it is given by the automobile industry to determine improvements or deteriorations in auto quality for consumer price index adjustment purposes. The automobile makers permit only economists and marketing specialists, not engineers, to meet with BLS statisticians. Selective information is given only to bolster claims of improved quality; the automobile companies put great pressure on the BLS to accept these claims without adequate data to support them. The industry then turns around and uses BLS quality improvement credits as proof the consumer is getting better automotive quality for his money.

It is clear that the sales success of the automotive industry is not simply due to the willingness of customers to buy, but also to public policy that ignores needs for rapid transit and builds the highways and provides other services that make possible the growth of the automotive subeconomy. It is also clear that the manufacturers are increasingly relying upon and encouraging a demand for automobiles which has little to do with a demand for transportation. General Motors' vice president, William Mitchell, pointed this up succinctly: "The motorcar must be exciting and create a desire and not become mere transportation, or we will have just a utility and people will spend their money for other things."

Such an attitude is not likely to give much attention to safety beyond the minimum demands for it in the marketplace. And even these minimum demands are restricted by a highly concentrated industry which, as George Romney, then president of American Motors, said in 1958, has adopted a "common product philosophy" that has ended its "basic product competition."

What truth may remain in the classical economic notion that the public interest lies in the unhindered operation of the free market has been seriously compromised by a concentrated industry capable of substantially defining the standards of the marketplace.[1] Thus, out of the array of demands the public might make for the automobile, that of visible styling changes is greatly encouraged by the industry's promotion and advertising, while those of safety and nonpollution are not encouraged. According to Ford's Gene Bordinat, a new rear end on a car model costs its maker between $25 and $50 million. Twenty-five million is more than the combined research and development expenditures of the industry on collision safety in the past 15 years. If, as Ford's Donald Frey says, the customer cannot describe the kind of car he wants until the manufacturer shows him some ideas and innovations, and if, as GM's Kenneth Stonex admits, increased public awareness of automobile safety (stemming from the GSA standards publicity) will produce faster adoption of vehicle safety features by his company, then there is a useful role to be played by both industry and Government in informing the consumer fully about product safety. Yet the industry, by successfully blocking Government efforts in this direction and by dominating the channels of communications through which the customer receives his information about automobiles, has obscured the relation of vehicle design to life and limb and has kept quiet its technical capability of designing and building crashworthy vehicles.

The reference to "communications" pertains not only to the content of advertising and promotion, but to the impact which the massive sums spent have on the communications media's attention to vehicle safety designs. It is more than coincidental that radio, television, newspapers, and magazines have generally ignored the role of vehicle design in producing the first and second collisions.

General Motors has made a special effort to persuade readers of opinion journals, Ivy League alumni publications, and scholarly journals that its tremendous powers of decision over automobile design are held by something more than an old-line, acquisitive corporation. The series of institutional advertisements called "General Motors Is People," with headlines like "Discoverer," "Originator," "Perfectionist," and "Safety Is His Business," have appeared in Atlantic Monthly, Harper's, the Reporter, the Princeton Alumni Weekly, the American Journal of Sociology, and numerous engineering school alumni publications. These ads do not sell cars; they try to sell General Motors as a worthy keeper of the people's trust.

UNPARALLELED INDEPENDENCE

The result of continuing efforts like this has been the automobile industry's preservation of its hegemony over the design of its products—an independence unparalleled among the manufacturers of any other transport vehicle. Aviation, marine, and rail vehicles and equipment must adhere to public safety standards. These standards are as important for the principle they represent as for the safety performances that have been registered. The principle is that the rule of law should extend to the safety of any product that carries such high risks to users and bystanders.

Only the Federal Government can undertake the critical task of stimulating and guiding public and private initiatives for safety. The public which bears the impact of the auto industry's safety policy must have a direct role in deciding that policy. The decision as to what an adequate standard of public responsibility in vehicle safety should be ought not to be left to the manufacturers, regardless of their performance. But the extraordinarily low quality of that performance certainly accentuates the urgent need for publicly defined and enforced standards of safety.

Two industry policies are especially inimical to a rational quest for safer automobiles. First is the all-pervasive secrecy that obstructs freedom of communication in the scientific and engineering communities. Secrecy also permits the industry to enjoy a double standard of proof. Liberty Mutual Insurance Co.'s demonstration safety cars have been criticized by auto company representatives on the legitimate ground that they were never crash-tested. Liberty's cars are scheduled to be crash-tested in late 1965, with public recording of the data by Derwyn Severy's group at UCLA. But the automobile industry has no plans to expose its vehicles to the same treatment. While it properly states that safety features have to be proven before adoption, it exempts such features as sharp fins, glare-ridden chrome, hardtops, wraparound windshields, undersized tires, smaller brake drums, and front placement of fuel tanks in rear-engine cars.

The second policy inimical to the quest for safer automobiles is the industry's research and development commitment. Probably no other major manufacturing industry in this country devotes so few of its resources to innovations in its basic product. Many scientists and engineers in government or outside the industry concur with William Steiglitz' observation: "It may well be that the evolutionary development of the automobile from the horseless carriage has gone as far as it can and that a totally fresh approach is required." This would mean innovation in an industry that has slowed innovation to a snail's pace.

THE MEAGER SUMS FOR SAFETY

An idea of how meager a sum the automobile industry spends for safety innovations was given in 1958 by Andrew Kucher, vice president for engineering and research at the Ford Motor Co. His was the only public estimate given up to the summer of 1965. Speaking for the Automobile Manufacturers Association, Kucher told an audience of motor vehicle administrators: "Because we are thoroughly sold on this philosophy, the motor vehicle manufacturers spend between $5 and $6 million each year in safety-oriented research programs. This expenditure is aimed at solving basic problems and also is a searching for new and better solutions to old problems."

Even granting Kucher a margin for exaggeration, the sum of $5 million amounted to less than one-twentieth of 1 percent of the industry's gross sales in vehicles that year. There is no evidence that any greater sums were spent in succeeding years. Ford listed 1965 expenditures of $700,000 for its new automotive safety center and $300,000 for designing and building prototype safety cars. Considering such an allocation, it is understandable why Ford's automotive safety center director, C. R. Briggs, was being realistic when he told Automotive News, "You can't expect breakthroughs."

Scientists in the Bureau of Public Roads estimate that the combined public and private support of highway traffic research (defined as the design and testing of safety measures and techniques) was $8 million at the most in 1964—the highest to date. This was broken down to $2 million spent by industry, $2 million spent by State governments (mostly from Federal disbursements) and private agencies, and $4 million spent by the Federal Government. Some accident specialists, like Dr. William Haddon, would place the true figure for high-quality research much lower. He does not think there are more than 10 competent scientists working full time in traffic accident prevention in this country. At the $8 million level, this country is spending about $166 in research for every traffic fatality.

With some 1,200 or less fatalities annually in civil aviation, the Federal Government spent between $35 and $64 million each year from 1960 to 1965 on research and development for greater air safety. This was in addition to what was spent for safety work by the aircraft industry itself. Expenditure of $64 million for 1,200 fatalities means over $53,000 per fatality.

The Federal Government's delay of decades in facing up to basic initiatives in vehicle safety is not without its price, for now the solution of the highway safety problem is fragmented and scattered among numerous Federal agencies, each jealously guarding its presumed prerogatives, and all either stanchly supporting or frightfully cowed by the automobile industry.

Federal activity in highway safety (apart from Government employee safety programs) in 1965 consisted of (a) supporting research by the Bureau of Public Roads and the Public Health Service; (b) regulatory activity over the operational safety of interstate commercial trucks and buses by the Interstate Commerce Commission; (c) educational and State support activity by the Bureau of Public Roads, the Public Health Service's Division of Accident Prevention, and the General Services Administration (the latter by means of safety standards for Government vehicles).

---

[1] In the sale of buses, buyer choice is almost synonymous with whatever General Motors chooses to offer. GM has over 90 percent of the bus business in the country. Since 1957, the Southern California Rapid Transit District has desperately tried to persuade GM to improve the braking systems of its buses. It was not until 1965 with competitive bidding of a small Ohio bus manufacturer and the district's threat of public denunciation that General Motors stated it would provide better braking capabilities on new district buses.

The Bureau of Public Roads and the Division of Accident Prevention have supported some university-based projects in accident investigation, tire skidding research, collision testing, and highway-vehicle communications systems. With few exceptions (the seat belt was one) these studies never yielded any policy recommendations affecting the vehicle. For the most part, the studies are not evaluated with the idea of translating knowledge into action. In the Division of Accident Prevention, the right to see these studies is granted at the discretion of the research grants chief. If he thinks an inquirer is not technically qualified to interpret the reports accurately, he can simply deny him access to the reports. The division has not even prepared summaries of these studies so that interested persons can learn the findings from this publicly supported research.

Whenever the Division of Accident Research is asked why it does nothing about known vehicle hazards, its answer is that it is primarily interested in the "human factor." If the "human factor" included executives of the automobile companies, the division's focus might have more immediate results. Unfortunately, the "human factor" is interpreted to mean only the driver.

The Federal effort in highway safety in general and vehicle safety in particular suffers from inadequate legislative safety, from insufficient funds, and from lack of administrative consolidation. The highway safety effort has not received high-level support.

On February 20, 1957, when he was still a Senator, Lyndon B. Johnson expressed on the Senate floor a thought that regrettably is still true. He called the "deadly toll of highway accidents" a problem whose "very familiarity has bred either contempt or indifference. * * * We cannot abolish the automobile, but neither can we ignore the problems that it brings to us." The Senator was proposing an automobile and highway safety division in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that, among other objectives, would "promote research into improved designs for automobiles."

A Federal research and development facility where problems of automobile safety could be comprehensively examined and solved is only the first stage. This function in turn must form a part of a larger highway transport research and development program. The Johnson administration is expected to formulate gradually an overall national transportation policy which presumably will involve a closer coordination of air, land, and sea transport systems and a more rational allocation of public resources, especially in the direction of high-speed rail systems and more novel forms of rapid land transit between cities. This policy may lead to an examination of the present inefficient and disparate administrative arrangements for various forms of transportation. The advantages of taking the Bureau of Public Roads out of the Department of Commerce and making it into a separate entity directly responsible to the President should be seriously explored. It could be the first step toward creating an overall Department of Transportation.

If the Government is to be made capable of securing continually safer automotive design, it will require a sharply focused supportive constituency dedicated to and skilled in pursuing the interests of safety. For until sufficient engineers, lawyers, physicians, and other specialists assume the roles of leadership that their superior knowledge makes available to them, legislators and administrators will continue to display contempt or indifference. What must be squarely confronted is the blurring of the distinctions between government and business under the guises of partnerships, voluntary approaches, and advisory committees. As in other consumer protection areas in recent years, there is considerable danger of Congress enacting the no-law law for automobile safety. The no-law law is ambiguous or makes no mention of enforcement (like the seat belt and brake fluid bills), provides no standards for balanced representation on advisory committees (or for how and when they should meet), does not consider the issue of indiscriminate adoption of private safety standards, requires no periodic progress report to Congress on administration and enforcement, does not stipulate that prescribed standards must be technically justified in writing that is publicly available, restricts authorizations for funds to a nominal or zero level, and is peppered with the word "discretionary" as to the promulgation and issuance date of standards.

The regulation of the automobile must go through three stages—the stage of public awareness and demand for action, the stage of legislation, and the stage of continuing administration. Since automobile safety ideally should keep pace with advancing technological capabilities, administrators have to do more than hold the line; they have to advance it. Without full disclosure, congressional review, and participation by a consumer-oriented constituency of professionally qualified citizens, obsolescence, and bureaucratic inertia will stifle the purpose of even a properly drafted law.

Motorists need to understand a few facts about automobile safety. First, safety measures that do not require people's voluntary and repeated cooperation are more effective than those that do. Second, the sequence of events that leads to an accident injury can be interrupted by effective measures even before there is a complete understanding of the causal chain. Apply these two cardinal principles of safety policy, proven in the control of epidemics and machine hazards, to highway safety and the spotlight turns on the engineering of the automobile.

Furthermore, our society knows a good deal more about building safer machines than it does about getting people to drive safely. Dr. Bernard Fox, a distinguished psychologist in the Division of Accident Prevention, after spending many years in research on the "human factor," concludes that the most feasible safety measure, and the one with the quickest and greatest results in saving lives and preventing injuries, is a crashworthy automobile.

A leading crash researcher and biophysicist, Dr. Carl Clark of the Martin Co., states: "Instead of the 40-mile-per-hour barrier collision survival being a 'spectacular accomplishment,' it should be a routine requirement of proper car and restraint design. Indeed, without major modifications of car structure and size, by applying what we now know about crash protection, a fixed barrier impact of 45 miles per hour [equivalent to hitting the rear of a stationary vehicle at over 75 miles per hour] should be experienced without injury, and crashes at higher speeds should be survivable."

The gap between existing design and attainable safety has widened enormously in the postwar period. As these attainable levels of safety rise, so do the moral imperatives to use them. For the tremendous range of opportunity of science-technology—by providing easier and better solutions—serves to clarify ethical choices and to ease the conditions for their exercise by the manufacturers. There are men in the automobile industry who both know the technical capability and appreciate the moral imperatives. But their timidity and conformity to the rigidities of the corporate bureaucracies have prevailed. When and if the automobile is designed to free millions of people from unnecessary mutilation, these men, like their counterparts in universities and government, will look back with shame on the time when common candor was considered courage.

TRIBUTE TO LESLIE FRY, VICE COMMANDER IN CHIEF OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, Nevada has been honored with the selection of a Reno attorney as senior vice commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and I would like to direct attention to the man and his outstanding ability. He is Mr. Leslie Fry, who will be honored at a special testimonial dinner by the Nevada Veterans of Foreign Wars in Reno, February 26. I expect a big turnout for this dinner because Mr. Fry is widely known and well liked—and it is the first time in our State's history that a Nevadan has achieved this high honor with the VFW.

Les Fry is a lifelong and close personal friend. I have watched with interest and admiration his fine work on behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and I have been honored to support his candidacy for moving upward in that influential organization.

Les Fry has continuously held leadership positions at various levels of the VFW since 1948. He served as Nevada State commander in 1959–60 and was a member of the National Council of Administration from 1961 through 1963, representing Nevada, Oregon, and California. He also served two terms on the National Budget Committee and for the past 2 years has been a member of the VFW National Security Committee.

Nevada is fortunate to have a man of Les Fry's caliber taking an active role in the national leadership of the VFW; and I venture to say the VFW is fortunate to have a man of this caliber who is willing to work with such energy and dedication.

PROGRESS ON NORTHERN CHEYENNE RESERVATION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, thanks to their own initiative and understanding assistance from both Government and non-Government sources, some Indian tribes have made remarkable progress during the past few years. One such tribe is the Northern Cheyenne, in southeastern Montana. Evidence of the development underway on that reservation is contained in the February 14 letter from the chairman of that tribe, John Wooden Legs, to the editor of the Lincoln, Nebr., Star.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Wooden Leg's letter in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 14, 1966.

EDITOR, LINCOLN STAR,
Lincoln, Nebr.

DEAR SIR: I have received a copy of an editorial that apeared in the Star some time in January entitled "How Good Are We?" This editorial concerns the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation of which I am president of the governing body.

After reading this editorial, it seems to me that additional information should be provided to you with the humble request to ask that you more objectively view the problems of the Northern Cheyenne Reservation.

For centuries, the Cheyenne has sought life of dignity. Even in our period of most extreme poverty, we sought dignity. We still seek dignity.

We admit that some of our people are poor. They are poor economically and socially. This has been caused by a lack of opportunity and isolation from the rest of society. Our situation has greatly improved in the past 3 years, however, and we feel that you are entitled to some objective information and humbly beg your indulgence in more favorably portraying our situation by printing additional facts in your paper.

Your editorial points out hopelessness in several areas on the reservation. The first area is one of education. The school at St. Labre that you mentioned in your editorial, is only one of several schools in and around the reservation. St. Labre has an enrollment of 245 Northern Cheyenne students. There is an eight-grade public school at Lame Deer, the center of the reservation, and many students from the reservation also attend public high school at Colstrip, Mont., north of the reservation. These two public schools have a combined total enrollment of 263 Northern Cheyenne students. In addition, there is a Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding and day school at Busby, Mont., with a total enrollment of 219 Northern Cheyenne students, 89 of whom are boarding students, 130 of whom are day students; and a Bureau day school at Birney with an enrollment of 14 Northern Cheyenne students. There has been considerable public interest apparent on the reservation in the past few years in obtaining a public high school on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation. Montana law at this time, prevents the Northern Cheyenne Reservation from obtaining a high school. We are hoping that through a publicity campaign on this situation, the community will take action to have this law changed and eventually obtain a public high school on the reservation.

The second area of hopelessness you indicated in your article was in the area of stockraising. You mentioned that, "It takes 20 acres of their bleak reservation land to support one steer." This area is considered some of the best cattle country in Montana. There is 100-percent range use by Northern Cheyenne Indians. The Northern Cheyenne Tribe has a tribal steer operation which has assets in the million-dollar category. This tribal steer enterprise occupies 19 percent of the Northern Cheyenne grazing land. In addition to this, there are 68 Northern Cheyenne cattle operators operating on other parts of the reservation. These operations vary in size from part-time operators owning 10 head to 1 individual with 900 head. What this means is that grazing operations provide income to more than 70 Northern Cheyenne families, in addition to the grazing rentals paid to individual landowners and the Northern Cheyenne Tribe.

You mentioned thirdly in your article that there is a small handicraft industry at Ashland, Mont. We assume you are making reference to the Guild Arts and Crafts factory at Ashland. This plastic assembly plant employed an average of 150 persons in 1965 with gross earnings fo $407,039.06.

You indicate an area of hopelessness in the fact that the Northern Cheyenne Reservation has no minerals. The Northern Cheyenne Reservation comprises 444,000 acres of land. This land is almost totally underlain by subbituminous coal. The Northern Cheyenne Tribe is currently negotiating with industrialists who are interested in this coal, and are considering leases for the exploration of the coal deposits. These prospective buyers of our coal are considering industrial developments provided our coal deposits are extensive enough. There is a small mine in Lame Deer which is producing 5,000 tons a year of this coal for local consumption. The Northern Cheyenne Tribe receives a small, yet important sum of tribal income from this source. The Northern Cheyenne Tribe has let oil and gas leasing permits. These permits provide $53,374 per year income to the Northern Cheyenne Tribe.

You have stated in your editorial that winter is in full blast at Ashland, Mont. This is true. We are in the middle of winter. You mentioned, however, that for most of the Cheyennes there is little shelter. The Northern Cheyenne Tribe received a $4 million claim settlement from the U.S. Government in 1963. We are building many new homes with part of this money. At present, we have completed 86 new homes; there are 35 under construction; 24 more have been approved for construction; and we anticipate that in addition to these, between 90 and 105 other new homes will be constructed. This will make a total of some 266 new homes purchased from judgment fund moneys. The Public Housing Administration is sponsoring a mutual help housing program on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation. Ten new homes are nearing completion at Busby, Mont., and 40 more are scheduled for construction soon in other communities on the reservation. Family plan money has also been used to repair or remodel 16 other homes. This makes a total of 332 new homes either constructed or scheduled for construction on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation.[1] There are approximately 503 resident Northern Cheyenne families. In addition to this, we understand that the St. Labre Mission has plans for the construction of 40 houses at Ashland. There are still log shacks that people must live in but it is not correct to say that there is not enough shelter for my people.

The judgment received by the Northern Cheyennes from the U.S. Government has also made possible a scholarship fund in the amount of $250,000. Negotiations with two banks are now underway to establish a scholarship trust fund. Proceeds from the trust will be used to send capable Northern Cheyennes to institutions of higher learning.

The industrial development fund made possible from the judgment fund, presently totals approximately $670,000. From this fund, the tribe has built a $100,000 factory building, the cost of which will be amortized over a 20-year period. During the period of amortization the Tribe will receive 4 percent interest on the unpaid balance. This money was invested to get the jobs at the handicraft industry at Ashland. A total of $19,000 was expended recently for a forest products feasibility study in an attempt to make use of the 80,000 acres of ponderosa pine on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation. Two major blocks of this timber were advertised for sale in 1965, but there were no bidders. We need a timber sale in order to create additional jobs on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation. We plan to advertise this sale again soon with lower stumpage rates than the earlier advertisement.

You may inform your readers that there is capital available from this industrial fund which is available to reliable and responsible prospective industries. Perhaps you can help us in our effort to attract industry to the Northern Cheyenne Reservation. This would be much more beneficial and have a more far-reaching effect than charity. During the month of September, the Northern Cheyenne Reservation had the highest level of employment that it has ever achieved. We believe that it was the highest level of employment of any reservation in Montana. Even at this high level of employment, our unemployment was still 20 percent, which compares unfavorably, I realize, with the 4.5 percent national average of employment. However, the Northern Cheyennes are good workers. They want jobs. Many of them need jobs. That is one of the reasons I am writing you this letter.

Not only are we Northern Cheyennes trying to help ourselves, but we are also receiving assistance in our efforts from many sources. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is helping us in many ways with their programs of credit, economic development, public works, education, vocational training, employment, community development, and in the upgrading of social services.

Furthermore, we are benefiting from many provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The Northern Cheyenne Tribal Council is sponsoring a community action program which has a staff of 40. This staff includes administrators, nurses, teachers, community health workers, and aids, most of whom are volunteers. They are directing special community health, remedial reading, and child development programs. The Northern Cheyenne Tribal Council also sponsors a Neighborhood Youth Corps which has provided employment for more than 100 youths, age 16 through 21; some are in-school and out-of-school programs at Busby, Lame Deer, and Ashland at Federal, public, and Mission schools. Other Neighborhood Youth Corps workers are employed at the Bureau of Indian Affairs Northern Cheyenne Agency, the Public Health Service Center, and by the tribe on various projects throughout the reservation. Nine VISTA workers are serving in a variety of ways throughout the reservation. During the summer of 1965, 120 preschool children on the reservation were taught in child development centers under the Headstart program. The Headstart program has been continued on the reservation under the community action program. During the summer of 1966, we hope to have 35 college students from Montana universities working on the reservation in a work-study program. Nearly $500,000 has been assigned to the Northern Cheyenne Reservation from the Economic Opportunity Act, and we feel that benefits from the amount spent so far are already much in evidence.

As a result of these Government programs, the employment at the Guild Arts and Crafts factory at Ashland, and through employment made possible through the construction of new homes on the reservation, the gross reservation income for 1965 was about $1.1 million. This means that there was a per capita income of approximately $500, or an average family income slightly in excess of $3,000 per year. With these salaries plus a tribal program for needy families of distribution of surplus commodities, I find it hard to believe your comment in your editorial that there is "scarcely a bite to eat."

We are realistic, however, and know that our economy needs strengthening. We still have much that needs to be done in improving our reservation. It can only be permanently strengthened through the creation of additional year-round permanent employment. We want to attract industry. We know things can be better. We will do everything we can to help ourselves. Please print this letter in the hope that some industrialist interested in locating on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation may read it.

---

[1] These figures do not include 62 trailer houses which have also been purchased from family plan funds.

Thank you very much for taking the time to read my long letter. I will be very happy to answer any questions you have about it.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN WOODEN LEGS,
President, Northern Cheyenne Tribe.

TRIBUTE TO MILES C. ALLGOOD ON HIS 88TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. HILL. At this time, Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to a fellow Alabamian and my longtime personal friend, who has the distinction of having been born on February 22, the same date as the Father of our Country, George Washington. I am speaking of Miles C. Allgood of Mentone, Ala., who served in the House of Representatives for 12 years as the Representative from the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama. On tomorrow, Miles Allgood will celebrate his 88th birthday.

Miles Allgood and I were both first elected to the 68th Congress. Before coming to Washington, however, he had already distinguished himself in Alabama as a public servant. At the age of 23 he was elected tax assessor of Blount County, Ala. Later he was elected State auditor and State commissioner of agriculture and industries. A lifelong Democrat, Miles Allgood had also been a member of the Alabama Democratic Executive Committee, and in 1920 he was a delegate from Alabama to the National Democratic Convention at San Francisco.

During his service in the House, Miles Allgood was indefatigable in his work for the people of his district, and of Alabama, and the Nation. No one had to question where he stood, because he always stood for the people and for the best interest of our country. Though the range of his interests and efforts was the range of the needs of our people and the strength and progress of our country, Miles Allgood can best be identified with his work to develop the water resources of our country. He served on the House Irrigation and Reclamation Committee every one of the years he was a Member of Congress. During this time, some of the most monumental reclamation programs in the history of our country were either carried out or conceived by our Government. Great projects such as the construction of Hoover Dam to impound the waters of the Colorado River to generate electric power and to serve irrigation and industrial needs, and the legislation to comprehensively develop the Columbia River Basin, including the construction of the mighty Grand Coulee Dam, are two examples of the magnificent accomplishments of the committee while Miles Allgood was a ranking member of the committee and most active and influential in its accomplishments.

From his service on the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee, Miles Allgood developed a special knowledge and understanding of the importance of developing the water resources of Alabama. He recognized that major opportunities for growth and economic progress centered upon the comprehensive development of river basins. He was among those of us who had advocated peacetime generation and disposition of electric power at Wilson Dam and the steamplant and the operation of the nitrate plants at Muscle Shoals, Ala. Miles Allgood and I accompanied President Franklin Roosevelt on his historic trip in 1933 through the Tennessee Valley, which included the inspection of the idle Wilson Dam and nitrate plants at Muscle Shoals. As a farmer and former commissioner of agriculture and industries in Alabama, Miles Allgood could readily foresee the great benefits to our farmers and to American agriculture in the production of fertilizers at the Muscle Shoals properties. As author of the legislation in the House which established the Tennessee Valley Authority, I well remember what a strong ally and supporter Miles Allgood was of the measure and how we stood shoulder to shoulder on the floor of the House in our battle to gain its passage. He was present at the White House when the bill was signed into law, and President Roosevelt presented him with one of the pens used in the signing ceremonies in recognition of his efforts.

We all know how much TVA has meant to the development of the Tennessee Valley and to our country, both in times of war and peace. We know that the capacity of TVA to supply electric power was a major factor in locating the first atomic fission plant in the valley and our winning the race with the Axis powers to construct the first atom bomb and hasten the end of World War II and our victory.

After leaving the House in 1935, Miles Allgood served as a member of the Farm Security Administration until he retired on December 1, 1943, culminating more than 40 years of public service.

Let me say, Mr. President, that serving one's fellow man is not an unusual characteristic of Miles Allgood and his family; in fact, it could be easily said that service to mankind is the family credo. Miles' great-great-grandfather came from England and settled in Virginia before the Revolutionary War. His grandfather settled in Blount County, Ala., in 1836. His father, Dr. W. B. Allgood, was a Confederate soldier and practiced medicine in Alabama for 50 years. An uncle, Stephen C. Allgood, was a minister of the Gospel. One of Miles' brothers, Will B. Allgood, was State treasurer and State auditor of Alabama. Another brother, R. V. Allgood, was an outstanding educator, and his son, Clarence, is today a Federal judge for the northern district of Alabama. His third brother, Homer W. Allgood, practiced medicine in Birmingham for many years and his son, Homer, is also a physician.

Mr. President, Miles has always seemed so young, so active, and so energetic that it is difficult to realize that this year he reaches pier 88 and that next year he and Mrs. Allgood, the former Miss Willie Fox of Montgomery, will celebrate their golden wedding anniversary.

I take great pleasure in warmly congratulating Miles Allgood on the occasion of his 88th birthday, and I know the Senate will wish to join me in sending him best wishes for many more years of continued good health and happiness.

A CALL FOR UNITY

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the people all across this land are backing the administration in its determination to give our soldiers in Vietnam the support they need to win a fight over the aggressors.

Once the Commander in Chief makes a decision, it is the inclination of the people to support him. President Johnson has made it perfectly plain that our fighting men are entitled to get the supplies and the support they need from the homefront. Because air strikes over North Vietnam will cut down on the ammunition that will be shot at our forces and their allies fighting in South Vietnam, it was necessary to resume the bombing.

As Newsday stated clearly in an editorial on January 28:

> The President alone knows all the facts and has all the information available. He is well aware of the risk and hazards of war. When he decides, and however he decides, he should have unanimous backing.

The editorial was printed shortly before the announcement on the resumption of the air strikes was made, but because of its clear understanding of the issue, it is timely. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD for its lucidity and forthright stand on the issues at hand.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsday, Jan. 28, 1966]

THE LONELY DECISION

As of this morning, no bombs have dropped on North Vietnam for 36 days. That is a long time, long enough by reasonable standards for any government to decide whether it wants continued war or lasting peace. The Government of North Vietnam apparently has not made the decision to negotiate. Now the question is: should President Johnson order bombing resumed?

The Pentagon, apparently, has reluctantly concluded that bombing should resume, based on evidence that the North Vietnamese are using this pause to repair bridges and highways and to ship more troops and munitions into South Vietnam. Renewal of bombing, of course, is subject to the President's decision as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

On the other hand, some influential Democratic Senators are attempting to organize support in their own party and among Republicans for a continued postponement of bombing, their apparent theory being that time may help convince Ho Chi Minh to negotiate; and that, perhaps, Hanoi has to weigh out the argument between the doves in Moscow and the hawks in Peiping before arriving at a decision.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana, the majority leader, and Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, have advocated that the bombing suspension continue. Now six other Democratic Senators are pursuing the same course. An Associated Press poll of 50 Senators willing to express their views found them split evenly on the resumption of bombing. Yet, as Secretary of State Rusk has pointed out, the North Vietnam-sponsored Vietcong have kept right on exploding bombs and mines in South Vietnam, and exactly what's the difference?

So, as has been the case in every American war, the lonely moment comes when the man in the White House must weigh out the arguments, balance the alternatives, and make a decision. It appears his decision will be to renew the bombing since the lull has failed to produce any viable evidence that North Vietnam wants to talk peace. Whatever that decision may be, it should have the full support of the American people, including the Members of Congress. The President alone knows all the facts and has all the information available. He is well aware of the risks and hazards of war. When he decides, and however he decides, he should have unanimous backing.

WABASH VALLEY WATER CONSERVATION AWARDS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, Eli Lilly & Co. was recently cited by the Wabash Valley Association for its outstanding and continuing efforts to prevent pollution of the Wabash River at its Tippecanoe Laboratories in Lafayette, Ind. This is the first time in its 9-year existence that the Wabash Valley Association, which has over 50 chapters in some 80 counties in Indiana and Illinois, has so honored an Indiana industry for its water conservation measures.

Eli Lilly & Co. has constructed waste disposal facilities at a cost of nearly $2 million and an operational cost of some $200,000 annually at its Lafayette plant which produces pharmaceuticals and agricultural chemicals. In addition, it maintains a waste monitoring system, both upstream and downstream from the installation, checking carefully on the water purity at both points.

In addition to Eli Lilly & Co., the Wabash Valley Association also commended the Ayrshire Collieries Corp. of Indianapolis for its reclamation activities in the strip mines of Clay County, Ind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed as part of my remarks articles from the Indianapolis News and the Terre Haute Tribune-Star which describe in further detail the awards made to these two Indiana companies.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis News, Feb. 5, 1966]

COAL FIRM, LILLY GAIN VALLEY HONOR

OLNEY, ILL.—Eli Lilly & Co. was honored here today for its "outstanding efforts in handling waste materials" at its Tippecanoe Laboratories in Lafayette, Ind., and "its continuing efforts to keep the Wabash River clean."

The Lilly company is the first Indiana industrial concern to be cited for its water conservation efforts by the 9-year-old Wabash Valley Association.

The honor came at the annual meeting of the association at Olney. More than 1,000 association officers and members attended.

Also commended by the association was Ayrshire Collieries Corp. of Indianapolis. It was recognized for its strip mine reclamation work in Clay County.

The Wabash Valley Association has headquarters in Mount Carmel, Ill. It was organized in 1957 in an effort to educate citizens in proper water management and soil conservation. There are 58 association chapters in the 80 counties wholly within the Wabash Valley watershed.

Many Indiana and Illinois Senators and Representatives are charter members of the group. Its president is Robert Gramelspacher, Jasper, Ind., businessman and a former member of the Indiana House of Representatives.

The waste disposal system installed by Lilly at the Tippecanoe facility cost nearly $2 million, and operational costs total more than $200,000 annually. The company has an active waste monitoring program, both above and downstream from the plant, and monthly results are submitted to the Indiana Water Pollution Control Board.

The Tippecanoe Laboratories were established in 1954 with 35 employees. Employment today is more than 300. Seven employees operate the disposal system on a round the clock basis. The system is large enough to handle the disposal needs of a city with 60,000 to 70,000 population. This population is roughly that of the cities of Lafayette and West Lafayette combined.

[From the Terre Haute (Ind.) Tribune-Star, Feb. 6, 1966]

ELI LILLY AND AYRSHIRE GIVEN HONORS BY WVA

OLNEY, ILL.—Eli Lilly & Co. was honored here Friday for its outstanding efforts in handling waste materials at its Tippecanoe Laboratories in Lafayette, Ind., and its continuing efforts to keep the Wabash River clean.

The Lilly company is the first Indiana industrial concern to be cited for its water conservation efforts by the 9-year-old Wabash Valley Association. Four other companies with plants in Indiana and Illinois also received commendations.

The awards were made at the annual meeting of the association at Olney. More than 1,000 association officers and members attended the awards program.

The Wabash Valley Association has headquarters in Mount Carmel, Ill. It was organized in 1957 in an effort to educate citizens in proper water management and soil conservation. There are 58 association chapters in the 80 counties wholly within the Wabash Valley watershed.

Many of Indiana and Illinois U.S. Senators and Representatives are charter members of the group. Its president is Robert Gramelspacher, Jasper (Ind.) businessman and a former member of the Indiana House of Representatives.

Association awards were presented by Henry J. Wallace, first vice president.

In accepting the award for the Lilly company, Jerome J. Stefaniak, Ph. D., director of the Tippecanoe Laboratories, expressed his appreciation for the recognition. He pointed out that the achievements were made possible by the efforts of the engineering and technical staff, headed by Robert H. L. Howe, Ph. D., and the full cooperation of the group assigned to waste disposal.

The Wabash Valley Association's citation states:

"Eli Lilly & Co. has performed a meritorious service in its effort to prevent stream pollution to the best of its considerable ability. The design, construction, operation, and maintenance of the Tippecanoe Laboratories in Lafayette, which are engaged in the production of pharmaceuticals and agricultural chemicals, are an outstanding example of a modern corporation's efforts to live in harmony with its environment.

"As the laboratories were originally designated, adequate waste treatment facilities were included as part of the building program. As the operations have been expanded, so have the waste treatment facilities."

The waste disposal system installed by Eli Lilly & Co. at the Tippecanoe facility cost nearly $2 million, and operational costs total more than $200,000 annually. The company has an active waste monitoring program, both above and downstream from the plant, and monthly results are submitted to the Indiana Water Pollution Control Board.

The Tippecanoe Laboratories were established in 1954 with 35 employees. Employment today is more than 300. Seven employees operate the disposal system on a 24-hour, 7-day-a-week basis. The system is large enough to handle the disposal needs of a city with 60,000 to 70,000 population. This population is roughly that of the cities of Lafayette and West Lafayette combined.

A second Indiana company to be commended by the Wabash Valley Association is Ayrshire Collieries Corp. of Indianapolis. It was recognized for its strip mine reclamation work in Clay County.

Illinois concerns honored for water pollution abatement are Marathon Oil Co.'s refinery at Robinson, Texaco's refinery at Lawrenceville, and American Machine & Foundry's wheel division at Olney.

GI EDUCATION—A GOOD INVESTMENT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the cold war GI bill, approved unanimously by both Houses of the Congress, is a good "good investment" in the words of a recent editorial in the Billings, Mont., Gazette.

As a cosponsor of legislation in this area, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in the February 16 issue be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GI EDUCATION A GOOD INVESTMENT

The cold war GI bill just passed by Congress recognizes the sacrifices made by servicemen in undeclared wars such as in Vietnam and Santo Domingo, but provides education, housing and health benefits regardless of whether a man has been in combat or not. The wisdom of the broad scope can be questioned, but education benefits are a way of rewarding the youths who cut short their scholastic career to serve in the Armed Forces.

Most of the $327 million to be spent the first year is for payments of $100 per month to cover college or vocational training, and by 1970 the yearly outlay is expected to reach $494 million. Most young men enlist in their late teens and with only a high school education. The payments will be an inducement to continue their schooling after finishing their service and thus fit themselves for jobs which more and more call for training beyond high school.

An incidental benefit to the country is in the prospect of these rewards making military service more attractive and help the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps compete with private industry for manpower. Education aid is measured by the period of duty and the prospect of getting a college education in exchange for service in the Armed Forces should appeal to many a youth, who otherwise, for financial reasons, couldn't expect to go to college.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE ADMIRAL OF THE FLEET CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the people of Hawaii were deeply saddened this past weekend by the death of the admiral of the fleet, Chester W. Nimitz. Hawaii owed this great naval officer a debt which it could never repay. The obligation was assumed at a point in space and time called the Battle of Midway.

But Midway was only one of the stars in Admiral Nimitz' constellation. There were many others—Coral Sea, the Marianas, Turkey Shoot, Tarawa, Iwo Jima, to name a few.

His staff bristled with the names of great fighting men—Halsey, Mitschner, Turner, Spruance, and Kincaid. There were many more. Before World War II ended, Admiral Nimitz commanded a fighting force of 2 million men and a thousand ships. Our Nation called on this man in its darkest hour. He took command of the Pacific Fleet December 31, 1941, but its fighting heart had been stilled at Pearl Harbor. Fortunately for us, Chester W. Nimitz never ran short of adrenalin. Slowly but surely, he began to rebuild our Pacific Fleet until it was able to sweep the enemy from the Pacific.

America will never forget his great deeds. Today we mourn his passing.

LAWYERS AND THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Phillip D. Hardberger, Executive Secretary of the Peace Corps, has recently written an excellent article for the American Bar Association Journal. Pointing to several specific accomplishments, Mr. Hardberger describes the opportunities open to lawyers in the Peace Corps. He cites the work of two lawyers in Ethiopia, where the Peace Corps is now maintaining a law school which will soon double and triple the number of lawyers in that country.

Mr. President, Phil Hardberger is already known to many of us for his work in the congressional liaison office of the Peace Corps. He is a bright and talented young lawyer, himself, and I highly commend his fine article.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

THE MEN OF THE PEACE CORPS: FOUNDING FATHERS OF A NEW ORDER

(NOTE.—Mr. Hardberger writes of the extraordinary opportunities open to young lawyers who volunteer for the Peace Corps. In Ethiopia, for example, there are only 21 native lawyers in a nation of 20 million. In Malawi, a Peace Corps man is serving as secretary for a committee that is drawing up that country's first complete set of law reports. Another member of the Corps spent 2 years organizing and selling the idea of savings and loan associations in communities that badly need financial help for the construction of housing. And in another Latin American country, Peace Corps workers are organizing legal aid clinics in a land where the poor have had no access at all to legal assistance.)

(By Phillip D. Hardberger, Executive Secretary of the Peace Corps)

"Every lawyer wants to be a founding father. These guys are going to get the chance," a Peace Corps official said wistfully when the first Peace Corps lawyer's program was announced.

The first Peace Corps lawyers have now been overseas for 27 months. They are not, of course, founding fathers in any literal sense of the word. The countries were already established, a legal system of sorts was functioning and there were at least a few indigenous lawyers. But compared with the opportunities in the United States for a young lawyer, the overseas assignments were still extraordinarily challenging.

LAND OF THE QUEEN OF SHEBA PRESENTS OPPORTUNITIES

Ethiopia is a good example of the opportunities and frustrations that lay before these lawyers. Ethiopia is the Abyssinia of the Old Testament and the reputed home of the Queen of Sheba.

The country has had a primitive legal system for hundreds of years, but the system has not changed substantially for hundreds of years either. For instance, the commercial court is still the court of the marketplace. Let us say there is a dispute over the sale of a goat. The judge is a village elder, who has a booth in the marketplace. The two litigants go to him, pay a few cents and tell their stories. The elder listens and decides who is right and who is wrong. That is the end of the trial. The judge has never seen a lawbook, and rarely knows how to read.

There had never been a law school in this country of 20 million people until September of 1963, and there were precious few lawyers. Even today there are only 21 native Ethiopian lawyers, although their ranks are augmented by another 38 expatriate lawyers from other countries who are practicing in Ethiopia.

All this is due to change drastically. Peace Corps volunteers, along with other expatriate teachers, have started a law school that is now attended by 90 students: 20 are in the third year of training; 30 are in the second year and 40 others are in their first year. When the first class is graduated in 1968, it will double the number of Ethopian lawyers in Ethiopia. When the second class is graduated, in 1969, it will triple the number.

But numbers tell very little of the story. Almost all the advocates in the country are completely untrained in the law. Many judges and other high-level government workers fall into the same category. Lawyers are desperately needed in all these areas.

The law school at Haile Selassie University began its first class in September of 1963. Like the rest of the university, it is located on the old palace grounds of Emperor Haile Selassie. The Emperor gave the palace so that the university would have a readymade physical plant. The law school is housed in the Duke of Harar's impressive palace.

The school has taken on the trappings of a European medieval school of law. It is not only training students, but is serving as the center of the law for the entire nation. The law journal is publishing the first written opinions in Ethopian history. The supreme court judges, many of whom are not lawyers, are taking night school courses. They discuss difficult questions of law in pending cases with the law school professors. Just as European professors' opinions were once given great weight in the courts, the opinions of these professors are highly regarded by the Ethopian judiciary.

The first volunteer teachers at the law school were Larry Chruch and Owen Cylke. Cylke, 25, was graduated from Yale Law School in 1963; Church finished his studies at the University of Wisconsin Law School in the same year. Both went immediately into the Peace Corps. Cylke taught real property at the university. Church's subject was business organization. They shared the teaching of a legal writing course.

"We had to write our own textbooks and prepare our own lessons," Cylke said. "Our main purpose was to turn out materials for future classes. Most of our day was spent preparing this material.

"Our first problem was to teach the students to think legally. They already have a deep feeling of integrity.

"It is not always easy to teach people formal legal concepts who have been practicing law for the past 50 years. But they were very eager."

COMMON LAW TEXTS IN A CIVIL CODE LAND

Some textbooks are available, but they are all of the American variety: i.e., "Simpson on Contracts, Prosser on Torts," etc. Ethiopia is a code country (its code was drawn up a few years ago by the Frenchman, René David), so what Prosser says is not necessarily the law in Ethiopia. The volunteers say that the American texts such as Prosser are still valuable.

"His reasoning is important. Prosser tells the students how to apply the law. The individual judge or lawyer always has the option of deciding that the social reasoning behind a rule of negligence will not be applicable here," Church explained.

Since there were no written opinions until the Peace Corpsmen arrived in Ethiopia, there are no written precedents. Precedent, of course, is not so important in a code country anyway, but Ethiopian judges often use the common law approach rather than applying the strict letter of the code.

In a recent supreme court case contesting the validity of a will, the lawyer opposing the will showed that it had been signed by only three witnesses. He pointed out the applicable section in the code which requires that there must be four witnesses to make a will valid. The court held that three witnesses were enough because this has always been the custom in Ethiopia. The decision weakened the code, but there was a good reason for it. Had the court held that four witnesses were necessary for a valid will, the ruling would have invalidated most of the wills in Ethiopia.

Lawyers and judges in the provinces are frequently unaware that there is a civil code. Hence, although the code is officially the law of the land and is used in Addis Ababa, Asmara, and other leading cities, it is unknown in most of the country.

The code, which was originally written in French, has been translated into Amharic and English. Courts are conducted in both languages also. This is an added difficulty for the students at the law school, who are often barely conversant in the language. And if they can speak English, they are probably not used to writing it. It is the Emperor's wish that all classes on the secondary and university level be taught in English so that all educated Ethiopians will be bilingual. The Emperor speaks French and Amharic fluently and has a smattering of English.

EMPERER GIVES SUPPORT TO PEACE CORPSMEN

The Peace Corps volunteer lawyers in Ethiopia have had strong support from the Emperor. He frequently sits in on faculty meetings at the law school and has astonished the law students and their volunteer instructors by quietly coming into a class and sitting through the lecture.

"Our Empire has need, in its government and in its commerce, for well-educated lawyers and particularly for those who have been training in their own university, in their own codes and customs," the Emperor said at the university's first convocation in 1961.

Not all the volunteer lawyers in Ethiopia are working in the law schools. Rhett Goldberg, a 1963 graduate of Harvard Law School, drafted ordinances for the capital city, Addis Ababa. He also acted as an adviser to the city council on legal matters and did extensive work on Addis Ababa's first city code.

Russell Berman, also a graduate of Harvard, drafted laws on the national level at the Institute of Public Administration. He also worked on a codification of all laws passed by the Ethiopian Parliament or issued by the Emperor. He drafted legislation on mining, minimum wages, pharmacy, unfair trade practices, pensions, hunting and conservation.

"Whatever came through the Prime Minister's office went across my desk," Berman says. "You have to become an expert on everything. For instance, I became more or less an expert in labor legislation. I had to. There was no one else to do it.

"The few Ethiopian lawyers don't want to bother with legislation or legal drafting. They become Assistant Ministers and Vice Ministers."

This is not the case in all of the developing nations. In the old colonial countries there are entirely different problems. These countries have a sound system of colonial law. But tribal law was largely ignored. With the withdrawal of the British, these countries were anxious to rework their judicial systems, weaving together old tribal law with the English common law. There is a strong desire in countries all over Africa to make their law distinctively national. The volunteer lawyers are helping in this effort. Volunteers in the former colonies are working in the ministries of justice to improve methods of judicial review, teaching in new law schools and writing legislation on a municipal and national level.

TENNESSEE GRADUATE WORKS ON MALAWI LAW

Philip Durand, a graduate of the University of Tennessee Law School, was a secretary to the committee on law reporting for the southern half of Malawi. There were only a few hundred pages of cases covering the years from 1923 (when the reports began) until 1952, when the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland Law Reports began.

"The first task was going through all cases to 1922 and deciding which cases were still good law and deleting those which have been overruled," Durand says.

"Ahead lay comparison of cases for completeness, correlation of all statutory changes, rewriting of headnotes, editing of cases to delete extraneous material, preparation of indices and cross-reference tables, and everything else that West or Callaghan or Commerce Clearing House can do so much better and faster."

Nor were Durand's problems solved at this point. There was still the matter of finances. Durand had to arrange this through the Malawi Government and from independent sources. He also had to make contact with publishers, negotiate contracts, and read proof.

"This was the type of job which has to turn into a long-range project with a definite tangible goal, or the frustrations would be enormous," said Durand. "It is rather difficult to read cases all day long just to find out what they say; yet, when I left, I took with me published volumes and can say 'This I helped with, and it remains in Malawi as a tangible sample of 2 years which were not wasted.'"

Durand's feelings are shared by the other attorney volunteers, including some whose jobs are quite different.

Thomas McCarthy, a 1963 graduate of St. John's University School of Law, served as an inspector of native courts in northern Nigeria. His official job was to inspect court records and investigate particular complaints that come into the Ministry of Justice.

"But my real job was to train the judicial staff of the north," says McCarthy. "I went to a provincial center each month and gave a 10-day course (on just about anything) to which the native authority brought the court personnel in the area that needed training.

"If this system works, the Commissioner will unleash a flock of inspector-teachers to cover the north, teaching the basic materials: penal code, criminal procedure and civil procedure, and court administration and records."

The system was first tried at Kano, Nigeria, and it worked well. Ten of the Kano courts (there are 31 altogether) now have at least one clerk who knows how to run a court.

CHICAGO MAN SELLS SAVINGS AND LOAN COMPANIES

The only formal projects for lawyers that the Peace Corps has are in Africa. However, lawyers are working in other parts of the world. For instance, in Latin America, volunteer lawyers are organizing savings and loan associations.

The first volunteer lawyer to work in this area was Bruce Pattner, who was graduated from the University of Chicago Law School in 1960 and who worked in the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department before entering the Peace Corps. Pattner's job was to go into Peruvian villages and explain to the communities' leading businessmen how a savings and loan company works. Most of the businessmen were not familiar with the savings and loan idea, so the explanation also took some selling. Pattner would explain what the organization would do, what the requirements of the Peruvian law were and what advantages the program had for the community and the directors.

If Pattner could enlist the businessmen's support, the rest of the community would usually go along with the idea. Pattner and his Peruvian associates would then draw up the charter, prepare the necessary documents and take them to Lima for approval by the national parent bank which would grant the charter. But Pattner's work was still not done. He had to help the fledgling savings and loan associations set up accounting systems and work with them until the first loans were made.

"We prepared everything in simple language. And we kept the documentation to a minimum," Pattner explained.

Before Pattner left Peru, he had set up 16 functioning savings and loan associations, an invaluable aid to the country's housing program since the loans were used for much-needed construction. Pattner also acquired valuable experience in the legal problems of international banking and construction.

He is now working in Washington, D.C., for a law firm that specializes in savings and loan work in Latin America.

While Pattner was overseas, he also worked in his spare time setting up legal aid centers, something that is vitally needed in almost all of the developing nations. In most of them today, there is practically no protection for the indigent defendant.

INCREDIBLE HUMAN ATROCITIES IN A JAIL

As another volunteer lawyer in Latin America said of the jail in his community:

"The jail contains some of the most incredible human atrocities any of us have ever seen in our white American lives. It is filled to overflowing, and every one of the prisoners is mestizo (Indian) and poor; the rich buy their way out if they ever get in. Many have never been tried, most have no idea when their terms will end, and a few have no idea on what charge they were committed. If there was any doubt about their innocence when they entered, there is none about their corruption if they are ever lucky enough to leave. They live like homosexual pigs, and are forgotten by the world outside which worries more about constructing a nicer jail than rehabilitating and defending the human decay inside."

The lawyer who wrote the above report is also setting up a legal aid society composed of lawyers and university law students.

Similar work is being done by volunteer lawyers who are participating in community development projects. These projects are basically designed to teach democracy on a local level. The volunteer's first job is to get the people in the community to recognize a common problem. He then acts as a catalyst to get the community to work together in the solving of that problem.

Community development is not strictly speaking a legal job, but a lawyer's experience in working with people and organizations is a valuable asset. It is a job of practical politics. The lawyer who works in community development will probably find that he himself grows along with the community.

As one community development lawyer said:

"I found it takes a conscious persistence to attend 4- and 5-hour night sessions once a week for months and months; to stay with my host country associates from morning to night in the barriadas, attending ceremonies, socializing, and then to ask for more by meeting with them informally each day during the week. The community organizer must have the ability to be aware of the overall form and movement of influence among its constituent parts. He must be able to sense who is influential and who is not, which issues are influential and how they are influential, and which are not. Still more, he must see how to manipulate his position and those of others; that is, he must be able to shape his participation in that institution according to that awareness."

Lawyers are now being accepted for community development projects in Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, and Nepal.

Whatever kind of job a lawyer has with the Peace Corps, he will gain invaluable experience. Not every volunteer lawyer can be a founding father, but he can have the satisfaction of knowing that he has made a valuable contribution to the people of a village or a nation.

Martin Gleason, a graduate of Loyola Law School, taught law at the University of Nigeria at Nsukka during his Peace Corps tour. He is now working in Washington as the legislative counsel to Senator PAUL DOUGLAS. A few months ago, he received this letter from a former student:

"DEAR MARTIN: Since the day you left us finally, our memories of you have always filled our hearts. During our conversation whenever we think of our discussion class we remember face and humor. We remember your discussion on Bracton, Holmes, Austine, Duguit and many other eminent jurists. Nor can I forget your good gestures and determination to acquaint yourself with our difficulties even when others like yourself would go on enjoying themselves.

"Good intentions of those around us have always equipped us with good memories of them even when they must have left us for the other part of the globe. They remind us how possible it is to bridge up the possible gaps which had hitherto existed between the people of this part of the world and the Americas. The Peace Corps venture I take as the greatest attempt at restoring understanding between people of this country and the United States. These men and women have done a duty which gold and dollar have failed to accomplish. Gold and dollar have each attempted this through aid but failed because they failed to find the real human need. * * *

"Best wishes from the law student you liked."

FLOOD DISASTER REPAIR, OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, almost on the eve of Christmas 1964 a terrible flood struck the Pacific Northwest, causing tremendous damage.

The entire delegation of the affected States, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and California joined together and with the help of the Public Works and Appropriations Committees, long-term Federal corrective action was taken.

However, the real job of repairing the flood damage fell on the people in the affected areas. Private citizens and public officials worked in a common effort to repair the ravages of this catastrophic flood.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks, a letter I received from Pacific Logging Congress executive vice president, Mr. Carwin A. Woolley, and the resolutions adopted by this organization at its 56th congress at Portland, Oreg., as mentioned in the letter.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Pacific Logging Congress,
Portland, Oreg., January 6, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: It is a pleasure to enclose herewith an official copy of the resolutions adopted by the Pacific Logging Congress at its 56th annual sessions in Portland, Oreg., November 8–10, 1965.

Your attention is requested to Resolution No. 8 which commends you for your leadership in securing passage of the Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act. Please be assured that our people are well aware and deeply appreciative of your energetic and effective endeavors in their behalf.

We think you may also find Resolutions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, and 10 of interest.

Sincerely,

Pacific Logging Congress,
Carwin A. Woolley,
Executive Vice President.

Resolutions of the 56th Pacific Logging Congress

(Adopted by majority vote of the Pacific Logging Congress membership, convened at its 56th sessions, Portland, Oreg., November 10, 1965)

RESOLUTION NO. I: NATURAL BEAUTY

The Pacific Logging Congress, proud of the contribution its members have been making since 1909 to the western economy, respectfully calls to the attention of the western delegations in Congress that tens of millions of acres of beautiful, green, growing, young forests which have followed our timber harvest in the last century attest along every major roadside in the West, through forest areas, that logging does not destroy the beauty of the country. The intrinsic beauty of steadily employed people in communities is just as important to the economy of the United States as natural beauty. We pray and petition, as free, taxpaying citizens, that our Congressmen and Senators examine every legislative proposal which would prevent us from practicing forestry and give it the kind of consideration intelligent men give to solving the other problems of the Nation.

RESOLUTION NO. II: TREE FARM ANNIVERSARY STAMP

The nationwide forest industry sponsored tree farm program which originated in the Pacific Northwest, will mark its 25th anniversary in 1966.

This is the most outstanding sustained conservation effort ever conducted under private sponsorship.

By this resolution the Pacific Logging Congress requests that the Postmaster General of the United States issue a stamp in commemoration of this most significant conservation milestone; and encourages each member of the Pacific Logging Congress to renew their active interest in this program, and support the silver anniversary celebration to be held at Montesano, Wash., on May 21, 1966.

RESOLUTION NO. III: REDWOOD REGION RECREATION ACQUISITION

The Pacific Logging Congress recognizes the strong public interest in the preservation of stands of old-growth redwood trees for park purposes.

The Pacific Logging Congress recognizes the growing need for recreation use of forest lands.

It is the position of the Pacific Logging Congress that acquisition of a large area of redwood forest land for National and State parks is unnecessary either to preserve old-growth redwoods or to provide needed recreational development.

Such acquisition would seriously jeopardize the economy of the redwood region.

Additional development of existing State redwood parks is necessary and desirable, but only minor acquisition of land is needed to accomplish this: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The Pacific Logging Congress opposes large-scale acquisition of redwood timberland for National or State parks and gives its full endorsement to the Redwood Park and Recreation Plan as proposed by the people of the redwood region to open 260,000 acres of private land to public recreation and to make available 8,000 acres of redwood-type land for State acquisition.

RESOLUTION NO. IV: NORTH CASCADES AREA

Whereas the North Cascades Area of Washington State, and its resources, are vital to the social and economic welfare of the citizens of adjacent communities, the State and the Nation.

Further, the boundaries of a proposed North Cascades National Park will exclude substantial acreage of commercial timberlands, now administered by the Forest Service, from full multiple use.

Whereas certain extreme preservation groups have designs on significant additional commercial timberland acreage in the Oregon and Washington Cascades for inclusion in parks or other single use areas.

Further, one of these groups has devoted large sums to the development of films, books, and other media containing gross misrepresentation and distortion of facts relevant to multiple-use land management, which have been disseminated with some effect to the general public.

In light of these developments: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Pacific Logging Congress, That the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture are hereby petitioned to have undertaken at the earliest possible date, an independent social economic study of the affected North Cascades area before any action is taken which would cause further withdrawals of any acreage from the status of unreserved multiple use; be it further

Resolved, That the Logging Congress request termination of moratoriums on multiple use of commercial forest lands.

RESOLUTION NO. VIII: COMMENDATION TO WESTERN CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

The Pacific Logging Congress commends the congressional delegations of Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho for their prompt action in securing the passage of the Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act, which gave the much needed relief to the forest industries for the restoration of Forest Service roads caused by last December's disastrous storms, and more particularly acknowledges the assistance of Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon, and Congressman Harold Johnson of California for their leadership in securing passage in their respective Houses.

RESOLUTION NO. IX: STUMPAGE APPRAISAL SMALL WOOD TIMBERS SALES

Whereas the contractual requirement to harvest the forest to close utilization standards will increase the cost of logging and reduce sales income of the logger relative to these costs.

And whereas the present stumpage appraisal procedures when applied to timber sales, which are under small wood recovery standards does not give appropriate recognition to the reduced margin between sales and cost and, therefore, results in stumpage becoming a larger share of the margin and a penalty against close utilization.

And whereas the announced policy of the Government was to avoid an increased impact of stumpage upon operators who elect the recovery of small wood.

We recommend that, stumpage appraisal procedures should be amended to insure that the cost of harvesting the whole forest to the close utilization standard is included in stumpage appraisal and the negative conversion return resulting from harvest of small wood be given appropriate recognition in determining the stumpage assessed against the particular timber sale being appraised.

RESOLUTION NO. X: TIMBER APPRAISALS

Whereas the Timber Appraisal Review Committee recommended that an independent competent economic study be made of the entire subject of profit-and-risk ratios used in Forest Service timber appraisals, and

Whereas this study has as yet not been initiated,

Therefore we recommend that industry and the Forest Service join together in financing such a study by an impartial organization.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Pacific Logging Congress mentioned the work done by the senior Senator from Oregon and the able Congressman from California [Mr. Harold Johnson].

However, the fact is that we were members of a team—a team which worked effectively for the people of a stricken area. In the Senate the members of the Public Works Committee, especially the chairman, Senator McNamara, and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] were instrumental in obtaining hearings and action on the Disaster Relief Act.

The members of the Appropriations Committee, especially Chairman Hayden and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], were most understanding in their considerable efforts to provide the needed money. Likewise, we in the Northwest owe a debt of gratitude to their counterparts in the House.

On behalf of all who worked to secure passage of the Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act I express appreciation to the Pacific Logging Congress.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Record at this point in my remarks three letters from the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, dated December 8 and 20, 1965, and January 18, 1966, on progress on flood-damage repair on BLM roads in western Oregon.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Bureau of Land Management,
Washington, D.C., December 8, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: In response to Mr. Berg's request of December 3, we are enclosing a statement concerning the BLM program of disaster relief for Oregon. Your interest in this vital program is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
EUGENE V. CUMWALT
(For Charles H. Stoddard, Director).

STATEMENT FOR SENATOR MORSE, PACIFIC NORTHWEST DISASTER RELIEF, OREGON

In addition to provisions for increased authorization under the Federal Highway Act and for restoration of forest devlopment roads and trails under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, Public Law 89-41 (Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965) authorized the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to reimburse timber sale contractors, or otherwise arrange to bear road and trail reconstruction costs, for a portion of the requirements to place roads, for which the contractors were responsible, in substantially the same condition as existed prior to the flood.

The act also authorized the Secretary of the Interior to grant any public land entryman additional time in which to comply with any provisions of law if the entryman had been prevented from compliance by the flood situation.

Supplemental appropriation bills for funds needed for emergency road repair and reconstruction are tabulated on enclosure No. 1.

Enclosures Nos. 2 and 3 furnish statistics on damage to BLM transportation systems in western Oregon.

[Enclosure 1]

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT APPROPRIATION BILLS SUPPORTED BY SENATOR MORSE, WHICH WERE PASSED AS A DIRECT RESULT OF THE NORTHWEST FLOODS

Supplemental for fiscal year 1965 (P.L. 89–16):	
Emergency road repair and reconstruction, western Oregon	[1] $8,500,000
Public Land Development roads and trails—Liquidation of contract authority	[2] 500,000
Supplemental for fiscal year 1966 (P.L. 89–309): Emergency road repair and reconstruction, western Oregon	[3] 6,320,000

[1] As of Dec. 1, 1965, it is estimated that 90 percent of this program has been accomplished.

[2] $190,000 of this was for eastern Oregon.

[3] These funds became available to the field on Dec. 2, 1965. A firm program has been prepared and it is anticipated that funds available will be fully obligated by June 30, 1966.

[Enclosure 2]

FLOOD DAMAGE ESTIMATE ON BLM ROADS IN OREGON DUE TO THE DECEMBER 1964–JANUARY 1965 FLOODS

Road miles, 1,444.

Bridges and major culverts, 65.

Total estimated flood damage to BLM roads in western Oregon, $16,100,000.

[ENCLOSURE 3]

FLOOD DAMAGE ESTIMATES ON OREGON TIMBER PURCHASER ROADS ON BLM TIMBER SALE CONTRACTS IN FORCE AT THE TIME OF THE DECEMBER 1964-JANUARY 1965 FLOOD

Number of sales involved	224
Total volume of sales (thousand board feet)	1,215,804
Bid value of timber in sales	$30,930,606
Appraised cost of timber sale roads	$7,709,000
Value of road accomplishment by timber purchasers at time of flood	$6,576,000
Current estimated cost of repair of damage to timber purchaser roads that will be assumed by the Government under regular appropriations	$250,000

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D.C., December 20, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is a progress report in further response to your November 15 letter on flood damage road restoration.

Recently my office and the Bureau of Public Roads have met, both in Washington and in the field, for a review of progress. The results have been excellent in achieving a number of procedural changes which will increase the progress on their vital program.

The Bureau of Public Roads is the Bureau of Land Management's road construction arm. We decide where the roads are needed, the purpose to be served, the type of road needed and the schedule for construction. BPR does the design, lets the contract, after we approve the final design, and supervises the contract.

The flood damage did create an extremely heavy workload for both agencies. However, initial emergency repair action was prompt and effective. Not one of our timber purchasers was adversely affected nor was multiple-use of our lands curtailed during the spring, summer, or fall.

Work has gone forward on flood damage restoration work and while there have been some delays, these have not been of a nature which produced significant adverse operational results.

The damage done to all road systems in Oregon was so extensive that after needed initial repairs it was necessary to schedule final reconstruction at a slower pace and to integrate it with regular work.

We expect, however, to have completed all surveys and road designs, to have practically all contracts let, and to have substantially obligated regular and flood damage funds by next June 30, barring a repetition of floods this winter.

Your remarks on the floor of the Senate were timely because they accelerated a review we had started last spring designed to overhaul this program.

We would like your permission to delay supplying the report requested by January 7 until about January 15—then the record you seek as of December 31 will be available and our report to you can be complete as of that date.

The flood damage disrupted our road system, complicated maintenance schedules and threw a large unexpected workload on our field people. Our engineers and maintenance crews put in many extra days and hours not only at the time of the flood but since then in an effort to cope with this unprecedented problem. The Bureau's road program is relatively small and it is heavily concentrated. However, our review shows that our field forces responded very well to the demands placed upon them.

The report we will make in January will supply precise figures on performance which will demonstrate the progress that has been made.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES H. STODDARD,
Director.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In further response to your November 15, 1965, letter we have compiled current data pertaining to the status of the entire road program in western Oregon.

The joint BLM-BPR meetings mentioned in our December 20, 1965, letter have proven to be quite fruitful. Several procedural changes have been adopted (operational and fiscal) which have resulted in increased efficiency and progress. Some of the more significant actions resulting from the meetings are:

1. The BLM State Director, Oregon and the BPR regional engineer, region 8, are developing flow charts which will describe in full the basic procedures involved in both agencies in implementing the road program.

2. Changes in fiscal procedures have been initiated which will reduce the size of allotted but unobligated balances. This change will free certain funds which have been unobligated, but not available.

3. The Bureau of Land Management has developed a 3-year road program for submission to the Bureau of Public Roads. This will enable BPR to do a better job of planning its overall workload and hopefully will result in more timely letting of BLM contracts.

4. The Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Public Roads have appointed liaison men to be the principal points of day-to-day contact for operational purposes. These men have prepared an advertising schedule covering both regular and flood damage programs that is designed to meet our goal of June 30, 1966. In addition, BPR has indicated that firm estimates of costs for the entire road program will be available February 1, 1966. Both agencies will then consult on the balance of funds that may be needed to complete flood damage work.

5. The Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Public Roads have agreed to conduct joint quarterly meetings to discuss the status of the road program. There will be a major annual meeting and the interim sessions will be designed to discuss the details of the ongoing program including program emphasis and operational requirements. The first meeting will be held on January 25, 1966. We believe these meetings and the procedural changes mentioned above will improve the functioning of both Bureaus in carrying out this important program.

Enclosures 1 and 2 are tabulations on the status of the BLM road program and the total O. & C. Grant Land Fund as of December 31, 1965.

The unobligated balance at any particular point during a fiscal year does not reflect the actual situation. Under our system a certain amount of the unobligated balance is always in the allotted status. Funds in this category are in the pipeline and are earmarked for specific projects. Therefore, allotted money will appear in the unobligated balance, but it is not in reality available.

The minus figure (−$358,107) shown in column 3 of enclosure 1 indicates the amount which is required prior to award of contract. The additional funds are being transferred from receipts earned during the second quarter fiscal year 1966.

The available balance ($7,025,414) which is the amount that remains unallotted and unobligated (column 8, enclosure 1) is still quite high because the fiscal year 1966 supplemental ($6,320,000) did not become available for obligation until December 2, 1965.

The Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Public Roads have jointly prepared project schedules that should enable us to have all flood damage and regular program contracts let by next June 30, barring a repetition of floods this winter.

Please refer to our letter of December 8, 1965, for information on the Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act. The data supplied at that time is still current.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES H. STODDARD,
Director.

Enclosures.

Status of BLM road program as of Dec. 31, 1965

	Roads						
	Regular appropriation			Supplemental storm damage			Grand total (8)
(1)	Bureau of Land Management (2)	Bureau of Public Roads (3)	Subtotal (4)	Bureau of Land Management (5)	Bureau of Public Roads (6)	Subtotal (7)	
Unobligated balance, June 30, 1965	575,724	2,615,060	3,190,784	1,184,073	4,034,443	5,218,516	8,409,300
Additional availability	495,976	2,697,427	3,193,403		6,320,000	6,320,000	9,513,403
Total available to Dec. 21, 1965	1,071,700	5,312,487	6,384,187	1,184,073	10,354,443	11,538,516	17,922,703
Obligations through Dec. 31, 1965	433,330	2,048,722	2,482,052	567,245	2,200,477	2,767,722	5,249,774
Unobligated balance, Dec. 31, 1965	638,370	3,263,765	3,902,135	616,828	8,153,966	8,770,794	12,672,929
Allotted but not obligated		3,621,872	3,621,872		2,025,643	2,025,643	5,647,515
Available balance, Dec. 31, 1965	638,370	(−358,107)	280,263	616,828	6,128,323	6,745,151	7,025,414
Anticipated additional availability	474,023	3,182,573	3,656,596				3,656,596
Total available for balance of year	1,112,393	2,824,466	3,936,859	616,828	6,128,323	6,745,151	10,682,010

Fiscal year 1966 status of O. & C. grant lands funds as of Dec. 31, 1965

	Regular Bureau of Land Management appropriation							Supplemental storm damage			Forest Service—Share of O. & C. funds	Grand total
	Roads			Other								
	Bureau of Land Management	Bureau of Public Roads	Subtotal	Forest development and protection, Bureau of Land Management	Operation and maintenance, Bureau of Land Management and Bureau of Public Roads	Subtotal	Total regular [1]	Bureau of Land Management	Bureau of Public Roads	Total storm damage		
Unobligated balance June 30, 1965	575,724	2,615,060	3,190,784	185,254	164,208	349,462	3,540,246	1,184,073	4,034,443	5,218,516	915,945	9,674,707
Additional availability	495,976	2,697,427	3,193,403	1,123,046	365,000	1,488,046	4,681,444		6,320,000	6,320,000	454,281	11,455,730
Total available to Dec. 31, 1965	1,071,700	5,312,487	6,384,187	1,308,300	529,208	1,837,508	8,221,695	1,184,073	10,354,443	11,538,516	1,370,226	21,130,427
Obligations through Dec. 31, 1965	433,330	2,048,722	2,482,052	1,062,265	142,935	1,205,200	3,687,252	567,245	2,200,477	2,767,722	868,462	7,323,436
Unobligated balance Dec. 31, 1965	638,370	3,263,765	3,902,135	246,035	386,273	632,308	4,534,443	616,828	8,153,966	8,770,794	501,764	13,807,001
Allotted but not obligated		3,621,872	3,621,872		178,488	178,488	3,800,360		2,025,643	2,025,643		5,826,003
Available balance Dec. 31, 1965	638,370	(−358,107)	280,263	246,035	207,785	453,820	734,083	616,828	6,128,323	6,745,151	501,764	7,980,998
Anticipated additional availability	474,023	3,182,573	3,656,596	476,954	435,000	911,954	4,568,550				920,719	5,489,269
Total available for balance of year	1,112,393	2,824,466	3,936,859	722,989	642,785	1,365,774	5,302,633	613,828	6,128,323	6,745,151	1,422,483	13,470,267
Forest Service												−1,422,483
Total remainder available to Bureau of Land Management												12,047,784

---

[1] Exclusive of Forest Service.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Director Stoddard is to be commended for the review he has given the work being done to restore damage.

Last fall when the Congress was considering the further funds needed to complete this work the House reduced the request by $2 million. The Bureau had substantial unobligated funds on hand and I directed attention to this situation when the bill was before the Senate.

It is quite evident from Director Stoddard's letters that the observations I made last fall have had a useful catalytic effect.

Even more, I believe some very, very timely revisions have been made. I do not want to overlook the important role the Bureau of Public Roads plays in the proper accomplishment of the BLM's road program. So along with the officials of the Bureau of Land Management I want the Bureau of Public Roads to know that Oregon, through the Bureau's proper Federal role in disaster relief, has been aided by the constructive work performed by BPR over the last several months.

I shall continue to follow this flood relief program with close interest in the months ahead.

A THREAT TO SPORT FISHING

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in the January 31 issue of Sports Illustrated there appeared an article concerning the threat to sport fishing in the recent developments in offshore commercial longlining by Japanese vessels. I sent that article to the Secretary of the Interior and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, the reply to my letter of February 18 from Deputy Director Abram V. Tunison of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,
Washington D.C., February 18, 1966.

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: We are pleased to reply to your letter of February 10 requesting comments on the Sports Illustrated article regarding the appearance of foreign commercial fishing operations in sport-fishing areas.

Recent developments in offshore commercial long lining by Japanese vessels in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans are of growing concern to many anglers and conservationists who are aware that these valuable gamefood fishes are not under adequate scientific study. We share this concern for two reasons: Our knowledge of the catches of these species is imperfect, and we do not yet understand how much fishing the resource can sustain. Thus, it is not possible to say whether the present level of fishing is excessive or not.

Apart from the dearth of facts about the fishery, the United States has no regulatory powers over foreign vessels fishing in international waters, even if such regulations were found to be necessary, unless such resources are included in an international convention.

In our own big gamefish tagging program on the Pacific coast, in cooperation with anglers, the International Gamefish Association, and the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, all of the tags returned so far have been from Japanese long-line vessels. The aims of this tagging program are to learn something of the migration, growth, population structure, and exploitation of striped marlin, blue marlin, and sailfish. If after obtaining the necessary facts, we find the resource is being overfished, we can then attempt to reach agreement with Japan on mutually acceptable regulations. Some new arrangements or extensions of existing conventions no doubt will be needed to bring together Government and fishery officials on these international problems.

Big gamefish problems are by no means restricted to those involving foreign nationals and the billfishes. Fears have been expressed also, that bluefin tuna stocks in the Atlantic Ocean are being fished too heavily. Tagging studies being conducted by the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution have resulted in a relatively high rate of return, but it is not possible to conclude from this research that the resource is being harmed. The individual States, of course, have jurisdiction over the activities of their citizens and can regulate offshore fishing through gear, size, and season limitations and landing permit systems. The interstate compact, represented by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, is a vehicle for developing reciprocal regulations along the coast. However, we would hesitate to urge imposition of restrictive regulations on U.S. fishermen without equal sacrifices by foreigners, especially without reliable catch and effort statistics and a great deal more research-derived information. Both are expensive and difficult to obtain on such wide-ranging species.

An international convention for the conservation of Atlantic tunas is now in the planning stage. When established, it will certainly be concerned with the conservation of the total tuna resource.

As fishing methods improve and worldwide fishing intensity increases, we must be ever more alert to guard against overfishing. Where certain kinds of fish are valuable to sport fishermen and commercial fishermen, the problems become more difficult. When the situation is complicated by foreign fishing activities off our coasts, these difficulties increase. The two Bureaus of the Fish and Wildlife Service are doing everything possible within the limits of available facilities and personnel to gather the scientific information necessary to understand the condition of these resources and their reaction to increased fishing intensity. Until adequate scientific information is available there is no substantial basis for negotiation.

Please call on us if we can be of further assistance.

A. V. TUNISON,
Deputy Director.

SAVING OUR WILD RIVERS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on January 18 the Senate overwhelmingly approved by a vote of 71 to 1 the bill to create a national system of wild rivers, S. 1446.

The February–March issue of National Wildlife, the official publication of the National Wildlife Federation, devoted a large share of its space to the wild rivers proposal. More than 200,000 families received this fine magazine, illustrated with magnificent photographs and sketches, and I am sure they will now have a better understanding and a greater appreciation of this landmark legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW CAN WE "SAVE" A RIVER?

Rivers are the veins and arteries of our continent—indeed, of the world. In the United States, they are not only sources of water, but vital avenues of transportation, essentials of industry, carriers of waste, centers of recreation, and the very core of existence of most wildlife—fish, birds, mammals, plants and forests, and man as well.

Our pioneer forebears, as they conquered the primitive back country, located their settlements at strategic points along waterways. St. Louis, for instance, became truly the "Gateway to the West" because of its location at the confluence of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers—jumping-off place for westward migrants, and receiving station for western products like furs.

Inexorably, the settlements turned to villages, then cities, and progress in many respects caused unfortunate changes. We built our cities and our vacation havens along those waterways, set our industries besides them, dammed and harnessed them for power and water and navigation, and loaded them with wastes.

As a result, most of the hundred thousand miles of streams in the United States large enough to be called rivers have lost their personality, if not their entire identity. Once lost, that identity can seldom be regained.

There are still, however, a handful of rivers—or sections of rivers—which have been left in their original state. Few are truly unspoiled in the strictest sense, but some still retain their original character or enough of it to be useful for recreation, inspiration, and scientific or historic purposes. This few hundred miles is all that is left.

Several years ago, a few farseeing Americans of conscience proposed that some of these disappearing rivers be set aside and preserved in their original state. They knew that, at the rate they were being altered by our expansion, it would not be long before there were none left, or at least none that were readily accessible to the public. Their philosophy was well expressed by President Johnson last year when he so thoughtfully pointed out that we owe future generations a glimpse of the world as God made it, not just as it looked when we got through with it.

In their attempts to save a few miles of free-flowing rivers, these enlightened pioneers worked for years against heavy resistance, and to little avail. They faced high-powered lobbies representing vested interests in power, manufacturing, irrigation, navigation, flood control, municipal water supply, and mining. Finally, in just the last few months, the growing realization of the need to preserve our natural beauty has given new strength to their arguments. The Wilderness Act took 9 long years in passing, will preserve 40 to 45 million acres of wilderness in its original state, and gave heart to the advocates of the wild rivers.

In the nick of time, the Ozark Scenic Riverways System was created, to save outstanding free-flowing sections of the Current and Jack's Fork Rivers in Missouri. President Johnson has directed that the Potomac be cleaned up and set aside "as a model of beauty and recreation for the entire country." The Senate already has passed a bill protecting the St. Croix and Namekegon Rivers in Wisconsin and Minnesota. Another bill would establish the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in New York. Many people urge that the Allagash in Maine and the Buffalo in Arkansas be preserved from the dam builders.

Now—perhaps at the moment that you read these words—the battle is being joined to save a share of the rest of the remaining rivers still deemed suitable. Conservationist-Senator FRANK CHURCH of Idaho and 31 cosponsors, with the support of the Department of the Interior and the Administration, has proposed S. 1446, The Wild Rivers Act. Patterned after the successful wilderness bill, it would take action in several directions to solve the problem.

As reported to the Senate by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, it would set aside—and take action to restore, outstanding segments of five rivers, with the related adjacent land, much of which is already in public ownership. It would provide Federal-State study of 11 other streams for addition to the national system, and set up machinery for consideration of still others.

The proposal further provides for administration of streams included in the system; for cooperation between Federal and State agencies in planning and management of them; for preventing the Federal Power Commission from authorizing dams or other structures that would affect protected waters; for cooperation with pollution-control agencies, and for consideration of commercial uses around the streams—lumbering, grazing, mining, and others that could harmonize with the wild river's basic purpose. The acquisition of land, water or easements for access could be financed through the land and water conservation fund, or by appropriation, property transfers, or donations.

The issue of a wild rivers system is expected to be discussed very thoroughly in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (of which Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL of Colorado is chairman) this year. Commitee hearings have not yet been conducted on the House versions of the Wild Rivers Act, but the proposal is expected to be fought, either openly or covertly, by those same vested-interest groups that opposed the Senate version.

The House committee will consider two proposals. One, H.R. 8630, by Representative JOHN RACE of Wisconsin, is the same as the original version of S. 1446. A second, H.R. 11395, by Representative WILLIAM R. ANDERSON of Tennessee, is the same as the version of S. 1446 that was reported to the Senate after committee hearings.

The Wild Rivers Act offers us a rare chance to save a vanishing American resource before it is too late. A massive expression of the will of the people can save these streams now. For once they are lost, no power on earth—no act of Congress or will of the people—can create another wild river.

OMBUDSMAN FOR BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I have already informed my colleagues that Mr. Alfred Bexelius, the present ombudsman of Sweden, will appear on March 7, 1966, before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure. Ombudsman, it will be recalled, is a form of citizen's defender against excesses of government. In Sweden—and other countries of the world which have created the institution of ombudsman—when a citizen is dissatisfied or angered by governmental actions which he feels are unfair or unjust, he complains to the ombudsman. In most instances, the citizen is satisfied when the ombudsman takes up the investigation, for he knows that the ombudsman will give the matter his full and fair attention.

Yesterday's Parade magazine featured an article by Jack Anderson entitled "A New and Frightening Trend: Intimidation by Government." Mr. Anderson writes that in too many cases today, the investigatory agencies of our Government—such as the Internal Revenue Service—are using their power to "intimidate, coerce, and strike back at persons who challenge the rulings or oppose the policies of the Government."

Mr. Anderson suggests:

In theory an innocent man has nothing to fear from investigators but few have the resources or funds to stand up against relentless Government prying.

Mr. President, since my subcommittee started its investigation into invasions of privacy by snooping Government agencies, I have come to this very same conclusion. As Mr. Anderson points out, many innocent men have had their reputations ruined because of these investigations. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, I will continue to fight governmental invasions of privacy. But, if we create an American ombudsman, perhaps one of his functions will be to come to the defense of those citizens who have been wronged as a result of a coercive Government investigation. We intend to explore this with Mr. Bexelius next month. In the meantime, I ask permission to insert Mr. Anderson's timely article at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW AND FRIGHTENING TREND: INTIMIDATION BY GOVERNMENT—WASHINGTON IS SWARMING WITH INVESTIGATORS READY TO HARASS THOSE WHO CHALLENGE THE UNITED STATES

(By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—In the tradition of the United States the Government's power of investigation is to be used for the good of the taxpayers, to ferret out the dishonest and the disloyal. But in all too many cases today this power is being turned against the citizens. It is being used to intimidate, coerce, and strike back at persons who challenge the rulings or oppose the policies of the Government.

A contractor who won't accept Government terms, a taxpayer who contests a Government ruling, even the associate of another person under investigation—all may now find themselves hounded by gumshoes. In one recent and ominous instance a number of persons exercising their constitutional right to protest the war in Vietnam were ordered investigated. In another case an official used the investigatory power as a club in a private squabble.

Of course, some of the targets of investigation are Reds, racketeers, and others not wholly deserving of sympathy. And in theory an innocent man has nothing to fear from investigators. But few have the resources or funds to stand up against relentless Government prying. Moreover, once investigators have come around questioning a citizen's neighbors and associates, a cloud of suspicion is raised that may never be dispelled. His reputation may be ruined even though he is innocent of any wrongdoing.

The coercive investigation, it should be noted, is not practiced in all cases by any means, nor is it followed by all Government agencies. The examples remain in the minority. But they are multiplying alarmingly.

One reason is that the Federal bureaucracy is literally crawling with investigators who, if they are to earn their salaries, must investigate someone. Many agencies have become topheavy with investigators No one can say exactly how many have found their way onto the Government payroll, for they are often camouflaged as attorneys, accountants, or consultants. But a top official of one Federal procurement agency confessed to Parade: "We used to have a large staff of engineers and a few lawyers and investigators: Now we have a large staff of lawyers and investigators and a few engineers."

Additionally, this has become an age of investigation, in which the routine background investigation has become accepted, and other forms of prying and snooping are widespread.

The policy of intimidation by investigation has many facets. A favorite harassment of investigators is to toss difficult cases, no matter how unrelated to taxes they may be, to the Internal Revenue Service. "A lot of other agencies try to use us," Commissioner Sheldon Cohen acknowledged to Parade. "We try to discourage this."

When the Government moved to take over private homes on military bases, owners who resisted complained that they were suddenly besieged by tax agents. The Justice Department's Land Acquisition Section brought tax pressure, for example, on Nashville builder, Edward Carmack, who was unwilling to sell 600 homes at Sewart Air Force Base, Tenn., at the Goverment's price. Ralph Luttrell, then section chief, admitted to Parade that he had drafted an official letter to Internal Revenue, pointing out the possibility of tax evasion in the Carmack case. The builder was subjected to an intensive investigation, which ended in dismissal of the charges. (A civil settlement is still awaiting the judgment of the tax court.)

One high official even used the Internal Revenue Service to take revenge on a driver whose car bumped his Cadillac at Washington National Airport. The official copied the license number of the other car, traced it to the owner, then ordered an investigation of his taxes.

Parade talked to several attorneys who defended clients in Federal cases. All but one complained of the Government's tactics. The most outspoken was Urbana, Ill., attorney, Joseph M. Williamson, who declared: "The Government is the most unfair and corrupt opponent that you will ever have in a courtroom. Federal agencies have conducted investigations of my clients that were unbelievably improper."

Certainly most Federal officials try to be fair. But the bureaucratic system tends to uphold the abuses of those few entrenched officeholders who regard themselves as the masters rather than the servants of the people. These latter usually are able to summon the massive weight of the U.S. Government behind their rulings and recommendations because most agency heads, unfamiliar with the details of a case, are inclined to accept the judgment of their subordinates.

And once investigators start bloodhounding a case, only the boldest bureaucrat would dare intervene. "This is the Age of Investigator," said one official. "The invesgator is king."

"It isn't safe to stick your nose into an investigation," explained another. "What if the guy turns out to be guilty? The next thing you know, the inspectors will be trying to link you to the case."

BUCKPASSING

When one regulatory agency rejected an investigator's recommendation that a Connecticut company be indicted for fraud, the investigator resubmitted his recommendation in stronger words. The commissioners, nervous that they might be accused of a whitewash, passed the buck to the Justice Department.

The case went to a U.S. attorney, who later admitted there was insufficient evidence for an indictment. But he didn't want to take the responsibility for overruling the agency. Playing it safe, he submitted the decision to a grand jury, which in turn felt he wouldn't have presented the case if an indictment weren't justified. Result: Company officials were duly indicted, though no one except the original investigator thought they deserved to be. The trial jury found them innocent—but not until they had gone through 2 years of mental anguish, Federal harassment, and legal expense.

How many individuals can stand up against the awesome power of the Federal Government? No private bank account can match the bottomless vaults of the Treasury. No private staff can marshal the manpower available to the Government. Once caught in the Federal vise, a private citizen must rely upon the restraint and fairness of the authorities to get an even break.

Some contend that the Government should offer no quarter to Reds and racketeers who will twist every comma in the Constitution to thwart justice. But others warn that any tactics the Government is permitted to use against them could be turned against anyone.

Many attorneys who would like to see Teamsters boss Jimmy Hoffa behind bars, for example, I believe the Government has carried its campaign to put him there too far. His every move has been shadowed, his every transaction scrutinized, his every associate investigated. Even two Congressmen who defended Hoffa on the House floor suddenly had their taxes audited.

The Justice Department has indicted some of his business associates, then offered to drop the indictments if they would testify against him. A Miami banker who had never been accused of anything worse than a traffic offense until he got involved in a deal with Hoffa, was hauled before a grand jury on tax evasion charges. The evidence wouldn't support a tax indictment, so the grand jury indicted him for perjury instead. Even this charge was later dropped. But meanwhile the banker was so discredited that he was forced to sell his banking interests at a sacrifice.

A Baltimore insurance man who did business with Hoffa was so harassed that he told Parade bitterly: "Five years ago I would have been willing to die for my country. Now I hate my country for what it has done to me."

There was sworn testimony, disputed by the Justice Department, that agents had even used voodoo in an effort to persuade Thomas Ewing Parks, an uncle of a Teamsters official, to testify against Hoffa. A Nashville voodoo doctor, Bishop St. Psalm, was allegedly retained to perform the mystic rites. He lit two candles on a portable altar, according to the testimony, then placed upon the altar an article of Parks' clothing borrowed from a dry cleaning shop. But the superstitious Parks, though a believer, apparently didn't respond to the voodoo spell.

Congressional investigators have turned up some astonishing facts about Government snooping. Investigators have planted secret microphones in everything from picture frames and desk sets to lamps and telephones. Listening devices have even been slipped into pillows for eavesdroppers who like pillow talk. Even more remarkable is a set of low-frequency coat buttons that can be fitted to a victim's coat in a matter of minutes. The top button is a microphone, the second a transmitter, the third a miniature battery unit. These will turn the wearer into a walking radio station whose every word is broadcast to the snoopers.

One Government agency made arrangements with Washington trash collectors to turn in all the trash picked up at some 50 addresses. When Representative CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, Democrat, of New Jersey, learned about it, he demanded an explanation from the Sanitation Department. Commissioner C. M. Duke wrote back that the trash was segregated "to determine from typical household units the characteristics of refuse for statistical and design purposes." He didn't explain why the trash for this study should be collected only from people under Federal investigation.

The Government also seems increasingly tempted to use its investigative powers to intimidate its critics. Many a newsman after writing a critical article has suddenly become aware of Federal watchdogs sniffing his trail. Several citizens who wrote to President Johnson expressing sympathy for the Vietnam demonstrators received replies from the Internal Security Division of the Justice Department. A spokesman blandly denied this was an attempt to intimidate anyone. But Jack Ferris, Jr., of Chattanooga, who exercised his inalienable American right to call the President "tyrannical, dictatorial and domineering," was promptly visited by Secret Service agents.

Dr. Carlton Fredericks has felt the hot breath of the Federal Government on his neck ever since he started feuding with the Food and Drug Administration 17 years ago. The agency has called him "a crackpot, culturist, food faddist and dispenser of nutritional nonsense." Yet amazingly, it has never taken him into court to prove the charges but has tried his case instead in the newspapers. The record against him consists almost entirely of press releases. More than once, agents have raided food-supplement producers who had absolutely nothing to do with Fredericks; yet the press releases, announcing the raids, have been devoted almost wholly to attacks on him. Food and Drug officials have warned newspapers and radio stations against him, have enlisted the help of the Federal Communications Commission to drive him off the air and, of course, have initiated an investigation into his taxes. Laments Fredericks: "Food faddists have a right to their beliefs. They have a right to buy the foods they want. They should not be made half criminals."

$2.35, PLEASE

One of the most insidious Federal weapons is the jeopardy assessment, which is supposed to be used to tie up the funds of taxpayers who might try to skip the country. Agents have used this power indiscriminately to force settlements out of reluctant taxpayers. In Missouri, one agent barged into a bank with a $2.35 assessment on a businessman's account, though the agent could have collected the money merely by calling on the businessman a few doors down the street.

Noel Smith, a Taylor, Mo., farmer, had his funds tied up for 4 years after he refused to pay a $570,000 tax claim. He was obliged to live off the proceeds of a business deal in Canada. The Government finally offered to settle the claim for less than 10 cents on the dollar. Though he stoutly insisted he didn't owe anything, he coughed up $54,000 in order to get access to his own bank account again. He complained that the 4-year ordeal had ruined his reputation, broken his health and cost him $1 million in lost profits. "If I had it to do over again," he says, "it would be easier to go to jail."

Several Government contractors complained to Parade that some agencies have become obsessed with audits and investigations. They have seized upon technical violations and treated respectable businessmen like criminals. In a case that has become all too typical, the Court of Claims recently lectured a Federal contracting official for his arrogance and arbitrariness. "He nearly took a shillelagh and struck the contractor down," declared the court.

For many contractors, Government profits are no longer worth the harassment. More than one told Parade they would never bid on a Government contract again. A top General Services Administration official said he doesn't blame them. "We're fighting with every contractor we do business with," he said wearily.

STRONG ARM STUFF

Frequently Uncle Sam holds up payment until the contractor, desperate for money to meet his bills, settles for less than he was supposed to get. One contractor, in order to rush work on the Bomarc missile, lived for 4 months in a trailer and worked around the clock at the missile site. But the Government was in no such rush to pay him. Eight years after the contract was completed, he is still trying to collect what is due him. Worse, Uncle Sam doesn't hesitate to use criminal charges to coerce a contractor into accepting civil settlement. "You will find," said an attorney, "that a fraud investigation almost always follows civil dispute." S. Harvey Klein, a Philadelphia electronics manufacturer, got into a legal hassle with the Government over the termination of a contract. Not until he had rejected the Government's settlement offer did he find himself under investigation for allegedly filing a false claim.

The Brussel Sewing Machine Co. had a Government contract reviewed by the renegotiation board, which concluded that the company's profits had not been excessive. After the case was closed an informer charged that the company had overstated its estimated cost. Investigators immediately swarmed all over the company, and the Government filed a false-claim charge. Unimpressed with the Government's arguments, the court concluded that it wasn't "the intention of the statute [governing such contracts] to make dealing with the Government hazardous, should someone later conceive the notion that the Government had paid too much."

John A. Maxwell, a Michigan manufacturer, was actually fined $30,000 and sentenced to a 3-year prison term because he followed the Government's own suggestion and filed estimated instead of exact costs. It had been agreed that the exact figure would be determined later. Though the Government had been a party to his act, it brought criminal charges against him for submitting estimated, hence false, figures. The appeals court found the Government's position so outrageous that it set aside the guilty verdict.

Most Americans look upon Uncle Sam as a benevolent big brother, which he usually tries to be. But lately our Federal uncle has been developing an alarming vindictive streak.

DON'T CUT LAND-GRANT COLLEGE FUNDS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the executive committee of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges said it was surprised and shocked at the 1967 budget cut of $20 million in funds land-grant colleges use for teachers' salaries and research. So am I.

When instituted in 1890, the annual appropriations of funds for teachers' salaries were for the purpose of placing land-grant colleges on a firm instructional foundation "for as long as this Nation shall live," to quote the language of Congress. Seventy years later, in 1960, Congress tripled the Federal funds, after reexamining the need for substantial Federal assistance. I call upon Congress to make its will felt again by restoring the nearly $12 million cut from the budget.

Some may think such a small amount can make no substantial difference. After all, is not education a multibillion-dollar business, and have not the universities gotten substantial new Federal funds in recent years?

This thinking neglects the fact that the land-grant colleges owe their existence to the Morrill Act and have made these Federal funds bedrock foundations of their fiscal stability. If they had to get the same money from interest on endowment, an endowment of $400 million would be required, according to the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

In many small colleges, the Federal funds constitute from 10 to 25 percent of the total budget. At the University of Idaho, they constitute about 7 percent of the instructional budget. At a meeting in Lewiston recently the president of the university, Dr. Ernest Hartung, said considerable harm would be done to higher education in Idaho in general, and to agricultural research, in particular.

This latter point is true because of a proposed reduction of $8.5 million in research funds for the agricultural research stations of the land-grant institutions. The cut comes on top of an even larger reduction in research funds for the Department of Agriculture.

It means that two land-grant colleges, the University of Idaho and Washington State University, which are located within 9 miles of each other and cooperate on agriculture research, would lose more than $166,000 in research funds at the very time the Western Wheat Quality Laboratory at Washington State is proposed for elimination.

In addition it is proposed that the county extension program which is run by land-grant colleges partly with Federal funds, be retooled to direct more resources to local income areas rather than spread it across each State. That seems like a good idea, but can we not do both?

This Nation will spend at least $15 billion this year, and perhaps $20 billion next year, on the war in Vietnam. And Congress is being asked, at the same time, to authorize a new educational aid bill for foreign lands. I think we can forgo new foreign aid programs for improved education abroad, if we must take needed money away from our colleges here at home.

THE NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in the February 24 issue of the Reporter magazine appears an excellent article by Douglas Pike analyzing the role of the National Liberation Front in the conflict in South Vietnam.

Mr. Pike, who has been actively studying the Vietnamese situation since 1960, points out that:

> From an organizational standpoint, one of the great advantages the Vietcong enjoyed in earlier days was a deliberately clouded picture of its true character. Socially, politically, militarily, and diplomatically, Vietnam is one of the most complex countries of the 20th century. Given this condition, the Vietcong was able to build and maintain a reputation abroad for being more or less an "agrarian reform" organization when virtually no one in Vietnam ever regarded it as such.

Another point made in this article that reflects upon the nature of the NLF is the fact that while the Vietminh in their struggle against French colonialism received the support of many religious groups in South Vietnam, including the Catholics, none of these groups have come to the assistance of the Vietcong or the NLF.

And we should also take note of his analysis of any projected referendum in South Vietnam on the issue of a Communist government versus non-Communist rule. His projection that the Vietcong would be "lucky" to get 10 percent of the vote is very revealing in regard to the issue of whether or not this struggle is a bona fide civil war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

How Strong Is the NLF?

(By Douglas Pike)

SAIGON.—The Vietcong's National Liberation Front (NLF) received a strong boost from Hanoi on January 24 when Ho Chi Minh dispatched a form letter to leaders of the Communist nations. In it Ho characterized the NLF as "fighting to achieve independence, democracy, peace, neutrality, and advancing toward the peaceful reunification of the fatherland." He declared that "If the United States really wants peace, it must recognize the NLF as the sole genuine representative of the people of South Vietnam." This position is an exact restatement of the position Hanoi has maintained toward the NLF over the years. What it failed to take into account, however, was the changed condition of the apparatus in the south, upon which so much of the Communist effort in Vietnam depends.

On the morning of January 7, an episode took place here that serves to point up this change. A three-man Vietcong terror squad, led by a 36-year-old Vietcong activist named Nguyen Anh Tuan, loaded a 264-pound chunk of explosive plastic with detonator into the false bottom of a three-wheeled cycle cart and pedaled it downtown toward the Alabama Hotel, where several hundred U.S. troops are billeted. A few blocks short of the hotel the three were arrested by suspicious police. At a press conference a week later, Tuan told newsmen that his only regret in the affair was his failure to achieve his mission. Tuan's candid attitude and his unconcern over the danger to Vietnamese children in a school adjacent to the hotel ("Such deaths cannot be helped") struck newsmen here as a refreshing change from the hypocritical posturings of the Vietcong over the years. Here was the enemy as he really was: a true believer acting without remorse for his victims and stanchly refusing to hide behind the standard captured Vietcong prisoner's plea that he had been involved in the whole thing against his will.

Yet Tuan's act, even if he had succeeded, would not really have been responsive to the present needs of the Vietcong cause. A successful explosion at the Alabama would not have moved the Vietcong any closer to victory, but would only have hardened American and Vietnamese determination, as have similar bombings in the past. The Alabama effort, in fact, was an old reflexive response to new circumstances, a failure to consider the changes taking place on both sides. As such, it was symptomatic in many ways of the general condition of the Vietcong as it enters the sixth year of the war.

CHANGES FOR THE WORSE

The Vietcong have lost the close identification with the people that marked their earlier days. The ranks of the older Vietcong cadres (roughly equivalent to officers, but loosely used to set full-time trained professionals apart from local supporters) have been thinned. There is now a dated quality and an inadequacy about their efforts. The idealistic attraction has faded. Vietcong supporters now mutter guardedly about the "revolution betrayed," and splinter groups call themselves "true Communist revolutionaries." Individual cadres complain in reports that the villagers have "lost their revolutionary vigor" or have become "mere bourgeois revolutionaries content only with gains in land reform."

Chiefly this is the result of Vietcong actions: increased taxation, forced conscription, and the brutal and bloody measures stemming from the Vietcong's almost paranoiac preoccupation with spies in its midst. The stepped-up air war also has had the effect of turning the villagers against the Vietcong. Instead of being their protector they now regard it as the magnet that attracts bombs and rockets and napalm from the air, and shells from distant artillery posts. The guerrilla war, once rooted in the people, has become a giant slugging match, and the ideals for which it claimed to stand—and which many Americans here in early days regarded with a certain sympathy—have been trampled under foot. Many changes have been taking place, of which the most significant involve Vietcong organization, cadres, and doctrine.

From an organizational standpoint, one of the great advantages the Vietcong enjoyed in earlier days was a deliberately clouded picture of its true character. Socially, politically, militarily, and diplomatically, Vietnam is one of the most complex countries of the 20th century. Given this condition, the Vietcong was able to build and maintain a reputation abroad for being more or less an "agrarian reform" organization when virtually no one in Vietnam ever regarded it as such.

The NLF, founded in 1960, can be traced back through its immediate precursor, the Viet Minh, to the Chinese Communist revolution. There are differences, to be sure, but there are also a host of similarities. The NLF organizers succeeded in enmeshing the rural Vietnamese villager in a network of "liberation associations" from which he has found no escape except to flee his village as a refugee. A pseudogovernment, an administrative liberation-association chain of command, was created, running vertically down from the NLF central committee to the village. At the village there was additionally a horizontal structure of liberation associations (at least six in each village: workers, farmers, youth, women, students, and cultural) as well as a tangled web of other social movements and organizations. All these were created ostensibly in the name of the villager and for his benefit. The farmer, for example, would get his own land, taken from the absentee landlord; women would get social status and equal rights with men, etc. Once recruited, the villager was told by the agitprop cadre that he must fight to defend the fruit of the revolution or lose his gains, which, specifically, meant taking orders from the cadres and contributing—financially and otherwise—to the cause. The villager thus found himself trapped in the organizational web, the victim of a campaign of social pressure, persuasion, indoctrination, intimidation, or outright terror, usually in that order.

Over the years the NLF demonstrated an impressive internal cohesion. The chief credit for this goes to the People's Revolutionary Party (PRP), which acts like the reinforcing rods in a ferroconcrete wall. The PRP, which publicly refers to itself as the "Marxist-Leninist element of the NLF," was formed in 1962 to succeed the Lao Dong, or Communist Party in South Vietnam. For a graphic representation of their relationship, picture the NLF as a broad-based pyramid with the villages at the bottom and the central committee at the top, and the PRP as a thinner and harder core pyramid within, but also rising from base to apex.

Ample evidence of the nature and role of the PRP exists in its own published materials, captured documents, and defectors' testimony. For example, a "Party Training Manual for Cadres," dated October 1965, declares:

"The People's Revolutionary Party is the party of the laboring class which will lead the people of South Vietnam to final victory. * * * The party's objective * * * is to overthrow imperialism, colonialism, and feudalism, to make or remake a life of peace, prosperity, and happiness with no more oppression and extortion * * * to smash the United States and its feudal servants and liberate the south.

"Once independence is obtained," the manual continues, "the next step is unification [of the two Vietnams], constructed and consolidated in every way to make the country powerful and rich, a stronghold of peace. Then will come the social reorganization work, along Socialist-Communist principles: land without demarcations, cooperative electrification of the rural areas, reeducation of individuals, nationalization of private property, cultural and scientific education for everyone, all progressing day after day to better and better things in all fields. Also, helping other small, weak countries to struggle against imperialism."

The society envisioned by the PRP for South Vietnam is clearly a Communist one. Perhaps this is the reason that the elite in South Vietnam has refused to support or cooperate with it. Not one South Vietnamese political figure of any note has ever associated himself with the NLF, nor has any important member of any Saigon government ever defected. Religious leaders likewise have consistently refused to associate themselves with the movement, whereas the Vietminh was supported by many religionists, including Catholics.

THE KEYSTONE

The NLF leaders are obscure. The chairman of the central committee, Nguyen Huu Tho, was a Saigon lawyer who sat out the Vietminh war and first ventured into political activism in the early 1950's when he led an anti-U.S. demonstration in Saigon. Nguyen Van Hieu, the NLF's first secretary-general and single most important figure, was a Saigon journalist with neither status nor following when he joined the NLF. The present secretary-general, Huynh Tan Phat, an architect, was and still is largely unknown to the general Vietnamese population. The PRP leadership has always been exclusively northern or loyal to the North. Like the NLF, it built a tight cadre structure.

The cadre has been the workhorse of the Vietcong effort since its inception. The cadre is told, and it is true, that "On your shoulders rests the entire burden of the revolution." Even after years of sifting through captured cadre reports, one is still impressed by the incredibly heavy loads which the cadres are expected to carry.

For example, a recent central committee directive to district cadres informed them that during the following month they were to: "(1) Increase recruitment into the Liberation Army by 25 percent; (2) Increase tax revenues in the district by 10 percent. * * *; (5) Develop an intensive hate America campaign in your area. * * *; (7) Eliminate all spies and reactionary (i.e., progovernment) persons in your area";—and so on, the listing continuing for a total of 17 items, any one of which would have occupied the full attention of a cadre for a month. At the end of the month, back goes the cadre's report, packed with statistics and evaluation. Then, a short time later, back down the line comes the "criticism memo;" "Although you achieved your norms in items Nos. 1, 4, 7, 9, 11, and 17," it reads, "you were deficient and therefore must rectify * * * Nos. 2, 3, 5, 6."

The ideal Vietcong cadre is a person who can go into a Vietnamese village and deliver an impassioned speech that will bring the villagers to their feet shouting, an ability as rare in Vietnam as anywhere else. He must also be skilled in guerrilla tactics, especially the ambush. In the hands of the Vietcong, this basic tactical unit has become far more than simply two machineguns pointing down a road. It has emerged as a rather sophisticated form of warfare, involving many elements: a frontal force, a closing force, a reinforcement ambush force, and a pursuit ambush force, all employed according to terrain, weather, size of the enemy force, etc. An ambush becomes a deadly chess game, successful only if you outthink your enemy. It calls for a high order of skill, intelligence, and experience in leaders, again rare qualities anywhere.

Thus the cadre can be the strength and weakness of the Vietcong. And while the principle that by developing good lower level leadership an organization can become efficient and powerful is correct, it also follows that such an organization is extremely vulnerable if anything happens to its cadre structure. And this precisely is what has happened.

Over the past 5 years the Vietcong has lost, chiefly through battle attrition, about 6,000 cadres. This may not be excessive considering the magnitude of the Vietcong effort, but it represents an incalculable loss to the organization. Rank-and-file soldiers can be replaced, but loss of a cadre permanently damages the system. In fact, the genesis of Hanoi's deep involvement in the south can be traced to the cadre shortage. At first these were the so-called "regrouped southerners," Vietnamese who had gone north during Operation Exodus in 1954–55. Soon this relatively small reservoir was exhausted, and by mid-1964 the "pure" northern cadre started appearing in numbers in the south.

But the supply from the north could not keep pace with the rank-and-file buildup in 1965, when the Vietcong's strength was increased by some 20 percent. The overall quality of the cadre has continued to decline, damaging the effectiveness and efficiency of the entire movement. Unskilled, poorly trained leaders have been thrown into the breach, especially in the Mekong Delta. Being unequal to the task they face, they have increasingly alienated the people by what strikes the observer as unnecessary brutality in conscription and taxation.

Cadre morale itself is low, as is the morale of the Vietcong rank and file. The year 1965 had been billed as the year of victory for the Vietcong, but the year's end found the Vietcong further from victory than ever. Shortages in food, medicine, and almost all other supplies except ammunition resulted from the rapid expansion of manpower. Worse, the influx of northern cadres led to marked hostility on the part of the southerners, who resent the highhanded manner of the northerner, a feeling exacerbated by deep and long-standing regional prejudices. In fact, region in Vietnam is as important as caste is in India. Their arrival deeply eroded the indigenous base of the NLF, for the northerner is totally loyal to Hanoi. Finally, the northern cadre has brought what historians may record as the most significant and disastrous change—that of doctrine.

DOCTRINE INTO MYTH

Vietcong theoreticians have traditionally held that there are three routes to victory: (1) the Khoi Nghia, or general uprising; (2) the famed Mao-Giap three-stage revolutionary guerrilla war; or (3) coalition government.

Khoi Nghia is a social myth, in the Sorelian usage. It is similar to and may have stemmed from the myth of the general strike, which was so powerful in early days of the Communist movement.

The myth is this: cadres, working through the various liberation associations and other social movements, arouse the social consciousness of the villager and engage him in a series of activities not unlike the civil-rights efforts in the United States, that is, mass meetings, demonstrations, protest marches, letters to district chiefs, and petitions, all lumped together under the term "struggle movement." Gradually this struggle movement will spread throughout the society and especially into the ranks of the South Vietnamese Army. Then, one morning, the whole country will explode and struggle movements will erupt simultaneously in all the 2,300 villages of the nation. At the same time the final disintegration of the army will take place and the soldiers will join the people en masse. No one will be left but a few imperialist lackeys in Saigon. With no opposition, the people will march to power.

This was the doctrine that dominated Vietcong thinking from 1960 to 1964. Basically a political or social strategy, it was not, however, regarded as bloodless; the Vietcong from 1958 to the present has assassinated or executed an estimated 61,000 Vietnamese village leaders and governmental representatives.

The Khoi Nghia strategy came perilously close to success with the widespread disorders and violence that developed during and after the last days of the Diem government, in late 1963 and early 1964. During that period the Vietcong stood at the gate of victory, but slowly its strength receded. The reasons are complex. Basically they stem from the new alinements and divisions of political power that emerged, involving the Buddhist leadership, students, Catholics, and of course the South Vietnamese military, all of whom had been relatively unimportant under the rigid controls of the Diem government. As a result, Khoi Nghia was abandoned by the leadership, although some of its forms still are practiced.

The doctrinal shift, which came in early 1964, was to the revolutionary guerrilla war of Mao Tse-tung and North Vietnam's General Vo Nguyen Giap. It was speeded and reinforced by the arrival of northern cadres, whose great political and military experience had been the Vietminh war against the French. Former southern Vietcong cadres who have quit under Saigon's chieu hoi (amnesty) program have described the transformation. One of them told me:

"The northerners said the idea of Khoi Nghia was all wrong, that the only way we could win was the way the Vietminh won, by building up our military forces, delivering military and psychological blows against the enemy, and finally fighting a new Dienbienphu and driving them into the sea."

FIGHTING THE WRONG WAR

The military doctrine continues to dominate the Vietcong, although chieu hoi returnees report that the whole concept of victory on the battlefield is being called into question in Vietcong ranks. Doubts are being raised as to whether the revolutionary guerrilla warfare techniques that won against the French are still applicable to face an entirely new technology of warfare.

The Vietcong leadership recognizes the condition but refuses to accept it as serious. Captured documents refer to the problem of the helicopter, whose mobility has transformed the face of the war in Vietnam, or the problem of tactical air support and its ability to concentrate firepower. Or, most frequently, the problem of the high-flying bombers from Guam, against which the Vietcong are totally impotent. At criticism and self-criticism sessions, returnees say, high Vietcong officials try to convince skeptical cadres that these problems can be solved. To deal with the problem of the helicopter, they say to drive 16-foot bamboo spikes into the ground, thus preventing the helicopters from landing. To solve the problem of the B–52, dig air-raid shelters deeper than 15 feet (or, as one American facetiously advised, drive 16,000-foot bamboo spikes into the ground). To solve the problem of tactical airpower, they advise closing with the enemy in hand-to-hand combat, or attacking in small units on many fronts rather than by massed frontal assault.

The Vietcong is obsessed with the airpower it faces. A significant percentage of Vietcong casualties now comes from the air. It was no accident that Radio Liberation, the Vietcong station, called the sabotage explosion at the Metropole Hotel in Saigon last December a blow against airpower: "More than 200 U.S. jet pilots were killed or wounded * * * bloodthirsty pirates who daily sow death in North and South Vietnam" (actually eight persons were killed, six of them Vietnamese; there were no pilots living at the Metropole, which is a billet for administrative and Medical Corps enlisted men).

The advice of the Vietcong officials adds up to little more than to make the best of a bad situation. But new secret electronic devices and other weapons are blunting or nullifying many formerly effective guerrilla tactics. In all likelihood, technology has made a Vietcong military victory impossible. Lower level cadres now know this. Probably the upper levels of the NLF and PRP in the South sense it. But apparently the leadership in Hanoi either cannot or will not face the obvious.

All along, the NLF has had a minority element which argued that the surest route to power was through the establishment of an NLF coalition with a Saigon government. This approach, it was argued, would call for a certain amount of social disorder of the Khoi Nghia type as well as some guerrilla warfare, but basically it would be the entering wedge of a move to bypass the enemy's military strength, use his own political disorganization to disorganize him further, and outflank the American presence. However, for any serious step toward coalition government, timing is all-important.

If the Vietcong had taken this route at the start and stuck to it, it might very well have succeeded. Now, however, after more militant means have failed, any suggestion of coalition government would probably smell of defeat and would be widely regarded as a sign of weakness by the Vietnamese.

All that remains of the idea of coalition government is the slender hope that some leverage for the NLF might be salvaged from a return to the Geneva accords. The possible outcome of any free election that might be held under such circumstances is worth examining. Of South Vietnam's 15 million people, slightly more than half are under 18 years of age, leaving a voting population of about 7 million, of whom perhaps 5 million could be expected to cast ballots. The Vietcong force consists of the following: 55,000 main force soldiers, the full-time, salaried military in formal units; about 115,000 guerrilla regionals or territorials, the so-called part-time guerrilla who fights and lives in his home territory; and about 45,000 political agitprop, tax collecting, indoctrination, training, and administrative cadres, many of whom are northerners. In addition there are 15,000 North Vietnamese Army troops in South Vietnam who are now arriving at the rate of about 4,000 a month; presumably some of these might vote. Behind this force are an estimated 500,000 true believers, persons who for one reason or another voluntarily supports the Vietcong cause and are willing to take risks to do so, as in hiding guerrillas, feeding them, and supplying information. This totals over 730,000. If one includes a quarter of a million additional votes from sympathizers, the Vietcong would get less than 1 million out of the 5 to 7 million votes cast.

This is a generous estimate. Others are less generous. A recent study of Vietnamese village attitudes indicates that 10 percent of the villagers are true believers, 20 percent waver between the Vietcong and the Saigon Government, while the attitudes of 70 percent range from a sort of determined neutralism to outright hostility toward the Vietcong. Using these figures, the Vietcong could only count for certain on its 10 percent, or 500,000 votes, plus some portion of the 1 million votes of the wavering 20 percent, depending on the campaign and circumstances. But this would leave it far short of anything like a majority.

Nothing at the moment indicates that the Vietcong leadership is willing to take its chances at the polls The Vietcong does not have now, and never has had, the majority of the people behind it. It would be lucky to get 10 percent of the votes cast in an authentic election.

In sum, the Vietcong today finds itself in a doctrinal box with all three of its possible routes to victory—the sociopolitical, the military, and the diplomatic—closed to it. Consequently, it has fallen back on the sterile thesis of the protracted conflict that will be won because the enemy, the United States, will tire of the whole affair and withdraw. But this does nothing for its own morale. Guerrillas living in swamps, without adequate food or medical care, far from their families, cannot be expected to fight on indefinitely.

WHY WE ARE IN VIETNAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has now concluded its present series of hearings. We have heard many arguments for a continuation of present policy and for a modification of that policy.

In considering all the issues involved in the Vietnam conflict, we must never lose track of the central issue—why we are in Vietnam, and why we must stay there. My colleague, Senator McGee, has had occasion to emphasize this central question. His remarks were hailed in editorial comment by the Wyoming Eagle on February 11.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial cited above be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Central Issue

Wyoming's senior Senator Gale McGee has described as superficial many points of debate over Vietnam.

He called upon the Senate Monday to zero in on the central issue—"why we are in Vietnam."

He charged critics of the administration conduct in Vietnam were avoiding that issue. He said they were using a series of "discursive arguments which question the efficiency or efficacy of a tactic or a battle plan or of the response or lack of response of diplomatic maneuvers in any one of a hundred areas."

He said superficial aspects of the Vietnam debate included—

"The question of how, whether, and when to conduct a dialog with the National Liberation Front;

"The question of the resumption of bombing across the 17th parallel;

"The hue and cry over whether or not we have reacted with hospitality and dispatch to the alleged peace feelers from Hanoi;

"Concern over the possibility that our actions will trigger the entry of Red China into this conflict;

"The implication that the efforts of our air arm in Vietnam were something less than effective;

"The contention among some that the Communists relaxed their activities during the holiday cease-fire and that somehow we had not adequately responded to that relaxation;

"The fact that we have, with the exception of New Zealand, Australia, and South Korea, received little in the way of direct help from our friends around the world."

We agree with Senator McGee that much of the debate on Vietnam is superficial.

Almost daily, the press carries stories quoting someone who objects to some single action or decision, who criticizes some single statement or who finds fault with one little facet of a many-faceted problem, or who has an idea of how one phase of the situation should or should not be handled.

And there is no doubt these many side arguments tend to obscure the central issue of why we are in Vietnam and why we must stay.

In his state of the Union message a few weeks ago, President Johnson said the "most important principle of our foreign policy is support of national independence—the right of each people to govern themselves—and shape their own institutions.

"For peaceful world order will be possible only when each country walks the way it has chosen for itself."

The President observed that, more than 6 years ago, North Vietnam started moving soldiers and supplies into South Vietnam.

"As the assault mounted," he said, "our choice gradually became clear. We could leave, abandoning South Vietnam to its attackers and to certain conquest—or we could stay and fight beside the people of South Vietnam. We stayed.

"And we will stay until aggression has stopped.

"We will stay because a just nation cannot leave to the cruelties of its enemies a people who have staked their lives and independence on our solemn pledge—a pledge which has grown through the commitments of three American Presidents.

"We will stay because in Asia—and around the world—are countries whose course of independence rests, in large measure, on confidence in American protection. To yield to force in Vietnam would weaken that confidence, undermine the independence of many lands, and whet the appetite of the aggressor. We would have to fight in one land, and then another—or abandon much of Asia to the domination of Communists.

"And we do not intend to abandon Asia to conquest."

The President reminded that "our decision to stand firm has been matched by our desire for peace."

There are those, in and out of Congress, who criticize President Johnson's policy in Vietnam.

But every poll that we have seen shows that the vast majority of the American people are firmly behind him and in full support of his handling of the situation in Vietnam.

We suspect the majority of the citizens of this Nation are more realistic—more aware of the central issue—than many of the critics.

THE NEW PAX AMERICANA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the obligations the United States has assumed under treaties with over 40 other countries are formidable, but apparently the U.S. obligation goes even further than we thought.

In the law of contracts it is elementary that if a number of people contract to do a certain thing together, and one or more of them default on their obligation, the contractual obligation is no longer binding on the others. Apparently this is not true of the international treaty obligations of the United States, because Secretary Rusk has told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the United States has an obligation under the southeast Asia treaty to oppose aggression regardless of what other signatory nations do. One wonders why, if this is true, treaties serve any purpose other than providing a cover of legality for what the United States would do anyway.

This is but one of several aspects of Secretary Rusk's remarkable testimony which Columnist James Reston discussed in yesterday's New York Times. In it Reston writes:

> The Rusk doctrine makes the Monroe Doctrine or the Truman doctrine seem rather cheap. Monroe limited his commitments to the Western Hemisphere. Truman wanted to oppose communism primarily by economic means. And even John Foster Dulles, who was not a timid man, thought each alliance should stand on its own terms and depend to some degree on what the other members of the alliance did.

Mr. Reston goes on to point out:

> But the Rusk doctrine draws no distinction between powerful industrial democratic states in Europe and weak undemocratic states in Asia. His view seems to be that the United States must redeem the promises of every alliance it has signed regardless of what the other signatories do, and that failure to keep everybody's promise in one alliance will destroy the confidence of the world in all other alliances we have signed.
>
> If this is true, it is odd that most of our allies in Europe, the Middle East and even in Japan are critical of our operations in Vietnam, but this is the thesis Mr. Rusk placed before the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the column, "Washington: The Rusk Doctrine," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Washington: The Rusk Doctrine

(By James Reston)

Washington, February 19.—Secretary of State Rusk has put a grim doctrine before the people of this country. He was a responsive and forthright witness before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and it is important that we understand what he thinks our duties and responsibilities are in the world.

First, in Vietnam, we are to commit to the battle whatever is necessary to end the aggression and bring about the freedom and security of South Vietnam.

What this means, he conceded, depends primarily on what the enemy commits (the Chinese committed 1 million men to the battle in Korea). He would not say there was no limit to the men and material the United States would send to Vietnam, but he stuck to his proposition that we would maintain military superiority there no matter long it took to stop the fighting.

RUSK'S OBJECTIVE

This objective, it should be noted, was not made conditional on what the South Vietnamese or any of the other allies contributed to the fighting. There is no longer much talk here of victory depending primarily on the South Vietnamese Army. Mr. Rusk discussed the freedom of South Vietnam as a vital American interest, essential to our own security and critical to all the other security commitments we have taken to over 40 other countries. This is a formidable doctrine.

Second, the Secretary of State gave an interesting interpretation of America's obligations as a member of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. In the event of armed aggression against the territory covered by that treaty, he said, America's obligation to oppose the aggression did not depend on all the members agreeing to oppose it, but it was America's duty to do so regardless of what the others did (which in Vietnam is very little).

THE AMERICAN COMMITMENTS

This did not mean, Secretary Rusk remarked, that the United States was obligated to oppose Communist aggression everywhere in the world or that we were going around looking for fights to put down. For example, we did not oppose Communist China's aggression in Tibet or the Soviet Union's aggression in Hungary, for we had not taken any commitment to do so, but this still leaves us with commitments the like of which no sovereign nation ever took in the history of the world.

For the United States is committed to oppose Communist aggression all along the periphery of the Communist nations from the North Cape of Norway through the heart of Europe to Greece and Turkey (NATO); along the southern frontier of the Soviet Union in the Near and Middle East (the Eisenhower resolution); and thence through southeast Asia (SEATO) to Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Japan, and Korea. And if you add our obligation under the Organization of American States and our obligations under the United Nations, you take in most of the rest of the world.

The Rusk doctrine makes the Monroe Doctrine or the Truman doctrine seem rather cheap. Monroe limited his commitments to the Western Hemisphere, Truman wanted to oppose communism primarily by economic means. And even John Foster Dulles, who was not a timid man, thought each alliance should stand on its own terms and depend to some degree on what the other members of the alliance did.

But the Rusk doctrine draws no distinction between powerful industrial democratic states in Europe and weak undemocratic states in Asia. His view seems to be that the United States must redeem the promises of every alliance it has signed regardless of what the other signatories do, and that failure to keep everybody's promise in one alliance will destroy the confidence of the world in all other alliances we have signed.

THAT BLANK CHECK

If this is true, it is odd that most of our allies in Europe, the Middle East and even in Japan are critical of our operations in Vietnam, but this is the thesis Mr. Rusk placed before the Foreign Relations Committee.

And the interesting thing is that the Senators cannot really do much about it, which accounts for all the frustration they have demonstrated on the TV screens in the last few days. For in the moment of crisis during the Communist attack on our ships in the Gulf of Tonkin, President Johnson asked for a blank check to deal with aggression all over southeast Asia—including the right to use any force "he" deemed necessary—and once he had published that request, the Congress had no choice but to grant it to him or—what was unthinkable—repudiate him in the face of the enemy.

THE SENATE'S DILEMMA

Nor can the Senate do anything to take back this promise under present circumstances. If Senator MORSE presses his resolution to withdraw the Tonkin Gulf resolution, obviously few if any Congressmen are going to vote with him and turn their backs on the 200,000 Americans now fighting in Vietnam.

But their helplessness merely emphasizes the transformation that has taken place in American and world politics. The President, if he chooses his time carefully, can obviously get almost any commitment he likes from the Congress in the moment of crisis, and under the Rusk doctrine, we are then obliged to redeem each commitment, regardless of what the other parties to the agreement do, or risk the destruction of the entire system of American alliances created since the last war.

All this goes well beyond Vietnam in space and time. Mr. Rusk has asked the Senate to contain the expansion of communism all along the periphery of the Communist empire, by force of arms and without allies if necessary, and the Congress cannot oppose him in present circumstances without opposing its own men in Vietnam, which it obviously will not do.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTARY MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which is S. 2791.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the difficult problem which we face in southeast Asia, and the complex relationships that problem bears to U.S. foreign and domestic policies generally, is better understood today than it was a week ago, or a month ago. More of our people have an appreciation for the facts of international life than ever before. The high-level and well-publicized debates and discussions in recent days have contributed vastly to a new growth of the national concensus that supports the commitments we have undertaken over the years for peace and humanity.

Now, in my opinion, it is time for the Senate to agree to a rollcall vote, not later than Wendnesday, day after tomorrow, on the pending bill which would authorize substantial new funding of the combat operations in South Vietnam. We can have this vote, and I am confident that it will be overwhelmingly favorable to these authorizations, and then get on with other very important business which is before the Congress.

The debate and discussion of our foreign and military policies have proceeded to the point where the voting can reflect the more mature, knowledgeable judgment of not only 100 Senators, but also the 194 million Americans we represent here.

Certainly some of the information developed in the frank discussions between Government leaders and the able committee members gave some information to our enemies we would rather have kept secret. But the value of this full-dress discussion with a few holds barred was worth much more to us than it could have been to the Communists.

To me it revealed that even the severe critics of the President's program in Vietnam had no alternative solution or solutions to offer. The main criticism was directed at the decision to undertake the task of protecting the human rights of the South Vietnamese in the first place. But the case remains overwhelming that we have no other course but to continue the war as we have been doing.

I am sure that the assurances given that no great escalation is planned and that no use of nuclear weapons is contemplated place the administration and its critics in virtual agreement. Much of the differences have been proven, I believe, to have been based on fear of escalation to a high degree.

From very able testimony of both Secretary Rusk and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, I am satisfied that the basic aims of the administration and our military leaders correspond almost identically with those of their critics. Heretofore, the critics have been unwilling to accept statements that the administration seeks less—rather than more—war in that area.

Heretofore, the critics appeared to suspect both military and diplomatic leaders of reckless adventure, and with lacking sufficient concern for the possibility of Chinese involvement. Heretofore, the critics have feared needless escalation of the conflict.

The clear answers of both Secretary Rusk and General Taylor before the committee, seen and heard in millions of American homes, should put these fears at rest. A commonsense understanding of our policy in Vietnam has thus been engendered on a much wider scale.

The basic issue is very simple. We are carrying on an extension of an American policy of aiding other nations who are seeking to preserve their governments against aggression and Communist subversion.

It has been North Vietnam—not the United States—that carried the war into South Vietnam. We have been ready—we are still ready—to negotiate a settlement of all difficulties, the foremost of which is the right of the people of South Vietnam to freely choose their own form of government and their own leaders in an honest election without fear of murder or violence.

To me, this seems to be the difficult but important duty that America has to assume as a result of her world leadership. If the present Communist effort at conquest in South Vietnam is allowed to succeed because America has been forced by her own people to withdraw, then there is no power in this vast area with its nearly 1 billion people which can keep a Communist wave from engulfing the entire subcontinent.

So, it is time to call the roll on whether we stand for the defense of freedom in Asia—as we have stood for such defense at home and in other parts of the world. Our vote on funds to supply our fightingmen will determine the support of this policy.

To delay a showdown on this issue will serve neither those favoring nor those opposing these authorizations. I am certain that those who have taken the lead in provoking the arguments, and who have been critical of the administration's policies in South Vietnam, will not necessarily oppose these authorizations.

The one big conclusion resulting from the hearings that have been held before the network television cameras is simply that, given the world as it has existed for the past decade, none of us can conscientiously say that we have vigorously identified and proposed substantive alternative approaches to the course of action that has been pursued to this point in South Vietnam.

It has been said frequently that perhaps the debate of recent days should have been held years ago, but few among us will confuse hindsight with foresight in this moment of reappraisal. All of us are aware of the problems that led the United States to risk grave military involvement earlier in Iran, in Greece, in the heart of Berlin, in Turkey, and in Cuba. In each of these areas, the mosaic of the challenge was unlike any other. In each instance, we calculated the odds, weighing them on a scale fashioned from the brutal and terrible lessons learned in World War II.

Only in Korea, within the generation since World War II, have we been compelled to invest American lives in large numbers in order to stand by our commitments. In Korea, it was a sudden and well-defined confrontation. Conversely, in South Vietnam, it has been a slowly and irregularly defined application of our moral, as well as military, resources.

The understanding of our commitment in South Vietnam has likewise developed much more slowly. The American people in this instance have at times seen through the glass darkly, simply because fact and illusion have been intermingled far too frequently in discussions of the issues.

But no American need apologize for being confused by the complex situation in Vietnam. As my distinguished colleague, Senator Russell from South Carolina, stated a few days ago, even the most sophisticated and reflective Americans have been bewildered by the plethora of fact, fiction, rumor, and speculations generated by the problems in Vietnam.

It goes without saying, because it has been said so often before, that we are fighting a different kind of war in South Vietnam. We are pledged to help the Government of South Vietnam, on its own territory, to fight an insidious guerrilla campaign directed from North Vietnam. We are fighting alongside the South Vietnamese that they may have the sacred right of self-determination—that the government they have in the future may be a government based on the consent of the governed.

The nationally televised hearings held in recent days by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee focused on the diplomatic and political considerations underlying our activities and our challenges in southeast Asia.

A unique and marvelous feature of our free society has once again been demonstrated. We are blessed with freedom of debate and discussion that strengthens first, our resolve, and second, the forces and effect of our position in world affairs.

It has long been believed that the pen is mightier than the sword. Now the writer, with his pen has strong new electronic allies in the mobilization of intellect that leads to successful decisionmaking.

As beneficial as the televised Foreign Relations hearings were, I wish it had been possible for the American people to have sat in on the hearings held earlier concerning the pending authorization bill before the Committee on Armed Services and the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations.

Starting January 20, these two committees held a series of hearings which necessarily were behind closed doors because of the military security involved. We took testimony from 11 witnesses over a period of some 10 days. We heard from the military leadership of this Nation, both civilian and uniformed.

For the past week, the published version of the testimony taken in these hearings has been available to the members of the Senate and to the entire Nation. I regret that it has not been possible for millions of our citizens to have the benefit of the facts brought forward in these hearings, and which are now available publicly in printed form, for I am convinced that our inquiries produced significant new data concerning technology and tactics applicable to the new type of warfare in South Vietnam.

It was the feeling of the members of the two committees that these were the best hearings on the military aspects of our current worldwide posture that we have ever had.

Much has been made in columns and commentaries concerning the doubts that exist regarding the "legality, morality and feasibility" of our posture in South Vietnam. General Taylor, with millions of Americans across the Nation as witnesses, steadfastly asserted that our military objectives possibly can be achieved without an all-out war. He admitted the risks, and they are obvious. But he also pointed out the tremendous increase in the Vietcong attrition rate, now estimated between 16,000 and 17,000 men a month. With such losses continuing, the Vietcong could be hard pressed within a few months to maintain the pressures on local South Vietnam political and social structures that in the past have been the difference between winning and losing in that part of the world.

Both Secretary of Defense McNamara and General Wheeler, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, stated in the closed hearings of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees that with the mobility and firepower we have been able to bring to bear in South Vietnam, the ground rules of guerrilla fighting, the classical concepts that the Vietcong borrowed from the Red Chinese, are now being revised. American expertise and technology can alter long-standing concepts.

I especially recommend to the Members of the Senate who are concerned about the size of the commitment we will have to make in South Vietnam, a further examination of the colloquy between Senator Mansfield and Secretary McNamara appearing on pages 140 to 145 of the printed hearings that are now available on your desk.

One can, with some confidence, deduce from this discussion that while no positive limitation of our manpower needs is possible, we can control and we can subdue the Vietcong in South Vietnam without gravely gambling on an allout ground forces confrontation with Red China.

The ingredients of our success in South Vietnam are new tactics based on new technology, emphasizing mobility, and overwhelming firepower. In addition, time can now be utilized in favor of a steady buildup within South Vietnam of the social and economic structures required to prevent Communist takeover in the years ahead.

In this connection, I would recommend to the Senators that they review the testimony that Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, gave as a result of questions from Senators Russell, and Saltonstall, on Monday, January 24. This testimony appears on pages 248 to 259 of the printed hearings.

General Johnson's statements reflect the realistic understanding that our military leadership has for the social and economic problems of our South Vietnamese friends. The testimony of this soldier who is responsible for the successful conduct of combat operations in

South Vietnam, was reassuring to me personally. Let me quote to you one statement which appears in the published record on page 253, when Senator ELLENDER was inquiring of General Johnson about the effectiveness of our anti-insurgency tactics.

General Johnson said you have to look at the philosophy of the insurgent. The general said:

> It is necessary for him to create an instability that will cause the government to fall. He must maintain some minimum level of turbulence in order to bring pressures to bear on the government that will cause that government to fall and another government to come to power in which he hopefully will gain some part, and begin to subvert from inside rather than outside.
>
> So, therefore, all of the actions that they can take against the forces of law and order contribute to this level of turbulence that they must maintain and the more effective we are in suppressing this turbulence, and the more presence that we have, it seems to me, the more he must increase his turbulence in order to force an overthrow. I think that is what has happened to him, so that the actions that he has taken in the course of the last 6 months to a year are now coming to be counterproductive for his purposes.
>
> He is no longer the friend of the peasant, because he is putting greater and greater burdens on the peasants.

Many, many other points were made in these hearings on the pending authorizations that serve to reinforce my conviction that we must pursue vigorously our military actions against the guerrillas in South Vietnam and must continue bombing their supply lines outside populous areas in North Vietnam.

Even within the last 24 hours, we have seen encouraging developments within South Vietnam that would indicate a continuing buildup in internal stability there, a stability that the Vietcong has been dedicated to prevent. The announcements of Premier Nguyen Cao Ky of several steps to strengthen the internal organization of his government, leading toward popular elections in 1967, are the direct outgrowth of the recent conference at Honolulu. At that conference, President Johnson demonstrated once again that we have no selfish or imperialistic ambitions in southeast Asia or in South Vietnam.

May I respectfully suggest that some of my colleagues who have been quarreling and criticizing, but who have been shy of positive alternative approaches, take special note of the continuing efforts to provide economic, social, and political stability for this troubled part of the world. Premier Ky's responses to the President's suggestions are further evidence that the South Vietnamese are vigilant to the complex internal problems they must grapple with in addition to the aggression of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese.

May I suggest further that we demonstrate equal vigilance here in the Senate. Many complex domestic problems as well as other international situations await our attention. We should proceed without further delay to schedule a vote on the pending military authorizations not later than Wednesday of this week.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, one of the lofty purposes of our involvement in Vietnam is said to be to make a stand against tyranny and slavery in favor of democratic self-determination. We can prescribe no less for ourselves. Ours is no monolithic society, but one in which divergent views may be aired, in which discussion is free and open, and in which the minorities are protected.

Thus, many of us who had reservations and questions about the involvement sought an opportunity to be heard and to promote the free and open discussion we value so highly. Our opportunity was the presence before the Senate of an authorization measure to supplement what has already been voted.

The present authorization measure calls for $4 billion plus for the war effort, a part of more than $12 billion in supplemental funds for Vietnam fighting. I support these appropriations. I support our fighting men and have no wish to deprive them of anything.

There has been no effort to speed up the approval of the remainder, which is now pending. On the contrary, the Senate moved with its customary pace for this time of year.

The members of the minority were accorded the privilege of time off for Lincoln Day dinners. The great debate on section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act came and went without any charges that debaters were impeding the war effort.

The official administration position is that debate on the conduct of the war and on the degree of involvement is correct and worthwhile. Two administration witnesses so testified before the open hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee last week.

Yet we have been exposed, in more recent days, to the spectacle of a high administration official apparently attempting to muzzle Senate debate by using representatives of veterans' organizations.

Debate and discussion bring into the open what has been whispered and rumored. Talking about issues not only is proper in the American system, but performs a worthwhile purpose. When this free and open discussion is conducted in the Senate, the greatest deliberative body in the world is performing its constitutional function to advise upon foreign policy.

When we muzzle discussion we do a disservice to our system of representative democracy. The right of the people to know and the right of dissent is inherent in our system. When we lose those rights, we no longer have freedom and self-determination for ourselves, much less for export.

Fruitful results already have come from this kind of discussion.

The Vice President has been both promoting moral aid for our war effort and seeking additional troops from allies.

The maritime union's voluntary effort to refuse to load ships bound for North Vietnam is another step in tightening a noose on our adversaries without resorting to further troop commitments or nuclear war.

Some other positive steps in backing our fighting men and promoting our principles and goals have occurred since the debate began. Muzzling debate, impugning the patriotism of fellow Americans, are not positive steps in backing our men or our effort. Indeed, they undermine our system.

TRAPPED BETWEEN THE IMPOSSIBLE AND THE INTOLERABLE

It has been said that in Vietnam we are "trapped between the impossible and the intolerable."

These are the horns of our dilemma. Yet, I do not subscribe to such a wholly pessimistic view. To conclude that a solution is impossible is to despair alike of military and peaceseeking efforts. We do not share the outlook of the suicide who finds life so intolerable that the effort to continue is entirely useless.

Yet, the possibilities for success in our venture in Vietnam are extremely dim.

It is not "impossible" for our own great Nation to furnish 600,000, 800,000, or a million men for military action and support. But it may be literally "intolerable" to our Nation and its citizens to do so.

It is not, strictly speaking, intolerable to live with a weak and chaotic government in Saigon which controls no more than a quarter of South Vietnam. But it may prove literally impossible to provide through its single agency an effective and democratic government. Should Saigon secure a measure of control over the quarter now dominated by the Vietcong, and over the half in dispute between them, the difficulties will become even greater, and even more impossible.

The ingredients of our problem are so many that they confound and confuse not alone the so-called doves and the hawks, but even the owls.

The military problem alone is enough to give us pause. But we are told that its solution will achieve nothing unless a far more difficult solution in Vietnam's internal life is effected.

Further, the political problem, bad as it is in South Vietnam, is not confined to the scene of strife in that one small country. It involves also North Vietnam, the other half of a divided people, together totaling 32 million in a land half the size of Texas. It involves the Communist giants, China and Russia. It must be a concern of the 40 nations with whom we have bilateral and multilateral treaty relationships. It involves, now, nearly three times that number who are members of the United Nations. The cast of characters and the scope of the action outdo the vast concepts even of Tolstoi in his classic novel, "War and Peace." Beside the reality of war and peace, even the fiction of genius must pale.

Others have spoken out, all with concern, many with wisdom. None has an immediate solution, and neither do I. But I, and most Americans, hold the deep conviction that the birth of solutions is best accomplished through the midwifery of discussion. As a Member of the Senate, I feel a deep obligation to contribute to the utmost extent of my ability, even though it may draw charges—and these have already been made against me in the public print—of moving in an area which may exceed my competence, or of giving comfort to Communists by criticism, no matter how well-meaning or constructive in intent.

"DEBATE MUST NEVER CEASE"

But let us not be afraid of discussion. Let us examine every aspect of public policy in Vietnam. This an issue involving the lives of our sons, and also our daughters, for the outcome may keep them from being burned. This is a question calling for the most lavish expenditure of our treasury. Affected deeply are the relationships we hold with other nations. Even the basic question of the justice and morality of our cause must not be exempt from examination.

Nothing in American policy should be sacrosanct from public scrutiny. It is not only the privilege but it is the duty of the Congress, and of the Senate in particular through its constitutional role of advice and consent, to examine, to think, to ponder, to suggest, to be an active and stalwart force in helping to shape the Nation's foreign policy in such a time as this.

It is pertinent to quote the words of a great leader of this Nation who is in high office today:

> The primacy of the executive branch in foreign affairs in no way lessens the moral and legal responsibility of the Congress to work for national policies which come to grips responsibly and realistically with urgent demands of the world crisis. * * * Responsible debate must never cease, even in wartime.

These words appeared over the signature of our Presiding Officer, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, in the July 1959 issue of Foreign Affairs. In a discussion of the Senate in Foreign Policy, the final paragraph of an excellent exposition by the Vice President of the Senate's role in such a time as this concludes:

> Congress was not created to govern, and it should not attempt to do so. Yet this is no time for Congress to submit meekly to the Executive will. In fact, it could not submit even if it were so inclined, because there is not one Executive will, but a number of conflicting wills which have not yet surrendered to the authority of an overriding national purpose.

What is our national purpose in Vietnam?

Is our purpose military victory? If so, what will constitute such a victory? What will be its cost in lives, in the destruction of a countryside which already needs rebuilding, in the continuation of warfare already continuing for two decades, in the ever-expanding homelessness of refugees? Will military victory assure political democracy? Will it aid economic development?

Behind the military goal is our deeper purpose to contain the international aspects of communism's ambition? Will our deeper involvement lead us to the dangerous trap of a land war in Asia against the Chinese? Will we then succumb to the temptation to use the fantastic engines of atomic destruction and loose thermonuclear warfare upon the world?

After many years, we have achieved some measure of a stable relationship with the other Communist great power and the other great nuclear power, Russia. Is our policy jeopardizing the future there irreparably?

Or is our purpose for Vietnam a viable settlement which will meet the aspirations of the population of that divided country, a settlement in line with our often-announced and longstanding policy, so often honored in the breach, of self-determination? Is our purpose after all broader than military victory? Is not it the achievement of a sound peace, one perhaps which does not fully satisfy any one participant but with which all can live?

Emil Ludwig, the famous German author and biographer, whose work included a noteworthy life of Napoleon, once produced a little parable in which he depicted a small boy asking questions as he saw men going off to war.

"Why," he said, "are they going to war?"

"They go to fight the enemy," he was told.

"Why do they fight the enemy?" asked the boy.

"So they can win the war," was his reply.

"And why must they win the war?"

To that came the answer: "So we can have peace."

To the boy, the answers added up to a great riddle. "I do not understand," he said. "They leave peace to go to war to win a victory so they can have peace. But they have peace in the first place."

There is a strange illogic in all wars, and the war in Vietnam is no exception. Perhaps the greatest illogic in every war is the very existence of the conflict. There is only one end to every war, and that is a gathering at the peace table. It is far more logical to hold those meetings, as we are seeking to do, long before we destroy the economy, the lives, and the liberties of the warring people.

FOUR ASPECTS FOR CONSIDERATION

Today I hope to discuss four aspects of our complex situation. There are many more, and even a long speech can only scratch the surface. But these are the questions I wish to explore to some extent.

First, with all the discussion that has taken place, there are still points needing clarification about the history of our involvement. The present never stands without relationship to the past, and our view of the future is clarified by a better knowledge of the progression of events leading to it.

Second, we need to take a good hard look at where we stand now. We are perhaps at the most critical point in the history of our Vietnam involvement. Decisions made now may affect the history of our Nation and of much of the world for the next 10 or 15 years, possibly more.

Third, after looking at the crossroads where we stand in history, we must try to see what lies down each of the alternate routes before us. One of these is the road of escalation. What are the implications of a decision for steadily expanding troops, installations, bombing raids, perhaps mining of harbors, and strikes against powerplants or even agriculture and food supplies? Where does this lead us in Asia? What does it do to us in America? Where will it take us in our relationships with the rest of the world?

Finally, I want to examine the other fork of the road, to see where a go-slow military policy, combined with continued and intensified efforts at nonmilitary solutions, may lead us.

First, then, to history:

THE VIETNAMESE NATIONALIST MOVEMENT BEFORE 1954

Many informed Americans know that the Chinese ruled Vietnam for a thousand years, the French for 80, and the Japanese during World War II. But there are in the history of the Vietnamese search for nationhood some little known factors which have an enlightening bearing on our plight there today.

The nationalist movement became intense in opposition to the French rule in the 1930's. Of the many movements and programs aimed at securing independence for Vietnam, which was then one of the three associated states comprising Indochina, the one which gained the most prominence before World War II was the Independence League, also known as the Vietminh. Its leader was the Communist, Ho Chi Minh.

Thus Ho Chi Minh's appearance on the scene, which many may not realize, was many years before any U.S. involvement. He opposed the French as a nationalist revolutionary seeking to throw off colonial rule. In 1940, when the Japanese threatened to take over control from the French, as they soon did, the French Governor General asked if the United States would supply 120 planes and some antiaircraft guns. We refused.

Ho Chi Minh continued to oppose the new masters of Vietnam, the Japanese. The United States entered the war. The Vietminh leaders worked with American agents of the Office of Strategic Services. U.S. military forces in China during the war supplied arms to the Vietminh and there was hope, and even expectation, on the part of Ho and other Vietminh leaders that the United States would back Vietnamese independence rather than support the return of French colonialism.

The Japanese surrendered in August 1945. The Vietminh forces, under the same General Giap who commands now in North Vietnam, moved to Hanoi and the Emperor, Bao Dai, agreed to abdicate in favor of the Vietminh. On September 2, 1945, in the train of these events, Ho Chi Minh announced the Vietnamese Declaration of Independence. Communist though he was, and Communist though he is today, Ho read as the opening sentences of that declaration, words taken from our own American Declaration of Independence:

> All men are created equal. They are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, and among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

American political stock, says Ellen Hammer in "The Struggle for Indochina," had reached a peak in which "the name of the United States evoked associations with the Declaration of Independence, George Washington, Abraham

Lincoln, and the Atlantic Charter; and American OSS agents had not hidden their sympathy for Vietnamese aspirations."

But Ho and his Vietminh associates were Communists. The United States, it soon became clear, would not do anything to help them. The people, however, were not so concerned, and are not to this day, with Ho's communism as they were with his nationalism. By his leadership they had, as the declaration put it, "overthrown the monarchic constitution that had reigned supreme for so many centuries." The Emperor Bao Dai had become Citizen Van Thuy. Vietnam seemed united under Ho Chi Minh.

In January of 1946, elections were held for a national assembly. There were irregularities, and apparently some fabrications of returns, and elections came out as they were expected to. But there is no doubt that Ho Chi Minh was at that time, as he was about to launch a typical Communist organization in the country, the most popular leader in the country and a genuine hero.

Ho had established himself in the north, but the British had accepted the Japanese surrender and the task of maintaining order in the south. There the people shared the demand for independence which the Vietminh had achieved in the north. But the British were sympathetic to the French. French troops formerly under Vietnamese guard rearmed, and the counterrevolution began.

Soon Saigon was again French controlled. Skirmishes and atrocities went hand in hand with a long series of negotiations with the Vietminh until in late 1947 the French set up in Saigon a "nationalist" counter to the north with its handpicked leader, incredibly, none other than the ex-Emperor Bao Dai.

The struggle for Vietnamese independence, achieved under Communists in the north, thus became a part of the cold war with the advancement of Bao Dai in Saigon as the nationalist counterleader in the south, the discredited former monarch who had been pliant to the French and whom the Vietnamese so generally detested. The failure of this, and the succeeding political regimes in the south was, in the words of Robert Scheer's report to the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, entitled "How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam," a failure because:

> It overlooked the internal history of the country and proposed to create a nationalist government by fiat of a foreign nation. It was a program based primarily on the needs of America's anti-Communist foreign policy. A revolution to rival that of the Communists would have had to respond to the felt needs of the Vietnamese people. The preoccupations of U.S. policy were never those of a majority of Vietnamese, and this has been at the root of the failure.

It should be noted, however, that at this time there was no official U.S. involvement with the French-backed Bao Dai nationalist regime, but the support of such individuals as former Ambassador William C. Bullitt was interpreted as U.S. backing.

THE U.S. RECOGNIZES BAO DAI

In March 1949, an agreement known as the Elysee accords gave Bao Dai recognition as chief of state in Vietnam, which thus became the scene of a struggle between two competing governments. A great many concessions were given to the French in the accords, such as that the French nationals would still be tried under French law. It is small wonder that Bao Dai was viewed by most Vietnamese as merely a French puppet and in no sense a nationalist leader worthy of respect, such as that so largely linked to the name of Ho Chi Minh, Communist or no. And he was a Communist then, but they still liked him.

Now we come to the crucial point in this early history of Vietnam in its postwar, post-French days of nominal independence. This is where we came in.

Bao Dai, our State Department found, was making sincere efforts to unite all truly nationalist elements in Vietnam, and on February 7, 1950, the United States recognized the Bao Dai government. We have never, of course, recognized the government of Ho Chi Minh in Hanoi.

What was the next step? Predictably, it was military aid.

Personally, I have now come to the conclusion, and I have several times stated publicly, that I shall never again vote for military aid to other nations. That conclusion is based on other situations, particularly the struggle between India and Pakistan, on whose border I saw burned-out Patton tanks we had furnished Pakistan, whose defeat was by Sherman tanks we had furnished India. We have furnished Israel with arms and we have furnished Jordan with arms. Turks and Greeks, clashing on Cyprus, have both received our military largesse. In Vietnam guns and materiel we furnished to the south have now been turned on our own boys by opponents from the north.

To return to the theme, recognition of Bao Dai in February was followed on June 27, 1950, by President Truman's announcement of "military assistance to the forces of France and the associated states in Indochina and the dispatch of a military mission to provide close working relations with those forces."

Between that time and the fall of Dienbienphu in May of 1954, our $2.6 billion worth of military and economic aid to the French in Vietnam paid for 80 percent of the cost of the war against the Vietminh. We were already quite heavily committed in the Truman administration; the help we gave them soared higher as we drew closer to French collapse; but to his credit, there was a reluctance by President Eisenhower to make the massive effort some would have liked for him to have made then. In "Mandate for Change" General Eisenhower has written of this period, when the people supported the Vietminh in their fight against the French and saw Ho Chi Minh as their hope for independence:

> The enemy had much popular sympathy, and many civilians aided them by providing both shelter and information.

The French and the Bao Dai regime could not draw support from the people, and they could not induce the regular Vietnamese soldiers to fight with any heart on their side.

HOW DEEP IS ALLEGIANCE TO SAIGON?

It would contribute little to review again the story since 1954. For those who are familiar with it, it must be obvious that the earlier period in which Ho Chi Minh became for so many Vietnamese the great liberator figure does much to explain what followed.

To many Vietnamese, Ho's communism is secondary; it is his nationalism and his leadership against the unwanted interloper from outside, which counts above all. First it was the French, then the Japanese, then the French again, and now the Americans whom he has opposed. Would anyone dare judge how solid underneath is the commitment of the South Vietnamese against Ho Chi Minh even today?

Compare two statements, one about the situation in 1953–54 and the other about the situation in 1965–66. The first is a further quotation from President Eisenhower's book:

> I have never talked or corresponded with a person knowledgeable in Indochinese affairs who did not agree that had elections been held as of the time of the fighting (i.e., before Dienbienphu), possibly 80 percent of the populace would have voted for the Communist Ho Chi Minh as their leader rather than Chief of State Bao Dai.

Those are the statements of President Eisenhower. Now let us go back to 1965 and 1966.

The second statement is that of General Westmoreland and General Stilwell, as cited by Senator YOUNG in his January 14 speech to the Senate:

> General Westmoreland stated to me that the bulk of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were born and reared in South Vietnam. General Stilwell, in Thailand, went further. He stated that 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting in the Mekong Delta area south of Saigon, were born and reared in that area. They were not infiltrators or Communists from the North.

So we see that President Eisenhower says that as much as 80 percent of the people would have voted for Ho Chi Minh in 1954; General Stilwell says that 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting in the delta today are native to the area.

Mr. GRUENING. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HARTKE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. This evidence of what many of us have long been convinced to be a fact, that this is a civil war taking place in South Vietnam, and that a majority of the people are against the Government, and against intervention of all kinds, is very significant and very important.

In a speech made at Northwestern University, the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Ball—whose speech was reprinted in the Washington Post a week ago Sunday—stated very definitely that if this were a civil war, we had no business there.

That was a very important admission, because I believe the facts show clearly that we did intervene in a civil war, that we took and are now taking the unpopular side, whose rules would not last for a moment were it not for our vast military and financial support. I think it important that that issue be brought home to the American people.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank my friend from Alaska. I think there is no question that this civil war is being directed by the Communists to a great extent. I think there is no question that the Communists are doing everything they can to prolong the civil war. Communists have a long history of moving in on either side in a situation of national unrest and confusion; it does not make much difference to them which side they support. That is a fact we need to realize over in this part of the world. To deny it is to deny to the people of the United States a significant factor they are entitled to know. Whether they agree with the Senator from Alaska, with what the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] stated a few moments ago, or with what the Senator from Oregon says, the American people are entitled to know what the facts are. They are also entitled to know the opinions of the Members of the Senate. If they wish to be persuaded by the opinions of the Senators, that is another thing; but they certainly are entitled to be in possession of the facts; and I think they should insist, through the press, the radio, and television, on more public exposition of what our national policy is to be.

I know that the Secretary of Defense says he does not wish to testify, and there is no possible way we can force him to, but I think in good conscience, he should want voluntarily to come before the committee and tell the American people, "This is the situation, this is our policy, these are our goals, and these are the facts."

No one wishes him to tell how many troops will land on a certain beachhead, or how many will be in a certain valley today, or how many helicopters are going in.

I know that I can go to my television set every morning and hear a complete military review, probably much more informative and complete—which is a compliment to the press of this country—than what I probably could find out if I had an official military briefing that same morning.

No one wishes to interfere with that. No one wishes to jeopardize the life of one single American boy. What we want to do is save lives. We do not win wars with dead American soldiers; what we win them with is live boys, and I, for one, wish to keep them that way.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I hesitate to interrupt while the Senator delivers this historic speech—and it is a historic speech—but the colloquy he has just had with the Senator from Alaska with regard to getting the facts to the American people causes me to make this observation and comment.

As I look around the Senate Chamber, I see five Senators on the floor and one in the chair, a total of six, 1 hour after high noon, discussing, in a great historic debate, some issues the solution of which, in my judgment, will determine whether hundreds of thousands of Americans will die in the next 24 to 36 months. I fear this will happen unless our country changes its course of action and follows a procedure that will result in an honorable, negotiated settlement of this war.

I think it is very important that this Government be brought much closer to the American people than it is at the present time. We move at such a terrific pace, in this modern age, in the operation of the Government, that I wish to renew here, so that it may be a matter of record, the expression of a view which the Senator from Oregon has held for a long time. As I have said before there is no good reason why the small number of people sitting in the gallery should be the only people in the country who have the opportunity of hearing the Senator's speech.

We are living today in a great age of technology. Television and radio have developed to such a degree that it is possible for the people to be continuously informed, through those media, without causing the slightest interruption or inconvenience to the operation of any agency of the Government including the Senate. I say that the American people are entitled to learn of a historic debate such as this, and the contents of such a great speech as is now being made on the floor of the Senate, from a medium more direct than the press gallery. Therefore, the senior Senator from Oregon renews his suggestion that every major debate in the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives should be made available to the American people through television and radio. The mechanics could be so arranged that they would not in any way interfere with the operation of the Congress. I realize that the old bromide argument will be brought forth again, namely, that there would be grandstanders in the Senate and the House who would try to steal the show.

The American people will take care of grandstanders. But the American people are entitled to know from their elected representatives what is going on in our Government.

The President of the United States has only to whisper a suggestion that he would like to take to television, and all the channels are open to him. The executive branch of the Government has those media at its beck and call. I say that the Congress should be brought close to the people. The people should demand that we adopt the necessary changes in the rules of the Senate and of the House of Representatives so that major debates such as this could be brought directly to the people.

I do not suggest that every hour of our sessions should be available to television and radio, but I am saying—and that is why I support a rule of germaneness for the so-called formal part of each day's session—that debates on pending business should be available to radio and television, if they wish to use them for broadcasting. If such arrangements were made, there would be a quick change in the policies of this Government, because the people would insist upon it. The people ought to be able to turn the dial and take a look at the floor of the Senate. They do not have the hundreds of dollars it takes to come to Washington and look in person. We need to bring the Congress close to the people. I say that if the Congress had been close to the people in the last 3 years, American boys would not be dying in South Vietnam today. The American people would have stopped it before the holocaust started.

I wish to say that I am greatly indebted to the Senator from Indiana for his speech, and I am glad that he has raised his voice today to point out how important it is that we get the facts to the people. And once again, I acknowledge my indebtedness to my teacher, the Senator from Alaska, with whom I have stood shoulder to shoulder in the debates of the last 2½ years, as we have tried to stop this shocking, unconstitutional, illegal war of the President of the United States in southeast Asia. It is a war that is sending increasing numbers of American boys to their slaughter.

I want the American people to be able to get the facts, and not be dependent so much on the handouts from the White House, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense. That is why I would open up the Congress, as far as its availability to the people is concerned, by seeing to it that our major debates are broadcast by television and radio to the American people.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank my friend the Senator from Oregon. There is no question that the Senate does not have an opportunity to make the real, final, decisionmaking process available to the American people. In the Senate, we open up committee hearings where debate and discussion are being held, but the final debate and the final decision, the final course which America will take is determined on the floor of the Senate, not in the Senate hearings. Sometimes, as the Senator from Oregon well knows, the committee may not represent the mood of the Senate. Frequently it does, but sometimes a committee finds itself unable to persuade the Senate even with its majority opinion—sometimes an overwhelming majority opinion—as it reports to the Senate floor. The issue comes to the floor, and there we find new issues, new questions, new items constantly being raised, not on this issue alone but upon domestic questions, upon the question of what to do about medicare, about what to do on adult education, fields in which the Senator from Oregon has been a leader so many times. In all of these things, as well as in the field of foreign affairs, the people are entitled to make the final decision based upon the facts. As the Senator from Oregon has stated, if there are any grandstanders, any who wish to go out and make a mockery of the situation, the people will take care of them by means of the election process. That is the American system. It has worked very well for a long time. It has produced the strongest nation in the world. I should like to see it keep on going in that same direction.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Let me say, first, that if the policies which the Senator from Oregon has just advocated, of allowing all news media—television, radio, and so forth—to reach the American people, had been followed from the beginning of our involvement, we might not be in the tragic mess we are now in, because, long since, American public opinion—which is just now beginning to be informed—would have exerted its influence on the actions of the President and Congress and we would not be in this situation today. I very much hope that his suggestions will be followed, that we will see the fullest exposition of the arguments made in the Senate and House so that the American people can finally be informed.

Second, of all the many important statements which the Senator from Indiana has made, none is more pertinent than that he and the Senator from Oregon, and the rest of us who are trying to slow down this disastrous course are trying to reverse this course of action, are trying to save American lives. That is the essence of our objective.

Our objective is to save American lives, to try to prevent the wanton killing in a cause which is not good. We are not proceeding in a way that will achieve a satisfactory result. It is alleged that we are in there to stop communism. This is not the way or the place to do it. The whole presentation of the administration is based upon a misconception—perhaps not deliberate, but it is not based on fact.

The old story that we were invited there by a friendly government, and that we have a solemn commitment there made by three Presidents is not true. This can be demonstrated again and again, as the Senator from Indiana is now demonstrating, and as has been discussed on the floor, to those who would listen. If the American people could only know that, that we are wantonly sacrificing our boys for a cause that is not as represented to them, they would be heard from much more definitely than they are at the present moment.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank my friend, the Senator from Alaska, for his observations. To those who care to listen to the speech which the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] is going to deliver later today—in which he analyzes the administration's position step by step—they will find it to be a fine exposition. I commend it to the Senate. I have read the speech, and I thought it was excellent. I thought the Senator from Alaska would like to follow the speech later when it is delivered.

Mr. GRUENING. I have read it. I was privileged to be with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] on television last Sunday, when he expounded on some of the points in this speech, showing how mistaken administration policy is. His exposition may not be quite like that of the Senator from Oregon, or myself, but it is a very important contribution to an understanding of the mistakes which the administration is making today.

Mr. HARTKE. That is at the heart of what we are talking about. Certainly, the mere fact that Senators disagree should not be enough to excite anyone, or to get anyone upset or feel disappointed with our American system.

If we are going to have a Senate which is going to do nothing except rubber-stamp all policies, or make a bloc vote on every single issue that comes before it, we might as well abolish the Senate. It would serve no useful purpose. That is not the function of the Senate. The Senate is a living and a vital institution which, under the Constitution, definitely has special responsibilities. If there are 100 varying points of view, that would be no discredit to the Senate. It would be a credit to the thinking people of America that they elected individuals who represented so many different viewpoints, and not the monolithic kind of thinking so prevalent in many parts of the world today—and not alone in the Communist world.

Mr. GRUENING. Especially on an issue which is so crucial and vital to everything in which we believe. Also to the lives of our young men who are now being needlessly sacrificed.

Mr. HARTKE. I cannot permit this occasion to go by without commenting upon the mission undertaken by the chairman of the delegation which I had the privilege of serving with during the latter part of November through December, for about 5 weeks, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], when we went into Japan, Hong Kong, India, and other parts of the East. There we had the opportunity to listen to the opinions of those people at firsthand, and there we found out that no matter how hard we tried—and I suppose the Vice President is finding the same thing to be true—no matter how much we asked them to join us, they turned their heads and said, "This is your problem. This is your concern."

Any thinking American knows that these people are living within a stone's throw of being threatened by this same Communist aggression; yet they say, "We are not concerned. We are not going to put one soldier beside your soldier. We are not going to send any materiel for you."

I know that we did receive a hospital truck from Spain. I believe that West Germany—where a quarter of a million of our boys are stationed, helping to defend their system—is going to send one team of medical experts.

This is, in some way, a measure of the confidence they have in our program in Vietnam. Unfortunately, I believe it is also a measure whose meagerness I decry and believe to be shameful; but, this is it. We have to face the facts. We cannot keep our heads in the sand like an ostrich and say these facts do not exist. The fact is, these people are not going to help us there. They are not going to do so, at least so far as I can see.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is aware that these tokens have been given to us only after great pressure from the administration, and only because the givers of these tokens are recipients of our lavish foreign aid, aid which is used as a method of persuading them to give these tokens for this cause.

When I was in South America a year ago, I found that every American ambassador had received instructions from his Government to go to the President of the country and request that it give aid to the cause in Vietnam. They were reluctant to do so. Some of them refused to do so. Some came up with a token as a matter of compliance, a token paid for out of the lavish foreign aid which we give them. That is the kind of support they are giving us.

Mr. HARTKE. The number of 40 nations has been referred to in relation to anti-Communist aggression pacts, referring to our bilateral agreements. As to those 40 nations, what if they would all send, not a big share of their regular army, not great quantities of their volunteers, but what if they would send even a thousand men each? That could release 40,000 American boys who would not have to be drafted. That would at least be a declaration of the support which we claim we have throughout the world. I believe that we have a right to question why we do not have that kind of support.

Australia, where the Vice President is making his appeal right now, has not sent one single drafted Australian boy to Vietnam.

Who is paying the bill for the South Koreans in Vietnam? The South Korean Government is not paying for it. It is all in the hearings here. The Secretary of Defense makes the plain and outright statement that we are paying the bill. We are paying for the soldiers from South Korea who are now fighting.

These are facts which are known.

Mr. GRUENING. We are paying all of it—in blood and in money.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wonder whether our paying the bill for the South Korean soldiers might possibly meet the definition of mercenary?

Mr. HARTKE. I will leave that question because I believe the answer is implicit. The headlines, however, in the newspapers in South Korea state how they were able to put the squeeze on America to get the bid "upped" so that we would pay them enough for sending Korean soldiers to Vietnam. Those were the headlines in Korean newspapers. I know that the Senator from Oregon will agree with me that in Pakistan—where we were treated wonderfully—the press there, which we know is controlled by the Government, admit they are pro-Chinese in relation to our war effort in Vietnam. All we have to do is read the press. It is written down in English. The same thing is true of India. They are pro-Russian there. Thus, we have Pakistan which is pro-Chinese and India which is pro-Russian. These people are on their doorsteps.

Mr. GRUENING. And they are cosigners of the SEATO Treaty.

Mr. HARTKE. I think there should be a thorough review of the SEATO Treaty, and when the time comes——

Mr. GRUENING. I am referring to Pakistan.

Mr. HARTKE. It might be a good idea to go into that treaty, but I am not going to take the time to do it now.

HOW MUCH CONTROL?

To resume my statement, here, where 5 million of the south's peasants harvest three-quarters of the nation's rice, the people are hundreds of miles from the border with North Vietnam. Yet, 60 percent of them "at a conservative estimate," says an on-the-spot correspondent of the Washington Post, Ward Just, recently on January 23, "give their allegiance to the Vietcong."

In short, from the beginning we have supported a regime which has continued to exist, from the days of the French on down, only by a constant shoring-up process. It has been said that the present government in Saigon could not last 2 weeks without our presence and support. At the beginning of 1965 it was reported that the rate of desertion among new recruits for the South Vietnamese Army stood at 30 percent.

Since 1960 the grip of the Saigon government upon the area and the people of South Vietnam has not expanded, but, frankly, apparently has deteriorated. At least this is the conclusion to be drawn from a study published by the U.S. operations mission in Saigon. In this "Analysis of Property Tax Compliance in Vietnam," our AID agency—this is the U.S. Government agency—there reports that 165, or 71 percent, of the 234 districts into which Vietnam was divided in 1964 did not even reply to a central statistical tax inquiry. A map giving the results appears on page 89 of the February 1966, issue of Current History. Obviously a large part of the blank area which did not respond is the same as the area in firm control of the Vietcong, or under contention. The areas replying include some of those around Da Nang, Nha Trang, in a part of the central plateau area, some portions of the Mekong Delta and the Camau Peninsula, and most of the area around Saigon and a hundred or more miles north.

But for the reporting areas, the figures show progressively more and more tax delinquency in every year from 1960 on. In that year, in these areas over which Saigon held some sort of tax collection control—a function which reflects government control, and about which we have heard much as to the Vietcong and their tax collections—property taxes to the Saigon government were 44 percent delinquent. That was in 1960. From there the delinquency went to 47 percent, then to 51 percent, and in 1963 to 57 percent. But by 1964 the ability of the Saigon government to collect taxes in these districts, comprising less than a third of the total, had so slipped that 74 percent of all taxes for the Saigon government were delinquent.

Is this governmental control?

ANTICOMMUNISM IS NOT DEMOCRACY

Is this the condition of a country which has the solid support of its citizens? At the very least, there is the administrative chaos which must accompany a civil war. There is some support, of course, for the government of General Ky. But can anyone be sure that the situation indicates that the support of the majority of the people, if it could be accurately measured, would go to Saigon? Or is it possible that millions more than we would like to think believe that whatever government exists in Saigon is necessarily only another puppet of a foreign power?

General Edward Lansdale has said this:

> The harsh fact * * * is that * * * the Communist subversive insurgents have grown steadily stronger, in numbers and in size of units, and still retain the initiative to act at their will * * *. The Communists have let loose a revolutionary idea in Vietnam. It will not die by being ignored, bombed, or smothered by us. Ideas do not die in such ways.

"The government exists for the people" is one of the Communist slogans. Its nationalism appeals, as does nationalism everywhere, to people whose history has been replete with a government existing for the sake of privilege, for the benefit of foreigners—whether Chinese, French, or—as they misunderstand our motives—Americans. We say we want to bring them democracy. We have not succeeded, because we are outsiders. We have brought them anticommunism, but that is not democracy. Indeed, it is a poor substitute for democracy.

Yet ours is a revolutionary origin. Our goal for many years was "no entangling alliances." We were warned by George Washington against such ventures, and we have never sought colonial empire. We have built our own democracy in which we believe. It has attracted to our shores millions who have seen in the shining torch of the Statue of Liberty a welcome to a way of life filled with respect for each individual, with hope for release from oppression rife in other countries.

We still hold to those ideals. They are the reason for our antipathy to the collectivist philosophy we know as communism. We are still concerned for the welfare of every person, and our conscience has been more stirred in recent times than for many years past over the plight of the poverty stricken, in our country, and overseas, the undereducated, the elderly poor, the racially disadvantaged, and all those who have not fully shared in our great economic abundance.

Our motives in Vietnam are laudable. But the frequent fate of good intentions even there may be but one more illustration about the old adage of the road whose pavement they provide. Where are we going? What must our policy and our strategy be?

EXAMINATION IS OVERDUE

We are now, belatedly, in the midst of an examination of our course which should have long since been made public as the Senator from Oregon has just said. Too long we have acquiesced in apathy to unexamined policies without realizing where they were leading us. It is good that at last the white light of public attention has been thrown upon Vietnam. We in the Senate are exercising the right of advice and consent in our discussions, late in the day as they come to some.

My concern is not of recent origin. More than a year ago, on February 6, 1965, I made a plea for the kind of determinations and clarification in Vietnam which we are seeking now. In a speech which I made a full year ago to the Jacobi Society dinner in the Statler Hilton Hotel here in Washington, and which may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 16, 1965, I said—I might mention that that was the day when nine of our men were killed in Pleiku. That was the most that had been killed up to that time. That event took the headlines—not that my speech would have taken the headlines, but I want Senators to know what took place on that day.

I said:

> President Johnson * * * must clearly enunciate his goals and how he intends to reach them * * *. The President should and must tell America, first, and the rest of the world what our posture is; what our aims are; what our interests and commitments are; how we intend to meet those commitments. We must know where we are going and what we are going to do in Vietnam.

I also said:

> Leadership by consensus cannot be applied to foreign policy * * *. Yet, vacillation and indecision can be confused with weakness. Discussion of the alternatives in Vietnam can, in the absence of clear policy from the architect of policy, be mistaken for strife.

These were my words of a year ago. So let us not be deceived. Discussion of alternatives is not dictation of policy. Dissent may be as much a function of advice as is consent. Consideration of alternative steps which may be taken, publicly conducted in a responsible manner, is an obligation of democracy.

On the other hand, manipulation of public opinion to fit support to decisions already irrevocably taken is the style of totalitarianism, whether Fascist or Communist. Among us, dissent can never be treason or we shall have forfeited our birthright.

IS THE HONOLULU DECLARATION UNLIMITED COMMITMENT?

On Lincoln's Birthday the headline of the Washington Post read, "L.B.J. Reassures Critics on Escalation." The subordinate headings interpreted the President's press conference statement as meaning: "Rules Out Wider War or Pullout" and "View Differs Little From Kennan's or Gavin's, He Says."

I hope the headline writers have not misunderstood or misinterpreted. The declaration of Honolulu only 3 days earlier, on February 8, did not seem to take such a position when it said:

> We must defeat the Vietcong and those illegally fighting with them on our soil * * *. The defeat of that aggression is vital for the future of our people of South Vietnam.

To this statement of purpose by the Government of Vietnam we assented by a pledge to prevent aggression. The Honolulu declaration as a whole was characterized by Walter Lippmann, whose judgment is certainly no official assessment, as a commitment "to win the war and to defeat and liquidate the enemy forces, and then to reconstruct the country as it is regained for the Saigon government."

I do not believe we can have it both ways. We cannot simply dig in and hold the line in a refusal to escalate, even pulling back to consolidate our strong points in the strategy of General Gavin, and at the same time do what the declaration of Honolulu indicates. To quote Mr. Lippmann further:

> The big objective which the words of the document declare is a total victory for General Ky. To accomplish this enormous objective, very large forces will be needed. The declaration must therefore be read as a commitment of American forces limited not be considerations of policy but only by our ability to break the logistical bottlenecks which hold down the number of troops we can land and support.
>
> If these are not the political and military decisions on which the Honolulu conference agreed, no time should be lost in making clear to our people what in fact the commitments are.

General Ky made the statement today that the difference between the President's position and his position is not great, as the President indicated, but General Ky added, "Let me make it clear that we do not intend to negotiate with the Vietcong."

THE ROADS BEFORE US

I said that I want to explore the direction of each of the ways leading from the crossroads in history where we stand. In fact, there are not two but at least three roads and probably many more down which we can go. Each of them must eventually come out at the same general destination—a peace based on a cease-fire and the conclusion of some modus vivendi under which North Vietnamese and South Vietnamese can coexist.

One of these roads, which I hope only a very small number of Americans would wish to take, is capitulation. This might not be impossible, but it would indeed be intolerable. We have already, in too many ways to make such full retreat possible, committed ourselves to one of the other two roads before us.

The first of these, to which I now turn, is the one which Mr. Lippmann paints in such stark terms. It is the road of unlimited escalation, with American troops commitments rising to 400,000, 600,000, 800,000, 1 million if necessary, as one member of the military said.

It is a road upon which our chauffeur will be named military necessity and upon which we would travel at a faster and faster speed, throttle to the floor, and never mind the backseat jouncing, the terror and pain of either the pedestrians in the way or the backseat passengers who must take the ride willy-nilly. Nor does the road of faster and faster escalation provide necessarily more safety than comfort. There may be other traffic coming out to meet us, China for example, or even Russia. At such speed a head-on collision could be fatal not only to the driver but to us in the back seat as well.

The second road, to which I shall return later, is the one which General Gavin and Ambassador Kennan have pointed the way. It, too, has pitfalls and potholes, and it will put a heavy strain on our shock absorbers. To the casual mapreader it may appear the longer of the two, but sometimes the longer way around is the better way home. Let us now look at each in turn.

THE ROAD OF ESCALATION: CASUALTIES, MORE MANPOWER

What can we expect along the road of escalation?

First, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] ably pointed out, increasing casualty lists. Escalation breeds escalation on the other side. That is what happened during 1965 as we increased our troops, began our bombing, started to search and destroy with American forces. Here is what Richard Dudman of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch writes in the February issue of Current History:

> At the beginning of 1965, the 500,000 or so South Vietnamese men under arms were still fighting a counterinsurgency war with the support and advice of about 20,000 American troops. The war was being lost. The Vietcong had a solid hold on a half dozen base areas that the government troops did not dare try to invade. In more than half the country, they could roam at will by night, collect taxes, draft recruits, and obtain intelligence information.
>
> By the end of 1965, the B-52 planes were pounding reported Vietcong concentrations every day, and American forces had mounted to 165,000, plus another 50,000 on Navy ships deployed off the coast. The U.S. buildup quickly outdistanced the North Vietnamese infiltration, which exceeded the American forces in Vietnam through 1964 and until the spring of 1965.

And then what happened? Mr. Dudman continues, and this needs emphasis:

> Rapid Vietcong recruitment in the south, however, more than kept pace with the influx of U.S. forces. The troop ratio fell from about 5 to 1 (anti-Communist to Communist) to less than 3 to 1 by the end of 1965. Most authorities have considered that a ratio of 10 to 1 or better is needed to defeat an insurgent army.

As recent months have progressed, the war has become more and more a conflict between the Americans and the Vietcong. We have taken over the fighting for several reasons. Some of them are related to the fact that the principals in the war, the Vietnamese themselves, have been by policy shut out from American planning and informed of big engagements only at the last moment.

Mr. Dudman further writes:

> When the Vietnamese participated, the chances were greater that the Vietcong would learn of the action and slip away before it began.

In smaller engagements, U.S. forces are more likely to meet up with the enemy than are South Vietnamese troops. Last November, a Pentagon weekly summary showed, American efforts resulted in enemy contact more than once in every 10 tries; the South Vietnamese efforts made contact only once in every 250 tries. The figures were 11.3 percent for U.S. troops, 0.4 percent for Vietnamese; I repeat, four-tenths of 1 percent for the South Vietnamese. Some of the other results, the casualties, can be seen any day by going down to Walter Reed Hospital.

Second, even leaving aside the jump in casualties as we pour in more and more men, there is the very serious matter of the manpower which is involved.

We congratulate ourselves on our steadily advancing economy. We have brought the unemployment figure below 4 percent for the first time in years. Where are we to get another quarter of a million troops for Vietnam? Or a half a million more? Or still more than that?

Nor is the manpower problem simply that of supplying these numbers as bodies delivered to the area of combat. Behind them must stand the logistic support of more and still more service personnel. Beyond that lies the increasing drain from civilian industries to the deadweight tasks, which generate no economic multiplier effect, of producing military supplies and equipment.

ESCALATING INFLATION

Third, there is the vast adverse economic effect upon our homefront. Foremost among economic consequences is the real threat of inflation.

Here again, the potential inflationary effect is greater than it was at the beginning of World War II, for example, because we are starting in a tight economy. The present high level of employment in conjunction with the high percentage of plant capacity in use has been accompanied by increased consumer demand, as witness the amazing sales figures in the automobile industry in the last 2 years. Twenty-three percent of American families now have two cars. As competition for workers grows, wages are bound to grow as well. More are able to afford a second car, to continue with the one example. The demand for civilian goods, which we are unable fully to meet in an escalated war economy, builds up price pressures.

The result is the familiar wage-price spiral which feeds inflation. As the economy has tightened in recent months, we have seen signs that its lies dangerously before us even without the increased economic pressures of Vietnam.

One reaction to those fears of inflation has been the increase in the discount rate. I have no quarrel with the good intentions of the Federal Reserve Board and Mr. Martin. But, I do not believe this action is achieving the beneficial results they intended, and it has already introduced some adverse side effects into the economy. But if we go down the road of unlimited escalation in Vietnam, with the vast costs that are not only foreseeable but inevitable camp followers of war, that change in interest rate will feed the inflation and complicate the Federal effort to finance the costs.

Where do we get the money to run a war? It has to be financed by the Treasury, which means borrowing, since tax income can not begin to meet the big added strains. Are we going to finance a huge military venture, escalation unlimited, at a 5-percent rate by the Treasury? Are we going back to the days of the 6- and 7-percent Liberty Bonds of World War I with the resultant scandals and the depression that follows?

We are seeing now an increase for military purposes of $12.7 billion in a supplementing authorization and appropriation because of Vietnam. This is not the end. How large will the increase in our debt become? $20 billion? $30 billion? $50 billion? Suppose it costs us 5 percent interest on a $30 billion total before we are through. That is an annual burden of $1.5 billion, as much as the cost of our antipoverty program today.

We have no forecast, and certainly none which is reliable, as to the duration and ultimate cost of what lies ahead. True, we did not have that in World War II either, but then the issue as to whether we should join in defense of the free world against open, large-scale aggression entailed no doubt. We had to do it, no matter what the cost, and we did it gladly. Here we do not have the same kind of absolute compulsion, nor the same kind of glad support for the effort. Yet, many see us becoming drawn into an escalation not only of cost and manpower, but of time—5 years, 10 years, 15 years. An all-out military effort may shorten the active military phase, but how long will it take to repair the scorched earth, to build a viable economy, and whose expense will bear the burden? Who will carry the burden?

Historically, such enormous drains on the treasury of any country paying the cost of war have led to inflation—inflation whose virtual absence has contributed so greatly to the past 5 years of our unprecedented growth and prosperity. The only real effective alternative in wartime is controls, with all that they entail. These we had to impose even in the Korean war, where we had the support of other nations as we do not have today, and scarcely expect to have. Do we want to go down the road of controls again?

EFFECTS ON BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

On Monday of this week Secretary of the Treasury Fowler discussed the progress of our balance-of-payments program, in a press conference which he shared with Secretary of Commerce Connor and Federal Reserve Chairman Martin. He presented an estimate that the balance of payments would worsen in 1966, the press reported, "as a result of stepped-up operations in Vietnam." I quote from the article by Frank C. Porter in the Washington Post on Tuesday, February 13:

> Before escalation, the Defense Department estimated that its overseas operations would contribute $1.4 billion to the minus side of the ledger in 1965, he said.
>
> The estimate was raised to $1.65 billion after the step-up, Fowler continued, and now it appears that the current annual rate is closer to $1.8 billion.
>
> The Secretary said the last guess now is that the foreign exchange impact of Vietnam could add another $300 billion during 1966, bringing the total Defense Department bite on the payments balance to $2.1 billion. This would not include overseas economic aid.

But we cannot omit the overseas aid estimates from the financial picture. We are now asked to embark on a vast program for the benefit of the people in South Vietnam, not simply as a humanitarian effort, but because the theory is that this vast outpouring will bring support for the Saigon Government, which is so essential if our total propping-up program is to succeed. If past experience is any criterion, Secretary Fowler's estimates are bound to be on the side of minimizing, rather than maximizing, the Federal costs.

Even the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has repeatedly warned us of that. Frankly, his estimates of the costs of this war have been somewhat scarey, but they are accurate.

So among the economic effects are increased inflation, perhaps to be accompanied by controls of various kinds; a war financed at high interest rates; an increased balance-of-payments problem; all geared to the unknown and perhaps unpredictable.

ESCALATION AND TAXES

And how about taxes?

We have already seen the request. At this time, when escalation has reached only a portion of its probable ultimate, should we take that road, for a rescinding of the excise tax reduction voted last year? We are asked to reimpose the 10-percent excise tax on telephone service and to defer the relief we provided by removing the tax on new automobiles.

In addition, there are other "one shot" tax measures called for right now. This, too, is only a beginning if we turn up the road of escalation. Such measures are demanded in proportion to the magnitude of our efforts; as the cost increases, so does the need for tax changes which hit, directly or indirectly, every American and his family. They are inevitably dictated by two necessities—to fight inflation by withdrawing in taxes the spendable income of the people, and to raise the revenues so far as is feasible, thus paying as we go to the extent possible, and reducing dependence on deficit financing.

Where will this course lead us? Two years ago we reduced personal and corporate income tax rates by $11½ billion. We did it on the theory that it would stimulate the economy and do so, paradoxically, with benefit to the Federal Treasury in increased receipts based on the jump in gross national product. Frankly, that course worked. We have seen the beneficial results. They were good.

But a wartime economy is a different animal from a peacetime economy. It is a rapacious consumer of goods, of manpower, of resources, and its end products move to far-off fields to be spent as mortar ammunition and napalm bombs, as shot-down helicopters and expended material of all kinds. These economic products do not add to but rather drain the national wealth. The peacetime economy is a tiger in your tank; the wartime economy is a tiger in the jungle, a marauding depredator in the same category as sheepkilling wolves of the Old West. We may indeed have both guns and butter, but we shall have to pay for both. If we spread the butter thinner, it will be because we are paying for the guns. Let us make no mistake about it: pay for them we must.

Furthermore, the road to escalation is open ended. No one, because the imponderables are so great, can offer us a firm estimate of the amounts about which we are talking. We have a strong economy, but we can base it upon gains that will eventually set back the unprecedented growth we have been making.

Casualties, manpower, inflation, balance of payments, taxes—these are among the baggage we will have to carry if we take the road of escalation. But what of the things we will have to leave behind? The things we cannot take with us?

Chief among them, of course, is a whole broad range of domestic programs. All across the budget spectrum they lie. For instance, consider the so-called Great Society programs. I supported them wholeheartedly last year. In fact, I supported the medicare program a little more than the others. We left an open end in that program. We should have provided for the hospitalization of old people for as long as they needed to remain in hospitals, not merely for 90 days.

These programs, too, are casualties. Already many of them are wounded. we will tend them, bandage them, try to heal the amputations, and probably save them from death. But they are suffering sore blows, shot down by our own military efforts on the road to escalation. We shall shortly look at some of these in specific terms.

THE VIETNAM GREAT SOCIETY

In more general terms, we are now committed to a Great Society program, so to speak, in South Vietnam. The declaration of Honolulu says in part III under "Purposes of the Government of the United States" that the United States is pledged "to give special support to the work of the people of that country to build even while they fight. We have helped and we will help them, to stabilize the economy, to increase the production of food, to spread the light of education, to stamp out disease."

I would far rather fight a war on these enemies of mankind in Vietnam than to fight a military war there. In normal times our commitments to economic aid of this kind are determined by relating them to the needs of others throughout the world as well. Now we are linking the reason for and the cost of this expanded effort in Vietnam to our military effort. The total of our AID funds requested for all of the world put together for fiscal 1967 is $2,048 million. For Vietnam the amount is $550 million, well over a quarter of the total, and this does not count military aid, nor another $98 million in Public Law 480 funds.

How much will this additional Honolulu declaration task cost us, over and beyond the military effort? Is this to be, under planning for escalation, another open-ended program? An inquiry of the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations to learn what may be the prospect brought the reply that the figures they have on economic aid to Vietnam at the moment are classified. So I cannot state them to the Senate, and the American people cannot have them.

OUR OWN GREAT SOCIETY CASUALTIES

Meanwhile, what are the casualties of our own programs, which escalation will increase? Some of the answers are in the budget.

The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation program is cut by $140 million.

In agriculture also, the sum available for rehabilitation of land and property because of natural disaster is reduced by $20 million.

The entire amount of funds available for loans through the Rural Electric Administration to cooperatives is cut out—$462 million.

A $100 million figure has disappeared from the Rural Housing Insurance Fund. The Farmers Home Administration loses $650 million in loan funds. The Small Business Administration drops out $309 million in guaranteed loans. The same is true of $450 million in "Fannie Mae"—FNMA—of the Housing and Urban Development program.

All of these last, however, plus others which make a total of $4.7 billion, are not strictly speaking cuts in the same sense as some of the others. At a later time I want to discuss this separately. The plan is to put all of these loan funds into a pool and to sell government participations, which will be bought by public investment—an idea which may have considerable merit. To do so will require new legislation. But to include this figure as a cut in the budget is a $4.7 billion distortion which in fact is doubled by its accomplishment. Not only can the budget show a drop of this enormous amount, but also when the participations are purchased, the Treasury will have an equal sum available for expenditure now with its own obligation deferred for later payment to those who have purchased them. The net result is an availability of more than $9 billion in this one-shot effort which will not at all appear in the budget.

To continue, the budget drops out $175 million in National Defense Education Act loan funds to students in higher education, on the theory that these loans can be absorbed by the new private capital in the guaranteed loan program of the Higher Education Act. But this overlooks vital problems of transition which create grave difficulties in some States, including my own State of Indiana. There is a serious possibility that the result will be inability for many students now receiving National Defense Education Act loans to secure the money they need next fall for continuing their education.

Then there is the much discussed cut in the school milk and school lunch program money. The Vietnam war can be directly charged with the reduction of the school milk money by 80 percent, from $103 million to $21 million. The funds for school lunches are also reduced by $19 million.

Yet we say that we are going to provide breakfast as well as lunch. Many of us know that the only warm meal some of these children have is furnished by the school lunch program. And all of us recognize that the reduced price of milk for the school lunch program is one of the greatest builders of a healthy and strong America that we have today.

Health research facilities are cut by $35 million. Twenty million dollars has been cut in instructional and research funds for 68 land-grant colleges. Yet these are the very institutions upon which the greatest demands will be made under the new GI cold war bill which has just been enacted into law.

These are some of the costs at home for which we are trading the escalation we face in Vietnam. We cut our schoolchildren in lunch and milk money by $101 million—because Vietnam currently costs us that much every 3 days. We slice $20 million from rural disaster rehabilitation so that we can do more to rehabilitate the South Vietnamese lands suffering manmade rural disaster there. We delete $164 million in school district funds for the so-called impacted areas—enough to pay for killing a little more than 400 Vietcong at the estimated cost of $400,000 each.

STANDING STILL IS FALLING BEHIND

There are other potential economic casualties on our homefront society besides the direct cuts. These consist not in the direct cuts, but in the reduction to the status quo from the envisioned progress which we should instead be making. Wherever we fail to advance we are not just holding our own—we are falling behind, for our population will continue to grow, as it has by 15 million persons since the last census, that of 1960.

Can you think of better uses for our money than spending $3,500 just in ammunition alone for each Vietcong who is killed? There has been talk of helping the hard-pressed States through returning some of the Federal income for their tax use, and I have sponsored such a bill with Senator JAVITS. Is anyone willing to predict that we will share Federal revenues, much as we need to do so, while we are straining our sinews to raise Federal revenue for escalation?

There has been talk, not altogether utopian either, about instituting a negative income tax to help lift our most poverty-stricken out of their stultifying degradation. An article in last Sunday's Washington Post discussed this under the heading, "Guaranteed Income Gains Acceptance." It notes that Congressmen of the Democratic Study Group have proposed serious examination of the idea. So has the President's Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress in its report of only 2 weeks ago. While we are pouring out open-ended billions in Vietnam through following the road of escalation, this too will not get off the ground.

Likewise there are other unfulfilled economic needs whose accomplishment must of necessity be delayed—extension of the Interstate Highway System; increase in the minimum for social security beneficiaries; extension and concentrated effort upon the next frontier of education, adult education; addition of drug payments to the medicare program. The list could go on and on.

WHAT IS THE COST-BENEFIT RATIO?

In listing budget casualties, I did not mention public works. We do not have available how much these may suffer. I do know that when the Army Corps of Engineers considers a new project it makes a careful cost-benefit study. If the ratio of costs to benefits is too high, if the price turns out to be too great for what will result, the project is dropped.

Is escalation going to yield us a satisfactory cost-benefit ratio? If the Army Corps can scrutinize civilian works on this basis, should not the entire military involvement be weighed likewise against the possible benefits in Vietnam? It is my studied conclusion that by this test, escalation fails.

I have been examining the terrain we shall have to cross if we take the road of escalation. I said that we will face increased casualties, a manpower shortage, and economic problems which include inflation, worsening balance of payments, increased taxes or economic controls. Nor are these all of the costs which we must consider in computing a cost-benefit ratio. There are the costs I have pointed to in our Great Society programs—budget cuts, deferment of projects until later, all manners of economic casualties.

There are other costs which escalation will bring, costs without a price tag. Among these, and they have formed the center of great amounts of discussion, are those based upon our relation with other nations, our standing in the eyes of the world. Some people do not want to consider our standing in the eyes of the world, but this will be part of the cost.

Dr. Eugene Carson Blake has long been one of the Nation's foremost Protestant churchmen and a great leader of the ecumenical movement. He has just been elected general secretary of the World Council of Churches, which makes him as close to being the Protestant counterpart of the Pope as the world provides. Dr. Blake says, from the standpoint of world Christian leadership, that any U.S. victory in Vietnam will have "a racial stigma" because of "the bombing of a less developed nation of colored people by a large, rich, white one."

HARSH COMMENT FROM FRANCISCANS

From France a publication of the Franciscan Order, Freres du Monde, views our position in these rather severe and harsh terms:

> In Vietnam, peace is not a football game between two equal teams.

Somehow I gain the impression that some people believe that the debate taking place here concerns whether Army is going to beat Navy or whether Notre Dame is back in the days of the Knute Rockne teams. They seem to believe that this is an athletic contest we are discussing. I did not utter these words. These words were written in a publication of the Franciscan Order.

I continue to read:

> On the one side there is an aggressor, the United States, and on the other, a people who are continually being oppressed, bombed, and decimated.
>
> If you do not see the matter in this light it is because you have admitted that anticommunism is an end that justifies all means, including tortue, napalm, and dozens of daily bombardments against North Vietnam.

> It is the United States which implacably practices the dangerous policy of escalation, but for a small consideration we shall instead blame the Vietnamese patriots who insist upon gaining their freedom. It is the United States which daily is menacing the world peace, but for a small consideration we shall come to thank them for building peace in the shadow of intercontinental missiles.

This is not the effusion of Communist propaganda from Russia. It is the comment of a Catholic religious order's publication, the same order whose brown robes with knotted cords about the waist may be seen as they lead Jerusalem pilgrims along the Via Dolorosa to the high altar in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, which, as the senior Senator from Oregon knows, we visited 2 days before Christmas. What price good will throughout the world if it brings such comments as these from such a source?

I shall not attempt details, which have been repeatedly discussed by others including many experts, concerning the escalation policy in our international relations. We all know that this is not Korea. We stand virtually alone, in a unilateral action taken without the blessing of the United Nations—which the Senator from Oregon has repeatedly requested—and without the partnership of most of the 40 nations with whom we have formal treaty relationships.

I have said before that our great danger in escalation is that by this means we may move toward the very thing we must avoid, a land war with Asia. Every U.S. military leader that I know of, from Eisenhower and MacArthur on down—or up, according to how we look at it—has warned us against getting bogged down in a land war in Asia. Gen. Maxwell Taylor, as Walter Lippmann noted in his Tuesday column, "has recognized that the prospect of a land war with China is today our greatest worry." I opposed, as did many Senators, resumption of bombing, because I fear that this escalation will lead to greater likelihood of that war we do not want.

Let me say that if the discussion and debate has in any way taken us off that course, it has been that much to the good, at least.

Finally, having looked down that fork in the road, and having cast up the cost-benefit ratio, I find that it does not warrant the project of escalation. The costs are too high, and although I have not spelled them out, I believe the nonmilitary costs, the noneconomic costs, are in themselves too great even without reference to dollars and cents cost, or to the cost in casualties.

DOWN ANOTHER ROAD

I have said earlier that, like all but possibly a few dedicated pacifists, I likewise reject the notion that we can suddenly and completely withdraw from Vietnam. Probably there is but one road left for us to choose—possibly more, but at least that one—and that is a road whose choice has been made by a growing number of Americans, led by General Gavin, Ambassador Kennan, and hopefully, I think, by President Johnson himself. Here is a policy which makes as much sense as anything can in this situation. It is one which can stop what Emmet John Hughes in Newsweek recently called "The Diplomacy of Drift" as the title of an article in which he said that our globe-traveling peace missionaries "can have little to say about Vietnam that could not have been said a year ago at least as persuasively. For a year's massive show of American force has armed American diplomats with neither new argument nor new advantage. Never in this generation of Americans has so much power been spent so lavishly to gain so little."

This is from the man who sat at the right arm of President Eisenhower in the White House for so many years.

It is time to cease lavish spending of our power for little gain. At the same time, even though we have made a mistake in getting in deeper and deeper in the middle of what is to so large an extent probably a civil war, and because we have no smallest wish to see Communist control and influence extended in Vietnam or anywhere in the world, we cannot withdraw immediately from South Vietnam.

We have, all too inadvertently, come to the point where we have on our hands first of all the major responsibility for a military operation of great magnitude and difficulty, in support of a political structure which has also somehow become accepted as our responsibility. We are attempting, as Ambassador Kennan put it, "not only to defend the frontiers of a certain political entity against outside attack, but to assure the internal security of its government in circumstances where that government is unable to assure security by its own means." That is a monumental task, one far beyond the normal obligations of a military alliance.

I do not say we are incapable of doing so. I do say that the cost is too great for the benefit. We have a great military establishment, capable of performing, as the men who are there have so well shown, with the greatest of ability. Our ultimate aim should not be escalation, but extrication. But extrication must come in the only valid way it can be done, and that is by means of negotiation. We are going to have to bring those boys home, and the only way we can do it is by negotiation.

For this, the prospects are best if we resist the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese sufficiently to prevent them from any closer approach to their goal of military victory as a route to political domination, keeping the pressure on in the proper places but not seeking to widen the war in North Vietnam with the attendant risks and dangers that entails. I think we need to bear in mind the words of Mr. Kennan, with which I agree:

> I see in the Vietcong a band of ruthless fanatics, partly misled, perhaps by the propaganda that has been drummed into them, but cruel in their purposes, dictatorial, and oppressive in their aims. I am not conscious of having any sympathy for them.
>
> I think their claim to represent the people of South Vietnam is unfounded and arrogant and outrageous. A country which fell under this exclusive power would have my deepest sympathy, and I would hope that this eventuality at any rate would be avoided by a restrained and moderate policy on our part in South Vietnam.
>
> But our country should not be asked, and should not ask of itself, to shoulder the main burden of determining the political realities in any other country, and particularly not in one remote from our shores, from our culture, and from the experience of our people.
>
> This is not only not our business, but I don't think we can do it successfully.

TOWARD A CEASE-FIRE

We can hold them in check, and continually explore every avenue for bringing about a conference which will end that stalemate in a military sense by a realistic settlement in a political sense.

This, I believe, is what the country wants. This is the tenor of the vast majority of the letters I receive. It was in support of my position, and today it is 89 percent. This is the position of an increasing number of public persons, of writers with background and expertise in Far Eastern affairs, of editorial writers, of such interpreters of America as the editorial writer in the Satuday Evening Post who, in the issue of January 15 written long before the Foreign Relations Committee hearings, had this to say:

> We say we are fighting for the liberty and independence of the people of Vietnam. The Communists say they are fighting for the liberty and independence of the people of Vietnam.
>
> We say we will stop the bloodshed if they will stop their aggression. They say they will stop the bloodshed if we stop our aggression.
>
> We say we want to negotiate on the restoration of the 1954 Geneva Treaty, interpreted our way. They say they want to negotiate on the basis of the treaty interpreted their way.
>
> We are convinced we must "teach them a lesson." They think they are teaching us a lesson.
>
> As is often true, each side can argue its case reasonably and believe in it passionately. What is at stake here is not a matter of moral rightness but rather a deadly conflict of national interests. As long as each side takes "negotiation" to mean that the enemy must confess his sins, there will probably be no peace—for years. Is it what the people of Vietnam want?

On Friday, February 11, Ambassador Goldberg stated:

> President Johnson believes there might be a reciprocal reduction of hostilities, without negotiations, which could be a significant step toward peace.

It was our hope that cessation of bombing in North Vietnam would lead to a reduction of activity by North Vietnamese. In Honolulu, General Westmoreland told a press conference, that, although terrorism had increased, attacks by large units, battalion size and up, were fewer recently than during November and December. A South Vietnamese Army spokesman has been quoted as saying that Vietcong activity during the first week of February was the lowest in 18 weeks. For the first time in 10 months an entire week went by without attacks or sabotage in the Saigon region. According to General Westmoreland at Honolulu, again, infiltration remained at about the same level "before, since, and during" the bombing pause—about 4,500 per month.

The first thing to achieve is a reciprocal reduction of hostilities such as Ambassador Goldberg speaks about. Reduction of Vietcong activities such as those I have reported should be met not by escalation on our part, but by similar lulls, accompanied by the greatest vigilance but without provocative initiation of attack.

The first formal essential to full peace talks is cease-fire. We have had cease-fires by mutual agreement recently. There was one at Christmas, and there was another for the New Year, Tet. Admittedly, a cease-fire would be a stalemate, from the military standpoint. But it could bring about the needed respite, whenever it can be achieved, on which a fuller settlement can eventually be reached.

Belligerency evokes belligerency, and we cannot expect escalation to bring the peace we need, the peace we seek, the peace we must secure. There is no question of suing Hanoi for peace, of "groveling," to use the word so recently misapplied by Barry Goldwater to our stance. We are big, we are powerful, and they know it as well as we do, as well as the rest of the world. We need not bully in order to be firm. Out of our strength we can afford to be magnanimous. To fear loss of face in our position is ridiculous. To give the governments of both Saigon and Hanoi a means toward peace without loss of face my appear difficult, but surely it cannot be impossible.

Our resolution offered to the Security Council called for "discussions without preconditions" in order to arrange a conference "looking toward the application of the Geneva accords." North Vietnam is not a United Nations member and objected to the United Nations route, but North Vietnam is a signatory to the Geneva accords and has made a great point of resting its case upon them.

The Security Council resolution which we desired adopted spoke of using all appropriate means, "including the provision of arbitrators or mediators." The words are those of our draft. The possibility of mediation, if not by officially designated United Nations members as mediators, is still one which exists. There are other countries, friendly to us, who are also in relationship with Hanoi, such as India, who could be of potentially great service in helping achieve that first step, the important cease-fire which would halt the shooting war and start the peacemaking process.

Finally, as leaders of the world, and in particular of the free world, we should be too far down the road of civilization to find no other way possible than war, and that against a small Asian nation through whom we might become exposed to conflict with the masses of Communist China. As long ago as the Kellogg Pact we disavowed war as a means of national policy. The fact that we have not declared this to be a war makes it no less a violation of our pledges over the years, to the United Nations, and to support the Geneva Conference. At that time, on July 21, 1954, although we did not sign the accords, we made a "unilateral declaration" which stated:

> Our Government declares with regard to the aforesaid agreements and paragraphs that (i) it will refrain from the threat or the use of force to disturb them, in accordance with article 2(4) of the Charter of the United Nations dealing with the obligation of members to refrain from the threat or use of force; and (ii) it would view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the aforesaid agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security.

Despite all that has occurred since the Geneva accords, if for no other reason than the declaration of ours, freely made on our own initiative, we must take a position with regard to our actions there, as the editorial heading in the February issue of the Idler puts it, to "elevate them a little lower."

I am not discouraged. If it is worth the cost of one life to fight in Vietnam, how much is it worth to fight for the peace table? The way is not easy, but neither is the way of escalation, and we come out both ways at exactly the same point which puzzled Emil Ludwig's apocryphal small boy:

Why do they leave peace to go to war to win a victory so they can have peace?

I am not a pacifist, but I am proud to be a peaceseeker. When the times demand all-out military effort, as they did in World War II, I count it a privilege to have been a member of our Armed Forces. I will support them with all that I can to provide for their protection, wherever they are. But their best protection is to get them out of the line of fire, to arrange for negotiations, and to apply more faithfully than we have done our own repeated proclamations of the right of self-determination for the people of the troubled land of Vietnam.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my opinion, there has just been made in the Senate one of the truly great speeches of this historic debate on the issue of American foreign policy.

I am only sorry that all Americans who would like to have heard it could not have heard it. That is why I said a few minutes ago that I believe we should give serious consideration in the Senate to changing our rules of procedure so that these great debates can be made available to the American people through their radios and television.

I congratulate the Senator from Indiana for his great speech. Of the many points he raised, I am so glad he also raised the point of the moral issue that is involved. I am particularly glad that on page 20 of his speech, he cited the position taken by the Franciscan Order in France.

Having made reference to the views of that religious order, I wonder if the Senator, with the consent of the Senate, would permit me to supplement his statement and add to it by reference another document involving the position of men of religion in regard to the issue that confronts the American people vis-a-vis this war and our moral obligations with relation to it. It is a document of a page and a half that I want to relate to the Senator's speech on this issue. I spoke in Madison, Wis., at a general meeting dealing with our foreign policy issue involving the war in Vietnam. I spoke at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, and I was told by those in charge that I spoke to something like 3,600 people who were in attendance. There were two closed television circuits to other auditoriums necessary to accommodate the audiences. It is such interest that I have found characteristic at the grassroots of America. But that morning I was invited to attend a breakfast of some members of the clergy in Madison, Wis., some 30 of them.

I was filled with great humility as a result of a letter that these members of the clergy presented to me, which relates directly to the Senator's speech with regard to the moral issues involved in this war.

I think I should put this letter into the RECORD, having given the background. These pastors of various churches, which I shall name after I complete reading the memorandum, presented this letter to me:

To the Honorable WAYNE MORSE.

From the Madison Emergency Committee of Clergy Concerned About Vietnam.

Honored by your presence in Madison, we are drawn together to share with you our acute distress over the war in Vietnam. We confess that we have not wanted to face up to the tragedies of this war. We have preferred to keep our churches unsullied by the painful controversies of our day. Most of us have been silent while bombs have begun to fall once more onto the Vietnamese countryside. We have said little from the safety of pulpits while American and Asian young men are killing each other with increasing dispatch and in alarming proportion. Few of us have let our President know of our disappointment that the peace offensive has withered and of our urgent hope that his approach to the United Nations may effect reconciliation among the combatants.

All too often, we have hidden behind our failure to become informed about the situation in Vietnam. We have been afraid to risk opinions that are not fortified by expertise and by firsthand knowledge of the military, political, economic, and sociological data. We have sought comfort in ignorance and have been willing to let affairs of the world be ordered by the power of information, rather than by the power of moral insight. We admit our political naivete, and we are tempted to bewildered inaction.

We are heartened, however, by your outspoken attempts to bring an end to the conflict and to halt escalation of the war. Recognizing the ambiguities that must be weighed in formulating national policy, we seek your continued leadership in sorting out clouded issues and in offering clear alternatives to the course being followed by our Government. We appeal to you and to our other elected representatives to guide our Nation out of the inevitable morass which increased military involvement in Vietnam promises, into a passionate struggle for peace which dares to be rebuffed and which does not give up when met with apparent failure.

We pledge ourselves to support the waging of peace and to lift up before the public conscience those moral issues raised by the conflict in Vietnam. In our effort to grapple with the complexities of technical fact and strategy, we are deeply troubled:

1. By our overwhelming military presence in a foreign land, without convincing evidence that our action there is supported by the peoples whom we presume to protect.

2. By the irreparable damage which our weaponry is dealing to the homes, crops, and other resources of a country struggling for economic subsistence.

3. By the inflexibility of military conscription whereby ethical dissent from this particular war is not considered valid grounds for being absolved from military duty.

4. By the implications of a wartime public mentality which does not grant that efforts

to end the war may be a genuine exercise of patriotism and of concern for American fighting men.

5. By the staggering loss of life and the enormous financial commitments to this war when the enemies of all mankind—hunger, disease, and poverty—stalk our Nation as well as the rest of the world.

6. By the fact that human beings continue to resort to arms in an age when nuclear chaos is always present.

We commit ourselves to foster moral sensitivity, and we ask you to instruct our political imaginations—to the end that war may no longer be the instrument by which nations seek to resolve their differences.

Andrew Davison, First Baptist Church; Manfred Swarsensky, Temple Beth El; Billy F. Bross, Bethany Methodist Church; Gary Des Jardin, St. Matthew's Lutheran Church; Winslow Wilson, Methodist District Superintendent; James LaRue, Baptist Student Center; Lowell Messerschmidt, Church of the Divine Saviour (Evangelical United Brethren);

Charles K. Paton, Messiah Lutheran Church; Donald Bossart, Methodist University Center; Clifford Fylling, Plymouth Congregational Church; Oscar Fleishaker, Beth Israel Synagogue; Myron M. Teske, Lutheran Campus Ministry (NLC); Arnold Leverenz, Covenant Presbyterian Church; Ellsworth Kalas, First Methodist Church; Richard Wichlei, Southwest Wisconsin Association, United Church of Christ;

Elizabeth Gwynn, University YWCA; Robert Trobaugh, Wesley Methodist Church; Robert C. Shaw, St. Andrews Episcopal Church; Donald D. Fenner, First Evangelical United Brethren Church; T. Gordon Amphlett, Director of Christian Education, West Wisconsin Conference of the Methodist Church;

Richard Winograd, B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation; Amos Shinko, Ashbury Methodist Church; Anthony A. Farina, Our Master's Church (Evangelical United Brethren); Edwin Beers, Campus Minister, United Church of Christ; Ray E. Robinson, Sherman Avenue Methodist Church; Willard W. Schulz, Conference Superintendent, Evangelical United Brethren; Gomer Finch, Bethany Methodist Church; Connie Parvey, Lutheran Campus Ministry (NLC).

The following ministers wish to express their support of this statement, except for item 3, above relating to military conscription:

James W. Jondrow, University Presbyterian Church; Sarah Ellis, Church of St. Francis (Episcopal); Richard E. Larson, Bethel Lutheran Church.

I think the Senator will agree with my feeling, which I just referred to, of deep humility. In my judgment, there is a growing interest, at long last, on the part of religious leaders, men of the cloth, of this country to consider the great moral issues that are involved in this war.

In my judgment, there is a great need for an acceleration of spiritual concern about the immorality of this war, because I happen to think that, when all is said and done, it is a moral issue more than any other issue that is involved.

As I have said for two and a half years and repeat again today, in my opinion, my country's course of action in Asia is immoral and cannot be reconciled with the teachings of a belief in a supreme being.

I am glad that this group of clergymen has seen fit to take the position that they have taken in this great statement they have issued.

Mr. President, if we do not measure up to our moral obligations, in regard to which I believe we are sorrowfully wanting at the present time across this Nation, it will not be too long before, figuratively speaking, the church bells of America will be tolling, tolling, because we have caused a death blow to what has always been a great record of moral values in our country. I believe we are walking out on those moral values in these troubled days.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I wish to thank my good friend, the Senator from Oregon, for those warm words.

With regard to the message from these ministers, I would imagine that if most of the Members of Congress, both the House of Representatives and the Senate, examined their mail closely, they would find that they possibly receive proportionately more mail from ministers on this issue than on any other subject. This is so even though frequently these people are hesitant to write on political matters for fear that it will be misinterpreted. I know that my mail is that way.

Most letters that I receive are not only saying, "Do this, do that." They are very thoughtful letters. They go into all the issues.

The people have been following the debate, which I believe is so good. They have been listening. They have been hearing things. They say they have been hearing things that they never knew before. They say, "I never heard that before." They say, "This is news to me."

I should think that the news media would want to continue to feel that they have a place in this situation where there is a moral responsibility. In a democracy, there is not only the right of freedom of expression but a duty of expression and a duty to express oneself fully and then to let the people decide.

I really have no fear of the result. I believe I know what they think. But even if it turned out that they did not think the way I thought they should, I believe that they should be permitted to make their own determination. But they should do it on the basis of all the facts.

It is for this reason that I hope all of those who feel they must hide behind some secret door, would express themselves fully in public, except for those matters which are, of necessity, truly touching national security. They should speak out, not alone in open debate, or on the radio and television, where sometimes the time is limited, but in front of the representatives of the people, in front of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

I wish to say again that I thank my friend from Oregon for giving me the opportunity to participate in a very educational trip in that section of the world, a trip which made it possible for me at least to have a firsthand opinion of what those people over there want for a better way of life, not a better way of death.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. As the chairman of that delegation, I wish to thank each member of the delegation for the cooperation I received at all times in carrying out my administrative duties in the handling of that trip.

I became very interested in the observations that the Senator from Indiana made along the route as he saw firsthand the cost we have paid in many, many ways for our mistaken policy of military aid.

I shall never forget the day in New Delhi, when the Senator from Indiana and the head of the professional staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Dr. Marcy asked me a question. I could not go with them one afternoon on a trip to the front, but they saw to it that I had the same experience the next day. They said to me that night, "Senator, do you know the best known American name in India?"

I started to ponder and the Senator from Indiana said, "Come on and guess."

After a little reflection I said, "I suppose the best known American name in India is Chester Bowles, our very able Ambassador here in New Delhi."

The Senator from Indiana and the others laughed at me and said, "No, you are wrong. The best known American name in India is Patton. We will prove it to you tomorrow."

Then, the Senator from Indiana told me of the experience he had had that day and which I had the next day in stopping and talking to Indians in villages along the highway, assisted by an interpreter. When asked what the name Patton meant to them their almost invariable response was a response of anger. Sometimes they would shake a fist, point a finger, and say, "Patton, Patton. American tanks you sent to kill us."

We had a graphic experience as to what military aid means in India among the masses of the people. We are either going to win the masses of the people or the cause of freedom is going to be lost in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

They recognize that our military aid, serving Pakistan and India, put them in a military position where they could carry on a war against each other with our equipment.

What kind of moral position did that leave us in?

As the Senator heard me say on the trip, it left us in a position of moral bankruptcy. Our military aid, time and time again in place after place in the world has left America morally bankrupt. That is why I shall continue to oppose the military aid on the format we have been conducting it, financing it, and giving it.

I am glad that the Senator from Indiana in his speech today announced, as he told us before we got back to the United States, that he had had his fill of American military aid.

I wish to thank him for the statement that he made today.

Mr. HARTKE. I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon, along with the masses, as the Senator knows, we were the last Senators that visited with the Prime Minister, who went to Tashkent with Shastri. We were not invited to his birthday party. We were guests of the entire government. They treated us in a royal fashion and they tried to make life for us as comfortable as possible.

Mr. Shastri's birthday was during that time. On his birthday cake there was a replica of the Patton tank, as an indication that they had conquered the great American military machine in the battlefield of Pakistan, and they had taken them over with World War II Shermans and Centurions. It was a matter of military pride for them and contempt for us and contempt for the aid we have given there.

There are a lot of people in India, according to the information they gave us, and I have no reason to doubt it. The population of India, in which we have a vital stake, is more than Africa and South America combined.

I do believe, with all respect to the efforts we made there, that we have a long way to go in establishing the type relationship with India which can bring stability to that part of Asia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Indiana spoke about the Patton tank graveyard, where the Indians were showing our destroyed Patton tanks. Tanks which were perforated with holes caused by the shells of the Shermans and the Centurions that the Indians had placed in ambush to use as artillery. The RECORD ought to show today that the Senator from Indiana and I, and the other members of our delegation, saw busload after busload of Indian schoolchildren being brought day after day to that so-called Patton tank graveyard to see for themselves how U.S. military aid had caused them the great trouble that resulted from the war. Implanted in the minds of those schoolchildren was anti-American resentment of the course of action that this country had followed by supplying military aid. In my judgment, that was one of the most dramatic, one of the most disturbing sights we saw in our 5-week tour of Asia.

The Senator from Indiana has said that we received nothing but lipservice in support of U.S. foreign policy in Vietnam, but no sincere support for our aid anywhere. Leader after leader told us that he hoped we could get the war over with as soon as possible, and without involving the rest of Asia in a war with China. It is a war with China that the nations of Asia and their leaders fear.

Mr. HARTKE. I might emphasize that point further. I asked one of the Indian ministers, "Do you object to our offering aid to Pakistan?" I did not mean that I was proposing an offer of aid to Pakistan; I was only making a suggestion. I said, "Suppose we provided you with all the military equipment you need to defend yourself against the 'Paks.' Suppose we provided you with all the economic aid you thought was necessary to start rebuilding your country, and also provided Public Law 480 food, which we are now providing, to relieve the starving people. What if we cut off all our aid to Pakistan, of whatever nature whatsoever, and made sure that you had enough military equipment to defend yourselves against Communist aggression, which exists on the Chinese border? Would you be willing to join us in Vietnam and help to oppose the Communist aggressor?"

The answer to that was very clear and very quick: "That is your problem; that is your concern. We are neutral."

I hope the Vice President will obtain more satisfactory results from his briefings and interviews. I shall be much interested in the outcome.

Perhaps I have said enough for today.

WHAT THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION THINKS ABOUT THE LEGALITY OF OUR POSITION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association in Chicago today passed a resolution stating that the position of the United States in Vietnam is in accord with international law.

The resolution, received from the ABA's Council on International Law, was passed unanimously, 279–0.

This resolution stated:

> The position of the United States in Vietnam is legal under international law and is in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Southeast Asia Treaty.

A copy of the resolution was sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Said resolution stated:

> Article 51 of the United Nations Charter preserves the right of any U.N. member to engage in self-defense and call on other U.N. members to help.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say goodnaturedly to my friend, the Senator from Missouri, that apparently what the American Bar Association needs is a freshman refresher course on both international law and constitutional law.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TOWARD A NEW ASIAN POLICY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, 3 weeks ago Under Secretary of State George W. Ball defined and defended the present foreign policy of the United States in an address before the Northwestern University Alumni Association. He did so ably and articulately. His speech conforms closely to the testimony Secretary Rusk gave to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Friday. Both dwelt at length on the policies which brought us into Vietnam, as well as the conflict itself. It is here, with the premises which underlie our policy, that the issues must be joined if there is to be meaningful debate on our Asian policy for the future.

Mr. President, in fairness to Under Secretary Ball, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of his address, as published in the Washington Post of February 6, 1966, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HANOI MYTH OF AN INDIGENOUS REBELLION

(Address by Hon. George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, delivered last week before the Northwestern University Alumni Association at Evanston, Ill.)

The beginning of wisdom with regard to Vietnam is to recognize that what Americans are fighting in the jungles and rice paddies of that unhappy land is not a local conflict—an isolated war that has meaning only for one part of the world.

We can properly understand the struggle in Vietnam only if we recognize it for what it is: part of a vast and continuing struggle in which we have been engaged for more than two decades.

Like most of the conflicts that have plagued the world in recent years, the conflict in Vietnam is a product of the great shifts and changes triggered by the Second World War. Out of the war, two continent-wide powers emerged; the United States and the Soviet Union. The colonial systems through which the nations of Western Europe had governed more than a third of the people of the world were, one by one, dismantled. The Soviet Union under Stalin embarked on a reckless course of seeking to extend Communist power. An Iron Curtain was erected to enclose large areas of the globe. At the same time, man was learning to harness the power of the exploding sun, and technology made mockery of time and distance.

The result of these vast changes—compressed within the breathless span of two decades—was to bring about a drastic rearrangement of the power structure of the world.

A WESTERN DAM

This rearrangement of power has resulted in a very uneasy equilibrium of forces. For even while the new national boundaries were still being marked on the map, the Soviet Union under Stalin exploited the confusion to push out the perimeter of its power and influence in an effort to extend the outer limits of Communist domination by force or the threat of force.

This process threatened the freedom of the world. It had to be checked and checked quickly. By launching the Marshall plan to restore economic vitality to the nations of Western Europe and by forming NATO—a powerful Western alliance reinforced by U.S. resources and military power—America and the free nations of Europe built a dam to hold back the further encroachment of Communist ambitions.

This decisive action succeeded brilliantly. NATO, created in 1949, stopped the spread of communism over Western Europe, and the northern Mediterranean. But the world was given no time to relax. The victory of the Chinese Communists in that same year posed a new threat of Communist expansion against an Asia in ferment. Just as the Western World had mobilized its resistance against Communist force in Europe, we had to create an effective counterforce in the Far East if Communist domination were not to spread like a lava flow over the whole area.

BALANCE MAINTAINED

The first test came quickly in Korea. There the United Nations Forces—predominantly American—stopped the drive of Communist North Korea, supported by materiel from the Soviet Union. They stopped a vast Chinese army that followed. They brought to a halt the Communist drive to push out the line that had been drawn and to establish Communist control over the whole Korean peninsula.

The Korean war was fought from a central conviction: That the best hope for freedom and security in the world depended on maintaining the integrity of the postwar arrangements. Stability could be achieved only by making sure that the Communist world did not expand by destroying those arrangements by force and threat and thus upsetting the precarious power balance between the two sides of the Iron Curtain.

It was this conviction that led to our firm stand in Korea. It was this conviction that led America, in the years immediately after Korea, to build a barrier around the whole periphery of the Communist world, by encouraging the creation of a series of alliances and commitments from the eastern edge of the NATO area to the Pacific.

The SEATO treaty that was signed in 1954 was part of that barrier, that structure of alliances. It was ratified by the Senate by a vote of 82 to 1.

Under that treaty and its protocol, the United States and other treaty partners gave their joint and several pledges to guarantee existing boundaries—including the line of demarcation between North and South Vietnam established when the French relinquished their control over Indochina. Since then, three Presidents have reinforced that guarantee by further commitments given directly to the Republic of Vietnam. And on August 10, 1964, the Senate, by a vote of 88 to 2, and the House, by a vote of 416 to 0, adopted a joint resolution declaring their support for these commitments.

A GREEK ANALOGY

Today we are living up to these commitments by helping South Vietnam defend itself from the onslaught of Communist force—just as we helped Iran in 1946, Greece and Turkey in 1947, Formosa and Korea in 1950 and Berlin since 1948.

The bloody encounters in the highlands around Pleiku and the rice paddies of the Mekong Delta are thus in a real sense battles and skirmishes in a continuing war to prevent one Communist power after another from violating internationally recognized boundary lines fixing the outer limits of Communist dominion.

When we think of Vietnam, we think of Korea. In Vietnam, as in Korea, the Communists in one part of a divided country lying on the periphery of China have sought by force to gain dominion over the whole. But in terms of tactics on the ground, Greece is closer analogy. For there, 20 years ago, as in South Vietnam today, the Communists sought to achieve their purpose by what is known in their lexicon as a "war of national liberation."

They chose this method of aggression both in Greece and Vietnam because tactics of terror and sabotage, of stealth and subversion, give a great advantage to a disciplined and ruthless minority, particularly where—as in those two countries—the physical terrain made concealment easy and impeded the use of heavy weapons.

But the Communists also have a more subtle reason for favoring this type of aggression. It creates in any situation an element of confusion, a sense of ambiguity that can, they hope, so disturb and divide freemen as to prevent them from making common cause against it.

This ambiguity is the central point of debate in the discussions that have surrounded the South Vietnam problem.

SUBVERSION SINCE 1954

Is the war in South Vietnam an external aggression from the north, or is it an indigenous revolt? This is a question that Americans quite properly ask—and one to which they deserve a satisfactory answer. It is a question which we who have official responsibilities have necessarily probed in great depth. For if the Vietnam war were merely what the Communists say it is—an indigenous rebellion—then the United States would have no business taking sides in the conflict and helping one side to defeat the other by force of arms.

The evidence on the character of the Vietnam war is voluminous. Its meaning seems clear enough: The North Vietnamese regime in Hanoi systematically created the Vietcong forces; it provides their equipment; it mounted the guerrilla war—and it controls that war from Hanoi on a day-to-day basis.

The evidence shows clearly enough that—at the time of French withdrawal—when Vietnam was divided in the settlement of 1954, the Communist regime in Hanoi never intended that South Vietnam should develop in freedom. Many Communists fighting with the Vietminh army were directed to stay in the south, to cache away their arms and to do everything possible to undermine the South Vietnamese Government. Others—80,000 in all—were ordered to the north for training in the North Vietnamese army.

The evidence is clear enough also that the Communist rulers of the north resorted to guerrilla warfare in South Vietnam only when the success of the South Vietnam Government persuaded them that they could not achieve their designs by subversion alone.

In September 1960, the Lao Dong Party—the Communist Party in North Vietnam—held its Third Party Congress in Hanoi. That congress called for the creation of a front organization to undertake the subversion of South Vietnam. Within 2 or 3 months thereafter, the National Liberation Front was established to provide a political facade for the conduct of an active guerrilla war.

NINE REGULAR REGIMENTS

Beginning early that year, the Hanoi regime began to infiltrate across the demarcation line the disciplined Communists whom the party had ordered north at the time of the settlement. In the intervening period since 1954, those men had been trained in the arts of proselytizing, sabotage and subversion. Now they were ordered to conscript young men from the villages by force or persuasion and to form cadres around which guerrilla units could be built.

Beginning over a year ago, the Communists apparently exhausted their reservoir of southerners who had gone north. Since then, the greater number of men infiltrated into the south have been native-born North Vietnamese. Most recently, Hanoi has begun to infiltrate elements of the North Vietnamese army in increasingly larger numbers. Today, there is evidence that nine regiments of regular North Vietnamese forces are fighting in organized units in the south.

I mention these facts—which are familiar enough to most of you—because they are fundamental to our policy with regard to Vietnam. These facts, it seems to us, make it clear beyond question that the war in South Vietnam has few of the attributes of an indigenous revolt. It is a cynical and systematic aggression by the North Vietnamese regime against the people of South Vietnam. It is one further chapter in the long and brutal chronicle of Communist efforts to extend the periphery of Communist power by force and terror.

UNACCEPTABLE CONDITION

This point is at the heart of our determination to stay the course in the bloody contest now underway in South Vietnam. It also necessarily shapes our position with regard to negotiations.

The President, Secretary Rusk and all spokesmen for the administration have stated again and again that the United States is prepared to join in unconditional discussions of the Vietnamese problem in an effort to bring about a satisfactory political solution. But so far, the regime in Hanoi has refused to come to the bargaining table except on the basis of quite unacceptable conditions. One among several conditions—but one that has been widely debated in the United States—is that we must recognize the National Liberation Front as the representative—indeed, as the sole representative—of the South Vietnamese people.

Yet to recognize the National Liberation Front in such a capacity would do violence to the truth and betray the very people whose liberty we are fighting to secure. The National Liberation Front is not a political entity expressing the will of the people of South Vietnam—or any substantial element of the South Vietnamese population. It is a facade fabricated by the Hanoi regime to confuse the issue and elaborate the myth of an indigenous revolt.

History is not obscure on this matter. As I noted earlier, the creation of the front was announced by the North Vietnam Communist Party—the Lao Dong Party—in 1960, soon after the North Vietnam military leader, General Giap, announced that "the north is the revolutionary base for the whole country." But the Hanoi regime, while applauding its creation, has taken little pains to give the front even the appearance of authenticity.

The individuals proclaimed as the leaders of the front are not personalities widely known to the South Vietnamese people—or, indeed, to many members of the Vietcong. They are not revolutionary heroes or national figures. They have little meaning to the ordinary Vietcong soldier who fights and dies in the jungles and rice paddies.

Instead, the names he carries into battle are those of "Uncle Ho"—Ho Chi Minh, the President of the North Vietnamese regime—General Giap, its military hero. When Vietcong prisoners are asked during interrogation whether they are members of the National Liberation Front, they customarily reply that they owe allegiance to the Lao Dong—the Communist Party of North Vietnam—which is the equivalent of the Hanoi Communist regime.

The front, then, is unmistakably what its name implies: a Communist front organization created to mask the activities of Hanoi and to further the illusion of an indigenous revolt.

The name of the organization was carefully chosen. It bears the same name as the National Liberation Front of Algeria. But there the resemblance ends, for the Algerian front did, in fact, represent a substantial part of the Algerian population. It played a major role in an insurgency that was clearly an indigenous movement and not an aggression imposed from outside.

The Algerian front, moreover, commanded the respect and, indeed, the obedience of the people. When it called a strike, the city of Algiers virtually closed down. By contrast, the front in Vietnam has shown its fictional character by revealing its own impotence. On two occasions it has called for a general strike. These calls have been totally ignored by the people of South Vietnam.

The Algerian front was a vital force in the Algerian community. It secured the overt allegiance of the old, established Moslem groups and leaders. As the revolt progressed, Moslems serving in the Algerian Assembly and even in the French Parliament announced their support for the front.

But the front in Vietnam has utterly failed in its efforts to attract the adherence of any established group within the society—whether Buddhist, Christian or any of the sects that form substantial elements in Vietnamese life.

Quite clearly, the people of South Vietnam—if they are aware of the front at all—know it for what it is: the political cover for a North Vietnamese effort to take over the south—in practical effect, the southern arm of the North Vietnamese Communist Party.

REINFORCING A FICTION

To be sure, the Vietcong military forces include a number of indigenous southerners under northern control. Neither the United States nor the South Vietnamese Government has ever questioned that fact. But the composition of the Vietcong military forces is not the issue when one discusses the role of the front. The issue is whether the front has any color of claim as a political entity to represent these indigenous elements.

The evidence makes clear that it does not. It is purely and simply a fictitious organization created by Hanoi to reinforce a fiction. To recognize it as the representative of the South Vietnamese population would be to give legitimacy to that fiction.

The true party in interest on the enemy side—the entity that has launched the attack on the South Vietnamese Government for its own purposes, the entity that has created, controlled and supplied the fighting forces of the Vietcong from the beginning—is the North Vietnamese regime in Hanoi. And it is the failure of that regime to come to the bargaining table that has so far frustrated every effort to move the problem of South Vietnam from a military to a political solution.

In spite of these clear realities, we have not taken—nor do we take—an obdurate or unreasoning attitude with regard to the front. The President said in his state of the Union message, "We will meet at any conference table, we will discuss any proposals—4 points, or 14 or 40—and we will consider the views of any group"—and that, of course includes the front along with other groups.

As the President has also said, this false issue of the front would never prove an insurmountable problem if Hanoi were prepared for serious negotiations. But we cannot, to advance the political objective of the Communist regime in Hanoi, give legitimacy to a spurious organization as though it spoke for the people of South Vietnam.

EVERY BOUNDARY IMPORTANT

A European friend once critically observed that Americans have "a sense of mission but no sense of history." That accusation is, I think, without warrant.

We do have a sense of history and it is that which enables us to view the war in South Vietnam for what it is. We Americans know that it is not, as I have said earlier, a local conflict; it is part of a continuing struggle to prevent the Communists from upsetting the fragile balance of power through force or the threat of force.

To succeed in that struggle, we must resist every Communist effort to destroy by aggression the boundaries and demarcation lines established by the postwar arrangements. We cannot pick and choose among those boundaries. We cannot defend Berlin and yield Korea. We cannot recognize one commitment and repudiate another without tearing and weakening the entire structure on which the world's security depends.

Some thoughtful critics of our Vietnamese policy both in Europe and America challenge this. They maintain that the West should not undertake to defend the integrity of all lines of demarcation even though they may be underwritten in formal treaties. They contend that many of these lines are unnatural since they do not conform to the geopolitical realities as they see them. They contend in particular that—since the passing of colonialism—the western powers have no business mixing in the affairs of the Asian mainland. They imply that—regardless of our commitments—we should not try to prevent Red China from establishing its hegemony over the east Asian land mass south of the Soviet Union.

INACCURATE PREMISE

Proponents of this view advance two principal arguments to support their thesis.

They contend that the very weight of Chinese power, its vast population and its consequent ability to mobilize immense mass armies entitles it to recognition as the controlling force of southeast Asia.

As a second reason for acknowledging the Chinese hegemony, they contend that for centuries China has maintained a dominant cultural and political influence throughout the area.

They claim, therefore, that southeast Asia lies within the Chinese sphere of influence and that we should let the Chinese redraw the lines of demarcation to suit themselves without regard to the wishes of the southeast Asian people.

This argument, it seems to me, does not provide an acceptable basis for U.S. policy.

The assertion that China through hundreds of years of history has held sway over southeast Asia is simply not accurate. Successive Chinese empires sought by force to establish such sway, but they never succeeded in doing so, except in certain sectors for limited periods. For the people of southeast Asia have, over the centuries, shown an obstinate insistence on shaping their own destiny which the Chinese have not been able to overcome.

To adopt the sphere-of-influence approach now advocated would, therefore, not mean allowing history to repeat itself. It would mean according to China a status it had never been able to achieve by its own efforts throughout the ages. It would mean sentencing the peoples of southeast Asia against their will to indefinite servitude behind the Bamboo Curtain. And it would mean turning our back on the principles that have formed the basis of Western policy in the whole postwar era.

Nor can one seriously insist that geographical propinquity establishes the Chinese right to dominate. At a time when man can circle the earth in 90 minutes, there is little to support such a literal commitment to 19th century geopolitics. It is a dubious policy that would permit the accidents of geography to deprive peoples of their right to determine their own future free from external force. The logic of that policy has dark implications. It would rationalize the greed of great powers. It would imperil the prospects for developing and maintaining an equilibrium of power in the world.

The principles of the United Nations Charter are doctrinally more in tune with the aspirations of 20th century man.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

This does not mean, however, that the political shape of the world should be regarded as frozen in an intractable pattern: that the boundaries established by the postwar arrangements are necessarily sacrosanct and immutable. Indeed, some of the lines of demarcation drawn after the Second World War were explicity provisional and were to be finally determined in political settlements yet to come. This was true in Germany, in Korea, and South Vietnam as well.

But those settlements have not yet been achieved, and we cannot permit their resolution to be pre-empted by force. This is the issue in Vietnam. This is what we are fighting for. This is why we are there.

We have no ambition to stay there any longer than is necessary. We have made repeatedly clear that the United States seeks no territory in southeast Asia. We wish no military bases. We do not desire to destroy the regime in Hanoi or to remake it in a Western pattern. The United States will not retain American forces in South Vietnam once peace is assured.

The countries of southeast Asia can be nonalined or neutral, depending on the will of the people. We support free elections in South Vietnam as soon as violence has been eliminated and the South Vietnamese people can vote without intimidation. We look forward to free elections—and we will accept the result as a democratic people is accustomed to do. Yet we have little doubt about the outcome, for we are confident that the South Vietnamese who have fought hard for their freedom will not be the first people to give up that freedom to communism in a free exercise of self-determination.

Whether the peoples of the two parts of Vietnam will wish to unite is again for them to decide as soon as they are in a position to do so freely. Like other options, that of reunification must be preserved.

A SHARED INTEREST

In the long run, our hopes for the people of South Vietnam reflect our hopes for people everywhere. What we seek is a world living in peace and freedom—a world in which the cold war, with its tensions and conflicts, can recede into history. We are seeking to build a world in which men and nations will recognize and act upon a strongly shared interest in peace and international cooperation for the common good.

We should not despair of these objectives even though at the moment they may seem rather unreal and idealistic. For we would make a mistake to regard the cold war as a permanent phenomenon. After all it was less than two decades ago that Winston Churchill first announced in Fulton, Mo., that "From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the Continent." And two decades are only a moment in the long sweep of history.

During the intervening years, major changes have taken place on both sides of the Iron Curtain. A schism has developed within the Communist world. The Soviet Union has become the second greatest industrial power. The Soviet people have begun to acquire a stake in the status quo, and after the missile crisis of 1962 the Soviet Union has come face to face with the realities of power and destruction in the nuclear age and has recognized the awesome fact that in the 20th century a war between great powers is a war without victory for anyone.

The changes taking place within the Soviet Union and among the nations of Eastern Europe are at once a reality and a promise. Over time—and in a world of rapid and pervasive change the measurement of time is difficult indeed—we may look forward to a comparable development within Communist China—a maturing process that will deflect the policies of Peiping from bellicose actions to a peaceful relation with the rest of the world.

After all, it is not the American purpose simply to preserve the status quo. That was not our history and that is not our destiny. What we want to preserve is the freedom of choice for the peoples of the world. We will take our chances on that.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, so first of all, let me make clear that I shall hazard no miracle cures for Vietnam; some omelets may prove indigestible, but none can be unscrambled. President Johnson's options there keep narrowing. He searches for the rudiments of an acceptable settlement, for the diplomatic door that might lead to the conference table, and for effective ways to wage the war, while confining it within manageable limits. In these endeavors, he has my fullhearted support.

He will also have my support when it comes time to vote the money necessary to carry on the fight. Our men are fighting bravely and well. Whatever funds they need should be provided by the Congress. We are committed and we must not make a difficult position worse by failing to support our fighting men.

In voting the funds necessary to support our soldiers, I do not mean to imply support for the policy which got them there, or endorse similar policies in the future. Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, made it quite clear that no endorsement of policy was implied by voting for an authorization or appropriation bill. He said:

> I think it is important that the Senate and the Nation clearly recognize this bill for what it is: an authorization of defense appropriations. It could not properly be considered as determining foreign policy, as ratifying decisions made in the past, or as endorsing new commitments.

Consequently, my purpose today is to look both behind and beyond Vietnam; behind it to the concepts on which our present policies rest, and beyond it toward a future policy for Asia. I realize this is not an easy time to take the long view, embroiled as we are in a hard jungle war. Nations, like soldiers, seldom plan their futures from foxholes.

And yet our present agony summons us to scrutinize the premises which led American troops into Vietnam in the first place. What role are we assuming on the mainland of Asia? What does it portend for the future?

Even to pose such questions these days invites rejoinders of abuse—broadside volleys of "appeasement," "neoisolation," or just plain "Munich." So let me say, at the outset, that I regard myself as a very practical internationalist. I believe the United States, as a great world power, has global responsibilities to discharge. Our present interests compel us to shape a workable foreign policy which will first, contain Russia and China, and second, discourage the further spread of communism. It is not with these goals, but with our current approach to them in the underdeveloped world, that I must register my dissent.

Mr. Ball's speech underscores the basic flaw in our Asian strategy: he draws no distinction between the problem of Red Chinese aggression and that of general Communist expansion. It is evident that the State Department still views communism as one big octopus, and the United States as the diver groping to cut off its tentacles, whenever the monster stretches them beyond its present lair. This mission is taking us down into dangerouly deep and murky waters.

Consistent with this view, Mr. Ball makes three main points. First, that a barrier has been fixed around the Communist world and that it has become the responsibility of the United States to hold it intact—alone if necessary. Second, that the war in South Vietnam is not a revolution but a disguised aggression from the north, the purpose of which is to extend international communism beyond the fixed barrier. Third, that the concept of spheres of influence is out of date, and that mainland China has no claim to any special influence in southeast Asia.

Let us begin by considering Mr. Ball's first point. The war in Vietnam, he contends, "is not a local conflict," but "a part of a vast and continuing struggle in which we have been engaged for more than two decades." The struggle is the bitter harvest of World War II, out of which the United States and the Soviet Union emerged as the two great powers. The Soviet Union, under Stalin, then "embarked on a reckless course of seeking to extend Communist power." In response, the United States and its allies in Western Europe formed NATO as a "dam to hold back the further encroachment of Communist ambition." But, with the coming to power of the Communists in China in 1949, the world faced "a new threat of Communist expansion." To meet it, "we then built barriers around the whole periphery of the Communist world through a series of alliances and commitments." Through the SEATO Treaty, we undertook to "guarantee existing boundaries including the line of demarcation between North and South Vietnam." Our intervention in Vietnam is, therefore, but another battle in the "continuing war to prevent one Communist power after another from violating internationally recognized boundary lines fixing the outer limits of Communist dominion."

Underlying Mr. Ball's analysis, and administration policy as well, is the assumption that the system of alliances which worked in Europe will also work in the vast region which has just thrown off European rule—in Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. Yet, even in Europe, NATO did not, strictly speaking, "stop the spread of communism." NATO held fast the Iron Curtain; it stopped the westward movement of Russian aggression. It is true, of course, that the occupation of Eastern Europe by the Red Army led to the imposition of Communist regimes in these countries. But behind the NATO defense line, communism continues to exist. It still claims the second largest political party in Italy, and the fourth largest in France. To repeat, NATO did not "contain communism," it prevented the Soviet Army from marching into Western Europe.

Behind the NATO shield, we have not faced violent Communist wars of national liberation. The reason is that internal conditions of the NATO countries gave no root to revolt. Only in Greece did the Communists try it, in a guerrilla war which Mr. Ball compares with Vietnam.

True, we extended aid to the Greek Government, but we did not intervene with combat troops. The Greeks put down the revolt themselves.

Moreover, moving American forces into European countries is not at all like sending them to Asia. When our armies remained in Western Europe, following World War II, it was to forge a vital link in a collective chain of defense that had real substance. We were welcomed by people with whom we shared a common culture and civilization. Most of them, having experienced our kind of freedom, willingly did their part in manning the NATO line, drawn against the Soviets.

Unfortunately, we seem to have been mesmerized by the success of our postwar European policies, NATO and the Marshall plan. With the emergence of Red China in Asia, our diplomats reacted like generals determined to fight the next war the same way they had fought the last. Military alliances were hastily formed to "contain communism" in Asia, served up with American Foreign Aid on a global platter, a Marshall plan writ large. Communist China, we determined, was to be stopped in Asia, as Russia had been in Europe.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield at that point, or would he prefer to finish his speech first?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania at this time.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend. First, let me compliment him on the fine speech he is in the process of making. He was courteous enough to give me a copy of the speech before he began. I have had an opportunity to read it and I believe that it makes an excellent contribution to the important debate which is presently going on.

I am interested in the Senator's analysis of George Ball's speech of some weeks ago, and in particular the point which the Senator is now discussing—with which I agree—that there is a vast difference between the situation in Europe, particularly as it existed some time ago, and the situation which now exists in southeast Asia.

The Senator will recall that the Secretary of State and other administration spokesmen have made a great point of the alleged analogy between the Chinese position and our response to it, and the reaction of the Chamberlain government to Hitler's expansionist actions before World War II. I take it that the Senator is of the view that the analogy is not an apt one. I wonder whether that is correct?

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is correct. The threat which faced Europe, posed by Hitler's Germany, was the threat of German conquest—Hitler's vision of a Germany which would stretch from the Rhine to the Urals. In his "Mein Kampf," written much earlier in his life, he presented a blueprint for German conquest.

China is both a bellicose and a dangerous nation. I would place no confidence whatever in the present Peiping regime. I believe that we must take care to prevent any attempt by China to conquer neighboring lands in Asia. But, thus far, the Chinese have not embarked upon the naked conquest of Asia.

The much discussed treatise of Chinese Marshal Lin Piao, for example, is not a "Mein Kampf," prescribing Chinese conquest of Asia, but, rather, as I later mention in this address, a kind of "do it yourself kit" which analyzes the Chinese revolution and recommends Chinese methods to Communists in other Asian lands.

It strikes me that this is a very important distinction, Mr. President. There is a difference between the problem posed by the Chinese effort to spread communism through revolution, and that posed by frontal Chinese aggression. Our present policy tends to blend the two together; it confuses the Asian situation with the European situation in the days preceding Hitler's attempt to conquer Europe.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator. I wonder whether he would be willing to pursue this alleged analogy a little further, because while there is a certain superficial resemblance between the European situation at the time before Hitler struck, and the situation in southeast Asia today, my own view is that the analogy is fundamentally unsound, that we should approach the South Vietnamese-American-Chinese situation, really, almost "de novo," or on an "ad hoc" basis, without placing much reliance on alleged analogies at other times and in other places.

I would ask my friend this. A good deal of emphasis has been placed by administration spokesmen on the fact that perhaps we are being confronted with another Munich and if we do not stand up and fight now, all of southeast Asia will fall and Chinese communism will prevail in all that part of the world. There is, of course, a surface similarity between nazism and fascism on the one hand and Chinese communism on the other. They are all totalitarian doctrines.

I wonder if the Senator would not agree with me that in each instance the ideology is merely a cloak of idealism thrown over a policy of expansionist nationalism.

The trouble is that we Americans, with our democratic tradition, become so mesmerized with opposition to any form of totalitarianism, that we are not astute enough to recognize, as perhaps we should, that what we are dealing with in both cases is expansionist nationalism, but expansionist nationalism in vastly different areas and under vastly different conditions.

Mr. CHURCH. First of all, let me say that I find Fascist and Communist totalitarianism equally repugnant. Second, with respect to the present war in Vietnam, I think it cannot honestly be maintained that this is a struggle between the forces of tyranny on the one hand and the forces of freedom on the other.

Mr. CLARK. Can the Senator expand on that?

Mr. CHURCH. I mean that neither the government in Hanoi nor the government in Saigon is in truth a free government. It is just possibly the reason why we are told that most of the people in Vietnam are uninterested; they find they have little choice.

Mr. CLARK. And actually neither is a democratic government.

Mr. CHURCH. That is true. There is no democratic government in either part of Vietnam today.

Mr. CLARK. There is none in southeast Asia, with the possible exception of the Philippines.

Mr. CHURCH. There are free governments in Asia today. India, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Japan are the best examples. I want to give them full credit. Particularly the Indians, I think, deserve credit for tremendous determination against odds—conditions of great adversity—in maintaining a democratic government. But most Asian and African governments are not free. They are not democratic governments. Certainly, this applies to the present regime in Saigon supported by the United States.

So I think, if we are going to approach the war in Vietnam on a purely ideological basis, then we must be careful to recognize that the struggle there is presently between two despotisms. I hope the Government in Saigon will one day become a true democracy, that it will find a wider basis of popular support, and that it will come to foster a broadening freedom. But that is not the case at the present time.

If I may go to the third point the Senator from Pennsylvania raised, which was the point of expanding nationalism, I say again, relating the Senator's question to the situation in Vietnam, that the expanding nationalism we face there is not Chinese nationalism, but Vietnamese nationalism. Oftentimes the Secretary of State has referred to the war in Vietnam as Ho Chi Minh's war. When he appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I asked him if the aggression he kept referring to was not the aggression of North Vietnam rather than of China, and he admitted this was so.

I think, given the history of this struggle, the facts are that Ho Chi Minh was the original revolutionary leader who led the Vietnamese people successfully in their war for independence against the French, and that the division between North and South Vietnam which emerged from that war at Geneva, in 1954, was meant to be temporary, and that the elections on the question of unification for the entire country, which were supposed to have taken place 2 years later, in fact never occurred.

Mr. CLARK. And why did they not occur in the south?

Mr. CHURCH. The regime in South Vietnam at that time, Diem's regime, was opposed to the elections. President Eisenhower, in his book, makes the statement that the best opinion he could marshal indicated that, had the elections occurred, perhaps as many as 80 percent of the people would have voted for Ho Chi Minh.

Mr. CLARK. So we have either actively encouraged or acquiesced in preventing a democratic solution of the governmental problems in South Vietnam.

Mr. CHURCH. I may say to the Senator that there were good reasons to question whether an election at that time—in the north as well as the south—would have been a free expression of popular opinion, but that begs the point, I think, because part of the Geneva Pact of 1954 was the agreement that elections would be held, and that agreement was broken. either side has kept the agreement, as the Senator well knows. But the question of determining whether or not the line of demarcation between north and south would remain as a common boundary, or would remain as it was, was never put to the test of ballots. So, 10 years later, it is being put to the test of bullets.

If there is in this situation an element of nationalist expansion, it is Vietnamese in character. It is the attempt of Ho Chi Minh, the original revolutionary leader, to lay claim upon the whole country, and it comes after a failure of the Geneva Pact to permit the elections which were to settle that issue 10 years ago.

Mr. CLARK. Does it not also include a failure on the part of the Diem government and its successor to go to the people of South Vietnam in a democratic way to determine what they wanted to do with their own destiny?

Mr. CHURCH. I can only say the elections were never held. The reasons given have been several.

The most frequently heard has been that no meaningful elections could have occurred in North Vietnam because it was a closed Communist society and everyone would have had to vote one way.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with that statement.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree, too.

But, at the time the agreement was entered into in Geneva, it was known that North Vietnam was going to become a Communist country. Nevertheless, the elections were agreed to. But they were not held. Then Ho Chi Minh began his effort to bring down the South Vietnam regime by force.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield further, I suggest that the principal reason for not holding an election in South Vietnam was that Diem's government would have gotten licked.

I take it from something that was said earlier by the Senator that we still have a totalitarian government in South Vietnam which we are supporting, so that unlike the situation with Hitler and his aggression against the democratic nations of Western Europe, we find ourselves intervening on the side of one dictatorship against another dictatorship.

Would the Senator care to comment on that?

Mr. CHURCH. In all honesty, this is the existing situation. We do it upon the grounds that the north is attempting to forcibly seize the south, and that we are committed to the Saigon regime to prevent the success of an aggression being perpetrated by Hanoi.

I believe that there is much evidence to sustain the supposition that the Hanoi Government is in fact giving all possible help, encouragement, direction, and assistance to the Vietcong rebels in the south. I have no quarrel with that fact. It must be recognized. The evidence makes it quite irrefutable.

The distinction that I am trying to draw is one between North Vietnam and China. Here, it seems to me, is an obvious attempt by Ho Chi Minh to complete the revolutionary war in Vietnam, which began against the French, and which now continues against the Americans.

From the standpoint of Hanoi, this is one continuous effort to achieve Vietnamese independence by driving the Western nations out.

We do not see our role as remotely corresponding to that of the French because, as the Senator knows, the French purpose was to restore French control over Vietnam and reestablish the French colony there.

Our purpose is quite different. We have no interest in establishing an American colony in South Vietnam.

We know that our purpose is quite different.

The important question is: How does it appear to the Vietnamese? After so long and bloody a struggle on their part to drive out the French, it must seem to many Vietnamese that this is but a continuation of that war, looking to the eventual establishment of Vietnamese independence after Western nations have been driven from the land.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. This situation is fundamentally different from the Nazi aggression in World War II where, I take it, the Senator would agree with me unquestionably that freedom and democracy were at stake.

The Western democracies, which were of the same philosophical bent as ourselves, were fighting for their lives against totalitarian and nationalistic German aggression. We, in my opinion, justly, rightly, and necessarily, went to their assistance.

But is that not an entirely different situation from the situation which confronts us in Asia today?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes; the struggle in Vietnam is essentially a civil war between groups of Vietnamese to determine which government they shall have, and whether the division line shall remain in effect. When I went to school that was a civil war.

We keep asserting to the world that this is not a civil war in Vietnam. But, no matter how one divides the Vietnamese, north and south, Communist and non-Communist, they still remain Vietnamese. We are the only foreigners to have intervened, apart from the small numbers of Australians and New Zealanders, and the one combat division of Koreans that we have summoned there.

So, to Asians this war does have a very different appearance. In no case is it comparable to the situation that confronted us when Hitler sent his armies across Europe in an attempt to conquer the continent.

If the Chinese were sending their armies south into Vietnam, Laos, Burma, and Malaysia, then we would have a comparable situation, with the Peiping government undertaking to conquer other Asian lands. That, in my opinion, would be a situation similar to that which we faced in Europe in the days of Hitler.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to make one more distinction with respect to the alleged analogy to Hitler and Munich, and then I will let the Senator return to his speech.

There is no doubt in my mind—I wonder if the Senator agrees—that Hitler's Germany represented a military menace which, if not stopped, would have overrun not only Western Europe but also Great Britain and would in the end have posed a very real threat to both Russia and the United States. It possessed a military machine, the efficiency of which probably has not been equaled since the days of Napoleon.

The Senator makes the point, and it is a good one, that this is a war of North Vietnam against South Vietnam. But we both know that North Vietnam is being enormously encouraged by mainland China.

I ask the Senator if the administration spokesmen who argue the Hitler-Mao Tse-tung analogy might not consider this distinction:

China has no airpower. Hitler had enormous airpower. China has no seapower. Hitler had a great fleet of submarines and pocket battleships in the Atlantic. Hitler had enormous firepower in terms of tanks and heavy artillery and eventually in V-bombs and rockets.

China has very little of that. China is a primitive nuclear power, a country having very little heavy artillery and, so far as I know, an insignificant rocket capability. In vast contradistinction to Hitler, China's military might lies almost entirely in its large land army.

Its capacity for offensive action is limited to the perimeter of mainland China, although it might include North Vietnam, and even South Vietnam. The withdrawal of Chinese troops from India leads me to believe that the State Department has vastly overemphasized the threat arising from the offensive military capacity of mainland China. There can certainly be no comparison with the aggressive military capabilities of Nazi Germany.

Mr. CHURCH. I would agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania that modern, highly industrialized Nazi Germany represented a military threat of a different dimension than that presently posed by China. The important thing, however, is to recognize that—whatever may be the threat of Chinese aggression in Asia today—we are presently engaged in a war that concerns the Vietnamese. If we press that war far enough north toward the boundaries of China, a point will be reached—no one knows exactly where; but a point will be reached—a point where the Chinese will come down into Vietnam, just the way they came down into Korea. Then, of course, we would find ourselves engaged in a war of an entirely new character.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I stress this point because when we fail to distinguish between the problem of China, on the one hand, and the problem of North Vietnam, on the other, we get ourselves into a frame of mind which is all too prevalent: that is, in the name of defending Asia against China, we fight against North Vietnam. This, of course, leads us to confusion; and what we need is more clarity and less confusion if we are to fashion a workable policy in Asia.

I now yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. In an effort to help to clarify that policy, I wonder if the Senator from Idaho would agree with this observation: If we push mainland China to the point of coming in with her ground army in defense of North Vietnam, and to assist the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong in their aggression, we have only two choices. The first is to pour hundreds of thousands of additional American troops into that area to stop that ground warfare. The second is to use nuclear weapons to destroy China. I ask the Senator to comment briefly on what he believes Russia might well be expected to do under those circumstances.

Mr. CHURCH. If that tragic sequence of events were to occur, the danger of a general nuclear holocaust would be very grave.

Mr. CLARK. There is no doubt about what that would mean to the people of the United States of America.

Mr. CHURCH. No, indeed. The stakes are mortal. This is the reason the Committee on Foreign Relations came out from behind closed doors to examine the issue of Vietnam. The American people are entitled to know how grave might be the circumstances of a widening war in Asia. I believe the public hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations have performed a vital service. The American people were invited to witness our deliberations. As a result, the people of the country are better apprised of the war in Vietnam, its present implications, and the possible consequences that might attend a widening war in southeast Asia.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for emphasizing the differences between the problem we faced in the days preceding the outbreak of the Second World War in Europe and the problem we now face in Asia. Unless we understand these distinctions, we have no chance of fashioning a policy that is designed to deal with the realities in Asia today.

The gulf that separates Europe from Asia is immense. Most of the newly independent Asian governments—like those in Africa—contend with internal upheaval. Most are hard pressed to satisfy the demands of their suddenly unfettered peoples. Most lack democratic traditions, and have instead "strong man" regimes under one-party rule. Their people wretch in poverty and often bear the yoke of ancient wrongs. "Capitalism," not "communism," is the ugly word, conjuring up images of a hated colonial past. Socialism prevails by force of circumstances, since adequate private capital is unavailable.

With these countries, the United States enjoys no close communion, no cultural, political, economic, or ethnic bond. We are an alien in Asia, a suspect rich Western power, the only one that remains after the others have fled.

In these circumstances, it is meaningless to talk about military alliances which have raised a "barrier" against communism around the rim of Asia. If the SEATO and CENTO alliances bar communism, then a sieve bars water and plate-glass window bars light. SEATO has not responded to the Communist threat in Vietnam; the United States takes its stand there practically alone. Apart from the regime we sustain in Saigon, the only military allies we can honestly claim in Asia—South Korea, Taiwan, and Thailand—account for less than 5 percent of the Asian people. Rather than flaunting our meager alliances as evidence of a sound Asian policy, we should view them as shocking proof that we lack one.

Given the grievances of most Asian peoples, future revolutions are inevitable. So, too, the Communist determination to take them over. In Eastern Europe, the Red army implanted Communist regimes; in Asia Chinese troops have not penetrated neighboring lands to thrust up Communist governments.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH I yield.

Mr. INOUYE. Would the Senator from Idaho describe the Chinese military occupation of Tibet?

Mr. CHURCH. The occupation of Tibet was the laying of forcible control upon an area over which the Chinese have long asserted dominion, and which most of the rest of the world has also acknowledged as being within traditional Chinese claims.

I do not, for a moment, condone the methods that were used by the Peiping government to assert that dominion, but I am fully aware that Chiang Kai-shek, who is, as the Senator from Hawaii well knows, the presiding head of the Chinese Government recognized by the United States, a government presently situated on the island of Taiwan, also claims Tibet as a part of the traditional land area over which the Chinese have asserted dominion.

I therefore believe that Tibet falls in a different category than other independent nations which lie beyond the traditional boundaries of China. I do not believe that Tibet can be compared, let us say, with Burma, Thailand, or Vietnam, which are generally recognized as sovereign and independent nations.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I thought the comment of the Senator on Tibet was a very good answer to an extremely intelligent question. However, it was largely put on political and diplomatic grounds.

I point out that, from a military point of view, the situation in Tibet was vastly different because there was no feasible possibility there of Indian forces or American forces or other forces opposed to the mainland Chinese Government delivering a military counterpunch to drive the Chinese Communists out of Tibet.

The situation existing there is very much like that which existed in Hungary in 1956. We had great sympathy for the people of Tibet. We had great sympathy for the freedom fighters of Hungary. However, we came to the reluctant, but I believe the correct, conclusion that that was not a place in which one could intervene.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as I have stressed, a distinction must be drawn between the threat of Chinese aggression, on the one hand, and the problem of communism, fostered by revolution, on the other. American policy keeps blending the two together, presumably because the two threats were synonymous in Europe.

This leads me to Mr. Ball's second point, that the Vietnamese war is not "an indigenous rebellion," but a case of "external aggression." The evidence shows clearly enough, Mr. Ball writes, "that the Communist regime in Hanoi never intended that South Vietnam should develop in freedom." From the start, we are told, the Vietcong rebels have been trained, directed, and supplied from the north in "a cynical and systematic aggression" which Secretary of State Dean Rusk describes as "Ho Chi Minh's War."

While citing the evidence, Mr. Ball might also have mentioned—but did not—that the line of demarcation, separating North and South Vietnam, as agreed upon at Geneva in 1954, was not intended as a permanent boundary, and that the elections on the question of unification which were scheduled for 1956, never occurred. The reason, widely accepted at the time, was that "Uncle Ho," the revolutionary hero who had won independence for both parts of Vietnam, would have garnered as much as 80 percent of the total vote.

So what was not settled with ballots 10 years ago, is now being settled with bullets, in a civil war among the Vietnamese, northern and southern, Communist and non-Communist. We can portray this war as a case of external aggression, but most Asians are not likely to see it that way. After all, we are the foreigners in Vietnam today. The North Vietnamese are not foreigners; they are Vietnamese. There are no Chinese troops fighting in South Vietnam. The only non-Vietnamese soldiers there are American, along with some of our Australian, New Zealand, and Korean allies. And race is a factor, on a continent whose people have so recently thrown off the domination of white, Western nations. We are engaged in a war in which we, a Western power, are fighting Vietnamese who are oriental, and we are fighting them in Vietnam. As Harvard's John K. Fairbank, a noted American authority on Far Eastern affairs, so graphically put it in a recent article:

> We are sleeping in the same bed as the French slept in even though we are dreaming very different dreams.

They are dreams indeed if we think that by interjecting American troops into ex-colonial lands we shall stifle the spread of communism for long. No nation—not even our own—possesses a treasury so rich, or an arsenal so large, as to quench the smouldering fires of revolution throughout the whole of the emerging world.

Violent convulsions are bound to occur in many countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, wherever injustice lacks a remedy and progress must spawn on force. Should suppression of revolt abroad become an American obsession, we will yield to the Communists the one prize they most covet, an uncontested claim upon every incipient revolution. If we do not attempt through our diplomacy and by our example to guide these currents toward democratic ends, rather than trying in vain to stem them, the Communists will be left to ride their crest.

Worse still, the importation into Asia of troops from the Western World, furnishes the Communists with an issue of great popular appeal; it invariably condemns the challenged government to the contemptible charge of puppetry.

We would do well to remember that, despite our massive intervention in South Vietnam, the war persists and intensifies. Far from being extinguished, it spreads now into Thailand.

Yet the Burmese Government, without our intervention, snuffed out a Communist insurrection. U.N. Secretary General U Thant recently said about Burma:

> The Burmese Communist Party is still underground after 17 years and still illegal. Burma has over a thousand miles of land frontier with mainland China. If the Burmese Government had decided at some stage to seek outside military assistance, then I am sure that Burma would have experienced one of two alternatives: either the country would be divided in two parts or the whole country would have become Communist long ago.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I believe that the Burmese analogy is well worth stressing, and I hope that it will receive appropriate attention in the press reports of the Senator's speech. To me, it is quite convincing.

Is it not true that in another Asian country, Indonesia, an anti-Communist movement—with some overtones which I must say I am not very happy about—succeeded in getting rid of the Chinese Communist Party and reestablishing control of Indonesia for the Indonesians? It was perhaps a totalitarian control, but I draw the tentative conclusion that we do better in the fight for freedom and against Chinese communism if we keep America out of it, than we do if America goes in.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Communists are not doing very well in their effort to seize control of the underdeveloped world.

Mr. CLARK. Except where we try to move in.

Mr. CHURCH. On the whole, they are making very little progress. In Vietnam they had the momentum of nationalism to carry communism forward.

Unhappily, the revolutionary leader there who secured Vietnamese independence was a Communist. However, only in those cases where communism has latched onto nationalism, has it become a formidable force in the ex-colonial regions of the world.

We should take heart from that. We should be careful not to inject ourselves in such a way that the Communists can then exploit our presence to make themselves the champions of the nationalist cause.

I am afraid that this is what has happened in Vietnam. I believe this is the reason that, despite the enormity of the assistance which we have given to the Saigon government and despite the tremendous superiority of the firepower we possess in that country, the war persists and the Vietcong continue to grow in number in South Vietnam.

Again I say we must differentiate between the problem of containing China, on the one hand, and the problem of discouraging the spread of communism through revolution, on the other. There is just one great force that, in the long run, can prevail against communism in the underdeveloped world. It is not the primacy of American arms. It is indigenous nationalist resistance to communism; and if we are insensitive to that force, and intervene with mighty Western armies in a region of the world which has just managed to throw off the colonial dominion of the Western nations, then I am afraid we will permit the Communists to exploit nationalist aspirations, and give them the one cause that can rally popular support to their standards. We will thrust the nationalist banner into Communist hands. They could not ask for more.

Mr. CLARK. I agree completely with what the Senator has just stated. It occurs to me there is another aspect of this case—I do not know whether the Senator will agree or not—and that is that our best defense against communism is the support of such programs as President Kennedy's Alianza para Progreso and other foreign aid programs which enable the people of the underdeveloped countries of the world to move out of the condition of misery, of starvation, of inadequate shelter; because those conditions are breeders of communism, and that is where, in my judgment, our major effort should be placed.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator, and I hope that we shall perfect a new policy in coping with the problems posed by guerrilla warfare. This is what we desperately need in Asia, and our failure thus far to devise such a policy, including some measure of discretion and restraint, is one of the reasons for the difficulties that we now face in that part of the world.

I am now happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, first of all I wish to commend the Senator from Idaho for the statement which he is making today, in following up an article he prepared for the Washington Post, published on yesterday, which I understand was an answer to a previous speech made by Under Secretary Ball at Northwestern University 2 or 3 weeks ago.

Secretary Ball's statement, in my judgment, is the best single statement of the administration's position on Vietnam that has come to my attention. Mr. Ball, as the Senator knows, is one of the most able men ever to serve in our Government.

But I also think that the answer which the Senator from Idaho is giving today, which follows roughly what he had to say in the Washington Post yesterday, is the finest critique of the administration position that I have heard.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. McGOVERN. From now on when constituents write my office for a clear statement of the pros and cons on administration policy on Vietnam, I shall send them the statement by Under Secretary Ball and the answer by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is very generous, particularly when one considers the very lucid and effective arguments he himself has made in constructive criticism of our Asian policy.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator. During the celebrated debates between Vice President Nixon and the late President Kennedy in the 1960 presidential campaign, one of the news commentators asked each candidate to state what he regarded as the most important qualification that he could bring to the Presidency.

Vice President Nixon said he felt that his most important asset was his experience. Senator Kennedy replied that he felt the most important quality that he brought to high office was his sense of history.

I believe that the Senator from Idaho has indicated in all of his statements on the problems that face us in southeast Asia a very clear understanding of historical forces.

I believe that the greatest single mistake we have made in southeast Asia, in the years after World War II, has been a tendency to see the revolution of that area as another manifestation of Hitlerism.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. McGOVERN. In other words, we learned the lesson of Hitler, as the Senator from Idaho has said, but we applied it to the wrong situation; and, having done that, we have offered the wrong medicine for the problems of that part of the world.

It is my own feeling that even if there had never been a Soviet Russia, even if there had never been a Red China, we would have seen revolutions in Asia in the years after World War II. The Japanese shattered the old colonial empires of southeast Asia, during World War II. The people in southeast Asia, once freed from control by the countries of Western Europe, were not about to submit placidly to imperial control again after the defeat of Japan in 1945.

I think our policymakers, for the most part, understood the historical forces that were moving in the world at that period. We perceived the forces of nationalism and the aspirations for a better life being asserted. As a consequence, we urged our British friends to get out of India and Malaya. We told the Dutch that in our judgment it was imperative that they withdraw from Indonesia, and we exerted considerable pressure to see that that was done. We ourselves pulled out of the Philippines.

The only area where we decided to buck powerful historical forces was in French Indochina; and we have been in trouble ever since. Does the Senator agree basically with that analysis?

Mr. CHURCH. I agree completely with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. I am afraid that we have failed to take our own advice.

We understood and encouraged the nationalist aspirations of Asian peoples when they were directed against the European colonial powers. The one blindspot was Vietnam. When, for example, the Indonesians pressed for independence against the Dutch, we encouraged the Indonesians, and we discouraged the Dutch; and in the end, the Dutch recognized that there was no way they could enforce their dominion over the resistance of 100 million people in Indonesia. We also stood with the Indians when they claimed their right to independence against the British.

Now the European powers have yielded their empires. Independence has come to all these Asian lands. The only western nation that remains is the United States, curiously enough the one power that never seriously engaged in empire-building during the previous 100 years.

We know that our role has nothing whatever to do with colonialism; and I would be the last to question our motives in Asia. We do hope to see an independent South Vietnam created, and certainly we have no colonial ambitions there.

But motives are one thing. The appearance of war to other Asians is quite another. I am afraid that choosing Vietnam as a place to make a stand, and importing, from the opposite side of the globe, a vast Western army to fight against the revolutionary leader who secured Vietnamese independence from the French, reflects a failure to comprehend the great historical forces which have been at work in Asia. I am sorry that we failed to see for ourselves what we so clearly saw where others were concerned, in the years that preceded our involvement in Vietnam.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have a brief comment to make. I am unable to remain in the Chamber to listen to the remainder of the speech of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], but I read it this morning and I wish to commend him on it.

There is no one in Congress, in my opinion, who has made a more consistent and thoughtful contribution to this dialog in the field of foreign affairs than has the Senator from Idaho.

The speech the Senator is making is a most creative evaluation of our posture in the world, particularly in the Far East. I wish to commend him for his excellent contribution to the significant discussion which has been going on in the area of foreign policy in the last few weeks.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much for his generous remarks.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. To continue my colloquy with the Senator from Idaho, having suggested that we do not have a monopoly on virtue, it is somewhat encouraging to know that neither do we have a monopoly on mistakes, particularly in the underdeveloped countries of the world.

As the Senator has stated so well in his remarks on this subject, the Chinese have gotten into all kinds of trouble in those areas of the world where they have intervened in a heavy-handed manner. They have been rebuffed in large parts of Africa. They have got into difficulties in Cuba recently, and they have certainly had setbacks for their cause in Indonesia; in fact, in every area where they have intervened in a clumsy and heavy-handed manner, there has been a backfire.

The reason is clear: In those areas, their interventions have run counter to strong nationalistic aspirations. It seems to me the one place they have had notable success, as the Senator has stated in his speech today, is in the area where we have been most heavily involved; namely, in Vietnam. There are no Chinese soldiers fighting in Vietnam. The foreign forces involved in that conflict are from our country—not from China or Russia.

We are involved in a constantly disappointing effort to impose an outside Western solution on a problem which is basically Vietnamese. It is clear that neither we nor the Communists can easily counter the tide of nationalism without grave costs.

We have been the beneficiary of national aspirations when our policies have been intelligent; likewise, we have had to pay for our mistakes where we have been too heavily involved as in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

So I commend the Senator for his superb address today on the challenge of Asia. It is another of a series of brilliant statements he has made in the field of foreign policy.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, If the Senator will permit me, I might say to the Senator that some time ago I wrote an article for the New York Times magazine on the very question the Senator has raised, that is, on the error of intervening too much in countries that have just won independence. The Russians have made that error. The Chinese are also making it. And, alas, we, too, have made it.

Wherever this happens, the consequences are predictable. The nationalist feeling reacts strongly against the intervenor. I could cite examples in Africa, and I think in Asia, too, where this has happened.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator has referred to his article that appeared in the New York Times magazine on November 28, 1965. He also delivered a very fine statement before the Economic Club of Detroit on February 22, 1965, entitled "Are We Too Deep in Africa and Asia?"

Because there is a certain continuity in the Senator's thinking in his previous articles and the speech he is making today, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Idaho this afternoon the two previous articles referred to may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Morse in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McGOVERN. I might say that that trilogy of articles should comprise a very good textbook for any citizen who is interested in reviewing not only the problems and hazards we face in that part of the world, but also the opportunities that are open to us if we seize upon them with imagination and intelligence.

Before I yield the floor, I should also like to take this opportunity to commend the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy] for the statement he made over the weekend, calling upon our Government to be realistic in the negotiating prospects that are ahead in Vietnam. I think we have to face up to the facts. We must recognize that we are up against an indigenous guerrilla force in Vietnam, headed by the National Liberation Front. To negotiate, we must be prepared to talk with the people who are doing the fighting and with the leaders who are directing them in both North and South Vietnam. The Senator from New York emphasized that negotiations must include the guerrilla leaders. Secondly, he recognized that they must be given some role in any provisional government that is established. We may have complete confidence in the integrity of the government of Saigon, but the fact remains that when the Vietminh laid down their arms in 1954, they did so with the understanding that an election would be held in 1956. For various reasons that election was not held and they were frustrated in their hopes of winning it. It is not hard for me to guess why they are skeptical about getting into negotiations without reasonable assurance that they will have some part in setting the ground rules for future elections.

So I again commend the Senator from Idaho, as well as the Senator from New York, for the contribution they have made to this historic debate.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I can speak with enthusiasm of the really splendid contribution which the senior Senator from Idaho has made on this occasion and on several occasions in recent months which have been alluded to, and which I am glad to see are being placed into the Record by the Senator from South Dakota.

I think this is a profound analysis of what is our basic approach. It is done without any caustic criticism. It is a constructive approach. I hope it will be taken seriously by those who are responsible for our mistaken policies.

I am glad to see the reference made to the statement of Under Secretary Ball. It so happens, in connection with the statement made by Secretary Ball, that it has some serious flaws. He made the analogy between Vietnam and Greece. In that connection, George C. Vournas, who was in the U.S. service in the Middle East during the difficulties there submitted an article which I ask unanimous consent be included at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Idaho along with some other material. It is entitled "Is Vietnam Another Greece?", which points out some errors and challenges the statements of Mr. Ball. There are also several editorials and articles bearing on this general subject from the New York Times and the Nation that I ask unanimous consent for inclusion.

Another point which I think should be emphasized in reference to the statement made by Secretary Ball is that if the Vietnam War is a civil war, an indigenous rebellion, we would have no business being in there. That is an important admission to which I have alluded before. This review is also borne out by the statement of former President Kennedy, who referred to it as a civil war. He was elected to the House in 1946 and became a Member of the Senate in 1953. He called it a civil war. That fact was also confirmed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] who was there and received assurances from Generals Westmoreland, Stilwell and others there that it was essentially a civil war in South Vietnam.

I think one of the most important aspects of this issue is the fact that the information which has been emanating from official sources is incorrect.

I ask that there also be printed at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] an article by James Reston from the Sunday New York Times of February 20, entitled "Washington: The Rusk Doctrine," in which it is pointed out that the Rusk doctrine will stretch us so thin that we will have nothing left.

I also ask that there be printed at the end of the speech of the Senator from Idaho a letter to the editor published in the New York Times of February 21 entitled "Error in Vietnam Policy," an editorial published in the New York Times of February 21, entitled "The Vietnam Commitment," and three consecutive editorials from the February 14 issue of the Nation, entitled "Everything But Peace," "The Economics of It," and "AID for Whom?"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. I again wish to commend the Senator for the fine statement he made and for his stimulating and important contribution to this great debate which, at long last, is now being had on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator.

It was my privilege to have lunch with our Secretary of State today, in the course of which we went into the ramifications of the Rusk doctrine, as Mr. Reston described it in this morning's New York Times. My difficulty with the Secretary's position is that he bases our participation in the war in Vietnam upon the obligation that we assumed under the SEATO Alliance.

It seems perfectly evident to me that the SEATO Alliance has not responded to the Communist threat in Vietnam. An alliance is a collective undertaking. The purpose of an alliance is to secure binding covenants of two, three, four, or more governments, with the objective that all will act in common concert if the aggression toward which the alliance is directed should occur.

It cannot be persuasively maintained that the other signatories to the SEATO Alliance have responded to the Communist threat in Vietnam.

Pakistan is a member of SEATO. France is a member of SEATO. Neither of these countries has responded in any way. The Philippines is a member of SEATO but we still await any contribution by the Filipinos of combat troops for the war in Vietnam.

In other words, the undertaking of the SEATO Alliance has never been fulfilled. The parties are in default. It is an extraordinary doctrine that, when other parties to an alliance default upon their obligation, the alliance nonetheless remains intact, and that commitments undertaken by the United States remain obligatory.

There is no such doctrine in the ordinary law of contracts. To my knowledge, there never has been such a doctrine before in the law of international relations. It is a strange, if not unique, interpretation to insist that the United States continues to be obligated by a treaty which is otherwise in default.

There may be good reasons, quite apart from the SEATO Alliance, to account for our presence in Vietnam. This is a separate and arguable question. But, it is self-evident that the SEATO Alliance has not functioned. Other major signatories are simply not present in Vietnam. Therefore, it seems extraordinary for the Secretary of State to contend that our obligation under the treaty required us to intervene in Vietnam. It is a doctrine quite without precedent to my knowledge in the history of diplomacy.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. In my view we are in violation of the SEATO Treaty. In the first place, article I provides:

> ARTICLE I
>
> The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

When we use force we are in violation of article I, and we are using force now.

Article IV, which was invoked, provides:

> ARTICLE IV
>
> 1. Each Party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the Parties or against any State or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate.

There has been no unanimous agreement, as the Senator pointed out. The case of the administration grows weaker and weaker. Every time U.S. spokesmen come up with a justification it falls to the ground after one checks the pertinent documents.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator. We find ourselves in the position of justifying the war on a higher plane, but that is unfortunate if it leads to doctrines which are not tenable.

I question the validity of a continuing obligation of the United States under a treaty that is in default. That is exactly what has happened to the SEATO Treaty. It has failed to respond to what we regard as Communist aggression in Vietnam.

As I have tried to stress, it is nationalism, not communism, which is the dominant force in the ex-colonial regions of the world. Outraged nationalist indignation in Indonesia is putting the Communists to the sword. We have no conspicuous presence there for the Communists to exploit. Fortunately for us, Sukarno asked us out many months ago.

If we had a better sense of history, we would scoff at the notion that Vietnam is some sort of test case, where Communists must be taught to abandon their resort to force. Regardless of the final outcome in Vietnam, guerrilla wars will continue to break out in the future whenever internal conditions in any country seed revolt. We can draw no battleline—in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, or any other foreign country—which will either put an end to future revolutions, or cause the Communists to quit trying to take charge of them.

Rather than rushing in with our troops, whenever a guerrilla war in some distant country takes a bad turn, we should begin to exercise prudent restraint. The Communists are doing badly in the underdeveloped world. Only where they have managed to seize hold of nationalist aspirations, have they gained the upper hand. The lesson for us, in dealing with Communist rebellions in Asia, should be to hold our distance, extend our aid at arm's length, and avoid implicating ourselves so openly as to convert these struggles into American wars.

This brings me to the third, and final, point in Mr. Ball's presentation, that southeast Asia does not lie within the Chinese sphere of influence. Furthermore, that the whole sphere-of-influence doctrine is "19th century geopolitics, a dubious policy which would permit the accidents of geography to rationalize the greed of great powers and imperil the prospects of developing and maintaining an equilibrium of power in the world."

This is sheer sophistry. If anything should be clear, it is that the present equilibrium of power between the United States and the Soviet Union rests upon an implicit recognition of our respective spheres of influence. We did not dispatch an American Army into Hungary in 1956, not because we lacked sympathy for the freedom fighters, but because we calculated that our military penetration of the Iron Curtain would lead to war with Russia. The Soviet Government had reasserted a longstanding Russian influence in Eastern Europe, formerly exercised by the czars. We may trade with these countries, and even encourage their governments to be more independent, but we may not garrison our combat troops in them.

Likewise, with the proclaiming of the Monroe Doctrine, we have long asserted an American sphere of influence in the Western Hemisphere. The Russians are permitted normal dealings with Latin American countries, but they may not convert them into Soviet military bases. Khrushchev made the mistake of trying it in Cuba. We drove him out with an ultimatum that brought the world to the brink of nuclear war.

In the face of these realities, it is astonishing to argue that spheres of influence have gone out of date. It just is not so. We pretend otherwise, because current American policy in southeast Asia refuses to concede to China that which we claim for ourselves in the Western Hemisphere and implicitly acknowledge to the Russians in Eastern Europe. The relative weakness of China today permits this. But what of tomorrow, when China has achieved real nuclear capability? Is it not the duty of diplomacy to look ahead?

The tragedy is that we resist the quest for a rational relationship with mainland China. By this I do not mean that we can expect to be friends. Peiping is feuding with most of the world, including the big majority of the Communist countries.

The reasons go much deeper than the Communist complexion of the Peiping regime. Arnold Toynbee, the renowned historian, reminds us:

> From 1840 to 1945, China was attacked, stamped on, humiliated, and fleeced by one warlike foreign country after another—first by Britain, then by France, and finally by Japan, a parvenu country which had borrowed its civilization from China. A century of such treatment would be enough to make a saint turn savage.

Recognizing the historic roots of China's defection does not, of course, eliminate our need to deal with any consequent threat of Chinese aggression. We cannot permit Communist China to conquer Asia, for this would indeed upset the equilibrium of power upon which stability and peace depend.

But we do not defend Asia against China by fighting against North Vietnam. Mr. Ball himself admits it:

> The people of southeast Asia—

He assures us—

> have, over the centuries, shown an obstinate insistence on shaping their own destiny which the Chinese have not been able to overcome.

It is not communism in Hanoi, but the unremitting pressure of the war itself, which makes North Vietnam increasingly dependent on China, thus eroding away her hard-won independence.

Neither is China contained in Asia by an American buildup of the military forces of South Vietnam. It would make as much sense to argue that the United States could be contained in the Western Hemisphere by a Communist Chinese buildup of the military forces of, say, Guatemala.

Fortunately, the equilibrium of power in Asia that can effectively contribute to the containment of mainland China is not a matter of exclusive concern to the United States. The chess-playing Russians, with greater reason than we to fear Chinese expansion, practice containment in the king's row, by strengthening at Tashkent the peace between India and Pakistan; we play the game in the pawn's row by innocently waging in Vietnam what appears to Asians to be a neocolonial war. Is it any wonder that Japan flinches; that the Philippines balk; that India lectures; or that Mao Tse-tung gloats.

I totally disagree with the Department of State: to view Ho Chi Minh's war as no more than an extension of Stalin's postwar aggressions in Europe—to regard communism still as a seamless web—is not "the beginning of wisdom." It is the denial of wisdom. It is a view of the world as rigid and doctrinaire as that of the most credulous Marxist. It is a myopia reminiscent of the Bourbon Kings of whom it was said:

> They have learned nothing, and forgotten nothing.

The beginning of wisdom for American diplomacy in Asia is to stop confusing the problem of Communist guerrilla wars with the problem of Communist China. The two may be related, but there still remains a fundamental difference between aggression and revolution. Chinese Marshal Lin Piao's militant treatise is not a "Mein Kampf," prescribing a blueprint for Chinese conquest of Asia, but a do-it-yourself kit for the use of Communist revolutionaries in other Asian lands.

Likewise, there is a difference between preventing China from invading neighboring lands, and attempting to impose a quarantine on Chinese influence. With our arms, if need be, we can accomplish the former, but not the latter. As long as China looms above the little countries bordering her in the Balkans of Asia, her influence will fall over them like a shadow. If this historic sphere of Chinese influence is unacceptable to the United States, we can deny it—not by stabbing at the shadow in Vietnam—but only by striking down, and then dismembering, China itself.

The price of war with China, as other nations have discovered, would be higher than any we have ever paid before. Those who think that our national interest requires a showdown with China anyhow, and that now is a better time to fight than later, would do well to ponder the words of our former Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway. In his memoirs, he writes:

> But I challenge any thesis that destroying the military might of Red China would be in our own long-range interest. We could create there, by military means, a great power vacuum. Then we would have to go in there with hundreds of thousands of men to fill that vacuum—which would bring us face to face with Russia along a 7,000-mile frontier. If we failed to go in, then Russia herself would fill it, and the threat to our own security would not have been abated by one iota.

It is not likely that China will bring such a hideous war upon herself. Peiping speaks fiercely but acts with caution. Chinese troops are neither stationed nor engaged outside her borders. Her volunteers have long since been withdrawn from North Korea. Chinese troops marched across the disputed boundary line into India, but quickly withdrew again.

Yet, American troops still remain in South Korea, and engage, in ever larger numbers, in the war in Vietnam. However difficult it may be to achieve a satisfactory settlement in southeast Asia, we must not permit South Vietnam to become another Asian garrison for American forces. Our country has no need for fixed footholds on the Asian mainland so close to China. These enclaves mire us down, inhibit our mobility, and exacerbate against whatever prospect there may be for an eventual accommodation with Peiping.

The American interest calls for a modus vivendi with China which is as viable as the one we have found with the Soviet Union. To search for it is the task of statesmanship.

A sound Asian policy would pledge American assistance to countries threatened by Chinese attack, taking full advantage of the mobility of our sea, air, and island-based military deterrent in Asia. More important still, any enduring containment of China must rest upon the resistance of stable Asian governments, which command sufficient internal support, regardless of the ideology they profess, to form a counterbalance to Chinese power.

A sound Asian policy would also distinguish between the prevention of Chinese aggression and the repression of Communist insurrection in other Asian lands. In dealing with guerrilla warfare, we must develop a sense of discretion and restraint, if we are to encourage, rather than impede, indigenous resistance, which alone can prevent the banner of nationalism from falling into Communist hands.

Toward such goals, the Vietnamese war, in which we are caught fast, is a poor starting place. But we have no other. And the hour is late.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator on what in my judgment is one of the soundest and ablest speeches which has been made in this continuing debate of Vietnam.

The Senator has penetrated the weaknesses of the State Department policy as expounded by Under Secretary Ball.

I am particularly impressed with that part of his speech in which the Senator speaks of a sound Asian policy for America. I entirely concur with him that the Vietnamese war in which we are caught fast is a poor starting place for a sound Asian policy.

In the judgment of the Senator, what effect will further unilateral American escalation of the war in Vietnam, whether by land, sea, or air, have on a sound American-Asian policy?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, to the extent that the war in southeast Asia widens, it becomes less manageable. I believe it is therefore in our interest to do all that we can to confine it within its present limits. Fortunately, the fulfillment of our pledge to the Saigon government can only be achieved in South Vietnam. It is there that the war is being fought.

Mr. CLARK. With the exception of our bombing of North Vietnam.

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is correct. However, the thrust and purpose and the war is to overthrow the Saigon government. This obviously can only be accomplished in South Vietnam itself. Therefore, I should hope that we would not permit our frustration over the continuing struggle in the south to lead us toward striking ever outward, upon the theory that by bombing Hanoi or Haiphong, or by eliminating the cities or industries in North Vietnam, we will somehow put an end to the insurrection in South Vietnam.

I think it is well to remember that North Vietnam is an agrarian country. Only 10 percent of its economy is industrial. We can destroy the industries there and level the cities and inflict great casualties. But I do not think this will cause the North Vietnamese to give up, any more than the bombing of North Korea ever caused the North Koreans to give up.

It is more likely that such bombing will merely harden the resolve of the Hanoi Government to persist in the war, thus making it more difficult to reach a negotiated settlement.

I hope that we will concentrate our military effort in the south where the insurrection must be put down and where, alone, we can keep the pledges we have made to the Saigon government.

Mr. CLARK. I take it that the Senator would agree with me that, under the present circumstances, and for very good reasons, we cannot afford to withdraw our troops from South Vietnam.

Mr. CHURCH. I am in complete agreement with the Senator. As the Senator knows, I have never advocated a precipitate unilateral withdrawal of American troops. But I hope that we can reach a satisfactory settlement which will permit an eventual, orderly American disengagement.

The President has himself emphasized that we desire no permanent foothold in South Vietnam, that we ask for no alliance with the South Vietnamese Government, that we are willing to recognize the neutrality of that government—and, indeed, that entire region—and that we want no military bases there.

In all of these respects, I am in full agreement with the President. However, I am troubled that, 13 years after the end of the fighting in Korea and 10 years after the Chinese have withdrawn all of their troops from North Korea, and without any kind of guerrilla war to justify our continued presence in South Korea, we nonetheless keep an army of not less than 50,000 American troops stationed in that country.

We must not permit the same thing to happen to us in South Vietnam. The

American interest is not served by such military toeholds in southeast Asia. They are unnecessary from the standpoint of our own security. They tend to mire us down and to impede our mobility. I hope that we avoid in South Vietnam what we failed to avoid in Korea.

Mr. CLARK. I take it that the Senator would also agree with me, that if the Hanoi government were to commit the remainder of its well-trained army—and I take it that he would also agree that there is a substantial part of its well-trained army which has not yet been committed to South Vietnam—and particularly if the Chinese should come into the war with "volunteers," we might then of necessity be required, in order to stay where we are and not be driven out by force, to further increase our ground forces in South Vietnam, this being counterescalation on the other side.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree with the Senator. We shall have to take the necessary military steps to prevent the Hanoi government from forcing us out of South Vietnam. Whether we ought to have gone there in the first place, or whether it was in the American interest to make pledges to Saigon in the aftermath of the French defeat is quite another question.

We did so, and having made those pledges, we must honor them. We cannot permit the Hanoi government to force us out of South Vietnam.

I think it should be evident that there is no disagreement on this score. None of us who have criticized American policy in southeast Asia, no member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to my knowledge, no Member of the Senate, has advocated an American withdrawal from South Vietnam in repudiation of the pledges we have made to Saigon.

Mr. CLARK. I say to the Senator that I am in complete agreement with that statement, and further, that I intend to address myself, on the floor of the Senate, to the broad questions of our policy in Vietnam later this week.

I will make an observation, and ask the Senator to comment on it: Assuming that the forces ranged against us in South Vietnam are not drastically increased by either the commitment of additional regular North Vietnamese troops or the commitment of Chinese volunteers, does the Senator agree with me that it would be a tragic mistake to further increase substantially the American forces in South Vietnam, to make an effort to conquer the real estate which we have lost, and pursue a policy of search and destroy in areas which have not been held by ourselves or our allies for months if not years, with the result that the American casualty rolls will necessarily increase? Does the Senator agree that the wiser policy would be to follow the advice of General Gavin and former Ambassador Kennan, to make do with what we have, to encourage our South Vietnamese allies to press with their troops to recover the ground which they have lost, remembering the injunction of President Kennedy, given only a couple of months before his assassination, that this is their war, that they must win it or they will lose it, that we can help them with arms and with advice, but that in the end if there is not the will to win by the South Vietnamese, to pacify their own country, we should not attempt to do the job for them?

Mr. CHURCH. I say to the Senator that if we had remembered the Kennedy injunction, we would not have 200,000 troops in Vietnam today. We have gone beyond that point.

We decided, when it became evident that the South Vietnamese were unable to overcome the rebellion, that we would move in our own combat forces and undertake to do so ourselves. To be sure, we fight alongside the South Vietnamese. They have suffered heavy casualties: I do not mean to make light of their gallantry. But increasingly, the burden falls upon American troops, as the size of our army there grows. We are told now that perhaps there may be 300,000, 400,000, half a million, or 600,000 American troops in South Vietnam by the end of this year. I do not know.

I do not wish to leave the impression, however, that I believe in the enclave theory. I think that under the present circumstances, we cannot afford to hole up in fixed position along the seacoast, and still retain much chance of securing a satisfactory settlement.

We are there. We have converted this struggle into an American war effort; and now I think we must pursue a dynamic strategy in South Vietnam. I am not a military man; I cannot pass upon the requirements of that strategy, but I think that we must look for guidance to our officers in command, who are on the ground, know the condition and the situation, and have to deal with it there.

I do wish to stress, however, that I think the American military effort must be concentrated in South Vietnam, and that whatever the difficulties are, whatever the strategy we pursue in the south, we must not let the frustrations of this war lead us toward widening the battle ever northward toward the boundaries of China. I think that there will come a place, if we do, where the Chinese will come in, as they did in Korea.

Mr. CLARK. One final question—and in advance of asking it I again thank the Senator for indulging me in this colloquy, and also express again my admiration for the splendid speech he has made.

It is still official State Department and Defense Department doctrine that the major burden of this war is being carried by the South Vietnamese. We are told again and again that four out of every five military incidents in the South are South Vietnamese initiatives, and not American initiatives. We are told of the upward of a half million South Vietnamese men under arms, fighting, we are told, for the defense of freedom in their country.

I refer again to the Kennedy statement of 2 or 3 years ago. If that is the fact, as the State Department and the Defense Department continue to insist it is the fact, why do we not let the South Vietnamese win this war, with the support which we can give them with the 200,000 troops and with the untold treasure we are pressing in there; why do we have to make this an American war?

Mr. CHURCH. I say to the Senator, the question is a poignant one, but it is no longer a timely one. The war has become an American struggle. American troops are now committed to it in such numbers that I think this reality must be faced.

I believe, however, that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania underscores the fact that guerrilla warfare, in the last analysis, depends upon the internal situation within the country victimized by Communist insurrection. In the long run, the Government challenged will prevail, or will be toppled, depending upon the willingness of the people of the country to rally behind it.

The Greek Government was able to put down a Communist rebellion, one that the State Department itself likens to the war in Vietnam. The Greek Government had aid from the United States, to be sure, but not American combat troops. The Greeks put down the rebellion with their own troops.

The Philippine Government put down a somewhat comparable insurrection, involving Communist elements, without the intervention of foreign troops. It was done by Filipinos.

The Burmese were able to snuff out a Communist-led insurrection in their country, despite a thousand miles of common frontier between Burma and mainland China.

On the other hand, the Batista government in Cuba was unable to put down a Communist-led rebellion.

I think, Mr. President, that we must get used to the fact that we live in a generation of revolution; that many governments are going to be challenged, in many countries in the underdeveloped world, from Asia to Africa to Latin America, and that the United States simply cannot intervene in all of these situations for the purpose of imposing American solutions. If we try to do this, our country will soon be regarded as the sentinel of the status quo, as the self-appointed defender of governments despised by their own people. Thus, we will give to Communists everywhere the banner they most want to uphold; namely, an unchallenged claim upon every incipient revolution, the compelling assertion that they alone are the champions of change.

Mr. President, it will not work. It cannot work. I hope and pray that we will find the wisdom to avoid any policy so foredoomed.

From the lessons of the present and the past, we must begin to find the guidelines for a new policy much better suited to the problem of revolutionary wars in the underdeveloped world.

If we summon a sense of restraint, I do not despair for the future because, unlike many others, I am not afraid of communism. I have been in Communist lands. The system has little to commend it. It is inefficient. It is tyrannical. It is bureaucratic. It is not possessed of any dynamic attraction that is likely to ensnare and subdue the world.

Mr. President, the great quest of men everywhere is for freedom. Not many countries have achieved it in full measure, but people everywhere yearn for it. It is the very force working within the Communist world to change the Communist system itself. It is the force working outside the Communist world, the very force which produces revolutions.

In the long run, the ancient yearning of mankind for freedom will prevail. Communism will never inherit the world.

EXHIBIT 1

ARE WE TOO DEEP IN AFRICA AND ASIA?

(By the Honorable FRANK CHURCH, U.S. Senator from Idaho, before the Economic Club of Detroit, Feb. 22, 1965)

In 1957, his first year in the Senate, it was CHURCH who modified the jury trial amendment to the civil rights bill, to assure Negroes the right to serve on Federal juries, a procedural safeguard which opened the way for the first Senate action on civil right in nearly a century.

FRANK CHURCH has not been content to assess the international situation from his Senate office in Washington, but has traveled extensively throughout the world. He was a delegate to the economic conference of the Organization of American States in Argentina in 1957, and to the International Parliamentary Union at Warsaw, Poland in 1959. He led a delegation on a 5-week factfinding tour of Africa in 1960, and then made a personal inspection of American bases and trouble spots in the Pacific area late in 1962.

The senior Senator from Idaho has been outspoken in his belief that our key to Asia is a satisfactory settlement of the political war in Vietnam. It is a pleasure for me to present to you the Honorable FRANK CHURCH, U.S. Senator from Idaho, who will discuss "Are We In Too Deep in Africa and Asia?" Senator CHURCH. [Applause.]

Hon. FRANK CHURCH. Thank you very much, Joe Hudson, for an extremely nice introduction, Mayor Cavanagh, General Bork, and gentlemen of the Economics Club of Detroit.

Our time is limited but let me just say in the way of amenities that I am very proud to be here. I know your two fine Senators, PAT MCNAMARA and PHIL HART, very well. They are good friends of mine and I respect them highly. It is a special privilege to come and address so distinguished an audience in the great State they represent in the Senate of the United States.

PART I. FROM ONE EXTREME TO ANOTHER

"We can never again stand aside prideful in isolation," so spoke Lyndon B. Johnson at his inauguration.

All Americans should agree with the President. Head-in-the-sand isolationism died a generation ago. It isn't likely to be resurrected.

As a confirmed internationalist, I favor strong American support for the United Nations, and I believe in a sensible foreign aid program.

But the pendulum of our foreign policy can swing from one extreme to the other. Once we thought that anything which happened abroad was none of our business; now we evidently think that everything which happens abroad has become our business. In the span of 30 years, an excess of isolationism has been transformed into an excess of interventionism.

Since the days of the Marshall plan, the United States has constantly expanded the scope of its commitment to foreign governments. From Western Europe, we have moved into Africa, the Middle East, and the Far East, until the dimension of our involvement has become global. Our troops are now stationed in no less than 30 countries, we are pledged to defend 42, and we are extending aid, in one form or another, to nearly 100 nations.

Why have we spread ourselves so thinly? What compulsion draws us, ever deeper, into the internal affairs of so many countries in Africa and Asia, having so remote a connection with the vital interests of the United States?

The answer, I think, stems from our intensely ideological view of the cold war. We fancy ourselves as guardian of the "free" world, though most of it isn't free, and never has been. We seek to immunize this world against further Communist infection through massive injections of American aid, and, wherever necessary, through direct American intervention. Such a vast undertaking has at least two defects: First, it exceeds our national capability; second, among the newly emerging nations, where the specter of Western imperialism is dreaded more than communism, such a policy can be self-defeating. As a seasoned, friendly foreign diplomat recently put it: "The United States is getting involved in situations where no one—not even a nation of saints—would be welcome."

This is not to say that we should write off Africa or Asia. It is to say that a foreign policy of intervention, which was right for Western Europe, is apt to be wrong for those continents which have just thrown off European rule.

We were welcomed back to war-devastated Europe in 1945 to be a nuclear sentinel against further Russian aggression. It was the expansion of hostile Russian power which summoned us, not the color of the red banner, or our distaste for the way of life inside the Soviet Union. There was no confusion among the NATO allies as to the identity of the enemy. As long as the Russian threat remained imminent, we all faced in the same direction, united by a single will.

There was still another reason for the success of our intervention in Europe—a condition so obvious that it is often overlooked, and yet so fundamental that its absence in Africa and Asia accounts for most of our setbacks on those continents. In Europe, we stood among people with whom we shared a common ancestry, whose political and economic systems were similar to our own, and whose traditional values derived from the same mainstream of historical experience that we call Western civilization. This cultural bond meant that most Europeans generally shared our aims and our point of view.

But if the inhabitants of Western Europe tend to see the world as we do, as a global arena in which free people are arrayed against Communists, it does not follow that Africans and Asians share this view. They have been participants in a different revolution, more potent and widespread than the Communist brand—a revolution foreshadowed two centuries ago, by the American War for Independence, and whipped into flame by Woodrow Wilson's ringing reaffirmation of the right of self-determination. Neither Marx nor Lenin fathered the revolt against colonialism, and we needn't permit their successors, in Moscow or Peiping, to exploit the colonial issue to Communist advantage.

To avoid this, we must understand that, for most Africans and Asians, our concept of self-government and individual freedom is totally unreal, having never been experienced. In many, if not most, of these emergent lands, it is colonialism, not communism which is the ugly word.

Because these facts are so well known, it puzzles me that American foreign policy in Africa and Asia has not been tied to them. We have plunged into these former colonial regions as though we had been designated on high to act as trustee in bankruptcy for the broken empires.

First of all, we strained relations by trying to induce governments to line up with us in the cold war, a struggle in which few felt any real interest. Forgetting that we ourselves had insisted upon our right to stay neutral for most of our history, we assailed neutralism as a kind of Communist trick. Later, having painfully learned that cold war neutrality always served as a badge of independence and sometimes even as an umbrella for it, we changed tune, but, even then, we kept on administering our aid programs in ways designed to freeze out the Russians and Chinese.

In regions craving aid from any source, our freezeout policy was bound to give rise to cries of undue interference. Soon, African and Asian governments were demanding aid without strings attached, while accusing the United States of practicing neocolonialism. Worse still, sensing that we feared competition from Communist sources, many a government craftily raised the ante on us, threatening to go to the Reds for help if we failed to meet some new demand.

Worst of all, we have permitted ourselves to be drawn into the internal political affairs of so many African and Asian countries that anti-American feeling is rising at an alarming rate. Our Embassies are being subjected to increasingly frequent attacks, our information libraries are being sacked, and demagog from Cairo to Djakarta court popular favor by rebuking us. Afro-Asian delegates at the U.N. castigate us with words of extraordinary violence. Clearly, the policy of intervening too much in the volatile ex-colonial regions of Africa and Asia, is backfiring on the United States.

PART II. MISTAKES IN AFRICA

Much of this could have been avoided. I visited Africa in 1960, immediately after John F. Kennedy's election, in company with two of my colleagues and the President's youngest brother, TED. Wherever our presence became known, eager crowds would gather to shout, "Kennedy, Kennedy." The word had spread through Africa that the newly elected President of the United States had, as a Senator in 1957, spoken up for Algeria in her war for independence against France. For the first time our country was being identified, by Arab and black alike, with legitimate African aspirations. Opportunity was beckoning our way.

If we had continued to champion Africa nationalism, the cause that counts with the people; if we had declared ourselves strongly in favor of rightful independence for the Portuguese territories, the flaming issue in Africa today; if we had held ourselves at arm's length from the shifting factional fights for power within the seething young African countries, regardless of the labels chosen to solicit outside support, I have no doubt that our influence in Africa would have kept on growing.

But we haven't yet managed to harness our zeal. Rational restraints give way to emotional involvement, which, in turn, leads to more intervention. Fortunately, the Russians have made the same mistake in Africa, and now the Chinese seem eager to repeat it. Here are two examples, one Russian, one American, which constitute, in my judgment, showcase illustrations of how not to conduct a winning foreign policy in Africa:

Six years ago, Nikita Khrushchev scurried to the rescue of Sekou Touré strongman of Guinea, after this little west African country had been stripped bare by the departing French. It seemed a perfect marriage, since the Guinean leaders, raised in the radical tradition of the French labor movement, were Marxists anyway, and anxious to establish a model Marxist state.

When I arrived in Conakry, the country's capital, in December of 1960, Guinea had taken on all the appearances of a satellite. Communist advisors sat beside every government minister. Numerous Red-donated projects were under construction, including a big printing plant, and the place swarmed with Communist technicians, transplanted from countries behind the Iron Curtain. Guinea had plainly been taken over.

Into this captured country, President Kennedy sent a young Ambassador, Bill Atwood. His instructions were to play it cool. He was to say it was their business, not ours, to choose the system they preferred; that we were interested only in helping them, in a modest way, with some of their problems of human suffering. Kennedy felt, if we didn't press too hard, that Guinea would soon discover the Russians weren't 9 feet tall.

And so it happened. It wasn't long before Guinea began to resent the heavy-handed interference of the Russians. Relations became so strained that the Soviet Ambassador was declared persona non grata, and ordered to leave the country. Meanwhile. Guinea began to reassume control over her own course. Today, her attitude toward the United States is much improved, and her ties with the West are growing again.

The mistake of too much intervention, which the Russians made in Guinea, we seem determined to duplicate in the Congo. Africans wonder why the United States, having no historic, economic, or security interest in the Congo, should so involve itself in that country's civil war. I also wonder why.

I know, of course, that the State Department regards the Congo rebels as a Communist front, even though our own envoy in Stanleyville, whose long agony with the rebels was climaxed when they forced him to eat an American flag, declared, after his rescue, that be believed the rebellion to be purely African, not Communist, in character. His statement was met with stony indifference by the American press.

For the fact is that our embrace with Moise Tshombe is popular in the United States. We see him as a vociferous anti-Communist. What matters, however, is how the Africans see him. To most of them, he is the African equivalent of an "Uncle Tom," a puppet of the imperialists who uses white mercenaries to subdue his own countrymen. I doubt that Tshombe will ever win African acceptance. Our identification with him serves only to turn the tide of African opinion increasingly against us.

PART III. THE LESSON OF PAKISTAN

Regrettably, we are creating similar problems for ourselves in Asia by the same excess of interventionism. Pakistan is a classic example. At fantastic cost, we undertook to enlarge and modernize the armed forces of Pakistan. Our theory was that this assistance would bolster the country's defenses against Russia, but it was India, contesting with Pakistan over Kashmir, which felt threatened.

Still, we persisted. After all, hadn't Ayub Khan appeared before a joint session of the Congress, and addressed us in the reassuring accents of a British country squire. On the Communist issue, the Indians seemed much too conciliatory, but we felt sure Ayub Khan could be depended upon, come what may. He himself said so. To the Congress, he intoned: "Let me tell you, that if there is real trouble, there is no other country in Asia on whom you will be able to count. The only people who will stand by you are the people of Pakistan."

That's past history now. Having used us for his purpose, Ayub Khan was the first to flirt with Red China, when India was attacked. The fervent courtship of Pakistan only lost us favor there. In the recent elections, the main issue between the two presidential candidates was who was the most anti-American; Ayub Khan won.

PART IV. OUR DILEMMA IN VIETNAM

To the case against excessive American intervention in Africa and Asia, the State Department has a stock answer: the Communists won't let us quit. South Vietnam is pointed to as the proof of our dilemma. If we permit the Vietcong to overthrow the Saigon Government, then the gates are open, so the argument goes, to successful Communist subversion of all the other governments in southeast Asia.

But the hard fact is that there are limits to what we can do in helping any government surmount a Communist uprising. We can give arms, money, food and supplies, but the outcome will depend, in the final analysis, upon the character of the government helped, and the extent to which the people are willing to rally behind it.

The Saigon government is losing its war, not for lack of equipment, but for lack of internal cohesion. The Vietcong grow stronger, not because they are better supplied than Saigon, but because they are united in their will to fight. This spirit cannot be imported; it must come from within. The weakness in South Vietnam emanates from Saigon itself, where we, as foreigners, are powerless to unite the spoiling factions. A family feud is never settled by outsiders. Only the Vietnamese themselves can furnish the solution.

As to the other governments in southeast Asia, they are not so many dominoes in a row. They differ, one from another, in popular support, and in capacity to resist Communist subversion. The Malayans, with British help, because of their own determined resistance to communism, successfully put down a long and bloody insurrection. Guerrilla wars—even when nourished from without—can be won by sitting governments, but only in countries where shelter for the rebels is not furnished by the people.

Our reason for being in the Orient isn't that of fashioning Asian governments. It isn't communism, as such, which accounts for our presence in the Far East, but rather the containment of Peiping. This can be best accomplished if China is ringed with stable, independent governments, which refuse to be the pawns of Chinese ambition. As Yugoslavia has proved in Europe vis-a-vis Russia, even a Communist government can play such a role.

It would be to our national advantage then to seek an international agreement for the neutralization of the whole great region that used to be French Indochina. The transitional phase of such a settlement might be policed by the United Nations, or by a special high commission set up to preside over a cease-fire in South Vietnam, to supervise the withdrawal of all foreign troops, and to maintain order, while an independent and unalined new government is formed by the Vietnamese themselves.

The neutrality of the whole region could be guaranteed by the signatories to the international agreement. Thus, the military might of the United States would remain available as a deterrent against Chinese aggression from the north, which is—or ought to be—our governing national objective in southeast Asia anyway.

In like manner, we may find it in our national interest to pledge our armed might beyond the defense of India, or some other Asian government, against a future Chinese attack, that these governments might avoid the need for developing nuclear shields of their own, while we avoid the dangers of further nuclear proliferation. This kind of guarantee, which would be a real deterrent to Chinese military aggression, lies within our capability, and would preclude a power vacuum in Asia, so feared by the architects of our present policy.

To those who protest that such a course would fail to protect against growing Chinese influence in such countries as Laos, Cambodia, Burma, or Vietnam, brought on through intensified Communist activity within these countries, I submit that the scoreboard on our present policy of direct intervention in southeast Asia shows that we are now losing this contest. Burma and Cambodia, though both non-Communist governments, have been moving steadily closer to China. Laos is limbo, after an American involvement, at heavy cost, in that country's internal affairs, turned sour. The war, in Vietnam, despite Saigon's preponderant military advantage, is going from bad to worse.

This somber truth is underlined in the events of the past fortnight—the stepped-up Vietcong attacks upon American bases in South Vietnam, and the consequent loss of more American lives. We must hope that our retaliatory bombings of military installations in North Vietnam, intended to demonstrate the strength of our will and purpose, may persuade Hanoi and Peiping that the United States is not, and never have been, a paper tiger. Having made a solemn commitment to Saigon, we intend to keep it. The military might we can bring to bear upon North Vietnam is formidable indeed, and so it would behoove the Communists to explore with us the way to a peaceful solution in southeast Asia.

All of us recognize the heavy burden of decision which our President bears. And we would do well to remember that the seal of his office is an American eagle, clutching a bundle of arrows in one claw and an olive branch in the other. The judicious use of both the arrows and the olive branch represents our best hope for avoiding a widening war in Asia.

Those who would use the arrows alone are actually calling for war. The systematic and sustained bombing of North Vietnam, unattended by any proffered recourse to the bargaining table, can only lead us into war. North Vietnam, lacking air and sea power, must answer on the ground. Her response, in the form of added military pressures against the south, Saigon can hardly be expected to withstand. As a consequence, the next step will be to send American land forces into battle, thus converting the struggle into an American war on the Asian mainland. That China will, sooner or later, enter such a war, I have no doubt.

To those who say that we must not parley now, because we would bargain from a position of weakness, I reply that they take too restricted a view of our strategic position in southeast Asia. They look only to the plight of the war in South Vietnam, forgetting that American power in southeast Asia rests not upon the weakness of Saigon, but upon the strength of our own possession of the sea and air. Our recent retaliatory blows should make it clear to Hanoi and Peiping that we will not quit under fire, nor withdraw, nor submit to Communist coercion. We can strike back with relative impunity, from floating bases which are beyond Communist reach, and inflict heavy punishment upon them. Ours is not a position of weakness from which to deal.

PART V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Although it is natural for our attention to be fixed upon the gathering crisis in Vietnam, I nonetheless commenced this address with the purpose of undertaking a general review of American foreign policy throughout the whole of the excolonial world. My thesis has been that we have allowed ourselves to become overinvolved in both Africa and Asia. In saying this, I fully recognize that the United States cannot withdraw to seek refuge within some happy hunting ground of our own choosing.

But it is mandatory, in these former colonial areas, that we establish foreign policy goals which are not beyond our reach; that we observe priorities which correspond with our real national interests; that we concern ourselves less with other peoples' ideologies, and that we adopt techniques which are sensitive to, and compatible with, the prevailing sentiment of the people in each great region of the world. Measured by these criteria, we are too deeply involved in the internal affairs of the emerging nations in Africa and Asia.

I believe that President Johnson intends, in a prudent and responsible way, to redress the balance. His emphasis on attending to the neglected problems at home is sensible. The long-run influences we exert abroad will hinge, in large measure, upon the kind of society we build in our own land.

In any reappraisal of American foreign policy in the underdeveloped world, so recently freed from colonial bondage, we would do well to recall the wise words of President Kennedy, spoken in November of 1961. "We must face the fact," he said, "that the United States is neither omnipotent nor omniscient, that we cannot always impose our will on the other 94 percent of mankind, that we cannot right every wrong or reverse every adversity, and that therefore, there cannot be an American solution to every world problem." [Applause.]

Joseph L. Hudson, Jr. Thank you very much, Senator Church, for such a complete exposition of your opinion. We have a tradition in the Economic Club to ask questions about various affairs relating to your talk. The first one:

(Reading question): "What are the chances of ending the Vietnam war by proposing a united neutral Vietnam under U.N. protection?"

I interpret that to mean united of North and South Vietnam under U.N. protection.

Hon. Frank Church. Well, I would say that, in this area of the world, the U.N. cannot really give protection. Still the U.N. could play a very useful role in administering whatever agreement the major powers might reach that would underwrite the neutralization of this region, immediately to the south of China. That is why I said, in my address, that I think such an agreement must be backed up by a commitment on the part of the signatory powers to uphold, with the full military power that the signatories possess, the integrity of the region against any outside attack. This would mean that the American military power would remain as a deterrent against actual Chinese expansion into this region.

Gentlemen, as things are now going, the likelihood of Chinese expansion—actual Chinese intervention, possession, and occupation of large parts of southeast Asia—is becoming ever more real. That would mean that we would eventually have to deal with a situation much worse than the one we are now facing in southeast Asia.

Joseph L. Hudson, Jr. (Reading question): "Does not your public advocacy of negotiation weaken our bargaining position if negotiation does actually occur?"

Hon. Frank Church. Any kind of public advocacy involves certain risks. But gentlemen, when the stakes are so great, then I think it is incumbent upon all of us who hold public trust to open a discussion of the alternatives, so that the American people, who will be asked to fight the war, will have some knowledge of what is basically involved. What this question presumes is closing our society in the name of conformity of opinion. Now we either run a free society or we don't, and if we're all going to keep quiet and march in step to whatever official tune is played in Washington, then we have relinquished the most precious prerogative we have as Americans, and we have forsaken the processes of freedom, because of our fear of the consequences that flow from freedom. I would not accept that condition and remain in the U.S. Senate. [Applause.]

Joseph L. Hudson, Jr. (Reading question): "Why should Peiping accept a neutralized southeast Asia? What do you suggest we do if Peiping will not accept truce terms acceptable to us?"

Hon. Frank Church. If it's not possible to negotiate an acceptable settlement, then, of course, it follows that we do not settle. In Korea, negotiations preceded an end to the fighting by 2 years. But in the end we reached a truce. I remember that—you all remember it, too. The elections of 1952, when Dwight D. Eisenhower pledged to go to Korea to arrange a settlement of the war. Eventually, we will settle in southeast Asia at the conference table. Now, I can't tell you when Hanoi or Peiping may be willing to deal, or on what basis—but I'd like to find out.

Moreover, it is with Hanoi that we are now principally concerned. The Chinese are not occupying North Vietnam. Their armies are not there. In fact, Chinese physical presence in North Vietnam is much less substantial than our own physical presence in South Vietnam. This is today still a war between the North Vietnamese and the South Vietnamese and between the South Vietnamese and the South Vietnamese. Hanoi has a great deal at stake in this. She does not want to be occupied by China. Her historic sense of independence, the popular resistance of the Vietnamese toward the Chinese, finds its roots over centuries of past history. While this still remains essentially a Vietnamese conflict, our prospects for settling it on a satisfactory basis are best. If it is transformed into a Chinese conflict, with a Chinese occupation and possession of the area, then, of course, it will become more difficult to find satisfactory answers. That is the second reason why I think that we should accompany this stepped-up military effort—of which I approve—with a tandem diplomatic effort so that both the arrows and the olive branch are used. That would represent, in my opinion, our best chance for avoiding widening war in Asia.

Joseph L. Hudson, Jr. One more question on Vietnam and then we'll have a few other subjects to cover.

(Reading question.) "How much more prestige is there to lose if we pull out of Vietnam?"

Hon. Frank Church. Well, gentlemen, I happen to be one who never thought we should have gone into Vietnam at the end of that long, painful, and futile French war. But we did. And it is true that when a nation does make a commitment, then, of course, it invests prestige with it. I do not minimize the need to protect that prestige in southeast Asia as much as possible. Therefore, I have never advocated a unilateral withdrawal from South Vietnam, or quitting under Communist pressure, or breaking our pledge to give assistance to the Saigon government.

On the other hand, the surest way I know to turn this country back into a country of isolationists is to tell the American people that wherever we go to assist a sitting government in this big world in some struggle to put down a rebellion in which the Communists are engaged—that every time we do this, we have to guarantee the outcome of that struggle with our own troops, as though the very life of the United States depended on it, then, believe me, we're in deep water, and the American people, with their great commonsense, are going to get very tired of it very soon.

With respect to South Vietnam, three American Presidents have said: Our purpose is to help the Saigon government try to win its war. But they have also been careful to say it's not our war and ultimately it's a war that only they, themselves, can win. I agree. Most Communist guerrilla wars have been successfully suppressed, like in Greece, like in Malaya, like in the Philippines, but we can't guarantee that result every time.

If, every time the point is reached where a guerrilla war may be lost, we're going to convert it into an American war, and do as Mr. Baldwin of the New York Times said yesterday—send out a million Americans to fight a war that God knows how long it's going to last, or where it's going to end, or what settlement will follow that would be as good as what we've got to work with today—then we're going to turn this country into a citadel of isolationists again. We've got to keep our wits about us and remember that we serve our national interest—our national interest—by our commitments abroad. And when a situation develops as this one has, we must access the cost in terms of our real national interest.

I'm for fighting wars when our vital interest is at stake and we've never flinched. But I'm not for getting this country engaged in folly, in futile wars, way out on the other side of the world, over questions to which we cannot furnish any durable answer. That I think is what we're in danger of doing if we now embark upon the path to widening war in the jungles of southeast Asia.

Joseph L. Hudson, Jr. Two more questions.

(Reading question): "Should we do away with the United Nations and organize a group of world powers based on population?"

Hon. Frank Church. I'll make the answer very short. No, I do not think we should do away with the United Nations. The United Nations has been an extremely useful instrument in many places like Suez, like Cyprus and other places. It has served the interests of peace. But there is no international organization, at this stage of world history, that can give us any cure to the problems of war, when the major interests of the major powers are involved. This is too much to expect from the United Nations. So I would say, let us strive to keep the United Nations in as strong and healthy condition as possible, because it serves as a very useful instrument for the human race in the settlement of many peripheral wars that could become extremely dangerous in the absence of a United Nations.

Joseph L. Hudson, Jr. Our last question relates to foreign aid.

(Reading question): "American business has a big stake in the foreign aid program in that 85 percent of aid-financed purchases abroad must be made with American firms. Is this one of the freezeout features of the foreign aid program you would like to repeal, and how would this affect the chances of passage of the foreign aid bill?"

Hon. Frank Church. That's true. It is running at between 80 and 85 percent. Is this one of the freezeout features of the foreign aid program I would like to repeal?

No, no. I think that one of our most dangerous problems today, gentlemen, is the pressure on the American dollar in the international market. Do you know how much we've spent in the Congo? We spent $400 million there. Just think of that.

We've got to begin to exercise some discipline upon our emotions. This tremendous outflow of American money, in all of its forms, and a part of it is foreign aid because, although 80 percent of the money is spent here, 20 percent of the money is not, and this does constitute a part of the outflow of American dollars.

Our military installations abroad are another open gate for the outflow of American dollars. I think that, unless we redress the balance of payments, we're going to have the American dollar devaluated in the course of time. The Federal Government and the President are determined to avoid that. But unless my knowledge of economics is very insufficient, it can't be avoided indefinitely unless we finally redress the balance-of-payments deficit.

Now, if the dollar collapses—and I don't mean to suggest that there is any imminent danger of that today—but it's under pressure and we know the seriousness of the problem if the dollar were ever to collapse. The British pound collapsed in 1931 when that was the principal currency of the world, and a devastating worldwide depression followed. We could see the great economic strength of the Western World weakened immensely if this were to happen. The only way we're going to see that it doesn't happen, in the long run, is to turn our adverse balance of payments around. And that's got to be done, both through the adoption of the recommendations of the President, and through some curtailment of the outgo of American dollars in the programs we have undertaken abroad I hope that both actions will be responsibly pursued in Washington. [Applause.]

L. S. Borke. Senator, we are indebted for this very informative explanation of your views, and to you, Joe Hudson, for handling the duties of presiding officer so capably. The meeting is adjourned.

Adjournment.

How Many Dominican Republics and Vietnams Can We Take On?

(By Frank Church)

Throughout the country there is uneasiness about our foreign policy, coming from such different quarters and expressed in such divergent ways that the underlying reason for the apprehension is often obscured. Americans are always prepared to fight when their country is threatened; no foreign power can intimidate us. The doubt and the disagreement relate to how deeply we should involve ourselves in civil wars of other countries. Young idealists protest our efforts in behalf of so many tottering governments afflicted by decadence and despotism and frequently despised by their own peoples. Scholars warn that the United States must not function as the global sentinel of the status quo.

These are merely different ways of questioning American military intervention as a means for coping with guerrilla wars in foreign lands. People are wondering: Are we to be self-appointed firemen scurrying to quench every revolutionary blaze, no matter how repugnant the government that sounds the alarm?

This, many suspect, is the mission we are embarked upon. Since it is an unaccustomed role that clashes with our own revolutionary origins and our natural reluctance to furnish a shield for any kind of despotism, we seek refuge in soothing semantics. We downgrade freedom by equating it with the absence of communism; we upgrade a host of dictatorial regimes by dignifying them with membership in what we like to call the "free world." We tell ourselves that the remedy for their hungry and oppressed is a ration of foreign aid, with which we seek to buy a little reform, some small measure of relief, as a substitute for revolution. Finally, we suppress any lingering doubts with a heady dose of evangelical zeal.

Thus we appear to have launched ourselves upon the most far reaching American crusade of this century. Dissenters are not apt to be forgiven for their heresy, but hotly branded as "appeasers" held up to scorn for being either "soft on communism" or sold on surrender. Plainly the course of prudence is to march in step.

Nevertheless, there are dissenters who will not be silent. Among them are senior lawmakers in the Senate who, for differing reasons, harbor misgivings about the apparent trend in American foreign policy. These men cannot be lumped together and dismissed as "neoisolationists." Seasoned Senators like Fulbright, of Arkansas, Russell, of Georgia, Aiken, of Vermont, and Mansfield, of Montana are not escapists who yearn for the return of bygone days when we behaved as though we could keep out of all foreign wars.

Such an interpretation profoundly misconstrues the nature of the current anxiety in the Senate, where even the most outspoken foreign policy critics—Oregon's Wayne Morse and Alaska's Ernest Gruening—are anything but a new breed of isolationists.

Senators such as McGovern, of South Dakota, Clark, of Pennsylvania, Gore, of Tennessee, and the author of this article are confirmed internationalists—strong supporters of the United Nations, of sensible foreign aid programs, of the Peace Corps and of vigorous U.S. support for the NATO alliance. We have upheld the President's quest for a settlement in Vietnam and opposed any unilateral withdrawal of American forces.

The skeptical mood in the Senate derives, not from nostalgia for the past, but from a searching examination of the present—this age of ferment in which we live. In a brief 20 years, rampant nationalism has swept like a tidal wave over the once-imposing colonial empires. Half a hundred newborn countries struggle for life, hard pressed to satisfy the demands of their suddenly unfettered peoples. Everywhere the remnants of the old order are being challenged. Instability is inevitable. An erupting volcano cannot be capped. No nation—not even our own—possesses an arsenal so large, or a treasury so rich, as to damp down the fires of smoldering revolution throughout the whole of the awakening world.

Even our most militant interventionists concede that the United States alone cannot protect every tottering government from violent overthrow. Our purpose, they say, should be to abstain from interfering with "good" revolutions, while suppressing the "bad."

But since insurgencies these days usually include Communist elements, forecasting the end result becomes a very chancy business. When Batista was overthrown in Cuba, we gambled on Castro and lost; when the military junta in Santo Domingo faced rebellion in the streets, we decided not to gamble. Instead, we dispatched 20,000 troops to put down the revolt, and thus assumed the responsibility for an occupied country.

How many Dominican Republics and Vietnams can we take on? What if revolutions should now occur in Bolivia, Nigeria, and Iran?

The question, we are told, will somehow find its answer in Vietnam. This is our trial-by-ordeal, the third and final test of our capacity to resist Communist aggression. Having taught the master plotters that outright invasions will be beaten back (Korea), that nuclear intimidation will fail (Cuban missile crisis), the United States must now teach the Communists that managed uprisings from within, guerrilla "wars of national liberation," are also in vain. Then the prospects for peace will brighten again.

This is a form of self-delusion. Guerrilla wars, after all, are not the links of a single chain that can be broken in any one place. They can be better compared to a contagious disease, the germs of which are carried on the winds of change. The danger of infection is universal with immunity confined only to countries enjoying good internal health.

So we have seen guerrilla wars, often infected by the Communist virus, erupting in scattered, unconnected countries around the globe, wherever infirmity within invites revolt. Even as we struggled to end the insurgency in Vietnam, rebellion broke out in the Dominican Republic, on the opposite side of the world. At this very moment, there is serious danger of similar uprisings in a score of countries across Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The causes of these impending revolutions are essentially indigenous, whatever the name of the ideology proclaimed or the colors of the banners unfurled. Regardless of the outcome in Vietnam, we shall have to live in a world beset with guerrilla wars for many years to come.

In these circumstances, we should start to exercise a prudent restraint and develop a foreign policy more closely tied to a sober assessment of our own national interests. For too long we have tilted with windmills in world affairs.

As President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson can no more protect the world from insurrection than Woodrow Wilson could make it safe for democracy.

Emphatically, this does not mean that we should ignore Communist-infested guerrilla wars in the future; rather, it means we should keep our intervention commensurate, in each case, with what we as a nation really have at stake. From our current involvements, we should learn some lessons, and apply them as guidelines in the future.

In the case of the Dominican Republic, for example, the potential threat of a Communist takeover occurred in a region of prime strategic importance to the United States. The Cuban missile crisis of 1962, which brought us to the brink of nuclear war, decisively demonstrated how much is at stake for the American people in the Caribbean. We will not abide another Castro-type regime so close to our southern shores. Although we can debate whether or not Communists had actually seized control of the uprising in Santo Domingo, the President's decision to send in American troops sprang from his most fundamental responsibility as Commander in Chief—the defense of the country.

In Vietnam, on the other hand, the security of the United States is not the issue. Saigon doesn't stand guard over Seattle. By defeating Japan in the Second World War, we conquered the Pacific Ocean. We police it, patrol it and reign over it with unchallenged naval and aerial supremacy. There is no way for the land-locked forces of Asia to drive us from the Pacific.

In all honesty, we are fighting in Vietnam, not to defend Honolulu or Seattle, but to defend our national reputation. We have promised much, and now we must make good or risk a loss of confidence in us. The spector of a spreading desertion of the United States around the rim of Asia—not the threat posed by a Communist government in Vietnam—is the real fear thrusting us into the jungles of Indochina.

The lesson to be learned from Vietnam is that when the outcome of a guerrilla war does not threaten the vital interests of this country, we had better deal with it at arm's length. If we decide to give money, food or guns, the aid should be rendered from afar. Every precaution should be taken to avoid implicating ourselves so deeply as to convert the conflict into an American war.

Military intervention on our part, even where it cannot be avoided, is always an expensive and protracted adventure. Already we are finding it much harder to get out of the Dominican Republic than it was to get in. In South Korea a dozen years after the truce, we still have more than 50,000 American troops on duty and the country is sustained by a yearly injection of a half-billion-dollar American dole.

Unless we can discover an acceptable way to extricate ourselves from Vietnam, the price will go even higher there. Our annual bill, once $200 million, now exceeds that figure tenfold. Next year, according to present, estimates, the total will surely pass $5 billion. Others in a position to judge are forecasting an outlay closer to $12 billion. If each guerrilla war which takes a bad turn is to become an American responsibility, there will be no end to the mounting burden—in lost lives and spent treasure.

Accordingly, we must recognize the folly of trying to impose an American solution upon every insurgency abroad. The turmoil of our time will last for generations; some Communist-tinged guerrilla uprisings will succeed, others will fail. Challenged governments may fortify themselves with weapons from abroad, and seek help in other ways, but the ultimate decision will depend on the government's own character, and the willingness of the people to rally behind it. Political, social, economic, ethnic, and religious factors will weigh more heavily in the balance than primacy of arms. The French Army never lost control of the war in Algeria, but the Algerian people were so alienated in the process that the colonial government lost its capacity to govern. It was then that De Gaulle bowed to the inevitable.

Faced with the same sort of popular test, non-Communist governments overcame rebellion in Greece, the Philippines, Malaya and Burma, while Communist-led rebels won out in Cuba. That some governments will fail the test should be no reason for us to panic, or on that account to intervene with American troops. Nationalism, not communism, is the dominant influence of the age. Even when the two combine, communism has become the servant of nationalist aspirations.

As an international force under one directorate, determined to take over the world, communism is a bust. China and Russia are bitter enemies, while the smaller Communist countries are proving surprisingly independent, evolving their own national versions of Marxism. The Communist world is unraveling; it bears no resemblance to a monolithic mass.

Therefore, we must escape the trap of becoming so preoccupied with communism, as such, that we dissipate our strength in a vain attempt to enforce a global quarantine against it. Our first concern in foreign affairs is not the ideology adopted by other peoples, but the threat that other governments may pose to the United States.

In Asia, the potential threat is Peiping, not Hanoi. Had we stayed out, Ho Chi Minh might have forced the reunion of South Vietnam, but Hanoi will never conquer Asia or threaten the world beyond. When we took up the wreckage of empire left behind by the departing French, we ensnared ourselves in a Vietnamese war of secondary importance.

Our involvement, however, has proved so useful to Red China that the Peiping government, above all others, wants to see the war prolonged. It is Mao Tse-tung, among the Communist leaders, who most adamantly opposes a settlement, exhorting Hanoi to keep up the fight and taunting us to do likewise with "paper tiger" insults.

Our failure to comprehend, long ago, Mao's shrewd appraisal of the war in Indochina has proved a great misfortune. It has enabled him to use us as a tool to further Chinese ambitions in Asia.

Just as the Communist leaders in the Kremlin, following the defeat of Hitler, reimposed the Russian sphere of influence over the Balkans which had existed earlier under the czars, so the Reds in Peiping, after 1954, have sought to reestablish over Indochina the influence so long enjoyed by the Chinese emperors. This region, in fact, is not unlike the Balkans, consisting as it does of small, bordering countries over which China looms like a dragon over a handful of lizards.

In the natural course of events, we cannot hope to deny China her influence in southeast Asia, any more than China can deny us ours in the Caribbean. The containment of China can best be accomplished, not by wars pitting imported Western troops against orientals, but by the resistance of stable Asian governments, which command sufficient popular support to maintain effective internal order.

Unfortunately, the American involvement in a lengthy war in the "Balkans of Asia" undermines this objective. As most Asians are inclined to see it, the United States has intervened in a war that is primarily a Vietnamese affair regardless of whether the struggle is viewed as an insurrection in the south or a covert war by the north against the south. Either way, American troops, not Chinese, are engaged in the fight; American planes, not Chinese, are doing the bombing.

So it is that the extended American participation in the Vietnamese war works against our larger interests in Asia. The longer it lasts, the more convincing China is apt to appear as the self-styled champion of Asia for the Asians, and the faster Chinese influence in neighboring lands is likely to grow.

Even now, Burma and Cambodia move toward China. Sturdy friends of the United States like the Philippines and Japan grow increasingly restive. Worse still, India and Pakistan, whose flank we thought we were protecting against Communist envelopment, plung into war with one another. Behind our battleline in Indochina, Singapore separates from Malaysia, and Sukarno, despite a Communist uprising in Indonesia, still makes us his favorite whipping boy. Even as we hold on in Vietnam, the dominoes wobble all about us.

Peiping also gains in other ways. The Vietnamese have historically opposed Chinese domination, but prolonging the war makes Hanoi increasingly dependent upon China for support, compromising her hard-won independence. Within the divided Communist camp, the continuing war can be pointed to as proof that the Russian doctrines of peaceful coexistence with the West are demonstrably false, while within China itself the daily tongue lashings administered to the "American devils in Vietnam" furnish the Red Government with a convenient shibboleth to rally the people to greater labors at home.

Beyond southeast Asia, on the broad global front, a protracted struggle in Vietnam could yet lead to a shotgun marriage—on Chinese terms—between the feuding titans of the Communist world. The hopeful thaw in our relations with the Soviet Union would then give way to a full-scale resumption of the cold war, our adversaries welded together again by our own hand. This may still be part of the price we shall pay for the corner into which we have painted ourselves in Indochina.

None of this is written in criticism of Lyndon B. Johnson. Like Kennedy before him, Johnson inherited an American commitment in Vietnam, and he intends to honor it. At the same time, he is moving American policy in the right direction, toward the conference table. His arm's-length treatment of the war between India and Pakistan, coupled with his immediate resort to the United Nations, suggest that he sees the need for restraint in the use of American forces. Once freed of the war in Vietnam—whether through a settlement or the suppression of further resistance by a massive American military occupation—Johnson may endeavor in the future to avoid dispatching American troops whenever it appears that a revolution in some distant place may not be going our way.

For the United States in the 20th century is not the replacement of 19th-century Great Britain. The colonial house of Western Empire has been taken over by its former subjects, and we shall not be welcomed in as a new master. Nor should we want to be. What more dismal, self-defeating role can we assume than that of voluntary protector of every privileged potentate and petty tyrant who happens to claim tenancy?

Yet, in order to escape this trap, we must discard the prescription of "not another inch," which places a premium value on all real estate and fails utterly to take into account that there are areas where the assumption of governing responsibility is much more of a liability than an asset. Moreover, in the former colonial regions of Africa and Asia, where resentment of the white man still festers, the application of too much American muscle could easily prove ruinous, spreading Communist expansion instead of thwarting it.

Finally, as we grope with guerrilla wars in this age of revolution, let us understand that there is no American breastwork that can successfully contain them. The NATO defense line, on which we do sentry duty, has held fast in Western Europe because stable governments, commanding strong internal support, joined together for a mutual purpose. Our intervention there, moreover, was welcomed by people with whom we shared a common ancestry, culture, and civilization.

In the recent direction of our diplomacy, we have made no mistake so fundamental as the assumption that American military intervention, which was right for Western Europe, would be right also for those continents that have just thrown off European rule.

Violent convulsions are bound to occur in many of the emerging countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, wherever injustice lacks a remedy and progress must spawn on force. Should suppression of revolt abroad become an American obsession, we will yield to the Communists the one prize they most covet, an uncontested claim upon every incipient revolution. If we do not attempt through our diplomacy and by our example to guide these currents toward democratic ends, rather than trying in vain to stem them, the Communists will be left to ride the crest.

Why have we been so reluctant? As a people who proudly proclaimed our right to revolution in the years of our infancy, why do we so recoil, when others assert the same right, in these years of our maturity and strength? The Communists haven't changed the rules of revolutions by meddling in them. Never have such wars been fought in splendid isolation, not even our own. There were as many Frenchmen at Yorktown, when George Washington accepted the surrender of Cornwallis, as there were American Continentals.

Senator FULBRIGHT, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, believes that our own attitude toward revolution has profoundly changed as our circumstances have improved.

"It is not surprising," he writes, "that we Americans are not drawn toward the uncouth revolutionaries of the non-Communist left. We are not, as we like to claim in Fourth of July speeches, the most truly revolutionary nation on earth; we are, on the contrary, much closer to being the most unrevolutionary nation on earth. We are sober and satisfied and comfortable and rich; our institutions are stable and old and even venerable."

There is much truth in FULBRIGHT's appraisal. In dealing with guerrilla wars of the future, the President will find it hard to temper a fear-inspired passion for American intervention, should he choose to try. But if he submits to the siren songs of the new crusaders, he may well forfeit the great place in history he desires, for it will ill serve our interest, as it lies beyond our power, to impose a Pax Americana upon an unwilling world.

EXHIBIT 2

(By George C. Vournas)

IS VIETNAM ANOTHER GREECE?

The speech of the Honorable George W. Ball before the Northwestern University

Alumni Association at Evanston, Ill., published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 31, 1966, deserves some comment, if not elucidation.

The writer concedes at the very outset that his knowledge of Asian affairs would hardly qualify him to either offer suggestions or observations on Vietnam or the related question of Chinese containment. However, the analogy of U.S. intervention in Greece, if allowed to go unchallenged, may lead us to dangerous assumptions. Both premise and conclusions are based on error and do violence to the truth, giving validity to the often repeated charge abroad that the United States has a "sense of mission but no sense of history." Mr. Ball states:

"The Soviet Union under Stalin embarked on a reckless course of seeking to extend Communist power."

And further:

"But in terms of tactics on the ground, Greece is a closer analogy. For there, 20 years ago, as in South Vietnam today, the Communists sought to achieve their purpose by what is known in their lexicon as a war of *national liberation*. (Emphasis supplied.)

"They chose this method of aggression both in Greece and Vietnam because tactics of terror and sabotage, of stealth and subversion, give a great advantage to a disciplined and ruthless minority, particularly where, as in those two countries, the physical terrain made concealment easy and impeded the use of heavy weapons."

The past 20 years have separated fact from fiction on this subject, and the facts are well established. First honors for dispelling the fog must go to Winston Churchill's "Triumph and Tragedy" (Houghton Mifflin Co., 1953); second, Vladmir Dedijer's "Tito" (Simon & Schuster, 1963); and last, but not least, Milovan Djilas' "Conversations With Stalin" (Harcourt, Brace & World, 1962).

1. There was not a question of war of *national liberation* in Greece. The Greek war for national liberation was fought in 1821–27, receiving acclaim and support from freedom-loving persons the world over.

During World War II the Greeks, after a magnificent resistance to the German-Italian occupation, followed closely on the heels of the retreating Germans, and occupied the entire Greek territory. Since the EAM (national liberation front) was in control practically of the entire country, no question of "liberation" was involved. The issue over which tens of thousands lost their lives was the "form of government" to be established.

The EAM, to which the overwhelming majority of the Greek people belonged, was suspicious of English motives—particularly after Churchill's insistence upon the return of King George II. The resistance fighters opposed it. They knew that the Greek dynasty and its local retinue were the instrument and symbols of what the Chinese now call "neo-colonialism." It is a historic fact that the Greek dynasty was imposed upon Greece by British diplomacy. (King George I, a Danish prince and founder of the Glyksburg dynasty in Greece, was in the pay of the British Exchequer from the day he first set foot on Greek soil in 1863 to the day he was assassinated in Salonica in 1913.) George II, after an exile of years, returned to Greece in the middle thirties. Soon thereafter he sanctioned the Metaxas quasi-Fascist dictatorship—a regime that filled old Greek jails and forts with political prisoners and the waterless islands of the Aegean with exiles.

2. The issue which caused the clash in Athens in 1944 was settled by the Varkiza Agreement, the King—then in London—having agreed to the appointment of a Regent. General Scobie, while ordaining Greek Cabinets with a liberal facade, armed and countenanced Rightist gangs (known as "X"-ites) and otherwise promoted a reign of terror at the countryside, presenting all former participants in the EAM with the choice to either be slaughtered like lambs or be shot like wolves. Under such provocation "even a saint would turn savage."

The world did not know then what Mr. Churchill proudly records in his history ("Triumph and Tragedy," p. 227) that he and Stalin had agreed on the division of the Balkans on October 9, 1944:

"(Churchill) '* * * Let us, settle about our affairs in the Balkans. Your armies are in Rumania and Bulgaria. We have interests, missions, and agents there. Don't let us get at cross purposes in small ways. So far as Britain and Russia are concerned, how would it do for you to have 90 percent predominance in Rumania, for us to have 90 percent of the say in Greece, and go 50–50 about Yugoslavia?' While this was being translated, I wrote out on a half sheet of paper:

	Percent
"Rumania:	
Russia	90
The others	10
Greece:	
Great Britain (in accord with United States)	90
Russia	10
Yugoslavia	50–50
Hungary	50–50
Bulgaria:	
Russia	75
The others	25

"I pushed this across to Stalin, who had by them heard the translation. There was a slight pause. Then he took his blue pencil and made a large tick upon it, and passed it back to us. It was all settled in no more time than it takes to set down."

Mr. Churchill was elated with this agreement. Referring to it years later, he declared: "I made an agreement with Stalin, and he kept it."

Then we have Tito's biographer, Vladimir Dedijer, who, after enumerating the various acts and deeds of the British in Yugoslavia and the support given by Churchill to King Peter, etc., states (page 250):

"For those reasons Yugoslavia's early postwar attitude toward events in Greece was dictated by the danger which threatened its independence and free development from that quarter."

Mr. Dedijer attributes the Tito-Stalin breach to the Greek revolution and Stalin's suspicion that Tito supported it.

Then we have Milovan Djilas' (both Djilas and Dedijer have been jailed by Tito) "Conversations With Stalin." He states (page 131):

"In Greece a civil war was being fought. Yugoslavia had been charged in the United Nations with giving it material aid and inspiring it; while Yugoslav relations with the West, and especially with the United States, were strained to the breaking point.

"When I think back, it seems to me that the Soviet Government not only looked with satisfaction at this sharpening of Yugoslav-Western relations, but even incited it, taking care, of course, not to go beyond the limits of its own interests and possibilities. Molotov almost embraced Kardelj in Paris after the shooting down of two American planes in Yugoslavia, though he also cautioned him against shooting down a third. The Soviet Government took no direct action with respect to the uprising in Greece, practically leaving Yugoslavia to face the music alone in the United Nations, nor did it undertake anything decisive to bring about an armistice—not until Stalin found it to his interest."

And on page 181:

"Stalin then turned to the uprising in Greece. 'The uprising in Greece has to fold up.' (He used for this word *'svernut,'* which means literally *to roll up*.) 'Do you believe'—he turned to Kardelj—'in the success of the uprising in Greece?'

"Kardelj replied, 'If foreign intervention does not grow and if serious political and military errors are not made.'

"Stalin went on, without paying attention to Kardelj's opinion: 'If, if! No, they have no prospect for success at all. What do you think, that Great Britain and the United States—the United States, the most powerful state in the world—will permit you to break their line of communication in the Mediterranean Sea! Nonsense. And we have no navy. The uprising in Greece must be stopped, as quickly as possible.' "

3. To say, "The Soviet Union under Stalin embarked on a reckless course of seeking to extend Communist power," on the basis of the Greek experience, is totally untenable. All the polemics, releases, and communiques by the White House and State Department at the time notwithstanding, the established fact remains that Stalin—as far as the Greek revolution was concerned—was on the side of Truman! (On this very point it would be pertinent to quote a paragraph from an article which appeared in The Nation magazine—issue of January 17, 1966, written by Howard Zinn under the title, "Setting the Moral Equation," p. 68, 2d col., 5th line:

("A political scientist doing strategic research for the Government told me recently with complete calm that his institute decided not too long ago that they had been completely wrong about the premise which underlay much of American policy in the postwar period—the premise that Russia hoped to take over Western Europe by force.")

The United States did not intervene in Greece until *after* Great Britain threw in the sponge. In other words, the aim of the Greek fighters—elimination of British neocolonialism—was realized. When the United States intervened, the conflict could be negotiated and amicably settled if political conditions in Washington permitted it. We must not forget that the reservoir of goodwill in Greece is great, indeed, going back to 1821, the struggle for Greek independence from the Turks, and the aid America gave to the cause. The United States is looked upon not only by Greeks, but by the better-informed the world over as the fairest daughter of Greek classicism. In addition, present-day America is the host country to many hundreds of thousands of erstwhile Greek immigrants who are part of the American Commonwealth. (Every fifth family in Greece has a close relative living in the United States.) However, McCarthyism at home, growing daily into hurricane force, permitted no such ending. "Anticommunism" became a substitute for policy, with the result that soon thereafter U.S. presence was extended to Turkey, then Iran, etc., etc., around the periphery of the Soviet Union. This is how and when the cold war was born.

4. U.S. intervention, being free of "neocolonialism," succeeded where Great Britain failed. King George II was restored to the throne and Greece, thanks to American aid, recovered to an extent from the ravages of war, occupation, and civil strife. The past 20 years or so have been more or less tranquil. The last elections—the first truly free since the pacification of the country—gave an overwhelming majority to Papandreou's Center Union. This government was booted out of power on July 15, 1965—evil tongues say with U.S. connivance—by the King, before the expiration of its term, Greece being governed since by a coalition of minority parties with royal blessing. The fragile Greek economy, however, saddled as it has been with back-breaking financial burdens to maintain a military establishment under NATO, is tottering. As a result, inflation has raised its ugly head. This, in turn, has added to the hardships of the working people, with the result that strikes by work-

ers in private industry, government employees, schoolteachers, etc., are on the daily menu. Unemployment and underemployment is rampant. As a result, mass immigration (more than 400,000 workers have gone to West Germany) is denuding the country. There are those who already see foreboding clouds in the horizon. When the inevitable storm breaks out, whom are we going to blame?

I do not pretend to know what the ultimate outcome will be in Greece or Vietnam—which, naturally enough, constitutes today the primary concern of the United States from the Commander in Chief to the most lowly Private or citizen. The signs of the times point, however, that in the nuclear age U.S. security will best be served not through the reiteration of discredited past myths, which will hardly contribute to keeping the Soviet Union and China apart, but if day-to-day policies of the United States are brought in harmony with American heritage as envisaged by Jefferson and the Founding Fathers. U.S. policies have heretofore championed Kings, Pashas and Economic Potentates. The field of social justice for the peoples of the world has been left entirely too long to the Communist side to exploit. The Honolulu declaration of President Johnson and the Vietnamese leaders issued on February 8, 1966, does not come one moment too soon. To paraphrase Mr. Ball: "After all, it should not be * * * the American purpose simply to preserve the status quo."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 20, 1966]

WASHINGTON: THE RUSK DOCTRINE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 19.—Secretary of State Rusk has put a grim doctrine before the people of this country. He was a responsive and forthright witness before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and it is important that we understand what he thinks our duties and responsibilities are in the world.

First, in Vietnam, we are to commit to the battle whatever is necessary to end the aggression and bring about the freedom and security of South Vietnam.

What this means, he conceded, depends primarily on what the enemy commits (the Chinese committed 1 million men to the battle in Korea). He would not say there was no limit to the men and material the United States would send to Vietnam, but he stuck to his proposition that we would maintain military superiority there no matter how long it took to stop the fighting.

RUSK'S OBJECTIVE

This objective, it should be noted, was not made conditional on what the South Vietnamese or any of the other allies contributed to the fighting. There is no longer much talk here of victory depending primarily on the South Vietnamese Army. Mr. Rusk discussed the freedom of South Vietnam as a vital American interest, essential to our own security and critical to all the other security commitments we have taken to over 40 other countries. This is a formidable doctrine.

Second, the Secretary of State gave an interesting interpretation of America's obligations as a member of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. In the event of armed aggression against the territory covered by that treaty, he said, America's obligation to oppose the aggression did not depend on all the members agreeing to oppose it, but it was America's duty to do so regardless of what the others did (which in Vietnam is very little).

THE AMERICAN COMMITMENTS

This did not mean, Secretary Rusk remarked, that the United States was obligated to oppose Communist aggression everywhere in the world or that we were going around looking for fights to put down. For example, we did not oppose Communist China's aggression in Tibet or the Soviet Union's aggression in Hungary, for we had not taken any commitment to do so, but this still leaves us with commitments the like of which no sovereign nation ever took in the history of the world.

For the United States is committed to oppose Communist aggression all along the periphery of the Communist nations from the North Cape of Norway through the heart of Europe to Greece and Turkey (NATO); along the southern frontier of the Soviet Union in the Near and Middle East (the Eisenhower resolution); and thence through southeast Asia (SEATO) to Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Japan, and Korea. And if you add our obligations under the Organization of American States and our obligations under the United Nations, you take in most of the rest of the world.

The Rusk doctrine makes the Monroe Doctrine or the Truman doctrine seem rather cheap. Monroe limited his commitments to the Western Hemisphere. Truman wanted to oppose communism primarily by economic means. And even John Foster Dulles, who was not a timid man, thought each alliance should stand on its own terms and depend to some degree on what the other members of the alliance did.

But the Rusk doctrine draws no distinction between powerful industrial democratic states in Europe and weak undemocratic states in Asia. His view seems to be that the United States must redeem the promises of every alliance it has signed regardless of what the other signatories do, and that failure to keep everybody's promise in one alliance will destroy the confidence of the world in all other alliances we have signed.

THAT BLANK CHECK

If this is true, it is odd that most of our allies in Europe, the Middle East and even in Japan are critical of our operations in Vietnam, but this is the thesis Mr. Rusk placed before the Foreign Relations Committee.

And the interesting thing is that the Senators cannot really do much about it, which accounts for all the frustration they have demonstrated on the TV screens in the last few days. For in the moment of crisis during the Communist attack on our ships in the Gulf of Tonkin, President Johnson asked for a blank check to deal with aggression all over southeast Asia—including the right to use any force he deemed necessary—and once he had published that request, the Congress had no choice but to grant it to him or—what was unthinkable—repudiate him in the face of the enemy.

THE SENATE'S DILEMMA

Nor can the Senate do anything to take back this promise under present circumstances. If Senator MORSE presses his resolution to withdraw the Tonkin Gulf resolution, obviously few if any Congressmen are going to vote with him and turn their backs on the 200,000 Americans now fighting in Vietnam.

But their helplessness merely emphasizes the transformation that has taken place in American and world politics. The President, if he chooses his time carefully, can obviously get almost any commitment he likes from the Congress in the moment of crisis, and under the Rusk doctrine, we are then obliged to redeem each commitment, regardless of what the other parties to the agreement do, or risk the destruction of the entire system of American alliances created since the last war.

All this goes well beyond Vietnam in space and time. Mr. Rusk has asked the Senate to contain the expansion of communism all along the periphery of the Communist empire, by force of arms and without allies if necessary, and the Congress cannot oppose him in present circumstances without opposing its own men in Vietnam, which it obviously will not do.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 21, 1966]

ERROR IN VIETNAM POLICY

To the EDITOR:

Perhaps the most significant remark made by George F. Kennan in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 10 was that "From the long-term standpoint, therefore, and on principle, I think our military involvement in Vietnam has to be recognized as unfortunate, as something we would not choose deliberately if the choice were ours to make all over again today.

This, in substance, agrees with Senator FRANK CHURCH'S recent assertion that "In Vietnam, the security of the United States is not the issue. * * * In all honesty, we are fighting in Vietnam not to defend Honolulu or Seattle, but to defend our national reputation."

Here we have the bare, blunt facts before us; that if we had the choice to make over again, we would not follow the course we did and involve ourselves in affairs in Vietnam. Does anyone doubt that truth of this? We admittedly made a mistake in involving ourselves again in a land war on Asian soil, for which error in judgment American lives and resources have been and are now being paid, with not knowing what the future holds in store in the way of continued sacrifices, and the possibility of an ensuing nuclear war with its catastrophic consequences.

Under such circumstances, is it any wonder that there has been so much adverse criticism regarding our policy in Vietnam? I believe that what the President and the American people are going to have to decide is: Shall we be stubborn and remain in Vietnam not for the sake of our national security but for the sake of our national reputation? Or shall we swallow our pride, recognize the mistake we have made, and withdraw? We have no other choice—it is one or the other.

NO ADVERSE EFFECT

I believe we are big enough and strong enough to withstand any adverse effect that a withdrawal might engender. In fact, I believe we would gain in stature in world opinion, rather than the reverse, by doing so, just as I believe Pope Paul VI and Secretary General U Thant would applaud and commend such action on our part.

While it may be that there is a moral issue involved in a withdrawal from Vietnam, is there not a far greater moral responsibility on our part at stake, when to remain can lead to a devastating nuclear war, entailing, as it would, the possibility of a virtual wiping-out of civilization? Certainly, doing so will save American lives, and would leave the onus of war upon others.

The Soviet Union's relation with Communist China would not be improved were the latter to become too aggressive in Asia. The issue of war should be allowed to lie between them, not with us.

EMERSON C. IVES.

PAWLING, N.Y., *February 12, 1966.*

[From the New York Times, Feb. 21, 1966]

THE VIETNAM COMMITMENT

Secretary Rusk's argument that the United States has an obligation to defend South Vietnam under the 1954 SEATO Treaty hinges on the claim that, prior to American intervention, there was an armed attack from North Vietnam, rather than subversion. Against subversion, the only American commitment in the treaty is to consult the other signatories. "We have no obligation to put it down," Secretary Dulles said at the time.

But this discussion before the Fulbright committee is hardly worth nursing, since the United States has committed itself to the Saigon Government unilaterally—without real support from many of its SEATO partners. The issue is not whether the United

States is committed, but whether it is overcommitted.

The overcommitment has come in the Johnson administration's decision to bomb North Vietnam and send massive American forces into South Vietnam to engage in offensive combat. Until recently, the American obligation had been simply to provide economic aid, weapons and advice to a South Vietnamese Government that was able and willing to defend itself and to make the main effort in so doing.

An even more important issue now is whether this commitment should be further expanded by lifting the American presence from 200,000 to 400,000 or 600,000 troops. That move would not only mean a quantum jump in escalation, but would fundamentally alter the character of the war. Such escalation would turn the conflict into an American war with South Vietnamese auxiliaries. It would implement an offensive strategy that, in effect, means the destruction of the South Vietnamese countryside in an effort to annihilate Vietcong forces. It would mean an end to the normal counterinsurgency approach, which hinges on defensive action to win over the population, protect the villages and cut the guerrillas off from their source of food and recruits so that they wither on the vine. It would mean a vastly increased number of American casualties in an overmilitarization and over-Americanization of what is essentially a Vietnamese political conflict.

A further massive build-up—which would surely be matched by the other side—would hinder the possibilities of a negotiated settlement. It would probably result in a new military stalemate at a higher level of commitment.

Meanwhile, with inflation, destruction of villages, hundreds of thousands of additional refugees and American control of the war, the Saigon Government and its provincial administration structure would lose authority, coherence and sense of responsibility for the Nation's future.

The question is whether South Vietnam is to be treated as a friendly country or, in effect, an enemy country to be bombed into submission with the consent of its unrepresentative national government, and then reconstructed. Is the American commitment the limited one of helping a viable government or the unlimited one of taking over the war to seek an American victory? And will the vital flexibility needed to achieve a compromise settlement by negotiation be enhanced or destroyed by the strategy of escalation?

[From the Nation, Feb. 14, 1966]

EVERYTHING BUT PEACE

If President Johnson was trying to emulate the Stephen Leacock character who jumped on a horse and rode off in all directions, his Honolulu conference could not have been better conceived. Since his election in 1964, Mr. Johnson has been improvising moves in the Vietnam war for publicity effect, with apparently no concern that each policy contradicts the preceding one. In perspective, the Honolulu meeting will be seen as merely another venture in diplomacy by showmanship, a technique which may work in domestic politics but which is ill suited for dealing with international problems.

To appreciate the full absurdity of the Hawaiian spectacular, one must read the entire text of the joint communique and the bombastic declaration of Honolulu, which together occupy half a newspaper page. Such a farrago of pompous nonsense is rarely achieved by official proclamation writers, who generally manage to cloak duplicity in fewer words. In this instance, obfuscation was heightened by the pronouncements of the principals before and after the formal gathering. Mr. Johnson prefaced the negotiations with a bellicose speech in which he described his domestic opponents, who are rapidly becoming a majority in the Senate, as a "group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope." For his part, the self-appointed South Vietnamese Premier, Nguyen Cao Ky, appealed at a post-confabulation press conference for an extension of the bombing to Haiphong, and declared that he would never negotiate or enter a coalition with the National Liberation Front. By the end of 1967 he expects to win the glorious victory that for 20 years has eluded the French, the Americans, and his own Vietnamese.

Ky's stand on negotiations raises a vital point. In all his offers of unconditional discussions, President Johnson has never gone beyond suggestions that the National Liberation Front would encounter no difficulty in having its views considered at a peace conference. This was widely construed as meaning that the NLF could attend as part of the North Vietnamese delegation, thus conforming to the American position that the conflict in Vietnam was not a civil war but a war of aggression waged against South Vietnam by the Communists of North Vietnam and China.

On February 6, however, Ambassador W. Averell Harriman, presumably speaking for the administration, gave some ground with the suggestion that the NLF could attend as an independent group. The obvious idea was to make a peace conference possible without antagonizing the South Vietnamese Government. Consistent with Harriman's move toward a compromise on the question of NLF representation, Walter Lippmann (New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 8) expressed the hope that the President was "talking turkey" to Premier Ky in Honolulu and telling him to "get ready for the readjustment of U.S. policy in accordance with the real military prospects in Vietnam." Judging by the outcome, it was Ky who talked turkey and, as far as Mr. Johnson is concerned, the United States is now committed to conquering all of South Vietnam for Ky or his successors.

What hypnotic power does the premier of South Vietnam, who came to power by a putsch, extends over the President of the United States? It cannot be the specter of a separate peace between the Communists and Ky's government that perturbs Mr. Johnson, for Ky has ruled that out in the only bit of hard news that emerged from the whole affair. A reasonable inference is that Mr. Johnson feels Ky's Government must be shored up at all costs, since another putsch at this juncture would shatter the image of a selfless American defending the Vietnamese against Communist enslavement. How else explain why Mr. Johnson, who is so lion-hearted when telling Senators where they get off, lets the Vietnamese generals dictate the politics of a war in which Americans are doing the decisive fighting and paying all the bills?

Promises of a Great Society for Vietnam are such stuff as dreams are made of. The Vietcong and the peasants among whom they live may be harried from the air, but they hold three-fourths of the country. The NLF is more of a government than the cabal in Saigon. The bomb detonations drown out Mr. Johnson's promises. The gift that must precede all others is peace, and after Honolulu that seems further off than ever.

THE ECONOMICS OF IT

Every war has its economic aspect, but rarely is savagery so well matched with rapacity as today in Vietnam. Last December, Takashi Oka, a correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, reported that for Americans "with the right combination of patriotism, venturesomeness, and hardheaded profit seeking," investment in Vietnam could be most rewarding. The AID guarantees American investors up to 100 percent against losses through war, expropriation, insurrection and current incontrovertibility, and up to 75 percent against all other risks, including commercial risks. So far the boys have been dong fine. Both the Monitor and Newsweek—(Jan. 31) report 20 to 30 percent annual returns on investment in South Vietnam.

The Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette received a sour comment on this idyllic situation from a Charleston lawyer described as a moderate to conservative Republican and a firm believer in the benefits of free enterprise. "If this isn't economic imperialism, what is it?" exclaimed the lawyer. "Since when are exploiters guaranteed against loss, entitled to a return of 20 percent or more? Are such people pioneers or racketeers?"

Big as well as small business follows the flag. The two largest U.S. banks, Bank of America and Chase Manhattan, have asked for licenses to open branches in Saigon, and First National City and American Express are also studying the opportunities. Fifteen banks are already operating in South Vietnam, with the French and British in dominant positions. While doing a job on the Vietcong, shouldn't we be correcting this situation too? Henry M. Sperry, a National City Bank vice president, thinks we should. After cordial visits with Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and Vietnam officials, Sperry declared that it would be "illogical" to permit the French and British to "monopolize" the banking business, because South Vietnam's economy "is becoming more and more U.S.-oriented."

And with so many big spenders around it is also becoming more and more inflationary. The Newsweek story pointed out that the United States has been pouring vast amounts into South Vietnam—$600 million a year in foreign aid alone, or more than one-fourth of that country's gross national product. The current $500 million military construction job is not being done by organizations like the Seabees of World War II—that wasn't free enterprise. A consortium of U.S. construction companies is handling the job this time, with a payroll that will rise to 65,000.

Of course if the Vietcong should win the war and get back their own country, the boom would collapse. But the American business community is confident that nothing so calamitous will be allowed to take place. As one big construction official said, "Johnson certainly wouldn't build all this for the Communists."

AID FOR WHOM?

If nothing else, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on Vietnam are making painfully clear how hard it is to get a sensible response from a bureaucrat. David Bell, the Administrator of AID, told Senator J. W. Fulbright's group that the $2.7 billion in economic aid pumped into Saigon's corrupt economy since 1954 has left the country in "much better" condition, with "considerable agricultural improvement"—although in the next breath he had to admit that Vietnam, which used to be the rice bowl of southeast Asia and as such a great exporter of the commodity, now is in such terrible economic shape that it must import $21 million worth of rice each year. To some extent, of course, this is because U.S. troops and airmen have burned their ricefields.

Bell said he felt that the AID program had done a lot of good. For whom? For the Saigon crooks? For the North Vietnamese? Bell admitted that one of AID's very significant problems is the ease with which Vietcong agents can go into stores in South Vietnam, buy U.S-supplied medicines and groceries, and, with a little cautious dodging, take them to North Vietnam or even China. The Saigon merchants, imbued with the patriotism we hear so much about, will sell to anyone, especially if he is willing to pay black-market prices for the goods we gave their transient rulers for nothing. Senator JOSEPH CLARK pointed out that more than 10 years ago President Eisenhower insisted that economic aid to Vietnam be dependent on the reform of the Government. Had this policy been followed? No, Bell conceded, it hadn't.

Sometimes the cheerful recitation of multibillion-dollar mistakes brought pained outcries from Senators who cannot understand such smug waste. "There is a $37 billion backlog of unmet needs in communities in this country," ALBERT GORE remarked, "yet this year alone we will spend half of that in Vietnam." Yes, said Bell, and that's too bad; but he thought GORE might be overlooking the brighter side, which is that Korea has sent a division of troops to the war. (He said this in earnest, as if he did not mean to mislead, as if he could not see the shining irony of it—that we have two divisions of U.S. troops stationed in Korea, whence one division of their troops come to our assistance.)

It is not likely, with the administration stanchly resisting any conversation with the American people, that much information of consequence will come out of these hearings. Indirectly, however, the administration's efforts to suppress news is already having the desired and expected reaction—a flurry of exposés by newsmen such as the Washington Star's Richard Critchfield, four of whose articles from Saigon placed in the RECORD by Sentaor CLARK gave the first session of the Foreign Relations Committee its only meaty information. "Though the United States has spent billions in Vietnam, it has invested only $4 million in land reform from 1954 to 1960, nothing from 1960 to 1965 and is spending only $1 million this year," writes Critchfield. "The United States gives goods, the goods are sold to people with money to buy them and the money goes to support the war. But the effect is to nourish an urban economy in which the middle and upper classes prosper but does almost nothing to improve the life of 80 percent of the peasant population."

It would take FULBRIGHT's group 3 hours to drag that much information out of a man like Bell, and then it would come forth wrapped in misleading excuses. Critchfield is not the only reporter on the scent. Richard Harwood of the Washington Post writes, "Of the total AID package of more than $500 million for the current fiscal year, less than $2 million is earmarked for schools and school supplies in the villages, only $1.1 million for rural water systems, $1.8 million for 6,000 rural self-help projects, $12.8 million for public health, and $5.8 million for agricultural development. The total for these projects—about $24 million—is less than the $27 million AID will invest this year in a desperate effort by the national police force to curb the misuse of U.S. aid and to stop the flow of contraband to the Vietcong.

This kind of tough honesty, which is seen with encouraging frequency in the American press these days, is going to make the artful dodging of administration witnesses sound all the sillier.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to highly commend the Senator from Idaho for the brilliant speech he has just made, in which I associate myself not only in connection with his policy statement on foreign policy but also in connection with his legal analysis of the situation.

Later in the week, I shall supplement his speech with a further answer to Secretary of State Rusk and Under Secretary of State Mr. Ball in connection with their allegations that the SEATO Treaty, in some way, somehow, is supposed to justify the unconstitutional and illegal war in southeast Asia.

I shall also make that speech for the benefit of the delegates of the American Bar Association.

Mr. President, I also wish to say that I enthusiastically support the general policy expressed by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] in his proposals for seeking to obtain a negotiated settlement of the war. For a long time, I have stated that it cannot be settled on any bilateral negotiation basis between the United States and South Vietnam on the one hand and North Vietnam on the other. It must be settled with multilateral negotiations, with the noncombatant nations sitting at the head of the table, making clear to the combatants that negotiations will have to be arranged through third party intervention.

I am satisfied that unless that course of action is followed, the odds are in favor of the United States going down in history as being more responsible than any other nation in the world for leading mankind into a third world war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain communications which I have received on the subject of the war in Vietnam. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed the article by Jean Facouture, which appeared in the New York Review of Books for March. Mr. Facouture is author of "Vietnam Between Two Truces." He also wrote a biography of Ho Chi Minh and a book on the Geneva Conference of 1954. He was on the staff of General Leclerc in 1945 and was a correspondent in Vietnam for Le Monde. He is now a fellow of the Center for Near Eastern Studies at Harvard.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Suggest imposing economic blockade on countries supplying North Vietnam. Keep up the good work.

GEORGIA LEE HARDY,
Chairman, HOW (Housewives Opposing War).

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The hopes of American honor and world survival rest upon you and your brave colleagues.

RALPH and PHOEBE FRIEDMAN.

EUGENE, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for this great service you are doing for us, the American people.

DORIS and WINDSOR CALKINS.

ALBANY, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE E. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We wish to commend you for the courage with which you are pursuing your convictions regarding the situation in Vietnam. We are in complete agreement with you and pray that you will be given the strength to pursue this vital service to your country.

Mr. and Mrs. ELDRED T. COBB.

MEDFORD, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Your outspoken opposition of our unfortunate Vietnam policy makes you one of the most important men in public life. Stay with it.

JAMESON D. SELLECK.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

While at variance with you on many occasions, I wholeheartedly support your attitude toward our position in Vietnam. Speaking only as a private citizen I feel compelled to make my views known. As a Marine Corps veteran of World War II and an off-and-on member of the American Legion my attitude is undoubtedly unpopular with many former and current comrades and friends. However, I feel I must make my personal views known to the one person who in my estimation makes more sense and is doing more to try to bring about a reasonable solution, or enlightment at least, in our current situation.

DALE JOSEPHSON.

EUGENE, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Complete support for your view. Please send copies of recent Foreign Relations Committee hearings. Thanks.

Mr. and Mrs. ALBERT B. CULVER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You spoke well our sentiments exactly to the general today. Great going. Keep it up.

AL and LOIS BALTEAU.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I am very proud of you.

EMERY HOOVER.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a fellow teacher I admire your courage on behalf of labor and your opposition to the Vietnam fiasco. You are a man I would like to be.

Fraternally,

GEORGE J. ACKO.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your stand on Vietnam 100 percent.

Mr. and Mrs. C. R. MOE.

JUNCTION CITY, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your stand on Vietnam.

CLARENCE M. MORE.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 18, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Fully support your fight to bring peace to Vietnam.

FRANK FULLER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 17, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You are doing a superb job. We endorse you completely.

Dr. and Mrs. ROBET D. GOLDMAN.

EUGENE, OREG., *February 17, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Behind you. Insist on McNamara in public hearing.

DOROTHY DANN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 18, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

As an Oregon Republican I support you now and in the future.

Mrs. WILLIAM B. GRUBER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Ten thousand percent support Vietnam sanity fight.

WALTER FRANCIS,
TINA MICHAEL,
PETER SIMCICH.

PORTLAND OREG.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Room 417, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge you have at Friday's Senate hearings the 11 interim reports issued by the International Control Commission between 1954 and 1960. Bless you.

Mr. MASON DRUKMAN.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Ask Rusk how many North Vietnamese have been killed or captured in the current fighting.

KERMIT ROHDE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You have my vote of confidence on Vietnam. Keep up your knowledgeable conviction. Opposition is using emotionally charged language that is Johnson programed.

D. MEEKER,
Encyclopaedia Britannica Films.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

After reading the Journal "Viet War Row Boils in Senate" continue the fight and get this question for debate onto the floor of the Senate. Keep up the good work.

FREDERICK G. RILL.

MEDFORD, OREG.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand against the Vietnam war.

EDWARD SICKLES, M.D.

SAUSALITO, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Applaud your courageous forthright stand on Vietnam. Please continue your noble effort. Many people support you.

ROBERT FRICK.

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senators MORSE and FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We admire you, support you, love you. Please continue your valiant peace efforts.

ELAINE and RICHARD KUNTZ.

PRINCETON, N.J.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Rusk stated this morning that we are not fighting communism. I thought we were. Can that be explained to the public more fully?

NATALIE M. CARROLL.

TOLEDO, OHIO,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Hearings Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Ask Rusk why, if Hanoi is a motivation power behind the Vietcong, why don't we bomb it and stop that power. Also ask him if free elections are held in South Vietnam and it goes Communist then what do we do? I agree with you completely and hope you can convince enough of Congress to vote the pending appropriation bill down.

DENNIS HEFNER.

PASCAGOULA, MISS.,
February 18, 1966.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations for your courageous stand toward public review of our Vietnam fiasco. It would be more desirable for us to fight pinks and fiscal irresponsibility in Washington.

JOHN SMITH.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You are voicing the sentiments of millions. More power to you, Senator, and thank God we have you.

FRANK J. SCHORR.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We back you 100 percent in Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT L. BOWMAN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are 1,000 percent behind you. Please continue to fight for freedom for Vietnam. You are truly the voice of the liberal in the United States.

Gratefully yours,
Dr. and Mrs. GERALD SCHREIBER.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your foreign relations hearings. The spectacle of the most powerful Nation waging undeclared war on a little one is absolutely disgusting.

GEORGE P. HILL.

JAMAICA, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Caucus Room,
Washington, D.C.:

The gratitude and admiration for your courage, sincerity, and frankness. Carry on.

ANNE M. CORBITT.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Caucus Room,
Washington, D.C.:

Ask Secretary Rusk why didn't we inspect Cuba as we said we would. Why haven't we gone into Cuba as we have gone into Vietnam? I think Cuba is just as important or more so. I will be listening to TV for you to ask these questions. I think they are highly important.

L. G. SHEARON.

DETROIT, MICH.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I listened on TV to the Senate committee investigating Vietnam and I believe that you among all those who spoke met the issue squarely. The President, I believe, has usurped the powers of the Congress in sending American troops to Vietnam and committing American resources to Vietnam in other countries with congressional approval.

JOHN J. SULLIVAN.

SCARSDALE, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your cry. What can we do?

Mrs. B. A. FELDMAN.

MIAMI, FLA.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Watched you yesterday, today. God bless you. Don't stop. Six and one-half years Army, 15 years police sergeant. Love America. Repeat don't stop.

JACK ATWOOD.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your criticism of Johnson administration war hawks. Vietnam war is a disgraceful chapter of American history, should be stopped immediately. Most Americans support your position. Keep up good work.

New York, N.Y.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We fully support your efforts to stop the brutalizing and dehumanizing Vietnam war. May you succeed in these efforts.

Dr. and Eric Riss.

New York, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up your fight against our commitments to 40 countries.

Harry T. Morrissey.

San Diego, Calif.
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

I believe in your philosophy. Thank you very much from the 50 people at Gue Ranch.

Jocelyn Gue.

North Haven, Conn.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

This is our first fan message though we have all along supported your position on Vietnam. Your televised presentation was great. You have our support 100 percent.

James and Hazel McNeal.

Cleveland, Ohio,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Morse,
Washington, D.C

Your Honor: You are the best man in Washington, D.C., to protect us but where is my son now? He joined the Army at 17.

Gus Gruzis.

Riverton, N.J.,
February 18, 1966.

Senators Morse and Fulbright,
Congressional Investigating Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your Vietnam policy investigation. I also agree completely with your reservations about this conflict. Go to it.

Paul T. Martin.

Atlanta, Ga.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Care of Senator Fulbright,
Washington, D.C.:

Many Georgians are proud of you both. God save America.

James Epps Moody.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Hawks flying scared. Hurray. Morse for President in 1968. Only regret are not my Senator.

R. G. Lewis.

Orleans, Mass.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Ask Dean Rusk, Oxford classmate, whether administration policy consistent with Christianity, in God we trust. We are not marching unchristian soldiers as to war and not to peace. Quote Jesus: "If your enemy hungers feed him, if he thirsts give him to drink, then you will be heaping coals of fire on his head." Am all for you. Senator Morse keep up the good work.

Axel B. Gravem.

New York, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for expressing views of millions of patriotic Americans about Vietnam and exposing shameless falsehoods we have been told.

E. D. Williams.

San Mateo, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Utmost thanks and respect to you for helping shed light on this ridiculous situation.

Mr. and Mrs. Louis Belkin.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Future generations of America will thank you for opposing our misguided action in Vietnam.

Milton J. Polissar.

Ogden, Utah,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

We are behind you all the way in our struggle in Vietnam.

Justin F. Grover,
K. M. Grover.

Chicago, Ill.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please don't end hearings. Find more witnesses. Don't abandon us now. Keep going.

Mrs. Stuart Horne.

New York, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support Senate hearings and urge continued efforts to end this morally and militarily indefensible war.

Dr. and Mrs. Abraham White.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo to you. Please keep opposing this undeclared war.

Dixie Berry.

Elizabeth, N.J.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Best wishes on your efforts for peace in Vietnam.

Benjamin Gelsand.

Madison, Tenn.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Your fearless voice gratefully heard by many. Please continue fight.

Gene Staley.

Maryville, Tenn.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are a valuable man. I congratulate you on your courage and good judgment.

Hugh Yoakum.

Calais, Maine,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are certainly correct in your statement that the American people do not want war, but they feel helpless. Eight to ten percent of our people who are abnormal mentally may crave any kind of excitement, but power is extremely dangerous to put in the hands of a neuveau riche. It is often abused. Our country has not learned to use its power correctly and there are those persons in Washington in that category. The tremendous power of one of our lobbies determined on war with China is another factor which will push the way. This war makes just as much sense as does the queen in Alice in Wonderland when she screams "off with her head." Keep up your good work for the sake of America and its people. They are worth it.

L. Murchie Todd.

Hershey, Pa.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Just back from Philippines. Agree with with you. Militarists selfishly motivated. Need hearings.

John M. Hume.

Denver, Colo.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. Continue the good fight on Vietnam. You have my wholehearted support. The hope of this Nation rests with you.

William Hannah.

Toledo, Ohio,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senator from Oregon, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your recently expressed eight-man policy differences with General Taylor and the administration. Congratulations.

J. McLeod Little.

Oak Park, Ill.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your brave and enlightened attack on the warmongers. Your dumb opposition again demonstrates the old proverb that a fool defends his mistakes while a wise man corrects his errors.

Mr. and Mrs. J. A. Henricks.

Midland, Mich.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for defending the Constitution and for your antiwar efforts. Please keep it up.

Committee for Peace.

Topeka, Kans.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are with you all the way.

Lester Silk.

Kingman, Ariz.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Hearing,
Washington, D.C.:

Please ask Secretary Rusk if the administration is willing to have NFL-Vietcong as well as Hanoi representatives sit at Vietnam conference table. Thank you.

John F. MacPherson.

Kingston, Pa.,
February 18, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Greatly admire your attitude committee hearings as covered by NBC-TV. Major yet untouched subject U.S. billion-dollar tactical nuclear weapons arsenal. Tactical nuclear artillery ammunition is available according to past Executive reports. Why could not this type of nuclear power be used at once until North Vietnam sees futility of continuing conflict?

American lives are worth saving now.

Respectfully,

John H. Uhl.

Owensboro, Ky.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Senator: I have been very concerned about our assisting Britain in defeating the Rhodesian Government and at the same moment the British are shipping supplies to North Vietnam. Why do we spend so much money, men, and material in South Vietnam under the pretext of trying to free one small nation while enslaving even a smaller one. Would you please ask Secretary Rusk about this. I'll be watching. I have, do, and will continue to support you 100 percent.

Owen Hembree.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We stand behind you. Vietnam hearings beneficial. Youth must be saved. War must stop.

Ida Messinger.

Detroit, Mich.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations for expressing the viewpoint of most American people. We need more Senators like you.

Mrs. Helen Hammond.

Detroit, Mich.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Hundreds of thousands of us are sleeping better because of your courage and that of Senator Fulbright. Please prevail.

F. Butler.

Lincoln Park, Mich.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

God bless you, Senator Morse, for the wonderful words you are speaking out for us American people. We are praying for you every day and night. God give you strength to go on and others like you.

Mrs. Josephine Salliotte.

Yonkers, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Dear Sir: More power to you in your fight against the Johnson war and Taylor, et al. The only way we will ever win this war in Vietnam is by losing it.

Charles G. Meyer, Sr.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

All people who support the values of freedom and humanity applaud your noble spirit.

Richard R. Holt.

J.F.K. International Airport, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo and congratulations. Support your views, keep up the good work.

D. M. Tucker,
Pilot, Trans Caribbean Airways.

West Palm Beach, Fla.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please ask supporters of Vietnam killing how they relate this to their churchgoing.

Annette Roberts.

Tucson, Ariz.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We wholeheartedly support your courageous stand in current Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing. All truly patriotic Americans should be grateful for your rational analysis of our foreign policy.

Roy M. Emrich,
Robert M. Kalpach,
Hormoz M. Mahmoud,
Carl T. Pomizuka,
Department of Physics,
University of Arizona.

Englewood, N.J.,
February 18, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

You are America's hero and savior, remarkable man.

Mrs. A. Maiwald.

Berkeley, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your stand on Vietnam. If neither North, South Vietnam are sovereign states, how can any nation claim treaty obligations to either of them?

Sam Wainwright.

San Jose, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We welcome your frank and persistent questioning of the administration South Vietnam policies. We wish California had a Senator of your courage and patriotism.

Raul Pimentel.

New York, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Why isn't McNamara on as a witness and why hasn't a committee gone to Peiping? Mao Tse-tung is not a despicable character. Having lived in Peiping for 25 years and knowing the Premier of China, we know that he and Chou en Lai are not despicable characters but are interested in the National People's Republic of China and are not interested in war with the United States.

Miss Delight Salter.

Asbury Park, N.J.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Millions of Americans are grateful and bless you for your valiant efforts for peace in Vietnam.

L. & H. Manufacturing,
Louis Rubel,
President.

Oklahoma City, Okla.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Deeply appreciate your views on Vietnam. You have grateful support here.

Mrs. Frances Pierce.

New York, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

You have stated your views this morning in an articulate and lucid manner. It is my hope that you gain more support for your position as you have gained mine.

Elizabeth L. Packer,
Mother, Houswife, Teacher.

St. Paul, Minn.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Though not of your constituency we feel compelled to express our gratitude for your persistent attempts to arouse the conscience of all Americans, we regret that there are not more Senators who are willing to speak so honestly, nevertheless we want you to know there are other Americans who share your concern.

George Bowen and Paul Sontag.

New York, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

It was encouraging to know you intend to do what you can to place a reluctant Senate on record in regard to the war in Vietnam.

Edward M. Collins.

Framingham, Mass.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Ask Secretary Rusk what Hanoi's escalating was that in turn makes us escalate. Good luck.

Mrs. Athur Crowe.

New York, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Your courage in seeking peace and challenging military cant is deeply appreciated. Thank you,

John Duffy.

Riverside, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Investigating Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Ask investigating committee why they go 3,000 miles away to fight the Communist when they won't fight them when they are all around us here.

Mrs. Callie Dobenz.

Sacramento, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We want you to know that we are behind you in your opposition against the senseless and useless war in Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. E. J. Runkle.

Birmingham, Mich.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

My congratulations to you on your stand yesterday with General Taylor. Ask Taylor where our peace and freedom of choice is drafting our childless fathers to fight this stupid war.

Peggy Dawson.

Campbell, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Why not try prayer to almighty God in your sessions.

Rev. Harold Beeson.

La Honda, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Admire your courageous stand re Vietnam involvement.

Sincere best wishes,
Mr. and Mrs. Ed McClanahan.

Dallas, Tex.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Committeee on Foreign Relations,
Washington, D.C.:

Suggest asking Dean Rusk what effect Red China admittance to the United Nations would have on ending Vietnam war.

Carl Brannin.

New York, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please get into hearing record OKA article, Christian Science Monitor, January 26, denying consensus behind Ky.

John W. Darr, Jr.

Gainesville, Fla.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations and our heartfelt thanks for your courageous stand in the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Brent Wallis.
Helen Wallis.
James Sajovic
Michael Geisen.
William Greenhood.
Patricia McGann.

Great Falls, Mont.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Your voice is needed. Thank you for millions of Americans.

Mrs. F. Mitchell.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for being America's conscience. You express our hopes and needs to stop war.

Mr. and Mrs. S. A. Myerson.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Don't weaken. Stress Vietnam one country we're outsiders. Start negotiations including Vietcong now.

Jerry Schnitzer and Family.

Flushing, Mich.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Hearing Committee,
Washington, D.C.

Honorable Senator Morse: I enjoy hearing your comments on Vietnam and I agree with you. I only have one fault with you that you are not the Senator of Michigan.

Mrs. William Mazzarre.

Bakersfield, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Public has your backing. Demand why Nationalist China not allowed to fight.

Jack M. White.

La Jolla, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Please push idea United Nations not United States must become policing agency of world. Congratulations.

Mrs. Cyrus Pachter.

Cleveland, Ohio,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I have four questions that I would like Mr. Rusk to confirm.

1. How weak could this war in Vietnam make our country over a period of 1 or 2 years?
2. How many thousands of our boys lives would be taken?
3. How could we possibly excavate a war of this kind with no allies?
4. Is it true that a President can make a mistake?

Mrs. S. Euclid.

Woodbury, Conn.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Congressional Hearings,
Washington, D.C.:

Please ask under what conditions the North Vietnam are now living. What is their status?

——— ———.

East Lansing, Mich.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Call Donald Duncan, ex-master sergeant, U.S. special forces, to testify before foreign relations. I support you entirely.

Michael Rosenstein.

Albuquerque, N. Mex.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I completely support your courageous, ethical stand on Vietnam.

William Dodd.

Sheboygan Falls, Wis.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Chambers,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep tayloring. We pray that more forthright men like you and Fulbright may awake to help us recover from our misguided political accident. If gives us hope that our Senate has not yet reached the baseness of Rome that Cicero opposed for two decades before the end of the Roman empire.

Rydberg and Healy clans who had hundreds in uniform in World War I and II and whose sons and grandsons are now being uniformed to free the Asian swamps from everything, with respect and best wishes.

Douglas Mott.

New York, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are the greatest American. We're very proud of your stand on Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. George Wittner.

New York, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your forthright position on Vietnam tributes to highest American values and tradition. Congratulations.

Mr. and Mrs. Ronald S. Clemens.

Napa, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We are supporting your policy.

Clarence Sager.

Gainesville, Fla.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In complete accord with you and Senator Fulbright and your intelligent, patriotic, and courageous efforts.

Mrs. Jennie Bratley and Family.

New York, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are the greatest American. I'm very proud of your stand on Vietnam.

Harriet Wasserman.

Houston, Tex.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

My congratulations to you on your clear and concise report to the Nation via television media. Although I am not one of your constituents, I congratulate you.

Florence Geringer.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your courageous stand yesterday represents the voice of the people. Keep up the good work.

Alma Allyn.

Cambridge, Mass.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly support your criticism American Vietnam policy. Extricate us from colossal misguided blunder.

Peter W. Carey.

Tucson, Ariz.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We express full support for your stand on United States Vietnam policy and congratulate you on your performance in the face of strong opposition.

Byrd Schweitzer, Mr. and Mrs. George Papcun, Mr. and Mrs. Nathan Perlman, Mr. and Mrs. William Goldblatt, Mr. and Mrs. George Maxwell, Doris Stanislauski, Dr. and Mrs. James McDonald, Marian Martin, Susan Hibbs, Mr. and Mrs. Walter Smith, Dr. and Mrs. Cornelius Steelink.

Wilton, Conn.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your role in the Foreign Relations Committee hearings. I support your views unconditionally.

Mrs. Henry H. Newell.

Tacoma, Wash.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

I have watched your outstanding statements on television concerning the Vietnam war. My husband is a seasoned military officer now serving in Vietnam. He is in complete agreement with your views and 100 percent behind you. We read your Senate speech and lawyers committee report and it is very much to the point. Please keep up the good work. There are thousands of lives depending on the outcome of what is decided at these hearings.

Our major oil companies are paying the Vietcong to leave their trucks and storage areas alone. It may be added that none of these oil facilities have ever been attacked or damaged.

I am remaining anonymous on the advice of our attorney, Mr. Rex Roudebush. However, if you wish, I would be delighted to talk to you personally and privately.

Bravo, Senator Morse, you are most respected for your efforts.

By Rex S. Roudebush.

Methuen, Mass.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God and thank you. We believe you are right and sincere. Please don't give up your effort.

Maxine Wallace,
Joan Seglin.

San Mateo, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Applauding your efforts to reveal the truth about United States Vietnam involvement. Keep it up.

Anne and George Carter.

New York, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for Wayne Morse. You are on the moral side. We are with you in your unremitting efforts to contain the madmen in Washington. We don't want our children sent to Vietnam to be slaughtered.

Rosalind Dann,
Ethel Levenson,
Robert Levenson.

Storrs, Conn.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your eloquent statement this afternoon has our full support and sympathy.

Dr. and Mrs. Joseph Cary.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Please keep up your excellent efforts on behalf of our long-range best interests.

A. J. Horn Burlingame.

Central Valley, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for you and Senator Fulbright in this present critical point in mankind's history.

Frances and John Adler.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your brave and patriotic fight against war hawks Johnson, General Taylor, and Rusk.

Geo. Perman.

Orinda, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I've always taken a dim view of you. I apologize. You were magnificent during the hearings representing the minority with great dignity and restraint, though I don't necessarily agree with you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Woodburk Lamb.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

We endorse your inquiry into our country's involvement in Vietnam. Keep punching.

John Duggan.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator William Fulbright,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on hearings, especially your comments on final one today. Hope administration policy takes heed.

Rev. Howard G. Matson.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

I support and encourage your opposition to our action in Vietnam.

Mrs. Ada Rae Walton.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Applaud and concur in your statements on Vietnam this afternoon. Please continue your magnificent resistance.

Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Passen and Son.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue in your courageous stand. Knowing you are in Washington gives me some hope.

Mary Sue Pardington.

New York, N.Y.,
February 19, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Hope you will continue important probe of dangerous Vietnam policy. Are you inviting Walter Lippmann?

Mr. and Mrs. Joseph E. Cadden.

Los Gatos, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Buidling,
Washington, D.C.:

You are one of the most courageous men in the world today. Thank you, Senator.

Dr. and Mrs. Alan Clarke.

Seattle, Wash.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Watched you on TV and behind you 100 percent on your stand. Don't give up your fight for constitutional government.

Marguerite Engh.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

We endorse your inquiry into our country's involvement in Vietnam. Keep punching.

Joseph Rhine.

Palo Alto, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for fearless and patriotic stand in challenging the administration's Vietnam policy.

C. K. Dunbar.

New York, N.Y., *February 19, 1966.*

Senator Morse,
The Senate, Washington, D.C.:

We thank you for your courageous and wise stand.

Lipman and Mary Bers.

Ventura, Calif., *February 19, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulate you on your firm stand against war in Vietnam and support you wholeheartedly in your efforts against appropriation for escalation. Thank you for alerting the American people to the grave danger facing them.

Mr. and Mrs. Earl Loughboro.

Santa Monica, Calif., *February 19, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

To a wonderful Jeffersonian. We are back of you 100 percent. Stop the war in Vietnam.

Dr. Paul and Mary Wescher.

Bakersfield, Calif., *February 19, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks to your courage on opposition to military commitment in Vietnam. You speak for millions.

Beth Wilson.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

We endorse right of inquiry into our position in Vietnam. Endorse views also please continue.

David S. Levinson.

Sausalito, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks. Keep going. Urge calling Donald Duncan. Expose faults analysis. Urge ground nuclear armed planes.

Margaret B. Porter.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse.,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Our gratitude for your criticism of policy in Vietnam.

Prof. Howard Holtzer.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

I fully support your position on deplorable Vietnam situation.

Isaac Zafrani.

Syracuse, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand. It's about time somebody stood up to President Johnson on the Vietnam stand.

Philip Rizzo.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the fine work. We are behind you.

Mr. and Mrs. Walter J. Stack.

Ottawa, Ontario, Canada,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Just watched you on TV Canadian Broadcasting Co. Congratulations on your magnificent stand on Vietnam. We are right behind you. Expecting large demonstrations in Ottawa first week of March with Staughton Lynd and many others.

Mrs. Walter Josephy,
Canadian Campaign for
Nuclear Disarmament.

Philadelphia, Penn.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

We are with you a hundred percent.

Mr. and Mrs. Joseph E. McGee.

Oakland, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

I am on your side.

Anna Mae Allen.

Madison, N.J.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for TV hearing. We support you fully.

Mr. and Mrs. Eee Quinland.

Detroit, Mich.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you, Senator Morse for logically defending our country's welfare against administrative dangers foreign policy.

Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Wright.

San Diego, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

I support you 150 percent. You are a courageous man, performing outstanding service for the overwhelming majority of Americans, who don't want this horrible Vietnam mess continued another day. Your comments to General Taylor—gutter devastation. Let me repeat you're an outstanding man.

Sincerely,

V. Lyle Schafer.

Whittier, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you, Sir, for all your effort and may God give you the strength and the courage to continue. I support you and I am behind you and I believe as you do that all Americans are equal to any task if we understand it. I urge you to continue in your endeavors because I trust you implicitly and may God give you the strength and the breath to speak for us, as long as one American speaks, all is not lost.

Thank you again, sincerely.

Florence C. Inowitz,
A Soldier's Mother.

Tully, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

My hope is with your grave and forthright stand on Vietnam. You are a patriot and the finest example of American courage. I am telegraphing Senator Kennedy to support you.

Anne L. Reese.

Greatneck, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Whole heartedly with you on Vietnam. Please continue your courageous fight.

Jean Christie.

Spokane, Wash.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Hundreds of us agree with you. Good luck to you, keep up the good work.

Agnes Christopherson.

Trenton, N.J.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Your policy regarding Vietnam has our complete support.

Thomas and Janice Kummer.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for your courage and intelligence.

Mary Foley Grossman.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

You give great joy—great relief. A fine statesman speaking out for peace.

Frank Lansdown.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Our wholehearted support for your position on committee hearings. Thank you.

David and Frances Sebold.

Marstons Mills, Mass.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

You have given us back our faith in democratic government. Your questions were brilliant and we are proud you are a fellow American. Liberations fronts cannot be built anywhere unless there is justified discontent. One cannot eradicate discontent with napalm bombs and impose reactionary generals to preserve the status quo. Our respects and admiration for being a spokesman for a thinking American people.

Louis and Ruth Devolder.

San Leandro, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work.

Georgina Sellers.

San Antonio, Tex.,
February 18, 1966.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Although warmongers and speculators capture headlines, majority of intelligent, compassionate Americans are horrified and dismayed at prospects of feeding the cream of our youth and breeding stock of America into the maw of the most senseless war in our history, which, apart from indescribable misery, suffering and anguish, strengthens the gleeful Chinese and Russians and weakens us. You are the champion of millions of silent supporters in a just and righteous cause.

B. F. Pitman, Jr.

Canton, Ohio,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

For your courageous stand on the Vietnamese issue we extend to you our support, our admiration, and our heartfelt gratitude. We should be ashamed of being Americans these days if it were not for statesmen like you.

Edmond and Doris Franklin.

Stamford, Conn.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Truly American mothers are thanking God for one truly American Senator. Please persevere.

Grace O'Conner.

Ogden, Utah,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. Beautiful job. If help needed, let me know.

Ray W. London.

Coronado, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your splendid tribute to Senator Fulbright expressed my own appreciation of his remarks, and the importance they have to our future. Your own contribution is of gigantic value and my gratitude is unlimited. Be assured of my support.

Hedwig Thompson.

Hartsdale, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand opposing the totally unwarranted remarks of General Taylor yesterday. They were all too reminiscent of certain remarks made by German military figures after World War I. Keep up the good work for peace.

Prof. Erwin Singer.

San Jose, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your great courage, we are with you word for word.

Bernie and Lisa Kalvelage.

Berkeley, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up good work. Vietnam war increasingly unpopular here.

Walter Packard.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

We greatly respect your courage and integrity in the Vietnam debate. This family wholeheartedly supports you.

Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Sargent,
and Children.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Ninety percent of people we talked to strongly commend your courageous stand against Vietnam war.

Mr. and Mrs. Carl M. Levin.

Wilmette, Ill.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Your exposition and analysis on this afternoon's hearings deserve highest gratitude and praise.

Harry, Ruth, and David Barnard.

Atlanta, Ga.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Thank you, Senator, for your view on Vietnam. You're the real guardian of world peace.

Dorothy C. Yang.

Westminster, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Foreign Relations Committee
Washington, D.C.

Informed Americans with you all the way. Do not waiver. Country's survival depends on it.

Mrs. Marilyn A. Potter.

Drexel Hill, Pa.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

My congratulations and gratitude.

Mrs. Donna Lucci.

Santa Ana, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

All hope for peace depends on people like you and Senator Fulbright. Our humble thanks.

Agnes H. Barnes.

Overland Park, Kans.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your position on Vietnam, like hundreds more in Kansas City. Admire your courage.

John and Betty Pelot.

Clarence, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Have followed all Foreign Relations Committee hearings. We agree with all your statements.

Mr. and Mrs. H. R. Lenz.

New York, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senator Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

If democracy survives in this country it will be due to courageous men like you.

Dr. and Mrs. Marc Vosk.

Dallas, Tex.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Certainly appreciate your firm stand on our policy in the Foreign Relations Committee.

J. E. Moore.

Janesville, Wis.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your viewpoint and discussion with Rusk. Stand fast to your convictions. We are all with you.

Mrs. Charlene Kleifoth.

Eau Gallie, Fla.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

All good Americans support you in your courageous efforts in exposing the evil that permeates our Government today with respect to our foreign policy and in particular to the debacle in Vietnam.

Thodore G. Dell.

Santa Monica, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

We want peace. Support you all the way. Keep fighting. Our prayers are with you.

The Stranger Family.

Sacramento, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good fight. We need you to help us stop this fight in Vietnam.

Mrs. Angleo Melin.

Warren, Ohio,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

My full support to a man who does not confuse morality with patriotism. Many are with you in your struggle to restore civilian control of the Military Establishment from Commander in Chief to the impassioned "gentleman" from Louisiana.

William Kloss.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are grateful for your courage. Please keep opposing the war in Vietnam.

Anna Nacke.

Rockaway Beach, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You have already earned a place in history as the American spokesman for sanity. You were brilliant today against wooden Rusk. For sake of humanity please continue your efforts toward negotiations and elections. Otherwise our bombs on nuclear sites in Sinkiang within few months.

The Student Mechanical Engineering.

Palo Alto, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue wisdom and rationality and reinstate Congress arbiter American welfare.

Shan Stewart.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. Keep up the fight you must make them see the light of day. We admire and respect you.

Florence W. Rakowitz.

Haverford, Pa.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

As one of the many who share your doubts about the wisdom and morality of postwar U.S. foreign policy I wish to thank you for superbly representing the United States with courage and determination.

David Bresler,
Psychology Department, Bryn Mawr College.

Baltimore, Md.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

God bless you and give you strength to help lead the American people out of the misguided wilderness. We must somehow find a civilized way to live with all people.

William and Esther Cylus.

Santa Barbara, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We have watched the Senate hearings shown on television. Thank you for your forthright statements against administration policy in Vietnam. Keep up the good work. We need more men like you.

Mr. and Mrs. Melvin Bootjer.

Pomona, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I have seen you on television in the last 2 days and I heartily endorse the position you are supporting.

Patrick O'Reilly.

New York, N.Y.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Watching committee hearings on television. Have been impressed with your eloquence, convictions, and faith in the American people. Please continue the good fight.

Martin Rossoff.

Pleasant Ridge, Mich.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As members of the Presidents Club we congratulate you for your courage and wisdom as seen in the Senate hearings on Vietnam. We are proud of you and support your position fully.

Mr. and Mrs. Max J. Pincus.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations; a great contribution. Almost singlehanded you and Senator Fulbright redeemed integrity of our country.

Mrs. J. H. Stewart.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.;

Appreciate your firm logical statement. We Californians appreciate you, our third Senator.

Helen Mishell.

Beverly Hills, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

I still agree with you. Keep up the good work.

Mrs. David Solomon.

Cupertino, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Senator, I wish you success and back your views in Vietnam 100 percent.

Eric Nelson.

Palos Verdes Peninsula, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Senator Morse, will you please use your offices to relay this night letter to President Johnson. I have no question about supporting our troops in Vietnam, I just do not want to see our troops used there. I would like to continue my affection for President Johnson, I would like to continue to think of President Johnson as a Roosevelt-type President, therefore, I would like to have you urge him to discontinue this war in Vietnam, I do not wish to see our men killed in this war.

Sincerely,

Roy W. Fulwider.

New York, N.Y.,
February 19, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Dear Senator, our deep appreciation and thanks for the integrity and intelligence you have shown in the televised hearings. We are in fullest agreement with you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. J. M. Dobbs.
J. B. Dobbs.

Pittsburgh, Pa.,
February 18, 1966.

Honorable Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please accept my sincere thanks for your courageous fight in opposition to further escalation of the war in Vietnam.

J. Cutler Andrews,
Professor of History, Chatham College.

El Cajon, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Don't let the pressure boys of the executive branch squelch your voice for balance of powers and constitutional government.

If the United States is wrong let us admit it and get on the right course. We don't have to keep up a wrong to save face, we aren't that foolish.

Richard J. Peterson,
Attorney at Law.

Louisville, Ky.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on excellent exposé of misguided heads of present administration for United States to stumble into major war with China. Only serves Russian purpose and shows U.S. leadership as uneducated fools. Thirty years ago United States was major friend of China, sending aid of food during famines of 1930. Korea and South Vietnam situations not comparable.

John Rippel.

Erie, Pa.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

Robert M. Finnell.

Spokane, Wash.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please get Hubert home before we go broke. Wait, he might give Texas and Johnson to them.

Doyle O. Edwards.

Beverly Hills, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Trust that in your Vietnam speech next week you will answer militaristic smear by asking whether the truth helps Hanoi end? Whether any disagreement with administrative policy and thus allegedly helpful to Hanoi doesn't leave congressional discretion to the military and executive contrary to the Constitution? Best wishes.

Bernard Reich.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

It is my belief the great majority of people detest administration's policy in Vietnam.

Jeannette Page.

Springfield, Ill.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up your good work. Get us out of Vietnam.

Adalin Borman.

Modesto, Calif.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your efforts on Vietnam appreciated. Keep discussion going deescalation, cease fire, negotiations, elections.

Mr. and Mrs. Glen Booth.

St. Louis, Mo.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your speech in Wisconsin absolutely right. Only chaos will result from present gun-crazy policy. Vote against the draft and the war.

Mrs. Glen Pyle.

Ann Arbor, Mich.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue your fight for a sane foreign policy. Wish I could vote for you.

William L. Richards.

Pasadena, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Three cheers for your superiority, your knowledge and your brilliance in representing the U.S. people.

Mary Meyers.

St. Paul, Minn.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

A thousand congratulations. Please continue to fight for us.

Elizabeth B. Deaux.

North Canton, Ohio,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Morse,
Old Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am behind you 100 percent on the congressional hearing.

Sincerely,

Theodore Greene.

La Grange, Ill.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We are with you all the way in your views on treaty and Vietnamese conflict. We repudiate Johnson's policy in southeast Asia.

Rudy and Irene Meier.

North Bend, Oreg.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Please investigate any American companies who pay money to Communist Vietcong and take necessary action against said companies.

Lavonnie Brimhall.

Highland Park, N.J.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator W. Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

We are 100 percent, especially your stand on Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. Ben Gelfand.

Oakhurst, N.J.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your courageous fight. You are earning the respect and support of every decent American.

Mark Dorio.

Suffern, N.Y.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on questions today re Geneva agreement denial free elections 1956 suggestions for role U.N.

Mrs. Robert Grant.

Decatur, Ala.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Dear Sir: Have been watching the committee meeting today and thoroughly convinced you are 100-percent correct. Please, for the good of all true Americans pursue your present course.

Very truly yours.

Mr. and Mrs. M. D. Rich and Sons.

Oak Park, Mich.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Morse and Senator Fulbright,
Senate Foreign Committee Investigation,
Washington, D.C.:

You are the only ones that can stop Big Brother from making 1984 a reality for mine and all children. There must be checks and balances.

Naomi Gunsaulus.

Sacramento, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your courage. Twenty-five people who agree.

J. Montaldo.

Seattle, Wash., *February 17, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

What would the Northwest, the Nation do without you.

William Hunt.

Pacifica, Calif., *February 17, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Care of U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D.C.:

Please accept my deepest gratitude for your courageous action during these most difficult times. As a father who is raising three sons, who prays that they may live in a world of peace and realizes that we are draining our precious resources, I ask that you continue your great work.

Marvin Schneider.

Jamestown, N.Y., *February 17, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thanks be to God for forthright men like you. Support you. Thanks.

Mrs. Ann Cusimano.

Dallas, Tex., *February 17, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Foreign Relations Hearing Room,
Washington, D.C.:

Taylor claims Vietcong losing 16,000 per month. Since strength of Cong is set at 200,000, is Taylor predicting Cong defeat within year? If not, why not? Since administration spokesmen refer to North Vietnamese fighters as foreign aggressors, why does northerner Ky govern South Vietnam? Keep up good work.

Mr. and Mrs. L. E. Klar.

Pittsburgh, Pa., *February 17, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Room,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for you and men like you. Good luck.

Mrs. Hetty Schu.

Ventura, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We salute and support your strong stand in the committee. We are 100 percent behind you.

Daisy and Walter Hassall.

North Hollywood, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our fullest support for your courageous stand on Vietnam. Please continue your efforts.

Norman Levine George Morris, M.D.

Santa Ana, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your leadership in exposing governmental halftruths and doubletalk on Vietnam.

Donna and Neal Newby.

Croton on Hudson, N.Y.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your courageous voice on behalf of sanity and humanity is deeply appreciated.

Sophia and Richard Boyer.

San Bruno, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations to you, sir, and to your distinguished colleagues who are courageous enough to dissent.

Arlene R. Truman.

Seattle, Wash.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Regarding today's hearing. Also your other positions. Hooray for you.

Mr. and Mrs. John Hedrick.

Hollywood, Fla.,
February 17, 1966.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Caucus Room,
Washington, D.C.

Honorable Senator Wayne Morse, Sir: I have noticed none of the Senators have asked why the great armies of Chiang Kai-shek have not been used in place of our boys; after all we are fighting her war. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Thomas J. Breenan.

Plattsburgh, N.Y.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You were magnificent today and we support you.

James D. Arnquist.

Roanoke, Va.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Am with you all the way. God bless you.

Mrs. Kenneth Keough.

Brookline, Mass.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. Your voice is heard. More Senators should have the courage of you and Senator Fulbright.

W. Fitzpatrick.

Vancouver, Wash.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Morse,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulation to the voice of the American people, keep up the great and courageous work.

Barbara Deming.

Fresno, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Applauding course of your questioning of General Taylor.

Louise Erickson.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Regarding your interview with General Taylor and your efforts in general bravo my little pressure group a wife 6 children and myself thank you for earnestly representing us in the Asian matter.

Edward A. Jones.

Allentown, Pa.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Hearings,
Washington, D.C.:

"Congratulations." You truly are a man in the eyes of God, and the world.

Keep up the good work.

May God bless, guide, protect, and direct your paths; and all others there; and elsewhere, who are fighting for truth and righteousness.

Please read: Job, 40th chapter; 10th to 14th verses.

Please read this to the Assembly.

Prophetess Adeline G. Smith.

Memphis, Tenn.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please do not any of you get angry and blow up leave that for our poor boys on the battlefield to do for you. By all means be cultured and refined.

Mrs. Ruby Hassell.

Haddonfield, N.J.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

May you survive all the vicious attacks against your loyalty and be vindicated in your faith in the American people's distrust of administration's war in Vietnam at the polls, carry on.

Elizabeth Farr.

Newport News, Va.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

My name, Howard L. Jackson, Army 5 years lacking 12 days. Senator, sir, ask one question would you sacrifice one just one American for all Vietnam ask that one question to General.

Respectfully yours,
Howard L. Jackson.

Centerport, N.Y.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

What about, Geopolitiks, Maj. Gen. Hanse Haushofer, the father of Geopolitik southeast Asia. For more call RL 7–0749.

Victor Mahnken.

Concord, Calif.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

I hope this letter reaches you personally, although I have never met you I have heard much about you all my life mostly from my grandfather, Russell M. Harrison of Portland, Oreg., and more recently from my husband, Sgt. R. M. Omalley, USMC with whom you had dinner on Thanksgiving Day, 1965, at USNH at Yokuska, Japan, he was there recovering from wounds received in Vietnam. Until my husband was wounded I had not paid much attention to our U.S. foreign policies, since that time I want to learn the reasons my husband has to fight and risk his life, I have now read and listened about the war as much as possible during the Foreign Relations Committee hearings. I am in full agreement with you and the other Senators who are against our foreign policy in Vietnam. I also feel that the U.S. Government has no right to give our money and aid to Communist nations which in turn support the governments which are killing our men. I feel that U.S. policies need a good looking at, what can I do to express my opinion and help change our policies. My husband is also against this military action. Requested me to get information on the Senate debate and forward them to him. Can you help me to do this again. I want to say I am 100 percent behind you and thank you for the stand you are taking. Someday I hope to have the pleasure of meeting you.

Mrs. Virginia Omalley.

Kent, Ohio,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Call your attention to 1956 report by International Control Commission as quoted, page 172, in Vietnam edited Marvin Gettleman, "The degree of cooperation given to the Commission by the two parties has not been the same while the Commission has experienced difficulties in North Vietnam. The major part of its difficulties has arisen in South Vietnam."

Dolores Noll.

Detroit, Mich.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. You are wrong. The American people as a people have already repudiated this meddling murder of American and Asian people but have had no representation to express their feelings heretofore, and why don't you expose the interests who are perpetrating this war? Copy to Senator Pat McNamara.

R. C. Hill.

Berkeley, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Important technical difference between undeclared war in Vietnam and action in Korea not so far mentioned in hearings; letter action under U.N. mandate not unilateral action by United States. Insistence on declaration considered unfortunate since possibly affirmative, thus stiffling dissent. More and more dissent needed.

Dorothy L. Thomas.

San Jose, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are the conscience of our foreign policy.

Robert W. Bick.

Palo Alto, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Regarding today's testimony and limited war. Taylor understandably refused to specify limitation of means. Why not question him or Rusk on limited objectives. It will accept legally elected coalition government in return for protection of minorities. Compare our 14 points with Vietcong program printed as appendix to Bernard Falls' "Two Vietnams."

Stanford Committee for Peace in Vietnam, Stanford University.

Daytona Beach, Fla.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

I never heard Mutual Broadcasting radio mention you once today whilst giving long coverage to Maxwell Taylor. None of NBC. Same coverage to Maxwell Taylor, no mention of Senator Morse, of ABC. Every half hour, long arguments by Maxwell Taylor, Senator Morse mentioned feebly once and once fairly. [Applause from gallery.] Alex Dreier tonight was very fair to you. This is honorable broadcasting, is it? It is a national disgrace. Whilst our "patriots" were taking over a thousand million dollars (I can say billion) of German alien property in 1919, the American free press printed German atrocity stories, to confuse the American people so they would not protest the theft of the German properties.

George Edwin English.

Hollywood, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Well done. The Senate and House are the legislative, the President executive. Generals are under Senators in the United States. Congratulations.

James F. Hyland.

La Jolla, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I honor your efforts to bring sanity into Vietnam madness. We must put rational limits to our objectives.

Robert C. Elliott.

Sherman Oaks, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are firmly behind you in your stand against the war in Vietnam, and we wish to congratulate you upon your magnificent testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Thursday. Keep up with it.

Robert T. Wilkerson,
Marian Sultan.

Seattle, Wash.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Applaud your patriotic, courageous, farsighted role in Thursday hearing.

Please ask Rusk Friday, Does he support novel Maxwell Taylor doctrines that we may unilaterally intervene when legitimacy of government is unclear (as in Saigon successive coup d'etats), because our commitment is to people?

If so, would he apply elsewhere? Particularly China Government not recognized by us?

John Daschbach.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo.

Dr. Eugen Eagle.

San Rafael, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Senator Morse: Congratulations on your stand regarding Vietnam. Practically speaking, we stand, with General Gavin, and morally, with the World Council of Churches. You, however, are our spokesman. Further, it is perhaps time that the President be reminded of his moral responsibilities to the world as well as his legal restrictions under the U.S. Constitution. A war is a war is a war. Time was when aggressive military exercise was legislated not executed. A twist of semantics seems to have taken this legality right out of the laps of Congress and placed it in the hands of a paranoic megalomaniac. I only pray that you, Senator Fulbright, and men such as Mr. Kennan, and General Gavin can persuade your colleagues of your own honest concern and to show up intellectual bigotry and political blackmail wherever it may occur.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. R. Barret Mineah.

Williamstown, W. Va.,
February 17, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C. :

You render our Nation a tremendous service exposing tragedy of Vietnam to public scrutiny. Why are we sending boys 8,000 miles to die in Vietnam jungles and swamps after betraying Cubans at Bay of Pigs? Have McNamara testify open hearings. You know of course he has been shockingly wrong heretofore.

Gerald W. Traner.

Buffalo, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Watching hearings on TV we both believe you are right. Please continue as representative of sanity and honor.

Mr. and Mrs. R. Goldsmith.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We the people love and thank you for your outspoken, humane, and courageous defense of truth.

Mrs. Luba Adelson.

Bloomington, Ind.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep it up. Congratulations on good job by you and Senator Fulbright in Senate hearings.

Mrs. Ray Heffner.

Beverly Hills, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate.
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you.

Mr. and Mrs. Jean Leon.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

My husband and I are in complete accord with your position on Vietnam. I would like to add that most of friends have the same viewpoint and so do many of our acquaintances. It seems to be a prevailing fear to oppose any viewpoints of our President's position, probably due to the usual smear tactics.

Mrs. Charles Namson.

New York., N.Y.
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Morse: I thank you very much. It's a courageous battle you're fighting. I thank you very much.

Kim Stanley.

Cortland, N.Y.,
February 17, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks and congratulations for the service you have rendered the country in airing the Vietnam mess in committee hearings made public on television. In my opinion there are millions of Americans who are very concerned about our Viet policy past and present and who are apprehensive about the future. Let the good work go on and let the will of the people prevail through Congress to resolve this issue in a sensible Christian manner.

H. B. Burnham.

Columbia, S.C.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I believe the bulk of America supports your stand in questioning the legality of our being in Vietnam. Certainly I do. I trust you will continue to oppose such action, especially our becoming more and more involved in our ultimate questionable goal.

Sincerely,

Walter Pruitt.

East Lansing, Mich.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our admiration, respect, and gratitude for your long continued reasoning in the Vietnam debate.

Dr. and Mrs. Theodore Guinn.

Springfield, Ill.,
February 17, 1966.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We admire you for stating your honest opinion and the true reflection of opinions of many people who are taxpayers and loyal Americans in this country. With reference to daily headlines, why not suggest at the present hearing a provision for security, the safety and welfare of the citizens of this country, who paid Federal taxes and deplore the waste of lives and goods in a foreign issue which cannot be resolved by the expenditure of either.

Archie Thomas.

Stockton, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand on Vietnam.

Stanley Steed.

Cleveland, Ohio,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Greatly appreciate and strongly endorse your efforts for peace Vietnam. Please continue.

Dr. Voneida.

Ypsilanti, Mich.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

I highly commend your efforts in the Foreign Relations Committee.

William A. Harju.

Boulder, Colo.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. These hearings make us proud that we have thinking men of your high caliber representing us. It also makes us aware that a good democracy must be constantly watched and tended. Your comments and committee activity were outstanding. Keep up the excellent work.

Glenn D. Alberg,
G. William Alberg.

Washington, Conn.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

The courage and tenacity displayed by you and Senator Fulbright to regain control of our Government has the profound gratitude of thinking Americans. Cut off the draft and stop authorizing blank checks for the joy boys to use and waste as they desire. All over-told shipping American boys to die in Asian fever-ridden swamps without declaration of war illustrates need for Congress to stand on its own feet.

L. H. McMahon.

Bridgeport, Conn.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on Vietnam stand taken with Taylor today. I applaud your great courage.

Steven Jonas, M.D.

Lafayette, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I deeply appreciate your clarity and courage in today's hearings on Vietnam.

Don Sanford.

Woods Hole, Mass.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

We back your statements in committee today and your stand on Vietnam completely.

Mr. and Mrs. J. Ostergard.

Ossining, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your Vietnam stand and efforts to inform Senate and public.

Mr. and Mrs. E. J. Walker.

Edinburg, Tex.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Nation as well as the gallery applauded your forthright and firm reply to General Taylor's implied smear "that you were giving comfort to Hanoi" in asserting that millions are opposed to the administration's Vietnam war policy. Congratulations for putting a moral stance above a sham patriotism, keep pitching.

Respectfully,

Andrew Ostrum.

New York, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Glad of your incorruptible good sense, grateful for your courage.

Mr. and Mrs. Will Turner.

Riverton, N.J.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senator Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate your efforts and the open hearings on Vietnam. Keep up good work.

Mr. and Mrs. Lyle Tatum.

Loxley, Ala.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senator Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Great work you doing up there. Hold it to them, big boy.

John W. Finch.

Chicago, Ill.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senator Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I have always considered you the greatest political figure in the world. Your devastating rebuke to the military mouthpiece of the Pentagon gutter pipeline will be an immortal tribute to you.

L. I. Lounsbury.

Baltimore, Md.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senator Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your stand on Vietnam.

John and Susann Mitchell.

Middletown, Conn.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senator Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thousands of us here in Connecticut are with you on the Vietnam mess. Keep up the good work.

Richard and Edna Repass.

Glendale, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Morse: Thanks for yesterday and today. With you all the way.

Respectfully,

Mrs. Dorothy Reid.

Royal Oak, Mich.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Part-time Consultant Taylor had few definite, specific, unqualified answers. Please tabulate ratio of unhedged answers to total questions and read into record. Ask Rusk exactly, definitely, specifically total tonnage and men coming over trail. Pentagon wants specific amount of money to do a job not specific at all.

Gerald Sigman.

Cambridge, Mass.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Continue to represent the truth, sir. 1968.

Robert P. De Angelis.

Cleveland, Ohio,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand against General Taylor's outrageous tactics. Keep up the fight for democracy.

Dr. E. W. Pfeiffer.

North Hollywood, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your belief as expressed at the hearing today.

The Faemark Family.

Great Neck, N.Y.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your sharp questioning of Gen. Maxwell Taylor. We consider you a fine American patriot and a great Senator.

Mr. and Mrs. Milton Shaller.

Hartford, Conn.,
February 17, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In my opinion you are one of the most respected men to have tried to give the American people the facts on the Vietnam situation, etc. Taylor, Gavin, sing the same song, and they are all out of tune. I want you to keep me personally informed. Please confirm.

William Delorey Sullivan.

Hickory, N.C.
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. Keep up the good work. We are with you 100 percent.

Mr. and Mrs. Claude Reed.

Santa Barbara, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on magnificent presentation at Vietnam war debate in committee hearings.

Mr. and Mrs. Robert H. Sollen.

Yuma, Ariz.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank goodness Senator Morse we have an interested citizen as well as an honest statesman in Washington. Even though there are problems concerned with Vietnam I think you are pursuing the right course. Having served on Senator Keagle's publicity committee I feel secure in saying that America in general is with you. Certainly China has too many people unless we explode our nuclear weapons over their land. Therefore, let's seek to settle it at the conference table as you suggest. Permission granted to use as is.

Christie G. Turner.

Woodstock, Vt.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your splendid stand. What can we do to help?

Mr. and Mrs. R. E. Mertens.

Berkeley, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Continue fight against Pentagon, State Department idiocy. Morse for President, '68. Need Democratic foreign policy.

Antony Fainberg.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You and Chairman Fulbright were magnificent today.

Morris Watson.

Skokie, Ill.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your efforts at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings. You speak for all loyal Americans.

Hugh Edwards and Family.

Livingston, N.J.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep fighting with the same courage and intelligence for a course of reason and sanity.

Mr. and Mrs. Leonard Tyler.

Ogden, Utah,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good fight. We are behind you.

Hugh and Rose Kelly.

Rosewell, N. Mex.
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

We are gratified by your wisdom and courage. Reference Foreign Relations Committee and heartily concur with your opposition to present governmental policies regarding Vietnam. Please express our thanks to your many colleagues.

Mr. and Mrs. A. Leo Mueller.

Sierra Madre, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for your voice on the television hearings. Your concern for truth comes through.

Marion D. Beardsley.

Mill Valley, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Vigorously agree with your courageous stand on Vietnam and determination to let the people know.

Evelyn Hannay.

Champaign, Ill.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I thoroughly agree with your stand not to escalate the war in Vietnam. The Asian problems seem to be mainly concerned with food. I don't see how a larger war will solve these problems.

John H. Barr.

River Edge, N.J.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

You have my full support in opposition to this Government policy on Vietnam.

Leo Uman.

Great Neck, N.Y.
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up your valiant campaign for peace and no escalation Vietnam, despite all smears. We believe your actions in best traditions of American democracy.

Richard Pack and Family.

Freeport, N.Y.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of my two grandsons thank you for your efforts for peace.

Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Harris.

Meridian, Miss.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

As a citizen of the United States, a mother and a voter, I thank you for trying to end the war in Vietnam. I am in complete agreement with the stand you have taken.

Mrs. Hickman Parr.

Milton, Mass.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations for excellent retort to Taylor. Continue battle against forces which resort to massive falsehoods.

L. H. Rasmussen.

Brookline, Mass.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

All honor to you, Senator Morse. I agree with you to repudiate present Government course in Vietnam. Urge stopping bombing and negotiate end of war with Vietcong.

Roy Brown.

Chicago, Ill.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

My gratitude for your courageous stand and hopes it will prevail.

Judy Smith.

Augusta, Ga.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are right.

J. H. Bryan.

Columbus, Ohio,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. America is behind you all the way. There is no substitute for total victory.

Charles and Evelyn Jones.

Croton on Hudson, N.Y.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on showing great courage which is much needed in your encounter with Maxwell Taylor. Our country needs more men who are sensible.

David and Elain Disick.

Chicago, Ill.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. The only red-blooded American left in this country. Keep up the good work.

Roy Rieck.

State College, Pa.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

I, too, am frightened. Through your leadership and courage may you block every move of my Government of escalating this war. I wish tomorrow was election day 1968.

Mrs. Leon Frankston.

Berkeley, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the persistent work in Foreign Relations Committee debate. Televise congressional sessions as well.

Vartkes Yeghiayan.

Bloomington, Ind.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand against illegal war. An immediate national referendum should be taken to determine what the American people want.

Rose Nash Freedman.

Wellesley, Mass.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Strongly support your position regarding Vietnam war.

Dr. and Mrs. T. R. Dawber.

Colorado Springs, Colo.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you. We have three sons. We don't care to have our three sons die to protect the political issues of the Government of Vietnam. Please continue to help keep our American children for America. We will watch for your guidance to lead us in 1968.

David and Betty Polhemus.

Chicago, Ill.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your Vietnam views and admire your courage.

Helen Karanikas.

West Hempstead, N.Y.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

War is monstrous in a civilized society. We must find a saner way to settle our differences. Continue your good work. Thank you.

Mrs. Sylvia Umlas.

New York, N.Y.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As parents of draft age son, we thank you for your fight for peace in Vietnam. We say support our troops by bringing them home alive. We back your resolution rescinding President's blank check.

Mr. and Mrs. David Weixel.

Seattle, Wash.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

God bless you. Keep up the good work.

C. E. Johnson.

Richmond, Va.,
February 17, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue to oppose the war in Vietnam. I served 42 months in World War II, serial No. 02047477.

Harold P. Rose.

Roosevelt, N.J.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our sincerest thanks for your outspoken efforts in defending the cause of morality and democracy.

Robert and Diana Mueller.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

In full accord with your stand on Vietnam. Public hearings must continue.

James Cummins.

Jackson, Miss.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up opposition to Vietnam war. You are wonderful.

Sincerely,

Barbara Brandt.

Chicago, Ill.,
February 17, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your vigorous and effective criticism of the administration's policies regarding Vietnam. Keep up the good work.

Virginia A. and John K. Langum.

Chicago, Ill.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for the service to our country.

Mrs. H. W. Shields.

Pueblo, Colo.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. I would be proud to be a resident of Oregon.

Arthur L. Lewis.

Cleveland, Ohio,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for expressing our views. May God bless you and stop this war.

Arlene Smith.

Ann Arbor, Mich.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

To one who may bring peace, bravo.

Jodi Perlman.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

God bless you, a true disciple of God, for peace and humanity.

Grace Locke.

Los Altos, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

I am deeply grateful to you, as are millions of Americans in growing numbers, for your patriotic, nationalistic stand on our Vietnam involvement and your concern about asking our American youth to die fighting in a country that has done us no harm, nor could.

H. B. Herron.

San Jacinto, Calif.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Caucus Room,
Washington, D.C.:

Senator Wayne Morse, I love you. Tell Maxwell that the American Indians are still around and that they are not in favor of planting any more corn outside the stockade. We question the legality of the war in Vietnam and we don't wish any more boys sent over there.

Charlotte Kincaid.

Falmouth, Mass.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Speaking for myself only as a woman, I appreciate our Nation's dilemma confronted with this complex situation. Can only say that I support your committee's deliberations completely. Only hope that God will give you and the committee members good judgment for our many sons, husbands, and relations in the Armed Forces confronted with this dilemma.

Mrs. Nancy M. Baugh.

Fort Wayne, Ind.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are the kind of American we need to hear from. Congratulations for your courage and honesty. Keep on with the investigations.

Mr. and Mrs. Jack Schrick.

Toronto, Ontario, Canada,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. Keep that mustache bristling. We hope that you will continue to make the facts available to the American people.

Moira Armour,
Fiona St. John.

East Norwalk, Conn.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We and all our friends are solidly behind you.

Mary W. Wykoff.

Baton Rouge, La.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I pray that you are deluged by messages from the people of the United States praising you for your sensible and undaunting stand in your Vietnam policy. God bless you and your colleagues who voice your sentiment.

Respectfully,

Doralice Fontane.

Rowayton, Conn.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your view Vietnam.

Emphatically,

Harry Marinsky.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo for your honesty, courage, and determination. We pray for a return to truth, sanity, and peace. You have the support of my family and many friends. We are listening to the hearings with renewed hope for peace.

Cecelia Reif.

San Jose, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your declaration of war from the President or out of Vietnam. Good work, Senator.

Ron Taylor.

Sewickley, Pa.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep after them with your questions. Right or wrong, it always keeps people on their toes. Good luck.

R. H. Coe.

New York, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We gratefully support your patriotic stand for peace in Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. Morris Dorsky.

New York, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

You have our total support in present congressional debate.

Dr. and Mrs. George Feldman.
Mr. and Mrs. Lester Trimble.
Fred Wilhelm.
Louisa Harris.

Detroit, Mich.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand. Will you ask this question for me? Is not the Vietcong poration on the enclave theory and thus being so successful?

Mrs. David Wells.

Lawndale, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Myself and all true Americans applaud and support your patriotic and statesmanlike stand regarding America's involvement in Vietnam. History will accord you the true status you deserve and we feel much better being Americans knowing there are Americans like yourself protecting the honor of our country.

Thad S. Shirley,
Real Estate Broker.

South Gate, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your statements before Senate hearings today. You are giving the good fight.

Kenneth W. Rottger.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Just a little old housewife OSU graduate who knows what's keeping it on. I'm a registered Republican. Keep diggin', keep it up.

Mrs. William Kumler.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

You were beautiful. They must see the truth for all of mankind. Please continue.

Richard Levin.

Chicago, Ill.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Our deepest gratitude for your unflinching courage. We fully support your efforts to end our cruel involvement in South Vietnam. You are perfectly correct in predicting popular refutation of this doomed national policy. Please continued your leadership.

Quentin D. Young, M.D., and Family.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Sir you have rendered a great service to your country in these televised committee hearings and by your attitude one doubts if you care you're the one who will be repudiated by the people of the great State of Oregon.

Loren Gresham.

Albuquerque, N. Mex.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are deeply indebted for your courageous exposure not only of the illegality but of the futile butchery of the Vietnam war.

Dwight Spencer.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand. Many silent Americans pray your prodigious efforts will bear fruits.

Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth O. Miller.

Grosse Pointe Park, Mich.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

You are correct in predicating our Nation repudiates the Viet war. Please be assured millions of Americans are with you.

Mr. and Mrs. C. E. Bradley.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for your tenacity and integrity—you truly are our voice. We are grateful.

The Nicol Family.

Akron, Ohio,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Supporting you on your stand about Vietnam. Tell the chairman and the rest of the committee if you like.

James E. Bennett.

Detroit, Mich.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We wholeheartedly support and appreciate your stand in the current Senate hearings on our Vietnam policy. We also regret that we are unable to directly support you with our votes.

Mr. and Mrs. Orian Worden.

Lincoln Park, Mich.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building, Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations to you, Gruening, and Fulbright. Don't lose courage.

Anne P. Woolery.

North Hollywood, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

You are thwarting executive usurpation of congressional prerogative, and spiking the guns on unbridled militarism. I am proud to be your countryman.

George Drexler.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are really getting people thinking about injustice and folly of our Vietnam war. Bravo.

Waldemar and Marian Hille.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly support your position on foreign policy in Vietnam and Dominican Republic. Thank you for your conscience and courage. You can help us regain our self respect.

Robert G. Putnam, M.D.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Admire your great courage and dedication to best interests of United States. Know that we earnestly support you.

Mr. and Mrs. Monroe Rude.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We fully support your courageous fight against the war in Vietnam. To you and your colleagues we may owe our lives. We urge you to run for President next election. We believe there are millions who feel as we do about this issue.

Carl and Nell Ranta.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Entire family united in support of your position opposing President's war in Vietnam. Give 'em heck; we will mobilize support for your position.

Ruth and Howard Gottstein.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: I uphold your stand with regard to U.S. policy in Vietnam. I have thought very highly of you as a Senator and wish I could vote for you. If you run for President. I will.

Yours sincerely,

Eleanor R. Heltzel.

Seattle, Wash.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Support for your policy is growing. Keep up the good work. Keep fighting for the constitutional government and speaking for the little people.

Charles Dean.

Amarillo, Tex.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Never has so much been owed by so many to so few. I humbly thank you for your stand. You cannot count the cost but only the reason, and reason is the only sense that separates us from animals. For us who weep for the loss of freedom you are a small quiet voice that echos the thoughts of tomorrow—a tomorrow of God and country—they must live.

Your obedient servant,

Ron Smith.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your efforts in the Vietnam tragedy and urge you to intensify all endeavors for an immediate peaceful settlement.

Irving and Marian Tilin.

North Hollywood, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. We support your position on Vietnam completely.

Israel and Caroline Baker.

Denver, Colo.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up debate and with dissent on Vietnam. Dialog necessary for clarification our Nation.

Margaret Haley.

Beverly Hills, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

God bless you for your stand on Vietnam. Keep up the battle.

Mrs. Rosemary Dolgin.

Bakersfield, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are absolutely right on Vietnam and other stands you have taken. You are one of the very few true statesmen of this century.

G. H. Slack.

New York, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

U.S. Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for representing our hope for peace and rational open conduct of government. Please continue telling the truth.

Mr. and Mrs. Howard Alk.

New York, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

We want to express our admiration for your strong stand today questioning retired Gen. Maxwell Taylor. We watched the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on television and we admire your courage. President Johnson has bypassed Congress, United Nations, and the opinions of the people of this country. We want you to know that you are not alone in upholding the ideals and belief in freedom of choice for all people whatever their circumstances.

June Lathrop, Tad Lathrop, Kevin Lathrop, Ross Coates, Agnes Coates, Meghan Coates, Arwyn Coates.

Beverly Hills, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for speaking so eloquently the thoughts of so many of us.

Mrs. David Solomon.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are proud of you. Keep up the good work.

Anna Weiss.

Santa Rosa, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Today you distinguished yourself as one in the American tradition of free debate. In contrast General Taylor appeared as Madison Avenue propagandist. We are with you.

Harold and Susan Hill.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations, commend your courageous stand Foreign Relations Committee. Keep working for peaceful solution Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. Leon Olson.

Providence, R.I.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

We are with you.

Robert and Nancy Hamilton.

Buffalo, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

You are right, keep fighting.

Thank you.

Mr. and Mrs. Donald Zangerle.
Mr. and Mrs. John Marziano.

Sunnyvale, Calif.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

We wish to add our wholehearted support re your courageous position in opposing the administration's policy in Vietnam. It is a sorry situation when Americans' right to disagree is called unpatriotic. With men like you there is still hope.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. Lewis Duckor.

Seattle, Wash.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work, Wayne. And help the salvation of us boobs sitting on the sidelines who can't be heard, were not able to express our voices on the meat of the subject; namely why are we in Vietnam. And stick by your stand of our constitutional government.

Allen Peters,
Democratic Precinct Committeeman.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your courage, dedication, and true patriotism. And mostly for having stood alone.

Prof. ARNOLD MECHANICS.

PROVIDENCE, R.I.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I thank you. I do not propose to be governed by generals.

ILSE POLITZER.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE and Senator FULBRIGHT,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for asking the questions that concern all Americans. Why do we allow communism in Cuba and we fight it thousands of miles from home. It's wonderful that we have these sessions to inform us.

Mr. and Mrs. ERNEST KOENIG.

SAUSALITO, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE B. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You speak for humanity. We support you fully against the war escalation.

The MOSTLLER FAMILY.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We fully support and agree with your stand on Vietnam situation. Letter follows.

Mr. and Mrs. JOSEPH L. MCENULTY.

FLUSHING, N.Y.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your position on Vietnam wholeheartedly.

Mrs. VIRGINIA ROBINSON.

FREEPORT, N.Y.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Deeply appreciate your forthright position during hearings. Your views reflect our profound hope for peace.

Mr. and Mrs. MARTIN HARRIS.

BOSTON, MASS.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

God and truth are on your side.

RICHARD METAFORA.

GARY, IND.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bless you. Keep up the good work.

ELSIE WENDT.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Guard your health, human race needs you for its survival.

Mr. and Mrs. GEORGE M. PIKSER.

FARMINGDALE, N.Y.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Saw TV channel 7 in Farmingdale, L.I., tonight. Thank you.

G. ZAHN,
Assistant Professor of Mathematics, State University.

MORGANHILL, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I agree with you wholeheartedly. Wish there were more like you.

Mrs. LOUISA FLAHERTY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Standing alone in support of unpopular causes is not new to you. I join many others who thank God each day you are a Member of the Senate.

ELIZABETH M. BROUSE.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Don't lose heart. Continue the fight. Grassroots are with you and growing.

Mrs. JEAN HARRISON.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep talking, people are starting to listen. Your courage and your conviction on Vietnam gives a new definition to American patriotism whereas the militarist would suffocate decency and reason under the weight of blind allegiance to a bad policy. Your voice rings clear where opinions are. Truth will prevail.

WILLIAM V. HANEY.

MORGAN HILL, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am one of the millions you spoke about. Keep up the good work.

SID FLAHERTY.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We want to compliment you and to thank you for your service to this democracy and to the cause of world peace in the present hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Please keep up your good work and let us know if we can help in any way.

Mr. and Mrs. GEORGE A. SAGE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

With other writers I want to express my gratitude for your courage and wisdom.

H. KONINGSBERGER.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Don't lose heart. Continue the fight. Grassroots are with you and growing.

H. N. BRODERSON, M.D.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your Vietnam policies. Keep punching. You represent the hopes of many people outside Oregon.

Mr. and Mrs. IRVIN SEGALL.

NAPA, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Saw you on TV tonight; agree with you 100 percent. Keep up the good work. Johnson war is unconstitutional. Was once in Saigon for 10 days. Telegramed Johnson last June: "Your foreign policy bringing on world war No. 3. When they drop the first atom bomb on America may you be among the toll."

GUSTAD F. JACOBSEN,
Merchant Marine Radio Officer.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for your magnificent position in hearing today. Keep up the good fight for peace.

Mr. and Mrs. HERSCHEL SOLOMON.

SUNNYSIDE, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your remarks in the hearings today. Please continue to fight for peace.

DAVID JENKINS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

Applauded wholeheartedly your dealing with General Taylor. My heart is with you and efforts for Vietnam peace.

PAUL THEK.

BOSTON, MASS.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

We are grateful to you and the committee for the vital importance of Vietnam hearings.

Mr. and Mrs. CHARLES NACKEY.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Deeply appreciate your courage as a statesman and your stand on Vietnam. I am from a family that had relatives in the Revolutionary War with England; not a recent arrival. The United States needs more statesmen like you.

CORA SWEET.

LAVERNE, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Give 'em hell, old buddy. Millions of us believe we should go all out or get out. Please get with Curtis LeMay, even the guts of an Eisenhower bluff would end it. You'll remember our horrible grassroots attempt to get bombers 15 years ago. Someway or another, that worked. Step up to it, boy. We all love a 16-caliber man and you're still not too old to be President. Believe it or not, still kicking hard. Formerly from Medford, Oreg., and never waved a flag since.

JOE R. NEIL.

COSTA MESA, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As longstanding admirers of your forthrightness and honesty we support your stand on Vietnam.

GENE and MYRTLE WAGGONER.

MONTEREY, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Give 'em hell, Senator. We're with you.

F. S. and E. J. MCFARLAND.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are grateful to you for your efforts for peace. Please continue. Thank you.

Mr. and Mrs. ARTHUR D. MILLER.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your challenge to General Taylor magnificent, keep up the good work. Congratulations.

Mr. and Mrs. PEARSON B. SELK.

LOS GATOS, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work. Do not let them intimidate you. Millions pray for you.

Mr. and Mrs. ALAN CLARKE.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support you. Keep it up.

LEWIS J. SILVERS.
HERBERT KENNEDY.
WILLIAM WALKER.
FRANK DUNN.
ANTHONY KRAPS.

BURBANK, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations for your courageous fight to inform people of Vietnam situation.

MERRILL and CAROL JACKSON.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Heartfelt thanks for your courageous stand on current issues. We are with you, you millions strong and the polls will so record sincerely.

S. WILLIAMS.

PORTOLA VALLEY, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Although a Republican businessman, I am 100 percent for de-escalation, the United Nations, and WAYNE MORSE.

ROBERT V. BROWN.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your effort to defend American people against the conduct of an illegal war.

Mr. and Mrs. HUGH TUSMAN.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Care Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo, all thinking humane Americans are indebted to you for your courage and honesty.

MORRIS S. WORTMAN.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please press Rusk on whether we now will accept Geneva agreement.

CHRISTIAN BAY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are very proud of you. Keep up the good work in the Senate hearings.

FRANCES W. SHIPPEY.

EVANSTON, ILL.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Enthusiastically support your efforts to bring the war in Vietnam to the conference table. Your courage and candor are in the best tradition of American patriotism.

Sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. WALTER MASUR.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

God bless you. This country needs more men like you.

L. H. WHEELER.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are in full support of the hearings you are conducting into the Vietnamese war. The spirit that you are carrying on is in the interest of all humanity. The bombing and the napalming of women and children must be stopped.

Mr. and Mrs. CHARLES WILSON.

GADSDEN, ALA.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Agree with you 100 percent in your Vietnam stand. Never thought we would ever agree with you on anything. Suggest we abide by Geneva accord of 1954.

Dr. and Mrs. JOE ROGERS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Good work. You're wonderful. A great demonstration of moral courage. Please keep it up.

Admiringly,

BETTE L. STERN.

WINNETKA, ILL.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for men like you in the United States.

Dr. and Mrs. RICHARD MARCUS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You speak for the majority of people we know. We admire your integrity.

ROBERT and PEARL PORTERFIELD.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Stand pat where you are—definitely on the right side of the Vietnam debate.

ANN SANCHEZ.

STAMFORD, CONN.,
February 18, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Saw on TV your exchange with General Taylor. We support you 100 percent. Congratulations for your courage.

Mr. and Mrs. MORRIS ROTHENBERG.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Senator MORSE, you are a great man.

JOSEPH PROCTOR.
DOUGLAS HALL.
ROBERT GARDNER.

EVANSTON, ILL.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue speaking out against our policy in Vietnam. Applaud and concur your stand.

Dr. and Mrs. H. HIRSHFIELD.

PROVIDENCE, R.I.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORRIS,
Washington, D.C.:

I watched you on TV today. Practically all the M.D.'s I talk with daily are all for you. You are our spokesman; keep it up.

RAYMOND H. TROTT, M.D.

WEST HYATTSVILLE, MD.,
February 17, 1966.

WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your comments to Taylor reflect the feelings of many silenced Americans. Please continue speaking out.

NATHAN and PAMELA WOODRUFF.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Tomorrow when Rusk testifies you will be openly fighting a dictatorial President whose disregard for international law, the United Nations and his people's constitutional rights has disgraced my country throughout the world. Most of all you will be fighting the cynicism and despair now overtaking idealistic youth everywhere.

EDWARD BERNSTEIN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support you stand for sanity in Vietnam; keep up the fight for peace.

Dr. and Mrs. ROBERT J. DUMMEL.

TROTWOOD, OHIO,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep speaking up. God, humanity, and us on your side.

D. EUGENE LICHTY.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As an ordinary citizen we support you fully in your stand on Vietnam.

THYRON and JUANITA HOOD.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I am the majority of people who agree with you have no way of expressing our opinion. Thank you for doing it for us.

Sincerely,

J. F. GRANT.

VERNON, N.Y.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your courageous and honest conviction on our policy in Vietnam.

LOUIS and KATIE SEIDEN.

POMONA, CALIF.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Senator MORSE, I love you.

LAUROSE PAGE.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 17, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Have Rusk clarified position on Geneva Agreements. Acceptance or just basis for negotiation.

THOMAS PLAUT.

LANSING, MICH.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We are grateful for your heroic efforts. All America will be someday. Please continue.

ROBERT AND MARGARET WASSERMAN.

WAKEFIELD, R.I.,
February 17, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your patriotic and intelligent stand in the Foreign Relations Committee hearing.

E. R. and W. H. TOWNSEND.

ROSLYN HEIGHTS, N.Y.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Your interrogation of General Taylor today was a brilliant service to the country exposing inconsistencies and reckless attitude of administration and its military advisers your work beginning to have telling effect and deeply grateful personally and am sure years to come entire country will honor your great work.

ROBERT L. ZIMLER.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
February 17, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God in this modern world there is still a voice like yours crying out in this vast wilderness searching for the truth to help mankind. God bless you and give you strength.

EARL C. JUST.

MENLO PARK, CALIF.,
February 17, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work. You're doing our country a great service.

T. I. STENSIG.

LOUISVILLE, KY.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Affairs Investigation Committee, Washington, D.C.:

We are behind you 100 percent. Against escalation of war.

Mr. and Mrs. SOL ABOFF.

FAIRLAWN, N.J.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are forever indebted to you for your courageous battle against the generals.

JENNY KARTE.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you. We are very fortunate to have a gentleman of your intellect and integrity using words instead of arms to seek peace.

Mr. and Mrs. SHELDON B. KEELER.

MOUNT KISCO, N.Y.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Pour it on. You speak not only for Oregon but for sane men everywhere.

HERBERT G. BOHNERT.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please keep up your good work. We need peace.

EVAN WINFIELD.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We fully support yours and Senator FULBRIGHT's endeavor for a rational foreign policy.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT L. CANFIELD.

[From the New York Review of Books, Mar. 3, 1966]

"VIETNAM: THE LESSONS OF WAR"

(By Jean Lacouture)

"On the long thin coast of Vietnam," wrote John K. Fairbank in the last issue of this paper, "we are sleeping in the same bed the French slept in even though we dream different dreams."

The dreams of course are very different but so are the beds and the dreamers themselves. Let us compare them and see when the end of the night may come.

Nothing could be more valuable for American leaders at the moment than a close examination of the disastrous errors made by the French in Indochina from 1945 to 1956. To know the faults of a friend may not cure one's own, but from France's experience America might well learn something of what has gone so dreadfully wrong in Vietnam today.

The French had three great dreams for Indochina and each led them into a different and more ugly phase of the war. At first, in 1946, they clung briefly to the dream of reestablishing their prewar empire in Indochina. Indeed, for one hopeful moment they seemed to be on the verge of a promising new colonial policy: General Leclerc, sent out to reconquer the territory, decided instead to negotiate with the Vietnam revolutionary leader, Ho Chi Minh. Leclerc recognized Ho's Vietnam as a "freestate," connected with France, but controlling its own diplomacy, army, and finances. This was the first agreement made between a European colonial power and the Asian revolution—and one of the shortest lived and saddest in retrospect. For within weeks the intrigues of colonialists in Saigon and Paris and extremists among the Vietminh and its nationalist allies succeeded in scrapping it. The way was now open for France to plunge into full-scale colonial war. But it soon became clear to everybody that this would have been a hopeless venture, doomed from the start by the half-ruined state of France, the lack of an air force and navy, and the disapproval of the Russians and Americans.

At this point the French conceived their second Indochinese dream which led them into a second war, lasting from 1948 to 1951. Now they would transform their colonial struggle into a civil war. Against Ho's Vietminh they would set in opposition the "independent" Emperor Bao Dai, encouraging him to cultivate his own anti-Communist but nationalist leadership—a policy described by the distinguished Scholar Paul Mus as "nationalist counterfire."

Perhaps it might have succeeded if the nationalists had been given a chance to make it work. But their power and prestige and autonomy were always limited. While Vietnamese and French troops died courageous. Bao Dai preoccupied himself with tiger hunting, his ministers with profiteering. The Vietminh methodically liquidated Bao Dai's officials, dominated the countryside, and organized its soldiers into divisions soon after the Chinese Communists arrived on the northern frontier in 1950.

After this decisive event and the outbreak of the Korean war, France dreamed once again of transforming the nature of the war in Vietnam, this time into an international conflict with communism. In September 1951 General de Lattre arrived in Washington to argue that France, faced with Vietminh subversion supported by Communist China, now needed and deserved to have its risks shared. He was given both credits and weapons. But later, in 1954, on the eve of Dienbienphu, the French Government demanded far more: It requested that several hundred American bombers be ordered to attack the enemy from Manila. To these requests Washington finally responded that "Indochina does not fall within the perimeter of the area vital to the defense of the United States."

We can now admire the wisdom which led President Eisenhower to reject both the agitated appeals of the French and the advice of Admiral Radford and Vice President Nixon, both of whom recommended intervention. But we may well ask why a country not considered of vital importance to American interests in 1954 became so in 1965. The Communist camp, after all, is no longer a monolithic force able to exert unified global pressures as had been the case in 1954. In Korea, moreover, Chinese had recently been fighting American soldiers, something they have since refrained from doing; and missile strategy has meanwhile diminished the importance of local air force bases. One can only conclude that the diplomatic views of American leaders have hardened during these years. In the light of Mr. Rusk's performance the diplomacy of John Foster Dulles must be reconsidered and credited with an admirable flexibility.

Thus France launched three wars in Indochina and lost them all. Its allies having refused to provoke a brutal extension of the war in order to avoid a local defeat. France's dream of an international anti-Communist crusade collapsed at Dienbienphu in the spring of 1954. General Giap destroyed France's main combat force; the Vietminh controlled two-thirds of Vietnam; and neither Hanoi nor Saigon were protected from attack.

Ho Chi Minh had offered negotiations 6 months before this debacle and had been ignored. Now Moscow and Peiping were agreeable to an international détente and Washington seemed prepared to accept the consequences of its failure to intervene. Thus at the Geneva Conference table in 1954 the Western Powers benefited from a certain complicity on the part of Molotov and Chou En-lai: The West succeeded in wresting from the victors half the territory and the larger part of the material wealth of Vietnam. Ho agreed to fall back to the north in exchange for a promise that elections preparing the way for unification would be held in 1956—elections that he had no doubt of winning.

A great deal of confusion surrounds this Geneva settlement. It must be emphasized that the only texts signed at Geneva were the armistice agreements between the French and the Vietminh. No one at all signed the "final declaration" of the Conference—both the United States and South Vietnam had reservations about it—and it carried only the force of suggestion. But apart from the North Vietnamese, the French were the only nation that formally guaranteed to carry out the Geneva accords that provided both for partition at the 17th parallel and for elections.

And now France committed a new error (its last?), dreaming this time that it might finally leave Vietnam and forget it altogether. Diem, now installed as dictator in the South, wanted the French to quit his country as soon as possible. This was not only because certain French interests were intriguing against him—something that helped strengthen his position as a nationalist leader—but also because the French Army was the only force that could compel him to hold elections in 1956. In the event, the French quickly yielded and the last of their army departed in April 1956.

The consequences of this final French error were, and remain, enormous. Diem was now free to declare himself free of all the Geneva obligations and soon did so with American encouragement. The south could now be reorganized as an anti-Communist bastion, from which a reconquest of the north could eventually be launched. The Diem government in fact soon created a Committee for the Liberation of North Vietnam, which, beginning in 1958, parachuted agents into the north, notably into areas such as Vinh, where Ho's agrarian reform had provoked violent peasant uprisings. But meanwhile the north, considering itself cheated by Saigon and Washington (with France's cooperation), began preparation to exploit the political and social discontent in the south to establish a base for subversive operations. And Hanoi was to show itself far more adept at this political game than Saigon.

Could the French have resolved this Vietnam problem? In fact, they were confronted by two immensely volatile forces whose demands would have shaken any Western governments, as they are shaking the United States today. First, the demands of a people thirsting to overthrow colonialism and to recover their national identity, their freedom of maneuver, and their unity. But also the demands of a revolutionary group, supported by one of the great power blocs, which claims the right to impose its authority on the entire nation in the name of a Communist doctrine highly suspect to the majority: a group, nonetheless, whose heroism, discipline, and ruthlessly effective methods seem to assure its success.

It is the deep and constant intermingling of these two forces which have made the Vietnam problem seem so hopeless and defeating to the West. How can a Western government successfully sponsor an independent "nationalist counterfire" when the strongest feelings of many Vietnamese have been invested for many years in the local civil war; and when one finds among those who have rallied to the Vietminh, and then the Lao Dong and the NLF, a great many patriots, drawn to the organization because they believe it to be the hope of Vietnamese nationalism, capable of defeating colonialism and Western domination.

Perhaps it might have been possible for the French to disassociate the nationalist inspiration in Vietnam from the Communist organization. But to do this would have been very difficult. For to gain the confidence of the nationalists I believe that French aid to Vietnam would have had to meet three extremely demanding conditions: that the donor of the aid would have no right to intervene directly in the government; that the aid would be given to the most worthy leaders; and that it would not lead to the creation of oligarchies of profiteers and a climate of corruption.

By all these standards the French failed. If they ever had a chance to survive the Asian revolution, they lost it, basically, because they were unwilling to alter their patronizing colonialist attitudes and deal with Asians with some sense of mutual respect or cooperation. For the most part they preferred instead to appoint and then control the manageable, the incompetent, and the operators, many of whom made fortunes out of the corrupt French aid program.

Opposed in Vietnam, then, were a coherent, principled, and implacable revolutionary movement of militants organized in the villages—the country's fundamental social and economic unit—inspired by an evident nationalism and posing as defenders of stern justice and equality; on the other hand, a regime obviously supported and controlled by foreign powers, partly composed of former colonial officials, disdainful of peasant claims, tolerant of a social order where the influential and successful were frantically engaged in profiteering—preparing for the arrival of the inevitable catastrophe. The only possible result was a catastrophe on the scale of Dienbienphu.

How relevant is the French experience to Vietnam today? Certainly the American situation is different in important respects, but really how different? For example, the United States has no colonial past in Vietnam, no strictly imperialist drive for economic gain. But its objectives are, curiously, both more altruistic and more imperious than those of its predecessor. After all, a country seeking colonial profits is quite capable of making a compromise to preserve at least some of its endangered wealth. But what of a country that supposes itself to be defending a selfless principle? In fact, the United States does seem to have several fairly concrete motives; e.g., to prove to certain nations that it is faithful to its alliances; to show the underdeveloped peoples of the Southern Hemisphere how costly it can be to choose Marxism-Leninism. There would seem to be sufficient elements of calculated self-interest here to make realistic bargaining possible—on the basis of spheres of influence, for example.

A second difference concerns the size and power of the forces involved. General Westmoreland not only commands a good many more troops than General Navarre (750,000 as compared with 500,000) but he is also relatively free from the financial, logistical, and transport problems that plagued the French. A far greater advantage, however, lies in America's enormous firepower as well as its Air Force and complete mastery of the sea. It is no exaggeration to say that the United States and South Vietnamese forces are now 20 times more powerful than the army of General Navarre (which had no more than 80 combat planes at its disposal during the battle of Dienbienphu). The small size of the present theater of operations in South Vietnam thus becomes a favorable factor of great importance: The French forces were charged with the defense of all Indochina, a territory four times the present size of South Vietnam.

But given these advantages can it be said that the United States is now succeeding where France was forced to retreat? Of course, one answer must be yes, in the limited sense that it is impossible to imagine the United States suffering a major defeat in the present circumstances. During the past year President Johnson has been able to dispatch enough American troops to Vietnam to avoid another Dienbienphu, but beyond this the situation is less than hopeful. The arrival of over 100,000 troops has done no more than stabilize a deteriorating military situation; it did not result in a sharp swing of military advantage to the Western side, as certain observers had expected. The military map published on January 30 in the New York Times showing four-fifths of the South "under Vietcong influence" must be regarded as accurate, notwithstanding contrary claims by officials. (Incidentally, this map recalls the military charts the French press did not dare to publish 12 years ago. The American public has recently been getting far more information on the Vietnam question from the press, television, Senate hearings, etc., than was ever available in France.)

The fact is that American policy in Vietnam, although originally inspired by very different intentions, now resembles all too closely the disastrous policy of the French. The United States has also failed to solve the problem of providing support to genuine local leaders without excessive intervention in the country itself. Indeed, it can be said that the French—perhaps hypocritically—did nevertheless succeed in transferring some responsibilities to the Vietnamese: These were quite feeble ones in military matters, rather more important in politics, and nearly total in such administrative work as tax collecting. By contrast, we are now seeing the progressive Americanization of both the war and the country itself: The influence of the local military headquarters grows weaker; the efficiency of the government in Saigon continues to decay; American experts have taken over a great many local functions. Of course one understands the concern for efficiency, but the psychological effects are hardly calculated to encourage the emergence of authentic nationalist leaders at the present time, as Roger Hilsman forcefully pointed out in his recent testimony before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Certainly the Americans have done no better than the French in finding worthy non-Communist leadership. There is no need to reexamine now the tragic liquidation of

Diemism, an event made inevitable by the sectarian religious isolation and the oligarchic obstinacy of the Ngo family. But since then, what decadence. Sad mandarins from certain conservative milieu in Saigon—courageous and outdated men—are followed in office by juntas composed of young generals-of-fortune who add a new star to their shoulders after each defeat in battle.

As for the moral climate in Saigon, one can only say that the corruption which dominated the life of the city's elite in 1953 has now been democratized. Shady dealings having to do with aid and military programs are no longer confined to people in high places, but seem to involve every kind of business. Testifying before the Senate on February 4, Mr. David Bell, the director of foreign aid, said that he knew of no black market in Saigon—which only shows that a brilliant and hard-working official has had no time to stroll along the streets of a town where someone begs you to break the law at every step.

It would be wrong to predict a priori that President Johnson's new counterinsurgency and pacification programs, based on plans for economic and social development in the southern villages, will fail as totally as did the quite similar plans sponsored by the French and later by the Diem regime. Can they produce a qualitative change in Vietnamese attitudes toward the present government and the United States? What can be said is that any efforts by political and army leaders in the south, however doubtful their results, will surely be more effective than the current bombings of the north. I will not take up the moral aspects of these attacks. It should be sufficient to examine their diplomatic and military results thus far. According to predictions made in January 1965, several weeks of daily raids would bring the north to its knees and thence to the negotiating table. In fact, Messrs. Ho and Dong have since toughened their demands, passing from the relatively flexible "four points" of March 8 to the recent letter of January 31, which refers to the NLF as the "only representative of South Vietnam"; until then, Ho had mentioned only the NLF "program."

As for military results, we must realize that the bombing of the north has no overwhelming impact on a people who only recently emerged from a resistance movement and are now being trained to return to one; for the most part their lives are not greatly affected by the destruction of a bridge or a truck depot. On the other hand, in January 1965 there were two northern regiments in the south, while now in February 1966 there are eight. Furthermore, the combat reserve forces in the north are numerous enough to permit the dispatch of more northern troops to General Giap in the south every time the United States escalates the bombing. The American public has been told that the north is being bombed to save American lives. But, on the contrary, it seems clear that the bombing in the north only increases the pressure on General Westmoreland's troops: The American footsoldier must pay for the destruction caused by the American Air Force. And if Hanoi itself is bombed, we may be sure that the Vietcong forces have well-laid plans to take atrocious revenge on Saigon, a city they have both infiltrated and surrounded. The adversaries have now sunk their claws into each other and so long as the ground fighting continues, we may expect that each blow will be followed by damaging reprisals.

Thus a political solution becomes all the more urgent—although unlike the settlement of 1954, it will not be preceded by a military disaster. But here American diplomacy is the victim of its own myths. Because the U.S. Government has decreed from the first that the war in the south was originally provoked by invasion from the north, it has insisted that a solution must be negotiated with Hanoi, and only Hanoi.

A false historical analysis has led to a political impasse. For a careful study of the history of South Vietnam over the last 10 years will show that from 1956 onward, strong resistance groups, the surviving members of political-religious sects crushed by Diem, were in active opposition to the regime in the south; they were in fact already called Vietcong by the Diem regime at that time. Furthermore, this essentially nationalist dissident movement gained added support as a result of the rural discontent which led Diem to suppress the elected municipal councils in 1957; it spread further after the promulgation of the terrible law of 1959 which prescribed the death penalty for all accomplices of Communists—and communism comes cheap in South Vietnam.

At this time the resistance was composed of nothing more than southern groups organized in self-defense against Diem. Hanoi had made no connection with them. The North Vietnamese did not begin to exploit this situation and infiltrate agents until 1959; and it was only after pressure from a southern congress of "former Vietminh resistants" in March of 1960 that they prepared to intervene. At the Northern Communist Party Congress in September of the same year the Hanoi government gave direct encouragement to the revolutionary activities in the South. Still, it was not until November 11, 1960, following an attempted military putsch against Diem, that the Vietcong—feeling the pressure of competition from military nationalists—gave itself formal identity and established a political headquarters by creating the National Liberation Front.

Today it is clear that the NLF leaders are closely linked to Hanoi, on which they depend for much of their supplies and arms. But anyone concerned with a peaceful settlement in Vietnam should be aware of both the local origins of the front and its strong persisting regionalism—its attachments to the milieu, traditions, economy, and countryside of the South which give it a fundamental autonomy.

And yet, notwithstanding the fact that the southern origins of the Vietcong insurrection have been carefully confirmed, no element of the Vietnam problem has been so neglected, especially in American official circles. We may be astonished, for example, that the immense, spectacular, and probably sincere efforts of recent American diplomacy to persuade Hanoi to negotiate finally produced, after 30 days of pause in bombing, a single defiant letter. Yet America is dealing here with a small and poorly armed country; its allies are reluctant to give it aid too openly, fearing a crushing American response. Certainly it is a Communist government, but one presided over by a man who in 1946 and 1954 was able to prove to the French his willingness to accept compromise. And of the four points posed as conditions by Hanoi last year, Washington now accepts three. Why then doesn't Ho play Lyndon Johnson's game? In a conference the North Vietnamese would hold so many trumps that their present position is hard to understand.

But perhaps they were not in a position to negotiate at all. If we look back over the history of the NLF we find support for the view that Hanoi is not able to speak for the front. First for psychological reasons: The published program of the NLF expressly mentions the possibility of an independent South Vietnam; and it looks forward to forming an alliance with Laos and Cambodia only. Thus it seems most unlikely that the front would consider itself adequately represented by the northern government. Finally, there may be a purely practical reason. Combat conditions in the south are such that it is by no means certain that a decision or an agreement even if approved by the NLF would be supported by all the fighters in the field.

If we are to undertake a serious and credible search for peace in Vietnam, we must take account of this diversity of the southern resistance; we must recognize that it is in fact a federation of maquis of different ages and different inspiration, and that it is not as yet completely unified.

There is not as much geographic and psychological distance between the typical southern military chief and Ho Chi Minh as there is between Ho Chi Minh and Mr. Kosygin. But to be effective now in Vietnam diplomacy must certainly take account of the maquisard and his part in the war. It must also attempt to understand the role of the Central Committee of the NLF, where Maoist influence is strong but where all tendencies coexist; of the Lao Dong party in Hanoi, with its pro-Chinese and pro-Russian factions; and the Political Bureau in Peiping, with its cast of performers, both civilian and military. And finally we must comprehend the very complex position of the Soviet Union, which is quite unwilling to sacrifice either its policy of peaceful coexistence or its commanding position as leader of the Communist world. If the diversity of governmental levels, alliances, and forces involved in the war presents difficulties, it also offers many more chances for an alert diplomacy than were available during the monolithic conflict of the cold war.

It is true that American leaders now argue that to recognize the Vietcong is to admit defeat. A curious intellectual position indeed—to refuse to recognize your adversary for what he is. Perhaps it is worth recalling that in December 1953, after Ho Chi Minh had first announced himself ready to negotiate, the French Socialist, Alain Savary, suggested to Georges Bidault (then Foreign Minister, now living in Brazil) that he seek Ho out for talks. "You only make them bigger by talking to them," said Bidault—who did finally talk with Ho's delegate at Geneva, but after the fall of Dienbienphu.

Recognizing the Vietcong certainly will not solve the problem of peacemaking in Vietnam at a stroke. It would nevertheless be an extremely constructive idea to focus diplomatic attention firmly on the South at the present time—without meanwhile ceasing efforts both to make contact with Hanoi and to assess Communist Chinese intentions.

But to bring about peace it will not suffice simply to recognize the existence of a powerful revolutionary organization supported by the North and already in control of the largest part of the national territory. More important is the task of reestablishing the constitutional legitimacy which Diem embodied for a brief period—reactionary as he was—and which has since vanished. The NLF is an essential element of this legitimacy because it is the heir to the revolt against Diem's totalitarianism as well as the principal force of resistance to foreign intervention. But there are others who make up the social and political society as well—the Buddhists, the Catholics, and also the Army, a bourgeoisie in uniform.

An effective policy to bring about a peaceful settlement should begin by making it possible for each of these groups to return to an active political role. While General Ky, after having won his sole victory of the war at Honolulu, occupies the stage, we may be sure that the other groups are ready in the wings, waiting for the protection and encouragement the United States could still supply. And from such a revived political life we could expect an authoritative leadership to emerge whose lot it would be to debate with the NLF on the future of the South and to establish a coalition government to represent South Vietnam in future peace conferences. While the NLF is the largest force in the South it recognizes that it is obviously not the only force, reserving a large fraction of the seats on its central committee for groups who do not belong to the NLF. The democratization of power in South Vietnam is not a fantasy. The destruction of the small democratic movements struggling to survive under Diem was among the factors that led to the civil war.

French colonial policy was only too familiar with these very diverse political factions and brilliantly played them off, one against the other. But to divide and rule became a pathetic policy as France's control became more feeble. An American policy which seeks a peaceful settlement must take account of both the sociopolitical pluralism of South Vietnam and its extraordinary capacity for finding original—and local—solutions to its problems. Surely it is time for American leaders at last to confront the people with whom they have become so inextricably involved.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock tomorrow noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the Senate adjourned, under the previous order until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 22, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 21, 1966:

U.S. ATTORNEY

John M. Imel, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

To be lieutenant colonel, Women's Army Corps

Bouton, Irma V., L195.
Brinegar, Maurine O., L531.
Deady, Virginia R., L167.
Howes, Alice N., L146.
Stout, Ariel E., L126.
Thompson, Ruth D., L121.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Bass, Robert E.
Beer, David C.
*Bernard, Donald P.
*Chandler, Deck E.
*Cummings, Ronald A.
*Delaney, Thomas B.
*Dempsey, John J.
*Dinsmore, Harry H.
Downey, John J.
*Dykhuizen, Robert F.
*Ebersole, John H.
*Fox, Lay M.
*Gallagher, William J., Jr.
*Ireland, Roger G.
*Klein, Chester L.
Kramer, Scott G.
*Laning, Robert C.
*Lehman, Ross M., Jr.
*Linehan, Francis J., Jr.
*Lonergan, Walter M.
*Long, James A.
*Martin, Stuart H.
*Milnes, Roger F.
Neptune, Edgar M., Jr.
*Pascoe, Delmar J.
Richardson, Fred W.
Rosenwinkel, Norbert E.
*Sparks, Henry A.
*Speaker, Richard B.
Steen, Frank G.
*Sweeney, Francis J.
*Trummer, Max J.
*Watten, Raymond H.
*Webb, Martin G., Jr.
*White, Neil V.
Wilber, Martin C.

SUPPLY CORPS

*Aitken, Douglas G.
*Balcom, Vaughnn O.
Baird, Richard S.
*Batterson, Robert E.
*Bland, Herbert L.
*Blandin, Sherman W., Jr.
Doucette, Forrest H.
*Duncan, Henry C.
*Dunn, George G.
Elmore, John W.
*Ericson, James B.
Forrest, James E.
*Grinstead, Eugene A., Jr.
Harbaugh, Norman R.
Haslett, Robert H.
Holbert, Kelley V.
Josselyn, Allan H., Jr.
Larson, Leslie O., Jr.
Lewis, Raymond O.
McHenry, Wendell, Jr.
*O'Loughlin, Richard C.
*Patton, Gerald J.
Peffley, John F.
Renfro, Edward E., III
Rodgers, Wallace F.
Tongren, Hale N.
*Williams, William C.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

*Capers, Keene H.
*Doyle, William F.
*Hutcheson, Richard G., Jr.
Keeley, John A.
Lavin, Henry T.
*Morton, Frank R.
Parham, Thomas D. Jr.
*Ray, Milton U.
Trower, Ross H.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Cunning, David P.
Forquer, Charles J.
Francy, William J.
Gault, Alan C.
*Grahl, Ralph B., Jr.
Hansen, Bernard L.
Iselin, Donald G.
Jones, Whitney B.
Kaloupek, William E.
Lalande, Albert M., Jr.
Miller, Charles G., Jr.
More, David C.
Patrick, Donald A.
*Rogers, William R.
Saunders, Edward M.
Souder, Charles L.
Spangler, William S.
Van Leer, Blake W.
Walton, Albion W., Jr.
Yount, George R.

DENTAL CORPS

*Bassett, Donald R.
Beall, Frank P., Jr.
Chap, Bernard
*Green, George H.
Holmes, Corey H.
Mahoney, Jack D.
*Marmarose, Frank A.
*Rogers, William J., Jr.
Samuels, Homer S.
Scribner, James H.
*Sobieski, Edward F.
Stephenson, Thomas D.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Baldridge, Henry D., Jr.
*Bing, John H.
Boyd, Thomas A., Jr.
Burr, Leonard W.
*Curtis, Ned B.
Eastman, Robert W.
*Goldenrath, Walter L.
*Keener, Mary F.
*Lester, William F.
McLellan, David J.
Miller, Lloyd W.
Rasmussen, John E.
Ray, Jewel P.
*Rigg, Robert F.
Sabbag, George J.
Shepherd, William H.

NURSE CORPS

Blaska, Burdette M.
Bulshefski, Veronica M.
Reilly, Alice R.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abbott, William B., III
*Abelein, Herman C.
Ackerman, Richard F.
*Ackerman, Warren J.
Adams, Robert L., Jr.
Addis, Robert W.
*Adler, Robert E.
Akagi, Joe L.
Aldern, Donald D.
Alexander, Adam G., Jr.
Alexander, Marvin G.
Alexich, Milton P.
Allen, Douglas A.
*Allen, James A.
Allen, John B.
Allen, Richard C.
*Allender, Gene T.
*Alley, Lester L.
Altwegg, David M.
Anderle, Charles K.
*Anderson, Charles L. R.
*Anderson, Norris O., Jr.
Anderson, Paul L.
*Anderson, Stanley J.
*Anderson, William J., III
Angier, Donald L.
*Anglim, Daniel F., Jr.
Applegarth, Samuel H., Jr.
Argiro, Vincent J.
Arn, Robert W.
*Arnold, Henry C., Jr.
Arnold, John E.
*Arp, Phillip S.
*Ashmore, Jackie K.
*Ashurst, Albert J.
*Asmus, Paul A.
*Aston, William J.
Atherton, Robert F.
*Ausbrooks, Erskine P., Jr.
Avallone, Eugene M.
Averyt, Howell D.
*Axthelm, Charles E.
Ayres, James H.
*Babine, Arthur L., Jr.
*Bachtold, James R.
Backman, Fred M.
Bacon, James A.
Badgett, John J.
*Baggett, Talmadge S.
Baillie, Richard H.
*Bain, Robert
*Baker, James E., Jr.
Baker, James G.
*Bakke, Harlan J.
Balchunas, Robert C.
Baldridge, Louis D., Jr.
Baldwin, Robert A.
*Barbee, Delbert F.
*Barker, Harold D.
Barker, Merle M.
*Barnard, Ralph E.
*Barnes, Clifford P.
Barnes, James P.
Barnett, Gerald P.
Barney, Glenn P.
Barrett, Gardner S.
Barrow, Robert W.
*Barunas, George A., Jr.
Batten, Charles G.
*Bauer, Edward C.
*Bauman, Charles J., Jr.
*Beasley, James W.
*Beates, James K.
Beatty, Lloyd D.
*Beck, Stuart M.
Beech, Wayne L.
Beecher, John D.
Beem, Jack M.
*Belk, Reece G., Jr.
*Bell, Gerald R.
*Bennett, Robert W.
Benton, Hugh A.
Berg, Frederick H.
*Bergman, Daniel
Bibby, Lowe H., III
*Bickel, William B.
*Bigenho, Roy M.
Bills, Robert G.
*Bippus, Henry
Bird, Charles S.
Blades, Lawrence T.
Blair, Closkey L., Jr.
Blake, Harry R., Jr.
*Blasi, Richard R.
*Blough, Arthur K., Jr.
*Boakes, William H.
Boles, Lee R.
Boles, Richard L.
*Borgstrom, Charles O., Jr.
Bos, Roger C.
Boschen, Henry C., Jr.
Bosse, Joseph H., Jr.
*Bowen, Jack W.
Bowen, William J.
*Bowers, Thomas L.
*Bowersox, Earl C., Jr.
*Bowling, William H.
*Braddy, Don L., Jr.
Bradford, Gerald R.
Bradshaw, Brice L.
*Brady, Allen C.
*Brainard, Donald R.
Brandel, William J., Jr.
*Brantley, William J.
*Bres, John H.
Bress, Allyn V.
Brewer, Glenn M.
Bridge, Daniel T.
Bridges, Kenneth K.
Bridgham, Russell B.
*Briggs, Douglas W.
Briggs, Edward F.
Broadwell, Edward A.
Brogan, Robert C.
Brooks, Walter A.
*Broomhead, Marvin S.
Brown, Bobby J.
*Brown, Bruce W.
Brown, Charles H.
Brown, Gideon L., Jr.
*Brown, Peter G.
Brown, Robert L.
*Bryan, Gordon R., Jr.
Bryant, William R.
*Buck, John A.
Bucklin, Jerald W.
*Buffkin, John W, Jr.
Burkemper, Raymond G.
*Burkhalter, Edward A., Jr.
Burnett, James A.
*Burnham, Rowland E.
*Burton, Herbert O.
*Bush, Charles L.
Butler, Charles A..
*Butts, John L.
*Buzzell, Carlisle W., Jr.
*Byrd, Paul R.
Cahill, William A., Jr.
*Calhoun, William P.
Califf, Toxey H.
Callahan, Earle R.
*Campbell, Neil V.
Campbell, Ronald A.
*Campbell, William E. Jr.
Campion, Robert F., Jr.
*Carlson, Burford A.
*Carlson, George R.
*Carraway, Terry F.
*Carter, Edward W., III
Case, Richard W.
Caskey, Donald L.
Cassani, Henry L.
Caswell, Frederic C., Jr.
Caudill, William E.
Cecil, Durward C.
Chambers, Lawrence C.
Chandler, Albert N., Jr.
Charbonneau, George L.
Chasse, Robert L.
Cheatham, Augustus B.
Cherrier, Herbert A.
Chertavian, Armen
Chesser, Samuel L.
Chewning, Robert W.
*Childers, Donald J.
Chisum, Oscar C.
*Christensen, Donald Albert
*Christenson, Donald Allen
Christie, Francis J.
*Church, George A.
Clare, James S.
*Clark, Andrew
*Clarke, John R.
*Clausner, Edward, Jr.
Clermont, William J., Jr.
*Clubb, Reginald D.
*Coale, William A.
*Cobern, Ernest L.
Coffman, Charles L.
Coiner, John A.
*Colenda, Herbert F.
*Collins, Charles H.
Collins, Frank C., Jr.
Collins, Harold E.
Combs, Robert E.
*Compton, Bryan W., Jr.
Condon, Edward J.
*Conlon, Frank S.
Connally, Robert F., III
Connell, Lewis E.
Connelly, Robert B.
Connors, Eugene T.
Conrad, Peter C.

*Cook, Carroll T.
Cooney, David M.
*Cooper, Carleton R.
Corbett, William J., III
*Cornelius, Winston W.
Cornwell, James W.
*Cornwell, Robert R.
Corsepius, Everett D.
Coski, Bernard J.
Costigan, Robert A.
*Crawley, Don E.
*Criner, James E.
Croft, Alfred J., Jr.
Cromwell, John P., Jr.
*Crosby, Russell U.
*Cross, Daniel F.
Cross, William F.
*Crowder, James P., Jr
Cullins, Peter K.
Cunningham, Melville D.
Cunningham, Richard B.
Cunningham, Alan R.
*Dagg, Robert M.
Dallaire, Richard P.
Dallamura, Richard A.
*Daly, Norman F.
*Danis, Anthony L., Jr.
*Danner, William P.
Darodda, Aldo J.
Darrell, Charles G.
Darwin, William C.
Davis, Henry J., Jr.
Davis, Jay K.
Davis, Michael C.
Davis, Paul H., Jr.
*Davis, Ralph O.
*Davis, William J.
Deaton, Paul
*DeCook, David W.
*DeFelice, Edward A.
Demun, Taylor K.
DeView, Joseph R.
*DeWitt, Duane D.
*Diers, Charles E.
*Dietrich, Henry T., Jr.
Dietz, Richard C.
*Dittmar, Louis C.
*Dobbins, John B., Jr.
Dodd, Charles A.
*Dodd, Robert L.
*Doering, Eugene R.
Doggett, William K.
Dorso, James N.
Drews, Sheldon
*Duke, Marvin L.
*Dukes, Warren C.
*Dunaway, Gene T.
*Dunbar, John P.
*Dungan, John D.
*Dunn, Robert F.
*Dunn, Theodore Y., Jr.
Dwyer, Laurence A.
Eakle, Burke E.
Earl, William C.
*Easterling, Crawford A.
Eastman, Alfred C., III
Ebbert, Edwin L.
*Eckert, Richard H.
*Eckhout, Wilmont S.
*Eckstein, John R.
*Edmonds, Hobart J., Jr.
Edmunds, Philip H.
Edris, Richard J.
Edwards, Chester C.
*Ehleringer, Henry G.
Ekman, Roger E.
Elder, James C.
*Elfelt, James S.
*Ellinghausen, Walter A., Jr.
Elliott, Charles L.
*Ellis, James L.
*Ellison, David J.
*Englehart, Harry J.
Engquist, Gordon W.
Enos, Ralph L.
*Erkelens, Clarence
Eshman, John R.
*Estabrook, Robert K.
*Estes, Dana, II
*Estes, Leland F.
Etchison, Frank L., Jr.
Evans, Daniel H., Jr.
Evans, Laverne E.
Farley, James W.
Farris, George K.
Federico, Charles D.
*Feit, Harry H., Jr.
*Fenton, Robert E.
Finn, Gerard P., Jr.
Fitzpatrick, Joseph A.
*Fletcher, Charles D.
Fontaine, Richard K.
Ford, James M., Jr.
*Forrester, James H.
*Forsyth, Robert J.
*Forsythe, Forrest
Foster, John F.
*Foster, Ralph W., Jr.
*Foster, William F.
Fowler, John W.
*Fox, Kenneth
Fox, Raymond G., Jr.
Frame, Edward L.
*Francis, John P.
Francis, Thomas A.
*Franke, Richard D.
Franklin, Billy D.
Fremd, Harry L.
*French, Jack T.
*Frost, William L.
Fruchterman, Richard L., Jr.
*Fuller, Robert B.
*Gaddy, James K.
Gahafer, Joseph G.
Gair, Bruce O.
Galing, Searcy G.
*Gallagher, Lawrence E.
*Gamber, Harold W.
Garcia, Jaime
*Gardner, Richard C.
*Gardner, Richmond
*Garrett, Everett C.
Gatje, George C.
Gearhart, Norman R.
*Geiger, Eugene D.
*Gerlach, Richard E.
Gibbins, Gareth W.
*Gilbertson, John E.
Gilchrist, John F., II
Gillcrist, Paul T.
*Gillespie, Charles R., Jr.
*Gire, Howard A.
Glancy, Thomas J., Jr.
*Goebel, Herman E., Jr.
Goetschius, Forrest D.
Gordon, David E.
*Goslow, Paul
*Gottschalk, Art W., Jr.
*Goulds, Ralph J.
*Govan, George W.
*Grady, Edward L., Jr.
*Graf, Harry R.
Grandfield, Francis J., Jr.
Grant, Richard T.
*Grant, Thaddeus R.
Granum, Bradford S.
Grappi, Robert L.
*Grayson, William R.
*Greathouse, David M.
*Green, John N.
*Green, Richard W.
*Green, Robert E.
*Greene, John L.
Greenleaf, Wilbur E.
Greff, Clarence H., Jr.
*Griffin, Jack R.
*Guffey, Elton E.
*Guion, Joseph E.
Gurney, Charles E., III
Gustaff, Vito J. V.
*Haff, William B.
Hahnert, William F., Jr.
Haight, Gardiner M.
Hale, William T.
Hall, Harrell W.
*Hall, Timothy K.
*Hallett, Edward R.
Hamilton, John W.
Hamilton, Leo L.
*Hampton, Charles T.
Hansen, Merle C.
Hansen, Ronald R.
*Hanson, Elighue G., Jr.
Harbick, Donald L.
Hardisty, Huntington
Harnden, Charles G.
*Harper, Lorren G.
Hart, Donald F.
Hart, Richard L.
*Hart, Stephen L.
*Hart, William D.
*Hartell, Ronald D.
*Hartigan, Richard B.
Hartnett, Bernard E., Jr.
*Hassman, Andrew U., Jr.
*Hausler, Carl O.
*Hawk, James T.
Hawkins, Phil R.
*Hayden, Glenn M.
Hayes, Morris L.
*Hayman, Robert B.
Head, John L.
Healy, Richard H.
Hedges, Ralph R.
Heenan, Richard D.
Heffernan, George A.
*Heigl, John T., Jr.
Henson, Otis A.
Heon, Robert H.
*Herbert, Thomas J.
*Herbig, Henry F.
*Herndon, William J., Jr.
*Herrin, Holden R.
Hession, James M.
Hetu, Herbert E.
*Hibson, Leo A., Jr.
Hicks, Harold F., Jr.
Hiehle, Frank G., Jr.
*Higginbotham, Leonard H.
Higgins, Clinton K., Jr.
*Hill, Howard A.
*Hill, James C.
*Hines, Gulmer A., Jr.
*Hinsen, Kenneth L.
*Hirz, Joseph D.
*Hodnett, Robert A.
Hoffman, Merle L.
*Hoganson, John H.
*Holland, James S.
*Holler, Edward R.
Hollick, Frederick B.
Holmberg, Lennart G.
Holt, Neil G.
*Holt, Robert E.
*Hoover, Richard M.
*Hopf, Elwood J.
Hopper, Richard S.
Horne, Charles F., III
Hovater, James D.
Howe, Richard B.
*Hubbs, Donald R.
Hughes, Peter F. H.
Hughes, Wayne P., Jr.
Hull, George T.
Hume, Robert J.
*Humphries, George P.
Hunt, Albert M.
*Hurd, Russell E.
Ingley, Edmund W.
Inman, Bobby R.
*Ismay, Arthur P.
Jaburg, Conrad J.
Jackson, Thomas L.
*Jameson, James N.
Janulis, George
Jarvies, John E.
Jarvis, Donald H.
Jayne, Gordon H.
*Jenkins, Paul J.
*Jenkins, Ralph A.
*Jennings, John S.
*Jermann, Donald R.
*Jesse, Harold W.
*Jett, William S., III
Jewell, Thomas A.
*Jimmerson, Thomas J., Jr.
*Johns, Arthur J.
Johns, Forrest R.
*Johnson, Dale C.
Johnson, Donald L.
Johnson, Guy D.
*Johnson, Joseph J.
*Johnson, Richard C.
*Johnson, Richard D.
*Johnston, Frederick B.
Johnston, Maurice M., Jr.
*Johnstone, Richard A.
Jones, Carol W.
Jones, John E.
Jones, Samuel O., Jr.
Kaczmarek, Carl C.
Karvala, Curtis A.
*Kasehagen, Arthur T.
*Katz, Martin
Kaulback, Russell D.
Keach, Donald L.
Keane, James P.
*Keathley, Charles C.
Kehoe, James W., Jr.
Kelley, Frederick W.
Kelln, Albert L.
Kelsey, Robert L.
Kemble, John R.
*Kennedy, Nevin, III
Kennedy, Ronald W.
Kennedy, Robert C.
Kennedy, Walter J.
*Kersch, Roger N.
Kilmer, Donald A.
*King, William R.
*Kingery, Samuel G.
Kinnebrew, Thomas R.
*Kinsley, Donald T.
*Kirchner, David P.
Kirschke, Ernest J.
*Klabo, Richard T.
*Klett, George J.
Knopp, William A.
Knutson, Donald W.
Knutson, Wilbert D.
*Koch, Richard A.
Koehler, Walter C., Jr.
Kollmann, Glenn E.
*Kollmorgen, Leland S.
Kosar, William S., Jr.
Kovarick, Frank L.
Kraft, Leroy M.
*Kramer, Robert P.
Kuehner, Karl E.
Kuhn, Edwin A.
Kully, Sheldon D.
*Kunkle, Floyd S., Jr.
*Lacy, James E.
Laighton, Robert H.
Lake, Charles M., Jr.
Lamb, Derwin T.
Lancaster, Robert W.
Langton, Charles E., Jr.
Larocque, George N.
*Larry, Walter C.
Lasowski, Donald T.
*Latimer, Samuel E., Jr.
*Lautermilch, Paul A., Jr.
Layman, Lawrence
*Leach, Everett N.
*Leach, Ralph W., Jr.
Leahy, John P.
*Leibold, William R.
*Leibowitz, Martin M.
*Leis, Alfred C.
Lenox, Glen W.
*Lentz, Charles M.
*Leppin, William F., Jr.
*Lewallen, John D.
Lewis, Charles G.
*Lewis, James R.
Lewis, James T.
*Libey, John D.
Lidel, Carl J.
Lighter, Elbert D.
*Lindsay, John D.
Liston, John M.
*Little, James G.
Loberger, James C.
Lockhart, Glenn S.
Lofton, Freeman L.
Logner, Robert L.
*Longhi, William J.
Looney, Francis L.
Loposer, Avery K., Jr.
Lounsberry, Jack A.
*Loyd, Rupert H.
Luckett, Thomas W.
Ludwick, Louis L.
Lukas, Thomas E.
Lunt, Vernon S.
*Luskin, Arthur G.
*MacFie, Richard B.
MacKercher, John C.
Madden, Raymond A.
*Madeo, Joseph F., Jr.
*Maice, Lee, Jr.
Mains, Homer O., Jr.
Malone, Roy W.
Manara, Vincent J., Jr.
Mann, Robert E.
Manring, Charles D.
Marbott, Henry W.
Marin, William T.
*Martin, William K.
Martin, William R.
Massimi, Robert F.
Matherson, Richard
Mattioni, Blasco
Mau, George W., Jr.
*Maxwell, Daryl O.
May, Porter E.
Maynard, Donald J.
*Mazzolini, John A.
*McAdams, John W., Jr.
*McAnulty, David J.
McBurney, William J.
*McCarthy, Francis X.
McCormick, Daniel G., III
McCutcheon, Edwin L.
McDaniel, Clarence L.
*McDonough, William D., Jr.
McFadden, Grafton R.
McGaughy, Richard W.
McGeachy, Francis L.
*McGlohn, Robin H., Jr.
McGrath, Harold A.
*McGuire, Eugene J.
McIntyre, John J.
*McKee, Kinnaird R.
*McKee, Samuel T.
*McKellar, Edward D., Jr.
*McLaughlin, Robert F.
*McLemore, Albert S.
*McLoughlin, James
McMillan, Donald G.
*McNally, John H.
McNeely, James S.
*McNerney, James F.
*McQueston, Jack E.
*McQuillin, John P.
McWey, Russell B.
McWilliams, Frederick F.
Mead, Theodore E.
Meader, Bruce I.
Meadows, Okey I.
Meek, Kenneth L.
*Meeks, Robert B., Jr.
Meeks, Thomas L.
Mehl, James P.
Meltzer, Melvin
*Mench, Leland E.
*Merchant, Paul G.
Merrill, Forest J.
*Merrill, Warren H.
*Merritt, Glen C.
Meserve, Charles L.
Messina, Sylvester C.
*Metcalf, Joseph, III
*Metz, Forrest E.
Mhoon, Fred M.
Michaels, Robert J.
*Mikkelsen, Richard E.
Milius, Paul L.
Miller, Donald A.
Miller, Floyd H., Jr.
*Miller, James P.
Miller, James L.
Miller, Kenneth R.
Miller, Robert L.
Miner, Duane A.
*Minnigerode, John H. B.
Mischke, Gayland J.
Mitchell, Edgar D.
*Mitchell, Joe C.
Mitchell, John R. C.
*Mitchell, "J" Wallace
Mitchell, Leland G.
Moffitt, Russell L.
*Montgomery, Graden L.
Moody, Thomas J.
Moore, Charles J.
Moore, Ernest M. Jr.
Moore, Loren I.
Moore, Mallie B.
Moore, Tommy C.
Moore, Virgil W., Jr.
Moriarty, Peter M.
*Morin, Richard J.
*Morris, Howard L.
Morris, Robert Eastin
Morris, Robert Elliott
*Morrow, Charles D.
Morse, Jack L.
Moss, William C., Jr.
Mountford, Edward J.
*Mow, Douglas F.
*Moyer, Donald R.
*Mueller, George E.
Mullin, James
Muncy, William E.
Murphy, Douglas C.
Murphy, Gilbert F., Jr.
Murphy, Ray D.
*Murray, Douglas V.
*Muto, Charles J.
Myers, Carroll E.
Myers, William S.
Nation, William C.
Naugle, James O.
Naylor, Charles K.
*Neff, Richmond B., Jr.
*Negron, Delis, Jr.
Nelson, Eric A., Jr.

Nelson, Jack H.
Nesky, Anthony, Jr.
*Nevius, William B.
*Newell, William C., Jr.
Newsome, James W.
Newton, Robert B.
Nolan, Joseph D.
*Norman, Frederick W., Jr.
Norman, Thomas V., Jr.
*North, Sylvester F.
*Northrup, Wilmer R., Jr.
Norton, Richard J.
*Nunneley, John K.
Nunneley, James K.
*Nyce, William E.
O'Brien, Jerome L.
O'Connell, James M.
O'Donnell, John H., Jr.
O'Donnell, John W.
Ogara, Patrick E.
Ogden, Howard A., Jr.
*O'Hara, Jack F.
O'Kane, John D.
O'Leary, William E.
*Olsen, Richard L., Jr.
Olson, James W.
Olson, Willard R.
*O'Meara, Charles K.
*Orem, John B., Jr.
Organ, James W.
Orvis, Peter H.
Orzalli, John B.
*Ostrand, Allen E.
*O'Toole, Kevin J.
Outlaw, Thurber A., Jr.
*Overbey, Frank E., Jr.
Overdorf, Thomas R.
*Owens, Robert L.
*Ozburn, Forrest C., Jr.
*Padgett, James P.
*Page, Carroll S., Jr.
Palatini, Glenn L.
*Palau, Henry S.
Palmer, Wallace C.
*Panciera, Vincent W.
Pappas, George T.
*Parker, Harry M., Jr.
Parks, William W.
Parrish, Donald E.
*Parthemer, Lloyd L.
*Paschal, Joseph B., Jr.
Patch, Irwin, Jr.
Pattee, Richard S.
Patten, Michael A.
*Patterson, Jerry C.
Paul, Raymond E.
Paul, Robert F.
*Paulk, Joseph M.
Pauly, Donald E.
Pearce, Earl H.
Pearson, John F., Jr.
*Pegues, John K., Jr.
Pendell, Carl R.
Penney, William R.
Pennypacker, William S.
Pentony, John F.
*Perry, Roger E., Jr.
*Pester, Benjamin H.
*Peterson, Loyd G., Jr.
*Peterson, Richard E.
*Pette, Donald C.
*Pettigrew, Raymond A.
*Peugh, Everett R.
*Pheasant, Alan G.
*Phillips, Alan R.
*Phillips, Harry E.
Phillips, William R.
Pierce, William H., Jr.
Pilon, Jerome R.
*Pinning, Joseph E.
Piper, Harold L.
*Piraino, Daniel
Pirrone, Anthony P.
Plow, Arthur E.
*Pogson, Charles H.
Pogue, David W.
Polatty, Donald B.
Pollak, Charles D.
Pouls, Michael C., Jr.
Powell, William V.
Powers, Trent R.
*Powers, Wilbur P.
*Prange, Eugene H.
Prezioso, Ronald
Prisby, Donald E.
Prosser, Walter R.
*Puccini, Joseph E., Jr.
*Pulley, Gerald P.
Quinn, Robert T.
Quitmeyer, Herman C.
Rabun, Floyd K.
*Radja, James E.
Rainville, Duane D.
*Raithel, Albert L., Jr.
Ramsey, David G.
Rankin, George M., Jr.
*Ray, Thermon L.
*Ray, Thomas B.
*Raymer, Edward C.
Raynes, Robert R.
Rea, Maurice W.
*Read, Garlin R.
Redfield, John M.
*Redman, James R.
Reed, Richard W.
Reed, William H.
*Regan, William B.
*Reh, Donald E.
*Reid, Albert R.
Renicky, Donald D.
*Rentz, Frank L., Jr.
*Replogle, Thomas H.
Reynolds, Roy S.
Ricardo, Benny J.
Rice, James O.
Richards, William C.
Richardson, Richard H.
Ries, Allen L.
*Rigsbee, Clifford M.
Rilling, Alexander W.
Riordan, Edward J.
Ritchey, Donald D.
*Rivard, Earl J.
Rivers, Wendell B.
Roane, Donald P.
Roberts, Charles T.
*Roberts, Dean E.
*Roberts, Douglas H.
Roberts, John A.
*Roberts, Robert E.
Roberts, William E.
Robertson, Douglas B.
*Robinson, Donald G., Jr.
*Robinson, Robert B.
Roby, Grady H.
Rockwell, Nevin L.
*Rockwell, Richard F.
*Rockwood, Jerred R.
*Rogers, James O.
Rogers, Richard J.
*Root, John B., Jr.
Rossoe, John W. F.
*Rough, Jimmie L.
*Roush, Randall C.
Rowland, James C.
*Rowland, Mervin
*Rowlands, David M.
*Rowley, Reginald C.
*Rubin, Arnold J.
*Rubins, Fredrick K.
*Rudy, Bryan C.
Ruecker, Kenneth H.
Rueff, Eugene C.
*Rush, Thornwell F.
Rushing, Charles F.
*Russ, Jack E.
*Russell, George G.
*Rutherford, Ralph B.
Sagerholm, James A.
*Salin, Robert S.
*Sample, Wilbur H.
*Sandberg, William G.
*Sarosdy, Louis R.
Sassone, Charles H., Jr.
Saunders, William H., III
*Saxton, Frank
Sayers, Robert M., Jr.
*Saylor, Eugene H.
Scarafone, Ronald
*Schaber, Rolph E.
Schack, Edwin R., Jr.
Schaer, Oscar
*Schlank, John J., Jr.
Schonenberg, Hans P.
*Schriefer, Walter A.
*Schubert, Leslie H., Jr.
Schuller, Gordon J.
*Schulte, Richard J.
*Schultz, Ford J. E.
*Schutz, Walter J.
*Schwartz, Sheldon O.
*Schwarz, Ira N.
Scott, John H., Jr.
Scull, John D.
Searfus, William H.
Sears, Glen R.
Sease, Hugh S., Jr.
*Seay, Wesley H., Jr.
Seeger, Charles E.
*Self, William H. C.
*Semeraro, Angelo P.
Service, James E.
Seymour, Ernest R.
*Shabe, Gerard P.
Shafer, Lawrence
*Shaffer, Guy H. B.
*Shaid, Robert A.
Shanahan, Thomas L.
*Shaughnessy, William D.
*Shaver, Frank T.
Sheehan, William F., Jr.
Sheldon, Robert E.
Shellman, Curtis B., Jr.
Sherar, Robert C.
*Sherman, Peter W.
*Shrine, Bertram, Jr.
*Shutty, Michael S.
Sierer, Payson D., Jr.
Sigmon, Harold F.
Sigsworth, David E.
*Simmons, Robert R.
Simon, Philip C.
Sims, Clifford M., Jr.
Sims, Gelzer L., Jr.
Sinclair, Alexander M.
Sisson, Donald E.
Skube, Edward A.
Skyrud, Jerome P.
*Small, Robert H.
Smedberg, William R., IV
Smeltzer, John L., Jr.
Smith, Carol C., Jr.
Smith, Hugh T.
Smith, Kenneth G.
Smith, Ordell
*Smith, Robert G.
Smith, Scott L.
*Smyth, James M.
*Snell, Glen A.
*Sobieski, Leonard J.
Solterer, Carl F.
*Soracco, David L.
Sorensen, Everett B.
Span, William F.
Speer, Richard T.
*Spencer, John R.
*Spencer, Robert W.
*Spowart, David J., Jr.
Springer, Howard C.
Sprunk, William, Jr.
Squires, Walter G., Jr.
Stader, John F.
Stalder, Roy F., Jr.
*Stalzer, Charles E.
Stanley, Joseph K.
*Stanley, Richard M.
Stark, Peter A., Jr.
Starn, Harrison F., Jr.
*Steckbauer, Theodore C.
*Stein, Earl M.
Stein, George D., Jr.
*Stenke, George
*Stephan, Robert A.
Stewart, Rodney L.
*Stewart, Thomas P.
Still, Donald A.
*St. Lawrence, William P., Jr.
*St. Marie, Joseph
Stocklmeir, Dean
Stoehr, Leonard A.
*Storeide, Arthur J.
*Storm, John S.
*Stornetta, Wakefield S. M.
Stout, Edward N.
Stovall, Walter W.
*Strand, John A., Jr.
Straney, Charles N.
*Stratmann, Charles I.
Streightiff, Charles W.
Strohm, James J.
Strong, William L.
Strunk, Arthur A.
Sullivan, Robert H.
Summers, Howard P.
*Surman, William V., Jr.
*Surovik, George A.
Sutherlin, Benjamin T. W.
Swank, Donald E.
*Swanson, Carl W., Jr.
*Swenson, Erick N.
Sylvester, Gerald D.
*Szymanski, Andrew G.
*Tallet, Arthur J.
Tallman, Elmer C.
Tate, Charles G.
Taylor, Clinton W.
Taylor, Edmund B., Jr.
*Taylor, Francis C.
Taylor, James D., Jr.
Taylor, Jesse J.
*Tennison, Lonnie D.
*Tetrick, Claude J.
Thamm, Tom B.
Thiel, Louis H. C., Jr.
Thomas, David H.
*Thomas, Gerald E.
*Thomas, John K.
Thomas, Kenneth G.
Thomas, Richard T.
Thomas, Robert J.
Thomas, Robert F.
Thompson, Archibald S.
Thompson, William S.
*Thomson, William O.
Tillerson, Leonard E.
*Tillotson, Ted K.
*Tillson, John G.
*Todd, Walter H., Jr.
*Tomb, Paul D.
*Tomsky, Jackson M.
*Townsend, "G" "E"
*Traub, Charles, III
Treadwell, Lawrence P., Jr.
Treiber, Arthur E.
Trans, Mike J.
Trimble, Richard W.
Troffer, George J., Jr.
*Trotter, Thomas K.
Troutman, Burl A., Jr.
*Tucker, Leonard L., Jr.
Turnage, Robert L.
*Turnbull, James R.
*Turner, Keith S.
*Turney, Robert F.
*Turpin, Lander H.
Tuzo, Lamar W.
*Tuzo, Paul B., III
Tyson, Billie C.
Uehlinger, John C.
*Utterback, Paul W.
Vahsen, George M.
*Vail, Harold W.
*Vaillancourt, Richard P.
Valade, Larry G.
VanArsdol, Robert A.
VanBuskirk, George F.
VanHook, Gordan
*VanReeth, Eugene W.
Varley, James F.
*Venable, Jack D.
Verser, John K.
*Vestal, Edwin C., Jr.
Victor, Francis W.
*Villanueva, Xavier V.
Wadsworth, Francis L.
*Wales, John R.
*Wallace, Donald E.
Wallace, Robert J.
Wandres, Victor C.
Ward, Arthur T.
Ward, Carl B.
Ward, John E.
*Ward, Thomas M., Jr.
*Warner, Brooks F.
*Wasilewski, Alex, Jr.
*Waterfield, Willard F.
*Waterloo, Francis C.
*Watson, Peter J.
Watson, Thomas W.
Webber, Gene D.
Webster, Edward W. V.
*Weeks, Robert H.
*Weisheit, Burton A.
Welch, Clyde R.
Wellman, Harold N.
Wenzel, Robert F.
*Werner, Robert V.
Wettroth, John R.
Wheeler, Robert A.
Whelan, Edward C., Jr.
Whelchel, Henry C., Jr.
Whistler, Ralph N., Jr.
*Whitaker, Robert M.
White, Maurice G.
White, Paul G., Jr.
White, Steven A.
*Whitmire, Vivien C.
*Whittemore, Frederick H.
Whorton, William R.
Whyte, Kent E.
*Wigent, Richard A.
*Wilber, Walter E.
Wilde, Stanford R.
Wilhelmi, Quentin E.
Wilkens, John, Jr.
*Wilkinson, Edward L.
Wilkinson, Joseph B., Jr.
*Williams, Allen D.
*Williams, Charles D.
Williams, Charles K.
Williams, John T.
Williams, Ross N.
Williard, Bobbie D.
*Willis, Chesley E., Jr.
Willis, Francis R.
*Willson, Donald K.
Wilson, Charles E.
Wilson, Donald M.
Wilson, Jack L.
Wilson, Robert R.
*Wilson, William W.
Wimberly, Tommy C.
*Winant, Barent P., III
*Winberg, William, III
*Winfrey, Harvey M., Jr.
Winfrey, John A., Jr.
Winkel, Raymond N.
Winkler, Richard C.
*Winnefeld, James A.
*Wiram, Gordon H.
Wise, William E.
Wolff, Kenneth E.
Wood, Cecil E.
*Wood, Lewis I.
Wood, Ralph E.
Wood, Stephen C.
*Woodbury, John L., Jr.
Woodbury, Robert E.
*Wooden, Neal R.
*Woods, Searle W.
*Worden, Dwight G.
Wright, Richard L.
Wright, Ross W.
Wynkoop, Thomas E.
Yamnicky, John D.
Yeager, George E.
Yetman, William R.
Yocom, Ernest
Yoran, George F., Jr.
*Young, Casanave H., Jr.
*Young, Robert A.
*Youngblood, Norman L., Jr.
Youngquist, John A.
Yount, Tim B.
Zacharias, Jerrold M.
*Zeisel, Richard S.
*Zoehrer, Herbert A.
Zvanovec, Ladimir J.

MEDICAL CORPS

Alexander, Charles E., Jr.
Andersen, Martin G.
Arana, Thomas
Atkins, Claude C.
Austin, James A.
*Baggett, Arthur E., Jr.
Baker, Richard A.
Balyeat, George E.
Barcay, Stephen J., Jr.
Bargatze, Fred O.
Barreca, Joseph P., Jr.
*Barsoum, Adib H.
Beaudry, Arthur A.
Belser, Robert D.
Best, William C.
Bingham, Elmer L.
Blackburn, Laurence H., Jr.
Borowsky, Melvin
Bowman, Ercil R., Jr.
Boyden, Douglas G.
Bramlett, Charner W.
Brisbin, Robert L.
*Brown, James M.
*Brown, Robert A.
Burke, Erwin L.
Carver, Michael C.
Childers, David O.
Clarke, Eugene J., Jr.
Colburn, James E.
Cooke, James K., Jr.
Cooper, Paul D., Jr.
Crews, Quintous E., Jr.
Daane, Thomas A.
Davis, Milton D.
Dean, Philip J.
de Arrigoitia-Rodriguez, Enrique M.
Debevoise, Neilson T.
Dempsey, William C.
Dewaal, Jan G.
Deyton, John W., Jr.
Easterling, James F.
Emich, Charles H.
Escajeda, Richard M.
Fairfax, George T.
Fosburg, Richard G.
George, Frederick
German, Roy E.
Gilchrist, Don K.

Glass, James L., Jr.
Glick, Herbert E.
Glover, Clarence K., Jr.
Hamlin, Charles R.
Harrison, Lucius A., Jr.
Hart, George B.
Houston, Harry R.
Hughes, James L.
Hughes, Luman H., Jr.
*Jensen, Joseph E., Jr.
*Jones, Robert C.
Jones, Warren J., Jr.
*Jones, Warren R.
Kane, John R.
*Kaufmann, Edwin D.
Kawaguchi, Toshiyuki P.
Kinneman, Robert E., Jr.
Knab, Douglas R.
Labudovich, Marco
Lambdin, Charles S.
Larson, Dale L.
Lee, Dixon A.
Linaweaver, Paul G., Jr.
Logan, Jerome A.
Lowery, Clinton H.
Lukas, John R.
Lukens, Robert W., Jr.
Maher, Francis L.
Mazzarella, Italo C.
McGrew, Clinton J., Jr.
McRoberts, Jay W.
Miller, Alan G.
Millerick, Joseph D.
Mills, Mitchell
Moga, Gregg M., Jr.
*Monahan, George F., Jr.
*Mozley, Paul D.
Mullen, Joseph T.
Mulligan, William P.
Mullin, Robert L.
Muntz, Keith S.
Neugebauer, Marion K.
O'Connell, Joseph P.
Plaut, Martin R.
Pratt, Hugh S., Jr.
Proulx, Ronald A.
Real, Jack D.
Rinaldi, "J" Jerome
Rivas, Hector M.
*Roberts, Franklin M.
Robinson, Donald W.
Rosa-Garcia, Mario E.
Royal, Orren L.
Rudinger, Edwin A.
Schanberger, John E.
Schorn, Victor G.
Seaton, Lewis H.
Stebbins, George G., Jr.
Stevens, John J.
Stotka, Victor L.
Sullivan, Edward J.
Sweeny, John P.
Teneyck, David R.
Trone, James N.
Trumble, Theodore J.
Upton, Richard T.
Varon, Myron I.
Wenger, Norman E.
Whetsell, Joe E.
*Wiggs, Alfred E., II
Willett, Leo V., Jr.
Woodstein, Ira J.
Young, James M.

SUPPLY CORPS

*Andrus, Harold R., Jr.
*Baker, Clovis M.
*Baker, James J., Jr.
*Ball, Thomas F., Jr.
Barrett, Charles W.
*Baunsgard, Perry E.
*Bayers, John A.
Benedict, Joseph W.
Boyce, Thomas A.
Boyle, John J.
*Bozewicz, John E.
Brady, James A.
*Bray, Joseph A., Jr.
Brett, Justin D.
*Brown, Everett G.
*Bruch, Herbert W.
*Burbank, Donald D.
Calais, Clifford A.
Carson, Donald E.
Cavanaugh, Alfred G.
*Chandler, Hugh H.
Crane, Barrett
*Devilbiss, Robert J.
Dickey, William H.
Donnelly, Goodwin III
Drake, William D.
Dreese, Richard N.
*Dunlevy, John H.
Durham, Graydon M., Jr.
Edsall, Van T.
Fanelty, William C.
Foster, Robert W.
Frost, Shirley D.
Hamilton, Oliver W., Jr.
*Hamilton, William C., Jr.
*Hammond, James E.
*Hansen, Neil K.
Harris, Emerson M.
*Hendershot, Theodore R.
Henderson, John S.
Hill, Robert E.
Huising, Don L.
Hurt, Richard O.
*Hutchinson, Arthur E.
Galvez, Richard M.
Gillespie, James A., Jr.
Giordano, Andrew A.
Goeres, Gerald F.
Gordon, Donald B.
Gudbranson, Larry G.
Guffy, Wellard R.
Gustavson, Arthur R.
Jackson, Arthur D.
*James, Billy M.
Jerich, Frank J.
*Johnson, Ernie F.
Kauder, Robert
Kerwath, Richard C. F.
*Kick, David L.
King, Gerald H.
Kirch, Frederick J.
Klatt, Ivan J.
Kohl, Jacob D.
*Kreissl, Leary B.
Landfair, Robert W.
Luoto, Hugo M., Jr.
Mayer, William H.
*McNally, Joseph J.
*Mija, Theodore
*Mitchell, Billy R.
*Mitchell, William F.
Morrison, Quinn B.
*Morrow, David F.
*Mulligan, Thomas J., Jr.
*Nehez, James R., Jr.
*Nelson, George W.
Newman, William H.
*Pettijohn, Thomas P.
*Phleger, Charles P.
Picht, George C.
*Porter, Orland A., Jr.
Postak, John N.
Postich, George
*Reade, Lowell A.
Reynolds, Richard F.
*Rhodes, Daniel M.
*Rice, Charles E.
*Rixey, Charles W.
Ryan, William J.
Samuelson, Charles H.
Sandrock, John E.
Schriner, James A.
Searles, Donald W.
*Shealy, Oscar C., Jr.
Short, Carl W.
*Simcich, Alfred F.
Smith, Charles E.
*Smith, Herbert R.
Spears, Laurence
*Stevens, Robert J.
*Stratton, Dene B.
*Tapp, James G.
Tesch, Donald A.
Thomas, Magnus R.
Thompson, Gerald J.
*Tracy, George D.
Trueblood, Howard G.
*Umstead, Walter W., Jr.
Wadsworth, Ben A., Jr.
Waller, Edmund M., Jr.
*Wasson, John A.
*Watson, Lawrence A.
Weisskopf, William M.
*Welge, Harry K.
Wells, John L., Jr.
*White, George H.
*Will, James C.
*Wirsing, John A.
York, William B., Jr.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bareiss, Richard E.
*Berger, John W.
*Berry, Reginald A.
Bevan, Leroy A.
Bontrager, John K.
Carr, John F.
*Conte, James W.
Cooper, William D.
*Dillard, Donald H.
Duffy, John J.
Fairchild, Benjamin C.
*Feagins, Walter B., Jr.
*Flatley, Eugene T.
Foelber, Robert E.
*Ford, Thaine E.
*Frimenko, Michael
*Fuller, William C.
*Geary, Joseph F.
*Hardage, Owen A., Jr.
*Heaney, Harold V.
*Hershberger, John R., Jr.
Hogan, James J.
*Howland, Barker C.
*Huffman, William W.
*Insko, Myron C.
Johns, Harry D.
*Keen, Homer E., Jr.
Kuzawa, Edward S.
Lamond, Bernard J.
*Lang, Robert F.
Letten, Lloyd W., Jr.
Linzey, Stanford, E., Jr.
Miller, Harry R.
Moore, John T.
Morrill, Giles D.
*Nelson, Everett B.
*Nerthling, Edwin J.
*O'Brien, Robert P.
*Perry, Johnie L.
*Rittenhouse, James C.
Roberts, Maurice E.
*Samuel, William R.
Schaeffer, John F., Jr.
Schmid, Calvin F.
Shaw, Charles A.
Simmons, David E.
*Stroman, Henry W.
*Szczesny, Charles A.
Taylor, Gerald W.
Thompson, John E.
*Veltman, Dean K.
*Winterhoff, Norman E.
*Zeller, Dwight F.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Armatrout, Merritt F.
Bannister, William H.
Biederman, Jack C.
*Bodtke, David H.
*Butler, Charles W.
*Church, Archer E., Jr.
Coughlin, Richard D.
*Courtright, Carl
*Degroot, Ward W., III
Dixon, Olin L., III
*Fail, Raymond P., Jr.
Field, Robert T.
Gates, Paul R.
Green, Lawrence J.
*Litke, Robert A.
Mooney, Malcolm T.
*Mueller, William A.
Myers, Clayman C., Jr.
*Olson, Paul D.
*Raber, Robert R.
Saravia, Benjamin L.
*Stevens, Warren G.
Sutherland, Andrew G.
Sutley, Robert M.
*Trueblood, Donald R.
Williams, Curtis R., Jr.
Williams, Edward J., Jr.
Wilson, William L.
*Wingast, Stanley
Zobel, William M.

DENTAL CORPS

Allensworth, Thomas M., Jr.
*Armstrong, William P.
*Bradley, Kenton T.
Brault, Alfred O.
*Chutter, Reinald J.
Clark, Charles N., III
Collevecchio, Emidio J.
Collier, Richard D.
Corderman, Roy C., Jr.
Cotton, William R.
*Deaton, Herbert C.
*Enoch, James D.
*Evans, Charles G.
*Falcone, Philip R.
Fulcher, Clyde L.
Gaston, Robert A.
Hall, Ollie V., Jr.
*Hardin, Jefferson F.
*Hembre, Lloyd E.
*Hyde, Jack E.
Jackson, Clyde R.
Kaneshiro, Kenneth K.
Keene, Harris J.
Kelly, James F.
Koutrakos, John
Lawrence, Joseph J., Jr.
Lommel, Tennyson J.
Longton, Robert W.
*Luther, Norman K.
Muller, Henry, III
Phillips, James W.
Prince, Richard D.
Russell, John R.
Sand, Ralph E.
Schultz, Chester J., Jr.
Scott, James F.
Shiller, William R.
Shirley, Robert E.
Slagle, Lowell E.
Strauss, Philip W.
Timby, Robert E.
Tugwell, Howard S.
Ulrey, Richard D.
Vessey, Robert A.
Watkins, Eugene A., Sr.
Whatley, Thomas L.

MEDICAL SERVICES CORPS

*Akers, Thomas G.
Bean, Willis E.
*Berry, Newell H.
*Boudreaux, Joseph C., Jr.
Browne, Weldon G., Jr.
Daniel, Harold E.
*DeWitt, Richard G.
Doucet, Louis E.
*Dowling, James H.
Drake, Wilbur R.
*Duffey, William S.
Ferris, Ezra F.
*Flaherty, Edward M.
Garver, Richard M.
*Gellman, Martin
Green, Gale R.
Green, William J., Jr.
Harris, Albert C.
Holcombe, John T.
Honish, Joseph E.
Howard, Wallace R.
Hughes, Robert G.
*Jordan, Robert D.
Karrer, John L.
Litalien, Robert V.
Mateik, Edward D.
McClendon, Frank O., Jr.
McConville, William E.
*McIlraith, James D.
McIntosh, Francis W.
McKay, Charles E.
Meyer, Robert E.
*Mitchell, Thomas G.
Owen, Orville K.
Peppler, Leonard A.
Ragle, Philip R.
*Reed, Robert F.
Robinson, Donald J.
*Rudolph, Henry S.
Schindele, Rodger F.
*Schlamm, Norbert A.
Shaffer, Weller J., Jr.
*Summerour, Thomas J.
Tedford, Charles F.
Williams, Daniel N.
*Zaller, Frank A.

NURSE CORPS

Bryan, Francis E.
Conder, Maxine
Dalmaso, Amelia M.
*Davis, Alice L.
Gagnon, Eva M.
Gardill, Norma H.
Hogan, Hazel L.
Miller, Jean L.
Parent, Shirley M.
*Polignone, Josephine M.
Stipe, Gloria J.
Stone, Charlotte R.
Weeter, Bessie R.
Williams, Alice K.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abbott, William A.
*Ace, Robert F.
*Adams, Ben L.
*Adams, Frederick G.
*Adams, Harold W.
*Adams, James J.
*Adams, Jerome B.
*Adams, Jessie W.
Adams, Ralph J.
Adams, Samuel W., Jr.
*Adams, Thomas C.
*Addison, Carl W., Jr.
Aderholt, William L., Jr.
*Adgent, Robert B.
*Ahrenstein, Monroe J.
Ailes, Robert H.
*Ake, Charles F.
Alberda, Donald E.
Alberg, Donald J.
Albero, Carl M.
*Albright, William E., Jr.
*Albritton, David L.
Aldana, Louis P.
Alexander, William T.
Alexander, John C., Jr.
*Alexander, Sherman G.
*Allemang, John D.
Allen, Alvin K.
*Allen, Archie E.
*Allen, David L.
Allen, George S.
*Allen, John E.
*Allen, Robert L., Jr.
Allison, Kenneth L.
Almstedt, Theodore A., Jr.
*Alton, Homer W.
Alvarez, Franklin F.
*Alves, Arcenio, Jr.
Ambos, Brooks L., Jr.
*Ames, Laverne W.
Andersen, Leonard H.
Anderson, Archie A.
Anderson, Anders T.
*Anderson, Charles R.
*Anderson, Edwin K.
Anderson, Edward E., Jr.
Anderson, Franklin W.
*Anderson, Gary M.
*Anderson, George B.
*Anderson, James B.
*Anderson, John A.
*Anderson, Peter N.
Anderson, Ronald M.
*Anderson, Thomas J.
*Anderson, Thomas A.
*Andrade, Allan L.
Andrews, Charles H., Jr.
*Angus, Marvin S.
*Anthony, Phillip D.
*Appelhof, Gilbert A.
*Apple, John D., Jr.
*Aquilino, Salvatore P.
*Araki, Makoto
Arcuni, Philip
*Armor, Jack M.
*Armstrong, Clarence E., Jr.
*Arnold, David L.
*Arnold, James G.
*Arnold, Thomas F.
Arthur, Stanley R.
*Arvin, Vernon E.
*Ashbacher, Raymond W.
Atkins, Brandon T.
Atwell, Robert F., III
*Aucoin, James B.
*Audilet, Garland O.
*Ausley, Joe H., Jr.
*Austin, Ellis E.

*Avery, Paul R.
Avila, John, Jr.
Avila, Raymond D.
Avis, Dwight E., Jr.,
*Aydt, Roger D.
*Ayers, Harry P., Jr.
Aylward, William E.
*Ayres, David R.
*Ayres, Gordon K.
Baakkonen, Ronald R.
*Baals, John R.
*Bachman, Robert A.
*Bailes, Ralph T.
*Bailey, George M.
*Bailey, James E.
*Bailey, John H., Jr.
Bailey, Samuel M., Jr.
Bailey, William B.
*Bajuk, Donald R.
*Baker, Donald A.
Baker, Jack
*Baker, John K.
Baker, Peter A.
*Baker, Robert E.
*Baker, Robert C.
*Baker, Robert G.
Baker, Robert B.
Baker, Ronald E.
*Baldwin, Oa F.
Baldwin, Roger L.
Ball, Daniel L.
Ball, Marvin L., Jr.
Ballantine, James C., Jr.
*Ballou, James E.
Ballou, Joseph F.
*Balsley, Joseph W.
*Bandy, Clifford W.
Bangert, James E.
Bank, Milton H., II
*Bankowski, Walter F.
*Banks, William K.
*Barbour, William J., Jr.
Barclay, Gordon J.
*Barenti, Jerome C.
*Baril, Robert F.
Barker, Ernest W.
Barker, Harold D.
Barker, Nathaniel C.
Barker, Richard H.
Barlow, John R.
*Barnes, James H.
*Barnes, Joel F.
Barnes, Paul D.
*Barnett, Stephen B.
*Barney, Charles R.
*Barnhardt, David F.
*Barnhart, Harold D.
Barnum, Craig L.
*Barret, Lee E., Jr.
Barrett, Maurice J., Jr.
*Barrigar, Donald B.
*Barringer, Robert A.
Barstow, Kenneth W.
Bartee, William J.
Bartlett, Larry D.
*Bartley, Robert H.
Bartocci, John E.
Barton, Bryan W.
*Barton, Robert L.
*Bassett, Charles G.
Bassin, Paul H.
Bauer, Herbert
*Bauer, Paul F., Jr.
*Bauman, John M.
*Baumgartner, James A.
*Baumstark, Richard B.
*Bauschka, Patrick F.
*Beagle, Clyde A., Jr.
Beakey, Jack D.
*Beall, Thomas J.
*Beamon, Joseph E., II
*Bean, Lynn B.
*Bear, Dale F.
Beasley, Charles J.
Beatty, Don G.
Beatty, James R., III
Beck, Donald E.
Beedle, Leland S., Jr.
*Beene, Jerry T.
Behrends, Paul O.
*Belisle, Gerald M.
Bell, Robert T.
Bell, Roger Q.
*Bellinger, John R.
*Belto, Meryl A.
Bender, James E.
*Bendit, Billy L.
*Benediktsson, Philip W.
*Benjamin, Charles L.
*Bennett, Peter C.
Bennington, Bruce A.
*Benoit, Richard S.
*Bentley, Arthur L.
*Bentley, Robert E.
*Benz, Philip H.
Benz, Valentine G.
*Berg, Milfred C.
*Berg, Werner G.
*Bergfeld, Rudolph P., III
*Bergman, Walter R.
*Bernard, Eugene C.
*Berry, Roy A.
Bertrand, Jon S.
*Bess, George D.
*Best, Albert H., III
*Bethea, Carl L.
*Bethel, Robert G.
Betterton, Thomas C.
*Betts, Roger S.
*Betts, William M.
*Bevan, John A., Jr.
*Beving, Duane U.
*Bewley, Jack D.
Bickmore, Edward C., Jr.
Biele, Charles E., Jr.
*Bigler, William W.
*Biles, George E.
*Bilicki, Daniel R.
*Billings, Alfred J.
Billings, Charles H.
*Binger, James D.
Bingham, Tad H.
Binsfeld, Arthur J.
*Bird, Richard E.
*Bird, Thomas C.
*Bisek, Dennis G.
*Bishop, Doyse R.
*Bishop, Jack D.
*Bishop, Larry D.
Black, Arnold E., Jr.
Black, Richard O.
Black, Robert J.
Blackner, Ronald K.
*Blair, David B.
Blair, Frank
*Blaisdell, Richard W.
Blake, Raymond G.
Blanchard, Lewis T.
*Blankenship, James M., II
Blasko, John E.
Blessing, George R.
Bletch, James W.
*Bloise, James E.
*Blouin, Robert E.
*Blumie, John A.
*Bocim, William T.
*Bode, Michael G.
*Boebert, Frank L., Jr.
*Boelter, Dan A.
Boerner, Delbert D.
Boggess, Paul E.
Boggs, Harold A., Jr.
*Boguslawski, William T.
Bohls, Donald W., Jr.
Boice, Frank B.
Boling, James R.
*Bolte, William S.
*Bolton, John M.
Bond, Charles S.
*Bone, John S., Jr.
*Bonhag, Walter D., Jr.
Bonsall, Frederic M.
*Booth, Peter B.
*Borcik, Andrew J., Jr.
Borden, Robert C., Jr.
Bornstein, Paul A.
*Bossert, John L.
Bostick, James H.
*Bouder, Raymond S.
Bower, Bruce B.
Bower, Richard D.
*Bowers, John P.
*Bowers, Richard F.
Bowers, Robert L.
*Bowlin, James F.
Bowman, Henry C.
*Box, Roger E.
*Boyd, Jack
*Boyer, Jesse V., Jr.
Boyle, James T.
*Boyle, Ronald R.
*Boyles, Harlan H.
Boyne, Peter B.
*Bradford, "J" "W"
Bradley, Frederick L., Jr.
Bradley, Walter S., Jr.
*Brame, Willie C., Jr.
Brandenburg, Robert L.
Branin, John W.
*Branscomb, Max G.
*Braunschweiger, Andrew E.
Brazzon, Robert
Breckon, Richard L.
Bredbeck, William J.
*Bredderman, Rudolf T.
Breed, William L.
*Bremser, William J., Jr.
*Brenneman, Harold R.
*Brennen, William L.
Brenner, Leroy E.
Brewton, Edward A.
*Briggs, Stanley
*Bright, Richard A.
*Bright, Thomas B.
Brittain, Jimmy R.
*Britton, Jack B.
*Britton, Vernon J., Jr.
Bronson, Edward F.
*Bronson, Hiram S., III
Brookes, Allan G., Jr.
*Brooks, Bernard A.
Brooks, Dennis M.
*Brooks, James W.
*Brooks, Otis M.
*Brothers, John W., Jr.
*Broton, Chester F.
*Brown, Bruce F.
*Brown, Charles E., II
*Brown, Claude C.
*Brown, Daniell M.
Brown, Donald G.
*Brown, Donald L.
*Brown, Frederick J.
*Brown, Howard A.
*Brown, James E.
Brown, James J.
*Brown, Ora D., III
Brown, Parke L., Jr.
*Brown, Peter J.
*Brown, Ralph N.
*Brown, Ralph E., Jr.
Brown, Randall R.
*Brown, Robert H., III
*Brown, Roger W., Jr.
Brown, Thomas S.
*Brown, William S., Jr.
Brown, William T.
*Brown, William M.
*Browning, Elmer L.
*Browning, Wayne B.
*Broyles, Bill R.
*Bruen, George M.
Bruni, Richard L.
*Bruso, James W.
*Bruyere, Thomas E.
*Bryan, John E., Jr.
*Bryans, Brian K.
*Bryant, Don M.
Bryant, George W.
*Bryant, "H" Donald
Bryant, Leroy
*Buchwald, Robert D.
Buck, David E.
Buck, Ralph V.
Buck, Wilbur P.
*Buckland, Rann K.
*Buckley, Jimmy L.
Buchner, James A.
*Bueche, Arthur H. Jr.
*Buehler, William S.
Buffkin, Charles R.
*Buggy, Joseph S.
Builder, Gustav F.
Bull, John S.
Bullene, Richard E.
Bullock, Harold O., Jr.
Bumbaca, Dominic J.
Bump, Stanley E.
*Burch, Jesse C.
Burcher, Philip E.
Burchett, Chester W.
*Burdick, Howard F., Jr.
*Burgess, Eric C.
Burgess, John E.
*Burke, Joseph S.
Burke, Michael T.
Burke, Thomas J.
Burleigh, David P.
*Burleson, Frank M.
Burns, Gerald J.
*Burns, James W.
Burns, James M.
Burns, John D.
*Burpo, James H.
*Burrows, Jack
Burrows, James B.
*Burson, Donald L.
*Burt, Russell H.
*Burton, James L., Jr.
*Busby, Richard E.
*Bush, Vernon R.
*Bushnell, Malcom W.
*Butler, Clarence B.
Butler, Robert P.
Butner, Richard W.
Butsch, Lester H.
Butterfield, David L.
*Button, Ralph L.
*Butts, Richard F.
Byers, Carl A.
Byers, John M.
*Bylund, Howard E.
*Byng, Weston H.
Bynon, Robert W.
*Byrom, James T.
Caciola, James J.
Cahill, Lionel A., Jr.
*Cahill, Walter A.
*Cain, William L.
*Caine, Paul E.
*Caldwell, John M.
*Caldwell, Leland C.
*Caldwell, Theodore E
*Calhan, James R.
*Callahan, John F., Jr.
*Callaway, Jack M.
*Callnin, William J.
*Camacho, Richard G.
*Camp, Joe D.
*Campbell, Carl E.
*Campbell, John R.
*Campbell, Norman D
*Campbell, Ronald K.
*Campbell, Thomas G
*Cannon, James R.
*Capley, Joe H.
Cappabianca, Domenic R.
*Carder, Denny M.
Cargill, Denny B.
*Carlson, Richard A., Jr.
Carlson, Robert G.
*Carlson, Walter G.
Carnefix, Jack H.
Carnes, James R., Jr.
Carptenter, Rex N.
*Carpenter, James
*Carpenter, Jack R.
Carr, Samuel L.
*Carre, David M., Jr.
*Carrigan, Richard C.
*Carroll, Peter A.
Carson, William G.
*Carswell, Michael S.
*Carter, Richard A.
*Casey, Richard F.
*Casey, Ronald C.
Cashman, James M.
*Cason, Louis J.
*Castle, Ronald G.
*Cates, Gus V.
Cathro, Alexander Y.
*Catoe, Ralph D.
*Catola, Stanley G.
*Catron, Jerry M.
Chadwick, Charles A.
Chaffee, Roger B.
*Chalmers, William C.
Chambers, Richard K.
*Chancellor, Dean H.
*Chancy, Thomas M.
Chanslor, Richard M.
Chapman, Rodney M.
Charles, Richard N.
*Charneco, Carlos M., Jr.
Charpentier, Vincent F.
Chase, Robert M., Jr.
*Chase, Warren T., Jr.
*Chatham, Walter L.
*Chauncey, Arvin R.
*Chestnut, Lawrence, Jr.
*Chrans, Ronald L.
Christensen, Ejnar S., Jr.
*Christensen, Cyrus R.
Christensen, John E., Jr.
*Christensen, Charles C.
Christenson, Robert W. S.
Christenson, William C.
*Christian, Alvern D.
*Chistopher, Allyn C.
Christopher, Maurice A.
*Chumley, Sylvester G.
Cicchetto, Mario J.
Clancy, Wilbert C.
*Clark, Bruce A.
*Clark, Fred L.
*Clark, George G.
*Clark, George E.
*Clark, James M.
Clark, Loren L.
*Clark, Thomas B.
Clarke, Douglas L.
*Clay, Jack D.
*Clayton, George H., Jr.
*Cleary, Patrick R.
Clem, David W.
Clevenger, Redmond L.
Clock, Harry S.
*Clock, Richard V.
*Clynes, Charles E.
Cobb, David W.
*Cobb, Roy L.
*Cobean, Samuel W.
Cobi, Frederick B.
*Cochran, Thomas L.
*Cochran, William F.
*Cocotis, Bruce T.
Coe, Kerry E.
Coen, Francis M.
Coffee, Gerald L.
*Coffey, Robert C.
*Coffman, William R., Jr.
*Cohen, Milton N.
*Cokefair, Judson K.
Cole, William M., II
Coleman, James J.
*Coleman, Joseph S., Jr.
*Collard, Keith P.
Collins, David M.
*Collins, Erwin A.
*Collins, Jay R.
*Collins, Leroy, Jr.
*Comstock, George W.
*Condron, Thomas E.
Conklin, Andrew J.
*Connell, Laurence M.
*Connelly, John J., Jr.
Conner, Eugene D.
*Connery, John D.
*Connolly, Leo J.
Connor, Ronald L. F.
*Conti, Francis A.
*Cook, Herman K.
*Cook, Richard D.
Cook, Thomas L. P.
*Cook, Wilmer P.
Coolbaugh, Jesse D.
*Cooley, David L.
*Coolidge, Julian L., II
Cooper, David S.
Cooper, John D., Jr.
*Cooper, Scott E.
Corbeil, Rodolphe N.
Cordle, "J" "T"
*Corica, Kenneth J.
*Corkins, Charles W., Jr.
*Corkrum, Richard C.
*Cornell, John P.
*Cornett, Charles S., Jr.
Corr, Peter S., Jr.
*Corrigan, Richard W.
*Cosgrove, Robert R.
*Costello, Donald H.
*Costilow, Kenneth L.
Coulbourn, Samuel W.
*Counsell, Duane J.
Couture, John F.
Cowan, Terrance E.
*Cowling, Cecil G.
*Cox, Edward F.
Cox, James P.
*Cox, Larry G.
Cox, Robert L.
Cox, William W.
*Coyle, Charles A.
*Coyne, Thomas
*Coyne, William L.
*Cracknell, William H., Jr.
Craig, Harry E.
*Cramer, Dean E.
*Cramer, Edward A., Jr.
*Cramer, Erich H. E.
*Crawford, Paul G.
*Cremo, John, Jr.
*Cress, Robert B.
Creswell, Lawrence K.
*Crew, Perry L.
*Crickey, James E., Jr.
*Crim, Billy R.
Cromer, Charles C.
*Crook, Bernard
Cross, Claude C.
*Crouse, David R.
Crowe, William M., Jr.
Crowell, Robert L.

*Crowson, Christopher G.
Crozier, Ronald L.
*Cruse, Reese E.
*Crutchfield, Claud C.
Cueroni, Lee A.
*Culberson, George W., Jr.
*Cullen, Joseph P.
Cumblidge, Kenneth E.
*Cummins, Clarence M.
Cundari, Francis L.
*Cunningham, Donald E.
Cunningham, Joseph F.
Curlee, John L.
*Curry, Keith R. W.
Curry, Newell L.
Curry, William H., Jr.
*Curtis, Joe C., Jr.
Curtis, Paul J.
*Cust, Harlan R.
*Cutter, Alan B.
*Cyr, Byron A.
*Czar, Raymond J.
*Dahl, Lowell D.
*Dailey, Eugene O.
Daly, Frederick T., III
*Daly, John S.
Dammann, Frederick O.
*Dangelo, Anthony V., Jr.
Daniels, Eugene R.
Daniels, Louis D.
*Daniels, Richard O.
Daniels, Robert D.
*Dankel, Kenneth M.
Darby, Thomas E., Jr.
*Darling, David D.
*Daum, Richard A.
Davenport, Charles A.
*David, Ralph H.
Davis, Dennis L.
*Davis, Donald V.
*Davis, George E.
*Davis, Howard C.
*Davis, Jimmy W.
Davis, John W., Jr.
Davis, Lyle E.
Davis, Philip C.
Davis, Robert E.
*Davis, Robert B.
Davis, Robert D.
Davis, Robert J.
*Davis, Thomas A.
*Davison, Gregory L.
Daws, James R.
*Day, James O.
Dean, Bill C.
*Dean, Robert V.
Dearman, James M.
*Debode, Donald G.
*Deboxtel, Lawrence L., Jr.
Deegan, Robert F.
*Deering, Robert M.
Deesch, Earl H.
Defibaugh, Carl F., Jr.
Degress, Francis B., III
*Degroot, Henry Jr.
Delange, Merrill A.
Delashmitt, Robert E.
*Deleon, John T.
Demarco, Anthony R.
Demarest, Joseph G., III.
*Demarino, Thomas V.
Demars, Bruce
*Dement, Ira B.
*Demers, Henry J., Jr.
*Denison, William F.
*Dennis, Don J.
Dennis, Jefferson R., Jr.
*Dennis, Paul L.
*Denoon, Norman L.
*Denton, Douglas J.
*Deutermann, David W.
*Dewey, Richard F.
*Dewitt, Michael T.
Dewitt, William H.
*Dickens, Russell J.
Dickens, Russell D.
*Dickerson, Kenneth A.
Dickey, James P.
*Dickey, John E.
Dickey, Kenneth R.
Didier, Jacob P., Jr.
Dillard, John S.
Disher, John S.
Dixon, John C.
Dixon, Ned E.
Dockweiler, Ernest W.
Dodd, Jimmy J.
*Dodge, Richard H.
*Doebbler, Gordon B.
*Dolan, John H.
Dollenmeyer, James K.
Dolliver, Richard H.
*Donahue, John F.
*Donlan, William J.
*Donley, James M.
*Donnegan, Richard
Donnelly, Thomas F.
*Donohue, Douglas J.
Doragh, Robert A.
*Doubroff, Jerome S.
Doughdrill, Charles W.
Dove, Ray W., Jr.
*Drake, Donald L.
*Draney, Jerald L.
Draper, Tim L.
Drew, Kenneth W.
Duben, Edward M.
*Duckworth, Jess R.
*Duffield, Frederick H., Jr.
Duffy, Leonard C.
Dugan, Ferdinand C., III
Dulik, Andrew F.
*Dumas, Paul J.
*Dungan, David A.
Dunham, William C.
Dunlap, James H.
Dunlap, Stanton P.
*Dunn, Robert R.
Duplechin, Eliott J.
*Durckel, Ronald E.
*Duval, Thomas J.
*Dvorak, Robert
*Dwyer, William L.
*Dyer, Nathaniel B., Jr.
Dyer, Thomas E.
*Dyer, William E.
*Dyro, Stanislaus G.
*Eagye, Vernon A.
*Earhart, Kay E.
*Earnest, Charles M.
Easter, Haroldean E.
Edgar, Gail W.
Edney, Leon A.
*Edwards, Claude E., Jr.
*Edwards, Joe D.
Edwards, Joshua V.
*Edwards, Walter J.
*Egan, Robert W.
*Eiken, Donald N.
*Eisele, Roderick L.
*Elfsten, Robert N.
*Elgen, Thomas D.
Elich, Robert L.
*Elinski, Michael, Jr.
*Ellingson, Norman D.
*Ellingwood, Arthur R., Jr.
*Elliot, Arthur J., II
*Elliott, Bernard C.
*Ellis, Frank K.
*Ellis, Hal R., III
Ellsworth, Warren R., Jr.
*Elpers, William W.
*Emerick, Charles D.
*Emery, William F.
*Emmerson, Milo E.
Emmett, Richard F.
*Emsley, Albert P., Jr.
*Endo, Norio B.
*Engelhardt, James H.
*England, Robert N.
Enkeboll, Richard E.
*Eoff, Albert W., II
Epstein, Julian D.
Ericksen, Peter E.
Erickson, Larry D.
Erikson, Theodore W.
*Ermis, Leroy C.
*Errickson, John J.
Essig, John R.
Estes, William B., Jr.
Eulenstein, Karl H.
*Evans, Alton R.
*Evans, Frederic H.
*Evans, James A.
*Evans, James R.
Evans, James D.
*Evans, Philip R.
*Evans, Ronald E.
Everding, Edward J.
*Everett, John B., Jr.
*Everly, Vernon R.
Ewing, William B., III
*Eylar, Frederick P.
*Fahey, William F.
Fahrney, David L.
*Fair, Thomas W.
*Faircloth, Gerald F.
*Fallon, Thomas F., Jr.
*Fantry, William T., Jr.
*Faris, William E.
Farley, Edward B., Jr.
*Farnsworth, John F.
*Farrar, Charles E.
Farrell, Edward J.
*Farrell, Lawrence M.
*Farris, John H.
*Fehrs, Walter H.
*Feingersch, Allen
*Fellowes, John H.
Felt, Bruce C.
Feltham, Marshall E.
*Fennell, Abe P., Jr.
*Ferguson, Van L.
Ferm, Dennis W.
Fernald, Lloyd W., Jr.
*Festag, Albert P.
Feuerhelm, Duane L.
Fickenscher, David B.
*Fidelibus, William T., Jr.
Fidlar, Richard A.
Field, Benjamin H.
Fields, Chester J., Jr.
Fields, David E.
*Filbert, Arthur S.
Findley, Ronald C.
*Fink, George E.
*Finley, Dean M.
Finley, John L.
Finn, William A.
*Firey, Roger S.
*Fischer, Theodore A., Jr.
Fischer, Warren H.
*Fish, Benjamin L., Jr.
*Fishback, Frederick L.
Fishburn, John H.
*Fishburn, Lewis R.
Fisher, Harvey E.
*Fisher, Norman E.
Fisher, Richard L.
Fiske, Harry K.
*Fitch, Dee N.
*Fitzgerald, John F.
Fitzgibbons, George P.
*Fitzpatrick, Raymond F.
Fitzpatrick, John J.
*Fitzwilliam, Peter K.
Flage, Donald W.
*Flannery, Gerard J., Jr.
*Flather, Charles R.
*Flatley, James H., III
*Fleak, Walter H., Jr.
*Fleming, Bruce S.
*Fleming, William J.
*Fleshman, Samuel A., II
*Florko, Donald J.
*Flory, Richard L.
*Floyd, Rodney R.
*Flynn, John J.
*Flynn, John J., Jr.
*Flynn, Samuel C., Jr.
*Flynn, Thomas E.
Flyum, James K.
*Foley, Jerold W.
Follmer, Lloyd D., Jr.
Foote, Ernest D.
*Ford, Bruce P.
*Ford, Homer L., Jr.
*Ford, Lyndall C.
*Ford, Randolph W.
Forderhase, Larry A.
*Fordham, Barton W., Jr.
*Fordice, James E.
Foreman, Merlin L. R.
Foresman, James H., III
*Forgy, James P.
Forster, Johann R.
*Forster, Robert M.
*Fosko, Paul D.
Foss, Robert N.
Fossett, Birchard C.
*Foster, John A.
*Foster, Paul E.
*Fournier, Joseph O.
*Fournier, Paul R.
Fowler, George M.
*Fowler, Jim B.
*Fox, George R., Jr.
*Fox, John F. J.
Fox, Robert F.
Fox, Thomas R.
France, Morgan M.
*Frank, Thomas P.
*Frankenberger, Paul F.
*Franklin, William P.
*Frankoski, John P.
Fredrichs, Robert W. M.
Fredrickson, Arthur H.
Freeman, George H.
*Freeman, Thomas L.
*French, Douglas E.
*French, Frederick A.
*Frey, Robert D.
Frey, Thomas E.
Friederich, Bruce
*Fries, Charles L.
Fritz, Wayne R.
*Fromm, George R.
Frommer, Paul S.
Frontz, Leroy, Jr.
*Fuller, Dale G.
Fuller, Donald E.
Fuller, Roger W.
*Funderburk, Jeryl D.
*Furey, Edwin M.
*Furrow, Donald E.
*Furtado, Francis J.
Gable, Carl F., Jr.
Gage, Robert J.
*Gagne, Wilfred C.
*Gallo, Henry A., Jr.
*Gallagher, Joseph G.
*Gallion, Lawrence B.
Gallotta, Richard A.
*Galvin, Robert J.
Gambel, Arlin H.
Gambill, Richard K.
Gant, James R.
Garcia, Rodolfo, C.
*Gardella, John K.
Gardiner, Kent L.
*Gardner, James R.
*Garrett, Richmond D.
*Garrett, Roger D.
*Garrison, Charles H., Jr.
*Garvey, James J.
*Garvin, John K.
*Gash, John A.
*Gatto, Paul J.
*Gault, Harry R.
Gautier, Walter J.
*Gaylor, Elvin L.
*Gearin, Billy D.
*Gehrig, Jerome C.
Gentz, Richard C.
*George, Troy H., Jr.
*Gerhart, Guy L.
*Gerrald, Benjamin W.
*Gesling, Marion L.
Giambattista, Michele D.
Gibson, Alfred P.
Gibson, Douglas B.
*Gibson, James C., Jr.
*Gifford, Robert M.
Gilbert, Bertrand M.
*Gilbert, James C.
*Gilbert, John D.
*Gilbert, Robert L.
*Gilchrest, Edwin B., Jr.
Gilchrist, William F.
*Gilchrist, James L.
*Gilkison, Edward R., Jr.
Gillespie, John P.
*Gillette, Nelson M.
Gilliland, Lawrence A., Jr.
*Gillin, Robert A.
*Gillmore, Francis L.
Gilson, Carroll P.
Gimber, Harry M. S., III
*Ginn, James T.
*Ginther, Larry L.
*Giuliani, Leonard E.
*Gladis, John T.
*Glaeser, Frederick W.
Glancy, Robert J.
*Glenn, Eugene R.
Glenn, William A., II
Glickman, Thomas W.
*Glover, Fred B.
*Gluse, Michael R.
*Godbey, Thomas N.
*Godefroy, Pierre L.
*Goggin, Richard E.
*Golden, Edward E.
*Golder, Thomas V.
Goldstone, Ronald G.
*Goodale, Charles N.
*Goodwin, James B.
*Gookin, Robert B.
*Gordon, Stewart R.
*Gore, Lawrence C.
Gott, William B.
Gowans, George K.
*Grady, Roger D.
Graff, Howard B.
*Graham, Frank M.
Graham, George D.
*Gralow, Richard T.
Grant, Edward J.
*Grant, Freeman A., Jr.
Grant, Gerry D.
*Grant, Howard W., Jr.
*Grant, Richard L.
*Graves, William S.
*Gray, Anthony W., Jr.
*Gray, Olin A.
*Green, Gerald E.
Green, Richard F.
*Green, William H.
*Greene, George C.
*Greene, Richard O.
*Greene, William H., Jr.
Greeneisen, Kermit W.
Greenhoe, Duane F.
*Greenwood, Richard L.
*Greer, Albert E.
*Greer, Joe C.
*Greer, Robert E.
Gregg, Donald A.
*Gregory, Kenneth A.
Greiling, David S.
Gresens, Larry W.
*Grewe, Webster
Griffin, David H.
*Griffin, John H.
*Griffin, Thomas R.
Griffith, Dwaine O.
Griffitts, Jerry R.
Grimes, John E.
Grimes, Thomas W.
*Grimes, William H.
*Grimmell, Robert L.
*Griswold, Gale M.
Groat, John E.
*Groscup, William D.
*Gross, Sidney L.
Grossman, Dean A.
*Grossoehme, Clyde
*Grove, Ronald R.
*Grow, Robert L.
Gruendl, Paul L.
*Grunawalt, Richard J.
Guernsey, Charles H.
*Guimond, Louis F.
Gulli, Carmano J.
Gulliver, Victor S.
Gundermann, Richard T.
Gunderson, Donald H.
Gustafson, Charles B.
*Guttery, Thomas H.
Guyle, James D.
*Haack, Norman E.
Haas, William R.
*Hagen, Dale N.
*Hahne, Dayton R.
*Hale, Bill J.
*Hale, Frederick W.
*Hale, William F.
*Haley, George K.
*Halliday, George W.
Hall, Charles R., III
Hall, Gordon B., Jr.
Hall, Harley H.
Hall, Joe L.
*Hall, John O.
*Hall, Robert A.
*Hall, Thomas J.
*Halloran, Richard J.
*Hamilton, Edward A.
*Hamilton, Verlie M.
Hamlett, John W.
Hammack, John E.
Hammer, Roger D.
*Hammock, Donald P.
Hammond, Edward R., Jr.
*Hancock, Gus H., Jr.
Handley, Paul L.
*Haning, James L.
*Hannaford, William H.
*Hannah, Elmore K., Jr.
Hannify, Michael F.
*Hansen, Herbert L.
*Hanson, David F.
*Hanson, Donald C.
*Hanson, Morton H.
Hanson, Ralph E.

Harjehausen, Lawrence O.
*Harkins, Billy M.
*Harkins, Vyron V., Jr.
*Harmon, Jack E.
*Harmon, Oliver E.
Harner, Charles F. Jr.
*Harney, Patrick F.
Harper, John A.
Harre, James L.
Harrington, John R.
*Harriott, Robert K.
*Harris, Buford A., Jr.
Harris, Lee K.
*Harris, Roger W.
*Harris, William R.
Harriss, David J.
*Harscheid, David G.
*Hart, Raymond J.
Hart, Robert N., III
Hartfelder, Richard F.
*Hartley, Donald A.
*Hartman, Anthony G.
Hartman, Richard D.
Harvey, Walter D.
*Haskell, Hugh B.
Hastie, Robert K.
*Hastings, Ralph H.
*Haswell, Fremont G., Jr.
*Hatch, Philip B., Jr.
*Hatch, Ross R.
Hatcher, Jerry M.
Hawk, Allan H.
*Hawkins, Charles D., Jr.
Hawkins, Leroy T.
*Hawkins, Sam H.
Haworth, Alvin G., Jr.
*Hay, Donald G.
*Hayes, Michael F.
*Hayes, Newton G.
Hayford, James E.
Haynes, Harald J.
*Hayward, Stearns L.
Healy, Howard R., Jr.
*Healy, Jerry F., Jr.
Heckathorn, Richard T.
Hedden, Forrest F.
*Heekin, John P.
*Hefferon, Thomas W.
*Hegeman, Joey W.
*Heiland, Charles E.
Heim, George J.
Heimburg, Edward R.
*Heinlein, Joseph E., Jr.
*Heisinger, Duane L.
Heisner, Robert I., Jr.
Hellewell, John S.
*Hellman, John S.
Hemenway, David J.
Hemphill, Allen P., Jr.
Henderson, Mark D., Jr.
Henken, Raymond N.
*Henry, John A., Jr.
Henry, Michael C.
Henry, Patrick, Jr.
Henry, Thomas C.
*Hensley, James V.
Herbert, Leo E.
*Herbert, Roger G.
*Herd, Robert V.
*Hering, Frederick L.
Herrigstad, Harvey W.
Herring, George G., III
*Herring, Hubert B.
*Herring, Thomas S.
*Herzog, Harvey
*Hesse, Gerald H.
*Hessler, John L.
Hester, James H.
*Hewitt, Paul E.
Hewitt, Wesley C.
Hewlett, Barry N.,
Heyde, John S., Jr.
Heyward, Shannon D.
*Hibbard, Grant W.
*Hickerson, James M.
*Hickey, John F., III
*Hickman, Jimmie E.
*Hickman, Thomas W.
Hickox, Joseph E.
Hiebner, Robert J., Jr.
*Higgins, John J.
Higgins, William H.
*Higginson, John J.
Hilaire, Paul D.
Hildenbrand, Daniel C.
*Hill, Carl M.
*Hill, Kenneth E.
*Hill, Raymond W.
*Hills, Willard A.
Himes, Elton G.
*Hindman, Charles D.
Hines, Dean H.
Hipp, William J.
Hippard, Clyde M.
*Hipps, Carl E.
Hite, Philip R.
Hix, Jack M.
Hixson, Harold Y.
Hoag, Joseph H. S.
*Hobbs, William L., Jr.
Hobler, William J., Jr.
*Hodapp, David H.
Hodges, Robert L.
*Hodgskiss, William L.
*Hoerner, Fredrick C.
*Hoffman, Chauncey F.
Hoffner, Conrad C.
Hogan, Lawrence M.
*Hogg, James R.
Hoggatt, James W.
*Hohenstein, Clyde G.
Holland, Clyde W.
Holland, Joe L.
*Holland, Tommy L.
*Holland, Wylen R.
*Holleman, Chester H.
Holloway, Richard V.
*Holm, John P.
Holm, Norman E.
Holmes, Henry D., Jr.
Holmes, Wayne M.
Holt, John A., III
Holt, Maltbie L., Jr.
Holtzclaw, John W.
Holzschuh, Jacob R.
*Honea, Milton D.
*Hoole, Frederick
Hooper, John R., Jr.
Hoover, Cameron L.
Hoppe, Herbert L.
*Horne, Roger B., Jr.
*Horne, Ronald G.
Horsefield, John E.
*Horsley, George W., Jr.
*Horton, Jerry D.
*Hosey, H. P.
Hoskins, James D.
*Hough, Van Q.
*Houglum, Leon P.
*Howard, Harlan C.
*Howard, John A.
*Howard, Richard A.
*Howay, John W.
Howe, Frederic N., Jr.
*Howe, John E.
Howe, Jonathan T.
*Howell, Thomas A., Jr.
Hower, James J.
Howland, John H.
Huebel, Melvin R.
*Hueber, Fred P.
Huey, John R., Jr.
*Huggins, Andrew C.
Hughes, Henry F.
*Hughes, Howard W.
*Hughes, Robert S.
Hughey, Ira A.
Humble, Clinton D.
Hunsicker, Edmund K.
*Hunter, Wallace R.
*Husted, Murl E., Jr.
*Husted, Richard C.
*Huston, William G.
*Hutchinson, Charles K.
*Hyatt, Charles E.
Hyatt, Leo G.
*Hyde, Ronald P.
Ildas, Alvin G.
*Ingalls, Frederick G.
*Ingram, William A.
Inman, Ronald C.
Innes, Alexander R.
*Ion, Dalton L.
*Irby, Irvine D., Jr.
*Isaacs, Charles R.
*Isenhour, William J.
*Jackets, Michael E.
*Jackson, Jack M.
Jackson, James P., Jr.
*Jackson, Lester T., Jr.
Jackson, William I.
Jacobsen, Alan J.
*Jacobson, Lennart R.
*Jaeger, Robert H.
*James, Edgar L.
*James, Ernest W.
*James, James, E. M.
James, Thomas P., Jr.
*James, William B.
*Jamison, Kermit
*Jarratt, Guy C., III
Jarrett, Edwin B.
Jaynes, David W.
*Jebb, Robert D.
Jefferson, James F.
*Jellison, Harry E.
*Jennings, Mark J.
*Jennings, Robert L.
Jensen, George W.
*Jensen, Richard S.
Jerome, John D.
Jessen, James D.
*Jines, Milton L.
*Johannesen, Allen C.
*Johe, Richard E.
*Johns, Clifford M.
Johnson, Charles E.
*Johnson, James E.
*Johnson, Joseph W.
Johnson, Kenneth W.
Johnson, Leonard W, II.
*Johnson, Myron S.
*Johnson, Norman C.
*Johnson, Paul S., Jr.
*Johnson, Phillip S.
*Johnson, Raymond C.
*Johnson, Robert B.
*Johnson, Ronald J.
Johnson, Robert A.
*Johnson, Ronald L.
Johnson, Theodore R., Jr.
Johnson, Thomas H.
*Johnson, Verlyn D.
*Johnson, Walter E.
*Johnson, Wendell N.
*Johnston, Donald W.
*Johnston, Donald H., Jr.
*Johnston, Harold B., Jr.
*Jones, Clyde W.
Jones, Colin M.
Jones, Gary W.
*Jones, Jack E.
*Jones, Jerry E.
*Jordan, David C.
Jordan, Dennis R.
*Jordan, Henry M.
Jordan, William T.
Josselyn, Jay A.
Judge, Joseph I.
*Judge, Michael J.
*Juif, Robert J.
Junghans, Peter A.
*Jurgens, Robert A.
Kaiser, Edward R., Jr.
Kalin, Robert E.
*Kalinowski, Raymond S.
*Kalinyak, Paul P.
Kampen, Kenneth B.
*Kantor, Clifford S.
*Kapustka, Herman L.
*Karas, Robert E.
*Karn, Alvin R., Jr.
*Karnakis, Nicholas
*Kaseote, George
*Kasnicki, Edward J.
*Kassebaum, David L.
Kato, Haruo
Katz, Bennett D.
*Katz, Robert E.
Katzen, Murry
Kaufer, Richard A.
*Kay, James R.
Kay, William G.
*Keathley, James W.
Keating, Harold E.
*Keegan, Arthur E.
*Keeley, Edward C.
*Keene, Charles R.
*Keiffer, Leo H.
*Keith, John F.
Keller, Harry R.
*Keller, William E., Jr.
*Kelly, Francis P.
*Kelso, Frank B., II
*Kemper, Ralph C.
*Kemper, Robert D.
*Kenaston, George W.
Kennedy, James H.
Kennedy, Peter M.
*Kennedy, Thomas C.
*Kennedy, Thomas L.
*Kennelly, Bernard J.
Kenney, Daniel J.
*Kenney, Richard A.
*Kenney, Theodore C., Jr.
Kentopp, Donald E.
*Keough, Robert J.
Kerr, William A., Jr.
Kershner, Robert L.
*Kerslake, Ronald W.
*Kersting, William H.
*Kesteloot, Robert W.
*Keyes, James L.
Kiefer, Martin D.
Kiel, Richard H.
Killingsworth, Monte L.
*Kilpatrick, Thomas E.
*Kilpatrick, Louis A.
*Kimball, Paul E.
*Kinert, John H.
King, Carleton J., Jr.
*King, Charles C.
King, James W.
*King, John D.
*King, Melbourne P.
*Kinney, Ben J.
*Kinsel, Herman L.
*Kiper, William D.
Kirkland, Thomas J., III
*Kirkpatrick, John H.
*Kirkpatrick, Wayne A.
*Kirkwood, Robert L.
*Kittleman, Donald L.
*Kitzelman, Glenn E.
Kizer, Theodore L.
*Klein, Argyle G.
*Klish, Theodore, Jr.
*Kloman, John H.
*Klugh, Robert P., Jr.
Knapp, Daniel L.
*Knapp, Ralph E.
*Knight, Burton L.
*Knight, Dennis K.
*Kniveton, Robert
Knodle, William C.
*Knott, Howard E., Jr.
Knott, Richard C.
*Knowles, Russell, Jr.
Knutson, Jerry G.
Kochaba, Edward T.
Koehler, Norman E., III
*Koenig, Edwin L.
Koffler, Samuel
Kohn, Arthur F.
*Koll, William P.
*Kolstad, Thomas C.
*Komisarick, Adam
Komp, Richard L.
*Kordek, Walter A.
Korthe, James D.
Koster, Alfred M., IV
*Kraemer, Kenton K.
Kraft, Robert M.
*Kral, Anthony J.
*Kramer, James B., Jr.
*Kramer, Rex W., Jr.
Kramer, Theodore R., Jr.
*Kratch, David A.
*Krekel, Lyman E.
*Kremin, Richard A.
*Kreutzberger, Donald J.
Kriewall, Royce L.
Krilowicz, Thomas J.
*Kristof, John J.
*Kronnagel, Julius
*Krueger, Milton E.
*Kruger, Allen L.
*Kuck, Donald L.
*Kuehler, Donald E.
*Kuehmeier, Joseph K.
Kunkel, Larry D.
Kuntz, David S.
Kurihara, Thomas M.
*Kurz, Walter C.
*Kushner, David A.
*Kuykendall, Herbert B.
KveDeRis, James P.
Lacher, Richard S.
*Laclair, Paul J.
Lagueux, Paul B.
Lahr, Carl F.
Laird, Travis H.
*Laitsch, Lowell C.
Lamay, Urban R., Jr.
*Lamb, Larry R.
*Lambert, Raymond A.
*Lamberth, Billy C.
*Lambright, Harold R., Jr.
*Lamotte, Francis J.
Lampert, George E., Jr.
*Landroche, William J., Jr.
*Lang, William R.
*Lange, Christian A., Jr.
Lange, William G.
*Langenheim, John P.
Langholz, Marcus J.
*Langley, Thomas R., Jr.
*Langston, Nicholas D.
Lanman, George M.
Laperouse, Kenneth J.
Larabee, Kent W.
*Larsen, James L.
Larson, Charles R.
Larson, Charles W., II
Lasko, Harvey D.
*Lassey, Karl I.
*Lattig, Edward C.
*Laux, Arno H.
Law, James E.
Lawler, Casimir E.
*Lawson, Henry T.
Layton, Thomas C.
Leahy, Vincent J.
*Leban, Carl
*Leblanc, Thomas D.
Lecropane, Richard R.
Lee, John J.
Lee, John W.
*Lee, Kenneth C.
*Leech, Robert J.
*Leeds, Rene W.
*Legare, Maurice T.
Legg, Billy J.
Legg, William E.
*Leird, William A.
*Lenhardt, Harry F., Jr.
Leonard, William J.
*Lerner, Albert M.
Leslie, William N.
Lester, William E.
Leuschner, Robert L., Jr.
*Levendoski, Richard J.
Levin, Richard R.
*Lewedag, Loren M.
*Lewin, Theodore E.
*Lewis, Harold S.
Lewis, Marwood D.
*Lewis, Norman H.
*Lewis, Tom A.
Lidke, Donald E.
*Lightner, Darrell A.
*Linch, Donald T.
Lindstrom, Harry E.
Lino, Norman J.
*Lipscomb, Jack C.
*Littlewood, Lyle E.
Livingston, Gill F.
*Livingston, John G., Jr.
*Locke, Jerry L.
Lockwood, Robert K., Jr.
Loewenthal, Robert G.
*Logan, David E.
*Lohr, James R.
Loman, Cleve E., Jr.
*Lomheim, Louis G.
Long, Carl H., Jr.
Lonnegren, Robert C.
*Loudermilk, Henry E.
*Lovdal, Rodney H.
Lowe, Gary B.
Lowery, Needham H.
*Lown, Paul C.
Lowrance, Douglas L.
*Lowry, Abner P.
*Lubberstedt, Richard L.
Lucas, William E.
Luehring, Davidson
Lueker, Wendell H.
*Luetschwager, Edward E.
Luke, Charles T., Jr.
Luke, Robert A.
*Lumbert, Albert W.
Lynch, Clayton W.
*Lynch, Dale W.
*Lyons, James E.
*MacArthur, James D.
MacCubbin, George E., Jr.
*MacDonald, Richard W.
*Mack, Robert J.
*MacKay, Gerald W.
MacKay, Richard W.
*MacLaren, John H.
*MacNichol, Malcolm S.
Madara, Richard J.
Maddox, Ralph R.
*Mademann, Paul F.
Madouse, Richard L.
Magner, Lawrence R.
*Magness, Eddie R.

*Magnus, Ralph S.
Maguire, Thomas J.
Mahon, Edward J., Jr.
Mahony, Terrence M.
Maiberger, George L.
*Majors, Frances D.
*Malcolm, Wesley R.
*Maliczowski, William
Malley, Kenneth C.
*Malloy, Malcolm A.
*Maloney, John J.
*Malvin, Frederick B.
*Manes, William C.
*Mann, John P.
*Mansfield, James L.
*Marcantonio, Anthony W.
Marcom, James C.
*Marcus, Robert U.
Margedant, John W.
Marin, Richard
Markey, Alden C.
*Markley, Wade E.
*Marks, Arthur J.
Marnane, Thomas A.
*Marovich, Michael
*Marriott, Michael J.
*Marshall, Raymond E.
Marshall, William H.
*Marthinson, Detlow M., Jr.
*Martin, Frank P.
Martin, John S., Jr.,
Martin, Marshall W.
Martin, William G.
Martinson, George P.
*Martoski, Robert W.
Marxer, Hugo E.
Mason, John A., III
Massimino, Andrew S.
Masten, Lawrence E.
Masterson, James E.
*Maston, Joseph H., III
Maticko, Eugene R.
*Matteson, Kelvin L.
Matthews, Gary D.
*Maurer, Earl T.
Maurer, William H., Jr.
*Mautino, Richard L.
Maxwell, Kenneth A.
*Maxwell, Matthew T., III
*May, James L.
*May, Robert C.
*Maybee, Dan C.
*Mayfield, Albert L.
*McAllister, Richard C.
*McAloon, John J.
*McAvenia, Harold G., Jr.
*McBride, Michael A.
*McBurnett, Kenneth S.
McCabe, Ebe C., Jr.
*McCaffery, Robert A.
*McCain, James R.
*McCampbell, Richard L.
McCandless, John E.
*McCart, Benjamin H.
*McCarter, Kenneth W.
McCarthy, Gerald D.
McCarthy, James F.
*McCartney, William A.
McCauley, George K.
McCauley, Hugh W.
McCaull, John W.
McClary, Richard C.
McCloskey, Donald T.
*McClure, Dale R.
McClure, Gilson K., Jr.
McConkey, Edward C.
McConnel, Richard A., Jr.
*McConnell, Edward W., II
McConville, James E.
*McCormick, Bruce A.
McCracken, Richard L.
McCulloch, James M.
McCullough, Lawrence E.
McCullough, Robert F.
McCutchan, Milton L.
*McDaniel, Rodney B.
McDermott, Joseph T.
*McDonald, Carl G.
McDonald, Gerald W.
*McDonald, Ray M.
*McDonald, Richard R.
*McDonough, Vincent P.
*McEachen, Angus D., III
*McEnaney, Thomas J., Jr.
McEwen, Richard D.
McFarland, James S.
*McGarry, John G.
McGee, Donald J.
McGehee, William R.
McGill, James A.
McGinty, Thomas J.
McGlamery, James L.
McGlasson, Daniel E.
McGlasson, Bruce
*McGlynn, James R.
McGrail, Charles R., Jr.
McGuigan, David B.
*McHenry, William G.
*McHugh, Charles E.
McHugh, Richard M.
McHugh, William M.
*McIndoe, James E.
*McKamey, John B.
McKenna, Michael F.
McKinney, Charles P.
*McKinnon, John D.
*McKinnon, Patrick C.
*McKinstry, Thomas W.
*McKitrick, Edward R. Jr.
*McKnight, James D.
McManes, Kenmore R.
McMicheal, George L.
*McMillan, Lee Q.
McMillen, Kenneth A.
McMorris, John A., II
*McMullin, Joseph F.
*McMurry, William T.
*McNally, James A.
*McNeill, Richard J.
McNichols, John P., Jr.
McPherson, Roger B.
*McPherson, Albert A.
*McTighe, Roger P., Jr.
McVay, Wesley J., Jr.
*Mead, Gerald R.
*Meadows, Landon O.
Mease, Richard C.
Meaux, Richard P.
*Medwedeff, Channing W.
*Meehan, James F.
Meeker, Quentin S.
Megehee, Louis D., Jr.
*Meier, Leonard M.
Meier, Myron D.
*Meier, Ronald L.
Meighen, Thomas J.
Melanson, Edward J., Jr.
*Melcher, Roland O.
Melendy, Herbert E.
Meleski, David R.
Melnick, Norbert W.
*Melvin, Edmund W.
*Melvin, Virgil B.
*Mendenhall, Ivan F.
Mericle, David L.
Merino, Frank Q.
*Mesimer, Grady F., Jr.
Metz, Frederick J.
*Metzler, Charles D.
Meukow, Walter T.
*Meyer, Allan G.
*Meyer, Richard E.
Meyering, James M.
*Miceli, Joseph D.
Mickle, William M.
Middleton, John E.
*Miefert, Milton D., Jr.
Mihaly, Donald G.
Miklos, Thomas J.
*Miles, John I.
*Millard, David R.
*Miller, Charles H., Jr.
*Miller, David G.
Miller, Edmund B.
*Miller, George
*Miller, Merle E.
Miller, Peter R.
Miller, Robert C.
*Miller, Robert L., Jr.
*Miller, Wayne W.
*Millon, Donald H.
*Mills, Albert
*Mills, Leon R.
Mills, Neal O.
*Mills, Thad W.
*Milner, Harry M.
Miniter, Howard E., Jr.
*Minton, David C., III
*Miron, James J.
*Misura, Paul
*Mitchell, Clyde L.
Mitchell, David L.
Mitchell, Donald L.
Mitchell, Henry H.
*Mitchell, Kenneth
Mitchell, Oscar E.
*Mitchell, Ralph M.
Mitchell, William T.
*Mitchell, William J.
Modeen, Victor D.
*Modrak, George P.
*Moke, Paul D.
*Molenda, Paul H.
*Monk, Samuel W.
*Monroe, Vincent D.
*Monteleone, Vito J.
Montgomery, Donald J.
Mooney, Andrew R.
Mooney, Harold L., Jr.
Moore, Aubrey A., Jr.
Moore, David W.
*Moore, Harold A., Jr.
*Moore, James A.
Moore, Jimmie R.
*Moore, John W.
*Moore, Nelson E.
*Moore, Rowland W.
Moore, Thomas R., Jr.
Moore, Walter L., Jr.
*Moran, Richard A.
Morcerf, Lester A., Jr.
Moreau, Ronald F.
*Morgan, Garner E., Jr.
*Morgan, Rawls B.
Morgan, William O.
*Morgan, William N.
*Morris, Charles S.
*Morris, Clarence T., Jr.
Morris, David R.
*Morris, Hal B., Jr.
*Morris, John D.
*Morris, Joseph M.
Morrison, Orrin L.
*Morsches, Robert W.
*Mortimer, Edmund C
*Morton, Stewart M.
*Moser, Carter H.
Mott, Louis D.
*Mount, Eugene A.
*Mouser, Hugh P.
*Moyers, Gilbert E.
*Mozier, Richard A.
*Mueller, John A.
*Mulholland, Howard E.
Mullaney, Charles F., II
*Mullen, Cornelius W.
*Mullen, John T.
Muller, Herman F.
*Muller, John G.
*Muller, Robert C.
*Mulloy, Charles S.
*Mulvihill, James H.
Mumford, Robert E., Jr.
*Munn, Robert J., Jr.
Munro, William S.
Murdoch, Thomas M.
*Murphy, David R.
*Murphy, Edward J., Jr.
Murphy, James H.
*Murphy, James J., Jr.
*Murphy, John A.
Murphy, Michael A.
*Murray, Frank S.
*Murray, James C.
Murray, Thomas R.
Murrell, Charles J.
*Myers, Ashley A.
*Myers, Dale P.
Myrah, Leonard C.
Nace, Larry D.
*Naddy, Llewellyn L.
*Nagel, "L" "D"
Neary, Joseph F.
*Neeley, Wallace W.
*Nelson, Bobby C.
*Nelson, Carl A.
*Nelson, Glenn T.
*Nelson, Paul J., Jr.
*Nelson, Robert E.
*Nelson, Robert L.
*Nelson, Sven D.
Nequist, John E.
*Neuhard, Henry H.
Neuhaus, Charles F.
Nevin, Robert F.
*Nevins, Richard E.
Nevitt, James E.
*Newbury, Alfred C.
Newby, Burton C.
*Newcomb, James W., Jr.
*Newcomb, Zeanious L.
Newell, John W.
*Newell, Richard E.
Newman, William D.
*Newsom, Joe R.
Newton, Clifford A.
*Newton, Robert L. L., Jr.
Ney, Kenneth L.
Nicholas, Joseph
Nichols, Richard D.
*Nicholson, Harry E.
Nicholson, Odis A.
*Nickell, Herbert E., Jr.
Nider, Kenneth E.
Nielsen, Niel P.
Nightengale, Chester L.
*Niles, Wilmer J.
Noel, Donald E.
*Noggle, George A., Jr.
Noll, Charles F.
Normand, Eugene J.
*Norris, Francis C., Jr.
*Norris, Richard J.
North, David M.
*Northam, Thomas A., Jr.
*Norton, William S.
*Nowak, Edward M.
*Nucci, Eugene M.
*O'Berle, Ronald J.
*O'Brien, Donald W.
O'Brien, George E.
*Ochs, Dorance L.
O'Connell, Daniel J.
*O'Connell, Jerome A.
O'Connell, James J.
*O'Connor, Edwin A.
*O'Connor, Neil F.
O'Connor, Paul
Odea, Thomas V.
*O'Donnell, Robert G.
*O'Donovan, James P.
*O'Dwyer, Kyran M.
Oehlbeck, Ronald J.
*Ogle, Peter W.
*O'Halloran, William J.
O'Hara, James P., Jr.
*Ohmen, Douglass J.
*O'Keefe, Martin P.
*O'Keefe, Timothy R.
O'Keeffe, Frank P.
Oliver, William L., III
*Oliverio, Theodore E.
*Olmer, Lionel H.
*Olson, Albert W., Jr.
*Olson, Carroll A.
Olson, Philip C.
Olton, Tinley L., Jr.
*Ondak, Gerald S.
O'Neill, James P., Jr.
Ong, Richard E.
*Onstott, Donald D.
*Oppedahl, Phillip E.
*Ore, William E.
*Orear, Gilbert A.
O'Rourke, Bernard F.
*Orrik, David N.
*Orzech, Bernard P.
*Osborne, Dale H.
*Osgood, Wayne R.
*O'Shaughnessy, John A.
*Ostrom, Joseph E., Jr.
O'Sullivan, Joseph F.
*Otto, Max W.
Overeem, Donald P.
*Overstreet, George H.
Overstreet, James H.
*Owen, William L., Jr.
*Owens, Darrel D.
*Owens, John G.
*Owens, Robert S.
*Owens, Sherman H.
*Owings, Dwight C.
Oyler, Charles C., Jr.
*Page, Arthur M.
*Paine, Francis S., Jr.
Pakradooni, Haig H., III
*Palmer, Edward J.
*Palmer, Gerald A.
*Palmer, Howard L.
*Palmer, Jerry J.
Palmer, Stanley B.
Palmer, William N., II
*Pape, Frank F.
*Pappas, Jimmy
Parcell, Kenneth H.
*Pardue, James I., Jr.
*Parham, Gerald D.
*Parker, Jackson K.
*Parker, Ronald H.
*Parkhurst, Sherwood L.
*Parks, Charles L.
Parnell, Ural C.
*Parsons, Marland W., Jr.
Parsons, Robert A.
Partlow, James G.
*Pasquinelli, Francis C.
*Patrick, Andrew K.
*Patterson, Donald R.
Patterson, Ralph A., Jr.
Patterson, Dale K.
*Patterson, Robert G.
*Pattin, Stephen M.
*Patton James M.
Paul, John S.
*Peabody, James P.
Peace, John D., III
Peacher, Robert W.
*Peake, Stephen R.
*Pearigen, Jare M.
*Pearson, James W.
*Pearson, Merton A.
*Pedersen, Dan A.
Peebles, Baker L.
*Peek, Robert F.
Peerenboom, William H.
*Peetz, Robert E.
Pellock, Lyle E.
Pelton, Wade A.
Pember, Norman L.
*Penders, Joseph W.
*Pendleton, Benjamin L.
Pennington, Ronald M.
*Pennock, Murray F.
Peresluha, Edmund J., II
*Perrella, Albert J., Jr.
*Perro, Michael A., Jr.
*Perry, Henry B.
*Perry, Leonard G.
*Perry, Richard C.
Persels, Max D.
*Persons, George R.
*Peters, Frank J., Jr.
*Petersen, James C.
*Peterson, Bob L.
Peterson, Kenneth D.
*Peterson, Karl L.
*Peterson, Laurel C.
*Peterson, Peter C., Jr.
Peterson, Paul A.
*Petree, Noel H., Jr.
Pharis, Wade J.
*Phelps, Freddie J.
Philipps, George
*Phillips, John M.
*Philo, Arthur R.
*Piche, Paul D.
Picher, Francis X., Jr.
*Pickel, Theodore C., Jr.
Pickett, Ronald B.
*Piersall, Charles H., Jr.
Pietrzak, Edward S., Jr.
*Pinion, David E.
*Piotti, Walter, T., Jr.
*Pippins, Elery H.
*Pirotte, James H.
Pistotnik, James J.
Pitts, Phillip R.
*Plassmeyer, Joseph D.
*Pocklington, William D.
Poindexter, John M.
*Polfer, Clarence R.
*Pollard, Ronald T.
Poole, James R.
*Poole, Thomas E.
*Poore, Thomas W.
*Porcaro, Anthony P.
Porter, Donald H.
Porter, Richard G.
Porter, Richard E.
*Porter, Robert W.
*Potter, Clare E.
Pounds, Philip C., Jr.
Powell, Daniel G.
*Powell, Stewart G.
*Powell, Wendell W.
*Poyet, Elmer F.
Prater, James
*Previ, Wallace M.
Price, Dennis J.
Price, Earl C.
*Prien, Richard K.
*Pritchard, Joseph R.
Prochazka, Henry R.

*Proctor, Allen D.
*Prokop, Phil G.
*Promersberger, Edward. S.
*Propper, Ronald M.
*Propst, William F.
Prosser, Norman E.
Pruett, Ronald L.
Puerling, Peter N.
*Pundt, Cameron A.
*Pursley, John E.
Purvis, Samuel M.
*Pyle, Loyd E.
Quantock, Charles W.
Quast, Harry S.
*Queen, Ronald J.
Query, William C., Jr.
*Quigley, Francis J.
Quinn, David R.
Quinn, James H.
*Quinn, James E., Jr.
Quitiquit, Max
*Raab, Charles F.
*Rae, Paul O.
*Ragan, Charles P.
*Raines, Frederick L.
*Rangeo, Bennie
*Rankin, Andrew M., II
*Ray, Willard D.
Ray, William J.
Raymond, Calvin D.
*Rayome, Francis L.
*Read, Benton M.
Reagan, Louis L.
*Ream, Ronald L.
*Rebber, Roger B.
Redder, Lawrence F.
*Reed, Benjamin W., Jr.
Reed, Richard O.
Reed, Robert B., Jr.
Reeve, William F.
Rehme, John A., Jr.
*Reich, Merrill D.
Reichart, Harold L., Jr.
Reid, James R. III
*Reid, Ralph G., Jr.
*Reifschneider, Jack L.
*Reiley, Ralph H., Jr.
*Reinhardt, Ellwood B., Jr.
*Reis, Joseph J., Jr.
Reitmeier, Bernard S.
Rempt, Henry F., Jr.
*Rennaker, Charles L.
*Renner, Joe D.
Rentschler, Richard L.
*Repass, Donald E.
*Repta, Robert S.
*Reynolds, Robert L.
Reynolds, Ted W.
*Rhoads, John D.
Rice, Edward J.
Rice, Lloyd A.
Rice, Loren M.
*Rich, Willis S.
Richards, Lawrence E.
*Richards, Warren D.
Richardson, John D., Jr.
*Richardson, Ronald W.
*Richter, John H.
*Richter, Paul G.
Richter, Ralph Jr.
*Riedemann, Walter J., Jr.
*Riefler, George B.
*Rigg, Richard G.
*Riggs, Selby B.
*Rigmaiden, Ray
*Rij, Michael A., Jr.
Riley, Charles E.
*Riley, Joseph F.
*Rimson, Ira J.
Ritchie, Sherwood L.
*Roach, John C.
*Robbins, Philip D.
Roberson, Harold J.
*Roberts, Charles R.
*Roberts, Gordon W.
Roberts, James J.
*Roberts, Ned C.
*Roberts, Tommie W.
Robertson, Lester S.
*Robertson, Hollis E.
*Robertson, Robert J.
Robinson, John W.
Robinson, James C.
Robinson, Kenneth F.
Robl, John L.
*Roderick, John T.
*Rodgers, Robert D.
Roeser, Walter V., Jr.
Rogers, Claude L.
*Rogers, David T.
*Rogers, Eugene
*Rolfe, Clair E.
*Rollman, Gordon L.
*Romano, Gennaro J., Jr.
Romoser, William K., Jr.
*Ronni, James A.
Rook, Wilson C.
*Roper, Vincent W.
*Ropiak, Joseph
*Roscoe, Simon A., Jr.
Rose, Rufus R.
Rose, William A.
Rosenthal, Ronald
Rositzke, Robert H.
Ross, Norman A.
Ross, Thomas E.
*Rothe, Jack F.
Roudebush, Daniel L.
*Roundtree, Jack L.
Rower, Jay A.
*Rowsey, James M., Jr.
*Ruchala, Joseph F.
Rucker, William A., III
Rucks, Ronald A.
*Ruhle, Robert C.
*Rush, Claude E.
*Russ, William M., Jr.
Russell, Earl H.
*Russell, Kay
Russell, Richard W.
*Russell, Richard E.
Rutemiller, Oren G., Jr.
Rutherford, Harry M.
*Ruthrauff, Clifford B.
Ryan, Joseph A.
*Ryan, Patrick F.
*Ryan, Thomas M.
Rydzewski, James C.
*Sabin, James F.
*Sabine, Frederick R.
*Sachtjen, Jerry W.
Sage, Alfred G., Jr.
Sagehorn, Gerald L.
Sakey, Leyon D.
Sale, William L.
*Saleh, Richard E.
*Salisbury, Jack S.
Salley, Alexander M.
*Salo, Elmer E.
Salovitch, Edward M.
Sanders, Franklin H.
Sanders, Kit C.
Sanders, Wilbur F. III
*Sandler, Charles A.
Santoro, Paul J.
*Sappenfield, Gerald A
Saracco, Robert L.
*Sarphie, Jack E., Jr.
Sawyer, Tommy D.
*Sayers, Samuel L.
*Scahill, Lawrence J.
Scales, Richard H.
*Scarlett, Frank B.
Schaeffer, George R.
Schafer, Dennis N.
Schaffer, David G.
*Schaible, David L.
*Schaier, John D.
Schaper, Delmar O.
*Schatz, Robert G.
Scheible, Jack W.
Schell, John J.
Schenk, Parley G.
*Scheyder, Ernest J.
*Schiavone, Anthony J.
Schilling, Noel K.
*Schilling, George F.
Schimming, John G.
Schiwitz, Preston G., Jr.
Schleicher, Richard J.
*Schmidt, Arnold C.
*Schmidt, Robert H.
*Schmidt, Robert P.
*Schmitt, Arthur F., Jr.
*Schneider, Walter L. III
Schneider, Henry J.
Schneider, Russell P.
Schneidewind, Gilbert P.
*Schnitzer, Lawrence E.
*Schoeff, Kendall E.
*Schreck, Milton W.
*Schreiner, Raymond J.
*Schroder, Donald C.
*Schultz, Alwin L.
*Schulz, Paul H.
*Schulze, John M., Jr.
*Schumacher, Duane O.
*Schussler, Gerald A.
Schuster, Eugene J.
*Schutte, John J.
*Schwaab, Denis T.
*Schwartz, Hugh L.
*Schwartz, Ralph C.
*Scoffield, Gary A.
Scott, Douglas L.
*Scott, Thomas W.
*Scovel, Frank D.
*Scranton, Herbert H.
Searcy, William P.
*Sears, Johnny M.
*Seaward, Hobart E.
*Sechrest, Edward A.
Sedor, Gerald
Segelhorst, Herbert E.
*Seiler, Melvin E.
Self, James M.
Servis, Walter M.
*Sesma, Ramon A.
Severance, Laverne S., Jr.
*Sexton, Delbert A.
*Shaffer, Clyde H.
*Shannon, Philip M.
*Shaw, Charles I.
Shay, James E.
*Shelso, David A.
*Shelton, Donald D.
Shelton, Lyle T.
*Sheppard, Donald E.
*Sheppy, Clayton L.
Sherrill, John T., Jr.
*Sheubrooks, William L.
Shewmaker, John B.
Shields, Ronald M.
Shimmons, George R.
*Shinn, Robert A.
*Shirley. Fred E., Jr.
Shirley, Gerald B., Jr.
*Shirley, Vernon D.
*Sholl, Theodore G.
*Shores, Howard V.
*Short, Benjamin F.
Short, John S.
*Short, Leroy A., Jr.,
*Shultz, Theodore B.
*Sibley, David N.
Sick, Gary G.
Siegel, Kent R.
*Siegrist, Edward A., Jr.
*Sierra, Edward P.
*Sigg, Earl C.
*Sikes, James H.
Sikes, Kenneth J.
Silvia, Charles P.
*Simerly, Glen E.
Simmons, Robert R.
*Simone, Thomas J.
Simonton, Bennet S.
*Simpson, Benjamin M., III
*Simpson, James H.
*Simpson, John E., II
*Sinclair, Leonard A.
Sipple, Vincent J.
Sisson, Lewis W.
*Sitek, Thomas W.
Skelly, John F.
Slater, Larue D.
*Slaughter, William T.
Slawson, Bruce L.
Sledge, Carl M.
Sloan, Dennis Y.
*Sloan, John H.
*Sloan, William D.
Sloane, Stephen B.
*Slusar, Donald A.
*Smetheram, Herbert E.
Smith, Albert R.
*Smith, Bernard J.
Smith, Bertram D., Jr.
Smith, Clarence L.
Smith, Don L.
*Smith, Donald W.
*Smith, Frederick H., Jr.
*Smith, Gene A.
*Smith, George O.
Smith, Jack S.
Smith, Jimmy F.
*Smith, John P.
Smith, John C., Jr.
*Smith, Joseph C.
*Smith, Lee O.
Smith, Leon L., Jr.
*Smith, Neil D.
Smith, Phillip D.
*Smith, Thomas C.
*Smith, Thomas F.
*Smith, Vernon C.
*Smith, William L.
Smith, William E., Jr.
Smith, William J.
Smith, William S., Jr.
Smithey, William J. H.
Snell, William F.
*Snook, Ernest B., Jr.
*Snow, Kennedy B.
Snow, Robert G.
Snyder, Carl T.
*Snyder, Richard C.
Snyder, William R.
Sokil, George H.
Solomon, Selig
Somer, Frank L.
*Somers, David W., Jr.
*Sommer, Leroy G.
*Sones, William C.
*Songster, John H.
Sonnabend, Jerome R.
Soule, Stephen L.
Southard, Howard V.
Southern, Wilson E.
Sowley, Roy G.
Spane, William T., Jr.
*Spann, Homer R.
*Spellman, Fred G.
*Spencer, Lane L.
*Spero, Joseph R.
Spillars, Harold S.
*Spink, Peter J.
Spinks, Billy J.
*Splitt, Robert F.
*Spousta, Allen F.
*Springer, Emerson T.
*Sprung, John R.
*Squires, Howard J.
Staats, Beverly R., W., II
*Staats, Michael C.
Stacey, John L.
Stafford, Hugh A.
*Stammer, Walter H., Jr.
Stampfli, Donald M.
*Stanford, Robert L.
*Stanwick, Stanley W.
*Steckel, John H.
Stedman, Ren E.
Steece, Robert B.
Steele, William M., Jr.
Steelnack, Robert A.
*Stefanou, Christopher M.
Stegall, Woodie C., Jr.
*Steinbrink, Earl E.
*Stelly, John M.
*Stennett, William A.
*Stephens, John A.
*Stephens, William J.
*Sterling, John C.
*Sterling, Paul G.
Sterton, William D.
*Stevenson, Barr S.
Stevenson, Leon M., Jr.
*Stewart, Charles C.
*Stewart, Dennis J.
Stewart, Edward L., Jr.
*Stewart, Edwin M., Jr.
*Stewart, George W.
Stewart, Joseph A., Jr.
Stewart, Keith A.
Stewart, Raymond E.
*Stiers, Lawrence K.
*St Martin, Arthur J.
Stockhausen, Edward L.
*Stocking, Sigurd I.
Stockton, John B.
*Stoeckel, Anthony W.
Stoetzer, Raymond N.
Stogis, Peter D.
*Stoke, Henry W., Jr.
*Stokes, Bobby J.
*Stone, Elmer M.
*Stone, George P.
*Stone, Lowell P.
Stong, Russell J.
Stoodley, Francis H.
*Storey, William D.
Stouffer, John W., II
*Stowell, Marshall A.
Strahm, Kenneth A.
Strange, Robert O., Jr.
*Stratford, Robert H.
*Streuli, Joseph W.
*Strey, Dennis W.
Strickland, Stanley P.
*Strommen, Gene A.
*Strong, Daniel L.
Strunk, David W.
Stucky, Walton K.
*Stutz, James D.
*Sullivan, Eugene J., Jr.
*Sullivan, Gerald T.
*Sullivan, Gene F.
*Sullivan, Jermiah F.
*Sullivan, Robert G.
*Sullivan, Thomas J., Jr.
Sutphen, Harold J.
*Swan, Robert S.
*Swanson, Matthew C.
*Swarthout, Gerald L.
*Swartz, Theodore R.
Sweat, Wesley A., Jr.
Sweeney, Leo H.
Swift, Charles J., Jr.
*Swinnerton, Ronald H.
*Sykes, Floyd E.
*Sylvester, Vincent
*Tabrum, Gerrald R.
*Tache, Warren N.
*Taff, Clarence O., Jr.
Taft, Franklin L.
*Tager, Bruce A.
*Taggart, Donald J.
Tait, William J.
*Talbert, Joseph T., Jr.
*Talbott, Merrill L.
*Tambini, Anthony L., II
*Tarbuck, Richard R.
Tarrico, George J.
*Tasker, William G.
Tate, Robert H., Jr.
Tateosian, Franklin D.
Tatro, Peter R.
Taunt, Melvin E.
*Taylor, Gaylen D.
*Taylor, Hugh, R.
*Taylor, James E.
*Taylor, Jeremy D.
*Taylor, John D.
*Teachout, David S.
*Teague, Foster S.
Tema, Robert P.
*Templeton, Wilbur D. Jr.
*Terrell, Jerry L.
*Teter, Eugene V.
*Thall, Raymond, L.
*Thaubald, Edward J.
*Theodorelos, Pete J.
Theriault, Willard
*Thibault, George E., Jr.
Thoen, Glenn R.
Thomas, Bruce A.
Thomas, David M.
*Thomas, Dewayne A.
*Thomas, James W.
*Thomas. James G.
*Thomas, John H., IV
*Thomas, Richard L.
Thompson, Alan H.
*Thompson, James K.
*Thompson, Jack D.
Thompson, Jimmy P.
*Thompson, Tommy L.
*Thompson, Theodore R.
*Thornsley, John T.
*Thorpe, Gordon L.
*Thorpe, Jack C.
Thorpe, Paul J.
*Thurber, John D.
*Thurneysen, Jon S.
*Tibbitts, Barrick F.
*Tiderman, John M.
*Tierney, James S.
*Timlin, Joseph W. Jr.
*Timm, Dwight D.
Tish, Samuel A.
Tobey, Stephen
Toehlke, Walter A.
*Tollinger, John N. Jr.
Tonnessen, Herbert G.
Toole, Morton E.
*Touchton, John H., Jr.
*Tracy, Theodore R.
Trammell, Arthur B.
Trost, Henry J., Jr.
Trowbridge, Charles F., Jr.

*Trupp, Adam R.
Truxall, Charles W., Jr.
*Tubbs, Kenneth A.
*Tucker, Edwin B.
*Tucker, James E.
*Tulley, Cecil R.
*Tullis, James V.
*Tully, Joseph F.
Turner, Charles W.
Turner, John J., Jr.
*Turner, Robert R.
Turpin, Thomas R.
*Tyler, Maurice F., Jr.
*Tyszkiewicz, Arthur K.
Ulrich, John L.
Ulrich, Thomas R.
Underhill, Samuel G.
*Ustick, John
Vacanti, Salvatore D.
*Vallera, Rocco D.
Vandemark, James J.
*Vanhorne, Alfred L.
Vanlandingham, Clyde H., Jr.
*Vannice, James R.
Vanorden, Douglass L.
Varnadore, James
Varshock, George A.
Vaughan, Edward B., Jr.
Vaughn, Charles G.
Veek, Eugene B.
Venezia, Howard
*Vermillion, John E.
*Vescelius, Milton J., Jr.
*Vezina, George R.
Viessmann, Alex J.
*Villalobos, Julian
*Villenave, Robert A.
*Vincent, Robert F.
*Vispo, Peter P.
Vohr, James C. Jr.
Volden, Thelmar O.
*Vollmer, William E. Jr.
*Vonier, Richard L.
Vosseller, Richard T.
*Vowell, Joe L.
*Vyskocil, James A.
*Wachob, James R.
*Waddell, Jack W.
Waddell, Watson W.
Waddell, Walter R. Jr.
*Wagner, John A.
*Wakatake, Clifford K.
*Walden, Warren L.
*Walder, Edward F. Jr.
*Waldrop, Glynn A.
Walker, Clarence L. Jr.
*Walker, Jimmy W.
*Walker, Richard A.
Walker, Thaddeus O. Jr.
*Wall, Arthur D. Jr.
*Wallace, Earl D.
*Wallace, Laird E.
*Wallace, Turner P. Jr.
*Walling, Samuel E.
*Walsh, Daniel C.
*Walsh, John B.
*Walsh, Robert E. Jr.
*Walston, Jerry D.
*Walter, Clyde M.
Wantz, Leslie H.
*Ward, Compton E.
*Ward, James A.
Ward, Richard R.
Warden, Kenneth J.
Wardwell, Arthur F. Jr.
*Waring, James D.
*Warren, James W.
Warters, Robert L.
*Watkins, Robert L.
Watkins, William D.
Watson, John A.
Wattay, Alexander E.
Watters, Gustav F.
*Watts, Henry A.
*Watts, James W.
Watts, Robert B.
Waugh, Samuel A. Jr.
*Way, Edward R.
*Weatherby, Theodore R.
Weatherly, James H.
*Webb, Kenneth H.
*Weber, Gerald M.
*Weber, Gustav A. Jr.
*Webster, John A. Jr.
Webster, Kenneth A.
*Wehner, George D.
*Weichman, Denis R.
Weidler, Ronald E.
*Weidman, Russell H.
Weiland, Robert F.
*Weisman, Burton S.
*Welch, Ralph W.
*Welch, Richard D.
Wellborn, Robert M. Jr.
*Wells, Charles T.
Welsh, David M.
*Werenskjold, Gary W.
*Weseleskey, Allen E.
*Wesolowski, Walter
*West, Charles T.
*West, Norma P.
West, William W.
*Westfall, Van F.
Westlake, William R.
Whaley, Thomas P.
*Wheat, Elbert E.
*Whelan, Mathew J. Jr.
*Whitbeck, Charles J.
White, George W. Jr.
White, John R.
*White, Laurence A. Jr.
*White, Richard F.
*White, Robert S.
White, Robert W.
*Whiting, Donald W.
Whitlinger, Gregory L.
Whitmire, Wilson R.
*Whittle, Henry W.
Wible, William K.
Wicks, Lester H. Jr.
*Wiebelhaus, Clarence J.
*Wieschhoff, Kenneth H.
*Wilbern, Jack M.
Wilbur, Charles H.
*Wild, Ronald A.
*Wilde, John H., Jr.
*Wiley, Byron A.
*Wilkey, Perry A.
*Wilkins, George H.
*Will, Robert A.
*Wille, Paul, A.
Willey, Bruce T.
Williams, Bennie J.
Williams, Barton B.
*Williams, Carl E.
Williams, Doyne G.
Willis, Clyde P.
Wilson, Bruce D.
*Wilson, Donald C.
Wilson, Garry L.
*Wilson, Leonard O.
*Wilson, Robert M.
*Wilson, Russell W.
Wiltsie, Ronald J.
*Wincek, Walter J.
*Winchester, Morton S.
*Windham, Marshall E.
*Windsor, Nelson E.
Wing, Rodney C.
*Wingerter, Edward W., Jr.
*Winn, Perry R., Jr.
Winters, Richard D.
*Wirth, Charles G.
Witherspoon, Charles R.
Witt, Robert T., Jr.
*Witt, Robert F.
Wolfe, Roderic L.
*Womack, Bernard J.
*Womack, David R., Jr.
Womack, Leonard R.
*Wood, Clarence W.
*Wood, Melvin C.
*Wood, Rex S.
*Wood, Richard G.
Wood, Sidney E., Jr.
*Woodbury, Orpheus L., III
Woodrow, Warren A.
*Woods, Brian D.
Woods, Francis G.
*Woods, Herbert P.
*Woods, Theodore K., Jr.
Woods, Walter E.
*Woodworth, Benjamin B.
Woolard, Gerald W.
Woolman, Joseph C.
*Workman, Charles E.
Worrell, Dwight I.
*Worrock, Bryce K.
*Worst, Dale R.
Wright, Arthur S.
*Wright, Frederick E.
*Wright, Joseph R.
*Wright, Joseph M. P., Jr.
Wright, Keith M.
*Wright, Orville, Jr.
*Wuthrich, Richard E.
Wyatt, Raymond E.
*Wylie, Clayton R.
*Wylie, Ronald P.
Wynn, Earl B., Jr.
*Yarbrough, William P., Jr.
*Yelle, "A" Courtney
Yessak, Lawrence G.
*Yetter, William S.
Yockey, Harry M.
*Yost, David A.
*Young, Charles T.
*Young, Edward B.
*Young, Kenneth G.
*Zackowski, Terrence L.
*Zaludek, George M.
*Zdolsek, Martin F.
*Zechlin, Frank F.
*Zelna, Denis P.
Zimmer, Emory P.
Zimmerman, Willard C.
*Zinn, Thomas E.
*Zipperer, William R.
*Zipse, Robert L.
*Zirbel, William D.
Zollars, Allen M., Jr.
*Zwick, John E.

MEDICAL CORPS

Aden, Gary C.
Albright, Harry R.
Allshouse Herbert E.
Almond, Douglas V.
Amalong, Ronald J.
Ambrose, John F.
Ambur, Richard F.
*Anderson, Edgar J.
Anderson, Edward E.
*Anderson, John A.
Anderson, John R.
Anderson, Robert L.
Anderson, William T.
Atwell, Marshall E.
*Aubrey, Royal G.
*Austin, David A.
*Bailey, Albert G.
Bailey, Robert J.
*Balding, Thomas L.
Barr, Mason, Jr.
*Bassham, Harold L.
*Bates, Thomas R.
Bellinger, Creighton G.
*Benoit, Richard P.
*Bertuch, Albert W.
*Biehl, Robert F.
Birdwell, Thomas R.
*Bistrong, Herbert W.
*Blackburn, James H.
Bolter, Delano W.
Bonagura, Lucas J.
*Boodish, Wesley
*Boorstin, James B.
Boren, Charles W.
*Bowlds, Joseph H.
Boyd, Dale W.
Brandt, Eugene M.
Brannon, William L., Jr.
Brettschneider, L.
Brewer, Jack R.
*Briant, Thomas P.
*Brierre, Joseph T., Jr.
*Bryan, Richard W. D.
*Budd, Frank W., Jr.
*Burkett, Patrick R.
Byrd, Thomas R.
*Caldwell, Marvin G.
Cannon, Richard E.
Cantow, Edward F.
Cantrell, Robert W.
*Caratti, John F.
Carlson, John D.
Carr, Geoffrey O.
*Carson, Thomas E.
*Case, Jerry L.
Caspar, George H.
*Cassells, Joseph S.
*Castell, Donald O.
Chapman, David W.
Christ, Ronald L.
*Christensen, Harvey E.
Cilento, Bartley G.
*Cochran, Robert C.
*Conrad, Robert N.
Cordray, Douglas R.
Corradi, Richard B.
Cotten, Charles L.
Council, John C., Jr.
*Cowherd, Donald W.
*Cramer, Adelbert D.
Cramer, Philip G.
Crow, Judson L.
Cudek, Ronald P.
Cummins, Larry E.
Cywinski, John S.
Daily, Wilfred J., Jr.
Davies, Raymond O., Jr.
Davis, David R., II
Decker, John S.
Deignan, William E.
Demaria, Frank, Jr.
Dematteo, Joseph A.
*Diamond, Evans
Digiovanni, Cleto, Jr.
*Dockhorn, Robert J.
*Draper, Wilmot S.
Duff, Donald F.
Duhamel, Robert R.
Dunn, Julius E., Jr.
*Dunphy, Barry E.
Durr, Michael J.
*Early, Calvin B.
Economus, Peter
Erbs, Ronald C.
*Essex, Francis X.
*Farmer, Richard G.
Farrell, Thomas, A.
Feeney, Robert A.
*Fenning, John B.
Fitzgerald, Robert B.
Fleisher, David R.
Floyd, Robert, Jr.
Flynn, Patrick W.
Fogg, Charles D.
Fore, William W.
Fornes, Michael F.
Foti, Philip R.
*Frankhouser, George V., Jr.
Frensilli, Frederick J.
Freidland, Sigmund W.
Friedman, Paul J.
Fulwyler, Robert L.
Gallagher, Hugh S.
*Gareis, Frank J.
Gee, William
Geiger, Gerald F.
George, Robert A.
Getman, Richard B.
Gibbs, Benjamin F., Jr.
Giddings, Jack E.
Gilbert, Edward C.
Gilliland, Robert L.
Goffinet, John A.
Goldberg, Melvin J.
Gordon, Carl J.
Graber, Edward J.
Green, David
Gregonis, Joseph G.
Greiff, Barrie S.
Grimm, Arthur R.
*Grossi, Thomas A.
Grossman, Marvin
Guiles, Paul A.
Guitierrezpenas, Humberto O.
*Hagele, Herbert C., Jr.
Hand, David J.
Hanna, Charles A.
Hargrove, Charles B.
Harper, Clarence J.
Harrington, Randall L.
Hebert, Peter W.
*Heller, Warren
*Hiehle, John F.
Higgins, Thomas G.
Hill, Trafford, Jr.
Hiller, Bruce H.
Hinchliffe, Joseph G.
*Hix, William R.
Hoback, Daniel P.
Hoertz, John H., Jr.
Hofmann, Richard M.
*Hogan, Bartholomew T.
Holley, Herbert S., Jr.
Holley, Hilmon D., Jr.
Hollinger, George W.
Hollingsworth, Ralph R., Jr.
Hudson, Royal C., Jr.
Humeston, Frederick L.
Hussey, Michael B.
Hutman, Burton S.
Izuno, Gene T.
Jacklin, Harold N.
Jackson, Rudolph E.
Jackson, Russell T.
James, Revis W., Jr.
Janicki, Robert S.
Jeffrey, Clyde G., Jr.
Jernigan, Jerry M.
Jewusiak, Edward M.
*Johnson, David W.
Johnson, Ernest J.
Johnson, Thomas P.
Johnson, Walter T.
Johnson, William W.
Jolliff, James W.
*Jones, Daniel M.
Jones, Edward M.
Jones, George R.
Joyce, Robert W., Jr.
Jurich, Robert M.
Katz, Harry I.
Kaye, Martin I.
Kellett, Cyril F., Jr.
*Kelley, David L.
Kelly, Robert J.
Kessler, Carl P.
Kidd, Jack C.
Kinzie, Daniel H., IV
Knight, Jimmie H.
*Kostiuk, Eugene S.
Kramer, Jeffrey
Langston, Randall A.
Lapolla, James J.
Larsen, Reynold T.
Larson, Donald M.
Leadbeater, John C.
Lee, Frederick M.
*Leisse, Fred C.
Lentz, Ronald J.
Leslie, Edward L.
*Lewis, Frederick D.
Lieberman, Allan D.
Loeb, Richard O.
Lohr, Lloyd D.
*Lopez, Domingo A.
*Lord, James M.
*Louden, Charles M.
*Luehrs, James G.
*Lynch, John I., Jr.
Maier, John E.
Mangelson, Ned L.
*Manring, Daniel A.
Marcel, Jesse A., Jr.
Mark, Allyn L.
*Markham, Thomas N.
Martin, William A.
Mauk, Sid F., III
*McClain, Garvin H.
McDaniels, "L" "B"
McGeoy, Thomas J., Jr.
McGrail, John F.
McKelvey, John M.
*McLean, Walter L.
*McMahon, David J.
McTammany, John R.
Meador, James C., Jr.
Melton, Russell W.
Messick, Joseph M., Jr.
Meyer, Russell
Milbauer, John P.
Miller, Edward I.
Miller, Jay H., Jr.
Mindel, Eugene D.
*Moloney, Charles J.
*Monell, William C.
Morgan, Elwood E.
Morgan, James D.
*Muehlberger, James J.
*Murphy, Eugene L.
Nagel, Charles L.
Nathanson, Donald L.
Nedelman, Philip B.
Nelson, Allan D.
*Nevara, John B.
Newburger, Alan C.
Nicholas, Carmine F.
*Nicholas, William R.
*Norton, John W.
O'Donnell, Joseph E.
Ohslund, Ronald K.
*O'Loughlin, John M.
Olsen, James A.
*O'Reilly, Richard R.
Page, Crockett H.
Panzetta, Anthony F.
Pappas, Socrates W.
Pasquale, Dominick N., Jr.
Patlovich, Joseph
Pawsat, Richard A.
*Pedersen, Carl M.
*Pellecchia, Joseph A.
Perlin, Elliott
Peters, John W.
Phelps, Jerry A.
Philip, Gordon W.
Pickering, Michael J.
Pine, Robert H.
Piscatelli, Robert L.

Pisculli, Leo M.
Playford, George A.
Plott, Dwight M.
*Polglase, Van Nest, Jr.
Pollard, Emil E.
Portu, Raymond, D.
Powell, Kent L.
Power, Curtis G., Jr.
Preuss, Donald G.
Quinn, James J.
*Ramlo, John H.
*Ramsey, Charles H.
Randall, Harry G., II
Rashid, Kenneth D.
*Reed, Jerome M.
Reed, Ralph E.
*Rivers, Leslie D.
Robinson, Edward J.
*Robitaille, George A.
Robnett, Truman J.
Roeder, Donald K.
Rogers, Albert K.
*Roling, Gerald T.
Rosen, Arthur D.
*Roy, Donald E.
Rozansky, Norman M.
*Rundlett, Fred A.
Runnels, John B.
Russo, John F.
Sandok, Burton A.
Satloff, Aaron
Sauer, Robert H.
Schillaci, Richard F.
*Schneider, Paul J.
Schwartz, Bradford B.
*Schwartz, Ronald A.
*Seal, Robert B.
Secrist, Wilbur L.
*Senn, James P.
*Sewell, Sidney R.
Shapiro, Richard
*Shea, David W., Jr.
*Shultz, Richard R.
*Shumaker, James L.
Silberman, William C.
Sitnick, Joseph L.
*Skinner, Wendell L.
Smalkin, Michael D.
Smith, Charles B.
Smith, Edward H., Jr.
*Smith, Franklin A.
*Smith, Laurie N.
*Smith, Raphael F.
Snyder, James L.
*Spaur, William H.
*Spencer, Edward M.
Spencer, Frederick A.
Sphar, Raymond L., Jr.
Sponaugle, Harlan D.
Standefer, James E.
Stanell, Robert E.
Stanton, Kevin C.
*Steimel, Herbert A.
Stone, Robert T.
Stoop, David R.
Straumanis, John J., Jr.
*Strickland, George T., Jr.
Strom, Clarence G.
Stucker, Fred J.
Suerig, Karl C.
Swan, Robert J.
Swanger, Ronald F.
*Swensson, Norman L.
Swierzewski, Stanley J., Jr.
Swogger, Leo G., Jr.
Tate, Harry R.
Taylor, Fredric S.
Taylor, James Z.
Tenney, Richard L.
Thomas, Jackson W.
Thompson, Robert L.
Thompson, Sidney E.
Thompson, William F.
*Tobin, John J., Jr.
Tompkins, Albert E.
*Torpey, David J., Jr.
Trunnell, Thomas L.
Tucker, Gary J.
*Urbanc, Andrew N.
*Urschel, William P.
Vanbrocklin, James D.
Vanburen, William E.
*Vandewyngaerde, George A.
*Ventzek, Albert T.
Vincent, Harry B., Jr.
*Volcjak, Charles B.
Vorosmarti, James, Jr.
*Wachter, Francis W.
Wald, Grover H.
Waldron, Richard L.
*Wall, Norman R.
Wanger, William H.
Warren, William S.
Watson, John T.
*Weber, David M.
Weintraub, Harvey
Weisman, Stephen A.
Welch, Brent A., II
*Wengert, James W.
Westfall, Florent F., Jr.
*White, Paul C., Jr.
Whitehead, William O.
Widmann, Donald E.
*Wilkes, Harman D.
Williams, John E.
Williams, Robert B.
Williams, Richard A.
Wilson, Cecil B.
Wilson, Donald D.
Winans, Robert G.
*Wolfe, Wayne H.
*Yanko, Robert P.
Yon, Joseph L., Jr.
York, Jack L.
Zane, Alan I.
Zelles, Gary W.

SUPPLY CORPS

Abele, Robert B.
Adams, Richard G.
Aldenderfer, William D.
Allen, Johnny L.
*Allnutt, Alvin H.
Andersen, Thomas C.
Anglim, David L.
*Ault, William U.
Avis, Bruce W.
Balding, David W.
*Banas, John M.
*Barnett, Andrew F., Jr.
Barstad, Clarence H.
*Baxter, John W.
*Beck, Kermit E.
Berg, Robert K.
*Bilicke, Eric W. H.
Bilodeau, James H.
*Bittner, Burton F., Jr.
*Boike, Robert J.
*Booth, Stanley L.
*Borchardt, Heinz R.
*Bradley, Donald A.
Briggs, John M.
*Brown, Alan S.
*Brown, Lee
*Buckley, John E.
*Buffoni, Thomas J.
*Bulluck, Edgar G.
Buscher, Bernard A., Jr.
*Butts, Whitmore S., Jr.
*Carenza, John L.
*Carson, Francis W.
Carter, Eugene T.
*Chafey, William D.
Champion, Andrew A.
*Chipley, Charles L., Jr.
*Connolly, George S., Jr.
*Coombs, Douglas F.
*Cooney, George J.
*Corbitt, James R.
*Cornett, Fred O.
Craft, Thomas G.
*Crawford, James L.
Croeber, Hans R.
*Cronin, George W., Jr.
Crouch, Robert L.
*Crutchfield, Franklin D.
*Cunningham, John H.
*Daddona, John M.
Dawson, Gerald L.
Delduca, Ronald M.
*Delleney, Jimmie S.
*Dennis, Ward J.
Deshaney, Donald J.
*Dewey, Edward P.
*Dickey, James A.
*Dickinson, Thomas D.
Divelbiss, Carl D.
Dodds, Richard E.
*Dohmeyer, Russell S.
*Dolenga, Harold E.
*Dunn, Bernard D.
*Easley, Richard P.
*Eaton, Thomas E., Jr.
*Eizenhoefer, David J.
*Eppen, Eugene D.
*Erickson, Douglas L.
*Estes, Arthur, Jr.
*Evans, Lloyd R.
*Farley, Charles V.
*Fidd, Joseph A.
*Fields, Simeon
*Finbraaten, Laurence K.
*Foley, Donald P.
Furiga, Richard D.
*Gerstenberger, Wayne W.
*Gilvary, Daniel J.
*Girman, Robert J.
Godsey, Shirley T.
*Gore, Bobby J.
*Gorenflo, Louis W.
*Goulette, James D.
*Greene, Walter C., Jr.
*Griffin, Edward J.
*Gumpert, Leroy C.
*Hahn, Gary E.
Hale, Joe M.
*Hanna, Wallace J.
Hardin, Edward L.
Harlow, Charles E.
*Harmon, Robert G.
*Hart, James J., Jr.
*Hatcher, Harold S.
*Hawkey, William C.
*Higgins, Ernest C. M.
*Hinkle, Otis R.
Hollingsworth, Charles E.
*Hopkins, Richard B.
*Horner, Raymond N., Jr.
*Houghton, Donald W.
*Hughes, Horald M.
*Hurst, Harvey R.
*Irons, John H.
Iverson, Ronald I.
Jackson, Ronald L.
Jahn, Donald R.
Johnson, Rodwell C.
*Jones, Billy N.
*Jones, Channing E.
Jones, Jack L.
Jones, Kenneth W.
Jones, Leland B.
*Juncker, Carl F.
Kachigian, George N.
*Kalafut, George W.
*Krietemeyer, Diedrich K.
*Krueger, Lloyd W.
*Kulikowski, Jack A.
Lane, Dean S.
*Langer, Gerald D.
*Lantsberger, Robert E.
*Larsen, Henry O.
Lee, Gerald L.
Linehan, Daniel J., Jr.
*Loftus, Raymond P.
*Loveday, William G., Jr.
*Lubben, Vernon L.
Macafee, Douglas C.
*Magee, Gilbert L.
*Malzahn, Walter G.
*Marino, Leonard J.
*Martin, Michael J.
*Martin, William J.
Martineau, Paul J.
*Maxwell, Kenneth H.
*McCullers, Lawrence E.
McGarvey, John J.
*McHugh, Thomas H.
*McKinnon, Daniel W., Jr.
*McMullen, Franklin D., Jr.
McNall, Phillip F.
*Meiners, Arthur C., Jr.
*Milburn, Raymond F.
Miller, Harold E.
*Miller, James E.
Milliken, Gail L.
*Mitts, Joseph P.
*Monaghan, William T.
Moore, Richard C.
*Moran, Lloyd D.
Mouton, Earl F.
Mummert, Dale R.
*Munkres, Glenn R.
*Murphy, Jamie R.
Murphy, Ronald D.
*Murray, Harlan E., Jr.
Nace, Richard H.
Naughton, Thomas J.
*Nichols, Gerald M.
*Niles, Donald R.
Nolan, John E.
Novak, Karl J.
Nuss, Gary B.
Nygaard, Richard B.
*Oaks, Jacob G., Jr.
*O'Connell, Arthur B.
*Olivier, Denny R.
*Olson, Gene P.
*O'Malley, Robert H.
*Osgood, Douglas C.
*Otto, Ronald E.
*Pace, Earl H.
*Parr, Harold S.
Patterson, Jerry G.
*Peters, William A.
*Petras, George A.
Phillips, Robert A.
Pierce, Leon L.
Pinnell, Joseph K.
*Plante, Rene E.
*Platt, Stuart F.
*Pliska, Robert F.
*Pope, Jere P.
Popik, Charles T.
*Prokop, Jan S.
*Quartana, Joseph P.
*Raffels, John F.
Rankin, Ronald W.
Reed, John D.
Reilly, Joseph V., Jr.
Renner, Richard B.
*Rice, Henry L., Jr.
*Ridley, David E.
*Riser, Joseph R.
Robinson, Robert L.
Rook, Eugene C., Jr.
*Rounds, Richard N.
*Rubenstein, Ralph S.
*Ruehlin, John H.
*Rupe, Charles H.
*Rusch, Donald R.
Schulte, Conrad P.
*Sechler, John L.
*Sellars, James B.
Sheehan, John E., Jr.
Shirley, Kenneth R.
Shoemaker, Leroy E.
Shroeder, John, Jr.
Shuler, Jettie C.
Sims, Thomas M., Jr.
Skelly, James F., Jr.
*Smith, Franklin D.
*Smith, John A., Jr.
Sodrel, Donald L.
*Sofley, Billy R.
Sommer, Melvin R.
Squibb, Rodney K.
*Starrett, William I., Jr.
*Steadman, Willard G., III
St. Martin, Robert W.
*Stoeffler, John A.
*Stone, Donald R.
*Sullivan, Raymond V.
Templeton, James R.
*Terry, Victor W.
*Thomas, Gary B.
Thompson, James
*Thompson, Robert L.
*Tobin, Isidore L., III
*Todd, Blaxton V.
*Trawick, George L.
*Trenkle, William H.
*Tudor, Clyde E.
Vanhouten, Richard E.
*Vannaman, Thomas L.
Vanpatten, Edward R.
*Vedra, Charles A.
*Walker, Richard C., Jr.
*Wallace, Edwin R.
*Walsh, Richard S.
*Weinberg, Harry H.
Weissinger, Thomas R.
Weller, Thomas C., Jr.
*Westmoreland, Perry L.
*White, James A.
Whittaker, James B.
Wilber, James R.
*Williams, Robert L.
*Williams, Thomas C., Jr.
*Wright, James H.
Wright, Robert E.
*Youmans, Raymond W.
*Young, Benjamin L.
*Young, Jack L.
*Young, Ronald A.
*Zepczyk, Joseph M.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Baggott, Frank B.
Baker, Robert E.
Barcus, Richard E.
*Bedingfield, Robert W.
*Berg, Vernon E., Jr.
*Bertulio, Caesar J.
*Black, Gerald W.
Borden, Robert S.
Bott, George F.
*Bredemeier, George F.
*Brown, Robert G.
Cook, Gordon S.
Craven, Allen B.
Debock, Ronald G.
*Donan, William E., Jr.
Fink, Rufus B.
*Franklin, Robert C.
Glynn, John J.
Goetz, Herbert M., Jr.
Gordon, Robert E.
Kaelberer, John H.
*Kase, Mark
*Keefe, Lawrence F.
Kelley, Haven C., Jr.
*Kennard, William E.
Magor, Warren F.
McPhail, Clark B.
Murray, Frederick J.
*Murray, George P.
*Nordeman, Francis X.
*O'Brien, Eugene C.
Osborn, Roy C., Jr.
Parker, Alton M., Jr.
Peloquin, Anthony R.
*Piirto, John A.
Respess, Thomas B., Jr.
*Six, Jack E.
Spencer, Carroll R.
Takesian, Eli
Tate, Robert C., Jr.
Thacker, Donald L.
*Vantassel, Lowell W.
Whitaker, Frederick E.
Yeich, John D.
*Young, Christopher B.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

*Ahrens, William N.
*Baggs, Charles C.
Barczak, Jerome J.
Bauer, John G.
Bligh, James E.
Boyce, Heyward E., III
*Brockwell, Sterling M., Jr.
*Carle, Barry
Clearwater, John L.
Cook, Carlisle F., Jr.
*Cope, Ronald P.
*Crisp, Hugh A.
Derr, Frederick M.
*Dobler, Leland R.
Dunn, Jerome R.
Earnst, Rossell A.
*Endebrock, Frank L., III
Fegley, Charles E., III
*Flack, Frederick P.
*Fraser, John C., Jr.
Gawarkiewicz, Joseph, J., III
*Godsey, Jack L.
*Goodman, Robert F.
Grady, Noel A., Jr.
*Jacob, Richard E.
*Johnson, Don P.
*Jones Darrell E.
*Kelch, John A., Jr.
Kenny, Robert E.
*Kimmons, Victor H.
Kirkpatrick, James D.
*Kirkwood, Kenneth K.
*Klein, Dale M.
Knauf, Richard H., Jr.
*Landes, William G.
*Ledder, William R.
Lewis, Edmund F.
*Lonegan, Thomas L.
*Lukacz, John, Jr.
*MacDonald, Malcolm J.
*McCorkle, William J.
*McHugh, Robert J., Jr.
McMenamin, Lester E., Jr.
*McNeill, James E.
*McPartland, Eugene J.
*Merritt, Frederick D.
*Miller, Robert K.
*Morris, Robert B., Jr.

*Mosher, Thomas F.
Murphy, Frank J.
*Nash, Archie R.
*Newcomb, Frank M.
*Petersen, Norman W.
*Quinn, Robert E., Jr.
*Resnick, Rudolf
*Schattner, Bernard L.
*Seeber, Earl R., Jr.
Shafer, Richard V.
*Shanley, John J., Jr.
*Shirley, Ronald G.
*Shumate, James W.
*Siegle, Richard L.
*Tobin, James M.
*Totten, John C.
Westcott, John A.
*Young, Joseph F.

DENTAL CORPS

*Annis, Robert B.
Ashton, Loye A.
*Bach, Richard S.
Badger, Daniel G.
*Baker, Terrance W.
*Ballard, Gerald T.
Batenhorst, Kenneth F.
*Besley, Keith W.
Bloch, George A.
Bourgeois, Aubrey J., Jr.
Bowen, Lathe L.
Brazil, Robert W.
*Brown, Charles A.
*Brown, Max W.
*Buckis, David C.
Bumgardner, Willie A.
Callihan, Michael D.
Carlson, Roy F.
Carroll, Peter B.
Cassidy, Robert E.
Cervera, George A., Jr.
Ciardello, Carmen A., Jr.
*Clegg, Milton C.
*Coleman, Robert Y.
Connor, James B.
Cottle, Kenneth L.
Couvillion, William A.
*Cowen, Carlton R.
*Cronin, Thomas J.
Crum, Walter A., Jr.
*Cushing, John R., Jr.
Dewaters, Robert S., Jr.
Diven, Joel O.
Driscoll, Daniel J., Jr.
Dupcak, Joseph, Jr.
*Ebert, Walter H.
Eckerson, Peter L.
*Eden, George T.
Eisenburger, Michael M.
*Eklind, Ronald R.
*Fishel, David L.
*Fitzgerald, Donald E.
Franz, Larry V.
Girolami, John J., Jr.
Graham, Eber R., Jr.
Hearon, Donald L.
*Heget, Harry S., Jr.
Henry, Richard W.
Hesby, Richard A.
Hodes, Leonard F.
Holcomb, John B.
Holroyd, Samuel V.
*Howarth, Hugh C.
*Hube, Albert R.
*Hudson, Elmer R., Jr.
*Huelster, Peter C.
Jann, Robert C.
*Johnson, Charles M.
*Kasenchak, Peter
Kelley, James C., Jr.
*Kozma, Ernest S.
*Kravets, Thomas F.
Krysinski, Theodore T., Jr.
*Krzeminski, Arthur E.
Lancaster, Lamar L., Jr.
Lehman, Paul C.
*Lehman, Ralph N.
*Lekas, James S.
*Linkenbach, Charles R.
*Loizeaux, Alfred D.
*Lowe, Cameron A.
Lowman, Jack V.
*Luke, Alan B.
Mather, John G.
Matson, John E.
*Matthews, Ted A.
*Maw, Ralph B.
*McCall, Frank J., Jr.
McCreery, Robert J.
McMahon, Joseph P.
*McWalter, George M.
*Monasky, George E.
*Mosby, Edward L.
*Murphy, Richard A.
*O'Shields, Paul W.
Pedrick, George R.
Pierce, Gerald L.
*Pille, Joseph G.
Poe, Gerald S.
Poidmore, Sam J.
Rackley, Otis D., Jr.
Rodegerdts, Carl R.
Roper, William Z.
*Rucker, William H., Jr.
Sawyer, Hershel G., Jr.
*Scholl, Jerome T.
Schonbrun, Robert G.
Sconyers, Jimmy R.
*Scott, Gale L.
Scott, Ronald W.
*Shaffer, Richard G.
*Shelin, Ronald A.
*Short, George A.
Stalb, Douglas B.
*Stevens, Mark M.
Thibodeau, Richard A.
Thriftshauser, Roger W.
*Turner, Donald W.
*Uveges, Alfred C.
Vaught, James E.
*Vernino, Arthur R.
Walker, Oscar B.
Watkins, Owen T.
Wheetley, Woodrow D.
*Williams Robert E., Jr.
*Wingard, Charles E.
Wittgow, Walter C., Jr.
*Yacabucci, James E.
Yeager, James E.
Zotter, Frank E.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Aaron, Alvin J.
*Agosti, Lindo E.
*Baker, Robert R.
Baldauf, George W.
Bertka, Robert E.
Blankenship, William L.
Bolton, Richard B.
*Boone, Harry M., Jr.
*Boudreau, Harold J.
Bowden, Ronald R.
Bowdren, Laurence P.
Brideau, Donald J.
Bryan, James O.
Bryant, Eugene M. Jr.
Casler, Wilfred I.
Chastain, Howard T.
*Clark, James L.
Collier, Patrick J.
Condon, Earl N.
*Cooper, Thomas G.
Correll, Joseph M.
Crebs, Rollin L.
*Davis, William P.
Dietz, Bruce J.
*Doud, Robert H.
Dunham, Chester J., Jr.
Eckerman, Weldon R.
Ellis, Glenn M.
Erwin, Richard E.
Fernandez, Manuel S. P.
*Fletcher, William E.
Flower, Norman L.
*Formeller, Frank J. Jr.
*Fowler, Ephraim E., Jr.
Francis, Raymond D.
Freeman, Benjamin C.
French, James A., Jr.
*Gillenwaters, John D.
Gobbel, Henry D.
*Goerner, Ralph T., Jr.
Gonsalves, John H.
Goodson, James E.
Gouldman, John R.
*Halverson, Charles W.
*Hartgrove, Albert R.
Hatch, Emery J.
*Hatten, Ann C.
Heaton, Harley L.
Hoover, Donald E.
Jenkins, Benny J.
*Johnson, David A.
*Jones, George D.
*Joseph, Sammy W.
*Jungblut, Elmer D.
Kane, George P.
*Karr, Joseph T.
Kemp, James E.
Kessler, Raymond B.
Kolter, Cherry L.
*Lachapelle, Norman C.
Lanier, Bobby M.
Lawson, Donald R.
Leadford, William M.
Lecas, Kenneth E.
*Lembeck, Arthur C.
*Lisenbee, James B.
Littner, Henry D.
Lowe, Samuel C.
Lowi, Bertram H.
*Macklin, Jack E.
Martin, Douglas M.
McAuliffe, Terrence J.
McClung, Denzel H.
McDermott, Roland W.
McFee, Charles A.
Millard, George W.
Miller, James E.
*Mobbs, Philip H.
*Mohler, Clarence B.
Moore, Charles J.
Mullinix, Chloe A.
*Myers, James I.
*Nelson, Paul D.
Nourigat, Earl R.
Novak, Paul J.
Nowak, Frederick F.
*Olson, James J.
*Palmer, Jack J.
Pearce, Charles J.
Peckenpaugh, Normand L.
Pelletier, Louis E.
*Pitzer, William B.
Ramsey, George W.
*Renard, Joseph R.
*Risko, George J.
*Roberts, Billy D.
*Roberts, Billie C.
Robinson, Jack V.
*Rooney, Mary L.
Rucker, Thomas J.
*Ryan, William A.
Sanderson, Roy D.
Seminara, James
*Shuler, Donald E.
*Sickels, Forman J.
Simmons, Carl B.
*Sollman, John R.
Sowers, Hubert H., Jr.
*Spangler, Henry J.
*Springer, Martha J.
*Stanberry, William R.
Stephens, Bobby L.
Surface, Robert L.
Swindall, Victor A.
Tandy, Roy W., Jr.
Thompson, Russell J.
*Toscano, Frank, R., Jr.
*Tuttle, Richard G.
*Ulmer, Fred C., Jr.
*Vanhooser, Russel P.
Webb, Laurence H.
Wherry, Robert J., Jr.
White, Robert L.
*Wilson, James W.
Woomer, Edward F., Jr.
Young, Arthur L.
*Ziegler, Harry F., Jr.
Zimmeht, John A., Jr.
*Zseltvay, Andrew J., Jr.

NURSE CORPS

*Adams, Louise J.
*Allen, Patricia M.
*Altenhofel, Dorothy A.
Baker, Elizabeth W.
*Bell, Lou E.
Benson, Dawn M.
Beran, Irene L.
*Birkhimer, Marion L.
*Boone, Kathleen L.
Brickle, Mary L. A.
Buesteton, Rogene V.
Burrell, Margaret M.
*Butler, Lois J.
Bynum, Joan C.
Cabay, Cecelia H.
Carroll, Shirley F.
*Chisholm, Marie A.
Chute, Judith R.
Davidson, Joan G.
*Durian, Emma T.
Edwards, Jacqueline
Eisiminger, Vetah M.
*Emond, Lucille G.
Fields, Mary A.
*Frazier, Frances M.
Gardner, Patricia V.
*Garlutzo, Kathryn R.
*Gaughan, Rose A.
*Gedrys, Patricia C.
*Gillespie. Jacquelin C.
Golebiewski, Rita J.
*Gomes, Alma M.
Gronell, Mary L.
Halsema, Grace M.
Hamill, Ann M.
Hardesty, Stella M.
*Herrington, Daisy J.
*Higgins, Margaret J.
Hines, Alyce M.
*Hogan, Nora M.
Hudson, Anatalie P.
*Jacobson, Dorothy M.
Johnson, Mildred E.
*Jones, Beverly J.
Jones, Mary V.
Jones, Phyllis A.
Joyce, Edna T.
*Kearns, Joyce C.
Kinney, Eleanor J.
*Lindberg, Marie F.
*Long, Rose M.
*MacEnery, Joan M.
Manns, Ann A.
*Marcotte, Natalie M. G.
Medina, Rosenda
Mele, Louisa A.
Miller, Eleanor J.
*Miller, Eva F.
*Moris, Patricia J.
Morlock, Ruth E.
Murphy, Catherine M.
Neth, Norma D.
Noble, Frances A.
O'Banion, Lois
Obeirne, Eileen B.
Parnell, Maryann C.
*Patmore, Nancy M.
Pechulis, Verna M.
Raucheisen, Mary L.
Rock, June M.
*Rohde, Esther J.
*Rosenquist, Hildegarde
*Sabold, Sarah R.
*Schulze, Charlotte I.
*Schreiber, Marilyn T.
*Sisk, Elizabeth A.
Streit, Mary J.
*Thomas, Betty A.
Thomas, Jean M.
Thomas, Odessa
Walsh, Eileen C.
*Whitesell, Margaret L.
*Williams, Erlene I.
Wilson, Elizabeth A.
*Wilson, Lela B.
*Yelle, Dorothy A.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Aaron, Gary W.
Abbett, Arthur W.
*Abbey, James R.
Abbott, Ernest L., Jr.
Abbott, Stephen L.
*Abel, Warren R.
*Abercrombie, Michael G.
*Abrahamsen, David L.
Abrames, Ralph B., III
Abrams, John L.
Acken, John M.
Ackerman, Ronnie J.
Ackermann, Peter G.
Acord, Jiles U., Jr.
*Acree, Paul G.
Acuff, John E.
Adams, Alton L.
Adams, Gale D.
Adams, Gerald G.
Adams, John R.
Adams, Martin H.
Adams, Paul E.
Adams, Stanley E.
*Adams, William V., Jr.
*Addicott, Raymond W.
Adzigian, David J.
*Afdahl, Darwin F.
*Agamaite, James N.
Agnew, Alfred H.
Ahlstrom, Kenneth T.
Aimes, George R.
Aisenberg, Bernard
Akers, Roy P. H.
Akins, Edwin P.
Akita, Richard M.
Akridge, Garth R.
Alberts, John H.
*Albright, Lee H.
*Albright, Robert E.
Albright, Richard C.
Alcorn, Wendell R.
Alden, James H.
Alexander, Jack T., Jr.
Alexander, Robert C.
Alexander, Clyde, Jr.
*Alexander, James W.
Alexander, Thomas L.
Alfonso, Matias R.
Allan, Andrew S., III
Allan, Lawrence W.
Allard, Michael J.
Allbee, Ives R.
*Allee, Donald W.
Allen, Barry M.
Allen, George W.
Allen, John E., Jr.
Allen, John E.
Allen, Louie R.
Allen, Ronald M.
Allen, Ronald E.
Allison, Albert A., III
Alogna, Michael T.
Alsaker, Rudolph L.
*Althouse, Thomas S.
Alwin, Orville F., Jr.
*Amaro, Alfonso
Ambler, James C., Jr.
*Ames, Harry L.
Amrose, Lawrence A.
Amundson, Frank B.
*Andersen, Kenneth E.
Andersen, Leighton E.
Anderson, Arnold R.
*Anderson, Alan A.
*Anderson, Chase D.
*Anderson, Charles A.
Anderson, Douglas K.
*Anderson, Gerald L.
Anderson, Harry W., Jr.
Anderson, Harry B., Jr.
*Anderson, James D.
Anderson, Kurt V.
Anderson, Peter C.
*Anderson, Philip C.
Anderson, Richard A.
Anderson, Robert J.
Anderson, Robert L.
*Anderssen, Arthur H.
*Andes, Robert C.
Andreen, Philip N.
Andress, Autry C.
*Andrews, Michael K.
Andrews, Robert D., Jr.
Andridge, Phillip C.
*Angel, Arnold
Anna, Dale G.
Anson, Robert, Jr.
*Anspach, Girbirt L., Jr.
Antenucci, James E.
Anthony, Robert H.
Antilla, Charles E.
Appleman, Wayne R.
Appleton, Robert W.
Aquilino, Paul P.
*Arbogast, Glenn W.
Arch, John G.
*Archer, David B.
Archer, Douglas W.
*Archer, Edward C.
*Argo, John T., Jr.
*Argus, Ballard L.
Arman, David R.
Armke, Kenneth W.
Armontrout, Bill M.
Armstrong, Michael W.

Armstrong, Robert D.
*Armstrong, Donald
Armstrong, Henry C.
Armstrong, Jerry W.
Arndt, Eric D.
*Arner, Raymond T.
*Arnest, Charles S.
*Arnold, Bruce B.
*Arnold, David P.
Arnold, Jeffrey M.
*Arnold, Larry J.
*Arnold, William K., Jr.
Arnspiger, Gordon S.
Arrington, Joe M.
Arruda, George, Jr.
Arrufat, Frank R.
Arthun, George B.
Arthur, Andrew A.
Arthur, George E.
*Arthur, John R.
Artman, George E.
*Artz, Brenton T.
*Ash, Robert F.
Ashby, John L.
*Ashman, Kenneth E.
Askegard, Vernon R.
Askins, Thomas H., Jr.
Atchley, Brian K.
*Atherholt, William B.
Atherholt, Gerald K.
Atkins, Kenneth P.
*Atkinson, Richard N.
Atwood, John E.
Auble, Edward C.
*Auborn, James J.
*Aubuchon, Robert G.
Augee, Michael L.
Augustyn, Frank J.
Auld, David
*Austin, Michael G.
*Austin, William M.
Ausum, James C.
Avery, Robert Y.
*Ayres, Frank H.
Babby, Lloyd W.
Babcock, Ross C.
*Bacchus, William I.
Bachman, John H., Jr.
*Backus, Lee F.
*Backus, Richard
*Bacon, Earl L., Jr.
Badger, Frederick H.
*Baehr, John G., Jr.
Baer, Peter J.
*Bagby, James L., Jr.
Bailer, John R.
*Bailey, Artise G., Jr.
Bailey, George H., Jr.
Bailey, James L.
*Bailey, Jerold D.
Bailey, Larry Wayne
Bailey, Larry Weldon
Bailey, Monroe M.
*Baird, Don W.
*Baker, Charlie R.
Baker, Earl M.
*Baker, Garrett E.
Baker, Gilbert A.
Baker, Gregory J.
Baker, Herbert N., Jr.
*Baker, John L.
*Baker, John S.
Baker, Julian T., Jr.
Baker, Michael E.
*Baker, Ronald C.
*Baker, Steven M.
Balaun, James A.
Balderston, Kenneth K.
Baldock, Fredrick C., Jr.
Baldwin, David O.
*Baldwin, John M., III
*Baldwin, Richard C.
Baldwin, Robert F., Jr.
Ball, Holten D.
Ball, Kent A.
*Ball, Robert L.
Ballard, Charles S.
Ballard, Don E.
*Ballard, Robert C.
*Ballew, Robert D.
*Ballew, William C.
*Balling, Maurice T., III
*Baloga, Stephen J.
Balut, Stephen J.
Bane, Thomas J.
*Banford, Alfred J., Jr.
*Bansak, Stephen A., Jr.
Barb, Charles E., Jr.
*Barber, Arthur D.
*Barber, Bruce F.
Barber, Edgar H.
Barbera, Kevin G.
*Barbour, Richard E.
*Bare, Robert J.
Barhite, Lawrence K.
*Barker, Edward P.
Barker, Herbert C.
*Barker, Walter G., Jr.
Barker, Wilbert B.
*Barkley, Clarence D.
Barkley, James E.
Barkley, John E.
*Barnes, Frank
Barnes, Gerald O.
*Barnes, James H.
*Barnes, Keith A.
*Barnes, William L.
Barnes, William D.
*Barnett, Donald C.
Barnett, Philip S.
Barnich, William C., III
Baron, John J.
Baroody, Joseph D.
Barra, Paul A.
Barrett, Gary T.
Barrieau, Ernest G.
*Barrow, Alston M.
Barrows, Blair
Barry, Robert F.
Bartels, Ronald D.
Barthold, Todd A.
Bartlett, Franklin W., Jr.
Bartlett, John B.
*Bartlett, Michael R.
Bartlett, Stephen D.
Bartley, William F., Jr.
*Bartman, Carl N.
Bartol, Peter W.
Bartolomei, Marino J.
*Barton, Harry L.
*Barton, Robert J.
*Baser, Van D.
*Basile, John A.
*Bass, Julius P., Jr.
*Bass, William M., Jr.
Bassett, Edward O.
Bates, Allen W., Jr.
Bates, James M.
*Bates, Robert C.
*Batie, Howard F.
Batte, Charles D.
*Battin, Harry B.
*Batts, Charles J.
Bauch, James H.
Bauder, Frederic S., III
*Bauer, Maurice D.
*Bauldin, Elmer L., Jr.
Baumrucker, Charles J., Jr.
*Bayer, Charles J.
*Bayless, Calvin D.
*Bayless, Thomas H.
*Baylis, Ronald E.
Bayrer, Ralph L.
*Bays, Robert
*Beakschi, Peter F. M., III
*Beall, David A.
*Bealle, William E.
*Beals, Robert O., Jr.
*Beamer, William E.
Bean, Todd M.
Bearce, Charles G., Jr.
*Beasley, Fenn C.
Beasley, Robert L.
Beason, Tyrone D.
Beaton, John H.
Beaubien, Donald C.
Beauchaine, Roger A.
Beaver, Gregory P.
Beck, Woodrow W., Jr.
Becker, Charles J., Jr.
Becker, Donald D.
Becker, Jerry L.
Becker, Richard E.
Beckmann, Carlton B.
Bednar, Robert
*Beedle, Ralph E.
Beerkircher, Ronald W.
*Beers, Ronald C.
Beesley, Norman L.
Begley, Jerry N.
Begue, Donald L.
Behle, Theodore L.
*Behm, Dennis D.
Behm, Douglas E.
Behrend, Robert M.
Beitz, William G., Jr.
*Bekkedahl, Douglas L.
Belan, Robert D.
Belanger, Raymond L.
*Belile, Curtis E.
*Bell, Merlin G.
Bell, Michael L.
Bell, Robert F.
*Bell, Ronald I.
Bellen, Alex W.
Bellingham, Herbert J.
Bellone, William J.
*Belmore, Richard K.
*Belton, David C.
Belvin, William S.
Bender, Frank J.
Bender, Nathan J., Jr.
*Benepe, John W.
*Benintende, Bob
*Bennett, Paul L.
Bennett, Richard A.
*Bennett, Robert G.
*Bennett, Robert F.
*Bennetts, James H., Jr.
Bennion, Paul A.
Beno, James W.
Benson, Edward O.
Bent, Christopher O.
Bentley, James S.
Bentley, Johnny E.
Benton, John E.
*Benton, William C., III
Bentz, Francis J.
*Benzing, Joseph C.
*Berg, David A.
*Berg, John S.
Bergstedt, Merrill W.
*Berkey, Thomas J.
Berley, Leonard E.
*Berliner, Harold I.
*Bern, Russell H.
Bernard, Bradford L.
Berrio, William J., Jr.
Berry, James D., III
Berry, John D.
Berry, Maxwell R., III
*Berry, Michael L.
Berry, Richard L.
Bessey, Roland B.
*Best, Jimmie M.
Bevilacqua, Nicholas D.
*Bewick, James S.
Beyer, Dean H.
Beyman, David E.
*Bezrutch, Rudolph A.
Biancaniello, Anthony R.
Bickford, Leonard R.
Bieber, Arlyn C.
Biederman, John H.
Bieraugel, Eugene E.
*Bierig, Frederick A.
Bigelow, William F., II
Biggers, David J.
*Biggs, John A.
*Bildhauer, William M.
*Billings, Bryce G.
*Billings, Richard A.
*Billue, Sidney K.
Binder, Frederick H.
Binder, Raymond A.
*Bingham, John H. L.
*Bird, Walter R.
*Bishop, Bruce B.
Bishop, Charles K.
Bishop, Charles H., Jr.
Bishop, John F.
*Bishop, Joseph B.
*Bishop, Richard K.
*Bissonnette, Laurence A.
Bittel, William H., III
*Bivins, Howard V.
Bjorge, Gary J.
Bjorkner, Arthur C.
Black, James D.
Black, John C.
Black, Richard E.
*Blacksher, James U.
Blackwell, Edward S., III
Blades, Donald E.
*Blair, James N.
Blair, Ronald E.
*Blake, William D.
*Blakeley, William R.
Blakely, Josslyn F., Jr.
*Blakemore, James E.
Blakeslee, Theodore F.
Blanchard, Robert D.
*Bland, Jess R.
Blanding, Michael S.
Blank, Gilbert C.
Blank, Thomas J.
*Blankenship, Monte J.
Blaylock, Robert J.
Blee, William A.
*Blegstad, Gary C.
*Blesch, Jerry M.
Blessington, George J.
Blevins, Luther
Blew, Gilbert L.
Blewster, William H.
Blink, James S.
*Blocher, John M.
Blomquist, John A.
*Bloom, John L.
Bloomer, Phillip R.
*Blouch, John W.
Blum, John H.
*Blumberg, Lawrence B.
Blumenshine, Leonard J.
Boardman, Fred R.
Boardman, John W.
Boatwright, Ralph N.
*Bobbitt, Bert A.
Bobrek, Frederick J.
Bocklage, Vincent P.
Boehmer, William J.
Bogard, Thomas H.
Bogert, Charles N.
*Boggess, Randolph C.
Bohn, John L.
Boland, Thomas P.
Bolster, James J.
Bolton, John N.
Boltz, Ronald O.
*Boman, Kirk S.
*Bomar, John T., III
Bombard, Thomas S.
Bonawitz, Richard P.
*Bond, James L.
Bond, Jon L.
*Bond, William C.
Bond, William M.
*Bonds, John B.
Bonham, Mark W.
Bonner, William J.
Booher, Dean E.
Boom, Frederick L.
Boone, Frederick O., Jr.
Boone, George J.
*Boorda, Jeremy M.
Booth, George R.
Booth, Stuart E.
Booth, Windsor P., Jr.
*Bopp, Stanley O.
Borghoff, Francis A., III
Borgstrom, Karl F. T.
*Borho, John M.
Borine, Carl A.
Borland, John B.
Born, Terry R.
Borowski, Peter R.
*Borsic, James P.
*Boss, Ronald A.
Boston, Michael R.
*Bostwick, Stephen H.
Bothwell, Robert B.
Botsford, Neil
Boucher, Charles E.
Boughton, Louis C.
Bourgeois, Roy L., Jr.
*Bourland, David L.
Bouxsein, Russell A.
*Bovat, Lawrence B.
*Bove, Roger G.
*Bowers, Charles H.
*Bowers, Fred F.
Bowker, Arnold J., Jr.
Bowman, Bradley J.
Bowman, Gilbert P., Jr.
Bowman, William T.
Boyce, Bert R., Jr.
*Boyd, John T.
Boyd, Richard B.
Boyer, Charles L.
Brabson, Ben D., Jr.
Bradbeer, Thomas G.
*Bradbury, Robert B.
Bradford, James D.
Bradford, Ray A.
Bradley, Clarence D.
Bradley, George H.
Bradley, Philip B.
Bradshaw, James E.
Bradshaw, Wilton D.
*Bradt, Leonard D., Jr.
*Brady, Carl O.
Brady, James C.
Braham, Donald F.
Brainerd, William H.
Braly, Sam W.
*Bramble, Keith K.
Branch, Allen D.
Brand, Robert J.
Brand, Walter N., III
*Brandon, Herman T.
Brandow, Barry G.
Braning, Ancil H., Jr.
*Branish, Ronald L.
*Brann, James G.
Brasher, James C.
Braswell, Johnnie L.
Brebner, Dante C.
*Breeland, Loran V.
Breithaupt, Paul D.
Bremner, Bruce B.
Brennan, Michael J.
*Brennan, William J.
*Brenner, Gordon J.
*Brenton, George W., III
Brereton, Richard G.
*Brewer, Harold L.
Brewer, Ricks G.
Brickett, John F.
*Briggs, Edward
Brink, James A.
*Brinkman, Charles B.
Brinks, Lawrence H.
Brinks, William H.
Brisack, Philip R.
Brislin, Robert J.
Broadman, Lynn M.
Brock, John F.
Brock, Kenneth J.
Brock, Leroy K.
*Brock, Lynn S.
*Brockett, William A., Jr.
*Brockway, David M., Jr.
Brod, John W.
*Brodehl, Richard B.
Brodt, Gary A.
Bromhal, Robert L.
Bromwell, James E.
*Bronson, Marshall W.
*Brook, Harvey J.
*Brooks, Edward J.
*Brooks, Lynn A.
Brough, James A.
Broussard, Barry D.
Brown, Ballard C.
Brown, Billy D.
Brown, Billy E.
Brown, Boyd P., Jr.
Brown, Buell L., Jr.
Brown, Carroll D.
*Brown, Charles M., Jr.
*Brown, Charles F.
Brown, Charles F., Jr.
*Brown, David C.
Brown, Denis R.
Brown, Dennis C.
*Brown, George E., Jr.
Brown, George H.
Brown, Harry E.
Brown, James D., III
Brown, James E., Jr.
*Brown, Jay S.
Brown, Jerald D.
Brown, John L.
*Brown, Joseph R.
Brown, Laurence S.
Brown, Lewis R.
*Brown, Noel W.
Brown, Philip H.
Brown, Philip W.
Brown, Ridgely P.
Brown, Robert F.
*Brown, Roger D.
Brown Ronald L.
Brown, Stephen T.
Brown, Walter R.
Brown, William G.
Brown, William F.
Brown, William B.
Browning, Robert D.
Brownlee, James L., III
Broxholm, Donald T.
Broyles, James P.
*Broz, Joseph P.
*Brucato, Philip E.
*Bruce, Clayton E.
Brugman, Eloy R.
*Bruins, Berend D.
Brun, Charles R.
*Brunelle, William T.
Bruner, Edward R.
Brunner, Maurice T.
Brush, James D., II
Bryant, Herbert V.
*Bryant, James C.
Bryant, William L.
*Bryner, John E.
Buche, John A.
*Buchholz, Brian R.
*Bucholz, Albert A., Jr.
Buciak, James J.
*Buck, Arthur E., Jr.
Buck, John M., II
Buckley, Francis P.
Buckley, James J.

Buckley, Peter P.
Buelow, Thomas W.
Buhler, Carl P.
Bulharowski, John F.
Bullard, Johnie P., Jr.
Bullington, Edwin H.
Bunch, Samuel T.
*Bunger, Robert H.
Bunyan, Edgar W.
Burch, Othney P.
Burchill, John F.
Burdick, Gary R.
Burford, Benjamin W.
*Burford, Ronald E.
*Burger, Neil A.
Burges, Rufus T., Jr.
Burgess, Jerry J.
*Burke, Alan B.
*Burke, Charles R.
*Burke, Gary L.
Burke, Kevin J.
*Burkhart, Paul T., Jr.
*Burklo, Donald E.
*Burkons, Hugh A.
Burmaster, Ross A.
Burnand, Robert W., Jr.
Burnett, Robert S.
Burnham, Paul L.
Burnham, William J.
Burns, Alvin E.
Burns, Bradley G.
Burns, Charles E.
Burns, Joseph E., Jr.
Burns, Louis D., III
Burns, Robert L.
*Burr, Thomas S.
*Burrell, Donald O.
*Burres, George E., Jr.
*Burritt, James G.
*Burrow, James B., Jr.
Burrows, John S., III
Burrows, Peter V.
Burrus, Gary M.
Burstein, Robert C.
Burton, Charles G.
Busboom, Ronald L.
Bushard, Joseph W.
Bussey, Laurence T.
Bustard, John T.
Butcher, William T.
Butler, David A.
*Butler, Edward A.
Butler, James L.
*Butler, John H.
*Butler, Joseph M.
Butler, Thomas S. K.
Butts, David E.
Butts, Gary R.
Buxton, Edward D.
Buzzell, Bruce E.
Byers, Billy E.
Byers, John A.
Byrd, Darrell E.
*Byrne, Robert M.
Byrnes, Charles P.
Byrnes, James D.
Byrnes, John B.
Cabana, Jean R.
Cabello, Herminio, Jr.
*Cabik, Steven R.
Cacchione, David A.
Cagle, Thomas G.
*Cahill, Allen L.
Cain, Joseph J., Jr.
Calbert, Jack F.
*Caldwell, Benjamin E.
Caldwell, Robert B.
Caldwell, Robert E.
Caldwell, Ronald A.
Caldwell, Stuart N.
Calhoun, David L.
*Calhoun, William M.
Call, Robert N.
Callahan, Michael J.
*Callahan, Paul L.
Callahan, Thomas D., III
Callaway, William T., Jr.
*Callen, Darl H., Jr.
*Calligan, Christopher C.
*Callis, William A.
Calvert, Daniel R.
Calvert, Richard C. M., III
*Calvert, Robert E.
Cameron, Alan G.
*Camp, Don L.
*Camp, Peter W.
*Camp, Richard A.
*Campbell, Archibald G.
Campbell, Bruce B.
Campbell, Charles E.
Campbell, Douglas T.
Campbell, David C.
Campbell, Edward L.
Campbell, Guy R.,III
Campbell, Harry M.
Campbell, Jimmy R.
Campbell, Richard W.
Campbell, Terry L.
Campbell, William K.
Campione, Frank J.
Canaday, Carlton W.
*Canady, Paul A.
Candelo, John E.
Cangelosi, Joseph
Canham, Lester F., Jr.
*Cantwell, Jerry P.
Capewell, John, Jr.
*Capie, Donald J.
Capone, Louis R., Jr.
*Caporicci, Joseph A.
*Carden, James D.
Carey, Edward F.
Carignan, William R.
*Carlin, John T., Jr.
Carlson, Allan T.
Carlson, Charles J.
*Carlson, Douglas L.
Carlson, John J.
*Carlson, John A.
*Carlson, Paul E.
Carlson, Ronald
Carlson, Roy F.
Carlton, Lester M., Jr.
Carmichael, Larry L.
Carney, Charles H.
*Carney, James A.
Caron, Ernest J. J.
*Carpenter, Allan R.
Carpenter, Christopher J.
Carpenter, Everett L.
Carpenter, Robert E.
Carr, Howard E., Jr.
Carr, James R.
Carr, Robert C.
*Carrico, James E.
Carroll, Donald W., Jr.
Carroll, Gerald R.
Carroll, James E.
Carroll, Kenneth R.
Carroll, Leslie J., Jr.
*Carroll, Terrence O.
Carson, David, J.
Carter, Billy D.
*Carter, Gordon H.
Carter, James E.
*Carter, Major L.
*Carter, Owen T.
Carter, Robert T.
*Carter, William M.
Carton, Robert V., Jr.
Cartwright, Peter W.
Cartwright, Howard
Caruana, Charles R.
Caruso, Salvatore A., Jr.
*Carver, Donald B.
Casanovas, Michael G.
Case, Ernest A.
Case, John R.
*Cashin, Joseph W., Jr.
Cashion, James H.
Cason, Lamar H.
*Cass, Dudley E.
Cass, Edward C.
Cassiman, Paul A.
Casten, Richard O.
Cathcart, Thomas H.
Cattau, Richard L.
Causey, Robert E. G.
Causey, William C., III
Cauttrell, Charles C., III
Cavanaugh, James P.
Cavanaugh, John P.
Cavas, Anthony J.
Cerletti, Joseph M.
*Cerrone, George J., Jr.
Cerruti, "E" Richard J.
*Chace, Alden B., Jr.
*Chadwick, Stephen K.
Chaffin, Bradford A.
Chafin, Thomas L.
*Challender, Jack L.
*Chamberlain, Robert F.
*Chambers, Robert H.
Chambers, Robert A.
*Champion, Robert H.
Chance, Jack H.
Chandler, Robert C.
Chapin, Douglas M.
Chapman, Eugene N.
*Chapman, John R.
Chapman, John W.
Chapman, John C.
*Chapman, Robert D.
*Chapman, Walter T.
*Chappel, James R.
*Chappell, Richard L.
Chappuie, Louis E.
*Charette, Francis W.
Charles, David M.
Charnigo, Richard
Charvet, Paul C.
Chase, John P.
Chastain, Lenuel B.
*Chasteen, Robert W.
*Chauncey, Gregory A.
Cherry, Royal W., Jr.
*Chesbrough, Geoffrey L.
*Chesley, Howard S.
Chesser, Marvin B., Jr.
*Chesson, Ralph R., Jr.
Chester, Frederick R.
Chester, James B.
*Chicoine, Eugene P.
Childress, Samuel L.
Childs, Robert M.
Childs, William R.
Chinn, Garretson W.
*Chinnes, Bennie A.
Chipman, Donald W.
Chituras, Charles C., Jr.
Choate, David C.
Christ, Gerald G.
*Christen, Samuel E.
Christensen, Wesley J.
*Christensen, Edward L.
*Christensen, George A.
Christensen, Clyde V.
Christian, Darryl W.
*Christian, Paul E.
Christian, David C.
*Christianson, Daniel T.
Christie, Volney L.
Christison, Robert A.
*Chugg, Howard R.
Church, James A.
Church, Jerry A.
Church, Wayne C.
Churney, Andrew V.
Ciepiela, Robert
Cincotta, Eugene A.
Cindrich, Evan
*Cisler, Thomas M.
*Cistriano, John J.
*Clancy, Robert S.
Clanton, Lewis E.
Clare, Thomas H.
Clarey, Stephen S.
Clark, Arthur
*Clark, Charles T. B.
*Clark, Colin M.
*Clark, David G.
Clark, Glen D.
Clark, Howard B.
*Clark, James W.
*Clark, Jerry A.
Clark, Larry K.
Clark, Reuben E.
Clark, Richard M.
Clark, Robert T.
Clark, Robin B.
Clark, Thomas E.
Clark, Tony F.
*Clark, Vady R.
Clark, Walter T.
*Clark, William L.
Clark, William A.
*Clarke, Carl W.
*Clarke, Edward J.
*Clarke, Wayne C.
Clason, Aryl B.
Clawson, Paul F.
*Claypool, Allan J.
*Cleary, Donald J.
*Cleary, Francis P.
*Cleater, John F.
*Clemenger, John W.
*Clement, "A" Michel
Clemmer, Everett D.
*Clendenin, James E.
Clendenning, John R., Jr.
Clevenger, Ronald M.
Clickner, John C.
*Cliff, William R.
*Clifford, Robert M.
Clifford, Richard A.
*Cliffton, Donald W.
Cline, Richard G.
Cline, Robert N.
Cline, Warner B.
Cloues, Richard W., Jr.
Clouse, William J.
*Clow, Wallace G., Jr.
*Clugston, Joe E.
*Clyde, David N., Sr.
Coatti, John P.
Cobb, David A.
*Cobb, Harold N.
Coble, Thomas D.
Cochran, John R., Jr.
Cochran, Robert O.
Cochran, Virgil F.
*Coe, Dana A.
Coffey, Bill R.
Coffey, Thomas E.
Coffman, John Y., III
Cogan, James C.
Cohen, Samuel
*Cohen, Steven R.
Cohick, David G.
Coiner, Jerry C.
*Cole, Charles E.
Cole, Legrande O., Jr.
*Cole, Steven C.
Cole, Thomas H., Jr.
Coleman, Alan B.
Coleman, Carrol E.
Coleman, Donald H.
Coleman, Garnett W.
Coleman, Jon S.
Coleman, Michael C.
*Coleman, William E.
*Collins, Edward E.
*Collins, Edward G.
Collins, James W., Jr.
*Collins, Johnny W., Jr.
Collins, Robert J.
Collman, Charles B.
*Colucci, Anthony R.
*Colwell, Charles R.
*Combs, David L.
*Comfort, Richard L.
Comiskey, Richard J.
Commander, Frank A.
*Commins, William J.
Compton, Frank R.
Comte, Thomas E.
Conard, Dean E.
Conaway, Joseph A.
Conaway, Larry J.
*Condon, Daniel J., III
*Conjura, John E.
Conjura, Joseph G.
Conklin, John B.
Conlon, Timothy J.
Connell, Carl B., Jr.
*Connor, Joseph D.
Connolly, John J.
Connolly, Michael B.
Connolly, Patrick J., Jr.
*Connor, Ernie E.
*Connor, James D.
*Connor, John C.
Connors, James R.
Connors, Tracy D.
*Conrey, Thomas R.
*Conte, John C.
*Conway, Frank M., III
Conway, Gary K.
Cook, Arvil L.
Cook, Charles T.
Cook, David F.
Cook, David C.
*Cook, Larry E.
*Cook, Martell J.
Cooke, Oren B.
*Coon, David W.
*Cooper, George T.
Cooper, Terry B.
*Coopersmith, James M.
Copeland, Aaron C.
Copeland, Richard G.
Copenhaver, John R.
*Copley, David R.
Copp, Thomas F., Jr.
Corbett, Charles H.
*Corbin, Floyd E.
*Corcoran, Joseph F.
Cordle, James C.
Corn, Robert H.
*Cornell, Thomas R.
*Cornforth, Clarence M.
Cosby, James W.
Costa, William J.
*Costello, Charles F., Jr.
Cotignola, Anthony R.
Cotter, Joseph D., Jr.
*Cotter, Robert A.
*Cotton, Douglas L.
Coulson, Robert L.
Counts, Karl M.
Counts, Norris G.
*Coupe, Jay Jr.
*Courtney, William R.
Cousins, Belmont W.
Cousins, Harry R.
Covan, James P.
*Covey, Robert W.
*Covington, William E., III
*Cowan, Charles B.
*Coward, Jimmie K.
*Cowart, John M.
*Cox, Charles C.
Cox, Edwin R., Jr.
*Cox, Gary L.
Cox, John A.
*Cox, John H.
Cox, John P.
Cox, Virgil G.
Coy, Larry L.
Coyle, Paul D.
Crabtree, Albert E.
Crabtree, James E.
*Craddock, John R.
*Craggs, John R.
*Craig, Dean W.
Crain, Donald R.
*Cramer, Charles C.
Crane, Wendell E.
Cranston, Craig H.
Crary, William A., Jr.
*Crawford, David C.
*Crawford, Earl R.
*Crawford, Harry E.
Crawford, James M.
Crawford, Leslie P., Jr.
Crawford, Timothy B.
*Creath, Billie R.
Creecy, Carson H., Jr.
Creel, Robert B.
*Creighton, Charles B.
Creighton, Robert, Jr.
*Crellin, Ronald E.
*Creps, Stephen G.
Crestin, David S.
Crimmins, Patrick J.
Crippen, Richard P.
Cristallo, Peter P.
Croasmun, Robert F., Jr.
Crockett, John E.
Croix, Larry E.
*Croll, Larry R.
*Crombie, Kenneth M.
Cromwell, James H.
Crooks, Richard A.
*Crooks, Stephen C.
Crosier, Charles D.
Cross, Jerry V.
Cross, Ronald W.
Cross, Stanley O.
*Cross, William D.
Crossman, Alan E.
Crossman, Walter A.
Crosson, James D.
*Crouch, John M., Jr.
Crouch, John H.
Crouch, Warren R., Jr.
Crowder, John K.
*Crowhurst, Henry D.
Crowl, Charles H.
*Crowley, Edward J.
Crownover, James W.
Crum, David L.
*Crumly, Jerry M.
Crummey, John K.
*Crump, Edward W.
Cryan, Richard A.
Cuccia, Robert A.
Cullen, Robert L.
Culleton, David O.
Culligan, Francis J.
*Cully, John D.
Culver, John B., III
Culver, Norman W.
Cunningham, William P., Jr.
Cunningham, Edward J.
Curnen, Robert E.
*Curran, Daniel A.
*Curran, Lawrence A.
Curran, Lawrence E.
*Curran, William F., Jr.
*Currey, John M.
Currie, Daniel L., Jr.
Currie, Laurin C.
*Curry, Edward M., Jr.
*Curry, Harry G.
Curry, Samuel B., Jr.
Curtin, John O.
Curtin, Peter M.
*Curtis, Lynn H.
*Curtis, Richard A.

Curtis, Richard B.
Cushing, Matthew M.
*Cybul, Harvey J.
Czerwonka, Walter L.
Czuchra, Norman R.
Dabbs, John E.
Daggett, Vernon P.
*Dahl, Dennis K.
Dalberg, Richard L., Jr.
*Dale, Fredric M.
Daley, Michael J.
Dalise, Louis L.
Dallas, Stephen W.
Dallolio, David A.
Dalrymple, Edward K.
Dalton, Clem E.
*Dalton, Gerard H.
*Daly, Richard J., Jr.
Dammann, Eli L.
Damon, George A.
Damron, David A.
Damron, Jim L.
Damrow, Rodney E.
Daniels, Fred G.
Daniels, James E.
Danielson, Larry M.
Danks, John H.
Dann, Warren K.
Dannov, Bernard A.
Darrow, Ronald L.
Daubenberger, Charles B.
Dauwalder, Robert H.
Davenport, Richard R.
Davenport, Virgil T.
Davey, James A. G., Jr.
David, Noel A.
Davidson, Alan N.
Davidson, Dan L.
Davies, John G.
*Davis, Alton T.
*Davis, Calvin W.
*Davis, Dock H.
*Davis, Edward A.
*Davis, George B.
*Davis, James D.
Davis, James E., Jr.
*Davis, Jay N.
Davis, John P., Jr.
Davis, Lynn H.
*Davis, Martin D.
*Davis, Milton E., Jr.
Davis, Paul W.
*Davis, Richard C.
*Davis, Richard G.
*Davis, Richard E.
Davis, Robert L.
Davis, Ronald L.
Davis, Royce P., Jr.
*Davis, Thomas E.
Davis, Thomas C., Jr.
Davis, Vance P.
Dawdy, Benny L.
*Dawson, William D.
Dawson, William J. C.
Day, James S., Jr.
*Daymude, John O.
*Dean, David M., Jr.
*Dean, Joel A.
Dearborn, Ray N.
Dearie, John R.
Deboer, Kenneth F.
Debolt, Robert F.
*Deburkarte, Donald E.
*Debuzna, Joseph A.
Decampi, John W., Jr.
Decker, Larry E.
Decker, Robert L.
*Decker, Stephen S.
Decker, Wilbur L.
*Declercq, Keith L.
*Deevy, Thomas J.
Defloria, Joseph G., Jr.
*Degavre, Robert C. O.
*Degnan, Joseph E.
Dehart, Leon A., Jr.
Dekerlegand, Ronald J.
Dekker, Jon K.
Delagarza, Robert D.
Delaney, Edward J.
Delaney, Paul R.
Delapena, Federico A.
*Delesie, James C.
Deleyiannis, Steven J.
*Delgado, Josue J.
*Delles, Gary J.
Dellinger, David L.
Delnickas, Thomas J.
*Delp, Alan F.
*Delury, Michael E.
Demartini, John J.
Demech, Fred R., Jr.
Demeter, Michael J.
Demko, Robert J.
Dempewol, Donald G.
Dempsey, Don E.
Demshar, Carl W.
Denault, Donald R.
*Denney, James R.
Denning, William J., III
*Dennis, Michael R.
Dennis, William E.
Dennison, Clarke O.
*Denson, Stephen L.
*Deputy, Robert W.
Dercole, Albert M.
*Dereemer, William S.
*Derf, Tad A.
Derosa, Robert
Derouin, Albert B.
*Derr, Donald A.
Derrig, Dennis P.
Derusso, Alfred L.
*Desens, Robert B.
*Desmond, Dennis J., Jr.
Desrosiers, Richard A.
Deters, Richard A.
*Devoe, George M., Jr.
Devries, Robert A.
*Dew, Thomas E.
Dewey, Gary G.
*Dias, Gerald F.
Dibble, Paul F.
Dick, Warren H.
Dickinson, Charles P., Jr.
*Dickson, Frank C., II
Dickson, Guy T., Jr.
Dickson, Ronnie A.
*Dickson, Robert E.
Dickson, William H.
Dieckhoff, Philip H.
*Diedenhofen, John W., Jr.
*Diedrich, Gerald B.
*Diehl, Robert W. J.
Diem, Gustav
Dieter, Clarence J.
Dietrich, William V.
Dilger, Dean E.
Dill, Donald L.
*Dillard, Odell G.
Dimeglio, Frank J.
*Dimotta, Emil C., Jr.
Dinan, Ferdinand E.
*Dinunzio, Henry V., Jr.
Disco, George K.
*Ditchey, Robert L.
*Ditmore, George W., II
*Divers, Harry C.
Dixon, George L.
Dixon, Robert O.
*Dixson, Max H.
Dobbins, James R.
Dobson, Kent M.
Dockham, Gary L.
Dodd, Ernest E.
*Dodd, James L.
Dodge, Rex H.
*Dodson, Durrett B.
Doege, Karl F.
Doggett, Thomas E.
Dolan, Thomas E.
*Dolezal, Raymond E.
Dolge, Alan L.
Dollar, Donald H.
*Dollard, John A.
*Dolph, William A.
Dombrofski, Carl E.
*Dombrowski, Walter, Jr.
*Dommers, Richard W.
*Donahue, James J.
*Donahue, James W.
Donahue, Robert P.
*Donaldson, William J.
Donaldson, Eugene J.
Donalty, Francis W., Jr.
Donelson, Richard T.
Donica, Frederick M., Jr.
Donlan, Patrick T.
*Donnelly, William K.
Donnelly, William W., Jr.
Donohoe, Keith W.
Donohue, James P.
Donovan, Dennis M.
Donovan, James M.
Donovan, Orville J., Jr.
Donovan, Robert J.
*Donovan, William F.
Doppelhammer, Marlyn A.
*Doran, George W.
*Dorman, Craig E.
Dorsey, Medford D.
Doswell, Eugene V.
*Doty, Wells B.
*Dougherty, Robert J.
Dougherty, Joseph I.
*Dover, Jack R.
Dowden, Darnell L.
*Dowling, Edgar J., Jr.
Downing, Jimmie V.
Downing, Joseph A.
Downs, Charles P.
Downs, George R., Jr.
Doyle, John E.
Doyle, Joseph L.
*Doyle, Thomas F., Jr.
Dracon, Harry
*Dragos, Octavian
Drake, Albert W.
*Drake, George H., Jr.
*Draper, John F.
Draper, John K., III
*Dreifke, Hilmer W.
*Dressel, Henry F.
*Dressel, Robert H.
Dresser, George B.
Drew, Floyd I.
*Drewett, James E.
Driver, Jerry B.
Drommerhausen, Jerald R.
*Droste, James B.
Drury, Warren R.
*Dryden, Victor D.
DuBois, Harold K.
DuBois, Thomas M.
DuBose, Beverly M., III
*Dubs, Theodore B.
Duckett, Samuel J.
Duckstad, Robert J.
*Duckworth, Stephen M.
Duda, Daniel M.
Dudley, James C.
*Dudley, Nicholas L.
Dufault, Victor P.
Duffy, Denis C., Jr.
*Dufresne, Michael P., Jr.
Dufresne, Raymond A.
*Dugan, John J., Jr.
Dugan, Richard A.
Duggan, Peter M.
Dugger, Travis R.
*Dukat, Frank
Duke, Michael L.
Duke, Robert A.
Duke, Robert B., II
*Dukes, Gary R.
Dumont, Robert C.
Dunbar, John D.
*Duncan, Duane S., Jr.
*Duncan, Marshall Y.
Duncan, Robert W.
Dunham, Donald T.
Dunham, Royal B., Jr.
*Dunlap, Calvin R., III
Dunlap, Robert A., Jr.
Dunlap, Stephen E.
Dunn, Donald B.
Dunn, Marvin
Dunne, James
Dunne, Lawrence R.
Dunne, Paul J.
*Dunstan, Richard A.
*Dunton, Lewis W., III
*Dunton, Lloyd W., Jr.
Durbin, Charles F., Jr.
Durbin, James L., Jr.
*Durbin, Larry A.
*Durham, Dan W.
Dutcher, David D.
Dwyer, Phillip W.
*Dyches, Ken B.
Dyer, George L., Jr.
*Dyer, Robert D.
Dykstra, Roger G.
Eakin, Brian S.
Earl, Richard L.
Easley, George A.
Eason, James R.
*Eason, Spencer C., III
Eastin, Lane J.
*Eastman, Peter R.
*Eastwood, Thomas I., III
*Eater, Charles H.
*Eaton, Gareth R.
Ebany, John A.
Ebbs, James G.
Eberhard, Peter
Eberhardt, Henry E., III
Ebersol, Robert E.
Ebert, Kenneth A.
Eberth, Raymond L.
Eckard, William F., Jr.
Eckstrom, David M.
*Econie, Leonard R.
Edgar, James R., Jr.
*Edleson, Stuart K., Jr.
*Edmonson, Norman V., Jr.
Edmonston, Lee K.
Edmunson, Lawrence L.
Edwards, L. Vernon, Jr.
Edwards, William W.
Efferen, Harry J.
*Efird, William A.
Egg, William C.
*Eggar, Matthew C.
Eggers, Anthony E.
Ehlers, Gene E.
Ehlers, William J.
Ehret, Howard C.
Eichenberger, Johnny M.
*Eichman, Thurman E.
Eide, David B.
*Einspruch, Henry, Jr.
Eison, Charles E.
Ek, Roger W.
Elder, Bobby V.
*Eldred, William A.
Elkins, Frank C.
*Eller, John C.
*Ellern, James B.
*Elliot, Bruce
*Elliott, Ronnie R.
Elliott, Shirley H.
Elliott, Wilson W.
Ellis, Billy M.
Ellis, George J.
*Ellis, John M., III
*Ellis, John R.
*Ellis, Joseph L.
Ellis, Robert L.
Ellis, Thomas D.
*Ellis, William F.
Ellwein, Theodore A.
*Elmore, Lawrence L.
*Elwell, Royce G.
Elwood, John B., Jr.
*Emanuel, Richard C.
*Emarine, Larry L.
*Emerson, Norman P.
*Emmons, Ernest E.
Endrud, John N.
Engel, Daryl L.
*Engelking, James F.
Engelman, Martin H.
Engler, Kenneth G., Jr.
*English, David C.
English, Ted W.
Engman, Lee M.
Engwell, Darrel W.
Ennes, James M., Jr.
Enos, Francis L.
Enstam, Dennis A.
Epler, Robert A.
*Eppinger, John P.
*Epstein, Joseph L.
Epstein, Robert W.
Eral, Willson J.
Erbrick, Dennis W.
Erdmann, John F.
Erickson, James E.
*Erickson, Lawrence E.
Erickson, Ralph H.
Erickson, Richard P.
*Ericson, Jon K.
Ernst, Kenneth L.
*Ernster, Glen H.
Errington, Harry R.
Erzen, Robert J.
Esbeck, Leonard J.
Estabrook, James M., Jr.
Estabrook, Kent S.
*Estell, William A., Jr.
Estes, David D.
*Etchingham, John B., Jr.
*Etter, Charles E.
Eubanks, Glen E.
Eunson, Jack T.
Evans, Irvin C., Jr.
Evans, James B.
Evans, Larry W.
*Evans, Robert B.
Evans, Stephen C.
*Everett, Robert F.
*Everly, John H.
Eversole, Delmar
Every, Martin G.
*Ewert, Lawrence E.
*Ewing, Donald R.
Ewing, Neil D.
Eyre, John E.
*Fachinger, Joseph A.
*Fagan, Cornelius J.
Fagan, James F., Jr.
Fagan, Robert J.
Fagundes, Joseph M.
Fahrbach, James C.
Fair, Regis D.
*Fairbanks, Richard M., III
Fairbanks, Willie B.
*Fairow, Jesse E.
Fait, John V.
Falcon, Michael F.
*Fant, Robert S., Jr.
*Fantin, Jonnie R.
*Farber, Martin J.
Farina, Robert G.
Farmer, William R.
*Farnsworth, Blaine K.
*Faro, Jackie R.
Farquhar, James A.
*Farrell, Edward R.
*Farrell, Gerard D.
*Farris, Ronald M.
Faubion, John M.
Faulkner, Bennie J.
Fautz, Ronald A.
*Fedon, George F.
Feeley, John F.
*Feeney, Harry J., III
Felkins, Shirley L.
Fellows, George R.
*Fellrath, Frank M., Jr.
Felton, John M., Jr.
*Felton, Robert W.
Felts, William T., III
Fendelander, William G.
Fender, Thomas, Jr.
Fenno, Raymond D.
*Fentress, Clydus M.
Ferg, Richard G.
*Ferguson, Billy J.
Ferguson, Bergess A.
*Ferguson, Donald R.
Ferguson, Jerry E.
Ferguson, John L.
Ferguson, Jerry D.
Ferguson, Ronald D.
Ferguson, Robert L.
*Ferrell, John L.
*Ferriter, Nicholas M.
Fertig, Lanny L.
Fetchenhier, Joel J.
Fetrow, James D.
Feuchtwanger, William A.
Feuerbacher, John M.
Fichtner, Ernest
Fiebelkorn, George A., Jr.
Field, John B.
Fields, David D.
Fields, Kenny W.
Fife, Stephen E.
Finch, Parker T., Jr.
Fingerhut, David J.
*Fink, Carl M.
*Fink, Raymond C., Jr.
Finley, Robert E.
*Finn, Edward S.
Finney, Donald W.
Finster, Alfred J.
Firestone, Philip G.
*Firnbach, James D.
*Fischer, Ernest C.
Fischette, James E.
Fish, Donald E.
*Fisher, Adam, Jr.
*Fisher, Arthur W., III
Fisher, Bruce J.
Fisher, Charles K.
Fisher, Gordon E.
Fisher, Isaac A.
*Fisher, Marty R.
Fisher, Paul E.
Fisher, Walter S.
Fitch, Frederick W.
Fitch, Jonathan
*Fitch, Sanford
*Fitrell, Stuart J.
*Fitzgerald, John A.
*Fitzgerald, George M.
*Fitzgerald, Richard N.
Fitzgerald, James R.
Fitzgerald, James I.

Fitzmaurice, John P., III
Fitzpatrick, Gregory D.
Fitzpatrick, Thomas G.
*Fitzsimons, James M.
Fixman, Kent L.
Flagler, Norris J.
Flaherty, Anthony F.
Flanagan, William P., Jr.
Flanigan, Michael J.
*Fleenor, Harold E.
*Fleming, Myron T., Jr.
Fletcher, Roger W.
Fletcher, Robert A.
*Fletcher, William D., III
Flexner, Robert E.
Flint, Lewis W.
*Flintoft, Richard A.
Flintzer, Philip E.
Flower, Roger P.
Flynn, Claude M.
Flynn, Joseph W.
Flynn, Philip D., Jr.
*Flynn, Richard P.
*Flynn, William K.
*Fogarty, James M.
*Foley, John H.
*Folsom, John H.
*Fontenot, Nolan J.
*Foody, Richard R.
*Forbes, Donald E.
Ford, Frederic H.
Ford, Michael E.
Ford, Michael D.
Ford, Preston W., Jr.
Fore, William D.
*Foret, Minest J.
*Forgione, Ralph
Forkin, Thomas
*Forrest, Charles E.
Forrest, Donald A.
Forrest, James C.
Forrest, Matthew D.
*Forrest, Paul J.
Forrester, Andrew H.
Forrester, William D.
Forsgren, Craig M.
Forsyth, James H.
*Fort, John H.
*Fort, Ronnie T.
Forte, Edward T.
Forte, Frederick F.
Fortenberry, Bobby J.
Fortin, Peter G.
Fortkamp, John H.
Fortner, Michael T.
*Forys, Michael G.
Foss, Edward L., Jr.
Fossette, John F.
*Fossum, Erling P.
Foster, Alan W.
*Foster, Donald E.
Foster, John D., Jr.
*Foster, John W.
Foster, John D.
Foster, Lewis R.
Foster, Melvin B.
*Foster, Michael L.
*Fournie, Thomas A.
Fowler, Robert C.
*Fowler, Thomas A.
*Fowlkes, Paul D.
*Fox, Brett H.
Fox, John, Jr.
Fox, Robert E.
Fox, Ronald L.
Fox, Thomas H., Jr.
*Fox, William E.
Foy, Warren S.
*Foyle, Robert C.
*Francis, Stephen T.
*Francis, Wayne H.
*Francis, William C.
Franco, John A.
*Frank, Allen J.
Frank, William M.
Franka, Floyd E.
*Franke, Donald K.
Franklin, James A.
Franklin, Thomas L.
Frankovic, Robert J.
Franks, Clifford I.
*Franz, David
Franz, Rodney C.
Frazier, Gerald A.
Frazier, James R.
Frazier, Paul H.
*Frederick, Ronald E.
Frederick, Felder J., III
Frederick, Charles E.
Frederickson, Dennis R.
Freeman, Dumont S., III
Freeman, James W., Jr.
Freeman, Stanley A.
Freeman, Thomas W.
French, Joel R.
French, John C., Jr.
*French, Robert L.
*French, Thomas P., Jr.
*Frewing, John L.
*Frick, Dean E.
*Frick, Frederick M.
Friedrichsen, Lewis J., Jr.
Friswold, John D.
*Fritz, Jerome C.
Fritz, Thomas W.
*Frizzell, George E.
Frizzell, Ralph E.
Froehlich, Jacob C.
Froehlich, Edward W., Jr.
Fronce, John O.
Frost, Bobby E.
Frost, John A.
Fry, Larry L.
Fry, Philip N.
*Fryer, Charles W.
Fuessenich, Leonard C.
Fugate, Robert W.
Fugatt, Carl R.
Fugere, Donald W.
Fulbright, Terrell W., Jr.
Fuller, Charles H.
*Fuller, George C.
*Fuller, James D.
*Fuller, John P.
Fuller, Robert D.
*Fullerton, John P.
*Fullerton, John D.
*Fulton, Stephen H.
*Fulton, William L., II
*Fulton, William J.
Funk, Ronald C.
Fuquay, Paul K.
Furey, William C.
Furlong, William K.
Furuli, David T.
*Futch, George W.
*Gabriel, Thomas O.
*Gabryelski; Richard M.
*Gaffney, Frank J.
*Gaines, William A.
*Galanti, Paul E.
Galassi, James A.
Galazzi, Stefan P.
*Galbraith, Joseph L.
Galen, James F., Jr.
Galinski, Thomas P.
Gallagher, Lawrence A.
Gallagher, Gerald M.
Gallagher, Daniel A.
*Gallaher, Dale M.
Gallinaro, Nicholas C.
Galloway, John M.
Galvin, William P.
Gamble, Ted K.
*Gamboa, Jose C.
Gandy, Richard N.
*Ganley, Richard E.
Gann, Fred L.
*Gann, James W., Jr.
Gantous, George A.
Gantz, John R.
Ganun, James V., Jr.
Gapp, Donald R.
Garcia, Ramon
*Gardner, Forrest W.
*Gardner, James S.
Gardner, Matthew M., Jr.
*Garlick, Richard E.
*Garmon, Gerald S.
Garner, Philip F.
Garns, Keith M.
*Garoutte, Lawrence H.
Garrett, Allen L.
*Garrett, Jerry D.
Garrett, John H.
*Garrett, Marvin A.
Garrick, Daniel R.
Garrison, Carl D.
Garrison, Douglas N.
*Garrison, Stephen A.
Garrison, Terrence M.
Garry, Andrew J.
Garthner, John P.
Gartner, John B.
Gartzke, Arthur A.
Garvey, Arthur J.
Gaskell, James W.
*Gass, Alan R.
Gaston, Thomas L.
Gates, Floyd D.
*Gatti, Desmond F.
Gaudiano, Antonio W.
*Gaukroger, James G.
*Gaul, James H.
*Gaulden, James C., Jr.
Gautschi, Charles L.
Gay, George R.
Gay, Malcolm G.
*Gaynor, Cornelius W.
Geary, Charles D., Jr.
Geary, William J.
Gebhardt, Darrell E.
*Gee, Daryl L.
*Gee, George N.
Geers, Samuel K.
Geis, Lewis A., Jr.
*Geis, Neil F.
Geise, Barry R.
Geisel, Norman H.
Genden, Lawrence M.
Gender, John E.
Genereux, Bruce T.
Gensler, Robert L.
*Gent, Jack O.
Gentry, Charles S.
*Gentry, Donald G.
Gentsch, Frank M., Jr.
George, Harold W.
Georgiana, James J.
*Gerdts, Richard J.
*Gerhardt, Charles L.
Gerken, Kenneth G.
Gerwe, Franklin H., Jr.
*Ghirardi, Lawrence F.
*Ghrer, Grady F.
Giannotti, Sterling M., Jr.
Giasi, Ralph W.
Gibbs, Kenneth R.
Gibbs, Hugh D.
Giberson, Paul G.
Giddens, Emory E.
Giebner, Richard H.
Gieschen, Leonard H.
Gilbert, John P.
*Gildersleeve, Elmer J.
*Giles, Robert E.
*Gill, Gary E.
Gillen, Robert L.
Gillespie, Robert G., Jr.
Gillespie, Robert V.
Gillette, Norman L.
Gilligan, Thomas J.
Gillis, Malcolm E., Jr.
Gillow, Stuart C.
Gilmore, Barry W.
*Gilmore, Richard D.
*Gilson, James D.
Gingras, Peter S.
*Ginieczki, Richard F.
Giovannelli, Joseph M.
Giovinazzo, Anthony
Girard, Brian E.
Girouard, Marvin J.
Gizzarelli, John L., Jr.
*Gladding, George S.
Gladwin, Harold R.
*Glasier, Peter K.
Gleed, Richard C.
*Glenn, Walter L., Jr.
*Glockner, Herman O.
Glossinger, John L.
*Glover, Jimmy N.
*Glover, William F. H., III
*Gluck, John M.
Gobbel, James T., Jr.
*Godek, Leonard S.
Godfrey, William T.
*Goebel, David M.
*Goebel, Louis E.
Goeckel, Jon K.
*Goettel, Bruce D.
*Gold, Bennett A.
Goldberg, Goeffrey P.
Goldberg, Jeremy R.
Goldblatt, Howard C., Jr.
Golden, Alfred T., Jr.
*Goldman, Dan E., Jr.
Goldman, Robert B.
*Goldsborough, Martin W.
*Gomez, Francis A.
Gomez, Luis V.
Gompper, James H.
*Gonatos, Michael J.
Gonnella, Robert
*Gonzalez, Charles F., III
Good, Hoyt R.
Good, Joseph S.
Goodall, Thomas J.
*Goodman, Grayson A.
Goodman, James E.
*Goodman, Jerry E.
Goodman, Marvin C.
*Goodness, Louis
*Goodrich, James M.
Goodwin, Charles B.
Goodwin, Eugene C.
*Goodwin, James H.
Goodwin, Maxwell E., Jr.
*Googins, Bruce R.
*Gordon, Donald P.
*Gordon, Gary B.
Gordon, Hayes I.
*Gordon, Richard S.
Gordon, Thomas C.
Gorham, William E.
Gosnell, Raymon R.
Gottschalk, Ronald B.
Gottschalk, Gary L.
Gottschalk, Gary W.
*Goudreau, James A.
*Goudy, Ronald C.
Gould, William H.
*Gower, Roger E.
Graber, Harold F.
Gradick, Herman W. I., Jr.
Grady, Edward A.
*Graf, Karl R.
Graff, Russell J.
*Grafton, Patrick S.
*Graham, Billy M.
*Graham, Charles I.
*Graham, Edward M.
*Graham, Homer H., Jr.
Graham, Ian K.
Graham, James W.
Graham, James P.
*Graham, John E., Jr.
Graham, Joseph B., Jr.
Graham, Thomas K.
*Graham, Walter H.
Granito, William R.
*Granneman, Gary A.
Granneman, Ralph G.
Grant, David L.
Grant, Frederick E.
*Grant, Louis R., II
Granuzzo, Andrew A.
Graves, James M.
Graves, Robert J.
Graves, William T.
*Gravley, Thomas W.
Gray, Brian E.
Gray, Donald W.
Gray, Gary M.
Gray, Jimmie L.
*Gray, Myron P.
*Gray, Ronald D., III
Gray, Ronald A.
Gray, Silas G.
*Gray, Victor S., Jr.
Gray, William T., IV
Grazier, Donald L.
Green, George L.
*Green, Norman R., Jr.
*Green, Robert L.
Green, Thomas B., III
Green, William J., Jr.
Greene, Arthur C.
Greene, Otis J., Jr.
*Greene, Patrick E.
*Greene, Robert F.
*Greene, William W. B. Jr.
Greenlee, Thomas P.
*Greenman, Robert P.
*Greenquist, Victor S.
Greenwood, James S.
Greenwood, Kenneth L.
*Gregoire, Guy J.
*Gregory, Carl W.
Gregory, Julian O., Jr.
Gregson, Robert B.
Greiner, Richard M.
*Gressett, Otho C., Jr.
Griebel, Bernard A.
Griffey, David R.
*Griffin, Charles D., Jr.
*Griffin, Charles M.
Griffin, Gerald F.
*Griffin, Harold C., Jr.
Griffin, Ralph B.
Griffin, Thomas D.
Griffith, Douglas K.
Griffith, John B.
Griffith, Rodger J.
Griffith, Ronald L.
Griffiths, David J.
*Grigg, Lewis W.
*Griggs, Stanley D.
*Grinstead, Darrel J.
Grisham, Billy M.
*Griswold, Robert J.
Groebe, Philip B.
Groff, Jon P.
Groman, Alphonse W., Jr.
*Grondahl, Clayton M.
Grondzik, Thomas W.
Gronewold, Clyde A.
Gross, Omer, S., Jr.
Grotenhuis, John H.
*Grove, Frank H.
Groves, Robert H.
*Grunwald, Gerald M.
Grygo, Edward W., Jr.
*Grzymala, Thomas C.
Guarnieri, Fred R., Jr.
*Guehring, Paul N.
*Guerin, Gerard W.
Guhl, John A.
Guinn, William A.
Guizzetti, James S.
Gulledge, Hal A.
Gullett, Fred W.
Gundler, Lawrence W.
Gunn, George R., Jr.
*Gutteron, William L.
Gutzmer, Paul R.
Guyer, John O.
*Guyon, Robert J.
*Gwadz, Robert W.
*Haag, Robert L.
Haas, William L.
*Habermann, Richard C.
*Hackney, Daniel T.
*Haddick, John R.
Hafer, Owen V.
Hagan, Robert G.
Hageman, Theodore H., Jr.
*Hagerup, Jack E.
Hagey, Donald W.
*Haglund, Paul D.
Hahn, Harold T.
Hahn, William H.
Hakim, Paul R.
Hakin, David L.
Hale, Oswald K., III
Hale, Patrick R.
Halka, Richard S.
*Hall, Allan M.
Hall, David W.
*Hall, James B.
Hall, Jerry A.
Hall, Roy W.
Hall, Wendel V.
Hall, William A.
Hall, William E.
Hallberg, Ronald C.
*Hallead, William C.
Hallett, Fred N.
Halliday, Nicholas E.
Halperin, Mark I.
Halstead, Kenneth A.
Halverson, James M.
Halverson, Ronny R.
*Hamel, James A., Jr.
Hamill, Ernest E.
Hamilton, Andrew W.
Hamilton, David L.
Hamilton, Frank W.
*Hamilton, Jack E.
*Hamilton, Ross M.
*Hamilton, Wayne E.
*Hamly, Frederick, N.
Hammer, George C.
*Hammer, John L., III
Hammon, Eugene N.
Hammond, James W.
Hand, William E.
Handberry, John E.
*Hands, Donald D.
Handy, David G.
Handy, James M., Jr.
Hanes, Weldon B.
*Hanlein, Jon K.
*Hanley, John J. Jr.
*Hanley, Michael D.
Hanley, Russell G.
Hanna, Monte R.
Hannahoe, Bart B.
Hannon, Kevin M.
Hansen, Christian L.
Hansen, Laurence R.
Hansen, Leo B.
*Hanson, Claude L.
Hanson, George M.
Hanson, Harold C.
Hanson, Jaryl P.
*Hanson, Michael K.
*Hanzel, Joseph A., Jr.
*Harbour, George A., III
Harcharik, John A.
*Hardekopf, Robert A.
*Hardy, James C. C.
*Hardy, Richard E.
Hargreave, David
*Hargrett, Gregor J.
*Harkin, Thomas R.
Harley, James H.

*Harlow, James H. V.
Harmon, Andrew J., Jr.
Harmon, Gary D.
Harmon, Shirley R., Jr.
Harmon, Thomas J.
Harms, John H.
*Harney, Allen D.
Harper, Billy E.
Harper, Bruce G.
Harper, Oscar M., Jr.
Harrel, David B.
Harrell, Henry H.
Harrington, Thomas M.
Harrington, James R.
Harris, Donald L.
Harris, Frank A.
*Harris, James P.
Harris, Larry C.
*Harris, Leigh
Harris, Marshall P., Jr.
Harris, Philip A.
*Harris, Robert H.
Harrison, Allen L.
Harrison, Charles E.
Harrison, Charles W.
*Harrison, Edward J., Jr.
Hart, Bruce B.
Hart, Harvey H., Jr.
Hart, Larry M.
*Hart, Patrick V.
*Hartleroad, Bobby L.
*Hartman, Charles W., III
Hartman, Harvey L.
*Hartman, Michael A.
*Hartman, Robert C.
*Harvey, Marvin T., Jr.
*Harvey, Paul R.
Harvey, Richard L.
*Harvey, William C.
Harward, Charles L.
Haskins, John B.
*Haskins, Toner C., Jr.
Haspel, Peter A.
Hass, Richard P.
*Hastings, Richard W.
Hasty, Richard L.
*Hatfield, Philip N.
*Hatfield, Richard E.
Hathorn, Luther G.
*Hatton, Lester W., Jr.
*Hauck, Frederick H.
Hauff, Richard A.
*Haugen, Ronald G.
Hause, Rusel C.
Haushalter, William H.
Haveman, Jason N.
*Havey, Brian J.
Hawkins, Charles L.
Hawkins, Homer, Jr.
*Hawley, John G.
*Hayes, Gilbert F.
*Hayes, Richard J.
Hays, Donald E.
*Hays, George E., Jr.
Hayward, William K.
Hazelton, John A.
Heare, Charles I., Jr.
Heaslet, Gary A.
Heath, Julian F.
Heath, William J.
Heathcock, Amos D., Jr.
Heatherly, Sherman L.
Hebert, Thomas E.
*Heck, David W.
Hedrich, James W.
Hedrick, Jerry W.
Heemstra, James W.
Heeter, Nelson M.
*Heffernan, Thomas J.
Heidenreich, Gene E.
Heil, Harold W.
Heil, James H.
Heilig, John
Hein, Robert N.
Heins, Roger J.
*Heintz, Arno E., Jr.
Heintzelman, Thomas G.
Heinz, Michael K.
*Heinzelman, David B.
*Helbig, Raymond A.
Helbron, John W.
Helle, Frederick A.
*Helms, Arthur R.
Helpap, John F.
*Helweg, Arthur W.
*Hemphill, Harold S.
Henderson, Gerald W.
*Henderson, Willie B., Jr.
*Henderson, Phillip C.
Henderson, David F.
*Hendrick, William S.
Hendricks, Herman M.
Hendricks, John N.
Henkel, Ralph H.
*Henley, Richardson L., Jr.
Hennessey, Henry J.
Hennessy, Daniel S.
*Hennessy, William J., Jr.
Henning, Fred L., Jr.
Henning, James G.
Henricks, Dean D.
*Henry, Russell J.
Hensen, Hans H.
*Hensley, Andrew J., Jr.
Hensz, Donald E.
Herbers, Donald A.
Herbert, Alan R.
*Herbert, Thomas L.
*Herbert, William G.
*Herda, George F.
*Hering, Frederic S.
*Herman, Paul G.
Hermann, Herbert E.
*Hermann, Kermyn J.
Hermer, Robert W.
Hermetz, Robert A.
*Herring, Arthur E., Jr.
Herring, James A.
*Herriott, Jack A.
Herrlinger, Albert P.
*Herrmann, John S.
Herron, David E.
Hertzberg, Arthur G.
*Hertzfeldt, Daniel R.
Heslin, Peter L.
Hess, Donald L.
*Hess, Norman B.
Hester, Brabham M.
*Hewett, Harvey J., Jr.
*Hewitt, John F.
*Hewitt, Robert E.
*Hewlett, Harold E.
Hey, Donald B.
Heye, Joseph B.
*Hiatt, Dennis R.
Hibbeln, Harold K.
*Hickam, Aubrey W., Jr.
*Hickox, Oscar J., Jr.
*Hicks, Gerald F.
Hicks, Lloyd H.
*Hicks, Robert L.
*Hicks, William L.
Hiers, Donald L.
Hiete, Kurt, L.
Higbee, Andrew S.
Higginbotham, Harry E.
Higgins, Lawrence P., Jr.
Higgins, Terrence A.
Hightower, Clyde C. III
*Hilburn, Thomas B.
Hildebrand, William T.
Hildeman, Robert E.
Hilgers, Ronald O.
Hill, Alan T.
*Hill, Andrew J.
Hill, Hugh B., Jr.
Hill, James K.
Hill, Jerry W.
Hill, Stanley E.
*Hill, William G.
Hilstrom, Peter C.
Hilton, Wesley W.
Himelfarb, Roy A.
Himmelheber, Peter A.
Himstreet, Thomas R.
Hindle, Carl E.
Hines, Henry L., Jr.
Hing, Dale L.
*Hingsberger, Andrew J., Jr.
*Hinkle, John C.
Hinton, Curtis A.
Hinzman, Robert E.
Hitch, James H.
*Hitchborn, James B.
*Hitchcock, Thomas K.
*Hoag, David W., Jr.
*Hoag, Stephen E.
Hoar, Joseph W.
*Hoard, Mahlon J.
*Hobbs, Lawrence F., Jr.
Hobbs, William B.
*Hobson, Kenneth C.
Hobson, Wendell L.
*Hockey, Edmund R.
Hodson, Robert G.
*Hoffman, David W.
*Hoffman, William S.
*Hoffman, William G.
Hoffmann, Joseph L.
Hogan, Augustine L., III
*Hogg, George W.
Holcomb, Billy J.
*Holland, Howell W.
Holland, Jerry O.
*Holland, Samuel T.
Holland, William M.
*Hollingsworth, William L.
*Hollister, William C.
Holloran, Thomas J.
Hollow, Francis E.
Holloway, Robert L.
Holmes, David L.
Holmes, Milburn J.
*Holt, Philip N.
Holt, Robert B.
Holthaus, Kenneth R.
*Holton, Wilbur E.
Holubec, Ray A.
*Homer, James J.
Honey, John A.
Hooper, Charles N.
Hooper, Harold D.
Hoover, William N.
Hopkins, Leonard E.
Hopps, Gary D.
Horangic, Basil R.
Horn, Adrian G.
Horner, Donald W.
Horner, Tom J.
Horning, Edward D.
Horoschak, Theodore, Jr.
*Horst, Carl H.
Horton, Billie J.
*Horton, Charles O.
Horton, Jerry D.
*Horton, Leslie E.
*Horvath, Frank J.
Hoshko, John, Jr.
Hotz, Robert W.
Houchin, Larry K.
Hough, Coles T.
Houk, Thomas L., Jr.
Houmiel, Frank R.
Houston, John R., Jr.
Howard, Homer L., Jr.
Howard, Thomas F.
Howarth, John N.
*Howarth, Paul E.
Howe, George A.
*Howell, James D.
Howell, James E.
*Howell, Robert L.
Howes, Wayne F.
Howie, Robert J.
Howson, Richard J.
Hoy, John W.
Hoyer, George F., Jr.
Hoyle, Earl D.
Hoyle, Jonathan B., Jr.
Hoyt, Richard A.
*Hronek, William R.
Hubbs, David A.
Huber, Mark C.
*Huchthausen, Peter A.
Huck, Lloyd A.
Hudiburgh, Charles W.
*Hudson, Leroy G., Jr.
Huff, Clifford R.
Huff, George S.
Huff, Stanley R.
Huffman, Harold D., Jr.
Hughbanks, James B.
*Hughes, Carl D.
Hughes, David E.
*Hughes, Faust F., Jr.
*Hughes, Frank W.
Hughes, Fred T.
Hughes, Gerald W.
Hughes, Herman W.
Hughes, James W.
*Hughes, James
Hughes, John W., Jr.
*Hughes, Kirk A.
*Hughes, Michael B.
Hughes, Richard F.
Hughes, Robert S.
*Hughes, William A.
Huizenga, Delbert G.
*Huling, John M., Jr.
Hull, Jack E.
Hull, Kent S.
Hulse, William T.
*Hult, Robert A.
Hultz, Glenford B.
Humbert, John P.
Humm, William R.
Humphrey, David D.
Humphreys, John R., III
Humphries, Joseph R.
Hunsucker, Royce H., Jr.
Hunt, Deighton A.
Hunt, Donald B.
Hunt, John P.
Hunt, Merrill R.
Hunt, Neil L.
*Hunt, Paul D., Jr.
*Hunt, Paul D.
*Hunter, John R.
Hunter, Samuel W.
*Huntington, Solomon P.
Hupp, Arnold J.
Hupton, James R.
*Hurd, Michael F.
*Hurley, Robert F., Jr.
*Hursh, Learmel
Hurst, Cecil R., Jr.
*Hurst, Paul D.
Hurvitz, Sheldon P.
Husband, Thomas S.
*Hutcherson, Robert E.
Hutchinson, Fred A.
*Hutchinson, Jack G.
*Hutchinson, David V.
Hutchinson, David E.
Hutchinson, Kent E.
Hutchinson, Glyn A.
*Huth, Donald W.
Hutton, Joseph J., Jr.
Hutton, Terrence
*Hyde, Albert R.
Hyde, Max T.
*Hyland, John J., III
Hylbak, Martin C.
*Hymel, Philip J.
Iavarone, Dennis M.
Idleberg, Norman
Igleheart, Robert V.
Imbrie, Frank D.
Ingold, David L.
*Ingram, Alan F.
*Ingram, Charles R.
*Ingram, Isom I.
*Ingram, Kenneth K.
Ingram, Rodney R.
*Inskeep, George W.
*Iobst, Paul H., Jr.
Irving, George H., Jr.
Irwin, Thomas C.
Isaacson, Dennis L.
*Ise, William H.
Ishiguro, Guy A.
Ishikawa, Donald H.
Ison, William B., Jr.
*Ivanoff, George R.
*Jacanin, John A.
*Jackle, Rudolph E.
Jacklin, Doyle W.
Jackson, Arthur F.
Jackson, Douglas A.
Jackson, Edward L.
*Jackson, Grady L.
Jackson, Hartley E., III
*Jackson, James B.
Jackson, Jerry L.
*Jackson, Jon H.
*Jackson, Lesley J.
Jackson, Robert J.
Jackson, Thomas F., III
Jackson, Virgil F., Jr.
*Jacob, Daniel J.
Jacobs, Albert B.
Jacobs, Ralph E.
Jacobsen, John R.
Jacobsen, Richard S.
Jaeger, Lowell E.
Jager, Fred G.
James, Carl E.
*James, Charles L.
James, David, III
James, Franklin W.
James, Ralph E., Jr.
James, William E.
*Jamieson, Jerry G.
Jamison, James L.
Jampoler, Andrew C. A.
Jancuski, John
Jandt, Donald E.
Janek, George A.
Janes, Frank G., III
Janicke, Paul M.
Janke, David C.
*Jankowsky, Alexandre
Janney, John W.
Jarosz, Thomas J.
Jarvis, Gary T.
Jay, John C.
Jeddeloh, Horst
*Jeffers, Paul R.
Jelinek, James C.
*Jenkins, Jon M.
Jenkins, John P.
Jenkins, Kenneth R.
Jenkins, Larry G.
Jenkins, Richard H.
Jenkins, Robert E.
*Jenkins, Tim M.
Jenks, David M.
Jenks, Jack N.
Jenks, Thomas L.
Jennings, Roger L.
Jensen, Don R.
Jensen, Jack J.
Jensen, Jay L.
Jensen, Nils H.
Jensen, Richard A.
*Jensen, Robert W.
Jensen, Roger C.
*Jerger, Allan D.
Jessberger, William A.
Jessel, David G.
Jessell, Charles T., Jr.
Jessen, Robert F., Jr.
*Jetton, James R., Jr.
Jewell, Robert M.
*Jiannas, John S. E.
Jillson, William K.
Johansen, Robert A.
Johanson, John H.
*John, Joseph R.
Johns, Ernest H.
Johnsen, Bruce R.
Johnsen, William A.
Johnson, Alan J.
*Johnson, Arnold G.
Johnson, Bjarne E.
*Johnson, Bradley
Johnson, Bruce M.
*Johnson, David K.
Johnson, Don B.
*Johnson, Edwin R.
Johnson, Ernest W., Jr.
Johnson, Hilton B.
Johnson, James A.
Johnson, Jerry A.
Johnson, John R.
*Johnson, John L.
*Johnson, John P. A.
*Johnson, John D.
*Johnson, Kenneth M.
*Johnson, Kenneth H.
Johnson, Kenneth F.
Johnson, Leonard F.
Johnson, Mack, Jr.
Johnson, Marvin F.
Johnson, Melvin E.
Johnson, Michael A.
Johnson, Neil H.
Johnson, Paul W.
*Johnson, Philip H.
*Johnson, Raymond
*Johnson, Richard Louis
Johnson, Richard A.
Johnson, Richard Leroy
*Johnson, Rolland D.
Johnson, Robert C.
Johnson, Rodney E.
Johnson, Robert W.
*Johnson, Robert O.
Johnson, Robert A.
Johnson, Ronald W.
*Johnson, Terry L.
Johnson, Torrey M.
Johnson, Wayne H.
Johnson, William L.
*Johnston, George R.
*Johnston, James R.
Johnston, John E.
Johnston, Joseph E.
*Johnston, Robert S.
*Johnston, Thomas F.
Johnston, Thomas L., Jr.
*Johnstone, Richard O.
*Johnstone, Robert M. Jr.
Johnwick, Robert L.
Jolluck, Lawrence M.
Jones, Brian G.
Jones, David E.
*Jones, David F.
*Jones, James L.
Jones, Jerry R.
Jones, Kenneth E.
Jones, Leon M.
Jones, Louis E.
*Jones, Ord
*Jones, Richard Allan

Jones, Richard Alden
*Jones, Robert D.
*Jones, Robert E.
*Jones, Thomas L.
Jones, William P.
*Jones, William D.
Jones, William H., Jr.
Jones, Winslow D.
*Joplin, James E., Jr.
Jordan, Hubert F., Jr.
*Jordan, James F.
*Jordan, William M.
Jordan, William F.
Joseph, John B.
*Journey, Robert J.
Joy, Thomas P.
*Judge, Charles V., II
Juerling, James R.
Jumper, Ralph D., Jr.
Jung, Dean H.
Jurecka, Edwin K.
Justesen, Norman S., Jr.
Justis, Edward T., Jr.
Kadick, Nicholas K.
Kahle, Richard A.
Kaiser, David G.
Kaiser, John C.
Kaiserian, Harry Jr.
Kaiss, Albert L.
Kalinoski, Edward F.
Kallemeier, Richard L.
*Kalleres, Michael P.
*Kallus, Ernest R.
*Kammerdeiner, Roger N.
Kamp, George E.
*Kane, Charles R.
Kane, David C.
*Kane, John C.
*Kane, Michael L.
Kanninen, Michael L.
Kantor, William P.
Kaplan, John C.
Kapp, William K., Jr.
Kapusta, Edward F.
*Karatkiewicz, Joseph M.
Karch, Paul R.
Karns, Norman M., Jr.
Karns, Terry G.
Karp, Leonard
Karpers, Paul A.
*Kasdorf, Clifford P.
Kaser, Walter E.
Kasson, Henry C.
Katabian, Paul G.
*Kathan, Robert H.
Kauffman, Daniel G.
Kaul, Craig B.
Kaupas, Thomas R.
*Kay, Norman B.
Kay, Robert E.
Kayle, Paul W.
Kaylor, Raymond J.
Kays, John M.
Kazee, William W.
*Keadle, Alvin O.
Keane, John T.
Keating, Roger M.
Keber, Peter Jr.
*Keck, Alvin D.
Kee, Kenneth R.
Keefer, James F.
Keegan, William E., III
Keeling, Robert A.
*Keenan, Thomas D.
*Keener, William D.
Keesling, Ralph E.
*Keffer, David F., Jr.
*Kehl, Stephen L.
Kehoe, John F.
*Kehrli, Lynn C.
Keim, Edward F.
Keiski, Laurie P.
Keith, John T.
*Keith, Robert S.
*Keithley, Charles L., Jr.
*Keleher, John A.
*Kelleher, John M.
*Keller, Douglas G.
*Keller, Paul P.
Keller, Raymond D.
Keller, Warren R.
Kellerman, John P.
Kelley, George J.
Kelley, Kenneth W.
*Kelley, Richard A.
Kelley, William E.
*Kellogg, Joseph H.
Kelly, Charles F., Jr.
Kelly, David J.
Kelly, Jack M.
Kelly, James N., Jr.
Kelly, James E.
*Kelly, John P.
Kelly, Monte W.
Kelly, Paul O.
Kelly, Richard T., Jr.
Kelz, Ivan D.
*Kemp, Edward E.
*Kemp, Roger W., Jr.
Kenan, Richard M.
Kendig, Lane H.
Kendrigan, James R.
Kennedy, Edgar V.
*Kennedy, John R.
*Kennedy, John C.
Kennedy, John J.
Kennedy, John R.
*Kennedy, Robert S.
Kennedy, Terry P.
Kennedy, William J., Jr.
*Kennelly, Robert J., Jr.
Kenney, Daniel E.
Kenney, Patrick C.
Kenney, Thomas A.
*Kenny, James H.
*Kenny, John J., Jr.
*Kerachsky, Harvey S.
Kerans, Douglas E.
Kerbaugh, John T.
*Kerns, Kenneth H.
*Kerr, Frank L.
Kerr, Jerry F.
Kersey, Paul C.
Kerwick, Richard P.
Kesel, Philip C.
Kesler, Kenneth L.
*Kester, Patrick J.
*Kesterson, Joseph A.
*Ketner, Barry R.
Keul, Robert P.
Keyser, Carey S.
Kicker, Charles K.
*Kidd, George N.
*Kiely, Richard K.
Kientz, Albert C., Jr.
Kierland, Peter L.
Kierzkowski, John P.
*Kiess, Dean W.
*Kihlstrand, Dennis E.
Kilby, Kent T.
*Kile, Thomas J.
*Kilgore, Michael W.
Killingsworth, Ernest C., Jr.
Kilpatrick, John M.
Kimball, Darrell H.
*Kimble, Kenneth K.
*Kime, Steve F.
*Kindley, William R.
*King, Charles J.
*King, Donald M.
King, Edward L.
King, Francis E.
King, John Barry
King, John W.
*King, John Bever
King, William H., Jr.
King, William E., Jr.
*Kinger, Joseph M.
Kingsbury, William W.
Kingston, Peter
*Kinnard, James L.
Kinne, William B.
Kinney, Raymond T., Jr.
Kinsella, Robert J.
Kinsey, David L.
Kinsley, Arthur M.
*Kinsley, Dudley J.
Kinzel, Dale A.
Kiraly, Joseph S.
Kirby, Kenneth N.
Kirby, William D.
Kirk, Ronald H.
Kirk, William A., Jr.
*Kirkland, David G.
*Kirkland, Herbert D., III
Kirkland, Kenneth W.
Kirkpatrick, Paul
Kirpatrick, James H.
Kirscher, John V.
*Kirvan, William H., Jr.
Kiser, Roy E.
Kish, William J.
*Kisiel, Roger W.
Kisieleski, Kenneth R.
Kislack, Arthur
Kiss, Joseph T.
*Kissick, Ralph L.
Kistler, Robert L.
Kitchen, George A.
Kittell, John F.
Kivimaki, Larry J.
Kjos, Wendell A.
Kleiber, Kenneth D.
Klein, Thomas H., Jr.
Klemmer, Robert C.
*Kleyn, Frederick G., III
*Klinger, Robert L.
*Klintworth, Philip G.
*Klippert, Richard H., Jr.
Kluck, Marvin D.
Kludt, Carl J.
Kluegel, Kenneth J.
Klug, Jack G.
*Klukas, Herbert A.
*Knapp, William H.
Knaub, Thomas J.
Knickerbocker, Ronald W.
Knight, Gordon E.
*Knight, William E.
Knight, Windall R.
*Knochel, Charles A.
Knosky, Michael J., Jr.
*Knostman, Paul B.
*Knowles, John T.
Knowlton, William R.
*Knubel, John A., Jr.
Knudsen, Richard W.
*Kobar, Michael L.
Kobor, David J.
Koch, Dean H.
Koch, Edward F.
Koch, Eugene H., Jr.
Koch, Frank C.
*Koch, Robert W.
Kocher, Homer L.
Kochert, Gary L.
Koconis, Emmanuel H.
*Koeber, Charles J.
Koehler, Ernest G.
*Koenig, Rodney C.
Koenning, Kenneth K.
*Kohankie, Robert W., II
Kohler, Charles L.
*Kohler, Robert W.
Kohn, August
Kolar, Michael J.
Konheim, Jon M., L.
Koops, John B.
*Kopanski, John W.
Korb, Lawrence J.
Korhonen, Kenneth R.
Koshay, Joseph C.
*Koss, Russell S.
*Kotchka, Jerry A.
Kozlowski, Neil L.
*Kramer, Lawrence J.
*Kramer, Robert L.
Kranda, William R.
Kraus, William L.
Krause, Dean R.
Krause, John F., Jr.
*Krause, Lawrence C.
Kreiser, Alfred J.
Kreitzburg, John W.
Kresge, James J.
*Kreutzmann, Kenneth P.
*Krieger, Thomas A.
Krier, Dennis C.
Kroeger, Kurt
*Krommenhoek, Jeffrey M.
Krueger, Dan W.
Kruger, Gary L.
Kruger, Richard W.
Krupinski, Kenneth C.
Krupp, Marvin M.
Kruse, John L.
Kryger, Eugene A.
Kubik Robert W.
Kuchem, Francis R.
Kuehl, James R.
Kuehnel, Charles G.
Kuhlke, William, III
*Kuhn, Frank R.
Kujawa, Anthony J.
Kulas, Alan M.
Kulpe, David A.
Kundzala, Stephen P. Jr.
Kunkel, Gregory J.
Kunold, Robert
*Kunsky, David A.
*Kuntz, Robert P.
Kurath, Franz H.
Kuroski, Richard L.
Kurtz, Howard S. W.
*Kushins, Allan M.
Kutz, Charles J.
Kuybus, George W.
Kuzmich, David L.
Labadie, Mark E.
*Labatt, Walter B.
Laberteaux, Jerome N.
*Labyak, Peter S.
Lacey, Jack W.
Lacey, James M.
Lacey, John W.
Lackey, John E.
Lacock, Larry H.
Ladhams, Alan G.
Lafontaine, Peter F.
*Larandeur, Larry B.
*Laidlaw, Charles E.
*Laine, Lawrence L.
Laird, Ralph T., Jr.
*Laity, Walter W.
Lake, Larry J.
*Lally, Robert F., Jr.
Lamantia, Charles
*Lamasters, Edward R.
Lamb, John P.
Lambert, David A.
Lambert, Robert E.
Lambrecht, Marvin W.
Lambright, John J.
Lamm, William F.
Lammers, Thomas A.
*Lamoureaux, Frederick H.
*Lamoureux, George J.
Lanckriet, Richard D.
Land, Clinton D.
*Landeck, Albert W.
Landkamer, Robert L.
Landroth, Dale M.
*Lane, James B.
Lane, Richard S.
Lang, Donald H.
Lang, Francis X., Jr.
Lange, Robert O.
Langley, Bobby D.
Lanman, Henry A., III
*Lantow, Michael R.
Lantzer, Lawrence A.
Lanzen, William D.
*Laplante, John B.
*Larisch, Erich W., Jr.
*Larkin, Robert R., Jr.
*Larocque, David F.
*Larsen, Calvin L.
*Larsen, Jerome E.
Larsen, Russell E.
Larson, Victor R., Jr.
*Lasiter, Elvie D.
Laskay, Norman F.
*Lastaiti, Ronald S.
*Latham, Peter R.
Lathouse, William A.
Latourette, Robert J.
Latta, Donald A.
*Lattimer, George W.
Lauer, John N.
Laumeyer, Richard H.
Laux, Jerome J.
Lavender, George W.
Lavin, John M.
Lawler, John C.
Lawler, Philip W.
Lawlor, Andrew J.
Lawrence, Robert W.
*Laws, Richard L.
Laws, William J.
Lawson, Archie B.
*Lawson, Urbie A.
*Lawton, Roy E.
Leahy, Frank E., Jr.
Leasure, John O.
*Leatherman, John B. Jr.
Leatherman, Jerry N.
Leavitt, Martin J.
Leblanc, Glyn R.
*Leboeuf, Lovencie A., Jr.
Lecates, William B.
Lecrone, Wayne H., Jr.
Lecroy, Floyd G.
Lederman, Arthur L.
Ledoux, Lawrence J.
*Lee, Charles R.
Lee, James R.
*Lee, Joe R.
*Lee, Kenneth S.
*Lee, Richard N.
Lee, Roger J.
Lee, Warner F.
Leeds, Ronald P. E.
Lefcort, Richard B.
Leffew, Floyd B.
Lefsky, Lawrence H.
Legard, Edwin N., Jr.
Legge, John P.
*Legrande, Lawrence C.
*Lehman, Harry
Lehnus, Ronald K.
Leightley, Albert L., II
Leiper, Anderson S.
Lemasters, Max E.
Lemieux, Roger L.
Lemmert, Robert W.
Lemoine, Charles A.
Lemon, Wendell E.
Lemons, Doyle R.
Lenartz, Robert F.
*Lencses, David B.
Leniart, Joseph J., Jr.
Lenze, Lavern J., Jr.
*Leonard, Edwin W.
Leonard, John A.
*Leone, Anthony D.
*Lepak, Ronald R.
Lesh, Vincent E.
Lester, Edwin T.
Leto, David D.
*Letourneau, Charles E.
*Letteney, Lawrence K.
Lev, Samuel R.
*Levangie, James C.
*Levasseur, Camille J.
*Leventis, Alexander A.
*Levi, George E.
*Levings, William H., III
Levingston, Clarence W., Jr.
Levinson, Richard H.
Lewis, Carl B.
*Lewis, Ernest L.
*Lewis, Frederick L.
*Lewis, John H.
*Lewis, Oscar Y., Jr.
*Lewis, Robert J.
*Lewis, Robert P.
*Lewis, Stanley T.
*Lewis, Thomas A.
Lewis, Weldon M., Jr.
*Lhuillier, Robert L.
*Liacopoulos, Vanpeter
Libbey, Robert E.
Libby, Lawrence L.
*Licalsi, Anthony L.
Licker, Stephen S.
*Liddicoat, Joseph C.
*Lieb, Edward J.
*Lieblein, William H.
Lierman, John S.
*Lies, Niel E.
*Life, Richard A.
*Light, Henry D.
Limongelli, Joseph L.
*Limstrom, Kenneth R.
Lind, Carl V., Jr.
Lind, David L.
Lindeman, Jon B.
Lindenauer, Richard M.
Linder, Jesse L.
Lindgren, Edward R.
*Lindsay, James H., Jr.
Lindsay, John R.
Lindsey, John H.
*Lingan, Henry B., III
*Lingley, Gordon S.
Lingo, Norman E.
Linn, Charles A.
Linn, Richard W.
Linquist, Harry L.
Linquist, John E.
Linzy, Walter A.
Lipman, Hilliard L.
Lippincott, Richard J.
Lipscomb, Calvin D.
Lish, George I.
*Lison, Stephen A.
Liston, Thomas M.
*Little, Edwards S.
Little, Harvey E.
*Littleton, Martin W., III
*Livendale, George W.
*Livernois, Omer A., Jr.
Livesey, James E.
*Livingston, William C.
Llewellyn, James D.
Lloyd, Douglas S.
Lloyd, James W.
Lloyd, Michael D.
Lloyd, Robert, Jr.
Lobb, Frank H.
*Locher, Oliver G.
Lockard, Philip K.
Lockard, Robert E.
Locke, John E.
Lockett, Carl F.
*Lockhart, Howard
*Lockhart, Theodore C.
Lockwood, Robert N.
*Lockwood, Stuart M.
Loconte, Manlio A.
Loconte, Salvatore J.
*Lodge, Charles D.

*Lodge, Raymond F.
Logan, Royal H., Jr.
Logie, John H.
Lohman, Richard D.
*Lojko, Boley A.
*Lombard, Dorn R.
*Lombardo, Stephen W.
Long, Barry
Long, William E.
Longanecker, Gary E.
*Longfellow, Dennis R.
*Lonnon, Lawrence W.
Lonsdale, Paul T.
Loomis, Charles A.
Loomis, Edwin C.
Lopez, Teodoro G.
Lorenc, Richard M.
*Lorenzen, Mylan W.
Lorenzen, Phillip H., Jr.
*Lorino, William J.
Losen, Frederick C.
Losey, Stephen
*Losoya, Rodolfo
Lotridge, James K.
*Lott, Lawrence E.
*Lotz, Robert
Love, Everette K., Jr.
Love, Joe B.
Love, John C.
Lovett, James E.
Lowe, Robert W.
Lowman, Richard W.
Lucas, Donald M.
*Lucas, James D., Jr.
*Lucey, John F.
Luetschwager, Wilbert L.
Luffman, James M.
Luft, John C.
Luke, John D.
*Luker, Richard A.
Lundgaard, Stanley H.
Lundquist, Dallas E.
*Lundquist, Donald G.
*Lunneberg, Thomas A.
Lunsford, Edwin C., Jr.
Lushbaugh, Larry C.
Lute, Ronald K.
Lutes, James E.
Lutz, Gilbert M.
*Lutz, Mark E.
Lyde, John H., Jr.
Lyle, Robert W.
Lynch, Anthony J.
*Lynch, Charles W.
*Lynch, Daniel W.
Lynch, Floyce M.
*Lynch, James R.
*Lynch, Michael G.
Lynch, Philip N.
Lynch, Robert L.
*Lynch, Thomas John
Lynch, Timothy Joseph
Lyne, Daniel J.
Lynn, David L.
Lyon, Barbee B.
*Lytle, Vincent A.
Mabery, Lester R., Jr.
Mabie, Harold C.
*MacDonald, William R.
MacDonald, Michael J., III
*MacDougall, Donald G.
MacFarlane, David M.
*MacGregor, John A.
MacInnis, Neil Jr.
*MacIsaac, Peter C.
*Mackay, John G., Jr.
Mackey, Austin G.
Mackin, Gilbert H.
*MacKinnon, Ranald R.
Macomber, David B.
Macomber, John A.
Madden, Don R.
*Madden, Frank J., Jr.
Madden, Walter W.
Maddocks, Ronald J.
*Maddox, George N.
Maderos, Jules J.
*Madison, Russell L.
*Madonia, Vincent
Maehl, Carl E.
Maffett, Sidney G., Sr.
Magana, David
MaGee, John J.
Magnuson, Robert E.
Magoon, Stephen T.
*Magretta, William R.
*Magruder, Peyton M., Jr.
Maguire, John M.
Magurn, John T.
*Mahannah, Stephen L.
Maher, Daniel E.
Maher, Thomas W.
*Maheu, John C.
Mahle, Jack D., Jr.
Mahon, Roy O., Jr.
Mahoney, James A.
Mahoney, Thomas R.
Maiden, Michael S.
*Maiellaro, Edward A.
Maier, Richard D.
Main, Delwyn L.
*Majeski, Robert A.
Major, Watson H.
Makowski, Eugene R.
*Malave, Pedro M.
Malay, Steve Jr.
Maldonado, Jeanpierre A.
Malec, Vernon M.
Maley, James M.
*Maley, Michael D.
*Mallen, Frank H.
Mallery, John A.
Malley, William J.
Malloy, Charles J., Jr.
Malloy, John F.
Malloy, William J.
*Malone, Robert N.
*Malott, James S.
Man, Robert M., Jr.
Manderfield, Leonard L.
*Maness, Anthony R.
Mangine, Ronald T.
*Mangold, Joseph H.
*Manicke, Harold V.
*Manker, Myron W.
Manly, Lawrence G.
*Mann, Edward B., Jr.
Mann, James T.
Manning, Dennis B.
Manning, Gary C.
Manning, John C.
Manno, Frank R.
*Manno, Samuel F.
*Mansell, Philip L.
*Mansfield, Richard H.
Manson, Allen L.
Manta, Vincent J.
*Mantel, Thomas J.
Mapes, Richard P.
*Marano, Augustine C.
Marcalus, Frederick C.
*March, Randall A.
Marcy, Freeman B.
Margolis, Jayward H.
*Margosian, Paul M.
*Marik, Rudolph F.
Marking, Ronald A.
Markley, James H.
Markwood, Richard A.
*Marrical, Anthony R.
*Marron, Ronald H.
*Marsden, Leo J.
*Marsh, Alan G.
Marshall, Bruce C.
*Marshall, Frank G., III
Marshall, Jerry T.
*Marshall, James A.
Marshall, James F.
Marshall, John J.
Marshall, William C.
Marthens, John F., III
Martin, Alexander J.
Martin, Barry J.
Martin, Charles B.
Martin, David A.
*Martin, Edward F., III
Martin, Edward F.
Martin, James H.
Martin, John A.
Martin, John B.
Martin, Robert O.
Martin, Roger B.
Martin, Thomas L.
Martin, Timothy C.
*Martin, Walter P.
Martin, Wayne A.
Martin, William W.
*Martineau, Richard G.
Marting, Neil W.
Martyn, Gerald A.
Marusa, John M.
*Marvin, Robert C.
Masar, Gerald M.
*Mason, Henry B.
*Mason, John A.
Mason, Scott M.
*Mason, Thomas E.
*Massanari, Gerald J.
*Massey, Scott S., Jr.
Massick, Frank L.
Masters, David W.
Masters, William O., II
Masterson, Joseph O.
*Masterson, Roy C.
Matan, Thomas W.
Matchett, Paul E.
Mathews, Michael F.
*Mathiowetz, Donald R.
Mathis, David E.
Mathis, Samuel J., Jr.
Matlock, James A.
*Matthews, Dean E.
*Matthews, John G
Matthews, Willard P.
Mattison, William C., Jr.
Mattox, Jeremy
Mattson, Gregory L.
*Mattson, Peter A.
Matyas, Stephen M.
*Matyasovics, John V.
*Maurer, John H., Jr.
*Maxey, Fred, Jr.
Maxson, John A.
*Maxson, Robert J.
Maxwell, David G.
Maxwell, Thomas E.
May, Cyril V., Jr.
May, Dale T.
May, Robert E.
*Mayer, Luke F., Jr.
*Mayfield, David M.
Mayfield, Robert J.
Mayhew, David R.
Maynard, Dudley J.
*Maynard, William T.
Mazza, Anthony D.
Mazzoni, Raymond M.
McAfee, Jerry L.
McAfee, Rudolph
McAlister, James S., III
McAllister, James P.
McAlpin, Roger W.
*McAninch, Frank L.
*McArthur, Ronald E.
McArthur, William D., Jr.
McAulay, David L.
McBee, John O., II
McBride, Charles D., Jr.
McBride, Kenneth B.
*McBride, Michael A.
McBride, Robert K.
*McCahan, George V.
McCallum, James A.
McCallum, Paul K.
*McCammon, Peter L.
*McCarthy, David J.
*McCarthy, Jack R.
*McCarthy, John J., Jr.
McCarthy, John O.
McCarthy, Michael F.
*McCarthy. Robert M.
McCarthy, Robert K.
McCartney, Donald M.
*McCasland, James S.
McClain, Philip A.
McClanahan, Kenneth D.
McClard, Theodore R.
McClard, Thomas J.
McClay, Robert E., Jr.
McClelland, Alan A.
*McClement, Charles C.
McCloskey, David J.
McClung, Bernard D.
McClung, Lonny K.
McClure, Alvin R.
McClure, Kenneth R.
*McCluskey, Stephen C.
McColly, John C.
McConlogue, William J.
McConnaughey, John S., Jr.
*McCormick, William M.
McCormick, James T.
McCoy, Charles W.
McCoy, Dennis F.
McCracken, Wallace D.
McCraith, Laurence P.
*McCray, Donald
*McCray, Ronald E.
*McCrosky, Dan S.
*McCulloch, David H.
*McCullough, Donald C.
McCullough, William L.
McDade, William J.
McDaniel, Hugh H., II
*McDaniel, Vernon D.
McDaniel, Velwood B.
McDaniel, Wadsworth W.
McDavitt, Frederick H.
McDermid, Edward J.
McDiarmid, James E.
McDonald, Gerald H.
McDonald, James Andrew
*McDonald, James Anthony
*McDonald, Thomas A
McDonogh, Paul E.
McDonough, John R.
*McDougal, Rodney L.
McDowell, Donald J.
McDowell, William M.
McDuff, Richard A.
McElhiney, William L.
McEneany. Daniel M.
McEown, William J.
McFadden, John A., III
*McGann, Thomas P., Jr.
McGary, Charles W.
McGee, James W.
McGill, Claude F.
McGinty, Patrick E.
McGlincey, John C.
*McGlone, Hugh F., Jr.
McGovern, Peter J.
*McGrath, John M.
McGrath, John T., Jr.
McGray, Andrew F.
McGregor, Theodore S.
*McGuire, John F.
*McGuire, Thomas P.
*McHugh, Richard G.
*McHugh, Vincent J.
McIlwaine, Chalmers M. S., Jr.
McInnis, Louis C., Jr.
*McIntosh, Paul B.
*McIsaac, William E., Jr.
*McIver, Leroy V.
McKay, John D.
McKean, James R.
*McKechnie, Thomas W.
*McKenna, John F.
McKenna, William J.
McKeon, Michael G.
McKibbin, Richard A.
McKillop, Donald A.
McKinney, Billy J.
*McKinnon, Clark D.
*McLaren, James M.
*McLean, Robert
McLellan, Daniel M.
McLeod, Henry M.
McLeod, James C., Jr.
McLeod, Roy A., Jr.
McMahan, Carl W.
*McMahon, James T.
McMichael, Robert E., Jr.
McMichael, William S.
McMillan, Edward F.
McMillan, Robert C.
McMullen, Ivan F.
McMurray, Melvin R.
McMurrin, Donald L.
McNair, Martin B.
McNeely, Ellis E.
McNeer, William P., Jr.
*McNeill, Corbi A., Jr.
*McNeill, Donald R.
McNitt, James M.
*McPhail, Eugene B.
McPherson, Claude O., Jr.
McPherson, James B.
McQuade, Charles B.
*McQuaig, Mack A.
*McQuarrie, Robert K.
*McRae, David A.
McRae, David E.
McRoy, Willie C.
McSherry, Bernard P., Jr.
McVeigh, William J., III
*McVey, Robert E.
*McWhinney, Robert T., Jr.
*McWhite, Peter B.
*Mead, Robert M.
Meadows, Guy E.
*Meakim, John T.
Means, James F.
*Meckler, Jacob M.
*Medaglia, Cornelius P.
Meddings, William A.
*Meenen, Fred M.
*Mehard, William J., Jr.
*Meinert, William A.
Meinig, Joseph L.
Meisner, Julian R.
Meizen, Malcolm J.
Melampy, Ronald F.
Melander, Errol N.
*Melendy, David R.
Meling Nile S.
Melinosky, Theodore F.
Melkerson, Jon E.
Mellen, Norman H.
Melosky, John F.
Menard, Gerald M.
Mendello, Andrew R.
*Mendicino, John S.
*Mengden, Joseph D.
Meno, Timothy D. B.
*Mercer, Thomas A.
*Merchant, Steven L.
Meridith, Kenneth A.
*Meredith, William C., III
Meredith, Sidney E.
*Merkey, Russell K.
*Merkle, James A.
Merrick, Meredith S.
Merrigan, Robert J. P.
*Merrill, Hugh A.
*Merrill, Lawrence H.
Merritt, John O.
Merten, Lawrence D.
Mertz, Daniel W.
Merz, Vincent P.
*Meskel, Thomas J.
*Messer, James S.
Messick, James R.
*Messikomer, Edwin E.
*Meston, Stanley S.
*Mettler, James H.
*Metz, Thomas R.
Meyer, David E.
Meyer, Dwight H.
*Meyer, Frank D.
*Meyer, Frederick C., Jr.
Meyer, Gary J.
Meyer, Gordon C.
Meyer, Harvey K., III
*Meyer, Kenneth L.
Meyer, Richard R.
*Meyer, Victor A.
Meyers, John M.
Meyers, Paul H.
Meyers, William M.
Michael. George L., III
*Michels, Bruce E.
Mierse, Walter F.
Mihalik, Charles S.
Mikesell, Robert E.
*Mikolajczyk, Ronald J.
*Miles, John, H. T.
Milkowski, Gerald C.
*Millard, John W.
Miller, Albert E.
Miller, Andrew P., Jr.
Miller, Barry K.
Miller, Beryl C.
Miller, Burton H., Jr.
Miller, David E.
*Miller, Delbert B.
Miller, Floyd H., Jr.
Miller, Fred W., Jr.
Miller, Frederick A.
Miller, Gary L.
Miller, Gary R.
Miller, Herman M.
Miller, James L.
Miller, James W.
Miller, James W.
Miller, John M.
Miller, John E.
Miller, Kenneth C.
*Miller, Ralph R., III
*Miller, Raymond P.
Miller, Robert L.
Miller, Ronald H.
Miller, Ronald C.
*Miller, Roy E.
Miller, Thomas G.
*Miller, Timothy L.
Miller, William Charles
*Miller, William Claughton
Miller, William C., Jr.
Millham, Robert L.
Milligan, Charlie R., Jr.
Milligan, James M.

Milligan, John H., III
Milliman, James G.
Millner, James E.
*Mills, Clifford C.
Mills, Leland M.
Mills, Nelson A.
*Mills, Raymond R., Jr.
*Mills, Robert C.
*Minard, Duane E., III
Minassian, Roger A. D.
*Miner, James R.
Minner, Alfred A., Jr.
*Minsterman, Sebastian T.
Mirkin, Howard B.
Mitchell, Charles F.
*Mitchell, Charles R.
Mitchell, David G.
Mitchell, Eugene F.
Mitchell, John E.
*Mitchell, Robert L.
Moberg, John W.
*Modlin, Frank W.
Moeller, Roy P.
Moerman, Eric R.
*Moessner, Paul C.
*Moffatt, Robert B.
Moffett, Peter F.
*Moir, Weston G.
Molitor, Arthur A., Jr.
*Monaghan, Brian D.
Monash, Richard F.
Moncur, Robert L.
Monday, Charles B.
*Monell, Joel C.
Mongeon, Glenn C.
Monk, Clifton F.
Monpas, Leroy
*Monroe, Harry, III
Montgomery, Robert C.
Montminy, Raymond J.
Montminy, Wilfred E.
Monty, Arthur D.
Mooberry, William J.
Moody, David D.
Moody, John M.
Moore, Andrew H.
Moore, Charles W.
Moore, Guy C., Jr.
Moore, James C.
Moore, Larry A.
Moore, Michael M.
Moore, Neal D.
*Moore, Ralph S.
*Moore, Robert H.
Moore, Ronald C.
Moore, Ronald R.
*Moore, Warwick B.
Moores, John D., Jr.
Moorhead, Charles E.
Moorhead, William F., Jr.
Moossy, Robert J.
Moran, Robert C.
*Morawey, Michael R.
Mordecai, Donald D.
*More, Alan R.
*Moreland, Richard J.
Moreus, Richard W.
*Morgan, James P.
Morgan, John D.
Morgan, Michael C.
Morgan, Paul L.
*Morgan, Richard D.
Morgan, Thomas L.
Morgan, William M.
Morgens, Warren K.
Morgenson, David L.
Morin, Robert E.
*Moritz, Carl A., Jr.
*Moritz, Charles J.
*Morler, Edward E.
*Morley, Franklin M.
*Morley, Thomas D.
Moroney, Joseph M.
Morris, Thomas P.
*Morrison, Charles K.
Morrison, Dean E.
*Morrison, Michael F.
*Morrison, Vance H.
Morrissey, Richard L.
Morrissey, Stephen J.
Morrow, Edward A.
*Morrow, Granval L.
Morrow, Theodore F.
Morse, John A.
Morse, Richard E.
Morton, Norman L.
Moseley, Leo O., Jr.
Moses, Raleigh W.
*Moshenrose, Charles A.
*Moshgat, Jack W.
Mosley, Curtis R.
*Mosser, Joel E.
*Motteler, Terry R.
Moulis, Edward J., Jr.
Moulson, John A.
Moulton, George E., Jr.
Moulton, Thomas A.
Mount, Donald L.
Mouw, Vernon R.
Mowrer, Ronald L.
Moxley, Richard A., Jr.
Moxon, John S.
Moya, Clarence B.
*Moyer, David F.
Moyer, William W.
*Moyle, Robert K.
Moynihan, Brian G.
*Muehlhauser, Joel W.
Mueller, James E.
Muhlbauer, Norbert L.
Mulkerrin, Joseph M.
*Mullen, Graham C.
Muller, William G., III
*Mullin, John H.
Mullin, Richard J., Jr.
Mullins, Billy D.
Mullins, Charles E.
*Mullins, David L.
Mundy, Hugh F.
*Munger, Jerry W.
*Munkasy, Warren C.
Munsee, Stewart F.
Munzenberger, Karl A.
Murch, Leroy
Murchison, Spencer M.
Murchland, Gayle J.
Murdock, Walter E.
Murphy, Christopher L.
Murphy, James M.
*Murphy, Jerome T.
Murphy, Jerome S.
Murphy, Leslie G.
*Murphy, Robert S.
Murphy, Robert J.
Murphy, Roger W.
*Murphy, Thomas F.
*Murphy, William C.
Murray, Douglas P.
*Murray, Gilbert C.
Murray, Peter G.
Murray, Philip A.
Murray, Robert A.
Murray, Thomas P.
*Murray, William L.
Muskovac, John J., Jr.
Musselman, Gordon W
*Musson, Thomas A.
*Mustin, Thomas M.
Mutz, Moffett D.
Muzik, Howard P.
*Muzzy, Marcus M.
Myers, Beauford E.
Myers, Collin K.
Myers, Estill E.
*Myers, Fraser R.
Myers, Richard G.
Myers, Robert A.
Myers, Ronald W.
Naegle, John C.
Naert, Richard J.
Nagy, John D.
*Nair, Sterling E., Jr.
Najpaver, Joseph C.
*Nakayama, Homer S.
Naldrett, William J.
*Nall, Franklin D.
*Nardone, Carl F.
Nash, Frank E.
Nash, John M.
*Nash, Michael A.
*Natter, John T.
*Nawrocki, Jerome A.
*Neal, John S.
Neal, Robert H., Jr.
Neal, William C., Jr.
Nechville, Stanley C.
Nedelsky, Michael
*Nee, David M.
Nee, Kevin P.
Neeb, Karl A.
*Needham, William P.
Neeley, James M.
Neher, James R.
Neill, Robert S.
Nelson, Charles R.
Nelson, Claude F.
Nelson, David J.
*Nelson, Denton J. C.
Nelson, Ernest H., Jr.
*Nelson, Geoffrey A.
*Nelson, Leonard M.
*Nelson, Peter J.
Nelson, Robert C.
*Nerup, Robert K.
Nester, Robert W.
Neuberger, Douglas F.
*Neuman, Dennis E.
Nevelle, John A., Jr.
Newberry, Jackson I., Jr.
*Newcomb, John E.
Newcomb, William L.
Newell, David W.
*Newell, Michael T.
*Newkirk, Roger S.
*Newton, Eugene D.
*Newton, Frank H., III
*Newton, Roy I.
*Nichol, Robert D.
*Nichols, Charles L.
Nickell, Boyd T.
*Nickerson, Guy D.
*Nicklas, Charles
*Niederstadt, Robert G.
*Nipper, Collin D.
Nix, Harold D.
*Njus, Ingmar J.
Noble, Donald S.
Noblett, Donald E.
Nocula, Michael J.
Noel, Thomas C., Jr.
Nohr, Ralph J.
Noice, Gary E.
Nolker, Douglas D.
*Norcross, William G.
Nord, Thomas C.
Nordstrom, Jon D.
Norfleet, Robert K.
Norman, Peter A.
Norman, Warren A., Jr.
*Norman, William S.
Norman, Willie L.
*Norr, Herbert E.
*Norris, James R.
Norris, Sidney R.
North, Wayne K.
*Northrup, Paul W.
*Norton, Charles K., Jr.
*Norton, Jack T., Jr.
Norton, Richard N.
Norwood, Haywood V., Jr.
Norys, Robert M.
*Novak, Edward M.
Novak, William J.
*Novelline, Joseph A., Jr.
Nowak, Robert G.
*Nowell, Herbert T.
Nugent, Thomas J.
Numrich, Edgar T.
Nunneley, Frederick R.
*Nutt, Stephen D.
Nutting, John F.
Nylec, Nicholas T.
Nyre, Larry L.
*Nystrom, Stephen C.
*Oakes, Charles W.
Oakes, Don E.
Oakes, Loy E.
*Oates, Anthony B.
Oberg, Russell C.
*Obermeyer, Boyd D.
*Oborne, Laurance E.
*O'Brien, Arthur J.
*O'Brien, Joseph R.
*O'Brien, Martin J.
O'Brien, Robert C.
O'Brien, Stuart A.
O'Brien, Thomas P.
*O'Brien, William S.
O'Brien, William G.
O'Busek, Joseph B.
*O'Connell, Douglas A.
*O'Connell, Gerald D.
*O'Connell, Robert L.
*C'Connor, Kip
*O'Connor, Michael B., Jr.
O'Connor, Robert F.
O'Connor, Thomas P.
*O'Connor, Thomas F., II
*Odell, Peter G.
*Odle, Billy F.
*O'Donnell, Francis X.
O'Donnell, Robert J.
O'Donnell, William H.
Oertel, E. James
*Oetinger, Mark
Offutt, Berch R.
Offutt, James R.
Ogden, Charles W.
Oglesby, Robert W.
O'Hara, Robert E.
Ohliger, George E.
Ohls, Henry G.
Ohlson, William N., Jr.
Ohm, John C.
Ohrn, John A.
O'Keeffe, George C.
*Okeson, James C.
*Oldham, George R.
O'Leary, Daniel J.
Oliver, David E.
Oliver, Lawrence E.
*Oliver, Raymond A.
Oliver, William W.
Olmstead, Dennis W.
Olney, Frank J., Jr.
Olsen, Dennis S.
*Olsen, George D.
*Olsen, Glenn R.
*Olsen, James R.
*Olson, Donald W.
*Olson, Jerrold E.
Olson, Marcel E.
Olson, Morris T.
*Olson, Phillip R.
Olstad, Vincent K.
Oneal, James M.
*Opeka, John F.
Oprian, Thomas M.
Orahood, Douglas W.
*O'Reilly, Howard C.
Orejuela, Henry
*Orlando, Joseph G.
Orndorff, Omar W.
*Orr, John D.
*Orriss, David A.
*Orth, Nelson E.
Osborne, Edson H., Jr.
*O'Shea, Donald J.
*Osterman, Richard J.
Ostlind, James E.
*O'Sullivan, Edward J.
Otto, Douglas C.
Otto, Paul E.
Ouellett, Alfred F.
*Overstreet, John W., Jr.
Owen, Bruce W.
Owen, Kenneth J.
Owen, Noel F.
*Owen, Robert H.
*Owen, Thomas J.
Owens, James H.
Owens, Robert W.
*Owens, Thomas
*Owens, William A.
*Oxman, David C.
Oyler, Joseph G.
Oziemkiewicz, Alfred E.
Pace, Salvatore A.
*Packman, Robert I.
Pail, Norbret J.
Palazzolo, Richard F.
Paller, Jack
*Palleschi, Richard A.
*Palma, Richard J.
*Palmatier, John S.
*Palmer, James M.
Palmer, Joseph A., Jr.
*Palmer, Robert E.
Panagrossi, Anthony P.
*Pancoast, Patrick A.
Panian, John M.
*Paquin, James E.
*Parchen, William R.
Parham, Donald L.
*Parise, Merle J.
Park, John P.
Parker, Bigelow M.
Parker, John E.
Parker, John C.
Parker, Judson W.
*Parker, Richard J.
*Parker, William C., Jr.
*Parker, William L.
Parker, William T., Jr.
Parks, Norman B.
*Parlier, August E., Jr.
Parmenter, Lester L.
Parnie, Alexander D., Jr.
Parrett, David P.
Parris, Fred J.
Parsons, Thomas M.
*Parsons, William D.
*Partin, Benjamin R.
*Partrick, Robert E.
Partyka, Eugene J.
Partyka, James F.
Paschall, William D.
Pasela, Stanley J.
*Pastore, Michael J.
*Pata, Rudolf J.
Paterno, Joseph F.
*Patrick, Cecil A.
Patrick, Nyle S., II
Patrick, Roger S.
Patrick, Roger D.
*Patten, Michael J.
*Patterson, Wilbur R.
Patterson, Donald R.
Patterson, Mervil L.
Patterson, John C.
Patterson, David W.
Patton, Allen L.
*Patton, David P.
Patzmann, Bruce R.
*Paul, Gerald E.
Paul, Harold W.
Paul, Herbert N.
Paul, Richard V.
*Paul, Vernon B.
*Paulson, Leonard W.
Paulson, Wesley H.
*Payne, Edwin F.
*Payne, Robert J.
Payne, William M.
Payton, Dale E.
*Pazak, Jerome J.
Peacock, John R.
*Pearce, James W.
Pearce, Robert W.
*Pearson, Dale Q.
Pedersen, Dennis F.
Pederson, Robert M.
Pedisich, John A., Jr.
*Pedretti, Donald F.
*Peebles, Robert G., Jr.
Pegues, Marvin R.
*Pelletier, Arthur D., Jr.
Pelot, Kent B.
Pelouze, Harry P., III
*Pelton, Frank E., III
*Pendleton, Alan R.
*Pennington, Donald R.
*Pennington, Richard A.
*Penny, Douglas C.
Perez, Edward
*Perez, Manuel J., Jr.
*Perisho, Gordon S.
*Perkins, Ernest D., II
Perkins, Norman L.
Peroni, Carl A.
Peroni, Victor D.
Perry, Albert G., Jr.
*Perry, Lonnie J.
*Perry, Philip W.
Person, Danny J.
Perz, Warren J.
Pesce, Victor L.
*Peters, Joseph P.
Petersik, Thomas J.
Peterson, David H.
Peterson, Dennis W.
*Peterson, David A., Jr.
*Peterson, Gary G.
Peterson, James P.
*Peterson, Julius E.
*Peterson, Klaus R.
*Peterson, Myron J.
Peterson, Merle A.
*Peterson, Ralph D.
Peterson, Wayne J.
*Petkiewcz, Joseph M.
Petri, Charles H., III
Petrone, Stephen R.
Pettengill, David E.
Petty, James G.
*Petty, John A.
Pewitt, Nelson D.
*Pfahler, Richard N.
Pfeiffenberger, George W.
*Pfingstag, William C.
*Pfister, William C.
*Phayre, Martin G.
Philipps, Philip, Jr.
Phillips, Carroll E.
Phillips, Ernest E., Jr.
Phillips, Edwin R.
*Phillips, George B., Jr.
Phillips, Gary N.
*Phillips, Joseph L.
Phillips, John B.
Phillips, Jerry A.
Phillips, Norman L.
Phillips, Roger V.
Phipps, Bobby
*Phoebus, Charles R.
Pianka, Michael J.
Pickett, John D.
Pickett, Larry J.
Piekney, William R.
Pieno, John A., Jr.
Pierce, Charles D.
Pierce, Eugene L., Jr.
*Pierce, Roy, Jr.
*Pierce, Sidney R.
Pierpoint, Arthur W., Jr.
Pierson, Kenneth L.

Pike, Alan S.
Pike, Gary E.
Pilcher, Carroll D.
Pilgeram, Allen C.
Pilgren, Richard B.
Pinto, Vito J.
Piper, Larry W.
Piret, Ronald S.
Pittam, Richard O.
*Pitz, Paul B.
*Pitzer, Ronald T.
Plaatje, John W.
*Plath, Richard N.
*Pless, Michael T.
*Plotz, Steven C.
*Plourde, Jean E.
Plumlee, William W.
Plyler, Dwight M., Jr.
*Poe, John R.
Poellnitz, Walter D., III
Pollard, Jerry D.
Pollock, Robert E.
Polo, Arthur D.
Pomykal, Glenn W.
Pontius, Duane H.
*Poore, Alfred M.
*Pooser, James E.
Pope, Walter L.
*Popp, Arvel J.
*Popp, Robert L.
Porter, John W.
Porter, Paul G.
*Porter, Philip E.
Porter, Robert C.
Porter, Russell E.
Porter, Steven M.
Porterfield, Gary L.
Porzio, Arthur
Post, Warren L.
*Postel, Dale E.
Postulka, Richard J.
Potter, Dennis R.
Potter, Robert G.
Potter, Tracy J.
Powell, David W.
Powell, George B., Jr.
*Powell, Robert H.
Powers, Desmond J.
Powers, Don G.
*Powers, Thomas E.
Poynor, John I.
*Pozzi, Robert J.
Pratt, Richard A.
*Pratt, Thomas R.
*Pratte, Roy J.
Premeaux, Gordon R.
Prentice, Wiley E.
*Preston, Joe W.
*Preston, William G.
Price, Albert L.
Price, Carl J.
Price, Ellis F.
*Price, Thomas D., Jr.
Priest, Sidney R.
Primacio, Leo P.
*Pritchard, Donald G.
*Procopio, Joseph G.
Propati, Joseph
Proud, George E.
Provan, Michael J.
*Pryzby, Stanley J.
Puariea, Donald H.
*Puchtler, Wolfgang H. G.
*Pulver, William D.
Purcell, Darrell W.
*Purdy, Alan M.
Purnell, Louis S.
*Pursel, Thomas M.
Purves, Ralph A.
Puschel, Philip P.
Quade, Edward L.
Quarles, Herbert R., Jr.
*Queen, Robert A.
Quinn, Richard C.
Quinn, Robert O.
Quint, Harold L.
Rabuczewski, Thomas A.
Racey, Patrick C.
Raclaw, David B.
Radtke, Dean R.
Raebel, Dale V.
*Raetzman, Donald P.
Rafer, Gerson P.
*Ragan, James E.
Ragan, Stephen P.
*Raggett, Michael M.
Raiter, Friedrich E.
Ramey, John R.
Ramirez, Gilbert C.
Ramm, Edward J.
*Ramos, Frank S.
Rampacek, Brian B.
*Ramsdell, James V., Jr.
*Ramsey, Roger C.
Rand, Charles H.
Randall, Peter R.
Randle, William M.
Raney, William R.
Rankin, Paul L.
Rankin, Robert L.
Rannells, Edward W.
Ransom, William E.
Ranson, William M.
*Ranzinger, William F.
*Rapp, Michael D.
*Rappe, Gerald C.
Rask, Stephen J.
Raso, Jack L.
Ratcliff, John W.
*Rathjen, Arthur D.
*Rau, Morton D.
*Raulerson, Charles R.
Ravdin, Richard
*Rawls, Hugh M., Jr.
Ray, Gerald L.
Ray, Michael J.
Raymond, Clinton F.
Rayner, Peter N.
Read, Edwin L., III
*Reader, Robert J.
Ready, John K.
Reagan, Richard C.
Ream, James D.
*Reber, Peter M.
Rec, Raymond P.
Redfield, Bruce B.
Redmon, Howard G.
Redmond, William G.
Reece, Dale I.
*Reed, Gary A.
Reed, Randall S. N.
Reed, Richard E.
Reed, Walter L., Jr.
Reep, Roger, F.
Rees, David H., Jr.
*Reese, Francis B.
Reese, John F., II
*Regan, John F.
*Regan, John T.
Regan, John C. B., III
Regan, Paul G., Jr.
Register, Mahlon E.
Rehak, James M.
Reich, Donald G.
Reiche, John C.
Reichhelm, Edward P.
Reid, Alan T.
Reidgreen, John B.
*Reiling, Victor G., Jr.
*Reilly, Edward L.
Reilly, Errol F.
*Reilly, John T.
*Reilly, John R.
*Reilly, Leo J.
*Reilly, Thomas M.
Reinders, William T.
*Reinhardt, Edward W.
Reinhardt, David S.
Reisner, William F.
*Reistetter, Emery A.
Reitmeyer, Robert F.
Rekittke, David E.
Rell, Louis R.
Remley, Barry G.
Renner, Kenneth D.
Renola, Anthony C.
Renschen, Robert L.
Repetto, Bruce E.
Repko, Bill
Resweber, Owen J., Jr.
Reuling, Todd J.
Reuman, Robert W.
Revesz, William, Jr.
*Reynolds, Franklin E.
Reynolds, Ronald R.
Reynolds, Robert W.
Rezek, William V.
Rhea, Kennedy "J"
*Rhodes, Donald W.
*Rhodes, James M., Jr.
Ribolla, Romolo T.
*Rice, Ervin E.
Rice, Frank R.
Rice, Michael G.
Rice, Richard R.
*Rich, Harry E.
*Rich, James E.
Rich, James M.
*Rich, Philip C.
Richard, Frederick L.
Richard, Russell R.
*Richard, Theodore J.
*Richarde, Henry M., Jr.
Richards, Frank L.
Richards, James M.
*Richards, Stewart W.
*Richardson, Robert W.
Richardson, Samuel E., III
Richardson, Earnest W.
Richey, Jacque D.
Richmond, Frederick J.
Ricks, Morris L., Jr.
*Riddell, Richard A.
*Riddick, George T., Jr.
Riddle, Ferdinand A., Jr.
Ridenour, Daniel C.
*Ridgel, Randolph M.
*Ridgely, Philip J.
Ridley, Frank M., III
Rieber, Stephen L.
*Riedel, Leonard W.
Rieder, Richard W.
Riehl, Frederick G.
*Riemenschneider, Bert R.
Riess, James R.
*Riess, Joseph R., Jr.
*Rifer, Vernon L.
Riker, Robert T.
Riley, Stephen G., Jr.
Rimel, Robert F.
Rimer, David A.
Rinard, Patrick W.
Rines, Robert W.
*Ring, Henry M.
Ringberg, David A.
*Rising, Lynn M.
Ristad, Arnold C.
*Ristow, John D.
*Ritt, Dayton W.
Ritter, John E.
Ritts, Frederick H.
*Roach, John A.
*Roark, David L.
*Robb, Jeffrey D.
Robb, Thomas W.
*Robbins, David L.
*Robbins, Robert C., Jr.
Robe, Charles E.
Roberg, John H.
Roberson, Bernard G.
*Roberson, John L.
Roberts, Alvin P.
Roberts, Clarence A.
Roberts, Donald K.
Roberts, John K.
*Roberts, Keith C.
Roberts, Richard E.
Roberts, Walter V., Jr.
Roberts, Wellington
Robertson, Charles L., Jr.
*Robertson, George W.
Robertson, Curtis R.
Robinson, Keith P.
Robinson, Philip O.
Robinson, Roger J.
*Robinson, William L.
Robohm, Peter
*Robson, John E.
Roche, Peter J.
Rochelle, Balford R.
Rockhold, James A.
Rockom, Joseph W.
Rodammer, Eugene E.
Rodder, William, Jr.
Rode, Jack W.
Rodee, Donald C.
Rodegerdts, Henry E.
Roe, Charles R.
*Rogas, Edward, Jr.
Rogers, James D.
Rogers, James S.
*Rogers, James W.
Rogers, John T.
Rogers, Louis A.
Rogers, Paul H., Jr.
Rogerson, Henry P.
Rohlfs, Wayne A.
Rojahn, Lawrence R.
Rojas, Franklin E.
Roll, Francis P.
Rollins, Gary T.
Rollinson, Paul W.
Rollo, Charles J.
*Rolow, Melford D.
*Roman, Gordon G.
Romer, Phillip B.
*Romero, Edward R.
Ronan, Edward S.
*Ronan, Lawrence E.
*Ronka, Paul A.
*Rood, Charles F.
Rood, Robert E.
*Roode, Peter G.
Rope, William F.
*Roper, James E.
Roppe, Richard E.
Rose, Archie J.
*Rosenbach, Bernard H.
*Rosenbach, Bernard L.
Roshon, Paul R.
Roski, Jeffery H.
Ross, Carl W.
Ross, Charles E.
*Ross, Ernest E.
*Ross, James A.
Ross, James E.
Ross, Robert F.
Ross, Robert M.
*Rosser, Theodore N., Jr.
*Rossi, Joseph L.
*Rosson, Vernon L.
Rote, Edward A.
Rothery, Michael J.
*Roton, James R.
*Rotsch, Herman D.
Rough, Robert L., III
*Rountree, John M., Jr.
Rouse, David T.
*Rouse, Wayne
Roussel, Alan J.
*Routh, Eugene C.
Roux, Leo G., Jr.
Rowe, Thomas F.
Rowland, William D.
*Rowson, Joseph P.
*Roy, Bill
*Royalty, Kenneth M.
*Roybal, Genaro M.
Roycraft, Gary O.
Royer, Robert J.
*Ruch, Werner F.
Rudeen, James C.
Rudy, Kieran F.
*Rue, Thomas A.
*Ruff, John C.
*Ruff, Paul G., III
*Ruland, William J.
*Ruliffson, James H.
Rumble, William R.
*Rummel, Harold L.
Rumpler, Robert A.
*Rumsey, Peter A.
Ruonavaara, Gerald N.
*Rupprecht, Robert P.
Rushlow, Myron R.
Russell, Gerald D.
Russell, Kenneth H., Jr.
*Russell, Peter F.
Russell, Ronald
Russell, Robert D.
Russler, Dennis C.
Rust, Gregory B.
*Rust, Robert S.
Rutherford, Robert B., III
*Rutherford, Paul F.
Rutherfurd, Guy G., Jr.
Rutkiewicz, Richard C.
Ryan, Timothy J., Jr.
Ryan, Timothy J., III
Ryburn, Windel D.
*Ryland, Robert B.
Ryle, Charles S.
Ryon, Robert L.
Saas, David E.
Sabados, Theodore J.
Sacco, James N.
Saddington, William G.
Sadler, Dudley C.
*Sadler, John W.
Sagerian, Ara
*Sala, Virgil
Salcedo, Frederick
Saline, Walter M., Jr.
Salkeld, Stephen A.
Sallstrom, Richard E.
Salners, Edward A., Jr.
Saltzman, Richard S.
Sampson, Harry B.
*Sampson, Neil E.
*Sampson, Stanley E.
Samuels, James C., Jr.
Samuelson, Roland W.
Sand, James C.
Sandberg, Robert L.
Sandelin, Jon C.
*Sanders, Charles T.
*Sanders, George W.
Sanders, John G.
Sanders, Thomas E.
Sanders, William M.
Sanderson, Dan C.
Sandison, Ernest F.
Sandstrom, John F., Jr.
Sanftner, Thomas R.
Sanger, Paul W., Jr.
Sanjenis, Michael L.
*Santi, Ralph L.
*Sapp, Neil C.
Sarek, Lawrence G.
*Sargeant, Harry Jr.
Sargent, Frederick W., Jr.
Sargent, Richard C.
Satin, Joel L.
Satter, Richard S.
Saub, Jerry C.
Sauley, Edward A., Jr.
*Saunders, Phillip G.
Sautebin, James N.
Sauter, Ronald M.
Savage, Kenneth D.
Sawyer, Thomas E.
*Saxon, Ross E.
*Saxton, Harry J.
Scanlon, James C.
*Scanlon, Jerome B.
Schagg, Frank L.
Schaefer, Jack
*Schaefer, Lyle H.
Schaefer, Robert D.
Schaff, James C.
Schall, Ronald K.
Schalon, Lee E.
Schambelan, Howard L.
*Schardt, Delvin L.
Schatz, Arthur D.
Schatz, Jay R.
*Schaus, Richard H.
Scheffel, William J.
Scheiner, Robert
Scheiwer, John J.
Schemmel, Robert J.
Schena, Anthony R.
*Schenck, Robert S., Jr.
Schenck, Stewart H.
*Schenck, William H.
*Schenewerk, Donald D.
Scheppelmann, Robert H.
Schetter, Harry W.
Schettig, Robert C.
Scheuneman, Thomas W.
*Schiffer, John R., Jr.
Schiffman, Marvin C.
Schilleman, Robert P.
*Schiller, Frederick C.
*Schilling, Gerald W.
Schilson, Terry E.
*Schiltz, Raymond A.
*Schindler, Richard B.
Schindler, Thomas F.
Schirmer, Theodore C. Jr.
Schlecht, Vernon E.
*Schlegel, James D., II
Schluter, Robert C.
*Schmeling, Leslie L.
Schmidt, Carl E.
*Schmidt, Charles T.
*Schmidt, Clemens E.
Schmidt, Henry E.
Schmidt, Karl M.
*Schmitz, Marion C.
Schneck, Thomas F.
Schneider, Glenn D.
Schneider, William B.
*Schneider, Charles R.
Schneider, Eugene H.
Schneider, Leonard W.
Schneider, Wayne E.
Schneider, Homer F.
Schoeller, Roy C.
Schoenfeld, Ronald V.
Schoenherr, Peter D.
Schoenleber, Robert H.
Schoeppner, Gary H.
Scholle, Lewis F.
Schooley, Thomas R.
Schoonaert, James H.
*Schrade, Richard D. C.
*Schrader, John Y., Jr.
Schrader, William R.
Schriver, Walter J.
Schroeder, David D.
Schroeder, Bryan K.
*Schroeder, Kenneth A., Jr.
*Schroeder, Arthur F., Jr.
Schroeder, Leonard
Schroeder, Gerald M.
*Schroller, Kermit W., Jr.
*Schropp, John W.
Schrotel, John T.
Schrupp, Manfred S.
*Schubert, Carl E.

*Schuller, David D.
Schultz, Bernard P.
Schultz, Peter H.
*Schuman, Daniel D.
*Schupbach, Duane F.
Schwabacher, John H.
*Schwaderer, Darwin L.
*Schwalbert, James G.
*Schwartz, Henry W.
Schwartz, Ronald R.
*Schwartz, William T.
Schwartzman, Bernard
Schwefler, Kenneth G.
Schweitzer, Robert F.
*Schweizer, George W.
*Scopa, Robert J.
Scott, Alan D.
Scott, David E.
*Scott, Elva S., Jr.
*Scott, Gerald D.
Scott, John M.
*Scott, Joseph W.
Scott, Larry L.
*Scott, Raymond A.
Scott, Richard R.
Scott, Sherrod
Scovil, James A., Jr.
Scudder, Robert H.
Seale, Jesse W.
*Searcy, Millard J., Jr.
Seay, Marvin E., Jr.
*Seelig, Martin A.
*Sehorn, Donald D.
*Seiberling, Ronald K.
Seibert, Anthony L.
Seibold, Dean P.
Seidelhuber, Michael J.
Seidensticker, Stephen S. W.
Seifert, Philip M., Jr.
Seiler, Richard W.
*Sekula, Basil, Jr.
Selby, Neil B.
*Self, George H.
Sellers, John G., III
Sellers, William A.
*Senn, Laurence E.
Serumgard, Robert T.
Setser, Beve W.
Settlemyer, Charles T., III
*Severin, Lawrence R.
*Sexton, George R.
Sgamma, Philip N.
Shadburn, Dale T.
*Shafer, Jerry P.
Shafer, Jimmie F.
Shaffer, Howard C., III
Shaffer, Jerry A.
Shaffir, Melvyn L.
Shagory, George E.
*Shane, Raymond J.
Shank, Roy D.
Shankel, William L.
Shannon, Craig
Shannon, Gerard C.
Shannon, James B., Jr.
*Shannon, James R.
Shardy, James E.
*Sharp, Clay L., Jr.
Sharp, David D.
Sharp, David R.
Sharp, Terry R.
Sharpe, Raymond A., Jr.
*Shaw, Joseph W., Jr.
Shaw, Richard H.
Shaw, Sidney S.
*Sheafer, Edward D., Jr.
Sheaver, James F.
Sheehan, Gerard R.
*Sheets, Floyd A.
*Sheffield, George A.
Shelby, David C.
*Sheldon, William G.
Shell, Richard C.
*Shelton, Gene B.
Shepardson, Richard L.
Shepherd, Gary L.
*Sherer, Cecil W.
Sheridan, Charles J., Jr.
*Sheridan, Joseph L.
Sheridan, Thomas C.
*Sherman, James L.
Shettle, Melvin L., Jr.
*Shields, Donald K.
Shillingsburg, John W.
Shinn, Jay F.
Shirley, George L., Jr.
Shirley, James A.
Shirmer, Dan A.
Shore, John H.
*Short, Jerome H.
*Short, Travis E.
*Shoup, Linn T.
Showalter, Jerome V.
Shrigley, Robert E.
*Shriver, James A.
*Shuman, Arnold B.
Shutt, John J.
Shutters, Gerald H.
Sicari, Anthony C.
Sidner, Gerald B.
Siebel, Richard A.
*Sieglaff, Peter M.
Siegler, Francis N.
*Siemer, John R.
*Silver, Dwight E.
Simants, Richard A.
Simer, Murice M.
Simmons, Daniel P., Jr.
*Simmons, Richard L.
Simmons, Stephen C.
*Simmons, William T.
Simola, Peter C.
Simon, John F.
Simonds, John A.
Simpson, Franklin L., Jr.
Simpson, Robert L.
*Simpson, Stephen T.
Simpson, Troy E.
Sims, Roger D.
Sines, William M.
Singer, Don A.
*Singer, Edward A., Jr.
Singleton, Don S.
*Siren, William H.
*Sirmans, James S.
*Sisk, Raymond M., Jr.
*Sites, Bruce L.
Siwik, Joseph C., Jr.
Sjostrom, John E.
Skidmore, Arnold E., Jr.
Skubi, Anthony J., Jr.
Slack, William M.
*Slate, Dennis Y.
Slater, John W., III
Slater, Marcus B., Jr.
Slater, Thomas S.
Slaton, John C.
Sleeper, Thomas E., Jr.
Slikker, Fred C.
*Sloan, Deward V., Jr.
Sloan, John B.
Sloan, Robert S., III
*Sloat, James W., Jr.
Sluder, Jerry L.
Sly, William G., Jr.
Small, Lawrence N.
*Smart, Ronald E.
*Smith, Bradford D.
Smith, Charles R.
*Smith, Dan H.
*Smith, David L.
Smith, David R.
Smith, Edmond V.
*Smith, Edward J.
*Smith, Franklin, J., III
*Smith, Fred W.
*Smith, George B.
Smith, Gerald K.
Smith, Glenuel R., Jr.
Smith, Gordon H.
Smith, Hamilton S., Jr.
Smith, Jay H.
Smith, Jerome E.
*Smith, John W.
Smith, John D.
Smith, Kenneth R.
Smith, Kenneth P.
*Smith, Leighton W., Jr.
Smith, Leighton J.
Smith, Leonard H., Jr.
Smith, Lewis E., Jr.
Smith, Lyman H., II
*Smith, Michael S.
*Smith, Michael O.
Smith, Norman W.
Smith, Norman D.
Smith, Oliver D.
Smith, Robert, III
*Smith, Roger W.
Smith, Ronald C.
Smith, Thomas A.
Smith, Walter J., Jr.
Smith, Ward B.
*Smith, William R. H.
Smith, William E.
Smithlin, Michael J.
*Smyth, Gregory S.
Smyth, Jerry S.
Smythe, Hugh M.
Snider, Raymond R.
*Snow, Franklin D.
Snow, Hugh B., Jr.
Snyder, Allen R.
Snyder, Christian R.
Snyder, Donald M.
Snyder, Frederick M.
*Snyder, George A.
Snyder, Harold K.
Snyder, Ian M.
Sobieray, Edmund S.
*Sobierski, Jan M.
Sodeman, Paul D.
*Sofman, Peter D.
*Sokol, David
Sokol, Stanley E.
Soleau, Bertrand S., Jr.
*Soles, Thomas E.
Soliday, Wayne A.
*Soluri, Elroy A.
Somoya, Richard D.
*Sontheimer, Robert M.
Sootkoos, Donald R.
Sorelle, Arthur W., III
*Sortwell, Fred N.
Sowden, Thomas R.
Spahn, Albert W.
*Spalenka, Rudolph J., Jr.
*Spane, Robert J.
Sparks, James L.
Sparks, Thomas P., III
Sparrow, Richard S.
Spear, Charles A.
Speight, James H., Jr.
Spencer, Donald W.
Spencer, Henry B., II
*Spencer, William D.
Spendley, Ronald C.
Spetrino, David A.
Spindler, Joel S.
Spinn, Wilmer L.
Spires, Hewlett O., Jr.
Splittstoesser, Clair D.
*Spofford, Barry A.
Spoon, William D.
Sprague, Brinton Jr.
*Sprague, Herbert O.
Sprague, William E.
Springall, Peter S.
*Springer, Charles H. T.
Springer, James V., Jr.
Spurck, Danial N.
Staat, William A.
Stacy, Edward G.
Stadsklev, Thomas D.
Stagliano, Anthony C.
Stahl, Dale S., Jr.
Staley, John P., Jr.
Stalker, Earl, Jr.
*Stancil, William C., Jr.
*Standish, John A.
*Standridge, Wylie L., Jr.
*Stanford, Harold M.
Stanland, Daniel R.
*Stanley, Jay L.
*Stanley, Milford E.
Stansbury, Frederick A.
Stanton, Bernard M., Jr.
Stapleford, Isaac B.
Stapleton, Daniel V., Jr.
Stark, Charles R.
Stark, Charles F., Jr.
Stark, James F., Jr.
Stark, John W.
Stark, William C.
Starkey, James W.
Starling, Jay D.
*Starnes, Glenn M.
Staub, Bernard F.
Stauber, Orville D.
Stearns, Basil L.
Stebbins, Lynten H.
Steckel, James E.
*Steckman, David L.
Stedman, Glen P.
*Steele, Billie O.
*Steele, Daniel L.
Steele, Raymond D.
Steele, Robert A.
*Steele, Thomas A., III
Steele, William A.
Steenrod, Ralston W.
Stegina, Robert F.
Steiger, Gary C.
Stein, Clarence L., Jr.
Steinbaugh, Robert K.
*Steinbruck, Charles G., Jr.
Steinsiek, Glen D.
*Stem, David J.
Stempien, Vincent R.
*Stemrich, Patrick J.
*Stender, Charles F.
*Stender, Richard H.
Stent, Ferdinand T.
*Stephan, Roland C.
*Stephens, David A.
*Stephenson, William W., II
*Stephenson, Gary P.
*Stere, David H.
Sterk, Truman D.
*Sterner, George R.
*Sternfels, Urvan R.
*Stevens, Harry J., III
*Stevens, John B.
*Stevens, Orville L.
*Stevens, Paul L.
Stevens, Robert L.
*Stevens, Stanley H.
Stevenson, Thomas D.
*Steward, Mobray W.
Stewart, Douglas D.
Stewart, James C.
*Stewart, Jake W., Jr.
*Stewart, John C.
Stewart, Richard C.
Stiehr, Peter E.
*Stiens, Robert E.
Stills, Francis M.
*Stilwell, William C.
*Stinson, William A.
Stivers, James
*Stivers, Robert L.
St. John, Edward P.
*St. John, James B., Jr.
Stoakes, Richmond B.
Stockwell, Philip R., Jr.
Stoddard, Robert A.
Stodulski, Richard W.
*Stokes, Paul A.
*Stolgitis, William C.
Stoltman, Richard H.
*Stone, Arthur W.
Stone, Robert N.
Stone, Thomas J.
*Stone, Thomas E.
*Stone, Walter F.
Stone, William L.
Stonelake, Henry T.
*Stoorza, Edwin L., Jr.
*Storms, Kenneth J.
Story, Harold D.
*Story, William F.
*Stotsenburg, John C.
*Stouder, Nial E.
*Stoufer, Donald A.
Stough, Kenneth F.
Stoughton, Charles R.
Stovall, William T.
Stover, Herbert W., III
Stowe, William A.
Stowers, Herbert L., Jr.
Straley, Richard P.
*Strand, Richard C.
Strand, Joseph M.
Strasemeier, John K.
*Stratton, Craig A.
Strauchen, Edmund R., Jr.
Strauss, Harry M.
Streets, Richard R.
Strickland, John G.
*Strickland, James D., Jr.
Strickland, Walter L.
Strickler, Cyrus W., III
Strickler, James W.
*Stricklin, Eldred B.
*Stringer, Thomas C., Jr.
*Stroebel, Donald W.
Strole, Douglas L.
Strong, Donald S.
Strong, William J.
Stross, Robert E.
*Stroud, Joal C.
Stuart, Charles L., Jr.
Stuart, Charles R.
Stuart, David J.
*Stubbe, Robert P.
*Stubbs, Leslie E.
*Stubbs, William O., Jr.
*Stuckemeyer, John A.
Studer, John A.
Stumpe, Clarence H.
Stumpo, Thomas R.
Sturm, Lynn A.
*Sturvist, Gerald H.
Sullivan, Donald R.
Sullivan, Dennis
*Sullivan, John L.
*Sullivan, James T., Jr
Sullivan, John M., Jr.
Sullivan, John P.
*Sullivan, Michael E.
Sullivan, Thomas P.
Sumeracki, Gerald S.
Summey, Morris L.
*Sund, Jeffrey O.
*Sundberg, Andrew P.
Sundstrom, Arthur J., Jr.
*Sushka, Peter W., Jr.
Suter, Gary T.
Sutton, Gwynn, R., Jr.
Sutton, Michael A.
Sutton, Paul D., Jr.
Svetlik, Gerald L.
Swain, Ray E.
Swalley, Charles E.
Swan, Thor O.
Swank, Jay L.
*Swanson, Charles E.
Swanson, William E.
Swarner, David W.
Swart, Coleman A.
Swartley, Steven W.
Sweat, Arthur J.
Sweat, Samuel F.
Sweet, John K., Jr.
Swenson, Lennart A.
Swett, Richard W.
*Swickey, James N.
Swilley, Robert H.
*Switzer, Charles M., Jr.
Sycuro, Astor. J., Jr.
*Sykes, Dustin C.
*Sykes, Harold A., III
Sykulski, Theodore F.
*Syphers, Grant E., Jr.
Szarleta, Melvin A.
*Szekely, Richard A., Jr.
Szoch, Charles J.
Szymanski, John S.
*Tabb, Hugh A.
*Taft, George
Tahaney, Hubert F., Jr.
Tait, James E., Jr.
Takac, John J., Jr.
*Takeuchi, Robert S.
Tallas, Gregory G.
Tallent, Merrell B.
Tallent, Ralph E.
Tallman, Robert H.
*Tamny, Michael A.
Tancrell, Norman F.
*Tansey, Philip M.
Tanski, John W., Jr.
Tapper, Jack A.
Tapscott, John C.
Taranto, Richard
Tarpley, Robert P.
Tarsa, Leon F.
Tarver, William A., III
*Tatom, Charles H.
Tatum, William J.
Taulli, Frank R.
*Taylor, Andrew J., Jr.
Taylor, "B" "J," Jr.
*Taylor, Carroll E.
Taylor, Don H.
Taylor, Francis J., Jr.
*Taylor, Harley V.
Taylor, James S.
*Taylor, John F.
*Taylor, Norman C.
Taylor, Paul F.
Taylor, Peter G.
Taylor, Robert W.
Taylor, Robert M.
Taylor, Wayne C.
*Taylor, William L.
*Tease, Henry V., Jr.
Tedder, George L., Jr.
*Teeple, William W.
Tekorius, Algimantas J.
*Teller, John P.
Terry, James W.
Terry, Michael R.
Terry, William E.
*Tew, Glider C.
Thalken, Gerald E.
Thatcher, David O.
*Thau, August B.
*Thaxton David R.
Thayer, Kent H., Jr.
Theirbah, Thomas C.
*Theis, John H., Jr.
Theisen, Charles A.
*Thelen, Antoni A.
*Theriot, Simon, Jr.
Thesing, Kenneth L.
Thomas, Bobby J.
*Thomas, Edward C., Jr.
*Thomas, Frank H., Jr.

Thomas, James C.
Thomas, Larry A.
Thomas, Lonny L.
Thomas, Peter D.
*Thomas, Peter W.
Thomas, Stephen L.
Thomas, William A.
Thomasson, Ronald E.
*Thomassy, Louis E., Jr.
*Thompson, Allan M.
*Thompson, Allan W.
Thompson, Bryson H.
Thompson, Clifford J.
Thompson, Hugh B.
*Thompson, James J.
Thompson, James E.
Thompson, John M.
Thompson, Lawrence W.
*Thompson, Merville R.
Thompson, Marvin G.
*Thompson, Paul D.
Thompson, Thomas R.
Thompson, Tarlton R., Jr.
Thompson, Tad G.
*Thompson, Wayne E.
*Thompson, William W.
Thomson, Ronald J.
*Thoren, John A., Jr.
*Thornton, Jack C., Jr.
Thorson, Gordon B.
Thorson, Orval F., III
Tibbetts, Verne P., Jr.
Tice, Richard J.
*Tidball, Robert N.
Tiernan, Barry V.
*Tiernan, Michael C.
Tiernan, William F., Jr.
*Tierney, Sean E.
Tilko, John, Jr.
*Tillotson, Charles R.
Tillotson, George A.
*Tilton, James R.
Timoney, Edward
Timpson, Donald G.
Tims, Jacob R.
Tinder, William P.
*Tipps, Robert L.
*Tipton, John E.
Tipton, Stephen M.
Titus, Robert G.
Tobergte, Paul E.
*Tobias, Charles E.
Tobin, Paul C.
*Tobolski, Donald M.
*Todd, Terrence S.
Todesca, Charles J., Jr.
Toft, Richard J.
*Tolbert, Clarence O.
Tolbert, William H.
*Toler, Roger H.
*Tolmie, Richard A.
Tomaszewski, Walter J.
Tomblin, Larry G.
Tomek, George W., Jr.
*Tomlin, Joseph M.
Tompkins, Joseph G., Jr.
*Tompkins, Paul S.
*Tomsho, Michael E.
*Tonti, Louis G.
Toombs, Robert D.
*Toone, John P.
*Torbit, Jerry B.
*Toreson, Arthur H., Jr.
*Tortora, Carmine
Tosi, Charles A., Jr.
Tousley, Bobbie E.
*Towers, Edwin L.
Towle, John M.
Townsend, Grant R., Jr.
*Townsend, James T.
Townsend, Okey, Jr.
Trafton, Robert T.
Traill, Charles R.
Trainer, William F.
Trammell, Robert B.
Trantham, Donald B.
*Travis, David T.
*Trax, Lindsay J.
Traxler, Ronald W.
Treanor, James E.
Trees, Robert D.
*Tremblay, Maurice U.
Tremmel, Phillip G.
Treutlein, Francis G.
Trimble, Donald M.
Trimble, William B., Jr.
Triplett, Bruce A.
*Tripp, Richard W., Jr.
Tripp, Robert R.
Trisel, Terry E.
Tritt, Jerry R.
*Trombly, Edgar G.
*Trotman, George, Jr.
Trowbridge, Ernest V.
Truesdell, Charles L.
Tryon, Glenn A.
Tschudy, William M.
*Tuck, Gordon L.
Tucker, Albert L.
*Tucker, Douglas
*Tucker, Duane E.
Tucker, Leo P.
Tuell, Thomas B.
Tuggle, Dean O.
*Tull, Lloyd W.
Tullgren, David B.
Tumma, Thomas R.
*Tune, Cecil L., Jr.
Turbeville, Fred M., Jr.
Turnbull, Benjamin H.
Turnbull, James L.
*Turner, Charles E.
Turner, David A.
Turner, David C., Jr.
Turner, Delano F.
Turner, Frank B.
Turner, Gary F.
Turner, Hurley C., Jr.
*Turner, James S.
Turner, Kenneth W.
Turner, Richard M.
*Turner, Stephen A.
Turpin, Anthony A.
Tyler, Jim G.
Tyler, Ronald L.
Tynan, Douglas M.
Tyndall, Gene R.
Tyner, Jimmie C.
Tyree, Harry S., Jr.
*Uber, Thomas E.
Uldrick, Thomas S.
Ulery, Larry R.
Ulrich, Allan W.
Ulrich, Donald C.
Underwood, Walter J.
Underwood, John B.
Unger, Maurice H.
*Ungerman, William E.
Upham, Walter J.
Upton, Jon W.
Uren, Lyle J.
*Urice, Ronel M.
*Urquhart, Andrew W.
*Usborne, Roger W.
Utter, David E.
Vaccarella, Theodore L.
*Vadinsky, George
*Vagenas, James T.
*Vanallman, Alfred C.
Vanausdle, Larry R.
Vanbalen, George H., III
Vanboven, Harry L.
*Vanbrackle, Vernon L., Jr.
Vanburen, James W.
Vance, Richard M.
Vancil, Richard T.
Vandergaw, Bruce A.
Vandergrift, Ronald W.
Vanderlippe, Paul A.
Vanderveer, Robert M.
Vanderwoude, Richard S.
Vanemon, Peter J.
*Vangorp, Dirick, P.
Vanhoy, William L., Jr.
Vanmale, Nicholas R.
Vanorden, Edwin W., Jr.
*Vanpelt, Albert M.
*Vansaun, Arthur
*Vanslyke, James C., Jr.
Vatter, Lawrence J.
Vaughan, Clarence L.
*Vaughan, Herschel M., Jr.
*Vaughan, Trotter
*Vaught, Russell S.
Vaupel, David K.
Veahman, Louis P.
Veeneman, Wayne A.
*Veirs, James W., Jr.
*Veith, Dennis A.
Velez, Robert F.
Verbelia, Joseph J.
*Verd, George H.
*Verdell, William S.
*Verhasselt, Robert R.
Vermillion, Wesley D.
*Vernallis, Samuel L.
*Vesseliza, Robert R.
Vetter, Paul B., II
Vicar, Anthony J.
*Vick, John E.
Vickaryous, James A.
Vidrine, Earl
Viegelmann, Kurt A.
*Viera, James J.
Vieth, Charles E.
Villani, Salvatore A.
Vincent, Benjamin B.
*Vincent, Chester
Vincent, Michael W.
*Vincent, William Lansing
*Vincent, William Lee
*Vinson, Clyde R.
Vinson, Lindell R.
Vodra, James L.
*Voeth, Harry A.
*Vogel, Raymond W., III
Vogel, Thomas W.
*Vogl, John F.
*Volk, John S., II
*Vollmar, Fredrick J., Jr.
Vonland, Roger A.
*Vopelak, Richard J.
Voss, Paul R.
Voss, Robert C.
Vossler, Robert J.
Vowinkel, Russell C.
*Vreeland, Roy A.
Wade, Richard J., Jr.
Wade, Shelba H., Jr.
Waechter, William
*Wagner, Frank
*Wagner, George F. A.
*Wagner, Robert G.
Wagner, Walter L.
*Wagoner, Joseph E.
Wagoner, Thomas A.
*Wahler, Fred R.
*Wainscott, Robert P.
Walck, James F.
*Walde, Donald R.
Waldheim, William W., II
Waldron, Ronald J.
Wales, Steven E.
*Walker, Benny H.
Walker, Charles R.
Walker, Charles M.
Walker, Ernest B., Jr.
Walker, Frederick D.
Walker, Garrett T.
Walker, Harold J.
*Walker, James E.
Walker, James C.
Walker, Jerry D.
Walker, John T.
Walker, John A., Jr.
*Walker, Michael R.
Walker, Robert G.
Walker, Ronald W.
*Walker, Thomas L., Jr.
Walkins, John L.
Wall, James T.
Wallace, Robert A., II
*Wallace, Roy N.
Wallace, Ronald K.
*Waller, James M.
Waller, Joseph N.
Waller, Tonie M.
*Wallin, Steven R.
Walls, Stewart E.
Walma, Kenneth D.
*Walman, Michael L.
*Walraven, Leonard W.
Walser, Kenneth C.
Walsh, Arthur L.
*Walsh, Bernard
Walsh, Donald F.
Walsh, William G.
Walter, Merritt N.
*Walters, Claude J.
Walters, Jack, Jr.
Walters, John B., III
*Walton, Harold A.
Walton, James A.
Wann, Charles B.
Warbington, Fred J.
*Ward, Jerry N.
Ward, John W.
Ward, Paul V.
*Ward, Thomas V.
Ward, William A.
Ward, William R.
Wardsmith, Anthony D.
Waring, Patrick J.
Warner, Charles F., Jr.
Warner, Lawrence E.
Warner, Neal C.
Warr, William E. C., III
Warren, Donald E.
Warren, James M.
Warren, John E.
*Warren, William E., Jr.
*Warthin, Jonathan C.
*Waterfield, Russell J.
Waterhouse, Robert E.
*Waterman, George R.
*Waters, Daniel L.
Waters, Douglas R.
*Waters, Gordy W.
Waters, Ralph W.
Waters, Robert T.
Watford, Jennings C.
*Watkins, Donald E.
Watkins, Ralph W.
*Watkins, Richard S.
Watler, Karl W.
Watrous, Timothy B.
Watson, James T., Jr.
*Watson, Randolph G.
Watson, Robert B.
Watson, Thomas C., Jr.
Watts, David L.
Way, George E.
Way, John R.
Waynick, Thomas F.
Wazenegger, Charles J.
*Weatherly, Larry M.
Weaver, Charles H.
*Weaver, James E., Jr.
Weaver, Richard L.
*Webster, William J.
*Weegar, Carl A.
*Weeks, Letcher G.
Weeks, William A.
*Wehner, Joseph L.
*Weigant, John A.
Weihrich, John A.
*Weiner, Martin
*Weiner, Stephen E.
Weingartner, David L.
Weinhold, Julius F., Jr
Weinnan, Barry M.
*Weis, Edward W.
Weisenburger, Thomas W.
*Weisensee, William J., Jr.
Weisiger, Carl C.
*Weiske, James W.
*Weiss, Daniel C.
Weissinger, John L.
Weissman, Joel M.
Weixel, John C.
Welch, David J.
Welch, Harry G.
Welch, Torrey A.
*Welford, Marcus, Jr.
*Welham, Walter F., Jr.
Welker, Robert E.
Weller, Reginald F.
Wellington, John C.
Wellman, James P.
Wells, Donald H.
Wells, Donald A.
Wells, James R.
*Wells, Jan P.
*Wells, Norman L.
*Wells, Robert M.
Wendt, Thomas C.
Wenger, Charles M.
*Werling, Donald F.
*Werlock, James P.
Werlock, Stephen T.
*Werner, Henry A.
Wernsman, Robert L.
Wert, William G.
*Wertin, John E., III
*Wertz, Edward J.
Werwaiss, William F.
*Wesner, Ross C.
*West, David C.
West, Karl G.
*West, Michael E.
West, Robert A.
West, Walter D., III
*Westbrook, Richard E.
*Westcoat, William C., II
*Westerman, Thomas F.
Westin, Brian E.
Wetmore, Sanford H.
Wetter, John C.
Whalen, "G" Walter, Jr.
*Wheaton, David J.
Wheaton, Warren W.
Whedbee, Charles M.
Wheeler, Gerard C.
Wheeler, Harmon E.
*Wheeler, John R.
*Wheeler, Kenneth B.
*Wheeler, Sidney E.
Wheldon, Maurice A.
Whetsel, Carlton E.
Whisenant, Richard D.
*Whitaker, Roger B.
*Whitcomb, David H.
White, Arthur E.
White, Donald C.
White, Francis P.
*White, John K.
*White, John D., II
*White, Joseph A., Jr.
White, Marvin E., Jr.
White, Michael A.
White, Morris D.
*White, Robin J.
White, Ronald E.
White, Ronal L.
*White, Thayer D.
White, Tramel A., Jr.
White, William W.
*Whitehurst, Byron P.
*Whitehurst, Chester M.
Whiteley, Richard C.
Whitfield, James B.
Whiting, David P.
Whitley, John B.
Whitt, Bruce L.
*Whitt, Eugene N.
Whitten, Guyon E., Jr.
Whitters, James P., III
Whittleton, Thomas R.
Whitus, Ernest F.
Wiborg, Lloyd H.
*Wickert, Alan J.
*Wickman, Raymond H.
Wiedner, Donald L.
Wiggins, James R.
*Wiggins, Robert H.
Wight, Norman I.
*Wigley, Duane L.
Wike, Max A.
Wilbur, Gene L.
Wilcox, Roy G.
Wilczewski, Francis R.
Wildhaber, Justus E.
*Wildman, James H.
Wilhelm, David J.
*Wilhoit, James M.
*Wilkerson, David P.
Wilkes, Jerry W.
Wilkie, Robert C.
Wilking, Arnold P., Jr.
Wilkins, Robert L.
Wilkins, Stephen V.
Will, Thomas F.
Willard, Daniel S.
*Willett, "D" "G"
*Williams, Anthony J., Jr.
*Williams, Charles W.
*Williams, Charles L.
Williams, Douglas A.
*Williams, David D.
*Williams, David Lawrence
Williams, David Lee
Williams, Elmer K., Jr
Williams, George M.
Williams, Gary O.
Williams, Harold D.
Williams, John H., Jr.,
Williams, John C.
*Williams, John T.
Williams, Joseph F.
Williams, James I.
Williams, Larry J.
*Williams, Lowell K.
*Williams, Mitchell L.
Williams, Richard O.
Williams, Robert J.
Williams, Roy P., Jr.
*Williams, Russell T., Jr.
Williams, Roger L.
Williams, Robin H.
Williams, Robert L.
Williams, Roy R., Jr.
*Williams, Samuel E.
Williams, Thomas D.
Williams, William G.
*Williamson, William S.
Willigan, Walter L., Jr.
Willingham, Hiram L.
Willis, Jerome E.
Willis, William H.

*Willmott, James J.
*Willoz, Clifford P., Jr.
*Wills, James W.
Wills, John A., Jr.
Wilson, Clyde
Wilson, Clyde E., Jr.
Wilson, David D.
Wilson, Denny F., Jr.
Wilson, Dennis L.
Wilson, Douglas M.
Wilson, Ernest E.
*Wilson, Harold D.
Wilson, Harvey J.
Wilson, Joe H.
Wilson, John F., III
Wilson, Paul H., III
Wilson, Phillip M.
Wilson, Robert K.
Wilson, Robert L.
Wilson, Roger C., Jr.
Wilson, Ronald A.
Wilson, Thomas B., Jr.
Wilson, Torrence B., III
Wilson, William J.
*Wiltgen, Donald G.
Windbigler, John J.
*Winder, Jon W.
*Winter, Ward L.
Wintersgill, Blair H.
Wisdom, Louie J.
*Wise, James L.
*Wisely, Hugh D.
Wisleder, Dean E.
Witman, William P.
Witt, Eric N.
Witt, John O.
*Witten, Robert L.
Wittig, Robert H.
Wojcik, Walter J.
Wolf, Kenneth H.
*Wolf, Richard J.
*Wolf, Theodore
Wolfe, Harry H.
*Wolfe, John T.
Wolfe, Ronald G.
Wolfram, Charles B.
Wollard, Wayne E.
*Woller, Robert H.
Woloszyk, Donald J.
Wood, Charles G.
Wood, David L.
*Wood, Forrest K.
Wood, Harold K., Jr.
*Wood, John G.
Wood, Philip L.
Wood, Risdon S.
Wood, Virgil W.
Wood, William H., III
Woodburn, Stevens E.
*Woodbury, Laurence O.
Woodbury, Roger L.
Woodfin, Ronald L.
Woodham, Sim E.
*Woodka, Thomas K.
Woodman, James B.
Woodmancy, Allan F.
*Woodruff, Peter B.
*Woodruff, William H.
Woodruff, William W.
*Woods, Donald L.
*Woods, James R., Jr.
*Woods, Ralph H.
*Woodward, Benjamin W., III
*Woodworth, George P., Jr.
Woolfolk, William W., Jr.
*Wooster, Robert G.
Wootten, James P.
Wootten, John F.
Worley, Donald R.
Wortley, Cabray, Jr.
Wright, Coleman J.
Wright, Frederick M.
Wright, Gerald A.
Wright, James J.
*Wright, Timothy W.
*Wright, Will R.
*Wunderly, William L., Jr.
*Wurts, Edward V., III
*Wylie, Hilton A.
Wyne, Philip W.
Xiques, William E.
Yaconiello, William J.
*Yandell, Lawrence A.
*Yandrofski, Ronald M.
*Yanovsky, Allen J.
*Yanus, James F.
*Yates, Joseph W., III
Yeager, Claude D., Jr.
Yeates, Dennis J.
Yeates, William L.
*Yeatts, Thomas R.
*Yerkes, Alan C.
Yingling, Glenn H.
Yocum, Gerald R.
*Yohanan, Robert R.
Yohe, Robert B.
*Yonkers, David P.
Yonov, Serge A.
Yothers, James W.
Young, Alfred H., Jr.
Young, Bruce A.
Young, David L.
Young, Donald P.
Young, Emery W.
*Young, Gerald F., Jr.
Young, Peter A.
*Young, Robert L.
*Young, Robert B.
Young, Robert A.
Young, William K.
Yovan, Stephan
Yowell, Kirby D.
*Yufer, Kenneth L.
*Yunker, Orland W.
Zabrocki, Alan D.
*Zaccagnino, Anthony J.
*Zachman, William H.
Zagorski, Anthony J.
Zambori, Donald P.
Zane, David
Zaretki, John P.
Zavodsky, Wesley D.
Zelfer, Gerald T.
Zeppieri, Ronald J.
Zerbe, Michael R.
*Zetterberg, Forrest L.
Zike, James R.
Zimmerman, Robert C.
*Zimmerman, Raymond P., Jr.
Zimmermann, Robert F.
Zimmermann, Harold K.
Zink, Alan E.
*Zink, Roy A.
Zinn, Robert W.
Zizza, Francis E.
*Zogg, Raymond, Jr.
*Zucca, Gary J.
*Zuhr, Raymond A.
Zuilkoski, Stephen K., Jr.
Zwall, Richard

SUPPLY CORPS

*Abbott, Gerald W.
Abbott, James E.
*Abernethy, James R., Jr.
*Aleva, David A.
Allan, James B., Jr.
*Allbaugh, Charles U.
*Alwine, Paul R., Jr.
*Amman, Delos A.
Anderson, Ellwood A., Jr.
*Anderson, Louis G.
Anderson, Roger D.
*Armistead, William B.
Atherton, James A.
Ayers, James D.
Ayers, Keith K.
*Baird, Robert B.
*Baker, Charles E., Sr.
*Baker, Joseph R.
*Baker, Roland J.
Baldwin, Seth W., II
Bankhead, Royce E.
*Barnes, Edmund L., Jr.
Barr, Charles V.
Barraford, Jerome H., Jr.
Bartel, Joseph R.
*Bartholomew, Frank L., III
Beane, Douglas R.
*Beasley, Ronald D.
*Beer, Robert O., Jr.
*Bell, John W.
*Bennett, Paul G.
*Bentson, Gordon J.
*Bergeron, Wilfred J., Jr.
Berndt, Philip A.
*Bestor, Robert H., Jr.
*Birindelli, James B.
Bissett, John L.
Blankenfeld, Richard K.
Block, Donald P.
*Boehmler, Erwin W., Jr.
*Bondi, Peter A.
Bossert, William W.
Boswell, Wilbur F., III
Bradley, Stephen P.
Brake, Robert L.
*Braswell, Carmen B.
Brewton, Brian E.
Brochu, Robert A.
*Bromen, Roger R.
Brooks, Joseph F.
*Brown, Bernard E.
*Brown, Jack M.
*Brown, Reed E.
Brzozowski, Lawrence D.
*Buhr, Joseph D.
*Burk, William E.
*Burnett, Michael H.
*Burnham, John K.
Callahan, Denis J., Jr.
Cangalosi, Davis S.
*Cantrall, Edward L.
Carney, Vance E.
Carr, William N.
*Carre, Darwin B., Jr.
*Carroll, John P.
Castillo, Floyd R.
Ceo, Jerome J.
*Chalupsky, Raymond J.
Champagne, Buvens L., Jr.
Chandler, David L.
*Chapman, Richard B.
*Chism, David M.
Christenson, Allen R.
Clark, James M.
*Cleary, Richard T., III
Clopton, Jerry D.
*Coburn, John M.
*Collins, William A.
Connell, David B.
Conner, Frank H.
*Cooper, William K.
Copler, Robert D.
*Corbet, James T.
*Costello, John N.
Courtney, Thomas M.
*Cox, Thomas P.
Crabb, Dal E.
Creigh, Donald F.
Cribbs, Ferdinand P., Jr.
Crocker, William G.
*Cronin, John L., Jr.
Crow, Jack D.
Dahm, Eugene E.
*Dailey, John C., Jr.
Daniels, John G.
Dannenbring, David G.
*Danner, Glenn R.
Davee, Francis W.
*Davidson, James P.
Davis, George F., Jr.
*Delasfuentes, Jose, Jr.
*Denvir, Quin A.
Desmelik, Russell C.
Dominy, John F.
*Dunn, William F.
Duryea, Robert J.
*Earle, Samuel B., III
Ebner, Jerome M.
Eckard, Harold A.
Edgar, Richard A.
Ehle, Roger E.
Elledge, Ira F.
Elliott, Richard E.
Emrich, William D.
Erickson, Paul R.
Evans, William C.
Everhart, Robert B.
Fahey, Eugene M.
*Fay, Todd L.
*Fellows, Fred Y., III
*Fields, Billy J.
*Fincke, Edwin A.
Fischer, Charles E.
Fitzgerald, Thomas P.
Flaiz, James F.
*Fleming, James A., Jr.
Flood, Harry E.
Flowers, John H.
Floyd, Edward T.
Fodor, James N.
*Foley, Richard L.
Fort, John L.
Fowler, Robert
Fox, George E., Jr.
Frantz, Harold W.
*Frassato, Robert C.
Frazee, Samuel R., Jr.
Freeman, George W., III
Fugazzi, William H.
*Fulghum, Robert E.
Fuller, Franklin B.
Gallagher, Theodore J., Jr.
*Gallion, Robert Z.
*Garmus, David P.
*Garrison, Thomas M.
*Geary, John P.
Gee, Charles D.
*Gent, Raymond D.
Geroe, Marvin K.
*Gillick, Gerald C.
Glisson, Donald J.
Grace, Eldon W.
*Green, Harold C., Jr.
Greenlee, Frank E., Jr.
*Greer, George W., III
Griffin, Jon E.
Griffin, Peter J.
Griffith, David B.
*Grim, James W.
Groves, William D.
Gutierrez, Jose R.
Haas, James J.
*Hale, Ronald A.
*Hall, George T.
*Hamm, Michael R.
*Hanscom, Frank E.
Hargrave, Philip N.
*Harms, Herbert M.
Harper, Wesley E.
*Harrington, Phillip H.
Harris, Thomas J.
*Hekman, John G.
*Helme, Gordon T.
*Helmuth, Robert A.
Henderson, John R., Jr.
Henley, Miller P.
Henson, Verlin C.
Hernandez, Edward S., Jr.
*Hill, Clark E.
Hislop, Charles E.
*Hodapp, Charles A.
Hodges, James W., Jr.
Hogan, Brian T.
Holbrook, William F.
Holland, Donald L.
Hooker, James S.
*Hopkins, William L.
*Houston, Charles R.
Howes, Joseph D.
Huffman, James W.
*Hunt, George A.
Hunt, James D.
Isaacs, Thomas M.
Isackson, Robert K.
Janse, Anthony L.
*Johnson, Thomas L.
*Johnson, William W.
Jones, William M.
Jordan, Charles W., Jr.
*Karosich, James C.
*Kasriel, Jerome D.
Kavanaugh, John T.
*Keating, Jeremiah A.
Keister, Richard R.
*Keller, Leonard, Jr.
Kennedy, John B.
*King, William D.
*Kittredge, Thomas M.
Klein, Richard B.
*Knowles, Thomas N.
*Koch, Karl W.
Kopesky, Dellos A.
Kopser, Raymond J.
*Kosch, Charles A.
Koselka, James A.
*Kostin, Edward B.
*Krehely, Donald E.
Kugler, Robert A.
Kuster, Ulrich E.
*Kyllo, Roger A.
Lamb, Donald L.
*Laurent, Daniel H.
Lawrence, Phillip L.
Leake, George R., Jr.
Leding, Michael J., Jr.
*Lehmann, Charles
*Lidberg, Alfred A.
*Lillico, Keith R.
Loreen, Jon M.
Lovett, Edwin L.
Luna, Eston M.
Lutz, Gerald G.
Lynch, Harry V.
Madsen, Wayne H.
Maloney, Michael J.
Mandel, Allan L.
*Marohn, Louis N.
Marshall, William B., III
*Mather, Gregory A.
McAuley, Malcolm J.
McCanne, William G., III
McCormick, Robert B.
McCourt, James M., Jr.
*McCraw, Thomas K.
*McGavran, Francis J.
*McKeever, George F.
McKim, John L.
*McSwain, Franklin L.
Mellies, Jay L.
Mencarini, Richard
Meneely, Frank T.
Merritt, Frank W., Jr.
Meyer, James R.
Miles, James R.
*Miller, James R.
Milon, Francis J.
*Mitchell, Carl M.
*Mix, Victor E.
Monroe, James L. D.
Monson, Jon P.
Moreland, Richard D.
*Morgan, George P., Jr.
Morgan, Ronald D.
*Morris, John D., III
Morris, Myron L.
Mortimer, James R.
*Moum, Jerry D.
Munak, James S.
*Murray, Brian J.
*Mustaine, Myron P., Jr.
*Nagel, John W.
Nebel, Gerald L.
*Nelson, Wayne J.
*Niesar, Gerald V.
Oberle, Michael J.
*O'Connor, Joseph A.
Oehrlein, William P.
O'Neill, Eugene W., Jr.
O'Reilly, James T.
Owens, Robert K.
*Pace, John E.
Paine, John S.
*Parker, James F.
Parks, Leonard C.
Parsons, Donald S., Jr.
Payne, Michael T.
*Pearson, David E.
*Pedersen, Carl J.
Perce, George S.
Perkins, Larry L.
*Perrill, Fredrick E.
*Peterson, Dale J.
*Phillips, James D.
Pierce, John H.
*Piester, Fay M.
*Pinckney, Pembroke T., III
Pinskey, Howard S.
Pittman, Harold S.
*Popik, Michael J.
Porche, Mitchell S., Jr.
Poulin, Robert A.
*Prager, Gerald D.
*Pressley, Joseph L.
*Price, Clifford R.
*Pugh, Richard C.
*Quigley, Patrick J.
*Quinn, John T.
*Quinn, Kenneth J.
Radke, Neil A.
*Rasmussen, Paul D.
*Redick, John A.
*Redman, William E., Jr.
*Reed, William A.
Reese, Sam, Jr.
*Renfro, Jack D.
Reynolds, Marvin D.
*Richards, Gary T.
Richards, Gerald W.
*Rittenhouse, Ferness L.
Robbins, Donald T.
Robbins, William H., III
*Roche, Douglas R.
Rodgers, Gary L.
Rodine, Robert L.
*Roe, Marshall C., Jr.
Rose, Frank, Jr.
Rosson, Bobby J.
*Rowan, Alan J.
*Rueckert, Jon
*Russell, Frank A.
Ryder, Thomas V.
*Ryland, Charles W.
*Sandeen, John K.
Sanders, John F.
*Sapera, Leonard J.
*Sareeram, Ray R.
*Sattler, Roger C.
Savola, Vernon V., Jr.
Scheid, Ronald D.
*Schwartz, James M.
Seddon, Thomas A.
Sekowski, Edwin E.
Sellers, James B.
Semelsberger, Russell T.
Shannon, William N.
Shaw, John M.

Sheffield, Charles H.
*Sherman, Bruce L.
Shetler, George L.
Sickafoose, Keith E.
Sienknecht, Ronald T.
Sigelman, Alan J.
*Sikes, James E.
*Sloan, James B.
*Smith, James A.
*Smith, Olen B., Jr.
Smith, Richard D.
Sneiderman, Marshall L.
*Soletti, Lawrence A.
Spicer, Adrian W.
Spinnler, William W.
*Starnes, Bobby F.
*Steen, George S., Jr.
*Steiner, Richard A.
Stone, Kenneth D.
Storzer, Alan D.
*Sullivan, Michael J., III.
*Suter, David F.
*Szalapski, Jeffery P.
*Taube, Arden R.
Terry, James H.
Tharp, Clarence G.
Thomas, Dudley J.
Thomas, Robert L.
Thomas, Woodson B.
*Thompson, Robert H.
Tidball, Ronald G.
*Tiger, James D.
*Tomcheck, John K.
*Torres, Esteban U.
*Torrey, Tracy E.
Trbovich, George M.
*Treanor, Richard C.
*Tripp, Donald E.
*Trotter, Edgar S., Jr.
*Tully, Albert P., Jr.
Turley, Marion C.
Turnage, William B.
*Ullius, David J.
Ura, Dennis A.
*VanNess, Robert L.
*Vaughn, Arthur A.
Verhage, Ronald G.
Verhulst, Glenn A.
*Voyles, Clyde W.
Waddell, David S.
Wagner, Gregory L.
*Wagoner, John D.
*Waite, Richard, IV
Wakefield, Robert C.
Wall, Donald B.
Wallace, Edward F.
*Wallace, James J.
Wallace, William W.
Warren, Robert M.
*Watkins, Robert S.
*Watrach, Dennis K.
*Weaver, Edwin R., Jr.
*Webb, Evans W.
Webster, Bert R.
*Welch, Kenneth T.
*Welch, Richard A.
*Wells, Michael V.
Whitaker, Bartley L.
Willetts, David A.
*Wilson, Michael G.
Wiste, Roger W.
*Witt, Terry J.
*Woodward, Joseph F.
*Worsena, Richard F.
Wrenn, Harry L., III.
Yaney, Donald L.
*Young, Robert R.
Zedaker, William R.
Ziegler, Frederick G.
*Zumbro, Sherrod B.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Awes, Vernon E.
Curran, Wade H., Jr.
Depascale, Daniel F.
Dunks, Max E.
Eckles, James W.
Erick, Robert J.
Fitzgerald, John B.
Goff, Ronald H.
Kerner, William B.
Lauer, Robert E.
O'Neil, Michael P.
Patz, Norman R.
Scanlon, John J.
Wishard, John W.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Anderson, Keith K.
Archer, Wiley J.
*Argus, Wilbert L., Jr.
*Bender, Carl H., Jr.
*Berget, Kaspar G., Jr.
Beuby, Stephen C.
*Black, Dorwin C.
*Black, Wilson M.
*Blackwell, Larry G.
Bond, Ronald L.
*Bordas, Peter S.
Brady, Patrick J.
*Brandon, Robert L.
*Bratzler, John H.
Brents, Daniel R.
Buckner, Ernest W.
*Buffington Jack E.
*Buntley, Ronald E., Jr.
*Camden, Edward B.
Carnell, Donald L.
*Carter, Stuart L.
*Chapla, Paul A.
*Cloar, James A.
*Cofer, Rufus H., Jr.
*Coffey, Fred S.
Cornue, Michael E.
Cote, Armand A.
*Crain, Harold S., Jr.
Crane, Thomas C.
Day, Norman W.
*Drennon, Patrick W.
Ehlers, Harold V.
*Elkstrand, William N.
Elliott, James R.
*Endebrock, Robert N.
*Farlow, David E.
*Finn, James R.
Fluharty, David H.
*Fowler, George E., III
Frauenfelder, Henry R.
Gallagher, Thomas E.
*Gallen, John J., Jr.
Gamble, Charles S.
*Gardner, Thomas N.
*George, Emory J.
Gohier, Robert W.
Goin, Paul T.
Grenney, William J.
*Griffith, Verne E., Jr.
*Gruhn, Gordon G.
Hansen, Robert E.
Harris, William F.
*Heine, William A., III
Henley, Joseph L.
*Henry, Eugene S.
Hentschell, James S. M.
*Houck, Carl P.
Houlihan, John W.
*Jackson, Bruce L.
Kidder, Walter S.
Koelsch, Peter
*Kurtz, James P.
Laabs, Walter W., Jr.
Leap, Joseph B.
*Lehder, Wilfred E., Jr.
*MacKenzie, Kenneth B.
*Martinelli, Salvatore A.
Mattimore, Bernard G.
*McCahill, Dennis F.
McCullagh, Paul W.
McLaughlin, Arthur P.
Merry, Henry L.
*Michna, Thomas B.
Miller, Graig J.
*Monney, Neil T.
*Morrison, Paul A.
Morrow, James R.
Mott, John K.
Mountjoy, John L.
Murphy, Paul
Neely, Ralph C.
*Newman, Lewis L.
Noble, Chappell N.
O'Hara, David M.
*Olson, Harold M.
Orndorff, Philip B.
Orr, David H.
*Perrine, Robert T.
Petty, Larry K.
Pickart, Gail P.
*Rabke, Walter E.
*Ringel, Duane A.
*Ross, Gerald H.
Schneider, John D.
Schomberg, Gerard F.
Scully, Brian J.
*Shalar, Alexander
*Sharp, Robert W.
Shaw, Arthur R.
Sherman, Myron B.
Smith, Earl E.
Smith, Erik T., Jr.
Smith, Jack M.
Smith, Raymond C.
Smith, Sherrill E.
Starr, Ronald J.
Stellman, Harry M., III
Stephan, Dean E., Jr.
*Stephenson, Walter S.
*Stokes, Stephan R.
Stone, Roger R.
*Street, Clifford G.
*Sturmer, Donald C.
Sullivan, James B.
Tarbox, James S.
Taylor, Ernest D.
Thatcher, Richard B.
Thomas, David T.
*Thompson, Donald J.
Thompson, Ronald B.
*Thorp, Robert D.
*Thrasher, Stephen M., Jr.
*Towle, Nathaniel A.
Underwood, John P.
VanDiver, Earnest L.
Waits, Charles V.
Waldo, David T.
*Wells, Donald R.
Wenck, Norman C.
*Wheeler, David E.
*Wiedmer, Roger E.
*Williams, John K.
Willman, John N.
*Woodford, Donald L.
*Yoder, Dan S.
Zassenhaus, Hans W. E.
Zimmerman, David G., II

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Adkins, David D.
Althauser, Robert V., Jr.
Anderson, Francis G.
Anderson, Stanley H.
*Andrews, James R.
Armstrong, Joseph C.
Ashton, George H.
*Baird, John R.
Baker, Donald E.
*Barrows, Joseph R.
*Beckner, William M.
*Bellais, Patricia A.
*Bennett, Floyd E.
*Branscum, William E.
*Brown, Gary D.
Brown, Seth E.
Brown, Wayne A.
Buhaly, Albert L.
Buxbaum, Richard J.
Cannizzaro, John S.
*Carnahan, Clarence L.
Carroll, Jake R.
Casey, Clarence J.
*Chatelier, Paul R.
Chieco, Richard W.
Clark, Robert P.
*Coan, Richard M.
Cole, Jimmie D.
*Connolly, John F.
*Corbett, Myron R.
Cowan, Morris J., Jr.
Cunningham, Robert S., II
*Cusick, Richard A.
Deeter, Victor R.
*Delaughter, John D.
*Denison, Neslund E.
*Duncan, Alexander R.
Fenno, John D.
*Ferguson, John C.
Ferris, William A.
*Flewelling, Lloyd J.
Friend, Ruth L.
Fullerton, Jack G.
*Furr, Paul A.
Gannon, John H.
Gaunce, Humphrey G., Jr.
Gay, Kenton W.
*Gendron, Eugene G.
Giard. Emile N.
*Gillentine, James D.
Gillespie, Franklin D.
*Glassford, Kenneth F.
Gogel, Casper J.
Golden, Robert M.
Goldsmith, Seth B.
Green, Charles M.
*Green, Ronald K.
Greider, George J.
Hall, Richard T.
Harmon, Robert W.
Hartman, Carl H.
Hatten, Arthur D., Jr.
*Heller, Billy L.
Henderson, "S" Douglas
*Hill, Thomas A.
Horne, William O.
*Hudson, Cecil D.
Humphrey, Ronald D.
Jenkins, Lloyd M.
*Jiminez, Pedro
*Johns, Jack E.
Johnson, Jay A.
*Johnson, Paul W.
Johnson, Robert A.
Juda, Thaddeus A.
Kalfas, Dimitri L.
*Kehoe, John J., Jr.
Kepple, John C.
*Kinsella, Lawrence T.
Laughlin, Leo L., Jr.
*Lewis, John R., Jr.
Mackin, Thomas F., Jr.
Mason, James J.
McAllister, Robert G.
McCurry, Romeo G.
*McGuire, James S.
McPeters, Roland E.
*Meyers, Wessel H.
*Morin, Richard A.
*Murrell, William R.
Nathan, Howard W.
Nelson, John W.
Owen, Donald R.
*Owens, Norman K.
*Palmer, David D.
*Palmer, George J., Jr.
*Parker, Henry E.
*Parrish, William C.
Patterson, Patrick R.
Payton, Richard A.
*Peck, John A.
*Peterson, Warren R.
Phillips, Donald D., Jr.
Praria, Paul A.
Rath, Arthur R.
*Rector, Douglas E.
Rhodes, Durward L.
Rice, Loren W.
Rosplock, Jerome D.
Rowe, Charles L.
*Royals, William E.
*Rutledge, Bobby G.
Santana, Frederick J.
*Saye, Clarence B.
Schmutz, Clinton E.
Self, William L.
Shackelford, Paul R.
Simmons, John W., Jr.
*Skelly, Robert S., Jr.
Smith, Robert E.
*Sparks, Jonathan C.
Sperry, Curtis W.
*Stayton, Richard A.
*Stewart, Ronald H.
*Stockman, Roger E.
*Tharp, David C.
*Theisen, Charles J., Jr.
Thompson, Bobbie L.
Tilton, Delmar L.
Tomczyk, Frank E.
Toops, Paul E.
*Tucker, John R., Jr.
Tworzyanski, Chester
Urevig, Glenn E.
Vail, John R.
*Wallace, Robert J.
Wallace, Robert O.
Warren, Joseph E.
Wesolowski, Carl A.
*Wesson, Billy R.
Wheeler, John R.
White, Harry G.
Wilder, James O.
*Williamson, Lee P.
Winningham, Joe
Zettl, Bernard L.

NURSE CORPS

Allred, Mary E.
Ancelard, Madeline M.
Anderson, Donna L.
Antonini, Mary L.
Arndt, Karen I.
Austin, Barbara L.
Baker, Yvonne P.
Barbour, Susan R.
Barron, Bernice
Barry, Diane E.
Barter, Columba F.
Belcher, Beverly C.
Benning, Luella M.
Bigos, Donna J.
Bodger, Leilani S.
Boyle, Irene A.
Boylen, Janet S.
Bradley, Mary E.
Bridges, Barbara J.
Budacki, Rosemary E.
Burkholder, Alvena R.
Burns, Karlene F.
Byrne, Janet L.
Campbell, Mary S.
Carroll, Mary N.
Chorba, Barbara A.
Collins, Anita L.
Conrad, Ruth M.
Corazza, Judith M.
Corbit, Elizabeth A.
Coski, Joanne
Crouch, Jean C.
Cunningham, Mary K.
Davis, Harriett L.
Delaloye, Martha V.
Delbrouck, Waynelle C.
Deneault, Joyce A.
*Dickson, Barbara A.
Dimarco, Virginia R.
Dion, Joyce M.
Doherty, Maureen P.
Dooley, Mary E.
Drew, Sharon L.
Dunn, Glenda G.
Dye, Josephine B.
*Dyer, Alice
Fagan, Mona F.
Fandel, Virginia M.
Fisher, Thelma J.
Foreman, Evelyn N.
Fox, Patricia M.
Fruin, Mariellen
Funkhouser, Betty J.
Gregg, Leah S.
Groden, Anne E.
Gundelfinger, Mary A.
Hall, Laurie L.
Handlin, Sondra K.
Hansen, Joann
Hennessy, Jo A.
Higgins, Mary A.
Hileman, Rebecca J.
Holt, Sally A.
Huskey, Bobby G.
Jensen, Sandra L.
Jinks, Sandra L.
Johns, Ruth E.
Johnson, Carol M. H.
Johnson, Ethel G.
Jones, Marianna L.
Jordan, Glenda L.
Kaiser, Christine J.
Kanalz, Mary R.
Kerber, Sally A.
Kolazyk, Sheila M.
Kruseski, Catherine R.
Lark, Bonita P.
Lasota, Marguerite S.
Lawrence, Ellen L.
Lencioni, Beverly C.
Leonard, Ann M.
Leveille, Alice L.
Lightfoot, Mary J.
Little, Sonya K.
Lundberg, Georgia L.
Lyons, Susan E.
Maloney, Anne C.
Marks, Alita C.
McCaughey, Anne M.
*McDonald, Patricia K.
McGinn, Margaret M.
McIlvain, Barbara N.
McKenzie, Regina C.
Megonnell, Joann H.
Miller, Linda
Mirsky, Zina E.
Moffett, Sulinda
Montero, Rose M.
Muszynski, Elizabeth F.
Nelson, Marilyn C.
Newton, Katheryn E.
O'Connell, Anne L.
Odom, Helen A.
Orzechowski, Charlene
*Pack, Valaine
Pengelly, Sally J.
Plockelman, Margaret M.
Pruden, Ethel B.
Quellette, Carol L.
Quinlan, Mary E.
Raymond, Barbara A.
Reed, Martha M.
Richmond, Marcie M.

Rivera, Anna J.
Roskos, Elizabeth
Ross, Cheryan C.
Rosselle, Donna B.
Ryan, Irene C.
Ryan, Alicia M.
Schmitz, Dolores J.
Schneider, Blanche M.
Schreiber, Kathryn M.
Schuyler, Ann B.
Seibert, Rosemary S.
Simenson, Marcia R.
Singler, Patricia E.
Skola, Nancy A.
Sobotik, Barbara J.
Spacek, Annette M.
Staley, Patricia L.
Stewart, Shirley A.
Stine, Joyce A.
Sucec, Eileen
Sulkowski, Mary L.
Sullivan, Brenda H.
Thompson, Marjorie C.
Thompson, Virginia J.
Titus, Lynn C.
Vanderbosch, Barbara A.
Virgilio, Beatrice S.
VonCollin, Margaret E.
Walcutt, Sharolyn K.
Wallace, Lona A.
Walter, Carolyn A.
Ward, Judith A.
Ward, Patricia A.
Watson, Anita C.
Watts, Colleen R.
Webb, Carolyn M.
Weber, Carolyn D.
Weber, Myra R.
Wehrle, Barbara F.
Wenglar, Dorothy M. A.
Werderitsch, Judith A.
Westover, Mary L.
Wheatley, Anne A.
Winterhoff, Joan M.
Wolte, Marilyn B.
Wright, Joyce I.
Yucha, Shirley A.
Zanzig, Alba C.

The following-named officers for temporary promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-3 subject to qualification therefor as provided by law;

Hanson, Francis G.
Kelly, Harold A.
Orner, Bernard
Travis, Richard D.
Wagner, Charles P., Jr.

*Capt. James A. Lovell, Jr., U.S. Navy, for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the Navy in accordance with article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution.

*Comdr. Beverlee J. Allen, U.S. Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of commander subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

*Comdr. Shirley J. Kaye, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the Supply Corps subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named women officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

*Baker, Elizabeth S.
*Denby, Sara P.
*Dilorenzo, Julia J.
*Gregg, Elizabeth L.
*Horn, Emile L.
*Kuhn, Lucille R.
*MacLean, Carol J.
*Sloman, Jean P.
*Zierdt, Lucy E.

SUPPLY CORPS

Beiszer, Margaret C.

The following-named women officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Benner, Sara L.
Blake, Sally A.
Coyer, Ann E.
Feldes, Marcia A.
Hahn, Janice L.
Loser, Margit M.
Maddox, Vivienne D.
Mulrooney, Elsie L.
Stege, Mary C.
Sutphen, Patricia C.
Tiller, Trudith D.
Tyndall, Sara M.
Wylie, Elizabeth G.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Bane, Thomas J.
Baumrucker, Charles J., Jr.
Bellingham, Herbert J.
Bowman, William T.
Brown, Ronald L.
Brunner, Danny J.
Burns, Robert L.
Campbell, Guy R., III
Dann, Warren K.
Easley, George A.
Ek, Roger W.
Fiebelkorn, George A., Jr.
Finney, Donald W.
Flint, Lewis W.
Fritz, Thomas W.
Gabryeiski, Richard M.
Gerwe, Franklin H.
Granuzzo, Andrew A.
Himelfarb, Roy A.
Janke, David C.
Johnson, John D.
Kelley, William E.
Kobor, David J.
Koch, Dean H.
Ledoux, Lawrence J.
Leightley, Albert L., II
Lemmert, Robert W.
Lev, Samuel R.
Lynch, Anthony J.
Manicke, Harold V.
Miller, John M.
Miller, Ralph R., III
O'Brien, Robert C.
Parchen, William R.
Parker, William T.
Patterson, Mervil L.
Raebel, Dale V.
Ratcliffe, John W.
Schroeder, Gerald M.
Shelby, David C.
Tahaney, Hubert F., Jr.
Todesca, Charles J., Jr.
Turnbull, James L.
West, Walter D., III
Wintersgill, Blair H.

SUPPLY CORPS

Anderson, Elwood A., Jr.
Anderson, Louis G.
Ayers, James D.
Bartel, Joseph R.
Buhr, Joseph D.
Creigh, Ronald F.
Fischer, Charles E.
Groves, William D.
Oberle, Michael J.
Paine, John S.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Hansen, Robert E.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Bond, James C.
Fullerton, Jack G.
Jones, Bobby N.
Laughlin, Leo L.

Gerald L. Dawson, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the restricted line of the Navy, in the permanent grade of lieutenant and the temporary grade of lieutenant commander.

Russell L. Rose, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy, in the permanent grade of lieutenant and the temporary grade of lieutenant commander.

Lt. (junior grade) Dean S. Higgins, U.S. Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer (W-2), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Chief Warrant Officer (W-3)

Acuff, Burnis R.
Altomare, Gasper R.
Alves, Frank
Ambrose, Timothy J.
Andress, Samuel E.
Arnott, Joseph R.
Baier, Kenneth C.
Beckner, Charles C.
Bishop, Herbert H.
Bloomfield, Albert B.
Bocko, Peter P.
Bohline, John C.
Bonenberger, Norman G.
Booth, Franklin H.
Breeding, James R.
Briley, George L.
Broyles, Kermit E.
Carroll, William O.
Cavanaugh, Charles H.
Christensen, Jack C.
Chapman, Homer L.
Christie, Harold D.
Clark, Harlan D.
Colter, Lessie H.
Corbin, "E" "J"
Cottrell, Billy R.
Crouss, Herman F.
Donnelly, Frederick J.
Dredger, Robert F.
Duenwald, Vernon D.
Elkins, Harvey W.
Engle, Clarence W.
Engler, Donald A.
Epoch, Wilbert M.
Fazer, Vernon T.
Feeney, James F.
Fore, Ralph W.
Forgey, Augustine H.
Fousie, Howard M.
Gardner, John F.
Gentry, Gerald H.
Giblin, Walter L.
Gibson, William E.
Gimmel, Daniel G.
Gordon, Robert C.
Grueser, Sidney L.
Hamryszak, Peter J.
Hansen, Donald A.
Heeney, Joseph F.
Hill, James W.
Hollowell, Joseph M.
Holmes, Theron C.
Howell, Abbie R.
Johnson, Byron W.
Johnson, Harley, Jr.
Kopchinsky, Edward A.
Lamb, James H.
Lofgren, Earl W.
Loftus, Joseph F.
Long, Henry A., Jr.
Lowe, Kenneth A.
Madewell, John A.
Mansell, John T., Jr.
Martin, Vincent E.
Mathiasen, Vernon A.
Mathison, Elmer L.
May, Willie C., Jr.
McCarron, John H.
McNaught, Ray A.
Miller, William V.
Mitchell, Harold H.
Morgan, Attis N.
Morissette, Lucian G.
Murray, Eugene C.
Noonan, Robert J.
Pace, William J.
Parrett, Vanita F.
Pierson, Harmon L.
Pillow, John T.
Porter, Newell H.
Prince, Louis F.
Prisk, Lloyd E.
Racette, Arthur H.
Redden, Dennis J.
Reed, Abner D.
Revolinsky, Walter R.
Rooney, Philip J.
Rowland, George H., Jr.
Sanchez, Rogelio, Jr.
Scanlan, Philip T.
Schlais, Alvin E.
Smith, William R.
Spisak, Frank
Stenstrom, Joseph F.
Still, Stephen R., Jr.
Stone, Thurman R.
Stoughton, Richard M., Jr.
Sullivan, John V.
Talton, Lewis E.
Taylor, Earl P.
Taylor, Jodie V.
Travis, John R.
Treanor, Peter F.
Unkle, Osborne L.
Upton, "L" "R"
Vedomske, Cyril M.
Walsh, William K.
Webb, Howard J., Jr.
Welch, Calvin K.
Wheeling, James T.
Willis, Donald W.
Wilson, Charles E.
Windham, Joe C.
Yates, Wallace G.
Zwer, Don O.

Chief Warrant Officer (W-4)

Allen, Charles N.
Axtell, Clair F., Jr.
Barron, Harry L.
Barry, Timothy A.
Blevins, William C.
Blood, Hiawatha E.
Booth, Robert C.
Bracy, Lloyd E.
Bradley, Robert E.
Brooks, Samuel N.
Brown, Charles E.
Brown, Denton C.
Brown, Leo E.
Bryson, Allen C.
Buck, Billy
Burdett, Lesta D.
Burns, Lawrence C., Sr.
Calfee, Julian E.
Carr, Franklin P.
Carrozza, Salvatore
Chapin, Junior R.
Childers, Sanford L.
Crawford, Jack
Crowell, James L.
Cseselka, John
Davis, Robert E.
Deal, Franklin D.
Dehnbostel, John H.
Dinga, John A.
Dixon, Robert E., Jr.
Doyle, Alfred L.
Doyle, Roger V.
Dressel, Howard B.
Dudley, Melvin L.
Edalgo, Tyson
Fazio, Michael
Fetterman, Melvin W.
Fitzhugh, Herman H., Jr.
Flynn, James L.
Frazee, Wilton J.
Freel, James H.
Frye, Ward W.
Frye, Warren A.
Gordy, Granville E.
Gould, Alexander
Hammond, Robert R., Jr.
Harris, Walter B.
Harter, Richard S.
Hartley, Clair C.
Hayes, Layton A.
Heckendorf, Leonard H.
Henke, Walter L.
Holley, Bernard M.
Howell, Albert W.
Hudgins, Luther M.
Hudson, James H.
Hull, William T.
Jones, William S.
Jorgensen, Herbert R.
Kanavel, Jack R.
Klein, Marcus G.
Kummer, Arthur J.
Lathen, Sylvester H.
Lenon, Horace G.
Leroy, John D., Jr.
Lewis, Eugene I.
Lipe, James C.
Lovelace, Darrell M.
Lunt, Alfred G.
Mable, Earl D.
Marion, George L.
Martin, Melvin L.
Matson, Francis M.
Matthews, Carl W.
Mazza, Robert J.
McCaffrey, John W.
McConnell, Howard E.
McDonald, Edwin W. J.
McFall, Henry R.
McGuire, Shely W.
McInnis, Edwin L., Jr.
Miller, Daniel J.
Mintz, Kermit T.
Moore, Orange J., Jr.
Moorehead, Harold L.
Morris, Benjamin F.
Morrison, William M.
Morrissey, Robert M.
Mount, Marvin A.
Moye, Edwin B.
Myers, Russel E.
Nash, Kenneth P.
Nelson, Carl A.
Newill, Lawrence E.
Noble, Lowell I.
Page, Jack W.
Palmer, Charles E.
Palmer, Roger A.
Parks, Joe
Perdue, Samuel K.
Powner, Walter J., Jr.
Ragan, Lionel B.
Ramage, Rudel E.
Redding, Victor L.
Reddoch, Donald W.
Resch, Raymond R.
Rosenkoetter, Russell E.
Scheppmann, Leroy E.
Schmidt, John J.
Shea, Richard H.
Shirley, Raymond R.
Skoldberg, George W.
Slater, Charles
Smith, Gerald F.
Smith, Paul F.
Steele, Burton A.
Taylor, Rex C.
Thompson, Robert A.
Tucker, Lester B.
Tworek, Flavius S.
Unger, George W., Jr.
Vaughan, Troyce D.
Walker, Jack H.
Warwick, Charles A., Jr.
Webster, William W.
West, William O.
Williams, Thomas W.
Willig, Faye L.
Wright, Virgil W.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Beagan, Rose B.
Blumberg, Janet L.
Bonner, Jeanine A.
Clemmer, Patricia L.
Conklin, Norma E.
Day, Grace
Engle, Nancy J., Jr.
Green, Marianne S.
Hanlin, Ruth A.
Hartshorn, Lena M.
Heimerl, Johanna F.
Hill, Linda M.
Hower, Susan A.
Jeske, Nance G.
Kern, Annie L.
Kuhns, Jeannie J.
McCarthy, Margaret M.
McDonald, Caterine E.
McKenzie, Ora A.
McMunn, Patricia J.
Meyer, Evva G.
Motz, Ingrid M. I.
Peters, Geraldine
Rausch, Rosemary E.
Smalley, Phyllis E.
Stephens, Clair M.
Stolzenbach, Mary M.
Taddei, Alice R.
Visbisky, Michal M.
Watson, Kathryn A.
Wiggins, Linda L.
Wofford, Dorothy J.
Abbey, Donald L.
Abell, Terry A.
Abbott, Richard L.
Abelon, Asher D.
Abrams, Steven S.
Ackland, Thomas B.
Adams, Charles E.
Adams, Gary R.
Adams, Phillip A.
Adell, James M.
Agle, Roy L.
Ahlborn, Edward R., Jr.
Alcott, Shelby O.
Alford, John W.
Alitt, Bruce D.
Allen, George R.
Allen, James F.
Allin, John W.
Allison, Dennis P.
Allison, William S., III
Almond, John W., Jr.
Anawalt, Richard A.
Anciaux, Louis N.
Andersen, Franklyn D.
Anderson, David C.
Anderson, David M.
Anderson, Richard G.
Anderson, Ross K., Jr.
Anderson, Sanford C.
Anderson, William G.
Andrew, Dall H.
Ardizzone, Robert L.
Armstrong, Arthur J., Jr.
Arndt, William D.
Arnold, William T.
Arvedlund, Richard L.
Asher, John W., III
Aston, Albert H., Jr.
Astor, Lawrence I.
Athanson, John W.
Atkinson, Larry R.
Aucella, John P.
Auer, James E.
Aulenbach, Thomas H.
Avery, Donald W., Jr.
Bachmann, Richard G.
Baffer, Roger A.
Bafico, Richard E.
Bahr, Harold E., Jr.
Bailey, Thomas A.
Baker, David A.
Baldwin, Gary A.
Ball, Harry F., Jr.
Ball, Richard H.
Ball, Robert H.
Banda, Lionel A., W.
Barber, Stanley D.
Barg, Mark S.
Barlow, Wayne C.
Barnes, Edwin R.
Barnes, Stanton J.
Barney, William C.
Barron, John M.
Barrow, Edward M., Jr.
Barstad, Willis A.
Barthel, Donald A.
Bartol, John H., Jr.
Barton, Creighton E.
Barton, Edmund C.
Batchelder, Charles M.
Batterman, Dean H.
Batzel, Thomas J.
Baumgart, Stephen W.
Baumhofer, William J.
Baxter, George R.
Beam, Lawrence P.
Bean, Charles D.
Beard, Travis N.
Beasley, Max H.
Bechthold, George W.
Beck, Fernand P., III
Beckham, Robert F.
Bedford, John L.
Behrman, Richard W.
Beland, Conrad L.
Bell, Corwin A.
Bell, Denis J. W.
Bell, Henry L., Jr.
Bellamy, Gary S.
Beltz, Ivan L.
Benchea, Traian
Bender, John C.
Bennet, David H., Jr.
Bennett, Franklin L.
Bennett, Gary P.
Bennett, Robert L.
Benson, Jeffrey L.
Beranek, Bernard F., II
Bernstein, William P., II
Berry, Earl, Jr.
Berry, Russell E., Jr.
Biersach, James E.
Bignell, James P.
Binckes, Jeffrey B.
Biro, Michael R.
Bishop, Samuel E.
Blackwell, Cecil L., Jr.
Boak, Charles W.
Bohley, Carl M.
Bolan, Robert S., Jr.
Boldt, David E.
Boley, John R.
Bonar, James W.
Bond, "C" Ward, Jr.
Bond, Robert J.
Bonsignore, Michael R.
Booth, Carter
Borlet, Robert A.
Botten, Leroy H.
Bowen, Andrew J., IV
Bowen, William E.
Bowes, William C.
Bowman, Thomas E., III
Boyd, Ronald A.
Boyen, Richard E.
Bracy, Michael B.
Bradford, William E.
Brady, Charles R.
Brahmer, Frederick E.
Brandt, Thomas K.
Bratton, Charles S.
Breard, Harold A., Jr.
Brearton, Gerald A.
Breen, Alfred L., Jr.
Breen, Frank J., III
Breithaupt, David E.
Brent, Melvin C.
Brickman, Edward P.
Bridgeman, Robert J.
Briggs, Steven R.
Brinkley, William S.
Briski, Richard J.
Brockmeier, Robert O.
Brodie, Reid III
Broesamle, Robert R.
Brougher, William S.
Brouwer, Frederick P. II
Brown, Charles E., Jr.
Brown, Jerry B.
Brown, Richard W.
Brown, Thomas E.
Brown, Thomas H.
Brown, William C. III
Browne, Peter A.
Browne, Vernon G.
Bruce, John H.
Bruns, Frederick W.
Buck, Earl F.
Buckingham, John W.
Buckingham, Duane W.
Buckley, Robert F., Jr.
Buckley, Thomas D.
Buell, Kenneth R.
Buelow, Richard W.
Buescher, Stephen M.
Bugg, William E.
Bullard, Walter M., Jr.
Bunce, Richard L.
Bundy, Norman L.
Bunnell, Melvin L.
Burke, James E.
Burke, John P.
Burnham, John L.
Burns, John P., Jr.
Burris, Robert N.
Burroughs, Lawrence D.
Busemeyer, David G.
Bustamante, Charles J.
Butler, Francis W.
Butler, Garry W.
Byrnes, David T.
Byrnes, Richard P.
Byster, Martin B.
Calande, John J., Jr.
Calhoun, Ronald J.
Calvano, Charles N.
Campbell, Brian F.
Campbell, Cletus L.
Campbell, David R.
Campbell, Robert L.
Campbell, William H., Jr.
Cantele, John A.
Carey, Michael T.
Cargill, Lee B.
Carl, Lester W.
Carlsen, Kenneth L.
Carmichael, William R., Jr.
Carr, Michael R.
Carroll, Joseph F.
Carrothers, Peter C.
Carter, James O.
Castro, John
Cate, Eugene N., Jr.
Celebrezze, Anthony J., Jr.
Chapman, Austin E.
Chernowski, John A.
Cherry, Richard B.
Chidester, William T.
Christensen, Donald W.
Christensen, Charles L.
Christensen, Steven R.
Christie, John B., II
Clair, Robert A.
Clark, Arthur D.
Clark, Christopher M.
Clark, Dennis M.
Clark, Jackie L.
Clark, Ralph B., Jr.
Clark, Robert A.
Clarke, Gary D.
Clarke, Wayne A.
Cochran, Frederick F.
Cockrell, Milford N., Jr.
Coker, David J.
Collier, Robert L.
Collins, James A.
Collins, Joseph S.
Colnaghi, George L.
Colston, Michael G.
Colyer, John M., Jr.
Conley, Dennis R.
Connaughton, James B.
Connell, James R.
Conner, Bryan T.
Conrad, Thomas M.
Conroy, John D.
Cook, Chandler L.
Cook, Eugene E.
Cook, James A.
Cook, John F., Jr.
Cook, Joseph T.
Cooley, Leslie W.
Cooper, William B., Jr
Corgan, Michael T.
Cornish, David O.
Corsette, Richard B.
Costarakis, Dennis A
Coulter, William L.
Counts, Jimmie A.
Counts, William A.
Cowan, Stanley E.
Cox, Landon G., Jr.
Craig, Leon H.
Craig, Philip C.
Crane, Mark F.
Crane, Richard W.
Crawford, Charles R.
Cressy, Peter H.
Cribley, James M.
Criswell, William T., IV
Cronin, Michael P.
Cronin, Robert R.
Crusoe, John A.
Cunha, George D. M., Jr.
Curtin, Andrew J.
Curtis, Donald L.
Cushard, William N., Jr.
Czerwonky, James H.
Dabich, Eli, Jr.
Dade, Thomas B.
Dahlvig, Alan L.
Dalager, Neil R.
Dale, Vernon A.
Dalton, Henry F.
Dankievitch, Robert J.
Daramus, Nicholas T., Jr.
Daugherty, Shaun M.
Daughters, Milo P., II
Daunis, Alexander B.
Davey, Francis L., Jr.
Davidson, Edward R.
Davidson, Wayne F.
Davis, Henry H., Jr.
Davis, Theron L.
Dawes, David R.
Day, Patrick A.
Dean, Philip W.
Dean, Victor E.
Deboer, James K.
Decarli, Wiley P.
Deforth, Peter W.
Degolian, Felix E., III
Dehnert, Charles E.
Delgaizo, Theodore J.
Delong, James J.
Denbow, Kenneth D.
Dennis, James A., Jr.
Deprey, Allan W.
Dermyer, William D.
Dersham, Earle R.
Desantis, Antonio F.
Detrick, Ernest M., II
Detweiler, John H.
Deutermann, Peter T.
Dibari, Charles C.
Dick, Allen H.
Dielen, Walter J.
Dietz, Francis H., Jr.
Dillon, Leo G.
Dimeling, William R.
Ditto, Anthony P.
Divoky, Wayne F.
Dixon, Robert L.
Doherty, Dennis C.
Doll, Lawrence A.
Donahue, Drake A.
Donahue, Joseph F., Jr.
Donegan, John J., Jr.
Donelan, John O.
Donovan, Charles A., Jr.
Dorman, Merrill H.
Dorminey, David H.
Dorrenbacher, John S.
Dougherty, Alfred F., Jr.
Dow, Walter O.
Dowdy, James W.
Downs, William E.
Doyle, William J., III
Drake, Neil H.
Draper, William H.
Driscoll, Kurt A.
Duke, James R.
Dulz, Gerald D.
Dunbar, Perry J.
Duncan, Stephen M
Dunn, Michael J.
Durfee, David L.
Duskin, Douglas J.
Dye, William R.
Dykes, Richard A.
Earner, William A., Jr.
Eastman, Kenneth O., Jr.
Eastman, Robert L.
Ebel, Paul E.
Ebert, David J.
Eckert, John
Eddy, Charles P., III
Eder, Anton A.
Edge, Jacob, II
Edmiston, James B.
Edrington, Frank R., II
Edwards, Donald W.
Edwards, Joseph W.
Eissing, Frank E., III
Ellis, David M.
Ellis, Richard H.
Ellis, Samuel H.
Ellison, William T.
Elrod, Stephen A.
Elshoff, Jay E.
Emery, George W.
Emrich, Roger G.
Engler, John G.
Ettel, Edward E., III
Eve, Edward A., III
Eversole, Bary L.
Ewing, Ronald W.
Fairfax, Perry C.
Fallat, Thomas J.
Farkas, Daniel P.
Farrell, Richard M.
Farrin, George P.
Featherstone, Peter A.
Felice, Anthony J., Jr.
Felsenthal, Edward G.
Felte, James F.
Fenner, David L.
Ferencie, Steven H., Jr.
Ferguson, Robert D.
Fetterhoff, Charles E.
Fields, James R.
Fields, Joseph H.
Finley, John C.
Fiori, Mario P.
Fischer, John N., Jr.
Fishburn, Charles G.
Fister, George R.
Fitzgerald, John E.
Fitzgerald, William C.
Fitzgerald, Cecil M.
Flatley, William F.
Flavell, William A.
Fleming, Richard T.
Fobes, Robert W., Jr.
Fogel, Wayne A., II
Fones, James M., Jr.
Fontaine, Roland G.
Fontana, James D.
Fooshee, Terry W.
Ford, Jack C.
Forster, Robert D.
Fossella, Joseph F.
Foust, James E., III
Franklin, Allyn R.
Franklin, Ted G.
Franson, Alvin L.
Fraser, Douglas F.
Fratello, Thomas F., III
Frazer, Charles D.
Frazer, Paul D.
Freeman, Ernest R.
Freeman, Rufus A.
Freese, Donald R.
Freibert, Ralph W.
French, Charles E.
Frost, David E.
Fujimoto, Toshio
Furgerson, Ronald M.
Furniss, Peter R.
Gaines, John F. A.
Gainor, John W., III
Gallagher, Gerald R., Jr.
Galloway, Charles E.
Galm, Lawrence F.
Garber, Jan W.
Garcia, Abel A.
Gard, Albert W., III
Garde, James C.
Gardiner, Peter C.
Gardner, John H., III
Gareffa, Joseph J.
Garrett, Daniel L.
Gates, Jonathan H.
Geissler, Richard F.
Generous, William T., Jr.
Gentile, Willard J.
Genung, Edward N., Jr.
Georgius, David R.
Gerber, Dean E.
Gibbons, Michael F., Jr.
Gibbs, Anthony W.
Gibson, Louis S., III
Gibson, Raymond O., Jr.
Giddens, Robert G., Jr.
Gilbert, James D.
Gilbert, Jerry D.
Giles, James M.
Gill, James E.
Gilpin, Girard H.
Gilroy, Vincent J., Jr.
Glaes, Roger B.
Glassner, Arnold
Gleason, Carroll F., II
Glenn, Danny E.
Goff, William G., Jr.
Gooding, William B. J.
Goodlett, Wallace D.
Goodridge, William W.
Goodson, Jimmie
Goodspeed, James W.
Goodwin, Edward F., Jr.
Gosnell, Charles E.
Gost, Evans G.
Gould, John W.
Grace, Harry T., Jr.
Graft, George W.

Graham, Charles N., Jr.
Graham, David S.
Graham, Edward N.
Graham, John E., Jr.
Graham, Lawrence L., Jr.
Grant, Donald E.
Grantham, Wiley G.
Graves, George W., Jr.
Grayson, Thomas H.
Green, Forrest B.
Green, Thomas R.
Greene, David L.
Greene, John F.
Greeneisen, David P.
Gregory, Francis C.
Gregory, Richard O.
Greiner, Paul T.
Gretchen, Matthew M.
Grider, George W., Jr.
Griffin, John C.
Griffin, Keith H.
Griffin, Lloyd W.
Griffith, Clyde E.
Gross, Lawrence R.
Gross, Stephen G.
Grossman, Arthur J., Jr.
Grover, Harold R.
Gubbins, Philip S.
Guest, George R.
Guffey, Richard E.
Gunn, William T., III
Gustafson, William C.
Gustafson, Robert P.
Guthrie, Stephen D.
Haeni, Frederick P.
Hahn, William D.
Haines, Douglas M.
Hall, Edward M.
Hall, James R.
Hall, Thomas F.
Hall, William L.
Hallowes, David M.
Hamilton, William J., IV
Hand, James R.
Haney, Tom B.
Hansen, Carl K.
Hansen, William L.
Hanson, Donald E.
Hanson, Orville O.
Hanson, Wayne L.
Hardaway, Edward V., II
Hare, Floyd D.
Harken, Jerry L.
Harman, Michael J.
Harmon, James H.
Harper, Robert L.
Harrell, James D., IV
Harris, Ben W.
Harris, Jon R.
Harris, Wilson F., Jr.
Harrison, Robert W., Jr.
Hartford, Edward S., Jr.
Hartman, Richard H.
Harvey, John M.
Harvey, Timothy R.
Haslet, William J.
Hauhart, James N.
Hauser, Warren A.
Hayes, Cornelius C., Jr.
Heathwood, Desmond J.
Hefter, Jack C., Jr.
Heggie, Doyglas G.
Heilig, Herbert R.
Heim, David L.
Heimovics, Richard D.
Heine, Joel K.
Heins, Raymond R.
Hellawell "G" Alan, Jr.
Helsper, Charles F.
Helt, James F.
Hendley, Thomas M., Jr.
Hendricks, Peter L.
Hendrickson, Kenneth E.
Herbert, Michael J.
Herman, Klemme L.
Hermansen, Bruce T.
Hess, Lee R.
Hetzel, William C.
Hidy, Don R.
Higgins, Earl J.
Higgins, Robert W.
Highland, Jeffrey A.
Hill, Richard D.
Hilton, Francis W., Jr.
Hilton, Jay I.
Himchak, William A.
Hinchliffe, Frederick, II
Hinds, James J.
Hirsch, Henry C.
Hoag, Raymond A.
Hobdy, William B.
Hoefling, William A., III
Hofer, James H.
Hoff, Robert G.
Hogan, James J., III
Hoivik, Thomas H.
Hokanson, Anders, Jr.
Hollenack, William R.
Holliday, Harley J.
Hollis, Jan M.
Hollister, Jack D.
Holme, Thomas T., Jr.
Holmes, David F.
Holmes, Frank C.
Honhart, David C.
Hood, David J.
Hood, John M., Jr.
Hooks, Jack D.
Hooven, Harry C.
Hopkins, Irvin G., II
Hopkins, Larry M.
Hopkinson, Rodney
Horst, Rudolph A.
Hougham, Ronald L.
Houghton, Hugh J., Jr.
Houser, Donald F., Jr.
Howard, David B., Jr.
Howell, George C.
Howell, Melvin C.
Hoy, Stephen G.
Huchting, George A.
Hucks, Jerry P.
Hudak, Roger J.
Huffman, Kenneth A.
Hughes, William C., Jr.
Hulings, Joseph S., III
Hull, David N.
Hunt, Clark H.
Hunt, James C., II
Hunt, Rex E.
Huss, Jerry F.
Hutcheson, James E., Jr.
Hutchins, Guy J.
Hutchins, Richard H.
Hutt, Gordon W.
Hutter, George R.
Huxel, Lawrence L.
Hyland, Richard J.
Iannone, Niles A.
Iber, William R.
Ingram, Luther G., Jr.
Isger, Albert A.
Itkin, Richard I.
Jackson, Marshall N.
Jackson, Robert P.
Jackson, Thomas D.
Jacobs, Donald E.
Jacqmin, Michael R.
James, David R.
Jameson, Clarence H., Jr.
Jamnick, Bill P.
Janssen, Kenneth L.
Jara, Paul T.
Jarvis, Ronald A.
Jaudon, Joel B.
Jeffries, John W.
Jerard, Albert B., III
Johns, William P.
Johnson, Alan F.
Johnson, Arne E.
Johnson, Charles E.
Johnson, Charles P.
Johnson, Earl P.
Johnson, Gerard G.
Johnson, Patrick W.
Johnson, William A.
Johnson, William S. J.
Johnson, William S.
Jokela, Carl R.
Jones, Dennis R.
Jones, James V.
Jones, Jeffrey B.
Jones, Robert E., Jr.
Jones, Robert C.
Jones, Thomas E.
Jones, Thomas H., Jr.
Jordan, Jerry W.
Jordan, John F. Jr.
Jordan, Stephen B.
Jordan, Wesley E., Jr.
Judd, Raymond J.
Kahn, William M.
Kahrs, "J" Henry, III
Kaiser, Frederick H., Jr.
Kajdan, Lawrence J.
Kallestad, John R.
Kalshan, Vernon A.
Kaman, William J.
Kammann, Richard W.
Kane, Richard E., Jr.
Karabasz, Felix F.
Karr, Kenneth R.
Karson, Jack L.
Kaup, Karl L.
Kearns, Robert J., III
Keefe, Gary L.
Keel, Donald P., Jr.
Keeler, Robert W.
Keen, Walter R.
Keenan, Robert W.
Keene, Russell A., Jr.
Keitz, David A.
Kell, Richard E.
Kelley, Bernard J., Jr.
Kennedy, John E., Jr.
Keown, Marcus G., II
Keppel, William J.
Ker, Keith R.
Kerley, James B.
Key, Albert W.
Key, Wilson D.
Killian, James E.
Kilmer, Ronald W.
King, George L., Jr.
Kinnear, Richard J.
Kinney, Dan L.
Kirk, Gary L.
Kirkpatrick, Max H.
Kiviranna, Henno
Klemick, Ronald J.
Klose, William F., II
Knight, John M.
Knowles, Kenneth A., Jr.
Knudsen, Kenneth M.
Koczur, Daniel J.
Koehn, James R.
Koermer, Robert
Koester, Marlin L.
Kolon, Carl S.
Konold, David W., Jr.
Kordons, Uldis
Kotowski, Joseph E.
Kottke, Robert A., Jr.
Kovel, Stephen H.
Kozak, Karl M.
Koziewicz, Michael R.
Krakker, Thomas P., Jr.
Kramer, Alfred V.
Krause, Michael S.
Kreidler, Leo A.
Kreinik, Eugene G.
Kremkau, Frederick W.
Kreutziger, Karl G.
Kreiger, Eric W.
Kriesen, Arthur J.
Kriewall, John A.
Krishfield, Robert C.
Krohne, Theodore K.
Krueger, Rudolph V.
Kuhs, John M.
Kuneman, James E.
Kunze, Adolf Wilhelm G.
Kurtz, John M.
Kutch, Raymond A.
Lachata, Donald M.
Lagassa, Robert E.
Lamay, Thomas V.
Lamb, James J.
Lamberth, Charles L.
Landers, Michael F.
Landgrebe, James H.
Lanford, Randall G.
Lang, James R.
Langham, George D.
Langley, James L.
Langsdorf, Michael G.
Lankford, Jimmy G.
Lapic, Jeffrey R.
Larson, John C.
Lasswell, James B.
Laury, Glenn P.
Laws, Robert D.
Lawyer, Clarence M., III
Leake, David F.
Lederhaas, Joseph
Leeke, Howard W., Jr.
Leemkuil, Karl J.
Leever, George R.
Lemonte, Burges A., II
Lennox, Richard J.
Lents, John M.
Lenz, Bruce B.
Lepsch, Donald L.
Lerch, Cloyd S., Jr.
Lesko, John E.
Lett, Austin S., Jr.
Levin, George B.
Lewis, Jary W.
Lewis, Jerry A.
Lewis, Robert J., Jr.
Lilly, David E.
Lincoln, Walter B., Jr.
Lindell, Colen R.
Lindsay, Lowell E.
Linn, Gail F.
Linn, Larry E.
Lippert, Lee M.
Lippiatt, Thomas F.
Lippy, David E.
Little, Robert D.
Littlefield, Gaston D.
Litton, Thomas R.
Livingston, Donald J.
Locke, Thomas B.
Lockett, Jerry T.
Logan, Carl F.
Logan, Guy B., Jr.
Long, Herman J., Jr.
Long, James E.
Long, William K.
Longcore, Duane M.
Looper, Norman G.
Lopresti, Samuel J.
Louk, John D.
Lounsbery, William J.
Love, George P., III
Lueth, Charles E.
Lugo, Frank J.
Lundy, George W., Jr.
Lutes, David B.
Lynch, Charles S.
Lynch, Daniel J., II
Lynne, Jimmy S.
Lyon, Jeffrey J.
Lyons, Robert W.
MacAleer, Stephen C.
MacDonald, Timothy A.
Machens, Ronald R.
Mackie, Frederick D.
MacLaughlin, Donald C., Jr.
Maclin, Charles S.
Maddock, George A.
Madison, Lynn J.
Madura, Donald F.
Mahaffy, Lorrence A., Jr.
Maier, Robert A.
Male, Allen M.
Malmros, Michael H.
Mangeno, James J.
Mangin, Daniel F., III
Manjerovic, Nicholas R.
Manning, Edward F.
Maples, David G., III
Marik, Charles W.
Maris, Franklin H.
Markowitz, Stephen A.
Marlow, Frank J.
Marquardt, Judsen R.
Marsden, Phillip S.
Marsh, Larry R.
Marsh, William L.
Martin, Thomas T.
Martinache, Charles G.
Martinsen, Glenn T.
Marton, Warren A.
Mascitto, Eddy J.
Mason, Donald R.
Mather, David R.
Matheson, Robert B.
Mathis, Donald W.
Mathis, William W.
Matjasko, Louis S.
Maus, Leo D.
Mavis, John A.
Mayer, John B.
Mays, Michael E.
Mayton, William T.
Mazetis, Gerald R.
McAlister, Donald L.
McAloney, Frank E.
McAloon, Albert J., Jr.
McAnally, John A.
McBride, Edward F., Jr.
McCabe, John S.
McCandless, Walter E.
McCann, William R., Jr.
McCarthy, Charles B., Jr.
McCarthy, Michael J.
McCleary, Joseph R.
McClellan, William D.
McClung, Gary L.
McCord, Dennis M.
McCreary, Martin W., Jr.
McCrory, Donald L.
McCrumb, James B.
McDermott, Michael N.
McDevitt, Michael A.
McDonald, John E.
McDonald, John J., Jr.
McDowell, William A.
McGonagle, Leo E.
McGraw, Floyd M.
McGuire, Kenneth R.
McKay, Dennis A.
McKenna, Richard B.
McKenna, Russell E., Jr.
McLaughlin, Robert H.
McManus, Richard W.
McMillan, John H.
McPherson, Richard S.
McQuown, Michael J.
McWhinney, John L.
Meakin, John D.
Meek, Danny L.
Mehle, Roger W., Jr.
Meier, John O.
Mercer, David S.
Meredith, Denis C.
Merkel, Alan N.
Merrick, Fred H.
Metcalfe, James A.
Metviner, Kenneth S.
Meyer, Thomas E.
Meyers, David W.
Meyett, Frederick E., Jr.
Mezmalis, Andrejs M.
Miehle, Richard A.
Mikulis, Thomas J., Jr.
Miles, Larry E.
Miles, Richard J.
Millen, Joel D.
Miller, Fredrick E.
Miller, George M., III
Miller, Luke H., Jr.
Miller, Robert G.
Miller, Thomas H.
Miller, Warren C., Jr.
Mills, John S., Jr.
Mills, Robert W.
Minter, Charles S., III
Mister, Richard W.
Mitchell, Albert H., Jr.
Mitchell, Mitchell A.
Mitchell, Robert M.
Mitchell, William H., Jr.
Moeckel, George P.
Moffitt, William C.
Molczan, Eugene M.
Money, Jack L.
Monish, Aubrey R.
Montgomery, George K.
Monticello, Donald A.
Moore, David B. A.
Moore, James P.
Moore, Jeffrey E.
Moore, Robert B., II
Moran, Daniel H., Jr.
Moran, William P., Jr.
Morgan, John H., II
Morgan, Ronald R.
Morgan, William L.
Morrill, Edgar M., Jr.
Morse, Clayton K.
Mosher, Wayne O.
Moskowitz, Donald A.
Moslener, Carl F.
Muehlenbrock, Dale R.
Muench, Paul W.
Mugar, Mark W.
Mulholland, Lyle J.
Mundell, Jack L.
Mundis, John A.
Mundy, Rodney O.
Munger, George E.
Murphy, Robert P.
Murray, Edwin A., Jr.
Murray, Robert L.
Murray, Troy Y.
Musick, George M., III
Musitano, Charles M.
Mutch, Frank K.
Myers, James B. M.
Mysliwiec, Richard J.
Nadolski, Michael E.
Nargi, Anthony J.
Nash, Malcolm P., III
Naumann, Walter H.
Navone, Peter F.
Nearing, Lloyd
Nelson, David A.
Nelson, Donald R.
Nelson, Edward M.
Nelson, Harvey G.
Nelson, John W.
Nelson, Norman K.
Nelson, Richard C.
Nerangis, Nicholas J.
Newcombe, Eddie Y.
Newkirk, Charles R.
Newsom, John H.
Newton, John L.
Newton, Robert C.
Newton, Robert G.
Ng, George H.
Nicholson, Eugene P., III
Nicholson, David C.

Nickerson, Robert G.
Niebuhr, Walter W., II
Nightengale, Charles E.
Niss, Robert J.
Nobbs, Robert G.
Nolan, George F.
Norby, Richard W., Jr.
Norfleet, Richard N.
Norris, Dwayne O.
Northcraft, Zane W.
Norwood, Kenneth E.
Nuckols, James H.
Nutt, Richard L.
Oakes, Anthony J., Jr.
Oakwood, John P.
Oatway, William H., III
O'Brien, Michael C.
O'Brien, Terence J.
O'Brien, Thomas J., Jr.
Obsitnik, Michael P.
O'Claray, Daniel G.
Ohrenschall, Charles V.
O'Keefe, Cornelius F.
Okeson, Jerry K.
O'Leary, Charles P., Jr.
Oliver, David R., Jr.
Olson, Donald M.
Olson, Kenneth P.
Omohundro, Richard E., Jr.
Opitz, William J.
Orgera, Winthrop B.
O'Rourke, James E.
Orr, Charles R.
Ortwein, Richard M.
Osborne, Ronald D.
Ostromecky, John R.
Otis, Robert B.
Ottinger, Gary B.
Otto, David A.
Overgard, William H.
Owen, Michael A.
Pace, Richard R.
Palen, Don G.
Palenscar, Alexander J., III
Palmer, Richard L.
Papadakis, Myron P.
Parker, Gerald T.
Parker, Raymond F.
Parker, Richard C.
Parkhurst, Nigel E.
Parks, John L.
Parmenter, Donald J.
Parotti, Phillip E.
Parsons, David W.
Parsons, Jeffrey M.
Parsons, Michael G.
Pate, Dwight W.
Patterson, Bernard L., III
Patterson, James K.
Pattison, Roger W.
Pauze, Philip C.
Pawlyk, William J.
Payne, John M.
Pearson, John W., Jr.
Pearson, Rufus J., III
Peil, Richard L.
Pekary, Raymond L.
Penn, William L.
Pennington, Chad A.
Peoples, Denton L.
Perkinson, Brian T.
Peroni, Peter R.
Perrie, Thomas D.
Perry, Harold E.
Pessoney, John T.
Peterman, Thomas R.
Peters, Victor L.
Peterson, John C.
Pfalzer, James R.
Pfeiffer, John J.
Phillips, Paul E.
Pike, William H., Jr.
Pilalas, Jason M.
Pilcher, Thomas E.

Pinneker, Jerald L.
Plummer, Galen R.
Polich, Robert
Pollard, John E.
Polli, Joseph J.
Pope, Carroll G.
Porter, John D.
Potrzebowski, Anthony C.
Powers, John A., Jr.
Prather, Jerauld S.
Pratt, Richard R., Jr.
Preszler, Alan M.
Price, William W., Jr.
Priebe, George C.
Proffitt, James R.
Puckett, David B.
Purcell, William O., Jr.
Purdy, Randolph S.
Pye, David B.
Quanbeck, Brian R.
Quillin, Philip D.
Quinton, Peter D.
Rabin, William D.
Radik, Frank M.
Ragano, James V.
Rahl, Roger L.
Randall, Robert E.
Raulston, Donald R.
Rave, James A.
Rawls, James L.
Ray, Harold B.
Ray, Roy L., Jr.
Rayle, Lynn T., Jr.
Redd, Benjamin D., Jr.
Redford, Thomas G., Jr.
Redington, Joseph J., III.
Reed, Carter T.
Reed, John J.
Reed, John R.
Reemelin, Thomas E.
Rees. Bob G.
Reese, Dennis F.
Reeves, Donald L., Jr.
Regan, James P.
Reif, David C.
Reilly, Edward J., Jr.
Reinhardt, Kenneth G., Jr.
Renfro, Mark A.
Renzetti, Joseph L.
Retz, William A.
Reumann, Richard E.
Rew, Richard W.
Reynolds, Keith E.
Richards, John J.
Richardson, Kennett T.
Richardson, David P.
Richter, Stephen W.
Rigby, George E., Jr.
Riley, David R.
Ring, James E. P.
Ring, Roger E.
Ritchie, James R.
Rixse, John H., III
Robbins, Charles B.
Robbins, William A.
Roberts, Thomas A.
Roberts, Walter S.
Roberts, William J., Jr.
Robertson, Thomas J.
Robinson, David B.
Robinson, William B.
Robson, James D.
Rocheleau, Ronald D.
Rodgers, Roger D.
Roeckner, Frank W.
Rogers, Donald T.
Rogers, Richard B.
Rohm, Fredric B.
Rolfe, Thomas H.
Rollosson, Peter L.
Romig, Edward L.
Rooney, Philip J.
Rosenfelt, William R., Jr.

Rosenthal, Stephen A.
Ross, Benjamin F., III.
Ross, Raymond H., Jr.
Rossa, Thomas J.
Rotter, John W.
Roundy, Paul V., III
Rouse, William G.
Rowan, Donald J.
Rowe, William L.
Roy, Rudolph J., Jr.
Rubeck, James T.
Ruck, Merrill W.
Ruckner, Edward A., Jr.
Rueff, James L., Jr.
Ruegg, Ronald R.
Ruffin, James T.
Ruland, Walter B.
Rummele, John E.
Runkle, William A., Jr.
Runquist, Lars H.
Russell, Robert E.
Ryan, John E.
Ryan, William M.
Ryker, Jerud W.
Saacke, Paul
Saber, Gerald W.
Sabo, William P., Jr.
Saidman, Donald E.
Salmon, Harry P., Jr.
Salquist, Roger H.
Sammons, William C.
Sampsel, Michael M.
Sanders, James H., Jr.
Sanger, Kenneth T.
Santa, Charles R.
Sargent, Ian H.
Saul, Robert W., Jr.
Savage, Peter P.
Savod, Michael H.
Sawyer, Merrill C.
Scanlan, Paul T.
Scanlon, James J.
Schaefer, Eric
Schafer, Carl E., II
Schall, Hugh E.
Schaller, Martin N.
Schantz, John M.
Schantz, Robert E.
Schery, Ferdinand M.
Schleifer, Paul
Schmida, David M.
Schmidt, Charles M., Jr.
Schmidt, William C.
Schneck, Gary G.
Scholand, Gerald W.
Schowalter, Ronald O.
Schroeder, Roger G.
Schuerger, Richard F.
Schufeldt, Coral V.
Schuppert, Stephen M.
Schwab, James A.
Schwing, Emil M.
Scott, Crawford W.
Scott, Eugene W.
Scott, Gerald W.
Scott, Jon P.
Scott, Lawrence A.
Scott, William J.
Scully, Michael A.
Seay, Austin M.
Seay, Clarence W., Jr.
Sebastian, Gary F.
Segen, John P.
Segrist, Edward L., Jr.
Selden, Thomas L.
Sell, Charles F.
Semeter, Leon T., Jr.
Settle, Stuart W., Jr.
Sewell, Ralph B.
Shackelton, Norman J., Jr.
Shafer, William D.
Shaffer, John L.
Shaffer, Lloyd E.
Shank, Lewis P.

Shanley, Richard J., Jr.
Sharp, Lawrence R.
Sharpe, Joseph D., Jr.
Shaw, James A., Jr.
Shaw, Robert D., Jr.
Sheehan, John W., Jr.
Sheerer, George D.
Sheldon, Robert J.
Shelley, Michael H.
Shelton, Charles B., III
Shelton, James C., III
Shepard, James M.
Sheppard, Jay M.
Sheridan, Philip J.
Sheridan, Thomas R.
Sherman, Allan
Sherrill, John A.
Shields, Robert J.
Shires, Charles D.
Shirley, Cloyce E.
Shirley, John W.
Shull, James M., Jr.
Shute, David C.
Shutt, Kenneth G.
Siburt, Forrest N., Jr.
Sickel, Walter F., Jr.
Sidford, Richard L.
Simmonds, James L.
Simmons, Derek J.
Simmons, Robert E.
Simmons, Samuel F., Jr.
Simon, William K.
Simpson, Michael G.
Sinclair, William E.
Sindorf, Thomas J.
Singler, James C.
Siskin, Edward J.
Skele, Martins
Skrzypczak, Casimir S.
Slaughter, Jimmy R.
Slaughter, Dennis R.
Small, Selden M.
Small, William E.
Smelley, Allan R.
Smiley, Stanley K.
Smith, Douglas G.
Smith, Gary
Smith, Homer F., II
Smith, Kenneth W.
Smith, Lewis C., Jr.
Smith, Philip A.
Smith, Randall R.
Smith, Robert J.
Smith, Robert S.
Smith, Wilton J., Jr.
Smutko, John R., Jr.
Sodergren, Brian
Solomon, Paul W.
Solon, James D.
Soly, Edgar C., Jr.
Soverel, Peter W.
Sowers, Joseph A.
Sowersby, Roger L.
Spear, Michael J.
Spence, Robert L.
Spencer, Gerald L.
Spencer, Robert C.
Spradlin, Louis E.
Spruance, James H., III
Staehle, Charles M.
Stageman, James H., Jr.
Stahlkopf, Karl E.
Starwich, Patrick C.
Staten, Howard S.
Stauffacher, John J.
Steber, Forrest E.
Steele, Robert L.
Stegenga, Michael W.
Steiner, William S.
Stemwedel, John A.
Stephan, David G.
Stevenson, Ronald B.
Stewart, Donald S.
Stewart, Harry A., Jr.
Stewart, James M.

Stewart, James H.
Stewart, William J.
Stiger, Robert D., Jr.
Stinson, Larry A.
Stoddard, Howard S.
Stoecker, Dale F.
Stonaker, Roland H., Jr.
Stone, Charles W., Jr.
Stone, John F.
Stormer, John C., Jr.
Stout, Michael D.
Stowell, Ralph H., Jr.
Strasser, Joseph C.
Striffler, Paul J.
Sturgeon, Robert W.
Sudol, Walter E.
Sullivan, Kevin F.
Sumner, Thomas W.
Susch, Stephen L.
Sutherland, Frederick H.
Sutton, Paul W.
Swenningson, Aaron P.
Tanis, Robert N.
Tanner, Eric R.
Tanner, Michael
Tartikoff, Peter A.
Tate, James A.
Tate, Robert W.
Tate, William A.
Taylor, Alan B.
Taylor, Thomas L.
Taylor, Wade H., III
Tebben, Ronald D.
Telfer, Grant R.
Templin, Erwin B., Jr.
Tenney, Stuart L.
Testa, Ronald F.
Tetrault, Roger E.
Theep, Raymond T.
Thiessen, Crispin W.
Thomas, David B.
Thomas, Gary L.
Thomas Michael L.
Thomas, Raymond M.
Thomason, Harper J., II
Thompson, Gary R.
Thompson, George F.
Thompson, Laile H., Jr.
Thompson, Olen D.
Thompson, William H., II
Thompson, William R.
Thorell, James C.
Thorn, John C.
Thornhill, David W.
Thornton, James C.
Thorson, Kenneth W.
Thrasher, Craig L.
Thurman, Curtis F.
Tidball, Douglas D.
Tieslau, Robert B.
Tillapaugh, Martin J.
Tilley, Edmond A., Jr.
Tillinghast, Theodore V.
Tillotson, Frank L.
Tobey, Robert M.
Tobin, Paul E., Jr.
Todd, James N.
Toensing, Ronald H.
Tomlin, Kit P.
Tomy, Wallace S.
Toth, Stephen S.
Towne, Thomas N.
Tozer, Charles N.
Trabandt, Charles A.
Tracy, George P.
Trani, Frederick E., Jr.
Traver, James E.
Truesdell, John M.
Tucker, Kenneth A.
Tullis, Paul E., II
Turk, Edward J., Jr.
Turley, Charles W.
Turner, Eric A.
Turner, James R.
Twardy, Clement R.

Tyrone, Irving L.
Ullman, Harlan K.
Umphrey, Willard L.
Ungerman, Michael K.
Ursprung, David L.
Valenta, Joseph R.
Vanarsdall, Clyde J., III
Vanburen, Robert L.
Vanhoften, Scott A.
Vannice, Robert L., Jr.
Varelas, Constantine
Vaughan, George D.
Vaughan, Raymond E.
Veeck, Charles R., Jr.
Vetter, David A.
Vockel, William P.
Vonderlinden, Arthur F., Jr.
Vonsydow, Vernon H.
Vorbau, William A.
Vreeland, Peter G.
Wagner, Karl B., Jr.
Waide, Kenneth B., Jr.
Wakefield, Richard G.
Wall, David H.
Wallace, Michael T.
Walsh, Edward L.
Walster, Thomas G.
Walters, Ronald F.
Walther, Arthur E.
Walther, Ronald G.
Walton, Don H.
Waples, Robert E.
Ward, Dan S.
Ward, Trenwith R.
Warn, Jon C.
Warnken, Lawrence F.
Warren, Roy D.
Waterfill, Joseph H., III
Waters, Peter D.
Watson, Jeter M., III
Weale, Gary D.
Weaver, Charles T.
Weaving, Edward J., Jr.
Webb, Bruce C.
Webber, David A.
Webber, Robert T.
Webber, Thomas H., III
Webster, Douglas M.
Webster, Richard A.
Weidman, Richard L.
Weidman, Robert H., Jr.
Weidner, Arthur H.
Weidt, Roland L.
Weihmiller, Gordon R.
Wells, David A.
Wellumson, Douglas R.
Weniger, Marvin J.
Wermuth, John J., III
Werner, Robert M.
West, Gerald F.
Westgard, Carl T.
Westhaus, William A.
Whalen, Frank R.
Whaley, Ronald T.
Whisler, Bruce A.
White, Chester G., Jr.
White, Donald M., Jr.
White, Larry R.
White, Peter R.
Whiting, Jay N.
Whitmore, Michael K.
Whitney, Payson R., Jr.
Wildman, Robert A.
Wilkin, Howard A.
Wilkinson, John G., Jr.
Willandt, Theodore A.
Wille, Frank O., III
Williams, David W.
Williams, James C.
Williams, John D.

Williams, Michael V.
Williams, Ronald L.
Williams, Richard H.
Williams, Thomas J.
Williamson, James K.
Wills, Ronald J.
Wilson, Albert S.
Wilson, Charles E.
Wilson, Gary W.
Wilson, Ray G.
Wilson, Richard A.
Wilson, Robert M.
Wilson, Ronald K.
Wilson, Walter L.
Winter, Stanley R.
Winters, Curtis J.
Wisniewski, Thomas C.
Witcraft, William R.
Witt, Charles R.
Witter, Raymond L.
Wold, Norman L.
Womble, Talmadge A.
Wood, David B.
Wood, Hansel T.
Woodman, Robert E.
Woods, Jerry R.
Woods, Paul F.
Worcester, John B.
Wright, Julian M., Jr.
Wright, Malcolm S.
Wright, Patrick E.
Wyatt, Charles E.
Wyttenbach, Richard H.
Yarbrough, Milton E., Jr.
Yeend, George W., Jr.
Young, George F.
Young, Kenneth E.
Young, Leonard G.
Young, Philip M.
Zakis, Peter
Zambreno, Pasquale A.
Zanzot, Douglas H.
Zielinski, Richard A.
Zimmerman, Sherwood R.
Zlatoper, Ronald J.

SUPPLY CORPS

Actis, Charles L.
Andrews, Ernest L., Jr.
Arendt, Richard D.
Barsness, James L.
Bednar, Edmund J.
Bell, James J.
Bergquist, John R.
Bettridge, Thomas M.
Bingemann, David A.
Black, James T.
Boone, Paul R.
Breeding, Earnie R.
Brown, Gene S.
Bunch, Joseph R., Jr.
Burton, James C.
Butler, David E.
Carter, William P.
Chisholm, Douglas L.
Cole, Chester B.
Collins, Michael E.
Conner, John T.
Cook, Kendall R.
Crooks, Roger E.
Cutter, David L.
Davis, Fredric C.
Defrancia, James M.
Demetriou, Eugene M., Jr.
Douglas, Bruce E.
Driskell, James D., III
Dunn, Robert G.
Duvall, Russel W., II
Fischenich, Joseph R.
Fisher, Gary C.
Garabedian, Richard E.
Ginter, Howard A.
Goodwin, Frederick E.
Granger, Milledge E.
Green, David H.
Gripka, David J.
Grover, Kenneth L.
Gushue, William, Jr.
Halperin, Frederic I.
Hankins, William W.
Hansen, Neal C.
Hart, Charles A.
Hawkins, Drake C.
Healy, Theodore J.
Heenan, Donald F.
Hennessy, Daniel K.
Hering, Joseph F.
Heslop, Thomas C.
Hinchman, James F.
Hobbs, Dennis W.
Hopper, Frederick E.
Hubbard, Robert E.
Hundelt, George R.
Johnson, Joseph C.
Johnston, David G., Jr.
Johnston, John M.
Jordahl, John C.
Jung, Dietger E.
Kanaley, Thomas M.
Kaufman, James D.
Kenlin, Alfred W.
Kennedy, William L., Jr.
Kerr, Harold L., Jr.
Kleinfeldt, Richard F.
Knesel, Barry M.
Kunkle, Gary J.
Lafianza, Bernard J.
Larson, James R.
Lavery, John C.
Leeper, James E., Jr.
Lehner, Paul M.
Lovejoy, John W.
Lovstedt, Joel M.
Lutz, Alan L.
Lutz, Harold G., Jr.
Macaulay, Charles P.
Marien, Roger A.
Maurer, Walter J.
McCall, Charles R.
McClung, Hugh B. L.
McClure, John M.
McDermott, John E.
McGinnis, Thomas M., Jr.
McIntyre, John F., Jr.
McMonagle, James M.
Meador, Charles E.
Miller, Larry D.
Miller, Richard E.
Mitchell, John W.
Mundy, Gerald B.
Murphy, Charles G.
Naiva, William A.
Newell, Robert R.
Newton, Kenneth R.
Nomura, Gerald T.
Norris, David C.
Norton, Robert L.
Nugent, George A.
O'Hara, Patrick J.
Parrott, Ralph C.
Phillips, Bruce A.
Pinskey, Carl W.
Price, Robert F.
Revere, Sidney P., Jr.
Ricketts, Max V., Jr.
Roberts, William J.
Rubel, Michael J.
Rutherford, David O.
Ryan, Paul J.
Schamp, Roger G.
Schuller, Christopher C.
Schultz, Robert A.
Schwerin, Robert R.
Severance, Robert A.
Sewell, John B.
Shay, Gary E.
Shefman, Ronald T.
Shields, Edward J.
Singer, George M.
Smith, Richard M.
Sockwell, John E., III
Sollars, Thomas E.
Spring, Rheuble A.
Stafford, Joe R.
Stewart, Michael R.
Stocker, Vernon D.
Stockslager, Earl M.
Storz, Erwin F.
Straupenieks, Imants A.
Strickland, Robert M., Jr.
Strittmatter, Bernard D.
Summers, John H.
Swint, Joel K.
Tennant, Don L.
Terwilliger, Jackson R.
Tonjum, James F.
Tracy, John J.
Travers, Donald E., II
Ullman, Robert C.
Unsicker, David W.
Vanpelt, David S.
Wells, Paul D.
Wilkens, William T.
Williford, David A.
Wong, Dennis W. H.
Yannessa, Thomas D.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Andrews, Richard E.
Battaile, Kenneth P.
Bedenbaugh, Garnett F.
Bremer, Gary E.
Buckwalter, Lee W.
Christiansen, David R.
Clancy, Eugene J.
Davis, Robert L.
Drouin, Leon E., Jr.
Eckert, James W.
Hamer, Richard B.
Hanks, James E.
Hosey, Gary R.
Hudspeth, Robert T.
Juliano, Peter G.
Kelley, Kenneth C.
Kressin, Louis A.
Lynch, John F., III
McKee, Thomas C.
McKenna, John C.
Myers, Richard L.
Orfanedes, Evangelos C.
Pero, Michael A., Jr.
Pierce, Walter C., Jr.
Rankin, Terry V.
Robinson, James Y., Jr.
Rohrbach, Richard M.
Ross, David H.
Sheaffer, Donald R.
Snyder, Robert L.
Stewart, Stephen E.
Thimes, John F.
Vaudreuil, Wilfred J., Jr.
Wheeler, Warren O.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officer's Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the Line or Staff Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Kenneth D. Aanerud
Michael Abraham III
J. B. Abston
Jeffrey T. Ackerson
Hugh M. Adams
John B. Adams
Russel M. Adams
*Vance E. Aeschleman, Jr.
Richard L. Affeld
Edwin W. Aiken
Robert E. Aker, Jr.
David L. Albright
Francis J. Alexander
Samuel J. Alexander
Daniel W. Allen, Jr.
*John S. Almon
James L. Alstaetter
William D. Ames
Richard D. Amme
Gene G. Anderson
Howard B. Anderson
Walter Andersook
John R. Andrade
Michael W. Andrews
Roger M. Andrews
Barry A. Applewhite
Gale T. Arkwright
Roland J. Armstrong
John K. Arnold
Larry W. Arnold
Richard W. Ash
David B. Ashworth
Eugene E. Auerbach
Julian L. Austin
Ronald K. Baba
Stephen D. Baer
Theodore I. Bahn
John G. Bailey
Timothy D. Bailing
Paul T. Baird
James W. Baker
Richard F. Baker
Anthony D. Baldino
John G. Ball
Carl E. Balsam
Robert L. Barber
Henry H. Barbour
Burnice E. Barnett, Jr.
Edward D. Bartel
Robert G. Bates
Russell C. Bauer
Willam L. Beall
David J. Beattie
Robert S. Beckett
David L. Beckner
Thomas J. Bedford, Jr.
William P. Beede
Denis P. Behan
Adolf H. Beil
William R. Beith
William R. Belangia
David E. Bell
John E. Bell
Terry R. Bellman
Barry I. Benator
Robert T. Benbow
James J. Benn III
Frank A. Benson
Billy B. Benton
Richard A. Bereza
Gilbert C. Bernard, Jr.
Jay P. Beskind
Bernard E. Beveridge
William L. Bianchini, Jr.
Peter P. Bibbo
James M. Bielefeld
*George M. Biery II
Robert E. Biggerstaff
Alfred A. Bingham III
John W. Bishop, Jr.
Joseph C. Bisti
Ernest J. Bitten
Michael B. Bixler
Evan J. Black
Foster J. Blair II
Mark W. Blanchard
Samuel Bledsoe
Donald S. Boal
Gary M. Bogert
Peter H. Bohling
William M. Bokesch
Robert C. Bond
Robert E. Bone
Frederick Bopp III
David W. Bouck
Thomas K. Boughner
Frank L. Bowman
Rex J. Browser
Brian F. Boyce
Thomas A. Boyd
Robert W. Boynton, Jr.
Matthew P. Braatz
*James D. Braden
Thomas M. Brady
Richard L. Bray
David P. Breuer
Norman K. Brewer
Irwin J. Brilliant
Mark P. Brindle
Stephen J. Brinn
John C. Brittenham
Robert J. Brockman
Thomas G. Broughton
Ronald N. Brown
Robert J. Brudno
David A. Bryant
Robert D. Buchanan, Jr.
James R. Buckingham
Timothy P. Bumann
Jonathan R. Burge
James G. Burke
Edward D. Burmeister, Jr.
Barry E. Burns
Clair G. Burrill, Jr.
David R. Burrill
Gary L. Burton
James E. Butler
*John W. Byam, Jr.
Charles W. Cairnes, Jr.
Leonard A. Caldwell, IV
Eric Scot Calvert
Bruce W. Campbell
Horace J. Campbell
Richard P. Campbell, Jr.
Richard A. Cannon
Thomas M. Cannon
Terry R. Cantor
Dean R. Capper
John B. Caraway III
Forrest R. Carbary
Nicholas D. Carbone
David L. Carroll
James N. Carroll
Thomas V. Carroll
Albert O. Carter
*William C. Carter
Salvator S. Caruso
Michael M. Cassaday
John P. Cassidy
William F. Cassidy
Natale M. Ceglio, Jr.
Andre J. Chagnon
Edward R. Chamberlin
Carder D. Chandler
Gary C. Chapman
Gary A. Chessman
*Chett T. Chew
Stephen R. Childs
Robert A. Christianson
Clyde W. Chute
Lawrence L. Claassen, Jr.
James P. Clancy
Robbin D. Clare
Samuel M. Clawser, III
Marc A. Clement
*Archie R. Clemins
Robert C. Cliff
Robert L. Clifford
Thomas J. Clothier
Burt M. Cloud, Jr.
Clelland D. Collins, Jr.
James E. Compton
George F. Conery, Jr.
Clinton J. Coneway
Stephen A. Connelly
Robert A. Cook
John J. Coonan, Jr.
Patrick E. Cooper
Jeryl W. Cordell
Henry R. Corder, Jr.
John J. Costello
*Terrence W. Costello, III
James P. Coury
Charles C. Covey
Charles S. Coward
Kenneth L. Cox
Mariner G. Cox
Thomas J. Cox
Paul A. Crable
Eugene E. Cragg, Jr.
Richard N. Crain
James T. Cress, Jr.
Paul L. Cripe
Joseph P. Crociata
Alan K. Crockett
James O. Crockett
Stanley J. Crognale, Jr.
James D. Cromwell
Ted R. Crosby
Joseph M. Crotty
William H. Crouch, Jr.
Joseph M. Crow
Roy L. Crum
Charles H. Cruse
Peter J. Cruser
Victor H. Cuchens, Jr.
Timothy E. Cullen
William G. Culp
David L. Cummings
John P. Curran
Max C. Current
James E. Curtin
Stephen E. Curtis
Alan M. Dadd
John R. Dahlstrom
Gary L. Daines
John L. Dale
Robert W. Daley
Richard L. Dallmeyer
William F. Dalporto
Donald C. F. Daniel
Harold E. Daniels, Jr.
Welborn O. Darden, Jr.
Clay S. Davis, Jr.
Herman E. Davis
Kenneth E. Davis, Jr.
*Robert W. Davis
*Joseph W. Davison
Leonard J. Deal, Jr.
Donald J. Deda
Michael E. Deegan
Kenneth E. Degraffenreid
Thomas B. Denegre III
Daniel A. Depompei
Paul C. Dessart, Jr.
James D. Devine
Gary G. Devoss
Barry S. Dickerson
Gary E. Dillow
Leonard A. DiLorenzo
Kirk J. Ditzler
Gregg W. Dixon
Frank J. Dobscha, Jr.
Paul T. Dolan
Richard C. Dolson
William L. Dowdy III
Charles E. Downton III
Edward T. Doyle
Gerard F. Doyle
Frank S. Dozier
Darrell L. Dreher
Leo P. Dreyer
Alan H. Drinan
John J. Driscoll, Jr.
William G. Droms
Dennis R. Drowty
George F. Druist
Donald D. Duff
John F. Duffy
James K. Duke
William C. Duke, Jr.
James M. Dunteman
Robert E. Durick, Jr.
Henry C. Duwe
Gary T. Dye
David E. Eckstorm

Thomas J. Eddinger, Jr.
Charles G. H. Eden
Donald K. Edgerton
Dean E. Edson
Robert B. Edwards
Thomas F. Elliott
Timothy D. Elliott
Thomas H. Ellis
James E. Ellison
Wallace M. Elton
Daniel T. Elwing
John T. Engstrom
Donald E. Ensign
William J. Erckmann, Jr.
Christian D. Ericksen
Keith G. Ericson
Larry L. Ernst
*William A. Espich
David P. Evans
Kirk E. Evans
Michael J. Evans
Samuel H. Evans
Jon T. Eyer
William N. Fadden
Lawrence V. Fairchild
Edward J. Feeherry, Jr.
James W. Feeney
David T. Feher
*Michael R. Fehrenbacher
*Lewis A. Felton
Roy E. Fenstermaker, Jr.
Robert P. Ferguson
William M. Ferree
Norman P. Findley III
Dwight D. Fisher
James D. Fisher
Robert B. Fisher, Jr.
Timothy J. Flaherty
Graeme L. Flanders
Michael Flannery
Brian G. Flora
Orville A. Flowers
John W. Flude, Jr.
Theodore T. Foley II
William F. Font, Jr.
Jesse R. Foster
John L. Foster
Sam L. Foushee, Jr.
Edward M. Fowler
James F. Fox
James S. Fox
Robert T. France
Burt R. Francis, Jr.
Ronald E. Franklin
William E. Franson, Jr.
James J. Frantz
Richard L. Franyo
John P. Franz
Claude W. Freaner
James M. Freiband
Roger W. Freise
John R. French
Roland F. Frerking, Jr.
Kenneth E. Frick
Charles F. Friday
Robert P. Furick
Ernest J. Gabona
Alan L. Gaines
John R. Galbraith
James M. Galinsky
Michael J. Gallagher
William J. Gallagher, Jr.
Robert M. Gallo
Jerry V. Gammill
James K. Gardner
Garrett A. Garrettson
James T. Garrigan
Mark C. Garrison
Thomas C. Garrison
Wayne T. Garrison
Markham L. Gartley
Michael A. Gary
Peter J. Gaskin II
Robert J. Gebeaux
Stanley P. Germond
Raymond W. Gibbs
John J. Gibson
Terrell A. Gibson
Jerry Q. Gilder
Thomas F. Gillespie
Robert C. Glenn
Joe C. Glover
William S. Glover, Jr.
Charles H. Gnerlich
Russell C. Goedjen, Jr.
Edgar S. Goff, Jr.
Rex C. Gold
Robert M. Goldfried
*Gilbert Goodgion
James R. Gorman
Joseph P. Grace
Paul J. Gravelle
David M. Graves
Larry A. Graves
Maurice D. Green, Jr.
William G. Green
Richard D. Greenamyer
Jonathan M. Greene
Joseph G. Greenleaf
David J. Grieve
Gerald L. Griffin, Jr.
Martin L. Grossbeck
George W. Grothe
Richard J. Growney
Larry E. Gruber
William R. Gruver
Andrew J. Guinosso
William J. Gustafon
*Michael H. Guth
James D. Haberzetle
William F. Hack
James L. Hains
David P. Hall
Steven C. Hall
John W. Hamilton III
Douglas L. Hammer
Gerald S. Hanley
Lash D. Hansborough
Frederick D. Hansen
George K. Hansen
George R. Hansen, Jr.
Leo E. Hansen, Jr.
Peter H. Hanson
Richard F. Harbeson
Stanley L. Harding
Donald F. Hardy II
*Thomas G. Hardy
Daniel J. Harmon, Jr.
Timothy J. Hartnett
Ray K. M. Hartzell
Charles K. Harvey
John C. Harvey
Robert L. Hattan
Charles J. Haughney
*William J. Havener
Lawrence J. Haverty, Jr.
William B. Hayden
Channing W. Hayes, Jr
Jesse M. Hayes
Dennis C. Hayzlett
Charles R. Head
Nelson K. Hekel
Nicholas M. Hellmuth
George T. Helm
Victor H. Hemmy, Jr.
Dyke D. Henderson
Kent K. Henkel
David C. Henny
George M. Henry
Ricki V. Hermes
Lawrence R. Hern
William M. Herr, Jr.
Carl D. Herscher
*Michael M. Hertel
George D. Hess
Paul D. Hess
Ricky L. Hicks
David J. Hierl
John M. Higginbotham
Billy J. Hill
Walter J. Hindenlang
*Donald C. Hintz
Duane D. Hobson
William C. Hodges
Joel J. Hoffman
John T. Holloman
Ronald E. Holmes
Robert W. Holst
Robert M. Holty
Robert W. Honse
Joseph M. Hooban, Jr.
Francis E. Horahan
James E. Horrell
Steven P. Hosp
Erik S. Hougland
*Thomas E. House
*Kenneth G. Howe
Richard G. Hubert
Warren P. Hudson
Jack G. Hufty, Jr.
John S. Hughes
Richard L. Hume
Alan W. Humphrey
Charles A. Hunt
George W. Huntington
Francis Iafrate
Robert W. Ickes
James D. K. Ing
William H. Ingraham
John C. Ingram
Rush O. Inlow
William R. Inlow
Dennis W. Ireland
*Robert "E" Jack
Stephen E. Jacobson
Bruce N. Jaffe
Curtis P. Jahn
Harrison W. James, III
Wiley F. James, III
Marc Janes, Jr.
William L. Jensen
Thomas J. Jezierny
Bruce H. Johnson
Donald M. Johnson
George K. Johnson, III
Richard C. Johnson
Thomas J. Johnston, Jr.
Arthur D. Jones, III
Francis T. Jones
James A. Jones, III
Lloyd K. Jones
Ronald W. Jones
Timothy G. Jones
Michael F. Jordan
Ronald R. Jordan
Roy W. Josi
Robert A. Joslyn
Erwin M. Joye
Joseph E. Kain, Jr.
Frank J. Kalas, Jr.
Robert A. Kamrath
John R. Kappa
David D. Kardell
Herbert W. Karg, Jr.
Horace C. Kauffman, Jr.
Francis F. Kaufhold
Robert L. Keber
Frederick Keenan
Alan C. Keiller
Stuart J. Keiller
James T. Keiper
Larry B. Keith
Donn K. Kelly
Howard K. Kelly
James M. Kelly
Michael C. Kelly
Donald F. Kemlein, Jr.
William E. Kennedy, Jr.
John F. Kenny, Jr.
David L. Kerstein
George L. Ketterer
Robert B. Kidd
Martin D. Kilgo
Charles E. Killian
David M. Kinard
David R. Kircher
Kris A. Kirkland
Gary D. Kitchen
Owen A. Klahr
Andrew J. Klinchak, Jr.
Kenneth E. Klostermann
Fred K. Kluessendorf
Joseph J. Kochanski
Victor D. Kolodziej
Bernard L. Kosinski
Edward F. Kosnik
William L. Kostar
Donald M. Kowalsky
John D. Krause
Thomas W. Krekel
Michael M. Kress
*Loren T. Krienke
Stephen G. Krum
Donald M. Kruse, Jr.
*Rodney E. Kuehn
James E. Kunkel
Stephen G. Kupka
Joel C. Labow
Robert J. Labrecque
*Raymond G. M. Lah
William P. Laino
Peter S. Lamprou
Thomas F. Lang
James M. Larkins, Jr.
John M. Larson
Karl B. Lautenschlager
John M. Lawless
George M. Leber, Jr.
Donald A. Lee
Henry C. Lehman
Gary F. Leidecker
*James R. Lemons
John A. Leo, III
Fred P. Leonard, III
Robert E. Leonard
William J. Leonard, Jr.
Kurt W. Libby
John B. Lienhard
Robert M. Lightstone
William D. Linch, Jr.
William T. Lindsay
Michael W. Lingo
Parker S. Linton
*Warren N. Lipscomb, Jr.
John T. Lisle
Richard A. Livingston
Bruce W. Lockwood
Dennis M. Loftus
Edward C. Long, III
Philip L. Long
Frederick Lonsdale
Joseph P. Loughran, Jr.
Leonard N. Loveday
Edward J. Lowery, Jr.
Richard D. Lowrie
*Walter W. Luther, Jr.
Peter J. Lynch, III
Douglas V. Lyon
Joseph E. Lyons, Jr.
Gayle R. McAdams
Glenn E. McAdams
James W. McAuley, Jr.
Raymond L. McCabe, Jr.
John P. McCaffrey
Spencer W. McCallie
Jeffrey J. McCartney
John B. McCarty
Richard J. McCarty
Richard S. McConnell, Jr.
William S. McConnell
Richard F. McCormack, III
Robert B. McCoy
*Stephen S. McCray
Clarence H. McCullen
William E. McCune
William H. McGann, III
Charles N. McGarry
Terry R. McGee
William E. McGee
Richard C. McGinity
*James E. McGlinn
Ronald L. McKinney
William J. McNally, III
Charles R. McRae
Harry E. McTyre, Jr.
Joseph B. McWilliams, Jr.
John L. Macconnell
Jonathan T. Mack
Donald K. Mackenzie
Thomas J. Maconkey, Jr.
Stephen S. MacVean
James R. Madson
Rodney E. Magner
Paul W. Mahlstedt
Gary L. Mahn
Bruce G. Makela
Carl V. Mallett
Joseph J. Mallini
Eric Mandel
Michael R. Manes
Garrett N. Mangin, II
Walter L. Margeson, Jr.
Lee B. Marshall
Charles F. Martin, II
*James M. Martin
Xavier K. Maruyama
Richard M. Marzano
James B. Massey, III
Quentin S. Masters
David R. Mathers
William M. Mathers
Brian J. Mathison
John L. Matthews
Thomas F. Matthews
Ronald L. Mattioda
Francis E. Maule, III
David O. Maupin
Conrad J. Mayer
Richard L. Mayhue
Terrence Q. Maynard
John J. Mazach
Michael L. Mears
Robert E. Meintzer
George R. Melnyk
William E. Mercer
Stephen C. Merriman
Douglas C. Metcalf
Gregory M. Michelson
George R. Middleton
Michael J. Mielnik
James E. Miller
Nicholas P. Miller
Richard S. Miller
Robert J. Miller
Wayne H. Miller
Robert C. Mills
Ronald A. Milner
Joseph, W. Minarick, III
*Charles S. Mitchell, IV
*John M. Mitchell
Gerald E. Mittendorff
Robert L. Moline
Clifford F. Molloy, Jr.
William B. Montano
Michael F. Montgomery
Billy G. Moore
Michael W. Moore
David N. Morey, III
James F. Morgan, Jr.
Roy S. Morgan
*David W. Morse
James C. Morss
William R. Mosby, IV
Anthony M. Muir
Michael S. Mulvany
Joe A. Munn
Andrew M. Murphy
Dennis E. Murphy
James K. Murphy, Jr.
Robert J. Murphy
Henry B. Myers
Terry E. Mynar
Carl F. Nagy
John C. Neale
Alan W. Nealley
Robert W. Nearing
David S. Nekomoto
Dennis G. Nelson
Harold E. Nelson, Jr.
Kenneth S. Nelson
John E. Neumeister, III
William J. Neville, Jr.
Frederick J. Nevinger
Richard D. Newcomb
James K. Newell, III
Donald E. Newman
Vernon L. Newman
Edward G. Niblock
Loring B. Nichols
Robert L. Nicol
Patrick J. Noonan
Donald S. Norman
Phillip J. Norman
David H. Norton
Richard W. Nowak
Francis E. Nuessle, Jr.
Neal S. Oberg
Gerard M. O'Brien
Thomas E. O'Brien
Alfred J. O'Donovan, III
William O'Dwyer
*James H. Offutt, III
Charles E. O'Grosky, III
Roman S. Ohnemus
Daniel T. Oliver
John F. O'Malley
Haines A. O'Neil
James E. Orkins
Victor P. Orlandi
Gene F. Ott
Marvin M. Ott
Robert G. Paine, III
James G. Palmborg
Donald A. Palmer
Dennis E. Pankratz
Richard L. Parisen
Henry S. Parker, III
Frederick C. Parsons, III
Joe C. Parsons
Benjamin W. Partridge, III
Leonard A. Pasquini
John C. Patton
Thomas W. Paul
William H. Payne III
Edward L. Peabody
Gordon D. Pedersen
Doyle D. Peel
Dennis R. Pelletier
Charles W. Pennington
Terry F. Peppard
James A. Perakis
Dan Lee Peresich
Robert A. Pergler
*Robert E. Perkins
Albert M. Perring
Albert K. Perry
Frank R. Perry
David L. Perschau
Dennis L. Peters
Alan T. Peterson
William C. Peterson
David W. Pettis, Jr.
John F. Pfaff
Larry W. Phillips
John W. Phipps
Frank P. Piazza, Jr.
Joseph C. Picken III
Robert D. Pickett, Jr.
Peter W. Pierce
Richard B. Pierce, Jr.
Robert J. Plante
Ronald E. Plummer
Jon H. Poehler
*Steven N. Poggi
John S. Pomeroy
John R. Pope
John M. Pospisil
Douglas C. Postle
*John A. Potts
Norbert J. Potts
Harry C. Powell, Jr.
Augustus K. Pratt, Jr.
Leonids Predtechenskis

*Victor M. Prep, Jr.
Leland H. Price
Alfred C. Prince, III
Brian T. Prinn
Gerald J. Prusaitis
James W. Puffer
Mark S. Quinton
Edward A. Raker
Richard E. Raleigh
James M. Ramsey
Jeffrey W. Randall
Robert N. Ray
Richard M. Reass
Michael P. Redington
Rodney A. Reed
John J. Regan
William C. Regmund, Jr.
James M. Regnier
Thomas H. Reid
Peter S. Reis
Bryan E. Remer
Merlin M. Renne
*William M. Ribble
John A. Rice
Peter B. Richardson
Austin M. Rist
Stephen L. Ritchey
Douglas B. Ritter
Charles R. Roberts
John E. Robertson
Stephan R. Robertson
Charles L. Robinson
William P. Robinson
William B. Rochelle
David E. Rogers
Frank W. Rogers III
George T. Rogers
Daniel J. Rooney
Allen D. Rose
James A. Rosiak
Paul D. Ross, Jr.
Milton D. Roth, Jr.
William W. Rouzer
Bruce P. Rowe
Clifford H. Royal
Edward A. Rudegeair
Frederick L. Rudell
Charles A. Ruedebusch
Victor E. Ruehl III
Henry D. Rumble, Jr.
Ward R. Rusling
Stephen J. Russ
James M. Russell
John A. Russo
David J. Ruth
Terrence P. Ryan
David M. Sage, Jr.
Fred W. Sage III
Harlan R. Sager
Stuart K. Saints
Walter A. Salerno
Barry E. Sammons
Bonum B. Sams, Jr.
William T. Sandalls, Jr.
Christopher F. Sandberg
*Marvin L. Sanders
Robert C. Sanders
Fred C. Sandquist
Vincent D. Sapp
Quentin N. Saracino
Richard E. Saunders
Clarence M. Saylor, Jr.
Theodore S. Schaefer, Jr.
Donald C. Schafer
Kenneth A. Schechter
Charles H. Schlehuser
Clifford L. Schmidt
Charles A. Schnepf
William L. Schoch
*Gary W. Schoen
Leonard J. Schoeppner
*Paul L. Schofield
Ronald W. Scholz
Frederick C. Schramm, Jr.
Paul G. Schuler
Michael A. Schuster
Norbert V. Schwartz
*Mervyn A. Schwedt
Donald E. Scott
Jerry W. Scott
Robert P. Scott
John J. Seery
Robert J. Semet
Lavern K. Senn
Lachlan W. Seward
Terry I. Seymour
John P. Shea III
Robert C. Sheffield
Eugene Shelar, Jr.
Marshall R. Sherman
John T. Sherron
Edwin E. Shipe III
Michael P. Shoemaker
Barron D. Shoffner
Norman E. Siems, Jr.
Titus S. Sigler
Richard T. Siler
Samuel I. Silverman
Donald L. Sims
Larry L. Sims
Charles M. Simonsen
Norman H. Slagle
Robert L. Slane
David G. Slear III
Sylvester H. Slowik
David A. Smith, Jr.
David B. Smith
Edward W. Smith III
James H. Smith
Norman A. Smith
Steven E. Smith
Thomas J. Smith
Milton L. Sneller
Richard E. Snitzer
Sidney E. Snook
Richard K. Snouffer
Warren B. Snyder
Allen H. Somers
David C. Sopko
George H. Soule, Jr.
Mark J. Southerland
Gordon D. Spence, Jr.
David J. Spencer
Tadd E. Spicer
Douglas R. Sprague
William D. Sproul
John A. Stabb
Garen K. Staglin
Robert A. Stahl
David F. Stankeivicz
Theodore R. Stanko, Jr.
William H. Stanton
Duane M. Starr
Paul V. Staudte
David S. Steen
Nicholas J. Steffen
David A. Stein
Jeffrey F. Stein
Leif M. Steinert
*Richard G. Stevens
Thomas R. Stevens
Ernest H. Stevenson
Alford M. Stewart, Jr.
Jamie B. Stewart, Jr.
John C. Stewart
Michael E. Stillabower
John A. Stilwell, Jr.
Fred Z. Stiteler
Lawrence C. Stoneberg
Robert J. Storan
*George K. Stratis
Charles L. Stratton
Thomas L. Strausbaugh
Robert E. Strayhorn
*James G. Stuckey
Albert F. Stumm, Jr.
Dennis B. Sullivan
Angelo J. Summa
Gary R. Summers
John W. Sutherland
Michael T. Sutherland
Jeffrey L. Swank
Dennis L. Swartz
James D. Sweeney
*John M. L. Sweet
James E. Swickard
Robert D. Swingle
*David T. Tackney
James K. Tate IV
Brent D. Taylor
William L. Taylor
Richard B. Teed
Robert L. Tercek
Thomas J. Terrill
Douglas J. Tersteeg
John W. Theisen
Bruce E. Thielen
Robert E. Thiemer, Jr.
Michael J. Thole
Gerald R. Thom
Richard S. Thomas
William J. Thomas, Jr.
Dwight W. Thompson
Edward C. Thompson
Jesse L. Thompson
Jesse B. Thompson, Jr.
Joseph R. Thompson
Oland D. Thompson
William E. Thompson
David J. Thomsen
Arthur Allen Thorstad
Bruce E. Thunberg
Martin A. Tice
*John A. Tomasko
William J. Tomlinson
Alan M. Tompkins
Russell J. Tonkin
Michael A. Toth
John B. Totushek
John W. Townsend
Richard T. Tracy
*Michael J. Transue
Edward R. Treadway
Douglas E. Treter
*Larry D. Trueman
William C. Truesdell, Jr.
Michael T. Tuley
Paul A. Tummonds
Patrick A. Tuzzolo
James E. Tweddle
John T. Tyler, Jr.
Richard J. Uhrie, Jr.
Robert S. Unks
Robert R. Upp
Lawrence W. Urbik
James H. Utter
Robert D. Vanas
George T. Vangilder
Alan E. Vanloy
James R. Vansant
Paul S. Vanteslaar
Barend L. Vanzanten
William C. Vasey
Larry E. Vaughan
Harry F. Vellines
Duane R. Velte
Jeffrey T. Vernallis
George A. Vincent, III
John M. Volkmann
Michael W. Waddell
Donald A. Wadsworth
Lawrence L. Wagenseil
David T. Waggoner
David L. Wagner
Stanley D. Wainwright, Jr.
William T. Wallace, Jr.
David F. Walsh
Emmet M. Walsh
Thomas J. Walsh
Harold W. Walter
Alfred J. Waltz
Chester D. Ward
Lewis A. Ward
Thomas Waring
John F. Waschbusch
Andrew J. Watson
David Watson
Bruce R. Watts
William J. Waylett, Jr.
Cleve O. Weathers
Brian L. Webber
Carl M. Webber
Craig S. Weber
*Steven D. Weber
Paul E. Webster
Charles J. Weeks, Jr.
Herold J. Weiler III
Stuart Weiselberg
James T. Welch
William R. West
Kenneth R. Wetzel
Eugene P. Wheary
David L. Wheeler
William R. Wheeler
Giles M. Whitcomb
Allen H. White, Jr.
*James W. White
Robert B. Whitley
Frank C. Whittemore
Douglas G. Widener
Andrew L. Wihtol
John L. Wilcock, Jr.
Robert B. Willard
Kent A. Willever
Allen L. Willhite
*Clyde R. Williams
Edward L. Williams III
Frank L. Williams
Kenneth R. Williams
Robert E. Williams, Jr.
Ronald D. Williams
Warren W. Williams II
Francis T. Williamson, Jr.
Donald L. Wilson
Eldon S. Wilson
Thomas J. Wingfield III
Robert D. Winston, Jr.
Ronald L. Wise
John L. Wisniewski
William H. Withrow, Jr.
James P. Woerner, Jr.
Norman K. Womer
Peter W. Wong
Stephen E. C. Wong
Dana J. Wood
Larry A. Wood
Richard H. Woodfin, Jr.
John M. Woodruff
Walter B. Woodson, III
Edmund B. Woollen
Jack C. Worthington
John A. Worthley
Charles D. Worthy, Jr.
James E. Wright
Rudolph R. Yanuck, Jr.
*Richard J. York
William J. Zaist
Donald D. Zilmer
Clayton G. Zucker
Leonard F. Zuga
Kenneth C. Zuhr
Howard O. Zumsteg, Jr.

The following-named graduates from Navy enlisted scientific education program to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Freeman F. Adkins
John M. Angleton
Bobby C. Appling
William Baranowski
Jerome E. Beaulier
Robert B. Birchfield
Gurnie G. Bowden
Lawrence C. Bucher
Thomas E. Bunge
Franklin J. Burns
Richard E. Carlson
Garland W. Caudill
Richard J. Davidson
Robert G. Driscoll
Imants D. Eicens
James K. Engelken
Robert M. Fay
Robert S. Fritzius
Raymond M. Fuentez
Tommy E. Gaston
James B. Hagen
Melvin E. Hochhalter
Charles A. Hoffer
Joseph D. Hughes
Richard K. Hughes
James W. Johnson
James R. Jones
James E. Kincaid
William B. King
Joseph J. Kubina
Frank S. Langill
Jerry W. Leach
Donald E. Mandeville
John W. Maras
Troy E. Mathis, Jr.
Raymond A. McDonald
Lawrence L. McMenimen
Robert E. Mollet
Gilbert F. Monell, Jr.
John E. Norton
Richard B. O'Keefe
Kenneth C. Pilecek
Harry L. Piper
Kenneth J. Plis
Robert E. Pursley
Robert G. Randolph
Glenn F. Richardson, Jr.
Charles L. Roller
Richard K. Ruff
Harry R. Schaede
Charles R. Schaefer
Harry F. Specht, Jr.
William P. Sturm
Ronald M. Thompson
Robert H. Warren
Mark C. Zradicka

*Frank I. Burley, Jr., OCEN–I, USN, to be a permanent ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Line of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Donald R. Feeley (Civilian College Graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*Clifford W. Gates (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenant commanders and temporary commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*John Caruso, Jr.
*Jennings M. Grisamore
*Gerard W. Jauchler

*Joseph P. O'Connell (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Frank E. Dully, Jr.
*Francis S. Morrison
*Stanley S. Weglarz

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Curtis D. Adams
*Henry K. Bunnell
*John S. Decker
*Peter W. Herbert
*Crockett H. Page
*Berton T. Schaeffer
*Albert E. Tompkins

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Robert R. Abbe
*Robert L. Abrams
*William R. Applegate
*Joseph R. Asiaf
*Robert W. Burt
*Richard O. Butcher
*Charles S. Crummy
*William B. Davis
*John J. Funkhouser
*Earl B. Breenberg
*Bryon C. Gwinn II
*David O. Haugland
*Russell L. Marlor
*Richard E. Perkins
*Alan D. Rosenberg
*John M. Smith, Jr.
*James K. Summitt
*Ernest M. Wood, Jr.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Dental

Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John M. Box
*David L. Gaston
*Wayne J. Toth

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenents in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Loye A. Ashton
*Thomas J. Cronin
*Frederick A. Curtice

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenents (junior grade) and temporary lieutenents in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Edward G. Grace, Jr.
*Gordon B. Groff
*Jerome E. Isaacs
*Richard H. Libby
*Thomas J. Newell, III
*James H. Wible

*Frank H. Blue, Jr. (U.S. Navy retired officer) to be a permanent lieutenant in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*John G. Miller (U.S. Navy retired officer) to be a lieutenant commander in the line of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*Furman L. Hensley (U.S. Navy retired officer) to be a chief warrant officer, W-4 in the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*Cecil "J" Puckett (U.S. Navy retired officer) to be a chief warrant officer, W-2 in the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John D. Anderson
John P. Anderson, Jr.
Norman L. Barr, Jr.
Archie B. Blackburn
Stephen A. Blackman
Bernard J. Bortz
James E. Brodhacker
Thomas C. Brown
Robert S. Bryles
Louis E. Buettner
Thomas B. Burkhardt
William H. Campbell
John R. Charters
Jack S. Cooper
Wayne F. Crossman
Melvin D. Cunningham
Jack Egnatinsky
Edmund F. Fallon, Jr.
Michael S. Gold
Richard K. Goodstein
Michael D. Gorman
John M. Harris, III
Karl D. Holschuh
Warren B. Howe
John P. Keane
Robert M. Korbelak
Paul A. Kvale
Clayton A. Lang
Andrew J. Lanier, Jr.
Albert G. Leroy, Jr.
Raphael K. Levine
Robert P. Lonergan
Larry J. Marroy
Gerald T. Mayer
Paul L. McBurney
James M. McClurkan
Gordon T. McMurry
William H. Montgomery
Howard Myers
Adrian F. Newens
Stanley G. Norman
Charles E. Nye
Robert F. Oldt
William D. Owens
Dixon Presnall
James D. Roberts
Hunter B. Rogers III
George H. Saltzberg
Meredith F. Sirmans
Ronald C. Sullivan
Robert B. Telfer
Harvey Thalblum
Francis X. VanHouten
John P. Vincent
George T. Wall
Richard A. Wiklund
Richard F. Willis
William B. Wood

*William R. Heit (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named enlisted personnel to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Leroy E. Arnold
*Benjamin D. Barbee, Jr.
*Russell W. Barnhill
*Gerald M. Bell
*Lyle E. Belter
*Edward Bobola
*John E. Bruhn
*Raymond A. Butler, Sr.
*Gordon L. Carpenter
*Normand L. Charland
*David E. Closson
*Robert C. Coleman
*Robert R. Cote
*Orlin E. Cunningham
*Raymond M. Curran
*Dennis D. David
*Zachary M. Davies
*Donald M. Davis
*Donald R. Davis
*Jerrold H. Dodson
*William R. Goodhartt
*Richard B. Gutshall, Jr.
*Michael Hamas, Jr.
*Johnnie D. Hammons, Jr.
*George J. Hansel
*Charles H. Hayes
*Terrial L. Hazelton
*Charles R. Hill
*Leonard J. Julius
*Glen M. King
*Ernest J. Loos
*John A. Maas
*Leland R. Maassen
*Charles F. Mann, Jr.
*Edward G. Markley
*Paul R. Milliken
*Arvin A. Mincer
*Leonard L. Moore
*Patrick H. Moore
*Walter A. Nacrelli
*Reginald E. Newman
*Kenneth L. Owens
*Lawrence F. Raymond
*Richard D. Reynolds
*Edward A. Rice, Jr.
*Michael T. Riley
*Robert H. Robertson, Jr.
*Ralph E. Robinson
*Dale F. Sander
*Elvin L. Schlegel, Jr.
*John Schroll
*Walter O. Sherwood
*Alfred L. Sides
*James P. Smith, Jr.
*Robert E. Smith
*Robert F. Spencer
*Douglas R. Sperry
*Gene N. Stewart
*Lloyd C. Taylor, Jr.
*Donald D. Thorson
*Ronald F. Turco
*William E. Waln
*Everett L. Wilson
*Lavern V. Wolff
*Earl R. Wooll

The following-named enlisted personnel selected as alternates to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Myron J. Hickey
*Thomas N. Crumbley
*Dale E. Bradford
*Duane E. Potter
*Allen M. Thrall
*James H. Graham
*Robert A. A. Jeffs
*Kenneth S. Snow, Jr.
*James R. Blanton
*William C. Ludwig
*Melvin G. Hostetler
*Darrell L. Price
*Furman K. Cooper
*Gordon W. Mathewson
*William P. McGrath
*Paige M. West
*Jerome J. Bielawski
*Robert J. Arnold
*Donald R. Gray
*Gary T. Davis
*William H. Strohl
*James A. Conners
*William Rhode
*Robert L. Russnogle
*Harold G. Bolster
*Richard L. Smith
*Charles E. Hoyt, Jr.
*Walter R. Gorsage, Jr.
*Dudley J. Wildes
*Elio Mataldi
*Robert B. Taylor
*Robert L. Wooldridge
*Gerald L. Gardner
*Richard W. Ebersole

The following-named warrant officers to be permanent warrant officers W-4 in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Roy J. Allard
James J. Carney
Nickolas A. Cracolice
Pierre P. D'Auteuil
Herman C. Horn
John R. MacNaughton
Jesse L. Purser
Donald J. Reinke
Stanley F. Salagan

The following-named warrant officers to be permanent warrant officers W-3 in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert C. Ballinger
Allen O. McKelvey
Robert B. McLaughlin
Harold B. Rice

The following-named warrant officers to be permanent warrant officers W-2 in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John H. Briody
Burrell E. Duncan
John W. Ellis, Jr.
George W. Glabb
Milton T. Hathcock
Meredith D. Jacobs
Joseph Kremsner
Coy L. Layel, Jr.
Harry W. Meyer
Warren K. Nelson
Lawrence B. Yarbrough

The following-named warrant officers to be permanent warrant officers W-3 and temporary warrant officers W-4 in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Walter R. Abney
Robert N. Bauer
Eugene F. Begley
Harold F. Brothers
Ralph W. Gilbrook
Jesse M. Haines
Keith B. Hill
Robert F. Hoffsetz
Winstead B. Kirschner
Leonard J. Kreahling
Harold K. Lawrence
Joseph A. Mazgay
Leo J. Murray
Gordon B. Newton
Thomas U. Parsons
Charles H. Reustle
Steve H. Robinson
Warren L. Shelton
Frank W. Singer
Conward B. Southard
Coleman D. Smith, Jr.
Edward E. Wilgus

The following-named warrant officers to be permanent warrant officers W-2 and temporary warrant officers W-3 in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Marvin M. Aldrich
Paul K. Barger
Edward H. Bissen
Jack E. Bromley
Paul Epoch
Roy E. Fenstermaker
William R. Hamlin
Donald F. Heckbert
Benjamin M. Johnson
Charles E. Player
Billy J. Rawlins
William M. Sessions
George R. Smith
Jack "D" Turner

In the Marine Corps

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

George T. Ackerson
Thomas M. Anderson
Henry D. Babers
Terrance W. Bache
Irving A. Bassett, Jr.
Frank M. Batha, Jr.
William P. Bau
Harlow C. Bell, Jr.
Roy B. Bentson
Roger J. Berger
Stephen R. Berkheiser
George V. Bershinsky
Norman K. Billipp
Lee D. Bodkin
John W. Bowman, Jr.
Joseph J. Brennan
John P. Brown
Warren R. Brundage, Jr.
Randolph D. Brunell
Donald L. Buckle
William R. Bunker
Kenneth R. Burns
John W. Bush
Thomas D. Camp
Francis P. Campbell
James A. Cathcart
Michael P. Chervenak
Edward E. Chipman
Joseph A. Cialone, II
Robert P. Cipriani
Clelland D. Collins, Jr.
Kermit C. Corcoran
Thomas W. Crew, II
Otis F. Curtis, IV
Wallace M. Davis, Jr.
Luis A. De La Garza
Robert J. De Luca
Bernard M. Devinny
Daniel C. Douglas
Paul F. Drnec
Thomas W. Drummond
John W. Dumas
James V. Dunlap
John C. Eldred
Frederick J. Emmett, Jr.
George J. Eschenfelder, III
Richard G. Esler
Donald V. Esmond
David P. Evans
Stanley M. Falkenstein
Martin L. Fenik
John L. Fischer, Jr.
Joseph M. Fitzgerald
Morris O. Flecher
Donald R. Forester
Robert C. Frame
Robert L. Frantz
John K. French
John F. Fry
Erich E. Gabrys
Joseph C. Gallo
Albert H. Gates
Logan T. Gay, Jr.
Howard L. Gerlach
William R. Gibney, Jr.
Robert W. Gillespie, II
John P. Glasgow, Jr.
Lawrence O. Graeber, III.
Ainslie A. Gray, Jr.
John W. Greenfield
Raleigh R. Griffiths
Randolph L. Habeck
Jerald J. Haggerty
James C. Hajduk
John L. Hamilton
Douglas L. Hammer
Jerry B. Haney
Arlen J. Hanle
Russell J. Harrison
James F. Hartman
William M. Hatch
Channing F. Hayden, Jr.
Channing W. Hayes, Jr.
James J. Henderson, III.
Robert Hickerson
Edmond R. Hinkle
James D. Hintz
Richard W. Hodory
John Holderness
John C. Holmgreen, Jr.
Walter S. Horsfall
Darrel R. Hotard
James L. Huff
Richard E. Hulslander
William R. Hunt
Homer G. Hutchinson, III.
Larry W. Hutson
Randall N. Jacobsen
Richard S. Johnson, Jr.
William F. Johnson
Richard P. Jozwiakowski
Lawrence G. Karch
Peter F. Keating
Robert J. Keefe
Michael S. Kelly
Thomas J. Kelly, Jr.
Carl B. Kepford
Jack Kettler
Thomas G. King
William C. Krauter
Robert J. Kuhlman, Jr.

Coleman D. Kuhn, Jr.
Francis W. LaMotte, Jr.
Robert K. Lange
Richard M. Larson
Edmond H. Lawrence
Robert C. Lewis
Ralph B. Lilja
Herman I. Little, Jr.
Charles H. Leoffler
John T. Lovell
Willis J. Lovitt, Jr.
Paul J. Lowery
Robert E. Lund
Bruce D. Mansdorf
David O. Martin
William M. Mathers
Robert J. Matthews
Larry E. McCorkle
Denis H. McDonald
Harold S. McGinnis
Matthew O. McKnight
Bradford B. Meyers
Edward L. Michael
Charles R. Miller
Peter B. Millichap
Walter H. I. Moos
Richard G. Morin
Dean L. Mottard
Garrell S. Mullaney
James E. Murray
Edward M. Myers, III
Allen D. Nettleingham
Richard B. Newton
William A. Norris
Stephen J. O'Neill
James A. Pelli, Jr.
William C. Peters
Darrel L. Pfeifer
Charles L. Phillips
David J. Pienta
Charles W. Pigott
Edward J. Polasek, Jr.
John R. Pope
David L. Purvis
James K. Ramaker
Brian A. Rindt
Charles E. Riordan
Robert R. Rivers
Frank H. Roberts, Jr.
Leonard Robertson
Roland G. Robertson
David B. Robinson
William L. Rosbe
William W. Rouzer
Robert G. Schmitt
Charles J. Schneider, Jr.
Karl R. Schroeder
James J. Shea II
Robert A. Shearer
William A. Sheridan, Jr.
Cameron M. Smith, Jr.
John R. Smith
Marshall I. Smith
Michael D. Smith
James A. Spinks III
Larry J. Springer
Richard A. Steele
James C. Stokes, Jr.
Dale C. Synnes
John A. Tagliaferro
David E. Taylor
John W. Theisen
Thomas L. Thompson
Martin A. Tice
Charles J. Toeniskoetter
Roger L. Torneden
Edward L. Trainor
Kevin F. Trainor
Alan J. Tucci
Curtis A. Twiddy, Jr.
Andres Vaart
Michael W. Waddell
Thomas U. Wall
Brian L. Webber
John Wegl
Alexander D. Welch
Carl J. West III
Robert A. Wetzel
Richard J. White
Robert M. White
Michael C. Wholley
David E. Wilbur
Thomas W. Williamson
Nathan A. K. Wong
Dana J. Wood
Larry A. Wood
Evan K. Woodworth
Virgil L. Young
Nels C. Youngstrom, Jr.
Jerry A. Zimmer

The following-named (Army Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert W. Boehm
Walter R. Walsh, Jr.
Ellsworth J. Turse, Jr.
James R. Williams

The following-named (meritorious noncommissioned officers) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Jerry K. Baird
Theodore G. Balderree
Theodore T. Bean
Paul M. Cook
William R. Daniel
Samuel D. Davis
Edwin E. Eloe
Joaquin C. Gracida
Ernest L. Hall
James R. Harvey
Ronald A. Hellbusch
Raymond J. Hoogendoorn
Donald R. Huskey
Bruce A. Lang
Ronald J. Laughlin
Danny E. Mathis
Richard J. Matteson
Alfred H. Mossler
Phillip C. Norton
James C. Orr
Frank D. Powell
Raymond H. Schmidt
Kenneth C. Shumate
William K. Terrell
William E. Treadwell
Colin B. Tweddell
Digby H. Willard
Jon L. Zellers

The following-named (platoon leaders class) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John C. Astle
Bradley E. Barriteau
Patrick L. Barry
Garold N. Batterman
Thomas J. Billison
Ross A. Brown
John D. Brune
Walton F. Chapman
Kenneth L. Christy, Jr.
Ronald A. Conley
Louis M. Croy, Jr.
Francis J. Cuddy, Jr.
Terry M. Curtis
Richard L. Daerr, Jr.
Hiram T. Dale
Robert W. Dray
David E. Feiring
Robert B. Gauntner
Woodruff C. Goble
Frederick H. Graefe
Andrew M. Haglage
Dennis E. Hammond
Gale E. Heaivilin
John L. Hickman
Munn E. Hinds, Jr.
Daniel C. Holcomb
Nathaniel R. Hoskot, Jr.
John C. Howell
James G. Hulsey
Joseph D. Joiner
Van W. Keck
John J. Krauer
Timothy L. Laplaunt
Walter V. Lemmond III
Steven P. Lindsey
Carl E. Long
Walter W. Lubbe, Jr.
John F. Noel, Jr.
Steven J. Olson
John P. Oppenhuizen
Richard M. Perkins
William L. Reilly
Robert L. Ridenour
Philip B. Rooney
Alfred B. Russ
Woodson A. Sadler, Jr.
James L. Scott
Derek A. Shubin
Larry G. Stone
Hardwick Stuart, Jr.
John J. Sullivan
Bronson W. Sweeney
William P. Symolon
Joseph R. Turner, Jr.
Vank Veselka
John W. Wells
Vincent J. Whibbs, Jr.
Fred M. Winkler
James Wolfe
Richard W. Zehms

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Charles O. Buirge
John R. Connors
Randolph A. Gangle
Ronald R. Groves
John M. Jeffries
Virgil W. Jones
Thomas J. Marziaz
John C. Maynard
John C. McGee
Joseph M. Piatt
George R. Robison
Richard L. Ruhlman
Kenneth S. Russom
Russell H. Sutton

(Note.—Asterisk (*) indicates ad interim appointment issued.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 21, 1966.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Robert L. Sumwalt, of South Carolina, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

Victor Bussie, of Louisiana, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

Timothy J. May, of Colorado, to be General Counsel of the Post Office Department.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The 37th Anniversary of League of United Latin American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with a warm appreciation of the good works of the League of United Latin American Citizens, popularly known as LULAC, I join in the laudatory comments of my colleague from Texas [Mr. WHITE], in this Chamber on Thursday last, the 37th anniversary of the founding of the organization, that as Congressman WHITE says has become one of the outstanding groups of our Nation for the fostering of good citizenship.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to participate with the members of the league in the patriotic observances that annually are a vibrant feature of the Fourth of July holiday in the district that I am honored to represent in this body. American citizens of Latin blood are a numerous and proud part of our community, and they hold a high and dignified place of eminence in all the activities of our people. The brilliant record of one of the leaders of LULAC, the Honorable David Cerda, as a judge in the courts of Cook County, has been a source of great satisfaction.

Robert Shaw in Atlanta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, in 1965 Atlanta entered into major league sports with the franchise of the Atlanta Braves, and most recently with the newly formed National League football team, the Atlanta Falcons.

Last week, Atlanta, always a cultural center, scored another "big league" feat, with the Atlanta Arts Alliance announcement that the distinguished Robert Shaw has been named music director of the Atlanta Symphony Orchestra.

Mr. Shaw will resign his post as associate conductor of the Cleveland Orchestra and will assume his duties in Atlanta in 1967.

One of the world's most renowned choral directors, his famous Robert Shaw Chorale has made musical history in its tours of 48 States, and its celebrated Russian tour in 1962.

Conductor Henry Sopkin, retiring after 21 years of selfless and able service to his art and his city, leaves Mr. Shaw a carefully assembled aggregation of 80 excellent musicians—a solid foundation from which to launch further musical triumphs.

The Atlanta Arts Alliance, under the able leadership of Chairman Richard H. Rich, and Vice Chairman Lucien Oliver, Charles L. Tower, symphony president, and Charles R. Yates, chairman of the symphony executive committee; are to be commended for their painstaking search of over 100 applicants from the United States and Europe—the search which culminated in the selection of Mr. Shaw.

The late Arturo Toscanini said of Robert Shaw: "I have at last found the maestro I have been looking for." As Atlanta Constitution Columnist Bruce Galphin noted, "So has Atlanta."

The Schools of Compton, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, a singular honor has come to a section of my constituency, the city of Compton, Calif., and I am pleased to share the recognition with my colleagues.

In a way, this honor synthesizes a number of interrelated issues which have had our attention for a long time.

We speak of poverty, of racial tensions, of law violation. There is general agreement that the heart of the matter is education and understanding—and the heart of education, we have been told many times, is "money"—as if "money" alone could buy the skill to inspire children to learn, prevent dropouts, and give to a community a deep and penetrating interest in raising the educational level of its citizens.

The fullest measure of money means little without the zeal to do, the imagination to conceive, the willingness to dare, and genuine dedication to a cause.

In this city of Compton, there are people with all these qualities—and their dedication is to education—although their wealth is modest. These are the people who administer its school system under the able leadership of Mr. Leonard C. Erickson, superintendent of the Compton city schools.

More than 17,000 pupils crowd its classes. We are advised the cost of educating each student is the lowest in all of Los Angeles County—and understandably so—as Compton is a city with a number of poverty areas—and no Federal funds are allocated for building new school structures.

Yet this community voted to increase its property tax, to increase it so that new schools could be built. The entire community voted this sacrifice. An entire multiracial community voting in favor of the future.

This, however, is not unusual.

It was decided to build the first of these schools in the area of the city where the need was the greatest. This, too, is not unusual.

But rather than merely decide to build a school that would house a specific number of pupils, the goal was more ambitious. It was decided to build a school that would be beautiful, one in which the community would take pride, one that would provide a welcome atmosphere, one that the people would cherish, one that would motivate students to learn, an oasis of knowledge—a center of learning worthy of any city—anywhere.

And all this they hoped to achieve on the slimmest of budgets.

Long, tedious hours went into the search for the answers. It would have been easy to merely press a button or two and have a school much like all other schools—and no one would complain, for they would be getting what they would naturally expect.

But the city of Compton can be proud. This school, designed by the architectural firm of Carmichael-Kemp, AIA, to be built in a section designated by Los Angeles County as a hard-core poverty area, has just received a national award for its excellence in architecture—its beauty, its warmth, its color—and its functional use in education, from the American Association of School Administrators' Architectural Jury of the National Education Association. This architectural jury is composed of three of the Nation's leading architects selected by the American Institute of Architects, and three of the Nation's most eminent educators.

This is no small school. It is 2 stories with more than 30 classrooms, and gentlemen, the cost of building this school will be well within the budget set by the State of California as the average cost for similar size structures. It is fitting, too, that this institution of learning will be named the Clarence A. Dickison Elementary School, honoring a pioneer of the city of Compton, who was not only its first mayor, but who also made his contribution to education as a teacher, vice principal, principal, and a member and president of the Compton City Elementary School Board.

And as if Compton needed further honor, the California State Department of Schoolhouse Planning is considering using this award-winning school for a pilot study relative to the savings effected by its type of structure in heavily populated areas.

This coveted award, naturally, means a great deal to Mr. Erickson, the Board of Education, and to the architects, Dan Carmichael and Dick Kemp, but it means immeasurably more to the people of the area. A school worthy of the wealthiest city anywhere is theirs.

Estonia's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on February 24 the thoughts of Americans will be with the brave people of Estonia because that will be the 48th anniversary of Estonia's proclamation of independence as a democratic republic.

In September of 1921 Estonia was admitted to the League of Nations. In 1939 the Soviet Union forced a mutual assistance treaty on Estonia and established Russian naval and air force bases on Estonian territory. In June of 1940 Russian troops took over and established a puppet government. Today the proud land of Estonia is a Soviet colony.

On February 24 Americans everywhere will join with millions throughout the free world in prayers for the quick delivery of the brave people of Estonia from Soviet bondage.

The Federal Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in the other body, Senators question the judgment of military policymakers in an active confrontation with North Vietnam, and they criticized the advice and direction of the State Department in defining and pursuing a national policy in regard to that conflict. They are carrying out a basic responsibility of the Senate in foreign affairs. We in the House have the fundamental power of the purse. It is well that we should carry on a dialog over the judgment of the Federal Reserve and criticize the advice and directives of the Treasury.

Foreign policy and economic policy: These two subjects now before the Congress and the people are both of awesome proportions and equally fraught with dangers for the future of our land and the position of our country in world affairs.

Personally I am not so well qualified that I would care to substitute my judgment for those who have the prime responsibility for decision. However, there should be no hesitancy to raise questions as they appear and to seek comment and explanation wherever these seem appropriate. I have before, Mr. Speaker, joined Mr. HENRY REUSS from Wisconsin in voicing concern over recent actions of the Federal Reserve. Their action on monetary policy uncoordinated with our fiscal decisions was unquestionably within their powers. But we have not only the right but also the obligation here in the House of Representatives to critically weigh the effects of their decision and question its impact on the country.

Let us state the matter clearly. The Federal Reserve determined that there was an existing trend of inflation and a growing potential in the trend that threatened our economic health. There is ample data available to give considerable merit to that analysis. The Federal Reserve further determined that the remedy for the malady they had diagnosed was a heavy dose of interest increase across the board—to discourage the volume of loans they perceived to be overheating the economy and feeding inflation. Watching the patient over these passing months, I can agree with the finding on the symptoms, but the medicine has had some dangerous side effects.

One very disturbing side effect is the following: The report of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis released February 11, 1966, reports that in the recent refunding of the Federal debt the average maturity or due date on our Federal notes are shorter than in 1965. In 1965 the average maturity was 64 months, and that lengthing had come through great effort on the part of Mr. Dillion and Mr. Rossa, and others, of the Treasury. Now we are slipping.

The latest report is that average maturity is now 60 months. The shorter the maturity of the public debt the more inflationary will be its influence. Short-term debt is more liquid and it, therefore, represents a more liquid asset in the hands of those who hold it. The more liquid people's assets are, the more likely they are to spend. If we do not now raise the long-term interest rate above the present 4.25 ceiling, we will continue to shorten the maturity rate and tend to lower long-term interest rates in relation to short-term rates. This will make plant and equipment loans more attractive and feed inflation. Here it appears interest increase will feed interest increase for some time to come.

The Fed stated they were acting to discourage business loan expansion in commercial banks. Look at what has happened. Last year in November when the Fed took the plunge, these loans were running at an annual increased rate of 21 percent. Now with over 3 months passing since the Fed's decision, business loans are increasing at a 26-percent annual rate, an increase of 5 percent. The deterrence sought did not occur; the fact, the action probably accelerated loans in fear of further increases by the Fed which is not unlikely.

We turned over $23 billion in our recent refinancing by the Treasury; 6.5 billion were on notes for just under 5 years for a "magic" 5-percent return, the balance was turned over at a maximum interest rate. This has meant almost $3 billion increase in our Federal debt service, up from 10 billion per annum to 13 billion. This outflow of Federal funds has the least dynamic effect in the economy and would not be consciously sought as a proper fiscal choice.

Let us look at where the full impact of the Fed's interest rate increase was felt. Not in the business loans as data discloses, but in the field where decreased activity was already a problem—the homebuilding and other construction fields. In California alone private single dwelling construction has decreased an alarming 40 percent from last year at this period. The traumatic effects in the mortgage market have all agencies scrambling to raise interest rates where already other deterrents were effectively dampening construction. This building field happens to be one of the most dynamic and provides maximum velocity in the economy. So a serious brake on this segment leads to grave and justified concern.

I would raise this question loud and clear, gentlemen. Is the Federal Reserve really up to date on the patient? They may be quite correct about symptoms but the old medicine does not have the right reaction on the patient. Is it fair to point out that the age of change has demonstrated not only that all things are changing, but that they are changing at an increasingly rapid rate. Does the Federal Reserve appreciate that the commercial banks are not only drastically different than they were as institutions 15 years ago, they are also dramatically different than they were 5 years ago.

Is there any doubt that the various facets of our economy respond with a different timing and a different degree of reaction than was the case when our national economy was simpler and dominated by fewer leading segments.

It is time to go back to anatomy, gentlemen, of the Fed. Your medicine kit is out of date and may be downright dangerous. We do not need nostrums like the old patent medicines that cured everything from chilblains to hoof and mouth disease. We need remedies more selective in their amelioration and more effective in meeting the new diseases from which old symptoms seem to flow.

The intermix of fiscal and monetary policy also seems highly desirable. The Treasury must put on a bolder front not only in seeking the cooperation of the Federal Reserve, but equally and perhaps even more painful, it should counsel the Congress on selective tax increases. Can we expect to meet the competing and expanding demands of the war abroad and the efforts at home without restraints? The answer seems clearly negative. But I am confident that we do not need to handcuff the desirable goals of balanced growth, if mature and enlightened judgment is made as to what segments of the economy assume the burdens and suffer the restraints.

Up to now the Federal Reserve, in my judgment, has merely assured the existence of the condition they were so sure they could see coming—inflation. In addition, they have placed on segments of our economy burdens that the conditions of the times simply do not warrant. Will the gentlemen of the Federal Reserve Board please indicate to those of us in Congress if the reactions in the commercial banks were in tune with their expectations? How long has it been since the Federal Reserve has made a profile of the working institution designated as a commercial bank in 1966?

What studies does the Federal Reserve Board have relative to the velocity of various segments of our economy and the degree of response in each to interest rate change?

Why should the Fed's monetary policy operate without consideration for and cooperation with the administration's fiscal policy?

Mr. Speaker, most of the heat has been taken off the Federal Reserve because the inflation they warned about is more evident now than when they acted. What I should like to know is the following:

First. Are we sure that in its action the Federal Reserve did not, in fact, make a contribution to some of the present inflation?

Second. Can we believe that of all modern institutions the Federal Reserve is the only one unchallenged by change? Alone not required the painful adjustment to complexity; sharpening its tools and diversifying its arsenal of weapons to cope with the complexities of our economic life.

Third. Without demonstration can we be sure that the model of the banking community used in Washington is an accurate reflection of what exists in the dynamic changing environment throughout the country?

Fourth. Are we getting the full benefit of balanced choice in all the alternatives that operate to spur output in times and places of lag and to deter inflation at the time and in the places where "overheating" is a fact?

Let us keep asking questions so long as the truth appears elusive. In our time dogma is deadly and doubt must be a constant companion.

Ashburnham Bicentennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, February 22 has a special significance for the town of Ashburnham, Mass., in my district. Not only does the day mark the birthday of George Washington—a day when the people of this great Nation pay homage to the memory of the man who most fully personifies our most cherished traditions of strength, wisdom, and independence—but it also marks the day of the founding of this thriving community, which I have the honor and privilege of representing in this House.

And with the coming of February 22 this year, there will have come to an end in Ashburnham a year that will long be remembered by the town as the year of celebration marking the 200th anniversary of this proud, outstanding community.

It is a year ago this month, Mr. Speaker, that the Ashburnham Historical Society opened Ashburnham's yearlong bicentennial with a silver tea in the Ashburnham Community Church with members and guests dressed in colonial costumes. Later on in April, the gala bicentennial ball was held in the Oakmont Regional School cafeteria. The highlight of the anniversary celebration came in October with a huge parade, one of the finest ever held in northern Worcester County, which attracted over 30,000 people and several thousand marchers.

There were more than 100 units from Massachusetts and New Hampshire which thrilled the crowds along the 3-mile parade route through the center of the town. It was particularly pleasing for me to arrange for the participation of Federal units in the parade at the request of my friend, W. Irving Taylor, chairman of the bicentennial parade committee, and I am happy to report to my colleagues in the House that the various branches of the service were well represented in the parade.

With the opening of Ashburnham's bicentennial, I was happy and proud to send a special message of greeting to the Ashburnham community and under unanimous consent the text of my letter will be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1965.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN,
Ashburnham, Mass.

MY DEAR FRIENDS: I have been informed that you will celebrate the 200th anniverary of the incorporation of Ashburnham on February 22, and I am very proud and pleased indeed, to send you and the loyal patriotic people of your outstanding community, my heartiest congratulations upon this great event and all best wishes for the future.

Your great town of Ashburnham is rich in history, strong in patriotism and loyalty to the Nation, vigorous in its progress and advancement. For the magnificent contributions of your people throughout the years since the early origins of our Government, I express my deep gratitude; for your magnificent achievements, my unbounded admiration; for your inspiring loyalty to the Nation, my pride and appreciation for your noble, forward-looking public spirit and your high purpose for the future, my prayers, my pledge of wholehearted cooperation, and my complete confidence in your ability to reach your high goals.

This day will go down in the history of our State and our country. It is another proud marker of your progress, your vitality, and your determination to go forward.

Warm regards and best wishes to all.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

In these troubled times, Mr. Speaker, it is well to recall, as we pay homage to the memory of George Washington, that the early settlers of Ashburnham were of the same intrepid breed of pioneers which helped to build this great land. Like George Washington, they chose liberty as their standard and rejected tyranny at all costs.

It was on February 22, 1765—that same year that George Washington was supporting Patrick Henry's revolutionary Stamp Act in the Virginia House of Burgesses—that the little settlement of Dorchester Canada in the rocky wilderness came into existence as the incorporated town of Ashburnham.

Located in the easternmost part of Worcester County on the New Hampshire line, Ashburnham was established from seven early land grants, notably the Dorchester Canada or Township grant of 1735, which was divided among the descendant's of the stalwart men who fought in the Canadian expedition of 1690.

The names of Starr, Converse, and Rolfe also figure prominently among these early grants which were given by a grateful Massachusetts Bay Colony in recognition of the gallantry and great contributions of these families in the building of a new land.

It was in 1650 that young Dr. Thomas Starr gave his life in a struggle with the fearsome Pequot Indians, leaving behind a young wife and eight small children. It is the later descendants of this family who benefited from Dr. Starr's heroism when they were given 400 acres of land in his memory.

A similar grant is named after Maj. James Converse whose heirs benefited from his distinguished service to the colony. The son and two daughters of the Reverend Benjamin Rolfe were given 600 acres after escaping an Indian raid in 1708, in which the parents and another sister lost their lives.

It is from these heroic deeds and sacrifices of the pioneer settlers that Ashburnham got its start, and it is from the spiritual strength, resourcefulness and determination of these early forebears that our Nation got its strength and purpose to become the great country it is today—truly a giant among the nations of the world, the most powerful, richest, and most advanced with the highest standards of living the world has ever known.

Among the great names still echoing from that rugged and glorious period of growth and progress in golden history of Ashburnham is that of Cushing, which is with us today in the living memorial of Cushing Academy, named after the Reverend Thomas Cushing, and one of the great secondary schools of the Nation.

It was my great privilege to participate last year in the 100th anniversary celebration of Cushing Academy, which is today, more than ever, a model of academic excellence.

The Reverend Thomas Cushing was the first minister for the Ashburnham settlement. On the occasion of his half-century sermon, delivered on November 3, 1818, he reflected on past events in the history of the town, describing the perilous days when "soldiers were stationed in these parts to range the wilderness and protect the scattered inhabitants which numbered under 50."

After recounting the births, deaths, illnesses, and marriages which took place during his years of ministry, he concluded with this description of the Revolutionary War, which is particularly noteworthy at this time of homage to the memory of George Washington:

> The opposition to the acts of the British Parliament, the war that ensued, * * * cannot be fully conceived of by the present generation. It cost the States immense blood and treasure.
>
> What people have been more highly favoured? God raised up Washington to lead our armies to victory and independence; and when the new Constitution was established, he was, by a unanimous vote of the people, placed twice at the head of the Government, where he shone with as distinguished lustre as at the head of our armies. What is the man in all history to be set in competition with him?

If Washington could have visited Ashburnham any time last year he would not have been surprised by the looks of some residents of the town because the bicentennial celebration prompted many to wear the wigs and garments of colonial America. Even the parades would have seemed familiar to him, featuring as they did, oxen, horse-drawn carriages and wagons, various fife and drum corps, and bagpipe units. He certainly would have been impressed with the October 10 fireworks display, one of the largest ever presented in the area, and the cannon firing, and the "Gentlemen of the Brush" would not have surprised him.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that on the whole George Washington would have been well pleased with the birthday year of Ashburnham and all the wonderful events which went into making it the great memorable celebration that it was—the Boy and Girl Scout participation, the helicopters and antique automobiles, the lovely and gracious bicentennial queen, the time capsule with its ballpoint pen and modern razor among its contents, the parties and balls.

I think also that George Washington would have been convinced that Ashburnham has not stood still, but has kept pace with the times and the demands of the age in which we live. He would draw inspiration, as we all can, from the great and glorious history of our past, as reflected all over America by the growth and prosperity of hundreds upon hundreds of thriving communities like Ashburnham.

Let us all be thankful, with hearts overflowing with everlasting gratitude, for the blessings of the Creator and the epochal work and achievements of those who have preceded us and whose blessed memory we honor on days of remembrance.

Let me again express the hope and the prayer that the next 200 years will bring to Ashburnham and all its loyal people that greatness in the spirit and the ways of independence, liberty, and peace which will insure prosperity and happiness, not only in the material sense, but in the spiritual graces that have always been so much a part of this splendid American community.

"John F. Kennedy on Education"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the impending publication of a new volume entitled "John F. Kennedy on Education" compiled and edited by William T. O'Hara, now assistant dean of the University of Connecticut School of Law. The volume bears a preface written by my dear friend and distinguished colleague JOHN BRADEMAS. I commend it to you as an introduction to Mr. O'Hara's fine volume:

"JOHN F. KENNEDY ON EDUCATION"

(A preface by Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana)

"Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress," President John F. Kennedy told Congress as he began his special message on education of January 29, 1963. Kennedy went on to present the most sweeping program for Federal help to education ever advocated by an American President.

Yet, as Arthur Schlesinger has recently reminded us, "Little disappointed the Kennedys more in domestic policy that their failure to make significant progress in Federal aid to education." ("A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House," Houghton Niffiin Co., Boston, 1965, p. 662.)

Schlesinger's judgment, while accurate, must be tempered. For less than 3 years after Kennedy's 1963 message, nearly every education measure which he had then pressed Congress to enact had become law.

President Johnson's leadership, substantial margins in Congress committed to education and widespread public support—all these factors helped produce the extraordinary record of education legislation of 1963–65; the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Acts of 1963 and 1965, the Health Professions-Educational Assistance Act and major amendments to the Vocational Education and National Defense Education Acts, to cite only a few of the principal measures.

William O'Hara's book, "John F. Kennedy on Education," is a valuable documentation of the contribution of President Kennedy's leadership to the remarkable educational achievements of the 88th and 89th Congresses.

For despite the tragedy of the assassination and despite the hurdles which frustrated the passage of education bills during the 3 years of his Presidency, Kennedy, by his vigorous advocacy of increased Federal support of education, helped make possible the later achievements.

By providing excerpts from Kennedy's public statements on education during his years as a Representative and Senator as well as during the 1960 campaign and the presidential period, Mr. O'Hara has illumined a significant aspect of Kennedy's entire political career. These speeches and articles reveal Kennedy's continuing interest in education, in the broadest sense of the word. They reflect his profound concern with the quality of American life, his respect for intelligence and ideas, his rapport with the academic community, and his preoccupation with the problems of young people.

Again and again Kennedy speaks of improving the dialog between the politician and the scholar, of the responsibility of the young to prepare for leadership in a democracy, of the value of education not only as a national resource in the cold war but as essential in enhancing the quality of the life of the individual.

Mr. O'Hara, now assistant dean of the University of Connecticut Law School, was, as counsel to the special subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee from 1962 (April) to 1963 (November), a direct participant in work on most of the education bills Congress considered during President Kennedy's administration and is therefore well qualified to undertake this highly useful compilation.

Kennedy's interest in education as a public issue grew and matured over the years—from the Congressman's proposal to improve selection procedures for service academy appointments to the Senator's opposition to the loyalty oath requirement in the National Defense Education Act to the President's plea to Congress for Federal aid to education over a broad spectrum. As a member of the two congressional committees with primary jurisdiction over education bills, the House Committee on Education and Labor and the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Kennedy was exceptionally well schooled in the politics of education by the time he came to the Presidency. As a legislator, he saw firsthand the major obstacles confronting advocates of education bills: the issues of civil rights, aid to church-related schools and Federal control.

All these issues are, in one way or other, still with us but all have, in at least one respect, been overcome: Congress is passing major education bills and the role of the Federal Government in support of American education has grown substantially in the last few years. Indeed, during my four terms in Congress, especially as a member of Congressman Kennedy's old committee, Education and Labor (and presently holder of his old seat as second-ranking member of the subcommittee which handles elementary and secondary school bills), I have myself witnessed this significant change.

Congress and the American people have been taking seriously President Kennedy's observation in his first message to Congress on education, on February 20, 1961. "The human mind is our fundamental resource." President Johnson has long shared this conviction and the Nation is now investing more in this most valuable of all our resources. Mr. O'Hara's book traces the Kennedy commitment to that investment.

The book moves from the congressional years to the 1960 campaign and the presidential years and concludes with a section on that most successful of all John F. Kennedy's appeals to American youth, the Peace Corps.

The appendices will be useful to students of Kennedy's domestic policies. They list education bills he introduced while in Congress and those enacted into law during his administration.

Voting Record of Congressman Wayne L. Hays on Major Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my voting record on major bills to come before the House of Representatives during the 89th Congress to date. I have done this since I have been in Congress and mailed out copies so that my constituents could have a convenient method of checking my record. As voters in the 18th Congressional District they have the right to know how their Congressman represented them in Washington and how I voted on the major issues. The record follows:

How I voted	Issue	Status
Yes	Appalachian Regional Development Act authorizes aid to revive economy of Appalachian region.	Enacted.
Yes	Public Works and Economic Development Act authorizes loans and grants in economically depressed areas.	Enacted.
Yes	Extension of Manpower Development and Training Act for 3 years	Enacted.
Yes	Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 authorizes $1,300,000,000 to improve elementary and secondary education.	Enacted.
Yes	Higher Education Act of 1965 authorizing grants for college students with exceptional financial need, fellowships for teachers, and a National Teachers Corps.	Enacted.
Yes	Reduction of excise taxes	Enacted.
Yes	Social Security Act amendments to authorize medicare and 7 percent increase in social security benefits.	Enacted.
Yes	Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 extending public housing, urban renewal, and community facilities laws and authorizing grants to communities for water and sewer facilities.	Enacted.
Yes	Establish a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development.	Enacted.
Yes	Voting Rights Act of 1965 to enforce the 15th amendment	Enacted.
Yes	Abolish national origins quota system in immigration	Enacted.
Yes	Authorize $1,800,000,000 for fiscal 1966 for antipoverty program under Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.	Enacted.
Yes	Federal Water Pollution Control Act to strengthen control over water pollution and increase aid for community sewage projects.	Enacted.
Yes	Establish a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities	Enacted.
Yes	Provide average 10.4 basic pay increase for uniformed military personnel.	Enacted.
Yes	Provide 3.6 pay increase for classified, postal, and other Federal employees.	Enacted.
Yes	Increase veterans' disability compensation	Enacted.
Yes	Foreign aid bill providing economic and military assistance	Enacted.
No	Resolution proposing constitutional amendment for Presidential continuity.	Adopted.
Yes	Establish effective controls for depressant and stimulant drugs	Enacted.
Yes	Cold war GI bill	Approved by Congress.
No	Asian Development Bank Act	Passed House.

Hon. Basil L. Whitener Addresses Statesville, N.C., Veterans Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, Congressman BASIL L. WHITENER strongly supported the position of the United States in a speech made before a veterans group at Statesville, N.C., on February 18, 1966.

My distinguished colleague from North Carolina said that the greatest problem confronting our Nation at the present time is the Vietnamese war.

I feel that my colleagues will find his fine speech to be most interesting and informative, and I request that it be inserted in the RECORD.

ADDRESS BY HON. BASIL L. WHITENER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM NORTH CAROLINA, AT ANNUAL BARBECUED RABBIT AND CHARITY BALL, HARMONY SCHOOL, STATESVILLE, N.C., FEBRUARY 18, 1966

It is a pleasure for me to be with you this evening on this unique occasion. I am happy to be here in Iredell County and to have the opportunity to visit with so many of my friends with whom I have been associated in various capacities and have had the pleasure to know personally down through the years.

My friends, there are a number of things I could discuss with you in the brief time I have been allotted this evening. I think I know, however, what is uppermost in your minds at the present time. As mature and responsible citizens, I know that you share my view that the greatest problem confronting our Nation at the present time is the war in which we are engaged in southeast Asia.

The erosion of constitutional liberty in the United States, the increase in our national debt with resulting inflationary pressures, the problems that we have with respect to crime and juvenile delinquency, and the great effort we are making to improve the standard of living for every segment of our population all recede into the background whenever we consider the full impact and significance of the commitment we have made to keep the light of freedom from going out in southeast Asia.

During the past several weeks I have referred to the Vietnamese war in a number of speeches I have made in North Carolina. I plan to speak to the Midwinter Conference of the Veterans of Foreign Wars tomorrow night in Charlotte. In the course of my remarks I will discuss the Vietnamese war. I feel it is imperative that our people come to know why we are in Vietnam and by so doing muster that moral and material support which our Government must have if we are to halt the spread of communism.

It is necessary for us to understand our involvement in southeast Asia. It is necessary for us to realize that the battle in Vietnam is another incident in the struggle which has been going on for the past two decades to prevent the entire free world coming under the Communist yoke.

We are familiar with our successful economic and military efforts to contain Russian communism in Europe, Africa, and the Middle East. The Marshall and Truman plans saved the Western European nations and Greece and Turkey from communism.

Our military forces in West Germany and our commitment through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has held the Russian military machine at bay in Europe and the Middle East. Our stand in Berlin, our intervention in Lebanon, and our refusal to be intimidated diplomatically and militarily at other strategic points in Europe have given Europeans the opportunity to reach the highest standard of living in their history.

On the other side of the world communism has been just as virulent, insidious, and cancerous. When the history of the 20th century is written, the fall of China to communism will be listed as one of the, if not the, greatest catastrophe for the free world.

The late Gen. Joseph Stilwell said that two American divisions in 1946 could have prevented the yoke of communism from being placed over the necks of over 700 million Chinese. The magnitude of the Communist take-over in China staggers the imagination.

Communist China poses not only a threat to the liberation of southeast Asians, but to Japan, the Philippines, and Australia. The 226 million Russians have cause to view with great alarm the threats to world peace emanating from Peiping.

My friends, there would be no problem in South Vietnam today were it not for the fanatical support that the Chinese Communists are giving to North Vietnam. The President said on February 17, 1965, that "Our purpose in Vietnam is to join in the defense and protection of freedom of a brave people who are under attack that is controlled and that is directed from outside their country."

For the past 10 years North Vietnam, with Chinese help, has been trying to subjugate South Vietnam. Few people realize the terrorism, sabotage, assassination, and kidnaping to which the South Vietnamese people have been subjected during the last decade. Only in 1961 did the South Vietnamese call upon the United States to furnish greater military assistance. As late as January 1, 1965, total U.S. forces committed to South Vietnam amounted to only 23,000 persons.

During 1965, however, American determination to bring the Communists in Vietnam to the conference table by diplomatic means or to bring about a military decision has caused a buildup in our forces to approximately 181,000 at the end of 1965. At the present time over 200,000 American troops are in Vietnam, and the number is rapidly increasing. Our forces have joined the 679,000 South Vietnamese citizens under arms.

The war in Vietnam is unlike any other struggle in which our Nation has been engaged. Our troops are fighting in the most difficult terrain in the world and under climatic and environmental conditions without parallel in our history.

A look at the magnitude of our military operations during 1965 should dispel any doubt that our enemies might have as to our intentions in South Vietnam. The Communist forces lost over 34,000 men killed in Vietnam in 1965. The United States and Vietnamese air forces flew 12,000 strike sorties into North Vietnam and over 60,000 within South Vietnam. The U.S. Navy and Marine Corps flew more than 6,600 sorties into North Vietnam. Over 39,000 sorties were flown in South Vietnam.

In the third quarter of 1965 alone more than 500 highway bridges were destroyed. The U.S. Air Force carried over 265,000 tons of cargo into South Vietnam and more than 660,000 passengers. In addition to our purely military operation in South Vietnam, the United States distributed to the South Vietnamese people over 106,000 tons of foodstuffs.

We built over 2,400 military and civilian type buildings in South Vietnam. Imports by ships into the country rose more than 800 percent during 1965. More than 20,000 American civilians were employed in the country at the close of the war.

The tragic part of our effort to destroy Communist aggression in Vietnam has been the casualties we have suffered. Over 1,300 American troops lost their lives, and many thousands were wounded in 1965. In our operations we lost more than 240 aircraft.

Unless there is a dramatic change in the attitude of the Communists, however, we can expect a drastic increase in our commitment of men and material to South Vietnam during 1966. We must be prepared to face the grim fact of additional casualties.

In our past wars we have had the support of our major allies. In South Vietnam, instead of enjoying the support of our allies, we are suffering by reason of their trade with North Vietnam and China and their constant criticism of our efforts to preserve freedom in southeast Asia. It is ironic that those nations we have helped the most to preserve their freedom in Europe from military and economic aggression are the countries which are interfering with our military and diplomatic efforts in Vietnam.

I admire many of the fine qualities inherent in the character of our oldest ally, the Republic of France. I cannot admire, however, the French attitude toward Vietnam, or for that matter, France's attitude toward American efforts to maintain a free Europe.

France lost the war against communism in Indochina. Instead of supporting the United States in the valiant effort our country is making to undo some of the damage of the French debacle, France openly advocates our withdrawal from her former colonial empire.

Our Government is greatly disturbed over the extent of trade on the part of the free world with Communist China and North Vietnam. I am greatly concerned over the matter. I feel that it is a grave problem which calls for stern measures on the part of our Government.

I know you will find it hard to understand why free world nations in 1964 sold to Communist China and North Vietnam $989.4 million worth of material while at the same time buying from these nations $1,204.4 million. Much of the material sold to Communist China finds its way into North Vietnam and down the Ho Chi Minh trail into South Vietnam.

It is a bitter, but tragic, fact that American boys are dying in Vietnam as the result of material brought into Communist ports in China and North Vietnam by ships flying the flags of our allies.

I feel that the United States should remind our allies that the prosperity they are enjoying and the peace they are experiencing is due to a great extent to the presence of American dollars in their economies and American soldiers on the ramparts of freedom in Europe. I do not believe that we should be expected to support and defend governments which embarrass and harass us diplomatically and which trade with the common enemy of all mankind.

President Eisenhower stated that the nations of southeast Asia are like so many dominoes. If one nation falls before communism, the other nations, in turn, will topple. It is for that reason, therefore, that our efforts in Vietnam must not be permitted to fail.

Many of our people have vigorously opposed our policy in southeast Asia. That is their right and privilege as American citizens. It would be wise for all of us, however, to seriously weigh any statement we might make or any action we might take which could give aid and comfort to our enemies.

In exercising our freedom of speech and press, those great freedoms guaranteed to us in the Constitution, we should be sure that we are not strengthening the hand of the tyrant whose objective is the destruction of our Constitution.

The United States has made a sincere effort to resolve the Vietnamese war through diplomatic means at the conference table. Our efforts to negotiate the war, and our offers of vigorous economic assistance to both friend and enemy alike, have been scornfully rejected by the North Vietnamese and with hysterical invective by the Chinese Communists.

We must continue to keep all avenues of a negotiated settlement open while pressing for a military solution. A withdrawal from Vietnam under existing circumstances in that country would be equivalent to the defeat of the United States. Such a defeat would spark a renewed effort on the part of the Communists in every part of the world. Abandonment of our commitment to stand by South Vietnam would be disastrous to American prestige throughout the world.

My friends, I am aware of the concern felt by the American people over the war we did not seek in southeast Asia. As a veteran of the Second World War with over 3 years of combat service, and as the father of a son of military age, I know something of the anguish, the worry, and the apprehension that is felt by the fathers and mothers throughout the land.

As the richest and most powerful nation in the world destiny has given us the task of preserving freedom. In our support of free institutions throughout the world we must not overlook the preservation of constitutional government and the health of our economy at home.

A bankrupt America which has forsaken its constitutional heritage cannot long hold back the tide of communism. While vigorously making every effort to hold atheistic communism in check we should reaffirm our devotion and dedication to the great constitutional principles which have led us to our place of world leadership.

Hon. Basil L. Whitener Addresses Midwinter Conference, Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from North Carolina, Hon. BASIL L. WHITENER, made a splendid speech on February 19, 1966, before the midwinter conference of the Veterans of Foreign Wars at Charlotte, N.C.

In his speech he strongly supported the position of the President in the effort that our Nation is making to halt the spread of communism in southeast Asia.

I was greatly impressed with the remarks made by my fellow North Carolinian, and I request that the speech be inserted in the RECORD.

ADDRESS BY HON. BASIL L. WHITENER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM NORTH CAROLINA, BEFORE MIDWINTER CONFERENCE, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, CHARLOTTE, N.C., FEBRUARY 19, 1966

I am deeply grateful for the opportunity to be with you this evening and to have a part on your fine program. I am very proud of my membership in the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is more than a patriotic organization. It is not just another organization of Americans who have worn the uniform in time of war. Ours is an organization of patriotic Americans dedicated to the very highest ideals and principles of patriotism and citizenship and devoted to constitutional principles of government.

This great organization is one of the oldest veterans groups in the Nation. Its history can be said to date from October 11, 1899, when a charter was granted to a group of Spanish-American War veterans by the State of Ohio under the name of American Veterans of Foreign Service. In 1913 the Colorado Society of the Army of the Philippines and an organization at Altoona, Pa., under the name of Veterans of Foreign Service joined with the American Veterans of Foreign Service to form our present Veterans of Foreign Wars. The stage was set, therefore, for a new and powerful patriotic force to be exerted in the future economic, social, and military life of the Nation.

The requirement that members of the VFW must have served in a foreign war, insurrection, or expedition has set the VFW aside as a unique organization. The official objectives of the VFW, as prescribed by Congress in the VFW constitution, are restatements of fundamental principles of Americanism.

VFW objectives are "fraternal, patriotic, and educational; to preserve and strengthen comradeship among its members; to assist worthy comrades; to perpetuate the memory and history of our dead and to assist their widows and orphans; to maintain true allegiance to the Government of the United States of America and fidelity to its Constitution and laws; to foster true patriotism; to maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom; and to preserve and defend the United States from all her enemies whomsoever."

My friends, these VFW objectives enunciated more than half a century ago are the bedrock upon which this great veterans organization flourishes. It is these objectives which have brought the American people to look upon the VFW with respect and admiration.

I am familiar with the wonderful work of the VFW. I have observed the assistance that VFW contact representatives have given veterans, regardless of whether they are VFW members, in connection with cases they have had pending with the Board of Veterans Appeals and the various discharge review and correction boards in the Pentagon.

The administration of veterans benefits is one of the most vital functions of the Federal Government. Although the Veterans' Administration is an independent agency without an official in the President's Cabinet, it has more employees than all the executive departments with the exception of two. With a budget averaging $5.9 billion annually the Veterans' Administration spends more money than all the executive departments with the exception of three.

The American people stand behind their Government's effort to provide for our veterans and their dependents. This tremendous effort utilizes 4 percent of all the doctors in the United States. Thousands of nurses, physiotherapists, occupational therapists, and clinical and counseling psychologists are employed in the service of our veterans.

Twenty-two million Americans living today have worn the uniform of their country. With their families they comprise 44 percent of our entire population. The Veterans of Foreign Wars in administering to the needs of this great veteran population is performing an essential service with a dynamic impact on the future of our Nation.

Since the time of formation of the VFW our Nation has been involved in a continuous struggle to preserve American freedom at home and to uphold the dignity of man and Christian civilization throughout the world. In this noble pursuit our country has been forced to fight despotic tyranny unleashed in Europe by imperial Germany during World War I, the pagan forces of nazism in World War II, and Communist aggression in Korea in 1950.

This organization supported the policies of our Nation in each of these struggles. In addition to the major wars, our country has been called upon to take part in numerous other campaigns and expeditions in the last half century. Each of these military actions has had the support of the VFW.

During the past 50 years the VFW has truly fulfilled its official objectives. It has fostered true patriotism and has fought to maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom. And, above all, the VFW has steadfastly maintained its fidelity to the Constitution of the United States.

We meet tonight at a very critical period in the history of our Nation. We assemble at a time when our country is again engaged in a historic effort to destroy a threat to the liberties of free people at home and abroad.

As members of an organization dedicated to the security of our Nation and its institutions, we have more than an average interest in the events taking place today at home and abroad in our struggle with communism.

American participation in the Vietnam war is the greatest single event occupying the attention of the American people today.

The war in Vietnam is not an isolated instance of Communist aggression. It is an important phase of a Communist conspiracy to enslave the world, which had its origin in the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia.

The principles of democratic government and the liberties of free people have been the target of atheistic communism for the last half century. With the emergence of Russia after World War II as a great military and economic power, the tentacles of communism were rapidly extended throughout the world.

On more than one occasion during the past 20 years the United States has come face to face with communism, and we have stood firmly against all threats, militarily and politically. We can be proud of our record in opposition to communism. Communism does not respect the institutions of government and political principles of the free world.

Communism has a healthy respect only for military force. Our overwhelming military strength and the support of our people in the cause of freedom and justice have enabled the United States to prevent Communist enslavement in Europe, in Asia, and in Africa.

While our national leaders could see the Communist menace in other parts of the world, they failed to see it at our very doorstep in Cuba. Cuba went to the Communist side because of an unrealistic and misguided American foreign policy. Our leaders are determined, however, not to make the same mistake in Santo Domingo and the other nations of Latin and South America.

The struggle in Vietnam is a cruel and little understood war. Many of our people ask the question: Why are we in Vietnam?

I shall attempt to answer that question. We are in South Vietnam because the Communist effort to subjugate that country is another step along the road to Communist domination of southeast Asia.

We are in Vietnam to halt the spread of communism and to prevent the ultimate subjugation of Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, the Philippines, India, and Pakistan. The history of South Vietnam is a tragic example of the fate that befalls a country when a great power abandons a colonial empire and leaves a political vacuum. When the French pulled out of their former colonial possession of Indochina after suffering an ignoble defeat, the road lay open for the entire subjugation of that strategic part of the world by the Communists.

While negotiating an end to the Indochina war at Geneva in 1954, the Communists were making plans to take over all former French territory in southeast Asia. When pursuant to the Geneva agreement Vietnam was partitioned, North Vietnam immediately began to send guerrillas into South Vietnam. Arms and ammunition were stored in South Vietnam for future use. Many of the tunnels and other fortifications we have heard so much about recently were constructed during this period.

North Vietnam felt that South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia could be subjugated by infiltration, sabotage, and the aggravation of the war-torn conditions in that troubled area. South Vietnam resisted, however, and the story of that little nation's heroic effort unfortunately has been overlooked. The South Vietnamese were determined to have a peaceful and independent future, free of Communist domination.

Although harassed by North Vietnam with military attacks and terrorism, South Vietnam actually had, by 1960, exceeded prewar levels of food production and per capita income. Stepped-up Communist terrorism, sabotage, assassination, and kidnaping of civilians forced South Vietnam, however, to ask the United States in 1961 for increased military assistance.

This assistance has greatly increased during the past year. If anyone doubts the determination of the United States to halt communism in South Vietnam, he should examine our record in Vietnam for 1965. At the beginning of 1965 U.S. military strength in Vietnam was 23,000 men. At the end of 1965 approximately 190,000 Americans were in the country. At the present time we have over 200,000 troops in South Vietnam, and we can expect more military forces to be sent during the coming months.

While meeting Communist force with force in Vietnam, the United States has shown a sincere desire to settle the Vietnamese war by negotiation at the conference table. By indicating our willingness to negotiate, however, we have made it plain to the Communists that we are not going to surrender as some in our Nation apparently would have us do under the misguided view that it is possible to negotiate on an honorable basis with the Communists.

We have in the past several months demonstrated to the world that we will accept an honorable diplomatic solution to the Vietnamese war. Our efforts have been met with scorn on the part of North Vietnam. Communist China has gone to every length to vilify and attack the United States.

With China at her back North Vietnam has not indicated a willingness to negotiate. Instead, North Vietnam has increased military activity on all fronts. Our current military buildup in South Vietnam, therefore, is to meet this military challenge.

The United States has not had the support it deserves from the free nations of the world in the Vietnamese war. Countries that the United States has helped to preserve their independence economically and militarily during the past 20 years have openly criticized our efforts to preserve freedom in South Vietnam.

Several of these governments today stand protected behind the shield of American military might in Europe. Our resources and military power have enabled these nations to have the highest standard of living in their history. While urging the United States to abandon its commitment to help South Vietnam, they utterly fail to realize that if the United States were to abandon its commitment to preserve freedom in Europe they would fall victims to communism within a very short time.

Our Government has been disturbed over the attitude of many of these countries. I am concerned over not only their political policies which hamper our efforts to win the Vietnamese war, but I am gravely concerned over the persistent foreign trade between these countries and North Vietnam, and particularly with Communist China. It is no secret that much of the material reaching Communist China from the free world finds its ways into North Vietnam.

My friends, total free world trade to Communist China and North Vietnam in 1964 amounted to $989.4 million. At the same time the free world imported from Communist China and North Vietnam $1,204.4 million. This enormous trade between free world countries and Communist China and North Vietnam is enabling the Communist machine to destroy the liberties of free people in southeast Asia.

The ports of North Vietnam and Red China are clogged with ships flying the flags of England, France, the Scandinavian countries, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, Austria, and even our Latin American neighbors. I believe it is imperative that our Nation adopt a stern and realistic policy with our allies in the matter of trade with Communist China and North Vietnam.

We should make it plain to these nations that they cannot expect to enjoy our military protection and our foreign aid dollars while engaging in trade that results in death of our young men in southeast Asia and destruction of the liberties of free people.

There are those in our Nation who cringe from a possible confrontation with Red China. The United States has never deliberately attacked any nation. If war with Red China comes, it will come through direct intervention of that country in the Vietnamese war. In the event of such an occurrence the United States should not spare any of its material and military resources to destroy Chinese aggression.

It was my privilege last fall to visit Formosa and to talk with the great Chinese Nationalist leader, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. I also visited Thailand, Japan, the Philippines, and Hong Kong. I had a firsthand look at the vast and complex military and economic problems with which we are confronted in southeast Asia.

We have an awesome responsibility, and the task that lies ahead of us will demand great sacrifices on the part of our people. The President and our Government deserve the support of the American people in our effort in southeast Asia.

In our exercise of the right of freedom of the press, of the news media, of the pulpit, and of our educational institutions we should be very careful to avoid doing those things which will give aid and comfort to our enemies and prolong a conflict that will bring about the tragic loss of life.

As one who spent over 3 years in combat during World War II, and as the father of a son of military age, I know something of the anguish, apprehension, and worry that exists in the minds of the American people today.

Our country has not asked for the responsibilities and obligations which weigh so heavily upon us in the struggle for the preservation of Christian civilization. As the most powerful and most enlightened nation on earth the responsibilities and obligations have been thrust upon us. We must fulfill the demands that this period in history has placed upon us. If we fail, our prosperity will become the slaves of communism.

My friends, I want to say in conclusion that I am proud of the record that the Veterans of Foreign Wars has made in the cause of national security and the furtherance of our democratic institutions. It is a comforting thought to know that the VFW is growing year by year in membership.

While ever watchful over the welfare of our veterans, the VFW has strongly supported the broader aspects of our national life. As long as the Veterans of Foreign Wars and other great patriotic organizations founded on similar principles exists, the United States will continue to hold high the torch of liberty.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. J. William Hough, minister, Fredericksburg Methodist Church, Fredericksburg, Va., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee for the wisdom and the courage of George Washington, whose birthday we celebrate today. Here, in this Chamber where the Senators of the Nation which he led in its infancy, meet to debate and to make decisions affecting the lives of millions of Thy children, we pray that they may be responsive to Thee, who art the source of this Nation's goodness and greatness.

We confess, our Father, that though we imprint our currency with the words, "In God We Trust," we have often been more prone to place our confidence in our judgment than in Thine and to rely more on physical might than spiritual strength. For this strong tendency to develop our military muscles rather than our spiritual fiber, forgive us.

In this day when this Nation is faced with decisions which involve the fate of mankind, we pray that every Member of the U.S. Senate and every official of our Government, from the President to the latest recruit in the Armed Forces or the last clerk employed, will truly seek to know Thy will, who art the ultimate authority. Our limited understanding of Thy purposes convinces us that every person on this earth is precious in Thy sight and that we are all members of Thy universal family. We earnestly pray that Thou wilt motivate us to negotiate our differences rather than to seek to kill those who differ with us.

On this day, then, when the normal business of Government is largely suspended in honor of George Washington, to whom as to a father the early leaders of these United States turned to set the course for the ship of state, grant that all in positions of authority and all who work behind the scenes to assist them, may look to Thee, the Father of us all, for the course Thou wouldst have us set as we sail through the troubled waters of the present into the uncertain latitudes of the future. And, having been given the course by Thee, help us to maintain Thy course rather than change the orders according to our limited vision.

All this we pray in the spirit of the one who prayed: *Not My will, but Thine be done,* even Jesus of Nazareth. Amen.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of January 24, 1901, Washington's Farewell Address will be read by the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], heretofore designated for that purpose by the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. METCALF advanced to the desk and read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the People of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed toward the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism, the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free Constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefitting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated, and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyments of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding of them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealously, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defense posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, pursuant to the order entered yesterday, Monday, February 21, 1966, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 23, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEBRUARY 22, 1966.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Frank A. Tobey, pastor, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any nation.—Proverbs 14: 34.

Almighty and Eternal God our Heavenly Father, we, Thy humble servants, do give Thee grateful thanks for this great land of liberty—founded upon righteousness and favored from its beginning by Thy wisdom and power.

As we celebrate today, the birth of George Washington, the Father and first President of this great Nation, keep us mindful of our unique heritage and of the loyalty, devotion, and sacrifice of our forebears.

So fasten our fortunes to Thy purpose and so fire our minds with a vision of Thy righteousness that our works may be just, that our children and the children of all nations, for generations to come, shall rise up and call us blessed.

Through Him who is the Lord of all life, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5831. An act to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass and cement windows for Our Lady of the Angels Seminary of Glenmont, N.Y.;

H.R. 10185. An act amending certain estate tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939;

H.R. 10625. An act relating to the tax treatment of certain amounts paid to certain members and former members of the uniformed services and to their survivors;

H.R. 11006. An act to extend the statutory burial allowance to certain veterans whose deaths occur as a result of a service-connected disability;

H.R. 11007. An act to provide statutory authority for the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to assume the duties of Administrator during the absence or disability of the Administrator, or during a vacancy in that office, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11747. An act to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4599. An act to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel of Denver, Colo.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 14, 1966, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mrs. **MINK** read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the People of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country; for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism, the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free Constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated, and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyments of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is broils and wars between themselves, of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute: they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding of them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetuated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not be be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe, that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

REPORT OF OPERATIONS OF DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read:

To the Congress of the United States:

As provided by section 205 of title II of the Dual Compensation Act—Public Law 88–448, approved August 19, 1964—I am transmitting a comprehensive report of the operations under that title of the departments and agencies in the executive branch.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 21, 1966.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the message and accompanying papers are referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

There was no objection.

FEDERAL RESERVE ACTION ON DISCOUNT RATES

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, after the stirring delivery of Washington's Farewell Address by our colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], it is with reluctance that I take the well of the House to disturb our unity in looking at our past to discuss something in which I am sure there is no unity—to discuss one of the problems of our present. I speak of the action of the Federal Reserve in increasing the discount rate which has caused an increase in interest rates. I spoke yesterday on the record about this matter, Mr. Speaker. I think the evidence that is before us now indicates the Federal Reserve in taking the action they did—and when they did—did not deter inflation but as a matter of fact assured that inflation would be increasingly a part of today's problems. I think the record will show that if the Fed expected to settle the problem of inflation, they are just as much of a settling influence in the problem of inflation as a hound dog would as a participant at a rabbit picnic.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that today's article by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak be printed at this point in the RECORD because they have some very excellent remarks in this regard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The article referred to is as follows:

MORE FED MEDICINE

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The fact that the Federal Reserve Board is intent on still another interest rate boost is bringing President Johnson face to face again with the historic question of whether he or the banking industry shall determine major economic policy.

This will be one of the many uncomfortable issues to be tossed at Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. (Joe) Fowler when he appears before the Senate Finance Committee Friday. One Democratic Senator—EUGENE MCCARTHY, of Minnesota—plans to frame the issue in the form of a touchy question.

Does the President need standby economic powers, including statutory authority to overrule the Federal Reserve Board, which serves as America's central bank and has always been dominated by commercial bankers?

The administration is seeking no such power and would prefer not to have the question asked. Yet, the question of the Fed's cherished independence from the executive branch is once again critical as a result of the inflation scare spawned by the Vietnam war.

The interest rate boost decreed by the Fed 3 months ago in defiance of Mr. Johnson has failed completely as an anti-inflationary device, just as critics predicted. Instead, it started a chain reaction in interest rate boosts. And though orthodox bankers deny it, this increase in the cost of money has been as inflationary as an increase in the cost of steel.

Working on the theory that if the first dose of medicine doesn't work try a second, the Fed is geared for another discount rate boost within 60 days. Whether this will really stop inflation is debatable. It will, however, escalate the runaway cost of money.

Indeed, bankers are privately demanding another boost in the discount rate—the rate charged by the Fed for money loaned to the banks—to justify their own increases in money rates to astronomical levels.

This raises the question of the indistinct, delicate relations between the White House and the Fed. Mr. Johnson came off second best to Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin last December when the Fed raised the discount rate without consulting the President.

Some high administration officials now believe Mr. Johnson made a political mistake in publicly disagreeing with Martin and should not oppose the forthcoming second discount rate boost—or still a third increase later this year.

This caution shows up in Mr. Johnson's failure to fill a vacancy on the Reserve Board created January 31, when the term of C. Canby Balderston, a Martin ally, ended. Although the President could take control of the Board by filling that vacancy, he has let Balderston remain as a lame duck.

The basic reason for this is Mr. Johnson's inability to find a Board member who will support his position but not anger Martin to the point of resigning. Thus, the White House has turned down a suggestion for the job forwarded by a prominent Democratic Senator on grounds that he is an "easy money" man.

While accepting Martin's private recommendation that the new Board member not be an economist, the President also has ruled out a commercial banker. What he wants is a moderately liberal businessman (though Assistant Secretary of Commerce Andrew Brimmer, who would be the Board's first Negro member, is under consideration).

Yet, the identity of Balderston's replacement begs the question that Senator McCarthy plans to raise in the Finance Committee: Why should the President not have the power to regulate national monetary policy as he has the power to send 200,000 men to Vietnam; why should Presidential authority stop short of controlling interest rates?

Whatever Secretary Fowler's answer to these questions, it will transcend the simplest debate over tight versus easy money. The fundamental issue is whether the President can control a Vietnam inflation without ending 6 years of economic growth. If he permits the Fed to raise the discount rate again this spring without a serious effort to block it, he will say implicitly that the job can't be done.

TRANSPORTATION AND ITS IMPACT UPON THE ECONOMY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, during my service in the Congress I have been greatly interested in transportation and its impact upon the economy and national security of the United States.

As the Representative of a highly industrialized district I have been particularly concerned over the problems existing in connection with rail and highway freight transportation. The severe shortage of boxcars in the country is causing undue hardship on the shippers and manufacturers in my congressional district.

It is a problem which must be solved by the railroad industry and the Government if our economy is to continue to advance and if we are to be certain that we will have an adequate supply of boxcars of all types in the event of a great national emergency.

Mr. Speaker, it is an ironic fact that the Nation had more boxcars in 1925 than it has today. In that year 2,414,083 boxcars were in service in the Nation. At the close of 1965 only 1,547,307 boxcars were in service.

A 1925 boxcar had an average capacity of 44.8 tons. A boxcar in 1965 had an average capacity of approximately 57 tons. The greater carrying capacity of the boxcar today, however, does not offset the total loss in tonnage resulting from the continued shrinking of our boxcar fleet.

During 1965 the Nation's railroads placed in operation 87,826 new cars, which was a greater number than had been placed in service in either of the 2 previous years. Unfortunately, however, 78,661 cars were retired from service. These figures give a graphic illustration of what is taking place in the Nation in regard to our freight car supply.

Some of the Nation's railroads have made a sincere effort to respond to the demand made upon them by industry for freight cars. Severe car shortages, however, have been experienced during the past several years. In an attempt to temporarily solve the car shortage in certain areas of the country the Interstate Commerce Commission has issued car service orders which have required railroads to make a part of their boxcar fleet available to other roads more severely affected by the car shortage.

In other words, the ICC has been shifting cars from one hard-pressed road to another road in a more serious situation by reason of the car shortage. The car service orders, however, are no answer to the problem. It is imperative that legislation be passed by the Congress to assure that the railroads will maintain at all times an adequate supply of freight cars. The economy demands it, and it is absolutely necessary in the interest of national security.

The railroads which have kept abreast of their needs for cars are not to be blamed for the car shortage. Heavily taxed and confronted with many problems involving labor, regulation, and tremendous passenger deficits, some of the roads have not kept up with the boxcar demand. In the interest of national security and the demands of our everyday economy I feel that some thought should be given to helping the railroads which have tried to keep up to date, overcome the boxcar shortage through long-term loans, tax credits, or other financial assistance in proper cases.

Within the past several days I have had numerous contacts from manufacturers in my congressional district with reference to the recent ICC service order requiring the Southern Railway System to deliver 350 boxcars per week to St. Louis, Mo., in order that the cars may be distributed on western railroads suffering a severe boxcar shortage. They are the innocent victims of the present crisis.

Under the dynamic leadership of D. W. Brosnan, the Southern has revolutionized the railroad industry in the Nation. The Southern has made tremendous strides in providing better and cheaper service for its shippers. Thousands of new boxcars incorporating the very latest technological advances have been placed in service on the Southern under Mr. Brosnan's leadership.

The Southern has not raided its neighboring railroads for boxcars. Yet the requirement that the Southern be made to deliver 350 of its cars per week to western railroads will compound an already serious car shortage existing on the railroad. The result is that shippers and manufacturers in my congressional district will experience undue delays in the movement of their shipments.

Mr. Speaker, this is an intolerable situation. I feel that the constituents of my colleagues have experienced similar situations in connection with the railroads in their areas. I am hopeful that the appropriate committees of the Congress will look into this matter and report legislation that will bring relief to the railroads, the manufacturers, and above all, to the average American whose security and economic well-being is vitally affected.

U.S. ACTION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA CONSISTENT WITH INTERNATIONAL LAW

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there have been a number of charges leveled against the legality of American actions in Vietnam.

Yesterday, the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, by unanimous vote, answered these charges by affirming the legality of the U.S. participation in Vietnam under international law, the United Nations Charter, and the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

I thoroughly agree with the bar's resolution, which states:

> Whereas in recent hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate, it has been stated that international lawyers are agreed that the U.S. position in Vietnam is illegal and in violation of the Charter of the United Nations; and
>
> Whereas articles 51 and 52 of the charter sanction steps for self-defense and collective and regional security arrangements such as the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization to which the United States is a party; and
>
> Whereas in the course of these hearings it has been suggested that an expression on this subject by the American Bar Association would be appropriate: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the American Bar Association,* That the position of the United States in Vietnam is legal under international law, and is in accordance with the Charter of

the United Nations and the Southeast Asia Treaty; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this association be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit a copy of this resolution immediately to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate.

PROPOSED INQUIRY INTO THE OFFICIAL CONDUCT OF JUDGES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, last week a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee heard testimony on the problem created by corruption, laxity, incompetence, or senility on the Federal bench. There was emphasis on the importance of public respect for our system of laws, and the grave danger that is presented when a cloud of corruption or incompetence hangs over the Federal judiciary.

Mr. Bernard G. Segal, of Philadelphia, chairman of the American Bar Association's Committee on Judicial Selection, Tenure, and Compensation, put it this way:

> It is axiomatic that of all our historic American traditions, none is more basic than the citizens' respect for the law. This respect requires confidence in the institutions of the law, and in the men who administer them. The citizen's esteem for his courts and the judges who preside in them is of the very essence of our kind of society.

Mr. Segal, Judge John Biggs, Jr., the chairman of the judicial conference committee on court administration, and Mr. Joseph Borkin, Washington attorney and author of the book, "The Corrupt Judge," were in agreement that impeachment is the only remedy available today for action against judicial misconduct.

Both Mr. Borkin and the chairman of the subcommittee emphasized the serious problem that has arisen in Oklahoma where the Judicial Council of the 10th Judicial Circuit made an attempt to bar Judge Stephen S. Chandler from handling cases because it was stated he was "either unwilling or unable" to perform his judicial functions adequately.

Mr. Borkin, a man with an impressive background in the study of the problems of corruption and misconduct in the judiciary, pointed out that Judge Chandler, in return, has made serious charges of attempted bribery and other misconduct against two other judges—Alfred P. Murrah, chief judge, 10th Circuit, U.S. Court of Appeals, and Luther Bohanon, district judge, U.S. District Court for the Eastern, Northern, and Western Districts of Oklahoma.

Mr. Borkin stressed that this dispute in Oklahoma has been an upsetting factor in the Federal courts in Oklahoma since 1962, and he declared that these charges should not be permitted to stand. He emphasized that there can be no compromise short of a full investigation to clear the judges or to force their removal.

I agree with Mr. Borkin that great damage has been done because the courts, the executive branch, and the Congress have taken no effective steps to clear up this scandalous situation. I have waited patiently for months, and I have hoped that the Justice Department, the courts, or the Congress would initiate or suggest a proper legal investigation to clear the air and put an end to this outrageous situation in the judiciary in the 10th circuit.

There has been no effective action taken, or even started. Therefore, I am today instituting the only action available to try to get to the bottom of this.

I have introduced a House resolution authorizing and directing the House Committee on the Judiciary to investigate the conduct of the three Federal judges in Oklahoma involved in this controversy. Upon its finding of fact, the House Judiciary Committee would be empowered to institute impeachment proceedings or make any other recommendations it deems proper.

The committee would also be empowered to require the attendance of witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents—including financial statements, contracts, and bank accounts—as it deems necessary.

The resolution in no way establishes the guilt of the principals involved. It is necessary to the launching of an investigation for the purpose of determining the facts essential to an intelligent conclusion and eliminating the cloud now hanging over the Federal judiciary.

The resolution follows:

H. RES. 739

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized and directed, as a whole or by subcommittee, to inquire into and investigate the official conduct of Alfred P. Murrah, chief judge, 10th Circuit, U.S. Court of Appeals, Stephen S. Chandler, chief judge, U.S. District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma, and Luther Bohanon, district judge, U.S. District Court for the Eastern, Northern, and Western Districts of Oklahoma, to determine whether in the opinion of said committee the said judges or any of them have been guilty of any high crime or misdemeanor which in the contemplation of the Constitution requires the interposition of the constitutional powers of the House. Said committee shall report its findings to the House, together with such resolutions of impeachment or other recommendations as it deems proper.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress, at such times and places in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents—including financial statements, contracts, and bank accounts—to administer the customary oaths to witnesses, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary.

DOWNFALL OF U.S. MERCHANT MARINE STRENGTH

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the downfall of U.S. merchant marine strength may be closer at hand even than many of us in Congress have been indicating. News of an increase in cargo insurance rates on the seas could mean that U.S. ships would be virtually eliminated from the common carrier shipping market.

The major shipping insurance firms in London have now advised that insurance rates on cargoes shipped in vessels more than 20 years old should be increased by about 100 percent. The word is going out that only newer ships should be used.

As pointed out by many Congressmen recently, our Government has allowed our merchant shipping fleet to go downhill steadily over the past several years until now a large percentage of U.S. ships afloat are more than 20 years old.

The new rates could go into effect as early as March 1, a week from today. Insurance firms do not legally have to follow the London lead, but they can be expected to do so.

The penalty rate would mean an 8-percent increase in a shipper's total bill on one cargo, according to one example mentioned by American shippers yesterday as they prepared to make an effort to ward off the increase.

This would be enough to divert a great volume of shipments from American ships to the generally newer fleets of other nations such as Japan, Russia, Norway, and Germany.

And still our cries for a greater American merchant marine go unheeded.

According to my understanding, this country would have to build new ships at a rate of 135 every year if we were to avoid a major disaster to our merchant shipping capability. Even without the increased insurance rates on older ships, U.S. shipping is a sick industry.

The problem is highlighted by the fact that President Johnson's budget calls for the construction of only 13 new ships in the coming fiscal year. We are treated to the spectacle of the Secretary of Defense saying that our merchant fleet is adequate, when obviously it is not.

If the merchant fleet were an ordinary domestic business, there would be small cause for concern. But our national security is at stake. The merchant marine is a vital arm of national defense. And this is not a new or superficial idea.

It has been acknowledged by the Congress beginning in 1936. It is understood today in most other nations. It is known here in Congress today. But it has been tragically overlooked by the administration.

We face today an absolutely vital need for attaining a U.S. merchant marine philosophy. As proposals for consideration, I want to call attention to the 12 steps I put forth as suggestions in my remarks of February 16, and to other ideas which have been advanced in recent months by those both in this Congress and elsewhere who understand the importance of regaining strength in our merchant marine.

FEDERAL TAX POLICY

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I recently delivered a paper I prepared on Federal tax policy before the Missouri Oil Jobbers Association in St. Louis. Many people have asked to have a copy of it and perhaps it will serve a purpose to have it placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Accordingly, I am doing so.

I think the main point I would like to hammer home, if I could, is that the tax cut of 1964 was successful because it followed classical tax policy. It did not follow the policies being advocated by the new economists.

The point of difference between the two schools of thought is fundamental. It shows up in expenditure policy. The classical tax theory starts on the premise that our tax rates are so high they are impeding economic growth and that a decrease in the rates will broaden the base which will bring in greater revenue, provided this beneficial result is not impaired by too much interim deficit being financed by issuing more Federal debt securities in context of the Federal debt already extant. If the deficit to be financed is too great it will have to be monetized, which would result in price inflation and so rob the economy of any real growth and, for that matter, any real increase in aggregate purchasing power, let alone the structural damage it would cause.

The theory of the new economics, as I understand it, is to increase aggregate demand in the society by decreasing taxes but at the same time continuing the rate of increase in governmental spending. The inflationary forces feared by some, they argue, will be absorbed through utilizing the idle plant capacity and the unemployed within the society.

I advanced a rebuttal to this theory in 1964 on a pragmatic basis. I argued that what the new economists identified as idle plant capacity in this era of automation was largely inefficient and obsolete plant capacity and that the unemployed were largely those with few marketable skills. I did not argue that you could not get roast pork by burning down the barn, but I argued that pursuing that course destroyed a great deal of important and basic economic structure within the society and, anyway, there was a much more efficient way to get roast pork—the unemployed employed—namely through training and retraining.

Be that as it may, the issue was centered on the Republican motion to amend the tax bill of 1964 to make it effective only if the Federal governmental expenditures were held to $97 billion for fiscal 1964 and to $98 billion for fiscal 1965. Although the administration amidst great fanfare defeated this amendment, President Johnson then proceeded to follow its basic philosophy. Expenditures for fiscal 1964 were $97.7 billion and for fiscal 1965 they were $96.5, $0.8 billion less than the average set forth in the defeated amendment.

Two things have distracted the public's and Congress' attention from this important history.

First. The President continued to increase his requests from the Congress for spending power and Congress gave it to him. This is what received practically all the attention from the news media. The President's power to spend increased rapidly, but he did not increase his spending; he merely increased his carryover powers to spend.

Second. The dialog of both the new economists and many critics of the Johnson administration aided in this obfuscation. The new economists kept talking as if their theory was being tested. The critics of the Johnson administration kept talking about President Johnson as the big spender. Both points were untrue.

However, now the theory of the new economists is being tested. The test began in September 1965 when the expenditure rates zoomed from an annual rate of $97.3 to where it is now about $112 billion. It is unfortunate for them that the test is occurring when plant utilization has gone over 90 percent and unemployment has gone to 4 percent.

However, they are now talking about tax increases and the Congress is going to comply at least by eliminating part of the tax cut which was enacted last year.

The new economists' tax increase theory to produce sustainable economic growth and maximum employment is as wrong as was their tax cut theory. Our Federal tax rates even after the cuts of 1964 and 1965 are still so high they are impeding economic growth. An increase in rates will further impede economic growth, and the tax base. If price stability is maintained, the tax collections for the balance of fiscal 1966 and certainly for fiscal 1967 will be far below the estimates projected in the President's budget message this January. The only way out for the new economists, and it is a dangerous short term way out, is to forget about maintaining price stability.

There is only one proper course of action—it is utilization of fiscal policy all right, but it relates to the expenditure side of the ledger and it means cutting the expenditure side so that neither tax increases nor additional Federal debt securities are necessary.

Fortunately, a careful review of Federal expenditure policies, foreign and domestic, will reveal that the social objectives of those programs are being defeated because we are flooding the engine with too much expenditures, not giving too lean a mixture. So expenditure restraint is correct both for aggregate Federal fiscal policy as well as for many of the specific Federal programs.

At present there is no indication that President Johnson intends to exercise expenditure restraint. I have only one small consolation to be derived from the President's new fiscal policy, that is his statement that he will ask to increase taxes, badly as he knows this will damage the economy, rather than ask to have a greater load placed on the managers of the Federal debt. This is significant because even at this point the new economists are still arguing in public that we do not have to worry about the size of the Federal debt. Obviously, in private they are more worried about the consequences of the size of the Federal debt than they are about the consequences of increasing taxes. It is about time.

The paper on Federal tax policy is as follows:

FEDERAL TAX POLICY

(Remarks of the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, St. Louis County, before the Missouri Oil Jobbers Association, Khorassan Room, Hotel Chase, St. Louis, Mo., Monday, February 14, 1966)

I appreciate that businessmen are not supposed to be concerned about philosophy and, for that matter, perhaps politicians aren't either. However, I am going to try to talk a little tax philosophy here today because, increasingly, business judgments are being altered by it.

It has been my observation over a number of years that business judgments increasingly are being made, not on the basis of economic considerations, but rather upon the Federal tax consequences.

This means that important business judgments are being made through the political mechanism of the society, rather than through the marketplace or private mechanisms. I suppose that human beings trained in or experienced in political science can make economic judgments from time to time, as soundly as those who are trained in or experienced in economics. However, common sense should tell us that in the long run the practicing economists, that is my euphemism for businessmen, can make more sound economic judgments per judgment to be made than can those in politics. Furthermore, the marketplace is a stern disciplinarian for the shoddy economist, while I am not so certain that the ballot box is quite as stern a disciplinarian for the shoddy politicians. It certainly is not so stern a disciplinarian for shoddy economic judgments, albeit it might exercise considerable restraint on shoddy political decisions.

There is an even more important reason for being concerned about those in politics making economic decisions in a society. It involves the very concept and, I would argue, the basic genius which has made our society successful in raising the standard of living to such high levels and across such a broad spread. I am referring to the concept that if the powers within a society are concentrated into the hands of a few people, no matter how well motivated or how intelligent, educated and wise they may be, in the long run this produces an erosion of human freedom and an ebbing of innovation in all fields of human endeavor, economics, art, science and, yes, even philosophy.

Accordingly, in 1789 when the full forest was not so hidden from the minds of those days by the luxuriance of the individual trees, we separated out and sought to balance off the powers of church from the powers of state, the military powers from civilian powers. And within government itself we divided its vast powers horizontally into legislative, judicial, and executive functions and vertically into Federal, State, and local governments, leaving the residuum of power, which was considerable, in the people. We did not seek, however, to separate out and balance off economic from political power, mainly, as I see it, because in those days economic power was vested in land holdings and with the wide open frontier in America there was little concentration of this power, whether in the private sector or in government.

As the 19th century unfolded, however, mass production moved economic power from land to machinery, and the corporate form of doing business provided a new form to concentrate this power. The political sector reacted by passing antitrust laws and establishing regulatory bodies to separate and balance out these powers. Government further sought—through election laws—to prevent concentrated economic power from moving too heavily into exercising political power.

In the latter part of the 20th century, perhaps we have not been sufficiently alert in recognizing the concentration of economic power in the hands of national union leaders and the need here to separate and balance off this power. Certainly we do not seem to be alert to what seems to me to be the greatest danger to human freedom of them all, concentrating economic power into the same hands that hold political power.

This apathy is difficult to understand in light of our recent experiences with the Nazi and Fascist states which, by definition, were social organizations concentrating economic and political power into the hands of the same small group of people. Indeed, they were called, and properly so, totalitarian states. And what happened to human freedom and innovation under such a concentration of power? Those who would argue that these were malevolent men who controlled the powers, rather than benevolent men, must certainly recognize the same results occur in the Communist states even if these oligarchists are deemed to be benevolently motivated. The flaw lies in concentrating power.

I think it is very important that Americans today rethink this philosophical tenet of the separation and balancing of powers within a society. Do they agree that a concentration of powers into the hands of any small group, no matter how well qualified and how well motivated, in the long run bodes ill for human freedom and human innovation from whence springs future progress?

In doing this rethinking to see whether or not they conclude that concentration of economic and political power in the same hands is, let us say, as dangerous in the latter part of the 20th century as it was feudal Europe where the vast free lands of a frontier were not present to dissipate economic power, they should also consider the quality of the economic judgments made. Are these judgments best made by those who specialize in economics, through the use of the marketplace mechanism, or by those who specialize in political science, utilizing the ballot box mechanism?

Now, having laid this groundwork, let me point to an area of debate going on today in the political area, in the Federal Congress, which directly relates to it. This debate is over fundamental Federal tax policy. Should Federal taxes be levied as neutrally as possible, merely to pay for the expenditures of the Federal Government, relegating the debate over the role the Federal Government is to assume to Federal expenditure policy?

Or should tax policy be used affirmatively to achieve certain other goals? There is no question that the levying of taxes, whatever be the philosophical theory behind it, just to pay for the expenditures of government or to deliberately produce other results has economic consequences, and the greater the need for governmental revenues to meet increasing government expenditures, the greater economic impact the imposition of taxes has.

However, I argue that it makes a great deal of difference, whether you write tax laws with the desire to minimize the economic impact of the tax take, or whether you intentionally seek to achieve specific social results.

Whatever human activity is taxed is, to some extent, burdened. So through tax laws government can burden certain endeavors and leave other endeavors unburdened which, if in competition with each other, can constitute a preference. The theory of the protective tariff is bottomed on this axiom.

The Federal sumptuary excise taxes on liquor and tobacco derive theoretical support from this axiom, albeit taxing sumptuaries has been found to be an excellent revenue producer and the main concern of the tax writer is to be certain that the tax rate isn't so high that the bootlegger has so large a margin of profit, vis-a-vis the legitimate taxpaying producer, that the tax rate gets beyond diminishing returns.

Tax take is an arithmetical formula stated as follows: Tax base times tax rate times a factor I call collectibility. As the tax rate goes up the base tends to diminish and so does the factor of collectibility. Accordingly, the tax rate can become so high that we actually collect less taxes, not more, from raising the rate. We would collect more by lowering the rate which would increase the base and, also, the factor of collectibility.

I am satisfied that the Federal corporate and individual income tax rates were raised in the 1920's, 1930's, and 1940's to where they passed the point of diminishing returns. I think that even with the tax rate cuts of 1948, 1954, and 1964, our rates are still considerably beyond the point of diminishing returns.

However, there is an important factor which has kept the high Federal corporate and individual income tax rates from being as effectively beyond the point of diminishing returns as the rates themselves would indicate. This factor produces what tax collectors and economists know as the "effective" tax rate—around 25 percent—not 47 or 71 percent.

It is primarily this factor which enables the political practitioner to utilize the Federal tax structure to render major economic decisions, many of which he could not make through direct governmental expenditure policy.

This factor is the bundle of tax differentials, tax exemptions, varying tax rates, alternative methods of calculation, etc. which enable both individuals and corporations to avoid paying the published normal tax rates. The result is the phenomena of business judgments being made on the basis of tax considerations, rather than economics, to which I referred at the beginning of my paper.

Actually, we cannot have major tax reform, which is usually directed to these bundles of differentials, until we have lowered the tax rates. The reason lies in the fact that as long as the rates are high any alteration of the differentials, even one-half a percent, let alone 27½ percent, creates considerable economic consequence. It affects the wages, profits and savings of all manner of men and women and their industries. The pressures exerted on the Congress each time it seeks to alter differentials in the Tax Code, even in the slightest way, proves to any pragmatic observer of economics and political science the truth of this observation.

It is like a ship underway. If it is moving at a fast rate, say 25 knots, just the slightest touch to the rudder and the direction is altered, but if the rate of speed is a sluggish 2 or 3 knots, even the application of full rudder takes time to produce a change in direction. So with tax rates—reduce them and the economic consequences of the differentials in our tax laws are reduced. So some have argued that those who wish to manipulate the economy by means of the political process have deliberately kept the rates high. How deliberate all this may be is a question, but that this is the result is beyond doubt.

Now, some have said to me, "How can you, with your various proposals for tax credits—to parents for part of the money they have spent for educating their children, to employers for an added amount beyond their total expenses for training and retraining manpower, to businesses for spending money in basic research, etc.—argue that you are a tax neutralist? Here you advocate using the tax power as a negative sort of a selective Federal excise tax, not to burden an economic endeavor to produce revenue, but to narrow the tax base by permitting an exemption to a particular economic endeavor."

This is a fair observation and deserves a full answer. I argue that my proposals follow the neutralist tax theory. Let me restate it. Government should collect its revenues with as little economic impact as possible. Tax collectors have always sought to tax that which was flourishing, rather than that which was languishing. Tax collectors have always sought to collect that which was easy to collect and avoid trying to collect that which, by its nature, was hard to collect. Tax collectors really have no morals about them. What seems to some observers to be in the nature of morality or equity really is only a matter of pragmatism. If a tax is equitably levied and equitably collected, the incidence of collectibility is enhanced. Conversely, when a tax is inequitably levied or collected, the incidence of collectibility diminishes rapidly. Accordingly, throughout history good tax collectors have always set aside areas of endeavors from the tax base which they do not tax.

I would also argue that it is sound tax policy, when the tax base is income, not capital, never to go after the goose, only after the golden eggs. I would also argue that it is sound tax policy not to tax an area of private expenditures which, if curtailed, would require direct governmental expenditure.

I also think the human being as an economic producer should be upgraded in our Federal tax laws to be at least the equivalent of a machine. A machine in our tax laws is set up on a capital account basis which allows for deductions for depreciation, expenditures for improvements, repair, maintenance, transportation, etc. Very few of these deductions are permitted to a human being or his employer. Part of the human capital account of particular importance today are the moneys invested in education and training.

Although the 16th amendment to the Constitution does not permit the Federal Government to tax capital, only income, the failure of our accounting profession to reflect properly the capitalization of a human being has permitted the Federal Government, in effect, to tax this capital. The tax credits I propose really are in areas of capital expenditures which, if properly treated, would qualify as plowback of capital which neither could nor should be taxed.

Almost all States historically have exempted from the levy of the bill collector a man's tools for making a living. So I have made a further proposal that the Federal Government should not only not tax seed corn—but should not tax a modicum of the seed corn, if planted to increase the plot beyond the original productive acre. If economic growth is part of standing still in a moving world, then a producer should be able to retain free from taxation enough seed corn to plant 2 acres where he had 1 before. If our tax base is income, and this is the essential tax base of our Federal Government, then such tax policy will produce a greater base and make way for a lower rate with yet a greater take.

The greater debate between the tax neutralists and the tax activists on fundamental Federal tax policy is much more sophisticated than that which I have been discussing. It is true that the tax activists must have high tax rates to achieve their goals, by doling out the differentials, or preferentials, where they deem it wise economically and/or, I regret to say, politically However, even more important to make their theories work, they argue they must have the Federal Government spend more money than it takes in, even beyond the increased revenues. It is a never ending chase. When they equate the governmental budget to the social budget, and that is what they are doing, of course the balance is never attained.

The theory is to use governmental fiscal policy, tax policy and debt policy, to increase aggregate purchasing power in the society which, in turn, will increase total production in the society to meet the ensuing demand. This, in turn, will require the producers to hire more manpower to meet these higher levels of production. This brings about the full cycle by increasing purchasing power within the society through the wages and salaries paid to the new workers. The trouble is the cycle is a spiral and ignores the basic structure on which the economic process is based.

To understand one of the basic fallacies of this theory, it is necessary to realize that the Federal debt is not simply a matter of deferred taxation, serious as the implication of that may be for later taxpayers, but that the federal debt has become the base upon which our monetary policy is based through the impact of the Federal debt on the Federal Reserve System. To put it bluntly, if there were no Federal debt securities available, we would have to set up an entirely new system for creating and maintaining the value of money in our society.

It is the power to monetize the Federal debt that lies behind the basic theory of using Federal debt financing to increase purchasing power within the society. The Federal income tax rate cuts of 1964 were proposed by the new economists as a way to increase total purchasing power in the society by: (1) releasing $12 billion in tax reduction to the private sector for business and consumer spending; (2) by continuing to expand, not curtail, Government expenditures; (3) by paying for decreased revenues and increased Government spending by increasing the amount of money extant in the society by having the Federal Reserve System, not business and the consumer, buy the additional Federal bonds which had to be offered.

The neutralist theory for the 1964 tax cut which they supported and which they had been urging for many years was that the income tax rates were impeding economic growth (eroding the tax base). If the rates were lowered, they argued, the base would expand and the tax take would be greater. However, to accomplish this without interim economic damage, the Federal expenditures had to be curtailed, because to finance both loss of revenues and increased expenditures by additional debt the Federal Reserve System would have to increase the money supply beyond the proven and anticipated real economic growth in the society. The increased purchasing power within the society would be unreal. It would be mainly the result of inflating the dollar. There would be no real economic expansion. A 3-percent rise in the implicit price deflator would take $16 billion of real purchasing power out of the society in return for the $12 billion increase in private purchasing power through the tax cut.

The important point that most people in America have lost sight of, including, I regret to say, many businessmen, is that the neutralist theory won out, not the theory of the new economics. The 1964 tax cut proved successful. The Republican motion to amend the 1964 tax bill stated simply that Federal expenditures had to be held to a $97 billion level for fiscal 1964 and a $98 billion level for fiscal 1965. President Johnson, after jawboning the Republicans for offering such a motion and successfully getting his leaders in Congress to defeat it, then went ahead, to his credit, and did them one better. Now everyone should look at the figures. They are the Government's figures. They are published and for anyone to see. Expenditures for fiscal 1964 were $97.7 billion, $0.7 billion more than the Republicans recommended. However, for fiscal 1965, the figures were $96.5 billion, $1.5 billion below the proposed figure.

For 2 months of the present fiscal year 1966, July and August 1965, the President was still manfully holding to the theory of expenditure restraint needed to make the 1965 excise tax cut beneficial. The annual expenditure average for those 2 months was $97.3 billion.

However, in September 1965, the real Lyndon Johnson stood up, not just the "Vietnam hawk" but the "poverty king" as well. Expenditures zoomed to an annual rate of $114 billion, at which rate they stayed for awhile, but are now on the increase. The 1967 budget message the Congress received late in January of this year raised the deficit for this fiscal year, 1966, from $3.9 billion to $11.1 billion, if we include the $1.2 billion increase in taxes and the $3 billion sale of capital assets the new estimate projects. The tragedy is that if the President had held to the $98.7 billion rate of expenditures agreed upon as late as June 1965, the budget would be in balance this fiscal year. Inflation would be curbed. Our balance-of-payments problem would be met head on. Both our economic and our military power to meet international commitments would be enhanced, not weakened.

Instead we now, all of us, whether we like it or not, are going to have a chance to see how the new economics really works.

We are now engaged in deficit financing in a period of high economic upturn. We can get roast pork by burning down the barn—unemployment has gone below 4 percent—but I suggest that there are better ways of getting roast pork, less damaging ways, structurally.

Now my concluding remarks relate to what most of you probably expected me to talk about in more detail—some of the differentials in our tax laws that give preference to certain businesses or forms of doing business. For years I have been embarked upon a program of tax equalization—to make our tax laws neutral in respect to differing forms of doing business in competing areas of economic activity. I am anxious to bring this equalization about for two basic reasons. (1) I want to broaden the tax base. Anytime we can get an enterprise within the tax base we can lower the tax rates for everybody and still increase the tax take. (2) I also want to improve the incidence of collectibility which lowering the rate and broadening the base will accomplish, but so will improving the equity. A sense of equity is important in our Federal tax system, based as this system is upon the understanding and cooperation of our citizens. Many people chuckle when I say our tax collections are largely on a cooperative and voluntary basis. They have in mind the penalties, fiscal as well as criminal, which are imposed from time to time upon the backsliders.

However, I would argue that the overwhelming majority of persons and businesses file honest tax returns because they feel that others are doing the same and bearing their share. When we read about the offenders being caught and punished this gives us confidence that the system, by and large, is across the board and that we are not suckers paying while others get by. This is quite a different emotion from one of making an honest return only for fear of being caught. It is making an honest return because it is believed by and large everyone else is doing the same and the tax burden is being borne equitably and generally throughout the society.

Now those who seek to have tax equality between forms of doing business should never forget that the real objective should be, for example, the single taxation of corporation, not the double taxation of cooperatives. However, in this day of a basically unreformed Federal income tax system and the need for revenue increasing, and the failure of those in power to understand that lowering the rate is the best way of increasing the base and so increasing the take, from a practical sense tax equity must come from increasing the single tax imposed on the co-op to more closely approximate the double tax imposed on the corporation.

Let me say, however, that there is equality in my judgment in providing for a tax differential for the cooperative which is limited to a marketing or purchasing process for its own membership and which is truly run by its members. The historical farm cooperative has a reason for a tax treatment different from a business dealing with the general consuming public at arm's length, as it were.

I posed the following syllogism to a leader of one of the larger cooperatives a few years ago.

"Berle and Means pointed out in their classic study of corporations that when the stockholders reach a certain number and diffusion, in essence we have an organization controlled by management which has great powers to perpetuate itself in office and to name its successors. I think this is a true observation, and I see nothing sinister in this picture. (In many respects this is a healthy situation, provided all corporations don't reach this size.) The same situation applies, however, to the cooperative form of doing business. When a cooperative's shareholders or participants reach a certain number and diffusion, in essence we have a management run organization and the management has great powers to perpetuate itself and to name its successors. I see nothing sinister in this; in fact, this, too, is healthy. But I ask this question, what is economically or socially beneficial in the co-op form of doing business over the corporation form of business, once the two forms reach or begin to approximate the size described? I see no reason to give a differential tax treatment, one over the other. They are two management groups in competition with each other. Both enterprises should be in the tax base on an equal basis.

I see every reason for equalizing the Federal income tax laws to achieve this end. However, as I have said, I think it is important that a distinction between the closely owned farm cooperative be made, just as a distinction is made for the proprietorship and partnership form of doing business. Politically this is wise, because I find the big management controlled co-op hiding behind the concept of the small farm cooperative in fending off the day of tax equalization.

It is still great to be for the little fellow in America. I hope it always stays that way.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the Members of the House in commemorating the birthday of our first President, George Washington. This annual observance, with Washington's Farewell Address read to us, is always one of the most inspiring events of the congressional session.

I am pleased to inform the House that the city of Hometown, Ill., has made a most significant gesture today while commemorating Washington's birthday. I submit for the RECORD as part of my remarks a letter which Mayor Francis E. Anderson directed to all the citizens of that fine community.

CITY OF HOMETOWN, ILL.,
February 1966.

Hometown will observe "Honor Our Armed Forces Day" on February 22, 1966. We are asking all residents to display the American flag either inside or outside depending on the weather. We believe that it is fitting that honor be accorded the men and women who are doing so much for us both at home and in foreign lands.

Draft cards have been burned and torn, derogatory signs have been carried and displayed; all incidents which would tend to discourage anyone who might be called upon to lay down his life for his country. We hope that "Honor Our Armed Forces Day" in Hometown will help in some manner to let these men and women know that we thank them for their devotion to country.

Your help in the promotion of the display of the American flag on this day is greatly appreciated.

FRANCIS E. ANDERSON,
Mayor.

I am very proud, Mr. Speaker, to represent a community with the fine leadership and true patriotic spirit that is being exhibited today in Hometown, Ill.

DE GAULLE-JOHNSON MEETING BADLY NEEDED

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, because of the enormous importance to the United States of French participation in the Atlantic alliance, I have urged President Johnson to arrange to visit Paris at the earliest possible date for the single purpose of meeting with President de Gaulle.

The visit is an overdue—and badly needed—gesture of friendship. The Presidents of France and the United States have had no real discussion for 5 eventful years. It might well be the historic first step down a long and mutually rewarding road of free world teamwork.

It is nearly a year since the House Republican committee on NATO first urged President Johnson to visit President de Gaulle. During that year the opposing views of France and the United States, in regard to the Atlantic alliance, have hardened to an alarming degree.

This week President de Gaulle once more gave fair warning that France will not put up with the present NATO command arrangement after 1969. In this he has been completely consistent. He issued much the same warning on September 9, 1965, when he said the French role in NATO is "subordination which is described as integration." He has repeatedly said France wants to remain allied with us but not on the basis of subordination.

If press reports are accurate, we have given De Gaulle an impossible choice, rebuffing his request for an alternate form of alliance. In effect, we have responded, "Accept the present arrangement or we will have nothing to do with you."

If we continue to respond to De Gaulle's challenge only by making plans contingent on French withdrawal, the inevitable conclusion is that the United States has written off France as an ally and considers the loss of small consequence.

Even if NATO finds a way to struggle along without France, the loss would be enormous. Former President Eisenhower recently described NATO without France as almost unthinkable. France occupies the great heartland of the Atlantic community. Through it flows the costly infrastructure of the alliance. The defense of Europe would be very difficult to organize without France.

The alienation of France would be a setback of incalculable proportions, not only in military terms but in economic, political, and spiritual.

Clearly the lack of French-American accord forms the major obstacle to getting on with the job of strengthening NATO, so it can deal with the many urgent problems which confront the Atlantic community.

The war in Vietnam, important though it is, must not be permitted to distract the President's attention from the mounting crisis in Europe.

AUTHORIZATION TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports on H.R. 12169.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SOCIAL REVOLUTION FOR VIETNAM

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent talks in Honolulu were directed toward a primary emphasis upon a program of social revolution in the Vietnam countryside.

Social reform must be an integral part of our efforts in Vietnam because the elimination of Vietcong terrorism can be of no permanent usefulness unless the people are able to rebuild their lives and their economy.

The Los Angeles Times, on February 10, discussed the urgent priorities involved in this social revolution. Their perceptive editorial follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 10, 1966]

SOCIAL REVOLUTION FOR VIETNAM

Whatever new military steps might have been secretly decided upon at the Honolulu conference of top American and South Vietnamese leaders, the public emphasis of the talks—and thus the public commitment—was focused upon an ambitious program of "social revolution" in the Vietnam countryside.

This is the "other war," the war of reform, which has the dual aim of bettering the lives of the people and of eradicating the accumulated grievances upon which the Vietcong have built so much of their success.

It is a war we have not been winning.

President Johnson made it clear in his Los Angeles remarks that he knows how hard are the tasks the United States and South Vietnamese Governments have set for themselves. Officials in the field whose job it is to carry out the planned programs of social, economic and political construction know even better the enormous obstacles to be overcome.

Even assuming total dedication on the part of South Vietnams leaders and the ready availability of U.S. dollars, the going will be slow at best. The new programs, in fact, probably won't reach more than 10 percent of the village population by the end of the year. Nor will simply sending cadres into these villages of itself assure progress.

The first requisite, of course, is to clear areas of the Vietcong and to provide enough protection so that the Communists won't come back. Without security, peasants will have no incentive to cooperate and without cooperation there can be no reforms.

Next the Saigon government must find and adequately train the more than 40,000 teachers, health workers, technicians and administrators needed to start and carry out the social revolution. Without well-prepared and highly motivated personnel, reforms cannot even be talked about.

Recruiting these workers won't be easy.

Since the rebellion began, 20,000 of them have been murdered. They are Vietcong targets because they represent the government and because they carry the promise of improving life for the people, thereby undercutting the Vietcong appeal.

Those in this country and elsewhere who pretend to see the Vietcong as a movement against repression have yet to explain how killing nurses, doctors, teachers, and agricultural workers serves this end.

Finally, there is the task of overcoming deep-rooted attitudes which stand in the way of reform. Cynicism, corruption, suspicion, class prejudice, a reluctance to adopt new methods—all will be working against the new programs.

General Ky, his prestige bolstered by the Honolulu talks—the first time a Vietnamese Premier has met an American President—gives every public indication of being behind the reform program. It will take his full support, and much more besides, if there is to be any hope for success in this overdue but still vital revolution.

FLEET ADM. CHESTER NIMITZ

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who served in the U.S. Armed Forces in the Pacific during World War II share a particularly deep sense of grief over the passing of Fleet Adm. Chester Nimitz.

More than any other single man, Admiral Nimitz was the architect of a winning strategy in the Pacific theater of operations.

President Roosevelt appointed him commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet shortly after the disastrous surprise attack against the United States at Pearl Harbor. When assigned this immense responsibility the large part of America's seapower had been destroyed. Japanese bombers had sunk 18 ships at Pearl Harbor, including 8 battleships.

The fleet, under Admiral Nimitz' leadership, recovered quickly and won a decisive victory over the Japanese forces in the Battle of the Coral Sea only 6 months later. The Battle of the Coral Sea and our subsequent victory in the Battle of Midway were the pivotal events in dooming the Japanese to their ultimate surrender.

At the time of surrender, the forces under the admiral's command included 6 divisions of U.S. marines, 6,256 ships, 14,847 combat aircraft, and the hundreds of thousands of men necessary to operate these weapons of war—the greatest armada ever assembled under one flag in history.

Admiral Nimitz served his country during peacetime in many capacities, including the chairmanship of President Truman's Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights, and 8 years as a member of the Board of Regents of the University of California.

The admiral, as the men who served under him can testify, demonstrated that victory in combat is not only a matter of superior might but also the creation of a superior determination and morale. His achievements, in war and peace, exemplify courage and judgment as well as compassion and patriotism.

We shall sorely miss his inspiring presence as we face the grave challenges ahead.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RIBICOFF FOR ALERTING CITIZENS ON THE TRAFFIC ACCIDENT PERIL

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, is a modern Paul Revere. No Member of the 89th Congress deserves more credit than he does for alerting our citizens to that deadly enemy of human life and happiness—the traffic accident—which lurks within every community and which daily claims the lives and wrecks the future hopes and happiness of men, women, and children.

His constant plea for congressional action reverberated in my mind when I read of the violent death of the Republican minority whip of the Maryland legislature, the critical injury of a lovely young lady legislator and the injury of others last Thursday night in the city limits of Annapolis.

The fact that these legislators were mangled, although preliminary reports indicate that high speed was not involved, called to mind a statement made by Col. John Paul Stapp, the noted Air Force expert on the durability of the human body, that 42 percent or more of our traffic accident fatalities occur under survivable conditions.

If this is the case, then by appropriate preventive action we could save between 10,000 and 20,000 lives a year.

Last week Mr. Ralph Nader, author of the thought-provoking and industry-provoking book "Unsafe at Any Speed," testified before Senator RIBICOFF's subcommittee. I consider this testimony to be of such importance that I am placing it in the body of the RECORD for the convenience and attention of every Member of Congress and the general public.

Mr. Nader is an able and an angry man. He has made a strong prima facie case for swift and effective action. I sincerely hope that full-dress public hearings will be scheduled in the near future, since the last such hearings were conducted 10 years ago by Alabama Congressman Kenneth Roberts. Surely the automobile industry will want an opportunity to answer the grave charges set forth by Mr. Nader. Perhaps more importantly, hearings on traffic safety should be expedited since more than 350,000 American citizens have perished since those hearings were concluded. It cannot be repeated too often that the traffic accident is the No. 1 killer of young people under the age of 25.

In my home county of De Kalb in Georgia all 12 traffic fatalities who died between January 1 and February 12 of this year were 28 years of age or younger. Nine were 21 years of age or younger. One was a 13-month-old baby. Seven of these fatalities occurred on the Interstate System in our county.

Fifteen Members of the Senate and 24 Members of this House have now sponsored the bill to create a National Traffic Safety Agency which would be charged by this Congress with responsibility to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and study of the total traffic accident phenomenon and by vigorous application of findings.

Mr. Nader has put the spotlight on one facet of the problem. Again I express appreciation for Senator RIBICOFF's unrelenting plea that this 89th Congress act now.

The text of Mr. Nader's testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF RALPH NADER BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION, SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, U.S. SENATE, FEBRUARY 10, 1966

The basic subject of inquiry before this subcommittee relates to the Federal role in motor vehicle safety. The public safety is one of the first and most fundamental functions of any government. Yet it is quite obvious that over the past five decades, there has been no more serious avoidance of governmental responsibility for the public safety than that which has persisted to the present day in the area of automobile transportation.

Year after year, with Medea-like intensity, the motor vehicle, through its traumatic and polluting impacts, performs as the greatest environmental hazard in this country—a hazard whose inceptions and consequences do not conform neatly to municipal, county, and State boundaries. And year after year, our scientific, technological, and organizational knowhow, and potential, to literally invent the future of motor vehicle safety, expand exponentially and thereby expose the shocking, shameful gap between what can be done and what is being done.

The enormity of this neglect by Government is not without some aggregate measure. The fatality toll on our streets and highways, since the first death by auto in 1899, is almost 1¾ million; millions more have been permanently crippled and tens of millions have been injured. Last year, it is estimated that just under 50,000 people were killed and, too little noticed, over 4 million were injured. Deaths in 1965 amounted to approximately 1.8 million man-years of life lost. Between the ages of 5 and 30, extinction by motor vehicle is the American way of death; for the population as a whole, it is the fourth leading cause of death and the first manmade cause of death. These figures do not include the incalculable harm to individuals from automotive pollution.

Such are the statistics whose long familiarity is received with a conditioned boredom by most of the people who hear them. But they are bleeding statistics, notwithstanding their inability to project the rending torment of the tragedies to which they give numerical expression. The material costs, direct and indirect, of automible collisions and injuries last year was about $20 billion—a figure about equal to the retail sales of new automobiles in 1965. No other major consumer industry begins to approach this significant equivalence.

Against such a massive and costly assault on the safety of motor vehicle travel, the Federal Government has remained largely inert. It is instructive to ask and strive to reply to the following questions:

Why does the Federal Government not have the responsibility of setting safety standards for all highway motor vehicles as it does for all other transport vehicles—air, marine, and rail which all together account for 2 percent of the injuries and 8 percent of the fatalities in transportation?

Why has the Federal Government not spent more than $5 million a year on highway safety research—driver, highway, and vehicle—when it has spent between $40 and $60 million a year on civilian aviation safety research—a form of transport which takes one-fiftieth of the lives and less than one five-hundredth of the injuries that are lost and incurred respectively on highways.

What kind of priorities and human values obtain when Congress can pass the Highway Beautification Act last year authorizing a sum of $320 million to be appropriated over a 2-year period for landscaping, scenic enhancement, control of junkyards and outdoor advertising while the highway mayhem festers in neglect?

How can a national trauma which diverts some $20 billion a year be approached, purely from a rational policy of conserving resources and reducing the level of nonvolitional expenditures, with such trivial resources and authority?

The answers to these questions invite detailed responses. In the interest of time, however, only brief commentary is possible.

First, the gigantic costs of automobile collisions have been integrated into our economy in such a way as not to motivate corrective or preventive action. The costs fall overwhelmingly, not on the producers of motor vehicles or the builders of highways, but on the users of motor vehicles who presently are in no position to require safer design and construction. This situation is quite unlike air, marine, and rail transportation. Mishaps and casualties in these forms of transportation fall not only on the passengers but also on the operators and manufacturers as well. Consequently, there is an economic incentive—the continuing attractiveness of such modes of transport to travelers—for operators and manufacturers to take corrective action. The Federal Government also requires standards of safety to be met. It is important to note that the Government has been more alert in regulating the safety of a mode of transport if the hazards threaten the economic well-being of that system as they would for air, marine, and rail travel.

Death and injury by automobile neither threaten the auto industry nor the highway transport system generally. As far as motivating safer designs are concerned, automobile transport is by far the most impervious to casualties than any other type of transportation. It can absorb tremendous carnage on its roads without affecting the viability of automobile transportation. Under present conditions, there is little economic incentive for the auto maker to concern himself seriously with auto casualties and collisions—for the costs and penalties are not upon him. Actually, the more cars depreciate through collisions, the greater the demand for new and used cars. Only when there is a real threat of cost or other adverse feedback, as in the mass litigation over the 1960–63 Chevrolet Corvairs, does a manufacturer take notice and correct as General Motors did for the Corvair rear suspension system after those 4 tragic model years. But such feedbacks are very infrequent and, until the Corvair cases, never on a mass basis.

Neither do automobile collisions and injuries threaten the economy generally—at least there is no felt threat to the economy as there would be if, for example, a pest attack destroyed most of the cotton crop. For the costs of the highway epidemic are essentially economic demands feeding a vast highway accident service industry composed of medical, hospital, police, legal, insurance repair and administrative services. To put it squarely, death on the highway produces incomes and profits for hundreds of thousands of people and companies. It is a multibillion-dollar industry whose dynamics are hardly about to be in the direction of self-liquidation. The energies of lawyers and physicians (to choose the skills ideally most subject to professional standards of conduct) are so taken up in the care and handling of postaccident problems that they have had little time, even if they had the inclination, to exert effective and sustained efforts toward prevention of collisions and injuries. Law and medical students are offered a curriculum which does not even provide for the study of prevention in the context of their respective professional disciplines.

Thus, the economics of the highway accident industry and the operational health of the highway transport system do not breed self-correcting forces and the attention of government that obtains to a substantial degree in other forms of transportation. This condition has made the annual toll of 50,000 dead and millions injured the most expendable horror of our technological society. In America, life is cheapest on the highway. In macabre fact, as people lay dying and bleeding, they are contributing to the gross national product which takes but does not give to prevent further human losses.

Second, the Federal role has been held to the barest minimum through the efforts of the automobile industry whose over-riding objective is to preserve complete control over the design of automobiles and the manner in which they are merchandised. The continuance of private control over auto design is considered important by these companies as they continually narrow the quality of their competition between themselves—a phenomenon well known to economists who study the behavior of highly concentrated or oligopolistic industries. However innovative the auto companies have been in cutting the costs of production their end product—the automobile—has been obsolete, particularly in terms of safety, for over 30 years. Unconventional insight into the "why" of this deplorable condition was offered by George Romney in 1958 when, as president of American Motors, he rendered his classic testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly. Mr. Romney stated that the auto manufacturers by adopting a "common product philosophy" have ended "their basic product competition." "Why should they promote customer interest," Mr. Romney noted, "in new product engineering possibilities that might eventually obsolete their existing production facilities?"

Instead, the competition between the auto companies centers around exaggerated touting of trivial differences garnished by throbbing adjectives and beckoning young women, large promotional expenditures, the size and strength of dealer systems and price adjustments at the dealer level. When it comes to the product itself—the automakers are competing more and more about less and less. "Protective imitation" by Ford, Chrysler, and American Motors becomes ever more insistent as the dominant product and price leader—General Motors with over half the market—reflects the limits of permissible variation. Notice, for example, the uniformity of the useless, recessed bumper design which exposes fenders, lights, etc., to damage and costly repair in slight contacts with other vehicles or structures. The irreverent question was never truer—"Did you see the latest Ford, made by Chrysler, down at the Chevrolet dealer?"

By concentrating so heavily on auto style, the companies achieve the flexibility of stimulating and then exploiting a wide array of emotional involvements by the buying public in their new automobiles. Producers of consumer products generally seek to form many identities between their products and potential consumers. With increasing precision, manufacturers of such goods have learned that by selling an aura, a package or a style of a product, the buyer's attention to the quality of the product is diminished. For automobiles, this choice of sales strategy leads to definable advantages for a highly concentrated industry with enormous barriers to entry by new domestic firms. For one thing, it leads to the progressive reduction of consumer sovereignty because its inherent thrust is to expand and exploit consumer ignorance of the basic functional qualities of the vehicles and focus attention on images and trivial distinctions. For another, it is a highly convenient deflator of any pressures for technological innovation if the market system was operating under the strains of a competition that offered the consumer genuine choices. In terms of product competition, the automobile industry is closer to closed enterprise than it is to free enterprise. Because their market structure, conduct and performance have subverted the basic requisites of a free market system, we have the spectacle of a gigantic industry wallowing in a profitable technological stagnation and relying on superficial cosmetic changes and the inexorable coming of a new year every 12 calendar months to peddle the "all new, unsurpassed" car model. How tragic are the results and how costly the impact on purchasers of America's largest consumer durable. The car buyer pays over $700 (according to a study by MIT, Harvard and University of Chicago economists) when he buys a new car for the cost of the annual model change which is mostly stylistic in content. Consider how much safer today's automobile would be if over the past two decades the car buyer received annually a substantial safety advance—both in the operational and crashworthy aspects of his automobile—for that $700 payment.

Instead, cars are being built which, standing still, can kill adult and child pedestrians who fall or are inadvertently pushed into their sharp points and edges. And passengers can die in collisions at speeds as low as 5 m.p.h. Is it any wonder that, at present rates, at least 1 out of every 2 living Americans will either be killed or injured (disabled beyond the day of injury) in an automobile collision? For those with a full life span of 70 years ahead of them, the probabilities are considerably higher. Yet the orgy of expenditure for style which is charged to the consumer every year as entirely standard equipment continues unabated. A style change for the rear end of a Mustang, for example, will cost the manufacturer close to $50 million.

There are those rare instances when the impressive containment of public self-criticism by auto executives exhausts itself temporarily. Such an instance occurred in January 1964 when Donald Frey, a perceptive vice president of Ford Motor Co., told a gathering of automotive engineers: "I believe that the amount of product innovation successfully introduced into the automobile is smaller today than in previous times and is still falling. The automatic transmission was the last major innovation of the industry." (The automatic transmission, you may recall, was first adopted on a mass-production basis in 1938–39). Henry Ford II seemed troubled by this same lack of innovation when he told the same audience: "When you think of the enormous progress of science over the last two generations, it's astonishing to realize that there is very little about the basic principles of today's automobiles that would seem strange and unfamiliar to the pioneers of our industry * * *. What we need even more than the refinement of old ideas is the ability to develop new ideas and put them to work." The smog-ridden people of Los Angeles for many years have been troubled by the same thought as they struggled against an intransigent, unified industry that produced millions of little pollution factories on wheels and refused to apply the necessary remedial engineering to clean them up. Apparently, diagnosis is far from treatment. The 1966 Ford advertisements boast of "engineering magic." The expectant reader, rushing to read on, learns that this "magic" is composed of an optional stereo-sonic tape system and a station wagon tailgate that swings open for people and pulls down for cargo. With such "magic" our space endeavors would have gotten us no further to the moon than Mount Everest.

The annual model change ritual is not meaningful innovation for the public safety and welfare; its purpose is to "stir the animal" in the car buyer. It is aimed not at the reason of men but at their ids and hypogastria. Can there be anything less than a fundamental contempt for the consumer in the following advertisements:

A closeup picture of the front of the Buick Skylark over the title "Son of gun." The copy asks the reader: "Ever prodded a throttle with 445 pound-feet of torque coiled tightly at the end of it? Do that with one of these and you can start billing yourself as the human cannonball."

Teenagers can turn on the radio and hear an ad that begins with a deep growl. Is it a cue for Tarzan of the apes? An announcement of a circus coming to town? By no means. It is the Pontiac widetrack tiger and the announcer urges the listener to come on down and ride the tiger at tiger country (formerly known as your Pontiac dealer).

A 1966 Buick Riviera ad tries this sensual effect: "If there are two things the romantic Italians love, one of them is automobiles. Dashing, dramatic automobiles. Now, some people think Italy has a monopoly on the red-blooded cars that make hearts beat faster and the adrenalin flow. But those people have another think coming. The tuned car is here. Con Brio."

Other ads urge the potential driver to "drive it like you hate it," or, after spelling out the 400-plus horsepower, advising that "it's cheaper than psychiatry."

While the recent spate of Ford safety ads, in response to a growing public outrage over unsafe design, urge the reader to "cultivate a safety state of mind * * * thinking safety" (and GM is doing the same), Ford continues to name its cars with such aggressive and ferocious titles as Comet, Meteor, Thunderbird, Cobra, Mustang (Mustang means "a wild, unbreakable horse") and Marauder (which means literally "one who pillages and lays waste the countryside"). There are also the Plymouth Fury and Barracuda, the Oldsmobile Cutlass and the Buick Wildcat—to name a few. And coming soon to join the menagerie on the highways are the Mercury Cougar and the Chevrolet Panther.

As Prof. Jeffrey O'Connell of the University of Illinois Law School asked recently in a letter to the New York Times, detailing some of these calculated appeals to power, speed, and other aggressive instincts: "Shall the wolves be shepherds?"

The answer to this question must be "No." It must be "No" for two independently sufficient reasons.

First, a genuine democracy has to provide for the participation of the public in decisions relating to technology whose use is so fraught with tragedy to millions of people. There is an old Roman adage which says: "Whatever touches all should be decided by all?" The automobile touches us all in the most ultimate ways. The safety the motorist gets when he buys his car should not be determined solely by manufacturers—especially a tightly knit few—whose interests are necessarily one of profit-parochialism. A democratic polity should not permit an industry to unilaterally decide how many years it wishes to hold back the installation of superior braking systems, safer tires and fuel tanks that do not rupture and incinerate passengers in otherwise survivable accidents, suppress safer instrument panels and steering assemblies and seat structures and frame strengths, or to engage in a stylistic orgy of vehicle-induced glare, chrome eyebrow bumpers and pedestrian impalers—to take only a few examples of many. Instead the amount of safety should be determined by a fuller dialog and clash of values of the entire democratic community. This is hardly a new idea. Our country has applied such a philosophy long ago to other areas of safety—safety codes for buildings and factories, food and drug regulations, safety standards for aircraft, ships, and trains, safety examinations for professional skills. However inadequate such rules and their administration are, they do represent progress when contrasted with the alternatives. They also represent society's decision that democratic participation is to extend to hazardous economic activities or products.

In the area of automobile design, this public participation to raise continuously the operational and crashworthy safety of motor vehicles does not exist. The automobile has been the sacred cow. Because of the attenuated competition of a concentrated industry, product choices are being made, in effect, for the consumer by the manufacturers to the extent that they have muted the market signals which consumers would ideally have in exercising their choice or expressing their wishes. More significant, the public has not been able to make its collective judgments felt through the governmental process. This is the case because both the automobile and its maker are in the uniquely immune position of being outside of the law, in four ways.

1. The automobile does not have to adhere to any meaningful public safety standards for crashworthiness and operational safety. Existing State standards are limited to headlamps and a small number of other equipment; they are grossly inadequate even in the areas they purport to cover and enforcement is virtually nonexistent. All States, it is believed, now require windshields along with windshield wipers.

2. There is no public inspection to insure that automobiles are built even to conform with the manufacturers' own quality control standards. Indeed, there is no requirement that there be a public filing of the numerous confidential bulletins and service letters or other communications between manufacturers and dealers concerning defects and deficiencies discovered in new car runs after thousands of these cars have already been sold. The unknowing driver who survives a collision because of such defects is required to assume any legal responsibility—not the manufacturer.

3. The role of automobiles in causing accidents and injuries goes virtually uninvestigated while the police are duty bound to enforce laws written almost exclusively in terms of driver fault. Clearly, there are differences between accident causes and injury causes—the latter causes are overwhelmingly related to the auto's design. Yet note the accident report form in State after State and see how there are no categories for the cause of injury and only categories for driver fault as the cause of accident—vehicle failure is routinely considered owner or driver neglect.

4. There are not statutory criminal penalties for manufacturing a defective automobile dangerous to life. An automaker is not within the scope of such laws. But drivers are exposed to criminal fines and imprisonment—manslaughter charges—for gross negligence leading to one or more deaths. Driver behavior is within the rule of law; vehicle design and manufacturing behavior is outside the rule of law. Could corporate and managerial immunity from public accountability be more complete?

Being outside the law has all the predictable consequences of public anarchy. I shall not dwell here on a detailed enumeration of the hazardous features and safety obsolescense of contemporary automobiles. They have been well enumerated, together with a realistic vision of safety innovations that can come with an automobile if there was the care, in the first feasibility study of the New York State safety car program. Other research reports and data analyses financed through Federal grants and contracts similarly inform. But I do want to allude to the industry practices that are adverse to the public's safety interest and that comprise the second reason for governmental action—

1. The industry has actively cultivated a consumer ignorance about safety by promoting a concept of an automobile that stresses style, ride, and performance. While eager to tell the potential customer about the rated horsepower, acceleration capability, and kinds of interior decor, the automaker will not tell him, even if he demands it, such important facts about the safety of the cars as: brake stopping ability, tire skid and blowout resistance, roof collapse strength, door latch and door hinge strength, the dash panel's and windshield's cushioning ability, the amount of rearward displacement of the steering wheel and shaft under a forward crash into a fixed barrier, the side and roof crash resistance of the vehicle and the seat anchorage strength. These technical values can all be given in quite precise terms against clearly expressed criteria. Since the automakers boast about their instrumented crash testing, they must have the answers. But they will fight to the end to deny their publication for the motoring public—notwithstanding the fact that nearly half of all cars will be involved, sometime in their use, in an injury-producing collision.

Lamentably, this industry's secrecy places severe restraints on company researchers and ruptures the canons of scientific communication with professional colleagues outside the industry. Again and again, I have listened to independent scientists and engineers at universities and elsewhere outside the industry complain at the near impossibility of communicating with industry employees on what is presumably a common dedication to save lives. The corporate plea of proprietary data is an excuse, not a reason. The reason is that the carmakers want no public knowledge of their safety work or neglect thereof. Such knowledge might raise expectations or ignite indignations for greater safety.

2. The automakers are spending a pittance on safety research and development for basic innovation. In the area of vehicle aerodynamics and handling analysis—a subject of growing urgency as vehicle speeds increase—there is deep neglect and shocking theoretical ignorance. Of more immediate interest is the flimsy allocation of human and financial resources to crashworthiness or second collision research. It is doubtful whether General Motors, a company which grossed $20.7 billion in 1965 (greater than the entire gross national product of Brazil and greater than the Government of France's revenue that year) devoted $1 million for second collision research in 1965— or two-hundredths of 1 percent of its gross receipts.

3. The auto industry is utterly devoid of any measure of corporate humility so necessary for internal regeneration. Never once in response to public questioning has any company representative admitted the dangerous connection between auto exhaust and driver safety. Yet experts such as Harvard's Ross McFarland and Cal Tech's Arlie Haagen-Smit have warned about the fatigue and nausea-inducing impact of carbon monoxide levels not infrequent in heavy urban or suburban freeway traffic. In addition, reduced visibility from automotive pollution has led to temporary closing down of turnpikes. Those who still prefer the voluntary approach should remember the action by Ford Motor Co. which took off on many of its models the blowby devices that curtailed crankcase emissions in 1964 after it had agreed to put them on earlier in order to avoid legislation. It took these devices off without notifying car buyers or the Government, and did not reinstall them until notified by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The hardening of the corporate arteries even extends to an adamant refusal to recognize the dangers of pointed ornaments, dagger fins, and sharp edges prevalent on the front and backs of automobiles to many of the nearly 500,000 pedestrians struck each year by motor vehicles. Still the juggernaut plunges ahead. Consider the description of the 1966 Toronado—a brandnew musclecar—by Hubert Luckett, executive editor of Popular Science: "Functionally, the front bumper design is insane. It shares this monstrous affront to commonsense with several Detroit cars this year. A massive wedgelike projection on the sides would be murderous to a hapless pedestrian unfortunate enough to step in its path. And it could easily hang up on a guardrail post, turning an otherwise minor mishap into a disaster." A brandnew car with old line negligence.

4. By its repeated behavior, the auto industry has shown that public pressure is the only stimulus to which it grudgingly and slowly responds. Auto companies opposed seat belts for years, ridiculing their proponents, then finally offered them as optional extra cost equipment and in January 1964, under pressure of enacted legislation, decided to make them standard equipment. The industry rigged odometers—an inher-

ently deceptive practice which fleeced and misinformed motorists about rental fees, warranties, trade-in wear and gas mileage—until the National Bureau of Standards proved an average overregistration in mileage by some 3.5 percent. Caught in the act, the industry relented to new standards but only after making sure they were still inadequate. The point is that there is never any punishment or deterrent to such behavior, as there would be for individuals. The only question for the industry is when will it be exposed and chided, not how it will have to face up to the law—which does not exist. And just yesterday the auto companies announced that a collapsible steering column and a dual braking system will be available for the 1967 models—thanks to the pressure by public officials which took off the shelf designs that were there for years. Such concessions have been wrung from the industry only after thousands of deaths and millions of injuries have occurred. The companies have not changed their phony arguments about a 3-year leadtime, about exorbitant cost, about the product "looking like a tank" and other obstacle courses which now can only, at best, be overcome in piecemeal and slow fashion. The manufacturers are always telling us what they cannot do in vague unsupported terms, never what they can do. Even when they announce the installation of collapsible steering columns for next year's models, they do not give us the performance values of the design. These are the same companies who offered padded dashboards for extra cost until 1965 on most models even though they offered little safety advantage and on some models were a greater hazard than unpadded dashboards.

5. In recent months, the auto companies, moving as a coalition through their trade body, the Automobile Manufacturers Association and their technical servant, the Society of Automotive Engineers, are forging new institutions and new industrywide unanimities to stall or fight off the increasingly focused expressed of the motorist's need for greater vehicle safety. One such institution heavily promoted and influenced by the industry and its tax-exempt agent, the Automotive Safety Foundation, is the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission—presently adhered to by a majority of States on the urging of State motor vehicle administrators. The VESC is a wholly unnecessary interlayer between the States and the Federal Government that torpedoes the very meaning of federalism and distorts out of all proportion the utility of regional State compacts. After all, the very purpose of a federal government is to assume responsibility for those public issues which significantly and continuously are interstate in character. The VESC is a device to block Federal action and strip the States of independent legislative initiatives. This latter objective was driven home to the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Motor Vehicles and Traffic Safety in 1964 when the Automobile Manufacturers Association sent the committee chairman, Senator Edward J. Speno, a letter imperiously recommending that all the vehicle safety bills before the Committee be referred to the VESC.

State support for the VESC has come primarily from State motor vehicle departments who have long been accustomed to working with the AMA and who have shared its preference for keeping vehicle safety issues on an administrative level of decisionmaking. The abundantly generous hosting of parties and dinners by the auto industry at annual meetings of the American Association of Motor Vehicles Administrators—a private, not public organization incidentally—helps restore old friendships. It is no coincidence that the AAMVA is presently housing the VESC in its offices in Washington and that the Automotive Safety Foundation has granted funds to the AAMA for VESC promotion.

The united industry front can also be seen in the manner in which the General Services Administration is being handled—a development which might be of considerable interest to this subcommittee. GSA trundles along conceding prearranged industry positions, ignoring outside advice by acknowledged specialists such as the FAA's John Swearingen and Dr. Merrill Allen of Indiana University, in a headlong thrust toward making a mockery out of the legislative intent of the Roberts bill, Public Law 88–515. The purpose of this law was to have an active safety-oriented Federal procurement of passenger vehicles serve as a meaningful pacesetter instead of a contorted instrument to promote industry options, to facilitate industry price increases and to ratify existing industry safety levels.

Against such a background and foreground of industry practice and policy, the Federal Government must take a decisive role in highway safety. This does not mean that the Federal Government should preempt the field entirely from the States. It does mean that the various endeavors undertaken by public authorities be analyzed to determine which level of Government is best equipped to have the particular responsibility. No longer can we afford to repeat the general invocation—so beloved by the traffic safety establishment—that "the primary responsibility for traffic safety is vested in the States." In questioning the fervent advocates of this article of faith, I have never been able to derive any revealed justification other than it was so in the days of William Howard Taft. But these advocates have their undisclosed reasons that all lead to protecting the status quo dedicated to the proposition that traffic safety is chiefly driver behavior and may the special interests be protected forever after. For when the status quo is perturbed by State actions, as is occurring in New York, where the automobile is coming in for some attention, these advocates press hard for the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission and traditional AMA wisdom as the founts for all States to look to for inspiration and guidance. In refusing the repeated requests to appear at an executive hearing in Iowa sent them by Attorney General Lawrence F. Scalise, the four auto companies complained of the burden it would be to appear at such State hearings and informed him that the AMA representative would be there only. The AMA representative, Karl Richards, then stood up and declined to answer any technical questions or any questions dealing with corporate policy or specific cars. Iowa's right to know about the safety of the products that its people purchase and drive by the hundreds of thousands every year was squelched by an industry that just was bigger than that State.

I view the task of the Federal Government as one of implementing a public policy for automobile safety that brings into operation the scientific and engineering talents and resources of the Nation. It is encouraging to note that, at long last, the thinking and research done by a tiny group of bright, dedicated civil servants in the Bureau of Public Roads' Office of Research and Development is beginning to find verbal receptiveness among the Department of Commerce's top policymakers.

Speaking before the Highway Research Board on January 18, 1966, Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, Allan S. Boyd, said: "Probably the most promising approach to significant, tangible improvements in highway safety in the immediate future lies in the application of modern technology * * *. Its application, in essence, means that we must understand the capabilities and limitations of the driver and then design improvements in the vehicle-highway system to make his driving more reliable and more effective. It means we can prevent accidents or mitigate their consequences by additions or modifications to the vehicle and the roadway."

Last November, Secretary of Commerce, John T. Connor, was quite emphatic in drawing upon the findings of the Bureau of Public Roads:

"So the Interstate System is getting results. And it is getting them because highway engineers relied on facts and rejected the emotional and widely held, but fallacious, belief that almost all accidents are somehow caused by driver error or failure, through carelessness or irresponsibility.

"This belief stems naturally enough from our system of accident reporting, which tends to be in terms of traffic violations, and from our concept of legal liability, and it has been reinforced by well-publicized safe driving campaigns. It leads, of course, to the assumption that, if almost all accidents are caused by driver error, the way to eliminate them is to make all drivers drive better.

"And since most motorists consider themselves good drivers, it leads further to the assumption that most accidents are caused by a small group of dangerous, accident-prone drivers. Therefore, if we could get them off the road we would not have accidents.

"Unfortunately, these assumptions are not supported by the facts. An analysis by the Bureau of Public Roads just last summer showed that almost an entirely different group of drivers is involved in accidents each year, and removing the repeaters—those who have two or more accidents in any one year—would have virtually no effect on the following year's accidents. The facts are that the great bulk of accidents involve average, normally responsible drivers. No one is immune. It is the accumulation of rare accidents, occurring to all too many generally good drivers, that principally account for our annual traffic toll.

"The fact is that most drivers, most of the time, are driving near the limits of their ability—considering the complexity of the traffic situation and of the driving task. * * * In our pursuit of safety the emphasis on remedial engineering rather than reprimand represents an important breakthrough."

The next step from such an understanding would seem to be to construct a scale of policy priorities aimed at reducing automobile casualties. Two operating principles of a profoundly proven nature in many fields of man-machine interaction are crucial here: (1) Safety measures that do not rely on or require people's voluntary and repeated cooperation are more effective and more reliable than those that do. (2) The sequence of events that leads to an accident-injury can be broken by engineering measures even before there is a complete understanding of the casual chain. Thus, for example, improved braking systems that do not fade or lock, safer tires, safer handling characteristics, and the elimination of vehicle-induced glare and carbon monoxide reduce the strains on the driving task and the risk of accidents. And most important, a crash-resistant automobile which protects the occupants from collision forces can make accidents safer, if not altogether safe. Indeed, since present technology is capable of producing cars economically, conveniently and attractively to protect occupants without significant injury in collisions up to and over 50 m.p.h. (depending on the nature of the collision), and since at least three-fourths of all deaths and serious injuries occur at impact speeds under 50 m.p.h., the course of action for rational men to pursue is to have such automobiles built.

The plain fact is that it is faster, cheaper, and more enduring to build operationally safe and crashworthy automobiles that will prevent death and injury than to build a policy around the impossible goal of having drivers behave perfectly at all times under all conditions in the operation of a basically unsafe vehicle and under often treacherous highway conditions. We can try ad infinitum to get all 95 million drivers to learn, and instantly act on this learning, that panic brake applications in certain emergency situations, particularly on wet surfaces, are likely to lock the brakes with consequent loss of control of the vehicle. Or we can simply apply what is presently known and build automobiles with antilocking braking systems.

The lessons are as comparable in automobile design for injury prevention as they are for accident prevention. A crashworthy automobile is the last clear chance to prevent bloodshed; it is that final net that catches all the contributing factors in the collision sequence and cuts the sequence so that casualties are prevented or minimized. In this strategic placement, a crashworthy vehicle is highly efficient in that it can take all the infinite and far more intractable variables expressed through the behavior of drivers interacting with highways and vehicles and make the output fail-safe. By way of illustration, a safe dash panel, steering assembly and seat structure are constant factors ready to avert disaster; they do not depend on how they feel, on how they are educated or exhorted or admonished or fined to do their work. They do their work because they are there, in shape all the time. Just 4 years of automobile production will comprise half of all mileage traveled. A mass production industry can turn out such vehicles on the command of a tiny handful of men. Automating safety in automobiles consequently has great administrative as well as time advantages.

Yet instead of a rigorous analysis of priorities so as to get the fastest and most efficient safety output from given inputs, we hear the incantations about "balanced traffic safety programs" or that it is really all "the nut behind the wheel." The best that can be said about such thinking is that it is primitive. A civilized society should want to protect even the nut behind the wheel from paying the ultimate penalty for a moment's carelessness, not to mention protecting the innocent people who get in his way. These and other similar handy mottoes are part of a self-serving ideology—there is no better word for it—of traffic safety strongly developed and perpetuated by the automobile industry in order to divert the public's gaze from the role of vehicle design. Consider the potent force of the second collision idea once it was sprung loose, not from industry sources, but from the projects supported by the Federal Government which wrapped data and photographs around this idea to nurture it on its way to the political and legislative policymaking process.

Here we arrive at the nub of the problem in traffic safety. The barriers to progress and innovation are not knowledge gaps but the overabundance of special interests which the scientists euphemistically call "nontechnical obstacles" to change. These special interests tragically have included the very groups which could have been the classic countervailing and disciplining powers on the auto industry—namely, the casualty insurance industry and the American Automobile Association. But the accommodations of other interests with the auto industry have sacrificed the vehicle design safety interest.

The latest performance of the direct and indirect power of the automobile and allied interests to divert, deter, and diminish the more effective measures for cutting the highway toll will become apparent very shortly when the administration sends its proposed Highway Traffic Safety Act of 1966 to the Congress. Reliable public indications point to a request for substantially more funds for research which is desirable. But the administration's proposal will not solve the jurisdictional and administrative bottlenecks within the executive branch that have impeded action, will not request authority for mandatory automobile safety standards, will not provide for the construction of prototype safety cars, but will ask for sizable sums of money for existing and least effectively conceived programs at the State level—all to be primarily guided for the consumer's benefit by the Department of Commerce. (If this latter arrangement is a paradox, it is an institutionalized one.) Another no-law law for the consumer's protection will be put before Congress and the National Safety Council, the Automotive Safety Foundation, the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, the Auto Industries Highway Safety Committee, and the President's Committee for Traffic Safety—those misnomers of the traffic safety establishment—will breathe a sigh of relief.

Of course, my predictions could be wrong. I would be delighted if they were.

Until the suffocating hand of the so-called national traffic safety organizations and their omnipresent automotive patron is lifted once and for all by an aroused citizenry and government, the critical priorities will not be translated into action. A good place to begin anew is with the President's Committee for Traffic Safety. This Committee is an executive agency employing civil servants over whom stand Mr. William Foulis, the Executive Director, and Dr. Richard Tossell, his assistant. These two men are privately paid by the automobile and insurance industries. The President's Committee really functions only through the administrative committee (of the Advisory Council to the President's Committee) which sets the policy. The President's Committee is composed of 16 private citizens and its Chairman, William Randolph Hearst, Jr. As a Government agency controlled outright by private automotive interest groups, the President's Committee occupies a place unique in the history of American government. Never before have private business groups established themselves within Government in order to exploit the prestige of the President and his Office. Officials in the Department of Commerce and other Government agencies have repeatedly urged that this anomalous condition be terminated, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., notwithstanding. It can only be assumed that once the President finds time to turn his attention to this problem, it will be resolved in the only appropriate manner.

Last week, President Johnson stated to the American Trial Lawyers Association that the "gravest problem before this Nation—next to the war in Vietnam—is the death and destruction, the shocking and senseless carnage, that strikes daily on our highways and that takes the highest and more terrible toll each year." Implicit in this statement would seem to be an increased awareness of the necessity for Federal leadership. In the most important area—that of obtaining safer automobile design and construction, there is a need for five Federal functions:

1. Standards and inspection function: The establishment of carefully administered dynamic standards for automobile safety performance to get faster application of known technology and override the barriers to innovation now rampant in the huge bureaucratic structures known as the American automobile companies. To have meaning, standards require an attendant form of inspection or crashworthiness certificate to make sure the standards are met. Both criminal penalties and injunctive powers should be provided in any legislation.

2. Research and development function: Behind the chrome curtain there is too little safety research and many an excuse between research and use. A Federal facility for research into automobile design safety will serve to advance sharply the state of knowledge and will also encourage and support independent centers of such work around the country and break the near monopoly of automotive engineering presently held by the automobile industry. Such a facility will be a major contributor to the constant upgrading of Federal performance standards and would include the design, construction and testing of prototype vehicles, as envisaged by S. 2162 introduced by Senator GAYLORD NELSON and presently before this subcommittee.

3. Federal support function: Financial and technical assistance to the States for the establishment of proficient accident-injury investigative teams to collect the data for future preventive policies and to provide the facts for the just adjudication of legal responsibility instead of the automatic bias of blaming the driver in lieu of an investigation. Elemental notions of due process of law require such a program. Support should also be given for vehicle inspection of a scope well beyond the nominal procedures employed today and the inspection standards written by the auto industry. Administrative safeguards against corruption and other abuses of State inspection programs must be carefully devised.

Data and other experience from these accident-injury investigations and inspections should be aggregated and processed with the objective of determining patterns of make and model failure due to defective design or poor quality control. All bulletins and other communications between the manufacturer and dealer about such defects should be publicly filed with the appropriate State authority together with a copy of the communication to the car buyer which should be required under prescribed forms.

The Federal Government must establish once and for all, as it has for aviation safety, the principle and practice of recalling defective makes and models of automobiles for correction by the manufacturer at its dealer or other suitable location. The 1960–63 Corvairs with their extraordinary tendency for rear-end breakaway behavior leading to uncontrollability and rollover are prime candidates for such callbacks. There are at least 750,000 Corvairs remaining out of these 4 years of production. By merely adding rebound straps, replacing the rear springs, and installing an antiroll bar in the front suspension—at a total material and labor cost to Chevrolet not exceeding $15 per car, the risk of many deaths and injuries can be substantially reduced. Warnings to owners, through adviseries and printed decals in a prominent location on the vehicle, about the critical importance of the proper tire inflation pressures front and rear should be included.

4. Statistical and data processing function: The Nation can no longer rely on a private organization—the National Safety Council—for its traffic accident-injury statistics. In no other area of mortality and morbidity statistics has the Government relied on a private organization. With the immense potential offered by the computer for fast, complex, and meaningful data processing and with the forthcoming implementation of the Baldwin amendment pressing the States for more explicit, more uniform, and more adequate highway safety standards, it is all the more incumbent upon the Federal Government to establish a complete statistical facility.

The entire information and data output of projects financed by the Federal Government at universities or other institutions should be obtained by the Government. The decade long situation at the Cornell Automotive Crash Injury Research (Cornell Areonautical Laboratory) whereby data relating to specific accident cases are funneled exclusively to the manufacturers and denied all public agencies, even though these data are obtained chiefly through Government funding and support, is a disgrace too long tolerated and overdue for congressional investigation.

5. Educative and alert function: This should involve a governmental contribution to the improved working of the marketplace. First, the manufacturers should be required to file annual reports detailing, with supporting technical data, the operational safety and crashworthy improvements in their automobiles and disclosing any deteriorations. This information should be then translated into readily understandable consumer publications distributed by GPO to better inform the car buyer about the choices available to him and generally to improve his critical capacity. In addition, the antitrust laws should be rigorously enforced to dissolve any collusive or concerted activity on an industrywide basis or between various manufacturers to restrain the development and/or marketing of safety features. An analysis of the present scope of antitrust law may well lead to recommendations for strengthening them to cover subtler, though just as harmful, anticompetitive behavior.

If these and other Federal functions in highway safety are to be administered fairly and efficiently, a thorough reorganization of the present dispersal of responsibility into one or possible two administrative units is necessary. With the President's recommendation last month for a Department of Transportation, it is quite clear that the administration is engaged in just such an endeavor as part of an overall reorganization of the Government machinery for transportation.

All the above points to meticulous care in drafting the law to anticipate the many problems that would otherwise arise and provide the necessary safeguards against easy administrative rigidity, erosion, or capitulation to the regulatees. This is a demanding legislative task—one that calls for an ambitious exercise of the legislative hearing function to gather together the facts and judgments that will increase the wisdom of final policy decisions. This subcommittee has compiled two volumes of considerable value, but the bulk of the iceberg remains beneath the ocean. Many more volumes need to be assembled to explore the workings of government, industry, and to hear from other groups and specialists connected with motor vehicle safety in various ways. Taken together they will illuminate the pitfalls and tragedies of the past which are to be avoided, extend the awareness of the problems and remedies throughout the land, and construct a scenario of the future toward which we all should strive.

THE JOB CORPS IS MAKING PROGRESS IN THE WAR AGAINST POVERTY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a really excellent article by Howard Persinger, staff writer for the Aliquippa Steelworker, which appeared in the January edition of that publication. The article is entitled "Opportunities Unlimited," and it describes the tremendous contribution to America's future being made by the Camp Parks Job Corps Training Center in Pleasanton, Calif., which is operated for the Office of Economic Opportunity by Litton Industries, Inc., educational systems division.

The article points out that 2,000 disadvantaged young men from all over the Nation are currently receiving basic and citizenship education and widely varying job training in such important fields as office machine repair, automotive work, radio and electronics, welding, building maintenance, and culinary arts. In addition, the corpsmen have access—for the first time—to arts and crafts, and publish their own newspaper. As the article puts it, Camp Parks has brought to the corpsmen "a rebirth of hope where there was despair, and light where there was darkness."

Mr. Speaker, we must not ignore such compelling evidence that the Job Corps is making tremendous progress in the war against poverty. I would like to have Mr. Persinger's article, together with a related Steelworker editorial entitled "Last Chance To Be Somebody" inserted at this point in the Record:

Opportunities Unlimited

(By Howard Persinger, staff writer)

"Opportunities unlimited." Within these two words is contained a world of meaning to approximately 2,000 boys. These boys are now receiving training in basic education, citizenship, and in a vocation at the Camp Parks Job Corps Center, which is located at Pleasanton, Calif. The two words symbolize a rebirth of hope where there was despair, and light where there was but darkness.

"Opportunities unlimited" is the appropriate slogan of the Job Corps training center, and it is diligently applied with the idea of enabling the boys to obtain gainful employment as a result of the training received there.

The center at Camp Parks is one of many such centers, others being located at different points over the Nation. Part of President Johnson's war on poverty program, the Job Corps was set up to train that segment of our youth who for one reason or another, have no place to go and no way to get there. Centers have been set up for both boys and girls.

Steelworker Editor Franceschini and this writer had the privilege of visiting the Camp Parks Center on December 9, therefore it is used as a case in point to illustrate the whole program.

Located not far from San Francisco, Camp Parks is a former Army base that has been reactivated for use by the Job Corps. It is operated for the Government by Litton Industries, Inc., educational systems division.

We spent the better part of a day touring the camp in the company of Mr. Gordon Lowe, who was most helpful and cooperative. To portray the fine work being done here is a very difficult task. One can hear or read about the wonderful work and accomplishment of these centers, but cannot come to full realization except by personal exposure. There is nothing more worthwhile than helping youngsters to help themselves, and the personnel of the camp is doing a tremendous job.

Boys come to this center from all over the country. They are under no obligation to remain, and can leave at any time. It is significant that only 18 percent do leave, and strong testimony that the boys are acutely aware of the opportunity they have.

The entrants range in age from 16 to 21, and their education level varies of course. Some of them cannot read. To remedy this, each boy receives 2½ hours per day instruction in basic education. The classes are arranged according to reading levels. This primary type of education enables many boys to pass Selective Service tests, and get into the Army. The vocational training equips them with a skill to get a job. Both of these encourage the boys to get further education on their own after finishing the Job Corps training. The boys may stay in the center up to 2 years and upon the satisfactory completion of training in one vocation may take up a second.

During the course of the day we visited most of the vocational schools, and the basic education classes. We visited with some of the boys in their rooms, and lunched with them in their dining hall.

I was impressed by the automotive school, and I guess a lot of the boys are, too, since it is one of the more popular vocations. Due, I guess, to the love that most young fellows have of tinkering with cars. But these boys weren't tinkering * * * they were learning. The school contains among other things, a complete auto body and paint shop, and there were autos in various stages of being rebuilt. Some of the kids were learning how to repair automatic transmissions (a formidable looking project).

The Volkswagen Co. set up a shop within the school to teach the boys how to repair their autos. The company installed all the equipment in this unit and sent their representatives in to instruct in the operation of it. In brief, the boys learn all facts of auto repair and maintenance here, under the careful supervision of competent instructors. This was true of all the vocational schools, as well as all other facilities.

We visited the electronics school, and watched the boys as they were learning basic theory and practical application. After learning the fundamentals of circuitry and soldering the boys are furnished with components, and learn from scratch, by assembling a complete radio. After it is completely wired and alined, the boys are given a case in which to put it. Ergo, they have their own personal radio. I think this touch is most beneficial, since it gives a sense of accomplishment, that nothing else could impart.

Next was the typewriter repair shop, and as we went through this and saw typewriters in various stages of assembly or disassembly. I was amazed at the intricacy of the dadblamed things. As Gene Houck, one of the instructors remarked, "People come through here, see this, and the first thing they say is * * * hmmmm, I wonder if you could tell me what is wrong with my typewriter, it does this * * *."

In line with this is a plan, now forming, to teach the boys the intricate and much needed art of appliance repair and servicing.

After this came the school to teach the boys building maintenance, and it was here that we really received an eye opener. I don't think there was anything missed in the way of showing the boys what to do in the way of taking care of a building. I guess if one never took care of a building, then one really has no idea of just what is involved and required to do the job. It is so vast that I won't try to describe it * * * let it suffice to say that I have the greatest respect for building maintainers, henceforth and forevermore. So be it.

There is an arts and crafts shop that is a revelation. I say a revelation because it is here that boys with innate talent are given a chance to demonstrate it. Among the things taught here is painting, weaving, jewelry making, and ceramics. Some of the work produced by the boys is outstanding, and particularly the paintings I saw displayed.

One of the places we missed was the culinary arts school, but I imagine that it is on the same high level as all the others.

In the course of our travels, we visited the camp library. As we scanned the shelves, they seemed somewhat bare. In conversing with the librarian, we asked about this. This kindly woman fairly glowed as she told us of the large amount of books that were checked out, and of the interest the boys had in general reading and study. I personally feel that this is a real criteria of complete success. Once you get them interested in reading, they are halfway home on the road to success.

There are other fine activities and facilities provided for the boys. There is a spacious recreation hall with snack bar and tables. This is where the boys spend their free time in relaxation. It is closed during work and study periods. For the athletic minded there is a gym, also a ballfield and basketball court. The camp also has a theater, and the boys put out a remarkably fine newspaper. At this point I would like to extend compliments to one of the staff photographers of the paper. This is Maurice du Pont, who does some real tough photography.

At lunch with some of the boys we partook of a meal consisting of meat with tomato sauce, potatoes, broccoli, salad, and cake. There was a choice of beverages, coffee, tea, or milk. The meals are planned and nutritionally balanced. There are seconds available, if one is so inclined.

The camp is run on the honor system and the boys are self-policing. This is very effective, and makes the lads aware of their duties and responsibilities. Naturally they are under supervision, but in general terms, they are on their own.

A boy's room is his home and we were invited in to visit with some of them, where we were treated in a very hospitable manner. Since it is their home and therefore their castle, they are free to fix them up as they see fit. Of course it must be kept clean. This is the only restriction and this is the way it should be. Some of the boys are interested in landscaping, and have done some good work outside various buildings.

One thing that stood out in my mind throughout the entire day was this * * *. There is a vitality and enthusiasm in all the camp personnel, from administration to all the instructors. One senses instinctively that they are receiving great joy from their work, and getting a "big bang" from the knowledge that they are really doing a fine job helping these kids. What helps to uplift our youth is of extreme benefit to the whole Nation.

As the day progressed, we talked to many of the boys and it was both gratifying and heartwarming to hear the enthusiasm expressed about the Job Corps in general, and of the new lease on life they were obtaining from it. The frequent comment was that they realized it might be the last chance they could have to get a start in life on a more compatible basis with other people. Some of these kids have had it darn rough, and have seen more of the adverse side of life than they should have at their age, and it has instilled in them a knowing that they have to grasp this opportunity, and go from here. Life has taught them commonsense, and I look for great things in their future.

"For what good are pearls of wisdom, without the thread of commonsense to string them on."

Last Chance To Be Somebody

A recent visit to the Youth Job Corps center located in Camp Parks, Calif., convinced me of the worthiness and necessity of the Job Corps. Contrary to what we read in the daily press, I witnessed firsthand the outstanding job being done to motivate and reclaim individuals that would in all probability be social problems the rest of their lives. The corps takes service rejects, school dropouts, boys flirting with the law, lads so ill adjusted that it is impossible for them to hold steady jobs, and semi-illiterates.

These boys spend half of their corps day in school and the other half in on-the-job training. I joined them in their routine. Their conversations and actions unfolded a burning desire for a place in society, a willingness to learn, strong efforts to be mannerly and polite, and above all—motivation.

It is true the Job Corps fails with 30 percent of these boys, but the 70 percent that remain expressed their opinion of the Job Corps with the words: "Would you mess up your last chance to be somebody?"

Even if the percentages were reversed, the old adage, "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," sure fits.

Just imagine what the cost would be in social and welfare dollars if these boys were allowed to drift into adulthood.

The Youth Job Corps must survive and be expanded to reach every eligible youth.

The Job Corps fulfills President Johnson's prophetic words, "We must make taxpayers out of people, not taxeaters."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Hagan of Georgia (at the request of Mr. Edmondson), for the rest of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. Abernethy (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for 15 minutes, February 23; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hutchinson) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 23, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2077. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, transmitting the third special report of the Commission, pursuant to section 107, Public Law 87–256 (H. Doc. No. 386); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2078. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480, agreements signed during January 1966, pursuant to Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2079. A letter from the Secretary, the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, transmitting the annual audit report for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 662, 83d Congress; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

2080. A letter from the Executive Vice President, National Fund for Medical Education, transmitting a report of an audit of the National Fund for Medical Education for the year ended December 31, 1965, pursuant to section 14(b), Public Law 685, chapter 1036, 86th Congress; to the Committee on Judiciary.

2081. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report of cost ascertainment for the fiscal year 1965, as authorized by 39 U.S.C. 2331; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1294. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 12169. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 12958. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 12959. A bill to provide that the value of annuities and pensions payable under the Civil Service Retirement Act or any other Federal law shall not be taken into account for State inheritance tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 12960. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide for the payment of pension to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows who are now ineligible for such a pension; and to increase the rates of pension payable with respect to widows of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 12961. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax to offset losses of retired pay sustained by certain individuals who retired from the Armed Forces before June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 12962. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 12963. A bill to amend section 709(f) of title 32, United States Code, relating to contributions to retirement systems in the case of caretakers and clerks employed by the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 12964. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the planting of crops on acreage diverted under the cotton, wheat, and feed grains program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12965. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the planting of crops on acreage diverted under the cotton, wheat, and feed grains programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12966. A bill to make technical amendments to titles 19 and 20 of the District of Columbia Code; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 12967. A bill to amend the act of August 4, 1950 (64 Stat. 411), to provide salary increases for certain members of the police force of the Library of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 12968. A bill to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Res. 739. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct certain investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

400. Mr. MOORE presented a memorial of the West Virginia Legislature relating to the importation of glassware from the Republic of Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R 12969. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Vivona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACKAY:

H.R. 12970. A bill for the relief of Aristide G. Coletta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12971. A bill for the relief of Teresina Mancini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12972. A bill for the relief of Adolf L. Vandendorpe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

331. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Ralph Boryszewski, Rochester, N.Y., relative to the impeachment of the Honorable Stephen S. Chandler, U.S. district judge for the western district of Oklahoma, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Right-To-Work Fight Misses the Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, of all the legislative issues which have confronted Congress, few have stirred as much controversy as the proposal to repeal section 14(b)—that provision of the Taft-Hartley Act which leaves with the several States authority to outlaw union shop agreements.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the text of an article which appeared in the February 26, 1966, issue of the Saturday Evening Post. The article sets forth a position that I have consistently taken throughout the debates on this subject:

THE RIGHT-TO-WORK FIGHT MISSES THE POINT

(By Congressman ROBERT P. GRIFFIN)

Few political struggles have raged so long and so bitterly as the battle over the right-to-work provision of the Taft-Hartley Act. Since its enactment in 1947, thousands of fiery speeches have been lavished on this issue; election campaigns for high office have hinged on it; literally tons of propaganda, pro and con, have inundated lawmakers. Within the last year alone it has caused jammed hearing rooms, angry shouting matches and even a Senate filibuster.

As ranking Republican member of the Education and Labor Subcommittee which handles this issue in the House, I have watched this emotional binge with growing dismay. In my view, right to work is a sham battle which too often ignores the issues. It is time we stopped tilting at windmills and faced facts.

The cause of the fuss, section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, is only 44 words long. Simply stated, it allows each State to decide whether labor-management contracts within its borders can require workers to join or pay dues to a union as a condition of employment. Today, 19 States exercise their authority to ban such agreements. Labor unions and their allies want to stop this by repealing 14(b) so that there would be no barrier to the union shop and many more companies could be organized with compulsory union membership. Most management groups are vehemently opposed.

The typical appeal for retaining 14(b) claims that compulsory unionism is somehow un-American—and therefore should not be sanctioned by Federal law. While many sincere people hold this opinion, I believe that they miss the point.

Obligatory membership is not necessarily so unusual or tragic. Many of the lawyers who urge on Congress the view that un-Americanism is somehow involved are themselves members of a compulsory union—the bar association. In 28 States, including my home State of Michigan, no attorney may practice in the courts without joining the bar association and paying dues. Like other attorneys, I have complied with this requirement since graduating from law school, and I have never felt that it corrupted my principles.

The vital question, I submit, is not whether I must join but whether and how my fundamental rights are affected when I do. An involuntary organization possesses extraordinary power since its members may not resign, or stop paying dues, without grave consequences. Thus, any such group should assume unusual responsibilities. As Justice William O. Douglas of the U.S. Supreme Court has written, "If an association is compelled, the individual should not be forced to surrender any matters of conscience, belief, or expression." A citizen should not be forced to choose between his job, the bread for his family—and his convictions.

My compulsory bar association would be un-American if it refused membership because of racial or religious bias, if it fined or expelled me for exercising the constitutional right to dissent, or if it used my dues money to support political candidates or political causes. In hard fact, these very practices are commonplace among labor unions. In my view, these are the central issues that have been sidestepped throughout the discussions about the right-to-work section. That is why I insist that repeal of section 14(b) is acceptable if—and only if—it is accompanied by legal safeguards against the abuses of power by the unions.

While many labor unions are free of such abuses, many others are not. This was amply demonstrated last summer at hearings before our committee. While I believe these hearings were often directed to the wrong issues, they did uncover some shocking instances of union abuse of constitutional rights, including freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and the right to equal employment opportunities.

C. F. Smith, a Texan, is a graduate engineer who passed his master electrician's examination in 1943 with an extremely high grade. For more than 20 years he has been a contractor, with a few other electricians in his employ. Many times over the years Smith and his employees have sought admission to the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, but the local union in Houston would never accept them as members. To Smith the reason is obvious—he and his workers are Negroes.

In spite of his unsuccessful attempts to join, Smith has suffered for being nonunion. "The unions have picketed our jobs," Smith testified, "and a number of our clients have been harassed because they elected to use our services in lieu of union electrical contractors." Texas is a State with a right-to-work law. Smith's problems would undoubtedly be even worse if Texas permitted compulsory-membership contracts, unless effective safeguards made racial discrimination impossible.

The fact is that every serious study of the Nation's unions shows racial discrimination by unions to be widespread. Despite the new Civil Rights Act, there are still many lily-white locals. A recent national study showed that less than 1 percent of the apprentices in the building and construction trades are Negroes. Even in supposedly liberal New York State, the figure was reported to be only 2 percent.

Velio Iacobucci, a movie projectionist from Upper Darby, Pa., was another witness before our committee. A veteran union member, he decided in 1962 to run against the president of his local on a reform platform. The election was held under conditions which Iacobucci claimed were fraudulent. In any event, he was defeated. He was then summarily expelled from the union. Without membership, he is unable to work in most Philadelphia theaters. To ply his trade, he has had to buy an interest in a theater—using borrowed money—and hire himself as a projectionist.

Our committee learned that a local of the United Steel Workers had expelled two of its members after they filed and supported a petition to decertify the union as the bargaining agent with their employer—although the privilege of filing such a petition is guaranteed by our labor laws. Because of the union's action against them, the men lost their jobs under the union-shop contract. Clearly the right to democratic dissent is meaningless if you lose your job for exercising it.

The spending of union dues to aid political candidates is another outrageous practice which dilutes the citizenship rights of those compelled to pay union dues in order to work. Federal law forbids unions to contribute dues funds directly to support candidates for Federal office. But dues money is directly, and liberally, employed in non-Federal elections. It is also used indirectly in Federal elections.

When I asked witness Sidney Zagri, legislative counsel for the Teamsters, if union funds were used to support candidates for State and local offices, he expressed an attitude that is typical of many union leaders: "I say we would be derelict in our duty to our membership if we didn't."

The records of a major union, the United Auto Workers, were included in the hearings and provided further evidence of the abuse of the political freedoms of workers for whom union membership is compulsory. The report shows, for example, that in 1960 the UAW contributed to many campaigns. Some of the funds went to help Orville L. Freeman run for Governor of Minnesota, some to help Otto Kerner in his campaign for the Illinois governership. Well over $100,000 went to the union's voluntary political arm, the Committee on Political Education—COPE—which operates in Federal elections.

Even more dramatic is the plight of workers whose religious beliefs prevent them from joining an organization such as a labor union. For example, among the Plymouth Brethren, a fundamentalist sect, some members have lost job after job because they refused affiliation with a union. In many parts of the country there are such groups which are opposed to union membership as a matter of conscience. Their members constantly have trouble finding—and keeping—jobs.

Countless stories of this kind cry out the need for reform within the American labor movement and, more specifically, for an overhauling of the union-shop provisions of the law. A simple repeal of section 14(b) would undoubtedly increase the violation of constitutional rights, for union shops would quickly be organized in the States that now forbid them. On the other hand, the mere retention of right-to-work laws will not cure many of the abuses either.

My proposal, embodied in a bill I have introduced, would eliminate the section 14 (b), thereby extending the privilege of negotiating union-shop contracts to unions in all 50 States—but at the same time safeguarding the rights of union members. This bill would make it unlawful for a union entering into an agreement requiring membership as a condition of employment (1) to discriminate on account of race, color, or creed; (2) to fine or penalize a member for exercising any legal or civil right guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States; (3) to use dues or assessments for political or other nonunion purposes; (4) to cause the discharge of genuinely religious objectors to union membership.

Of course, it would be meaningless to recite fundamental individual rights without means for enforcement. Under my bill, a compulsory-membership clause in any collective-bargaining agreement would become void if the union involved should disregard any of the law's provisions.

Some of the problems of democratic rights in unions were faced in 1959 by the Landrum-Griffin labor-reform law, which I cosponsored in the House and which then-Senator John F. Kennedy sponsored in its Senate version. This was a valid first step, but experience since then proves that further steps are needed.

The basic safeguards I have outlined must be coupled with any repeal of section 14(b)—for the special privileges enjoyed by unions are linked both in fact and in the public view with special responsibilities. I am convinced that the American people would not long allow Federal sanction for compulsory membership in unions which abuse the rights of their members. This would amount to second-class citizenship for millions of workers. Before long the public would demand much stronger remedies—such as the application of antitrust laws to labor organizations.

It is high time to put aside the hollow clichés that permeate debate over this subject. It is time for all factions of industry to recognize that collective bargaining is a way of life in this country. And it is time for union leaders to recognize that special responsibilities must accompany union authority to require membership as a condition of employment. This, and not emotional arguments over the right to work, is the real issue in the right-to-work battle.

Blackmail in Home Rule Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, according to the press, a group calling itself the Free D.C. Movement was launched yesterday. It is apparently an offshoot of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. One Marion Barry, Jr., director of the Washington office of SNCC in speaking for the new organization announced plans for a consumer boycott against all Washington merchants who refuse to support District home rule. The support demanded from Washington merchants will be to sign petitions, wire the President and Members of Congress, display a "Free D.C." sticker in the window of his business establishment and contribute financially to the treasury of the "Free D.C. Movement." Those who refuse to meet these demands will be blacklisted and boycotted. It is further reported that one cleric who has pledged support to the new movement said he was "sorry that this kind of militancy is necessary" but all other methods have failed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not speak from the premise of one who is fundamentally opposed to home rule. However, I am shocked that the advocates of home rule are now going to resort to the unconscionable methods of blackmail recited above. This goes far beyond the legitimate pressures that should be applied to gain political ends. Steps such as those requiring people to sign petitions, to make financial contributions, and display window stickers are offensive to my sense of fair play. They violate freedom of conscience and the right to freely petition without duress. Indeed they are totally repugnant to the precepts of a free and open society. This kind of blackmail campaign is not going to win any friends for home rule among Members of Congress. It will be completely counterproductive and alienate support now existent.

Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that before we take up home rule legislation again perhaps we had better investigate the need for another type of legislation. Perhaps we should investigate the need to outlaw conspiracies to frighten, intimidate, and threaten under the guise of an economic boycott. This pernicious philosophy that the ends justify the means can be completely destructive of the fabric of a democratic society. Mr. Speaker, I do not like totalitarian and dictatorial methods even when practiced in defense of a good cause. And I repeat that I speak as one who is not opposed to home rule. The people who intend to resort to these tactics are a disgrace to the legitimate cause of home rule for the District of Columbia. They will fail as the forces which seek to employ tyrannical methods always fail when within the context of a democratic society they seek to substitute the weaponry of blackmail for the rule of reason.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Frank W. Blackwelder, All Souls Memorial Episcopal Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God.—Isaiah 40: 3.

Almighty and indestructible Heavenly Father, awaken our minds this day to the significance of the Lenten season.

As the word "lent" means "springtime," so may our minds and spirits be renewed, reborn, and refreshed during this religious interval.

Allow this spiritual season to be both an interim of deleting wrong attitudes and of augmenting our lives with sound principles. Help us to remove the inertia which impedes spiritual progress and to add to our natures evidences of increased devotion and loyalty to Thee.

May these 40 days of discipline of body, mind, and spirit enlighten, inspire, and stimulate our wills to serve Thee and magnify Thy glory.

We thank Thee for Thy servant, our beloved Chaplain, with whom we walked and worked for a little while upon this earth. Thou hast received him into Thy nearer presence. Give unto his family and loved ones the consolation of Thy grace. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 22, 1966.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate in due form of law showing the election of THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN as a Representative-elect to the 89th Congress from the 17th Congressional District of the State of New York, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of John V. Lindsay, is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PRESERVATION OF OUR NATURAL HERITAGE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 387)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Albert Schweitzer said:

> Man has lost the capacity to foresee and to forestall. He will end by destroying the earth.

The most affluent nation on earth may feel that it is immune from this indictment. A nation that offered its people—a century ago—uncharted forests, broad sparkling rivers, and prairies ripe for planting, may have expected that bounty to endure forever.

But we do not live alone with wishful expectations.

We live with history. It tells us of a hundred proud civilizations that have decayed through careless neglect of the nature that fed them.

We live with the certain future of multiplying populations, whose demands on the resources of nature will equal their numbers.

We are not immune. We are not endowed—any more than were those perished nations of the past—with a limitless natural bounty.

Yet we are endowed with their experience. We are able to see the magnitude of the choice before us, and its consequences for every child born on our continent from this day forward.

Economists estimate that this generation has already suffered losses from pollution that run into billions of dollars each year. But the ultimate cost of pollution is incalculable.

We see that we can corrupt and destroy our lands, our rivers, our forests and the atmosphere itself—all in the name of progress and necessity. Such a course leads to a barren America, bereft of its beauty, and shorn of its sustenance.

We see that there is another course—more expensive today, more demanding. Down this course lies a natural America restored to her people. The promise is clear rivers, tall forests, and clean air—a sane environment for man.

I shall propose in this message one means to achieve that promise. It requires, first, an understanding of what has already happened to our waters.

THE POLLUTION OF OUR WATERS

> Pollution touches us all. We are at the same time pollutors and sufferers from pollution. Today, we are certain that pollution adversely affects the quality of our lives. In the future, it may affect their duration.

These are the words of the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee. They were written in November 1965.

At that time, every river system in America suffered some degree of pollution.

At that time, discharges into our rivers and streams—both treated and untreated—equaled the raw sewage from almost 50 million people. Animal wastes and waste from our cities and towns were making water unfit for any use.

At that time, rivers, lakes, and estuaries were receiving great quantities of industrial chemicals—acids from mine runoff—detergents and minerals that would not break down in the ordinary life of the water. These pollutants were reentering domestic and industrial water supplies. They were killing fish. They posed hazards to both human and animal life.

By that time, on Lake Erie 6 of 32 public recreation and swimming areas had been closed down because the water was unsafe for human beings. The blue pike catch in the lake had fallen from 20 million pounds in 1937 to 7,000 pounds in 1960. The oxygen that fish need for life was being rapidly devoured by blooms of algae fed by pollutants.

At that time, in the lower Arkansas Red River Basin, oil field development and irrigation were dumping salt into rivers. The result was an additional annual expense of $13 million to bring in fresh water.

I have placed these comments in the past tense not because they are no longer true. They are more tragically true today than they were 4 months ago.

I seek instead to make them a benchmark in restoring America's precious heritage to her people.

I seek to make them that point in time when Americans determined to resist the flow of poison in their rivers and streams.

I seek to make them ancient history for the next generation.

And I believe the conditions they describe can become just that—if we begin now, together, to cleanse our rivers of the blight that burdens them.

A START HAS BEEN MADE

The 1st session of the 89th Congress launched a major effort to save America's water resources.

It authorized quality standards for all interstate waters.

It provided—in the Water Pollution Control Act of 1965—new resources for treating the wastes from our cities.

It created the Water Resources Council to coordinate all aspects of river basin planning. This unified effort promises to make the work of pollution control more effective.

We mean to make full use of these new instruments. They will require increased expenditures, in a year of few increases for urgent domestic programs. We shall make them.

Yet at this point the development of new knowledge, and new organizations to carry on this work, is as crucial as our dollars.

We must combine all the means at our disposal—Federal, State, local, and private—progressively to reduce the pollution of our rivers.

A CLEAN RIVERS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

I propose that we begin now to clean and preserve entire river basins from their sources to their mouths.

I propose a new kind of partnership—built upon our creative federal system—that will unite all the pollution control activities in a single river basin. Its task is to achieve high standards of water quality throughout the basin.

The clean rivers demonstration program I recommend has four requirements:

1. Appropriate water quality standards—authorized by the Water Quality Act of 1965—must be adopted for every part of the basin.
2. The States and local communities must develop long-range plans to achieve those standards and to preserve them. The plans must be comprehensive, and they must be practical.
3. Where it does not already exist, a permanent river basin organization must be created to carry out the plan. It must represent the communities and the States. It must work closely with the Federal Government. The organization must be prepared to revise the plan as conditions require, so that new threats to the quality of the river may be turned back.
4. Communities must be willing and able to contribute funds necessary for constructing facilities. They must be prepared to levy charges for their use—charges adequate to maintain, extend, and replace them when needed.

THE FEDERAL ROLE

Federal financial assistance will be necessary if the clean rivers demonstration program is to succeed.

In most watersheds there are communities wholly without treatment facilities. There are some with only the most basic means for removing solid wastes.

Substantial funds will be necessary to construct the initial facilities. I therefore propose to:

Eliminate the dollar-ceiling limitation on grants for sewage treatment facilities in these clean river demonstrations—but only in the demonstrations.

Provide special funds to finance both planning and project costs in clean river demonstrations.

In the first year, I am asking $50 million to begin this program.

To administer the program most effectively, we must reorganize the Federal effort. In the past, the Federal antipollution effort has been organizationally separate from water conservation and use programs.

One agency should assume leadership in our clean water effort.

That agency should be the Department of the Interior.

Today the Department's water management programs range from saline water research to irrigation. It is responsible for wildlife preservation, and for administering the national park system. Its Secretary serves as Chairman of the Water Resources Council. Thus its present task, and the logic of good government, require that it be entrusted with an important new effort to clean and preserve entire river systems.

I shall shortly submit to the Congress a reorganization plan to transfer to the Department of the Interior the Water Pollution Control Administration now housed in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

BENEFITS OF THE PROGRAM

The program has one ultimate goal: to clean all of America's rivers. This year we shall start with those few basins whose States and communities are prepared to begin. As additional organizations are formed and their plans drafted, more basins will qualify.

The projects will be self-sustaining. Federal assistance is planned for the initial construction of local treatment works. Thereafter, local communities will collect revenues from users sufficient for the operation, expansion, and replacement of the facilities. Continuing responsibility will reside where the benefits accrue—with local authorities.

The projects will allow experiment with new forms of organization. State and local participation may be based on an interstate compact, a river basin commission, or even a conservancy district. The central requirement is for sufficient jurisdiction and authority to develop and carry out the long-range plan.

These projects will enable us to curtail and control pollution in entire river basins. Broad-scale planning of water standards in broad stretches of a river can achieve substantial economies. More efficient plants can be built to treat the wastes of several communities and nearby industries. Integrating the control of streamflow and treatment plant operation can reduce costs—for example, by fitting the type and amount of day-to-day treatment to varying stream conditions.

OUR ESTABLISHED PROGRAMS

The clean rivers program now holds great promise for restoring and preserving water quality. But in the beginning it can affect only a few areas.

Our existing programs must continue. They must be improved—not only to help rescue other rivers from pollution, but because they provide the foundation for the river basin demonstration projects.

Federal grants for waste treatment plants now total more than $725 million. More than 6,000 projects are under construction or already completed. For fiscal 1967 I have requested the Congress to appropriate $150 million, the full authorized amount, to continue this vital effort.

Under last year's act, the initiative for water quality standards rests, until July 1967, with the States. State governments now have an obligation to demonstrate their willingness and ability to control pollution. Some have already done so. The Federal Government must extend all possible help to enable the States to meet this responsibility.

I am therefore recommending that support for State water pollution control agencies be doubled. The added amount should be used at the Secretary's discretion to assist States in devising effective water quality standards. It should be used to prepare plans for abating pollution.

ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY

Standards, however, mean little without the power to enforce them. Existing Federal authority to abate water pollution is unnecessarily time consuming, complex in procedure, and limited in jurisdiction. Steps must be taken to simplify and strengthen these procedures.

I recommend that—

1. The Water Pollution Control Act be amended to eliminate the two mandatory 6-month delays that unnecessarily burden its procedures;
2. The Federal Government have authority immediately to bring suit to stop pollution, when that pollution constitutes an imminent danger to public health or welfare;
3. More weight be given by the courts to the evidence produced in administrative enforcement hearings;
4. The Federal Government have the right to subpena witnesses to appear at administrative hearings;
5. The Secretary be given the right to initiate enforcement proceedings when pollution occurs in navigable waters, intrastate or interstate;
6. Registration be required of all existing or potential sources of major pollution, and U.S. officials be given the right to inspect such sources; and
7. Private citizens be allowed to bring suit in Federal court to seek relief from pollution.

These are strong measures. But the menace of pollution requires them.

It poses a major threat to the quality of life in our country.

RESEARCH FOR COMPREHENSIVE POLLUTION CONTROL

The river basin proposals I am submitting take advantage of the best techniques available today. They apply new concepts of efficient organization. But if pollution control is to cope with increasing volumes of waste from our growing industry and population, new knowledge and technology are required. It is a challenge to research organizations, both private and public, to develop these technologies.

1. There must be new integrated systems of disposal. Many liquid wastes can be transformed to solids or gases—or vice versa. Research can show which form is least harmful and least costly. Research can reduce costs through combined solid-liquid disposal systems.

2. The technology of water treatment must be improved. We must find ways to allow more reuse of waste water at reasonable costs. We must remove or control nutrients that cause excessive growth of plant life in streams, lakes and estuaries. We must take steps to control the damage caused by waters that heat up after cooling generators and industrial engines.

3. More must be learned about the effects of pollutants and the present level of pollution. Better equipment must be developed to measure pollution load and movement. We must assess the results of particular pollutants on plant, animal, and human populations. We should continually monitor the quality of our environment, to provide a yardstick against which our progress in pollution abatement can be measured. We must apply the most modern techniques of systems analysis.

Such research will lead to pollution standards suited for each location and type of pollutant. It will permit us to direct our control efforts more efficiently. I am proposing that we spend over $20 million next year on this research.

CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION

The Clean Air Act of 1963 and its 1965 amendments have given us new tools to help attack the pollution that fouls the air we breathe.

We have begun to counter air pollution by increasing the tempo of effort at all levels of government.

In less than 2 years Federal financial assistance has stimulated a 50-percent increase in the air pollution budgets of States and local governments. Federal standards for the control of automobile exhausts will apply to the 1968 models. The Federal interstate abatement program will significantly supplement State and local efforts to deal with air pollution.

I am heartened by the progress we are making. But I am mindful that we have only begun our work. I am forwarding to the Congress proposals to improve and increase Federal research, financing, and technical assistance to help States and local governments take the measures needed to control air pollution.

POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

The Federal Government is rightly expected to provide an example to the Nation in pollution control. We cannot make new demands on State and local governments or on private industry without putting the Federal house in order. We will take the necessary steps this year to insure that Federal activities do not contribute to the deterioration of our water and air.

Last November I signed an Executive order requiring that all new Federal installations include adequate water pollution control systems. Agencies are required to submit long-range plans to bring existing installations up to the high level of pollution control required of new facilities. These plans are to be submitted by July 1 of this year. We are providing the funds necessary to implement them.

I also intend to issue an Executive order dealing with air pollution from Federal activities. The potential dangers of air pollution have only recently been realized. The technical and economic difficulties in conserving the purity of our air are, if anything, greater than in protecting our water resources. Nevertheless, I intend to see that the necessary steps are taken to curtail emissions from Federal installations.

HUMAN RESOURCES FOR POLLUTION CONTROL

New projects and new technology are of little value without skilled people dedicated to putting them to effective use.

I propose to enlist the services of those in industry and the universities.

I propose to attract skilled administrators and scientists to the challenges of full-time occupations in pollution control.

Critical skills are in short supply in all public pollution control operations. We need to train scientists and social scientists in these activities, and to demonstrate the advantages of Government service as a lifetime occupation. I propose to establish traineeships, fellowships, and an internship program in Federal pollution control activities. The participants will be in residence in Federal pollution control programs throughout the country.

IMPACT ON OUR CITIES

The pollution control programs I have recommended will benefit all Americans.

But nowhere will the impact be greater than on our cities.

These steps can clean the air that is today blighted by smoke and chemicals.

These steps can bring to growing urban centers abundant supplies of pure water to sustain today's prosperity and to satisfy tomorrow's needs.

These steps can enrich the daily life of the city dweller and his children by restoring surrounding waterways to their unspoiled natural beauty. For we know that ugliness is degrading and costly, but that beauty can revive the human spirit and enlarge the imagination.

NATIONAL WATER COMMISSION

In no area of resource management are the problems more complex—or more important—than those involving our Nation's water supplies. The water shortage in the Northeastern United States is a dramatic reminder that we must take every possible step to improve the management of our precious water resources.

I propose the establishment of a National Water Commission to review and advise on the entire range of water resource problems—from methods to conserve and augment existing water supplies to the application of modern technology, such as desalting, to provide more usable water for our cities, our industries, and our farms.

This Commission will be composed of the very best minds in the country. It will judge the quality of our present efforts. It will recommend long-range plans for the future. It will point the way to increased and more effective water resource measures by the Federal Government, working in close cooperation with States, local communities, and private industry.

SAVING OUR FORESTS

Since the century's beginning the National Government has labored to preserve the sublime legacy that is the American forest.

Time after time public intervention has prevented the destruction of irreplaceble forest lands.

Our national park and forest systems are America's principal trustee in the vital task of conservation. The task cannot be accomplished in a single stroke. It requires patient determination and careful planning to secure for our people the beauty that is justly theirs. It merits careful planning.

I propose that we plan now to complete our national park system by 1972—the 100th anniversary of Yellowstone, the world's first national park.

Substantial progress has been made during the last 4 years. Yet many scenic masterpieces remain unprotected and deserve early inclusion in the national park system.

A REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

I propose the creation of a Redwood National Park in northern California.

It is possible to reclaim a river like the Potomac from the carelessness of man. But we cannot restore—once it is lost—the majesty of a forest whose trees soared upward 2,000 years ago. The Secretary of the Interior—after exhaustive consultations with preservationists, officials of the State of California, lumbermen and others—has completed a study of the desirability of establishing a park of international significance.

I have reviewed his recommendations, and am submitting to the Congress legislation to establish such a park. This will be costly. But it is my recommendation that we move swiftly to save an area of immense significance before it is too late.

OTHER OUTDOOR RECREATION PROPOSALS

Other major outdoor recreation proposals which should be approved in 1966 are:

1. Cape Lookout National Seashore, N.C.
2. Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Mich.
3. Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, Ind.
4. Oregon Dunes National Seashore, Oreg.
5. Great Basin National Park, Nev.
6. Guadalupe Mountains National Park, Tex.
7. Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, Mont.-Wyo.
8. Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area, Utah-Wyo.

For a region which now has no national park, I recommend the study of a Connecticut River National Recreation Area along New England's largest river, in the States of New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Connecticut.

I propose the early completion of studies and planning for two new parks—the Apostle Isles Seashore along Lake Superior and North Cascades in Washington State.

NATIONWIDE TRAIL SYSTEM

In my budget, I recommended legislation to extend Federal support to the Appalachian Trail, and to encourage the development of hiking trails accessible to the people throughout the country.

I am submitting legislation to foster the development by Federal, State, and local agencies of a nationwide system of trails and give special emphasis to the location of trails near metropolitan areas.

PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC SITES

Historic preservation is the goal of citizen groups in every part of the country. To help preserve buildings and sites of historic significance, I will recommend a program of matching grants to States and to the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

WILD RIVER SYSTEM

I am encouraged by the response to my proposal for a national wild rivers system, and I urge the Congress to complete this pioneering conservation legislation this year.

COSTS OF LAND ACQUISITION

The spiraling cost of land acquisitions by the Federal Government, particularly for water resource and recreational purposes, is a matter of increasing concern.

Landowners whose property is acquired by the Federal Government are, of course, entitled to just compensation as provided by the Constitution. At the same time, land for the use of the general public should not be burdened with the increased price resulting from speculative activities.

I have requested the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, together with the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior, and the heads of the other agencies principally concerned, to investigate procedures for protecting the Government against such artificial price spirals.

A CREED TO PRESERVE OUR NATURAL HERITAGE

To sustain an environment suitable for man, we must fight on a thousand battlegrounds. Despite all of our wealth and knowledge, we cannot create a redwood forest, a wild river, or a gleaming seashore.

But we can keep those we have.

The science that has increased our abundance can find ways to restore and renew an environment equal to our needs.

The time is ripe to set forth a creed to preserve our natural heritage—principles which men and women of good will will support in order to assure the beauty and bounty of their land. Conservation is ethically sound. It is rooted in our love of the land, our respect for the rights of others, our devotion to the rule of law.

Let us proclaim a creed to preserve our natural heritage with rights and the duties to respect those rights:

The right to clean water—and the duty not to pollute it.

The right to clean air—and the duty not to befoul it.

The right to surroundings reasonably free from manmade ugliness—and the duty not to blight.

The right of easy access to places of beauty and tranquillity where every family can find recreation and refreshment—and the duty to preserve such places clean and unspoiled.

The right to enjoy plants and animals in their natural habitats—and the duty not to eliminate them from the face of this earth.

These rights assert that no person, or company, or government has a right in this day and age to pollute, to abuse resources, or to waste our common heritage.

The work to achieve these rights will not be easy. It cannot be completed in a year or 5 years. But there will never be a better time to begin.

Let us from this moment begin our work in earnest—so that future generations of Americans will look back and say: 1966 was the year of the new conservation, when farsighted men took farsighted steps to preserve the beauty that is the heritage of our Republic.

I urge the Congress to give favorable consideration to the proposals I have recommended in this message.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 23, 1966.*

CLEAN RIVERS DEMONSTRATION BILL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the President's clean rivers demonstration proposal offers us an opportunity to halt and, ultimately, to reverse the trend toward pollution in America's rivers. A piecemeal approach by separate communities has long since proven inadequate. The pollution problems of any community can only be dealt with in the context of the problems of all the other communities within the same river basin. Only when each of our river basins is considered as a whole can pollution be brought under effective control.

This bill will permit the Federal Government to join with the States and local agencies in a broad-scale plan to clean up entire rivers. The cost of the program is too great for local agencies to bear alone, and so the Federal Government must participate. Federal participation, however, will be based on the willingness of the local agencies to assume full responsibility, without further Federal assistance, for operating, replacing, and expanding the pollution control facilities once they have been constructed. This means that local agencies will have to find the funds to finance the ongoing needs of their projects. The goal is to provide a financing system, based upon revenue bonds and user charges, that will place the burden of pollution control on those who cause the pollution.

The clean rivers restoration bill is not a substitute for existing Federal pollution control programs. It supplements those programs by providing for an intensive Federal-State approach on selected rivers that will point the way toward a long-range solution to the pollution problem on those and other rivers. Until a river basin plan is in effect, the other programs will continue to operate. Once a river basin plan is in effect, however, all pollution control programs of the Federal Government must then be administered in a manner that is consistent with the plan.

This is a farsighted and well-planned program which needs our urgent support.

MOVE WATER POLLUTION TO INTERIOR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's proposal to transfer responsibility for the national effort against water pollution to the Department of the Interior is a wise move.

In saying this, I do not wish to detract from the valiant efforts made, first by the Public Health Service alone, and then by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in initiating the Federal antipollution program.

It was natural to begin this effort with the Public Health Service, for originally its most dramatic impact was in the field of health. But as time passed, it became apparent that it was both unfair to the Public Health Service, and inefficient for the Nation, to insist that scientists and medical personnel concerned with the war on disease also become river basin planners and water control experts.

The President's proposal, therefore, seems to me to be eminently sound. Coupled with his recommendation for legislation that will place the war on pollution on a river-basin basis, we have been given the basis for a powerful two-pronged weapon which to mount an effective attack on one of the most pressing of our domestic problems.

I believe these measures will greatly speed our efforts to end the grave and growing pollution in our streams and rivers.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 17]

Baldwin
Blatnik
Bolling
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cederberg
Chelf
Cohelan
Conyers
Cramer
Dowdy
Ellsworth
Fallon
Farnsley
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Harvey, Ind.
Hosmer
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Matthews
Miller
Moorhead
Morris
Murray
Ottinger
Patman
Pool
Powell
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Scott
Senner
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Steed
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Walker, N. Mex.
White, Idaho
Willis
Zablocki

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZATION FOR FILING OF REPORT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tonight to file privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL PARKS ON THE NORTHEN COAST OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am joining the President of the United States in proposing the creation of a Redwood National Park in my district along the northern coast of California. Accordingly, I am introducing a bill developed for this purpose by the agencies of the Federal Government.

To me and all of my constituents—620,000 strong—the strip of coastline from San Francisco north to the Oregon border is among the beauty spots of the world. It amazes me that it took until 1962, when the Point Reyes National Seashore was created, to recognize this area for national status. Now it has become clear that one of the rarest resources in the world—the tall coast redwoods—should be recognized as one of our great national assets and that suitable redwood forests be set aside under the care of the National Park Service. By my words and action today, I fully endorse this concept.

But while I endorse the concept, I must be frank to say that I cannot endorse all of its parts. There are a number of reasons for this:

The first is that I saw the completed bill for the first time only last night. While I am well aware of its main provisions, I have not had time to study the small print nor otherwise learn the details.

Second, this is just as well because I think it mandatory that extensive committee hearings be held in the National Capital and in the redwood empire, as we call it, to weigh the values of this bill and sort its facets. I have consulted the gentleman fom Colorado and, in his wisdom, he agrees.

Further, I hope to be in a position to offer any improvements necessary to perfect the proposal. More than 400 Members of this honorable body may find it hard to question the protection of beautiful redwood forests, and it is understandable. But there is only one—the Congressman from the First District of California—who has the direct responsibility to protect also the legitimate interests of all of the people who live there.

Rightly or wrongly, there is a great deal of opposition to a Redwood National Park within my district. Many people are critical that the State of California has not developed the recreational potential of the more than 100,000 acres of cathedrallike redwood forests it has held in State parks for many years. Because the timber products industry represents more than 70 percent of the local economy, others fear for their jobs. And still others, who pay property taxes, fear that the tax base will be seriously eroded by Federal acquisition of private lands, thereby increasing their own tax load. These are reasonable concerns that I, as their Representative, also must voice.

As the Members may be sure, some 30 bills to create a Redwood National Park have been introduced in this House. Still others discussed the situation with me and asked me about it; for this I will be eternally grateful. My own effort has been to work with the National Park Service, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, and the Bureau of the Budget up to and including a final meeting last night. I personally flew Government officials over mile upon mile of redwood forests, introduced them to local officials, lumber workers, and other citizens and otherwise acquainted them with the area and the problems major new Government acquisitions would cause.

As a result, I present to you today what I consider to be an honest attempt at compromise. It is an effort to fully recognize an esthetic obligation to the future while meeting the mundane obligations of today. It attempts to solve the economic problems such a park would create while others would shrug them off as a necessary sacrifice to the preservation of beauty. The main provisions of the bill are these:

First. Creation of a Redwood National Park by acquiring Jedediah Smith and Del Norte Coast Redwoods State Parks from California and acquiring other virgin redwood forests to connect the two into one large park. Although the bill also includes acquisition of the entire Mill Creek watershed, much of which is nonpark quality, I intend to propose some other method of watershed control—perhaps by contract with the private owner—to protect the virgin groves downstream and maintain a major employer in business.

To do this, I am irrevocably committed to introduce a second bill creating a National Redwood Park that contains the description of a corridor tying the Jedediah Smith and the Del Norte State Parks together as requested by some of the people of the area directly involved.

Second. An economic adjustment payment to local governmental bodies to not only offset property tax losses but to assist in other areas of economic adjustment, such as job retraining.

Third. An immediate crash program for development of the park to provide jobs and speed the expansion of the tourist industry. Coupled with direction to proper Government agencies to exert every effort in the areas of manpower retraining and relocation, this again is an honest effort to solve a major problem.

There are other proposals now pending before the Congress. Also, many varied opinions on the size and location of the proposed National Redwood Park are held by many constituents of my congressional district and many conservation organizations outside of the area involved.

I believe everyone agrees that the final recommendations will be made by the appropriate committees of the House and the Senate, and only after detailed hearings are held and evaluations made of the various proposals.

While I am quite naturally concerned about the effect any proposal will have on the landowner, I am more particularly concerned about the people involved—the men and women who work in the forest products industry, the people who are in service jobs or businesses that will feel the economic impact, the overall effect on the tax base of school districts, the county of Del Norte and any other political subdivision.

I think this bill is a reasonable starting point, and I submit it to the Congress for its serious consideration.

In conclusion, I feel it incumbent upon me to bring to the attention of the Congress another conservation matter that is of great importance to the people of my district and the Nation.

The Point Reyes National Seashore in Marin County, just north of San Francisco, was authorized prior to my arrival in Congress. The original authorization was for $14 million. This amount has been funded by the Congress.

The problem now confronting us is the fact that the Park Service now estimates an additional $30.5 million will be required to complete the land acquisition originally recommended for inclusion in the project.

While consideration is now underway for the creation of the Redwood National Park, I wish to remind the Members of Congress that we have an additional responsibility to complete the authorization and financing of this very important national seashore project which is immediately contiguous to the major population communities of the San Francisco Bay area. This is my first priority conservation project for our congressional district. I have committed myself to see it through.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, as one who for a long time has supported some type of self-government for the District of Columbia, I was amazed yesterday to read in the newspaper and to observe on television last night some recent proposals that have been made.

Every individual has a right in good conscience to take his position upon an issue, and certainly this is an issue that has been controversial.

Mr. Speaker, in recent years the economic boycott has been used in many instances and has come to be a way of life in this country. But the proposal which was brought forward yesterday goes far beyond anything of that type. It proposes that any merchant in the District of Columbia who does not support home rule all out will be listed and economically boycotted. But, in addition, he will be assessed a portion of a $100,000 kitty to fight for home rule in this District.

In other words, this is the most glaring example of outright blackmail that it has ever been my opportunity to observe. As one who supported very strongly the bill which this House passed for home rule for the District, I have been continuing my efforts to get favorable action on that bill and to get it to the President.

Such exhibitions of misguided and half-baked leadership in the District of Columbia make far more difficult the task of those of us who are sincerely attempting to give an opportunity for home rule to the people of the District.

THE 17TH ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL PANCAKE DAY RACE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the 17th annual running of the International Pancake Day race was held yesterday in Olney, England, and Liberal, Kans.

I had the pleasure of being in Liberal and witnessing the record performance of Miss Rachel Crites, age 18, of Liberal, Kans. The new record time for covering the 415-yard course is 1 minute 4.5 seconds.

The winner in England was Miss Janet Bunker, 16, who covered the course in 1 minute 5.1 seconds, which equaled the old record held by Mrs. Binnie Dick, of Liberal. Timewise, the race in Liberal, Kans., is subsequent to the race in Olney, England, and therefore, Miss Crites knew in advance the challenge she faced.

The International Pancake Day race has become world famous and as it now stands, Liberal contestants have been victorious nine times, those in Olney, eight. Everyone who participates in Pancake Day activities in Liberal, in our Nation's Capital, and in Olney, England, deserves a great deal of credit.

What started in 1950 on a rather small scale has become an annual event, attracting thousands of people and, needless to say, it does much to stimulate good will throughout both countries.

I congratulate Rachel Crites, the new champion, and also pay special tribute to the Liberal, Kans., Junior Chamber of Commerce for sponsoring this spectacular event.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks that have just been made from the well by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk]. I composed some remarks yesterday and inserted them in the Appendix of the Record because there was no opportunity, it being Washington's birthday, to address the House on this subject.

As one who is not opposed fundamentally to home rule, I do want to declare my complete distaste for the methods of economic blackmail that apparently now would be substituted for the rule of reason in dealing with this very important proposal.

I congratulate the gentleman from California for taking the floor to express his sentiments in this respect.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 736 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 736

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12752) to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith] representing the minority, and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if I may have the indulgence of the House for a very few minutes, I should like to discuss in those few minutes this new revenue bill. Permit me to say in the first instance that, like every Member of this House, I am opposed to raising taxes. There is only one thing that I am more opposed to as a Member of this House, and that is to this Government going deeper and deeper and deeper into debt every year.

Now, taxes are always burdensome and are ever increasingly becoming burdensome, but, as I indicated, we have to look at the long-range program and we have to weigh and evaluate the question of which is the worse evil, the raising of more revenue or the increasing of our national debt. Above all this, of course, is the ever-present and ever-increasing danger of ruinous inflation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would change the method of collecting taxes, which the committee estimates would bring in considerable revenue. The other provision of the bill would not repeal but, rather, reinstate or reauthorize the collection of certain excise taxes. It would reimpose these excise taxes, which were scheduled under the bill passed last year to expire and which would therefore under this bill add additional revenue.

Mr. Speaker, I was opposed to the repeal of these taxes on previous occasions on the same theory and on the same philosophy that I am now stating here; namely, that you have to have some semblance of fiscal responsibility. I just belong to that old-fashioned school that believes somewhere down the line there has to be a day of reckoning and that you just cannot keep on spending, spending, and spending, and keep adding and adding to the national debt. So I reluctantly take the unpopular position here of supporting this bill—no man in public life likes to take an unpopular position, particularly the one of raising the burdens of taxation—and I take this position upon that theory and upon that philosophy of fiscal responsibility.

Now, what is the situation here? We owe—and I have the most recent figures—a little matter of $320 billion. This is the figure that the Treasury comes up with. But if all of the obligations of the Government were added it would be many times that figure. In fact, it would be in the astronomical figure of trillions. The interest on that acknowledged figure of $320 billion is $12.8 billion annually.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Roosevelt came here in 1933, Mr. Hoover was spending approximately one-third of that amount of money to run the entire National Government—everything; armed services, welfare, and everything else.

Now the proponents of the Great Society tell us that we have the greatest era of prosperity we have ever had in this Nation. I believe that is true. I do not believe there is any question about it. The Nation is enjoying unprecedented prosperity.

But, Mr. Speaker, I come back to the point that a large portion of that prosperity is the result of governmental spending, and that if the Government keeps accelerating the spending which we are now experiencing, we will have just that much more of this artificial prosperity.

However, somewhere—and I come back to my original point—down the line there has to be a day of reckoning.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another reason I go along with this tax bill is, to lessen the deficit that we are facing—is because of the retarding effect that it will have upon inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I have stood in the well of this House at least 20 times in the last 20 years and made the statement, that I feared inflation worse than I feared communism; that we were in more danger of destroying ourselves from within than we were from without.

Mr. Speaker, we have inflation today. Would anyone deny that? If you are not familiar with it, ask your wife about it when she goes shopping. It is increasing all the time. This will serve to place a little brake upon that evil of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, there is an additional reason: We are fighting a war over there in Vietnam. We do not call it a war, but the boys over there in the jungles and the rice paddies will tell you that it is a war. The mothers scattered throughout your districts who are sending their boys over there, the casualty lists, will all tell you that we are in a war. And, Mr. Speaker, we are coming in here tomorrow, or the next day—in the next few days, at any rate—with authorization for additional billions of dollars because of that war that is going on over there. Whether we should be there or not is another question. The fact is that we are there and we have to support our boys who are there.

Mr. Speaker, is there anyone in this House today—and if so I shall yield to him—who will differ with me when I say that the end of that war is not in sight; that it could well last for 5 or more years? It could well last for 10 or 20 years, if we do not fight an all-out war, if we follow the appeasement policy permitting the Communists to call the signals and we run only the defensive plays.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a situation here where we have got to maintain some sense of responsibility on the domestic front.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just happen again to be old-fashioned enough to believe that we can not have our pie and keep it too—or to put in conversely, we cannot have both butter and guns.

But yet I see no indication whatever upon the national horizon to cut down on this domestic spending. On the contrary, we are authorizing more and more and more new programs that are going to cause greater and greater and greater deficits, and further debase our currency and hasten that day of confrontation when we have to realize what is going on.

Would it not seem the prudent thing to do—would not private business or private enterprise or the private individual who has some sense of responsibility and prudence—would he not try, if he got into trouble on one side—would he not try to retrench on the other? Oh, but no, not the Government—not the Federal Government. We are going to continue both the domestic spending and the acceleration of the welfare state and at the same time furnish more and more of the sinews of warfare which come, incidentally, very expensively.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about the future of this country. I am very much concerned about the perpetuation of the Republic with its cherished institutions. I think it is time to stop, look, and listen a little bit and try to get back on an even keel.

I do not like this bill—I repeat. I do not like this rule. Because traditionally I am opposed to closed rules, but I think we have to have this or some other method of stabilizing our fiscal situation. Therefore, like most of you, I am going to go along reluctantly with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, when my friends, the able gentleman from Arkansas—and there are very few in this House, if any, who are more able than he is—comes before the Committee on Rules again—which I anticipate, before too long, and asks for another increase in the debt limit—and you remember we had two or three last year and we will probably have at least—I know we will have at least one more and possibly two or three more before this Congress is over—or certainly before this situation is solved—I am going to be against it.

As one Member of this House of Representatives, I am trying to call the attention of the American people to our financial situation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa, who I might say is not responsible for our unfortunate debt situation.

Mr. GROSS. There is one figure that I would like to add to the figures that the gentleman has given and that is the figure of $1,206 billion of public and private debt in this country as of December 31, 1965. That is an increase of between $88 billion and $89 billion over the figure for 1964. Somehow or other, as the gentleman has said, we have to stop spending. But like the gentleman, I see no evidence of it. Already in this session of Congress I have seen millions voted for Interama. I have seen more millions for a National Air Museum voted through Congress and the $1 billion Southeast Asian Development Bank went through as if the skids were greased. I see no evidence of anyone trying to cut back on spending. It is going to be hard for me to reconcile a vote for this bill here today in the light of the spending that has already been authorized for projects that could and should have been deferred.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. He usually makes a valuable contribution. I can understand how he will find it difficult to vote for this tax bill even as I have already stated I am finding it difficult to do so.

I have a great admiration for my friend from Iowa, as he knows, and I am not trying to put words in his mouth. I am sure that, knowing him as I do, he will evaluate this situation, and that, at least in my judgment, he will come up with the conclusion that I have reached that, as bitter as a pill may be, some medicine must be taken at this time.

I express the hope that the administration and the Congress will act prudently and responsibly and curtail these new programs in the interest of giving the necessary support to the war effort and in the interest of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I am no newcomer to the philosophy which I have just enunciated. As a matter of fact, I have been hoisting the danger signals on this floor for many years. Not in the sense of "I told you so," but because I think it is worth repeating. I shall submit, in the nature of an appendix to my remarks here today, a statement that I made upon this floor on March 19, 1952, some 14 years ago.

The title of that speech was, "High Taxes Result in Unbridled Spending," and is as follows:

> Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 578 and ask for its immediate consideration.
>
> Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Allen], and pending that, I yield myself 15 minutes at this time.
>
> Mr. Speaker, for the past two decades this splendid young Republic has been going through one crisis after another; some were real, others mere political creations advanced to perpetuate those in control of the government in power. Today we are faced with another crisis, a real crisis, a crisis that threatens to destroy the fiscal foundation of the Republic. We are on the brink of the precipice of national bankruptcy. More and more thoughtful citizens throughout the country are realizing and fully appreciating the dangers ahead if this unbridled governmental spending is permitted to continue.
>
> Today we, the representatives of the people, are given an opportunity to apply the brakes and thus make a further contribution toward reversing the trend in extravagant governmental spending.
>
> This rule makes in order the consideration of H.R. 7072, the annual independent offices appropriation bill, a bill appropriating funds for the next fiscal year for most of the Federal bureaus. The President, through his Budget Bureau, requested of the Congress a total of $2,085,097,390 for these bureaus. The Appropriations Committee, under the able leadership of its subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has cut that request by a total of $700,048,695. In every case the committee has made substantial reductions excepting, of course, such items which are fixed and not susceptible to reduction.
>
> As one who has long been interested in this economy drive, I desire now to express, in the premises, on my own part and on the part of my coworkers, the gratitude of all economy-minded Members of this body for the committee's efforts. While further efforts will be made in the form of appropriate amendments to make even further economies, I apprehend that determined efforts will be made by those Members of the House who consider themselves liberal minded to restore the reductions made by the committee in an effort to continue the spending spree. This effort must not prevail. The line must be held.
>
> ### BALANCED BUDGET
>
> Mr. Speaker, I have been alarmed for the past several years over the dismal picture presented of the country going deeper and deeper each year into the red while the Federal Government digs deeper and deeper into the pocket of the American taxpayers. More than a year ago a little band of southern Democrats, with the aid of others, in this body got together and agreed to accept the President's challenge to cut his budget. Last year we succeeded in trimming that budget several hundred million dollars. This year others have joined our group and the work continues. We have reason to believe that, with the addition of more and more converts to the cause, the budget can be balanced this year in spite of the $82,000,000,000 request of the President with the resultant $14,000,000,000 proposed deficit. If the economy line is held on this bill and the succeeding appropriation bills yet to come before us, there will be no necessity for any deficit. We can place ourselves on a pay-as-you-go basis. Therefore our immediate objective this year should be a balanced budget.
>
> It is as obvious as the noonday sun that if we cannot balance the budget now, with an alltime high national income of cheap money together with an alltime high taxing program, the hope of ever balancing the Nation's budget is indeed dim. In fact, prudence suggests that under such conditions we should be retiring a part of our gargantuan debt and fortifying our fiscal condition for the eventual rainy day.
>
> ### FANTASTIC GROWTH OF NATIONAL DEBT
>
> Mr. Speaker, the growth of our national debt and the fantastic amount of taxes extracted from our people has caused me to do a little research. I thought it might be well to call the attention of the Congress and the country to some comparative figures of taxes and expenditures by our Federal Government at 25-year intervals over a period of the past 160 years of the country's history. The startling results are as follows:

Period	Total expenditures	Net receipts	Change in public debt
1789 to 1813	$219, 233, 000	$221, 816, 000	[1] $6, 024, 000. 00
1814 to 1838	534, 759, 000	644, 634, 000	−71, 053, 000. 00
1839 to 1863	2, 232, 812, 000	1, 130, 702, 000	1, 109, 339, 000. 00
1864 to 1888	8, 833, 181, 000	8, 881, 529, 000	264, 858, 000. 00
1889 to 1913	12, 701, 857, 000	12, 787, 468, 000	−191, 584, 000. 00
1914 to 1938	124, 883, 429, 000	89, 393, 932, 000	35, 971, 693, 000. 00
1939 to 1952 [2]	638, 131, 389, 000	419, 494, 298, 000	260, 193, 628, 740. 39

[1] 1790 to 1813.

[2] To Mar. 13, 1952.

To say that the figures are startling is an understatement. It is significant to note that in the first period of the country's existence, when the Jeffersonian principle that the people who are least governed are best governed was in full bloom, and prior to the growth of the doctrine of paternalism that the poor young striving Republic actually had a substantial balance of more than $6,000,000 in the Treasury. Compare that figure with the national debt of more than $260,000,000,000 today and one is compelled to question the oft-repeated statement that the country today is more prosperous than ever before in its history. Moreover, I desire to again call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the Government is no different in its fiscal affairs from the individual or a corporation. The management of Government is a business matter. The fact that Government is big business makes no difference. And I repeat what I have often stated on the floor of this House, "There is a bottom to the Government's meal barrel as well as to the individual's or the corporation's."

INCONCEIVABLE DEBT

Mr. Speaker, we have been lulled into complacency so long by the so-called liberal thinkers and have been so accustomed to appropriating the taxpayers' money in denominations of billions that it is impossible to comprehend what a billion really is. Some mathematician, in an effort to comprehend a billion dollar figure, has come up with this startling illustration:

"If a person had started in business in the year A.D. 1 with a billion dollars capital, and if he had managed his business so poorly that he lost $1,000 each day, in 1952 he still would have enough capital left out of his original billion to continue in business, losing $1,000 a day, for almost an additional 800 years, or until the year 2739."

Now in order to attempt to get some conception of how long it will take us to retire the present national debt of over $260,000,000,000 let us assume that we are frugal and prudent and start retiring that debt at the rate of $500,000,000 a year; 520 years would be required to retire the debt.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, if further emphasis is desired on our financial status one needs only to refer to the fact that it now requires more than $6,000,000,000 per annum in the form of interest to service this enormous debt. The Treasury has now asked for and we appropriated last week an increase of $300,000,000 to take care of the increased interest on that debt over last year. In other words, the interest alone on our national debt is costing the taxpayers now about one and one-half times as much as the total expenditures for 1 year of the Federal Government in the period 1914–38.

DARK BUT NOT HOPELESS

Mr. Speaker, that, sir, is the fiscal condition of the greatest business in the world, the United States of America. It is an unpleasant picture. It cannot be passed off lightly with the explanation that we are in a global warfare against communism, another crisis. Neither can we comfort ourselves into further complacency by adding to that the fact that we have recently emerged victoriously from a global strife with Nazi Germany and totalitarian Japan. The fact is that the country has been victorious in other contests at arms and through other crises throughout its history without serious impairment of its financial structure. Those crises, prior to World War II and prior to the Soviet Russian menace, were serious too in their day. Can it be logically reasoned that the situation in this country for the past 6 years has been so grave as to require the extraction of more taxes from the American people than was taken from them in the first 156 years of the country's existence? I think not.

Permit me to again point out to my colleagues what I have repeatedly pointed out on the floor of the House during the past 6 years that so far as the masters of the Kremlin are concerned they want neither war nor peace. Their main purpose, in my humble judgment, is to conquer this country, as they have conquered all others, by the simple procedure of bleeding us white in the destruction of our economy. They would accomplish this here as elsewhere through fear, infiltration, by prodding us into national bankruptcy, and taking over in the resultant confusion of chaos and hunger. No one realizes more than the Kremlin strategists that a hungry belly cares little about the type of government it lives under. In substantiation of this I call your attention to the well-known fact that more than 600,000,000 peoples have been drawn behind the Iron Curtain without the firing of a single gun by a Russian soldier.

When the blank checks, running into untold billions, are requested of the Congress for national defense and military and economic aid to foreign countries, we of the Congress, the representatives and spokesmen for the American taxpayers, must stop and ponder. We must approach these requests realistically, giving due weight to the probability of the correctness of this view. For, it must be obvious to all that we Americans cannot indefinitely continue to arm and feed half the world. America is a rich nation but there is a limit even to the resources of this great Nation. As one who made an on-the-spot study of world conditions in 13 foreign countries immediately following the war, I have always recognized the necessity for a helping hand to those who were making an honest effort to resist the plague of communism. But I have always consistently opposed the enormous amounts involved and advocated a more realistic contribution. It is unthinkable that we should now comply with the President's request for another $8,000,000,000 contribution.

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. Speaker, the solution to our financial problem and the responsibility therefor are strictly up to the Congress. More than that it is up to this House to see that the dangerous trend is reversed. I need not remind you that the wise men who founded this Government provided that because we of the House must originate all taxes and appropriations we should be elected every 2 years. We cannot hide behind the Chief Executive or complain of the traditional policy of the other body to increase appropriations. Certainly, at best the responsibility is twofold, the President and the Congress. Furthermore, I should like to refresh your memories today by calling your attention to the fact that the people of America are tax conscious as never before. The income tax, originally designed and practiced as a soak-the-rich tax, has become so enlarged that it now digs into the pockets of the smallest businessman, the white-collar worker, and the day laborer. The policy, under the Fair Deal program, of everybody touching the Federal Government has likewise developed into the policy of the Federal Government touching everybody. Even the humblest citizen now realizes that the Federal Government is no Santa Claus. In fact, we have reached the saturation point in taxation. With the tax rate as high as 90 percent in the upper brackets, the incentive for businessmen to make money scarcely exists, while the day laborer and the middle class find it difficult to live under the high rate of their own taxes.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the people, the overburdened taxpayers of this country, are looking to us, as their representatives, to at least balance the budget. In fairness to those who founded this Republic and to the generations of future Americans yet unborn, we can do no less.

SOLUTION

Mr. Speaker, I fear that I have been boresome, and that I may even be charged with pessimism, in this long recital in an effort to emphasize the seriousness of the situation. It is serious. America is at the crossroads in its fiscal policy. If we do not change that policy we became a bankrupt people. If we destroy the faith and credit of the Government we lose everything, our economy, our standard of living, yes, even our cherished liberties.

If the Congress is to regain its constitutional control of the purse strings; if the budget is to be balanced; if we are ever to liquidate this enormous debt, I respectfully suggest and urge that the following formula be adopted:

First. Our legislative committees, as well as committees on appropriations, must cease reporting out bills except those which are absolutely essential to our economy and national defense.

Second. Every Member of this body must recognize that the objective of balancing the budget is his most important assignment.

Third. Sectionalism, partisan politics, responsiveness to highly organized minorities, must give way to the national need for a sound financial policy.

Fourth. Every dollar appropriated must be considered as carefully as if it were coming out of the pockets of the Members themselves, as indeed the Members' proportionate share is.

Fifth. Our congressional committees, particularly the appropriation committees, must be staffed with an adequate staff of experts equal in efficiency to the staffs of the various governmental agencies who appear before them seeking appropriations.

Sixth. The Congress and the country must recognize that financial solvency is as important as military might in preparing ourselves against any potential foreign aggressor, a fact which our military captains should be made to understand.

Seventh. Our foreign friends must be made to understand that there is a limit to the resources of America.

Eighth. The system of permitting the carryover of unspent funds from the current fiscal year into the new year must be abandoned. A meticulous study of the 1,200 pages of the President's budget this year will show that the carryover of unspent funds from the current fiscal year will exceed $60,000,000,000.

Ninth. The procurement of military requirements, which constitute more than 50 percent of our expenditures, must be placed in the hands of trained civilians who appreciate the value of the dollar.

Tenth. And finally, the citizens of the Republic, now conscious as never before of the burdens of taxation. must practice the doctrine of States responsibility as well as States rights. The practice of looking to Washington for Federal aid in civil responsibilities of their own must cease. They must realize that there is no State, county, or city whose financial statement is not sounder than that of the Federal Government.

Finally, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this budget can be balanced and must be balanced this year. Whatever it takes to balance it must be done. A $14,000,000,000 deficit under the President's budget recommendations is unthinkable. If this country, the last fortress and haven of a free people, is to survive our fiscal policy must be placed on a sound basis. The time is now. Next year may be too late. Now is the time to place the country above party.

In the name of the Founding Fathers who gave the country its birth, in the name of the untold thousands who have died to preserve it, in the name of free peoples every-

> where, I beseech you to save the Nation from bankruptcy and thus perpetuate this, the most glorious form of free government ever conceived by the minds of men.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

First, may I commend the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer], on the very fine statement that he has made. I find myself in complete agreement with his statement and wish to concur in his remarks.

I cannot help but feel that some of us have a right to feel a little foolish and maybe a little embarrassed here today in connection with this bill.

Last year I remember that we had quite a tax cut. We supported it. We were all pleased to go and tell our constituents that after all these years we were able to do away with many of the wartime excise taxes and reduce others, particularly in the case of the telephone excise tax, as to which many of us had bills in. That tax was reduced. We glowingly reported it to our constituents. Even in some areas the various telephone companies sent notices with their bills to telephone users commending those who supported that particular bill.

Now we find that that particular reduction has lasted less than 2 months, and we are back in here today asking for certain changes in those taxes and others.

At the same time it was my understanding last year, when we voted these heavy tax cuts and reductions, that we had assurance from the administration that the budget to be presented for 1967 could be handled within our income without the necessity of increased taxes or, for that matter, could be handled with the tax bill as passed last year. At least that was my understanding.

Apparently that has not taken place at the present time. Even today, as we are about to consider this bill today, we do not know what the cost of the continuance of the war will be. We have no idea of determining that as of now. It is much more than it was last year. I still feel that we should in some way give thought to curtailing some of these programs, not extending existing ones and starting new ones until we get this war over and find out what the cost will be.

I anticipate that before the first of July we will again be asked to increase the debt ceiling. At the same time we seem to be fighting three wars—a war in Vietnam, a war on poverty, and a war on inflation—and then, on top of that, we are being asked by the administration to spend for international health and international education. It does not seem to make too good sense to me. I think we are definitely going to have a day of reckoning. I think it could be very serious when it comes, because the taxpayers of the United States of America will not be able to feed and clothe the entire world and to fight everybody's war.

So far as the resolution under consideration today, House Resolution 736, it does provide a closed rule, with 4 hours of debate, and points of order are waived. The rule is closed, of course, because once again, the entire tax code would otherwise be open. Points of order are waived in order to comply with the Ramseyer rule. The bill would provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule. I reserve the balance of my time but, as I have said, I have no requests for time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith], and ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BOYCOTT OF THE MERCHANTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I shall consume the 5 minutes, but something occurred yesterday in the District of Columbia, a report of which appeared in the local newspapers, of such an extraordinary nature that I do not think we ought to ignore it. I think it is a historic thing that ought to be brought to the attention of the Congress and at least put into the Record.

The gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk] referred to it briefly in a 1-minute speech this morning. I wish to read a newspaper clipping that appeared in the Washington Star last night. I have never known of anything of the nature proposed that has ever been suggested before in the history of our country—a threatened boycott of the whole merchant population of the District of Columbia.

This is the threat that that community of business people in the District, unless they change their views and go along with this proposal to have this type of home rule in the District, shall be required to contribute to a fund of $100,000 to promote the piece of legislation that a certain private organization is trying to put across. They are perfectly bold, and frank and serious.

I am going to read you this article, and it speaks for itself. It is a pure threat of blackmail, blackmail of a business community to the extent of $100,000. I am going to read this article because I want to make it a matter of record as to who is behind it.

This is from the Washington Star of February 22.

> Details of a plan to coerce District businessmen into supporting home rule legislation by threatening them with a boycott were announced yesterday by three local civil rights groups.
>
> Rt. Rev. Paul Moore, Suffragan Episcopal bishop, joined spokesmen from the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the D.C. Coalition of Conscience—

Whatever that is—

> in urging support of the campaign among 7,000 District merchants.

That is the campaign to raise $100,000.

> "We are sorry this kind of militancy is necessary to bring to people the right to vote," Bishop Moore declared, "but all other methods have failed. We have tried lobbying, police talk, and even picketing and demonstrations."
>
> Banding together as the "Free D.C. Movement," spokesmen for the groups said businessmen will be asked to—

And here are the four things that they are going to be forced to do—

> (1) sign petitions for home rule, (2) send telegrams to the President and Congress urging passage of home rule legislation, (3) display "Free D.C." emblems—

Whatever they are—

> and (4) raise $100,000 in contributions to a new "Merchants and Businessmen's Committee to Free D.C."

Now, that is the blackmail.

> John W. Diggs, a northeast barber and chairman of the committee, said the first targets of the boycott will be announced Thursday after a conference with representatives of a major department store and a large grocery chain.
>
> All merchants who fail to participate in all four steps of the campaign will be listed in some 100,000 leaflets to be distributed in the District, and residents would be asked to boycott them "step by step," Diggs said.
>
> Diggs said the $100,000 was being sought to run advertisements in newspapers across the country "to counteract" a Board of Trade campaign against home rule.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this to the House. I do not think that this needs more argument, but I think everybody in the United States ought to know when a bold blackmail attempt is made out in the open in the Nation's Capital. It ought at least to be known by the people of the United States.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 327, nays 50, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—327

Abbitt
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Casey

Celler
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Grover
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks

Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Michel
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy Ill
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins

Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Selden
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Watts
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger

NAYS—50

Abernethy
Adair
Andrews, Glenn
Ashbrook
Baring
Bray
Broomfield

Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Chamberlain
Clawson, Del
Conyers
Derwinski
Devine

Dickinson
Diggs
Duncan, Tenn.
Erlenborn
Fino
Griffiths
Gross
Gurney

Haley
Hall
Hansen, Idaho
Hungate
Hutchinson
Jones, Mo.
Kupferman
McClory
Nelsen

O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Quillen
Reid, N.Y.
Roncalio
Schmidhauser
Secrest
Shipley
Skubitz

Smith, Calif.
Stalbaum
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Weltner
Whitten
Williams

NOT VOTING—55

Adams
Baldwin
Blatnik
Bolling
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cederberg
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Cramer
Dowdy
Downing
Ellsworth
Fallon
Farnsley
Fisher
Garmatz

Goodell
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Kirwan
Leggett
Lennon
McCarthy
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Matthews
Miller
Moorhead
Morris
Murray
Ottinger

Patman
Pool
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Scott
Senner
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Walker, N. Mex.
White, Idaho
Willis
Zablocki

The resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Patman with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Goodell.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Ottinger.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Walker of New Mexico.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Murray.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Rogers of Texas.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Cohelan.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Lennon.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Hagan of Georgia.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Willis.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Farnsley.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Leggett.

Mr. BUCHANAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be allowed to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12752), to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 12752, with Mr. HANSEN of Iowa in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] will be recognized for 2 hours and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 12752, is intended first and foremost to provide additional revenues to help finance the expenditures required to sustain our operation in Vietnam. In large part it does this without increasing tax rates.

Raising revenue is the sole purpose for the three major provisions of the bill—the acceleration of estimated income tax payments by corporations and the 2-year moratorium on rate reductions in the excise taxes on passenger automobiles and telephone service. The remaining provisions of the bill—while they entail revisions in tax collection procedures which stand on their own merits—are proposed at this time because they too will raise revenue. These latter provisions include graduated withholding, quarterly payments by the self-employed of their estimated social security tax, and an increase in the percentage of tax to be paid currently through withholding, estimated taxpayments, or both.

THE BUDGET WOULD BE BALANCED BUT FOR VIETNAM

Mr. Chairman, it is not a very pleasant responsibility that we in the Committee on Ways and Means have, coming to our colleagues in the House from time to time asking for support with respect to problems of debt management and asking for support with respect to tax bills. On the other hand it was a pleasure for us in 1962, in 1963, and again in 1965 to be in a position of suggesting to you that it would be well for us to reduce some of the taxes that had been levied or increased in World War II and levied or increased again in the Korean war and continued for all of this period of time.

Before I explain the various provisions of this bill I would like to make some observations about our budgetary and fiscal situation. First, were it not for the special costs connected with our operations in the defense of Vietnam, the budget for the current fiscal year would be much closer to balance than was anticipated in the January 1965 budget message of the President. Furthermore, in the coming fiscal year, the budget presented to us, were it not for the Vietnam expenditures, would show a surplus in the administrative budget.

I requested that our staff people go through the budget to determine wherein increases were occurring over the January 1965 estimate in the budget for fiscal 1966. I have before me, Mr. Chairman, a table which I will insert in the RECORD setting forth the source of these increases. In addition I have a table showing for 1967 the extent to which the deficit is attributable to the increases arising from the conflict in Vietnam:

TABLE 1.—*Fiscal 1966 expenditures*

[In millions]

1966 budget in January 1965	$99,687
Major increases, not including Vietnam:	
Commodity Credit Corporation ($3,680 to $4,142)—mainly feed grains and cotton production increases and advance payments offset by lower level of outstanding certificates at end of 1965 that had to be repurchased	462
Military pay increases—Larger increases and earlier effective date than had been proposed by the President	743
Interest on the Public Debt ($11,500 to $12,000)	500
NASA ($5,100 to $5,600)—Accelerated deliveries by contractors	500
Veterans' benefits—Primarily effect of new laws increasing compensation, pensions, and death benefits over amounts recommended by the President, with some overrun in caseload estimates as well	288
Post Office ($714 to $878)—Resulting from 5-day work week for postmasters and increased volume of mail	164
Subtotal, major increases, not including Vietnam	2,657
Major decreases:	
HEW ($7,776 to $7,662)—Mainly in education (slower start than budgeted) offset by congressional increases in NIH, social security, etc. The education reduction is mainly in the new program for elementary and secondary school assistance which is off to a slower start than has been anticipated	114
AEC ($2,530 to $2,390)—Due to congressional reductions, construction delays, program slippages, cost reductions, etc	140
Allowances for contingencies and Appalachia (estimated last January in lump sum and now distributed among the component elements)	432
Subtotal, major decreases	−686
All other changes, net ($1,971+$31)	2,002
Subtotal, 1966 expenditures not including Vietnam increases	101,689
Increases, Vietnam	4,739
Total, administrative budget expenditures fiscal 1966 in 1967 budget	106,428

TABLE 2.—*Comparison of administrative budget receipts and expenditures in fiscal 1967 with and without H.R. 12752 and with and without Vietnam expenditures*

	Billions
Administrative budget expenditures:	
Total	$112.8
Without Vietnam (−$10.5 billion)	102.3
Administrative budget revenues:	
Total	111.0
Without H.R. 12752 (+$4.8)	106.2
Administrative budget deficit (−) or surplus (+):	
Deficit (including special Vietnam costs and H.R. 12752)	−1.8
Deficit without H.R. 12752 (with special Vietnam costs)	−6.7
Deficit without special Vietnam costs or H.R. 12752	+3.9

The growth in Federal revenue attributable solely to the growth of the economy would have reduced the deficit for the current fiscal year from the $5.2 billion estimated in January 1965 to $2.9 billion, were it not for the unanticipated increases in expenditures for Vietnam of $4.7 billion. The continuing growth of the economy—growth due largely to the tax reductions enacted in recent years—is expected to produce a further increase in revenues of $7.5 billion in the upcoming fiscal year. Since the increase in expenditures unrelated to Vietnam amounts to only $0.6 billion, this revenue increase would have been sufficient to provide a substantial surplus in the Federal accounts in fiscal 1967, were it not again for Vietnam. Even with these Vietnam costs, however, the year-to-year increase in revenues—due to growth—exceeds the $6.4 billion increase in proposed expenditures, so the budget deficit would be narrowed even in the absence of this bill.

The Members will recall that prior to the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1964, former Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon stated that despite the $11.5 billion tax reduction provided in that legislation, he felt it would be possible to balance the budget in the fiscal year 1967. This goal would have been achieved in the coming fiscal year if we were not faced with the extraordinary developments in Vietnam, developments which could not be anticipated when the Revenue Act of 1964 was under consideration by the Congress.

I believe that it is clear that it is the Vietnam, and only the Vietnam, operation which makes this bill necessary.

H.R. 12752 WILL IMPROVE THE 1966 AND 1967 BUDGETS

The second observation I would like to make concerns the improvement this bill will bring about in the budgetary outlook for both the fiscal year 1966 and the fiscal year 1967.

Its provisions will increase revenues in the current fiscal year by an estimated $1.2 billion on an administrative budget basis. They will increase fiscal 1967 revenues by $4.8 billion over the revenue that would be generated under existing tax rates.

As a result, the administrative budget deficit for the fiscal year 1966 will be reduced from $7.6 to $6.4 billion and will fall sharply to $1.8 billion in the fiscal year 1967. Without the bill, the administrative budget deficit in the coming fiscal year would be $6.7 billion, $0.9 billion less than the 1966 deficit, but still too far from balance.

The revenue effects of the bill will be even more significant in their impact on the consolidated cash budget which is useful in understanding the economic impact of the budget. The deficit anticipated in this budget in the fiscal year 1966 will be reduced from $8.1 to $6.9 billion by this bill. In the fiscal year 1967, it is expected this deficit will be eliminated and a small surplus achieved as a consequence of the approximate $5 billion added to cash receipts by this bill.

The bill will produce the significant revenues I have outlined without increasing income tax liabilities and without raising the two excise tax rates above 1965 levels. The various changes in collection procedures will speed up the collection of liabilities. This change in the timing of tax collections will result in the collection of some revenues in fiscal 1966 that would not otherwise be collected until fiscal 1967. It will also result in the collection in fiscal 1967 of even larger amounts that would not otherwise be collected until 1968 and later fiscal years. The moratorium on the two excise tax rate reductions will not increase rates above their 1965 levels but will merely freeze them at these levels for 2 additional years.

The revenue impact of this bill is temporary in the sense that the new collection procedures will not increase revenues once the transition to the new payments basis has been completed. Furthermore, the moratorium on excise tax rate reduction is set to expire on April 1, 1968.

The figures I have presented to you are based on expenditure estimates appearing in the President's budget document. We all know the uncertainty which surrounds these expenditure figures. I know that many of you hope to see some of these expenditures reduced and I hope we can. There is nothing on the domestic scene I would like to see better, for example, than to eliminate entirely the 1967 deficit of $1.8 billion.

On the other hand we also know the uncertainty of the expenditures for Vietnam. We all hope that they do not have to be substantially increased but we certainly are not sure that this may not occur.

While recognizing the uncertainties in our present expenditure situation we concluded the only responsible position we could take at this time was to take the expenditure totals as they appear in the budget and base the current revenue program on them. I know of no other basis for determining revenue needs under present conditions.

Let me tell you about this, my friends. We do not know whether this is the only request that this Congress may be considering in the field of taxes. That will depend upon what we do with domestic spending. That will depend upon what happens in Vietnam.

But, Mr. Chairman, we cannot let our management of fiscal affairs be such as to jeopardize our stability here in the United States, and if subsequently it takes further action in this field, I believe that the membership of this great body will not shirk its responsibility. But let us now look at the situation as it is before us.

A TIME FOR MODERATION

The third observation I would like to make relates this bill to our present economic position.

The expenditures of individual households and business firms will be moderated as a result of the increasing taxpayments required by this bill. I purposely use the term "moderate" because that best describes the impact I believe this bill will have. This effect is entirely appropriate at this time. After 5 years of continuous expansion, the longest such period of peacetime expansion on record, little slack remains in the economy.

At the start of the expansion in 1961, nearly 7 percent of the civilian labor force was unemployed and 22 percent of manufacturing capacity was idle. Under these circumstances, the expansion could, and did, proceed with little pressure on prices. The wholesale price index remained virtually unchanged during the years 1961 to 1964 while the expansion created jobs for the unusually large number of new entrants to the labor force as well as for many of those formerly unemployed.

Now, however, for the first time in 9 years, the unemployment rate stands as low as 4 percent of the civilian labor force. Manufacturing capacity is being utilized at very nearly the rate businessmen prefer. Some pressure on prices is already evident as a result. After 4 years of stability, the index of wholesale prices increased by 2 percent in 1965. The percentage increase in the consumer price index was 1.7 percent as compared to an average increase during the years 1960 to 1964 of 1.2 percent a year. Furthermore, but for the effect of excise tax reductions enacted in 1965, the increase would have been 1.9 or 2 percent.

If further expansion continues at too rapid a pace, bottlenecks will develop in areas where manpower with the required skills is scarce and severe pressures will be placed on the industries which produce machinery and other capital goods. In the past, similar developments have served as a breeding ground for inflationary price increases. The needs of Vietnam, coming at a time of prosperity, could force too vigorous an expansion if they are not financed through added revenues.

At the same time I do not believe we should choke off our economic growth with measures that are too severely restrictive. We still continue to need a moderate expansion in investment and in incomes to provide for our capital needs and for our raising labor force. We will also need the revenue growth these factors will bring.

The provisions of this bill will help to moderate demands on available capacity. The most important provision from the standpoint of tax collection is the one requiring the further acceleration of corporate estimated tax payments in excess of $100,000. While many of the 16,000 large corporations affected set aside funds to meet tax liabilities as those liabilities accrue, some corporations will postpone planned investment outlays as a result of the bill. Such postponement will be favorable to continued economic stability, since business expenditures for new plant and equipment capacity are currently at very high levels. After increasing at an annual average rate of 7.5 percent a year in 1962 and 1963, business-fixed investment expenditures increased by 11.5 percent in 1964 and by 15.4 percent in 1965. Announced plans for the first half of this year indicate that investment spending will again rise substantially. A postponement of some planned investment by business firms, therefore, may well promote better balance between investment in new capacity and the rate of growth in demand for the products for such capacity.

The revised method of withholding will moderate consumer expenditures. Following the enactment of this bill the amount of tax withheld from wages and salaries will be increased by about $100 million a month, or by $1.2 billion a year at annual rates. These additional amounts withheld will be offset as far as individual taxpayers are concerned by lower tax payments in the spring of 1967 or by higher refunds. Nevertheless, they will reduce disposable incomes, and, therefore, consumer spending, during the rest of 1966 and the early part of 1967.

The bill will also make an important contribution to the effort to reduce the deficit in our balance of payments. If inflationary pressures are permitted to develop, U.S. exports will be placed at a competitive disadvantage in world trade and much of the substantial gain made in recent years will be lost. A source of strength in the U.S. balance-of-payments outlook for several years has been the fact that the prices of U.S. goods have remained relatively stable while the prices of goods produced by other nations have risen.

THE BILL IS FAIR

A fourth observation I would like to make concerns the broad distribution of the burden imposed by this bill. The revenues provided by this bill will be collected in a fair and equitable manner from a broad cross section of the population. The provisions which will raise the most revenue—accelerated corporate payments—affect the Nation's largest corporations. Graduated withholding affects over 60 million of the Nation's wage earners. The self-employed, who will not be affected by graduated withholding, will be affected by the revised requirement for declarations and by provision for the quarterly payment of estimated self-employment tax. Finally, the excises on passenger automobiles and telephone service are broadly based. Restoring the rates of these taxes to December 1965 levels will not impose hardship on the companies involved or on particular consumers. A very broad group of our consumers will be affected by the moratorium on the excise reduction on the telephone tax and the tax on the purchase of new cars.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Let me now turn to the specifics provisions of the bill. The six provisions of H.R. 12752 are grouped under two titles. The first of these titles embraces the provisions which adjust tax collection procedures. The second superimposes a moratorium on rate reductions scheduled under present law with regard to the excises on passenger automobiles and general and long distance telephone services and teletypewriter service.

Three of the four provisions regarding tax collection procedures are measures which will bring about desirable adjustments and should be approved on their own merits. The fact that they involve a change in the timing of tax collections which will provide a temporary increase in tax receipts merely enhances their importance under present circumstances. The remaining provisions, that is, the acceleration of corporate tax payments and the excise tax moratorium, are proposed solely on the basis that they will provide needed revenues.

DIFFERENCES FROM PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

The provisions differ in three important respects from the recommendations of the President. In the first place, your committee's bill merely imposes a 2-year moratorium on the excise tax rate reductions scheduled under present law in the case of the tax on passenger automobiles and the tax on telephone service. When the moratorium expires on March 31, 1968, the rates of these excises will fall to the levels scheduled for those years under the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965. This treatment stands in sharp contrast to the administration's proposal. The latter would have delayed the entire schedule of reductions until 1968. That is, it would not have returned the rates to the level scheduled for 1968 under present law but would have provided only the reductions scheduled under present law for 1966. Thereafter, further reductions would follow the schedule set down in the Excise Tax Reduction Act at the intervals specified. Thus, under your committee's bill the automobile excise will reach the permanent level of 1 percent and the telephone excise will be repealed beginning in 1969. Under the administration proposal this position would not have been reached until 1971.

The second major differences between your committee's bill and the President's recommendations concerns graduated withholding. The administration proposal made no provision for persons with large amounts of itemized deductions. Thus, while it would have reduced underwithholding substantially, it would also have increased overwithholding, particularly for families with incomes of $5,000 to $10,000. Your committee felt the latter result was inconsistent with the objective of greater accuracy sought through graduated withholding and that it might impose a hardship on a number of families of average or below-average means. Therefore, your committee has approved a provision, which I will describe in more detail shortly, which permits individuals with large itemized deductions to adjust their withholding to reflect this fact.

The third major difference between the bill and the President's program is in the area of declarations of estimated tax. The President proposed no change here while the bill tightens up on the filing requirements by moving the minimum requirement for current payment from 70 percent to 80 percent of tax liabilities.

GRADUATED WITHHOLDING

The first provision in this bill relates to graduated withholding.

The bill replaces the present flat 14-percent rate withholding system with a more accurate system which will aline tax withholding more closely to the final tax liability for the majority of wage earners. The present withholding system takes only three determinants of tax liability into account: the number of exemptions, a 10-percent allowance for deductions based on the standard deduction, and the average of the tax rates in the first four taxable income brackets. It does not take into account the graduated tax rates which apply when taxable incomes exceed $2,000 for single persons and $4,000 for married couples. Nor does it take account of the minimum standard deduction, itemized deductions, or marital status. Because these widely used features are not taken into account, the amount withheld often differs widely from the taxpayer's final liability.

The Treasury estimates that 63.1 million returns will be filed for the year 1966, including both taxable and nontaxable returns, which will indicate that tax was withheld but that no payments were made on declarations. On only 10.8 million of these returns would the tax withheld come to within $10 of the final liability if the present system is continued. On 39.8 million returns—20 million of them with incomes of $5,000 or less—overwithholding would be shown; that is, the amounts withheld from wages during the year would exceed tax liability. On 12.5 million other returns underwithholding would be shown; that is, not enough tax would be withheld to meet the full liability.

When a taxpayer is underwithheld, he must pay the balance of his liability at the time he files his final return for the tax year. If this balance due amount is unexpected or large, as it was for many taxpayers in the spring of 1965, it may cause the taxpayer financial hardship. When the taxpayer is overwithheld, he must file a return at the close of the tax year to obtain a refund. The procedure forces him to apply for, and wait to receive from the Government, a portion of his wages. This can be a hardship, particularly when the excess withholding is large relative to income.

Your committee's bill substitutes six graduated withholding rates which range from 14 to 30 percent for the present single rate of 14 percent. These rates reflect, in full, the tax rates which apply to the first $12,000 of a single person's taxable income and the first $24,000 of a married couple's taxable income. These rates are included in two separate schedules and two sets of withholding tables, one for single persons and heads of households, and the other—with wider brackets to take account of the split-income provisions—for married persons and surviving spouses.

The structure of the withholding rates and brackets incorporates a 10 percent allowance for deductions and the minimum standard deduction. The latter is reflected by increasing the amount of a withholding exemption to $700 and by providing that the first $200 of annualized wages is to be exempt from withholding. The minimum standard deduction, members will recall, is equivalent to a basic $200 amount for married couples, heads of households, and single persons plus $100 for each exemption.

The graduated rates will apply to wages paid on or after May 1 of this year. Married persons will be required to file new withholding exemption certificates between the time the bill is enacted and May 1 if they want to be withheld on under the schedule applicable to married persons. Many wage earners, both married and single, will want to file new certificates in any case, however, since those who now deliberately understate their exemptions for withholding purposes will probably want to claim all their exemptions. Under the bill, voluntary adjustments to increase withholding will not be necessary in most cases.

Beginning in 1967, wage earners with large itemized deductions relative to their income will be able to adjust their withholding by claiming special withholding allowances which will be treated like exemptions for withholding purposes. The allowances will be optional. They will be given with respect to estimated itemized deductions in excess of 12 or 15 percent of estimated wage income depending on the amount of this wage income. One withholding allowance—over and above the exemptions for dependents, and so forth—will be given with respect to each full $700 of excess itemized deductions, with the exception that one withholding allowance can be claimed if excess itemized deductions exceed $350 but are less than $700. As a safeguard, estimated itemized deductions for this purpose cannot exceed the amount listed on the tax return for the previous year and estimated wages cannot be less than the wages received in the preceding year. It is expected that the computations indicated here will not actually have to be made by taxpayers but that they will be able to determine the number of withholding allowances from a simple table.

If the more accurate withholding procedure provided in this bill applied throughout 1966, approximately twice as many tax returns would show tax withheld that came within $10 of the liability. Moreover, the amount of overwithholding would be reduced by more than $650 million while the amount of underwithholding would be reduced by roughly $1 billion.

ESTIMATED SELF-EMPLOYMENT TAX

The second provision in the bill requires self-employment social security taxes to be paid on declarations of estimated tax.

Wage and salary earners covered by the social security system have their annual social security tax withheld from their wages according to the rate specified. This is not true, however, for self-employed persons. Presently they are not required to pay their tax during the current year, but instead can wait until the following spring.

This bill places self-employed persons on the same current-payment basis with respect to their social security tax liability which employees already are on. It does so by requiring them to pay quarterly payments of estimated self-employment tax beginning in the year 1967.

These quarterly payments will be correlated with the quarterly payments of income tax self-employed persons currently are required to make. The rules presently applicable to the declaration and quarterly payment of estimated income tax will, beginning in 1967, simply apply to the total of the estimated income tax and the estimated self-employment social security tax.

UNDERPAYMENTS OF INSTALLMENTS OF ESTIMATED TAX

The third provision in the bill relates to the provisions for filing declarations of estimated tax.

Prior to 1954, taxpayers who failed to pay at least 80 percent of their final liability currently, either through withholding, quarterly payments, or both, unless certain exceptions applied, were subject to a penalty equal to 6 percent interest calculated on the difference between the amount paid currently and 80 percent of the liability. In 1954, the percentage limit for defining underpayments of installments of estimated income tax was reduced from 80 to 70 percent. Your committee's bill restores the percentage to 80 percent. It also makes a comparable increase in the percentage applying where a taxpayer for one or more quarters computes his estimated tax by annualizing his income received to date.

This action is consistent with the other adjustments in collection procedures contained in this bill. Except for the one change I have already noted, it does not change the special provisions which excuse persons who underpay their installments from penalty if they meet one of several alternative tests. This provision will apply for 1967 and later years.

ACCELERATION OF CORPORATE TAX PAYMENTS

The fourth provision in the bill relates to the acceleration of corporate income tax payments.

Corporations with an estimated tax liability in excess of $100,000 presently are required to pay a part of their estimated liability in excess of $100,000 during the current taxable year. The portion to be paid currently is being increased from year to year in accordance with a schedule set down in the Revenue Act of 1964. Under this schedule, corporations will be fully current with respect to the estimated tax in excess of $100,000 by 1970. Your committee's bill simply accelerates the transition to full current payment so that it will be completed in 1967 rather than 3 years later.

Under the present schedule, corporations using a calendar year accounting period would file their initial declaration and pay 9 percent of their estimated 1966 liability in excess of $100,000 on April 15 of this year. On June 15 they would pay an additional 9 percent of the estimated liability and on September 15 and December 15 they would pay installments of 25 percent on each date. Under the bill, the payments due in April and June, 1966, will be increased to 12 percent of the estimated liability and the amounts due in April and June 1967 will be increased from 14 to 25 percent of the estimated liability.

THE EXCISE TAXES ON PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES AND TELEPHONE AND TELETYPEWRITER SERVICE

The fifth and sixth provisions in the bill relate to the manufacturers' excise tax on passenger cars and the tax on communication services.

Congress provided for the outright repeal or eventual repeal of almost all of the then-existing excise taxes in the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965 except the sumptuary taxes on alcohol and tobacco.

Of the many taxes affected only three were not scheduled for outright repeal during 1965 or on January 1, 1966. One was the stamp tax on transfers of real property whose repeal was scheduled for 1969 to accommodate State and local government property tax collection procedures. The other two were the excise tax on passenger automobiles and the excise tax on telephone and teletypewriter service.

The tax on passenger automobiles was reduced from 10 to 7 percent upon enactment of the bill and to 6 percent on January 1, 1966. The tax on telephone service was reduced from 10 percent to 3 percent on January 1, 1966. Further reductions were scheduled which would have repealed the telephone tax by 1969 and reduced the automobile excise to a permanent level of 1 percent in the same year.

Your committee's bill provides a moratorium on the rate reductions scheduled for these two excises but only for a 2-year period. The rates will be held at 7 percent for automobiles and 10 percent for telephone service until April 1, 1968, when they will be reduced 2 percent and 1 percent, respectively. These are the rates scheduled for that time under present law.

I realize that a number of Members are asking why did we select these two excise taxes for temporary retention rather than others. This was a decision that none of us wanted to make because as we indicated in our report on the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, we do not believe that selective excises represent a good tax source.

However, faced with the revenue requirements that we were, I believe we had valid reasons for making the selections we did.

First. These are the two largest single revenue producers. For example, all four of the former retail taxes put together yielded only slightly more than the extra revenue we are obtaining from the automobile tax in 1967 and considerably less than the additional revenue we are obtaining from the telephone tax in 1967. Thus we would be faced with the problem of selecting a combination of a large number of other taxes if we did not rely on these two.

Second. It is also evident that Congress considered the outright repeal of these two taxes was less urgent than in the case of the numerous other excises which it did repeal outright by or before January 1, 1966.

Third. It is a much simpler matter administratively, for both business firms and the Government, to increase a tax on a commodity or service for which the payment and collection machinery is still in effect than it is to reinstitute a tax previously repealed.

Fourth. These two excises affect a broad cross section of the population. Thus their burden is borne more generally than is true of most of the other excises.

The 10-percent rate on telephone service will go into effect with respect to bills which are rendered after the first day of the first month which begins 15 days or more after the date of enactment. The excise tax on automobiles will be restored to 7 percent on the day after the day this bill is enacted. On the same day the 7-percent rate becomes effective, dealers will be liable for a tax on the cars they have in inventory equal to 1 percent of the manufacturer's price of these cars. The tax will be collected from dealers by manufacturers.

CONCLUSION

In concluding I would like to say that in my opinion you should vote for this bill—

If you are interested in seeing that we pay for our operations in Vietnam on a current basis;

If you are interested in bringing our budget as nearly into balance as possible; and

If you are interested in preventing the development of serious inflationary pressures.

I have no doubt that this measure is needed now and I urge you to vote favorably on it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. When the tax reduction bill was enacted in 1964, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] very properly warned the House that it could not travel two roads.

Mr. MILLS. That is right. I am warning again.

Mr. GROSS. And you are doing the same again.

Mr. MILLS. Right.

Mr. GROSS. But the warning did not seem to take effect.

Mr. MILLS. Let us go back to that, if the gentleman will bear with me just a minute. Actually, if you analyze the budget and extract from the budget these extra Vietnam costs that we are adding in 1966 and in 1967, as set forth in the budget, whether they are right or wrong, and take them out of the bill——

Mr. GROSS. And they are not all war costs.

Mr. MILLS. No, not all of the increases are Vietnam expenses but if we take these alone out of the spending, and look to our budget receipts for 1967—in spite of any other increases which have occurred—there would be enough revenue without this bill to have a balanced budget on the basis of the budget projection for fiscal year 1967.

Therefore, I have stated, and I state it again, that it is the extraordinary expenses attributable to our operation in Vietnam that are responsible for the Ways and Means Committee reporting this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I wish I could agree with the gentleman, but I am afraid that it goes beyond that, far beyond Vietnam.

Mr. MILLS. My friend is a good mathematician. Just take the budget. If you will look at the table I inserted in the RECORD in my remarks you will see the figures that enabled me to reach that conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just briefly?

Mr. MILLS. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman mentioned withholding. If my memory serves me correctly, the warning was out when the tax bill was passed in the House that it would result in exactly what it did in 1965, but by virtue of a closed rule nothing could be done about it at that time.

Mr. MILLS. No. It is my recollection as the bill passed the House in 1963 we had a 15-percent withholding rate in effect for 1964 which was the correct rate for that entire year, on the basis of the tax rates applicable in that year. The Senate, however, did not complete action on the bill in 1963—and it became known as the Revenue Act of 1964 because they passed it sometime in February 1964. Anyway, there was an argument at the time as to whether we should apply the 15-percent rate of withholding or the 14-percent rate of withholding which was the appropriate withholding rate for the rates applicable in 1965. The decision was reached to apply the 14-percent rate in 1964 since 2 months had gone by. This was not high enough but 15 percent probably would have been too high.

Mr. GROSS. I will leave it to the memory of the other Members.

Mr. MILLS. I agree with the gentleman that it would have been well to have had graduated withholding at that time.

Mr. GROSS. But we were locked up then, as we are again today.

Mr. MILLS. This did not arise in our initial consideration but in the conference.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. The gentleman from Arkansas almost got to the point where he was looking into a crystal ball as to what we might expect in the future as to any tax bill. From the testimony before your committee, would you care to project what you think might happen with respect to a meaningful tax bill in this session of Congress or shortly thereafter, as to what we might expect as we look down the road?

Mr. MILLS. Let me say to my good friend from Illinois that I do not have a crystal ball in the first instance. Fortunately, I do not think one has to have a crystal ball in order to answer your question.

I believe commonsense requires of us to exercise great restraint at this particular time. The important thing to me, in times such as this, is to try to get the economy and the budget as nearly into balance, if it is possible to do. While, of course, I would not want now to bring to the floor of the House a bill providing for a general increase in taxes, I think it is premature to reach a decision on that matter now. First, I want to find out what a majority of this Congress wants to spend in fiscal 1967—not what the administration wants to spend but what the Congress wants to spend. Then we must find out what the actual Vietnam expenses will be.

Mr. ARENDS. I may say to the gentleman that is exactly what is worrying me. Is there any evidence of restraint in this House? We have had only a few small noticeable opportunities to reduce expenditures of the Government during this session and immediately we failed to take any action that would indicate the Congress would move toward less spending. That is what worries me. There is not, in my humble opinion, any restraint being shown toward reducing expenditures. Unless we do stop spending, we will have additional tax raising bills before us.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Arkansas are not talking about any broad attempts to reduce spending. However, whenever we know unexpected emergencies may arise, then we have to take notice of this possibility. If we can hold down other areas to accommodate the unexpected, we may be able to live within the revenues we have, but if we do not succeed in doing it and we want taxation to be used in the way to more nearly bring about a balance in the budget and the economy, then obviously we would have to make some further effort and search for additional revenues. But I am not prepared to go into that until after I have found out what the Congress itself will do with respect to spending.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Arkansas and for the distinguished committee that he chairs, but could the gentleman explain to me why when the committee is bringing to the floor of the House a bill to reduce taxes they call it the excise tax cuts or income tax reductions but when you are bringing a bill to the floor which does in effect increase taxes, instead of calling it a tax increase, you call it a Tax Adjustment Act of 1966?

Mr. MILLS. I hope the wording did not mislead my friend. Most of this bill raises revenue by adjusting collection procedures. This part does not raise tax rates but there is no doubt that we are going to collect more from the American people in fiscal year 1967. Actually when we refer to revenue acts in the normal nature of things we refer to tax rate increases, such as where we raise a bracket rate from 14 to 15 percent, and so on.

Mr. RUMSFELD. If the gentleman will yield further, that is an increase.

Mr. MILLS. We are not increasing the tax of anyone over what the individual had to pay in calendar year 1965.

Mr. RUMSFELD. But this is calendar year 1966.

Mr. MILLS. That is right, but this year has just begun and not much in taxes has been paid by most people.

Mr. RUMSFELD. And is not true that the automobile taxes of the individual will be increased?

Mr. MILLS. Well, now, let me tell you about the automobile tax. The rate went from 7 to 6 percent on January 1, 1966.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I am asking the gentleman from Arkansas if this is not true, that this is calendar year 1966?

Mr. MILLS. I will not argue on that point.

Mr. RUMSFELD. And that there are some taxes that are going up and up, which means an increase?

Mr. MILLS. Oh, yes; the auto tax will go up 1 percent from what it was on January 1, 1966. The telephone tax also will go up from what it was on January 1, 1966. I believe I explained that.

Mr. RUMSFELD. All right.

Mr. MILLS. But they are not up over what they were in 1965.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, my concern is that the people are going to have to make some decision in November, and I hate to have them be confused by words. It seems to me that this does represent a tax increase.

Mr. MILLS. The restoration of the pre-January 1, 1966, excise rates is a minor point in this bill. The adjustment in collections is the main thing and not to take this into account in the title of this bill would be misleading. If the gentleman from Illinois can give me complete assurance that when we reduced the automobile tax on January 1 from 7 percent to 6 percent, that it was reflected in a reduction in sales price, then I can answer the gentleman's question as to whether the tax is going to have any effect when it goes back up 1 point.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Well, I certainly cannot give the gentleman any figures on that.

Mr. MILLS. Of course not, and I do not believe anyone else can.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The Department of Commerce does not seem to want to discuss this angle of the situation. Now, if Congress sees fit to increase the excise taxes on automobiles, does the gentleman have any information as to whether this money will be earmarked for Mrs. Johnson's highway beautification program?

Mr. MILLS. It would take subsequent action by the Congress to accomplish any such result. There is nothing contained in this bill that would do it.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, it would take subsequent action and it could not be earmarked?

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the membership for having listened to me, and I hope they will follow the committee's lead in voting for the bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas, our able chairman, has put this debate in the proper context.

This is an issue that involves the fundamental fiscal policy of our country, and it represents the first opportunity that this House has had this year at any rate, to zero in on these questions.

Mr. Chairman, Congress indeed has the burden and the basic responsibility for making fiscal policy. I believe it is well that we understand what we are doing.

First, I would like to correct something that I believe might have created a misapprehension, when the chairman said that the corporate speedup was essentially a revenue measure. I believe that this is accelerating a reform that the committee has long been confronted with. It is an acceleration, all right, but I would like to regard it more as a reform.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I certainly agree with my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis]. It is fortunate that it comes at a time when it produces $3.3 billion in revenue.

Mr. CURTIS. I feel that it is a fortunate time, and I would refer all members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to the table which appears on page 4 of the committee report which shows the breakdown of the revenue measures.

Actually, there is only $60 million additional revenue from tax increases for fiscal 1966, and only about $1.2 billion in fiscal 1967. The balance as provided for in the bill, or some $1.2 billion for fiscal 1966 and $4.8 billion for fiscal 1967, represent one-shot operations which are in the nature of reform in accelerated payment of taxes and are not tax increases.

Mr. Chairman, President Johnson in his economic report to the Congress on February 16, on page 29, makes this remark:

> Perhaps our most serious economic challenge in 1966 will be to preserve the essential stability of costs and prices which has contributed so significantly to our balance progress.

Mr. Chairman, I, of course, would emphasize this, but I would also emphasize his choice of words where he says "perhaps."

Apparently President Johnson and this administration are still not convinced that this is an actuality, in spite of the fact that the consumer price index has gone up 2.2 points from December to December, and the wholesale price index, from December to December, has gone up 3.4 points. In the month of January alone, for which we just now have the figures, it has gone up an additional 0.5 point, which represents an annual rate of a 6-point increase in the wholesale price index.

Mr. Chairman, frankly, this bill now pending before us represents taking a tack hammer to hit at a major fiscal problem, and let us not kid ourselves about it. The President has not addressed himself in his budget message to this Congress, or at this session, to the fundamental problems that this country faces as a result of the expenditure policies of this administration.

And I emphasize, it is expenditure policies—which is a part of fiscal policy. I think it is about time that this administration woke up to the facts of life and looked at the economic indicators. This administration defended itself through its spokesmen, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and others before the Joint Economic Committee in regard to these economic indicators. They said to me, "Well, Congressman, after all most of this consumer price index has been in the agricultural area. It is not a general thing. This is an agricultural cyclical problem."

I said, "How do you figure?" They said, "Well, look at the industrial price index—it has held steady."

And, indeed, it had. But this is the very area I pointed out where the administration sought to impose, and I say illegally, its wage price guidelines in aluminum, copper and steel. The President's Council of Economic Advisers said to me—and this is all a matter of public record—"Well, why do you talk about those three—they have been publicized. There are all sorts of other instances where we moved in which were not publicized." I said, "Well, I am interested in that."

But let us get to the key point. What would have happened to the industrial price index if wage price guidelines and these strong arm techniques had not been employed? Where would the consumer price index be? As I said to the Secretary of the Treasury, "What forces were you resisting that brought you to use these pressures to hold to the wage price guidelines? Were these not inflationary forces?" I think it is clear that this is what the picture is.

We are in a serious situation. People for years have asked me—What is the matter with deficit financing? I have sought to reply that it creates such problems as we are now seeking to grapple with. Now one of the great achievements of the Eisenhower administration—and it was a difficult matter to achieve—was to break the inflationary psychology that had gripped this country after World War II. It is not easy to break that psychology once it takes hold and it creates an inflation that feeds on itself. Purchasing agents of the various corporations, of course, try to build up inventories if they are anticipating inflation that will create price increases in the future. All sorts of economic maladjustments occur when business decisions are made on the basis of anticipating inflation.

As a result of policies carefully followed and sometimes not so carefully, some of it was luck—but as a result of policies followed in the late fifties, this psychology of inflation was broken and the Kennedy administration retained or gained the benefits to a large degree. With propriety, the Kennedy administration and, at the beginning, the Johnson administration talked about how they were able to hold the wholesale price index and consumer price index. Indeed, we had a great record of price stability. This must be the context in which we view this recent increase of 3.4 points in the wholesale price index, in context of no increase for the past 6 or 7 years. But what happens when the inflationary psychology begins to build up again? Then we have this feeding on itself and it is hard to reverse. This is some of the damage being created by the Johnson administration temporizing with this very serious problem.

I would like to direct attention to another quotation from the President's economic report of 1966. The first quotation was on page 20 in respect to inflation. On page 151, where the President is talking, or rather his Council of Economic Advisers are talking, about the deficit in our international balance of payments. Note this well:

> Nevertheless if a deficit continues too long or becomes too large, the strength of the country's currency can be impaired. There is in fact an absolute limit of any country's ability to continue in deficit. Eventually it must run out of reserves as well as borrowing capacity.

The question is, Has not the United States reached this point? On page 163 of this same report we find a startling figure which is not mentioned let alone pointed up in the President's messages or in the statements of the Secretary of the Treasury about our international balance of payments: net sales of U.S. gold jumped from $0.1 billion in 1964 to nearly $1.7 billion in 1965—the greatest sale of gold going out from the United States in 1 year since back when the gold rush began in 1958.

This administration just mentions this. It does not dwell on it. It does not relate it to these serious fiscal problems. As Chairman Mills pointed out, this problem of inflation bears directly on our international balance of payments. One of our great assets in the international balance of payments is our plus in trade, our exports over our imports. Inflation hurts exports and increases imports.

This administration in its economic messages last year was talking about how it was counting on increasing our balance of trade to further lower this international deficit. And yet here is another statistic that this administration has been ignoring. Our surplus of exports over imports, instead of increasing, as the administration had planned and hoped in calendar year 1965, decreased by $1.9 billion.

This, I might say—and this is something that this House might think about and our Committee on Ways and Means—is to some degree the result of the very shortsighted policy, I would argue, of the interest equalization tax, which seeks to put a curb on the amount of private investment that may go abroad. There is no question that exports depend upon capital investment abroad, and when we curtail our investment we are bound to be cutting in at the base of the increase of our exports.

The Secretary of the Treasury has reiterated before our committee that it is true that the interest equalization tax, if imposed at any length, is damaging to the United States. The administration recognizes it must be only temporary and each month it continues it creates damage, and yet here we are moving into the third year. Each year that this is on it creates this further kind of damage.

So here we are with a choice before us, because we are not meeting the basic problem, restraining expenditures. I agree with the gentleman from Arkansas, Chairman Mills, that when we are confronted with Hobson's choice, inasmuch as expenditures are not being curtailed, there are only two basic ways—there are some others that I want to mention, too—but only two basic ways in which we can finance this increased expenditure: One is through increasing taxes; the other is increasing debt. What is the choice? We reduced excise taxes and corporate and individual income tax rates on the theory that those rates were so high they were impeding economic growth.

I am pleased that the committee report uses that very language in referring to the subject. At page 7:

> The Revenue Acts of 1962 and 1964 and the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965 were in large part directed at the removal of restraints to growth in the private sector of the economy arising from tax rates that were too high.

They are still too high, I think most people would agree. So there is damage when we increase these rates again. Let us not kid ourselves.

But what is the alternative? What is the damage that is created if we put a further burden in the field of debt management? There is one small consolation—and it is very small—I derive from the administration's suggesting to the Congress that we increase taxes and not increase debt further, at least to this small degree.

The administration spokesmen, the Council of Economic Advisers, are still talking in terms of the "new economics." They are still saying, "What is the matter with debt?"

Publicly they express no concern about increasing the amount of the Federal debt further, but obviously the administration, by recommending this bill, is in effect saying to the Congress, "Look, you had better create the damage in the field of taxes, by increasing these taxes, than by putting a further load on the debt."

I am so pleased that this is out in the open. At least I hope it gets out in the open, because we do have a serious problem in debt management. We have a ceiling on long-term debt of 4¼ percent interest. Long-term Government securities are being sold in the marketplace at a discount today which makes the actual yield about 4.7 percent. This administration cannot market any more long-term debt under these circumstances.

We have a turnover of about $90 billion of debt this year which we have to refinance, and much of the refinancing is in short-term Federal securities, near money. These create highly inflationary forces. This is what Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board was trying to point out to the country and to the Congress—this is one reason the Federal Reserve Board took action by increasing the interest rate or discount rate, not because they wanted interest raised, but because the Federal Government had no way to market its debt in an orderly fashion. Of course, we should not put a further burden on our debt managers.

I want to point out the facts about this increased deficit which Chairman MILLS directed attention to in his presentation, and rightly so. We are in fiscal year 1966. Fiscal year 1966 does not end until July 1 of this year. The budget that was presented to us in January relates primarily to fiscal year 1967, but it also includes a major revision in fiscal 1966. The new budget does not go into effect until July 1, 1967, and the Congress has not acted upon it, but Congress has already acted in regard to the power to spend that is granted to the President for fiscal year 1966. These are the months that we are in right now. But Congress still can say something about the revised and increased expenditures levels for fiscal 1966 set out in the 1967 budget message.

The deficit which was presented to us for fiscal year 1966 a year ago January was $3.9 billion, and the revision in the budget that was presented to us this January—not for 1967, the revision of 1966 budget—shows a deficit of $6.9 billion.

President Johnson keeps talking about 1967, that the budget is only going to be out of balance by $1.8 billion. What about the increase deficit from $3.9 to $6.9 billion? Actually, the figure should be about $11.1 billion, because $1.2 billion is this revenue that he hopes to get from the bill that we have right before us. So he is compensating from anticipated action of the Congress. $3 billion is from selling Federal assets. About $1.7 billion is converting our silver coins to copper—seigniorage. These are one-shot propositions.

Now I am getting to another basic problem I see facing us, aside from the fiscal aspect. Our military leaders have told us this is not a short war—that is, if we intend to attain our objectives.

To come in with a fiscal program like this, relying on one-shot propositions for financing—such as sales of capital assets, acceleration of taxpayments, seigniorage, and things of that nature—is irresponsible. To finance a war that is not going to end in 1967—if we attain our objectives in this fashion is no way to get across to the people abroad, particularly to our enemies, that we do intend to stay until we get results.

I know if I am evaluating my enemy I do not listen to what he says. I look to see what he does. If I see that he is running his fiscal affairs in such a way that he is not planning on a long-range basis, but is planning on a hand-to-mouth basis, I am not so convinced he means business.

I am deeply concerned about these shortcomings that are revealed in this kind of fiscal program that this administration has presented to us.

My concluding remarks are these. There is a remedy. It lies in expenditure reform. This Congress should exercise some leadership in bringing forth some recision bills. If the Executive will not stop spending, let us start bringing in some recision bills in the areas where we think these expenditures should be curtailed.

Finally—I would say this—I honestly believe we can finance this war and have butter, too. I think we can have guns and butter, but we cannot have rancid butter, as I have described it. Many of these Federal programs we have are redundant, duplicating, unduly costly, not attaining their stated objectives.

This is particularly true in this great area of manpower training, which is one of our crucial problems. There is redundancy all over the place. There are programs interfering with each other. In another tremendous area we have redundancy, costliness, and ineffectiveness in one that bears on this problem of international balance of payments—our foreign aid programs.

If we would get around to intelligent expenditure policies and efficient administration of them I believe that we can finance our Federal programs and get the results that we are seeking. This can be a great society; or it is a great society, if we can only keep it.

We have got to start out developing recision bills. In our minority views or supplemental views, we point out—six of us—that we agree with Chairman MILLS that under these circumstances, with Hobson's choice before us, the thing to do is to put the added economic burden in the field of taxation, damaging as it may be, rather than to put it in the field of Federal debt, which would cause greater damage.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I was pleased to hear the gentleman refer to this as a tax increase, because, as I referred to earlier in this regard, the title of the bill, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, distresses me, because I do not believe that this title is totally accurate.

Later on in the report, it says that the tax adjustment bill is designed to contribute revenues to aid and finance the increased costs of Government associated with operations in Vietnam.

Is that a totally accurate statement, or does it in fact really only tell part of the truth? How can you earmark funds? Is it not true there are domestic increases it will finance?

Mr. CURTIS. It is only partly true. Chairman MILLS presented statistics that developed this point. About $2 billion of this is for the so-called Great Society programs and only a part of it is for Vietnam.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does anyone have the slightest idea of how many commitments have been made around the world by some of our galloping emissaries?

Mr. CURTIS. You mean the Vice President, for example?

Mr. GROSS. You can use him as an example.

Mr. CURTIS. We have no idea, but we will probably find out someday when maybe someone in the House will rise to say, "Well, are we not going to stand behind our executives?" That will be another question.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT].

Mr. UTT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to call the attention of the House to the fact that there are some minority views, dissenting views, on this bill. As usual, they appear in the classified section. Maybe you have not gotten that far, but I would suggest they be read because they do give some very potent arguments against the bill.

I take this time also to advise the House that I will offer a motion to recommit this bill with instructions to the committee in order to eliminate title II, which are the excise taxes that we are restoring in the bill. This will not be a straight motion to recommit. I am unhappy that at this time again our committee brings legislation to the floor in a package form covering two or three different subjects, many of which I am oftentimes in support and maybe one of which I am against, so I never have an opportunity to vote my position on the various parts of these bills.

My motion to recommit will divide this legislation into the parts which I happen to favor, which are outlined by the gentleman from Arkansas, Chairman MILLS, and give me and the Members of the House an opportunity to vote against the excise tax increase on automobiles and telephones. I am opposed to the excise tax increase for two reasons: At the time we voted this reduction into effect a year ago we were facing a smaller deficit in fiscal 1966 than we are now facing for fiscal 1967. Certainly if, when we were facing that great deficit a year ago, we could repeal the excise taxes, then certainly today, facing a very small deficit as forecast by the President of $1.8 billion, we have no excuse for replacing those taxes except to condition the American public for a substantial increase in income taxes both corporate and personal. In the last 2 years our excesses of spending outside of Vietnam have gone mainly into what they call the Great Society, which is not in my estimation a free society. It is an enforced welfare state which has failed in every country which adopted it. Besides that, there has not been one welfare program or one program initiated by the Federal Government that will create in the American people the one thing that is necessary to make a great and free society. This one thing is motivation. You cannot legislate motivation. The more money we give to people not to do something the less they do and the less creative they will be and the less contribution they are going to make to the Great Society of America. So I think it is well to understand that our welfare costs have doubled, from $6 billion in 1964 to over $12 billion by 1967. Instead of bringing more prosperity, this is going to bring more indolence and we are going to take from the thrifty and give to the shifty.

For these reasons I will offer a motion to recommit this bill so as to eliminate the excise taxes. Then let us come back with a bill later in the session distributing the tax over the entire American public, not a selective tax. Let us have a 5-percent increase on top of the amount of taxes we have to pay. Call it any kind of a tax you want to, in order to finance the war, but let us wait until the end of the session before we even increase this tax and let us find out if this Congress will use the restraint that it should necessarily have in order to reduce spending. It would be very easy to reduce our spending and our appropriations between $1 and $2 billion if we will simply take the bull by the horns and practice a little financial discipline.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UTT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I want to ask the gentleman a question which I think is bothering every American who has a telephone, and that includes practically every American. As we go back to the excise tax reduction bill of last year, we notice that we repealed the excise taxes on furs, jewelry, air conditioners, cameras, and so forth. It goes through quite a list of luxury items in this category. Then we get over into matters dealing with bowling alleys and billiard and pool tables and coin-operated amusement devices, cabaret taxes, general admissions taxes on horseraces and dograces, and so forth. I notice we are not reimposing these luxury taxes in this bill but we are reimposing the tax we removed last year on our telephone users.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LATTA. This administration bill is reimposing the tax on telephones. The tax applies to the high income and low income groups alike. Some can afford to pay this tax and others cannot. Can the gentleman from California give me the logic used by his committee in following this course of action?

Mr. UTT. I can say to the gentleman from Ohio that it represents a rather torturous bit of logic, but there is some logic to it; that is, that the other taxes to which the gentleman referred had been repealed completely. These taxes which we are increasing are still administratively on the books. The item of increasing them does not present as much of an administrative problem to those who are paying them as would be the case with respect to the other taxes. Yet I might say to the gentleman that the telephone company and the automobile companies will not pay the tax. They will pass it on. So they do not care one way or the other whether this tax bill passes or not.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this is the same reasoning that the very honorable chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means used before the Committee on Rules when I propounded this question to him, but it just does not seem very logical. It does not seem like much of an argument to me to be attaching this additional telephone tax to users just because the telephone tax was not completely eliminated last year. Thought should have been given to the matter of which excise taxpayer could afford to pay an additional tax more.

It seems to me that it would have been much less burdensome to our lower income groups—and just as easy from a tax writing standpoint—to have reimposed the luxury taxes that I have previously named, rather than attaching this tax increase to the telephone tax just because all of it was not completely eliminated last year. Until this bill is amended, which can only be done on the motion to recommit, to tax these luxury items rather than the telephones, I cannot support it.

Mr. UTT. I would agree with the gentleman from Ohio, but I simply tried to give the gentleman the tortuous logic which was used in the committee in order to arrive at this point.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, when this debate opened I thought that I might have the good fortune of following not only the distinguished chairman of our committee, but the equally distinguished and capable gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] and I decided that I would tell the members of the Committee that I was doubly fortunate in following two such men.

But by reason of the change in the program, I confess to being trebly fortunate, for not only do I follow the chairman, who in his usual gracious, capable, and nonpartisan way, presented the merits of the pending bill, not only was I able to look forward to following the distinguished gentleman from Missouri who did his usual magnificent job exploring in an obviously nonpartisan way the economics of the situation, but I have the treble good fortune of following our good and sturdy Member, the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT].

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate somewhat lest I disturb these placid nonpartisan waters that have obtained through this afternoon, for I am exceedingly pleased that the majority of the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means have indicated their support for the measure now under consideration, even though their support is characterized by them as "reluctant" in their separate views.

Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised at their reluctance, for that is not uncharacteristic of the support for many of the measures and programs that have been advanced and enacted and successfully established over the years in which I have served in the Congress. I am not a little bit surprised, however, that the minority's expressed reluctance, while not of a measure sufficient to cause them to vote against the pending bill has its basis in their concepts and convictions with respect to fiscal responsibility.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. KEOGH. I have no alternative but to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I just want to express to the gentleman from New York that I hope he will not go so far as to force any of us to change our mind.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I pondered that very possibility greatly.

I was on the verge of simply extending my remarks. But the whole tenor of this debate followed the chairman's statement on such a high, nonpolitical, nonpartisan basis that I was impelled to take the floor. But accepting the advice of my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the request of the gentleman from New York is granted and the gentleman yields back 5 minutes.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, the reports of the press in recent days are replete with references and articles to the effect that an attempt will be made to make this overall issue—fiscal responsibility—a primary topic of debate in this very important year.

I do not wish to be misunderstood, Mr. Chairman, my esteem and commendation for the minority's expressed concern for fiscal responsibility scarcely knows bounds. I congratulate them warmly and enthusiastically for their expressed endorsement of responsible action in fiscal matters. Certainly no one could be critical of such pronouncement.

I think, however, Mr. Chairman, that even a cursory scanning of the RECORD reveals some variances in the armor of fiscal prudence that has come from orators of the minority in recent weeks. For instance, Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly call attention to the subway strike and settlement in the city of New York only last month. This is a geographical area in which the minority is not presently without considerable power and responsibility for the caliber of fiscal responsibility manifested in the affairs of that great city. This settlement has been criticized as inflationary and very considerably and noticeably beyond the wage-price policy of the present administration.

I should like to quote briefly from excerpts of the statement of Mr. Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, in this matter:

> I deeply regret that the New York transit strike had to be settled on terms that far exceeded the Government's wage guideposts.

> The strike and the terms of its settlement were costly not to New York alone. They constitute a serious violation of the wage-price policy of the Federal Government designed to protect a whole Nation from destructive inflation.

Mr. Ackley's statement goes on and concludes with this very significant final sentence:

> The public interest has been adversely affected both by the strike and by the terms of its settlement.

So, Mr. Chairman, while I am delighted to have the minority, even with their characteristic reluctance, in support of the measure, I am somewhat disappointed that their reluctance on this occasion is assigned to supposed deficiencies in the bill from the standpoint of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, our actions here in the Congress by necessity and nature are many times based on comparisons. I would, therefore, as graciously and sincerely as I know how, invite a comparison between the President's tax program in this bill with the wage settlement in New York. Let the minority use their own expressed yardstick or dimensions of fiscal responsibility and let them tell us which is the more fiscally prudent action in our present economic situation—this bill or the wage settlement in New York.

If such an examination is objectively made, Mr. Chairman, I am confident that whatever reluctance there might have been will disappear and this legislation and the other measures that the President has taken and is taking will receive the wholehearted—not reluctant—support of my good friends on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that this is fiscally prudent legislation worthy of the strong and enthusiastic endorsement of all of my colleagues. The President in a letter on January 19 to our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means said he was faced, as the Nation's Chief Executive, with three choices.

The President made this prefatory comment:

> The moneys that will flow into the Federal Treasury under present tax laws will not be sufficient to maintain the right fiscal balance during the coming year. Without any changes in the tax laws, budget receipts will rise sharply in response to the sustained economic expansion. But they still would be too low to maintain our economic growth and prosperity without running the risk of inflation.

Then the President turned to the three choices he faced: A deficit in excess of $6.5 billion, which would require the Government to borrow the additional money; an increase in corporate and personal income tax rates, or other new taxes; or temporary restoration of certain excise taxes, and adoption of graduated withholding of individual income taxes and current payment of corporate income taxes to put the American people on a pay-as-you-go basis without increasing the total tax bill due.

The President chose the third alternative—which he called—and note these adjectives—"moderate, equitable, responsible, and essential." And he also assured us:

> If our needs in Vietnam require additional revenues, I will not hesitate to request them.

If this tax bill—one that is designed to withdraw about $2.7 billion from private purchasing power in calendar 1966—were the only force in the direction of economic restraint, I might be tempted to give more weight to the views of those who tend to grasp at one small component of current economic performance and regard it as sure proof that the U.S. economic machine is overheating.

But think back a bit on fiscally prudent measures that have already been taken.

The Federal Reserve Board last December 5 boosted the discount rate from 4 to 4½ percent.

And President Johnson put his Federal budget for fiscal 1967 together in such a way that the added costs of the Vietnam situation received top priority.

In conclusion, the President and his advisers have defined the aim of fiscal policies over the next 18 months as follows:

> To preserve the sound economic expansion we enjoyed in 1965 and earlier years—to maintain a strong and healthy prosperity—and to move toward lower levels of unemployment but neither so far or so fast that bottlenecks and inflationary pressures arise.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, is an essential part of the moderate, equitable, and responsible course that is being followed at this time. Therefore, I urge its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS].

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the precedent set by my illustrious colleague, the gentleman from New York, I intend to make only a few observations and to submit my remarks.

Mr. KEOGH. I am confident that my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, will maintain the high plane of debate that I sought not to disturb.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the motion to recommit to be offered by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT]. If this motion is adopted, I would support the bill, because the most objectionable part would be stricken.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to House passage of the bill now before us known as the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, H.R. 12752. The reasons for my opposition are set forth in the separate views in the accompanying committee report in which my esteemed committee colleague from California [Mr. UTT] and I joined. I also concur for the most part in the well-considered separate views of my other Republican colleagues who serve on the Committee on Ways and Means.

In an important sense the bill before us today is not just a tax bill; it is a spending bill. The bill is before us because we have spent too much in the past, we are spending too much in the present, and we propose to spend too much in the future. And the truth of the matter is that if this Congress acquiesces in the fiscal policies of this administration, the bill now before us will not be the last tax bill that we will be requested to approve this year.

The alleged justification for this increase in tax burden on which we will vote today is the recognized need to finance fully the cost of our defense commitments in southeast Asia. But the truth of the matter is that our necessary defense spending could largely be met out of existing revenues if the administration would only agree to defer some of its grandiose Great Society spending programs. My assertion in this regard can be demonstrated by reference to the administration's own figures. An analysis of the budget figures reveals that increases in Great Society costs will amount to at least $3.5 billion for fiscal year 1967. The budget also anticipates an increase in revenues under existing law of $6 billion in fiscal year 1967 resulting from growth in the level of economic activity. If the revenue increase is realized as projected and the expansion of the Great Society was deferred until it could be afforded, we would have budget adjustments that would come close to compensating for the estimated buildup in Vietnam costs for fiscal year 1967 of $10.5 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I would remind my colleagues that it was only last June that we were told it was fiscally prudent and economically desirable for the Congress to approve sweeping excise tax reduction legislation. It was also last June amid great fanfare that the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965 was signed into law. I cannot help but wonder what kind of ceremony will be arranged to attend the signing of the bill now before us when it passes the Congress. I cannot help but also wonder how many months will elapse before the administration will be back with the Second Tax Increase Act of 1966.

The off-again, on-again approach to tax policy pursued by the administration constitutes a dangerously unsettling attempt to attain an aura of fiscal responsibility at a time of soaring extravagance, intolerable waste, alarming inflation, and stifling debt. The administration's fiscal maneuvers which are charted in an obscure way in the budget message can only lead to distrust of our policies and declining confidence in the integrity of our Government. Time magazine for February 18, 1966, contains an essay captioned "Reading the Budget for Fun and Profit" which states:

> Lyndon Johnson, who delights in making use of every available lever of power, has used the budget to further his own ends more than any of his predecessors.

Mr. Chairman, rather than charting a responsible fiscal course in his budget message, the President has outlined an uncertain and contradictory collection of spending programs that is devoid of any evidence of fiscal discipline or expenditure restraint. The bill now under consideration is intended to further these confused purposes.

Mr. Chairman, table B-9 on page 394 of the budget message provides the shocking information that the gross expenditures of the Federal Government in fiscal year 1967 will be $175 billion—or approximately 25 percent of our gross national product. This is $12 billion more than is contemplated for the current fiscal year and $30 billion more than was spent as recently as 1965. Is national defense the category in which the largest increase over 1965 has occurred? Not at all. The increase for national defense, comparing 1965 with 1967, is $10.8 billion but the increase for the category health, labor, and welfare is $11.2 billion. This spending trend makes it inescapable that we ask ourselves the fundamental question, "Should the Great Society have priority over our endeavors in Vietnam?"

Our last budgetary surplus was in fiscal year 1960. Since then Federal spending has increased 47 percent and we have added $35 billion to the public debt with what will be seven successive deficits at the end of fiscal year 1967. During the course of the debate today we will undoubtedly hear attempts to rationalize this record of fiscal profligacy on the grounds that as a percent of our gross national product our debt is not growing. Several observations can be made about this fallacious rationale. First, Government spending is a part of our gross national product and therefore as spending grows so does our gross national product. Second, such an assertion implicity assumes that we do not intend to retire or pay off the debt. Third, the contention ignores the fact that the growing debt carrys with it growing interest charges which in the 1967 budget will be the largest single nondefense expenditure item in the amount of $12.8 billion. And, fourth, the contention fails to take account of the fact that rising debt tends to severely restrict the flexibility and resources that will be available to deal with future contingencies.

Mr. Chairman, I have stated I am opposed to the enactment of H.R. 12752. I believe the measure is a breach of faith with the Nation's taxpayers. Six months ago the American people were told it was good economics to cut taxes on such items as sales of automobiles and telephone services. I believe it is still good economics and it would also be good economics to provide for our increasing expenditures in Vietnam by practicing economy at home on nonessential programs of the Great Society. I disapprove of the fiscal manipulations of the administration as evidenced by its 1967 budget and I intend to manifest that disapproval by voting "no" today.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I supported this legislation, H.R. 12752, when it was considered by the Committee on Ways and Means. I also support this legislation on the floor of the House today.

I do so, however, with a reasonable degree of reluctance, hesitancy, misgiving, and regret.

No one, of course, likes to increase taxes. There is nothing politically popular about a tax increase bill, and this is a tax increase bill. Make no mistake about it.

I recognize the fact that it has been called by other titles. In fact, the official title of the bill is the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. It has often been referred to in the press as a restoration of certain taxes or an adjustment or acceleration of collection of revenue. I admit that these references do no sound quite as bad as the phrase "tax increase," but I submit, Mr. Chairman, that just like the phrase, "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet," this bill raises revenue, and you cannot make its effect any different by using other labels. This bill will impose additional taxes on the American people, taken from the fruits of their labor, $1.155 billion in fiscal year 1966 and $4.830 billion in fiscal year 1967.

In other words, without this bill the American people would have more money to provide for the basic necessities of life, and even some of the conveniences of life. Without this bill American industries would have more capital under which to conduct their operations and more surplus from which to pay dividends to stockholders.

Regardless of what name we assign to this legislation, the fact of the matter is that we do need additional revenue, and we may as well face up to it. And this is the reason why I am supporting this legislation.

It has been pointed out by some, that the primary purpose of this legislation is to help pay for the increased costs of the war in Vietnam. It is true that the cost of the war in Vietnam is increasing. But, by the same token the revenue under present tax laws is increasing and our economy is expanding and increasing also. If the cost of the war in Vietnam was the only expenditure increasing, and we were not receiving any other increases in revenue, there would be no argument whatsoever as to the necessity and fairness of this legislation.

When American men are fighting and dying on foreign soil, it is the duty of the U.S. Congress and the American people to back them 100 percent. Regardless of how they got there; regardless of whether we approve of our foreign policy in its entirety, it is our duty to stand behind American troops wherever they represent us in any part of the world. I am confident that all good patriotic American citizens feel that way, and in that light, would be willing to support this bill. The American people are willing to sacrifice, and I use that word advisedly, for I do not mean we will have to sacrifice the hungry and poor. But the American people are, as a whole, willing to work a little harder, to tighten up their belts, and to make whatever extra contribution is necessary to help insure the freedom of our country.

The thing that causes many of us a great deal of concern about this legislation, however, is the belief that this tax bill in the final analysis will be used for other purposes. Many of us feel that we should be making every effort to delay and hold up, if not completely eliminate, some of these nonessential programs, rather than accelerating them as has been proposed by the President.

We have all heard much about guns and butter. I think our economy is strong enough to provide some butter along with the guns, and I am, therefore, not advocating eliminating butter in its entirety. I do feel, however, that we must eliminate the gravy—and the gravy train.

What we are doing is paying, in many instances, millions upon millions of dollars for people to be worthless and no good; while good and industrious young men are fighting for us in Vietnam. The American people are wondering why we are doing this, Mr. Chairman; and they are entitled to know. They want us to justify this legislation and to be sure it will serve the purposes we are told it is designed to serve.

Mr. Chairman, the real reason for this bill, then is to try to halt inflation, and to try to bring the Federal Government costs into balance. If we have failed to halt or reduce our expenditures in other areas we will be compounding the error if we fail to meet our financial responsibilities by raising the revenue to pay for them.

We therefore have two choices to make as to the real reason why increases in expenditures are necessitating this tax bill: It will pay for either first, the war in Vietnam; or, second, the war on poverty. Or, to put it in even more descriptive language, as it is actually being applied today we have a choice between jungle warfare in Vietnam and jungle warfare in the United States of America.

And now, for comments on a few of the provisions of the bill itself:

The most unfortunate part of the entire bill is the fact that we have found it necessary to raise some of the excise taxes so soon after having found it desirable to reduce them. We have always agreed that excise taxes were among the most undesirable forms of taxation. They have been under constant criticism for years, and were only meant to be temporary taxes when they were first enacted. But, as I have said before, Mr. Chairman, nothing seems to be more permanent than a temporary tax, unless it is a temporary Government building in Washington, D.C.

In increasing these taxes, however, we took the most convenient items to increase. Or, it may be more appropriate to say we took the least inconvenient items upon which to increase the tax. These, of course, were the taxes on the telephone and automobiles. These taxes had not been completely eliminated. Therefore, the bookkeeping mechanisms did not need to be reestablished.

A second reason for choosing the automobiles and telephone was the fact that they would bring in more revenue than the other items reduced last year. In fact, these two items will bring in revenue for fiscal year 1967 in the amount of $1.205 billion.

We did make three major changes in the excise tax proposals as presented by the administration which I feel are substantial improvements.

First of all, we limited this increase to 2 years rather than postponing the present law which calls for a gradual reduction of these taxes for 2 additional years. In other words, the committee provided that in 1968 the taxes on automobiles and telephones would revert to the same level that they would be under existing law in the absence of this bill. The administration, on the other hand, proposed that we start all over again with the present schedule at today's rates in 1968.

The second change was an attempt by the committee to eliminate, as much as possible, the hardship on the automobile dealers of the 1-percent increase in excise taxes for automobiles in stock at the time of the passage of this bill. There was $25 million additional revenue involved by adding the 1-percent increase to the floor stock. Since the dealers in many instances did not know what the manufacturer's cost of the automobile was, the committee provided that the manufacturers would be designated as the collection agents for these taxes and would therefore bill each dealer for the amount he would owe on the automobiles he had in stock at the time of passage of the bill.

The third change, and improvement, to the existing law was to exempt nonprofit hospitals from the telephone excise tax in its entirety. Under existing law, Government-owned hospitals, whether they are city, Federal or State, are now exempt from payment of an excise tax on telephone service. Educational institutions, both Government and nonprofit, are likewise exempt from excise taxes on telephones under existing law. It was felt by the committee that the noprofit nongovernment hospitals should receive the same treatment as Government-owned hospitals, particularly since many of these nonprofit hospitals had already prepared their budgets counting on the 7-percent telephone tax reduction of January 1 to offset increased costs to them of social security taxes and other expenditures. Rather than impose this economic hardship on them, the committee felt the existing law should be amended so as to eliminate the telephone excise tax for them.

In the section of this bill involving graduated withholding taxes and speedup in payment of certain corporation taxes, we find that we have a one-shot tax advance of about $1.1 billion in fiscal year 1966 and $3.6 billion in fiscal year 1967. This is one of the reasons the bill has not been called a tax increase bill, but it does mean additional money from the pockets of the American people this year.

And the advance they are making to the Government will continue to be advanced year after year ad infinitum. They will never get it back. But, on the other side of the picture, is the fact that this procedure does not provide the Federal Government with additional revenue in later years, since it is a one-shot step-up procedure. If additional revenue is needed in future years, an additional tax increase will be necessary.

There are two problems involved in this withholding tax and speedup collection proposal to which the committee gave a great deal of attention. One is in the area of overwithholding by virtue of the graduated withholding tax proposal. One of the purposes of the graduated withholding tax proposal, in addition to advancing the collection of revenue, was to bring collection more in line with the actual tax liability of the individual. Yet, we found that the graduated withholding tax proposal provided for an increase in overwithholding to $6.050 billion. In fact, for the wage earners in the $5,000 to $10,000 income bracket, there was still $3.5 billion overwithheld. While we all realize we cannot eliminate all underwithholding and all overwithholding, the committee did want to reduce the inconvenience of overwithholding as much as possible. With this in mind, we came up with a seemingly complicated formula which would permit an additional $700 exemption to each employee whose deductions in the preceding year exceeded 12 percent of the first $7,500 of his income and 17 percent of income over $7,500. He will get an additional $700 exemption for withholding tax purposes for each $700 of deductions over the percentages I have just stated for calendar years beginning after December 31, 1966.

As I said before, this is a rather complicated formula, but it represents the best efforts of the committee in trying to eliminate as much as possible the hardship which may have been caused by increased overwithholding.

The other problem involved in this adjustment of taxes was the effect the additional $1 billion tax collection in fiscal year 1966 and the additional $3.2 billion collection in fiscal year 1967 would have on our Nation's corporations.

It was pointed out to the committee by the Secretary of the Treasury that since this acceleration of tax payments only applied to corporations earning over $100,000 a year it would involve the type of businesses which normally made provision in advance for setting funds aside for their tax responsibility as it accrued. Corporations do in many instances buy short-term bonds or certificates of deposits in order to obtain interest income from these funds so set aside.

It should, therefore, cause no great shock to these corporations to make tax payments early. On the other hand, however, it is obvious that the advance payment of their tax liability will reduce the cash capital they will have on hand. It could, in fact, reduce their operating funds wherein these corporations could be using their funds set aside for tax payments rather than having to make short-term loans from the bank or selling their own bonds for interim operating capital.

This bill, then, could be costly to some corporations even though they have made provision for payment of taxes when they come due under existing law. They may have to sell bonds in the month in which they would be paying interest rather than receiving interest, and this could cause some reduction of dividends to the stockholders by virtue of their having to use surplus capital which they would have had on hand if this legislation had not passed.

The Secretary of the Treasury assured the committee, however, that all of these contingencies had been taken into consideration and that it should have no visible effect on the revenue received from these corporations in the future.

So let me say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that by and large after recognizing that the need for additional revenue exists, this is a well worked out piece of legislation. The Committee on Ways and Means, and particularly the chairman, has done a commendable job.

This is my 14th year as a Member of the House of Representatives. I had served for 11 years before I had the privilege of being assigned to the Committee on Ways and Means. I had been a Member of the Congress long enough for most of the novelty and awe to wear off. In fact, I am reminded of the story many of us have heard concerning the young Congressman who, when first elected to the House of Representatives, walked through the august halls of Congress looking around at his colleagues in amazement and wondering how he ever got here. But, when he quickly caught on to the hustle and bustle of our daily operations and became acquainted with his colleagues, he began to wonder how the rest of us ever got here.

But, regardless of having been here for a number of years, I am indeed impressed with the thoroughness and the meticulous detail with which all bills referred to the Committee on Ways and Means are deliberated and explored. Such is the case with this bill. The chairman was extremely fair as he always is. The suggestions of every committee member were thoroughly considered. And, as I pointed out, some changes were made as a result of these suggestions. Mr. Chairman, this bill was, I believe, the best that could be produced at this time concerning this subject.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS].

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill. I am not opposed to the acceleration of tax collection, but I am opposed to deferring the reduction of the auto excise taxes and telephone excise taxes. Unlike the gentleman on the other side, I find this bill, however, neither illogical nor tortured logic. It is simple logic and untortured tax collection. The way you run this bill is to pick up the taxes from four payers in the State of Michigan, the automobile industry, which causes more employment in this country than any other one industry. One person in every six gainfully employed persons in this country is employed either directly or indirectly because of the automobile industry. Therefore, I feel that industry is not the proper industry to have the excise tax reductions deferred. I think we should have looked a little further and done a more equitable job in the taxing of all of the industry of the country for the payment of those things that are necessary for our people.

I oppose this bill, Mr. Chairman, and I want to make it quite clear, even if this bill passes, I trust this House returns again and reduces the excise taxes on telephones and automobiles.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, it is with a sense of regret that I rise to protest the proposed reimposition of excise taxes requested by the President. I say regretfully for two reasons. First, because, as I told the members of the Committee on Ways and Means last month, I had looked forward to 1966 as the first year in the 10 years I have been in Congress when it would not be necessary to protest against the continuance of these so-called temporary taxes in general and the discriminatory levy on automobiles in particular. I am certain that not only members of the committee, but of the House at large, looked upon that prospect with equal pleasure.

Second, I would regret very much if my words today were so interpreted as to suggest an unwillingness on my part to support our fighting men in South Vietnam. Nothing could be further from my intentions. We obviously need more funds to do the job there. I recognize this and am ready to do my part. The question before us today is simply whether the reimposition of these excise taxes, admitted by the President to be unfair and burdensome is a just and proper means to raise these needed revenues. I submit that it is not.

In his message to the Congress on May 17, 1965, the President proposed the program of excise tax reduction on the grounds that it would—

> Lower prices to consumers;
>
> Lessen the burden of regressive taxes on low-income families;
>
> Raise business profits by expanding sales and cutting costs of tax compliance;
>
> Cut the Government's costs of tax collection and enforcement;
>
> End an unfair burden on many businesses and workers who produce the commodities singled out for excise taxation;
>
> Free consumers from the distorting effects of these taxes on their market choices.

It is true, of course, that the administration initially only wished to reduce the automobile excise tax from 10 to 5 percent. However, when the committee insisted that the rate be dropped to 1 percent the President agreed saying:

> While I prefer the program I recommended, I feel that if the tax is to be removed the Ways and Means Committee program represents a prudent way of doing so.

Last year a significant chapter in legislative history was written when these selective excise taxes were cast out, in principle and in fact, from our overall tax structure. The committee, after months of study, and Congress have done their work and done it well. These excises were found guilty as charged as being inherently discriminatory and a drag on the economy. Today, however, we are being asked to set aside much of last session's good work. The President has recommended that the reduction in the automobile and certain telephone excise taxes, made law only a few months ago, be "temporarily" postponed for 2 years.

I believe that the 2-year extension provision would set a bad precedent. During the Korean war emergency the excise tax on automobiles was raised from 7 to 10 percent. This increase and other ones were lent some credibility for being temporary by the fact that they required an annual affirmative action by Congress to their continued life. Mr. Chairman, it took over 12 years after the Korean war to remove these so-called temporary taxes even with this annual review requirement. I am not at all optimistic that this temporary restoration will be any shorter by a 2-year extension. While I was somewhat encouraged by the action of the committee in insisting that after this 2-year period the schedule of staggered reductions be accelerated, it would come as no great surprise to me if 2 years from now we were asked to extend these temporary taxes for another 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, no matter how the military situation changes in the months immediately ahead, it appears likely that our presence in South Vietnam will be required for a period considerably longer than 2 more years. The President himself has warned us of a long period of involvement. That being the case I would respectfully suggest that instead of seeking what may be the quickest and easiest method for increasing tax revenues we should strive to obtain what is the fairest and best form of taxation. I am not satisfied that the reimposition of these taxes, which no one here, I believe, would deny are burdensome and discriminatory, represents the fairest or best means to obtain the money we may need. Why should two sectors of our economy be made to shoulder such a heavy share of the added cost of our military effort?

It is highly unjust to arbitrarily single out the automobile excise tax as a possible source of additional revenue simply because automobile sales are high, or because restoration of this tax could be accomplished with little administrative difficulty. In all fairness, can we reimpose this tax on a highly necessary and useful consumer product while allowing the purchase of luxury items such as mink coats and diamond rings to go untaxed?

It may well be, Mr. Chairman, that the restoration of these taxes is the most expedient thing to do, but that is not the question. Rather we should be asking, Is it the right thing to do? For the present I have yet to be convinced that the administration cannot solve our fiscal problems without resorting to these admittedly discriminatory measures. I am satisfied that we are going to need a good deal more money for our efforts in Vietnam in the months ahead, and I will support increasing such taxes as may be found to be required. We cannot cut back where it reduces our military effectiveness, especially at a time when American soldiers are in daily combat. Nevertheless, I am convinced that these added tax revenues can be and should be collected on a fair basis.

Therefore, let us not act hastily and undo what has been successfully accomplished by the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, but let us carefully explore possible areas of Federal expenditure where economies might be achieved or look to other more equitable sources for additional tax revenues.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on this bill with some reluctance, because I have reacted to its provisions with conflicting thoughts.

I accept the fact that we need additional revenues to finance the Nation's military operations in Vietnam. In this respect I favor the effort being made to secure these revenues through changes in the tax laws. But, after considerable consideration of the situation that faces us, I disagree with a part of the method employed to obtain the revenues.

My comments on the bill have been set forth in separate views published in the report on H.R. 12752 by the Committee on Ways and Means. Let me outline these for you.

The Revenue Act of 1964 gave the American taxpayer the largest tax cut in the history of our country, and in doing so, the Congress acted in a fiscally responsible manner. That act, which I wholeheartedly supported, was designed to bring about a balance of our Federal budget, and I certainly think we would have accomplished that goal except for the Vietnam conflict.

We have seen the very favorable economic improvements that have resulted from the 1964 act. Unemployment is down to 4 percent and all indications are that we will continue to have a high rate of economic prosperity.

Before enactment of the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, I cautioned that each measure must be judged in terms of its impact on the Federal budget and in the light of our defense posture in Asia, and elsewhere. Fiscal responsibility should be stressed, I said, and should be the guiding force and dominant feature in any future tax legislation.

In his budget message to the Congress this year, the President estimates a budget deficit of $6.4 billion for fiscal year 1966 and a deficit of $1.8 billion for fiscal year 1967. These deficits will exist although the Congress has been asked to approve a tax measure which will result in a revenue increase of $4.8 billion when the measure is fully effective.

In this connection, we should ask ourselves whether we, as representatives of the people, have accepted fully our responsibilities. Our goal under present circumstances should be one of achieving a balanced budget, and our efforts should be aimed in that direction.

American lives are being sacrificed on the battlefields, and I am convinced Americans at home are willing to make the necessary sacrifice to pay for the support of our forces in Vietnam.

This is confirmed by personal discussions with many of my constituents and from the general nationwide support given the President in this unfortunate situation.

This legislation is titled the "Tax Adjustment Act of 1966." But, in my estimation it fails to meet the needs. It is unfair in the treatment of the excise taxes. I believe the American people would desire that our revenues be obtained in a different manner.

The bill makes several adjustments in tax collection procedures that will speed up income tax payments by individuals and corporations. No additional tax burdens are imposed. These provisions I favor. It restores the excise tax on automobiles and communications to the levels of January 1, 1966. It delays the scheduled reductions in the taxes on automobiles and telephones—which apply to essentials for the American people. I believe it is unfair to restore and delay further cuts in the excise taxes on automobiles and telephones and not restore the cuts on the luxury and other items not as essential to the people.

Why raise and maintain excise taxes on automobiles and communications and not restore the excises on such items as furs, jewelry, luggage and handbags, and toilet preparations in the retail field? Why not restore manufacturers' taxes on such items as television sets and sporting goods, just to name two items on the list reduced last year. And, what about restoring the taxes on cabarets and clubs?

Personally, I do not wish to restore any of these excise taxes, which are considered regressive in nature. I reiterate that we should not raise the excise rates that affect automobiles and telephones, however, unles we turn to other less essential items.

It seems to me that it would be more fiscally responsible to ask the American taxpayers—both individuals and corporations—to give up half of the income tax received under the 1964 act as his contribution to the war effort. This would result in revenue increases, at a minimum, of more than $5.5 billion annually. The American public, I am sure, would support such a "victory tax." It would bring about a balance in the Federal budget, and in my judgment would be a much more fiscally responsible approach to our domestic and world situation today.

Needless to say, the income tax applies greatest to taxpayers who can best afford it. The excise, or "nuisance taxes," apply to those least able to afford them—except in the so-called luxury items.

There have been recent reports in the press that the Administration is, in fact, considering other measures designed to keep down inflation and to obtain the revenues needed for military and domestic programs. We may be called upon within the next few weeks or months to adopt income tax legislation that I believe is needed now, and which we could be considering today.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to act properly in giving our Government the funds it needs to support our fighting men in Vietnam. I disagree with the excise tax provisions we have in H.R. 12752. I believe the American people would want us to simplify the whole procedure through the income tax laws, and I favor the "victory tax" plan I have suggested.

Finally, the "victory tax" increase would be eliminated swiftly and we could all feel much better over the results—revenues to finance the Vietnam war and a balanced budget.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, the American people are not being told the truth by this administration. They are not being told about the accounting tricks and budget gimmicks in the fiscal 1967 budget. They are instead being told that the budget is almost balanced. I think this Congress ought to make certain that the truth gets before the people. This is a good place to start.

Part of this tax package is a tax hike, let us make no mistake about it, and part of it is a glorified accounting trick to shift future revenues into the coming fiscal year. The tax hike is one of the most unfair I have ever seen and the accounting tricks are multi-billion-dollar deceptions designed to beef up fiscal 1967 revenues.

Now I would go along with this sort of thing to some extent if we needed the money for a 1- or 2-year war effort, but that is not the case here. We have enough money for the war effort—even if it drags on for as long as this administration would seem to indicate. The President wants these extra revenues so that the American people can be tricked into thinking we can afford his wild-eyed and extravagant world-saving programs. The tax package we are voting today is a piece of wool to pull over the eyes of the American taxpayer. This is not the function the Congress ought to fulfill.

I think that Congress should tell the American people that this tax package represents a tax on the President's rose-colored glasses. Last year, the President put on his rose-colored glasses to tell us that nothing foreseeable in Vietnam could jeopardize the proposed excise tax cut. Those were great rose-colored glasses. The reason given for this tax package is the cost of Vietnam—although the budget could easily be cut in nondefense spending so that we might avoid the need for this tax package.

The American people are going to pay for this tax package so that the President's misjudgment in Vietnam does not put any real dent in the proposed expenditures for his wild-eyed, world-saving programs.

The most unjustified thing in this tax package is the reimposition of the telephone excise tax. As the AFL-CIO said last year, this is a tax on low- and middle-income families. The typical telephone-owning family will pay $5 or $10 a year to the Government because of this tax. I think that this tax is 100 percent unnecessary.

There are dozens of reasons why this particular tax should not be reimposed even if we had an overwhelming legitimate need for increased tax revenues. Let me give a few. The telephone excise tax is the only excise on an essential household utility. It falls directly on the consumer and if eliminated, benefits only the consumer by its removal, not some middleman. The most emphatic reason for removal of the telephone tax is that it will fall on 8 million families with incomes under the national $3,000 poverty line. Certainly we have programs that could be sacrificed to avoid this kind of a tax boost.

I would like to suggest that we cut out part of the "poverty" program to make up for the telephone tax hike. I understand that only 1 family out of 10 among our Nation's poor will collect anything from the so-called poverty program this year. More than half of these families would profit if the Congress threw out this telephone tax hike. Forgetting about this telephone tax hike would be a better "poverty" program than Sargent Shriver has ever come up with. It would help poor people, not social workers.

I urge the Congress to reject the telephone tax boost. It is a tax on the poor to pay for waste. It is a tax on free speech to underwrite secrecy and misrepresentation.

I am glad to see that the excessive withholding rates for middle-income families have been reduced. Otherwise, under administration proposals, millions of middle-income taxpayers would have been indirectly taxed through unfair excessive withholding.

As I have already said, this country is not so badly in need of money that we have to resort to the telephone tax. It is the most unfair of the excise taxes. There are many programs that should be cut before an unfair tax like this is imposed. It is not as if we need the money for desperately essential war-related programs—we have enough revenues for those programs. This revenue being sought today is being sought to pay for grandiose global and domestic giveaways that would be out of place even in the best of fiscal years.

The programs I am thinking of are programs like the international health and education program which talks about world saving while there are millions of needy, illiterate, or starving Americans. I am talking about foreign aid, which pours good money after bad in every corner of the globe. I am talking about military aid to Europe, while Europe thumbs her nose. In line with this concern, I have introduced a resolution to call on the President to begin withdrawing our troops from Europe. We could save enough money that way to skip this telephone tax. Of course there are domestic programs that ought to be slashed—like the poverty program and the infamous "rent supplement." I think we ought to ask ourselves what sort of thing the telephone tax will make room for in the budget. I have no doubt the telephone tax has been paired by backroom planners with some worthless program we would be well advised to defeat even if we had a budget surplus.

The revenues to be voted here today are not aimed only at subsidizing waste abroad—this budget contains enough waste on the home front as well. I understand that the President is tightening his own belt by reactivating the Presidential yacht. I am sure that the American public will be overwhelmed by this sacrifice. Last year, the President tried to pass a tax on bread. Perhaps this year there will be wedding cakes in the White House budget. Either we are fighting a war or we are not. It is time to stop playing "let's pretend."

I believe that we ought to hold taxes down and cut back on wasteful domestic and overseas programs. If we must have the wasteful programs, then let us pay for them without revenue devices like the excise tax on telephones. There are, after all, alternative revenue sources.

The chairman of this distinguished committee says that there is no painless tax. I do not agree with him. There is a painless tax and voluntary to boot.

I believe that a national lottery would easily surpass the telephone tax in the revenues it would bring in. I think that quite a bit of money could be raised by a lottery operating to support the U.S. war effort. In World War II, we had "Victory Bonds"—why not a "Victory Lottery" in this conflict? It would be less painful and more profitable than the telephone tax.

Let me say again that I oppose this tax package. It is more a deception than a revenue device. The President has strained every muscle to camouflage fiscal reality. He has milked every possible source of jumped-up revenues to cram as much revenue as possible into the coming fiscal year. He has made a great effort to disguise our real need to dispense with wasteful domestic and overseas spending programs. I wish a similar effort had been made to tell the American people what is going on, at home and abroad.

I urge the Members of this House to show courage and vote down this tax bill.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Committee's indulgence at this point to make an overall observation about this program.

First, I am sympathetic. I feel very strongly that the first part of this tax package needs to be accomplished with respect to withholding. While I am not willing to rely on these new proposals as a means of raising the necessary revenue for the war emergency, I am willing to accept them as a step in the right direction.

I believe what we ought to realize here is that we are dealing with reform that would need to be done whether or not we were in an emergency. We should not rely on this suggested reform as a means of raising the additional revenues required for the emergency in which we find ourselves.

Nevertheless, despite my misgivings, I would be willing to support it if it were not coupled with the other provision to restore or defer the excise tax reduction on telephones and automobiles.

I believe, however, in trying to find the means of additional revenue that we should not seek the easy—I will use that term instead of the more harsh term, expedient—way of raising the revenue.

We should not impose the burden for this additional money on any particular segment. While it is true that the great majority of our citizens do now subscribe to telephone service and will be participating and that a great majority of our citizens do now purchase automobiles and will be participating, it is nevertheless wrong in my judgment to seek to have these two categories of people alone bear the burden of this extra cost.

It is my thinking that the final judgment will be that this tax proposal will not be a shining example of the many illustrious efforts of this committee and the administration heretofore to face up to our responsibility.

I wish I could support this because I do want to be a part of accepting the responsibility to raise the revenue necessary to take us through this emergency.

I think we are not doing that with the first part. We are just merely reforming where we need reform and the revenues are not going to be sufficient. It is purely a one-shot proposition.

In the second place, I think we are being unfair in deferring the reduction of these excises. I believe that we should resist the desire to be expeditious in this thing and face up to the responsibility of levying whatever tax is necessary to take us through the emergency and provide, in doing so, that when the emergency is over, the tax levied for that purpose automatically expires.

Last year the telephone subscribers were told that 7 percent of the 10-percent excise tax on telephones would come off in January 1966 and that the remaining 3 percent would come off by January 1, 1969. The automobile dealers and purchasers of automobiles were told that the excise tax on automobiles would be reduced to 1 percent by January 1969.

To place a moratorium on the reduction of these excises on absolute necessities without restoring the excises on certain luxuries which were removed entirely, effective at the end of last year, is wrong. It just is not equitable.

I fully understand and appreciate the fact that the Treasury's original proposal has been modified and that the action advocated here is to impose a moratorium with the expectation that the ultimate reduction will occur as originally scheduled. Moreover, I fully understand that it is easier to adopt this moratorium since the two excises in question do remain in our statutes; and while this modification of the original proposal does make the plan more palatable, it nevertheless is still distasteful in that it does not remove the inequity of collecting an excise on necessities while luxury items go free.

The observation has been made that this action is more desirable than the imposition of a general tax increase because a general increase should be deferred until the Congress can reduce expenditures for programs not related to our efforts in Vietnam.

I believe that we can reduce expenditures in certain nonemergency fields in sufficient amount to meet accelerated costs of the war in Vietnam; and while I do not want to see many of the measures the first session of this Congress enacted reduced to a state of impotence, I do believe that the prudent action to take at this time is to reduce to a minimum certain of these expenditures rather than to reimpose the excise tax on household necessities such as telephones and automobiles.

I wish I could support the program. Under the conditions that it is presented and in the belief that we are doing a most unfair thing to a large segment of our citizens with perhaps no consideration for other things, I cannot.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CALLAWAY].

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I guess the first rule of political expediency that any of us hears in beginning our political education would be that it is expedient to vote for all spending programs and it is expedient to vote against all tax increases.

We have nad a real temptation in the 89th Congress to vote for spending programs. There have been many and they have been massive, offering something for everybody. I have been tempted, like everybody else, but I felt that responsibility called for me to vote against these spending programs, and I have voted consistently against them with the exception of the expenditures for defense, and justifiable pay raises for people in Government service, which I wholeheartly support.

Much more tempting, however, is the temptation today to vote against this tax increase. It is always popular to vote against a tax increase, and I guess it always will be. It would be particularly popular to vote against this one, because it is so discriminatory against certain essential businesses, telephones and automobiles.

Of course, there is the added temptation that by voting against this increase we would somehow convince this administration at least to cut down on unnecessary spending.

I feel, however, that we probably should resist this temptation, though reluctantly, because I do not think there is one Member of the House who feels that if we fail to pass this tax increase the administration will really stop spending in the areas where it should have stopped spending already. I think all agree, whether we pass this bill or not, this administration is going to spend money, and spend it fast, for its many unprecedented social programs.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to have massive spending. We are going to have a massive budget, and we are going to have a deficit so much higher than the well publicized $1.8 billion, that those who have talked of this figure have only smiled when they told us about it. It will be massive.

I think, therefore, that the overriding issue is one of fiscal responsibility. We have a choice. We are going to have a massive deficit this year. Do we pass it on to future generations to be paid for by inflation, or do we take our medicine and pass a tax increase now? This, very simply, is our choice.

As much as I oppose in this bill, as much as I oppose the spending spree that made it necessary, I will reluctantly vote for it and say that it is the better part of a bad situation to vote for the tax increase now, and at least have the courage to pay for a little bit of our sins while we are still here.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

If I remember correctly, when the tax reduction bill was passed last year, the chairman of the committee indicated that it was necessary, in part, to promote employment in this country.

Now, if I understand it correctly, we have unemployment of 4 percent or less. My question to someone on the committee is, What effect will today's proposed increases have on employment? We have been told previously that tax reduction would be an aid to employment, in other words would decrease unemployment. Are we now going to travel in the opposite direction with respect to employment in the passage of this bill?

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I see the gentleman from Missouri is on his feet, and I assume he is prepared to give his usual thoughtful answer.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York, but I would point out that the point is well taken, of course, to this degree. However, we have increased the employment of young men by about 200,000 in recent months, and it will increase further, also, in the defense industries. First, of course, we have had increases of the men in uniform. In the defense industries there has been an increase of around 200,000 to 300,000. So I suppose this would all be a part of it. The point that I would like to make—and I thank the gentleman for giving me this opportunity to make it—is this: This administration is still talking in terms of this being the longest peacetime upturn in our history. This ceased to be true about June 1965. We have been in a war economy and are in one now. The peacetime theories do not prevail. I think the same point would be made in respect to employment. You cannot consider employment or other economic factors in a wartime period in the same way that you can in peacetime.

Mr. GROSS. Speaking of alleged prosperity and since the gentleman from Missouri is on his feet, I wonder if he would agree with me that the almost $89 billion increase in the public and private debt in 1965 made a very substantial contribution to the alleged prosperity of this country.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; and some of that debt is worrying a lot of people because of its quality. Yes. This is a factor which above all I would hope the administration spokesmen would consider. And, also, I hope the administration will stop talking about how well off this country is when they know that we have boys in Vietnam dying. This is no time to be talking about prosperity, and I am fed up with their boasting about it.

Mr. GROSS. Especially when the public and private debt increases by $88 to $89 billion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield a minute and a half additional to the gentleman from Iowa, if he wants it, if he will yield to me.

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Being by nature somewhat bold, I would assume to interject myself in a discussion between the gentleman from Iowa and his colleague from Missouri. I would, however, be compelled to point this out.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to deal with this on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. KEOGH. That is another reason why I would make so bold as to be on my feet. I would remind the gentleman that the tax reduction effected by the act of 1964 amounted to $11.5 billion. The pending bill delays the effective reduction of the scheduled reductions in the excises on automobiles and telephones to the extent of $1.2 billion. I think it cannot be gainsaid by anyone but that the Tax Reduction Act of 1964 was a great contributing factor to the state of the economy generally today.

Mr. GROSS. How about 1965?

Mr. KEOGH. And I think that for years, for years, it has been conceded when unemployment in this country gets down to, or near, or below 4 percent that you are virtually at full employment. My point simply is that it seems to me a delay for 2 years in the reduction of these excises, in my amateur opinion, would have absolutely no effect upon the employment rate.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, no one realizes more than I do that what I am about to say will be an exercise in futility, especially in addressing some 20 or 25 Members who are on the floor. I think I understand what the final result will be. I do not intend to make any point of order that a quorum is not present, because I think minds are pretty well made up.

Mr. Chairman, I am in a different position than most of those who have already, or will speak on this bill, inasmuch as I was one of those six who voted against the tax reduction bill last June. At that time I explained that it was not because I was opposed to the reduction and elimination of wartime excise taxes, which should have been removed many years ago, but rather I was opposed to reducing our revenue at a time when we were preparing to authorize an increase in the debt limit. I thought at the time that both actions would have an inflationary effect, and I believe my fears in this respect have been confirmed.

Now, if I voted against the repeal and reduction of taxes last June, some may get the idea that I would be in the most favorable position to vote for this bill today. I will take the few minutes that have been granted to me, to explain why I believe this House will be acting in a most inconsistent and irresponsible manner by adopting the bill now before us.

First, I would remind my friends who are inclined to vote for this bill, that last June we eliminated the excise taxes on many luxury and nonessential commodities and services, and while the bill we are voting on today proposes to restore the cuts which were made on such essential items as automobiles and telephone services, we are doing nothing to reinstate the taxes on jewelry, furs, luggage, purses, handbags, toilet articles, electric, gas and oil appliances, many of which fall into the luxury class, enjoyed by the more affluent segment of our society. When we speak of other items which were included in the removal of excise taxes last June, we are talking about the expensive hi-fi sets, color television, all types of sporting goods, the more sophisticated types of photographic equipment and projectors, used by those who have the means to pay for their indulgence in these types of hobbies. Last June we also removed the excise taxes from cabarets and night clubs, dues for exclusive social clubs, safe deposit boxes, bowling alleys, and billiard parlors, as well as the excise taxes on telegraphic services. The people who use these facilities and services have been relieved of the nuisance and excise taxes, and there is nothing in this bill today to restore those cuts. However, this bill does propose to reinstate the reductions which were made on automobiles and telephones, certainly as essential as any commodity I know.

Tell me, Mr. Chairman, how we are going to justify the discrimination which will be made by the adoption of this bill?

Now let us get down to another consideration which apparently has been overlooked by most people, especially those who are content to let someone else do their thinking for them. I know the President, in his state of the Union message, made some 12 days after some of these reductions had taken effect, recommended the reinstatement of the tax levies on automobiles and telephone service, but I ask you in all sincerity, do you think this recommendation was made as the result of a study by the President. Certainly not, and while I know he accepts the full responsibility of any recommendation he makes, I think all of you know that the same advisers who made the recommendation for the cut last June, made the recommendation for the increase at this time. They were wrong last June and I say they are just as wrong this time. All they are doing now is compounding the mistakes of the past.

Do you mean to tell me, Mr. Chairman, that it was a great surprise to anyone who pretends to know what is going on in the world, to learn that the cost of the war in Vietnam was to continue to rise, and that those who made those recommendations last June did not know that when Congress came back into session this January that there would be the necessity of providing additional revenue? If they did not know that they have no business being in the position of being the advisers to the President.

Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but I am telling you that, while we are attempting to go through a lot of bookkeeping maneuvers to collect taxes in advance, and we are going to recoup a small portion of the excise taxes we removed last June, we are still going to fall short of raising the money which will be needed to carry on the operations upon which we have embarked throughout the world, including the war in Vietnam. I am not an economist, I am not even an accountant or bookkeeper, and I do not have a crystal ball. I do believe that I am a man of average intelligence, who has tried to benefit from the experience I have gained throughout the years, and I try to use those faculties with which I am endowed, and on that basis, I am making the prediction here and now that either one of two things will happen before this session of Congress adjourns. Either the President will be coming to this Congress asking for additional revenue, in the form of new or increased taxes, or the fiscal year 1967 will end with a deficit far larger than has been estimated by the President's best advisers. Of course, the Ways and Means Committee which brings us this bill today, under a closed rule, which I voted against, will be back before us with another bill, under a closed rule, asking for an increase in the debt ceiling. I continue to have hope, and I hope that this time they will bring us a bill authorizing a permanent debt ceiling, instead of trying to kid the public with a so-called temporary debt ceiling, maintaining the old nonrealistic permanent debt ceiling of $285 billion.

Mr. Chairman, we are being asked today to approve this bill, consisting of some 50 pages of very technical language, which I doubt if as many as six Members of this House can explain in detail, but which will unquestionably be adopted, to be added to other volumes of the United States Code, and to be translated into regulations of the Internal Revenue Service, which will add to the headaches of the taxpayers and the occupants who make up their returns.

How much more simple it would be, Mr. Chairman, if we would send this bill back to the Ways and Means Committee, with a simple request, worded something like this: "Permanently remove the excise taxes which we reduced or eliminated last June, and then add a surtax to the present income tax of whatever amount is needed to produce the revenue which this administration estimates is necessary to carry on the activity in Vietnam, said additional tax to be automatically repealed, at the end of the fiscal year following the cessation of hostilities and the removal of all U.S. troops from Vietnam." Thus we would be honest in saying to the public that this is a war tax, levied for a specified purpose, and is to be removed when that purpose has been fulfilled.

Again I say, Mr. Chairman, as many speakers have said before, I do not like to vote for a tax increase but I do believe in paying our bills. If we are going to spend the money and if we are going to incur the expenses carrying on a war in Vietnam, I think we should pay for it and when we have paid for those expenses, then take the taxes off.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, it is with some reluctance that I, as a member of this committee, voted to reimpose these taxes that were taken off. I had to do it after considering the alternatives. I think this is quite important. Here we are trying to do something to raise some necessary additional revenue. If we do not do this, the alternative is a further increase in the income taxes, as the gentleman from Missouri stated, and whether he thinks so or not, in my judgment, that would meet with far less pleasurable reaction on the part of the people than this particular method of doing it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. HERLONG. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Do you think it would be a more responsible action? I am not talking about the political angles, I am talking about being responsible and acting responsibly.

Mr. HERLONG. In my judgment, this is the most responsible way that we can provide the necessary money at this particular time, after having gone carefully into all of these alternatives in the committee. I would say to the gentleman, the other basic alternative is a larger deficit. I am just as happy as I can be that somebody in the Treasury and in the administration now recognizes the dangers of big deficits and wants to do something to prevent it as we go along.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe that these are the alternatives—a deficit or higher taxes. I think there is one other alternative and that is to cut down on the unnecessary spending.

Mr. HERLONG. I would agree with the gentleman completely. But does the gentleman seriously believe that there is any possibility of doing that in this Congress?

Mr. GROSS. Not as long as there is a rose garden at the White House and the ability to twist arms—no.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Even if the Congress does reduce the 1967 budget, I do not see anything wrong in fiscal year 1967 in actually having a little bit of a surplus.

Mr. HERLONG. I would be delighted to see that come about.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. The answer to that is—we could if Congress would pass recision bills affecting fiscal year 1966—that is what I would like to see.

Mr. HERLONG. There are a lot of things a lot of us would like to see done here. But we are faced with a condition and not a theory. The condition with which we are faced at this time certainly impels us to vote for this legislation.

I would remind the gentleman that of all the taxes that were taken off the last time—these are the only two which were not completely taken off. These were reduced or were in the process of being phased out. The gentleman mentioned a number of items which should or could be taken care of by putting the tax back on these items before we did something in this field.

Let me remind the gentleman that what we are seeking in this bill is money, and with respect to the items that the gentleman mentioned, while the taxes have already been taken off, I would remind you that the machinery for collecting these taxes is still in existence and it will not be nearly as difficult to put these back on as it would be to reimpose taxes where the machinery has already gone out of existence for their collection.

The items that the gentleman mentioned as something that should be put back before we went into this earlier, for example the cabaret tax that he is talking about—maybe it should be put back—but you only get $47 million in a full calendar year out of that. From the tax on furs and so on you only get $30 million for the whole year. On air conditioners, $34 million. On phonographs, television sets, and records, you get a total of $225 million on all of these items.

This, to me, is not what we are after. We have to get larger sums of money. This is the most painless—and responsible—way that I see in which we can get the money at this time.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Do you think there are some principles involved also?

Mr. HERLONG. Of course there are principles involved. The principle I am thinking of most is coming nearest to balancing our budget. This is the way I believe we should act if we are to act responsibly. I therefore urge the membership to support this bill and vote against any motion to recommit.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may require to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 12752, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. The fact that I oppose this legislation does not mean that I am against responsible financing of Government obligations. On the contrary, my vote will instead be a vote against what I consider to be the fiscal irresponsibility which brings this bill before us at this time.

We are told that this tax adjustment bill is necessary to aid in financing the increased costs of Government associated with the war in Vietnam and, in so doing, to avoid the creation of serious inflationary pressures. Certainly I agree that our support for our boys and our objectives in Vietnam should receive first priority. I also feel that we should support the war effort by providing for effective safeguards against inflation at home. But it seems to me that what we are doing in this bill is asking the taxpayer to tighten his belt while allowing the Federal Government to let its belt out. In other words, it appears that the real purpose of this legislation is to seek Congressional approval for the administration's proposals for new and expanded domestic and welfare programs while at the same time waging a costly war of indefinite duration abroad. When increased Government spending for these expensive programs at home, together with the necessary costs of Vietnam, are imposed on an already vigorous economy, the result can only be inflation.

It seems to me that we, as Members of Congress, have both a moral and fiscal responsibility to those we represent to approach today's revenue problem in a realistic and forthright manner. As I see it, the current difficulty does not spring so much from a lack of revenue as from a lack of control over Government spending. In this bill, however, we have an opportunity to serve notice that any request for higher taxes must be matched by a corresponding demonstration by the administration that unessential, nondefense spending will be substantially reduced or postponed until this threat of inflation is past and the situation in Vietnam is resolved. This is a time for both the Congress and the administration to establish meaningful priorities. Unless this is done, we will soon have before us other bills calling not only for new tax increases but more economic controls as well.

Although I have no objection to the several adjustments in tax collection procedures set out in H.R. 12752, I do seriously question the wisdom of singling out telephone service and automobiles as the two items on which to raise this additional revenue. In this day and age, telephones and automobiles are more often necessities than luxuries.

I respectfully submit, therefore, that before we in the Congress embark on piecemeal tax increases, we first insist upon a hard reappraisal of current and future nondefense Government spending so that we can properly determine what, if any, tax legislation is really essential.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] such time as he may require.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I can quite understand and sympathize with the financial predicament in which the administration now finds itself. None of us would welcome the prospect of owing more than we are able to pay. None of us would welcome the dilemma of trying to make a dollar out of 98 cents, if I may paraphrase an old saying.

Indeed, how often have breadwinners in every walk of life emerged from the holiday season in a virtual panic over how they would pay for the indulgences and largess to which they have yielded in the spirit of the season?

I am sure we can all sympathize with the administration's predicament over how to find the money to pay for all the promises and commitments that have been made for the next fiscal year.

I share that sympathy. I readily appreciate the gravity of the situation.

However, I cannot sympathize with the proposed means by which the administration would solve its problem.

I cannot sympathize with the legislation now before this body which, no matter what else it may be called, is an outright slap in the face for the American taxpayer. It is an insult to the intelligence of every last citizen of this land. It is as pure an example of two-faced political skulduggery as we have ever seen. I admit that I was convinced last June, along with 400 of my distinguished colleagues in this body, in believing the President's glowing promise and infectious optimism when he forecast vast economic benefits to be gained through a cut in Federal excise taxes.

I believed him when he told us that his proposed program of excise tax revisions would "spur growth and move us closer to full employment by removing an unnecessary drag on consumer and business purchasing power."

I went along with the President when he forecast that a cut in excise taxes would "lower prices to consumers; lessen the burden of regressive taxes on low-income families; raise business profits by expanding sales and cutting costs of tax compliance; cut the Government's costs of tax collection and enforcement; end an unfair burden on many businesses and workers who produce the commodities singled out for excise taxation; and free consumers from the distorting effects of these taxes on their market choices."

I believed the President when he told us on May 17 last year:

> In proposing these reductions, I am fully aware of our present and prospective commitments for the defense of the free world. It is impossible to predict precisely what expenditures these may involve in the future. There is, however, no present indication that expenditures will increase to an extent that would make these excise tax reductions inadvisable.

Thus, less than a year ago, the President indicated he was fully aware of our present and prospective commitments, and that there was no indication that expenditures would increase so far to require that we keep these excise taxes. Although he did not mention Vietnam by name, I have assumed all along that he meant to include our involvement in Vietnam as part of his analysis of the situation.

The President also told us:

> Our international responsibilities require that we redouble our efforts to assure the continued healthy growth of our economy. Barring some sudden change in the present world situation, I am sure that these excise tax reductions will be a sound and profitable investment in that growth.

Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1965, this Nation was deeply and irrevocably committed to the Vietnam war. We were in it up to our necks and any knowledgeable, thinking person knew that we were destined to be in it for quite some time to come. We were, in fact, farther away from a peaceful settlement of that war in May of 1965 than we are at this very moment.

I submit that in the months since last May, there has been no sudden change in the world situation, nor has there been any surprising change in the extent of our commitment on behalf of the defense of the free world.

We in the Congress at that time, just as we are now, were effectively kept in the dark about the truth in Vietnam. Few of us had more to go on than the day-to-day newspaper accounts of jungle ambushes, attacks on air bases, dynamiting of GI barracks, and air raids on Communist strong points. If the President told us that he was fully aware of our present and prospective commitments, we had no choice but to believe him. If he told us it was in the best interest of our domestic economy and of our international responsibilities to cut excise taxes, we had no choice but to believe him.

And I, along with the 400 other Members of this body, did believe him. We voted 401 to 6 in favor of the reduction in excise taxes on June 2, 1965.

Any man who assumes the tremendous burdens of the Presidency must, by nature and pressure, be a prudent man. Thus, I reasoned, the President's appeal for reduction of excise taxes was couched in prudence and economic wisdom; that it was sound and feasible; and I voted in favor of the plan.

The President was applauded by the business community. He was applauded by labor. He was cheered by the Nation's consumers. By proposing to eliminate a multibillion-dollar tax burden from around the necks of America's merchants and consumers, he won a legion of supporters.

Prior to the President's message calling for repeal of excises, I had introduced a bill on my own in the Congress to repeal just the 10-percent Federal tax on telephone calls. Through a little elementary arithmetic, I was able to tell the taxpayers in my congressional district that they would share an annual saving of close to $2 million with repeal of the telephone tax. In 1964, some 129,618 users in my district had paid out $1.9 million in telephone excise taxes.

Even before the President told me so, I was able to figure out for myself that a cut in these taxes would prove a shot in the arm for the economy. The 1964 cut in corporate and individual income taxes had produced an obvious upsurge, so a further cut in the tax imposed on an essential communications service could only accelerate the upsurge.

The accuracy of all our predictions is still open to speculation. The reduction went into effect only some 12 days before the President demanded that it be reinstated. And even now, it has been off the books only some 54 days. If this bill is allowed to pass the Congress, we will have associated ourselves with the shortest tax cut in history.

If this obvious case of political duplicity was not bad enough, the President compounds the insult by insisting on a domestic program that flirts dangerously with inflation, that endeavors to expand programs of dubious value, and that amounts to a direct contradiction of the attitude he is asking us to assume in approving the postponement of excise tax cuts.

There is no quarrel with the fact that in order to spend all the money the President wants to spend in fiscal 1967, we are going to have to dig up new sources of revenue. We either accept that or we face a monstrous deficit which is certain to trigger a disastrous period of uncontrolled inflation.

There is, of course, a third alternative and I call upon the Members of this body and of the other side to join me in an appeal to the President to take a pair of Texas-sized pruning shears to the budget of fiscal 1967.

I call upon the President to reevaluate his domestic spending program for the next fiscal year and suggest that postponement or reduction in many of the Great Society's domestic programs and I leave this to the discretion of the President where to use the blue pencil. I call upon the administration to weigh a possible postponement of some of these Great Society programs against the economic impact certain to result from a postponement of an excise tax cut.

I call upon the Members of Congress to reject this excise cut postponement provision and to insist on a reevaluation of the budget and a reappraisal of the priorities on Federal spending.

The reinstatement of Federal excise taxes is not the answer to the fiscal problems now facing this country. To accept such a notion is to court fiscal disaster.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

I rise in support of this bill. I shall oppose the motion to recommit. I take that position without any enthusiasm, as I am sure no Member of this Congress ever is enthusiastic about increasing the taxes on our people. In fact, I do so with some reluctance. On the other hand, it seems to me that under present circumstances responsibility requires support of this additional revenue bill. I support it reluctantly because I think that last year by prudent action the administration and the Congress could have avoided the fiscal situation that makes this bill necessary.

In the face of a growing war in Vietnam, the administration proposed, and this Congress enacted during the last session, the largest program of domestic spending in our history. As a result of last year's action, the deficit for this fiscal year 1966 that we are now in is projected at over $7 billion. In fact, if we used accurate bookkeeping, we could say that if we look at the actual spending as compared with our traditional sources of revenue, the resulting deficit would be close to $12 or $13 billion. For bookkeeping purposes that deficit has been reduced by an almost $1 billion windfall from seigniorage, which, added to the $3.3 billion from the sale of assets which, also through a bookkeeping process, shows up as a reduction of expenditures, and then this bill itself, reduces the deficit by another $1.15 billion. With all of this, we end up with what appears on the record to be a $6.4 billion deficit—and that in a year of relatively high prosperity.

I would point out that last January the administration estimated expenditures for this fiscal year 1966 would be $7 billion less than current estimates. In other words, when the administration came to Congress a year ago this time and projected the fiscal program for this country for the year 1966, which we are now in, the administration underestimated expenditures by $7 billion. This bill is part of the penalty that we must pay for that profligacy.

Admittedly, almost $5 billion of the increase is attributable to the cost of the war. But I suggest that the administration knew those costs would be in excess of the January estimates when they made those estimates and sent that projection up to the Congress a year ago. I suggest that the true costs for 1966 were camouflaged in order to get the Congress to enact the increased domestic programs, many of questionable urgency in view of the war.

It seems to me that we have got to make up our minds about a few things. There certainly should be no question in anyone's mind but that we are engaged in a war, a war in Vietnam.

There is a question, I think, sometimes as to whether we are willing to fight a war to end the aggression and terrorism in that area.

Look at the budget just presented to us for the coming year—fiscal 1967. How can we as a people, how can our fighting men, and how can Hanoi or Peiping be convinced that the administration is really determined to fight this war, when they see some of the things going on here at home?

Take the financial plan of this Nation which has been presented to us by the President. In a time of war, when the economy is booming, when shortages are appearing, when the demand for manpower is intensifying, a nation needs to adopt a policy of restraint. It needs to adopt a budget which says, "Let us proceed with caution. There is possible trouble ahead." It should shun like the plague an expansionary budget in an already greatly expanded economy, lest it supply those last few breaths of air which cause the balloon finally to burst. Then we will have inflation upon us, with all its evils and hardships and suffering.

Yet, how should we characterize a budget which not only proposes that this Nation undertake all its normal expenditures while paying the heavy costs of the war, but also proposes to increase domestic spending for new programs just enacted, and then, on top of everything else, proposes for immediate enactment by the Congress new programs which will cost still more money?

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a war budget before us. It is the kind of budget that one would propose if one wanted to stimulate a depressed economy in peacetime. It is potentially a very dangerous budget. It can bring on economic dislocations, not only miserable in themselves, but exceedingly harmful to the war effort.

This is a budget which proposes to spend in 1 year the fantastic sum of $112.8 billion more than this Nation has ever spent in any other year, including the World War II years. And too, as we find in various places in the budget, that amount understates the actual spending by $6 billion from the sales of assets has been used to produce at least a bookkeeping reduction in spending estimates. Actual expenditures in the President's budget will be almost $119 billion. Expenditures will be kept there—at $119 billion—only if—and this is a real big "if"—Congress is willing to go along with some of the reductions and questionable cuts proposed by the President in the same budget. Since 1961 there has been a $37 billion increase in the annual level of spending—and do not think that this is all because of the war. Only a third of that increase can be attributed to Vietnam.

While the administration was trying last year to convince Hanoi of our seriousness in Vietnam, the adminstration was prodding this Congress to turn out the largest program of domestic spending this Nation has ever seen. It is difficult to blame anyone for thinking that this Nation was more concerned with its domestic affairs than it was with fighting a serious war.

As a result of that program enacted last year, as a result of continuing large-scale appropriations for new programs, look at what our people and our fighting men and our enemy can read in the newspapers today. Here are just three of many items appearing in the last couple of days. Remember, we are supposed to be at war, and in a costly war.

Item No. 1 is from the Washington Evening Star:

> Washington is receiving a Federal beautification grant of $483,000 for landscaping around buildings. Other cities who are receiving grants are Pittsburgh, which will get about $465,000 and New Haven, about $325,000.

Item No. 2 is from a very recent newsletter of the National Education Association:

> The U.S. Office of Education is concerned lest some of the nearly $1 billion Congress made available under title I of the Education Act go down the drain because local school districts haven't yet figured out how to use it properly.

Item No. 3 is from the Washington Daily News:

> The Baltimore Health Department requested a Federal grant of $300,000 to conduct an antismoking campaign in the fifth grade in the city's public schools.

Does this sound like an administration which has decided to make the hard decisions required by the kind of war in which this Nation is engaged? I suggest to you that we did not act like a nation at war in 1964, nor in 1965, nor are we doing so today. As a consequence, that war drags on. We apparently will not act like a nation seriously at war even during fiscal 1967 if we are to enjoy all of the luxuries which we will lavish on ourselves under the President's budget. And what about the period beyond that—beyond fiscal 1967?

We are told that we will be heavily engaged for a long time in Vietnam. But Hanoi and Peiping, if they look at the budget closely, will conclude that we must be planning to get out soon, because with the heavy costs of the proposed domestic spending programs, we will be in a frightful fiscal situation if the equally heavy costs of the Vietnam war continue beyond fiscal 1967. Why? Because this budget is being financed—and even this bill finances it to a degree—from future revenues. We are selling assets and taking advantage of windfalls and speeding up tax collections to reduce the deficit for fiscal 1966 and fiscal 1967. There will come a time, Mr. Chairman, and it will come soon, when those wells will run dry. Then we will have either a colossal deficit or colossal tax increases or both plus Federal controls of wages, prices, and rent controls if the war continues.

It seems to me that a nation which has made a decision to fight a bitter war to a successful conclusion would not dare to take such a grave risk.

Mr. Chairman, yes; I support this bill, this additional revenue that will be provided. I oppose the motion to recommit. I believe it is the only reasonable thing to do under the circumstances. However, I would caution that this is only part of what the present circumstances require. There are those in this debate who have suggested alternatives. They say that we have the alternative of higher taxes or reduced expenditures. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, we do not enjoy the luxury of alternatives. We have to do both. It is because we have to do both on this occasion that I am going to support this tax bill. This will not be enough. We also have to do the other things, namely, to cut back and use restraint in the area of our expenditures. There must be a real change in the thinking of the Administration and the majority in this Congress.

If we are to support our men in Vietnam, if we are to end the present crisis of credibility that disturbs our people today, and if we are to convince our people and Hanoi of our seriousness in resisting aggression and terrorism, if we are to avoid inflation, a bust, we must not only enact this tax, but we must also reef in our spending sails. We must get out of a dream world and come down to reality.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, the Revenue Act of 1964 provided the American taxpayer a substantial tax cut. This tax cut was predicated on a fiscally responsible budget which was designed to be in balance and actually would provide for a major reduction in our national debt this year. Our sober responsibilities throughout the world and particularly in Vietnam have now changed that situation. Fiscal responsibility requires that some adjustments in our current tax rate be made to meet our responsibilities in leading the free world.

The present bill makes several adjustments in tax collection procedures that will speed up income tax payments by individuals and in particular by corporations. These provisions do not add additional tax burdens. Indeed, this section of the bill represents a marked improvement.

Another section of the bill, however, delays the schedule of reductions in taxes on automobiles and telephones. Particularly with respect to telephones, it is impossible for us in 1966 to call the use of telephones a luxury. The telephone and automobile are essential to people in all walks of life. Our hard-working industrial and agricultural producers find these items essential to their well-being.

Because we need additional revenue, given the current world situation, it is, of course, necessary that a tax adjustment be supported. I intend to support this present legislation on final passage but will take the opportunity to support a properly designed motion to recommit to take out that section which, in my estimation, unfairly reimposes taxation on automobiles and telephones without restoring the excise taxes on a wide variety of luxury items and without restoring excise taxes on cabarets and nightclubs. I opposed a closed rule on this bill because I feel it is in order for us to consider other areas of tax reforms that would meet our Nation's needs and yet, at the same time, refrain from putting too heavy a burden upon our working people.

One such recommendation that has long been overdue is the need to reduce the present oil depletion allowance which currently gives an unwarranted tax advantage to an advantageously situated small segment of our population. It is unfortunate that a progressive reduction in the oil depletion allowance has not been incorporated in the present bill. To meet that need, I have introduced legislation in the House which will reduce the oil depletion allowance from its present rate of 27½ to 20 percent in progressive steps over a 3-year period.

I respectfully call to the attention of the chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee the fact that a sensible reduction in the oil depletion allowance will bring to the Nation substantial revenue without reimposing upon our working people in our factories and on our farms a heavier share of the tax load.

Finally, I believe it is time we redistributed that load by eliminating the special tax privileges that currently exist. The place to start is the reduction of the oil depletion allowance. The time to start is now.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, so long as U.S. fighting men are in Vietnam, we have a solemn obligation to support them. The fulfillment of that obligation necessarily involves a higher level of taxation.

During the last session, when the administration proposed a reduction in the automobile excise tax I heartily applauded the idea of eliminating this burdensome and discriminatory tax which has been aimed at the industry of my State. However, because of our commitments in Vietnam, I made it clear then that any excise tax reduction should be accompanied by a corresponding increase in the level of nondiscriminatory general taxation.

Today, we are confronted with the need to raise more revenue, and we have a choice to make. We are in a position to reimpose a discriminatory automobile excise tax or we could choose another course. We could, and we should, pass legislation increasing general taxes that would be fairly applied and equally directed to all parts of our country.

As a Representative of the State of Michigan, I feel that I must vote against final passage of the discriminatory bill before us. However, I want to make it clear that if this bill does not pass, I stand ready to support a request by the President for an increase in nondiscriminatory general taxes.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, this bill has my deep concern—particularly the temporary restoration of excise taxes on telephones and automobiles. During the first session of the Congress, I supported the legislation to rid the country of these inequitable taxes.

However, the emergency created by the war in Vietnam is such that I cannot possibly avoid the consequences of not providing the additional income necessary to cover the tremendous expenses incurred by the war and our domestic policy.

While balancing my strong feelings against excise taxes on the one hand and the demands of our country on the other the latter must prevail. Until a peaceful settlement is reached in southeast Asia we, as Americans, must all be willing to sacrifice in some way to support our fighting men in the armed services. Our heritage dictates the course we must follow.

It is my sincere hope that the responsible committee of the Congress—in this instance the Ways and Means Committee—will begin working on a substitute tax program, so that excise taxes on telephones and automobiles can eventually be eliminated as Congress intended in accordance with the legislation passed during the first session.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to provide revenues to aid in financing the increased costs of Government associated with operations in Vietnam. I am in full accord with this purpose. But I must object to the means by which these revenues are to be collected.

Mr. Chairman, in the last session of this Congress, the American citizen was assured by this body that he was to be afforded cuts in excise tax rates on automobiles and telephone service. No doubt many Americans based their own budgets on this reliance. Are we now, less than a year later, to rescind this assurance, and risk dangerous inflationary pressures?

Mr. Chairman, I have long been an opponent of those fiscal policies that neglect the presence of an ever-increasing national debt. I believe that the present bill's existence was made necessary only because of excessive spending in the past, and is an example of how unwarranted spending directly affects the American citizens.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, no one believes any more strongly than I in trying to have a balanced budget, but I do not believe that this bill is the way to accomplish that desired objective. If the administration and this Congress really want to balance the budget, this can be easily accomplished through reduction in domestic spending which will in no manner impair necessary progress in this country.

For the administration to suggest that this tax increase is needed to help finance the war in Vietnam tortures all reason. There might have been some validity in this argument if the President had called for a reduction or even a continuation of the present level of domestic expenditures this year. Unfortunately, notwithstanding the additional cost for prosecuting the war in Vietnam, we found the President appealing for additional increases in his Great Society programs—even to extending them to the peoples of the world.

Mr. Chairman, the American taxpayer should not be the scapegoat for our failure to practice fiscal responsibility. He should not be required to shoulder the added tax burden simply because of the administration's desire to launch new social legislation for the benefit of the world.

As long as this Congress accedes to every request of the President we shall never see a reduction in unnecessary domestic expenditures.

Accordingly, there is no justification for the increase in excise taxes on telephone service and automobiles, both of which are essential to every American family no matter what its lot or station in life may be. It is about time we considered the interests of the overburdened taxpayer instead of the overzealous tax spender.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, it is with some reluctance that I rise today in support of this bill.

I am aware of the mounting cost of the Vietnamese conflict and the strain it has placed upon the Federal budget. As a responsible Member of the Congress, I cannot vote for expenditures and, on the other hand, vote against the taxes to pay for these expenditures. At a time when American lives are being lost in defense of freedom, Americans will not refuse to pay increased taxes to support their fighting sons. It is not the imposition of taxes that I oppose, it is the method employed in this bill that I am against.

Mr. Chairman, I was a vigorous supporter of the legislation which was signed into law last year which would cut and, in many cases, eliminate the so-called nuisance excise taxes. I think that the concept embodied in this legislation was sound and my views on this matter are unchanged.

I feel that there is much that is good in this bill. The adjustments in tax collecting procedures is, I think, meritorious. I am, however, unalterably opposed to the restoration of excise taxes on automobiles and on telephone services. I am, as I said on the House floor last year, opposed to most of these excise taxes as a matter of principle but I am particularly opposed to levying excise taxes on necessities of life, and make no mistake about it, the telephone and the automobile are no longer luxuries to most Americans.

Why, Mr. Chairman, does the Committee on Ways and Means advocate restoring these tax cuts and yet refuse to support a restoration of the excise taxes on items which are luxuries, such as furs, toilet articles, and jewelry.

This is not in its entirety a good bill, Mr. Chairman, and in common with many Members of this House, I would like to vote for much of it and oppose the rest, but, unfortunately, the system does not work that way and when the yeas and nays are called, I cannot say 60 percent yea and 40 percent nay.

As much as I wish this were the case, it is not and it is with great reluctance that I cast a favorable vote today. But I know that it is my duty to support fully our military effort in southeast Asia. So long as we are committed to this action, the Congress owes a duty to our men in uniform to provide them with full support. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, and only for this reason, I shall vote to support H.R. 12752.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration today proposes to raise more money from individuals and industry alike by revoking the recent excise tax cuts and speeding up the take in personal withholding and corporate income tax payments.

Many a U.S. taxpayer, already burdened by the new social security levy that began January 1, will find his paycheck reduced by adoption of this legislation. Yet, the administration is not willing to do its share by cutting back nonessential expenditures and deferring initiation of new programs which cannot be justified in view of our current budgetary situation.

The administration has requested approximately $3.25 billion more in fiscal 1967 for programs in health, education, welfare, housing, poverty, and manpower training. From the beginning, it has shown a determination that the war in Vietnam will not interfere with its beloved Great Society programs. Programs of dubious value continue to be expanded. There has been no restraint exercised in nondefense spending so far as I can see, with the exception of needed and proven programs such as the school milk fund.

It should be obvious to us all—the administration included—that greatly increased expenditures for social programs have brought us face to face with the problem of inflation. In calling for help to the poor, the administration should realize that it is the poor who suffer most from inflation. Even a small rise in the cost of living works a hardship on the poor and the millions of pensioners and others who must live on fixed incomes.

In its efforts to conceal the degree to which this Government is operating at a deficit the administration has proved most ingenious in finding new sources of revenue. Unfortunately, however, the administration is relying to a great extent upon nonrecurring revenues amounting to more than $12 billion. This is just a temporary expedient, and we will have to face the music sooner or later.

I am unalterably opposed to the provisions of this bill which would restore the excise tax on automobiles and telephones to the levels of January 1, 1966, and delay the further cuts which we voted last year. Why should automobile buyers and telephone users be singled out to bear the burden of raising revenue? I find it impossible to support this principle and will therefore vote in favor of recommitting this bill with instructions to delete the provisions relating to excise tax restoration.

Furthermore, I object to the manner in which these proposed revisions have been presented to the taxpaying public. The public has been led to believe that these tax adjustments are a painless means of enabling the administration to meet its obligations. However, not only do the revisions mean that less money for consumption will be available on a nationwide basis, but the result is that the administration is borrowing on the future.

Confronted with the prospects of continued deficits and an ever-rising national debt, it becomes imperative that we exert a much more stringent discipline over the nature and volume of Federal spending. We should not spend first and then worry about where the money is going to come from. That is what the administration has been doing. If it had exhibited a little fiscal commonsense, there would be no need for the legislation before us today.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any man that has made a better impression upon me since I have been a Member of Congress than the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. In fact, I do not think there has ever been a more able Representative in the Congress than the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. I always make a desperate effort to follow his good, sound judgment and vote for all the bills that he reports from his committee.

I certainly want to vote for any and all the necessary legislation to finance the unfortunate Vietnam war.

I was a Member of Congress when the excise taxes were placed on automobiles, travel tickets, telephones, and numerous other items and every other Member of Congress at that time who made a speech on this subject stated that the excise taxes would be removed soon after World War II. This is truly a nuisance tax and I voted on several occasions during the past 10 years to remove taxes from plane and railroad tickets, also telephone service; however, we were not successful in having these taxes removed until last year.

Now, that it has only been in effect for approximately 1 month, we are here again trying to place this excise tax on the same items. I could easily vote for this bill increasing taxes if the section pertaining to excise taxes were deleted. I certainly am of the opinion that these excise taxes are more of a nuisance to the public than they are of financial benefit to the Treasury and I will be compelled to vote against this bill in its present form.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in disagreement with the proposal to increase the excise taxes which the Congress so recently voted to reduce. One of the principal reasons given is that the war in Vietnam will require additional funds, and undoubtedly this is a compelling reason. It is equally important to try to keep the budget in balance, and there is strong justification in the requirement to hold back the forces of inflation. It is awkward, of course, to vote against a measure designed to achieve either of these purposes. Nevertheless, I believe a request for additional taxes should not have been forthcoming until a determined effort had been made to curb nonessential expenditures on the homefront.

Military expenditures other than for the Vietnamese war have been trimmed $1.6 billion below last year's level. These reductions are largely in the area of troop housing and similar areas where a need for improvements has long existed. Also, there have been decreases in impacted-area school funds, in school lunchroom programs, and in agricultural programs of long standing. But it is disappointing to note that, on the contrary, increases of $3.2 billion have been proposed in the programs of the Great Society. Surely these are not more important than the programs previously referred to. There also is an increase in the funds requested for foreign aid. The extreme reluctance of most of the nations of the world to help in the struggle against the spread of communism in southeast Asia does little to encourage bigger programs in foreign aid.

It just does not appear to me that things are in balance. I believe that a protest vote is justifiable. I would hope that there will be a readjustment in proposed spending to provide a better balance between the things that are really needed and the things that can be postponed.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to see that the Ways and Means Committee has proposed a method, in the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, to provide funds for the support of our Vietnam operations which does not result in a general tax increase nor affect tax liabilities. I am also pleased to see, and I must commend the committee, that the bill will provide the needed funds without generating serious inflationary pressures in the domestic economy. It may, in fact, from my reading of the bill, have the more desired effect of having a moderating influence on the expenditures of individuals and business firms.

The major function of the bill will be to improve the procedures for collecting taxes, without affecting tax liabilities. I think that the proposed changes in the graduated withholding of Federal income tax from wages and salaries will result in a more satisfactory condition for the individual taxpayer at tax filing time. The effect of the proposed change, as explained in the committee report, will be to bring the amount of tax withheld during the year more in line with the total amount of tax due. The new withholding rates should benefit both those groups who find that sufficient tax has not been withheld, so that they have had to make a large payment when filing their tax return, and that group which finds, after preparing their tax return, that too much has been withheld and they are entitled to a refund.

According to the committee report, the largest single source of additional revenue is attributable to advancing the payment dates for corporate tax, so that the current payments basis for corporations with tax liabilities in excess of $100,000 will be reached in 1967 instead of 1970 as scheduled under present law.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 12752, the tax adjustment bill of 1966, because I believe it is designed to provide revenues necessary to finance the increased costs of government associated with military operations in Vietnam.

I support it because I believe that the language of the bill is designed to finance these costs in a manner which will avoid the serious inflationary escalation which would undoubtedly take place if this bill should fail to pass.

I recognize that inflation may probably come even if the bill does pass, but I believe that there will be less dangerous inflation if this bill becomes law.

Mr. Chairman, it is always unpopular to vote to levy taxes or to increase existing taxes, and it is especially unpopular to restore a tax or taxes which were removed less than a year ago. I view this legislation as a choice between casting a popular vote—as a vote against taxes always is—or a vote to face up to the responsibility of levying increased taxes for increased costs of government occasioned by a major military operation. When faced with the choice between doing that which is popular at the time, or that which I believe to be an act of responsibility, then I must forgo temporary popularity and strive to be responsible when it comes to legislation.

With all my heart, I hope that we will soon be able to accomplish an honorable and successful termination of our military operations in southeast Asia. When that day comes, I shall introduce and support the necessary legislation to repeal everything that we shall enact today. I view this bill today as a measure necessary to the successful prosecution of our military efforts in Vietnam, and I believe that the people of the district which I have the honor to represent are willing to support this position.

Many of my dear friends have written me urging me to, in effect, support the motion to recommit, and some of them have said that if the motion to recommit does not pass, that it may cost them an average of $9 per year. To those dear friends, I affectionately and respectfully reply that $9 a year is a small price to pay for our freedom and the freedom of our children.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that we can soon repeal the taxes which we shall enact today, but under present conditions which exist in Vietnam, I must respectfully vote against the motion to recommit and vote for H.R. 12752.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, after much reflection on the need for the additional revenues provided for in the tax adjustment bill before us and on the specific means the legislation would utilize, I shall vote in favor of the motion to recommit.

I recognize that increased tax revenues may be required to support our military efforts in Vietnam, and, whatever our individual views may be about the wisdom of the policies being pursued there by the present administration, there is an unquestionable obligation to provide the resources American troops require.

On the other hand, it is clear from today's debate that the proposed tax adjustments would produce considerably more in revenues than are required for the purposes of the Vietnam war. In effect, therefore, we are being asked to increase taxes, including certain excise taxes which this very Congress reduced or repealed just last year, on what amounts to an emergency basis even though a substantial portion of those taxes would not be applied to the prosecution of the war.

I see no justification, Mr. Chairman, for reneging on our promise of last year for less compelling reasons than the national security. If the administration is concerned about the threat of inflation—as, indeed, they should be—there are more effective ways of dealing with it than by reimposing excises on telephone service and automobiles. If the administration simply wants to reduce a prospective budget deficit, then the more appropriate action would be a reduction in proposed spending.

The passage by Congress and the approval by the President of last year's excise tax reduction bill was based on sound economic and social grounds. I do not believe the situation has changed sufficiently to warrant the abrupt about-face which this bill would entail.

The recommittal motion, Mr. Chairman, will remove from the bill only the provisions restoring telephone and auto excise taxes. At the same time, it will leave in the bill enough additional revenues to meet the President's request for the extra funds for the Vietnam war. Anything more than that should be considered on its own merits—not under the cover of war—and should be approved, if at all, only after the administration has removed nonessential spending from its appropriations requests.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I will vote today not to reimpose the excise taxes on automobiles and phone calls for the same reason I supported President Johnson's request last year to repeal those taxes—because repeal would "advance the cause of fairness and balance in our tax system."

I agreed with President Johnson's argument last year—and I have not changed my mind—that repealing the excise taxes would "spur growth and move us closer to full employment," and "lower prices to consumers." Most importantly, I strongly agreed that repealing the excises would "lessen the burden of regressive taxes on low-income families" and "end an unfair burden on the many businesses and workers"—in this case auto and phone company workers—"who produce the commodities which are singled out for excise taxation."

If there is need for increased taxes, we should use those forms of taxation which are related to the ability to pay. We should not reimpose arbitrary taxes which fall most heavily on working people. Taxes which were unfair and discriminatory last year would be just as unfair and discriminatory this year.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, having voted for the motion to recommit, which was unsuccessful, I vote "no" on final passage.

I do not believe that the debate has produced any justification for this tax increase.

Despite the cost of the war in Vietnam, it is obvious that an honest attempt to control nonmilitary Federal expenditures would make this tax increase unnecessary.

For political reasons, it is perfectly obvious that President Johnson will continue to pursue his "guns and butter" policies. If the House had shown legitimate legislative independence and rejected this tax increase, proper economies in nondefense agencies and departments could have been realized.

This tax increase is, in effect, a blank check for further runaway Federal spending at the expense of the taxpayer.

I have not been a critic of the President's policy in Vietnam. He certainly has enough critics among the radical left of his own party. It is obvious, however, that he is attempting to appease the dangerous radical left of the country by continuing the wild-eyed politically motivated spending schemes of the so-called Great Society. This is the reason for this tax bill, and I reiterate that therefore I cannot support it.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I fully recognize the need for additional revenue to meet the increasing costs of our commitment in Vietnam and to continue necessary domestic programs. And I am willing to support measures to raise the needed revenue, so long as we adhere to the sound taxation principle of ability to pay in raising the revenue.

I have always opposed excise or sales taxes—Federal or State—because they are regressive and often strike hardest at those who can least afford them. If the excises are imposed on items which are clearly luxuries, my objections are not as strong because low-income families are not usually the purchasers of luxuries.

I was very pleased last year—as I know many others in this body were—when we finally took action to do away with many of the Federal excise, or "nuisance" taxes on a rather wide range of items—from handbags to theater admissions. And I was particularly pleased about the action with respect to the excises imposed upon two necessities of modern life, automobiles, and telephone service.

In this day and age, ownership of an automobile—even a new auto on occasion—should not be considered a luxury. Certainly telephone service—local or long distance—is not a luxury.

To raise or postpone lowering the cost of using either, I believe is wrong. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against the proposed Tax Adjustment Act of 1966.

As I said a few moments ago, I am prepared to vote for measures to raise the money we need to carry out our operations in Vietnam. But I am not in favor of reimposing or continuing a regressive tax which ignores the ability to pay in its application.

Mr. Chairman, I agree in substance with the views of our distinguished and very able colleague from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS], a member of the Ways and Means Committee. His views are outlined on pages 49 and 50 of the committee's report.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] in his usual fashion has explained fully and comprehensively the provisions of the bill before the committee. I shall not undertake to repeat any detailed explanation. I have requested time to make very briefly one or two observations which I think are pertinent.

First, Mr. Chairman, I support this bill, because we need the revenue to keep our Government fiscally sound.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I must observe that in connection with the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, I cautioned that the administration and the Congress should not proceed too far and too fast with the complete repeal or too drastic reduction of some of the excise taxes—the auto and telephone tax—then being considered. I pointed out that a too drastic or abrupt reduction in the automobile and telephone taxes would result in an abrupt loss of considerable revenue which the forthcoming budgets might not be in a position to absorb.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the months which have ensued since that action have borne out my prediction. We are now in a necessary posture of restoring some of the cuts which were made somewhat too abruptly in these taxes in the last session. I recognize that the action then was taken in complete good faith, and of necessity Members of Congress relied on the information which we had before us. It was simply a matter of judgment which I at the time thought should be exercised along the paths of greater restraint.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me summarize very briefly the reasons why I support the bill before us and why this action is necessary now to maintain a fiscally responsible course for the Government.

The bill is designed to help finance the additional expenditures required by the Vietnam conflict without generating serious inflationary pressures in the domestic economy. The modifications in collection procedures provided in the bill will have a significant effect on revenues in the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 even though they will not increase tax liabilities. The improved collection techniques will also mean important benefits to the vast majority of taxpayers, in that amounts withheld will more nearly approximate final liabilities.

We are advised that the increased tax collections resulting from this bill will have a moderating influence on the expenditures of individuals and business firms, an influence that will tend to offset the inflationary effects of increased defense expenditures. Such a policy is appropriate in view of the near capacity levels of output and employment at which the economy is now operating, and may well promote better balance between the rate of growth of output and investment in expanded capacity. It will also support our effort to reduce the deficit in our balance of payments, in contributing to the comparative stability in the prices of U.S. goods as compared to rising prices of the goods of other nations.

It should also be pointed out that by selecting the excise taxes on telephone service and passenger automobiles for restoration, administration, and collection of the taxes will be much simpler both for business and the Government than would be the reinstitution of taxes previously repealed—such as the tax on cosmetics or jewelry—since these taxes on automobiles and telephones had only been reduced and the machinery for collection and payment is still in effect.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against this excise tax bill for these reasons. The Johnson-Humphrey administration asked Congress to repeal excise taxes last year, to take effect January 1, 1966. We repealed. I voted for this repeal.

This excise tax cut had been in effect 12 days when the President came before us and asked us to put the tax back on. The reason given—the cost of the war in Vietnam. The Johnson-Humphrey administration knew full well when the taxes were repealed that the war was going to require great increases in expenditures.

The administration knew full well last year, when it was plastering all manner of costly Great Society welfare legislation on the books that many new billions of dollars would have to be snatched from the taxpayers to pay the tab.

It is irresponsible management of our Nation's fiscal affairs to cut taxes, knowing that spending policies would require their almost immediate reenactment. I cannot and will not support such careless tax and spending policies.

Further, it is not necessary to reimpose these excise taxes if the administration will live within its means.

All it has to do is stop piling new spending for new programs and it will be possible to finance the usual, needed domestic programs as well as the Vietnam war.

Lastly, this bill proposes to reimpose excise taxes on autos and phone bills only. It does not include many luxury items such as mink coats and jewelry. Autos and phones are necessities today, not luxuries, and this bill hits everyone, particularly many who can afford it least.

We are today witnessing the oldest trick in the political book. It goes something like this: First, make a big noise about reducing or repealing an unpopular tax. Be the hero of the day. Then, when the reduction has been in effect for such a short time that it is hardly noticeable, cry loudly about pressing national emergencies and reinstate the tax with obvious reluctance. The theory is a simple one. You do not lose any significant revenue, everybody loves you for repealing the tax, and nobody really blames you for being forced to reimpose it to save the country from some peril.

But, Mr. Chairman, today this theory will not work. The American people are too tired of being tricked, and they will not believe in the tricksters.

Less than a year ago, in action long overdue, the Congress repealed excise taxes which were supposed to have been a temporary expedient to finance the Korean war. We did this at the request of the administration, accompanied by great fanfare from White House press sources.

Now, the President knew at the time that he could not continue to increase spending and at the same time lose all this tax revenue—$1.7 billion of it. Nor did he have any intention of cutting down on the expensive programs of the Great Society or practicing any real austerity in spending.

The result of all this is clearly before us in this bill we consider today. The taxes will be reimposed, and before we have even had a chance to notice that they were gone.

Mr. Chairman, my Republican colleagues and I warned last year that this tax cut would have to be accompanied by a little belt tightening in the administration. But the belt has been loosened instead, and now it is the consumer who must tighten his belt. The same consumer, I might add, who has been tightening his belt for some time now due to the increase in prices caused by the administration's reckless and inflationary fiscal policies.

The problem that the administration faces today is not caused by lack of revenue. It is caused by a lack of control over Government spending and a refusal to meet the responsibility of balancing a budget.

Tax revenues have already increased by $28 billion in the past 5 years. But spending has far exceeded that figure, and we have seen Government expenditures rise by $37 billion in the same 5 years.

And, contrary to administration propaganda, less than a third of that increase is due to the war in Vietnam. The rest is due to gross irresponsibility with the taxpayer's dollars.

Mr. Chairman, it is far beyond time for us to put a stop to this never-ending and dangerous game in which the taxpayer must always be the loser. It is high time for us to demand what we should have insisted upon long before this—a balanced budget, where the administration behaves like all of us must, and lives within its means.

The American taxpayer is not an endless source of money. He is already being hit squarely in the pocketbook by inflation, and now the administration is asking him to cough up more money to help pay for more inflation.

I urge the Members of this House to defeat the proposal before us today to reinstate the excise taxes, and stop this reckless policy which can only lead to the ruin of our economy.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, we have to face the fact that we cannot meet our obligations in Vietnam and make the threat of inflation disappear with mirrors. We need sound, long-range fiscal planning and a thoroughgoing review and overhaul of Federal programs and spending.

This is why I am voting against the administration's Tax Adjustment Act, H.R. 12752, today and why I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Before we move forward on any tax increase, there should be a general belt-tightening within the Federal Establishment. I feel sure that substantial funds can and should be obtained by exercising greater economy in Federal spending and by cutting the "fiscal fat" out of unnecessary and wasteful Federal programs. I know that this can be done without damage to the administration's overall program.

For example, modifications of the farm program and the Public Works and Economic Development Act, both of which I voted against, could pare nearly $6 billion from the Federal budget over the next 5 years.

This Tax Adjustment Act we are considering here today is not a sound, long-range measure. Many of the contributions that the administration claims it will make to the Treasury are illusory. In fact, $4.7 billion of the $6 billion total that the administration claims the measure will bring in is not a revenue increase at all. This $4.7 billion is just a temporary gain resulting from a speedup in collections of corporate and individual taxes that would have been collected anyway. Over the long haul, this will not add one single, solitary nickel to the Treasury and when the short-term windfall is spent to meet today's deficit, where will the administration turn for money to continue existing programs?

The moratorium that the administration proposes for excise tax reductions on automobiles and telephone service is arbitrary and discriminatory. Why were automobiles and telephone service singled out? The administration tells us that the companies involved do not object. Why should they? In this day and age, cars and telephones are necessities. The costs will be borne, not by the companies, but by the average consumer.

Mr. Chairman, before the administration comes to Congress to ask for new taxes, it should undertake an immediate review of Federal spending and cut away the fat. We might also consider a tax on war profits. Then, if additional funds are needed the administration should come forward with responsible long-range proposals that do more than merely defer the day of reckoning.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, because I recognize fully the necessity for increasing the Government's revenues at this critical time, I shall vote for H.R. 12752, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. My support, however, is extremely reluctant.

The administration argues that this measure is needed in order to finance the war in Vietnam. I disagree. The war could be financed out of current revenues if the administration would only cut down on its unprecedented high level of spending for domestic programs, as I have long urged. It has refused to do so. It is this refusal that leads me to conclude that this administration has neither the wit not the will to take this necessary course and so I am constrained to vote for this tax increase.

Without the added revenues provided by this measure, we would court a disastrous inflation, increased deficits in our international balance of payments, and more rapid draining of our dwindling gold supply.

Inflation presents one of the major domestic dangers to our economy today. All steps, such as this bill, that will help to dampen the flames of inflation, deserve support.

The bill is poor in several respects. It restores excise tax cuts on cars and telephone rates, which the Congress voted to lower just last year. Cars and telephones are necessities for most people and it does not seem right to restore a tax on those items while leaving untouched the luxury items—jewels, furs, luggage, cosmetics, and the like—on which we also removed taxes last year.

We are told that the automobile and telephone companies, which are enjoying record prosperity, do not object to this tax restoration. To me, this is a meaningless argument. It is not the companies that will pay this tax; it is the consumers.

NO SPENDING BRAKES

It is deeply disturbing that the Administration shows no sign of applying the brakes significantly to its deficit spending on the domestic front. Instead, it tries to tell us that everything would be wonderful and that the budget would be heading toward an early surplus if it were not for the extraordinary costs of the war in Vietnam.

This argument is punctured completely by the excellent statement of six minority members of the Ways and Means Committee whose supplemental views accompany the report on H.R. 12752. They point out that Federal spending has increased rapidly until, in our next fiscal year, it will be $37 billion higher than it was in 1961, but that less than one-third of this spending increase can be attributed to the costs of the war in Vietnam.

During this same period, our revenues have climbed as well. Our income will be higher by $28 billion in fiscal 1967 than it was in 1961. Thus, it is readily apparent that our deficit condition was not caused by lack of revenues but by lack of restraint and intelligent selectivity in Government spending. These figures support my claim that the war in Vietnam could be financed by prudence on the domestic front.

BAD PLANNING OR DECEIT?

Another disturbing aspect to this legislation is that it shows either that the administration has not been forthright in telling the American people what the war in Vietnam is going to cost or that its planning is very bad.

Last year, when the administration asked for these tax reductions it said we could afford the loss of revenues involved. Now, just a few months later, the administration comes back-pedalling to Congress. Are we to believe that our military and diplomatic aims are so little understood by those responsible for planning them? Or are we to conclude that this is merely a method for easing the country slowly into the facts of our situation? Either way, it is very troubling. One does not wish to think that the Government does not know what it is doing. Nor does one wish to think it is concealing its intentions from the public. But it is hard to avoid reaching one conclusion or the other.

TAX REFORMS NEEDED

Tax reform is sorely needed, particularly tax reduction. But this cannot come until the way is prepared through sound and responsible spending policies. That is why I have voted to eliminate the enormous Federal subsidies to big farms and plantations, to reduce foreign aid, against the Appalachian redevelopment program, the antipoverty bill, and other deferrable or unnecessary programs.

I have long urged that we raise individual tax exemptions from $600 to $900 a year, a reform that would ease the burden on the hard-pressed head of household at a time of rapidly rising costs of living. But this would cost the Government some $8 billion a year in lost revenues. As long as the Government continues to spend upwards of $500 million a month beyond its income, such a proposal has no chance of acceptance.

I oppose the deficit-spending policies which make this bill necessary. It is those that are to blame and not just the war in Vietnam. I shall vote for it with the warning that if this Congress and this administration do not quickly establish strict priorities, we will face calls for more taxes and very likely for Government controls over the economy to check the mounting flames of inflation that are searing the public, in particular the poor, and which will soon become so painful that even this administration will have to react.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, on January 13 of this year, I rose to speak against the reimposition of the "luxury taxes" on automobiles and telephone service that had been suggested by the President the evening before in his state of the Union message. I maintained then, and I continue to believe today, that automobiles and telephone service are necessities to most Americans and should not be taxed as luxuries. For this reason, I will vote to recommit the bill before us, with instructions to strike the provision delaying the excise tax reductions on autos and telephone service.

If the bill is not returned to committee, I will be compelled to vote for final passage for a very important reason: additional revenues are required to offset the rising costs of the war in Vietnam, or serious inflation will be stimulated.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their own remarks on the bill before the Committee of the Whole at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself just 1 minute.

I want to take this occasion to congratulate my very distinguished friend from Wisconsin for his statement in support of the bill and in opposition to the motion to recommit. My friend is always very logical. I wanted the House to know that he has thoroughly convinced me that we ought to be against the motion to recommit, and I hope other Members on this side will feel as I do about it and join me in opposition to the motion to recommit and in support of the bill on final passage.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments are in order to the bill except amendments that are offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The bill follows:

H.R. 12752

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Section 1. Short Title, etc.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Tax Adjustment Act of 1966".

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1954 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

TITLE I—ADJUSTMENT OF CERTAIN COLLECTION PROCEDURES

Section 101. Income Tax Collected at Source.

(a) PERCENTAGE METHOD OF WITHHOLDING.—Subsection (a) of section 3402 (relating to requirement of withholding) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) REQUIREMENT OF WITHHOLDING.—Every employer making payment of wages shall deduct and withhold upon such wages (except as otherwise provided in this section) a tax determined in accordance with the following tables. For purposes of applying such tables, the term 'the amount of wages' means the amount by which the wages exceed the number of withholding exemptions claimed, multiplied by the amount of one such exemption as shown in the table in subsection (b) (1):

"TABLE 1.—*If the payroll period with respect to an employee is weekly*

"(a) Single Person—Including Head of Household:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $4	0.
Over $4 but not over $13.	14% of excess over $4.
Over $13 but not over $23.	$1.26 plus 15% of excess of $13.
Over $23 but not over $85.	$2.76 plus 17% of excess of $23.
Over $85 but not over $169.	$13.30 plus 20% of excess over $85.
Over $169 but not over $212.	$30.10 plus 25% of excess over $169.
Over $212	$40.85 plus 30% of excess over $212.

"(b) Married Person:

"TABLE 1.—*If the payroll period with respect to an employee is weekly*—Continued

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $4	0.
Over $4 but not over $23.	14% of excess over $4.
Over $23 but not over $85.	$2.66 plus 15% of excess over $23.
Over $85 but not over $169.	$11.96 plus 17% of excess over $85.
Over $169 but not over $340.	$26.24 plus 20% of excess over $169.
Over $340 but not over $423.	$60.44 plus 25% of excess over $340.
Over $423	$81.19 plus 30% of excess over $423.

"TABLE 2.—*If the payroll period with respect to an employee is biweekly*

"(a) Single Person—Including Head of Household:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $8	0.
$8 but not over $27	14% of excess over $8.
Over $27 but not over $46.	$2.66 plus 15% of excess over $27.
Over $46 but not over $169.	$5.51 plus 17% of excess over $46.
Over $169 but not over $338.	$26.42 plus 20% of excess over $169.
Over $338 but not over $423.	$60.22 plus 25% of excess over $338.
Over $423	$81.47 plus 30% of excess over $423.

"(b) Married Person:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $8	0.
Over $8 but not over $46.	14% of excess over $8.
Over $46 but not over $169.	$5.32 plus 15% of excess over $46.
Over $169 but not over $338.	$23.77 plus 17% of excess over $169.
Over $338 but not over $681.	$52.50 plus 20% of excess over $338.
Over $681 but not over $846.	$121.10 plus 25% of excess over $681.
Over $846	$162.35 plus 30% of excess over $846.

"TABLE 3.—*If the payroll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly*

"(a) Single Person—Including Head of Household:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $8	0.
Over $8 but not over $29.	14% of excess over $8.
Over $29 but not over $50.	$2.94 plus 15% of excess over $29.
Over $50 but not over $183.	$6.09 plus 17% of excess over $50.
Over $183 but not over $367.	$28.70 plus 20% of excess over $183.
Over $367 but not over $458.	$65.50 plus 25% of excess over $367.
Over $458	$88.25 plus 30% of excess over $458.

"(b) Married person:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $8	0.
Over $8 but not over $50.	14% of excess over $8.
Over $50 but not over $183.	$5.88 plus 15% of excess over $50.
Over $183 but not over $367.	$25.83 plus 17% of excess over $183.
Over $367 but not over $738.	$57.11 plus 20% of excess over $367.
Over $738 but not over $917.	$131.31 plus 25% of excess over $738.
Over $917	$176.06 plus 30% of excess over $917.

"TABLE 4.—*If the payroll period with respect to an employee is monthly*

"(a) Single Person—Including Head of Household:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $17	0.
Over $17 but not over $58.	14 percent of excess over $17.
Over $58 but not over $100.	$5.74 plus 15 percent of excess over $58.
Over $100 but not over $367.	$12.04 plus 17 percent of excess over $100.
Over $367 but not over $733.	$57.43 plus 20 percent of excess over $367.
Over $733 but not over $917.	$130.63 plus 25 percent of excess over $733.
Over $917	$176.63 plus 30 percent of excess over $917.

"(b) Married Person:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $17	0.
Over $17 but not over $100.	14 percent of excess over $17.
Over $100 but not over $367.	$11.62 plus 15 percent of excess over $100.
Over $367 but not over $733.	$51.67 plus 17 percent of excess over $367.
Over $733 but not over $1,475.	$113.89 plus 20 percent of excess over $733.
Over $1,475 but not over $1,833.	$262.29 plus 25 percent of excess over $1,475.
Over $1,833	$351.79 plus 30 percent of excess over $1,833.

"TABLE 5.—*If the payroll period with respect to an employee is quarterly*

"(a) Single Person—Including Head of Household:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $50	0.
Over $50 but not over $175.	14 percent of excess over $50.
Over $175 but not over $300.	$17.50 plus 15 percent of excess over $175.
Over $300 but not over $1,100.	$36.25 plus 17 percent of excess over $300.
Over $1,100 but not over $2,200.	$172.25 plus 20 percent of excess over $1,110.
Over $2,200 but not over $2,750.	$392.25 plus 25 percent of excess over $2,200.
Over $2,750	$529.75 plus 30 percent of excess over $2,750.

"(b) Married Person:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $50	0.
Over $50 but not over $300.	14 percent of excess over $50.
Over $300 but not over $1,100.	$35.00 plus 15 percent of excess over $300.
Over $1,100 but not over $2,200.	$155 plus 17 percent of excess over $1,100.
Over $2,200 but not over $4,425.	$342 plus 20 percent of excess over $2,200.
Over $4,425 but not over $5,500.	$787 plus 25 percent of excess over $4,425.
Over $5,500	$1,055.75 plus 30 percent of excess over $5,500.

"TABLE 6.—*If the payroll period with respect to an employee is semiannual*

"(a) Single Person—Including Head of Household:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $100	0.
Over $100 but not over $350.	14 percent of excess over $100.
Over $350 but not over $600.	$35.00 plus 15 percent of excess over $350.
Over $600 but not over $2,200.	$72.50 plus 17 percent of excess over $600.
Over $2,200 but not over $4,400.	$344.50 plus 20 percent of excess over $2,200.
Over $4,400 but not over $5,5000.	$784.50 plus 25 percent of excess over $4,400.
Over $5,500	$1,059.50 plus 30 percent of excess over $5,500.

"(b) Married person:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $100	0.
Over $100 but not over $600.	14 percent of excess over $100.
Over $600 but not over $2,200.	$70 plus 15 percent of excess over $600.
Over $2,200 but not over $4,400.	$310 plus 17 percent of excess over $2,200.
Over $4,400 but not over $8,850.	$684 plus 20 percent of excess over $4,400.
Over $8,850 but not over $11,000.	$1,574 plus 25 percent of excess over $8,850.
Over $11,000	$2,111.50 plus 30 percent of excess over $11,000.

"TABLE 7.—*If the payroll period with respect to an employee is annual*

"(a) Single Person—Including Head of Household:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $200	0.
Over $200 but not over $700.	14% of excess over $200.
Over $700 but not over $1,200.	$70 plus 15% of excess over $700.
Over $1,200 but not over $4,400.	$145 plus 17% of excess over $1,200.
Over $4,400 but not over $8,800.	$689 plus 20% of excess over $4,400.
Over $8,800 but not over $11,000.	$1,569 plus 25% of excess over $8,800.
Over $11,000	$2,119 plus 30% of excess over $11,000.

"(b) Married Person:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $200	0.
Over $200 but not over $1,200.	14% of excess over $200.
Over $1,200 but not over $4,400.	$140 plus 15% of ex-excess over $1,200.
Over $4,400 but not over $8,800.	$620 plus 17% of excess over $4,400.
Over $8,800 but not over $17,700.	$1,368 plus 20% of excess over $8,800.
Over $17,700 but not over $22,000.	$3,148 plus 25% of excess over $17,700.
Over $22,000	$4,223 plus 30% of excess over $22,000.

"TABLE 8.—*If the payroll period with respect to an employee is a daily payroll period or a miscellaneous payroll period*

"(a) Single Person—Including Head of Household:

"If the amount of wages divided by the number of days in the payroll period is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $0.50	0.
Over $0.50 but not over $1.90.	14% of excess over $0.50.
Over $1.90 but not over $3.30.	$0.20 plus 15% of excess over $1.90.
Over $3.30 but not over $12.10.	$0.41 plus 17% of excess over $3.30.
Over $12.10 but not over $24.10.	$1.91 plus 20% of excess over $12.10.
Over $24.10 but not over $30.10.	$4.31 plus 25% of excess over $24.10.
Over $30.10	$5.81 plus 30% of excess over $30.10.

"(b) Married Person:

"If the amount of wages divided by the number of days in the payroll period is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $0.50	0.
Over $0.50 but not over $3.30.	14% of excess over $0.50.
Over $3.30 but not over $12.10.	$0.39 plus 15% of excess over $3.30.
Over $12.10 but not over $24.10.	$1.71 plus 17% of excess over $12.10.
Over $24.10 but not over $48.50.	$3.75 plus 20% of excess over $24.10.
Over $48.50 but not over $60.30.	$8.63 plus 25% of excess over $48.50.
Over 60.30	$11.58 plus 30% of excess over $60.30."

(b) AMOUNT OF WITHHOLDING EXEMPTION.—Paragraph (1) of section 3402(b) (relating to percentage method withholding table) is amended by striking out the table set forth therein and inserting the following table in lieu thereof:

"*Percentage Method Withholding Table*

"Payroll period:	Amount of one withholding exemption
Weekly	$13.50.
Biweekly	26.90.
Semimonthly	29.20.
Monthly	58.30.
Quarterly	175.00.
Semiannual	350.00.
Annual	700.00.
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period).	1.90."

(c) WAGE BRACKET WITHHOLDING.—Paragraph (1) of section 3402(c) (relating to wage bracket withholding) is amended by striking out the tables set forth therein and inserting the folowing tables in lieu thereof:

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is weekly and he is not married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$4	14% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$4	$5	$0.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5	$6	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6	$7	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7	$8	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$8	$9	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$9	$10	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$10	$11	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$11	$12	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$12	$13	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$13	$14	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$14	$15	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$15	$16	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$16	$17	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$17	$18	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$18	$19	2.10	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$19	$20	2.30	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$20	$21	2.40	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$21	$22	2.60	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$22	$23	2.70	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$23	$24	2.90	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$25	3.00	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$25	$26	3.20	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$26	$27	3.40	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$27	$28	3.50	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$29	3.70	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$29	$30	3.90	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$30	$31	4.10	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$31	$32	4.20	2.00	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$32	$33	4.40	2.20	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$33	$34	4.60	2.30	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$34	$35	4.70	2.50	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$35	$36	4.90	2.60	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$37	5.10	2.80	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$37	$38	5.20	3.00	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$38	$39	5.40	3.10	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$39	$40	5.60	3.30	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$41	5.80	3.50	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$41	$42	5.90	3.60	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$42	$43	6.10	3.80	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$43	$44	6.30	4.00	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$45	6.40	4.10	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$45	$46	6.60	4.30	2.10	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$46	$47	6.80	4.50	2.30	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$47	$48	6.90	4.70	2.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$49	7.10	4.80	2.60	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$49	$50	7.30	5.00	2.70	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$50	$51	7.50	5.20	2.90	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$51	$52	7.60	5.30	3.00	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$53	7.80	5.50	3.20	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$53	$54	8.00	5.70	3.40	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$54	$55	8.10	5.80	3.60	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$55	$56	8.30	6.00	3.70	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$57	8.50	6.20	3.90	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$57	$58	8.60	6.40	4.10	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$58	$59	8.80	6.50	4.20	2.00	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$59	$60	9.00	6.70	4.40	2.20	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$62	9.20	6.90	4.70	2.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$62	$64	9.60	7.30	5.00	2.70	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$66	9.90	7.60	5.30	3.10	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
$66	$68	10.30	8.00	5.70	3.40	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$70	10.60	8.30	6.00	3.70	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$70	$72	10.90	8.60	6.40	4.10	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$74	11.30	9.00	6.70	4.40	2.20	.30	0	0	0	0	0
$74	$76	11.60	9.30	7.00	4.80	2.50	.50	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$78	12.00	9.70	7.40	5.10	2.80	.80	0	0	0	0	0
$78	$80	12.30	10.00	7.70	5.40	3.10	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$82	12.60	10.30	8.10	5.80	3.50	1.40	0	0	0	0	0
$82	$84	13.00	10.70	8.40	6.10	3.80	1.70	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$86	13.30	11.00	8.70	6.50	4.20	2.00	.10	0	0	0	0
$86	$88	13.70	11.40	9.10	6.80	4.50	2.30	.30	0	0	0	0
$88	$90	14.10	11.70	9.40	7.10	4.80	2.60	.60	0	0	0	0
$90	$92	14.50	12.00	9.80	7.50	5.20	2.90	.90	0	0	0	0
$92	$94	14.90	12.40	10.10	7.80	5.50	3.20	1.20	0	0	0	0
$94	$96	15.30	12.70	10.40	8.20	5.90	3.60	1.50	0	0	0	0
$96	$98	15.70	13.10	10.80	8.50	6.20	3.90	1.80	0	0	0	0
$98	$100	16.10	13.40	11.10	8.80	6.50	4.30	2.10	.10	0	0	0
$100	$105	16.80	14.10	11.70	9.40	7.10	4.80	2.60	.60	0	0	0
$105	$110	17.80	15.10	12.60	10.30	8.00	5.70	3.40	1.30	0	0	0
$110	$115	18.80	16.10	13.40	11.10	8.80	6.50	4.30	2.10	.10	0	0
$115	$120	19.80	17.10	14.40	12.00	9.70	7.40	5.10	2.80	.80	0	0
$120	$125	20.80	18.10	15.40	12.80	10.50	8.20	6.00	3.70	1.50	0	0
$125	$130	21.80	19.10	16.40	13.80	11.40	9.10	6.80	4.50	2.30	.40	0
$130	$135	22.80	20.10	17.40	14.80	12.20	9.90	7.70	5.40	3.10	1.10	0
$135	$140	23.80	21.10	18.40	15.80	13.10	10.80	8.50	6.20	3.90	1.80	0
$140	$145	24.80	22.10	19.40	16.80	14.10	11.60	9.40	7.10	4.80	2.50	.60
$145	$150	25.80	23.10	20.40	17.80	15.10	12.50	10.20	7.90	5.60	3.30	1.30
$150	$160	27.30	24.60	21.90	19.30	16.60	13.90	11.50	9.20	6.90	4.60	2.40
$160	$170	29.30	26.60	23.90	21.30	18.60	15.90	13.20	10.90	8.60	6.30	4.00
$170	$180	31.06	28.60	25.90	23.30	20.60	17.90	15.20	12.60	10.30	8.00	5.70
$180	$190	34.10	30.80	27.90	25.30	22.60	19.90	17.20	14.50	12.00	9.70	7.40
$190	$200	36.60	33.30	29.90	27.30	24.60	21.90	19.20	16.50	13.80	11.40	9.10
$200	$210	39.10	35.80	32.40	29.30	26.60	23.90	21.20	18.50	15.80	13.10	10.80
$210	$220	41.80	38.30	34.90	31.50	28.60	25.90	23.20	20.50	17.80	15.10	12.50
$220	$230	44.80	40.80	37.40	34.00	30.70	27.90	25.20	22.50	19.80	17.10	14.40
$230	$240	47.80	43.80	39.90	36.50	33.20	29.90	27.20	24.50	21.80	19.10	16.40
$240	$250	50.80	46.80	42.70	39.00	35.70	32.30	29.20	26.50	23.80	21.10	18.40
$250	$260	53.80	49.80	45.70	41.70	38.20	34.80	31.40	28.50	25.80	23.10	20.40
$260	$270	56.80	52.80	48.70	44.70	40.70	37.30	33.90	30.60	27.80	25.10	22.40
$270	$280	59.80	55.80	51.70	47.70	43.60	39.80	36.40	33.10	29.80	27.10	24.40
$280	$290	62.80	58.80	54.70	50.70	46.60	42.60	38.90	35.60	32.20	29.10	26.40
$290	$300	65.80	61.80	57.70	53.70	49.60	45.60	41.60	38.10	34.70	31.30	28.40

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is weekly and he is not married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$300	$310	$68.80	$64.80	$60.70	$56.70	$52.60	$48.60	$44.60	$40.60	$37.20	$33.80	$30.50
$310	$320	71.80	67.80	63.70	59.70	55.60	51.60	47.60	43.50	39.70	36.30	33.00
$320	$330	74.80	70.80	66.70	62.70	58.60	54.60	50.60	46.50	42.50	38.80	35.50
$330	$340	77.80	73.80	69.70	65.70	61.60	57.60	53.60	49.50	45.50	41.40	38.00
$340	$350	80.80	76.80	72.70	68.70	64.60	60.60	56.60	52.50	48.50	44.40	40.50
$350	$360	83.80	79.80	75.70	71.70	67.60	63.60	59.60	55.50	51.50	47.40	43.40
		30 percent of the excess over $360 plus—										
$360 and over		85.30	81.30	77.20	73.20	69.10	65.10	61.10	57.00	53.00	48.90	44.90

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is weekly and he is married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$4	14% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$4	$5	$0.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5	$6	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6	$7	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7	$8	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$8	$9	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$9	$10	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$10	$11	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$11	$12	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$12	$13	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$13	$14	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$14	$15	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$15	$16	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$16	$17	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$17	$18	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$18	$19	2.10	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$19	$20	2.20	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$20	$21	2.30	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$21	$22	2.50	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$22	$23	2.60	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$23	$24	2.80	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$25	2.90	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$25	$26	3.10	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$26	$27	3.20	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$27	$28	3.40	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$29	3.50	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$29	$30	3.70	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$30	$31	3.80	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$31	$32	4.00	2.00	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$32	$33	4.10	2.10	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$33	$34	4.30	2.30	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$34	$35	4.40	2.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$35	$36	4.60	2.50	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$37	4.70	2.70	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$37	$38	4.90	2.80	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$38	$39	5.00	3.00	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$39	$40	5.20	3.10	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$41	5.30	3.30	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$41	$42	5.50	3.40	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$42	$43	5.60	3.60	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$43	$44	5.80	3.70	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$45	5.90	3.90	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$45	$46	6.10	4.00	2.10	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$46	$47	6.20	4.20	2.20	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$47	$48	6.40	4.30	2.30	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$49	6.50	4.50	2.50	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$49	$50	6.70	4.60	2.60	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$50	$51	6.80	4.80	2.80	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$51	$52	7.00	4.90	2.90	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$53	7.10	5.10	3.10	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$53	$54	7.30	5.20	3.20	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$54	$55	7.40	5.40	3.40	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$55	$56	7.60	5.50	3.50	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$57	7.70	5.70	3.70	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$57	$58	7.90	5.80	3.80	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$58	$59	8.00	6.00	4.00	2.00	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$59	$60	8.20	6.10	4.10	2.10	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$62	8.40	6.40	4.30	2.30	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$62	$64	8.70	6.70	4.60	2.60	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$66	9.00	7.00	4.90	2.90	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
$66	$68	9.30	7.30	5.20	3.20	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$70	9.60	7.60	5.50	3.50	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$70	$72	9.90	7.90	5.80	3.80	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$74	10.20	8.20	6.10	4.10	2.10	.30	0	0	0	0	0
$74	$76	10.50	8.50	6.40	4.40	2.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$78	10.80	8.80	6.70	4.70	2.70	.80	0	0	0	0	0
$78	$80	11.10	9.10	7.00	5.00	3.00	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$82	11.40	9.40	7.30	5.30	3.30	1.40	0	0	0	0	0
$82	$84	11.70	9.70	7.60	5.60	3.60	1.70	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$86	12.00	10.00	7.90	5.90	3.90	1.90	.10	0	0	0	0
$86	$88	12.30	10.30	8.20	6.20	4.20	2.20	.30	0	0	0	0
$88	$90	12.70	10.60	8.50	6.50	4.50	2.50	.60	0	0	0	0
$90	$92	13.00	10.90	8.80	6.80	4.80	2.80	.90	0	0	0	0
$92	$94	13.30	11.20	9.10	7.10	5.10	3.10	1.20	0	0	0	0

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is weekly and he is married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$94	$96	$13.70	$11.50	$9.40	$7.40	$5.40	$3.40	$1.50	$0	$0	$0	$0
$96	$98	14.00	11.80	9.70	7.70	5.70	3.70	1.70	0	0	0	0
$98	$100	14.40	12.10	10.00	8.00	6.00	4.00	2.00	.10	0	0	0
$100	$105	15.00	12.70	10.60	8.50	6.50	4.50	2.50	.60	0	0	0
$105	$110	15.80	13.50	11.30	9.30	7.30	5.30	3.20	1.30	0	0	0
$110	$115	16.70	14.40	12.10	10.00	8.00	6.00	4.00	2.00	.10	0	0
$115	$120	17.50	15.20	12.90	10.80	8.80	6.80	4.70	2.70	.80	0	0
$120	$125	18.40	16.10	13.80	11.50	9.50	7.50	5.50	3.50	1.50	0	0
$125	$130	19.20	16.90	14.60	12.30	10.30	8.30	6.20	4.20	2.20	.40	0
$130	$135	20.10	17.80	15.50	13.20	11.00	9.00	7.00	5.00	3.00	1.10	0
$135	$140	20.90	18.60	16.30	14.00	11.80	9.80	7.70	5.70	3.70	1.80	0
$140	$145	21.80	19.50	17.20	14.90	12.60	10.50	8.50	6.50	4.50	2.50	0
$145	$150	22.60	20.30	18.00	15.70	13.50	11.30	9.20	7.20	5.20	3.20	.60
$150	$160	23.90	21.60	19.30	17.00	14.70	12.40	10.40	8.30	6.30	4.30	1.30
$160	$170	25.60	23.30	21.00	18.70	16.40	14.10	11.90	9.80	7.80	5.80	2.30
$170	$180	27.50	25.00	22.70	20.40	18.10	15.80	13.60	11.30	9.30	7.30	3.80
$180	$190	29.50	26.80	24.40	22.10	19.80	17.50	15.30	13.00	10.80	8.80	5.30
$190	$200	31.50	28.80	26.10	23.80	21.50	19.20	17.00	14.70	12.40	10.30	6.80
$200	$210	33.50	30.80	28.10	25.50	23.20	20.90	18.70	16.40	14.10	11.80	8.30
$210	$220	35.50	32.80	30.10	27.40	24.90	22.60	20.40	18.10	15.80	13.50	9.80
$220	$230	37.50	34.80	32.10	29.40	26.70	24.30	22.10	19.80	17.50	15.20	11.30
$230	$240	39.50	36.80	34.10	31.40	28.70	26.00	23.80	21.50	19.20	16.90	12.90
$240	$250	41.50	38.80	36.10	33.40	30.70	28.00	25.50	23.20	20.90	18.60	14.60
$250	$260	43.50	40.80	38.10	35.40	32.70	30.00	27.30	24.90	22.60	20.30	16.30
$260	$270	45.50	42.80	40.10	37.40	34.70	32.00	29.30	26.60	24.30	22.00	18.00
$270	$280	47.50	44.80	42.10	39.40	36.70	34.00	31.30	28.60	26.00	23.70	19.70
$280	$290	49.50	46.80	44.10	41.40	38.70	36.00	33.30	30.60	27.90	25.40	21.40
$290	$300	51.50	48.80	46.10	43.40	40.70	38.00	35.30	32.60	29.90	27.20	23.10
$300	$310	53.50	50.80	48.10	45.40	42.70	40.00	37.30	34.60	31.90	29.20	24.80
$310	$320	55.50	52.80	50.10	47.40	44.70	42.00	39.30	36.60	33.90	31.20	26.50
$320	$330	57.50	54.80	52.10	49.40	46.70	44.00	41.30	38.60	35.90	33.20	28.50
$330	$340	59.50	56.80	54.10	51.40	48.70	46.00	43.30	40.60	37.90	35.20	30.50
$340	$350	61.70	58.80	56.10	53.40	50.70	48.00	45.30	42.60	39.90	37.20	32.50
$350	$360	64.20	60.80	58.10	55.40	52.70	50.00	47.30	44.60	41.90	39.20	34.50
$360	$370	66.70	63.30	60.10	57.40	54.70	52.00	49.30	46.60	43.90	41.20	36.50
$370	$380	69.20	65.80	62.50	59.40	56.70	54.00	51.30	48.60	45.90	43.20	38.50
$380	$390	71.70	68.30	65.00	61.60	58.70	56.00	53.30	50.60	47.90	45.20	40.50
$390	$400	74.20	70.80	67.50	64.10	60.70	58.00	55.30	52.60	49.90	47.20	42.50
$400	$410	76.70	73.30	70.00	66.60	63.20	60.00	57.30	54.60	51.90	49.20	44.50
$410	$420	79.20	75.80	72.50	69.10	65.70	62.40	59.30	56.60	53.90	51.20	46.50
$420	$430	81.80	78.30	75.00	71.60	68.20	64.90	61.50	58.60	55.90	53.20	48.50
$430	$440	84.80	80.80	77.50	74.10	70.70	67.40	64.00	60.60	57.90	55.20	50.50
$440	$450	87.80	83.80	80.00	76.60	73.20	69.90	66.50	63.10	59.90	57.20	52.50
$450	$460	90.80	86.80	82.70	79.10	75.70	72.40	69.00	65.60	62.30	59.20	54.50
$460	$470	93.80	89.80	85.70	81.70	78.20	74.90	71.50	68.10	64.80	61.40	56.50
$470	$480	96.80	92.80	88.70	84.70	80.70	77.40	74.00	70.60	67.30	63.90	58.50
$480	$490	99.80	95.80	91.70	87.70	83.60	79.90	76.50	73.10	69.80	66.40	60.50
$490	$500	102.80	98.80	94.70	90.70	86.60	82.60	79.00	75.60	72.30	68.90	63.00
$500	$510	105.80	101.80	97.70	93.70	89.60	85.60	81.60	78.10	74.80	71.40	65.50
$510	$520	108.80	104.80	100.70	96.70	92.60	88.60	84.60	80.60	77.30	73.90	68.00
$520	$530	111.80	107.80	103.70	99.70	95.60	91.60	87.60	83.50	79.80	76.40	70.50
$530	$540	114.80	110.80	106.70	102.70	98.60	94.60	90.60	86.50	82.50	78.90	73.00
$540	$550	117.80	113.80	109.70	105.70	101.60	97.60	93.60	89.50	85.50	81.40	75.50
$550	$560	120.80	116.80	112.70	108.70	104.60	100.60	96.60	92.50	88.50	84.40	78.00
$560	$570	123.80	119.80	115.70	111.70	107.60	103.60	99.60	95.50	91.50	87.40	80.50
		30 percent of the excess over $570 plus—										
$570 and over		125.30	121.30	117.20	113.20	109.10	105.10	101.10	97.00	93.00	88.90	84.90

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is biweekly and he is not married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$8	14% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$8	$10	$0.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$10	$12	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$12	$14	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$14	$16	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$16	$18	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$18	$20	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$20	$22	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$22	$24	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$26	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$26	$28	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$30	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$30	$32	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$32	$34	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$34	$36	3.90	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$38	4.20	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$38	$40	4.50	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$42	4.80	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$42	$44	5.10	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$46	5.40	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is biweekly and he is not married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$46	$48	$5.70	$1.70	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$48	$50	6.10	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$50	$52	6.40	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$54	6.70	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$54	$56	7.10	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$58	7.40	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$58	$60	7.80	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$62	8.10	3.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$62	$64	8.40	4.10	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$66	8.80	4.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$66	$68	9.10	4.70	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$70	9.50	5.00	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$70	$72	9.80	5.30	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$74	10.10	5.60	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$74	$76	10.50	5.90	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$78	10.80	6.20	2.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$78	$80	11.20	6.60	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$82	11.50	6.90	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$82	$84	11.80	7.30	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$86	12.20	7.60	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$86	$88	12.50	7.90	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$88	$90	12.90	8.30	3.90	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$90	$92	13.20	8.60	4.20	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$92	$94	13.50	9.00	4.50	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$94	$96	13.90	9.30	4.80	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$96	$98	14.20	9.60	5.10	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$98	$100	14.60	10.00	5.40	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$100	$102	14.90	10.30	5.70	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$102	$104	15.20	10.70	6.10	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$104	$106	15.60	11.00	6.40	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$106	$108	15.90	11.30	6.80	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$108	$110	16.30	11.70	7.10	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$110	$112	16.60	12.00	7.40	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$112	$114	16.90	12.40	7.80	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$114	$116	17.30	12.70	8.10	3.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$116	$118	17.60	13.00	8.50	4.10	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$118	$120	18.00	13.40	8.80	4.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$120	$124	18.50	13.90	9.30	4.80	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$124	$128	19.20	14.60	10.00	5.40	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$128	$132	19.80	15.30	10.70	6.10	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
$132	$136	20.50	15.90	11.40	6.80	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$136	$140	21.20	16.60	12.00	7.50	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$140	$144	21.90	17.30	12.70	8.10	3.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$144	$148	22.60	18.00	13.40	8.80	4.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0
$148	$152	23.20	18.70	14.10	9.50	5.00	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$152	$156	23.90	19.30	14.80	10.20	5.60	1.60	0	0	0	0	0
$156	$160	24.60	20.00	15.40	10.90	6.30	2.20	0	0	0	0	0
$160	$164	25.30	20.70	16.10	11.50	7.00	2.80	0	0	0	0	0
$164	$168	26.00	21.40	16.80	12.20	7.60	3.40	0	0	0	0	0
$168	$172	26.70	22.10	17.50	12.90	8.30	4.00	.10	0	0	0	0
$172	$176	27.50	22.70	18.20	13.60	9.00	4.60	.70	0	0	0	0
$176	$180	28.30	23.40	18.80	14.30	9.70	5.20	1.20	0	0	0	0
$180	$184	29.10	24.10	19.50	14.90	10.40	5.80	1.80	0	0	0	0
$184	$188	29.90	24.80	20.20	15.60	11.00	6.50	2.30	0	0	0	0
$188	$192	30.70	25.50	20.90	16.30	11.70	7.10	2.90	0	0	0	0
$192	$196	31.50	26.10	21.60	17.00	12.40	7.80	3.50	0	0	0	0
$196	$200	32.30	26.90	22.20	17.70	13.10	8.50	4.10	.30	0	0	0
$200	$210	33.70	28.30	23.40	18.90	14.30	9.70	52.0	1.20	0	0	0
$210	$220	35.70	30.30	25.10	20.60	16.00	11.40	6.80	2.60	0	0	0
$220	$230	37.70	32.30	26.90	22.30	17.70	13.10	8.50	4.10	.30	0	0
$230	$240	39.70	34.30	28.90	24.00	19.40	14.80	10.20	5.60	1.70	0	0
$240	$250	41.70	36.30	30.90	25.70	21.10	16.50	11.90	7.30	3.10	0	0
$250	$260	43.70	38.30	32.90	27.50	22.80	18.20	13.60	9.00	4.60	.70	0
$260	$270	45.70	40.30	34.90	29.50	24.50	19.90	15.30	10.70	6.20	2.10	0
$270	$280	47.70	42.30	36.90	31.50	26.20	21.60	17.00	12.40	7.90	3.60	0
$280	$290	49.70	44.30	38.90	33.50	28.10	23.30	18.70	14.10	9.60	5.10	1.10
$290	$300	51.70	46.30	40.90	35.50	30.10	25.00	20.40	15.80	11.30	6.70	2.50
$300	$320	54.70	49.30	43.90	38.50	33.10	27.70	23.00	18.40	13.80	9.20	4.80
$320	$340	58.70	53.30	47.90	42.50	37.10	31.70	26.40	21.80	17.20	12.60	8.10
$340	$360	63.20	57.30	51.90	46.50	41.10	35.70	30.30	25.20	20.60	16.00	11.50
$360	$380	68.20	61.50	55.90	50.50	45.10	39.70	34.30	29.00	24.00	19.40	14.90
$380	$400	73.20	66.50	59.90	54.50	49.10	43.70	38.30	33.00	27.60	22.80	18.30
$400	$420	78.20	71.50	64.80	58.50	53.10	47.70	42.30	37.00	31.60	26.20	21.70
$420	$440	83.60	76.50	69.80	63.00	57.10	51.70	46.30	41.00	35.60	30.20	25.10
$440	$460	89.60	81.50	74.80	68.00	61.30	55.70	50.30	45.00	39.60	34.20	28.80
$460	$480	95.60	87.50	79.80	73.00	66.30	59.70	54.30	49.00	43.60	38.20	32.80
$480	$500	101.60	93.50	85.40	78.00	71.30	64.60	58.30	53.00	47.60	42.20	36.80
$500	$520	107.60	99.50	91.40	83.30	76.30	69.60	62.80	57.00	51.60	46.20	40.80
$520	$540	113.60	105.50	97.40	89.30	81.30	74.60	67.80	61.10	55.60	50.20	44.80
$540	$560	119.60	111.50	103.40	95.30	87.30	79.60	72.80	66.10	59.60	54.20	48.80
$560	$580	125.60	117.50	109.40	101.30	93.30	85.20	77.80	71.10	64.40	58.20	52.80
$580	$600	131.60	123.50	115.40	107.30	99.30	91.20	83.10	76.10	69.40	62.70	56.80
$600	$620	137.60	129.50	121.40	113.30	105.30	97.20	89.10	81.10	74.40	67.70	60.90
$620	$640	143.60	135.50	127.40	119.30	111.30	103.20	95.10	87.00	79.40	72.70	65.90
$640	$660	149.60	141.50	133.40	125.30	117.30	109.20	101.10	93.00	85.00	77.70	70.90
$660	$680	155.60	147.50	139.40	131.30	123.30	115.20	107.10	99.00	91.00	82.90	75.90
$680	$700	161.60	153.50	145.40	137.30	129.30	121.20	113.10	105.00	97.00	88.90	80.90
$700	$720	167.60	159.50	151.40	143.30	135.30	127.20	119.10	111.00	103.00	94.90	86.80
		30 percent of the excess over $720 plus—										
$720 and over		170.60	162.50	154.40	146.30	138.30	130.20	122.10	114.00	106.00	97.90	89.80

“If the payroll period with respect to an employee is biweekly and he is married—

“And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$8	14% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$8	$10	$0.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$10	$12	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$12	$14	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$14	$16	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$16	$18	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$18	$20	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$20	$22	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$22	$24	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$26	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$26	$28	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$30	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$30	$32	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0
$32	$34	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$34	$36	3.80	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$38	4.10	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$38	$40	4.40	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$42	4.70	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$42	$44	4.90	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$46	5.20	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$46	$48	5.50	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$50	5.80	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$50	$52	6.10	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$54	6.40	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$54	$56	6.70	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$58	7.00	3.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$58	$60	7.30	3.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$62	7.60	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$62	$64	7.90	4.00	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$66	8.20	4.30	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$66	$68	8.50	4.50	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$70	8.80	4.80	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$70	$72	9.10	5.10	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$74	9.40	5.40	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$74	$76	9.70	5.70	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$78	10.00	6.00	2.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$78	$80	10.30	6.30	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$82	10.60	6.60	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$82	$84	10.90	6.90	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$86	11.20	7.20	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$86	$88	11.50	7.50	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$88	$90	11.80	7.80	3.80	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$90	$92	12.10	8.10	4.10	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$92	$94	12.40	8.40	4.40	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$94	$96	12.70	8.70	4.70	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$96	$98	13.00	9.00	5.00	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$98	$100	13.30	9.30	5.20	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$100	$102	13.60	9.60	5.50	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$102	$104	13.90	9.90	5.80	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$104	$106	14.20	10.20	6.10	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$106	$108	14.50	10.50	6.40	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$108	$110	14.80	10.80	6.70	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$110	$112	15.10	11.10	7.00	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$112	$114	15.40	11.40	7.30	3.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$114	$116	15.70	11.70	7.60	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$116	$118	16.00	12.00	7.90	4.00	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$118	$120	16.30	12.30	8.20	4.30	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$120	$124	16.80	12.70	8.70	4.70	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$124	$128	17.40	13.30	9.30	5.30	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$128	$132	18.00	13.90	9.90	5.80	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
$132	$136	18.60	14.50	10.50	6.40	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$136	$140	19.20	15.10	11.10	7.00	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$140	$144	19.80	15.70	11.70	7.60	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
$144	$148	20.40	16.30	12.30	8.20	4.30	.50	0	0	0	0	0
$148	$152	21.00	16.90	12.90	8.80	4.80	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$152	$156	21.60	17.50	13.50	9.40	5.40	1.60	0	0	0	0	0
$156	$160	22.20	18.10	14.10	10.00	6.00	2.20	0	0	0	0	0
$160	$164	22.80	18.70	14.70	10.60	6.60	2.80	0	0	0	0	0
$164	$168	23.40	19.30	15.30	11.20	7.20	3.30	0	0	0	0	0
$168	$172	24.00	19.90	15.90	11.80	7.80	3.90	.10	0	0	0	0
$172	$176	24.70	20.50	16.50	12.40	8.40	4.40	.70	0	0	0	0
$176	$180	25.30	21.10	17.10	13.00	9.00	5.00	1.20	0	0	0	0
$180	$184	26.00	21.70	17.70	13.60	9.60	5.60	1.80	0	0	0	0
$184	$188	26.70	22.30	18.30	14.20	10.20	6.20	2.30	0	0	0	0
$188	$192	27.40	22.90	18.90	14.80	10.80	6.80	2.90	0	0	0	0
$192	$196	28.10	23.50	19.50	15.40	11.40	7.40	3.50	0	0	0	0
$196	$200	28.70	24.20	20.10	16.00	12.00	8.00	4.00	.30	0	0	0
$200	$210	29.90	25.40	21.10	17.10	13.10	9.00	5.00	1.20	0	0	0
$210	$220	31.60	27.10	22.60	18.60	14.60	10.50	6.50	2.60	0	0	0
$220	$230	33.30	28.80	24.20	20.10	16.10	12.00	8.00	4.00	.30	0	0
$230	$240	35.00	30.50	25.90	21.60	17.60	13.50	9.50	5.40	1.70	0	0
$240	$250	36.70	32.20	27.60	23.10	19.10	15.00	11.00	6.90	3.10	0	0
$250	$260	38.40	33.90	29.30	24.70	20.60	16.50	12.50	8.40	4.50	.70	0
$260	$270	40.10	35.60	31.00	26.40	22.10	18.00	14.00	9.90	5.90	2.10	0
$270	$280	41.80	37.30	32.70	28.10	23.60	19.50	15.50	11.40	7.40	3.50	0
$280	$290	43.50	39.00	34.40	29.80	25.20	21.00	17.00	12.90	8.90	4.90	1.10
$290	$300	45.20	40.70	36.10	31.50	26.90	22.50	18.50	14.40	10.40	6.40	2.50
$300	$320	47.80	43.20	38.60	34.00	29.50	24.90	20.70	16.70	12.70	8.60	4.60
$320	$340	51.20	46.60	42.00	37.40	32.90	28.30	23.70	19.70	15.70	11.60	7.60
$340	$360	54.90	50.00	45.40	40.80	36.30	31.70	27.10	22.70	18.70	14.60	10.60
$360	$380	58.90	53.50	48.80	44.20	39.70	35.10	30.50	25.90	21.70	17.60	13.60
$380	$400	62.90	57.50	52.20	47.60	43.10	38.50	33.90	29.30	24.80	20.60	16.60
$400	$420	66.90	61.50	56.20	51.00	46.50	41.90	37.30	32.70	28.20	23.60	19.60
$420	$440	70.90	65.50	60.20	54.80	49.90	45.30	40.70	36.10	31.60	27.00	22.60
$440	$460	74.90	69.50	64.20	58.80	53.40	48.70	44.10	39.50	35.00	30.40	25.80
$460	$480	78.90	73.50	68.20	62.80	57.40	52.10	47.50	42.90	38.40	33.80	29.20
$480	$500	82.90	77.50	72.20	66.80	61.40	56.00	50.90	46.30	41.80	37.20	32.60
$500	$520	86.90	81.50	76.20	70.80	65.40	60.00	54.60	49.70	45.20	40.60	36.00
$520	$540	90.90	85.50	80.20	74.80	69.40	64.00	58.60	53.20	48.60	44.00	39.40
$540	$560	94.90	89.50	84.20	78.80	73.40	68.00	62.60	57.20	52.00	47.40	42.80
$560	$580	98.90	93.50	88.20	82.80	77.40	72.00	66.60	61.20	55.80	50.80	46.20

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is biweekly and he is married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$580	$600	$102.90	$97.50	$92.20	$86.80	$81.40	$76.00	$70.60	$65.20	$59.80	$54.50	$49.60
$600	$620	106.90	101.50	96.20	90.80	85.40	80.00	74.60	69.29	63.80	58.50	53.10
$620	$640	110.90	105.50	100.20	94.80	89.40	84.00	78.60	73.20	67.80	62.50	57.10
$640	$660	114.90	109.50	104.20	98.80	93.40	88.00	82.60	77.20	71.80	66.50	61.10
$660	$680	118.90	113.50	108.20	102.80	97.40	92.00	86.60	81.20	75.80	70.50	65.10
$680	$700	123.40	117.50	112.20	106.80	101.40	96.00	90.60	85.20	79.80	74.50	69.10
$700	$720	128.40	121.70	116.20	110.80	105.40	100.00	94.60	89.20	83.80	78.50	73.10
$720	$740	133.40	126.70	120.20	114.80	109.40	104.00	98.60	93.20	87.80	82.50	77.10
$740	$760	138.40	131.70	124.90	118.80	113.40	108.00	102.60	97.20	91.80	86.50	81.10
$760	$780	143.40	136.70	129.90	123.20	117.40	112.00	106.60	101.20	95.80	90.50	85.10
$780	$800	148.40	141.70	134.90	128.20	121.50	116.00	110.60	105.20	99.80	94.50	89.10
$800	$820	153.40	146.70	139.90	133.20	126.50	120.00	114.60	109.20	103.80	98.50	93.10
$820	$840	158.40	151.70	144.90	138.20	131.50	124.70	118.60	113.20	107.80	102.50	97.10
$840	$860	163.60	156.70	149.90	143.20	136.50	129.70	123.00	117.20	111.80	106.50	101.10
$860	$880	169.60	161.70	154.90	148.20	141.50	134.70	128.00	121.30	115.80	110.50	105.10
$880	$900	175.60	167.50	159.90	153.20	146.50	139.70	133.00	126.30	119.80	114.50	109.10
$900	$920	181.60	173.50	165.40	158.20	151.50	144.70	138.00	131.30	124.50	118.50	113.10
$920	$940	187.60	179.50	171.40	163.30	156.50	149.70	143.00	136.30	129.50	122.80	117.10
$940	$960	193.60	185.50	177.40	169.30	161.50	154.70	148.00	141.30	134.50	127.80	121.10
$960	$980	199.60	191.50	183.40	175.30	167.30	159.70	153.00	146.30	139.50	132.80	126.10
$980	$1,000	205.60	197.50	189.40	181.30	173.30	165.20	158.00	151.30	144.50	137.80	131.10
$1,000	$1,020	211.60	203.50	195.40	187.30	179.30	171.20	163.10	156.30	149.50	142.80	136.10
$1,020	$1,040	217.60	209.50	201.40	193.30	185.30	177.20	169.10	161.30	154.50	147.80	141.10
$1,040	$1,060	223.60	215.50	207.40	199.30	191.30	183.20	175.10	167.00	159.50	152.80	146.10
$1,060	$1,080	229.60	221.50	213.40	205.30	197.30	189.20	181.10	173.00	165.00	157.80	151.10
$1,080	$1,100	235.60	227.50	219.40	211.30	203.30	195.20	187.10	179.00	171.00	162.90	156.10
$1,100	$1,120	241.60	233.50	225.40	217.30	209.30	201.20	193.10	185.00	177.00	168.90	161.10
$1,120	$1,140	247.60	239.50	231.40	223.30	215.30	207.20	199.10	191.00	183.00	174.90	166.80
		30 percent of the excess over $1,140 plus—										
$1,140 and over		250.60	242.50	234.40	226.30	218.30	210.20	202.10	194.00	186.00	177.90	169.80

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly and he is not married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$8	14% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$8	$10	$0.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$10	$12	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$12	$14	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$14	$16	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$16	$18	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$18	$20	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$20	$22	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$22	$24	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$26	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$26	$28	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$30	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$30	$32	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$32	$34	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$34	$36	3.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$38	4.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$38	$40	4.40	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$42	4.70	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$42	$44	5.00	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$46	5.30	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$46	$48	5.60	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$50	5.90	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$50	$52	6.20	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$54	6.60	2.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$54	$56	6.90	2.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$58	7.20	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$58	$60	7.60	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$62	7.90	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$62	$64	8.30	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$66	8.60	3.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$66	$68	8.90	4.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$70	9.30	4.50	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$70	$72	9.60	4.80	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$74	10.00	5.01	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$74	$76	10.30	5.40	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$78	10.60	5.70	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$78	$80	11.00	6.00	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$82	11.30	6.40	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$82	$84	11.70	6.70	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$86	12.00	7.00	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$86	$88	12.30	7.40	2.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$88	$90	12.70	7.70	3.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$90	$92	13.00	8.10	3.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$92	$94	13.40	8.40	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$94	$96	13.70	8.70	4.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$96	$98	14.00	9.10	4.30	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$98	$100	14.40	9.40	4.60	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$100	$102	14.70	9.80	4.90	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$102	$104	15.10	10.10	5.20	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$104	$106	15.40	10.40	5.50	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$106	$108	15.70	10.80	5.80	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$108	$110	16.10	11.10	6.20	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

“If the payroll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly and he is not married—

“And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$110	$112	$16.40	$11.50	$6.50	$2.10	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$112	$114	16.80	11.80	6.80	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$114	$116	17.10	12.10	7.20	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$116	$118	17.40	12.50	7.50	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$118	$120	17.80	12.80	7.90	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$120	$124	18.30	13.30	8.40	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$124	$128	19.00	14.00	9.00	4.30	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$128	$132	19.60	14.70	9.70	4.90	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
$132	$136	20.30	15.40	10.40	5.50	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$136	$140	21.00	16.00	11.10	6.10	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$140	$144	21.70	16.70	11.80	6.80	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0
$144	$148	22.40	17.40	12.40	7.50	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$148	$152	23.00	18.10	13.10	8.20	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$152	$156	23.70	18.80	13.80	8.80	4.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$156	$160	24.40	19.40	14.50	9.50	4.70	.50	0	0	0	0	0
$160	$164	25.10	20.10	15.20	10.20	5.30	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$164	$168	25.80	20.80	15.80	10.90	5.90	1.70	0	0	0	0	0
$168	$172	26.40	21.50	16.50	11.60	6.60	2.20	0	0	0	0	0
$172	$176	27.10	22.20	17.20	12.20	7.30	2.80	0	0	0	0	0
$176	$180	27.80	22.80	17.90	12.90	8.00	3.40	0	0	0	0	0
$180	$184	28.50	23.50	18.60	13.60	8.60	4.00	0	0	0	0	0
$184	$188	29.20	24.20	19.20	14.30	9.30	4.60	.40	0	0	0	0
$188	$192	30.00	24.90	19.90	15.00	10.00	5.20	.90	0	0	0	0
$192	$196	30.80	25.60	20.60	15.60	10.70	5.80	1.50	0	0	0	0
$196	$200	31.60	26.20	21.30	16.30	11.40	6.40	2.10	0	0	0	0
$200	$210	33.00	27.40	22.50	17.50	12.60	7.60	3.00	0	0	0	0
$210	$220	35.00	29.20	24.20	19.20	14.30	9.30	4.50	.40	0	0	0
$220	$230	37.00	31.20	25.90	20.90	16.00	11.00	6.00	1.80	0	0	0
$230	$240	39.00	33.20	27.60	22.60	17.70	12.70	7.70	3.20	0	0	0
$240	$250	41.00	35.20	29.40	24.30	19.40	14.40	9.40	4.70	.50	0	0
$250	$260	43.00	37.20	31.40	26.00	21.10	16.10	11.10	6.20	1.90	0	0
$260	$270	45.00	39.20	33.40	27.70	22.80	17.80	12.80	7.90	3.30	0	0
$270	$280	47.00	41.20	35.40	29.50	24.50	19.50	14.50	9.60	4.80	.60	0
$280	$290	49.00	43.20	37.40	31.50	26.20	21.20	16.20	11.30	6.30	2.00	0
$290	$300	51.00	45.20	39.40	33.50	27.90	22.90	17.90	13.00	8.00	3.40	0
$300	$320	54.00	48.20	42.40	36.50	30.70	25.50	20.50	15.50	10.60	5.70	1.40
$320	$340	58.00	52.20	46.40	40.50	34.70	28.90	23.90	18.90	14.00	9.00	4.30
$340	$360	62.00	56.20	50.40	44.50	38.70	32.90	27.30	22.30	17.40	12.40	7.50
$360	$380	66.20	60.20	54.40	48.50	42.70	36.90	31.00	25.70	20.80	15.80	10.90
$380	$400	71.20	64.20	58.40	52.50	46.70	40.90	35.00	29.20	24.20	19.20	14.30
$400	$420	76.20	68.90	62.40	56.50	50.70	44.90	39.00	33.20	27.60	22.60	17.70
$420	$440	81.20	73.90	66.60	60.50	54.70	48.90	43.00	37.20	31.40	26.00	21.10
$440	$460	86.20	78.90	71.60	64.50	58.70	52.90	47.00	41.20	35.40	29.50	24.50
$460	$480	91.80	83.90	76.60	69.30	62.70	56.90	51.00	45.20	39.40	33.50	27.90
$480	$500	97.80	89.00	81.60	74.30	67.00	60.90	55.00	49.20	43.40	37.50	31.70
$500	$520	103.80	95.00	86.60	79.30	72.00	64.90	59.00	53.20	47.40	41.50	35.70
$520	$540	109.80	101.00	92.30	84.30	77.00	69.80	63.00	57.20	51.40	45.50	39.70
$540	$560	115.80	107.00	98.30	89.50	82.00	74.80	67.50	61.20	55.40	49.50	43.70
$560	$580	121.80	113.00	104.30	95.50	87.00	79.80	72.50	65.20	59.40	53.50	47.70
$580	$600	127.80	119.00	110.30	101.50	92.80	84.80	77.50	70.20	63.40	57.50	51.70
$600	$620	133.80	125.00	116.30	107.50	98.80	90.00	82.50	75.20	67.90	61.50	55.70
$620	$640	139.80	131.00	122.30	113.50	104.80	96.00	87.50	80.20	72.90	65.60	59.70
$640	$660	145.80	137.00	128.30	119.50	110.80	102.00	93.30	85.20	77.90	70.60	63.70
$660	$680	151.80	143.00	134.30	125.50	116.80	108.00	99.30	90.50	82.90	75.60	68.30
$680	$700	157.80	149.00	140.30	131.50	122.80	114.00	105.30	96.50	87.90	80.60	73.30
$700	$720	163.80	155.00	146.30	137.50	128.80	120.00	111.30	102.50	93.80	85.60	78.30
$720	$740	169.80	161.00	152.30	143.50	134.80	126.00	117.30	108.50	99.80	91.00	83.30
$740	$760	175.80	167.00	158.30	149.50	140.80	132.00	123.30	114.50	105.80	97.00	88.30
		30 percent of the excess over $760 plus—										
$760 and over		178.80	170.00	161.30	152.50	143.80	135.00	126.30	117.50	108.80	100.00	91.30

“If the payroll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly and he is married—

“And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$8	14% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$8	$10	$0.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$10	$12	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$12	$14	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$14	$16	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$16	$18	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$18	$20	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$20	$22	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$22	$24	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$26	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$26	$28	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$30	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$30	$32	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$32	$34	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$34	$36	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$38	4.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$38	$40	4.30	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$42	4.60	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$42	$44	4.90	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$46	5.10	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$46	$48	5.40	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$50	5.70	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly and he is married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$50	$52	$6.00	$1.90	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$52	$54	6.30	2.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$54	$56	6.60	2.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$58	6.90	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$58	$60	7.20	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$62	7.50	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$62	$64	7.80	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$66	8.10	3.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$66	$68	8.40	4.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$70	8.70	4.40	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$70	$72	9.00	4.70	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$74	9.30	5.00	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$74	$76	9.60	5.30	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$78	9.90	5.50	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$78	$80	10.20	5.80	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$82	10.50	6.10	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$82	$84	10.80	6.40	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$86	11.10	6.70	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$86	$88	11.40	7.00	2.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$88	$90	11.70	7.30	3.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$90	$92	12.00	7.60	3.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$92	$94	12.30	7.90	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$94	$96	12.60	8.20	4.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$96	$98	12.90	8.50	4.20	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$98	$100	13.20	8.80	4.50	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$100	$102	13.50	9.10	4.80	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$102	$104	13.80	9.40	5.10	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$104	$106	14.10	9.70	5.40	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$106	$108	14.40	10.00	5.60	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$108	$110	14.70	10.30	5.90	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$110	$112	15.00	10.60	6.20	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$112	$114	15.30	10.90	6.50	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$114	$116	15.60	11.20	6.80	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$116	$118	15.90	11.50	7.10	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$118	$120	16.20	11.80	7.40	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$120	$124	16.60	12.30	7.90	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$124	$128	17.20	12.90	8.50	4.20	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$128	$132	17.80	13.50	9.10	4.80	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
$132	$136	18.40	14.10	9.70	5.30	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$136	$140	19.00	14.70	10.30	5.90	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$140	$144	19.60	15.30	10.90	6.50	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0
$144	$148	20.20	15.90	11.50	7.10	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$148	$152	20.80	16.50	12.10	7.70	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$152	$156	21.40	17.10	12.70	8.30	4.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$156	$160	22.00	17.70	13.30	8.90	4.60	.50	0	0	0	0	0
$160	$164	22.60	18.30	13.90	9.50	5.20	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$164	$168	23.20	18.90	14.50	10.10	5.70	1.70	0	0	0	0	0
$168	$172	23.80	19.50	15.10	10.70	6.30	2.20	0	0	0	0	0
$172	$176	24.40	20.10	15.70	11.30	6.90	2.80	0	0	0	0	0
$176	$180	25.00	20.70	16.30	11.90	7.50	3.30	0	0	0	0	0
$180	$184	25.60	21.30	16.90	12.50	8.10	3.90	0	0	0	0	0
$184	$188	26.30	21.90	17.50	13.10	8.70	4.50	.40	0	0	0	0
$188	$192	27.00	22.50	18.10	13.70	9.30	5.00	.90	0	0	0	0
$192	$196	27.60	23.10	18.70	14.30	9.90	5.60	1.50	0	0	0	0
$196	$200	28.30	23.70	19.30	14.90	10.50	6.20	2.10	0	0	0	0
$200	$210	29.50	24.70	20.30	16.00	11.60	7.20	3.00	0	0	0	0
$210	$220	31.20	26.30	21.80	17.50	13.10	8.70	4.40	.40	0	0	0
$220	$230	32.90	28.00	23.30	19.00	14.60	10.20	5.80	1.80	0	0	0
$230	$240	34.60	29.70	24.80	20.50	16.10	11.70	7.30	3.20	0	0	0
$240	$250	36.30	31.40	26.40	22.00	17.60	13.20	8.80	4.60	.50	0	0
$250	$260	38.00	33.10	28.10	23.50	19.10	14.70	10.30	6.00	1.90	0	0
$260	$270	39.70	34.80	29.80	25.00	20.60	16.20	11.80	7.50	3.30	0	0
$270	$280	41.40	36.50	31.50	26.50	22.10	17.70	13.30	9.00	4.70	0.60	0
$280	$290	43.10	38.20	33.20	28.20	23.60	19.20	14.80	10.50	6.10	2.00	0
$290	$300	44.80	39.90	34.90	29.90	25.10	20.70	16.30	12.00	7.60	3.40	0
$300	$320	47.40	42.40	37.50	32.50	27.50	23.00	18.60	14.20	9.80	5.50	1.40
$320	$340	50.80	45.80	40.90	35.90	30.90	26.00	21.60	17.20	12.80	8.50	4.20
$340	$360	54.20	49.20	44.30	39.30	34.30	29.40	24.60	20.20	15.80	11.50	7.10
$360	$380	57.70	52.60	47.70	42.70	37.70	32.80	27.80	23.20	18.80	14.50	10.10
$380	$400	61.70	56.00	51.10	46.10	41.10	36.20	31.20	26.30	21.80	17.50	13.10
$400	$420	65.70	59.80	54.50	49.50	44.50	39.60	34.60	29.70	24.80	20.50	16.10
$420	$440	69.70	63.80	58.00	52.90	47.90	43.00	38.00	33.10	28.10	23.50	19.10
$440	$460	73.70	67.80	62.00	56.30	51.30	46.40	41.40	36.50	31.50	26.50	22.10
$460	$480	77.70	71.80	66.00	60.20	54.70	49.80	44.80	39.90	34.90	29.90	25.10
$480	$500	81.70	75.80	70.00	64.20	58.30	53.20	48.20	43.30	38.30	33.30	28.40
$500	$520	85.70	79.80	74.00	68.20	62.30	56.60	51.60	46.70	41.70	36.70	31.80
$520	$540	89.70	83.80	78.00	72.20	66.30	60.50	55.00	50.10	45.10	40.10	35.20
$540	$560	93.70	87.80	82.00	76.20	70.30	64.50	58.70	53.50	48.50	43.50	38.60
$560	$580	97.70	91.80	86.00	80.20	74.30	68.50	62.70	56.90	51.90	46.90	42.00
$580	$600	101.70	95.80	90.00	84.20	78.30	72.50	66.70	60.80	55.30	50.30	45.40
$600	$620	105.70	99.80	94.00	88.20	82.30	76.50	70.70	64.80	59.00	53.70	48.80
$620	$640	109.70	103.80	98.00	92.20	86.30	80.50	74.70	68.80	63.00	57.20	52.20
$640	$660	113.70	107.80	102.00	96.20	90.30	84.50	78.70	72.80	67.00	61.20	55.60
$660	$680	117.70	111.80	106.00	100.20	94.30	88.50	82.70	76.80	71.00	65.20	59.30
$680	$700	121.70	115.80	110.00	104.20	98.30	92.50	86.70	80.80	75.00	69.20	63.30
$700	$720	125.70	119.80	114.00	108.20	102.30	96.50	90.70	84.80	79.00	73.20	67.30
$720	$740	129.70	123.80	118.00	112.20	106.30	100.50	94.70	88.80	83.00	77.20	71.30
$740	$760	134.30	127.80	122.00	116.20	110.30	104.50	98.70	92.80	87.00	81.20	75.30
$760	$780	139.30	132.00	126.00	120.20	114.30	108.50	102.70	96.80	91.00	85.20	79.30
$780	$800	144.30	137.00	130.00	124.20	118.30	112.50	106.70	100.80	95.00	89.20	83.30
$800	$820	149.30	142.00	134.70	128.20	122.30	116.50	110.70	104.80	99.00	93.20	87.30
$820	$840	154.30	147.00	139.70	132.40	126.30	120.50	114.70	108.80	103.00	97.20	91.30
$840	$860	159.30	152.00	144.70	137.42	130.30	124.50	118.70	112.80	107.00	101.20	95.30
$860	$880	164.30	157.00	149.70	142.40	135.10	128.50	122.70	116.80	111.00	105.20	99.30
$880	$900	169.30	162.00	154.70	147.40	140.10	132.80	126.70	120.80	115.00	109.20	103.30
$900	$920	174.30	167.00	159.70	152.40	145.10	137.80	130.70	124.80	119.00	113.20	107.30
$920	$940	180.00	172.00	164.70	157.40	150.10	142.80	135.50	128.80	123.00	117.20	111.30
$940	$960	186.00	177.20	169.70	162.40	155.10	147.80	140.50	133.30	127.00	121.20	115.30
$960	$980	192.00	188.20	174.70	167.40	160.10	152.80	145.50	138.30	131.00	125.20	119.30
$980	$1,000	198.00	189.20	180.50	172.40	165.10	157.80	150.50	143.30	136.00	129.20	123.30
$1,000	$1,020	204.00	195.20	186.50	177.70	170.10	162.80	155.50	148.30	141.00	133.70	127.30
$1,020	$1,040	210.00	201.20	192.50	183.70	175.10	167.80	160.50	153.30	146.00	138.70	131.40

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly and he is married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$1,040	$1,060	$216.00	$207.20	$198.50	$189.70	$181.00	$172.80	$165.50	$158.30	$151.00	$143.70	$136.40
$1,060	$1,080	222.00	213.20	204.50	195.70	187.00	178.20	170.50	163.30	156.00	148.70	141.40
$1,080	$1,100	228.00	219.20	210.50	201.70	193.00	184.20	175.50	168.30	161.00	153.70	146.40
$1,100	$1,120	234.00	225.20	216.50	207.70	199.00	190.20	181.50	173.30	166.00	158.70	151.40
$1,120	$1,140	240.00	231.20	222.50	213.70	205.00	196.20	187.50	178.70	171.00	163.70	156.40
$1,140	$1,160	246.00	237.20	228.50	219.70	211.00	202.20	193.50	184.70	176.00	168.70	161.40
$1,160	$1,180	252.00	243.20	234.50	225.70	217.00	208.20	199.50	190.70	182.00	173.70	166.40
$1,180	$1,200	258.00	249.20	240.50	231.70	223.00	214.20	205.50	196.70	188.00	179.20	171.40
$1,200	$1,220	264.00	255.20	246.50	237.70	229.00	220.20	211.50	202.70	194.00	185.20	176.50
		30 percent of the excess over $1,220 plus—										
$1,220 and over		267.00	258.20	249.50	240.70	232.00	223.20	214.50	205.70	197.00	188.20	179.50

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is monthly and he is not married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$16	14% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$16	$20	$0.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$20	$24	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$28	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$32	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$32	$36	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$40	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$44	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$48	4.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$52	4.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$56	5.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$60	5.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$64	6.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$68	7.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$72	7.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$76	8.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$80	8.80	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$84	9.40	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$88	10.00	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$88	$92	10.60	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$92	$96	11.20	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$96	$100	11.80	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$100	$104	12.40	3.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$104	$108	13.10	4.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$108	$112	13.80	4.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$112	$116	14.50	5.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$116	$120	15.10	6.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$120	$124	15.80	6.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$124	$128	16.50	7.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$128	$132	17.20	7.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$132	$136	17.90	8.40	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$136	$140	18.50	9.00	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$140	$144	19.20	9.60	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$144	$148	19.90	10.20	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$148	$152	20.60	10.80	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$152	$156	21.30	11.40	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$156	$160	21.90	12.00	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$160	$164	22.60	12.70	4.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$164	$168	23.30	13.40	4.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$168	$172	24.00	14.10	5.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$172	$176	24.70	14.70	5.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$176	$180	25.30	15.40	6.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$180	$184	26.00	16.10	6.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$184	$188	26.70	16.80	7.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$188	$192	27.40	17.50	8.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$192	$196	28.10	18.10	8.70	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$196	$200	28.70	18.80	9.30	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$200	$204	29.40	19.50	9.90	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$204	$208	30.10	20.20	10.50	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$208	$212	30.80	20.90	11.10	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$212	$216	31.50	21.50	11.70	3.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$216	$220	32.10	22.20	12.30	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$220	$224	32.80	22.90	13.00	4.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$224	$228	33.50	23.60	13.70	4.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$228	$232	34.20	24.30	14.40	5.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$232	$236	34.90	24.90	15.00	5.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$236	$240	35.50	25.60	15.70	6.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$240	$248	36.60	26.60	16.70	7.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$248	$256	37.90	28.00	18.10	8.60	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$256	$264	39.30	29.40	19.50	9.80	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0
$264	$272	40.60	30.70	20.80	11.00	2.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$272	$280	42.00	32.10	22.20	12.30	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$280	$288	43.40	33.40	23.50	13.60	4.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$288	$296	44.70	34.80	24.90	15.00	5.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$296	$304	46.10	36.20	26.30	16.30	7.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$304	$312	47.40	37.50	27.60	17.70	8.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$312	$320	48.80	38.90	29.00	19.10	9.50	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$320	$328	50.20	40.20	30.30	20.40	10.70	2.20	0	0	0	0	0
$328	$336	51.50	41.60	31.70	21.80	11.90	3.30	0	0	0	0	0
$336	$344	52.90	43.00	33.10	23.10	13.20	4.40	0	0	0	0	0
$344	$352	54.20	44.30	34.40	24.50	14.60	5.60	0	0	0	0	0

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is monthly and he is not married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$352	$360	$55.60	$45.70	$35.80	$25.90	$15.90	$6.70	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$360	$368	57.00	47.00	37.10	27.20	17.30	7.90	0	0	0	0	0
$368	$376	58.50	48.40	38.50	28.60	18.70	9.10	.70	0	0	0	0
$376	$384	60.10	49.80	39.90	29.90	20,00	10.30	1.90	0	0	0	0
$384	$392	61.70	51.10	41.20	31.30	21.40	11.50	3.00	0	0	0	0
$392	$400	63.30	52.50	42.60	32.70	22.70	12.80	4.10	0	0	0	0
$400	$420	66.10	54.90	45.00	35.00	25.10	15.20	6.10	0	0	0	0
$420	$440	70.10	58.40	48.40	38.40	28.50	18.60	9.10	.70	0	0	0
$440	$460	74.10	62.40	51.80	41.80	31.90	22.00	12.10	3.50	0	0	0
$460	$480	78.10	66.40	55.20	45.20	35.30	25.40	15.50	6.30	0	0	0
$480	$500	82.10	70.40	58.80	48.60	38.70	28.80	18.90	9.30	.90	0	0
$500	$520	86.10	74.40	62.80	52.00	42.10	32.20	22.30	12.40	3.70	0	0
$520	$540	90.10	78.40	66.80	55.40	45.50	35.60	25.70	15.80	6.60	0	0
$540	$560	94.10	82.40	70.80	59.10	48.90	39.00	29.10	19.20	9.60	1.20	0
$560	$580	98.10	86.40	74.80	63.10	52.30	42.40	32.50	22.60	12.70	4.00	0
$580	$600	102.10	90.40	78.80	67.10	55.70	45.80	35.90	26.00	16.10	6.80	0
$600	$640	108.10	96.40	84.80	73.10	61.40	50.90	41.00	31.10	21.20	11.30	2.80
$640	$680	116.10	104.40	92.80	81.10	69.40	57.80	47.80	37.90	28.00	18.00	8.60
$680	$720	124.10	112.40	100.80	89.10	77.40	65.80	54.60	44.70	34.80	24.80	14.90
$720	$760	132.40	120.40	108.80	97.10	85.40	73.80	62.10	51.50	41.60	31.60	21.70
$760	$800	142.40	128.40	116.80	105.10	93.40	81.80	70.10	58.40	48.40	38.40	28.50
$800	$840	152.40	137.80	124.80	113.10	101.40	89.80	78.10	66.40	55.20	45.20	35.30
$840	$880	162.40	147.80	133.30	121.10	109.40	97.80	86.10	74.40	62.80	52.00	42.10
$880	$920	172.40	157.80	143.30	129.10	117.40	105.80	94.10	82.40	70.80	59.10	48.90
$920	$960	183.60	167.80	153.30	138.70	125.40	113.80	102.10	90.40	78.80	67.10	55.70
$960	$1,000	195.60	178.10	163.30	148.70	134.10	121.80	110.10	98.40	86.80	75.10	63.40
$1,000	$1,040	207.60	190.10	173.30	158.70	144.10	129.80	118.10	106.40	94.80	83.10	71.40
$1,040	$1,080	219.60	202.10	184.60	168.70	154.10	139.50	126.10	114.40	102.80	91.10	79.40
$1,080	$1,120	231.60	214.10	196.60	179.10	164.10	149.50	134.90	122.40	110.80	99.10	87.40
$1,120	$1,160	243.60	226.10	208.60	191.10	174.10	159.50	144.90	130.40	118.80	107.10	95.40
$1,160	$1,200	255.60	238.10	220.60	203.10	185.60	169.50	154.90	140.30	126.80	115.10	103.40
$1,200	$1,240	267.60	250.10	232.60	215.10	197.60	180.10	164.90	150.30	135.80	123.10	111.40
$1,240	$1,280	279.60	262.10	244.60	277.10	209.60	192.10	174.90	160.30	145.80	131.20	119.40
$1,280	$1,320	291.60	274.10	256.60	239.10	221.60	204.10	186.60	170.30	155.80	141.20	127.40
$1,320	$1,360	303.60	286.10	268.60	251.10	233.60	216.10	198.60	181.10	165.80	151.20	136.60
$1,360	$1,400	315.60	298.10	280.60	263.10	245.60	228.10	210.60	193.10	175.80	161.20	146.60
$1,400	$1,440	327.60	310.10	292.60	275.10	257.60	240.10	222.60	205.10	187.60	171.20	156.60
$1,440	$1,480	339.60	322.10	304.60	287.10	269.60	252.10	234.60	217.10	199.60	182.10	166.60
$1,480	$1,520	351.60	334.10	316.60	299.10	281.60	264.10	246.60	229.10	211.60	194.10	176.60
		30 percent of the excess over $1,520 plus—										
$1,520 and over		357.60	340.10	322.60	305.10	287.60	270.10	252.60	235.10	217.60	200.10	182.60

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is monthly and he is married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$16	14% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$16	$20	$0.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$20	$24	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$28	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$32	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$32	$36	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$40	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$44	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$48	4.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$52	4.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$56	5.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$60	5.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$64	6.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$68	6.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$72	7.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$76	8.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$80	8.60	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$84	9.10	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$88	9.70	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$88	$92	10.30	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$92	$96	10.80	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$96	$100	11.40	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$100	$104	12.00	3.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$104	$108	12.60	4.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$108	$112	13.20	4.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$112	$116	13.80	5.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$116	$120	14.40	6.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$120	$124	15.00	6.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$124	$128	15.60	7.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$128	$132	16.20	7.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$132	$136	16.80	8.30	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$136	$140	17.40	8.80	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$140	$144	18.00	9.40	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$144	$148	18.60	9.90	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$148	$152	19.20	10.50	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$152	$156	19.80	11.10	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$156	$160	20.40	11.60	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$160	$164	21.00	12.20	4.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$164	$168	21.60	12.80	4.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$168	$172	22.20	13.40	5.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is monthly and he is married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$172	$176	$22.80	$14.00	$5.70	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$176	$180	23.40	14.60	6.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$180	$184	24.00	15.20	6.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$184	$188	24.60	15.80	7.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$188	$192	25.20	16.40	7.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$192	$196	25.80	17.00	8.50	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$196	$200	26.40	17.60	9.10	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$200	$204	27.00	18.20	9.60	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$204	$208	27.60	18.80	10.20	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$208	$212	28.20	19.40	10.70	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$212	$216	28.80	20.00	11.30	3.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$216	$220	29.40	20.60	11.90	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$220	$224	30.00	21.20	12.50	4.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$224	$228	30.60	21.80	13.10	4.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$228	$232	31.20	22.40	13.70	5.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$232	$236	31.80	23.00	14.30	5.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$236	$240	32.40	23.60	14.90	6.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$240	$248	33.30	24.50	15.80	7.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$248	$256	34.50	25.70	17.00	8.40	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$256	$264	35.70	26.90	18.20	9.60	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0
$264	$272	36.90	28.10	19.40	10.70	2.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$272	$280	38.10	29.30	20.60	11.80	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$280	$288	39.30	30.50	21.80	13.00	4.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$288	$296	40.50	31.70	23.00	14.20	5.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$296	$304	41.70	32.90	24.20	15.40	7.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
$304	$312	42.90	34.10	25.40	16.60	8.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$312	$320	44.10	35.30	26.60	17.80	9.20	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$320	$328	45.30	36.50	27.80	19.00	10.40	2.20	0	0	0	0	0
$328	$336	46.50	37.70	29.00	20.20	11.50	3.30	0	0	0	0	0
$336	$344	47.70	38.90	30.20	21.40	12.70	4.40	0	0	0	0	0
$344	$352	48.90	40.10	31.40	22.60	13.90	5.60	0	0	0	0	0
$352	$360	50.10	41.30	32.60	23.80	15.10	6.70	0	0	0	0	0
$360	$368	51.30	42.50	33.80	25.00	16.30	7.80	0	0	0	0	0
$368	$376	52.60	43.70	35.00	26.20	17.50	8.90	.70	0	0	0	0
$376	$384	53.90	44.90	36.20	27.40	18.70	10.00	1.90	0	0	0	0
$384	$392	55.30	46.10	37.40	28.60	19.90	11 20	3.00	0	0	0	0
$392	$400	56.70	47.30	38.60	29.80	21.10	12.30	4.10	0	0	0	0
$400	$420	59.00	49.40	40.70	31.90	23.20	14.40	6.10	0	0	0	0
$420	$440	62.40	52.50	43.70	34.90	26.20	17.40	8.90	.70	0	0	0
$440	$460	65.80	55.90	46.70	37.90	29.20	20.40	11.70	3.50	0	0	0
$460	$480	69.20	59.30	49.70	40.90	32.20	23.40	14.70	6.30	0	0	0
$480	$500	72.60	62.70	52.80	43.90	35.20	26.40	17.70	9.10	.90	0	0
$500	$520	76.00	66.10	56.20	46.90	38.20	29.40	20.70	11.90	3.70	0	0
$520	$540	79.40	69.50	59.60	49.90	41.20	32.40	23.70	14.90	6.50	0	0
$540	$560	82.80	72.90	63.00	53.10	44.20	35.40	26.70	17.90	9.30	1.20	0
$560	$580	86.20	76.30	66.40	56.50	47.20	38.40	29.70	20.90	12.20	4.00	0
$580	$600	89.60	79.70	69.80	59.90	50.20	41.40	32.70	23.90	15.20	6.80	0
$600	$640	94.70	84.80	74.90	65.00	55.10	45.90	37.20	28.40	19.70	11.00	2.80
$640	$680	101.50	91.60	81.70	71.80	61.90	52.00	43.20	34.40	25.70	16.90	8.40
$680	$720	108.30	98.40	88.50	78.60	68.70	58.80	49.20	40.40	31.70	22.90	14.20
$720	$760	115.30	105.20	95.30	85.40	75.50	65.60	55.60	46.40	37.70	28.90	20.20
$760	$800	123.30	112.00	102.10	92.20	82.30	72.40	62.40	52.50	43.70	34.90	26.20
$800	$840	131.30	119.70	108.90	99.00	89.10	79.20	69.20	59.30	49.70	40.90	32.20
$840	$880	139.30	127.70	116.00	105.80	95.90	86.00	76.00	66.10	56.20	46.90	38.20
$880	$920	147.30	135.70	124.00	112.60	102.70	92.80	82.80	72.90	63.00	53.10	44.20
$920	$960	155.30	143.70	132.00	120.30	109.50	99.60	89.60	79.70	69.80	59.90	50.20
$960	$1,000	163.30	151.70	140.00	128.30	116.70	106.40	96.40	86.50	76.60	66.70	56.80
$1,000	$1,040	171.30	159.70	148.00	136.30	124.70	113.20	103.20	93.30	83.40	73.50	63.60
$1,040	$1,080	179.30	167.70	156.00	144.30	132.70	121.00	110.00	100.10	90.20	80.30	70.40
$1,080	$1,120	187.30	175.70	164.00	152.30	140.70	129.00	117.30	106.90	97.00	87.10	77.20
$1,120	$1,160	195.30	183.70	172.00	160.30	148.70	137.00	125.30	113.70	103.80	93.90	84.00
$1,160	$1,200	203.30	191.70	180.00	168.30	156.70	145.00	133.30	121.70	110.60	100.70	90.80
$1,200	$1,240	211.30	199.70	188.00	176.30	164.70	153.00	141.30	129.70	118.00	107.50	97.60
$1,240	$1,280	219.30	207.70	196.00	184.30	172.70	161.00	149.30	137.70	126.00	114.30	104.40
$1,280	$1,320	227.30	215.70	204.00	192.30	180.70	169.00	157.30	145.70	134.00	122.30	111.20
$1,320	$1,360	235.30	223.70	212.00	200.30	188.70	177.00	165.30	153.70	142.00	130.30	118.70
$1,360	$1,400	243.30	231.70	220.00	208.30	196.70	185.00	173.30	161.70	150.00	138.30	126.70
$1,400	$1,440	251.30	239.70	228.00	216.30	204.70	193.00	181.30	169.70	158.00	146.30	134.70
$1,440	$1,480	259.30	247.70	236.00	224.30	212.70	201.00	189.30	177.70	166.00	154.30	142.70
$1,480	$1,520	268.60	255.70	244.00	232.30	220.70	209.00	197.30	185.70	174.00	162.30	150.70
$1,520	$1,560	278.60	264.00	252.00	240.30	228.70	217.00	205.30	193.70	182.00	170.30	158.70
$1,560	$1,600	288.60	274.00	260.00	248.30	236.70	225.00	213.30	201.70	190.00	178.30	166.70
$1,600	$1,640	298.60	284.00	269.40	256.30	244.70	233.00	221.30	209.70	198.00	186.30	174.70
$1,640	$1,680	308.60	294.00	279.40	264.80	252.70	241.00	229.30	217.70	206.00	194.30	182.70
$1,680	$1,720	318.60	304.00	289.40	274.80	260.70	249.00	237.30	225.70	214.00	202.30	190.70
$1,720	$1,760	328.60	314.00	299.40	284.80	270.30	257.00	245.30	233.70	222.00	210.30	198.70
$1,760	$1,800	338.60	324.00	309.40	294.80	280.30	5.70	253.30	241.70	230.00	218.30	206.70
$1,800	$1,840	348.60	334.00	319.40	304.80	290.30	275.70	261.30	249.70	238.00	226.30	214.70
$1,840	$1,880	359.90	344.00	329.40	314.80	300.30	285.70	271.10	257.70	246.00	234.30	222.70
$1,880	$1,920	371.90	354.40	339.40	324.80	310.30	295.70	281.10	266.50	254.00	242.30	230.70
$1,920	$1,960	383.90	366.40	349.40	334.80	320.30	305.70	291.10	276.50	262.00	250.30	238.70
$1,960	$2,000	395.90	378.40	360.90	344.80	330.30	315.70	301.10	286.50	271.90	258.30	246.70
$2,000	$2,040	407.90	390.40	372.90	355.40	340.30	325.70	311.10	296.50	281.90	267.30	254.70
$2,040	$2,080	419.90	402.40	384.90	367.40	350.30	335.70	321.10	306.50	291.90	277.30	262.80
$2,080	$2,120	431.90	414.40	396.90	379.40	361.90	345.70	331.10	316.50	301.90	287.30	272.80
$2,120	$2,160	443.90	426.40	408.90	391.40	373.90	356.40	341.10	326.50	311.90	297.30	282.80
$2,160	$2,200	455.90	438.40	420.90	403.40	385.90	368.40	351.10	336.50	321.90	307.30	292.80
$2,200	$2,240	467.90	450.50	432.90	415.40	397.90	380.40	362.90	346.50	331.90	317.30	302.80
$2,240	$2,280	479.90	462.40	444.90	427.40	409.90	392.40	374.90	357.40	341.90	327.30	312.80
$2,280	$2,320	491.90	474.40	456.90	439.40	421.90	404.40	386.90	369.40	351.90	337.30	322.80
$2,320	$2,360	503.90	486.40	468.90	451.40	433.90	416.40	398.90	381.40	363.90	347.30	332.80
$2,360	$2,400	515.90	498.40	480.90	463.40	445.90	428.40	410.90	393.40	375.90	358.40	342.80
$2,400	$2,440	527.90	510.40	492.90	475.40	457.90	440.40	422.90	405.40	387.90	370.40	352.80
		30 percent of the excess over $2,440 plus—										
$2,440 and over		533.90	516.40	498.90	481.40	463.90	446.40	428.90	411.40	393.90	376.40	358.90

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is a daily payroll period or a miscellaneous payroll period and he is not married—

"And the wages divided by the number of days in such period are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
At least—	But less than—	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such periods—										
$0	$0.75	14% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$.75	$1.00	$0.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$1.00	$1.25	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$1.25	$1.50	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$1.50	$1.75	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$1.75	$2.00	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.00	$2.25	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.25	$2.50	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.50	$2.75	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.75	$3.00	.35	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.00	$3.25	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.25	$3.50	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.50	$3.75	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.75	$4.00	.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.00	$4.25	.55	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.25	$4.50	.60	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.50	$4.75	.60	.30	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.75	$5.00	.65	.35	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.00	$5.25	.70	.40	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.25	$5.50	.75	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.50	$5.75	.80	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.75	$6.00	.85	.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.00	$6.25	.90	.55	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.25	$6.50	.90	.60	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.50	$6.75	.95	.65	.30	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.75	$7.00	1.00	.70	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.00	$7.25	1.05	.70	.40	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.25	$7.50	1.10	.75	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.50	$7.75	1.15	.80	.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.75	$8.00	1.20	.85	.55	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$8.00	$8.25	1.20	.90	.55	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$8.25	$8.50	1.25	.95	.60	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$8.50	$8.75	1.30	1.00	.65	.35	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0
$8.75	$9.00	1.35	1.00	.70	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$9.00	$9.25	1.40	1.05	.75	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0
$9.25	$9.50	1.45	1.10	.80	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0
$9.50	$9.75	1.45	1.15	.80	.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$9.75	$10.00	1.50	1.20	.85	.55	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0
$10.00	$10.50	1.60	1.25	.95	.60	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$10.50	$11.00	1.65	1.35	1.00	.70	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0
$11.00	$11.50	1.75	1.40	1.10	.75	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0
$11.50	$12.00	1.85	1.50	1.20	.85	.55	.25	0	0	0	0	0
$12.00	$12.50	1.95	1.60	1.25	.95	.60	.30	.05	0	0	0	0
$12.50	$13.00	2.05	1.70	1.35	1.05	.70	.40	.10	0	0	0	0
$13.00	$13.50	2.15	1.75	1.45	1.10	.80	.45	.15	0	0	0	0
$13.50	$14.00	2.25	1.85	1.50	1.20	.85	.55	.25	0	0	0	0
$14.00	$14.50	2.35	1.95	1.60	1.30	.95	.65	.30	.05	0	0	0
$14.50	$15.00	2.45	2.05	1.70	1.35	1.05	.70	.40	.10	0	0	0
$15.00	$15.50	2.55	2.15	1.80	1.45	1.15	.80	.45	.20	0	0	0
$15.50	$16.00	2.65	2.25	1.85	1.55	1.20	.90	.55	.25	0	0	0
$16.00	$16.50	2.75	2.35	1.95	1.60	1.30	.95	.65	.35	.05	0	0
$16.50	$17.00	2.85	2.45	2.05	1.70	1.40	1.05	.75	.40	.10	0	0
$17.00	$17.50	2.95	2.55	2.15	1.80	1.45	1.15	.80	.50	.20	0	0
$17.50	$18.00	3.05	2.65	2.25	1.90	1.55	1.25	.90	.55	.25	0	0
$18.00	$18.50	3.15	2.75	2.35	2.00	1.65	1.30	1.00	.65	.35	.05	0
$18.50	$19.00	3.25	2.85	2.45	2.10	1.70	1.40	1.05	.75	.40	.15	0
$19.00	$19.50	3.35	2.95	2.55	2.20	1.80	1.50	1.15	.85	.50	.20	0
$19.50	$20.00	3.45	3.05	2.65	2.30	1.90	1.55	1.25	.90	.60	.30	0
$20.00	$21.00	3.60	3.20	2.80	2.45	2.05	1.70	1.35	1.05	.70	.40	.10
$21.00	$22.00	3.80	3.40	3.00	2.65	2.25	1.85	1.55	1.20	.90	.55	.25
$22.00	$23.00	4.00	3.60	3.20	2.85	2.45	2.05	1.70	1.40	1.05	.75	.40
$23.00	$24.00	4.20	3.80	3.40	3.05	2.65	2.25	1.90	1.55	1.25	.90	.55
$24.00	$25.00	4.40	4.00	3.60	3.25	2.85	2.45	2.10	1.70	1.40	1.05	.75
$25.00	$26.00	4.65	4.20	3.80	3.45	3.05	2.65	2.30	1.90	1.55	1.25	.90
$26.00	$27.00	4.90	4.40	4.00	3.65	3.25	2.85	2.50	2.10	1.75	1.40	1.10
$27.00	$28.00	5.15	4.65	4.20	3.85	3.45	3.05	2.70	2.30	1.90	1.60	1.25
$28.00	$29.00	5.40	4.90	4.45	4.05	3.65	3.25	2.90	2.50	2.10	1.75	1.40
$29.00	$30.00	5.65	5.15	4.70	4.25	3.85	3.45	3.10	2.70	2.30	1.90	1.60
$30.00	$31.00	5.90	5.40	4.95	4.45	4.05	3.65	3.30	2.90	2.50	2.10	1.75
$31.00	$32.00	6.20	5.65	5.20	4.70	4.25	3.85	3.50	3.10	2.70	2.30	1.95
$32.00	$33.00	6.50	5.95	5.45	4.95	4.50	4.05	3.70	3.30	2.90	2.50	2.15
$33.00	$34.00	6.80	6.25	5.70	5.20	4.75	4.25	3.90	3.50	3.10	2.70	2.35
$34.00	$35.00	7.10	6.55	5.95	5.45	5.00	4.50	4.10	3.70	3.30	2.90	2.55
$35.00	$36.00	7.40	6.85	6.25	5.70	5.25	4.75	4.30	3.90	3.50	3.10	2.75
$36.00	$37.00	7.70	7.15	6.55	6.00	5.50	5.00	4.50	4.10	3.70	3.30	2.95
$37.00	$38.00	8.00	7.45	6.85	6.30	5.75	5.25	4.75	4.30	3.90	3.50	3.15
$38.00	$39.00	8.30	7.75	7.15	6.60	6.00	5.50	5.00	4.55	4.10	3.70	3.35
$39.00	$40.00	8.60	8.05	7.45	6.90	6.30	5.75	5.25	4.80	4.30	3.90	3.55
$40.00	$41.00	8.90	8.35	7.75	7.20	6.60	6.05	5.50	5.05	4.55	4.10	3.75
$41.00	$42.00	9.20	8.65	8.05	7.50	6.90	6.35	5.75	5.30	4.80	4.35	3.95
$42.00	$43.00	9.50	8.95	8.35	7.80	7.20	6.65	6.05	5.55	5.05	4.60	4.15
$43.00	$44.00	9.80	9.25	8.65	8.10	7.50	6.95	6.35	5.80	5.30	4.85	4.35
$44.00	$45.00	10.10	9.55	8.95	8.40	7.80	7.25	6.65	6.10	5.55	5.10	4.60
$45.00	$46.00	10.40	9.85	9.25	8.70	8.10	7.55	6.95	6.40	5.80	5.35	4.85
$46.00	$47.00	10.70	10.15	9.55	9.00	8.40	7.85	7.25	6.70	6.10	5.60	5.10
$47.00	$48.00	11.00	10.45	9.85	9.30	8.70	8.15	7.55	7.00	6.40	5.85	5.35
$48.00	$49.00	11.30	10.75	10.15	9.60	9.00	8.45	7.85	7.30	6.70	6.15	5.60
$49.00	$50.00	11.60	11.05	10.45	9.90	9.30	8.75	8.15	7.60	7.00	6.45	5.85
		30 percent of the excess over $50 plus—										
$50 and over		11.75	11.20	10.60	10.05	9.45	8.90	8.30	7.75	7.15	6.60	6.00

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is a daily payroll period or a miscellaneous payroll period and he is married—

"And the wages divided by the number of days in such period are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
At least—	But less than—	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such periods—										
$0	$0.75	14% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$.75	$1.00	$0.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$1.00	$1.25	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$1.25	$1.50	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$1.50	$1.75	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$1.75	$2.00	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.00	$2.25	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.25	$2.50	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.50	$2.75	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.75	$3.00	.35	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.00	$3.25	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.25	$3.50	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.50	$3.75	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.75	$4.00	.45	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.00	$4.25	.50	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.25	$4.50	.55	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.50	$4.75	.60	.30	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.75	$5.00	.60	.35	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.00	$5.25	.65	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.25	$5.50	.70	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.50	$5.75	.75	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.75	$6.00	.75	.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.00	$6.25	.80	.50	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.25	$6.50	.85	.55	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.50	$6.75	.90	.60	.30	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.75	$7.00	.90	.65	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.00	$7.25	.95	.65	.40	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.25	$7.50	1.00	.70	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.50	$7.75	1.05	.75	.45	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.75	$8.00	1.05	.80	.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$8.00	$8.25	1.10	.80	.55	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$8.25	$8.50	1.15	.85	.55	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$8.50	$8.75	1.20	.90	.60	.35	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0
$8.75	$9.00	1.20	.95	.65	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$9.00	$9.25	1.25	.95	.70	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0
$9.25	$9.50	1.30	1.00	.70	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0
$9.50	$9.75	1.35	1.05	.75	.45	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$9.75	$10.00	1.35	1.10	.80	.50	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0
$10.00	$10.50	1.45	1.15	.85	.55	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$10.50	$11.00	1.50	1.20	.95	.65	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0
$11.00	$11.50	1.60	1.30	1.00	.70	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0
$11.50	$12.00	1.65	1.35	1.10	.80	.50	.25	0	0	0	0	0
$12.00	$12.50	1.75	1.45	1.15	.85	.60	.30	.05	0	0	0	0
$12.50	$13.00	1.80	1.50	1.25	.95	.65	.35	.10	0	0	0	0
$13.00	$13.50	1.90	1.60	1.30	1.00	.75	.45	.15	0	0	0	0
$13.50	$14.00	2.00	1.65	1.40	1.10	.80	.50	.25	0	0	0	0
$14.00	$14.50	2.05	1.75	1.45	1.15	.90	.60	.30	.05	0	0	0
$14.50	$15.00	2.15	1.85	1.55	1.25	.95	.65	.40	.10	0	0	0
$15.00	$15.50	2.25	1.90	1.60	1.30	1.05	.75	.45	.20	0	0	0
$15.50	$16.00	2.35	2.00	1.70	1.40	1.10	.80	.55	.25	0	0	0
$16.00	$16.50	2.40	2.10	1.75	1.45	1.20	.90	.60	.30	.05	0	0
$16.50	$17.00	2.50	2.15	1.85	1.55	1.25	.95	.70	.40	.10	0	0
$17.00	$17.50	2.60	2.25	1.95	1.60	1.35	1.05	.75	.45	.20	0	0
$17.50	$18.00	2.65	2.35	2.00	1.70	1.40	1.10	.85	.55	.25	0	0
$18.00	$18.50	2.75	2.45	2.10	1.75	1.50	1.20	.90	.60	.35	.05	0
$18.50	$19.00	2.85	2.50	2.20	1.85	1.55	1.25	1.00	.70	.40	.15	0
$19.00	$19.50	2.90	2.60	2.25	1.95	1.65	1.35	1.05	.75	.50	.20	0
$19.50	$20.00	3.00	2.70	2.35	2.05	1.70	1.40	1.15	.85	.55	.25	0
$20.00	$21.00	3.15	2.80	2.50	2.15	1.85	1.55	1.25	.95	.65	.40	.10
$21.00	$22.00	3.30	3.00	2.65	2.35	2.00	1.70	1.40	1.10	.80	.55	.25
$22.00	$23.00	3.45	3.15	2.80	2.50	2.15	1.85	1.55	1.25	.95	.70	.40
$23.00	$24.00	3.65	3.30	3.00	2.65	2.35	2.00	1.70	1.40	1.10	.85	.55
$24.00	$25.00	3.85	3.50	3.15	2.85	2.50	2.20	1.85	1.55	1.25	1.00	.70
$25.00	$26.00	4.05	3.65	3.35	3.00	2.70	2.35	2.05	1.70	1.40	1.15	.85
$26.00	$27.00	4.25	3.85	3.50	3.20	2.85	2.50	2.20	1.85	1.55	1.30	1.00
$27.00	$28.00	4.45	4.05	3.65	3.35	3.00	2.70	2.35	2.05	1.70	1.45	1.15
$28.00	$29.00	4.65	4.25	3.85	3.50	3.20	2.85	2.55	2.20	1.90	1.60	1.30
$29.00	$30.00	4.85	4.45	4.05	3.70	3.35	3.05	2.70	2.40	2.05	1.75	1.45
$30.00	$31.00	5.05	4.65	4.25	3.90	3.55	3.20	2.90	2.55	2.25	1.90	1.60
$31.00	$32.00	5.25	4.85	4.45	4.10	3.70	3.35	3.05	2.70	2.40	2.05	1.75
$32.00	$33.00	5.45	5.05	4.65	4.30	3.90	3.55	3.20	2.90	2.55	2.25	1.90
$33.00	$34.00	5.65	5.25	4.85	4.50	4.10	3.70	3.40	3.05	2.75	2.40	2.10
$34.00	$35.00	5.85	5.45	5.05	4.70	4.30	3.90	3.55	3.25	2.90	2.60	2.25
$35.00	$36.00	6.05	5.65	5.25	4.90	4.50	4.10	3.75	3.40	3.10	2.75	2.40
$36.00	$37.00	6.25	5.85	5.45	5.10	4.70	4.30	3.90	3.55	3.25	2.90	2.60
$37.00	$38.00	6.45	6.05	5.65	5.30	4.90	4.50	4.10	3.75	3.40	3.10	2.75
$38.00	$39.00	6.65	6.25	5.85	5.50	5.10	4.70	4.30	3.95	3.60	3.25	2.95
$39.00	$40.00	6.85	6.45	6.05	5.70	5.30	4.90	4.50	4.15	3.75	3.45	3.10
$40.00	$41.00	7.05	6.65	6.25	5.90	5.50	5.10	4.70	4.35	3.95	3.60	3.25
$41.00	$42.00	7.25	6.85	6.45	6.10	5.70	5.30	4.90	4.55	4.15	3.75	3.45
$42.00	$43.00	7.45	7.05	6.65	6.30	5.90	5.50	5.10	4.75	4.35	3.95	3.60
$43.00	$44.00	7.65	7.25	6.85	6.50	6.10	5.70	5.30	4.95	4.55	4.15	3.80
$44.00	$45.00	7.85	7.45	7.05	6.70	6.30	5.90	5.50	5.15	4.75	4.35	4.00
$45.00	$46.00	8.05	7.65	7.25	6.90	6.50	6.10	5.70	5.35	4.95	4.55	4.20
$46.00	$47.00	8.25	7.85	7.45	7.10	6.70	6.30	5.90	5.55	5.15	4.75	4.40
$47.00	$48.00	8.45	8.05	7.65	7.30	6.90	6.50	6.10	5.75	5.35	4.95	4.60
$48.00	$49.00	8.65	8.25	7.85	7.50	7.10	6.70	6.30	5.95	5.55	5.15	4.80
$49.00	$50.00	8.90	8.45	8.05	7.70	7.30	6.90	6.50	6.15	5.75	5.35	5.00
$50.00	$51.00	9.15	8.65	8.25	7.90	7.50	7.10	6.70	6.35	5.95	5.55	5.20
$51.00	$52.00	9.40	8.90	8.45	8.10	7.70	7.30	6.90	6.55	6.15	5.75	5.40
$52.00	$53.00	9.65	9.15	8.65	8.30	7.90	7.50	7.10	6.75	6.35	5.95	5.60
$53.00	$54.00	9.90	9.40	8.90	8.50	8.10	7.70	7.30	6.95	6.55	6.15	5.80
$54.00	$55.00	10.15	9.65	9.15	8.70	8.30	7.90	7.50	7.15	6.75	6.35	6.00
$55.00	$56.00	10.40	9.90	9.40	8.95	8.50	8.10	7.70	7.35	6.95	6.55	6.20
$56.00	$57.00	10.65	10.15	9.65	9.20	8.70	8.30	7.90	7.55	7.15	6.75	6.40
$57.00	$58.00	10.90	10.40	9.90	9.45	8.95	8.50	8.10	7.75	7.35	6.95	6.60
$58.00	$59.00	11.15	10.65	10.15	9.70	9.20	8.75	8.30	7.95	7.55	7.15	6.80
$59.00	$60.00	11.40	10.90	10.40	9.95	9.45	9.00	8.50	8.15	7.75	7.35	7.00
$60.00	$61.00	11.65	11.15	10.65	10.20	9.70	9.25	8.75	8.35	7.95	7.55	7.20

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is a daily payroll period or a miscellaneous payroll period and he is married—

"And the wages divided by the number of days in such period are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
At least—	But less than—	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such periods—										
$61.00	$62.00	$11.95	$11.40	$10.90	$10.45	$9.95	$9.50	$9.00	$8.55	$8.15	$7.75	$7.40
$62.00	$63.00	12.25	11.65	11.15	10.70	10.20	9.75	9.25	8.75	8.35	7.95	7.60
$63.00	$64.00	12.55	11.95	11.40	10.95	10.45	10.00	9.50	9.00	8.55	8.15	7.80
$64.00	$65.00	12.85	12.25	11.70	11.20	10.70	10.25	9.75	9.25	8.80	8.35	8.00
$65.00	$66.00	13.15	12.55	12.00	11.45	10.95	10.50	10.00	9.50	9.05	8.55	8.20
$66.00	$67.00	13.45	12.85	12.30	11.70	11.20	10.75	10.25	9.75	9.30	8.80	8.40
$67.00	$68.00	13.75	13.15	12.60	12.00	11.45	11.00	10.50	10.00	9.55	9.05	8.60
$68.00	$69.00	14.05	13.45	12.90	12.30	11.75	11.25	10.75	10.25	9.80	9.30	8.85
$69.00	$70.00	14.35	13.75	13.20	12.60	12.05	11.50	11.00	10.50	10.05	9.55	9.10
$70.00	$71.00	14.65	14.05	13.50	12.90	12.35	11.75	11.25	10.75	10.30	9.80	9.35
$71.00	$72.00	14.95	14.35	13.80	13.20	12.65	12.05	11.50	11.00	10.55	10.05	9.60
$72.00	$73.00	15.25	14.65	14.10	13.50	12.95	12.35	11.80	11.25	10.80	10.30	9.85
$73.00	$74.00	15.55	14.95	14.40	13.80	13.25	12.65	12.10	11.50	11.05	10.55	10.10
$74.00	$75.00	15.85	15.25	14.70	14.10	13.55	12.95	12.40	11.80	11.30	10.80	10.35
$75.00	$76.00	16.15	15.55	15.00	14.40	13.85	13.25	12.70	12.10	11.55	11.05	10.60
$76.00	$77.00	16.45	15.85	15.30	14.70	14.15	13.55	13.00	12.40	11.85	11.30	10.85
$77.00	$78.00	16.75	16.15	15.60	15.00	14.45	13.85	13.30	12.70	12.15	11.55	11.10
$78.00	$79.00	17.05	16.45	15.90	15.30	14.75	14.15	13.60	13.00	12.45	11.85	11.35
$79.00	$80.00	17.35	16.75	16.20	15.60	15.05	14.45	13.90	13.30	12.75	12.15	11.60
		30 percent of the excess over $80 plus—										
$80 and over		17.50	16.90	16.35	15.75	15.20	14.60	14.05	13.45	12.90	12.30	11.75"

(d) Disclosure of Marital Status; Determination of Marital Status; Treatment of Surviving Spouse.—Section 3402 (relating to income tax collected at source) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(l) Determination and Disclosure of Marital Status.—

"(1) Determination of status by employer.—For purposes of applying the tables in subsections (a) and (c) to a payment of wages, the employer shall treat the employee as a single person unless there is in effect with respect to such payment of wages a withholding exemption certificate furnished to the employer by the employee after the date of the enactment of this subsection indicating that the employee is married.

"(2) Disclosure of status by employee.—An employee shall be entitled to furnish the employer with a withholding exemption certificate indicating he is married only if, on the day of such furnishing, he is married (determined with the applicaton of the rules in paragraph (3)). An employee whose marital status changes from married to single shall, at such time as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe, furnish the employer with a new withholding exemption certificate.

"(3) Determination of marital status.—For purposes of paragraph (2), an employee shall on any day be considered—

"(A) as not married, if (i) he is legally separated from his spouse under a decree of divorce or separate maintenance, or (ii) either he or his spouse is, or on any preceding day within the calendar year was, a nonresident alien; or

"(B) as married, if (i) his spouse (other than a spouse referred to in subparagraph (A)) died within the portion of his taxable year which precedes such day, or (ii) his spouse died during one of the two taxable years immediately preceding the current taxable year and, on the basis of facts existing at the beginning of such day, the employee reasonably expects, at the close of his taxable year, to be a surviving spouse (as defined in section 2(b))."

(e) Withholding Allowances for Itemized Deductions.—

(1) Allowance.—Section 3402(f)(1) (relating to withholding exemptions) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (D),

(B) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(F) any allowance to which he is entitled under subsection (m), but only if his spouse does not have in effect a withholding exemption certificate claiming such allowance."

(2) Withholding allowances based on itemized deductions.—Section 3402 (relating to income tax collected at source) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) Withholding Allowances Based on Itemized Deductions.—

"(1) General rule.—An employee shall be entitled to withholding allowances under this subsection with respect to a payment of wages in a number equal to the number determined by dividing by $700 the excess of—

"(A) his estimated itemized deductions, over

"(B) an amount equal to the sum of 12 percent of the first $7,500 of his estimated wages and 17 percent of the remainder of his estimated wages.

For purposes of this subsection, fractional numbers shall not be taken into account.

"(2) Definitions.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) Estimated itemized deductions.—The term 'estimated itemized deductions' means the aggregate amount which he reasonably expects will be allowable as deductions under chapter 1 (other than the deductions referred to in sections 141 and 151 and other than the deductions required to be taken into account in determining adjusted gross income under section 62) for the estimation year. In no case shall such aggregate amount be greater than the amount of such deductions shown on his return of tax under subtitle A for the taxable year preceding the estimation year.

"(B) Estimated wages.—The term 'estimated wages' means the aggregate amount which he reasonably expects will constitute wages for the estimation year. In no case shall such aggregate amount be less than the amount of wages shown on his return for the taxable year preceding the estimation year.

"(C) Estimation year.—In the case of an employee who files his return on the basis of a calendar year, the term 'estimation year' means—

"(i) with respect to payments of wages after April 30 and on or before December 31 of any calendar year, such calendar year, and

"(ii) with respect to payments of wages on or after January 1 and before May 1 of any calendar year, the preceding calendar year (or, if the employee has filed a return for the preceding calendar year, and if he has in effect a withholding allowance under this subsection based on using the current calendar year as the estimation year, such current calendar year).

In the case of an employee who files his return on a basis other than the calendar year, his estimation year, and the amounts deducted and withheld to be governed by such estimation year, shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(3) Special rules.—

"(A) Married individuals.—The number of withholding allowances to which a husband and wife are entitled under this subsection shall be determined on the basis of their combined wages and deduction. This subparagraph shall not apply to a husband and wife who filed separate returns for the taxable year preceding the estimation year and who reasonably expect to file separate returns for the estimation year.

"(B) Only one certificate to be in effect.—In the case of any employee, withholding allowances under this subsection may not be claimed with more than one employer at any one time.

"(C) Termination of effectiveness.—In the case of an employee who files his return on the basis of a calendar year, that portion of a withholding exemption certificate which relates to allowances under this subsection shall not be effective with respect to payments of wages after the first April 30 following the close of the estimation year on which it is based.

"(D) Limitation.—The Secretary or his delegate may by regulations provide that one or more of the withholding allowances to which an employee would, but for this subparagraph, be entitled under this subsection shall be denied because such employee's estimated wages are above the level at which the amounts deducted and withheld under this chapter are generally sufficient to offset the liability for tax under chapter 1 with respect to the wages from which such amounts are deducted and withheld.

"(E) Authority to prescribe tables.—The Secretary or his delegate may prescribe tables pursuant to which employees shall determine the number of allowances to which they are entitled under this subsection. Such tables may be based on reasonable wage and itemized deduction brackets.

"(F) Treatment of allowances.—For purposes of this title, any withholding allowance under this subsection shall be treated as if it were denominated a withholding exemption."

(3) Status determination date.—The last sentence of section 3402(f)(3)(B) is amended to read as follows: "For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'status determination date' means January 1, May 1, July 1, and October 1 of each year."

(4) Civil penalty.—

(A) Subchapter B of chapter 68 (relating to assessable penalties) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6682. FALSE INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO WITHHOLDING ALLOWANCES BASED ON ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS.

"(a) Civil Penalty.—In addition to any criminal penalty provided by law, if any individual in claiming a withholding allowance under section 3402(f)(1)(F) states (1) that the wages (within the meaning of chapter 24) shown on his return for any taxable year were less than such wages actually shown, or (2) that the itemized deductions referred to in section 3402(m) on the return for any taxable year were greater than such deductions actually shown, he shall pay a penalty of $50 for each such statement, unless (1) such statement did not result in a decrease in the amounts deducted and withheld under chapter 24, or (2) the taxes imposed with respect to the individual under subtitle A for the succeeding taxable year do not exceed the sum of (A) the credits against such taxes allowed by part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1, and (B) the payments of estimated tax which are considered payments on account of such taxes.

"(b) Deficiency Procedures Not To Apply.—Subchapter B of chapter 63 (relating to deficiency procedures for income, estate, and gift taxes), shall not apply in respect of the assessment or collection of any penalty imposed by subsection (a)."

(B) The table of sections of such subchapter B is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 6682. False information with respect to withholding allowances based on itemized deductions."

(5) Criminal penalty.—Section 7205 (relating to fraudulent withholding exemption certificate or failure to supply information) is amended—

(A) by striking out "section 3402(f)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3402", and

(B) by striking out "any penalty otherwise provided" and inserting in lieu thereof "any other penalty provided by law (except the penalty provided by section 6682)".

(6) Effective date.—The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall apply only with respect to remuneration paid after December 31, 1966, but only with respect to withholding exemptions based on estimation years beginning after such date.

(f) Transitional Determination Status Date.—Notwithstanding section 3402(f)(3)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, a withholding exemption certificate furnished the employer after the date of the enactment of this Act and before May 1, 1966, shall take effect with respect to the first payment of wages made on or after May 1, 1966, or the 10th day after the date on which such certificate is furnished to the employer, whichever is later, and at the election of the employer such certificate may be made effective with respect to any payment of wages made on or after the date on which such certificate is furnished.

(g) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section (other than subsection (e)) shall apply only with respect to remuneration paid after April 30, 1966.

Sec. 102. Estimated Tax in Case of Individuals.

(a) Inclusion of Self-Employment Tax in Estimated Tax.—Section 6015(c) (relating to definition of estimated tax in the case of an individual) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Estimated Tax.—For purposes of this title, in the case of an individual, the term 'estimated tax' means—

"(1) the amount which the individual estimates as the amount of the income tax imposed by chapter 1 for the taxable year, plus

"(2) the amount which the individual estimates as the amount of the self-employment tax imposed by chapter 2 for the taxable year, minus

"(3) the amount which the individual estimates as the sum of any credits against tax provided by part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1."

(b) Addition to Tax for Underpayment of Estimated Tax.—

(1) Section 6654(a) (relating to addition to the tax for underpayment of estimated tax by an individual) is amended by inserting after "chapter 1" the following: "and the tax under chapter 2".

(2) Section 6654(d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Exception.—Notwithstanding the provisions of the preceding subsections, the addition to the tax with respect to any underpayment of any installment shall not be imposed if the total amount of all payments of estimated tax made on or before the last date prescribed for the payment of such installment equals or exceeds the amount which would have been required to be paid on or before such date if the estimated tax were whichever of the following is the least—

"(1) The tax shown on the return of the individual for the preceding taxable year, if a return showing a liability for tax was filed by the individual for the preceding taxable year and such preceding year was a taxable year of 12 months.

"(2) An amount equal to 70 percent (66⅔ percent in the case of individuals referred to in section 6073(b), relating to income from farming or fishing) of the tax for the taxable year computed by placing on an annualized basis the taxable income for the months in the taxable year ending before the month in which the installment is required to be paid and by taking into account the adjusted self-employment income (if the net earnings from self-employment (as defined in section 1402(a)) for the taxable year equal or exceed $400). For purposes of this paragraph—

"(A) The taxable income shall be placed on an annualized basis by—

"(i) multiplying by 12 (or, in the case of a taxable year of less than 12 months, the number of months in the taxable year) the taxable income (computed without deduction of personal exemptions) for the months in the taxable year ending before the month in which the installment is required to be paid,

"(ii) dividing the resulting amount by the number of months in the taxable year ending before the month in which such installment date falls, and

"(iii) deducting from such amount the deductions for personal exemptions allowable for the taxable year (such personal exemptions being determined as of the last date prescribed for payment of the installment).

"(B) The term 'adjusted self-employment income' means—

"(i) the net earnings from self-employment (as defined in section 1402(a)) for the months in the taxable year ending before the month in which the installment is required to be paid, but not more than

"(ii) the excess of $6,600 over the amount determined by placing the wages (within the meaning of section 1402(b)) for the months in the taxable year ending before the month in which the installment is required to be paid on an annualized basis in a manner consistent with clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A).

"(3) An amount equal to 90 percent of the tax computed, at the rates applicable to the taxable year, on the basis of the actual taxable income and the actual self-employment income for the months in the taxable year ending before the month in which the installment is required to be paid as if such months constituted the taxable year.

"(4) An amount equal to the tax computed, at the rates applicable to the taxable year, on the basis of the taxpayer's status with respect to personal exemptions under section 151 for the taxable year, but otherwise on the basis of the facts shown on his return for, and the law applicable to, the preceding taxable year."

(3) Section 6654(f) (relating to definition of tax for purposes of subsections (b) and (d) of section 6654) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Tax Computed After Application of Credits Against Tax.—For purposes of subsections (b) and (d), the term 'tax' means—

"(1) the tax imposed by this chapter 1, plus

"(2) the tax imposed by chapter 2, minus

"(3) the credits against tax allowed by part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1, other than the credit against tax provided by section 31 (relating to tax withheld on wages)."

(4) Section 7701(a) (relating to definitions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(34) Estimated income tax.—The term 'estimated income tax' means—

"(A) in the case of an individual, the estimated tax as defined in section 6015(c), or

"(B) in the case of a corporation, the estimated tax as defined in section 6016(b)."

(5) Section 1403(b) (cross references) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) For provisions relating to declarations of estimated tax on self-employment income, see section 6015."

(c) Ministers, Members of Religious Orders, and Christian Science Practitioners.—Section 1402(e)(3) (relating to effective date of waiver certificates) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(E) For purposes of sections 6015 and 6654, a waiver certificate described in paragraph (1) shall be treated as taking effect on the first day of the first taxable year beginning after the date on which such certificate is filed."

(d) Effective Date.—The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966.

Sec. 103. Underpayment of installments of estimated income tax in case of individuals.

(a) In General.—Section 6654(b) (relating to amount of underpayment), and section 6654(d) (relating to exception) as amended by section 102(b)(2) of this Act, are amended by striking out "70 percent" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "80 percent".

(b) Effective Date.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966.

Sec. 104. Installment payments of estimated income tax by corporations.

(a) In General.—Subsection (a) of section 6154 (relating to installment payments of estimated income tax by corporations) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Amount and Time for Payment of Each Installment.—The amount of estimated tax (as defined in section 6016(b)) with respect to which a declaration is required under section 6016 shall be paid as follows:

"(1) Taxable years beginning in 1966.—With respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965, and before January 1, 1967, such estimated tax shall be paid in installments in accordance with the following table:

"If the declaration is timely filed on or before the 15th day of the—	The following percentages of the estimated tax shall be paid on the 15th day of the—			
	4th month	6th month	9th month	12th month
4th month of the taxable year	12	12	25	25
6th month of the taxable year (but after the 15th day of the 4th month)		16	29	29
9th month of the taxable year (but after the 15th day of the 6th month)			37	37
12th month of the taxable year (but after the 15th day of the 9th month)				74

"(2) Taxable years beginning after 1966.—With respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966, such estimated tax shall be paid in installments in accordance with the following table:

"If the declaration is timely filed on or before the 15th day of the—	The following percentages of the estimated tax shall be paid on the 15th day of the—			
	4th month	6th month	9th month	12th month
4th month of the taxable year	25	25	25	25
6th month of the taxable year (but after the 15th day of the 4th month)		33⅓	33⅓	33⅓
9th month of the taxable year (but after the 15th day of the 6th month)			50	50
12th month of the taxable year (but after the 15th day of the 9th month)				100

"(3) Timely filing.—A declaration is timely filed for the purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2) if it is not required by section 6074(a) to be filed on a date (determined without regard to any extension of time for filing the declaration under section 6081) before the date it is actually filed.

"(4) Late filing.—If the declaration is filed after the time prescribed in section 6074(a) (determined without regard to any extension of time for filing the declaration under section 6081), there shall be paid at the time of such filing all installments of estimated tax which would have been payable on or before such time if the declaration had been filed within the time prescribed in section 6074(a), and the remaining installments shall be paid at the times at which, and in the amounts in which, they would have been payable if the declaration had been so filed."

(b) Effective Date.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965.

TITLE II—POSTPONEMENT OF CERTAIN EXCISE TAX RATE REDUCTIONS

Sec. 201. Passenger Automobiles.

(a) Postponement of Rate Reductions.—Subparagraph (A) of section 4061(a)(2) (relating to imposition of tax) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) Articles enumerated in subparagraph (B) are taxable at whichever of the following rates is applicable:

"7 percent for the period beginning with the day after the date of the enactment of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 through March 31, 1968.

"2 percent for the period April 1, 1968, through December 31, 1968.

"1 percent for the period after December 31, 1968."

(b) Floor Stocks Tax.—Section 4226 (relating to floor stocks taxes) is amended—

(1) By adding at the end of subsection (a) the following new paragraph:

"(8) 1966 tax on automobiles.—On any article subject to tax under section 4061(a)(2) which on the day after the date of the enactment of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 is held by a dealer and has not been used and is intended for sale, there is imposed a floor stocks tax at the rate of 1 percent of the price for which the article was sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer. Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, the tax imposed under this paragraph shall be paid by such dealer and shall be collected from him by the manufacturer, producer, or importer."

(2) By amending subsection (d)—

(A) by striking out "and except" and inserting in lieu thereof "except", and

(B) by striking out "delegate." and inserting in lieu thereof "delegate, and except that the tax imposed by paragraph (8) shall be paid at such time after 60 days after the date of enactment of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 as may be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate."

(c) Conforming Amendments.—

(1) Section 6412(a)(1) (relating to floor stocks refunds on passenger automobiles, etc.) is amended by striking out "January 1, 1966, 1967, 1968, or 1969," and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1966, April 1, 1968, or January 1, 1969,".

(2) Section 209(c)(1)(G) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (relating to general provisions for transfers to the Highway Trust Fund) is amended by striking out "section 4226(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 4226(a) (other than paragraph (8) thereof)".

(d) Effective Date.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles sold after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Sec. 202. Communication Services.

(a) Postponement of Rate Reductions.—Section 4251 (relating to tax on communications) is amended—

(1) By striking out subsection (a)(2) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(2) The rate of tax referred to in paragraph (1) is as follows:

"Amounts paid pursuant to bills first rendered—	*Percent*
"Before April 1, 1968	10
"After March 31, 1968, and before January 1, 1969	1"

(2) By striking out subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(c) Special Rule.—For purposes of subsection (a), in the case of communications services rendered before February 1, 1968, for which a bill has not been rendered before April 1, 1968, a bill shall be treated as having been first rendered on March 31, 1968. For purposes of subsections (a) and (b), in the case of communications services rendered after January 31, 1968, and before November 1, 1968, for which a bill has not been rendered before January 1, 1969, a bill shall be treated as having been first rendered on December 31, 1968."

(b) Nonprofit Hospitals.—Section 4253 (relating to exemptions from tax on communications) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Nonprofit Hospitals.—No tax shall be imposed under section 4251 on any amount paid by a nonprofit hospital for services furnished to such organization. For purposes of this subsection, the term 'nonprofit hospital' means a hospital referred to in section 503(b)(5) which is exempt from income tax under section 501(a)."

(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to amounts paid pursuant to bills first rendered on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 15 days after the date on which this Act is enacted for services rendered on or after such first day. In the case of amounts paid pursuant to bills rendered on or after such first day for services which were rendered before such first day and for which no previous bill was rendered, such amendments shall apply except with respect to such services as were rendered more than 2 months before such first day. In the case of services rendered more than 2 months before such first day, the provisions of subchapter B of chapter 33 of the Code in effect at the time such services were rendered, subject to the provision of section 701(b)(2) of the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, shall apply to the amounts paid for such services.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any committee amendments?

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MILLS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I have two such committee amendments, the first of which is on page 32 of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. Mills: Page 32, strike out lines 5 and 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"If the number determined under the preceding sentence is not a whole number, the fraction shall be disregarded; except that, if the number determined is one-half or more but less than one, it shall be increased to one."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, permit me to take the opportunity of explaining this amendment, if I may.

This amendment concerns the procedure for claiming withholding allowances contained in your committee's bill. Taxpayers who anticipate that, based on prior experience, they will have large itemized deductions relative to their income may claim these withholding allowances, which have the effect of withholding exemptions. By doing so, they will be able to adjust their withholding to prevent the excessive overwithholding which might otherwise develop.

The number of withholding allowances which may be claimed is based on the amount of excess itemized deductions. Excess itemized deductions are equal to estimated itemized deductions in excess of 12 percent of income up to $7,500 and 17 percent of income above this figure.

Under the bill as it now stands, no withholding allowance may be claimed unless the amount of excess itemized deductions equals a full $700. It has come to the attention of your committee that this stipulation makes it difficult for families with low and moderate incomes to take advantage of the withholding allowance procedure. A family with an income of $5,000, for example, would have to have itemized deductions of $1,300, or 26 percent of its income, before a withholding allowance could be claimed.

Your committee is of the opinion that the bill should be amended to make it easier for taxpayers with modest incomes to avail themselves of the withholding allowances. The committee therefore proposes an amendment to H.R. 12752 which will permit a taxpayer to claim single withholding allowance if his excess itemized deductions equal $350 but are less than $700. Thus, in the above example an allowance could be claimed when itemized deductions totaled $950, or 19 percent of income, the average for itemized deductions as a percent of adjusted gross income.

This amendment only applies to the first withholding allowance. Two withholding allowances could not be claimed unless excess itemized deductions equalled or exceeded $1,400, three could not be claimed unless the excess totaled $2,100 or more, and so forth.

The amendment will be of chief importance to those with moderate incomes and relatively heavy itemized deductions. The importance to such taxpayers is indicated, however, by the fact that if two-thirds of those eligible for withholding allowances solely as a result of this amendment claim those allowances, the amount of withholding will be reduced by $400 million a year.

This amendment will go into effect in the calendar year 1967 as a part of the entire withholding allowance procedure. As a result, it will not affect fiscal 1966 revenues at all and will reduce fiscal 1967 revenues by only $65 million.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the committee to adopt the committee reported amendment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in complete support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it was perfectly clear when the administration first presented the proposal for a change in the withholding system that it was going to considerably aggravate the problem of overwithholding that has existed in the past and which will even still exist in the future; a situation whereby our taxpayers by law are forced to pay in during the course of the year in excess of their real tax liability, and then wait for a refund in the following year.

I suggested during the course of the hearings to the Treasury that I thought they could devise a formula whereby at least some of this overwithholding could be alleviated, by giving recognition to the deductions that the taxpayer might have in excess of the standard deduction.

Mr. Chairman, that is the case which results in the usual situation of overwithholding.

When we acted in the committee, we acted on the basis of individual income tax statistics prepared by the Treasury. The Treasury representatives agreed to a formula for avoiding overwithholding. After we considered the matter and concluded our executive sessions, new statistics were prepared. I was not satisfied. I believe it imperative that the committee take another look at what we had done during our normal consideration of this particular problem, in view of the later, and presumably more accurate, statistical data that we received.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that the chairman of the full committee thought likewise, and that this matter was reconsidered and a further liberalization was made so as to reduce even further the extent of involuntary overwithholding.

I would say, however, Mr. Chairman, to you and to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I hope that our staff and the staff of the Treasury Department will still focus their attention on the problem of overwithholding that still exists. I feel it is intolerable and inexcusable that we do not do everything we can to try and bring the tax withheld down to as close to the liability of the individual as is possible.

Now, Mr. Chairman, all of us know we can never hit it right on the head. But at least we can avoid the overwithholding that is current in our system today.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has made some real progress in partially correcting the situation, but I feel there is much more to be done. I hope the attention of the Treasury staff will be directed to that problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MILLS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment, which is clerical and technical in nature.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MILLS: In each of the tables beginning on pages 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, and 27 strike out "14 percent of wages" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$0".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

The Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ALBERT, having resumed the chair, Mr. HANSEN of Iowa, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12752) to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 736, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

For what purpose does the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] rise?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. UTT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. UTT moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 12752) to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 2, strike out lines 7 and 8.

Page 47, strike out line 4 and all that follows through line 9 on page 51.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that in the opinion of the Chair, the "noes" had it.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 187, nays 207, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—187

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.

Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Bandstra
Baring
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Cabell
Callaway
Cameron
Carter
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dole
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Findley
Fino
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gettys
Giaimo
Goodell
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanley
Hansen. Idaho
Hardy
Harsha
Henderson
Hicks
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kastenmeier
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kupferman
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Mackie
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stalbaum
Stanton
Stephens
Taylor
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Utt
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Weltner
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

NAYS—207

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Bennett
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callan
Carey
Casey
Celler
Cleveland
Colmer
Corbett
Culver
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Hagen, Calif.
Hamilton
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kelly
Keogh
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Laird
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rees
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Senner
Sickles
Sisk
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Watts
White, Tex.
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young

NOT VOTING—38

Baldwin
Blatnik
Burleson
Cederberg
Chelf
Cohelan
Cramer
Dowdy
Edwards, La.
Fallon
Farnsley
Fisher
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Kee
King, Calif.
Martin, Ala.
Matthews
Miller
Moorhead
Pool
Redlin
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
St. Onge
Scott
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Toll
White, Idaho
Willis
Zablocki

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Cramer for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Harvey of Indiana for, with Mr. Miller against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. White of Idaho against.

Mr. Martin of Alabama for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Cohelan against.

Mr. Cederberg for, with Mr. Farnsley against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. King of California against.

Mr. Talcott for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Slack with Mr. Moorhead.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Fallon.

Mr. Hogan of Georgia with Mr. Redlin.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Matthews.

Mr. Pool with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Chelf with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.

Mr. DE LA GARZA changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. POAGE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KUNKEL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 246, nays 146, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—246

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Carey
Carter
Casey
Celler
Clark
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Corbett
Corman
Culver
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Hagen, Calif.
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Leggett
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Redlin
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Sickles
Sisk
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Watts
White, Tex.
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young

NAYS—146

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Baring
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bray
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Cameron
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Craley
Cunningham

Curtin
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dole
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Fino
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gettys
Goodell
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Henderson
Hicks
Horton
Hutchinson
Jennings
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kastenmeier
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Long, La.
McCulloch
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Mackie
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morton
Mosher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Roncalio
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Stalbaum
Stanton
Stephens
Talcott
Taylor
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Weltner
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

NOT VOTING—41

Baldwin
Bandstra
Blatnik
Burleson
Cederberg
Chelf
Cohelan
Cramer
Dowdy
Duncan, Oreg.
Edwards, La.
Fallon
Farnsley
Fisher
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Kee
King, Calif.
Martin, Ala.
Matthews
Miller
Moorhead
Patman
Pool
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
St. Onge
Scott
Senner
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Teague, Tex.
Toll
White, Idaho
Willis
Zablocki

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Mr. Miller for, with Mr. Roudebush against.

Mr. King of California for, with Mr. Martin of Alabama against.

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Cramer against.

Mr. Patman for, with Mr. Cederberg against.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Scott against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Teague of Texas.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Rogers of Texas.
Mr. Farnsley with Mr. Slack.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Bandstra.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.

Mr. HALPERN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD on the bill just passed immediately prior to the conclusion of general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those of us who spoke on the bill in general debate may revise and extend our remarks and include such extraneous material in the form of tables and so on in relation to such remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 744) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 744

Resolved, That THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, of New York, be and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MASSACHUSETTS MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO. OF SPRINGFIELD, MASS., RECEIVES SPECIAL MERIT CITATION FROM POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN FOR OUTSTANDING COOPERATION WITH POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT IN ZIP CODE AND OTHER PROGRAMS

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co. of Springfield, Mass., is now in its 115th year of operation. Over that period of time, it has grown into one of the largest life insurance companies in the country and today ranks 10th largest in assets of the more than 1,600 life insurance companies in the Nation. Its growth has been marked by conspicuous and outstanding leadership. It has made incalculable contributions to its home office city. Its officers and employees have been in the forefront of community campaigns to make their locality a better place to live, work, and play. It has been cited many times for its cooperation in community and governmental activities.

On January 14, 1966, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co. was presented with a special merit citation for outstanding cooperation with the Post Office Department in ZIP code and other programs. I know it was particularly pleasing to Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien to confer this citation upon a company from his own home city. The presentation, the first of its kind since he assumed the Cabinet post, was made by Postmaster General O'Brien to Mr. Charles H. Schaaff, president of Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co. in appropriate ceremonies in the Postmaster General's office. I was privileged to attend the event along with the postmaster of Springfield, Mass., Arthur B. Morin, officers of the company Second Vice President J. Walter Reardon, Secretary Harrison B. Clapp and Communications Department Manager Alexander T. Muir.

In citing Massachusetts Mutual, one of the first major life insurance companies in the Nation to complete the addition of ZIP codes to its master files, Postmaster General O'Brien said:

> Naturally, I am proud that a company from my hometown is being honored, but today's award has nothing to do with the fact that we both come from Springfield, Mass. It has everything to do with the kind of vision, spirit of cooperation and creative innovation that the Post Office needs from the business community and which it is most certainly receiving from Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Mr. O'Brien noted that 80 percent of the Nation's 74 billion pieces of mail is generated by business and that the Massachusetts Mutual "is 100 percent behind the Post Office in our drive for better service." He continued:

> The award is richly deserved. This example of leadership also means better service for the company's policyholders.

Earlier in the week Mr. O'Brien said in a press release:

> Massachusetts Mutual has played a leading role in the Mail Users Council in my hometown of Springfield and has actively presorted its mail as a cooperative effort with the postal service. The firm has given technical assistance to other companies to bring about improved mailing procedures and has been helpful to the Post Office Department in scheduling its mailings.

Upon accepting the award from Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Schaaff made these remarks:

> Thank you, Mr. Postmaster General. I am very pleased to receive this award on behalf of my company, the Massachusetts Mutual Life, for at least two good reasons. First, we are naturally anxious to cooperate with our Government in every way and in your effort to have everyone participate in the ZIP code program; and, second, because I am very certain that this accomplishment of ZIP coding our entire file will result in greater efficiency in our operations for the benefit of our policyholders.
>
> I also want to compliment you on your postmaster in Springfield, Mr. Arthur B. Morin, who has helped our company in many ways over the years, and made a particularly important contribution to the accomplishment which led to the presentation of this award. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I take pride that the Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co. is located in my congressional district. It is housed in a magnificent and elegantly beautiful building that is a splendid credit to its officers and employees and the thousands of its policyholders throughout the world. The history of this great company is a proud and notable one. Under unanimous consent I include it with my remarks:

HISTORY OF THE MASSACHUSETTS MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.

The Massachusetts Mutual was founded on May 15, 1851, with capital of $100,000 raised through subscriptions from 30 citizens of Springfield, Mass., then a town with a population of 12,000. This stock was retired in 1867, and the company has been a mutual organization ever since.

Three chairs, two desks, two pictures, a stove, table, and city map were the company's first assets, and net receipts for the first year were $5,000.

The company's first full-time employee was Francis B. Bacon, who received a salary of $800 a year. The first president was Caleb Rice, who had gained fame as sheriff of Hampden County. Devoting only part of his time to this position, he received a salary of $50 the first year, and $100 the second. He became Springfield's first mayor when the city was incorporated in 1852.

The first policy was issued on August 2, 1851, to Harvey Danks, who also became the company's first sales agent. There were anxious moments in the early days, particularly at the thought of claims any mail might bring. For example, one early policyholder insured for $3,000 succumbed after paying only one premium. It was some 3 months before the claim was settled, and, even then, the money had to be borrowed. But the records show that there has never been another such delay in the almost 115 years that have ensued.

The company's early growth was largely confined to New England, but, by 1855, agencies had been established in New York City, Albany, Cleveland, Chicago, and Detroit. By 1868, when an agency was opened in San Francisco, the Massachusetts Mutual spanned the continent.

The first home office was a single room in a downtown Springfield building. By 1868, the increase in business necessitated larger quarters, and a new building was constructed, also in downtown Springfield.

Caleb Rice died 22 years after the company was founded, and was succeeded by Ephraim W. Bond. That same year, the new home office was extensively burned, and the building was subsequently rebuilt and reoccupied. Col. Martin Van Buren Edgerly was elected president in 1886 and served until 1895, when John A. Hall was elected. Mr. Hall died suddenly while on a trip to London in 1908, and was succeeded by William W. McClench.

A few weeks after Mr. McClench was elected president, the company moved into its second building, erected on the site of the building which housed the original one-room office. Mr. McClench held the presidency from 1908 to 1928, guiding the company through the days of World War I. Total war losses were just over a half-million dollars, while the influenza epidemic of 1918 had a far more serious impact on the company.

The home office staff, which numbered 100 in 1907, had grown to some 400 by 1924. Insurance in force had passed the $1 billion level just 1 year earlier. In 1927, the company occupied its present home office complex, at 1295 State Street in Springfield, some 4 miles east of the city's main business district.

William H. Sargeant was the company's chief executive through the worst years of the great depression. Policy loans hit abnormal figures, and, by mid-1932, more business was going off the books than was being issued.

The company, along with the rest of the country, began to recuperate from the shock and the initial effects of the depression, however, and in 1936 Bertrand J. Perry was elected president of the still-growing company. Mr. Perry served as president until 1945, when he became chairman of the board. When he retired as a director in 1955, his association with the company spanned 58 years. Alexander T. Maclean had succeeded Mr. Perry as president and served until his death in 1950. On May 19 of that year Leland J. Kalmbach became president and served in that position until 1962, when he was elected chairman of the board and chief executive officer, and Charles H. Schaaff became the company's 10th president.

In 1951, the company's 100th anniversary year, its assets were $1.4 billion. Insurance in force totaled $3.2 billion. New insurance delivered that year amounted to nearly $348 million.

This past year—1965—new insurance delivered amounted to well over $1.9 billion. Insurance in force passed the $12 billion level. And assets, which have doubled about every 12 years since 1928, increased to more than $3.3 billion. New alltime records in the sale of both individual and group life insurance were set during the year with individual insurance sales topping $1 billion for the 7th consecutive year. January of 1965 was the largest individual-life-sales month in the company's history.

Another milestone achieved in 1965 was the surpassing of the $1 billion level in outstanding mortgage loans. The company's first mortgage loan of $2,000 was made in 1859.

The company today ranks as the 10th largest in assets of the more than 1,600 life insurance companies in the Nation. It also is ranked among the country's top 22 financial institutions and the top 40 business organizations in general. The company lists more than 700,000 individual policyholders, and is licensed to do business in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Its Springfield home office staff numbers some 2,200 and its field force of 3,500 is distributed in 120 general agencies, 285 district offices, 42 group insurance offices, and 9 mortgage loan and real estate offices.

Also in 1965, the company occupied a four-story addition to its home office site. The new east building, which provides some 184,000 gross square feet of additional floorspace, is one of the largest commercial structures erected in the Greater Springfield area since the present home office was built in 1927. The entire home office complex now occupies some 85 acres of land.

The company also reported in 1965 that its new investments now average more than $1.5 million each working day. Total amount of the company's entire investment portfolio now at work in the Nation's economy is approximately $3 billion. The company's investment division comprises three major departments—securities, mortgage loans, and real estate.

The company is considered to have one of the outstanding field forces in the life insurance industry today. Substantiating this is the fact that one out of every eight company field men and women is a member of the industry's elite sales group, the million-dollar round table. The industrywide average membership in this group is 1 of every 72. In addition, one out of every five Massachusetts Mutual representatives is a chartered life underwriter, the industry's highest educational designation, compared to 1 of every 18 for the industry. Also, two of every five Massachusetts Mutual representatives have qualified for the National Quality Award, an industrywide honor, compared to 1 of 13 in the entire industry.

The company prides itself on its quality field force, as well as on its contracts and its policyholder service. The company's letterheads are impressed with the trademark, "In Our Second Century of Service."

Best's Life Insurance Reports, an annual edition reporting on many aspects of legal reserve companies, fraternal benefit societies, and assessment associations operating in the United States, makes these comments on the Massachusetts Mutual:

"The company, now in its second century of operation, is purely mutual and is particularly a policyholders' institution. It has long been most ably managed. It ranks very highly and enjoys a most excellent reputation in all respects * * *. Every important benefit and privilege which the company has given to new policyholders has been given to old policyholders on the same terms, except when expressly forbidden by State or other laws."

In another section, the report adds: "In operations a very important item is expenses, which have been kept remarkably low. Careful selection and underwriting of business has produced a very favorable mortality experience. Policy lapses and surrenders have been low. Net cost to policyholders is remarkably low."

Throughout its history, then, one of the company's foremost objectives has been superlative service to its policyholders. Though the implementation of ZIP codes to its master file is merely one area of service, it points up the company's constant efforts toward that foremost objective. The company, in this area alone, has at all times cooperated with the Post Office Department. Since its inception in July 1961, company secretary, Harrison B. Clapp, has chaired the Springfield Mail Users Council, which has sponsored discussion meetings on the nationwide improved mail service program, the accelerated business collection and delivery program, the ZIP code program, and the scheduled parcel post program. Communications manager Alexander T. Muir has spoken on postal matters to various groups, and through nationwide test mailings has assisted Springfield Postmaster Morin and the New England regional office to provide substantially improved airmail service for the area.

In this area of policyholder service and in every other area, the company, indeed, takes pride in Best's comment that the Massachusetts Mutual is "particularly a policyholders' institution."

POLICY BACKED

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, Thailand understands the domino theory much better than some of us back home, the Atlanta Constitution is convinced.

Editorially the paper declares:

> We are in Vietnam to make it clear that communism may not achieve cheaply, through the guise of wars of liberation, what it knows would be costly on the open battlefield. For if we are found wanting in the will to resist covert aggression, we are in

effect inviting use of the method again in other parts of the world.

Thailand knows it is "one of those parts of the world," the paper continues, adding that the Vice President visited Bangkok "to assure our Thai allies of aid in case of guerrilla aggression, as well as to discuss economic development of the area."

Because this editorial discusses an issue on which we are committed to stand firm, it will be of general interest to my colleagues and I, therefore, am making the article available in the Record.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Feb. 15, 1966]

THAILAND UNDERSTANDS

Vice President Humphrey's mission to Thailand pulls back into focus the underlying reasons for our massive commitment in South Vietnam. That focus often slips away in the day-to-day heat of battle and debate over specific tactics.

We are in Vietnam to make it clear that communism may not achieve cheaply, through the guise of wars of liberation, what it knows would be costly on the open battlefield. For if we are found wanting in the will to resist covert aggression, we are in effect inviting use of the method again in other parts of the world.

Thailand is one of those parts of the world. The kingdom's rulers know it. Already, externally trained or inspired guerrillas are practicing terrorism in northeastern Thailand.

In fact, Thais are concerned that if the war is ended in South Vietnam, Chinese and North Vietnamese efforts may be centered on Thailand. So they are less than enthusiastic about a negotiated settlement.

Thailand has been a consistent friend of America in southeast Asia. It provides air bases that bolster our Vietnamese operations. And if we should later find it necessary to expand our troop commitments extensively and attempt to seal off the Vietcong's supply routes from the north, Thailand would be a base of our operation.

So the Vice President is in Bangkok to assure our Thai allies of aid in case of guerrilla aggression, as well as to discuss economic development of the area.

To the Siamese leaders, the domino theory is not such an object of ridicule as it is to some back home.

LANDOWNERS BATTLE BRUSH PROBLEM TO RESTORE GRASS AND SAVE NEEDED WATER

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, landowners of my State and probably of your State are engaged in a real fight to repulse the spread of moisture-stealing, worthless woody plants and brush—more than 50 percent mesquite—that threaten to engulf the land.

It may sound like so much science fiction, but these dense, prolific brushes are suffocating the livestock industry throughout many other sections of our country, robbing the ranchers of soil, water, and livestock grazing.

The Soil Conservation Service and its range conservationists have surveyed the problem twice in the past 18 years and verify the alarming situation that more than 80 percent of the grassland in Texas has become infested with brush.

Neither livestock operators, nor the Nation, can afford grasslands in poor condition, nor can we afford to lose the millions of acre-feet of water consumed annually by brush and weeds. Water lost to brush is water lost to all beneficial use. In Texas alone there is more water lost in 1 year to brush alone than is used by the city of Los Angeles. Just this morning the President sent this Congress a special message pointing out our critical shortage of water. Where can we hope to save so much water as cheaply as we can through adequate brush control?

In the face of this tenacious enemy, farmers and ranchers, not only in Texas, but throughout the rangelands of the entire country, are struggling to restore the abundant grasslands that once covered our plains and prairies.

The landowners in my district—the 11th Congressional District of Texas—are excellent representatives of the stalwart stewards of soil, water, and grassland who are waging this battle all across the United States.

The whole Nation owes these people a continuing debt of gratitude for their efforts at increasing grassland agriculture, to maintain its role in production, and to protect American agriculture.

Though treatment is going on all the time, the progress being made against the woody invader is far from encouraging. Treatment is costly, it is complex, and there is the disheartening probability of reinfestation on treated acres after a few years. Actually, most treatment results only in control, not elimination of brush.

This is a serious matter and Texas landowners have no illusions about the toughness of the job. On the other hand, I have no misgivings about their competence and will to handle it, but they must have the cooperation of their Government, and above all, we must not lose the enthusiasm and the momentum which has been built up over the years. The Nation will suffer or benefit as these landowners lose or win the struggle.

The Soil Conservation Service is keeping close watch on the problem and providing technical assistance in treatment programs. Its plant materials centers are working at adapted grasses and legumes to recapture the land from brush, but a great deal more research and work is needed, and important as it is, brush control is only one of the many problems which should be studied in a grass and forage research center. Until such a center is a reality, one of the largest and most vital segments of our food supplying effort is going to be without needed coordination.

REDWOODS

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on restoring the quality of our environment is a remarkable document. In addition to masterfully summarizing the problems we face, and the opportunities which we have neglected, it sets the stage for a meaningful exposition of the whole problem in the public forum. It is time that we begin to give our best thinking to this vital subject.

I am at heart an optimist. Therefore I have concentrated my attention on the opportunities outlined in the message. The various recreation proposals which are outlined in the message seem to me to be the essence of these opportunities.

The proposal that we establish a Redwood National Park is a case in point. But it is not one on which we can ponder long. We must not allow hesitation or procrastination to overcome the need for quick action. Even as I talk, the last of the great redwoods forest is being felled. Only a fraction of virgin forest still remains and the lumber industry is making short work of that fraction.

The redwood is a valuable resource. The wood has many unique and desirable characteristics. It resists rotting. It is almost impervious to insect attack. It weathers well. It is beautiful and can be worked easily. This is the reason there is a steady demand for its use in lawn furniture, house siding, and decorative fences. Its resistance to insects is also the reason why it lives for thousands of years in its native state.

But the redwood is also a national resource that must be preserved. I do not suggest that we deny the lumber industry the right to use redwoods. I do suggest that, considering their needs, we devise some way to preserve part of the forest for future generations.

Redwoods are fast-growing trees. They replace themselves as usable lumber within 100 years. It is my feeling that it would serve all purposes, the naturalist and the public, and the lumber industry, to preserve part in virgin stand and allow the remainder to be managed in the manner the lumber industry does so well, to provide sustained yields of a valuable lumber.

Establishing a Redwood Park does not preclude lumbering. Preserving a unique and unparalleled scenic masterpiece is not antithetical to the interests of the lumber industry.

You have all heard of the cedars of Lebanon. I am told that a bare remnant is left. In fact, this storied grove of trees existed mostly intact well into this century. Now the remaining virgin forest is measured by individual trees, some of which are a thousand years old. The visitor today is not struck by the beauty of the individual trees in their unique majesty, but rather is appalled at the short-sightedness of the men who allowed all but this pitiful remnant to be cut and used. I propose that, when the administration's proposal for a park reaches this House, we find a way to enact it quickly, lest we be judged in the same manner the stewards of the cedars of Lebanon are now judged.

TRAILS

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the President has addressed our attention to the problem of restoring the quality of our environment. It was a disturbing message. I admire his courage in detailing, in such graphic form, our society's "sins of omission."

We did not consciously set out to destroy our environment, but rather like Topsy, it "jest growed that way." But whatever the reason, it is time we faced our obligations squarely and set about righting the wrongs we have visited on what most of us consider the most beautiful piece of real estate in the world.

I was particularly impressed with the President's reference to the establishment of a nationwide system of trails. A visit to the C. & O. Canal on Sunday illustrates the universal appeal a pleasant surrounding and a path have for our citizens.

There is no reason why we cannot encourage this type of facility throughout the country. By the turn of this century it is estimated that 85 percent of our people will live in cities as opposed to 65 percent now. As the cities grow the land that is available will be put to some use. Part of that land should be reserved for just such simple pleasures as the weekend stroll. It would have been a tragic waste of good real estate had the C. & O. Canal been filled in and converted to residential or industrial use. But throughout this country this is exactly what is happening to other lands within or adjacent to our great cities. No one is consciously planning its destruction and removal as a recreational asset, it is just happening because there has been no thought given to this type of use. This certainly is a sin of omission.

We can stimulate local communities to provide facilities for the stroller, the walker and the hiker. They should be located near him.

A nationwide system of trails will stimulate local communities to provide their own systems.

A program to encourage the establishment of trails and hiking paths need not be an expensive one. The land and water conservation fund will surely encourage development but mostly it requires that government provide the vision and the leadership by judicious designation of areas already in the public ownership. By making such a designation of suitable areas the Federal Government can stimulate the development of a trails system which will meet the needs of both the urban dweller and the serious outdoorsman. Wyoming is pleased to recognize this national need and to help fulfill it, Mr. Speaker.

BENNETT CITES NEED TO CHANGE SYSTEM OF ELECTING PRESIDENT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, since 1959 I have introduced and supported legislation to change the system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States. I am gratified that there is a renewed interest in this major constitutional problem and I am hopeful that positive action will take place in the 89th Congress.

I am today reintroducing legislation first introduced by me on the opening day of the 87th Congress dealing with this important subject.

My amendment falls into the proportional plan proposals and it is the one I feel is both fair and needed by our Nation at this time. The proportional method was first proposed in the 1870's and it was approved by the Senate in 1950, but not by the House.

The legislation which I am introducing today would abolish the electoral college system, preserving only the electoral vote. Each State's electoral vote would be equivalent to the number of Representatives and Senators from that State, thus preserving the concept of States rights. Each presidential candidate would receive the same proportion of the electoral vote as his share of the State's popular vote. The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President would be elected, if such a number is a majority of the whole number of electoral votes.

If there were no majority for any candidate, then the Senate and House of Representatives in joint session would choose the President from the persons having the two highest numbers of electoral votes. A majority of the votes of the combined membership of the two bodies would be necessary for a choice. The Vice President would be chosen in a like manner.

I believe this proposal to be the nearest thing to electing a President by direct popular vote of the people while at the same time retaining and preserving the present relative strength of each State in the election of a President.

There are other important arguments in favor of my amendment:

First. The election of a candidate with a minority of popular votes would be prevented under most if not all circumstances.

Second. Minority parties in States where there is a dominant major party would have their votes count, thus giving the single voter an opportunity to affect the outcome of an election.

Third. Fraudulent voting or vote-counting and accidental circumstances would be less likely to defeat the choice of the voters.

Fourth. Sectionalism will tend to be abated.

Fifth. Proportionate voting would strengthen the two-party system in the States.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that my amendment will be given careful consideration by the Congress and enacted into law at an early date.

A copy of my resolution follows:

H.J. Res. 842

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"Section 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution.

"The electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby established. The President and Vice President shall be elected by the people of the several States. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States. Until otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year preceding the year in which the regular term of the President is to begin. Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress.

"Within forty-five days after such election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, the official custodian of the election returns of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons for whom votes were cast for President and the number of votes for each, and the total vote of the electors of the State for all persons for President, which lists he shall sign and certify and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives open all certificates and the votes shall then be counted. Each person for whom votes were cast for President in each State shall be credited with such proportion of the electoral votes thereof as he received of the total vote of the electors therein for President. In making the computations, fractional numbers less than one one-thousandth shall be disregarded unless a more detailed calculation would change the result of the election. The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of such electoral votes. If no person have a majority of the whole number of electoral votes, then from the persons having the two highest numbers of electoral votes for President the Senate and the House of Representatives sitting in joint session shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. A majority of the votes of the combined authorized membership of the Senate and the House of

Representatives shall be necessary for a choice.

"The Vice President shall be likewise elected, at the same time and in the same manner and subject to the same provisions, as the President, but no person constitutionally ineligible for the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

"SEC. 2. The provisions of section 1, article II, of the Constitution, which preceded the fourth paragraph thereof insofar as they relate to conditions of eligibility for the office of President, and the twelfth article of amendment to the Constitution, are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 3. This article shall take effect on the tenth day of February following its ratification.

"SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

A SNEAKER ON SNEAKERS

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Customs Bureau's recent adoption of new guidelines for the tariff evaluation of rubber-soled footwear has threatened the continued prosperity of one of the principal employment areas of my congressional district, Connecticut's Naugatuck Valley, the home of the United States Rubber Co.'s footwear division. I have today introduced legislation to reverse the Customs Bureau's action.

Since August 19, 1965, when the Customs Bureau published notice of its intention to reduce the tariff on rubber-soled footwear through the adoption of revised valuation guidelines, I have made numerous administrative efforts to prevent this action and to avert its obvious threat to the employment security of a large number of my constituents.

I have had voluminous correspondence with the Secretaries of State, Labor, Treasury, and Commerce and with the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Gov. Christian Herter, as well as with the Commissioner of Customs, and I have set forth in detail in our correspondence and conversations the hazards of the adoption of these new guidelines. In this endeavor I have had the full and personal support of representatives of the labor and industrial segments concerned, and I am convinced that these efforts were favorably received in several areas. I had been encouraged by many expressions of sympathetic consideration of the Naugatuck problem from various Federal officials, and while working closely with representatives of management and workers of Naugatuck's footwear plant, I was again especially pleased to note the very receptive audience accorded these officials by Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz who heard their complaints at a special meeting in October of 1965.

Despite these presentations, however, the Customs Bureau has adopted these new guidelines, and moreover, it has announced its intention to apply this tariff reduction retroactively to include imports which entered this country over 3 years ago. On February 4, 1963, the Customs Bureau served notice on all appraising officers to suspend evaluation of all imported rubber-soled footwear which had not then been liquidated for tariff application. Now, after postponing the importers' obligation to pay any tariff for over 3 years, the Bureau is retroactively reducing the tariff which has accrued during that period. In view of the large Federal revenue loss involved in this measure, this action deserves further scrutiny, and to assist the Committee on Ways and Means in its deliberation on this matter I have requested from the Commissioner of Customs an accounting of the number of pairs of footwear which have not been dutied, as well as a calculation of the amount of uncollected duty involved.

This highly discriminatory treatment of imported footwear is not a new phenomenon. It is paralleled by prior policies of allowing imported rubber overshoes containing synthetic rubber to escape full tariff application and by the gradual whittling away of the traditional pattern that is still appropriate for our domestic footwear industry. The results of these practices and policies appear most vividly in the Department of Commerce trade statistics which reveal an incredible rate of import growth within the past decade. In 1955, imports of protective rubber footwear totaled 185,412 pairs, or 0.63 percent of domestic production. By 1963 this figure had skyrocketed to 12,812,518 pairs or 55.25 percent of total U.S. output.

As imports of rubber-soled footwear continue to rise in volume—from 40,000 pairs in 1954 to in excess of 21 million pairs in 1965—it is becoming clear that the recent Customs decision is another step in the wrong direction. When one considers that the foreign producers have multiplied their 1954 volume of shipments by 500 times, rising from less than 1 percent of domestic production in 1954 to about 20 percent in 1965, while domestic shipments have advanced by only three times in the same period, it becomes clear that the importers have been allowed to capture more than their fair share of our domestic market growth in rubber-soled footwear, and that the time has come to apply the brakes before our entire domestic industry is irreparably injured in the process.

My bill will put on the brakes. It calls for the continued application of the basis of valuation established by Presidential proclamation in 1933 to all rubber-soled fabric footwear imports which have entered this country since the date when Customs suspended valuation. This action will restore to the Treasury the full measure of accrued back duties which have been owing since early 1963, and it will avert a major economic problem for this vital industry and its thousands of employees.

I am confident that the Members of this House will recognize the merit of this legislation and its importance to the thousands of hourly rate wage earners who depend on its protection. I strongly recommend its early passage.

MISSISSIPPI HEADSTART PROGRAM

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to read in this morning's Washington Post, the announcement that a contract had been signed by the Office of Economic Opportunity for a continuation of the Mississippi Headstart program. I should like to take this opportunity to commend Mr. Shriver, the Director, Mr. Berry, the Assistant Director for Community Action, and Dr. Richmond, the Director of Headstart, for refunding one of the most worthwhile Headstart programs in the country.

Since all of the facts were not given in the newspaper stories, I would like to bring to your attention the resolution of some of the issues which have delayed the signing.

The total project will cost 6.2 million of which the Federal share is 5.6 million. It is a 6-month program and will enable 9,135 children to attend Headstart training classes. There will be 122 training centers all over the State in every congressional district.

In order to avoid some of the problems of the previous year OEO has worked out certain new procedures. For example:

The agreement signed yesterday provides for a new personnel and management team who have experience and training in budget and money matters.

A new accounting firm, Ernst & Ernst, of Mississippi, has been retained.

A prominent Jackson attorney will be counsel and the office has been moved from Beulah.

In addition, three additional highly qualified people, all Mississippians, will be members of the new board—a professor of psychiatry, an educator, and a pediatrician.

A new handbook on accounting and fiscal procedures has been developed.

New payroll and personnel procedures will be adopted.

Because of the desperate need of the children in Mississippi for this kind of help and in order to eliminate one of the points of contention arising out of the previous program, a $35,000 escrow account has been established from private sources to cover any disallowances which may arise from last year's programs in the final audit.

Hopefully, none of this money will need to be used but it is there because of the concern of these private organizations to see this desperately needed program go forward.

I was one of the Congressmen who greeted the little Headstart lobbyists from Mississippi when they came to tell us about their classes a week or so ago. I am sorry that more of you were not able to meet these future citizens. The Headstart program has been an outstanding success all over the country but its meaning for the poor children of Mississippi is uncalculable.

I believe that we need more Headstart programs in Mississippi and I have been assured by OEO that additional money is available for any organization offering an effective program which abides by the war on poverty regulations and the civil rights law. I am glad to know, too, that the Labor Department and OEO have funded a program to retrain 7,500 displaced migrant laborers in Mississippi. This is most welcomed news and I trust that State and local authorities are cooperating fully in getting this project underway as rapidly as possible. Similar projects in other parts of the State are desperately needed.

It is also good news that the surplus food distribution is going to go forward and will be increased.

Not too long ago I joined my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK], in bringing to the attention of the House the desperate plight of the poor people of Mississippi. We intend to pursue this matter even though the announcements of the last few days are most reassuring.

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING—EFFORTS OF CONGRESSMAN LINDLEY BECKWORTH TO ASSIST STUDENTS, TEACHERS, AND OTHERS TO OBTAIN SUMMER EMPLOYMENT IN WASHINGTON, D.C., AND OTHER EFFORTS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am 52 years of age and have held elective legislative offices 26 years—one-half of my life. I have represented the Third Congressional District 24 years. I was in the Texas Legislature 2 years.

Each Texas Member continues to represent and will until January 3, 1967, the congressional district or area from which he was elected in 1964. Because I was reelected for a 12th 2-year term in November 1964, which term began in January 1965, I am now and shall continue to be the Congressman from the nine counties—Smith, Gregg, Van Zandt, Upshur, Wood, Camp, Rusk, Panola, and Shelby—of the present Third Congressional District until January 1967. A new congressional term will begin in January 1967. The 1966 elections will determine who is to represent each of the newly formed districts.

Our present Third Congressional District is to be abolished as of January 3, 1967. A new Third Congressional District is to be located in the western part of Dallas County and will border Tarrant County of which Fort Worth is the county seat—as of January 3, 1967. The 1960 population of the Fourth District was 216,371; the 1960 population of the First District was 245,942; the 1960 population of our Third District was 293,942. Five of the nine counties of our Third District—the five with county seats are Camp—Pittsburg; Panola—Carthage; Rusk—Henderson; Shelby—Center; Wood—Quitman—are to be placed in Congressional District No. 1 which has in it Paris, Marshall, and Texarkana.

Four of our nine counties—the four with county seats are Gregg—Longview; my home county of Upshur—Gilmer; Smith—Tyler; and Van Zandt—Canton—are to be placed in Congressional District No. 4. Neither the First nor Fourth District lost a county. I have run for office every 2 years in two of the nine Third District counties—Camp and Upshur—for 30 years; I have run for office in eight of the nine counties—Camp, Upshur, Van Zandt, Smith, Gregg, Panola, Wood, Rusk—every 2 years for 28 years. I have run for office in Shelby county 8 years.

I quote from an article that appeared in the Tyler Courier Times January 13, 1966 concerning Hon. Brady Gentry, an outstanding and beloved citizen of Tyler:

> On the Washington scene 4 years and seldom raising his voice in the House, Gentry won recognition as one who diligently informed himself on bills and voted his convictions with apparently no regard for party lines or political expediency.
>
> Yet, in his one bid for reelection, against a formidable foe, he came out on top. In 1954 he defeated the man who had preceded him. LINDLEY BECKWORTH of Gladewater, who in 1952 made an unsuccessful bid for the U.S. Senate against Price Daniel.
>
> But Gentry won in a close vote and BECKWORTH returned to Congress in 1957 after Gentry stepped down. Ironically, the only election Gentry ever lost was a congressional election back in the 1930's.
>
> The victor in that race was a former schoolteacher by the name of LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

The post offices in the present Fourth Congressional District are as follows:

Collin County: Allen, Anna, Blue Ridge, Celina, Copeville, Farmersville, Frisco, Josephine, Lavon, McKinney, Melissa, Nevada, Plano, Princeton, Prosper, Renner, Westminster, Weston, Wylie.

Fannin County: Bailey, Bonham, Dodd City, Ector, Gober, Honey Grove, Ivanhoe, Ladonia, Leonard, Randolph, Ravenna, Savoy, Telephone, Trenton, Windom.

Grayson County: Bells, Collinsville, Denison, Dorchester, Gordonville, Gunter, Howe, Pottsboro, Sadler, Sherman, Southmayd, Tioga, Tom Bean, Van Alstyne, Whitesboro, Whitewright.

Hunt County: Caddo Mills, Campbell, Celeste, Commerce, Fairlie, Floyd, Greenville, Lone Oak, Merit, Quinlan, Wolfe City.

Kaufman County: Crandall, Elmo, Forney, Kaufman, Kemp, Mabank, Rosser, Scurry, Terrell. Rains County: Emory, Point.

Rockwall County: Fate, Rockwall, and Royse City.

Two colleges and one university that are in the seven counties to which four of the nine counties of our Third Congressional District are to be added are East Texas State University, Austin College, and Grayson County Junior College. I attended East Texas State Teachers College. Also my folks, A. S., W. P., David Paul Slaughter, and others went to East Texas. My father and twin sister—SFA graduates—taught. My father, a native of Georgia, and his second wife, Pearl Sloan Phipps, taught last in Smith and Upshur Counties. I taught school 3 years. While teaching I coached basketball and drove a schoolbus. I feel sure some students from these schools referred to above as well as other colleges would welcome the opportunity in the future to obtain summer employment with the Government in Washington. I say this as one who also attended Sam Houston State Teachers College, SMU, Baylor—law—and Texas University—arts and sciences and law. Also I did some work through Abilene Christian College. In the newly created Fourth District there are about 40 newspapers, 18 radio stations, and 2 TV stations. Dallas television and radio programs reach many people in the new Fourth District.

I was born in Kaufman County June 30, 1913. I lived in Henderson County. My mother, Josie Slaughter, daughter of Elder W. W. Slaughter, a Primitive Baptist preacher, of Edgewood, taught in Henderson County. I now live and have lived for 24 years in the same house in the Union Grove community in Upshur County, Gladewater, Route 2. This is about 9 miles from Longview, the last city on the eastern side of the new district and about 150 miles from Denison and Sherman and Gordonville on the northwestern side of the new Fourth District. I married Eloise Carter, daughter of Barney and Mattie Palmer Carter, Tyler, Tex., in 1942—nearly 24 years ago. We have five children, Gary, Carter Otis, Mary Eloise, Linda Louise, and John Barney, all of whom attend school.

In the Texas Legislature I was a member of the Education—Hon. Charles Tennyson was my chairman—and Appropriations Committees and dealt with problems of education, institutions of higher learning, and State hospitals. In the Congress I was second ranking member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—the committee of which Speaker Rayburn was chairman—and I have served on the Foreign Affairs and Post Office and Civil Service Committees. I have practiced law—I am a member of the Gregg County Bar Association—farmed, worked on a cattle ranch, in a tailor shop, grocery, filling station, and cafe. I have shoveled gravel on the State highway and done oilfield work. Because of these varied school and employment experiences, I have been and am convinced that people sincerely desire to learn more about how their Government in Washington works. My bill, H.R. 242, will help students get summer employment in Washington, D.C., in my opinion.

I include some remarks I made on the floor of the House of Representatives July 12, 1965.

> This is the third Beckworth bill which has been brought to the floor of the House of Representatives to apportion summer jobs among people of the States and the District of Columbia. The purpose of H.R. 242 simply is to pave the way for more equitable distribution of Government summer jobs in the Washington area among young people from all of the States. Even though the Civil Service Commission has recently made a sincere effort to provide for wider representation among the States in filling these summer jobs, the Commission's program has only scratched the surface as I see it. This is attested by evidence presented at our public hearings that approximately two-thirds of the 6,000 temporary employees appointed here in the summer of 1964 were residents of the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia. This obvious disparity clearly results from lack of a firm statutory directive which will insure young people in all of the States a truly equitable opportunity to participate in the unique summer experience of working in the Nation's Capital.
>
> My father and mother were teachers and first prepared to be teachers in Commerce, Tex., and, incidentally, were married in Greenville while they were attending school in Commerce. They were always interested in governmental activities as I always have been. My mother taught in Van Zandt County and my father went to school in Kaufman County and was teaching and farming on halves in Kaufman County when I was born. My parents taught their pupils the importance of being interested in governmental activities. My wife and I have three sons and two daughters. We have urged them to be interested in government.
>
> In the time when my parents were in school and first began to teach, few people undertook to come to Washington to work, particularly in the summertime. Times have changed. Many types of people seek employment with the U.S. Government. Particularly teachers and boys and girls who are students wish to come to work in Washington in the summertime in order to learn about the workings of their Government. The requests for these jobs are many.
>
> My bill H.R. 242 is identical to my bill H.R. 5968 of the 87th Congress which passed the House by a vote of 301 for to 18 against and is similar to my bill H.R. 10 of the 88th Congress which passed the House by a vote of 309 for to 19 against. I most sincerely hope that the House will again approve the very practical and necessary reform embodied in H.R. 242.

I quote from my remarks during a hearing in the Senate on my bill H.R. 242:

> On July 12, 1965, the House again passed this legislation on a record vote of 336 for to 22 against. I most sincerely hope that your subcommittee and your full committee will approve the very practical and necessary reform embodied in H.R. 242.

As a former teacher, I have always favored and I strongly favor educational benefits for our servicemen and veterans. In the 1st session of the 86th Congress I introduced H.R. 7724, "a bill to amend section 1622 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to clarify the meaning of the term 'change of program of education or training' as used in such section." A favorable report was given on my bill by the American Legion on July 15, 1959.

I quote the pertinent part of a letter written to Representative Dorn by Mr. Miles D. Kennedy, of the American Legion:

> "In connection with H.R. 7724, while we have no resolution on the subject matter, I would advise that the American Legion's rehabilitation representatives feel such an amendment to section 1622 of title 38 of the United States Code is desirable. We, therefore, trust the subcommittee will favorably consider H.R. 7724."

The Veterans' Administration gave a favorable report on my bill. The bill was reported favorably by the Dorn subcommittee on July 21, 1959, and its provisions have now become law.

I consistently have supported and do support the policy of standing firm in Vietnam.

As a member of the Texas Legislature and a Member of Congress for 24 years, I have supported the conservation, preservation, development, and proper utilization of our natural resources such as water and soil. This I shall continue to do.

I supported the so-called GI bill for World War II veterans and I always have favored and do favor generous pay and benefits for service people and their dependents and generous benefits and pensions for veterans and their dependents. I supported the most recent GI legislation, H.R. 12410 and S. 9 which passed the House February 7, 1966. I quote the pertinent part of a letter written me April 26, 1944 from Austin, Tex., by Harry E. Rather, of the American Legion of Texas:

> Dear Lindley: Thanks for your prompt reply in regard to the resolution passed by the department executive committee regarding the Legion's GI bill of rights for World War II veterans. We know that you are for this legislation. We have known it all along and we are very pleased to find that you were at least one of the Congressmen from Texas to sign discharge petition No. 8.

I quote part of a letter written December 31, 1945, which I received from Mr. Joseph M. Stack, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Kansas City, Mo.:

> I have the page from the Congressional Record reprinting your remarks and the various communications you have received in connection with your activities in behalf of veterans and their dependents, and I wish to express my appreciation for your efforts along this line.

Also I quote a part of a letter which was written to me March 13, 1963, by one of the outstanding leaders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

> You are known to have supported all veteran legislation.

I have tried to help our unemployed, including our older workers. Some evidence of my efforts is shown by my statements and the tabulations in the Congressional Record, volume 110, part 3, pages 2857 and 2862. I quote two paragraphs from a letter written me by Senator Pat McNamara, March 25, 1964. He is chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging:

> Thank you for calling my attention to the material you inserted in the Congressional Record of February 13 concerning Federal employment of older workers. The staff of the Senate Special Committee on Aging tell me that they noted the data when you inserted it in the Record and that it is one of the best discussions of the subject.
>
> You are certainly to be commended for your zeal in combating age discrimination in Federal employment, and I wish you well in your further activities along this line.

HOURLY MINIMUM WAGE PROVISIONS FOR HARVEST WORKERS IN OREGON

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to extend the hourly minimum wage provisions to agricultural harvest operations would have an effect on farm labor in Oregon quite contrary to the stated intentions of the authors of the proposal. I am referring particularly to workers in fruit, vegetable, and berry harvest operations where payment is customarily made on a piecework basis.

The provisions of H.R. 10518 would not raise the wages of professional harvest workers in Oregon. The present piecework payment, translated into an average hourly wage, already exceeds the proposed $1.15 per hour minimum for such a worker. Information compiled and published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture demonstrate that farm wage rates in the Pacific Coast States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and California are higher than in any other area of the Nation.

I am concerned here today, however, with the fact that the bill would have a major detrimental effect on part-time employment opportunities for students, housewives, pensioners, the partially disabled, and others who, through choice or through no fault of their own, might not consistently earn the equivalent of the minimum wage. Thousands of workers in these categories would be effectively excluded from earning the supplemental income, the spending money, or the college education fund that has customarily been available to them through piecework harvest employment.

The producers of these crops are suffering from the cost-price squeeze, and if H.R. 10518 is enacted they will be forced to limit employment to those whose potential for production and whose performance is clearly sufficient to equal the minimum wage. If, because of severe labor shortages, the farmer is forced to employ all available help regardless of capability, then the minimum wage provision would be a serious and unjustifiable economic penalty.

I want to quote briefly from an article in the February 1 issue of the Flying Eagle, the student publication of the Harrisburg Union High School, Harrisburg, Oreg.:

> Thousands of youngsters work a few weeks each summer harvesting Oregon's pole bean and berry crops. They are needed, they want to and like to, but most of all they help because it gives them the opportunity to earn their own money.
>
> But they may have to enter the ranks of the unemployable. That is, unless those

> who believe they should have the opportunity to work do something about it. Thousands of youngsters may be legislated out of their jobs.
>
> The bill before Congress makes no provision for those who work on a piece-rate basis.

These young people want to work, and we should be providing additional opportunities for their employment instead of reducing their chances as is proposed in H.R. 10518.

The bill, as presently written, would prohibit youngsters under 12 from working, except in fields owned by their parents. Considering the number of youngsters under 12 who eagerly seek the opportunity to earn spending money during the summertime, after school, or on weekends in fields near their homes, this is an unreasonable limitation. For those between the ages of 12 and 16 and for full-time students, the bill provides for a minimum wage of 85 percent of the adult rate. For all others, the minimum hourly wage would apply.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of the migrant worker are many, but in all candor, I must say that as far as Oregon is concerned, the enactment of an hourly minimum wage for harvest work is not going to solve a single one of his problems. It may, in fact, serve to reduce the total income of a migrant family by preventing or discouraging the employment of the young and the aged. One of the major problems of the migrant worker is underemployment, a situation brought about by the limitations of the harvest season, not by an overabundance of workers in the labor market. To the contrary, when the crops are ready to be picked, there never seems to be enough workers to go around for the short period of harvest.

At this point, someone might well suggest that if wages were higher, there would be a sufficient labor force to meet the demand. The fact is that competition for experienced pickers is such that the piecework rate can provide a substantial hourly wage. Let me cite just a few examples of the earning capabilities of steady, experienced workers in Oregon harvest operations.

At the 1965 rate of 4½ cents per pound for picking cherries, a man and his wife earned $1,009 in 10 days in Marion County, Oreg. This was slightly over $50 per day for each of them for a 10- to 11-hour working day. During the same period, in the same orchard, a single man earned $492.05.

At the rate of 3 cents per pound, a good worker in the pole bean harvest in western Oregon can earn up to $20 per day.

In one apple orchard, at the 1965 harvest rate of $4 to $4.50 per bin, 40 percent of the harvest workers averaged $3.05 per hour.

In the blackberry fields, a family of 4 picked 578 crates at 55 cents per crate in a period of 4 days. This was a father, mother, and two high school children—total earnings for 4 days, $317.90.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention here to suggest that every worker earns the type of wages cited in these examples, but I do want to emphasize that Oregon growers offer piecework rates that encourage earnings well in excess of the proposed minimum wage. These producers would be delighted, I am sure, if every worker in the field earned the maximum wages possible, but not every person who hires out for harvest work is capable of maintaining a consistently high rate of production, and many are simply not motivated to do so. Among these are high school and college students, housewives, and the active elderly who find that picking berries, beans, or fruit is a healthful and enjoyable way to earn extra dollars, but who are not dependent upon the income for their total livelihood. Because of the chronic shortage of full-time harvest workers, however, these people play a vital role in Oregon's $75 million hand harvest operations.

Testimony before the General Subcommittee on Labor discloses that the hourly rate for certain farm labor in some parts of the United States is as low as 50 cents per hour. I recognize that it is the intention of the sponsors of H.R. 10518 to help correct that kind of inequity, but it should not be done in such a way that it limits employment opportunities in areas like Oregon where average wages already exceed the proposed minimum.

I am opposed to the bill in its present form, and urge that the minimum wage provisions be eliminated in agricultural harvest operations where payment has customarily been made on a piecework basis, and that the bill be amended to permit youngsters of all ages to continue to seek afterschool employment in safe and suitable harvest work.

THE 68TH ANNIVERSARY OF SINKING OF BATTLESHIP "MAINE"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the 15th of February is an anniversary that will be observed by Spanish-American War veterans as long as any remain, and it is my hope and prayer that later generations of Americans will continue the observance of the anniversary on which the battleship *Maine* was sunk in Havana harbor and the United States of America was started on the road to world leadership.

It was the commencement of what future historians will call the 50-year war—the War with Spain, an interlude of peace and preparation, then World War I, another interlude of peace and preparation, and World War II—the 50-year war that changed the face of history and started the peoples of all the world on a march to higher heights of human welfare and universal brotherhood.

As the last veteran of the Spanish-American War in this body, I have sought as best I could to help in placing the war with Spain in its rightful place in American history. The spirit of 1898 was one of the noblest manifestations of unselfish idealism of the ages.

In a large sense the Spanish-American War is the war of our country only casually remembered, misunderstood at the best, and grossly undervaluated as a direct and driving force in the expansion and the moral enrichness of our own country and the mighty changes that have come as earthquakes of humanity all over the world.

It is no exaggeration to say that when the *Maine* went down, with 266 precious American lives, in the harbor of Havana on February 15, 1898, a force was ignited that would not dull until benefiting change had come to every nation of the world and some measure of benefit to every human being everywhere.

As the years roll on, Mr. Speaker, the war with Spain will come more truly into its rightful place in the history of our country. It is natural that in the rapid succession of events at the advent of the 20th century the war with Spain and its tremendous impact upon the development of our country as a world power should have been minimized if not overlooked.

Since I have been a Member of this body, I have never failed to observe the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine* on February 15 or the day closest thereto when the House was in session. This year we were not in session on February 15, and by unanimous consent my special order was reset for today.

Today I am including in my remarks the address on February 14, 1906, of Lt. Col. Alfred C. Sharpe, 30th U.S. Infantry, secretary of the army of Santiago de Cuba, at the dedication of the battle monument on the ruins of Fort El Viso at El Caney in Cuba. That was 60 years ago.

Please note that this address was made 8 years after the Santiago campaign and at a time when the President of Cuba, the Government and the people of Cuba, all were grateful to the United States and the American soldiers and sailors who had come to the aid of Cuba in her distress and misery.

I might explain that Colonel Sharpe's address is included with other addresses in the report of the Santiago Battlefield Commission issued from the press of John S. Bridges & Co. of Baltimore in 1906. It is listed in the Library of Congress as E717.1.S67.

This Santiago Battlefield Commission on February 15, 1906, visited Siboney, Cuba, as guests of A. E. Borie, vice president of the Bethlehem Steel Co., and selected, we are told, "the site for the proposed monument, to be erected by the Juragua Iron Co., commemorating the landing place of General Shafter and staff and Kent's 1st Infantry Division, and the subsequent reenforcements of the V Army Corps in Cuba, as well as the location of the base hospital of the Santiago campaign from which all the wounded and sick were sent back to the United States."

In due time the monument was erected at Siboney by the Juragua Iron Co. I saw that monument at Siboney in 1955, some 57 years after I, with my comrades of the 33d Volunteer Michigan Infantry, had landed there in late June of 1898, wading ashore from small boats, holding above us our Springfield rifles high in the air. The 33d Michigan was the first volunteer regiment after the Rough Riders to land in Cuba. Yet the monument at Siboney made no mention of the 33d Michigan.

If the monument at Siboney is still standing, I know that Archie House, past commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans, will join me in the suggestion that someone at some time set that monument right as a historian. Archie and I are the only ones left of Company I, 33d Michigan, and we know that our regiment, even though unmentioned in the inscription on the monument, was among the very first to land.

Mr. Speaker, here is Colonel Sharpe's address of 60 years ago:

ADDRESS OF COLONEL SHARPE, AT DEDICATION

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, we have come across the seas to dedicate on this historic field a monument to the memory of brave comrades who here gave up their lives in battle. Unlike most wars whose glowing campfires and flashing guns have thrown their lurid glare across the pages of history, the conflict in which these men fought and died was waged neither for the defense of cherished institutions at home nor for subjugation and conquest abroad.

They were not actuated by sordid ambition and lust of power which have been the cause of so many cruel struggles among the children of men. They came not at the behest of loyal princes struggling for the succession to a throne, nor yet for the extension of commerce nor for the acquisition of new domains. Their mission here was of a far different nature and so unique in its motive and so brilliant in its achievement as to be perhaps without a real parallel in the history of war.

UNHAPPY PLIGHT OF CUBANS

The people of Cuba had long been struggling to cast off the hated yoke of Spain; without recognition as belligerents, without a treasury, without a navy; hunted down and penned like animals in camps of reconcentration; half naked and dying by thousands of starvation; with poor arms and limited ammunition, they yet maintained the unequal struggle through years of suffering and horror such as has seldom blackened the annals of the race.

Deeply moved by these sad conditions, so shocking to every sentiment of humanity, the great heart of the American people went out to these unhappy neighbors in unfeigned compassion and sympathy and began to demand how long in all good conscience this reign of desolation could be permitted to endure.

The right of one government to intervene in the internal affairs of another had long been debated by the publicists and discarded as a pernicious and dangerous doctrine. Our own Washington had even warned the fathers to beware of entangling alliances. But anyone the least acquainted with the genius of our institutions and the character of our people could not have failed to foresee that sooner or later the cry of these sorrowing Cubans would pierce the soul and rouse the conscience of the great Republic of the north, and then woe to him who should stand in the way of their swift and righteous judgment.

BRITAIN'S DECLARATION OF WHITEHALL

It was not difficult, perhaps, for the people of England to understand the feelings of their American kindred in this delicate situation. They had themselves been similarly circumstanced a hundred years before when in the famous Declaration of Whitehall, after recounting some of the horrors of the French Revolution, they declared:

"This state of affairs cannot subsist in France without implicating neighboring powers; without giving them the right and imposing upon them the duty of arresting the progress of an evil which only exists by the successive violation of all laws and every sense of propriety, and the subversion of the fundamental principles which unite men by the ties of social life."

But in that instance England was intervening to restore a throne—not to emancipate an enthralled people. And in the American Revolution several years prior to that date the aid which came to the colonies from France was recognized not so much as an intervention in behalf of the colonists as an effort to humble the power of England.

To the nations of continental Europe, however, the kindly impulses of the American people were not so readily intelligible. They hugged the delusion that sectional differences were still smoldering among us and that united action on any great question of policy, especially one so serious as to involve the possibility of war, would be next to impossible.

Accustomed to suppress individuality and keep the faculties of the mind among the masses inert, they did not realize that ours is indeed and in fact a government by the people, and that in point of intelligence, generous sentiment and spontaneous individual initiative the American character, as some one has justly declared, is probably the most striking and positive which the human family has produced.

Such a people, once convinced of the righteousness of a cause, do not stop to count the cost nor calculate the benefits. Strongly imbued with the militant missionary spirit, their leaders are not only encouraged to lead on, but even impelled further possibly than they originally intended to go or deemed it expedient to go. So it was in the great War Between the States in 1861; and so it was again in the war of 1898.

MCKINLEY SEES APPROACH OF STORM

President McKinley and his able advisers saw the approach of the coming storm; with noble forbearance and high statesmanship they exhausted every resource of diplomacy to find, if possible, some basis of pacification and adjustment without an appeal to arms. And it is only fair to Spain to remember that these overtures were received and treated with a consideration which gave promise of ultimate peaceful success.

But suddenly, like the flash of an electric bolt, a horrible event in the harbor of Havana dissipated all possibility of settlement and passed the question from the deliberations of cabinets and diplomats to the forum of the people. The explosion of the *Maine* seemed to set the Republic on fire. Its reverberations shook the remotest hamlet in the land.

The story of Cuba's wrongs became the theme of daily conversation and the burden of the daily press; it was told with touching pathos in the Halls of Congress; from ocean to ocean pulpits rang with burning philippics and the congregations again began singing the grand old war song, the sublime "Battle Hymn of the Republic":

"Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming
 of the Lord;
He is trampling out the vintage where the
 grapes of wrath are stored;
He hath loosed the fateful lightnings of his
 terrible swift sword;
His truth is marching on.

"In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born
 across the sea,
With a glory in His bosom that transfigures
 you and me;
As He died to make men holy let us die to
 make men free;
While God is marching on."

VOTE IN CONGRESS IS UNANIMOUS

And so the war began; obedient to the will of the people and without one dissenting vote, the Congress made an appropriation of $50 million at the immediate disposal of the President. This remarkable unanimity of action, obliterating all party lines and discovering the undivided Nation in solid phalanx behind the President as their Commander in Chief was perhaps one of the happiest surprises which surprising America has ever given to the nations of the world. And had they learned no other lesson save this, the opportunity to proclaim in such an unmistakable and splendid manner the absolute unification and solidarity of our great country would of itself have been worth all the money the war cost.

It is gratifying also to recall at this juncture the resolute attitude and good will of our cousins in old England. We are told that when approached by some of the continental powers with a proposition for a coalition in behalf of Spain the British Government declined absolutely to consider it; and upon being pressed as to her attitude in case such coalition were formed without her, replied that in that event she would stand by the United States.

I am aware that the truth of this statement has been seriously questioned, and it must be confessed that the tone of the British press at that time was by no means friendly; but whether the report be true or false we certainly know this: that ever since the memorable victory which here crowned our arms 7½ years ago, British respect for America has been steadily growing and has been seeking expression on every proper occasion in words and tokens of esteem.

Contemplating these happy conditions and hoping that England and America may continue to draw still closer and closer together "hands clasped across the sea" and girdling the world with the benign influence of Anglo-Saxon institutions, who shall measure the results of the war of 1898?

NATION MOBILIZE FOR WAR

We will not stop to review the dramatic scenes which followed the declaration of war: the hasty mobilization and embarkation of Shafter's splendid corps; the disquieting rumors of phantom warships; the long, tedious voyage; the skillful landing under protection of our gallant fleet; then the affair at Guasimas, followed by the prompt advance and the final glorious culmination here on that memorable July 1 when Capron's guns opened the day at El Caney. Those stirring events are vividly remembered by all and need not here be recounted.

But it is gratifying to recall the fact that American prowess on this field was fully maintained at the high standard of its best and loftiest traditions.

We had been taught by former wars to believe that when troops in action had sustained certain losses approximating 14 or 15 percent, it would be necessary to bring up the supports, and when such losses reached the alarming proportion of 25 percent, the morale would be seriously shattered and further advance without reenforcements would be effectually checked.

But it remained for the American Army on this field to establish a new world record. Without supports, without a man in reserve, and after a most exhausting march through the torrid jungle, the single thin line which rushed to the assault of these entrenched positions lost more than 15 percent, before it had traversed half the bullet-swept zone: yet they gallantly pressed on, many of the regiments, exposed to direct and converging fire, such as the 7th of Lawton's, and the 6th, 13th, and 16th of Kent's, leaving upward of 30 percent lying along the bloody path across the deadly plain.

DEFENSE OF NATION IS IN PREPAREDNESS

It may not be inappropriate to pause just here for a moment to repeat, as it should be repeated on every proper occasion and in every proper place, the lesson here impressively emphasized that if we would reach across the sea and strike a blow as quick and crushing and decisive as was struck here in 1898, we must have the most perfect instrumentalities with which to do it; we must have not only an adequate modern Navy but a highly specialized and adequate Military Establishment as well.

Relying with confidence upon our splendid battleships to do their part, we must, nevertheless, remember that their action stops with the shore. A ship, however magnificently equipped and handled, cannot fight on land; neither can a navy spare its vessels for transportation. Nor should we be satisfied with a contemplation of our vast resources and fall into the fatal belief that a land force can be suddenly improvised. Military resources and military strength are two widely different things and must not be confounded.

We may possess untold wealth in the one and be sadly destitute in the other. The speedy organization, equipment, and embarkation of some of the dashing volunteers who participated so honorably in the Santiago campaign, was indeed a fine exhibition of American initiative and organizing power.

But our admiration for their bold and gallant action should never be permitted to obscure the fact that an immediately available and well-trained force cannot be suddenly created. In addition to the preliminary work of organizing and equipping, the training of the modern soldier demands an irreducible amount of time, and time in the operations of war is an element which neither gold nor genius can command.

MUST ALWAYS BE READY FOR WAR

I know these are familiar and oft-repeated truisms, but, we regret to say there is still great need of their repetition. And they should be repeated and repeated again until our people come to a realization of their full meaning. We should never grow weary of reciting the old Roman proverb, as true today as when it was first uttered, that if we would have commerce, if we would have national stability, if we would have honorable and lasting peace, we must be ready for war.

This is the first and second and third duty of the state. Had we been compelled in 1898 to postpone the invasion of Cuba until we could have organized and prepared a sufficient volunteer force, training them in all the scientific appliances of the present day, the strategic advantages would have been entirely lost, the enemy would have gained time to prepare a more formidable defense, the threatened coalitions would probably have been consummated, perhaps our command of the sea interrupted, and the story of Cuba would have been far different.

After the roar of battle has ceased to resound in our ears, after the armies are called home and affairs have resumed their normal course, we are prone to look back upon the conditions which led to the conflict as something out of the ordinary and as not liable to happen again.

NEW RESPONSIBILITIES AS WORLD POWER

But human wisdom cannot foresee the varied form in which opposition to our wide-expanding, world-engirdling Republic may next appear; having become a great world power we certainly shall be expected to meet the obligations of a world power; without an effective and immediately available land force backed up by a properly organized and trained reserve, no suddenly improvised transports however numerous, and no hastily assembled levies, however brave and patriotic, will suffice.

It is encouraging to see that the President of the United States, himself a veteran of the Santiago campaign, is leading the thought of the country in this important matter. In his last annual message to Congress he declares:

"We cannot consider the question of our foreign policy without at the same time treating of the Army and Navy."

He points out the importance of thorough preparation and training, and adds:

"Only by such training in advance can we be sure that in actual war field operations and those at sea will be carried on sucessfully."

If the campaign of Santiago shall have brought our people to a serious contemplation of these vital truths, leading them to delevop and resolutely maintain an adequate transport service against all the arguments and influences of the intense commercialism of the day and a rational system of National Reserves capable of immediate and effective action, we shall recognize another debt of gratitude to the prompt and ready men who came over the seas to give battle here in 1898.

TRIBUTE TO SOLDIERS AT SANTIAGO

Time will not permit us to call the roll of our heroic dead—lustrous with the names of the invincible Lawton, the knightly Ludlow, the brave Wikoff; yea, bearing also the names of Liscum, and Hamilton, and Egbert, and Haskell, and Forse, and Fornance, and the two Caprons, and scores of others less conspicuous, perhaps, in military rank but of no less conspicuous virtue.

Many of them fell here gallantly charging these gallantly defended trenches; others succumbed to wounds or sank under wasting disease here contracted; and others still escaping the storm of shot and shell which swept down from these embattled heights, survived only to fall on other fields of glory in far away Luzon or under the walls of ancient Pekin.

Soldiers every one of them. "Men who put their creed into their deed" and who, though conscious they were participating in a great drama on the stage of life, never stopped to act a part, never looked to the crowd for applause. And yet, what paeans of applause their splendid achievements did evoke!

The President of the United States cabled to General Shafter:

"The President of the United States sends to you and your brave army the profound thanks of the American people for the brilliant achievements at Santiago, resulting in the surrender of the city and all of the Spanish troops and territory under General Toral. Your splendid command has endured not only the hardships and sacrifices incident to campaign and battle, but in stress of heat and weather has triumphed over obstacles which would have overcome men less brave and determined. One and all have displayed the most conspicuous gallantry and earned the gratitude of the Nation."

FORTITUDE, GALLANTRY, SACRIFICE

And the major general at the head of the Army telegraphed from Washington:

"Accept my hearty congratulations on the record made of magnificent fortitude, gallantry, and sacrifice displayed in the desperate fighting of the troops before Santiago. I realize the hardships, difficulties, and sufferings and am proud that amid those terrible scenes the troops illustrated such fearless and patriotic devotion of the welfare of our common country and flag. Whatever the results to follow their unsurpassed deeds of valor, the past is already a gratifying chapter of history."

And General Shafter, describing in his official report the charge of Kent's division, declared: "In this fierce contest words fail to do justice to the gallant regimental commanders and their men."

But why dwell on these splendid tributes of praise. "True fame demands not panegyric aid."

The memory of these modest soldiers is not only dear to their comrades; not only revered by their countrymen; it is embalmed also in the gratitude of all patriotic sons of Cuba; yea, it is enshrined everywhere in the heart of humanity.

LASTING MONUMENT TO VALOR

In erecting this monument to these valorous men we would also proclaim, not only to the people of Cuba on whose soil it stands, but to every stranger who may chance in coming years to visit this hallowed spot, the magnitude of the event and the sacredness of the principles which it commemorates.

We wish it to stand here so long as stone and bronze may endure a fit emblem of stalwart heroism and unbending devotion to duty.

We desire here to mark the spot where the last vestige of absolutism in the Western Hemisphere was forever struck down and a struggling people lifted to honored place among the nations of the world.

Above all we cherish the hope that it shall remain an enduring reminder to the inhabitants of this beautiful island, not only of the men and events in memory of which it is raised, but of the priceless boon of civil and religious liberty here won for Cuba with such costly blood, and that this precious heritage can be preserved only by the same unwavering fidelity to duty which led these soldiers from the northland across the tropic seas.

And while we consecrate this monument as a memorial to the unmeasured benefits conferred, not only upon Cuba, but upon the cause of human freedom in all lands under the sun, we would also leave it here as a shrine to which every child of this young Republic can turn and receive fresh inspiration for the duties of a pure and noble citizenship.

PATRIOTISM AND DEVOTION OF CUBANS

Let not the people of Cuba look upon this monument merely as a tribute to the soldiers of a foreign land. Let it remind them, also, of their heroic compatriots, who under the brave and unconquerable Garcia, struggled so many long and bloody years in the cause of Cuba libre.

Well do we recall those final days of June, when in the midst of drenching rain and mud almost impassable, we saw them moving steadily to their appointed positions under the leadership of Castillo, and Sanchez and Benitez, and Marti and Rabi and Lora and their other dauntless commanders; their scanty clothing torn and tattered, many of them in bare feet and bare heads, and carrying their meager supply of food in bits of rags twisted and tied in the form of sacks. Gladly our generous men shared their rations with them and bade them Godspeed in their splendid struggle.

And so I repeat that while we establish this monument especially to commemorate the achievements of our own country, it would certainly fall short of our purpose did it not also bear testimony to the dauntless patriotism and devotion of those heroic sons of Cuba.

And to those who survived that long, sad period of darkness and are permitted to see the joy of this auspicious day, we extend our sincere felicitations, wishing them and their happy country a bright and glorious future. Ciudadanos de Cuba. Nostros os saludamos, como a la aurora de risueno dia; y os decimos: Adelante, a conquistar el porvenir con honor y gloria.

LOOKING WITH CONFIDENCE TO FUTURE

Comrades of the Army of Santiago de Cuba, we do not forget that we are here to speak of the dead, not to praise the living. But in turning from this hallowed ground and casting our eyes over this once distracted but now happy and prosperous land, the soldiers who fought at Guasimas, El Caney and San Juan and Kettle Hills can find a fitting reward for their valor.

And the consciousness of having been permitted to contribute in some small way to such a splendid result is a satisfaction which all will carry with them to the end of life. This monument which we here affectionately dedicate may indeed molder away; the very ground on which it stands may be submerged by the onrolling waves of yonder restless sea; but the eternal principles of humanity and justice which summoned the soldiers of the great Republic of the north to this field and for which our fallen comrades here laid down their lives shall never fail nor grow dim.

Standing on this historic height which marks another step in the mighty march of human progress, we can look with unwavering confidence to the coming years, realizing that these imperishable principles which constitute the very form and fabric and substance of our own national and social existence, are surely, irresistibly, spreading throughout the world, and have at last, through the shedding of much heroic blood, found a firm and impregnable lodgment in the heart and conscience of mankind.

We are justly proud of the splendid part which our own beloved country has had in exemplifying these high and holy principles and in enlightening the world with the effulgence of their glory; and now on this consecrated ground and as we depart from this sacred shrine, we would renew to her, our native land, our heartfelt vows of fealty and pledge to her again, as did our fathers of old, "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

TRIBUTE BY VETERAN WASHINGTON NEWSMAN

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include in my *Maine* anniversary address of 1966 an article by Bascom N. Timmons, in the Houston Chronicle of February 15, 1966, that was called to my attention by my friend and colleague, the Honorable BOB CASEY. For myself and my fellow veterans of the war of 68 years ago I wish to express to Mr. Timmons our appreciation of his tribute to the high caliber of the veterans of the war with Spain whom he knew at the commencement of his distinguished career as a chronicler of the Washington scene. His article follows:

LAST SURVIVOR IN CONGRESS TO TALK AGAIN ON 1898 WAR

(By Bascom N. Timmons)

A Congress in which action on its floor and in top committees gives priority to a war 10,000 miles away in Vietnam will pause briefly this week to mark the anniversary of a disaster which triggered the Spanish-American War 68 years ago. It will hear a speech by one of its oldest Members, Representative BARRATT O'HARA, Democrat, of Illinois, last congressional veteran of that long-ago day when this Nation stood face to face with destiny.

As in all our wars we were unprepared for the Spanish-American War. We had an Army of only 25,000 Regulars when Congress declared war on Spain, the fourth most powerful nation in the world at that time. Every man who fought for the United States in that war was a volunteer. President McKinley asked for 125,000 men; more than a million offered their services.

Few armies have ever suffered more than the AEF of 1898 in Cuba, in Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. There were cholera, typhoid, yellow fever, malaria, dengue fever, and tropical epidemics which could not be coped with in those days.

Perhaps the high rating this writer places upon the soldiers and sailors of the Spanish-American War is because there were so many of them of high caliber around when he began to report the Washington scene.

Adm. George Dewey was there and I came to know him well. I was also to know Gens. Arthur MacArthur and Nelson A. Miles. There were John J. Pershing, Peyton C. March, Leonard Wood, and others who became generals.

Theodore Roosevelt, of San Juan Hill Rough Rider fame, had been President of the United States and one of my cherished assignments was to accompany him when, as a private citizen, he ran for a third term on the Bull Moose ticket.

Congress had many Members who had been Spanish-American War soldiers or sailors. (I believe that in all 93 have served in its Halls.) Best of all I remember Richmond Pearson Hobson, of Alabama, who as the heroic young commander of the collier *Merrimac*, with a volunteer crew of seven men, under a hail of fire sank his boat in Santiago Harbor to obstruct the escape of the Spanish Admiral Cervera's fleet.

The one Spanish-American veteran who still serves in Congress is Representative BARRATT O'HARA, a sprightly and youthful 83 years old. How does it happen that a man of 83 could have fought in a war only a little less than 68 year ago? Well, O'HARA, a 15-year-old high school sophomore, enlisted in the 33d Michigan Volunteer Infantry and landed in Cuba 3 days after the arrival of Teddy Roosevelt and his Rough Riders. O'HARA, as a doughboy, participated in the siege of Santiago de Cuba.

The valiant Spanish-American War men who have become our senior war veterans—the deans of our fighting men—are few in number now. And once again O'HARA will arise in the House of Representatives to keep what he calls "a solemn obligation in comradeship with those with whom he served in his youth, to keep aflame in a modern world the spirit of 1898."

NEW YORK ELECTION DEMONSTRATES THE ABSURDITY AND DISCRIMINATION OF THE SO-CALLED VOTING RIGHTS LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the Congress passed legislation last year which authorized a Federal takeover of election machinery in States that polled less than 50 percent of their normal voting strength in the previous Federal elections. They called it the "voting rights bill." It is generally agreed that the proposal was conceived in the liberal mind of our Attorney General, the Honorable Mr. Katzenbach.

Of course, the idea was to concoct a formula that would reach certain States, of which my own was one, and exempt others. There is no doubt that the distinguished Attorney General had in mind the exemption of his own, that of our President, and other favored areas.

Following passage of this most discriminatory legislation and the unusual ceremonial signing thereof by our President, the Department of Justice dispatched carpetbagger registrars to some counties in some States which the legislation was designed to affect. As time passed registrars have been sent to other counties in these States. As the pressures are applied, others most probably will be sent in.

Regrettably, a large segment of the Nation's population, though qualified and registered, just will not take the time to vote. Another large segment will not vote unless the candidates, teams of speakers and precinct workers are beating the drums, knocking on doors and doing other things to arouse interest and coax the electors to the polling precincts. At times it is even necessary to arouse animosities, evoke an occasional ruckus, scandal or just a plain physical scuffle to get certain voters to the polls. Even when all these things are done, we still have a very substantial number who just will not vote and also another substantial number who even refuse to take the time to register.

But no matter for what reason the actual voting within a State fell under the 50 percent formula, the State was automatically brought under Mr. Katzenbach's voting bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a few days ago there was an election held in the 17th Congressional District of the State of New York. I am told that this is generally known as the Silk Stocking District of Manhattan. Their per capita income is very high. Their educational opportunities and training are said to be exceedingly good. This is a constituency that keeps itself informed; at least, this is what we are told.

The campaign was quite spirited. It made national headline news. The news media in New York City and all over the country gave it tremendous coverage. It was hailed as a prestige battle between the citys' new mayor, John V. Lindsay, and the State's junior Senator, ROBERT F. KENNEDY, both of whom are frequently mentioned as potential candidates for President. Indeed, these two can match headlines with any in the country. Incidentally, each of them was out front a year ago in the fight for the so-called voting rights bill as prepared by Mr. Katzenbach. They were terribly concerned about the vote in some States falling under the 50-percent potential. Both were crying out for a law—a Federal law—which would authorize Uncle Sam to move in and take over local election machinery, down South, that is.

Press reports indicate that nothing was left undone by the candidates and their respective forces in this recent congressional campaign. Considerable money was expended. Party bigwigs were called in for stimulating speeches. Precinct workers toiled long hours day and night. No door knocker was allowed to catch dust. This was the campaign—the campaign—to decide who was the strong man of Manhattan, Mayor Lindsay or Senator KENNEDY.

Notwithstanding the extraordinary effort and tremendous stimulus, thousands upon thousands of these well-informed people never showed up to vote. The turnout was a dismal flop. Considerably less than 50 percent of those registered voted and since quite a large number are not registered, the turnout was far, very far, under the 50-percent potential, the formula set forth in the Johnson-Katzenbach voting rights law.

So, the returns in this congressional election brings the election and the district under Mr. Katzenbach's theory of "Federal suspicion." If the theory of the Johnson-Katzenbach voting rights law is applied, then the light vote calls for and demands Federal intervention.

But have those who last year cried out for a Federal voting law complained? Has Mr. Katzenbach, the President and others, who last year were so concerned about those areas whose voting strength fell under the 50-percent formula expressed any concern? Have they suggested Federal intervention? Do they plan to take to the television for a late night show to tell the country, "We shall overcome?"

Mr. Speaker, if this election had been held in my State, and had the returns been comparable, official Washington would be in the throes of painful contortions over the plight of the people down in poor little ole Mississippi.

But what we have discussed here, Mr. Speaker, all happened in the great State of New York. To the liberal politician that makes it quite a different thing. It is perfectly all right, above suspicion and just fine if an election up-the-country produces only a nominal vote; but if such happens in the Deep South, well, it is serious enough to warrant a complete abandonment of responsible duties in Washington, take to the television for a night show and subsequently to the Halls of Congress to pass a law.

Although I have been listening, no word has come from the Department of Justice, the White House, or other sources in Washington that consideration will be given to passing some kind of law that will henceforth correct the light voting in the 17th Congressional District of New York. In view of the interest last year by proponents of the so-called voting rights law, I think just for the sake of consistency it might be appropriate that they take a look and speak out. What about it, Mr. Katzenbach?

Mr. Speaker, the highly regarded columnist and editor, Mr. David Lawrence, commented on this election in his column which appeared in the press on February 13, 1966. I include same as a part of my remarks, as follows:

GIVES NATION EXAMPLE OF ABSURDITY OF VOTING LAW

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—New York City has just given the Nation a significant example of the absurdity of that section of the 1965 voting-rights law which permits the Federal Government to intervene in any State or district which employs a literacy "test or device" to qualify voters and in which 50 percent of persons of voting age do not go to the polls. Such a situation is supposed, on its face, to be evidence of discrimination. Though it is obviously a form of "government by suspicion," nevertheless several States are subject to Federal penalties because a certain number of persons did not vote in the presidential election of 1964.

In New York's 17th Congressional District, on Tuesday of this week, there was an election to choose a successor to Representative John W. Lindsay, who resigned to run for mayor of New York City. The results show that THEODORE KUPFERMAN, the Republican nominee, received 44,225 votes, while Orin Lehman, the Democratic nominee, got 43,230. The conservative candidate, Jeffrey St. John, received 7,810 votes. But all these together totaled only 92,265 votes. Yet there are 219,814 registered voters in the district. So here is a case where less than 50 percent of even the registered voters went to the polls.

Under the voting-rights law, 50 percent is the yardstick. If 50 percent of the voting-age population is not registered or fails to vote, this is supposed to be a sign of discrimination. In the 17th Congressional District in New York City—an environment where "liberalism" prevails—the voting-age population unquestionably is far in excess of 219,814. But many persons eligible to vote do not take the trouble to register just as those who are registered often don't bother to vote. In New York County only 50.5 percent of the voting-age population went to the polls in 1960 and around 50 percent voted in 1964. Does this prove that there was plenty of discrimination but not quite enough to get under the 50-percent mark?

The argument against the South is that Negroes are prevented by "literacy tests" from registering. But there are "literacy tests" in New York State, too. The State law provides that a person is not eligible to vote unless he can read and write the English language or has completed six grades in a school in which the primary language of instruction is English. This has been brushed aside now by the Federal statute which says that eligibility to vote cannot be conditioned solely on ability to read or write the English language.

The motives that guide a citizen in not bothering to register or in failing to vote are numerous. The new voting-rights law, however, takes it for granted that in one section of the country this must be due to discrimination. In order to be consistent and apply the law equally throughout the United States, it becomes necessary for the Federal Government to assume that, whenever and wherever less than a 50-percent vote is cast, something is wrong and that this is deliberately caused by discriminatory acts.

The spotlight of the country has been focused on the South, because many of the voting districts there show less than 50 percent of the voting-age population went to the polls in the November 1964 election. The election specified by the voting rights law as the test was a presidential election. This usually attracts in some parts of the country a large percentage of voters, but just the opposite may happen in other parts. In the South, for example, where the Democratic party has been dominant for many years and the party for which the State's electoral votes will usually be cast has for a long time been a foregone conclusion, many citizens feel their vote would be superfluous.

Yet the law says that in any State where a literacy "test or device" existed and the turnout was less than 50 percent in the 1964 presidential election, either statewide or in a subdivision, Federal voting examiners may be appointed and the tests suspended, while the State is penalized for a period of 5 years. The Supreme Court is now dealing with the constitutionality of these provisions, and in the recent arguments before the Court some of the Justices questioned the basis for the 50-percent rule.

The New York City election is a conspicuous illustration of how inconclusive or irrelevant the 50-percent yardstick can prove to be.

REV. DR. BERNARD BRASKAMP, CHAPLAIN

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLANCY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned last night of the death of our beloved chaplain, the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp. In these troubled times we all leaned heavily on his spiritual guidance and inspiration. The prayers he offered at the opening of our daily sessions were filled with wisdom and deep concern for our Nation.

Mr. Braskamp was a most conscientious and devoted servant of mankind. His own great personal integrity, his loyalty and dedication have been an inspiration to all of us. I believe it is the universal sentiment of the House that he has endowed us with a spiritual enrichment that we shall long remember. He gave us renewed strength and courage in difficult times.

For 40 years Dr. Braskamp served as pastor of churches in the Washington area and then in 1950 assumed his duties with the U.S. House of Representatives as its first full-time Chaplain. We were fortunate indeed to have the benefit of the ministrations of a man of his caliber, and I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to his everlasting memory.

REDEDICATION TO THE CAUSE OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it was my recent pleasure to be invited to speak at an observance of the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day.

The program, held in Beverly Shores, Ind., was sponsored by the American-Lithuanian Club of Beverly Shores and featured a colorful presentation of Lithuanian folk songs and dances, with participants wearing native costumes.

Under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the observations I made on that occasion, Sunday, February 13:

ADDRESS BY MR. CHARLES A. HALLECK

In one sense I am happy to be with you today. Happy, particularly to meet with you, to enjoy your friendly hospitality and to take part in the observance of a historic occasion.

On the other hand, apart from the feeling of fellowship, we cannot really rejoice that the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's independence must be celebrated "in exile," so to speak. We would all rather, very much rather, that the situation might be otherwise—that we could be celebrating a continuation of Lithuania's independence and membership in the world's family of free nations.

But I can say, honestly and sincerely, that I am proud to be here.

I am flattered that you have asked me to be with you on this ceremony of rededication to the cause of Lithuania's independence.

In a larger sense what you are doing here today is rededicating yourselves to the cause of freedom for all mankind.

You are demonstrating your opposition to tyranny in whatever form.

Certainly nobody knows better the meaning of the words "freedom" and "tyranny" than the Lithuanian people.

Throughout their difficult history they have had to take up arms against invading armies.

To the people of your gallant nation, tyranny is not just a word found in speeches.

It is a real and terrible experience.

By the same token, to the Lithuanian people freedom is not something to be taken for granted, like the air we breathe.

Freedom is something for which they have for centuries fought and died.

Let's review a little history.

Forty-eight years ago, almost to the day, the Lithuanian nation proclaimed its independence. This marked the survival of this country, with its long history and rich traditions, in spite of more than a century in the hands of the Russian czars.

Reborn in the midst of World War I, Lithuania was able to assert her independence only after Soviet troops, which had moved into her territory, had been driven out with Allied help.

On July 20, 1920, in a treaty with Lithuania, the Soviet Government declared "the right of all nations to free self-determination" and, on this basis, recognized "the sovereign rights and independence of the Lithuanian state."

The Soviet Government further renounced for all time "all the sovereign rights of Russia over the Lithuanian people and their territory."

During the two decades of Lithuanian independence which followed, the Soviet Government reiterated these pledges in other agreements with the Lithuanian Government.

As late as October 1939, while forcing Lithuania to sign a "mutual assistance pact," the U.S.S.R. claimed to guarantee Lithuania's independence.

By that time, as we now know, the Soviets had already reached secret agreements with Nazi Germany under which the Baltic States were to fall within the Soviet sphere of influence.

Thus Lithuania, as so many times before, had again become a pawn on the chessboard of European power politics.

By the summer of 1940 Lithuania had been occupied by Soviet troops and, after rigged elections during July of that year, the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

And, as we all know, "incorporated" means that Lithuania was declared to be an integral part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

It is not merely a satellite country, but has been totally swallowed up, with not even the pretense of a separate nation.

Thus did the Communists betray their earlier promise to recognize the sovereign rights and independence of the Lithuanian state. It was typical of Soviet treachery.

Everyone recognized that the claim of self-determination was pure fiction—an insult to the intelligence of all loyal Lithuanians.

The United States was quick to denounce this illegal act and has consistently refused to recognize the forced incorporation of Lithuania into the U.S.S.R.

And in spite of the walls behind which the Soviet Union seeks to hide it, we know that the Lithuanian people have not accepted the denial of their independence.

I recall that some years back, a committee of the House of Representatives exposed the Soviet use of deportation, persecution, and economic exploitation in an effort to consolidate its control of Lithuania.

But none of these actions has destroyed the enduring will of the Lithuanian people for freedom and independence. In short, the U.S.S.R. has been unable to either "Russianize" or "Sovietize" the Lithuanian people. I know that you are not surprised at this.

Nor do I think that anyone who knows the character of the Lithuanian people is surprised that a nation which has produced such great champions of liberty as Mindaugus and Vytautas the Great—and which got the sweet taste of freedom under President Smetona—refuses to forget its own history.

We are not surprised that a people as vigorously independent as the Lithuanians refuses to submit to forced "collectivization."

Nor are we surprised that such a deeply religious people refuses to renounce God.

And we are not surprised that a people with such a rich and distinct ethnic and cultural background and tradition refuses stoutly to even pretend to be "Slavic."

In a word, the free world is not surprised at the courage of the Lithuanian people now struggling under the stifling hand of communism, or at their determination to one day regain the independence they have temporarily lost.

For history has demonstrated, time and again, that Lithuania is a nation with a fighting heart.

But I have an idea I know who is surprised: the rulers in the Kremlin.

Because they have failed to destroy the Lithuanian nation as a distinct people.

For that is exactly what the Red regime has tried to do.

But all of the well-known Communist techniques—from use of outright force and terror to sly propaganda and "re-education"—have not succeeded in subverting the Lithuanian character or in destroying the Lithuanians' sense of identity and love of freedom.

The stalwart resistance they have shown and are showing cannot help but be a source of inspiration to others suffering under the same yoke.

And especially is it an inspiration to those of us living under a flag of liberty.

By observances such as this you are reminding yourselves and free men everywhere that human bondage has not yet been wiped from the face of the earth and that much needs yet to be done.

The way may well be long and hard for all of us.

Freedom was never easily won. It is never easily held.

Four times since I was a young man in the uniform of World War I, my country has come to the defense of freedom.

We are in such a conflict today, and we must be prepared for whatever else may be demanded of us in the months and years to come.

As we look ahead, it might be well to recall the words of the late John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State under our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Speaking at the congressional inquiry into the incorporation of the Baltic States by the U.S.S.R. 13 years ago, Secretary Dulles said this:

"What of the future? First of all, let us never lose hope that there is a future."

"I recall," he said, "I was looking in my Bible yesterday—some of the earliest history recorded in the books of the Old Testament. The nations there mentioned are such as Israel, Arabia, Egypt, and Lebanon. How many times have these nations of many thousands of years ago been submerged, to rise again?"

"The Baltic peoples," Secretary Dulles continued, "in the face of every imposition, retain their will to be free and maintain their steadfast opposition to Soviet despotism. Terrorism has been prolonged now for 13 years. Many of their courageous and noble representatives have been executed, deported, or driven into exile. But their martyrdom keeps patriotism alive."

Then Secretary Dulles said this:

"Some may say that it is unrealistic and impractical not to recognize the enforced incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union. We believe, however, that despotism of the Soviet type cannot indefinitely perpetuate its rule over hundreds of millions of people who love God, country, and who have a sense of personal dignity.

"The Soviet system which seeks to expunge the distinctive characteristics of nation, creed, and individuality must itself change or be doomed ultimately to collapse. The time of collapse depends largely on whether the peoples who remain free produce spiritual, intellectual, and material richness; and whether we have a faith that can penetrate any Iron Curtain; and we must be sure that captive peoples know that they are not forgotten, that we are not reconciled to their fate, and above all, we are not prepared to seek illusory safety for ourselves by a bargain with their masters which would confirm their captivity."

Let me say now for myself: As majority leader in the U.S. House of Representatives at the time Mr. Dulles made that statement, I shared those sentiments with him.

I still hold to them.

We would be guilty of wishful thinking if we believed the collapse of the Soviet Union is imminent.

But there is a growing evidence that all is not well with the Red conspiracy.

Cracks are beginning to show in the Communist front.

Mr. Castro, who not so long ago was welcoming the Red Chinese to his shores and boasting of his alliance with them, now accuses them of bad faith.

Red China, in turn, is increasingly belligerent toward Russia, accusing the U.S.S.R. of all sorts of things, while the Kremlin casts an increasingly wary eye at the intentions of Chou En-lai and Mao Tse-tung.

Apparently there has been a falling out among thieves.

This is the weakness of gangsters, whether they are gangster lords of the numbers games or gangster nations.

They rule only through terror and violence. There is no sense of honor within their own ranks.

And there is room for only one at the top on the world of dictators.

I learned with gratification that the recently completed Ecumenical Council in the Vatican consecrated two Lithuanian bishops. This, it seems to me, is a significant development for Lithuanians here and abroad.

And I read with a great deal of interest that Communist masters are becoming increasingly concerned about the generation of young Lithuanians.

As I understand it, they are becoming a touchy problem.

It seems they just are not conforming the way they are supposed to.

They refuse to be brainwashed.

We hear there are commotions when Communist Party or governmental decisions have been published and when the campaign to explain them and enforce them is underway.

In other words, a lot of Lithuanians just are not buying this business of government from the top down.

Thus is history repeating itself in this brave country.

Because through the ages, whether occupied by German, Polish, Swedish, or Russian forces, the people of Lithuania have remained faithful to their culture, their history and their church.

Every year in the House of Representatives many Members arise to join with you in the observance of the anniversary of your Independence Day.

And I find one theme running through the remarks by my colleagues on this occasion—a universal respect for the character of the Lithuanian people.

Today, as I am sure you know, the largest Lithuanian community beyond the borders of your native land is here in America, with more than a million of your countrymen having been welcomed to our shores.

Here you are giving full measure of your energies and talents to help us produce that spiritual, intellectual and material richness that will speed the end of bondage for all freedom-loving people.

One thing the Communists either refuse to believe or just do not understand: that "Truth, crushed to earth shall rise again."

There is solid evidence that truth is rising again in Lithuania in spite of all Soviet efforts to keep it down.

Our task here in this great land of freedom and opportunity, of blessings and bounty, is to make sure the people of Lithuania know they have a powerful and faithful friend who has not forgotten and will not forget their hopes and aspirations.

Thank you for inviting me to take part in this significant occasion.

BOXCAR SHORTAGE IS YEAR-ROUND PROBLEM

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the boxcar shortage at harvesttime has grown into a year-round problem, and I have called this situation to the attention of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I have asked the distinguished chairman of that committee to request a rule on the Senate-passed bill to give the Interstate Commerce Commission additional rate-setting powers that would lead to an adequate supply of boxcars in all parts of the Nation. This is the bill for which hearings were held by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee last fall, in which many of our colleagues, including myself, spoke in support of passage.

The Interstate Commerce Commission tells me that the boxcar shortage has been in existence in varying degrees of severity for 17 years, and that the Commission would be in an excellent position to remedy the situation if the House joins the Senate in passing this bill giving the ICC the authority to establish reasonable per diem rental rates on boxcars.

The House Committee completed the hearings on this bill last year, and all that now needs to be done is for the committee to request a hearing from the Rules Committee so that the bill can reach the House floor for action. I hope this is done without delay, so an end can be put to the deplorable situation that sees the Nation's boxcar supply decreased by over 2,000 cars a month. With mounting international problems and plans to increase food shipments to needy nations, the United States cannot afford to have a further deterioration in the railway freight system.

HE DID AND IT HAPPENED

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in last Saturday's Akron Beacon-Journal a most interesting letter to the editor appeared. Imagine the plight of this poor man.

TO THE EDITOR:

I was told in 1964 that if I voted for Barry Goldwater that taxes would go up and there would be further war in Vietnam.

They were right—I voted for Goldwater and taxes have gone up and there is more war in Vietnam.

CHARLES CHURCH,
First National Tower Building.

WHEELING NEWS-REGISTER AND CHARLESTON GAZETTE PUBLISH FORTHRIGHT VIETNAM EDITORIALS

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, there is mounting concern in my State about our involvement in Vietnam. Two prominent Democratic newspapers in West Virginia have published forthright editorials reflecting this concern. They are the Wheeling News-Register and the Charleston Gazette.

So that my colleagues will have an opportunity to read these penetrating editorials I include them in my remarks.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register, Feb. 21, 1966]

WHERE THE REAL DANGER LIES

In arguing for the administration's stand in Vietnam, Secretary of State Dean Rusk constantly seeks to draw a parallel between Vietnam and the war against Hitler, thus arousing all the complex emotions bound up with World War II and its aftermath.

Yet any analogy between an international war precipitated by a dictator's career of brazen territorial conquest, and the consequences of a social revolution arising from the ashes of colonialism, is utterly false.

There has been aggression in Vietnam, we admit. But the essential facts are that an indigenous national revolution began there during the Japanese occupation, that under Communist leadership the revolution swept away French colonial rule, that to fill the vacuum an international agreement was reached at Geneva providing for military neutralization and self-determination for all of Vietnam, and that the United States then set out to upset the Geneva pacts by establishing a military satellite in South Vietnam.

North Vietnam's response, first by supplying and training guerrillas and then by sending in its own troops, was certainly aggressive, but it was above all a response. To equate it with Hitler's aggressions across national frontiers is a spurious debating tactic and nothing more. Were the two situations comparable, the United States would have no trouble winning support and sympathy from the overwhelming majority of U.N. members, as we did in resisting a genuine case of internationally indicated aggression in Korea. Support and sympathy in the U.N. on Vietnam is something we conspicuously do not enjoy.

As long as Mr. Rusk and others high in the administration insist on distorting and misrepresenting the true facts of this situation the greater the chances of an even wider war at the expense of thousands of American lives.

If we will stop confusing the containment of China with the containment of communism, we will understand that the best barrier to Chinese national ambitions is the indigenous nationalism of southeast Asia—which Ho Chi Minh represents in Hanoi whether we like it or not, and which a neutralized coalition regime could represent in Saigon.

Some fear that if we left it to the Vietnamese to make their own choice the two Vietnams might later be reunified under Communist control. This is not at all certain. Yet even a Communist Vietnam, truly expressive of popular aspirations and militarily neutralized under Russian, American, and perhaps U.N. guarantees, could stabilize the area far better than an open-ended American military commitment which generates its own instability. The issue is not one of ideology, but native, anticolonial revolution.

The real danger in the administration's blind position with Vietnam is the generalizing of this particular adventure into a doctrine of counterrevolutionary responsibility. To say that we have a duty to wage a war of antiliberation wherever the Communists choose to wage a war of liberation is to fulfill their own prophecy for them. America has in fact no obligation to police the world against social uprisings, and could not do so if it tried. Whatever the outcome in southeast Asia, let us avoid being trapped by Marxist dogma into accepting a role the Marxists invent for us.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, Feb. 22, 1966]

VIETNAM RAISES QUESTION OF WHO'S BEING CONTAINED

Assuming even that South Vietnam's Government is prepared to initiate the desirable and necessary reforms outlined by President Johnson at Honolulu, no one should get the idea that the war will suddenly terminate.

To begin with, Laos received, under the Kennedy administration, more aid per capita than any other country. Yet, as Arthur M. Schlesinger, in his recent book makes clear, "Laos simply did not have the national or social structure to absorb the remorseless flood of American bounty." South Vietnam, of course, is considerably worse off than Laos ever was.

And in the second place, the assumption that Marshal Ky's privileged regime is anxious to spread the wealth around ranks on a par with the assumption West Virginia's Board of Public Works is panting to support executive budget and short ballot amendments. By this time Americans should have realized the vested elite, home or abroad, never surrenders prerogatives and powers voluntarily.

"There are" said the New York Times, about a week ago, "no shortcuts out of the Vietnamese morass."

Indeed, if there were, the world may rest assured President Johnson long ago would have discovered them and acted upon them. The President, whose political antenna, in any event, is as sensitive as any man's, is well aware of the divisive force the Vietnam war has become in our society and what that division can do to wreck consensus government.

To quote the Times again:

"The United States is in for a long, hard, more costly, and more dangerous war."

France found this out during the late 1940's and early 1950's.

Unwilling to learn from France's bitter lesson, apparently the United States must suffer through a similar harsh experience.

Despite advice from every acknowledged Far Eastern expert, including General MacArthur, that the United States has no business getting bogged down in a land war on the Asian Continent, the United States is now in a full-scale land war on that continent and daily pouring additional American lives down a vast, bottomless maw.

The war is being pursued and carried out largely on the advice of diplomats and militarists who have consistently and unerringly erred in their predictions as to what was required to win the war and who have yet to admit they and their panaceas have been everlastingly wrong.

The eternal excuse for failure has been not enough. Not enough firepower was brought to bear, not enough bombs were dropped, not enough of the right targets were hit, not enough American troops were committed to South Vietnam's defense, not enough of our allies have wakened to the seriousness of the situation, not enough resolve has been demonstrated by the United States to convince Hanoi and the Vietcong of our purpose in Vietnam. Always not enough—never a doubt that no matter what is tried or how much is waggered in materiel and in manpower, the bet may not be enough to counter the stakes shoved in by the other side.

Thus, the United States has been gradually and steadily upping the ante.

In a brief 3 years its complement of troops has risen from about 25,000 to more than 200,000. Within 6 months thousands additional cannon fodder will have been transported across the Pacific by boat or air. In fact, the same brilliant tacticians who've recommended covering all bets are today cautiously proclaiming that some time during 1967 the United States will need and will have 600,000 youngsters fighting for the fatherland in Vietnam.

This is what our foreign policy of the last 18 years is leading to. This is the policy known as containment, conceived under Secretary of State Dean Acheson, continued under Secretary of State John Dulles, and still chugging along under Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Somehow, isn't it time someone asked the question:

"Who's being contained—them or us?"

TVA BRIDGE ACT

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation which would amend the TVA Bridge Act to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation by the Tennessee Valley Authority of certain highway and railroad bridges.

This amendment is necessary to give the authority to use appropriated funds to the TVA in order to raise, widen, or reconstruct bridges which have become obstructions to navigation on the Tennessee River and its tributaries. There are several points where bridge alterations would permit more effective use of the waterway but especially important is the Tennessee State Highway 58 bridge over the Hiwasee River, near Charleston and Calhoun, Tenn. When this bridge was originally constructed there was little prospect of great water traffic. Now, however, the Hiwasee services a tremendous industrial complex, including a giant Bowaters papermill and an Olin Matheison plant. The TVA has deepened the present channel to accommodate present and potential traffic but the full benefits of this vital waterway cannot be fully realized until bottlenecks have been removed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge members of the Public Works Committee to favorably consider this important legislation.

NEED FOR BAIL REFORM

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCKWEIKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago the attention of the country was focused upon an incident that happened in Pennsylvania involving 19-year-old Tyrone Collins, who, while free on $500 bail pending the trial of an assault charge in Mobile, Ala., moved to his new home in Pennsylvania in alleged violation of the conditions of his bail. Alabama bondsmen, without the aid of Pennsylvania law enforcement authorities, or any search or arrest warrant or any other judicial process, summarily removed Collins from his home in Norristown, Pa., by force during the middle of the night and, without the interposition of any judicial authority, removed him some 1,000 miles away to Alabama.

The country was shocked, not because it felt that Tyrone Collins should not have to stand trial on the charge levied against him by the authorities of the State of Alabama, but because of the procedures employed by the bondsmen to return Collins to Alabama. The decision of private citizens, motivated simply by a desire to protect their financial investment, using summary action and force to abduct their quarry from the domain of the sovereignty of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to a distant part of the country, without any judicial sanction and consequently without any assurance of procedural due process, was more than most people believed tolerable. Yet, according to longstanding court decisions, what happened in the Collins case was not proscribed by the due process guarantees of the Constitution, nor by any other provision of Federal law.

The Collins incident brought to light a situation not generally known to the public: that at common law a bondsman possesses the power to take a bailee into custody summarily at any time and return him to the authorities who initially sanctioned his release, and that this power may be exercised even when the bailee has fled to another State or jurisdiction. Virtually no restriction is placed upon what the bondsman may do to effectuate this return. There need be no compliance with State arrest procedures, with procedures securing persons against unreasonable searches and seizures, or with any requirement that a person taken from one State to another without his consent be given a judicial hearing on the reasonableness of the removal. In short, the bondsman can act without the sanction of any State or Federal tribunal. This common law rule is still the law today.

Not only had the integrity and sovereignty of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania been flaunted by what had happened, but it was also apparent that there had been, at least by modern standards, a violation of individual rights that in analogous circumstances could never legally occur. It was evident that this situation could no longer be tolerated. No longer could society condone a philosophy that regarded the bailee as nothing more than the bondsman's chattel—a mere piece of property that the bondsman-owner could abuse in any way without answering to the law for his actions.

The irony of the Collins situation was made all the more poignant by the fact that when the State officials request the return of a fugitive from justice who has taken refuge in another State, they comply with very strict procedures, specified by article IV, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution, which utilize the executive authority of the refuge or asylum State for taking the fugitive into custody. Only after the fugitive has been given a hearing in the asylum State by the authorities of that State, and it has been determined that he has left the jurisdiction of the demanding State in violation of law, can the fugitive be turned over to the authorities who seek his return to the State whence he originally fled. If a public official must go through this sort of procedure to get back a person who is already a convicted criminal, how strange it was, people thought, that a private person, owing no allegiance and no sense of public duty to any State authority, answerable to nothing but his own conscience, could ignore such procedures in seizing an individual who was not a criminal but simply an accused, presumed by the law to be innocent of the charges pending against him.

Recognizing that something should be done, I resolved to correct this state of affairs, so as to make bail bondsmen subject to minimum standards of procedural due process, as are State authorities in comparable situations.

Accordingly, I have introduced a bill, which has also been introduced in the Senate by Senator TYDINGS and is being cosponsored by several of his colleagues, which will provide for the implementation of these minimum standards in cases such as that involving Tyrone Collins. In formulating the content of the bill, we were fortunate to have the counsel and advice of Mr. Ronald Goldfarb, a noted authority on bail problems, whose recent book, "Ransom," pointed out the need for reform in this area.

Simply stated, the main provisions of the bill I have introduced are these:

First, when a bondsman seeks the return to another jurisdiction of a person who has violated the conditions of his bail, the bondsman must apply to a judicial officer of the United States—either a Federal judge or a U.S. Commissioner—for a warrant authorizing the taking into custody of the fugitive bailee.

Second, if the bondsman is able to show probable cause that the person named in the warrant application has violated the terms and conditions of his bail, the judicial officer shall issue the warrant, and the person is to be brought promptly before the judicial officer for a hearing.

Third, at the hearing, the fugitive bailee is to be informed of the nature and purpose of the proceeding against him, of his right to retain counsel, of his right not to make a statement, and of the fact that any statement made by him may be used against him. He also is to be given reasonable opportunity to consult counsel.

Fourth, at the hearing the bondsman must establish that the identity of the alleged fugitive bailee is as he asserts, that the bondsman and the fugitive are in a bail relationship, and that the conditions of bail imposed to secure the fugitive's appearance in a future judicial proceeding have been broken.

Fifth, if the necessary showing is made at the hearing, the judicial officer is to issue a warrant for removal of the fugitive bailee, promptly and directly, to the appropriate authorities of the jurisdiction whence he has fled.

Sixth, violation of these procedures by the bondsman is made a Federal crime, punishable by a fine of up to $5,000, or imprisonment of up to 2 years, or both.

It is my hope that this legislation will receive the prompt attention of both Houses of Congress and that hearings will be held at the earliest possible date.

I invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in this effort to remedy a long-standing and grievous flaw in the pattern of existing law.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Dec. 27, 1965]

AN ALABAMA INVASION

We are glad that Tyrone Collins has been restored to his family in Norristown after a harrowing experience with two Alabama bail bondsmen during the previous week. It was quite a Christmas story.

And it is to be assumed, of course, that with the proper recourse to proper legal procedures, he will yet answer whatever bona fide charges may be facing him in Mobile. In any event, it should be made clear that Pennsylvania is not in the business of being a refuge for persons wanted in out-of-State courts.

Nevertheless, the manner in which young Collins was virtually kidnaped from his home a week ago by the two bondsmen—in a manner too reminiscent of old-time bounty-hunters—was such an outrageous infringement of the laws and procedures of this Commonwealth that it should not be forgotten or brushed aside.

Representative RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Republican, of Pennsylvania in whose district the highly illegal "grab" was made, has interested himself rightly in this case since the start and is intent not only on investigation but corrective legislation, if it is needed, in Congress. In view of the appearance of an armed invasion of this sovereign State by citizens of Alabama, which the Collins case presents, it is evident that some very specific legislation may be required.

In Alabama bail bondsmen may not need warrants in "hot pursuit" of their quarry, but in Pennsylvania they do. We expect visiting bondsmen—or law officials, for that matter—to abide by this Commonwealth's rules of procedure when they are in this jurisdiction. It does not seem much to ask—but if it requires Federal law to make the point, then let us have such a law on the books.

[From the Evening Bulletin, Dec. 29, 1965]

THE COLLINS CASE LESSON

A rap on the door on a Sunday night. Men bursting in to snap handcuffs on a suspect—men with the effrontery to demand money from a mother, "if you want this boy to eat." Then a trip of hundreds of miles to put a bail bond jumper named Tyrone Collins back in Alabama.

Such tactics are repellant to Pennsylvanians' sense of fair play. They sound too much like the gestapo, or the Soviet secret police. Therefore there was instant indignation in this part of the country when Tyrone Collins was grabbed at his Norristown home by representatives of a Mobile bonding firm. Not only the NAACP was outraged; thousands of Pennsylvanians felt the same, including a Congressman, a Governor, an attorney general.

The charge on which young Collins presumably skipped bond was serious enough—knifing a fellow high school student. It developed that this was not the only charge against him. He had racked up two counts of driving without a license since his return to Norristown. But though it began to look as if Collins was not the ideal teenager, the idea of bail bondsmen breaking and entering, without a warrant, still was repugnant. Surprisingly enough, some legal experts dug into their books and read them to say that the bondsmen were legally right.

There is, therefore, a lesson in the case of Tyrone Collins, though perhaps not what it first seemed to be. The point is that America's laws on return of bail skippers are primitive and need statutory correction. Certainly, no felon ought to be given refuge merely because he crosses a State line; but a man on bail is not yet tried, and therefore is presumed to be innocent. An orderly, legal procedure ought to be necessary before he can be dragged out of a home at night. The Collins case makes the need for revised laws evident.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 29, 1965]

BAIL BOND ABDUCTION

Pennsylvania authorities are properly investigating the alleged abduction of 19-year-old Tyrone Collins from his home in Norristown by two bail bondsmen. We hope the inquiry will be thorough. The seizure of young Collins at his home in Pennsylvania and his transportation in handcuffs to Alabama, presumably without a legal arrest or any court action, raise grave questions about the law and its application in such cases.

The bondsmen are reported to believe that they acted in accord with Pennsylvania law. But how could Pennsylvania authorize bondsmen from Alabama to seize a Pennsylvania resident, without a valid Pennsylvania warrant, and transport him beyond the jurisdiction of the State? If any statute purports to give such authority, it should itself become the subject of searching analysis. For it would appear to sanction an outrageous encroachment upon basic Federal rights.

The issue here is not, of course, any crime that the young man may have committed in either Alabama or Pennsylvania. If he is fairly convicted of violating the law of either State, he should be punished for the specific offense. But bondsmen who have guaranteed the appearance of an accused person in one State cannot be permitted to kidnap him in another State and return him against his will, without regard to the orderly processes of extradition.

It is worth remembering that the Lindbergh Act provides stiff Federal penalties for anyone who knowingly transports across a State line any person who has been unlawfully seized or carried away "and held for ransom or reward or otherwise." While this law was passed to deal with the typical interstate kidnaping, its terms are broad and it illustrates the seriousness of abducting a person and carrying him across a State line illegally for any purpose. If the overly eager bondsmen violated any law in this case, State or Federal, they should be prosecuted. And if the law itself seems to justify such dubious seizures, without waiting for extradition authorities and the courts to act, it should certainly be modified.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Feb. 3, 1966]

BAIL JUMPERS AND THE LAW

Under the Constitution of the United States, it should not be necessary to write a special law to require bail bondsmen to observe due judicial process in seeking to recover alleged bail jumpers across State lines.

The fourth amendment is quite specific: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

In should not be necessary to spell out that amendment to be sure that bondsmen get the message, but it is. Just before Christmas two Alabama bondsmen came to this State and, though told specifically by Norristown police not to seize a suspect without a warrant, proceeded to do so—at gunpoint and in the middle of the night—and carried a teenage youth back to Alabama with them.

Thus we believe that the bill introduced jointly by Representative SCHWEIKER, of Montgomery County, and Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, deserves, and should get, prompt consideration and speedy passage by Congress. It merely requires the bondsman in pursuit to obtain a warrant from a Federal judge or U.S. Commissioner, and assures the suspect of an immediate preliminary hearing before being hauled back to the original court of jurisdiction.

It is shocking in this day and age to find that a basic citizen right of this kind has been so fragilely protected. It is time to correct the situation—or constitutionality has lost its meaning.

[From the Harrisburg Patriot, Feb. 7, 1966]

BAIL REFORM

The Schweiker-Tydings bill to reform bail bond procedures should be given careful attention by the Congress.

Representative RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Republican, of Pennsylvania, and Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, Democrat, of Maryland, want bondsmen to be required to get warrants and institute extradition proceedings before they chase bail jumpers across State lines.

Back in December, Alabama bondsmen abducted Tyrone Collins, 19, of Norristown, claiming he had jumped $500 bail. Under law, Collins was virtually the chattel of the bondsmen and they could direct his actions in any fashion they wished. The law goes back centuries and resembles the Fugitive Slave Law of the pre-Civil War era.

Bail serves a useful purpose in our system of justice, and bail jumping is a serious offense. Those who jump bail must be apprehended for the public's safety and to uphold the power of the courts. But bail bondsmen should have to observe some tighter legal procedures when crossing State lines. The Schweiker-Tydings bill would correct the abuses inherent in the present process without allowing those who jump bail to get away with it.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Feb. 1, 1966]

SCHWEIKER SEEKS INTERSTATE CURBS ON BONDSMEN

WASHINGTON, January 31.—Representative RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Republican, of Pennsylvania, on Monday introduced a bill providing that bondsmen who fail to obtain a warrant before removing an alleged bail jumper to another State would face Federal prosecution.

SCHWEIKER's legislation was prompted by the seizure shortly before last Christmas of 19-year-old Tyrone Collins by armed Alabama bondsmen who forcibly entered his home in Norristown, Pa., at night, handcuffed him at gunpoint, and took him back to Alabama to await trial on an assault charge.

The case focused national attention on the sweeping, virtually unsupervised power of bonding agents to pursue alleged bail jumpers.

The Schweiker bill would establish for the first time a formal statutory removal procedure to be followed by bondsmen which would be supervised by U.S. judicial officers in the State to which the alleged bail jumper had moved.

It would be a simplified form of the current extradition process which law enforcement officers must follow to regain custody of a fugitive who had fled to another State.

The bondsman would first be required to procure an arrest warrant from a U.S. commissioner or U.S. judge in the asylum State and then bring the accused before that judicial officer for a prompt hearing.

At such a hearing, the bondsman would apply for a warrant for removal from the asylum State, at which time the judicial officer would inform the accused of his right to counsel and to waive the hearing if he so desired.

If the accused requested a hearing, the warrant for his removal would not be granted until the judicial officer had heard evidence from both parties and satisfied himself as to the identity of the accused, that the accused had been admitted to bail in the State in which he had been charged; that the accused had violated the provisions of the bail agreement, and that the bondsman was a valid representative of the bonding company.

A bondsman convicted of failure to comply with the specified procedures would be guilty of a Federal crime and be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

The Collins case, SCHWEIKER said, "points up the need for Congress to develop formal removal procedures governing the conduct of bail bondsmen in recovering custody of alleged bail jumpers who have crossed State lines."

"The dangers," he added, of the present system have been clearly demonstrated by the actions of the bondsmen in this case. At present, the law does not prescribe procedures in this field, and I believe that due process of the law can only be insured by the enactment of the bill we are introducing today. This legislation would merely require bondsmen to follow the same procedures now used by policemen under similar circumstances."

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 2, 1966]

BONDSMAN'S POWER QUESTIONED—COLLINS SEIZURE CASE REVEALS NEED FOR CURB

(By Jerome S. Cahill)

WASHINGTON, January 1.—Tyrone Collins is a lanky, light-skinned Negro youth of 19 who stands 5 feet, 9 inches tall, weighs 137 pounds and has blue eyes and a beatnik-style haircut. No stranger to trouble, he is accused of slashing a Mobile, Ala., high school student in 1964 and more recently got into a scrape in Montgomery County, Pa., over a couple of traffic violations.

He is not exactly the sort of person Central Casting might have recommended for the leading role in the tug of war between Pennsylvania and Alabama that received nationwide headlines and television coverage this holiday season.

DRAMATIZES POWER

And yet whatever the youth's shortcomings, the Collins case is important to the American people. His seizure by armed Alabama bondsmen who invaded his Norristown home in the dark of night just 6 nights before Christmas has served to dramatize as never before the sweeping, virtually unsupervised power of bonding agents in pursuit of alleged bail jumpers.

Competent legal authority supports the effort of Representative RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, in whose congressional district the Collins seizure took place, to impose some judicial restraints on this power. The argument is that under present procedures, abuses can arise—and have arisen.

IMPOSTERS CONVICTED

Examples are not hard to find. A few years ago in Ohio two bail bondsmen posed as FBI agents, and held a man and woman captive for 11 hours while they questioned them about a bail truant. The imposters were convicted in a Federal court.

Even closer to the Collins incident was the case involving a pipeline worker from Pangburn, Ark., named Watt Ralph Williams. While on a construction job near Ravenna, Ohio, in 1958, Williams was charged with drunken driving, paid a $50 fee and obtained his release pending trial on a $500 bond.

ASLEEP IN HOME

Williams jumped bail, and the bonding company assigned a special investigator named Rawney Trunko to find him. Trunko was an unpaid special deputy of Summit County, Ohio, and did indeed find Williams on March 28, 1959, in the middle of the night, asleep in a bedroom with his wife and infant child at the home of Williams' elderly father in Pangburn.

U.S. District Judge J. Smith Henley described the scene.

"The court finds from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that Trunko and Pratt (a companion) entered the house," Judge Henley wrote in his decision in the case, "that Trunko inquired as to the whereabouts of Watt Williams after showing his badge to the latter's father; that Trunko upon being informed that Watt Williams, his wife, and infant child were asleep in an adjoining room, entered that room without knocking, and that he shone a flashlight on Watt Williams and directed him to get up and dress.

DISPLAYS BADGE

"When Williams and his wife requested an explanation of Trunko's presence," Judge Henley continued, "the latter displayed his badge as a special deputy sheriff and also exhibited the Ohio bench warrant, and permitted Williams, his wife, and possibly his father to see the pistol that Trunko was carrying."

Judge Henley found that Trunko's actions, "all of which was done under color of law and State authority," was "wrongful and illegal, amounting to a violation of Williams' right not to be deprived of his liberty without due process of law, a right clearly protected by the 14th amendment."

The judge refused to convict Trunko because he found the agent had posed as a law officer for his own convenience and not with the willful intent to deprive Williams of his civil rights. In announcing this decision, Judge Henley made it clear, however, that he was not condoning Trunko's conduct.

"In the court's estimation," Judge Henley said, "Trunko's conduct is properly characterized as highhanded, unreasonable, and oppressive." He went on to describe it as an affront to the duly constituted authorities of White County and the State of Arkansas, and of a nature tending to bring law enforcement into disrepute.

Currently pending in Congress is a bill calling for a wholesale revision of the bail system as it applies to Federal cases, and an attempt is expected in the wake of the Collins case to amend that measure to meet some of the issues raised by the case.

"It certainly is a bad situation," said an aid to Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, Democrat, of Maryland, chairman of the Senate's subcommittee on improvements in judicial machinery.

RETIREES, RESERVISTS, AND CONGRESS

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to speak before the Peninsular Retired Officers Club, the Reserve Officers Association and the Polaris Chapter of the Naval Reserve Association at a meeting in my congressional district.

I believe that some of the views I expressed might be of interest in other areas:

RETIREES, RESERVISTS, AND CONGRESS

(By Congressman CHARLES S. GUBSER, 10th District, California)

While our attention is properly focused on the heroic deeds of our active military forces who are under fire tonight in the jungles of Vietnam, in the air above it and the sea around it, those of us who daily deal in military matters cannot forget the retirees who have served this Nation in past wars and the reservists who stand ready to serve it now.

Both groups have contributed and are still contributing to the strength of our forces now in combat.

Tonight I'd like to talk about retirement legislation and about Reserve legislation, and my reasons for talking about the two groups are precisely the opposite—the retirees because they have been somewhat forgotten by Washington, and the Reserves because, unfortunately, they haven't been forgotten by Washington.

Some of you retirees may feel neglected but as the reservists present can tell you—take heart, as long as you are neglected you are not reorganized.

Retirees are justified in feeling neglected because they have seen some of their traditional, cherished benefits whittled away and because we have been too long in finding solutions to some of their problems. But, actually, this has been a time of ferment on retired issues in the Nation's Capitol. A Presidential Commission only recently finished an extensive study of all Federal retirement systems and the study, as might be expected, was attended by all sorts of rumors about a contributory retirement system, elimination of 20-year retirement, switching to a high-five system, as in the civil service, and so on. In the light of the rumors, I think we can say the Commission did the military retirement system a great favor by leaving it alone.

But a special House Armed Services Subcommittee on Retirement—of which I happen to be a member—has been conducting its own study of retirement and I am hopeful we will come up with some important recommendations and, possibly, some legislation. These may cover such important areas as survivor benefits, retired pay entitlement, and assured medical care. On the last item—medical care for retirees—the Defense Department is due to submit legislation and I am especially hopeful we can pass some legislation in this area. In fact, under normal circumstances I would hazard a prediction that we would, but, of course, you realize that the present circumstances are not normal. We are engaged in a war in Vietnam. American boys are fighting and American boys are dying and their needs must be the first consideration of the Congress. And it is possible the exigencies of that tragic problem may prevent us from getting to some needed personnel legislation.

So with that reservation, let me discuss some of these retirement problems with you.

But first, I want to pull a switch on you. I want to discuss the situation with the Nation's Reserves because I want to do a bit of lobbying with you. Turnabout, they say, is fair play. I want to ask you to influence your fellow citizens in behalf of a strong Reserve. The Defense Department seems determined to reduce the strength and readiness of the Reserve, and even though Congress has given clear mandates to the contrary, the Department is, in part, succeeding. Make no mistake about it—if it is succeeding it is because public opinion, if not wholly on its side, is at least apathetic. Charles Dudley Warner said, "public opinion is stronger than the legislature, and nearly as strong as the Ten Commandments." If public opinion were aroused against the so-called merger of the Reserve Forces you could make book on it that the Defense Department would desist from the whole idea.

Don't misunderstand me, I think there is much Congress can do. I have an idea how the threat can be fought on Capitol Hill and I hope to have an opportunity to vote for that idea before this session is over. But if the battle is to be permanently and surely won—the people must understand it and believe in it. The members of this club—and of the several other organizations represented here—are uniquely qualified to be the Johnny Appleseeds of this education process, spreading the germ of understanding among your fellow citizens. I suppose, after all, that in Massachusetts 200 years ago there were people who didn't understand what those Minutemen were doing, running out in the middle of the night and making all that fuss.

The Defense Department's treatment of the Reserve reminds me of the story of the philosopher who was trying to teach a horse to live without eating. He had the horse down to one straw a day, but then the horse ruined the experiment by dying.

The Defense Department failed to give the Reserves the equipment they need to be 100-percent combat ready and then said the Reserve had to be reorganized because they weren't in a high enough state of readiness. So DOD decided to reorganize them out of existence.

When the Defense Department announced its first plan to merge Reserve forces—in December 1964—it declared grandly that it could do the whole thing without bothering the Congress. It bothered the Congress, however, a lot more than DOD ever dreamed it would. The plan was sold to the public—as so many things in Defense are these days—as a streamlining and a cost reduction. It was to save $150 million a year, Defense said.

You know the story of what followed. A subcommittee of our Armed Services Committee held lengthy hearings, chaired by the renowned F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana. At the conclusion of the hearings the Secretary of Defense conceded, in a public statement, that legislation would be necessary before the merger could take place.

The Secretary then submitted legislative requests, the subcommittee considered these requests and concluded its hearings with this statement: "On the basis of extensive testimony * * * in both open and closed sessions, the subcommittee believes that the present proposal of the Department of Defense to merge the Army Reserve components is not in our national interest."

The subcommittee also said that it is—and I quote—"strongly opposed to any departmental action which would, for practical purposes, destroy the Army Reserve by transferring all of its organized training functions to the 50 State National Guard organizations. Therefore, it will not support the proposal to merge the Army Reserve into the National Guard as presented by the Department of Defense."

On top of that, the defense appropriation bill, signed into law in September of last year, contained restrictive language prohibiting use of any funds appropriated for the Army Reserve to implement a realinement or reorganization of the Reserve Components. The appropriation language, I might add, continued to carry strength figures for the Reserve, including 270,000 for the Army Reserve and 380,000 for the Guard.

There just could not be any clearer expression of congressional will on the subject.

The ink was barely dry on the appropriation bill when Defense announced it was setting up a highly trained, selected Reserve, made up largely of Guard units, and at the same time was deactivating other units with a combined total strength of 55,000 Army reservists. Defense publicly announced the plan had been cleared with Senator STENNIS, of the Senate Armed Services Committee. The Senator promptly took the Senate floor to deny he had ever agreed to the proposal.

On November 13, just about 3 weeks after Congress adjourned, Secretary McNamara deactivated 751 Army Reserve units in one fell swoop.

Then, on November 18, Defense did a complete flip-flop and in a message to all of its regional component corps commanders announced "DOD and DA continue to support the 8-division, 16-brigade, 550,000 structure, all in the National Guard * * * When Congress reconvenes in January, DOD and DA will urge the Congress to support the reorganization plan as originally proposed and to enact the * * * legislation * * * necessary to accomplish fully the objective of the proposed reorganization." The memorandum then laid out precise plans to start effecting the reorganization by July 1, noting "reorganization planning in accordance with the foregoing will be resumed." The budget, as submitted for next fiscal year—fiscal year 1967—presupposes approval of the reorganization.

If that isn't as arrogant a disregard for the Congress as could be exercised I don't know what is.

Of course, all of this planning upheaval is, of itself, hurting the readiness, to say nothing of the morale, of the Reserve Forces.

Now there are two things about the original merger proposal that I think we should not forget and which I don't think most people understood.

The more important is that it was not just a merger but a great reduction in the size of the Reserve. Frankly, this is what worries me the most. I hold no brief for the Army Reserve over the National Guard or vice versa. I think both have important missions. But what the original plan would have done is greatly reduce the number of people being trained to defend this country in time of emergency. Let's look at some figures: There were 8,000 drilling units in the Reserves—about 4,000 each in the National Guard and Army Reserve. The McNamara plan would reduce this to 6,000. The total Reserve strength would have been reduced to 700,000 to 550,000.

The cuts would not have fallen solely on the Army Reserve by any means. I think even some National Guardsmen misunderstood this. Both forces would have been weakened. For example, the plan contemplated elimination of 21 divisions; 15 of them in the National Guard.

The other point I think should be understood is that the so-called saving is not tied to merger, it is tied to reduction. You can always save money on the Armed Forces—by cutting them. Some of us happen to think that is penny wise and pound foolish. Secretary McNamara's minions could not defend the alleged savings during the hearings. The figures varied repeatedly. It was finally conceded that it would be years before any savings were realized. But the point that was blurred is that savings would come about by reducing the size of the force, with only a miniscule part attributed to any management saving because of merger.

Just how anybody can defend a cut of our Reserve Forces at a time like this—when we are in a grim, shooting war in southeast Asia, with the end not in sight—is beyond me.

The Army Reserve furnished 68,833 men and 294 units for active duty during the Berlin crisis in 1961. During the Korean war it furnished 244,800—not counting the Reserve officers already on active duty.

Now we are in a war where the committed force is on a level with what we used in Korea. And still the Defense Department moves ahead with plans to scale down the Reserve.

I notice that even such McNamara fan club members as columnist Joseph Alsop, who never tires of heaping praise on the Secretary, has twice urged a callup of the Reserves in recent columns. Specifically, Alsop said this: "The increase in General Westmoreland's troop requirement, from 6 to 9 division equivalents, in turn means requirements for more U.S. troops than can be rapidly provided without calling up the Reserves."

He added that "specialized troop units, easily obtainable by a callup, are needed to break the logistical logjam" in Vietnam.

As that character in Alice in Wonderland said, "Things get curiouser and curiouser."

What can we do to stop it? The idea I have is one first mentioned by Mr. HÉBERT. It is simply legislation by Congress completely spelling out the composition, strength, organization and administration of the Reserve components. The Constitution says the Congress shall raise and support the Armed Forces and decide on their organization. And I think we'd better start doing it for the Reserve while there is still something left to support.

A good Reserve is a very inexpensive national insurance policy.

But remember what I said: the effort can only succeed with public opinion behind it. And that is your job.

Now, turning to retirement, I know at the very mention of the word big, red letters light up in every retired officer's mind and they spell: Recomputation.

I don't think I have to tell you how I stand on recomputation. The fight I helped lead on the floor of the House in 1963, to provide recomputation in 1963 pay scales to pre-1958 retirees, was one of the toughest I've had in 14 years in the House and the victory was certainly the most satisfying. Nothing would give me more satisfaction than reestablishing the principle permanently this year—at least for those who were promised it throughout their careers.

I would be less than candid with you, however, if I did not tell you that our chances are pretty slim. We won that fight in 1963. But even then it was a tough battle. And we paid a price. Many Members in both Houses voted for the bill with the understanding it would be the last go-around for recomputation. The bill was presented in the Senate in that light. In fact, the spokesman for a leading retired group, under questioning before a Senate committee, conceded it was his understanding that approval of the bill would settle the recomputation issue and in the future only the cost-of-living system was to be used.

With that kind of background, it would be exceedingly difficult to get the Congress to reverse itself again and reinstitute the recomputation system of raising retired pay. It would be difficult to get through the House and almost impossible to get through the Senate, and it could endanger the passage of other worthwhile retired legislation that we have a reasonable hope of getting enacted this year or in the near future.

I don't know if you would have fed me dinner had you known I was going to say that, but those are the facts of life, no matter how much you and I might wish they were otherwise. I assure you, however, that the right in the cause of recomputation will never be swept under the rug as long as I am in Congress. I shall always be looking for the opportunity to correct an injustice and when it comes, many of us will be ready.

But our practical problem of today does not mean that substantial improvements cannot be made now in laws for retired personnel.

While I can't say at this time just what our subcommittee will do, I feel there are some important areas where benefits can be expanded—or at least better protected.

One of these is giving military retirees a better equity in their retirement. We hear endless figures quoted to us about the size and cost of military retired rolls, how annual cost is over $1 billion today and will top $2 billion by 1970; how there are over 462,000 retirees today and will be over 800,000 by 1975; how the average 20-year retiree will be drawing retired pay for over 32 years, given normal life expectancy.

What we don't hear is how many survivors are left without any equity in retired pay. If, for example, a 30-year military retiree goes out and gets himself run over by a truck 1 month after retirement, his retirement equity dies with him.

The only protection survivors of military retirees have is the retired serviceman's family protection plan, which is a little like term insurance bought late in life. An idea of its shortcomings can be gained from the fact that only 15 percent of military retirees participate in the plan. The rest have no protection for their survivors.

By contrast, more than 80 percent of civil service retirees participate in the civil service survivor annuity plan—for the very good reason that a modest deduction allows them to leave a substantial annuity to their survivors.

I don't see why we can't provide a comparable system for military retirees and I intend to do everything in my power to see that we do.

Another benefit I want to talk about is medical care for retirees and their dependents. And I'd like to go into this in some detail because it is an area where there has been great neglect and where there are new and hopeful signs of action.

I introduced a bill on this subject in the 88th Congress primarily as a vehicle to get some action—and action we got. A subcommittee under the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina, who is now chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, conducted an outstanding study. And it discovered what some of us had been saying all along: that medical care for retirees is a traditional benefit provided for more than 100 years; that military men had been clearly promised such care as an inducement to make service a career; and that the Defense Department policy of no longer programing beds for retirees in military hospitals was rapidly destroying this benefit.

The subcommittee concluded the Government had a strong moral obligation to provide care to retirees and their dependents. But it recognized that it would be impossible to provide all this care in military facilities in the future. So it told the Defense Department to "promptly submit recommendations for necessary legislation to resolve the retired military health care problem in an equitable and feasible manner."

Well, "promptly" by Pentagon standards has turned out to be about a year and a half, but such legislation is on its way. Technically, the legislation is still in the Budget Bureau, which, as you undoubtedly know, is the land of stillbirths for much military legislation. But we have reason to believe the bill will be sent to Capitol Hill shortly, and I have seen a copy of it.

Generally what the bill would do is extend the Dependent Medical Care Act to military retirees and their dependents. Those who have served 30 or more years or who retired involuntarily would pay a $25 deductible for each hospital stay, or $1.75 a day—whichever is greater. This is the charge now levied for active duty dependents. The retirees would pay a 20-percent deductible for outpatient care.

However, for those who voluntarily retire with less than 30 years, the deductible would be $50 for each hospital admission and the outpatient treatment deductible would be 40 percent.

Retirees and their dependents would continue to be eligible for care in military facilities, subject to availability of space.

The bill has these other features:

A system of priorities would be set up for care in military facilities giving higher priority to 30-year retirees and their dependents than to retirees with less than 30 years.

Beds would continue to be programed for retirees in military hospitals, the number to be determined by the service Secretary on a case-by-case basis, taking into account professional training requirements for doctors and availability of beds in civilian hospitals in the area. (The Rivers subcommittee had recommended 10 to 20 percent of new beds for retirees and I understand this is what the Surgeons General prefer.)

At age 65, retirees who are eligible for social security medical care would be transferred to that program. Those not eligible under social security would continue in the military retiree program.

In provisions not related to retirees, the bill also provides outpatient care to active duty dependents and long-term care for retarded children of military personnel. Both are new benefits, and both are extremely worthwhile.

The program would cost about $120 million in fiscal year 1968, its first full year of operation, and could be expected to rise gradually to an annual cost of about $190 million.

Now, of course, I don't want to prejudge the legislation before our subcommittee has had a chance to consider it. But it has some obviously attractive features. Some retiree beds would continue to be programed in military facilities. Retirees would get a program of care in civilian facilities for the first time, and those who live far from a military hospital would no longer be denied this important benefit.

Some of the other provisions are going to take careful study. The social security medical care supplemental program has some features, such as nursing care, which are not available under the Dependent Medicare Act. These may prove desirable to military retirees. On the other hand, we are going to have to take a close look at cost to see the individual is not charged more at a time in life when he is least able to pay.

The provision for higher charges for those with less than 30 years service is also going to need close scrutiny. With so many laws designed to encourage retirement before 30 years, there may be serious questions of equity as well as problems in administering the provision.

Speaking personally, I cannot approve the section which establishes higher priority of availability of medical facilities for 30-year retirees than those with less than 30 years. I can justify a reduced deductible payment for the 30-year retiree because he has contributed of himself for a longer period. But as long as we have laws which allow retirement at less than 30 years, I cannot discriminate against any retiree on the basis of availability of hospital facilities. When a retiree is sick, a hospital bed should be available—period—whether he served 20 years or 40.

The Department of Defense has created discrimination against some retirees with its ill-advised recomputation system—let's not create another type of discrimination.

But these are details to be worked out. The important thing is to have a bill the executive branch supports that we can shape into acceptable legislation.

Admittedly, this bill is quite different from the legislation I first introduced on the subject which was based on a program proposed by the Fleet Reserve Association. But, as I indicated, that was meant to be a catalyst. Frankly, I am not so concerned with the method as with the principle. We never get everything that all of us want in any one bill. But what is important is to prvoide for all of our retirees an assured program of care, one that cannot wither away because of administrative neglect.

We are in a time when the Government is making an enormous effort to improve the health of all citizens. Most of you will probably be quite surprised to hear that our annual Government expenditure for health programs of all types is in the neighborhood of $7 billion. In the face of that gigantic national commitment, it is simply unthinkable that we would let lapse the medical benefits of military retirees that have been provided for over 100 years.

Finally, and most important of all, we must reinstill in the hearts of all our retirees faith in their Government's promises, faith that when their Government pledges them a benefit it will never be taken away.

The moral obligation of the Government to keep its word to individual military men is more important than any amount of dollars involved. I believe that during the recomputation fight and I believe it now.

And this time, I think we are going to win.

COST-OF-LIVING INCREASES FOR SOCIAL SECURITY RECIPIENTS

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to provide cost-of-living increases in the benefits paid under the Social Security Act.

My bill would provide an automatic 3-percent increase in benefits whenever the Consumer Price Index reflects a similar increase in the cost of living. I am advocating these cost-of-living adjustments to social security payments because cost studies by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicate that this method, alone, among all the proposals for reasonable improvements in benefits can be accomplished without further increase in social security taxes.

The actuarial studies show that the growth of the economy would provide the necessary revenues to provide cost-of-living adjustments.

Mr. Speaker, the most effective action we could take to protect the earning power of those living on fixed incomes would be to stop Government-stimulated inflation which reduces the value of their dollars. Unfortunately, the administration has not demonstrated any inclination to hold-the-line on deficit spending. We, therefore, should make a strong effort to protect older Americans from the loss of income because of factors beyond their control.

From 1958 until the most recently enacted increase in social security benefits, recipients suffered a 7-percent loss in buying power. The bill I have introduced would prevent such loss of purchasing power in the future.

There are other changes which should be considered in the present social security system. One of these is a bill which I introduced during the first session of the 89th Congress. It is H.R. 7340, a proposal to pay 100 percent of primary benefit to widows under the Social Security Act. I urge that consideration be given to this legislation at an early date.

CELEBRATE GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY ON SUNDAY PRECEDING AND CELEBRATE FREEDOM WEEK

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a House joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annual proclamations designating the Sunday of each year immediately preceding February 22—the anniversary of the birthday of George Washington—as Freedom Sunday, and to designate the calendar week of each year during which February 22 occurs, as Freedom Week.

For some years, Freedom Week has been celebrated by the members of Sertoma International. This is an organization of business, professional, and agricultural men who have come together in bonds of personal friendship—united in dedication to service of their communities. Sertoma, which has over 450 clubs throughout the United States, Canada, and Mexico, derives its name from the organization's slogan, "Service to Mankind."

Many Sertoma Clubs in the State of Kansas have visited schools this week, distributing to each student a copy of our Declaration of Independence. Certainly it is right and proper that America's young people be instilled with a sense of national heritage.

It is also proper that all Americans everywhere be given the opportunity to celebrate a week each year as a tribute to this same national freedom heritage.

SHORTAGES IN VIETNAM

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the ever-lengthening list of shortages being suffered by our fighting men in Vietnam is, in my opinion, a national disgrace and this Congress should investigate them forthwith. I believe these critical shortages can no longer be swept under the rug and ignored by this Congress. They have now become common knowledge to the parents of our servicemen serving in Vietnam and they are demanding to know why these shortages exist when we have been spending approximately one-half of our Nation's total budget for defense and related items. When one considers the staggering expenditures of the Department of Defense over the past couple of years, our fighting men in Vietnam should be the best equipped soldiers ever sent into battle. Instead, reports indicate that they are not only unbelievably ill equipped, but are improperly fed. It has been reported that until recently, an estimated 70 percent of our troops in Vietnam were eating C-rations as a steady diet because of food shortages and the shortage of food-storage facilities.

Soldiers from my district are writing home, as I am sure they are from every Congressman's district, asking their families to mail them such essentials as jungle boots, fatigues, underwear, socks, and so forth. The New York Times of Monday, February 21, 1966, verified the needs of our fighting men when it revealed:

> Shortages of winter and summer uniforms, overcoats, raincoats, fatigues, jungle boots, underwear, socks, and other items are widely reported. The Army has reduced considerably the normal amount of clothing initially issued to recruits, and the marines expect to issue only half a bag soon unless the shortages are relieved.
>
> In Vietnam there has been no ammunition rationing as such, but many different items, including 5.56-millimeter ammunition for the M–16 rifle, 2.75-inch rockets, illuminating shells, and 750-pound bombs, have been issued on an as available basis, which means these items are not always available without limitation.
>
> In part, these and other scarcities in Vietnam are due to Vietnam's inadequate port capacity and local supply problems.
>
> Spare parts of every type for aircraft, helicopters, communication and electronic equipment, engineering equipment, and motor transport are in short supply everywhere; it is not uncommon for a Navy destroyer to wait for months for spares for missiles, or generators. Even barbed wire, sandbags, and other field fortification materials have been in short supply.

A Toledo, Ohio, TV station has editorially revealed that a signal company repairman with the 1st Cavalry in Vietnam had written a Toledo, Ohio, manufacturer for parts for generators needed to supply communications for an emergency field hospital. In his appeal, the serviceman revealed that such a requisition would take at least 90 days to fill through regular military channels and since they were needed immediately, he was requesting them directly from the manufacturer. The Toledo company shipped the parts free of charge and received a thank you message from the serviceman's commanding officer. Other reports indicate that our fighting men are short of certain weapons, that machineguns have been stripped from tanks in Europe to be used in Vietnam and that a gas shortage at An Khe had restricted the use of jeeps and tanks. Marines at Danang are reported to have run out of mosquito spray in the midst of a malaria epidemic last November and were forced to evacuate 800 infected men.

A critical ammunition shortage arose when our one and only gun-powder plant was hit by a crippling strike last December—McNamara has now taken the advice of the military and ordered the reopening of another powder plant—namely, the Badger Ammunition Depot in Wisconsin, but it will not be in full production until June. During the time this powder plant was out on strike, we had to send to Europe for small arms ammunition for Vietnam. Someone has said this was like "robbing Peter to pay Paul." The Senate Preparedness Subcommittee has found that combat communications radios, spotting equipment for mortars, trucks, troop carriers, aircraft warning systems, bomber guidance systems, and even helicopters were in short supply.

In addition to all these shortages of vital equipment, we apparently have an enormous logistics problem which is affecting our war effort in Vietnam. It has been reported that as many as 100 cargo ships have been backed up in South Vietnam harbors costing an estimated $1 million a day. There have been reports that ships have waited as long as 2 months to move dockside and unload. This backlog has resulted in hold orders to other ships on the west coast and in ports stretching from Hawaii to Tokyo. CBS Correspondent John Flynn, reported from Saigon recently that "ships carrying fresh vegetables sometimes wait so long that part of their cargo spoils."

If ever there was a need for a nonpolitical investigation of a war effort by Congress, it is now.

JOHN E. FOGARTY IS HEART-OF-THE-YEAR

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the American Heart Association conferred a singular and most deserved honor on our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty]. In recognition of his tireless efforts on behalf of the many health programs which have come before us in this body, and especially those which have supported the assault on heart disease, the gentleman was chosen to receive the Heart-of-the-Year Award.

Appropriately, the presentation was made at the White House under the approving eye of the President.

Our colleague's interest and dedication to the cause of health are not a new story to Members of this body. This award, as coveted and distinguished as it is, is but the latest in a long line of similar citations which have been bestowed on the gentleman. His deep commitment to the highest standards of public service have earned him the recognition, gratitude, and admiration of all of his countrymen, and of the world.

He has been cited for his work not only in the field of health, but on behalf of the youth of this country, of veterans, and of the business community.

He holds the Parents Magazine National Distinguished Service Medal for his work on behalf of the youngsters of the Nation. In 1959, he won the Albert Lasker Award for his work on behalf of medical research and public health. He donated the $5,000 honorarium of this award to the Rhode Island Parents Council for Mentally Retarded Children. He also donated an $8,000 honorarium some years later to what had become the John E. Fogarty Foundation for work with mentally retarded children when he won the Kennedy Foundation's Leadership Award for public service. A whole list of health and educational facilities in his native State have been named after him.

Our distinguished colleague is holder of a great many honorary degrees, many more than have been bestowed on public figures of far greater educational attainments. He is honorary doctor of laws at the University of Rhode Island, doctor of political science at Providence College, doctor of science at Rhode Island School of Pharmacy, doctor of humane letters at Bryant College, and doctor of laws at Brown University.

He has also received honorary degrees of doctor of laws from Salve Regina College, Brandeis University, St. Francis College, Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, Georgetown University, University of Notre Dame, Manhattan College, and Loyola University.

He holds an honorary degree of doctor of science from New York Medical College, and doctor of pedagogy from Rhode Island College. In addition, he holds honorary membership in a host of medical societies and organizations. It is rare, indeed, when the gratitude and respect of a professional community is so great as to manifest itself in so many ways.

During presentation ceremonies of the Heart-of-the-Year Award, the President offered some remarks in recognition of the event and of the illustrious record of our distinguished colleague which, perhaps in more graphic terms than any, underscore his personal crusade on behalf of better health for his State, his Nation, and for the world.

Under unanimous consent, I insert at this point, so that it will be a permanent part of the Record, an appropriate excerpt from the President's remarks on that occasion.

The excerpt follows:

Remarks of the President Upon Presentation of Heart-of-the-Year Award of the American Heart Association to Congressman John E. Fogarty

Congressman Fogarty, Dr. Taussig, ladies and gentlemen, when we read that a fully functioning heart is possible within 5 years, we pay tribute to congressional leadership, and particularly to Congressman John Fogarty, of Rhode Island.

When we finally call a halt to the wholesale murder of heart disease, all of us will bless the day that Congress took effective action. John Fogarty represents the little State of Rhode Island in the U.S. Congress, but his crusade for better health has led him often to the first house of the land.

He came here last August 4 for the signing of the Community Facilities Act. He was back again the next day at the signing of the Community Health Services Extension Act, Community Mental Health Centers one week; Community Health Service Extension Act the next week.

Four days later he came back to see us as a sponsor of the National Institutes of Health for the signing of the Health Research Facilities Act. In October he was back at the White House again for the signing of the heart, cancer, and stroke amendments, to establish regional medical centers to help us in fighting these killer diseases.

Now he is back with us again this morning. He doesn't have a bill in his pocket, a congressional bill, I mean, but this, I think, I can tell you: When he comes to this house, he is always welcome.

For John Fogarty knows what we all must learn, and that is that no society can be great which is not first of all healthy.

NEW CARRIER SHOULD BE NAMED AFTER ADM. CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation calling for naming our next nuclear aircraft carrier after one of America's great naval figures, the late Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz.

I believe that Admiral Nimitz' career symbolizes our U.S. Navy. He was tough, adroit, well schooled in Navy tactics, every bit a leader of men of which our Nation can justly be proud. His job, after we were attacked in 1941, was to take a crippled Navy to sea, to stand off numerically greater forces, and to rebuild our might on the seas.

His epic battles in the Pacific brought the aircraft carrier into prominence, and proved that it could be a devastating instrument of war. The submarine was also brought into the Pacific sea war, and proved itself deadly.

No one can adequately measure the gratitude that our Nation has for the courageous and skillful leadership Admiral Nimitz gave our Pacific fleet when the chips were down. He had vision, daring, and an uncommon sense of strategy and planning.

Two decades after World War II we are again in perilous times. Our dependency upon the aircraft carrier increases as the danger of another large-scale conflict grows. It is only appropriate that we bestow upon our next nuclear carrier, the latest development in our nuclear Navy, the name of the man who made the aircraft carrier a potent and formidable element in sea warfare.

I am hopeful that my colleagues, who admire and respect the late Admiral Nimitz, will join with me in this effort.

HOME FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning the Committee on Public Works will open hearings on a bill introduced last Monday by my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. Gray] for the erection of a $750,000 home for the Vice President of the United States.

In the light of the speed with which the committee is acting on this proposal there is apparently some emergency with which we are not aware. But, paradoxically, there is no emergency from the point of view of the administration with respect to furnishing proper housing for our servicemen.

Last September the Congress provided funds for military housing sorely needed. Some of our servicemen have been living in little more than barns, even in tents. Last December the Secretary of Defense arbitrarily shelved our appropriation for military housing. In testimony before our committee the Defense Department claimed that this unilateral action was taken because of other budget demands and that the expenditure would add to the inflationary pressures.

I concur in the desirability of furnishing proper housing for our Vice President. But why the rush?

And I should like to ask this question: Why should we at this time concern ourselves about furnishing an expensive house for the Vice President, admittedly needed, when the Secretary of Defense refuses to use the funds we have already appropriated to furnish proper housing for our fighting men?

If proper housing for our servicemen is to be deferred because of budget limitations and inflationary pressures, why should not the same principle apply in connection with an expensive house for the Vice President? First things first.

DISASTER STUDY NEEDED NOW

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, three times in recent months we have seen transportation tangled, communications snarled, commerce crippled, and Government stalled by regional disasters. It is ironic that this great Nation, while perfecting its defenses against enemy attack and sabotage, should remain so vulnerable to the whims of weather and the failures of any single public utility.

Northeastern commerce and industry have been gravely hurt by the transportation and communications breakdowns accompanying last November's blackout and the New York transit strike. During the blizzard last month, public services throughout the great Washington metropolitan area were virtually suspended, and the Federal Government alone lost $10 million in salaries on a single snowbound day. Most serious, of course, have been the human tragedies caused by these periods of temporary paralysis.

We have ample proof that our present precautions against such occurrences are inadequate. We need, right now, a full national survey to discover what resources we do need and where they can be found, so that all levels of American government and all public utilities might be prepared to meet every conceivable emergency.

I am today introducing a bill authorizing and directing the Office of Emergency Planning to study this question, in cooperation with State and local governments, and to make a full report to Congress by December 1, 1966. In my judgment the OEP is best qualified to take such an inventory for three reasons: First, because national security is directly involved; second, because the OEP already has relevant information; and third, because the leadership of the Federal disaster agency is essential in preparing to meet emergencies which do not respect State and local lines.

Through the survey I propose, the OEP should be able to submit reasonable recommendations to Congress, and also encourage local and State governments to evaluate their own resources and prepare realistic contingency plans.

While we may never be able to forestall all blackouts, or anticipate all storms, we should be able to combat their crippling effects. The study proposed in my bill would help us mobilize our resources and meet the challenge implicit in the following article, from the Washington Post of February 15:

> Moscow Clears "Impossible" Snow
>
> Moscow, February 14.—Moscow turned out 2,000 snow-clearing machines today to attack what Tass called such an unprecedented snowfall that "even oldtimers cannot remember."
>
> And, the Soviet news agency added, the machines "did the impossible: Transport services were not interrupted for a single minute." Tass said 27.5 inches of snow fell in "several hours."

THE TAX AND SPEND PHILOSOPHY

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the administration today asks the House to raise taxes by the tune of $6 billion by reimposing excise taxes on telephones and cars and by changing withholding tax collection methods. We are told these taxes are necessary to raise money to finance the war in Vietnam and to put the lid on inflation. We are told if we do not agree to these taxes, we will be deeper in debt.

I refuse to buy this line. This is not the only course open to Congress and this administration. The administration's Great Society budget is topheavy with domestic spending lard. There is no sound reason why it cannot be taken out to avoid this tax increase.

Cars and telephones are necessities. Why should users of these necessities be penalized when there are so many obvious areas where nonessential spending can be curtailed? The answer is that there is no more logic to this course than there is to cutting back existing, proved programs, like the school lunch and milk programs and the land-grant college programs, while at the same time moving to set up dozens of new, untried expensive programs.

The administration has ignored our constant warning that you cannot fight a major war of unpredictable costs while at the same time spending borrowed money at home harum-scarum.

It is time for Congress to insist that this administration start acting with fiscal responsibility. It is apparent the only way to insure that the spenders do so is to refuse to go along with their "tax and spend" philosophy which is damaging this Nation's economic foundations and sapping the strength of American taxpayers.

I therefore intend to vote no to this preposterous tax increase.

J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Devine] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, many words have been spoken and written about one of the greatest Americans of our time, John Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

This well-deserved praise has reached a climax in an article appearing in the Columbus Dispatch, February 20, 1966. This article is particularly significant in that it follows a question-and-answer technique which directly quotes Mr. Hoover on a number of law enforcement problems as well as making reference to internal security matters.

I feel it is important that every Member of the U.S. Congress have a chance to study the answers given by this dedicated and patriotic public servant.

> J. Edgar Hoover Views Crime and Communism—"Columbus a Key Espionage Target"
>
> J. Edgar Hoover is the foremost authority on law enforcement and counterespionage in the world. Because of this, the Dispatch asked him a series of questions about rising crime and Communist activities in the United States today, and Hoover has taken time from his busy schedule to answer each one.
>
> Hoover has been Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for more than 40 years. Now 71, he still vigorously directs FBI operations throughout the Nation in the endless war against crime and subversion. He has received numerous awards for his dedication and devotion to law enforcement.
>
> Hoover has devoted his life to combating criminals and agents of foreign powers that would undermine our Government and change the American way of life.
>
> In answering the following questions, Hoover discusses central Ohio as a possible target for enemy agents, the groups behind demonstrations at universities across the Nation, the extent of the Communist intelligence network, crime in general, police "brutality" charges, and juvenile delinquency.
>
> Hoover also makes suggestions for correcting some of the evils that plague our people and our Nation.
>
> SYMPTOM OF SICKNESS
>
> Question. Mr. Hoover, you have long been the spokesman for law enforcement in the United States. Recently, the FBI reported more than 2.6 million serious crimes per year. What's wrong with us as a nation?

Answer. The steady growth of crime in the United States is a symptom of a tragic sickness which afflicts vast numbers of the American people. I refer to it as the "decadence disease." It is characterized by lethargy, indifference, neglect. In the lives of persons who are afflicted with this disease, pleasure comes before duty—integrity, industry, personal responsibility take a back seat.

We need to rededicate ourselves, individually and as a people, to the strong moral principles which are an inseparable part of our heritage of greatness.

Question. Pinpointing what precise factors are causing the recent upsurge in crime? According to your uniform crime reports, victimizing of innocent people is increasing six times faster than the population.

Answer. All categories of major crimes are increasing. During the first 9 months of 1965, compared with the same period in 1964, there was a 5-percent rise in crime. Aggravated assaults were up 2 percent; auto thefts, 3 percent; murders, robberies, burglaries, and larcenies of $50 or more, 5 percent; and forcible rapes, 6 percent.

Question. You have had more than 41 years as FBI Director; have you noticed any change in the morality of our Nation?

Answer. I have witnessed a number of changes. Look, for example, at the growing prevalence of sex and sadism on the shelves of magazine stands and bookstores. Look at the crowds who flock to motion picture theaters to see sensual trash which is little more than a pretext away from obscenity. And look at the mounting numbers of illegitimate births, the homes broken by divorce or infidelity, the growing acceptance of promiscuity.

Question. Why?

Answer. Dirt accumulates when there is no longer the pride nor the determination to do something about it. Americans, in growing numbers, are developing a dangerously indulgent attitude toward crime and filth and corruption.

Question. We are shocked that 57 law-enforcement officers were murdered in line of duty in a 12-month period, but even more so with your report that 1 out of every 10 police officers was assaulted. What is behind it?

Answer. We in law enforcement recognize that hazards are an inherent part of our work. These hazards exist whenever men of the law rise to meet the challenge of those who hold themselves above or beyond the reach of the law. Let me emphasize, however, that there is no room on the streets of America for the person who would deliberately strike down an honest, devoted officer. * * * Such individuals should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. If mentally or emotionally ill, they should be confined to an institution.

PROBLEM OF PAROLE

Question. A convict on parole or probation costs the Government a great deal less than one cooped up behind bars. How well is the system working?

Answer. A convict on parole or probation costs the taxpayer less money provided parole or probation does not serve as an avenue for him to commit additional crimes. * * * We know from hard experience that the "School of Easy Justice" has graduated too many failures. For example, during the 5-year period of 1960–64, no less than 225 police officers were killed by felons. Seventy-eight percent of the criminals had prior records of arrest, and more than half of this group had previously been arrested for crimes of violence. Almost one-third were on parole or probation at the time the murder of the police officer occurred.

We in the FBI believe in the humanitarian principle of parole and probation. We support reasonable and properly administered programs of rehabilitation. But, at the same time, we are unalterably opposed to the premature release of unreformed and unrepentant offenders to resume warring against society.

Question. If you were in charge of all paroles and probations, what changes would you make?

Answer. Let me repeat: We in the FBI support the humanitarian principle of parole and probation. Experience clearly shows that, in those areas where weaknesses exist, the fault lies not in the principle but in the administration.

Question. What are some of these administrative weaknesses? How can they be overcome?

Answer. First, I believe that every parole system should be divorced from political influence and that it should be insulated from other outside pressures. Second, I feel that the utmost care should be exercised in the selection of parole and probation officers—that the qualifications demanded, and the salaries offered, should be commensurate with the heavy responsibilities of the position. Third, an end must be put to the all-too-common practice of overburdening parole and probation officers with more cases than they can effectively handle.

Question. W. E. B. DuBois Clubs have been branded by you as a spawn of the Communists. What is the real extent of this movement and what strength does it have?

Answer. The W. E. B. DuBois Clubs were founded at a convention in San Francisco, Calif., in June 1964. The convention was organized, controlled and manipulated by the Communist Party. These clubs claim to be "Marxist-oriented" and not under party control, but such claims are mere attempts to hoodwink the American people. The DuBois Clubs represent a direct effort by the Communist Party to penetrate, infiltrate and influence college students in the United States.

The DuBois Clubs have ben strikingly successful. Today there are some 40 chapters of the DuBois Clubs in the United States, the majority on college campuses. In recent months, DuBois members have participated in the demonstrations against American policy in Vietnam. The DuBois Clubs represent one of the party's most effective techniques of influencing our young people.

Question. As a highly industrial community of aircraft, electronics, nuclear research, higher education and growing diversified business surrounded by prosperous rural and farm lands, we wonder if we qualify as an espionage target?

Answer. Columbus certainly would be a key Soviet-bloc espionage target. You are a growing city encompassing a vast variety of industrial and technical installations, both private industry and the Government. Your city certainly is not being overlooked by the Soviets.

SEVENTY PERCENT ARE SPYING

Question. How extensive is the Soviet network?

Answer. A Soviet defector has told us that an estimated 70 percent of the Soviet diplomatic officials in this country have intelligence assignments. We face not only the Soviets but also the spy networks of such satellite nations as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania. The problem is most formidable.

Question. Is there a link between Communist Party, U.S.A., and Soviet communism? * * * with Chinese communism?

Answer. The Communist Party, U.S.A., is now, as it has always been since its origin in 1919, obediently loyal to Moscow. The party in this country closely follows the Russian line, supporting Soviet policies and denouncing this country.

A few party members did develop sympathies toward the Peiping position, but they were expelled. Many of these pro-Red Chinese expellees are currently leaders in the Progressive Labor Party and the May 2 movement, the two major Communist groups in this country supporting Mao Tse-tung.

Question. "What are the Progressive Labor Party and the May 2 movement? Do they operate in central Ohio?"

Answer. These two groups are pro-Red Chinese organizations in the United States. They contain, among others, former members of the Communist Party, U.S.A., who broke with the party over the Sino-Russian dispute. The Progressive Labor Party and the May 2 movement have participated in recent demonstrations and protests against American policy in Vietnam. Primary strength of these pro-Red Chinese organizations is in the New York City and west coast areas.

They are not strong in the central portion of the country, though they seek new bases of operation. The May 2 movement is chiefly pointed toward young people and has the college campus as a key target. These are extremely militant groups which seek to undermine our security.

CITIZENS CAN HELP

Question. What can a businessman or a farmer or housewife do to help the FBI?

Answer. A citizen can help the FBI by promptly reporting any information in his possession concerning espionage, sabotage, or subversive activities. No person should undertake to conduct his own investigation—that is the FBI's job. It is amazing how often information furnished us by a citizen helps us solve a case.

Question. Recent demonstrations against our foreign commitments have been pretty widespread. What is behind them?

Answer. The Communist Party is today actively exploiting the demonstrations and protests against American policy in Vietnam. Party and DuBois members have helped plan the various demonstrations and have participated themselves. The Communists would like nothing more than to see these student protest demonstrations intensified and made more extensive. Not only would these activities be helping the party's cause, but they also would be undercutting our foreign policy. Not in recent years has the party had such a field day, working in every way to take advantage of student unrest.

Question. Are they indicative of disregard for law and resistance to authority?

Answer. In America we have the right to dissent—this is the very essence of free government. We must protect the right of any individual to freely and candidly speak his mind. However, the right of dissent is something vastly different from acts of civil disobedience—of trying to block trains, burning draft cards, and blocking traffic by lying in the street.

Our system of free government cannot continue if a person chooses to obey what laws he likes and disobey those he doesn't like. This is sheer anarchy. Far too many of the anti-Vietnam demonstrators have scoffed at our constitutional principles and mocked our democratic way of life.

They encourage the law of the jungle and are sowing the seeds of disrespect for law which can only damage our fight for freedom. Freedom does not mean license. It means responsibility and respect for the rights of others.

Question. Many teenagers seem to think adults of another generation are down on them and that teenagers are generally regarded as delinquents. What advice do you have for young people?

Answer. Perhaps there are some adults who too quickly condemn teenagers—all teenagers. The fact is there is less than 5 percent of our juvenile population involved in serious criminal activities. The great majority of our teenagers are honest young people. It is wrong for all juveniles to be condemned for the misdeeds of a few.

It is also a mistake for our honest teenagers to dismiss the juvenile crime problem because only a relatively few of their generation are involved. They must realize they will be stuck with the troublemakers far longer than today's adult population. Hence, they have a much greater personal interest in seeing that something is done to control them and correct their destructive ways.

NEED DECENT PAY

Question. Back to crime. Will you discuss police salaries, personnel selection, training, and indicate whether these have a relation to the crime problem?

Answer. Police salaries, personnel selection and training are basic ingredients to effective law enforcement. Decent wages must be paid to obtain decent men. And, the greatest of care must be taken in selecting personnel for law enforcement work. There are few tasks more important to a democracy than the just enforcement of our laws—a task which must not be entrusted to unsuited individuals. Training, of course, is the hallmark of any profession. Attract good men, carefully select and expertly train them, and you will have a good law enforcement agency, one which can meet the onslaught of crime and avoid the pitfalls of legal technicalities.

Question. Columbus is the hub of central Ohio. How do we stack up as to crime and subversion?

Answer. A total of 12,864 crimes of murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny $50 and over, and auto-bile theft was reported in the Columbus area in 1964. This amounted to 1,583 serious crimes per 100,000 residents of the area. Burglaries led with a total of 5,752. There were 3,455 serious larcenies, 2,371 automobile thefts, 659 aggravated assaults, 506 robberies, 90 forcible rapes, and 31 murders.

Question. What is the Communist situation in Ohio?

Answer. The intense interest of the Communist Party, U.S.A., in Ohio is illustrated by the fact that the party recently sent one of its top organizers, Phil Bart, former national organizational secretary, to take over the Ohio district. Ohio, with its industrial complexes and military installations, naturally is a target for all types of Communist subversion. The Ohio district of the Communist Party has produced such current party leaders as Gus Hall, Arnold Samuel Johnson, and Hyman Lumer.

Question. Some citizens, perhaps too many, take police as a matter of course. Respect for law enforcement seems to have suffered. What should be done by police as well as citizens?

Answer. Through the years law enforcement has borne the brunt of attack of virtually every special-interest group. It is common practice for anyone who runs afoul of or opposes a law, whether it be the criminal, the juvenile rioters, the social reformer, to demean law enforcement, to shout "police brutality," to claim infringement of rights. All too often the charges are accepted as fact by well-meaning, if ill-informed, individuals and groups, and are given wide circulation. Rarely do the facts overtake the charges, and untold damage is done to law enforcement and its efforts to preserve law and order.

Naturally, every law enforcement officer must strive to perform his duties in a totally objective, impartial and legal manner. The great majority do this. But it is time for the majority of the citizens to be heard from. It is time for the honest citizens who look to law enforcement for protection to start providing more support and cooperation. It is time for them to call a halt to the baseless maligning of law enforcement by selfish individuals who fail to realize or simply do not care that the destruction of law enforcement will mean also the destruction of law and order.

HONORABLE PROFESSION

Question. Would you encourage a young man to prepare for a local law enforcement career?

Answer. Certainly. Law enforcement is an honorable profession. It is an essential job, and while its monetary rewards may not be great, it provides one with the satisfaction of knowing he is performing a true service for his country and his fellowman.

Question. What are the facts concerning the integrity of local law enforcement officers on the whole? Brutality?

Answer. The great majority of the men and women who comprise our Nation's law enforcement agencies are honorable and a credit to their profession. A few are not, and some are prevented from a just performance of their duties by corrupt officials above them. There are a few cases of brutality, as revealed by the fact that our investigations led to the conviction of six officers in fiscal year 1965. But there were 1,787 allegations of brutality in the year, many of which were unfounded, irresponsible and made purely for the purpose of intimidating local law enforcement agencies and harrassing the FBI.

Question. Columbus Police Chief George Scholer and Franklin County Sheriff Stacy Hall are FBI trained. Do they cooperate with you? Are they competent and reliable?

Answer. Both Chief Scholer and Sheriff Hall are graduates of the FBI National Academy, Mr. Scholer having completed the training in 1953 and Mr. Hall in 1958. There has been an excellent and beneficial cooperation among their departments and the FBI.

Question. Do some groups try to push you into fields not within your lawful province because of their special interests?

Answer. Yes, indeed. At various times, campaigns have been mounted and pressures exerted for the FBI to furnish physical protection to civil rights workers, or to investigate a local murder case, or to perform other functions outside our jurisdiction and authority.

Ironically, at the same time, we have also been criticized for carrying out certain duties which we are required to perform by law.

My answer to critics such as these is always the same. The FBI is not a policymaking organization. We investigate violations of laws enacted—and we carry out policies laid down—by others. So long as we have the responsibility to investigate alleged violations of a particular Federal law, we will continue to carry out that responsibility—thoroughly, promptly, impartially and without apology to anyone.

Furthermore, we will continue to avoid encroachments upon the sovereignty of other authorities, and we will refuse to yield to the pressures of special-interest groups who would have us perform functions not assigned to the FBI by Congress, the President or the Attorney General of the United States.

LAW NEEDS THE PRESS

Question. Does the press get out of line?

Answer. A small segment of the Nation's news media does get out of line. Some, in fact, make a career of being opposed to law enforcement. But the vast majority of our news media have been stanch supporters of law enforcement—true allies in the fight to preserve law and order. Law enforcement needs and welcomes the support of the press.

Question. We believe Dispatch readers have a right to know what happens in the community and Nation as long as we do not jeopardize security or litigation. In your view does publicity of crimes hurt or help? Should we publicize civil disobedience and acts of resistance against law?

Answer. Publicity of crime most certainly does help, but it should be complete publicity which records not only the crime, but its solution and the resulting court action. Too often news media will give tremendous coverage to a crime and later ignore or play down the solution. Complete reporting is needed.

The same would hold true with respect to coverage of acts of civil disobedience and the like. They should be publicized through "in depth" reporting—reporting which describes both sides of the issue, reporting which delves below the surface to expose any hidden objectives, any obscure groups which may be using the events to the detriment of our society. Alert newsmen, who have dug below the surface, have saved our Nation much grief and strife by exposing the tawdry nature of many demonstrations.

A PROUD HISTORY

Question. We are a home-owned independent evening and Sunday newspaper in its 95th year. FBI representatives have had many contacts with our staff. How can we help the cause of government under law?

Answer. Your paper has a proud history of service to its community. It is a typical example of the American free press striving to protect our freedoms, our heritage, our integrity. A newspaper has been rightly called the conscience of the community. Columbus, I believe, is blessed with a good conscience. As long as your paper objectively and honestly reports the news, it will continue to be a good conscience and a strong link in the chain of democracy.

NASSER RETREATS FROM HIS PEACE PLEDGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have read with great disappointment that President Nasser, in a recent speech at the University of Cairo, rejuvenated his warlike stance vis-a-vis the Yemen. This recent speech by President Nasser, wherein he threatened to maintain his Yemen intervention, contrary to treaty provisions, contradicts the widely voiced optimism that has reigned for some months.

President Nasser is quoted in this morning's New York Times as having said:

> If anyone thinks we have become tired because we have stayed in Yemen so long, let me say that we are a struggling nation, a fighting nation, a patient nation. We can stay in Yemen for 1 year, 2 years, 3 years, or even 5.

Thus it appears that the Jiddah agreement, which provided for a staged withdrawal of Egyptian troops from Yemen, is threatened. Nasser excused his belligerence by pointing to the sale of American Patton tanks to Israel, and claiming that conservative, reactionary forces in the Middle East, goaded by Western powers, were bent upon countering his influence and even plotting against his life. These are charges which, due to lack of adequate, firsthand knowledge, I can neither substantiate or reject.

But in the first instance, I cannot understand how 200 Patton tanks added to Israel's defenses could possibly, in a serious way, undermine the security of Egypt, in view of that country's massive procurement of Communist arms.

I am inclined to believe that President Nasser is an inherently suspicious ruler, intemperate, and not to be trusted. Perhaps it is impossible to find the opposite in the Middle East, a region perpetually upset by extreme political shifts, personal feuds, and contradictory ambitions.

The truth is that it is foolish to expect, through aid commitments, that American policy can effectively influence the realities in the Arab world.

The Jiddah conference was an Arab initiative. It seemed that President Nasser had faced the hurtful consequences of his intervention, and had concluded that nothing useful could be gained by continuing a war which showed little prospect of political advantage or military victory.

This was the opinion expressed to me by many people.

I must say, however, that this tenuous supposition hardly justified the renewed aid agreement with the United Arab Republic, which was undertaken during the congressional recess and in spite of clearly understood congressional sentiment. The Jiddah accord spurred the optimists onward.

As I review recent history, I have come to doubt the wisdom of buying influence, particularly in an area of unique instability of constantly shifting loyalties.

Under the present circumstances, the United States is not justified under any pretext to render agricultural assistance to Egypt, when such assistance merely facilitates foreign intervention. Unless the United Arab Republic fulfills its treaty obligations with respect to the Yemen, we should not be expected to honor an aid commitment which the recipient can use to underwrite its hostile exertions.

Past American attempts to curb Nasser's obsession with foreign troublemaking have repeatedly failed. Officially, we have been setting unreal expectations. I cannot agree with the State Department that we are, in consequence of our generosity, gaining any so-called leverage over the course of events. In any case, these are not, in substance, for us to determine. It is contradictory to assist a developing nation which expends its meager resources on external adventure, intrigue, and excessive arms procurement.

The United Arab Republic has been spending millions of dollars to support its Yemini venture. Additional millions have gone to arms purchases, for the stated reason of contending with the so-called Israeli threat, but actually used as an instrument to bolster the power and prestige of Nasser's Egypt as against real and potential Arab rivals. It does not seem to me that this is a particularly promising field for the projection of American influence and, indeed, our mingling in this uncertainty may actually damage our cause. I thoroughly agree that it is in our national interest to support a balance of power in this troubled area, especially in view of Israel's threatened existence. But I doubt earnestly that this can be accomplished through periodic efforts to court the favor of inconsistent personalities. In any case, we invariably wind up in a very ambiguous, and often embarrassing, position.

If honest self-help is the new look in our foreign aid program, then perhaps we should take a longer view of Egypt.

President Nasser's recent threat to break the Jiddah agreement underlines the insurmountable contingencies with which, by force of our policy, we are faced with in the Middle East. It is an anxious warning to all who would place their trust too quickly and none too wisely.

I must add, Mr. Speaker, that it is particularly curious, and most discouraging, that Nasser's words came on the eve of Mr. Anwar el Sadat's good-will visit to this country. I fail to see what can be won through recourse to bluster and threats to the peace, lacking both validity and commonsense.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by the Clerk I am not recorded on this last vote. I was in the Chamber at the time the vote was being taken. If I had been recorded, I would have voted "yea" on the bill, H.R. 12752.

VIETNAM

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, among the many statements which appeared on George Washington's Birthday, there was one which particularly caught my attention because it shows what history still has to teach us.

In the New York Journal American an editorial quotes these words of our first President at the time of the Revolution:

> I am under more apprehension on account of our dissensions, than the effort of the enemy.

As the Journal American pointed out, those deeply concerned words could just as well have been spoken by President Johnson today.

We have nearly 200,000 American servicemen in Vietnam. Within recent days, the parents, the wives, and the children of these men—more than half a million of our citizens—have been treated to television programs, and a few newspaper headlines which seem to imply that our boys in Vietnam do not have the support of American public.

We are engaged with an enemy who does not believe that American public opinion will ultimately turn against our efforts in Vietnam and make it impossible for us to continue. This is a delusion, but one which the events of the last few days have undoubtedly strengthened.

Those who sincerely seek peace in Vietnam must be made aware of the fact that every newspaper headline and every televised speech which feeds the delusion of doubt in Hanoi and Peiping serves only to prolong the conflict. It is time to tell our soldiers and our enemy, alike, that the American public overwhelmingly supports our objectives in Vietnam. Furthermore, they support overwhelmingly the policies which President Johnson is pursuing to accomplish those objectives. Let us look at the facts.

On "Meet the Press" last Sunday, White House aid McGeorge Bundy—who has been the key national security adviser to both President Kennedy and President Johnson—pointed out that the President has been acting in Vietnam with the greatest of restraint. He cited as evidence that perhaps 10 percent of the public actually would like the President to go farther.

I have examined several recent opinion polls on this matter, and I find that the figures are even higher. Roughly one-third of the country believes the President should take much stronger military action than he himself has as yet found necessary.

For example, in December of last year according to the Harris poll, fully 33 percent of the American people believed that we should carry the ground war into North Vietnam. Some 39 percent believed that we should step up the bombing in North Vietnam at the very time when the President called for a suspension of the bombings to let the world see who was sincere, and who was insincere, about the desire for peace in southeast Asia.

Again, in January according to the Iowa poll, 36 percent of all Americans thought that we should bomb Hanoi and the other large cities of North Vietnam.

According to the Gallup poll, 31 percent advocated bombing the big cities of North Vietnam. As recently as this month, a Mutual Broadcasting poll reported 33.6 percent of Americans as saying that we should go all out and do whatever is necessary to defeat Hanoi.

At the same time, these same polls show that only a handful of Americans would favor a complete U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam. The Harris poll puts the number at 9 percent; the Iowa poll puts it at 15 percent.

It is obvious from these and all the other polls that the policies our Government is now pursuing in Vietnam represent what the overwhelming majority of our citizens believe should be done.

President Johnson has said that we intend to stay. He has also said that we intend to do no more than is absolutely necessary to bring the other side to the conference table. This is a positive program which contains our best hope for peace, not only in Vietnam but throughout southeast Asia. The President's critics, as I have shown, represent no significant portion of U.S. public opinion, nor do they offer any sensible, workable alternative whatsoever.

The voices of dissent will continue. The timid, the uncertain, and the bewildered will continue to be heard. They were heard during our Revolution, but in history, their echo becomes dimmer with every passing year. What is remembered now is the determination, the wisdom, and the restraint of the leader who brought us safely through.

I would like to assure the President that, in my opinion, history is going to repeat itself.

I fully expect that at some future time, a Member of this great body will rise to quote from an editorial concerning President Johnson in Vietnam similar to the Journal American editorial about President Washington which I hold in my hand, and which I now insert in the RECORD:

[From the New York Journal-American, Feb. 22, 1966]

NOW, AS THEN

"I am under more apprehension on account of our own dissensions, than the effort of the enemy."

The deeply concerned words could well have been spoken by President Johnson who has, indeed, expressed similar concern. But they were written by George Washington. They are as applicable today, as then, and his birthday makes their recollection appropriate in this time of national stress when our difficulties without are rendered more serious by dissensions within.

The quitters are in full, loud voice. They would have us pull out of Vietnam, willy-nilly, in virtual surrender and world disgrace, in shameful abandonment of pledge and honor.

There are, too, sincere doubters who believe our engagement in Vietnam should never have been started. These, too, are in demanding chorus.

And there are, of course, the outright Communists within our midst, and their duped peaceniks who seek by clamor to frustrate reason.

There are dissensions by many whose stature gives importance to their views and by many of low station whose importance is that their noise may convey to Hanoi the tragically mistaken assumption that our Nation prepares to unfurl a white flag.

But the flag still is and will be, to the day of victory, a banner of meaningful stars and stripes so historically made possible by George Washington and now so historically maintained by President Johnson and the vast majority of the American people.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States sent to Congress on February 10 a message in which he outlined his proposals to open up a new war of great importance to all Americans—a war against hunger. Let me quote for you the opening sentences of this message.

> Men first joined together for the necessities of life—food for their families, clothing to protect them, housing to give them shelter. These are the essentials of peace and progress. But in the world today, these needs are still largely unfulfilled. When men and their families are hungry, poorly clad and ill housed, the world is restless—and civilization exists at best in troubled peace.
>
> Hunger poisons the mind. It saps the body. It destroys hope. It is the natural enemy of every man on earth. I propose that the United States lead the world in a war against hunger. There can only be victors in this war. Since every nation will share in that victory, every nation should share in its costs. I urge all who can help to join us.

With these inspiring words, President Johnson submitted his new proposed Food for Freedom Act to the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

Populations are exploding today. Every nation in the world recognizes this. Yet, tragically, some of the most underdeveloped countries are girding their production to industry often to the manufacture of implements of war. But food for peace will mean just what it says if the President's proposal is approved—only nations that gear their own efforts to increased agricultural output will receive maximum aid from the United States. The key to the new program is self-help. Also, references to friendly nations would be deleted, taking food for peace out of the political sphere. The whole emphasis will be on giving agricultural aid to those countries which help themselves.

The second innovation in the President's proposal is his intent to eliminate the requirement that food aid be out of our own surplus. No longer would food allotments be based on mere availability in our storage bins, but the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to acquire food for world needs as they arise. This approach would be of tremendous benefit to the American taxpayer as well, because we would be spending less money to stockpile and store commodities. It would be a boon to the American farmer. For example, the President is asking for an increase of 10 percent in rice acreage in 1966. He is asking for permission to buy dairy products for distribution abroad, as well as at home. He is requesting an increase in soybean production this year, a supplement to earlier decisions to increase this year's production of wheat and barley. And finally, the President states that he is prepared to divert some of our 60 million acres now in conservation use if necessary in "the critical race between food and population."

A third major change in the President's program is a shift from acceptance of local currency in foreign countries to a dollar credit sale. This will be an orderly transition to be completed within 5 years, as the attempt will be to establish a pattern of loans comparable to present development loans. The thrust is to move out of local currency to the point where we will have a demand on the dollar resources of the countries involved. As a practical matter, most countries receiving aid would not be able to meet dollar commitments readily, nor would they be forced to do so, but this change would give us a claim on dollars on a long-term basis.

Summed up briefly then, the President's proposal will make self-help an integral part of our food aid program, eliminate the surplus requirement for food aid, emphasize the development of markets for American farm products, authorize greater food aid shipments over current rates, emphasize the building of cash markets and shift toward financing food aid through long-term dollar credits rather than sales for foreign currencies, continue the financing of the food aid program under the Commodity Credit Corporation, increase emphasis on combating malnutrition, continue to work with voluntary agencies in people-to-people assistance programs, and provide for better coordination of food aid with other economic assistance.

Hearings have already begun in the House Agriculture Committee on the overall problem of world hunger. I am following the progress of these hearings closely, for I am deeply concerned with the problem of hunger in the world. While in India last year, I got a firsthand look at the suffering and misery that most Americans cannot possibly understand still grips much of the world. I am in total accord with the President when he says:

> We can make our technology and skills powerful instruments for agricultural progress throughout the world—wherever men commit themselves to the task of feeding the hungry.

I believe this to be a task worthy of Americans. It calls upon us to give the best of ourselves, to stretch forth the hand of brotherhood to all who are in need. I am convinced that we cannot remain apathetic to the accelerating seriousness of the problem of world hunger, and I fully intend to support such a program that will increase American aid while still benefiting the consumer and the farmer at home. The new food-for-freedom program is a sound one and a visionary one, and I am hopeful that it will meet with quick approval by both Houses of the Congress.

OUR MOST NEGLECTED MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEM: EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TODD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following speech by Mike Gorman, executive director of the National Committee Against Mental Illness. He discusses how inadequately the needs of our emotionally disturbed children are being met.

OUR MOST NEGLECTED MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEM: EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

(By Mike Gorman, Washington, D.C., executive director, National Committee Against Mental Illness; fellow, American Psychiatric Association, honorary; fellow, American Public Health Association)

Last year, the American Psychiatric Association and a number of organizations in the field of child psychiatry sponsored two conferences on planning mental health services for children in the new community mental health center program. As a prelude to their recommendations, they released what they regarded as the most reliable current data on the size and nature of the problem.

There is a seeming national consensus that there are about 4 million children under the age of 14 who are in need of some kind of psychiatric intervention because of emotional difficulties. Of this number, anywhere from a half million to a million children are so seriously disturbed that they require immediate psychiatric help.

Very few of these children are getting the treatment which they need. Although close to 300,000 children were seen in outpatient psychiatric clinics in 1963, in most cases the treatment consisted of 1 or 2 diagnostic interviews followed by the admission that there were no facilities in the particular area for prolonged treatment.

We have some fairly reliable data which indicate that about 14,000 of these children are confined in State mental institutions. We also know, on the basis of a trend which has been developing over the past 5 years, that by 1970 the number of children aged 10 to 14 hospitalized in these institutions will have doubled.

But those of us who visit a number of State hospitals each year are convinced that these estimates do not reflect the full extent of hospitalization for childhood mental illness. Furthermore, applications to the National Institute of Mental Health for hospital improvement grants over and over again include data which document the point that an amazingly high percentage of their long-term residents were first admitted as children or adolescents.

For example, an analysis of a 5,000-bed State hospital at Tuscaloosa, Ala., reveals that more than half of the male schizophrenic group who have been in that hospital 20 years or more were first admitted between the ages of 14 and 29. The Alabama report estimates that 1 in every 4 young patients "can anticipate being permanently hospitalized for the next 50 years of their lives."

It is my contention that the increasing flood of these young children in the hospitals is not being reflected in existing national data. For example, 10 percent of the 7,000 patients at Rockland State Hospital in New York are children under 16 years of age, and plans have already been completed for an additional 400-bed unit at that hospital to handle the rising tide of disturbed children being admitted annually.

If time permitted, I could cite comparable data from many other State hospitals across the land. In many of these institutions, where there is no specialized unit for children, the child is lost on an adult ward which is frightfully overcrowded and understaffed.

In addition to the State mental hospitals, there are a handful of residential treatment centers which care for about 2,500 children a year. In 15 of our States there are no such facilities, either public or private; in 24 of our States, there are no public units to care for children from low- and middle-income groups.

To sum up, it is an undeniable fact that there is not a single community in this country which provides an acceptable standard of services for its mentally ill children running the spectrum from early therapeutic intervention to social restoration in the home, the school, and in the community.

As a nation, we now have a precious opportunity to create a new pattern of appropriate services for these disturbed children. Every State in the country is now engaged in completing plans for new community mental health services; it is incumbent upon all of us to insist that services for children be an integral and major segment of these new community mental health centers.

I would like to underscore the hope that those of you who are designing these new services divest yourselves of any rigid notions as to what constitutes the proper facility for an emotionally disturbed child. Beyond an agreement with a position enunciated in a recent article in the American Journal of Psychiatry that hospitalization in most State mental institutions adversely affects the child because "he promptly loses the right to be a child," I would plead for a wide variety of services suited to the individual needs of each child and to the capabilities of each community.

There is a real danger, for instance, that we will overemphasize the need for residential treatment centers for children, thereby losing sight of the vast majority of disturbed children who do not need such 24-hour hospitalization. In this country, we tend to overemphasize hospitalization as the only way of handling a child who does not conform to the fierce and often conflicting demands of present-day living. Psychiatric leaders in many other countries have been quite critical or our inability to handle these children in other ways than by total confinement. We do ourselves a great disservice when we push many of these mildly disturbed children out of the community and into a faceless institution.

We need a more flexible, less doctrinaire approach to the whole problem of the disturbed child. It isn't all just black or white—successful adjustment or an institution several hundred miles away. It is in the intermediate areas where we can do the most effective job for the majority of these children—in the schools, in the mental health clinics, the day-care centers, the courts, and so on. By developing the screening and treatment potential of these familiar agencies, we don't run away from the problems—we face it and we bring many untapped human resources to it.

This need for a flexible, eclectic approach was enunciated admirably in a recent observation of Dr. William Beach, who is the coordinator of children's services for the California Department of Mental Hygiene:

"Children are ideal candidates for multipurpose programs close to home," he states. "If you can develop programs to meet his needs locally, so that he can study at home and stay in a normal environment at an early state in his illness, there would be no need to take him out of that home and consign him to an isolated State mental hospital.

"This becomes doubly important when you consider that our aim is not to adjust the child to an institution. What we want is to adjust the child to life in the community he is growing up in.

"Ideally, we do not want this child to adapt only to the teacher in the hospital school, to the doctor on the ward, to the technicians—all pseudo-parents. We want him to work out his problems in the setting in which he is going to live: his home.

"If he needs residential treatment, as a small percentage will, then this, too, should be available close to home, and for as brief a period as possible. If home conditions are utterly impossible in terms of the child's recovery, then a foster home with adults trained in caring for disturbed children is one answer. The child can still utilize the 'life laboratory' available only in the community."

There is also a need for differentiation of services according to the age of the child. As the American Psychiatric Association Conference on Planning Services for Children emphasized, inpatient service is not suitable for very young children who can best be served by therapeutic nursery schools. By the same token, services to school age children might concentrate on the provision of special classrooms and special teachers within the public school system. At the late school age and adolescent level, group therapy and therapeutic group recreational activities may be more effective.

I am particularly concerned with the enormous untapped potential of the schools in handling emotionally disturbed children. The Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health, which was unable to devote sufficient attention to the problems of childhood mental illness because of a shortage of funds, did issue a monograph titled "The Role of the Schools in Mental Health." It is quite an important document, laying the greatest emphasis upon the therapeutic role of the schools because of their central position in the child's life. In the study itself, there are key sections devoted to skilled nursery education, the spotting of difficulties in kindergarten, and the need for immediate intervention when basic learning difficulties become apparent.

To those of us who suggest these new approaches in settings other than rigidly psychiatric ones, there is the usual retort that we can never train enough psychiatric manpower to do this kind of job. I agree. It is sheer folly to think that we can ever train enough personnel to give individual psychotherapy to every disturbed child. It would not only be inadvisable to do so in terms of available manpower, but I submit that it would be totally unwise.

As the joint commission report noted, we must add to the skills of those who deal most directly and continually with the child.

For the past 4 years, an experiment has been going on in Tennessee and North Carolina in which selected teachers are being taught psychiatric skills and then used as teacher-counselors in specialized schools for disturbed children. This experiment follows the pattern of the French experience in which more than 3,000 of these teacher-counselors play a key role in working with emotionally disturbed children in that country. Called Project Re-Ed, the philosophy of its originator is stated very forcefully in a recent description of the first 4 years of the experiment:

"The problem of providing for emotionally disturbed children is a critical one requiring bold measures. Society will not continue to tolerate the assignment of disturbed children to detention homes, to hospitals for adults, or to institutions for the mentally deficient * * *. The United States does not have and will not be able to train a sufficient number of social workers, psychiatrists, psychologists and nurses to staff residential psychiatric facilities for children along traditional lines. It will not be possible in the foreseeable future, with manpower shortages becoming increasingly more acute, to solve the problem of the emotionally disturbed child by adhering to limited patterns * * *. For effective work with children, the worker's personal attributes weigh more heavily than his professional knowledge and technical skills. Re-Ed represents an explicit break with the predominant philsophy of developing professional people in our society, a philosophy that minimizes individual differences and relies most heavily on extensive and expensive periods of training to assure competence."

While it is too early to make definitive comments on the success of these experiments, there is every indication that it is preventing the institutionalization of many children. The average stay of pupils at the specialized schools in Tennessee and North Carolina is about 4 months; the close and continuing liaison between the specialized schools and the regular school systems in the area provides a natural transition back to full-time schooling when it is deemed advisable.

In order to work more effectively with children in the schools, we need many more teachers specially trained to work with those who are emotionally disturbed. The U.S. Office of Education recently estimated that we need approximately 100,000 of these specialized teachers right now to staff classes of not more than 10 children each for the more than 1 million children it estimates need these individual psychological and educational services. How many do we have now? The best estimate I could get out of the Office of Education was less than 3,000.

I am therefore delighted to report to you that the mental health center staffing legislation which passed the Congress last year also included a tremendous boost in programs for training teachers of the handicapped. Over the next 3 years, $100 million is authorized for this purpose and, since the greatest need is for teachers of the emotionally disturbed, as pointed out in the Senate report on the legislation, I am confident that for the first time in our history we will begin to close the gap between the supply and the insistent demand.

The aforementioned legislation also includes $35 million over the next 3 years in support of research and demonstration projects designed to produce more effective methods of teaching and reeducating the handicapped, with a new proviso allowing Federal support for the construction of such experimental facilities.

We can therefore look forward in the coming years to a number of new approaches as fruitful in originality as the George Peabody College experiment in Tennessee and North Carolina.

There are so many who could help. For example, as the joint commission report notes, there are 6,000 pediatricians in this country but the great majority of them lack sufficient psychiatric orientation to capitalize on their professional potential.

We have just begun to scratch this great potential of people who can help people. In Washington, D.C., we are using mothers whose own children have completed their education. They are given a year's training in psychiatric concepts and then work on the psychiatric service at Children's Hospital.

In many cities in the country, trained youth workers are going into neighborhoods where trouble exists and applying their knowledge and affection to those children who are in revolt against the "norms" of modern society. As the noted psychiatrist Dr. Kenneth Appel has pointed out, there is a deep and tragic irony in the fact that millions of Americans, unemployed, retired, or otherwise rendered unproductive by society, seek a meaningful role in life, while millions of our children, our mental patients and others sunk in despair seek a helping hand. Dr. Appel pleads for a linkage between this great untapped human potential and the vast needs of the troubled and submerged in our democracy. Automation may eventually provide most of the material wants of our society, but it cannot ever replace the hand-to-hand and heart-to-heart relationship which is at the core of the helping services.

During this past summer's experience with Project Headstart—which reached more than 600,000 children under the age of 6—thousands of adults and children served as volunteers. As this program resumes this fall and winter, the goal is to reach down to children 3 years of age and to expand voluntary and community participation.

The first several thousand trainees of VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America—are now serving in all regions of the country. A sizable percentage of these dedicated people have chosen to work in the mental health field and, having addressed several groups of VISTA trainees, I can assure you they will make wonderful workers in the vineyard of childhood mental illness.

There have been exciting developments in other areas of childhood mental illness which have highlighted the necessity for a comprehensive survey of existing needs and the selection of a set of priorities for the next decade and beyond.

The first incisive plea for such a national survey came in a resolution adopted by both the American Psychiatric Association and the American Academy of Child Psychiatry as a direct result of a 1963 conference on training needs in the field of child psychiatry. Noting that the survey of adult mental illness by the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health had led to a long-needed overview of the problem which resulted in positive recommendations and subsequent legislation, the conference adopted the following resolution:

"In sum, it was the consensus of the conference that what the joint commission had done by way of presenting the Nation with a program to combat mental illness as a whole should now be done in comparable manner and style for the problem of childhood mental illness. The conference members recognized and accepted their obligation to inform the public of the needs of children and registered their opinion that a national survey should be conducted under the leadership of representatives of the entire spectrum of child-care professions in the fields of mental illness and health. They pledged to work for the launching of such a study, looking to the formulation of a national program to combat childhood mental illness and to secure the wherewithal to carry out such a plan."

At the March 1965 meeting of the National Mental Health Advisory Council, the membership of that council voted unanimously to request the National Institute of Mental Health to explore with all national organizations interested in the emotional health of children the possibility of a joint commission survey comparable in depth and scope to the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health study.

I am happy to report that several exploratory meetings have been held, and that a Joint Commission on Mental Health Services for Children has been incorporated.

Legislation to provide Federal support for this survey was passed in the last session of Congress, and it is hoped that the commission can get going with its very vital work within the next couple of months.

The quest for a national blueprint of mental health services for children is of vital importance, but it is no substitute for continued efforts at the State and local level to meet the immediate and pressing emotional problems of so many of our children.

I am not here today to pass judgment on how Michigan is doing in improving the lot of the emotionally ill child. However, I think you and I would agree that only a minimal start has been made in this State in providing services for the 300,000 children who need them.

I am aware of the fact that you have several excellent facilities for children. Hawthorn Center is known throughout the Nation for the variety and range of its programs, and there are additional high quality facilities for children at the Lafayette Clinic in Detroit and at the Children's Psychiatric Hospital in Ann Arbor.

I note that you are embarked on a program to build separate residential units for children in existing State hospitals. My comments on such a development are guarded: it is a vast improvement over housing children in with adults in these hospitals. However, you must be constantly on your guard to maintain and preserve a high level of care in these units. I have toured most of the well-known State hospital children's units—some of them founded in the 1920's and 1930's when it was the current fashion in psychiatric circles—and I am constantly brought up short by the inadequacy of staff, the overcrowding and the depersonalization.

I am much more impressed with your many efforts to create alternatives to 24-hour custody—day school programs, day care centers at your State hospitals and clinics, and half-way houses where children can achieve a successful transition back to school and the community.

Under your own Community Mental Health Services Act, and under the 1963 and 1965 legislation providing Federal aid in the construction and staffing of mental health centers, there is a real opportunity to press for expanded community services for children. I plead with you to insist upon the inclusion of children's services in any center plan which is forwarded to Washington for matching support.

You also have a law on your books providing reimbursement to school districts establishing classes for the emotionally disturbed child. It is my understanding that only 72 such classes were started in the 1964–65 school year. This is pitiably low for a State which has pioneered in training teachers of the handicapped at its colleges and universities. Dr. William Morse, of the University of Michigan, estimates that your present programs are reaching only 1 in every 20 disturbed children; with the impetus of the new national program for training teachers of the handicapped, you should be able to expand these school services many times over in the next few years.

I am reminded of the statement made several decades ago by Katharine F. Lenroot, one of the great architects of the U.S. Children's Bureau: "We are prodigal in our dreams for children, but often miserly in our deeds. And that, I suspect, traces back frequently to an elementary difficulty all of us have at times in knowing how to get from where we are to where we want to go."

We must now move boldly at the national level in identifying a broad set of objectives which will get us "from where we are to where we want to go."

I am confident that the Joint Commission on Mental Health Services for Children is the appropriate vehicle for this long delayed journey into the future, and I know that all of you here today will work with us in other parts of the country to see that it fulfills its terribly important mission.

In conclusion, just a few remarks about the situation here in Battle Creek and the surrounding areas.

First of all, I want to salute you for founding the Battle Creek Child Guidance Clinic 14 years ago and for keeping it functioning under what at times must have seemed somewhat discouraging circumstances, in the face of many tribulations, financial and otherwise. I think all of you good citizens can draw deep comfort from the fact that you have undoubtedly saved hundreds upon hundreds of children from a lifetime of hospitalization in a remote mental institution.

As an illustration, I received a letter a few weeks ago from Dr. Matthew J. Trippe, professor of educational psychology at the University of Michigan, who served for a time with the U.S. Office of Education as their specialist in programs for emotionally disturbed children. In the course of a survey in which he visited a great number of mental hospitals housing children, he was uniformly told by clinical directors of these hospitals that between 40 and 60 percent of the children did not belong there, but they were so hospitalized because local clinics and other mental health services were not available.

However, you are now being given additional responsibilities. Under the provisions of Public Act 54, you are expanding your services to cover the adult mentally ill. This expansion of services, in addition to the present heavy load of children you carry with an inadequate staff, necessitates a significant broadening of financial support for your activities.

As I have said elsewhere in Michigan over the past few years, I think the State must do a great deal more financially in implementing the broad and progressive purposes of Public Act 54. The State limitation of $1 per capita in support of local services is totally unrealistic; most States are abandoning these rigid ceilings. For example, Governor Rockefeller in his budget presentation less than a month ago, proposed $32 million in State matching funds for community mental health services during 1966. This comes to about $2 per person, and many cities and counties in New York State exceed the matching amount required. On a per capita basis, Michigan is far behind most of its sister States in support of community mental health services.

On a local level, you have the task of convincing your fellow citizens that a modest increase in millage taxation is a small price to pay for preserving the mental health of hundreds upon hundreds of their own children. I was quite shocked to learn that in May 1965 the voters of this area defeated a proposal for additional mileage taxation for mental health services. In Michigan there seems to be plenty of money for new highways, automobiles, color television sets, and the like, but very little money to preserve the most precious of all resources—our children.

For those of you who vote to deny these services to children, the handwriting on the wall is very clear. I have just finished reviewing a report from Operation Headstart which points out that at least 10 percent of the 600,000 children in the program were in such deep emotional trouble that it had already crippled their development by the age of 4.

I know that you also face personnel shortages, and that you are finding it very difficult to recruit an adequate number of professional people to handle your expanding services. This is part of a psychiatric personnel shortage which plagues clinics and community mental health centers in all parts of the Nation. A recent survey by the American Psychiatric Association reported that less than 10 percent of all psychiatrists are working in the field of child psychiatry, and of these 1,346 who report their major specialty as child psychiatry, only 25 percent are certified by the appropriate professional body.

I am not discouraged by these figures; I don't think you should be either. At the national level, mainly through the programs of the National Institute of Mental Health, we are increasing the numbers of available psychiatric personnel at a remarkable rate. Furthermore, as I have indicated at several points in this talk, we have an unlimited horizon in using the talents and resources of people who do not fall into the current rigid professional structures.

We are not resting on our oars. In 1965, Congressman Gibbons, of Florida, introduced a bill to provide several hundred million dollars in Federal assistance to train child development specialists to work in the schools with troubled children in kindergarten and in the first three grades. Hearings on the Gibbons bill, which also provides grants to elementary schools to employ these child development specialists, were completed in January of this year, and the chances of its passage in this session are quite good.

I know that you are constantly being told that State and local taxes have reached a confiscatory level and that mental health services are doing quite well financially. This is sheer hogwash. Last year, less than 3 percent of all State and local tax moneys were used to fight mental illness, which the American Medical Association has described as "America's most pressing and complex health problem."

In a nation which spends $20 billion for recreation, $11 billion for alcoholic beverages, $7 billion for tobacco products, and $1 billion for candy, there is room for the additional expenditure of a few hundred million dollars so that 4 million of our children who are emotionally troubled can be helped so that they may lead useful and productive lives.

FOUR AMENDMENTS WOULD STRENGTHEN PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S OMNIBUS CITY DEMONSTRATIONS, METROPOLITAN, AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashley], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moorhead], and I intend to propose four amendments designed to strengthen President Johnson's Omnibus City Demmonstrations, Metropolitan, and Urban Development Act of 1966.

Hearings on the bill will begin before the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee on February 28.

The amendments are aimed at:

First. Assuring greater coordination both in Washington and on the local level of Federal programs affecting urban areas;

Second. Applying the proposed demonstration cities program to the areas of greatest need, and

Third. Initiating a program leading to new and better systems of urban mass transit.

We have today issued a press release describing more fully and giving the texts of the amendments we shall propose. I include the press release hereafter:

February 23, 1966.

Representatives Thomas L. Ashley, Democrat, of Ohio; William S. Moorhead, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; and Henry S. Reuss, Democrat, of Wisconsin, today announced they would propose four amendments to President Johnson's 1966 Omnibus City Demonstrations, Metropolitan, and Urban Development Act, designed to strengthen the program. Hearings begin next Monday, February 28.

The amendments follow:

1. Centralized coordination of Federal activities in urban areas: The new Department of Housing and Urban Development must coordinate its activities with respect to urban programs conducted by other departments—such as the city portion of interstate highways, the poverty program, and health, education, and welfare programs. The proposed amendment will require the Secretary to act as a clearinghouse for urban affairs, and to coordinate all Federal programs affecting urban areas. "If any disagreement or dispute should arise in the coordination of Federal programs * * * and the officers in charge of any of these are unable to reach a solution thereto, the HUD Secretary shall refer the matter to the President for his decision or for such other action as may be appropriate."

2. Demonstration cities program: The administration's demonstration cities program, while excellent in its general purposes, is believed to need strengthening with respect to the method by which cities qualify for demonstration cities grants to rebuild or restore entire slum or blighted sections or neighborhoods. The administration bill merely sets forth general criteria for such qualification. The proposed amendment will supplement these criteria by requiring two additional criteria for eligibility:

First, that the sections or neighborhoods in question be "subject to high-priority economic and social pressures, such as population density, crime rate, public welfare participation, delinquency, poverty, unemployment, educational levels, health and disease characteristics, and substandard housing.

Second, that there be in effect for these sections or neighborhoods a "workable program" such as is currently a requirement for urban renewal funds.

3. Local urban coordinators: The administration bill sets up Federal "urban coordinators," to go into effect at some future time, and only for those cities qualifying for the demonstration cities program. The proposed amendment, instead of setting up new and special agencies, would utilize the 76 existing FHA regional directors, who between them have jurisdiction for all of the urban areas of the 50 States. To the extent that they need additional specialist help, for example in urban renewal and conservation practices, the Secretary is directed to provide such help. The amendment would have the advantage of cost saving through utilizing an existing decentralized Federal setup; it could be put into effect at once; and it would fit the needs of all urban areas rather than just the limited number participating in the demonstration cities program.

4. Expedited program for research, development, and demonstration of new systems of urban transport: The Mass Transit Act of 1964, while it has been of considerable assistance to localities in improving traditional modes of transportation such as buses and subways, has failed to bring about needed research, development, and demonstration of entirely "new systems of coordinated urban transport that will carry people and goods within metropolitan areas speedily, safely, without polluting the air, and in such a way as to contribute to sound city planning and development."

The proposed amendment directs the Secretary of HUD to prepare for the Congress by January 1, 1967, a program, similar to our efforts in the Manhattan project for atomic energy, in the space program to put a man on the moon, in the program to develop a supersonic air transport, and in the Boston-Washington high-speed railway, which will "aim at breakthrough results within 5 years of its approval by the Congress."

The proposed program is to concern itself with all aspects of new systems for metropolitan areas of various sizes. It is to concern itself with the technical, financial, economic, governmental, and social aspects of the problem. In this connection, experts from such universities as Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and such aerospace companies as North American Aviation, have recently testified that a program of this sort has an excellent chance of bringing about the required breakthrough. The proposed program would "provide national leadership to efforts of States, localities, private industry, universities, and foundations."

The four proposed amendments are attached:

"AMENDMENT NO. 1: CENTRALIZED COORDINATION OF FEDERAL ACTIVITIES IN URBAN AREAS

"(a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall be the coordinator of all programs and activities conducted by, or with assistance from, the departments, agencies, and establishments of the Federal Government in metropolitan and other urban areas. The Secretary shall establish such procedures for the correlation of these programs and activities (including joint consultation and joint action to the maximum extent feasible), shall receive, disseminate, and act as a clearinghouse for such information relating to them, and shall take such other steps as may be necessary or appropriate to assure that the programs and activities conducted in any such area will supplement and support each other and will be fully coordinated in carrying out the purpose of this Act.

"(b) If any disagreement or dispute should arise in the coordination of Federal programs and activities under subsection (a), or any inconsistency between statutory provisions or objectives or administrative practices which hinders or obstructs the effective coordination of such programs and activities should be found to exist, and the officers or entities involved are unwilling or unable to reach an agreement or solution with respect thereto, the Secretary shall refer the matter to the President for his decision or for such other action as may be appropriate.

"AMENDMENT NO. 2: ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CRITERIA

"A comprehensive city demonstration program is eligible for assistance under sections 6, 8, and 9 (of H.R. 12341) only if—

"(1) the Secretary determines that such program covers sections or neighborhoods which are subject to high-priority economic and social pressures, such as those involving or resulting from—

"(A) population density,
"(B) crime rate,
"(C) public welfare participation,
"(D) delinquency rate,
"(E) poverty levels,
"(F) unemployment rate,
"(G) racial strife,
"(H) educational levels,
"(I) health and disease characteristics, and
"(J) degree of substandard and dilapidated housing;

"(2) there is in effect with respect to such sections or neighborhoods a workable program certified under section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949.

"AMENDMENT NO. 3: LOCAL URBAN COORDINATORS

"(a) Each of the regional directors of the Federal Housing Administration, with such assistance as the Secretary shall make available to him, shall act and be known as the 'urban coordinator' for the metropolitan and other urban areas within the region subject to his jurisdiction.

"(b) It shall be the function of each urban coordinator to provide assistance and information to local authorities and private individuals and entities within his region in connection with all programs and activities conducted within such region by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and to provide current information and data to all relevant Federal departments and agencies with respect to the programs and activities being conducted within such region by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and with respect to other public and private activities within such region which relate to the programs and activities of the Department.

"(c) The head of each Federal department and agency shall keep each urban coordinator currently advised with respect to the programs and activities being conducted by such department or agency in the region subject to his jurisdiction.

"(d) To the extent provided by the Secretary, each urban coordinator shall assist the Secretary in the performance by him of his centralized coordinating functions.

"AMENDMENT NO. 4: EXPEDITED PROGRAM FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION OF NEW SYSTEMS OF URBAN TRANSPORT

"The Secretary shall prepare, and submit to the President and the Congress no later than January 1, 1967, a draft program for research, development, and demonstration of new systems of coordinated urban transportation that will carry people and goods within metropolitan areas speedily, safely, without polluting the air, and in a manner that will contribute to sound city planning. The program shall aim at breakthrough results within 5 years of its approval by the Congress; it shall concern itself with all aspects of new systems of urban transport, for metropolitan areas of various sizes, including technological, financial, economic, governmental, and social aspects; it shall provide national leadership to efforts of States, localities, private industry, universities, and foundations. The sum of $1 million is authorized to be appropriated for the preparation of this program."

MENTAL RETARDATION FACILITIES AND COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963.

Its primary purpose is to provide national funds to assist in staffing of community mental retardation facilities. It logically follows an amendment to the 1963 act, passed last year by Congress, which provides national funds to assist the staffing of community mental health centers.

It also would amend the 1963 act to provide national funds to pay the costs of acquiring the sites for both mental health centers and mental retardation facilities.

National funds to help staff the mental retardation centers, under the bill I am introducing, would total $30 million and would be appropriated through June 30, 1969 as follows: $8 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; $10 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; $12 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

The great majority of mentally retarded children can become useful citizens with proper training. Between 75 and 85 percent can become self-supporting. But the costs of training are high and few local communities can afford them.

This amendment would help pay the salaries of the skilled persons needed to train the mentally retarded.

DULUTH TO BE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CAPITAL FOR EIGHT STATES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I need not call to my colleagues' attention the many outstanding contributions made by one of Minnesota's greatest and most productive citizens. Of course, I speak of our fellow colleague, the Honorable JOHN BLATNIK. Our distinguished colleague has spawned, worked for, and been responsible for enactment of more legislation to help people and the country in general than almost any other House Member. It is with personal pleasure that I ask his remarks of February 21, 1966, be reproduced for the benefit of all concerned.

DULUTH TO BE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CAPITAL FOR EIGHT STATES

(Remarks of Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK at the opening ceremonies of the regional EDA office in Duluth, Feb. 21, 1966)

Mr. Foley and distinguished guests, today marks a proud moment in the history of northeastern Minnesota. We are singly honored to have the eight statewide headquarters for this most important program for economic development right here in Duluth. This concept of economic development on a regional basis recognizes that governmental borderlines are not the existing limits of the economic problems of an area. They exist beyond county lines and they exist beyond State lines as well. As Gene Foley can attest, it took lots of strong argument and many witnesses and many drafts of legislation before this regional concept became law. As I look back on the many Saturday and late hour sessions it took to pass this bill, it is a real refreshing and satisfying feeling for me to officially cut the ribbon on one of the first of eight regional centers throughout the United States.

This regional area office means a stimulating role for Duluth as a key point in a fresh and dramatic program to develop areas that lag behind the Nation's overall prosperity. This new act authorizes over $3 billion over a 5-year period for planning aid, research and technical assistance, and public works loans and grants for projects which will facilitate industrial expansion and open up stable employment on a much larger scale. The act also provides long-term, low-interest-rate business loans to firms for locating and expanding in designated areas.

Under this act we have incorporated the best features of ARA and APW. Both of these programs were highly successful in stimulating the economy right here in the eighth district. As you know, over a 2-year period we had over 170 APW projects that amounted to over $10 million. In the same amount of time under the ARA program, 20 new industries creating 900 new jobs and costing over $8 million brought a real lift to the economy of the eighth district. Part of this $8 million also went to retrain 1,200 workers and to bring technical assistance grants to our fishing, lumber, and iron ore industries. Good as these programs were, they were short-term solutions. With this new act, a 5-year regional approach sets its sights for long-range planning.

I am honored that Duluth will be the center for this long-range economic development. We could call it the economic development capital of a multistate area with approximately 14 million people.

This opening of the Commerce Department's Economic Development Administration in Duluth will have many dividends. It will make the city a focal point of a great and historic region. From this region an increasing number of business, State, and community leaders will come to Duluth for decisions on wide-ranging programs to develop new economic vitality and create permanent jobs in their States. This influx will in itself have an impact on Duluth. New families, new requirements for housing, a new payroll of around $400,000 a year, approximately 50 new employees—all this means an uplift in the economy of the city.

I hope what we have started today is a chain of economic reaction—solid and lasting. I hope this bold, imaginative economic planning for maximum use of the resources which abound in this region will grow far beyond anything yet envisoned.

I hope in a few short years we can look with as much pride to the success of this Economic Development Act as we now look to the successful acts that produced the Duluth High Bridge and auditorium.

THE INCREASING IMPORTANCE OF URBAN SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Kluczynski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we enter upon our duties of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, all of us can, I believe, look back with considerable satisfaction upon the accomplishments of the Congress during the previous session. Each of you may be proud of the part he played in helping bring to reality the Great Society envisioned by President Johnson.

One of the most important achievements was the creation of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development. President Johnson wisely recommended the passage of legislation creating this new agency, for as he pointed out:

> In the remainder of this century—in less than 40 years—urban population will double, city land will double, and we will have to build in our cities as much as all that we have built since the first colonist arrived on these shores. It is as if we had 40 years to rebuild the entire urban United States.

The appointment of Dr. Robert C. Weaver as Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development was confirmed by the Senate. The President is to be commended on this appointment. Dr. Weaver brings to this post over 30 years of experience in working with housing and other related urban problems. By training, by experience, and by strength of character and personality, he is well equipped to supply the leadership essential to the implementation of this vital new position. Secretary Weaver is, in brief, the best possible man for the job.

His task will be made easier by having available to him the outstanding talents of an individual sharing the same initials and, indeed, the same first name and middle initial, Dr. Robert C. Wood. Dr. Wood, at the time of his nomination a professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, recently served as Chairman of the President's task force to study the organization and function of the new Department. My Small Business Subcommittee on Urban Small Business Problems was most fortunate in having Dr. Wood appear as a witness in one of our hearings last summer. Dr. Wood's acknowledged expertise in the field of urban problems will be of the greatest value to this new Department.

The cities of our Nation are in a time of increasingly rapid transition. A growing population, unprecedented general prosperity and business growth, the stubborn nature of pockets of poverty, the continuing shift of our population to urban centers, have all contributed to an increased tempo of change.

Such programs as urban renewal, our vast new Federal highway system, and the expansion of facilities by local units of government, coupled with an unprecedented building program by the private sector of the economy, have made it necessary for many thousands of small businesses to seek new locations. Estimates of the total number of dislocations suffered by small businesses during the present decade from urban renewal alone run as high as 200,000. Nor is this confined to our metropolitan areas; almost half of all urban renewal projects are in towns of less than 25,000 population.

As our Nation becomes increasingly urbanized, the quality of our cities and the lives of our people dwelling in them becomes of even greater importance. President Johnson has wisely made the revitalization of our cities a matter of the highest priority, calling for action at the Federal level and cooperation with all units of government in what he has termed a "creative federalism."

In many ways the city is the natural home of small business. Because of the demand for specialized goods and services urban areas have traditionally been the natural habitat of a broad variety of smaller firms which collectively offer the consumer a spectrum of choice unmatched in the history of man. Indeed, it could be said that just as the city offers much to the small businessman by way of supplies and potential market so too does the small business community within the city contribute a great deal to urban life.

At the present time, too little is known about the effect of urban change upon small business. Data showing the impact of Federal programs is only fragmentary; even less information is available concerning the effects of activity by local governmental units and the private sector of the economy. Nor is there agreement as to precisely which factors of change are causing small business difficulties. As an example—some observers see the growth of suburban areas as presenting great opportunities for small businessmen, others characterize the so-called flight to suburbia as a grave problem endangering the very existence of smaller merchants.

In recognition of the overwhelming importance of urban small business problems, Representative Joe L. Evins, chairman of the House Small Business Committee created a new subcommittee to hold hearings on urban small business problems.

The purpose of these hearings is to identify the changes taking place in our cities today, and to assess their impact upon small businesses. The subcommittee is undertaking during this study to determine such matters as—

What will the city of tomorrow be like?

What will be the role of small business in it?

Are present federally financed programs such as urban renewal harming small business? What is being done to aid the small businessman in successfully meeting these forces of change? Is enough being done in this respect?

Beyond this, it is the goal of these hearings to find new ways in which the revitalization of our cities can create new opportunities for smaller firms, to seek methods by which small business can be assured of full opportunity to participate in the growth which lies ahead in our urban areas.

Last year, 10 days of hearings were held. Witnesses were heard in Washington, Chicago, Rochester, New York City, and Atlanta. Testimony was received from Federal officials, from ranking city officials and administrators; and at the grassroots level well over a hundred small businessmen told the committee of the problems and opportunities which urban renewal and other forms of urban change had presented to them.

During the course of our hearings, the staff of the Urban Renewal Administration has been most helpful to us.

Our hearings to date have been most useful. We have attempted to follow the guidelines set forth by the gentleman from Tennessee, Chairman Evins. In so doing, we have amassed a wealth of information on the problems actually being faced today by small businessmen in our Nation's cities. We have learned much, too, of the new opportunities being created for small business by the revitalization of our metropolitan areas. The five volumes of hearings which are being published contain case studies and individual testimony which will give us all new insight into these complex problems.

During the months ahead, it is the intention of the subcommittee to continue these hearings. Testimony will be received from the American Institute of Planners, the National Institute of Housing and Rehabilitation Officials, the League of Cities, the conference of mayors and other similar organizations. When this phase of the hearings is completed, we will proceed to call the Federal Highway Administrator, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

We will explore with these officials the problems which we have uncovered during the course of our hearings and seek their counsel on these matters. We will then formulate our recommendations and report them to the full House Small Business Committee for its approval and submission to this body.

SUBSTANDARD CRUISE SHIPS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill designed to drive substandard cruise ships out of the trade on cruises that start and end at an American port.

At the present time the U.S. Coast Guard can only hold foreign-flag vessels to standards set by the International Safety of Life at Sea Convention. The United States has the world's highest safety standards, but a substantial number of these ships in the coastal cruise trade are not subject to American safety standards.

These vessels have been aptly referred to as "floating junkyards." Not too long ago one of these cruise ships exploded, and to date the exact cause has not been determined. Most of the passengers on such vessels are Americans, and the false impression that they are being transported under adequate safety standards, when they are not, should be corrected.

Legislation barring these scavenger ships from the cruise trade between one American port and another is the quickest, safest, and best way to correct this situation, and I urge early consideration of my bill which will accomplish this.

BACK TO BLUE HEAVEN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if any Member of this House does not have nostalgic memories of "My Blue Heaven" and other heart songs made popular by Gene Austin. This warmhearted man, who loves people and to whom music was a way of expression, has touched the heartstrings of countless millions in America and throughout the world with his songs. Gene Austin was recently in Miami and I saw him stir with old and tender memories a great audience at a lovely social affair by playing and singing many of the songs he made famous.

Gene Austin today can still touch the heart with a piano and his voice, and above all by his charming friendly manner. I think my colleagues would enjoy an article about Gene Austin by Columnist Larry Thompson which appeared in the Miami Herald of February 22, 1966. I offer this article for the RECORD because I know so many will be pleased to know that Gene Austin is still going strong.

BACK TO BLUE HEAVEN

The other day I was sitting at my desk when that grandpappy of all press agents and promoters, George Maines, walked in with a sturdy redheaded gentleman and introduced Gene Austin.

"The Gene Austin?" I gulped as I floundered to my feet.

That evening when I got home I called the family around me.

"Guess who I met today," I said.

"President Johnson?"

"I will give you a hint. This is a very famous singer."

"Bobby Darin?"

"Johnny Mathis?"

"Joan Baez?"

"Roger Miller?"

"One of the Beatles?"

"One of the Rolling Stones?"

"Of course not," I said. "You aren't even warm. The one and only Gene Austin."

Silence.

Finally, from the boy: "Who's he?"

Who is Gene Austin? What a ridiculous question. Why when I was a boy, he was just the most, that's all he was. When I bought a Victor attachment to fit our old Edison so I could play thin records, Gene Austin was the hottest thing on platters.

Fame, as the poet once wrote, is fleeting.

I have read somewhere that Austin's classic, "My Blue Heaven," has enjoyed greater sales than any other recording. That shows there still are many people like me who remember him.

I will admit that I was surprised to hear that "My Blue Heaven" was such a big seller, after all these years. If I had made a guess, I would have said that Bing Crosby's "White Christmas" probably led the pack.

At least it seems to me that it is played more, year after year, than any other record.

In the days when Austin and Rudy Vallee were at the peak of their fame, it was harder to sell a million records than now.

Back in those days there weren't so many phonographs, and the adults did most of the buying. Now, if your daddy or mamma is rich and famous, success is practically rammed down your throat, and you can enjoy the same kind of instant success if you are shaggy and different.

This, presumably, is because the teenagers do most of the record buying.

Well, I have no argument with that. The young people have the money, they are entitled to their own tastes, and for all I know their idols have talent.

But I was mighty proud to meet that king of the olden times, the high tenor with the red hair, who made "My Blue Heaven" sound like a paradise enow.

FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDING AND AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leo S. Tonkin, former associate counsel of the House Select Committee on Government Research and now executive director of District of Columbia Council on Higher Education, recently made a highly informative address before the Society of the Sigma Si, a national society composed of scientists and engineers devoted to scientific research. The speech was made at the Rolla campus of the University of Missouri. Mr. Tonkin's remarks concerned the scope and impact of Federal research and development expenditures on American colleges and universities. This is a topic of first importance to this House and the entire Nation. I am pleased to include in the RECORD a copy of Mr. Tonkin's thought-provoking and timely remarks:

FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDING AND AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Government research and development funds have become one of the largest sources of revenue to our Nation's colleges and universities. Educational institutions now receive about 12 percent of all Federal research and development funds. In fiscal year 1966, this percentage will equal approximately $1.938 billion of the total Federal research and development expenditure of $15.5 billion.

This $2 billion figure constitutes 15 percent of all expenditures in U.S. colleges and universities and fully 75 percent of the expenditures for research in those institutions.

Some 70 percent of educational funding will follow the route of project grant and contract research with the remaining 30 percent earmarked for research centers administered by the institutions under Government contract. These university research centers will receive an estimated $587,900,000 in Federal funds during the present fiscal year (1966).

Total research expenditures of the Government in fiscal year 1966 will equal an estimated $5.6 billion. Of this figure, basic research will account for $2 billion with 46 percent of that basic research budget—$952,265,000—slated for institutions of higher learning.

As with any large Federal expenditure, criticism and comment are raised. With respect to university research, a growing critical interest has brought acute awareness to the Congress that it has an important responsibility for supervision and incisive study of Federal research programs.

With such a vast and complex subject and in such a few short months, obviously, several committees have been unable to suggest fruitful solutions to all of the problems under consideration. But the hearings and reports have specified areas where better coordination and planning are recommended, and where further study of the larger and thornier issues is needed.

My remarks this evening will be addressed to an initial analysis of some of these issues, that bear directly on the Government-university relationship vis-a-vis the research dollar.

(*a*) Priorities and Federal involvement: As the breadth of Federal support of research has increased, it has become more and more difficult to establish criteria to define the limits of the Federal involvement.

The National Science Foundation, according to its Director, Leland J. Haworth, "decided that the cause of science could best be served by placing primary emphasis on merit and supporting competent scientists of demonstrated ability, or young scientists with a high degree of originality and potential."

Any scientific field qualifies; the projects chosen for support are those "that are most susceptible to a truly scientific approach and are fundamental in character."

Does this obligate the Federal Government to support all basic research of scientific merit? It seems to me that NSF—and indeed the whole Federal research program—is presently without useful guidelines for stopping short of that total commitment. From their testimony, many scientists and educators would welcome total support.

Many Congressmen would not. When a Member of the House rose in 1962 to complain about an $89,000 National Institute of Health grant to support a study of "behavioral cocktail parties," he was not challenging the scientific validity of the study, but questioning the appropriateness of Federal support.

In the 19th century, liberal Congressmen were guided by the criterion that Federal support should go to research "within neither the province nor the capacity of the individual or of the universities." And if their support for such research was meager, it was largely because they deemed only a limited variety of research studies as advancing the "national interest."

Clearly, we have come a long way from those narrow criteria. Today, many spokesmen for Federal support of research would defend the "behavioral cocktail parties" study because for them, the concept of "national interest" embraces "science for the sake of science." The umbrella is big enough for everybody.

Perhaps Curt Stern had this all-inclusive support version in mind when he described the scientist-investigator in these words: 'He can incessantly find delight in the discoveries made by other men; those of the past and those of his own times. And he can learn the difficult lesson that the journey itself and not only the great conquest is fulfillment of human life."

However, Dr. Alvin M. Weinberg, director of Oak Ridge National Laboratory, has succinctly said, "Society does not a priori owe the scientist, even the good scientist, support from society on grounds other than that the science is carried out competently and that it is ready for exploitation. Scientists cannot expect society to support science because scientists find it an enhancing diversion."

Two congressional committees have very recently addressed themselves to research priorities. In January, Congressman REUSS asked, "Are we matching research and development goals with national goals?" And Representative DADDARIO has recommended in strong terms that the National Science Foundation must hasten to set priorities and illuminate national science policy. I might note that streams of recent witnesses before both of these congressional committees, hardly addressed themselves to the salient issues of overall policy determination and budgetary direction. Rather, the comments reflected individual interests and academic orientation. Primarily because of limited availability of Federal research funds, more truly long-range thinking is needed from each of the major fields of scientific study. This objective overview-perusal from each of the academic disciplines must then act as the basis for cogent articulation of immediate as well as long-term goals for the Federal research and development program.

(b) Research effectiveness: Closely allied to a discussion of priorities and expenses is the matter of optimum productivity in the research program. It is vitally necessary to remember the striking limitations that work to counter the full effectiveness in the overall R. & D. commitment.

Funds are naturally limited. More important, however, highly qualified and competent scientific investigators are also in short supply as are physical facilities and technical backup personnel. The federally sponsored research program is calling forth the greatest array of talent in the history of our Nation. The future requirements for scientific manpower will be even more demanding.

Dr. Wallace Brode, a past president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, summed up this possible "manpower shortage" when he wrote in the January 1964 issue of Science: "There is a crisis but it is one of approach to a limited supply ceiling and the need for better and more efficient education, rather than a need to produce more trained individuals. Production of more after the ceiling has been reached in the supply of qualified candidates merely means lowering the standards to create more poor scientists and engineers. Future leadership in science and technology is not to be based on numbers, but rather on improved quality of the graduate. This will require better teaching of only those who are qualified to receive instruction."

If highly competent research personnel really are in increasingly limited supply, then indeed the wisdom of funding research into "behavioral cocktail party" attitudes and "flavor of aroma components in roasted peanuts" must of necessity be challenged as meritorious of Federal support.

Dr. Weinberg also has voiced concern in this area with words seldom heard from the scientific community. "There is already evidence," he says, "that our ratios of money to men in science is too high, and that in some parts of science we have gone further more quickly than the number of really competent men can justify." Since 1950, he points out with allowances for inflation and the like, the number of Ph. D.'s in science and engineering has doubled, but expenditures for research have increased fivefold.

In the critical area of basic research, where Federal support might well be at an already dangerously low level comparatively speaking—the finest concentration of scientific talent is needed. But with the increasing talent demands from the applied sciences and development fields, coupled with a possible overall quality manpower shortage, this country might well be on the verge of shortchanging itself in the quality of its basic research programs. I can say that this is a question that will occasion the continuing attention of the Congress in the months ahead.

TEACHING MAY SUFFER

A very wise Persian proverb says that "men exist for the sake of each other; thus teach them or be tolerant with them; for a person is better unborn than untaught."

At the graduate level, research is one of the best teachers. Most science graduate students are engaged in research and are thus in close contact with professors similarly engaged. The lab in great measure is the classroom of the graduate.

The story is quite different at the undergraduate level. With research demanding more of a faculty member's hours, he naturally has less time to devote to teaching. There are those who contend that academic distinction and productivity should not be measured by the number of hours a professor spends in the classroom, but rather by the quality of teaching. In the exceptional case, where the professor is indeed of a superlative stature and is often available to students outside the classroom, the paucity of teaching hours is of minimal significance. But it is a developing reality that research and publication have given too many in the undergraduate cadre an "exit with grace" from teaching, with no compensatory provisions, such as "better quality teaching in fewer hours," accompanying the trend.

This situation has assumed serious dimension in some colleges and universities. The loser has been the undergraduate student.

Dr. James A. Perkins, president of Cornell, notes, "The critical problem in the next 10 years is not so much one of research but one of students. The recent pattern of Federal aid is not generally directed toward instruction."

Dr. David Henry, the University of Illinois president has said, "The physical needs for education will somehow be met. It is not clear how the teaching task will get done."

Certainly research broadens the quality of any teacher. The danger lies in overemphasis. To safeguard against the teacher drain which already has afflicted too many faculties, university administrators must insist on a sensible balance of both teaching and research.

The Elliott committee was strong in its judgment: "* * * if there is a conflict that can be labeled 'teaching versus research,' it is a problem that must be resolved not by a triumph of one over the other, but by proper balance between the two."

The Reuss subcommittee, in its October 1965 report, also had pointed words for the "teacher drain."

"Undergraduate teaching is all too frequently a thankless chore left to those unable to get research money—whether senior professors or younger assistants. In this topsy-turvy situation, the undergraduate may find that the university established mainly for his sake has no real place for him in the new scheme of things."

"The committee finds that too many scientists and engineers have been diverted over a relatively short period into research work, and too few are available for teaching. It will be necessary both to limit the requirements for research manpower over the short term and through an appropriate system of incentives, to increase the flow of qualified personnel into teaching."

A Reuss committee table showed that, in the 12-year period 1953–64, inclusive, the number of teachers (on a full-time equivalent basis) increased from 177,000 to 324,000 or only 83 percent, while enrollment more than doubled, and full-time equivalent of research workers at the same institutions more than trebled (up from 23,000 in 1953 to 71,000 in 1964).

John Fischer, editor of Harper's, places the quandary in simple perspective by asking "Is there a teacher on the faculty?" He pessimistically feels that it is unlikely "* * * that we can hope for any drastic improvement in college teaching to come from either the administration or the faculties. It will come, if at all, only as the result of outside pressure—from parents, alumni, and the students themselves."

Mr. Fischer overlooks one very important "outside pressure"; namely, the Federal Government and the Congress in particular. The Government has justifiably refrained from exerting pressures and persuasions on academia via research grants. But in this instance, Government money at times is being used to aid and abet a disturbing academic trend. Let there be no mistake, the Congress is aware of the detrimental effect that Federal research money sometimes has on undergraduate teaching. If the school, acting in concert with such groups as the American Association of University Professors, or the splendid association gathered here this evening, fail to correct the widening valley between student and professor, then the Government can and surely will attach certain unwelcome provisions to Federal research contracts.

While a college or university might feel reticent to unilaterally impose sanctions and regulations, the Congress will not have cause for similar reluctance. We are now in a period in which the universities literally are being cajoled and petitioned to "amend their teaching ways." For the sake of academic autonomy and faculty administrative prerogatives, let us hope the institutions heed the recommendations. If not, for the sake of the students and higher education, the Congress and the agencies will do the heeding.

It is here that distinguished ladies and gentlemen like yourselves can be so effective. You can recognize the need for more teachers and maximum teacher accessibility as well as more research. You can note the tenor of congressional and agency comment. You can respond to this situation by articulating a forceful policy and following a program that offers positive guarantees for the use of Federal research funds concomitant with adherence to realistic teaching schedules within your institutions. A positive and demonstrable policy in this regard, from within the academic community, would hardly go unnoticed in Washington, and most assuredly, after proper communication would aid in your efforts to secure new research grants, and Federal institutional support.

PANELS OF PEERS

In awarding Government research grants and contracts, many agencies rely on the advice of established experts and faculty scholars in selected academic disciplines. These groups have been of much benefit to the agencies in pinpointing quality research proposals and competent investigators. However, a concentration of membership on the panels has evidenced itself over the years, with the large research institutions having a most discernible head-count majority.

In citing the growth of a "panel establishment," the Elliott committee found that many agencies utilize the same panelists from the same universities time and time again A 5-year study of the National Institutes of Health indicated 49 percent of the names occurred repeatedly.

The research community, through this panel peer grouping is approaching a "closed community of excellence," patronized by the benevolent Government eye. Alvin Weinberg thus says, "The panel system is weak insofar as judge, plaintiff, and defendant are usually one and the same."

I have known of more than one instance where a very respected professor, having worked under large Government research funding for many years, has chosen to join the faculty of a smaller institution—not represented in the "panel establishment." Much faster than a spring thaw his Government research funding disappeared and his Washington receptiveness was a thing of the past.

This entire issue was cast in sharp focus when the Woolridge committee filed its 1965 report. There, a top group of experts were drawn together to report to the President on the National Institutes of Health. Of the 74 people comprising eight life science panels advising the Woolridge committee, eight were Government employees; of the remaining 66, 59 were 1963 NIH research grantees. From all 11 of the advisory panels, 38 members were listed in the 1963 edition of Roster of Members of Public Service Public Advisory Groups. These men were asked to make assessments of the output of a system of project approval in which they were intimately involved both as grantees and as member of peer review groups. Is it any wonder the Woolridge committee with the assistance of such panels, found that the best available method for awarding research grants is through procedures utilizing scientific peer judgment panels?

It is recognized that most panelists come from institutions rated excellent under established standards, such as number of doctorates awarded and faculty membership in the National Academy of Sciences. Still, even the Academy in a special report has recommended that panel membership be on a short-term, rotating basis and from a wide circle of academia. This sentiment has received strong endorsement from the Elliott and Reuss committees, and a limited change in panel membership might well be anticipated.

ACADEMIC CRITICISM AND CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIVENESS

Many say that the Congress does not have the scientific expertise or advice to accord meaningful scrutiny to the university research and development program. This is partially true. Too often a congressional committee accords perfunctory treatment to the issues involved. Occasionally, a committee is established to do a particular research study job (e.g., Elliott select committee), but with a one-time-around survey, many schools are justifiably reticent to mobilize their administration for a large effort at the expense of considerable time and money.

Or other times standing committees and subcommittees, whose mandate is a total research and development look-see, cannot but study the academic problems disjointedly and sporadically—holding hearings and issuing reports on a particular aspect of the program now, with little or no follow-through for many months or even years.

Further complaints of legislative research perusal are directed to "nitpicking." Congressman MINSHALL, of Ohio, a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices, commented on the research grants listed in the National Science Foundation's annual report filed in mid-February of 1965. He referred, somewhat sarcastically, among other things, to "fright substances and alarm reactions in mollusks, Cornell University, $11,200." And then he said, "Until I have had an opportunity to interrogate National Science Foundation witnesses, I offer no comment other than the fact that I am intrigued by the idea of taxpayers supporting studies of how mollusks react when frightened. I have always accepted 'cool as a clam' as a truism, and I question how many taxpayers appreciate having their money spent to perhaps learn otherwise."

Let it be noted, however, that this line item scrutiny—usually on "title of project" basis alone—keeps faculty investigators and agency people on their toes and alert to the sensitivities of Congress and their constituents relative to the sensible expenditures of public funds.

On the subject of committee testimony, admittedly, most of the commentary before congressional committees is from agency men—university people being extremely reticent to appear; and, if they do, are rarely critical in depth. Dr. Abelson, editor of Science has said, "The witness in questioning the wisdom of the establishment pays a price and incurs hazards. He is diverted from his professional activities. He stirs the enmity of powerful foes. He fears that reprisals may extend beyond him to his institutions. Perhaps he fears shadows, but in a day when almost all research institutions are highly dependent on Federal funds, prudence seems to dictate silence."

Institutional presidents sometimes seem the most reluctant to speak out—perhaps for fear of jeopardizing their relationships with the Federal agencies. (The same fear may muffle the criticism of federally subsidized scientists, thus stifling the efforts of the Congress to learn of inefficiencies and inadequacies that are present in the Federal research program.)

When invitations were extended by the Elliott committee to a number of influential university presidents to provide testimony on current problems in the Government-university relationship, a few gave careful study to the matter and provided helpful suggestions. But some refused the invitation outright or offered empty generalities and glowing platitudes, or gave the committee what it needed least; less than candid expressions of immediate self-interest, cloaked in the familiar altruistic rhetoric of science and education.

Subsequent requests by the committee to colleges and universities for facts and figures on Federal expenditures were in many instances ignored or given perfunctory attention—often, it must be admitted, because the institution did not keep adequate track of where the Federal funds were going.

Faced with these realities, strong attention should be focused on how to insure a steady flow of critical and knowledgeable commentary from the university campus. Constructive criticism is vital to a more productive Federal research program—particularly if offered by the investigators themselves. Don Price, dean of Harvard's Graduate School of Public Administration and the new president of the AAAS, in noting the need for more critical comment from the scientific community, says, "Even as dissenters, they must be established, and the future status of their estate must be developed with care if we are to adjust our constitutional system to modern technology without losing our freedom."

And Logan Wilson of the American Council on Education has well summarized the concurrent responsibilities of academicians and Government officers: "Each institution should have its own sense of public mission, of course, but my own conviction is that the educational community has a right and a responsibility to share with the Government in the determination of policies and directions, that will, as much as any other factor, shape our whole future.

FEDERAL CONTRACT RESEARCH CENTERS

Under a usual cloak of Washington-imposed secrecy, some 20 or so Federal contract research centers—university affiliated though usually physically distant from the campus proper—perform complex, mission-oriented research and development work for the Government. The atmosphere is devoid of more than a dozen or so student assistants (if that) and reflects open chagrin at the idea of visitations by the centers researchers to campus classrooms and labs.

One fact stands dominant; namely, the heavy concentration of Federal research funds at these installations. In fiscal year 1966, almost $6 billion will be spent by the Government at "captive labs." One result of this funding is that the academic institutions sponsoring the facilities are usually considered the recipients of the money in general. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, the universities proper rarely see any of the money, or, too often even the research results. Where labs are found, a closer examination of university accounts will invariably show high laboratory funding, with the main campus receiving a much more balanced and proportional share of the total Federal research allocation. This fact should be well remembered in any "geographic dispersion of funds" discussion and the side issue of the haves versus the have-nots in university research.

For example, according to figures just released by the Reuss subcommittee on research, Johns Hopkins University was the third largest recipient of Federal funds for all university research conducted in fiscal year 1964. In that year, Hopkins received somewhat in excess of $70 million from the Federal agencies—but $55 million of that total was from the Department of Defense alone. And virtually all of that money was earmarked for the Hopkins Applied Physics Lab in Silver Spring, Md., many miles distant from the Homewood campus in Baltimore.

Not a few university presidents with captive labs located at their schools continually insist before congressional committees that the centers are indeed part of their institutions' educational missions and thus should be retained. But, the affiliation all too often appears as a tortured one, necessitating a good deal of stretch to the imagination. Nevertheless, the centers do perform a vital service at a splendid level of productivity. The labs undoubtedly assist their parent institution in such matters as prestige and drawing power on the academic professions and student interest.

Also remember that the labs perform a good deal of applied research, an area underfunded according to people such as Drs. Teller and Kantrowitz. It is clear that the contract research centers have a continuing mission for the future. It remains for the academic community to secure a better assimilation of the work of these labs into the educational mission of the universities.

SCIENCE VERSUS EDUCATION

Whenever possible, research money should be allocated in such a way that it also will do the greatest good educationally. If two institutions or two investigators have the same competence to perform a given piece of research then the choice ought to go to the one with the greater capacity and willingness to involve students in the research experience. But it is quite another thing to compromise the research investment in pursuit of an educational objective.

This research compromise now reaches beyond questionable investigator subsidization, and is transferring research funds into a catchall category of curriculums and institutional development grants. The expanding effort to build new academic centers, to improve departments, and to expand institutional capacity should be labeled properly as an academic development program—certainly not one of research. Thus, our national research program, as presently evolving in higher education, should in reality be two mutually sustaining programs—one, a constantly expanding research effort, conditioned on excellence and productivity; and the other, an institutional development program geared to future increases in graduate education and research operations.

The National Science Foundation Board in a 1958 statement—as pertinent today as then—wisely noted that, "Problems of Government-university relationships in the Federal support of research at colleges and universities should be explicitly and completely disassociated from the budgeting needs and cries of the institutions and from the general issue of Federal aid to higher education. In the consideration of these relationships there should be no implication that Federal sponsorship of research is a convenient subterfuge for Federal aid to institutions of higher learning."

In the field of academic development there are already excellent programs carried on by such agencies as the National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration which embrace open ended, Federal assistance to expand, in quantity and quality, institutions and science departments within those schools. In addition, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 has just completed its first full year of operation. The results show almost $300 million expended in the 12 months of fiscal year 1965 on undergraduate and graduate facilities development. The great bulk of this amount was allocated for institutional science building construction—bricks and mortar assistance which will enable schools to command legitimate approbation of agency research distributors in the future.

Unfortunately, there is a growing diffusion of intent with reference to the dual mandate of the Federal Government in the areas of institutional development and of academic research. In a September 1965 statement to the Cabinet, President Johnson stated that, "Research supported to further agency missions should be administered not only with a view to producing specific results, but also with the view to strengthening academic institutions and increasing the number of institutions capable of performing research of the highest quality." Here the President is speaking of the research dollar doing two jobs—mission project study and academic development.

In a paper by NASA's Thomas Murphy and Thomas Adams, delivered to the 1965 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, the writers stated this resultant dilemma:

"Can a mission-oriented agency use geography as a criterion in awarding grants, recognizing full well that it concomitantly will sacrifice time, quality, and money in the process? When grants are given to one institution on grounds other than merit, there is little basis for denying similar grants to other universities which would not normally merit them."

I submit that the development activity referred to by Murphy and Adams, might well lodge in any of the agencies commissioned to perform research. However, development programs should be clearly labeled as such and submitted to the Congress for consideration and approval. The relevant congressional committee should have full information on proposals and recommendations in both important areas of academic research and institutional development. Only in this way can legitimate priorities be established together with a Government-wide program of expanding quality research, and an increase in institutions capable of performing that research.

We cannot permit a continuation of the current ambiguity of interest. The wisest expenditure of the important research dollar lies in the balance. Both research and academic development are necessary, and at usually the same time—but can one research fund do both jobs? Too often, when attention is directed to research programs, commentators are talking in terms of Federal construction, geographical dispersion of funds for academic development, or student assistance and traineeship programs for future research expertise. Admittedly, all these programs ultimately lead to more research, but the limited research dollar cannot be the elixir vitae for comprehensive higher education advancement.

It is certainly a laudatory objective to develop new academic centers of research and scholarly proficiency. More colleges and universities with the "superlative" label attached are certainly needed. But to build such schools with Federal project research dollars would not only jeopardize at least for the present, the overall research program, but would put second-rank universities on a dangerous "easy street" to institutional expansion. It might well be noted that schools such as Johns Hopkins and Harvard did not attain their present excellence by way of Federal dollars; rather they achieved a preeminent position in education which in turn prompted the flow of Federal funds for research.

As a case in point, we have here at the University of Missouri, an excellent institution of higher learning. The student body is large and growing, the proliferation of campuses is noteworthy, the array of talent and productivity is increasingly impressive. It is a school such as this that might well wish to increase its funded research, bearing in mind the existing caveats on too much research vis-a-vis the academic mission of the institution.

There is something of the "chicken or egg" dilemma here, however. Should the University of Missouri set priority sights on more research dollars or on academic improvement and development programs first, which in time would garner the desired increment in funded research? A marvelous program, ideally suited to the University of Missouri and one that I am sure is already known by this institution, is the science development grants program of the NSF. Under its provisions very large open-ended grants are annually awarded to academic institutions that are not now among the very foremost in science but that have substantial present strength and, in addition, have shown sound planning for future improvement.

Many in Washington speak of the need for new academic centers of excellence. This NSF program is one important way to meet that need. And yet, the President's new budget, while recommending a substantial increase in funds for the National Science Foundation, has only a $5 million increase to a $45 million total, over last year's budget figure. Unfortunately, for a program which commands such widely voiced support from all quarters, it is most discouraging that it fails to receive larger funding. I would suggest that budgeting for vital science development programs such as this might well command your close attention and comment over the months ahead to Washington.

This, then, is the state of Government support of university research today. The work of the Congress over the past year has been accompanied by a restrained and reasoned approach to the questions and problems that surround our national research program. The fear that Congress is about to curtail its support of research or stifle the efforts of the Nation's deserving scientists, or turn its back on the many problems of higher education is wholly without foundation.

Seemingly, the most obvious requirement on the part of the academic and scientific community would be an articulate form of response, recognizing research program modification as inevitable and healthy, and embracing constructive, specific suggestions for changes best serving the Nation's interest, and the institutions educational mandate. You might well disagree with some of my comments this evening, but do have a capacious and vocal interest in all of them.

Naturally, there are difficulties in the Federal research program and the situation promises continuing concern over the months ahead. During this time of reappraisal and program modification, one fact is clear—if institutions are to maintain the educational ideals and traditional autonomy in conjunction with strengthened research activity, then the major advances in this Government-university partnership must be premised on clearly defined educational philosophy and sound institutional organization.

In order to clearly articulate and define a campus research policy, those responsible for our institutions of higher learning must take a more active role in the decisionmaking processes involving Federal funds. They must be aware of the changing Washington spirit, and they must know how to plead their cause before the Congress. They, and indeed you, should be totally aware of the issues I have mentioned this evening. Know of their impact on the research programs, and participate in the dialog that swirls about these questions, particularly in Washington.

If solutions are to be found for many of the imbalances and inequities in the campus-Government research partnerships, the solutions most properly should be proffered from within the academic community. Welcome this responsibility. Develop your suggestions, suggestions for change, where warranted, and suggestions for maintenance of policy where desired.

Above all, take part in the discussions that call your opinions to Washington and take part not on a sporadic or disjointed basis but with firm, concerted effort on behalf of your particular disciplines and as spokesmen of the academic community.

Now you might well ask, How can you suggest we criticize the agency that supports us, or the programs under which we have applied for funds? But my friends, it is not a reliance on criticism that I am recommending, but rather positive and constructive commentary on your part. Believe me, ladies and gentlemen, the Congress will respond with alacrity to your challenge for excellence.

Certainly research continues to be the key to national growth and security. This vibrant, scientifically oriented era of the mid-20th century might well be termed the research years—a time when an evergrowing portion of our physical human resources is being diverted into the unknown and then turning raw discovery into great technological achievements for man's benefit. It has become a matter of common faith that much greater advancement is yet to come.

Indeed, no one has summarized the spirit and vibrance of the research years more eloquently than Ernest Hemingway, when he said, "We are living in the morning of an epoch, and in the fog of the early dawn men walk confused and see strange sights. But the fog will melt under the rays of the very sun which has created it, and the world of truth will be seen to be solid and lovely again. All the glory of life, all the romance of living, all the deep and true joys of the world, all the splendor and the mystery are within our reach."

NOTIFICATION OF NEXT-OF-KIN OF DECEASED SERVICEMEN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, on February 9 I had inserted in the RECORD a copy of a letter I wrote to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara concerning the Defense Department's procedures for notifying next-of-kin of deceased servicemen.

I now would like to have printed in the RECORD the reply from the Department of the Army, which explains the very sensitive nature of notifying loved ones of the death of a serviceman.

Col. J. L. Blackwell, in response to my inquiry, points out many of the problems connected with casualty notification and outlines some of the complexities confronting the various services. He also mentions that the current system is now being studied. I am extremely hopeful that this study will result in a better, more compassionate way of notifying a mother that her son has been killed—instead of an impersonal taxi driver delivering the death message during the night.

At this point, I would like the RECORD to show Colonel Blackwell's letter to me, as well as my reply to him. The correspondence follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, OFFICE
OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., February 18, 1966.

Hon. HORACE R. KORNEGAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KORNEGAY: The Secretary of the Army has asked me to reply to your inquiry addressed to the Secretary of Defense in behalf of Mr. Howard White concerning the current system of casualty notification.

One of the most sensitive functions the Army has to perform is the notification of families of military personnel who have been reported in a casualty status. We share your concern and realize the emotional trauma experienced by anyone at any time in receiving news of a loved one's death. All military actions involving U.S. personnel in oversea areas are newsworthy and closely covered by representatives of the news media, who furnish their reports by the speediest communication facilities available. Therefore, it is imperative that initial notification be made as promptly as possible since additional grief is caused the families should the information be received prematurely through news media releases.

Up to this time, commercial telegraph has proved to be the most expeditious and efficient means in making notification. Taxicab drivers must, of necessity, be employed at times by Western Union to assist in the delivery of casualty notifications depending on the time the message is received at a local branch office and the area in which the addressee resides. They are advised of the contents of the message and instructed to be on the alert for indications of shock reaction and to offer their services when necessary.

With the rising casualty rate among U.S. forces in Vietnam as the result of our more intensive role, the matter of casualty notification has been the subject of several news items and editorials, especially in areas from which major contingents have departed such as Fort Bragg, N.C. Many recent requests have been received from various civic, military, and veterans organizations and, although the suggestions may seem to be workable with present personalities and conditions at a given local level, these are not necessarily workable when extended to the complexities involved by the membership of the entire Army which currently exceeds 1 million. Additionally, the prevailing local factors are also always subject to change upon departure of enthusiastic personnel currently available.

We certainly do recognize notification of next of kin as one of our basic responsibilities in a most sensitive area. It must be accomplished and controlled by the military not only in order to provide prompt, factual, and reliable notification but also to assure prompt and efficient coordination of all other actions which include the appointment of the survivor assistance officer, return of remains and press releases.

Recent instructions have been issued restricting telegraphic notification actions for overseas casualties to the hours of 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. daily. Though the attention of the public is currently focused on the Vietnam situation, the loss of a son or husband is considered an equally shocking and distressing experience irrespective of the location of circumstances of occurrence. We cannot in good conscience establish separate, preferential procedures for any particular area without considering relatives of the entire army. However, a current study is being conducted to ascertain the feasibility of initiating a notification system using military resources rather than Western Union facilities. A decision on this matter is expected not later than May 1 at which time you will be further advised.

The Army is aware of the need for personal assistance to bereaved families confronted with many unfamiliar demands at this crucial time. An officer, well informed as to these needs, is appointed to visit the home and extend courteous, efficient, and sympathetic assistance for as long as the need exists.

Your thoughtfulness that the feelings of others might be spared as much as possible is most understandable and I am grateful for your interest in this matter.

It is noted that on February 9 you entered the substances of Mr. White's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, therefore, the Department of the Army solicits similar action on your part.

I hope the foregoing information gives you an appreciation of our active and continuing interest in this very real problem.

Sincerely,

J. L. BLACKWELL,
Colonel, GS Office, Chief of Legislative Liaison.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 23, 1966.

Col. J. L. BLACKWELL,
Office, Chief of Legislative Liaison,
Department of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLONEL BLACKWELL: I want to thank you for your courteous reply to my letter of February 9, addressed to Secretary McNamara concerning the Army's current system of casualty notification.

I can very readily appreciate the Defense Department's problems in this extremely sensitive area. I can easily understand also that the Army, as you point out, cannot establish separate, preferential procedures for any particular area and would not suggest that you even consider such a policy.

My concern is for every mother and father and every wife who must in the future face the terrible emotional strain of receiving the news that the son or husband has been killed—regardless of the circumstances of the death or wherever they may live.

After writing to Secretary McNamara about the instance of a mother receiving the shocking news that her son had been killed in action in Vietnam, I went to North Carolina and visited with the parents of the young man who gave his life for his country. The Hiram Stricklands are a proud family. They were proud that young "Butch" had alway wanted to be a soldier. They were, quite naturally, grieved that his Army career was only 19 months long. But, 19-year-old "Butch's" mother, in her grief, kept reiterating one point in her conversation with me. "Please," she asked, "do whatever you can to help the feelings of some other mother of some other boy killed in the service." As she mourned her son, she wanted to alleviate the unnecessary trauma that might come to another serviceman's loved one. She received the death notice at night from a commercial taxi driver who handed her a telegram and went off again into the night.

I repeat my earlier plea for a better way. I am extremely hopeful that the current study you are now conducting will produce a more desirable and compassionate procedure. I know that the Army will persist in its efforts until a better way is found and put into use.

I will be pleased to have your correspondence inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as I know that many others will be interested also in your efforts to find a better way.

I am grateful for your assistance and for your most courteous reply.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HORACE R. KORNEGAY.

SENATOR PAT McNAMARA TO STEP DOWN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it was the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] who once said of Michigan's senior Senator [Mr. McNAMARA]:

> I believe it can be said of the Senator from Michigan, "Behold a Senator in whom there is no guile." Everyone always knows where he stands. He does not make any ambiguous statements. He does not cast any ambiguous votes.

That statement, in a nutshell, sums up very well one of the outstanding characteristics about the public life of PATRICK V. McNAMARA. His colleagues in the Senate have always known where he stood, and we in Michigan have always known where to find our Senator. Invariably, it has been on the side of the public interest.

I have just been notified of Senator McNamara's decision not to seek reelection this year. He will step down at the end of 1966 after 12 years of dedicated and effective service to his State and Nation in the Senate of the United States.

I know I echo the sentiments of thousands of my fellow Michiganders when I say that we had hoped Pat McNamara would seek election to a third term in the Senate. We accept his decision regretfully and wish him well as he serves out his final year in the Senate and in the years ahead.

As he leaves the Senate, Pat McNamara can point to an enviable record of public service. Americans for years to come will lead better lives because Michigan sent Pat McNamara to the U.S. Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the Detroit Free Press last fall carried an article by Mr. James Robinson calling attention to Senator McNamara's outstanding record of accomplishment, particularly during the first session of the 89th Congress.

I hope Members of both the House and Senate will take the time to read Mr. Robinson's article about Michigan's senior Senator and his record of public service. It is a record of which the people of Michigan and the Nation can be very proud.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, which appeared in the November 15, 1965, edition of the Free Press under the headline, "Going Like 60 at 71—That's Pat McNamara," be printed as part of my remarks at this point in the Record.

Going Like 60 at 71—That's Pat McNamara

(By James Robinson)

Pat McNamara, Michigan's senior Senator, has returned to Detroit to spend the 2-month recess between sessions of the 89th Congress.

For McNamara, who at 71 is nearing the end of his second term as Senator, the annual visit could be the start of a new campaign for reelection—or a final report to the people on his achievements in the U.S. Senate.

"This year has been most gratifying—the best of my 11 years in the Senate," McNamara said in a leisurely interview over lunch at the Whittier Hotel, where he and Mrs. McNamara have an apartment.

The Senator is giving no hints on the question uppermost in the minds of Michigan politicans: Will he run for a third term in 1966?

But, as he reviews this year's Congress, it soon becomes obvious that the facts belie McNamara's own statement to the Senate on October 4, his birthday anniversary.

"When a man reaches the age of 71 years," McNamara said on that occasion, "there is very little to celebrate."

McNamara, at 71, has much to celebrate. This has been, by far, his most productive year as a Senator.

Before leaving Washington, he counted the pens he received from President Johnson for legislation in which he had a major role in enacting. The total: 19 pens.

"I've been down to the White House so many times this year for bill-signing ceremonies, I'm thinking of going into the pen business," McNamara said. "I could stock a stationery store."

There are other reasons for McNamara to celebrate. Few men at 71 are more active or more interested in the world about them.

He looks healthier, and younger every time you see him. A bit overweight, certainly less "vigor" than Bobby Kennedy. But who says a senior Senator should play touch football?

The reasons for McNamara's high opinion of the 89th Congress are easy to understand.

"We passed 85 percent of the 1964 Democratic platform this year," McNamara explained.

"And next year—we are going to go back and get the other 15 percent."

McNamara takes special pleasure in two of the year's most important pieces of legislation—medical care for the aged and Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools.

Both were part of his first campaign in 1954. He labored on problems of the aged and on behalf of better education for many years prior to entering the Senate.

"Back in the 1920's I was concerned because Michigan had no old-age pension," he recalled. "So I took a job—one of those unpaid jobs—as executive secretary of the Michigan Old Age Pension League.

"We got the first pension law on the books in Michigan. Frank Murphy (former Governor) was cochairman."

In the Senate, McNamara invented the popular and politically potent Special Committee on Aging and was its first chairman. He still is the senior Democratic member, but gave up the chairmanship when he took charge of the Committee on Public Works a few years back.

Congress this year also passed the McNamara-Fogarty Act, creating a new administration on aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"It gets rid of the welfare stigma which has been so obnoxious to the senior citizens," McNamara said.

A former Detroit school board member, McNamara now serves as ranking majority member of the Senate Subcommittee on Education.

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, on his recent visit to Michigan, told a Detroit audience that "Pat McNamara has done more for the cause of education in this country than any Member of the Senate, except possibly Wayne Morse."

McNamara is proud of the tribute, and proud of the opportunity he has had to boost education.

"The horizons of education are limitless," he explained.

"We'll never have enough money to bring all the education they can absorb to everybody who wants it and needs it. But we must keep going. There are always new frontiers every day."

The list of legislation McNamara sponsored or managed in committees and during floor debate is almost endless.

In fact, the bulk of what the Nation identifies as President Johnson's Great Society moved during the last 2 years through McNamara's hands, either as chairman of the Public Works Committee or as the ranking Democrat on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, where he also is chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor and the Special Subcommittee on Poverty.

He managed the war on poverty act last year and again this year. He cosponsored the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 which adopted the regional approach to aiding distressed areas such as the Upper Great Lakes.

The President's Appalachian Regional Development Act moved through McNamara's Public Works Committee, or rather, the Senator moved the bill with some not-too-gentle shoves. Mr. Johnson was most appreciative. He picked a Michigan lawyer, John Sweeney, to run the program. Sweeney got his start in Washington as an aid to McNamara.

Even Lady Bird Johnson's pet legislation—the Highway Beautification Act—was a McNamara measure. There was some tugging and pulling between the Senator and the White House before the President agreed to McNamara's requirement that the money come out of the general revenue rather than the highway trust fund, which is threatening to run a deficit before the interstate roads are completed in 1972.

McNamara considers the Beautification Act "a feeble first step in the right direction."

The time has come, he says, for more control over scenery along Federal highways, especially billboards and auto graveyards.

"But it is really a timid measure," he said. "We're going to pay for all the vested rights and give the billboard companies 4 or 5 years to comply. You know, the industry admits a billboard will pay for itself in 5 years."

On the subject of next year's election and whether he will run again, McNamara weeks ago made his position clear in typically blunt fashion.

"I'll make a decision when the time comes and then I'll let everyone know."

He added: "I feel great. I certainly feel well enough to run and there's no reason why I shouldn't, so far as the way I feel.

"But I don't want you to think that means I will be a candidate.

Age is much more likely than health to play a part in McNamara's decision, despite recurring reports of ill health that stem from an illness just prior to his 1960 campaign for reelection. That year he led the Democratic ticket in Michigan at a time when rumor had him on the verge of death.

If he decides to go for another term, as his friends are now urging him to do, McNamara would be 78 at the end of another 6 years in the Senate. That's not particularly old, by Senate standards; but it isn't young either, and the Senator is conscious of his advancing years.

In his first speech upon return to Michigan last week, at a birthday dinner honoring Representative James O'Hara, Democrat of Utica, the Senator told his audience:

"When my colleagues celebrated my birthday in the Senate last month I told them when a man gets 71 there is very little for him to celebrate.

"But that doesn't stop me from helping others celebrate. Especially, young fellows like Jim O'Hara."

Friends say it is possible McNamara may decide to step aside next year and give some younger Democrat a chance—a bright young fellow like G. Mennen Williams, perhaps, or Mayor Jerome Cavanagh.

But don't bet on it. The Senator smiled coyly last Saturday night when Congressman O'Hara produced a large button labeled "Reelect McNamara in 1966," and proceeded to tell 400 Macomb County Democrats: "Pat, you're the greatest. You're my only candidate."

ADULT HEALTH EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce H.R. 12976 the Adult Health Protection Act of 1966.

Some time today our colleagues in the Senate will hear Mr. Harrison Williams, Democrat of New Jersey, introduce a measure identical with the one I place before you at this time.

This bill would authorize the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to make grants to medical schools, community hospitals, health departments, and other public nonprofit agencies to establish and operate adult health protection centers. It would authorize grants for the establishment and operation of these centers for a period of 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, the system envisioned here will do more for preventive medicine and health protection than anything yet proposed. In addition to many other features, it will bring modern instrumentation and computer use to bear on a recognized, growing health problem represented by chronic illness and the increasing scarcity of professional health personnel.

What this act does is to make way for a healthy mutation in our preventive health care practices in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I have often been impressed by the fact that—when the time is ripe—innovations occur independently to a number of people. It is rather noteworthy that last fall, after the passage of the Medicare Act, both Senator WILLIAMS and I were concerned about the aged who were not going to be helped by the medicare system. And, independently, we addressed ourselves to the solution—or solutions—of the problem.

In September 1965 Mr. WILLIAMS reminded the Senate that the increasing numbers of our aged and aging population present a growing problem with special significance for chronic diseases. He pointed out that an estimated 74 million Americans are afflicted by one or more chronic disorders. He went on to cite pertinent statistics on the high incidence among the elderly of a host of cripplers—blindness, deafness, epilepsy, arthritis, rheumatism, glaucoma, and others.

Then Senator WILLIAMS said:

> The final answer to the health problems of the aging and aged is surely not limited to the provision of a broad range of care services to all who need them. We must also envisage a more comprehensive effort to identify and control, during our productive years, such chronic diseases which, if ignored, take such high toll in later life.

And he concluded with the thoughtful words:

> Let us not hesitate to add another milestone beyond medicare. Let us give medicare its next logical handmaiden, preventicare.

At about the same time last fall I had an opportunity to speak at the dedication of Hall Manor, Cranston's first low-rent housing development for the elderly, in my home State of Rhode Island.

I took the opportunity to remark before that audience:

> I wonder, for instance, how many Americans realize that there now exist more than 2,500,000 elderly people who will actually not benefit from most of our national programs for the aged.
>
> These elderly cannot secure low-rent housing, cannot participate in recreational programs or in vocational rehabilitation projects, will hardly, in fact, benefit at all from the new medicare provisions.

I said that there is, therefore, an urgent need for long-term comprehensive care for the elderly who cannot take care of themselves. I called then for an entire program of services to provide for all the needs of life—in short, for what I called living care.

Finally, I concluded that we need nothing less than full Federal responsibility for maintaining the neglected lives of our 18 million elderly population.

In the measure that Senator WILLIAMS and I are proposing today, this conviction is spelled out in unmistakable terms. We state that "the Congress hereby finds and declares that the Federal Government has a duty to assist the adult population of the United States, particularly the aged and the aging, in protecting, maintaining, and improving their health."

Mr. Speaker, from this premise we propose for the first time to provide Federal assistance in the establishment and operation of regional and community health protection centers for the detection of disease; to provide assistance for the training of personnel to operate such centers; and to provide assistance in the conduct of certain research related to such centers and their operation.

I do not propose to read this bill aloud to you here, but its purpose is to encourage and assist, through grants, in the planning, establishment, and operation of regional health and community protection centers, each of which will provide health appraisal and disease detection services, on a periodic basis, to any adult who requests such services, if he has attained age 50 and resides within the geographic area served by the centers.

These health protection centers would provide a series of basic tests for the detection of abnormalities in the cardiovascular, respiratory, gastrointestinal, genitourinary, and musculoskeletal systems as well as defects in metabolism and organs of special sense.

Specific diseases or conditions to be tested might include hypertension, various forms of cancer, rheumatoid arthritis, respiratory insufficiency, diabetes, kidney disease, obesity, and hearing and vision impairment.

The tests would be administered by technicians, nurses, and medical specialists using automated or semiautomated equipment which has already been proven to give swift, accurate, and reliable results. The results of these tests, along with data provided by the person undergoing the health appraisal, would be fed into a computer. It is estimated that the battery of tests could be administered within 2½ hours.

The results of the tests, summarized by the computer, would be referred to the private physician of the person taking them. In cases where the persons either did not have a private physician or was medically indigent, the tests would be referred to a physician in accordance with local practice.

The adult health protection centers are intended to provide an efficient means for the detection of abnormalities or indications of disease—but not to replace full examinations. Their purpose is to place in the hands of the examining physician a summary of basic data and to place promptly under a physician's care a person with indications of disease conditions.

The health protection centers would conduct training programs in the operation of technical disease detection procedures and would research and develop new disease detection tests and equipment. Additional grants to the centers would be authorized for operational research and for the establishment of internships to give on-the-job training to physicians, nurses, and technical personnel. The centers would also conduct community education programs on preventive health care.

Finally, a 12-man Advisory Council on Adult Health Protection would be established to advise the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service in the administration of this program. This Council will include men who are leaders in the fields of medicine, public health, public welfare, or representatives of national organizations concerned with the interests of the aging. And it shall include one or more national leaders known for their dedication to the national interest and the welfare of the Nation's citizens.

The basic idea behind the act, put simply, is this: to launch a genuine, nationwide preventive medicine campaign. By making these testing services available to any person age 50 or above, on a voluntary basis, we will encourage men and women approaching retirement to take regular health examinations and we will facilitate the giving of full examinations by practicing physicians.

Mr. Speaker, the long-range answer to the health problems of the aging is in early identification and control of disease and prevention of illness and disability.

Now, ideally, we would achieve this goal by having periodic health examinations for everyone. Realistically, of course, we know that there are not enough physicians to accomplish a program of this scale.

Fortunately, a way has been found out of this dilemma.

What we are proposing in this act is to take the proven automated testing techniques from an unusual project in California—called Kaiser Permanente—and adapt them for demonstration on a communitywide basis in other areas of the country.

Assisted by a grant from the Division of Chronic Diseases, Public Health Service, the Kaiser Foundation health plan in Oakland has developed a multitest laboratory that is immensely accurate and remarkably economical.

Some 40,000 Kaiser-Permanente health plan beneficiaries are participating in this pilot health program. Their experience will now become the basis for this first nationwide preventive medicine effort, so far as the chronic diseases are concerned—just as, once upon a time, a preventive medicine effort had to be launched against the infectious diseases.

May this new effort be as successful as that campaign proved to be.

Once again I want to repeat what I said at Cranston last fall.

I know well that, hearing this proposal, many voices will cry out—cry out as they did against medicare, and as they did against the heart disease, cancer, and stroke program, and as they cried out against most of the other farsighted public health bills passed by the 89th Congress.

But I say to them, as I said in this House last year, when asked where "this kind of business" will end: that I, for one, intend to keep going and going until we take adequate care of as many people as we possibly can who so badly need better health services, no matter how long it takes.

I promised, in my "Living Care" speech, to introduce legislation to help the elderly. This bill I introduce today is the first piece of such legislation I intend to introduce in this 2d session of the 89th Congress. It is a vital piece of legislation, for only by preventive care can we hope to reduce the staggering load of suffering borne by the elderly in our midst.

As most of you know, I have concerned myself with the problems of the aged for the past decade. In 1956 I supported the President in establishing a Federal Council on Aging, and in 1959 I introduced legislation calling for the White House Conference on Aging that was held in 1961.

In 1963 I introduced the Older Americans Act which finally passed in 1965. I am happy to say that the Aging Administration that it created within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is now a going concern.

I am proud of this record and of these successes. Yet it is no exaggeration to say that I believe that the Adult Health Protection Act of 1966 will be the most important single piece of legislation concerning the aging and the aged that I have ever introduced into this House.

LOUIS CARDELL GERRY

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on February 5 the House of Representatives lost a constituent, a taxpayer, a business leader, a Republican, a gentleman, a friend of the people and, I am both proud and personally grieved to say, a fellow Rhode Islander and a friend.

Mr. Louis Cardell Gerry, of Providence, R.I., died on February 5 at the age of 81 after a career as business executive and financier, after nearly two decades as president of Rhode Island Hospital, after a lifetime of service to his fellow man.

He was a director of a score of corporations, a trustee of Brown University, a former chairman of the Providence chapter of the American Red Cross, a 33d degree Mason, a recipient of the first Greater Providence Chamber of Commerce annual Roger Williams Award for outstanding service to the community.

Over a long period of time he was associated with the Rhode Island Community Chests. He served the State without compensation as racing and athletics administrator under the former Gov. William H. Vanderbilt, during which time he was the author of a modernized set of racing rules for the State. During World War II he served with the United War Fund, was vice chairman of the Rhode Island Salvage Commission, a member of the committee of Veterans' Information Center, and both during the war and afterward was a member of the First Army Advisory Committee.

The man of whom I speak did not hold public office, though he was a devoted public servant; a private citizen who exemplified enlightened and perceptive support of sound legislation; a friend of Governors and Members of Congress. Particularly, to me, he was a source of inspiration in his chosen avocation as the president of one of the oldest and, by reason of his association with it, one of the leading hospitals of our country.

Blessed with the insight of leadership, he chose wisely in his selection of people of similar purpose, energy, and concern for others. He brought Rhode Island Hospital to the forefront of excellence in its avowed functions of quality patient care, education, and research to benefit the people of the Providence Plantations and the entire State.

He developed new concepts of care for an institution that has provided a century of service to the sick and injured. He and Rhode Island Hospital together have been in the vanguard of progress for meeting the health needs of our State.

Before Congress passed legislation to help stimulate local financing of facilities for student nurses, Rhode Island Hospital—recognizing the need to attract more qualified young women to this important profession—constructed a nursing arts building and a senior student nurses dormitory, appropriately named the Gerry House.

Before Congress undertook to support Mr. Johnson's present master plan for advancing the Nation's health, Rhode Island Hospital faced the problem of its responsibility to the people of Rhode Island and is at this moment in process of developing plans for a large, 12-story building solely dedicated to the care of the ambulatory patient. This ambulatory patient center will meet the increasing need for health care at the most economical levels of construction expense and cost to the patient.

Such are two examples of long-range planning which only the most progressive of our country's medical centers are providing. By reason of leadership such as Mr. Gerry's, such hospitals demonstrate an understanding of Mr. Johnson's theme, which he expressed recently in these words:

> It is imperative that we give first attention to our opportunities—and our obligations—for advancing the Nation's health. For the health of our people is, inescapably, the foundation for the fulfillment of all our aspirations.

Louis Cardell Gerry, in an annual report to his hospital's corporation a few years ago, voiced a similar concern:

> We have indeed come far. What a comfort it would be to be able to stop climbing, seat ourselves comfortably and view our accomplishments. Such, however, is not desirable; it is not even possible. We have come far, it is true, and although it sounds paradoxical we have even farther to go than ever. As we progress in one area, several more areas are opened up. We are, in the truest sense of the word, in an expanding universe.

McNAMARA'S CONTRADICTIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, like every other Member of Congress, I imagine, I am receiving an increasing number of letters from the district I represent concerning the war in Vietnam.

I am well aware that this is a theater of operations 8,000 miles from our shores in an area of the world where newly created nations abound and this, to some degree, contributes to the confusion that exists over the entire aspect of the war there.

But an even greater contribution to the confusion and, in my opinion, the single most significant factor causing the controversy over our policy and actions there, is the record of contradictory statements for which Secretary McNamara is responsible.

I believe as well that, because we have withheld the truth from the people and camouflaged what the situation was in Vietnam a year ago, that we cannot now show the people how much better the situation is today. To do so would prove beyond question that we did not tell the truth a year ago.

I am a great believer, Mr. Speaker, in "the record," that chronicle of events made famous by Al Smith when he first said, "Let's look at the record."

It is quite fashionable these days for officials of the Government to make one statement one day and then deny it the following day or else say something quite different and hope that no one will remember what they said the first time. This is a dangerous and deplorable habit; particularly deplorable when it is practiced by the Secretary of Defense.

Secretary McNamara's statements on the war in Vietnam make a fascinating collection of confusion and contradiction which would be amusing if the subject matter were not so grave. I think it will serve an enlightening purpose if all his statements are put together in one place in the RECORD so future historians can study it.

Let us begin with a statement he made on March 22, 1962. At that time, returning from a conference in the Pacific, McNamara told newsmen that South Vietnam had taken the offensive.

Less than 2 months later, while in Saigon, McNamara told newsmen "there is no plan for introducing American combat troops in South Vietnam." This was on May 9, 1962.

Two days later, on May 11, 1962, McNamara said he was "tremendously encouraged."

A White House policy statement dated October 2, 1963, contains this statement:

> Secretary McNamara and General Taylor reported their judgment that the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965.

Secretary McNamara, in Honolulu on November 20, 1963, announced that American troops would start being withdrawn before the end of that year, 1963. The following month, Secretary McNamara changed his mind. He said in Saigon on December 21, 1963, that we would not go ahead with troop withdrawal plans.

Another month went by before the Secretary delivered another pronouncement that should be made a part of the

RECORD. After the fall of Diem, in which he, himself, undoubtedly had a part, McNamara said:

> The new government * * * has considerably more support than its predecessor, and the military revolutionary committee is beginning to take action to intensify military operations and to improve civil administration.

Everything was coming up roses according to the Secretary when he testified here on the Hill a month later, on January 27, 1964. At that time he said that most of the 15,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam should be withdrawn before 1965 was over. He said he did not believe the United States "should assume the primary responsibility for the war in South Vietnam."

The Secretary continued to see the situation there through rose-colored glasses 2 months later. Back from his fourth trip to Saigon, he reported that the Khanh regime had "produced a sound central plan for the prosecution of the war" and that the situation "can be significantly improved in the coming months."

Nine days later, the Secretary's opinion had taken a turn of 180 degrees. On March 26, 1964, he said:

> The situation in South Vietnam has unquestionably worsened, at least since last fall.

He said also that the situation was "not hopeless, but not particularly optimistic."

Three days later, however, things took another turn for the better. On March 29, 1964, McNamara said:

> The training personnel we have assigned there will come back as their training mission is completed. Perhaps some can return this year; some next.

The truth of the matter came from his own statement a month later when, on April 24, 1964, he told newsmen that U.S. strength in the Vietnam area was on the rise. He said:

> I don't want to predict what the totals will be at the end of this year or at the end of 1965.

On that same day, the Secretary came up with a real prize in this statement:

> I don't object to its being called McNamara's war. I think it is a very important war and I am pleased to be identified with it.

Back in Saigon for another look-see, the Secretary was very pleased with what he saw. He said:

> Excellent progress. The plans we laid out in March, if they are consistently followed up, will work effectively.

This was on May 13, 1964. Back in Washington the next day, May 14, 1964, he said that "certain additional U.S. personnel will be needed in Vietnam." Let us mercifully draw the curtains to denote the passage of 24 hours.

On May 15, testifying again here on the Hill, the Secretary was reported to have been "gloomy" and to have said that the anti-Vietcong efforts had deteriorated.

Oh, "what a difference a day makes," as the songwriter says.

On August 5, 1964, the Secretary reported U.S. bombing raids against North Vietnam and reported "energizing" additional Army, Marine, Air Force, and antisubmarine units.

If there is one point in this recount of a thoroughly shoddy situation when it can be said that the custard pie had hit the fan, it was on November 26, 1964, when Secretary McNamara told newsmen they should not interview General Taylor because in his words:

> It would be impossible for Max to talk to these people without leaving the impression the situation is going to hell.

Bear with me, Mr. Speaker. I know that this recounting stretches the credibility to the snapping point, but there are three more "pronouncements" I would like to include.

On February 18, 1965, buoyed up by heaven knows what, the Secretary of Defense said:

> The past year has also brought some encouraging developments.

Visiting in Saigon for the sixth time, the Secretary assayed the situation and delivered himself of this:

> We are no longer losing. It will be a long war.

One more quotation, Mr. Speaker, and I will rest my case. In December of 1965, Mr. McNamara said, when he returned from his seventh trip, that he was "suprised" at the intensity of the war.

I wish I could, like Shakespeare, leave him to heaven, but I cannot. This man, this computerized genius, is at the helm of our ship of war and this dreary record of his faltering, misunderstanding of the situation and the foe we face in Vietnam is a cause for alarm.

If the Secretary had had confidence in the American people and had told them the truth about the situation in Vietnam each time I have recorded his statements, there would not now be the division, the controversy, and the confusion which exists in the minds of many.

I hope this recording serves a useful purpose in setting his record straight.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows, to:

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for February 24 and 25, on account of official business.

Mr. CHELF (at the request of Mr. NATCHER), on account of death of close friend.

Mr. DYAL, for Thursday, Friday, and Monday; February 24, 25, and 28, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Utah), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUCHANAN (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Utah), for 1 hour, on February 28; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 15 minutes, today, on two different subjects; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WAGGONNER (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Utah) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DERWINSKI.
Mr. FINO.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
Mr. SHRIVER.
Mr. MCCLORY.
Mr. MATHIAS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. NATCHER.
Mr. RONCALIO in two instances.
Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER in two instances.
Mr. GILLIGAN.
Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.
Mr. VIVIAN.
Mr. MULTER in two instances.
Mr. IRWIN.
Mr. FRASER.
Mr. COOLEY.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1904. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes.

DEATH OF REV. BERNARD BRASKAMP, CHAPLAIN

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREIGG] is recognized.

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it was with a great deal of sadness that I am called upon today to announce to you the sudden death of our beloved Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Braskamp was born in Alton, Iowa, a small farm community in my district of northwest Iowa.

Since coming to the Congress last year, I was most pleased and proud to have had a series of opportunities to reminisce with our Chaplain about the heritage we both shared. Through this association, I developed a strong sense of respect and admiration for Reverend Braskamp. He typified the personal elements so necessary to the stature of the honored position he held for 16 years. It is significant to recall that the position of Chaplain of the House of Representatives assures us that our daily deliberations begin with thoughts of our

Creator—and the burden of such a responsibility was fully carried by the man whose memory we honor today. The toll of time which placed him among my elders never suffered him to be anything but enthusiastically concerned with his duty to God and this honored body.

My predecessor, the Honorable Charles B. Hoeven, resides in the same community of the birthplace of Reverend Braskamp. There was a great friendship and affection between these gentlemen, and it has been a source of real pride over these many years to the citizens of Alton to have a native-born son serve in as high a position as Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives.

I join with all of the Members of the House of Representatives extending to the immediate family our deepest sympathies.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREIGG. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, all of us are deeply grieved by the loss of our beloved Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp. Only a few days ago he walked with us and among us in this chamber, and tonight he walks with angels.

This man of God, this noble character, has been our spiritual adviser and mentor for 16 years.

His was the voice of the servant of the Lord, adjuring us to maintain the added dimension of spiritual values in all our earthly works. His prayers dimension of spiritual values in all our earthly works. His prayers often reflected the mood and tempo of the House—its crises, its defeats, its victories. In every case he reminded us that these things shall all pass away, but the Kingdom of the Lord shall endure forever. His messages were essentially messages of hope—as is the Christian philosophy itself.

Therefore, while we sorrow at his passing, we are comforted by the knowledge that our friend and spiritual shepherd, has gone to the just reward that surely awaits him.

This distinguished churchman served his Presbyterian congregation for 40 years and was the dean of Presbyterian ministers in Washington, D.C. He was moderator of the Synod of Baltimore, comprising Presbyterian Churches in Washington, Baltimore, and New Castle, Del. His outstanding leadership in sending church aid to the people of Holland during the war caused Queen Wilhelmina to knight him in the Order of Orange Nassau.

Dr. Braskamp's 16 years of service in the House were the capstone of a long and effective career. His interest in politics and government dated back to the days when he enrolled at Princeton specifically to have the opportunity to hear the lectures of its then President, Woodrow Wilson. Mr. Braskamp was originally an Iowan and earlier had attended Grinnell College.

As the House knows, Reverend Braskamp was a learned theologian and philosopher, notwithstanding his love of baseball and his boyhood desire to become a major league player. His scholarship did not prevent his enjoying simple, human things. His humanity was the quality which made him our friend and confidante, as well as our official pastor. We shall greatly miss him; we can never repay our debt to him.

Mrs. Albert and I extend his children and all his loved ones our deepest sympathy.

Mr. GREIGG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GREIGG. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Dr. Braskamp, all of us in this Chamber have lost a good friend and wise counselor. We who have served during his chaplaincy have been strengthened spiritually and religiously by his daily prayer and by the messages which he gave at the opening of each session.

I was particularly fortunate to become well acquainted with him. We were both graduates of the University of Michigan, and would reminisce on many, many occasions about Ann Arbor and our attendance at the university.

Although Dr. Braskamp was a man of God, he was an individual who had a broad interest in all facets of life and a deep appreciation for all people. His daily prayers while we were in session reflected this interest in and concern for his fellow men.

I can speak for those of us on this side and say without hesitation or qualification that this Chamber and its Members were better, each and every day, because we had as the Chaplain of the House, Dr. Bernard Braskamp. We will miss him, and we all extend to his family our very deepest condolences. Dr. Braskamp has left an indelible impression on the House of Representatives.

Mr. GREIGG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREIGG. I yield to the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to concur in the beautiful expressions made here this afternoon by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, by the distinguished majority leader, and by the distinguished minority leader in the tributes they have paid to our late Chaplain, Dr. Braskamp. It was my privilege to have been closely associated with Dr. Braskamp. I saw him almost every day. His office was very close to mine.

Invariably he was a man of good cheer and good spirit, optimistic by nature. He loved his fellowmen. He loved this House of Representatives. He loved our country, and he loved his church and his God. As those who have spoken previously to me have said, all of us in this body are better off because of his years of service here.

He lived a beautiful life. He was saddened with the passing of his wife a few years ago. We used to talk about that. But he was a man of great courage and great faith.

Mr. Speaker, the House has lost a dear friend in the passing of Dr. Braskamp, our Chaplain for more than 15 years. A kind and gentle man was Dr. Braskamp, and we in this House are finer men—we are of stronger faith—because he dwelt among us for so many years.

When I think of Dr. Braskamp, I think of those words which he lived by, from the Book of Joshua, chapter I, verse 9, when the Lord said to Joshua:

> Be strong and of good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed: for the Lord Thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest.

I think that describes the beautiful, inspiring mind of the man who served us so well and so faithfully for so many years.

Dr. Braskamp was born to humble beginnings, but through his own inspiration, intelligence, and hard work, he earned his first degree from the University of Michigan, while working at odd jobs on the campus. His academic record was so superior that he was awarded a scholarship to the Hartford Theological Seminary in Connecticut. From there, he transferred to the Princeton Theological Seminary where he earned both a bachelor's degree in theology and a master's degree in philosophy. He came to us, Mr. Speaker, as acting chaplain for 3 years, and then in 1950, he was elected Chaplain.

A man of wisdom, of kindness and of noble spirit was the Reverend Braskamp, and we shall all miss him. Mr. Speaker, it is the spirit a man leaves behind for which he is most remembered, and Dr. Braskamp was a noble servant of our Lord, who gave of himself unselfishly for his fellow man. His soul now lies with God, where he will receive eternal love. We thank our Lord that Dr. Braskamp ministered to us for so many years.

Mr. GREIGG. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREIGG. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, this House has suffered a deep loss in the death of its Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp. He brought into this Chamber daily a quiet radiance of certainty: that life is continuous; that what we do here is part and parcel of the long trek man is making out of unconscious perfection to perfected consciousness. To him the ancients expressed his deep belief that "never the spirit was born, the spirit shall cease to be never, end and beginning are dreams—birthless and changeless and deathless remains the spirit forever, dead though the house of it seems."

He exhorted us daily to be true to the best that is in us—true to the principle of integrity, honor, and loyalty upon which this great country that he loved so deeply was founded.

I am sure all who knew him rejoice that he has stepped across the threshold so quietly, so gently—may the Infinite bless and keep him now and always.

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREIGG. I yield to the very distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp has come as a painful shock to the membership of the House of Representatives. In his 16 years of ministering to the spiritual needs of the Members, of opening our daily sessions with a simple, earnest prayer, and of friendly talk with individual Members and informal groups, Dr. Braskamp had gathered to himself a host of warm friends. Characteristically, his daily opening prayer, by which Dr. Braskamp's name became familiar to many whose needs or inclinations lead them to consult the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, was brief, to the point, and marked by both a strong religious feeling and a logical commonsense. Since 1958, he had prefaced his prayer of each day with a Scripture text, an admirable custom which I hope his successors may keep up. His strongly held Presbyterianism was not allowed to narrow the scope of his ministry in the House of Representatives, and both his prayers and his Scripture selections were always made in such a way as to hearten and encourage each Member of the House, whatever his particular faith or denomination might be. Those of no creed, or of faiths widely differing from his own, were alike responsive to Dr. Braskamp's human and spiritual warmth, to his evident sincerity, and to his moral force.

Dr. Braskamp came to the House of Representatives as Chaplain after a career of 40 years' service to Presbyterian congregations in Washington, D.C. He had first come to Washington as a young man, in 1911, immediately after his graduation, with degrees both in theology and in philosophy, from Princeton Theological Seminary and Princeton's Graduate School of Philosophy. At first he was assistant pastor of the Church of the Covenant, which is now the National Presbyterian Church, and then was called to the pastorate of the Gurley Memorial Presbyterian Church. He took the lead in the merging of the Gurley congregation with that of the Gunton-Temple Church, and in building the present Gunton-Temple Church at 16th and Newton Streets. There he remained as pastor until his retirement in 1952. In 1950, when Dr. Braskamp was elected Chaplain of the House of Representatives, he was already well known to Members of Congress, as it was then remarked that he had, within the past 10 years, officiated as Acting Chaplain more than 175 times in the House of Representatives, and more than 75 times in the Senate. In 1952, upon his retirement from the active pastorate, Dr. Braskamp became the first full-time Chaplain in either House of Congress.

Dr. Braskamp wore his years and experience, like his learning, lightly. He was a humble and unassuming man, seasoning his earnest remarks with a deprecatory wit. One of his casual remarks has entered into the treasury of American humor, along with the much-quoted sayings of Abraham Lincoln, Mark Twain, and Will Rogers. When someone commented to him about his praying for the House of Representatives, he corrected the statement by saying: "I always look out over the House of Representatives and then I pray for the country."

As pastor of the Gunton-Temple Church, Dr. Braskamp served with distinction, directing his congregation in ways of expressing their faith through practical action. For his church's relief aid to Holland in the period of postwar reconstruction, and for his own personal leadership in that effort, Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands in 1947 made him a Knight of the Order of Orange Nassau, bestowing the decoration upon him personally at a ceremony in the Netherlands Embassy. In the last days of his pastorate, he was dean of the Washington Presbyterian ministers. At the time of his death, he was president of the Princeton Theological Seminary Alumni Association of Washington, and moderator of the synod of Baltimore.

In common with numerous other people, Members of Congress, former members of his congregation, or just friends and acquaintances, I feel a deep loss in the removal of Bernard Braskamp from our midst. He was justly admired and revered by Members of the House of Representatives for his good qualities, both as a straightforward and friendly human being, and as a devoted servant of God. His memory will long be treasured.

I might say, only a few days ago, within the past week, Dr. Braskamp called to see me in my office and to inform me that he intended to retire at the end of this session. I said to him, "Doctor, you may retire as chaplain, but you will always remain the chaplain emeritus of the House of Representatives as long as you live."

I wish to express my personal sense of loss, and my deep sympathy to the surviving members of Dr. Braskamp's family: to his son, Bernard, Jr.; to his daughter, Mrs. Norman E. Tucker; to his brother, Otto, and to his sister, Christina Braskamp. To all of these I offer, both a tribute of sorrow, and an assurance that the splendid record made by their father and brother will stand in honor and affection as long as those who knew him may live.

It is my fervent hope and prayer that now, as in the past, Bernard Braskamp may continue to look out over the House of Representatives, and that from his place in Heaven he will continue to pray for the country.

Mr. GREIGG. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREIGG. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our esteemed Chaplain and my professional colleague, gives occasion for expressions of sorrow at his passing and condolences to his survivors. Eulogies to great men are, on rare occasion, best spoken when such men can no longer hear the testimonies to their greatness. The occasion of our Chaplain's translation into glory is an instance of this sort, for the Rev. Bernard Braskamp was such a humble man that tributes to him could embarrass him. In his heart and mind he felt that tributes belonged alone to the God whom he loved and the Lord whom he served. He believed that God had brought him to the position as Chaplain of the House of Representatives, so that he could perform the dual function of an ambassador for Christ, namely, to speak to us for God and to speak to God for us.

He never lost his sense of the prophetic role. His daily meditations were begun by citations from the Holy Scriptures, so that we might be reminded to listen first to the voice of God before we presumed to lift our hearts and voices to God. He was a profound theologian, as his prayers amply indicated.

He captured the tensions of our times, the fears of our hearts, and the struggles in our minds in his role as intercessor for us all. He knew our weakness, so he led us to lean on God's strength. He knew our need for wisdom, so he asked God to give us wise and understanding hearts. He knew the loneliness we feel in making crucial decisions, so he prayed to God to guide us with His unfailing presence.

His pastoral concern reached down into our private and family concerns. He sought us out when he sensed our need for personal encouragement, and he served as prophet and intercessor when affliction and sorrow touched members of our families.

On this Ash Wednesday, 1966, when Christians throughout the world meditate upon the suffering and death of our Lord Jesus Christ so that He might reconcile men to God and to one another, we pause to honor the memory of one who followed in the steps of Him "Who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." May the blessing of God now rest on that ministry to us as we comfort Chaplain Bernard Braskamp's loved ones and ourselves with the promise given those who walk in His steps: "Where I am, there shall also my servant be."

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my fellow Iowan, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my distinguished colleague from Iowa, and the leadership of the House of Representatives in the comments and remarks that have been made here on this sad occasion.

All of us are deeply grieved by the loss sustained through the passing of this good servant of the Lord.

In Dr. Braskamp I found, as a native Iowan and a fellow Presbyterian, a welcome handclasp and a friendship that was stimulating.

During the 14 months I knew him I came to look forward to his incisive choices of Scripture that prefaced the opening prayer each day. Dr. Braskamp distinguished himself as a churchman in this area long before he came to serve as Chaplain of the House of Representatives. I am certain that his 16 years of service to this body will stand as an eloquent monument to a gifted and dedicated spirit.

Mr. GREIGG. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREIGG. I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our Chaplain and friend, Reverend Braskamp, has saddened all of us here in the House of Representatives. I, like all of my colleagues, will miss Dr. Braskamp's thoughtful and inspiring message each day as the House opened, but even more, the very presence of this man was a comfort to all who knew him. We all felt the influence of his guardianship over our deliberations and his concern that we do what is right for the people of this country. I believe that I can find no better words to sum up Dr. Braskamp's life than the following words from one of his very own prayers for us:

> Endow us with that magnanimous and sacrificial spirit of our Saviour who never spared Hismelf in the great mission of giving to needy humanity the morning wonder and glory of a new day.

Mr. Speaker, we may all feel honored to have known and associated with Reverend Braskamp, and our days will be less full for his absence.

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, our beloved Chaplain, Reverend Braskamp, has gone to the Great Beyond.

I want to compliment the gentleman in the well of the House, the gentleman from Iowa, the distinguished Speaker, and the leadership of the House of Representatives for taking this time to recognize this great Chaplain. He opened each one of our sessions with an opening prayer, and I think we would all agree he was of great service to all the Members of this House for many, many years and served them well. Also he was a servant of God in the best meaning of that word. He was loved by all who knew him. I personally am stronger for having had the privilege of associating with him.

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the late and Reverend Dr. Braskamp, not because he was Chaplain of this House, but because he was a personal friend of mine. I had many friendly discussions with him, unknown to many of my colleagues. In one of our discussions we discussed the term "Aloha." When I gave him what we in Hawaii deem to be the meaning of "Aloha," he said, "That is what this world really needs—Aloha—the spirit of love. The love of man for God. The love of man for man."

Mr. Speaker, he gave me much counseling during the short time that I knew him. Because I found in him a man of great wisdom, I sought his counsel in many matters. As a friend I shed a tear for him upon his passing and to his loved ones I extend my sincere condolence and my deepest sympathy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the death of Chaplain Bernard Braskamp.

Born in Alton, Iowa, 79 years ago, he knew the rigors of life in those comparatively early pioneer days. He struggled for the education that eventually brought him to the Presbyterian ministry and thence, in 1950, to the duties of Chaplain of the House of Representatives and it has been my pleasure to know him since that time.

In 1961, Reverend Braskamp suffered the grievous loss of his beloved wife but his dedication to the House of Representatives and its Members was not diminished.

He will be greatly missed in the Chamber in which he officiated so long, and I join with my colleagues in extending sympathy to the surviving members of his family.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the voice of this body's spiritual leader has been stilled and the Members stand bereft as we mourn the passing of a great Christian, our Chaplain.

It is not an easy task to invite divine intervention in the affairs of the Nation when so many of us approach God's throne by such devious paths. Our Chaplain, however, was unique in that while he respected the doctrinal sensibilities of each one of us, he was able to speak in tones of conviction and reverence that reflected our endless groping toward the true light.

Reverend Braskamp and I, as fellow Presbyterians, found much in common in our concern over some of the liberal tendencies espoused by too many of those of our persuasion. Beyond that, he was one of my most respected counselors and I often discussed with him some of those perplexities that beset the souls of all of us in our contemplation of the ascendancy of lawlessness as well as that philosophical preoccupation with the atheistic contention that "God is dead."

Our hearts go out to his family in this time of sorrow. We are joined with them in this moment of heartbreak. But in the contemplation of a glorious sunrise on that distant shore, we rejoice with them that our good friend, and their beloved, will be there to greet us when we, too, have crossed over.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over the years in this body, we meet many outstanding individuals with whom we rub elbows day by day. Some of them are the type of men who leave their mark and who have a profound effect on the minds and souls of those with whom they come in contact. Now, we have lost one of the great ones in the passing of our beloved Chaplain, Dr. Bernard Braskamp. As we carry on without him, those of us who have known him will feel the presence and the guiding light of this strong man of God. He will continue to influence our lives as long as those lives shall last.

Dr. Braskamp was a kind and understanding person whose sole thought was to give of himself to others. His prayers were thoughtful and always gaged to the spiritual needs of each day. He was down-to-earth as Christ was down-to-earth, deeply spiritual, of course, as a great minister must be but still a simple and unassuming man among men.

When he first became our Chaplain, I asked him, just before a new Congress, whether he would think favorably of inviting the membership to join in the Lord's Prayer. He thought it was a good idea and from that time until this past January, Members will recall that at the opening of each new Congress we said the prayer together as the Lord taught us.

Dr. Braskamp always gave me credit for this procedure, and I have no doubt that in his mind this was deserved. However, as I always told him, I got the idea from his predecessor, Dr. Montgomery. Nevertheless, I am glad it was I who suggested it to Dr. Braskamp and I commend the practice to his successor. To me, there is nothing more stirring in the entire congressional year than the moment when we bow our heads and say the Lord's Prayer together.

And so our beloved Chaplain has been called to some work higher than mortal and we shall have to depend on memories to sustain us in our loss. My sympathy goes out to his bereaved family. They will take comfort from the knowledge that he is now with his beloved wife who preceded him to heavenly rest some years ago.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the account of the passing of Dr. Braskamp which appeared in the morning press revealed a full and useful life of dedication to the ministry.

I was deeply impressed reading of the determination this gentle, modest man showed as a youngster fighting against odds to get an education.

We all know how devoted Dr. Braskamp was to the House of Representatives as an institution and to each of us as individual Members.

His kindness and good will was reflected in every conversation I ever had with him, and I had many, because talking with him was always a warm and pleasant experience.

Dr. Braskamp brought to his assignment as Chaplain of the House of Representatives a distinguished background of church leadership.

But it was not his experience, but his qualities of character—his helpfulness, his humanity and his never-failing sense of humor—which so endeared him to all of us.

As he was devoted to us, we were devoted to him, and shall sorely miss having him walk among us from day to day.

To his bereaved children and to his brother and sister I offer my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has had the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives and hearing the daily inspirational messages of Dr. Bernard Braskamp, will never be quite the same sort of person.

His was a quiet voice, but a voice of power. It was a soothing influence in the often troubled din of congressional debate. His wise counsel helped many a troubled legislator over the rough spots which so often occur.

Dr. Braskamp will be missed, but his influence will never quite be forgotten in the House of Representatives and we are better human beings and America is a better place because he served here.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Dr. Bernard Braskamp, Chaplain of the House of Representatives for the past 16 years, is indeed a sad occasion for every Member of the House. His spiritual guidance and eloquent prayers have been an immeasurable source of inspiration and comfort to us all ever since he first assumed his duties in 1950. We have all lost a beloved pastor whose abiding interest was the spiritual welfare of this House and all who had the good fortune to know him.

Dr. Braskamp spent virtually his entire ministry in the city of Washington, D.C. In 1911, after receiving his bachelor of theology and master of arts in philosophy, he accepted a call to the famous Church of the Covenant, now known as the National Presbyterian Church. From that time on he was a leader in the spiritual affairs of the city and became an internationally recognized leader in religious circles.

However, we will all remember him as one of our own, leading us, praying for us, and counseling us in his gentle, convincing way. It was my privilege to be his friend, and it was a friendship from which I grew great sustenance. He was always willing to lend an ear, he was a kind and effective spiritual counselor. He was a man of profound convictions, a man whose life was moved by a deep faith in God. This faith and conviction was manifest in everything he did, and certainly we Members of the House were far richer because of his influence.

In a moving prayer offered in the House after the death of President John F. Kennedy, Dr. Braskamp prayed:

> We are not saying "farewell" but only "goodnight" for this is our faith that someday we shall dwell together in hallowed union and be forever with our blessed Lord in that fairer land whose language is music and where there is eternal joy.

In this spirit, I bid my dear friend a fond "goodnight."

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the total amount of good in the world is measured by the quality of superior lives. So long as we have men in the character of our beloved Chaplain, evil can make no headway. We mourn his passing in the ripeness of years, but even more we treasure the memory of his days among us.

Dr. Braskamp has filled two careers with worthy deeds. First, he served his chosen church with distinction through a long period that would encompass an ordinary lifetime. Then he came to us in the House, where he has touched the life of each and every one of us, possibly at times when we were scarcely aware of his influence. The inner glow of security in his own personality shone through and warmed us when we were sick at heart and overwhelmed with doubt and uncertainty.

> Greatness and goodness are not means, but ends.
> Hath he not always treasures, always friends,
> The good, great man? Three treasures, love, and light,
> And calm thoughts, regular as infant's breath;
> And three firm friends, more sure than day and night,
> Himself, his Maker, and the angel Death.
>
> —COLERIDGE.

Dr. Braskamp's career calls to mind the ancient rabbinic legend of Sandalphon, the angel of prayer, as rehearsed for us by Longfellow. In the legend, Sandalphon stood at the outermost gates of the city celestial listening to the sounds that ascended from the earth beneath:

> From the spirits on earth that adore,
> From the souls that entreat and implore
> In the fervor and passion of prayer;
> From the hearts that are broken with losses,
> And weary with dragging the crosses
> Too heavy for mortals to bear.
> And he gathers the prayers as he stands,
> And they change into flowers in his hands,
> Into garlands of purple and red;
> And beneath the great arch of the portal,
> Through the streets of the City Immortal
> Is wafted the fragrance they shed.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join with my colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of our late beloved friend and Chaplain, the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp.

Reverend Braskamp was a great and good man, Mr. Speaker, a man who devoted his life to the Christian ministry. As Chaplain of the House, Reverend Braskamp in his daily prayers—memorable, devout, searching prayers—recorded the stream of human events.

His memorial prayer for the late President John F. Kennedy was pure eloquence. His prayer of hope for his successor, President Lyndon B. Johnson, was an inspiring message of encouragement to our new leader.

From a small house in Alton, Iowa, Dr. Braskamp made his way ultimately to Washington and to this House. He was a wonderful man—a great American, a fine human being, a gentleman, and a living inspiration to us all. We shall miss him greatly.

I extend to his family an expression of deepest sympathy in their loss and bereavement. A great and good man has gone to his reward.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, this House has sustained a great loss this week with the passing of our beloved Chaplain, the Rev. Dr. Bernard Braskamp.

In his quiet way, Dr. Braskamp was a constant source of spiritual comfort to all Members of this House, both those who shared his denominational preference and those who were members of other faiths. All of us, in different ways, have profited by knowing this kindly and gracious man. His passing leaves a great void in this House, but he shall never be forgotten by those of us to whom he gave so generously of himself.

For more than a half century, Dr. Braskamp did God's work and the world is a better place for his presence. To all Members of the House his loss comes as a personal one. Each of us has lost a good friend.

Mrs. Daniels joins with me in extending our condolences to his son, Bernard, Jr., and to his daughter, Mrs. Norman E. Tucker, and to the other members of his family.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Washington as a freshman Member of the House, one of the things I found most heartening was the high quality spiritual guidance given the Members of the House of Representatives by their Chaplain, the late Reverend Bernard Braskamp. Perhaps I responded more warmly to him because he was a fellow Iowan and because he also rose from modest beginnings and found, through education, a means to serve others. I only know that I found his daily message a source of wisdom and inspiration and one which helped me view the daily round of quorum calls, rollcalls, and speeches as part of the continuing march of our national history.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say how fortunate the House of Representatives has been in being served by so illustrious a Chaplain as Dr. Braskamp, and I join all Members, both old and new, in offering my sympathy to his family and to all who have lost his valued guidance. Dr. Braskamp, however, had lived life to the full and in a manner worthy of his calling. There can be no finer eulogy to him than to paraphrase a line from one of the last prayers he offered for us. Surely, for him, that prayer, uttered just a few weeks ago, was fully answered for he, indeed, had "removed from him everything that holds us back from a complete surrender to Thy ways and Thy will."

Mr. Speaker, there can be no higher praise than to acknowledge that in Dr. Braskamp, we knew a man who preached to us, not only with his words, but also with his life.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the unexpected death of our beloved Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, was a great shock. He was a man of wisdom, and good counsel who daily reminded this House that everything we do here, no matter how vital and enduring it may seem at the moment, shall all pass away but that the Kingdom of the Lord shall endure forever.

For 16 years Chaplain Braskamp ministered to this House, invoking divine blessings on our efforts. Although he was a stanch Presbyterian, he served God; and his ministry applied alike to all who serve and have served in this House.

We will miss this good and wise man who so honorably served the Lord in this Hall of public servants. I join my colleagues in extending condolences to his family and assure them that their father and brother has won an enduring place in the annals of Congress.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, all of us are saddened with the passing of our beloved Chaplain. His voice is now silenced but he is still to be heard. He is saying to us now what he has many times said in his counsel to us, individually and collectively. Whatever the loss, whatever the problem, however dark and formidable things may appear, whatever our grief and whatever our hardship: "Be of good cheer."

In our grief of losing Dr. Braskamp we need but remind ourselves of his sustaining words of encouragement: "be of good cheer." "God's will be done."

The words he lived by come from Joshua:

> Be strong and of good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed; for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest.

In his prayers, as he opened each session for 16 years, he would inspire us and encourage us in the tasks before us. In more ways than we will ever know he gave us courage and renewed our strength.

To his bereaved family I offer my sincerest sympathy.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the passing of our beloved Chaplain. Dr. Bernard Braskamp, who labored in the service of the Master for over half a century, climaxed his ministry with almost two decades of service to the House of Representatives.

For these many years he has opened our daily deliberations with appeals for divine guidance, inspired us to nobler efforts as we struggled with the problems of war and peace, and lightened our labors with spiritual comfort.

For some time Dr. Braskamp had prefaced his daily devotions with passages from the Bible. I believe that these recitations from the Scriptures have led the members of his congressional flock to read further from the Word of God.

Like Apollos, one of the fellow servants of the Apostle Paul, Dr. Braskamp was an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures, instructed in the way of the Lord, and being fervent in the spirit, he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord.

Mrs. Collier and I extend our sympathies to the family. We know that they will be comforted and sustained with the knowledge that the ministry of their father and brother has borne much fruit.

In the words of the Master:

> Well done, good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today this House is saddened by the loss of a great man, Dr. Bernard Braskamp.

Our beloved Chaplain has been taken from us. God's vicar in the House of Representatives has been called to the side of his Maker.

What can I say? Words fail to adequately express the impact of this man upon all of us who serve today in this body, and those who preceded us during the 16 years Bernard Braskamp was the Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

For nearly six decades, this good, this tender, this dedicated man unselfishly gave of himself in the service of others.

He came to us following four decades as pastor of one of the Nation's Capital's greatest churches.

This man was always available to comfort.

He was always available to counsel.

This man was always available to give hope where there seemed to be none. He was always ready with a smile and a humorous word to cheer, and somehow brighten even the darkest of days.

This House has had its giants. It does today. It will tomorrow.

But, somehow, a man like Bernard Braskamp is in a class all to himself.

He performed not a simple—not an easy task.

He tenderly, wisely led his flock. He was the good shepherd.

Both Mrs. Gibbons and I extend our heartfelt sympathies to Dr. Braskamp's family.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp was pastor to us all. There was not a Member of this body who did not feel a personal closeness to him. Our grief at his passing is deep and it is universal. He served his God and his fellowman with humility and dedication. The influence of his spirituality, reflecting his simple but unquestioning faith, will remain with us forever.

He was devoted to his wife and children, and after the death of Mrs. Braskamp he seemed to be marking time, as it were, until the happy hour of his reunion with his beloved in the realms above.

To his daughter, Mrs. Norman E. Tucker, and his son, Bernard, Jr., and other members of the family I extend my sympathy.

It seems only yesterday, although actually a number of years ago, that Dr. Braskamp was telling me with pride of his son's marriage to a charming young woman of Chicago's South Side. After that marriage the Chicago delegation felt that we had a share in the proprietorship of the House Chaplain. We often reminded him that while he may have been born and brought up in Iowa, his daughter-in-law came from our State of Illinois. Dr. Braskamp was so beloved everyone sought some reason for claiming a special share in him.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that all of us here note the passing of our beloved Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, D.D. Dr. Braskamp has faithfully served the House of Representatives for 16 years and during all those years provided a needed and welcomed daily moment of reflection and rededication.

For more than 40 years Rev. Dr. Braskamp served his church and God well. His church in return recognized his service and godliness. At the time of his death he was moderator of the Synod of Baltimore, dean of the Presbyterian Ministers in Washington and president of the Princeton Theological Seminary Association in Washington.

It was the mark of the man, Mr. Speaker, that despite the many different religious beliefs held by the many Members of this body he was able to find a common, sincere ground for all. He daily was the means whereby each Member, in keeping with his own faith, could for a moment at least withdraw from the frenetic life and ponder the higher order of things. It is ironic and sad, Mr. Speaker, that this same privilege is denied many of our schoolchildren.

In the past 16 years that Dr. Braskamp was Chaplain of the House of Representatives, I came to know him quite well. It was a matter of some amusement between us, for instance, that Brooklyn could also claim him as a son since he was ordained there in 1911. The power, sincerity, and warmth of the man were such that I consider myself fortunate to have known him. To that I can only add that I have lost a true friend as was his lovely wife who passed away about 5 years ago.

I extend to his son and daughter and loved ones my deepest sympathy upon their great loss.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, with profound sorrow I join my colleagues in expressing our grief over the loss of our Chaplain, Dr. Bernard Braskamp.

He was a great force for good in our midst and all of us are better for having known him. He was full of sympathetic and generous impulses toward us, and all mankind, and he will not be forgotten by any of us who served here with him.

We mourn his passing as a cherished member of our family circle, and I wish to join my friends and colleagues in expressing my great esteem for our friend and spiritual leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the death of Dr. Bernard Braskamp, Chaplain of the House of Representatives, was a shock to all of us and countless others who knew and respected him.

Many of you knew of the warm friendship existing between the late Dr. Braskamp and Charles B. Hoeven, a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives from the Sixth Congressional District of Iowa, until his retirement in 1964.

The moving tribute to Dr. Braskamp by his longtime friend will be of deep interest to everyone.

TRIBUTE TO DR. BERNARD BRASKAMP

(By Hon. Charles B. Hoeven, former Member of Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of Iowa)

Dr. Bernard Braskamp, Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives, was one of my dearest and devoted friends. I deeply regret his sudden passing and shall miss him very much in the days that lie ahead.

Dr. Braskamp became Chaplain of the House of Representatives in 1950 and served in that capacity with honor and distinction until the time of his death. Prior to becoming Chaplain, Dr. Braskamp had served as Assistant Chaplain for 3 years during the absence of the then Chaplain, Dr. Montgomery.

Dr. Braskamp was born in my hometown of Alton, Iowa, and I recall making a speech in the House of Representatives when he was first chosen to be the Chaplain of the House. In that speech, I tried to reflect the feeling of admiration and pride which the people of Alton had for one of their distinguished sons. Later on, when Dr. Braskamp's prayers in the House were first published as a House document, he asked me to write the foreword which he continued to use in subsequent publications until the time of his death. It also has been my rare privilege, as chairman of the Republican conference of the House of Representatives, to nominate Dr. Braskamp for the position of Chaplain on the convening of three sessions of the Congress.

In introducing Dr. Braskamp to some of my friends, I often referred to him as one of my "shirttail relatives," in that his oldest brother married one of my father's sisters. In short, we had a close companionship throughout our joint service in the House of Representatives, and I have many happy recollections of our close association throughout the years.

Dr. Braskamp took great pride in the fact that for many years three Alton, Iowa, boys served together in official capacities in the House of Representatives; they being the late Claude S. Scheckel, one of the official reporters of debates, Dr. Braskamp as Chaplain, and myself as a Member of Congress from the

Sixth Congressional District of Iowa, in which the town of Alton, Iowa, is located. Practically every day when the House was in session, the three of us chatted together about people and events in our old hometown. Naturally, our friendship ripened throughout the years.

Dr. Braskamp was a great and a good man, whom I can best describe as a first-class Christian gentleman. Although an ordained minister of the Gospel, with deep religious convictions, he was also one who had the "common touch." He was a dedicated and loyal servant of his Lord and Master and served well his day and generation. Those in the House of Representatives, whom he served so well, have had their lives enriched through the daily prayers offered in their behalf. Mrs. Hoeven joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to the surviving son and daughter and to all members of the family.

"Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, for 16 years the U.S. House of Representatives was privileged to have as its Chaplain the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp. This servant of the Lord lived a life reflecting his profound belief in God and the principles He taught.

Reverend Braskamp's actions will long serve as an inspiration to each of us who knew him. His wise reflections and ministrations were sources of strength and courage to this House in many difficult times.

I would take this opportunity to express my sympathies to Dr. Braskamp's family. What a great sense of loss they must feel at this time. At the same time, they must also sense a feeling of pride and love knowing that God's work was furthered during Reverend Braskamp's lifetime.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow that I learned of the passing of our Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, who so faithfully served the House of Representatives for 16 years. My association with Dr. Braskamp had been but a brief 3 years, but I had come to rely on his devotion to our spiritual needs, which was marked by a distinct capacity to raise our level of vision of the tasks and responsibilities thrust upon us and to broaden our outlook. His daily prayers inspired us to rely on balanced judgments, steady hands, and awakened conscience, and to pray and work for the good of our fellow men. He had given us courage and steadfastness to face our duties with new hope. He was an intimate, respected member of our family and will be sorely missed.

My deepest sympathy goes to the members of his family in their great loss.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, When Dr. Braskamp, our beloved Chaplain, died the House lost another one of its inspirations. It would be needless for me to say he was a devoted, able public servant because everybody knows that.

He had that happy facility, whether you were in bed ill or on your feet feeling fine, of making you feel better. He was truly one of God's great leaders. All of us will miss him much.

Our deepest sympathy goes to his loved ones in this, their hour of great loss.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it would be extremely disappointing if I were unable to add a few words to the volumes of appreciation and admiration which followed the passing on of our beloved Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp.

All of us are familiar with the outstanding events of his life, from his birth in Alton, Iowa, to his quiet "moving on" here in Washington. None of this needs to be repeated here.

In the 16 years that he served as the first full-time Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives, all of us became aware of his practice of reciting appropriate verses of Scripture, preliminary to his prayer for divine guidance and support for the deliberations of the Members of Congress.

This mild-mannered and devout man of the spirit was beloved by all. In my frequent contacts and informal visits with Reverend Braskamp, I always felt a warmth radiating from this man. He displayed a kindly consideration and respect for the serious nature of the work of the Congress as well as an appreciation of the Members' desire to acknowledge that the guidance of divine providence entered into the grave decisionmaking in the U.S. House of Representatives.

In going from us, it is comforting to believe that he has gone on—a little ahead of us, and that somewhere he is still repeating those verses which were a testimony to his and our faiths in the mercy and justice he sought to convey to us and to all mankind.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker the death of the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp means not only the loss of an inspiring spiritual leader, but the loss of a valued personal friend to each Member of the House of Representatives, as well as to vast numbers of his former parishioners in Washington, and to the many who had come to know him in other ways. It is difficult to imagine how so simple and unassuming a man could achieve so spectacular a success in his ministry.

Somehow, his earnest sincerity became all the more effective because it was combined with friendly humor, just as his learning and logic became the more effective because they were combined with wit. The words of praise and sorrow spoken on the floor of the House since his death, and entered in the Record, are no mere matter of courteous recognition of Dr. Braskamp's 16 years of devoted service as Chaplain, but a heartfelt tribute of affection from the numerous individuals who had felt the full impact of his personality.

Seeing what great numbers of individuals are deeply and personally affected by Dr. Braskamp's death, I am reminded of the story about the funeral service of another great minister of the Gospel, Father Francis P. Duffy, chaplain of the "Fighting 69th" in World War I. A man is said to have come to the door of New York's great St. Patrick's Cathedral, while the service was going on, and demanded to be admitted because, he said, he had been an intimate friend of Father Duffy. The policeman with whom he was expostulating waved one hand toward the full cathedral, and the other toward the overflow crowd massed on the sidewalk, and said: "So were all these."

It took little contact with Dr. Braskamp to establish a feeling of intimate friendship. He was one who cared deeply, for the fulfillment of his Christian ministry in the service of God, for his prayerful contribution to the welfare of the country and of the House of Representatives, and for the concerns of each individual who came in any way within the scope of his generous ministry. He was so effective as Chaplain of the House of Representatives because we knew that he was truly concerned, both about each of us as a human individual, and about our problems of political and moral judgment.

He was aware, and he made it his business to keep us aware, that every political problem has its moral aspect—that every proposed measure must be scrutinized from the viewpoint of two inseparable questions: "Will it work?" and "Is it right?" The pragmatist is satisfied with the answer to the first question. The starry-eyed idealist is satisfied with the answer to the second. The Christian politician, as Dr. Braskamp so often and so forcibly reminded us, must seek solutions both practical and just. The Reverend Bernard Braskamp has earned from us, his many sorrowing friends, the noblest epitaph any man could hope for: we feel that we are better men for having known him.

On Sunday, April 18, 1965, Dr. Braskamp was the guest on my special Easter Sunday television and radio broadcast. Because of the reflections of Dr. Braskamp's life and work given in the discussion we had on this occasion, I am particularly pleased to share with my colleagues excerpts from this interview:

Mr. Horton. In keeping with the spirit of this Easter Sunday, I am pleased to have as my guest today the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives. Dr. Braskamp is the first man ever to serve the House of Representatives full time as its Chaplain and he has served the post longer than any other man in history for the past 16 years.

Our Chaplain is a native of Iowa; he graduated from the University of Michigan and received his master's degree from Princeton University. Before coming to the House of Representatives in 1950, Dr. Braskamp served 40 years as pastor of a number of churches in the Washington area. Of Dr. Braskamp, the late Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn from Texas, said, "To the entire membership of the House of Representatives he is a counselor, friend, and brother."

I am honored to endorse this sentiment and welcome Dr. Braskamp to this Easter Sunday "Report From Washington."

Dr. Braskamp. Frank, that is a very complimentary introduction. I appreciate it.

Mr. Horton. Thank you, Dr. Braskamp. I'm sure that my constituents would be very much interested in what special ministerial duties you find distinguish your work in Congress from the many years you served in individual churches.

Dr. Braskamp. I remember very distinctly when I first ascended the rostrum to offer the prayer 16 years ago. Mr. Taft's campaign manager from Ohio said, "Now, 'Barnie,' " (he always called me "Barnie") "I'll tell you what you want to do—you want to take a good look at the Congressmen, then pray for the country."

I've been doing that ever since.

Mr. HORTON. Has the House always had a minister that serves as Chaplain?

Dr. BRASKAMP. Yes, I think so, from the very beginning of the Continental Congress.

Mr. HORTON. I always note that when there is some pressing national concern, some national crisis, you frequently reflect this in your prayers and ask for God's help.

Dr. BRASKAMP. Naturally, I try to make my prayers appropriate for the occasion and when there is some very pressing crisis, I refer to that.

Mr. HORTON. I try, of course, to get over for the opening of each session. Many of our citizens don't realize that we start at 12:00 noon when we are in session. Of course, we do open with a prayer. Do you usually perform that function?

Dr. BRASKAMP. Yes. According to the ruling made by the Speaker, I am privileged to have one guest Chaplain per week. For awhile, with 435 Members, we had so many requests the Speaker decided to limit the number. So, from that time on we have had only one per week.

Mr. HORTON. I notice also that you have the habit of prefacing your opening prayer with a verse of Scripture. Why do you do this and where did this custom come from?

Dr. BRASKAMP. Well, naturally one evening when I was in my study I picked from my bookshelves a copy of the "Book of Prayers," by Edward Everett Heel, who was Chaplain of the Senate in 1900, and I noticed that he prefaced all his prayers with a verse of Scripture. So, the next morning I told the Speaker that I had made this observation and he suggested I do the same thing. Ever since I have been prefacing all my prayers with a verse of Scripture—from both the Old and New Testaments.

Mr. HORTON. Do you find that you get many comments from the Members of the House or from spectators who are in the gallery about the prayer?

Dr. BRASKAMP. Oh yes, quite frequently at the close of the prayer someone comes to me and says it was a fine prayer or that they appreciate my remembering an event in my prayer.

Mr. HORTON. Of course, I realize that many people don't know this, but your work does include more than opening each session with prayer. Tell me a little about some of your other duties.

Dr. BRASKAMP. As you stated a moment ago, I happen to be the first Chaplain in the history of the Congress who is making it a full-time ministry. Years before all the Chaplains were men with parishes of their own. Naturally, they couldn't spend much time with the Congress after the prayer. But after my prayer I usually sit on both sides and make no distinction between the two parties, and I feel as much at home with the Democrats as I do with the Republicans—the Republicans as much as the Democrats.

Mr. HORTON. Do you have many opportunities for private counseling or any requests for private counseling?

Dr. BRASKAMP. Yes, quite frequently I have, in addition to my duties to offer the opening prayer, requests for counseling. I have an office in the Capitol—a very fine office; it's very beautiful. I frequently have time for counseling with Members of the Congress. They have their own problems, you know, as the folks did in my parish before during those 45 years that I was in the ministry.

Mr. HORTON. From my knowledge of the work you do, you really are not only a minister for all the Congressmen in the House of Representatives, but probably your congregation is the largest in the country.

Dr. BRASKAMP. Well, you take 435 Members and their families and clerks—or anyone who connects in any way with Congress—and all are perfectly free to call on me for any service I can render.

Mr. HORTON. I think it is important this Easter season to leave the impression with those who are watching this show and listening to it on the radio that there is a sense of faith in God and a reverence for God here in the Nation's Capital. And, in spite of all the inroads that have been made into prayer in school, the problems dealing with the Supreme Court decision, there is a strong reliance here in the Congress on God.

Dr. BRASKAMP. I believe, FRANK, that during the last 10 years there has been noted evidence on the part of the Members in spiritual things. The first subject of conversation when I visit with a Member of Congress is one of religion.

Mr. HORTON. Dr. Braskamp, are there any special events that you have noticed in the last 16 years that stand out in your mind in your duties as Chaplain?

Dr. BRASKAMP. The day when the Puerto Ricans opened fire, I happened to be on the floor and sat about 50 feet from Kenneth Roberts of Alabama. I called every day on those Members of Congress, especially when men they knew were seriously injured. I had a wonderful opportunity then to find out just what their thoughts were along the line of the spiritual.

Mr. HORTON. Another thing I'd like to point out, Dr. Braskamp, is that I hold in my hand a book of prayers that were offered by you. This was published as a public record and I understand that very shortly you are going to have a new book "Book of Prayers" which will set forth some of the prayer messages that you have given in the openings of Congress.

Dr. BRASKAMP. This one contains all of the prayers that I have offered, not any of the prayers of the guest chaplains. The Speaker thought we might as well include only the prayers of the Chaplain. Now these books are printed every 4 years by resolution of Congress.

Mr. HORTON. Dr. Braskamp, in the short time that we have left, perhaps you might say a word by way of an Easter message to my constituency.

Dr. BRASKAMP. I would be delighted, for after all, you and I, as church members and Christians, believe that the Easter Sunday is the greatest day on the calendar of the church year, emphasizing some of the things we often take for granted. First, it is the outstanding manifestation of the power of God—Son of God raised from the dead by the power of God. And then, the outstanding fact that we're thinking about the resurrection of the Christ. The atheist doesn't, of course, believe in anything of that kind and says it is all a record, this whole business of religion; then the agnostic says, "Who knows, Christ is not with us now." But those who believe in the Christian faith feel that Christ has risen from the dead and is now among us.

Mr. HORTON. I think it is appropriate as we close that we recognize that even here in Washington, where there is great bustle and great activity of a capital of a democracy where man is free under God, we pause here to pay honor of God and to recognize that the things we have, the gifts we have, the talents we have are gifts to us from God and that it is important for each of us to use those as best we can to make His kingdom here on earth a little bit better for those that we serve.

Dr. Braskamp, I want to thank you for being here today.

Dr. BRASKAMP. I'm grateful to you, FRANK, and send my greetings to your folks, will you?

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I would call to the attention of the Members of the House that funeral services for Reverend Braskamp will be held Friday, February 25, at 1 p.m. at Sixth Presbyterian Church, 16th and Kennedy Streets NW., with the interment at Rock Creek Cemetery. Those wishing to pay their respects may call at the Hines Funeral Home, 2901 14th Streets NW., until 10 p.m. today and between the hours of 8 a.m. and 10 p.m. tomorrow, Thursday, February 24.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and public service of the late Reverend Braskamp.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE BERNARD BRASKAMP, D.D., CHAPLAIN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 745

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Bernard Braskamp, D.D., Chaplain of the House.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to his memory the Speaker appoint a committee of seven Members to attend the funeral services.

Resolved, That the necessary expenses in connection with the funeral services be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints, as members of the committee to attend the funeral of our beloved Chaplain, the following Members of the House: Mr. GREIGG, Mr. GROSS, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. BANDSTRA, Mr. CULVER, Mr. HANSEN of of Iowa, and Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The House stands adjourned in memory of our late beloved Chaplain.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, February 24, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2082. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of approval of mortgage insurance on housing project for the elderly in Houston, Tex., Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2083. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings through direct procurement of components used in production of variable timing fuses, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2084. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a communication relative to the report on potential savings through direct procurement of components used in production of variable timing fuses, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2085. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, to provide economic assistance to local governmental bodies affected thereby, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DANIELS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 5147. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Acts of 1959 to permit until December 31, 1965, certain additional health benefits plans to come within the purview of such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1296). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 741. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 9963, a bill to promote the economic development of the State of Alaska by providing for U.S. participation in the statewide exposition to be held in Alaska during 1967; without amendment (Rept. No. 1297). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 742. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12169, a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1298). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 743. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12889, a bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1299). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 12973. A bill to require certain sanitation measures in laundries of federally operated or federally assisted hospitals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 12974. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of surplus personal property to State and local governments, Indian groups under Federal supervision, and volunteer firefighting and rescue organizations at 50 percent of the estimated fair market value; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12975. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder based on increases in the cost of living and the gross national product; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 12976. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act by adding a new title X thereto which will establish a program to protect adult health by providing assistance in the establishment and operation of regional and community health protection centers for the detection of disease, by providing assistance for the training of personnel to operate such centers, and by providing assistance in the conduct of certain research related to such centers and their operation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 12977. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIDER:

H.R. 12978. A bill to permit the city of Memphis, Tenn., to count expenditures in connection with the Beale Street interceptor sewer as local grants-in-aid to certain urban renewal projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 12979. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 12980. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 12981. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat sintering or burning as a mining process in the case of shale, clay, and slate, used or sold for use as lightweight concrete aggregates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 12982. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 12983. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the determination of American selling price in the case of certain footwear of rubber or plastics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 12984. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 12985. A bill to provide that the United States shall make no payments or contributions to the United Nations for furnishing assistance to Communist countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 12986. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as it relates to those areas to be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 12987. A bill to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 12988. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12989. A bill to provide that tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use on motor vehicles shall comply with certain safety and labeling regulations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12990. A bill to prescribe certain safety features for all motor vehicles manufactured for, sold, or shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12991. A bill to provide for research, design, development, and construction of fully operational passenger motor vehicles in prototype quantities embodying certain safety features; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12992. A bill to establish a National Highway Traffic Safety Center to promote research and development activities for highway traffic safety, to provide financial assistance to the States to accelerate highway traffic safety programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 12993. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to limit the maximum rate of percentage depletion to a rate of 20 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 12994. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove certain limitations on the amount of the deduction for contributions to pension and profit-sharing plans made on behalf of self-employed individuals and to change the definition of "earned income" applicable with respect to such plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 12995. A bill to amend the act of November 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 772), providing for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges by the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 12996. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1886, relating to the transportation in the coastwise trade of passengers on foreign vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 12997. A bill to extend until July 15, 1968, the suspension of duty on electrodes imported for use in producing aluminum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 12998. A bill to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for community mental retardation facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 12999. A bill to declare the Illinois and Michigan Canal abandoned as a navigable waterway of the United States of America, to quitclaim any interest the United States of America may have therein to the State of Illinois to remove or prevent clouds upon land titles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 13000. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13001. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 13002. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide for a method of designating U.S. ports for export of commodities donated abroad; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 13003. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 13004. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of California (by request):

H.R. 13005. A bill to provide recognition as veterans of the Indian wars for persons who took part in the capture of the Ute Indians in 1906, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 13006. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 13007. A bill to amend section 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 13008. A bill to amend section 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 13009. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, to provide economic assistance to local governmental bodies affected thereby, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 13010. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 13011. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, to provide economic assistance to local governmental bodies affected thereby, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 13012. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 13013. A bill to amend the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 by repealing section 209(g); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 13014. A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHITE of Texas:

H.R. 13015. A bill to authorize the construction of extensions of the American Canal at El Paso, Tex., operation and maintenance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 13016. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of periods of service performed as a commissioner of the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 13017. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 13018. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 13019. A bill to provide for the humane treatment of vertebrate animals used in experiments and tests by recipients of grants from the United States and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 13020. A bill providing for a study of serious interruptions of certain essential services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 13021. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist States and communities in meeting the initial cost of establishment and operation of programs for the care of patients with kidney diseases and to train professional personnel needed to conduct such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 13022. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery on Federal property in Los Angeles County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.J. Res. 842. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.J. Res. 843. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually proclamations designating the Sunday of each year which occurs immediately preceding February 22, a Freedom Sunday and the calendar week of each year during which February 22 occurs as Freedom Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.J. Res. 844. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the fourth week in April of each year as "Youth Temperance Education Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.J. Res. 845. Joint resolution to require that reports on imports into the United States include the landed value of articles imported, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.J. Res. 846. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Comimttee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.J. Res. 847. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.J. Res. 848. Joint resolution to provide that an aircraft carrier shall be named the *Nimitz;* to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 740. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the obligation of all member nations of the United Nations to resist acts of aggression like those of the Communists in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H. Res. 746. Resolution creating a select committee of the House to study the problems of urban areas; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 747. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 13023. A bill for the relief of Caterine and Giacomo Pescetto and their minor child, Enrico Pescetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 13024. A bill for the relief of Clifton R. Kindt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 13025. A bill for the relief of Peter Cayouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 13026. A bill for the relief of Rosa E. Llobell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 13027. A bill for the relief of Michele Barbieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 13028. A bill for the relief of Abraham Nassi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13029. A bill for the relief of Ruby H. Holder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13030. A bill for the relief of Oswald Ethelred Gunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13031. A bill for the relief of Arthur Othterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13032. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Fontana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13033. A bill for the relief of Pietro D'Angelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 13034. A bill for the relief of Nasser Shahoulian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 13035. A bill to provide for the free entry of a triaxial apparatus and rheogoniometer for the use of Northwestern University; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 13036. A bill for the relief of Stephen H. Clarkson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

332. By Mr. MAHON: Petition of students of Big Spring, Tex., Senior High School; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

333. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Convention of the Diocese of Washington of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Washington, D.C., relative to security under the law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

> (b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the third calendar quarter of 1965 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Norman Abelson, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,062.50. E. (9) $479.92.

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.

D. (6) $41. E. (9) $92.12.

A. Actors' Equity Association, 226 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,500.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 525 School Street SW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $800. E. (9) $759.

A. Allen & Murden, Inc., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London E. C. 3, England, and Norwegian Shipowners Association, Post Office Box 1452, Oslo, Norway.

D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $626.05.

A. Allen & Murden, Inc., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Informal Committee of 16 European and Other Foreign Cruise Ship Lines, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $10,500. E. (9) $3,497.24.

A. Nicholas E. Allen & Merrill Armour, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 228 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,012.50. E. (9) $190.13.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Cancer Society, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $8,302.74.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $210. E. (9) $210.60.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $3,073.23. E. (9) $3,073.23.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $10,777.47. E. (9) $10,777.47.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $112.75. E. (9) $13,794.78.

A. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Nurses Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $10,177.50. E. (9) $10,177.50.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $814.48 E. (9) $814.48.

A. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $1,650.12.

A. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $225. E. (9) $32.60.

A. American Thrift Assembly, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $225. E. (9) $32.50.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $16,351.56.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Consolidated International Trading Corps., 180 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $104.67.

A. Roy A. Archibald, 1705 Murchison Drive, Burlingame, Calif.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $200. E. (9) $50.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.

B. Class one railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.

D. (6) $175.49. E. (9) $1,152.03.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Commissioner of Baseball, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $331.96.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Floor Covering Committee Affiliated with the National Council of American Importers, 295 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $203.08.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Lever Brothers Co., 390 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. The Arthritis Foundation, 1212 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $1,359.49.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3,676.

A. Automatic Car Wash Association-International, 4432 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $2,500.

A. Robert C. Barnard.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Wm. J. Barnhard, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Italy-America Chamber of Commerce, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $69.84.

A. Lowell R. Beck, 1705 DeSales Street, Washington, D.C.

B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $60.

A. William S. Bergman, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Legislative Council for Photogrammetry, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,279.70.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3,821.92.

A. Joel D. Blackmon, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $43.18.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3,851.16.

A. Blue Cross Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $3,938.85.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $6,275.60. E. (9) $731.67.

A. Blumberg, Singer, Ross & Gordon, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $6,250.

A. Melvin J. Boyle, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,328.52.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 122 Sheraton Gibson Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. National Coordinating Committee of the Beverage Industry.

E. (9) $274.95.

A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Florence I. Broadwell, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,432.73.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $700.

A. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employes, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $7,514.14. E. (9) $7,514.14.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors & Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,460. E. (9) $3,460.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,800.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. South Pacific Sugar Mills, Ltd., Suva, Fiji.
E. (9) $2,400.

A. Robert J. Brown, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $74.

A. Robert W. Bruce, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $204. E. (9) $567.

A. James E. Bryan, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,564.92

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 805 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

A. Gustave Burmeister, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,406.25. E. (9) $8.15.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $155. E. (9) $155.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $584.50. E. (9) $249.49.

A. George H. Buschmann, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $33,050. E. (9) $8,366.04.

A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 331 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. U.S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 331 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert B. Byrnes, 1703 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 2403 East 75th Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $21.26.

A. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 805 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.
D. (6) $1,842. E. (9) $2,677.36.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8323 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. W. W. Carson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 1124 Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $24,968. E. (9) $36,455.19.

A. Donald E. Channell, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $14.60.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Dental Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $31,763.33. E. (9) $247.95.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,913. E. (9)$9,700.85.

A. Citizens Radiophone Association, 3306 Kanter, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $20. E. (9) $6.35.

A. William F. Claire, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 13125, Kansas City, Mo.
E. (9) $1,279.39.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. A. Gross & Co., et al.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $94.02.

A. David Cohen, 1223 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1223 Connecticut Aevenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,391.56. E. (9) $276.45.

A. Nicholas S. Collins, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $9.53.

A. Paul G. Collins, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $16.10.

A. Committee for Time Uniformity, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $52.25.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,375.

A. Council for a Livable World, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,722 87. E. (9) $13,330.54.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $416.43. E. (9) $416.43.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Writing Instrument Manufacturers Association, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $30,172.65.

A. A. Harry Crane, 303 New England Building, Topeka, Kans.
B. Southern Railway System, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $57.76.

A. Henry Ashton Crosby, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council for a Livable World, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,982.24.

A. Cuba Claims Association, Inc., 407 Lincoln Road, Miami Beach, Fla.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $190.71.

A. C. B. Culpepper, Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc., Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Michael P. Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $22.30.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.

A. Debevoise, Plimpton, Lyons & Gates, 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Edward G. Sparrow, 1 East 66th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James F. Doherty, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,432. E. (9) $454.67.

A. Ronald D. Doremus, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $27.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,535. E. (9) $2,618.23.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $553.14.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $122.63. E. (9) $41.74.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. Walter A. Edwards, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., Post Office Box 1776, Raleigh, N.C.
B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,600.44.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,625.

A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $41.08.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $65.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,500.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $607.37. E. (9) $35.

A. Emergency Committee To Protect Cotton Growers, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,246.33. E. (9) $4,191.29.

A. Robert L. Farrington, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chinese Government Procurement and Services Mission, Division for Taiwan Sugar Corp., 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $95.40.

A. Joe G. Fender, 2033 Norfolk Street, Houston, Tex.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Mello G. Fish, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,835. E. (9) $300.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $46.73.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $586.78. E. (9) $586.78.

A. James F. Fort, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $351.25.

A. Robert W. Frase, 1820 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Book Publishers Council, Inc., 1 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $6,017.

A. Milton Fricke, Papillion, Nebr.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. David C. Fullarton, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $288.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,741.37. E. (9) $463.95.

A. Harry J. Gerrity, 907 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Building Owners & Managers, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $150.63.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retired Teachers Association and American Association of Retired Persons, Executive Office, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,288.90.

A. Royce L. Givens, 234 Seventh Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,230. E. (9) $1,725.

A. Robert Glicker, 1642 South 52d Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

A. Jack Golodner, 286 N Street SW., Washington, D.C.
B. Actors' Equity Association, 226 West 4th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $310.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 15401 Detroit Avenue, Lakewood, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $21,000.45 E. (9) $20,957.59.

A. Dale Greenwood, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Washington Railroad Association, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
E. (9) $408.75.

A. J. S. Grigsby, Jr., 1103–1111 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $3,200.

A. Milton S. Gwirtzman, 844 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. HRH Construction Co., 579 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $148.65.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15. E. (9) $13.

A. Robert N. Hampton, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,874.98. E. (9) $354.95.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,749.98. E. (9) $50.48.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,812.50.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $1,141.11.

A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $800.

A. Laurance G. Henderson, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mayer, Friedlich, Spiess, Tierney, Brown, & Platt, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill., and Simpson, Thatcher, & Bartlett, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y., and 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $202.50. E. (9) $202.50.

A. Carey W. Hilliard, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $541.45. E. (9) $31.

A. Frank N. Hoffman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. John W. Holton, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $39.50.

A. Roland S. Homet, Jr.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harold A. Hosier, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $174.17.

A. David P. Houlihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9.75.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) $2,649.99.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Automatic Merchandising Association, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $108.75.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Floyd E. Huffman, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $660.94. E. (9) $47.

A. B. A. Hungerford, 331 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. George P. Byrne, Jr., 331 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Meryle V. Hutchison, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,026.14.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,284.04.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $26,704.55.

A. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $2,017.35.

A. Ralph K. James, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $440. E. (9) $43.08.

A. Chas. B. Jennings, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $175. E. (9) $71.

A. Karelsen, Karelsen, Lawrence & Nathan, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Ken Kendrick, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers.
D. (6) $5,692.24. E. (9) $5,692.24.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. Kenneth B. Keating, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Population Crisis Committee, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Robert H. Kellen, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Preservers Association, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. William F. Kenney, New York, N.Y.
B. Shell Oil Co., 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $262.50.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $264. E. (9) $6.81.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Equipment Distributors & Sprinkler Irrigation Association.
E. (9) $746.76.

A. J. B. Kirklin, Pecos, Tex.
B. Emergency Committee To Protect Cotton Growers, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,055.04.

A. Robert M. Koch, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $50.

A. William L. Kohler, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $348.77.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,960. E. (9) $424.01.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. T. J. Stevenson & Co., 80 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $49.25.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $525.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $7.50.

A. Warren Lawrence, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $57.28.

A. Robert J. Leigh, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $118.

A. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Chemical Co., 110 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,015.19. E. (9) $3,015.19.

A. John Linnehan, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $706.60.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $1,537.24.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $197.

A. Donald C. Ludwig, 3306 Kanter, Detroit, Mich.
B. Citizen's Radiophone Association, 3306 Kanter, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $20. E. (9) $6.35.

A. Donald C. Ludwig, 3306 Kanter, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Citizen Band Council, 3306 Kanter, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $6.35.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $798.46. E. (9) $220.05.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $52.88.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., Eleventh and L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,712.50. E. (9) $2,106.31.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $100.

A. Alfred R. McCauley, 720 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hanna Mining Co., 100 Erieview Plaza, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $30.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. W. J. McDonald, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.

A. Stanley J. McFarland, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $864.08. E. (9) $158.67.

A. Mrs. Barbara D. McGarry, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and its subcommittee, Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 4107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,300. E. (9) $73.12.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,594.70. E. (9) $549.80.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $340.75. E. (9) $12.83.

A. Shane MacCarthy, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Printing Industries of America, Inc., 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $675.

A. Olya Margolin (Mrs.), 924 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,242.02. E. (9) $142.97.

A. J. M. Massey, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $479.37.

A. Albert E. May, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $340. E. (9) $37.44.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,900. E. (9) $410.

A. Henry Mayers, 2301 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,420. E. (9) $1,592.77.

A. Carl J. Megel, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Teachers, 716 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $6,050.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,952. E. (9) $291.77.

A. Ellis E. Meredith, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Apparel Manufacturers Association, Inc., 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,700.

A. William R. Merriam, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $3,425.

A. M. Barry Meyer, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $1,468.20.

A. Michigan Citizen Band Council, 3306 Kanter, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $6.35.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Blue Cross Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,206.14. E. (9) $307.35.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Textile Association and Canadian Particleboard Association.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,253.35.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational, Inc., 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,737.50. E. (9) $21.60.

A. Graham T. T. Molitor, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Biscuit Co., 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $462.33.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $625.

A. Carlos Moore, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Clarence W. Moore, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Cuba Claims Association, Inc., 407 Lincoln Road, Miami Beach, Fla.

A. Mrs. Jennelle Moorhead, Eugene Continuation Center, Eugene, Oreg.

A. Curtis Morris, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, 304 West 58th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $43,650.

A. T. H. Mullen, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John J. Murphy, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bricklayers, Masons & Plasterers, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,600. E. (9) $262.30.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7264, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $118.29. E. (9) $168.49.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,174.98. E. (9) $160.34.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,564.92.

A. National Association of Building Owners and Managers, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $755.96.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $24,743.93. E. (9) $11,423.85.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $843,028.53. E. (9) $14,485.31.

A. National Association of Postal Transportation Contractors, Inc., 4201 31st Street South, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) $100.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10,627.79.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $450.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,692.24. E. (9) $5,692.24.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $1,853. E. (9) $2,762.37.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $545,341.05. E. (9) $11,644.42.

A. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5,547.89.

A. National Committee for Immigration Reform, 1616 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,780. E. (9) $3,496.53.

A. National Committee for a New Patent Office Building, 1331 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,665.71.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, care of Dr. A. B. Baker, Division of Neurology, University of Minnesota Hospital, Minneapolis, Minn.
E. (9) $2,000.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,716.88. E. (9) $5,327.04.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
E. (9) $16.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $85,687.48. E. (9) $14,992.55.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 920 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,265.09. E. (9) $20,265.09.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $57.98.

A. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,802.95. E. (9) $1,760.40.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,370.

A. National Livestock Feeders Association, 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $2,600. E. (9) $2,600.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue, South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $906.33.

A. National Preservers Association, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $19,427.90. E. (9) $12,529.92.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $902.87. E. (9) $1,229.

A. National Rice Users Conference, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $22,100. E. (9) $29,039.54.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,321.30. E. (9) $11,617.29.

A. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,325.35. E. (9) $11,042.04.

A. National Tax Equality Association, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,846.21. E. (9) $7,229.23.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $480.

A. National Utility Contractors Association, Inc., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (9) $1,387.50.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $1,759.12. E. (9) $1,526.98.

A. George R. Nelson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $784.04.

A. North Carolina Cotton Promotion Association, Inc., Box 5425, Raleigh, N.C.
E. (9) $1,014.70.

A. North Carolina Railroad Association, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
D. (6) $2,745.66. E. (9) $649.44.

A. Richard T. O'Connell, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,050. E. (9) $50.48.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Sugarcane Planters, Fourth Floor, Gonzaga Building, Manila, Philippines.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine Sugar Association, Davies Building, Manila, Philippines.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Samuel Omasta, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $15.

A. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $5,490.71.

A. Osceola Operating Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $3,928.79.

A. John A. Overholt, 10400 Connecticut Avenue, Kensington, Md. and 1106 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,480.78.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Lynn C. Paulson, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $65.75.

A. Brig. Gen. John L. Person, U.S. Army, retired, La Salle Building, Washington D.C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,083.33.

A. Sandford Z. Persons, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United World Federalists, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $118.21.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $188.60.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Population Crisis Committee, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,618. E. (9) $28,292.03.

A. John H. Pratt, 905 American Security Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $31.42.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Bermuda Trade Development Board, Hamilton, Bermuda.
D. (6) $1,666. E. (9) $80.45.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bulk Food Carriers, Inc., 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $900.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 1050, Elizabeth, N.J.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $1,552.65.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Seatrain Lines, Inc., 595 River Road, Edgewater, N.J.
D. (6) $900.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. South Atlantic & Caribbean Line, Inc., 250 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200.

A. Edward M. Raymond, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $58.45.

A. Robert E. Redding, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for Time Uniformity, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert E. Redding, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $21.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $799.98. E. (9) $188.62.

A. Research to Prevent Blindness, Inc., 598 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $3,000.

A. James W. Respess, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $320.31. E. (9) $112.36.

A. John Arthur Reynolds, 653 East Cortland Avenue, Fresno, Calif.

B. Western Cotton Growers Association, Post Office Box 512, Fresno, Calif.

D. (6) $937.50. E. (9)$750.

A. John J. Riley, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $152.80.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $180.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $200.

A. John F. Rolph III, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Rubenstein, Wolfson & Co., Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. National Independent Coal Operators Association, Pikeville, Ky.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $130.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, Inc., 1555 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $544.51.

A. J. T. Rutherford, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $254.03.

A. Oswald Ryan, 525 School Street SW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 525 School Street, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $30.10.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco, Calif., et al.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,150. E. (9) $3.36.

A. C. Herschel Schooley, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Bankers Association of America, Sauk Centre, Minn.

D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $2,953.04.

A. James M. Schuette, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Beer Wholesalers' Association of America, Inc., 6310 North Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Dwight H. Scott, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. National Biscuit Co., 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $591.93.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,592.23. E. (9) $339.47.

A. Arnold F. Shaw, 503 D Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Comite de Productores De Azucar, Lima, Peru.

D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $644.93.

A. Arnold F. Shaw, 503 D Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Industria Escobera Mexicana, S.A., Nuevo Laredo, Tamps., Mexico.

E. (9) $13.70.

A. Kenneth D. Shaw, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $474.99.

A. John E. Shea, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William L. Shea, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Osceola Operating Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,550. E. (9) $1,128.79.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $300.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $575.

A. Single Persons Tax Reform Lobby, 1692A Green Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $411.40. E. (9) $390.57.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $24,675. E. (9) $6,967.55.

A. W. A. Smallwood, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $47.65.

A. James E. Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $327.26.

A. Milan D. Smith, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.

B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 712 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,249.99. E. (9) $1,520.56.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,025. E. (9) $228.35.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.

D. (6) $1,038.90. E. (9) $10,779.93.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103–1111 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

D. (6) $29,263.26. E. (9) $4,887.36.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.

E. (9) $150.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. State and Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $16,915.95.

A. Raymond E. Steele, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American and Canadian Importers of Green Olives, Inc., 70 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $53.50.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. AFCO Credit Corp., 108 John Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $113.91.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association to Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa; Association of Landowners of Okinawa.

E. (9) $1,000.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fuji Iron & Steel Co., Ltd., 80 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $500.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Hohenberg Co., Inc., 1431 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $215.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. ICI (New York), Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $595.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters' Association, No. 2, 3-Chome, Nihonbashi, Muromachi, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters' Association and Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers' Association of Tokyo, Japan; Miscellaneous Goods Division, Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York, Inc., and Imported Footwear Group, National Council of American Importers, Inc., New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $1,450.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan Steel Wire Products Exporters' Association, 36 Hisamatsucho, Nohonbashi, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan.
E. (9) $215.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan Vinyl Goods Manufacturers' Association, 11, 3–Chome Akasaka-Denmacho, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan.
E. (9) $50.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. A. D. Sutton & Sons, 1 West 37th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $200.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Toyoshima & Co., Inc., 303 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $140.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Mercantile Exchange, 6 Harrison Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 520 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $233.72.

A. Philip W. Stroupe, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $174.90.

A. Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 3900 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $102.66.

A. Roger H. Sullivan.
B. American Sugar Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 224 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $40.24.

A. Monroe Sweetland, 1705 Murchison Drive, Burlingame, Calif.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $335. E. (9) $50.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,342.04.

A. Eugene M. Thore, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Bert Tollefson, Jr., 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. Blue Cross Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,730.10. E. (9) $695.26.

A. Dwight D. Townsend, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cooperative League of USA, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,112.99. E. (9) $1,625.

A. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $68.

A. Richard S. Tribbe, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,900. E. (9) $43.50.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gladys Uhl, 1616 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee for Immigration Reform, 1616 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,777.96. E. (9) $267.29.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,510.55.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $3,500.

A. United World Federalists, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,754.01. E. (9) $1,754.01.

A. F. Bourne Upham III, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $580.

A. Charles R. Van Horn, 17th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., Charles and Baltimore Streets, Baltimore, Md.

A. Veterans of World War I, USA, Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $125.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Voice of the People in Action, 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
B. Dr. Russell Forrest Egner, 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
D. (6) $180. E. (9) $110.35.

A. Volume Footwear Retailers Association, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $11,300. E. (9) $4,784.12.

A. Harold S. Walker, Jr., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $261. E. (9) $11.44.

A. Franklin Wallick, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,466.33. E. (9) $933.96.

A. William A. Walton, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Clarence M. Weiner, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,375. E. (9) $151.65.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $30.90.

A. Western Cotton Growers Association, Post Office Box 512, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $10,296.08. E. (9) $2,025.

A. The Wheat Users Committee, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $38,875. E. (9) $45,362.85.

A. Don White, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $768.77. E. (9) $1,237.68.

A. John C. White, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Douglas Whitlock II, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,475. E. (9) $115.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $135.86.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of American Indians, 1765 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $26.77.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) $2.10.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Tribe of Indians, Wellpinit, Wash.

A. Robert P. Will, 487 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, 1111 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $1,169.64.

A. Edmond L. Williams, 4201 31st Street South, Arlington, Va.
B. National Association of Postal Transportation Contractors, Inc., 4201 31st Street South, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $5.

A. Kenneth Williamson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,744.61. E. (9) $378.04.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government of the Bahamas, Nassau, Bahamas.
D. (6) $6,264.50. E. (9) $418.69.

A. Nathan T. Wolkomir, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,307.73. E. (9) $1,111.82.

A. Albert Y. Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,998.

A. Lester L. Zosel, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1965:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19______ ◄

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(*a*) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(*c*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $________Dues and assessments
2. $________Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $________Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $________Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $________Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $________TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $________Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $________TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $________TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $________Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $________Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $________"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?

Please answer "yes" or "no": ________

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	(*"Period"* from Jan. 1 through __________________, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(*a*) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $________Public relations and advertising services
2. $________Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $________Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $________Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $________Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $________Telephone and telegraph
7. $________Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $________All other expenditures
9. $________TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $________Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. $________TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $________TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $________Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $________Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates*	*Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11:	Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15:	Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL	

PAGE 2

A. Norman Abelson, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $515.60. E. (9) $48.25.

A. Charles D. Ablard, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $22.

A. Actors' Equity Association, 226 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,500.

A. Clarence G. Adamy, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

A. Air Force Sergeants Association, Post Office Box 908, San Antonio, Tex.
E. (9) $300.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 525 School Street SW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $759.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,038.97. E. (9) $3,038.97.

A. Mrs. Donna Allen, 3306 Ross Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee to Abolish House Un-American Activities Committee, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $960. E. (9) $1,437.47.

A. George Venable Allen, 4370 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.

A. Nicholas E. Allen & Merrill Armour, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,845. E. (9) $13.80.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,318.75.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.; 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $28,553. E. (9) $28,553.

A. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $37,450.76.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,430.20. E. (9) $3,978.73.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $324,642.52. E. (9) $5,853.94.

A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Humane Association, 896 Pennsylvania Street, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $2,180.52

A. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,275. E. (9) $1,275.

A. American Insurance Association, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,807.50. E. (9) $6,807.50.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,188.93. E. (9) $3,070.13.

A. American Justice Association, Inc., Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.
D. (6) $2. E. (9) $2.

A. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $229.48. E. (9) $28,056.45.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $3,782.77.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $409.13.

A. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selisgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $4,543.63. E. (9) $4,543.63.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $688.30. E. (9) $688.30.

A. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and the Subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for public elementary and secondary education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,096.97. E. (9) $614.12.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,815. E. (9) $7,327.

A. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,421.65.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,709.46.

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,341.37. E. (9) $1,341.37.

A. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $900.

A. American Surveys, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Certain cement companies.

A. American Taxpayers Association, 326 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,574.03.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, Whitinsville, Mass.
D. (6) $5.57.

A. American Texile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $12,751.78. E. (9) $12,751.78.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,947.14. E. (9) $1,947.14.

A. Cyrus T. Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spiegel, Inc., 2511 West 23d Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $96. E. (9) $181.04.

A. George W. Apperson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Transit Union, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. David Apter, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council of the Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1477 West Pender Street, Vancouver, B.C.

A. David Apter, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Guild of Prescription Opticians of America, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW.,

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,944.06.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Margaret Lee Weil, 50 East 83d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2.

A. The Arthritis Foundation, 1212 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $670.12.

A. The Associated General Contractors, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,003.59. E. (9) $1,003.59.

A. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $525.

A. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $170.71.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $100.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,834.03.

A. The Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $300.

A. Robert L. Augenblick, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard W. Averill, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael H. Bader, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington D.C.

A. Douglas B. Bagnell, Fairhope, Ala.
B. Maine Potato Council, Presque Isle, Maine.
D. (6) $300.

A. Frank Baird-Smith, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald Baldwin, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $412.86.

A. Harry A. Barbour, 4925 Deal Drive SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and Washington Parking Association, Jefferson Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,999.97.

A. Ernest L. Barcella, Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Robert C. Barnard.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $562.50. E. (9) $11.07.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. William G. Barr, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. Wesley Barthelmes.
B. Insurance Co. of North America, Life Insurance Co. of North America.
D. (6) $335.30. E. (9) $120.50.

A. James P. Bass, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Laurie C. Battle, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roy Battles, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. John H. Beidler.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,725. E. (9) $471.89.

A. James F. Bell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $18.

A. J. O. Bellenger, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $6.47.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $5,250.

A. Reed A. Benson, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The John Birch Society, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Mass.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,124.59.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Federation of Trades and Labor Unions.
D. (6) $5,670. E. (9) $386.80.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leon G. Billings, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Robert J. Bird, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass.

A. John B. Bivins, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $670.

A. Wm. Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,355.50. E. (9) $1,158.54.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,811.24.

A. Eugene P. Boardman, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,269.04. E. (9) $29.

A. Fred F. Bockmon, 405 Luhrs Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $688.46.

A. Maurice G. Boehl, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $148.47.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $3.65.

A. Samuel E. Boyle, 428 South Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Col. A. A. Brackett, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue S.E., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Brady, Sheraton Gibson Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. National Coordinating Committee of the Beverage Industry.

A. A. Marvin Braverman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Michael Ladney, Jr., 18125 East Ten Mile Road, East Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $1.50.

A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,709.46.

A. Wayne L. Bromley, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,950.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $500.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $746.64.

A. J. Robert Brouse, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Animal Health Institute, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $51.85.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cuban Electric Co., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Co.'s, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $841.20.

A. Donald C. Bruce, 3219 Oliver Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Conservative Union, 1010 Vermont Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250.03.

A. Robert W. Bruce, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $68. E. (9) $214.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. America Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $3.32.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 803 Mosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, 22 Warren Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Bulgarian Claims Committee, 22 Warren Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $245.82.

A. George S. Bullen.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Norman D. Burch, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $66.90.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George J. Burger, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. C. P. Burks, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $562.50.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $18,861.49. E. (9) $429.

A. Gustave Burmeister, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,447.92. E. (9) $6.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.
E. (9) $8.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,999.99.

A. Hollis W. Burt, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $58.75.

A. Herbert H. Butler, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $100.

A. Monroe Butler, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 331 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. U.S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 331 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert B. Byrnes, 1703 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 2403 East 75th Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $11.50.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1120 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $60.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $252.

A. Carl C. Campbell, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 803 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Marvin Caplan, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,705. E. (9) $152.11.

A. Ronald A. Capone, 505 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London E.C. 3, England.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $295.81.

A. Col. John T. Carlton, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, DC.

A. James R. Carnes, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $153.94.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8323 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. H. Allen Carroll, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $71.

A. Blue Allan Carstenson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,446.02. E. (9) $186.31.

A. Eugene C. Carusi, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 1124 Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $41,726.65. E. $37,609.83.

A. Alger B. Chapman, Jr., 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Alaska Pipeline Co., Post Office Box 6554, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $74.46.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 420 South Milwaukee Avenue, Libertyville, Ill.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $196.29.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Asociacion de Comerciantes, en Licores de Nogales, Sonora, Obregon No. 102, Nogales Sonora, Mexico.
E. (9) $44.22.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., 139–141 Franklin Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,103.75. E. (9) $178.72.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar, S. A. de C. V., Bladeras 36, Primer Piso, Mexico D. F., Mexico.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $1,159.90.

A. James W. Chapman, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,708.50.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

A. Mr. A. H. Chesser, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $29.

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,739.01. E. (9) $5,062.55.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Citizens Political Action Association of Prince Georges County, Md., 6302 Furness Avenue, Oxon Hill, Md.

A. Allen C. K. Clark, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Earl W. Clark.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,225. E. (9) $202.85.

A. James E. Clark, Jr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Roger A. Clark, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Conference of America, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 13125, Kansas City, Mo.
E. (9) $502.65.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Oil Shale Corp., 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., et al.
E. (9) $5.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $1.46.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Tobacco Co.
D. (6) $124.99. E. (9) $217.49.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.
D. (6) $124.99. E. (9) $217.49.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co.
D. (6) $124.99. E. (9) $217.49.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. P. Lorillard Co.
D. (6) $124.99. E. (9) $217.49.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philip Morris, Inc.
D. (6) $124.99. E. (9) $217.49.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.
D. (6) $124.99. E. (9) $217.49.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Superior Oil Co.

A. Clay L. Cochran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,350.90. E. (9) $400.83.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $42.71.

A. Joseph Cohen, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Cole & Groner, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Task Force of Small American Shipbuilders, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $216.27.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Navigation System, Inc., Box 7, Agana, Guam.

A. J. I. Collier, Jr., 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $212.49.

A. Collier and Shannon, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Collier, Shannon & Rill, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Footwear Manufacturers Association, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) 170.

A. Collier, Shannon & Rill, 1625 I Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tool and Stainless Steel Industry Committee, c/o Carpenter Steel Co., Reading, Pa.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $290.

A. Nicholas S. Collins, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $12.12.

A. Paul G. Collins, The American Bankers Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Committee for Automobile Excise Tax Repeal, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,183.68.

A. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,970.

A. Committee for a Free Cotton Market, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,804.84.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $5,428.92.

A. R. T. Compton, National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul B. Comstock, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond F. Conkling, 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $43.15.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $126. E. (9) $25.80.

A. Harry N. Cook, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Waterways Conference.

A. Edward Cooper.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John Shepherd Cooper, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $2,004.97.

A. Joshua W. Cooper, 626 South Lee Street, Alexandria, Va.
B. Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee, Inc., Post Office Box 239, Portsmouth, N.H.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,391.30.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Council of Forest Industries, 1477 West Penden Street, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

D. (6) $3,000.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Footwear Division, Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $22.85.

A. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) $1,545. E. (9) $57.23.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Lightweight Aggregates Percentage Depletion Committee, care of John W. Roberts, Post Office Box 9138, Richmond, Va.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. A. P. Møller, 8 Kongens Nytorv, Copenhagen, Denmark.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Savings & Loan Bank of the State of New York, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert E. Cronin, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

A. John T. Curran, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,800. E. (9) $2,090.38.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Charles A. Darnell, 3129 Brereton Court, Huntington, W. Va.

B. Sheet Metal Workers International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. F. Gibson Darrison, Jr., 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. New York Central Railroad Co., 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $895.83. E. (9) $14.64.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 901 West 22d Street, Oak Brook, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $674.32.

A. Clifford Davis, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Louisville Gas & Electric Co., Louisville, Ky.

A. Clifford Davis, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Shawnee Coal Co., Nashville, Tenn.

A. Lowell Davis, 601 Ross Avenue, Mart, Tex.

D. (6) $160.40. E. (9) $160.40.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association, Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Nursing Home Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Laundry-Dry Cleaning Association of D.C., 2401 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Peoples Life Insurance Co., Equitable Life Insurance Co., and Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Responsive Environments Corp., 21 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Tony T. Dechant.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. E. Deilke, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. L. E. Deilke, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) $3,000.

A. James J. Delaney, Jr., 1003 Lancaster Drive, Anchorage, Alaska.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Milton C. Denbo, 1341 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Automatic Car Wash Association, 4432 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1.50.

A. Max A. Denney, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $600.

A. Leslie E. Dennis, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $645.

A. John M. Dickerman, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Lumber & Building Material Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $112.39.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $562.50. E. (9) $57.30.

A. George S. Dietrich, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association On Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Engineering Co., Inc., 74 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $1,267.15. E. (9) $67.15.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 S Street, Sacramento, Calif.

D. (6) $1,082.40. E. (9) $32.40.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Thurman & Wright, 1203 Latham Square Building, Oakland, Calif.

A. Disabled American Veterans, National Service Headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $6,375. E. (9) $2,971.25.

A. Robert H. Distelhorst, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $337.50. E. (9) $4.75.

A. District of Columbia Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 710 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $180. E. (9) $180.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $38,529.50. E. (9) $44,184.49.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Transit Union, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James F. Doherty, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,696.00. E. (9) $461.30.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $187.50. E. (9) $12.94.

A. Paul E. M. Donelan, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Ronald D. Doremus, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $22.50.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $86.50.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,441.95. E. (9) $146.

A. Leonard K. Dowiak, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. R. Michael Duncan.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. William E. Dunn, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. D. Durand, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $225.

A. Walter A. Edwards, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $320. E. (9) $110.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,625.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Jewelers of America, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $69.01.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $24.98.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Basic Management, Inc., Post Office Box 2065, Henderson, Nev.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Coachella Valley County Water District, Coachella, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 111 North Hope Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Las Vegas Valley Water District, 3700 West Charleston Boulevard, Las Vegas, Nev.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $5,947.50. E. (9) $217.17.

A. Grover W. Ensley, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $404. E. (9) $50.40.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,171.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $2,050. E. (9) $33.40.

A. Family Tax Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

A. William J. Fannin, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $77,560.40. E. (9) $24,205.08.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $600.

A. Bonner Fellers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Sugar Cane League of the U.S.A., 414 Whitney Building, New Orleans, La., and Florida Sugar Cane League, Post Office Box 1207, Clewiston, Fla.

A. Maxwell Field, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
B. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $23.25.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1477 West Pender Street, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $125.

A. William J. Flaherty, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $104.28.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,266.66. E. (9) $28.34.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $1,200.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

A. James W. Foristel, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $537.50. E. (9) $70.73.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $57.

A. John G. Fox, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $171.36.

A. Morley E. Fox, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Central Arizona Project Association, 1124 Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $129.18. E. (9) $136.20.

A. Charles A. Francik, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y.
D. (6) $420.

A. R. Frank Frazier, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $46,754.55. E. (9) $10,531.99.

A. Garrett Fuller, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Columbia Steamship Co., 1210 Standard Plaza, Portland, Oreg.

A. John Baxter Funderburk, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Gadsby, Hannah, Colson & Morin, 729 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for International Housing Through Private Investment, 729 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $182.90. E. (9) $567.31.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota railroads.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $14.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25.

A. Aubrey D. Gates, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $170.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $848.30. E. (9) $374.86.

A. Harry J. Gerrity, 907 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Building Owners and Managers, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $4.95.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1246 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retired Teachers Association and American Association of Retired Persons, Executive Office, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,293.31.

A. Arthur P. Gildea, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $78.09.

A. Ginsburg & Feldman, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Plastic & Chemical Corp., Railroad Avenue, West Haverstraw, N.Y.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $75.65.

A. Ginsburg & Feldman, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. Upper Ohio Valley Association, 902 Union Trust Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Glenn P. Glezen, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Philip M. Glick, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District of Columbia Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 710 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $180. E. (9) $65.

A. Jack Golodner, 286 H Street SW., Washington, D.C.
B. Actors' Equity Association, 226 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $310.

A. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 640 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Florists' Transworld Delivery Association, 900 West Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,086.23. E. (9) $3,420.29.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 15401 Detroit Avenue, Lakewood, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,617.18. E. (9) $3,617.18.

A. James A. Gray, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8.75. E. (9) $205.75.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Dale Greenwood, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Washington Railroad Association, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association (Export Agency Division), Calcutta, India.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Oceanic Properties, Inc., Post Office Box 2780, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. J. S. Grigsby, Jr., 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,800.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, American Smelting & Refining Co., and American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co.
D. (6) $4,200. E. (9) $1,800.

A. Seymour S. Guthman, Executive Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Syndicat des Distillateurs et Producteurs de Sucre de Madagascar, 282 Boulevard, St. Germain, Paris, France.

A. Milton S. Gwirtzman, 844 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. HRH Construction Co., 579 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $14.30.

A. Robert W. Haack, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $692.31. E. (9) $144.56.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,225. E. (9) $141.91.

A. Hal H. Hale, 421 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Andrew G. Haley, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $170.71.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. G. Hall, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,875.10.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comision Nacional Para el Estudio de la Caña y el Azucar, La Paz, Bolivia.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $4,062.50. E. (9) $398.74.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $400. E. (9) $29.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Mildred B. Harman, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Women's Christian Temperance Union, 1738 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) $750.49. E. (9) $345.68.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,833.34. E. (9) $23.15.

A. R. A. Harris, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $3,250.12.

A. Burr P. Harrison, Graichen Building, Winchester, Va.

B. Savage Arms, Westfield, Mass., et al.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hays & Hays, 920 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $35.75.

A. John C. Hazen, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $114.03.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $175. E. (9) $52.85.

A. Robert W. Healy, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Smith & Pepper, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $50.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and the subcommittee Bi-Partisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $250.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $121.80.

A. H. Struve Hensel, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. H. C. Stuelcken Sohn, Stuelckenwerft, Hamburg-Steinwerder, Germany.

D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $323.79.

A. John K. Herbert, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Magazine Publishers Association, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $383.14.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Savage Arms, Westfield, Mass., et al.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $12.79.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $65.43.

A. J. J. Hickey, 405 Majestic Building, Cheyenne, Wyo.

B. Union Pacific Railroad Co.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

E. (9) $1,290.51.

A. John W. Hight, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $100.

A. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Norman Hill, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,188. E. (9) $21.65.

A. James A. Hirshfield, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $600.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.

B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3.40.

A. Irvin A. Hoff, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $41.45.

A. Hogan & Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Kaiser Industries Corp., Kaiser Center, Oakland, Calif.

D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $67.58.

A. Lawrence J. Hogan, 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Apartment Association of America, Inc., 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,925. E. (9) $252.

A. Lawrence J. Hogan, 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Joint Committee on Transportation for Metropolitan Washington.

A. Lawrence J. Hogan, 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Specialty Contractors' Associations, Inc., 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $632. E. (9) $128.14.

A. Fuller Holloway, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $5,475. E. (9) $425.89.

A. Lee B. Holmes, 829 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $12.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1119 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Roland S. Homet, Jr.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles L. Huber, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $3,625. E. (9) $2,866.97.

A. W. T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $275.

A. B. A. Hungerford, 331 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. George P. Byrne, Jr., 331 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,087.50.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $15,290.38. E. (9) $15,290.38.

A. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $6,247.20.

A. Institute of Appliance Manufacturers, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. International Armament Corp., 10 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.
E. (9) $4,000.

A. International Association of Machinists, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,531.91.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $21,373.40.

A. The Interstate Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $2,975. E. (9) $2.25.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., 19 Summit Court, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $14,674.33. E. (9) $22,007.09.

A. Rear Adm. Alexander Jackson, Jr., 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $196.90.

A. Walter K. Jaenicke, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph K. James, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $440. E. (9) $21.73.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $100.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,374.51. E. (9) $38.16.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Chas. B. Jennings, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn., et al.
E. (9) $100.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,607.74. E. (9) $151.36.

A. T. Richmond Johnson, Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Central Arizona Project Association, Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Ned Johnston, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Geo. Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
E. (9) $47.65.

A. Lyle W. Jones, 3206 Ferndale Street, Kensington, Md.
B. Illinois Association of Consulting Engineers, Post Office Box 1202, Springfield, Ill.

A. Karelsen, Karelsen, Lawrence & Nathan, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $202.23.

A. William J. Keating, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $275.

A. Eugene A. Keeney, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas John Kehoe & Associates, 1904 Rockwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
E. (9) $1,733.

A. John T. Kelly, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. Thomas A. Kelly, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,408.34.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
E. (9) $108.95

A. William J. Kerwin, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Longshoremen's & Warehouseman's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,409.26. E. (9) $2,363.66.

A. John L. Kilcullen, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $50.

A. Edward W. Kiley, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Equipment Distributors and Sprinkler Irrigation Association.
E. (9) $902.62.

A. Ludlow King, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman, 200 C Street SE, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,193. E. (9) $1,193.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $315. E. (9) $43.31.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,802.

A. Robert M. Koch, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $30.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $4,977.09.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,462.50. E. (9) $1,787.71.

A. June Kysilko, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,990. E. (9) $5,352.97.

A. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $8,765.38.

A. Laborers' Political Action League, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,398.19.

A. Kenneth C. Landry, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Richard H. Lane, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing.

A. Robert D. Larsen, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Swaziland Sugar Association, Mbabane, Swaziland.
D. (6) $3,300. E. (9) $201.98.

A. Reed E. Larson, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Right To Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $50.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900.

A. George H. Lawrence, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $312.50. E. (9) $94.03.

A. Warren Lawrence, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $129.91.

A. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $36.25. E. (9) $108.

A. Leonard F. Lee, 402 Solar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $42.30.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $118.

A. G. E. Leighty, 400 First Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Nils A. Lennartson, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $8,749.98.

A. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Chemical Co., 110 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Gilbert B. Lessenco, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Mills, Inc., 9200 Wayzata Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Edith M. Lesser, 2924 Rittenhouse Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,299.99.

A. Roy T. Lester, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $185. E. (9) $11.75.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $1,170.13.

A. Lightweight Aggregates Percentage Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 9138, Richmond, Va.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $820.65.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4.28.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,576.93. E. (9) $1,336.33.

A. Donald J. Lipsett, 1420 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Conservative Union, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,729.16.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $481.25. E. (9) $10.15.

A. Basil R. Littin, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Continental Oil Co.

A. Maj. Gen. George O. N. Lodoen, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Long, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Printing Pressmen & Assistants' Union of North America, Pressmen's Home, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $150.

A. Paul H. Long, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $40.85.

A. R. C. Longmire, Pauls Valley, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., Roanoke, Va.
D. (6) $600.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Medical Corp., 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Charles Emmet Lucey, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Support Group for Progressive Banking, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $20.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,331.27. E. (9) $382.76.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,531.25. E. (9) $4.25.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., Eleventh & L Building, Sacramento, Calif.

B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,712.50. E. (9) $607.43.

A. Breck P. McAllister, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Employes' Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,442.40.

A. McCarty & Wheatley, 1200 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Semitropic Water Storage District, 2714 L Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
D. (6) $250.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, State and Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $100.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $112.50.

A. Guy G. McConnell, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Albert L. McDermott, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Angus H. McDonald.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,230.98. E. (9) $220.28.

A. Stanley J. McFarland, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $878.20. E. (9) $160.66.

A. Mrs. Barbara D. McGarry, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and the subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Commission for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Benny W. McGehee, Post Office Box 908, San Antonio, Tex.
B. Air Force Sergeants Association, Post Office Box 908, San Antonio, Tex.
D. (6) $300.

A. F. Howard McGuigan, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.
D. (6) $3,836. E. (9) $102.25.

A. E. Perkins McGuire, 800 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. H. C. Stuelcken Sohn, German Shipyard, Stuelckenwerft, Hamburg-Steinwerder, Germany.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $745.79.

A. William F. McKenna, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $34.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,316.67. E. (9) $28.30.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,835.02. E. (9) $41.03.

A. William F. McManus, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $675. E. (9) $208.15.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert D. McMillen, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $433.04.

A. Shane MacCarthy, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Printing Industries of America, Inc., 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $475. E. (9) $750.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $627. E. (9) $116.85.

A. Jos. R. MacLaren, 4 Linden Drive, Hudson Falls, N.Y.

B. Potlatch Forests, Inc., 320 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $825. E. (9) $370.77.

A. H. E. Mahlman, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.

D. (6) $812.50. E. (9) $35.75.

A. Don Mahon, 1127 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1,156.87.

A. Carter Manasco, 5932 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.

B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,400. E. (9) $102.69.

A. Rufus W. Manderson, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,000.

A. Olya Margolin (Mrs.), 924 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,242.02. E. (9) $147.75.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,802.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Robert O. Marritz, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $42.

A. David M. Marsh, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Insurance Association, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $400. E. (9) $7.35.

A. Michael Marsh, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $396.16.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $75.73. E. (9) $68.06.

A. Thomas A. Martin, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $90.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $100.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $100.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,384.54. E. (9) $1,210.

A. J. M. Massey, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $393.34.

A. P. H. Mathews, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $292.10.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $45. E. (9) $9.20.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Albert E. May, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $364. E. (9) $11.07.

A. Robert A. Means, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $3,135.72. E. (9) $7.30.

A. Carl J. Megel, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Teachers, 716 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $6,300.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,256. E. (9) $355.10.

A. Lawrence C. Merthan, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $250. E. (9) $137.50.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

E. (9) $1,548.70.

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Shawano, Wis., and Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. Capt. A. Stanley Miller, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $100.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Associated Telephone Answering Exchanges, Inc., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $90.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The League of New York Theatres, Inc., and The National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc., 137 West 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $90.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Dallas, Tex., Chamber of Commerce.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.

D. (6) $2,625.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $3,465.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $317.46.

A. Luman G. Miller, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Oregon Railroad Association, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Othmer J. Mischo, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Missouri Railroad Committee, 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $248.91.

A. Stephen A. Mitchell, Post Office Box 932, Taos, N. Mex.

A. J. R. Modrall, Post Office Box 466, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
B. Aetna Life Insurance Co. and Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., 151 Farmington Avenue, Hartford, Conn.

A. J. R. Modrall, Post Office Box 466, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
B. Travelers Insurance Co. and Travelers Indemnity Co., 1 Tower Square, Hartford, Conn.

A. Marion S. Monk, Jr., Batchelor, La.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. G. Merrill Moody, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13.84. E. (9) $78.28.

A. Carlos Moore, 25 Louisiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $177.67.

A. Morison, Clapp, Abrams & Haddock, the Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $1,700. E. (9) $1,252.39.

A. T. H. Mullen, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John H. Murdoch, Jr., 402 Barclay Building, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
B. National Water Co. Conference, 402 Barclay Building, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.

A. John J. Murphy, Wilelinor Estates, Route 2, Box 113-D, Edgewater, Md.
B. National Customs Service Association.

A. Robert F. Murphy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,582.16. E. (9) $58.15.

A. William E. Murray, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William E. Murtha, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.
B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Building Owners & Managers, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $306.76.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $6.75.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $495.71. E. (9) $7,411.46.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $350.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,627.32. E. (9) $1,627.32.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,000. E. (9) $23,371.64.

A. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $829.87. E. (9) $485.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $40,798.90. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,824.70. E. (9) $12,824.70.

A. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $200.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee To Abolish HUAC, No. 555 Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,437.47. E. (9) $1,437.47.

A. National Committee for Immigration Reform, 1616 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,798.33.

A. National Committee for International Development, 1762 Church Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $393.02.

A. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc., 26 Auburn Avenue, Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $9,256.48. E. (9) $9,256.48.

A. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $605.19. E. (9) $605.19.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $29.93. E. (9) $250.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa.
E. (9) $755.95.

A. National Federation of Independent Business Inc., 920 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21,748.64. E. (9) $21,748.64.

A. National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,229.31. E. (9) $1,211.38.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,581.92. E. (9) $20,697.51.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $105.47.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,353.81. E. (9) $384.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,446.50. E. (9) $1,446.50.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (7) $25,417.49.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $446.75.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,999.98.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Right To Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,777.16. E. (9) $3,105.44.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5,572.69.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $865.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $87,252. E. (9) $3,959.

A. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $100.

A. National Utility Contractors Association, Inc., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $1,256.20. E. (9) $1,800.

A. Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, 81. 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,600. E. (9) $7,328.16.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alan M. Nedry, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $1,767.88.

A. George R. Nelson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,031.91.

A. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $423.25. E. (9) $423.35.

A. Sarah H. Newman, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers League, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,650.

A. George L. Nichols, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $35.11.

A. Patrick J. Nilan, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $511.18.

A. Stanley D. Noble, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Robert W. Nolan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Charles M. Noone, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $527.63.

A. Joseph A. Noone, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $455. E. (9) $5.66.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. North Carolina Cotton Promotion Association, Inc., Box 5425, Raleigh, N.C.
E. (9) $346.43.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. M. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Michael J. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $469.25.

A. Ira H. Nunn, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $250.

A. Seward P. Nyman, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $650.

A. William B. O'Connell, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Transit Association, 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $796.26.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for Balanced Legislative Representation, 870 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $4,407.91.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. El Paso Natural Gas Co., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $397.55.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Amusement Business Association, Box 143, Southfield, Mich.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $12.23.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Roadside Business Association, 1430 Rand Tower, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $1,322.15.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 7703 Normandale Road, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $527.66.

A. John B. O'Day, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,502.76.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Sugarcane Planters, Gonzaga Building, Manila, Philippines.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine Sugar Association, 409 Davies Building, Manila, Philippines.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Jane O'Grady, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,030. E. (9) $418.41.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,659.12.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel Omasta, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5.

A. Harry D. Orr, Jr., 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Robert O. Anderson, Roswell, N. Mex.
E. (9) $50.95.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Osceola Operating Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2,650.14.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa.
B. Campbell Soup Co., 375 Memorial Avenue, Camden, N.J.

A. Walter Page, Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
E. (9) $89.63.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramac, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. D. Parel, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James D. Parriott, Jr., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Marathon Oil Co., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25.

A. James G. Patton.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $405.99.

A. Lynn C. Paulson, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $27.99.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Family Tax Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.

A. Peter J. Pestillo, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,437.48. E. (9) $125.

A. A. Harold Peterson, 500 Minnesota Federal Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. National R.E.A. Telephone Association, 500 Minnesota Federal Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,392.12.

A. Ervin L. Peterson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation & Internal Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $43.50.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, Post Office Box 6787, Orlando, Fla.
E. (9) $7.50.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $21.

A. Kenneth T. Peterson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, 6 East Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,499.99.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John P. Philbin, 510 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $109.56.

A. Richard N. Philleo, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $25.70.

A. Tom Pickett, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $28.49.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $1,155.

A. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $20,566.34. E. (9) $1,350.

A. James K. Polk, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

A. John W. Pompelli, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $25.30.

A. Robert R. Poston, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $142.87.

A. Ramsay D. Potts, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $6.75.

A. William J. Potts, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4.80.

A. Graydon R. Powers, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marvin J. Powers, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $400.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Forrest J. Prettyman, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y., Arthritis Foundation, New York, N.Y., National Multiple Sclerosis Society, New York, N.Y., and United Cerebral Palsy Associations, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,750.01. E. (9) $6,290.41.

A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $101.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.03. E. (9) $40.

A. James A. Ransford, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Co.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $150.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,150. E. (9) $1,995.13.

A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Texas Railroads.

A. J. A. Reidelbach, Jr., 1119 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1119 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. William M. Requa, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $131,129.17.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,189.90. E. (9) $8,010.87.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Continental Oil Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Company (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,133.34. E. (9) $12.

A. Dorsey Richardson, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Entertainment Law Committee, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. State Farm Mutual Insurance Co., Bloomington, Ill.

A. Richard J. Riddick, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $238.90.

A. Siert F. Riepmax, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Austin L. Roberts, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $812.50.

A. Clyde F. Roberts, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roberts & Holland, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Furman-Wolfson Corp., 1440 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $106.40.

A. Roberts & Holland, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. I.O.S., Ltd. (S.A.), 119 rue de Lausanne, Geneva, Switzerland.
D. (6) $9,700.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $500.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Animal Health Institute, c/o Mr. Robert Brouse, 1030 15th Street NW., Room 940, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $183.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $437.50.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, South 609 Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $526.

A. John F. Rolph, III, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ad Hoc Committee of Publishing Companies, 60–62 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $27.18.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 110 Williams Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $0.76.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pinkerton's, Inc., 154 Nassau Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $378. E. (9) $224.12.

A. William H. Ryan, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,461.52.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Business Press, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,145.03.

A. William H. Scheick, 1735 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $144.19.

A. C. Herschel Schooley, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Bankers Association of America, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $2,976.55.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington, D.C., Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc., 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $28.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 1771 N Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $874.17. E. (9) $170.52.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $665. E. (9) $206.05.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $47.67.

A. David C. Sharman, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., care of Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $1,093.75. E. (9) $474.08.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $604.

A. Carroll M. Shaw, 6326 Southcrest Drive, Shreveport, La.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts, Trowbridge & Madden, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William L. Shea, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Osceola Operating Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,075. E. (9) $575.14.

A. Ira Shesser, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Max Shine, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $992.50. E. (9) $20.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 306 International Trade Mart, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $767.

A. Sidley, Austin, Burgess & Smith, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,900.

A. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $245. E. (9) $1114.33.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $31,700. E. (9) $6,614.67.

A. Harold S. Skinner, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Continental Oil Co.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

A. Harold Slater, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $437.50. E. (9) $15.88.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $12.

A. W. A. Smallwood, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dudley Smith, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. E. Stratford Smith, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Smith & Pepper, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Gordon L. Smith, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 640 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $22.40.

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $50.50.

A. Irvin A. Smith, 418 East Rosser Avenue, Bismarck, N. Dak.
E. (9) $489.85.

A. James R. Smith, 1060 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.

A. Smith & Pepper, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $250.

A. Robert B. Smith, 121 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 200 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 829 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $30.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $87.20. E. (9) $65.

A. Thaddeus S. Snell, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Particleboard Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1726 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $54.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,163.46.

A. J. R. Snyder, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainman.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, Post Office Box 3719, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,461.79. E. (9) $4,612.08.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $221.58.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103–1111 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $33,034.64. E. (9) $5,550.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
E. (9) $150.

A. William W. Spear, 214 Fremont National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $729.17. E. (9) $10.03.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. State and Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $12,416.10.

A. Raymond E. Steele, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American & Canadian Importers of Green Olives, Inc., 70 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $84.50.

A. Nell May F. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D.C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hamilton Watch Co. and Elgin National Watch Co.
D. (6) $200.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Metlakatla Indian Community, Post Office Box 142, Metlakatla, Alaska.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Box 907–X, Route 7, Scottsdale, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Seneca Nation of Indians, 25 Main Street, Salamanca, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tuscarora Nation of Indians, Tuscarora Reservation, Lewiston, N.Y.

A. Ronnie J. Straw, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Herald E. Stringer, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $4,625. E. (9) $415.51.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 520 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $87.60.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Sam S. Studebaker, Tipp City, Ohio.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 3900 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $64.10.

A. Roger H. Sullivan.
B. American Sugar Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. C. Austin Sutherland, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 224 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $48.60.

A. Russell A. Swindell, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
B. North Carolina Railroad Association, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
D. (6) $2,772.66. E. (9) $842.15.

A. Ralph L. Tabor, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. C. M. Tarr, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,846.14. E. (9) $81.60.

A. Wm. B. Thompson, Jr., 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John N. Thurman, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 635 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $710.81.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. E. Linwood Tipton, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 2355 Alameda Street, Vallejo, Calif.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce of Vallejo.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,314.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $127.40.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $28.38.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,933.34. E (9) $24.95.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,107.50. E. (9) $18.75.

A. Joel B. True, 840 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Galen Douglas Trussell, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dick Tullis, 307 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.
B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $100.

A. John W. Turner, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L.E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Range Association, 375 North Fulton Street, Fresno, Calif.
E. (9) $80.70.

A. Gladys Uhl, 1616 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee for Immigration Reform, 1616 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,135.26. E. (9) $462.19.

A. David G. Unger, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $690.

A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $50,783.27.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $411.75.

A. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $23,002.25.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $15.

A. Charles R. Van Horn, 17th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., Charles and Baltimore Streets, Baltimore, Md.

A. Mrs. Lois W. Van Valkenburgh, 1673 Preston Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. Citizens Committee for UNISEP, 20 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $121.90. E. (9) $7.

A. Veterans of World War I, USA, Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $175.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Voice of the People in Action, 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
B. Dr. Russell Forrest Egner, 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
D. (6) $460.

A. John S. Walker, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hanna Mining Co., 100 Erieview Plaza, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $17.

A. William A. Walton, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,607.50. E. (9) $3,598.15.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Weaver, Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $300.

A. Weaver, Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5. E. (9) $1.89.

A. Weaver, Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $25.18.

A. E. E. Webster, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $805.15.

A. Dr. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Welch, 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Wellington Management Co., 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Wenchel, Schulman & Manning, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Michael Ladney, Jr., 18125 East Ten Mile Road, East Detroit, Mich.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $601.30.

A. John C. White, 1317 F Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 1317 F Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marc A. White, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Donald S. Whyte, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $375.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $250.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $1.40.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of American Indians, 1765 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) $2.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Tribe of Indians, Wellpinit, Wash.

A. John Willard, Box 1172, Helena, Mont.
B. Montana Railroad Association, Helena, Mont.

A. Harding deC. Williams, 1300 Connecticut, Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,916. E. (9) $74.17.

A. Robert E. Williams, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $465. E. (9) $275.35.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $213.66.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Automobile Excise Tax Repeal, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $81.62.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government of the Bahamas, Nassau, Bahamas.
E. (9) $26.62.

A. Clark L. Wilson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 245 Second Street NE., Washington D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,392.31.

A. Richard W. Wilson, 121 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $90.

A. Morton M. Winston.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Everett T. Winter, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Richard F. Witherall, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Lawton B. Wolfe, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation-Communication Employees Union, 3960 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Albert Y. Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

A. Hal J. Wright, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Support Group for Progressive Banking, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $25.

A. Howard E. Young, 4622 Creek Shore Drive, Rockville, Md.
B. Best Universal Lock Co., Inc., Post Office Box 103, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $30.90.

A. J. Banks Young, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $408.

A. Kenneth Young, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,836. E. (9) $316.80.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,006.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Zimring, Gromfine, and Sternstein, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Roger E. Zylstra, 1101 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Smith & Pepper, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1965:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19______ ◀

REPORT
PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◀

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◀

A. Ad Hoc Committee of the Construction Industry Advancement Funds, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth D. Allen, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Plywood Association, 1119 A Street, Tacoma, Wash.

A. American Transit Association, 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Aris Gloves, Inc., 10 East 38th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William S. Bergman, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Consulting Engineers Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William S. Bergman, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Employment Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cuban Electric Co., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Lowell A. Burkett, 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Caplin & Drysdale, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Village Green Corp., Charlottesville, Va.

A. George C. Cheek, 1119 A Street, Tacoma, Wash.
B. American Plywood Association, 1119 A Street, Tacoma, Wash.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Wisconsin Corp., 500 Union Street, Seattle 1, Wash.

A. Francis J. Curry, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cummins-American Corp., 1825 Glenview Road, Glenview, Ill.

A. Jerome R. Gulan, National Federation of Independent Business.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th Street & New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Randolph M. Hale, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Humor Lobby, 4323 52d Road South, Arlington, Va.

A. James W. Hunt, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas John Kehoe and Associate, 1904 Rookwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

A. Glenn T. Lashley, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. D.C. Division, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. Edward Lashman, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

A. E. Leitz, Inc., 468 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John M. Lynham, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Charles and Katrushka J. Parsons, 310 Park Avenue, Pasay City, Manila, Philippines.

A. McClure & Trotter, Suite 405, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Coca-Cola Co., Post Office Drawer 1734, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Gordon L. McDonough, 3808 Warren Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. David S. Moir, 2244 Live Oak Drive, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Henry J. Moreschi, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, 304 West 58th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Central Scientific Co., 1700 Irving Park Road, Chicago, Ill.

A. Olson & James, 809 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mr. Jack Baer, A–421 Park Drive Manor, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Earle W. Putnam, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mr. William Edwin Richardson, 2633 North Sycamore Street, Arlington, Va.

A. Stanley W. Schroeder, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Gerald A. Simmons, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. P. Sommer, 31 Lafayette Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.
B. National Columbus Day Committee.

A. Warren G. Taylor, 605 Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee, 605 Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.

A. Craig L. Thomas, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

A. Joseph P. Tumulty, Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Estate of Harry S. Leyman, care of Frost & Jacobs, 2310 Central Trust Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Weaver, Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. E. Leitz, Inc., 468 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

A. Well, Gotshal & Manges, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aris Gloves, Inc., 10 East 38th Street, New York, N.Y.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God of deliverance, we come to Thee on this Ash Wednesday asking Thee to deliver us from evil. As Jesus went into the wilderness to prepare himself for the cross, we find ourselves in a wilderness needing preparation.

Cleanse us from our sins and all unrighteousness. Open our hearts to Thy grace that in us and through us the evil of the world may be overcome with good.

We return unto Thee in sackcloth and ashes, as it were, that the world might be saved. In quietness and confidence may we renew our strength as a nation at this seat of government, in the name of Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 21, 1966, and Tuesday, February 22, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 387)

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message from the President which is at the desk be referred jointly to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Senate Committee on Public Works. I have discussed this with the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, and it is agreeable to him. The message includes items relevant to the jurisdiction of both committees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Committee on Public Works, jointly, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Albert Schweitzer said:

> Man has lost the capacity to foresee and to forestall. He will end by destroying the earth.

The most affluent nation on earth may feel that it is immune from this indictment. A nation that offered its people—a century ago—uncharted forests, broad sparkling rivers, and prairies ripe for planting, may have expected that bounty to endure forever.

But we do not live alone with wishful expectations.

We live with history. It tells us of a hundred proud civilizations that have decayed through careless neglect of the nature that fed them.

We live with the certain future of multiplying populations, whose demands on the resources of nature will equal their numbers.

We are not immune. We are not endowed—any more than were those perished nations of the past—with a limitless natural bounty.

Yet we are endowed with their experience. We are able to see the magnitude of the choice before us, and its consequences for every child born on our continent from this day forward.

Economists estimate that this generation has already suffered losses from pollution that run into billions of dollars each year. But the ultimate cost of pollution is incalculable.

We see that we can corrupt and destroy our lands, our rivers, our forests and the atmosphere itself—all in the name of progress and necessity. Such a course leads to a barren America, bereft of its beauty, and shorn of its sustenance.

We see that there is another course—more expensive today, more demanding. Down this course lies a natural America restored to her people. The promise is clear rivers, tall forests and clean air—a sane environment for man.

I shall propose in this message one means to achieve that promise. It requires, first, an understanding of what has already happened to our waters.

THE POLLUTION OF OUR WATERS

> Pollution touches us all. We are at the same time pollutors and sufferers from pollution. Today, we are certain that pollution adversely affects the quality of our lives. In the future, it may affect their duration.

These are the words of the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee. They were written in November 1965.

At that time, every river system in America suffered some degree of pollution.

At that time, discharges into our rivers and streams—both treated and untreated—equaled the raw sewage from almost 50 million people. Animal wastes and waste from our cities and towns were making water unfit for any use.

At that time, rivers, lakes, and estuaries were receiving great quantities of industrial chemicals—acids from mine runoff—detergents and minerals that would not "break down" in the ordinary life of the water. These pollutants were reentering domestic and industrial water supplies. They were killing fish. They posed hazards to both human and animal life.

By that time, on Lake Erie, 6 of 32 public recreation and swimming areas had been closed down because the water was unsafe for human beings. The blue pike catch in the lake had fallen from 20 million pounds in 1937 to 7,000 pounds in 1960. The oxygen that fish need for life was being rapidly devoured by blooms of algae fed by pollutants.

At that time, in the lower Arkansas Red River Basin, oilfield development and irrigation were dumping salt into rivers. The result was an additional annual expense of $13 million to bring in fresh water.

I have placed these comments in the past tense not because they are no longer true. They are more tragically true today than they were 4 months ago.

I seek instead to make them a benchmark in restoring America's precious heritage to her people.

I seek to make them that point in time when Americans determined to resist the flow of poison in their rivers and streams.

I seek to make them ancient history for the next generation.

And I believe the conditions they describe can become just that—if we begin now, together, to cleanse our rivers of the blight that burdens them.

A START HAS BEEN MADE

The 1st session of the 89th Congress launched a major effort to save America's water resources.

It authorized quality standards for all interstate waters.

It provided—in the Water Pollution Control Act of 1965—new resources for treating the wastes from our cities.

It created the Water Resources Council to coordinate all aspects of river basin planning. This unified effort promises to make the work of pollution control more effective.

We mean to make full use of these new instruments. They will require increased expenditures, in a year of few increases for urgent domestic programs. We shall make them.

Yet at this point the development of new knowledge, and new organizations to carry on this work, is as crucial as our dollars.

We must combine all the means at our disposal—Federal, State, local, and private—progressively to reduce the pollution of our rivers.

A CLEAN RIVERS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

I propose that we begin now to clean and preserve entire river basins from their sources to their mouths.

I propose a new kind of partnership—built upon our creative Federal system—that will unite all the pollution control activities in a single river basin. Its task is to achieve high standards of water quality throughout the basin.

The clean rivers demonstration program I recommend has four requirements:

1. Appropriate water quality standards—authorized by the Water Quality Act of 1965—must be adopted for every part of the basin.

2. The States and local communities must develop long-range plans to achieve those standards and to preserve them. The plans must be comprehensive, and they must be practical.

3. Where it does not already exist, a permanent river basin organization must be created to carry out the plan. It must represent the communities and the States. It must work closely with the Federal Government. The organization must be prepared to revise the plan as conditions require, so that new threats to the quality of the river may be turned back.

4. Communities must be willing and able to contribute funds necessary for constructing facilities. They must be prepared to levy charges for their use—charges adequate to maintain, extend, and replace them when needed.

THE FEDERAL ROLE

Federal financial assistance will be necessary if the clean rivers demonstration program is to succeed.

In most watersheds there are communities wholly without treatment facilities. There are some with only the most basic means for removing solid wastes.

Substantial funds will be necessary to construct the initial facilities. I therefore propose to eliminate the dollar-ceiling limitation on grants for sewage treatment facilities in these clean river demonstrations—but only in the demonstrations; provide special funds to finance both planning and project costs in clean river demonstrations.

In the first year, I am asking $50 million to begin this program.

To administer the program most effectively, we must reorganize the Federal effort. In the past, the Federal antipollution effort has been organizationally separate from water conservation and use programs.

One agency should assume leadership in our clean water effort.

That agency should be the Department of the Interior.

Today the Department's water management programs range from saline water research to irrigation. It is responsible for wildlife preservation, and for administering the national park system. Its Secretary serves as Chairman of the Water Resources Council. Thus its present task, and the logic of good government, require that it be entrusted with an important new effort to clean and preserve entire river systems.

I shall shortly submit to the Congress a reorganization plan to transfer to the Department of the Interior the Water Pollution Control Administration now housed in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

BENEFITS OF THE PROGRAM

The program has one ultimate goal: to clean all of America's rivers. This year we shall start with those few basins whose States and communities are prepared to begin. As additional organizations are formed and their plans drafted, more basins will qualify.

The project will be self-sustaining. Federal assistance is planned for the initial construction of local treatment works. Thereafter, local communities will collect revenues from users sufficient for the operation, expansion, and replacement of the facilities. Continuing responsibility will reside where the benefits accrue—with local authorities.

The projects will allow experiment with new forms of organization. State and local participation may be based on an interstate compact, a river basin commission, or even a conservancy district. The central requirement is for sufficient jurisdiction and authority to develop and carry out the long-range plan.

These projects will enable us to curtail and control pollution in entire river basins. Broad-scale planning of water standards in broad stretches of a river can achieve substantial economies. More efficient plants can be built to treat the wastes of several communities and nearby industries. Integrating the control of stream flow and treatment plant operation can reduce costs—for example, by fitting the type and amount of day-to-day treatment to varying stream conditions.

OUR ESTABLISHED PROGRAMS

The clean rivers program now holds great promise for restoring and preserving water quality. But in the beginning it can affect only a few areas.

Our existing programs must continue. They must be improved—not only to help rescue other rivers from pollution, but because they provide the foundation for the river basin demonstration projects.

Federal grants for waste treatment plants now total more than $725 million. More than 6,000 projects are under construction or already completed. For fiscal 1967 I have requested the Congress to appropriate $150 million, the full authorized amount, to continue this vital effort.

Under last year's act, the initiative for water quality standards rests, until July 1967, with the States. State governments now have an obligation to demonstrate their willingness and ability to control pollution. Some have already done so. The Federal Government must extend all possible help to enable the States to meet this responsibility.

I am therefore recommending that support for State water pollution control agencies be doubled. The added amount should be used at the Secretary's discretion to assist States in devising effective water quality standards. It should be used to prepare plans for abating pollution.

ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY

Standards, however, mean little without the power to enforce them. Existing Federal authority to abate water pollution is unnecessarily time consuming, complex in procedure, and limited in jurisdiction. Steps must be taken to simplify and strengthen these procedures.

I recommend that—

1. The Water Pollution Control Act be amended to eliminate the two mandatory 6-month delays that unnecessarily burden its procedures;

2. The Federal Government have authority immediately to bring suit to stop pollution, when that pollution constitutes an imminent danger to public health or welfare;

3. More weight be given by the courts to the evidence produced in administrative enforcement hearings;

4. The Federal Government have the right to subpena witnesses to appear at administrative hearings;

5. The Secretary be given the right to initiate enforcement proceedings when pollution occurs in navigable waters, intrastate or interstate;

6. Registration be required of all existing or potential sources of major pollution, and U.S. officials be given the right to inspect such sources; and

7. Private citizens be allowed to bring suit in Federal court to seek relief from pollution.

These are strong measures.

But the menace of pollution requires them.

It poses a major threat to the quality of life in our country.

RESEARCH FOR COMPREHENSIVE POLLUTION CONTROL

The river basin proposals I am submitting take advantage of the best techniques available today. They apply new concepts of efficient organization. But if pollution control is to cope with increasing volumes of waste from our growing industry and population, new knowledge and technology are required. It is a challenge to research organizations, both private and public, to develop these technologies.

1. There must be new integrated systems of disposal. Many liquid wastes can be transformed to solids or gases—or vice versa. Research can show which form is least harmful and least costly. Research can reduce costs through combined solid-liquid disposal systems.

2. The technology of water treatment must be improved. We must find ways to allow more reuse of waste water at reasonable costs. We must remove or control nutrients that cause excessive growth of plant life in streams, lakes, and estuaries. We must take steps to control the damage caused by waters that heat up after cooling generators and industrial engines.

3. More must be learned about the effects of pollutants and the present level of pollution. Better equipment must be developed to measure pollution load and movement. We must assess the results of particular pollutants on plant, animal, and human populations. We should continually monitor the quality of our environment, to provide a yardstick against which our progress in pollution abatement can be measured. We must apply the most modern techniques of systems analysis.

Such research will lead to pollution standards suited for each location and type of pollutant. It will permit us to direct our control efforts more efficiently. I am proposing that we spend over $20 million next year on this research.

CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION

The Clean Air Act of 1963 and its 1965 amendments have given us new tools to help attack the pollution that fouls the air we breathe.

We have begun to counter air pollution by increasing the tempo of effort at all levels of government.

In less than 2 years Federal financial assistance has stimulated a 50-percent increase in the air pollution budgets of State and local governments. Federal standards for the control of automobile exhausts will apply to the 1968 models. The Federal interstate abatement program will significantly supplement State and local efforts to deal with air pollution.

I am heartened by the progress we are making. But I am mindful that we have only begun our work. I am forwarding to the Congress proposals to improve and increase Federal research, financing, and technical assistance to help State and local governments take the measures needed to control air pollution.

POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

The Federal Government is rightly expected to provide an example to the Nation in pollution control. We cannot make new demands on State and local governments or on private industry without putting the Federal house in order. We will take the necessary steps this year to insure that Federal activities do not contribute to the deterioration of our water and air.

Last November I signed an Executive order requiring that all new Federal installations include adequate water pollution control systems. Agencies are required to submit long-range plans to bring existing installations up to the high level of pollution control required of new facilities. These plans are to be submitted by July 1 of this year. We are providing the funds necessary to implement them.

I also intend to issue an Executive order dealing with air pollution from Federal activities. The potential dangers of air pollution have only recently been realized. The technical and economic difficulties in conserving the purity of our air are, if anything, greater than in protecting our water resources. Nevertheless, I intend to see that the necessary steps are taken to curtail emissions from Federal installations.

HUMAN RESOURCES FOR POLLUTION CONTROL

New projects and new technology are of little value without skilled people dedicated to putting them to effective use.

I propose to enlist the services of those in industry and the universities.

I propose to attract skilled administrators and scientists to the challenges of full-time occupations in pollution control.

Critical skills are in short supply in all public pollution control operations. We need to train scientists and social scientists in these activities, and to demonstrate the advantages of Government service as a lifetime occupation. I propose to establish traineeships, fellowships, and an internship program in Federal pollution control activities. The participants will be in residence in Federal pollution control programs throughout the country.

IMPACT ON OUR CITIES

The pollution control programs I have recommended will benefit all Americans.

But nowhere will the impact be greater than on our cities.

These steps can clean the air that is today blighted by smoke and chemicals.

These steps can bring to growing urban centers abundant supplies of pure water to sustain today's prosperity and to satisfy tomorrow's needs.

These steps can enrich the daily life of the city dweller and his children by restoring surrounding waterways to their unspoiled natural beauty. For we know that ugliness is degrading and costly, but that beauty can revive the human spirit and enlarge the imagination.

NATIONAL WATER COMMISSION

In no area of resource management are the problems more complex—or more important—than those involving our Nation's water supplies. The water shortage in the Northeastern United States is a dramatic reminder that we must take every possible step to improve the management of our precious water resources.

I propose the establishment of a National Water Commission to review and advise on the entire range of water resource problems—from methods to conserve and augment existing water supplies to the application of modern technology, such as desalting, to provide more usable water for our cities, our industries, and our farms.

This Commission will be composed of the very best minds in the country. It will judge the quality of our present efforts. It will recommend long-range plans for the future. It will point the way to increased and more effective water resource measures by the Federal Government, working in close cooperation with States, local communities, and private industry.

SAVING OUR FORESTS

Since the century's beginning the National Government has labored to preserve the sublime legacy that is the American forest.

Time after time public intervention has prevented the destruction of irreplaceable forest lands.

Our national park and forest systems are America's principal trustee in the vital task of conservation. That task cannot be accomplished in a single stroke. It requires patient determination and careful planning to secure for our people the beauty that is justly theirs. It merits careful planning.

I propose that we plan now to complete our national park system by 1972—the 100th anniversary of Yellowstone, the world's first national park.

Substantial progress has been made during the last 4 years. Yet many scenic masterpieces remain unprotected and deserve early inclusion in the national park system.

A REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

I propose the creation of a Redwood National Park in northern California.

It is possible to reclaim a river like the Potomac from the carelessness of man. But we cannot restore—once it is lost—the majesty of a forest whose trees soared upward 2,000 years ago. The Secretary of the Interior—after exhaustive consultations with preservationists, officials of the State of California, lumbermen, and others—has completed a study of the desirability of establishing a park of international significance.

I have reviewed his recommendations, and am submitting to the Congress legislation to establish such a park. This will be costly. But it is my recommendation that we move swiftly to save an area of immense significance before it is too late.

OTHER OUTDOOR RECREATION PROPOSALS

Other major outdoor recreation proposals which should be approved in 1966 are:

1. Cape Lookout National Seashore, N.C.
2. Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Mich.
3. Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, Ind.
4. Oregon Dunes National Seashore, Oreg.
5. Great Basin National Park, Nev.
6. Guadalupe Mountains National Park, Tex.
7. Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, Mont.-Wyo.
8. Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area, Utah-Wyo.

For a region which now has no national park, I recommend the study of a Connecticut River National Recreation Area along New England's largest river, in the States of New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Connecticut.

I propose the early completion of studies and planning for two new parks—the Apostle Isles Seashore along Lake Superior and North Cascades in Washington State.

NATIONWIDE TRAIL SYSTEM

In my budget, I recommended legislation to extend Federal support to the Appalachian Trail, and to encourage the development of hiking trails accessible to the people throughout the country.

I am submitting legislation to foster the development by Federal, State, and local agencies of a nationwide system of trails and give special emphasis to the location of trails near metropolitan areas.

PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC SITES

Historic preservation is the goal of citizen groups in every part of the country. To help preserve buildings and sites of historic significance, I will recommend a program of matching grants to States and to the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

WILD RIVER SYSTEM

I am encouraged by the response to my proposal for a national wild rivers system, and I urge the Congress to complete this pioneering conservation legislation this year.

COSTS OF LAND ACQUISITION

The spiraling cost of land acquisitions by the Federal Government, particularly for water resource and recreational purposes, is a matter of increasing concern.

Landowners whose property is acquired by the Federal Government are, of course, entitled to just compensation as provided by the Constitution. At the same time, land for the use of the general public should not be burdened with the increased price resulting from speculative activities.

I have requested the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, together with the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior, and the heads of the other agencies principally concerned, to investigate procedures for protecting the Government against such artificial price spirals.

A CREED TO PRESERVE OUR NATURAL HERITAGE

To sustain an environment suitable for man, we must fight on a thousand battlegrounds. Despite all of our wealth and knowledge, we cannot create a redwood forest, a wild river, or a gleaming seashore.

But we can keep those we have.

The science that has increased our abundance can find ways to restore and renew an environment equal to our needs.

The time is ripe to set forth a creed to preserve our natural heritage—principles which men and women of good will will support in order to assure the beauty and bounty of their land. Conservation is ethically sound. It is rooted in our love of the land, our respect for the rights of others, our devotion to the rule of law.

Let us proclaim a creed to preserve our natural heritage with rights and the duties to respect those rights:

The right to clean water—and the duty not to pollute it.

The right to clean air—and the duty not to befoul it.

The right to surroundings reasonably free from man-made ugliness—and the duty not to blight.

The right of easy access to places of beauty and tranquility where every family can find recreation and refreshment—and the duty to preserve such places clean and unspoiled.

The right to enjoy plants and animals in their natural habitats—and the duty not to eliminate them from the face of this earth.

These rights assert that no person, or company, or government has a right in this day and age to pollute, to abuse resources, or to waste our common heritage.

The work to achieve these rights will not be easy. It cannot be completed in a year or 5 years. But there will never be a better time to begin.

Let us from this moment begin our work in earnest—so that future generations of Americans will look back and say: 1966 was the year of the new conservation, when farsighted men took farsighted steps to preserve the beauty that is the heritage of our Republic.

I urge the Congress to give favorable consideration to the proposals I have recommended in this message.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 23, 1966.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1904) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1924) to amend section 39b of the Bankruptcy Act so as to prohibit a part-time referee from acting as trustee or receiver in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68) recognizing the 50th anniversary of the chartering by act of Congress of the Boy Scouts of America, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10431. An act to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe;

H.R. 12232. An act to amend title 1 of the United States Code to provide for the admissibility in evidence of the slip laws and the Treaties and Other International Acts Series, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12264. An act to declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administrative purposes is held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1904) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the pueblos of Acoma, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 10431. An act to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; and

H.R. 12264. An act to declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administrative purposes is held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12232. An act to amend title 1 of the United States Code to provide for the admissibility in evidence of the slip laws and the Treaties and Other International Acts Series, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSIONS TODAY AND ON FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today and on Friday next.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

VIETNAM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am on notice that a request for unanimous consent to vote on the pending measure would be objected to, and therefore I shall not make such request at this time nor during the morning hour.

I think it is well to keep in mind, however, that both this measure and the measure that is before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations are urgently needed if we are to uphold this Nation's military commitment in South Vietnam. These matters cannot be long delayed without injury to the Nation's interests.

I hope that Senators realize how important this matter is, as they proceed to make their positions clear. We are told there will not be a filibuster on the measure. I hope not. I would point out that Americans are fighting and dying today to support the commitments made by this Government. Senators can quarrel, if they wish, about the wisdom of those commitments; but I think they would do better to advise the President of the United States, as our Commander in Chief, on a personal basis, of their worries, fears, and hopes, rather than give aid and comfort to the enemy. I may feel compelled, before this debate is over, to point out that some of the debate and some of the statements being made here and elsewhere to the press, are giving aid and comfort to the enemy, and, in the last analysis, are costing the lives of our men.

I hope, Mr. President, that we will be permitted to vote on the matter sometime this week, because this is a very vital issue that is of the utmost importance to our Nation; and if Senators wish to object, or do not want the unanimous-consent request made, I would appreciate it if they would simply authorize me to say so, and I shall refrain from seeking unanimous consent to limit debate and bring the matter to an immediate vote.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to comment on two points the Senator has made.

First of all, I wish the Senator to know that I agree with him on the desirability of a vote this week. I want him to know also that I shall not agree to a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on it, because I believe that if we hold sessions for a reasonable number of hours each day, we will get a vote on it this week.

Some of us are busily engaged in preparing what we consider to be a very basic statement of policy on the part of those of us who disagree with the escalated war policy which we think is inherent in the pending bill. As far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, I would join in any objection to a filibuster on this bill. But I have not heard anyone talking about a debate that could possibly be characterized as a filibuster.

However, some of us have an honest, sincere belief that the pending measure raises such vital questions of policy in the field of American foreign relations that we feel we should not vote on it until certain statements on that policy have been made. We think each Senator should have the right of discussing the pending measure on its merits without any time limitation being imposed upon him.

I would be the most surprised man in the Senate if we did not reach a vote on the bill before the week is over. I think we should vote on it before the week is over; but only after the regular course of debate has taken place.

As to the comment the Senator from Louisiana has made that he thinks the point of view of some of us may be aiding and abetting the enemy, that, of course, he is privileged to discuss, and we shall reply.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, may I say that as far as I am concerned, my position is well known.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's 3 minutes have expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My position is well known, and I am proud to speak for a State that is united almost to a man behind our national policy. While I have received some criticism, I have received a great amount of applause as well from such States as New York and California.

Mr. President, as far as Louisiana is concerned, my mail runs 99-plus percent in favor of the position I take, that we should give those men in Vietnam all the help they need, and that, having committed ourselves, we should not renege on those commitments. I say further, Mr. President, that in Louisiana—and I was there last weekend—and also in Arkansas and Texas I have yet to find a single person who expresses any disagreement with the firmness that this Nation proposes to show in resisting aggression in southeast Asia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I concur with the distinguished acting majority leader. I have prepared a short statement, which I may as well present to the Senate at this time.

Yesterday, we observed the birth anniversary of George Washington. He was our first Commander in Chief. He was made general and Commander in Chief of the united Colonies on June 15, 1775.

In that capacity, he had his problems with the Continental Congress in securing supplies, weapons, pay, and other necessities for his army.

Those experiences were a factor in making the President the Commander in Chief when the Constitution was written.

Now, 191 years later, a similar problem confronts us.

The Commander in Chief, based on estimates which have been prepared and supported by our field commanders in Vietnam, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the National Security Council, and the Budget Bureau has presented a request for $4.8 billion for aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and other items.

The request has been carefully processed by the Armed Services Committee and the Defense Department Appropriations Subcommittee. They heard 11 witnesses. From 16 to 24 Senators were present at all of those hearings.

The bill which the committee reported is not a policy measure. It is a bill to authorize funds for needed equipment and research.

After it was reported to the Senate, the Foreign Relations Committee began hearings on another measure. It triggered a broad discussion of our policy in and toward Vietnam.

In and out of committee, on and off the Senate floor, a diversity of views and viewpoints have been freely expressed—to withdraw, to pause longer, to escalate, to deescalate, to limit the struggle.

And all this time, the request for weapons and equipment languishes. Virtually no speeches have been directed to the measure before us.

There have been allegations and fulminations that "we are spread dangerously thin" and that "shortages appear" but the request of the Commander in Chief for authority and funds to procure weapons and supplies reposes in the Senate without action.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Until this authorization is approved, no money can be appropriated. If the Commander in Chief because of urgent necessity should obligate funds without this authority, the Congress would be the first to castigate him.

The time for more talk on this pending measure is past. The time for action is here and now.

The well-being of more than 200,000 American troops, 12,000 miles from home, is involved.

The continued and successful prosecution of the present struggle is at stake. To delay further action on the pending request means that Congress must accept responsibility for failure to act.

It has been said that in the 10-year struggle of the French with the Vietminh, that the war was lost not at Dienbienphu but in Paris. I trust it may never be recorded that if we fail in our objectives, that the failure occurred not at Danang, or in the highlands of Vietnam, but in Washington.

To seek cloture on a measure involving our national security, our pledges to Vietnam, and our obligations under the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization would be absolutely incredible. The impact of such action on troop morale could scarcely be measured. Its impact on world reaction could scarcely be evaluated.

The time has come to close the debate and act. I believe I speak for the vast majority of the Republican minority when I say we are ready to act now and approve the request which is before us.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator from Illinois read the statement which he read a few minutes ago with regard to the situation which confronts the Senate in regard to the pending business. Many of us do not agree with the conclusion he has reached that there is no basic policy question involved in the pending bill. That is where we find an honest difference of opinion among Senators, because some of us think the pending bill does involve a basic policy question. It involves the foreign policy vis-a-vis the United States and Asia. That is the policy issue involved in the pending bill. I say it should be discussed in some detail in the discussion of the bill.

I simply wanted to file this caveat of disagreement with what the Senator from Illinois had to say, to at least show the public that there is a difference of opinion with regard to the policy and that it is involved in the pending bill.

In view of even what the Secretary of Defense has said, I will show in remarks on the floor that we are drawing close to a potential escalation of the war which will result in the killing of thousands of American boys whose lives should not be sacrificed. The bill involves the decision of the President of the United States to escalate the war. We think it involves a policy question and we think we ought to discuss that policy question in this authorization bill.

I do not question the sincerity of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], or the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], or the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], who have already said they do not see a policy question involved. It comes to a question of a time limit. I have already announced, and I now announce, that if we devote ourselves to a discussion of the bill on the floor, and if we do nothing but discuss the bill, we will get to a vote by the end of the week.

The Senator from Illinois calls the attention of the public to the allegation that any prolonged discussion of the bill somehow, in some way, is letting down the boys in this war. We do not accept that. We think, because of the policy issue involved, this issue should be determined in order to seek to protect the boys in southeast Asia, because some of us believe that if we follow the policy which can be followed under the bill we are going to sacrifice unjustifiably many boys who ought to be saved. That involves a policy question.

So far as the time element is concerned, there is already delivered materiel of war to the boys in southeast Asia that cannot even get unloaded and we cannot get the ships in now.

I have not heard a scintilla of evidence that there is being denied to our boys over there anything in the way they need for the conduct of the war on its present scale. If that were the case, we would be unanimous in wanting to take whatever steps were necessary to see that they will get whatever materiel, to the maximum extent necessary, for their protection.

I do not think there is any basis for creating the fear in this country that a discussion of basic foreign policy in the Senate for a week is going to jeopardize our boys in that area. If that were the case, we would wonder why those boys had not been given that protection long before this.

My judgment is that if we discuss this bill, with our differences of opinion, and have a full discussion, we will get to a vote on it by the end of the week. My friend, the Senator from Illinois, said he thought cloture would be a mistake because of the effect it would have not only on our American boys overseas, but on others as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Tydings in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. He is quite right when he says that we ought to get to the issues in the pending bill and vote on it. I believe we ought to do it. I believe we can do it if we discuss this bill fully. I think we could get to a vote by the end of the week.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. First, I want to commend the Senator when he says that after reasonable debate we should be able to vote some time this week. His attitude is encouraging.

Second, he said he has no evidence that our boys over there are in actual need. Fortunately, they are getting materiel there for their needs, but if there is much more of a delay, there is going to be a critical need for some items.

Mr. MORSE. Of course, I do not think we should continue the present policy. There is a great difference between the question of supplying our boys and the question of whether we should continue the present policy. It is the policy we are discussing. As I am going to urge in my remarks, if we continue this policy, we are headed for an escalated war that will end up in a war with China.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for this discussion be extended 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think there is division of opinion on supplying what the boys need, as the Senator from Oregon has said, but there is a need for debate on the President's policy. Therefore, when I make my address, I shall discuss the policy. I think the debate on the question of policy is good for the country.

I hope that we do see it through. There is nothing to stop the Senate from having night sessions.

I have a speech to make. It will not take more than 35 or 40 minutes. I understand that others wish to speak also. Let us give everybody an opportunity to speak and still vote on Friday.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the senior Senator from New York that this is the issue before us.

I believe there is a policy issue here as to whether or not there is going to be a reassessment of the position of August 1964. I believe that a vote on this measure does exactly that.

That is why I am going to give the Senate an opportunity to vote on the resolution of August 1964.

Do not forget that it provides a rescision clause. I believe the time has come to place restrictions on the President and not give him carte blanche authority that the resolution of 1964 gave him.

I refuse to believe only two of us would have voted against it in August 1964 if all the facts had been known at the time. There are other Senators who now believe as Senator GRUENING and I believe and continue to believe.

At that time we had 20,000 soldiers there. There are 200,000 men there now. The figure could go to 400,000, 600,000, or 800,000. If we get into a war with China, it may go to 3 million in 36 months after the war breaks out.

I think the time has come to place a restriction on the Commander in Chief and not give him carte blanche authority. I am going to offer that as an amendment to this bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, may I ask a question?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would like to finish this and then yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The Senator is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe the President got a power of attorney limited by the situation which we have there, notwithstanding his words. I believe this vote approves his policy to the date covered by the appropriation, which covers 400,000 personnel.

Therefore, I and others will reserve the right to vote against the appropriation if the President is unwise enough in persisting in not joining with us in connection with the resolution of August 1964.

I agree with the Senator that there is a replacement clause. I shall vote no, but I reserve the right to vote yes tomorrow if the President persists in not joining us in this decision.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from New York, the former attorney general of his State whose legal advice I follow frequently—but not on this occasion—a power of attorney can be given, but one can subsequently fire the attorney.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I rise in the Chamber at the end of this discussion.

In answer to a direct question as to whether or not this money was needed promptly and whether this bill should be passed promptly to help our military effort in Vietnam, the director of the AID program, Mr. Bell, said, in his opinion, it should be passed, the sooner the better.

Inasmuch as this is a supplement to the 1966 appropriation, and in the interests of the men who are now fighting on the front in South Vietnam, I hope the Senate will pass this bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, quite briefly on this subject, and as one who handled the appropriation bill last year, and urged that more money be put in at the time for the war in Vietnam, I can state as a fact, knowing the background of these needs, that this money is needed now; that the critical date is fast approaching when failure of it will cause actual delay in providing the hardware of fighting a war, including helicopters, 2.75 rockets, and items of that kind.

There is no question about the critical timing, and it is necessary to pass this bill as soon as we can.

I commend the Senator from Oregon for his willingness to dispose of it with dispatch this week.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the presence of the acting majority leader and the Democratic whip—and I have postponed making this request until he was in the Chamber—I ask unanimous consent that certain communications, editorials, and newspaper stories dealing with my position in regard to the war in Asia be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I hope that it will not be necessary to object—I note that the Senator has, from time to time, placed in the RECORD in support of his position great numbers of communications. I understand that in some instances it has taken up as much as 40 pages of fine print in the RECORD.

Mr. President, let me say, as a Senator from Louisiana, that I would imagine the majority of those communications—perhaps all of them—support the position of the Senator from Oregon, a position which is contrary to the one this Nation is taking today on the subject of the war in Vietnam.

I do not wish the RECORD to give the impression that the people of this Nation are not behind their President, are not behind their Government, or that they are not in support of our young men fighting in Vietnam.

I, for example, have many thousands of communications and letters supporting the position of President, the position of the Government, and the position I have taken in regard to this matter.

I do not object to the Senator's placing certain selective matter in the RECORD which supports his position. I would hope that the Senator is not seeking to place in the RECORD all correspondence in support of his position, because it would seem to me it would only be fair for those of us who take the opposite position in the matter to place an equal amount of correspondence in the RECORD. The question would then become to what extent should we burden the RECORD with more of the same.

In other words, there is no doubt in my mind that some of the letters I receive—and some of these letters come from the State of Oregon, and other States—that there are people who support his position. There is also no doubt whatever that many people do not. Likewise, in the State of Louisiana, let me say that the mail I receive is very nearly unanimous. As of this date, it might very well be unanimous in support of my position. I would hope that we could work out some rules of procedure by which we would be able to give both sides an equal opportunity to load the RECORD with correspondence in support of both positions.

Let me ask the Senator from Oregon whether this is all the mail he receives, or only certain selected samples which he believes most adequately support his position?

Mr. MORSE. I will be glad to tell the Senator, if he will allow me to respond.

Mr. President, since last Friday, my office tells me that we have received over 15,000 pieces of mail. In fact, we have a group of volunteers over there today opening up the mail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the last count shows well over 90 percent in support of my position. The reason I have from time to time put communications, pro and con, in the RECORD, is as follows:

There are those who seek to give the impression that the Senator from Oregon is a lonely voice in the wilderness in this country in connection with his opposition to the war in South Vietnam. I am satisfied that there are millions of Americans who share my point of view, and they are going to be heard from in increasing numbers in the months ahead.

Mr. President, look at what those of us opposed to this war are up against. So far as the media of information in this country are concerned, the President has only to raise a little finger and he is on television for as long as he wishes to be. The top officials of the Government have only to let it be known that they wish to make a statement, and the statement is reproduced throughout the press of the country.

Now, Mr. President, it takes a great deal of immodesty—and I plead guilty; it takes a lot of nerve—and I plead guilty; in fact, some would say a lot of brass to walk onto the floor of the Senate and ask unanimous consent to have these communications placed in the RECORD.

But, I owe a great deal to those citizens who have sent them to me.

Mr. President, there are forces in this country who feel they are not being heard, that they are not being given an opportunity to present their points of view. I am even having difficulty in the Committee on Foreign Relations, thus far, getting certain witnesses that I believe should come forward in a public hearing to testify on the basic policy questions involved. For, whether we know it or not, we have come to a crossroads in American history. Mr. President, if you and I could come back to the world 35 or 50 years from today, we would then be reading about the historic debates of these days in the Senate. But none of us can even guess or prophesy in what direction this great Republic is going to go.

It is for each Senator, in my judgment, to exercise his own judgment as to how best to represent the people of his sovereign State. It happens to be my judgment that I owe it to the many people who have communicated with me—and I do not begin to place all their communications in the RECORD, but I wish my friend from Louisiana to know that I believe it is a fair sampling—that I want those who are protesting to have an opportunity, through this medium, to be heard throughout the country.

The Senator from Louisiana knows that there are a variety of parliamentary ways in which we can get the same material into the RECORD. I think, however, that in the interests of time we should insert this material in the RECORD, and let the Senator who inserts it assume the responsibility for inserting it. I want the Senator to know that I have been very careful, that I have given the strictest of instructions to my staff that no communication shall be placed in the RECORD which in any way would reflect on anyone or violate any of the rules of the Senate.

As part of this historic debate, there should be placed in the RECORD the material that I ask to be inserted. It is up to the Senator from Louisiana and every other Senator to decide what they wish or do not wish to insert in the RECORD. The Senator from Louisiana is within his parliamentary rights to object. But, Mr. President, if I cannot get these communications inserted, I shall get them into the RECORD by reading them.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I do not propose to deny the Senator his right to put this information in the RECORD. I merely say that I have never known any time in the history of this great country, in my study of history, when American boys who are fighting in a battle in support of the Nation's position, both in terms of its solemn treaty commitments and an act of Congress authorizing that our troops be sent there, when a Senator has so much seized upon the opportunity—particularly to fill the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to seek to appear before the American people and urge that this Nation was going to lose in its courage, its determination to see through an international commitment which it has made. I am not going to object to putting this matter in the RECORD. I merely say, that to the Senator from Louisiana, the impression would be given that these communications speak for a majority of the American people. They do not speak for 1 percent of the people of Louisiana. They do not speak for 1 percent of the people of Texas, to the best of my knowledge, and I doubt that they speak for a substantial percentage of the people of any State which touches the great State of Louisiana, which I have the honor to represent in the Senate.

It does seem fair to me that if there are going to be a great number of communications placed into the RECORD by any one Senator, every Senator should have the same opportunity, and I have some doubts as to the great burden that will be imposed on the printer.

If each of us has 15,000 letters, we might be asked why we did not print the rest of them when we put some of them into the RECORD.

I simply urge that we have some rule of fairplay as to what extent we are going to burden the RECORD.

I have many letters supporting this Government that I would like to put into the RECORD. I would like to have letters from Americans whom I regard as patriots put in the RECORD, because I suspect that many of those letters that are printed may not be exactly loyal Americans.

I know there are some heart-touching letters I have received from American citizens who realize this has been a great sacrifice to them. Many of them have paid a great price in the loss of loved ones and personal sacrifices, but nevertheless they support the commitment of the United States.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to say to the Senator from Louisiana that those of us who oppose what we consider the great folly of preceding administrations, particularly this one, in involving ourselves militarily in Vietnam feel that we should not be sending our boys to fight and die in South Vietnam because the defense of South Vietnam is not essential to the defense of our Nation. Nothing that happens in Vietnam affects our national security. We invited ourselves in. We are fighting there for people who do not fight effectively for themselves. We have had very little support from our allies, with whom we have pleaded for it. The report of the hearings released by the Armed Services Committee on the pending authorization bill, makes it apparent that we are going it practically alone, except for a few token contributions that we have had to work hard to get and that came in late.

Those of us who oppose this participation in an Asian civil war do not yield to anyone in our patriotism. It is our desire to see that we do not embark on a course which cannot be successful, in achieving the ends we allege we seek, that is too costly in lives and treasure in an area which I do not think is worth the life of one American boy.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We are there because of a commitment we had in the protocol to the southeast Asia Defense Treaty, which permitted us to resist aggression in the very area of South Vietnam.

I rather resent the Senator's saying that the people of South Vietnam are not willing to fight for their country against the threat of communism. Let us understand this. There have been several governments there. Some of those governments were not as popular as some of us would like them to have been, but not one of them has been as unpopular as is communism.

More than 1 million people left North Vietnam with nothing more than they could carry with them, after having worked a lifetime to accumulate certain property and goods, in order to go to South Vietnam to try to escape communism, not knowing what kind of government they were going to have in South Vietnam.

When they did get there, they did all they could to uphold an anti-Communist government to try to save themselves from communism. Little mayors, little aldermen, little chiefs of communities have been slaughtered by the Communists. Nevertheless, they continue to oppose communism—50,000 people have been killed by the Communists because they did not want to live under communism and support communism; 45,000 men of the South Vietnamese Army have made the supreme sacrifice in fighting on the field of battle, not counting the hundreds of thousands of those who have been injured fighting for their country.

If one considers the sacrifice these people have made in fighting not to be under the Communists, as General Taylor has said, to compare the number to this country, we would have to multiply that number by 20. If we compared those sacrifices to the population of the United States, it would amount to 1,800,000 people in this country—mayors and other little town leaders, who would have had their heads chopped off. The South Vietnamese continue valiantly. There are 20 South Vietnamese units compared to 5 American units on the field of battle today. So those South Vietnamese are fighting bravely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We did not decide to send troops into South Vietnam until North Vietnam did. South Vietnam made it clear that its people did not want to be overwhelmed by aggression from the Communists. We saw that they were going to need help. So when the Government of North Vietnam marched its troops in there, we sent our troops in, in accordance with our treaty commitment. People should look long and hard at the fact that we are living up to our commitment.

South Vietnam is a nation which has paid much to stand up against communism, and yet we hear on the floor of the Senate that the people of South Vietnam are not fighting. The South Vietnamese have paid a greater price in relative terms than this country has ever paid in any war it has engaged in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon that certain matters be printed in the RECORD?

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your stand in the Vietnam war. Americans should have more representation like yours.

MILTON LUBEN.

LA JOLLA, CALIF.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Your views make sense to us on Vietnam. Please continue.

Dr. and Mrs. ROBERT MISHELL.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In full support and appreciation for your courageous leadership on Vietnam issue.

ROBERT and MARGARET CASE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your courageous stand regarding Vietnam. Your publicizing the issue urgently needed.

WALTER BODLANDER.

NEW ROCHELLE, N.Y.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Continue open debate. No support for Vietnam war. Admire your courage.

Mrs. RUTH SCHWARTZ.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The 60 members of our Democratic Club and the great majority of mothers at our nursery school are solidly behind you. We are for cessation of bombing, recognition of NLF, no further escalation. We are absolutely against blank check appropriation for war. We think recent CDC resolution on Vietnam very significant of public feeling. Many middle-of-road Democrats locally go along with this position. Thank you and good luck.

Mrs. STEPHANIE FEDERMAN,
President, Los Feliz Silverlake Democratic Club.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to do your utmost to stop the useless slaughter of Vietnamese and American men.

IRENE DAO.

NEW ROCHELLE, N.Y.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for open hearings. We must oppose increased appropriation and insist on negotiations.

Mr. and Mrs. HAROLD L. POSNER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your courage. Please continue.

MORTON KLEINMAN, M.D.

SAUSALITO, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations.

GERTRUDE and ALEXANDER SAXTON.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I share Vietnam views on full disclosure, including Galbraith report.

JOHN H. GOODWORTH.

GREENVILLE, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep fighting in courage and patriotism. You and GRUENING among the great of American history.

ELEANOR E. SAWYER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Agree with you.

KAREN HUMPHREY.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your courage and convictions are admirable, realistic, and humane. You, and the members of our Government who oppose further expenditures for the escalation of the Vietnam war are neither puppets nor politicians, you are true statesmen. There are thousand like me, who are backing you every inch of the way. Our democracy and our culture belong to us, as Americans. We cannot foist or project our way of life to satisfy the few who may profit from an empty victory, while sacrificing our boys, and children and little babies of both sides. Thank you for being concerned about the dignity of man.

Very sincerely,

JEAN W. KAUFMAN.

MOUNT DORA, FLA.,
February 21, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Now is the time for the free nations of the world to actively demonstrate their true desire for freedom. Now is the time for us to reevaluate the extent of unity we may anticipate from our foreign aid policies. Every nation of the free world should be represented with military aid in Vietnam. This is a struggle of the free world over communism and should be represented as such thus eliminating the United States as principal protector. Nations receiving our foreign aid should discontinue shipments to nations jeopardizing the peace of the world. Our minority population will not enable us to stop communistic infiltrations and uprisings throughout the world as a sole trustee for peace. Now is the time for our people to support and commend Senators FULBRIGHT and MORSE for their valiant convictions in our behalf as well as union leaders' recommendation curtailing shipments to North Vietnam.

ALFRED P. BERRY.

OLYMPIA, WASH.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We heartily endorse your views on Vietnam and foreign policy, also your courage and loyalty.

Mr. and Mrs. H. W. MCCLEARY.

MORRO BAY, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend your stand opposing Vietnam war.

Mr. and Mrs. DAN RICH.

DENVER, COLO.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your continued efforts for peace in Vietnam, especially recommendation for Vietcong participation.

PEACE WORKERS.

KNOXVILLE, TENN.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

God bless you for speaking up for all Americans.

LORRAINE and BURT WOMACK.

CRYSTAL LAKE, ILL.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate what *you* have done in informing citizens of this Republic what is going on in our Government. Our sincere gratitude. Keep up the good work.

GEORGE D. LYNCH.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D.C.:

You are not alone. There are many of us that support you. I spent 5 years in the Pacific, so therefore I support you entirely.

NORMAN B. PRINCE.

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up your courageous stand. You are so right.

Dr. and Mrs. DONALD S. SEARLE.

KINGS POINT, N.Y.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your courageous efforts on behalf of sanity are truly remarkable. God give you the strength to continue.

Mr. and Mrs. EISNER.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You were great at the Senate hearings. Keep up your efforts.

Sincerely,

Lucille Boss.

River Forest, Ill.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up your good fight. Since we don't care to wage a sincere war, we should stop this faucet dripping blood. The draft should be replaced by an American system of well-paid and honored volunteers.

Mrs. Paul Harvey.

Forest Hills, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We fully support your views on our involvement in Vietnam and would wish that more Members of Congress had your understanding of the situation.

George and Agusta Lippmann.

Miami, Fla.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue your gifted effort to publicize the truth about Vietnam.

William B. Nall and Charlotte Nall.

Detroit, Mich.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

We feel that you represent the very best in American politics. We urge you to continue your courageous efforts to bring the truth to the American people.

Your longtime admirers,

Pat Ryan.
Helene Mrokowski.
Mary Lou Langan.
Jack Zobel.
Peter Zobel.
Judy Smale.

Stockton, Calif.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Fully support your position on Vietnam and hope you escalate your efforts informing the public.

Leonard and Barbara Fass.

Detroit, Mich., *February 20, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Support Kennedy's proposal. Negotiate with Vietcong. We applaud your efforts to stop Viet war.

Mrs. E. Kalish.

Buffalo, N.Y., *February 20, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

You and Senator Fulbright are to be congratulated for your insight and patriotic work. Please accept my profound respect for your stand.

R. C. Travis.

Lakewood, N.J., *February 20, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your stand on Vietnam. Urge you to continue to fight for curtailment of U.S. involvement.

Jerome and Beatrice Schurgin.

Bridgeport, Conn., *February 20, 1966.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Finally your voice is being heard. Please continue your courageous efforts to bring about a negotiated peace in Vietnam.

David Hunter.

Redondo Beach, Calif.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

No nation has the right to intervene in the internal affairs of any other nation with the whole world apprehensive of our conduct. Let us pray that the other side does not have another reckless man. Stand your ground, Senator.

Frank Morris.

Maspeth, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your stand on the Vietnam policies for a peaceful solution.

Rosario Laveidi.

Little Neck, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Full support for your stand on Vietnam. Please continue to speak for those who are opposed to our involvement in Vietnam.

Lester Rhoads.

Great Neck, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We of the Long Island committee to end the Vietnam war gratefully applaud now as always your forthright stand against American Vietnam policy. We feel there is sufficient ferment in Congress for many Senators to express their concern in a concrete way. Therefore, we hope your amendment, even though fully justified, will not be worded so strongly as to scare off the votes of Fulbright, Kennedy, Clark, etc., in which case, Johnson would announce another mandate in his favor. We suggest wording which is palatable to enough Senators so that Johnson will have no victory in Congress.

Yours with deep respect,

David Blum.

Monterey, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly approve your Vietnam investigation. Wish you were my Senator.

Jim Kinney.

Marinette, Wis.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you very much for your stand on the Vietnam question.

Sincerely,

Mrs. August Haller.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I want to thank you because you told the truth. And I will not let my boy fight Vietnamese. Let them fight their own war.

Mrs. Dorothy Lovings.

New Haven, Conn.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

War obsolete. We also, unless Vietnam war stopped. Fight against ignorance admirable, keep pressure on.

Doris W. and Eric G. Channon.

Levittown, Pa.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. Keep up the good work.

C. Eelman.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Hooray for guts, decency, rationality. Up peace, down war for peoples of world. Hooray, Morse.

Beatrice Pogin.

San Francisco, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Am firm admirer your dignified approach in persuading people to goodness, reason, tolerance, debate.

Gerald Paul.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D.C.:

Splendid work. Please continue to oppose war in Vietnam. All want peace.

Elaine M. Sulliger.

New York, N.Y.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate Investigating Committee on Vietnam, Washington, D.C.:

Be assured that the great majority of Americans are behind you. True patriotism as you know is humanity, strength, and sanity.

Sarah Brown.

New Haven, Conn.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Wholeheartedly and warmly support your position that we have been misguided by the administration in the conduct of Vietnamese war. Please continue vital hearings until the balance of the Senate awakens to their duty as well.

I. H. Pollack.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree with your position. This is a cruel and senseless war. Keep fighting.

Gratefully,

Mr. and Mrs. Albert Aizuss.

Chehalis, Wash.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily endorse your concern to prevent escalation of Vietnam war. Extensive military personnel increase and North Vietnam bombing undoubtedly pressures China toward aggressive defensive action. Escalation will be disastrous.

Appreciatively,

W. Clyde Beecher.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

A copy of following telegram sent to President Johnson. Rusk's statement that we must teach Communists that they cannot win in Vietnam is reminiscent of nothing so much as the Nazis on the occasion of invading Poland. In the name of this country and a democratic foreign policy, stop it.

James and Katherine Gallagher.

New York, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your courage, honesty, and consistent effort to end the immoral and inhumane war in Vietnam gives us some hope. We agree a vote should be taken, but there must be insistence that our Congressmen truly represent the people's will for peace.

Ruth Shallit and Evelyn Hyman.

Crystal Lake, Ill.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate what you have done in informing citizens of this Republic what is going on in our Government. Our sincere gratitude. Keep up the good work.

E. G. Harris.

Albany, Calif.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate your long fight to end American involvement in Vietnam. Don't get discouraged.

Mr. and Mrs. F. H. Hughes.

Philadelphia, Penn.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Applaud your position at hearings. Keep up the good work.

James McBride.
Jack Daschbach.

Mill Valley, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your Vietnam stand for American decency. Wish we could help more.

Nathan Adler.

Pasadena, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We approve and support open letter on Vietnam New York Times of Sunday February 13, 1966.

Arthur H. Vaughan.
Audrey J. Vaughan.

Miami Beach, Fla.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

We wholeheartedly agree with your views on the Vietnam war. Your gentlemanly but firm debate with General Taylor was well stated. Hope the leaders of our country will heed your advice. Continued health and good luck to you.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. Hyman Kirsner
and Family.

Oakland, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations Senator Morse. Our family is grateful to you. We fear the backward element of the South, the Birchers and the extreme right have taken over foreign policy of our country. We suggest the character of General Ky in all its monstrosity be given publicity. Best wishes and thanks.

The Kane Family.

Manhasset, N.Y.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Regarding Vietnam this is the first time you've been right and I approve.

P. Daniel.

Palo Alto, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your position on American policy in Vietnam. Mr. Johnson's return to the theory that any acts are justified if they are anti-Communist is irresponsibility which jeopardizes the entire world.

William C. Paulsen.
Mari G. Paulsen.

Detroit, Mich.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

If we cannot investigate State and CIA, we are going Fascist.

C. Magar.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

As an Oregon resident of less than 2 months I am pleased and proud to find myself represented by you. As a Johnson supporter in the last election I find myself in full support of your position on Vietnam. There are more people who support you and your position than even you realize.

H. Frederick Weston.

Monmouth, Oreg.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on magnificent fight in Senate hearing on the war in Vietnam. The statement that million more Americans will support the President and Rusk is false. We want our boys home with us; to be free of the dreadful fear of nuclear warfare with any nation.

Mr. and Mrs. Edward A. Hewell.

Bakersfield, Calif.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

We are with you all the way. Billions of people are counting on you to speak for us.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. Thurston Hunt.

Mount Vernon, N.Y.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are doing a remarkable job in the hearings before Foreign Relations Committee. You are speaking for our family and dozens of others we have spoken with. You have our unqualified support.

Arthur and Betty Fast.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Your efforts to keep American public informed on Vietnam war are sincerely appreciated. Do not become discouraged. We support your action in the Senate hearings.

Mrs. Paul Ramonowski,
Mrs. Frank J. Latler,
Mrs. B. E. Haffner,
C. J. Stacey,
Doris Curtis.

Huntington, N.Y.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your courageous, intelligent Vietnam position and urge continued open debate in the Senate.

Ruth Kelsey, Jean Levine, Maxine Roz, Mafalda Yurkewicz, Philip Greene, Judy Greene, Sally Lineweaver, John R. Lineweaver, Elizabeth Barkell, Richard Barkell, Stephanie Elind, John Lowry, Muriel Kanter, James McKay, B. J. Zukas, Sam R. Raskin, Mildred Raskin, Elayne Seligman, Theodore Salzman, Nanette Salzman, Adam Raskin, Henry Lowry, Louis Kanter.

New York, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations, debate General Taylor. Disaster if we do not pull out in time. Thank you.

Luis Vazquez.

New York, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I fully support your stand on Vietnam, yours being one of the few voices of sanity now heard in Washington.

Sebern Ferry.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work.

Robert Venturi.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work.

Vanna Venturi.

Navarre, Ohio,
February 19, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work. America is behind you. The next President of the United States will be the man that brings our boys back from this useless murdering in Vietnam.

David Colucy.

Cortland, N.Y.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your analysis and commend your stand during the hearings.

William and Judith Griffen.

WESTBURY, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please communicate to the President that I share your wise sentiments concerning Viet conflict.

Dr. and Mrs. JULIAN G. KIRCHICK.

ROSLYN HEIGHTS, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulate you subject Vietnam. MORSE will be included in future "profiles" incurred.

WILLIAM R. KITTAY.

SAN PABLO, CALIF.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree 100 percent with your stand on Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. DONALD KAY.

CULVER CITY, CALIF.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations continued struggle world peace.

JUNE HUGHES.

FREEPORT, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Your leadership in opposition to current policy in Vietnam is in the highest tradition of our country's ideals.

Dr. and Mrs. CHARNEY and Family.

SAN PEDRO, CALIF.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge more public hearings exploration constructive proposals from University International Relation Centers and Ambassador Goldberg.

RUTH MILLER THOMPSON.

RUTHERFORD, N.J.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Good show sir. Carry on for the sake of the Nation.

A. GIANCOTT, M.D.

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.
February 19, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for your courage and your defense of decent principles and of America. Bravo Senator MORSE.

TED GODFREY.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Myself, my family, and a great many of my friends are in complete sympathy with what you are trying to do. You are saying what definitely needs to be said.

GEORGE B. HOOVER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue your courageous fight against administration policy in Vietnam.

JOSEPH and MARJORIE GROELL.

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo, bravo, bravo, your stand on America's Vietnam policy is the world's last hope.

Gratefully,

LUCIA POYER.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We deplore Rusk's cynical testimony on Vietnam and support your opposition to the war.

Mr. and Mrs. WM. MICHAEL.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Nation's hope for peace lies in your continued courageous quest for sane Vietnam policy.

MARC KAMINSKY.
Miss RITA CAHN.

UTICA, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your concern, urge accepting World Council of Churches 10-point program for Vietnam peace ending wars brutality.

Dr. and Mrs. H. ROBERT GEMMER.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate and support your position Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. E. C. LEWIS.

THOUSAND OAKS, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree stop killing Americans unconstitutionally. Civil wars aren't within treaty commitments. Negotiate don't escalate.

Mr. and Mrs. C. B. HENRICHSEN.

LOS GATOS, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington. D.C.:

I concur with your convictions regarding the potential of the Vietnam situation. Please persist in your efforts.

DONALD W. JOHNSON.

CHATSWORTH, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Our hearts and hopes with you on Vietnam issue. How can we support you?

Mr. and Mrs. ROLAND F. BRYAN.

NEW HYDE PARK, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your position taken at the recent Foreign Relations Committee hearings. Hope it will help toward bringing about successful negotiations and peace in Vietnam. Wiring the President to give full consideration to your suggestions.

ROBERT, KAREN, LAURIE, BETTY, and FRANK PHILLIPS.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. Your courageous stand on Vietnam is in the finest traditions of the U.S. Senate. Please feel free to call upon us for financial support in any campaign you choose to undertake.

Dr. and Mrs. RAYMOND OJA.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I applaud you on your brave stand in the fight for peace. Talking at the conference table on the Vietnam issue is the only mature position we can take. Thank you for your efforts and good luck.

NATALIE GHENT.

CHICAGO, ILL.
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our own family and the entire Nation owes you an inestimable debt of gratitude for exposing the facts about our frightening march into war and ultimate annihilation.

Mr. and Mrs. ARTHUR BASSIN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations, we agree with your sound position on Vietnam situation, please continue open debate so that American public can be aware of what is happening. You have the backing of many intelligent substantial citizens.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT TRACHINGER.

SYOSSET, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Applaud again your Vietnam stand, strongly support repeal Tonkin Resolution and negative appropriation vote.

Mr. and Mrs. E. R. STABLER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D.C.:

After listening again to you and Senator FULBRIGHT want to give you more than wholehearted support. Am a member of SANE, local protest group against war. Writing to Senator JAVITS re supporting you. What additional help can the little people give?

Sincerely,

Mrs. EVELYN F. MARKS.

BOSTON, MASS.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Wholeheartedly support your position re Vietnam debate. Anxious to lend support where needed. Please advise.

LAWRENCE M. WHITE.

CHAMPAIGN, ILL.,
February 21, 1966.

The Honorable Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We wish to commend you for your forthright stand in letting the people know about the utter futility of present administration policies in escalating the undeclared war in Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. STUART L. TUCKEY.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Your searching questions and enlightening remarks at committee hearings on Vietnam gives one hope for speedy and lasting world peace. Won't have to worry about population explosion if war continues much longer. Our young men can serve our country much better than killing and being killed. Urge you to continue public hearings in hope administration will change present policy.

Aaron and Yetta Sonntag.

Studio City, Calif.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We urge you to continue your fight for a peaceful solution to the war in Vietnam and for your continued efforts for a world at peace.

Pearl and Jack Ayeroff, Yetta and Royal Judd, S. Airoff, Dorothy and M. Newman, Carl and May Levin, Eve and Borrx Siminowsky, Helen Erlich, Al and Rea Silver, John and Martha Yeiskal, Esther Werner, and Roslyn Schuldenfrei.

Honolulu, Hawaii,
February 19, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your courageous testimony.

Setsu Okubo.

Long Island City, N.Y.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your continuing informed and courageous stand on Vietnam.

Pyllis C. Korman.

New Brunswick, N.J.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Command courageous vital exploration Vietnam issue. Urge Sergeant Duncan, February Ramparts magazine, as committee witness.

L. D. Meeker.

Huntington, N.Y.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Continue Vietnam criticism. Kennedy deserves your support, recognizing NLF as genuine South Vietnamese political force.

Miss Barbara Jean Berg.

Staten Island, N.Y.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The continuing use of U.S. Forces to resolve political issues in Vietnam runs counter to a belief warmly embraced by me; namely self-determination. I urge you to consider again proposals made by Senators Fulbright, Morse, and Kennedy aimed at bringing this senseless carnage to a speedy conclusion.

Charles McGuire.

Fort Wayne, Ind.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for so loyally and sincerely defending the rights of the American people.

Please do not let the Senate hearings on television die. They offer so much hope. We want to listen and have a grave and great responsibility to know what's going on.

Mr. and Mrs. Jack B. Schreck.

Ferndale, Mich.,
February 22, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate and support your views on the Vietnam situation. Many thanks for your outspoken, courageous stand.

Mr. and Mrs. J. H. DeCook.

San Leandro, Calif.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

I appreciate your concern on the Vietnam situation. Keep up the good work.

L. Armstrong.

Salem, Oreg.,
February 15, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I have been following the various discussions on the Vietnam issue in which you were involved and see you finally have woke up some of your colleagues to the dangers our country is facing and how it has come about.

I am enclosing several clippings I took from the morning paper which coincides with my feelings and many of the folks in this area. There are some of our Congressmen that need enlightening on these issues. Al Ullman who usually is right has caught the bug somehow and should be educated to the truth of what is really going on. Hatfield may beat Duncan too if Duncan does not see the issues in their true light.

As I see it we are wasting not only the flower of our manhood but resources as well in a war that never should have been.

Do hope you will keep in good health and retain your perspective on these issues, I remain,

Your very good friend,
W. A. Rentschler.

Preaching and Practice

To the Editor:

We Americans, leaders of materialism and technology and supposed subscribers of Christianity and democracy, must make it hard for foreigners to understand and follow.

Being seriously threatened with a modern ideology, we use medieval methods to combat it (slapping at mosquitoes, when threatened, instead of halting their spread by sterilizing their breeding areas). Communism only thrives under conditions that would make Christians and freedom lovers hang their heads in shame (economic, political, and social exploitation, ignorance, filth, disease, poverty, etc.). We spend billions monthly to halt its onrush, but only thousands to eliminate the breeding grounds, with missionary work, economic, and technical aid. We allow our moneyed interests to spread throughout the world to satisfy their lust for gain by exploitation of natural and human resources, protected by their influence in foreign governments. We retard production of food and economic progress in a starving world. We give aid to status quo governments. Americans abroad display economic and social superiority.

Are these masses fighting for communism by their civil action at the ballot box or battlefield, or are they trying to give their existence meaning? Will guns and our boys' lives kill an ideology, or strengthen the cause of the suppressed? Have these monthly billions and lives reversed communism the last 20 years? Could we be imperfect in the execution of a perfect faith? Have we underevaluated this threat? Have we sent our boys to the wrong frontline, armed with wrong weapons?

Howard Wildfang.

Illegitimate War

To the Editor:

The founders of the United States of America expected the Nation to make war, when necessary, in an open and above-board manner. They expected it to declare its intention openly after due debate of the reasons, to state them clearly and name the enemies specifically.

They intended making war to be solely a legislative prerogative. In article I, section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution, they provided that "the Congress" shall declare war. They did not mention the Executive in the connection.

The records of the debates in the Constitutional Convention reveal that the framers definitely intended the President not to have power to declare war. He was to be able to use the Armed Forces and other resources of the country to "repel sudden attacks," but was not to be able to wage aggressive war to serve his purposes alone as sovereigns had done since time immemorial.

Nevertheless, the United States is deeply involved today in a war Congress did not declare and has not openly debated; a war for uncertain reasons, indefinite objectives, and against insufficiently identified enemies.

It would be difficult if not impossible to determine who got the Nation into the war in Vietnam, when, and how. Also futile, except for the purposes of historians. President Johnson has recognized it as "really war," issued orders to escalate it, then deescalate it, now escalate it again, resulting in "confusion worse confounded."

The illegitimacy of the thing is being ignored generally, and perhaps it may well be so now. But what of the future? Is the United States committed to the principle that the President and his aids, particularly the aids, may make war a la Vietnam whenever and wherever they see fit to do so? Shall the Congress forfeit its rights and duties through neglect? Shall the Constitution be amended by ignoring provisions which interfere with the plans of the executive department?

In short, shall the switch from democracy to autocracy or hog-wild bureaucracy now taking place in Washington, D.C., be allowed to continue?

Silvanus Kingsley.

A Cheaper Way

To the Editor:

The sudden and dramatic move of President Johnson to export the Great Society even to South Vietnam has its sides to look at too. After the great idea possessed L.B.J. he ordered Vice President Humphrey to Vietnam to fill in the menu, and let the Viets know what to expect. That was quite an order, but probably Hubert's imagination is fertile enough to come through abundantly. Whether it will be two wheelbarrows in every garage, or two motorcycles, we should know shortly.

There is little that I or any reader can do about this arbitrary decision to export our wealth, except possibly to turn on the TV to take our minds off the subject. But then we will be confronted with Government commercials imploring us not to travel abroad, but to stay home and lessen the dollar drain.

But if there has got to be a program like this, maybe we are aiming it in the wrong direction. Perhaps it would be better to offer the Great Society program to North Vietnam if they would agree to quit fighting. It could be cheaper in the long haul.

If we follow the pattern of all 20th century wars, we will tear the country up, and after hostilities, start in rebuilding it for them.

Why wouldn't it be better to start in improving before destruction? Being as L.B.J. is using some of my money to pay for his big plans, I take the liberty to make this suggestion.

R. F. Cook.

Salem, Oreg.,
February, 19, 1966.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: My wife and I greatly appreciate your vigorous opposition to our national policy in Vietnam. We believe that the present policy not only is lacking support among most nations but can well bring shame and possible defeat. We are urging public debate upon the floor of the Senate to bring out facts in Vietnam.

Will you please do all in your power to make this possible? Also, please keep up your opposition. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Luther Max Wills.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 12, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Morse: I wish to congratulate you on your talk at the Senate debate.

I feel so thankful we have a liberal minded Senator with so much courage and understanding.

I am also encouraged that you have more in your camp as time goes on. Also the signing of the protest letter to President Johnson of January 21 by 76 Representatives was a step forward.

Would you please send me a copy of the Aiken-Mansfield report on their recent visit to Vietnam? I would like to add that this should be made available to all U.S. citizens. Could you reveal to the public the facts as to how Thailand has become a military dependent of the American Treasury as you referred to in your speech?

Your camp is growing, let us keep on. If the time is not too short perhaps we will win.

Respectfully,

Alice Hedgpeth.

Hermiston, Oreg.,
February 13, 1966.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Morse: Although I am not a member of your party, I feel compelled to express my appreciation to you for your expression of protest against our involvement in Vietnam. How thankful we are for the voices of protest at this time and for those dedicated to peace.

Seeing and hearing the interrogations last week by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was a great experience. Restored, to a great extent, our faith in our elected representatives, especially from the several who obviously put principle above party.

Sincerely,

Mrs. A. L. Larive.

Salem, Oreg.,
February 10, 1966.

U.S. Senator Wayne Morse

Dear Sir: I must say I have come to think a great deal more of you in the past year as the senior Senator of Oregon.

I have not gone along with you on all matters, but I do say you are on the right track on the Korean war and I support your thinking.

Also you are right on the giveaway of U.S. dollars which is draining our Nation to a point where we will need help should we be attacked.

I appreciate your forthrightness in these matters and my support is yours so long as you keep working for the good of our great Nation.

Respectfully,

Harlan H. Harris.

Salem, Oreg.,
February 15, 1966.

U.S. Senator Wayne Morse
Senate Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Am dropping this short note to let you know you are doing the job well and we are back of you every inch.

We pray we can stop this giving to everyone else, there is a limit as to what good old America (as we use to know it) can and should do.

We have three grandsons in service now and for what, they don't know and neither do we.

I knew you personally when in Eugene, you are well acquainted with my brother Cy Slocum, he is a different person now we thank God for it.

Senator Morse keep up the good work we are backing you.

Yours truly,

Mrs. Harlan H. Harris.

Portland, Oreg.

Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
U.S. Senate.,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: We wish to express our unequivocal support for your policies relative to Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

With thanks and our best wishes we are,

Sincerely yours,

W. L. Mahoney.
Mrs. W. L. Mahoney.
Steven J. Mahoney.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse: I am writing to express my thanks for your efforts in the Vietnam situation. I hope you will keep it up as we certainly do need your help and the help of all those that want peace.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Dorothy McCune.

Grants Pass, Oreg.,
February 14, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Please continue your courageous fight to try to find a solution to the Vietnam situation.

Your actions the last few days have given renewed hope to a great number of we Americans that our country can be saved from total war.

I have disagreed with a number of your views but you have my full support for your actions in this regard.

Our Constitution clearly states only Congress can declare war. Yet in the past 20 years, the spirit of this safeguard has been disregarded by changing the name of war.

As a concerned citizen, I wonder why an amendment can't be added to our Constitution that only Congress can commit any drafted troops to battle on any foreign soil?

We are supposed to be a democracy and the elected representatives of the people are supposed to be the very basis of our Government to control any one who has desires to be a ruler of our country .

With the new terms of "policing," "protecting," etc., now being used, do you believe a constitutional amendment would return this balance of power to our elected Congress?

Please continue your brave fight for the future of our country.

Respectfully,

Beatrice Bennett.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing on behalf of both my husband and myself to applaud your eloquent and courageous stand against our policy in Vietnam. Everything you say rings true and is factual. As to the American people not standing for it—I don't know. I am amazed at the apathy and lack of concern shown. It is true that it is up to them, but you of Congress are better informed and are the real guardians of the people. "Forgive them, Father, for they know not what they do," is as true today as it was 2,000 years ago. A letter to the editor in today's paper, signed by H. Guy Goodsell, states that the speeches, "delivered on the steps of the Pioneer Post Office, were read from manuscripts. They were academic and unimpressive. Most of the applause was from the demonstrators themselves." I was there, and I thought the speeches were excellent, factual, and plausible. There were a number of spectators standing opposite who could be seen clapping their hands. Peace seems to be boring and unexciting. The human animal is indeed an enigma. I can say for sure that the arguments advanced by the hawks sound anything but academic.

I feel that President Johnson has usurped his authority to an extent to warrant impeachment. His judgment certainly has not been to the advantage of the people of this country. He flagrantly betrayed the people who voted for him, and that includes both of us. Along with poor advice, he was offered very good advice by many knowledgeable people. Many writers and commentators were counseling withdrawal before it was too late. The Saturday Review and the Nation were full of such counsel. We have acted like a tyrant and a bully and if we don't mend our ways we will suffer the lot of the tyrant and bully.

Perhaps we could take Ky and the rest of his ilk and set them up in a fortification (enclave) on the coast similar to that of Chiang on Formosa. If 600,000 of these "dedicated South Vietnamese troops, fighting for freedom" can't defend this position, then who are the people, and who are we helping to defend what? Sidney Hook says that "Democracy is the will of the majority of the people, be it communism or whatever." If the majority are Vietcong, it is their country.

All moral aspects aside, and speaking strictly as business people and taxpayers, it seems asinine to pour billions of dollars into a country for development and reform while we are simultaneously spending billions to blast it to bits. I can only say that in my estimation you cannot bomb ideology nor can you buy it, which seems to be the latest strategy of our President. If he is acting in an intelligent manner, I fail to see it. At any rate, I hope the scales will fall off enough Congressmen's eyes to enable them to see the frightening picture and do something to get us out of this hellish Asiatic morass.

You are espousing what is now an unpopular cause, but it is not the first time that you have done so, and it is certainly more popular than it was a year ago. We express our heartfelt gratitude to you for the fight you are making in the cause of peace, certainly including a revision of our entire foreign policy. You are right, and I wish that you were our President.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Howard W. Harris.

Cave Junction,
February 12, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse: I am with you all of the way, and I sure get a great kick out of watching you on TV. Looks to me, when you get going, that you are just beginning to fight Johnson and his war.

Stick with it. This is going to end just as you said it would with Johnson the most discredited President we have ever had. It is my opinion that nothing but complete power will satisfy him.

I am a Democrat; always voted Democrat, but now shall vote my first Republican vote for Hatfield on account of his views on war being the same as yours and unless Robert Kennedy runs for next President, I'll bet I vote for a Republican President. I've had enough.

Keep up your good fight. I might get to vote for you next for President. But I wouldn't wish that on you.

Best wishes,

Mrs. Pansy Hallock
(*The woman miner of the Siskiyous*).

Portland, Oreg.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Morse,
Senator J. William Fulbright,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Sirs: In your present popularity explosion (and probably at any other time) the best I can expect for my letter is that your secretary's secretary's, secretary's secretary will file it among the stuff you may read someday when, like all human beings, you might need a little extra praise.

History will, of course, remember you for your statesmanship and so will I but particularly for the satisfying end of that last televised day of the committee hearings when Rusk and I watched, without fully comprehending the implications, as you peeled yourself a willow switch. Suddenly you pounced and were warming up the Secretary's pink bottom. Rusk had some reason to hope, with the administration's typical contempt for other people's intelligence, that having reached the end of the last day and having been able to sidestep completely the Midwest Senator who took up the same question (while prudently attributing it to a female constituent) he had reason to hope that he would escape completely having to explain the phenomenon of five or six men in our Government having all the wisdom and virtue and courage in the entire world. Your timing was perfect for bursting that balloon. It well may be that you and our Wayne Morse can someday take credit for having saved humanity. At one time, such a statement would have been pure rhetoric; now, as every thinking person knows, it can be stark reality.

Thank you, Senator, for giving us the thrill of a lifetime.

Respectfully,

Mrs. B. Moore Savage.

Troutdale, Oreg.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Morse: After much reading and soul searching I find myself agreeing more and more with your opinions and your stand concerning the Vietnam situation.

To me, the issue has been a paradox. It has been most difficult to weed out the facts from the emotional overtones and contradictions emanating from the State Department, the press, and from private citizens—influential and otherwise.

The copy of your recent speech in the Senate—"The State of War in Vietnam"—which I recently received from your office has verified the conclusions I too have reached.

I sincerely hope that before all humanity goes down en masse before the gales of nuclear destruction we will have reached, as nations, that level of maturity so desperately needed for survival—a maturity embodied in international law and respect, out of need if for nothing else, on the part of all nations (not just theirs, but ours) for this legal system.

Please carry on.

Sincerely yours,

Lois P. Ross.

Agness, Oreg.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senator of the State of Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I am grateful that there are men like Senator J. W. Fulbright and you, having the courage to express the gravity of the situation in Vietnam relative to the world. Men like you endure abuse because you dare seeing the facts realistically, this against the general trend of keeping in line with the executive branch of our Government.

With great interest I followed the Foreign Relations Committee's hearings and am only glad that we live in a democracy where this is possible. I only hope that enough Americans learned the facts and will realize that we are heading for a general war, unless we change our course of action.

You are well informed and see the global perspective of our involvement in southeast Asia. I do not need to reiterate our position in this world of today. However, what frightens me is that in the year 1966, we, as human beings, as civilized people, resort to war as an extension of diplomacy; where discussions fail, arms take over with all its horrible consequences. Seemingly we never learn and only men like you can enlighten the people here and abroad that this is wrong.

We are now in an impasse. We hear that since 1947 over $800 billion was spent on armament in our country alone. We came to accept the slaughter of our youths and have pride in killing the youth of other nations. Where are we going; have we learned nothing from history?

We hear of escalation—of eventual confrontation with China, with Russia. If this ever comes about, we all know there will be no winners, only losers, there will be no honor involved; we will set back civilization for centuries, if not forever.

Looking at the world today, there are more authoritarian governments than democracies, and even democracy is interpreted differently in different countries with different backgrounds. So, why do we interfere in a (basically) civil war in Vietnam. It is said to stop communism, aggression. Which communism, which aggression? At the same time our President and Secretary of State mention this, they say that neither China, nor Russia dares to get involved in Vietnam. This is rather illogical. Further, it is conceded that Russia and China have ideological differences, which, in my opinion only results of Russia coming of age and prosperous, more liberal, and more realistic whereas China still burdens from past humiliation and European enslavement. Given time and opportunity (U.N.) China will become eventually less belligerent and more moderate, but we must convince the Chinese, as we did the Russians, that we are sincere and have no obscure motives.

North and South Vietnam, for that matter Laos and Cambodia, were until 1954 Indochina, a French colony. This is the crux of the matter. From the Vietnamese people's point of view, we are continuing the French colonial policy of imposing our (Western) will upon them. We profess to have limited goals, such as free elections. Free elections do not impress a people who were colonized, occupied by Japanese, then occupied by the French again, with British and American assistance. Free elections do not mean much to a people who never had an election period. What does make sense to them is to be free—free from interference of the Western powers, under any form of self-government, whether good or bad. The worst domestic government is better than the best—foreign imposed—one.

I experienced the same situation in occupied Holland during the war, later in the Dutch Indies. These peoples were rather crawling before walking on their own, than having "goodies" under foreign domination. Democracy as we know it, is not, at this time, possible in Vietnam, as it is not possible in so many countries. We must realize this and not always compare them with ourselves. What they do have in common with us as human beings is that they wish to be free. Therefore, we must change our policy according to reality.

The 17th parallel was a dividing line, imposed by the British, in order to avoid bloodshed and to create a "cooling off" period giving the French an opportunity to withdraw behind this parallel, a Vietnamese collaborators' sanctuary, as Canada became the sanctuary for those who collaborated with the British during our Revolutionary War.

Feelings are high now. We, being the strongest nation in the world, can afford, without losing face to be realistic and civilized and show the Vietnamese, as well as the world, that we are a peace-loving people.

We escalated within a short time from 15,000 advisers in Vietnam, to an Army of presently 205,000 man. In addition, we were told, another approximately 100,000 men are involved in various ways, including Navy and Air Force. When we had 15,000 men there, our casualties were relatively low. With escalation, casualties increased. I understand South Vietnam has presently 650,000 men in arms. I cannot see where the safety of the remainder of our forces would be in jeopardy if we, as a gesture of good will, as proof of our good intentions, withdrew 45,000 men. If the North Vietnamese would respond withdrawing, we gradually could reduce our forces while in the meantime we created a climate where all parties concerned could be persuaded to come to the conference table. The Vietcong, now fighting (in their view) a war of liberation, should be included in discussions. Then we can indeed talk free elections, which seems the entire purpose of our boys dying there. This would be in accord with our contention that we seek an honorable solution.

I believe that this way we could convince the Chinese, the Russians, for that matter, our allies in Western Europe, that we really have no obscure reasons for being there and that we will leave Vietnamese soil soon thereafter. The alternatives are obvious. A global, atomic war, perhaps extermination of the human race. Is this what we offer our children?

Dear Senator, I apologize for taking so much of your valuable time, but trust this letter will have some merits for you to explore. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Ted Blokker.

Halfway, Oreg.,
February 10, 1966.

U.S. Senator of Oregon.

Dear Senator Morse: We do hope you may find time to read this letter, for we want you to know, we are in back of your stand on the Vietnam crisis 100 percent and we thank God that Oregon's Senator was one of the two Senators in the Nation, that had the will and honesty to the people to vote against giving the President the power of a dictator to lead their country into a war. A war that could last for 20 years.

Now this same President cannot and is not honestly seeking a peaceful settlement of this war, not when he seeks and takes the advice of men like McNamara, Dean Rusk, and General Taylor. Men that cannot or will not let the American people know just what they are doing. After all we are the ones that have to pay with our boys and money.

Our President just returned from Honolulu. He promised the Vietnamese everything in the book and to continue the slaughter of our school kids, for that is all they are.

He tells us to build more schools, for what?

The girls say they can get along fine with what schools we have, and if this means disregard for the Constitution of United States is not stopped, the only boys we will have left are the ones with a jail record. In fact that's about all we have left now in Baker County.

Senator, I want you to know the draft board of Baker County is taking boys in their freshman year out of college at midterm. These boys have good grades.

It is so bad that Mr. Lyle Johnson, registrar at E.O. College also a member of the draft board resigned from the draft board and publicly stated that the unfairness was his reason for his resignation.

Where is this going to end?

Sincerely,

PERCY LAIRD.
MRS. PERCY LAIRD.

PORTLAND, OREG.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
417 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to commend you for your persistent stand on the Vietnam issue and urge that you continue your course through the rougher waters ahead.

I fear that this Nation has committed itself to a most regrettable course. We are now caught in a war both unjust and immoral and one in which the people of Vietnam, the women and children, suffer the greatest.

My hope is that the posture of this Nation can return once again to the one of peacemaker and our only hope now is that your voice and that of others continue to be heard as part of the conscience of these United States.

In peace,

JOSEPH M. ERCEG.

SALEM, OREG.,
February 13, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just want you to know that I am thankful that we have an American Senator such as yourself who has the courage to protest the Vietnam mess.

When did America assume the self-appointed role of world ruler and cure-all for every country's ills, to the drain and detriment of our wonderful country?

This is a critical time, in my opinion, as at the rate we are now going, it will soon be that all dissenters will be suppressed and branded as un-American and unpatriotic. Then everyone will be afraid to express themselves. Thanks again for caring.

Sincerely,

KEN REINER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is to inform you that I fully support your stand on the undeclared war in Vietnam. I feel it is the responsibility of the Congress to commit this country to war if such action is necessary. I urge you to continue your effort to lead the President back to the constitutional path.

In addition, I would like to say that the televised Senate hearings now going on are a great public service. Prior to these hearings one could only obtain the facts through the written press and I am highly skeptical of much that is printed in these media. Facts can be slanted or altered to suit the writer. I prefer to see it with my own eyes and form my own opinion.

I will close with a word about myself. I am not a bearded beatnick, instead I am a Republican and I tend to lean toward the conservative. I am discharged from the Marines after 4 years of active duty and consider myself much more patriotic than the average person. It is for this reason that I do not want the Constitution of the United States to be so flagrantly violated by the President. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

ALBERT L. DEAN.

GRANTS PASS, OREG.,
February 10, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I take this means to express my admiration for your attitude and stand on our foreign relations policies. That our circumvention of the U.N. is ridiculous and the waste of our resources in foreign lands scandalous should be apparent to any thinking person. Apathy, ignorance, or both on the part of our American public can be the only reason I can think of being responsible for same.

I respect your thinking in every respect and may God grant you the power to persevere.

If I, as a thinking American citizen, can support you in any way other than my vote I would consider it an honor.

Sincerely,

R. E. HOWARD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 9, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate of the United States of America,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just finished reading your speech in the Senate on Wednesday, May 5, 1965, "The Undeclared War in Vietnam." I have also read, listened, and watched as much as possible in connection with your views on this and other points of the U.S. foreign policy.

May I say, even though I am not yet a U.S. citizen, that in my modest opinion you have a correct appraisal of the dangers of the present situation. More to the point, let me assure you of my admiration for your continued courage and devotion to the interest of the country as you understand it.

In a recent TV debate you appealed to the American people to make themselves heard where it counts: in the ballot box. It is my earnest hope that in the not-too-distant future I may be able to support you precisely in that place. In the meantime I shall be grateful for the continued mailing of information as your office has been doing in the past.

Yours sincerely,

ANTONIO COLÁS.

ALBANY, OREG.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for all you are doing to try and put an end to this awful war that we should have no part of.

Also thank you for the TV coverage of the Senate investigation hearings. Everyone in this country should hear and see them. Our papers here including the Oregonian do not cover them enough. Thank you.

Sincerely,

MRS. H. D. BLAKELY.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 10, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing this letter to express my thanks that we have a Senator from Oregon that has the courage to stand up and fight for his convictions concerning our policy in Vietnam. Your views are shared by a great many Oregonians and your record has proved that you will not be dictated to by any man.

So thanks again to a great Senator from Oregon who is writing a brand new chapter in "Profiles in Courage."

Sincerely,

HOWARD MCCAMMEN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 9, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I listened and watched TV yesterday over channel 8, and heard the very fine interview of our Senators with Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, retired, as he advised Senators to investigate our United States-Asian policy.

It was a wonderfully dignified and informative session and you, Senator MORSE, were magnificent. I, too, wonder when we will return to constitutional government. I'm concerned about the power being displayed by our top leaders in the administration.

Also the Oregonian this morning had President Johnson's big plans regarding Vietnam, "Powermen" and easing needs of Vietnam's woes before we even have the Communists out of South Vietnam. I had to look on page 10 to find a very small article about the important meeting with the Foreign Relations Committee. Why? It must really be true that our press is being controlled as the FCC is trying to control all radio mediums.

We are at war. Why shouldn't we let Congress make the decision to declare war so all the people will know where we stand.

I have a boy in the Air Force, and two more boys coming up.

Do all you can to let the people know.

Sincerely,

MRS. MILTON C. LOCKWOOD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am proud to have you as my Senator. It is extremely difficult for me to decide whether the war in Vietnam is correct or not, but it doesn't take any insight to know that we are going about the process in an incorrect, immoral, and self-defeating manner. If we are going to have a war, we should declare it. If we are not going to have a war, we should not be fighting, at the level we are fighting.

It is your honest dissent which makes possible a discussion of the issues and out of this comes the strength of our Nation. Please accept my encouragement to keep up the hard work you are carrying on.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH CRAWSHAW, M.D.

ONTARIO, OREG.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Mr. Harris and myself have been listening to the Senate hearings on TV and you are to be commended on the way you have been speaking out on the situation at hand; and I'm sure the people of Oregon are justly proud we have such a Senator as you who has the courage to take a definite stand on these issues.

We ask God's blessings upon you; and we sincerely thank you.

Mr. and MRS. E. K. HARRIS.

FEBRUARY 11, 1966.

Re Vietnam war:

I'm a registered Republican. But in national policies to me we are one. That is my political philosophy. Also, I am thoroughly disillusioned about the efficacies of any war. In my era, we made the "world safe for democracy." Ha!

But I believe in the democratic processes. Hence this letter. Under our law, we have a voice through elected representatives only. When the administration makes war without bringing the issues to vote by our representatives, that administration is denying me, as a member of that society, my rights to be heard and infringing on my freedom. I can't understand our President who champions the cause of political freedoms to other distant countries, but denies the same privileges to his own people; what is more amazing is for one who professes to "come let's sit down and reason together" to conduct himself so. His commitments are first to the American people, and not to Vietnam.

I shall be forever grateful to the American press, television, and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for bringing the Vietnam crisis live before "our eyes and ears." This is a service of the highest good, at least to me, a common person, to help me to adjudge the situation, and to form a just decision.

I thank you and your colleagues for working so long and so hard to give us this service.

Sincerely yours,

Marie Tiggelbeck.

La Grange, Oreg.

Ontario, Oreg.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: I have been watching the Senate Committee meetings on TV.

I wish to thank you for the courageous stand you have taken. I know every peace-loving citizen of Oregon appreciates the stand you have taken.

Your concern for our boys that bear the battle is heartening to the boys and parents that have known the heartbreak of war and war it is.

I know the people of Oregon can count on your support.

Yours truly,

Sibyl T. Hendricks.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 10, 1966.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I wish to make my support of your courageous position on Vietnam clear to you again at this time, this critical time of decision, when you often must be tempted to despair by the obduracy of the many leaders who seem bent on destroying peace and the possibility of international cooperation.

You may count on my support in your further efforts to restore our national policy to sanity and legitimacy.

Sincerely,

Rolfe La Forge.

Oregon City, Oreg.,
February 10, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank God someone is beginning to speak up in regards to this problem of secrecy and half-truths in the State Department and other areas of Federal activity.

I am a stanch Democrat but something must be done soon to let the entire population know the facts. I'm sure we cannot continue with a policy of limited information—it's bound to backfire sooner or later—the good people of this country have to know or goodby democracy.

Keep up the good work and more of it please. I think you are writing the next chapter in a "Profile of Courage." America needs the crusade of yours now. It is our only means of salvation. The people must be honestly and fully informed.

My prayers go with you. Let me know what else I can do to help you.

Cordially,

J. C. Boyle.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 10, 1966.

Dear Senator: I am very much concerned with the escalation of this Vietnam war. I give you every support in your effort to stop it. I have listened to all the TV committee hearings. I feel our foreign policy should be changed.

Mrs. Dorothy O'Dell.

Salem Oreg.,
February 10, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We follow your activities in the newspapers, and hear you often on TV. We just wish to tell you that we admire your courage in being a dissenter under our present administration, that we think your opinions on the Vietnam war are correct, and that we are behind you 100 percent in whatever you do.

Our best wishes to you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Lloyd DeGroote.

Portand, Oreg., *February 11, 1966.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Your comments from time to time and most recently on television during committee investigations regarding our situation in Vietnam are most interesting and I wholeheartedly support them. As a veteran of World War II, I find it increasingly difficult to explain to my two oldest boys why they must, in all probability, eventually serve in a war in Vietnam.

I have long felt that it is the duty of every citizen of this country of ours to support his Government by whatever measure is necessary. This is the first time in my life that I have questioned the wisdom of the necessity of action outside the United States. I want you to know that I appreciate your willingness to stand up against the forces that have almost made it unpatriotic for those of us who have voiced opposition.

It does seem to me that there must be other ways to handle this situation without draining the lifeblood of our Nation's future through our young people.

Sincerely yours,

Sed Stuart.

Winston, Oreg.,
February 9, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you again for your stand on the war in South Vietnam.

Many people were shocked by the resumption of bombing of North Vietnam and the treatment of the South Vietnam people suspect of being in sympathy with the Vietcong.

From pictures in newspapers, I wonder if our troops are any less brutal than the Japanese were in World War II.

The thing that bothers so many people who voted for President Johnson in preference to Mr. Goldwater, is that Mr. Johnson has done exactly what Mr. Goldwater said he would do.

I cannot help but wonder if this feeling will not be reflected in the coming elections.

Here in Oregon, Mr. Hatfield has been critical of our Vietnam policy and as he is a very popular Governor, I am very much afraid the next Senator from Oregon will be Mr. Hatfield.

While no one can look into the future, it does seem to me that the chance of peace is a very slim one.

Is it possible to take from the President the power to wage war without the consent of Congress?

Thank you again for your stand on South Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph B. Hulse.

Salem, Oreg.,
February 10, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: This is the first letter I have ever written to Washington. Little people like myself are getting stirred up over Vietnam. Ordinarily we expect our Congressmen and Senators to run our Government properly.

Thank goodness you are awake and doing a good job. If we have made a mistake by getting into a war in Vietnam, let's correct the situation as quickly as possible. Everyone makes mistakes, and the United States is no exception, and I certainly feel we have no business fighting in Asia.

Again, I want to say thank you for taking the stand you have.

Sincerely,

Mrs. W. D. Gwynn.

Redmond, Oreg.,
February 14, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I appreciate the stand our Senate delegation has taken regarding the Vietnam war, particularly that of Senator Morse.

I trust this policy will be widely adopted and pursued and that we soon may win there decisively without expanding or extending the war, and that we may thereafter mop up the mess and bring our men and equipment home.

It is incredible and inexcusable that after what our men went through in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war, we are starting through the combat all over again.

Trust that Senator Morse will continue to be vociferous and effective.

Sincerely,

Mrs. C. E. Stranahan.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 13, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I congratulate you on your increasing support in peace efforts for the Vietnam issue. Your much appreciated report letters have given me (and others) a much greater understanding of the issue and your sincere efforts to settle it with ethics and honor.

I sincerely hope you will receive the honor of a Nobel Peace Prize for your dedication. More power to you.

Sincerely,

James H. Robinson.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 14, 1966.

Senator Wayne L. Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I want you to know that I support you in your stand in the Vietnam war.

Sincerely,

E. J. Hangerud.

Eugene, Oreg.,
February 15, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Your stand on Vietnam makes me very proud to be an American and to be able to say you represent me. My wife and I won't forget what you have done. But more has to be done.

I just saw photographs taken by Felix Greene and heard him talk at the University of Oregon. He presents conclusive proof the bombing of the North has destroyed hospitals, schools, nurseries, old people's homes; and it has strengthened the resolve of the North to fight harder. Can't you get him to testify before the committee? People don't know this kind of thing is going on. American boys are being taught how to torture and are being turned into brutal killers. Somebody has got to do something to stop this madness. Urge the President to stop bombing; negotiate a cease-fire; state our support for the Geneva agreements and our pledge to carry them out; and grant the Vietcong equal status with the Saigon government in negotiations. Thanks.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND B. PRATT.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept my humble thanks for your tireless effort to depress any accelerated action in Vietnam. We all hope and pray that you, with the help of some of the other Senators and Congressmen, that it will be possible for you to regain some of the powers which are being taken away from you. After the promises made in the islands, it looks pretty hopeless—but please keep trying.

We can't wait for election time to exercise our will against stepping up this so-called war. Something must be done before then to stop it, and I pray that you will be given the strength to carry on your battle against any acceleration of the situation. * * * and now the power that the executive branch seems to be taking away from Congress.

It appeared that Professor Kennan made a very deep impression with his answers to the many tiring questions, and we can only hope now that the Senators on this committee will band together and act to prevent us getting into war any deeper than we already are. It appears that your courage to speak out is giving a few of the rest of them a little courage also.

Gratefully yours,

AGNES D. HALL (Mrs. H. T.).

GRANTS PASS, OREG.,
February 14, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This letter will let you know that my family and a great majority of the people of Grants Pass, Oreg., are backing you and the committee.

I agree with the committee, the American people should be told the facts about what is going on in our Government.

Please don't let us down.

Yours truly,

WOODROW W. MORACE.

WINSTON, OREG.,
February 14, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SENATOR: I am grateful for your brave and bold stand on Vietnam.

We have overextended ourself all over the earth.

We have no right to be in Vietnam anymore than Chinese Armies have a right to be in Mexico.

The world is too big for us to rule alone.

Sincerely,

FRANK P. LIENING.

SALEM, OREG.

SENATOR MORSE: Please continue to ask for debate on Vietnam.

Yours truly,

CHESTER HORN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been negligent in not telling you before that I fully support your position on Vietnam in which I have been in accord for a long time.

I am gratified that several members of the Foreign Relations Committee to some extent are inclined to agree with your views and I wish to report that many of my friends, who in the past were definitely in favor of our entry in Vietnam, have changed their thinking to coincide with yours.

Yours very truly,

W. A. BRUSHOFF.

P.S.—I should like my name to be placed on your mailing list.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 14, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Let us commend you again for demanding that there be debate on the administration policy in Vietnam. Your almost lone voice is at last being joined by others. Our best hope, it seems to us, is to dampen down this conflict until the issues can be clarified and resolved in negotiation. As long as the President talks in vague generalities the other side will refuse to meet with us. Please continue to "hammer away." You are making yourself heard.

Yours respectfully,

RUTH and WALTER R. WARREN.

EUGENE, OREG.,
February 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support your Vietnam position 100 percent. Your efforts to bring this undeclared war to the conference table are appreciated.

Thank you very much for what you are doing. The best of luck to you. May you be successful in your efforts.

Yours truly,

JOHN W. BERG.

EUGENE, OREG.,
February 11, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: We absolutely concur with the views expressed by former Ambassador Kennan and General Gavin before your Committee on Foreign Relations this week, and have written a card to President Johnson to that effect.

We've been desperately worried about the limb we've evidently got ourselves onto in Vietnam, and the collision course the administration seems bent on, to say nothing of the breakdown of checks and balances between the Congress and the President.

The public hearing and the TV coverage were a tremendous service to national sanity, and we're particularly grateful to Mr. Kennan for one of the most dynamic approaches to foreign policy we've ever heard.

As always, you make us proud of being Democrats and Oregonians. Thank you for all your months of being a voice in the wilderness regarding the Vietnam war. If you can think of anything useful we can do to impress it upon the administration, we'd appreciate hearing about it in the newsletter.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN BLUNT.

FEBRUARY 16, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you to express my approval of your stand on the Vietnam war. Keep up your protests and perhaps eventually the American people will have foresight enough to see and understand that our people in Washington are leading us into a hopeless situation with a great sacrifice of American lives and money.

I still have not understood their explanation of our commitment. Who in Washington has the right to sacrifice our young Americans on Asian soil? Is this war continued in all its hopelessness for the benefit of our industrialists who are profiting from this war?

The Asian peoples are not of our culture, they do not think the same as we of the Western World and surely the President and his supporters with all our tax money to dole out freely aren't going to change their thinking.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ELLEN ERICKSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.

FEBRUARY 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I'm listening and you are superb.

No need to answer this note. Please use it as a statistic.

Yours truly,

Mrs. RUTH ASHFORD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 15, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am opposed to any further involvement in southeast Asia.

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. REAM.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
February 26, 1966.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Once again the people of Oregon have reasons to be proud of their contribution to the U.S. Senate. Your fearless, logical, and searching examination of the witnesses in the present hearing gives us confidence that there is still some reason left in the Nation. Together with the chairman of the committee you have made his hearing something new in the history of our country.

I am not sure that the majority of the people will support you, but I am sure that history will show that you have made one of the most significant contributions to democratic government. More power to you.

Sincerely,

FRED W. KNICKREHM.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 19, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am not qualified to be specific, but I want to say the course you are following in the current Vietnam dispute is in accord with my thinking. As I understand it, you are basing your argument on legal grounds—that we should respect the authority of our Constitution, the Charter of the United Nations, and international law. We have a fringe in our society of common law violators—and listening to the TV hearings this week it seems that some people in high places are prone to disregard some restrictions too.

In regard to the joint resolution of August 1964, I felt at the time that the administration was asking for a vote of confidence, to show the world that the country was behind the President in repelling attack. I had no thought, and suppose the idea was quite general, that this did not authorize massive military preparations. I believe

Secretary Rusk read the fine print at the hearing the other day attempting to show this authorized escalation, but I'm sure the Congress and the people did not interpret it so at the time. They thought of the resolution as a whole.

I feel you are doing a real service in arousing public opinion to an awareness of the extent of our involvement without full disclosure and debate. It is time for Congress to assume more control as one of the three major branches of Government and to base our actions on constitutional grounds.

With all good wishes,

Yours very truly,

Fred W. Dost.

Yoncalla, Oreg.,
February 21, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We have been very interested in the foreign relations discussions and wish to commend you for the stand you are taking in opposition to the war in Vietnam. In our little town it seems that nearly everyone is against the war. Continue to work for peace and better foreign relations.

Sincerely yours,

Delbert Dickey.

Bend, Oreg.,
February 23, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We, my 88-year-old mother who is an active reader both in current affairs as well as my realm of extra medical magazines, my wife who is an avid reader of current literature especially in her efforts to obtain a community theater here in Bend, a very active person in League of Women Voters, A.A.U.W., and Community Theater, as well as currently making quite a study of water rights and utilization of water and last of all myself, an ophthalmologist, wish to express our appreciation of your sturdiness of character and forthrightness in the present hassle our country finds itself.

I have toyed with and mentioned it to you one night in an after-hour depression letter about leaving this home of ours for parts unknown in the fantasy of more freedom of living, expression, better representation in government, and other facets that the United States of America has in the past been our prerogative here. It looks as though that this is a stupid outlook. The best place to fight one's battle is on the home ground. That, Senator Morse, is what you are doing. We congratulate you. We are happy that our Senate is no longer a "one man show" with the often stated "rubberstamp."

We just wish to thank you, Senator Morse. No answer is necessary as you have plenty of other correspondence and time is short.

Very sincerely,

Kenneth H. Oakley, M.D.
Jessie H. Oakley.
Betty L. Oakley.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 23, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have watched with great pride your dignified and responsible criticism of the administration policy in Vietnam, and wish you to know that I am in full agreement with you, and have so advised the President.

Respectfully,

Mrs. Milton D. Hyman.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 20, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We watch the hearings with interest and some degree of hope. At least there is some honest searching and frank discussion of issues instead of parroting phrases like "Let's stop communism."

We realize you are tired, but encourage you to keep on with the good work.

Sincerely,

Esther C. Richards.

Albany, Oreg.,
February 17, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I am so proud of the battle you are putting on for the continuance, or should I say, the return to the American tradition.

The applause you drew this morning during the General Taylor hearing was well-deserved and I joined in. When you get into a scrap you are 6 feet tall and as rugged as the forward wall of the Green Bay Packers.

Keep it up, I meet many people during the course of my day and feel them all out on the Vietnam situation; the sentiment is almost unanimous for your stand. Only the obvious sufferers from thyroid imbalance seem to oppose you.

My wife and two sons, aged 10 and 18, join me in hearty thanks for your battle which you now appear to be winning. May God continue to bless us with your service as our Senator.

Very respectfully,

Harry Smith.

Coos Bay, Oreg.

Dear Senator Morse: I cannot help but write and tell you that I was proud, very proud, to be a resident of the State of Oregon and an American this afternoon as I watched the Foreign Relations Committee hearings on Vietnam.

I am of the generation which is sending its members over to that swamp-infested country, 8,000 miles away, to fight for something that the President says is right, and moral, and the American thing to do. I have tried to enlist in the Army, but could not get in because of allergies. I do feel that we should get this damned thing over. Whether this is accomplished by escalation to the point of all-out war, or by withdrawing from a theater where we evidently are neither needed or obligated to be.

I agree with your statement in regards to our being there under the auspices of the SEATO pact. The thing that angers me, is the fact that we are entered into a war and yet there has been no declaration of war, there has been no serious debate in the hallowed Halls of Congress, there has only been the word from the President that this is the thing to do. It is right. I cannot help but feel somewhat of a traitor when I sit here and doubt the word of the President of the United States of America. But I do feel that we as Americans have the right, I might even say the duty, to question each and every administration. For these are but mere men. Even though they are supposed to speak for the mass of Americans, there is always the possibility that they are not now directing this great country of ours in the direction that the bulk of the American people wish.

I am a Republican, but I am an American first, and then a Republican. I do believe that it is the obligation of all Americans to not accept blindly the word of the administration. And this is just what I am doing. I have many friends over there, and a couple have come home the hard way. When I heard General Taylor say that the soldiers over in Vietnam would be greatly hurt if they were withdrawn without having won a favorable, I could not help but feel a bit questionable. No man who is in a war wants to go on fighting when he can see no appreciable victory. No man willing wants to kill other men. Sure, this often has to be done, but at times when his home, his family, his country are in danger. But is there such a situation now? No. So why should he feel so let down if his country calls him home? I imagine that he won't.

So I urge you to carry your fight to the American people, and I imagine that you will find that the mass of America is behind you in your feelings about the war in Vietnam. I salute you as an American and as an Oregonian. I say that I am behind you and proud to have you as my Senator.

Sincerely,

Larry Breniman.

Eugene, Oreg.

Dear Senator Morse: This is just a brief note to congratulate you for your courage and strength in standing up for what you feel is right. I'm a graduate student in journalism at the University of Oregon and have been here only 7 or 8 months, but I am proud to feel you are my representative in Congress. You are a U.S. Senator first, Senator from Oregon second, and that is all the difference in the world between yourself and your esteemed colleagues from the Deep South.

Keep fighting—there are a good many here at the university who are with you 100 percent. Yours is a voice which will not be forgotten when they write the histories of those men who loved their country and did not want to see it dishonor itself.

Sincerely.

Ross E. Heller.

Springfield, Oreg.

Senator Wayne Morse: Keep the good work up. We are just two of the many who are in accord with you.

Respectfully yours,

Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Parker.

Eugene, Oreg.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Please know how much so many people here appreciate your position on Vietnam. You have been absolutely right. As a professor of political science at the university, I can testify that the students and faculty follow your speeches carefully. While not enough of them have spoken out in your support, there are more and more who do so, and that at least is encouraging in these calamitous times.

I am proud of being an Oregonian every time you make a Senate speech on this question. Your courage gives strength to many others, and I believe you are one of the few national leaders who has the respect of the most informed and humane young people.

Thanks for sending us a copy of your recent speech on the Senate floor, that contains so much relevant background information that is so rarely considered. We will use it and pass it on.

Sincerely,

Daniel Goldrich.

Medford, Oreg.,
February 17, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: I wish to express my gratitude for your courageous stand with regard to U.S. policy in Vietnam. I know that it is far from a comfortable position to oppose a national policy which often provides fuel for the passions of jingoists and others with chauvinistic tendencies. It is unfortunate in the extreme that you may be subject to accusations of being a "comsymp," a traitor, and such like foul and unjust vilifications. Such attacks only increase my admiration for you and others who take similar responsible, if unpopular, positions.

While I realize that we are faced with problems of staggering complexity in southeast Asia, for which no easy solutions exist, and while I do not always agree with your thinking (though I usually do), I strongly feel that you are invaluable to the Nation as "gadfly" and counselor, and I can only hope that your stings and counsels do not go unheeded, for the good of our country and the world.

With you as my Senator, I am indeed proud to be an Oregonian.

Yours very truly,

STEPHEN R. BUNGUM.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 11, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I don't quite know how to begin this letter, or rather how to put down in words how I feel.

My son was home for a few days after his basic training. He left last night, rather early this morning for another camp. He will be stationed there for 16 weeks, then God knows where.

He left some notes on how to survive, in case he is sent over. It made me sick when I read them. Not 6 months ago, he was in Bible college studying for the ministry. Now he is taught how to kill or be killed. Is that why we send our boys to school? Just when they know what their goal in life is, it is snatched away? Maybe I sound like a nut but this is how I feel about all of this business.

I have another son home now, but it is a matter of time before he will be called. Which I hope will not happen, but no doubt it will. He also is in college.

But what I would like to know is why our boys have to go, when they haven't even had a chance to live. Is that why we have children? Just to have them leave, not of their own accord, but because they have to? How can they be the citizens of tomorrow, if there is no tomorrow for them?

Sincerely,

A SOLDIER'S MOTHER.

LA GRANDE, OREG.

SIR: Keep up the good work on the Viet situation.

Well done.

C. E. SMITH.
NICHOLAS SMITH.
Mr. and Mrs. BEN HIBB.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 12, 1966.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I, my wife, and my son (who served over a year in South Vietnam) heartily agree with you and Senator FULBRIGHT that this is an unnecessary and dangerous war and we should stop before we go too far.

Men who fight for right like you, are always in the minority.

We can see that Senator FULBRIGHT too is a man who is concerned, not only with the welfare of the United States but of the whole world.

Lots of luck.

Mr. and Mrs. LEONARD MOEN and SON, ROD.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 12, 1966.*

SENATOR MORSE: I deeply appreciate seeing the Foreign Relations Committee hearings both days on TV channel 8. It was said by Sir Winston Churchill in World War II that "never did a nation, owe so much to so few" in reference to Britain's fighter squadron, I would paraphrase that by saying "never did so many owe so much to any person as you."

I have believed as you that this foreign aid is all wrong. I have great fears that this war could end up in world war III.

We sure owe you a lot and I pray for your good health.

Respectfully,

D. W. SONNELAND.

GRANTS PASS, OREG.

DEAR SIR: Why are we not winning this so-called war in Vietnam? Why are the Vietcong able to ambush the South Vietnamese and our men so often? Is it because our own leaders don't have the cunning and skill to outwit them? Why don't we let Chiang Kai-shek's troops, who are well trained and eager to fight with us, do so? We are supposed to be the richest and strongest country in the world with the biggest fighting forces and yet this war is dragging on and on. Why? If we don't want to win, what are we fighting there for?

Last but not least, has this war been declared? If not, what are we doing there?

Yours truly,

W. M. BRINDLEY.

NEOTSU, OREG., *February 18, 1966.*

Senator MORSE: I would like to compliment you on your stand in the present so-called war situation and pray that you will receive full backing. You are so very right both from a national and Christian attitude.

I am a Republican yet feel that our country's good exceeds our political support.

Thank you,

Mrs. GEORGE F. KOLZOW.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 11, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been following the Senate Foreign Relations hearings closely and wish to commend you for your part in obtaining them and also for your most astute remarks during the hearings.

Thank you very much. Your courage and your integrity is appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. O. G. ROGERS.

EUGENE, OREG., *February 18, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for sending us your Senate speech of January 19.

We are against this war and agree that we should withdraw. We like the last paragraph of your speech particularly. We are surely great enough not to worry about saving face.

One thing I know. You can't make friends by killing people.

More power to you.

Sincerely,

JEAN H. SUTHERLAND.

FAIRVIEW, OREG., *February 18, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I just wanted to let you know how much the public Senate Foreign Relations Committee has meant to us. Truthfully, I don't think many of the average Americans knew much more about the whole situation than the poor people of South Vietnam that we are supposed to be protecting.

After all, this is a land where we are supposed to have a voice in what goes on in our Government. Many of us are derelict, in not letting you people know how we feel on such subjects.

If we have made a definite commitment, then we must live up to it. However, I certainly can see no point in pouring in thousands upon thousands of more of our young men into a war that has never been termed a war. I'm in full agreement with you.

It seems a shame that when people disagree they are tagged with all sorts of unsavory names, but that seems to be the common thing these days.

One thing that has bothered me quite a bit, I haven't heard much said about it in the committee hearings either; if the South Vietnamese want us there, our form of government and all, why are they not as fanatical as the Vietcong?

Apparently, these Vietcong will go to any lengths to obtain their objectives, even to dying for them. True, I've read about many of the people of South Vietnam dying, but I have heard (or read, I should say) that it is all on their own land, so to speak. Yet, the Vietcong are always making daring raids, even on our own Embassy in Saigon, among other places. Does this sound like a people that really are eager for our form of government?

One of the witnesses, no, I beg your pardon, it was one of the Senators, stated when you talk to the people of the land you find how they really feel. Well, does anyone think it is the little people of the United States that say, "We want to go to war"?

Like you, I don't think we can just draw our troops out but I am very much opposed to escalating the whole thing. To me, it is illegal and should be settled by the United Nations, as you have often said.

There is nothing wrong with an honest disagreement, regardless of who it is with. They have tried to make any disagreement look like an aid to the enemy which is so far from the truth, really.

Thank you for taking the stand you have and may you continue to do so.

Sincerely yours,

BETTY BREWER.

EUGENE, CALIF., *February 10, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please know that I endorse your legal and moral point of view toward the Vietnam situation.

Yours truly,

LENORAH B. PLATTS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 20, 1966.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As we reviewed the recent hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee on our television today, it was apparent that our Government is leading us on a wrong path.

You, sir, as well as your distinguished colleague and chairman of the committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, stand out as giants among pygmies. Your courage, your logic and your determination to bring the truth to the American people is admirable.

We wish to express our sincere thanks for your truly American, humanitarian point of view. You have our full support on this most important matter to every citizen of this as well as every nation of the world.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. EUGENE LAPIN.

PAISLEY, OREG., *February 15, 1966.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MR. MORSE: Thank God we have a few men left in Congress of your caliber. You seem to be the only one with any gumption left.

Keep up the good work, the American people need more such leaders as yourself.

You can imagine how bitter we are over this war in Vietnam as our son is a freshman in college and now faces being drafted. His hope is to graduate and make a career of the Air Force as a pilot, but now it does not seem likely they will let him finish. In this great Nation where we stress education—why take these boys out of college? We need them educated for future leaders.

Twenty years ago when I attended college the boys were all called including my husband to fight the war to end war. This we did not mind but now to have the same thing happen to our son and to fight a war we have no business to be fighting makes us bitter indeed.

The U.N. should be forced to help in this war or be eliminated as an ineffective organization. Why should we fight the world's battles? After Vietnam there will be others. There is no end. I have yet to talk to one single person in favor of this war. Doesn't the will of the people mean anything or do we have a dictatorship?

Is this the means our President has for creating the Great Society. Kill off enough boys to eliminate unemployment. Make millionaires by all the profits connected with war. Yes, even for us cattle producers it is nice—more food to feed the Army—prices going up but rest assured we would rather have our boys home where they belong than all the profits in the world.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. P. E. Brattain.

Salem, Oreg.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This is to inform you that I support your stand on the issue of Vietnam. I hope that you and Senator Fulbright will be able to accomplish that which will be toward the betterment of all.

Thank you and much luck,

Yours very truly,

Dva Concepcion.

Salem, Oreg.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: In the Vietnam debate you are saying what needs to be said, and saying it well.

The administration's pronouncements concerning our Asian tragedy have seemed to me to be hollow rationalizations for inept foreign policy management and military prostitution. If the issues were less serious, I would probably be merely embarrassed for the grotesque posture that this country has assumed—but, as it is, I'm dismayed.

I am a hell of a long way from being convinced that a constitutional democracy—a free society—is so anemic and vulnerable that it must apologize for the exercise of restraint and fear the scorn of those who admire brute force. Possibly I'm being overly cynical, but I wonder sometimes whether the commitment we are made so painfully aware of was with the people of Vietnam—or with the Military Establishment and its supporting industries.

We do not want to see an expansion of totalitarian Chinese influence; that is not the issue. But certainly there are alternatives to an aimless, unconstitutional war—a war which, oddly enough, is being waged with a motley group outside the main body we are actually trying to affect. The administration, and many of your colleagues, have not placed any great strain on their imagination in seeking less primitive and more effective counters to the marriage between Russo-Chinese influence and socio-economic revolution. Somehow we must alienate that affection—and I think we can.

You have my unqualified endorsement in this matter, small measure though it is.

Sincerely,

Dan Peer.

Eugene, Oreg.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing to lend my support to the courageous and honorable stand that you have taken in the U.S. Senate regarding United States involvement in Vietnam. You and Senator Fulbright have ably and eloquently stated the feelings of myself and so many of my friends.

By all means continue your stand, in the hopes that an impression may be made upon the administration. In this endeavor you have my heartfelt thanks and support.

Sincerely yours,

Alan G. Fantel.

Bend, Oreg.,
February 16, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Senator: Regarding the stand you have taken against the war in Vietnam, I agree with your feelings wholeheartedly. Keep up the good work and get us out of there now.

Very truly yours,

D. W. Elliott.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: It certainly is heartening to know that someone like you is steadfastly bringing the truth to the American people about Vietnam.

It seems reasonable to assume that millions of Americans voted for President Johnson because of their natural assumption that he would be more reluctant to escalate the conflict in Vietnam than Senator Goldwater. Do you feel that these Americans have much the same aversion to escalation now as they had then? It would seem so. I was wondering how much support the President actually has for his program of escalation.

Some time ago Mr. Walter Lippmann remarked that nothing would excite the admiration of people around the world as much as a policy of restraint on the part of the world's most powerful nation toward a weak nation such as North Vietnam. But perhaps our leaders feel that the real reasons which prompt their actions are too strong for them to exercise restraint. This would indicate an inherent weakness in our position. We are afraid of ideas.

All kindest regards,

Nordin L. Larson.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 18, 1966.

Dear Senator Morse: As one of your constituents, I would like to express my support and admiration for the courageous stands which you have taken regarding several of the Johnson administration programs.

Although there are times when I disagree with what you say, I am extremely thankful that we have a man of you caliber in the Senate.

We remember you daily in our prayers, as we do all of our elected officials, that God might direct you in your important and formidable job.

Sincerely,

Rev. W. Douglas Thompson.

Burns, Oreg.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We, have been viewing and listening to the hearings on TV of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Just wanted to send you our congratulations. We are with you, all the way. It is very refreshing to us and others to hear you mention the desires and needs of the American people. The hearings seem to us, to be very conspicuous in the lack or dismissal of this matter.

With our best wishes to you, and kindest regards.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. Andrew J. Shull.

Portland, Oreg.,
February 17, 1966.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: Believing as I do that we cannot successfully contain communism by force of arms, I am heartily with you in your stand on Vietnam. In this connection I am enclosing copy of a resolution that came to me from another of your constituents, and I should greatly value your opinion of this paper. In any event, I want you to know that there are those among us who take a vital interest in what you are doing and wish to assure you of our active support.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. M. W. Lorenz.

"Resolution To Promote Measures for a Peaceful Solution to the Revolution in South Vietnam

"Whereas the population of Vietnam is 80 percent rural; and

"Whereas most of these people live and work on land which they do not own; and

"Whereas the economic conditions under which they must live as tenants of large landowners are extremely oppressive and the social conditions resulting therefrom are untenable in their indignities inflicted upon these people: Be it therefore

"*Resolved,* That our U.S. Government, and in particular our Department of State, be urged to bring all its influence to bear on the Saigon Government that a decent, practical, and pervasive land reform program be forthwith initiated. This, in the opinion of the petitioner, is the most effective way to end all warlike action in Vietnam, removing the cause thereof, and to secure for the people of these United States not only a tactical, but also a moral victory in southeast Asia."

What is offered here in support of this resolution, has been taken substantially from two publications, one published by our Department of State, the other by the U.S. Operations Mission to Vietnam; it is the terminal report by J. P. Gittinger of December 1959. According to the Department of State, later data on the subject are not available. However, the assumption that conditions after 1959 reverted to those prevailing when Diem came to power, were confirmed by Stephen G. Cary, associate national secretary of the American Friends Service Committee who spent 3 months recently in Vietnam, much of this time in the hamlets.

On page 50 of the Gittinger report we read:

"Traditionally, rents have been 50 percent of the crop for the land alone, with all labor, fertilizer, seeds, draft power, and equipment provided by the tenant or rented at extra cost. Tenants had no security of tenure. The tenants could be removed at the landlords' will as the result of sale, whim, or fancied insult.

"Twelve million people live in this Nation, 9 million of them in rural areas. * * *

Approximately 5 million people live in tenant households, 3 million comprise landless laborer families, and the remaining 1 million live in owner-operated or landlord households."

And on page 51: "Tenants often own one-tenth or two-tenths of an acre, and may rent another half acre or acre."

On page 1 of the same report: "When the Diem government came to power * * * about 40 percent of the riceland areas was held by some 2,500 individuals—0.025 percent of the rural population."

This is a ratio of 25 landowners for every 100,000 population.

And now quoting from "The Land Problem in the Americas," by Lester D. Mallory, in the State Department Publication No. 7112, released in December 1960, page 15:

"Land tenure in Taiwan (Formosa) which the Chiang Kai-shek government found on the island, was such that tenants paid as much as 60 to 70 percent of their main crops in annual rent, and they (likewise) had to buy their own seed, fertilizer, and other necessities."

It can be assumed that in crowded areas in South Vietnam rents are more likely approaching these figures of 60 to 70 percent of the crop than the conservative estimate of 50 percent given in the U.S. Operations Mission report.

From page 16 of the same Department of State publication, we learn that after an extensive land reform program carried through by Chiang in 1949 (and it should be added that this was done for political rather than humanitarian reasons, namely to break the resistance against the Chinese overlords by destroying large Taiwanese landownership, which was the backbone of the resistance), 75 percent of Taiwan's farmers now own all or part of the land they till; the land is being improved, better seed and more modern farm implements are being used, and the farmers are taking an active interest in community affairs and government.

The English publication "Land and Liberty" had this pertinent story in its November-December 1965 issue. It is on an experiment in an Indian village district which a band of young American and English Quakers undertook:

"In 1946 at the village district of Pifa in the Ganges delta, armed with an unusual amount of patience these young Quakers explained their plan to the peasants, fishermen and landlords, and met with general approval and consent. They organized a cooperative enterprise in cultivating the land and in marketing the produce. They set up day schools for the children, evening schools for adults, clinics, etc.

"Progress was slow but sure, there was advance along the whole line.

"Five years after the experiment began, Karl Eskelund, noted traveler and author, visited Pifa and found that the young Quakers had lost heart. At first, both the peasants and the fishermen earned more than ever before. The result was that the landlords raised their rents. The people began to lose courage. What was the use if for all their efforts they got no benefits? The landowners waxed fatter, the peasants and fishermen had no more than they had before. The experiment was soon ended. Perhaps, after all, the old methods were the best."

The patience of the native Asian peasants seems to be surpassed only by the naivete of our foreign aid missions.

Further support of the Saigon government should be conditioned on the prompt introduction of a decent, practical, and pervasive land reform program. This alternative to communism would give new hope to the oppressed toiling masses of the free southeast Asian countries, thus eliminating the cause for the widespread unrest there. An outline of such land reform is contained in the pamphlet, "Indian Village Economy," obtainable from Taxpayers Digest, Post Office Box 03066, Portland, Oreg., 97203. Single copies free, additional copies 10 cents each.

PORTLAND, OREG.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My family and I wish to add our wholehearted support and praise of your courageous and honest stand on this issue of our involvement in Asia. Until we were able to watch the proceedings on television, our administration's policy by secrecy has been a source of anger and frustration. Such a policy causes a great loss of confidence in an administration that goes contrary to its pre-election promise.

The State of Oregon is extremely proud, and history books of the future will shout the name of its illustrious Senator to the far corners of the world.

With highest regards and heartfelt thanks.

Mr. and Mrs. LOUIS M. ALLARD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I just want to take this opportunity to commend you on your very able statements made at the recently televised Foreign Relations Committee hearings. As you must be aware, you have growing support from the humble citizens that you represent here in Oregon and speak for throughout this country. Thank God, we have a very factual news media in the national TV industry and we do not have to rely on the kept press that reports the news in this area.

On all sides I now hear from my fellow citizens after watching the debates on the Vietnam war, that you would never suspect that what is being reported in the Journal and Oregonian on your efforts to give Congress a chance to declare itself on this war, was the same thing that we see and hear on TV. Keep up the good work.

In fact Senator, I heard one fellow who I know, never has supported you with his vote or anything else, unbend enough to speak with grudging admiration in this matter, "MORSE is absolutely right on Vietnam issue but it too bad he is from Oregon." I asked why he spoke that way, and he lamely alibied, "Well I disagree with him on so many things, I sort of hoped I could keep it 100 percent."

So, Senator, in closing let me reassure you, that you are picking up more popular support on the Vietnam issue everyday and if the Congress doesn't hurry up and assert itself as the representative of the governed, many can hardly wait to a vote a change in the complexion of the Congress as it is now made up. You might apply that to the executive branch with a great deal of certainty.

Sincerely,

P. C. LEINEWEBER.

THE GENEVA ACCORD

According to testimony rendered by Secretary of State Rusk in the caucus room in the Senate Office Building on February 18, 1966, the United States of America and South Vietnam were not signatories to this treaty. It thus appears that the responsibility for enforcement of the treaty is the business of the signators only. If North Vietnam was a signator to this treaty, then legally North Vietnam is entitled to enforce the treaty, which of course North Vietnam is legally doing in the best manner it knows how, and that regardless of its political views. In this sense, the United States and South Vietnam are the violators of that treaty.

ALBERT E. GALLIN.

PORTLAND, OREG.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am proud to have you as my Senator. You are gaining ground every day in your fight against this preposterous war in Vietnam. I will do all that I can to help you.

Yours very truly,

ROY W. MARVIN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 19, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to express my appreciation to you for what you had to say in the hearings on Vietnam. I thought both you and Senator Fulbright were eloquent and what you had to say were the highlights of the hearings.

I think it was a great service to the American people to be able to listen in, for it is the right of the American people to make decisions if, indeed, we have a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. We cannot let it perish from this earth.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

Mrs. D. A. POWELL.

ASTORIA, OREG.,
February 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Even though we have restarted the bombing of North Vietnam, we, the eighth-grade Sunday school class of Trinity Lutheran Church of Astoria, hope that you will help the President find ways to bring peace in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

Beth Rasmussen, Sue Howard, Susi Alao, Roberta Hagerup, Bonny Van Osdol, Carl Nyberg, Steve Larson, Jim Herold, Steven Leach, Dan Young, Eighth Graders of Trinity, Mrs. Bruce Pond, Teacher.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Louisiana that I have the greatest respect for his opinion and for all those who do not agree with me on this vital issue. This may not be the time for lengthy discussion, but during the course of the debate I think I shall be able to demonstrate that the official pronouncements of our alleged commitment undertaken by President Eisenhower and by two other Presidents did not commit our Nation to send troops into southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I believe that this is an issue which is not exactly as it has been represented.

I do not challenge or question the integrity or the devotion or the honesty of anyone who disagrees with these views. However, there is far more to this issue than appears on the surface. No one detests communism or totalitarianism in any form more than I do.

Brought up in the tradition of freedom and in the practice of all the basic liberties—of speech and press and assembly and worship—we cannot but oppose the advance of communism.

However, Mr. President, we are not going about it in the right way, at the right time, and at the right place, to stop it.

That view is supported by a great number of sincere people, who feel as deeply as does the Senator from Louisiana and as I do.

It would be highly desirable for communism to vanish from the face of the earth, and that we could stop its advance. However, it is my opinion that we are not proceeding in the right way in southeast Asia to halt communism's advance.

I believe, as the debates go on, that the pertinent facts will be further elucidated.

I am hopeful that the discussion will prove valuable in informing the American people. They are entitled to know the pros and cons of the issues that are involved here, both the administration's policy and the modifications that have been proposed by various Senators, and I believe that the overdue debate we have been having has been helpful in enlightening public opinion.

I hope that out of it all will emerge a sounder foreign policy, under which we can get together and achieve the results that we all desire, and that is to get out of our military involvement in southeast Asia as honorably and as quickly as it is possible for us to get out.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I merely wish to say, in conclusion, that the South Vietnamese people have an army in the field of 700,000 men. They are fighting for the defense and the independence and freedom of that country. Those troops are giving a very good account of themselves. I hope that we will hear no more of the argument that the South Vietnamese are not fighting.

Having listed the number of casualties that the army has suffered in fighting for the defense of its country against the Communist aggressive forces, I shall seek to make available for the Record the number of casualties that we estimate the Communists have suffered because of the courageous action in the field of this South Vietnamese Army.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of receipts and expenditures, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965, which, with the accompanying report; was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated February 9, 1966, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Lee C. White, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably sundry nominations in the Environmental Science Services Administration, and the Coast Guard. Since these names have already appeared in the Congressional Record, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask that these names be placed on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Tydings in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations are as follows:

Clinton D. Upham, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Environmental Science Services Administration; and

David Gershowitz, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Coast Guard.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FANNIN:

S. 2957. A bill for the relief of Wing Yuen Wong, also known as Wing Yuen Gee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. McClellan):

S. 2958. A bill to make certain expenditures made by the city of Little Rock, Ark., eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 2959. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fernando N. Pino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 2960. A bill for the relief of Ilija Georgievski, Marika Georgievski, Mile Georgievski and Suzana Georgievski; and

S. 2961. A bill for the relief of Nishan Cadirci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 2962. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, to provide economic assistance to local governmental bodies affected thereby, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request).

S. 2963. A bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916; and

S. 2964. A bill to amend the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, to permit the Commission to require the carriers in the offshore domestic trade to keep uniform accounts and permit Commission representatives to inspect the accounts and records of such carriers; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. Simpson):

S. 2965. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit or deduction for certain political contributions made by individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Williams of Delaware when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2966. A bill to authorize the adjustment of status under the Immigration and Nationality Act of nonimmigrants who are natives of the Western Hemisphere to that of aliens admitted for permanent residence if they had made applications for such an adjustment under such act which were pending on December 1, 1965; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 2967. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to reduce the rate of duty on racing shells; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2968. A bill for the relief of Sesha Gopalan Rugmonyammal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTYRE (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Muskie, and Mrs. Smith):

S. 2969. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for additions to a reserve for certain guaranteed debt obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. McIntyre when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2970. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pedro I. Matias and his wife, Benilda G. Matias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. Eastland):

S. 2971. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 2972. A bill to promote health and safety in metal and nonmetallic mineral industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CERTAIN EXPENDITURES BY THE CITY OF LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to make certain expenditures by the city of Little Rock, Ark., eligible as local grants-in-aid for the purpose of title I of the Housing Act of 1949.

For a number of years, officials of the city of Little Rock, Ark., have been working to eliminate the slums of the city. They have made great progress and have attained national prominence for their urban renewal activities. One of the most imaginative and, by far, the most ambitious effort, to date, is the Central Little Rock Urban Renewal project which encompasses the entire central business district of the city. This project promises to provide demonstrations of solutions to many of the vexing problems of downtown America. This 508-acre project has already achieved both public and private renewal in an amount approaching $20 million.

As a part of its considerable investment in the rebuilding of the center of the community, the city of Little Rock has built a new public library, an arts and cultural center, and a municipal and courts building at considerable expense to its residents. This is but a small part of the total investment that will be made by the community in the development or improvement of urban expressways and thoroughfares, street lighting, traffic control systems, parking facilities, improved water and sewer facilities, parks, and landscaped open areas.

The city of Little Rock has made plans for the rejuvenation of its downtown area which will create the most inviting and desirable center possible for the economic, social, and cultural benefit of the entire community.

The library, the arts center, and the municipal building are integral parts of the renewal of downtown Little Rock. Local expenditures on these buildings should be recognized as local contributions to the total renewal effort. This bill would give such recognition.

Mr. President, there are many precedents for action of this kind. The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 similarly recognized local expenditures for the Downtown Sports Stadium in St. Louis, Mo., the cultural and convention centers in Denver, Colo., and Norfolk, Va., and the memorial hospital in Michigan City, Ind.

It might be preferable to enact general legislation establishing better standards for recognizing local expenditures in connection with downtown renewal projects. In the meantime, however, local improvements like these in Little Rock should not be excluded from the computation of local contributions to the renewal project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2958) to make certain expenditures made by the city of Little Rock, Ark., eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT [for himself and Mr. McCLELLAN], was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in the northern counties of my native State of California, there stands awesome proof of the poet's sage observation that "only God can make a tree."

Our redwood empire has stood since prehistoric times. Here is some of the finest handiwork of our Creator, "who has given man domain over the work of His hand." Here we may truly give thanks for the magnificent dwelling place He has given us.

I regret to say that with the march of civilization, these remarkable redwood groves, which come down to us from the original face of nature, are diminishing and gravely endangered.

For the enjoyment and edification of generations yet unborn, let alone the inspiration of the present population, we must insure the preservation of this unique natural resource. To achieve that goal, I introduce a bill to establish a Redwoods National Park affording perpetual protection against despoilation and defacement by man of the most spectacular stands of these trees and of the ecology they encompass. I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk until the close of business March 2, 1966, for coauthorships, which I invite from both parties, on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the request of the Senator from California is granted.

The bill (S. 2962) to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, to provide economic assistance to local governmental bodies affected thereby, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the idea of a Redwood National Park has been the subject of lively controversy and long and intensive deliberation. Like many other proposals relating to matters of this sort, I regret that in all probability the bill I am introducing will not be wholly satisfactory to all who are interested in this proposal or likely to feel its impact.

Among conservationists there are some who would broadly extend the area to achieve a maximum preservation of redwood groves. Such an extension, however, would greatly restrict the livelihood of established communities in our northern counties.

Many months ago I opened discussions with constituents representing diverging views, including representatives of various conservation groups and of the lumber industry. In an effort to resolve these differences, I asked them to meet in my office with the Secretary of the Interior. Following these discussions and subsequent studies of the feasibility of the project and of its impact on local communities, this bill was produced. It has the support of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget.

I should like to add that there has been a long history of cooperation between the Federal Government and the State of California in the preservation of natural resources for the enjoyment and inspiration of mankind. Over 100 years ago the administration of Abraham Lincoln set aside from the public domain the matchless valley of Yosemite as a scenic park under the administration of the State of California. Thirty-six years later the area was returned to Federal control, and Yosemite became one of the foundation stones of our national park system. I am proud of the continuing cooperation between Federal and State organizations in California for the use of public lands for the public good. It was a key element in the drafting of this bill, which has the full support of the government of the State of California.

This proposed legislation has been drafted in the executive branch after thoughtful appraisal of a wide range of problems, with full awareness of the immediate economic repercussions. The proposal is not, and should not be, partisan in nature. The Interior Committee will, of course, consider all of these aspects carefully. The provisions of this bill must be examined painstakingly at future committee hearings. Its purpose will command, I am confident, widespread endorsement. Its urgency is undeniable.

Of original forests of giant redwoods encompassing nearly 2 million acres there remain today only 300,000 acres of virgin lands. The area to be set aside for perpetuation is a modest amount which may be deemed most representative and inspiring. The reserved area, under combined Federal and State administration, will yield substantial benefits, extending from safeguarding watersheds and fisheries to providing recreational opportunities and public education. Protected for the years ahead would be a tree of record height, a towering 367 feet.

The State of California, conscious of its riches and obligations, already has been able to set aside, with aid of substantial public subscription, some 50,000 acres, only about 2½ percent of the forests which once distinguished our State. With the pressures of civilization and advancing economy, it is estimated that at present harvest rates all unprotected old growth may disappear within 20 to 30 years, surely by the turn of the next century. This would be an indescribable tragedy, one we cannot permit because of the inability to resolve our differences on how to prevent it.

The emphasis in this bill is upon safeguarding blocks or groves. The cost will be substantial but there is reason to anticipate generous support for the project from foundations, public-spirited citizens, conservation groups, and nongovernmental sources.

The setting aside of such an area inevitably will impose immediate inconvenience and inflict some financial hardship. There will be an impact upon counties, school districts, industries, and individuals. In full consciousness of this inevitable consequence, imagination and restraint have been exercised.

This bill recognizes—which I have long contended—the Federal obligation to aid in adjustments in welfare that Federal acts make imperative. There is proposed a formula of financial aid for the governmental entities whose fiscal affairs would be most affected. Transitional arrangements are contemplated for those whose privately owned lands may be acquired. Careful scheduling of acquisition and development has been proposed to minimize unemployment. It is anticipated that construction and increased tourism will create additional jobs within a short period of time, for a net gain in employment and business.

Much argument has been heard that such an undertaking will ruin the local economy. I suggest that reliance upon a single industry—lumbering— itself ultimately would have the same result. Surely revenues of local governmental agencies, payrolls, and regional commerce would decline as cutting of these trees proceeds.

The proposed financial assistance to area public agencies is consistent with national purpose, for the preservation of these unequalled and irreplaceable groves is for the benefit of all our people. Similarly, the Federal-State land exchanges anticipated under the legislation are designed to preserve a heritage for the whole citizenry.

The highlights of this proposed legislation—which I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a portion of my remarks—will illustrate the degree of thought expended in its preparation.

The area involved, located in Del Norte and Humboldt Counties, would encompass California's own Jedediah Smith and Del Norte Coast Redwoods State Parks and embrace the stand of the tallest trees surviving, a separate unit along Redwood Creek. The extent of Federal purchases would be 25,000 acres, of which nearly 8,000 would be virgin growth.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 3 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Mr. President, some of the trees to be protected for all time stood and grew in the State of California in the time of Christ.

The estimated acquisition cost for private lands in Del Norte County is between $45 and $57 million; private philanthropy is expected to pay for the tall trees unit acreage. Provision will also be required for development and maintenance costs.

Financial burdens upon entities in the area would be eased by interim economic adjustment payments by the Federal Government, entirely in accord with several acknowledged precedents. This assistance would be provided over a 5-year period and limited to three-fifths of 1 percent of the fair market value of property removed from county and local tax rolls. There also would be reimbursement to the State for increased school aid required to offset tax revenues. The aggregate of such outlays would run from $270,000 to $342,000 for each year of the period.

Landowners could elect to receive payment in annual installments, with interest on the unpaid balance of established valuation. Purchase would be financed from the land and water conservation fund, with perhaps additional proceeds from other programs carried on by the Interior Department. Public donations also are anticipated to help defray acquisition costs, as I have suggested.

California would transfer to the United States its two parks and in return would receive Federal holdings including Muir Woods National Monument in the San Francisco Bay area, the King Range area adjacent to Humboldt Redwoods State Park, and other mutually agreed tracts now in the public domain, of comparable value and suitable for State recreational and conservation purposes.

I submit there is an undeniable and increasingly urgent need to perpetuate this natural heritage, and I trust that this bill will open the way to reaching this goal.

AMENDMENT NO. 487

Mr. **METCALF**. Mr. President, I have long been in favor of a measure such as that proposed by the Senator from California. The President of the United States in his state of the Union message recommended such a national park. On behalf of the administration, the distinguished Senator from California is today introducing the administration bill which has the support of the President, the Secretary of the Interior, and the other people he has named.

When I attended Stanford University, I first became acquainted with the redwood trees. When I was in the military service, stationed at Sunnydale, Calif., and at Fort Ord, I spent some leave among the redwoods. It was a source of great spiritual satisfaction.

I have been familiar with the redwood trees for more than 30 years. Today, after consultation with the distinguished Senator from California, I am introducing an amendment to his bill to provide for a larger and more expanded Redwood National Park than is suggested in the administration bill.

As the Senator from California has said, the metes and bounds of the area to be incorporated in the bill will be discussed before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of which he and I are members. In the course of that discussion, I hope that the committee will agree to my amendment and thus enlarge the bill which the distinguished Senator has today introduced.

I am submitting this amendment on behalf of myself, Senator CLARK, Senator DOUGLAS, Senator GRUENING, Senator INOUYE, Senator KENNEDY of New York, Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Senator MCCARTHY, Senator MCGEE, Senator MCGOVERN, Senator MUSKIE, Senator NELSON, Senator NEUBERGER, Senator RIBICOFF, Senator TYDINGS, and Senator YOUNG of Ohio.

Mr. President, there is not a more majestic, awesome tree than the redwood. It is the patriarch, the giant of the plant and animal kingdoms. The redwood antedates the mammal, dwarfs all other living things.

Redwood forests flourished 130 million years ago. They once extended across the Northern Hemisphere, into the then-temperate Arctic, through Europe and Asia. Through the ages climate and geology forced the redwoods of Europe down to the Mediterranean, where they perished. The Asian redwoods were driven to a small isolated area of central China. In North America the redwoods are making their last stand, along the northern California coast.

Now it is man, not nature, who is endangering the redwood forests. The biggest, most accessible trees go first. In 1909, there were an estimated 102 billion board feet of virgin redwoods in the western forests. This was reduced to 72 billion by 1920, to 57 billion by 1931, to 35 billion—including some second growth—by 1953. At the current cutting rate the bulk of virgin redwood in private hands will be gone by 1980. Most of the virgin redwood—93 percent of the virgin growth—is privately owned. Only 86,723 acres, not all of it virgin growth, have been set aside in State parks.

The Redwood National Park we propose would be located within portions of Humboldt and Del Norte Counties, in northwestern California. The proposed park is south of the town of Klamath, north, east, and southeast of the town of Orick.

Our amendment does not go nearly so far toward redwood preservation as President Theodore Roosevelt proposed. He felt "most emphatically that we should not turn into shingles a tree which was old when the first Egyptian conqueror penetrated to the valley of the Euphrates, which it has taken so many thousands of years to build up, and which can be put to better use." The great majority of remaining redwoods would remain in private hands. Our amendment would authorize establishment of a park of 90,000 acres, including 42,000 acres of virgin forests, among them the world's tallest trees, 18 miles of coastline, 11 miles of usable beach, 12 miles of river frontage along Redwood Creek on which spring float trips can be made down a canyon enclosed in virgin redwoods, 18 miles of scenic highway, 57 miles of additional display roads, renowned Klamath River fishing, good sites for campgrounds, sufficient acreage for watershed protection, outstanding panoramas, and major concentrations of wildlife.

The amendment would authorize appropriations of up to $100 million for acquisition of land, waters, and improvements thereon, and up to $50 million additional, the latter contingent on matching funds from non-Federal sources.

Within the past 3 years timber cutting has been underway in 12 areas within the proposed park. Cutting is planned in 11 additional areas. The time is short.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of our bill, and for the amendment to remain on the table for 7 days, to accommodate any additional Senators who may wish to cosponsor the amendment.

I am sure that, in the course of the committee hearings and in the course of discussion in executive sessions, the distinguished Senator from California and the other proponents of a larger national park will be able to come to a satisfactory conclusion in an effort to save these great trees.

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **METCALF**. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Mr. President, I appreciate the generous comments of the Senator. I am happy to be associated with him in the legislation I have introduced.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **METCALF**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for 3 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, orderly procedure in this great, free society of ours calls for full and fair public hearings with respect to the enactment of legislation. At these hearings all of those in contention over a given proposal may be heard.

That was precisely what my able friend, the Senator from Montana, and I did with respect to legislation concerning the great parks which Congress has established in recent years. The legislation which I have introduced is, as the able Senator knows, not only recommended by the President of the United States and by the Department of the Interior, but also by the Bureau of the Budget, since an expenditure of public funds will be necessary in order to carve out part of this as yet unspoiled country for the benefit of the people.

I believe that this is legislation in which men and women interested in conservation, both Democrats and Republicans, can join.

As my friend, the Senator from Montana, said, when the time comes for committee hearings, let those of varying or conflicting views come forward, and then let the committee members make their decision as to what constitutes the public interest which all of us seek to serve.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am delighted to yield to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from Montana and the Senator from California that the objective of Senator KUCHEL's Redwood Park bill has my enthusiastic support. Mr. President, you cannot go into the redwoods and not come out a better person for having been there. In my judgment, based on my own subjective reaction, there is no more inspiring cathedral on the face of the earth. Mr. President, you cannot go through this natural cathedral and not find yourself closer to all those spiritual beliefs that have been instilled into you since you were in the cradle roll in Sunday school.

If anyone suggested that a great manmade cathedral should be torn down in order to salvage its gold leaf, we would be aghast. To think of tearing down this natural cathedral of the Creator in order to get a few paltry profit dollars out of the lumber is almost a sacrilege. Therefore, as to the objective of the bill, I am in complete agreement. I have not studied all of the procedures involved, but I am sure they can be worked out to the satisfaction of all of us.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I wish to make one further comment. The Senator from California and I are not in disagreement as to the objectives that we seek.

The Senator from Oregon has most eloquently set forth the fact that these great redwood trees are natural spiritual cathedrals which we should maintain. My amendment would merely enlarge the objectives of the bill which the Senator from California has introduced.

I wish to point out that the Sierra Club, the Wild Life Management Institute, the Wilderness Society, the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, the National Parks Association, the Federation of Western Outdoors Clubs, the Izaak Walton League, the Public Affairs Institute, Trout Unlimited, the Audubon Society, and Citizens for a Redwood Park all favor an enlarged park. In addition, Representative JERRY COHELAN, of the Senator's own State of California, and Representative JOHN SAYLOR, the great conservationist from Pennsylvania, have introduced legislation similar to my amendment in the House of Representatives.

So many people in the United States, including many citizens of California, favor my amendment, which would create an enlarged redwood park.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. METCALF. Certainly.

Mr. KUCHEL. I merely wish to express my thanks to the able senior Senator from Oregon for his splendid comments of a few moments ago.

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the important legislation introduced by the junior Senator from Montana, my distinguished colleague Senator METCALF, to preserve a valuable area in the State of California as the Redwood National Park. The great redwood trees of California are a national treasure, a unique treasure found nowhere else on earth, and it is truly the interest of all people in the United States that is represented by legislation to preserve these noble creations of nature.

Although wise and foresighted conservationists have, over the years, acted to preserve some important areas of the State of California for the protection of the redwoods, this effort is not sufficient to provide the protection needed. The lumber industry, which has engaged in logging these great trees where they are not preserved, makes the admission that all virgin redwoods not now preserved in State parks will have been cut within 30 years. Many of the best stands will be lost within 15 years. Thus, we must act rapidly to provide Federal protection on a scale not now attainable through private and State efforts. These redwoods are irreplaceable. They are among the oldest living things on this planet.

I urge early passage of the bill to establish a Redwood National Park introduced by the junior Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 487) was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF SHIPPING ACT, 1916

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement and purpose of need, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2963) to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., January 27, 1966.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are submitted herewith four copies of a proposed bill, together with a statement of purpose and need for the draft bill, to amend the Shipping Act, 1916.

The need for and purpose of the proposed bill are set forth in the accompanying statement.

The Federal Maritime Commission urges enactment of the bill at the 2d session of the 89th Congress for the reasons set forth in the accompanying statement.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN HARLLEE,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy, Retired,
Chairman.

STATEMENT AND PURPOSE OF NEED FOR BILL TO AMEND SHIPPING ACT OF 1916

This proposal inserts a requirement in section 28 of the Shipping Act that a witness must first claim his privilege against self-incrimination before immunity from prosecution will be granted. As currently worded, section 28 gives automatic immunity to any subpenaed witness. Statutes of more recent enactment than the Shipping Act, 1916, generally contain the qualifications here inserted. See section 214(c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1124(c)) and section 1004(i) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1484(i)).

AMENDMENT OF INTERCOASTAL SHIPPING ACT, 1933

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, to permit the Commission to require the carriers in the offshore domestic trade to keep uniform accounts and permit Commission representatives to inspect the accounts and records of such carriers. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of purpose and need for the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2964) to amend the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, to permit the Commission to require the carriers in the offshore domestic trade to keep uniform accounts and permit Commission representatives to inspect the accounts and records of such carriers, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., January 27, 1966.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are submitted herewith four copies of a proposed bill together with a statement of purpose and need for the draft bill, to amend the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, to permit the Commission to require the carriers in the offshore domestic trade to keep uniform accounts and permit Commission representatives to inspect the accounts and records of such carriers.

The need for and purpose of the proposed bill are set forth in the accompanying statement.

The Federal Maritime Commission urges enactment of the bill at the second session of the 89th Congress for the reasons set forth in the accompanying statement.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN HARLLEE,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy, Retired, Chairman.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR BILL TO AMEND THE INTERCOASTAL SHIPPING ACT, 1933, TO PERMIT THE COMMISSION TO REQUIRE THE CARRIERS IN THE OFFSHORE DOMESTIC TRADE TO KEEP UNIFORM ACCOUNTS AND PERMIT COMMISSION REPRESENTATIVES TO INSPECT THE ACCOUNTS AND RECORDS OF SUCH CARRIERS

This proposal would amend the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, to authorize the Commission to require that ocean carriers in the offshore domestic trades keep uniform accounts and permit the duly authorized representatives of the Commission to inspect the accounts and records of such carriers. The amendment follows generally similar provisions in the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 20(5)) and the Federal Aviation Act of 1959 (49 U.S.C. 1377).

Through a system of uniform accounts, subject to audit by the Commission's duly authorized agents, the Commission will more effectively enter upon investigations of rates and more promptly issue its final decisions in rate cases. Some carriers which are subject to rate regulation by the Commission under the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, are also subject to regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Maritime Administration and thus are required by statute to maintain records of account in conformity with the requirements of those agencies. The Commission would not prescribe accounts different from those required by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Maritime Administration unless the regulation of the domestic offshore commerce requires depreciation. Toward the end of uniformity and the avoidance of duplication of effort on the part of the Government, representatives of the Commission are currently exploring with the other two agencies the prospects of a coordinated audit program.

Subsection (b) of this proposal is essential to conduct realistic audits. The inability to audit the data of controlling interests or affiliates could very easily result in audits and information that would be worthless or misleading. It is not an unreasonable burden upon carriers operating in our commerce or those connected with them, to make available, when reasonably necessary, to the regulating agency all the information necessary for that agency to perform its responsibilities.

TAX CREDIT AND DEDUCTION FOR DIRECT CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLITICAL PARTIES OR CANDIDATES FOR POLITICAL OFFICE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to allow a tax credit and a deduction for direct contributions to political parties or candidates for political office. Under this bill individual taxpayers would be entitled to a credit of 70 percent of so much of a political contribution as does not exceed $25. Thus, for a contribution of $25, a taxpayer could reduce his income tax by $17.50, and if each spouse contributes $25, married couples could receive a credit of 70 percent of $50 on their joint return. This bill also would allow a deduction for political contributions in excess of more than $25, but not in excess of $100.

The proposals reflected in this bill should go a long way toward helping both political parties obtain funds needed to finance their campaigns.

Neither the credit nor the deduction provided by this bill would extend to indirect political contributions. Thus, for example, assessments by unions of their members to create a fund for political activities would not be eligible for the credit or deduction. On the other hand, if the employee made his contribution directly both the deduction and the credit would be available.

Contributions which would be deductible or eligible for the credit under this bill include gifts to the national committee of a political party, a State committee designated by the national committee, or a local committee designated by a State committee. In addition, amounts contributed directly to an individual who is a candidate for elective public office would also be allowable, provided they are made to a committee that under the law is required to report its contributions.

A political party, for purposes of this bill, means a party which fielded a candidate for President or Vice President in at least 10 States; or in a nonpresidential election year it means a party which fielded a candidate for President in 10 or more States in the last presidential election. This is the same definition of a political party contained in legislation offered by the former chairman of the Democratic Campaign Committee.

Under the bill, the deduction or credit would be available with respect to political contributions made after the date of enactment of the bill.

There is no magic in the figures or formula mentioned in the bill. Rather, I am endorsing here the principle of our approving a program whereby we can finance campaigns through smaller contributions by the people.

At the same time we need to restrict the present method of soliciting contributions from corporations through the guise of calling such donations advertisements.

I have submitted other bills to the Treasury Department dealing with this phase.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2965) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit or deduction for certain political contributions made by individuals, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senators from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE and Mrs. SMITH], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow deductions for additions to a reserve for certain guaranteed debt obligations and for other purposes.

This bill, which was drafted by the United National Trade Organizations for Remedial Tax Legislation, an association of a number of trade organizations representing American small businessmen, has as its main purpose the protection of the Federal Treasury from an erroneous interpretation of the Internal Revenue Code which has been drawn by the Internal Revenue Service.

I would point out that the small businessmen who support this bill have gone into court time and time again to challenge the Internal Revenue Services interpretation of the law, and that the courts have consistently upheld the taxpayers. Nevertheless, the Internal Revenue Service has refused to follow the court decisions, and has insisted on following a path which satisfies neither the taxpayers nor the needs of the Federal Treasury itself.

The details of this technical bill are fully explained in a fact sheet published by the United National Trade Organizations for Remedial Tax Legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the fact sheet on this bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues will read this fact sheet and then give this bill their full support. In order that they may have the opportunity of associating themselves with the bill, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 2 weeks so that Senators may join me in sponsorship of this worthwhile legislation.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The bill (S. 2969) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for additions to a reserve for certain guaranteed debt obligations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McIntyre (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Exhibit 1

Condensed Fact Sheet

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for additions to a reserve for certain guaranteed debt obligations and for other purposes

1. Need: To clarify the original congressional intent with regard to reserve for bad debts; to halt Internal Revenue Service prosecution of taxpayers who have interpreted the 1954 Code in accordance with prevailing judicial opinion; to further a more competitive relationship between large and small business; to bring tax accounting more nearly in line with established and accepted accounting methods; to protect the Federal tax revenue.

2. General significance: (a) Amount of guaranteed debt obligations now held by lending agencies, $28 billion; (b) net losses from bad debts on above guaranteed debt obligations and now taxed as "income": $590 million.

3. Revenue implications: (a) Immediate revenue loss through enactment, zero. (Bill contains provisions for a taxable "Suspense Account" in the same amount as increased opening reserve deductions for taxpayers newly considering—as a result of this legislation—risk of loss from bad debts attributable to guaranteed debt obligations.)

(b) Future revenue loss through enactment, zero. ("Suspense Account" provisions allow deductions based on growth of taxpayers and increases in amount of guaranteed debt obligations only. In relation to present gross national product there will be no deductions in excess of those taken before enactment.)

(c) Predictable revenue loss in relation to present gross national product through failure to enact, $206,500,000.

(1) Strongly worded appellate and district court decisions are going against the Internal Revenue Service. (*Wilkins Pontiac* v. *Commissioner,* 398 F. 2d 893 (C.A. 9th) reversing 34 T.C. 1065; *Foster Frosty Foods, Inc.* v. *Commissioner* (C.A. 10th) reversing 39 T.C. 772; *Family Budget Service Inc.* v. *U.S.* (U.S. Dis. Ct., So. Dis., Miss., Meridian, Div., Civil Action Nos. 1152, 1152(M), Nov. 20, 1963).)

(2) Business leaders are supporting the legislation rather than subject small enterprises to the expense and confusion of prolonged litigation, even though the measure guarantees equitable treatment only in terms of future growth. Court decisions, however, will apply also to existing guaranteed debt obligations. Resulting imminent deductions from taxable income are $590 million. Losses to the Federal tax revenue if Congress fails to act, $206,500,000.

DETAILED EXPLANATION

It is characteristic of the reserve method for the handling of bad debts that there is a "double deduction" in the year during which the taxpayer elects to be on that method. A reserve is set up based on the experience of the taxpayer or if no experience is available, on that of other similar taxpayers. At the close of the taxable year charges are made against the reserve for those debts which it may be determined have gone bad within the year. Additions are made to the reserve to offset the charges, plus an allowance for future losses attributable to current accrued income, but arising later. E.g., a new taxpayer elects to be on the reserve method. When he opens his business he has no receivables, but anticipates that he will have some. He establishes an opening reserve of zero. During the year he has bad debt losses of $100. He charges his reserve with $100, making the reserve —$100. He has receivables at the close of the year of $1,000, either direct (which he holds himself) or indirect (which he has discounted with recourse). He knows through his own experience or that of others that he may expect about $100 worth of those receivables to go bad. He adds $100 to his reserve to bring it back to zero plus another $100 to offset future losses. In this opening year and only in this opening year his reasonable additions to reserve for bad debt are $200. He has a double deduction amounting to a total of $200, and his closing reserve for future losses stands at $100. Had he elected to be on the specific chargeoff method, he would have been able to deduct only the $100 for the accounts which actually went bad during the year, and would have been taxed on the full $1,000 worth of receivables as income, even though only $900 of this amount will ever be collected.

Treasury concessions

Until recently Treasury has stoutly maintained that in order to qualify for purposes of section 166(c) of the 1954 code, relative to reserve for bad debt, a receivable must be directly payable to the business that would establish such a reserve. Since discounted receivables are payable to lending agencies, even though the business has endorsed the paper and bears the full risk of loss exactly as if it had had sufficient working capital to retain the receivables, Treasury has denied the deduction. Strongly worded district court and appellate court decisions favoring the taxpayer, congressional investigations and an aroused public opinion have caused Treasury to reconsider its position. In meetings held with Treasury personnel, the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and representatives of the Nation's small business community all present, Treasury has approved all aspects of this bill except two:

1. The bill would protect the interests of taxpayers who have correctly interpreted the 1954 code in accordance with judicial opinion. These taxpayers have maintained a reserve for bad debts with reference to guaranteed debt obligations in the past and have already (correctly) taken their deductions in prior years. Treasury would have the bill force these taxpayers to relinquish their deductions for all open years, file amended returns, and commence anew under the provisions of the bill which are meant to apply only to taxpayers who would begin to consider guaranteed debt obligations in their reserve computations as a result of enactment of this legislation. Because there are no revenue implications of any importance in this matter, because these taxpayers doubtlessly must retain their deductions as a matter of survival, because their right to the deductions has been confirmed by judicial precedent, because they would not even be expanding the scope of their reserve considerations, let alone changing their methods of accounting, it is imperative that Treasury not be permitted to alter the bill to their detriment. In the presence of staff members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, including the Chief of Staff, Dr. Laurence Woodworth, Treasury officials could offer no justification for their attack on these particular taxpayers except that "It seems fairer, to us," and "You can hardly expect us to encourage that sort of thing." [Court challenges of Internal Revenue Service and Treasury policies by citizens and taxpayers].

2. The bill would apply to all guaranteed debt obligations. Treasury would limit the reserve method to paper having a maturity date more than 18 months from its date of origin. Treasury's justification is that the "carry back loss provisions of the existing code will provide compensation in regard to shorter term paper."

Treasury seems unable or unwilling to comprehend that the financial problems of small business are immediate. The small firm struggling to grow is faced with "this week's payroll" and "this month's accounts payable." It is small comfort to the businessman who has reached the limit of his borrowing capacity, who has seen his credit ruined, that he may get back, next year (or even next month) tax money he was forced to pay on "profit" that never existed. The fact that the bill already limits the benefits of the reserve method to future growth is more than enough of a compromise. Any further sacrifice of small business' working capital is unnecessary and intolerable.

General significance

The "double deduction" in the opening year under the reserve method is the main practical reason for Treasury's reluctance to follow the decisions of the courts. There is an enormous amount of contingent liability or guaranteed debt obligations on the books of the Nation's lending agencies most of which has not previously been considered in computations of reserves for bad debts. According to Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, lending agencies hold about $28 billion of these guaranteed debt obligations. Had Treasury and Internal Revenue Service properly interpreted the 1954 Code, reserves would have been established against this contingent liability as it built up down through the years, and there would have been no potential problem of sudden impact upon the revenue.

However, because of Treasury and Internal Revenue Service insistence that discounted receivables (even those discounted with recourse) did not qualify for purposes of section 166(c), only the relatively few taxpayers mentioned previously had the foresight, the funds, and the fortitude to set up such reserves, anyway, and challenge Treasury in the courts. Now business is becoming increasingly aware that the Tax Court (which had found in favor of the Government) is being reversed in no uncertain terms by the U.S. Circuit Courts of Appeal. (*Wilkins Pontiac* v. *Commissioner,* 398 F. 2d 893 (CA 9th) reversing 34 TC 1065; *Foster Frosty Foods, Inc.* v. *Commissioner* (CA 10th) reversing 39 TC 772; see also, *Family Budget Service, Inc.* v. *U.S.* (U.S. District Court, So. Dist., Miss., Meridian Div., Civil Action Nos. 1152, 1152 (M), 11/20/63)). The courts simply do not believe that it was the intent of the Congress to discriminate against those smaller businesses, who must discount their receivables with recourse in order to obtain working capital, particularly when there is no such unfair distinction spelled out in the law.

Need for prompt legislative solution

Small business has great respect for the Nation's judiciary and would be willing and eager to abide by its decisions under normal circumstances. In this issue, had the courts declared the law to be as Treasury has interpreted it in the past, small business would seek to have such an illogical, unjust law changed. However, the courts have consistently held that the present law is not as Treasury has interpreted it. But the U.S. Treasury is not bound to follow these decisions and has given every indication of an intent to drag taxpayer after taxpayer through court after court in the vain hope that somewhere along the line some circuit may find in favor of the Government, unless small business and the Congress agree to emasculate this proposed clarifying legislation.

Even Treasury officials must agree that the attitude of small business leaders during this struggle has been completely responsible and restrained. Taxpayers and citizens have been specifically requested not to flood their Congressmen and Senators with constituent mail. The many trade organizations supporting the clarifying amendment have agreed to work through one single alliance in the sincere belief that this is a nonpolitical, nonpartisan matter; that the Congress will act in behalf of tax equality for small business on the merits of the case and on the merits of the case alone.

Small business leaders are concerned with three aspects of an eventual judicial solution to this problem.

1. Prolonged litigation will be extremely expensive to those taxpayers whose cases are pending before the circuit courts, regardless of the certainty of decisions favorable to those taxpayers.

2. The courts are already jammed with unheard and undecided cases, and the time element involved merely adds to the confused and unhealthy climate resulting from at-
3. The courts have no choice but to in-
tempts to use this approach.
terpret the law as it exists and cannot offer a compromise alternative to decisions which of necessity must have a severe impact upon the revenue.

Revenue implications of the court decisions

If small business is forced reluctantly to pursue this issue in the courts, at great expense, it is extremely doubtful that the tide of judicial opinion will change. Eventually, after many small enterprises have been bloodied in the battle, enough circuits will have decided in favor of the taxpayers to cause even the most timorous of managements to begin considering risk of loss arising from guaranteed debt obligations, in computing reserves for bad debts. The effect of compelling small business to obtain redress of its grievances through the courts will be as follows:

The breakdown of the existing guaranteed debt obligations, $28 billion, is about $20 billion for automobile dealers and $8 billion for all others.

The net loss from bad debts on this amount of risk will be about 1¾ percent for the automobile dealers and about 3-percent average, for other types of business. The total loss from bad debts is therefore $590 million. This is the best possible estimate based on statistics provided by the National Automobile Dealers Association and various other National, State, and regional trade organizations such as those of the appliance dealers, mobilehome dealers, furniture dealers, jewelers, farm and power equipment dealers, freezer and locker provisioners, marine equipment and boat dealers, etc.

Logically assuming that perhaps half of the bad debt losses now being excluded from reserves and therefore incorrectly included in taxable income would run into the surtax bracket, the imminent new deductions from taxable income of $590 million translate into revenue losses of well over $200 million.

This is certainly a substantial amount to be siphoned off from Federal tax revenues somewhat precipitously, particularly when small business is not asking for any such windfall.

Legal authorities from coast to coast agree that it is naive of Treasury to assume that if it blocks legislation, it can somehow win in the courts. It would be even more naive of Treasury to assume that small businessmen throughout the country (and there are more than 4,700,000 of them) will not be made aware of the legal and moral strength of their position. The court decisions will simply confirm the right of small business, under the present law, to deduct reserves for bad debts with reference to the existing amount of guaranteed debt obligations, as well as with reference to the future growth of those obligations.

Doubtful if Treasury can stem the tide

It is also extremely doubtful if Treasury could stem the forthcoming deductions through accusations of "change in accounting methods." Most businesses today are on the accrual basis and employ the reserve method of handling bad debts, at least for the receivables they retain themselves. The courts will be overwhelmed with cases should Treasury challenge, on the basis of "change in accounting methods" the expected sudden inclusions of guaranteed debt obligations in reserve for bad debt computations by taxpayers who have been employing the reserve method all along, for direct receivables.

THIS BILL IS THE LOGICAL ANSWER

This proposal has built-in provisions for the protection of the revenue. The bill would permit taxpayers to establish bad debt reserves against the $28 billion worth of guaranteed debt obligations, without having to go to court, but at the same time would cause them to establish a "suspense account" in a like amount. The "suspense account" is fully taxable, so the net result is no effect on the revenue.

In future years, should the economy continue to expand and these same taxpayers grow, the bill would give them the full benefit of the reserve method for the excess of their guaranteed debt obligations over and above what they are now, and the consequent additional amount of bad debt reserve needed over and above what is established upon enactment of this legislation. The only taxpayers who would be exempt from the "suspense account" would be those courageous few who have correctly interpreted the code in the past, and who are already taking reserves for all liabilities, both direct and indirect, plus new businesses just starting out after this desperately needed legislation has cleared the air.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I wish to announce that I have appointed the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I wish to announce that I have appointed the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

CAPE LOOKOUT NATIONAL SEASHORE, N.C.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 251.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 251) to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That in order to preserve for public use and enjoyment an area in the State of North Carolina possessing outstanding natural and recreational values, there is hereby authorized to be established the Cape Lookout National Seashore (hereinafter referred to as "seashore"), which shall comprise the lands and adjoining marshlands and waters on the outer banks of Carteret County, North Carolina, between Ocracoke Inlet and Beaufort Inlet, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Proposed Boundaries—Proposed Cape Lookout National Seashore", dated April 1964, and numbered NS–CL–7101–B, which is on file in the Office of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior: *Provided, however*, That such seashore shall not include those lands and interests in lands which are bounded on the north by the southerly boundary of the Cape Lookout lighthouse property, on the east by a line located seven hundred and fifty feet inland from the mean high water line of the Atlantic Ocean, on the south by the northerly boundary of property now owned or leased by the United States Coast Guard and other Federal agencies, and on the west by the easterly boundary of property of the Thomas Gold heirs (as shown on a map prepared by J. G. Hassell in October 1961 and recorded at page 4 of the Map Book Numbered 6 in the office of the Register of Deeds, Carteret County, North Carolina) and the waters of Lookout Bight.

SEC. 2. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Federal property located within the boundaries of the Cape Lookout National Seashore may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for the purposes of the seashore. Such transfer shall be made without transfer of funds. Non-Federal lands, marshlands, waters, or interests therein located within the authorized seashore may be acquired by the Secretary of the Interior only through donation, except that he may purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or may acquire by exchange, the lands, marshlands, and waters or interests therein comprising the Shackelford Banks.

(b) When acquiring lands by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the boundaries of the seashore and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property in the State of North Carolina under his jurisdiction which he classifies as proper for exchange or other disposition. Failing to effectuate an exchange of properties of approximately equal fair market value, the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

(c) Any person who on January 1, 1966, owned property which on July 1, 1963, was developed and used for noncommercial residential purposes may reserve for himself and his assigns, as a condition to the purchase or acquisition by exchange of such property by the Secretary, a right of use and occupancy of the residence and not in excess of three acres of land on which the residence is situated, for noncommercial residential purposes for a term ending at the death of the owner, or the death of his spouse, or the death of either of them, or, in lieu thereof, for a definite term not to exceed twenty-five years: *Provided*, That the Secretary may exclude from such reserved property any marsh, beach, or waters, together with so much of the land adjoining such marsh, beach, or waters as he deems necessary for public access thereto. The owner shall elect the term of the right to be reserved. The Secretary is authorized to accept donations of property for purposes of the seashore in which a right of use and occupancy for noncommercial residential purposes is reserved for the period stated in this subsection if the land on which the residence is situated and to which the right attaches is not in excess of three acres and there is excluded from the reserved property such marsh, beach, or waters and adjoining land as the Secretary deems necessary for public use and access thereto.

(d) A right of use and occupancy reserved in lands that are donated or otherwise acquired pursuant to this section shall be subject to termination by the Secretary upon his determination that such use and occupancy is being exercised in a manner not consistent with the purposes of this Act and upon tender to the holder of the right of an amount equal to the fair market value of that portion of the right which remains unexpired on the date of termination.

(e) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or acquire by exchange, not to exceed one hundred acres of lands or interests in lands at or near Beaufort, North Carolina, as an administrative site, and for a landing dock and related facilities that may be used to provide a suitable approach or access to the seashore.

SEC. 3. When title to the lands and interests in lands which under section 2(a) of this Act may be acquired for the purposes of the seashore by donation only is vested in the United States, the Secretary shall declare the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register. Such notice shall contain a refined description or map of the boundaries of the seashore as the Secretary may find desirable and such exterior boundaries shall encompass, as nearly as possible, the area generally described in section 1 of this Act. Copies of said description or map shall be furnished to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate not less than thirty days prior to publication in the Federal Register. Following such establishment, and subject to the limitations and conditions prescribed in this Act, the Secretary may, subject to the provisions of section 2 hereof, acquire the remainder of the lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of the seashore.

SEC. 4. The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing, including shellfishing, on lands, marshlands, and waters under his jurisdiction within the Cape Lookout National Seashore in accordance with the laws of the State of North Carolina and the United States, to the extent applicable, except that the Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting or fishing shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish or wildlife management, or public use and enjoyment. Except in emergencies, any rules and regulations of the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be put into effect only after consultation with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission and the North Carolina Department of Conservation and Development.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall administer the Cape Lookout National Seashore for the general purposes of public outdoor recreation, including conservation of natural features contributing to public enjoyment. In the administration of the seashore and the administrative site, the Secretary may utilize such statutory authorities relating to areas administered and supervised by the Secretary through the National Park Service and such statutory authorities otherwise available to him for the conservation and management of natural resources as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 6. The authority of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, to undertake or contribute to shore erosion control or beach protection measures within the Cape Lookout National Seashore shall be exercised in accordance with a plan that is mutually acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army, and that is consistent with the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $3,200,000 for the acquisition and development of the seashore in accordance with the purposes of this Act.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this is the Cape Lookout National Seashore bill which was reported out of the Senate Interior Committee, was passed by the Senate, and has been acted upon by the House of Representatives. They have made some amendments, most of which are clarifying and to which we have no objection whatever.

However, the House of Representatives has submitted one amendment which is very important; so I ask that the Senate concur in the House amendments, with an amendment; and I send to the desk the proposed amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 23 after the words "Shackleford Banks." add the following: "Land donated by the State of North Carolina pursuant to this subsection shall constitute consideration for the transfer by the United States of 1.5 acres of land that is to be used as a site for a public health facility in the village of Hatteras, Dare County, North Carolina.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this was an amendment suggested in the Senate by the very distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and is one which I believe should be reincorporated in the bill before it is passed.

The problem has been discussed with the leadership on both sides of the aisle, and I ask unanimous consent at this time that the amendment to the amendment be concurred it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say that I believe the Senator from Nevada knows how much I appreciate the course of action that he has followed in regard to this amendment. It is so typical of him. Without this amendment, the bill would violate the Morse formula and we would be presented with a parliamentary situation from time to time, or at least I would be. When we get a bill over from the House and it does not follow the Morse formula and then we add it in the Senate and it goes back to conference and it is eliminated in conference, it puts me in a difficult parliamentary position.

I wish to cooperate. I wish to work out the passage of these bills, but I do not like to be taken advantage of, either, parliamentarywise. I wish the Senator from Nevada to know that, as well as the Senate as a whole, that this is not the first time the Senator from Nevada—with his never failing courtesy and consideration—has taken into account the very point he is taking into account now, and I wish to thank him very much and, of course, I support the amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I have every reason to believe that the amendment which the Senate is about to add will be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] to the amendment of the House.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was concurred in.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to add the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] to the list of Senators who have joined me in sponsoring S. 1484, the Quality Stabilization Act. I ask unanimous consent that his name be added and that it be listed among the sponsors at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2911) to amend section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, at the next printing of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 9, 1966, the names of Mr. COOPER and Mr. DOMINICK were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2908) to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to prevent certain employees of community action agencies and Volunteers in Service to America from engaging in pernicious political activities, introduced by Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. PROUTY) on February 9, 1966.

RESCHEDULING OF SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS ON MILITARY JUSTICE AND JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CERTAIN ACTS SET FOR MARCH

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on March 1, 2, and 3, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights and a specially appointed Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, will resume joint hearings on 18 bills (S. 745 and S. 762) originally scheduled for January. These bills are designed to improve the quality of military justice and to more effectively safeguard the constitutional rights of military personnel involved in judicial and administrative proceedings.

Hearings originally scheduled by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights for February 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, and 10 on S.

2097, a bill to provide judicial review to determine the constitutionality of grants or loans under certain acts, have been rescheduled for March 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, and 17.

Both sets of hearings were postponed due to other pressing business of the Senate.

The hearings on each occasion will commence at 10:30 a.m. in room 2228 of the New Senate Office Building, except on March 2 when the hearings will be held in room 212 of the Old Senate Office Building. Any person who wishes to testify or submit statements pertaining to the bills should communicate with the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF MILES W. LORD TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, March 2, 1966, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Miles W. Lord, of Minnesota, to be U.S. District Judge, District of Minnesota, Vice Dennis F. Donovan, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILFRED FEINBERG TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, SECOND CIRCUIT

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, March 2, 1966, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Wilfred Feinberg, of New York, to the U.S. Circuit Judge, Second Circuit, Vice Thurgood Marshall.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ELMER B. STAATS TO BE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, I wish to announce that a hearing on the nomination of Elmer B. Staats to be Comptroller General of the United States, will be held on Wednesday, March 2, 1966, at 10 a.m. in room 3302, New Senate Office Building.

Any person who wishes to appear before the committee, or who desires to submit a statement for the record in connection with this nomination, should contact the clerk of the Committee on Government Operations, room 3304, New Senate Office Building.

POPULATION DIALOG GROWS AS HEARINGS ON S. 1676 CONTINUE; SWEDEN TO SHARE ITS FINDINGS ON MARCH 9

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, from time to time the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures, of which I am chairman, reports on the progress of the population dialog which started June 22, 1965, when public hearings began on S. 1676, my bill to coordinate and disseminate birth control information upon request.

Thus far the subcommittee has held 19 public hearings to discuss various aspects of the population crisis. It has heard the oral contributions made by 71 witnesses. I ask unanimous consent that a complete list of witnesses to date be printed in the Record as exhibit 1 at the close of my remarks.

The hearings will continue this session until the subcommittee feels that it has looked into as many as possible of the pertinent problems related to the population explosion.

On March 2, for example, one of the witnesses will be Prof. Albert Blaustein, law librarian at Rutgers University, who will discuss American law and how it relates today to the population problem. His contribution will be valuable. Certainly if a review of law is desirable then it ought to be undertaken.

On March 3, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman will contribute further to the discussion as to how we can properly feed the inhabitants of the earth.

The following week on March 9, a three-member team from Sweden, headed by the Secretary General of the Swedish International Development Agency, Mr. Ernst Michanek, will tell the subcommittee of the work of the Swedish Government to provide birth control information to nations requesting it. The Swedish story is unique and the subcommittee felt that if the knowledge of Sweden could be shared by others then all of us would be a little wiser through such coordination and dissemination of information.

To date the hearings have brought out the crucial relationship between the dissemination of birth control information as lack of that information relates to poverty, health, educational needs, quality of life, responsible parenthood, broken homes, national economy, natural resources, food supplies, crime and juvenile delinquency. The hearings have covered many aspects of these vital problems both at home and abroad. Very distinguished men and women have testified.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Men and Women Who Have Made Oral Contributions During the 89th Congress to the Population Dialog During Hearings on S. 1676, Senator Ernest Gruening's Bill To Coordinate and Disseminate Birth Control Information Upon Request; Listing Is by Day of Appearance, as of February 25, 1966

JUNE 22, 1965

Representative Paul Todd, Democrat, of Michigan (Kalamazoo), a U.S. Representative from the Third Congressional District of the State of Michigan.

Representative Morris K. Udall, Democrat, of Arizona (Tucson), a U.S. Representative from the Second Congressional District of the State of Arizona.

Senator Joseph S. Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia), a U.S. Senator from the State of Pennsylvania.

Senator Frank E. Moss, Democrat, of Utah (Salt Lake City), a U.S. Senator from the State of Utah.

Representative D. R. Matthews, Democrat, of Florida (Gainesville), a U.S. Representative from the Eighth Congressional District of the State of Florida.

Senator Ralph W. Yarborough, Democrat, of Texas (Austin), a U.S. Senator from the State of Texas.

JUNE 23, 1965

Dr. Frederick Seitz, Washington, D.C., president, National Academy of Sciences.

Senator Joseph D. Tydings, Democrat, of Maryland (Havre de Grace), a U.S. Senator from the State of Maryland.

Representative James H. Scheuer, Democrat, of New York (New York City), a U.S. Representative from the 21st Congressional District of the State of New York.

Representative O. C. Fisher, Democrat, of Texas (San Angelo), a U.S. Representative from the 21st Congressional District of the State of Texas.

Robert C. Cook, Washington, D.C., president, Population Reference Bureau.

JUNE 29, 1965

Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., Palo Alto, Calif., chairman of the 1959 Draper Committee which dealt with military and economic aspects of foreign aid.

Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, Cambridge, Mass., special assistant for science and technology to former President Eisenhower and professor at Harvard.

Dr. John Rock, Brookline, Mass., distinguished Catholic gynecologist and author, a major contributor to the development of the oral contraceptive pill.

JULY 9, 1965

Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, former president of Colombia and president of the editorial board of the Latin American magazine Vision and Progreso.

Ben H. Bagdikian, Washington, D.C., author of "In the Midst of Plenty: The Poor in America."

JULY 21, 1965

Hon. Kenneth Keating, New York City, national chairman of the Population Crisis Committee, former Senator from New York State.

Hon. John Martin, Grand Rapids, Mich., State chairman of the Republican Party of Michigan, attorney.

Mrs. Gladys Avery Tillett, Charlotte, N.C., U.S. Representative to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women.

George J. Hecht, New York City, publisher of Parents' magazine and chairman of the American Parents Committee.

Gertrude S. Friedman, Ph. D., Washington, D.C., representing the Unitarian Universalist Association.

Representative John Conyers, Jr., Democrat of Michigan (Detroit), a U.S. Representative from the First Congressional District of the State of Michigan.

JULY 28, 1965

Hon. Chester Bowles, U.S. Ambassador to India.

John D. Rockefeller 3d, New York City, chairman of the board of the Population Council.

Dr. Frank Notestein, New York City, president of the Population Council and demographer.

Dr. Joseph L. Fisher, Washington, D.C., president of Resources for the Future, Inc.

AUGUST 10, 1965

Hon. Stewart L. Udall, Washington, D.C., Secretary of the Interior.

Senator Peter H. Dominick, Republican of Colorado (Englewood), a U.S. Senator from the State of Colorado.

Dr. Alan F. Guttmacher, New York City, gynecologist and obstetrician, president of Planned Parenthood—World Population.

Dr. Ernest M. Solomon, Chicago, Ill., gynecologist and obstetrician, representing the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism.

AUGUST 11, 1965

Hon. Walter N. Tobriner, Washington, D.C., President of Board of Commissioners.

Mrs. Fred A. Schumacher, Washington, D.C., executive director of Planned Parenthood Association of Metropolitan Washington, D.C.

Dr. Robert B. Nelson, Washington, D.C., gynecologist and obstetrician, medical director of Planned Parenthood Association of Metropolitan Washington, D.C.

Dr. Murray Grant, Washington, D.C., Director of Public Health, District of Columbia Department of Health.

AUGUST 17, 1965

Hon. Robert B. Duncan, Medford, Oreg., a U.S. Representative from Oregon.[1]

Dr. Andre Hellegers, Baltimore, Md., associate professor of obstetrics and gynecology, Johns Hopkins University Hospital.

AUGUST 18, 1965

Hon. Marriner Eccles, Salt Lake City, Utah, former Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve Board.

Dr. Ernest Lyman Stebbins, Baltimore, Md., dean, School of Hygiene and Public Health, Johns Hopkins University.

Dr. Leslie Corsa, Jr., Ann Arbor, Mich., director, Center for Population Planning, School of Public Health, University of Michigan.

AUGUST 24, 1965

Rev. Dexter L. Hanley, S.J., Washington, D.C., director, Institute of Law, Human Rights and Social Values, Georgetown University Law Center.

Mrs. Birgitta Linner, Uppsala, Sweden, author, family counselor, and teacher.

Mrs. Gabrielle Edgcomb, Washington, D.C., Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

Mr. William B. Ball, Harrisburg, Pa., general counsel, Pennsylvania Catholic Welfare Committee.

AUGUST 31, 1965

Hon. Milward L. Simpson, Cody, Wyo., U.S. Senator from Wyoming.

Dr. Mary Calderone, New York City, executive director, Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS).

Henry Caulfield, Washington, D.C., director, Department of the Interior's resources program staff.

James V. Bennett, Kenwood Park, Md., former Director, Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Department of Justice.

Dr. Virgil M. Rogers, Washington, D.C., director, automation project, National Education Association; and former dean of education, Syracuse University.

Harold W. Swank, Springfield, Ill., director, Illinois Public Aid Commission.[2]

SEPTEMBER 8, 1965

Clifford C. Nelson, New York City, president, the American Assembly Columbia University.

Dr. Joseph Hall, Miami, Fla., superintendent, Dade County (Fla.) Schools.

Mrs. Jane Roberts, Miami, Fla., chairman, Dade County (Fla.) Board of Education.

Frank Sloan, Miami, Fla., chief of planning and policy, Dade County (Fla.) Schools.[3]

SERTEMBER 15, 1965

Hon. John Brademas, South Bend, Ind., U.S. Representative from Third District of the State of Indiana.

Harold W. Swank, Springfield, Ill., director, Illinois Public Aid Commission.

Wallace Kuralt, Charlotte, N.C., director, Mecklenburg County Department of Public Welfare.

George Wyman, Albany, N.Y., commissioner, New York State Department of Social Welfare; chairman, American Public Welfare Association Committee on Public Welfare Policy; former director, California State Department of Social Welfare.

SEPTEMBER 22, 1965

Oscar Harkavy, Ph. D., New York City, director, population program, the Ford Foundation.

Bernard Berelson, Ph. D., New York City, vice president, the Population Council.

Irene Taeuber, Ph. D., Washington, D.C., senior research demographer, office of population research, Princeton University.

Dr. Jack Lippes, M.D., Buffalo (Kenmore), N.Y., inventor of Lippes Loop, an intrauterine device.

JANUARY 19, 1966

Dr. E. L. Tatum, New York City, N.Y., biologist, 1958 Nobel Prize winner for medicine and physiology.

Dr. Dickenson W. Richards, Jr., New York City, N.Y., physician, 1956 Nobel Prize winner in medicine and physiology.

Dr. Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, Woods Hole, physician, 1937 Nobel Prize winner in medicine.

Dr. Polykarp Kusch, New York City, N.Y., physicist, 1955 Nobel Prize winner in physics.

JANUARY 26, 1966

Mrs. E. T. Chanlett, Chapel Hill, N.C., U.S. delegate to the Inter-American Commission of Women.

Dr. Philip M. Hauser, Chicago, Ill., director, Population Research and Training Center and Chicago Community Inventory, University of Chicago.

Dr. Luigi Mastroianni, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa., primate research with intrauterine devices.

Dr. Roger Lincoln Shinn, New York City, N.Y., professor of applied Christianity and dean of instruction, Union Theological Seminary; adjunct professor of religion, Columbia University.

FEBRUARY 9, 1966

Mrs. Theodore F. Wallace, Shawnee Mission, former national president, United Church Women, National Council of Churches.

Mr. James MacCracken, New York City, N.Y., executive director, Church World Service Department, Division of Overseas Ministries, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States.

Dr. Raymond Ewell, Buffalo, N.Y., vice president for research, State University of New York, professor of chemistry and chemical engineering, consultant on research to AID, consultant on fertilizer industry for Government of India and for the United Nations.

Dean William E. Moran, Jr., Washington, D.C., Georgetown University School of Foreign Service; president, Catholic Association for International Peace.

FEBRUARY 15, 1966

Mr. Richard W. Reuter, Washington, D.C., Assistant Secretary of State for Food for Peace, former executive director of CARE.

Mr. Edwin L. Harper, Fairfax, Va., guest scholar, the Brookings Institution Center for Advanced Study.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Statement by him paying tribute to Mr. Aaron J. Racusin, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Procurement Management.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Statement by him on Estonian Independence Day.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, among the millions of words that have been spoken and written about Vietnam, occasionally a clear and lucid exposition breaks through the fog of confusion that has been generated in recent months.

This type of clarity is characteristic of a lead editorial in today's Washington Post, entitled "Speaking of Surrender."

This editorial states in part:

> When North Vietnam insists that the United States recognize the National Liberation Front as the sole representative of the people of South Vietnam, however, it itself is asking for a surrender—an unconditional surrender by the United States and the South Vietnamese.

The editorial closes as follows:

> The power that is demanding a surrender in South Vietnam is North Vietnam, when it asks that we recognize the NLF as the sole representative of the South Vietnamese people. It is a surrender that would abandon American commitments now and imperil American ability, in the future, to continue any effective resistance to Communist aggression on the Asian mainland.

If any Member of the Senate disagrees with the statements and conclusions in this editorial, I would hope that he would present, in the Record, the reasons for his disagreement.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "Speaking of Surrender," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 23, 1966]

Speaking of Surrender

It is being widely argued by those who oppose the Government's policies in South Vietnam that we are making the surrender of North Vietnam a condition to negotiations. What the United States is asking of North Vietnam is the cessation of the aggression against South Vietnam—and that does not require any loss of territory, surrender of forces or impairment of sovereignty.

---

[1] Unable to testify because of illness.

[2] Rescheduled for Sept. 15, 1965.

[3] Unable to appear because of hurricane; to testify in 1966.

When North Vietnam insists that the United States recognize the National Liberation Front as the sole representative of the people of South Vietnam, however, it itself is asking for a surrender—an unconditional surrender by the United States and the South Vietnamese. On January 24, Ho Chi Minh sent to 14 Communist countries and other interested parties the letter explicity making this condition. He said:

"If the United States really wants peace, it must recognize the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam [the political arm of the Vietcong] as the sole genuine representative of the people of South Vietnam and engage in negotiations with it."

It is remarkable that this language has not been recognized by everyone as the equivalent of a surrender ultimatum. The NLF, from the beginning, has been only an arm of North Vietnam. As an Australian Government study pointed out last summer: "The National Liberation Front for the liberation of South Vietnam was established as the instrumentality of the Communist Party of Vietnam, the Lao Dong Party, itself the governing party of North Vietnam." New Zealand's white paper on Vietnam pointed out: "The Vietcong military and political apparatus in South Vietnam is an extension of an elaborate military and political structure in North Vietnam." It concludes that "North Vietnam has committed aggression against the Republic of Vietnam under the guise of a 'war of national liberation.' "

It cannot be denied that the NLF, directed from Hanoi, has been able to get numbers of South Vietnamese to join the Vietcong. But it is an organization conceived in Hanoi, as an arm of the North Vietnamese Communist Party, and as an instrument of the North Vietnam state. Were the United States to agree to recognize the NLF as the "sole" representative of South Vietnam, it would be tantamount to recognizing the government of North Vietnam as the "sole" representative of South Vietnam. That, obviously, would be a total surrender.

One could look at such a capitulation in two ways. Those who say we have no stake in Asia and should never have intervened in South Vietnam, still would have to acknowledge that we did intervene and that we made clear commitments of our power by congressional enactment, by treaty and by the declaration of authorized officials. Capitulation of this kind would betray those commitments.

Those who admit we have a stake in Asia and an interest in containing communism there would have to acknowledge the infinite calamity of (in practical effect) surrendering in the field a force of 700,000 men willing to fight on our side in the continuing struggle against aggression in Asia. And that would be but the beginning of our losses. Many others now willing to fight with us, in the face of our withdrawal in South Vietnam, surely would make their accommodation with the forces of aggression on the Asian mainland.

The administration has been reproached for not mobilizing in Asia the sort of an international concert of powers we formed to contain Communist aggression in Europe. We ought to have more allies and more contributions from the allies we have. But we may be sure that whatever international help we now have, we would have less help and fewer allies from now on, in containing Communist aggression in Asia, if we withdrew from South Vietnam under conditions amounting to a surrender.

The power that is demanding a "surrender" in South Vietnam is North Vietnam, when it asks that we recognize the NLF as the "sole" representative of the South Vietnamese people. It is a surrender that would abandon American commitments now and imperil American ability, in the future, to continue any effective resistance to Communist aggression on the Asian mainland.

THE BIG MONEY BEHIND THE DIRKSEN AMENDMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Congress should be aware of the formidable and well-financed forces that are working behind the scenes to win enactment of the Dirksen 1-man 10-vote amendment.

Whitaker and Baxter, the tremendously successful political powerbrokers from California, are putting some impressive muscle into this fight.

They have hired such able and well-connected Democrats as Sam Brightman for a fat $15,000, and a persuasive and attractive former Democratic staff official. Every Senator who has been here more than 2 or 3 years, knows and likes Rein Vander Zee—as well as others.

If money can do the job, it will be done. The Dirksen forces lost this fight 2 years ago, and again last year. But never—and I mean never—have they been nearly so well organized, so smartly or heavily financed as they now are, or as politically potent. This is going to be a tough hard fight. Those of us who oppose the Dirksen amendment must be prepared to recognize what a power juggernaut we are up against.

Paul Hope, in a recent article published in the Washington Star spelled out the dimensions of this struggle, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIRKSEN DRIVE PICKS UP HELPER

(By Paul Hope)

A well-heeled and professionally staffed campaign seems to be breathing some life into Senate Republican Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN's effort to lessen the effect of the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling.

DIRKSEN is fighting for congressional approval of his constitutional amendment to let the people of each State decide whether they want one house of their legislatures to be apportioned on factors other than population. The Supreme Court has ruled that both the upper and lower houses of State legislatures have to be based as nearly as possible on population.

A Dirksen lieutenant claims the Senator is within three votes of having the two-thirds necessary to get the amendment through the Senate. Last year it failed by seven votes. It is expected to come up again next month.

DIRKSEN claims the Supreme Court ruling, which is throwing control of State legislatures to urban areas, is upsetting the system of checks and balances developed by the Nation's Founding Fathers. He calls the situation the "gravest constitutional issue ever to confront" representative government in the United States.

DIRKSEN's new effort to drum up grassroots and congressional support is being run by a team of professionals out of a five-room suite in a downtown Washington office building.

Those in charge will talk about almost anything but where the money is coming from to finance the operation. Such inquiries are directed to DIRKSEN's office and his office says it's coming from contributions.

It's obvious the campaign is well financed.

In charge is Whitaker & Baxter, a San Francisco public relations firm whose services don't come cheap.

Eight people are in the Washington office. Their salaries alone would total in the neighborhood of $10,000 a month.

Whitaker & Baxter have hired a lobbyist, John Flynn of a Washington law firm, who has listed his fee at $15,000. Samuel C. Brightman, longtime public relations director for the Democratic National Committee, also has been hired as a part-time consultant.

Rent on the suite amounts to several hundred dollars a month. A massive national distribution of pamphlets and other propaganda is being undertaken, involving large printing and mailing costs.

Television tapes containing messages from Senators and House Members are being distributed free to stations around the country. However, part of that tab is being picked up by the Federal Government, since the tapes are made in Government facilities available to congressmen at minimal costs.

Coordinating the effort in DIRKSEN's office is a Senate employee, Clyde Flynn, Jr., minority counsel for the Senate subcommittee on constitutional amendments, on which DIRKSEN serves.

The top man in the downtown Washington office is Robert M. Smalley, who resigned last year as public relations director for the Republican National Committee to take a job with Whitaker & Baxter. During the 1964 presidential campaign Smalley was press aid to William E. Miller, the GOP vice-presidential candidate.

Another top man is Ernest Tupper, a former lobbyist for the American Can Co., who has a financial consulting business in Washington. Tupper worked for the DIRKSEN amendment last year for the National Commission for Constitutional Government but since efforts have been consolidated he moved over to the Whitaker & Baxter suite.

Another lobbyist for the amendment last year, Rein J. Vander Zee, former top assistant to Bobby Baker in the Senate Democratic leadership office, apparently is not involved in the operation this year.

Among groups supporting the DIRKSEN amendment are the American Farm Bureau Federation, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and the National Association of Real Estate Boards. Smalley says, however, that none of these groups has put up money to finance the Whitaker & Baxter operation.

Arrayed against the Dirksen forces are a host of organizations, many with powerful and well-financed lobbies in Washington. They include labor unions, civil rights groups, the liberal Americans for Democratic Action and the National Committee for Fair Representation. Their coordinator is Lawrence Speiser, Washington representative for the American Civil Liberties Union.

In typical Dirksenese, the Senator from Illinois, in announcing his grassroots drive last month, said his troops were "going forward to meet the infidels."

The leader of the antiamendment forces, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, declared it was more as though DIRKSEN and his cohorts were "riding off to belabor a dead horse."

Speiser, who said his forces slacked off after the amendment was defeated last year, is taking no chances with DIRKSEN. He is starting to count his senatorial noses to see that some of them haven't got under the Dirksen tent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have a conviction on this subject and a deep feeling concerning it. We feel that this is probably one of the great constitutional crises of the last 100 years. Therefore, we prepare for battle. The trumpets do not give forth an uncertain sound when we go to battle. Accordingly, we are organized. We are thoroughly organized. We do have outstanding committees in every State, including the State which the Senator from Wisconsin represents in part. We mean to do business.

I do not know that we can persuade my distinguished, affable, and lovable friend from Wisconsin. I trust that we can somehow educate him as to the error of his ways and have him become a repentant sinner and hit the sawdust trail down to the sinner's bench.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say to the able Senator from Illinois that I very much appreciate his remarks. I say that those of us who do not support the 1-man, 10-vote principle have not given up hope for the Senator from Illinois, that maybe he will listen to us this time and perhaps be persuaded.

Let me also say that, of course, this is a very important issue and the Senator from Illinois has well organized his forces.

There is no question that there is a formidable committee in my State of Wisconsin working for the 1-man, 10-vote principle, but I simply wish to invite the attention of the Senate to what is at stake on this issue, to disclose how much is being spent, and the fact that Whitaker & Baxter who have done an efficient job fighting to kill health legislation and other legislation designed to promote the common welfare are now employed in the battle against equal votes for all Americans.

They have an impressive office and staff working in Washington. Many Senators were not aware of this until recently.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wonder whether there has been filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives any statement of expenses and the source of the funds being used by the committee which the Senator has just been discussing with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. The committee of which I am the chairman consists entirely of Members from the Senate and the other body. It is not for us to file the statement. Whitaker and Baxter will have registered any person required by law to do so and they will make their report in due course.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will they make their quarterly report as required under the rules of the House of Representatives before this matter comes to a vote, so that the people of the United States and Members of the Senate can see the source of the funds which they receive for their lobbying expenses?

Mr. DIRKSEN. While the Senator raises that question, let me suggest to him that he go over and see brother George Meany and find out how much money they have been spending to resist our efforts, and then we will all work from a common pattern and lay it out where all the American people can see. I am delighted to do it, any old time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has made a statement on the amount spent by our side. To the best of my knowledge, we have spent on our side approximately $600, about $500 of which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] spent in giving lunches for various groups to apprise them of our strategy and what we are doing. I would be surprised if we spent as much as a thousand dollars. On the other hand, the other side simply dwarfs us in the vast amount it has available.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is not spending Mr. Meany's money?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. Meany is not to my knowledge spending money on our cause. He is supporting us.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Illinois says in his statement that a financial report of his committee will be made public and available.

Because of the tremendous effort which the committee is putting forth and which is also being put forth by a great number of lobbyists who are being hired for the specific purpose of perpetuating malapportionment, or supporting the Dirksen amendment, I believe that the American people are entitled to know where the funds are coming from and how this specific committee is operating.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is an educational committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Well, an educational committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We are bringing light to the people, and they are beginning to see.

Mr. TYDINGS. Would the distinguished Senator from Illinois use his influence to have the committee file its quarterly report, so that we may take a look at it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; and I should like to have the Senator from Maryland use his influence with the AFL–CIO, so that they will file their reports.

I am sure the Senator is aware of the fact that they are more interested in killing our efforts than they were in connection with the 14(b) effort. Mr. Meany said, before the Industrial Union Council here in Washington, that he would rather see 14(b) run forever. I know where we are going. I know what the objective is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, may I have 3 more minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. As the distinguished Senator from Illinois knows, there are a great many organizations, including the League of Women Voters, who are supporting us. They are interested in the Dirksen amendment and also in other legislative proposals. There are organizations like the American Council of Churches, and many others, for example, who are vitally interested. They maintain that they do file the reports that they are supposed to file, and they do it on a regular basis.

I am concerned with a specific committee, which is soliciting funds throughout the Nation to have a constitutional amendment adopted. It is fairly known that this organization is spending great sums of money and is hiring lobbyists.

We do not know where the money is coming from, or how much money is being spent in connection with this constitutional amendment proposal.

I believe that, in the public interest, the committee should file its quarterly report in time for Congress to learn where the money is coming from.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was a Member of Congress when the Antilobbying Act was passed. I helped to write it. I believe I know what the law is. I think I know what reports are required. We are law-abiding citizens, seeking to educate the people on the peril which faces the country. We know when the reports must be filed. And they will be filed in due course.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

FOURTEENTH ANNUAL PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on Thursday morning, February 17, the 14th consecutive annual Presidential prayer breakfast was held. The breakfast was attended by the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House, members of the Cabinet, members of the Supreme Court, members of the diplomatic corps, Governors of various States, and members of the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

Also there were present presidents of national and international labor unions, outstanding leaders in the field of industry and business, chancellors and presidents from a select number of universities and colleges, and men of distinction from the courts, communications, and every other phase of our economic life.

We have found this event to be very meaningful, not only to those of us who gather at the breakfast, but also to millions of citizens across this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the program and proceedings.

There being no objection, the program and the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 14TH ANNUAL PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

PROGRAM

8 a.m.

U.S. Navy Sea Chanters: "Sweet Hour of Prayer."

Presiding: The Honorable FRANK CARLSON, U.S. Senate.

Invocation: Lt. Gen. M. H. SILVERTHORN, U.S. Marine Corps, retired.

Old Testament reading: Mr. Justice Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

Greetings from the House breakfast group: The Honorable ALBERT H. QUIE, Member of Congress.

Greetings from the Senate breakfast group: The Honorable JOHN STENNIS, U.S. Senate.

New Testament reading: The Honorable Henry C. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury.

Prayer for national leaders: Dr. Richard C. Halverson.

Message: Dr. Billy Graham.

The President of the United States.

Benediction: Dr. Abraham Vereide.

Closing song: "America."

Senator CARLSON. The invocation will be given by Lt. Gen. M. H. Silverthorn, U.S. Marine Corps, retired.

General SILVERTHORN. May we remain standing, please, and bow our heads in prayer. Our Heavenly Father, we come before Thee this morning fully cognizant of our weaknesses and our shortcomings, but with thankful hearts for the many blessings Thou hast bestowed upon us and upon our country. Instill in us the desire to devote our bodies, our minds, and our spirits in sacrifice and devotion to Thee. Bless this assemblage with Thy Holy Spirit. Teach us the true meaning of Thy way, the truth and the life, so that we shall put aside self and strive for the fulfillment of Thy will. Help each one to realize his role in his own profession, his own family, and with those who look to him for leadership.

Our Father, we ask Thy blessing on all who serve their country, not counting the cost; on all who labor, not asking for any reward save the knowledge that they are obedient to Thee. Oh God, create in the nations of this troubled world that love for Thee and for each other which will unite all men. We ask Thy aid to those who strive for peace, and we pray that Thou wilt transform the hearts of men everywhere that they may exalt peace above war, service above gain, and righteousness above personal glory. We especially ask Thy blessing on our President, upon his advisers, and upon all in authority in every branch of our Government. Fortify and strengthen them with the armor of Thy righteousness.

Father, we thank Thee for this food. As we partake of it to the nourishment of our physical needs, may the spiritual content of our program encourage, strengthen, and fortify our spiritual needs.

These things we ask and do in the name of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

Senator CARLSON. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, distinguished guests, and all gathered in this Christian fellowship, today we extend to you a special welcome to the 14th annual Presidential prayer breakfast. The occasion which brings us together is unique. People from all backgrounds and countries, as well as people representing many different viewpoints, are actually meeting together in a fellowship made possible by the spirit of Jesus Christ. We're especially pleased to welcome presidents of national and international labor unions, some of the outstanding leaders in the fields of industry and business, the chancellors and presidents from a select number of universities and colleges, the national officers and the State presidents of the U.S. Jaycees, who have done such an outstanding job in encouraging similar breakfasts throughout this Nation. We also recognize this morning the leaders from our courts, our communication networks, as well as a host of others who represent a great cross section of our Nation's life.

The growth of the prayer breakfast movement during these past 14 years has been remarkable. As a result of this breakfast, practically every State in the Union now holds an annual Governor's prayer breakfast with the leaders of that State and others, and literally hundreds of smaller groups are meeting to foster faith and freedom in this land and around the world.

We're especially honored to have such a fine delegation from Canada, headed by the Honorable Paul Hellyer, Minister of Defense. For the last 2 years, a National Canadian prayer breakfast has been held in Ottawa, which is typical of national prayer breakfasts which are now being held, or are being planned, in countries like Ethiopia, Liberia, Costa Rica, Brazil, Korea, and Japan. Some form of this idea has now spread to over 50 countries and on every continent. There's a growing appreciation for the values that are gained when leaders meet in the spirit of prayer, recognizing that our ultimate hope and trust is in our Lord.

This annual event grew out of the inspiration that has been received in the prayer breakfast groups which meet weekly in the the U.S. Senate and in the House of Representatives. And in these days, when there's so much confusion and misunderstanding, it is unfortunate that there's still a lack of communication, especially among the leaders of the world, and it's our hope that, through the spirit of Christ and the spirit of prayer, we might bridge the gap between the desire for peace and peace itself. So, in this spirit, I want to extend a most cordial welcome on behalf of the Members of Congress, who annually invite the President of the United States to join them for this occasion.

Vice President HUMPHREY asked that his warmest greetings be conveyed to the international luncheon and breakfast. He congratulates the Christian leadership on its inspired role in strengthening spiritual dialog among the nations, and it is his hope that the power of prayer will be realized and applied to a greater extent than ever before in meeting the great problems of our times.

INTRODUCTION OF HEAD TABLE GUESTS

Dr. Abraham Vereide, secretary general of International Christian Leadership.

Hon. Charles Terry, Governor of the great State of Delaware.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable John Gardner.

Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, Justice Abe Fortas.

Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, Dr. Guillermo Sevilla-Sacasa.

Minister of Defense of Canada, the Honorable Paul Hellyer.

Member of Parliament and Under Secretary for Parliamentary Affairs in England, the Honorable George Thomas.

Member of the House of Representatives in Liberia, the Honorable Charles C. Dennis.

Postmaster General, the Honorable Lawrence O'Brien.

Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable Nicholas Katzenbach.

Governor of West Virginia, the Honorable Hulett Smith.

Executive Director of International Christian Leadership, Dr. Richard C. Halverson.

I purposely refrained from introducing one man who is not going to appear on the program as one of the speakers, but I assure you we're all indebted to him. We're not only indebted to him this morning, but we have been indebted to him for nine past breakfasts, and I want you to meet the host this morning. You're his guests, we all are, Mr. William C. Jones of California.

The Scripture reading this morning from the Old Testament will be by the Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, the Honorable Tom Clark.

Justice CLARK. Mr. President, Senator CARLSON, and my friends. I read from chapter 40 of the book of the Prophet Isaiah:

* * * * * *

Senator CARLSON. Every Thursday morning they have a prayer group that meets in the House of Representatives, a very outstanding group. This morning we're going to have greetings from that breakfast group from the Honorable ALBERT QUIE, a Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

Representative QUIE. Mr. President, honored guests and friends, I want to bring you greetings from the prayer breakfast group in the House of Representatives which meets every Thursday morning. This is one fellowship of believers on the Hill.

Individual faith cannot grow in isolation from other people, but through fellowship it can grow. This group is not made up of people who are alike. We're all different—of both political parties, of different gradations of political thought within each party, from different parts of the country, of different religious faiths and different traditions. But we have one common bond, and that is the love of Jesus Christ.

As one looks at the differences within the world today, I remember well a young boy when I was in high school who came from Germany. His parents had just lost their lives and he had escaped—at a different time of the world than we're in today. He spoke to a group of young men who were waiting for the challenge to enter the Second World War's fight. And when he told us what happened to him, he ended up and said, "What this world needs more than anything else is love."

And so, as we meet today, I think we should recognize that Christ's love does not demand that we be all alike or that only people who agree with each other love. The most difficult task is to love your enemies, and this is our responsibility, because we are engaged here in political warfare, and those who are in this group at times are each other's enemies. Love does not mean that we do not strive as hard as we can for what we believe in, nor does it mean that we should refrain from opposing or resisting that which we do not agree in. But love does mean that in all our struggles there is never a final enmity.

And so, as this world faces its present crisis the greatest hope we can give to mankind is the love of Jesus Christ—the only hope for peace is His love amongst people who will always differ in political thought, in races, and in national origin. But yet this is the bond in which we can all be in fellowship.

Senator CARLSON. Now it's a distinct privilege and honor for me to present the man that leads the Senate prayer breakfast group, a truly great Senator from the State of Mississippi, a good friend of mine, Mr. JOHN STENNIS.

Senator STENNIS. Mr. President, friends of the Presidential prayer group, I bring you special greetings, good wishes and good will from the Senate breakfast group—about 20 or 25 of the Senate membership who meet every Wednesday morning in the Vandenberg Room of the Senate restaurant. After contesting with each other week after week and year after year over material things, we meet there for a mutual exchange of ideas on spiritual things, and I think that we thereby find the better man.

I want to share with you an experience in the quest for what is material and what is spiritual—what is passing and what is enduring.

Early one morning I went to Mount Vernon, and spent 2 hours in communion with the memories of that remarkable man who did so much to cradle our country in its early days. I was so impressed with some of the thoughts I had during an imaginary journey with him over his estate and, in my imagination, I thought of bringing him with me to the city of Washington. And, still in my imagination, understand, I asked General Washington to get in my car with me; he did. He immediately was impressed with the fact that this was a vehicle with no visible power, and asked me, "What is this machine?" I told him that this was a modern automobile for surface transportation—that we had over 70 million of them daily using our highways throughout the Nation. He was greatly surprised.

I turned the car radio on, and when the music and song started he said, "What is this?" I said, "A radio, General; it is a popular and widely used means of communication and entertainment. Its use in cars and homes is nationwide, in fact international." He seemed confused.

By that time a railroad train was approaching. He inquired, "What is this moving on wheels?" "That is called a train, a carrier of heavy cargo. We have them throughout the Nation, and the continent" I replied. He was almost bewildered.

By that time we were nearing the National Airport; a passenger plane was gliding down. He said, "What is that huge thing in the sky?" I replied, "A passenger airplane, General, carrying from 50 to 150 people. These planes often travel 500 miles or more an hour. Many hundreds of them fly day and night schedules throughout the Nation and throughout the world."

By that time we were in the little city of Alexandria, Virginia. General Washington said, "That building over there is familiar to me."

I said, "Yes, General, that's Christ Church in Alexandria. That's where you used to attend church services." He said, "Do they still have church services there?"

I said, "Yes."

"Sabbath school?"

"Yes."

"A minister?"

"Yes."

He said, "Do they still read and use the Holy Bible as the source and guide of their worship?" I said, "Yes, General." His final question was, "Is that the same Bible as used in my time?" I answered, "Yes, General."

He said, "I feel better now. I am content." And with that, he was gone.

I felt strengthened. It was clearer to me that the real and enduring strength of our Nation is not in our missiles, our bombers, our carriers, our artillery and guns. These are the material things. They will pass.

Where is our strength? The strength of our Nation is found in the fighting hearts and the spirit of sacrifices of our men in faraway Vietnam. The strength of our Nation is found in the strong minds and courageous souls of the many millions of our men and women who carry the daily burdens of life who have faith in God and who put spiritual values first. The strength of our Nation is found in the unselfish service of our leaders, large and small, in every walk of life throughout our Nation who has faith in God and in our system of self-government and try to make it work.

These are our strength.

These things are all of the spirit. They will not pass. They will endure.

Senator CARLSON. Scripture reading from the New Testament by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Henry C. Fowler.

Secretary FOWLER. Mr. President, Senator CARLSON, friends of the Presidential prayer breakfast, the New Testament reading this morning is from the letter of Paul to the Romans, chapter 12.

* * * * *

Senator CARLSON. Intercessory prayer for our Nation and our national leaders by Dr. Richard Halverson.

Dr. HALVERSON. Mr. President, let us all rise together. Let us pray:

Almighty God, from whom all blessings flow, we join our hearts in gratitude to Thee this morning for the bountiful benefits Thou hast lavished upon us as a people. Forgive us for the presumption and pride which causes us to behave as though we did it alone, as though we did not need God. Cleanse us from our personal, private sins. Remove our corporate guilt. Make us aware of the needs of those less fortunate. Sensitize us to the wretchedness, the tragedy, the lovelessness, the loneliness of men, and grant us the love and the gentleness and the thoughtfulness that binds men's wounds and draws men together.

We join our hearts this morning in praying for our President, his family, his staff and colleagues, for all who serve with him. Especially would we remember him in the lonely hours when, after all the counsel has been received, the final decision is his alone.

Oh God, help us to understand what it means to be in this loneliness, where the destiny of the whole world rests with the decision he makes, and may we daily and hourly uphold him in these times.

We remember the Vice President, as he journeys. We commend unto Thee his loved ones in his absence from them. Wilt Thou prosper his time with leaders of other nations. Wilt Thou communicate through him the desires of this Nation for justice and peace to all the peoples of the world. And wilt Thou return him safely to us in good health.

We pray for every member of the Cabinet in their several responsibilities. We pray for the Members of Congress. We pray for the courts of our lands, for the Governors of our States and State legislatures, for all who are in authority.

Oh God, may we know as never before that promotion cometh neither from the East, nor the West, nor the South, but the Lord is the judge. He puteth down one and puteth up another. And all authority is ordained of God. Send upon our Nation deep, corporate humility, that together we may seek the will of Almighty God to do it.

Let They blessing abide upon us, oh Lord, not because we are worthy of it, because we need it, because we need in this hour of history to be the people of God. And let Thy will be done in us, as it is in heaven. We ask this with thanksgiving, in the name of Him who loved us and gave himself for us, Jesus Christ, our Savior and Lord, who taught us when we pray to say:

"Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen."

Senator CARLSON. We are delighted this morning to have with us a great Christian leader, a great national and international leader, a friend of all of us. We always enjoy having him here, and it's a great privilege for me to present a personal friend of mine, Dr. Billy Graham.

Dr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, Senator CARLSON, Mr. Speaker, distinguished guests, last night it was my privilege to go with the President to Atlantic City, and in that magnificent speech that he made before about 30,000 educators from all over America, he said this: "Our times are filled with peril." And certainly this generation has been called the tormented generation. And this is the generation destined to live in the midst of crisis, danger, fear, war, and death.

When we read of the scores of little wars in many parts of the world which rarely make headlines in America, when we read the threatening statements of some world leaders and the growing nuclear capabilities of several countries, we sense that something is about to happen. We know that things cannot go on as they are. History is about to reach an impasse. We are now on a collision course. Something is about to give. Hard, major decisions have to be made. The world crisis presses in around us. We wish we could escape. We wish that it was just a bad dream that would go away. But there is no escape.

On that tragic November day in 1963, President Kennedy had prepared to say to the Dallas Citizens' Council, "We in this generation are by destiny, rather than by choice, watchmen on the walls of freedom."

And he was to close his speech, after reviewing American military power, with these words: "Our strength is not in armament alone, but as was written long ago, 'Except the Lord built the house, they labor in vain that build it.' "

There are two statements that Jesus Christ made 20 centuries ago that are relevant today but that are rarely quoted, even by clergymen. As a matter of fact, I've never heard a sermon on either one of these statements. Christ said in Luke 12: 49, "I am come to set fire to the earth." Have you ever heard a sermon on that?

Then, in Matthew 10: 34, He made another strange statement. He said, "Think not that I am come to send peace on the earth." He said, "I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his family, and a man's foes shall be they of his own household."

There are those who have tried to reduce Christ to the level of a genial and innocuous appeaser. But Jesus said, "You're wrong. I have come as a firesetter and a sword wielder."

There were thousands of people in Christ's day who could not understand what He meant when He said He would come to set fire on the earth. They were goodhearted, kind people, who were anxious to have a better world. They were idealistic, but they were ignorant of the deep-seated disease of human nature. They looked at the world through rose-tinted glasses.

They were like the mother of Lee Oswald, who said, "He was always such a good boy." They were like the professors of Heidelberg University who praised the goodness and the character of Joseph Goebbels when he was getting his Ph. D. degree. They were like the people of Buenos Aires who thought that Eichmann was a model citizen. They were like the people whom John F. Kennedy described in "While England Slept." They could not believe the crisis was as deep as it was.

The people of Jesus' day did not know, as He did, the deep-seated evil within human nature. They did not know how deeply fixed were the roots of pride, greed, selfishness and lust in human society. They could not believe that Jeremiah was right when he said, "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." They could not believe that the result of sin is spiritual death and that a holy God judges sin in nations as well as individuals. Their understanding of evil in the world was shallow and superficial. It seemed to them that everything could easily be put right by better understanding between peoples, by better education, and by social solutions alone.

And that first Christmas night when the announcement to the shepherds was made, it seemed to indicate that the optimists were right when the angels said, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth, peace, good will toward men."

However, they had ignored the 53d chapter of Isaiah, which declared that he would be despised and rejected of men. They had ignored the many prophecies that indicated that the world would rebel against him. They were certain that Jesus, with His wonderful personality and His gentle nature, had come to lead them. They were certain that all would soon be peace and happiness in the world. But they were making a tragic mistake. And it's the same tragic mistake being made by many well-meaning people today who have only a superficial knowledge of the Bible. And Jesus had to correct their easy optimism and warn them that His coming did not mean a quick utopia. He had to make clear to them that His coming, far from meaning peace, meant war. Far from being a drug to sooth society to sleep with man's evil nature still smoldering and liable to explode at any time. His message was a fire that would set society ablaze with division and strife. He taught that His fire would eventually destroy the bonds of fear, ignorance, injustice, and racial prejudice. But He also warned that this will mean division and strife.

Those who are dominated by selfishness, lust and prejudice are going to fight the change that Christ wants to bring to their lives, to their family, and to their world. Thus, he said, "There will be division and strife because of Me." And this is the fundamental truth, not only of the Bible, but of the conditions round about us in 1966, and we will only delude ouselves if we try to be more optimistic than Jesus Christ.

The basic problem facing our world is not just social inequity, lack of education, or even physical hunger. We are finding that highly educated and well-fed people have greeds, hate, passions and lust that are not eliminated by any known means of education. The roots of sin in our hearts are extremely deep, and this is the basic cause of the world's problems, and only the fire of the Lord can burn them out.

This is precisely what Christ came to do. He didn't come to treat symptoms. He came to get at the very heart of man's disease, and that's what Good Friday and Easter are all about, and this is why former Chancellor Konrad Adenauer wrote an article few weeks ago urging the world to turn to God. He says that only in a return to God can we find peace.

These statements about fire and the sword of Christ are probably a shock to many of you here this morning. We've been taught so long that Jesus Christ was the Prince of Peace, and indeed He was. We've been taught that He was the very incarnation of the everlasting love, and indeed He was. But we have misunderstood the divine definition of peace, and we've misunderstood the divine definition of love. Then how can this loving, peaceful Christ be reconciled with this flame-setting and sword-bearing Christ who comes to set the world on fire? There is no contradiction at all.

John Wesley, the founder of the Methodist Church, interpreted this quote of Christ as meaning, "I come to spread the fire of heavenly love over all the earth." There is a sense in which true love is a fire. Genuine love can never be complacent and passive. In the Bible it's spoken of as a refiner's fire. It is the man who loves his school the most that shouts the loudest for his team at a football game. It's the man who loves his country the most that will fight to preserve its freedom. It is the man who loves his neighbor most who will fight against all that hurts, deprives, and oppresses his neighbor.

"Who is offended," shouted Paul the Apostle, "and I burn not." Think how Christ, with righteous indignation, drove the moneychangers out of the temple, how he often rebuked the Pharisees for plundering widow's houses. And those who have a love of freedom will do everything in their power to keep that freedom that they have.

Patrick Henry was burning with love of freedom when he said, "Give me liberty or give me death."

George Washington was burning with love of country when he shivered from the cold and went hungry at Valley Forge.

Those who hate tyranny and love freedom will take sides when little nations suffer terror and aggression from those who seek to take their freedom from them.

But Jesus warned, "When you take sides, you will be opposed by those who do not understand the deep problem of human nature and the true definition of love." To preserve some things, love must destroy others. Love is never, never, never neutral.

When Abraham Lincoln was 22 years of age, he visited New Orleans, and saw a slave girl being pinched, prodded, and trotted up and down a room like a horse to show what good merchandise she was. Lincoln's heart bled. It was on this trip that he formed his opinion of slavery. It ran its searing iron into him then and there. Lincoln touched the arm of his companion and said tensely, "By God, boys, let's get away from this. If I ever get a chance to hit that thing, I'll hit it hard."

Lincoln loved men, whatever their color, with a deep love, and because he loved human beings his soul blazed against the slave trade with an intense and relentless hatred. He fought against it with a passion that finally burned it out of existence in this country. However, his love for men did not bring peace and unity. It did not bring him a high popularity rating. Read his biographies. It created strife and division. It took a war, it took a bloodbath—because he hated tyranny, oppression, and prejudice. He was damned and criticized more than any President in American history. It eventually cost him his life. However, it brought him the inward peace of conscience that a man can know only when he is morally right. And ultimately it brought him the admiration of the world, and it made a place for him in history unparalleled by any other American.

Or, look at Winston Churchill. No man in history loved England more, but during the late 1930's he was mercilessly criticized when he warned about the growing power and ambitions of Hitler. In the same way, the love of God will force us to take sides when we are confronted with moral evil.

If we love the poor and underprivileged, we will want to destroy the slums and ghettoes that have no places in an affluent America. If we love the young people of America, we will do everything in our power to destroy the things that hurt their character and jeopardize their future. But that will bring us into immediate opposition. Even today, in this country, if you're a patriot, salute the flag, sing "The Star-Spangled Banner," and say you believe in America, you're immediately in conflict with those who are saying that patriotism is passé.

Thus, we have found that, as Jesus taught, love of God, love of neighbor and love of country does not necessarily bring peace. And God's love is 10,000 times more intense than any human love can possibly be. The Bible says, "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten son." He came to burn out of the hearts of men and out of society lust, greed, selfishness and evil, and He met with opposition. He was despised and rejected. He was crucified. And the blackest picture of the human heart is the cross where evil Roman soldiers murdered Him. But though they killed Him, they could not destroy the flame of His love.

The Bible teaches that He rose again, and this Christ is in the world today with His sword and His fire fighting against evil and lust and selfishness, and jealousy and hate and oppression and tyranny. But Jesus said, in the Sermon on the Mount, "Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake."

And it's my prayer today that we will recover our moral courage in this country. But if we recover our moral courage, it's going to take a moral and spiritual awakening that must sweep this country from coast to coast like a prairie fire, and quickly. It could begin here this morning. It could begin in your heart. And I'm asking you today at this hour to come to the cross and rededicate yourself to Jesus Christ, who loved you so much that He was willing to die for you.

The last verse of "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" should challenge every one of us this morning:

"He has sounded forth the trumpet that shall never call retreat. He is sifting out the hearts of men before His judgment seat. Oh, be swift my soul to answer Him, be jubilant my feet. Our God is marching on."

Mr. President, in those hours of decision that you have to make, you have our prayers, our love, and our support. God bless you, sir.

Senator Carlson. The President of the United States.

President Johnson. Dr. Graham, my beloved friend, Senator Carlson, distinguished guests at the head table, my dear friends, I am pleased to return again to our annual prayer breakfast and to be among so many of my old friends. In this room this morning we have been privileged to hear one of the great speakers and leaders of our time, and he has been heard by some of the great leaders of the most powerful nations in all the world. Yet, not a single one of us is ashamed to say, "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help."

Just a few blocks from here, on the front of the National Archives, is an inscription: "The past is prologue." As your President, I have had many occasions to realize the truth of that statement. Throughout our long history, our Presidents have struggled with recurring problems. The way they handle those problems and their successes or failures can guide us in the actions that we are called upon to take today.

But there are some things that history cannot teach us, and among them is how to bear without pain the sending of our young Americans into battle, and how to fill the aching void as we wait for the news of their fate, and how to console the wife or the mother or the little children when that news is bad.

These are the times when I recall the wisdom of Abraham Lincoln when he said: "I have been driven to my knees many times by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go. My own wisdom and that of all about me seemed insufficient for the day." In private prayer at unusual moments, I have found courage to meet another day in a world where peace on earth is still only an empty dream.

The prophet Isaiah tells us, "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; and they shall walk and not faint."

I believe that with all my heart. But in these troubled times I am sustained by much more than my own prayers. I am sustained by the prayers of hundreds of Americans who daily take the time to look up from their own problems in order to try to give me a little encouragement in mine. Not long ago I received a letter one morning from a mother whose son had been killed in Vietnam. She spoke of the pain and the loss and the tears that are ever ready to flow, but through all of this were words of encouragement for me from this dear little lady, and in her letter she concluded:

"Mr. President, I wish I could tell you all that I feel in my heart. There just aren't words. So we ask God to bless you and your little family, that He will guide you in all the terrible decisions that you must make. As long as we believe, our strength is in our faith in God, and He will never fail us."

My countrymen, in those words from that dear mother are to found the greatness of this Nation and also the strength of its President.

The benediction by Dr. Abraham Vereide, executive director of the International Council of Christian Leadership.

Dr. Vereide. And now may He who has not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, of love and a sound mind, grant us the grace and strength to go out and translate into action and living what we have learned this morning.

And now may the grace of our Lord, Jesus Christ, the love of God the Father and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit grant an abiding presence to each one of us and throughout the world. Amen.

THE 17TH ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL PANCAKE DAY RACE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the 17th annual International Pancake Day Race was run yesterday. It is a goodwill event between the housewives of Liberal, Kans., and Olney, England, and is always held on the Tuesday before Ash Wednesday. I am proud to announce that the race yesterday was won by Rachel Crites of Liberal. She ran the course in 1:04.5 minutes, setting a new record and putting the American girls ahead 9–8 in the annual Shrove Tuesday contest against the women of Olney.

This race is sponsored by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Liberal, for the promotion of international relations between England and the United States.

Some years ago the people of Liberal heard of this 500-year event of pancake racing over a 415-yard course from the town pump to the church. The city of Liberal challenged the women of Olney, England, to this race, and the challenge was accepted by Rev. R. C. Collins, the Vicar of Olney.

In Old England, it was customary for the housewives to drop whatever they were doing and hurry to the church at the tolling of the bell, to be "shriven" of their sins.

In 1445, a wife in Olney, England, started baking her pancakes rather late. They were not quite finished when the church bell rang, so she hurried off to the "shriving" carrying her griddle and pancakes with her. Thus the annual sporting event was born.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR DIRKSEN

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, our distinguished minority leader rendered an outstanding and valiant service recently in the Senate and to our great Nation in his efforts in opposing the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Many editorials and articles have been written about his outstanding service. I have one editorial to present today. I wish to read one paragraph:

> Dirksen's triumph was a victory for the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, who warned that American democracy could survive only through preventing of such accumulations of power that could overwhelm the individual citizen.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Illinois State Journal, Springfield, Ill., of Saturday, February 19, 1966, entitled "Why Dirksen Triumphed" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The People Agreed: Why Dirksen Triumphed

Senator Everett M. Dirksen's victory in blocking repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act may someday rank in history as the most significant action of the 1966 session of the U.S. Congress.

This verdict may be returned because the Dirksen triumph may eventually be recognized as a turning point in American affairs. History may record that it was during this session of Congress that heed was taken of the increasing concern about the growing concentrations of power that threaten the freedom of the individual American.

For Senator Dirksen's monumental victory was a defeat not only for the vast and too-often abused power of labor unions, but a check at least on the spreading of Federal influence and control into those areas traditionally preserved for the States.

Dirksen's triumph was a victory for the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, who warned that American democracy could survive only through preventing of such accumulations of power that could overwhelm the individual citizen.

Dirksen fought—almost alone—for a fundamental principle that has made America great. That he won is in itself a tribute to the personal greatness of this man. It has been almost universally recognized that no other Member of the Senate could have prevailed against odds so overwhelmingly against him.

But Dirksen did win despite the storm of abuse raised against him and the often deliberate distorting of his motives. An effort was made by extremists of the left to smear him as antiunion because he insisted on the right of individual States to enact right-to-work laws if they so desired.

Such legislation has never been a serious issue in Illinois. This State has long prospered under conditions that encourage the formation of unions.

But it was Dirksen's position that Illinois, no more than any other State, should, through its representation in Congress, attempt to force other States to abolish legislation deemed of value to their own interests.

If individual States could be forced to do this in the area of labor legislation, they could be so forced in other areas as well.

Although Dirksen waged his fight almost single-handedly on the floor of the Senate, there were subtle signs that he was reenforced by the force of public opinion that cast a great shadow over the proceedings.

There appeared to be a firm grasp by leaders of the majority Democratic Party and by President Johnson himself that the majority of Americans understood what Dirksen was trying to do and supported him in his cause.

Had there not been this awareness it is probable that the power of the Presidency and the overwhelming Democratic majority in the Senate would have crushed Dirksen's use of the filibuster, a time-honored congressional tool of the minority.

The fact that these powers were not used testify to the righteousness of Dirksen's cause and the recognition of the will of the American people. Through Dirksen's efforts the latter have won a significant victory over the forces that favor centralized power.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT GROUP OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, last night an official of the Office of Economic Opportunity informed a member of my staff that a Headstart grant of $5.6 million had just been approved for the Child Development Group of Mississippi through Mary Holmes Junior College.

This is the same group that last year was called to account for over one-third of a Headstart grant of $1.4 million.

The approval of this grant, under the circumstances, fails to comply with the very strong insistence of the Senate Appropriations Committee that recipients of Federal poverty funds should be financially responsible and capable of administering the funds given to them. In view of the facts of this case it shows, in my opinion, poor judgment or a complete disregard for the law passed by Congress.

The Senate Appropriations Committee amended the 1966 poverty program appropriations bill which amendment was approved by the Congress and provided:

> That no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for any grant until the Director has determined that the grantee is qualified to administer the funds and programs involved in the proposed grant * * *.

In its report the Senate committee referring to the poverty program stated:

> Perhaps the very nature of the circumstances under which this crash program was originated and conducted made it inevitable that errors would result. However, many lessons should have been learned from the experiences of fiscal year 1965 and the errors should not be repeated. The committee emphasizes that the mere fact that good has been accomplished by the entire poverty program does not excuse the unwarranted use of funds.
>
> Accordingly, the committee strongly feels that the Director of OEO in all instances should require a thorough examination to be made of each applicant to determine that the recipient is capable of properly administering the grant and that the Director should make a continuing surveillance to determine that the terms of the grant are complied with.
>
> To accomplish this it is strongly recommended that the OEO make the following procedures a part of the administrative requirements and the rules and regulations: "(2) The community action programs should be operated only by responsible people of the local community wherever possible and every effort should be made by personal contact if necessary to this end.
>
> "(3) Strict accounting controls should be insisted upon in connection with all money advanced."

In the hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee, to which I have previously referred, OEO Director Mr. Sargent Shriver placed in the record a list of expenditures by the Child Development Group which were questioned by the OEO. The list appears at page 591 and totals over $500,000, an amount more than one-third of the total grant of $1.4 million.

It was stated by OEO as part of the table that listed the questioned items that these items would be cleared and/or evaluated in the final audit by OEO. The final audit has now been completed, the date of the report being February 7, 1966.

At my request and the request of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, officials of the General Accounting Office made a comparison of the February 7 audit with the OEO audit of last July. This comparison made by the General Accounting Office indicates that of the original 17 items questioned, only 2 or 3 have been resolved. I have this comparison in writing in my office, and a copy is in the files of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, as well.

It is obvious from the General Accounting Office comparison that the Child Development Group of Mississippi has failed to account for tens of thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, of dollars and that this group is no better prepared now nor is it any better qualified to properly account for and administer the $5.6 million new grant than it was to account for and administer properly the first grant of $1.4 million.

The management and the leaders of the Child Development Group remain virtually the same as when they were held to this accounting. The $1.4 million of new grant, as given them, is equal to exactly 4 times the amount of the original grant, as to which there were so many shortcomings.

The Group is directed by virtually the same board of directors—the leaders are the same—that mismanaged or misspent one-third of the first grant. It is the same group that operated from Mount Beulah, at Edwards. They merely moved 12 miles into the city of Jackson.

To illustrate how irresponsible this group has been in the handling of Federal money, I quote from the report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations investigators, made on July 14, 1965, after an inspection of the Child Development Group records:

> At best there appears to be a serious lack of fiscal responsibility attending the administration of the whole project.

An OEO audit report of the Child Development Group made July 31, 1965, stated:

> Our evaluation of CDGM accounting system disclosed various deficiencies which included the following:
>
> 1. Accounting procedures—there exists no written description of the accounting system including the titles of various accounts, explanations of expense classifications, as well as the prescribed flow of financial documents. To a great extent the unsatisfactory condition of records and related data are attributable to the lack of written accounting procedures since the preparation of such procedures are usually a part of an accounting engagement of this type.
>
> 2. Internal controls—we found that the basic requirements for a sound system of internal controls were lacking, including the separation of voucher approval and the cash disbursing functions and the review of these functions by independent personnel.
>
> 3. Accounting records—at the time of our audit the accouting records did not properly reflect the current status of OEO funds, supportable expenditures and the composition of the non-Federal share.
>
> 4. Property accounting—as of the date of our audit, no procedures or inventory control records existed to account for furniture and supplies, which cost in excess of $106,000. The exact locations and balances of these assets are unknown.

The deficiencies and discrepancies that existed in the Child Development Group of Mississippi accounting system when the first audit was made in July of last year still existed in February of this year, less than 2 weeks ago, and I charge that they still exist.

According to the final audit report of the Office of Economic Opportunity, dated February 7, 1966:

> No system had been established to control or account for purchased property.

Further, the OEO audit report stated:

> Among some of the audit items still shown as outstanding on the February 7 audit:
>
> "1. $106,000 of property purchased but unaccounted for.
>
> "2. An overpayment of $12,300 to a civil rights organization allegedly for room and board.
>
> "3. $3,850 in salaries to the grantee college, including several weeks salary at $150 per week to the college president for work which the OEO auditors say there is no evidence he performed any work or services.
>
> "4. $180,000 local contributions which did not approach agreed amount or was overvalued."

OEO claims that these matters have now been resolved and all the discrepancies of major proportions have been satisfied.

The truth is they were forgiven, not satisfied.

Unauthorized purchases were waived by OEO after the fact, a clear violation of their own rules.

The contract agreement was so ignored and abused to forgive the illegal and improper expenditures that this solemn agreement was made a sham and meaningless paper. If this case is to be a precedent, no contract with OEO has any meaning and provides no protection or assurance that Government money will be properly spent and accounted for.

The people of Mississippi have responded to the needs of the poverty stricken, and in recent months and years much progress has been made in this regard. Although they do not approve of some policies and regulations imposed upon them, local authorities and local private citizens of Mississippi have in good faith accepted the poverty program and conducted many successful and worthwhile projects. When the program has been sponsored and operated by responsible local people there has been no trace of scandal or discord. At this moment many applications by competent organizations are now pending in OEO offices that would provide the training proposed for some of the same children as is proposed in the Child Development Group grant. It is my opinion that some of these applications are being held deliberately, pending the approval of the Child Development Group and other grants that would supersede and overlap them, thus providing grounds for their disapproval.

As the benefits of successful poverty programs become obvious, those who have been fearful and hesitant will shed their reluctance and skepticism and the benefits to the poor will spread through more and better projects. On the other hand, to award one-half the Headstart funds allotted to Mississippi in a grant to an organization that is financially irresponsible and whose leaders are generally regarded at best as being incapable to conduct a school for children would undermine and destroy the accomplishments already made.

To do so will play into the hands of extremists and will give weight to the argument made those who oppose the poverty program on the grounds it has no regard for the poor but is instead devoting millions of the taxpayers' dollars to special groups and individuals who use the money for their own selfish interests.

If the poverty program fails in Mississippi, it will not be because responsible, honest, and capable local leadership will not respond. It will fail because responsible, honest, and capable local leadership has been bypassed and rejected by the national and regional administrators of the program.

The pain and anguish of the poor who will suffer because they fail to receive funds that were squandered or mismanaged, or misspent, or misappropriated will not be on the hands and consciences of concerned Mississippians. Sound capable leaders stand ready to respond. If these leaders are spurned in favor of the incompetent, failure of the poverty program will rest squarely on the irresponsible bureaucrats who fail to recognize or ignore irrefutable facts such as I have presented to the Senate today.

Mr. President, I warn Senators to beware of voting for a bill or a provision in a bill which directly or indirectly approves the expenditure of money on the basis of the way in which it has been shown the original $1.4 million grant to this group has been spent. I warn Senators to be wary of approving an allowance of additional funds in the amount of $5.6 million—exactly four times the amount of the original grant—without a proper accounting for the expenditure of the first grant.

I shall have something to say later for the enlightenment of the Senate, because I believe the Senate is entitled to receive the enlightenment, about the excessive salaries paid in this field of activity. This situation has existed in Mississippi and in Washington.

The OEO was under tremendous pressure last year when it tried to correct the improper expenditures, about which I have spoken. Mr. Shriver, in all good faith, told me that he planned to move the headquarters of the organization last summer. When he undertook to do so, the workers in the headquarters more or less rebelled and refused to move and to comply with what was to have been his order. Under pressure from various civil rights influences and organizations, Mr. Shriver did not require that removal. Frankly, he promised the Committee on Appropriations that he would move them, and he has moved them out of that community to nearby Jackson, 15 miles away. But the management, supervisors, and most of the controlling group remain exactly the same.

In the face of the request of the Committee on Appropriations and the additional appropriation that was included in the law, I cannot, with all deference, see how in the world Mr. Shriver approved $5.6 million. I am determined to keep up with this situation, based on the lawful expenditure of money—the ordinary, common, simple, honest, legal expenditure of hard dollars of appropriated funds, as to which Congress certainly has a responsibility.

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, during the Lincoln Day adjournment this year, I had the honor to speak before fellow Republicans at meetings in Los Angeles and Santa Ana. These meetings were held under the auspices of the California Republican League. I spoke also at meetings in San Francisco and Fresno held under the auspices of the Republican County Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a partial text of the remarks I delivered at the Los Angeles meeting be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the partial text was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Partial Text of Remarks by U.S. Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, at Lincoln Day Luncheon, of the California Republican League, Los Angeles, February 14, 1966

This occasion is devotedly addressed to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, savior of a nation, emancipator of a race. In his spirit, you have established the California Republican League, a volunteer party organization where great issues which confront our people may be debated and discussed. You seek to apply a rule of reason to complex questions upon which our people and our representatives must render judgments. You seek to revitalize our Republican Party, to make it a forward-looking and successful political instrumentality, to which Americans may once again turn and give their faith. I join you with enthusiasm in that worthy endeavor.

Mr. Lincoln left an indelible stamp on our party as a national party of American progress.

"The dogmas of the quiet past," he said, "are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."

The stormy present of the 1860's was the fury of the Civil War. It did, indeed, make our country's past in Lincoln's time appear quiet. In the ebb and flow of human events, calm and quiet have given way in continuing cycle to squall and storm. As I meet with you here in California in 1966, over a century after the strife of Lincoln's day, violence once again has begun to erupt around the world and, alas, is in evidence among our own people at home.

Once again, storm clouds are appearing. They cast their shadows on peoples who had fondly hoped that peace and plenty might finally be their lot. Science has made enormous strides which can unbelievably benefit us all. It has unlocked the doors to terrible secrets available equally for good or evil. The tragedy is that man himself has not kept pace with these scientific milestones. He appears sometimes at a loss as to what to do. He enjoys very little wiser guidance than he had a century ago. Lust for power, greed, fear and hate still compete with our belief in God, and in freedom, and in the brotherhood of man.

Our own constitutionally guaranteed freedoms have lately been grossly abused as emotions seem to elbow reason out of the way. Respect for law has been arrogantly flouted. The memory of Watts hangs heavy on our conscience. The dignity of our judicial system has been undermined. A New York judge's writ has been torn up before TV cameras and so have draft cards. A Communist flag is unfurled on Pennsylvania Avenue by those who side with North Vietnam. One beatnik contemptuously records anti-Amercian propaganda for use by Hanoi. And, at the other end of the political spectrum, a secret rightwing political organization, proudly proclaiming that it has adopted Communist techniques, tries to pull down the temple by the amazing assertion that our American Government is 60 to 80 percent Communist dominated. All these things, and many more, increase the difficulties which beset us today.

The people, the plain ordinary people, about whom Lincoln was concerned, have a duty, greater than ever before, to discharge their civic obligations as reasonable, rational, thinking citizens. The future of this Republic rests largely in their hands.

What a tremendous challenge to the Republican Party. Our two-party system has been traditionally one of the most effective checks and balances in our national life. That system is in danger. Republicans represent but a third of the Congress. Only twice since 1932, has our party controlled our Federal Legislature. Democrats today outnumber Republicans in this State by about 1,400,000. Their registration is up 109,000 from January a year ago, while ours is up but 64,000. In the country as a whole, 53 percent of our people consider themselves Democrats, while only 25 percent classify themselves as Republicans. There is talk of a black man's party, a white supremacy party, a labor party, and a self-styled conservative party. Some people are demanding that the two major political parties reconstitute themselves, one into a so-called liberal party, the other into a so-called conservative party. It will be good for the Nation, and for our party, if such a realinement does not occur.

Tom Dewey set this argument to rest when he said:

"These impractical theorists * * * want to drive all the moderates and liberals out of the Republican Party and have the remainder join forces with the conservative groups of the South. Then they would have everything neatly arranged indeed. The Democratic Party would be the liberal-to-radical party. The Republican Party would be the conservative-to-reactionary party. The results would be neatly arranged too. The Republicans would lose every election, and the Democrats would win every election. It may be a perfect theory but it would result in a one-party system."

How best, my fellow Republicans, do we respond to this challenge to our party and its future in this time of upheaval? Do we not need to demonstrate that we believe in the best interests of the people as a whole, that we seek, constructively, to solve our current day dilemmas, that we open wide our doors to all Americans of good will? Must we not attract, by the Lincoln-Eisenhower philosophy, by the Hiram Johnson, Earl Warren, Goodwin Knight philosophy, men and women from all walks of life, from every color and creed?

It is frightening to think that political parties in America might be based on race. It is frightening to contemplate parties created on the sole basis of economic or social interests. A labor party, a businessman's party, a farmer's party, each claiming priority over other segments of our national life is not a very good way to assure a happy future. It is our party which now must revitalize itself. To serve this country, and, incidentally, to win elections, we need to represent a broad spectrum of our American society, to present a national point of view which reflects the national American interest, to rededicate ourselves to human freedom, to equal opportunity under law for all Americans, to equal justice for all, not for just some, to a Republican Party to which rich and poor, high and low, black and white, Christian and Jew, men from labor and from business and farms may give their allegiance. This meeting here today includes almost every segment of our local society, I am happy to observe.

Mr. Chairman, you do not make forward progress by walking backwards. You do not merit the people's faith at the ballot box if you try to destroy the people's faith all the rest of the time. In a world literally shrunken into a neighborhood, you cannot isolate yourself or your country.

You do not step back from the abyss of nuclear obliteration by demanding that the test ban treaty be junked. You do not advance towards the dream of a world of law by reviling the United Nations. You do not contribute to the defensive strength and power of our beloved country by urging that our constitutional tax provisions, which furnish the money for our military forces, be summarily repealed. You do not honor the American maxim of equal justice under law by demanding repeal of civil rights legislation, largely written, incidentally, by Republicans in the Congress. You do not build a successful, vital Republican Party by seeking to make it an exclusive club.

Lincoln gave us a guideline: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or so well do for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

Over the last 10 decades the Republican Party and its leaders from Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt to Robert A. Taft and Dwight D. Eisenhower have been generally successful in striking the balance as to where our country's needs are best served. From the preservation of the Union and the freedom of of the slaves a century ago, through the creation of the Departments of Agriculture, Justice, Commerce, and Labor, the establishment of the merit system for Federal employees, antitrust regulation, conservation of our natural resorces, labor-management legislation, statutes providing incentives for States, local governments and private industry, to solve specific problems, to Eisenhower's fiscal integrity, his education and cultural exchanges and his treaties furthering peaceful cooperation, the record of Republican achievements has been high.

We are now in an era of increasing urban and suburban growth. By 1975, 80 percent of all Americans will be living in urban areas. And nowhere is mental sterility more apparent than in many of our major urban cities, too long controlled by Democratic political bosses. Our major metropolitan areas continue to be clogged with slums, with traffic and with crime. Racial tensions remain. All the urban renewal and public housing in the world will not mean a better America unless we work to help people to become better. Houses alone will not cure the problem. Money alone, no matter how bountifully expended, will not create morality. Legislation by itself cannot guarantee solutions. The stated goals of the war on poverty reflect a national concern for the poor. But the administration of this Federal program has been gutted by Democratic Party politics. When Republicans in the Senate sought, by amendment, to apply the Hatch Act to the poverty legislation, we were defeated. We intend to try again. When we tried to preserve the traditional Federal-State relationship, by requiring that the Federal Government deal with the States rather than with individual cities, we were again defeated. Republicans do not oppose Federal action which seeks to eliminate slums or to help the destitute look forward to better days. But the position we took in trying to fashion better legislation ought to be a vigorous issue in the next campaign.

In urban redevelopment, the bulldozer approach ought not to preempt the field. It is to the credit of Republicans in the Congress that we were able successfully to offer legislation by which rehabilitation of existing structures may be accomplished when it better serves the public interest. Under such circumstances, neighborhoods may be preserved and the wholesale relocation of the poor may be avoided. And by the way, Republicans do not believe that $10,000 a year income families ought to receive Federal rent subsidies, and we said so with our votes.

Republicans have taken a lead in realistic Federal interests in air pollution and water pollution. I am glad to recall I am the author of the first Federal air pollution statute enacted several years ago. Water pollution and water scarcity will be unsolved problems in which our country has an interest, and in which our party has an interest. If the rivers of America are not made pure in the next quarter of a century, water scarcity will be a nationwide problem.

While population will increase one-third, water consumption will double. In the same period of time, additional water must be imported into the Pacific Southwest, including southern California, or our own future growth will become bleak. I think the chances of enacting a gigantic repayable reclamation bill importing water into the Lower Colorado River Basin are fairly bright.

Our party has traditionally stood for human freedom and for equal opportunity and equal dignity before the law for all of our citizens. The first legislation dealing with civil rights, since the Civil War, was enacted under the leadership of the Eisenhower administration. In 1964 and again in 1965 the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act were largely written in the office of the Republican leader of the Senate, EVERETT DIRKSEN, and generally reflected the philosophy of Lincoln today. Republicans need to demonstrate that men of every race will feel at home in Lincoln's house.

Education is a matter of national concern and a matter of abiding concern to the Republican Party. The first so-called aid-to-education law was adopted in Mr. Lincoln's administration, the land-grant college program, under which our own State university has grown to preeminence among all the schools of the world. In modern times, it was the late Bob Taft who successfully authored in the Senate the first bill to provide Federal assistance to public education in areas which needed assistance to meet the growing needs of their youth.

Taft said it this way in the Senate: "In the matters affecting the necessities of life—and I should like to confine it so far as possible to the necessities of life; namely, to relief, to education, to health, to housing—I do not believe the Federal Government can say it has no interest and say to the people 'Go your way and do the best you can' * * * because I think we have a responsibility to see if we cannot eliminate hardship, poverty, inequality of opportunity to the best of our ability."

Education concerns the youth of our land, and surely, it concerns the future of our country.

The birth rate of the Second World War has provided the Republican Party with a unique opportunity. Last year 1 million more young Americans reached the age of 18 than in 1964. The average yearly increase in America's teenage labor force in the 1960's will be almost 6 times the average yearly increase in the 1950's. By the 1968 presidential election, the average age of our electorate will have dropped from 33 years in 1960 to 25 years or less.

Thus, the youth of our Nation enters political life with a clean slate. For them the political battles of the 1930's have faded, and receded into history. They are entering a society where our Republican philosophy must be one of ever-expanding horizons for all, rather than merely dividing up what exists between the "haves" and the "have-nots." They are entering a society with an awareness that all the slogans and imagery of the past, whether it be New Frontier, Fair Deal, New Deal, or Great Society, have not solved the problems of an urbanized America or of a deeply troubled world.

Will you as active leaders of the Republican Party encourage these young Americans to join our ranks by showing a receptiveness to new ideas and a willingness to reach out for people from all walks of life? Yours is an historic opportunity to strengthen our Nation and our party by bringing this energy and this zeal to the service of the Republic through the Republican Party. If we fail, this Republic and this party will be in trouble.

Far above every other question which deeply concerns the American people is the question of peace or war. Vietnam and all that it portends, or may portend, is uppermost in the minds of each of us. A U.S. Senate committee is holding hearings on the whole spectrum of American foreign policy in southeast Asia. It serves a highly useful public purpose by so doing. Members of the executive branch of Government have a duty to cooperate with the committee, to answer questions in open session on our policy, except, of course, in those instances where the security of the United States would be damaged by public disclosure.

Whether you agree or disagree with our response to a call for help by South Vietnam, the fact is that we are in that country with more than 200,000 young Americans risking and giving their lives, writing a new and moving chapter in American courage.

A few weeks ago, on the campus of UCLA, I said that America and her allies are in South Vietnam today "only for the purpose of assuring, or helping to assure, a people's freedom to chart their own course, unhindered by acts of aggression from without their borders. We have applied a measured force in seeking to obtain this limited objective which surely stands for decency and integrity by which we wish our country to be guided."

I said then, and I repeat now, that we believe disputes among nations ought to be settled at the conference table. I have no patience for politicians who publicly pick out their favorite bomb sites as their own personal prescription for what they call victory.

I have no patience for those who want us now to leave. The victory we seek is freedom, independence and peace for South Vietnam. I have no doubt that some of the North Vietnamese leaders feel assured that American resolve will not be constant and that time will bring success to their misnamed "war of liberation." But time will demonstrate the fallacy of their opinion for we shall not run away.

The doorway to peaceful discussion will remain open, as it should. We ardently pray for a just peace. America plots no war. We are not aggressors; nor, indeed is South Vietnam. "Leave your neighbor alone" is all we say to the North Vietnamese Communist regime. We are a decent people, and we cherish the freedom of man. We are an honorable people and so we shall remain. And that, I think, is precisely the prescription for the Republican Party in the stern and pressing days which lie ahead.

NEW GEORGE WASHINGTON COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, under a standing order of the Senate in effect since 1901, on Washington's birthday, the Washington Farewell Address is read. There is a similar standing order in the House of Representatives. Yesterday, I was privileged to read that address in the Senate.

Immediately after the reading of the address, there was a ceremony in the Vice President's office for the dedication of a new 5-cent stamp, which bears a reproduction of the famous Peale portrait of the first President that hangs in the President's office.

During the course of that ceremony, Richard J. Murphy, Assistant Postmaster General, gave a dedication speech; Representative MINK—who read Washington's Farewell Address yesterday in the House of Representatives—made a talk, and I made a short speech.

I ask unanimous consent that those remarks be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF RICHARD J. MURPHY, ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON STAMP, U.S. CAPITOL, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 22, 1966

I am greatly honored today to participate with Senator METCALF and Representative MINK in paying homage, on the 234th anniversary of his birth, to the most universally admired and respected figure in our Nation's illustrious history.

This has become a pleasant tradition in the postal service, for not only was President Washington first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen, but he was, together with his friend, Benjamin Franklin, the first to appear on an American postage stamp in 1847. Since then he has appeared on 74 different occasions—more often than any other person. Only 212 individuals have ever been honored by appearing on U.S. stamps, and most of them only once, so the philatelic distinction accorded this remarkable patriot is indeed rare.

It is no accident that public recognition should be so continuous and widespread for never has such a multitude of people owed to one individual a greater measure of appreciation for the blessings bestowed upon them.

Oppressed colonists, yearning to breathe free, witnessed imminent defeat transformed into victory by the magnificence of his generalship. A disorganized confederation, struggling with hard-won independence, was endowed with the Constitution which lives yet today under the guidance of his presiding talent. The fledgling Federal Republic became this American Nation, fathered during its infant years by his preeminent leadership.

Any one of these tasks would have entitled this largely self-educated Virginia planter to a prominent niche of honor in the glories of our history. But for one individual, who by his own judgment inherited "inferior endowments from nature," to have accomplished all this and more, is what gives an almost breathtakingly unreal quality to our Nation's past.

More than any citizen before or since, Washington symbolizes the basic national unity underlying the infinite diversity which is America. Not for words or for thoughts, nor for oratory, nor for appearance, nor even for talents is Washington accorded the first rank in historical honors, because in all of these he was clearly surpassed by many of his contemporaries. But for his deeds, for his acts of greatness, for solid accomplishments which time has not diminished is Washington universally acclaimed.

In the latter half of the 18th century, there appeared in a fledging America, under the most unlikely of circumstances, an aggregation of talent so remarkable as to be rarely witnessed in any other epoch in any other nation. Here among such giants as Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Adams, Washington was chosen unanimously to lead the Nation and was recognized universally as the preeminent citizen of the Republic. No amount of acclaim by any subsequent generation could possibly equal that approbation.

Washington stands today as a unique historical figure, symbolizing above all character, duty, and patriotism to an age, which for all of its sophistication and worldliness, still quietly prizes these qualities as most noble virtues. Bigger than the office he was about to enter, the only occupant never to actively seek the job, he gave the office the basic mold which forms it today.

Just as few, if any, military commanders had ever faced greater odds against the achievement of victory, so, too, Washington as President faced the unbelievably difficult task of forging a Federal Government from an inheritance of roughly a dozen clerks, an empty Treasury and a slightly under 700-man army. The measure of success afforded his efforts is best attested by the fact that we gather here today, in the world's most powerful nation, to reflect upon the staggering magnitude of that feat.

Today as our Nation again faces external challenges fraught with peril, we would do well to ponder that Washington's unique contribution was that he had the indomitable courage and resolute determination to meet the challenges that came to him in his time. As we encounter new challenges, so must we devise new solutions to meet the needs of our day. This is a lesson which General Washington's successors in the executive branch, President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY, understand very well. As our leaders strive to secure for our generation the liberty, peace, national unity, and institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge advocated by Washington in his Farewell Address, let them be comforted by the knowledge that even so enormous a figure as the Father of our Nation was not without his severe detractors, but history has been more kindly disposed to his achievements than to his opponents' criticisms.

Let the Nation be comforted by the fact that as the life of Washington attests, providence has been good to us by providing us with the right man in the right place at the right time; and the shining example of triumph over adversity which is the story of the citizen-soldier from Mount Vernon remains forever a source of constant strength to his successors.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE PATSY T. MINK

The new George Washington stamp we are dedicating here today honors a man associated deeply with the early folklore of our young Nation. Yet, in spite of the legendary quality of this man, his career shows him to have been eminently a man of action and public affairs.

George Washington was a member of the Virginia Assembly in colonial times, a soldier in the French and Indian War, a Member of the Continental Congress, commander of the Revolutionary armies, a member of the Convention that drafted the Constitution and President of that Convention, then finally the acclaimed first President of the Republic.

Preeminently a man of his times and a man of history, George Washington has become to modern Americans a symbol of our traditions, which we renew today in the simple ceremony of dedicating a new stamp. Such a small thing to link us to our past and to renew in us a sense of our history.

And yet, besides his historicity, George Washington was an amalgam of those virtues that truly belong to the roots of the great American spirit. Despite his scintillating accomplishments as general and public official, he went to his New York inaugural full of doubts as to his own competence for the high office of the Presidency. Perhaps it was his devoted public service that earned for him the accolades of his countrymen, but not least was he loved for the life he lived in accord with one of his plain maxims: "Labor to keep alive in your breast that little spark of celestial fire, called conscience."

George Washington, riding by stagecoach to that inaugural ceremony, carried the conscience, the hopes, and virtues of a new land with him. Refusing higher titles of monarch or king which a grateful people might easily have been persuaded to accord him, he remained true to the spirit of that Constitution which he had helped draft. Washington framed for us forever the vision of America when he said in his inaugural address:

"The preeminence of free government should be exemplified by all the attributes which can win the affections of its citizens and command the respect of the world. The preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the republican model of government are justly considered, perhaps, as deeply, as finally, staked on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people."

George Washington put his faith in the promise of that experiment and carried the dreams of a newly independent people with him. Truly he is uniquely American and our own, as perhaps no other figure in our history is, and no individual comes to mind so readily as he when one hears the words of Thomas Jefferson: "When a man assumes a public trust, he should consider himself as public property." George Washington is the public property, the pride of all Americans. Much of what we are has descended directly from him.

REMARKS OF SENATOR METCALF

It is an honor for me to participate in the dedication of this new 5-cent George Washington stamp, a stamp that reproduces an original painting that hangs here in the Vice President's office.

George Washington was not only the Father of our Country, but in a sense he is the father of one of the most effective instruments of communication ever conceived: the postage stamp. The first series of U.S. postage stamps was issued in 1847, and, fittingly, one bore the portrait of George Washington.

The use of postage stamps revolutionized our postal system, and today, as we adapt large-scale mechanization, involving sophisticated computers, optical readers, and other devices bringing the Post Office Department into its own too long delayed industrial revolution, I think it highly fitting that there be a new stamp honoring this towering figure. For George Washington is a man who symbolizes beginnings—the beginning of our drive for liberty, the beginning of our country, the beginning of creating a tradition of a powerful but responsive Chief Executive, and the beginning of the two-party system in our country.

Today, on his birthday, it is traditional to read his Farewell Address, and I am proud that I was chosen to deliver this great address a few minutes ago in the Senate Chamber.

Throughout that great address in which he bid goodbye to his countrymen as he left the high office he was the first to hold, is the admonition that this Nation must be unified.

It runs like a golden thread throughout the fabric of the address. He warns against alienating any part of the country from the rest. He calls upon the North to work with the South and the East with the West.

It was Washington's great prestige, his parliamentary skill, and his patience as the President of the Constitutional Convention that held that body together at times when the conflicts appeared almost irreconcilable. The union of the 13 Colonies was dear to him and under his skillful direction the Constitution was written and our Nation established.

One of the greatest sources of the solidarity of the great Nation that grew from the confederation of 13 Colonies is the postal system that has enabled citizens from Maine to Hawaii to keep in touch with each other. The history of our postal system is a history of growth with the Nation. In Washington's day we had only the post roads but in the Constitution he made it the obligation and responsibility of the new Nation that they be established and maintained. As the Nation grew to the west the pony express and the railroads took over the duties of carrying the mail. The remote areas were still tied to their home States in the East by the postal system.

Today, of course, we have means and methods of communication of which the Founding Fathers never dreamed. But the basis of communication is still our postal system. American business is dependent upon it, law enrforcement relies upon it, it is still the greatest means of communication to make our country one Nation from Alaska to Florida.

Therefore it is especially appropriate that on this 234th anniversary of Washington's birth, just after the reading of his classic farewell message in both Houses of Congress, we carry out the main tenet of his address with the issuance of a new stamp honoring the Father of our Country.

DEMAND FOR ACTION TO RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE AND EXTEND THE COVERAGE OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my fellow Senators a discussion which is now raging, apparently involving George Meany, the president of the AFL–CIO, who has come out in support of an increase in the minimum wage. Mr. Meany at the same time has said that the labor movement—of which he heads the largest unit—will not "toady" to any political party holding off on a needed minimum wage increase.

Mr. President, a minimum wage increase is a proposal I have consistently supported. It is high time the Congress took action, even if the administration seems to be refusing to make up its mind.

The labor movement, having lost this year's battle to repeal 14(b), has turned to the administration in hopes that the President would this time come out strongly in support of a significant minimum wage increase. Labor knows only too well—as I have pointed out on numerous occasions—that the present $1.25 minimum is at least 25 cents per hour below the administration's own definition of the "poverty level." Yet the administration still refuses—and has refused for over a year—to support any specific increase in the minimum wage, and instead contents itself with general pronouncements that the minimum wage is, of course, much too low.

The bill I introduced last year, on the other hand, would, if enacted, have given our working men and women a $1.50 minimum wage right now—not at some uncertain future date when the administration makes up its mind.

I point out to Senators from industrial States like my own that a minimum wage increase would also give industry in our States some measure of protection, as we have too long suffered from the unfair competition based on substandard wages and other labor conditions in effect in certain areas of the country—primarily in the South.

We are now well into the 2d session of the 89th Congress, yet this most pressing legislative matter seems to be perpetually bogged down.

I would remind my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that we need not await a definitive policy statement from the administration. Where the need is clear, we have a responsibility to act in the public interest.

I would also say to the Senators on my side of the aisle—the Republican side—that Mr. Meany has presented us with a very significant opportunity, for, when he says labor will not toady to any political party, he has gone back to the declaration of independence of the labor movement in the days of Samuel Gompers. Gompers insisted that labor cannot be taken for granted by either political party. Since 1932, it has been taken for granted. I welcome this restatement of labor's declaration of independence, and express the hope that Senators on both sides of the aisle will see that here is a need which cries out to be met, that we will meet it, and that labor will feel free to seek our continued support of the legitimate objectives for which it is contending—on their individual merits, rather than on some narrow partisan basis of being one way all the time, regardless of the merits.

FEDERAL PROGRAM OF FELLOWSHIPS IN HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on February 10, I introduced a bill to establish a Federal program of fellowships in highway transportation engineering. I said at the time that there exists a critical shortage of trained men in this important field.

Because the quality of modern highways is closely involved in the growing problem of traffic safety, I proposed the Federal program to encourage more graduate students to pursue highway traffic engineering.

My points were underscored by a news item in the National Observer of February 14. I ask unanimous consent that the story be printed in the Record following my remarks to illustrate the need for my legislation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Lack of Engineers Drives New Jersey To Train Its Own

Trenton, N.J.—Federal aid has caused a boom in highway construction throughout the Nation. But, as New Jersey has discovered, there aren't enough highway engineers to design and build the new roads and improve present roads.

The shortage of trained personnel is expected to get worse, and the department has taken the obvious course of stepping up its recruitment program to fill 100 openings. But it has found that colleges aren't turning out enough engineers, and private firms lure them away with higher pay. Last year, it was able to hire only 30 engineers.

So, to supplement recruiting, the department has started to produce engineers itself. It has enrolled 86 of its nonprofessional engineering employees, such as draftsmen, mapreaders, and engineering aids, in the first of a series of special night courses.

It will take 5 years for a man to qualify for assistant highway engineer, by attending classes 3 nights a week at three county vocational schools at State expense while maintaining full-time employment. The vocational schools were selected as less costly than accredited engineering schools. Courses, such as mathematics, soil mechanics, surveying, paving, and materials, were specifically programed for the department, and many of the instructors are highway department engineers. The courses add up to the equivalent of 2 years of college.

At the end of 5 years, the department will have new engineers and the men will have better jobs and higher salaries, with a potential of tripling their present pay.

THE ATTACKS ON THE PROPOSED RAMPART CANYON DAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, one of the greatest of many resources of my State of Alaska which can be developed for the welfare and benefit of the economy of the free world is an extraordinarily fine damsite on the Yukon River, Alaska, at Rampart Canyon. The Corps of Engineers has estimated that 5 million kilowatts of hydroelectric power can be produced for delivery at tidewater at the very low cost of 2 to 3 mills per kilowatt hour. This is the largest untapped source of hydroelectric power at the lowest cost of any power resource now known to be available to the United States. This is power which will, increasingly, be needed to meet the demands of an expanding American population and to power industries needed for the defense and economic growth of the free world.

In the course of the last session of Congress and the session before that imaginative legislation has been enacted and strongly endorsed by the American people to root out the causes of poverty and eradicate the blight of economic insecurity from the Nation.

Construction of the Rampart Canyon Dam could be one of the most significant attacks on poverty that can be imagined. The wise utilization of the waters of the Yukon for a new industrial complex in Alaska will provide thousands of jobs for people now lacking hope of economic stability and the promise of security for their children. The constructive use of the Nation's resources is a fundamental necessity in creating a climate of economic progress in which the menace of poverty can be greatly diminished. Alaskans and many students of economics and engineering who have investigated the resources of the Yukon River believe Rampart can be a mighty contribution to the progress and prosperity of America and that, for this reason, it must be built.

Despite the undoubted wisdom of the plan for constructing Rampart Canyon Dam, this project has come under violent and unreasoning attack by certain voluntary societies whose primary iterest is in conservation of wildlife resources. I am deeply sympathetic with the motives of individuals and groups who are concerned about possible losses of wildlife in Alaska as a result of construction of the Rampart Dam. I am a fervent conservationist myself and am always alert to the dangers to our environment of wasteful destruction of wildlife. As Governor of Alaska I put an end to the then existing bounty on the bald eagle and caused that noble bird to be protected thenceforth. I have enthusiastically supported the conservation measures introduced in Congress during my 6 years of service in the Senate. However, I believe it is entirely likely that construction of Rampart Dam with the great reservoir to be created would greatly enhance the Alaska environment for all forms of wildlife and would permit introduction of new species not now existing there. I am certain that estimates of the loss of migratory fowl, fish, and furbearing animals which have been widely quoted are exaggerated and unreliable.

The frenzied efforts of those whom I call "extremist" conservationists to prevent construction of Rampart Dam has taken on an air of irresponsibility and recklessness which I think must be exposed. The screeching and roaring against Rampart by those who call themselves conservationists has repeatedly rent the ear of many public forums and has found expression in innumerable statements appearing in publications of the conservation societies.

The latest exhibition of irresponsible criticism of Rampart appears in a particularly shocking form. My attention has been called, as I believe has that of many Members of Congress, to an article in a publication entitled "Young Citizen," of January 14, 1966, which presents the slanted opinion of Rampart which has been expressed by the extremely powerful lobbying groups interested in conserving ducks, geese, fish, and other forms of wildlife. This magazine, which is distributed widely to schoolchildren, contains statements about the Rampart project which are entirely erroneous and which give a completely biased view of the importance of the project.

Repeating the same statements that have been made by the conservation societies, the following are errors which appear in this article which fifth grade students are required by their teachers to study:

First, that the "battle of Rampart Dam" is being fought "in the Halls of Congress." In the first place I know of no "battle" over Rampart Dam. The Corps of Engineers is now endeavoring to complete its feasibility study of the project, this having been unduly delayed by the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to supply a recommendation required by the corps before its report can be completed. This scientific and highly professional activity of the Corps of Engineers is no "battle." In any case, no "battle" is being fought in the Halls of Congress since no legislation dealing with Rampart is now before any committee of Congress at all.

Second, that the dam would cost about $1.3 billion in Federal money. This is entirely untrue. Every plan for construction of Rampart contemplates that every cent and more of the $1.3 billion invested for its construction would be repaid with interest to the U.S. Treasury. I am particularly dismayed that this erroneous statement is followed by the implication that this cost is why I support construction of the Rampart Dam.

This is such an outrageous distortion of my position that I intend to make every effort to see that fifth grade children are not misled about the importance of Rampart.

Third, there is no need for the vast amounts of electric power that it would produce. The Federal Power Commission has estimated, in its study of national power requirements completed in December 1964, that by 1980, less than 15 years from now, the needs of this Nation for electricity will increase 2½ times. Although Rampart Dam is now estimated to be the Nation's single largest source of power, with its 5-million-kilowatt capacity, this would supply less than 1 percent of the country's needs in 1980. By 1990 the growth in population accompanied by growth in needs for electricity will mean that every kilowatt of Rampart power will be needed even more urgently to supply requirements.

Fourth, atomic power will probably be available by the time the dam is ready. This is clearly not the case. The study of the Federal Power Commission to which I have referred finds that nuclear power cannot be produced at a rate as low as that of Rampart power before the end of this century. Further, very serious problems concerning the safety of generation of nuclear power and disposition of nuclear waste remain to be solved. In this connection, I would advise the conservationists who glibly propose substitution of nuclear power for Rampart power take note that the radioactive waste resulting from nuclear power production constitutes a truly serious problem with respect to conservation of natural resources. Thus, suggestions of nuclear power in lieu of Rampart power are quite unrealistic.

As I understand that a large number of Members of Congress have received communications from fifth-grade schoolchildren protesting Rampart Dam because of the article they read in a publication authorized by the schools and assigned for reading, it is my hope that those who endeavor to answer these letters will obtain the facts concerning Rampart in order to give our schoolchildren accurate information.

WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS' POWERFUL PLEA FOR SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Washington Daily News, in a recent editorial, has come out flatfootedly against the administration's proposal to kill the school milk program.

In as logical, as concise and as unanswerable an editorial as I have read in a long time, the News summarizes the arguments for continuation of the school milk program.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> INVESTMENT IN CHILDREN
>
> Every day, in 92,000 schools across America 16 million children exchange a few pennies for cartons of milk. The pennies are only part of the cost; the rest is paid by the Nation's taxpayers.
>
> All this has been going on pleasantly for a dozen years until it's as much a part of the school scene as homework. Now President Johnson proposes quite a change.
>
> He wants to cut the program 80 percent and to give what's left only to the needy. How this would happen, in the actuality of school lunch lines, is not explained.
>
> Nor is it explained what happens to the $80 million worth of milk the program represents. Industry sources say the Government would have to buy the milk anyway as a surplus commodity. Then it would be stored expensively, as butter, cheese or dry milk. If that is the case, no real saving is indicated.
>
> The school milk program has been a relatively small public health investment in children at all economic levels. As long as the Government is in the subsidy business and up to its ears in surplus commodities, it seems better to keep the kids drinking milk than to put it in storage.
>
> If all agriculture price props were removed, that might be a different story.

SCHOOL MILK CUTBACK GOES AGAINST THE GRAIN OF NEW SOCIETY'S PROGRAMS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am gratified to report that 37 of my Senate colleagues have already joined me in my efforts to maintain the special milk program for schoolchildren at its present level by joining me in sponsoring legislation to make the present program permanent.

It is not difficult to understand why the program is receiving such overwhelming support. It has proved itself over the years as a means of insuring proper nutrition for our Nation's youngsters. The administration's proposal to cut the program by 80 percent and utilize a means test in distributing milk under the program simply flies in the face of the facts.

Frankly, I have difficulty in understanding why an administration which has proposed and enacted such a vast amount of social legislation wishes to cripple the school milk program. The inconsistency of this proposal, when compared with the social legislation proposed by President Johnson and passed by Congress over the past 2 years, was brought home to me anew by two pieces of mail I received in my office recently.

The first was a pamphlet put out by the Office of Economic Opportunity describing the way in which a Headstart program should be run. The pamphlet stated under the heading, "Improving Nutrition":

> Midmorning and midafternoon snacks should be a part of the daily routine and should be planned to provide maximum nourishment.

Yet the Department of Agriculture has stated before the House Agriculture Committee that it is no longer appropriate to provide children "with additional milk service over and above that consumed with their complete lunch at reduced cost" unless these children pass a means test.

The second piece of mail was a letter I received from a young Wisconsin mother. This is what she wrote:

> As the mother of seven children I object strenuously to the proposed cutback to the milk subsidy program and aim it just for the needy. At present my children drink a combination of one-half powdered and one-half whole milk to the tune of 1½ gallons per day (95 cents per day) ($6.65 per week). The four school age children fill in the rest of their needs at school in the milk program.
>
> We are a self-supporting family—one step ahead of poverty—but we need this milk program in order to insure the proper milk supply for our children during the school year.

Mr. President, this family probably would not qualify under a means test for free school milk. If it could qualify, it probably would be too proud to do so. But, as the letter states, this family is "one step ahead of poverty." How can we reconcile the impact on this and literally millions of other families of a cutback in the school milk program with the importance of midmorning and midafternoon snacks as indicated in the Project Headstart pamphlet. I do not believe that we can. I hope the administration will take a second look at the 80-percent cutback proposal before they ask us to vote it up or down.

THE LEGAL POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, last January 25 an organization describing itself as the Lawyer's Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam wrote to the President decrying the actions of the United States in that country.

The letter, subsequently described in the press at great length, said the committee had reached the "regrettable but inescapable conclusion" that our actions "contravene the essential provisions of the United Nations Charter, to which we are bound by treaty; violate the Geneva accords, which we pledged to observe; are not sanctioned by the treaty creating the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization; and violate our own Constitution and the system of checks and balances which is at the heart of it."

On Monday, Mr. President, the house of delegates of the American Bar Association unanimously repudiated the position taken by the Lawyer's Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam—a position that has been echoed by several Members of the Congress.

This morning, the White House made available a letter from five of the country's most outstanding scholars of international law: Prof. Louis B. Sohn, of Harvard; Prof. Myres McDougal, of Yale; Prof. William Bishop, of Michigan; Prof. Neill Alford, of Virginia; and Prof. Richard Baxter, of Harvard.

These distinguished students of the law conclude by saying:

> The legal position of the United States in South Vietnam is clearly defensible. It would, in fact, seem the legal position most compatible with protecting the genuine self-determination of the people of South Vietnam.

Because this letter deals thoroughly—and, to my mind, conclusively—with the doubts raised by the Lawyer's Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam, I ask unanimous consent that it be included at this point in my remarks.

I express the hope that it will be widely reported by the press, at least as widely as was the Lawyer's Committee statement. I commend it to the attention of the Senate at a time when we are being asked to support those legal principles with the resources our soldiers need in Vietnam.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Charlottesville, Va.,
February 14, 1966.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear President Johnson: The law professors who sign this letter or whose names are appended to it are all currently teachers of international law or teachers maintaining an active professional interest in this subject. This letter is written to state our disagreement with the conclusion of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam contained in its letter to you of January 25, 1966. The lawyers committee concludes actions by the United States in Vietnam "contravene the essential provisions of the United Nations Charter * * * violate the Geneva accords * * * are not sanctioned by the treaty creating the Southeast Treaty Organization * * * (and violate) our own Constitution * * *." We comment upon the objection of the committee resting upon American constitutional grounds only to note that it turns upon a narrow construction of Presidential power in foreign and military affairs, with little support in constitutional history, and apparently abandoned in 1861 even by President Lincoln, to whom the committee twice refers, after his opposition as a Congressman in 1848 to the policies of President Polk in the war with Mexico.

Our principal concern is with the committee's erroneous analysis of the international legal position of the United States in its assistance to the Republic of South Vietnam. As many of us affirmed in our letter to you of November 20, 1965, initiated by Prof. E. Ernest Goldstein of the University of Texas Law School:

"The presence of U.S. forces in South Vietnam at the request of the Government of that country is lawful under general principles of international law and the United Nations Charter. The engagement of U.S. forces in hostilities at the request of the Government of South Vietnam is a legitimate use of force in defense of South Vietnam against aggression. We believe that the evidence indicates that the United States and South Vietnam are taking action that attacks neither the territorial integrity nor the political independence of the People's Republic of Vietnam—action that seeks only to terminate aggression originating in North Vietnam."

We reaffirm this statement. While we anticipate diverse views upon questions generated by a policy as important as that of the United States in South Vietnam, and welcome discussion of these issues, the letter of the lawyers committee contains such egregious errors that we consider necessary an immediate refutation of the most significant of these.

The lawyers committee develops an excessively narrow construction of article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. It misunderstands the difference between collective security arrangements under article 51 of the charter and regional arrangements under article 52. The committee totally disregards the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense, in the sense of states aiding each other against attack by the invitation of their established governments, well established in international custom and recognized expressly or tacitly in a long succession of security treaties and in the Charter of the United Nations.

These various errors which distort the perspective of the committee are accentuated by an apparent blindness toward the well-documented direct and indirect aggression by the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam which the United States seeks to repel.

We have not, as a group, read the 26-page memorandum, apparently endorsed by a number of our distinguished colleagues, and referred to by the committee as the basis for its letter. Our comments are based upon statements in the letter of the committee and in the article concerning the letter appearing at page 6 of the New York Times of February 5, 1966.

The committee's apparent contention that a collective self-defense agreement between a member of the United Nations and a nonmember is precluded by article 51 of the United Nations Charter has little basis. Indeed, the article refers to an inherent right which the charter does not purport to deny, and probably could not deny, a nonmember; this right having been affirmed in customary international law and recognized in a long succession of security treaties.

The history of the article is well known. The article was framed principally to accommodate the obligations of the American Republics assumed under the Act of Chapultepec. There is nothing in the charter which might impair significantly the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense.

The territorial integrity and political independence of South Vietnam has been threatened by North Vietnam. Action taken by U.S. forces has been proportional to aggression undertaken by North Vietnam and to attacks upon U.S. units. There have been no threats by the United States against the territorial integrity and political independence of North Vietnam: to the contrary—promises of economic assistance have been made if it ceases its aggression. The policy of the United States has been consistently to shift the conflict from a coercive to a diplomatic context, using United Nations facilities to the extent that these are available.

The United States can rely upon an inherent right of individual and collective self-defense apart from the charter and not superseded by it. It is also important to insist that the United States, like other states, has the competence, upon the invitation of a particular state being subjected to aggression, to act until the United Nations can deal effectively with the kinds of aggression characterizing conflicts of the type in South Vietnam.

There is no requirement in the United Nations Charter, in any other international agreement or in international custom that parties to a collective security pact have regional identity, historically or geographically. There is no apparent conflict between the U.S. action in South Vietnam and the SEATO (Manila) Treaty, the Saigon Government ("free territory under jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam") having requested assistance.

The contention by the lawyers committee that South Vietnam is not a state because described as a "temporary zone" in the Geneva accords of 1954 ignores the facts of 12 years during which South Vietnam has received widespread recognition. The signatories to the Geneva accords could have had no competence forever to preclude others from recognizing South Vietnam as a state. The widespread recognition of South Vietnam likewise disposes of the argument that there is only one Vietnam and thus that the strife is purely civil. The Geneva accords of 1954 have been violated by the Communists with such regularity and abandon and the conditions which the accords contemplated have changed so radically that many of their provisions, such as limitations upon troop reinforcements and supply imports, are now clearly obsolete.

Your signatories share the interest of the lawyers committee and of the American bar generally in attaining world peace through law. They also share the desire that diplomatic rather than military instruments be used to attain this end. But although all signatories do not intend to imply that they approve of every U.S. action or policy relating to Vietnam, they agree that the legal position of the United States in South Vietnam is clearly defensible. It would, in fact, seem the legal position most compatible with protecting the genuine self-determination of the peoples of South Vietnam.

Very sincerely,

Wm. W. Bishop, Jr.,
Professor of Law, University of Michigan Law School.
Richard R. Baxter,
Professor of Law, Harvard Law School.
Myres S. McDougal,
Professor of Law, Yale Law School.
Louis B. Sohn,
Bemis Professor of International Law, Harvard Law School.
Neill H. Alford, Jr.,
Professor of Law, University of Virginia.

UTAH SUFFERS FROM FEDERAL SCHOOL FUNDS CUTBACK

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Johnson administration has proposed to cut drastically the funds for federally impacted schools during the coming fiscal year. If this proposal is permitted by the Congress, Utah districts stand to lose more than $3 million in the next fiscal year.

This would result in a drastic slash in Federal aid to local school districts and may force these districts to curtail a wide variety of school services in Utah. School years may be shortened, salaries may be cut and operating programs curtailed.

The President has proposed the cut to help finance such programs as the war on poverty and others steeped in controversy, wild spending, and heavy in political patronage. Yet in an area where the Federal Government has a direct commitment—because, after all, it is responsible for creating a problem of a heavy influx of students that otherwise would not be there—the President has proposed a serious cut.

Some districts such as Davis, in Utah, would be cut more than a million dollars; this at a time when 5,000 new employees are being assigned to Hill Air Force Base located in Davis County. Mr. President, this cut would represent a loss of nearly half of its operating budget at a time when new federally connected students are being added.

It is important that Congress restore Public Law 874 funds to the present authorized level.

I ask unanimous consent that the proposed Budget Bureau cuts as compared to the Office of Education requests for fiscal year 1967 in Utah be listed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Utah districts	Before cut	After cut
Tooele County District	$614,335	$261,652
Davis County District	1,768,180	683,454
Granite School District	437,179	27,418
Murray City School District	34,615	0
Weber County School District	673,191	283,009
Board of Education of Ogden City	525,174	197,009
Box Elder County District	275,641	98,623
Logan City Board of Education	22,867	0
Grand County District	72,527	27,900
Kane County District	27,140	10,735
Duchesne County District	31,119	1,769
Emery County District	55,594	19,288
Daggett School District	18,016	7,962
Washington County District	43,823	7,845
Cache County District	71,096	12,445
Wayne School District	16,317	5,368
Garfield County District	37,995	10,499
Morgan County School District	36,379	15,100
Total, Utah	4,761,188	1,670,076

BURIAL OF SGT. MICHAEL LAWRENCE SHEA AT ARLINGTON CEMETERY, FEBRUARY 23, 1966

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, today a soldier of World War I realized an American soldier's dream of immortality—to find his final resting place in that bivouac of the brave—Arlington Cemetery.

Sgt. Michael Lawrence Shea, 109859, Company D, 102d Machinegun Battalion of the American Expeditionary Forces in France, a resident of Jamestown, R.I., had attained the age of 81 years.

But the year of 1918—the halfway mark of his life—brought the badge of courage he was always proud to wear.

If the stone that is to mark his resting place were spacious enough, Michael Shea's younger comrades of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars would have inscribed upon it every word of the recommendation he had earned those bloody days of October 24–27, 1918.

These younger men look beyond their own memories of Vietnam and Korea and the Pacific and European fronts of World War II to remember that heroism is the heritage of the American soldier in every decade.

This is the recommendation:

From: Commanding Officer, Company D, 102d Machinegun Battalion.

Subject: Recommendation, second lieutenant.

1. The following noncommissioned officer has displayed marked qualities of leadership, bravery, and devotion to duty. Recommendation is hereby made that he be appointed a second lieutenant.

2. Sgt. Michael L. Shea, 109859, Company D, 102d Machinegun Battalion, displayed marked qualities of leadership, aggressiveness, and devotion to duty during attack on enemy positions in the Bois d'Ormont, northeast of Ormont Farm, October 24–27, 1918. When the situation dictated the use of exposed positions in the face of intense artillery and machinegun fire, Sergeant Shea continued to visit his gun squads, keeping them intact, advised of situation, and inspiring confidence in them under the most trying circumstances by his personal example and performance of duty in the face of the greatest of danger. Continuous and effective sniping by Sergeant Shea's guns from positions established by him after personal observation of possible target resulted in losses for the enemy. Sergeant Shea displayed initiative and aggressiveness by making opportunities for his guns that resulted in enemy losses, one entire machinegun crew being killed in an attempt to get in behind our infantry and another enemy gun being completely silenced after its location had been ascertained. When an enemy shell landed near one of machinegun squads, killing or wounding the entire crew, Sergeant Shea, though himself painfully wounded, helped in every way possible to administer first aid and dress his men's wounds, refusing all attention until after his men had been provided for.

JOHN C. MARROLL,
First Lieutenant, Infantry, U.S. Army,
Commanding.

The treasured enlistment record of Sergeant Shea was a procession of perilous engagements: Chemin des Dames, February 11, 1918, to March 17, 1918; Toul Sectors, May 31, 1918, to June 6, 1918, and June 20, 1918; Chateau-Thierry, July 18, 1918; St. Mihiel, September 12, 1918; Meuse, September 24, 1918; Argonne, October 15, 1918; and Verdun, October 27, 1918.

These are names and places and dates for the history classes of our schools to record in terms of heroes—human heroes—who wrote those pages of history in patriotic service and sacrifice. These are sacrifices to be remembered when the freedoms of mankind are at stake—when new generations must recall the lives that made their liberties secure.

To the devoted wife who survives Sergeant Shea—Mrs. Bertha Dannin Shea—goes the sympathy and appreciation of an entire people. This was expressed in the honors of Arlington as the young soldier of today draped the flag of our country over the casket of the soldier of yesterday—who is our soldier forever.

So Sgt. Michael Lawrence Shea joins his Arlington comrades of many wars—old soldiers who will never die—as long as this land of our never forgets.

INVESTIGATION OF A.T. & T. BY THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure has followed with intense interest the investigation of A.T. & T. by the Federal Communications Commission. One reason for our interest is that this is probably the most important single administrative proceeding in a decade.

Second, and equally important, is the fact that the FCC has adopted a rather unusual procedural approach to the problem.

A very pertinent analysis of this approach was contained in an editorial in the Washington Evening Star of January 29, 1966.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 29, 1966]

AN ODD KIND OF COURT

A private citizen haled into court might properly feel some uneasiness if he found the prosecutor privately meeting with the judge to suggest how the trial might be run, even to ruling on objections and tinkering with the way evidence could be submitted.

Yet that is roughly the position in which the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. finds itself in the current rate proceedings before the Federal Communications Commission. True enough, a regulatory agency isn't a court, and the affair is being billed as an investigation, not a trial. But the whole business apparently is a close enough parallel to have brought a stinging objection from one of the FCC Commissioners, Lee Loevinger, to the way the agency plans to run the hearings.

What disturbs both Mr. Loevinger and A.T. & T. is the role of the Common Carrier Bureau, an arm of the FCC. The Bureau not only has the rights of an investigator and prosecutor but also participates in some Commission decisions.

As Mr. Loevinger put it, the FCC in effect "has authorized one of the adversary parties to this proceeding to rule upon objections filed by the other party, to suggest procedure to be followed, and to specify the issues and the order of consideration of evidence, all without notice or opportunity for comment from the other party."

Mr. Loevinger has described all this with such adjectives as unfair, inefficient, unreasonable, and impractical. And while he has drawn the fire of one colleague who doesn't think a rate hearing should be run precisely like a court trial, it seems to us the Commissioner has a point.

There can be no quarrel with the FCC's investigation of the telephone company's rates. The agency is well within its rights in ordering such a study. And although A.T. & T. stockholders have been displaying nervousness since the probe began, no damage to the company's reputation is likely to eventuate.

However, it is a matter of legitimate concern that the company should receive fairplay during the hearings to come. The way ground rules are set up now, the match looks pretty one sided.

WHITNEY YOUNG ON THE GREAT JOB OF AMERICAN NEGROES IN VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the course of civil rights legislation in the past 2 years has been so spectacular that many people have assumed that civil rights problems are now a thing of the past. This is especially true of an America in which Vietnam has yanked public attention away from almost every other subject and monopolized so much of public and government concern.

Yet, as we know, the civil rights problem is still as real and as deep as the prejudice which still blinds and sickens too many Americans.

One development which I have found has done much to overcome racism in recent months has been the remarkable performance by Negroes serving their country in combat in Vietnam.

The perceptive and able Whitney Young, whose syndicated column is carried throughout the country, recently wrote of the performance of Negro troops in South Vietnam. He showed eloquently that this patriotic demonstration is nothing new for Negroes. He concludes in a passage which all Americans should take to heart:

> But I suppose the point of all this is to stimulate us to accelerate the pace with which we close the gap between Negro citizens and other citizens in this country before those courageous veterans of Vietnam return to find that that for which they fought at great sacrifice thousands of miles from home is not yet a reality in their own communities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column written by Whitney Young be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WAR AND AFTERMATH

(By Whitney M. Young, Jr.)

Frederick Douglass said: "Once let the black man get up on his person the brass letters, U.S. Let him get an eagle on his button and a musket on his shoulder, and there is no power on earth which can deny that he has earned the right to citizenship in the United States."

I am reminded of this as I think of the role our Negro soldiers are playing in Vietnam—and this apart from the controversies concerning the war and America's involvement in it.

There are, unfortunately, many Americans who remain unconvinced by the obvious imperatives to move swiftly and immediately in the direction of equal opportunity.

For these I recommend a hard look at the record of our fighting personnel in Vietnam where, to all intents and purposes, race is irrelevant. At that distant outpost in southeast Asia, in spite of dangers and loneliness, the muck and mire of a war-torn land, Negro soldiers fight and die courageously as representatives of all America.

The Negro soldier is more integrated in this conflict than in any other, and more integrated in that setting than at any present-day American base.

In the job to which he has been assigned the Negro soldier has demonstrated skill, courage, and loyalty equal to that exhibited by all others. It would seem that if there were any individual looking for reasons to evade this service, and who had any arguments for resisting participation, that individual would be a Negro. But he has not done so, and for this reason—as well as for many others—every American who, in one way or another, has blocked fair and equal treatment for the Negro citizens here at home should engage in some soul searching and an analysis of his own attitudes and motivations.

In spite of brutal discrimination, humiliation, segregation—and even slavery—the Negro has readily responded to the call of the colors and has given his all for his country in time of war, even when that country has given little indication that it considers him a first-class citizen.

The records go far back into the American Revolution—where Crispus Attucks was the first American to give his life in the Boston massacre—the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and every other war that the Nation has fought. In a large percentage of cases he volunteered his services, and there were even instances where he actually had to fight for the right to fight. Often his skills were underutilized, and various branches of the Armed Forces either would not give him opportunity to apply those skills or by official policy assigned him to only menial tasks.

Today this has changed substantially. But not nearly as fast as it should; or as fast here, on the home bases, as in Vietnam. It is still a rather tragic commentary on American society that some Negro enlistees feel that a greater economic security, educational opportunity, and dignity can be achieved in the Armed Forces than in the private sector of our lives.

But I suppose the point of all this is to stimulate us to accelerate the pace with which we close the gap between Negro citizens and other citizens in this country before these courageous veterans of Vietnam return to find that that for which they fought at great sacrifice thousands of miles from home is not yet a reality in their own communities.

FOSTER GRANDPARENTS PROGRAM

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I would like to say a few words about a project being conducted in New Hampshire as a part of the war against poverty, a project which I think deserves a a real pat on the back.

I refer to the foster grandparents program being conducted under the auspices of the New Hampshire Social Welfare Council. This project, which is part of a national antipovery demonstration program, has enlisted about 25 elderly persons with low incomes to serve as foster grandparents to the extremely unfortunate young children at the Laconia State School and, just recently, at St. Peter's Orphanage in Manchester. Eventually there will be as many as 38 elderly participants at these and perhaps other institutions. The foster grandparents earn $1.25 an hour for up to 20 hours of service per week to supplement extremely meager resources—one of them had previously subsisted on $40 a month.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that this project is accomplishing much that is worthwhile—both for the pathetic little children and the poor and lonely elderly participants. The children involved, all of whom are under 5 years of age, are terribly disadvantaged: Many are mentally retarded or extremely palsied; some are blind or deaf or both; some are tragically disfigured—and all are alone in the world. Most have never known real love and affection. At the Laconia State School, before this program began, each nurse had charge of 19 youngsters, all of whom are incontinent and unable to feed themselves. The sheer physical task of feeding and cleaning the children and cleaning the wards meant that many of the children simply lay on their beds all day long, except when being fed or cleaned, staring at the walls of their wards with blank eyes.

Now these children are given personal, loving care by their foster grandparents. Little personalities are being developed. The children's facial expressions are changing—smiles are replacing looks of fear—and previously unused limbs are being tested. In some cases, real progress is being made.

The previously lonely and largely destitute foster grandparents have found new purpose in life, as well as a new source of income. So great is their enthusiasm for their work that on the day following a recent snowstorm, when all State offices were closed and local business paralyzed, only 4 of 21 foster grandparents failed to report for their regular tours of duty at the Laconia State School.

The feelings of the elderly participants can be summed up in the words of one foster grandmother, who says:

> We were lonely, and beginning to feel on the shelf, so to speak, and not really needed. These children have presented a challenge, and each day we look forward to going back. We're old and lame and stiff in the morning but by afternoon we've forgotten our ills and we feel a newness of life. To some of us who have been dependent on our own children to help in a financial way, this project has proved to be a blessing. We are grateful for this opportunity and wouldn't miss it for the world.

Mr. President, this program strikes me as being an eminently worthwhile part of the war against poverty, and a real godsend to the little children and elderly persons who are participating. I want to take this opportunity, therefore, to highly commend the project and its director, Mr. Vallance A. Wickens, and his fine staff, which includes Mrs. Pierrette Guay and Mrs. Pauline Sherman.

VIETNAM

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star in Tucson, Mr. William R. Mathews, has traveled extensively throughout the Far East and has recently visited Vietnam. He is an experienced and perceptive observer of foreign affairs whose editorials have won him a distinguished reputation.

On February 15, Mr. Mathews published an editorial about our Nation's policies in Vietnam which I believe is most timely and well reasoned. I commend it to every Member of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Tucson (Ariz.) Daily Star, Feb. 15, 1966]

WHEN PEACE ATTEMPTS FAIL, WAR FOLLOWS

Amid all of the public debate that is now going on throughout the country, there is one outstanding fact. Not a single thing new has been proposed. Practically all of the suggestions that critics have made have been tried over and over again by President Johnson. In every case, despite the President's urgent pleading, failure has resulted.

Let us go down the list.

The most recent suggestion is the one made by Gen. James Gavin to establish enclaves in and around the principal cities of South Vietnam. As the President has said correctly, that is going on right now, and has been going on. Every military operation has been based on some important South Vietnam city. The big trouble in Vietnam is that on account of lack of troops and overly cautious leadership the current military operations amount to little more than reconnaissance forays into the countryside.

The same might be said of George Kennan's testimony before the Fulbright committee. He wails about the danger of bombing industrial targets. It might bring China into the war. He failed to mention that Peiping shouted warnings about bombing before we began the bombing that is now going on daily. He conspicuously laments, as almost everybody in our entire Nation does, that the war is going badly. He offers not one feasible suggestion of a constructive character.

No wonder the President said that we were already doing what these noted experts said. He could have gone much further by recounting again and again how he has already acted on the suggestions of other critics. He has gone repeatedly to the United Nations, and was urged by its Secretary General to cease bombing.

He stopped the bombing for 37 days, because he was told that if he did, it then would be possible to get negotiations started. He has used every influence he could find to try to persuade Hanoi to come to a conference table. He has made it plain, through his lack of vigor in prosecuting the war, and particularly in withholding the bombing of the industrial complexes in and around Hanoi and Haiphong, that he wants to get American troops out of South Vietnam.

Now the suggestion is made we should negotiate with the Vietcong. There has been no response from Hanoi, yet critics continue to blame the President. They seem to think he has some kind of magic that he refuses to use, and that Vietcong leaders in Hanoi are reasonable people.

Suggestions are made that we should begin our political and economic work in the villages. Too little publicity, except in the Arizona Daily Star, has been given to the rapidly growing program that has been underway for months, if not years, of village help. The United States is furnishing raw materials and technical aid, advice, and supervision. Enormous progress has been made reclaiming villages from the Vietcong. The educational program not only has involved building new schoolhouses and training teachers, but also the printing of more than 2 million textbooks.

If the President is to be criticized, he should be criticized for making war too cautiously. He has listened too much to his critics, as continued offers to negotiate and make peace show. The result is that Hanoi, Moscow, and Peiping see him as a weakling. They reject scornfully his proposals, because they see chances of a complete victory over a nation that fights a war as if it were a paper tiger.

When an enemy rejects all offers to negotiate or meet, there is only one thing left to do, and that is to take the offensive on the land, the sea, and the air, and hurt the enemy so badly that he will plead to make peace.

THE MEAT AND POULTRY PRODUCTS INSPECTION LAWS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I oppose any amendment to the meat and poultry products inspection laws which would shift the cost of inspection from public funds to the processor. These proposals are inconsistent with the philosophy of the inspection laws and would adversely affect the health and welfare of the American consumer as well as Maryland's important poultry industry and meatpacking industries.

The purpose of Federal inspection is to protect the public safety by insuring that only healthy animals which have been processed under sanitary conditions move in interstate commerce. Like our pure food and drug laws, the meat and poultry inspection acts are for the benefit of the general public. To shift the cost of inspection to the producer might encourage some smaller producers to cease interstate shipments to avoid Federal inspection costs and thereby jeopardize the health of purchasers in those States. This occurred in 1947, when meat inspection costs were shifted to packers, and 51 companies dropped Federal meat inspection. As a result of public outcry, the meat inspection costs were returned to the Federal Government 1 year later.

Shifting the cost of inspection to meat and poultry processors would merely take this expense out of the Federal budget and shift it to consumers in the form of higher prices for meat and poultry. Such a price rise would force low-income families to eat more meatless meals. In effect, the cost of inspection would be partially borne by those families who can least afford it rather than by the entire taxpaying public.

Finally, any reduction in meat and poultry consumption would have a severe adverse impact upon Maryland producers and packers. Poultry production is a highly competitive industry which is located in a part of our State that sorely lacks adequate employment opportunities. To shift inspection costs to the poultry industry could seriously disturb the economy of our Eastern Shore and put productive people out of work.

PROGRESS IN BUILDING CODES

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the February issue of American County Government, the magazine of the National Association of Counties, carries an excellent editorial by Mr. Bernard F. Hillenbrand, the executive director of the association and the editor of the magazine. The editorial is entitled "Progress in Building Codes—at Last." The editorial commends the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations for its recent adoption of a comprehensive report dealing with the modernization of building codes and the need for increased attention to the problem by all three levels of government. In the report the Commission submits a number of recommendations for the consideration of the Congress and of State legislatures.

I commend Mr. Hillenbrand and his organization for their interest in working toward solutions of the many problems in this difficult field. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS IN BUILDING CODES—AT LAST

(By Bernard F. Hillenbrand)

Congratulations to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) for its brandnew (January 13, 1966) report recommending a presidentially appointed building code drafting group to develop a single model performance building code to be made available for optional adoption by States and localities.

This is an enromously important first step to return some sort of order to the continuing building code mess. It is estimated that there are 5,000 separate building codes in the United States. A great many communities have no codes at all. Most of the existing codes are specification codes. Many argue that these have restricted the free use of new and unproved products because many specification codes favor one product over another and thereby restrict competition.

At present there are four major private proprietary codes sold to local subscribers. Manufacturers have pointed out that the variations between these codes and the restrictions added by their subscribers have made it difficult to apply fully mass manufacturing techniques to the factory production and national sale of houses and building components. Such a mass process is comparable to those which have given us the relatively inexpensive automobile and electrical appliance. One authoritative magazine has estimated that the code jungle may add $1,000 to the cost of a new house.

At the ACIR hearing it was reported that three of the four proprietary code groups hoped to have a first draft of a uniform model code finished "by summer." This would be wonderful news (1) if all four proprietary code groups were joining in the effort; (2) if the model were a performance code instead of a specification one; and (3) if this effort resulted in a real follow-through and is not a delaying tactic to thwart a national model performance code.

This effort to consolidate is a step that is decades overdue and, if properly developed, could make a major contribution to American building.

The ACIR report recommends that all levels of government and the proprietary code groups participate in the drafting of a model performance code. It recommends that the drafting be done by a separate group or as part of the program of the Temporary National Commission on Codes, Zoning and Taxation, and Development Standards recommended by the President in his 1965 message on urban areas.

The ACIR report completely rejects the idea that the Federal Government develop a national building code and enforce it on the States and localities through the grant-in-aid device. It was the unanimous opinion of the Commission that the individual States should be the agencies to determine what code or codes will be adopted at the State and local level.

In addition to the recommendations for a group to develop a model performance code, the Commission also recommends:

1. That Federal agencies be instructed to develop and use a common set of standards in Federal construction.

2. That Federal and State research on building codes, specifications testing, and enforcement and procedures be expanded.

3. That each State prepare and promulgate a comprehensive model building code for permissive adoption by local political subdivisions and establish a State building construction review agency.

4. That each State establish professional qualifications for building inspectors, license candidates, and establish State training programs.

There are many sincere people who feel that a uniform model code would somehow be a violation of States rights and local home rule. The plain fact is, however, that we already have single uniform model codes in such areas as electrical equipment, plumbing, and refrigeration. There really is no evidence that these single uniform model codes have in any way undermined State and local government prerogatives.

New York State has already demonstrated the value of the recommendations of the ACIR. Its 1951 performance code has been adopted by two-thirds of the codable communities in that State and is working well.

Every county interested in codes should read the ACIR report. NACO will be happy to provide a copy free of charge as soon as they are available from the printer.

This may very well be the single most valuable as well as the most controversial report produced to date by the Commission.

NEW FRONT

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, to fight ideas one must use other ideas, and this is the other front on which we are fighting in Vietnam.

> Only guns can hold back guns—

The Atlanta Constitution has pointed out, adding—

> What happens behind the U.S. military shield is equally important in this new kind of warfare.

The newspaper found hope in the administration's new emphasis on an economic and social offensive, commenting that—

> The presence of the U.S. Secretaries of Agriculture and Health, Education, and Welfare at the President's Hawaiian conference is as important as the presence of the generals.

The newspaper states:

> The long, hard climb toward responsive government free of externally imposed domination must be accelerated if the defense of South Vietnam is to mean anything.

In the belief that this editorial from which I have quoted will shed light on a matter of great national and international concern I am asking permission of my colleagues to have it inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Feb. 8, 1966]

THE WAR WIDENS

The emphasis at Honolulu on an economic and social offensive in South Vietnam is encouraging.

Only guns can hold back guns, of course. So long as the Communists reject peace and persist in attempts to take South Vietnam by force, they must be held back.

What happens behind the U.S. military shield is equally important in this new kind of warfare, however.

And the presence of the U.S. Secretaries of Agriculture and Health, Education, and Welfare at the President's Hawaiian conference is as important as the presence of the generals.

United States aid efforts in South Vietnam have already introduced health, education, and agriculture innovations on a revolutionary scale.

But the mere doubling of the rice crop, the construction of 12,000 hospitals and clinics, the creation of 5,000 classrooms, the supply of millions of textbooks and vaccinations—all of this has been insufficient, for in Saigon there has been no political coordination.

It is said that the new plans for social and economic offensives originate now in Saigon, however, and that is a hopeful sign. Still, the President would serve this country and the South Vietnamese people well if he would lay down some firm guidelines to the Saigon government in these current conversations so as to assure that they will take advice as well as aid dollars in the future. Administrative skills are short in that embattled country. U.S. administrators could conceivably guide the Saigon government in making itself effective without intruding into its internal prerogatives; certainly effectiveness has been lacking in the past despite the herculean U.S. efforts to aid the people.

No sudden miracle, no full-blown U.S.-style democracy, can possibly spring out of the shellbursts and the poverty of South Vietnam. But the long, hard climb toward responsive government free of externally imposed domination must be accelerated if the defense of South Vietnam is to mean anything. We're glad the President is emphasizing it at Hawaii.

And we can understand the warmth of his rebuke to those critics who, at times, do not seem to comprehend what he is trying to do, much less credit it. It is not an entirely dishonorable undertaking for this Nation to defend, with its own lives, and raise up, with its own wealth, an impoverished and embattled people from whom it wants nothing—and a people who, without such help, would be conquered by aggression and governed by force. It would be a more self-indulgent course for this rich Nation to look the other way and shun responsibility to help the South Vietnamese on grounds they are outside the sphere of our selfish interest, which they are. But it would hardly be a more honorable course.

THE CLEANUP OF THE SOUTH END OF LAKE MICHIGAN

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, one of the most penetrating and well-written newspaper articles to appear on the newly created U.S. Water Pollution Administration's first case—the cleanup of the south end of Lake Michigan—was Richard Lewis' article in the Chicago Daily News of February 3, 1966.

I would like to have Mr. Lewis' article appear at this point in the RECORD as an indication of the fine work undertaken by this commission.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Feb. 3, 1966]

CLEANUP OF LAKE SET

(By Richard Lewis)

The newly created U.S. Water Pollution Control Administration has scored a signal victory in its first case—the cleanup of the south end of Lake Michigan.

Under terms of an agreement with the biggest complex of steel, petroleum, and chemical plants in the world, the health agency said polluted lake areas should improve markedly by next summer.

Clustered mainly in the South Chicago and Indiana-Calumet areas, the industries agreed to meet new water-quality standards by purifying waste discharges by December 1968. This means some of them will spend millions of dollars on water purification equipment. Some already have.

The agreement was announced at a press conference at the Bismarck Hotel Wednesday by Murray Stein, Chief Enforcement Officer of the WPCA.

He characterized it as "a remarkable breakthrough" in water-pollution abatement.

Unable to predict how long it would take to fully restore the lake waters, Stein left no doubt about the WPCA's goal:

"What we hope for ultimately is that these measures will return the lake to the condition it was in when the Indians were here—and with the same biota (fish and plants)."

The Enforcement Chief referred to changes in plantlife of the lake produced by the dumping of phosphates and other chemical wastes. These changes have affected the fish population.

Experts surveying Lake Michigan have predicted that it may take a century for the south end of the lake to recover the purity and plant and animal life it had in premetropolitan times.

Stein and Regional WPCA Director H. W. Poston said these three achievements have been made possible by the antipollution agreement:

1. "We have a program that will save the lower end of Lake Michigan and preserve quality for present and future use."

2. The restoration of the lake "will be accomplished in a few years." It's not "one of those programs that await the millenium."

3. "The program is such that it can be lived with by State, municipal and industrial parties involved."

The last point indicated the technique the Federal agency employed to persuade industry and local government to spend money on pollution abatement engineering.

Concealed by the agency's kid-glove manner was the mailed fist of a tough antipollution law, passed by Congress last year. The law empowers the new agency—which the new law created equal to the U.S. Public Health Service—to take recalcitrant polluters into a U.S. district court, where they could be fined.

Stein and his chief deputy, Peter Kuh, a former Chicago Sanitary District attorney, opened the Federal drive to clean up the lake last spring.

The agency called an antipollution conference of all industries and governmental units concerned with the lower end of the lake. The result of the weeklong session was the appointment of a panel of experts to draw up "realistic" water quality standards for the lake and streams that feed it.

ASKS COMPLIANCE

These standards were unveiled at a resumption of the conference early in January. At that time, Stein asked industry when it would be able to comply.

Although industry spokesmen agreed in principle with the standards, they were not ready to tell the agency when they would be able to meet them.

Stein recessed the conference until last Monday. After 2 days of executive sessions, a time agreement was reached—the end of 1968. By that time, all industries and government units will absolutely control waste discharges to meet the new criteria it was agreed.

POLICING OUTLINED

Policing of the agreement is to be done by the regional office of the agency and State agencies. The Federal Government retains supervision of scientific methods to determine compliance.

As a concession to industrial conferees, the Federal agency agreed that the water quality criteria would be subject to adjustment when justified by investigations or laboratory findings.

Kuh said this provision was designed to deal with unusual situations that are likely to become temporarily troublesome. Some variation from the time schedule may be granted to a few industries by State and local antipollution agencies, with the concurrence of the Federal agency.

DEADLINE ON WORKS

Preliminary engineering plans for waste control must be filed with the agency by the end of this year. Final engineering plans are due in June 1967.

All antipollution engineering works necessary to meet water quality standards must be completed by December 1968.

Bacteria counts and chemical pollutant criteria adopted last month for open water (the lake) equal or are higher than those recommended by the U.S. Public Health Service.

THE 50-STAR FLAG AND THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, all of whom have in their States that proud repository of the Nation's mail, the post office, that there is apparently a breakdown in communication to certain of these edifices regarding news of the admission of Alaska and Hawaii to our Republic.

The Sheridan College Young Republicans of Sheridan, Wyo., called attention recently to the surprising fact that flying over the U.S. post office at Sheridan was a flag bearing, not 50, but 48 stars. The Young Republicans memorialized my State's congressional delegation and soon after the 48-star flag was hastily withdrawn and replaced with the current national standard.

Mr. President, I speak on this matter, not for the purpose of embarrassing the officials of this local post office or the Postmaster General, whom I have notified of this situation by letter, but to alert my able colleagues to the recognition gap that may very well be prevailing in post offices within their States. I have asked Postmaster General O'Brien to take steps to see that in the days of the Great Society the only lawfully recognized U.S. flag be flown over each of this Nation's post offices.

I would suggest that if the moneys cannot be readily found to purchase 50-star flags, perhaps some funds from the so-called post office beautification program can be diverted to this good purpose. In this Senator's opinion, the flag of the United States is a beautiful sight over any building, particularly a Federal building.

I ask unanimous consent Mr. President, that the petition of the Sheridan College Young Republicans and my letter to the Postmaster General be printed in the Record with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and petition were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Interior and
Insular Affairs,
February 21, 1966.

Hon. Lawrence F. O'Brien,
The Postmaster General,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Postmaster General: I should like to call your attention to a rather surprising omission which was found recently at the post office in Sheridan, Wyo.—or, more properly, above the postoffice.

It has been years since our Union was enlarged to include the States of Alaska and Hawaii. We are a Nation now with 50 proud and coequal States. It thus seems strange that in 1966 a 48-star banner would be found flying over the post office in my State or any State.

The matter was brought to my attention by the Sheridan College Young Republicans who, in a memorial sent to Wyoming's congressional delegation, said, in part, "The 48-star flag is still being flown at the Sheridan County Post Office, city of Sheridan, County of Sheridan, State of Wyoming."

Following publication of the memorial, the flag was replaced by the postmaster at Sheridan.

I bring this matter to your attention with the hope that you will take appropriate steps to see that all postal installations, however humble they might be, are provisioned with the correct national standard, for no Great Society can fail to acknowledge 2 of the 50 States which it governs.

I am enclosing for your perusal a copy of the aforementioned memorial.

Sincerely yours,

Milward L. Simpson,
U.S. Senator.

Memorial to the Congress of the United States With Reference To Replacing the National Flag That Is Being Flown Over the Post Office in the City of Sheridan, Wyo.

Whereas the national flag represents the living country and is considered to be a living thing emblematic of the respect and pride we have for our Nation; and

Whereas the national flag represents the highest ideals of individual liberty, justice, and equal opportunity for all; and

Whereas there are men who are dieing today protecting this Nation's commitments; and

Whereas the national flag was created by resolution of the Continental Congress in Philadelphia on June 14, 1777; and

Whereas on April 4, 1818, Congress restored the design to the original 13 stripes and provided that a star should be added to the blue field for each new State; and

Whereas the States of Alaska and Hawaii have joined the Union since the 48-star national flag was officially flown; and

Whereas the 48-star flag is still being flown at the Sheridan County Post Office, city of Sheridan, county of Sheridan, State of Wyoming: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Sheridan College Young Republicans, That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to replace the national flag at the Sheridan County Post Office; be it further

Resolved, That the present national flag flown at the Sheridan County Post Office be destroyed according to flag etiquette by private burning; be it further

Resolved, That a copy hereof be promptly transmitted to U.S. Senator G. W. McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Representative in Congress Teno Roncalio.

For the SCYR:

Virginia Wells,
Secretary-Treasurer,
Sheridan College Young Republicans.
January 25, 1966.

THE MINTING OF HALF DOLLARS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on February 15, I brought to the attention of the very efficient Director of the Mint, Hon. Eva Adams, a news item from the February 12 issue of U.S. News & World Report that "half dollars are scarce—virtually nonexistent—in all cities." In view of the fact that the mint had distributed enough silver half dollars bearing the likeness of the late President Kennedy to provide three for every man, woman, and child in the United States and, yet, practically all of them had gone into the hands of either collectors or hoarders, I asked the Director of the Mint to let me know what the silver in the previous 50-cent piece is worth and what the silver in the 50-cent coins to be minted pursuant to the coinage bill that I sponsored last year is worth.

The Director of the Mint replied that the silver in the 50-cent coins of 90-percent fineness have a value of about 46.8 cents, but that the silver of the new half-dollars of 40-percent fineness would have a value of about 19.1 cents. I was further advised that the mint has plans to really flood the country with the new coins; and if the hoarding continues, I shall urge the mint to continue to step up production because the Government can make a profit of nearly 30 cents on each one of those coins bought and retired from circulation.

Of course, anybody can put any sentimental value he pleases upon a coin that bears a good likeness of former President Kennedy, but speculators who bought those coins with a view to melting them into bar silver now face a substantial loss, and those who find out the actual worth of the new 50-cent pieces will be more inclined to use them as currency than as an investment in silver.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the letter from Hon. Eva Adams to me on this subject may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C., February 21, 1966.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Robertson: Thank you for your letter of February 15, 1966, concerning the 50-cent coins bearing the image of the late President Kennedy.

You ask what the silver in a half dollar is now worth at the current silver prices. For your information, the current market price of silver, the Handy and Harman quotation, continues at $1.293 per troy ounce. This price has been unchanged since early September 1963. The value of silver in the half dollar minted under legislation previous to passage of the Coinage Act of 1965, and for the composition authorized under the 1965 Act is compared as follows: (1) The half dollar of 90 percent fineness contains approximately 0.36+ fine ounce of silver; this quantity of silver at the current price would have a value of about 46.8 cents; (2) the new clad half dollar authorized by the Coinage Act of 1965, with an overall fineness of 40 percent, contains approximately 0.14+ fine ounce of silver; this quantity of silver at the current price would have a value of about 19.1 cents. Thus the new coin would have about 27.7 cents less silver in it than the one of higher fineness.

The new half dollar is now being coined in quantity at the Denver Mint, and a large stock will be accumulated prior to release for circulation in the early spring. As you know, this coin, which bears the date 1965, otherwise closely resembles the first Kennedy design half dollar. In fact, except for the date change, the two types cannot be told apart by visual inspection. Because of this similarity in appearance, plus the fact that the mint will continue to make and issue them in great volume, leads us to believe that the general public will cease to regard the Kennedy design coins chiefly as mementos.

We realize that some time is usually necessary for the public to become acquainted with new coins. However, since the half-dollars of lower fineness are substantially the same in appearance as the present ones they should be well received. And, with the general understanding that volume production will continue for many years in the future, the public should soon begin to use half dollars for the purpose for which they are intended, as a circulating medium of exchange. We are also hopeful that in due time, the former halves of higher silver content will come out of hiding and assist us in bringing to an end the current shortage of this denomination.

I trust that this will provide the information you wish, Senator Robertson. We appreciate so much your interest and concern in the matter. If you have further questions, please do not hesitate to get in touch with us.

Sincerely,

Eva Adams,
Director of the Mint.

PROPOSED RECOGNITION OF THE VIETCONG

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, there has been much talk in recent days, in this body and out of it, about recognizing the Vietcong and offering it participation in the Government of South Vietnam. But this is not what the North Vietnamese, the masters of the National Liberation Front in the South, are after. They insist, as the Washington Post points out in its lead editorial today, on recognition of the NLF as the sole representative of the people of South Vietnam. And this, as the Post says, is tantamount to insisting upon unconditional surrender by the United States and the South Vietnamese.

> It is a surrender that would abandon American commitments now and imperil American ability, in the future, to continue any effective resistance to Communist aggression on the Asian mainland—

The Post continued. Its point was emphasized by a second offering, written from Bangkok by Joseph Alsop. This column clearly points up the present danger to Thailand, the next target in the Communist drive to capture all of southeast Asia. Preparations for the attempted takeover, Alsop writes, are "undoubted, well established facts." And, he adds:

> There can be no doubt that the shock of an American retreat and surrender in Vietnam would open the door wide for this attempted Communist takeover.

I ask unanimous consent that both the lead editorial from today's Washington Post and Mr. Alsop's column be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speaking of Surrender

It is being widely argued by those who oppose the Government's policies in South Vietnam that we are making the surrender of North Vietnam a condition to negotiations. What the United States is asking of North Vietnam is the cessation of the aggression against South Vietnam—and that does not require any loss of territory, surrender of forces, or impairment of sovereignty.

When North Vietnam insists that the United States recognize the National Liberation Front as the sole representative of the people of South Vietnam, however, it itself is asking for a surrender—an unconditional surrender by the United States and the South Vietnamese. On January 24, Ho Chi Minh sent to 14 Communist countries and other interested parties, the letter explicitly making this condition. He said:

"If the United States really wants peace, it must recognize the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam [the political arm of the Vietcong] as the sole genuine representative of the people of South Vietnam and engage in negotiations with it."

It is remarkable that this language has not been recognized by everyone as the equivalent of a surrender ultimatum. The NLF, from the beginning, has been only an arm of North Vietnam. As an Australian Government study pointed out last summer: "The National Liberation Front for the liberation of South Vietnam was established as the instrumentality of the Communist Party of Vietnam, the Lao Dong Party, itself the governing party of North Vietnam." New Zealand's white paper on Vietnam pointed out: "The Vietcong military and political apparatus in South Vietnam is an extension of an elaborate military and political structure in North Vietnam." It concludes that "North Vietnam has committed aggression against the Republic of Vietnam under the guise of a 'war of national liberation'."

It cannot be denied that the NLF, directed from Hanoi, has been able to get numbers of South Vietnamese to join the Vietcong. But it is an organization conceived in Hanoi, as an arm of the North Vietnamese Communist Party, and as an instrument of the North Vietnam state. Were the United States to agree to recognize the NLF as the "sole" representative of South Vietnam, it would be tantamount to recognizing the Government of North Vietnam as the "sole" representative of South Vietnam. That, obviously, would be a total surrender.

One could look at such a capitulation in two ways. Those who say we have no stake in Asia and should never have intervened in South Vietnam, still would have to acknowledge that we did intervene and that we made clear commitments of our power by congressional enactment, by treaty and by the declaration of authorized officials. Capitulation of this kind would betray those commitments.

Those who admit we have a stake in Asia and an interest in containing communism there would have to acknowledge the infinite calamity of (in practical effect) surrendering in the field a force of 700,000 men willing to fight on our side in the continuing struggle against aggression in Asia. And that would be but the beginning of our losses. Many others now willing to fight with us, in the face of our withdrawal in South Vietnam, surely would make their accommodation with the forces of aggression on the Asian mainland.

The administration has been reproached for not mobilizing in Asia the sort of an international concert of powers we formed to contain Communist aggression in Europe. We ought to have more allies and more contributions from the allies we have. But we may be sure that whatever international help we now have, we would have less help and fewer allies from now on, in containing Communist aggression in Asia, if we withdrew from South Vietnam under conditions amounting to a surrender.

The power that is demanding a "surrender" in South Vietnam is North Vietnam, when it asks that we recognize the NLF as the "sole" representative of the South Vietnamese people. It is a surrender that would abandon American commitments now and imperil American ability, in the future, to continue any effective resistance to Communist aggression on the Asian mainland.

Matter of Fact: On a Theme From Kennan

(By Joseph Alsop)

Bangkok.—Nearly 16 years ago, George F. Kennan, working at fever heat, dashed off the first draft of a famous policy paper. On the basis of the arguments therein set forth, President Truman made his magnificently courageous Korean decision, and a long chain reaction of Asian disasters was thus averted, albeit at heavy cost.

If one can trust the transmitted versions of Kennan's recent Senate testimony, he has by now forgotten just about all the arguments he assembled for presentation at the Korea meetings at Blair House. But with regard to this country, he is at least quoted as admitting that an American retreat and surrender in Vietnam would have an "unfortunate" effect.

"Unfortunate" is a pretty mild word for the reality. The Chinese Communist Foreign Minister, Chen Yi, has quite openly described Thailand as "next" on the agenda after Vietnam to at least one Western visitor in Peiping. And the preparations for an assault on Thailand's independence are quite plain for anyone to see.

In order to grasp the nature of these preparations, it is first of all necessary to grasp the basic facts of Thailand's geography. Briefly, the mountainous northeastern part of the country and the southern provinces on the Malay Peninsula are both fairly inaccessible from the center, and both regions have non-Thai populations.

The northeast, with its Lao and Vietnamese inhabitants, and the extreme south, with its Malays, have therefore been selected as the prime targets by the Communist planners in Peiping and Hanoi. In the southern provinces, a base was provided by the Communist guerrillas who fled into the Thai jungles after the failure of the assault on Malaya. In the northeast, the Vietnamese who fled to Thailand during the French war also offered useful human raw material.

A good deal has already been published about this Communist effort in Thailand. But its coldly calculated character has never been well conveyed. In the southern provinces, for instance, secret jungle camps were organized, where recruits from the villages were intensively trained by the refugees from the Malayan war.

Many scores of recruits from the northeastern provinces were also conveyed in secret into the parts of Laos controlled by the North Vietnamese Army (from which solemn treaty obligations of course required the North Vietnamese troops to be totally withdrawn 4 years ago). A hundred or so of the most important agents were even taken by sea to Hong Kong, and thence into China, for advanced training.

In this manner, quite serious though still limited guerrilla movements have by now been organized in both the target areas. The ruthless terrorism that is such a characteristic feature of "liberation" movements, has begun on a considerable scale. In short, the pattern is clear, down to the last detail.

As of now, it is not an especially alarming pattern, since the Thai Government has organized energetic countermeasures. But let the United States take the advice of George Kennan and his friends. Let the Vietnamese war end in a retreat and a surrender. Then anyone with the smallest knowledge of Asian affairs can foresee that the effect in Thailand will be quite dramatically "unfortunate."

To be sure, Senator Fulbright's antiadministration witnesses do not seem to have included many persons with any knowledge whatever of Asia. If one may judge from this distance, a good specimen witness was Prof. Hans Morgenthau, whose errors of basic historical fact, concerning southeast Asia have been so crude and glaring that his pose as an expert is in the nature of a comic turn.

Yet the double standard that now prevails is still a bit bewildering. Think, for instance, of the outcry that would be heard from people of Morgenthau's stamp, if the CIA were discovered to be attempting in North Korea, or even in North Vietnam, anything comparable to what the Chinese and North Vietnamese Communists are quite openly attempting here in Thailand.

Even more bewildering, one must add, is the total carelessness of consequences and the flat refusal to face unpleasant facts. For these preparations for an attempted takeover in Thailand, please remember, are undoubted, well-established facts. And there can be no doubt that the shock of an American retreat and surrender in Vietnam would open the door wide for this attempted Communist takeover.

NATIONAL SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL WEEK

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is a privilege for me to join our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Senator Ribicoff, in cosponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 130 to provide for the designation of the week of May 8 to May 14, 1966, as National School Safety Patrol Week.

School safety-patrol programs have long played an important—indeed essential—role in inculcating the importance of "stop, look, and listen" to young Americans. As Senator Ribicoff rightly pointed out in his introductory remarks, the programs have been very successful. Since they began, the traffic death rate of schoolchildren has dropped by nearly one-half.

Any recognition and encouragement which we can give to school safety patrols is not only well earned by these groups but also will serve to strengthen the program. The members of these groups and their classmates whom they protect and influence will be all too shortly wearing out the rubber on their automobile tires instead of the leather on their shoes. The rules learned now will be very useful in the future.

If I may be permitted a personal reference, Mr. President, I have some firsthand knowledge of the school safety patrol since my own children were active in it in their school years in Omaha. The serious, responsible way in which they approached their duties was, I am sure, typical.

And any parent who has been fortunate enough to have a child in the patrol realizes that there is an almost immediate increase in attention to safety in that household. Carelessness, whether on the streets or in the home, is simply not tolerated.

Mrs. Hruska and I have always been grateful for the training our children received from the patrol and we are convinced that they are better and more safety-conscious citizens because of it.

The Cornhusker Motor Club, the Nebraska affiliate of the American Automobile Association, has been providing equipment and know-how to patrols since the program's inception in the early 1920's. We in Nebraska are proud of their record: In almost 45 years of patrol operation, there has never been a traffic fatality at a corner guarded by a Nebraska school-patrol boy.

I am indebted to Mr. Barclay Wade, editor of the Cornhusker Motor Club News, for the following anonymous poem which effectively tells the story of the unselfish contributions of the 6,000 boys and girls serving on patrols in the State of Nebraska and of the nearly 1 million who serve throughout the country:

TRIBUTE TO THE SCHOOL PATROL

The raindrops beat on the slippery street
 Under skies that are dull and gray,
While the demon Skid lurks, shrewdly hid,
 To mangle a life away.

But a youngster brave, with demeanor grave,
 Stands guard as the autos roll.
And with watchful care guides his charges there,
 The boy of the school patrol.

His eyes are bright as his belt of white
 As he peers through the daylight dim,
And his emblem beams like his youthful dreams
 As he thinks of the trust in him.

For he knows, this lad, that each Mom and Dad
 Would barter their very soul
For each child he'll guide to the other side
 This boy of the school patrol.

O parents wise, do you realize
 The part that these youngsters play,
In rain or shine, in foul weather or fine,
 Four times every study day?

Then at close of day, when you kneel and pray
 That your child may be safe and whole,
Just say a prayer for his guardian there—
 The boy of the school patrol.

It gives me great satisfaction to join in the praise of these young citizens and to cosponsor this proposal to designate a National School Safety Patrol Week.

BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, very recently, the Kentucky Constitution Revision Assembly included a prohibition on wiretapping and eavesdropping in the proposed new Kentucky constitution.

The leader in the adoption of this provision was Mr. George Street Boone, distinguished attorney of Elkton, Ky., and member of the assembly.

At my request, Mr. Boone has supplied some of the background for this rather unusual and foresighted constitutional provision.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Boone's letter of January 18, 1966, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Elkton, Ky.,
January 18, 1966.

Hon. Edward V. Long,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Long: I have your letter of January 3 about the wiretapping and eavesdropping ban in the proposed new Kentucky constitution.

It is gratifying to know that you are considering legislation to extend protection for individual privacy.

The objection of the Kentucky Constitution Revision Assembly to wiretapping and eavesdropping is fundamental and philosophical. In my rural law practice I do not encounter the problem to the extent that it occurs in metropolitan centers, but like Mr. Justice Holmes, I feel such interception of communications is dirty business.

The burgeoning population and the increasing number of advertisements of eavesdropping equipment in national publications such as the New York Times has disturbed me.

Since I first read it in law school days, it has seemed to me that the Dissent by Justice Brandeis in *Olmstead* v. *United States* (277 U.S. 438, 72 L. Ed. 944) most cogently expressed my concept of the dangers. The majority opinion in the case held, as you will recall, that wiretapping was not prohibited by the constitutional prohibition of unreasonable searches and seizures. But as Mr. Brandeis said, the greatest danger seems to come from the insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning, but without understanding.

It seems almost a principle of nature that one never knows the quality of what he has until it is gone. It appears that privacy is being seriously infringed and some action needs to be taken.

It is my understanding that the constitution of Puerto Rico provides that "wiretapping is prohibited." No State constitution has gone so far, but there is a provision giving ground for some control in the Constitution of the State of New York. In article I, section 12, of the New York constitution there is a prohibition of unreasonable interception of communication.

The "Model State Constitution," published in 1963 by the National Municipal League, 47 East 68th Street, New York, N.Y., suggests in article I, section 1.03, protection against unreasonable interception of communications.

Justice William O. Douglas discusses the situation in "The Right of the People," published by Doubleday & Co. in 1958. This is illuminating.

Senator Wayne Morse delivered a series of very fine speeches before the Senate in 1954 on the subject of wiretapping and privacy. These contained excellent background material.

Most of the prohibitions have dealt with wiretapping and it was our feeling that this was too narrow in view of the technological advances in the interception of communications.

Accordingly, the proposal as adopted by the Kentucky Constitution Revision Assembly reads as follows:

"Prohibition of interception of communications. The people shall be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and possessions from interception of telegraphic, telephonic, and other electronic means of communication, and from interception of oral and other communications by electric, electronic, or mechanical means."

Vigorous criticism was directed at the breadth of this proposal. It was said it would interfere seriously with police activities and would endanger national security. The assembly felt that national security was the obligation of the Federal Establishment, which would have the power to overrule any State constitutional prohibition. It also felt that police activity was essential for the benefit of the individual and his interest would best be protected by the absolute ban.

The newspaper and magazine reports on the activities of State authorities in the field of national security were a cause for concern. It was believed this type of State investigation should not be encouraged.

The question was also raised as to whether the language in our draft was so broad as to prevent the use of hearing aids or eyeglasses. The distinction was accepted that these devices were primarily considered to be for reception of stimuli rather than their improper interception.

The Louisville Courier Journal, our most influential newspaper, criticized the constitutional approach to the problem on the ground that wiretapping should be controlled by statute. The editorial writer suggested that any ban made in a constitution might be outmoded in a generation by advances in technology, but in regard to that point of view, desire for privacy was recognized at least by the code of Hammurabi over 4,000 years ago. It was felt the need was so fundamental that our constitutional assembly should do its best to extend further protection, even if we were unable to imagine and protect against all possible future invasions of the right.

The assembly has finished its work and it is my great hope that the document we prepared will be accepted by the people. The sentiments I have heard expressed by the ordinary citizen seem to favor our prohibition. I hope it is the sentiment of the majority.

Of course, battles in these fields are won, but the war is never finished.

I wish my assistance could be substantial. Our action was the product of a democratic bias and a feeling that common decency could do no less.

I applaud your concern and am grateful for what you are trying to accomplish to secure protection for the privacy of man in this increasingly complex society.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE STREET BOONE.

THE CRUCIAL ISSUE OF VIETNAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, sometimes it seems difficult for Americans to understand why only a small number of our allies are furnishing material support to South Vietnam in its struggle to remain independent. One can count on the fingers of one hand the number of allies participating militarily alongside the United States and the South Vietnamese in the Vietnam hostilities.

Let me point out, however, that support of the cause of Vietnamese independence and of the right of a small country to work out its own destiny without outside interference cannot be measured in military terms alone. Indeed, strong moral support can be just as significant as material support.

A case in point with respect to the latter proposition is the position taken by our good neighbor to the north, Canada. Canada, by virtue of her membership on the International Control Commission, which was established to police the implementation of the Geneva Accords of 1954, has not committed troop units in Vietnam. Furthermore, as a middle power in the world community of nations, she cherishes her independence in world affairs and has repeatedly demonstrated that she is no puppet of her stronger and more populous neighbor to the south. Nevertheless, Canada strongly supports the view that the hostilities in Vietnam are the result of aggression planned, directed, encouraged, and supported by Hanoi, and she shares Washington's assessment of the consequences of a Communist takeover of South Vietnam.

Canada's Foreign Minister, Paul Martin, gave an articulate and eloquent exposition of Canada's position on "the crucial issue of Vietnam" in a statement in the House of Commons on January 25. The first part of his statement clearly describes the situation in Vietnam. Here Mr. Martin considers the points of the "indigenous" character of the Vietcong, the nature and purpose of Hanoi's aggression, and the consequences for Asia and the world if the current efforts to defend South Vietnam fail. The second part of his statement is an illuminating outline of Canada's policy on Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Martin's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRUCIAL ISSUE OF VIETNAM

(Statement by the Honorable Paul Martin, Secretary of State for External Affairs, in the House of Commons on January 25, 1966)

I trust that there will be an opportunity soon for the House to undertake a broad review of foreign affairs. Today, I thought I should like to confine my statement on behalf of the Government, to the crucial issue of Vietnam. No issue has so much preoccupied public opinion in Canada or the members of this House in recent months. No issue has aroused greater misgivings or greater uncertainty about where the right course for Canada lies. Probably no issue has cast a darker shadow on the prospects of peaceful accommodation and peaceful cooperation in the world.

The policy of the government in relation to the Vietnam problem is now a matter of record. It was stated before the External Affairs Committee on Wednesday and Thursday, June 9 and 10. If I restate it today, it is because I regard it as right to do so at the outset of this new Parliament and in the light of recent significant developments in the situation.

In our view, the situation in Vietnam needs to be viewed from three separate perspectives. First, there is what I might call the perspective of internal dissent in South Vietnam. This is something we must expect in any new country where the people live on the margin of subsistence. It exists because the process of social and economic transformation that is the basis of any significant development is bound to involve dislocation and disruption. It exists in greater degree in a country like South Vietnam because of the intervention from the outside. This, in turn, has made it impossible for successive governments in that country to lay a recognizable basis for political stability.

But let us not on that account equate that outside intervention with the desire for social and economic change. Let us remember that long before the conflict in South Vietnam erupted into open hostilities it was the agents of change—the administrators, the teachers, the public health workers and others like them—who were the prime targets of terror. Let us remember that, whatever the change of government in Saigon, and there have been many, the level of that terror did not abate. And let us also remember that, when the government of President Diem was forcibly overthrown in 1963, it was not overthrown by men or groups whose loyalty was pledged to the Vietcong.

This is not to discount or to downgrade the hold which the Vietcong has by one means or another been able to establish over sections of South Vietnam and its people; it is merely to suggest that we should be entirely mistaken if we regarded the Vietcong as embodying a consensus of dissent in Vietnam. So far as we know, none of the major groupings in South Vietnam, the Buddhists, the Catholics, the trade unions, the intellectuals, the students, are significantly represented in the Vietcong movement. Certainly, there is nothing to suggest that there is any basis for the claim of the Vietcong to be the sole legitimate representatives of the people of South Vietnam.

Second, there is the matter of outside intervention. Admittedly this is a difficult situation to disentangle in a divided country. After all, it is often argued: What is the sense in speaking of intervention in a context where Vietnamese are involved on both sides? I suggest to the House that, whatever the circumstances in which these dividing lines were drawn, they have come to reflect political realities which it will take time to alter. They neither justify nor diminish the fact of aggression.

What is happening in Vietnam may not be aggression in the classical sense of the term but it is aggression all the same, and it is aggression carried out in this case under the guise of a war of liberation. The aim of that aggression is to establish in South Vietnam a form of political organization which we have no evidence to suggest that the people of South Vietnam would freely choose for themselves.

We have said that in principle we appreciate and support the purposes and objectives of the policy of the United States. This was affirmed by the Prime Minister when the matter was first discussed in this House. We have said that because, as the Prime Minister put it, we cannot in this nuclear world of ours "afford any permissible kinds of international violence" of the kind by which the North Vietnamese are trying to achieve their objectives in the South. We have said this because we are of the view that the people of South Vietnam must be left to work out their own future free from outside pressure or intervention. We are not disposed to deny to the people of the South the right of self-determination which we have conceded to others in accordance with the solemn principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

Third, there is an even more perspective, one from which I think the course of developments in Vietnam has to be viewed. I do not want to urge on the House the "domino" or any other currently fashionable theory. But I do suggest to the House that we cannot look at the situation in Vietnam in isolation. In neighboring Laos, the country is to all intents and purposes partitioned. The part that is under Pathet Lao control is being freely used for the movement of men and materials from North to South Vietnam. Members of the armed forces of North Vietnam have been engaged in open attacks against the armed forces of the Royal Government of Laos. All this is in clear contravention of the undertakings solemnly given in Geneva in 1962; and Canada was a member of that Conference.

In northeastern and southern Thailand, there are the beginnings of the same kind of terror which marked the first phase of insurgency in South Vietnam. As in the case of South Vietnam, this is being aided and abetted from outside but with this difference, that the Thai Patriotic Front, as it is called, is still operating from Peiping. It has within the past several weeks been joined by a new clandestine organization, the National Liberation League and Army of Malaysia, which is dedicated to the overthrow by revolutionary means of the Government of Malaysia.

Are we, then, seriously to assume that all these movements are coming into being because the legitimate channels of local dissent in these countries have been closed? Or is this part of the pattern of permanent revolution which is being propagated in some quarters? I suggest to the House, on my responsibility as Secretary of State for External Affairs, that these are questions which we must seriously ponder before we condemn U.S. policy in Vietnam.

That is our assessment of the forces that are at work in the present conflict. There are those who would have us alter that assessment for the mere sake of giving the appearance of Canadian independence as though independence consisted only in taking positions which are necessarily against those of one's friends. Our policy in this situation represents our own honest assessment of the position and is not a reflection in any way of pressure imposed on us by the United States or by any other country. In this matter we are as independent as in Her Majesty's government in the United Kingdom. I say to the House that, after more than 11 years of active involvement in the situation in Vietnam, we are perfectly capable of arriving at an independent assessment of that situation without having recourse to false credentials. The question we must surely ask ourselves is this: Can we ignore the challenge of the aggression by these Communist liberation fronts in Asia?

Were we able to ignore the situation in Europe 20 years ago? I am not saying that the situation in Europe now is comparable with that existing at present in Asia. Undoubtedly there is a détente in effect between the West and the Soviet Union in Europe. I am talking about the situation in Asia, where a different state of affairs prevails but where there are some comparisons to the history of the immediate postwar period in Europe. No one will deny that mistakes have been made in Asia and I think some have been made by the United States. But there is, it seems to me, a parallel between the situation in Asia and that in Europe following the end of the war.

We must ask ourselves what the failure of U.S. efforts in Asia would mean to us as well as to that country. We must ask ourselves what it would mean to India, to Thailand, to the island countries, the Philippines, New Zealand, and Australia. We must ask ourselves what it would mean to many countries in Asia and Africa which, although critical of the United States, would be deeply concerned over a Communist victory in Vietnam. I ask what would be the concern of the Soviet Union in these circumstances. I must ask the House whether Canada's real interests would be promoted by a U.S. defeat. I must ask the House what such a defeat would mean by way of encouragement to an aggressive brand of political action. It is because of these considerations for Canada and other countries that we cannot deny the importance of this conflict in Vietnam to us all. I have given the House my assessment of the conflict. I shall now turn to the policy which we have thought it right for Canada to follow in relation to this conflict.

In the first place, there is our membership on the International Commission. The House is well aware that this has been an increasingly frustrating commitment. The circumstances facing the Commission today bear little resemblance to those envisaged when the Commission was given its mandate. Nevertheless, we have thought it right to maintain a Canadian presence in Vietnam. We have done so because the Commission still has a function to perform in bringing its objective judgment to bear on the facts of the situation, because the Commission continues to maintain, at least in symbolic form, the validity of the Geneva agreements on which, all the parties seem to agree, any fresh settlement of the Vietnam conflict must be constructed, and because the Commission may still be able to play a part in the context of such a settlement, if not to serve as a channel of contact between the parties themselves.

The charge is sometimes made that Canada has failed to act impartially in discharging its responsibilities on the Commission. This charge, in my judgment and on my examination and on the advice of my officers in whom I have the fullest confidence, men who have served Canada in Indochina for 11 years, has no basis in fact. I reject it without any hesitation. We have acted impartially in relation to all the facts and all the evidence which has come before the Commission. Contrary to what is sometimes asserted, we have been associated with findings against South Vietnam as we have been associated with findings against the north. We subscribed to the Commission's Special Report of June 1962 because it represented a balanced presentation of events in Vietnam. We also appended a minority report to the Commission's special message of February 1965, not because we disputed the findings of the majority but because it was our view that there were other factors which it was legitimate to include on the basis of all the evidence available to us at that time. In all this, I think, we need make no apology to our Commission partners for the way in which we have interpreted our responsibilities on the Commission.

To my knowledge, for example (and I state this not by way of criticism but by way of fact), our Polish colleagues on the Commission have never found occasion to support a finding against North Vietnam and have frequently refused even to participate in an investigation where such a finding was likely to be the outcome. Yet it would be found that Canada, as a member of the Commission, did not hesitate where this was called for to criticize the actions of the Government in the south. The Commission has no authority to criticize any state not a signatory of the Geneva agreement but the implications are there for everyone to read and there was no reservation made in the Canadian position with regard to the Commission's report of 1962.

Then there is the matter of sending Canadian troops to Vietnam. We have made it as clear as it can be made that we should not regard such a course as being compatible without responsibilities on the International Commission in Vietnam. This is far from being the frivolous argument some have professed it to be. The Geneva cease-fire agreement, which the Commission is there to administer, prohibits in its very terms the introduction of military forces into either part of Vietnam. It would scarcely be right for one of the powers which has been entrusted with the supervision of the agreement to abet one of the parties in an infraction of its terms. Any other position on our part would certainly have the gravest consequences to our ability to carry out peacekeeping functions not only in this area but more generally and in other contexts. I believe we can all take pride in Canada's achievements in this field of international activity and I believe it is imperative in the interests of international peacekeeping not to jeopardize our ability to contribute significantly to such activities.

Altogether apart from membership on the Commission, however, the Government's policy, as I have stated it twice in this House and as it was reaffirmed by the Prime Minister the other day, is that the Government has no intention to recommend at any time the commitment of our forces to Asia unless pursuant to an obligation under the Charter of the United Nations.

My next point is this. Our policy has been directed toward helping to bring the present conflict from the battlefield to the negotiating table. This has always been our position and it remains our objective. We have made it clear, and the Prime Minister did so again only the other day, that we do not look upon the present conflict as being amenable to a military solution alone. We have taken every opportunity available to us to probe the possibilities for peace and, indeed, we are doing that at this very time. We proposed a pause in the bombing of North Vietnam last April, not because we looked to one side only to make concessions but because we hoped that such a pause might provide a climate in which it would prove easier for the other side to respond in a positive way. We have welcomed the current pause, which has now been in effect for an entire month, and the search for a peaceful conclusion of the conflict which has accompanied it.

Although the absence of any positive response from the other side has been a matter of deep disappointment to us, we have expressed the hope that the pause might be further extended until all reasonable possibilities have been exhausted. I simply ask: Have all reasonable possibilities been exhausted? I should hope that the pause would continue as long as possible. I should hope that before any final steps were taken in this regard the most careful consideration would be given to an examination of any indication that North Vietnam was now seriously engaged in examining the possibility of negotiations. In the final analysis, however, we must recognize that it is not for Canada to take the crucial decisions which lie immediately ahead since we are not a party to the hostilities. On the other hand, we do think there may well be a contribution which Canada can make to an ultimate settlement because of the long experience we have had of the problems at issue in this whole area.

We have expressed our regret that, in a situation which so deeply engages the concern of the international community, the United Nations has been prevented from playing any effective part. We recognize, as the Secretary General did again in his press conference on Thursday last, that there are reasons why the United Nations has been unable to act in the present circumstances.

It is clear that China could regard the Secretary General, I regret to say, as persona non grata. It is true that China is not a member of the United Nations. It is true that South and North Vietnam are not members. It has not been possible to use the United Nations fully and there has been a failure on the part of some nations to appreciate the great role that the office of the Secretary General affords in so delicate a situation.

These are obvious reasons why the United Nations has been unable to act and why the Secretary General himself, has not been able to act as fully as he would have liked. But I hope he will continue to explore all the possibilities that may be open to him as Secretary General to encourage action that will set this conflict on a course of peace. I would also hope with him that there may yet be a role for the United Nations in securing the terms of any settlement of the present conflict. If and when that time comes, I can assure the Secretary General and the House that the Canadian Government will do whatever it can to enable the United Nations to carry out its responsibilities in this area as it has done in similar circumstances elsewhere.

We have also directed our thinking toward the great task of rehabilitation in that whole area that will have to form a part of any durable settlement of the Vietnam conflict. We have resumed our pledge to participate in the works of the Mekong Development Committee. We have subscribed to the capital of the Asian Development Bank, which has now been established. We are prepared to devote further substantial resources to regional development in southeast Asia, in which I hope both communities in Vietnam could play their full part and derive their full benefit. Indeed, I should go further and say that I should look toward this whole field of regional development as providing a framework within which these two communities might be able to establish a basis for mutual acceptance and cooperation.

Over the past month efforts have been made by many countries to explore the opportunities there may be for peace in Vietnam. Canada alone, and Canada in concert with others, has done what it could do to try and bring about negotiations. The House will be aware of the efforts which have recently been made by the United States to reaffirm it readiness to negotiate an honorable conclusion to the present conflict. We are satisfied beyond any doubt that the efforts of the United States during the past month through its Secretary of State, through its Vice President, through its delegate to the United Nations and through others, have been sincerely directed toward trying to bring about negotiations without any preconditions.

It is regrettable that no response has been forthcoming, and I think it is only fair to point out that, whatever some may think of the course of action by our neighbor the fact is that no one can suggest that the United States has not sincerely sought to achieve negotiations. As I said in the United Nations, those who criticize the United States ought to engage in the same energetic pursuit to persuade North Vietnam and others that the time has come when we should have negotiations to establish peace.

I cannot predict how much longer the present pause in the bombing of North Vietnam will last. I can assure the House that our views in this regard have been made known in a way which we believe, in the circumstances to be the most effective way of presenting our point of view. What has happened in conjunction with this pause was an effort by the United States to seek peace.

In the short run, there may well be an intensification of the level of military activity in Vietnam. I should hope that, even at this hour, we could avoid that possibility and that we should have some positive indication from Hanoi, as a result of the efforts that have been made during the course of the last weeks to try and bring about negotiations with the North consistent with the offer to negotiate that has been made.

It is clear that the Geneva agreement is regarded by the parties as a suitable point of departure for any future settlement. I should not want to suggest to the House that there is formal agreement between the parties on this particular formulation. The Government of North Vietnam holds that its four points contains the essence of the military and political provisions agreed to at Geneva and must be accepted publicly by the United States before any political settlement of the Vietnam problem can be envisaged. What I am concerned to do is to state the minimum common ground on which there appears to be agreement and from which negotiation would necessarily have to proceed.

There would also seem to be agreement between the parties that there should be a withdrawal of foreign military forces and a dismantling of foreign military bases in Vietnam. This is again a minimum formulation. The Government of North Vietnam would regard this as a prior condition to any settlement. For its part, the United States has made it clear that it wants neither a continuing military presence in South Vietnam nor bases in southeast Asia. But it also has made it clear that this is on condition that there is peace in the area.

So far as the internal affairs of South Vietnam are concerned, there is agreement on the basic proposition that these must be settled by the people of South Vietnam themselves without any foreign interference.

I have said that we are not one of the belligerents in this regrettable conflict. We regret that the United Nations is not capable of serving the function for which its charter provides. That is not the fault of a country like Canada or the fault of any one member of the United Nations. This is a situation involving grave issues and the Government has had to consider, in its assessment of the problem, the consequences in Asia which in the fullness of time could well provide the same effects as attended the end of the Second World War.

I believe that our relations with the Soviet Union are now on a much firmer foundation. I believe that the threat of conflict between the Soviet Union and the West has very considerably receded. However, we are now faced with a dangerous situation in Asia. Canada, as a member of the International Commission, is doing its utmost to discharge its responsibilities. Canada is ready to do what it can to provide resources to help in bringing about economic improvement in this regrettably unstable region if only there can be peace, and peace is possible only if the parties to a dispute are willing to engage in a fruitful discussion. I can assure the House that this Government had done everything it could to bring about discussions leading to negotiations which we hope could bring peace in Indochina.

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY—STATEMENT BY THE ANTIDEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Antidefamation League of B'Nai B'rith—an organization that has long been in the forefront of combating extremism—has recently compiled and published a comprehensive report on the activities, the scope, the philosophy, and the tactics of the John Birch Society.

I am sure that other members of this body are like myself, constantly asked to supply information about this society. This report seems to me to be the most accurate and timely compendium of data that has thus far been made available, and in order that my colleagues might avail themselves of this information I intend in the next few days to ask that various sections of the report be printed in the Record.

Today, I ask unanimous consent that the first section of the report—"The Strength, Growth, and Thrust of the John Birch Society"—be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The John Birch Society—1966: Strength, Growth, and Thrust

The middle of 1964 to the present has been a period of continued growth and expansion for the American radical right in general and for the John Birch Society in particular. In the 7 years since it was founded in Indianapolis early in December 1958, the Birch Society has emerged as the spearhead of the radical right. It is the only group on the far right which is permanently organized all across the country at the grassroots level. It alone plans now to spend a million dollars a month.

Among the major organizations of the radical right, only the John Birch Society has a nationwide paid staff of organizers and public relations men, a membership active and activated, a permanent recruiting program, a tightly controlled and generally efficient centralized direction, and a financial income which enables it to continue to expand its nationwide organizational structure.

Starting from scratch at the beginning of 1959, the Society has grown to a membership of about 80,000 in some 5,000 chapters across the country, and at the end of 1965, was pushing toward the 100,000 mark. Since 1963 its membership has almost doubled; its cash income more than quadrupled.

The 80,000 membership, directed by Founder Robert Welch, from the Belmont, Mass., headquarters of the society, just about equals the membership of the Communist Party when the Communists were at the peak of their strength in the United States in 1944. The society is, in fact, a movement and a propaganda and recruitment "apparatus" on the far right that is comparable to the Communist "apparatus" on the far left in the 1930's and 1940's. The earlier movement of the radical left preached communism while today's Birch Society, on the radical right, claims to preach anticommunism. But in terms of organizational concept, structure, and tactics, the similarities between the two operations often appear more persuasive than the differences.

INFILTRATION TACTICS

The Birchers, like the Communists of 20 and 30 years ago, are burrowing their way into the fabric and the grassroots of American life and it is already clear that it will take a major effort by responsible forces to root them out.

The overwhelming majority of Birch members still conceal their membership in the society.

The Birch Society today has spawned scores of front groups, formed to lure unsuspecting Americans into the Birch orbit and to ripen them up for eventual recruitment into the society by enlisting their support for limited and high-sounding causes with whose slogans, at least, few would disagree.

The Birchers have already infiltrated the American political party structure and in some areas have secured footholds at the precinct level and a measurable degree of influence in various arms of the political party apparatus.

Like the Communists, the Birchers have been establishing local book stores all across the country which serve as distribution centers for Birchite and other radical right propaganda, as gathering places for radical rightists, and as focal points for Birchite activity, much as Communist bookstores in the 1930's and 1940's served a similar function.

The Birchers have available a large stable of speakers, ready, willing, and able to travel anywhere in the country to address local meetings, sponsored not only by Birch groups, but by local civic, political, and service organizations as well.

Like the Communists, the Birchers have set up their own publishing house and are not only pumping their own books and pamphlets into the Nation's ideological bloodstream, but are reprinting the propaganda of like-minded radical rightists for wholesale distribution to their own network of bookstores and to bookstores operated by other far rightists as well.

CELL STRUCTURE

The Birchers are organized into small units designed to operate as isolated islands, impervious to penetration by outsiders. The Communists called these units cells; the Birchers call them chapters.

The Birch membership is supervised and directed by paid professional organizers, set up on an area, State, and local basis. These professionals were called organizers by the Communists; the Birchers call them coordinators.

Like the Communists, the Birchers get their official "line" from a central headquarters. The Communists got their "line" from Moscow, via national party headquarters; the Birchers get their line from Founder Welch via Birch headquarters in Belmont.

Like the Communists, the Birchers brook no deviation from the "line." The Communists expelled deviationists; the Birchers do the same, careful as always to refund prepaid dues on a pro-rata basis.

(Bircher applicants abjectly fill out a membership form that is a resignation signed in advance, agreeing when they join that the Society can drop them at any time and without any necessary explanation for doing so.)

Like the Communists, Birchers are urged to take an active role in political and community organizations. For instance, Robert Welch, in 1960, urged his followers to join their local PTAs at the start of the school year, to get their conservative friends to do likewise, and to go to work to take the PTAs over.

AN IDEOLOGICAL CADRE

The Birchers seek to accomplish their purposes by enlisting the support of a dedicated, zealous, disciplined, and thoroughly-indoctrinated ideological cadre of workers—distinctly a minority in their areas of operation, whether local, regional, or national.

The Birch Society is not designed to mobilize anything close to a majority of the American national population. Like Lenin, Robert Welch of the John Birch Society believes that a dedicated minority which knows what it wants, can move mountains.

The Birchers' target is the American mind. Like the Communists, their aim is to change—and eventually to control—American political thinking. Their ultimate goal is political influence and political power.

The Communists of two and three decades ago pointed to the growing and—to them—extremist activities of big capital. According to the Communists, capitalism, then in its "last stages," was evolving into fascism and imperialism. In the same spirit, Robert Welch analyzed, in mid-1965, the development of the forces against which he has allegedy alined his society:

"(1) The Communist conspiratorial apparatus is now closing in, with every conceivable pressure and deception, on all remaining resistance to the establishment of its police state over our country; (2) the only existing force that has any possible chance of preventing the completion of these Communist plans is the John Birch Society; (3) we have no chance of stopping and reversing the long patient progress of this conspiracy except—exactly as stated in the Blue Book 6 years ago—by measures which are fantastic enough to be realistic in proportion to the danger."

Fantastic measures—some of them admitted by Welch to be "mean and dirty"—have become the trademark of Birch Society activity. And the wheels now are spinning. The active search for new members, after an initial policy of quiet recruitment, has been pushed with increasingly high pressure since 1963. All during which time the Birchers have worked to clean up their public image while Welch engaged in some hard-headed planning for future political influence.

MEMBERSHIP

The membership "explosion" that has vastly increased Birch membership rolls since the 1964 national political conventions was the result of many factors. Most of them were related to the Presidential elections campaign in which Birchers and other such extremists were active, welcomed, defended and, to a certain extent, triumphant. At the Republican convention, the Birch Society covered itself with a kind of respectability. Birchers misused the campaign as a vehicle to spread their own political propaganda and to recruit new members.

Many Americans were swept into the Birch ranks on the emotional tide of the campaign period. Many others joined after election day, when the frustration of defeat made them ripe for recruitment and when the Birch Society's postelection appeal to this group was summed up in the simple slogan: "Now Will You Join the John Birch Society?"

From August through December, 1964, the Society set new membership records and early in 1965, the growth was described by a jubilant Welch as having been of "geometric" proportions.

In 1965 membership growth continued, even though other factors were at work. For example:

Many who joined during the exciting days of the 1964 campaign found the Society demanded too much of their time, energy, and dedication. They either drifted away or were dropped from membership by the society itself, for like the Communists, the Birch Society does not tolerate "dead wood" for long.

Some of the 1964 recruits—especially Goldwater enthusiasts frustrated by the defeat of their champion—found the society too radical for their basically conservative viewpoints. They walked away along with still others who found it too "moderate" or too "educational."

Those who remained faithful to Welch's leadership as 1965 turned to 1966 were, for the most part, the zealous, the dedicated, and the indoctrinated—eager to carry out the monthly instructions sent to them by Welch from the society's headquarters in Massachusetts.

THE CALIFORNIA REPORTS

The Birch Society continues to distribute (in packets designed for the indoctrination of prospective members) the report of a 1963 investigation by the California Senate Factfinding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities. It found the organization to be neither secret, subversive nor antisemitic, Apparently because of the wide circulation of this 1963 report by the Birch Society, a second report was issued by the same committee in 1965. For understandable reasons, it has been ignored by the Birch Society.

The more recent report found that Robert Welch's organization "has attracted a lunatic fringe that is now assuming serious proportions" and has been "beset by an influx of emotionally unstable people, some of whom have been prosecuted in the courts for their hoodlum tactics in disrupting meetings, and heckling speakers with whom they disagree."

The committee's 1965 report concluded:

"We are more critical of the society now than we were then for the reason that it has, in our opinion, merited such criticism by reason of its activities exemplified by the irresponsible articles by a member of its national council, the republication of 'The Politician,' the inexcusable actions of its minority of irresponsible members, and a dangerous increase of antisemitism among a minority of its membership."

The members of the Birch Society are believers in the "conspiracy theory" of history and in absolute political truth which they alone claim to possess. It is through the conspiracy theory of recent American history that fear is aroused—fear, the essential ingredient of extremist strength. The operating premise of the John Birch Society, like that of the Communists, is that over all of our lives and over all the events of our time, there rules a powerful and protected establishment, perpetuated by a secret conspiracy of vast dimensions. To the Birchers it is communism—by which they mean the establishment of the last 30 years, including the American Government, whether controlled by Republicans or Democrats, whether directed by liberals or conservatives.

To each extreme, whether of the far left or the far right—to each "out" the other is "in."

The John Birch Society has grown in direct proportion to the growth which its founder sees in the power and influence of "the enemy." Welch has said his organization's chances of success in saving the country increased from 1 in 10 in 1958 to 1 in 4 today. Yet, paradoxically, he and his society claim that in the same period, "Communist influence and control" in the United States increased from 20 to 40 percent in 1958 to 60 to 80 percent today.

THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, several days ago I protested the reduction in funds for the special milk program. Since then I have received a flood of telegrams, letters, and calls urging me to support both the school lunch and special milk programs. I intend to do so. The reduction in funds requested by the Budget Bureau ignores the facts that such a cut would harm the dairy industry, would harm the schoolchilden now receiving the benefits of these programs, and would make necessary a means test as a qualification for receiving milk or food under the programs. As Senator JOSEPH TYDINGS pointed out so well a few days ago, that if we thought a means test for receiving medical care benefits for the aged was demeaning and an insult, this would be even more true for children in school.

I cannot ask that all the letters I have received be put in the RECORD. But I do ask unanimous consent that a representative sampling be printed in the RECORD at this point reflecting the views of Minnesotans.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
St. Paul, Minn., February 7, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: During the last number of weeks we have received two telegrams and a letter from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, copies of which are enclosed.

Because of the many benefits that are provided to our schoolchildren under these programs and because of their contribution to the education, welfare and health of the participants, I feel the lowering of payments to the schools will have a great detrimental effect on the school lunch and special milk programs in our State.

There is also a discriminatory feature in the cutback of funds as outlined in the second telegram that I feel worthy of mention. I would be concerned about the administrative arrangements for programs in Minnesota public schools in which special emphasis and direction were placed upon providing milk for needy children and children in schools without a food service program that would be above and beyond the efforts now being made by local school boards in taking care of these needs.

In view of the significant appropriation of money for recently developed and new programs, it is difficult for me to understand why programs such as school lunch and special milk which have proven to be so worthwhile in the schools of our State and the Nation and for which the needs are definitely known be curtailed in their appropriations.

Because of the substantially worthwhile contributions of these two programs and the increased participation in them by schoolchildren, I urge you to do everything possible to reinstate the funds to their present level and increase them accordingly each year to provide for the improvement and expansion of these excellent programs.

Sincerely,

DUANE J. MATTHEWS,
Commissioner of Education.

"CHICAGO, ILL.,
"January 27, 1966.

"C. E. HOLT,
"School Lunch Section, Department of Education, St. Paul, Minn.:

"For your information the President's budget for 1967 requests total of $183 million for school lunch with breakdown as follows:

"Cash payments, $129,415,000; section 11 special assistance, $6,500,000; section 6, $45 million; administration, $2,085,000.

"Request of $21 million for special milk program to be redirected to provide milk for needy children and children in schools without a food service. We will give you further details as quickly as they are available.

"DENNIS M. DOYLE,
"Food Distribution, USDA, Chicago."

"CHICAGO, ILL.

"CARL HOLT,
"Director, School Lunch Section, State Department of Education, St. Paul, Minn.:

"In accordance with instructions from the Bureau of the Budget to hold expenditures under the special milk program to $1 billion inclusive of administrative costs for this fiscal year you are hereby advised that the current deduction of 5 percent will be increased to 10 percent beginning with claims for the month of February. Schools and child care institutions should be notified as promptly as possible. As provided in section

215.7(e) of the special milk regulations no deductions will be made in reimbursements to needy schools.

"DENNIS M. DOYLE,
"*Director, Midwest Area, U.S. Department of Agriculture.*"

"U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE, FOOD DISTRIBUTION,
"*Chicago, Ill., December 28, 1965.*

"Mr. C. E. HOLT,
"*Director, School Lunch Section, State Department of Education, St. Paul, Minn.*

"DEAR MR. HOLT: This will supplement my wire of December 23 on the special milk program fund situation for the remainder of the fiscal year.

"As you know, Congress appropriated $103 million for the special milk program this year. Based on preliminary estimates of expenditures for the year, however, we would need at least $102 million obligating authority in fiscal year 1966 if the present 5-percent reduction is continued through the full year. In order to hold expenditures to $100 million as instructed by the Bureau of the Budget, it has become necessary to reduce obligations for the last half of the year by $2 million.

"Because the school year generally begins in September, about 40 percent of program obligations occur from February 1 to the end of the fiscal year. This, in order to reduce obligations by $2 million during the remaining 40 percent of the year, an additional 5-percent reduction in claims is necessary beginning with the claims for the month of February.

"No restoration of funds which may be saved by the percentage reduction method will be made after the end of the fiscal year.

"Although the wording of section 215.7(e) of the special milk program regulations, effective December 1, 1965, is not spelled out as thoroughly as it was in the former section 215.8(e) of the prior regulations, the intent is the same. No percentage reduction of reimbursement shall be applied to any part of claims submitted by needy schools approved for special assistance under the special milk program.

"We hope the overall impact of this section will not adversely affect program operations.

"Sincerely yours,
"DENNIS M. DOYLE,
"*Director, Midwest Area.*"

MENTOR PUBLIC SCHOOL,
Mentor, Minn., January 31, 1966.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: After much exposure to all the title programs, the poverty program, and colossal waste that will take place there; to know that the Federal Government is trying to give away money for endless "dreamed up" jobs for youth at $1.25 per hour (we know, because we had to dream them up and furnish names of students); then to know vast amounts of foreign aid moneys are given away with no strings attached—and to read about the plans for school lunch in foreign countries at our expense, we superintendents have trouble with our temperatures when we read the enclosed news item.

We have had to deduct 5 percent on each of our monthly lunch reports on the Federal milk program—which seems silly. Recently I received a letter from the State department of education stating that beginning with the February report 10 percent must be deducted. Every time I do this I think how picayunish the Government can be about established and proven programs and how unbelievably loose they can be on such programs as foreign aid.

In light of some of the things mentioned above, isn't it rather ridiculous that the Federal Government should play the lunch program aids so closely? We should be getting more commodities—meat in particular. This year we have received considerably less.

I have always gone along with the Democratic Party but I am beginning to cool quite a bit. Let Congress and/or the executive branch cut the school lunch program and it will be the biggest political mistake they ever made. This is one place where the money is not wasted on administrative costs. One party might blame the other, but the Democrats are in and must assume the responsibility. It really makes one perturbed to think that a cut in lunch aids was even considered—say nothing about bringing it about.

You will be smart if you work to increase lunch program aids to schools—not to decrease them. Cutting aids would be the biggest joke of the century.

Sincerely yours,
E. P. NEIBAUER,
Superintendent.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I am writing to you to ask you to do all that you can to prevent the cut in the appropriations for the school lunch and special milk programs.

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure that you would not want to take this away from them. Also, the appropriations that cover the aid for our lunch program. We have children in our school that would be quite hungry in the evening if they were not able to eat here at school. And, if they had to pay more for their lunches, they would not be able to eat the good hot lunches that are prepared. It is important to keep our youngsters here in the United States well fed at a price that parents can afford.

I would appreciate your efforts in preventing this cut.

Very truly yours,
MURIEL ROSS.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am a cook in one of our lunchrooms, in Bloomington. I can see how much good our hot lunch does for our boys and girls. Please see what you can do, so our school lunch and milk money will not be cut.

Sincerely,
ETTA MUNCHE.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Hon. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: Please do not cut the appropriation for the school lunch and special milk programs.

Sincerely,
MRS. LEONA JUNES.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Hon. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I am writing to you to ask you to do all that you can to prevent the cut in the appropriations for the school lunch and special milk programs.

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure that you would not want to take this away from them. Also, the appropriations that cover the aid for our lunch program. We have children in our school that would be quite hungry in the evening if they were not able to eat here at school. And, if they had to pay more for their lunches, they would not be able to eat the good hot lunches that are prepared. It is important to keep our youngsters well-fed at a price that parents can afford.

I would appreciate your efforts in preventing this cut.

Very truly yours,
MRS. GRACE LARSON.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
February 4, 1966.

Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Hon. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I am writing you because of the proposed cut in funds for school lunch and special milk programs. I am hoping you and others will give this much consideration before it is brought up before our lawmakers. If this cut is made, as proposed by President Johnson, it will mean the prices of lunch and milk will have to be raised. If the price of lunches are raised there will be less participating in our lunch program.

I am in hopes the proposed budget will be reconsidered by all persons who have the power to do so.

Very sincerely,
MRS. FLORENCE RYMAN.

WAUBUN, MINN.,
February 2, 1966.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MONDALE: We are very much concerned with the proposed cut in the budget for the support of the school lunch program. Should a reduction take place in the amount of our reimbursement and also a reduction in commodities we receive, it would seriously impair our program.

At the present time we are operating our school lunch program at a loss because we charge our students only 20 cents. If it became necessary for us to raise the price, many of our families would be unable to afford lunches for their children.

The board of education and myself feel that the support of the lunch program is a very worthwhile program and we would certainly not like to see a reduction in the support of it. In fact, if anything, an increase would be most helpful. This is a program that benefits all children and certainly is a very practical and humane way of making the very best use of any surplus agricultural products.

Sincerely yours,
HOMER M. BJORNSON,
Superintendent.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
January 29, 1966.

Mr. WALTER MONDALE,
Minnesota Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Twin City Chapter of the Minnesota School Food Service Association met on Monday, January 24, at Richfield.

This was the same day it was announced that the 1967 Federal budget recommended a cutback from $89 to $37 million for the school milk program. Also a reduction in the school lunch subsidy was announced.

The 500 members of this chapter from the school districts of St. Paul, Minneapolis, West St. Paul, Richfield, Bloomington, Robbinsdale, Edina-Morningside, Columbia Heights, and White Bear Lake urges you to work for the restoration of these funds so that the school milk program and the school lunch program can continue to meet the needs of our schoolchildren.

We trust that you and your colleagues will be able to execute economies in other areas rather than at the expense of the school food services.

Thank you sincerely,

Mayme Moore,
Secretary, Twin City School Food Service Association.

Minneapolis, Minn.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. Walter Mondale,
and
Hon. Eugene McCarthy,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Sirs: Please do not cut the appropriation for the school lunch and special milk program.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Alfred Nybo.

Stillwater, Minn.,
January 24, 1966.

Senator Walter F. Mondale,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Regarding the milk fund and school lunch programs—either all students should benefit or none. Where can the line be drawn? Only the rich and poor will be able to survive the Great Society.

We surely do not want the inspection costs added to the prices we already pay for meats and poultry.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. Vernon Hophan.

Arrowhead Cooperative Milk Producers Association,
Duluth, Minn., January 21, 1966.

Hon. Walter F. Mondale,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mondale: We, members of Arrowhead Cooperative Milk Producers Association, want you to do your utmost to restore any moneys that are being cut from the school milk program.

This program is one of the best and should be encouraged more, as it gives "nature's best food" milk, to the group that needs it most. It also supplies it to some who may not receive it otherwise.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

Roy E. Peterson,
Manager-Operator.

St. Paul, Minn.,
January 26, 1966.

Dear Senator Mondale: We are greatly disturbed over President Johnson's proposal to slash the school milk budget. We feel, as an average taxpayer, some other budget could be considered. Why do we always have to consider the needy, they receive plenty already, and it is we who pay for it; or the Cuban exiles, who else but us, is paying their transportation costs, etc.; or that highway beautification bill, is that as beneficial as a glass of milk?

Please give due thought to this proposal.

Gratefully,

Mr. and Mrs. Roger Reichel.

Bloomington, Minn.,
January 31, 1966.

The Honorable Walter F. Mondale,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mondale: Congratulations to you as our Senator from Minnesota.

Are you a supporter of the school lunch program as your predecessor, Vice President Humphrey is? I sincerely hope you are as I have a request to make of you.

I have worked in the school lunch program for 20 years and am aware of the benefits gained by our children by learning to eat a variety of different foods. The President's proposed budget included large cuts in the special milk program and the school lunch program. These cuts, if allowed to pass, would mean an increase in price to the children and may well cause some to have to go without a school lunch. My request is that you lend your support to disallow the proposed cuts and keep our school lunch program a vital part of the Nation's economy helping our future citizens grow up strong and healthy.

A friend of yours, Mr. Leroy Johnson, with General Mills, mentioned last week that he too was going to tell you how important it is to support the school lunch program.

Thank you for your consideration to this request.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. David V. Johnson.

St. Paul, Minn.,
January 25, 1966.

The Honorable Walter Mondale,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mondale: It was with considerable concern that we read that President Johnson's budget proposed reducing the sum spent on the school milk program to 37 million for 1967—and, further, that only needy children be allowed to buy milk at reduced cost.

It is our considered judgment that these proposals are false economies to the extreme.

In St. Paul where we sell milk at 1 cent to students bringing a lunch from home, we are certain that an increase to 4 cents (our cost) would seriously reduce participation among the very students who are most in need of milk at noon from a nutritional standpoint.

In secondary schools, which is our major service in St. Paul, it is difficult presently to meet the needs of all the underprivileged because such students will go to lengths to avoid being stigmatized as such. We feel certain that such is the case in most secondary schools and only slightly less true in elementary grades.

If the suggested reduction were applied to the school lunch program, it is likely that our lunch charge in St. Paul would be increased from its present 25 cents to 30 cents. We feel that such an increase would adversely affect participation among the very students most benefited by the program.

We have worked hard—and have been greatly assisted by State and Federal aids—to increase participation in both the school milk program and the school lunch program. St. Paul has more than doubled such participation in the past 5 years. We are working to continue this progress.

We urge that you give full consideration to this suggested reduction and work for its reconsideration if you can do so in good conscience.

Cordially,

S. W. Doucette,
Director, St. Paul School Cafeterias.

Bloomington, Minn.,
February 3, 1966.

Hon. Walter F. Mondale,
Hon. Eugene McCarthy,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sirs: Please do not cut the appropriation for the school lunch and special milk programs.

Respectfully,

Mrs. Gerald Evans.

Wettergren Dairy,
St. Peter, Minn., February 2, 1966.

The Honorable Senator Mondale,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mondale: I read in the paper where the milk program for the schools would be cut millions of dollars and just the needy would be the recipients. I don't know who is to do the classifying, etc., but I hope you will support the milk program on a full scale as is Ancher Nelsen.

I believe the milk that children get in the morning is the only breakfast that most of them get.

I trust that you will check into this matter.

Sincerely,

Robert W. Wettergren.

P.S.—I discussed this with Russell G. Schwandt, who was our speaker at Lions yesterday at my request, and he said to contact you.

Bloomington, Minn.,
January 27, 1966.

Hon. Walter F. Mondale,
Hon. Eugene McCarthy,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sirs: I am writing to you to ask you to do all that you can to prevent the cut in the appropriations for the school lunch and special milk programs.

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure that you would not want to take this away from them. Also, the appropriations that cover the aid for our lunch program. We have children in our school that would be quite hungry in the evening if they were not able to eat here at school. And, if they had to pay more for their lunches, they would not be able to eat the good hot lunches that are prepared. It is important to keep our youngsters well fed at a price that parents can afford.

I would appreciate your efforts in preventing this cut.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. Lillian Madnig.

Minneapolis, Minn.,
February 7, 1966.

The Honorable Walter F. Mondale,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I ask that you please reconsider the cut in appropriations for school lunch and special milk programs. I hope the cut will not be approved.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Frank Milleren.

THE PRICE OF BIG GOVERNMENT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson] delivered a masterful address on February 22, 1966, at the banquet of the Virginia branch of the Associated General Contractors of America at Hot Springs, Va. His subject was "The Price of Big Government."

This is another outstanding address by Senator Robertson, who has demonstrated time and time again his wisdom and great value to Congress and to the Nation.

As chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and as one who has had many years of experience in fiscal affairs, Senator Robertson is well qualified to speak on the subject. His service and efforts in behalf of fiscal responsibility and in behalf of the free enterprise system has been of great benefit to the Nation. There is no one in the country more qualified to speak with authority and experience on this subject.

I think the entire Nation will be rewarded by having an opportunity to read this wonderful address. I ask unanimous consent that the address of Senator Rob-

ERTSON, entitled "The Price of Big Government," be printed in full in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRICE OF BIG GOVERNMENT

(Remarks of Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON at banquet of the Virginia branch, Associated General Contractors of America, at the Homestead, Hot Springs, Va., February 22, 1966)

In an effort to form a more perfect union, our Virginia ancestors sponsored a convention to meet in Philadelphia in the summer of 1787. When it appeared that the efforts to agree upon a new Constitution would be wrecked over differences of opinion about the treatment in the new union of small States by large ones, the venerable Franklin suggested that a prayer be offered, asking the Father of light to illuminate their understanding, adding that he had lived a long time and the longer he lived, the more convincing proof he saw of the fact that God governs in the affairs of men.

As we meet tonight to discuss the effect upon our businesses and upon our lives of that "more perfect union" that was formed under the terms and provisions of the Philadelphia Constitution, our first action should be to give thanks to the gracious Providence that gave us George Washington, the anniversary of whose birth we celebrate today—the man who won our victory on the battlefield, the man largely responsible for the submerging of conflicting opinions at Philadelphia and the drafting of an instrument, said to be the greatest ever struck off by the hand and purpose of man, and the man who successfully launched our ship of state upon the troubled waters of international conflict. Tonight, we should join with Thomas Jefferson in saying of Washington: "* * * never did nature and fortune combine more perfectly to make a man great, and to place him in the same constellation with whatever worthies merited from man an everlasting remembrance."

I come to speak to you about States rights. Without Washington there would be no States rights. I come to speak to you about private enterprise. Without George Washington there would be no private enterprise, as we have known it.

Many of you probably know that my younger brother, Frank, was for many years a member of the Associated General Contractors of America. For 30-odd years, he headed a construction firm in Huntington, W. Va., that specialized in tunnel, railroad, and highway work. A few years ago, he concentrated his activities on a subsidiary called the Robertson-Fowler Co., with headquarters in Salem, Va. I mention the fact that my brother has been a contractor to indicate my interest in that type of business and my knowledge of construction problems.

While every Member of the Senate is compelled to touch base with a wide variety of problems, all of us attempt to specialize in some field, and especially is that true of the senior Members who become committee chairmen. For 10 years, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, I specialized in tariffs and taxes. For the past 20 years, as a Member of the Senate, I have specialized in legislation affecting financial institutions although I serve on six subcommittees of the Senate Appropriations Committee that handle about 96 percent of the budget.

My knowledge of the construction industry convinces me that contractors are just as much interested as bankers in sound fiscal and credit policies under which a businessman can get credit at reasonable rates and can bid on a job, knowing that inflation before the job's completion will not turn an estimated profit into an unexpected loss. In addition to that, every Virginia contractor believes in the preservation of States rights because he knows the form of good government we have had in Virginia throughout our history and the protection that Virginia laws and Virginia law enforcement officers give to those engaged in the construction industry in the Old Dominion are dependent upon the preservation of our State sovereignty.

I would be less than frank if I did not tell you tonight that there are clouds upon the horizon which, in my opinion, threaten the perpetuity, both in Virginia and the Nation at large, of our cherished system of private enterprise within the framework of American constitutional liberty.

In the first place, our National Government is making concessions to pressure groups that tend to question respect for law and order on the one hand and to threaten price stability on the other. In the second place, in endeavoring to finance what some economists call a 2-percent war, simply because the special costs (in additional to usual defense expenditures) are about 2 percent of what economists call the gross national product, and, at the same time, expand an unprecedented domestic program by more than $3 billion, the administration will accentuate present trends toward harmful inflation.

It may help our thinking about a so-called 2-percent war—meaning a war costing within 2 percent of a gross national product that exceeds $700 billion—if we will analyze what the economists mean by that pat phrase "gross national product."

The gross national product is defined as the total market value of all final goods produced and services performed in the Nation during a given period.

The gross national product is an imaginary figure. It includes all goods and services bought and sold and estimates for such things as rent on owned homes and food consumed by those who grow it. It includes goods and services consumed or used by consumers and also goods and services that go to public or private investment. It includes additions to business inventories and the net balance of exports over imports. It also includes all governmental activities.

As you might expect from the kinds of things that are included in it, the gross national product is based on estimates—good, bad, and indifferent—it is based partly on wholesale prices and partly on retail prices, and it always involves problems of how to measure what it would be if prices did not change.

Changes in the gross national product from year to year give some indication of the trend of the economy, at least to the extent that underlying changes in prices can be taken into consideration. And, from an overall point of view, the relation of military expenditures to the gross national product has considerable significance. The ratio of military expenditures to gross national product was very high during World War II—over 40 percent. After World War II it declined down to less than 5 percent, and it rose again during the Korean military buildup to about 12 percent. In 1965 the ratio was about 7½ percent.

The additional cost of military operations in Vietnam is estimated at a little over $10 billion, which is something less than 2 percent of the $700 billion gross national product. While 2 percent sounds like a very small figure, an additional $10 billion does not seem small. For one thing, it amounts to over 12 percent of the anticipated increase in the total output of our economy, which is operating at close to capacity.

When this $10 billion is translated into specifics, the proportion increases fast. Set-asides of copper for the military now amount to 6 or 7 percent of overall copper production. And when we consider specific copper products, the problem gets worse—15 percent of the production of magnet wire has been set aside for the military. In the case of flat rolled brass products, set-asides of 17 to 26 percent of 1965 production of those products have been established for ammunition strip alone. In the case of aluminum, set-asides come to about 10 percent overall, and all production of certain heavy aluminum extrusions is scheduled for the military.

Computing military needs on percentages of gross national product reminds me of the man who drowned crossing a river with an average depth of 3 feet. The average did not help him much when he got to the middle of the stream.

It is the increase in the demand for specific materials and specific equipment which creates shortages in the civilian market and which forces prices up. With the kinds of pressures I have indicated, it is understandable that the price of copper threatened to go up to such an extent that the President felt compelled to release copper from the national defense stockpile to meet the demand. Aluminum was released from the Defense Production Act inventory because of increasing demand and threatened increases in prices. Every housewife knows that the cost of living is going up. The statistics show a 12-percent increase in wholesale prices of farm products during the past year, an 8-percent increase in processed food prices, and an overall average increase in wholesale prices of 4.6 percent. Every man seeking a new home knows that the price of houses is going up. The statistics show an increase in construction costs at the rate of 5 percent a year and in wages in the construction industry of 6 percent or more a year. These increases in prices and the disclosure in the Federal budget that obligational authority for the present fiscal year is 18 percent above that of the past year are far more important than the relation between the cost of Vietnam and the gross national product.

We also know that the so-called 2-percent war in Vietnam may not stay indefinitely at that figure. At the present time, some 200,000 men have been committed to that struggle. The estimate of future commitments run all the way from 300,000 to 600,000 and the duration of the conflict from 1 more year to 10 or more.

While I intend to vote for every dollar the military needs to back up the brave Americans who are trying to stem the tide of communism in the jungles of southeast Asia, I believe the Federal budget contains other programs which can and should be deferred. I will vote to cut domestic nonessentials rather than raise taxes.

I did not believe Vietnam was the place to make a stand against communism, and in arriving at that conclusion I had the advice of the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur, an authority on the subject.

But, now that we have chosen that course, we cannot withdraw until we have convinced the Communists that they cannot win. Then, they may be willing to discuss an honorable and just peace. I pray that day will come soon, for the sake of our boys who are fighting against disease as well as sniper bullets in that malaria-infested jungle country.

As I have said, we face the dangers of inflation because we have seen a rise in the general level of prices. Some economists claim that the creeping inflation which usually accompanies the type of business expansion we have enjoyed for the past 10 years is a price the Nation can afford to pay for economic growth.

The purchasing power of our dollar has declined 15 percent in the past 10 years. That decline in purchasing power is illustrated by E bonds bought 10 years ago, the actual yield of which in present dollars is 1½ percent instead of 3¼ percent. To stimulate sales, the President has increased the interest rate to 4.15 percent but the

Treasury was already paying more than that on marketable notes of 5 years or less.

It is the slow but steady erosion of purchasing power that we call creeping inflation. In spite of the increase in the money supply two factors have held down price increases in recent years: (1) Few plants were operating at full capacity, and (2) increased production was running only somewhat ahead of an increase in the money supply.

The type of inflation that goes beyond the creeping stage into the stage of acknowledged damage is the type called demand-pull. Demand-pull inflation is created when the demand for goods and services outstrips the supply and additional money is being fed into the money stream to accentuate the pull. In recent years, production has been rising at the rate of about 4 percent per year. In the past year, output increased about 6 percent while the total of bank deposits and currency increased by 8 percent and at a time when much of our production will be devoted to war supplies.

There is a shortage of skilled workers in many industries and many of our factories are working at full capacity. In a situation of that type, to inject billions of dollars of borrowed money into the money stream, with a continuation of abundant credit, will undoubtedly create serious price increases. No one knows exactly what the deficit for the current fiscal year will be, but it will be much larger than previously anticipated because of war expenditures that will be included in fiscal 1966 instead of fiscal 1967.

Some of the money that the Government will borrow this year may need to come from Federal Reserve banks and for each dollar of Government bonds that a Reserve bank acquires, $6 of new potential credit is created. Thus the money supply may be increased far above the amount of deficit spending.

Another major problem for this session of the Congress will be bills to increase the powers of the Federal Government at the expense of the States.

An example is the bill to repeal State right-to-work laws.

I am not opposed to organized labor, and there is no evidence that these laws have injured unions. But I believe joining a union should be a voluntary decision of each worker and not something he is compelled by law to do under the threat of losing his job if he refuses.

The Virginia law seeks only to preserve this freedom of choice by the individual, and it is just as explicit in guaranteeing a man's right to join a union, as it is in protecting his right not to join. It is a freedom guaranteed by the Federal Constitution and the Congress has no authority to deny it.

If those of us who opposed repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law were asking, instead, for a Federal right-to-work law that would ban the union shops everywhere, organized labor might have reason to complain.

But all that section 14(b) does is to preserve the right of each State to decide this question for itself. The advocates of repeal are saying to the 19 right-to-work States, "You must go along with the 31 States which do not have such laws."

In short, the 14(b) repeal bill is just one more step in the steady process of destroying State sovereignty by centering all power in Washington. I am glad that we have defeated the repeal bill for this session.

But this is only one round in the almost endless battle to protect State sovereignty. We are faced with measures to Federalize unemployment compensation, to raise the $1.25 an hour minimum wage rate and extend its coverage to purely intrastate activities. Finally, we may even be asked to give the Federal Government control over the selection of juries in State courts.

I shall oppose all of these proposals because the remedies are worse than the alleged ills to be cured. They threaten our basic form of government by converting 50 sovereign States into mere segments of a centralized Federal Government.

Payroll taxes to finance social reforms are rising steadily, and the end is not in sight.

Only a few weeks ago the payroll levy on both employers and employees was increased to cover the cost of medicare and other changes made last year in the old-age retirement system.

If this Congress passes a pending bill to establish a new system of supplementary Federal unemployment compensation, the separate payroll taxes for this purpose also would go up substantially, especially if the wage base on which this tax is levied goes up from $3,000 at present, to $6,600, as proposed.

Unlike the old-age retirement, this tax is levied only on the employer.

When Congress first passed the Social Security Act more than 30 years ago it levied a Federal tax to induce the States to pass unemployment compensation laws. But most of this tax was credited to the employer to meet his obligations under a State law.

Although the pending bill would leave the State laws in operation, it would superimpose on those laws a schedule of Federal benefits to be paid after an employee had exhausted his period of State payments. My fear is that once we set up this machinery in Washington it will be only a matter of time until the unemployment compensation system is federalized completely.

As long as I have the high honor and the coveted privilege to represent you in the Senate of the United States, I shall exert my best efforts in behalf of sound fiscal policies and for the preservation of those priceless principles of political and economic freedom, which were born of the brain and purchased with the blood of our colonial ancestors. And, as I have seen our Government grow from a $4 billion government when I first entered the Congress, to a $112 billion government 33 years later, I share the sentiment of the man who said: "Any government big enough to give you all you want is big enough to take all that you have got."

THE REASON WE ARE THERE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am very much troubled by the mounting national debate on Vietnam—not because I would dampen debate. On the contrary, I believe debate is necessary for a full public understanding of any major issue.

But I am troubled because I am so much in disagreement with those who counsel our Government to pull out of Vietnam, to stop bombings and wait for the other side to agree to meet at a conference table, to dig mole-like holes called enclaves and wait for the other side to attack us.

My concern is deepened because—with the exception of the opportunists and rabble-rousers—many of those who counsel us to stop, pause, or hole up are people of sincerity and integrity. But I disagree with them all the same.

Why?

Because we are a nation born out of a historic struggle for freedom, a struggle predicated on the still controversial proposition that all men are created equal.

For nearly 2 centuries Americans have lived by that proposition and have extended it to mean that people who are created equal are also entitled to exercise their freedom through the orderly processes of self-government.

There has never been any question that Americans would defend their freedom at home. They did it in the 1770's and again in the 1860's.

But there have been many other confrontations elsewhere and on other issues. The principal issue in the War of 1812 was freedom of the seas. Our concern under the Monroe Doctrine was with the freedom of other American nations and we have moved troops often to protect their freedom. Then twice during this century our Nation was involved in major world conflicts to defend freedom abroad against wholesale onslaughts by various aggressors.

But since the Second World War our defense of freedom has had to change as the world grew smaller and as aggressors found new and more sophisticated ways to abridge the rights of man.

At times it was naked aggression, as in Korea. But more often in was through insurgency, subversion, and intimidation. And although the probing finger of the Communist attack has moved from point to point around the world, its effect has always been global and the United States could no more hide from it than could an ostrich whose head was in the sand.

The spearhead of the Communist attack is now directed against South Vietnam, that unfortunate land that is being crossed and re-crossed by contending armies. Our troops are fighting there to honor our general commitment to freedom and our specific commitment to the people of South Vietnam. Those commitments were not made hastily and they will not be broken easily.

Meanwhile, the President of the United States has the awful duty—as did many Presidents before him—to decide when the guns shall fire and when the bombs shall drop.

And we, who have many rights and privileges, also have certain duties. One is to support the commitment to freedom. Another is to hope that our Armed Forces will accomplish their mission and return home. And another is to conduct our affairs at home so that nothing we do will interfere with the first two objectives.

SOUND ECONOMY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it is being said that the economy is as sound as a dollar.

The President's objective is full employment without inflation.

He has asked that wage and price policies of labor and business be responsible, and he is promising that this administration will be "fully responsible."

Commenting on the President's comprehensive Economic Report to Congress, the Philadelphia Inquirer recently said:

> It might even be said that the economy is as sound as a dollar.

The Inquirer added:

> Economists are enthusiastically confident of the future.

Because of the light that this editorial focuses on a matter of vital concern to us all, I hereby submit it for inclusion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 28, 1966]

Profile of the National Economy

In his comprehensive economic report to Congress Thursday, President Johnson pronounced the state of the Union's business and financial health to be good and sound. It might even be said that the economy is as sound as a dollar.

The President did, in fact, temper his generally glowing portrayal of American prosperity with another timely warning about the continuing threat of inflation. He urged again that wage and price policies of labor and business be "responsible," and he made a personal pledge that fiscal policies of his administration will be "fully responsible."

He emphasized that the Government has neither the authority nor the desire to impose statutory controls on wages and prices—but he appealed for public cooperation in exercising voluntary restraints.

This is advice worth heeding by all concerned. There also should be continuing voluntary cooperation by the business and financial community in preventing excessive flow of American dollars abroad, so that the deficit in this country's balance of international payments can be eliminated.

We believe the American people are prepared to accept whatever tax adjustments may be required to do what needs to be done to defend the lines of freedom in Vietnam, or in any other place where this Nation's courage and honor are put to test by the forces of Communist aggression. The President has not yet asked for tax changes of a major nature that would demand substantial sacrifice or inflict real hardship upon the public. In time, however, he may find it necessary, in response to unpredictable events, to do so.

Economists are enthusiastically confident of the future. The domestic indicators support their forecasts. There is, though, the shadow of Vietnam hanging over all.

WHAT A COMMUNIST TAKEOVER WOULD MEAN TO SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, there has been much conjecture in the ongoing debate on our Vietnamese policy on how we would get along if the Communists should succeed in their ambitions to control all of that troubled land. Not too much thought has been given to what this event specifically would mean to the South Vietnamese.

In a column which appeared in the Evening Star on Monday, Crosby S. Noyes rectified this situation with a very perceptive look at what a Communist takeover would mean to South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 21, 1966]

Feasibility Versus Extermination

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

Of all the issues to emerge so far from the great debate on Vietnam in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the one which causes most trouble might be called the question of feasibility.

Critics of the American effort to contain Communist aggression in southeast Asia almost invariably start from the premise that it can't be done.

Even if they are finally persuaded that the task is feasible from a military standpoint, they remain unconvinced about the possibility of ultimate success. How, they ask, can the United States possibly achieve a stable political solution in Vietnam under the leadership that now seems available?

The question of feasibility, oddly enough, is never raised in connection with the Communist effort in South Vietnam. The military capacity of the Vietcong to "pacify" a country whose people, in the great majority, have resisted the Communist guerrilla forces bitterly for a decade is apparently never questioned. The ability of the leadership in Hanoi to absorb South Vietnam into the disciplined organization that exists in the north is apparently taken as a foregone conclusion.

Critics who boggle at the price of winning the war never think of the price tag that would be attached to a Communist victory in Vietnam. Those who protest most loudly against occasional civilian casualties incurred in fighting the Vietcong would cheerfully condemn a whole population to the tender process which the Communists refer to as "anti-imperialist purification."

The price, conservatively, would be the death of well over a million people. It would mean the systematic destruction of all the major groupings in the South—Buddhists, Catholics, and other religious sects, trade unions, intellectuals and students—all of which have remained strongly anti-Communist.

The purification process also would prove fatal to a large proportion of the leadership of South Vietnam, civilian and military. The landowners and urban bourgeoisie would suffer the fate of all such people with the takeover of a Communist regime. For the anti-Communists of South Vietnam, there would be no Formosa refuge.

The methods used by the Hanoi regime to establish its hold on the people is a matter of historical record. Even in North Vietnam, already partially "purified" for communism by the flight to the South of more than a million refugees in 1954, the toll was impressive. Indeed, it reached the point in 1956 that such a hardened revolutionary as Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap was moved to protest that the regime had "executed too many honest people" and "seeing enemies everywhere, resorted to terror, which became far too widespread."

Moralists who agonize over the American effort in Vietnam might do well to ponder the morality of abandoning 15 million people to a painful reconciliation with their brothers to the North. The Communists, to be sure, have no qualms whatever about the feasibility of attaining their objectives in the South. But in fact their problem is enormous, compared with the American problem of helping to restore order and stability in South Vietnam once the military struggle is won.

Under conditions of reasonable security, a stable and representative government in Saigon is by no means impossible. Remarkable progress in this direction was made between 1954 and 1956.

Stable government in South Vietnam was, in fact, an early casualty of the subversive war. The excesses of the Diem regime, his overthrow and the subsequent political upheavals were all the indirect results of Communist pressure. The present government of Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, which represents no more than a consensus of top military officers is recognized by everyone, including Ky himself, as a temporary military necessity.

The process of rebuilding, in the opinion of most experts on Vietnam, must be from the ground up, rather than from the top down. In many ways, the central administration in Saigon is less important to good government than the quality of leadership on the provincial, district, and village levels.

Election of top Government officials by universal suffrage is admittedly a difficult process in a country where the average person rarely ventures beyond the confines of his own village. A growing number of experts believe that indirect elections, starting with the selection of village councils and progressing upward through the higher levels of administration to the final designation of national leaders provides the best guarantee of responsible representative government.

Village elections held under the direction of the Ky government last year could represent, then, the start of the political rebuilding process. Even in the midst of war, the Vietnamese themselves are taking steps to restore the legitimacy of their government. And despite the pessimists, there is reasonable hope in Washington for success.

THE PROBLEMS OF WATER SUPPLY AND MANAGEMENT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, today we Americans are facing a national challenge in the mounting problems of water supply and management.

Our water need now stands at 370 billion gallons a day. In 1980—14 years from now—our water need will more than double. By the turn of the century—it will rise to triple what it is now.

In meeting such a monumental challenge we must consider and explore every possibility.

One approach to the problem is the North American Water and Power Alliance, more popularly known as NAWAPA.

Senator Frank Moss, my distinguished colleague from Utah, headed a Senate subcommittee that studied the NAWAPA concept, and when I was privileged to be a member of that body, we recommended that further studies be made jointly by the United States and Canada.

There is an excellent article about NAWAPA in the February 14 issue of the National Observer. Written by Patrick Young, I highly recommend it as a reference on a far-reaching resource problem.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the National Observer, Feb. 14, 1966]

Water Is the Most Efficient Crop They Can Harvest—A Dramatic Plan To Tap Canada's Rivers for a Continent's Needs

(By Patrick Young)

The deep, cool rivers of Canada are drawing covetous glances from some U.S. engineers, who talk of diverting Canadian streams to help slake rapidly expanding American demands for fresh water. And though our northern neighbors are responding to such proposals with the enthusiasm of a man told he must pay another's taxes, there is a growing feeling in the United States that Canada will eventually find water a profitable export, and agree to the diversion.

This may be years in coming. But Canada's reluctance to part with its water isn't stopping discussion of the proposed North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA), an ambitious plan to reverse the flow of several subarctic rivers, and redistribute their waters in Canada, the United States, and Mexico. This fascinating proposal, vast enough to boggle the mind of a Jules Verne, would cost $100 billion over

30 years. Should it ever reach full development, it would bring major changes to North America's topography.

NAWAPA envisions an Alaskan dam 1,700 feet high, a 500-mile-long reservoir high in the Rocky Mountains of British Columbia, a seaway for oceangoing vessels spanning Canada from the Great Lakes to the Pacific Ocean, and an 80-mile-long tunnel blasted through the *Sangre de Cristo* Mountains on the New Mexico-Colorado border. NAWAPA's 370 major projects would include 15 reservoirs larger than Hoover Dam's Lake Mead, the Nation's largest manmade lake.

Supporters contend the project would bring new life through irrigation to 86,300 square miles of arid land—an area nearly equal in size to Utah; help flush pollution from the continent's waterways, generate enormous amounts of electric power, and earn $4 billion a year through the sale of water and electricity. This, they say, would pay for NAWAPA's construction and operating costs.

In all, these backers say, the project would benefit directly one territory and 7 Provinces in Canada, 33 States in the United States, and Mexico's 3 northern States, as well as bring an economic and recreation boom to all three nations.

This concept of a continental redistribution of water is only a few years old. Until the Ralph M. Parsons Co. advanced its proposal in 1964, U.S. water planners talked of transferring water from one river basin to another within the United States, but not of diverting Canadian water.

The proposal often evokes the kind of skepticism people reserve for visionary projects. But many people who have studied NAWAPA think it is feasible.

"The concept is entirely practicable," says Senator FRANK E. MOSS, the Utah Democrat who headed a Senate subcommittee that studied the NAWAPA plan. "There have been enough engineering studies made in broad terms to establish that there is water available that can be transported and stored along the way, and that this is all within economic and engineering reach of our economy right now."

WHY PARSONS IS INTERESTED

Senator Moss' subcommittee recommended that further studies, including detailed engineering and cost surveys, be made jointly by the United States and Canada. The subcommittee said many water projects proposed by both governments could be integrated into the NAWAPA plan, thus reducing its cost. So far, however, the U.S. State Department has not formally proposed the NAWAPA concept to Canada.

Parsons, of course, is greatly interested in seeing its project developed, and not for altruistic reasons. "If they're going to spend a huge amount of money for construction, we're going to get a piece of it," says Ralph M. Parsons, chairman of the worldwide company that bears his name. And there seems little doubt that something must be done about the Nation's water needs, expected to double by 1980 and triple by the year 2000. These demands are particularly great in the Western United States.

"A water crisis is upon us. It will steadily worsen," Senator Moss' subcommittee said in its report last fall. "So great is the problem and so important its solution that it now has become impervative that consideration be given to what at one time seemed unachievable proposals."

NAWAPA is just such a proposal. It is not, however, a detailed engineering study. The plan was drawn up, without field surveys, on the basis of available topographical and hydrological data. "Everything that's been done has been done with maps," says a Parsons executive. "It's all swivel-chair engineering." And Parsons engineers are the first to concede that their plan needs detailed surveys to fully prove its practicability. "We don't want this thing thought of as a developed plan," Mr. Parsons says.

THE DAM ENVISIONED AT CHITINA

NAWAPA proposes to utilize some of the water that now flows unused into the Bering Sea from the northwest section of North America. High dams in Alaska and Canada's Yukon Territory would create a series of huge, interconnected reservoirs. One of these dams, on the Copper River near Chitina, Alaska, would tower 1,700 feet, nearly twice the height of the world's highest dam (988 feet) now abuilding in Russia.

Water in these manmade lakes would be diverted through rivers, reservoirs, canals, and tunnels as far south as Mexico. For the most part, the flow would be downhill. But, when necessary, powerful pumps would lift the water over mountains and to higher elevations to begin again its downward surge.

The key reservoir in the NAWAPA system would be a 500-mile-long lake in the Rocky Mountain Trench. This deep gorge, 3,000 feet above sea level, would be dammed to form the world's largest manmade lake, holding 518,200,000 acre-feet of water or 16 times the capacity of Lake Mead. Branching off from this lake, the system's major storage point, would be the Canadian-Great Lakes Waterway and the Fraser River. Together they would link the Great Lakes with Vancouver, British Columbia.

Water from the Rocky Mountain Trench could be used to maintain a constant level in the Columbia River in the Pacific Northwest. This would assure maximum year-round power output from generating plants on the river, as well as providing flood control.

ONE OF THE GREAT RECREATION LAKES

The Rocky Mountain Trench is adjacent to Canada's Banff and Jasper National Parks. "I see this as one of the greatest recreation lakes in the world," Senator Moss says. "It would be up against the Canadian Rockies, one of the most spectacular ranges in the world. It could even be a good transportation link between northern and southern British Columbia."

The southern tip of this reservoir would be in northern Montana. From here water would rush southward to be pushed over the mountains of central Idaho by six huge pumping stations. A canal 630 feet wide and 35 feet deep would carry the water into Utah, Nevada, and back into Utah where the water flow would split in two. The Colorado Basin aqueduct would carry water southwest into Nevada, California; and finally Mexico. The southwest aqueduct would flow into Arizona and New Mexico, before branching off into Mexico and looping up into Colorado.

All along this nation-spanning route, water would irrigate new farmland, serve industry, and quench the thirst of cities. Enormous new lakes would be formed—one a few miles north of Las Vegas, another near the Grand Canyon, a third east of Denver. And the water, as it flowed beyond this Nation's border, would enable Mexico to develop eight times the new farmland that Egypt's high dam abuilding at Aswan will provide.

"All three of the Northern States of Mexico are extremely arid, and suffer from a lack of water," Senator Moss says. "If water can be brought here, their agriculture will blossom. And this would help alleviate some of the poverty."

Canada, too, would benefit from the NAWAPA proposal, Senator Moss believes. "First, there is the power produced," he says. "The second thing is irrigation water in the Southern Provinces where they have a drought problem just like our Great Plains. The third is transportation."

The Canadian-Great Lakes Waterway would flow from the Canadian Rockies. Coupled with the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes, this 730-foot-wide, 30-foot-deep canal would provide a seaway between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. Thus man would create the fabled Northwest Passage, which early European explorers vainly sought.

The waterway would flow into the southern tip of Manitoba's Lake Winnipeg, before eventually emptying into Lake Superior. At Lake Winnipeg's northern tip, the Hudson Bay Seaway would link the waterway with Hudson Bay.

LINKING CANADA TO U.S. RIVERS

A barge canal splitting off from the waterway northwest of Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan, would flow through North Dakota and Minnesota to Minneapolis on the Mississippi River. This would link Canada to the Mississippi, Missouri, Tennessee, and Ohio Rivers. Wheat from Canada could flow to the grain elevators of Minneapolis or St. Louis, and steel from Pittsburgh or petroleum products from the gulf coast could be shipped to Canada.

Another segment of the NAWAPA proposal, which could be constructed separately, would harness the waters from rivers south and east of Hudson Bay. The James Bay Seaway would connect Hudson Bay with Lake Huron. Waters from dammed rivers in the mineral-rich Quebec northlands and diverted southwest would form the Knob Lake Barge Canal. The canal would join with the James Bay Seaway near the Quebec-Ontario border.

Controlling the sprawling fingers of NAWAPA would be an immense task, requiring sophisticated analysis of meteorological information, and the water and power demands of various parts of the continent. Water for summer irrigation in Mexico, for example, would have to be released from high-altitude reservoirs in Canada and the northern United States sometime the previous January or February.

To solve these problems, the NAWAPA plan includes a central computer center with a complex network of microwave systems, landlines, and relay stations covering two-thirds of North America. This system would relay the necessary instructions from the center's computers to deliver water when and where it's needed.

Yet even if this complex plan should become reality, it would not solve all this Nation's water ills. "This is not an answer to all the aches and pains," Mr. Parsons says. And Senator Moss agrees. "This concept isn't designed to supplant or make unnecessary efforts to clean up or use our water over again and again," he says.

NAWAPA supporters realize staggering problems must be solved if their plan is to be fulfilled. None will be more difficult than overcoming Canada's reluctance to participate. The Canadians say there is no such thing as continental water, and they aren't interested in supplying water to the United States if this means Canada might someday suffer.

ACT LIKE SEPARATE KINGDOMS

"While they're trying to make up their mind, they'll naturally barricade themselves behind a negative attitude," says an American long familiar with Canadian affairs. "But to talk about a continental approach to water is useless until you can get the Provinces to agree. They act like separate kingdoms up there."

This, indeed, is particularly true regarding water. The 10 Provinces of Canada control the water within their borders, and they find it nearly impossible to work together in developing this important resource. NAWAPA supporters, however, think at least part of the plan may soon take shape. This is the James Bay Seaway. A Canadian engineer, Thomas Kierans, has proposed a similar project, and there is talk the two plans might be combined to take advantage of the best features of each.

There is yet another reason why some NAWAPA supporters are confident the Canadians will eventually agree. "The almighty dollar always overcomes their prejudices," one of them says. "As we look at this, water is the most efficient crop they can harvest, and it makes sense for them to join in a continental redistribution system."

BANKERS JOIN EDUCATORS IN OPPOSING ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL TO CUT OFF NDEA STUDENT LOANS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, President *Johnson, in his budget message submitted* last month, indicated that the administration would propose legislation "to shift the National Defense Education Act student loan program to the newly authorized subsidized loan guarantee program" enacted as title IV, part B of the Higher Education Act of 1965—Public Law 89–329. An estimated $200 million will be borrowed under the National Defense Education Act student loan program during the next fiscal year. I fully favor the subsidized loan guarantee program established last year by the Higher Education Act, but believe the National Defense Education Act program must be funded and carried on, too.

Educators and college administrators throughout the Nation have already voiced their objection to the administration proposal which would oblige needy students to seek guaranteed bank loans to pursue their studies rather than obtaining the necessary funds directly from the colleges administering the National Defense Education Act loan program.

Now, the banking community has added its voice to the chorus of opposition to the administration proposal. While banks are already committed and are supporting the guaranteed loan provisions of the Higher Education Act written into law last year, they are fearful that under the administration proposal "a situation could possibly develop which might jeopardize the inception of the guaranteed loan plan and at the same time not fully serve the important needs of the National Defense Education Act program."

The views of the American Bankers Association on this question have been detailed in a letter to me by Charles E. Walker, executive vice president of the American Bankers Association.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter from the American Bankers Association, dated February 16, 1966, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
New York, N.Y., February 16, 1966.
Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: I am pleased to respond to your letter of January 27, seeking the views of the American Bankers Association with respect to the plan of the administration, as announced in the President's budget message, to propose legislation shifting the National Defense Education Act student loan program to the guaranteed student loan program, which was authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965.

As you are well aware, this association worked closely with those in the administration and the Congress, including yourself, who were principally responsible for the development of the provisions in the Higher Education Act of 1965 authorizing the new program of guaranteed private loans for college students. We are most interested in *seeing that this program is successful* and have firmly committed the resources of the association to that end.

The administration's proposal to transfer the student loan program of the National Defense Education Act to the new guarantee plan manifests a confidence in the private financial community which is most gratifying to the American Bankers Association. This expression of confidence in the capacity of the private sector to work with the Federal Government in meeting major national social needs should provide an added incentive for vigorous performance by financial institutions in meeting the loan demands arising from the new guarantee program.

Despite our gratification with the philosophy underlying the administration's recommendation, it is our considered judgment that implementation of that proposal at this time might not be in the best interests of either the National Defense Education Act program or the new guaranteed loan program. It is estimated that the guaranteed loan program may well generate student loan demand in the order of $500 million for the first academic year of operation. Meeting such an initial demand, with credit resources already under heavy pressure, is going to require a major effort on our part. If, additionally, the $200 million in anticipated loan demand from the National Defense Education Act program is shifted to the private credit sector, a situation could possibly develop which might jeopardize the inception of the guaranteed loan plan and at the same time not fully serve the important needs of the National Defense Education Act program. In short it would seem that the better course would be for the private sector to concentrate its energies and attention on a successful launching of the guaranteed loan program, and to withhold a decision on the proposed change in the National Defense Education Act loan program until the guaranteed private loan program has gained some experience and maturity.

I hope that these observations are responsive to your question and will be of benefit to you in your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES E. WALKER.

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT SPEAKS OUT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the George Washington University, Washington, D.C., bears a name long honored in our country. It is my belief that Dr. Lloyd H. Elliott, the new president of this justly famed institution of learning will administer his new duties in a manner which will add luster to its name and will continue and advance the aims and traditions so long associated with its functions.

Those persons not familiar with his background will be interested in learning of Dr. Elliott's intensive career in the area of education.

He was born in Clay County, W. Va., and began his undergraduate work in education at West Virginia Institute of Technology in the town of Montgomery. He continued his studies at Glenville State College, Glenville, W. Va., receiving his bachelor of arts degree from that college in 1937. Afterward, he attended West Virginia University at Morgantown, where he earned his master's degree in education.

Dr. Elliott has been in the education field all of his life, with the exception of the period of his military service dur*ing World War II. He received his doc*torate from the University of Colorado in 1948, having received some financial assistance under educational provisions of the so-called GI bill of rights.

Dr. Elliott came to the George Washington University from the presidency *of the University of Maine; and, in pre*senting his inaugural address on Monday, February 21, he spoke of the way in which many dissident elements of our present society have used universities in a manner not part of their historical heritage and not integral to their mission. He forcefully stated the imperative need to reserve to our universities their primary reason for existence—the advancement of knowledge.

West Virginia is proud of its native son, and I am confident that the citizens *of my State join with me in commending* him on the sound philosophy which he stated on the occasion of his assumption of the office of president of the George Washington University here in the Nation's Capital.

I ask unanimous consent that his inaugural address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY LLOYD H. ELLIOTT, FEBRUARY 21, 1966

Those who build universities are involved in a task that is always incomplete; their fellow-laborers include members of all generations. In joining that large group of men and women who have had a part down through the years in fashioning this distinguished university, I pledge my every effort.

The office to which you have elected me carries in itself a full measure of responsibility but, when coupled as it is with the founding of the Nation, the presidency of the George Washington University brings an even greater dimension of accountability. It was Washington's hope, you will recall, that students from all parts of the country would acquire the habits of good citizenship while being instructed in the arts and sciences.

In paying tribute again to the vision of the leader whose name this institution so proudly bears and, standing behind the seal which carries his profile, I join all friends of this university both far and near in working to realize now the greatness which it will one day attain.

Much has been written in recent years of this instrument of society—the university—in which the George Washington University holds membership. Perhaps there is still room for further dialog.

Traditionally, the university has been required to defend itself against outside intervention. Through the years this intervention has taken different forms. No matter what its origin, it has been aimed generally at restricting academic freedom—the first standard of a university. Many of our institutions must yet today fight continuing battles against such interference. Some of this interference is brought about by those who would make of the university a battleground for the dissident elements of our society. This is not unusual. Opposing groups have always sought to shift the debris of strife from their own doorsteps, and universities sometimes have been offered up on the sacrificial altar.

The university cannot be a tool of government; it cannot be a servant of industry; it must not become the playground of the rich nor the caretaker of the poor—the university cannot, in short, become something it is not, and still remain a university.

I suspect the greatest danger today stems from those who would like to turn the university into a battlefield for causes unrelated to academic freedom and the pursuit of knowledge. The necessities of the university remain the same, however, as in earlier years. They are the knowledge with which to consider the worthy life, the intellectual stimulation necessary to encourage the search, and the community of scholarship in which reason predominates.

The university is, therefore, an inappropriate home for the student who does not study, the professor who does not teach or search for knowledge, or the administrator who does not dedicate himself to the furtherance of the institution.

Given these simple requirements, the university is the proper home for the man who is reaching for something nobler than himself and, while reaching, wishes the guidance of accumulated knowledge and the inspiration of others who are dedicated to the same objective.

There is some danger that today's disorder in the university may render sterile the nourishment that is the heart of intellectual growth. As in earlier days, the university must be protected from such circumvention of its basic purposes.

For some time it has been recognized by most leaders in American society that to a very large degree what happens to America depends on what happens in American education. Business and industry, whether we speak of management training or antipoverty programs, have accepted the economic soundness of this general principle. The principle, of course, is equally sound when applied to the whole world. Namely, to a very great extent what happens to the world, depends upon what happens in educating the world's peoples. We are now hearing voices which suggest that America's relationship with the rest of the world, specifically its foreign aid programs, might appropriately be based on educating insofar as resources and personnel can be organized, the peoples of the world. The reasoning is rather simple and direct. It suggests that understanding is the only real path to a better life; understanding is to be gained through education; therefore, if we would achieve the necessary understanding, we must educate. To all the world we must ascribe our intellectual axiom that the truth will make you free.

Only in this approach can peoples learn the relationship of population to food production, economic problems and cultural pursuits, and the meaning of freedom or justice. Our foreign policy must somehow be extricated from the short-range "crisis to crisis," "brush fire to brush fire" conditions which have plagued us for several decades.

Here at home we are beginning to recognize the promises of a broader base of education. The program labeled Headstart, the efforts in continuing and adult education, the program for retraining workers in our changing society, the multidisciplined centers being established in metropolitan areas, the special programs for school dropouts, and the seminars on art and music are all evidences of a greater concern for education and training throughout our lives. A program, therefore, of domestic education based on knowledge of human behavior and human needs of all ages as being the most direct path to the Nation's welfare, is gaining acceptance.

Some years ago, we heard a philosophy of education which seemed to say that the formal school, as organized, should be all things to all people. In practice we rejected that philosophy as we must do so today. But education in all its facets, the out-of-school forms coupled with the in-school programs, has emerged as society's chief instrument for its own survival. Public policy, however, is only beginning to recognize that fact. The anthropologist, Margaret Mead, put it in today's perspective when she wrote:

"We must rid ourselves of the idea that anybody can ever finish his education. We cannot give our young people a good education. We can give them some education. We need extended education. We need to set up a program into which people can come at any time in their lives and get as much education as they can take."

America's economic base is now sufficient to release the manpower necessary for implementing a public policy of this kind and the productive power of our society is sufficient to provide the physical facilities and necessary equipment. That which remains is more challenging than that which has been achieved. We must decide now whether we have the moral fortitude to forgo more private pleasures in order to provide for the greater public benefit. Let me turn to another student of contemporary life, this time Walter Lippmann, for the precise statement:

"We must measure our educational effort as we do our military effort. That is to say, we must measure not by what it would be easy and convenient to do, but what it is necessary to do in order that the Nation may survive and flourish. We have learned that we are quite rich enough to defend ourselves, whatever the cost. We must now learn that we are quite rich enough to educate ourselves as we need to be educated."

Having made a case thus far for both a domestic and an international policy based on the achievement of understanding through education, I must now ask the question: What is the objective of the society built on education—the pursuit of truth, wherever it may lead? Its objective is manifold.

It includes a better life, adequate food and shelter, better health, greater control over nature's upheavals, relief from boredom, and a release of man's creative talents. While our objective may be broadly defined, it must rest on simple truths. Understanding comes from a great complex, but Shakespeare warned all when he wrote, "Who understandeth thee not, loves thee not." And while truths may be self-evident, sacred and undeniable, they do not make free those who lack understanding.

This Nation's responsibility to the world will require sacrifice and lives given in service to others; it will require humility, a long-term commitment, less emphasis on the material things ourselves, and a dedication to these objectives by example on the part of those who would teach the young. Of America it is being asked: Did this Nation come to power too soon? Is the leadership of the world which has been thrust into the hands of this young Nation too much of a responsibility? Is America unable to understand and, therefore, to grasp this leadership? Will America be too slow? Will the United States fail?

When George Washington urged the establishment of a center of learning in the Nation's Capital, did he dream that someday the world's heartbeat would be centered on the banks of the Potomac? Did he foresee, even then, that the university must serve as the world's center for the serious, critical pursuit of truth and knowledge?

Washington was ahead of his time in many areas. It is not too much to believe that his ideas for a college were also in the front ranks. It remains, however, for each generation to preserve the freedom of the university, and to guarantee its health.

Having fashioned an instrument of infinite worth in service to humanity, it remains to be seen whether or not our self-indulgence and the pursuit of private pleasure will prove to be hurdles too great to surmount. Perhaps the real test of civilization is now before the citizens of this Nation. When the work of the few is sufficient to provide for the many, what will happen to enthusiasm, discipline, meditation? Will lives be filled with noise, drivel, and frivolity? Will America have leadership, service, sweat and tears to export when that day comes? What follows when the fatigue of work no longer requires rest? Many peoples of the world do not have such a choice. How will we use our choice?

In order that people may make the reasoned choices, the university must continue to serve as the center for truth and understanding. As knowledge expands and explodes the responsibility of the university for integrity—the responsibility to speak with the unbiased voice of accumulated wisdom—becomes the duality of burden and opporunity.

As John Masefield wrote, "To be a member of one of these great societies must ever be a glad distinction."

To serve this noble institution is both an honor and a burden; and for whatever period it may be my responsibility, I pledge an uncompromising effort to achieve that level of courage and integrity necessary to the highest fulfillment of the office of president of the George Washington University.

CLEAN RIVERS DEMONSTRATION BILL

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the President's proposal for an attack on the water pollution problem on a river-basin basis offers an opportunity to take a giant step forward.

Our present pollution control programs are oriented toward the immediate needs of individual cities and municipalities throughout the Nation. While these programs are important and have served a useful purpose, they do not go far enough. We need now a program that will provide Federal assistance in cleaning up an entire river. We can do this if the States and cities will cooperate by taking the necessary action to be sure that the river, once clean, will remain clean. The Federal Government will help to take care of the backlog, so to speak, and the local agencies will then be in a position to control pollution in the future without further Federal assistance.

The program offers great promise. Its success will depend, of course, on the willingness of the States and local agencies to cooperate and participate in this concentrated attack. They must make plans that are broader than their immediate local needs. They must plan for the entire river basin. Our growing population permits no other course. It will do little good for one city to control the pollutants it dumps into a river if the other cities and communities along the river do not take similar action.

COLD WAR MYTHS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, many observers in foreign countries find U.S. foreign policy out of joint with the times. Our policy strikes them like the clothing fashions of the forties might strike us today: full of melancholy, but bulky, slightly humorous, and ill fitting.

And indeed we are draping today's realities in the raiment of yesterday, clothing uncomfortably complicated facts of life with a black and white view of the world which fit better in the forties than today.

Ronald Steel, an American who has come to this conclusion from the perspective of living in Europe while writing a book about NATO, "The End of Alliance," has contributed to numerous American and English journals. In the current issue of Commonweal, he discusses the manner in which we have transferred an eminently successful policy for Europe to the far different climate of Asia, bringing with us all the baggage of outmoded rhetoric. I believe Mr. Steel's article deserves the attention of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Cold War Myths" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLD WAR MYTHS

(By Ronald Steel)

Empires crumble, great leaders rise and fall, but political dogmas carry on, burdening each new generation with the obsessions of the last. The cold war is no exception. With its own set of dogmas evolved in the late 1940's, it has proved remarkably resilient to everything that has happened ever since. The world power structure has gone through an extraordinary upheaval during the past decade, but the popular mythology of the cold war remains solidly in place. Despite recent exercises in myth raking by Senators, journalists, and academicians, most of them are still unbowed, though perhaps a bit worse for wear. Our cold war slogans are comfortable, and like old sweaters, we hate to get rid of them even though they may be full of holes.

Some, of course, like that old standby, the "Sino-Soviet bloc," have had to be regretfully abandoned now that Peiping and Moscow are making a public spectacle over their inheritance claims to the new Jerusalem. Others, like the "international Communist conspiracy," although hopelessly outdated, linger on as handy explanations for otherwise depressingly complicated problems. As such they are extremely useful for Republican conventions, Birchite handouts, and congressional joint resolutions. They are not, however, normally taken seriously at the highest levels of government. There a more sophisticated set of myths remains supreme. As we have learned most recently from the inspirational explanations of our involvement in Vietnam, it is an American responsibility to intervene in the universal struggle between "freedom and communism," on whatever dubious or unfavorable terrain it may take place.

This dogma has a stirring ring, and in touching the proper spirit of moral fervor, it sets all the patriotic glands going. But it also conceals more than it explains about the nature of some of our involvements. It tells us nothing about the new ground of common interest between Russia and America, about the mounting spirit of independence in the satellites and the desire of Europeans on both sides of the Iron Curtain to shake themselves loose from their opposing protectors, about the tidal wave of anticolonialism which is sweeping the Western powers—America included—from their bridgeheads in Africa and Asia, about the convulsions going on within the Communist movement itself as nationalism takes precedence over the demands of Marxist ideology, and about the fact that the "communism" espoused in Belgrade and Hanoi may be just as hostile to Russian or Chinese imperialism as it is to Western intervention.

The conventional cold war labels conceal all this because they are rooted in a view of the world which has not changed to any real degree since 1948 when the Red army seemed ready to march to the channel and swoop a defenseless Western Europe into its paw. From this assumption, which seemed perfectly valid at the time, but which no one any longer considers likely, sprang the NATO alliance, the rearming of Germany, the semipermanent garrison of 400,000 American soldiers on the Continent, and periodic visions of an Atlantic Community knitting Europe and America together in atomic wedlock around the MLF. The belief that it is America's destiny to remain forever as the nursemaid of Western Europe has struck such deep roots on both sides of the Atlantic that, as that astute observer of our national folklore, D. W. Brogan, has commented, "anyone who resists or even complains is, if not an actual traitor to Western civilization, at least a howling cad."

But even those emotionally chained to the idea of a little Europe divided at the Elbe and nestling obediently under America's wing, are having a hard time reconciling this with the realities of a world which has changed profoundly since the Czech coup and the Korean war. With Europe no longer on her knees, with Russia no longer so menacing, and America no longer invulnerable, the conditions which originally inspired the alliance have disappeared. In their place are ambiguous and shifting relations between three changing powers, America, Europe, and Russia. Now that the two superpowers have become increasingly engaged by their dialog with one another and their preoccupation with a revived China, the Europeans are gradually moving toward a common approach to their own political problems that will of necessity involve a common defense no longer under American direction.

As one of the last monuments to the problems, and the rhetoric, of the late forties, NATO has been made largely irrelevant by its own success and the changing power structure in Europe. Today the whole focus of American interests is switching away from Europe, where the job of containing Russia has been largely achieved and can be taken over by Europeans themselves, to an unstable Asia and a revolution-prone "third world." There the sudden transition from colonialism to independence has been accompanied by virulent nationalism and civil disorders into which the great powers are drawn, or even fling themselves, for fear of losing influence to their rivals.

Consumed by our own quarrels with Russia, we could only see these disorders as part of the universal struggle between freedom and communism. And because that struggle had begun in Europe where the problem was one of defending weakened nations from a powerful Red army breathing down their necks, we let ourselves assume that the same situation applied everywhere else—ignoring that other nations might have reasons of their own for welcoming our military equipment. A military numbers game quite out of touch with the realities of geography and politics, the pactomania of the fifties rested on an obsession with aggression in areas where it was often unlikely and frequently impossible. Trying to reproduce NATO in contexts where virtually none of its elements applied, we somehow never let it sink in that Peru was not really in danger of a Russian invasion, that the only enemies Pakistanis and Indians worried about were one another, or that the states of Indochina were not so much threatened by a Chinese invasion as by the conflict of the great powers that have divided them into rival spheres of influence.

Dulles' pacts, for the most part, have been forgotten by all but that handful of diplomats and generals whose job it is to attend their yearly conferences in such agreeable places as Teheran and Rio. But the dogma that inspired them lives on untouched by the upheavals that have taken place since they were evolved some 15 years ago. The idea that all Communist governments are alike, all of them organized conspiracies equally hostile to American interests, is slowly being scuttled in Europe, but is not even challenged in Asia. There, by treating such Communist nationalists as Ho Chi Minh as agents of Peiping, we have managed to reinforce the very Chinese influence in Vietnam we have been trying to combat. And by intervening with our military power in a civil war among Vietnamese, we have polarized the extremes, handed the Communists the banner of nationalism, and made it seem as though we had imperial designs of our own.

The obsession with external aggression which burdened us so long in Europe has now changed its roost to Asia. The analysis is the same; only the object is different. Now that the Russians have begun to mellow, and are joining forces with the West to slam the door on the nuclear club and keep an unruly tiers monde in line, the specter of Cossacks sweeping to the Channel is being replaced by the vision of Mao Tse-tung picking up all the states of Asia from the Bay of Bengal to the Sea of Japan like falling dominoes. While this, to be sure, is an awful prospect, it is not a very likely one, since China has neither the means nor the freedom of action to impose its will on all of Asia. If the Chinese should embark upon a policy of direct aggression against their neighbors, this can be met by a judicious application of American air and sea power—perhaps joined by Russia, which has even more reason to contain China than we do, and other interested nations as well. But fomenting revolutions in unstable countries, however irritating and unfriendly, is not the same as direct aggression. And while the creation of stable, non-Communist governments on the Asian mainland is an eminently desirable goal, it is not one which can be achieved by American military power.

LINGERING DOGMA

The futile attempt to do so in Vietnam is simply the most dramatic example of how the old dogma has lived on to haunt our rhetoric and defeat our diplomacy. Although the postwar world dominated by those twin symbols of intransigence, Dulles and Stalin, has largely been eroded, the facade remains intact in the vocabulary of the outworn doctrines. Largely inappropriate to the political realities of the world of the sixties, the dogmas remain untouched because they alone explain a good many of our current involvements. Doubly mischievous, they not only inspire interventions of questionable wisdom, but provide the justifications for them once undertaken. "The dogma is," as Richard Rovere has pointed out, "the basis for popular Congressional assent" to most of current American policy, since "almost everything that we do in the mid-sixties * * * must somehow be justified with the rhetoric of the late forties."

It is not only the public, but the policymaker as well who suffers from this cultural lag, for those whose job it is to deal in realities have, in fact, become prisoners of their own rhetoric. So used to explaining every American involvement anywhere in the world—whether it be furnishing Cuban exile pilots to Tshombe or sending a gymnastics instructor to Guatemala—as part of the struggle between freedom and communism, they end up believing themselves the cold war pablum which they feed the public. The mythmaker becomes a mythmonger, as chained to his myth as Elvis Presley to his guitar. Even if he wanted to, he could not scuttle the old dogma without seeming to betray the very principles which he has been proclaiming to Congress and the voters with such tiresome and predictable ardor.

The mythmonger's excuse for chanting the old dogma, insofar as he himself is aware of its irrelevancy, is that the public is too unsophisticated to understand the nuances of foreign policy. But this, too, may be an old myth that has dragged on indecently long and should be given an early burial. The public is not as stupid as its leaders imagine, and in a good many instances—such as its favorable reception to Senator FULBRIGHT's minor heresies, and even the more fundamental criticisms of our Asian policy made more recently by Senators CHURCH, MORSE, GRUENING, MANSFIELD, and MCGOVERN—may be ahead of official wisdom in its freedom from cant and self-justification. The voters are rarely as chained to any particular line of policy as are the professionals whose job and whose self-respect are attached to those policies, and they are often willing to consider a good many of the unthinkable thoughts still whispered furtively in the corridors of the State Department.

Perhaps we are barking up the wrong tree in blaming the public for hanging onto the old myths. In truth it seems to be the policymaker, not the voter, who sees his assumptions as the epitome of political wisdom. To get him to contemplate the possibility that some of these may be outdated, or actually harmful, is to challenge much that he holds dear. "The really dangerous myths," as Irving Kristol commented aptly, "are not to be found among the unenlightened populace; they are lodged in the uppermost echelons of the government." Prying them loose from that citadel is a task of heroic proportions. It is also one of urgent necessity, for with all the talk of new realities, the old and cherished myths hang on with dogged persistence. Obscuring the real world in a fog of tiresome rhetoric, they hobble the mythmonger even more than a dogma-weary public, and paralyze the vitally needed reassessment of a foreign policy grown desperate and irrelevant.

A STUDENT SPEAKS OUT ON WATER POLLUTION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, Linda Olson, a student at the James Madison Junior High School in Appleton, Wis., has written an imaginative and charming essay dramatizing the water pollution crisis now facing this Nation. I commend Linda's essay "Drippy the Rain Drop" to Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRIPPY THE RAIN DROP

(By Linda Olson)

This is the story of my life. I used to be clean and nice, but now I'm dirty because I fell into the river and got all dirty like the other drips. They all told me that the water was getting dirty because of Mr. Brown.

Mr. Brown owned a factory, and he dumped all the mill's waste in the river. Then one day he turned on his water to get a drink, but it was all dirty.

So he went down to the water company and said, "Why is my water all dirty?" Then the man at the company said, "You just make water dirty so why should we clean your water for you?"

Then Mr. Brown said, "I will clean the river if you will clean my water." The man said, "It's a deal."

The very next day he cleaned the river and now the river is clean, and all the drips are, too. Now the sun comes out and gets water, and I'm one of the drips that came back up in the cloud.

ALASKAN NATIVE LEADERS SUPPORT SCHOOL INTEGRATION

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President on Monday I spoke of the Bureau of Indian Affairs policy of de facto segregation as practiced in Alaska at the BIA-operated schools. I spoke of the need of regional high schools in Alaska's outlying communities so that our native youth might have greater opportunities to attend high schools closer to their homes. I suggested that regional dormitories be constructed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to house our native youth and in conjunction with the dormitories, construction of regional public high schools so that the Indians and Eskimos of Alaska could attend wholly integrated schools.

In this morning's mail, I received a letter from Mr. Arthur L. Nicholson, the mayor of Bethel, Alaska, which is one of the outlying communities I spoke of on Monday. Mayor Nicholson recently wrote 50 village chiefs in Kuskokwim and the lower Yukon area requesting their views on the matter of native education in Alaska. Mayor Nicholson drafted a model resolution protesting the expansion of the Bureau of Indian Affairs high schools in Alaska and asked the village chiefs and counsels to express their feelings.

Now, I do not agree with that portion of Mayor Nicholson's letter that opposes expansion of the high school at Mount Edgecumbe. I do not agree for the reason that segregated facilities are better than no facilities at all, and as we have about 800 native children who are not afforded the opportunity to attend school anywhere, I strongly support this expansion of the Mount Edgecumbe facilities. This does not mean that I support the idea that Mount Edgecumbe should remain a segregated facility. Within a few city blocks of the Mount Edgecumbe installation is the complete public school system of Sitka. These two school systems should be combined. These native youth should attend public school with their contemporaries and nonnative children should be admitted to Mount Edgecumbe. It does not make good sense to operate two separate school facilities side by side when a combination of the two would provide integration of the school and greater utilization of financial and professional resources available. This resolution was sent out to the villages on February 3 and within 2 weeks replies were received from 10 villages that had already approved the resolution. This occurred in an area where mail service is limited to weekly or biweekly deliveries if the weather permits any delivery at all. This action by those village councils reinforces the views I presented here on Monday. These villages and Mayor Nicholson should be commended most highly for their interest in the education of their children and their desire to change the system.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter sent to me by Mayor Nicholson, the letter Mayor Nicholson sent to the village chiefs, the draft resolution and the list of the village councils who have approved the resolution, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter, the draft resolution, and the list of villages, with dates and names of councilmen, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF BETHEL,
Bethel, Alaska, February 18, 1966.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: In an effort to determine the consensus of opinion among the residents of the Kuskokwim and lower Yukon area regarding BIA secondary schools versus State-administered schools, the enclosed memorandum was mailed on February 3, 1966, to 50 villages in this area along with a suggested resolution.

Many of these villages consist of from 1 to not more than 10 families and do not have a village council. They were mailed copies anyway to try to keep them informed.

We have received to this date resolutions from 10 villages. We are enclosing a list of the villages, date of approval, and councilmen who signed the resolution.

Very truly yours,
ARTHUR L. NICHOLSON,
Mayor, Bethel, Alaska.

MEMORANDUM

From: Arthur L. Nicholson, mayor, city of Bethel.
To: All village chiefs—Kuskokwim and lower Yukon areas.
Subject: Regional high school.

DEAR VILLAGE CHIEF: The President's budget just submitted to the Congress included over $7 million for the BIA for the expansion of the school at Mount Edgecumbe.

I do not believe this is what the native people of Alaska want. Neither do I believe it is to their best interest. If this happens it means continuation of and expansion of the present policy of sending the young people away from their homes and families for their secondary education.

I believe that State regional high schools located in the trade areas where these young people have grown up would be much more acceptable and would prepare them much better for a productive and happy life.

The city of Fairbanks is striving for the location of a regional high school there. I believe this is an excellent idea if it is intended for students from that general area. It would be a replacement for the BIA schools and no doubt would offer better educational opportunities in an integrated school. If it is intended that it would serve the entire State this would still require that many of these students be taken away from their homes and families.

I think it would be wise for all village councils to express their feelings on this matter to our State and Federal Government officials without delay.

I am enclosing a copy of a resolution that might be used to assist you. You may use it as it is written or change it any way you wish to express the views of the residents of your village.

The State legislature and the U.S. Congress are in session now and I encourage you to make them aware of your feelings at the earliest time possible. You may send copies directly to these officials yourself or if you wish you may send them to the city of Bethel and we will send them on.

If we are to get a regional high school located in this area, it means that we are all going to have to work together. I would appreciate any ideas you may have for development in the area and would be happy to discuss them with you when you are in Bethel.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR L. NICHOLSON,
Mayor.

A Resolution Protesting the Expansion of the Bureau of Indian Affairs High Schools and Requesting That Adequate Secondary Schools Be Provided by the State

Whereas the Village Council of ———, being aware of the educational needs of its young people, and

Whereas the only secondary schools open to our young people are located great distances from their homes and families, and

Whereas to enroll into these schools involves a move away from the young students' home area bringing about a feeling of strangeness which detracts from their academic accomplishment, and

Whereas the schools open are completely segregated and not sufficient to the need, either in enrollment or opportunity, and

Whereas the State of Alaska being responsible for the education of all its young people: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Village Council of ———, That:

1. The U.S. congressional delegation from the State of Alaska be requested to oppose any further expansion of the BIA secondary schools for Alaska students but rather that any such funds be to the establishment of State-operated schools.

2. The Governor of the State of Alaska and our legislative representatives be advised of our feelings and requested to locate a State regional high school at Bethel at the earliest date possible for the benefit of the needy students of this area.

Approved this — day of ——— 1966.

———,
Council President,

———,
Councilman.

———,
Councilman.

———,
Councilman.

———,
Councilman.

———,
Councilman.

———,
Councilman.

Villages who have approved the State administered school resolution:

February 8, 1966, Napakiak, councilmen: James Willie, Robert Jimmy Ayagalria, Isaac Paul, Jack Kernak, Fetz Andrew, Allen Jimmy, secretary.

February 10, 1966, Kasigluk, councilmen: Irvin Brink, Alexie Pavilla, Jr., Nick Martin, Yaho Tinker, Nicholai Pavilla, Kilila Slim.

February 7, 1966, Kipnuk, councilmen: Luke Amik, Paul R. Kurnya, Jimmy J. Anoner, Carl Dock, Kay Sukoteuok, Yoku Pavila, David Martin.

February 12, 1966, Crooked Creek, councilmen: Miskka Andreanoff, Evan Wassily, Golga Sakar, Sr., Andrew Alexie, Onessia Phillips.

February 11, 1966, Akaik, councilmen: John Phillips, vice president; Frank Demantie, Wassilie Evan.

February 11, 1966, Tuntululiak, councilmen: Willie M. Wassile, John Enock, Katy Green, assistant secretary; Peter Luxie, Paul Andrew, Peter Miller.

February 10, 1966, Platinum, councilmen: James Kassayulie, Robert R. Echuck, Willie Echuck, Henry Williams, Henry Bavilla, Moses Kilbuck.

February 8, 1966, Naspaskiak, councilmen: Alexie K. Evon, Peter Clark, Teddy Clark, Wasley Jones, Peter Pittuska, Zacharies Steven, Nicholas Steven.

February 4, 1966, Kwigillingok, councilmen: Henry K. Evon, Tommy Phillip, Jesse K. Igkurak, Evon Agean, Walter Wallen, Frank M. Andrew, Joe Evon, Roland Phillip.

February 14, 1966, Kalskag, councilmen: Joe McKindy, Willie Pitka, Moses Vaska, Nick Passamika, Wassili Kameroff, Gulga Kameroff, George Ony.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this week marks the 20th anniversary of the signing into law by President Harry Truman of the Employment Act of 1946.

The significance of this law is not only in the procedures it established but also in its expression of the national concern that those able and willing to work should have an opportunity for employment.

The preamble of the act of 1946 states:

> The Congress declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production and purchasing power.

In this declaration of policy, the act stated the responsibility of the Government to review and evaluate economic developments, to analyze economic problems and to recommend methods and procedures by which these problems could be met.

The act established the Council of Economic Advisers, in the executive branch, and the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, and these groups over the past 20 years have provided a continuing overall review and examination of economic problems and issues.

The efforts to secure the employment objectives of the act have not been wholly successful. In the period 1949–58, the Nation experienced three recessions. After each of these the level of unemployment was higher than that before the recession.

These recessions indicated that existing measures for restricting declines and aiding recovery were inadequate. For example, 2 years after the 1953 decline the production index had risen above the prerecession peak, but the rate of unemployment was 4.2 percent, compared with the prerecession rate of 2.6 percent. This same pattern of decline and incomplete recovery appeared in the 1957–58 recession. By February 1959, production had returned to the prerecession high point, but the unemployment rate had climbed to 5.9 percent.

Partly for this reason, the Senate, in 1959, authorized the establishment of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems, of which I was chairman.

In late 1959 and early 1960 this committee held extensive hearings in 12 States and had a number of studies made on various aspects of unemployment. Its report made in 1960 contained a number of recommendations for legislative and executive action to deal with the problem of unemployment. Many of the recommendations of the committee have been enacted into law and others have formed the basis for new programs.

Among the steps taken to improve employment opportunities are the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; the Vocational Education Act of 1963; the Civil Rights Act of 1964—title VII—and 1965; the Economic Opportunity Acts of 1964; and the Education Acts of 1964 and 1965. All bear both directly and indirectly upon the question of full employment. The Education Acts have special significance since the highest rates of unemployment have regularly been among the poorly educated and unskilled workers. There is a need for continuing and improving these programs.

Over the last 5 years the gross national product has risen more than one-third. Total personal income has increased by 37 percent in this period. The number of persons holding jobs is higher by 7 million in the 5-year period, with an increase of 2.4 million in 1965. The weekly average manufacturing wage has risen by 26 percent. The rate of unemployment, now at about 4 percent, is at its lowest point since the mid-1950's, with the prediction that during 1966 the rate will drop to 3.5 percent, or possibly less.

The wide range of economic and social measures enacted by Congress in the past 5 years taken together have gone far to attain the objectives of the Employment Act. The tax reduction law of 1964 demonstrated substantially for the first time in our history that tax policy could be used to stimulate economic growth and expansion. It put to rest the shopworn theory that recessions and depressions in our economy are inevitable and beyond reasonable action and control. The economic growth we have enjoyed over the past 5 years would not otherwise have been attained. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 also contributed to economic growth and expansion as have a number of other measures.

Although it is possible to be optimistic about decreasing the rate of unemployment, the statistics may tend to conceal deeper problems—the number of areas in the United States where unemployment has persisted at a high rate, the large numbers of persons who have been unemployed for 15 weeks or longer, the large number of young persons who are unable to find employment, and the large number of members of minorities among the unemployed.

The issue of an acceptable or irreducible level of unemployment has frequently been the subject of discussion. I remember that this question came up several times during the hearings conducted by the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems in the testimony given by specialists in labor economics and by representatives of labor and management. One witness appeared to indicate that a certain undefined amount of unemployment was a positive economic good. There were references in the testimony to the very low levels of unemployment which existed at that time in some European countries, rates as low as 1 and 2 percent. While the question of the irreducible minimum has been raised, we have not yet given it the serious study and discussion that it must have if we are to achieve fully the objectives of the Employment Act of 1946.

I regret that one of the major recommendations of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems has not yet been acted upon—improvements in the unemployment compensation system.

In this Congress I have introduced in the Senate, and Congressman MILLS in the House, the administration proposals to improve this program (S. 1991 and H.R. 8282). The Ways and Means Committee held hearings on the bill in the last session, and I am hopeful that the Congress will act this year to provide the long overdue amendments.

There have been no important adjustments in the Federal unemployment compensation law in the 30 years since it was initiated and the many significant changes in our economy are not reflected in the basic law. Some of the causes and effects of unemployment are national in scope, and there is a Federal responsibility to meet the problem of the long-term unemployed.

There is also a need to extend coverage and to provide minimum standards for the duration and amount of benefits, as well as to improve the financing of the system.

The importance of the Employment Act of 1946 cannot be measured simply by its relationship to levels of unemployment; rather, the act is part of the positive picture of the substantial growth of the employed civilian labor force over the past 20 years.

The number of civilians employed in 1946 was about 55.2 million. In 1955 the number had increased to 62.9 million, and in 1965 employment in the civilian labor force stood at 72,179,000. There has, of course, been a proportionate growth in the national population during this period, but it has required a great effort to provide the capital, training, skills, and also public policy to enable the economy to absorb the increase in the labor force as well as it has.

I believe that we can review the 20 years since the enactment of the Employment Act of 1946 with respect for what has been accomplished, while we face the future with understanding that additional study and efforts are required to secure the full objectives of this important law.

TRUTH IN PACKAGING

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the biggest problem that any American consumer faces these days is simply gathering the factual product information that will allow him to make a rational buying decision.

If he buys auto tires, he is often uncertain exactly what grade he is paying for. If he shops in a supermarket, he often finds that a product's package poorly represents the true nature of its contents.

And if he buys a television set, he can find it extremely difficult to judge the size of one set against another.

The truth-in-packaging bill, as I am sure many of my colleagues are aware, is the answer that I hope Congress will offer for the consumer's supermarket problems.

The television set problem, happily, could be effectively solved with a simple Federal Trade Commission regulation, one that has already been proposed.

Under the measuring system now used by the industry, the consumer can easily find himself bewildered. And his bewilderment is understandable.

Say he buys a set that is advertised as a 25-inch model. He has a right to expect that the viewable picture will be 25 inches across at some point. But it never is.

And if he is trying to choose between, say, a 22-inch set and a 21-inch set, he has a right to expect that the picture of one will be an inch bigger than the picture of the other.

But this is not necessarily true, either. In fact, the 22-inch set may be only one-tenth of an inch larger that the 21-incher.

Confusing? No doubt about it.

How has this come about? First of all, the industry determines the size of a television picture tube by measuring it diagonally. But it is not just the viewable picture that is measured—it is the outside dimension of the tube at its widest point.

A tube with an overall diagonal measurement of 24.556 inches, for example, is rounded off to the nearest whole number and called a 25-incher, even though the size of the actual picture may be only 23 inches.

Under this measuring system, the temptation to flimflam is obvious. For advertising and merchandising purposes, the manufacturer can boost the size of his set a full "inch" just by thickening the glass a little at the corners.

For example, let us take a tube measuring 19.411 inches overall. That means it would have to be advertised as a 19-inch tube. But by adding one-tenth of an inch of glass, the diagonal distance would become 19.511 inches and the tube would be represented to the customer as a 20-incher, notwithstanding the fact that the actual picture size remains unchanged at 18 inches.

The customer, after all, is interested in the inches of picture, not the inches of glass.

The basic problem, once again, is merely to give the customer the basic facts he needs to make a rational buying decision.

Back in 1964, the FTC proposed a very simple ground rule to eliminate all this confusion. The suggested regulation said simply that for merchandising purposes, TV tube sizes would be determined simply by a diagonal measurement of that part of the tube on which a picture appears.

This size designation then would bear some reasonable resemblance to what the customer sees before him in the store. Hearings were held on the proposal in October 1964, but since then the idea has been shelved and no further action taken.

The FTC at that time did prepare a chart showing how different-sized tubes would be designated under the current industry practice and under the proposed FTC order. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[In inches]

Tube reference (1)	Overall diagonal measurement (2)	Viewable picture diagonal measurement (3)	Industry practice (4)	Proposed F.T.C. rule based on viewable picture diagonal measurement (5)
A	24. 566	23. 031	25	23
B	23. 373	22. 050	23	22
C	21. 707	20. 215	22	20
D	21. 479	20. 069	21	20
E	19. 411	18. 012	19	18
F	15. 748	14. 291	16	14
G	14. 842	13. 554	15	13
H	10. 871	10. 215	11	10

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the table shows how the present system can be be used to mislead purchasers.

Tube A is called a 25-inch tube but the picture the consumer sees is only 23.031 inches. Tube C is called a 22-inch tube but the actual picture is only 20.215 inches.

A consumer might reasonably conclude that tube A, called a 25-incher, would be 2 inches larger than tube B, called 23 inches. In fact, however, there is slightly less than 1 inch difference in the picture the consumer sees.

Likewise, tube C, called 22 inches, is not 1 inch larger than the 21-inch tube D but is actually only about one-eighth of an inch longer, a difference almost indiscernable to the consumer.

This problem is even worse for the buyers of color sets.

In a black-and-white TV picture, the screen extends around the corners and up the sides of the funnel. This has no effect on the visible picture but color TV tubes are different.

Technical considerations will not allow the color picture to curve around the sides of the tube. Consequently, the viewable picture of a color set is smaller in relation to the overall tube than it is in a black and white set.

One extreme result is demonstrated by a color set manufactured in Japan. One of these uses a tube with an overall diagonal measurement of 8.937 inches. But the viewable picture has a diagonal measurement of only 6.811 inches. Yet, under present industry practice, the set could be advertised in this country as a 9-inch model.

Even some industry leaders are acknowledging frankly that a sensible set of ground rules in this area would benefit everyone, manufacturers and consumers alike.

Printers Ink magazine reports a speech made by S. R. "Ted" Herkes, president of Motorola Products, at a meeting of appliance dealers in Seattle.

The article noted that color sets are already out in 19-, 21-, 23-, and 25-inch sizes and that one company has announced its intention of building a 22-inch set.

Then Mr. Herkes was quoted as saying this:

> Before things get out of hand, we encourage you retailers to exercise your franchise by demanding that you are not subjected to being placed in the position of having to justify unnecessary products such as the 22-inch color tube. It would appear that self-styled leaders of the industry, hoping to reap rectangular color benefits, are gambling that through some unforeseen stroke of luck they may hit on a tube size not already existing which might interest the public.
>
> Such marketing moves ordinarily would be considered healthy competitive practices but when the difference between the 21-inch and the 22-inch tube is not easily discernible, if indeed possible to differentiate optically, then the motives of those propagating this new and unnecessary size must be questioned.

Mr. Herkes warned that if the practice was not ended it might "needlessly invite an investigation by Government agencies."

Mr. President, I am not particularly concerned about the number of different sizes on the market. I am, however, anxious to see that these sizes be accurately described.

In short, Mr. President, I urge the Federal Trade Commission to proceed with whatever is necessary toward a regulation requiring that TV size designations be determined by measuring the viewable picture.

This, it seems to me, just makes simple good sense.

I think it would benefit the industry to have everyone playing by the same rules. And clearly, it would make buying easier for the consumer, who—as almost any shopper will testify—already has his hands full coping with the psychological traps and deliberate confusions he encounters at every turn.

PROFITS IN "CONTINUING EDUCATION"

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my attention was called the other day to a most interesting article which appeared in the "U.S. Business" section of Time for February 18, 1966 under the heading of "Publishing," entitled "Profits in 'Continuing Education'."

The article describes the manner in which corporate interest in education has grown and it describes the process by which, through amalgamation, there is a trend toward trying to meet, in a total fashion, the needs of every age limit for educational materials.

In the annual report for 1964 of the Crowell-Collier Publishing Co., the organization has stressed its interest in this total concept in the paragraph, entitled "Educational Planning and Development," as follows:

> Although we presently deal primarily with printed products, our business is not print alone but the materials of information and education in whatever form they may be processed.
>
> It is generally accepted that more scientists and engineers are alive today than in all previous recorded history. Scientific knowledge is doubling roughly every 10 years. Pressures for the development of more effective information storage and retrieval technology are unrelenting. The impact of innovation on our operations in the years ahead may be substantial. We intend to continue alert to our needs and to our opportunities.
>
> New media are under constant evaluation. Programed training courses are being tested in our own Collier-Macmillan Distribution Center in Riverside, N.J. We are introducing programed materials in our home study division. Initial results have been promising.
>
> We are continuing our investigation of the uses of audiovisual media in teaching. During the year, a joint enterprise with channel 13, WNDT, New York's educational television outlet, led to publication of Ingles Para Todos, a study guide to accompany a televised course in English for Spanish-speaking adults. The course was successful and was repeated.
>
> Educational materials for preschool boys and girls, training materials for functional illiterates, and adult education are among the other areas in which we are particularly interested.

Mr. President, I am very pleased to see that this fine publishing organization is looking toward the totality of the educational endeavor and I wish to commend it, as I commend the other groups in this area such as the Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc., and its affiliates, who are pursuing parallel courses.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Time article to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFITS IN "CONTINUING EDUCATION"

Just before Christmas, 9 years ago, the bulletin board at the Crowell Collier Building in New York carried a grimly humorous notice: "We regret to inform you that there is no Santa Claus." Crowell Collier was folding its two mass-circulation magazines, Collier's and Women's Home Companion, and dismissing its employees. There was speculation at the time that Crowell Collier would soon follow its magazines down the drain. Instead, says Chairman Raymond C. Hagel, 49, the company has "gone through a whole life cycle in less than a decade." Last week the company announced record profits of $9,292,000 on sales of $127,287,000 in 1965.

Crowell Collier achieved its comeback by catering to the Nation's evergrowing appetite for knowledge. In 1960 the company bought, for $8 million in cash and an undisclosed amount of stock, the Macmillan Co., the U.S. third largest college textbook publisher.

Crowell Collier & Macmillan, Inc., as the firm is now known, currently commands 5.3 percent of the $561 million textbook market. Chairman Hagel, a veteran of McGraw-Hill and the Scripps-Howard chain, who joined Crowell Collier as a consultant in 1957, next moved into another basic-education marketing area: home study. For $3,194,000 he bought a 96-percent share of the LaSalle Extension University of Chicago, a correspondence school, expanded its courses, and more than quadrupled sales by 1965. He went on to buy the Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., Ill., and Science Materials, Inc.; he also invested in Famous Artists Schools of Westport, Esquire, Inc., and in the book-publishing firm of Grosset & Dunlap. In 1962, for less than $1 million, he bought Brentano's, the 16-store chain of bookstores.

Two weeks ago, Hagel made another foray into what he describes as the field of "lifetime continuing education." For about $5 million, Crowell Collier bought the famed Berlitz Schools of Languages, and Berlitz Publications, Inc. Berlitz, which offers courses in 46 languages, is the innovator of a "total immersion" teaching technique that drowns a student with 13 hours a day of lessons, even at mealtimes. American firms are sending more and more of their men to Berlitz before sending them overseas, and now provide 40 percent of the firm's business, which last year amounted to a tidy $5 million. In April, Berlitz plans to add a Far East division, starting in Tokyo, to its American chain.

As for Crowell Collier, which hardly need worry about next Christmas, Hagel predicts more additions to the "continuing education" group.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE ANNIVERSARY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared on Estonian independence by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LAUSCHE

I take pride in offering my congratulations to the people and friends of Estonia as they celebrate that nation's 48th anniversary. Though the Soviet Union's forceful occupation of Estonia has continued since 1944, it is certain that Estonian patriots and their supporters in America still remain committed to the goal of a free and independent Estonia.

Estonia's tragic fate is similar to that of other Baltic States which Communist greed and treachery have devoured. Held in captivity by czarist Russia from 1721 to 1918, Estonian nationalism asserted itself until on February 24, 1918, the Estonian Parliament was able to proclaim the country a sovereign and independent state. Germany and Russia refused to accept this declaration and immediately dispatched soldiers in an attempt to overthrow the fledgling state. Sacrifice and dedication to freedom were the key factors which inspired Estonian patriots to repulse both invading armies. By 1920 Russia realized it would have to pay an exceedingly high price for continuing the fight against Estonia. In February 1920 Russia signed a peace treaty with Estonia renouncing all territorial claims to the state.

Peace treaty or not, Estonian leaders knew the deceitful and greedy minds of the Communists and maintained a vigilant eye against new Russian incursions. By 1939 their fears of a resurgence of Russian hostility became a reality. And on June 16, 1940, the Soviets issued an ultimatum demanding a friendly government in Estonia, and in addition, ordered thousands of Russian troops into the overwhelmed state. By July 1940 Russia had succeeded in incorporating Estonia into the Soviet Union. Before fleeing the advancing German forces, Russian soldiers left the country littered with dead men, women, and children, and had destroyed a large part of the towns and cities. Nazi treatment of the people was no better than that of the Soviets, and when they were expelled by the end of 1944, Estonia had lost more than 70,000 of its population.

I emphasize the point that Soviet tyranny still continues. No, we do not read of mass executions or deportations or hunger in Estonia. But that is not to say that Russian rule has become any more benevolent. It is largely because news is close to impossible to get from behind the Iron Curtain. It has been and will continue to be my goal to assist in whatever way I can to see that Russia's Iron Curtain is pierced and Estonia's people are given the right to exist in freedom and security. As her 48th anniversary is commemorated, let us all unite in our efforts to assist her in enjoying the fruits of freedom.

CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I want to join with many of my colleagues in expressing congratulations to the Lithuanian people on the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. It is one of history's great tragedies that the only Lithuanians who can freely celebrate this occasion are those no longer living in their native land. The Soviet dictatorship, which now controls Lithuania and so many other once-free lands, forbids the proper celebration of this historic holiday.

Lithuania proclaimed it independence on February 16, 1918. Its two Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, proclaimed their independence during the same year. Freedom flourished in these three small but proud and progressive nations for two decades. Then, during World War II, they were overrun by the Red Army and brutally incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Although these peoples are still shackled to the Soviet empire, the will to be free remains strong. They have known tyranny and despotism many times and they have overcome it. Their minds and hearts have never been conquered, and they know that one day they will overcome the Communist commissars who now rule over them.

My own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has many citizens of Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian descent. They are part of America's living link to these captive, but unconquered, nations. They have faith that their homelands will one day be free again to decide their own destinies. I share that faith.

REDUCTION OF SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I wish at this time to voice my opposition to any reduction in or elimination of the school milk program.

The special milk program for children was first enacted in 1954 for the purpose of making available for children milk which otherwise would be purchased by the Government as dairy products in an effort to support milk prices for dairy farmers.

During the 12-year period that the program has been in operation it has provided a substantial fluid milk market for farmers. Last year, for example, 1.6 billion pounds of milk was used in the special milk program for children, and all of it was marketed through commercial channels. This program therefore is an important public program because it provides the basis for better nutrition among our children and because it instills in our children good nutrition habits.

This program has been well received in each of the 50 States. The use of the program has grown with each succeeding year it has been in operation. Our school system, day camps, and child care centers have made the school milk program an important part of their own programs, and they have come to depend upon it for the benefit of the children under their care.

Today, more than ever before, we need a strong nation. Our strength must be maintained through our children—the leaders of tomorrow. To insure their potential, these children must be physically sound. One important way to develop healthy bodies is by a proper diet. Moreover, good nutrition relates to good academic performance.

The cutback in the school milk program from $103 million to $21 million is a drastic reduction of about 80 percent. Public schools, summer camps, orphanages, and other nonprofit institutions providing care and training for children would suffer.

Under the recommended budget, 700 Maine schools and 85 nonprofit summer camps would be deprived of the benefits of the milk program. The States would be hard pressed to provide the necessary funds to subsidize their surplus milk, and I am sure would be unable to meet the costs of a school milk program.

The Federal Government wishes to continue in the rehabilitation of the mentally retarded, in fighting juvenile delinquency, and in its war against poverty. It should not cripple the milk program which adds to the health of the individual child and the security of our Nation's future.

SPRUCE KNOB-SENECA ROCKS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as the sponsor of legislation to establish the unique Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in West Virginia, I feel a special pleasure in noting the excellent comments concerning congressional action in passing this legislation.

On November 7, 1965, a newspaper article, written by Mr. Orr Kelly, "Congress and Conservation: A Remarkable Record," appeared in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star; and stated in it were remarks crediting the Congress with wisdom and foresight in actions conserving various of our Nation's resources, including the establishment of Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks as the first national recreation area within the jurisdiction of the U.S. Forest Service.

Also, on Sunday, November 7, 1965, the Potomac, the Sunday magazine supplement to the Washington, D.C., Post, carried an article by Mr. Aubrey Graves hailing the establishment of this national recreation area as the realization of mountain lovers' dreams. As part of this article, Mr. Graves quoted remarks by Mr. A. Lee Maynard, carried in the publication, West Virginia Conservation, under the title, "Atop Spruce Knob."

I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Dec. 7, 1965]

CONGRESS AND CONSERVATION: A REMARKABLE RECORD

(By Orr Kelly)

To the surprise of almost everyone, more has been done by Congress this year to protect and develop the Nation's natural resources than in almost any other session in history.

"This will go down in history as one of the most memorable sessions of the Congress from the conservation viewpoint," according to the National Wildlife Federation.

Legislation on conservation, like that on other subjects, tends to come in spurts.

So when the last session of Congress adjourned after having enacted the wilderness bill, the Land and Water Conservation Act and other major pieces of natural resource legislation, the elated conservationists were prepared to wait awhile before much more legislation was enacted.

So they were amazed not only by the amount that was accomplished this year but also by the ease with which much of it has been accomplished.

It hasn't all been easy, of course.

The water pollution control bill was tied up in a disagreement between the two Houses for months. But it has now been passed and signed by the President in a form that is stronger than either of two original versions.

The proposal to ban billboards and junkyards along more than a quarter of a million miles of highway took a drubbing in committee. But, with a timely assist from the First Lady—and the First Man—a bill that is reasonably satisfactory to the conservationists has become law.

After years of controversy, Assateague Island on the Maryland-Virginia Eastern Shore has been set aside as a national seashore park, thus preserving a major recreational area.

The beautiful 100,000-acre Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks area of West Virginia has been made a national recreation area, the first such area to be established within the jurisdiction of the Forest Service.

The Water Resources Planning Act, which provides the machinery—and some of the money—for comprehensive planning to solve the Nation's water problems, has been signed into law. In signing the bill, President Johnson praised its sponsors for "an invaluable and farsighted contribution to America's future."

One of the most significant pieces of conservation legislation is a section of the Housing Act that greatly increases the help the Federal Government can give local governments in buying and developing urban open space.

In the past, the Federal share of urban land costs has been limited to 30 percent and this could be used only for undeveloped land.

Now, $310 million has been made available—on a 50-percent matching basis—and $64 million of this amount can be used for buying and clearing developed land. Another $36 million is provided for landscaping public property.

"This means we can begin developing some open space in the inner cities—in the slums, where it is needed—rather than entirely out in the suburbs," said Frank Gregg of the Conservation Foundation.

"But I think the most exciting thing about this new provision is what it might do for the waterfronts of our cities," he added. "Every town ought to take a new look at its waterfront and see if it can't be opened up now."

Another section of the Housing Act makes $700 million available on a 50-percent matching basis to help communities improve their sewage collection systems, a part of the Nation's monstrous water pollution problem.

The new Federal Water Projects Recreation Act is said to be like Einstein's theory. Only two men understand it and they don't agree.

But, basically, it permits the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation to build, operate, and maintain recreation facilities around its reservoirs.

Because it has lacked this power in the past, many of the great reservoirs of the West have been left with undeveloped shorelines. Or, in some cases, the inability of the Bureau to develop the shorelines has led to the uncontrolled growth of honky-tonk operations.

A vast system of major reservoirs and aqueducts would be planned for the Northeastern United States under a provision of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill.

Potentially, this is the most far reaching of all the conservation measures this year—though some would question whether the building of dams on a massive scale is true conservation.

With all that has been done this year and last, is there anything remaining to be done next year and the year after?

The conservationists say there's still plenty to be done, especially in the cities, where the people are, rather than out in the woods where the interests of the conservationists has traditionally centered.

And they fully intend to remind Congress and the President of his words in the message on natural beauty:

"We must not only protect the countryside and save it from destruction, we must restore what has been destroyed and salvage the beauty and charm of our cities. Our conservation must be not just the classic conservation of protection and development, but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation.

"Its concern is not with nature alone, but with the total relation between man and the world around him. Its object is not just man's welfare, but the dignity of man's spirit."

Mountain Lover's Dream Nears Reality

(By Aubrey Graves)

"ATOP SPRUCE KNOB

"(By A. Lee Maynard)

"I am not a mountain climber. I have not driven the piton deep into the rock and swung out over hundreds of feet of nothing so that I might climb even higher. But, after Spruce Knob, I think I understand why some men climb mountains.

"It is a rare and precious feeling to stand on the rooftop of West Virginia—to know that in all the State not a man stands above you.

"Up there is wind to be tested; wind that has never before felt the face of man. It brushes past carelessly, intent only on its purpose of creating a symphony, whistling and moaning through the wind-shaped spruces, pushing and twisting the limbs into shapes and patterns that testify to the wind's softly powerful force.

"There is practically nothing to see from this rooftop—nothing, that is, as long as sights are classified in terms of man-made objects. The hand of man is barely visible, and these visions are close at hand, easily left behind by moving down the trails and out of sight. In nature's classification, however, there is much to see. The mountains stretch away in all directions, unimproved by any of man's monuments to his own folly.

"It is possible to drop off the mountain down into the valley of Seneca Creek where careful eyes can spot native trout, perhaps for the first time. Campfires can burn brightly and quietly here, and the sound of rushing water provides a tranquilizer that will never be bottled—but may someday be stilled.

"It took nature thousands of years to mold the ridge and valley that are Spruce Knob and Seneca Creek. It may take man less than a decade to destroy it."

As far as Spruce Knob and Seneca Rocks are concerned, Lee Maynard can allay his fears to a considerable extent.

The Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, encompassing 100,000 acres of the finest scenery and recreation potentials in West Virginia, became a reality when President Johnson affixed his signature to Senate bill 7 on September 28.

The President, in signing the measure, noted that the area covers "some mighty spectacular country—a 22-mile canyon cut in the Alleghenies by the South Branch of the Potomac River; the jagged peaks of Seneca Rocks; fascinating rock formations on Spruce Knob."

The U.S. Forest Service plans to build additional camping grounds in the area, more and better trails and a scenic highway from Smoke Hole to Seneca Rocks—all as part of the President's program to make the Potomac River Basin a demonstration beauty spot for the Nation, with emphasis on recreation.

Provisions in S. 7 do permit some mining, lumbering, and livestock grading in the area. A dam is envisioned. The concern for conservationists now is to make certain that this will not be carried out in a manner that will destroy or damage the natural environment.

About 40 percent of the 100,000 acres is within Monongahela National Forest; some 60 percent is privately owned. Four-fifths of the area is forested, about 4 percent is cleared bottomland and the remainder is mostly in ridgetop and hillside farms, some abandoned and some still utilized.

Non-Federal lands are to be acquired at an estimated cost of $3.5 million, to be provided by the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Development costs are figured now at $19.8 million.

The area is divided into two parts: one containing 74,000 acres between Seneca Rocks and the Smoke Hole country; the other covering 24,000 acres around and north of Spruce Knob. Both will provide recreation facilities for 27 million people living within a 150-mile radius and some 60 million living within a 300-mile drive.

Within it are the fast-flowing, clear streams of the south branch of the Potomac and its tributary, North Fork, which offers white-water canoeing and excellent fishing; the high mountain country around Spruce Knob and Spruce Mountain, with beautiful and extensive scenic views; the highly scenic sidewalls of the two main streams; the long vistas of North Mountain, Cave Mountain and other of the high ridges, which appeal to hikers, hunters and sightseers.

Abundant wildlife roams the forests and mountains. There are impressive geologic formations such as the spires of Seneca Rocks, rising 1,000 feet above the valley floor, also Blue Rock, Castle Rock and Eagle Rock, all popular with mountain climbers.

Included are the intriguing Smoke Holes, over which a smoky haze hangs, and Seneca Caverns. Extensive opportunities exist for camping, picnicking, rock hounding and cave exploration.

If the envisioned—and controversial—dam is built at Royal Glen on the South Branch, just below its confluence with the North Fork of the South Branch, it will create a 2,800-acre reservoir on which, dam partisans say, boating would be permitted.

In addition to serving recreational needs, development of the area will provide new jobs and business opportunities in a section of high unemployment.

By 1970, the Forest Service estimates, annual recreational use of the area will amount to 1 million visitor-days and will provide an annual income of from $6.5 to $10 million for a part of distressed Appalachia.

DEATH OF ADM. CHESTER WILLIAM NIMITZ

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I know all in this Chamber were saddened over the death of Adm. Chester William Nimitz. Having had the pleasure of being in charge of some of this Nation's entertainment activities during World War II, I had the opportunity of becoming acquainted with this great man. During our visits to the Pacific, he could not have been more gracious and courteous despite the demands upon his time and the pressures of the war.

Mr. President, Admiral Nimitz' feats will certainly be enshrined in the annals of naval and American history. Given the awesome task of rebuilding our fleet following the devastating attack by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor, he fired our men with new courage and took the steps necessary to assemble the greatest armada under one flag in history. The rest is, although sounding legendary, history.

The battles of the Coral Sea, Midway, and Guadalcanal come readily to mind. It was this last engagement that turned the tide of war against Japan, and, of course, led to the surrender of Japan on the battleship, *Missouri*, on September 2, 1945. Admiral Nimitz rightfully participated in that ceremony.

Mr. President, upon returning to this country, Admiral Nimitz was given a tremendous welcome and invited to address Congress. In this address, he pointed out the importance of seapower in history and, of course, these words certainly have great significance today. Following the war, the five-star admiral was called upon to serve in various positions of responsibility in the Government and also served 8 years on the board of regents of the University of California. Interestingly enough, he also acted as an adviser on the motion picture portraying the life of our great naval hero, John Paul Jones. Certainly, Mr. President, Admiral Nimitz carried on in the finest traditions of our country and the Navy. His life, like that of John Paul Jones, will serve to inspire countless midshipmen as they continue in the great tradition of the Naval Academy, which Admiral Nimitz loved so dearly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Los Angeles Times and an article from the Washington Post commending Admiral Nimitz be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Feb. 22, 1966]

The Wise Legacy of Admiral Nimitz

Serenely, with the dignity that marked his life, Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz died Sunday at his home on the naval reservation on Yerba Buena Island, in San Francisco Bay.

Here was a man, an intellect, a military leader, who led the mightiest fighting fleet ever known—and ruled an area greater than ever entrusted to any one commander.

Admiral Nimitz, a submariner, supervised the Pacific underseas forces that brought Japan to its logistic knees in World War II, many months before the atom bomb administered the coup de grace. He also directed the buildup of an array of land and sea-based airpower that wiped out the enemy's fleets, and completed the devastation of its homeland.

This soft-spoken, introspective officer, therefore, presided over the vast engines of destruction of what mankind hopes was the last of the total wars. (One more global conflict, of course, would indeed be the last.)

Now that Admiral Nimitz has departed, at 80, to the special Valhalla reserved for our national heroes, it might be well to ponder his legacy. To the day of his death, he was an abiding believer in seapower. But he realized, and often said, that seapower must meet the changing strategic needs of our times.

For example, the major element of today's Pacific Fleet stands guard off southeast Asia. Modernized, mobile, it is our reliable backup for Vietnam land operations. Its commitment ranges from pole to pole. And it boasts the first nuclear-driven vessels ordered for the Navy, including the superb carrier *Enterprise*.

We have 56 nuclear submarines at sea; Polaris-armed submarines rim the world's continents.

Our Navy insures that supply lines will remain open between U.S. coastal ports and areas of conflict, large or small, actual or impending.

There is a continuing need to keep the fleet modern, however, despite the existence of missiles and rockets. As Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of Montebello, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, has said: "We must be alert to assure that the reluctance of the Defense Department to invest in surface warships does not let our Navy lapse into obsolescence. We must build modern warships for our future Navy—warships with the proven advantages of nuclear propulsion."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 21, 1966]

ADM. CHESTER NIMITZ, 80, DIES—LED HISTORY'S GREATEST FLEET

(By Edward T. Folliard)

Fleet Adm. Chester William Nimitz, the last of America's five-star sailors who distinguished themselves in World War II, died yesterday at his home on Yerba Buena Island, near San Francisco. He was 80.

A Navy spokesman said Admiral Nimitz, who had suffered a cerebral hemorrhage January 3 and was hospitalized for 2 weeks afterward, died of "complications following a stroke."

He had undergone back surgery November 9, 1964, and was in Oak Knoll Naval Hospital in Oakland, Calif., for a checkup when he suffered the stroke. President Johnson sent him a telegram at that time praising his "indomitable spirit that gave us hope 20 years ago."

A graveside service and burial with military honors are scheduled for Thursday afternoon at Golden Gate Cemetery in nearby San Bruno.

In World War II Admiral Nimitz had under his command the greatest armada under one flag in history—6,256 ships of all types, and 14,847 combat aircraft. Besides the hundreds of thousands of officers and enlisted men needed to operate and maintain this great force, he had under his command six divisions of U.S. marines.

But this was in August 1945, at the time of Japan's surrender in Tokyo Bay.

When Admiral Nimitz was assigned as commander in chief, Pacific Fleet, on December 17, 1941, the large part of America's seapower was a shambles. Ten days before this, Japanese bombers had attacked Pearl Harbor and sunk 18 ships, including 8 battleships—all of the heavyweights that the United States had in the Pacific.

Admiral Nimitz succeeded Adm. Husband Kimmel, who was relieved of his Pacific command after the Japanese attack. It was a painful duty for Nimitz since Kimmel was an old and close friend.

"It might have happened to me," he told the heartbroken Kimmel.

Admiral Nimitz had a formidable job on his hands. He not only had to prevent the Japanese from taking advantage of their Pearl Harbor strike, but also to rob them of the initiative and go on the offensive. Fortunately, his aircraft carriers were at sea when the bombs fell on December 7.

"I have just assumed a great responsibility which I shall do my utmost to discharge," he said on taking command.

He began to make good on that pledge in a spectacular way on May 4, 1942, when American and Japanese forces clashed in the Battle of the Coral Sea. The engagement lasted 5 days, and the consequence was that the Japanese were frustrated in an attempt to bring off a seaborne invasion of Port Moresby, New Guinea.

The Battle of the Coral Sea was fought entirely by naval air forces; at no time was there contact between surface ships, which got into the action only to the extent of firing their antiaircraft guns. The United States lost the aircraft carrier *Lexington* in the fighting, but the threat to Australia and New Zealand had been eliminated for the time being.

A month later, June 4 to 6, came the Battle of Midway in which American carrier planes sank four of Japan's finest and largest carriers and a heavy cruiser. An estimated 4,800 Japanese were killed or drowned.

This battle ended Japan's hopes of taking the Hawaiian Islands, and was a turning point in the war. Some time later, Admiral Nimitz said that after the Coral Sea and Midway victories, it "just became a question of time."

JUDGED CORRECTLY

Naval historians always have considered the Battle of Midway a great test of Admiral Nimitz's nerve and judgment. In ordering Adm. William F. Halsey to take his task force to the waters near Midway Island, he was risking a Japanese attack in some other area—but he had judged correctly that the enemy would strike toward the Central Pacific, and was waiting for him.

In mid-November of 1942, the Americans met the Japanese in the Battle of the Solomons, a fierce and old-fashioned engagement that thwarted an enemy attempt to drive the Yanks off Guadalcanal and into the sea.

The Japanese lost 2 battleships, a cruiser, 2 destroyers, and 12 transports. Something like 24,000 Japanese soldiers aboard the transports were drowned. The United States lost two light cruisers and six destroyers.

The tide of war turned against Japan with the final conquest of Guadalcanal. At this time, the commands of Admiral Nimitz and General of the Army Douglas MacArthur were separated, with Nimitz controlling land as well as sea forces in his area and MacArthur commanding sea and land forces in the South Pacific.

A ROYAL WELCOME

The Joint Chiefs of Staff later reassigned the commands, with MacArthur in charge of all land forces and Nimitz directing sea forces as the drive went forward that finally brought Japan to her knees.

Admiral Nimitz was aboard the battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay on September 2, 1945, to witness the formal surrender of Japan. He then returned to the United States and on October 5 received from Washington the greatest welcome the Nation's Capital had given a returning Navy hero since Adm. George Dewey came home after his victory in Manila Bay.

Addressing a joint session of Congress, the tall, white-haired Nimitz talked about the reasons for Japan's defeat, saying:

"Japan, a maritime nation dependent on food and materials from overseas, was stripped of her seapower" while the United States "had the seapower which made it possible to capture—and hold—the bases within Japan's system of inner defenses from which our Army's very long range bombers and other aircraft operated."

He urged Congress and his countrymen to maintain the Nation's seapower that "we may continue to live as free men."

"Seapower is our birthright," he said in another speech that year. "Without seapower we would not be the victors today."

As a young officer, Admiral Nimitz spent much of his career on submarines, and throughout World War II his flag flew from the submarine *Grayling* at Pearl Harbor, amidst the wreckage of ships bombed by the Japanese. He hauled down his flag in giving up his command, and on December 15, 1945, succeeded Adm. Ernest J. King as Chief of Naval Operations, an assignment that lasted for 2 years.

HEADED SECURITY GROUP

In 1951, President Truman appointed Nimitz as Chairman of a Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights, an agency that grew out of charges made by Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican, of Wisconsin, about Communists in Government.

Admiral Nimitz also served for 8 years on the board of regents of the University of California, and acted as adviser on a motion picture of the life of Revolutionary Naval Hero John Paul Jones.

Chester William Nimitz was born in Fredericksburg, Tex., on February 24, 1885, the son of Chester Bernhard and Anna (Henke) Nimitz. His paternal great-grandparents, Charles Heinrich and Meta (Meirrotte) Nimitz, came from Bremen, Germany, in 1843 and settled in Charleston, S.C. They later moved to Fredericksburg, a town with a large German population situated near the present site of President Lyndon B. Johnson's ranch.

REARED IN TEXAS

The future admiral's father died before he was born, and he was reared by his grandfather at Kerrville, Tex. As a youth, he wanted to go to West Point, but went instead to the U.S. Naval Academy. He was graduated seventh in his class at Annapolis in 1905.

He was assigned to the U.S.S. *Ohio*, and sailed aboard her to the Far East, where she became the flagship of the Asiatic Fleet. In September 1906, he was transferred to the U.S.S. *Baltimore*, and on January 31, 1907, he was commissioned as an ensign. His progression in rank thereafter was steady, and he was promoted to rear admiral on June 23, 1938.

In World War I, he was on submarine duty as aide and later chief of staff to Adm. Samuel S. Robison, commanding the submarine force of the Atlantic Fleet. Then in the postwar years came a course of instruction at the Naval War College in Newport, R.I., and various sea assignments.

In June 1939, Admiral Nimitz became Chief of the Bureau of Navigation of the Navy Department. He held this position at the time of the attack on Pearl Harbor. When President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed him commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, he proceeded to Hawaii in the greatest secrecy, in civilian clothes and under an assumed name.

FIVE STARS IN 1944

The ranks of admiral of the fleet and of general of the army, symbolized by five stars, were authorized by Congress in December of 1944.

Admiral Nimitz was the last of the four Navy men who achieved the rank. He was preceded in death by the others—Admirals King and Halsey and Adm. William D. Leahy, personal adviser to Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

Only two five-star generals remain of the five who held that rank: Dwight D. Eisenhower and Omar Bradley. The others, now dead, were Generals George C. Marshall, Douglas MacArthur and H. H. (Hap) Arnold, who was in command of the wartime Army Air Corps.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTARY MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which is S. 2791.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. **McINTYRE**. Mr. President, I rise to add my voice in support of this authorization bill.

The bill is recommended unanimously by the 17 members of the Committee on Armed Services.

These 17 members probably have some differences of opinion on whether we should have become committed in South Vietnam in the first instance and about what we should do to bring about an honorable end to the conflict there.

The reporting of this bill without dissent is to me an indication that the committee has looked upon it as a means of supporting the members of our Armed Forces and of making it possible for the President to negotiate from strength.

If there are Senators who are thinking of opposing this bill to record their displeasure with some aspect of the policies being followed in Vietnam, I urge them to consider how they would construe such opposition if they were on active duty in our Armed Forces and risking their lives in combat in southeast Asia.

If there are some who are tempted to vote "no" in protest against a failure to follow one course or another, I ask that they contemplate how those hostile to us would react to a substantial vote against this bill.

I submit that in such an event our adversaries are likely to be much more obdurate in their refusal to talk peace. If there is even a close vote, these adversaries are much more likely to scorn the diligent efforts of the President to find a solution that maintains our national honor.

The procurement authorization in the pending bill would support appropriations to buy more aircraft, missiles and tracked combat vehicles. Some of these weapons are needed to replace losses already incurred and others are sought to build our strength in case the Vietcong give us no choice except to continue to fight.

The research and development authorization would support a more intense effort to combat the new kind of malaria our forces have encountered in Vietnam. Other research and development objectives include more protective clothing, transportable medical facilities, devices to warn of the presence of a stealthy enemy, better defensive fire for helicopters, adaptations of aircraft to configurations useful in southeast Asia, and improved weapons and ordnance for the fleet.

The construction authorization would facilitate the movement of troops and supplies to southeast Asia and the unloading of weapons and equipment there, and it would provide facilities for our forces stationed in that area and the weapons they must use.

I am convinced the President is relentlessly pursuing an objective of peace with honor. If he succeeds, and we pray that he may, it would be a simple matter to stop the use of any funds authorized but no longer needed for their original purposes. But surely it is better to have the military potential this bill provides and not to need it than to need it and not have it.

As the chairman has suggested, I hope every Member of the Senate will conclude that this is a measure he can conscientiously support without compromising any convictions.

Mr. **YOUNG** of Ohio. Mr. President, it is my intention to vote in favor of S. 2791, the bill authorizing supplemental military appropriations for fiscal year 1966. Approximately one-third of the amount of the funds provided in the bill has already been spent by reason of the conflict in Vietnam. However, my vote will not be a vote approving the present policy of committing hundreds of thousands of our boys to the war in Vietnam.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I asked the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, when he was before our committee urging that we report the bill:

> Do you care to make a statement about how you personally, as Secretary of Defense, would regard this, whether you would regard this as congressional approval of further escalation of our fighting in South Vietnam?

To my question, Secretary McNamara responded:

> Unless the legislation is drawn differently than the present draft or unless the legislative situation develops differently than I believe it will, I would not believe this particular action of Congress would affect the question of escalation. I would not consider that the Congress in this action has expressed its will one way or the other, either in favor of or in opposition to escalation.

Also, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the highly respected chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, stated that a vote in favor of the pending bill is not a vote in favor of escalating or expanding the conflict in Vietnam but is merely a vote to authorize funds for our men serving in Vietnam, and that some of that amount has already been spent.

Many thousands of the finest young men who have ever served in our Armed Forces anywhere are now serving in Vietnam. I spent from September 28 to October 19, 1965, in southeast Asia. I visited every area of South Vietnam, including every Air Force base. I spoke with many GI's from my State of Ohio. With deep sadness, I have written to the mothers, fathers, and wives of a number of these boys from Ohio who were later killed in Vietnam.

Mr. President, those men did not ask to be sent overseas. Many of them have been killed or wounded or have been afflicted with malaria in its most virulent form. They have been exposed to other tropical diseases against which we Americans seem to have little or no immunity. They did not go over there of their free will. Therefore, we owe them the duty, so long as they are there, to provide them with the utmost support. That is the least we can do for those young men who are committed by this administration to conflict. It is better to provide those young men with more than they need rather than with less. So, of course I support measures for their welfare while they are involved in the fighting.

At the same time, I repudiate any suggestion that Americans in Congress and out of Congress have no reason to be critical of the policies of President Johnson and the militarists who seem to have had the President's ear to a far greater degree than they had with his immediate predecessors in the White House. I repudiate any suggestion that we lack patriotism.

By the way, a century and a quarter ago, a Member of the House of Representatives, Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, strongly and vehemently opposed a declaration of war by our Government against the Republic of Mexico.

His was the leading voice in Congress at that time against the Mexican War. Lincoln was villified and denounced by the flag wavers in the House of Representatives who questioned his patriotism. Time and events have proved his greatness.

Last week, at Atlanta, Ga., Secretary of State Rusk made another "warhawk" speech. He announced that neither international opinion nor dissension at home would cause the United States to halt its present policy in Vietnam. He told those who attended the meeting that the United States has a commitment in Vietnam, a commitment signed by three Presidents. It is evident that he referred to Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. But it has been stated many times in this Chamber, and can readily be proved, that President Eisenhower made no commitment whatever to involve our forces in combat overseas. On the day he left the White House, the United States had only 685 military advisers in Vietnam. He distinctly stated, time and again, that it was the responsibility of the Government of South Vietnam to prosecute the war there.

Our initial commitment to South Vietnam made by President Eisenhower in 1954 in a letter to the President of South Vietnam stated:

> I am instructing the American Ambassador * * * to examine with you * * * how an intelligent program of American aid * * * can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial.

He added:

> The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. * * * The U.S. Government hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government.

Can anyone claim that Prime Minister Ky of South Vietnam, who himself was born and reared in Hanoi, heads a strong, viable state? He claims to control only 700 of 2,600 villages in South Vietnam. He could not remain in power 1 month except for the operations of our Central Intelligence Agency and the support of our Armed Forces.

It is historically incorrect to state that the United States was committed to combat in Vietnam by President Kennedy who said:

> Transforming Vietnam into a Western redoubt is ridiculous.

Also, shortly before his assassination, our late great President, John F. Kennedy, said:

> I don't think that unless a greater effort is made by the Government [of South Vietnam] to win popular support that the war can be won out there. In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists.
>
> We are prepared to continue to assist them, but I don't think that the war can be won unless the people support the effort and, in my opinion, in the last 2 months the Government had gotten out of touch with the people.

There is no commitment whatever there. Secretary of State Dean Rusk is not being entirely truthful with the American people when he states that there is such a commitment.

It occurs to me that I would sleep better at night if Dean Rusk were not the Secretary of State of the United States. I am perhaps paraphrasing the statement of Jack Valenti, special assistant to the President, a dedicated public servant and a very fine man, in a speech he made not long ago when I say that frankly, I would sleep better tonight and every night, if someone else were Secretary of State. I am sure that many thousands of American parents of the more than 210,000 boys presently in the poisonous jungles and rice paddies of Vietnam—a nation that is of no strategic importance whatever to the defense of the United States—would sleep better at night if some outstanding American civilian leader were Secretary of State, rather than Dean Rusk, who is the leading war hawk in the President's Cabinet.

Recently Secretary Rusk was asked:

> In connection with any conference for a cease-fire or an armistice in Vietnam, would you be agreeable to permitting representatives of the Vietcong to sit at the conference table?

Dean Rusk said:

> I would have to consider that.

He refused to answer that question. He has stated on other occasions that he would be opposed to such a course of action. Yet our President in recent addresses has represented to the American people that he, in the quest for peace, will go anywhere and meet with anyone.

Every knowledgeable person in the United States knows that there can be no cease-fire or armistice in Vietnam unless the representatives of the Vietcong or National Liberation Front, so called, are included as delegates at that conference.

They should be included not as part of the Hanoi delegation but as independent delegates.

I would sleep better at night if we had some outstanding American appointed by our President as Secretary of State, after the President wrote a "Dear Dean" letter to eliminate this warhawk Secretary of State from his Cabinet.

I can name three outstanding Americans. I realize that it is perhaps effrontery for a humble Member of the legislative branch of the Government to make such a suggestion to our President.

There are many outstanding American civilian leaders, men of achievement, any one of whom would make a great Secretary of State.

Averell Harriman would certainly be an excellent and outstanding Secretary of State. It is well known that three Presidents, President Truman, President Eisenhower, and the late great President John F. Kennedy, tried to secure a limited nuclear test ban treaty. We failed to accomplish this until the matter was placed under the leadership of Averell Harriman. There has been no violation of that limited nuclear test ban treaty which was achieved by this great civilian leader, former Governor, man of attainment, and presently roving Ambassador at Large of the United States.

Another great American civilian leader who would have the respect of our country if he were Secretary of State would be the former Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg.

Mr. President, there are a number of U.S. Senators whose life achievements and outstanding patriotism are so unquestioned that there is no doubt but that they would make fine Secretaries of State. One such U.S. Senator whose name occurs to me is the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Secretary of State Rusk has said repeatedly—and I have heard him say it so many times I feel like telling him it is time to stop playing his worn-out record:

> If the neighbors to the North will stop their aggression in South Vietnam, then immediately we will withdraw our Armed Forces from South Vietnam.

I saw an officers' club being erected at Cam Ranh Bay. It seems to me that the club now being constructed would last in perpetuity. We are building permanent bases at Cam Ranh Bay and elsewhere in Vietnam and others in Thailand. It appears that we intend to be there for a long time.

Mr. President, after 1 or 2 weeks in southeast Asia, what I observed there caused me to change my mind about many things.

For example, I learned firsthand that the forces of the National Liberation Front, which is the official Vietcong organization in South Vietnam, were not infiltrators from the north, and that the bulk of them were not Communists. The NLF has representatives in various Asiatic, African, and European capitals.

Secretary Rusk, however, evades the question as to whether they should sit in a conference. Instead, his argument is that Hanoi represents the Vietcong, because of the close ties between the Vietcong and Hanoi.

Mr. President, our American Revolutionary War could properly be termed a national war of liberation. According to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, George Washington, when he crossed the Delaware River with his forces on Christmas night, was guilty of making a sneak attack. In almost every public speech our warhawk Secretary of State has made, that I have read, he refers to "sneak attack"—"the sneak attack at Pleiku," and sneak attacks elsewhere by the Vietcong.

Well, on Christmas night, in the darkness, Gen. George Washington took his little force across the Delaware River. We Americans do not consider that he made a sneak attack when he attacked the Hessians at Trenton, killed their leader, Colonel Rall, and captured 2,000 of them. We Americans consider that a great victory, and a turning point of the revolution.

I have suggested that I would sleep better at night if any one of three outstanding civilians in our country were Secretary of State instead of Dean Rusk. I see before me Senators whom I would like to see in that capacity.

One is the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], to whom I adverted a few moments ago, and whom I hold in highest admiration. But, of course, he has a sure and certain seat in the U.S. Senate. He is the greatest vote getter in the South. I happened to be in a delegation to a Democratic National Convention from my State of Ohio that cast some votes for him for nominee for Presdent of the United States some years ago. I know that his work is too important and he is too highly respected and honored by his Senate colleagues to consider leaving the Senate to serve as Secretary of State; but I am merely naming him as one of three distinguished Americans who, I feel, would have the confidence of the American people.

Secretary of State Rusk stated that the National Liberation Front was not duly elected by anyone in South Vietnam. Was Prime Minister Ky, this flamboyant air marshal, so called, of the Saigon government of South Vietnam elected? He was made Prime Minister by 10 generals who overthrew the civilian authority in the Saigon government, and he has been in power since, bolstered up, of course, by our CIA and by the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, would the Senator from Ohio mind yielding to me?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I hesitate to interrupt the Senator. I think he knows that he is one of the great sources of inspiration to the senior Senator from Oregon, and has been for a long, long time, particularly in connection with the views of the Senator from Ohio on foreign policy. I have said out of his presence, and I say now in his presence, that he, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], whom I see on the floor, and certain other Senators, have been my leaders in this field.

I was particularly interested in the Senator's comments about the position that the Secretary of State has taken in regard to the foreign policy of the United States in South Vietnam.

Does the Senator from Ohio share my interpretation of the policies of the Secretary of State in connection with his testimony the other day, when he pointed out that we have some 40 security pact commitments around the world, and does he share my understanding, subject to further clarification by the Secretary of State, that he would have us move in with American troops to enforce those security pacts if, in any of those underdeveloped areas of the world, a civil war breaks out, there is some challenge to an existing government, and we decide to support that existing government? Does the Senator share my view that apparently the Secretary of State's doctrine, as Mr. Reston referred to it the other day as the "Rusk doctrine," means that the people of our country can look forward to the commitment of thousands of American boys dying all around the world in case an issue is raised under any of those security pacts.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I share the Senator's apprehension. I share his views. That is precisely the import of the Rusk doctrine which draws no distinction whatsoever between powerful, industrial democratic states in Europe, and weak, underdeveloped, undemocratic states in Asia.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator will recall that the Secretary of State relies heavily upon the so-called Tonkin Bay resolution of August 1964. The Senator will recall that I asked the Secretary of State if he thought the vote would have been the same in the Senate had the Senate known that instead of having 20,000 troops there at the time of that resolution, we would have 205,000 in South Vietnam today plus an additional many thousands, making a total of some 305,000, if we count the Navy personnel now in the waters of that area, and the troops we have in Thailand and other surrounding areas.

Does not the Senator share my viewpoint that if the Senate knew at that time, in the course of 18 months, that we would have in the neighborhood of 300,000 American boys there, risking their lives in support of what the Senator has referred to as the South Vietnamese Government which is not even covered by the Geneva accords, that the vote might have been different?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I agree with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. In connection with the kind words of the Senator from Ohio concerning the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], that he was part of an Ohio delegation which once voted for the Senator from Georgia for President, I would add that if the Senator from Georgia had been Secretary of State or President at that time, we would not now be in the mess we are in southeast Asia today, because he opposed our military commitment. However, he may feel, having been committed, that we would have to go ahead; but, at that time, he was utterly opposed and so stated on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Georgia therefore deserves the congratulations and thanks of all of us for the stand which he would have exercised, had he been in power to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will permit me to express my humble thanks and deep appreciation for the very complimentary statements made about me.

It is true that I did strongly oppose becoming involved in Vietnam, even in a limited war, at the outset.

However, after we became involved, I must say in all candor that my views are completely different from those of the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Alaska as to how we could extricate ourselves.

I am looking for someone to come forward with a magic formula to permit us to get out of this situation with honor.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Of course, I had knowledge of the views of the Senator from Georgia regarding our initial involvement in Vietnam.

As a student of history, I know that at the time John Foster Dulles and President Eisenhower had come to a meeting of the minds that we would send in our paratroopers and airplanes to the rescue of Dienbienphu, trying to make a last minute effort to save the French colonial empire, the Senator from Georgia's strong views against that operation prevailed. His strong views also had important backers in Europe among our allies. Anthony Eden, then Foreign Minister of Great Britain, and Winston Churchill, Prime Minister, manifested a feeling of outrage that we would even think of sending in our Armed Forces at that time.

We refused to sign the Geneva accords in 1954 which provided that there would be an election in Vietnam—not in South Vietnam or in North Vietnam, but in Vietnam—and, it was agreed in that agreement that the line of the 17th parallel was not a boundary which separated the country but was an artificial demarcation line. The Geneva accords provided for a free election in Vietnam. Then, after the CIA and others got through, it was called off and that free election was never held.

President Eisenhower, in his memoirs stated that had the election been held in accordance with the Geneva accords, then, in his opinion, Ho Chi Minh would have received 80 percent of the vote.

Mr. President, recently, an argument has been advanced in the Senate and elsewhere which has no validity whatever I believe, and this is another of the straws at which Secretary of State Dean Rusk has clutched.

He refers to the SEATO treaty which this Nation entered into in 1954. The SEATO collective defense treaty was signed by eight nations. We signed. Australia and New Zealand were signers. Australia has sent 850 combat troops to our aid in Vietnam. New Zealand has sent a token force of 200 men.

Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, France, and Great Britain, also signed that agreement, but not one of them has sent a combat soldier to our aid. The nations who are closest to the scene of the trouble and would have the most to fear if there were real aggression to face, have not sent in one soldier.

Pakistan has refused and is unfriendly toward us.

In the Republic of the Philippines recently, there were demonstrations against us. To date, they have not sent in any soldiers.

The Kingdom of Thailand has not sent one soldier to our aid.

From Great Britain, none.

From France, none—nothing except hostility toward us.

This treaty provides that "each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties, or against any state or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety."

Mr. President, it is noteworthy to mention that Vietnam is not a party to this treaty. It is also noteworthy to mention in passing that there have been no unanimous agreements entered into pursuant to the provisions of this treaty. It is noteworthy to mention that the SEATO Treaty has never been invoked with reference to Vietnam. This is an argument which just has no validity whatever.

Here we are, the most powerful nation in the world, a nation whose Navy is greater and has more firepower than the navies of all the other nations of the world combined, an Air Force that is superior to that of all other nations combined; and yet there are some misguided people who seem to feel that Saigon is necessary to the defense of Seattle. Very definitely, Vietnam is of no strategic importance to the defense of the United States.

Mr. President, let us try to be optimistic. Let us hope that reason will prevail instead of the pronouncements of the warhawks such as Dean Rusk. Let us hope that there may be a conference and a cease-fire or armistice worked out, whether it is done under the auspices of the United Nations, the International Control Commission, or a reconvened Geneva Conference. Of course, should there eventually be a free election in Vietnam under the supervision of one of these organizations, then we must abide by the results.

When I was in Asia, there were anti-American riots raging in Japan, where we have spent $6 billion of American taxpayers' money building up that nation, and where there are now 250,000 men in her armed forces. They are rioting against us. They are telling the world through their newspapers that the United States is the only nation in the world that used the atomic bomb in warfare, and that it did not use it against the Germans, but used it against the yellow race.

This is the kind of trouble we are in in Asia, because of the belligerence and the thoughtless attitudes of men like Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield. I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Ohio. The courageous voice of the Senator from Ohio has been raised once again, as he had raised it before, against the mistaken course of action of our country in southeast Asia.

I said earlier he is a source of inspiration to me. This speech will be studied by American students of history after he and I have long left the scene; but it is appropriate today that his voice be raised again, because there are thunderous attempts being made, and being applied to the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Alaska, the Senator from Oregon, and the rest of us who are protesting this executive war of the United States in southeast Asia, which in our opinion, is against the public interest of this country, to deny the American people our side of the case.

But with fearless men such as the Senator from Ohio speaking out on this subject, I think many people are going to come to realize there is another side, and that the propaganda and pressure of the Johnson administration will not succeed in denying to the American people the chance to hear the other side on this issue.

I want to thank the Senator from Ohio for his courage. I want to thank him for his comments, with which I associate myself. In my opinion, he has performed a service for this Republic by this fearless speech.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I support S. 2791 as reported by the Committee on Armed Services, and I regret the delay which has attended the passage of this vital measure.

Although I attended and participated in all of the hearings on S. 2791 held by the Armed Services Committee, it had not been my original intention to speak on the floor of the Senate with regard to the bill. Time is an important factor in connection with this authorization, and I shall have more to say on this during this address. The report of the committee on the bill is adequate and self-explanatory, and, as I had anticipated, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate has ably managed this measure which the committee has recommended for passage without dissent.

In view of the course and tenor of the debate in the Senate since this measure was made the pending business, however, I feel compelled to comment not only on the bill itself, but also, and particularly, on some of the matters raised in the debate.

Mr. President, S. 2791 is a military authorization bill. It is not a foreign policy declaration. It is designed to meet urgent needs of our Defense Establishment. It is necessitated because the regular military authorization legislation for fiscal year 1966 proved to be inadequate, and, indeed, was acknowledged to be inadequate at the time it was acted upon by the Congress. It was well known at the time the regular military authorization for fiscal year 1966 was before the Congress last year that a very substantial supplemental authorization and appropriation would be necessary in the early part of this second session.

The authorizations in S. 2791 are for fiscal year 1966, of which there are now only slighty more than 4 months remaining. Even after the authorization before us is passed, implementation cannot be accomplished until the supplemental appropriation is considered and passed also.

In short, time is of the essence.

In truth, the only relevant issue raised by S. 2791 is its adequacy. As the distinguished chairman of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee has pointed out frequently in recent months, the subcommittee has found evidence that raises serious questions as to the sufficiency of military authorizations and appropriation requests in years prior to our Vietnam buildup, for the attainment and maintenance of Army modernizations and readiness at the level then required by our commitments. This situation has been accentuated, to say the least, by the substantial increase in our force commitments in southeast Asia.

Even when the situation in southeast Asia required only a token commitment of U.S. defense forces, we deemed it essential to maintain within the United States and in other areas of the world a very substantial Defense Establishment. The escalation of the war in Vietnam has in no way obviated the necessity for maintaining these forces at the same level, over and above that portion of our Defense Establishment preoccupied with the war in southeast Asia.

Not only is it necessary to provide in full measure the material required by our fighting men in southeast Asia, but it is also necessary that the material diverted and withdrawn from stocks and from units not committed to Vietnam be replaced. It is also necessary to prepare against the contingency that the war in southeast Asia will escalate further. It is well to hope for the best, but the only safe course is to prepare for the worst.

As the hearings on S. 2791 reveal, production of military material has been increased in some areas, and will be increased in other areas as a consequence of this authorization and the supplemental appropriation to follow. There is a serious question, however, as to whether our production base has been and is being broadened by the opening of additional production lines and alternate sources of procurement to the extent which probable future contingencies now appear to make prudent.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a relevant news article written by Mr. Hanson Baldwin, entitled "U.S. Combat Forces Spread Thin," which appeared in the New York Times of February 21, 1966, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am of the opinion, based on the evidence which is available, that there have been serious shortcomings in our preparedness efforts in recent years which bear materially on our capability to meet our commitments in Vietnam and worldwide. I am also convinced that unless these shortcomings are corrected more rapidly and with a more acute appreciation of the peril caused by them than has been evidenced to date, we are likely to suffer substantially as a result.

Despite the relevancy of the issue of the adequacy of this military authorization bill, I do not believe that it is appropriate to debate this matter in any detail on the Senate floor in connection with the bill. Any such debate, if it were meaningful, would necessitate the discussion of specifics, the revelation of which might well, and probably would, be of value and assistance to the enemy.

So much for the issues which are relevant to the bill under consideration.

There are many issues connected with the situation in Vietnam, which although not relevant to this bill, are on the minds and hearts of all Senators. Few, if any, of the Senators would probably concur in totality with all of the decisions made by our Government in connection with this war.

I am concerned that our military commanders in the field have been unduly limited in the conduct of operations. I shudder at the extent to which professional advice and recommendations of our senior military officers have been rejected.

I am convinced that a more realistic application of our air and sea power against military targets in North Vietnam might well alleviate the requirement for so large a buildup of U.S. forces on the ground in South Vietnam, and also might minimize American casualties and should greatly hasten a termination of the war.

I entertained the strongest misgivings about the lengths to which our Government took its most recent "peace offensive." My apprehension was based on the possibility and even probability that such intensive efforts for a negotiated settlement would be interpreted by the enemy as an expression of weakness on the part of the United States, thereby causing the enemy to persist in his aggression with renewed tenacity.

On all these matters and others, I have expressed myself in executive sessions of appropriate committees. I have also given voice to my opinions on these matters to members of the executive branch, including the President, in private. And, within limitations, I have commented publicly on the war and its conduct.

I am fully aware, Mr. President, of my right to debate all these matters fully on the Senate floor, and in other public forums, to give vent to my strongly felt opinions, and to voice my criticisms of the policies and decisions with which I disagree.

I am just as conscious, Mr. President, that my right to criticize publicly carries with it a weighty and sacred responsibility to refrain from saying or doing anything that would give aid or comfort to the enemy, or contribute to a protraction of the war in southeast Asia.

Whatever our individual opinions be about the advisability of our commitment in southeast Asia, or the precise nature of this commitment, the fact is that our Nation is at war in every practical sense of the word. American men have been and are now facing enemy fire in Vietnam. More than 2,000 Americans have already made the supreme sacrifice. Thousands of other Americans have suffered wounds and the ravages of disease wrought by this conflict.

We have a responsibility to authorize and appropriate funds for anything and everything needed by our Armed Forces in Vietnam. Our responsibility does not end there, however. We have an obligation to balance carefully any public criticism of our Government's policies in Vietnam which we are prone to utter, against our responsibility to keep the faith with those doing the fighting. It is inconceivable to me, and I feel sure to our men in southeast Asia, that we can keep faith with them if we say or do anything which gives useful information, aid, encouragement, or support to the enemy.

Mr. President, it is not for me to act as conscience to the Senate, or to any Senator except myself, nor would I presume to do so. I think it is fair comment, however, that the debate in the Senate in the past week has often indicated that far more attention has been paid by some to Senators' rights than to Senators' responsibilities.

By this comment I neither seek nor intend to impugn the motives of anyone. There comes to mind, however, both General Sherman's definition of war, and the familiar saying that "the road to hell is paved with good intentions."

It has been charged in the Senate that our Nation is an outlaw, acting contrary to international law and agreements and specifically that the United States is violating the Geneva accords, which, I might add, neither the United States nor South Vietnam signed. Not only are such charges grist for the Communist propaganda machines, but they are absurd.

In 1928, the United States signed the Kellogg-Briand Treaty, by which all signators renounced war as an instrument of national policy. To charge that the United States is in violation of the Geneva accords has about as much validity as charging that the United States violated the Kellogg-Briand Treaty by declaring war on Japan when Pearl Harbor was attacked.

It has been alleged in the Senate that the American people do not support our Nation's commitment and operations in southeast Asia. This allegation is patently false. For instance, opinion polls show that a majority of Americans approve of our present conduct of the war, and of the remainder who would change our operations, almost three times the number favor doing more with air and sea power than favor withdrawing. Such false allegations mislead the enemy concerning our will to continue, undermine the faith of our allies in our national pledges, and jeopardize the morale of the Americans doing the fighting.

Both our southeast Asian allies and our military men in the field are aware of the oft-repeated conclusion that the French lost the war not at Dienbienphu, but in Paris. While I realize that the situation in Vietnam now and the French war in Indochina are not on a parallel, and I am not one of those pessimists who believe that victory is impossible, I do think we should ponder the thought that should we lose the war in southeast Asia, it is probable that the responsibility for the loss is more likely by far to be situated in Washington than with our fighting forces in the field.

Our forces in Vietnam have been charged in the Senate with "aggression" and "military adventurism." Once again, not only are the charges intemperate and ill advised, they are ridiculously false.

If anything, our policies in southeast Asia, and our Government's intentions and motives, are far more altruistic than the actual circumstances justify. It is the official position of our Government, as expressed by the President and his principal assistants, that this is South Vietnam's war, and that the United States has the sole intention of assisting South Vietnam to oppose aggression and to maintain its independence. Our operations in Vietnam are severely, and at times, agonizingly, constricted to conform to this position. We scrupulously avoid any action that might jeopardize the political institutions of North Vietnam. We even eschew a unified military command with the South Vietnamese, although we learned from experience in Korea the advantage of such an organization.

Although our Nation's policies and operations are free of motives of aggrandizement, and to that extent justifiably altruistic, in a larger sense, and to a far greater extent than our Government chooses to publicly admit, this is our war. We fight not just for the freedom of the Vietnamese, but also for our own freedom.

The conflict in southeast Asia is but one battle in the farflung war of aggression being waged against freedom, and of which war the United States is the ultimate and final target. It is not the first, nor is it likely to be the last, eruption into overt conflict in this war which is waged against us. Only last month in Havana, Cuba, Communists of all factions from some 82 countries met and established a permanent organization with the avowed purpose and intention of aggression in the pattern of Vietnam on the continents of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. This Communist organization is to operate from Havana, Cuba. The highly publicized proceedings of the so-called "Tricontinental Conference" in Havana leaves no doubt that the United States itself is the principal and ultimate target of aggression at which the so-called wars of liberation to be supported and coordinated by the Havana organization are aimed and directed.

The fact is that the war in southeast Asia involves more than just an attack by Communist North Vietnam against South Vietnam. It is more, too, than an exhibition of the more violence-prone brand of communism pushed by the Red Chinese, of which we hear so much. The Soviet Union is supplying the major portion of the wherewithal with which the war is being fought by the Communists. The eastern European Communist countries are making substantial contributions to the aggression in Asia. Whatever the differences among Communists, they are all apparently agreed to assisting in the war of aggression in southeast Asia, just as they are agreed on starting new wars of this type in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

It is in this context that the antiwar criticisms and recommendations here in the Senate must be considered. It is in this context that the cries for U.S. withdrawals or surrender must be considered.

For instance, to give the self-styled National Liberation Front, which is the instrument of the North Vietnamese, representation in the government of South Vietnam, would be equivalent to giving gangsters representation on a police force. The Vietcong do unquestionably have influence and control over as many or more people in South Vietnam as does the Government of the Republic of Vietnam. The influence and control of the Vietcong was established and is maintained, however, through tactics of terror and military force of arms.

Any proposal or agreement by the United States for the inclusion of the Vietcong in a coalition government in South Vietnam would constitute a reward by the United States of Communist aggression and a betrayal of our solemn commitments to the people of South Vietnam. Even more unthinkable, it would render vain the supreme sacrifices made by more than 2,000 American servicemen in southeast Asia, who have given their lives there for the cause of freedom.

Americans would not be deceived. The foul odor of surrender, whether called by the name "coalition government" or labeled outright, remains the same, as do the shameful consequences.

By this time, Mr. President, it should be obvious even to the most naive, that there is no easy way out in Vietnam.

There are risks involved in all of the decisions on the war. There are risks that the Red Chinese will come into the war overtly, and there are risks that the Soviet Union will come into the war; and although I personally believe these risks to be of small magnitude, it must be acknowledged that they do exist.

It should also be noted, however, that there are also risks which attach to courses which involve retrenchment, withdrawal, or surrender, either directly or indirectly. The risks which attach to these courses are undeniably of great magnitude, particularly in terms of encouragement of aggression by communism in other areas of the world and on an even greater scale. The danger of a general war is not lessened by virtue of the fact that its likelihood or occurrence is postponed to a date in the future. We must face reality somewhere and sometime.

Some of my colleagues appear to be distressed because the war in Vietnam is an unpopular war. It will be a time for real concern about our own people when any war is popular with them.

Of far more relevance, the broad majority of Americans support the commitment of our Nation to wage war in defense of freedom, despite its unpopularity. Also, despite the philosophical meanderings and high-flown speeches to which they are subjected from all official quarters, I suspect that the great majority of the American people realize that it is their freedom, too, that is at stake, and are anxious to get on with winning the war and getting it over with.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I suggest that the Senate should demonstrate its own sense of responsibility by passing this military authorization so that we can get on with winning and ending the war.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Feb. 21, 1966]

U.S. COMBAT FORCES SPREAD THIN—READY UNITS AT HOME LARGELY COMMITTED TO VIETNAM WAR—SHORTAGE APPEARS IN ITEMS OF CLOTHING AND AMMUNITION

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The Nation's armed services have almost exhausted their trained and ready military units, with all available forces spread dangerously thin in Vietnam and elsewhere.

This is the conclusion of a study of U.S. Regular and Reserves forces by this correspondent.

Virtually all the combat-ready units in the United States have been committed to Vietnam, and except for a few Army and Marine battalions and a few squadrons of the Tactical Air Command no more units will be fully trained and equipped for a number of months.

In addition to the shortages in trained military manpower and in field-grade officers, there are major existing shortages in uniforms and clothing, and actual or potential shortages of various types of ammunition and equipment that are causing the services increasing concern.

The commitment of more than 200,000 men to Vietnam, supported by strong air and naval forces, and the maintenance of two divisions in Korea, more than five in Europe, and of smaller units elsewhere, including the Dominican Republic, have reduced the forces in the United States to a training establishment.

The experience level of the Atlantic Fleet and of all other commands has been reduced to provide the needs of Vietnam.

According to the services, the "squeeze" appears to be becoming worse instead of better. Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the U.S. Commander in Vietnam, is understood to have stated a requirement for some 200,000 more men in Vietnam during the 1966 calendar year, and a proportionate increase in air support.

High-level decisions about whether and how to meet these needs are expected shortly. The Joint Chiefs of Staff has recommended the limited mobilization of Reserve forces ever since last spring, but President Johnson and Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara ordered instead increased draft calls and voluntary enlistments to build up the Regular Forces.

In recent weeks, the services have been conducting studies at various command levels to determine how best to meet General Westmoreland's 1966 requirements. The alternatives considered were continuation of the present slow buildup of the Regular Forces by increased draft calls and voluntary enlistments; transfer of troops from Europe, Panama, Alaska, and anywhere else available; or a selected callup of the National Guard and Reserves.

The studies, as far as could be learned, have not yet been completed. But preliminary indications were that the first course—continued dependence upon draft calls and enlistments—could fill only a fraction of General Westmoreland's requirements within the time he desired them and that the result would be what one officer called "a very slow and disorderly buildup" of the regular forces with a greater and greater lowering of the experience level and more and more bottlenecks.

Transfer of troops from Europe and elsewhere would supply a greater proportion of General Westmoreland's stated requirements, but not all of them. Even the mobilization of the Guard and Reserve might not supply all his stated needs, it was said, since various material shortages—as well as shortages in certain types of trained manpower—might develop by the end of the year.

A recently retired officer, whose last active duty assignment was concerned with the Army's mobilization base and strategic reserve, said that "whatever the course of action [in Vietnam]—continued, escalated, or modified downward—we are in a situation of perilous insufficiency," without much capability of "a graduated response to any serious challenge."

The actual and potential trained manpower and material shortages are affecting all the regular services—particularly the Army and the Marines—and the Army National Guard and Reserves. One National Guard general said "there is not a Guard division in the United States today that could fight its way out of a paper bag." There are many reasons for the difficult situation in which the services now find themselves, officers say. Many of the officers in the services have long felt that many of Secretary McNamara's cost-effectiveness formulas were too rigidly applied and did not allow a sufficient "cushion" of supplies and equipment for emergencies.

Some of the centralized control procedures instituted in the Defense Department have proved to be too inflexible or too slow in response to the needs of the services.

For some years, even before Vietnam became acute, the services were tending to live off inventories, particularly in spare parts and ammunition, and full replacements were not provided.

EQUIPMENT WITHDRAWN

Equipment, particularly radios and automotive equipment, was withdrawn from National Guard and Reserve units to supply Regular Army units and this has not yet been replaced.

As the Vietnamese war became larger and larger the services were required until last year to fit the extraordinary expenses of the war into their regular budgets. The war was "unfunded" until last spring, and no special appropriation in any way commensurate with the war's expenditures was asked for until last month.

Service requests for reopening production lines of aircraft and other items were rejected or postponed until the emergency became acute. The letting of contracts was thus delayed and replacement of expended material was further delayed as available inventories became dangerously depleted. Officers point out that the administration's defense request for the fiscal year 1967, starting July 1, contains many items that were requested and rejected a year ago.

Other major reasons for today's "squeeze" are several. Expenditure rates—particularly for certain types of ammunition and ordnance and clothing—have been considerably higher in Vietnam than expected.

The administration's decision to depend upon the regular services, without calling up the Guard and the Reserves, increased tremendously the strain upon the Regular Army and the Marines.

RESERVES IN PLAN

The Army's concept of mobilization had always been predicated upon the assumption that in case of any war as large as Vietnam the Reserves would be mobilized, and the supporting combat and supply units essential to supply and sustain Regular Army combat units would be furnished by the Reserves.

The concept also envisaged the replacement in the United States of Regular Army units transferred to the theater of war by mobilized Reserve units, thus maintaining the strategic reserve available for use in any emergency.

The Marines also depended upon a fourth (Marine Reserve) division, well trained and equipped, to supplement their three regular divisions, which are already almost fully committed to Vietnam, the Western Pacific, the Caribbean and the Mediterranean, and to training duties.

The Army's problems have been further complicated by the fact that ever since the Korean war, the main thrust of the Army's strategic planning had been based upon the assumption of a mechanized war in the European theater. A major war in an undeveloped country, like Vietnam, with inadequate ports, piers, airfields, roads and warehouses, required considerably more specialized units, such as engineer construction battalions, terminal service companies, port construction companies and, for the Navy, Seabee battalions, than were included in the peacetime force totals of the regular services.

CADRES TRANSFERRED

Without mobilization of the Reserves some of these specialized units had to be created from scratch, and the trained cadres for them had to be transferred from other units.

Thus, the policy now in effect, of gradually building up the strength of the Regular forces by increased draft calls and voluntary enlistments, has resulted in very considerable reduction in overall experience levels and in constant "squeezes," or as one officer put it, in "robbing Peter to pay Paul."

The trained manpower situation in the services today is as follows:

REGULAR ARMY

The last of the Army's trained major units—the 25th Division in Hawaii—has just sent two of its brigades to Vietnam; the third is expected there shortly. No other major units in this country are immediately ready for service, although part of the 4th

Infantry Division at Fort Lewis, Wash., is expected to be trained shortly. About a third of the 101st Airborne Division (Fort Campbell, Ky.) and a third of the 82d Airborne Division (Fort Bragg, N.C.) are in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, respectively.

The two other brigades of both divisions, which have been used to provide replacements for Vietnam and cadres for new units, will be filled up to strength soon, but except for a few battalions they cannot complete unit training for some weeks.

They could, however, be sent overseas—as was the 1st Cavalry Division (airmobile)—without completion of unit training. The 5th Infantry Division (mechanized) (Fort Carson, Colo.), like other Army units, has been attempting to ease the heavy burden on the Army's crowded replacement training centers by training its own recruits; it cannot be ready for some months.

TRAINING DIVISIONS

The two armored divisions at Fort Hood, Tex.—the 1st and 2d—are acting, in effect, as training divisions; they have almost completed the training of one cycle of recruits who will be used to fill out new units or as Vietnam replacements and will start on a new cycle shortly. The III Armored Corps staff at Fort Hood was transferred bodily to Vietnam last year, and now a new corps staff, reformed and trained, has also been transferred there. The Army's new division, the 9th Infantry, at Fort Riley, Kans., and one of the three new brigades authorized last year, the 196th at Fort Devens, Mass., have just been activated, and will not be ready for many months. Smaller combat and support units are being filled up with new manpower and trained as rapidly as possible.

In Europe, the combat strength of the 7th Army has been approximately maintained in numbers, but the experience level has dropped as specialists and individuals have been transferred to Vietnam. Supply and support units are at their lowest strength since before the Berlin crisis of 1961.

The dimensions of the Army's problem are illustrated by the fact that the Army took in almost 100,000 drafted men in November, December, and January and 46,533 volunteers.

The training load for training centers, schools, etc., has climbed from 135,000 men in the month of January 1965 to 240,000 men in January 1966.

Scarcities in trained noncoms and in certain officer grades are becoming acute.

Officer candidate school graduates will climb from 2,319 in the fiscal year 1965 to 4,091 in fiscal 1966, and to about 11,000 in the next fiscal year, starting July 1.

In addition, Reserve Officer Training Corps graduates will provide almost 11,000 officers annually. However, these are all inexperienced second lieutenants; there is no immediate prospect of eliminating the shortages in major and lieutenant colonel rank unless the Army is authorized to call up individual reservists.

The Army's manpower problem will become more acute late this spring and summer, as the 1-year tour of duty of troops sent to Vietnam last year expires and thousands of troops must be replaced by trained men from this country.

MARINES

The Marines have been authorized another regular division, in addition to the three now in existence. The 3d Marine Division and most of the 1st are now in Vietnam, and the 2d Division at Camp Lejeune, N.C., is responsible for maintaining one battalion afloat with the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean and another in the Caribbean. The need for replacements for the Marines in Vietnam and for training cadres for the increased training load, will delay the activation of the new regular Marine division until late spring or early summer, and it cannot be ready for many months thereafter.

NAVY

The Atlantic Fleet is about up to strength in numbers of men, but the experience level has been greatly reduced by the transfer of 5,000 trained men and specialists to the Pacific. Ships in the Mediterranean and Carribean are kept as close as possible to full complement; the remainder of the ships in the Atlantic are to a large extent in a continuous training cycle. One antisubmarine warfare carrier, minecraft, and other ships have been in reduced commission or reduced complement.

The Navy has relieved some of its worst personnel problems by extending enlistments for 4 months, but this authorization ends June 30.

AIR FORCE

The Tactical Air Command and Military Air Command are particularly affected. For a time, the Air Force rotated squadrons for temporary duty to Vietnam, but this system has been replaced by assigning pilots to 1 year's tour of duty in South Vietnam or, if flying over North Vietnam, to 100 missions.

Squadrons that have been rotated to southeast Asia from the Tactical Air Command in this country have now returned to the United States, or other home stations, leaving their equipment behind at the bases from which they operated.

The F–105 fighter-bomber, being used by the Air Force against North Vietnam, is not in production; losses are being replaced by transferring F–105's from Europe, and these in turn are being replaced by McDonnell F–4's. But there is delay in the process and some of the returning squadrons find themselves temporarily without planes.

Some of the few Tactical Air Command squadrons remaining in the United States have been charged with a refresher training mission, in addition to attempts to maintain combat readiness.

Pilots of B–47 medium bombers, phased out of the Strategic Air Command, are being trained in the F–105 as replacements for Vietnam. The Military Air Command, which has long been strained with the airlift to Vietnam, has been utilizing to an increasing degree planes and pilots of the Air National Guard on weekend flights or on missions of a few days' duration.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVES

The Air National Guard, the Naval Air Reserve, and some units of the Naval Reserve are in relatively good condition, though few of them have really modern equipment. But the condition of readiness of the Army National Guard and of many units of the Army Reserve is lower than it has been in the past decade, according to many officers. Repeated withdrawal of equipment; the attempted merger by Secretary of Defense McNamara last year of the Reserves into the National Guard, a move opposed by Congress and still in abeyance; the inactivation of six Reserve divisions and the projected elimination of other Guard and Reserve units; the confusion resulting from the constant changes and reorganizations in the Reserve structure, and the saturation of the Army' replacement training centers with Regular Army inductees have all contributed to the low state of readiness.

Today, there are about 90,000 recruits of the National Guard and the Reserve waiting for 6 months' training by the Army; some estimates are that this total will increase to 120,000 by the end of June.

When Mr. McNamara deactivated the 6 Reserve combat divisions last year, he announced the creation of a select Reserve force of about 150,000 men, composed of 3 National Guard divisions, each composed of units drawn from 3 different States, 6 independent brigades, and hundreds of smaller combat and support units from the Guard and from the Reserves drawn from all 50 States.

This new high-priority force was to be built up to 100-percent strength and trained and equipped by this coming summer. The Pentagon hoped that about 15 percent or more of the 87,000 reservists in the 6 disestablished tactical divisions of the Reserve would voluntarily join the Guard.

Nevertheless, by virtue of its priority the select Reserve force is almost up to strength numerically, though several thousand of its men have not yet completed 6 months' training. The force is supposed to have completed all basic training and unit training through battalion level by the end of June, but opinions differ about whether or not it will be able to do so. Some Guard officers say it will maintain its training schedule; others say that shortage of equipment and delay in training 6-month inductees will make it impossible.

New York State has only 1,600 National Guardsmen, plus Reservists, assigned to the Select Reserve Force. Maj. Gen. A. C. O'Hara, chief of staff to Governor Rockefeller, said recently that "there is no SRF unit in New York State at the moment prepared for intensive training."

Twenty other National Guard divisions, and other Guard and Reserve units, not included in the SRF, are the "low men on the totem pole" in the military structure, and are many months away from readiness for deployment.

ARMS, CLOTHING AND EQUIPMENT

There are worldwide scarcities or shortages of many items. In Vietnam all the services have experienced temporary shortage or scarcities of many items, some of them due to the local shipping tieup and logistical difficulties. These have not materially interfered, however, with combat operations.

Clothing: Shortages of winter and summer uniforms, overcoats, raincoats, fatigues, jungle boots, underwear, socks and other items are widely reported. The Army has reduced considerably the normal amount of clothing initially issued to recruits, and the Marines except to issue only "half a bag" soon unless the shortages are relieved.

Some National Guard recruits have been temporarily drilling in civilian clothes until furnished with a suit of fatigues taken from the clothing allowance of other guardsmen. In some cases substitute items have been issued for standard ones.

The Defense Supply Agency, a centralized agency under the Secretary of Defense, which is responsible for procuring common-use end items for the services, said, through a spokesman, that there was a worldwide shortage of uniforms and clothing but that the United States had enough on hand and on order to meet its needs, that all troops were "well clothed" and there had been no interference with training.

The agency said it had initiated accelerated uniform and clothing orders last June, and that uniform and clothing contracts had increased from $55 million in the last quarter of the 1965 fiscal year to $200 million in the first quarter of the current fiscal year.

Officers pointed out, however, that increased clothing orders were not placed until after the start of the Vietnamese buildup and that inventories on hand were inadequate to supply needs until the contracts had been fulfilled.

Ammunition: Many different items of ground, air, and naval ordnance are in short supply. Reports that rifle ammunition shortages had interfered with the training of recruits are denied by the Army, but a spokesman said that at a few camps there had been temporary shortages, due apparently to maldistribution, which did not delay training more than 2 or 3 days.

Some units of the Air National Guard have reported shortages of certain types of bombs and other aircraft ordnance needed for training.

In Vietnam there has been no ammunition rationing as such, but many different items, including 5.56-millimeter ammunition for the M-16 rifle, 2.75-inch rockets, illuminating shells, and 750-pound bombs have been issued on an as available basis, which means these items are not always available without limitation.

In part, these and other scarcities in Vietnam are due to Vietnam's inadequate port capacity and local supply problems. Worldwide, there has been a major reduction in ammunition stockpiles, not yet compensated for by new production.

Spare parts: Spare parts of every type for aircraft, helicopters, communication, and electronic equipment, engineering equipment, and motor transport are in short supply everywhere; it is not uncommon for a Navy destroyer to wait for months for spares for missiles or generators.

The Military Air Command, which had stocked spare parts adequate to sustain a peacetime tempo of operations, is finding it difficult to keep its planes flying on the accelerated basis of the past year.

Arms and weapons: Except for some of the newest items the Army denies that it has any major weapons shortages. However, some of its weapons are old and the National Guard has severe shortages. In New York State, according to an assessment by General O'Hara, Guard units, even in the Select Reserve Force, are "still utilizing the M-1 rifle and have never been issued any quantity of M-14 or M-16 rifles."

"We do have," he said, "a few M-60 machineguns." Old ¼-ton trucks "are still being used with parts becoming almost impossible to procure; major weapons systems are old." Communications equipment is the "most critical" item in short supply, "and I foresee no immediate relief to this problem."

Many other items that are in short supply include generators of all types, batteries, tires for jeeps, trucks, and aircraft, engineer and material handling equipment such as forklifts, and, in Vietnam, barbed wire, sandbags and other field fortification material.

Aircraft: There is no actual shortage of aircraft and so far the United States has been able to replace its combat losses in Vietnam and its operational losses all over the world. But the margin of production over expenditure is small, aircraft production rates are still small and are limited chiefly, for combat aircraft, to the McDonnell F-4, the Douglas A-4, and the Northrop F-5. Increased losses and an increased air effort in Vietnam could greatly intensify the problem of aircraft replacement.

The scarcities or actual or potential shortages in trained manpower and equipment have caused considerable concern to the armed services, not only because of the increasing requirements of Vietnam and continued commitments elsewhere in the world, but because of the restrictive effect of these factors upon U.S. capability to meet other emergencies that might arise.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR McNAMARA

Mr. HART. Mr. President, within the past hour my senior colleague, Senator McNamara, has announced his decision not to seek reelection and to retire from the Senate at the end of this year.

At a time like this, everyone expects one to express regret. Yet, in my case regret is a very meager word, a very inadequate expression of what I feel when an old friend and comrade at arms prepares to leave the field.

I have read Senator McNamara's retirement statement several times. Typically, it it succinct and honest. He states, among other things: "I make this decision with both reluctance and relief." He is reluctant at leaving an exciting and personally gratifying and exciting job. He feels relief at having made a decision at a time when he was no longer sure that he could undertake the kind of workload he feels his State and Nation deserve.

I believe that every Senator will agree with me that there is nothing in Pat McNamara's history to indicate that his State or Nation have ever been shortchanged by his efforts.

There is no need for me to read the long list of significant legislation which he has offered, supported, and seen enacted into law. Everyone here is aware of it.

We will be deprived of a strong, effective force in this body, but we shall miss more than that.

We shall miss a colorful personality, a man who mixes crustiness and kindness, incisiveness and humor, pragmatism and idealism in an utterly charming manner. I am sure that charming is an adjective which my senior colleague perhaps would not select or approve.

Pat is a man who, after listening to 2 hours of involved argument, can cut to the heart of a problem with about five well-chosen words.

He is a man—as I well know—who will go to great lengths to do a good turn for a younger colleague and then gruffly wave off any attempt to express thanks.

Pat is no respecter of the conventional wisdoms and whenever he runs across one, he seldom resists the temptation to violate it.

In a profession that often regards personal publicity as a key to survival, Pat McNamara is no publicity seeker.

In a job where fence-straddling sometimes holds attractions, Pat McNamara never leaves doubt about his position.

In a city that puts a high premium on the diplomatic approach and the tactful answer, Pat McNamara speaks short, blunt truths.

Perhaps that has been one of his greatest contributions: his puckish ability to keep men and ideas from becoming overinflated. But, mind you, he does it with a blend of humor and tolerance that generates more laughter than anger, even within his targets.

I know that I have dared to become long-winded in Pat's presence on several occasions and I can testify that his retirement is a victory for every stuffed shirt in the Nation, in or out of the Senate.

Senator McNamara has a great many friends in the Senate. Perhaps some are closer friends than I, but no one owes him more than I do.

The State of Michigan is proud of his service. It is true that we find ourselves in agreement on most issues and personalities. However, my regret at Pat's decision, which I now seek without great success to voice, is not consciously affected by the fact that we are usually in agreement concerning public questions and public figures.

Pat just happens to be a solid, honest, and courageous Senator who will be missed, I believe, by every man and woman in the Chamber.

I am proud to have served as his junior colleague. If he approaches his retirement with relief, it is certainly a well-deserved relief.

Naturally, I want to say more, but I must bear in mind the sensibilities of my subject. He can tolerate a man who does not know how to begin a speech but he has very little patience with the man who does not know how to end one. I regret his retirement but it is largely a selfish regret because I shall miss him. All of us will. But we all know that he deserves—and will find—a pleasanter life than this job can offer him. And he will find some way to make his retirement a productive one.

Meantime, in the months between now and his retirement, every citizen of this country owes him a sincere "thank you." And I want to be first in line with mine.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Record at this point a statement issued a few minutes ago by Senator McNamara, which has been the basis for our expressions.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator McNamara

I have decided not to seek reelection to the U.S. Senate in November.

After 2 terms, representing 12 years in the Senate, I make this decision with both reluctance and relief.

I am, of course, reluctant to leave this body which has such a vital role to play in shaping our country for the present and the future. To have been an active participant in this effort has been exciting and personally gratifying.

Yet, there also is a sense of relief in making this decision, especially when one is at an age when he must question whether he can continue to give the kind of service over the next 6 years that his job demands.

As chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee and of several subcommittees, I have found that the responsibilities of handling legislation grow with each session of Congress, as do the services required of a Senator by his constituents.

While my health is reasonably good, relatively minor ailments in the past year or so have served warning to me that I might not be able to do full justice to my Senate responsibilities throughout another full term if I should seek and win reelection.

The requirements of our State and Nation demand nothing less than full-time dedication. Therefore, I have concluded that I should retire at the end of my present term rather than risk inability to meet my obligations.

The satisfactions of these years have been many. I am proud that many of the programs on which I based my two successful campaigns for the Senate, and for which I have since worked, have become reality.

These include Federal aid to education, health care for the elderly, new and strengthened civil rights laws, programs to build the economy toward full employment, and a beginning of the war on poverty.

However, I will leave the Senate with the full knowledge that none of these jobs will ever be truly completed. I will miss not being a part of the activity necessary to strengthen these programs and to develop new ideas to keep pace with a complex society.

Finally, I express my sincere thanks to the people of Michigan for their honor and trust. I want nothing more to carry with me into retirement than the conviction that I have been able to fulfill their confidence. Also, I am grateful for the privilege of having served under the banner of the Democratic Party of Michigan. One could wish for no greater support from a party, or for programs to champion that were more meaningful and responsible.

The letters I have received urging me to run for reelection are heartwarming and appreciated, but my decision has been made.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take just a moment to join with the junior Senator from Michigan and share with him the sense of loss and the feeling of regret that he has expressed over the announcement today of Senator Pat McNamara that he has decided not to run for reelection.

I know that Senator Hart, as well as other Senators, have tried to persuade Pat McNamara not to make that decision.

I visited with Pat McNamara over the lunch table over the last 10 days. He told me that this was his contemplated announcement. I tried to urge him not to do it. But, as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] has pointed out, when Pat McNamara makes up his mind, one can be sure that it has only been after very thorough and careful thought. He did reach this conclusion and made it clear that he was going to stand by it.

I want to say very briefly, as a colleague of his, who has served as a member of his Subcommittee on Labor, and as one who has had the privilege of having him serve as a colleague of mine on my Subcommittee on Education, that I just cannot let this moment pass without expressing for the Record my high regard not only for this great Senator's statesmanship, but also for his dedication and service to the people of the State of Michigan. He has shown a dedication not only to the people of the State of Michigan but also to the U.S. Senate and to all people of the country.

My testimony is that every boy and girl in every elementary and secondary school in America, public and private, and every college student in every college in America, public and private, not only now, but also for years to come, will owe a great debt of gratitude to Pat McNamara, of Michigan.

Pat McNamara, from the very beginning of his service as a Senator 12 years ago, has stood shoulder to shoulder with those of us who have urged that we break through the barriers of opposition to Federal aid to education and get on with the job of the Federal Government living up to its obligations to the young people of the country.

I notice that the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], a member of my subcommittee, and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], a member of the full committee, are in the Chamber.

Every Senator on the subcommittee and on the full committee can give the same testimony that I now give concerning the contribution of Pat McNamara to the Federal aid to education program that resulted in making it possible for President Kennedy, after the first year of his term in office, to thank the members of my subcommittee, including the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], for the support that we gave to him in getting started in breaking through the barriers to which I have just referred, and which resulted in President Johnson's being able to say, after we had completed action on 20 of the 24 segments of President Kennedy's original omnibus bill on education, that "the 88th Congress will go down in history as the education Congress."

Already the 89th Congress has exceeded the accomplishments of the 88th Congress in the field of Federal aid to education. I wish to testify that in my judgment, Pat McNamara, of Michigan, deserves great credit for the success we have had in the field of education legislation.

Now as a member of his Subcommittee on Labor, I wish to say that every working man and woman of the country, and every employer involved in the legislation, owes Pat McNamara, also, a great debt of gratitude for his industrial statesmanship in connection with legislation dealing with the problems of labor-management relations. As is pointed out in his statement, he has worked on the health legislation. We all know of his leadership in the Senate on the medicare bill. In my judgment, had we not had the stubborn insistence of this great Senator from Michigan, we would not have today on the books the medicare law for the assistance of the elderly of this country. Every old person in America, now and in the years to come, owes Pat McNamara a deep debt of gratitude.

I wish to comment on his fight for civil rights. Who could have been more persistent, insistent, and consistent than the Senator from Michigan, Pat McNamara, as he stood here and battled shoulder to shoulder with us, over the years, to try to see to it that second-class citizenship in the United States be eliminated, at long last, from the history of this Republic?

Then there is the matter he mentions in his statement of the work that he has done in connection with programs to build the economy of this country to full employment. Here again, we all owe him a vote of thanks.

But the last point of many that I could mention I wish to make in behalf of the people of my State. For Pat McNamara, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, has done a great job of passing judgment on public works requests on their merits. Here was a Senator who would not tolerate pork barrel. Under his leadership of the Public Works Committee, anyone who sought to get anything that was not on its merits had short shrift, as far as his handling of such requests was concerned. I thank him in behalf of the people of my State for the fair, impartial consideration he has given to us on our requests for public works in the State of Oregon, on their merits. All he asked was, "What are the facts? What can you show on the cost-to-benefit ratio? What can you show from the standpoint of public necessity?"

I have never asked for a public works authorization or appropriation except on the basis of presenting such facts; and I know that the people of my State would want me, at this time, to express to Pat McNamara the heartfelt thanks of the people of Oregon for his recognition of the public works needs of our State, and for his appreciation of the fact that as we build up the economic productive power of our country—and that is what sound public works do—we strengthen the security of the Republic itself.

These are only a few of the many items I could mention in connection with his great statesmanship as a Senator from Michigan; and I join with his junior colleague in expressing my sense of loss upon his retirement from the Senate at the close of the present term.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Oregon for those remarks, most importantly because I think there is no Member of this body for whom Senator McNamara has a deeper affection—though on occasions it has been concealed.

As the Senator from Oregon highlighted some of the significant legislative achievements of Senator McNamara, it occurred to me that he was listing those things which identify a good society: concern for those who are full in years, and provision for opportunity for those who are yet to begin their life, and to make sure that each one, young, old, and in between, is judged as an individual who is good or bad, and not by reason of the way his name is spelled or the color with which God has marked him.

In all of those areas, Senator McNamara has given effective, successful leadership.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, wish to join with Senator Hart and Senator Morse in expressing my great regret that Pat McNamara has seen fit to retire.

I hope he will not retire completely; he is too salty, too active, and too exciting a personality to retire in the literal sense of the term. I hope he will give his talents and his great heart and great friendship—which is what I have personally appreciated so much about him—to other causes, and that we will find him a frequent guest and friend right here on the floor of the Senate.

I adopt what my colleagues have stated as to his service, which I think has been extraordinary, and tremendously gratifying to the country and to the people of his State, and add to it that my personal experience with him as a man—we get to know men around here, of all the places on earth—has been that in his personality, his character, his integrity, and his idealism, he measures up to all the accomplishments with which he has so properly been charged, for credit of service to the people of his State and the people of the United States. I join with my fellow Senators in their warm sentiments and best wishes for many years of fruitful living to Pat McNamara.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself also with the views that have been expressed about the coming retirement of the senior Senator from Michigan. I have been honored and delighted to serve on the same committee with him.

I have been particularly struck by his concern for all people, particularly little people, when they are young, through their working years, when they are middle aged, and when they are old; and I know the Senate will not be as fine a body in his absence as it has been with him.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, it is with great regret that I have learned of the decision of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] not to seek reelection next November.

In his two terms here, he has established an enviable position in the esteem and affection of all of us. We respect his down-to-earth judgment. We respect his rugged honesty. We admire his ability to get to the heart of an issue quickly and to state it unmistakably.

He has been associated, as a sponsor and leader and legislative architect of programs of tremendous importance to our people and our country—education, civil rights, health care for the elderly, economic development, resources development and conservation, the war on poverty, and so many more.

All of us in the Senate, I am sure, hope to make a solid contribution to the future of our country, to leave our mark on its policies and its capacity to serve its people. Pat McNamara has done that beyond doubt.

I am sure we all regret his decision for personal reasons. I have mine. I played a small part in each of his campaigns for the Senate. I have been privileged to serve under his distinguished and constructive leadership as chairman of the Committee on Public Works. I have been the recipient of his warm friendship and return it in full measure.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks which have been made about the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] upon the announcement, which we regrettably heard today, that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works will not seek reelection.

Although I am a freshman, I was successful this year in being assigned to the Committee on Public Works. I have enjoyed the opportunity to serve in the Senate with the Senator from Michigan.

I can only reiterate the remarks which have been made concerning him. We hope, even though he does retire from the Senate, that his great ability, energy, and talents will not lie fallow and will be put to good use by the people of Michigan.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have just learned of the announcement of Senator Pat McNamara that he will not be a candidate for reelection to the Senate. I know this was a difficult decision for him to make, but one of the characteristics of Senator McNamara is his ability to make decisions that he thinks best, no matter how they affect him personally.

I have had the honor and the privilege of serving with Senator McNamara on the Senate Public Works Committee since 1957, and during the last 2½ years, I have served with him as the ranking Republican member of the committee. In this capacity, I have had a close relationship with him in the consideration and disposition of legislation before our committee. We have not always agreed upon legislative measures, and this is natural. But I have been impressed by his fairness as chairman of the committee to all members of the committee, whether they be members of the majority or minority.

Senator McNamara has always been willing and in fact has insisted that each member of the committee be given full opportunity to state his views and he has insisted that they be given full consideration. He has been large enough to accept the views of members of the committee when their reasoning convinced him. But at the same time, he has expedited the work of the committee and worked to secure action by the committee on the important measures before it.

Although a strong representative of his own State, he has been sympathetic and understanding of the problems of other States in areas of our country. I could give many examples of this quality; one that I will always remember was his interest in the problems of the Appalachian area, and the very fine way in which he devoted himself to the legislation, which is doing and will do so much for this region of our country.

In a broader sense, Senator McNamara's work, through his work in fields of legislation concerning river and harbor developments under the Corps of Engineers, highways, water, and air pollution control, economic development programs, and the TVA self-financing act has made major contributions to the economy and the strength of our Nation, and the welfare of the people.

His basic kindness and consideration for others, his forthright way of making decisions and taking firm positions on legislation which he supported, are testimonies to his character and quality as a human being. The Senate will miss Senator McNamara, and I shall miss him as a coworker and a friend.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President I wish to thank my good colleague [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and all the other Senators who have expressed themselves in overgenerous remarks concerning my announcement of today.

Let me assure them that I expect to be in the Senate for some months yet, and will be able to continue working with them on the programs in which we mutually believe.

I thank them again for their very flattering and overgenerous remarks about me. I appreciate them very, very much.

U.S. COAST GUARD OBSERVES ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, 25 years ago, on February 19, 1941, the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve was established with the enactment of Public Law No. 8 by the 77th Congress. As a captain in the Coast Guard Reserve and one who enlisted in it as a seaman shortly after its inception, it is with distinct pride that I rise here today and take this opportunity to honor this outstanding Reserve component of our Armed Forces on the occasion of its 25th anniversary.

Prior to the enactment of Public Law 8 the peak strength of the Coast Guard was somewhat less than 20,000 officers and men. They had no Organized Reserve forces and as the clouds of war darkened Europe and headed toward our shores, the Coast Guard was called upon to perform many additional duties. They found it necessary to expand as rapidly as possible.

The high caliber of its regular force, their complete devotion to duty and their gallantry in the face of danger are well known to the citizens of Rhode Island. Through the years our coastal waters and the heavily traversed sealanes off our shores were constantly watched over by the Coast Guard and we viewed with a personal pride many of their heroic exploits in that area.

With the creation of a Reserve component it was but natural that we who felt so close to the regular Coast Guard service and to some extent regarded some of their units as our very own, would expect nothing short of perfection and a similar high standard in performance of duty from the members of its Reserve force. Throughout World War II, that expectation proved fully justified as members of this newly created Coast Guard Reserve served with distinction, on every front.

From Guadalcanal to Okinawa in the Pacific, from North Africa to Normandy in the Atlantic—and they made all the stops in between—they manned troop transports, escort vessels, and landing craft, hitting the invasion beachheads with the troops and carrying on in noble fashion the proud tradition of their parent service. At the conclusion of the war the Coast Guard had 802 vessels of its own and in addition was manning 351 Navy and 288 Army craft.

Total Coast Guard personnel had reached a peak of about 174,000 and of that number more than 150,000, or nearly 90 percent, were members of the Coast Guard Reserve established by the enactment of Public Law 8 but a few brief years before. Less than 6 percent of this total Coast Guard force, both regular and reserve, were serving in shore billets as the war came to a close in August of 1945.

With its end, the Coast Guard was without funds to cover Reserve peacetime training. Additional legislation had to be enacted, Organized Reserve units established, and programs of regular training set up. Before this could be accomplished, many of those reservists who saw wartime service were discharged. Others, however, encouraged by the Coast Guard, organized themselves in training groups and met regularly each week without benefit of pay or other form of allowance until necessary legislation could be enacted and appropriation of funds made for established Coast Guard Reserve training.

Today, this program has been expanded to a point where there are presently 146 Reserve port security units with more than 10,500 men attending regular weekly drills. Many of these reservists are also qualified for assignment to floating units should conditions dictate.

Other Organized Reserve training units are of a support nature, providing additional trained personnel for vessel augmentation and activation, search and rescue, aviation, electronics, coastal forces, and mobilization detachments. During the past 7 months 4,142 members of these organized units received 2 weeks' active duty for training at the Coast Guard Reserve Training Center at Yorktown, Va.; another 1,031 at Alameda, Calif., while many more received their 2 weeks' training in their particular specialty at regular Coast Guard units or at Coast Guard or other service schools.

Currently, there are approximately 15,952 reservists in Organized Reserve training units. This is the maximum number that the present Coast Guard Reserve budget will support. Additional personnel, facilities and equipment are needed to meet mobilization requirements.

However, I can state with a great deal of conviction that from my experience and association with the Coast Guard Reserve a personal knowledge of the type of training that they are now receiving and the caliber of its men, the Coast Guard Reserve will, within the limitations of its operating budget, be both ready and reliable should they be called upon at some future date to help defend this Nation. This is indeed fitting for a service whose motto is "Semper Paratus."

It is therefore a great pleasure for me to address this honorable body here today and to pay deserving tribute to this organization, one with which I am exceedingly proud to be affiliated, the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve, on this occasion of its 25th anniversary.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR KENNEDY OF NEW YORK ON VIETNAM POLICY HAS SERVED A USEFUL PURPOSE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I believe that the Vietnam statement of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], has served a very real and useful purpose. When carefully read, it is apparent that the actual differences between his views and those of our administration are slight. But what he has done is to thoroughly establish the irreducible minimums on each side and highlight the area where negotiations could be conducted.

Essentially, what he has done is to narrow the spectrum of negotiations, thus affording certain guarantees to both sides. It would seem to me that rather than postponing the time when they might come to the conference table, his statement might serve to shorten this period.

Although I recognize that we may never get to a conference table, I would hope there would then eventually be a diminution of hostilities and a reduction in terroristic acts by the Vietcong which, in turn, would mean we could reduce the level of our military activity. In this connection, let us remember that time is on our side, and that the very passage of time without escalation of hostilities is in our favor.

I, for one, commend the Senator from New York on his thoughtful statement and also am delighted to see from the statements of General Taylor and Mr. Moyers that there is no great difference in viewpoint.

I sympathize immensely with our President in his problems, and I know that there is no man more intent on peace in the United States than he. However, we all recognize that the executive branch of the Government cannot express its views with the same freedom that we individual Members of the legislative branch do. And here is where we legislators, I believe, serve a useful role in giving some direction to our policy, and indications of where we hope to go.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OPPOSE DIRKSEN AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, after more than a year of careful study and evaluation of all aspects of State legislative apportionment, the League of Women Voters of the United States went on record last January in opposition to any amendment which would revoke or dilute the Supreme Court's decision requiring the apportionment of both houses of State legislatures on the basis of substantial equality of population.

The league found that the population standard for legislative apportionment is the "fairest and most equitable way of assuring that each man's vote is of equal value in a democratic and representative form of government."

In recent days, I have received letters from the president of the League of Women Voters of Maryland and officials of the League of Women Voters of various counties in Maryland. At least three of these letters came from the presidents of county organizations where the county today is substantially overrepresented in the Maryland State Legislature and will lose representation in a fair reapportionment of the Maryland House of Delegates and Senate.

I have also received letters from spokesmen of the League of Women Voters of the State of Tennessee, and the State of New Mexico, opposing the Dirksen amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to have these letters printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

League of Women Voters
of Maryland,
Annapolis, Md., February 9, 1966.

Senator Joseph D. Tydings,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Tydings: Your Maryland constituents have watched with a good deal of interest your leadership in the fight against the Dirksen amendment and for equitable representation in State legislatures. We know that as a former member of the Maryland General Assembly, you are aware of the real implications of malapportioned legislatures and the deleterious effect on the vigor of State government.

The League of Women Voters of the United States believes that both houses of State legislatures should be apportioned on the basis of population, and that the U.S. Constitution should not be amended to allow for factors other than population. The league in Maryland is happy to join the effort to defeat the Dirksen amendment and to support your efforts in any way that we can.

Respectfully,
Mrs. Howard Koss, *President.*

League of Women Voters of
Montgomery County, Md.,
Silver Spring, Md., February 12, 1966.

Senator Joseph D. Tydings,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Tydings: For many years the League of Women Voters of Maryland have been concerned with reapportionment for our own State. Now, however, our position has become a national consensus of the league just as reapportionment has become a national concern of all those interested in our government following the design of the U.S. Constitution.

We commend you on your leadership on this issue last summer, and hope that you will be equally successful in the next round against the opponents of fair representation.

Our consensus is that both houses of State legislatures should be apportioned according to population, and we oppose any constitutional amendment proposed to nullify the decision of the Supreme Court.

If apportionment is not based on population, then one of our basic rights as citizens of this country is infringed upon, and the erosion may well not stop with an unequal voice in government.

The league of this county was a solid part of the national consensus. You have our full support in your fight on the Senate floor, and our willingness to help in any way the league can.

Yours truly,
Mrs. William N. Garrott,
President.

League of Women Voters of
Montgomery County, Md.,
Silver Spring, Md., February 12, 1966.

Senator Joseph D. Tydings,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Tydings: I am sure that you are well aware that the league in Maryland has had an intense interest in reapportionment for a long time. Now our Maryland consensus has been translated into a national one after a year's study by members across the Nation. As the time rapidly approaches when the Congress will again be faced with this issue, we want you to know our consensus on this matter, and that you have our fullest support.

We feel that both houses of State legislatures should be apportioned according to population, and we oppose any constitutional amendment proposed to nullify the decision of the Supreme Court.

Citizens should have an equal voice in government on any level, and any modification of this right is a restriction of our liberty.

We wish to commend you for your outstanding fight for reapportionment last summer, and to assure you of our willingness to help in any way our league can.

Very sincerely yours,
Mrs. James A. Dorsch,
State Item Chairman.

Smithsburg, Md.,
February 14, 1966.

Senator Joseph D. Tydings,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Tydings: The League of Women Voters of Washington County has studied the apportionment of State legislatures and agrees with you that representation in both houses of State legislatures should be based substantially on population.

We oppose the efforts in the Congress to amend the U.S. Constitution to allow for factors other than population to be considered as a basis for representation.

We hope that State governments will be strengthened by having them more representative of the people, wherever they live.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. GEORGE W. COMSTOCK,
President, League of Women Voters of Washington County.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF FREDERICK COUNTY, MD.,
February 8, 1966.

The Honorable JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: During the 7 years of our existence, the Frederick County League of Women Voters has been engaged in the study of and work for gaining the reapportionment of our State legislature on the basis of population. Just as it looked as if our local and State league effort was going to be rewarded, opposition activity began in Congress. The Frederick League joined in urging the National League of Women Voters to adopt apportionment as a special study item. This was done. Enclosed is the resulting position which represents the feelings of league members throughout the country, Frederick County members included.

We hope this expression of our concern will be of value to you in acting upon this issue.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. BENJAMIN WARSHOWSKY,
President.

JANUARY 12, 1966.

STATEMENT OF POSITION ON APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

(As announced by the national board of the League of Women Voters of the United States, Jan. 12, 1966)

The members of the League of Women Voters of the United States believe that both houses of State legislatures should be apportioned substantially on population. The league is convinced that this standard, established by recent apportionment decisions of the Supreme Court, should be maintained and that the U.S. Constitution should not be amended to allow for consideration of factors other than population in apportioning either or both houses of State legislatures.

Of overriding importance to the league in coming to this decision is the conviction that a population standard is the fairest and most equitable way of assuring that each man's vote is of equal value in a democratic and representative system of government. Other considerations influencing league decisions are that the U.S. Constitution should not be amended hastily or without due consideration because of an "unpopular" court decision, and that individual rights now protected by the Constitution should not be weakened or abridged.

Against the background of its longstanding interest in State government, the league also hopes that by maintaining a population standard State government may be strengthened by insuring that State legislatures are more representative of people wherever they live. Finally, the league feels certain that the term "substantially" used in Supreme Court decisions allows adequate leeway for districting to provide for any necessary local diversities.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF ALLEGANY COUNTY, MD.,
Frostburg, Md., February 17, 1966.

Hon. JOSEPH TYDINGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: The League of Women Voters, after careful consideration of other alternatives, has gone on record in support of the apportioning of both houses of our State legislatures on substantially a population basis. This is not merely the opinion of a majority of the members, but is the consensus of large and small leagues, urban and rural alike, from all of the United States.

The Allegany County League of Women Voters would like you to know that we concur in the league's position and hope that you, as our representative, will do all you can in support of the principal of one man—one vote.

Sincerely yours,

MARY ELIZABETH H. VANNEWKIRK,
President.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF TENNESSEE,
February 21, 1966.

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your speeches on State legislative apportionment in the Senate, June 2, 1965, and November 2, 1965, were most edifying. Your arguments in favor of the population standard are well stated and no doubt the League of Women Voters of Tennessee will have occasion to quote from your analyzation of Senate Joint Resolution 103 in the near future, as we take action in support of the "Statement of Position on Apportionment of State Legislatures," issued January 12, 1966, by the League of Women Voters of the United States.

We note that Senators DOUGLAS, PROXMIRE, and others refer to you, Senator TYDINGS, as having taken leadership in opposing the so-called rotten-borough amendments. While we lack the financial affluence Senator DIRKSEN attributes to his "Committee for Government of the People," league members in Tennessee will oppose any amendment to the U.S. Constitution which would nullify the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling. If Senator DIRKSEN again rewords his proposal for amendment, we should greatly appreciate receiving your comments, which will be distributed to the 12 local league chairmen on apportionment here in Tennessee. May we have extra copies, 12 if possible, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, November 2, 1965, No. 200?

In his news release of August 19, 1964, Tennessee Representative JAMES H. QUILLEN, said in support of the Tuck bill, "The Supreme Court has seen fit to invade the function of lawmaking. This bill simply restores to Congress its rightful responsibility to make the laws of the land." Senator DIRKSEN, interviewed in U.S. News & World Report, January 17, 1966, devoted a good portion of his remarks on State legislative apportionment to checks and balances within the Federal Government. We would like your opinion of the possibility, as well as the plausibility, of legislation which would implement, rather than nullify, the Supreme Court decision.

Sincerely,

Mrs. E. RICHARD SHERWIN,
Apportionment Chairman.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF LAS VEGAS, N. MEX.,
Las Vegas, N. Mex., January 27, 1966.

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I should like to thank you for the collection of materials that you sent our league recently. We found the material most useful in our recent study of reapportionment. As you know, the National League of Women Voters made reapportionment an emergency study item less than a year ago.

Here in New Mexico we had just completed a State study on a similar topic, and so this gave us a chance to review the whole problem. Our local league, and the national league, recently arrived at consensus on this item, as you have undoubtedly heard from league members in your State, and we are supporting reapportionment of both houses of State legislatures on the basis of population—one-man, one vote. We are all opposed to any amendment to the Constitution making it possible to apportion either house on a basis other than population.

We want to thank you again for assisting us in our study by making so much material available to us.

Sincerely,

Mrs. THOMAS MALONEY,
President.

SUPPLEMENTARY MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the problem before the Senate, the supplemental military appropriations bill. I believe that it is very important for Senators to state their position on this matter, because it will have an effect upon the policy of the Nation and what happens in the world. Inasmuch as I believe that, in terms of the relationship of the executive and legislative arms of the Government, we are coming to something of a confrontation on this subject, it seems to be appropriate to speak now.

There are three aspects of the Vietnamese situation which I believe trouble our people greatly. First, we are troubled by irresponsible criticism—unjust criticism, to make use of a milder word—of U.S. policy in Vietnam. We are troubled by those who assume that the United States is to blame for this predicament, by those who ask us to concede all and achieve nothing, by those who confuse words with deeds, and posturing with policy.

Second, we are troubled by the possibility of military overcommitment, the pouring of unlimited numbers of American troops first into the quicksand of a largely guerrilla war—albeit an aggression by North Vietnam—then into a major Asian war; by plans that would expand the bombing of North Vietnam to punitive and not military targets alone, by those who believe escalation is a cure-all and by those who dream of military victory in a nuclear age where such victory courts only disaster for all.

Third, we are worried about the lack of clarity in our objectives, by the fact that the explanation of our goals is often in phrasemaking and not in specifics, by predictions that have invariably turned out to be overly optimistic—all this when clearness, steadiness, and consistency are called for.

CRITICISM OF OUR POLICY

The problem with much of the criticism of our policy in Vietnam is that it is most often destructive criticism.

Few of the critics have proposed viable alternatives to the policy they are attacking, and I have heard very few of the critics accuse Hanoi, Peiping, and the NLF with the same vehemence with which they have gone after our policy. Until the criticism on Vietnam takes on more balanced proportions and until it presents real alternatives, the value of the criticisms will not match the importance of its concern.

But the criticism has followed a number of paths that call out for refutation.

One consistent theme of attack has been the historical argument, one that attempts to get at the so-called root of the present situation in Vietnam. According to this view, the present struggle is merely a continuation of the Vietnamese struggle against colonialism, and the Vietcong are in the vanguard of a civil and revolutionary war; the people of Vietnam are said by this argument to regard the NLF as the true representatives of their desire for national dignity and independence.

Mr. President, I might characterize this whole argument with the phrase: this is Ho Chi Minh as the George Washington of Vietnam argument. The further charge is made that the United States would never be in this war today, were it not for our refusal to favor the holding of elections in South Vietnam in 1956, were it not for our helping Saigon to violate the 1954 Geneva accords, and were it not for our unwise backing of Diem and other dictators.

I believe this reasoning to be both wrong and counterproductive. Even if the conflict in Vietnam did begin as some sort of revolutionary confrontation in 1954, it quickly came under the command of Hanoi.

Today—and I have been there, and many others have been there—there can be no disputing of the fact that in South Vietnam the Vietcong are directly supported by troops and supplies from the North and are fighting in association with regular Hanoi troop units. Moreover, it seems highly unlikely to me that the Vietcong ever represented the true desires of the South Vietnamese. Otherwise, why would the Vietcong have to systematically murder over 12,000 village chiefs and village officials? Is murdering the leadership a sign that the people are on your side? Are 600,000 refugees to the Saigon side evidence of the people's support of the regime?

I have no crystal ball, but neither do the proponents of this line of reasoning have any evidence to back up their claims. The only thing we can be sure that the South Vietnamese really want is peace without slavery. Finally I see no real point to focusing the present debate on history.

To do so would be to go very wide of the mark. Even if the United States committed errors of judgment in the past, even if our vital interests were not initially involved, as they are now in Vietnam, certainly there is no turning back the clock. Vietnam is now a vital interest and it is to the present that debate must be drawn.

Another source of criticism has been international law. The critics contend that the Charter of the United Nations prohibits U.S. intervention in Vietnam without the approval of the Security Council and that, in any case, if there be any intervention at all, it must be under U.N. Security Council auspices. They also contend that U.S. commitments under the SEATO pact extend only to the obligation of consultation with other treaty members, not to military intervention.

These legal arguments are specious on their face. Indeed, the American Bar Association's House of Delegates found that to be the case.

In the first place, article 51 of the U.N. Charter provides for the right of individual and collective self-defense and article 53 permits regional defense organizations to function when the Security Council is duly notified. In the second place, while it is correct that the SEATO pact does not legally bind the United States to take military action in defense of what is called under the treaty a "protocol state," we are morally and practically bound to take such action when we are convinced that aggression has occurred endangering the security of the treaty area. To say that we are not legally obliged to intervene is not to say that it is not proper and right for us to intervene, and now we have.

A third line of criticism has maintained that our present line of action in Vietnam is likely to lead to Communist Chinese intervention and a full-scale Asian land war.

The fact is that Red China has not moved to take any direct military hand in Vietnam to counter our military operations. Even when we began bombing the supply lines in North Vietnam, Peiping did not intervene militarily as it threatened. That does not mean that Peiping may not react tomorrow—this is solely a matter of Red Chinese choice and the possibility of such intervention must always be taken into account. But our military commanders believe that so long as we stay in South Vietnam—and our plans certainly do not include any invasion of North Vietnam or even the overthrow of the government in Hanoi—Red China will refrain from intervening.

Should Red China decide to come in, however, our military commanders in Vietnam believe that its supply lines both in the air and on the ground would be severely overextended. Given these logistical problems and our own force-level projections, our commanders are confident that they can deal with the Red China military contingency.

One point, however, must be emphasized in this regard—we cannot shrink from defending our interests or protecting our allies, simply because of the possibility of a Red Chinese countermove. We cannot let fear of an aggressor paralyze our will. Every precaution should be taken to avoid Red Chinese intervention, but not at the price of sacrificing the cause for which we fight.

Another school of criticism has centered around the belief that we can end the conflict by a series of concessions to Hanoi and the Vietcong. Six months ago, this group was demanding that the United States cease bombing targets in the North. Bombing was halted for 37 days—I agreed with that pause, but I also agree that we had better learn from experience—and all we received from Hanoi was added defiance and a military buildup. Several weeks ago, they insisted on our bringing the Vietnam situation to the U.N. This too was done without receiving any positive response from Hanoi. Now these same people are rallying around the cry that the United States ought to try to force the government in Saigon to form a provisional coalition government with the Communists prior to negotiations or free elections.

This is the proposal put forward by my colleague from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. His proposal is entitled to thoughtful consideration by all. As I have read it and others have read it, it sought to bring about a coalition government in Saigon before negotiations as an inducement for negotiations. But apparently the author of the proposal says that is not what he has in mind at all. What he has in mind is that the National Liberation Front should be a party to the negotiations. I said that myself a week ago, as did many others. As to the point of a coalition government, I believe, and Secretary of State Dean Rusk so testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that the United States will abide by all results of any genuinely free elections. Moreover, should future negotiations decide upon a provisional coalition preceding free elections, I would support this as well.

My point is, however, Why should we surrender in advance the question of what the composition of the provisional government should be until we find this concession to be warranted in the course of negotiations? In order to encourage Hanoi to the conference table, I too have proposed concessions; namely, to accept the NLF as an independent negotiating party. In view of the fact that Hanoi has insisted upon a "decisive role" for the NLF in South Vietnam, Senator KENNEDY's proposal is not likely to be enough of an inducement. The proposal would only open the door for further Hanoi demands for concessions. The line must be drawn somewhere.

I believe we must make concessions to reality and not to fear, and also not to ungrounded hopes. In this regard I have urged the President to propose the inclusion of the NLF in any future negotiations on Vietnam as an independent group or party with a participating role. It is my impression, moreover, that President Johnson is moving in this direction as evidenced by Averell Harriman's press conference of 2 weeks ago in which he said that the NLF could attend talks "as an independent group who have an interest in the discussion." It now remains for the President to make this policy public.

Recognizing the NLF as an independent negotiating group is a delicate diplomatic matter with deep political and military implications. On this proposal rests the future stability of the present Saigon government, and the cause for which we fight. But, I believe that it is a necessary proposal and one that is superior to the alternatives of either insisting that the NLF attend the conference only as part of the North Vietnamese delegation; or allowing the NLF to attend the conference as the decisive part of a newly constituted South Vietnamese Government as Ho Chi Minh demands. The former alternative is not likely to bring the Communists to the negotiating table and the latter would only serve to reward terror and aggression. Opponents, like the Communists in Vietnam, who are capable of marshaling such large forces, have to be dealt with in peace negotiations, but we cannot do so at the price of selling out an ally. The line I draw here takes account of the vast difference between making the NLF a party to negotiations on the future of Vietnam and giving them a place in the Government before negotiations. The composition of the Government in Saigon should be a matter for future negotiations, and should not be prejudged by any prior concessions at this time.

Finally, I believe that it is irresponsible to criticize our posture in Vietnam from the assumption that the guilt is on the American side, that the reason a peace conference has not been called is due to some fault of our own sincerity, and that otherwise the Communists would jump at the chance to negotiate. It is one thing to question the judgment of the President; it is another to question his motives and intentions. There is no doubt in my mind that we are trying to seek peace in Vietnam, and that guilt for the continuation of the war rests not in Washington, but in Hanoi and Peiping.

I have urged the Congress, since June 1965, to conduct a full-scale debate on Vietnam and with Senator RANDOLPH have offered two resolutions for that purpose. I am not against debating the issues of Vietnam. I am not against attacking the judgments of the administration when I think the President is wrong. I am against forms of debate which score points, which exploit the peoples' fears without giving them knowledge, and which criticize everything without offering alternatives.

THE MILITARY SITUATION

Much attention of late has focused on the military situation in Vietnam, and I am disturbed by the fact that this debate has been dominated either by advocates of military passivism or by the advocates of open ended military expansionism. I believe that the consequences of passivism would be a longer war and that the consequences of expansion would be a larger and more dangerous war. Neither is likely to lead to negotiations.

First, the concept of confinement to set military enclaves in Vietnam, which is what General Gavin was first thought to have advocated, is untenable. But I agree with General Gavin that the administration should limit our commitment in South Vietnam to the forces we can deploy without general mobilization or material prejudice to our other military responsibilities in the world and this requires that primary consideration be given to the coastal area, the Mekong Delta, and the Saigon region in which 70 to 80 percent of the Vietnam population is to be found. The way to accomplish this is not to have U.S. troops consolidate in static defense perimeters and wait for the Communist troops to attack them.

Second, I reject the theory that we should punish the enemy into submission by whatever military means appear expedient. The advocates of this theory do not understand the central fact of the nuclear age and they have failed to learn the lessons of history as well. In the nuclear age, "victory" on the battlefield in the sense of bringing the enemy to submission is an illusory goal. Expansion begets counterexpansion, and the cost of the war spirals beyond any reasonable objective. Moreover, wars of the past demonstrate that the punishment of an enemy through all-out air attacks does not diminish greatly his will to fight on.

I am opposed to bombing: First, the civilian populations in Hanoi and Haiphong; second, dams that provide drinking water and irrigation; third, powerplants that serve only civilian purposes; and fourth, sources of food supply for the people of North Vietnam. These are not vital military targets; they are punitive targets.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator from New York feel it is possible to send 100 planes daily to drop bombs without hitting a lot of civilians? Does the Senator think that it is possible to confine ourselves to military targets? I do not believe it is possible.

Mr. JAVITS. I think it is practical with the modern bombing techniques to pinpoint military targets. That does not mean that some civilians in the area of a military target might not be killed. But we cannot scramble this omelet without breaking some eggs. I cannot guarantee that kind of immunity in response to the question of the Senator.

By confining our bombing to military targets we are showing our good faith; that we do not intend to punish the civilian population in North Vietnam. That is all I am talking about. It represents a military and not civilian bombardment.

Mr. GRUENING. If the Senator will permit, I have one more observation.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield for an observation.

Mr. GRUENING. I consider our bombing of North Vietnam thoroughly immoral and illegal. It is the kind of thing that does not bring honor to the United States. When Hitler and Mussolini entered into Spain's civil war and bombed Spanish towns, when Mussolini attacked Ethiopia and rained death from the air on its villages, when Goering bombed Rotterdam, there was profound revulsion in the United States. What we are doing now we condemned unsparingly on those previous occasions. It is outrageous that we should be doing the same thing now.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry that I disagree with the Senator on that score.

The Hanoi government and the Vietcong, from all one can see, are engaged in a ruthless and murderous enterprise in Vietnam.

Our military forces in Vietnam are there quite properly and legally, in my opinion, and are entitled to be there by virtue of international law and treaty obligations. We have been, moreover, invited into South Vietnam by the legally constituted Government of that country—a government which is recognized by most of the world with the exception of the Communist bloc. I again refer you to the ABA brief of February 22, 1966, which supports my argument.

Mr. GRUENING. I think there was no legal justification for our being in South Vietnam in the first place. The allegations made by the administration that three Presidents have supported such a policy and that the United States has made a solemn national pledge to do what we are doing are not factual. President Eisenhower offered economic aid, and with conditions which were never fulfilled. President Kennedy merely sent military advisers. It is only within the last year that we have sent our troops into combat and started bombing.

We are the strangers in that country. The others, north and south, are all Vietnamese. I think there is just as much evidence that we are aggressors as are those whom we charge with aggression. It is their country; we have no business there. Our intervention has never been authorized by Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. On that theory, we might sell the whole thing out to the Communists and forget about Asia and the rest of the world, because it is possible to dress up the national role of liberation anywhere one pleases. If the case is as impeccable as the Senator from Alaska says it is, the Communists have found the Achilles heel of the whole free world, and we are through.

But I do not believe that. I believe people have a right to self-defense; and if they do not have the means to defend themselves because the other fellow is better prepared and disciplined—as the Communists are—they have a right to call on other free people to help to defend them. Someone will get hurt in the process, but someone always gets hurt when there is immorality, aggression, and murder in the world. I could not disagree more with the Senator from Alaska.

I am also opposed to a vast buildup of American troops in Vietnam. Such a buildup would not only entail a general economic, military, and civilian mobilization in the United States; it would also have to be at the expense of defending other U.S. interests throughout the world. We must not lose sight of priorities of interest. We must not overcommit our troops where we have other responsibilities to uphold.

Based upon my own observations in Vietnam and upon talks I have had with military commanders there. I believe that the military policy now being pursued in South Vietnam is, in general, a policy adaptable to a force with a ceiling of approximately 400,000 men. I invite the attention of Senators to page 55 of the hearings of the Committee on Armed Services on the bill which is before us, where the order of magnitude which is contemplated by this appropriation is discussed. The testimony is that of Secretary McNamara, so far as it can be made public commensurate with the interest of security. Secretary McNamara said:

> The net increase we are asking above the original 1966 total is 452,843.

I should like to read a question asked by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the reply by Secretary McNamara:

> Senator ELLENDER. Well, of that 453,000, how many of those will be used in South Vietnam?
>
> Secretary MCNAMARA. Well, these are additions to the total U.S. military force, and it is not possible to say that any of those in particular will be used in South Vietnam. But in the net, all of them are being added because of the South Vietnam conflict.

So I think it is fair to say, Mr. President, that we are dealing with a troop strength of 450,000, as the policy upon which we are basing this appropriation.

We are in the process of building up and consolidating our military positions on the coast up to the 17th parallel, around Saigon, and in the Mekong Delta, and we should continue to focus our pacification and construction efforts within these areas. The enclaves which we now have must be linked up into a stable, contiguous, and democratically run area. This area should then be used as a springboard for the application of power—for probes in the countryside, to keep the Communist forces on the move and to prevent them from consolidating.

So our military strategy should always keep our global needs in mind. Most importantly, we should never allow battlefield commitments to limit or determine policy choices. The quicksand of a jungle guerrilla war can only be avoided by conscious and determined choices at policy levels, specifying limits within which we propose to proceed and the means which we propose to devote to the attainment of our goals.

THE CLARITY OF U.S. OBJECTIVES

It is an onerous task in hard and long struggle to keep objectives clear in the minds of the policymakers, in the minds of the American people, for the enemies, and for the world. It is difficult, but it must be done. Unless objectives are made clear and held firm, they become the targets for the forces of frustration and hysteria, and they become suspect even by those who want to believe.

I would like to suggest that if the President is to continue to have the support of the American people, and my own support, as well, he must not waver or let the public become confused on six key points:

First, that our interests are involved in Vietnam, and that it is a war to stop the expansion of communism by naked aggression; that the United States understands the distinction between true revolutionary upheavals based upon popular discontent and so-called wars of national liberation.

Second, the President should propose to include the National Liberation Front in future peace talks with a full participating role. The time must come when the Saigon Government has to face this reality, and we must not lead them to believe otherwise.

Third, we must never let ourselves or others believe that there is a final military solution to this kind of war. The risks are too grave. Our purpose is to show that aggression does not pay.

Fourth, the President should always keep the extent and nature of U.S. commitments in Vietnam before the people of the United States and subject to their approval. There is some fear that new commitments were made between Washington and Saigon in Honolulu, and the President should make it clear that no secret commitments were entered into.

Fifth, one of our main goals in Vietnam is to insure future elections in that country which will be genuinely free, and to allow the Vietnamese people to determine their own way; and this includes the question of reunification. We must leave no doubt in the minds of the world that the United States will accept the results of free elections, probably under United Nations control; and should the National Liberation Front be victorious at the polls, we will accept that, too.

I have confidence, however, that free people in the future, as has been the case with free people in the past, will prefer freedom to slavery and will not, therefore, vote the Vietcong in as their rulers.

Sixth, we must never lose sight of the fact that a real peace and true stability will have to await the evolution of social and economic justice within Vietnam, and that it is up to the United States to convince whoever are the leaders in Saigon that a real victory can come only when they successfully promote the dignity of their people and the decency of their lives.

CONGRESS AND VIETNAM

Before I conclude, I should like to deal with the meaning of the coming vote, which we hope will take place not later than this Friday.

I believe it is important for each Senator, without being offensive or disrespectful, to serve notice on the President. I believe that the President is making a great mistake in not coming to Congress for another support resolution to replace the one of August 1964, which is completely out of date and no longer relevant. He would thereby give us an opportunity to join in developing what should be the policy of the United States.

In voting for this supplemental military authorization bill, we in Congress must do so with our eyes open. We should understand that by approving this measure we are in effect ratifying the administration's policy in Vietnam in its presently contemplated order of magnitude. Unlike the debate on the previous supplemental appropriation for Vietnam of $700 million in May 1965, which did not involve such a decision, this one does. For at that time, it was not yet clear, as it is now, that the President does not intend to seek any additional authority from the Congress.

It is necessary for the President to seek new authority. We cannot merely pass a resolution because, if we did, it would destroy the President's position as the leader of the foreign policy of the Nation. This is an authority which he has under the Constitution. The President must give us the opportunity and must take the initiative.

The Constitution gives the President the initiative in matters of foreign policy and gives him enormous powers, not only as President, but also as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. At the same time, the most significant power given to Congress by the Constitution, in addition to the power to declare war, is the control over appropriations. Thus, Congress can use the power of the purse to affect the power of the sword.

I have decided to vote for this supplemental authorization bill because I believe that the order of magnitude contemplated by this bill is necessary to the cause for which we are fighting in Vietnam. If I did not feel that way it seems to me that duty would compel me to seek to amend the bill or to vote against it.

I have specified the order of magnitude, as indicated by Secretary McNamara's testimony, as being approximately 400,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam.

However, in voting for the bill, I reserve the right to vote against future authorization bills should I believe they would constitute an overcommitment of our resources, or if I find myself in disagreement with our fundamental policy.

I emphasize these points because we often hear it said that the President's executive power has grown to enormous proportions, and that Congress power has become subservient to it. But the essential fact of this imbalance is not that the executive has grown too big, but that Congress has let itself become too small. Thus, if we truly do not believe in the President's course, this is the opportunity to assert our power. If we agree with it, this is the time to affirm our support.

I have been arguing for nearly a year that the President should come to Congress with a new resolution to update the Bay of Tonkin resolution voted by Congress in August 1964. He has chosen not to do so. I believe this is a mistake on his part, but I recognize that in not doing so, he is exercising his prerogative and his powers to the fullest.

Congress must be prepared to exercise its powers to the fullest also. We can pass a resolution on our own initiative if we choose to do so. And those who oppose the magnitude of the U.S commitment in Vietnam and who oppose the additional commitment contemplated by this authorization bill, have the opportunity—and the duty, it seems to me—to seek to amend this bill accordingly. I do not agree with the Senator from Oregon on this matter, but I believe he is taking the proper course, as he sees it, in seeking to amend this bill, in order to rescind the Bay of Tonkin resolution. I respect him for taking that step, although I shall vote against his amendment.

So let us not delude ourselves or the American people. The vote on this authorization bill does affect our policy in Vietnam. I intend to vote "yea" with my eyes open, because I believe in that policy, because I believe that our cause is just and because I believe the order of military magnitude contemplated by this authorization is worthy of that cause.

I close by saying that I reserve the right to vote against future Vietnam bills if that is the only way the President gives us to express agreement or disagreement with U.S. policy. I express the hope that, in the interest of the Nation and in the interest of crystalizing the country behind the President's policy, the President will ask us, as he did in August 1964, to join with him in a declaration of policy, which policy would then represent the policy of the United States.

Mr. President, while I believe there is no deep division in the country concerning Vietnam, I believe that there is deep worry in the country.

I believe that the President can go a long way toward relieving the American people of that deep worry by asking Congress to join with him, under the advice and consent authority of Congress—and the Senate specifically—in declaring the determination of the United States to seek peace, to honor its commitments, and to pursue limited objectives by limited military means.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I believe that the present debate should be brought to the earliest possible conclusion. I believe we should proceed to the consideration of the authorization bill with the greatest dispatch. I wish we could vote today.

I believe the debate should be brought to an early conclusion. I intend to make my remarks very brief.

In the light of what has been said in the Senate over the past few days, I feel that I must say something in my capacity as a member of the Armed Services Committee, as one who has maintained an abiding interest in foreign affairs and in international politics, as one who has always been concerned with the state of preparedness of the United States, and as one who has had an opportunity to visit our forces in southeast Asia and to see the splendid work that our American boys are doing there.

Mr. President, the debate over the validity and correctness of Presidential policy in southeast Asia at this time is poorly timed. The debate should have been conducted on the basis of whether or not the additional funds are needed to sustain what we are doing.

It is unfortunate that so many Members of Congress have seized on this particular issue as a time and place to debate policy—indeed, "debate" is stretching the point—and to attack with great vitriol the basic policy of the administration, which puts us in southeast Asia today.

I would be hypocritical if I did not point out that I have opposed the administration vigorously on many, many issues in this body. But I should like to note now that in his basic policy, in his announced intention to preserve the independence of South Vietnam, in his apparent determination not to abandon southeast Asia to Communist conquest, I support my President 100 percent.

Mr. President, I do not know of any time in previous wars—certainly not in my living memory—when Congress has been engaged in active debate over whether or not we should be at war, at a time when we actually are at war. The fact of the matter is we are currently involved in Vietnam. Thousands of American boys are fighting there, risking their lives daily, and unfortunately too many of them losing their lives.

I wonder what kind of spectacle this debate presents to the boys in Vietnam who are suffering privation, disease, and discomfort, and risking death. I wonder what they think about it, though I do not wonder too much, because I have a pretty good idea. I have been out in the field and have talked to them; and I am sure this is not the greatest morale booster we could engage in.

Mr. President, it seems to me that there are three alternatives available to us. The distinguished Senator from New York has pointed out that the critics of Presidential policy have hardly been constructive, but have, on the other hand, been destructive. They have not presented an alternative policy.

As I say, it seems to me there are three alternatives.

We can withdraw from southeast Asia. We can pull out all of our forces. But when we do so, we must understand that South Vietnam will surely be overrun by the Communists. It would, in very short order, be in the hands of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese.

Now, South Vietnam, taken alone, is perhaps not of great geographic or strategic importance. But southeast Asia as a whole is of very great geographic and strategic importance. And if we withdraw from South Vietnam, we can expect that Laos would soon go, Cambodia would go, Thailand would be under severe pressures, and ultimately, unless we created a major troop buildup there, would fall under Communist domination, or at least suffer pressure to compel them to make an accommodation with the Communists. The way would be open for Communist adventures in Burma and the Indian subcontinent. If the dominoes fell as they would like them to fall, they would eventually be free to work their evil will on Africa, and ultimately South America. That would be the consequence of withdrawal.

We would, further, destroy, I believe, the will and determination of peoples everywhere to resist Communist aggression by force.

There is a second alternative. We could stand and fight a war of attrition, determining, perhaps, not to lose, but lacking in the determination to win. We could draw static defense perimeters around the coast, and sit there and wear out men and machines and waste material resources, year after year after year, in a war of attrition that would be very, very costly over the long pull, that would do nothing to convince the Communists of our determination to deal with dispatch, decision, and resolution with so-called wars of national liberation. It would do nothing to discourage further military adventures by them.

Then there is a third alternative. We can resolve to do what is necessary to win.

I do not think we could win at the conference table right now, because I do not think that the Communists will be willing to make satisfactory terms as long as they are not convinced of our determination to use the very great military power we possess. They have rebuffed our peace offensive. We sent our emissaries all over the world, trying to find a means to bring Hanoi and Peiping to the conference table with something approaching a reasonable attitude, and we were rebuffed. All we got for our pains were belligerent speeches from Hanoi and Peiping, and the manifestation of their determination to keep the war going by infiltrating more troops and more supplies into South Vietnam.

Therefore, Mr. President, we must use the very great power that we possess. We must use our military muscle to destroy the will of the enemy to wage war against South Vietnam, by destroying his capacity to wage war. When we prove to him that war is a costly instrument of national policy, indeed so costly an instrument that it is one he cannot resort to, then ultimately we can negotiate a reasonable peace with honor, and we can, in the process, I believe, discourage the precipitation of any further so-called wars of national liberation, and we can convince the world that not only do we possess great power, but that we are willing to use it, if necessary, in the cause of preservation of the right of peoples everywhere to self-determination.

We hear a lot of claptrap about not having a popular-based government in Vietnam. Mr. President, I would like to know how we could really establish a popular-based government in Vietnam. There could not be a meaningful election in that unhappy country today. We could not send Dr. Gallup in to take a poll that would be meaningful.

What we must do, of course, is use our influence to make the government that exists there as responsive to the needs of the people as possible. That we are doing, and we are doing it far more conscientiously, you may be sure, Mr. President, than North Vietnam would do if she exercised suzerainty over the South Vietnamese today.

What is little known, apparently, about what is going on in Vietnam, is the fact that not only are our troops engaged in fighting there, they are engaged in constructive work, through civic action programs aimed at the rehabilitation of villages, the building of schools, the digging of wells for pure water supplies, the combating of disease and infection; and most important, our boys are helping to develop leadership in the local and provincial level there. They are trying to instill into these people a sense of responsibility of and a knowledge of the art of self-government. We are trying to do what we can to help create a viable, democratic society in South Vietnam today—a land which has great potential if it can ever be militarily secured.

Too many critics of administration policy have not proposed any constructive alternatives. I noted three alternatives a while ago, and I suggest that we follow the third, which I believe to be in harmony with the basic policy of the present administration.

So far, I have not heard anyone propose a realistic middle ground between withdrawal and victory which would assure the independence of the South Vietnamese, that would stop Communist aggression, and at the same time save the lives of our soldiers and the South Vietnamese who are fighting today. I have seen no such proposal.

There are those who say, "Well, we cannot be involved in a massive land war with Red China." There is an assumption that using our military might to combat Communist aggression in Vietnam today would automatically result in involvement of the United States in a massive ground war with Communist China—some even say a nuclear war with Communist China—which, to me, seems a little bit ridiculous. But, I believe that this reflects two things: One, a failure to understand the facts; second, a haunting fear of the specter of a belligerent Red China involved in a massive war with the United States, which fear is so great that men are moved to say, "Let us avoid any confrontation, even if it costs territory and the lives of human beings, even if it means that vital areas of the world must slip under Communist control."

Mr. President, under optimum conditions, the Red Chinese could not send great masses of ground troops into South Vietnam sufficient in number to beat a determined effort by South Vietnam, the United States, and their allies. The problems of logistics, the problems of supply and communication, and the problems of transportation are too great.

We possess absolute air superiority. We could deny them any close air support. We could, with the commission of great numbers of troops—and, of course, the necessity to increase the flow of supplies—interdict their supplies.

We possess absolute naval superiority. The enemy could be denied support from the sea. And, too, Red China, I believe, understands that if she did involve herself in a massive way in South Vietnam, we would not give her sanctuary, she would risk the loss of her embryo nuclear development through bombing, and we could blow her industries out of existence, industries which only now are recovering from the great leap forward. There is also the threat of a million and a quarter men under Chiang Kai-shek on her eastern flank. She would run the risk of getting deeply involved in a war that she could not win, to the extent that she would lose face and would lose ground in her rivalry with the Soviet Union for influence and power in the Communist bloc nations.

Beyond that, Mr. President, are we always going to check with Peiping and ask what they are going to do, before we resist Communist aggression?

The best way to avoid involvement with Red China, the Soviet Union, or any of the Communist-bloc nations, I would say, would be to withdraw to fortress America, to take all our forces in all parts of the world, where we might risk a direct confrontation, and bring them back to the United States and live with the fortress America concept, and return to primitive isolationism, return to a policy which was advocated at one time by men who were called rightwing extremists.

Mr. President, I reject the notion that we can have a fortress America.

It is incumbent upon us, if we are to preserve our own security, to maintain our defense perimeter as far away from our own shores as possible, and as close to the enemy's shores as possible.

We cannot do this by timorously withdrawing and avoiding a direct confrontation every time Peiping rattles the saber.

Mr. President, we are in Vietnam today because we must be there.

As the strongest nation in the free world, we are the free world's first line of defense.

In every era of human history, it falls to the lot of some great nation to emerge as the leader of the world. It has fallen to our lot, in this era, to do so. It is our responsibility. I trust that we will accept it.

We are in Vietnam because if we fail to meet Communist aggression with military force in this confined front, we will increase the likelihood that we will have to meet it on a much broader front later on, and at a greatly increased cost in human life and material resources.

Mr. President, I do not believe in the use of war as an implement of national policy, unless we are forced to do so by a belligerent enemy who is an aggressor.

I had the privilege of serving in the U.S. Navy in the Western Pacific during World War II, and I have had the opportunity to see the splendid work our boys are doing now in Vietnam. Believe me, this is an even better generation of fighting Americans that America has produced than the one to which I belonged.

I do not like to see these boys wounded or maimed. I do not like to see life ebbing away from them.

We did not start this war, but if by our failure to meet aggression we convince the enemy that war is an altogether satisfactory and effective implement of national policy, then perhaps we are going to have to send another generation to be cannon fodder later on.

I do not believe that Woodrow Wilson was too visionary when he thought that eventually we could achieve peace, and that men could beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. I believe that it can be achieved, but it cannot be achieved if we appear to be weak. Regardless of how strong we are, we can appear to be weak if we show no willingness to use our strength, if necessary, even if we build up a mighty arsenal in an effort to deter war. We must think, Mr. President, in terms of the spectrum of deterrence. We need our missiles, our strategic bombers, and our Polaris submarines as a deterrent to global war, to thermonuclear war, but let us think in terms of the spectrum of deterrence—big conventional wars, little conventional wars, small brush fire wars—let us try to deter any kind of war which could ultimately escalate into a general conflagration.

I submit we should confine the war to the smallest possible front, by doing what is necessary to win it, by intensifying our effort, and not by "escalation"—which is a term opponents who have criticized the administration's policy use as a scare word—"escalation" implies broadening the front—using more sophisticated efforts. The efforts should be intensified to the smallest possible front.

Perhaps someday we can leave a little better legacy to the generations that follow us than has been passed on to my generation or the generation now in Vietnam, if we will show the determination to do so.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I have listened to the very able and reasoned speech of the Senator from Texas. I wonder if he would mind indicating more fully the meaning of his reference to the need to destroy the capacity of the enemy to make war in South Vietnam. Whom did he refer to as the enemy? I would like to have more precisely his meaning.

Mr. TOWER. The enemy in this particular instance are the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. Hanoi is actively waging a war of aggression against South Vietnam by infiltrating great numbers, in regimental and division strength, into South Vietnam. These are not shirttail militia; these are regulars. Hanoi is supplying them with the equipment necessary to wage an active war. This is the enemy.

Of course, in an indirect way, Peiping is the enemy, because Peiping supplies the hardware. Of course, Peiping is not directly involved so far as troops or units of her armed services are concerned. By destroying the capacity to wage war, I mean to include specific military targets. This is to be determined after careful study by the military profession, who know what valid military targets are and what are not. By that I mean destroy supply depots and their ability to supply the troops in South Vietnam, their ability to manufacture armaments that might go into South Vietnam. In other words, by destroying anything that enhances their ability to make war.

I would like to make it clear, and I have made it clear, I do not think it is necessary to bomb the civilian population. I do not think it is necessary to destroy civilians in large numbers. Obviously, if a military target is hit, certain civilians are going to be jeopardized. The Vietcong have engaged in wanton killing of civilians merely for the purpose of terrifying those citizens. I do not advocate that, but I advocate attacks against their ability to wage aggressive war against South Vietnam.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is very helpful. He has just said the effort should be to destroy their capacity to manufacture weapons, to supply troops serving in South Vietnam, and he has also indicated that, indirectly, China is the enemy. He indicated, thirdly, that supplies of hardware were coming from China.

Now, adding those together, is the Senator advocating an attack upon the supply lines or factories in China?

Mr. TOWER. Let me hasten to assure the Senator I am not advocating any armed attack against China. What we should do is hit the lines of supply. The supplies manufactured in Red China should be destroyed after they get to North Vietnam, or South Vietnam, if that is possible.

No, I do not advocate destroying or waging an attack against Red China.

There are some neutral countries that are supplying certain materials to North Vietnam. I do not advocate that we bomb them. But certainly I advocate that we destroy the lines of supply—that is to say, if we are going to conduct the war. It seems to me that is basic to all military operations. Napoleon said that an army travels on its stomach. I assume this also applies to all logistical operations. It was our ability to destroy their sources of supply when we were bombing Germany that resulted in our winning the war. Of course, we were able to attack home industry, because we were then at war with Germany. The same is true of Japan. It was our ability to destroy their lines of supply that resulted in winning the war. I think it is going to be necessary in this war.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his elucidation. It is my understanding that the Senator is advocating a limited war——

Mr. TOWER. As a matter of fact, I have said let us confine the front. I do not want us to be involved on a broader front, but I am afraid we are going to have to later on. The statement I was making is that if we allow the Communists to push us more and more, eventually we will have to resist them at some place, and it will be more costly then than it would be now. This is essentially the line I take.

Mr. GORE. I am trying to discover where the line of demarcation would be, as compared to the views which the Senator from Tennessee has expressed. I have expressed the hope——

Mr. TOWER. I hope the Senator will state them, because I did not have the privilege of hearing his remarks.

Mr. GORE. I have stated, if I may briefly recapitulate, that I thought our goal would be to limit hostilities within bounds which I thought would be reasonably manageable and that our country's goals in this conflict should be the achievement of a tolerable political settlement which would permit the disengagement of combat forces at the earliest feasible time.

With that brief statement of the views I have expressed to the Senator, would he mind drawing some line of demarcation? I wanted to have an expression. I assume the words mean the same to me as they do to him.

Mr. TOWER. If I understand the Senator correctly, he is saying that the objectives are limited, that our goal is to achieve disengagement——

Mr. GORE. Achieve a political settlement.

Mr. TOWER. Achieve a political settlement.

Mr. GORE. Which would permit our own disengagement of combat forces at the earliest feasible time.

Mr. TOWER. I would be perfectly willing to if we could work out a political settlement that would result in a disengagement, provided such settlement comprehended what I understand to be the minimum condition of the President as expressed in his speech in Baltimore last year, and that is to guarantee the independence of South Vietnam.

I will settle for this by anyway we can achieve it. I believe that in the light of the failure of the peace offensive. It was not our fault that it failed, because we tried. I believe we allowed our passions to be sorely tried in the process. We restrained ourselves from bombing Vietnam in an effort to show good faith and that we genuinely wanted a peaceful result. All that we got was belligerent words thrown back in our teeth.

It appears we will now have to bring more military pressure to bear before we can achieve a climate that will result in disengagement.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator very much. He has added a great deal of clarity to the statement, so far as I am concerned. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TOWER. I thank my distinguished friend from Tennessee.

Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to say that it is my fervent hope that the Senate will not delay this matter further and proceed to act on the supplemental authorization. This is the least that we can do for the boys who are fighting a dirty, rotten war and at the same time, through their compassion, trying to help the people of South Vietnam. They are men who understand their mission probably more clearly than many men in public life in this country understand it; men who do not complain; who are proud of what they are doing; and who are reflecting so much credit on the United States.

It is more important in this world that we be respected than that everybody approve of what we do.

Our motives are honest. We do not seek to impose our systems of politics or economics on any country that does not want them. We do not seek territorial aggrandizement. We are trying to create a climate in this world in which all peoples can aspire to self-determination, social and economic progress, and freedom, and have some reasonable hope of realizing that aspiration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may include certain documents to record the activities of our troops describing exactly what civic action is and how our troops are going about it in aiding and helping the people of South Vietnam.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[News release from U.S. Marine Corps]

PHU BAI: MODEL OF COUNTERINSURGENCY

WASHINGTON, September 9.—Marine activity in the vicinity of the Phu Bai airstrip near Hue is a model of counterinsurgency operations—a model being followed by marines in most village pacification activities. The pattern requires aggressiveness, patience, and understanding.

Near Phu Bai, marines have gone to work in five village complexes to develop the combination of confidence in the security from the Vietcong, and confidence in the good intentions of the marines. Security from the Vietcong is, as always, the basic first step. Marines have swept the area, and now conduct patrols and ambush operations on the periphery of their main area of operations to keep the Vietcong off balance. Back in the villages, counterinsurgency activities are underway with vigor, and with good results.

Medical, education, and engineering and other civic action programs have been undertaken. In addition, local popular forces are being trained by the marines—including a marine lieutenant who speaks Vietnamese, and several squads of marine infantrymen who are learning the language rapidly. The Vietnamese and Americans live, work, and eat together in this training outfit. The marines provide the popular forces with tactical instructions; the marines in turn are given valuable information on the local situation—customs, language, religion, and terrain. There is a camaraderie among troops involved in this program based on mutual respect, and a sense of growing professional competence.

The rapid development of this popular force is of particular interest when it is recalled that, at Le My, a village near Da Nang, internal security of the village is largely handled by popular forces trained in that village since the marines' arrival in May. It is significant that the marines are accepted completely by the villagers and are accorded the same treatment by the local officials and merchants as the Vietnamese servicemen and local inhabitants receive. They confide information concerning Vietcong sympathizers and active Vietcong and willingly undertake to find out useful information about Vietcong activities and intentions.

The good relations are not achieved at the expense of the Government of Vietnam, however. Marine civic actions are coordinated through the local and district officials, and relations with the Government and with Vietnamese Army units in the area are excellent. The indications are encouraging. Le My was a classic operation which brought a village in a mere 4 months from under Vietcong domination to a positive, pro-Government area in which the Vietcong are unwelcome. Near Phu Bai there are prospects of the same sort of achievement. There is no easy or quick path to success.

These Vietnamese villages are small and there are many of them near our bases. The orderly process of pacification, achieved only with patience, is being accomplished in the 3d Marine Amphibious Force areas. The problems of pacification are being identified and solved, and each day the Vietcong can move freely in less and less of the country. Each day they can impress a few less men. Each day peace, prosperity, and security loom up as a real possibility in Vietnamese villages where the meanings of these words have never been demonstrated to a child or teenager.

RECENT ACTIVITIES IN VIETNAM

It's almost impossible for an American to visualize what the years of Vietcong terror and exploitation have done to the people of South Vietnam—the little people, farmers and fishermen, who have no thought of politics and who just want to live in peace. It's likewise almost impossible to realize how much our marines have done to bring them the security and peace that they want so badly.

Every day we hear about the tactics, the air strikes, the casualty rates, and other topics from Vietnam.

I'd like to spend a few moments discussing some less sensational activities in Vietnam. The Communists have repeatedly stated the importance of popular support for their so-called wars of national liberation. Without the active support of the people, or at least without their tacit support, a guerrilla movement can't hope to succeed.

As you're aware, the little people caught up in the Vietnamese war will support the Vietcong as long as the Vietcong can coerce them into providing such support, and coercion becomes a relatively simple process if the people are convinced that their government can't give them the security and protection they want so ardently. Once the people realize that their government is, in fact, protecting them from the Vietcong, their attitudes change dramatically.

Let me give you an example of how such attitude changes are brought about.

A few weeks ago, a Vietcong patrol forced a woman, in a village near DaNang known as Hao Lac, to serve as a guide for the patrol. She led them to a marine outpost and turned them in.

Hao Lac was once a Vietcong-dominated village in a valley which had been controlled by the Vietcong for years. When the marines first entered the valley, half of the people of Hao Lac ran for the hills. The rest hid their possessions. The children watched silently in doorways when the marines passed. The adults remained indoors. The Vietcong had told the people that the Americans would be their oppressors and that of the Americans none were more cruel or terrible than the marines.

The marines cleared the valley of Vietcong and then set the stage for a remarkable transition among the people. What changed the people from fleeing the Americans to turning Vietcong over to them?

A few women put the health of their children above the influence of Vietcong propaganda and sought aid from our Navy medical corpsmen. Soon sick call in the village and nearby hamlets was a common practice. One corpsman stayed in the village for 2 months helping the people, and in the process learning Vietnamese. It is a sad footnote that he was later killed in action. Once they'd cleared the area, the marines cooperated with Vietnamese agencies in a program to restore the area which years of Vietcong control had leeched dry.

The marketplace, closed for 5 years, was reopened. The school was repaired. And most important, with the area protected against the Vietcong, native Vietnamese experts—nurses, a teacher, and others—could once again work in safety. Other United States and Vietnamese service agencies were able to work in the valley after years of having to bypass it because of the Vietcong. The marines serving in the vicinity of the village treated the villagers and farmers with the consideration and kindness which comes so naturally to Americans, and which is absolutely essential to successful civic action. When equipment or aid in a reconstruction project was requested by the village chief, the marines provided it.

The villagers of Hoa Lac who originally fled have long since returned to the valley. They have removed the Vietcong booby traps which were once everywhere. Once she had security for her home and children it's small wonder that the village woman turned those terrorists over to the same marines who were instrumental in bringing that security.

In a letter to a Marine battalion commander, the Hoa Vang district representative observed: "We have particularly noted that all the marines of this battalion are interested in their work and are very brave. They are very polite to the people of the area, and they haven't teased the girls." Courtesy has always been a military virtue but I don't really believe we've ever been in a war—before this one—in which "teasing the girls" had any military significance one way or the other. This is truly a different kind of war.

There are many agencies, both Vietnamese and American, ready to come into a secure area and pick up where the troops leave off to establish a better life for the people. Security and civic action programs are only the initial steps. Once these first steps are taken, the better life comes for the people. It becomes increasingly evident to the people that the Vietcong—who have taken their food, exposed them to war, impressed their sons into service—have also denied them access to the fruits of orderly government and a decent life.

We've enjoyed some modest successes in our programs to win the support of the Vietnamese villagers. In cooperation with Vietnamese armed forces we've instituted a program of protecting the farmers' produce and rice crop from Vietcong expropriation, and assisting the more isolated farmers in getting their crops to market.

In the four Marine coastal enclaves, about 5,000 civilian patients a week are treated by Navy medical corpsmen. Most of the patients are children who have never had any opportunity for treatment of any sort. The kids don't know about vitamins; but, like youngsters anywhere, they'll take anything if a candy bribe comes with it.

As the Vietnamese people—the little people in the hamlets and villages—come to recognize the marines as their friends and protectors, our flow of information about the Vietcong increases. As our intelligence gets better, we're able to eliminate more Vietcong. As Vietcong casualties rise we're able to bring a greater degree of security to the countryside which, in turn, once again increases the help we get from the people. So you see, all of our activities—from combat, through village rehabilitation and medical assistance, to not teasing the girls—are designed to help the Vietnamese win this war of northern aggression.

Recent Activities in Vietnam

We're often asked about this thing called civic action in Vietnam and what our role is in the field of civic action and related activities. First of all, civic action, in its broadest sense, is any step taken by military units which contributes to social or economic development and, most importantly in a war of this nature, serves to improve the standing of military forces with the populace. Civic action is conducted at all levels, from an individual marine teaching a child to read, all the way up the scale to the use of large units on projects which are national in scope. An example of a really large project would be the development of the Ohio River Valley by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The extensive road net built by the Roman legions in the time of the Caesars is another example of a large-scale civic action project. Obviously, marines in Vietnam are not engaged in any such vast programs; however, I said that civic action is taken at every level and, in a campaign of the sort we're conducting in Vietnam, it's often those individual or group local projects which pay the biggest dividends. Let me give you a few examples of recent civic action projects and related activities of marines in South Vietnam.

About 2 months ago, Sgt. John D. Moss, a marine from Costa Mesa, Calif., who was serving with a photo-recon squadron at the Da Nang airbase, bought a horse. Since then he's been in the pony ride business. Almost any day of the week you'll find Vietnamese children waiting for him to appear with his horse. They don't know when, but they know he'll come whenever he has a little free time and then they'll have an afternoon of rides. As Sergeant Moss tells it, "They love the horse and for a little while each one of them is very happy. War is bad business, but taking these little ones for a ride makes them forget the ugly things for awhile. You know, when I get about 20 of these children laughing and arguing about getting on 'Willie,' I even forget the bad stuff myself." A big thing? Hardly. Just one marine's way of helping kids forget the realities of their world for a few moments. Contrived? Hardly. Americans are known the world over for their love of children; this is just another minor example. What benefit do we derive from activities like Sergeant Moss?

Who can tell? The Vietcong have done their best to paint us as invading barbarians. As long as the Vietnamese people believe these lies we can't hope to win their support. Sergeant Moss and his horse Willie are helping to prove them wrong.

Last June, the members of the 1st Battalion, 3d Marine Regiment donated $200 of the battalion's Protestant church services fund to the villagers of Hoa My near Da Nang. The village had never had a Sunday school and the villagers wanted one. They were more than willing to provide the labor for construction, but they couldn't afford the small amount of construction material which had to be purchased. Today Hoa My has its Sunday school. This is just another example of marines helping the people of Vietnam to help themselves.

These activities aren't all conducted by individuals or small groups of marines. Many of them are conducted by units as a normal part of the unit's service in Vietnam. Last fall, a marine helicopter squadron evacuated an entire village of more than 1,500 Vietnamese who had been stranded by rampaging floodwaters. The crewmen not only had to face the normal hazards of flying during the heavy rains but Vietcong sniper fire as well. Marines throughout the Pacific contributed blankets and clothing to assist the hapless villagers. With helicopters always in demand, there are armchair tacticians who might say that using this vehicle for other than purely military purposes is a waste of resources. We don't think so. We believe that no effort is wasted if it serves to impress upon the Vietnamese villagers that their government, with our help, is striving to bring security and peace to the countryside.

Few of these efforts have immediate, visible results. For this reason, it is difficult to assess their value in concrete terms. We've seen some results, though, which tend to support our view of the value of serving and protecting the little people caught up in this war.

One example of immediate results occurred in the village of Le My which is about 7 miles west of Da Nang. The marines had a lot of harassment in this area—sniping, booby traps, punji pits—that sort of thing. The villagers and the Vietcong would scatter when our daytime patrols approached: then at night, the Vietcong would move back into the village and resume control. In May, the 2d Battalion, 3d Marine Regiment, moved into the area lock, stock, and barrel. As part of a program of rural construction, these marines removed all of the punji pits from the paddies and the paths leading to them, making it safe for the villagers to work their fields once again. Charts were drawn up showing the villagers where fresh water was located. After a few days the villagers started getting the message—the marines were there to protect and help them, not to suppress them as they'd been told by the Vietcong. Once they got the true picture they commenced giving active support to the marines in their efforts to flush out the terrorists. One aged, bearded elder saved us a casualty by pointing out a booby trap to a patrol. Later, two women assisted a patrol by identifying a Vietcong trying to evade the search party.

It's the single, isolated, little acts such as these that convince us that our efforts are worth while. The dominant theme of our patrol actions is: Capture or kill the Vietcong; make friends with and protect the

South Vietnamese. In this sort of war, the use of friendship is often as important as the use of rifles.

Dr. Bernhard Fall, author of "Street Without Joy" and "The Two Vietnams," is fond of telling this story: An old sergeant was taking a training course in counterguerrilla operations and the standard quotation by Mao Tse-tung concerning the guerrilla being a "fish who swims in a friendly sea" was used. The instructor had spent all morning impressing his students with the importance of depriving the guerrilla of his base of support among the populace. Toward the end of the session, the instructor asked the sergeant to explain what actions could be taken by troops to dry up the friendly sea without which the guerrilla couldn't operate. The grizzled veteran thought a while, then answered, "Be nice to the goddamned people." Crude? Sure. True? Sure. That's what the civic action program is all about.

A question has come up in the last few weeks concerning civilian casualties as the result of Marine ground action in Vietnam. In its most common form the question is usually stated something like this: "If the success of the U.S. effort in Vietnam depends upon winning the support of the villagers for the Vietnamese Government, how can we hope to win this support if our troops cause casualties among the villagers and destroy their homes and fields?"

First, it's necessary to realize that we're in Vietnam to assist the Vietnamese Government in their efforts to eliminate the Communist Vietcong. In some areas the Vietcong have turned whole villages into fortified strongpoints. Our military actions in these areas lean more toward pure combat operations than to civic action operations. By combat operations, I mean the normal process of seizing the strongpoint and killing or capturing any Vietcong who have chosen to remain in their fortified positions. Because of the nature of the war, we often put ourselves at a military disadvantage by warning the populace beforehand of the impending attack. These warnings consist of instructions to the villagers to evacuate, the safe areas in which they may congregate during the attack; and the purpose of the attack. Every effort is made to spare the aged, the women, and the children during an attack. Even those who, through fear, choose to remain in the village are enticed from hiding, if possible, and evacuated. When the attack begins, there is no great artillery or mortar preparation as in normal combat. Marine infantrymen advance without the benefit of covering fire, often in the open. If no hostile fire is received, they conduct a house-to-house search for Vietcong, their weapons, fortifications, and supplies. When enemy material is discovered, it's destroyed; as are any buildings which have been fortified. Nothing is destroyed which is of no military value to the Vietcong. Marines do not destroy houses for the sake of punishment or the sake of impressing the villagers with the futility of assisting the terrorists. Since a great deal of effort is expended in village improvement once the village has been declared clear, our marines are careful about destruction of buildings.

Occasionally, a few terrorists will choose to remain in a fortified village in the hope of killing a few marines. When this happens, the village search often involves the exchange of small arms fire and the careful selective destruction of obviously fortified dwellings. Sometimes innocent villagers are flushed out by the shooting and are caught in the crossfire. Sometimes other innocent villagers who choose or were forced by the Vietcong to remain in the fortified buildings or tunnels become casualties during the course of the attack. These casualties are as rare as the Marines can possibly make them and still not hamstring their combat efforts. As the commanding general of the Marines in Vietnam has stated on this subject: "We are taking all possible steps to avoid such occurrences."

We're in Vietnam to win. Winning requires the support of the people. Every marine in Vietnam is aware of this fact. There have been civilian casualties in every war, sometimes massive casualties. This is not that kind of war and it won't become that kind of war through any action on the part of U.S. marines.

[From Pictorial Living, Feb. 13, 1966]

Leathernecks in Vietnam Are Winning Friends in a "War Within a War"

(By Doug Storer)

A few weeks ago, the mayor of Da Nang, the Vietnamese town where we have established our largest airbase, paid a surprise visit to a Marine field hospital there. With him was a local delegation laden with flowers, all come to thank the Americans for what they had done for Vietnam. Just as a formal speech was being made by the mayor, a little Vietnamese girl who was with the group broke away, darted up to the bedside of a wounded marine and placed in his hand a battered, much-loved plastic doll. Then, still without a word, the little girl ran shyly from the room.

A touching gesture of gratitude? Very. But more important still, it was a singular victory for the Marine civic action program in Vietnam.

I first heard of this remarkable program when I was in Vietnam recently. The Vietnamese war is a strange one. For us it is a counterguerrilla war, and success must be measured not only in land taken and Vietcong killed, but in gaining the trust and confidence of the people.

Both sides are battling for this same objective with the result that there is now a "war within a war" being fought in Vietnam. Gen. Maxwell Taylor recently described it as a "desperate war" make necessary because "there is more than a military victory to be won in Vietnam."

This victory is for the minds of the people. To achieve it, the Vietcong follow up their military attacks with Communistic propaganda and terrorism; we follow ours with civic action.

The strategy of civic action is simple. As soon as a village is occupied: help the suffering people, offer them friendship, bind up their wounds, provide them with what they need to get going again.

This direct, humanitarian effort has made friends quickly for the marines in some parts of Vietnam, but in areas where the Vietcong had previously been long entrenched, it has taken a lot of hard, patient work on the part of the weary leathernecks to win over the villagers made hostile by anti-American propaganda. Although terrified by the Vietcong, the people have been taught by the Communists to fear the coming of the Americans even more.

"The Americans will steal your possessions," the Communists have told them. "They will kill, cripple, and torture your people. Even take food from your children. And remember, of all savage Americans, none are more cruel, violent, and treacherous than the marines."

Civic action "weapons" to win the people are food, clothing, and medical supplies, building materials, and tools. But there are many others, some measured by "heart valve" alone, such as a little girl's first doll—the joy of learning simple numbers on the gun-callused hand of a big, kindly marine—a magical pair of glasses for an old man who thought dim eyes could never see again—a midwifery kit for an obscure hamlet where delivery and death, far too often, go hand in hand—the loan of a bulldozer to a poor farmer to help him break ground for spring planting.

Many of the "weapons" come from CARE packages—but they're CARE packages with a difference. These are specially put together by that famed organization of marines who know exactly what is needed to win friends.

These, and many more, are the varied "weapons" of kindness and compassion used by the marines in this humanitarian war—a war the marines are winning.

The signs of victory in this war are not always sensational and might pass unnoticed by us, but they are unmistakable to the marines.

They know, for instance, that civic action has achieved a victory when a Marine chaplain is invited to give the first service in a little mission church which, after being bombed out by the Vietcong, the marines have rebuilt with funds from their own slender paychecks.

In another case, a clinic which was set up under a thatched roof in a village square was ignored by the people for weeks; the medics waited but no one came. Then a young Vietnamese mother, wary still of the Americans she had been taught to hate, but desperate for her sick child, brought the baby to the clinic for treatment. A few injections worked wonders, the mother ceased to hate, told others of her child's recovery and in a little while the clinic was swamped with patients.

Occasionally, there is a very dramatic victory. Not long ago the marines finally occupied a village where the Vietcong had been in control for more than 2 years. The people of the village had been taught their lessons of hate and fear.

However, the marines put civic action to work immediately and waited patiently for the program to win over the people. But although the people accepted the food, the supplies and the help, they showed no signs of friendship or trust.

One day, though, while five village women were out fishing on the Han River in a sampan they were hailed by a Vietcong, a former Communist inhabitant of the village, who asked their help in smuggling him back into the village.

Hoisting the man into the little boat the women slowly paddled back to the village. There they rowed along the bank until they spotted a marine sentry whereupon they boldly picked up the suprised Communist, dumped him into the water and signaled the sentry on shore with loud screams of "Vietcong. Vietcong."

The action of these women in delivering a Vietcong to the marines was a great breakthrough and soon after the whole hard-core village fell to civic action and its humane program.

Wherever the war to free Vietnam is fought, successes for the marine civic action program are occurring all over that unfortunate country.

And the Vietcong are feeling the pinch. As friendship grows for the Americans among the Vietnamese people, the enemy guerrillas find fewer and fewer places in which to hide out.

Up until recently, civic action—which the marines created as a voluntary program—has been supported mostly by the marines themselves.

Now you can join these gallant men in this fight for freedom. All you have to do to help the marines help the people of Vietnam is send a contribution, no matter how small, to The Marines CARE, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., 20036.

[News Release from U.S. Marine Corps]

A War Within a War

Washington, September 14.—A war within the Vietnam war is being fought by American Marines, armed not with guns but with simple, American-style kindness and understanding.

For the U.S. marines, Vietnam is a new kind of warfare. It is a war like no other, but with rules as old as mankind. It is a war that demands the cold-blooded courage to storm into battle, then the warmhearted kindness to comfort the victims—the hungry, naked children caught up in the nightmare of conflict.

It is a war of frontline diplomacy where one careless act can have costly consequences. It's a war where words backed up by deeds are equally as important as good marksmanship and brilliant battlefield tactics.

Vietnam is a war where both sides are battling to win the minds of the people; where victory for either side depends on the good will of the people rather than the physical occupation of land.

There are no textbook answers for this kind of war. The marines are writing the manual for problems as complex as human nature itself. It is often frustrating and the results are slow in showing. But it is beginning to pay off.

LeMy is a village complex which nestles along the south bank of the winding Ca De River about 7 miles north of Da Nang. The travelog narrator would describe it as a typical, sleepy little tropical community, graced by swaying palms and golden ricefields.

A few weeks ago, LeMy was a Communist stronghold—well entrenched and well boobytrapped. LeMy was the major Vietcong supply center for the entire valley leading in from the Ho Chi Minh infiltration trails.

The Vietcong of LeMy were preparing for an all-out attack on the vital, bustling airbase at Da Nang, just as other Vietcong had already hit Bien Hoa and Pleiku to the south.

President Johnson saw fit to call in the marines. The village of LeMy lived in fear of the day American marines would come. The Communists had told them how brutal the Americans were. The marines, they said, were the worst.

As the point squad of the 2d Battalion, 3d Marines approached a single shot rang out. A marine, struck in the shoulder, buckled and fell to the ground. The sniper disappeared. Not one villager had seen him.

The guerrillas hid in bunkers as the marines came to give food and clothing to the villagers. One by one, the marines tripped mines and booby traps. One by one, the marines dragged the guerrillas from their holes.

The villagers were startled to find mines in their front yards. They were startled to find the guerrillas living underneath their thatched huts.

"Why can't we just round up these people and march them through in front of us?" asked one frustrated squadleader.

"That's not the way we do it," he was told. "We've got to win them over, then hope they'll point out the mines and the booby traps and the guerrillas."

Lt. Col. David Clement, commander of the battalion, decided to make his stand at LeMy. "Somebody's got to win the war," he said. "To do that, we have to win the people. We've won a few around here. We'll win some more."

Clement's marines patiently went on with the difficult task of making friends. It took time. And more than one marine died from a sniper's shot while giving out food. But the Vietcong, by his fierce anti-American propaganda, unknowingly made the job easier.

When the villagers got used to the smiling faces under camouflaged helmets; when their hunger was sated by the extra rice; when they saw their women were not raped; when their sores began to heal after the corpsmen doctored them, they began to change their minds.

LeMy Village today is the showcase of the Marine Corps. Clement's marines have rebuilt bridges destroyed by the Vietcong. They have reopened the school for the first time in 7 years; the marketplace, closed for 5 years, is now open.

Maj. Gen. Lewis Walt, the burly, quiet-natured Kansan who commands the Marines in Vietnam, believes the patience from the beginning is paying off.

"We're reaping rewards we never really expected," he says. "Just a few weeks ago, some 1,600 villagers west of here suddenly decided they wanted no more to do with the Vietcong. They wanted to leave their village and be resettled in a safe place. But they were afraid to start walking for fear the Vietcong would start shooting them.

"We took our helicopters out and they crawled aboard, carrying all they could, leaving most of their possessions behind. It was quite a sight.

"Then, just the other day," said Walt, "five women were out in a sampan when they were stopped by a Vietcong. He wanted a ride to their village. When they got to LeMy, they pushed him out and began screeming, 'Vietcong. Vietcong.'"

The success at LeMy is enabling the marines to beat the Vietcong at his own game. When Clement's marines patrol the jungles around LeMy, they leave stakeouts behind where the now friendly villagers have reported guerrilla activity. A fire team of three or four marines hides in the jungle for days at a time, waiting for the Vietcong to come out of his hole.

Students of guerrilla warfare have long declared the importance of the people to the overall victory. The marines are taking lessons from the masters.

Red China's Mao Tse-tung summed it up decades ago: "The people," he said, "are the water in which the partisan fish swim. The fish can flourish only if the temperature of the water is right."

Mao felt it important enough to admonish his guerrillas with "three rules and eight remarks" on dealing with the people:

"All actions are subject to command.

"Do not steal from the people.

"Be neither selfish nor unjust.

"Replace the door when you leave the house.

"Roll up the bedding on which you have slept.

"Be courteous.

"Be honest in your transactions.

"Return what you borrow.

"Replace what you break.

"Do not bathe in the presence of women.

"Do not without authority search the pocketbooks of those you arrest."

No successful guerrilla leader has failed to realize the importance of the people. One expert of another era, T. E. Lawrence (of Arabia), noted that the guerrilla "must have a friendly population, not actively friendly but sympathetic to the point of not betraying rebel movements to the enemy."

Another more recent expert, Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, Hanoi's defense minister and the victor at Dienbienphu, describes guerrilla warfare as "neither more nor less than the mobilization of the rural masses."

Giap, in the Indochina War, gained the will of the rural masses by giving them the land they worked, and by killing off the unpopular landlords and government tax collectors.

Point nine of the Vietcong "oath of honor" is "to help the people, respect the people, and defend the people in order to win their confidence and affection."

The Communist guerrilla goes a step farther to gain this all-important community support—terror. Communist leaders have written: "Where voluntary community support is not spontaneously forthcoming at the outbreak of the struggle or cannot be sustained at the desired level, the guerrilla movement must resort to terrorism to compel such support."

"Terror," they say, "is the guerrilla leader's most potent weapon." Then they add, "The use of terror, to be effective, must be absolute."

Vietcong terror has been absolute. Literally thousands of village chiefs, town mayors, tax collectors, schoolteachers, and other government officials have been beheaded by the Vietcong, usually in full view of the helpless community.

Even more peasants, farmers, fishermen, women, and children have died in terrorist bombings, on mined highways, and in wrecked trains.

The Asian Communist counts on one thing. The West, with deep-rooted humanitarian ideals, reacts to bloodshed and protracted violence with a troubled conscience. They will not meet terror with terror.

American marines believe the concept of terror to be false. In the long run, they have found, kindness is the most potent weapon against the guerrilla. The marines' war within the Vietnam war is one of friendship. And it works.

Maj. Ben Ferrell, a drawling, former Tyler, Tex., lawyer, is civil affairs officer for General Walt's 3d Marine Amphibious Force. His job is making sure that 30,000 marines make friends with the Vietnamese.

"We have no special setup for civil affairs," he explains. "We work through the chain of command. Unit commanders go see the village chief and determine what the needs are—medical, public works, food, clothing.

"While some marines protect the village against the Vietcong, others dig wells, make water points, build bridges, dikes, and roads.

"Most readily accepted, I suppose, is medical aid. The people are a bit reluctant at first to come in for sick call. But give them a few days, and let a corpsman clean up a few dirty kids, and they come in droves."

The LeMy aid station, set up at almost the same spot where the first marine died in combat, is now treating some 200 Vietnamese patients a day.

"Our Navy doctors and corpsmen," says Ferrell, "are ambassadors with bandaids."

LeMy village near Da Nang is just one example of the marines' war within the Vietnam war. Walt's command of 30,000 men stretches out over 200 miles, in four enclaves along the coast of South Vietnam.

In the center of each enclave is an airbase, vital in the Vietnamese Government's war against the Vietcong. The airbases must be defended.

Around each of these airbases are battalions of young American marines living in the mud of foxholes with no more than a rubber poncho for a roof. Their conditions are hardly as good as the refugees of the war they are fighting. But somehow, between skirmishes, the marines find time and energy to help these refugees.

In the hills around Qui Nhon, 150 miles south of Da Nang, leathernecks of the Second Battalion, 7th Marines, have set up a roadside cafeteria offering free rice cooked to suit local taste.

Fifty yards away a tent has been erected. It is manned by two Navy doctors, three medical assistants, and an ambulance driver. A few of the people are reluctant to stop and be treated for fear of Vietcong reprisal, but the crowd increases daily.

Hospital Corpsman Kenneth Blackwell, of Fresno, Calif., says there were no people at all when the marines first arrived. As the days passed, he said, the villagers started to reappear—curious and afraid at first. They found the Americans friendly and they responded.

At the Hue-Phu Bai enclave, 40 miles north of Da Nang, the marines had added another orphanage to their long and growing list. Some 200 pounds of clothing, collected by marine wives in Hawaii, has been delivered to the 500 children at the St. Paul de Charles Orphanage.

A marine helicopter crewman who helped give out the clothes, said it is debatable who gets more satisfaction in the effort.

"This time yesterday," he said, "I was on a combat mission. Today, I'm giving clothes to kids. This job is more satisfying. Maybe it's more important, too."

At Da Nang, Sgt. John Moss, of Costa Mesa, Calif., has found another way to wage this war of friendship. About 4 months ago, he bought a small horse. Since that time, he has been in the ponyride business.

"When I show up with Willie, the horse," he says, "kids come running from everywhere. War is bad business, especially for the kids. Taking them for a ride makes them forget the ugly things for a while. For a few moments, each one of them is very happy.

"You know what?" he added, "I even forget the bad stuff myself."

The marines are waging this war of friendship with every weapon they have. Friendship sometimes comes in a can—a can of C-rations in the outstretched hand of a marine—for wars have traditionally produced scared, hungry people—and big, friendly marines.

Friendship sometimes comes in a bottle of pills or sirup—a bottle of modern science to treat such things as pneumonia where a pack of herbs on a victim's chest had been the remedy.

Friendship comes in the battle-scarred hands of a marine infantryman, teaching a Vietnamese boy to count in English; or hands giving what is probably the first real doll to a little girl destined by the fate of guerrilla warfare to spend her youth in an orphanage.

Friendship, the marines have learned, is the weapon to win this war within the Vietnam war.

"The Vietcong," says Lt. Col. David Clement, "have neither the firepower nor the reserve to counter us. When we can swim in the sea of people as well as they can, then we're going to win."

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, in addition I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a statement by Adm. Arleigh Burke, of the Center for Strategic Studies, which is perinent to the matter under discussion today.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement on Vietnam to the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific by Arleigh Burke, February 9, 1966

The North Vietnamese have failed to give any indications whatever of a willingness to negotiate the conflict in South Vietnam except on terms which would essentially require the withdrawal of U.S. forces and influence from southeast Asia, and specifically South Vietnam, and thereby abandon the free people of southeast Asia to eventual Communist domination.

These conditions are, of course, unacceptable to the United States because they are inimical to our national interests and security as well as to the interests of the free people of Asia.

And yet the North Vietnamese battalions which have been sent into South Vietnam have been badly mauled by the military power of South Vietnam and the United States. The Vietcong, controlled by Hanoi, have had most of their terrorist operations thwarted, although they have been successful in some of their terrorist activities against both the South Vietnamese and the United States and allied forces.

North Vietnam is a small country whose war effort is supported by both the Soviet Union and Communist China. North Vietnam could not continue its aggressive penetration into South Vietnam without this heavy support.

An examination of the relative power available to South Vietnam and the United States, and that available to North Vietnam and its Communist allies, clearly indicates that North Vietnam cannot hope to succeed in its efforts to conquer South Vietnam as long as both sides continue to fight.

Under these circumstances, then, it is desirable to examine why it is that North Vietnam continues in her efforts to take over South Vietnam when her prospects for success appear to be so small.

It is evident from the events of the past several months that the North Vietnamese have not been convinced that they cannot be successful.

There are three possible reasons which Ho Chi Minh and his advisers may have for their conviction that if they fight hard enough and long enough, they will be successful.

The first is that they may hope for a spectacular military disaster to some elements of the United States and allied forces now in South Vietnam. If military disaster should occur to our forces in South Vietnam, the North Vietnamese might expect that the people and the Government of the United States would be so shaken that they would withdraw our military forces in support of South Vietnam.

This possibility, I believe, is remote.

The second and more probable possibility is rooted in the history of Vietnam. The Vietnamese fought against the French for years. In the first 7 or 8 years the Vietnamese were defeated time after time. After years of this seemingly hopeless struggle, they eventually defeated the French on the battlefield at Dienbienphu.

Dienbienphu has great significance. In this battle a European army was defeated by an oriental army. In this battle a modern European army equipped with modern weapons was defeated by indigenous forces largely equipped with obsolete or captured weapons. In this battle an army of a nation which had both air and naval support was defeated by an army which had neither.

The significant point of the campaign terminating the battle of Dienbienphu was that the persistence, stamina, and will to win of the Vietnamese forced an ignominious defeat upon a powerful Western nation.

But as has been pointed out by many writers, the French campaign in Indochina failed not primarily because of the combat conditions in Indochina, but because of the conditions in Paris. The French Government and the French people had lost their will to resist the Communist takeover of the Far East. The sacrifice of many gallant French soldiers was in vain because the French people and the French Government withdrew their support of the campaign in Indochina, and France was again defeated.

The gradual reduction of the will to resist communism in France was not an accidental event. There were at that time many Communist organizations in France, the principal one being the Communist Party, which continuously conducted psychological warfare on the French people and the French Government. They were ably supported by Communist-sponsored organizations in other countries. They were also supported by non-Communist organizations and people in France who unwittingly accepted the Communist propaganda as being true. Important segments of the French mass media supported for one reason or another the Communist-front groups in the manipulation of public opinion in order to reduce popular support of the Government's resistance to Communist aggression. It is interesting to note that the insistence of the French Communist Party on giving in to the demands of Ho Chi Minh led to their complete ouster from the French Government under Premier Ramadier. The French electorate apparently had enough of the Communists in 1947, but the continual governmental paralysis served to weaken the French commitment in Indochina. The ultimate result was that as far as France was concerned, she eventually surrendered southeast Asia to the Communists.

The important point here is that the North Vietnamese proved to themselves that if they continued aggressive military and terrorist operations against France, and at the same time the whole Communist apparatus conducted psychological warfare in France against further resistance to Communist domination of Indochina, they would drive out the French. At first they failed. Eventually they succeeded.

Therefore, it is possible that Ho Chi Minh and his advisers are convinced that if they do fight hard enough and long enough and conduct a sufficient number of terrorist operations, and if at the same time the worldwide Communist movement conducts a global psychological warfare campaign directed at the United States and other free world nations, they will be able to repeat their victory over France, and the United States will eventually withdraw, with the consequences of their victory over the most powerful nation being inspiration for further aggressions with good chance of success. In short, they may believe that they have greater stamina than the United States, and that the losses they will surely suffer will be more than counterbalanced by the tremendous gains accruing to the Communists if the United States suffers military or diplomatic defeat.

The third possibility is that the North Vietnamese may be convinced that the United States will eventually negotiate on their terms, with perhaps some face-saving device for the United States and our allies. The United States has made extraordinary and unprecedented efforts to negotiate in South Vietnam. The United States has made many suggestions as to how these negotiations could take place, and all of them have been rudely rebuffed by Hanoi. The North Vietnamese may believe that if they continue their aggression and if the heavy propaganda is continued, the time will come when they can offer to negotiate under such conditions that South Vietnam will come under complete Communist control through negotiation. They may believe that the public demonstrations and many statements of prominent U.S. citizens indicate that eventually the majority of the people of the United States and the U.S. Government will be willing to accept Communist domination of all of southeast Asia in the name of peace.

Although the split between the Soviet Union and Communist China has been widened and intensified, it behooves us to be realistic about the reasons for the split. Both Communist hierarchies intend for communism to dominate the world, and as Hitler did, they have repeatedly said so. The Soviet Union believes that the most efficient way to accomplish this is through a détente and boring from within. The Chinese Communists believe that the only way is through violent revolution.

It is probable that these differences of opinion will continue to intensify, and there may even be border clashes and actual combat between the Soviet Union and Red China. But as long as Russia and China are ruled by Communists, they will both attempt to destroy all non-Communist nations and to extend their control and domain over the world. Therefore I do not anticipate that the Soviet Union will, in any meaningful way, help us out in the long run. The Soviets may try to create conditions in which Red China and the United States are locked in direct conflict, in the hopes that we both will wear ourselves out, and the Soviet Union could then, in our weakened condition, both take charge of the worldwide Communist movement and dominate most of the world.

Is this be true, then the Soviet Union, as one of the principal patrons of the Vietnamese war, will be interested in keeping us embroiled in Vietnam for as long a period as possible.

Grave choices now confront the United States, but so they have for a number of years in Vietnam. If we withdraw from South Vietnam either because of a military defeat or by means of negotiation, and South Vietnam comes under the control of the Communists, we will soon have lost our leading position in the world.

What if we escalate slowly, as has been advocated? Slow escalation means protracting the war—not only timewise but costwise. If there is any one lesson of past cold war crises, that is to act swiftly before the Communists compound and complicate the crisis. On the other hand, if we follow escalation a bit at a time, the total cost to the United States for eventually freeing South Vietnam from the Communists most likely will be greater in both men and resources.

What is the alternative? It is to take the difficult step of not only increasing the intensity of the war on the ground, but also blockading North Vietnam, mining Haiphong harbor, destroying all the military installations in North Vietnam regardless of their location, and using whatever means are necessary to prevent Communist supplies from coming into South Vietnam through Laos and Cambodia.

Some say this course of action runs the risk of direct conflict with Red China. It does, but the present course does too. The new course would make it Red China's clear-cut decision to initiate or not to initiate that conflict. The military operations can be suspended at any time if the North Vietnamese simply withdraw from their aggressive actions to take over their neighbor to the south.

The present course of piecemeal escalation, however, runs a greater risk of bringing in Red China by piecemeal decisions on her part.

Finally, there is one overwhelming conclusion about the war in southeast Asia: until the North Vietnamese and their sponsors are convinced that we really intend to prevent their takeover of South Vietnam, they will continue their aggression.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 2791, a bill to authorize the supplemental appropriation of $4.8 billion for military procurement made necessary by the fighting in South Vietnam.

This measure, as it has been outlined for us by the experienced, respected, and wise chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, would approve the appropriation of funds for the purchase of weapons; for military construction projects; and for various research, development, test and evaluation programs. Of the $4.8 billion involved, $3.4 billion is needed immediately for aircraft, missiles, tracked vehicles, ammunition, spare parts, and other types of hardware used by our fighting men in southeast Asia. A large proportion of this equipment is required to replace materials already destroyed or expended in combat.

Every member of the Committee on Armed Forces, after hearing expert testimony, agreed that this authorization was vital to our troops on the battlefield, if they are to carry out the missions assigned to them. It is imperative to eliminate the shortages that now exist and that will worsen if not quickly remedied. If we delay further in the passage of this authorization, we will have to assume responsibility for an increased number of American wounded and dead.

Mr. President, the Senate has been deliberating over S. 2791 since Wednesday of last week. During that time, several Senators have pointed out the fact that there is no language in this measure either defending or challenging the current policies of the United States in southeast Asia. All that this particular legislation seeks to do is to make possible the appropriation of the moneys required to maintain military personnel already operating in a perilous and dangerous combat zone. It would assure that those men have enough of the best equipment which we back home, can and must supply, in order that they can do the jobs assigned to them by their grateful Government.

Is this not the least that we can do for those men who daily risk their lives? Is it too much to ask that we curb our tongues, suppress our desire to demonstrate our knowledge with respect to foreign policy matters, at least until this bread, butter, and guns bill is out of the way? Would the sacrifice we would be making be anywhere equivalent to that which our boys overseas are making? I think not.

Today, over 200,000 American troops are stationed in South Vietnam; an additional 100,000 are based in Thailand and patrol the waters off the coast of southeast Asia. These young men are not architects of foreign policy. They are not privileged to sit in the councils that guide this Nation's destiny. They are given orders by their superior officers, and in the highest tradition of service to their country, they carry those orders out as efficiently and effectively as they can with that equipment which they have at hand. I say again, we supply that equipment and it is up to us, the Congress, to make certain that the soldiers and sailors, airmen and marines, have in hand the tools to accomplish their assigned tasks with a minimum of personal risk and a maximum of effectiveness.

Mr. President, I do not believe that I could stand to bear my share of the burden of guilt that would fall on the shoulders of Congress should we fail to discharge our responsibility to those men in southeast Asia who look to us for lifegiving support.

I cannot believe that any Member of this body would want to accept the snuffing out of an American life because a marine ran out of ammunition or an infantryman could not be given sufficient air cover.

For this reason alone, S. 2791 merits immediate and unequivocal Senate approval. The chairman and members of the Committee on Armed Services have sculptured this measure so that it is able to stand by itself, divorced from questions of our overall policy in Vietnam.

But while I have the utmost respect and admiration for the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, I personally cannot dissociate this bill from the broader aspect of our commitment to South Vietnam.

Mr. President, there is no question that Congress could bring about a direct confrontation with the President of the United States over the policy currently being followed in southeast Asia by refusing to raise the money required to maintain our military positions in South Vietnam. But, were we to do so, let us remember that we would make it impossible for the President to carry out his constitutional responsibilities of directing this Nation's foreign policy, and his equally awesome responsibility of being this Nation's Commander in Chief in time of limited or of total war. Should this irresponsible course be followed in this particular instance, it is clear beyond the peradventure of a doubt that the real losers in such a clash would be the young men serving in Da Nang, in Chu Lai, in Cam Ranh Bay, the men of the 1st Cavalry, the men of the 3d Marine Division, the pilots of helicopters and warplanes who—deprived of the means to wage battle—would be quickly driven into the sea by the onslaught of a determined and implacable enemy.

Mr. President, it has been stated by some that the consideration of S. 2791 offers the Senate a prime opportunity to question and attempt to change our policies and programs in Vietnam. They believe this body should extend its deliberations to criticize every facet of a policy that has already been scrupulously examined time and again by three Presidents, a host of administration officials, and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. A few Senators would have us review again a course of action this country has been embarked upon since we adopted the program of aid to Greece and Turkey in 1947, and—more specifically—since we put our hand and our seal to the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization in 1955.

Even before this pending appropriation authorization was brought up, there had been countless hours of speeches delivered in this Chamber with respect to our position in Vietnam. In addition, there have been many days of nationally televised hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations and every expert, every Senator, and every columnist has had his say, or has had his opportunity to have his say. With respect to those hearings, it seems to me, Mr. President, that from the discussions and the thousands of words which have been written by every real and every self-appointed expert on South Vietnam, there have merged only two conclusions. First, that the President and the critics of his policies in Vietnam, in truth and in fact, share basic common goals; second, that the critics of the President's foreign policies have been able to find no shorter, no easier, no more logical paths to the goals which we all seek than the ones which the President is today pursuing.

It goes without saying that today everybody wants a negotiated peace, and the President, if my memory serves me correctly, publicly and clearly made the point that he wanted a negotiated peace—so long as we did not have one which would sell out the rights of the South Vietnamese people or abandon our principles in a wild and hysterical pursuit of peace at any price. It is obvious to all that the alternatives of abject surrender and retreat, on the one hand, and all-out nuclear war, on the other, are unacceptable.

So far as I can determine, no one, from the President on down, likes the situation in which we find ourselves at the present time nor the situation which started developing in South Vietnam in 1954, when the United States made its first commitment to the people of that country. Surely, the revered and respected President John F. Kennedy did not like the situation which he inherited in 1961, when the Communists began stepping up their activities against the people of South Vietnam.

I should like to read some excerpts from the public papers of President Kennedy with respect to this subject.

On September 12, 1963, at a news conference, President Kennedy was asked:

> Mr. President, in view of the prevailing confusion, is it possible to state today just what this Government's policy is toward the current Government of South Vietnam?

President Kennedy responded as follows:

> I think I have stated what my view is and we are for those things and those policies which help win the war there. That is why some 25,000 Americans have traveled 10,000 miles to participate in that struggle. What helps to win the war, we support; what interferes with the war effort, we oppose. I have already made it clear that any action by either government which may handicap the winning of the war is inconsistent with our policy or our objectives. This is the test which I think every agency and official of the U.S. Government must apply to all of our actions, and we shall be applying that test in various ways in the coming months, although I do not think it desirable to state all of our views at this time. I think they will be made more clear as time goes on.
>
> But we have a very simple policy in that area, I think. In some ways I think the Vietnamese people and ourselves agree: we want the war to be won, the Communists to be contained, and the Americans to go home. That is our policy. I am sure it is the policy of the people of Vietnam. But we are not there to see a war lost, and we will follow the policy which I have indicated today of advancing those causes and issues which help win the war."

That was a statement by President Kennedy in 1963. It was about as unequivocal a position as anyone could take. That was the President's policy then; so far as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned, that is my policy today.

Quoting again from the public papers of President Kennedy I read from a message to President Diem on the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the Republic of Vietnam. The message is dated October 23, 1963, and is as follows:

> DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On behalf of the American people I extend greetings and best wishes to the Republic of Vietnam on its eighth anniversary. On this occasion I wish once again to express the admiration of the American people for the unfailing courage of the Vietnamese people in their valiant struggle against the continuing efforts of communism to undermine and destroy Vietnamese independence. The United States of America has confidence in the future of the Republic of Vietnam, in its ability both to overcome the present Communist threat to their independence, and to determine their own destiny. We look forward to the day when peace is restored and when the Vietnamese people can live in freedom and prosperity.
>
> JOHN F. KENNEDY.

I emphasize this line in particular:

> The United States of America has confidence in the future of the Republic of Vietnam, in its ability both to overcome the present Communist threat to their independence, and to determine their own destiny.

It would appear to me that the President of the United States had no intention of imposing on the people of South Vietnam any government that was not of their own choosing.

I cite another quotation from President Kennedy's papers. At a press conference on November 14, 1963, the President was asked:

> Would you give us your appraisal of the situation in South Vietnam now, since the coup, and the purposes for the Honolulu conference?

The President replied as follows:

> The PRESIDENT. Because we do have a new situation there, and a new government, we hope, an increased effort in the war. The purpose of the meeting at Honolulu—Ambassador Lodge will be there, General Harkins will be there, Secretary McNamara and others, and then, as you know, later Ambassador Lodge will come here—is to attempt to assess the situation: what American policy should be, and what our aid policy should be, how we can intensify the struggle, how we can bring Americans out of there.
>
> Now, that is our object, to bring Americans home, permit the South Vietnamese to maintain themselves as a free and independent country and permit democratic forces within the country to operate—which they can, of course, much more freely when the assault from the inside, and which is manipulated from the north, is ended. So the purpose of the meeting in Honolulu is how to pursue these objectives.

Under President Kennedy, in order to meet our commitments to SEATO and to the people of South Vietnam, we were forced to raise the level of our assistance and our manpower from a few hundred to over 25,000.

Surely President Johnson did not like the situation which he inherited in late 1963 and early 1964, when the Communists, sensing and smelling a military victory, increased their pressure and their manpower moving from North Vietnam into South Vietnam. Again, more men were required to meet our commitments to South Vietnam and to freedom.

It was obvious, and, in fact, I know of no men—even in the circles of retired military personnel—who contend that we would not have been driven out of South Vietnam and the people of South Vietnam subjugated to the cruel tyranny of the Communists, had we not increased our manpower and our efforts to the level of above 200,000.

I should think that every responsible individual understands that America cannot simply abandon pledges that date back to the administration of Dwight Eisenhower. We cannot lay down our arms and abandon the people of South Vietnam to bloody slavery merely because it has become bothersome, expensive, or even difficult for us.

Surely we have walked far beyond the "last mile" in quest of an honorable peace in southeast Asia. American envoys have traveled to all the major world capitals with which we maintain relations. In addition, they have gone to the capitals of smaller nations, and they have even made contacts with countries with which we do not normally have diplomatic relations in an effort to find some pathway, some partly opened door which might lead to the table where negotiations for an honorable peace could be undertaken.

At considerable risk to its men and to its tactical position, the United States ceased bombing North Vietnam for 37 days while the first thrust of the peace offensive was launched. The only response to this pause was a demonstrable and provable increase in the infiltration of Communist men and arms from North Vietnam into South Vietnam, and an increase in the abuse and the invective poured upon this Government and upon its President.

Mr. President, the government of Hanoi in the north, which is the father and sponsor of the Vietcong in the south, has left no doubt that it will continue its aggression until it has achieved its aim of conquering South Vietnam and driving out the United States. They will pursue that course until they are finally convinced that we have placed a military victory over South Vietnam beyond their reach.

Because we have seen that the carrot alone has no effect, we have been constrained to reapply the stick. We have had to match force with force, to meet aggression with steadfastness and determination. Our policy has revolved around this one, steady principle—that we will do whatever is required of us to preserve the right of self-determination of the people of South Vietnam.

As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations said on August 6, 1964, during the debate on the southeast Asia resolution:

> It should be made equally clear to these—meaning Communist—regimes, if it is not yet sufficiently clear, that their aggressive and expansionist ambitions, wherever advanced, will meet precisely that degree of American opposition which is necessary to frustrate them.

Mr. President, that was the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The day after these words were spoken, the House of Representatives and the Senate, with only two dissenting votes, approved the southeast Asia resolution, which came to be known in some quarters as the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. This resolution gave to the President the support of Congress:

> To take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the southeast Asia collective defense treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

Mr. President, I am convinced that Congress must affirm its support for the American fighting men in southeast

Asia—and for this Nation's policies in that area—by passing S. 2791 immediately and overwhelmingly.

We must demonstrate conclusively once again, to both friend and foe, that the debate over American policy in Vietnam does not show weakness or sharp divisions in our national resolve. We must prove and establish that, behind the clouds of discussion, there stands a strength of purpose and a unity of will that will not be shaken from within or from without.

Mr. President, there can be no greater indication of unwavering determination to keep our commitments, to live up to our written and spoken word, and to aid the people of South Vietnam, than quick and decisive action by the Senate of the United States on the passage of this military authorization program to assist our boys in South Vietnam.

I believe that the overwhelming sentiment of the Senate is as I have expressed it today, that the vast majority would like to get to an immediate vote for the reasons which I have outlined and for other reasons which I have not touched upon.

When we do vote, I believe that it will be clearly and eloquently demonstrated that indeed a vast majority of the Senators support our President and our policies in Vietnam, for, in my judgment, there will not be five votes against the measure.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the current debate on our Vietnam policy which has been continuing with increased confusion and dissention, demands, I believe, that all Senators carefully assess the case that has been laid before us and reach that judgment which is required of the Congress.

We have pending a bill designed to provide the military means through which the thousands of American boys in southeast Asia can pursue our objectives there. Indeed, the funds sought involve their very safety and the success of their dangerous mission.

It seems to me that there could have been a more appropriate vehicle for this debate. We could discuss a new Senate resolution rather than a supplemental military appropriation which involves the safety of our forces as well as the success of a military venture which will have a lasting effect on our global policies and effectiveness.

I do not wish to leave any doubt of my own position, which is based on expressions I have heard from my constituents, my work on the Armed Services Committee and the Preparedness Subcommittee, and my personal observations of the situation in southeast Asia.

Our commitment spans the administrations of three Presidents. It is based on our sacred pledge to an ally, and is bolstered by the southeast Asia resolution of August 10, 1964.

My own conclusions are drawn from many factors, most important of which was my inspection of the critical points in Vietnam where we have constructed powerful installations, provided excellent facilities, and made plans for carrying this war to a successful conclusion. From what I saw there, we are making great progress in aiding a people determined to preserve their freedom and in providing a situation which will lend itself to the long-range political stability of the country.

I believe the President has exhausted every honorable and peaceful recourse available to him in recent weeks.

The 37-day moratorium on bombing North Vietnam was virtually unprecedented in the history of warfare. It made the alternatives crystal clear to the enemy and demonstrated our desire for negotiations to all the world.

There were those who suggested to the President that there be additional delays in resumption of hostilities and additional emphasis on our peace offensive. At that time I wrote to the President stating my views and commenting on the damage that was being done to our position by what seemed to be an indefinite but one-sided cessation of hostilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the President of January 28, 1966, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 28, 1966.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It has been widely publicized that some Members of both Houses of the Congress have made written and verbal appeals to the Commander in Chief to continue the cessation of bombing in North Vietnam. These critics maintain that there are hopes for a peaceful resolution of the conflict at this time, and that stoppage of bombing raids can further these hopes. If this would accomplish the desired results I would be in complete agreement.

But every shred of responsible testimony that I have heard and studied and every observation I have made personally in that part of the world, convinces me that these advocates of a soft approach in South and North Vietnam completely misread Communist intentions, strategy, and the will to continue a war which they believe—perhaps rightly—they are winning.

Our policy has suffered in South Vietnam, just as it suffered in Korea, from a too heavy reliance on civilian advice and a reluctance to permit the military commanders to accomplish our limited military objectives.

In my view, the opinions of virtually every responsible U.S. military commander are contrary to our present policy. They recognize, and I agree, that the present experiment in halting the prosecution of the war can prove extremely expensive in terms of American casualties. I strongly believe that we should resume bombing of targets more strategic than those that have thus far been hit, and that you give serious consideration to a port blockade of Haiphong which will partly seal out aid to North Vietnam from the outside world.

It is my further view that we cannot face the other alternatives, which to date have included suggestions which translate only into surrender and/or appeasement.

Again I urge you to pursue strategic bombing policies which will increase the pressure on the enemy to a degree sufficient to bring him to the conference table.

Respectfully yours,
HOWARD W. CANNON.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, what has happened since those 37 days? How confused our forces in Vietnam must be to hear at this late date that the very reason for their sacrifices and risks is being strongly questioned at the highest responsible levels in Washington. How late an hour for some of us to rediscover the basic truths of the cold war and the basic nature of our adversary.

The truth is that we are indeed facing a determined and capable adversary whose defeat will require far greater effort and far greater sacrifices here at home and in the field than have been ventured to this date.

This is the nature of the challenge to our will in Asia. We were tested in Berlin and in the Cuban missile crisis. Now our determination is again being tested. The stakes are different, but the game is the same. I believe that our response must continue to be firm if we are to continue our role in world leadership.

I believe that, in the implementation of these policies, the course the President is following is correct and inescapable. Furthermore, in my judgment, the majority of the American people are behind the President. Americans are unwilling to write off the freedom of Asians to determine their own destiny.

Our task for the present, then, should continue to be one advising the South Vietnamese in their drive to suppress aggression and to build their nation and their life as they choose. Concurrently, we should continue our initiatives to bring about the peace which is so essential to progress in all of southeast Asia and the rest of the world.

What we ask of the enemy in Vietnam is clear and simple. Secretary Rusk has put it aptly:

> We are not asking them to surrender a thing except their appetite to take over South Vietnam by force.

Our objectives in Vietnam are limited. But our hopes for success are unlimited, for they reflect our hopes for our own people and for people everywhere.

So, I urge my colleagues to suspend the argument of how we came to be in Vietnam and instead vote on the bill at hand to provide our valiant fighting men who are giving their blood and their lives, the material and equipment necessary to do the job.

I urge the Senate to take immediate action and pass the pending legislation, thereby supporting our American fighting men and affirming our support for the policy being followed by the President.

Mr. President, I submit we have reached the point where this debate—at this point in time—no longer serves a useful purpose. Let us be done with talking and get on with the more urgent, immediate need of supporting our military men in convincing our adversary that their aggression must be abandoned and the dispute settled by negotiation.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY GIVES POVERTY PROGRAM GRANT TO MARY HOLMES JUNIOR COLLEGE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, Mississippi has been shocked over an announcement from the Office of Economic

Opportunity that the Mary Holmes Junior College has been given a poverty program grant of over $5 million for a so-called child development group.

Mr. President, this is particularly shocking to Mississippi because this is the same organization, the same personnel that so thoroughly discredited the poverty programs over the Nation in 1965. Out of a grant of $1,400,000 approximately one-third was called into serious questioning by the U.S. Government auditors and has not yet been accounted for.

Mr. President, I understand that this Mary Holmes Junior College is a shadow organization that is being used as a front to evade the necessity of consulting the Governor of my State upon those programs. It is also widely thought that this is a device to funnel funds into the *extreme leftist civil rights and beatnik* groups in our State, some of which have definite connections with Communist organizations. Mr. President, education of children is the furthest thing from their minds.

The Senate Appropriations Committee investigated this and made recommendations that these irregularities be thoroughly explored. It is my understanding that the irregularities have not yet been resolved. Moreover, this apparently is a rival organization to other grants that have been made in Mississippi to reputable leadership.

It is my opinion that if this grant is not recalled it will discredit the entire program not only in Mississippi but over the Nation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, if there is no further business, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 24, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 23, 1966:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Ralph S. Garrison
Stewart W. Hopkins
States M. Mead
Chester H. Taylor, Jr.
Edelen A. Parker
John H. Hoefer
Jim K. Carpenter
William S. Mailliard
Alvin A. Peterson
Dallas F. Jordan

MEDICAL CORPS

Robert A. Conard, Jr.
Richard H. Kiene
Robert E. Switzer

DENTAL CORPS

Francis J. Fabrizio

SUPPLY CORPS

Charles W. Shattuck
Leslie T. Maiman
James E. Gay
Paul N. Howell

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Ray C. Tindall

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Social Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which would provide for social security increases based on factors combining increases in the cost of living and the gross national product.

I have long urged humanization of our social security system. The benefits we pay are just not enough. Sometimes the Congress just cannot keep up with changing needs.

My proposal is that we link social security benefits to both increases in the cost of living and increases in the gross national product. The link to increases in the cost of living is obviously important to insure that our senior citizens are not hurt by inflation and declining purchasing power. I don't believe it is enough just to guarantee senior citizens the status quo in purchasing power.

I want to go beyond a cost-of-living rise. I want to have social security annuitants share in the American boom. I want them to share in the soaring American economy of the space age. The work they did in the thirties, the forties, and the fifties is an inseparable part of the soaring sixties. We should not forget our senior citizens. They laid the foundations for our present economic level.

The best way to have senior citizens share in the prosperity they helped create above and beyond maintaining their purchasing power is to link social security pensions to the rise in the gross national product. The factor I would use is a 1-percent social security rise for every 2-percent increase in the gross national product. This is because not all of the GNP translates into purchasing power increases for our people.

I think that humanization of our social security structure along the lines of my legislation is an important aspect of creating a brave new tomorrow.

Hon. Fred Ernst Busbey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked to learn of the sudden death of my very dear friend Fred Ernst Busbey, who represented the Third District of Illinois in the U.S. House of Representatives in the 78th, 80th, 82d, and 83d Congresses.

Fred Busbey was born in Tuscola, Douglas County, Ill., in 1895. He attended Armour Institute of Technology in Chicago, and Northwestern University in Evanston, Ill. He spent the majority of his life in Chicago where he was engaged in the investment brokerage business until his retirement in 1958 when he moved to Cocoa Beach in Florida.

Mr. Busbey was active in the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars programs, especially in Americanism and the fight against communism. As a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, Congressman Busbey was labeled as a militant foe of communism.

Fred Busbey's dominant thought was the welfare of the Nation. He was always an eager and able participant in the legislative proceedings in the House of Representatives and was held in the highest esteem by his colleagues.

Mrs. Murphy, as well as the many friends in the Third Congressional District, joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Busbey and family in their great hour of grief.

Praise for LULAC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to the praise already given to an organization which celebrated its 37th anniversary this past week, the League of United Latin American Citizens, commonly known as LULAC. I know, from personal experience, of the fine work they are doing in promoting the welfare of U.S. citizens of Latin American ancestry. In my district, there are several active LULAC chapters which are especially distinguished for their efforts to increase voter registration and participation among their members and in the community at large.

The members of LULAC in my district are also noteworthy for the strong social conscience which they manifest. They have often given voice to their concern about the general welfare at the local and State level, promoting not just the cause of their own members, but of all their fellow citizens. Their participation in Project Headstart in many communities is one example of their concern for all the members of our society.

I would not want to forget, Mr. Speaker, the fiestas which the LULAC's sponsor, which highlight the life of many communities and which not only entertain, but educate us all to the heritage which they possess. Such occasions serve a highly valuable function in promoting goodwill and respect among the peoples of differing ancestry who live together in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I join with other Members of Congress in stating that the League of United Latin American Citizens is to be commended for the activities of the past 37 years and wished all possible success for their future efforts.

Watershed Projects Benefit Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I consider the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566, to be one of the most popular and helpful pieces of legislation enacted by Congress in recent years.

In my home State of Kentucky, 143 communities have requested assistance under the small watershed program authorized by the act. Thirty-five of these have been authorized for help in formulating a watershed project plan to improve resource use and prevent flooding of watershed lands.

Twenty-three projects have been approved for U.S. Department of Agriculture help in installing the measures called for in their work plans, and the measures are now being accomplished. Two projects, Twin Creek in Harrison County and Meadow Creek in Wayne County, have been completed. The 23 active projects involve a combined total of 1,862,700 acres. Only three other States in the Nation have a larger acreage of watershed projects in operation. I believe this record speaks well for my State, and it strengthens my longstanding support of the program.

I consider the record of accomplishments in the 23 projects to be unusually good. Of the 187 floodwater retarding structures planned, 70 have been completed. In addition, 14 multiple-purpose structures have been planned, and 8 of these have been completed. Conservation land treatment work is progressing well, too. In the Cypress Creek project in Union County, for example, more than 90 percent of the farms are operated under conservation plans developed with the aid of the Union County Soil Conservation District, and cooperating landowners have applied nearly all of the measures needed for land stabilization and watershed protection.

Total estimated cost of all the watershed projects in operation in Kentucky—both Public Law 566 and pilot—is $56,301,000. More than 53 percent of the total is non-Federal costs. This impressive record of local financial participation is conclusive evidence of the interest and willingness of local sponsors to use their resources to the fullest in developing and carrying out project programs.

Reduced flood damages and other direct benefits are plainly evident in the projects where some or all of the measures have been applied. In addition, there are some important benefits from these projects that extend far beyond the watershed boundaries. For example, watershed activity in Kentucky has created more than 2,300 surface acres of water. These bodies of water have provided more than 19,700 visitor-days of recreation since 1962. An estimated 349 man-years of employment have resulted from watershed construction since 1960. Fifteen new industries or businesses employing 774 people have sprung up because of the watershed work. Another 28 industries and businesses have expanded to give employment to more than 800 additional people.

These watershed project results are substantial contributions to the economy and general well-being of Kentucky residents. I salute the local initiative and effort, and capable assistance from government at all levels, that made these results possible.

The Excise Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress considered the question of removing certain excise taxes, I offered my wholehearted support, having introduced a bill to eliminate Federal excise taxes on communication services that would have infused an estimated $4 billion into our economy in the first year of operation.

I supported this measure in the firm belief that Americans would rather see revenue made available by other means—by the resultant increased revenue from sales taxes or personal income taxes. This is especially true of the excise tax on telephone services and automobiles. The fact that these taxes require the greatest sacrifice from those lower income groups least able to meet this sacrifice made me most enthusiastic about seeing the telephone and automobile taxes removed. In the hope that savings would be passed on to consumers, giving a solid boost to the economy, I voted for the massive cuts in excise taxes.

Now this same Congress is being asked to restore the tax on automobiles and telephone services without taking any action on those taxes on furs, jewelry, cabarets and night clubs, television sets, sporting goods, and other more properly termed "luxury items."

If additional revenue is required, why do we not turn to the untouched tax cuts on these less essential items?

I cannot in good conscience vote against a measure I cosponsored a year ago when the same good reasons for eliminating communications taxes still exist.

At a time when our Nation is being asked to exert every effort to finance our commitment in South Vietnam—at a time when the school milk program for our Nation's youth is being reduced in the name of economy, it is inconceivable that the excise tax on mink coats will not be restored.

Because the Congress is being asked to undo what was the greatest service in the recent excise tax cut, without similar action on the least necessary of cuts, I must vote against this restoration.

If sacrifice is what is required, let us ask it of those who are best equipped to make that sacrifice.

Unless amended, therefore, to reflect what I believe to be just, I am opposed to this bill.

Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on February 24, 1966, Estonians all over the world are recalling the re-creation of their free independent nation. Forty-eight years ago on this date the people of Estonia constituted the Republic of Estonia, and thus reestablished their national independence which they had lost in the course of imperialist Russian expansion toward the West.

But the Estonian people were able to enjoy their freedom for merely two decades. The new masters of Russia—the Communists—with their Red army overran and occupied the country during World War II. This flagrant assault against her peaceful neighbor initiated Soviet Union's westward march for world domination. Thus, in it, the beginning of today's international tensions and threat to peace may be found.

Since this event, the Estonian people have been suffering under the oppressive yoke of their Communist taskmasters. Their lot under the Soviet neocolonialist rule has been of the vanquished; but they still have held fast to their confidence that Estonia will regain her freedom and independence. Their hope for that rests in the main on the United States as the acknowledged leader of the free Western World.

We recall Estonian Independence Day each year to reaffirm our friendship and support of the people in Estonia for whom freedom is still a memory and a dream. The Estonians who have come to the United States are a vital, contributing group of citizens. They know, as few can who have lived in freedom all their lives, the speed and ease with which liberty can be stolen and the suffering endured until it is regained.

Most of all, on this day we look to the future and resolve that we will never recognize the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States and we will never forget the true Estonia which must one day again be free.

The Spirit of Estonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the observance of the 48th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Baltic nation of Estonia will be celebrated in the 12th Illinois Congressional District on Saturday, February 26, 1966. One hundred or more Estonians will gather in Woodstock, Ill., to sing together, pray together, and to listen to speakers extol the great qualities of a people to whom tyranny and sacrifice are words written in lifeblood.

It is my privilege to be listed among the speakers and to take to this patriotic gathering greetings from the legislative branch of the American Government. There is much I could say in the brief time allotted me about the history of their country in the four thousand and more years that it has existed. I might recall their stubborn resistance to the invaders who came from the north and from the east. I could recap their existence as a part of Livonia, religious subjects of far-off Rome, and remark that their cities were members of the Hanseatic League when Estonia was part of the German domain. I could mention Tartu and Tallinn with the grand structures which date back to the 14th century or earlier and the impressive church edifices from which Communist overseers have forced the worshipers.

But most of all will I think and speak of the spirit of the Estonians, that proud, free spirit which survives despite the terrors of conquest and subjugation, murder and rapine, and repeated reprisals. I will speak of the great natural resources of Estonia, particularly the waters which surround it and the lakes which dot its surface. More than 1,500 lakes are there, as well as the Baltic Sea and 2 of its arms, the Gulfs of Finland and of Riga. According to science "water is the major constituent of all living matter." And so the people of Estonia survive and their spirits carry on in the pervasiveness of water—the patient, irresistible force of the tide above the surface and the ground waters which feed the springs, the fountains, and the geysers; waters which become waterfalls and rivers, gulfs, seas, and oceans which surround the continents. Water which is self-fulfilling and lifegiving to others is the symbol of the Estonians. It may serve both as a defender and protector and as a relentless enemy sweeping back those who do not know its swift running currents and its unplumbed depths.

To those Estonians, who will not hear me, I send greetings—wherever you are. I applaud your spirit and the inward strength which bears and buoys you as you work on, toward the ultimate freedom of your country. I applaud your great creative contributions to the countries and nations where you have gone to wait and work for that day of freedom. In my own congressional district are two young Estonians, Enno and Tiiu Nomm, who were admitted to the coveted Phi Beta Kappa chapter at the University of Illinois at the same time—a most unusual feat for a brother and sister of any background. But the spirit of free-flowing water is there and they sweep on.

So may it be with you and your descendants, as you fulfill your destinies and share with your adopted countries the lifegiving energy with which you are endowed.

Yeshiva Rambam Honors the Rabbinical Board of Flatbush

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of its chai—18th—anniversary, Yeshiva Rambam recently honored the Rabbinical Board of Flatbush by conferring its scroll of appreciation and esteem.

The Yeshiva Rambam is not a private institution. It is a school that belongs to the community which it serves faithfully. In every congregation in the community are to be found young boys and girls who acquired their knowledge of Judaism in that school. The Flatbush Jewish community feels the impact and carries the imprint of the scope and quality of its teaching. It is a living force that translates and gives meaning to the ancient wisdom of the Old Testament for the use and guidance of modern Jewry.

The Rabbinical Board of Flatbush consists of the spiritual leaders of congregations located in the Flatbush section of Brooklyn. Through the years the rabbinical board has supported the aims and purposes of Yeshiva Rambam. Every aspect of the school's educational program is formulated and supervised by the rabbinical board in collaboration with Yeshiva Rambam.

I look forward to a bright future and continued growth on the part of Yeshiva Rambam and share with them their high esteem and appreciation of the Rabbinical Board of Flatbush and the distinguished spiritual leaders who constitute its members.

My greeting to Rabbi Harczstark, administrator of Yeshiva Rambam, on the occasion of this anniversary and the scroll of appreciation and esteem that Yeshiva Rambam conferred upon the Rabbinical Board of Flatbush follow:

Rabbi SIDNEY HARCSZTARK,
Yeshiva Rambam,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR RABBI: It is a privilege and a pleasure to greet the supporters of Yeshiva Rambam on the occasion of its chai anniversary.

Your institution was organized under trying circumstances at a time of great need. It has done a tremendously fine job and filled a great need in our community.

It is only through religious instruction such as your institution provides that we can hope to eradicate crime and juvenile delinquency and promote ethics and morals.

It is well that you use this occasion to honor the Rabbinical Board of Flatbush. Too frequently, our rabbis go unhonored and unsung, yet strive day in and day out to improve our well-being. I join you in extending to them a hearty mazel tov and join in your prayer that the Lord may bless you and them so that your good work may redound to the benefit of mankind.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

Yeshiva Rambam is proud to confer this scroll of appreciation and esteem upon the Rabbinical Board of Flatbush.

As a token of our high regard and gratitude and in recognition of their contribution to the strengthening of Jewish education in the Flatbush Jewish community.

As distinguished members of the Rabbinical Board of Flatbush they have endeared themselves to their colleagues and the community for meritorious performance and supreme devotion to the teachings of traditional Torah Judaism.

February 2, 1966.

JOSEPH GREENBERG,
Chairman, Board of Governors.
SEYMOUR REINHARD,
President.
ISAAC MOINESTER,
Treasurer.

"Candid Camera" Creates Comic Controversy in the Borough of Bath, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the most popular television programs, "Candid Camera," recently paid a visit to the beautiful little borough of Bath, Pa., in my congressional district, leaving in the wake of its visit some highly comic confusion and no little controversy.

Last Sunday night, Bath and a small number of its residents appeared in filmed interviews on the nationwide program. The fanciful notion of the program's producers was simply to stage a public rendezvous between Mr. Ed Warnke, the popular and hard-working mailman who serves the borough's business district, and a lovely young lady in a flashy and expensive new convertible. The results were amusing when the program's interviewers then began talking with some of the 1,736 people who inhabit Bath, checking on the rumors which nearly always start in a small community when something like this happens.

I am grateful for the national publicity "Candid Camera" gave to one of the fine communities in my district. And I herewith invite them to return, at any time, to take another look at the friendly, hospitable people who are the backbone of our American society.

Action Needed To Put Interstate Highway Program Back on the Track

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to repeal the Byrd amendment and allow the highway trust fund to borrow from the Treasury to put the interstate highway program back on schedule for completion in 1972. The bill is a simple one.

H.R. 13013

A bill to amend the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 by repealing section 209(g)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 209(g) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (23 U.S.C. 120, note) is hereby repealed.

I am certain that most States are experiencing the same problem that our State of Minnesota is facing. The State department of highways is ready to go, but Federal funds are lagging behind.

As a case history of the serious trouble facing our interstate construction program, I have unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the following correspondence and report from John R. Jamieson, commissioner of highways, of the State of Minnesota.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS,
St. Paul, Minn., February 21, 1966.

Hon. DONALD M. FRASER,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DON: Thank you for your letter of February 9, in which you note that you will introduce a bill to repeal the Byrd amendment. This in our opinion is the most important step that can be taken to put the construction of the Interstate and Defense Highway System on a realistic financial basis.

A brief description of the status of the Interstate System in Minnesota is enclosed with this letter and will perhaps serve to emphasize the quandary in which we currently find ourselves.

The enclosure does not include the 5-month prolongation of the interstate construction program that now appears inevitable, but this will have little effect on the problem that looms in Minnesota's immediate future. As is indicated in column 3 of the table on page 3 of the enclosure, sizable Federal aid will be required during 1967 and 1968 to finance the vastly increased construction activity programed for those years. Even with a limited extension current funding procedures will make it impossible to implement this program.

During the next few years the Minnesota Highway Department is capable of completing a great amount of highway construction if sufficient funds are made available. The first essential step which must be taken in making provision for adequate funding is repeal of the Byrd amendment.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. JAMIESON,
Commissioner.

Enclosure.

INTERSTATE HIGHWAY PROGRAM IN MINNESOTA, JANUARY 1, 1966

There has been considerable information presented from time to time on the status of the interstate construction program, some showing the number of miles completed and open to traffic, miles under construction, and miles in the preliminary design stages. Most of these news releases make for interesting reading, but do not give the reader a clear picture of the status of the interstate program, as to the financing of the program or the possibility of the entire system being completed and open to traffic in accordance with the provisions of the 1956 Federal-Aid Highway Act which created the Interstate Highway System, as we know it today.

In order to give a little better insight into what is taking place toward completion of the Interstate Highway System in Minnesota, a few statistics will be presented showing the status of Minnesota's interstate highways as of January 1, 1966:

	Miles
Total miles of designated interstate highways in Minnesota	901
Open to traffic (includes 52.8 miles not completed to full standards)	277
Under construction	184
Preliminary engineering and/or right-of-way acquisition in progress	440

This means, to complete on schedule, Minnesota must complete and open to traffic an average of over 100 miles of interstate per year during the next 6 years.

It should also be noted from these statistics that Minnesota has some work in progress on every mile of the designated system in the State.

The published construction program has been tailored to complete the entire Interstate System in the State by the target date 1972, after giving due consideration to the necessary staging in the more complex construction projects. The Minnesota Highway Department has the capability of placing this work under contract and supervising the construction and it is confident the construction industry has the capability to do its part. The one element that is lacking in order to complete this huge and challenging assignment is an adequate supply of Federal-aid interstate funds as needed to maintain the construction schedule which has been set up to meet the 1972 completion date.

As we see it, there are two things that must be done to make adequate Federal-aid interstate funds available when needed.

1. Eliminate quarterly obligation controls to permit States to maintain an orderly construction contract letting schedule.

2. Increased revenue for the Federal highway trust fund so as to provide adequate funds to complete the Interstate Highway System on schedule and increase annual interstate apportionments to the States in such amounts as to permit the States to maintain realistic construction schedules.

The present and future condition of Federal-aid interstate funds for Minnesota, as we see it, is as follows:

	Million
Total Federal-aid interstate funds obligated as of Jan. 1, 1966	$514
Balance, Federal-aid interstate funds required to complete system	442
Unobligated balance of 1967 fiscal year apportionment (Jan. 1, 1966)	[1] 57
Estimated apportionment, 1968 fiscal year	68
Estimated apportionment, 1969 fiscal year	68
Estimated apportionment, 1970 fiscal year	70
Estimated apportionment, 1971 fiscal year	67
Total anticipated interstate Federal aid which will be available to Minnesota under present funding setup	330
Additional Federal-aid interstate needed to complete Interstate System in Minnesota	112

[1] Total 1967 fiscal year apportionment, $68 million: first quarter allotment made available Oct. 8, 1965; second quarter allotment made available Jan. 3, 1968; third quarter allotment expected on or about Apr. 4, 1968; fourth quarter allotment expected on or about June 30, 1966. Only three-fourths of annual apportionment will be available for obligation during this fiscal year (1966).

Federal interstate funds needed to implement 5-year program

[In millions of dollars]

	Preliminary engineering, right-of-way, railway, and utilities (1)	Construction contracts (2)	Total needed (3)	Apportionment (4)	Accumulative deficit (5)
1966	16	45	65	[1] 57	−4
1967	24	86	110	68	−46
1968	16	101	117	68	−95
1969	5	84	89	70	−114
1970	1	64	65	67	−112

[1] Balance, Jan. 1, 1966.

A nominal 2½-percent annual increase in construction costs would increase the $112 million deficit by another $20 million.

Attached copy of "Status of the Highway Trust Fund," a part of a Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads, news release, dated February 9, 1966, shows the balance in the trust fund on December 31, 1965, to be less than $9 million, and expenditures exceeded revenue by $266 million during the first half of fiscal year 1966 (July 1–Dec. 31, 1965).

Recommendations: (1) Immediate repeal of Byrd amendment, (2) adequate additional revenue be diverted to the highway trust fund to cover present cost estimates plus a reasonable increase in the construction cost index.

Table IV.—*Status of the highway trust fund*

[In thousands of dollars]

	3 months ended Dec. 31, 1965	1st 6 months, fiscal year 1966
Balance at beginning of period	235,613	284,858
Income:		
Tax revenue:		
Motor-fuel taxes (net after refunds)	660,624	1,441,651
Less motorboat fuel revenue [1]	11,000	23,400
Net for highways	649,624	1,418,251
Trucks, buses, and trailers	106,102	241,983
Tires, tubes, and tread rubber	128,395	254,054
Vehicle use	10,564	65,103
Total excise revenues	894,685	1,979,391
Interest earned	1,716	4,605
Advances from general fund	70,000	70,000
Total income	966,401	2,053,996
Disbursements for highways	1,193,131	2,329,971
Balance at end of period	8,883	8,883

[1] Transferred to the land and water conservation fund pursuant to title II, sec. 202, Public Law 88-578, effective Jan. 1, 1965.

The Federal share of the Federal-aid highway program is wholly financed by highway users on a pay-as-you-build basis. The Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (as since amended) levied or increased certain Federal excise taxes on motor fuel and automotive products, and earmarked their revenue specifically to a highway trust fund, which is the source of money for Federal highway aid to the States both for the interstate and the ABC programs. The taxes earmarked to the trust fund and their rates (until Oct. 1, 1972) are:

Motor fuel: 4 cents per gallon.

New trucks, buses, and trailers: 10 percent on the manufacturer's wholesale price.

Highway vehicle tires and tubes: 10 cents per pound.

Other tires, and tread rubber: 5 cents per pound.

Heavy vehicle use: $3 per 1,000 pounds annually on the total gross weight of vehicles rated at more than 26,000 pounds gross weight.

Under the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965 certain trucks and trailers were exempted from the truck excise after June 21, 1965; and beginning Jan. 1, 1966 the following taxes will also accrue to the highway trust fund:

Lubricating oil: 6 cents per gallon, if used for highway purposes.

Parts and accessories: 8 percent on the manufacturer's wholesale price of truck and bus parts and accessories.

National Brotherhood Week, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all Members of this body are aware this is National Brotherhood Week. The national chairman of this year's observance is a close personal friend of mine and a highly respected business and civic leader from Omaha, Nebr., Mr. V. J. Skutt, president and chairman of the board of Mutual of Omaha. I think Mr. Skutt clearly defined the purpose of brotherhood when he stated:

> Let us all, as Americans, join with one another and work together in a renewed sense of confidence and faith in our religious beliefs and our national heritage.

Brotherhood Week is sponsored by an organization dedicated to the highest ideals of our democratic society, the National Conference of Christians and Jews. This great civic group was founded in 1928, and seeks through education and discussion to promote mutual cooperation and understanding among the men and women of good will who belong to our beloved country's many religious and ethnic groups.

Its solemn purpose is to narrow the gap that separates the reality of our American society from our stated ideal of "one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." The National Conference of Christians and Jews is wholly supported by voluntary contributions from individual citizens, business firms, community organizations, and religious groups.

One of the main objectives announced by the Conference for Brotherhood Week is a rededication to the basic ideal of respect for our fellow man.

The President, in his Brotherhood Week Proclamation, has joined with all his fellow citizens in recognizing the importance of this observance. He has said:

> Brotherhood Week, 1966, brings with it for all Americans a poignant realization of our awesome moral responsibility to uproot * * * injustice.

The conference began its Brotherhood Week observance back in 1934. It said then that:

> Brotherhood Week is not to deal with doctrinal differences. It will not promote common worship. It will deal with our relationships as citizens.

The first World Brotherhood Week was held in 1951. Now, the occasion is observed in thousands of communities, including many which adopted the idea even before the conference suggested that they do so. It is endorsed by the Governors of the 50 States, and the mayors of most of our cities.

Brotherhood has been described in these moving words by the poet, Joseph Auslander:

> Brotherhood is a dream we keep apart from
> cynic's sneer and fool's derision;
> Beyond the grasp of graph or chart.
> It is a hunger in the heart:
> And in the soul a vision."

Chester W. Nimitz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz was a man who served his country well. He took command of our Pacific Fleet at a time when its fortunes were at their lowest ebb, only days after the attack on Pearl Harbor. He built that fleet into the mightiest the world had ever known and he led it to victory over the Japanese. When the surrender came that ended the war in the Pacific, it was Admiral Nimitz who signed for the United States.

After the war, and even in recent years, Admiral Nimitz continued to serve his country. Sunday he died. It is only right that we pause to pay tribute to this gallant man and to offer our sympathy to his family.

Lincoln Day Oration of the Honorable F. Bradford Morse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] delivered the annual Lincoln Day oration before the Middlesex Club of Boston. In his eloquent address, Congressman MORSE invoked the principles which inspired President Lincoln and the Republican Party to national leadership a century ago, and challenged all Republicans to carry forth the battle for freedom in our own era.

In calling for a "new birth of freedom" in these tangled and troubled times, Mr. MORSE declared:

> We must recall that the keystone of freedom is responsibility—and that the highest responsibility of a free political party is to govern—for the people.

Toward this goal, he called upon all Republicans to pursue Lincoln's vision of a party of the people, a great party of diverse men and women "joined together not because they share a common dogma, but because they share common goals."

Mr. MORSE's concise and compelling address merits the attention of all Americans, and I would include it in the RECORD at this point:

LINCOLN DAY ORATION OF CONGRESSMAN F. BRADFORD MORSE BEFORE THE MIDDLESEX CLUB, BOSTON, FEBRUARY 12, 1966

"Of strange, discordant, even hostile elements we gathered from the four winds and fought the battle through—under the constant hot fire of a disciplined, proud and pampered enemy."

So said Lincoln in speaking of a Republican Party which was not then 3 years old.

His words described the explosive emergence of a new force, made of shredded remnants of political failure, born to meet the troubled conscience of a troubled people, destined to preserve the integrity of a nation determined to destroy itself.

"Did we brave all then to falter now? Now when that same enemy is wavering, dissevered and belligerent."

These words, too, are golden with age, for though they challenge us today, Lincoln used them to chide Republicans a century ago.

For Lincoln knew, as we must learn, that unity begets strength, that discord breeds disaster.

Lincoln knew, as we must learn, that his party—our party—would deny its essential character and insure its own destruction were it to impose upon itself a discipline of ideological conformity.

Lincoln knew, as we must learn, that in the rich soil of intellectual competition and honest dissent do free men grow and free institutions flourish.

Yet, Lincoln knew, as we know, that a house divided cannot stand.

Lincoln knew, as we know, that a party partitioned cannot prevail.

Lincoln knew, as we have learned, that the Republican Party must never become narrow and exclusive—that it must include mechanics and merchants, laborers and lawyers, teachers and tailors, farmers and financiers, men and women from great cities and small, whether their roots be in Europe, Asia, Africa or Latin America, joined together not because they share a common dogma, but because they share common goals. "* * * of strange, discordant and even hostile elements we (gather) from the four winds."

Can we pledge less than to form and fight the battle through for the goals we share—for the people, for the commonwealth, for the Nation?

The road will not be easy. But we believe, as Lincoln told us, that the Republican Party "is the best hope of the Nation and the world." He warned our party that "their work is before them and from which they may not guiltlessly turn away."

Tonight we gather to pay tribute to our noblest son. Yet, as we honor his memory, we must respect his wisdom. As we salute his achievements, we must recall his ideals. As we invoke his spirit, we must heed his counsel. We must make Lincoln's dream our reality. For today, as a century ago, only a new birth of freedom can insure that a government for the people shall prosper.

We must free ourselves from ancient prejudices which have shackled our past.

We must free ourselves from archaic cliches which constrict the present.

We must free ourselves from discredited notions which can but stifle our future.

We must recall that the keystone of freedom is responsibility—and that the highest responsibility of a free political party is to govern—for the people.

We must, as Lincoln did, divine the aspirations of the people we seek to serve, and develop programs within basic Republic precepts to meet these aspirations.

Lincoln believed in the equality of all men before the law. And we can believe no less.

Lincoln believed in providing for all Americans an opportunity to achieve their highest potential. And we can believe no less.

Lincoln believed that government must seek to meet those needs of the people which they cannot themselves meet. And we, in this vastly more complex 20th century, can believe no less.

For if we honor Lincoln, yet fail to respect him, if we salute, but fail to recall, if we invoke but fail to heed, we desecrate his majestic memory. We dare not, we must not, we cannot.

We must fulfill our pledge to the greatest Republican statesman to provide government for the people.

As we go forward with our task, we echo the words of the poet Vachel Lindsay:

"He cannot sleep upon his hillside now.
He is among us—as in times before!"

And we may not guiltlessly turn away.

Hon. Fred E. Busbey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are all saddened to hear of the passing of our former colleague from Illinois, Fred E. Busbey. Mr. Busbey served with great distinction in the House for four terms and was recognized on both sides of the aisle as an extremely conscientious, knowledgeable legislator. He was also cherished for his warm personality and the genuine respect which he had for his colleagues here in the House.

During his service, Mr. Busbey represented portions of the district which I am now honored to serve. He was always respected and remembered in governmental circles and in the various communities he represented in south suburban Cook County, and his untimely passing was noted with great regret by his constituents who still considered him to be an outstanding gentleman and warm friend.

On a 4-Year Term for Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the President's recommendation to change the term of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives from 2 to 4 years has caused considerable discussion throughout the Nation.

Public hearings are being held by the Committee on the Judiciary on the proposed amendment to the Constitution. This is a vital matter which should be fully debated, not only in the Halls of Congress but by the people across the country.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my weekly news report to constituents of the Kansas 4th Congressional District and two pertinent editorials—one published by the Newton Kansan, and another by the Wichita Beacon.

I commend these editorials to my colleagues.

CONGRESSMAN SHRIVER'S WEEKLY NEWS REPORT, FEBRUARY 10, 1966

The President has recommended an amendment to the Constitution which would change the term of a Congressman from 2 to 4 years.

This is not a new proposal. From 1789 to 1960 there were 120 proposals introduced in Congress to change the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives. Two-thirds of those resolutions called for a 4-year term for House Members.

Legislation was again introduced early in 1965 to extend the congressional term. None of these proposals have seen the light of day.

However, the President's recommendation has prompted new interest, and there is the promise of committee hearings. The proposal has stimulated a healthy discussion, both pro and con, throughout the Nation.

During my 18 years of legislative service, I have learned something about both 2- and 4-year terms. I held 2-year terms in the Kansas House and am serving my third 2-year term in the U.S. House of Representatives. Prior to coming to Congress, I served two 4-year terms in the Kansas Senate.

The 4-year term does offer certain advantages. It permits more time to work on legislation. It gives continuity to the legislative process. It reduces the time necessary to campaign for reelection.

However, the major concern here should not be for the Representative. The central questions should be: Would such a change really provide more effective representation for the people? Would it mean better government? Would it strengthen the legislative process?

One of the principal objections to the President's proposal is that the congressional term would run concurrently with the presidential term. A Congress elected on the presidential coattails would tend to be a rubber-stamp Congress, regardless of who might be President.

This could downgrade further our doctrine of separation of powers and our system of checks and balances.

The growing influence of the Executive to legislate as well as administer our laws is clearly evident by this very proposal. Legislation introduced a year ago by a Democrat won little attention from the committee or House leadership. But a bill recommended by the President—drafted by the executive branch and introduced in the House—promises to move. There are too many such examples.

The primary consideration regarding the term of a Congressman today remains the same as when our country was founded. The legislative branch of Government must remain close to the people and the Representative must be responsible to the people who elect him.

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon]

FOUR-YEAR TERMS?

In 1787, in a series of articles now known as the Federalist Papers, James Madison wrote two articles advocating at least 3-year terms for Members of Congress. His arguments were much the same as those advanced by President Johnson in his state of the Union message when he advocated 4-year terms.

Said Madison:

"Some portion of the knowledge (of government) may, no doubt, be acquired in a man's closet, but some of it also can only be derived from the public sources of information and all of it will be acquired to best effect by a practical attention to the subject during periods of actual service in the legislature."

Said President Johnson:

"The mark of government is far more complex than in our early years, requiring more time to learn and more time to master the technical tasks of legislation."

In the same year that Madison's plea for long terms for Congressmen was printed the Constitutional Congress established congressional terms at 2 years. This represented a compromise between advocates of 1-year and 3-year terms.

The framers of the Constitution were vitally concerned that government should represent the will of the people. Thus, the elaborate system of checks and balances between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

Many political scientists and legislators have argued long and hard that the Constitutional Congress put too many checks on the efficient operation of government. Off-year elections have been deemed the nemesis of Presidential promises which have met Waterloos after midterm elections.

To recount two: Franklin Roosevelt's prestige suffered a setback in the midterm elections of 1938 and the Republican victories in the 1946 elections were a reaction to the failure of Harry Truman to relax enough wartime restrictions in the early post-World War II months.

Advocates of the President's proposal note that it contains the advantages of a unified national government provided by parliamentary systems which elect both a legislature and a prime minister at the same time.

But the proposal does not provide for the principal check upon parliament—its ability to bring down a government and bring about elections at any time with a vote of no confidence.

At the heart of the arguments is the principle of democracy. Proponents of 4-year terms argue that if democratic government is to succeed in today's complicated world Congressmen must have more time to devote to their legislative tasks and that Congress should work with the President rather than at cross-purposes with him.

Under the President's proposal, all House Members would be elected during presidential election years. This would tend to give a President a working majority in the House because presidential contests are the only national elections and usually the outcome of many congressional campaigns follows the vote for President.

Citizens should not be deceived about the fact that 4-year terms would change the entire complexion of American politics. The advantages and dangers should be weighed with full realization of their inevitable effect on American civilization.

[From the Newton Kansan]

TWO-YEAR TERM BETTER

President Johnson has proposed that the terms of Members of the House of Representatives be extended from 2 to 4 years. One of the arguments for the change is that Representatives have to spend so much time worrying about being reelected that they can't give their full attention to legislative matters.

This argument, of course, has its merits. Seeking reelection every 2 years does impose hardships, both financial and physical, on Members of the House.

But there are arguments on the other side that overbalance this one.

Were Representatives to be elected every 4 years during the presidential election many inepts whose sole qualification to office would be that they belong to the same party as the successful presidential candidate would be elected. This is true now, but it is also true that they can be tossed out by the voters 2 years later when they can't tie themselves to the coattails of a popular President.

The 2-year term keeps the people in charge of one House of the Congress. Each election they can exercise their right to either approve or disapprove what Congress has done during the past 2 years. And at the President's midterm they can do this without being influenced by the popularity of a candidate for President.

It is easy to see why the executive branch would like to see the terms of Members of the House coincide with the term of the President.

But the framers of the Constitution built in a number of checks and balances and the 2-year term for Members of the House is one of these devices.

Commemorate Armenian Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commemorate the 45th anniversary of the revolt of the Armenian people against the Soviet Union. In 1921, there was an uprising in Armenia against the Soviets who had a few months earlier taken the country into protective custody, so to speak. Unfortunately, the strength of the uprising was not sufficient to overcome Soviet power and it failed. Since then, Armenia has been subject to the rule of the U.S.S.R.

It is always unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, when the aspirations of any people for self-government are denied expression. Surely in a democracy, we must always salute the efforts of those who seek freedom and mourn any failures which occur. In that spirit, I join my fellow Congressmen in commemorating the 45th anniversary of the Armenian uprising and in looking forward to the day when self-determination will be a reality for all peoples.

Aaron J. Racusin, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Procurement Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee for Government Procurement, House Committee on Small Business, I have watched very closely the small business programs of the executive agencies. Since the Defense portion of the national budget continues to overshadow all others, I have given particular attention to the services which are charged with the procurement of our defense needs.

For many years I have been impressed by the energetic efforts of one individual who continues to give impetus to the Air Force small business program. Mr. Aaron J. Racusin, in a large measure, deserves the credit for the success of a dynamic program of the Department of the Air Force. Such success can be attributed to the fact that he is an intelligent and extremely well-informed individual of unusual ability. Of greater importance, however, has been his tenacity of purpose as reflected in the manner in which he has dedicated himself to insuring that the small business community throughout the Nation gets a fair share of the Air Force procurement dollar.

Mr. Racusin, originally a native of New York City, obtained his bachelor's degree at College of the City of New York and a law degree at St. Lawrence University—Brooklyn Law School. He practiced law in New York City before serving in the Army Air Force. After discharge he served as an attorney in the procurement division, Air Materiel Command, at Wright-Patterson, Ohio. Thereafter, he served with the director of procurement at Air Force headquarters and later as Deputy for Procurement Management in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

I join with Mr. Racusin's many friends in extending best wishes to him on his new appointment as Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Procurement Management.

Keep Small Communities Alive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I always welcome an opportunity to call attention to new industry in Wyoming, particularly when its operation gives indication of the vast potential of the State's attractive natural and business climate.

Just this week, I had occasion to distribute to visitors in my office samples of Wyoming cheese, handiwork of a flourishing dairy industry in Torrington.

Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of this new dairy plant in Wyoming is the guiding philosophy of Einer Pedersen, general manager and treasurer of Wyoming Dairy Foods, Inc.

Pedersen has given much thought to the development and growth of small communities and has said:

> It is important to keep the small community alive, and the way to do it is to develop homegrown industry that these communities can handle.

Naturally, there are limitations to the industry a small community can handle, but certainly the possibilities in agriculture-related industries have not been fully developed. The admirable growth record of Wyoming Dairy Foods Inc. is ample proof that a local community, working largely with local capital, can establish a solid, homegrown industry.

Wyoming Dairy Foods, Inc., is a comparative newcomer to the State scene, having begun operation in May of 1964 with a total complement of three employees. Within 16 months, it had advanced to a staff of 23 with an annual payroll of $70,000—a boost to the economy of Torrington and the entire State.

The extraordinary product has won a reputation from coast to coast for its distinctive taste.

The secret processes for Runesten, Wyoming Gold and Snowy Range cheese are stored in the corporation vault and in the mind of their originator, Mr. Pedersen, whose experience in cheesemaking dates from his native Denmark where he studied dairy bacteriology first at the University of Denmark, then as an exchange student at the University of Minnesota.

In 1933, Pedersen won his bachelor of science degree and soon entered the cheese business in Minnesota and then South Dakota. He first visited Wyoming in 1939 and went into the dairy business, moving to Cody where he developed his Runesten, a cheese he describes as "the Danish version of swiss cheese."

Pedersen moved to Torrington in 1964 where he and other Wyoming residents formed Wyoming Dairy Foods, Inc. Here he developed his Wyoming Gold and Snowy Range varieties. He says Wyoming Gold is excellent for cooking and Snowy Range "a fine sandwich filler and good with pumpernickel."

Perhaps the most unique product is the cheese stick—about 4 inches long and 1 inch square, covered with a protective wax coating and available in all three varieties. This is such a popular item that the Torrington plant is unable to keep up with orders.

An estimated 50,000 pounds of milk is processed a day at Wyoming Dairy Foods and on a peak day as much as 3 tons of cheese have been made.

Mr. Speaker, Wyoming is proud of Mr. Pedersen, the good people of Wyoming who have invested in this homegrown industry, and his fine product. Wyoming Dairy Foods has done more than demonstrate Wyoming's dairy potential—it serves as a living example of the strength and promise of our smaller communities. The example merits the attention of other small communities who are determined not only to stay alive—but grow.

Remarks by the President Before the Convention of the American Association of School Administrators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson in another moving speech, has given imaginative aim to his programs for a Great Society.

In a speech February 16 at Atlantic City to the American Association of School Administrators, he outlined the historic legislation of the Congress in 1965 and then concentrated on education.

He said he would send to Congress priority requests to enlarge Secondary Education Act programs; double funds for Operation Headstart; obtain funds for the National Teachers Corps; pass a Child Nutrition Act which will help pay for school breakfasts for children.

He also said:

> If education is to achieve its promise in America, it can not be done in Washington alone. Each State and each community must fashion its own design and shape its own institutions.

The President sees a new and enlarged roll for our schools as the center of community life. I share his hope that more adequate and expanded use of our schools can be made.

He said in a significant paragraph:

> It will provide formal education for all citizens—and it will not close its doors at 3 o'clock. It will employ its buildings round the clock and its teachers round the year. We can not afford to have an $85 billion plant in this country open less than 30 percent of the time.

The text of the speech follows:

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., FEBRUARY 16, 1966

I am honored to accept your award and happy to be here with the big brass of American education. I might have been with you tonight under other auspices—except that 30 years ago I left teaching for a different pursuit.

Tonight, our professions differ, but we have the same task: to build a society worthy of freemen. Two hundred years ago, our fathers laid the foundations. Two years ago, I challenged my fellow citizens to get on with the job. I said that we must build the Great Society in our cities, in our countryside—and in our classrooms.

Tonight our work is underway. Much of the needed legislation has been enacted: more than a score of landmark measures in the field of education alone.

It is a thrill to me to read the rollcall of these historic acts: the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the civil rights laws of 1964 and 1965, medicare, the Natural Beauty Act, the Higher Education Act of 1965.

And—not last and not least—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Laws are only designs for achievement. The barriers we must overcome do not yield merely because Congress takes a vote or the President signs a bill.

Two barriers are the most unyielding, each reinforcing the other in blocking our progress.

The first is poverty. We who have worked in schools know what it means for someone who starts life as a victim of poverty. It is a hard to teach a hungry child. Poverty breeds handicaps of mind and body which cripple him before he has a chance to get ahead. And we have learned all too well that poverty passes on its curse generation to generation.

The second barrier is racial discrimination. Because of it, children grow up aliens in their native land. For a ghetto—whether white or black or brown—is less than half a world. No child can be fully educated unless his life is opened up to the wonderful variety this world affords.

Two weeks ago, I called for the International Education Act of 1966 to promote the worldwide commerce of knowledge—to declare that learning is not a commodity which can be confined at the water's edge.

Yet within our own country there are still racial walls against hope and opportunity. Between the slums of the inner cities and their spreading suburbs, there are gulfs as deep and wide as any ocean.

If education is to be worthy of its good name, we must find ways to span these gulfs.

I pledge to you that the Federal Government will not be a silent partner in this enterprise.

I am sending Congress five top priority requests:

To enlarge each one of the programs in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—and to make them run through 1970;

To double funds for our imaginative and precedent-breaking Operation Headstart which will next year help more than 700,000 youngsters from poor homes get ready for the rigors of learning;

To fund the new National Teachers Corps so that our best college graduates can be recruited to work in our worst schools;

To pass the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to help pay for school lunches for those who really need them, without subsidizing those who can afford to buy their own. We also want school breakfasts for children who would otherwise start the day with empty stomachs.

Finally—and this summarizes reams of recommendations in a single sentence—my budget this year proposes a $10 billion Federal investment in education and training. In 1960 the Government was spending only a third this much. The Office of Education alone will spend on programs six times as much as it did 6 years ago.

And I promise you that this is only the beginning.

Almost 200 years ago, James Madison declared that Federal and State governments "are in fact but different agents and trustees of the people, constituted with different powers, and designed for different purposes." They are not "mutual rivals and enemies." They are partners.

Madison's definition has not changed, though the partnership grows closer and more creative.

If education is to achieve its promise in America, it cannot be done in Washington alone. Each State and each community must fashion its own design and shape its own institutions.

But we will need a common vision to build schools to match our common hopes for the future.

Every school will be different, but the differences will not range as they do today between satisfactory and shocking. We will have instead a diversity of excellence.

Tomorrow's school will be a school without walls—a school built of doors which open to the entire community.

Tomorrow's school will reach out to the places that enrich the human spirit: to the museums, the theaters, the art galleries, to the parks and rivers and mountains.

It will ally itself with the city, its busy streets and factories, its assembly lines and laboratories—so that the world of work does not seem an alien place for the student.

It will be the center of community life, for grownups as well as children: "a shopping center of human services." It might have a community health clinic, a public library, a theater and recreation facilities.

It will provide formal education for all citizens—and it will not close its doors at 3 o'clock. It will employ its buildings round the clock and its teachers round the year. We cannot afford to have an $85 billion plant in this country open less than 30 percent of the time.

In every past age, leisure has been a privilege enjoyed by the few at the expense of the many. But in the age waiting to be born, leisure will belong to the many at the expense of none. Our people must learn to use this gift of time—and that means one more challenge for tomorrow's schools.

I am not describing a distant utopia, but the kind of education which must be the great and urgent work of our time. By the end of this decade, unless the work is well along, our opportunity will have slipped away.

Many people, as William James once said, shed tears for justice, generosity, and beauty—but never recognize those virtues when they meet them in the street.

Some people are this way about rebuilding our society. They love the idea. But in the heat and grime, somehow they lose their zeal. They discover that progress is a battle, not a parade—and they fall away from the line of march.

You know that the job of building a better school and a better nation is hard, often thankless, work. Someone must take on the perilous task of leadership. Someone in shirtsleeves must turn ideas into actions, dollars into programs. Someone must fight the lonely battles in each community—make the accommodations, win the supporters, get the results.

Many of you have endured this hard journey from hope to reality—when the applause died, the crowd thinned out, and you were alone with the dull administrative details still to be done.

But this is how a Great Society must be built: brick by brick, and in the toil and noise of each day.

We have so little reason to be discouraged. Others face tasks so much more difficult than ours. Only last week I sat across the table from the very young leader of South Vietnam and heard him say of his country: "We were deluding ourselves with the idea that our weaknesses could not be remedied while we were fighting a war. * * * We will not completely drive out the aggressor until we make a start at eliminating these political and social defects."

The work of his government will not be easy. But these are not timid men. They have learned that government must meet the outreach of its people's hopes.

There at Honolulu, I pledged support to their plans for education in their country. This year alone we will help them build 2,800 classrooms, nearly three times the average for the last 10 years.

We will help them train 13,400 teachers, 8 times the yearly average of the last decade.

We will help them distribute nearly 6 million textbooks.

And we will help them educate almost a fourth as many doctors as the total number they now have.

This little country maintains 700,000 men in its armed forces, over 2½ times as many for its size as we have.

Yet, these leaders voiced no weariness before the task of getting on with reforms in education and health and agriculture. If they keep their commitment, they will be the real revolutionaries of Asia. For the real revolution is to build schools, and through them, to build a nation.

What they are committed to do, with our help, must be done under the most brutal conditions imaginable. Their civilian population lives in constant danger of terror and death at the hands of the Vietcong.

Last year over 12,000 civilians were kidnapped or killed by Communist terrorists. There were more than 36,000 incidents of terror—an increase of 10,000 over 1964. Two days ago, the Vietcong killed 39 civilians and wounded 7 others as they rode on buses.

Terrorism—deliberately planned and coldly carried out—continues to be the chef instrument of Vietcong aggression in South Vietnam. It is not just a byproduct of their military action; it is the way they hope to win the war.

Who—and what—are their targets? Schoolteachers and school administrators, health officials, village leaders, schools, hospitals, research stations, medical clinics—all of those people and places essential to the growth of a healthy, free society.

This is the terrible scarred face of the war too seldom seen and too little understood. Often it is not even reported by our journals most concerned about the war in Vietnam. These incidents usually happen in rural areas remote from the camera's eye. Observers are not invited when the Vietcong murder the mother of an officer in the Army of Vietnam as reprisal against her son—or torture and dismember the master of a local school.

But people who hate war ought not ignore this strategy of terror.

What is its purpose? It is through fear and death to force the people of South Vietnam into submission. It is as simple, and as grim, as that.

And it must not succeed.

If these tactics prevail in Vietnam, they will prevail elsewhere.

If the takeover of Vietnam can be achieved by a highly organized Communist force employing violence against a civilian population, it can be achieved in another country, at another time, with an even greater cost to freedom.

If this "war of liberation" triumphs, who will be "liberated" next?

There is a job of liberation in South Vietnam. It is liberation from terror, liberation from disease, liberation from hunger, and liberation from ignorance.

Unless this job is done, a military victory in South Vietnam would be no victory at all—only a brief delay until the aggressor returns to feed on the continuing misery of the people.

We have the military strength to convince the Communists they cannot achieve the conquest of South Vietnam by force.

But the building of a better society is the main test of our strength—our basic purpose. Until the people of the villages and farms of that unhappy country know that they personally count, that they are cared about, that their future is their own—only then will we know that real victory is possible.

I came away from Honolulu filled with new hope and energy. I came away convinced that we cannot raise a double standard to the world. We cannot hold freedom less dear in Asia than in Europe or to be less willing to sacrifice for men whose skin is a different color.

If this young nation—ridden with danger can show such determination, we, with all our wealth and promise, must be no less determined.

Our time is filled with peril. So it has been every time freedom has been tested.

Our tasks are enormous. But so are our resources.

Our burdens are heavy and will grow heavier. But the Bible counsels that we "be not weary in well-doing." The house of freedom may never be completed, but it will never fall—so long as you and I and those who share our commitment keep this vision of what we seek to build.

Aaron J. Racusin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record remarks which I have prepared concerning the recent elevation of Mr. Aaron J. Racusin to the position of Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Procurement Management.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Smathers: Aaron J. Racusin, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Procurement Management

Recently an appointment was made in the Department of the Air Force elevating Mr. Aaron J. Racusin to the position of Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Procurement Management. This appointment results from recognition of experience, dedication, and unusual ability as demonstrated by a most deserving public servant.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Procurement, Senate Committee on Small Business, I have been aware, for many years, of Mr. Racusin's contribution to the small business community. With Mr. Racusin in this new position, I am certain that the Air Force small business program will continue to grow and the small businessman's interests will be carefully safeguarded.

It is heartening to note that Mr. Racusin, a career civil servant who has worked at all steps of the procurement ladder and whose experience and knowledge have made him particularly accredited, has been elevated to this high post. I am equally pleased that the Air Force has shown unusual wisdom in selecting a man of Mr. Racusin's caliber to implement the congressional mandate in behalf of the small businessman.

The World War on Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, seldom do I include in the Congressional Record testimony which has been presented before the Committee on Agriculture, but I am doing so today. The Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the committee today in support of the concept of a world war on hunger and I feel that what he had to say is of such importance and such general interest that it should be made available at once to all the Members of the House and all those who read the Congressional Record.

The testimony follows:

Statement of the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, Before the House Committee on Agriculture, February 23, 1966

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, President Johnson, in his message on food for freedom less than 2 weeks ago, proposed that "the United States lead the world in a war on hunger." You, in this committee today, are beginning to mobilize our forces in that war.

I sincerely believe that, as you begin your deliberations today, you have the opportunity to set in motion a policy and a program that will be heralded in the years ahead as one of history's greatest steps forward. This policy, if carried out successfully, will do much to advance and insure a bright future for American agriculture. It will provide continued assurance of abundant supplies of high quality food and fiber at fair prices for all Americans. And it will firmly establish the United States of America on a course of world leadership toward total victory in the war against hunger—a war against the enemy of all mankind.

Victory in this war will save more lives than have been lost in all the wars of history. In opening the door to achieving the potential of enough food and fiber to meet the needs of all people in all nations it will open the door to progress in every other aspect of their lives.

To the millions of people in the newly independent and developing nations of the world, victory in this war means the opportunity to realize deep and urgent aspirations for higher levels of living under freedom.

To those in the highly developed nations that already enjoy material prosperity in a free society, it means continued growth in the future under conditions that make their freedom more secure.

I suggest that never before have the Agriculture Committees of the Congress of the United States had so great an opportunity to launch a policy and a program that means so much to so many.

A NEW PROGRAM

In this opening testimony on the food-for-freedom bill recommended by the President of the United States I should like to review with you the basic reasons for this new program.

These reasons are to be found in problems facing the world. They are to be found in new conditions prevailing here in the United States of America.

THE THREAT OF HUNGER

The worldwide problem, only recently commanding widespread public attention, has been highlighted as a race between population and food supply. There can be no better tribute to the breadth of vision and the high sense of responsibility of this committee, Mr. Chairman, than the fact that you have devoted your first week of hearings to testimony on the nature and magnitude of this problem from some of this Nation's most distinguished and competent authorities.

You have heard lucid and compelling descriptions of the population explosion that has come upon us only recently as death rates in developing countries have sharply declined.

You have heard how millions of lives that have been saved by successful public health measures are now threatened by hunger. Improved food production in these countries has not kept pace with increased needs.

You have been told of the urgent importance of policies and measures to control population growth in the developing countries. But even if such policies succeed as well as can be reasonably expected, there will remain an urgently critical need for food for at least one or two decades ahead.

Some of the authorities to whom you have listened have been less pessimistic than others. But all who have given serious study to the problem are agreed that unless present trends are altered much of the world will face famine of massive proportions within the next two decades.

Those trends, therefore, must be changed.

President Johnson, in his message on foreign aid and on education and health, expressed this administration's determination to offer help to those countries that seek to develop effective programs of population control.

And, in his message on food for freedom, the President charted the course for help to those countries determined to become more self-reliant in providing enough food for their people.

If these policies and programs are adopted, and if the developing nations will do their part, the trends that forecast the dark shadow of famine can be reversed.

The population trend can be altered downward.

The food production trend can be altered upward.

It is with the latter that we are primarily concerned today. We are concerned with it in terms of its import for a world in which peace and freedom can prevail. And we are concerned with it in terms of its meaning for American agriculture.

USDA'S CONCERN

Long before American newspapers and magazines publicized world food needs in black headlines with even blacker forecasts, the Department of Agriculture was seriously concerned.

For more than a decade the USDA has been involved in helping to meet the food needs of some 70 countries under Public Law 480. True, the extent to which our agricultural abundance could be used for this purpose was measured by that which could be termed surplus. Yet the $14 billion we have spent in providing food and fiber to developing nations have done more than any other program in history to avert hunger, malnutrition and famine.

Our Public Law 480 program has been increasingly directed toward encouraging economic development. We have consistently used our agricultural surpluses for assistance to developing countries to the maximum extent feasible under existing conditions at home and abroad.

Five years ago, when I assumed the responsibilities of this office, one of my major concerns was to insure that the unparalleled productivity of our American farms would be used most effectively—not only to provide a fair reward to the American farmer and abundant supplies to the American consumer—but also to alleviate hunger and want in less fortunate countries. I have never been able to accept the idea that there was any real surplus, in human terms, as long as human beings, even on the other side of the globe, suffer for want of food and clothing.

One of my first inquiries, back in 1961, was for an assessment of the extent of the need in the years immediately ahead. When I found that there was no ready answer I requested the Economic Research Service to make a careful study of world food needs. In October 1961 we published the World Food Budget, 1962 and 1966.

This provided our first comprehensive study of world food needs. It helped to guide our programs to expand commercial markets for the products of American farms. It helped us to plan exports under our food-for-peace program. It highlighted the opportunity for using food abundance to help build self-sustaining economies in countries receiving food aid.

This effort was only a beginning. In October 1964 we published the World Food Budget, 1970. This study presents the results of an expanded effort to examine the supply and utilization of food commodities throughout the world. It assesses world food needs and highlights the food deficit that prevails in two-thirds of the world. It evaluates the possibilities of closing the food gap. And it outlines the problems involved in that effort.

In its closing paragraph, the World Food Budget, 1970, presents the following conclusion: "While U.S. food aid will likely continue to play an important role in helping developing countries meet emergency needs and achieve more rapid economic growth, food aid is at best a temporary and inadequate measure. Higher food production is the only permanent way to overcome the food gap in most diet-deficient countries, although in some countries, development of nonfarm resources will result in foreign exchange earnings that can be used to pay for commercial imports of food."

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S CHARGE

A few months after the publication of the World Food Budget, 1970, President Johnson presented his 1965 farm message to the Congress. He said then:

"The disturbing downward trends in food output per person in both Asia and Latin America in recent years must be reversed. And these trends can be arrested and reversed only by a massive mobilization of resources in both the food-deficit countries and the advanced countries of the industrial West.

"We must use both our agricultural abundance and our technical skills in agriculture to assist the developing nations to stand on their own feet. Under our assistance programs we will make full use of the agricultural know-how in the Department of Agriculture and in the land-grant colleges and State universities. We will enlist the support and cooperation of private agencies and enterprises of all kinds.

"I am asking the Secretary of Agriculture and others concerned to study and recommend changes in agricultural policy that may be needed to accomplish these goals."

These were the guidelines under which we have carried out studies to determine what legislation ought to be proposed as the current Public Law 480 expires at the end of the year. We studied the question in cooperation with the Agency for International Development and other agencies and departments concerned. The President's recommendations for a new bill are made in the light of two major changes that have taken place since Public Law 480 was enacted back in 1954.

FOOD NEEDS INCREASE SHARPLY—SURPLUSES DECLINE

The first of these changes I have already noted. The world situation in terms of food needs is much more alarming today than it was 12 years ago.

The second change arises out of the success of our domestic farm commodity programs. With the legislation you enacted last year, and the laws already on the books, we have succeeded in supporting farm income while gradually eliminating unwanted surpluses. We now expect that within a few years available stocks of most agricultural commodities will have declined to a level no higher than need for an ever-normal granary. It is therefore no longer possible to envisage an effective program of food aid based on surplus commodities.

Our first task in developing a new program to meet these changes was to examine, in as specific quantitative terms as possible, the extent of food needs that can be expected to occur in aid-recipient countries in the years immediately ahead. In this task we built on the information that has been brought together in the World Food Budget, 1970, but we projected our estimates forward to 1975 and beyond. We then related the needs thus projected to America's capacity to produce.

MEASURING THE FOOD DEFICIT

In estimating the magnitude of the food gap we used grain as an indicator to simplify our projections. On the production side we based our assumptions on a continuation of recent trends in grain production in the developing countries—rising at a rate of about 2.6 percent annually, barely keeping up with population growth.

On the consumption side, however, we recognized that recent trends are unacceptable. Per capita consumption—now averaging 10 percent below minimum standards—has been increasing only about one-third of 1 percent a year. At this rate it would take three decades to bring the calorie content of consumption up to bare minimum standards.

This rate is clearly unacceptable to the hungry nations themselves.

It is morally unacceptable to us.

We therefore based our estimates on a more acceptable target that is within reach—the achievement within one decade of an average per capita consumption that would meet minimum standards.

If agriculture in these countries fails to improve any faster than its present rate they would experience very little overall economic growth—because so large a proportion of their total output comes from the agricultural sector. This means that these countries could not afford to pay for imports of food to fill that gap. It would have to be provided by food aid. Let's look at the magnitude of that food aid.

Beginning at a little over 18 million tons, it would reach 25 million tons by 1970, 42 million tons by 1975, and 62 million tons by 1980.

CAN U.S. FOOD FILL THE GAP?

Now let's turn to the supply side. This represents the amount of grain that would be available for food aid—over and above all domestic uses and commercial exports—if American farmers were to bring back into production all of the acres now diverted. This is based on expected yields under current price levels, and therefore represents more feed grains than wheat, even though wheat is most useful as food aid.

This study assumes that if diversion programs were ended all diverted acres would probably be back in production by 1970. That accounts for the sharp rise in availability shown for the first 3 years. After 1970 the more gradual rise represents an expected increase in yields per acre.

If we were to follow this pattern, by 1970 we would be producing 44 million tons more than food aid requirements. By 1975 we would still have an annual surplus of 30 million tons. (Where would we put it?) By 1980 there would still be a small annual surplus.

By 1985 there would be no way to fill the gap. As President Johnson said in his food-for-freedom message, "the time is not far off when all the combined production, on all of the acres, of all the agriculturally productive nations, will not meet the food needs of the developing nations—unless present trends are changed."

This disaster cannot be averted by calling back into production all of our diverted acres and shipping the surplus to the hungry world. It is true that we could put these acres back into production. We could use them to produce some 60 million more tons of grain for use in food aid programs. If our commodity programs were adjusted so that at least two-thirds of this grain would be wheat (which now constitutes nearly 90 percent of our grain shipments under Public Law 480) the cost would be at least $2 billion higher than present programs. (This is assuming that we would maintain farm income at its present level.) This estimate does not include the high cost of constructing in recipient countries the port and related facilities that would be necessary to handle such an increased volume of food aid.

But even at this cost we could only postpone the disaster for a few years. The greatest cost would be the lost years—the years during which those massive amounts of our grain would serve as a crutch—as a deterrent to delay action on the part of recipient countries to help themselves. We would be contributing to, rather than working to prevent, that disaster.

ONLY ONE SOLUTION

The disaster can be averted in only one way—by greatly accelerating the expansion of food production within the hungry nations themselves.

There is no time to be lost. The hungry nations are faced with a tremendous task in increasing their agricultural productivity. Those most densely populated will have to do it the hard way by increasing yields, for they already have under cultivation most of their available acres.

Their efforts to increase yields face many serious roadblocks. Some of them even lack sufficient government stability for the establishment of effective policies. Most of them lack incentives adequate to make it worth while for farmers to make any great effort to produce more. They face low rates of literacy, lack of know-how, and the absence of means by which to help farmers use new and better methods. Essential purchased inputs (fertilizer and other chemicals, machines, and tools) are scarce, and the hungry nations have little foreign exchange with which to buy them. Lack of roads, marketing facilities, farmers' cooperatives, and sources of credit are other handicaps. Most of them are in tropical regions where agricultural research and technological advance lag far behind that which has developed in the temperate regions of the world.

With all these handicaps, these hungry nations will need to increase their agricultural productivity at a rate higher than that ever achieved by the agriculturally productive nations. Clearly the task cannot—must not—be delayed.

HELPING NATIONS TO HELP THEMSELVES

This is why the food-for-freedom program places highest emphasis on self-help.

We can and will provide technical and capital assistance to help those countries that undertake effective programs to increase their own ability to provide food for their people.

We can and will help to fill the gap in their food and fiber needs as they pursue those self-help efforts and until they reach a level of self-reliance where they can either produce or buy what they need.

The task is difficult, but not impossible.

The Department of Agriculture has studied in detail increases in agricultural productivity over the years 1948 to 1963 of 26 developing countries, some in each of the major geographic regions of the world. Twelve out of the twenty-six have increased their agricultural production at annual compound rates of more than 4 percent per year. This surpasses rates ever achieved by the new economically advanced nations over comparable periods of time.

Many factors have contributed in varying degrees to their success. The 12 countries differ widely in climate, literacy rates, land resources, culture, and governmental systems. They had only one factor in common—a national determination to carry out self-help policies to improve their food production.

With similar determination and with assistance from highly developed nations, other countries can do as well. An annual average increase in agricultural production of 4 or 5 percent would go a long way toward defeating hunger in the decade ahead.

The food-for-freedom program is directed toward that goal. It is directed also toward one aspect of that goal that deals with quality as well as quantities of food.

One of the most serious manifestations of hunger in the developing nations lies in nutritional deficiencies, particularly the lack of proteins and vitamins, among infants and young children. It is estimated that in the developing nations of the free world some 171 million children under 6 years of age and 98 million between the ages of 6 and 14 suffer seriously from malnutrition. Millions die because malnutrition has sapped their resistance to childhood diseases. Millions who survive are permanently handicapped, physically and/or mentally. Progress in education as well as the nation's capacity to carry on vigorous economic development are seriously retarded by the degree of malnutrition that prevails in many parts of the world.

Today we know how to meet such nutritional deficiencies. We have developed new methods by which essential food requirements can be produced and processed at low cost. In the Department of Agriculture we are stepping up our own activities to meet the problem of malnutrition.

Other agencies of the U.S. Government are also attacking this problem. The AID is already fortifying donations under its Public Law 480 programs. I know that you will hear more about this aspect of the war on hunger when Mr. Bell presents his testimony.

WAR ON MANY FRONTS

Our Government is mobilizing for the war on hunger on many fronts. One of these fronts was described by President Johnson in his message on foreign aid. He proposed that the Agency for International Development increase its effort in the field of agriculture by more than one-third, to a total of nearly $500 million. One-third of this total will finance imports of fertilizer from the United States. The remainder will finance: Transfer of efficient farming techniques; improvement of roads, marketing and irrigation facilities; establishment of extension services, cooperatives and credit facilities; purchases of American farm equipment and pesticides; research on soil and seed improvements. I am sure that Mr. Bell will emphasize the importance of this effort to assist these nations to help themselves.

The President's message on health and education likewise offers intensive new programs, many of which will either directly or indirectly benefit the agriculture of the developing countries and help to win the war on hunger.

THE FOOD FOR FREEDOM ACT

You in this committee are now taking under consideration a major front in this war. Two companion bills are before you, one to authorize a new 5-year food aid program to replace Public Law 480 when it expires on December 31, 1966, and one to provide for an "ever-normal granary" by setting up commodity reserves.

The Food for Freedom Act of 1966 has two new features of utmost importance.

FOOD AID LINKED TO SELF-HELP

The first is the emphasis on self-help. This principle is referred to four times in the bill itself. It becomes an integral part of our food-aid program.

This link between self-help and food aid is essential to economic progress and growth in recipient countries. Instead of becoming increasingly dependent upon the United States they can build toward the freedom that comes only with self-reliance. Instead of an economy whose growth is seriously held back because the great majority of the people in rural areas are still outside the market economy, the recipient nation can look forward to the overall economic progress that follows when agriculture becomes more progressive and prosperous. Only when farm people begin to both buy and sell will these countries really begin to move their economies forward.

The link between self-help and food aid is likewise important to the people of the United States. Paradoxical as it may seem, agricultural development in the poor and hungry nations offers to us the best opportunity for expanding exports of the products of our farms and factories.

We know that economic development is the basis for expanded commercial trade. We have seen proof of that many times in recent years as we have observed how dollar sales of U.S. farm products have climbed in countries where economic growth is taking place most rapidly. For example, dollar exports of U.S. farm products in the 5 fiscal years 1961–65 increased over the 5 years 1955–59 by 16 times in Greece; by 13 times in Taiwan; by 10 times in Spain. They almost doubled in Israel, and increased by one and one-half times in Hong Kong. We have further observed that for every 10-percent increase in incomes in developing countries we can expect their imports of our agricultural products on commercial terms to increase by 16 percent.

And since economic development in the hungry nations depends so much on increased agricultural progress, it is only by hastening that progress that we can hope to begin to tap the great potential market that lies dormant in the underdeveloped world.

Finally, the link between self-help and food aid is of paramount importance because it is the only way to insure victory in the war against hunger. By means of this link, food from American farms today can help to insure that, by that time in the future when needs would be so great they could not possibly be met by American productivity, productivity in the developing world will have increased enough to meet the need. It is only by this link with self-help that American food aid can make its major contribution to banishing famine from the face of the earth.

END OF SURPLUS CONCEPT

The second new feature of importance in the Food for Freedom Act is the elimination of the surplus requirement. Commodities to be furnished would be those determined to be available by the Secretary of Agriculture, taking into account productive capacity, domestic requirements, farm and consumer price levels, commercial exports, and adequate carryover.

Food-for-freedom needs would be taken into account by the Secretary when he exercises his responsibilities under domestic farm programs. These programs are flexible enough so that production can now be geared to potential use. They will be administered so that American agriculture will produce enough food and fiber to meet domestic needs, commercial exports, food aid for those developing countries that are determined to help themselves, and reserves adequate to meet any emergency and to insure price stability.

Commodities available to food recipient countries will no longer be as limited as they have been in the past. The commodity "mix" sent abroad under concessional programs will be geared to the kind needed rather than circumscribed by the kinds held in stocks. We can expect the trend to be in the direction of commodities with special nutritional values.

Other features of the Food for Freedom Act reflect the best provisions of Public Law 480.

Emphasis on expanding international trade and building markets for American farm products is continued, with special emphasis on the long-term development of markets expanding under the impact of economic growth. Financing will continue under the Commodity Credit Corporation. Private trade channels will be used to the maximum extent practicable. Usual marketings will continue to be safeguarded. Donation programs through voluntary agencies will continue. There will be increased emphasis on combating malnutrition both in terms of selection of the commodities and in the authorization of the CCC to finance the enrichment of foods.

In the proposed act all sales, whether for foreign currencies or for dollars on credit terms, are placed under title I. The policy is established to shift from foreign currency sales to dollar credit sales at a progressive rate, so that the transition can be completed by December 31, 1971, except for U.S. requirements for foreign currencies.

All donation programs will be under title II of the act. Donations are authorized for such purposes as to meet emergency food needs, to provide food-for-work community and economic development programs and to carry out the U.S. pledge to the world food program.

Title III provides for uses that may be made of foreign currencies that accrue from foreign currency sales. Among the authorized purposes are: To finance U.S. expenses abroad; to develop new markets for U.S. agricultural commodities; to procure equipment for common defense; to promote economic development; to finance educational exchange programs; to make Cooley loans; and to finance research. Any U.S. agency having authority to operate abroad can use those currencies to carry out its programs.

I know you will study this bill carefully. I will be glad to go over it with you to answer any specific questions you may have.

FOOD AND FIBER RESERVES

The companion bill recommended by the President would authorize establishment and maintenance of reserves of farm commodities. This bill is important to the people of the United States as consumers, to our customers abroad, and to those developing countries who must depend on our food for a few more years.

For many years, the need for such reserve policy has been overshadowed by concern with excessive supplies of agricultural products. But wise legislation, improved administration of our farm programs and increased foreign demands have now depleted the stocks of most farm commodities. We do not want to permit the inventories of key food commodities to decrease to the point that we cannot meet our domestic, export and food-for-freedom commitments and still have a safeguard against an unforeseeable increase in demand or an unexpected reduction in supply.

The bill would authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish and maintain reserves of agricultural commodities primarily to assure a continuous, adequate, and stable supply to meet domestic requirements at fair and reasonable prices, and also to meet the requirements of commercial exports, domestic food programs, and the food-for-freedom program.

The commodities to be reserved and the reserve quantities for each marketing year would be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture after consultation with other interested agencies such as the Departments of Defense and State. They would be announced in advance of the marketing year. The Secretary would be authorized to adjust support prices, acreage allotments, and marketing quotas to achieve the production necessary to establish and maintain reserves. Commodities in the reserve would be available for disposal through sales, barter, donations, or redemption of payment-in-kind certificates.

Such a reserve is not a new idea—it was the basic principle of the ever-normal granary. In periods when supplies exceed expectations and needs, we set aside a reserve for periods of unusual demand or a short crop.

Actually, public concern over reserve levels for agricultural products goes back nearly 15 years to a report entitled, "Reserve Levels for Storable Farm Products," published in 1952 as Senate Document No. 130.

Department specialists estimated at that time that a reserve of 350 to 400 million bushels of wheat held by CCC, in addition to normal working stocks of around 100 million bushels held by the trade, would have been sufficient to offset the effects of one serious drought year followed by a moderate drought year.

For corn and other feed grains, a reserve supply of 700 to 800 million bushels would have been sufficient, in addition to normal working stocks of around 300 million bushels held in trade channels.

Since that time, we have done additional research on this problem, much of which contributed to the 1964 report of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission on the subject.

Under present law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is under a mandate to dispose of its stocks as rapidly as possible consistent with its price-support program and orderly market. The proposed legislation would permit us to stop short of total disposition of our inventories, to use the reserve to meet priority needs, and to encourage production of those items for which larger reserves are needed.

Wheat and dairy products offer current examples of how this authority might be used. Our wheat stocks will have been reduced to about a reserve level by next June 30. We have advised spring wheatgrowers that there will not be a program to reduce 1966 acreages below allotments. If it appears by midyear that the June 30, 1967, stocks will be below reserve needs, we may wish to increase wheat allotments by enough to build our stocks to reserve levels by mid-1968.

Dairy products are currently in short supply. We have virtually no inventory, although we expect to acquire some products again this spring. We have already announced our offer to purchase dairy products for school lunch programs at market prices above support levels. Under this bill, authority would be provided to take actions to build up reserve stocks if that course of action seemed to be required to assure adequate supplies and stable prices.

CCC inventories of rice, fats and oils, and nonfat dry milk, are presently low, but some of these commodities may be increased as a result of 1966 production.

To the extent possible, reserve commodities would be maintained as a part of the Commodity Credit Corporation's overall inventory for the particular commodity without individual lot specification. Government-owned stocks of reserve commodities in most cases would be stored under existing Commodity Credit Corporation storage contracts, and handled in the same manner as price-support commodities—utilizing the usual and customary channels of trade. Reserve inventories would be stored in or as near the area of production as possible so as to minimize the cost of transportation and handling and to permit greater flexibility in making dispositions.

Our aims would be to use the reserve agricultural commodities in the national interest. Under emergency conditions, the nature and extent of the emergency would dictate the disposal procedures to be followed. Under normal circumstances, dispositions from the reserve would be made under procedures now used for disposition of Commodity Credit Corporation price support inventories. We would plan to announce our procedures as far in advance as possible, so that producers and the trade could make their plans for the year.

This is an important bill at a crucial time. We need it to protect our consumers at home. We may need it to meet commitments abroad.

It will supplement the food for freedom program.

THE OPERATION OF THE NEW PROGRAM

In many ways, the new food-for-freedom program will operate in a manner similar to the operation of our food-for-peace program under Public Law 480. But the new legislation, designed to meet new conditions and urgent needs in the years ahead, will call for some significant modifications in the operation of the program. We expect that these will evolve with experience. But I know you are interested in our expectation as to how the new features of the program will be implemented. I will try to summarize some of the highlights of these new features.

GREATER RESPONSIBILITY

Food-for-freedom programs and domestic farm commodity programs, while not dependent upon each other, must complement each other. This will add to the responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture, who will be called upon to administer commodity programs in a manner that will assure the availability of commodities needed for food aid as well as to meet all domestic requirements and commercial exports.

Our commodity programs are flexible enough for us to meet that requirement, especially when buttressed by legislation for the establishment of commodity reserves. We expect that quantities needed for food aid may increase in the years ahead. As needs increase we can call back into production some of the acres now diverted.

Obviously, if this is to be done responsibly and effectively it will require more forward planning, a more careful evaluation of prospective needs and probable supplies, than was required when food aid was generally limited to "surplus" commodities. The resources and procedures of the Department of Agriculture, as well as those of the Agency for International Development, for estimating needs on both a short- and long-range basis will need to be expanded. The Secretary of Agriculture will need to take into account the foreign policy aspects of food aid and the degree of success of self-help efforts in recipient countries before he can make final determination about commodity programs.

ADAPTATION OF EXISTING INTERAGENCY PROCEDURES

A higher level of interagency coordination will be further implemented by adapting existing interagency operating procedures that have worked well under the old program.

Coordination under Public Law 480 has been carried out through the Interagency Staff Committee, on which representatives of Agriculture, State, AID, Defense, Treasury, Commerce, and the Bureau of the Budget meet under the chairmanship of the USDA. I would expect something like this interagency structure to continue, but that its increased responsibilities would enhance its importance.

CLOSER COORDINATION OF FOOD AID WITH OTHER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

The new food-for-freedom program contemplates closer coordination of food aid with other assistance programs directed toward food and agriculture in recipient countries. President Johnson, in his message on food for freedom, emphasized the need for a unified effort. He said: "To strengthen these programs our food aid and economic assistance must be closely linked. Together they must relate to efforts in developing countries to improve their own agriculture. The Departments of State and Agriculture and the Agency for International Development will work together even more closely than they have in the past in the planning and implementation of coordinated programs."

The Department of Agriculture and the AID have for several years been developing closer working relationships with each other in the food aid part of U.S. assistance programs. But the kind of unified effort to which the President referred means that Agriculture will also be called upon to participate in the planning of agricultural assistance activities and in reviewing the progress made in agricultural development.

This means that we are called upon to develop closer interagency operating relationships that will involve the Department of Agriculture in a shared concern for—not only the food component of assistance programs—but also that part of economic assistance that relates to self-help in the agriculture related sectors of developing nations.

This planning is primarily the responsibility of the AID. In discussing this problem with the Administrator, Mr. Bell and I have agreed that both the AID and the USDA could carry out their respective responsibilities most constructively if representatives of the Department of Agriculture accepted AID's invitation to participate in the planning—particularly for those major aid-recipient countries where problems of food and agriculture are of critical importance.

Specific procedures will be worked out under which such participation in agricultural planning can be carried out effectively. Through such participation the Secretary would be currently informed about the level of success of self-help efforts, and of needs which Agriculture might be called upon to meet.

INCREASED TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FROM USDA

President Johnson also pointed out that AID's policy of "calling upon the Department of Agriculture to assume increasing responsibilities through its International Agricultural Development Service" would "become even more important as we increase our emphasis on assisting developing nations to help themselves."

Mr. Bell has indicated his hope that the USDA will be increasingly helpful in this area. We have just signed a new interagency agreement under which AID seeks to "enlist as fully and effectively as possible on a partnership basis the pertinent resources of the Department in planning, executing and evaluating those portions of the foreign assistance program in which it has special competence." Under this agreement we expect to expand USDA's participation through participating agency service agreements with the AID.

The Department of Agriculture will thus become increasingly involved in providing technical assistance in agriculture and related fields. We will be able to, as the President said, "extend to world problems in food and agriculture the kind of cooperative relationships we have developed with the States, universities, farm organizations, and private industry."

EFFECTIVE ENCOURAGEMENT OF SELF-HELP

The new food-for-freedom program can truly be an instrument under which the millions of lives that are now threatened by famine under present trends can be saved. But this will result only if it proves effective in changing those trends by stimulating, encouraging, and—if necessary—insisting on effective self-help measures. This may mean agreements for no longer than 1 year, with provisions for periodic reviews of progress made toward self-reliance.

A FORECAST

I should like to conclude this testimony by sharing with you my own forecast of the course of this new war against hunger—a view of the potential outcome of the frightening race between population and food supply.

I make this forecast in the light of another explosion that has taken place in our generation—one that can hold far greater meaning, and that certainly holds far greater hope, than the explosion of population. I refer to the explosion of knowledge that characterizes our times.

Science and technology have progressed so far that it is now physically possible to produce enough for abundance for all.

But science and technology have likewise progressed so fast in the physical and material fields that our knowledge about the social, economic, and political relationships necessary to realize that abundance has not caught up.

This gap lies behind one of the most significant statements that I find in the World Food Budget, 1970: "The race is not so much one between population and food supply but a race between what could be done and what will be done."

What could be done has been largely determined by scientific and technological progress.

What will be done can be influenced in a large measure by how you, in this committee, take the lead in launching an all-out war on hunger by passing the Food for Freedom Act of 1966.

Under this food-for-freedom program, I foresee, in the years ahead:

A likely increase in our food aid programs, as they are used to meet the deficit in developing countries making a major effort to increase their own food production.

A consequent corresponding increase in American farm production, responsibly carried out under our flexible farm programs. As I see it, some, but not all, of our diverted acres will be needed in the years immediately ahead.

A gradual shift from aid to trade, under which our declining exports for food for freedom would be more than made up by increasing exports on commercial terms. These increased exports for dollars would be a product of the development that our food aid had helped to bring about.

As agricultural progress would stimulate accelerated economic growth in the developing nations I would hope to see higher standards of living, rising incomes, and a growing volume of international trade. As poverty, dependence, and insecurity decline, and as more of the developing nations become able to stand on their own feet and enter the international commercial market, I would expect a more rational pattern of international trade to develop. That would mean, for the American farmer, a very substantial increase in our exports of those commodities for which we have a real comparative advantage.

Most important of all, I would look forward hopefully to a future of peace and freedom, where peace would be more secure and freedom more widely cherished because the fear of hunger no longer threatened the people of any nation.

The food-for-freedom program proposed by President Johnson less than 2 weeks ago is directed toward that goal. Its appeal has already aroused deep interest around the world.

I have seen cables and reports telling of that appeal. I have personally seen the hope that kind of program offers to the peasants in Vietnam.

The United States of America today has an unparalleled opportunity to use its abundance to the benefit of all.

Mr. Chairman, and members of this committee, the bill—and the opportunity—are in your hands.

Peace Corps Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, on December 27, 1965, two Peace Corps volunteers—Miss Karen Ann Hiner and Mr. Arthur G. Webster III—celebrated their wedding ceremony while on duty in Eastern Nigeria. The bride is a constituent of the Honorable WILLIAM S. AYRES, of Ohio, while the groom resides in the Second District of Michigan, which I am privileged to represent in this House.

The couple met in training last summer at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo, where their contingent spent 11 weeks preparing to teach in Nigeria.

The wedding was conducted in Enugu, the capital of Eastern Nigeria. The wedding party was dressed in traditional Nigerian attire for the ceremony.

Following completion of their Peace Corps service in 1967, Mr. and Mrs. Webster plan to pursue university teaching careers, and hope to return to the University of Nigeria after further study in the United States. Both are enthusiastic about the stimulating atmosphere of the new university, built with U.S. aid. The University of Nigeria is presently a partner school of Michigan State University, and participates in the international exchange program of American and Nigerian students and faculty.

Karen and Gary have expressed their hope that more projects of this type will arise as part of America's program of aid-in-self-development to the new African States. I am proud of their service; it symbolizes the dedication of some 9,000 Peace Corps volunteers, serving in every quarter of the globe. I know that my colleagues join me in wishing Mr. and Mrs. Webster a long and happy life together.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. John C. Mayne, associate minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, in this hour we would pray for Thy loving kindness and tender mercy upon this our Nation, and upon the leaders here assembled on this day.

We are conscious of the awesome burdens upon the Chief Executive of our land, and the heavy decisions which rest upon those who make our laws, and the dangers which beset those who protect our Nation. We are thankful that Thy protecting arms have been around the President of this Senate in his journey of understanding and reconciliation.

O God, it is our fervent prayer that—through the fog of confusion we may see a pathway made straight; amidst the clouds of conflict we may view the sunlight of peace.

Great Father of mankind, in Thy wisdom Thou gavest Thy Son to teach us how to live in peace and love.

O Lord and Master, suffer us never to be complacent in the face of wrong; stab our conscience as long as little children starve in our slums or aging peasants suffer in the burning jungles of the East. And may that ancient freedom to voice concern for our America never cease. May discord of debate and confrontation never destroy the unity of purpose nor sever the strong cords which bind us together as brothers in this blessed Nation.

And now, stir our hearts with harmonies of majestic song—

> "Long may our land be bright,
> With freedom's holy light
> Protect us by Thy might,
> Great God our King."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 23, 1966, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TODAY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, for purposes of discussion, I should like to suggest a unanimous-consent request, that on Friday, debate on each amendment be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided between the sponsor of the amendment and the acting majority leader; and, further, that debate on the bill be limited to 4 hours, 2 hours on each side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, February 24, 1966, the Vice President had signed the enrolled bill (S. 1904) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the pueblos of Acoma, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OF STOCKS OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES HELD BY COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the orderly liquidation of stocks of agricultural commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the expansion of markets for surplus agricultural commodities, dated January 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON TITLE I AGREEMENTS UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for January 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON FINAL SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of the Seminole Nation, Docket No. 248 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTIONS

A letter from the Assistant Chief of Naval Material (Procurement), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research and development procurement actions of $50,000 and over, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE III OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the provisions of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide incentives to planned metropolitan development and to otherwise assist urban development (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to give the Federal Communications Commission certain additional regulatory authority over communication common carriers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

A letter from the Chairman, the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, entitled "Open Hearts Open Minds—How America Welcomes Foreign Visitors" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON PERSONAL AND REAL PROPERTY RECEIVED BY STATE SURPLUS PROPERTY AGENCIES FOR DISTRIBUTION TO PUBLIC HEALTH AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on personal and real property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF ACTING COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on potential savings through direct procurement of components used in production of variable timing fuses (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of approval of mortgage insurance on housing project for the elderly in Houston, Tex., Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on pricing of recorders purchased from Midwestern Instruments, Inc., Tulsa, Okla., Department of the Air Force, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need to reexamine planned replacement and augmentation of high-endurance vessels, western area, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on information relating to local employment created by the accelerated public works program, Area Development Administration, Department of Commerce, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on actions being taken to achieve greater utilization of limited-life and long-supply items in civil defense medical stockpile managed by Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of cost-sharing arrangements with the State of Oregon for the operations of fish hatcheries, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on inclusion of balconies and use of high-cost brick in constructing low-rent public housing projects, Public Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on allocation of school facility costs to five federally assisted urban renewal projects in New Jersey and Illinois, Urban Renewal Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need to strengthen supervision over city delivery carriers, Post Office Department, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need to consider storing processed commodities on a daily-rate basis, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the approval of mortgage insurance for a housing project for the elderly located near Fort Worth, Tex., Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on audit of Farm Credit Administration, fiscal year 1965, dated February 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXTENSION OF CERTAIN CONCESSION CONTRACTS AND PERMITS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the extension of certain concession contracts and permits (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS ON PETITIONS GRANTING THIRD AND SIXTH PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATION TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports concerning visa petitions approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions third preference and sixth preference classification (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COST ASCERTAINMENT REPORT, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a cost ascertainment report of that Department, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Delaware; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 22

"Concurrent resolution relative to the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the presidency and vice-presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

"Whereas at the 1st Session of the 89th Congress of the United States, begun and held at the city of Washington on Wednesday, the 4th day of January 1965, it was resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), that the following article be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the said Constitution, viz:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

" 'SEC. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

" 'SEC. 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

" 'SEC. 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

" 'Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.': Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 123d General Assembly of the State of Delaware (the Senate concurring therein)*:

"SECTION 1. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby ratified by the General Assembly of the State of Delaware and shall be to all intents and purposes a part of the Constitution of the United States.

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this preamble and concurrent resolution shall be forwarded by the Governor of this State to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C.

"SEC. 3. That the clerk of the house of representatives and the secretary of the senate be, and they are hereby directed, to deliver to the said Governor certified copies of this resolution at their earliest convenience."

A resolution adopted by the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council, favoring a careful reconsideration of the proposed site change of the manned orbital laboratory program from Cape Kennedy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the selection of that city as a demonstration city; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Spokane Tribe of Indians, opposing any change in the position of Commissioner of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted at a convention of the diocese of Washington of the Episcopal

Church, District of Columbia, relating to security under the law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of John F. Bradley, of Wilmington, Del., relating to the terms of President and Vice President and Congressmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of St. Louis County, Minn., urging reconsideration of the proposal that a reduction be made in the appropriation for aid to impacted areas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by Auke Bay Post No. 25, the American Legion, Auke Bay, Alaska, commending the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] for the service rendered by him to bring about the enactment of the so-called cold war GI bill of rights bill; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Parma, Ohio, expressing appreciation to Vice President Humphrey for his recent visit to that city; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 9883. An act to amend subchapter S of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1007).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

H.R. 12563. An act to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank (Rept. No. 1008).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 2973. A bill to permit Edward C. Bower to serve as a director of the Virgin Islands National Bank prior to his obtaining U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. Kennedy of New York):

S. 2974. A bill to amend the Wagner-Peyser Act so as to provide for more effective development and utilization of the Nation's manpower resources by expanding, modernizing, and improving operations under such act at both State and Federal levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Clark when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2975. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful certain actions designed to influence individuals to refuse or evade registration or service in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Smathers when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. Hruska):

S. 2976. A bill to provide for the construction of wells and other facilities necessary to provide a supplemental water supply to the lands of the Mirage Flats Irrigation District, Mirage Flats project, Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2977. A bill to provide incentives to planned metropolitan development and to otherwise assist urban development; and

S. 2978. A bill to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Sparkman when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Saltonstall):

S.J. Res. 138. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ervin concerning the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

MANPOWER SERVICES ACT OF 1966

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Wagner-Peyser Act so as to provide for more effective development and utilization of the Nation's manpower resources by expanding, modernizing, and improving operations under such act at both State and Federal levels, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2974) to amend the Wagner-Peyser Act so as to provide for more effective development and utilization of the Nation's manpower resources by expanding, modernizing, and improving operations under such act at both State and Federal levels, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Clark (for himself and Mr. Kennedy of New York), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a primary goal of this Nation's economic and manpower policies is the full and efficient development and utilization of its manpower resources. During the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, our commitment to these goals has taken on new meaning. We have begun to experiment with the full utilization of monetary and fiscal policies which are essential for the rapid economic growth necessary to achieve and maintain full employment. In addition, we have complemented this monetary and fiscal policy with legislation designed to promote an active and aggressive manpower policy. The results of these efforts are everywhere apparent—unemployment which was 6.7 percent in 1961 has fallen to 4 percent; gross national product which was $520 billion in 1961 rose to $675 billion in 1965.

The results are encouraging and the lessons are instructive, but our efforts represent only a beginning and we must go forward. This Nation cannot be satisfied while 32 million of her citizens remain in poverty, while Negro unemployment remains twice that of whites and teenage unemployment thrice that of others, and while countless millions have been deprived of the opportunity to realize their full potential.

Our continuing efforts to create full and efficient development and utilization of our human resources are dependent upon the implementation of our major legislation at the local community level. This implementation can be only as effective as the institutions which operate at this level.

One of these agencies is the Federal-State employment service. With its 2,000 local offices, the employment service reaches into the core of every city and rural area. It provides the facilities for those who seek assistance in choosing careers and finding new or better jobs.

The Employment Service has been given increased responsibilities in recent years. Already more than 20 pieces of major legislation are implemented, in whole or in part, by or through the Employment Service.

Much has happened in the more than three decades which have elapsed since the passage of the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 which created the Employment Service. During this period, the Employment Service has been transformed from a labor exchange into our frontline agency for translating manpower policy and legislation into operational reality. It now provides comprehensive manpower services to all jobseekers.

These services include interviewing, testing, occupational counseling, referral for vocational education and on-the-job training, and job development and placement.

These direct personal services, in turn, depend upon the collection, analysis, dissemination, and immediate availability of current labor market information.

Information must be available, not just for local job placement but for the matching of men and jobs across State lines and from one labor market to another.

There must also be information on employment trends, technological developments, and local, regional, and national economic changes.

Finally, the employment interviewer and counselor must have occupational guidance and career development information.

To provide these services on a nationwide basis requires no less than a modern automatic data processing system joining every employment center throughout the country.

To fulfill its assigned mission, the Employment Service must have qualified, well-paid professional and administrative personnel at all levels. Minimum professional standards and salaries should be established for Employment Service personnel.

Mr. President, these are but a few of the requirements of a modern manpower services agency.

The time has come to update the mandate of the Employment Service and to more clearly define its functions and responsibilities. The bill which I send to the desk contains this updated mandate and provides the Secretary of Labor with the tools necessary to transform the Employment Service into a manpower services agency which is so vitally needed if we are to continue to meet the human commitments of the Great Society.

Mr. President, I am pleased to note that Senator KENNEDY of New York, has joined in sponsoring the Manpower Services Act of 1966 and that Representative ELMER J. HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania, of the House Select Subcommittee on Labor is introducing identical legislation today in the House.

The Holland subcommittee and the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have scheduled joint hearings on the Manpower Services Act beginning March 7.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO FURTHER AMEND THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act in order to make unlawful certain actions by any person or persons designed to influence individuals to refuse or evade registration or service in the Armed Forces.

Briefly, the measure would prohibit such practices as calling upon students to ignore the directives of their local draft boards, as well as urging members of our Armed Forces in Vietnam to lay down their arms and come home.

It is also designed to outlaw harassing telephone calls to members of our Armed Forces and their families, as well as the activities of individuals like Ronald Ramsay, who by his own admission has been making tape recordings for Radio Hanoi exhorting American servicemen to cease carrying out their duties in South Vietnam.

Several measures have already been introduced, some of which are questionable from the standpoint of whether or not they violate legitimate discussions of the issues under the doctrine of free speech guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States. I believe that the proposed measure corrects these defects while at the same time permitting legitimate discussion of the issues.

This is a sincere effort to take care of the problem, while not stifling honest debate or legitimate discussions of issues that could produce constructive suggestions for the Nation's policymakers. It is solely designed to prohibit dangerous, seditious actions that undermine and subvert the effectiveness of our Armed Forces and threaten the very existence of the framework of law around which our society is constructed.

There are those among us who do not agree with the policies America is pursuing in Vietnam, and counsel against this Nation's participation in that conflict. But the vast majority of these individuals recognize that one can propose a policy and attempt to change it without subverting the best interests of this Nation.

The purpose of the measure, as I have previously stated, is designed solely to prevent activities on the part of any person or persons which go beyond legitimate discussion of the issues. Threatening telephone calls to the family of a serviceman in Vietnam, radio programs, recorded for use by a government that is killing Americans every day on the battlefields of southeast Asia, or a voice that attacks the very foundation stones of the community by inciting open lawbreaking certainly are matters beyond the realm of free speech.

The proposed measure is aimed at making such actions unlawful while at the same time upholding the constitutional freedom guaranteed individuals.

I sincerely trust that the committee to which this measure is referred will act promptly and favorably so that it can be enacted into law in this session of the Congress. It is, in my opinion, much needed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the proposed measure be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2975) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful certain actions designed to influence individuals to refuse or evade registration or service in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2975

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 12 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 452), is amended by inserting immediately before ", or who conspires to commit any one or more of such offenses", the following: "or any person or persons who distribute or attempt to distribute any written or printed matter which counsels, advises or urges individuals subject to the provisions of this title to evade or refuse registration or service in the armed forces, or to refuse to comply with or evade any of the requirements of this title, or of any rule, regulation, or direction issued pursuant to this title, or who knowingly counsel, advise, or urge the parent, guardian, or wife of an individual subject to the provisions of this title to counsel, advise, or urge such individual to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces, or to refuse to comply with or evade any of the requirements of this title, or of any rule, regulation, or direction issued pursuant to this title, or who distribute or attempt to distribute any written or printed matter which counsels, advises, or urges the parent, guardian, or wife of any individual subject to the provisions of this title to counsel, advise, or urge such individual to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces, or to refuse to comply with or evade any of the requirements of this title, or of any rule, regulation, or direction issued pursuant to this title, or who knowingly counsels, advises, or urges any individual or individuals subject to the provisions of this title to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces, or to refuse to comply with or evade any of the requirements of this title, or any rule, regulation, or direction issued pursuant to this title, whether such counseling, advising, or urging is directed to a particular individual or individuals or is directed to all individuals, or any class or group thereof, subject to the provisions of this title,".

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills, one titled "The Urban Development Act" and the other the "Housing and Urban Development Amendments of 1966." These are administration bills which the President has requested as part of his 1966 housing program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have each of these bills with a section-by-section summary thereof printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the President's housing program is a most ambitious one and involves several new and different individual programs which have a great deal of merit and in fact may represent new milestones in our search for effective programs to meet national housing goals. However, the very nature of these new programs, involving as they do the coordination of a variety of Federal and local activities, will require a great deal of study and consideration and extensive perfecting language and amendments before they will be ready for approval by the Congress.

There are several provisions in these bills which I do not approve but nevertheless I feel that they desire full hearings and consideration of the Senate, and I am therefore introducing them as submitted by the administration.

The general purpose of the urban development bill is to promote good and effective metropolitan development and to make more efficient the myriad of government services, State, local, and Federal, now available to growing urban areas. This is indeed a most commendable purpose and I fully endorse proposals to meet such an objective.

One of the titles of this bill authorizing FHA insurance for financing the development of new communities and loans to land development agencies contains almost the same language which was proposed last year and which the Congress turned down for further study. I have not had time to review the new proposal in detail but I am willing to give the administration an opportunity to testify on the matter and to justify its requests, I assume based on new information.

The Senator from Pennsylvania will recall that we felt last year that it had not had sufficient study at that time—the "new town" proposal.

Mr. CLARK. I do indeed. I remember, however, that last year we passed probably the most effective and far-reaching housing act in our history, certainly since I have been in the Senate, under the leadership of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator. I certainly agree with the Senator that it was a tremendous housing act. The Senator from Pennsylvania, who for many years served as a member of the Housing Subcommittee, helped things along.

Another section of the bill would increase the authorization for mass transportation assistance and add further funds for research and development. This would be no more than a continuation of existing law to keep the program going at present levels.

Another provision included in the bill would establish a new program of grants to States and metropolitan area agencies to help finance urban information centers. This provision has as its purpose the development of more data and information on existing programs and activities related to solutions of urban problems, all of which are highly desirable. However, I believe that here again we need to know in more detail what the President has in mind and how such a program will fit in with existing data collecting and information distribution programs already operating. We will look forward to receiving the details in hearings to be scheduled later.

The second bill entitled "The Housing and Urban Development Amendments of 1966" is a typical bill on amendments to existing housing laws in order to improve and perfect existing FHA, urban renewal, and other urban development programs.

Mr. President, I had hoped after passage of the omnibus housing bill of 1965 that the Congress would not need to take any action on housing programs for some time. However, the President has come forward with new proposals which in their depth of comprehension and potential accomplishment could have an impact on housing and urban development as significant as some of the great housing acts of the past. It is clear to me that a program of this magnitude should not be adopted without full consideration and debate by Members of Congress and all concerned.

I plan full and extensive hearings on these bills and all other bills pending before the subcommittee including S. 2842, the "Demonstration Cities Act of 1966" introduced by Senator Douglas, and S. 2804 on mass transportation, introduced by Senator Williams of New Jersey, and, I may add, also a bill—introduced by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] relating to housing in Alaska, S. 1915.

The date for the hearings will be announced as soon as the schedule is set.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and section-by-section summaries will be printed in the Record.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Sparkman, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2977

A bill to provide incentives to planned metropolitan development and to otherwise assist urban development

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Urban Development Act".

TITLE I—GRANTS TO ASSIST IN PLANNED METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

Findings and declaration of purpose

Sec. 101. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the welfare of the Nation and of its people is directly dependent upon the effective organization and functioning of the metropolitan areas in which two-thirds of its people live and work.

It further finds that the continuing rapid growth of these areas makes it essential that they prepare, keep current, and actually carry out comprehensive plans and programs for their orderly physical development with a view to efficiently meeting all their economic and social needs.

It further finds that metropolitan areas are especially handicapped in this task by the complexity and scope of governmental services required in such rapidly growing areas, the multiplicity of political jurisdictions and agencies involved, and the inadequacy of the operational and administrative arrangements available for cooperation among them.

It further finds that present requirements for areawide planning and programming in connection with various Federal programs have materially assisted in the solution of metropolitan problems, but that additional participation and cooperation are needed from the States and localities in perfecting and carrying out such areawide efforts.

(b) It is the purpose of this title to provide additional encouragement and assistance to States and localities, through supplementary grants for certain Federally-assisted development projects, for making effective comprehensive metropolitan planning and programming.

Grant authority

Sec. 102. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make supplementary grants to applicant State and local public bodies and agencies carrying out, or assisting in carrying out, development projects meeting the requirement of this title.

(b) Grants may be made under this title only for development projects in metropolitan areas for which it has been demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that—

(1) metropolitanwide comprehensive planning and programing provide an adequate basis fo revaluating (A) the location, financing, and scheduling of individual public facility projects (including, but not limited to, sewer, water, and sewage treatment facilities; highway, mass transit, airport, and other transportation facilities; and recreation and other open-space areas) whether or not federally assisted; and (B) other proposed land development or uses, which projects or uses, because of their size, density, type, or location, have public metropolitanwide or interjurisdictional significance;

(2) adequate metropolitanwide institutional or other arrangements exists for coordinating, on the basis of such metropolitanwide comprehensive planning and programing, local public policies and activities affecting the development of the area; and

(3) public facility projects and other land development or uses which have a major impact on the development of the area are, in fact, being carried out in accord with such metropolitanwide comprehensive planning and programing.

(c) Where the applicant for a grant under this title is a county, municipality, or other general-purpose unit of local government, it must demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that taking into consideration the scope of its authority and responsibilities it is adequately assuring that public facility projects and other land development or uses of public metropolitanwide or interjurisdictional significance are being, and will be, carried out in accord with metropolitan planning and programing meeting the requirements of subsection (b). In making this determination the Secretary shall give special consideration to whether the applicant is effectively assisting in, and conforming to, metropolitan planning and programing through (1) the location and scheduling of public facility projects, whether or not federally assisted; and (2) the establishment and consistent administration of zoning codes, subdivision regulations, and similar land-use and density controls.

Where the applicant for a grant under this title is not a general-purpose unit of local government, both it and the general-purpose unit of local government having jurisdiction over the location of the project must meet requirements of this subsection.

(d) In making the determinations required under this section, the Secretary shall obtain, and give full consideration to, the comments of the body or bodies (State or local) responsible for planning and programing for the metropolitan area.

(e) No grant shall be made under this title with respect to a development project for which a Federal grant has been made, or a contract of assistance has been entered into, under the legislation referred to in clause 1 of section 105 prior to February 21, 1966, or more than one year prior to the date on which the Secretary has made the determinations required under this section with respect to the applicant and to the area in which the project is located: *Provided,* That in the case of a project for which a contract of assistance under the legislation referred to in clause 1 of section 105 has been entered into after June 30, 1967, no grant shall be made under this title unless an application for such grant has been made on or before the date of such contract.

Extent of grant

Sec. 103. (a) A grant under this title shall not exceed (1) 20 per centum of the cost of the project for which the grant is made; nor (2) the Federal grant made with respect to the project under the legislation referred to in clause 1 of section 105. In no case shall the total Federal contributions to the cost of such project be more than 80 per centum. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including requirements with respect to non-Federal contributions, grants under this title shall be eligible for inclusion (directly or through refunds or credits) as part of the financing for such projects: *Provided,* That projects or activities on the basis of which assistance is provided under section 6(c) of the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966 shall not be eligible for assistance under this title.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. Appropriations authorized under this title shall remain available until expended when so provided in appropriations Acts.

Consultation and certification

Sec. 104. In carrying out the provisions of this title, including the issuance of regulations, the Secretary shall consult with the Department of the Interior; the Department of Commerce; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Federal Aviation Agency with respect to development projects assisted by those departments and agencies; and he shall, for the purpose of section 103, accept their respective certifications as to the cost of those projects and the amount of the non-Federal contribution paid or to be paid to that cost.

Definitions

Sec. 105. As used in this title—

(1) "development project" means a project assisted or to be assisted under section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965; section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; section 120(a) of title 23, United States Code; section 9 of the Federal Airport Act; section 3 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964; title VII of the Housing Act of 1961; section 5(e) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965; or section 101(a)(1) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of

1965 (for a project of a type which the Secretary determines to be eligible for assistance under other of the provisions listed above);

(2) "State" means any State of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or an agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing;

(3) "metropolitan area" means a standard metropolitan statistical area as established by the Bureau of the Budget, subject, however, to such modifications and extensions as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate; and

(4) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

TITLE II—LAND DEVELOPMENT AND NEW COMMUNITIES

Mortgage insurance for new communities

SEC. 201. Title X of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting after section 1003 the following new section 1004 and redesignating the remaining sections accordingly:

"New communities

"SEC. 1004. (a) New communities consisting of developments, satisfying all other requirements under this title, may be approved under this section by the Secretary for mortgage insurance if they meet the requirements of subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) A development shall be eligible for approval as a new community if the Secretary determines it will, in view of its size and scope, make a substantial contribution to the sound and economic growth of the area within which it is located in the form of—

"(1) substantial economies, made possible through large-scale development, in the provision of improved residential sites;

"(2) adequate housing to be provided for those who would be employed in the community or the surrounding area;

"(3) maximum accessibility from the new residential sites to industrial or other employment centers and commercial, recreational, and cultural facilities in or near the community; and

"(4) maximum accessibility to any major central city in the area".

Mortgage amount and term

SEC. 202. (a) Section 1002(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "$10,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$25,000,000".

(b) Section 1002(d)(1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) contain repayment provisions satisfactory to the Secretary and have a maturity not to exceed seven years, or such longer maturity as the Secretary deems reasonable (A) in the case of a privately owned system for water or sewerage, and (B) in the case of a new community approved under section 1004;".

Encouragement of small builders

SEC. 203. Section 1004 of such Act (redesignated as section 1005) is amended by adding after "broad participation by builders," the words "particularly small builders,".

Water and sewerage facilities

SEC. 204. Section 1005 of such Act (redesignated as section 1006) is amended by adding the following: "In the case of a new community approved by the Secretary pursuant to section 1004, the land shall be served, after its development, by—

"(a) public systems for water and sewerage which are consistent with other existing or prospective systems within the area; or

"(b) existing privately or cooperatively owned systems (including reasonable extensions thereto) which are approved as adequate by the Secretary and are regulated in a manner acceptable to him; or

"(c) if it is necessary to develop a new system and the Secretary determines that public ownership of such a system is not feasible, an adequate privately or cooperatively owned new system (1) which he finds consistent with other existing or prospective systems within the area; (2) which will be regulated, during the period of such ownership, in a manner acceptable to him with respect to user rates and charges, capital structure, methods of operation, and rate of return; and (3) regarding which he receives assurances, satisfactory to him, with respect to eventual public ownership and operation of the system and with respect to the conditions and terms of any sale or transfer."

Federal National Mortgage Association special assistance for new communities

SEC. 205. Section 302(b) of such Act is amended by inserting after "or title VIII," in the proviso the following: "or under title X with respect to a new community approved under section 1004 thereof,".

Urban planning grants

SEC. 206. Section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting the following before the semicolon in paragraph (4): ", or for areas where rapid urbanization is expected to result on land acquired or to be acquired by land development agencies with assistance under section 202(b)(1) of the Housing Amendments of 1955, or on land developed or to be developed as a new community approved under section 1004 of the National Housing Act".

Public facility loans

SEC. 207. Section 202(b) (redesignated below as section 202(c)) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding the following before the period at the end of the second sentence of paragraph (4): ", or (iii) to be provided in connection with the establishment of a new community approved under section 1004 of the National Housing Act".

Loans to land development agencies

SEC. 208. (a) Section 202 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b) and redesignating the remaining subsections accordingly:

"(b)(1) In order to encourage and assist in the timely acquisition of open or predominantly undeveloped land to be utilized in connection with the development of well-planned residential neighborhoods, subdivisions, and communities, the Secretary is authorized to purchase the securities and obligations of, or make loans to, land development agencies to finance the acquisition of a fee simple or other interest in such land for subsequent sale in accordance with this subsection. A loan under this subsection may be in an amount which shall not exceed the total cost, as approved by the Secretary, of acquiring such interest; shall be reasonably secured; shall be repaid in such manner and within such period, not exceeding fifteen years, as may be determined by the Secretary; and shall bear interest at the rate prescribed for financial assistance extended under subsection (a) of this section. As used in this subsection, 'land development agencies' means public corporations, including municipalities, authorized to carry out, and created or designated by or pursuant to State law for the purpose of carrying out, the functions for which financial assistance is available under this subsection.

"(2) The Secretary shall not extend any financial assistance for the acquisition of land under this subsection unless he determines that (A) the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms, (B) the development of a well-planned residential neighborhood, subdivision, or community on such land would be consistent with a comprehensive plan or comprehensive planning, meeting criteria established by the Secretary, for the area in which the land is located, and (C) a preliminary development plan for the use of the land meets criteria established by the Secretary for such preliminary plans.

"(3) Land acquired with financial assistance under this subsection shall be disposed of for development in accordance with a current development plan for the land which has been approved by the Secretary as consistent with provisions of the loan agreement, and shall not be sold or otherwise disposed of for less than its fair value for uses in accord with such development plan. Such plan shall, wherever feasible in the light of current conditions, encourage the provision of sites providing a proper balance of types of housing to serve families having a broad range of incomes. The Secretary shall adopt such requirements as he deems necessary to encourage the maintenance of a diversified local homebuilding industry and broad participation by builders, particularly small builders."

(b) The proviso in section 203(a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by

(1) striking out "section 202(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 202(a) and pursuant to section 202(b)"; and

(2) striking out "of such section" and inserting in lieu thereof "of section 202(a)".

TITLE III—URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

Increase in grant authorization

SEC. 301. (a) Section 4(b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1967" and substituting "$150,000,000 for fiscal year 1967; and $95,000,000 for fiscal year 1968".

(b) Section 6(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "and to $30,000,000 on July 1, 1966" and substituting "$30,000,000 on July 1, 1966; and to $40,000,000 on July 1, 1967".

TITLE IV—GRANTS FOR URBAN INFORMATION CENTERS

Findings and purpose

SEC. 401. (a) The Congress hereby finds that one of the principal impediments to coordinated and effective Federal, State, and local efforts in solving the problems of metropolitan and other urban areas is the lack of ready availability of information respecting the public and private programs and activities directed to their solution. The Congress further finds that the establishment of centers providing information on urban programs and resources would increase the effectiveness of present Federal, State, and local efforts to solve urban problems.

(b) It is the purpose of this title to assist States and metropolitan areas in demonstrating the value of improved and increased efforts in assembling and making available information and data on urban needs and assistance programs and activities through centers established for such purpose.

Grant authority

SEC. 402. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States and metropolitan-area agencies to help finance demonstration programs for the assembly, correlation, and dissemination of information and data needed for improving, coordinating, and more effectively utilizing governmental and other programs and activities available for the solution of local urban problems. Such demonstration programs shall include:

(1) the planning, establishment, and operation of urban information centers; and

(2) the assembly, correlation, and dissemination of urban physical, social, and economic development information and data through such centers for the purposes of:

(A) informing local governments, organizations, and individuals of the availability and status of Federal, State, and local programs and other resources for the solution of urban problems;

(B) providing Federal, State, and local governments with information useful and necessary to planning, programing, budgeting, and coordinating urban programs; or

(C) providing other information and data needed for public and private urban physical, social, and economic development activities.

(b) A demonstration program assisted under this section shall:

(1) specify the activities to be carried on and the kinds of information to be assembled and distributed;

(2) adequately justify its choice of activities, in terms of specified urban physical, social, and economic information needs and objectives, including comparisons of cost and usefulness where appropriate;

(3) represent substantially increased or improved activities on the part of the applicant State or metropolitan-area agency;

(4) contain a detailed budget together with procedures for adequate fiscal control, fund accounting, and auditing;

(5) be closely coordinated with related Federal, State, and local informational activities, including those receiving assistance under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and other Federal programs;

(6) not include any activity receiving assistance under other Federal programs; and

(7) meet such other requirements as the Secretary may establish to carry out the purpose of this title.

Extent of activities

SEC. 403. (a) An urban information center established by a metropolitan-area agency under this title shall be directed primarily to the provision of informational services of general metropolitanwide utility or of utility to the communities within that metropolitan area.

(b) An urban information center established by a State under this title shall be directed primarily to the provision of informational services of general statewide utility or of utility to communities not within metropolitan areas for which information centers have been established under this title.

Amount of grant

SEC. 404. (a) A grant under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost of the activities carried on under an approved program during one year.

(b) No grant shall be made under this title to assist in assembling data, or providing information, to be used primarily in the day-to-day operations of State or local governing bodies and agencies.

Federal information activities

SEC. 405. (a) Federal departments and agencies shall cooperate with States and metropolitan-area agencies in providing information to assist in carrying out the purpose of this title.

(b) The President shall undertake such studies to improve Federal agency program information capability and coordination as he may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

Evaluation of program

SEC. 406. The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable but not later than June 30, 1971, report to the President as to the effectiveness of the assistance provided under this title, and submit recommendations and appropriate legislative proposals regarding its termination or continuance.

Definitions

SEC. 407. As used in this title—

(1) "State" means any State of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or an agency or instrumentality designated by the chief executive of any of the foregoing;

(2) "metropolitan area" means a standard metropolitan statistical area as established by the Bureau of the Budget, subject however to such modifications and extensions as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate;

(3) "metropolitan-area agency" means (A) an organization or body composed of public officials which the Secretary determines to be representative of the political jurisdictions encompassing a metropolitan area; or (B) where no such organization exists and can qualify for a grant under this title, a public body or agency (i) designated by the governing body of that political jurisdiction within the area which contains the largest population, according to the most recent decennial census, and (ii) concurred in by other local political jurisdictions which, together with the designating jurisdiction, contain at least two-thirds of the population of the area; and

(4) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Appropriations

SEC. 408. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title: *Provided*, That such appropriations shall not exceed $5,000,000 before July 1, 1967, nor exceed $10,000,000 before July 1, 1968. Appropriations authorized under this title shall remain available until expended when so provided in appropriations acts.

The section-by-section summary accompanying Senate bill 2977 is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT

Section 1. Short title: The bill would be cited as the "Urban Development Act."

TITLE I. GRANTS TO ASSIST IN PLANNED METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

This title would provide the incentives for effective metropolitan planning and development recommended by the President in his recent message on city demostration programs. The major new objective is assurance of actual physical development of projects in the metropolitan area in accordance with the planning. The incentive consists of increased aid to federally assisted projects of a type which generally affect the growth of such area. This incentive would be given only where all public and private development in the area having a major regional impact is consistent with planned metropolitan development.

Section 101. Findings and declaration of purpose: Subsection (a) of this section would set forth congressional findings (1) that it is essential that metropolitan areas prepare, keep current, and actually carry out comprehensive plans and programs for their orderly physical development; (2) that these areas are especially handicapped by the complexity and scope of governmental services required, the multiplicity of political jurisdictions and agencies involved, and the inadequacy of the operational and administrative arrangements available for cooperation among them; (3) that present requirements for areawide planning and programing in connection with various Federal programs have materially assisted in the solution of metropolitan problems; but (4) that additional participation and cooperation are needed from the States and localities in perfecting and carrying out such areawide efforts.

Subsection (b) of this section would declare that the purpose of this title is to provide additional encouragement and assistance to States and localities, through supplementary grants for certain federally assisted development projects, for making effective comprehensive metropolitan planning and programing.

Section 102. Grant authority: Subsection (a) of this section would authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make supplementary grants to applicant State and local public bodies and agencies carrying out, or assisting in carrying out, development projects meeting the requirements of this title.

Subsection (b) of this section would specify that grants may be made under this title only for development projects in metropolitan areas for which it has been demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that metropolitanwide comprehensive planning and programing provide an adequate basis for evaluating as to consistency (A) the location, financing, and scheduling of individual public facility projects (including, but not limited to, sewer, water, and sewage treatment facilities; highway, mass transit, airport, and other transportation facilities; and recreation and other open-space areas) whether or not federally assisted; and (B) other proposed land development or uses, which projects or uses, because of their size, density, type, or location, have public metropolitanwide or interjurisdictional significance.

In addition, no metropolitan area would be eligible for the grants unless it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Secretary that adequate metropolitanwide institutional or other arrangements, such as a metropolitan council of governments, exist for coordinating local public development policies and activities on the basis of the metropolitanwide comprehensive planning and programing; and that public facility projects and other land development or uses (public or private) which have a major impact on the development of the area are, in fact, being carried out in accord with the metropolitanwide comprehensive planning and programing.

Subsection (c) of this section would specify that where the applicant for a grant under this title is a county, municipality, or other general-purpose unit of local government, it must demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Secretary that taking into consideration the scope of its authority and responsibilities it is adequately assuring that public facility projects and other land development or uses of public metropolitanwide or interjurisdictional significance are being, and will be, carried out in accord with metropolitan planning and programing meeting the requirements of subsection (b). In making this determination the Secretary is to give special consideration to whether the applicant is effectively assisting in, and conforming to, metropolitan planning and programing through (1) the location and scheduling of public facility projects (including, but not limited to, sewer, water, and sewage treatment facilities; highway, mass transit, airport, and other transportation facilities; and recreation and other open-space areas) whether or not federally assisted; and (2) its establishment and consistent administration of zoning codes, subdivision regulations, and similar land-use and density controls.

This subsection would further specify that where the applicant for a grant under this title is not a general-purpose unit of local government, both it and the general-purpose unit of local government having jurisdiction over the location of the project must meet the requirements of this subsection.

Under subsection (c) of this section, a political jurisdiction could receive these supplementary grants although some of its neighboring jurisdictions in the metropolitan area are ineligible for the aid because of departures from comprehensive metropolitan planning. However, under subsection (b), where such a departure by any jurisdiction in the metropolitan area has a major impact on the development of the metropolitan area, no jurisdiction in that area would be eligible for the supplementary grants under this title.

Subsection (d) of this section would specify that, in making the determination required under this section, the Secretary is to obtain, and give full consideration to, the comments of the body or bodies (State or local) responsible for planning and programing for the metropolitan area.

Subsection (e) of this section would provide that no grant may be made under this title with respect to a development project for which a Federal grant has been made, or a contract of assistance has been entered into, under the legislation referred to in clause 1 of section 105 prior to February —, 1966 (date of introduction), or more than 1 year prior to the date on which the Secretary has made the determinations required under this section with respect to the applicant and to the area in which the project is located. In the case of a project for which a contract of assistance under the legislation referred to in clause 1 of section 105 has been entered into after June 30, 1967, there is a further provision that no grant may be made under this title unless an application for such grant has been made on or before the date of such contract.

Section 103. Extent of grant: Subsection (a) of this section would limit a grant under this title to 20 percent of the cost of the project for which the grant is made. Also, the grant under this title could never exceed the Federal grant made to the project under other legislation. In no case are the total Federal contributions to the cost of such projects to be more than 80 percent.

It would be specified that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, including requirements with respect to non-Federal contributions, grants under this title would be eligible for inclusion (directly or through refunds or credits when a portion of the local share has meanwhile been paid in) as a part of the financing for such projects. Projects or activities on the basis of which assistance is received under section 6(c) of the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966 are not to be eligible for assistance under this title.

Subsection (b) of this section would authorize the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. Such appropriations would remain available until expended, when so provided in appropriations acts.

Section 104. Consultation and certification: This section would require the Secretary, in carrying out the provisions of this title, including the issuance of regulations, to consult with the Department of the Interior, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Federal Aviation Agency with respect to development projects assisted by those departments and agencies and, for the purpose of section 103 of this title, to accept their respective certifications as to the cost of those projects and the amount of the non-Federal contribution paid or to be paid to that cost.

Section 105. Definitions: This section would define certain terms used in the title:

1. "Development project" is defined to mean a State or local project assisted under certain specified Federal programs. (These programs are those which most often involve projects affecting the pattern of local land use and local growth.) The specified programs are—

(a) Grants for basic water and sewer facilities, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development under section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965;

(b) Grants for construction of sewage treatment works, administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act;

(c) Grants for highway construction (Federal-aid primary and secondary systems, but not the Interstate System) administered by the Department of Commerce under section 120(a) of title 23, United States Code;

(d) Grants for airport development, administered by the Federal Aviation Agency under section 9 of the Federal Airport Act;

(e) Grants for urban mass transportation facilities and equipment, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development under section 3 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964;

(f) Grants for acquisition and development of open space, or for beautification and improvement of public land, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development under title VII of the Housing Act of 1961;

(g) Grants for the acquisition and development of lands and waters for recreational purposes, administered by the Department of the Interior under section 5(e) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965; and

(h) Grants for public works and facilities, administered by the Department of Commerce under section 101(a)(1) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (but only if they involve works or facilities of a type which the Secretary determines to be eligible under sections (a) through (g) above).

2. "State" means any State of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or an agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing.

3. "Metropolitan area" means a standard metropolitan statistical area as established by the Bureau of the Budget, subject however to such modifications and extensions as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate.

4. "Secretary" means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

TITLE II. LAND DEVELOPMENT AND NEW COMMUNITIES

This title would expand the FHA mortgage insurance program for privately financed land development under title X of the National Housing Act (which was enacted as part of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965). It would authorize the Secretary to approve "new communities" for which certain special aids would be available, and would increase from $10 million to $25 million the maximum outstanding mortgage amount permitted under title X. In addition, this title would (in section 208) authorize loans by the Secretary to State or local land development agencies (which would be public corporations, including municipalities) to finance the acquisition of land to be utilized in connection with the development of well-planned residential neighborhoods, subdivisions, and communities.

Section 201. Mortgage insurance for new communities: This section would authorize the Secretary to approve a category of "new communities" for mortgage insurance under title X. These would consist of land developments, satisfying all other requirements under the title, which meet the special requirements of the section. (Subsequent sections of this title would authorize longer mortgage maturities and FNMA special assistance for this category of land development which would not be available to land developments, even though very extensive, which are not approved as meeting the special requirements.)

A development would be eligible for approval as a new community if the Secretary determines it will, in view of its size and scope, make a substantial contribution to the sound and economic growth of the area within which it is located. Such contribution would be in the form of—

1. Substantial economies, made possible through large-scale development, in the provision of improved residential sites;

2. Adequate housing to be provided for those who would be employed in the community or the surrounding area;

3. Maximum accessibility from the new residential sites to industrial or other employment centers and commercial, recreational, and cultural facilities in or near the community; and

4. Maximum accessibility to any major central city in the area.

This section contemplates development planned to provide a wide range of urban facilities and services, while maintaining close ties with any nearby major city.

The objectives and planning criteria for the existing land development program would also be applicable with respect to new communities. The Secretary would, under already enacted provisions of title X, review the site development plan to determine that it was consistent with overall comprehensive plans or planning actually being carried out for the area in which the community is to be located.

Section 202. Mortgage amount and term: This section would increase from $10 million to $25 million the maximum mortgage amount permitted at any one time for a single land development under title X. This increase would provide the flexibility needed to assure sufficient credit assistance for very large developments, including new communities or very large subdivisions.

The section would also exempt new communities approved by the Secretary from the 7-year maximum mortgage maturity generally applicable under existing law to mortgages under the land development program. Such an exemption is already provided in the case of privately owned water or sewerage systems.

Section 203. Encouragement of small builders: This section would make it clear that the present requirements for encouraging broad participation by builders in the land development program are intended particularly to encourage participation by small builders.

Section 204. Water and sewerage facilities: This section would require that in the case of a new community approved by the Secretary, the land shall be served, after its development, by (1) public systems for water and sewerage which are consistent with other existing or prospective systems in the area, or (2) by existing privately or cooperatively owned systems (including reasonable extensions thereto) which are approved by the Secretary and are regulated in a manner acceptable to him. However, the section also provides that, where there is no existing system that can serve the area and the Secretary determines that public ownership of a new system is not feasible, the land may be served by an adequate privately or cooperatively owned new system, under the following conditions:

1. The Secretary finds the system consistent with other existing or prospective systems within the area;

2. The system will be regulated, during the period of such private or cooperative ownership, in a manner acceptable to the Secretary with respect to user rates and charges, capital structure, methods of operation, and rate of return; and

3. The Secretary receives assurances, satisfactory to him, with respect to eventual public ownership and operation of the system and with respect to the conditions and terms of any sale or transfer.

Section 205. Federal National Mortgage Association special assistance for new communities: This section would, where the aid is needed, make FHA-insured mortgages with respect to new communities eligible for purchase by the Federal National Mortgage Association under its special assistance program. FHA-insured land development mortgages are now eligible for FNMA purchase under its secondary market program.

Section 206. Urban planning grants: This section would make urban planning grants under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 available to official governmental planning agencies for areas where new communities are to be developed with mortgage insurance assistance or where land is being acquired by land development agencies designated or created pursuant to State law. (Federal grants to local planning agencies for such planning are now available for metropolitan areas, depressed areas, and federally impacted areas.)

Section 207. Public facility loans: This section would waive the population limit (50,000) on the political jurisdiction eligible to receive public facility loans under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 in the case of public facilities serving new communities within such large jurisdictions.

Section 208. Loans to land development agencies: This section would authorize the Secretary to make loans to land development agencies to finance the acquisition of land to be utilized in connection with the development of well-planned residential neighborhoods, subdivisions, and communities. These land development agencies would include municipalities and other public corporations which are designated or created pursuant to State law. The land acquired would be sold to private builders, possibly after installation of basic public facilities, for the construction of well-planned developments. These could be residential neighborhoods, housing subdivisions, or more extensive developments, including new communities. The land could be developed by the private owners with or without the mortgage insurance assistance available under title X of the National Housing Act.

The loans would be limited to an amount not exceeding the total cost, as approved by the Secretary, of the acquisition of a fee simple or other interest in the land. The loans would be required to be reasonably secured and would be repayable within a period not exceeding 15 years at an interest rate of not more than the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States forming a part of the public debt, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth percent, plus one-half percent. For the current fiscal year this formula produces an interest rate of 4 percent.

Loans for land acquisition would not be made unless the Secretary determines that:

1. Private financing is not otherwise available on reasonable terms;

2. The development of a well-planned residential neighborhood, housing subdivision, or community on the land would be consistent with a comprehensive plan or with comprehensive planning, meeting criteria established by the Secretary, for the area in which the land is located; and

3. A preliminary development plan for the use of the land meets criteria which he has established.

The criteria for comprehensive planning would include criteria designed to assure maximum accessibility of the planned developments to any major central cities in the area.

The land acquired would be required to be developed in accordance with a development plan approved by the Secretary as consistent with the provisions of the loan agreement. Sales of the land to private persons could not be for less than its fair value for uses in accord with the approved development plan. A development plan, wherever feasible in the light of current conditions, would be required to encourage the provision of sites providing a proper balance of types of housing to serve families having a broad range of incomes. The Secretary would adopt requirements necessary to encourage the maintenance of a diversified local homebuilding industry and broad participation by builders, particularly small builders.

This program would assist the State governments that wish to establish land development agencies in order to take advantage of the State government's unique powers to promote the planned development of future urban growth. Cities, counties, and other political subdivisions could be designated by or under State law as land development agencies to participate in this program.

The loans authorized would be made from the revolving fund established by title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 to finance the public facility loans program. No additional authorization is now necessary. It is estimated that during the first full year of operations the amount of Federal funds committed for these new loans would not exceed $25 million.

TITLE III. URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

Section 301. Increase in grant authorization: Subsection (a) would increase by $95 million the authorization for grants under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. This act presently authorizes the appropriation of $75 million for grants for fiscal year 1965 and $150 million for each of fiscal years 1966 and 1967. Amounts authorized for a particular year but not appropriated may instead be appropriated for any later year.

Only $320 million of the present $375 million authorization has been appropriated, including $130 million provided, by "advance appropriation," for fiscal year 1967. The remaining $55 million authorization, plus the proposed additional $95 million, will be needed for the $150 million program level proposed for fiscal year 1968.

Appropriations are needed now for fiscal 1968 in order to continue the present policy of providing advance appropriations for this program, at least a year ahead of the current fiscal year. Such advance appropriations provide necessary assurance to the urban areas making use of these grants that Federal funds will in fact be available for local projects when needed. These projects frequently take several years to plan and institute, and it is greatly in the Federal interest to encourage, rather than discourage, adequate planning for them.

Subsection (b) would make a corresponding change in the provision in the act authorizing up to $10 million per year for research, development and demonstration projects. An additional $10 million would be authorized for such projects, during fiscal year 1968.

TITLE IV. GRANTS FOR URBAN INFORMATION CENTERS

Section 401. Findings and purpose: Subsection (a) of this section would set forth congressional findings that one of the principal impediments to coordinated and effective Federal, State, and local efforts in solving the problems of metropolitan and other urban areas is the lack of ready availability of information respecting the public and private programs and activities directed to their solution; and that the establishment of centers providing information on urban programs and resources would increase the effectiveness of present Federal, State, and local efforts to solve urban problems.

Subsection (b) of this section would declare the purpose of this title to be to assist States and metropolitan areas in demonstrating the value of improved and increased efforts in assembling and making available information and data on urban needs and assistance programs and activities through centers established for such purposes.

Section 402. Grant authority: Subsection (a) of this section would authorize the Secretary to make grants to States and metropolitan-area agencies to help finance demonstration programs for the assembly, correlation, and dissemination of information and data needed for improving, coordinating, and more effectively utilizing governmental and other programs and activities available for the solution of local urban problems. These demonstration programs are to include the planning, establishment, and operation of urban information centers; and the assembly, correlation, and dissemination of urban physical, social, and economic development information and data through such centers for the purposes of:

1. Informing local governments, organizations, and individuals of the availability and status of Federal, State, and local programs and other resources for the solution of urban problems;

2. Providing Federal, State, and local governments with information useful and necessary to planning, programing, budgeting, and coordinating urban programs; or

3. Providing other information and data needed for public and private urban physical, social, and economic development activities.

The programs would not include collecting original data, such as population data.

Subsection (b) of this section would require a demonstration program assisted under this section to:

1. Specify the activities to be carried on and the kinds of information to be assembled and distributed;

2. Adequately justify its choice of activities, in terms of specified urban physical, social, and economic information needs and objectives, including comparisons of cost and usefulness where appropriate;

3. Represent substantially increased or improved activities on the part of the applicant State or metropolitan-area agency;

4. Contain a detailed budget together with procedures for adequate fiscal control, fund accounting, and auditing;

5. Be closely coordinated with related Federal, State, and local informational activities, including those receiving assistance under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and other Federal programs;

6. Not include any activity receiving assistance under other Federal programs; and

7. Meet such other requirements as the Secretary may establish to carry out the purpose of this title.

Section 403. Extent of activities: Subsection (a) of this section would require an urban information center established by a metropolitan-area agency under this title to be directed primarily to the provision of informational services of general metropolitan-wide utility or of utility to the communities within that metropolitan area.

Subsection (b) of this section would require an urban information center established by a State under this title to be directed primarily to the provision of informational services of general statewide utility or of utility to communities not within metropolitan areas for which information centers have been established under this title.

Section 404. Amount of grant: Subsection (a) of this section would limit a grant under this section to 50 percent of the cost of the activities carried on under an approved program during 1 year.

Subsection (b) of this section would prohibit grants under this title to assist in assembling data or providing information, to be used primarily in the day-to-day operations of State or local governing bodies and agencies.

Section 405. Federal information activities: Subsection (a) of this section would require Federal departments and agencies to cooperate with States and metropolitan-area agencies in providing information to assist in carrying out the purpose of this title.

Subsection (b) of this section would require the President to undertake such studies to improve Federal agency program information capability and coordination as he may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

Section 406. Evaluation of program: This section would require the Secretary, as soon as practicable but not later than June 30, 1971, to report to the President as to the effectiveness of the assistance provided under this title, and to submit recommendations and appropriate legislative proposals regarding its termination or continuance.

Section 407. Definitions: This section would specify that, as used in this title—

1. "State" means any State of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or an agency or instrumentality designated by the chief executive of any of the foregoing;

2. "metropolitan area" means a standard metropolitan statistical area as established by the Bureau of the Budget, subject however to such modifications and extensions as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate;

3. "metropolitan-area agency" means (A) an organization or body composed of public officials which the Secretary determines to be representative of the political jurisdictions encompassing a metropolitan area; or (B) where no such organization exists and can qualify for a grant under this title, a public body or agency (i) designated by the governing body of that political jurisdiction within the area which contains the largest population, according to the most recent decennial census, and (ii) concurred in by other local political jurisdictions which, together with the designating jurisdiction, contain at least two-thirds of the population of the area; and

4. "Secretary" means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Section 408. Appropriations: This section would authorize the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. However, such appropriations are not to exceed $5 million before July 1, 1967, nor exceed $10 million before July 1, 1968. Appropriations authorized under this title are to remain available until expended when so provided in appropriations acts.

S. 2978

A bill to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Housing and Urban Development Amendments of 1966".

TITLE I—HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENTS

FHA-insured property improvement loans

SEC. 101. Section 2 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end of subsection (f) a new sentence as follows: "The amount of such premium charge with respect to loans made or refinanced within one year after the date of enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Amendments of 1966 may be included in computing the cost of improvements or of refinancing and may be deducted by the lender from the loan proceeds.".

Cooperative housing insurance fund

SEC. 102. Section 213 of the National Housing Act is amended by—

(1) striking out ", but only in cases where the consent of the mortgagee or lender to the transfer is obtained or a request by the mortgagee or lender for the transfer is received by the Commissioner within such period of time after the date of the enactment of this subsection as the Commissioner shall prescribe" preceding the colon before the proviso in subsection (m);

(2) striking out "insured under this section and sections 207, 231 and 232" in subsection (n) and inserting in lieu thereof "the insurance of which is the obligation of either the Management Fund or the General Insurance Fund"; and

(3) adding a new sentence at the end of subsection (n) as follows: "Premium charges on the insurance of mortgages or loans transferred to the Management Fund or insured pursuant to commitments transferred to the Management Fund may be payable in debentures which are the obligation of either the Management Fund or of the General Insurance Fund."

Mortgage limits for homes under section 221(d)(2)

SEC. 103. Section 221(d)(2)(A) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "$11,000" and "$18,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$12,500" and "$20,000", respectively.

Low-rent housing for displaced families—Term of lease

SEC. 104. Section 23(d) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and the following: "*Provided,* That the term may exceed thirty-six months where the public housing agency determines that the housing leased under this section is needed for displaced families."

Low-rent housing—Use of newly constructed private housing

SEC. 105. (a) Section 10(c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out "existing structures" in the last proviso, and inserting in lieu thereof "private accommodations".

(b) Section 23(a)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out from the first clause thereof the words "an existing" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "a".

Applying advances in technology to housing and urban development

SEC. 106. (a) To encourage and assist the housing industry to continue to reduce the cost and improve the quality of housing by the application to home construction of advances in technology, and to encourage and assist the application of advances in technology to urban development activities, the Secretary is directed to—

(1) conduct research and studies to test and demonstrate new and improved techniques and methods of applying advances in technology to housing construction, rehabilitation and maintenance, and urban development activities; and

(2) encourage and promote the acceptance and application of new and improved techniques and methods of constructing, rehabilitating and maintaining housing and the application of advances in technology to urban development activities by all segments of the housing industry, communities, industries engaged in urban development activities and the general public.

(b) Research and studies conducted under this section shall be designed to test and demonstrate the applicability to housing construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance, and urban development activities, of advances in technology relating to (1) design concepts, (2) construction and rehabilitation methods, (3) manufacturing processes, (4) materials and products, and (5) building components.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to carry out the research and studies authorized by this section either directly or by contract with public or private bodies or agenices, or by working agreement with departments and agencies of the Federal Government, as he may determine to be desirable. Contracts may be made by the Secretary for research and studies authorized by this section for work to continue not more than two years from the date of any such contract.

(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. All funds so appropriated shall remain available until expended when so provided in appropriation acts.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall limit any authority of the Secretary under title III of the Housing Act of 1948, section 602 of the Housing Act of 1956, or any other provision of law.

Rehabilitation and code enforcement grants

SEC. 107. The second proviso under the head "Urban Renewal Administration" in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966, is repealed.

Mortgage insurance for land development—Clarifying amendment

SEC. 108. (a) Section 1001(c) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "'mortgage'" and inserting in lieu thereof "'mortgagee'".

(b) Section 1001(d) of the National Housing Act is amended—

(1) by inserting after the words "sewerage disposal installations," the following: "steam, gas, and electric lines and installations,";

(2) by striking out the semicolon after "or common use", and inserting in lieu thereof a period and the following new sentence: "Related uses may include industrial uses, with sites for such uses to be in proper proportion to the size and scope of the development.";

(3) by striking out "but such term" and inserting in lieu thereof; "The term improvements"; and

(4) by inserting after "sewage disposal installation," in clause (1) the following: "or a steam, gas, or electric line or installation,".

(c) Section 512 of such Act is amended by striking out "or IX" and inserting in lieu thereof "IX, or X".

Repeal of provision for sale of Forest Hills Project, Paducah

SEC. 109. Section 1005 of the Housing Act of 1964 is hereby repealed.

Technical amendments

SEC. 110. (a) Section 106(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 is repealed.

(b) Section 113(a) of the Housing Act of 1949 and section 701(a)(3) of the Housing Act of 1954 are amended by inserting "(or any act supplementary thereto)" after "Area Redevelopment Act".

(c) Section 227(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "subsection (b)(2)" in clause (vi) and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (b)".

(d) Section 304(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "and the Association shall not purchase any mortgage insured or guaranteed prior to the effective date of the Housing Act of 1954".

(e) The last sentence of section 305(e) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "supplementing" and inserting in lieu thereof "supplementary".

(f) Section 308 of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "(a)".

TITLE II—CONFORMING NOMENCLATURE IN STATUTES TO DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT

SEC. 201. (a) The National Housing Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Federal Housing Administration" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development";

(2) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(3) by striking out "Commissioner" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"; and

(4) by striking out "Commissioner's" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary's".

(b) The heading appearing above section 1 of such Act is amended by striking out

"Creation of Federal Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Administrative Provisions".

(c) Section 1 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out the first paragraph;

(2) by adding after "Secretary" where it first appears in the second paragraph the following: "(hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary')"; and

(3) by striking out "Administration" in the last sentence of the second paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "Department".

(d) Sections 2(c)(2), 204(g), 604(g) and 904(f) of such Act are amended by striking out "the Commissioner or by any Assistant Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "an officer".

(e) The first sentence of section 206 of such Act is amended by striking out "shall be deposited" and inserting in lieu thereof "related to insurance under section 203 shall be deposited".

(f) The first sentence of section 209 of such Act is amended by adding "in connection with the insurance programs" after "made".

(g) Section 220(d)(1)(A) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(2) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary";

(3) by striking out "certification to the Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "determination"; and

(4) by striking out each place it appears "certified to the Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "determined".

(h) Section 223(a)(2) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(2) by striking out "said Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(i) The heading appearing above section 226 of such Act is amended by striking out "FHA".

(j) Section 302(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "a constituent agency of the Housing and Home Finance Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(k) Sections 302(c) and 306(e) are amended by striking out "House and Home Finance Agency or its Administrator, or by such Agency's constituent units or agencies or the heads thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development or its Secretary".

(l) Sections 303(g) and 308 of such Act are amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(m) Section 308 of such Act is further amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(n) The third paragraph of section 603(a) is amended by striking out "in any field office of" and inserting in lieu thereof "by".

(o) The second paragraph of section 610 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(2) by striking out "said Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(p) Section 803(b)(2) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Secretary or his designee" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Defense or his designee";

(2) by striking out "certified by the Secretary" in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "certified by the Secretary of Defense";

(3) by striking out "require the Secretary" in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "require the Secretary of Defense"; and

(4) by striking out "Secretary to guarantee" in the fourth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Defense to guarantee".

(q) Section 807 of such Act is amended by striking out the second sentence.

(r) Section 809 is amended—

(1) by striking out "Secretary or his designee" in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Defense or his designee";

(2) by striking out "Secretary to guarantee" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Defense to guarantee";

(3) by striking out "'Secretary or his designee', and 'Secretary'" in subsection (g)(2)(i) and inserting in lieu thereof "'Secretary of Defense or his designee', and 'Secretary of Defense'"; and

(4) by striking out "such Administration" in both places it appears in subsection (g)(2)(iii) and inserting in lieu thereof "National Aeronautics and Space Administration".

(s) Section 903(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(t) Section 903(d) of such Act is amended by striking out ", with the approval of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator,".

(u) Section 1003(b)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

Sec. 202. (a) The United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(b) Section 3 of such Act is amended by—

(1) striking out "Department of the Interior" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development";

(2) by striking out "an Administrator," and all that follows in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary.";

(3) by striking out the first sentence of subsection (c); and

(4) by striking out "neither the administrator nor any" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "no".

(c) Section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out subsections (a) and (b) and redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as (a) and (b).

(d) Section 5(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "shall sue" and inserting in lieu thereof "may sue".

(e) Subsection (c) of section 5 of such Act is deleted and subsections (d) and (e) are redesignated as (c) and (d), respectively.

(f) Section 7(b) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(2) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(g) Section 13 of such Act is amended by striking out "4(d)" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "4(b)".

(h) Section 16(1) of such Act is amended by striking out in the proviso "suits shall" and inserting in lieu thereof "suits may".

(i) Subsections (3) and (4) of section 16 of such Act are deleted and subsection (5) is redesignated as (3).

(j) Section 22 of such Act is amended by striking out "first" in the proviso at the end of subsection (b).

Sec. 203. Section 20 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act is amended—

(a) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter in this section referred to as the Administrator)" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter in this section referred to as the Secretary)"; and

(b) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

Sec. 204. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act is amended by striking out "Federal Public Housing Authority (or Public Housing Administration)" and inserting in lieu thereof "United States Housing Authority".

Sec. 205. (a) Section 301 of the Housing Act of 1948 is amended—

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(2) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"; and

(3) by striking out the last two sentences of subsection (a).

(b) Section 302 of such Act is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(c) Section 304 of such Act is repealed.

(d) Section 502 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(2) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary";

(3) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" each place it appears in the first and fourth sentences of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "United States Housing Authority";

(4) by striking out "Administration" each place it appears in the third sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "Authority";

(5) by striking out "shall sue" in the first sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "may sue";

(6) by striking out the second sentence of subsection (b);

(7) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Home Loan Bank Board" at the beginning of subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board";

(8) by striking out in subsection (c) "Home Loan Bank Board) the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Federal Home Loan Bank Board)";

(9) by striking out in subsection (c)(3) "Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board";

(10) by striking out in subsection (c)(3) "said officers or agencies" and inserting in lieu thereof "said officer or agency";

(11) by striking out in subsection (d) "Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner, respectively, may utilize funds made available to them" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may utilize funds made available to him"; and

(12) by striking out in subsection (d) "of the respective agencies."

Sec. 206. (a) Section 2 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "The Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituent agencies" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(b) Title I of such Act is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(c) Section 101(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "to the constituent agencies affected:".

(d) Section 106(a) of such Act is amended by striking out paragraph (1) and redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as (1) and (2).

(e) Section 107(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "Public Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(f) Section 110(j) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(j) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(g) Section 601 of such Act is amended by striking out "The Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the head of each constituent agency of the Housing and Home Finance Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(h) The heading above section 605 is repealed.

(i) Section 605 is repealed.

(j) Section 612 of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

Sec. 207. Section 602(d)(11) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or any officer or constituent agency therein," and inserting in lieu thereof "the Department of Housing and Urban Development or any officer".

Sec. 208. (a) Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(b) Section 402(c)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "Federal Security Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare".

(c) Section 404 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(f) 'Secretary' means the Secretary. of Housing and Urban Development".

(d) Section 507 is amended—

(1) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development", and

(2) by striking out "Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department".

(e) Section 508 of such Act is amended by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

Sec. 209. Section 304 of the Territorial Enabling Act of 1950 is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

Sec. 210. (a) Sections 312, 314, 701, and 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 are amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(b) Section 125 of such Act is amended by striking out "Commissioner" in both places where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(c) Section 314(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(d) Section 703 of such Act is amended by striking out clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "(2) the term 'Secretary' shall mean the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;".

(e) Section 801 (a) and (b) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(2) by striking out "Commissioner" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(f) Section 802(a) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "FHA";

(2) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(3) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(g) Section 811 of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency, including its constituent agencies" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(h) Section 814 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(2) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency (or any official or constituent thereof)" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development";

(3) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency (or such official or constituent thereof)" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(4) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency or any official or constituent agency thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(i) Section 816 of such Act is amended by striking out "Public Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(j) Section 817 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(2) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

Sec. 211. Sections 32 and 62(a) of the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 are amended by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

Sec. 212. (a) Title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(b) Section 102 of such Amendments is amended by striking out subsection (h).

(c) Section 113 of such Act is repealed.

(d) Section 202 of such Amendments is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(e) Section 403 of such Amendments is amended by striking out "Commissioner" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(f) Section 404 of such Amendments is amended—

(1) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(2) by striking out "Commissioner" each place it appears in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(g) Section 406 of such Amendments is amended—

(1) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(2) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(3) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

Sec. 213. (a) Section 104(d) of the Housing Act of 1956 is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(b) Section 602 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(2) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"; and

(3) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

Sec. 214. (a) Section 104 of the Housing Act of 1957 is amended by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(b) Section 604 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(2) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(c) Section 605 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(2) by striking out "Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

Sec. 215. (a) Sections 52, 53 and 56 of the Alaska Omnibus Act are amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(b) Section 53 of such Act is further amended by striking out "Administrator" in the second paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

Sec. 216. (a) Section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 is amended—

(1) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary";

(2) by striking out the comma and the clause beginning with "except" at the end of subsection (c)(2); and

(3) by striking out subsection (d)(6) and inserting in lieu thereof "(6) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(b) Section 306(b) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(2) by striking out "Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(c) Sections 802(a) and 808 are amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance

Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

Sec. 217. Section 5 of the Act of September 8, 1960, is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

Sec. 218. (a) Sections 207 and 312 of the Housing Act of 1961 are amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(b) Title VII of such Act is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(c) Section 312 of such Act is further amended by striking out "Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(d) Section 702 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator')" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary')"; and

(2) by striking out "Secretary from time to time" in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Interior from time to time".

(e) Section 905 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Public Housing Administration are" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is"; and

(2) by striking out "Administration" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

Sec. 219. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "Federal Housing Administration" in section 224(b) (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

Sec. 220. Section 2 of the Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962 is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Agency" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

Sec. 221. (a) The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(b) Section 9(c)(3) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;".

(c) The title of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

Sec. 222. (a) Section 312 and Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 are amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(b) Section 107(g) of such Act is amended by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(c) Section 312 of such Act is further amended—

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(2) by striking out subsection (b)(4) and inserting in lieu thereof, "(4) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(3) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" in subsection (c)(4)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(d) Section 318 of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(e) Section 805 of such Act is amended by striking out "'Administrator' means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(f) Section 810 of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(g) Section 1005 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(2) by striking out "Federal Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(h) Section 1006 of such Act is amended by striking out "Public Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(i) Section 1007 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Public Housing Commissioner are" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is"; and

(2) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

Sec. 223. (a) The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears in sections 101(c), (d), (e) and (g); 301(b); 313(b); 315(a)(8); 402 and 404(a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(b) Title VII of such Act is amended by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(c) Section 101 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator')" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary')"; and

(2) by striking out all of the second sentence of subsection (g) and inserting in lieu thereof "Nothing contained in this section shall affect the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to any housing assisted under this section, sections 221(d)(3) and 231(c)(3) of the National Housing Act, and section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, including the authority to prescribe occupancy requirements under other provisions of law or to determine the portion of such housing which may be occupied by qualified tenants."

(d) Section 107 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" in subsection (a)(2)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(2) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" each place it appears in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(e) Section 108(d) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Federal Housing Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and the Secretary"; and

(2) by striking out "Commissioner" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(f) Section 301 of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in the third sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(g) Section 315 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in subsection (a)(8) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(2) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator and Public Housing Commissioner are" in subsections (b)(1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is"; and

(3) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" in subsection (b)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(h) Section 401(5) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(5) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(i) Section 702 of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter in this title referred to as the 'Administrator')" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter in this title referred to as the 'Secretary')".

(j) Section 1113 of such Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

Sec. 224. Section 501 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1966 is amended—

(a) by striking out "Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(b) by striking out "Administrator" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

Sec. 225. (a) Sections 493, 657 and 1006 of Title 18, United States Code, are amended by striking out "Federal Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(b) The eighth paragraph of section 709 of such Title is amended to read as follows:

"Whoever uses as a firm or business name the words 'Department of Housing and Urban Development', 'Housing and Home Finance Agency', 'Federal Housing Administration', 'Federal National Mortgage Association', 'United States Housing Authority' or 'Public Housing Administration' or the letters 'HUD', 'FHA', 'PHA', 'USHA', or any combination or variation of those words or the letters 'HUD', 'FHA', 'PHA', or 'USHA' alone or with other words or letters reasonably calculated to convey the false impression that such name or business has some connection with, or authorization from, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the United States Housing Authority, the Public Housing Administration, the Government of the United States or any agency thereof, which does not in fact exist, or falsely claims that any repair, improvement, or alteration of any existing structure is required or recommended by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the United States Housing Authority, the Public Housing Administration, the Government of the United States or any agency thereof, for the purpose of inducing any person to enter into a contract for the making of such repairs, alterations, or improvements, or falsely advertises or falsely represents by any device whatsoever that any housing unit, project, business, or product has been in any way endorsed, authorized, inspected, appraised, or approved by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Housing and Home

Finance Agency, the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the United States Housing Authority, the Public Housing Administration, the Government of the United States or any Agency thereof; or"

(c) Section 1010 of such Title is amended—

(1) by striking out the caption and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development and Federal Housing Administration transactions";

(2) by striking out "Federal Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(3) by striking out "Administration" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Department".

(d) Section 1012 of such Title is amended—

(1) by striking out the caption and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development transactions";

(2) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(3) by striking out "Administration" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Department".

(e) The analysis of chapter 47, title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 1001, is amended—

(1) by striking out item 1010 and inserting in lieu thereof "1010. Department of Housing and Urban Development and Federal Housing Administration transactions"; and

(2) by striking out item 1012 and inserting in lieu thereof "1012. Department of Housing and Urban Development transactions".

SEC. 226. Title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(a) by striking out "Federal Housing Commissioner" in section 1804(b), (d) and (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(b) by striking out "Federal Housing Administration approved mortgagee designated by the Federal Housing Commissioner" in section 1802(d) and inserting in lieu thereof "mortgagee approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and designated by him".

SEC. 227. Section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act is amended by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in the first sentence of the fourth paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

SEC. 228. (a) The penultimate sentence of paragraph 7 of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes is amended—

(1) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development";

(2) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary";

(3) by striking out "Federal Housing Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(4) by striking out "Public Housing Administration" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development".

(b) Paragraph (11) of section 5200 of the Revised Statutes is amended—

(1) by striking out "or the Public Housing Administration";

(2) by striking out "or Administration" in both places it appears;

(3) by striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(4) by striking out "Administrator" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

SEC. 229. Any function or authority vested in or exercisable by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Chairman thereof, or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation immediately before the enactment of this title shall not by this title or anything therein be affected or impaired, or subjected to any restriction or limitation to which it was not then subject.

The section-by-section summary accompanying Senate bill 2978 is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Section 1. Short title: The bill would be cited as the "Housing and Urban Development Amendments of 1966."

TITLE I—HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENTS

Section 101. FHA-insured property improvement loans: This section would, with respect to loans made or refinanced within 1 year, permit the insurance premium charged by FHA for a title I property improvement loan to be paid by the borrower.

Section 102. Cooperative housing insurance fund: This section would remove certain technical obstacles to management-type FHA cooperative housing insured mortgages being transferred to a mutual insurance basis. This would thus facilitate use of the authority in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 which authorized such transfers.

It would permit mortgagees to use FHA's general insurance fund debentures for paying the mortgage insurance premiums on mortgages covering cooperative housing where the mortgages have been transferred to the cooperative housing mutual fund (management fund). In addition, mortgagees would be permitted to use any management fund debentures issued in connection with the mortgages transferred to the management fund for the payment of general insurance fund premiums.

Because these changes would remove any basis for objection by mortgagees to a transfer of insurance, a provision in the present law would be removed which requires the consent of a mortgagee before FHA can transfer cooperative housing mortgage insurance to the mutual fund. That is, in some instances, mortgagees have been reluctant to agree to the transfer because it would result in preventing their use of general insurance fund debentures for paying mortgage insurance premiums after the insurance is transferred. The amendments would permit such use of the debentures. In addition, all outstanding insurance on management-type cooperative housing projects would be authorized to be transferred to the mutual fund.

Section 103. Mortgage limits for homes under section 221(d)(2): This section would increase from $11,000 to $12,500 the maximum mortgage amount on a single family dwelling under the FHA home mortgage insurance program for moderate-income and displaced families (sec. 221(d)(2)). The mortgage limit on a two-family residence would be increased from $18,000 to $20,000.

These larger mortgage amounts are necessary because of increased housing costs, and the amendment is consistent with a similar change already made by the Congress in section 203(i) of the National Housing Act.

Section 104. Low-rent housing for displaced families—term of lease: This section would permit local housing authorities to lease dwellings without regard to the 1- to 3-year limitation provision contained in the present law, where the housing is needed to rehouse low-income families displaced by governmental action. The leasing program is an important relocation tool because it provides low-rent housing more quickly than new construction, especially for large families.

Families who are forced to relocate by reason of public projects are especially subject to the fear of further forced removals. For such families, relocation into housing which is held under a short-term tenure (such as 3 years) may serve only as a source of further insecurity and of actual hardship. By permitting local housing authorities to lease units for longer terms, where the housing is needed for displaced families, the local authorities will be enabled to make more adequate use of this provision toward meeting the needs of the very families it was primarily designed to help.

Section 105. Low-rent housing—use of newly constructed private housing: Prior to the 1965 act public housing could be constructed or acquired only on a long-term (about 40-year) basis because the Federal annual contribution, which is used both for subsidy and to amortize the capital cost through payment of annual debt service on the housing authority bonds, was in terms of a specified percentage of the development or acquisition cost, and this percentage contemplated about 40-year financing. Since the capital cost is substantially less in the case of acquired older housing, and since there is no capital cost in the case of leased privately owned housing, the "flexible formula" amendment was enacted to permit up to the same annual contribution to be paid as would be paid with respect to newly constructed public housing in the area regardless of the size of the capital cost or its nonexistence in the case of leased housing. This change was necessary in order to provide a sufficiently large annual contribution to permit the housing of low-income families in acquired or leased dwellings. This "flexible formula" was added to section 10(c) of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 by the 1965 act.

At the same time, the Congress enacted a separate comprehensive section 23 of the United States Housing Act for short-term (1 to 3 years, renewable) leasing of privately owned existing housing. This incorporates the same flexible formula limitation on the maximum amount of annual contribution or annual subsidy that could be provided with respect to such leased dwellings.

Thus, both section 10(c) and section 23 contain flexible formula provisions which permit paying the same annual subsidy with respect to leased or acquired existing housing as would be payable for newly constructed public housing in the community.

This amendment in this section would make it clear that the same flexible formula provisions could be used for the leasing of housing to be constructed as well as for the leasing or acquisition of existing housing. Important additional benefits would be derived from the flexible formula provisions in respect to leasing if they could be applied to proposed privately owned new construction as well as to privately owned existing housing.

This would be particularly true in the very promising prospects of joint ventures between public housing authorities and private owners in creating low- and middle-income developments. Presently such developments of new construction may only be financed under the 40-year standard low-rent financing provisions. These provisions are not suitable for leasing at desirable shorter terms, which are often the only terms available.

Section 106. Applying advances in technology to housing and urban development:

This section would establish a program to encourage and assist the housing industry to reduce the cost and improve the quality of housing through the application to home construction and rehabilitation of advances in technology, and to encourage and assist the application of advances in technology to urban development activities.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development would be directed to (1) conduct research and studies to test and demonstrate new and improved techniques, materials, and methods of applying advances in technology to housing construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance, and urban development activities, and (2) encourage and promote the acceptance and application of the new and improved techniques and methods of constructing, rehabilitating, and maintaining housing, and the application of advances in technology to urban development activities, by all segments of the housing industry, communities, industries engaged in urban development activities, and the general public. Research and studies conducted would be designed to develop and demonstrate the applicability to housing construction, rehabilitation and maintenance, and urban development activities, of advances in technology relating to design concepts, construction and rehabilitation methods, manufacturing processes, materials and products and building components.

Research and study projects could be undertaken either directly by the Secretary or by contract with public or private bodies or agencies, or working agreements with other Federal departments or agencies. Projects would be required to be completed within 2 years.

Provisions of title III of the Housing Act of 1948 and section 602 of the Housing Act of 1956 presently authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to undertake and conduct studies relating to the reduction of housing construction costs through the use of new and improved techniques, materials and methods. However, these existing provisions authorize such studies to be undertaken as part of broader research functions such as the collection and dissemination of data relating to market analyses, housing inventories, mortgage market problems, and the housing needs of special groups such as the elderly.

This section recognizes the importance of a program designed specifically to (1) reduce housing costs through application to home construction of technological advances, and (2) assist and encourage the application of advances in technology to urban development activities, by directing the Secretary to undertake such a program and authorizing specific appropriations for that purpose.

Funds necessary to carry out the provisions of the section would be authorized to be appropriated.

Section 107. Rehabilitation and code enforcement grants: This section would repeal a provision in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966, which limits the amount of urban renewal grant authority that can be used in fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for grants for rehabilitation and code enforcement.

The limitation that would be repealed is inconsistent with the general purpose of the rehabilitation and code enforcement grants. Authority for these grants was added to the Federal urban renewal law by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to encourage more conservation and rehabilitation and thus lessen the need for large-scale slum clearance and redevelopment. The limitation in the appropriation act limiting the total amount of these grants hampers the achievement of this purpose.

Section 108. Mortgage insurance for land development—clarifying amendment: Subsection (a) of this section would correct a technical error in section 1001(c) of the National Housing Act.

Subsection (b) would provide clarification regarding the types of improvements that may be covered by mortgages insured by FHA under the land development program (title X of the National Housing Act). The types of improvements permitted under title X are those deemed necessary or desirable to prepare land primarily for residential and related uses or to provide facilities for public or common use. This subsection would make no substantive change in this regard. It would resolve questions concerning the eligibility of specific types of improvements under title X. The subsection would expressly provide that steam, gas, and electric lines and installations are permissible improvements under title X, and would make it clear that industrial uses are included as related uses, with the industrial sites to be in proper proportion to the size and scope of the development.

Subsection (c) would add the title X land development mortgage insurance program to the provisions in section 512 of the National Housing Act. That section provides penalties for violations of the act by lenders, borrowers, builders, or others who may receive the benefits of the loan insurance programs. The amendment would include the land development program among those that could not be used by persons subject to the penalties.

Section 109. Repeal of provision for sale of Forest Hills project, Paducah: This section would repeal section 1005 of the Housing Act of 1964, because it cannot be put into effect.

That section directed the sale of an FHA-acquired rental housing project in Paducah, Ky., to the Paducah-McCracken County Development Council for use as a dormitory by the Paducah Junior College. The college has received private land donations and does not want the project.

Section 110. Technical amendments: Subsection (a) would repeal a requirement in the Federal urban renewal law that contracts for supplies or services which exceed the amount of $1,000 may be made or entered into only after advertising for bids.

The provision that would be repealed is inconsistent with a general Federal statute which imposes the advertising requirement on all Federal contracts of this type which exceed $2,500 in amount. The repeal of the provision in the urban renewal law would remove this inconsistency.

Subsection (b) would amend provisions in the urban renewal law and the urban planning grant law to make it clear that references in those laws to the Area Redevelopment Act include also references to laws which are supplementary to that Act. These amendments were inadvertent omissions from the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

Subsection (c)—technical.

Subsection (d) would repeal the 1954 prohibition against FNMA's purchasing loans insured or guaranteed prior to August 2, 1954. This provision was appropriate in 1954, as it protected the fledgling Secondary Market Operations from being inundated by offers of existing mortgages. However, it no longer serves this purpose. While repeal of this provision would make eligible for purchase a few mortgages of an age of 12 years and upward which are now not eligible, the number involved is negligible.

Subsection (e)—technical.

Subsection (f)—technical.

TITLE II—CONFORMING NOMENCLATURE IN STATUTES TO DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT

This title has no legal significance except to correct the wording of certain statutes to conform to existing law as provided in the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act.

The title would make technical amendments in the Federal statutes authorizing the programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and other related Federal laws to make the nomenclature in those laws conform to the provisions of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act. The amendments would make no substantive changes whatsoever in the provisions of the laws.

For example, under the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act, all functions and powers of the Department are vested in the Secretary of the Department. This title of the bill would therefore change the titles Housing and Home Finance Administrator, Public Housing Commissioner, and Federal Housing Commissioner, wherever they appear in the Federal laws, to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Likewise, the term "Housing and Home Finance Agency" would be changed to the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I am joining today the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], in sponsoring a joint resolution (S.J. Res. 138) to abolish the electoral college and institute a proportional method of casting electoral votes.

This proposal is substantially similar to other measures which we have introduced individually in the past. However, none of us claims pride of authorship since this is much the same resolution as the so-called Lodge-Gosset amendment, which passed the Senate by an overwhelming margin in 1950, only to die later in the House Rules Committee. I am most gratified that the four of us who have supported the Lodge-Gosset principle over the years have resolved minor differences and can now support the same resolution. I hope this unity will provide the strength to see it passed, for the years which I have devoted to studying this problem have convinced me ours is the best obtainable solution.

Our proposal will accomplish a number of reforms while avoiding the pitfalls inherent in each of the other resolutions that have been introduced.

First, we would abolish the electoral college which has been a useless appendage to our governmental institutions since the rise of political parties. Legally, the elector still stands where the Constitution placed him: an officer in whom rests the awesome discretion as to who shall lead the most powerful nation in the world. In many States, however, the elector is nothing more or less than the recipient of an empty honor gratefully given for long and faithful service to a political party. But whatever the qualifications of the electors, few of us now believe that any man or any few hundred men, no matter how wise or faithful, should be entrusted to make our greatest decision. We, therefore, assume that the electors are under a moral obligation to vote for their party's nominees. But ours is a nation of written laws and not of moral imperatives, and the language of the Constitution should be made to conform to what the overwhelming majority of citizens know is correct.

Second, we would also abolish the unit-rule system of counting electoral votes. This system, which completely disfranchises those who do not vote for the winner within their State, is indefensible. It requires candidates to concentrate on the large, pivotal States where elections are historically closely contested to the exclusion of smaller States and one-party States. It encourages the formation of third parties and of bloc voting since a small group can often determine the course of the entire electoral vote of a large State. This is precisely the same unit-rule system which many found invidious in Georgia. I personally feel that Georgians are perfectly capable of deciding what is best for themselves, but it is for us to propose what we think is best for the country. In a case challenging Georgia's unit rule, the courts found that the system was a denial of equal protection of laws. Certainly those who hailed that decision should support this amendment. Since it provides that electoral votes would be cast in proportion to the popular vote in each State, every man would have a voice in the election, and candidates would solicit the vote of every man in every State.

In 1956, the late President Kennedy led the eloquent and successful Senate opposition to an earlier version of this amendment. At that time, he frankly admitted our present system forces candidates to look to the large States in drafting platforms, nominating candidates and running campaigns. It was his thesis that urban interests are justified in having this power because State legislatures and the National House of Representatives were, allegedly, through gerrymandering, far overbalanced in favor of rural interests. Whatever the validity of this argument may have been in 1956, one man, one vote is clearly the law of the land today, and population is the only constitutionally permissible consideration a State may use in drawing districts for either house of its own legislature or for the seats of its congressional delegation. Since the objection that was raised in 1956 is no longer valid, I would trust and hope that those who embraced it then will join us now.

Third, our resolution proposes that if no candidate receives 40 percent of the total electoral votes, the election would be decided by the Senate and House in joint session, with each Senator and Representative having one vote. This would eliminate the undemocratic and unfair method according to which each State delegation—no matter how large or small the State may be—would have one vote in elections thrown into the House. By the reduction of the percentage of electoral votes required for election, we would also reduce the threat of elections being decided by Congress instead of the people and the threat of multiple parties.

Before concluding, Mr. President, I would like to mention three other proposals which have received serious consideration over the years. One of the most appealing, on its face, and the one closest to ours in principle is the direct election approach. Except to say that our amendment has the advantage of preserving the identity of the States in the presidential electoral process, I will not discuss the merits of direct election because, frankly, I believe there is no chance of ratification. The legislatures of three-fourths of the States are not going to vote away the added advantage of the two additional electoral votes granted them by reason of senatorial representation which benefit the great majority of States.

The district method, by which it is proposed that one electoral vote be given to each congressional district and two to the State at large is preferable to the present system, but it has two defects.

First, gerrymandering—which is in the ancient, if not honorable, American political tradition—could be used to thwart the will of the majority. Second, the votes of those not voting for the winner in a particular district would still not be registered in an election.

The administration has suggested another alternative, one which would abolish the electoral college and change the method of selection when no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes, but one which leaves the unit-rule system intact and untouched. It is this latter inequity—ignored by the administration—which is the most important and whose evils we must face every 4 years. This proposal, if ratified, may never have a bearing on any election. Indeed, it is hardly worth cranking up the complex and protracted amendment process to accomplish so little—it would be almost like chasing a fly with an elephant gun.

Mr. President, it may well be that there is much that can be done to improve our proposal in style, in language, or in procedure. I am convinced, however, that the approach is the soundest and has the best chance of ratification. I hope this is the one which will be reported from the Senate committee back to this body for debate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Reform the Electoral College" from the January 23, 1966, edition of the New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 1966]

REFORM THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

President Johnson has made a convincing case for a constitutional amendment to reform the electoral college. Never the independent deliberate body the framers of the Constitution intended, the electoral college developed almost from the beginning into a useless, even dangerous appendix in the body politic.

As recently as 1960, electors in Southern States attempted to exploit their technical right of independence to throw the contest into the House of Representatives. That is the principal difficulty, but Mr. Johnson calls attention to other potentially troublesome anomalies. If the election were decided in the House, each State would have only one vote, thereby giving Delaware or Vermont as much weight as New York or California. Since the House would choose the President and the Senate would choose the Vice President, the possibility exists that they would be picked from rival parties.

The reform which Mr. Johnson favors would require that the electoral vote of each State be cast automatically for the candidate who polled the most popular votes in that State. Such a change would improve the existing arrangement, but it would not eliminate the possibility that a candidate who polled a minority of the popular vote throughout the Nation could win because he carried the States which had a majority of the electoral votes. That did happen twice in the 19th century.

We believe that Congress should choose between two other proposals. One is the Lodge-Gossett plan which the Senate approved but the House rejected in 1950; it would divide the electoral vote of each State in exact proportion to the popular vote. The other provides for abolition of the electoral vote system entirely, placing the election on a straight population basis. Either of these methods would have the great merit of making certain that the outcome of a presidential election accurately reflected public preference on the one-man, one-vote basis.

In the past the cities helped defeat the Lodge-Gossett plan because it weakened their power in the electoral college; the small States were able to block the other plan because it would weaken theirs. The changes in apportionment, the rise of the suburbs and the increased mobility of the population have rendered these opposing fears obsolete. We think either of these two plans would be preferable to the Johnson proposal, but the latter is certainly preferable to no change at all.

NOTICE OF REPRINTING OF REMARKS BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ON UKRAINIAN PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a private order is being submitted for a reprint publication of all statements made by Senators concerning observance of the 48th anniversary of the Ukrainian proclamation of independence. If any Members of the Senate object to the reprinting of their remarks, kindly contact Mr. Raymond F. Noyes, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clerk. The purpose of this statement is to conform to the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing.

CHANGE IN HEARING ROOM FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMPROVEMENTS IN JUDICIAL MACHINERY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce a change in the hearings on S. 2722. The original announcement of the hearings appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 3359, on February 17, 1966. The hearings are still scheduled for March 1, at 11:30 a.m., and March 2, at 9:30 a.m. The hearings on March 1 will be held in room 6226, New Senate Office Building. On March 2 the site of the hearings will be room 6202, New Senate Office Building.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I present for the RECORD the names of additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2908) to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to prevent certain employees of community action agencies and VISTA volunteers from engaging in pernicious political activities.

The names were left off the bill as cosponsors due to a misunderstanding as to the time allowed to obtain them. For that reason, Mr. President, and only for that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be reprinted with the names as cosponsors as indicated on the following list:

S. 2908, introduced by Mr. Murphy (for himself and Mr. Prouty):

COSPONSORS

Mr. Allott, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Javits, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Lausche, Mr Miller, Mr. Morton, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Scott, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Williams of Delaware.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **PELL.** Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2911) to amend section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge], for himself and other Senators on February 9, 1966.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **CHURCH** subsequently said: Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2911) to amend section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of February 8, 1966:

S. 2888. A bill to insure that children participating in domestic nonprofit school lunch programs will be assured of adequate supplies of nutritious dairy products: Mr. Allott, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fong, Mr. Hart, Mr. Javits, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Moss, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Proxmire.

Authority of February 10, 1966:

S. 2915. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to grant fellowships for graduate study in highway transportation engineering: Mr. Bayh, Mr. Ervin, and Mr. Metcalf.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6845) to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Murray, Mr. Morrison, Mr. Udall, Mr. Corbett, and Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 12752) to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 12752) to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ST. LOUIS STUDY SHOWS CUT IN SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM HURTS POOREST FIRST

Mr. **PROXMIRE.** Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture's plans to cut the special milk program by 80 percent have raised a storm of controversy in this Chamber. Objections to this proposed cutback have been voiced from both sides of the aisle from Senators representing both milk producing and milk consuming States.

Why this massive protest to the administration's plans? The principal reason, Mr. President, is that anyone who takes a clear, realistic look at the administration's proposal realizes that it will hurt, not help, the poor children of our Nation.

Now the administration proposes to limit Federal support for school milk to those children who are designated as needy by a school administrator as well as those schools which do not have a school lunch program. I have already spelled out in some detail the onerous means tests the needy will be forced to pass to qualify for federally subsidized school milk. These tests are currently being used under the school lunch program and administrators find them to be quite unsatisfactory in pinpointing the needy.

Furthermore there is a large gray area of need which simply cannot be reached by a means test. There are parents too proud to accept a Federal handout for their children and thus be singled out as needy. There are parents too unschooled themselves to know how to qualify for free milk for their children. And finally there are parents who may be able to provide milk for their children in school but only at subtantial cost to themselves—parents who just are not willing to make the sacrifice for children who would rather drink soda pop at home than milk in school.

I might say, Mr. President, this involves literally millions and millions of children, because the time when the burden is greatest on almost any family is when the little children are in school. The mother has to be at home, and cannot be helping supplement the family income.

The sad thing about the administration's proposed cut is that these "gray area poor" will be hurt first and their children will be hardest hit. This is amply illustrated by a study which took place in the St. Louis schools way back in 1954–56. This study was conducted to relate consumption of milk under the school milk program to factors of family income. From the 1954–55 school year to the 1955–56 school year the price of milk was reduced 60 percent from 7½ to 3 cents per half pint. Here is what happened:

Children from low-income families increased their milk consumption by 367 percent. Think of it—an increase in consumption of 3½ times the previous level. Those from middle-income families increased consumption by 133 percent. Even in the middle-income group consumption doubled. Those children from high-income families drank 86 percent more milk—only one-fourth of the increase among the poor.

What does all this mean? It indicates to me beyond a shadow of a doubt that those poor income families that cannot or will not qualify themselves for milk for the needy will be hardest hit by the 80 percent cut in the school milk program.

WAR ON POVERTY GRANT TO MISSISSIPPI FOR LARGEST HEADSTART PROGRAM

Mr. **CLARK.** Mr. President, the $5.6 million war on poverty grant which was announced yesterday to Mississippi for one of the country's largest Headstart programs, will enable more than 9,100 poor children to start their schooling with the same advantages of education, health, and family guidance enjoyed by children from higher income families.

That grant, announced on Tuesday by Sargent Shriver, was awarded to Mary Holmes Junior College for a project to be administered by the Child Development Group of Mississippi. The Child Development Group conducted a Headstart program last summer for more than 6,000 disadvantaged children who are now started on their way to more useful and happier lives. The summer's project was experimental and new, testing an educational program whose methods were untried but whose promise was great. The Office of Economic Opportunity is satisfied that the experiment was a success, that the work of child development for poor families should continue in Mississippi.

Last summer's lesson has enabled the OEO, Mary Holmes Junior College, and the Child Development Group to incorporate improvements in the program which will insure that the new effort will be an even greater success than the first. The financial difficulties encountered in the summer will be resolved by more exacting procedures and the assistance of a national and widely respected accounting firm, Ernst and Ernst. New staff and board members have been brought into the program and new personnel procedures have been adopted to improve hiring practices.

We will watch this project with particular interest because it is involved with the humane work of erasing the plight of American children. And we can observe the program with special satisfaction because its promises for success are considerable.

Mississippi is providing examples for the entire Nation of what can be done when the resources of a State are united in accelerating the antipoverty effort. In the last 30 days alone, Mississippi has received more than $14 million in Federal funds for combating the roots and the effects of poverty. This money along with additional Federal funds, will finance sound and imaginative programs to help Mississippi redeem its economic and human potential.

POPULATION CONTROL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of the serious problems which has confronted the country in increasing urgency is: Can we achieve a consensus in the country which will make it possible to move forward in the area of population control and the concomitant phase of birth control which deals with the same problem?

There has been concern as to the attitude of the Catholic community toward this problem. From time to time, I have noted on the floor of the Senate what appeared to be a gradual conviction of the Catholic community that population control measures were essential both at home and abroad.

I was much heartened to note the results of a poll taken by the George Gallup Organization, Inc., on this subject. The results were presented in an article published in the New York Times on Thursday, February 17, under the byline of John W. Finney entitled "Poll Finds Catholics Back Birth Curb Aid."

Mr. President, the statistics are fascinating and I invite the careful attention of the Senate to them. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLL FINDS CATHOLICS BACK BIRTH CURB AID

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, February 16.—Most Americans, including Catholics, favor Federal aid to States, cities, and foreign governments for birth control programs, according to a recent poll.

The survey also shows that most Catholics in the United States believe that the Roman Catholic Church should modify its opposition to many forms of birth control.

They also believe that birth control information should be easily available to any married person who wants it, the poll found.

The survey into American attitudes on population policy was conducted last fall by the Gallup Organization, Inc., headed by George Gallup. It was taken for the Population Council, a nonprofit foundation that has been active in promoting population control programs at home and abroad.

The results of the survey, which is believed by population planners to be the most definitive yet conducted on the politically touchy subject of birth control, will be published soon.

The survey was based on a scientific sampling of 3,205 persons. By public opinion survey standards, this was a large cross-section. The Government's monthly unemployment report, for example, is based on a sampling of 3,500 persons.

The number of Catholics polled in the Gallup survey was not given, but in a probability sample such as is used in public opinion surveys, steps are taken to be sure of an adequate cross section of all groups.

The poll may have a considerable political impact; the administration is running into its first political difficulties in its quiet but deliberate move of the last year to extend Federal assistance to birth control programs at home and abroad.

Under a policy laid down by President Johnson a year ago, the Agency for International Development has begun extending assistance to foreign governments for direct support of birth control programs.

This policy has recently been challenged by Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, who represents a district with a large Catholic vote in Milwaukee County.

In letters to AID, Mr. ZABLOCKI has asked whether the agency, in its new policy, was not violating congressional intent. He argued that Congress meant to limit Government assistance to demographic and sociological studies rather than authorize outright support of birth control programs.

In view of Mr. ZABLOCKI's influential position as ranking Democrat on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, his letters have caused considerable concern among AID officials, who were already hesitant about pushing too fast into the politically sensitive area of birth control.

SUPPORT INDICATED

But the main finding to emerge from the poll was that the voters would strongly support any move by the administration to assist State or local governments or foreign countries in birth control programs.

In response to the question "Do you feel that the U.S. Government should give aid to States and cities for birth control programs if they request it?" 63 percent responded "yes," 28 percent "no" and 9 percent "don't know."

To the question "Do you think our Government should help other countries with their birth control programs if they ask us?" 58 percent said "yes," 34 percent "no" and 8 percent "don't know."

Of the 58 percent supporting foreign assistance, 62 percent—or a minority of the total sample—favored going beyond administration policy by furnishing birth control supplies. The present policy is limited to technical and financial assistance for family planning programs.

The church now opposes all chemical or mechanical methods of contraception but does condone the rhythm method in which intercourse is limited to the nonfertile periods of a woman's monthly cycle.

Among the Catholics polled, 56 percent favored a change in the church's policy, compared with 53 percent among non-Catholics, and 33 percent were opposed, compared with 22 percent among non-Catholics. The Catholic support for a change in policy was particularly strong among the younger generation; among those Catholics 60 or older, only 39 percent favored a shift in the church's position.

The poll showed that Catholics as well as non-Catholics were overwhelmingly in support of providing birth control information to married couples.

In response to the question "Do you believe that information about birth control ought to be easily available to any married person who wants it?" 86 percent of the non-Catholics and 81 percent of the Catholics replied "yes."

But a difference developed on the question whether such information should be easily available to any single adult person who wants it. A slight majority of non-Catholics—52 percent—favored such a policy, but it was supported by only 43 percent of the Catholics.

By coincidence, the survey was conducted in two periods immediately before and after Pope Paul VI's visit to the United States last October. In his speech before the United Nations, the Pope appeared to reaffirm the church's position on birth control.

PURPOSE OF THE NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have long been a supporter of the National Teacher Corps and was much disappointed when the Appropriations Committee refused, last year, to fund the National Teacher Corps program as it was recommended by President Johnson and approved by both the Senate and the House.

In the words of President Johnson, the National Teacher Corps "draws on that spirit of dedication of Americans which has been demonstrated time and again in peace and war, by young and old, at home and abroad. It will provide a challenge and an opportunity for teachers with a sense of mission, those best suited to the momentous task this Nation faces in improving education."

The National Teacher Corps will revitalize the education system in low-income areas by attracting dedicated and gifted teachers to serve for 2 years in those places in our Nation where they are needed most. Hopefully, they will continue to serve for many years. The children they teach will have more dedicated educational leadership. The quality of the teaching staffs will be improved. The tenure of the teaching staff can become more stable. The morale of the teaching profession will be strengthened.

In short, there will be quality teachers where quality teaching is most needed.

The Teacher Corps will be set up in a way that provides immediate benefits to local school systems and long-range benefits that will result from the training that Teacher Corps members will receive. Colleges and universities will be given the responsibility for both preservice training and the on-going 2-year training program.

This phase of the National Teacher Corps will benefit not only the corpsmen trained and the schools involved, but will encourage all colleges and universities to broaden their regular teacher-preparation programs to include the kind of training needed for the successful teaching of the children of poverty.

All that is required to set this excellent program in motion is passage of the appropriation bill now before us. I urge the committee to recommend and the Senate to approve the full amount requested by the administration.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR FLEET ADM. CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to announce to the Senate that memorial services for Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz will be held at Washington Cathedral on Friday, February 25, at 2 p.m.

I should also like to mention that I have sent a letter to the Secretary of the Navy urging him to name one of our coming new nuclear-powered carriers in honor of Admiral Nimitz.

I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
February 24, 1966.

Hon. PAUL H. NITZE,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of the distinguished career and service of Adm. Chester Nimitz, I hope the Navy will give serious consideration to naming one of the coming CVN's (nuclear-powered carriers) in his honor and memory.

I can think of no more fitting memorial to this man who championed seapower, fought constantly for peace, and served his Nation so long and so well.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN G. TOWER.

BIG SPRING, TEX., YOUTH FOR FREEDOM IN VIETNAM PETITION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Big Spring Youth for Freedom in Vietnam, Big Spring, Tex., recently circulated a petition supporting our policy in Vietnam.

Since this group is representative of many of our young people, I ask unanimous consent to have a newspaper article about their efforts printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Big Spring (Tex.) Herald, Jan. 30, 1966]

YOUNGSTERS FAVORING U.S. VIETNAM POLICY

(By Tom Barry)

The effects of the war in Vietnam can be felt thousands of miles away—by politicians, the electorate, demonstrators pro and con—and in Big Spring, where vibrations have reached into Big Spring High School.

Reaction to the war and its implications recently came from three Big Spring High junior classmen, David Thomas, Larry Arnhart, and Dale Pless. They were discussing, these 16-year-olds, Vietnam over the noon meal at the school cafeteria. More particularly, they were discussing draft card burners, beatniks, and the image given by a loudmouthed minority to the majority of teenagers. These boys felt something should be done.

PETITION PLAN

Others were listening to the discussion. Ten in all decided that the thing to do was to get 500 students to sign petitions saying they, even though nonvoting teenagers, support the present policy of the United States in Vietnam. When signed, the petitions will be sent to Members of Congress.

Forms were printed, permission of school authorities was granted to pass them out and post them on the bulletin board, and by Friday more than the original goal of 500 signatures of students had been obtained.

Also, the group gave itself a name—Big Spring Youth for Freedom in Vietnam.

Five hundred students represent more than one-third of the entire student body of the high school, according to the youthful chairman of the organization, David Thomas.

"We expect more, and will not close our signature drive until Tuesday," he said. "We have had surprisingly little opposition to the drive," he continued. "We've had more trouble with students signing two or more petitions each than with those who refuse to sign."

David said only three students have refused to sign the petition because they favor getting the United States out of Vietnam; and a few more refused to sign because they think the war ought to be accelerated.

Four purposes unite the 10 members of the organization to disavow the draft card burners; to show the adult world how they feel; to encourage representatives in Government; and to support the present policy in Vietnam. Some of the members of the group, like young Thomas, are strongly conservative in their political views; others are on the left side of the fence; and there are some who are middle-of-the-roaders.

After the petitions are signed, they will be divided into three groups of about equal numbers and mailed to Senator JOHN TOWER, OMAR BURLESON, representing the 17th District, and GEORGE MAHON, formerly representing the 19th District.

"We hope we have a better chance of the petitions having more weight by sending them to the three individuals rather than to President Johnson," Thomas said, "after all, in a few years we'll be the ones fighting in Vietnam if the war goes on, and it is an election year, even though we can't vote yet."

About 12 teachers are helping the group in one way or another, Thomas said, putting petitions up in classrooms and passing them around in government classes.

Will the petitions do any good?

"Well," Thomas said, "let's say our hopes are moderate."

"We thought we should do something," Thomas said. "We are hardly the type to demonstrate in the streets, and we know that petitions don't normally get a lot of results, but we wanted to speak our piece."

The vigor with which the 10 members of the organization are presenting their case for the majority of teenagers (already several teachers have announced open support of the campaign, according to Thomas) indicates that something beyond ignoring the normally quiet, "average" teenager, should result.

THE IMPORTANCE OF WATER CONSERVATION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Miss Kathy Allen, an outstanding student of Dumas High School, in Texas, has written an excellent essay about the importance of water conservation. This is a most perceptive article.

Since the matter of water conservation is of vital importance to us all, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the North Plains Water News]

WHY IS WATER CONSERVATION CALLED VITAL? WE CAN'T LIVE WITHOUT IT

WHY THE IMPORTANCE OF WATER CONSERVATION?

(By Kathy Allen, Dumas High School)

(NOTE.—Kathy Allen, 18-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Orval Allen, 1203 NE. 4th in Dumas, is the author of the essay printed in this issue of the North Plains Water News.

(Kathy is a graduate of Dumas High School, class of 1965. She was salutatorian of her class, finalist in the National Merit Scholarship Contest, State winner in one-act playwriting, district winner American Legion Oratorical Contest. She was active in speech, drama, math, debate, and National Honor Society. At the present time Kathy is a student at West Texas State University, majoring in speech and math.

(We are proud of Kathy's essay for two reasons. First, we thought it was an outstanding essay and, second, she is the daughter of our field representative, Orval Allen.)

All of the greatest and most complex reasons why we should be concerned about water can be summed up in one statement. We could not live without it. We could work for years listing the uses we have for water and still not have listed all of them. Almost every human activity on earth involves water to some degree. Scientists concerned with space travel immediately rule out the possibility of inhabiting any planet which does not show signs of the existence of water. Water is just this important to us. Although we cannot list every use we make of water, we can give some general uses. In this way, we can begin to realize how much we depend on water.

We are mainly concerned with water for our personal use. We drink it and, due to Nature's mystery, we would die without it. We use it in our cooking. It keeps us clean, and we use it to clean our clothes, houses, and other belongings. This explains why settlers first considered a water supply when establishing a settlement. And as more and more people crowded into cities, and as modern appliances have been invented, our rate of personal use of water has steadily increased.

Industries use tons of water every day. For example, it is estimated that it takes 70,000 gallons of water to produce 1 ton of paper. These industries use water in other ways, too. It is used to carry away waste, and it is used in their research laboratories.

Americans have made extensive use of our water resources for recreational purposes. Boating and water skiing are two sports which are enjoying ever-increasing popularity. Almost every town has its municipal swimming pool, and pools are finding their ways to more and more back yards. Skindiving, a comparatively new sport is also catching on. Surfing and fishing are equally popular. Thus, we can see that water plays an important part in our recreational activities.

These are only a fraction of the uses we have for water. Rivers are also used for transportation. Water is used to generate electricity, and anyone who has seen Niagara Falls can testify that water in the form of falls, rushing streams, or glistening lakes provides some beautiful scenery.

Now that we have a look at the importance of water to us, we can better realize that we should be concerned about our sources of water. However, one additional fact should make our interest more acute. We are fast depleting our water supply. To get a clearer understanding of just how we are losing water, we must understand the water cycle.

In nature, there is a continuous movement of water called the water cycle. As we know, all water runs downhill. Thus the majority of our water runs to the sea. This includes rivers and our water table. The other small percent runs into lakes or basins. If water remained here, we would have lost all of our water by now. But water does not stay there. The water in the oceans or lakes evaporates and is carried by air masses back over the land. As these air masses cool, the water vapor falls as rain, snow, or some other precipitation. This water again drains to lakes or to the seas, and the cycle continues.

A quick look at this cycle will tell us that we must catch this water between the time it falls as rain and the time it returns to the seas. Some regions, of course, receive more precipitation than others. This can easily be explained by the fact that air masses move from west to east. Laden with moisture, they rise over mountain ranges. As they cool, the moisture condenses and falls as rain, snow, or some other form of precipitation. By the time these air masses reach areas such as ours, they have lost the significant portion of the moisture they started with. Nature alone, of course, does not suffer, but when people crowd into these areas, make use of modern dishwashers and other conveniences, and draw gallons of water from the land for irrigation, a serious problem develops. Water problems are not limited to our area, either. As the water sources in other areas become unfit for use due to waste, dumping, or the like, these people, too, have a problem.

The evidence is clear and unmistakable. We cannot do without it, and yet, we are depleting our supply steadily each day. Let's consider the inevitable outcome of our failure to act. Picture with me a nation in the future. What was once fertile plains is now a barren desert. People can no longer live here. They are crowded around the Nation's few remaining water sources. The Nation's economy is at a standstill.

Perhaps this picture seems entirely unreal. You might think that such a thing is not at all possible. If so, you join the large group of Americans who are ignorant of the necessity of water conservation. These people need to wake up to the fact that our valuable water resources must be handled wisely.

Our situation at present is by no means hopeless. There is still time if we act now. Evidence of what can be done is the progress that has already been made. Industries, realizing the problem, have done extensive research on the treatment of waste. Experiments have been carried out in which chemicals were sprayed on shallow ponds to prevent evaporation. In some instances, these shallow ponds were made deeper to reduce the surface area. Experiments have been carried out to induce rain. Dams have been built to catch water and put it to better use. As slow as progress has been, it is still a step in the right direction.

Much remains to be done. The biggest and most important task ahead is the education of the American people. No water conservation project can be successful without the understanding and support of the people. A start has been made in our schools, but this is not enough. The welfare of our people, the economy of our Nation, and our very existence depend on a resource that we are wasting. Although the serious problem is not immediate, we cannot risk a delay in action. We must begin now to insure the conservation of a priceless resource—water.

OUR MONETARY POLICY IN A PROSPEROUS ECONOMY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Mr. Charles N. Shepardson, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, delivered some very excellent remarks entitled "Monetary Policy in a Prosperous Economy," at the 73d annual convention of the Mountain States Lumber Dealers Association.

I ask unanimous consent to have these remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONETARY POLICY IN A PROSPEROUS ECONOMY

(By Charles N. Shepardson, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System at the 73d annual convention of the Mountain States Lumber Dealers Association, Denver, Colo., January 29, 1966)

It is always a pleasure to come home. And today I come home again to Colorado.

But I must admit that pleasure is mixed with a little apprehension, apprehension in speaking to an industrial group like yours. If I'm an expert on anything, it's agriculture, not industry. And to compound my apprehension, today I'm not going to talk about either industry or agriculture. Rather I'm going to talk about the developing economic prosperity that we've been experiencing here in the United States for the last few years, and the problems it's beginning to pose for us, particularly those of us in the Federal Reserve System who have the responsibility of administering monetary policy.

A GLANCE BACKWARD

The economic scene: 1965 was a year in which we were bigger and better than ever according to most all of the broad indicators we use to measure our economy's performance. Industrial production grew 8 percent. The dollar value of our total national product increased 7½ percent. And all this came after 4 previous years of steady and substantial economic growth.

Employment in 1965 was the highest in years. We also made at least some progress toward solving our serious balance-of-payments problem.

Business and consumer confidence remained high. Businesses spent 15 percent more on new plants and equipment than they did in 1964, and they plan another large increase this year. As total income rose, consumer expenditures for autos, other durable goods, services, and even nondurable goods—for just about everything except houses—also rose sharply, even though they saved about the same share of income as in other recent years.

So—with almost everybody working, making higher incomes than ever, saving and spending unprecedented amounts, and confident about the future—what in the world was there to worry about?

One thing to worry about was that there were signs of imbalance and threats of unsustainability in the expansion developing. In an economy as diverse as ours, pressures and imbalances can exist in critical areas long before they show up in the overall statistics. In fact, by the time they do show up there, it may be too late to do very much about them. Ours is a very adaptable economy, but sometimes we are too sanguine about the insignificance of problems, so long as they remain selective and the overall picture continues to look good.

There was increasing evidence, as 1965 progressed, that at the high average rate at which human and national resources were being utilized, some critical resources were being badly strained. During the year we effected a further reduction in our unemployment rate, which had been too high for too long. We finally got close to the administration's interim target of 4 percent. But serious shortages of some kinds of skilled workers were developing even though among some groups of our people there continued to be altogether too many who could not find jobs.

By December, the overall jobless rate was down to 4.1 percent—the lowest since May 1957. In such Great Lakes industrial centers as Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee, Cincinnati, and Cleveland, unemployment rates went below 2½ percent. There, with virtually the only workers idle those moving from one job to another, the supply of labor was really tight. Around the country, factories were pressed for skilled workers such as tool and die makers, machinists, and sheet metal workers, and overtime for factory workers was the highest in the 10 years that records have been kept.

These scattered but critical labor shortages did not develop overnight. Manufacturers were operating at an average rate of 90 percent of capacity throughout the year and the rate in some industries was well over 90 percent. At such high levels of operations, labor shortages develop, overtime becomes necessary, older and less efficient plant is brought into operation, costs rise, and productivity declines.

There are also consequences elsewhere from the kinds of strain that develop when labor and capacity are inadequate for the demands put on them. As operating costs rise, businesses feel justified in raising their prices and, as you know, some have done so. Moreover, as availability of certain skills becomes more crucial to meeting the demands of customers, labor feels justified in demanding more generous wage settlements and, after 4 years of wage increases that kept pace with rising productivity, some settlements last year exceeded the administration's guideposts.

Eventually, training of new workers and additional investment in plant and equipment will ease the strains on our physical resources, but they don't help much over the short-run. In fact, the step-up in business capital expenditures last year, with all the demands it created for steel, machine tools, and the other labor and materials that go into new plants added significantly to the pressure on existing resources.

The kinds of pressures that developed last year had not been expected at the start of the year. In addition to the stepped-up pace of Government spending, private demands for goods and services turned out to be surprisingly large. There was a great flurry of activity early in the year which was expected to be temporary, since it reflected both the aftermath of the auto strikes in late 1964 and efforts of steel-using businesses to build up inventories in advance of an expected steel strike. But consumers continued to purchase autos and other consumer goods in record volume and, though businesses stopped spending quite so much for inventories, they began to spend more and more for new plants and machinery. Every time the Government asked them about their capital expenditure plans, the total planned for 1965 came out larger. It now appears that they spent $2 billion more for plant and equipment last year than they had been expected to at the start of the year—and the final figures aren't yet in.

The financial scene: So far I have been talking about the squeeze on resources of labor and productive capacity. Financial resources were also under increasing pressure last year. Both consumers and businesses increased their spending at a faster rate than their incomes were rising. They were able to do so only by relying heavily on borrowed funds. Debt expansion was substantial in 1965, so substantial as to raise serious doubts as to whether it was either sound or sustainable.

Consumer credit and business borrowing at banks accounted for the largest part of the increased credit flows, and did so right from the start of the year. Business loans at banks, for example, grew at an annual rate of 26 percent in the first quarter of 1965. This extraordinary increase reflected not just the financing required to rebuild dealers' stocks of autos and the accumulation of steel inventories, but also the funds needed by exporters and importers to hold inventories they could not move during the dock strike. It also included a very heavy volume of lending to foreign businesses, partly connected with earlier commitments. Things were expected to calm down once the auto and steel inventory buildups were completed, the dock strike was settled, and the President's February balance-of-payments program was underway.

But they didn't calm down. Businesses continued to borrow rather large amounts from banks, though less than in the early part of the year and less to finance their foreign activities. Financing in the security markets also increased sharply. Credit flows to business corporations over last year as a whole were nearly 50 percent larger than they were the year before. Internal funds available to them from undistributed profits and depreciation allowances, on the other hand, rose only 12 percent.

Rapid expansion of debt such as occurred last year tends to create two kinds of imbalances, both of considerable concern to us. It almost goes without saying, of course, that an expanding economy requires and can handle increasing amounts of debt, and we could hardly have sound and sustainable economic growth without a steady flow of appropriate amounts of debt. But as debt continues to mount in the economy as a whole, and especially as it appears to be financing an exceptionally large proportion of total spending, one begins to suspect that some businesses and consumers are taking on more debt than they can handle, that the quality of credit is declining, and that debt burdens for some are becoming dangerously high. One begins to worry about what happens to spending when, after this debt-financed binge, the debt must be repaid.

Sustainable growth in our economy requires that we not try to do too much at once. Excessive borrowing to support spending on goods and services that are in short supply is most likely both to add dangerously to wage and price pressures at the time and to require a sharp cutback in spending while the debts are worked off—the boom and bust we all want to avoid. This is one kind of imbalance that threatens the health of the economy through its effect on the financial position of borrowers and their spending plans.

A second imbalance—which is simply the other side of the same coin as excessive debt expansion—was the imbalance that arose in credit markets because demands for credit were running ahead of the supply of saving. The situation last year was compounded by several factors. The increased expansion in credit occurred at a time when there was virtually no increase in the total volume of funds flowing to savings institutions. Also, business corporations were so pressed for liquidity that they found it difficult to provide funds to others by adding to their holdings of bank deposits, U.S. Government securities, finance company paper, and other short-term securities. The surge in demand for a limited supply of investment funds resulted both in sharp increases in market interest rates—that is, in those rates that were free to move up—and very heavy demands on commercial banks.

Throughout the expansion period, the Federal Reserve has acted to supply banks with enough reserves to accommodate the needs of a growing domestic economy but hopefully not so much as to promote excessive and inflationary use of credit at home or to contribute to a worsening balance-of-payments situation internationally. For 4 years, this relatively easy monetary policy, together with expanding flows of savings, permitted substantial credit growth at interest rates that remained below their recent earlier high that occurred in 1960. But as 1965 progressed, provision of enough reserves to support a strong rise in the money supply was still not enough to prevent market rates of interest from rising considerably.

It became increasingly clear that an excessively large volume of bank reserves would have been needed to have halted the upward pressure on interest rates and to have reversed the trends that had carried money market rates above the discount rate and pushed time deposit rates against their ceilings. There was also growing evidence that heavy demands for credit were likely to be with us for some time to come. This increased the inflationary risks of coping with the situation through a large additional increase in bank reserves.

The problem as it related to bank credit expansion was that banks, faced with heavy demands for credit, were handicapped by the existing maximum ceilings payable on time deposits in their efforts to compete for such deposits.

The most appropriate solution to this situation appeared to us to be threefold: (1) To continue to supply a reasonable amount of bank reserves through open market purchases of Government securities; (2) to increase the discount rate, both to bring it into line with money market rates and indirectly to moderate the expansion of bank credit and money through increasing the cost of borrowed bank reserves; and (3) to raise the permissible maximum rate on time deposits so that banks would be better able to compete for money market funds needed to enable them to meet their large loan demands.

The threefold approach to reducing the distortion in credit markets recognizes the appropriateness of higher interest rates as a deterrent to excessive credit expansion in an economy that has absorbed most of its previous slack. The intent is not to cut off the expansion, but simply to keep it from accelerating to an unsustainable pace—to encourage both borrowers and lenders to examine proposed debt-financed expenditures a little more carefully and to screen and postpone some marginal projects.

In the 8 weeks since these actions were taken, new information that has become available has confirmed our judgment of the underlying situation. I am thinking here of the large upward revision in business plant and equipment expenditures in the last half of last year and in planned spending in the first half of 1966. There has also been a significant upward revision in the estimates of gross national product for the first three quarters of 1965 and a consequent raising of sights for the fourth quarter and the year ahead. In December, industrial production, personal incomes, wholesale prices, housing starts, new orders for durable goods, bank credit, and the money supply all showed sharp increases. And on top of all this came the need for greater military expenditures to finance the fighting in Vietnam.

A LOOK AHEAD

All these pieces of additional information suggest that the pressures on resources—human, material, and financial—that were developing last year could be even more intense this year. Price pressures and labor shortages are likely to increase with further expansion in activity and increased transfer of manpower to the needs of our military effort. Business demands for credit, which accounted for much of the increased credit expansion in 1965, are likely to remain very large. In addition to the big planned increase in plant and equipment expenditures, spending for inventories is likely to rise now that liquidation of steel inventories is about completed, and corporate profits, which benefited from a tax cut last year, may not rise much further this year.

Our balance-of-payments problem is still not solved. Though we have made some welcome progress toward equilibrium, we have a way to go yet. The last billion and a half of the deficit may be the hardest to eliminate. There is no easy way to improve the situation further, given our commitments to spend heavily for defense abroad, except to request financial institutions and nonfinancial corporations to continue to curtail, for the time being, their foreign lending and investing.

Military expenditures which were already accelerating last year are, as we all know, going to be even larger over the remainder of this fiscal year and are currently expected to be even larger in fiscal 1967. In the happy event that peace breaks out in Vietnam and such heavy military expenditures prove to be unnecessary, an intensification of the war on poverty and increased outlays for other needed domestic programs can be expected.

It is quite impossible to say what changes in monetary policy may be required from here on. Such changes will depend on many things—particularly on the full effects, which are as yet unknown, of the actions we have already taken, and on the Federal Government's fiscal and debt management policies. In the area of fiscal policy, the President's recent messages indicate that, although a large increase in spending is planned, a large increase in revenues is also expected—partly because of the continued rise in incomes and partly because of plans for an acceleration in the timing of receipts, which it is hoped will moderate not only Federal borrowing but also private spending.

Thus, it remains to be seen in what degree, and even in what direction, monetary policy may need to move in order best to promote the sustained and healthy growth of our economy. Monetary policy is a flexible instrument, and I can assure you we will be using it to the best of our ability to help bring about a continuation of a sound and sustainable economic expansion.

CONCLUSION

Now, in conclusion, what does all this mean to your business? What does it mean for construction and real estate finance?

You will note that it was the discount rate and maximum rates payable by commercial banks on time deposits that were raised in December. The ceiling rate on passbook savings was not raised. In the first place, such savings are in practice available on demand and, therefore, do not warrant as high an interest rate as time deposits with fixed maturities. Also, we did not want to disrupt the usual flow of individual saving to the variety of financial institutions and savings instruments.

Our actions raising time deposit ceiling rates are but another step in a series we have been taking in recent years to improve the functioning of financial markets. For a long time commercial banks were at a disadvantage relative to other financial institutions in competing for savings and money market funds. That disadvantage is being reduced, not by curbing other institutions but by eliminating unnecessary limitations on the banks. Hopefully, the end result will be freer and fuller functioning money and capital markets.

Evidence we have received to date suggests that banks have been using ther new found freedom in competing for funds wisely. There has been no great rush to raise rates or to compete too aggressively for funds.

Moreover, there has been no great shifting of savings among various institutions. Commercial bank time and savings deposits, in fact, have risen less sharply since the change in Regulation Q ceilings than they did before. And flows of funds to other savings institutions have not been greatly affected.

> Having said all this, although we expect a continued ample flow of funds into mortgages and residential construction this year, that flow will no doubt be dampened by our recent actions. But this, it seems to me, is warranted by the likely overall economic situation and, indeed, by the construction industry itself.
>
> I have been struck by the fact that we have been experiencing inflation in your industry for some years. Land values, construction wages, and construction costs in general have risen steadily and substantially. With the general economy likely to be under increased wage and price pressures this year, it is appropriate for some moderate additional restraint to be put on construction activity if disrupting price and wage pressures are to be prevented.
>
> The longer run needs of the economy for houses and construction of all kinds are very large. We want to do all in our power—both you in the industry and we in Government—to keep activity growing, but on a sound and sustainable basis.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for placing in the RECORD a statement of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] relative to the water resources development of this Nation of ours. Specifically, I was attracted by a statement that the Senator from Florida made relative to the criteria that the Corps of Engineers is now using in connection with the justification of navigation projects. To be sure that no Senators miss this important statement, I should like to repeat a few paragraphs from the statement of the Senator from Florida:

> You are all familiar with the efforts of the Corps of Engineers, and I say this in all candor as I know the engineers must take policy guidance from the Bureau of the Budget, to improve their methods of evaluating navigation benefits in carrying out the instructions issued by the Chief of Engineers under date of November 20, 1964, subject: "Waterway Improvement Studies—Navigation Benefits."
>
> Most of you are aware of the method that has been used in the past to calculate the so-called cost-benefit ratio of a project. Under the old and proven method, a survey of the resources of an area would be made to determine the products and tonnage that would be generated to move on a waterway, and the difference in the rate between the existing freight rate and the barge rate would be the savings attributable to the project. If the total of these annual benefits exceeded the annual total costs, including amortization and operation and maintenance, the project had a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio and was considered feasible; and the higher the ratio, the more desirable the project, therefore placing the project in an excellent position for congressional approval.
>
> Now comes the new criteria as prescribed by the Bureau of the Budget policy. In essence, the proposal would compare the barge rate with a theoretical rate that the competing modes of transportation might be compelled to adopt if a waterway were placed in operation. Of course, such a thing as this would tend to greatly reduce the benefits and frequently result in an unfavorable report.
>
> Should the competing forms of transportation place such theoretical rates into permanent effect there could be no argument, but they are not required to do so nor do they anticipate doing so.
>
> The new directive provides:
>
> "The traffic that would move over a considered waterway improvement will depend on the competitive rates by barge and alternative means that would likely be in effect with the waterway improvement. Therefore, estimates of waterway traffic will be prepared on the basis of projected 'water compelled' rates with consideration of all data and factors that are likely to modify current rates to take account of the competitive situation anticipated with the waterway in-being, and foreseeable technological developments applicable to the several transport media.
>
> "The benefits for the traffic (estimated as in above) that would move over an improved waterway will be computed as the difference in the projected competitive rates or charges for the movement by the alternative means that would be used in the absence of the waterway and the projected rates and charges utilizing the waterway. In developing the projected rates or charges, consideration will be given to all pertinent data and factors, including the competitive situation in the absence of the waterway, current rates, and foreseeable technological developments applicable to the several transport media. The benefits determined in this manner will be used in project justification and in the benefit-cost ratio.
>
> "In addition, reports will include an estimate of benefits obtained by applying unit savings based on the rates prevailing at the time of the study to the waterway traffic also estimated on the basis of rates prevailing at the time of the study."
>
> Based on this criteria, which seems absurd to me, a railroad might very easily fix rates in an area of a proposed project to discourage waterway traffic and thereafter raise the rates to the original level. Therefore, if on the basis of projected water compelled rates the benefits from an otherwise justifiable navigation project can be so depressed as to result in its rejection by the Engineers, the railroads can practically control the development of our inland waterways for navigation purpose by simply projecting totally unrealistic rates.
>
> The new directive is so ambiguous that few engineers can agree on its interpretation and to me it seems to be a shortsighted policy to insist on criteria which would tend to perpetuate a static or "no growth" climate for industrial development by continuing high transportation rates that the project would materially reduce.
>
> Incidentally, it is my understanding that no new projects have been approved under the new criteria, that is, since November, 1964, and that a review of many approved projects—with which we are in complete accord as being feasible and justified—under the new criteria would find them wanting for lack of a favorable cost-benefit ratio.

I am glad to associate myself with the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Louisiana, and many other Senators, in connection with the forthright statement which the Senator from Florida has made.

On January 14, Representative JIM WRIGHT, an outstanding Member of the House, addressed the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce. He, too, pointed out the fallacy of the formula that is now being forced upon good navigation projects. Representative WRIGHT said in part:

> During the past decade, your State has led the Nation in the development and conservation of your water supply. My hat is off to the citizens of Oklahoma City and of the western part of this State who have inspired the Nation with their display of statesmanship and vision in so actively supporting the Arkansas River project, even though thus far its tangible benefits have extended only to the eastern section of your State.
>
> And, despite the initial disappointment which all of us have felt over the somewhat negative report of the board of engineers for rivers and harbors, with men like MIKE MONRONEY, FRED HARRIS, and ED EDMONDSON plying the skill and resourcefulness and persuasion for which they are known, I firmly predict that no amount of obstruction will be able to hold back indefinitely the coming reality of the central Oklahoma project.
>
> As one Congressman from a neighboring State, I pledge to you that—as long as I have the privilege to serve on the Public Works Committee—this practical and necessary development will have my hand and my heart, my voice and my vote, and whatever help that I can give.
>
> The time is rapidly coming in the United States when that area blessed with a maximum development of its water resources will be better off by far than if it had oil or gold or uranium, or any other resource of the earth, but lacked water. I have never heard a more ridiculous or more specious argument than that forced upon the Corps of Engineers by the Bureau of the Budget that a better set of freight rates through other modes of transportation, brought about by a navigation project, should be considered as a cost rather than a benefit factor.
>
> It is obvious that the better rates will not come unless the canal is built. And if they should come as its competitive result, then I can't count that as anything but an additional benefit to the people.
>
> Development of our waterways was one of the first functions of government recognized by the Congress in the 1st decade of the 19th century. But the history of their development has been a history of thinking too small and acting too slowly.
>
> Not Oklahoma alone, but the Nation, will benefit by the central Oklahoma project. The best homiletic I have ever read on the subject was delivered on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives in 1848 by a young Congressman named Abraham Lincoln. He was speaking out against a Presidential veto of an omnibus public works measure.
>
> Lincoln demonstrated through the flawless logic that came to be his hallmark that, because of an inland waterway in remote Illinois, the sugar merchant in New Orleans sold his wares a "little dearer" and the housewife in Buffalo, N.Y., sugared her husband's coffee a "little cheaper."
>
> The history of that splendid professional group known as the Corps of Army Engineers has been a history of cautious calculations and conservative estimates to tonnages.
>
> The Engineers' projection on the Mississippi waterway was 9 million tons a year. In 1963, it carried almost 40 million tons—or 344 percent of the estimated volume.
>
> The Engineers projected 9 million tons a year for the Ohio waterway. In 1963, it was carrying 88 million tons, or almost 9 times the estimated amount, and the locks were having to be rebuilt to accommodate the burgeoning volume of usage.
>
> The original estimate, just a very few years ago, for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between New Orleans and Corpus Christi was only 7 million tons a year. That canal last year exceeded the official estimates by more than 10 times.
>
> But the value of water resource development cannot be written in tonnages alone. The great complex of industrial development in the United States has grown up primarily along our inland waterways system, and from this the Nation has benefited beyond measure.
>
> Last year, some 300 new industries sprang up along the banks of our Nation's navigable streams. This development not only creates a tax base for the local communities, it provides the payroll which generates other eco-

nomic activities ad infinitum. In context with all we have been discussing, this may be far more important for the future than we realize.

Mr. President, the central Oklahoma project, an extension of navigation from the Arkansas River to the vicinity of Oklahoma City, has recently undergone emasculation due to the application of this formula. Although the district engineer and the division engineer recommended to the chief of engineers the authorization of the central Oklahoma project, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, after reviewing the project and applying the new formula, recommended deferment of navigation until a demonstration of its worth could be made. We had been told repeatedly that the central Oklahoma project was one of the best, if not the best, of the navigation projects the corps had before it for consideration.

It is my understanding that this new criteria will result in no more navigation projects being built in the United States until the Congress or the executive agencies of this Government determine that the developing of the water resources of this country is of such importance to our growth and economy that they will return to the criteria which built the inland waterways of the country and provided the basis for billions of dollars of new industry along these waterways.

Mr. President, I join with others of this body in resisting a policy that is a detriment to the development of our country.

VIETNAM—PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SPEECH OF LAST NIGHT AND VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY'S RECENT TRIP TO THE FAR EAST

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it was my privilege to hear the television broadcast of the President's speech last night. He spoke the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of the American people in support of our Nation's position and in support of our men who are fighting in Vietnam at this very hour.

This morning it was my privilege, along with other Senators, to hear the Vice President speak about his trip to the Far East—Vietnam and other nations in that area—and his discussions with heads of governments there. In my opinion, that was one of the most eloquent and impressive statements which this Senator has had the privilege of hearing in a great number of years.

It is my hope that in due course the Vice President, while eliminating from his statement items that are necessarily confidential and secret, will make available to the American people information about his experiences and his conclusions as the result of his trip to that area.

Our Vice President exposed himself to considerable danger in order to visit our men on the battlefield, and in order to discuss with many leaders of foreign nations the desirability of stepping up aid they are giving this Nation, and also the desirability of working together toward social and economic reforms.

It would be best for the Vice President to speak for himself in these matters. Any Senator did not hear the Vice President this morning would be well advised to seek the opinion of the Vice President and let him explain what were his experiences and what his conclusions were.

Senators, of course, are privileged to know a great deal of secret information that the Vice President would not be privileged to give to the Nation as a whole.

One fortunate thing about our Vice President is that he is not inarticulate. He is very well able to explain his views and get across his ideas, even though some of the information he might like to marshal on which his conclusions are based might be of such secret or confidential nature that it cannot be made available generally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I repeat, as one who was fortunate enough to hear the Vice President this morning, I was extremely impressed. I hope all Senators who, for one reason or another, did not have occasion to hear him will have occasion to speak with him.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business and take up certain nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

George A. Avery, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia; and

Brig. Gen. Charles M. Duke, U.S. Army, and Paul L. Sitton, of the District of Columbia, to be members of the Advisory Board of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Irma V. Bouton, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we pass all matters on the Executive Calendar and start with the nomination of Lee C. White to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lee C. White, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be considered; and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The legislative clerk proceeded to read routine nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Environmental Science Services Administration and in the Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and they are confirmed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR McNAMARA OF MICHIGAN

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, today I wish to add my own personal comments to those of my colleagues who have recited the accomplishments of retiring Senator PAT McNAMARA.

Since I came to the Senate 4 years ago I have had the distinct personal privilege of serving on the Public Works Committee with the distinguished Michigan Senator as chairman. Our committee has made considerable progress in the last 4 years, and I wish to echo the comments of other Senators when I say that PAT McNAMARA's leadership and guidance will be missed. His 12 years of dedicated and progressive service to the Nation shall never be forgotten.

RENT SUBSIDIES

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, on February 6, the Arizona Republic in Phoenix—the largest daily newspaper published in my State—published a thoughtful and well-reasoned editorial on some of the dangers inherent in a program of rent subsidies. I believe this editorial deserves a wider audience and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arizona Republic, Feb. 6, 1966]

RENT SUBSIDY PLAN

One of the more controversial Great Society proposals is that of rent subsidies for those who do not otherwise qualify for public housing.

Last year Congress approved such a plan, but then the legislators refused to vote the necessary funds, charging that eligibility rules were so vague that persons who were not poor would qualify for subsidies. Whereupon L.B.J. came right back this year, asking for $30 million for rent subsidies in the fiscal year ending June 30, and requesting that the yearly payments be increased over 4 years to an annual rate of $150 million.

Under the plan, tenants would pay a quarter of their wages for rent, the Federal Government would subsidize the remainder. If the family's income increases, the rent subsidy will be reduced proportionately. Unlike public housing, which requires families to move after their income reaches a certain level, these families can continue living in their apartments whatever their income level, although they will not qualify for a subsidy if their income exceeds a specified ceiling.

Few would deny the need for rich America to provide adequate housing for its impoverished. And perhaps the rent subsidy plan will succeed where public housing, for all its good intentions, has not. But we would hope that Congress examines the proposal with a cold eye, to insure that it does not become a carrot for politicians to dangle before voters.

If such a possibility seems farfetched, we need only point to the experience of rent controls, which clearly were used as political bait to curry votes at the expense of a relatively small minority (i.e., the house and apartment owner).

In an incisive recent book, "Welfare, Freedom, and Inflation," world-famed economist Wilhelm Ropke noted:

"We have reached a stage when, to many people, it sounds strange when we ask the question why the earlier rule no longer holds good; that anyone who can afford to buy his suit out of his own pocket at the economic price, should also pay an economic price for his lodging.

"How does it come about that an otherwise perfectly reasonable citizen, who would be ashamed to let anybody else pay for his refrigerator, his motorcycle, or his lunch, has come to look on it as his unassailable right to shift part of the burden of the economic cost of his lodging onto someone else's shoulders?"

Professor Ropke was not, of course, referring to the truly poor, those whose impoverished condition puts them at the mercy of the state. He meant those greedy citizens who agitate for handouts or subsidies because they believe, or choose to believe, that nobody pays for anything that comes from the Government—that a handout or a subsidy is "free."

By all means, Congress should make provisions for those who genuinely need housing assistance. But it must take pains to exclude from the Government watering trough those who merely have their hands out in hope of something for nothing.

CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, 48 years ago on February 16, the people of Lithuania declared their independence. Latvia and Estonia also proclaimed their independence the same year. In the two decades of freedom that they enjoyed great progress was made. Agrarian reform was brought about, culture flourished, foreign trade was expanded, stable currency was introduced and other needed social reforms occurred. In short, the outlook for these small nations was bright. Independence and freedom, unfortunately, were too short-lived, for in 1940, these small Baltic States were ruthlessly overrun by Soviet aggression. In addition to exercising totalitarian political control, the Soviet Union has exploited the economic resources, stiffled cultural development and has attempted to substitute athestic communistic ceremonies for the deeply religious feelings of these brave people in the Baltic States.

Naturally, Mr. President, the sons and daughters of these captive nations who immigrated to the United States vigorously reacted to the destruction of freedom in their former native lands. Descendants of the peoples of the Baltic States continue to point out to the world this oppression under Soviet rule. All Americans resent the subjugation of these small nations. The policy of our Government reflects these sentiments, for our Government fails to recognize the cruel annexation of the small countries by the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I know free people everywhere join me today in hoping that the 25 years of enslavement of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian people will someday be ended and that these small countries together with all the nations of the world will be able to determine for themselves their own destiny.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY TO LEGISLATIVE BODIES

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, last November when the Interparliamentary Union Conference met in Geneva, Switzerland, which I attended as president of the U.S. delegation, a most interesting and informative address was delivered to the group by Edward Wenk, Jr., of the Library of Congress on the increasing importance of science and technology to legislative bodies in the world today.

Mr. Wenk made a scholarly and informative presentation, and I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Information Required by Parliaments in a World Increasingly Dependent Upon Science

(An address before the Interparliamentary Union Conference, Geneva, Switzerland, Nov. 5, 1965, by Edward Wenk, Jr., Chief, Science Policy Research Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress)

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary General, ladies and gentlemen, it is a very great privilege to have been invited to participate in this symposium of the Interparliamentary Union. And it is all the more an honor to represent the scientific community at this auspicious dedication of the Union's new home.

The long history and high purpose of this body in seeking world peace and enhancement of the democratic process are well known. Especially in Geneva, the city of peace, I felt it all the more appropriate to recall the basic relationships of science and politics that constitute the theme of my assignment. Science knows no national boundaries. In a troubled world, communications between scientists have often supplemented and aided international understanding when political solutions seemed remote.

In the United States, we have a long tradition of recognizing that politics and science mix. Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson actively sought advancement and applications of science to serve public purposes—then to help a newly developing nation.

Science and the democratic process were found to blend easily. They still do today. Both reflect a common striving for progress; both test emerging truths through the process of critical inquiry; both are subject to constant revision and to revitalization—not by edicts of a few but by contributions of many.

We recognize more today than ever before, however, that science is itself passive. Even technology is amoral, for the deliberate use of science for practical purposes may produce adverse as well as beneficial effects. What results depends much more on decisions of the politician and parliamentarians than on decisions of scientists or engineers. This, in fact, is science policy.

We are then faced with the question of what information is required for policy decisions.

If all history were recorded, we would probably find that emperors and empires failed for want of some specific piece of information. In our own technological era, satirists picture governments going down to defeat, or at least paralyzed not by too little information but by too much.

The scientific world also views with alarm problems arising from an exponential growth in literature that seems to propagate faster than a colony of rabbits. This topic of "Information Required by Parliaments in a World Increasingly Dependent Upon Science" thus invites opportunities to view the double calamity when two information-rich universes meet.

Rather than deal with the obvious, I should like to pose the thesis that additional burdens imposed on representative government by questions of public policy involving science can be met by the improved quality and structuring of information for deliberation and decisionmaking. And although this notion is discussed with principal reference to the U.S. Government, we may find a note of optimism: that all parliaments may find science a source of remedies as well as of problems—a means for fulfilling their modern basic functions in a democracy.

SCIENCE CONFOUNDS POLICYMAKING

Every parliament has a fundamental need for information to aid in the making of intelligent choices. The growing agenda about science and technology has sharply intensified that need. The pace of scientific discovery and engineering application has accelerated. Subject matter has become more complex. Relationships among Government, universities, and private enterprise have become more intertwined. Budgets have grown sharply, and policy decisions affect more people, more quickly and more continually than ever before.

To make these decisions, we have a critical need for information that is authentic, complete, and timely. And it must be available in a form suitable for comprehension and employment by a policymaker.

Delegates to this symposium of the Interparliamentary Union do not need to be reminded that the primary involvement of parliaments with science arises not from science for its own sake, but from the potential contribution of science to serve society. We know from recent experience that technology and science may strengthen national security, stimulate economic growth, provide food and fiber, counter disability and disease, and alter the qualities of natural environment.

This last concern refers not only to chemical pollution of air and water, but also to esthetic pollution of our cities from urban crowding amidst tasteless architecture, and acoustical pollution from noise. We have learned from the energetic application of science to military affairs that the consequences of science are critically influenced by policy decisions in the public domain. Thus, to maintain an environment salubrious to both body and spirit, the policymaker must seek a continuous partnership with science.

FIVE CLASSES OF ISSUES

Science-related decisions by the policymaker involve five classes of issues: (a) Identifying goals; (b) assigning priorities between competing goals (usually through appropriations); (c) determining the scope and direction of Federal involvement, in relation to State and private initiatives; (d) matching manpower, facilities, and information transfer facilities to goals, and (e) designating responsibility and authority to Federal agencies. All of these steps may be influenced by opportunities afforded by science.

INFORMATION ILLUMINATES ALTERNATIVES

Information about progress through science is then needed for three functions: to illuminate alternatives; to provide criteria for choice; and to facilitate political strategy.

The first role of information is to illuminate choices—not scientific choices, but political choices. Here, considerations of science must be integrated with economics, political processes, domestic and social policies, and institutional relationships.

Because resources are inevitably limited, choices must be made between alternative goals—as between funds for manned exploration of Mars or an accelerated search for cancer cure. Choices must be made between alternative means to reach the same goal—such as between manned bombers or submarine-based missiles.

INFORMATION PROVIDES CRITERIA FOR CHOICE

Information also forms the basis of rational criteria for choice. Cost-effectiveness indexes comprise one set of yardsticks for which data are required to assess both the costs and the benefits. As methodology for long-range planning improves, criteria will take into account total as well as initial costs, and also manpower requirements. Effects on society will also become a factor in choice, more and more amenable to rational actions as we conduct research in behavioral sciences as intently as we do in the natural sciences.

What is an acceptable level for sonic boom? Someday, we may adopt quantified criteria for such political questions in a democracy, based on the proposition that actions in the long run must increase options for the greatest number of individuals.

INFORMATION FACILITATES STRATEGIES

Every policymaker knows that correct decisions depend as much on timing and on effective implementation as on the original choice. Such a decision thus depends on balance between short-range and long-range factors, between investment and opportunistic exploitation. Because of the high costs and high risks that attend development of say a new supersonic transport or nuclear powered ships, there is clearly a need to avoid premature decisions. To defer commitment, to maximize options, to make the U-turn when at a deadend street, are well-known strategies for the effective exercise of political power and responsibility. All of these qualities of flexibility become more viable in the presence of scientific facts.

TYPICAL SCIENCE POLICY ISSUES

This informational framework for policymaking assumes real dimensions when considering science policy issues concerning both "ends" and "means." The first session of the 89th Congress was confronted with such questions as: authorizing of $5.4 billion for space exploration; long-range planning for space activities following the 1970 manned lunar landing; establishing goals for marine exploration and resources development, and improving coordination of 20 agencies engaged in oceanography; abating air pollution; expanding fresh water resources; conducting research on and developing a supersonic transport and high-speed rail transportation between Boston and Washington; establishing a new Environmental Science Services Administration; specifying requirements for academically related basis research, and for support of graduate students; defining needs to increase the number and geographical distribution of centers of research and educational excellence; facilitating the transfer of science to civilian-based technology; defining criteria for site selection for a new 200 Bev accelerator; studying economic implications of U.S. conversion to the metric system; appropriating over $16 billion for federally sponsored research and development, nearly half related to military security, but an even larger amount devoted to such technology-based activities as public works.

The list only suggests the diversity and complexity of questions involving science and technology—the relevance to a vast number of public purposes that become reflected, incidentally, in the jurisdiction of a large number of different congressional committees.

CONGRESSIONAL CONCERN FOR ADEQUATE SCIENCE ADVICE

In the United States, the White House moved late in 1957 to meet the unprecedented challenge of science-based issues. The President has now available a four-component advisory apparatus of experts: the office of Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology and the President's Science Advisory Committee; in 1959, the Federal Council for Science and Technology; and in 1962, the statutory Office of Science and Technology.

These initiatives found our Congress, already "outmanned and outgunned," at an even further disadvantage in maintaining some degree of parity in technical competence for policymaking. The Congress is continually the target of much unsolicited information. Some information originates from parties at interest, some from the executive branch. Frequently, the information is flavored by advocacy. While such contributions are essential to democratic political process for the Congress to be a mirror of consensus, the purification of information by impartial analysis, "to separate the signal from the noise," vastly increases value of information to the policymaker.

In 1963, Senators MONRONEY, ANDERSON, and BARTLETT, and Congressmen MILLER, DADDARIO, and Sibal, proposed a variety of steps that ranged from strengthening existing staff elements to creating entirely new legislative agencies patterned after the Office of Science and Technology.

All of these proposals reflect the desire for better rather than more science-related information. Even more significantly, these proposals implied informational resources made more useful through analysis. Decisionmakers always want access to raw data—but they now demanded access to powerful staff resources where the only loyalty is to objective interpretation. By this means, the Congress, like the President, may ask the right questions.

STRENGTHENED SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Many new sources have been developed. The Congress now looks to the President's Office of Science and Technology for governmentwide information on such interagency programs as weather services, oceanography, and science information. Otherwise, in crossing agency lines and committee jurisdiction, these programs tend to be fragmented so as to go beyond rational assessment.

The Congress also looks to the National Science Foundation as a source of statistics and analysis concerning funds for research and development, scientific and technical manpower and facilities. Such data are categorized so as to show the distribution by field, by agency, by performer, and even by geographical distribution.

The Congress has also recognized the function of the National Academy of Sciences to advise the Congress as well as the executive branch on special topics, but especially on the needs and opportunities of science itself. A new Academy of Engineering may soon be an additional source of counsel.

Congress has long sought the advice of competent outsiders. Greater use is being made of expert witnesses whose testimony is solicited singly or in concert to explain implications of scientific developments, rather than to invite a position on an issue.

These sources are increasingly effective as the Members inform themselves in order to break through the monolithic views of administration witnesses, and to identify alternatives from which the final decision was made—a decision often propounded with such energy as to make it appear that only one choice was available. Ultimately, however, the Congress has had to reinforce its own committee organization, its committee staff, and the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress as primary resources for gathering facts, for helping to identify issues, for obtaining testimony at hearings, and for identifying pros and cons of alternative actions.

NEW CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

When congressional apprehension rose in 1963 over the lack of control over growing research budgets, the House established a new Select Committee on Government Research. In its 1 year of operation, it developed a broad base of statistics and findings primarily on administrative elements of Federal research and development. Interestingly enough, its major recommendation for action applied to the Congress rather than to the Executive—to establish a new Joint Congressional Committee on Research Policy.

And also established in 1963 was a new Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, chaired by Congressman EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, one of the U.S. delegates to this symposium. His subcommittee opened with a series of "posture" hearings, and has continued even more intensified activity since. During this last session, the subcommittee held hearings on the present and future role of the National Science Foundation to assure the quantity and quality of the Nation's science resources to meet foreseeable national needs. Amendments to the Organic Act are being prepared.

In the 89th Congress, a new Subcommittee on Research and Technical Programs was established in the House Government Operations Committee under Congressman HENRY REUSS that has focused on conflicts between Federal research and education. A Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower under Senator GAYLORD NELSON held extensive hearings on the implications of undue localization of Federal research funds, while a new Subcommittee on Government Research has been established under Senator FRED HARRIS with a yet undisclosed agenda.

As suggested by the sample of actions of the 89th Congress mentioned earlier, many substantive and appropriation committees have been looking at how science serves explicit public purposes.

SCIENCE POLICY RESEARCH DIVISION

The major new step to expand the base of information and advice needed by the entire Congress to deal with science-related issues was establishment of the Science Policy Research Division (SPRD) in the fall of 1964. Following patterns enunciated through the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act of 1946 in such fields as international affairs, conservation, and social welfare, this new unit was established in the Legislative Reference Service by appointment of a number of technical specialists to serve all Members of both parties and all committees. The division deals with two sets of issues: concerning deliberate exploitation of scientific discovery to serve public purposes, and concerning the allocation or development of funds and manpower required to fuel the Nation's scientific enterprise.

Emphasis in the new unit was placed more on policy-type research than on reference-type inquiries and 1 year of operating experience strongly confirms congressional interest in utilizing this new capability at its highest intellectual potential. In operating terms, it functions much like the President's Office of Science and Technology. Issues are virtually the same. The main difference lies in SPRD having to avoid partisan advocacy and in having no responsibility to operate as does OST in carrying out coordination of interagency programs for the President.

During its first year, the division received more than 600 legislative-related inquiries—from 48 different Senators and 105 Congressmen, and from some 16 standing subcommittees in the 2 Houses. Assistance was furnished for 8 different committee hearings; 60 analytical studies were prepared, 10 of which were of 75 or more pages. Two major studies have been released with acknowledgment of SPRD authorship: "Government Weather Programs," a report of 203 pages for the House Committee on Government Operations, and "The National Science Foundation—a General Review of Its First 15 Years," a report of 286 pages prepared for the House Science and Astronautics Committee. The division also filled 30 requests for major addresses or statements; 175 for personal consultation; 118 for factual materials. It monitored over 450 requests for scientific information unrelated to policy.

NEW TECHNIQUES

One of the most important functions of the new division in dealing with science policy is the structuring of information to reveal relationships that often escape notice but that become increasingly significant because of implicit if not explicit impact of a decision on elements not conspicuously related to the issue. Arrays of facts make visible the inconsistencies between policies and programs of different agencies; time series show trends of budgetary commitments where past decisions may preempt future options.

This approach has been extended to become a systems analysis mode of problem solving. And here, it becomes possible to treat in a policy sense all elements related to one objective, for example, such as low-cost transportation. Otherwise, treatment as single elements of rail, ship, and/or truck could result in contradictory and self-defeating policies. A similar treatment proves necessary when dealing with management of human ecology where goals of high agricultural productivity enhanced by use of pesticides collide with other goals of protecting human health.

These steps—from fact, to one dimensional interpretation of fact, to a multidimensional analysis—are essential if information for science-based questions is to receive maximum utility.

NEW TOOLS

A collateral step yet to come is to employ modern automatic data processing equipment to store and retrieve selectively such facts as may be desired and, through experimental permutations, to search for subtle relationships not otherwise readily disclosed. Such equipment has been proposed to facilitate housekeeping chores of legislatures—to permit rapid readout of budget data or to determine status of pending legislation; to record votes, or to locate documents as their numbers increase. But such equipment also makes it possible to keep track of contract awards, the status of the Nation's manpower—and to test on paper through techno-economic models the quantitative merits of alternatives, say between two techniques for flood control. Such tools will be no panacea for dealing with science-related issues, but they will help meet problems of complexity and change, especially to permit a legislature to meet the expertise of the executive branch with some informed but independent judgments of their own.

Such tools must be servants, not masters. They should not be permitted to hasten the political process beyond the speed of human deliberation, or beyond the rate of reciprocal communication between parliaments and the grassroots of consensus.

Staff of a very special kind are required for legislative research and for effective employment of new informational tools dealing with science. Expertise in scientific disciplines is necessary, but not sufficient. Other background is necessary in legislative process, public law, economics, foreign affairs. Personal qualities are required of objectivity and ability to sense and solve problems, think logically and structure ideas. Staff are needed who combine muscular skepticism with a humanistic approach to science and technology—who, like the language translator, must speak two languages—that of science or engineering, and that of politics.

Blending science with public policy is so new that no readymade academic training ground exists for recruitment. Also, most candidates in this area began their professional development "at the bench" and usually view policy research as a diversion from their career. It has thus been necessary in the Science Policy Research Division to develop new policy staff at the same time that the analytical needs of the Congress were being satisfied.

NEW CONGRESSIONAL INITIATIVES

The 89th Congress has developed a new confidence in dealing with these issues in science and technology. There has been selective, critical probing; review of arguments of the Executive; action to end fence straddling, for example in a move toward more institutional grants for research as compared with project grants.

In the case of oceanography, the Congress has taken initiative over a wide front of action ranging from improved coordination to establishment of marine exploration as a new public purpose.

But involvement of the U.S. Congress in science policy affairs is intensifying, because the issues themselves are changing: after a vigorous growth of Federal science mainly to serve military security needs, more stabilized international relations and the growing concern about economic and social problems are accelerating a transition to a new mode of Federal technology. The present plateau in U.S. spending for research and development provides an opportunity to build a far more durable base for the present science-technology enterprise. A major problem, therefore, arises on how to employ and dispose the capabilities developed for security objectives for the continued benefit of man, how to integrate this composite of ideas and talent with the other significant elements in a free enterprise, pluralistic society of capital and entrepreneurship which have been the key to vigorous extension of our democratic ideals.

We thus pose a new set of science policy issues that pivot on the old questions of "Whether?" and "How?" Such questions were historically raised in relation to the scientific projects of military significance. But these past decisions did not have the economic, legal, and geopolitical implications of those being raised today.

Because the new issues cannot be handled on faith, protected by necessary considerations of military security, the funding and the legislative actions on science-related issues in the future must be far more carefully tuned to public support than may have been possible in the past. The Congress may extend its activities to new areas as they have previously in agricultural and health research. Recent action in the water resources, transportation, and pollution fields may well signal this trend.

To accomplish this transition, however, the U.S. Congress, as a mirror of consensus, is expecting to play an even stronger role in linking science to public policy, in blending engineering, economics, law and politics, funds and organization—the essential ingredients of technology. Federal structure for science and technology, at all levels, is being evaluated to update missions and roles, and legislation is being considered to meet the rapid obsolescence of science-based Federal agencies. But special interests and the general public must become better informed and more energetic participants in the democratic system, by conducting science policy research of their own.

SUMMARY

If parliaments are to maintain their basic functions in a democracy, they must provide for science to serve society. Better information is needed in dealing with science-related issues in order that they fulfill their coordinate role in policymaking—to identify public purposes; assign priorities; determine scope of Federal involvement; match resources to goals; and assure prudent Federal management. Such information must reveal alternatives of action as well as the criteria for choice and appropriate political strategies.

What we need is better information—not necessarily more. We must draw on the entire base of scientific discovery and on technology. We must also draw on the body of literature dealing with economics, law, public administration, and foreign affairs. Numerous devices to elicit information are available. But for information to be of maximum value for use by policymakers, it must be structured, analyzed, and arrayed to reveal complex, subtle, yet vital, relationships.

While these analyses for parliaments draw primarily on contributions of authorities in many fields, they may require a new family of staff resources. In the United States, a Science Policy Research Division has been established to serve the U.S. Congress. Its functions are similar to those of the President's Office of Science and Technology. But here, a policy research staff has been insulated from political involvement so that as advisers, their only loyalty is to professional objectivity. Their main role is thus to help the Congress ask the right questions.

Modern automatic data processing equipment and new information handling techniques will be increasingly utilized to meet the complexity and pace of modern decisionmaking. But these tools must never be viewed as substitutes for shrewd, informed political judgment.

Finally, in a representative government, it is increasingly apparent that parliaments must be not only recipients of science-based information. Parliaments must also be the source of information and interpretation—to illuminate the issues and alternatives before the Nation. Only by this step can we assure adequate exchange of views with the constituency, for parliamentary action to indeed be "the people's choice."

GOODNESS IS AS GOODNESS DOES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Dr. James A. McCain, president of Kansas State University, delivered the commencement address at Marymount College on May 30, 1965.

This address displayed a remarkable insight and understanding concerning America's image abroad. This evaluation entitled "Goodness Is as Goodness Does" is built upon the central theme of our personal and national preoccupation with our image both at home and abroad.

Describing this as disturbing, Dr. McCain states:

> It reflects far more anxiety over how we appear than how we are, over form rather than substance, over avoiding the appearance of evil rather than evil itself.

His suggestions in contrasting American with European education are most helpful and because this address forms such a steady guide in these days, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOODNESS IS AS GOODNESS DOES

Americans, like Narcissus of the Greek legend, have suddenly discovered their image. But unlike Narcissus, they are distressed by what they see. National associations of doctors, lawyers, and teachers, for example, are employing public information programs to change bad public images of their respective professions. Chambers of commerce have turned to Madison Avenue advertising experts to alter negative aspects of their images that hinder economic growth of their respective communities.

In fact, America's image abroad was a major issue in the last two national elections.

All of this is disturbing. It reflects far more anxiety over how we appear than how we are, over form rather than substance, over avoiding the appearance of evil rather than evil itself.

You college graduates of 1965, departing the groves of academe to enter an image-ridden society, would do well to apply the superior sense of values and intellectual insights provided by your education to the task of redressing the balance. More specifically, we should be more energetic in removing shortcomings than making it appear we don't have any.

Take the problem of America's image abroad as a case in point. We have been shocked by mob assaults on U.S. embassies throughout Asia, Africa, and Latin America in protest against our military actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. However, I can assure you from personal experience that overt hostility toward the United States is by no means a recent development but has flourished for many years in these same nations.

Much of this attitude is a compound of Communist propaganda and an altogether too human disposition to be resentful of a rich uncle who lives on the other side of the tracks. However, from visits I made during the past 7 years to some 50 universities in Europe, Asia, and the Near East and conferences with scores of Latin American students and professors, I assess this image as basically intellectual and social, rather than political, in character.

Outside the United States, universities are more influential in molding public opinion and reflecting the attitudes they mold than is the case here. The United States, according to the majority opinion I encountered, is equated with materialism, anti-intellectualism, and racial intolerance.

Our image abroad has been done grievous damage by race relations and civil rights crises in Arkansas, and more recently in Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi. In Europe, in the spring of 1957, I found communism universally stigmatized by the brutal suppression of the Hungarian revolt by Russian tanks and troops. Just a few months later our Little Rock crisis more than offset whatever propaganda advantage we derived from Hungary.

On the same trip I was shocked to learn that Scandinavian mothers dreaded the possible Americanizing of their children much as we abhor juvenile delinquency. Comic books, bubble gum, and rock and roll music were the hallmarks of the American influence.

European professors and students who had visited American campuses acknowledged the excellence of American scholarship in the major disciplines and the first-rate quality of our university Ph. D. programs. However, they were stunned by hyperthyroid student activity programs which undeniably depress undergraduate academic achievement with a resulting quality of education considerably below minimum European standards.

Unfortunate as this image is, I find even more distressing the proposals for correcting it. One extensive public opinion probe indicated that twenty percent of our people had no remedy to offer and the remainder favored more foreign aid, less foreign aid, or firing the Secretary of State. Apparently no one thought of remedying the conditions responsible for the image.

Now, how Americans are regarded by other people is a matter of vital concern to all of us. In "This Little Village We Call the World", to borrow a happy phrase from Adlai Stevenson, our economic welfare is conditioned by the rapport we can maintain with the common market or our capacity to persuade Nigerians to add wheat to their diet.

More important, victory in the cold war may well be decided by whether we or the Communists win the loyalties of some one and a third billion uncommitted peoples.

Obviously our self-interest requires that we zealously cultivate a favorable public image abroad. To do so successfully we must deal first with whatever shortcomings earn us a bad reputation, not the reputation itself.

Are we, as charged, a materialistic people more concerned with creature comforts than creative arts? By way of denial, we can cite our hundreds of symphony orchestras and art museums, unprecedented sales of paperback books and classical phonograph records. Unfortunately, however, the "Beverly Hillbillies" are a regrettably accurate measure of public taste in television, Mr. Minow's intellectual wasteland, and studies reveal that only 17 percent of Americans can be found reading a book at any given time in contrast with 40 percent of the people of many European nations. The Hollywood films which attract the largest audiences at home and give us such a lurid reputation abroad are usually sensational and utterly tasteless.

In contrast with the high humanitarian principles we profess, we must admit to a distressing degree of racial prejudice and discrimination. True enough, recent civil rights legislation by our Federal Government and the imminent prospect of legislation to remove racial barriers to voter registration are major steps toward solving these problems. Nevertheless, intolerance still poisons the hearts and minds of many of our people and still finds overt expression not only in the South but in other parts of the Nation as well.

I know that many of you in this graduating class have prepared for the teaching profession. If education is to contribute more effectively to cultural and intellectual enrichment, as teachers you must accept for yourselves and exact from your students unprecedented standards of excellence.

We have witnessed a gradual erosion of the image of the teacher as a person of profound knowledge. Chaucer's clerk of Oxford 600 years ago had "At his beddes heed twenty bokes, clad in blak and reed of Aristotle and his philosophye of a pedagogue in the eighteenth century, Goldsmith rhapsodized and still the wonder grew that one small head could carry all he knew."

Too often today, by contrast, public opinion accords the teacher a weak third place, after the doctor and lawyer, on the totem pole of erudition.

I know from personal experience that a distinguished college such as Marymount requires of those preparing to teach a broad liberal education including exposure to one or more of the fine arts. A principal measure of the success of these studies will be the extent to which you continue to cultivate them now that the compulsions of class attendance and grades are removed.

I think it both timely and fitting to recommend to the teachers a vigorous pursuit of new knowledge through avid reading of first-rate books and magazines, and no less so that they become patrons and supporters of the arts.

With the teacher thus fortified, the student's sights should be raised to a comparable degree. Four suggestions occur to me as I contrast American with European education.

First, high scholastic achievement should be enthroned as the distinction most to be cherished. In Sweden at the close of each high school academic year those students scoring highest on examinations are paraded through town on the shoulders of their fellows and earn the right to wear a distinctive cap to herald their achievement. In America such accolades are too often confined to beauty queens or, in schools such as mine, to quarterbacks or 6-foot-9 pivot men.

Secondly, a minimum requirement for high school graduation should be competence in the use of oral and written English. Ours are the world's only universities which admit students still in need of basic instruction in their mother tongue.

Third, I would revive the old-fashioned notion that a sound education is literary in character. Former Chancellor Hutchins of the University of Chicago deplored the fact that one can attend many American colleges for 4 years and earn a degree without having been required to read one good book in its entirety. This criticism is applicable with even more validity to many of our secondary schools. To cultivate enthusiasm for good reading should be a central aim of instruction.

Finally, compositions by the masters should have a major place on the programs of musicians and musical groups. Certainly no reasonable person would ban popular music or the stirring marches of the band from the high school scene. But to emphasize these at the expense of Beethoven, Brahms and Mozart is to distort the ends of education.

Of course, college graduates generally, whether teachers or members of other learned professions, must accept major responsibilities for sharpening America for her growing role of world leadership.

The task of stamping out intolerance will require the combined efforts of home, school, church, and the law, with the leadership and example supplied by college-educated men and women. False racist doctrines must be exposed to the light of scientific fact at every opportunity.

Persons of influence must help persuade the general public that not only our self-respect but our security demands a solution of this problem. The nonwhite nations of Asia, Africa, and South America will inevitably be more impressed by the treatment of our nonwhite minority at home than the idealism we profess abroad, and to win the loyalty of these nations is a major aim of the U.S. foreign policy.

Similarly, I would enlist your support for these various international programs through which America is so magnificently redeeming a responsibility for world leadership.

After a shaky start, the Peace Corps has discovered and put to excellent use an unsuspected reservoir of idealism among American youth, so long regarded as frivolous and self-seeking.

Through people to people, educational exchange, and foreign aid programs, we have extended the hand of friendship and shared our plenty with less privileged people all over the globe.

Thus the typical American of the 1960's is no longer the smug isolationist lampooned in the foreign press prior to World War II, and you can be certain that our image abroad has improved accordingly.

What Americans are, then, is the essence; the image we convey is only incidental. Our greatness as a nation is exceeded only by our aspirations. College graduates have an obligation stronger than most to seek the realization of those aspirations. The image will follow the achievement as the night follows the day.

ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today marks the 48th year since the Estonian—Diet—declared Estonia an independent state. I wish to take this opportunity to offer warm congratulations to the Estonian people and their thousands of friends in America upon commemorating that event.

But Estonia today is no longer independent—it saddens us to reflect that this proud nation has fallen under the yoke of the Soviet Union. In fact, it has been incorporated into the Soviet Union as one of the constituent republics. This was accomplished contrary to the will of the Estonian people during World War II. Although the Estonians do not relish their present imprisonment by Russia, they view occupation somewhat as an old phenomenon. Czarist Russia once occupied the country for almost 200 years, from 1721 to 1918. Yet even as Russian domination existed and as Russia attempted to replace Estonian culture with that of the Russians, Estonian nationalist fervor flourished and ultimately led to independence. That nationalistic spirit remains strong today.

World War I provided Estonia with the first genuine opportunity at self-determination. She took advantage of it and proclaimed her independence. After fending off numerous attacks by the Communists, she was able to enjoy approximately 22 years of relative independence. Her domestic program of increasing educational opportunities and agricultural and industrial output were summarily halted when Russia reoccupied her in June 1940. By July 1940 a Russian-sponsored Estonian Government had declared Estonia a member of the Soviet Union—an example of peaceful coexistence in action.

Born largely as a result of one war and imprisoned 22 years later after the outbreak of another war, Estonia's people have proved their hardiness through enduring so many years of turmoil and pain. But even these tragic circumstances have not compromised Estonia's desire for freedom and self-determination. This is truly a tribute to a brave and selfless people.

As we offer congratulations and cite Estonia's past achievements, let us also consider her future. Let us pledge anew our promise to aid her in her quest for freedom and independence. Estonia's plight must become the concern of all freemen.

FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, ever since 1961 I have sponsored legislation to establish a Federal Department of Transportation.

I am deeply concerned that a nation so heavily dependent on transportation continues to rely upon a transportation system that is in a state of chaos.

According to the President, our national transportation policies and programs are spread across 35 agencies and cost about $5 billion a year. Yet, there is now no central responsibility in the executive branch for developing unified transportation policy and little, if any, coordination among the hodge-podge of programs which subsidize or promote the various modes.

There is a pressing need, in the interests of a balanced, effective transportation system, to bring order out of this situation. A transportation department could help fulfill this need and, undoubtedly, save the taxpayers a lot of money.

I was glad, therefore, that the President has come to share my view about this matter. In his state of the Union message he proposed creation of a separate cabinet department on transportation.

In an article in the February 18 issue of Commonweal, the perceptive and able writer, Mr. William V. Shannon, succinctly spells out the dimensions of the transportation problem confronting our country. He points out the creation of a Federal Transportation Department is "only a modest, first step" toward the rationalization of transportation policies and programs that is so urgently needed.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by William V. Shannon be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Transportation Tangle

One of the surprises in President Johnson's state of the Union message last month was his request for a Cabinet-level Department of Transportation. This has been a favorite idea of reformers interested in transportation problems; Senator Clifford Case, New Jersey Republican, and other Members of Congress have from time to time introduced bills to create such a department, but no one expected President Johnson to espouse the change this year.

A British friend of mine who works at the World Bank expressed mystification that such a department had not been set up long ago or that its proposal now should be expected to stir any controversy. "Whenever the Bank sends a mission to even the most underdeveloped country, we assume as a matter of course that it will have a ministry of transport. Why doesn't the United States as the most developed country in the world have one?"

The principal answer is that ours is the only country in the world in which all the major forms of transportation—railroads, airlines, trucking, buses, barge lines, and merchant marine—are in private ownership. Each of them has at various times received enormous subsidies: land grants for the railroads, mail subsidies and the construction of airports for the airlines. Government-built superhighways for the trucks and buses, canals for the barges, and construction subsidies for the merchant marine. But when planning and regulation are under consideration, this public largess is forgotten. It is not in the interest of the various private operators to call it to anyone's attention, and the public tends to accept the myth that a railroad or an airline is a private enterprise quite like any other.

If most or all of these transportation elements were Government-owned, it would clarify the nature of the Nation's transportation problems. It would then be apparent that the genuine competition is not between rival airlines (such as *United* v. *TWA*) or between rival railroads (the *Pennsylvania* v. the *New York Central*) but between the different types of transport. The railroads compete with the airlines and buses for passenger traffic; they compete with the barge lines for certain freight business and with the trucks for other kinds. The wave of railroad mergers which started more than a decade ago and which is still underway makes this clear; only merged railroads are financially strong enough to withstand the competition of the truckers and other rivals. The discontinuance of passenger service also points to the same direction. The retreat from the passenger business represents a confession that the railroads cannot effectively compete for passengers under circumstances as they now exist. But both the mergers and the reductions in service are erratic moves decided upon solely on the basis of the financial circumstances of particular railroad companies. The interests of bondholders and stockholders get more attention than the public interest. Although the Interstate Commerce Commission has to approve specific mergers and cutbacks in service, there is at present no way for the Government to relate these moves to the rest of the transportation industry or to any coherent plan.

At the State level, Government has been edging toward public ownership. Thus, the State of New York controls the Long Island Railroad and is now negotiating an agreement with Connecticut for joint ownership of the passenger service of the New Haven Railroad in the bistate metropolitan area. Somewhat similar quasi-public arrangements for commuter railroad service exist in Boston and Philadelphia. At the Federal level, however, there is reluctance to develop concerted transportation policies, much less adopt any course of action that smacks of socialism. The result is that odd gaps and anomalies have begun to develop in the Nation's transportation network. It is impossible, for example, to travel by train between two such sizable cities as Boston, Mass., and Portland, Maine; indeed, there is no passenger railroad service at all in the State of Maine. There are already a half-dozen State capitals in this country which cannot be reached by train. Northeast, the airline that serves New England, is not profitable; the effort to make it so by cutting it in on the New York-to-Miami run already shared by two other airlines failed to generate enough additional revenues. Other airlines serving regional markets are healthier than Northeast but some are still economically marginal.

What would a "systems analysis" recommend in place of this jerry-built corporate structure in transportation? The densely populated corridor from Boston to Washington, D.C., provides an example. The hourly shuttle service by jet makes no sense for safety reasons; the airspace has become so crowded in this corridor that pilots have to take evasive action on almost every trip to avoid midair collisions. Travel by bus and private automobile does not make sense either for reasons of time and efficiency. Buses, even though breaking speed limits, still take more than 3 hours to drive from New York to Washington; private automobiles take about an hour longer. The logical way—safe, fast, and efficient—would be to travel from Boston to New York or New York to Washington by train.

It is now technologically possible to make either of these trips by train in less than 2 hours. Jet service should be reserved for long trips of 500 miles or more where the greater distance makes the use of jets reasonable and economic. Automobiles should be reserved for pleasure trips to the mountains and other relatively inaccessible places and for travel in and around towns and metropolitan suburbs where space on roads and in parking lots is still available; they ought not to be used for travel between major cities or into the congested centers of those cities. A rational allocation of patronage along these lines would eliminate any need for the fourth airport now being urged for Metropolitan New York (in addition to Kennedy, La Guardia, and Newark), or for the four extra lanes now being planned for the New Jersey Turnpike, or for the monstrous 10-mile bridge across Long Island Sound from Long Island to Connecticut being urged by superbuilder Robert Moses. It would also sharply reduce the fatalities from automobile accidents (nearly 50,000 persons were killed last year) and would make air travel safer by thinning out the traffic in the airlanes.

Similar reallocations would have beneficial effects if applied to freight. Trucks are ideal for lightweight cargo such as transistors and electronic parts and for transport between local points, but the trucking of heavy freight and over long distances is socially wasteful; such freight belongs on the railroads. Few motorists or taxpayers realize that highways would be considerably cheaper to build and would last much longer without major repairs if they were only used by automobiles; it is the heavy trucks pounding them day and night with the burden of tons of freight that wear out the Nation's highways.

The need also exists for many more mergers in both the railroad and airline industries with the stronger, moneymaking carriers eliminating wasteful competition with one another on profitable routes and absorbing the weaker, money-losing carriers. Transportation is a public utility just as are water, electricity, and telephone service; fast, efficient, safe, and dependable transportation for passengers and for freight ought to be available in all sections of the country whether they are rich or poor, densely populated or thinly populated, profitable or unprofitable.

Any effort to rationalize the Nation's transportation network will jeopardize the existing congeries of private interests. President Johnson's proposal for a Cabinet Department of Transportation is only a modest, first step toward rationalization, but it is sure to be resisted for that very reason.

COMMEMORATIVE POLISH MILLENNIUM U.S. POSTAGE STAMP

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have just received word from the Postmaster General that a special postage stamp will be issued this year to commemorate the Polish millennium, as I requested in a letter to him on February 18. I am very pleased by this news and I ask unanimous consent that my letter and Postmaster General O'Brien's affirmative response be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 18, 1966.

Hon. LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LARRY: I appreciate your assurance that the suggested Polish millennium stamp is under consideration as the last commemoratives for 1966 are being selected.

In writing now, I want to reaffirm my interest in this stamp and suggest how very meaningful it would be to the American people.

Poland has long been a beleaguered land. But her creative, strong-willed people have endured partition, tyranny, war, and now the oppression of communism, maintaining their love of beauty, their spiritual strength, and intense pride in their Polish heritage.

Our society has been nourished by the Polish people who have come to the United States and taught us to appreciate more than we might otherwise have learned of the remarkable culture now trapped behind the Iron Curtain. A stamp to commemorate the Polish millennium will awaken even more interest in the glory of Poland's ancient heritage. I very much hope that it will be approved.

With thanks for your consideration, and best wishes.

Faithfully yours,
PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., February 23, 1966.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It gives me great pleasure to advise you that I have approved a commemorative stamp to mark 1,000 years of Polish culture.

Because of your personal interest in this subject, I thought you would like to know about the stamp in advance of the public announcement. The date and place of first-day sale have not been determined at this time.

Your endorsement contributed significantly to my decision to issue a stamp for this important anniversary.

Sincerely yours,
LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN.

THE EDUCATION SECTIONS OF THE BUDGET

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, among the most important proposals the Congress shall act upon this year are those affecting our commitments to a myriad of education programs.

In just a few years we have made great strides toward insuring the best possible education for all Americans The landmark legislation passed in the most recent sessions earned Congress the title, "The Education Congress."

Just last month, I was extremely pleased to hear the elected leader of a great people tell us of his unlimited confidence in this Nation. He told us that we were strong and wealthy enough so that our commitments abroad need not curtail our progress at home He said specifically he would ask this Congress to "provide the resources to carry forward, with full vigor, the great health and education programs enacted last year." I associated myself fully with those remarks then, and I believe in them now.

But I am disheartened by a discrepancy between our vital education goals and certain proposals which are contained in the education sections of the new budget

The budget, indeed, calls for the resources to carry forward the education programs we enacted last year; but it also calls for a radical retrenchment in the federally impacted areas programs and a severe slash in funds for our land grant colleges. Several other longstanding education programs also are earmarked for substantial reductions.

Although I wish to address myself today to the proposed cutback in the impacted areas programs, I want to make it clear that the severe reductions in education programs which have demonstrated their effectiveness and value, if carried out, would result in a great setback for education in the United States.

There is no justification for reducing our commitments to progress in education. To reduce education programs solely because it was decided that money must be saved somewhere would be the worst form of false economy and could seriously affect the plans and budgets of thousands of school districts throughout the country.

The impacted areas program, Mr. President, since its inception in 1950, has been a model of efficient Federal cooperation in our country's educational endeavors.

For fiscal year 1966, the budget called for an appropriation of $347 million to support the program of payments to federally impacted school districts under Public Law 874, and of $50 million for assistance to school districts under Public Law 815. The new budget requests $183.4 million and $22.9 million, respectively, for these programs. Thus, the two programs have been hit upon as a likely area for an economy drive, which, if successful, would result in a savings of $190.7 million. It is my conviction, however, that savings of this scope would be neither justifiable nor advisable.

The budget states that the proposed cutbacks are justified in light of the impact of the large new Federal assistance programs on the schools. The document goes on to say that 874–815 assistance should be adjusted periodically to reflect the growth of assistance under Public Law 89–10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. I am not at all convinced of the soundness of the reasoning in those two statements.

It must not be forgotten that Public Law 815–874 are special programs of education assistance with very special reasons behind them. They may be said to have a dual purpose: to compensate for the weakened tax base which results when a good portion of the real property in a school district is federally owned, and thus not subject to local property taxes; and to help local districts to manage the increased outlay necessary for making good schools available to the children of Federal employees. With respect to the former, it should be noted that about 87 percent of the land in Nevada is federally owned.

On the other hand, the programs of aid under the 1965 elementary and secondary act have nothing to do with federally affected areas. They are intended to raise the quality of educational opportunity in general, and especially in economically deficient areas.

The key to the 815–874 programs is Federal burden. The key to the other program is a more complex concept involving overall educational standards and poverty.

Since the purpose of the programs are manifestly not the same, I see no reason why increase in assistance under Public Law 89–10 should be taken as justification for decreases under Public Law 815–874.

The effect of the proposed impacted area program reduction on the State of Nevada, Mr. President, illustrates the lack of wisdom of the cutbacks. Nevada would lose about $2 million a year in impacted area assistance—about the same amount it receives under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The result of the reduction, then, would be that little or no more Federal assistance for Nevada education would be avaliable than there was before the great educational programs enacted in the last few years. Funds under Public Law 89–10 will not by any means compensate for the loss of impacted area funds.

This would clearly mean a step backward for education in Nevada and some other States which would not be sharing in the education funds they expect and vitally need to finance a number of worthwhile programs to improve the caliber of American education.

Thirteen of Nevada's seventeen counties rely on impacted area assistance for operation and maintenance, construction and teachers' salaries. For most of the 13 counties, the impacted areas assistance comprises a very significant portion of the education budget, and Nevada educators are unanimous in stating that they cannot operate their education programs at the same high level without a continuation of the program.

They are equally unanimous in their observation that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will in no way fill the void which would be created by approval of the proposal to slash the impact program.

To illustrate the feelings of local educators on this most important matter, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from some of the many letters I have received from Nevada school superintendents and other Nevada educators be included in the RECORD at this point:

It is an error to assume that funds from the Elementary and Secondary Act will compensate for Public Law 874 funds for impacted areas. Title I, II, and III of the Elementary and Secondary School Act call for new programs, exemplary programs and innovations in teaching which are above and beyond the present education effort in the school. The Public Law 874 funds for impacted areas are funds for basic educational needs, and, if taken away, there are no funds available to replace the reduction. As a result the schools will suffer a drastic cutback in school services.

ROBERT BEST,
Superintendent, Lyon County School District.

Under Public Law 874, we will receive approximately $225,000, while under the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 we would receive only approximately $30,000. Also, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 expects us to expend over and above our present program, which we would be unable to do if we did not receive Public Law 874 money.

FLOYD SMALLEY,
Superintendent, Mineral County School District.

Certainly funds accruing to school districts under impact legislation will, in no way, be supplanted by the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Act. We will all continue to need impacted funds for those areas where there is no appropriate base for tax support and maintenance of schools.

If we should lose the funds now identified to come to us under Public Law 874 it would mean the necessity of finding income from local sources, which would require a minimum of 12 cents on the tax rate of which there is presently no leeway. Add to this the fact that the school district is asking for a bond issue of $5,200,000 for construction in the next 5 years, which, in 1967 will cost a minimum of an additional 11 cents, and you can see a rather gloomy financial picture for Elko County."

BURNELL LARSON,
Superintendent, Elko County School District.

The idea that funds provided under the Elementary and Secondary Act would supplant the losses under 874 is ridiculous. The only way funds are available under the Elementary and Secondary Act is in proposals over and above the present programs. Therefore, any curtailment of funds for operation of the present program would result in curtailment of the present program.

W. V. OLDS,
Superintendent, Churchill County School District.

The Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 does not apply to the same pupils to which the impact laws apply. The impact laws are vital to many districts, and the popularity among Congressmen prompted the Federal administration to hang Public Law 89–10 in the framework of Public Law 874 to help secure its passage. Now it seems that Public Law 874 has embraced a Trojan Horse.

GEORGE E. HARRIS,
Administrator, Federal Projects, Clark County School District.

The (reduced funds are) inadequate to, at the very minimum, maintain the type and standard of education we are obligated to offer the young people of this State. The funds we will receive under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will not compensate."

RAY TENNANT,
Superintendent, Nye County School District.

A move away from support of the impacted areas program to other Federal programs would be disadvantageous to Nevada at this time."

JAMES T. BUTLER,
Executive Secretary, Nevada State Education Association.

MISS RACHEL CRITES, SHROVE TUESDAY PANCAKE RACE CHAMPION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I take special pleasure in joining my distinguished colleague from Kansas in praising the achievement of Miss Rachel Crites—the new champion in the traditional Shrove Tuesday pancake race.

Those of us who are continually on the run might well take note of this young lady's prowess. For on Tuesday last, she sprinted a 415-yard course in 1 minute 4.5 seconds, flipping a pancake in her skillet along the way.

Her time set a new record in the event held each year in Liberal, Kans., and Olney, England.

The 18-year-old lady, an aircraft plant receptionist, proved her groundspeed and ability with a skillet were more than equal to the occasion, considering that Miss Crites has given Kansas the edge in this 17-year event, with a total of 9 victories.

OREGON SMALL BUSINESS EXPORT PROGRAM COULD BE A MODEL FOR THE NATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would like to invite attention to the outstanding work being done in my State to bridge the gap between theory and practice in stimulating exports.

An article in the January 17 issue of International Commerce magazine discusses a recent short course on exporting which was held in Oregon's Willamette Valley. It was organized through the cooperative efforts of the U.S. Department of Commerce; Mr. Willem Winter, head of the international department of Portland's First National Bank; Ray Teal, of the Oregon State University's cooperative extension service, and other Oregon businessmen.

As a result of thorough groundwork by the university's local extension agents, the audience which attended the session included more than 80 small business manufacturing firms, less than one-half of which had ever exported.

The consequences of this program were noteworthy. The article reports that on the following day, four businessmen requested specific information to enable them to get started marketing their products in the export trade.

As the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has pointed out to this body many times, about one-half of our States border the oceans and the seaways, and thus are in a position to benefit directly from the development of international trade. In addition, exports of U.S. merchandise serve high national purposes by contributing to the balance of payments and thus strengthening the dollar at home and abroad.

Our Government has been advocating export expansion for some time and the Senate Small Business Committee has since 1959 actively encouraged the small business community to take further advantage of the new world of opportunity. Since small firms constitute 94 percent of the country's manufacturing and probably even a greater percentage of its agricultural enterprise, expanding small business exports appears to hold a significant potential for both private and public benefit.

However, to bring home to businesses at the grassroots the tools and information which they need to actually enter international trade is a difficult task. Therefore, in my opinion, meetings such as the Willamette Valley course, which combined high qualities of organization and execution, offer great promise of being able to do this job.

I heartily commend the Department of Commerce and the Oregonians involved for the success of their program, and hope and advocate that it will serve as a model for many other programs throughout the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Department of Commerce magazine be printed for the information of all concerned following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Sessions on International Trade Had County Agents as Recruiters—Cooperative Efforts of Field Office, Bank, University Extension Officials Focus Attention on Advantages of Trading Abroad

Thanks largely to four Oregon county extension agents, the recent Willamette Valley International Business Short Course attracted to its opening session just the kind of student body its sponsors had sought. More than 80 small manufacturing firms, other businessmen, county commissioners and farmers were represented at the first of several sessions scheduled throughout the State.

The course was meant particularly to reach the small Oregon businessman interested in exporting but needing the impetus for the first step. Officials of the Department of Commerce field office in Portland, the First National Bank of Oregon's international department and the State university's cooperative extension service organized the course, determined to take the information to the people and not end up with experts talking to one another. The extension agents, each thoroughly familiar with his county, pitched in as recruiters.

As a result, the audience included a majority of people who had never exported.

POTENTIAL PROFITS

Ray Teal, marketing specialist with the service and a member of the Regional Export Expansion Council, opened the first session, making the farm segment of the audience feel right at home.

He was followed by Lloyd Porter, international trade specialist with the Commerce Department, who pointed out that the U.S. merchandise shipments abroad have doubled since 1950.

Willem Winter, assistant vice president for international banking at the First National Bank, explained methods for assuring payment when merchandise is sold overseas.

ASIAN MARKET

George Nakata, Pacific Supply Cooperative at Portland, cited Japan as a large and growing market for U.S. goods and pointed out that 67 percent of exports through the Oregon Customs District go to Asia with the major portion to Japan.

Freight forwarders were represented by H. V. Plimpton, of Harper, Robinson & Co., who outlined some ways in which exporters can ship merchandise without the usual headaches, through delegation of the job to a freight forwarder.

The field office reported that on the day following the session, four businessmen inquired after specific information to allow them to get started marketing products internationally.

REPORT ON ACTIVITY UNDER THE ALASKA OMNIBUS ACT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Members of the Senate will recall that on Good Friday, March 27, 1964, a tragic earthquake and seismic wave struck south-central Alaska, leaving some 115 persons dead and causing hundreds of millions of dollars worth of damage. Approximately half of the State's population lived in the stricken area, and the property in it constituted over half of Alaska's tax base.

Proportionately, no State of the Union ever suffered such devastation from a natural disaster.

The Federal Government moved swiftly to aid the State and its citizens in their hour of need. We in Congress promptly passed S. 2772, an emergency relief measure, which I had the honor of sponsoring, to aid the State and its public agencies. This measure became Public Law 88–311.

Then, to aid the State and our fellow citizens in the long, difficult task of rebuilding and rehabilitation, we enacted into law S. 2881, a far-reaching measure based on the findings and recommendations of the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission, of which the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, Senator Anderson, was chairman. This measure became Public Law 88–451, and I ask, Mr. President, that a report on activities and attainments under this law appear at this point in the Record. This report was transmitted to Congress by President Johnson, and I ask that the President's letter of transmittal precede the text of the report.

Mr. President, all of us can echo President Johnson when he describes the achievements under this law as "a tribute to the Congress, to the individual citizens of the State, and to the thousands of State and Federal personnel who worked so diligently following the disaster."

There being no objection, the letter and report were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The White House,
Washington, February 16, 1966.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: I have the honor to transmit a report of activity under authority of Public Law 88–451, describing the efforts of five Federal departments and agencies to assist in the recovery of Alaska following the earthquake of March 27, 1964.

The act, entitled "1964 Amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act" was designed to speed reconstruction of the areas devastated by the earthquake.

This report covers the period from July 1, 1965, through December 31, 1965. It clearly indicates that most of the actions authorized by Public Law 88–451 had been completed prior to this 6-month period. Only about $8 million was furnished through the grant and loan programs authorized by the act, while the total cumulative amount during the 18 months the amendments have been in effect approximates $60 million. Even this latter figure represents only a small part of the total recovery programs provided by the Federal Government under the various disaster relief authorities.

As of this date, more than $344 million in total Federal aid has been provided for the State, its communities, and its people. Of this amount nearly $169 million has been in the form of direct grants. More than $93 million was provided in the form of loans to individuals, business concerns, and other organizations. The balance represents the cost of repairs to damaged Federal facilities.

It is a tribute to the Congress, to the individual citizens of the State, and to the thousands of State and Federal personnel who worked so diligently following the disaster that Alaska has today substantially recovered from the earthquake that devastated her cities less than 2 years ago.

Sincerely,

Lyndon B. Johnson.

Third Semiannual Report to the Congress—Public Law 88–451—"1964 Amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act"

This report, required by section 7 of Public Law 88–451, covers actions taken by the Federal agencies under authority of the act during the period from July 1, 1965, through December 31, 1965.

Section 21 of the Alaska Omnibus Act, 73 Stat. 145 (1959), 48 U.S.C. prec. 21 nt., was amended to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make emergency fund expenditures which would provide more liberal Federal assistance to Alaska for the repair or reconstruction of earthquake-damaged highways in the Federal-aid highway system. An increase in the Federal contribution was authorized. This increase in Federal cost was limited to $15 million.

Action taken: Between July 1 and December 31, 1965, the Department of Commerce confined its action in Alaska under Public Law 88–451 to one project. It authorized construction of 3.37 miles of the Seward-Anchorage Highway in the vicinity of Turnagain Arm. The project cost $1,886,000, of which $849,077 was financed from Public Law 88–451 funds. This raised to $5,930,931 the amount of such funds that were allotted for repair of Alaskan highways and bridges damaged by the March 27, 1964, earthquake.

Section 51 was added to the Alaska Omnibus Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to:

(a) Compromise or release part or all of a borrower's indebtedness under programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration in Alaska and refinance outstanding indebtedness of applicants in Alaska who suffered earthquake damage or loss and wish to repair or rebuild dwellings or farm buildings or, when necessary, to purchase new building sites.

Action taken: Two loans totaling $11,500 were made under section 502 of the Housing Act of 1949 for the purpose of refinancing outstanding indebtedness.

(b) Compromise or release indebtedness under program administered by the Rural Electrification Administration in Alaska where borrowers suffered damage or loss as a result of the earthquake.

Action taken: No actions have been taken by REA under the authorities of this act. Borrowers are being assisted within the authority of the Rural Electrification Act and at present it appears that no action under the Alaska Omnibus Act will be required.

Section 52, added to the Alaska Omnibus Act, provided authority for the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to compromise or release a part or all of any obligation under the public facility loan program where the facility securing the obligation had been damaged.

Action taken: All necessary compromise and release actions possible under this section were accomplished during 1964.

Section 53 authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to enter into contracts for grants not exceeding $25 million for disaster-related urban renewal projects in Alaska, including open land projects. This authority is in addition to and separate from grant authorization contained in other acts, and provides that the Administrator may increase the capital grants under this authority up to 90 percent of the net project costs.

Action taken: The following summarizes, in tabular form, the status of projects which were financed under provisions of this section, as of December 31, 1965:

Project	Cumulative capital grants		July to Dec. 31, 1965, capital grants	
	Approved	Disbursed	Approved	Disbursed
Total	$24,945,978	$5,449,176		$5,449,176
Anchorage R-20(c)	10,000,000	1,490,032		1,490,032
Kodiak R-19(c)	6,132,765	2,262,990		2,262,990
Seldovia R-261(d)	3,538,034	716,452		716,452
Seward R-21(c)	1,511,753	277,784		277,784
Valdez:				
R-22(c)	2,171,439	701,918		701,918
R-25	1,591,987			

The following provides highlights regarding selected projects financed under section 53:

R-19(c) Kodiak: Formal acceptance of the stage 1 site improvements, completed under the S. S. Mullen contract, and administered by the U.S. Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks was accomplished and transferred to the city of Kodiak on October 29, 1965. The work included land fill, utilities, storm drainage, sidewalks and the paving of Marine Way. As of November 1965, the new ferry dock was 50 percent complete.

R-20(c) Anchorage downtown: The contract for buttressing a 10-block length of hillside north of Fourth Avenue was awarded in December 1965, to Stewart-Erickson Co. of Seattle for $4,716,437. Plans call for earth-filled buttresses; subdrains and grading; curbs, gutters, and sidewalks, storm and sanitary sewer systems; a water distribution system; street lighting, etc. All unsuitable material at the base of the slide area will be removed and filled with compacted gravel. Completion date is set for 600 calendar days after the notice to proceed. Approximately 12 acres of land have been acquired by the Alaska State Housing Authority (ASHA) which is the urban renewal agency.

R-21(c) Seward: In October 1965, a contract was awarded to Rogers Construction Co. and Babler Bros., Anchorage and Portland contracting firms, for road construction, street paving, curb, gutter, and sidewalk installation in the small boat harbor and D Street. Water and sewer mains will be laid in the small boat harbor area. Total estimated cost of the work is $319,530 with completion scheduled for October 1966. Improvements to the small boat harbor will help in rebuilding the city's tourist industry. Approximately 2 acres of land have been acquired by ASHA.

Valdez R-22(c) Old Townsite and R-25(c) Mineral Creek: In the Old Townsite urban renewal area, acquisition is approximately 40 percent complete and relocation is geared to how quickly residential construction proceeds in the Mineral Creek urban renewal area. Families are expected to move to the new townsite during this calendar year.

In the Mineral Creek urban renewal area, out of a total of 250 lots, 174 residential and 4 commercial lots have been sold. Construction of an elementary school was completed in 1965 and construction of a high school is almost finished. A State highway complex is nearing completion and the contract for construction of a mental hospital was recently awarded.

Section 54 allows a 30-year maturity period for Small Business Administration loans made to repair or replace earthquake-damaged dwellings in Alaska.

Action taken: During this reporting period, SBA approved 69 loans to homeowners in Alaska in the total dollar amount of $1,595,865.

Section 55 of the act authorizes the Chief of Engineers to make such modifications to previously authorized civil works projects in Alaska adversely affected by the 1964 earthquake and subsequent seismic waves as he finds necessary to meet changed conditions and to provide for current and reasonably prospective requirements of the communities they serve.

Action taken: Pursuant to the authority of the act, modifications were made to the authorized small boat harbors at Homer, Seward, Valdez, and Cordova. The Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1965 provided $2 million for this purpose. Actions taken at these harbors were as follows:

Homer Small Boat Harbor: The modification provides for enlarging the harbor area by 6.2 acres, a change in the existing breakwater, and extension of the north breakwater. Construction funds in the amount of $640,000 were allotted in October 1964. The work was placed under contract on November 5, 1964, and completed in July 1965.

Seward Small Boat Harbor: The modification provides for enlarging the anchorage by 12.45 acres. Construction funds in the amount of $400,000 were allotted in October 1964. The enlargement was part of a dredging contract. Under the contract, the small boat basin, the city dock, and the Alaska Railroad areas were dredged. The final increment for the expansion phase dredging of the small boat basin was completed in November 1965.

Valdez Small Boat Harbor: The modification provides for enlarging the anchorage area by 7 acres. Construction funds in the amount of $420,000 were allotted in October 1964. The work was placed under contract on October 28, 1964. Final inspection of the completed basin was held on June 9, 1965, and the facilities turned over to the city.

Cordova Small Boat Harbor: The modification provides for enlarging the mooring area by about 10 acres. Construction funds in the amount of $540,000 were allotted in October 1964. Enlargement of the small boat harbor was completed in May 1965.

Section 56. This section authorized the HHFA Administrator to purchase securities and obligations of, or to make loans to, the State of Alaska to finance any part of the programs needed to carry out reconstruction activities in Alaska related to the 1964 earthquake or subsequent seismic waves, or to complete capital improvements begun prior to the earthquake. The amount of purchase or loan is limited to $25 million. The projects covered under this assistance program are of the community facility type, and the program is administered by the Community Facilities Administration, a constituent agency of HHFA (HUD).

Action taken: On January 7, 1965, the State of Alaska accepted the offer of the U.S. Government to purchase $25 million worth of bonds, at 3¾ percent interest, as authorized under this section. This would include $19.5 million in series B bonds, with maturity between 1970–94 and $5.5 million of series A bonds with maturity between 1955–2004. This guarantee has made it possible for the State to sell temporary notes at a reasonable rate of interest, and funds obtained from these sales have financed recovery programs in Anchorage, Valdez, Cordova, Kodiak, Seldovia, and Seward.

The following describes the status of these two separate issues:

Nineteen and one-half million dollars in series B bonds: There have been no further developments with respect to these bonds since February 3, 1965, when the State of Alaska sold bond anticipation notes totaling $19,104,100 at 2.29 percent. The supporting bond issue must be delivered to the ultimate purchasers not later than October 1, 1968.

Five and one-half million dollars, series A bonds: As indicated in the report for the previous period, judicial determinations were required before this part of the loan could be finalized. We are advised by bond counsel engaged by the State—Hawkins, Delafield & Wood—that action to secure determination as to the validity of the sale of these bonds was filed in the Superior Court of Alaska in September 1965. Briefs have been filed by both appellants and appellees in the Supreme Court of the State of Alaska. Bond counsel reports that notice was received on November 26, 1965, that the case is scheduled for oral argument on February 1 and 2, 1966, in the Supreme Court of Alaska.

Section 57. This section provides Federal financial assistance to the State of Alaska to support a mortgage indemnification program to retire or adjust outstanding home mortgage obligations upon one- to four-family homes that were severely damaged or destroyed by the 1964 earthquake or subsequent seismic wave. Authorization for a $5.5 million grant by the Federal Government is established, to be matched by an equal amount to be contributed by the State of Alaska. Federal responsibilities under this program have been delegated to the Federal National Mortgage Association, a constituent agency of HHFA (HUD).

Action taken: As of June 30, 1965, it was reported that the formal Alaska mortgage adjustment plan was in the course of being amended to change the date before which all claims must be filed from July 1, 1965, to July 1, 1966. On July 6, 1965, the executed amendment was received by Federal National Mortgage Association, the agency representing the HHFA Administrator in the performance of duties delegated to him by the President in Executive Orders 11184 and 11196. The amendment had been executed by the HHFA Administrator on June 24, 1965, and by the Governor of Alaska on June 29, 1965.

The suit in the State courts of Alaska testing the constitutional validity of the State's prospective issue of series C bonds for financing the State's contribution to the Alaska mortgage adjustment fund has proceeded to final decree in the trial court. The decree affirmed that the Alaska mortgage adjustment plan, the amendment thereto, the special session laws of Alaska implementing the plan, and the program of borrowing and expending money of the State, authorized pursuant to said plan and said statutes, are legal, constitutional and valid in every respect. The decree was entered on July 13, 1965.

An appeal to the Supreme Court of Alaska has been perfected and it is now expected that the matter will be considered and adjudicated by the supreme court in early 1966.

Regulations of the Alaska Mortgage Adjustment Agency, with amendments as required by the HHFA Administrator, are to be approved and issued when the plan is put into operation. Two things remain as prerequisites before the plan can be put into operation. They are (1) an appropriation by Congress and (2) a favorable ruling by the Supreme Court of Alaska.

THE AMERICAN CONSCIENCE AND VIETNAM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Reverend Duncan Howlett, minister of the All Souls Unitarian Church of Washington, recently preached an able sermon on the American conscience and Vietnam. Mr. Howlett is in no sense a war hawk. He appreciates the feelings of many conscientious Americans that we should withdraw in order to reduce immediate bloodshed. But he correctly points out that if North Vietnam were permitted to take over South Vietnam by force, a reign of terror would follow. Santayana once observed that those who refused to learn from history were condemned to repeat it. This, in my judgment, applies to the present situation. To allow the police state of communism to sweep on unchecked is to reenact a second Munich and to assist in a cumulative ascent to power of tyrannical forces.

Dr. Howlett is to be commended for his vigorous and brave defense of freedom. I believe that as the issues become more clearly understood, the liberal and religious forces of the Nation will more and more agree with President Johnson's program for South Vietnam:

First. To resist and root out Communist attempts to take over South Vietnam by force and terror.

Second. To resist efforts to widen and deepen the war and to bomb the city of Hanoi. This would kill tens of thousands of innocent men, women, and children, set the public opinion of the world against us, and run the danger of bringing first China and then Russia into the war. If this last development were to happen, a nuclear war would almost inevitably result.

Third. As fast as territory is cleared from the Communists, to introduce land reform, the furnishing of seed and work animals.

In any event, Dr. Howlett's sermon is worthy of careful reading. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN CONSCIENCE AND VIETNAM

There are two sermons I have owed you for a long time, one on the sex revolution, which comes next week; the other on Vietnam, to which we come today. Few questions have troubled me as much during my years in the ministry and none any more than these two. There is no unanimity in the congregation on either issue. On both, feelings run high and convictions lie very deep. According to our tradition I shall not attempt to resolve either question on your behalf. Having thought each through as far as I can, I set the result before you in the hope that it may be of some use to you as the many people with whom I have talked and the many things I have read have helped me.

Perhaps never in our history have we, the people of the United States, wrestled with our conscience as people as we are doing today over the war in Vietnam. To begin with, it is not even a war in the technical sense that it has never been declared. Yet, because of the size of our military commitment, everybody, with full justification, speaks of the struggle as a war. Moreover, we are a peace-loving people and we always have been. We have our hawks and doves, to be sure, but as in the kingdom of birds, the doves far, far outnumber the hawks. Our blood curdles at pictures of wounded and dead Americans, wounded and dead Vietnamese, North, South and the Vietcong. We cannot bear to look at the pictures of wounded children, helpless victims of a conflict of which they know nothing.

As civilians, safely at home, comfortably housed, secure from ambush and terror, we nevertheless cannot quite escape the war, among other reasons just because it is not a war, officially speaking. With no censorship as in wartime, the news media, in particular the TV cameras, constantly thrust the horrors of the conflict before us. The Second World War, infinitely worse, at least in magnitude, was carefully screened from us at the time, except insofar as the suffering it caused could be used to inflame our passions against the enemy. But now for the first time we are permitted to see what war is like while it is going on, to know what American soldiers look like when they have been hit by enemy fire, and to see pictures of little children maimed for life by our machines of destruction. We see, and we turn away, our conscience as a people seared by the wrong that we do.

"In God's name stop it," cried a group of clergymen and others in a New York Times ad 2 years ago, after seeing some of these pictures. "Get out of Vietnam," cried another group unable to tolerate any longer for any reason American bombing of Vietnam villages and American killing, even of Vietcong soldiers. Since American soldiers first moved from advising to fighting, the call for a ceasefire has mounted steadily. Now we hear it in Congress as well as in teach-ins and peace marches across the land. "Negotiate. To the peace table. Now." And this cry, echoing up and down the United States, echoes and reechoes around the world.

Except for a few hawks who would like to tackle China before she becomes a full-fledged nuclear power, most of the American people agree with these sentiments. We want a world as peaceful and as prosperous as our own country. We believe such a world is possible. But we believe that it can come only as the democratic ideal itself is made real among the nations of the earth. As Clarence Streit reminded us before the Second World War, democracy has brought peace wherever it has gone. Wars of aggression always come from tyranny and dictatorship. The people, given the chance to make their views known, demand peace. The truth of Streit's observation has been demonstrated over and over since he first made it 30 years ago.

But the two ideals, democracy and peace, are not necessarily consistent. They were not when we entered World War I: they were not when we entered World War II, or the Korean war, and they are not now. Otherwise we should have no problem in Vietnam. If peace and democracy required the same course of action, we should call an immediate ceasefire and go forthwith to the conference table. But this is not the case in Vietnam. Neither the Vietcong nor North Vietnam accept the democratic ideal. South Vietnam does, although even there it is an ideal far from being fully realized. If the Vietcong and North Vietnam took over South Vietnam, as they would do if American forces were withdrawn, world democracy would shrink and world dictatorship would advance by that much. This is the American dilemma. In Vietnam today the two ideals of peace and freedom dictate two quite different courses of action.

Most of the argument raging about the Vietnam war has to do with detail: to bomb or not to bomb; the effect bombing has for and against our cause; when, where, how often to bomb, with what kind, and so on. Should we return to the Geneva accord of 1954? Should there be a new Geneva conference? or some other kind of peace talks with Hanoi? or the National Liberation Front? with whom, on what, when, where, under what conditions, if any, and so on. The proposals can be numbered by the dozen. Should our policy be one of containment? or enclaves? or all-out attack with invasion of North Vietnam? Shall we use nuclear weapons? What about the U.N.? the efforts of the Pope and other intermediaries?

I would not minimize the importance of any of these considerations. Decisions of many kinds must be made and in great detail. But if the average citizen like you and me is to talk intelligently on these questions, he has first to make up his mind on the central issues. Having done so, he can then more profitably move to the debate on the specifics. Do we choose peace or do we choose freedom? Here the battle on the facts begins and the basic issue is soon forgotten. Those who choose peace say that it will eventually lead to freedom, and those who choose freedom say it can only be established by driving out the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. What is the truth?

The administration has chosen freedom and has been pursuing it by military intervention of ever increasing size, scope, and cost in human lives on both sides. If you project where we are to be 5 years hence from the distance we have come in the last 5 years, you might find us at war with China. Is this the intent of the Government? The American people want to know.

We are aware that there is a political and social revolution in process in Vietnam today and that this revolution is but an aspect of the movement of peoples everywhere from traditional cultures, centuries old, into the commercial, industrial, technological civilization of the 20th century. In Vietnam and everywhere, this movement is accompanied by an equally basic political turnover—the emergence of millions from colonialism to self-government, whether by democracy or dictatorship. We are aware, too, that our involvement in Vietnam has no meaning apart from our involvement in the world struggle for power.

The President has seemed to say on more than one occasion that because of this, he and the military had a virtual blank check to do what they thought necessary in Vietnam. He has steadfastly refused to say how far he would go. But the clamor of public opinion in the teach-ins, peace marches, and public statements, backed up by the Senate hearings, demanded that the President more sharply define his objectives and the methods he will use to achieve them.

It is all to the good. The American people on the whole want to get off the war escalator. It has, they feel, gone far enough. Only the war hawks, of whom there are always some around, want to go to Peiping.

But our military presence in Vietnam raises a deeper question. Even though we escalate the war no further: even though we adopt General Gavin's and Ambassador Kennan's enclave formula, have we any right to be in Vietnam at all? Can we support this war in any moral sense? What is the national conscience on the more basic issue of war itself? We can answer this question, like the others, only by arguing it out with each other as we are now doing. In my mind the debate that has been going on for several years, now mounting to a climax through the nationally televised hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is a great thing. For in this debate, as in all things, we are united as a people, not because we agree as to the course we should follow, but because we agree on the ideals in accordance with which we shall decide what to do.

One of the favorite ways of attempting to solve the problem is by historical analogy, in particular with the thirties, when Hitler was rapidly gaining strength, and Europe had to decide whether to let him go on gobbling up territory or to risk war in an attempt to stop him. From the second alternative Europe turned away, for the suffering, death and destruction of the First World War were still too vivid in the minds of everyone. There was much talk even then that another war would bring an end to civilization. Almost any alternative seemed better than to resort to arms.

Most observers quite properly dismiss this analogy as too facile. But to reject the Munich accord analogy is not to dismiss all history as worthless in this instance or any other. Surely history can help us to profit by our mistakes. And certainly it can help us to understand current thought trends by tracing them back to their roots. In my mind, the present torrent of declarations by churchmen, educators, and others on the war in Vietnam is understandable only in terms of the background out of which they come. The most immediate and therefore the most obvious of these origins is the civil rights movement.

The remarkable involvement of the clergy, and to a lesser degree students, educators, and others, in the civil rights movement in the last 3 or 4 years did two things. It gave thousands of individuals a chance to participate actively in social change, when heretofore they had been, at best, commentators upon it. Secondly, it gave them a sense of power. No one doubts that the physical participation in freedom marches by men and women from all walks of life had much to do with the progress we have made in civil rights legislation and practice. The peace-now people who were active in the civil rights movement naturally feel that their views on Vietnam might be as successfully advanced by peace marches as their views on race were advanced by freedom marches.

There is, however, a profound difference beneath the superficial similarity between the two movements. The civil rights protests were directed against an intransigent government by an oppressed segment of our people. When the protests failed, as they did at first, citizens who were not oppressed began to join in the demonstrations. They joined in ever greater numbers until at last the Government began to mend its ways. By last year, solid citizens were marching in America's streets for freedom for the Negro, who would have been appalled at such an idea not long before.

The Vietnam protests are different. To say this is not to deny the right to stage peace protest demonstrations. But it is to emphasize the fact that these are not protests made in the streets, because they can be heard nowhere else. The demand for civil rights went almost unheeded until the American people took to the streets in great numbers. This is not true of American foreign policy in Vietnam. Protests against it have constantly been heard, weighed, and considered in high places. The organized demand that we get out of Vietnam goes back far beyond the civil rights movement. It has its roots in the peace movement itself as it emerged among clergyman and others in this country during the latter part of the 19th and early 20th centuries. This was the period of the establishment of the Hague Peace Conferences, and the International Court of Justice. At that time many ministers took the position publicly that all war was wrong. Many held to that position when war broke out in Europe in 1914. But when the United States became one of the belligerents in 1917, almost to a man the clergy repudiated their former position and led the call for the raising of arms and men to defeat "the Beast of Berlin," in that instance Kaiser Wilhelm II.

When the war was over and the world had been made "safe for democracy," in Woodrow Wilson's words, the denouement came, and it was shattering. The war to end war had not brought war to an end, for fighting continued in various parts of the world. Neither was the world safe for democracy, for communism and dictatorship was now on the march. Nor was it any longer so clear that the Kaiser alone had brought on the war. Historians began to point out that the economic and political rivalry of France, Germany and England, and to a lesser degree Italy, Austria and Russia, had been basic factors in bringing the nations to a test of arms. Many of the atrocity stories that had aroused the ire of the Americans were shown to have been pure propaganda. The complete turnaround of the clergy was then documented in a biting volume, "Preachers Present Arms" by Ray Abrams. Many a minister was truly ashamed to think that he had been so easily led to abandon his principles. In a wave of repentance, many signed peace pledges renouncing all war as an evil in and of itself. As a result, during the years when Hitler strode to power in Europe, the American Protestant clergy, to a marked degree, took the high-principled but simplistic position that all war is wrong. They called, not for resistance to nazism, but for negotiation looking toward keeping the peace.

The revelations following the Second World War were opposite to those that followed the first. We learned in the late forties that the worst atrocity stories we had heard about nazism were not half as bad as the truth. Far from being the victims of propaganda as we had been in World War I, during World War II we had neither known nor believed when we heard the depths of bestiality to which the Nazis had sunk.

These revelations had a profound effect upon the group we used to call the absolute pacifists. And again there was a change of heart. There were few now to say that war against another Hitler might not be justified. It is one of the dogmas of our age—one to which I fully subscribe—that the Nazi regime was the personification of evil, and that since it employed force to seek its ends, only force could have deposed it. Therefore such a war is justified. In this I wholly concur. As a result we are more sophisticated today, and there are few to say that they would never fight a war under any circumstances. What the Nazis actually did virtually destroyed the power of the pacifist arguments of the 1930's.

Nevertheless we hear today the same simplistic approach to the problem of peace we heard before the First and Second World Wars. Today again we hear the demand for peace on the part of high-minded people who find it intolerable to be citizens of a nation that visits the horrors of war upon another people. There might be war that could be justified, they say, but this is not one of them.

I share their sense of shame and guilt. I face the fact, as we all must, that every bomb that is dropped in Vietnam, I drop; every child that is hurt, I hurt; every village that is destroyed, I destroy. I settled for that back in the thirties, when in the face of the rising Nazi menace, I parted company with the pacifists forever. I first faced the fact then, and I hold to it today, that my guilt is not lessened by becoming a conscientious objector, and my hands are not kept clean because I personally do not wield a knife or discharge a gun against the enemy. While I enjoy the peace and safety of this country, I kill and destroy with the Armed Forces that keep this country safe from subversion at home and safe from invasion from abroad.

Can I then assuage my guilt for the havoc wrought by American arms in Vietnam by seeking to force the administration to terminate the war? Like everyone else, I devoutly desire peace, and think we should pursue it by every means possible. But here, it seems to me, history does have something to say to us. It can remind us that the simple way of peace was wrong in 1916. It was wrong in 1939, and I would say that for the same reason it is wrong in 1966. If peace is right now, then we never had any business in Vietnam in the first place. Some say we didn't. How you resolve this question depends upon your view of the role of the United States in the contemporary world. Are you one who thinks we should stay home and mind our own business? Or should we take a hand in the political affairs of the world? Should we withdraw from Germany? From our military bases around the world? If not, then why from Vietnam? The one question we must answer is: Where shall we take our stand for freedom, even if we have to fight? Where shall we say to those who would subvert a nation through terror: Beyond this point you shall not go.

We would all say it, I suppose—or almost all of us—should terrorists appear in the United States, whose purpose was to claim this country for the Communists, the America Firsters, or the Ku Klux Klan. We have asserted the right to do this in Europe, and there have been few to complain chiefly perhaps because we have not had to fight in order to do it. Do we draw the line there? At the moment we are saying to the Vietcong in Vietnam, "This land you shall not bend to your will by terrorizing its people." The origin of the liberation front in the revolt against the Diem regime does not alter the situation that exists now. The justice of the cause that brought the liberation front into being does not justify either the presence or the methods of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese in South Vietnam now.

We have chosen freedom in Vietnam rather than peace. But the trouble is, it has never been really clear that our choice was freedom for the Vietnamese. It has never been clear that we were doing more there than fending off the ultimate Communist threat to ourselves, with little or no thought for the Vietnamese themselves. To many, it looked as though we were trying to impose a new kind of colonialism on Vietnam as intolerable to most Americans as to the Vietnamese. As the weeks and months went by, as the war steadily escalated and the bombing of North Vietnam increased, stopped, and began again, the conscience of the American people was increasingly troubled.

Then came the Honolulu declaration. If, as that declaration stated, the reconstruction of the economy of Vietnam is our aim, if a free and independent Vietnam is our goal, then we have a role to play in that unhappy country that we can defend on principle and point to with pride.

The administration would have been in a far stronger position if it had formulated these policies and declared them definitively long ago, rather than now, as it appears, under the duress of an aroused public opinion. But the administration has now stated its objectives in Vietnam and now we know what they are: (1) to drive out the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese, and (2) to help the South Vietnamese to live in freedom, in peace, and in prosperity. We have long been engaged in both endeavors and our growing success may be seen in the increasing number of Vietcong defectors now coming over to the South Vietnam side. These defections show that the Vietnamese want what we all want—a chance to live in peace under a regime stable enough to maintain it.

We have now to remain true to these two specific goals, whatever the cost. While the military are driving the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong out, let us proceed with our program of hospitals, schools, dams, and factories. This program we can support with all our moral conviction. For every soldier we send to Vietnam, let us send a worker for AID or one of the several voluntary agencies now helping there. For every rifle, let us send a plow, for every round of ammunition a set of handtools. Let the buildup of arms be matched by the buildup of economy. Let an ever-widening stable social order be established in the wake of our military successes. Let the world see by what we do that we are in Vietnam, not for our own good primarily, but for the good of the free world as a whole.

If the Honolulu declaration is our blueprint, then our conscience as a people is set free again. In the light of that statement, amplified by testimony at the Senate hearings last week, we can support administration policies, despite our abhorrence of war and the suffering it brings. We can do so because we have been offered a course of action dictated by harsh reality, but guided by the humanitarian ideals for which we, as a people, have always stood. In Vietnam today, as so often in the past, we have chosen freedom, even in the face of war. We have done it because we believe it to be the only road to a final lasting peace.

Prayer: God of men and of nations, lead us to the right whence both peace and freedom flow. Amen.

PROPOSED REDUCTION IN THE SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, at this time I wish to state my opposition to any reduction in the school milk program.

I feel it is an efficient but effective way of helping provide a soundly nourished youth in this country.

In the past decade attention has been brought to the need for a healthy young America. We have initiated all manner of programs, on Capitol Hill and elsewhere, aimed at improving the overall physical condition of the Nation's youngsters.

The school milk program has certainly contributed to this.

For whether we like it or not, too often youths not considered financially needy are nevertheless nutritionally needy. Cash in the pocket does not always mean calories in the body.

The cost of this program is not of such magnitude to forestall other major programs of importance. The program, in fact, is one expenditure where there is definitely great value received for the dollars spent.

According to the President's proposal, the current appropriation of $103 million for the school milk program across the Nation would be reduced $21 million—an 80-percent cutback.

The Department of Agriculture estimates for this year indicate this program will help provide 36.6 million half pints of milk for Kansas schoolchildren. Under next year's proposal this would be reduced drastically—and thousands of children would be excluded from it.

Looking at it financially, it would cost Kansas taxpayers nearly $1 million in additional revenue to maintain the program as it now operates.

Here we have a program that is operating effectively and without problems, and it should be retained.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT EFFORTS: POLLUTION

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the President yesterday called upon the Congress to do something about restoring the quality of the American environment. It was a strong message, but it certainly did not exaggerate the urgency of this need. It would be impossible for that need to be overstated.

The deterioration of our environment has become an extremely serious matter. It is something we may have been able to ignore or overlook in the past, but it is a problem we can ignore no longer.

For we now possess means to eliminate the human race. We normally think of this awesome possibility in terms of the atomic bomb. Thousands of words have been written and spoken about the dangers inherent in our use of atomic fission. But the poet who said that the world will end, "not with a bang, but a whimper," he may have been more prophetic than he knew.

The simple fact is that we now possess means more insidious than the atomic bomb to eliminate ourselves from the face of the earth. More insidious because they are less dramatic, less obvious, more pervasive, more subtle, more a part of our daily existence. The automobile, the powerplant, the diesel engine, and the rest of our industrial complex, as it expands to meet the needs of increased population, threatens our very existence.

If it is to be used wisely, and by the very nature of water itself the attack upon pollution must be carried on in the context of a unified water conservation program. The Department of the Interior has traditionally been concerned with the wise conservation and development of our water resources. Assigning the war on pollution to the Department will complete the gearing up process. The full, comprehensive, and concentrated fight to clean up our rivers can now begin.

REPORT BY THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the recently issued seventh annual report of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has been receiving considerable attention around the country. The Commission is a bipartisan group charged with exploring problems and relations among Federal, State, and local governments. It has been my pleasure to serve as one of the three Senate members of the Commission since its inception, along with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

One of the major dilemmas of our Federal system as highlighted in the recent report of the Commission is described in a recent article in the Idaho Evening Statesman by Mr. John Corlett. He pleads for greater compassion by the Congress toward the States in the light of the efforts they are making to meet their problems. I ask unanimous consent to place the text of the article at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Idaho Evening Statesman, Feb. 1, 1966]

STATES MUST SEEK TO BE PARTNERS IN FEDERALLY AIDED PROGRAMS

(By John Corlett)

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was created 7 years ago by Congress with the avowed purpose of creating a climate of cooperation among National, State, and local units of government.

It was hoped that the Commission would serve as the forum for strengthening the federal system whereby there would be a balance of power among the Federal, State, and local governments.

The Commission has moved strongly in this direction, but in its seventh annual report, just off the press, it notes that the last Congress made some giant steps toward federalism by which the National Government assumed greater powers. This, of course, serves to unbalance the federal system.

The report noted that the National Government, by congressional action, moved into three fields in which the States heretofore held nearly unlimited autonomy—voting rights, financing, and administration of the public schools, and law enforcement. In addition, a bill has been introduced which would place the Federal Government squarely in the field of State taxation. This would be done in the name of "interstate taxation," but the States would lose many of the powers they now hold in assessing taxes within their own borders.

The last Congress enacted some 25 grants-in-aid programs or major expansions of existing programs, including the National Government's advent into the three new fields listed above.

It is no wonder that the Commission views these steps with some alarm, particularly since they all were consummated in such a short period of time.

In the short time it has been in existence, the Commission has sought to develop studies and programs in which roles of National Government, the States, the counties, and the municipalities are clearly outlined. The Commission, by its very makeup, is not anti-Federal or anti-State. Instead its research programs are based on the assumption that in governmental fields where the Federal Government should be supreme, the States have no place in them. And conversely, if the States have unquestioned dominance in other fields, the Federal Government ought to stay out.

But there are so many fields in which all the segments of government can play their roles in a cooperative manner for the benefit of the people. The Commission has sought above all else to promote these programs in order to vitalize the federal system.

Undoubtedly, the Commission will soon be making inquiries into the three fields in which the Federal Government has ousted the States as lone administrators, with the intent of making sure that the States and the local units of government retain as much say as possible in them.

It does no good to moan that the Federal Government should not be in these three areas because the moves were made without great outcry from the States and the people themselves.

The Commission, if it is to be effective in its avowed purpose of trying to strengthen the federal system, must receive all the moral support possible from the States, the counties, and the cities.

Legislatures, county commissioners, and the city councils must begin fighting for retention of their powers and build the necessary public support for themselves. Congress listens to strongly expressed public opinion.

This doesn't mean that the States must take an "anti-Federal" stand, but they must, as the Commission's report pointed out, seek to be "real partners" in the federal system.

More importantly, they cannot look to the Federal Government exclusively for funds for public programs, no matter what they be, but must share with the Federal Government in program costs.

"If the States stand aside and do not participate in a massive financial way in these programs," the Commission said, "the problems to which the funds are directed will eventually come to be viewed as primarily a Federal responsibility."

The States have been assuming a greater responsibility in the solving of problems in this growing age of urbanization. Most States are taxing almost to their limit and are making far-reaching changes in their governmental form. This Congress must be made to understand.

BOB HOPE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, for many years, Bob Hope has been touring areas all over the world bringing laughter, entertainment, and an all-too-brief moment of pleasure to our men, who man freedom's battle stations throughout the world.

These trips have been conducted during the Christmas season at a time when all of us like to be at home with our families. With the lovely family that he has, I know it is not easy for Bob to be away. Fortunately for our troops, his wife and family are most understanding.

The Congress of the United States, of course, is very much aware of Bob's great contributions, and in 1962 enacted Public Law 87–478, authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to him in recognition of his services to the country and his work for peace. I would like to ask unanimous consent that the law be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

As all my colleagues know, Bob's most recent trip was to southeast Asia where he entertained our young men who are doing such an outstanding job resisting Communist aggression. Joining Bob and also to be congratulated were Jerry Colonna, Les Brown and his band, Anita Bryant, Jack Jones, Peter Leeds, Kaye Stevens, Carroll Baker, Joey Heatherton, Dianna Lynn Batts, Fayard Antonio Nicholas, and Harold Lloyd Nicholas. This trip was a great success and I know it helped to convey to our fighting men the appreciation of the American people for what they are doing.

The San Diego Union editorially commented on the Christmas 1965 trip and made particular note of Bob's closing words on the Chrysler television special, which highlighted the trip. Because I believe as did the editorial that Bob's eloquent concluding statement penetrated the confusion that exists in this country regarding the role of the United States in Vietnam, I requested a complete transcript of his closing remarks so that my colleagues and the Nation might benefit from them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the San Diego Union together with the closing television remarks of Mr. Hope be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 88

Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to Bob Hope

Whereas moments enriched by humor are moments free from hate and conflict, and therefore valued by mankind; and

Whereas Bob Hope has given to us and to the world many such treasured moments; and

Whereas he has done so unstintingly and unselfishly, with heavy demands on his time, talent, and energy; and

Whereas his contributions over a long period of years to the morale of millions of members of the United States armed services, in addition to those of our friends and allies, have been of immediate and enduring value; and

Whereas these contributions have been made during Christmas and at other times by personal contact in countless miles of travel around the globe, to the farthest outposts manned by American youth, during times of peace and war, often under dangerous conditions and at great personal risk; and

Whereas while at home he has given firm and imaginative support to humanitarian causes of every description; and

Whereas in all this Bob Hope has rendered an outstanding service to the cause of democracy, as America's most prized "Ambassador of Good Will" throughout the world: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized to present in the name of the people of the United States of America a gold medal of appropriate design to Bob Hope in recognition of his aforesaid services to his country and to the cause of world peace.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such a medal to be struck and furnished to the President. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2,500 for this purpose.

Approved June 8, 1962.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Jan. 24, 1966]

THANKS FOR MEMORIES

About 30 years ago when Will Rogers, entertainment's early-day Art Buchwald, died in a plane crash, a fellow named Bob Hope was breaking into show business in vaudeville.

Today, Hope stands tallest among show business personalities with the GI's and ex-GI's who look back on dark days the comedian filled with laughter—World War II, the Berlin airlift, Korea, and the Vietnam war—accompanied by Johnny Grant and Jerry Colonna, who along with Hope have sacrified their holidays over the years.

Generals, the food, jungle living conditions and pretty girls all are foils, and Hope plays them like a concert-master as an almost reverent hush falls over the audience.

Bob Hope, the true American patriot, came through best, however, as he concluded his Christmas television special, filmed in Vietnam, to explain his country's reasons for being committed to battle.

The United States of America is taking a firm stand so that all of southeast Asia will not be turned into what Bob Hope terms a gigantic "cafeteria for communism."

Hope expressed the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of Americans, chiding detractors in humorist Will Rogers' style, as he alternately praised and thanked his GI audiences for sacrifices they are making for freedom.

He articulated the feelings of all thinking Americans, extending most tastefully our gratitude to all our fighting forces for their perseverance toward a just victory over militant Communists trying to impose their will on a free people in South Vietnam.

REMARKS OF BOB HOPE

You hear a few people say, "Get out of Vietnam." Here are some of our kids who are getting out the hard way. You get a feeling of humility when you walk through these wards and say "hello" to these men.

This was Christmas Eve at the 3d field hospital at Tan Son Nhut. And I said to this boy, CWO Robert Johnston, from Gordonsville, Va.: * * * "Are you all right?" And he pointed to his shot-up leg and said, "I just got my Christmas present—I'm going home." We heard none of them complain. It was a king-size study in courage.

And so, we're on our way home with exciting memories. We want to thank the Defense Department and the U.S.O. for the privilege of meeting some wonderful kids—kids who seem to be a lot more optimistic about this commitment than a lot of citizens here at home. In their everyday job of fighting this treacherous war, they know there's no alternative. They know that in this shrinking world the perimeter of war is boundless. They know that if they backed off from this fight it would leave all of Asia like a big cafeteria for the Communists to go in and pick up a country at a time. There are no reservations in their dedication. Our fighting men have confidence in the decisions of their leaders.

It's hard for them to hear the rumblings of peace over the gunfire, but when peace comes, they will welcome it. For nothing would give them greater joy than to bring the gift of freedom to the people of Vietnam.

Until then, they're ready to lay down their lives because they know how lucky we are to be Americans—and how very much we have to protect.

It made us proud that we could share our Christmas with them.

FLUORIDATION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on the weekend of February 6–8, the National Dental Health Assembly sponsored a conference to encourage widespread adoption of fluoridation of public water supplies in our communities. It brought together over 400 national authorities representing public affairs, engineering, the social sciences, communications, law, public health, medicine, and dentistry.

Sixty million persons live in communities that enjoy the benefits of controlled fluoridation; yet over two-thirds of the Nation's community water supplies are still not treated. Children in fluoridated areas have up to 60 percent less tooth decay than their counterparts living in nonfluoridated communities.

Among the reports presented at the symposium, one was delivered by pollster Louis Harris. In his talk, "Controversy and Opinions," Harris analyzes the puzzling question of why community acceptance of fluoridation is discouragingly slow despite the fact that a majority of the public prefer it. Most polls, according to Harris, show roughly four-fifths of the public favoring fluoridation.

Because by every measure of public opinion as we know it, you start out with a vast majority in favor of fluoridation—81 percent have heard of fluoridation—though I must

> say only 56 percent think it helps teeth—another 23 percent think it purifies water. But those who do know about it prefer fluoridation. That is, they think it's desirable by a count of roughly 80 to 20. The National Opinion Research Center survey (taken late last year)—it's 84 to 16. The Gallup survey * * * there's a 76 to 24 margin for it. And among those who have fluoridation the margin rises to 7 to 1.

What pattern is followed by communities faced with the fluoridation issue? Social science research, submits Harris, has contributed to the understanding of this phenomenon.

> First, a profile which I'm sure you're familiar with—people who are for fluoridation are upper-income people, people with a rising income, professionals, skilled labor, those who are politically aware and active, people who are younger in age, men, and people with children. Who are less for it? People in the lower income groups, people with static income from the white-collar groups, unskilled labor, people who aren't politically aware or active, older people, women, and those with no children.

Harris goes on to say there is "high emotion from the opposition" and "low emotional appeal" for the supporters of fluoridation. He points out that older people will always be against fluoridation because there is no obvious benefit for them. There are other resistances: the belief that it is revulsion against the scientific revolution is one. Another resistance, according to Harris, is the opportunity to contest community leadership, or to combating the "establishment." The feeling that it is too early to accept fluoridation is another point often expressed.

However emotional and intense the subject of fluoridation may be, it has thus far remained a nonpartisan issue. Harris cites a 1964 study which reveals that antifluoridation decisions were most likely to take place where local governments were nonpartisan. He goes on to say that the more partisan the government, the more likely referendums would pass.

> Conversely, the more partisan the government, where you had referendums, you were likely to pass it. Meaning that those whose roots go to the political process are more likely to take on fluoridation when they know darn well they can pass it—and that therefore they know how to deliver the goods because that's what they grew up learning and that's how they stay in power. The more nonpartisan types tend to feel they survive by more nonpartisanship and as a consequence don't really get into the battle. Their battling is done behind the scenes and not out in the open and unfortunately or not most of the fluoridation fights have been out in the open.

In conclusion, Harris recommended the use of public opinion research in campaigning for the adoption of fluoridation.

> I don't think you've used research properly. I don't mean your scientific research; you've not used public opinion research properly * * *. Every election is different. I think it's nonsensical to try to draw a conclusion that all fights for fluoridation are the same; each election must be approached as different. And once you take that assumption—that you draw on a cumulative drawing experience—you'll find you can beat the opposition.

DR. FLEMMING SUPPORTS FLUORIDATION

Mr. President, another distinguished participant in the conference is a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, now president of the University of Oregon, Dr. Arthur Flemming. As both national statesman and community leader, Dr. Flemming has been an articulate spokesman in the fight for fluoridation. He relates briefly the struggle fluoridation supporters face in his own hometown of Eugene, Oreg.

Community understanding and acceptance of fluoridation cannot be accomplished solely by support of national organizations and conventions. Dr. Flemming rightly points to "an increased investment of time, energy, and money, in an educational program at the grassroots." Characteristics of such a program should include a continuing and intensive program of education. Dr. Flemming warns that too often we discontinue our efforts after an election where opponents of fluoridation continue an intensive indoctrination campaign. Another suggestion, submits Dr. Flemming, is to extend the educational program to our schools. He recommends having the question of fluoridation of water supplies used as a national high school debate topic. Dr. Flemming stresses the importance of promoting open debate as being essential to the community's understanding and acceptance of fluoridation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Flemming's address be included in the Record following my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Toward a Nation of Health Literates

(By Arthur Flemming, Ph. D.)

Dr. Diefenbach, Dr. Rhyne, and friends: First of all, may I express my very deep appreciation to those who are responsible for developing this program for the opportunity of coming here and participating in what is certainly a very significant conference. I am delighted that I have had the privilege, as you have had, of listening to Mr. Rhyne's presentation. It seems to me that he has underlined points that need to be underlined. He is a very effective advocate in behalf of fluoridation. But as I think of him, and as I think of the contribution he is making to the life of our day, I also like to think of him as probably our Nation's, if not the world's most effective advocate of world peace through world law, and I am sure that many of you have noted the leadership that he has provided to this movement at a very critical time in our history.

As Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I backed the Public Health Service program for fluoridation of the Nation's water supplies. I was convinced, on the basis of the evidence that was presented to me, that it would prevent disease. I was likewise convinced that it would not impair the health of anyone. As I left office, I said that I would try to respond affirmatively to opportunities that might be presented to me to give expression to these convictions. This is why I am very happy to be here with you today.

As a resident of Eugene, Oreg., I soon discovered that there were many persons at the grassroots who did not share my convictions. Just before I became a citizen of the community, the voters had refused to approve a fluoridation program. In November 1964, 28,007 of the citizens of Eugene voted on a fluoridation proposal, and it was approved by a majority of 1,263. But, within a few weeks, the opponents succeeded in having the issue voted on again at a special election in September 1965, at which time a majority of 628 out of a total vote of 11,350 voted against fluoridation of our water supply. I might just parenthetically say that I was invited to participate in a panel discussion on this the evening before the first election, but I was out of the State and couldn't do it. I was then invited to participate in a panel discussion on the evening before the second election; I was in the city, and I did it. Now you can draw your own conclusions. I really think it suggests something—and that is, that there is some resentment on the part of the citizens at the grassroots at what they think are the efforts of some of us related to the national scene to impose something on them. And I think that this is a matter that has to be weighed carefully as we carry forward our campaign.

I agree with Mr. Rhyne that we have not raised the issue as often as we should as to whether or not it is appropriate to subject this issue to a referendum. However, I am afraid that in the State of Oregon, committed as it is to the concept of popular government, that we might have a little trouble with that issue even in the courts of Oregon. You know, in our State, if the legislature increases taxes in order to get additional revenue, the bill does not become law until 90 days after the Governor has signed it. There's no such thing as an emergency clause, and within that period of time, a comparatively small number of voters can make sure of the fact that this is voted on either at a special election or at the next regular election. And as one who is interested in the revenues of the State of Oregon, from the standpoint of the University of Oregon, I can assure you that from time to time we find this a little difficult.

But in any event, let's take a look at our situation from this standpoint of the poor results, nationwide, that we have had on referendum. What's wrong? To me the answer is clear. While those of us who believe in fluoridation have been obtaining the support of national organizations and have been talking to one another at conventions, our opponents have been doing a more effective job at the grassroots. And I believe that we must counter, with an increased investment of time, energy, and money, in an educational program at the grassroots.

What should be some of the characteristics of this program? First of all, I believe it should be a continuing program. If the issue is going to be on the ballot at a regular or special election, we do a pretty good job in carrying on an intensive program of education. But after the election, whether we win or lose, we drop our educational program for oftentimes a long period of time. Our opponents, however, pick up just where they left off the day before the election. That's just what happened in Eugene. Our opponents were defeated in November 1964, and they were at work the day after election, beginning to circulate petitions designed to get it back on the ballot at a special election.

I believe that we must do likewise. We need to insert advertisements in our newspapers and buy time on radio and TV throughout the year—not just in connection with a regular or special election. We need to bring qualified witnesses to our communities to speak on the subject on a continuing basis. We need the cumulative impact of a 365-day-a-year educational program, and until we carry forward such a program, we are not going to improve our batting average as far as referendums are concerned.

Now the second thing I would like to say about this educational program is this: I believe that we must develop special educational programs for the schools of our communities. In 1950, the late Senator Taft was engaged in a vigorous and intensive campaign for reelection in the State of Ohio. I was participating with him to some degree in that campaign. And I noted that he was spending a good deal of time in the last few weeks of the campaign speaking at high school assemblies. One evening when I was with him, I asked him why he was using his time in this way. He replied, "I know that in many instances the high school students will go home and talk at the dinner table about some of the points I underlined in my talk. I know of no more effective way of reaching the voters."

I believe that he was right, and I believe that the point that he was underlining is one that we still need to keep in mind, and certainly those of us who are interested in fluoridation of water supplies should keep it in mind. But at the same time, we must keep in mind that we are asking the schools to become involved in a very controversial and emotional issue within our communities. If our side is to be presented, we must help the schools make sure that the other side is likewise presented. If both sides are fairly presented, I have no doubt about the way in which the discussion will be directed at the family dinner table.

Why not try, for example, to have the question of fluoridation of water supplies used as the national high school debate topic sometime soon? Some of you will recall that the question of health care for the aged was used as the national high school debate topic in 1963. I believe that this played a major role in bringing many persons to the place where they demanded action in this area. You know, when a topic is selected, a very thorough, workmanlike job is done of bringing together a manual which presents material on both sides of the issue. I think that 1 year's debate on the merits of fluoridation of water in most of the high schools of the country would result in large numbers demanding action—not resisting action—on the part of our communities. And, of course, comparable efforts should be made to introduce the issue to students who are attending our colleges and universities. Likewise, I believe that our professional students in dental and medical schools should be introduced to a much greater degree than is the case at the present time to facets of health education, because they are key people in our communities and oftentimes it seems to me they have not been introduced as well as they might be to effective methods of health education.

Returning to our educational program within the community, I also believe that we must arrange for debates on the merits of fluoridated water between citizens of our communities. I do not believe that we can afford to ignore our opposition. I believe that we gain nothing—in fact, I think we lose—by attempting to ridicule the opposition. Some of their arguments have made an impact on large numbers of our citizens, and we must deal with them on their merits.

For example, some of our citizens who are active in the cause of civil liberties have decided to oppose the fluoridation of water supplies because they have accepted the argument that it is forced medication. I know that within our community you can't assume that the only people who are opposing fluoridation of water supplies are the extreme right, and that what might be termed the liberal element of the community are automatically for fluoridation of water supplies. I know of one leader in our community, who is highly respected, we lost at the last election because of her belief that there is a conflict between this and her concept of civil liberty. The kind of material that Mr. Rhyne has presented to us this morning is the kind of material that we must present to the citizens of our communities—some of them thoughtful, effective leaders within our communities. And I believe that if we are willing to meet our opponents in open, well-run public debates, we can accomplish a number of objectives.

We can do a better job of introducing our citizens to the individuals and organizations that support fluoridated water. I feel that too often we try to overpower Mr. Average Citizen with our impressive endorsement. I would like to see us, for example, take more time to tell our citizens about the U.S. Public Health Service, the causes in which it has been involved, the dedicated services of its career personnel, and its 30 years of investigation of fluoridated water. We need a TV program entitled "The Public Health Service Story," just as we need TV programs to tell the story of other agencies of the Government. Public Health Service is just a name to many of our citizens, instead of representing a group of dedicated workers who are giving the best years of their lives to improve the health of the people of this Nation.

I feel that we can, in open debate, do a more effective job of providing the main reasons for supporting fluoridated water. Our willingness to do it in open debate carries conviction. Our opponents will ignore most of our reasons, because they will not be able to refute them. And this will convey its own message to our listeners.

Also, I believe that in open debate we can do a more effective job of refuting the claims of our opponents. We can expose their case histories of alleged harm to the health of individuals who have lived in communities wtih fluoridated water. We can meet head on the claim that this is "forced medication" by using the kind of presentation that Mr. Rhyne has given to us. I know of no other controversial issue that has the kind of court record back of it that this one has. Just imagine, 30 times it has been tried out in the courts—30 times the courts have arrived at the same conclusion. We can use that. We can use it more effectively than we have, particularly if we acquaint ourselves with some of the reasons why the courts did arrive at this conclusion.

Finally, as I think of our educational program, I believe that we must do a better job of tailoring our educational programs to the conditions that confront us in our respective communities. No two communities are alike when it comes to dealing with this issue. This means that we must invest money in research which will bring to light the behavioral patterns in our communities. It also means that we must be willing to set aside our prejudices as to the best way in which to deal with this problem and accept the results of research that is conducted in our communities designed to identify the best approaches that we can take in order to achieve the desired results.

Emma Carr Bivins, in her article, "People Are Giving Us the Answers," in the November issue of the Journal of the American Dental Association, said: "If today's town can win on fluoridation, it may possess the capacity to achieve almost any other advance or innovation it desires." I agree. I think it's one of the toughest problems that we have in our communities today, and if we can solve it, it's going to help us deal with many other issues within our communities in a more effective manner.

There isn't any question in my mind at all but that we must move forward in our efforts to attain fluoridation of the Nation's water supply. We must do so in the interest of the health of the citizens of our community; we must do so in order to demonstrate that under our form of government, truth can and will prevail.

May I express, as a citizen, my appreciation to each one of you for your willingness to give the time that you are giving in order to become better prepared to carry forward what is certainly a very important crusade as far as our Nation is concerned.

NACD SUPPORTS PROPOSED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT ACT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, an outstanding organization working to conserve our soil and water resources has endorsed the new approach to rural planning and development proposed in the President's community development message and introduced in the Senate by Senator ELLENDER.

The National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, in a resolution at its annual convention February 6 through 10 in New Orleans, urged early and favorable consideration of this legislation. It noted that the objectives of the proposal are consistent with the broad conservation and resource goals of our soil and water conservation districts throughout the country.

The district supervisors who are members of this organization are familiar with all the problems of local planning on a district basis and an endorsement from them is highly significant.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I would like to call this resolution to the attention of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 13

PROPOSED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT ACT OF 1966

President Johnson has recommended to Congress the enactment of legislation entitled "The Community Development District Act of 1966.". This would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to designate, upon request, community development districts composed of towns and the surrounding rural area within normal commuting distance.

The purpose of these districts—to be governed by a board representing county and municipal governments concerned—would be to coordinate broad community planning efforts. They would be eligible for grants from the Department of Housing and Urban Development and other Federal assistance in order to:

(a) Provide for more equitable participation in community development activities by all segments of the community;

(b) Increase the efficiency of the use of natural resources on a regional basis;

(c) Provide for full representation of local governmental units in community planning efforts;

(d) Improve the relationships between rural and urban areas; and

(e) Facilitate cooperation between all public and private organizations engaged and interested in community development.

These goals are in harmony with the broad conservation and resource development objectives of soil and water conservation districts.

Furthermore, the establishment of community development districts would provide a means by which local governments could secure comprehensive planning services and special assistance from the Federal Government that would enable them to focus on natural resource development, as well as other important community needs, and make better utilization of the skills, information, resources, and assistance of local soil and water conservation districts.

The NACD supports the passage of this legislation and urges early consideration, with districts and by the governmental agencies concerned, of the manner in which soil and water conservation districts can most usefully contribute to the achievement of the objective of this program.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE HATCH ACT TO THE COMMUNITY ACTION AND VISTA PROGRAMS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on February 9, I introduced an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act extending the Hatch Act's prohibitions on political activity to the employees of the community action and VISTA programs, who receive the principal part of their salaries from Federal funds.

As I previously stated, this amendment was unanimously approved by the members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and was subsequently passed by the Senate during the first session. The conference committee unfortunately rejected the amendment. Any doubts that members of the conference committee had regarding my amendment last year should now be removed, for as the San Diego Evening Tribune commented:

> The extra year of experience since Congress eliminated Murphy's amendment last year should provide ample grounds for keeping it intact at this time.

This experience clearly indicates that the problem will not vanish on its own and action is necessary if we do not want to see the program become frustrated by political maneuverings.

In my own State, the problem persists. In the February 7 edition of the Economic Opportunity Report, there is an article about the poverty program in Los Angeles. This report, Mr. President, is prepared by Capitol Publications, which is a private independent organization which hopes to become a source for information regarding the many programs and agencies involved in the economic opportunity program. I wish them success, for certainly it will not be an easy task to penetrate this maze. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that an article from the Economic Opportunity Report be printed following my remarks.

Mr. President, I am most encouraged with the favorable reception that my amendment has received. Particularly encouraging is the favorable editorial comment. I share the sentiments of the Los Angeles Times that the program should not be "jeopardized by political finagling." The Times further states:

> The Johnson administration has indicated a desire to divorce the program from politics. If that is, indeed, the case, it should have no opposition to barring those that operate the program from political activity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cogent editorials that appeared in the San Diego Evening Tribune and the Los Angeles Times be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Economic Opportunity Report, Feb. 7, 1966]

Los Angeles Votes To Cut Poverty Program

Los Angeles County supervisors have voted to oppose an increase of local funds for the poverty program scheduled to take place July 1, 1967. Growing conflict between the poor and the local government over representation of the poor in administration of the local community action agency (economic and youth opportunity agency) is seen as a major cause behind this decision.

Under existing provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act, Los Angeles County is required to increase its share of financial backing for the economic and youth opportunity agency from a current 10-percent rate to 50 percent after July 1, 1967. County supervisors have opposed this increase, claiming they do not have sufficient funds available.

Behind the supervisors' decision is a long series of clashes dating back to the Watts riot, in what seems an unending struggle for control of the poverty program in Los Angeles. The various groups involved—political, racial, and ideological—accuse each other of trying to use control of the program to take political advantage of the poor. The final showdown may well come on March 1 when 1 million poor people in the county will go to the polls to elect 7 representatives from among their number to serve on the 23-member EYOA board.

Mayor Yorty, of Los Angeles, has supported the move by the county supervisors saying the city just doesn't have the funds to afford the increase of 50 percent. Representative Augustus Hawkins, Democrat, of California, whose district includes the Watts area, however, claims that Yorty and the county supervisors are grasping for control of the program without being willing to accept the responsibility that accompanies control. He added that the city should have funds available through savings gained as the program takes people off city relief rolls. If the city does not use these savings toward the program, he continued, then it is using poverty funds to subsidize local government. Should the county be unwilling to increase its commitment, Representative Hawkins foresees a possible decrease to Federal funds going to the local community action project and an increase in other programs which are controlled directly by the Federal Government through the Office of Economic Opportunity.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Evening Tribune, Feb. 12, 1966]

Politics and Poverty Program

Senator George Murphy, Republican, of California, has taken a commendable step toward keeping politics out of the poverty program.

He has introduced an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which would place executives who receive the principal part of their salaries from Federal poverty funds under the Hatch Act. This act is supposed to prevent politicking by Federal employees.

The Murphy amendment needs to stick this time. He introduced a similar proposal last year. It was accepted unanimously by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and passed the Senate without a dissenting vote. But this much-needed protection was cut out in conference.

The need for keeping politics out of the poverty program is plain to see. As Murphy said in a letter to his colleagues soliciting their support:

"The war on poverty is in danger of becoming bogged down by bickering and partisan political activities. This, of course, is most regrettable, and I am convinced that unless steps are taken to keep the program free from politics, the poor will benefit little, if any, from the program."

The extra year of experience since Congress eliminated Murphy's amendment last year should provide ample grounds for keeping it intact this time.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 14, 1966]

Program for Poor, Not Politicos

Poverty program personnel would be barred from political activity under a proposal offered by Senator George Murphy.

The Senator would amend the Economic Opportunity Act to provide that community action agency employees who receive more than half their salary from Federal poverty funds, and employees of the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) program would be placed under the Hatch Act.

Although the Senator's concern is primarily with the community action programs, VISTA personnel were included at the suggestion of other members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

The amendment was approved unanimously by the committee last year and passed the Senate without dissenting vote. It died, however, in conference committees, ostensibly as the result of White House pressures.

In the meantime, dissatisfaction with functioning of the poverty program has increased and complaints over unwarranted politicking are growing.

The Johnson administration has indicated a desire to divorce the program from politics. If that is, indeed, the case it should have no objection to barring those who operate the program from political activity.

The Job Corps, which operates under the Hatch Act, has largely avoided getting bogged down in politics. It would seem logical that restrictions imposed on that agency would serve an equally useful purpose in the poverty program.

The war on poverty is too important to be jeopardized by political finagling. As Senator Murphy emphasizes, the program should not be used to enhance the political fortunes of a few politicians or a political party.

Putting poverty workers under the Hatch Act will not solve all the problems of the program, but it should have a beneficial effect.

Adoption of the Murphy amendment would serve notice on poverty program personnel that they are there to help the poor, not the politicians.

THE PROPOSED REDUCTION OF THE SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during the past month many of us in this Chamber have spoken out against President Johnson's plans to cut back the school milk program for the next fiscal year. We have pointed out that to cut back such a worthwhile program by 80 percent simply to finance his war on poverty is to take from that which is worthy and tried and give to that which is untried and may not be worthy.

Recently we have received notification that the President also reduced the funds available for federally impacted schools. It is beginning to appear that the President is not leading a war on poverty as much as he is leading a war on children.

According to figures released by the Department of HEW, Office of Education, substantial reductions will be made in Public Law 874 funds. These funds are used for the operation and maintenance of schools in districts impacted by Federal military and civilian activities. In South Dakota alone the reduction is over $1 million.

If these proposed cuts go through, many of the school districts now operating would be forced to eliminate or cut back services that they are presently offering their students. Indeed, it is possible that some districts might have to close down completely.

Ellsworth Air Force Base in Rapid City, S. Dak., for example, is directly responsible for the size of Douglas Independent School District No. 3. Under the projected figures this school district would stand to lose $223,963. It has been estimated that the figure is four times the local ability to raise money to support their school program.

Mr. President, I fail to see any reasonable justification for this drastic cut in funds. All I can see is injustice tempered with politics. I see politics because these missing funds will ultimately end up financing some aspect of the poverty program in the vote-heavy urban areas. I see injustice because the President is penalizing the children and the families of those who have already made sacrifices. We must keep in mind that many of these children are not in impacted schools by choice. They are in impacted schools because their father serves his country and is stationed at a military installation. Or, even worse, they have remained behind at the installation while their father has gone to defend our freedom in Vietman. I would hope that the Senate will not allow such an injustice to occur and will restore the Public Law 874 funds to the present authorized level.

I ask unanimous consent that the proposed Budget Bureau cuts as compared to the Office of Education requests for fiscal year 1967 in South Dakota be listed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

South Dakota

Name of school district	Congressional district	1967 estimated entitlements under Public Law 874	Estimated entitlements under proposed amendments to Public Law 874 in fiscal year 1967 budget
Flandreau Independent School District No. 3, Moody	1	$30,612	$10,779
Pierre Independent School District No. 1, Hughes	1	85,788	24,636
Ravinia and Plain Center Independent School District No. 98, Charles Mix	1	9,349	4,773
Lake Andes Independent School District, Charles Mix	1	10,632	5,851
Pickstown Independent School District No. 96, Charles Mix	1	74,422	60,666
Chamberlain Independent School District, Brule	1	38,495	20,634
Buckeye Consolidated No. 13, Hughes	1	0	0
Sisseton Independent School District No. 1, Roberts	1	19,981	6,467
Wagner Independent School District No. 99, Charles Mix	1	7,699	2,002
Blunt Independent School District No. 2, Hughes	1	2,200	154
Harrold Independent School District No. 3, Hughes	1	0	0
Gettysburg Independent School District No. 1, Potter	1	24,197	9,085
Mobridge Independent School District No. 13, Walworth	1	10,082	0
Wahehe Common School District No. 83, Charles Mix	1	13,198	10,778
Elvira Township Independent School District No. 4, Buffalo	1	10,632	7,083
Victory Common School District No. 8, Buffalo	1	0	0
Pukwana Independent School District No. 1, Brule	1	0	0
Browns Valley Independent School District No. 103, Roberts	1	8,615	4,927
Highmore Independent School District No. 1, Hyde	1	11,915	6,467
Wessington Springs Independent School District No. 18, Jerauld	1	0	0
Platte Independent School District No. 97, Charles Mix	1	2,383	0
Congressional district total		360,200	174,302
Hot Springs Independent School District No. 10, Fall River	2	89,822	60,361
Piedmont School District No. 34, Meade	2	2,200	154
Rapid City Independent School District No. 1, Pennington	2	271,290	109,480
Sturgis Independent School District No. 12, Meade	2	101,736	51,430
Fort Pierre Independent School District No. 1, Stanley	2	11,549	5,236
Cold Brook School District No. 27, Custer	2	4,216	3,079
Todd County Independent School District, Todd	2	282,291	212,950
Douglas Independent School District No. 3, Pennington	2	1,002,313	778,350
Newell Independent School District No. 37, Butte	2	10,815	3,388
Custer Independent School District, Custer	2	18,514	6,159
Rapid Valley School District No. 4, Pennington	2	8,616	3,541
Hill City Independent School District No. 10, Pennington	2	$11,732	$6,159
Cleghorn Common School District No. 85, Pennington	2	2,566	462
Shannon County Independent School District No. 1, Shannon	2	242,146	189,853
Washabaugh Unorganized CSD, Washabaugh	2	15,948	10,162
Eagle Butte Independent School District No. 3, Dewey	2	83,587	62,206
Interior Independent School District No. 55, Jackson	2	11,182	8,161
Bennett County Independent High School District, Bennett	2	10,265	6,159
White River Independent School District No. 29, Mellette	2	42,894	30,642
Martin Common School District No. 2, Bennett	2	30,979	19,247
Timber Lake Independent School District No. 2, Dewey	2	7,882	2,155
Wood Independent School District No. 1, Mellette	2	4,583	3,234
McLaughlin Independent School District No. 3, Corson	2	61,408	42,190
McIntosh Independent School District No. 1, Corson	2	57,742	39,419
Smee Independent School District No. 4, Corson	2	64,340	49,118
St. Charles Common School District No. 104, Gregory	2	17,231	13,242
Blackpipe Common School District No. 8, Mellette	2	23,280	17,861
North River School District No. 16, Ziebach	2	4,583	2,617
Provo Independent School District No. 36, Fall River	2	182,633	142,204
Washington Common School District No. 26, Mellette	2	3,849	2,772
Edgemont Independent School District No. 37, Fall River	2	26,580	16,629
Wall Independent School District No. 58, Pennington	2	3,300	0
Keystone Common School District No. 2, Pennington	2	4,399	2,464
Common School District No. 3, Bennett	2	17,414	13,242
Duncon Common School District, Corson	2	4,949	3,850
Spearfish Independent School District, No. 104, Lawrence	2	12,465	0
Oral School District, No. 34, Fall River	2	3,483	1,693
New Ideal School District No. 112, Tripp	2	5,499	4,312
Reliance Public School District No. 9, Lyman	2	6,966	3,388
Hot Springs Common School District No. 1, Fall River	2	2,750	1,848
Deadwood Independent School District No. 102, Lawrence	2	6,599	0
Congressional district total		2,776,605	1,929,417
Total, South Dakota		3,136,805	2,103,719

JOHN F. KENNEDY ON EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the publication today of a most useful book serves to remind us of the great strides which have been made in education during the past few years.

The book is entitled "John F. Kennedy on Education" and is a definitive compilation of the late President's speeches and writings on that and related subjects from his days as a young Massachusetts Congressman to his untimely death.

Mr. O'Hara, assistant dean of the University of Connecticut School of Law, has rendered considerable service in bringing together President Kennedy's many writings. He has also ably traced the educational influences on his early life and the varied actions which Congressman, Senator, and finally President Kennedy took on behalf of education.

Our distinguished colleague in the House of Representatives, Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana, has written a preface to this excellent book. Since the preface, written by a Representative with a compelling interest in improving American education, is a valuable summary of "John F. Kennedy on Education," Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the preface to which I have alluded be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the preface to the book was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREFACE BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS, OF INDIANA

"Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress," President John F. Kennedy told Congress as he began his special message on education of January 29, 1963. Kennedy went on to present the most sweeping program for Federal help to education ever advocated by an American President.

Yet, as Arthur Schlesinger has recently reminded us, "Little disappointed the Kennedys more in domestic policy than their failure to make significant progress in Federal aid to education." "A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House," Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1965, page 662.

Schlesinger's judgment, while accurate, must be tempered. For less than 3 years after Kennedy's 1963 message, nearly every education measure which he had then pressed Congress to enact had become law.

President Johnson's leadership, substantial margins in Congress committed to education and wideswept public support—all these factors helped produce the extraordinary record of education legislation of 1963–65: the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Acts of 1963 and 1965, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, and major amendments to the Vocational Education and National Defense Education Acts, to cite only a few of the principal measures.

William O'Hara's book, "John F. Kennedy on Education," is a valuable documentation of the contribution of President Kennedy's leadership to the remarkable educational achievements of the 88th and 89th Congresses.

For despite the tragedy of the assassination and despite the hurdles which frustrated the passage of education bills during the 3 years of his Presidency, Kennedy, by his vigorous advocacy of increased Federal support of education, helped make possible the later achievements.

By providing excerpts from Kennedy's public statements on education during his years as a Representative and Senator as well as during the 1960 campaign and the Presidential period, Mr. O'Hara has illumined a significant aspect of Kennedy's entire political career. These speeches and articles reveal Kennedy's continuing interest in education, in the broadest sense of the word. They reflect his profound concern with the quality of American life, his respect for intelligence and ideas, his rapport with the academic community, and his preoccupation with the problems of young people.

Again and again Kennedy speaks of improving the dialog between the politician and the scholar, of the responsibility of the young to prepare for leadership in a democracy, of the value of education not only as a national resource in the cold war but as essential in enhancing the quality of the life of the individual.

Mr. O'Hara, now assistant dean of the University of Connecticut Law School, was, as counsel to the special subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee from April 1962 to November 1963, a direct participant in work on most of the education bills Congress considered during President Kennedy's administration and is therefore well qualified to undertake this highly useful compilation.

Kennedy's interest in education as a public issue grew and matured over the years—from the Congressman's proposal to improve selection procedures for service academy appointments to the Senator's opposition to the loyalty oath requirement in the National Defense Education Act to the President's plea to Congress for Federal aid to education over a broad spectrum. As a member of the two congressional committees with primary jurisdiction over education bills, the House Committee on Education and Labor and the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Kennedy was exceptionally well schooled in the politics of education by the time he came to the Presidency. As a legislator, he saw firsthand the major obstacles confronting advocates of education bills: the issues of civil rights, aid to church-related schools, and Federal control.

All these issues are, in one way or another, still with us but all have, in at least one respect, been overcome: Congress is passing major education bills and the role of the Federal Government in support of American education has grown substantially in the last few years. Indeed, during my four terms in Congress, especially as a member of Congressman Kennedy's old committee, Education and Labor (and presently holder of his old seat as second ranking member of the subcommittee which handles elementary and secondary school bills), I have myself witnessed this significant change.

Congress and the American people have been taking seriously President Kennedy's observation in his first message to Congress on education, on February 20, 1961, "The human mind is our fundamental resource." President Johnson has long shared this conviction and the Nation is now investing more in this most valuable of all our resources. Mr. O'Hara's book traces the Kennedy commitment to that investment.

The book moves from the congressional years to the 1960 campaign, and the Presidential years and concludes with a section on that most successful of all John F. Kennedy's appeals to American youth, the Peace Corps.

The appendices will be useful to students of Kennedy's domestic policies. They list education bills he introduced while in Congress and those enacted into law during his administration.

A NEW PLANT FOR THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, there has been some discussion recently on the Government Printing Office's announcement of plans to construct a new plant away from downtown Washington.

As I am in favor of this decision, I should like to call attention to an article printed in the ITU Review on January 27. This article points out in very clear and reasonable terms the fact that the new plant will serve the interests of efficiency and long-term saving. A study made by the International Typographical Union has revealed that a saving of $4.5 million can be made annually by concentrating GPO activities in one building located where more elbow room would be available.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article in the ITU Review of January 27, 1966, entitled "Logic Supports New Building for Government Printing Office" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Logic Supports New Building for Government Printing Office

A heated controversy is presently raging in Washington, D.C., regarding the Government Printing Office. The Public Printer has logically outlined plans for abandoning the GPO's obsolete four-building complex and constructing a new plant away from the downtown congestion.

Opposed to construction of the new building is the master printers (nonunion) section of Printing Industry of America and, undoubtedly, many agencies of the Government which are doing some of their own printing and proofreading. The jobs of many of the 1,800 ITU members employed at the GPO are at stake.

A statement on the proposed GPO relocation included the following facts which it seems will be of benefit to all ITU members. The U.S. Government bureaus, like bureaucrats everywhere, it must be remembered, exert a constant pressure for expansion from within. Each agency would like to do its own printing. They would use clerks, stenographers, and a miscellaneous potpourri of unskilled and semiskilled help to produce work of a questionable quality.

Government Printing Office operations are now conducted in a crowded, multistory, four-building complex in a congested-traffic area and in a location wholly incompatible with an industrial operation of this size. Insufficient floor space, restricted floor-loading capacities, limited ceiling heights, and narrow columnar spacing prohibit efficient placement of key production equipment, restrict the free flow of work in progress, and prevent raw-stock storage and interim storage at, or near, production points.

TENUOUS MATERIALS HANDLING

Because of insufficient warehouse space at this site, about half of the GPO's daily stock intake of from 16 to 18 freightcar loads of paper are received and rehandled from a warehouse located 15 miles from the GPO, and also from two other locations in the metropolitan area of the city. These factors impose an almost insolvable logistic problem, faced every working day, but the worst is yet to come.

The major portion of paper received at the main plant must be lowered five levels and power-trucked through a tunnel under North Capitol Street connecting the receiving warehouse with production areas in Building No. 3. Here it must be elevator-lifted as many as six levels before being placed at points of use in this building.

A careful study was conducted to analyze the possibility of acquiring additional space at the present location of the GPO. This study revealed that while more room was available, raw materials would still have to be handled from the receiving point in the warehouse building across North Capitol Street and trucked under the street and thence to points of use at the space added at this location.

NEED 27 FREIGHT ELEVATORS NOW

Complete dependence upon 27 freight elevators for movement of paper and partially completed work significantly retards efforts to streamline production operations. Safety hazards and greater than normal spoilage of both materials and products are created by multiple movements of paper and crowding skid storage into work areas. It was determined, after analyzing the results of this study, that the only permanent and practicable answer to the GPO's perplexing space and logistics problems would be relocation to an efficiently designed and engineered two-story facility.

Therefore, in 1963, the Public Printer submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing plans for such relocation, and asked that the $6,450,000 which the Congress had authorized for an annex to the present four-building complex be returned to the Treasury.

With the new building, as proposed by the Public Printer, all materials handling would be confined to the ground level. Transportation of stock, therefore, would be only on a horizontal plane from receipt of paper through succeeding printing and binding operations and, finally, to shipping and delivery. This is the key factor to the substantial savings expected of this plan.

RECOMMENDED BY PUBLIC PRINTER

Lighter supporting operations, including administrative offices, could then be arranged over this area on the second level. Because of the economies which could be realized by operating in a two-story building, the Public Printer felt it was incumbent upon him to recommend this course of action.

The cost of new facilities for the GPO, including the two-story building, is estimated at about $47 million. An annual saving of $3 million is anticipated in comparing present operating costs with the costs of production in the two-story building. An additional fringe benefit, that of vacating much needed downtown office space for more appropriate use, is estimated to be worth an additional $1.5 million. This makes a total of $4.5 million that can be saved annually by moving the GPO to an area where elbow room would be available.

Cost of the project would be recovered from the savings in about 10 years. And after the cost was recovered, the savings would continue to be returned for many years to come. The project, incidentally, has been authorized by both the House and Senate Public Works Committees.

The GPO expects to continue its long-established policy of buying specialty printing, and book and job printing which lends itself to procurement from commercial sources, consistent with law and the prudent expenditure of public funds. In the last fiscal year, more than 40 percent of the total volume of printing and binding ordered from the GPO was obtained from the commercial printing industry.

Whether the GPO moves to a new building or stays in the present complex there will be no change in the GPO's procurement of commercial printing. The question is simply whether to continue to operate in the present inadequate and obsolete plant, with its concomitant needless loss of $4.5 million per year, or construct a modernly designed and engineered building and effect that saving.

HAS AGRICULTURE COME TO A TURN IN THE ROAD?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, during the past week, it was my privilege to share the speaking platform at the 1966 annual convention of the National Livestock Feeders Association in Omaha with Mr. Carroll P. Streeter, editor of the Farm Journal.

As most Members of the Senate know, the Farm Journal is one of America's outstanding agricultural publications. Its large circulation and the high respect for its accuracy and objectivity make its editorial voice one of the most authoritative in its field.

Mr. Streeter's thoughtful address, "Have We Come to a Turn in the Road?" left a deep impression on those at the convention, including this Senator.

Based on his 39 years of experience as a reporter and editor of this highly respected publication, Mr. Streeter was able to present an accurate and revealing description of agriculture in our country today and its prospects for the future.

He laid particular stress on the fact that farm surpluses, a problem which has been plaguing American agriculture for decades, have largely disappeared. In fact, just the reverse is happening, shortages are beginning to appear. Mr. Streeter then made a thorough analysis of the conditions which have resulted in this dramatic turn of events.

In detailing world agricultural production trends and contrasting them with world population trends and projected needs for food, Mr. Streeter brought home a point which presents our country and the Congress with a most serious and challenging situation. He said:

> The people who control farming in the United States are going to do much to shape the destiny of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Streeter's remarks entitled, "Have We Come to a Turn in the Road?" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAVE WE COME TO A TURN IN THE ROAD?

(By Carroll P. Streeter)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—An address by Carroll P. Streeter, editor of Farm Journal, Philadelphia, Pa., at the 1966 annual convention of the National Livestock Feeders Association, Omaha, Nebr., February 16, 1966.)

The title of my talk, "Have We Come to a Turn in the Road?" is phrased as a question. But actually there is no doubt about it. We have come to a turn, all right, and it's a momentous one.

On the one hand, farming in this country is coming over the top of the hill, and prospects have never looked so bright. At the same time millions of people in half the world face the very real threat, not too far off, not just of continued hunger but of actual starvation.

I want to discuss both the bright and the dark sides of the picture and then suggest some things I believe we need do if we are to keep either our own prosperity or help others.

On the domestic farm scene when have we ever done better? In a business as big as agriculture, extending to every nook and corner of the United States and involving some 250 commercial products or more, things are never good all over at the same time. But neither are they bad all over at once. In the 39 years I've been roaming over this country as a farm magazine man I've never seen so many farmers and ranchmen doing so well at any one moment as this morning in February of 1966.

Farm income is at record heights.

The surpluses of food we've worried so much about in recent years have largely disappeared; some have vanished completely. We're short right now of dried milk, rice and anything containing protein (except soybeans where we might have a small carryover). Feed grains, of which we had an 85 million ton excess in 1961 have been fed down to 55 to 60 million tons by now—not far above what we should prudently carry as a reserve.

Something dramatic has happened to wheat, which for years has been the big villain in the food surplus picture.

About a year ago Farm Journal carried an article by Karl Hobson, of Washington State University, a leading authority on the wheat situation, reporting that the world wheat surplus was disappearing. It was news that surprised most of us.

In a recent dispatch to us Hobson now warns that the day of a severe shortage is drawing closer. In fact, he says, "the world right now is eating on borrowed time." For 6 years now the world has been consuming wheat faster than it raised it. The carryover in the four major exporting countries—the United States, Canada, Australia and Argentina—will be 1.2 billion bushels, nearly all of this in the United States and Canada.

"In the view of many," says Hobson, "this is about as low as we dare let the carryover get in today's world.

"As for the United States," he continues, "our carryover next July 1 (providing shipping restrictions are removed) is likely to be about 650 million bushels. This is about what we need for a strategic reserve, an amount below which we should never allow our stocks to fall."

So that's what's happening to our surpluses.

Meanwhile our exports, both for dollars and for free, are at record heights and before long should hit $7 billion a year. Right now we export the produce from one acre in every four of our cultivated land. In fact, it may well be that the best possibilities for growth in American agriculture from here on will lie abroad, not in the United States—a fact that more farmers need to wake up to.

In recent decades there has been a heavy exodus of people out of farming, and it is well known that by now farmers constitute only 7 percent of the population. To hear some people tell it you'd think this had been a calamity. Actually it has been for some, but for those who are left it has been a boon. It has simply meant fewer people cutting up an ever larger pie and getting larger slices.

Meanwhile the pie itself gets bigger every year. It has to, of course, when we have some 8,000 more people in this country sitting down to the breakfast table every morning—to say nothing of huge numbers abroad.

You know how bright the prospects look in the livestock business. Supplies are not only moderate but appear likely to stay that way, particularly in the beef world. For the present and the immediate future there's no threat of consequence from imports. Demand is at record levels not only here but in Western Europe and England. The livestock economy as a whole is robust, with nothing but good times immediately ahead.

The fact is, then, that farming in this country is coming into a new day. Not only is it a growth industry, but it is moving into stronger hands every day. There will be ups and downs, as there always have been, but if we can avoid a depression, a calamitous drought, serious inflation, or a major war the future is brighter than it ever has been for farmers who have the intelligence and the capital to stay in the game.

Contrast that with what's happening in the hungry half of the world. While we sit here in the glow of good times there's a crisis of truly alarming proportions looming in most of Asia, Africa, and the northern part of Latin America, where over half the world's people live. And it's going to affect each one of us, even though we live here and have plenty to eat.

These people aren't going to starve quietly. The desperate chaos that would result would make Vietnam look like a neighborhood argument. Some of you have boys in Vietnam this morning. You don't have to be told that what happens half way around the world affects you. You not only send boys to fight in a far-off jungle; you send a lot of tax money to support both a war and a food-aid program. And if the Communists, who thrive on this kind of misery, can take over huge chunks of the world, a piece at a time, someday our own security right here is threatened.

What's happened to pose this threat of mass starvation? We haven't been hearing about it, until lately anyway, and even now most of us haven't waked up to it.

In the 1950's we seemed to be making some gain in the race to feed the world's people. We know now that the gain was temporary. DDT had killed malaria mosquitos and thus opened up farming in large regions. Big irrigation projects had brought other land into production. The benefits of both were realized some years ago.

About the year 1958 the tide began to turn. By 1960 we were definitely losing in per capita food production in the world, and the gap is steadily widening. The farther into the sixties we get the more frightening the picture becomes.

Opening up new land has always been the chief means of getting more food in needy areas. But now the hungry half of the world is running out of new land to farm. That's the first big happening. The second is that since World War II the boom in population—in the same part of the world that's out of land—has been fantastic. Much lower death rates plus higher birth rates account for it.

This statement from Lester Brown, staff economist in the USDA and an expert in these matters, makes the picture clear:

"From the beginning of the human race until 1960," says Dr. Brown, "world population built up a little more than 3 billion people. Barring something drastic, by the year 2,000—34 years from now—we'll have another 3 billion. We will double what it took millennia to produce. In just 34 years, then, we will need to double world food output, even to continue at today's inadequate dietary levels."

We might do it if the land were where the people will be, but it isn't. Asia, for example, has 56 percent of the world's people, only 31 percent of its arable land. The productive part of the world is in the North and South temperate zones, but both the density of population and the lowest-yielding agriculture happen to be in the tropics.

The tropical parts of the world have increased yields per acre only 7 percent, as compared with 107 percent in North America. In the 1930s six big regions had grain to export. Today only two have any to spare—North America and Australia-New Zealand.

It's a sobering thought, and one that hasn't occurred to most of us, that the United States has about the only surplus of good land anywhere in the world. The 57 million acres that we have on the shelf, either through a Soil Bank or annual crop-control programs, constitutes the world's only safety valve.

The people who control farming in the United States are going to do much to shape the destiny of the world. Had you realized that this is you?

We're hearing a great deal these days—and will hear more—about taking this idle land back into production to feed the world's hungry. Many people are saying that it's ridiculous, even criminal, to let this good farm land sit here doing nothing when the world is so short of food.

Senator McGovern of South Dakota and Congressman Harold Cooley, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, are among the leaders in Congress who are talking about this.

It's an appealing idea of course: put this land back into production thus increasing our own business; get rid of the Government controls nobody likes; possibly spend no more money than present farm programs cost us; and feed the hungry. There's something here to appeal to just about everybody.

The trouble is the answer isn't that simple—it would be nice if it were.

For one thing, the hungry countries can't presently take in and distribute much more food than we are sending now. No country that can use more food is going without it. Before these nations can use more they'll have to develop ports, transportation facilities, and a distributive setup.

Indiscriminate dumping of huge quantities of our surplus foods could well do more long-range harm than good. It could smother markets over there just when farmers of these countries are struggling to get on their feet. Furthermore it could encourage some of these nations to go right on depending on us for food while continuing to turn their own scant resources to military buildups and attempts at industrialization. That's been one of the problems thus far.

What then is to be done?

Well first, we'll have to continue to send food from here—better food, enriched with vitamins and minerals, and probably even more of it than now. It should be the food people need—not just what we want to get rid of. It should be food especially for children, for nutritionists say that a child seriously malnourished up to age 6 is maimed for life, mentally as well as physically.

Second we'll need to do a lot more than we're doing already to step-up food production over there, where the hungry people are. That's the only real answer, for we certainly can't feed the world from here. If there's not much more new land that can be brought in, the only answer is to increase production per acre on the land there is. It will be a long, slow process, for it involves more than seed fertilizer, machinery and technical know-how. Those things can be supplied fairly easily. It depends first on such things as achieving stable government; a private enterprise system; a market economy in which a farmer can sell something, not just raise enough for his own subsistence; education; health; credit; roads and waterways. It means changing attitudes, traditions, and taboos built up over the centuries.

Because the process will be slow and because the need is so imminent, there's not a moment to be lost. Within 10 or 15 years we may need all of our own idle land back in production—those 57 million acres mentioned a moment ago that are the world's only land in reserve. By that time we've got to have agriculture in the hungry world on its own feet if a very large number of our fellow human beings are to escape starvation. That's the span of time we have to work with. It isn't much and it may not be enough.

This is one reason why we're going to have to be a lot tougher in dispensing foreign aid than we have been. Too often we have said in effect, "Here it is, take it and do what you want with it." From now on we are going to have to require, in return for our help, that the hungry countries turn their first energies to building up their own agriculture. You wouldn't think they would have to be forced to do it, but apparently that's the case. I'm glad to say that at long last, we have begun to toughen our give-away programs. It certainly seems high time.

There's a third big thing to be done and that's slow down population growth. It's as important as stepping up food production. I am happy that here there is something encouraging to report.

Maybe you saw an article in the February Farm Journal entitled "A Loop That Can Shake the World." If you didn't, let me take just a minute to tell you about it.

The Lippes Loop, as it's called, is a ridiculously simple, inexpensive contraceptive that even the poorest and most illiterate and most undisciplined people in the world can use. It is named after a young American doctor, Dr. Jack Lippes, of the University of Buffalo.

Actually it is nothing but a little zig-zag piece of plastic, an inch and a half long that looks about like a piece of doorbell wire. A doctor inserts it in a woman's uterus and as long as it's there she will not conceive. If she want children later she simply has the doctor take the loop out and she can have them. About 15 percent of women can't retain the loop or must have it removed but for the remainder it is 98 percent effective. It requires no attention, causes no discomfort, and there's no danger to health. It can be put in and forgot about. And it costs only a dime. Contraceptive pills, on the other hand, cost about $24 a year, and have to be taken regularly.

We said in Farm Journal that perhaps this little loop will have more impact on the world than the atom bomb—and it just might.

Indian Government officials think that it could bring India's population problem under control in 10 years. There's a factory there now turning out 14,000 a day.

In Korea, Formosa, Chile, Jamaica, Nepal, and many other overpopulated parts of the world hundreds of thousands of these loops are in use today, and millions will be tomorrow. They're even being used to limit the number of sacred cows which are such a scourge in India.

So far in this talk we have talked about our own booming farm economy and the dire food picture in the hungry world. But what do we need do at this juncture to keep America strong? Unless this country stays sound and vigorous we can neither protect what we have nor effectively be our brother's keeper elsewhere.

There are three distinct threats that I believe you as livestock men, and everybody else in rural America, need be concerned about. Certainly they should interest you as citizens, but also as livestock feeders, for sooner or later they will affect your business.

The first is the reapportionment fight now going on in Congress.

Until recently you had the right to decide how to choose your own legislatures—a privilege Americans have enjoyed since the founding of the Constitution. But on June 15, 1964, the Supreme Court of the United States took away your right to choose. It said that henceforth both houses of State legislatures must be apportioned on the basis of population. No longer would geography count for anything in selecting the State senate.

Now it may be that the people of some States will want it that way. But it may also be that the citizens of some States won't. The point is they won't get to decide. A Court down in Washington has decided it for them.

Senator Dirksen, of Illinois, now has a constitutional amendment before the Senate to let the people decide in a popular referendum how they want their own legislatures constituted. "In a country such as America," he asks, "is there something wrong with letting the people decide?" Well, is there?

If you are interested in protecting one of your most basic rights, write to your Senators and Congressmen and tell them you want them to vote for the Dirksen amendment. And do it right now.

A second threat I would mention is inflation which, if we get enough of it, could wreck our economy and the livestock business right along with it. The cause of inflation is simple: It's too much money and credit chasing too few goods. Too much money is caused largely by Government deficit spending. Too much credit is due to making borrowed money too cheap. The Goverment can cure the first by cutting down its spending on things that we can either forgo or at least postpone. The Federal Reserve System can control the second with tighter fiscal policies.

The economy is near the bursting point right now. Unemployment is at an alltime low. Many industries are running at capacity. Besides which we happen to have an expensive war on our hands, and it's getting more expensive every day. We hear about the war on poverty, but isn't one war at a time enough?

Wouldn't it be only sensible under such conditions to let most of the Great Society projects wait? If you think so, that's another thing you can tell your Senators and Congressmen. You can take care of that and reapportionment for the price of one postage stamp.

The third threat creeps up on us gradually, yet as inexorably as an incoming tide. It is the steady trend toward a paternalistic government—or, as somebody called it, the all-mothering state—which would take over our problems and us right along with it.

An amazingly perceptive French philosopher named deTocqueville saw the danger when he came over here to study democracy in America a good many years ago. When citizens become wards of the state, he warned (and I quote) "the will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent, and guided. Such a power," he said, "does not destroy but it enervates, extinguishes and stupifies a people till the nation is reduced to nothing but a flock of timid and industrious animals of which the government is the shepherd."

If you think he was exaggerating look around and see what is happening today. You won't need to look further than agriculture, where more and more farmers continue to get more and more of their income from Government. With one hand the Secretary of Agriculture beats down market prices for grain by dumping Government stocks while offering farmers bigger Government handouts in the form of direct payments with the other. A little at a time he gets a little stronger grip on American agriculture. He is more firmly in control of more farmers this year than he was last year. Even livestock feeders are affected. The Secretary has a lot to do with what they pay for feed.

Most all of us agree that everybody in this country should have a fair chance at health, education, and a job. We've accepted social security for the aged as a good thing. We know there are some social programs such as education, public health, and care of the poor that the individual cannot provide for himself that Government has to. Most of us believe in Government supports in agriculture to stabilize grain markets from temporary gluts and to stabilize markets temporarily.

But beyond that what? Do you want to go on down the path—which we are undeniably on now—toward the welfare state and socialism? Or do you want, enough to fight for it, a country in which the individual citizen stands on his own two feet, makes his own decisions, controls his own business and keeps government servant not master? Which turn of the road do you prefer for you and your children from this point on?

That, gentlemen, just may be the most important question of all.

TROUBLE AHEAD IN LATIN AMERICA?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, a respected Catholic journalist, who has written about Latin America for many years, interviewed scores of Latin American bishops, advisers to bishops, and newsmen at the recently concluded Vatican Council and during an earlier tour of Latin America. He reports a very widespread anti-American feeling with the right, center, and left of the Latin political spectrum.

What accounts for such a widespread alienation? The writer, Mr. Gary MacEoin, sums it up as follows:

> What [Latins] do not understand is how Washington can confine its concern to the military elements of the equation "The dictatorship holds back the explosion, but if the social and population pressures continue to mount, as they are mounting, the day of the catastrophic release has to come," one bishop told me.
>
> You provide a breathing space in which to work frantically for social progress, and then you fritter it away in business as usual.

It may be, Mr. President, that the observers whom Mr. MacEoin quotes have our policy somewhat out of focus, but if politics is the art of the possible at home, it is also the art of the realistic abroad, and part of this realism should be to see ourselves as others see us.

The salient fact is that our Latin friends are concerned, and they have reason to be. As Mr. MacEoin says, "They find the U.S. public bored with Latin America while concerned about less urgent problems of their own country and the other continents."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Have We a Latin American Policy?" which appeared in the February 11 issue of the newspaper of the Catholic Diocese of Boise, the Idaho Register, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAVE WE A LATIN AMERICAN POLICY?

(By Gary MacEoin)

"Virtually everywhere, from the top to the bottom and from the right to the left * * * a general distrust and suspicion of the Johnson administration and a very wide anti-American feeling."

That is what Columnist Walter Lippmann found on a recent trip to South America. Our relations with the Latin Americans continue to deteriorate, he sums up. There is "an urgent, almost desperate, need for change at the highest levels in Washington."

In Rome, during the last session of the council, I talked to scores of Latin American bishops, advisers to bishops, and newsmen. Almost without exception, the views they expressed to me confirm the conclusion which Lippmann has now reached. They find Washington talking rapid social progress while ready to use force to block social change.

They find the U.S. public bored with Latin America while concerned about less urgent problems of their own country and the other continents. Earlier in 1965, I had made a 2-month tour of nine Latin American countries, and what I then saw and heard fell into the same pattern.

The intensified anti-U.S. sentiment does not flow merely from our sponsorship and support of military dictatorships. Many are willing to concede that tough controls are needed to end inflation and corruption, and to accumulate capital by curbing the antisocial spending of the wealthy.

What they do not understand is how Washington can confine its concern to the military elements of the equation. "The dictatorship holds back the explosion, but if the social and population pressures continue to mount, as they are mounting, the day of the catastrophic release has come," one bishop said to me.

"You provide a breathing space in which to work frantically for social progress, and then you fritter it away in business as usual."

As for the Alliance for Progress, few take it seriously these days. "Try to look honestly at the economic facts," another bishop said to me. "The aid you offer bears no realistic relationship to the needs nor, indeed, to your ability to help. The strings attached have become chains.

"Only U.S. big business benefits. Each year the gap between our living standards and yours grows wider. Each year, you withdraw more capital in interest, dividends, repatriation of principal and inflated prices for the goods we must import than we get for our exports plus Alliance aid.

"Our capital needs for development grow. Our available capital diminishes. This is something we long suspected, but now it is fully documented by United Nations studies."

The mood of these and other speakers was one of sorrow more than anger. "We are going to transform Latin America," one said to me.

"We have no choice. If you lack the enlightened self-interest to help us, we'll do it in spite of you and—if necessary—against you."

The confidence that Latin America can transform itself by its own efforts is something new. Several bishops expressed it to me, usually in the context of what the Council said in Schema 13 on man's new realization of his powers, of what the Brazilians call conscientizacao, the development of group awareness.

"Passivity is a thing of the past," an archbishop told me. "Even at the lowest levels, people are rapidly growing aware of what is happening in the world and what can happen in their own backyard."

"If the people in the United States ever find that out," I suggested, "they will be mightily relieved to know they don't have to underwrite the transformation."

"That is for them to decide," he answered. "They have at least two case histories in this century of rapid development without external help. A preliminary step is to seize all fixed assets and to suspend practically all trading with the outside. Your businessmen won't like that.

"Next comes the stage of zenophobia, then that of aggressiveness, then the need for nuclear bombs along with the ability to manufacture them. No, I don't think there is much reason to be relieved at the prospect."

RETREAT ON REDWOODS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, this morning's New York Times carries an editorial, "Retreat on Redwoods," concerning S. 2962, the administration's bill to create a Redwood National Park, introduced Wednesday by the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. I wish to comment on the editorial and on the issue but first I ask unanimous consent to insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETREAT ON REDWOODS

In his message on conservation yesterday, President Johnson put forward an excellent program to combat water pollution, on which we will comment later, and he reaffirmed his support for several desirable bills now pending for national parks and seashores.

But on one of the most controversial of current issues in this field—the size of the proposed Redwood National Park in northern California—his stand is a sharp disappointment.

For some months the administration has been wavering between two plans. One, embodied in a bill by Representative COHELAN, of California, would establish a 90,000-acre park. More than a score of House Members have introduced similar bills. The alternative plan drafted within the Interior Department provided for a drastically smaller park. It would have afforded no protection to Redwood Creek Valley, which has the best surviving stand of primeval redwoods. But it would have been much more acceptable to the commercial interests that want to saw these ancient trees—some of them more than 2,000 years old—into lumber for use as building material, fenceposts, and similar purposes.

Public protests against this timidly conceived, grossly inadequate plan led to the last-minute "compromise" which the administration sent to Congress yesterday. It is a compromise that will satisfy no one who understands the values at stake in the preservation for all time of these unique, magnificent trees. We note with surprise and regret that Senator KUCHEL of California has agreed to sponsor this highly unsatisfactory bill, and with even more surprise and regret that Secretary Udall lends his reputation as a conservationist to such an unworthy compromise.

Only 43,000 acres are to be included in this proposed park. Since this acreage includes two existing State parks, little more than half of the land would be newly protected. Moreover, fewer than 7,000 acres would consist of primeval redwoods. The Redwood Creek Valley would remain available for private exploitation—except for one pathetically small enclosure of 1,400 acres, isolated from the rest of the park.

Buying up these redwood lands from private owners would be expensive, but dollars cannot be decisive when the asset is irreplaceable. As President Johnson so eloquently said in his message, "Despite all of our wealth and knowledge, we cannot create a redwood forest, a wild river, or a gleaming seashore." We urge Congress to take the President at his word and to create a Redwood National Park worthy of his rhetoric and of the great trees that are an indescribably beautiful part of America's natural heritage.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, immediately after S. 2962 was sent to the desk I introduced an amendment—No. 487—to S. 2962 on behalf of myself and Senator Clark, Senator Douglas, Senator Gruening, Senator Inouye, Senator Kennedy of New York, Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts, Senator McCarthy, Senator McGee, Senator McGovern, Senator Muskie, Senator Nelson, Senator Neuberger, Senator Ribicoff, Senator Tydings, and Senator Young of Ohio. Amendment 487 is identical to the Cohelan bill (H.R. 11723) which the Times correctly, in my opinion, views as preferable to the administration proposal. My description of the main features of amendment 487, and the organizations which support it, appear on pages 3823 and 3824 of the February 23 Congressional Record.

Those pages of the Record also carry Senator Kuchel's and my colloquy which indicates our general agreement on the need for a Redwood National Park although the bill and amendment 487 differ in important respects. We also indicated in our colloquy the desirability of hearings at which different viewpoints will be presented, and the committee members can make a judgment as to how best to serve the public interest.

SNCC PLANS "FREE D.C. MOVEMENT"

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, earlier this week the director of the Washington office of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—SNCC—Marion Barry, Jr., issued a press release at a news conference saying that a new program was being launched here in the District of Columbia in support of home rule. "The District of Columbia is still in political slavery," Mr. Barry stated, and he added that the "Free D.C. Movement" intended to launch a "grassroots and communitywide" campaign to protest the lack of the right to vote in the District of Columbia. Buttons and bumper strips are to be sold and distributed, and rallies are to be held on the streets, in churches, and in people's homes all over the city.

Every merchant and businessman will be asked, according to the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, February 22, to first, sign petitions for home rule; second, send telegrams to the President and Congress urging passage of home rule legislation; third, display "Free D.C." emblems, and, fourth, raise $100,000 in contributions for a new "Merchants' and Businessmen's Committee To Free D.C." According to the Star:

> All merchants who fail to participate in all 4 steps of the campaign, will be listed in some 100,000 leaflets to be distributed in the District and residents would be asked to boycott them.

The Star article also stated:

> Senator Robert Byrd, Democrat, of West Virginia, John L. McMillan, Democrat, of South Carolina, and the board of trade were singled out as special targets for their opposition to home rule by Marion Barry, SNCC director.

The Washington Post of Tuesday, February 22, stated that the group "made its first calls yesterday under plans to visit the owners of some 7,000 businesses in Washington." The Post said that each merchant "will be asked to sign a petition in support of home rule" and to display a "Free D.C." sticker on his window as well as "make a contribution to a fund to be used to publicize this year's home rule drive." According to the Post, merchants who refuse will be named by the movement in its call for a boycott, and, Barry was quoted by the Post as saying:

> We will not waste any time begging these businessmen to sign.

The article stated that Barry indicated that the first of the merchants who refused will be identified "at another press conference later this week, probably on Thursday."

The Post said that support for the group was "pledged by the Reverend Walter E. Fauntroy and Suffragan Bishop Paul Moore, Jr., of the Episcopal diocese here. Bishop Moore, according to the Post, stressed that the matter "is not a black-white issue, but one that has to do with freedom and justice."

Mr. Barry, in his press release said:

> We want to free District of Columbia from our enemies—the people who make it impossible for us to do anything about lousy schools, brutal cops, welfare investigators who go on midnight raids—

And he went on to say:

> The people in this city are tired of gestapo cops who break into their homes illegally and arrest them on flimsy charges * * * tired of a school system that causes 18,000 students to drop out of school in 5 years while during that same period only 15,000 students graduated * * * tired of Senator Robert Byrd taking bread away from hungry children by making it almost impossible for families to receive welfare aid in District of Columbia.

A statement was also issued by John W. Diggs, chairman of the self-styled Merchants and Businessmen's Committee To Free District of Columbia, saying that he had "decided to head a committee of the merchants and businessmen to help free District of Columbia and get the vote here" and that each merchant and businessman would be asked to "send telegrams in support of the right to vote to President Johnson, Congressman John McMillan, Senator Robert Byrd, and House Speaker John McCormack." Mr. Diggs said that the committee has "set its goal at $100,000," which will be used to "run ads here in Washington and across the country" and "to do a number of other things in our right-to-vote campaign." Merchants will be asked to make contributions to the committee, and those who refuse to sign petitions in support of the campaign will be boycotted. He said:

> This is what we intend to do and what we are going to do.

The petition which merchants and businessmen of the metropolitan Washington area will be coerced into signing will urge the Congress to grant to citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote and the right to elect a mayor and city council as the governing body of the Nation's Capital City.

Mr. President, I see nothing wrong with a group of citizens banding themselves together in a movement to press for legislation which they deem desirable. I see nothing wrong in their petitioning the President and Members of Congress urging that certain legislation be passed. The sending of telegrams to the offices of Members of Congress is something which occurs daily. The solicitation of contributions in support of a political objective is nothing new.

If the activities of the announced new movement were to be confined to the foregoing, I do not see how any fault could be found with such a program. However, the movement is reportedly not intended or designed to stop here; the announcements of the leaders of the movement indicate that a campaign of extortion, intimidation, and coercion will be leveled against all businessmen and merchants—large and small, Negro and white—who refuse to sign the petition and place cold cash into the hands of the newly formed committee. In other words, while the leaders of this movement speak of the right to vote, they publicly deny the individual merchant's right to his own opinion about home rule. They loudly proclaim themselves the self-styled liberators of the city from political slavery, and, in the same voice, announce their intentions to crush, by resorting to an economic boycott, the individual merchant's right to his own viewpoint. The leader of SNCC says, "We can't hurt McMillan and Byrd, but we can hurt the moneylord merchants of this city." This threat is ominously reminiscent of Los Angeles. One wonders if the SNCC leader has paused to consider that anything which hurts the moneylord merchants and businessmen of this city will hurt the people who make up the membership of SNCC. The SNCC leader says that "The merchants are in business because we support them with our money," and, "if we withdraw our support then they will no longer be around to oppose us." Has SNCC's leader contemplated the lot of some of his own followers should the day come when the merchants and businessmen would "no longer be around?"

SNCC's leader speaks of a school system that "causes 18,000 students to drop out of school in 5 years while during that same period only 15,000 students graduated." My office only this morning received information from Mr. John Riecks of the District of Columbia Board of Education, to the effect that, for the period 1961 through 1965, inclusive, the total number of dropouts in junior and senior high schools was 10,682, while the total number of 12th grade graduates was 18,245. Apparently, Mr. Barry used the number of students who dropped out of school from the 1st to the 12th grades, which would include those who transferred to private schools and those who left the city and transferred to new schools. In any event, a school system does not cause students to drop out of school; the fault lies elsewhere with dropouts. In many instances, students are simply dropouts by nature, and they will continue to be dropouts through life. It is convenient in these days to blame the school system or to blame society for school dropouts, for misfits, for sexual perverts, for youthful criminals, but may not the blame lie elsewhere?

The SNCC spokesman refers to "gestapo cops" who break into people's homes "illegally." If cops are breaking into homes illegally, procedures are available for adequate redress, but what evidence is there to support this extremist charge? He refers to "lousy schools" but chooses to say nothing of the 27,689 windowpanes smashed in District of Columbia schools by rock throwers, the replacement of which cost the taxpayers $112,868. These were the figures given at last year's hearings. He refers to brutal cops' but ignores the brutality of mobs which converge upon police stations to threaten and abuse cops for having done their duty, as happened last September in the 10th precinct.

Such banal statements as these from a SNCC spokesman have become so commonplace, Mr. President, as to be almost unworthy of comment.

What should cause serious soul-searching, however, is the support given to such an irresponsible, questionable, and dangerous movement by certain members of the clergy who were present at the press conference. In particular, I am concerned with the radical statements attributed to the Episcopal Bishop Moore, and I quote from the Post:

> He said he was "sorry that this kind of militancy is necessary" but that all other methods of dealing with the problem had failed.

In other words, you do what he directs or he will apply militancy tactics. This does not sound like the religious leadership, understanding, and tolerance that give significance to our Christian inheritance.

Mr. President, anyone who cares to look the facts in the eye cannot fail to be impressed with the utter arrogance of these self-styled and self-imposed leaders who intend to cow or overawe all who do not immediately fall into line, even against an individual's own better judgment as to what is best for himself and his own city. The demand for a contribution, with the threat of an economic boycott hanging over the merchant victims' head, constitutes nothing short of a high-handed shakedown. Those merchants who may have the courage of their convictions and whose considered judgment leads them to believe that home rule is not in the best interests of the Nation's Capital, may get their windows smashed for their pains, and the very least injury that can befall them will be the attempted economic destruction of their businesses. In other words, any means to an end, and, if force is required, use it. This would appear to be the order of the day.

Mr. President, who will be held responsible for the handling and dispensing of the contributions that are expected to pour in under duress? How will even the merchant who conscientiously supports home rule be assured that his dollars will be spent in behalf of the cause? The "Free D.C." committee says that it intends to match the moneys which the Board of Trade is purportedly planning to spend against home rule. I know nothing about the Washington Board of Trade's plans in this regard. But, if the Board of Trade does intend to spend money in opposition to home rule, at least there is no indication that it proposes to blackjack merchants into making contributions under duress and under the threat of an economic blitzkrieg. If the "Free D.C." committee can extort money for this cause, if it can blackmail merchants and businessmen into complying with its brazen demands, what can it do next? Who will be the target of its next ultimatum? What will be the next cause celebre for which it may exact money tribute?

Who will be held to an accounting of the ways in which one-tenth of a million dollars is to be spent? Who will be bonded? What books will be audited and who will do the auditing? Are those persons who are forced to contribute against their will, to have a voice in determining how their moneys are to be spent?

Mr. President, the actions of this SNCC group and its allies should now make it crystal clear, even to the blindest man, that, if home rule ever comes again to the District of Columbia, it probably will not, in reality, be home rule, but, rather, it may be rule by pressure group. The very thing I am talking about here today is a case in point. The Nation's Capital was recently subjected to a bus boycott, of which, according to the Evening Star of January 25, Mr. Barry was the main sponsor. That boycott was termed an overwhelming success by its promoters. Now, an economic boycott is going to be used as the ultimate weapon against merchants and businessmen who are bold enough to differ in their viewpoints from those expressed by leaders of the pressure movement. What clear and more convincing example is needed to show the people of the Nation what their Capital City is in for, if home rule comes to this city, than the example of this Damocles sword being dangled over the hapless heads of Washington businessmen by these self-crowned liberators from political slavery who have launched a campaign of coercion and intimidation to achieve their self-declared objectives?

Mr. President, the most unfortunate aspect of this battle cry of SNCC is its irresponsible flouting of the democratic processes of government. We all accept the exertion of legitimate pressures upon us as legislators from the various segments of the population, and telegrams and other expressions of opinion are normal to the right of petition and the legislative process, but we are witnessing here attempts to influence government by intimidation and coercion. By singling out Members of the Congress, including myself, who have important responsibilities in the handling of the affairs of the District of Columbia, and by proposing to force unwilling businessmen to contribute or be subjected to economic boycott, SNCC and its allies have resorted to the most blatant and unfair type of coercion. One cannot accept these actions as morally justifiable. I cannot believe that legislation enacted in such an atmosphere would be in the best interests of the District. Above all, a campaign to get a war chest of $100,000 to be raised by calls on businessmen sounds ominously like Chicago in the days of Al Capone's extortion rackets. It is shocking to see a repetition of this today in the Capital of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article written by Larry A. Still, entitled "Businesses Face Threat of Home Rule Boycott," published in the Evening Star of February 22, 1966; the article published in the Washington Post for February 22, 1966, entitled "Store Boycott Planned by New Rights Group Supporting Home Rule;" the press release of February 21, 1966, put out by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, on the statement by Marion Barry, Jr.; and a statement and petition of February 21, 1966, on this subject.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 22, 1966]

BUSINESSES FACE THREAT OF HOME RULE BOYCOTT

(By Larry A. Still)

Details of a plan to coerce District businessmen into supporting home rule legislation by threatening them with a boycott were announced yesterday by three local civil rights groups.

Rt. Rev. Paul Moore, Suffragan Episcopal bishop, joined spokesmen from the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the D.C. Coalition of Conscience in urging support of the campaign among 7,000 District merchants.

TO ANNOUNCE TARGETS

"We are sorry this kind of militancy is necessary to bring to people the right to vote," Bishop Moore declared, "but all other methods have failed. We have tried lobbying, polite talk and even picketing and demonstrations."

Banding together as the "Free D.C. Movement," spokesmen for the groups said businessmen will be asked to (1) sign petitions for home rule, (2) send telegrams to the President and Congress urging passage of home rule legislation, (3) display "Free D.C." emblems and (4) raise $100,000 in contributions to a new "Merchants and Businessmen's Committee to Free D.C."

John W. Diggs, a northeast barber and chairman of the committee, said the first targets of the boycott will be announced Thursday after a conference with the representatives of a major department store and a large grocery chain.

All merchants who fail to participate in all four steps of the campaign will be listed in some 100,000 leaflets to be distributed in the District, and residents would be asked to boycott them "step by step," Diggs said.

Diggs said the $100,000 was being sought to run advertisements in newspapers across the country "to counteract" a Board of Trade campaign against home rule.

Senator ROBERT BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, Representative JOHN L. McMILLAN, Democrat, of South Carolina, and the Board of Trade were singled out as special targets for their opposition to home rule by Marion Barry, SNCC director.

CITES WHITE SUPPORT

In endorsing the boycott tactic, Bishop Moore declared: "I want to make it crystal clear this is not a black and white issue. There are a number of District residents," he added, "who are white and clearly support this issue."

He said the campaign was decided on because "the business community has been using the money of the community to fight against justice and citizenship for the people who live in the community."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1966]

STORE BOYCOTT PLANNED BY NEW RIGHTS GROUP SUPPORTING HOME RULE

Plans to call a consumer boycott against all Washington merchants who refuse to support District home rule were announced yesterday by a new civil rights group.

The aims of the new Free District of Columbia Movement were described at a press conference by Marion Barry, Jr., director of the Washington office of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

Support for the group was pledged by Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy and Suffragan Bishop Paul Moore, Jr., of the Episcopal Diocese here, cochairman of the District of Columbia Coalition of Conscience, and by Rev. Edward A. Hailes, executive director of the Washington NAACP branch.

Barry said the movement will work against those he termed "moneylord merchants" who have teamed with "white segregationists" in Congress to block passage of home rule legislation.

The group made its first calls yesterday under plans to visit the owners of some 7,000 businesses in Washington.

SUPPORT DEMANDED

Each merchant will be asked to sign a petition in support of home rule; to send telegrams supporting it to President Johnson and certain Members of Congress; to display a "Free District of Columbia" sticker on his window, and to make a contribution to a fund to be used to publicize this year's home rule drive.

Merchants who refuse will be named by the movement in its call for a boycott.

"We will not waste any time begging these businessmen to sign," Barry said, adding that the first of the merchants who refuse will be identified at another press conference later this week, probably on Thursday.

Actual contact with the 7,000 businesses and solicitation of funds will be done by the Merchants and Businessmen's Committee To Free D.C., headed by John W. Diggs, owner of a barbershop and beauty salon in Washington.

BOARD OF TRADE HIT

Diggs said that the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade is raising $100,000 to fight home rule this year and that the same amount is therefore being sought from merchants who favor self-government for Washington.

A spokesman for the board of trade denied that the organization is building up a fund to combat home rule. He had no comment on the boycott proposal.

Barry charged that those who oppose giving Washingtonians the right to elect their own officials are keeping the city in "political slavery."

"We want to free District of Columbia from our enemies—the people who make it impossible for us to do anything about lousy schools, brutal cops, slumlords, welfare investigators who go on midnight raids, employers who discriminate in hiring and a host of other ills that run rampant through our city," he said.

Bishop Moore stressed that the matter "is not a black-white issue, but one that has to do with freedom and justice."

He said he was "sorry that this kind of militancy is necessary" but that all other methods of dealing with the problem had failed.

Mr. Fauntroy, pastor of New Bethel Baptist Church at 1739 S Street NW., where the press conference was held, declared that opposition to home rule is centered "in a small group of businessmen who do not wish to relinquish the inordinant power over the city which they have under the present system."

[Press release of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Washington, D.C., Feb. 21, 1966]

STATEMENT BY MARION BARRY, JR.

Ladies and gentlemen of the press, I am Marion Barry, Jr., director of the Washington office of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). The purpose of this news conference is to give some details about a new program that is being launched here in the District of Columbia—a grassroots and communitywide campaign for the right to vote for District of Columbia residents.

Washington, D.C., the capital of the Nation, is the only place in this country that is governed solely by Congress and where 900,000 people do not have the legal right to elect their own local government. This is political slavery.

Negroes and whites have been beaten, jailed and even killed for trying to get the right to vote in the South—and for trying to get Congress to pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965. But, that act has no meaning for the District of Columbia. The President appoints the Commissioners and the District judges; and, the judges in turn appoint the District school board; 900,000 district residents have no voice in District affairs. District of Columbia is still in political slavery.

The House of Representatives, led by a racist from South Carolina—JOHN McMILLAN, has refused to free us. The House of Representatives has refused to give the right to vote to 900,000 District residents. Therefore we are launching a campaign to free District of Columbia.

We want to free District of Columbia from our enemies—the people who make it impossible for us to do anything about lousy schools, brutal cops, slumlords, welfare investigators who go on midnight raids, employers who discriminate in hiring, and a host of other ills that run rampant through our city.

The people in this city are tired of gestapo cops who break into their homes illegally and arrest them on flimsy charges.

The people in this city are tired of a school system that causes 18,000 students to drop out of school in 5 years while during that some period only 15,000 students graduated.

The people in this city are tired of the way that landlord and tenant court is run. They are tired of the court being run for the benefit of the slumlords and not for the tenants.

The people in this city are tired of Senator ROBERT BYRD taking bread away from hungry children by making it all but impossible for families to receive welfare aid in the District of Columbia.

But, being tired is not enough. Talk is not enough. It takes more than that and we do intend to do more.

Who is it that keeps the District of Columbia in political slavery? The southern white segregationists led by JOHN McMILLAN have gotten together with the moneylord merchants of this city to oppose our right to vote. Congressman McMILLAN praises Mr. Davis, head of the Board of Trade, for opposing our right to vote. The moneylord merchants want to keep control of the city; they don't want the people to control their city.

We can't hurt Congressman McMILLAN or Senator BYRD but we can hurt the moneylord merchants of this city. The merchants are in business because we support them with our money. If we withdraw our support then they will no longer be around to oppose us. If the merchants who oppose our right to vote are our enemies, then why should we continue to support our enemies?

We have formed a movement for a free District of Columbia. This Free D.C. Movement will launch a campaign to protest the lack of the right to vote in the District of Columbia. We will distribute 75,000 to 100,000 leaflets with the following cartoon. We will sell and distribute buttons, bumper strips with the following design and we will hold rallies—on the streets, in churches and people's homes—in all sections of the city.

The Free D.C. Movement is going to work very closely with Mr. John W. Diggs, chairman of the Merchants and Businessmen's Committee to Free D.C. The merchant's committee will begin immediately to circulate a merchants petition to free the District of Columbia (Mr. Diggs will talk about that himself a bit later). The Free D.C. Movement has agreed to launch a boycott against those merchants who do not sign the free District of Columbia petition and display the free District of Columbia emblem in their windows.

We don't intend to wait; we are going to begin this program now. Our enemies are going to make this seem like a black-white issue, but it is not. This is a fight between those who want the right to vote and those who would keep us in political slavery—be they black or white.

Finally, there are rumors presently circulating that I am interested in political office in this city. I want to make it very clear that I am not interested in political office and that I have no desire to run for any office here or in any other city. I am interested in and will work for the day when residents of the District of Columbia have the right to vote.

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. DIGGS, CHAIRMAN, MERCHANTS AND BUSINESSMEN'S COMMITTEE TO FREE D.C., FEBRUARY 21, 1966

Ladies and gentlemen, my name is John W. Diggs. I am 50 years old and have lived in the District for 25 years. I own and operate the River Terrace Barber Shop at 3425 Benning Road NE. and Margo's Beauty Salon at 308 Riggs Road NE. I would consider myself a small businessman.

There is no question in my mind that the majority of the citizens in this community want the right to elect their own local officials—the right of self-government—and they want it now. Furthermore, I feel that a large segment of the business community also would like self-government for the District of Columbia.

I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Barry when he says that we should support our friends and withdraw our support from those who oppose our right to vote. Therefore I have decided to head a committee of merchants and businessmen to help free the District of Columbia and get the vote here.

In order for us to find out who our friends are, the committee will do the following: Circulate a petition.

In addition, the committee will ask each merchant and businessman to:

1. Send telegrams in support of the right to vote to President Johnson, Congressman JOHN McMILLAN, Senator ROBERT BYRD, and House Speaker JOHN McCORMACK.

2. Make a contribution to the Merchants and Businessmen's Committee To Free D.C.

I would like to explain the last point. It is my understanding that the board of trade is raising or has raised $100,000 to oppose our right to vote. Therefore, we have to raise money to counteract this force and to fight for our right to vote. We will need money to run ads here in Washington and across the country. We will need money to do a number of other things in our right-to-vote campaign. Since the board of trade raises its money from its members, it seems only proper that the money to support the Merchants and Businessmen's Committee To Free D.C. should come from merchants and businessmen. We will ask each merchant who agrees with us to make a contribution in proportion to the size of his business. In other words, larger businessmen would be expected to give more than, say, the small grocery owner. The Merchants and Businessmen's Committee To Free D.C. has set its goal at $100,000. If a merchant or businessman agrees to the above, he will get a "Free D.C." sticker that he would put on his door or window. This would show he is our friend.

If a merchant or businessman doesn't sign, then we would turn his name over to the Free D.C. Movement. The Free D.C. Movement has agreed to work closely with us and would call a boycott of the merchants that don't support us.

This is what we intend to do and what we are going to do.

METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON MERCHANTS AND BUSINESSMEN'S PETITION TO CONGRESS IN SUPPORT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

We, the undersigned merchants and businessmen of the Metropolitan Washington area, hereby petition the Congress of the United States to pass legislation during the first months of the 2d session of the 89th Congress to grant to the citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote, the right to elect a mayor and city council as the governing body of the Nation's Capital City.

We, the undersigned merchants and businessmen of the Metropolitan Washington area, wish to express to the Congress of the United States our sentiment and our support for the rights of the citizens of all parts of our country and we wish to express our extreme resentment of those who have professed to speak for the business community of this great Capital City of our society on this crucial issue, the right to vote, the right to freedom.

We, the undersigned merchants and businessmen of the Metropolitan Washington area, decry the cruel disenfranchisement of the citizens of the Nation's Capital and the shame and disgrace which this disenfranchisement brings to our great country throughout the world. We wish to bring to the attention of the Congress that this Nation was founded by those men who had the courage of their convictions and who protested and demanded that taxation without representation end forever between the shores of the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. We demand that the Congress wipe forever from the unfortunate deeds and acts of our country this blot, this inequity against its people.

Therefore, we, the undersigned merchants and businessmen of the Metropolitan Washington area, hereby pledge our complete physical and financial support to this great cause. We proudly add our name to the long list of those leaders of our community who have joined in this common cause.

JOHN W. DIGGS,
Chairman, the Merchants and Businessmen's Committee To Free D.C.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTARY MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 2791.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, lying on the desk is my amendment No. 481, cosponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the pending bill, S. 2791.

This amendment relates to the need for congressional approval for the sending of draftees to southeast Asia involuntarily. The consent of Congress would be required in order to have draftees sent to southeast Asia.

My amendment reads as follows:

> On page 3, after line 8, add the following new section:
>
> "SEC. 302. During any period that any armed force of the United States is engaged in armed conflict or hostilities in southeast Asia, no person who is a member of that armed force serving on active duty by virtue of involuntary induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to perform duty in such area, unless (1) such person volunteers for service in such area, or (2) the Congress hereafter authorizes by law the assignment to duty in southeast Asia of persons involuntarily inducted into such armed forces."

At the appropriate time, I shall call up my amendment and ask for the yeas and nays on it so that the American people can have—as they deserve to have—a clear expression of congressional intent on the use of draftees in the present undeclared war in Vietnam.

I appreciate the fact that this subject came up for discussion during the hearings, on the pending measure, before the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Subcommittee on Department of Defense of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. On this point the hearing record of this joint committee is most interesting in that it discloses that while the question was repeatedly raised as to why draftees are being sent to Vietnam while the reserves remain untouched and while we maintain a force of over 350,000 trained men in Europe, the answers supplied by the Department of Defense are completely unsatisfactory as will be seen when I analyze them presently.

It seems to me that this is a question on which the parents of draftees and potential draftees—and the draftees and potential draftees themselves—have a right to have the fullest possible debate in Congress and which Congress itself should decide.

Before I proceed to the analysis, I shall review briefly the facts with respect to the proposed legislation. I have stated them on the floor of the Senate before, but I believe they deserve a review now.

I had intended to offer a similar amendment to the defense appropriation bill, then pending in the Senate, some 6 months ago, almost to the day, on August 20, 1965. That morning the President asked to see me at the White House. The purpose of our meeting was to enable me to explain to the President in detail my opposition to our military involvement in Vietnam, which I had been voicing on the floor of the Senate for a year and a half.

I told the President that I disagreed completely with his administration's position; namely, that three Presidents had pledged support to this policy—that there was in fact no national pledge or an unavoidable commitment—that we had in fact asked ourselves into Vietnam. I also elaborated on my other reasons for believing that our involvement was folly—that it was a war we could not win—that continuation there would lead to greater and greater disaster.

While there, after I expressed my views, I told him I intended to introduce an amendment that very afternoon forbidding draftees to be sent to southeast Asia involuntarily without the consent of the Congress. The President earnestly urged me not to introduce the amendment. He said that in any event no draftees would be sent to Vietnam before January. After repeating his request that I take no such action, he said that if we were not out of Vietnam by January, I would be free to do anything I pleased. Of course, I would be free in any event, without his permission; but under those circumstances, and in accordance with the President's urgent request that I not offer the amendment at that time, and his hopeful expectation that our troops would be out of Vietnam by January, I naturally refrained from submitting the amendment.

Immediately upon returning to my office, I sent the President, by special messenger, a copy of my proposed amendment and the remarks I had prepared to make in support of it on that afternoon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks my letter of August 20, 1965, to the President.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, 6 months have now elapsed. We are still bogged down in an undeclared war in Vietnam which threatens to escalate into a third world war, and the price of which in any event, in lives and other costs, would be staggering.

While I disapprove entirely of our military involvement in Vietnam, it becomes clear that those who have enlisted in any of the Armed Forces—the so-called Regulars—have an obligation to go where their Commander in Chief sends them. As in the case of the 600 gallant men who took part in the Charge of the Light Brigade:

> Theirs not to reason why:
> Theirs but to do and die.

But an entirely different situation prevails when we reach into millions of American families and conscript these youths to fight involuntarily in this hopeless mess.

Since there apparently is no intention to ask for a declaration of war, this amendment will serve as a vehicle for Members of Congress to express themselves on an issue which strikes home in a literal sense.

Mr. President, I now analyze the testimony which took place in the hearings of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations on this subject matter.

As I said, the answers were rather unsatisfactory. I shall read portions of the testimony. It states:

Senator **Stennis**.—

There is then the word "deleted" in brackets. There are some 900 deletions in the testimony presented at this hearing which lasted 5 days. That makes it rather difficult for those who were not present at the hearings to find out what the specific answers to definite questions posed by committee members were.

AUGMENTATION OF FORCES

Senator **Stennis**. [Deleted.] On personnel, you are calling in 300,000 extra men, that is, augmenting our Regular Forces by that many. Let me put it this way. We have around 2 million reserves in all, do we not, in round numbers?

Secretary **McNamara**. About 1 million on paid status.

Senator **Stennis**. And we are having to augment these other forces by an increased draft.

CALL-UP OF RESERVE FORCES

Why don't we call up some of these Reserve units? Many of them are trained, and we have spent money on them.

Secretary **McNamara**. Yes, I think that is a very fundamental question, Senator **Stennis**, and we have considered it and decided not to for two reasons: One, we think it is more equitable under present circumstances to use the draft, and to use men who have not fulfilled their obligated service. About 70 percent of the officers of the Reserve and Guard Forces, for example, if I recall correctly, have completed obligated service and if they were to be called back would be fulfilling military service for terms in excess of those that others in our society have completed. Therefore, from a point of view of equity, it seemed wise to avoid use of the Reserves if we could.

I shall presently introduce an article from this morning's New York Times concerning this statement. It appears that in the short interval since Secretary McNamara testified 3 weeks ago, he may have changed his mind and is now thinking about calling up the Armed Reserves.

I continue to read:

Two, the Reserves, under the conditions under which we would be allowed to call them up, would probably be a perishable commodity. You may remember that in 1961 when the Reserves were called up, they were called for a term of 1 year under the provisions of the law. In this instance, if they were called for 1 year, it would be necessary, simultaneously, to activate new units in the Regular Forces so that we could replace the Reserves at the end of the year, and for that reason it seemed undesirable to call the Reserves.

Senator **Stennis**. You have no plans to call any of them now, not even specialist units?

Secretary **McNamara**. Not unless the requirements exceed the levels that we are now planning upon. But in anticipation that they might exceed those levels and, therefore, that it might be necessary to call Reserves, we have, as you know, undertaken to increase the strength of certain units known as "Selected Forces" so as to raise their combat readiness and have them prepared for duty if that becomes necessary in the future. But at present we have no plans to call them.

Senator **Stennis**. Well, to consider the equities of the situation, it is not particularly pleasant under any circumstances for anybody to be called, but these men you are talking about, 70 percent of them at least, went into this voluntarily beyond their ordinary military service, did they not?

Secretary **McNamara**. Oh, yes; you are quite right. They have volunteered for it.

FUNCTION OF RESERVE FORCES

Senator **Stennis**. I thought that is what Reserves were for. It is part of our military strength, what we provide for every year.

Secretary **McNamara**. I think it was felt the primary purpose of the Reserve was to fulfill a need that we couldn't fulfill by the draft or by volunteers. We think that we can accomplish our present force goals and deployments without recalling Reserves, by relying on the draft and volunteers.

USE OF RESERVES IN NONACTIVE STATUS

Senator **Stennis**. What about the hundred thousand men who have volunteered for the Reserve program in lieu of being inducted? They are inductees to a degree. They are put in the Reserve and they are now in a nonactive status. You say you have no facilities to train them.

Secretary **McNamara**. Yes.

Senator **Stennis**. You have about a hundred thousand; isn't that right?

Secretary **McNamara**. Let me check it.

Senator **Stennis**. Around that number.

What are your plans for them?

Secretary **McNamara**. Well, the number as of the end of fiscal year 1966, a few months from now, we think will be about 135,000.

Senator **Stennis**. Yes.

Secretary **McNamara**. At the end of last fiscal year it was about 32,000. Our plan is to train them as rapidly as our training system can accept them. The untrained backlog was 46,000 at the end of fiscal 1964 and at the end of 1967 it is anticipated it could grow perhaps 11,000 over the 135,000 now anticipated for end fiscal year 1966, depending upon the training system capacity in 1967. Currently we plan on training 52,000 of these men in fiscal year 1966 and 135,000 in fiscal year 1967.

Senator **Stennis**. Isn't there some way to reach those men and put them in active service? They have not served a day's active duty; have they?

Secretary **McNamara**. That is right.

Senator **Stennis**. Or even training?

Secretary **McNamara**. The point is that we don't need them in the Active Force now. We are taking all the men we can absorb in our training system for the Active Force at the present time. These are men that have a right to volunteer so long as we have a requirement for them, and under the terms of the present legislation, we are required to raise the force level of the Reserve and Guard and, therefore, we have to accept their enlistments. But——

Senator **Stennis**. You have to accept their enlistment?

Secretary **McNamara**. In order to fill our present prescribed totals of 270,000 and 380,000 men for the Army Reserve and Guard, respectively. Moreover, we don't wish to push them into the Active Force at this time for training because to do so would mean we would have to set up more cadres. To set up these training cadres, we would have to tear down the combat units of the Active Force. That is why our training capacity is limited at the present time and that is why these men will be trained in 1967 rather than in 1966.

RESERVE ACTIVATION

Senator **Mundt**. Have you been asked to answer—it may have happened when I was out of the room—questions about any plans you have for the possible activation of the Reserve?

Secretary **McNamara**. I was asked if we planned to call Reserves at any time in the near future and I answered, no. We have no intentions of calling them at any time in the near future but we recognize that circumstances may change and may make such a call desirable. In anticipation of that, we ask authority of the Congress to expend funds to increase the combat readiness of selected Reserve Force units and additional funds for that purpose are provided in this supplemental.

Senator **Mundt**. I ask it only because I have heard from a couple of reservists who think, should they sell their business or do something, there is no reason they should change their economic lives——

Secretary **McNamara**. No, sir.

Senator **Mundt**. Because of the imminence of that?

Secretary **McNamara**. No, sir; there is not, with the qualification that circumstances may change and we may have to call them.

ARMY AND MARINE POSITION ON DRAFT VERSUS RESERVE CALLUP

Senator **Thurmond**. Mr. Secretary, does the Army agree with you it is most desirable to increase the manpower by using the draft enlistments rather than by calling up the Reserves?

Secretary **McNamara**. In the first place, let me say that up to the present time we have met all of General Westmoreland's requirements, on time, with the exception of about [deleted] men [deleted].

I think the Army leaders might have preferred to call up certain selected personnel, but not including major combat units.

The Marines, in particular, opposed the callup of the Marine Reserve division unless it were to be sent into combat in Vietnam. Were that to be done, of course, and assuming it were called up under legislation similar to that passed in 1961 it would be a perishable asset because the reserves were called for only a 1-year period. And neither I nor the Chiefs would want to send a division to Vietnam if we could anticipate only 12 months of service from the time it was called up to the time it had to be returned to reserve status. So generally speaking, I think that up to the present time we are better off having relied upon the draft and volunteers

> than we would have been had we called the Reserves.
>
> Senator THURMOND. Does the Army agree with you that it is more desirable to increase the manpower by using the draft and enlistments rather than calling up the Reserves?
>
> Secretary MCNAMARA. Without question, I think they agree on the major combat units. With respect to some specialists I think they might have preferred to call Reserves.

Mr. President, I submit that that is an unsatisfactory and inadequate explanation of why we have called in draftees.

In Parade magazine for January 30, 1966, distributed with the Washington Post, there appeared a brief description of draft practices in a number of other countries. I ask unanimous consent that this description be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, with respect to sending draftees to Vietnam, the following is indeed significant:

> In South Vietnam all men, 18–35, face 3 years of military service. A large percentage of South Vietnamese conscripts desert each year. South Vietnam hires mercenaries to fight against the Vietcong. We support the South Vietnamese economy. Without us that country would go broke. Whether indirectly we are paying the South Vietnamese mercenaries is a question Washington declines to answer.

Mr. President, of course we pay for the mercenaries.

In connection with these mercenaries, we read in this morning's New York Times an article headed "1965 Desertions Up in Saigon Forces—Total Is Put Above 96,000—U.S. Aides Concerned." The article is dated Saigon, February 23. It is written by Neil Sheehan, in a special dispatch to the New York Times. The article begins:

> About 96,000 men deserted from the South Vietnamese armed forces last year, a total equivalent to nearly half of the American force that has been committed to the defense of this country.

So while we are reaching into every American home, taking our young men as draftees and sending them to the slaughter in southeast Asia, 96,000 of the South Vietnamese forces have deserted in the last year. This is the kind of war we are asked to fight with the blood of our young men, when the people in the armed forces there are unwilling to defend their own country, and are leaving the ranks and deserting by the tens of thousands. Of course, no punishment is meted out to them, and we Americans continue to pay those who remain in the service. This is a shocking situation.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article, "1965 Desertions Up in Saigon Forces—Total Is Put Above 96,000," be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. GRUENING. I likewise ask unanimous consent, in connection with Secretary McNamara's positive statements at the recent hearings on S. 2791 that there was no intention of calling up the Reserves at this time, that an article published likewise in today's New York Times, Thursday, February 24, headed "McNamara Hints Call-Up of Reservists for Vietnam"—indicating that there is little stability or assurance that the assurances and the promises made in one week are not going to be reversed in the next—be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. GRUENING. It is, of course, obvious, since Vietnam is receiving budget support in large amounts from the United States, that the United States is footing the bill for such of these mercenaries as have not deserted. It is a sad commentary indeed that Vietnamese must be paid to defend the so-called freedoms of their own country while we are conscripting draftees here in the United States to send to Vietnam to fight side by side with these mercenaries, and to take the places of those who are deserting the Army presumably fighting the cause of their own country.

It should be noted that when France was fighting in Vietnam to recolonize that country, it used no draftees. By an amendment to the French budget law of 1950, draftees raised under the French military draft were not permitted to be used outside of the territory of the French Republic except under a situation of declared war. No draftees were used in Indochina at all after 1949.

The United States with respect to waging an undeclared war in Vietnam is in the same position as France until the fifties and, absent a declaration of war or a clear expression of congressional intent in lieu thereof, draftees should not be sent to Vietnam involuntarily.

Mr. President, I have received a tremendous amount of correspondence on this subject since it was first known that I was planning to offer my proposed amendment. I have received hundreds of letters which reveal great alarm and distress. They come from every part of the country.

I do not intend to put all of them in the RECORD, but I shall read from a few of them, to give Congress and the people of the United States an idea of the deep concern and worry that exists in the hearts of the American people concerning the proposal to conscript draftees and send them to South Vietnam.

It is my hope that Congress, under my amendment, will have a chance to register its views, and let the people of the United States know just where each Member stands.

Here is a letter from Fordham University, New York. It says:

> DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I have just read a corrected description in the Times on your proposed amendment to the supplemental defense appropriations bill, and want you to know I wholeheartedly support the measure. Legalized involuntary servitude is perhaps the greatest offense against civil liberty possible in a free society such as ours; and for the Government to coerce a man into fighting a war he does not support is clearly a violation of the 13th amendment to the Constitution prohibiting involuntary servitude. The complexity and seeming hopelessness of the Vietnam situation only aggravate such infringements of personal liberty.
>
> Thank you for proposing the amendment; I hope your proposal gets the widespread Senate approval which it certainly deserves.
>
> I would appreciate your informing me of the progress of your amendment in the days to come.
>
> Very truly yours,

Here is a letter from a housewife in Vancouver, Wash.:

> DEAR SENATOR: As a lifelong Democrat, I am fast becoming an admirer of yours and always have been of Senator MORSE, and I wondered if you were aware—I bet you are—of the high wages paid civilian employers in Vietnam.
>
> A member of my family who has a prison record, and won't be drafted, is a second-rate welder.
>
> He has signed up to go to Vietnam for 3 years with some contractor banking $55,000 for him. The Government can turn around and draft my son, 20, who has worked his way through 2 years of college (still going) and has never been in trouble in his life. He has also never lived as he hasn't been able to afford to date a girl since his senior year in high school. He hasn't been able to find a part-time job that doesn't interfere with his classes, and if he did, he probably couldn't keep his grades up.
>
> His ambition has always been to be a history teacher—which he has always done "A" work in. Now I read that the Army will take the history and English majors before mathematics and science majors. He and I both feel Vietnam is sure suicide. It isn't something to die for. We would both fight for our country, but we feel this war is wrong. I have three sons, no education, work hard to just give my kids room and board.
>
> It's one thing to die for a cause you believe in, another to throw away all your dreams for a better life for nothing.
>
> I can't get a decent job because of my education (ninth grade). I'm 36 years old and I can't afford to go to school nights because it takes all my husband makes just to feed six people. Yet we need two paychecks to make ends meet and then to read about a civilian employee's wife in Vietnam sending home $36,000 in money orders in 6 months is too much.

Here is a letter from Arlington Heights, Ill.:

> Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
> *U.S. Senate.*
>
> DEAR SIR: I am a liberal, a Democrat and an ardent supporter of the President, but I applaud your stand to bar the use of draftees in Vietnam.
>
> I believe our involvement there is a diplomatic disaster and a moral tragedy as well. And, as everyone knows, we have failed militarily, which is not surprising since we can't possibly win (or even survive) a land war in Asia. Therefore, I urge you to do everything within your power to influence the administration to withdraw our forces.
>
> These days one has to listen closely to hear the voices of reason amid the clamor for bombs. But men like you and Senators CLARK, MORSE, and FULBRIGHT have more support than you may realize. What the administration fondly interprets as support of the Vietnam war is not that at all. It is merely a quiet tolerance sustained by a booming economy.
>
> I work for a large corporation and live in a suburban, middle-class neighborhood. I have a college education, a wife and three children, so I hardly represent the long-haired, "ban the bomb" crowd. And I have yet to meet a single person among my friends who supports our policy in Vietnam.
>
> My best wishes to you in the difficult days ahead.
>
> Sincerely,

Here is a letter from Orlando, Fla.:

Senator GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I wish to thank you for joining your small group of erudite, clear-thinking Senators who are unafraid to express their views in the face of all the jingoistic hoopla of the hawks and "me tooers." It takes courage to leave political expediency and stick to one's honest convictions. Senators FULBRIGHT, MORSE, CHURCH, MCGOVERN, and you, and a few more of your colleagues are truly outstanding men, and to be congratulated for your honesty and logical minds.

Eisenhower naively spoke the truth when he spoke at the Governors' Conference in November 1954: "Whoever maintains the sphere of influence in southeast Asia controls the tin, tungsten, rubber, oil, etc." Therein lies the raison d'etre—freedom? Humanitarianism? Commitments to whom or to what?

Sincerely,

Here is a letter from Kansas City, Kans.:

DEAR SENATOR: I am certainly in favor of your bill not to send draftees to Vietnam or any foreign wars. Being the mother of five sons, two of whom are already in the service—one just 19 in January—I do not wish to see them sacrificed after 16 weeks training. Boys sent to fight a man's war, when we have men in Reserve units who are well trained for these wars.

We have a unit of brokenhearted mothers ready to wage war.

Here is a letter from Villanova, Pa., from a physician:

DEAR SENATOR: In these dark days with our Nation committed to an illegal, immoral, and militarily psychotic war, it is most encouraging to see that some true Americans in public life will stand up and be counted. Your stand on dragging this issue out into the open and in regard to draftees being sent to southeast Asia are most commendable. Most of all I admire you for standing up and being counted in these days when powerful people think that consensus is more important than truth. Thank you from the bottom of my heart for all that you are doing.

Very truly yours,

Here is a letter from Fort Wayne, Ind.:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: The recent legislation you have introduced to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in Vietnam is without a doubt the most intelligent action to be taken in this disgraceful mess.

I have personally conducted a survey and have talked to hundreds of people in all walks of life in this area, and the response has been 100 percent in opposition to the administration's present policy in Vietnam and especially the drafting of our young men for this service.

Considering this as a basis I feel that the people of America as a whole will support you in your noble effort.

The most regrettable situation existing in our State, is the fact that our representatives evidently favor this warmongering giveaway program of human life against the will of the people.

I feel certain that I speak for the people of America in commending you and Senator WAYNE MORSE for your effort. May God be with you.

Sincerely yours,

Here is a letter from Berkeley, Calif.:

SENATOR GRUENING: This is a note of support for legislation you have introduced to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to Vietnam.

As a Korean war veteran, I can testify to the fact that a rudimentary knowledge of the army game and a sprinkling of luck is usually sufficient to keep a person out of a combat zone. Most draftees neither have the sophistication nor the opportunity to play the army game due to the rapidity at which they are assigned to combat divisions.

Regular Army men are quick to defend military action and to define themselves as soldiers in every sense of the word. They should be given the opportunity to practice their chosen profession. It is incongruous to have civilian conscripts in the Infantry in Vietnam and soldiers in quartermaster depots in the States. With proper training the draftee is capable of supplying the soldier's needs in the field. In a war of the nature of Vietnam, where there is considerable question as to the extent to which American soil and institutions are threatened, this is certainly all the draftee should be compelled to do.

It might be mentioned in passing that if military service in the lower grades could be made more palatable it is possible fewer draftees would be needed.

Your speeches and comments concerning Vietnam are one of the few lights of reason shining through the present fog of World War II cliches.

Here is a letter from a soldier on active service. His name and unit have been deleted, for obvious reasons. I do not wish to get him into trouble.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Recently I read of your efforts to introduce legislation designed to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to Vietnam, supplemented by your three logical and intelligent amendments. This letter in support of your legislative efforts which I consider to be of the highest order in the protection of individual freedom and which keeps a man from being reduced to the role of a mere pawn in the hands of statesmen, may have the insignificance in determining the successful outcome of your bill as my vote in determining the President in a national election, yet I offer you my support because symbolically it means as much in its little way in the tradition of American democracy as, on the other hand, the actual importance of your proposal does in defending and propagating that tradition.

Men I have known and served with in units during my one and three-quarter years in the military have volunteered and gone to fight in Vietnam, some for patriotic reasons, some for personal reasons. I admire their courage and their convictions; but for those whose values and political opinions do not lead them to this action your legislation is the means whereby they may express their choice and exercise their liberty.

Here is another letter from a soldier in uniform, likewise, whose name and unit are likewise deleted:

SENATOR GRUENING: Today it was announced on the radio that you and Senator MORSE are sponsoring a bill before the present session of Congress which advocates congressional approval of any Presidential action committing draftees abroad. If this is the case I would like to express my unconditional support.

For the past year or so I have followed with great interest the course of our Vietnam involvement. I have also read some excerpts from speeches by you and Senator MORSE, among others, on this involvement and I think that I am in complete agreement with you and Senator MORSE.

In summary I am dissatisfied with the present involvement as I think that: firstly, the United States became involved there under a President and Secretary of State who were overcome with their own anti-Communist involvements and acted not on what was there but what they thought was there; secondly, because our involvement seems to me a violation of the U.N. Charter and the 1954 Geneva agreements, and thirdly, because we are supporting there a regime (or regimes) that in effect is a dictatorship and seemingly unrepresentative of the Vietnamese people. Thus the same points that we accuse the NLF and North Vietnam of violating are exactly the ones that we and our allies there have and are violating.

I have not up onto this time expressed my opinion to any of our elected representatives mainly because I felt that it would do no good. I must at this time, at least, attempt to clear my own conscience.

Please let me express my support again for your course on the Vietnam question and wish you luck in this course you have elected to follow.

Here is a letter from Chicago, Ill.:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Congratulations on your proposed amendments to Senate bills 2791, 2792, and 2793 which would provide that persons drafted into the armed services should not be sent to southeast Asia involuntarily without congressional approval. It will certainly let the Senators stand up and be counted and let the people know how their representatives feel about this highly controversial issue of Vietnam, especially the parents of the young men who are being drafted or shortly face the draft. Senator MORSE and yourself have the appreciation and gratitude of many thousands who feel their representatives have somehow forgotten or ignored their constituents in this matter.

It is also urged that there be an open and prolonged debate on the floor of the Senate on every single aspect of the crisis in Vietnam, including how we became involved there and whether we have exhausted every single legal avenue in our search for peace.

Again I say, thank God the American people have a few courageous spokesmen who seek a policy that is just.

Here is a letter from Milwaukee, Wis.:

MY DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: This is to express my enthusiasm for your draft legislation concerning making service in Vietnam voluntary.

I was chief of the communications, media division of the ICA mission in Cambodia for 2½ years, leaving in late 1961. Ten of the people who worked under me in the division were Vietnamese and I went fairly often to Saigon. My opposite number in Saigon was through his duties well acquainted with the internal situation.

Here I have talked recently to young people and church groups in sort of general discussions resembling a little a teach in. There is real doubt regarding the morality of this war. People are not cocksure in either supporting or opposing it but there is a real moral crisis. Young men sincerely hold—some of them—that we are more or less the aggressor.

It is not a case of they not wanting to sacrifice their lives or health or eyesight or hearing and so on in what they doubt is really a just cause. It is that they do not believe one should kill when one's own country is only in a theoretical and possibly farfetched sense in danger. The history of this war is getting somewhat better known. I think many young men feel as they hear about the history of the war or read about it that they would have had to be fighting against the French if they were Vietnamese. Therefore they feel they would probably continue to fight against the successor to the French if they were Vietnamese.

The moral issue is very serious. We cannot just put it off on the State. We are responsible before God, each of us. To kill in the conviction that it is unjust to do so is murder. Nationality is only an incident in time in any case. Our moral responsibility is related to things eternal.

In my lifetime, and I am 60, I have never known this Nation to be so sharply and openly divided. I am glad it is divided.

The circumstance is proof that we are not morally bankrupt.

Man does not live by victory alone.

Most sincerely yours,

——— ———.

Here is a letter from Bridgeport, Conn.—they come from all parts of the country:

Dear Sir: Thank you for upholding the ideals of peace, integrity, good judgment, and democracy. While we are supposedly fighting communism thousands of miles from home our own people are beginning to wonder what has happened to our democratic processes here at home. The American people don't want war but we have it; the American people abhor this war and want a negotiated peace right away but our President speaks out continually for more men to die in Vietnam, for more billions to be delegated to destruction and horror. The American people are being pushed into a war that they do not want, billions of dollars are being spent on war while millions of our own people are in want, thousands upon thousands of young men are being dragged from school to fight a war in which they do not believe. I love America and have always felt proud of my Nation but I am aghast and terrified by the evidence of dictatorial power that seems to be overriding the will and moral questioning of the good people of this country.

Something must be done to turn this tide before the United States involves the entire world in nuclear destruction.

You and a few other thinking legislators seem to be the only men with courage enough to speak for what is right. Please keep it up. Peace has to be our only aim if we and the world are to survive. Think of what could be accomplished in Asia with $12 billion in food and medical help as opposed to bombs.

I hope you will press for your amendment to forbid sending draftees to South Vietnam against their will. In the light of all the mixed, moral feelings of the people in regard to this ill-advised and horrendous mess, it seems the only just thing to do.

I hope you will press further for a recall of unlimited powers such as President Johnson seems to think he should possess. Vietnam could be repeated throughout the world. Dictators have this prerogative; presidents of a democracy should not.

Here is a letter from Power, Mont.:

Dear Senator Gruening: We support, respect, and thank you for the stand you have taken on peace at a time when people are not fully aware of the truth or the consequences. The Senate hearings must go on and must be televised and reported to the American people. The first day the debate on Vietnam in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee room was on television we were so glued to our sets that we were unable to do any work except the bare essentials.

We support wholeheartedly your bill to amend the draft law so as to prohibit draftees be sent to Vietnam against their wish unless Congress approves. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

Here is a letter from Eugene, Oreg.:

Dear Senator Gruening: I have just learned, by mere chance, this morning that you have proposed an amendment or resolution in connection with the military assistance bill that would give draftees the opportunity to volunteer to fight in Vietnam rather than to be sent there under orders. It seems to me to be an inspired way to indicate opposition to the present policy of open-ended escalation of the war in Vietnam, as well as humane.

It is very odd that one has to depend on word of mouth for important news such as this. I have followed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on television almost in their entirety and have paid particular attention to reports on related matters in the press. Not one word have I seen of your proposal with regard to the draft, It is only because, in a reply to a letter to you written by an acquaintance you enclosed a copy of your amendment, and that I chanced to speak to her today, that I learned of it. No doubt you regret even more strongly than we do the seemingly total silence that has greeted your proposal.

My husband and I thank you deeply for this effort, as well as for your many others, to force reassessment of our policy in Vietnam. We have long admired you for your attempts, along with Senator Morse's, to inject reason into our foreign policy. We hope you will continue.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

Here is one from New York City:

Dear Senator Gruening: While you are not "my" [New York] Senator, your efforts on behalf of peace and rational behavior are really universal.

It is in this context that we write you to thank you and tell you we feel encouraged by leaders of your ilk—attempting to hold the future for us—and our children.

Please accept our warm thanks and appreciation for all that you do on behalf of an adult and mature society.

Cordially,

——— ———.

Here is one from Oakland, Calif.:

Dear Senator Gruening: May I compliment you on your suggested amendment to the millitary pay bill—concerning the assignment of draftees to Vietnam without congressional consent.

According to the newspaper accounts which I found the reasoning which you've advanced is very sound and I hope that others in the Senate will join with you in support of this proposed amendment.

I do hope that we will be hearing more of this amendment and I must tell you that I always find your statements concerning foreign and internal policy extremely incisive and thought provoking. Will continue to look for them with great interest.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Here is one from neighboring Virginia; McLean, Va.:

Dear Senator Gruening: I have read about your proposed bill which would make it necessary for men who have enlisted in the U.S. services to make this their career, or way to earn a living or way of life, to go to Vietnam before sending fresh, new draftees who have no choice but to do as told.

May I say that this makes sense to me, and as a U.S. citizen, I support this bill wholeheartedly, and will write to support such a bill to anyone that you would feel would be of influence in its passage.

——— ———.

Here is one from Seven Valleys, Pa.:

Dear Senator Gruening: I am writing to applaud your proposal that only volunteers and not draftees be sent to Vietnam without the consent of Congress.

I am also writing as a member of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom who attended the legislative seminar this past week and the legislative luncheon Wednesday and greatly appreciated your statements there.

Your record of opposition to this horrifying war is so outstanding that repetitive applause seems redundant, yet I feel it is important that you know that you have the support of many—and I believe of many you have not heard from. I have been doing a considerable amount of traveling by bus lately and wearing peace buttons, find myself conversing with strangers about the war. These conversations seem invariably to be with people who don't write to the Government, but who are extremely distressed at the war and anxious for a rapid peaceful settlement.

I might add that I do what I can to broaden the knowledge of the war of as many people as I can and any reprints of your speeches you could send me would be put to use and greatly appreciated.

In any case, thanks again from a grateful citizen.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Here is one from Chicago:

Dear Senator Gruening: I want to thank you and encourage you in your attempts to bring a little sense into our Vietnam policy. Your bill which prohibits sending unwilling draftees without the approval of Congress into this conflict is an admirable measure.

There are young men who see some point in this war and can risk their lives in it without risking the moral foundations of their lives. There are others, however, who, for very good reasons, are convinced that the campaign in Vietnam is wholly destructive to the Vietnamese people, and therefore unjust and detrimental to our proper goals as a nation. Forcing these young men to die in Vietnam amounts to forcing them to give up the usefulness and meaning of their promising lives, and to see themselves as marked for a stupid, useless, and meaningless death. No government should be permitted to do such violence to the moral fiber of those it represents.

Thank you and thank you again, for realizing this, and good luck in your efforts to make others accept it.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Here is one from Rocky River, Ohio:

Dear Sir: I hereby wish to express complete approval of your proposal to bar the sending of draftees to southeast Asia without congressional consent.

Respectfully yours,

——— ———.

Here is one from Madison, Wis.:

Dear Senator Gruening: For the last year or so I have been following your statements about the war in Vietnam and have been very much encouraged by what you have said. Your recent proposal which is coming up before the Senate soon to keep any draftees from being sent to Vietnam without the consent of Congress again gave me hope that perhaps there can be found a peaceful settlement for the war in the immediate future.

I only wish that more Senators and Congressmen for that matter, would have the courage to speak against the policy of our Government in southeast Asia, which can only lead to more bloodshed and to further slighting of much more important world and domestic problems.

Here is one from Denison University, in Granville, Ohio:

Dear Senator Gruening: You are to be very highly commended for introducing legislation that would prevent the sending of draftees to Vietnam against their wills without congressional approval. I should also like more generally to commend you for your outspokenness against our country's position in Vietnam.

My own position is that our military intervention in the affairs of Vietnam is cruel and totally unjustifiable in moral terms and that we should withdraw our troops and military commitment unilaterally and immediately. I am not for withdrawal in the sense of noncommitment, however, for I believe our country should offer nonmilitary aid to all of Vietnam and to all Vietnamese, whether their allegiance be with Saigon, Hanoi, or the Vietcong.

I'm glad there are people like you in the Senate; I only wish there were more of you. Keep up the good (nonviolent) fight.

Sincerely yours,
————.

Here is one from Tillamook, Oreg.:

My Dear Senator Gruening: I am addressing this letter to you because of the hope you have stirred in my heart when I read in our daily newspaper you would oppose sending our boys to Vietnam as draftees.

There has not been much hope in my heart for a good many months. We mothers of boys endangered by the draft don't really live. We just exist. During the last war my brothers (dedicated, purposeful, scholarly young men) served long and faithfully. I watched my wonderful mother fail before our very eyes as the war years took their toll. I have since then shelved these hellish memories in the deepest, darkest recesses of my mind wishing that such a world of sorrowing could somehow serve some useful purpose. We can't live in the past. But that is exactly what our President and certain others have condemned us to. To broadcast a message of peace and then refuse to discuss peace with the enemy. To send out our boys to fight and die when the President will not meet and amicably discuss peaceable settlement of our problems. We as a nation may be leaders in industry, commerce, or military might but we are not a truly great nation until we clothe ourselves in the raiment of humility and lead all nations in the quest for peace—that priceless goal worthy of all men's hearts.

As a mother and a hardworking officer in the Democratic Party I beg your every effort be directed toward removing ourselves from Vietnam where we stand despised by all our fellowmen. We have erred and greatness lies in how we face our problems now. History will record those who stand steadfast and courageously in the great battle for peace not military victory.

God bless you.

Very truly yours,
————.

I think that is a very wonderful letter from a constituent of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], written from the heart.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I did not want to interrupt the Senator from Alaska, but just listen. However, the comment he has made about the letter from a constituent of mine from Tillamook, Oreg., and one from Eugene, Oreg.—and there are many similar letters in my files—cause me to take only a moment to tell the Senator and to tell the people of the country, through this Record, why I was proud to join in cosponsoring his amendment. Many people do not understand that the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Oregon take the position that a line of demarcation is justifiably drawn between enlisted men and drafted men. I think it is most unfortunate that we have any enlisted men at all over there, for reasons I shall set forth in just a moment.

But the Senator from Alaska this morning has made the Record crystal clear. We are drafting men also. Drafted men are not volunteering. These men are being taken in by conscription under a draft law. They are being sent into a war zone where we have no right to be, and never have had any right to be. We are sending boys to their death without a declaration of war in open violation of article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

The Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Oregon have urged that at least sending men to war ought to be regularized. Congress ought to make up its mind whether we are going to declare war or not declare war. The President should make up his mind whether or not he is going to send us a war message, as Woodrow Wilson did on April 2, 1917, when he sent one to a joint session of Congress recommending war against Germany. At the beginning of the message Woodrow Wilson said he was without constitutional authority to make war in the absence of a declaration of war.

This is an elementary principle of constitutional law.

Then, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, following Pearl Harbor, sent Congress a war message asking for a declaration of war.

That is the position of the senior Senator from Oregon, and I know it is the position of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], who really has been my leader and teacher in this historic debate that has been going on now well over 2 years. He and I, now joined by a few others, have stood on this floor week after week and protested the course of action that our Government is following in American foreign policy.

We are saying by this amendment: If you are going to draft these boys and send them into war, then declare war. I believe the American people are entitled to have this administration take that course of action.

But, then, I point out also that this war has greatly divided this country, in spite of the apologists for this administration in and out of the Senate. This war is causing a great rift among our people at the grassroots of America.

I wish to say again to my President, as I have said so many times, I love him, but I love my country more.

In my judgment, my President needs to clarify this situation by making perfectly clear to our country what his objectives are. He completely failed to make those objectives clear in New York City last night. He spoke in terms of semantic emotional sanctions but not in terms of specific proposals for ending the war.

As I will say tomorrow when I make my speech in opposition to the pending legislation, the very terms of the pending bill authorizes an escalated war. The American people need to be told that the administration has in that bill—but they are not boasting or talking about it—the funds for escalating the war at any time the President decides to escalate it. I do not propose to vote to give my President that power.

In my judgment, that kind of arbitrary discretion should not be vested in any President at any time.

Then, what needs to be asked, of course, in talking about supporting a government in South Vietnam, is how did it happen that we decided to support a puppet government in South Vietnam? The government that we, the United States, created in open opposition and in violation of the Geneva accords of 1954 is the government which we seek to entrench in South Vietnam. We did not have the slightest right to set up a puppet government in South Vietnam and we now say to the world that we are going to support that government.

South Vietnam does not belong to the United States. South Vietnam does not belong to this little puppet that we are supporting by the name of Ky, either. South Vietnam and North Vietnam belong to all of the Vietnamese people both north and south.

Do not forget that the Geneva accords proposed that there be a 2-year period after the line of military demarcation was drawn separating the military forces of Vietminh and the military forces of the French in bringing about a reunification of Vietnam both north and south into one country.

They were to take 2 years to work out a program for reunifying Vietnam. That is what was provided. Who stopped it? The United States. That is going to be the sad, sordid, black record of history that will be written against our country for future generations of American boys and girls to see.

The amendment of the Senator from Alaska goes to the very core of this matter. It goes to the issue and the right of our country to be there in the first place. We had no right. If we had none in the first place, we have none now. What are we going to do? Are we going to support this regime in South Vietnam and impose this regime on North Vietnam? Do the American people know the plan is for the Ky regime to take over all of Vietnam?

We are headed for one of the bloodiest holocausts in the history of mankind if other nations of the world do not stop the United States.

It makes me unhappy to have to say this.

The fact is that every noncombatant nation of the world that is a member of the United Nations has a great and historic obligation to say to the United States, "Stop your war, for you are endangering the world."

The course of action that we are following in Vietnam makes our country the most dangerous threat to the peace of the world existing on the globe. We are following a completely improper course of action.

It is a sad thing that the other signatories to the United Nations are not following their commitment and obligation. What is needed is for them to stop talking behind the scenes in New York City and get the issue into the open before the Security Council and make up their minds whether they are going to assume their peacekeeping functions. If not, we should go to the General Assembly, where I am satisfied that 80 nations would proceed if it is put to them to do the peacekeeping.

What is needed is that the other nations of the world send whatever number of divisions of men are necessary to separate the United States and South Vietnam on the one side and North Vietnam and the Vietcong on the other.

South Vietnam should be turned into a checkerboard of buffer zones, with division after division of men from noncombatant nations being sent in, not to keep the war going, but to stop the fighting and to enforce a cease-fire imposed on the United States and the Vietcong.

Let me say to the world, "If you wish to avoid the great danger of an Asian holocaust you must make clear to my country that it must obey a cease-fire to be imposed upon us by the noncombatant nations of the world, in keeping with the provisions of the United Nations Charter."

It may not work, but we better try; because one thing is certain if we follow our present course of action we will end up in a massive war in Asia. Yes, I listened to the Vice President this morning. I do not share the views of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] at all. I listened to the Vice President. In my opinion he has lost all of his persuasive influence among thinking people who are willing to think about the great obligations of war and peace.

I never expected to hear my Vice President make this plea for war that he is making. Do not be fooled by his semantics. If we follow the course of action of the President of the United States and the Vice President as he is talking these hours, we are on the way to a major war in Asia.

That is why we say, in submitting the amendment, that we believe we had better come to grips with the question as to whether we shall send conscripted American boys to die in a war that has not been officially declared.

I well know that the speech I have just made, as well as others I have made, will bring down upon my head strong castigations and charges of disloyalty. In fact, last Sunday I was supposed to be boycotted by the American Legion at a speech I made at Harrisburg, Pa. Yet American legionnaire after legionnaire came to compliment me. One of them, introducing me to his 12-year-old and 14-year-old boys, said that when he heard on the radio that the American Legion was asking its members to boycott my speech, he drove 100 miles to be there, because, as he said:

> They are not going to tell me in free America—and we hope it will remain free—whom I can hear and whom I can't hear.

Of course, the attempted boycott by the American Legion provided me with an audience much larger than I otherwise would have had, because at the grassroots of America the people are concerned about what is happening in Vietnam.

Last Saturday afternoon, at 1 o'clock, I spoke at a high school in Madison, Wis. The sponsors of the meeting said that more than 3,600 persons were in attendance and that it was necessary to use closed television circuits to enable the overflow audiences that could not enter the auditorium to hear my speech.

Yes, Mr. President, at the grassroots of America the people are disturbed because they know we are not marching down the road to peace but are marching down the road toward more war.

The Senate has before it a bill which some of our colleagues say involves no question of policy. They say it concerns merely the question whether we shall provide materiel for the boys in Vietnam. But I say again, as I said yesterday, that the boys are not suffering from a lack of materiel over there. That was admitted again this morning by spokesmen for the administration. There is not one of us who would want to deny a single bullet or a single safeguard that a single boy needs, because they are not in Vietnam because they wanted to go there, but because their Government sent them there.

In these historic hours of this debate, we ought to take a look at the policy that is involved in the bill. The bill contains a bad policy, a policy that permits the carrying on of a greatly enlarged war if the President decides to enlarge it. I do not believe our country should risk that exercise of arbitrary discretion. The people of the country are entitled to know whether we are going to war under article I, section 8, or not.

So again I ask my President: "Why don't you send up a war message, and then ask Congress to decide whether it wants to declare war?" Such a proposal would arouse a public debate that is sorely needed in this country at every community level.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I continue to read from this outpouring of expression from the American people. I read a letter from historic Charlottesville, Va.:

> DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Congratulations on your continued, articulate opposition to our "holy war" in Vietnam. Like the holy wars of history, barbarity of indescribable dimension accompanies its execution. Unlike those wars, its continued execution threatens the security of the entire world. It also creates the most brutal selection of national priorities. Nothing can be more important to the crusader that the growing ability to slaughter the Asians—to divert public moneys from the feeding of the starving, the medication of the dying, the protection of the oppressed—to the ever more relentless and ruthless destruction and violation of life and property in a most indiscriminate manner.
>
> I applaud your amendment to the war bill to make the assignment of inductees to Vietnam subject to congressional approval a matter of option. I wish you every success in that matter.
>
> Please exert your influence to bring Secretary of War Dean Rusk—

The writer has slightly confused the Secretary's title—

> back to reality from the schizophrenically, moralistic hallucination which he takes to be the real world. In my own view, he is the most dangerous man to the progress of peace in the entire world. He appears determined to have his "war of attrition" with China which he so woodenly advocated when he sided with MacArthur in 1951.
>
> Please continue to voice your opposition to the war.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> ——— ———.

I read next from a letter I received from a minister in Mound City, Ill.:

> MY DEAR SIR: The Globe-Democrat says that you are back of a resolution that would give those who are to go to Vietnam, the right to express their opinions on this matter.
>
> As I see it the overwhelming majority of the people who have not expressed themselves in public demonstrations, are a long way from being satisfied with our entanglement in Vietnam, that according to figures has already cost 1,700 of the promising blood of America.
>
> If we are so much concerned with the freedom of people from Communist aggression, why did we turn a deaf ear to Cuba, when Castro took over lock, stock, and barrel?
>
> Recalling past history, I am convinced that the time has come for the young men to have something to say about their destiny. Their's has been too long, "to do and die, and not to ask why." I am with you in your efforts.
>
> I am,
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> ——— ———.

The next letter is from Kirkwood, Mo.:

> DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thank you for all of your good work on the conflict in Vietnam, and for your forthcoming resolution with respect to draftees in that connection. We shall be watching the outcome of the debate with interest.
>
> ——— ———.

I read next a letter from Kirkland, Wash.:

> HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
> *U.S. Senate,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> SIR: Thank you with all my heart for introducing the bill against requiring draftees to fight in Vietnam without the consent of Congress.
>
> I am a longtime admirer of your courageous stand against our policy in Vietnam.
>
> I feel that draftees should not be required to fight in Vietnam. Many are as against what we are doing there as are those who have been classified conscientious objectors. One's conscience may allow him to fight in a defensive war but not in this situation where innocent men, women, and children are being killed. I cannot believe that our men are defending our country when it has not been attacked. Young men, whose parents never thought we would fight an aggressive war, were taught to value human life, and now they must go against their consciences.
>
> Aside from objecting on moral grounds, they may also feel, as I do, that what we are doing in Vietnam is harmful to our country, that we are precipitating a world nuclear war that could devastate our country as well as most of the world.
>
> The only hope I see for our country, and the world, is in you and the other few leaders who have the insight and courage to speak out for the right on this issue. We ordinary people are not being heard. Many are afraid to speak out because they are so misunderstood, called traitors or draft dodgers. The issue doesn't come to us to vote on. We thought we were voting against escalation when we voted against Senator Goldwater, only to learn now that President Johnson was planning similar escalation when he was campaigning, but didn't say so, so we really had no choice.
>
> Respectfully and gratefully yours,
>
> ——— ———.

The next letter I shall read is from Bellingham, Wash.:

Senator **Ernest Gruening**,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: It is noted that you have introduced legislation to prohibit this Government from committing draftees to the Vietnam situation without the consent of Congress. Once again, I wish to express my personal gratitude to you for your efforts to turn the tide from control of the "war at whim" people.

It is inconceivable to me that the sort of thinking which drives us into such errors as Vietnam can have any ultimate effect other than to alienate decent people and drive them to the very extreme which we assert we are fighting to avoid. Overtaxation, degradation, and conscription of their children finally drove the Chinese to communism; the result will be the same here if our "leadership" refuses to come to terms with human decency.

Very truly yours,

The next letter, from Philadelphia, Pa., reads:

Hon. **Ernest Gruening**,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: Our morning paper carries word of your having proposed legislation to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam until Congress authorizes such assignments.

Short of a declaration of peace, this is the best news the concerned, thinking Americans could hope for. It is only regrettable that delaying tactics of the Administration held off the move for so long.

My husband joins me in extending congratulations to you on your wise and courageous move. May the bill very speedily become law.

Sincerely yours,

Here is a letter from Brooklyn, N.Y. It reads:

Dear Senator Gruening: Too frequently I find myself writing to Government officials and Members of Congress because I disagree with them, and much too rarely do I take time out these busy days to thank them for something well said or done. Let me at least partly correct this for myself by thanking you for the foresight, statesmanship, and the courage you have shown as one of the lonely voices opposed to the madness that is taking place in Vietnam, and even more particularly for your recent proposal not to permit draftees to be sent to Vietnam unless this is their choice and Congress so votes.

Thank you for your wisdom and your courage.

Here is a letter from Bellingham, Wash. It reads:

Dear Senator Gruening: I was most pleased to read in tonight's Bellingham Herald the AP report of the amendments that you and Senator **Morse** have offered to the administration's defense appropriation bill. The prohibition of involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam will, I hope, receive the support that it deserves. I respect you for continuing your efforts in behalf of an unpopular cause.

Sincerely,

Here is a letter from Berkeley, Calif. It reads:

Dear Senator Gruening: My entire family (two sons of voting age, two daughters almost voting age, my wife and myself) all strongly admire your brave and intelligent stand on the Vietnam issues. We have read from time to time the newspaper reports of your statements in Congress and just today the San Francisco Chronicle carried another story about the amendment you have proposed to the defense supplement bill for Vietnam. Please keep up your efforts in the name of sanity and morality.

The whole Nation owes you a debt of gratitude for your brave stand on Vietnam. I am sure that the war hawks are putting all sorts of pressure on the President and on the few brave Senators who speak out against intensification of the war. But I am equally sure that there are millions upon millions of us who ardently pray for a peaceful solution to this seemingly impossible situation, and we all are grateful to you, Senator **Gruening**.

I have thought that one possible solution would be to announce to the whole world and to the United Nations that we would accept any solution worked out by an impartial United Nations commission, with no strings or preconditions whatever. I believe this is the only way out for several reasons. One, the Vietcong and North Vietnamese could hardly refuse such an offer, and I am sure that world opinion would support such a move (while almost no opinion in other countries supports our present position). Second, I believe that no matter how or what the U.N. commission decided the issues, nothing—no matter what—would be so bad for us and the world as to continue to escalate the war. Any decision, however bad, would be less bad than a world war.

Again, may I tell you that you have our heartfelt admiration and highest esteem.

Here is a letter from Clovis, Calif. It reads:

Dear Senator Gruening: We were very pleased to hear of the amendment you wish to offer that would prohibit sending draftees to Vietnam without prior consent of Congress. We wish you every success in getting it passed.

We also hope you are able to stage public hearings on U.S. policy in Vietnam. We were very glad, and heartened, to read of your attitudes on Vietnam, as we have been very distressed concerning this issue, and sincerely hope somehow it can begin to be righted.

Sincerely,

Here is a letter from Freeport, N.Y. It reads:

Dear Senator Gruening: What a wonderful world this would be if there were more Senator **Gruenings**. You have my unbounded admiration and every time I read of your views in the newspapers my faith in human nature is restored.

Your solution to the draft problem regarding Vietnam is something long overdue. Our neighbor Canada is a good example for us—Canadians can be drafted to protect the country if it is attacked but cannot be sent overseas. When you are asked to kill, this seems the solution to the problem—one shouldn't be made to kill against his beliefs.

Keep up your great work.

Sincerely,

Here is a letter from Danville, Pa. It reads:

My Dear Senator Gruening: I saw in today's paper—the Philadelphia Inquirer—that you introduced legislation that the draftees should not be forced into going into Vietnam without the approval of Congress.

Please, please do everything in your power to bring it about. You will gain the undying gratitude of thousands of American parents if you do. Many sleepless nights are spent worrying about this very thing. These young boys are forced into the service and after only 8 to 12 weeks of training they are sent into the jungles and swamps of Vietnam and expected to defend themselves. This is inhuman and very unfair.

The older and more experienced men hold down the jobs back of the fighting areas.

I have a young son who will soon be called up for service (drafted) and it almost drives me out of my mind thinking he may be sent to Vietnam with so little preparation.

It seems to me the draftees are being penalized for not volunteering for the service, just as all the men in our country who do not go to college are penalized.

So please do whatever you can to help us in this matter.

Thank you.

Here is a letter from Bridgewater, Conn. It reads:

Dear Senator Gruening: For the first time in my life I wished I lived in Alaska, so that I could be one of your constituents. Your proposal that only draftees who wish to serve in Vietnam be sent there, is the most sensible thing I have heard yet in connection with this war—if this war is to go on.

I do not believe in this undeclared war. I think it is pointless, horrible and tragic. Yet if some wish to fight it let those be the ones to do it.

Blessings and luck in your amendment to the supplemental defense appropriation bill.

I have a telegram from Lothar Stewart, of Moorhead, Minn. It reads as follows:

Moorhead, Minn.,
January 26, 1966.

Senator **Ernest Gruening**,
Washington, D.C.:

Support proposed draftee amendments to pending Vietnam defense bill. Urge immediate end to involvement.

I have a letter from Baraboo, Wis. It reads:

Dear Senator: May we commend you for your honest remarks concerning the voluntary service in the phony war in Vietnam. If we could get legislation passed to do that as well as conscript wealth and war profits, perhaps the military couldn't have the power it does and we could use the vast sums to make living better for some of our unfortunate citizens. We have watched your voting record and work in Washington and would we have more statesmen like you.

These are merely a few of the hundreds of letters which I have received. However, these letters illustrate the deep and heartfelt concern and worry among the American people. I believe that if their message or their pleas could be presented to our colleagues we would have an affirmative vote in favor of the amendment.

There are many other communications that I could read. However, I shall read only a few more of these letters.

It is rather striking—and this cannot be emphasized too strongly—that we are sending these young men to Vietnam and taking them away from their families while a South Vietnamese force equivalent to virtually one-half of the total U.S. force of 200,000 that we have sent there—96,000 of the South Vietnamese soldiers—has deserted in the past year. Yet we are sending our young boys to die and to take the place of those men who will not fight for their own country.

That to me is one of the most disgraceful situations imaginable. It should be unthinkable that in this body and elsewhere our colleagues will support the sending of our young men to die in a foreign land whose people will not fight for themselves. The evidence of this appears in today's New York Times in a story describing how there have been 96,000 desertions this year. Yet we have been hearing all the official propaganda that with our growing troop involvement the morale of the South Vietnamese has vastly improved.

The evidence is overwhelming that we have gradually had to take over the entire conduct of this war. The situation has changed greatly since the time when President Kennedy, a few weeks before his death, said that:

> This is their war. We can give them assistance, but they are the ones who have got to fight. They are the ones who have got to win it.

Since that time it has become evident that there is little will on the part of our South Vietnamese so-called "allies" to fight this war, certainly not among the leaders, the corrupt grafters whom we support.

The evidence of corruption which confirms what has long been known, is contained in an article from today's Washington Post which I am having printed in today's Record. The article describes how the entire government is corrupt. It indicates that one of the biggest jokes in South Vietnam is that we are telling the corruptors and grafters in charge to stop corruption. That must be one of the biggest laughs they have. We would all be laughing if it were not so tragic. I ask unanimous consent that the article by Stanley Karnow in today's Washington Post entitled " 'Mr. Nguyer,' Saigon Employee, Chuckles Over Curbs on Graft" be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"Mr. Nguyen," Saigon Employee, Chuckles Over Curbs on Graft

(By Stanley Karnow)

Saigon, February 23.—The official announcement here yesterday that the South Vietnamese Government is creating a special court to try profiteers and grafters drew a chuckle from Mr. Nguyen.

"If that court does its job properly," he observed, "it will have to put almost the entire administration behind bars."

Mr. Nguyen, whose real name cannot be revealed, would know. He is deputy director of a key Saigon ministry that deals with the personnel problems of South Vietnam's 120,000 civil servants. By his own admission, Mr. Nguyen himself is up to his elbows in influence peddling, bribery and several less larcenous forms of moneymaking. Nguyen believes that nearly every other state employee must be so engaged, too.

Profitable sideline activities are so widespread, in Mr. Nguyen's view, that most Vietnamese civil servants can find little time to handle their regular functions. This partly explains why many American officials here, designated to work with the local administration, lead lives of quiet desperation.

It is not uncommon for a Vietnamese clerk to devote 3 or 4 hours a day to his Government job, then spend the rest of his time selling favors, speculating on imported commodities or arranging real estate deals. Mr. Nguyen, a true patriot, puts in a full official day and does his trafficking in the evening.

In large measure, this semblance of corruption stems from the fact that Vietnam is Asia, where public office has been traditionally used for private gain. More important, however, is the fact that the average civil servant here must resort to some kind of illegal operation if he wants to avoid starvation.

Except for an insignificant raise 2 years ago, civil service salaries have not changed since 1954, when South Vietnam attained its independence. In contrast, prices have spiraled astronomically over the past decade.

Thus a Government stenographer earns the equivalent of about $20 a month—roughly what a couple of Americans here spend on an ordinary dinner. Mr. Nguyen, whose official walls are covered with diplomas from French universities, makes $100 a month, the third highest salary in his ministry. He receives an additional $18 a month in special allocations.

To make ends meet, state employees indulge in various tricks. Those of a higher order can obtain privileged purchasing rights permitting them to buy wholesale quantities of merchandise for resale.

Contractors often find civil servants handy and willing intermediaries for sealing deals with the Government, and they pay tidy commissions for the service. Manufacturers frequently offer certain Government employees lucrative opportunities to win their sympathy for the future. A current offer in one ministry is 2,500 sacks of cement, which can be turned over at a 35-percent profit.

Lowlier civil servants must rely on more pedestrian techniques. Internal revenue department employees speed up the delivery of tax clearances for an additional 200 piasters, and exit visas can be processed quickly for an extra 1,000 piasters. Office boys and other menials simply swipe Government pencils and stationery for sale on the black market.

For Mr. Nguyen, making ends meet is considerably more complex. In line with his upper bourgeois standing, he supports four childen in private schools, occasionally endows his wife with jewelry, and wears a clean white shirt every day. His expenses run to the equivalent of $350 a month, or more than triple his official salary.

One of his most successful sources of income is the used car trade. He buys automobiles from departing Americans and sells them to wealthy Vietnamese, and he can gross from 50- to 100-percent profit on each transaction.

This business tangentially leads Mr. Nguyen into somewhat shadier realms. To pay the Americans with meaningful money he must find dollars, which gets him into black market currency deals. Moreover, he has to legalize the sales of automobiles from foreigners to Vietnamese, which entails greasing the palms of customs officials.

From time to time, Mr. Nguyen has to repair or refurbish his used cars with rare spare parts, available only through smugglers. And while he is at it, he may, on an ad hoc basis, handle whatever other contraband items that promise to yield a fast piaster.

His commercial acumen is such that, just moonlighting, Mr. Nguyen may well be quadrupling or quintupling his wage as a civil servant. He has pondered the possibility of quitting his Government job to engage in the used car trade full time.

His Government position is a good fulcrum from which to operate commercially, however. So Mr. Nguyen is sticking to it. "Besides," he will insist, "I want to do something for my country."

Mr. GRUENING. I read further, here is a letter from Urbana, Ill. It reads:

Dear Senator Gruening: Our evening paper reports that you and Senator Morse have introduced an amendment to the military appropriation bill prohibiting the drafting of men for service in Vietnam without the approval of Congress.

Thank you for that. Although I am far past the draft age, and am not myself affected by the bill, I feel it is morally reprehensible for a country to draft men to fight in a war that they believe is morally wrong, as is true of many men of draft age.

I hope that you feel free now to renew your opposition to the war in Vietnam. Opposition to the war is greatest among persons who know most about the situation.

Very gratefully yours,

——— ———.

Here is a letter from Los Angeles, Calif. It reads:

Dear Senator: While I am not one of your constituents, I do wish to congratulate you on your amendments designed to bar the sending of draftees to South Vietnam without the consent of Congress. Even if my own son were not being drafted next Tuesday, I would commend you for your stand, as I consider the involvement of the United States of America in Vietnam a disaster, stemming from a series of serious mistakes on the parts of all our Presidents since Roosevelt. While I do not blame President Johnson for the war, I do consider him responsible for the decision to bomb North Vietnam.

This mistake has apparently brought about the increased involvement of North Vietnam, increased determination of the majority of the Vietnamese people to rid their soil of the white man, increased dislike and distrust of us on the part of all the other nations of the world, Communist and non-Communist. I see our present path in Asia as national suicide.

I urge you to do all you possibly can to persuade the President and Congress to continue the efforts toward peaceful negotiations, even if they do not bear immediate fruit, and to bend all efforts toward convincing Ho Chi Minh of our sincerity in willingness to return to the Geneva accords of 1954.

I also urge you to use your power to strengthen the United Nations so that it may shoulder the responsibilities which only a world organization can carry out—maintaining peace and settling disputes among nations, large and small.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Here is a letter from Arlington, Va., just across the Potomac River. It reads:

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Gruening: I read yesterday evening in the Star of the excellent proposal by you and Senator Morse to make service in Vietnam by our boys voluntary and not compulsory. This is a fine and long-needed move. As of now, our sons, husbands, nephews, and others, are willy-nilly sent to the Vietnam blood bath.

It is unthinkable really, that our foreign policy in its essence means the lives of our finest young men. Also, strange is the policy that our youths must police and protect nations and peoples all over the world.

It is a pity that our citizens are not more articulate in protest against all this.

You might be interested to know what the voters are saying about the war in many sections of the country.

——— ———.

Here is a letter from Bridgeville, Pa. It reads:

BRIDGEVILLE, PA.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SIR: Keep up your good work against this unnecessary involvement in Vietnam and your proposal against involuntary service for draftees without congressional approval.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Here is a letter from Morehead, Minn. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: You seem to be one of the few Senators who has the courage to disagree with the President. Congratulations. Your proposal that draftees should not fight in Vietnam without the consent of Congress gets my wholehearted support, and I urge you to propose a few more things, such as bringing this problem to the United Nations for solution, and calling for a complete congressional investigation into our involvement in this war, the uses to which our foreign aid in South Vietnam has been put, the bombing of the villagers and peasants about whose right to vote we are so concerned, and many other matters about which there have been rumors and conjectures. Perhaps if enough Senators chorus together, they can be heard above the booming of the generals. Thank you.

——— ———.

Here is one from El Cerrito, Calif.:

I heartily commend you in your consistent opposition to the Vietnamese undeclared war. I consider it highly immoral in that we have broken the Geneva agreements about free elections and foreign soldiers in Vietnam while Johnson and the State Department lay unctuously the blame on North Vietnam for breaking the agreements. These are real totalitarian techniques, I feel.

I heartily concur in your proposal that no draftee should be sent to Vietnam without the consent of Congress.

Here is one from Hoodsport, Wash.:

We wish to express our agreement and support of your legislation to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to Vietnam without the consent of Congress.

In addition, we wish to protest the excesses of pettiness and arbitrariness practiced by the Selective Service. An illustration of this is contained in the enclosed newspaper clipping.

It is our hope that current Selective Service procedures will be subjected to investigation and reform.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the contents of the clipping enclosed with that letter, entitled "Father Drafted Hours After Physical for Failing to Report New Address," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FATHER DRAFTED HOURS AFTER PHYSICAL FOR FAILING TO REPORT NEW ADDRESS

A 25-year-old Madras man, married, and father of four children, was drafted into the Marines Wednesday, after failing to report change of address to the Selective Service. He was inducted and flown to San Diego within 24 hours of taking his Marine Corps physical.

Robert W. Swan said after his induction that he first registered for the draft 7 years ago in Milwaukee, while he was living in Gladstone. He got married the following year, and didn't hear from the draft board again until last November.

Meanwhile, he had moved from Gladstone to two different residences in Portland, then to Madras. He reported the Portland address to the draft board, but he told the Oregonian he forgot to report the second Portland address and Madras address.

In November, Swan got a letter asking him to take a physical from his family doctor and send the results promptly to the draft board.

Because the letter was delayed in being forwarded from Swan's old address in Portland to his current one in Madras, he was unable to report the results of the physical on time. This is how the draft board learned Swan had been delinquent in reporting his changes of address, Swan said.

In January, the draft board sent him another order to take a physical—but this time, at the induction center on Southwest Taylor Street. Swan took the physical Wednesday, passed it, and found himself inducted into the Marine Corps in a matter of hours.

He left Portland Airport for San Diego at midnight, less than 24 hours after passing the physical. He left behind his wife Norma and four children, who will receive a $145-a-month family allowance from the Marine Corps.

The Selective Service headquarters said that any delinquent registrant may be processed for induction despite his family status.

Mr. GRUENING. Here is one from Chicago:

I am writing to commend you for your strong opposition to President Johnson's war policy in Vietnam. I was glad to read of your proposed bill that would prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to serve in Vietnam without congressional approval.

I see that President Johnson is contending that the resolution passed by Congress in August, 1964, gives him authority to take whatever action he may choose in Vietnam. It seems to me that the time has come for Congress to reconsider this resolution. I know you voted against it at the time it was passed. I understand Senator MORSE is introducing a resolution to rescind this resolution. I am sure you will give it your support.

Here is another one from Los Angeles:

According to a report in today's issue of the Los Angeles Times you are introducing legislation to prohibit the Armed Forces from assigning draftees to Vietnam against their will.

I wish to congratulate you on this measure. It is a step in the right direction.

Having lived for nearly 8 years in the Far East, I greatly deplore Mr. Johnson's Vietnam policy. In fact, I consider it the greatest disaster for our beloved country.

May your efforts be successful.

Mr. President, I think these letters—a small sampling—demonstrate that the concern of the American people is deep-seated and overwhelming; and I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of these letters be printed in the RECORD following the others I have read.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, how many letters does the Senator wish to put in the RECORD?

Mr. GRUENING. I should say there are about 25 more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENTFIELD, CALIF.,
January 26, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We are very much in favor of your legislation to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam without the approval of Congress. Also not to resume bombing North Vietnam. Better yet get out of Vietnam.

Thank you.

——— ———.

SELAH, WASH.,
January 27, 1966.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I wish to commend you for your action in offering the amendments to prevent young American men being drafted and sent to fight in Vietnam unless Congress affirms. It is good to know that there are still men who are not afraid to stand up and be counted, when they feel the country is being led down the wrong path.

I feel that our entry into the Vietnam situation was poorly justified, and wonder if we may not yet discover that the same Vietcong we are trying to drum up such a hatred for, will not turn out to be the true patriots of their country. These are the same people who fought for their freedom from an admittedly short-sighted colonialist government.

Why are we in Vietnam? Is it to protect a notoriously graft-ridden government that we are risking the very finest our country has produced? I pray that this is not the case, and that if we are wrong, we have leaders strong enough to admit it, and soon.

I am the mother of four sons, and have watched fearfully as our asinine foreign policy has been allowed, like Topsy, to "just grow."

I pray for your continued courage and wisdom.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is to express my deep and sincere appreciation for the legislation which you have introduced to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in Vietnam. I am sure there are millions of real Americans who agree with you even though you may not hear from them.

Something must be done to bring this war to an early end. The life of one of our fine young men is worth more than the entire enemy. Our leaders should take a lesson from the policies of nations such as Sweden (no war since 1814) and Switzerland.

We are taking in Cuban refugees. Why not move the friendly Vietnamese to other lands where they would be safe. Surely there are countries that would willingly absorb these people, including our own United States. The cost hardly could be as great as the billions now being wasted in carrying on this present conflict. And, precious lives would be saved. I assume that our objective is to protect the inhabitants (not the land) from the Communist enemy.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

SEAL BEACH, CALIF.

P.S.—I am 79, have lived through three terrible wars. I am opposed to war except in defense of our country.

Ithaca, N.Y.

Senator Ernest E. Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your amendment whereby draftees not be sent to southeast Asia involuntarily without congressional approval.

——— ———.

Citrus Heights, Calif.

Senator Ernest Gruening.

Dear Sir: I have just read in the newspaper that you introduced legislation today to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam. That makes me very, very happy. I cannot believe that our President legally has the right to send our men to another country to kill and be killed where there is no formal declaration of war. The President says we are fighting for freedom and our way of life. What freedom do our men have when they are forced to leave their wives and homes, forced into Army camps, then taken, against their will, to another country to be mistreated, and suffer, then perhaps killed? Where is there any freedom in that?

Right now I am not too proud of being an American citizen.

Please, please, do what you can to stop this sending our men to Vietnam. I am just a poor working mother but please tell me what I can do to help you.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Chicago, Ill.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Gruening: We wish to commend you for introducing amendments to Senate bills 2791, 2792, 2793, bills now under consideration by the Senate Committee on the Armed Services and Foreign Relations, bills that would authorize additional military and AID programs for Vietnam.

For a long time you have shown much courage and a high sense of responsibility in your opposition to the undeclared war we are fighting in Vietnam.

For much too long our young men have been sent to Vietnam, by three presidents, for reasons that are highly ambiguous and whose legal right to do so is suspect.

When you do introduce your amendments we hope there are enough men in the Senate who will "stand up and be counted."

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Hon. Senator Ernest Gruening:

I read an article in the January 26 Daily News of your proposal to forbid sending draftees to Vietnam without the consent of Congress.

I am definitely in favor of this prosposal and I hope it will be passed.

Yours sincerely,

——— ———.

Brooklyn, N.Y.

Decatur, Ga.,
January 31, 1966.

Dear Mr. Gruening: Let me thank you for proposing legislation for not sending draftees into southeast Asia. I thoroughly agree with your ideas as expressed in the January 26th Congressional Record. I would like very much to see the draft replaced by alternative service, Peace Corps work, or meaningful employment. Too many of our youth lose hope and desire to make of themselves anything worthwhile as they are pressured by so many people to go into military service. It seems to me an exploitation of youth and military conscription is for Communist countries, not a democracy. Has there been any desire for this kind of legislation by any individuals or groups?

I am very proud there are men like you and Mr. Morse in Washington. It is too bad that there are not more who are as strong and morally right.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

San Francisco, Calif.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We read of your proposed amendments to pending bills for additional appropriations for the war in Vietnam, to wit; that military service in Vietnam be on a voluntary basis, and we wish to express our full agreement with the proposed amendments.

We have written to our Congressman and to our Senator requesting them to give all possible support to these amendments.

We further wish to thank you for the good fight you are making to bring this illegal, immoral, and brutal war to an end. It has disgraced and dishonored our country long enough.

Respectfully,

——— ———.

Davenport, Wash.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Congratulations on your decision to sponsor a bill to prohibit sending draftees to Vietnam.

I hope that such courageous action by responsible leaders, such as yourself, will give our Government cause to reexamine our policy in that area.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: It was good to learn that the President gave you permission to do as you thought best in 1966 in regard to making suggestions for the conduct of the Vietnamese war. As of now it seems inconceivable that he thought the war would be over by last December.

Your suggestion of not sending into jungle warfare the recent draftees (many of them very young) seems to me very sensible, not to say humane. Lacking training and experience, they could most quickly become casualties.

To my mind, our deep involvement in southeast Asia is deplorable—and very difficult to improve.

Respectfully yours,

——— ———.

Senator Gruening,
Alaska.

Dear Sir: You have my warm approval for your proposal to cease sending of draftees to Vietnam. It looks like you men in Congress are the only ones capable of exercising the restraint we so vitally need in this dangerous situation.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

San Francisco, Calif.

Tucson, Ariz.

Dear Senator Gruening: We wish to assure you of our support for your bill which would prohibit the drafting of young men for the war in Vietnam.

We hope there is a feeling strong enough in the Senate to pass the bill recently introduced by Senator Morse, to take back the power which was given to the President to prosecute this war. It is our feeling that the Congress did not have the constitutional right to abrogate its own power to declare war.

We are certain that unless President Johnson's powers are curtailed he will push us further and further toward a nuclear holocaust.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

Madison, Wis.

Hon. Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: I read with interest of your proposed bill to bar the Armed Forces from sending draftees to Vietnam without their consent unless Congress so orders. To force a man to fight a war which he believes is wrong is even more immoral than war itself. I support such a bill unequivocally.

As I write this the President has so far resisted the pressures to resume the bombing of North Vietnam. For the sake of the slim hopes which remain for peace, I hope he will continue to do so. I simply cannot understand how supposedly responsible public figures can advocate renewed bombing as the means to a cheap victory. It did not work in Korea, and it will not work in Vietnam. It will only unite the North Vietnamese in their determination to drive what they believe—rightly or wrongly—to be the foreign aggressors out of Vietnam, and will further dissipate what little the United States has retained of the world's respect.

I admire the courage and determination of the Senators and Congressmen such as yourself and Senators Morse and Fulbright who are resisting the current war hysteria to oppose our unrealistic and ultimately self-defeating Vietnam policy. Please continue to represent all the people, from all over the country, who, like myself, oppose what our country—despite our claims of defending freedom—is actually doing in Vietnam.

Yours very sincerely,

——— ———.

America—Land of the Free?

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: Your Senate speech, moving to keep draftees out of Vietnam, was summarized in the Chicago newspapers a few days ago.

While I have been a Republican for many years, I regret that I am not one of your constituents so I could vote for you. Being so logical on this point must mean that you also use sound commonsense on other Senate matters.

To me it is ironical that America, which is supposed to be the land of freedom, arbitrarily takes such freedom away from our young men, without recourse, and forces them (in some respects no different from a Russian slave labor camp) to fight 9,000 miles away with no hope for any permanent success.

I have in mind the case of a son of one of my neighbors—a Catholic family. The young man spent 2 years studying to enter the priesthood. When he decided not to continue, he was drafted last July and is now on his way to Vietnam. Here is just one instance of a boy of high character who, against his will and natural instincts, is being forced into the position of killing other humans whom he will never know. And may in turn sacrifice his life to no good purpose. The tragedy is that even though he makes the supreme sacrifice it is highly debatable whether he is actually defending America in Vietnam.

Our State Department and other do-gooders start out with the highly questionable premise that our national security is imperiled if Vietnam and all of southeast Asia goes communistic. Highly questionable because such countries are 9,000 miles away, whereas Cuba is only a short distance away. Yet the United States isn't seriously imperiled even though Cuba now is communistic. A nuisance but not a deadly threat.

It is said we are merely fulfilling our obligations as a member of SEATO. But where are all of the other SEATO countries who should be vitally interested if there is any real merit in our being in Vietnam? Aside from token forces from Australia, the Philippines, and Korea, the SEATO countries are not there. Primarily because they are oriental and don't care whether our boys live or die. In other words, fight to the last American. The Buddhists and the rest of the people won't work together for a stable government in Vietnam. The oppression of the government of Ngo Dinh Diem and the subsequent murders are incontrovertible evidence. So maybe a lot of their people don't care who rules their country.

Personally, I am of the firm opinion that all of southeast Asia could go communistic, and our national interests, if we stay clear, will be benefited rather than impaired. As someone recently wrote—socialism (i.e., communism) and famine go hand in hand. Recently U.S. News & World Report pointed out that in 1964 wheat sales from Australia, Canada, and the United States of America fed one out of nine Communists. This may be a completely erroneous ratio, but under any ratio our food supplies are vital to them. On this basis, within 10 or 15 years most of southeast Asia and China and India, whether communistic or not, will be sorely in need of our help to avoid starvation because of the continuing population explosion.

If we can only be sensible enough not to become involved in Asia, it seems inevitable that within the next 50 years Russia and China will be fighting. My own guess is that it will be much sooner because of the Chinese exploding population which already is overflowing into territory adjacent to Russia. As you know, there have been reports of numerous local border skirmishes between Russian and Chinese military forces. Just give them time.

So, Mr. Senator, this one citizen and voter salutes you. May you continue your efforts to keep our draftees—and the Regular Army—from ending up as cannon fodder in a large-scale land war across the world where we should not be involved under any circumstances. We talk about the reluctance of the Chinese and other orientals to lose "face." But our own war hawks insist that we must keep face and not pull out under any circumstances. Far better that we admit we made a stupid mistake in taking such unilateral action instead of asking the United Nations to handle the matter and save many American lives.

When we read about the student protests against involvement in Vietnam, many of us automatically think of beatniks and communistic leadership. This undoubtedly is true in some cases. But maybe there is a large undercurrent of student opinion resentful about being forced to kill and be killed where America's vital interests are actually not at stake. Someday these same students may be the nucleus of a youth party which will carry a swing vote that will be essential to the Democrats and the Republicans. Let's hope that more of your colleagues will begin to utilize your own good commonsense in this matter.

Yours very truly,

——— ———.

WILMETTE, ILL.

HOMINY, OKLA.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for introducing legislation which would permit the sending of volunteers only to Vietnam. Your actions and expressed attitudes on the war in Vietnam makes the growing despair over the course the President has taken in Vietnam more bearable. I am writing to our representatives to plead for support for your bill.

I contend that American women have had no part in helping to shape foreign policy although they make up 51 percent of the electorate. According to a Harris poll in September, 1964, they were voting for Mr. Johnson on the issue of peace. The enclosed is a copy of a news item from Newsweek which I placed on the bulletin board in our Democratic headquarters during the presidential campaign. I helped organize our local Democratic women's club, and now serve as its reporter. I find no strong support here for our involvement in Vietnam, but mostly confusion and disappointment.

You have earned our praise and admiration for your actions on behalf of what we believe to be the true feeling of the American people. (According to Theodore White and other political experts war and peace was uppermost in their minds when they went to the polls in 1964.) The candidate who advocated doing what President Johnson has now adopted was repudiated by the American electorate.

Many of our young people are well aware that responsible members of our society, including the last three Presidents, have expressed the opinion that American boys should not be sent to fight as ground troops for the South Vietnamese Government. How cruel and inhumane are we in this Nation that we could force our young people to be sacrificed on the altar of national pride, because the measures undertaken by President Eisenhower in 1954 proved to be self-defeating?

As an American woman I feel betrayed by these policies which never had the American woman's hand in their making. The President and his advisers, some of whom never have had to go to the people for approval or disapproval, surely did not take into account the woman's point of view on war and peace. It was American women who first proposed voting rights for womanhood. I contend that they have come of age politically, and that a better foreign policy will emerge when their views become reflected in its making.

Yours very truly,

——— ———.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 28, 1966.

Senator ERNEST H. GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am writing to assure you of the gratitude of many of us who deplore the ugly war in Vietnam for your undaunted and principled opposition to the present Government policy.

I am sympathetic to the difficulties which political method opposes to uncompromised idealism; however, I feel, as you obviously do, that there are times when the immensity of a moral outrage overcomes the usual and various considerations which determine our actions.

Your proposed bill to send only volunteer draftees into Vietnam is welcome and forces the burden of decision on Congress in lieu of the declaration of war which President Johnson refuses to ask.

I believe that yours will be remembered as a voice of honor in a shameful period of American history.

Respectfully yours,

——— ———.

P.S.—No reply necessary or expected.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I want to thank you and pledge my wholehearted support for your resolution concerning the sending of draftees to Vietnam.

I think the entire issue of Vietnam should be taken to the United Nations. As long as the United States is in Vietnam with troops, planes, munitions, actively engaged in the struggle, it will be extremely difficult to work out any settlement.

If we have a commitment in Vietnam it is time that this commitment be reexamined in the light of world peace.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

SEATTLE, WASH.

Thank you again for your work for peace.

ASTORIA, OREG.,
January 27, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Greatness in a man is the trait which compels him to take what may be considered an unpopular stand because he has examined himself within and the issue from without. Such is yours on the issue of the draft as it relates to the Vietnam situation. I concur wholeheartedly with your analysis of the situation and will give you all the moral support possible. It is fortunate for the whole world that men such as you are willing to stand for what is right and are willing to be counted.

The demagogs may get you—but you are a man.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thank you for your stand regarding the Vietnam situation.

A recent article in the local newspaper tells of your three amendments, all designed to bar the sending of draftees to South Vietnam unless they volunteer for such services.

There is so little we at home can do, but to tell those of you working so valiantly to end this terrible war, that we are with you in thought and prayer.

——— ———.

NORTH NEWTON, KANS.

WEST ORANGE, N.J.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I want to commend you not only for your petition to the President to extend the bombing pause but also for your proposal to stop draftees from being sent to southeast Asia. It is indeed refreshing to hear a voice raised against the "consensus." As I have stated in letters to the President, there are many of us in consensusland who believe the United States is waging an unholy war against the Vietnamese. The tragedy of this war is that many innocents are losing their lives, both Vietnamese and American, because of decisions which are, at best, debatable. At least you have given me some hope that even if the war is to continue, there is a possibility that some lives can be spared.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thank you for proposing an amendment to bar the sending of draftees to South Vietnam unless they volunteer for such service.

Best wishes and heartfelt thanks for your work toward, as Walter Lippmann said (January 25, 1966), "liquidating a mistake, for ending a war that cannot be won at any tolerable price, for cutting our losses before they escalate into bankruptcy, and for listening to commonsense rather than to war whoops and tom-toms."

Godspeed.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The January 28 edition of the Cleveland Press stated that you and Senator WAYNE MORSE introduced legislation to forbid sending draftees to South Vietnam against their will without specific congressional approval. May we express our heartfelt endorsement of such a measure.

The same edition carried the letter signed by 15 Senators including our conscientious Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, asking the President not to resume bombing at this time, and a column by Henry J. Taylor stating that McNamara should resign "on his record in the big questions that really count most." The article was titled "McNamara Computers Missed on Ships." It is no wonder ordinary citizens are confused if those in the inner circle of the Government are not agreed on the issues involved let alone the solution.

Why should our finest youths just starting to live die for such a muddled cause? How can we contemplate an allout war with Red China if we are unable to get supplies and men to even one spot as Vietnam?

Please do all in your power to continue pressing for peace negotiations. You have the support and well wishes of many people who love their country and their sons and do not want either destroyed in a senseless war which will not solve any problems that cannot be solved more effectively and efficiently at the conference table.

Respectfully yours,

——— ———.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Tonight I heard that you and Senator MORSE are proposing a method of preventing the sending to Vietnam of men drafted into our Armed Forces. I support that proposal. I should like to see the defeat of all appropriations bills for the support of that illegal war.

I have informed my Representative that I shall not vote for anyone in the 1966 election who supports this monstrous war.

I hope Mr. Johnson's proposal to extend the term of office of Representatives will fail. I consider it a typical Johnsonian trick to upset the present balance of power which makes it necessary for Representatives to lend an ear to their constituencies at least once in 2 years if at no other time.

Yours truly,

——— ———.

ALBANY, CALIF.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator from Alaska,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: May I express my concurrence with the amendment which has been submitted prohibiting the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam. It appears to me that since this is a war not legally declared by the Senate and House of Representatives then each draftee should have the moral right to decide whether his services should be in Vietnam. If such a decision were possible I think it would surprise the administration as to the number of young men who are not convinced that the Vietnam conflict is necessary to the security of the United States and the peace of the world.

In my discussions with parents of boys of draftable age I have found none who feel that sending their sons to Vietnam is either necessary to the security of the United States nor the most desirable way to preserve the peace. This is a war into which we never should have gotten and to allow its escalation by sending hundreds of thousands of unwilling American boys to fight in Vietnam can only lead to a greater disaster.

A final and interesting comment concerning the publicity given your proposed amendment. It appeared, even in the liberal San Francisco Chronicle, on a back page while the testimony of Secretary Robert S. McNamara before the House Armed Services Committee was given front-page headlines. He reported that we had a missile force powerful enough to destroy both the Soviet Union and Communist China simultaneously. What a happy thought.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

ELKMOUND, WIS.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily support amendment limiting conscription without war declaration. Grateful for all your work toward negotiation.

——— ———.

Hon. Senator ERNEST GRUENING:

I read in January 26 newspapers of your proposed legislation to forbid sending draftees to Vietnam against their will, unless Congress specifically approves.

I am very much in favor of this legislation.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR: This clipping appeared in our paper last night and I just want to say that I really admire you for your stand on draftees. Our son (being married and an expectant father), has received his notice for his physical. This has been his second time that he has been called for a physical. He has a good position and is a good son and husband so you can see why we are in full accord on your stand. We hope and pray that you and others like you will be able to get this proposal through. Good luck and may God bless you.

——— ———.

TOLEDO, OHIO.

BAN ON ORDERING DRAFTEES TO VIETNAM PROPOSED

Asserting that he was free of a Presidential restriction imposed last August, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat of Alaska, introduced legislation today to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam.

Senator GRUENING said that President Johnson told him at a White House conference August 26 that "if we were not out of Vietnam by January, I would be free to do anything I pleased."

Senator GRUENING offered three separate amendments, all designed to bar the sending of draftees to South Vietnam unless they volunteered for such service or Congress later authorizes "the assignment to duty in southeast Asia of persons involuntarily inducted" into the Armed Forces.

He was joined by Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat of Oregon.

The proposals were offered as amendments to the pending $12.8 billion defense supplemental bill for Vietnam.

Senator GRUENING said that he told Mr. Johnson at the August 26 meeting that United States involvement in the Vietnam fighting was "folly—that it was a war we could not win—that continuation there would lead to greater and greater disaster."

"The President earnestly urged me not to introduce the amendment," Senator GRUENING said. "He said that in any event no draftees would be sent to Vietnam before January. After repeating his request that I take no such action, he said that if we were not out of Vietnam by January, I would be free to do anything I pleased."

NORTH ANDOVER, MASS.,
January 26, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I read, with the first faint ray of hope, this article enclosed, in yesterday's Lawrence Eagle-Tribune. As this horrible war in Vietnam escalates and our boys die in ever-increasing thousands, you seem to be one of the few in Washington who cares about that. We realize with horror that Washington does not want to end the war; it only wants to talk about ending it. If there were no money, there would be no war, yet Congress is forcing taxpayers to see their money spent to slaughter their sons—all that makes life worth living for them.

In November 1964 the people voted for what we thought was peace; the vote was overwhelming. It was the only issue. This secret and most accurate poll of all said that 61 percent of the voters, Republicans and Democrats alike, did not want a war in Vietnam. Yet Washington turned a deaf ear to this voice of the people. Why?

In less than 25 years we have had three wars. Our losses in World War II are still open wounds. Then came the fiasco that was Korea which produced 160,000 casualties and left things just where they started. Now Vietnam, the cruelest war of all—one that cannot be won by fighting and dying—a civil war. And our boys are being sent to senseless slaughter by the hundreds of thousands to die in rice paddies of a people who does not want us there, helpless pawns of a government which would not listen to the voice of the people. Perhaps Washington thinks it is fighting communism but with Cuba 90 miles off our shores and communism running rampant in South America and the Supreme Court ruling that Communists do not have to register in this country, it just doesn't make sense. At least the men in World War II believed in what they were fighting for but these helpless pawns do not have even that to sustain them.

Washington has its volunteers—the Reserves. They chose to join. Yet our boys are being forced (drafted) to die before they reach the age of 26—nothing but a foreign legion. They are yanked from college before the ink is dry on their diplomas (if they are lucky enough to be allowed to finish) and sent 9,000 miles from home to die for a cause in which neither they nor we have any belief. This slaughter is fomenting a volcano of anger and resentment among parents, black, white, and yellow all across the Nation. These boys are not machines which can be replaced. They are the dearest possessions of parents, their hope of any future.

A better life—medicare, jobs, money, housing, reduced taxes—we do want these things for our sons. Slaughter them and all our reason for living and working is gone. Only bitter resentment is left.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

BILL ALLOWS VIETNAM OBJECTORS

WASHINGTON.—Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, proposed legislation Tuesday to forbid sending draftees to Vietnam against their will without specific congressional approval.

The Alaska Democrat was joined by Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in sponsoring the proposal. The ban was offered in the form of amendments to legislation to provide more money and more economic aid authority for South Vietnam.

GRUENING and MORSE are two of the leading critics of U.S. policies in Vietnam.

Gruening said he had planned a similar amendment to the defense money bill last August but held off at President Johnson's urging.

However, Gruening said, the President "said that if we were not out of Vietnam by January, I would be free to do anything I pleased."

He said "more than 5 months have now elapsed. We are still bogged down in an undeclared war in Vietnam which threatens to escalate into a third world war and the price of which in any event in lives and others costs would be staggering."

Gruening said enlistees had no recourse but to go where they are ordered.

But an entirely different situation prevails when we reach into millions of American families and conscript these youths to fight involuntarily in this hopeless mess," he said.

Wappingers Falls, N.Y.,
February 7, 1966.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: I am a retired country newspaperman, a Democrat who shares your views about the southeast Asia involvement. It was most gratifying to be able to hear you express your views on the television Saturday afternoon when you appeared on the "Youth Wants To Know" program.

It seems to me that the President by usurpation of power beyond that given him by constitutional authority has put our country in the position of a violator of international law, to say nothing of the obvious violation of our Federal Constitution. Unless the Congress moves rapidly to exercise the powers vested in it by the Constitution we will be well along the road to totalitarian government.

I am heartily in accord with the bill you propose to introduce to forbid the sending of conscripts to Vietnam. It has always puzzled me how the entire conscription machinery squares with the 13th amendment which forbids involuntary servitude in the United States for any reason except for punishment for crime. Since the Government is the only authority empowered to punish crime (private individuals cannot) it would seem to spell out the limit of Government to require such involuntary servitude.

It is my opinion that in contradiction to the contention of the administration it is a minority and not a majority of Americans who favor this Vietnam involvement. Witness the tremendous concern evident in the columns of the daily newspapers, the demonstrations taking place everywhere and the tone of letters written to editors of newspapers. Surely the election of 1964, if it had any significance, meant that the people did not want to disturb the peace of the world as they feared a Goldwater victory might result in.

President Johnson, speaking in Hawaii, said yesterday that we were in Vietnam to see that South Vietnam emerged a free country with a free government. Who appointed the United States to this role? The concerned peoples agreed at Geneva on free elections to determine this matter with such elections to facilitate the unification of the Vietnams. Whence is the authority for the United States to determine the future of South Vietnam in particular. Are we not here similar to Russia in preventing the reunification of Germany?

Please keep up the work you are doing which strengthens the integrity of the Congress. Congress can keep in check this reckless, irresponsible administration, if it will, by withholding the funds which it must have to operate.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

Canton, Mass.,
February 3, 1966.

Senator Ernest Gruening.

Dear Sir: Please continue the good fight as to the decision of draftees as to whether they will fight in Vietnam or serve their country in some other way. I am strongly opposed to this bloody, futile war, and hope you will oppose it in every way possible.

Yours very truly,

——— ———.

Dublin, N.Y.,
February 1, 1966.

Dear Senator Gruening: Thank you for your courage in opposing this terrible reliance upon violence. God bless you and give you strength to continue your efforts toward peace.

We support you in your resolution to deprive the President of authority to send draftees to southeast Asia (see New York Times editorial, Jan. 31).

We must negotiate with the NLF and stop this evil war.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Lafayette, Ind.,
February 3, 1966.

Senator Ernest [illegible]ng,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: I am writing to express my strong support for your suggestion that the approval of the Congress be required before inducted servicemen be sent to Vietnam. It would seem to me that, in a situation where the Congress has not declared war, the public should, through its representatives, have the right of deciding whether or not large numbers of inductees are to be sent into battle. I would hope that you will press this point in the Senate.

In a war such as this to which a great many people are opposed, it would seem more just to use inducted men in support and supply positions rather than as combat troops. I am particularly opposed to sending married men to the frontlines. (Incidentally, I am not married myself.)

I also feel that any attempt on the part of the administration to expand the war must be strongly and loudly resisted. The arguments put forth in favor of our participation in this war are not very good, to say the least. Any enlargement of the present war can only result in an increase in the number of lives pointlessly sacrificed.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

New Haven, Conn.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: We would like to support your efforts to force discussion of the Vietnam war through your amendment to prevent draftees from being sent to southeast Asia without congressional approval. We are shocked by President Johnson's arbitrary use of power and lack of candor in the conduct of the war, and by the absence of congressional debate.

You are one of the few Senators who have earned the respect of the voters who elected them.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Baltimore, Md.,
February 4, 1966.

Dear Senator Gruening: I am writing to you because the Senators from my own State do not seem to be the least bit interested in their constituents opinions.

However, I have written to them asking that they give their support to your bill for keeping draftees in the United States.

You see my husband has been drafted, and I think I am pregnant, and I think that we deserve a future. If my husband is sent to Vietnam, the future doesn't look too good.

You and Senator Morse seem to be a rare minority in that you care about the people in the United States. President Johnson seems to care only about people in other countries and the poor people here.

Well, now that Charles has been drafted, I'll be poor, because the allotment isn't anything to live off of, and I work for the SSA, and the Government doesn't pay well either.

Today we listened to your interview with Senator Pell. It seems to be the first time an attempt has been made to give the people even a hint of what is really going on in Vietnam, and even after all the talk on the program, it still isn't clear.

Please keep trying to get that bill through and keep up the fine job you've been doing. I wish there were more Senators like you.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

London, England,
February 4, 1966.

Dear Senator Gruening: As Americans temporarily living in England where U.S. prestige is low because of our involvement in the Veitnamese war, we are proud of your continuing efforts to stop escalation of this terrible conflict.

We especially wish you well with your amendment providing that no draftees be sent to southeast Asia without congressional approval.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Palo Alto, Calif.,
February 6, 1966.

Dear Senator Gruening: I urge you to withhold your support for further war appropriations until open and complete hearings have been held.

I commend you for your continued and forthright opposition to this immoral and illegal war. Never in history has one nation been quite so wrong as are we, now.

Most sincerely,

——— ———.

Renton, Wash.,
February 4, 1966.

Dear Senator Gruening: We read about your amendment on not sending draftees to Vietnam.

We deeply appreciate your efforts in the behalf of our boys and also the poor people of Vietnam caught in a war that is not of their making and must be horrible beyond all imagination in this day of modern warfare.

We want to thank you again and also Senator Morse in your fight to bring some kind of reason to the world today.

Will you please convey our thanks to Senator Morse?

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Jericho, N.Y.,
February 2, 1966.

Dear Senator Gruening: I hope I spelled your name properly. Just want you to know that I am just one of the people out of many that are in favor of your bill which you sent to the legislature 2 weeks ago. Draftees should not be sent to Vietnam unless they volunteer.

We have not been a family who have shirked their duty to their country when it has been needed.

My father-in-law served in World War II. He had three Purple Hearts.

My husband was in the Battle of the Bulge. He has three Purple Hearts.

My 20-year-old brother was killed in World War II. He was an only son.

Both my brothers-in-law served in World War II. One stayed in the Air Force for 20 years.

My son was drafted in October. He was working 40 hours a week at the time. This was to enable him to go to night college and when he had enough saved to matriculate to days. Since his country needed him he had to put his plans aside. He made up his mind he would do the best he could for his country.

It is a heartbreak for every mother, father, grandfather and grandmother to see these young boys go. They might as well send us with them when they send them to Vietnam. We have been through so many years of war. If these young men were given a choice I don't think it would be quite so hard on the parents. I also think it might help to do away with some of the demonstrations we've been having especially with the college students. I know if my son was given the choice and it was his decision to go I would feel better because I would know this is what he wanted and believed in. A lot of the boys with my son have had quite a bit of college. It seems so horrible to be making foot soldiers out of them and sending them to the slaughter like this without a choice. Now for the ones that don't want to go, there are many other jobs they can serve their country doing. There is no declared war in Vietnam. Most of the draftees are fine young boys with good educations. Who is going to run this country 20 years from now? The way they are going, all that is going to be left here is the morons that the service doesn't want. It takes a lot of educated men to run a country like this as well as soldiers to protect it. I hope these boys are given a chance to make a choice. I sincerely hope like many other people your bill goes through.

Respectfully yours,

——— ———.

P.S.—When a draftee is sent by choice he can do more for his country than 10 that are sent by force.

SAN MATEO, CALIF.,
February 14, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I wish to express to you my sincere thanks for your amendments 481, 482, and 483 to Senate bills Nos. 2791, 2792, and 2793. I have written Senators KUCHEL and MURPHY from my State of California, urging them to support your amendments.

I have the firm conviction that it is dead wrong, grossly immoral, and diametrically opposed to the principle of constitutional, democratic government that our President should be allowed to send our soldiers into battle of the magnitude of that in Vietnam without specific authorization by the Congress. And it is high time that the terrible mistake of our deepening involvement in Vietnam be thoroughly examined, publicly, by the Senate, and all of Congress. The adoption of your amendments would force such an examination.

I also feel that it is high time that Congress and the President, and the administration, put a little less stress on the state of the economy and the stock market, and a little more on the sanctity of human life—even that of our alleged enemies.

Again, my sincere thanks to you, Senator GRUENING. Keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

BETHESDA, MD.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: For some time I have admired your forthright statements on the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Now I think you deserve commendation particularly for the introduction of legislation to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to South Vietnam. This is undoubtedly the most democratic and American move that could be made to help solve our difficulties there. If your bill should become law, we would all very quickly see who sincerely believes the sacrifices of American men and money in Vietnam are worthwhile. I thank God that there is a person of your intelligence and courage in the U.S. Senate.

I am writing to the Senators and Representatives from my own State of Maryland asking them to support your bill, and if there is any other way in which I could help you in your work I would be only too glad to do anything within my ability.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senator, State of Alaska,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I was greatly cheered to learn in the San Francisco Chronicle of January 26, 1966, that you have offered three amendments to bar the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam.

While I realize that the chance of any amendment of this type to be adopted is extremely low, I am happy to know that at least two Senators, you and Senator MORSE, represent my view on this question.

Very, recently, I attended a special meeting for parents at our church in which our minister explained the current draft law with regard to objectors. I came away deeply disturbed and angry after learning that, at present, the chances for an alternative to combat service are good if the boy is absolutely against war under all conditions; however, if he objects to the Vietnam war, but not to defensive war, he has only the choice of accepting military service or going to jail for 5 years with loss of certain civil rights following release.

I asked how this condition differed from that of a German boy's choice under Hitler or a Roman during the imperial period. Our minister felt that a 5-year prison sentence is a milder punishment than could be expected in Hitler's Germany or imperial Rome.

I am far from satisfied that the choice of surrender of conscience or surrender to prison is good enough for an American boy when our country is not at war, nor is being threatened in any way. To present to a boy at age 18 this requirement for corpse-like obedience is to deny freedom of thought and action that his teachers have trained him to consider his American heritage.

If a path consistent with justice and good conscience is not to be found, the result will be corrupting in some form. Passivity, resignation, cynicism, hostility, rebellion, outright disloyalty are examples of many negative attitudes that could develop from repressed conscientious dissent.

I think that a free America would not treat its sons this way because it is wrong to do so. I think that a strong America (able to destroy Russia and China simultaneously) should not destroy the spirit of its youth this way because it is unnecessary in view of these circumstances:

1. So far, President Johnson has not thought it necessary to ask Congress for a declaration of war.

2. The armed services have not considered that an emergency exists which requires calling up reserves.

3. Soldiers in Vietnam return to the United States when their enlistment is over (even just after arrival there according to reports) indicating that total exposure both to the Army indoctrination and to the Vietnamese situation has not convinced them that they have any duty in Vietnam that conscience dictates. (The French would not support a heavier draft during their period of fighting there even though the alternative was the loss of all of Indochina.)

4. I have never felt that the armed services and Congress have fully exploited the possibility of maintaining peacetime strength by voluntary enlistment. If we are to be a worldwide police force, our policemen should be recruited as are those in cities and States, by adequate inducements to compensate for risks and hardships involved.

Besides being both wrong and unnecessary to deny freedom of choice regarding service in Vietnam, this denial threatens the welfare of the United States. The alienation of a reluctant soldier, his family, friends, and sympathizers may harm the United States much more than the soldier could hurt the Vietnamese. Paul Potter has summarized the convictions of many less articulate when he declares that, "To live decently in this society, to do what you believe is right, is self-destructive." How much of this despair lies below the surface phenomena of drug use, sexual liberatinism, alcoholism, the defiant style of dress and appearance which offend and bewilder conventional people?

My only hope is that courageous men such as you and Senator MORSE will gradually persuade more people at all levels to your point of view and we will halt our drift toward our version of Roman imperialism before either internal rot or external reprisal have destroyed us.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

TRANQUILLITY, N.J.,
February 12, 1966.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I have delayed far too long in expressing my appreciation for your outspoken criticism of the administration's policy on Vietnam.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I am sending to the President. It is not necessary to rehearse any of the arguments which I have presented to him. Let me, simply, express my hope that you, together with some of your colleagues, will be able to find a way to convince the President that there is far more dissatisfaction with his policy than he seems willing to recognize; and, further, that the Senate will insist on reasserting the constitutional demand that Congress shall have a voice in determining whether or not this country shall carry on a war.

Let me, further, express my support for your amendment to prohibit sending draftees to Vietnam except as volunteers without the consent of Congress. I am sure, furthermore, that you will oppose any measures which Mr. Johnson can interpret as endorsement of, or support for, his policy, or as a blank check for further action.

Respectfully yours,

——— ———.

FEBRUARY 12, 1966.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: With millions of people in all parts of the world, I was encouraged by your action in taking the problem of Vietnam to the Security Council of the United Nations; and by your continued expressions of determination to seek for a negotiated end to the war. Inasmuch as American intervention has vastly exceeded in quantity and quality of troops and arms the intervention by North Vietnam, the United States may well take the initiative to set the example for radical deescalation of the conflict. I urge, therefore, that we deescalate the conflict and make clear our readiness to negotiate not only with Hanoi, but with the NLF as a principal party to any settlement, inasmuch as the war was originally, in essence, a civil war.

That there may well be risks in this, I recognize; but I am sure that they are not as dangerous as the certainties which are entailed by continued escalation of the conflict. For this reason, I deplore your order to resume the bombing in North Vietnam, as a threat to world peace. One thing has been demonstrated by this policy initiated a year ago: it has served, as nothing else has done, to solidify the Government of Hanoi and the people of North Vietnam in their determination to fight. That this could have been expected has been demonstrated again and again throughout history: e.g., in the response of England to the German bombing in World War II.

As our Government has repeatedly stated, throughout three administrations, in respect to various declarations by the U.S.S.R. concerning peaceful intentions, it must be actions, not words, that count. To declare that we seek peace while intensifying the war, can only result in our professions carrying no weight but being under suspicion. Declarations by the Secretaries of State and Defense, by the military, as well as your own statement, have interpreted our actions as being motivated, controlled, and made necessary only for the purpose of stopping the aggression and protecting the freedom of the South Vietnamese people. However, may I respectfully call your attention to the sequence of developments following 1954, which I am sure are quite familiar to you (although they have been frequently ignored or distorted in statements to the people) which do not substantiate our claims? Rather, aggressive military action by North Vietnam has been demonstrated (as in the facts of the white paper by the State Department last spring) to have been largely in response to our action.

Allow me, Mr. President, respectfully but most urgently to protest against the policy which our Government is pursuing in Vietnam, in spite of clear demonstration of mounting dissatisfaction with that policy, not only by the people at large but by many of the most competent leaders of your party in Congress. It is my conviction that to persist in our present course will not only lead to world war, but will earn for the United States the loss of respect of much of the world. It would be ironic, and unfair to you, with your demonstrated concern, and consistent efforts, for the kind of society which will make possible a better life for all men, if you should continue to be imprisoned by the kind of policy initiated by Mr. Dulles (and persisted in by Mr. Rusk). It was this policy which was a part of the total outlook which was repudiated by the people in 1960 and even more emphatically in 1964.

ORANGE, CALIF.,
February 9, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We fully support the legislation introduced by you last week and supported by Senator WAYNE MORSE, prohibiting the involuntary assignment of draftees to Vietnam. Let those who feel strongly about forcing American freedom on the Vietnamese people go forth and do the fighting. Those who feel it is an unjust war should not be forced to defend our freedoms on someone else's soil.

We feel the Geneva agreements should be lived up to and all foreign troops be withdrawn from Vietnam. Let them have their free elections as was proposed in the Geneva agreements, but let them be free of foreign intervention and domination. We are also in favor of foreign aid to Vietnam after our troops are withdrawn and some responsible person be in charge of administering the foreign aid so as to prevent the aid from getting into the hands of enemies of the people, so the people can rebuild their economy.

Yours truly,

——— ———.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 10,1966.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Allow me to congratulate you on your amendments to the Vietnam aid bill—that I understand would prohibit sending our fine young American boys into southeast Asia against their will, without the approval of Congress, inasmuch as the war there is not authorized by the U.S. Congress.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 5, 1966.

ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your amendment concerning the necessity of congressional approval for draftee shipment to Vietnam.

——— ———.

WINNETKA, ILL.,
January 26, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your proposal to make Vietnam service voluntary.

——— ———.

NEW YORK., N.Y.,
January 26, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you, bless you for your efforts to change backward, shameful, Rusk Vietnam policy. Your draftee idea is great.

——— ———.

NEWINGTON, CONN.,
January 29, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I read in the paper on how you don't want the draftees to go fight in Vietnam unless Congress approves. I hope you keep up the fight as all the mothers are with you 100 percent.

As a mother I am in favor of it as my son just left for the Army. It was just 22 years ago I sent my husband and brothers off to war. I never thought I'd live to see the day my son would be in uniform to do the job. I thought his father and uncles had finished the job. Our joy was short lived.

I am an American and if I could see why we are there maybe I wouldn't feel this way. But I have never had a clear picture of why we are in Vietnam.

We should clean up our own country of Commies before we try to do it somewhere else.

Everyone I have talked to and that is many people are not in favor of this conflict. When you say war they disagree with you as its a police action like Korea, they tell me. I told them to ask a mother who lost a son and see what she'd tell them.

Something else I can't understand is why we are there and not the United Nations. I thought that was formed to try and keep peace. How come we are the only country there. I thought that was the whole idea of it being.

They take a boy 18 or 19 away from home. He can't vote and his parents are responsible for him. Yet the Army takes him, sends him where they want to and the parents don't even know where. Is this the country that we fought so hard for or is this just something I imagined. Where my son is right now, I don't know. My husband has a heart condition and he is not to worry but he is as upset as I am only he don't want me to know.

You keep up with your good work and I hope God is on both our sides.

Yours truly,

——— ———.

YAKIMA, WASH.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your stand re: draftees. These men, my son included, are not unpatriotic, there are very few draft-card burners among them—they simply find themselves thrown into a so-called political war which somehow requires the presence of 400,000 men (projected) to enforce this political ideology.

My son, and dozens of others I know, go reluctantly, but with that indomitable spirit of indestructibility, that enviable assurance that come what may, each will come out all right. As you well know, this has not and will not be so—let the professional soldier, the volunteer—fight in Vietnam. Don't force our sons who have been drafted march involuntarily to their deaths in a land 12,000 miles away; a land they know and care little about.

As you know, our position in Vietnam is untenable, ill-advised and contrary to our democratic beliefs.

Please do all you can to enact legislation to keep our draftees home where they belong—with millions of trained men, we can then withstand, even overcome any overt acts of direct aggression.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

SENATOR ASKS DRAFTEE BAN IN VIETNAM

WASHINGTON.—Asserting he was free of a Presidential restriction imposed last August, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, introduced legislation today to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam.

In a Senate speech, GRUENING said President Johnson told him at a White House conference August 26 that "if we were not out of Vietnam by January, I would be free to do anything I pleased."

GRUENING offered three separate amendments, all designed to bar the sending of draftees to South Vietnam unless they volunteer for such service or Congress later authorizes the assignment to duty in southeast Asia of persons involuntarily inducted into the Armed Forces.

He and Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, offered the proposals as amendments to the pending $12.3 billion defense supplemental bill for Vietnam.

GRUENING said he told Johnson at the August 26 meeting that U.S. involvement in the Vietnam fighting was folly; that it was a war we could not win; that continuation there would lead to greater and greater disaster.

"The President earnestly urged me not to introduce the amendment," GRUENING said.

PACIFIC GROVE, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thank you for your part in challenging the President's authority, assumed under the southeast Asia resolution, to wage an expanding undeclared war in southeast Asia. Thank you also for your proposal to make service in Vietnam on a voluntary basis. (This does not affect me, as I am above the draft age—60.)

I have been grieved and concerned for a long time about our Nation's policies and actions in Vietnam. Reading Senator EDWARD KENNEDY's "Fresh Look at Vietnam" in the current issue of Look magazine has deepened my concern, and I hope it has that effect on his fellow Senators.

Respectfully yours,

———— ————.

MADISON, WIS.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: As potential draftees, and as citizens of the United States who are opposed to the war in Vietnam, we would like to give our full support to your amendment that would bar the use of draftees in this unjust and unnecessary war. When 200,000-plus soldiers are fighting in a war that has never been declared as such, the absence of any substantial senatorial criticism is truly criminal. It is heartening to see that you and a few others have the courage to stand up against this war.

We hope that you continue in your position, and defend it as adamantly as you have in the past.

Sincerely,

———— ————.

PORTLAND, OREG.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am writing to encourage you in your fight for your legislation to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam.

I certainly hope you will succeed in getting this legislation through at once and will thus give those who wish to fight in Vietnam, along with the regular military personnel, an opportunity to do so. Yesterday's Oregonian suggested that soon the Korean war policy would begin to operate here. It means simply that the lower half of the freshman classes at various colleges would be removed for the draft, and it would continue on up to the lower quarter of the junior class. This seems very unjust to me, and a bit insane, too. If a student is serious in his pursuit of a degree in a vital profession, why not allow him to complete his education first? Then let him take his place among the ranks, too, or use him wherever his education can do the most good. But in the meantime, why not use the reservists first who are being trained and paid to fight when needed?

I do hope your sane and just proposal, as well as your good judgment, will prevail.

Sincerely yours,

———— ————.

SWITZERLAND,
February 4, 1966.

Senator E. GRUENING,
The Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I should like to express my deep approval of your resolution to deprive President Johnson of authority to send draftees to southeast Asia. As the mother of an all too soon to be draft age son I am most personally interested in the draft situation. As an American citizen I am exceedingly distressed by the war in Vietnam which I consider an outrage against the people of that country and against the very principles for which we say we stand—brought about without the consent of the citizens and slowly and dishonestly escalated into catastrophic proportions.

President Johnson has ignored the justified demand from Hanoi to include the Vietcong in discussions and his peace feelers have come to naught—as was to have been expected. With the resumption of bombardments by the United States we have entered once again into a state of Alice-in-Wonderland logic—a topsy-turvey reasoning that we can save a country and its people by smashing them to death.

I hope you, and such honest and outspoken critics of current U.S. foreign policy as Senator MORSE, will continue to act for the establishment of peace and for the protection of innocent victims of this cruel war—both American and Vietnamese.

Very sincerely,

———— ————.

MILLBRAE, CALIF.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: A request. Will you please suggest a solution to the Vietnam problem that will appeal to American conscience.

I belong to a group called Concerned Citizens of San Mateo County. The group feels that if we had something that would really move the general run of Americans, we would go allout to contact people.

If I had something mimeographed on a card (about the size of a postcard)—it could be printed on both sides—I could carry 50 or so in my pocket and give them out each day. What do you think?

Sincerely,

———— ————.

P.S.—We could flood the country with a mail-in.

Mr. GRUENING. So, Mr. President, we are confronting perhaps the gravest crisis in the history of our Nation. I say "perhaps the gravest crisis" because, in times past, when our Nation went to war, there was a large degree of unity, there was widespread patriotic support, based on real and justified conviction that our safety, our lives, our way of life, and everything that America stood for and holds dear were in grave danger. Under those circumstances, our people willingly marched to war.

That is not the situation today in regard to southeast Asia. I repeat my view that our alleged commitment lacks reality, is not based on any sound foundation, is in violation of the Constitution. Now the myth that we were asked in there by a friendly government, and acceded to that request, that three Presidents have supported that commitment, and that it has become a solemn national pledge has been pretty well disposed of by elucidation of the true facts. These facts are that we asked ourselves in, that President Eisenhower did not promise, but merely offered economic aid—and that with many conditions, none of which were ever fulfilled—and that President Kennedy merely added to our advisory role by sending some 15,000 to 20,000 advisers. But it is only in the last year or so that we have sent our men into combat, that we have made war without a declaration of war voted by the Congress. The latest justification, now being refurbished, stems back to the SEATO treaty, in which it is alleged we made a commitment to do what we are doing.

But when one examines the SEATO treaty one finds that in the first place, we are in violation of that treaty, because in article 1, the very first article, it says:

> The parties undertake, as set forth in the charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

Therefore, as we have gone to war, as we have used armed force, we are in violation of the very treaty which is now invoked as a justification for our actions.

It is pleaded by those who use this SEATO Treaty as a later justification for action that article 4 says:

> Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any state or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

In other words, if we are to fulfill the obligations such as they are now alleged to be under the SEATO Treaty, we would have had to go to Congress and ask for a declaration of war, which we have not done, for that way, and only that way would we be acting "in accordance with" our "constitutional processes."

Consequently, this later argument, now dredged up, when the previous arguments are shown to be mythical, also falls to the ground.

It is a tragic situation for those of us who deeply love our country, who have been steeped in its ideals and traditions, to have to stand by and see the course we are following. That course can only lead to disaster. It is already disaster. It is time we confessed to error—the greatest, most tragic error we have made in our history—and use every decent means to get out at the earliest possible moment. Any withdrawal which will stop the useless slaughter of American boys and the killing of civilians would be preferable to continuation of the course in which we are now involved.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

AUGUST 20, 1965.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It was very good of you to see me yesterday and to give me the opportunity to present to you my views on the present situation in Vietnam.

Enclosed is a copy of the speech I had on my desk when I spoke to you yesterday. This was prepared for delivery yesterday and in it I offered an amendment to the defense appropriation bill prohibiting the sending of draftees, without their consent, to southeast Asia. You will recall I spoke to you twice about this, and that at your earnest request I agreed not to introduce this amendment.

In compliance with your wish, I shall not introduce this amendment at this time, although I feel deeply that at the very least the Congress should pass on the sending of our draftees into the war in southeast Asia.

However, as I suggested to you at our meeting, I strongly urge you to announce publicly that—at least until there has been a review of the entire situation after the Congress returns in January or unless a grave national emergency develops—draftees will not be sent to southeast Asia unless they volunteer for such duty. Such a public announcement from you would do much to reassure the people of the United States.

I was pleased to hear from both you and Ambassador Goldberg of the strenuous efforts to secure peace in southeast Asia. As I told you, I was particularly gratified to notice your clarification of your position since your Johns Hopkins speech. Your announcement at your press conference on July 28, 1965, that there would be no particular problem in bringing the Vietcong and the National Liberation Front to the conference table, as I had been urging for some time, was most reassuring.

I was also pleased to hear your changed stand on the reunification of Vietnam through internationally supervised elections as provided for in the Geneva Conventions of 1954. Of course, as I said, it is difficult to convince those with whom we are seeking to arrange a cessation of hostilities of our bona fides while we continue the bombing of North Vietnam.

With best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senator.

Exhibit 2

[Parade, the Washington Post, Jan. 30, 1966]

Universal draft. Young men the world over are facing the same problem: military conscription. Britain (alone of the great powers), India, and Pakistan are among the few large countries relying solely upon voluntary enlistment in this deeply divided world. Poverty is so rampant in India and Pakistan that there are more volunteers than military facilities to house, clothe, and feed them.

Elsewhere the rule is conscription. In the Soviet Union all youths 17 and 18 who have completed secondary school are inducted. Service ranges from 2 to 5 years with leave only for emergency or outstanding service. Pay is $3.30 per month. Israel, surrounded by hostile Arab nations, requires military training of all men and unmarried women, 18 to 26. Reserve duties are obligatory for men until age 49, for childless women until age 34. In Red China which has a virtually bottomless pool of manpower, every man according to Maoist theory, is considered a soldier. In South Vietnam all men, 18 to 35, face 3 years of military service. A large percentage of South Vietnamese conscripts desert each year. South Vietnam hires mercenaries to fight against the Vietcong. We support the South Vietnamese economy. Without us that country would go broke. Whether indirectly we are paying the South Vietnamese mercenaries is a question Washington declines to answer.

Certainly we have fought side by side with mercenaries, employed their aid and information. France, Germany, and Italy all use conscription to supplement their regular forces. In West Germany every youth at 18 is liable for 18 months of service. In France boys are drafted at age 19 for 18 months active duty, 40 months availability, 12 years of reserve duty.

On the U.S. borders things are not so stringent. Canada has no conscription. In Mexico the young man chooses a white ball or a black ball. The white ball permits him to perform his military service by marching each Sunday for a year. The black ball puts him in the barracks and regular army duty for 1 year. Argentina uses a lottery system to select the unlucky few.

Exhibit 3

Total Is Put Above 96,000—U.S. Aids Concerned: 1965 Desertions Up in Saigon Forces

(By Neil Sheehan)

Saigon, February 23.—About 96,000 men deserted from the South Vietnamese armed forces last year, a total equivalent to nearly half of the American force that has been committed to the defense of this country.

Actually the figure reported by the South Vietnamese Government was higher, but informed sources said it did not take into account the fact that some of the deserters had later reenlisted. In addition, the figures are considered less than completely accurate because of the crude administrative procedures of the Armed Forces.

Nevertheless, the sources said, U.S. military officials consider the desertion rate very high and are deeply concerned about it.

Total desertions for 1965 were put at 113,000. Of these, 47,000 were from the regular Armed Forces—Army, Navy, and Air Force—and 17,000 were from the Regional Forces, equivalent of the U.S. National Guard; 49,000 were from the Popular Forces, or local militia.

The sources could offer no specific reasons for the high rate of Government desertions other than the intensification of the fighting and a general war weariness that has overtaken the country.

Most of the men who desert, the sources said, do so either while still in training camps or while moving to their first assignments.

Figures were not available for desertions during 1964, but it was understood that they had been substantially below the 1965 figures.

Desertions from the regular Armed Forces nearly doubled during the last year, reaching about 14 percent of their total strength. Desertions from the 270,000-man army, which forms the great bulk of the regular Armed Forces, showed a gradual increase during the year. They ran near 18 percent of total strength in December.

The Armed Forces discharged 48,000 men for various reasons in 1965 and suffered 13,000 killed, 23,000 wounded, and 6,000 missing in action or captured.

OVERALL FORCE INCREASES

Despite the high desertions and other losses, the Government relied on intensive recruiting, more stringent conscription methods, and the return of wounded to duty to increase the overall strength of the Armed forces from 510,000 men in December 1964, to 571,000 in December 1965.

The regular armed forces, for example, inducted 114,000 men during the year—77,000 volunteers and 37,000 conscripts.

Most of the deserters were men who had originally volunteered for service. The Regional Forces and Popular Forces—two militia units heavily affected—are composed entirely of volunteers. A majority of men in the regular armed forces also enlisted.

Most deserters, qualified sources suggest, do not defect to the Vietcong, but return to their homes in the villages, go into hiding or drift into the cities to look for civilian jobs.

Vietcong defections to the Government during 1965 totaled about 11,000. No estimates are available for guerrillas who deserted from Government units and did not report to Government authorities, but the number is believed to equal only a fraction of the desertions from the Government armed forces because the Vietcong usually exercise tighter control over their areas.

FOE STILL OUTNUMBERED

Although Government forces still outnumber the enemy by more than 2 to 1, the Vietcong have shown an ability to increase their overall strength more quickly than the Government. The total enemy force increased in the last year from 103,000 at the beginning of 1965 to 230,000 in December.

About 20,000 troops were North Vietnamese regulars who had infiltrated the south since last winter. About 40,000 more are political and administrative workers who do little fighting.

In another report made available here today, a U.S. military spokesman said that in the week that ended Saturday, 83 American servicemen were killed in South Vietnam, 354 wounded, and 4 reported missing in action. Twelve South Koreans and Australians were also killed, 17 wounded, and 1 reported missing.

In the same period, 197 South Vietnamese troops were killed.

The Vietcong guerrillas suffered 1,357 dead and 122 captured, according to the spokesman.

Exhibit 4

[From the New York Times, Feb. 24, 1966]

McNamara Hints Call-Up of Reservists for Vietnam

(By Jack Raymond)

Washington, February 23.—Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara told Congress today that partial mobilization and a Reserve call-up would be necessary if the enemy in South Vietnam widened the war. The thrust of his remarks indicated he thought these actions would be required.

The Secretary pointed out, in a 220-page "posture" statement on U.S. global defenses, that the administration had not wanted to call Reserves, preferring to rely on the draft.

But he also called attention to growing strength of Vietcong and North Vietnamese regular army forces in South Vietnam and to what he described as Communist China's increasing militancy.

Mr. McNamara emphasized evidence that the Peiping Government had undertaken serious insurgency in Thailand, similar to that in Vietnam.

HEARING IN SENATE

Appearing before a joint session of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, he said:

"In view of the continued buildup of Vietcong and North Vietnamese forces in South Vietnam, we now believe we should be prepared to deploy promptly additional forces to that area if required.

"President Johnson has stated categorically that we will give our commanders in Vietnam all the resources they need to carry out their mission. The deployment of additional forces to southeast Asia would require some further increases in our force structure and military strength."

After outlining impending increases, most of which had been previously announced, Secretary McNamara went on:

"Although the President has repeatedly stated that the United States has no desire to widen the war in southeast Asia, we cannot preclude the possibility that our opponents will nevertheless choose to do so.

"Such a contingency would necessitate at least a partial mobilization including the callup of some or all our Reserve forces and the extension of active duty tours."

Mr. McNamara spoke to the Senate panels in closed session, but a censored transcript of his report was released. Annually it has constituted the most comprehensive review of U.S. foreign policies and military commitments and plans by any Government official.

As Mr. McNamara testified, the Pentagon announced a call to Selective Service headquarters for the drafting of 900 male nurses beginning in April.

The Defense Department said the conscription of male nurses was necessary because of additional medical services needed for the treatment of casualties from Vietnam and also because of the general increase in the size of the Armed Forces.

Selective Service headquarters announced that the first deadline for student registration for planned draft deferment tests would probably come in late April.

Selective Service said it expected to sign within a few days a contract with a testing agency to prepare qualification tests similar to those used during the Korean war.

In these tests students seeking deferment, who believe that their local draft board might regard their standing in class as too low to be considered "satisfactory" under the draft law and thus not warranting deferment, may take a test. Their grades on the test may be submitted as evidence of satisfactory educational progress.

DENIES TIMES REPORT

Secretary McNamara, who was accompanied to the Senate hearing by General Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, talked briefly to newsmen after a 2-hour morning session in the committee room.

He denied a report published in the New York Times on Monday that the United States had spread thin its trained military manpower because of the demands of the war in Vietnam and elsewhere. The defense Secretary, when questioned about the article, asked General Wheeler to comment first.

General Wheeler said he did not agree with the article but acknowledged that there had been what he called a "draw down" of some U.S. forces because of Vietnam.

Secretary McNamara then said: "It is absolutely false to say that we are overextended and that we cannot fulfill our military requirements.

"We have never been better prepared."

In his formal statement to the Senate committees, Mr. McNamara devoted a lengthy section to rebutting allegations of shortages of arms and other military equipment

After reviewing his logistics policies and reporting on experiences in the Vietnam war, the Secretary went on:

"This is not to say that every one of the tens of thousands of Defense Department supply points is without a single inventory shortage. Anyone who has had experience with large supply systems knows that somewhere, sometime, something will be lacking."

The question of shortages "must be viewed in perspective," he said.

"The acid test of our logistics system is the ability of our forces to take the field and engage in combat," he asserted.

"Never before has this country been able to field and support in combat so large a force in so short a time over so great a distance, without calling up reserves and without applying price, wage and material controls to our civilian economy."

In his assessment of the international situation, Secretary McNamara noted that "the focus of the U.S. defense problem has shifted perceptibly toward the Far East."

He emphasized time and again the administration's concern over Communist China. In his report he included an appendix containing excerpts of a policy statement by the Communist Chinese Minister of Defense, Lin Piao, last September and quoted Secretary of State Dean Rusk's characterization of it as being "as candid as Hitler's 'Mein Kamp.' "

The war in Vietnam is a test case in a Communist Chinese "version of the so-called wars of national liberation, one of a series of conflicts the Chinese hope will sweep the world," the Secretary told the Senators.

Were the effort to bring about Communist takeover through "subversion, political assassination, and other forms of terrorism" successful in Vietnam, Mr. McNamara said, Peiping would "move forward with increased confidence and determination" elsewhere.

"Indeed," he said, "even without such a success, Communist China already has named Thailand as its next victim."

The Secretary described the insurgency start in Thailand as follows:

"A Thailand Independence Movement and Thailand Patriotic Front have already been established. The first is, apparently, intended to be the equivalent of the Vietcong and the second of the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam. Large sums of Thai currency have been purchased by Peiping in Hong Kong, and the study of the Thai language is now being emphasized in Communist China.

"In recent months a number of village officials and policemen have been assassinated in the northeastern areas of Thailand. Clashes have occurred with small bands of armed Communists, seemingly well equipped and trained; and a Voice of Free Thailand radio station has apparently been established in Communist China. Obviously the apparatus for the war of liberation in Thailand is being created."

Mr. McNamara said that the Soviet Union's leaders "fully appreciate" the perils of local wars that might escalate to nuclear war and that he believed the Communist Chinese were "reluctant to challenge the full weight of our military power."

"But it is clear," he said, "that we have yet to convince the Chinese Communists that their new drive for world revolution, using what they euphemistically call people's wars, will not succeed. But convince them we must."

He repeated his conviction that if Peiping's "challenge in southeast Asia" were not met the United States would be confronted with it later "under even more disadvantageous conditions."

He emphasized the administration's readiness to "cope with any further escalation of the conflict on their part" and at the same time its readiness "for a just settlement."

"But we have no intention of negotiating the surrender of South Vietnam," he said.

Mr. McNamara hinted that Communist China's aggressive attitude and her developing nuclear capability might compel the United States to develop and install an antimissile defense system geared to a nuclear attack threat from Asia.

The Defense Secretary has been doubtful in the past on proposals for establishing an antimissile defense system against a Soviet nuclear threat, on the ground that it would prove prohibitively expensive for the defense it would provide.

However, it has been indicated that he believes an antimissile system against Communist China might be feasible because of the more rudimentary nature of the Peiping government's nuclear arsenal.

Mr. McNamara in other portions of his military planning treatise indicated he was considering recommending three rather than one more nuclear-powered aircraft carrier. He also disclosed plans for purchases for the Air Force of the Navy's A–7 attack aircraft as a weapon in Vietnam.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, do I understand the burden of the Senator's argument to be that we should send the Reserves before this Nation sends any more draftees, or is his argument that we should not send anybody?

Mr. GRUENING. My argument is that we should not send the draftees without the consent of Congress. That is all my amendment does.

I think it is about time Congress took a little responsibility for involvement down there, and that is what my amendment seeks to accomplish.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My feeling was that we gave the President the authority when we authorized him, in August of 1964, to take whatever steps he found necessary to resist aggression in that area of the world. That was certainly, in my judgment, broad enough to cover putting troops in there, when the North Vietnamese sent their troops in.

The Senator has dwelt at considerable length on the question of the Reserves, and I just wondered if he is advocating that the Reserves be sent; or is he advocating that neither Reserves nor draftees should be sent?

Mr. GRUENING. I am not advocating the method of fighting this war. Secretary McNamara, in the hearings before the Armed Services Committee, stated—and I have read extracts from the hearings—that there was very little likelihood of their being sent.

That was only a few weeks ago, and yet today a leading front page story in the New York Times indicates that he has changed his mind.

I am not prepared to argue that this is desirable or undesirable. I am sticking to the fact which is the basis of my amendment, that I think that Congress should take a position on the matter. I think we should vote it up or down; and that Members of Congress should have a greater inclusion.

As the Senator from Louisiana knows, I was one of two Senators who voted against that resolution at the time of the Tonkin Gulf incident. I have no criticism of my fellow Senators who did not agree with me, but I think there is no question but that a great many Senators—and I think the Senator from Louisiana will agree with me—who voted for that resolution did not realize at the time that it would involve such a large escalation and increase of activities.

There are many Senators who would like to have a reaffirmation of the power of the President, or some variation to bring that authorization up to date.

I do not know whether the Senator from Louisiana anticipated such a large involvement as a result of his support of the resolution.

Maybe he did. Maybe he was more foresighted than others, but I think the issue now is that the draftees, at least in my judgment, are in a somewhat different category from those who entered the service voluntarily, have been paid for it, and are now part of what we might call the regular Military Establishment. If Congress decided it wishes the draftees to go, then it should vote accordingly. If Congress does not decide it wishes the draftees to go as volunteers, then it should vote accordingly. My amendment is an effort to get Congress to express itself and to participate in this great and vital, major undertaking that we have got into.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator has stated that this is an illegal war. Is he familiar with article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which explicitly states that nothing in that charter denies any nation the right of collective self-defense until such time as the Security Council of the United Nations has acted and taken steps to relieve that necessity of collective self-defense?

Mr. GRUENING. Before we get to article 51, there are articles 1, 2, 33, and 38 which forbid the use of armed forces in situations of this kind. I also wonder whether the Senator means that this is a war of self-defense for the United States. I do not consider it so. I believe that we have intruded into another country which is taking part in a civil war and we are fighting their war in a civil war. The question of self-defense is not involved in the slightest degree, in my judgment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Article 4 of the SEATO Treaty and the protocol to the SEATO Treaty which refers to article 4 are definitely collective defense arrangements to which we are committed. We are there in compliance not only with that treaty but also in compliance with a resolution which Congress passed last year. The Senator from Alaska voted against that resolution. That was his privilege. Since that time, he has made speeches against it about once a week. Sometimes he has done so once a day ever since he voted against it.

Mr. GRUENING. I believe that the Senator from Louisiana overestimates my capacities.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The vote on the resolution was voted by 416 to 0 in the House, and 88 to 2 in the Senate. The Senator was one of the two who voted against it, and has since spoken against it. This vote represents 99 percent of Congress, yet at least approximately once a week and sometimes once a day, sometimes twice a day, the Senator from Alaska has spoken against it.

Mr. GRUENING. That is because there were 504 votes on the other side.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The overall vote exceeded 99 percent. Congress passed its resolution in both Houses and it was signed by the President. We said that we feel the SEATO Treaty applies here, that this is a collective defense treaty, and that we are obligated to help these people who are defending themselves. We also said that the President should take whatever steps he deems to be necessary to resist aggression in the area.

When we said that, we gave the President a mandate to do whatever would be necessary to resist aggression. When the North Vietnamese troops marched down, we felt—and I feel now and am ready and prepared to say so—that the overwhelming majority of Congress had exactly that kind of mandate for the President in mind that when the North Vietnamese marched in their troops, that the President has the power—indeed, the duty—to resist aggression and to send in our troops if he thought it to be necessary to meet that aggression.

The Senator from Alaska has declared that this war is illegal. Is he familiar with the fact that outstanding law professors of international law, at Harvard, Yale, and in schools all over the country, signed a resolution some time ago declaring that in their minds there is no doubt that not only is U.S. action in compliance with the United Nations Charter, but it is also in compliance with our obligations under the SEATO agreement, and in compliance with the resolution of Congress?

The President did not even really need the resolution. He had the power anyway as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. Presidents have done that more than 125 times in the history of the country—even in the absence of a congressional declaration, or a treaty requiring us to do so.

Mr. GRUENING Let me say, in response to the Senator's comments, that there are a great many lawyers in this country who regard it as unconstitutional and illegal. I placed a brief in the RECORD a few days ago, signed by a number of distinguished law school deans, to which I invite the attention of the Senator from Louisiana. But, let us go back to the claim that the SEATO Treaty justifies what we are doing.

Article 4 states in part:

> 1. Each Party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the Parties or against any State or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

We are not meeting in accordance with the constitutional process. Our Constitution provides that only Congress can declare war. That we have not done. Another thing, this is supposed to be a collective defense treaty, but where are the cosigners? France is not there. They are violently opposed to it. Pakistan is not there.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. How about the other five countries? They are there.

Mr. GRUENING. They are there, feebly and belatedly, after much prodding on our part. They did not come in jointly with us at the beginning. We did not call any meeting of the seven nations saying, "Come on, boys, let us go in together." We knew they would not go along. It took us all these years to get those few nations to make token contributions.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let us discuss the legality of what we are doing in Vietnam. A few days ago the American Bar Association considered the question. A distinguished Member of this body suggested on television that our conduct was immoral, illegal, and that America was an international outlaw.

The American Bar Association is supposed to understand this sort of thing; and after studying the problem they voted 279 to 0, if I recall correctly that what we were doing in Vietnam was entirely legal, in line with precedents, in line with international law, and in line with the charter of the United Nations. They specifically referred to article 51, which states that nothing whatever in the U.N. Charter would deny the right of self-defense, individually or collectively.

This is collective self-defense we are talking about.

The Senator from Oregon has not seen that resolution. I read somewhere in the press, that the Senator from Oregon said that the whole group which had agreed unanimously should take a refresher course in international law.

Well, now, if they are going to have to take a refresher course in international law, where would they go to take it? I hope they would go to an outstanding university where they teach international law.

Mr. GRUENING. I will tell the Senator where they could go, to some of the law schools whose deans have taken the opposite position.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator may state that there are deans of law schools who are opposed to the U.S. position, but the Senator knows that there are not many schools which teach international law. I happen to be a graduate of Louisiana State University. We do not practice much international law down there. At LSU we do not teach it. Thus, if you wish to study international law, you have to go somewhere else, or buy a law book and read about it. If you want to study international law, a good place would be Harvard. They have been teaching it there for a great many years.

Here is the professor of international law at Harvard—he teaches international law—and he wrote a second letter to the President reaffirming his position, that what we are doing is entirely legal, and that the unanimous vote of the American Bar Association, 279 to 0, is correct. Here is a man who teaches international law at Yale University. That is a good law school. They teach international law there. They agree with us.

Here is a fellow who teaches international law at the University of Michigan. I know about that university. I have read their Law Review many times.

Here is a professor who teaches international law at the University of Virginia, where they have taught international law for a considerable period of time.

Thus, when we really get down to it, if we are to take a refresher course in international law as was suggested to the entire American Bar Association—I repeat, the entire American Bar Association—we had better not go back to law schools that have a longstanding reputation in the field, or we will have to be prepared to be in disagreement with the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GRUENING. Let me ask the Senator from Louisiana, was it not the American Bar Association from which the Chief Justice resigned in disgust a few years ago?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me say to the Senator from Alaska, if he has any doubts about the matter, I wish he would make some effort to see what the Chief Justice thinks about the issue here, because he was on television last night applauding the President—I saw it with my own eyes—when the President was making his speech in support of this Nation's position. Whom else is the Senator from Alaska going to rely upon besides himself and one other Senator? There is hardly an international lawyer in America who agrees with him.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator from Louisiana does not know many lawyers, then. There are many who disagree.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I know a great number of them. Let me say to the Senator that there are several right here in the Senate. Two-thirds of Senators are lawyers. Sitting in the Chamber at this moment is the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], a distinguished Senator and a distinguished judge. He is sitting right beside me.

I had occasion to be a delegate to the United Nations to consider these matters. All the Senator has to do is to read article 51 of the United Nations Charter, and he will see very clearly that we have a right to engage in collective self-defense.

That is what the treaty permits, so far as United Nations Charter is concerned. Some have suggested that the issue be taken to the United Nations. All right. We knew that very little would be achieved, but we did go up there.

What was achieved? That and zero are the same thing. That being the case, we have the responsibility to maintain our position in Vietnam.

Does the Senator want to respond? He had the floor. I will yield to him to respond.

Mr. GRUENING. I shall be glad to respond to anything the junior Senator from Louisiana wishes to have me respond to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Might I suggest to the Senator that what the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] suggests is what could properly be described as a surrender at Washington resolution. It is said that the French were not defeated at Dienbienphu but at Paris, because the French Government did not have the courage to give their courageous volunteer fighting men the help they needed. They would not draft men to send there. They had a number of courageous volunteers who were fighting there for the honor and position of their country. But when they were surrounded, no one else came to help the French troops who were already there.

We have sent to South Vietnam some of the finest fighting men in the uniform of the United States, some of which divisions have fought for the United States ever since its foundation, practically. The 1st Division is as old as the country. The 1st Cavalry is practically as old. The 1st Marine Division is an old division. We have the 101st Airborne Division there. We have some special forces. The 25th Division is there. These are among the best fighting men we have ever had.

I would be embarrassed to have Congress vote that these divisions, which have never been defeated, when they might be confronted by an enemy force, would have no help coming for them if help were needed. It would be a great disservice to men in divisions that marched behind George Washington, to those whose division raised the flag at Mount Suribachi on Iwo Jima—a monument commemorating that battle is close by across the Potomac River—to say that no help would be sent them if they were confronted by an overwhelming force. That would not be in accordance with American traditions, because we do not run out on our allies, and certainly we do not run out on our own boys.

Mr. GRUENING. I think the sequel, the subsequent remarks of the Senator from Louisiana, are not particularly pertinent to the subject we are discussing. We are discussing the issue of whether draftees shall be sent to South Vietnam without consent of Congress. I do not question the gallantry or the courage, and all the rest of the superlative qualities, of our men who are there. That is admitted. Nobody questions that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. How about the draftees who are there now? Suppose they were confronted by overwhelming odds, by an overwhelming number of men who came down from North Vietnam and surrounded them, as happened to the French at Dienbienphu. This country is 190 million strong. Does the Senator propose to leave those men there when they are faced with superior numbers, and say we will not send them any help?

Mr. GRUENING. That is not the issue. They should not have been sent there.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But they are there. The Senator would not have sent them there. He voted against the resolution. But they are there. They are our own boys. Are we to leave them there to be surrounded by superior enemy forces?

Mr. GRUENING. Nobody is going to leave them there. That is not a relevant argument.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is saying, "We will send no more boys." If they are surrounded, what will we do?

Mr. GRUENING. No; I say Congress ought to stand up and be on record, and if they want to send more boys, vote against the amendment. My idea is that Congress should be on record on an issue of this importance. The only thing on record is the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, which many Senators voted for not knowing what it meant.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let us see what the Senator's amendment provides. Am I to understand the Senator is saying that no boys will go over there unless they volunteer? So if a wife or mother says, "Don't go, don't go, particularly don't go, because if you do nobody will help you," what do we do with the boys who are left over there? Does the Senator want to get the boys out of there as fast as they can get out, turn tail, or will they have to stay there without help and die for their country which is capable of sending 100 times their number if need be? Are we going to say that we are not going to help men in the 1st Division, the 1st Cavalry, the 1st Marine, the Airborne troops, if they are faced with an overwhelming force, and, if they are surrounded, leave them, as the French left their troops at Dienbienphu, or would the Senator rather say that we are a nation of 190 million people, and an enemy should not take us on unless he realizes that we are strong and have the courage to stand behind our fighting men?

Mr. GRUENING. We have more than 300,000 troops in Europe, who are trained, many of whom have enlisted, and they could be sent. That is what an explanation of this proposed amendment will show. Nobody wants to do what the able Senator from Louisiana is suggesting. Nobody wants to leave those boys there.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I was at Fort Polk a couple of weeks ago. I saw some of these boys being trained. Many of them were 20 years old. I felt a little sorry for them, thinking how young they seemed. But then I did not feel so sorry when I remembered that my crew which volunteered to take the first boat of its kind to the beaches of south France in World War II, was about the same age at the time.

As a reservist myself, when I saw some of these young men, sorry though I may have felt, I would not want to take any of them on in a free-for-all fight, because they are to the man well able to take care of themselves.

They are not *timorous*. They are satisfied they will be successful.

The only thing that would worry them would be to have Congress adopt a law that would result in leaving them there and having them decimated, as the French were in Dienbienphu, when the French Chamber of Deputies did not have the courage to draft men to send over there.

Mr. GRUENING. I would like merely to reply that there would be no question of the united, 100-percent support of any action necessary to defend our country. We are not, in my judgment, defending our country. We have barged into a country which, we are told, has had 96,000 desertions from their own forces, and to defend that country we are sending our own troops to take the place of the deserters from their own country. That is all I am talking about.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ERVIN. I rise to ask a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alaska yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. GRUENING. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. ERVIN. Well, then I shall ask my question of one and all. I had the honor at one time of wearing the red "1" patch of the First Division on my left shoulder. The boys who belong to that division now are fighting in Vietnam. They were sent there by the Government of the United States. What I am interested in is giving those boys whatever help they need. What I want to know is when I am going to be given the opportunity to vote to aid them.

If the Senator from Louisiana can answer that question, I would certainly appreciate it, because I have two speaking engagements in North Carolina tomorrow. I am supposed to attend a Jackson Day dinner in North Carolina on Saturday also. I wonder whether I should stay here in order to vote to aid those boys who wear the red "1" on their left shoulder, or whether I can keep those speaking engagements, and attend the Jackson Day dinner.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I wish I could say to the Senator that we will vote tonight, or right now. However, those who oppose the position of their Nation do not appear to be willing to vote. They want to make more speeches. They certainly have that privilege, as the Senator well knows.

From a parliamentary standpoint, the amendment has not yet been offered. I wish the amendment were offered, so that I could speak against it and vote against it. It is inappropriate to speak against an amendment that has not been offered, and certainly one cannot vote against it until it has been offered.

One cannot even move to table the amendment until it is offered. I hope the Senator from Alaska will offer his amendment. He said he wants to go on record on this subject. I want to go on record, too.

Mr. GRUENING. It will be offered.

Mr. ERVIN. I share the position of the Senator from Louisiana on the amendment that has been suggested by my friend from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. Personally, I can see no reason for drafting men into the armed services if they are not to be sent to fight.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My reaction to this whole matter is shared by the people of the State of Louisiana. Many of them are confused as to how we got there, but they say, "While I do not understand how we came to be there, the fact is we are there."

My people say that we should either go all out or get out. The people say they prefer to go all out. The men have not been defeated, and they say that if our Nation's honor is committed, go ahead and fight. They believe in fighting to win, not fighting to lose. Americans do not surrender if they have not been defeated.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have not supported many of the foreign aid programs, which were passed on the theory that someone else will fight for us when the chips are down. I have not been in favor of the United States policing the entire universe.

The question before Congress now, as I see it, is not whether we ought to be in South Vietnam. As Grover Cleveland would say, we are confronted by a condition, not a theory.

We are there. Our boys are there. As I see it, the American Government and the Congress should give them all of the support they need. When all is said, there is only one of three things we can do. The first is to settle the controversy in South Vietnam by negotiation. Apparently the President has been willing to negotiate with anybody on the face of the earth, but nobody who can put an end to the fighting is willing to negotiate. Hence, negotiation is out the window for the time being. We have only two alternatives remaining: one is to fight and the other is to withdraw.

I believe that if we were to withdraw from South Vietnam, all of Asia would fall into the hands of the Communists. We then would be confronted by the questions of whether we would stand and fight in Japan, whether we would stand and fight in the Philippines, or whether we would stand and fight in Malaysia or in Australia, or whether we would ultimately have to fight, on the American mainland to defend our liberty.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Illinois. The Senator from Illinois stepped out. He may be back shortly.

I believe the Senator asked a proper question to get an answer as to what the Senator thinks the prospects are so far as the schedule of Senators is concerned on this debate.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and I had a conversation this morning, at their request, as to what we thought the prospects are of having a final vote on this matter.

I am certain the Senator from Louisiana would not think it improper for me to disclose that it was pointed out by the minority leader—and that is why I wish he were here—that several Senators on their side and several Senators on this side, whom we all know about, are not going to be here tomorrow and Saturday.

I had said yesterday, and I meant it then and I mean it now, that if the bill went through its regular course of debate, the probabilities were that we could vote by the end of this week. I thought so then. I do wish to say that after the colloquy on the floor of the Senate yesterday I was quite surprised to learn that there are substantially a larger number of speeches to be given on the bill than I was aware of yesterday, when I said in the regular course of debate that we could probably vote this week.

But even taking those speeches into consideration, I wish to say to the Senator from North Carolina, I am just as certain as I can be of anything that has uncertainty connected with it—and in debate on the floor of the Senate there is always some uncertainty as to the length of debate—I cannot imagine going beyond Tuesday night on the assumption that because of the absentees on Saturday there probably would not be a Saturday session. But that has not been decided yet, as the acting majority leader will probably tell us in a moment.

Inasmuch as I have been involved in this debate as one who is considered to be among those opposed to the bill, the Senate is entitled to know my plans. My plans are to make my major speech tomorrow. As soon as we call for a quorum it will be a signal for the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to come to the Chamber to make his major speech this afternoon. I believe there are one or two other speeches today.

Then, I intend to present my amendment on Monday because I have been assured Senators will be back on Monday. I am willing to have my amendment brought up on Monday.

The difficult matter, the so-called delicate matter, is that some would like to have a unanimous-consent agreement to fix the time to vote. I will not agree to that. A matter of the historic importance of this bill should be handled in regular debate. I will be no party to dilatory tactics. If there ever is any indication that anybody is engaging in filibuster tactics, I will sign a cloture petition.

After this matter is decided and Congress speaks, there is no question that we have to proceed to see to it that our supply lines are maintained.

I believe the Senator from Louisiana will not think that I am in any way violating any confidence when I say that the information presented to us from the administration is that right now there is no shortage of supplies. But one cannot go on indefinitely without having shortages of supplies, and no one could justify that situation.

Limiting myself to the matter of schedule, it is my suggestion for whatever it is worth, that we proceed with debate today and tomorrow. I will offer my amendment on Monday, and we can proceed with whatever discussion there may be. I will have bespoken myself on the amendment on Monday. It will take me only 5 or 10 minutes to recapitulate.

Then, I assume the Senator from Alaska will offer his amendment. There may be other amendments. I do not know. I cannot imagine not having this disposed of by Tuesday.

Mr. ERVIN. I fully understand the position of the Senator from Oregon. I believe that the safety of our Republic is dependent upon Senators standing on the floor of the Senate and expressing their honest convictions concerning matters pending before the Senate.

For this reason, I do not advocate prematurely setting any time for voting.

I believe that so long as a Senator feels he has something to say which his conscience dictates, it is not only his right, but his duty, to say it.

In view of what the Senator has said, could we reach some agreement not to vote before Monday? Such an agreement would not forestall debate or interfere in any way with adequate presentation on both sides of this matter?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the suggestion that the Senator from Louisiana urges most strongly is that if Senators wish to make speeches to please come to the Chamber and make the speeches.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has been most considerate on many occasions when he felt that he wanted to discuss something at considerable length and felt that it might inconvenience other Senators in getting on with bills that they were trying to have passed. He would, on occasion, come to the Chamber on a Friday afternoon and talk at considerable length.

I remember when the Senator from Oregon was the lone spokesman for the Independent Party of the Senate. I volunteered to sit in the Chamber on Friday afternoons because I know a lot of people like to go away and have a long weekend—as part of the TGIF crowd, "thank God it's Friday"—and like to get away ahead of the crowd to take a weekend rest.

The Senator from Louisiana volunteered to preside and to listen to the Senator's speeches. I thought they were good speeches. I learned something from them. Even when I did not agree with the Senator from Oregon, his speeches were still good speeches for his point of view. He made his record without impeding the conduct of the Nation's business.

It is not within the power of the majority leader or the minority leader to compel a large number of Senators to be present to hear speeches. If Senators become interested and their attention is attracted, perhaps they will stay; but it is not in the province of the leaders to compel other Senators to come to the Chamber to make speeches or to hear speeches made by other Senators.

The speeches appear in the RECORD. If a Senator makes a good speech, other Senators will read it. If it is not a good speech, they will make short shrift of it. If it is an impressive speech, it will attract the attention of the Nation, even though a relatively small number of Senators were in the Chamber.

The debate on the pending bill has been going on for many days. The bill has been before the Senate for 2 weeks. We have been debating it for 7 days on the Senate floor. If Senators desire to make speeches, they should come to the Chamber and make them. They ought to be willing to make them today or tomorrow.

If a filibuster is not taking place, Senators should not insist that a quorum be present to hear their speeches on Saturday. Senators ought to come to the Chamber and make their speeches. The bill has been before the Senate for 2 weeks. It was announced 3 days prior to its consideration that it would be the next measure to be taken up. Senators should not require additional time to compose their remarks; they ought to be ready to come to the Chamber and speak on behalf of their position. If they wish to take a stand one way or the other, they ought to come to the Chamber and take it, so that the Senate can reach a vote.

The bill was taken up following the conclusion of a successful filibuster. Now Senators are holding up the consideration of other important bills. Another urgent bill will shortly be reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations. The tax bill now in the Committee on Finance will be reported next week. The Government loses $8 million every day that Congress fails to pass the tax bill that will help to pay not only the cost of the war in Vietnam, but also the cost of the Government in general.

So once again, I say that if Senators wish to make speeches, they ought to come to the Chamber and make them. I hope the Senate will remain in session until 7 o'clock tonight. I shall endeavor to be present. Senators who wish to make speeches should not continue to hold up authorizations and other measures that are needed to help our boys who are fighting for our country today and our allies who are seeking to come to our aid.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I am not in disagreement with anything the Senator from Louisiana has said. I do not desire to make a speech on the floor of the Senate, but I have assumed the obligation of making two speeches in North Carolina tomorrow. All I am trying to find out is whether I can go to North Carolina and make the speeches, or whether I should cancel them.

Furthermore, I told the Senator from Louisiana a moment ago that as one who at one time had the honor of wearing the big red "1" on my left shoulder, I am ready to vote at any time the circumstances permit to send aid to the boys of my old division who are fighting in Vietnam.

I am also interested in getting some strength for the Democratic Party in North Carolina. A Jackson Day dinner is scheduled in Raleigh on Saturday. I am trying to find out from the Senator from Oregon whether, in his judgment, there is any possibility of a vote being taken on this issue, or any amendment to it, prior to Monday.

I merely wondered whether the Senator from Louisiana, as the assistant majority leader, and also as acting majority leader, would not reach a unanimous-consent agreement that there would not be a vote on this issue before Monday. If he should do so, I could make some speeches, not on the Senate floor, but in the great State of North Carolina.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I cannot give the Senator from North Carolina any such assurance, but I can make a pretty good prediction of what is likely to happen in the next couple of days. I cannot give the Senator any assurance because, so far as I am concerned, we ought to be voting on the measure—if Senators will seek to press for a vote to bring an end to talking—so that people around the world will know where we stand on this issue.

But it is not within my power to make Senators stop talking. That being the case, we are in for more conversation. The Senator from Oregon has informed us that he wishes to speak on this subject. I heard by the grapevine that he is thinking about talking for 10 hours. I am fully confident that he can talk that long; I have heard him do so. If the Senator from Oregon plans to make a 10-hour speech tomorrow, my view is that the Senator from North Carolina can safely go home.

Mr. MORSE. That grapevine had no grapes on it. I have no idea where anyone got the idea that I was planning to speak for 10 hours.

Mr. ERVIN. Perhaps the Senator from Louisiana can help me out of a quandry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be no vote on the pending measure or any amendment to the pending measure prior to Monday of next week.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I object.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Objection is heard.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I gladly yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We discussed the subject at great length this morning. The distinguished Senator from Oregon was as cooperative as I thought he could be under the circumstances. I read into the conversation an assurance that there will certainly be no vote on the bill before Monday.

I discussed the situation with the acting majority leader at considerable length not only today, but yesterday, as well. On the basis of that conversation, I am quite sure that there will be no vote before Monday.

I have taken unto myself the liberty to say to Senators on the minority side that they are free to go home this weekend to make speeches, to pursue their campaigns, and to do what ever else is necessary, with a free and easy conscience, and with no apprehension that there will be a vote.

Mr. ERVIN. I have the assurance of the Senator from Illinois; but I find it impossible to get the assurance of the Senator from Louisiana. Under these circumstances, I intend to back up those who are fighting the war in Vietnam. They are not forsaking their posts of duty; I do not feel, under the circumstances, that I can forsake my post of duty.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana and the distinguished Senator from Oregon were most considerate of the dilemma that confronts the minority leader. It is one of those things that happen about once in 25 years. They have been most sympathetic, almost to the point where they wept over my difficulties. I am sure that that weeping will endure for more than a night, as the Scripture does not quite say.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from North Carolina is one of the most diligent attendants and most indefatigable Members of this body. I am sure he realizes that we who wish to pass the measure should try to bring it to a vote as soon as we can. The Senator himself has so indicated by saying that the boys in Vietnam are not working bankers' hours; they are not taking off weekends. If they took off weekends, the Communists would likely clobber them on those weekends. The fact that American soldiers are fighting in Vietnam means that we should try to back them up; we should press as far as we can with diligence toward the passage of the bill.

If the Senator from North Carolina feels that it is necessary for him to return to his State, I suggest that we will try to obtain a pair for him, or that we will try to have him return before the vote, in the event that a vote appears to be imminent. We shall cooperate with him in every possible way that we can. At the same time, I feel that we ought, to the best of our ability, seek to bring the discussion to an end without denying any Senator his right to make a speech, so that we may then move ahead with the Nation's business.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Louisiana has said. However, his statement does not give me any assurance that I shall not miss a vote on a bill which I deem to be a bill of major importance.

It seems to me, from what the Senator from Illinois has said, that this is a situation in which the Senator from Louisiana might very well adopt the wise policy of cooperating with the inevitable and agreeing that there will not be any vote prior to Monday.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have been trying for the last 8 years to restore the respectability of the live pair. Back in the old days, Senators used to have standing pairs. If a Senator found it necessary to be absent for a week, he would make arrangements with another Senator. When a vote was had, a Senator from the other side of the aisle would simply say: "I have a pair with such and such a Senator. I do not know how he would vote, but since we are paired, I withhold my vote." The pair would be so recorded. Neither side would be recorded as to how they would have voted. Neither of the Senators voted at all.

That would be taking it to the extreme, but it would seem to me that, with the telephone service being what it is today, we should be able to say that if a Senator has commitments which would keep him away, we could accord him a live pair, and that pair could be recorded as if he were present and voting.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I appreciate that. However, those in Vietnam cannot get a live pair. I cannot see anything to do under the circumstances other than to cancel out my plans. My primary duty is to remain on the Senate floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My calculated guess would be that we shall not vote. However, I hope that we shall.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the prospect stares us in the face as clearly as anything can that we shall not vote until Monday. I have tried to cooperate. I could bring up my amendment on Monday and start on Monday.

The minority leader has already said that he has advised people on that side of the aisle that if they have engagements over the weekend they should feel free to keep the engagements, if I understood him correctly. I believe that is the meaning of what he has said.

As the Senator knows, several Senators on this side of the aisle have already made it clear that they cannot be present on Saturday. Some of these Senators want to get away tomorrow. I am not so sure that we can get a quorum on Saturday.

I believe that we shall save more time in the long run if we go through with our regular schedule on tomorrow and adjourn or recess until Monday. We could find out when the Senators will get back. I believe that most of them will be back by Monday morning. We could go ahead on Monday or Tuesday and get this out of the way.

It is for the Senator from Louisiana to decide. However, in my judgment, under these circumstances, there will be other Senators who will want to be present. I do not believe that we would profit by holding those Senators here who have other engagements.

I believe that we should go over to Monday.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I appreciate the view of the Senator from Oregon. However, I have noted that when an announcement has been made in the past that there would not be a vote or that nothing would happen, Senators who had intended to make a speech would tend to postpone their speeches until the Senate reconvened. They did this because they felt there would not be the proper atmosphere when many Senators were at home, and people could not care less about what was said on the Senate floor.

If we proceed on the basis that a vote is not likely but might happen, the interest in the debate will be greater. There would be a better chance of persuading Senators to go ahead and make their speeches.

I know that we shall not vote right now. I cherish that hope, but I know that it will not happen.

I should prefer for Senators to make their speeches. I should hope that we might vote tonight. If we do not do so, I shall accept that result. However, if I were to announce that there would not be a vote, Senators would go home saying: "I shall wait until we are ready to vote, and then I shall make my speech."

That being the case, I hope that we shall persevere in the matter and come to a vote.

Senators can find out what will happen in the next day or so. The prospects of voting soon do not appear to be very good.

I do not want to make a commitment that we will not vote at this time because Senators would put off their speeches. I hope that Senators will make their speeches, and, I am not trying to cut off any Senator from making speeches, but the Nation cannot wait on them indefinitely.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I understand the situation of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. However, I also understand the situation of the acting majority leader. Is the acting majority leader able to give the Senator from North Carolina and other Senators assurance as to whether it is his intention to attempt to call the Senate into session on Saturday? It seems to me that would clear the matter up.

If I were acting in the position of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, I should not make an agreement either. This is too vital a matter. As has been stated, the boys out there do not have any pairs.

I am sure that it would be of assistance to the Senator from North Carolina if it were known that we would not have a Saturday session.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have sometimes given assurance to Senators on my own, not as the majority whip or as acting majority leader. I recall one occasion when I was making a rather lengthy speech on the floor of the Senate at a time when I was outraged about what was being passed through this body. Some Senators said they had engagements. They asked me whether they could leave. I told them: "Go right ahead. I will give you my firm assurance that nothing will happen before midnight tonight."

Senators can assure one another that before a vote is had on Monday, they will make a speech and hold the floor for such a length of time that no vote will occur.

I do not want to take the responsibility of making such a commitment at this time. This is an important measure. Those who say that we must not vote may go ahead and make their speeches. I hope that no one will tell us that we should not vote because they have other commitments that we should hold up an important measure such as this until they can make a speech somewhere or leave for the week end and then come back.

I shall cooperate in every way that I can and try to give the necessary notice for Senators to return.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the remarks of the distinguished acting majority leader. I do not know what the prospects are of a vote on the bill. I hope that we might have a vote at least on some of the amendments to the bill this afternoon or this evening.

What are the plans of the Senator as to the length of the session today?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I hope that we shall be in session until 7 o'clock tonight. We could at least get some more speeches out of the way. I hope that Senators will make their plans, in the event we have a quorum call as late as 6 o'clock, to be available.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, no one is more dedicated to the right of full and free debate in the Senate than is the Senator from Georgia. However, I hope that the Senator will give us an opportunity to have ample, full, and free debate. I hope, if we are not going to vote this week, that we will have lengthy sessions next week and that we will get away from this rather desultory system that we have employed until now of addressing ourselves to this bill, and will actually get down to offering some amendments and bringing them to a vote.

This is a very important measure. It does not loom large in the fiscal sense when compared with some others that we see. However, some items involved in the bill are of tremendous importance to the more than 300,000 men who are engaged in this conflict in the Far East.

I hope that the Senator will, as acting majority leader, notify Senators to prepare themselves next week for lengthy sessions in an effort to bring about a vote on at least some of these amendments.

I would not cut off any Senator from the right to have full and free expression here. I doubt whether we will change the minds of many Senators.

We have carried this issue—in accordance with the purpose of those who oppose the measure—to the American people. They have had some week or 10 days in which to make up their minds. They have had all of this matter gone over in detail by conflicting witnesses on the television, the radio, and in the press at great length.

I believe that the jury is about ready to render its verdict, as far as the people are concerned, if counsel for the opposing party will let us have a chance to vote.

I hope that the Senator will serve notice that if we do not get a vote this afternoon, we will have lengthy sessions next week until we are at least able to have a test somewhere along the line as to the sentiment in the Senate on this measure.

Until now many of those who are fighting and killing our boys in South Vietnam might be of the opinion that Congress is likely to adopt a defeatist attitude and refuse to support our troops there and that it might be necessary to scuttle and run, leaving Vietnam under other than honorable conditions.

It would be very tragic for that impression to become widespread among those who are waging war against our allies, the South Vietnamese, and the force that we have sent to support the South Vietnamese. It might mean that the lives of American boys will be spared if we can get the message home to Vietnam that we have put our hands to the plow and do not intend to turn back. If we give them more indication of the tremendous military power of this country, I think we might see a greater willingness to transfer this fight from the rice paddies and the jungles to the conference table.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is our intention to have long sessions if this matter has not been voted on by Monday. I hoped that we could vote on it by Monday, but I do not see that in prospect. I hope that Senators will not make plans that will keep them from being here past the dinner hour. We can arrange to have dinner available here in the Capitol, and Senators can make their plans accordingly, and keep the Senate in session long hours starting on Monday.

If this Senator is in charge as acting majority leader at that time, that will be the course he will pursue; and I hope that the minority leader will give us his cooperation, and will recognize that on tomorrow and on Saturday, it will be very difficult to keep the Senate in session long hours.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the acting majority leader is correct; and we will cooperate for reasonably long hours.

As I indicated yesterday, I think the time for discussion is passed and we should be taking action. I concur in the statement of the Senator from Georgia; that is the reason I did not think debate could be concluded this week, and I thought a Saturday session would be rather abortive, because there are a good many Senators gone already, the number will increase very significantly this afternoon, and keeping a quorum here on Saturday will be no easy chore.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. As I said earlier, I think we ought to start with morning sessions on Monday, we ought to go right through with morning sessions, and stay a reasonable period each night, until we get this out of the way.

The only difference I have with my acting majority leader, and I have not been able to persuade him, is that I do not think you help at all by simply saying, "I am not going to tell you that you can go." They are going to go; we are going to lose a lot of Senators, in my judgment, between now and Friday night.

Get these speeches out of the way today and tomorrow; we will have most of the major speeches out of the way by tomorrow night, and we can start then with amendments and short speeches on the amendments Monday and Tuesday. But I say, most respectfully, I do not think you are helping to solve this problem by not being willing to agree to say, "We will start on Monday with the amendments; get your speeches over Thursday and Friday, and forget about a Saturday meeting." I do not think we can get a live quorum on Saturday.

During the delivery of Mr. GRUENING's speech,

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire with the understanding that his remarks will follow mine and that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am not surprised to note in a news story carried in the Washington Daily News yesterday that:

> The Defense Department has censored in its entirety a highly critical report by the Senate Preparedness Committee which charges the Army has serious deficiencies in manpower, training, and equipment.

There may be justification for making this entire report secret and classified. It might well disclose and specify situations which should not be known to this Nation's enemies and rivals.

I wish to emphasize, however, that this is just one further instance of the cloak of secrecy that is thrown around both our military and diplomatic situation throughout the world and particularly with respect to the Vietnam war.

Obviously, any facts relating to military plans and movements should be closely guarded. I, for one, do not wish to know them.

However, there is an aspect of our present situation from the standpoint of Senators and Members of Congress that would be amusing if it did not involve such grave and critical matters. I recently listened to a pep talk addressed to a group of Senators and Congressmen by a high official in our Government. He stressed the need of our Nation's presenting a united front. He urged us to impress our people with the justice of our cause, the efficiency and wisdom with which the war is being pursued, and the prospect of ultimate victory. I believe that his closing words were "go out and preach the gospel." Of course, that is based on the admonition of the Master to the Apostles. He said, "Go preach the Gospel," but he did not add, "remember it's all classified."

Members of the Senate are permitted to read the testimony presented to committees and subcommittees in executive session. Obviously, it is all classified, and once a Senator reads it his lips are sealed on every detail. He may be subject to suspicion if he uses any of the information after having received it from some other source.

This shroud of secrecy has prevailed ever since Secretary McNamara took over the Department of Defense. It pertained to matters of military housekeeping even before Vietnam. I have never read the recommendations of a committee to the Defense Secretary which led to an order to phase out an important installation in my State. After considerable difficulty I was told I could do so, but every word of it was classified. I cannot imagine that conclusions about the relative advantages of climate, labor availability, accessibility, and costs as between Portsmouth, N.H., and Philadelphia would fortify the Soviets or even particularly interest them. I refused to read the report because I would thereafter be gagged on every detail.

Our people want answers on the broad aspects of the situation which confronts us. They want general policies justified. The letters that pour into my office show frustration, bewilderment, and doubt. How can we reassure them or even respond to them if part of the facts are kept from us and our lips are sealed on the rest?

They are not satisfied with a simple statement that the President is the Commander in Chief, has access to all the facts, and we are sure he is thinking hard about them.

Referring to the report on the condition of our defense that the Pentagon has just suppressed, Moscow and Peiping probably already know most of it. Some of it should be revealed to the American people. Remember the Truman committee, with the express permission of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, investigated and reported on our defense posture beginning right after Pearl Harbor and continuing throughout World War II.

I strongly suspect that if this report is given to the people, it will be a revelation of glaring errors by the present Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Pentagon Suppresses Hill Report on Army," written by Jack Steele and published in the Washington Daily News of February 23, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBERS FOUND SERIOUS FAILINGS AT HOME AND ABROAD—PENTAGON SUPRESSES HILL REPORT ON ARMY

(By Jack Steele)

The Defense Department has censored in its entirety a highly critical report by the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee which charges the Army has serious deficiencies in manpower, training, and equipment.

The secret report, according to informed sources, raises serious questions about the Army's readiness—in view of these shortages—to cope with both a further acceleration of the war in Vietnam and the Nation's other worldwide military commitments.

The report is based on an inquiry begun by the subcommittee last autumn. Its investigators toured Vietnam and Europe and inspected Army camps and training centers in this country.

SANITIZING

Completed more than 2 months ago the report was sent to the Defense Department for customary security review. Usually, the Department deletes what it rules is classified information from such reports and clears what is left for public release—a process known as "sanitizing."

But in this case, the Department has stamped the entire report "classified" and informed the subcommittee none of its contents can be made public—presumably on grounds it would give vital information, as well as aid and comfort, to present or potential enemies.

Chairman JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, is reportedly still battling with Secretary Robert S. McNamara and other Defense officials to get the report cleared—thus far without success.

SAID NOTHING

Senator STENNIS and other subcommittee members have said nothing publicly about the Pentagon's suppression of the report—although its investigation of the Army's readiness to meet the Vietnam war buildup was well publicized when it was started last September.

But some subcommittee members are known to be irked over what they regard as the Defense Department's use of its power to classify vital military secrets to cover up past mistakes which cut the Army too thin in both men and equipment to meet an emergency.

Some privately accuse Mr. McNamara of holding up release of the report until the Army can claim that the manpower, training, and equipment shortages cited in the report have been corrected.

MORE CRITICAL

They note that, while the subcommittee's investigation began nearly 6 months ago, the Army deficiencies it uncovered may be even more critical today as a result of the rapid buildup of U.S. ground forces in Vietnam and the recent acceleration of the war.

Senator STENNIS, without mentioning the investigation or report, has called in recent weeks for both stepped up draft calls and at least a partial call-up of Reserve and National Guard forces to meet fast-growing manpower needs.

In a speech last Friday, he warned that the buildup in Vietnam should not be permitted to weaken U.S. forces elsewhere in the world to the point where they might not be able to respond to aggression if it should occur.

Senator STENNIS and Chairman RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, of the subcommittee's parent Senate Armed Services Committee also have taken the lead in urging the Senate to act quickly on the President's request for additional funds for the Vietnam war.

Mr. McNamara and other Defense officials presumably will be questioned closely about the Army's readiness at closed-door hearings of the Senate and House Armed Services and Appropriations Committees on next year's Defense budget.

But all such testimony presumably will be heavily censored before reports on these hearings are made public.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I desire to thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator from New Hampshire has made a distinguished contribution to the debate.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I rise as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee to support the supplemental military authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Maryland may continue.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is abundantly clear to me that the United States is determined that the security of this country is involved in our position in southeast Asia. In support of that position, we now have ashore in Vietnam some 200,000 men in 5 major Army units and 1 Marine unit. We have some 50,000 men in the 7th Fleet at the Dixie and Yankee stations off the coast of Vietnam.

In supporting this measure and the policy of this administration, let me say, following up the colloquy we have just heard, that I should like to vote at this moment; and if we had a chance to vote, this speech would not be made.

But it is clear that we will not have the chance to vote, and therefore the senior Senator from Maryland would put himself on record as supporting the proposition that if we are going to send men overseas and into battle, and accept the casualties that they are now sustaining, then we must be prepared to back them up.

Mr. President, with all Senators, I have followed closely the recent testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I was particularly struck with the theme developed by Secretary Rusk and General Taylor, as to the difference between United States and Communist objectives and policies in Vietnam.

Today I should like to expand that point. For the information of my fellow Senators, my words will take about half an hour, and I can cut them short if the leadership asks me to do so, should there be any chance that we can vote on any amendment or on the pending measure at any time.

Consider first the contrast in the objectives of the parties to the conflict. Time and time again, Communist leaders in Red China and Vietnam have made it clear what they hope to accomplish in southeast Asia. I would note, for example, the recent statement of the Chinese Defense Minister. He said bluntly that the seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of all issues by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution, and that it holds good uniformly for China and for all other countries. Just as communism in China, he said, succeeded by capturing the countryside and then encircling and defeating the cities, so the global Communist movement will ultimately succeed, first by capturing Asia, Africa, and Latin America—thereby encircling North America and Western Europe—and then by finally and decisively defeating the United States and our Western Allies.

And where is this to begin? the Chinese defense minister asks.

It has already begun, he replies. And the principal place in which it is already underway is Vietnam.

Vietnam is now the focus of the revolutionary movement against the United States. No matter what action America may take in Vietnam, the Communist Chinese are unshakable, as of now, in their determination to drive the United States out.

Compare the Communist objectives with those of the United States. I almost hesitate to recount U.S. objectives because they have been so clearly stated so many times by the President, and more recently by Secretary Rusk and General Taylor. Concisely, they are:

First. The preservation of the freedom of the South Vietnamese people to develop as they see fit, without external interference and without serving the policy of any other nation.

Second. A cessation of the fighting and bloodshed in Vietnam.

Third. Protection of the rights and authority of the free Republic of Vietnam.

Fourth. Demonstration to the Communist bloc that indirect aggression through so-called wars of national liberation cannot succeed and to the free world that the United States stands by its commitments.

The central objective of the President's policy, then, is independence for South Vietnam and freedom for its people to live in peace. I support that policy. Realization of this objective is necessary to the broader goal of creating conditions of stability throughout southeast Asia sufficient to permit a broad development program to which, as the President has stated, we should be prepared to contribute substantially.

We seek this objective in Vietnam in our own national interest. To abandon Vietnam, which the Communists have made the principal current testing ground for their theories of conquest through externally supported rebellion or wars of national liberation, would embolden the Communists and dangerously weaken the confidence in us of many free nations, with whom we are joined in mutual defense or economic development arrangements. It would mean confronting the same challenge in other places, probably under even less favorable circumstances.

The absence of peace and freedom in South Vietnam is due to aggression from the north and support by the regime in Hanoi for the Communists in the south who are seeking to overthrow their own government. Communist China has been increasingly open in pressing Hanoi to continue its aggressive policy.

It is American policy, constant under three administrations since 1954, to support the Government of South Vietnam in its efforts to defend itself and its people against this assault. We are pledged to provide all appropriate support for as long as is required to bring Communist aggression and terror under control.

Not so long ago, I stood on the floor of the Senate at the time of the Gulf of Tonkin incident and voted to support the President in using such force as was necessary to protect the interests of the United States in this theater of war.

In light of espoused objectives of both sides in this struggle, I see no reasonable ground on which to question the validity or, indeed, the essentiality of the American commitment.

If the stated Communist objectives were not convincing, consider the measures employed by them to reach these previously stated objectives.

Despite the buildup of U.S. forces, which I shall discuss later, there has been no indication of any significant change in Communist strategy. Their strategy seeks to:

First. Annihilate and disperse the Vietnamese, United States and other free world forces, while building up the Vietcong.

Second. Intensify military activity around the urban areas, particularly Saigon.

Third. Expand Vietcong controlled areas and consolidate control of the countryside.

Fourth. Organize rural support in order to control the jungle.

Fifth. Intensify economic warfare against the Government of South Vietnam.

How do they hope to accomplish these objectives? The Vietcong have a set of simple guidelines which emphasize the following courses of action: guerrilla warfare, evasion, ambush, small annihilation squads, and when possible, large scale operations.

And always terrorism in the night. Basic to all of these has been the use of terror and intimidation. By terror, the Vietcong attempt to cut off what lines the government has managed to build between itself and the people. They kidnap and murder land reform workers, rural credit agents, village chiefs, schoolteachers, and malaria workers. They threaten families in order to intimidate and induce cooperation from workers and officials.

They have no reluctance whatsoever to "gut," to disembowel, or to shoot those who choose not to cooperate. This is a statement of fact. In 1965 alone, the Vietcong murdered over 1,800 civilians in terrorist acts and kidnaped over 10,000.

Behind all this terror lies an even more dangerous threat to the freedom of South Vietnam—aggression from without. The case against North Vietnam has been documented too often for me to need to dwell on it at length here. Simply put, the war which the Vietcong are waging against the south is directed and supported politically and militarily from Hanoi, the capital of North Vietnam. It is commanded on the spot by leaders and specialists infiltrated from north of the 17th parallel—19,000 last year alone. It is largely supplied by weapons and equipment sent by North Vietnam, which in turn is supported by Red China.

In addition to hard core leaders and technicians, some 11,000 personnel from the regular North Vietnamese Army were sent south last year. The United States is not, as is charged from time to time, interfering in what is a local civil war.

The actions of the Communists in Vietnam are pure, unembellished aggression. As Secretary Rusk stated recently, aggression itself is the principal enemy of all civilized world orders and of all those countries, like the United States, which support world order under law—and not under force—and through the United Nations.

Contrary to those who say that the United States has no obligation to meet this aggression, I strongly believe that the course the United States has taken in southeast Asia is entirely proper and the only honorable one we can take.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator aware of the fact that on the point of legality, the American Bar Association considered the matter and, I assume, being good lawyers that they are, and most senior members of law firms belonging, they discussed and considered the question and voted 279 to 0 that what we were doing in Vietnam is entirely legal and consistent with the United Nations Charter, particularly article 51, which declares that nothing in the charter would deny any nation the right of collective self-defense.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Louisiana is correct. As a lawyer myself, I am convinced that to the extent we have international law, the United States is following a legal course of action and that we should and can under law participate realistically as responsible members of the United Nations organization.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Furthermore, recently I placed in the RECORD a letter signed by 21 professors of international law at our universities and colleges, headed by professors at Yale and Harvard—keeping in mind that a great number of universities do not teach international law, because their graduates have very little need of it for their practice. But these 21 professors of international law agreed to a man that the United States proceeded exactly as it should. I understand since that time 10 other professors of international law have added their names to that list.

So far as I know, there is no professor of international law who has taken a contrary view that this course of action is not inconsistent with our obligations under the charter of the United Nations.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his comments. I agree completely. If, as a responsible international citizen, we abandoned the world only to those who would apply force, then we would have no law at all. I only wish we had truly enforceable international law. We do have the spirit and fabric of international law, but we must seek to implement this law in support of government by law and not by force.

I argue that unless we face the Communists over there, the last remnants of stability in this already unstable world will begin to disappear. Our reasons for meeting force with force are basically twofold: First, it is in our own national interest to do so; and second, it is the only prudent and honorable thing to do, given the commitments we have made stretching back through three presidential administrations of both political parties.

Let me turn now to a brief discussion of the actions we have taken to meet this obligation.

After the signing of the Geneva accords of 1954 and contrary to the provision of those accords, that Communist forces regroup to the north of the 17th parallel, some of the best Vietcong guerrilla units were ordered to remote and inaccessible regions of South Vietnam. An estimated 10,000 Vietcong faded into the peasant population. Further evidence of these violations were the large numbers of arms and munitions hidden in South Vietnam by the Communist cadres left behind.

By 1956 it had become apparent that the Republic of Vietnam was a viable and increasingly prosperous state that would not fall peaceably under Hanoi's control. North Vietnam, therefore, began to rebuild and expand its covert apparatus in the south. From 1957 to 1959, over 1,000 civilians are believed to have been assassinated or kidnaped by the Vietcong. Terrorism and armed attacks greatly increased between 1959 and 1961. This is the record. During all this period the American Military Advisory Assistance Command in Vietnam consisted of less than 800 personnel. Finally, in December 1961, President Kennedy in response to a request by the Government of Vietnam increased U.S. strength to almost 2,000. At this point the Americans began for the first time to act as advisers at the battalion level in addition to performing logistic and supporting functions. As the level of Vietcong terror increased, so too did American military support, until the number reached 10,000 in 1962.

Note that the history of escalation in Vietnam was not the result of unilateral U.S. initiatives. What confronts the Communists today is the end-product of their own aggressive military activity.

I need not recount the events of 1965. They are fresh in the minds of us all—the increased infiltration, the introduction of regular North Vietnamese forces, the Vietcong attacks on American bases and installations, the buildup of Vietcong forces in preparation for a monsoon offensive, and the continued atrocities against the South Vietnamese populace. So too is the tremendous and rapid buildup of United States forces to over 200,000 that we have there today.

We should all keep in mind that our response has not been entirely military at all. The military gets the headlines, but the efforts we make in the social and economic fields are supported with equal vigor, and greeted with even more enthusiasm. The theme of the recent Honolulu Conference was on the building of a better life for the Vietnamese civilian. Significant progress has already been made in the economic and social spheres.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I visited that tortured country and saw the active effort we are making in social and economic areas—building schools, increasing agricultural production, training doctors and nurses, expanding medical facilities. To be sure, much more needs to be done, and the President has promised that it will be done. I heartily support these endeavors, without which military success would be without meaning. I am reminded of the few days I spent with the 3d Marine Division in Da Nang and in Hue Phu Bai. I went with the men—in wet, dirty dungarees. I saw them greeted with wide enthusiasm. At the platoon level, during sick call, the

American doctors spent a great deal of time treating the civilian population after they cared for our own men. Apart from this, through numerous economic programs, our military equipment is being used to construct canals, roads, bridges, marketplaces throughout the countryside.

But now, looking beyond our present military and nonmilitary programs, we have an even more important responsibility, the paramount responsibility, of achieving and bringing about an honorable peace; not peace at any price, but peace with honor—a peace that would enable the people of South Vietnam to resume their position among the sovereign and independent peoples of the world without fear of outside aggression. If we could be assured of such a peace, we would waste no time withdrawing our military forces.

We would prefer to see our troops at home rather than in the swamps, jungles, and rice paddies of Vietnam. I am satisfied that every responsible official in our Government would prefer to use our resources for the economic development of southeast Asia, not for its destruction.

Unfortunately for us, indeed unfortunately for all mankind, our efforts to achieve this peace have thus far been to no avail. Representatives of our Government have gone to every corner of the world; they have talked to countless officials of foreign governments—friendly and nonfriendly. All efforts have been rebuffed, in fact, scorned would be a better word.

The President said at Johns Hopkins University in Maryland last April that we were prepared to meet with anybody at any time at any place to discuss any issue, and that pledge still stands. We have not been taken up on it.

Recall what occurred during the recent pause in the bombing of North Vietnam. Vietcong activity in South Vietnam continued at a higher than average rate during the pause, terroristic acts against civilians continued, and infiltration increased under cover of the bombing lull.

Does this indicate a readiness to discuss peace on the part of the Communists? I think not.

And so the war continues, as indeed it must in the absence of prospects for an honorable peace.

But the question is justifiably asked, is success in the struggle in Vietnam of concern only to the United States and the Vietnamese? I think not. In my opinion, one of the most disturbing aspects of the war in Vietnam is the failure of most of our allies to join hands with us in the fight against Communist aggression. I feel strongly that an effective, lasting peace could be arrived at faster if more of our allies—and I speak with special reference to the sophisticated, modern nations of western Europe—were to share with us the massive burden of helping the people of South Vietnam. In view of our own actions during the last 25 years, the sight of so many of our friends standing idly by watching us, or, what is worse, openly criticizing us, while we fight, leaves me perplexed and unhappy.

At a later date I will address myself to the fact that many of our friends are openly trading with North Vietnam. This is reprehensible to me, and it must end.

At a time like this, a passive attitude on the part of our allies is both shortsighted and harmful. We are helping the South Vietnamese, because it is in our interest, and because we are able to do so. Others should help, because it is in their interest, and they are able. The attainment of stability and freedom from aggression in South Vietnam serves not only the interests of ourselves and the South Vietnamese, but of the entire free world. All of our allies should realize that they have a definite part to play in this conflict, and that what happens in South Vietnam will have an effect on their own destinies.

Some countries have already recognized this fact. Australia, New Zealand, and South Korea now have many battle units fighting shoulder to shoulder beside our own troops. The Government of Thailand has given consistently firm support to our policy and to the requirements for logistic preparations in their country. This kind of support is both helpful and heartwarming. It is not too late for other nations to follow suit. As we pledge our continuing support, it is reasonable to hope that the Vietnamese Government, and indeed our own, will continue to urge in many capitals a common response to our common threat.

Let me close with a personal summary of where I believe we stand concerning the most real and immediate threat to world peace—the struggle in Vietnam.

The U.S. view of the struggle as essentially one of aggression mounted, directed, supplied, and supported by North Vietnam has been reinforced during the last year by the increasing direct participation of the North Vietnamese in the war and the demonstrated inability of the Vietcong to mobilize the popular support they have long claimed.

The Chinese Communists, through Marshal Lin Piao's recent statement, have made their view of this struggle still more explicit under a doctrine calling for the expansion of Communist power by similar aggressive means throughout the world.

The immediate implications for the rest of Asia of a failure to suppress Communist aggression in Vietnam remain as clear and ominous as they always have been. In this connection it is not inappropriate to note the increasing subversive efforts being directed against Laos, Thailand, and Cambodia by the Communists and Chinese.

If all small nations on the periphery of Communist power are to retain their faith, that the cause of their independence and freedom is one to which the free world is devoted, we must continue to resist aggression in Vietnam.

If we were to cave in, we would let them down, and our troubles would only mount in the future.

With some degree of accuracy I would like to point to the lessons learned in Manchuria, Ethiopia, in the Rhineland and at Munich where force applied at the appropriate time would have prevented terrible destruction.

Our goal remains one of a peaceful settlement that will bring an end to the aggression, secure freedom of choice for South Vietnam, allow for the withdrawal of U.S. forces, and permit the direction of all our energies to the constructive purposes of economic and social development in southeast Asia.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I compliment the Senator on the very fine statement he has made.

Everybody is well aware of the magnificent record of the Senator as a marine officer serving his Nation on the field of battle.

May I say that the speech of the Senator is in keeping with his past record, as well as the service he has rendered in this body. It is an inspiring address. As one Member of the Senate I appreciate it very much.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

I remember that during the same years that I wore the Marine Corps uniform he wore the uniform of the U.S. Navy. We fought in our way at that time for the same cause that men are now fighting for in Vietnam, the cause of freedom in opposition to totalitarianism, or whatever name one may give it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am prepared to suggest the absence of a quorum.

I understand that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] has a matter that can be disposed of expeditiously.

I would be willing to yield provided I might retain my right to the floor and insist on my right if I find it necessary to insist on retaining the floor.

I yield on the condition that I may regain my right to the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like the RECORD to show that I have been seeking the floor and that the acting majority leader has refused to yield it until he calls for a live quorum. I do not object.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CANCELLATION OF UNPAID REIMBURSABLE CONSTRUCTION COSTS OF WIND RIVER INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, WYOMING, CHARGEABLE AGAINST CERTAIN NON-INDIAN LANDS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on Wednesday, February 16, 1966, the House of Representatives approved, with an amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 9, concerning certain reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project in the State of Wyoming. Therefore, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message from the House on Senate Joint Resolution 9, The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 9) to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands, which was, to strike out all after the resolving clause, and insert:

> That (a) all reimbursable construction costs heretofore incurred at the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, shall be allocated against the total irrigable acreage in the project according to the present land classifications.
>
> (b) The costs so allocated to land that passed out of Indian ownership prior to March 7, 1928, shall be canceled by the Secretary of the Interior if the patent from the United States contained no recital to the effect that the land is subject to irrigation construction charges, and the purchaser did not sign a contract to pay construction charges. Such cancellation, however, shall take effect with respect to any individual landowner when and only when the said owner obligates himself, his heirs, and assigns by contract satisfactory in form and substance to the Secretary that he will pay all reasonable construction charges incurred after the date of this Act in connection with the Wind River Indian irrigation project which are allocated to his land as provided in this Act and that such charges, if not paid, shall be a lien against the land.
>
> (c) Land that passed out of Indian ownership prior to March 7, 1928, shall, if the patent from the United States contains a recital to the effect that the land is subject to irrigation construction charges, either past or future, be subject to a lien in favor of the United States for such charges.
>
> (d) Reimbursable construction charges hereafter incurred at the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, shall be allocated against all irrigable acreage in the project according to land classifications then in effect, shall be a lien against the land, and shall not be subject to cancellation on the ground that the land was conveyed with a paid-up construction charge. Any such paid-up construction charge shall be deemed to mean a construction charge incurred prior to the date of this Act.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should say also that this matter has been cleared with both Senators from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE and Mr. SIMPSON]. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I express appreciation to the acting majority leader for yielding so that this matter could be considered. It will be of great help to the Wind River Indian irrigation project.

SUPPLEMENTARY MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I shall insist upon a live quorum. I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 36 Leg.]

Allott
Boggs
Brewster
Church
Clark
Ervin
Gore
Gruening
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, La.
McGee
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Prouty
Simpson
Symington
Talmauge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be requested to direct the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Fannin
Fulbright
Harris
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Miller
Mondale
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Tower
Tydings
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). A quorum is present.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I would like the RECORD to show it was not I, but the acting majority leader, who demanded the live quorum which has just been concluded.

I wish to discuss the present situation in Vietnam.

The Senate of the United States has often been called the greatest deliberative body in the world. On many occasions that reputation has seemed ill deserved—as when we permitted ourselves not long ago to become bogged down in a full dress debate on the question of amending the Senate Journal to include the Chaplain's prayer.

But there are also times when the Senate does function in a way which makes it the envy of all the other legislatures of the world. This, I believe, is such a time—and the debate on Vietnam which we are now conducting demonstrates how great a body this can be when it does its best.

There is one point which has become increasingly clear to me during the course of this debate:

The United States should never have become involved in a ground war on the land mass of Asia.

For the 11 years since the French withdrawal from Vietnam, the United States has been gradually sucked into a situation where 200,000 American troops are presently fighting what is essentially an American war on the Asian mainland. Originally, and indeed until the end of 1963, American policy was to call upon various South Vietnamese governments to win or lose their own war. As President Kennedy said in September of 1963:

> In the final analysis, it's their war. They're the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it.

As late as the fall of 1964 this was still our policy. President Johnson said, during the course of the Presidential campaign that he did not like to be called upon "to send American boys to do the job that Asian boys ought to do."

The State and the Defense Departments still insist today that primarily this is a war for the South Vietnamese to win; but it is becoming increasingly obvious that the 200,000 American troops now in combat have the primary mission of destroying and defeating the Vietcong and those parts of the regular North Vietnamese army which have been committed to battle.

Thus, for the second time in 15 years, we have ignored the sound advice of Generals MacArthur, Eisenhower, and Ridgeway and committed American ground troops in Asia in what is essentially an American war.

In the fall of 1963 there were only 10,000 Americans in uniform in South Vietnam, all acting as advisers to the South Vietnamese armed forces. Today the number exceeds 200,000 and there is talk in the Pentagon and in the Senate Armed Services Committee to the effect that the number may soon rise to 600,000.

If we had learned from the experience in Burma or the Philippines or, even more recently, in Indonesia, we would have avoided the error we have committed. In none of these cases did our failure to intervene in support of non-Communist governments bring the so-called domino theory into effect. In all three instances the Communist advance was repelled by native Asian governments which scorned to call on the United States for assistance. In fact, U Thant, the sagacious Burmese Secretary General of the United Nations, recently said that had Burma requested

American military assistance there would now be either a Communist takeover in that country or a civil war equivalent in violence to the hostilities in South Vietnam.

Our sound position should have been to base our air and naval power on the island chain running from Japan to Okinawa, Taiwan, the Philippines, Indonesia, and Borneo to Australia and New Zealand. It is nonsense to think that our only stopping place if we lose Vietnam is the beach at Waikiki.

A sound policy would rest our Pacific defenses on this island chain, rather than permitting our superb fighting forces to get mired down in the mud and jungles of southeast Asia.

Let us consider the capabilities and intentions of the Vietcong, the Hanoi government, and Red China.

It is difficult to know for certain what the intentions or capabilities of any of these three parties are. On the one hand, the Vietcong have recently been taking severe losses. It is said that their desertion rate is increasing, that they are losing their will to win. It is said also that Hanoi, having committed a significant part of its well-trained regular army to battle in South Vietnam, is having second thoughts as the determination of the South Vietnamese and the Americans increases. Assuredly, both the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese forces are under considerably heavier pressure than they were a year ago.

Similarly, China is essentially without air or sea power. There is grave question as to whether the Chinese Army can fight effectively as far away from their national boundary as the Mekong Delta. China has suffered a series of diplomatic reverses. Mao Tse-tung must be concerned at the threat of an American offensive, possibly nuclear in form, against his homeland.

It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that our adversaries will shortly be prepared to turn to the negotiating table under a cease-fire arrangement by neutral powers.

On the other hand, there is not the slightest present indication of a desire on the part of our adversaries to stop the shooting. The Vietcong, with the aid of Hanoi, have either themselves occupied or rendered untenable to the South Vietnamese a majority of the land mass of South Vietnam. While perhaps a majority of the people of South Vietnam are still under the jurisdiction of the Ky government in Saigon, most of them are huddled together in cities and towns overcrowded with refugees. And in that part of the countryside still under South Vietnamese control, there is increasing resentment against the totalitarian form the Ky government takes. The Vietcong appear well on their way to acquiring effective control over most of the people of South Vietnam still living in the countryside. And it is no answer to say that this has, to a substantial extent, been achieved by terror. It is, nevertheless, the case.

While the rate of desertion among the Vietcong is significant, desertions from the South Vietnamese Army are heavy, too. As their losses increase, as they have done during the last year, it is becoming increasingly doubtful how much longer the South Vietnamese Army will remain capable of carrying the brunt of defeating the Vietcong.

In this connection, Mr. President, I refer to an article from the New York Times of this morning entitled, "1965 Desertions Up in Saigon Forces—Total Is Put Above 96,000—U.S. Aides Concerned."

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the article may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it seems clear that the Vietcong, Hanoi, and Peiping are still convinced they are winning the war in South Vietnam and that accordingly they believe there is no need to go to the conference table.

Nor, despite the assertions of Secretary Rusk to the contrary, is it clear to what extent, if at all, the Vietcong are controlled by Hanoi, or Hanoi is controlled by mainland China. What seems certain is that further escalation of the American war effort, particularly a stepping up of the bombing of North Vietnam or a commencement of the bombing of Communist China will bring all three of our adversaries closer together. In my judgment, the risks of further American escalation in the light of the capabilities and intentions of our three adversaries, are not worth running in view of the chance of success which such escalation would create.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho. I am glad to have the Senator in the Chamber on this important matter.

Mr. CHURCH. I congratulate the distinguished Senator on the address he is making.

The Senator raised the question of escalation. I was wondering if the Senator had not been encouraged by the remarks of the President on the subject of escalation in his address in New York last evening.

Mr. CLARK. I was very much encouraged. In fact, with the exception of the last portion of the President's address, in which he raises the question of whether what we are doing in South Vietnam is worthwhile, I believe it was a most helpful statement of the American position.

The address indicates a disinclination to escalation and continued willingness to negotiate.

Mr. President, I ask that a copy of the text of the President's remarks may be printed in the RECORD at the end of my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. CLARK. I thank the distinguished Senator from Idaho for calling this matter to my attention.

The tactical military situation in Vietnam is worse than most of the American people think. Neither the State Department nor the Pentagon have yet been willing to furnish an unclassified map from which the American people could determine just how badly the ground war in South Vietnam has been going in recent years. But maps whose authenticity has not, so far as I know, been denied, showing the steady deterioration of the South Vietnamese-American position since 1962 have been printed widely in American newspapers and magazines.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. I apologize for not having intervened immediately following the question of the distinguished Senator from Idaho. I wish to ask another question of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The Senator from Pennsylvania expresses satisfaction with the President's speech of last night, with the exception that he has noted.

Does the Senator feel that the President's explanation of his policy in South Vietnam, especially relative to escalation and restraint of our military effort, reflects a change or constitutes a change from our policy, as the Senator previously understood it?

Mr. CLARK. I have difficulty answering that question categorically because this administration speaks with so many different voices from time to time that no one can be certain who is making the uncertain note on the trumpet.

I would say that since the President is the Commander in Chief and the Chief Executive of the United States his word should be the last word.

We heard from a Member of this body that testimony has been received in the Armed Services Committee that in the foreseeable future we might well increase our forces in Vietnam from 200,000 to 600,000.

We have had some fairly strong statements from the Secretary of State. Yesterday Secretary of Defense McNamara indicated the possibility of calling up the Reserves.

Hanson Baldwin—and if I may be mildly facetious for a moment, he is a fairly faithful exponent of Pentagon opinion—indicates that we are spread so thin that we may have to have massive troops called to the colors.

The President's statement of yesterday was helpful. I have great sympathy for the position in which he finds himself. I know he is subjected to differing views. I know that he listens carefully before he makes up his mind.

The President's speech of last night does tend to clarify matters in a most helpful way.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I believe it is true in this debate, to a greater degree than other debates, that words get in the way of understanding.

Mr. CLARK. One of the real problems is semantics.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

It strikes me, and I would like to have the reaction of the Senator, that the principal concern that resulted in that surge of alarm and present debate on

Vietnam policy is not attributable so much to our ability to manage a war in South Vietnam, as such, as the fear that what we do there may or may not trigger a direct Red Chinese intervention which would lead to an Asian war. Is this the impression of the Senator?

Mr. **CLARK**. I am afraid that I could not agree with that. I do agree that the concern over getting into a wider war with China is a real and deep one. I believe there is a similar or greater concern about our commitment in Vietnam.

My feeling is that we should not have gotten in there, and until the Baltimore speech of last spring we did not make a serious effort to get out.

I mention again the figures which I cited before the Senator came into the Chamber. At the time of President Kennedy's assassination we had only 10,000 American soldiers in South Vietnam, all of whom were engaged in advisory missions. Now, we have over 200,000 troops there.

The answer given is that South Vietnam might have been overrun by the Vietcong if we had not done that. Then, I say, was the game worth the candle? I doubt it.

I say further to my friend from Maine that the inevitable result of escalation from 10,000 men to 200,000 men is an increase in the rate of American casualties in a cause which I cannot convince myself is essential to our national security or the defense of our national honor.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. I understand, of course, that there may be differences of opinion, although not to the extent that there might have been a few years ago, as to whether we should have been involved in the first place. If we were to debate that question today, in terms of the situation when we first became involved in South Vietnam, I suspect that there might be quite a broad consensus as to what our policy is today.

Mr. **CLARK**. As to what our policy should have been.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. As to what our policy should have been. As of today, I still feel—and I am merely conveying to the Senator my view—that the great concern that grips the country so obviously and clearly today is not related to any doubts as to our ability, eventually, to get out of South Vietnam—if our problem were confined to South Vietnam—with honor and still to leave the situation subject to the control of indigenous elements in Vietnam. I think we could manage this. But my concern is that the means we may have to use in order to achieve that objective may at some point trigger a larger war. This is where my concern focuses, whatever the questions I might have had earlier, about our involvement in Vietnam.

Mr. **CLARK**. I share the Senator's concern deeply.

The Senator said something a moment ago about the problem we have about words. I agree with him. What do we mean by "getting out of Vietnam with honor"? What is honor? The Senator and I could discuss that for a long time without coming to any obvious solution.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. We get some light thrown on that question—at least, I do—when we realize that there are few in this body, or in Congress as a whole or in the country as a whole, who defend unconditional, unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam.

Mr. **CLARK**. I do not think there is anybody who does.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. So, at least, honor means that we must get something out of our withdrawal that will serve the national elements, the freedom elements, and the independence elements in South Vietnam.

Mr. **CLARK**. Let me pose a question to the Senator: Does the Senator believe that we could negotiate with the Vietcong and still get out of Vietnam with honor? Would that be an honorable thing to do in the light of the terror and the murders of the Vietcong, and their determination to install a Communist regime? Can we tie up our ideas of honor with negotiation with the one people who are fighting with us?

Mr. **MUSKIE**. The role that the Vietcong would play at the conference table, if we were to get that far, is a sticky problem. If we gave the Vietcong too large a role before we negotiated, we might hamper the ability of whatever government emerged in South Vietnam to develop viability, independence, and the ability to decide its own country's destiny.

Mr. **CLARK**. I agree with that.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. So we are concerned about that. Second, we are not really sure—and this has been the point of great debate in the Senate and throughout the country—as to what the Vietcong will do in South Vietnam. To what extent is the Vietcong wholly the agent of North Vietnam? To what extent is the Vietcong made up of indigenous elements in South Vietnam who would truly like to play a role in the destiny of their own country?

Mr. **CLARK**. It occurs to me that there are both kinds. It is fairly obvious, despite the view of Secretary Rusk to the contrary, that a large part of the Vietcong are indigenous South Vietnamese, sincerely, although mistakenly, believing they are fighting for the freedom of their own country, which they think includes North Vietnam—and it used to—in order to repel the white invader from their shores.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. The Senator would agree, would he not, that this is a point on which we cannot be enlightened under conditions of war?

Mr. **CLARK**. The Senator is correct.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. It is not possible to conduct a Gallup poll to establish that point to our satisfaction. This is why I believe there is some reservation on the part of our policymaking leaders in determining the role the Vietcong ought to play, first at the conference table, and then in the subsequent Government of South Vietnam.

Mr. **CLARK**. If we are ever going to have the shooting stop, that is a problem we shall have to face up to. Even though our policymakers may not be willing to disclose their hand, they will have to think the problem through and determine whether they are going to demand unconditional surrender by the Vietcong or will sit down and talk with them.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. From my point of view, we would be in a better position to refine our policy on that score if we were to get some kind of response from the other side.

Mr. **CLARK**. I could not agree more.

Mr. **MUSKIE**. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for this exchange.

Mr. **GORE**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **CLARK**. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. **GORE**. I have found the discussion very interesting, indeed. Was not the first government of France, following the end of World War II, a coalition government?

Mr. **CLARK**. It was called a popular front, and my recollection is that the Prime Minister was a Socialist, Mr. Blum.

Mr. **GORE**. Did not, in his previous term, General de Gaulle head a coalition government?

Mr. **CLARK**. He did. Actually, he had a good deal of trouble in preventing the Communists from taking over that government at the time he first went back into Paris.

Mr. **GORE**. If the Vietcong is the principal element of our adversary in South Vietnam, would it be possible, in order to get a negotiated settlement, to ignore a principal element of opposition?

Mr. **CLARK**. I do not see how it would. This is where I find myself, unfortunately, in strong disagreement with the Secretary of State, who takes what I consider to be the oversimplified view that the Vietcong is merely an arm of the North Vietnamese Government, and that we do not have to deal with them directly; that we have to deal only with Hanoi and perhaps with Peiping. To me, that is utterly unrealistic.

Mr. **GORE**. Does the Vietcong constitute some 80 percent of the fighting force in South Vietnam?

Mr. **CLARK**. Of the fighting force against us.

Mr. **GORE**. Of the fighting force against us.

Mr. **CLARK**. It is my understanding that while there are several regiments, perhaps as much as one division, of North Vietnamese troops fighting us, the Senator's statistics are correct.

Mr. **GORE**. Is the Vietcong a force that is indigenous to South Vietnam?

Mr. **CLARK**. It is my understanding that it is. The Vietcong have established diplomatic posts abroad in various capitals. I am not aware as to who their leaders in South Vietnam are; but there is not a shadow of a doubt, in my mind, that many Vietcong are indigenous South Vietnamese who just do not like what they consider to be the tyrannical and totalitarian government of General Ky.

Mr. **GORE**. Has there been a coalition government in Italy in recent years?

Mr. **CLARK**. Yes; but I do not believe Communists have participated in it. The same has been true of recent governments in France. The Senator may recall that the Communist Party is the largest party in Italy and the second largest in France.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one observation that bears upon that point?

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield to permit me to make one further observation?

Mr. CLARK. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee, then I shall yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. GORE. Following up these questions, will it not be acknowledged that there are dangers in coalition governments if a part of the coalition is a Communist force?

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, history shows very clearly that that is so.

Mr. GORE. But history is not unanimous in that regard, is it?

Mr. CLARK. No; but I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that very dangerous coalition governments which were set up initially in certain countries in Europe contained Communists who succeeded in getting hold of ministries of the interior. Czechoslovakia is a good example.

Mr. GORE Whenever Communists in a coalition government have succeeded in obtaining control of the ministries of propaganda and police, and perhaps the ministry of defense—but at least the former two—that has proved to be almost without exception, so far as I recall, a coalition fatal to freedom.

If on the other hand, the head of the government succeeds, as I believe did the head of the French coalition, in giving to the communistic element within the government, welfare, social security, or some ministry that does not give them control of a vital ministry, or public information, propaganda, police, or military authority, then it has not proven fatal.

I am not so concerned about who the parties to a negotiation may be. As I understand, President Johnson has said that there will be no insurmountable problem so far as this is concerned. I believe the President is maintaining commendable flexibility in this regard.

The structure of the government that may follow the cease-fire negotiation is, in my opinion, very important.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, does not the Senator agree that there are two quite different things involved here? First, who does one talk to in order to arrange a cease-fire and establish a truce? Second, what will the composition of the interim government be while an attempt is being made to hold free elections? The questions are not the same at all.

Mr. GORE. I agree. Free elections in the circumstances that prevail in Vietnam is another subject. However, lest I delay the thoughtful intervention of the Senator from Maine, I desist.

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator is correct in distinguishing between whom we talk to and the composition of the government. However, the question of whom we talk to must be subdivided. It depends on the role we are willing to accept for the Vietcong in the conference. If we accept them merely as a participant in the war, entitled to a place at the conference table and entitled to engage in the discussion, I believe that would create very little difficulty. However, if we are asked, as the North Vietnamese have insisted, to consider them to be representative of South Vietnam at the conference table, that is another extreme.

There is a sticky situation somewhere in between.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Maine to another solution. One solution might be that neither we nor the Chinese Communists go to the conference table, but that the Vietnamese people settle their problem for themselves. That may be the best way to do it, but it might not be practical.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, February 21, 1966, there appeared an article by Ferenc Nagy, former Prime Minister of Hungary.

The Senator may have seen this article.

Mr. CLARK. I did not.

Mr. MUSKIE. In this article Mr. Nagy said:

> As far as I know I am the only former political leader in exile in America who was the head of a coalition government in Central Eastern Europe after World War II.
>
> On the basis of my experiences in my own country and observations in the whole central and Eastern European area I would like to comment on Senator ROBERT KENNEDY's proposition of a coalition government for South Vietnam.

In an aside, I suggest that the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] has since refined his position on those points. However, at the time the article was written, he had not.

I continue to read from Mr. Nagy's article:

> The first thing to know is that if a coalition in an ideologically troubled country is established with the assistance of outside power or powers, then the strength and endurance of the participating political parties or groups is not dependent at all on domestic popular support but on the help of the outside great powers which are behind them politically.
>
> In my government the Communist Party had only 17 percent of popular support while my party alone was supported by more than 60 percent of the voters and the Parliament. Still the Communist Party could get in power in 2 years because they were supported by the Soviet Union and I was overthrown because no outside power gave me any help.

I believe this is a very interesting and useful illustration of the problem of a coalition government.

Mr. CLARK. I believe that it is, too. I have many serious doubts about whether a coalition government could be successful in South Vietnam. However, I point out that the situation which existed in Eastern Europe is really entirely different from the situation in South Vietnam at the moment. We had no American presence in Hungary. We have a big American presence in Vietnam, a much bigger American presence than Red China has.

The need for leaving the President great flexibility is clear. There are all kinds of possibilities; it might be feasible to have a coalition government of the sort suggested by the Senator from Tennessee, and not unlike the one we now have in Laos. With the existing power concentration, and the American physical presence, it would not be nearly so dangerous as the situation which existed in Hungary when we were a long way off.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, what we are discussing is the integrity of a coalition government after the American presence is withdrawn. This is the problem which we are discussing.

Mr. CLARK. I would not for a minute advocate a withdrawal of the American presence until after a free election had determined the composition of government that the people of South Vietnam wanted, and whether it was to be independent, a federation or, indeed, a unified government with North Vietnam.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in connection with the exchange that has just occurred, does not the Senator from Pennsylvania feel that there might quite properly develop a role for the United Nations or some other specially established international commission, that could have governing significance in the interim period so that, pending elections, we might be certain that no single element in South Vietnam could come to dominate. In other words, does not the Senator from Pennsylvania see the possibility of a role developing for the United Nations which might even substitute for a time for a local government in preserving the requisite order and in supervising the conduct of the requisite elections, on which an indigenous government could thereafter be formed?

Mr. CLARK. I should hope so. But, frankly, although I was gratified by our decision to go to the United Nations with the Vietnamese problem, we must remember that our adversaries are not members of the United Nations. If we were to have a cease-fire, both parties would have to agree. If we were to have international machinery to supervise an election, both parties would have to agree.

I should be somewhat skeptical as to whether Hanoi—or Peiping, if they were to inject themselves into the situation, as they well might—would be willing to turn the conduct of an election over to a United Nations team.

It occurs to me that a far more hopeful course would be to go back to the Geneva Conference or, in the alternative, to the International Control Commission, consisting of, I believe, India, Canada, and Poland, as the international agency for supervision.

Mr. CHURCH. That might be the kind of international commission that in the end would emerge, but I do think that an article which appeared in a recent edition of the Nation magazine, captioned, "The Tactics of a Truce," written by Jack D. Forbes, is worthy of the consideration of the Senate.

It envisions a supervisory role by the United Nations, though the article could be read in such a way as to substitute some other suitable international commission for the United Nations wherever that term appears.

Since the article specifies steps that might be taken toward a satisfactory truce, and ultimately toward self-determination for the people of South Vietnam, and since it is, in spirit, an article that conforms to the character and thrust of the excellent address that the Senator from Pennsylvania is giving this afternoon, I wonder if the Senator would mind if I asked unanimous consent to have the article published in the RECORD at a point following the conclusion of the Senator's remarks?

Mr. CLARK. I should be very happy to have that done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, there have been several references to Eastern Europe, and particularly to Czechoslovakia. I suppose I have probably had more nuts-and-bolts experience there than any other Senator, because I was in charge of the consulate general in Slovakia at the time of the Communist putsch in 1948.

I remember at that time, or a few months earlier, thinking that this putsch would occur, because an election was about to be held, and one knew that the Communists could not afford the results of an election, because they would have lost ground.

One also knew that when Jan Masaryk indicated that he would like to join the Marshall plan, that would be strong medicine for the Soviets, their immediate neighbors to the east.

So I remember, about 6 weeks before the putsch, I predicted that there would be a putsch, because the Communists could not accept a loss of power through election, which would be the inevitable result.

The powers that be above me in the State Department chain of command did not agree, and thought that the election could be held and all would work itself out. Lo and behold, when the time came, the Communists preferred the putsch to waiting for and abiding by an election.

The governing factor here is whether or not a strong presence would remain to enforce election results. If that presence were there to enforce the elections, one would not worry too much about the results of the election.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will permit an interjection, I would worry very much about them.

Mr. PELL. The Senator is probably more experienced in the Far East. I know he was in the Far East in the war. But from my experience in eastern Europe, in most of the countries there, the public will did not seem to go in the Communist direction when there was a truly free election.

Mr. CLARK. I merely point out that if for 11 years you support a totalitarian government, and then you go in with B-52 bombers and heavy artillery and small arms and shoot up the villages; and the other side does the same thing, with terroristic tactics, I think it is a pretty close question who the poor people are going to vote for if they once get a chance to vote.

Mr. President, I return to the subject I was discussing before this most interesting colloquy, and I thank my colleagues for their intervention. That was the question of why we cannot get an accurate map out of either the State Department, or the Defense Department, which will show the territory either controlled by the Vietcong or contested by them.

I was pointing out that they give us classified maps, small in scale, which purport to show some of this information, but then tell us we cannot use them to alert the American people to the situation.

We have seen many of these maps in news magazines and in the daily newspapers, but when I called one of them to the attention of Mr. David Bell in open session the other day before the Foreign Relations Committee, he said the map I was showing him was not accurate, and that he would give me an accurate map, but I could not use it.

I hope that when Secretary McNamara comes before the Foreign Relations Committee next week, he will be prepared to bring with him a meaningful map, and I would hope it would be unclassified. But even if he insists on classifying it, on the ground that this might give aid and comfort to the enemy because it would show them that we know where they are, at least he might let us have a classified map, so some of us on the committee can have some real understanding of what the military situation in Vietnam is with respect to the holding of real estate. If you do not hold the real estate, how can you go through with a social and economic program that is anything more than a rescue operation for refugees and the dwellers in a few overcrowded cities?

Mr. MUSKIE. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Simply for clarification. As the Senator knows, like many Members of Congress, this year, I spent some time in Vietnam. While there, we pressed for some enlightenment on the very point the Senator is discussing; in other words, to give us as accurate and precise a pictorial impression as possible as regards the state of control of real estate.

We were told over and over again that although we could be given something that might approximate the situation at a given instant of time, the nature of the war there is so fluid that almost any map that might be offered would in a sense be misleading as to what the situation is at the moment the beholder might be looking at it.

So when we were given maps, we were asked to withhold them, for the reason that they might be misleading at such time as we released them.

This may be too great a sensitivity on this point. I think the Senator is right in raising it, but I simply wished to state what we learned when we were there, and match it against what the Senator has been told.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his information. I have been told exactly the same thing.

Perhaps I am dealing more in logic than in common sense, but I do not see why one cannot draw a map which says, "We hold this particular province so firmly that we can go in there and build a school building, or a rural electrification plant, give fertilizer to the peasants, help them harvest their crops, and nobody is going to change it; that is our backyard. Here is another area where the control of the province changes back and forth; perhaps the Vietcong control it at night, we control it in the daytime."

We had an interesting example the other day of what happens when we build these schools. Sometimes the Vietcong burn them down, if they are built by the Saigon government. If the local people participate in building them, the Vietcong do not burn them down; they use them for evening meetings, at which they teach the children to sing Vietcong songs. Sometimes they use them as sanctuaries, because when there is an attack on a particular hamlet, they are pretty sure our troops or the South Vietnamese will not attack the little red schoolhouses. Then, as soon as the attack is over, they open fire from the schoolhouses.

Maps would also show that there are other areas which are all jungle and elephant grass, and are virtually uninhabited.

That kind of map, I think, considering our position in having to determine how much to vote in the way of social and economic aid for South Vietnam, is an important source of information to which I think we are entitled.

Mr. MUSKIE. Yet there is no way of determining whether an area identified as a secure area on the map is indeed secure, or controlled to the point where we cannot suffer damage. For example, Saigon itself is a secure area, but there is terrorism going on there all the time. When we were there, a hotel housing American servicemen was blown up.

Mr. CLARK. There is a strong school of thought—I believe this was mentioned in the Mansfield report—that Saigon is a hostage for Hanoi, and vice versa.

Mr. MUSKIE. There is a school of thought to that effect. My own feeling is that the reason the Vietcong do not move in on Saigon with greater force is that they are not in a position to do so, not because of any inhibitions tied to the protection of Hanoi. I doubt very much that they consider them mutual hostages, but I understand there is that view held by many people on our side.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, more or less attention is being directed to the problem of the Vietcong. Indeed, that seems to be the principal problem.

Now, should our goal be similar to intimations the Senator and I heard earlier today, suggesting the extermination of the Vietcong?

Mr. CLARK. I believe that is a hopeless objective. I do not believe we can ever do it. They can quit, of course. But I saw in the newspapers the other day that we have shot off 25,000 bullets for every Vietcong we have killed. That is not an effective method of warfare, in my opinion.

Mr. GORE. Just what is to be done, then, if the Vietcong are not to be admitted to negotiations, are not to have a part in the government, are not to be permitted to exist? What kind of war is this? What kind of war would it be necessary to wage to achieve the goal of extermination of the Vietcong in South Vietnam?

Mr. CLARK. I can see no other course but to demand unconditional surrender, which I deplore as being neither wise nor feasible. This is a problem which the administration must face.

Mr. GORE. In asking these questions, please understand that I have no fixed conclusions as to how the problem of Vietcong insurgency in South Vietnam should be handled. I doubt whether those who wish merely to ignore it, or to exterminate them, realize the extent of the areas held, according to such maps as the Senator and I have been privileged to see; and I doubt whether the problem is quite so simple as that. No attempt was made to exterminate the Communists in France after World War II because of their political affiliations. No attempt was made to exterminate Communist sympathizers in Laos before this settlement was reached.

I raise these questions only for contemplation, not to make an assertion myself as to how it should be done; but, it seems to me, that some of the sentiments which the Senator and I and others have been hearing recently are certainly unrealistic and not quite relative to the problem that prevails in South Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator; yet, in all candor, one has to give some thought to the analogy in Malaya after the war where, for 7 years, the British and the Malayans fought against the infiltration of Chinese Communists and, finally, exterminated them or persuaded them that they had so little chance to succeed that they returned to China.

We know of the present efforts of the Belaunde government in Peru to exterminate the Communists in the Andes. They seem to be doing rather well. The Betancourt government in Venezuela has been successful recently in exterminating the Communist minority. Therefore, I agree fundamentally with the Senator since I do not believe that we can do this in South Vietnam. We must examine these analogies with great care.

Mr. GORE. The disturbing problem—which I believe it truly to be—is that apparently some of our colleagues have easy and simple solutions to exterminate the Vietcong. I do not believe that is quite so easy as some appear to think it to be.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, a few final thoughts about the maps. In my judgment, these maps are substantially accurate. They show, as stated above, that most of the food producing area in South Vietnam and, indeed, most of the villages and hamlets are either completely under control of the Vietcong or so subject to raids which requisition the crops or, in the alternative, collect heavy taxes as a condition to permitting the peasants to harvest them, that South Vietnam, once a rice exporting country, is now importing at heavy cost a substantial part of its food supply. Moreover, the writ of the Saigon government runs feebly, if at all, to the overwhelming majority of the areas where the peasants live and cultivate their fields.

Nor do the present military tactics pursued by the American troops hold much prospect of success.

Mr. President, here one must be cautious, because I do not purport to be a military expert. A few moments ago, one or two of our colleagues congratulated themselves on having served with distinction in the Armed Forces of our country during World War II. Many of us served. I do not believe that makes any of us a military expert. However, as legislators, charged with the responsibility for voting authorization of funds for a war so far away from our shores, we have a duty, at least as civilians, to look at the facts. In my opinion, the search-and-destroy tactics are not a sound and feasible way to win the war.

Indeed, as Walter Lippmann has well said, these tactics are much like punching water. The "search and destroy" policy of killing Vietcong and North Vietnamese soldiers is a sterile one. The end result is an unnecessary increase in American casualties without any real countervailing advantage. Moreover it requires the investment of a fortune in terms of equipment and ammunition expended in bombing raids, amphibious expeditions, and the direction of our enormous firepower into the elephant grass and the jungles in efforts, often fruitless, to find and kill the enemy. In all too many cases, the enemy slips out of the traps we so elaborately lay for them. And once a contested area has been secured by American might, it is only a short time before our troops withdraw and the Vietcong come right back into the area where the battle took place.

In the course of all this, hundreds, if not thousands, of innocent women and children, as well as South Vietnamese farmers, are killed or rendered homeless. Surely this policy is certain to lose the hearts and minds of the very individuals we are trying to get on our side.

A good example of this was the recent highly publicized American offensive in Binh Dinh and Quang Ngai provinces. These provinces are densely inhabited, rich in rice, and have been largely under Communist control for the last year and a half. The major offensive against them was aimed at four North Vietnamese regiments which, with minor exceptions, refused to stand and fight. Having failed to corner the enemy, but having killed an unknown number of civilians, the Americans are now withdrawing, leaving devastation, destruction, and curses, not loud but deep, behind them.

One may ask concerning this "search and destroy" policy: How many Vietcong must we kill to persuade them to give up? How many Americans must die in the effort? How many South Vietnamese must also die, including innocent men, women, and children not engaged in the battle? What will the country look like after the engagements are over? Is this the way to secure the loyalty of the local population? And can we hold the real estate we reconquer in the course of the search and destroy offensives?

Additional unanswered questions, of course are: Cannot the Vietcong with Hanoi's support continue guerrilla warfare indefinitely, gradually, with our unwilling collaboration, bringing about the destruction of the economy and the countryside of South Vietnam? Perhaps more important, how much treasure and manpower, in the light of our other global commitments, will the military request from the White House in order to keep this kind of unrewarding warfare going?

A word about the political, economic, and social situation in South Vietnam. Ever since the French departed 11 years ago, we have been urging a series of frequently changing South Vietnamese Governments to establish a free democratic society in that part of their country not under Vietcong control. Several abortive efforts to achieve this result were, in truth, made, but every one of them has failed. Now it appears from the Honolulu Conference that still another effort will be attempted. The totalitarian Ky government has committed itself to reforming its habits and customs and installing social, economic, and political justice in the countryside under its control.

Yet dispatches from South Vietnam make clear that there is little opportunity for the average South Vietnamese peasant to participate in any significant way in the Government of his own country or, indeed, to rise in the ranks of that Government. Educational requirements and an inbred autocratic oligarchical society, confine positions of honor and good pay to the military, the civil servants, and the families of the landlords who still control the overwhelming proportion of the real estate in areas in which the writ of the Ky government still runs. Moreover, the age-long quarrels between Catholics, Buddhists, the various other religious sects, and long-standing jealousy between families originating in South Vietnam towards families from the north create a complicated social picture which gives little opportunity for a democratic solution in freedom. Over and above all these, Ho Chi Minh is still the father figure to most of the Vietnamese, North and South, who think in national terms. There is no comparable individual around whom the South Vietnamese can rally.

A good example of the difficulties confronting the efforts to bring social justice to South Vietnam appears in the New York Times for Monday, February 21, in an article by Charles Mohr under the headline "Saigon Social Ills Worry U.S. Aids." The heart of the article appears in the first two paragraphs, which read as follows:

> Many of the Americans who work in the South Vietnamese countryside believe that nothing short of major changes in the country's social system and in the performance of the Government can ever produce the political conditions necessary for victory over the Vietcong.
>
> They hope desperately—but skeptically—that Vice President HUMPHREY was right when he said with exuberance in Saigon recently that it was "our side," not the Vietcong, that would make a true social revolution in South Vietnam.

The article then points out the typical difficulties which arise in Kienhoa Province in the Mekong River Delta where, despite earnest efforts of American and South Vietnamese officials, there seems little hope that the 1966 pacification plan can succeed. In this area the Government controls only 30 percent of the terrain and a little more than a third of the population. Despite the B-52 bombings and wide military operations against them, the Vietcong guerrillas have tightened their hold on the countryside. As one American official was quoted as saying:

> The truth is, we are not offering these people any very good reason to switch sides.

Both because we and our South Vietnamese allies hold so little of the real estate, and because the whole social, economic, and political system in South Vietnam requires a drastic revision, almost impossible to accomplish in less than a generation, I have little confidence that our aid program will be any more successful in the future than it has been in the past.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. If the Senator would prefer to complete his remarks without my interrupting them, I would be pleased to withhold my request.

Mr. CLARK. No. The speech has been chopped up already.

Mr. McGOVERN. I am sorry another commitment will prevent my hearing all of the Senator's speech, but I have read most of the statement that he is making today. I think it is one of the most thoughtful and constructive statements yet offered on the Vietnam crisis. I hope very much that it will be carefully read by our officials in the State Department and the executive branch.

Mr. CLARK. I hope so, too, I may say to my friend, but I have some doubts about it.

Mr. McGOVERN. I know the Senator is highly regarded in the Government. I suspect that what he has to say is very carefully read, although not always followed as fully as it should be.

I share the Senator's conviction that the President of the United States very much wants to achieve a negotiated settlement of this conflict. I have never for one moment doubted the President's very real desire to achieve a peaceful and honorable settlement of this conflict. I think perhaps more than any one of us, he is concerned about the bloodshed and the sacrifice of American lives in that part of the world, and that he has a very strong and clear desire to move the conflict from the battlefield to the negotiating table.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. McGOVERN. I have thought about what prevents the other side from accepting the invitation to negotiations and it seems to me there may be at least three factors that explain this unfortunate situation.

I think the first factor has been the reluctance of the administration to state clearly that it is willing to enter into direct negotiations with the National Liberation Front.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania has said, while it is an unpleasant fact, that political group nevertheless controls a major portion of the countryside. It is an effective political and military force in South Vietnam. It is the force that has been shooting and killing the Government troops in South Vietnam. It is the force that has been shooting at our own men there. So, unpleasant as it may be, they represent a power to be dealt with and not merely as an appendage to Hanoi.

Second, I think we must state our willingness to permit that front some share in whatever provisional government is established. The Saigon government has, of course, a voice in this matter too as do other interested groups. But we must indicate our willingness to have the National Liberation Front involved in any kind of provisional government that is established before elections are held:

The third factor that I think stands in the way of negotiations is that every time we have expressed a desire for negotiations, we have stepped up the military operations. There have been more search and destroy operations, or more bombing attacks. Those offensive activities are doubtless interpreted by the other side as an indication of lack of good faith on our side to negotiate. We should be able to understand that, because various officials in our own Government have said that the other side did not seem to be interested in negotiations when they have accelerated their military activities.

I wonder if the Senator agrees with me that these three factors are pertinent. There may be others, but are they not factors which make the other side reluctant to enter negotiations?

Mr. CLARK. I agree. We cannot expect the other side to come to the negotiating table while we are engaging in military attacks.

There is an additional factor involved, which I think is important, and I wonder if the Senator will agree with me. The other side still thinks it is going to win. I have been accused of being a dove, and in some respects I am. I do not think we can permit them to think we are tired. I think we must stay to convince them that we mean what we say. I do think we should try to minimize the casualties. But we must remember that they think they are going to win, that we are not going to win, that we will get tired and that we will get out.

I would like to point out for the RECORD that there is not a single U.S. Senator who wants us to get out of Vietnam unilaterally.

Mr. McGOVERN. I have never recommended U.S. withdrawal before an honorable settlement and I know of no other Senator who has.

I do not believe either side can win a military victory. The cost of a clear-cut victory on either side is so high that it is beyond any interest that either they or we might have. This is not a war in which military victory is feasible for either side.

We have enough firepower in Vietnam so that we are not going to be pushed out. By the same token if we were to use that firepower to try to score what some call a victory, we would have to kill 3, 4, or 5 times as many innocent civilians as the number of guerrillas that would be killed.

We have reached what amounts to a military stalemate in the war, and that leaves no reasonable alternative other than a negotiated settlement.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator from South Dakota not agree that the President expressed the point very well yesterday in New York, and that what he said there is applicable to us as well as to the other side? I quote the President:

> We can live with anger in word as long as it is matched with caution in deed.

Mr. McGOVERN. I believe that is an excellent point. It is a more eloquent way of stating that old rhyme we used to state in childhood:

> Sticks and stones will break my bones but names will never hurt me.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McGOVERN. Many times the words, particularly those of the Chinese, are phrased in much more belligerent terms than their actions.

Mr. CLARK. I agree.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I commend the Senator on his excellent address.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his intervention.

Mr. President, I wish to speak for a moment about American capability. If we go for all-out war we could, of course, with our enormous firepower and the interjection of several hundred thousand additional American ground troops, together with a stepping up of our bombing in the south, wipe out the Vietcong; but we would wipe out South Vietnam with it and earn the undying enmity of those still living after the assaults had terminated.

We could also destroy the economy of North Vietnam and kill a good part of its population in order to induce surrender.

If China were to come in as a result of all this, we could win a war against China.

In short, to paraphrase the words of the well-known poem, it would be indeed a famous victory. But what would be left afterward?

None but madmen would advocate such a solution. There are limitations on the cost we can pay for total victory. As a civilized nation, there must be some limit to the number of people we are willing to kill and the amount of havoc we are prepared to wreak on a fundamentally innocent and, until recently, friendly people. There are limitations on our war capabilities in South Vietnam even short of a war with China. Among them, and they are important indeed, are, first, the number of American coffins our administration is prepared to see come home while the war is escalated and, second, the cost in terms of moving forward with our Great Society program, redressing the balance of our international payments, maintaining our friendly posture with the other nations of the world and, indeed, our own self-respect.

In the light of the foregoing, what should be American policy? Our present Vietnamese policy has: First, alienated most of our allies; second, impeded the conduct of our overall foreign policy; third, spread American military power too thin for our own safety; fourth, set back, for the foreseeable future, any prospect of a detente with Russia; fifth, set back the pacification of China and the bringing of that country into the family of nations; and, sixth, seriously damaged our hopes for arms control and disarmament.

On the domestic front, the costs of an expanded war will mean abandonment of the Great Society program or, in the alternative, a substantial increase in Federal taxes. Our problems in balancing our international payments have been substantially increased. So has the threat of inflation. There is a danger that measures may shortly have to be taken to combat inflation which could bring an end to the 5 consecutive years of prosperity the country has enjoyed.

And perhaps the most frustrating part of the unhappy position in which we find ourselves is that no one can be sure whether our present policy may not succeed before we realize it. It is entirely conceivable that the Vietcong, with the acquiescence of Hanoi and Peiping, may give up tomorrow. Yet I, for one, am unwilling to see us put all our chips on that possibility. It is true that our opponents are not 10 feet tall. It is true that they have grave weaknesses. But it is equally true that the creeping escalation into which our country has been sucked holds grave dangers for all Americans if it is further pursued. The time has come for us to draw up a balance sheet, and look at the advantages of further escalation, if there are any, as against the costs.

Before presenting my own view, I should like to say a word about the function of the Senate. There are Members of this body and many outside, both in and out of the administration, who believe that Senators should remain silent in the face of these critical problems lest by speaking out we give aid and comfort to the enemies of our country. But to me this is a primitive and wholly unacceptable view. In our pluralistic and democratic society the right of dissent is secured. Under our Constitution the Senate is required to give its advice and consent in matters of foreign policy. In my judgment, both the current hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee and the debate now going on on the floor of the Senate provide an important national service. In fact, I believe it my duty, as well as that of other Senators, to speak out on the subject of Vietnam.

Already the debate has accomplished much. We have forced the administration to carry out an "agonizing reappraisal," to borrow an old phrase, of its basic assumptions about our involvement in Vietnam. We have helped to sharpen the issues for the American people. We have pinpointed the dangers of following the belligerent course advocated by some administration leaders as well as some highly respected Senators. And in the end I hope we shall be successful in shaping a new course of action which will produce an honorable negotiated settlement.

What, then, should our course be? I conclude:

First. Viewing Vietnam in the light of our global commitments and our national capabilities, the military realities are such that the cost in casualties and money of further escalating the war in order to crush the enemy, to retake lost real estate and to pacify the country are too high to be acceptable.

Second. More and bigger bombing or a substantial buildup of American ground forces cannot change the military realities in our favor without unacceptable casualties and the expenditure of billions of dollars badly needed elsewhere. The forces arrayed against us can be increased indefinitely. The notion that we can achieve a decisive military superiority in South Vietnam is a dangerous fantasy because the adversary land powers of Asia, with substantially greater military manpower, will not permit us to do so except at the cost of entirely destroying the country and leaving nothing but devastation and ruin as the result of our efforts.

Third. The real problem is to achieve a settlement consistent with the military realities. While efforts are going forward at the United Nations and elsewhere to bring the shooting to an end, we should stay where we are in South Vietnam with what we have in terms of naval, air, and land power. We should increase our forces, our armaments, and our financial commitment only to the extent necessary to maintain our present position. We should require that the major burden of any effort to retake enemy-held territory should fall on the South Vietnamese, not on us.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my friend from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is probably going to say it; therefore, I may be intervening unnecessarily. As the Senator knows, I have not listened to all of his speech, but he has favored me with the text of it, and I find myself in general accord with it. I am proud to tell him this because he and I have agreed on major objectives. We have had variances of opinion as to how to implement the objectives we have in mind.

The Senator's descendants will have every reason to be proud of the record he is leaving behind today in his speech in this historic debate. In my judgment, it is a magnificent speech.

I am proud to be associated with the Senator in the advancement of some of our reasons for urging some modification of our Government's policy.

When the Senator makes the suggestions that he started to make as to what our policy ought to be, this does not mean that we are in any way going to risk our position in South Vietnam militarily. It does not mean that we are going to jeopardize the welfare of our boys over there. I think it means that we are going to save the lives of many of them who otherwise would be killed.

So far as I am concerned, I am proud to say that I wholeheartedly support General Gavin and his definition of an enclave program in South Vietnam. I strongly urge my Government to accept that program.

But the point I want to make is that we now hold this position, which means that the Vietcong cannot takeover. It means they cannot succeed in advancing. Many people get the idea that the enclave theory means some kind of retreat or some kind of surrender. That is pure nonsense. It does mean that in the holding operation we, I think, strengthen the possibility of other nations moving in with an entirely different status and for an entirely different purpose—the purpose of peacekeeping; the purpose of trying to work out a cease-fire; the purpose of trying to work out a negotiated settlement, not to be carried on under a bilateral arrangement between the United States and South Vietnam, on the one hand, and the Vietcong and North Vietnam, on the other; but with noncombatants sitting at the head of the table, leading the parties to an honorable and negotiated settlement. That must be the approach.

I shall stop now. The Senator has heard me say this many times. We have to play for that period of time when we can get multilateral participation in a settlement of this problem. It cannot be done, in my judgment, under the program that our administration has outlined.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator from Oregon and thank him for his helpful intervention.

I return to a discussion of my third point, which is what our course should be for the future. I had started to say that the real problem is to achieve a settlement consistent with the military realities.

I believe that from our present military position we should give our military commanders complete flexibility to utilize their present forces to the maximum extent consistent with an acceptable rate of casualties; and, in my judgment, such an acceptable rate would be very low indeed.

Fifth. In our search for a cease-fire and a peaceful settlement we must be prepared to deal at the conference table with the Vietcong.

I think it is generally agreed that our goal in Vietnam should not be unconditional surrender by our opponents. The

President has stressed, over and over again, that our aim is an honorable peace, not total victory.

But by pretending that the Vietcong do not exist—except as a sort of North Vietnamese expenditionary force—we are, in effect, demanding their unconditional surrender.

True, we are not seeking total victory over North Vietnam. It is not our aim to invade North Vietnam and occupy Hanoi. But this does not change the situation in the south.

It is absurd to contend, as the North Vietnamese do, that the National Liberation Front is the "sole" representative of the people of South Vietnam. In order to make that assertion a fact, the Vietcong and their allies from the north would have to achieve a total victory over the Saigon government. This we can never permit, either on the battlefield or at the conference table.

But if our position is that the Saigon government is the sole representative of the South Vietnamese people, then our objective must be that the Vietcong lay down their arms and submit to the Saigon government—in other words, total victory for General Ky. There is a difference between negotiating a compromise settlement which is not fully acceptable to either side, but not unacceptable to either side, and simply negotiating about where the Vietcong are to stack their arms before heading to the prison camp. The first type properly deserves to be called a negotiation; the second sort is not negotiation at all—it is simply settling the details on an unconditional surrender. And obviously nobody would agree to a so-called negotiation of the latter sort unless they were thoroughly beaten.

The one salient point in the Mansfield report—in which I understand there is general agreement—is that this is an "open ended" war. In other words, if our goal is to defeat the Vietcong to the extent that they are willing to come to a conference merely to settle the terms of their surrender, then we are in for a much larger war, because the other side can match us man for man into the hundreds of thousands, even without Chinese intervention. I hope we all appreciate the dangers of a war with China—and perhaps ultimately with Russia—if this escalation should occur.

However, if our goal is a genuine negotiation—and not just a negotiated Vietcong surrender—then I think we should say so plainly to the other side. Of course, we should not reveal our minimum bargaining position; there is not much room left for bargaining if we do that. But we should make it plain that our objective is not the unconditional surrender of the Vietcong, and the best way to do that is to make it plain that we expect them to come to the bargaining table in their own right. So long as they are under the impression that we expect them to stack arms and surrender, one could hardly expect them to take a positive view about our "peace offensive."

If we are really interested in a genuine negotiation—and not just a negotiated surrender by the Vietcong—what can we expect the negotiators to talk about? The answer is simple—setting the conditions under which the wounds of the war can be healed and the people of South Vietnam can achieve some measure of democracy and self-determination. It is essential that we not commit ourselves to any specific formula, and that we not bar any formula which might achieve this result, because the formula is what we will be negotiating.

We should be canvassing—and I hope our State Department planners are now studying—a variety of alternatives. It is likely that some sort of provisional government will have to be set up. I think it is most important that a definite date for the holding of free elections be established, that all the negotiating parties pledge themselves to guarantee the holding of such elections—unlike the prior Geneva accords, which the United States did not sign—and that a strong international force be sent into the country to enforce a cease-fire and to assure that the election, when held, is as free as it can be made.

The International Control Commission from the 1954 accords, made up of India, Canada, and Poland, still exists; perhaps it could do the job, given a sizable increase in manpower. Perhaps a new all-Asian International Control Commission should be set up, in which countries such as Burma, Malaysia, and the Philippines might participate. This is obviously a proper subject for negotiations.

If a decision should be taken to set up a provisional government which would have the duty of governing South Vietnam until free elections under international controls are held, obviously one of the toughest jobs for the negotiators—which would have to include the Saigon Government and the Vietcong as well as North Vietnam and ourselves—will be determining the makeup of the government. Since the establishment of some kind of government is an essential precondition to the holding of free elections, there is no way of avoiding the painful job of negotiating such a provisional arrangement.

It is most vital that we not walk into the bargaining session with inflexible attitudes and firm preconditions on this point.

To my regret, I note that a really inflexible position is still held by some people high in the administration. It may be possible to work out some form of international custodial government which could run and pacify the country until the holding of elections; this might be the best way out of the dilemma.

The negotiators might favor a hybrid arrangement for a provisional government with certain key functions—such as police, information, and justice—under temporary international control, and with other functions under South Vietnamese control. Or they might come up with a plan for an all-South Vietnamese provisional government, with the International Control Commission staying in the background and merely keeping the peace and guaranteeing the freedom of the elections, including, of course, the freedom to organize for political activity and campaign for office.

I think we have a right to expect that the other side will not take an adamant position requiring the exclusion of representatives of the Saigon Government in such a provisional arrangement. But, by the same token, I think they have a right to expect that we will not prejudge their claims for NLF participation.

So far as I can determine, and I confess the recent rash of confusing statements has tended to cloud the atmosphere, this is precisely what President Johnson's position is.

While he did not deal at any depth with the subject in his speech in New York last night, yet I think everything that I have said is consistent with the position he summarized during that talk.

According to press reports I have seen, Press Secretary Moyers has expressly declared "that kind of question is one that should be decided at the negotiating table." This statement was apparently made in response to a request for comment on the proposal that the United States keep the door open to the possibility of participation by the National Liberation Front in any provisional government which may be set up as a result of peace talks before free elections are held.

As one Senator who has long supported the President's efforts to achieve an honorable negotiated settlement, I am quite frankly grateful to the White House for this much needed clarification. I hope the President will seize every opportunity to bring this message home, and help to dispel the confusion which exists both here in the United States, and in Hanoi, about our aims. For I am one of those who continue to hope that when the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese have become convinced of our desire to achieve a settlement which is honorable without being unrealistic, the negotiations for which we have sought so long can begin.

I close my remarks with the hope that the President and his principal military and civilian advisers will give prayerful thought to the point of view which I have expressed this afternoon, and will refrain from further escalating the war in what, in my judgment, would be a vain effort to achieve that most elusive of objectives, military victory.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at the conclusion of my remarks a series of editorials, columns, and comments by the editors of the New York Times, Mr. James Reston, Mr. Joseph Kraft, Mr. Walter Lippmann, and Mr. Max Frankel, from which documents I have drawn much of the inspiration for this speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have listened to the address of the Senator this afternoon with attention and with admiration. He continues to display independence of thought.

I believe that he has made a most constructive contribution to the continuing dialog on Vietnam.

I commend him very strongly for the forthright and courageous address he has given this afternoon.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank my friend for his kind words. As he knows, he and I have stood pretty much together in this matter over the last several months.

Mr. CHURCH. I especially congratulate the Senator for his determination to advance the discussion in a dispassionate way, since we are searching for light instead of heat. This is obviously the need of the moment if our country's best interests are to be served.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I understand the views of the Senator from Pennsylvania and he understands mine. However, I disagree with the views of the Senator.

I ask the Senator what his judgment is concerning the legality of the position of the United States. Is the Senator one of those who believe that this Nation at present does not have the power to put troops there, that the authorization given the President in August is not sufficiently broad to empower the President to put those troops there, or that we are in violation of our United Nations Charter and treaty commitment?

Mr. CLARK. I have mixed views about that. I really have not attempted to firm up any definitive view. This is a rather secondary matter.

I do not believe that the Tonkin Gulf resolution added a single thing to the powers that the President had as Commander in Chief.

I do not think the repeal of that resolution or its modification would take away any of the powers which he had. Yet, from a purely legalistic point of view, I believe that a very good case can be made for the position that we find ourselves in a state of war, an obvious war, without that war having been declared by Congress as the Constitution requires. But I do not want to get legalistic about it because there are very many reasons, with many of which I sympathize, why it did not seem either feasible or wise to come to Congress to request a declaration of war.

The whole character of war has changed since our Constitution was framed. When we deal with so-called wars of national liberation, subversion, and sabotage, I am not at all sure that the strict constitutional requirement—which I believe has been violated—should nonetheless prevail.

With respect to the SEATO Treaty, only recently stressed by the Secretary of State, I do not believe that we have any obligation under that treaty to commit 200,000 men to the jungles of South Vietnam. On the other hand, I agree that we have the right.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am sure I agree at least in part with what the Senator has said here.

When President Eisenhower occupied the White House and John Foster Dulles was urging us to vote for a Near East or Middle East resolution, this Senator insisted that the President had the right to send troops to the Near East in the absence of any declaration by Congress.

It was the judgment of the Senator from Louisiana at that time that the necessity and wisdom of the President in sending the troops would be best declared after the event occurred, or after the provocation occurred, rather than in advance.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator could make a very good case for that, and I would not necessarily quarrel with him. However, trying to put oneself in the position of the President of the United States, one would be very reluctant to take massive military action without reassuring himself that the Congress was not going to shoot him down from behind.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We fought the Korean war that way, though, as the Senator very well knows.

Mr. CLARK. Yes; we did.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The President declared that such was our duty under the United Nations Treaty, and put troops in there, and Senator Taft of Ohio repeatedly criticized the President for not coming to Congress and seeking a resolution. We fought that war to a conclusion, such as it was, on that basis.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There have been 125 times, at least, if not more, when Presidents have undertaken to put the Armed Forces into action, either in defense of a position or to take a position, without a declaration of war.

The Constitution says that Congress shall declare war, but it does not deny the President, as the Commander in Chief, the right to put the Armed Forces of the United States into action prior to a declaration of war.

In this case, the President of the United States, recalling the Korean situation and Senator Taft's criticism of what happened, came and asked Congress for approval of what he had done; and those of us who voted on it—that is, many of us—clearly understood the meaning of those last words, which said that he would take whatever steps were necessary to prevent further aggression.

My thought at that time, as the Senate was voting on it, was that we could expect that the North Vietnamese might react violently to our response to their attack in the Tonkin Gulf, and that if that should happen, we proposed to counter whatever they would do thereafter; and it was my belief that when we sent troops down there, the President had the necessary authorization.

The Senator, of course, is familiar with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, the so-called Vandenberg proposal, which says that nothing in the United Nations Charter would impair the right of any nation to act in individual or collective self-defense.

Inasmuch as we had a treaty, we certainly had the right to construe that treaty—as we did with the August resolution last year—as requiring us to act to meet aggression.

In view of that, it would seem to this Senator, just as it seemed to the American Bar Association by a unanimous vote—I think it was 279 to 0—that we had a treaty obligation, and we had an act of Congress telling the President that "We think the treaty obligation is involved here, we have been attacked, we have struck back, we have anticipated further aggression," and we authorized the President to take whatever steps he deemed necessary to meet further aggression.

While I appreciate the Senator's argument, in the last analysis, it would seem to me that it would be the President, in compliance with that resolution, who would determine what he thought was necessary to meet that aggression, not the Congress, because the resolution explicitly states he should take the steps he thought necessary to meet the aggression.

Mr. CLARK. I do not wish to become involved in an argument with the Senator from Louisiana, because I think he can make a pretty good legal argument; in fact, he has just done so. I know that my friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] does not agree with him, and perhaps he will speak up in a moment.

But to me, the problem involved here is not the right of what the President did; it is the wisdom. We have a right to do a great many things which are not very wise.

It is in this area that, with deep reluctance, I find myself in some disagreement with what has been done. But I say again, as I said earlier in my speech I hope we are on the way to correct that situation.

I have put in the RECORD the President's speech in New York last night. I do not agree with the 10th point, about whether what we are doing there is worthwhile, but I think the rest of it was a temporate statement of a position which is opposed to escalation, and shows determination that we will not be thrown out; and I am in accord with that.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

THE 1965 DESERTIONS UP IN SAIGON FORCES—TOTAL IS PUT ABOVE 96,000—U.S. AIDS CONCERNED

(By Neil Sheehan)

SAIGON, February 23.—About 96,000 men deserted from the South Vietnamese armed forces last year, a total equivalent to nearly half of the American force that has been committed to the defense of this country.

Actually, the figure reported by the South Vietnamese Government was higher, but informed sources said it did not take into account the fact that some of the deserters had later reenlisted. In addition, the figures are considered less than completely accurate because of the crude administrative procedures of the armed forces.

Nevertheless, the sources said, U.S. military officials consider the desertion rate very high and are deeply concerned about it.

Total desertions for 1965 were put at 113,000. Of these, 47,000 were from the regular armed forces—army, navy, and air force—and 17,000 were from the regional forces, equivalent of the U.S. National Guard; 49,000 were from the popular forces, or local militia.

The sources could offer no specific reasons for the high rate of Government desertions other than the intensification of the fighting and a general war weariness that has overtaken the country.

Most of the men who desert, the sources said, do so either while still in training camps or while moving to their first assignments.

Figures were not available for desertions during 1964, but it was understood that they had been substantially below the 1965 figures.

Desertions from the regular armed forces nearly doubled during the last year, reaching about 14 percent of their total strength. Desertions from the 270,000-man army, which forms the great bulk of the regular armed forces, showed a gradual increase during the year. They ran near 18 percent of total strength in December.

The armed forces discharged 48,000 men for various reasons in 1965 and suffered 13,000 killed, 23,000 wounded, and 6,000 missing in action or captured.

OVERALL FORCE INCREASES

Despite the high desertions and other losses, the Government relied on intensive recruiting, more stringent conscription methods and the return of wounded to duty to increase the overall strength of the Armed Forces from 510,000 men in December 1964, to 571,000 in December 1965.

The regular Armed Forces, for example, inducted 114,000 men during the year—77,000 volunteers and 37,000 conscripts.

Most of the deserters were men who had originally volunteered for service. The regional forces and popular forces—two militia units heavily affected—are composed entirely of volunteers. A majority of men in the regular Armed Forces also enlisted.

Most deserters, qualified sources suggest, do not defect to the Vietcong, but return to their homes in the villages, go into hiding or drift into the cities to look for civilian jobs.

Vietcong defections to the Government during 1965 totaled about 11,000. No estimates are available for guerrillas who deserted from Communist units and did not report to Government authorities, but the number is believed to equal only a fraction of the desertions from the Government Armed Forces because the Vietcong usually exercise tighter control over their areas.

FOE STILL OUTNUMBERED

Although Government forces still outnumber the enemy by more than 2 to 1, the Vietcong have shown an ability to increase their overall strength more quickly than the Government. The total enemy force increased in the last year from 103,000 at the beginning of 1965 to 230,000 in December.

About 20,000 troops were North Vietnamese regulars who had infiltrated the south since last winter. About 40,000 more are political and administrative workers who do little fighting.

In another report made available here today, a U.S. military spokesman said that in the week that ended Saturday, 83 American servicemen were killed in South Vietnam, 354 wounded and 4 reported missing in action. Twelve South Koreans and Australians were also killed, 17 wounded and 1 reported missing.

In the same period, 197 South Vietnamese troops were killed.

The Vietcong guerrillas suffered 1,357 dead and 122 captured, according to the spokesman.

Exhibit 2

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 24, 1966]

Text of President's Remarks in the Freedom Awards

Twenty-five years ago—to a world darkened by war—President Franklin Roosevelt described the four freedoms of mankind:

Freedom of speech and expression.

Freedom of every person to worship God in his own way.

Freedom from want.

Freedom from fear.

Franklin Roosevelt knew that these freedoms could not be the province of one people alone. He called on his countrymen to assist those who endured the tyrant's bombs and suffered his oppression.

He called for courage—for generosity—for resolution in the face of terror. He said that:

"Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights—or keep them."

Wendell Willkie—Franklin Roosevelt's opponent in the campaign of 1940—shared his belief that freedom could not be founded only on American shores or only for those whose skin is white. "Freedom is an indivisible word," he said. "If we want to enjoy it, and fight for it, we must be prepared to extend it to everyone, whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us or not, no matter what their race or the color of their skin."

That was Republican policy 25 years ago. It was Democratic policy 25 years ago. It is American policy tonight.

How well have we done in our time in making the four freedoms real for our people, and for the people of the world?

Here in America we accord every man the right to worship as he wills. I believe we are more tolerant of religious or sectional differences than we were a quarter of a century ago. The majority of our people believe that a qualified man or woman—of any race—any religion—any section—could hold any office in the land. This was not so clear in 1940.

We are committed, now—however great the trial and tension—to protecting the right of free expression and peaceful dissent. We have learned to despise the witch hunt—the unprincipled harassment of a man's integrity and his right to be different. We have gained in tolerance—and I am determined to use the high office I hold to protect and encourage that tolerance.

I do not mean to say that I will remain altogether silent on the critical issues of our day. For just as strongly as I believe in other men's freedom to disagree, so do I believe in the President's freedom to persuade. Let me assure you that I will do everything in my power to defend both.

AMERICAN RECORD

Twenty-five years ago "freedom from want" had the ring of urgency for our people. The unemployment rate stood at 14½ percent. Millions of Americans had spent the last decade in the breadlines or on farms where the winds howled away any chance for a decent life.

Tonight there are still millions whose poverty haunts our conscience. There are still fathers without jobs and children without hope.

Yet for the vast majority of Americans, these are times when the hand of plenty has replaced the grip of want. For the first time in almost 9 years, the unemployment rate has fallen to 4 percent.

This liberation from want—for which we thank God—is a testimony to the enduring vitality of our competitive economy.

It is a testimony also to an enlightened public policy, established by Franklin Roosevelt and strengthened by every administration since his death.

That policy has freed Americans for more hopeful, more productive lives.

It has relieved their fears of growing old—by social security and medicare.

It has inspired them with hope for their children—by aid to elementary and higher education.

It has helped to create economic opportunity—by enlightened fiscal policies.

It has granted to millions, born into hopeless deprivation, the chance of a new start in life—by public works, private incentive, and poverty programs.

For the Negro American, it has opened the door—after centuries of enslavement and discrimination—to the blessings America offers to those willing and able to earn them.

Thus we address the spirit of Franklin Roosevelt, 25 years after his message to America and the world, with confidence and with an unflagging determination. We have served his vision of the four freedoms essential to mankind—here in America.

DENIED ELSEWHERE

Yet we know he did not speak only for America. We know that the four freedoms are not secure in America when they are violently denied elsewhere in the world.

We know, too, that it requires more than speeches to resist the international enemies of freedom. We know that men respond to deeds when they are deaf to words. Even the precious word "freedom" may become empty to those without the means to use it.

For what does freedom mean when famine chokes the land; when new millions crowd upon already strained resources; when narrow privilege is entrenched behind law and custom; when all conspires to teach men that they cannot change the conditions of their lives?

I do not need to tell you how five administrations have labored to give real meaning to freedom—in a world where it is often merely a phrase that conceals oppression and neglect.

Men in this room—men throughout America—have given their skills and treasure to that work. You have warned our people how insatiable is aggression—and how it thrives on human misery.

You have carried the word—that without the sense that they can change the conditions of their lives, nothing can avail the oppressed of this earth—neither good will, nor national sovereignty, nor massive grants of aid from their more fortunate brothers.

You have known, too, that men who believe they can change their destinies will change them.

Armed with that belief, they will be willing—yes, eager—to make the sacrifices that freedom demands. They will be anxious to shoulder the responsibilities that are inseparably bound to freedom.

They will be able to look beyond the four essential freedoms:

To the freedom to learn, to master new skills, to acquaint themselves with the lore of man and nature.

To the freedom to grow, to become the best that is within them to become, to cast off the yoke of discrimination and disease.

To the freedom to hope, and to build on that hope, lives of integrity and well-being.

This is what our struggle in Vietnam is about. This is what our struggle for equal rights in this country is about.

We seek to create that climate—at home and abroad—where unlettered men can learn, where deprived children can grow, where hopeless millions can be inspired to change the terms of their existence for the better.

THREAT OF TERROR

The climate cannot be created where terror fills the air.

Children cannot learn—men cannot earn their bread—women cannot heal the sick—where the night of violence has blotted out the sun.

Whether in the cities and hamlets of Vietnam, or in the ghettoes of our own cities, the struggle is the same. It is to end the violence against the human mind and body—so that the work of peace may be done, and the fruits of freedom won.

We are pitting the resources of the law—of education and training—of our vision and our compassion—against that violence here at home. And we shall end it—in our time.

On the other side of the earth, we are no less committed to ending violence against men who are struggling to be free.

It is about that commitment that I wish to speak now.

Tonight, in Vietnam, more than 200,000 young Americans fight for freedom. Tonight our people are determined that these men shall have whatever help they need and that their cause—which is our cause—shall be sustained.

But in these last days there have been questions about what we are doing in Vietnam, and these questions have been answered loudly and clearly for every citizen to see and hear. The strength of America can never be sapped by discussion—and we have no better or stronger tradition than open debate in hours of danger. We believe, with Macaulay, that men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely.

We are united in our commitment to free discussion. So also we are united in our determination that no foe anywhere should mistake our arguments for indecision—or our debates for weakness.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

What are the questions that are still being asked?

First, some ask if this is a war for unlimited objectives. The answer is plain: It is "No." Our purpose in Vietnam is to prevent the success of aggression. It is not conquest; it is not empire; it is not foreign bases; it is not domination.

It is to prevent the forceful conquest of South Vietnam by North Vietnam.

Second, some ask if we are caught in a blind escalation of force that is pulling us headlong toward a wider war that no one wants. The answer—again—is "No." We are using that force—and only that force—necessary to stop the aggression. Our fighting men are in Vietnam because tens of thousands of invaders came South before them. Our numbers have increased—because the aggression of others has increased. The high hopes of the aggressor have been dimmed, and the tide of the battle has turned. Our measured use of force must be continued. But this is prudent firmness under careful control. There is not, and there will not be, a mindless escalation.

Third, others ask if our fighting men are to be denied the help they need. The answer is again, and will be, a resounding "No." Our great Military Establishment has moved 200,000 men across 10,000 miles since last spring.

These men have, and will have, what they need to fight the aggressor. They have already performed miracles in combat. The men behind them have worked miracles of supply—building new ports, transporting new equipment, opening new roads.

The American forces of freedom are strong today in South Vietnam. And we will keep them so. They are led by a brilliant and resourceful commander—Gen. William C. Westmoreland. He knows the needs of war and he supports the works of peace. When he asks for more Americans to help the men he has, his requests will be immediately studied, and, as I promised last July, his needs will be met.

Fourth, some ask if our men go alone to Vietnam—if we alone respect our great commitment in the Southeast Asia Treaty. Still again the answer is "No." We have seven allies in SEATO and five of them are giving vital support, each with his own strength and in his own way, to the cause of freedom in southeast Asia.

Fifth, some ask about the risk of wider war—perhaps against the vast land armies of Red China. And again the answer is "No," never by any act of ours—and not if there is any reason left behind the wild words from Peiping.

We have threatened no one—and we will not.

We seek the end of no regime—and we will not.

Our purpose is solely to defend against aggression. To any armed attack, we will reply. We have measured the strength—and the weakness—of others, and we know our own. We observe in ourselves—and we applaud in others—a careful restraint in action. We can live with anger in word as long as it is matched by caution in deed.

Sixth, men ask if we rely on guns alone. Still again the answer is "No." From our Honolulu meeting, from the clear pledge which joins us with our allies in Saigon, there has emerged a common dedication to the peaceful progress of the people of Vietnam—to schools for their children, to care for their health, to hope and bounty for their land.

The Vice President returned today from his constructive and highly successful visit to Saigon and other capitals, and he tells me that he and Ambassador Lodge have found a new conviction and purpose in South Vietnam—for the battle against want and injustice as well as the battle against aggression.

So the pledge of Honolulu will be kept, and the pledge of Baltimore stands open—to help the men of the North when they have the wisdom to be ready.

We Americans must understand how fundamental is the meaning of this second war—the war on want. I talked on my farm last fall with Secretary Freeman, and in my office last week with Secretary Gardner—making, over and over again, the same central point: The breeding ground of war is human misery. If we are not to fight forever in faraway places—in Europe, or the Far Pacific, or the jungles of Africa, or the suburbs of Santo Domingo, then we must learn to get at the roots of violence. As a nation, we must magnify our struggle against world hunger and illiteracy and disease. We must bring hope to men whose lives now end at twoscore or less. Without that hope—without progress in this war on want—we will be called to fight again and again, as we must today.

Seventh, men ask who has a right to rule in South Vietnam. Our answer there is what it has been here for 200 years: The people must have this right—the South Vietnamese people—and no one else. Washington will not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. Hanoi shall not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. We will insist for ourselves on what we require from Hanoi: respect for the principle of government by the consent of the governed. We stand for self-determination—for free elections—and we will honor their result.

Eighth, men ask if we are neglecting any hopeful chance of peace. And the answer is "No." A great servant of peace, Secretary Rusk, has sent the message of peace on every wire and by every hand to every continent. A great pleader for peace, Arthur Goldberg, has worked at home and abroad in this same cause. Their undiscouraged efforts will continue. How much wiser it would have been, how much more compassionate toward its own people, if Hanoi had come to the bargaining table at the close of the year. Then the 7,000 Communist troops who have died in battle since January 1—and the many thousands who have been wounded in that same period—could have lived at peace with their fellow men. Today—as then—Hanoi has the opportunity to end the increasing toll the war is taking on those under its command.

Ninth, some ask how long we must bear this burden. To that question—in all honesty—I can give no answer tonight. During the Battle of Britain when that nation stood alone in 1940, Winston Churchill gave no answer to that question. When the forces of freedom were driven from the Philippines, President Roosevelt could not and did not name the date we would return. If the aggressor persists in Vietnam, the struggle may be long. Our men in battle know and accept this hard fact. We who are at home can do as much. There is no computer that can tell the hour and day of peace, but we do know that it will come only to the steadfast—never to the weak in heart.

Tenth, and finally, men ask if it is worth it. I think you know the answer. It is the answer that Americans have given for a quarter of a century, wherever American strength has been pledged to prevent aggression. The contest in Vietnam is confused and hard, and many of its forms are new. Yet our purpose and policy are unchanged.

Our men in Vietnam are there to keep a promise made 12 years ago. The Southeast Asia Treaty promised—as Secretary John Foster Dulles said for the United States—"that an attack upon the treaty area would occasion a reaction so united, so strong, and so well placed that the aggressor would lose more than it could hope to gain." But we keep more than a specific treaty promise in Vietnam. We keep the faith for freedom.

PRESIDENTS' PLEDGES

Four Presidents have pledged to keep that faith.

The first was Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his state of the Union message 25 years ago. He said: "* * * we are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations for our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers. We know that enduring peace cannot be bought at the cost of other people's freedom."

The second was Harry S. Truman, in 1947, at a historic turning point in the history of guerrilla warfare—and of Greece and Turkey and the United States. These were his words:

"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

"I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way."

The third was Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his first inaugural address. He promised this: "Realizing that common sense and common decency alike dictate the futility of appeasement, we shall never try to placate an aggressor by the false and wicked bargain of trading honor for security. Americans, indeed, all freemen, remember that in the final choice a soldier's pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner's chains."

And then 5 years ago, John F. Kennedy, on the cold bright noon of his first day in office, proclaimed:

"Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

This is the American tradition. Built in free discussion, proven on a hundred battlefields, rewarded by a progress at home that has no match in history, it beckons us forward now to the work of peace in Vietnam.

We will build freedom while we fight, and we will seek peace every day by every honorable means. But we will persevere along the high hard road of freedom. We are too old to be foolhardy and too young to be tired—too strong for fear and too determined for retreat.

Each evening when I retire, I take up—from a bedside table—reports from the battlefront and from the capitals of the world. They tell me how our men have fared that day in the hills and valleys of Vietnam. They tell me what hope there seems to be that the message of peace will be heard, and this tragic war ended.

I read of individual acts of heroism—of dedicated men and women whose valor matches that of any generation that has gone before. I read of men risking their lives to save others—of men giving their lives for freedom.

Always among these reports are a few letters from the men themselves.

If there is doubt among some here at home about our purposes in Vietnam, I do not find it reflected in these letters. Our soldiers, our marines, our airmen, our sailors, know why they are in Vietnam. They know—as five Presidents have known—how inseparably bound together are America's freedom and the freedom of her friends in the world.

Tonight I ask each citizen to join me—in the homes and meeting places our men are fighting to keep free from oppression—in a prayer for their safety.

I ask you to join me in a pledge to the cause for which they fight—the cause of human freedom.

I ask you for your help—for your understanding and your commitment—so that this united people may show forth to the world that America has not ended the only struggle worthy of man's unceasing sacrifice—the struggle to be free.

EXHIBIT 3

THE TACTICS OF A TRUCE

(By Jack D. Forbes)

To one degree or another all the parties engaged in the Vietnamese civil war profess a desire for peace, and yet the war continues. In part this is because no peace proposals made by either side have thus far included guarantees to protect the interests of all participants. The North Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front appear to desire conditions very unfavorable to the Saigon junta and the United States, while the latter groups appear intent upon the annihilation or disappearance of the NLF. No peace can be arranged until conditions are set forth which recognize the interests of all Vietnamese factions, including tribal groups, Buddhists, and neutralists.

In making any peace proposal, it must be assumed that all parties truly desire an end to hostilities, providing only that their relative positions of strength are not diminished by the immediate postwar stage of developments. Any serious peace proposal must realistically respect that condition.

The first step in any move toward peace would be the recognition by the United States that the Vietnamese war is a civil war, that the several most interested participants—NLF, Buddhists, tribesmen, neutralists, Saigon junta leaders, North Vietnamese, Catholics, et al.—deserve recognition as legitimately concerned groups and that no one of these parties can pretend to speak for the South Vietnamese or the Vietnamese as a whole. The United States must also face the quite obvious fact that the Saigon junta has no claim to call itself a legitimate government, being merely the end result of numerous unconstitutional seizures of power. It has no more claim to represent the South Vietnamese people than does the NLF or FULRO (the tribal alliance). In brief, there is no government in South Vietnam, but rather several factions engaged in a military-political struggle. And the United States must admit that it is the only significant non-Vietnamese participant in the civil war and that if it were not for the U.S. intervention the war would doubtless involve only Vietnamese.

Any serious peace proposal must, I believe, rest upon the following principles: (1) that a cease-fire must be arranged as a precondition for real negotiations under United Nations supervision; (2) that only the United Nations can properly supervise the transition to peace; (3) that South Vietnam will have to be under international control for a number of years to prevent a resumption of the civil war or the seizure of power by one faction; and (4) that all interested parties must not only be involved in the peace negotiations but must be provided with face-saving arrangements which will give all groups the opportunity for claiming a moral if not a military victory. I believe that the following proposal meets these conditions.

A cease fire should immediately be arranged, on the basis of existing "fronts," no matter how complicated the boundaries may be. Second, all military units in South Vietnam should be immediately placed under United Nations command and all non-Vietnamese (principally United States) and North Vietnamese troops should be withdrawn under United Nations supervision according to a carefully arranged schedule.

At the same time that United States, North Vietnamese, Australian and South Korean troops are evacuated, equivalent numbers of United Nations units, derived from neutralist or nonalined nations, should be introduced. Once all foreign and North Vietnamese troops have been replaced, a coalition government should be created, representing all factions, including tribal groups and non-Vietnamese minorities. As soon as conditions are appropriate, within perhaps 6 months, free elections should be held under the close supervision of United Nations authorities. Proportional representation for all parties and factions should be guaranteed, so as to insure the participation of all groups.

The United Nations forces should remain in South Vietnam for a period of at least 5 years subsequent to the first free elections and at least 1 year after the second free elections in order to guarantee that no powerful faction violates constitutional guarantees in the interim. Such a United Nations presence should also guarantee full freedom of speech and political activity.

During the 5-year (minimum) period of United Nations supervision, the armed forces of all South Vietnamese factions should be demobilized and replaced by a minimum-sized police force under civilian control. Likewise, the Mekong River project (or a similar scheme of economic development) should be implemented. The United States should—as it easily can—bear much of the cost of both the U.N. operation and the Mekong project.

Such a procedure as proposed above would, I believe, provide adequate protection for all factional interests. It would avoid further bloodshed and allow the South Vietnamese time in which to determine their own destiny. It would make full use of the United Nations, the only agency designed to settle a conflict such as exists in Vietnam. Finally, it would set a precedent for United Nations interim control of contested regions which might well be useful in Laos, Korea, Germany, and elsewhere.

EXHIBIT 4

[From the New York Times, Feb. 18, 1966]

"BUT 'TWAS A FAMOUS VICTORY"

General Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told two groups of Senators that "in the long term, we can achieve military victory" in Vietnam. But President Johnson has said: "We know, as our adversaries should also know, that there is no purely military solution in sight for either side."

It is being asked here and abroad: What is American policy? The American military men, on the whole, believe that the United States can and should achieve what they call a victory in Vietnam. The aim, as President Johnson has usually—but not always—expressed it, is that of a limited war proving that the United States cannot and will not be driven from South Vietnam. However, Secretary McNamara says he knows of no military expert in the Department of Defense who supports the "enclave," or limited strategy, concept; and after hearing Gen. Maxwell Taylor's testimony yesterday, Senator FULBRIGHT concluded that present U.S. policy "logically leads to unconditional surrender" and "to unlimited commitment."

The war cannot be won on the military front, and it is deceptive to let Americans and South Vietnamese believe that it can. Of course, the United States has the manpower and the firepower to destroy the Vietcong—but only by destroying all of South Vietnam in the process.

A "victory" that kills a few hundred Vietcong and at the same time destroys whole fertile valleys with their crops, their pitiful villages and huts and many of their innocent men, women, and children, is not going to "win" the war in Vietnam for anybody. Yet, as the Times correspondent Neil Sheehan showed in a vivid description, this is exactly what happened in Binhdinh Province in the recent massive allied sweep.

No one wins in such a victory. Everybody loses. Multiply the experience of Binhdinh Province a hundred times; spread it over all of South and North Vietnam, and what will the United States then proudly show to the world and to history? "A famous victory"?

[From the New York Times, Feb. 20, 1966]

WASHINGTON: THE RUSK DOCTRINE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 19.—Secretary of State Rusk has put a grim doctrine before the people of this country. He was a responsive and forthright witness before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and it is important that we understand what he thinks our duties and responsibilities are in the world.

First, in Vietnam, we are to commit to the battle whatever is necessary to end the aggression and bring about the freedom and security of South Vietnam.

What this means, he conceded, depends primarily on what the enemy commits (the Chinese committed 1 million men to the battle in Korea). He would not say there was no limit to the men and material the United States would send to Vietnam, but he stuck to his proposition that we would maintain military superiority there no matter how long it took to stop the fighting.

RUSK'S OBJECTIVE

This objective, it should be noted, was not made conditional on what the South Vietnamese or any of the other allies contributed to the fighting. There is no longer much talk here of victory depending primarily on the South Vietnamese Army. Mr. Rusk discussed the freedom of South Vietnam as a vital American interest, essential to our own security and critical to all the other security commitments we have taken to over 40 other countries. This is a formidable doctrine.

Second, the Secretary of State gave an interesting interpretation of America's obligations as a member of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. In the event of armed aggression against the territory covered by that treaty, he said, America's obligation to oppose the aggression did not depend on all the members agreeing to oppose it, but it was America's duty to do so regardless of what the others did (which in Vietnam is very little).

THE AMERICAN COMMITMENTS

This did not mean, Secretary Rusk remarked, that the United States was obligated to oppose Communist aggression everywhere in the world or that we were going around looking for fights to put down. For example, we did not oppose Communist China's aggression in Tibet or the Soviet Union's aggression in Hungary, for we had not taken any commitment to do so, but this still leaves us with commitments the like of which no sovereign nation ever took in the history of the world.

For the United States is committed to oppose Communist aggression all along the periphery of the Communist nations from the North Cape of Norway through the heart of Europe to Greece and Turkey (NATO); along the southern frontier of the Soviet Union in the Near and Middle East (the Eisenhower resolution); and thence through southeast Asia (SEATO) to Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Japan and Korea. And if you add our obligations under the Organization of American States and our obligations under the United Nations, you take in most of the rest of the world.

The Rusk doctrine makes the Monroe Doctrine or the Truman doctrine seem rather cheap. Monroe limited his commitments to the Western Hemisphere. Truman wanted to oppose communism primarily by economic means. And even John Foster Dulles, who was not a timid man, thought each alliance should stand on its own terms and depend to some degree on what the other members of the alliance did.

But the Rusk doctrine draws no distinction between powerful industrial democratic states in Europe and weak undemocratic states in Asia. His view seems to be that the United States must redeem the promises of every alliance it has signed regardless of what the other signatories do, and that failure to keep everybody's promise in one alliance will destroy the confidence of the world in all other alliances we have signed.

THAT BLANK CHECK

If this is true, it is odd that most of our allies in Europe, the Middle East and even in Japan are critical of our operations in Vietnam, but this is the thesis Mr. Rusk placed before the Foreign Relations Committee.

And the interesting thing is that the Senators cannot really do much about it, which accounts for all the frustration they have demonstrated on the TV screens in the last few days. For in the moment of crisis during the Communist attack on our ships in the Gulf of Tonkin, President Johnson asked for a blank check to deal with aggression all over southeast Asia—including the right to use any force "he" deemed necessary—and once he had published that request, the Congress had no choice but to grant it to him or—what was unthinkable—repudiate him in the face of the enemy.

THE SENATE'S DILEMMA

Nor can the Senate do anything to take back this promise under present circumstances. If Senator MORSE presses his resolution to withdraw the Tonkin Gulf resolution, obviously few if any Congressmen are going to vote with him and turn their backs on the 200,000 Americans now fighting in Vietnam.

But their helplessness merely emphasizes the transformation that has taken place in American and world politics. The President, if he chooses his time carefully, can obviously get almost any commitment he likes from the Congress in the moment of crisis, and under the Rusk doctrine, we are then obliged to redeem each commitment, regardless of what the other parties to the agreement do, or risk the destruction of the entire system of American alliances created since the last war.

All this goes well beyond Vietnam in space and time, Mr. Rusk has asked the Senate to contain the expansion of communism all along the periphery of the Communist empire, by force of arms and without allies if necessary, and the Congress cannot oppose him in present circumstances without opposing its own men in Vietnam, which it obviously will not do.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post]

THE AGNOSTIC VOICE

(By Joseph Kraft)

One voice, it seems to me, has been missing from the clamor over whether or not to resume bombing North Vietnam. It is the voice of those who don't know, and know they don't know—the voice of the agnostics.

Perhaps above all others, however, the agnostic voice deserves to be heard. For while dogmatic assertions are expressed in all quarters at all times, the fact is that American policy in Vietnam is largely grounded on hunches, guesses, prejudices, and assumptions—on propositions that are unknown and unknowable, untested and untestable.

For example, there is the assumption that the National Liberation Front, or Vietcong insurgent movement, is the pure puppet of the Hanoi government in North Vietnam. To hear the Secretary of State tell it, no doubt on that score can even be admitted.

But the U.S. Government knows next to nothing about the politics of the Vietcong. Systematic investigation was not even begun until late last summer. The study that resulted offers no explanation of why the Vietcong changed its secretary general three times in less than a year—a critical development. It does not indicate why the admittedly Communist element of the front, the People's Revolutionary Party was not set up until 1962, or why it was set up then—another critical development. It asserts that the secretary general of the Communist wing of the front is a man who has been for the last 3 years in Algiers—a manifest absurdity.

A second assumption in Washington is that there is no interest in negotiating on the part of the Hanoi government. That view is now supplemented by confident assertions that such experienced and Western-oriented leaders as President Ho Chi Minh and Premier Pham Van Dong have lost power to a Chinese-oriented hard-liner—Le Duan, the secretary general of the North Vietnamese Communist Party.

But that whole story finds its source in an English scholar, P. J. Honey. Mr. Honey has been out of North Vietnam for years. He has argued that since Ho Chi Minh is a clever fellow who would not work his country into a box, and that since North Vietnam is now plainly in a bad box, Ho Chi Minh cannot possibly be running the country. That theory, even if it had a respectable base in logic, is at least put into question by several visitors who have seen Ho Chi Minh in Hanoi during the last 2 months.

As to the notion that Le Duan is a Chinese-oriented hard-liner, it is pure speculation. It is matched by an equally justified speculation that Le Duan takes a middle position between those in Hanoi who look toward Moscow and those who look toward Peiping.

Still a third Washington assumption is that the Vietnamese struggle is a first step in a long-range Communist Chinese program for world domination. In support of that view Secretary of State Rusk and, following his lead, Secretary of Defense McNamara, have cited as the "Chinese Mein Kampf" a long article on strategic doctrine written by the Chinese defense minister, Lin Piao, last fall.

But as a recent study of the article by the Rand Corp. indicates, the Lin Piao statement can be read as a move by Peiping to wash its hands of the Vietnamese war. And to me, at least, there are indications both in the Lin Piao statement and in the important speech made recently by the political director of the Chinese army, Hsiao Hua, that the true point at issue is a struggle between Hanoi and Peiping for control over the Vietcong.

It may be, of course, that all the ruling official assumptions in Washington are right. But that is not the point. The point is that they rest on a foundation of guesswork. This country cannot be certain, or even close to certain, about any of the central political relations on the other side.

In this circumstance, agnosticism seems to me a healthy state of mind. And if it does not solve the question whether or not to bomb, it suggests the wisdom of caution; of not moving except when absolutely necessary; of a modest no-lose, as against an ambitious win; strategy; of small steps by small things.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post]

THE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL KY

(By Walter Lippmann)

The Honolulu meeting has a critical bearing on the attempts to bring about some kind of negotiation. There are several parallel attempts now underway—by the Secretary General of the United Nations, by the Pope, by a group of unalined governments, as well as various private diplomatic explorations. The status and the role of the Vietcong or as it calls itself, the National Liberation Front, in the negotiations is the key problem which must be solved in order that any kind of talks can begin. For inasmuch as the Vietcong is in military control of a large part of South Vietnam, a peace cannot be negotiated if the Vietcong does not participate in the negotiations.

There are, I understand, under consideration two formulas for dealing with the Vietcong. One is that a reconvened Geneva Conference should consist of the five great powers—China, the Soviet Union, the United States, France, and Great Britain, plus representatives of the North Vietnamese Government, plus two delegations from South Vietnam, one representing the Saigon government and the other the Vietcong. This formula reflects the actual military situation. For there are in being two powers in South Vietnam. Neither can be ignored in the making of peace.

This formula has been vetoed by the United States because it refuses to give the Vietcong any recognition as a government. There is now under consideration, therefore, a second formula. The reconvened Geneva Conference would consist of the Big Five, the two governments in Hanoi and Saigon, plus a delegation from the Vietcong. It may be as Ambassador Harriman seemed to suggest in a radio interview on Sunday, that this formula would be acceptable to the Administration. It would be very good news indeed if it were also acceptable to the other governments concerned.

In any event, since we are informed that no new important military decisions are being taken in Honolulu, the most important thing we need to know is what understanding the President reaches with General Ky about the format of the negotiations which we have asked the U.N. to promote. The fanfare of the reception could mean that the President has decided to commit this country to liquidate the Vietcong and to establish undisputed rule by General Ky or his successors over all of South Vietnam. But it might also conceivably mean that the President is talking turkey with General Ky and is telling him to get ready for the readjustment of U.S. policy in accordance with the real military prospects in Vietnam.

What, in short, has General Ky been promised? That is the question which will have to be answered if the American people do indeed have the right to know what they are fighting for and what kind of war they are involved in.

The President's speech of welcome to the two Vietnamese leaders was full of righteous indignation and scorn for those of us who still adhere to the long-established American military doctrine, followed by every President until Lyndon Johnson, that we must refrain from becoming involved in a land war fought predominantly by Americans against Asians on the Asian Continent. They believe, as Winston Churchill is reported to have said, that we must not jump into the water to fight the sharks.

Even General MacArthur, who fought the Korean land war, insisted repeatedly that the old American doctrine was sound. This was also the view of General Ridgway and of General Gavin, and of their Commander in Chief, President Eisenhower. No one needs to be abashed because he adheres to this doctrine. Nor need he refrain from pointing out that what is going on in Vietnam has been demonstrating that the doctrine is sound.

I do not think the President is a good historian when he says that those who are looking for ways to liquidate as humanely and honorably as possible what has proven to be a gigantic mistake "belong to a group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope." The historical truth of the matter is that those who think the President is mistaken base their conviction on a reading of the history of our era, particularly on the relations between the Western white governments and the peoples of Asia. In this historical perspective it is Lyndon Johnson who has broken not only with the old American wisdom but also with the new knowledge of the world as it is.

"We cannot accept their logic," said the President, "that tyranny 10,000 miles away is not tyranny to concern us." The President's critics are not saying that tyranny 10,000 miles away does not concern us. They are saying that we cannot and should not set up alone as judges, juries, and policemen wherever there is tyranny on the face of the globe. They are saying that we have enough to do within the undoubted areas of our vital interests in Europe and in this hemisphere and in the Pacific and that we should not pretend to omnipotence and omniscience.

The President's hot and unexamined generalities are a moral commitment to endless crusading in all the continents. As one who has never been an isolationist or a pacifist, I am dismayed by the exaggerations and generalizations which have been allowed to grow out of the great debate about isolation.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 1, 1966]

The President's Search for Peace

(By Walter Lippmann)

The resumption of bombing in North Vietnam is not a surprise, indeed it has been inevitable since the diplomatic content of the peace offensive was set. For on neither side has there been any overt effort to find the terms of a truce which reflect correctly the actual military situation. On both sides there has been some suggestion of softening the demands a little. But the basic objective of our adversaries remains the ascendancy of the Vietcong in South Vietnam, and our basic objective, as articulated repeatedly by Secretary Rusk, is the liquidation of the Vietcong and the ascendancy of General Ky and his successors in Saigon.

The whole worldwide attempt to end the fighting by negotiations is stalled on this disparity. The essential fact about the conflict of aims is that each side has a political objective which is beyond its military capacity. Insofar as Hanoi, and more certainly Peiping, are demanding the withdrawal of the U.S. forces before there is a political settlement in Indochina, they are demanding more than they have the military power to achieve. The United States is able to stand fast and hold on.

On the other hand, insofar as we are tied to Secretary Rusk's objectives, to defeat and eliminate the Vietcong, to keep the 2,800 villages permanently secured against the Vietcong, and to create a government in Saigon that, without being an American colonial government, is the ruler of the whole of South Vietnam—insofar as these are our purposes in Vietnam, we are fighting a war which is far beyond our or anyone else's military and political capacity.

The search for peace, to which the President rededicated himself as he announced the end of the bombing pause, will succeed or fail as we and they bring war aims into balance with military capacity. This will certainly not be done simultaneously by both sides. But if one side makes the first move, it will be difficult for the other not to follow suit.

Thus, if Hanoi says clearly, what it has hinted at vaguely, that the American forces need not withdraw before negotiations bring about an agreed settlement, it would be difficult, indeed impossible in the long run, for the administration to deny that the Vietcong must in fact be a principal party to a negotiated truce.

It is also within our power to break the deadlock which has caused the peace offensive to fail. And as we are the stronger power, the more invulnerable, it is both our duty and our interest to take the initiative. No one. I suppose, imagines any longer that the deadlock can be broken by bombing, by a little bombing or by a lot of bombing. And there are few observers of the war who think that the deadlock can be broken by doubling or tripling our forces. The way to break the deadlock is to adopt a military strategy which, because it has a limited objective, can be made to prevail by limited means. Thus, when and if we move to a holding strategy. we shall have revised and reduced our war aims to something more modest but more credible than Mr. Rusk's unattainable pursuit of the independence of the whole of South Vietnam under General Ky and his successors in Saigon.

I regard both the bombing pause and the resumption of the bombing as irrevelant to the real problem, which is how to make a truce which is consistent with the military realities, Some will say that by more and bigger bombing and by a big buildup of troops we shall be able to change the military realities in our favor. Experience and the history of this wretched war are against that hope. For the forces against us can be increased indefinitely, and the notion of a decisive military superiority over the land powers of Asia is a dangerous fantasy.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 17, 1966]

New Light on U.S. Policy—General Taylor Says Aim Is To Compel Acceptance of a Free South Vietnam

(By Max Frankel)

WASHINGTON, February 17.—Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor brought out in public today what other high officials here have made increasingly plain in private—namely that the U.S. terms for peace in Vietnam are much stiffer than the offer of "unconditional" negotiations has implied. Though caught up in a debate with some members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee about whether the administration's goals were "limited" or "unlimited," General Taylor left little doubt about what those goals are. He said the United States could, should and would achieve military and political successes of sufficient magnitude to force the Communists to accept an independent and non-Communist South Vietnam.

The Johnson administration has never wavered in the pursuit of that objective. Nor has it said anything to contradict the retired general's assertion that his personal testimony was wholly consistent with official policy.

Many observers and diplomats here and abroad, however, have misinterpreted the administration's offer to negotiate as an offer to compromise with the Vietcong in South Vietnam. General Taylor's testimony should have made it clear that such a compromise is not anticipated here.

That clarification was explicitly recognized at the end of the long hearing today by Senator J. M. FULBRIGHT, the committee chairman. The Arkansas Democrat said it seemed to him, in the language of the Ozarks, that the United States intended to apply the pressure until the Communists "holler enuff."

He said he wished instead that the administration was ready to deal with its principal adversary, the Vietcong, to seek "a compromise to stop the slaughter" and to give up the policy of waging a war that can end only "if all the Vietcong would go home and go north."

THE BASIC QUESTION

General Taylor did not dispute this summation of the essence of the argument between the administration and its critics. If the Vietcong would in fact go home and stop trying to take over South Vietnam, he said, they could at least obtain "compensation"—presumably in economic aid to North Vietnam. But his basic reply was a question "How do you compromise the freedom of 15 million South Vietnamese people?"

Compromise has had no appeal here because the administration concluded long ago that the non-Communist forces of South Vietnam could not long survive in a Saigon coalition with Communists. It is for that reason—and not because of an excessively rigid sense of protocol—that Washington has steadfastly refused to deal with the Vietcong or to recognize them as an independent political force.

It has offered to consider the Vietcong's "views" in negotiations and even to let the Vietcong sit in the delegation of North Vietnam, whose agents it says they are. Washington's purpose at such negotiations would be to ratify the end of the Communist threat to South Vietnam and not to compromise on the basis of the existing military balance.

As General Taylor reiterated, the administration believes the Communists have not been hurt sufficiently on the battlefield to enter into the kind of negotiations that have been offered. Privately, officials here agree with this presumed Communist assessment. They believe the Communists would now negotiate or give up only if they were prepared to honor the potential force that the United States can bring to bear.

As General Taylor also made clear, even the potential American military might is not enough to assure success. Force on the ground must be used to put the Communists into a "highly unfavorable" situation in South Vietnam, he said, while force in the air is used to inflict increasing loss and pain in North Vietnam.

NEED FOR VIABLE REGIME

In addition, he emphasized, the United States must construct a reasonably viable and stable government in South Vietnam and demonstrate a determination at home to see the struggle through.

The general said he was convinced that when all four conditions were met, North Vietnam would have been brought to the point where it was willing to talk. The purpose of the talks, he stressed, would be to "free South Vietnam from the Vietcong" and the essential ingredient is to "have them so beaten they'd be glad to come in and accept an amnesty."

These goals are not only "limited" but realistic, the general contended, although he would not be pinned down on the number of American troops that might have to become involved. The present 205,000 are not enough, he said, and 800,000 would be "fantastic" and unnecessary.

It is the realism of this assessment that troubled most of the administration's critics on the committee. They fear that no limits to the American involvement are in sight and that it could lead to an even more costly war with Communist China. Some seek more precise estimates of the ultimate cost, while others would prefer a reduction of the objectives—in other words, a compromise on the basis of present military and political strength.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. **MORSE.** Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, I would hope that other Senators desiring to speak on this subject would make themselves available to discuss it. I realize the difficulty of bringing Senators in, particularly those who have gone home in the snow, at this time of the evening. I had hoped that at least until 7 o'clock this evening, those who wanted to discuss the resolution would discuss it. I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum, and try to send word to all those desirous of making speeches that we would appreciate it if they would come and get their speeches made.

Mr. **MORSE.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. **MORSE.** I am willing to tender my judgment and the information I have received, but it is certainly not information involving all Senators; it is information, apparently involving those who are opposed to the bill, or think they wish to make some qualifying statements before they vote on it, that none of those are ready to make any speeches tonight, but that they will be here to make speeches tomorrow. I do not think, unless there are some in favor of the bill who wish to make speeches, that we will be very successful in getting any more speeches tonight.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I doubt very much that we will. My only feeling about the matter is—and I do not expect to vote tonight—that I would like to get the speeches made; and so I think it might be well to let the clerk call the roll, and while he is doing it, undertake to ascertain if any Senators desirous of making speeches are ready to make them.

I would urge Senators who wish to speak to make their speeches, so that we can proceed to a vote. They have been on notice now for at least 17 days that this matter was going to be before the Senate. We have had at least 7 days of debate. There have been 7 days that have intervened in between, when Senators had time to prepare their speeches; and I would hope that those who wish to make speeches would come and make them.

So I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. **CLARK.** Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion for one moment?

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. **CLARK.** I plead with the Senator to recognize the existence of the snowstorm, the lateness of the hour, and the fact that there are still several Senators who desire to make speeches who were not advised that we might be held in late tonight.

I call the Senator's attention to the custom of the majority leader in this regard, and express the very friendly hope that he will be willing to adjourn the Senate now, and come back in tomorrow. If he wishes to come back earlier tomorrow, that is all right, but——

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I do not plan earlier than usual. As a matter of fact, may I say to the Senator that I hope to make some progress with the Senate Finance Committee tomorrow; it is my thought that we might make some headway there, even if we fail to do so here.

I am on notice that a request to permit the Committee on Finance to meet while the Senate is in session would also meet with objection and, therefore, I do not propose that the Senate come in until noon tomorrow; but, I am merely trying to ascertain if there are any Senators available who desire to make speeches and put themselves on record on this matter. If none are available, then we will adjourn and meet tomorrow.

Mr. **MORSE.** Mr. President, I certainly wish to cooperate with the Senator from Louisiana. I was off the floor. I had to go over to my office for a manuscript-judging program. I am one of three judges on projects for some honors; but while I was there, I got in touch with two Senators who I know are going to speak on the bill. I asked each one of them if there was any chance of their making speeches tonight, and both told me that they had not gotten them "out of the typewriter" yet. Therefore, they cannot possibly make them until tomorrow. Of course, I can speak only for those two Senators. They will be given tomorrow. I do not know about the others. I believe that the Senator will find—as I told him earlier—that the speeches will probably all be delivered by late Tuesday, and the Senate can begin to vote.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. The Senator from Oregon predicted some time ago, if I recall correctly, that the Senate would be able to vote on this measure this week. I know that he made that prediction in good faith. I am sure that he will, in all probability, conclude the speeches he wishes to make on the subject this week.

However, I cannot bind other Senators. They are entitled to come in and be heard, make their views available for the RECORD, explain how they will vote and why they will vote, and how they believe others should vote.

I am therefore merely going to suggest the absence of a quorum in order that anyone who might wish to make a speech will be able to make it. If a Senator has, by this time, managed to get his speech "out of the typewriter," we would appreciate it if he would come on over and make it. Therefore, Mr. President, for those reasons, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have made the effort to determine if there are any other Senators who desire to make speeches tonight and are available to make them. My best information is that no one is available to make speeches this evening.

I would hope that one of these days we could find the answer to the problem of Senators who wish to make speeches and ask the leadership to hold up the Nation's business because they are not ready, when we have given them more than 2½ weeks to get prepared. Further, I would hope, one of these days, that we could work out some modification of the rules of the Senate so that we would not have requests by Senators that the Senate not vote because they have made commitments in their States, or elsewhere, and cannot be in the Chamber at the time of voting on a very important matter.

It occurs to me that perhaps one answer to the latter problem would be that we might agree to a modification of the rules of the Senate so that, let us say, on 5 days out of the year a Senator could, by unanimous consent, have a live pair arranged, so that he could be absent, and the person who agreed to give him the live pair could ask unanimous consent that both he and the absentee Senator be paired and be recorded as voting, rather than being recorded as not voting.

If that could be done, it would expedite the work of the Senate. It would be convenient to Senators and would help the Senate get on with the Nation's business. It would also greatly reduce the requests upon Members of this body, particularly at the leadership level, to keep the Senate in session because they could not be in the Chamber for a particular vote and did not wish anything to happen until they got back.

Mr. President, I know that Senators make these commitments and wish to be present and recorded as voting. We should, in my judgment, seek to restore respectability to the live pair as it existed in the Senate 30 years ago. We should also seek to restore some of our fine old traditions, and establish new ones, in order to carry on more efficiently the Nation's business.

My thought would be that, if we could arrange it so that—without abusing the privilege—if a Senator could not be present, he could be recorded as voting rather than as not voting, by unanimous consent of the Senate, it would very much expedite the procedures of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there are Senators who are still disposed to make speeches, although they are not prepared to make them at this time, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 25, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 24, 1966:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Lee C. White, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1970.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The nominations beginning Clinton D. Upham, to be commander, and ending John K. Callahan, Jr., to be ensign, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 10, 1966.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The nominations beginning David Gershowitz, to be captain, and ending Charles R. Polly, to be chief warrant officer, W-3, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 18, 1966.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Clarence W. Cranford, D.D., Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

"For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater; so shall My word be that goeth forth out of My mouth," saith the Lord.—Isaiah 55: 10–11.

We thank Thee, O Lord, that as the snow settles upon the earth, so Thy word can settle in our minds and hearts. Grant, O God, that as that word penetrates our thinking, it may bring forth the fruit of wise decisions and right actions.

We thank Thee today for him who, over the last several years, has led this body so often in prayer. We thank Thee for his witness and continuing influence. Grant Thy blessing upon his loved ones. May they be comforted by their memories of his life, and by their hope for the life to come.

We pray for the Nation for whom he prayed so often. We love our Nation, Lord. We thank Thee for its ideal of "liberty and justice for all." We confess we have not fully achieved the ideal, but, O God, keep us always moving in that direction. May no selfishness on our part, or lack of understanding, keep us from working for our Nation's welfare. We pray for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House with an amendment to the bill S. 251, to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes, in which concurrence of the House is requested.

The message also announced that Mr. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, pursuant to title 46, United States Code, section 1126c, appointed Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. PROUTY to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that Mr. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, pursuant to title 14, United States Code, section 194(a), appointed Mr. BASS and Mr. PEARSON to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

COMPENSATION OF TEACHERS AND TEACHING POSITIONS UNDER THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT OVERSEAS TEACHERS PAY AND PERSONNEL PRACTICES ACT

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6845) to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, and disagree to the amendments of the Senate and request a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MURRAY, MORRISON, UDALL, CORBETT, and BROYHILL of North Carolina.

PROPER LAND USE PROMISES LASTING BENEFIT

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, in the rapidly expanding urban and industrial area around Atlanta, we have come to appreciate the importance of wise land use planning to protect the community's valuable soil and water resources, and for the long-term benefit of investors in the Atlanta economy.

The Atlanta region is experiencing the same land use problems as those found in other dynamic metropolitan areas in the Nation. The answers to these problems are much the same everywhere. They are based on proper evaluation of the soils; following through with development programs that the particular type of soil will adequately support; taking the necessary steps to protect against erosion from land under development, and stabilizing the soil immediately following development.

Local governments, institutions, and urban and industrial developers in the Atlanta region have wisely sought, and have received, expert help from qualified soil and water conservation technicians in planning the best possible use of land under development.

The Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the State of Georgia, has provided vital technical assistance on soil and water conservation problems. In the State as a whole, SCS soil scientists last year completed soil surveys on about 1,870,000 acres of land.

I am confident that soil surveys will be used increasingly in Georgia's Fourth District to determine the best possible use of the land in a developing economy; to protect the land from erosion, the rivers and streams in the area from siltation, and those who buy and build on the land from loss due to building on soil that is not suited to the purpose.

I heartily commend the Federal, State, and local cooperation which has made possible the soil surveys and other soil and water conservation measures in the Atlanta area and throughout Georgia's Fourth Congressional District. Through experience, we have come to appreciate the immense value of these services—for the lasting benefit of this important and rapidly growing region of the American Southland.

HEARINGS IN REGARD TO THE B–727 AIRPLANE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to announce that next Tuesday, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will have before it in executive session the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to discuss the subject of the B–727 airplane.

All of us are aware that in the past few months there have been several regrettable accidents involving this type of aircraft. Many Members of the House have indicated to me their rightful concern over what has happened and what is being done to avoid repetition.

I wish to indicate that the formal investigations of the aviation authorities are going forward to determine what may have been the causes of the accidents and the steps that need to be taken to prevent recurrence. The record is not yet complete and definitive conclusions have not yet been reached.

The committee has no desire to anticipate what may be the findings, nor jump to any hasty opinions. We cannot overlook, however, our responsibilities to the people and to the Members of the House in the field of aviation operations and safety, as to what, if anything, should be done in the meantime. Accordingly, we are having these executive meetings so that we may be assured ourselves and in turn assure the Members that the proper measures have been and are being taken adequately to protect the public.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE INVESTIGATION OF THE NORTHEAST POWER FAILURE

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on the Investigation of the Northeast Power Failure be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANNED SPACE FLIGHT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight of the Committee on Science and Astronautics be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR ADMIRAL NIMITZ

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time first to advise the House that memorial services for Admiral Nimitz will be held in the Washington National Cathedral at 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, February 25.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 21]

Bandstra
Baring
Blatnik
Burleson
Casey
Cederberg
Chelf
Cohelan
Dawson
Derwinski
Dorn
Dowdy
Dyal
Edwards, La.
Farnsley
Fisher
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hansen, Iowa
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Jacobs
Kee
Martin, Ala.
Matthews
Miller
Moorhead
Pool
Powell
Reuss
Rivers, S.C.
Roudebush
Scott
Smith, Iowa
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Vigorito
Walker, Miss.
White, Idaho
Willis
Zablocki

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 390 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUPPLEMENTAL FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 742, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 742

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendment recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs now printed in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use and yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of the rule on H.R. 12169 providing for 3 hours of debate.

H.R. 12169 will authorize the appropriation of $415 million in supplemental funds for the economic assistance program of the Agency for International Development during the remainder of fiscal year 1966.

This authorization is essential to carry forward U.S. efforts to resist Communist aggression in South Vietnam and elsewhere in southeast Asia and to build stability in the Dominican Republic. In addition, the authorization will replenish the contingency fund which provides funds to the President for use in unforeseen and emergency situations where vital U.S. interests are at stake.

H.R. 12169 provides $315 million in new authority for supporting assistance, of which $275 million is for Vietnam; $15 million for Laos and Thailand; $25 million for the Dominican Republic; and $100 million for the contingency fund, for use in any part of the world where emergencies might arise.

There is a clear need for these funds. Appropriations now available for use in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic are exhausted. The contingency fund is exhausted. In fact, AID has had to "borrow" from other funding categories to finance our efforts in Vietnam. These "borrowings" must be paid back.

I am assured by AID that there are no further sources of funds and, in fact, funds for Vietnam are dangerously low. Any delay or any cut in the authorization now before the House would seriously hinder our efforts to defeat the Communists in the crucial struggle for southeast Asia.

The $275 million of supporting assistance for South Vietnam can be divided into two main elements. The first is $175 million to finance commodity imports which will help to fight inflation. I think all my colleagues would agree rampant inflation poses a major threat to economic and political stability wherever it occurs. But in a war situation such as Vietnam, the effects are even more serious and an integral part of our program is designed to bring more goods into the economy to keep the forces of inflation in check.

The second major element of the program in Vietnam to be financed from the funds authorized in H.R. 12169 is $100 million for counterinsurgency and rural construction. Included in these programs are public safety, logistic management, public works, refugee relief, agriculture and welfare, and development projects. As you can see from this brief listing, these funds will have a direct impact on the people of that war-torn land. These funds will support the outstanding work of the Agency for International Development in helping to build a better life and to give the Vietnamese hope for the future.

Approval of these funds will help support the military efforts in Vietnam and carry forward the pledge made in the declaration of Honolulu to win the crucial battle against disease, ignorance, and poverty in South Vietnam.

The expanded AID program in Vietnam entails increased administrative expenses. AID has estimated that approximately $1.4 million will be required to meet recruitment costs and pay for other administrative and support services. Therefore, the committee has included authority to use up to $1.4 million of supporting assistance funds for administrative expenses incurred only in connection with Vietnam programs. This authority would require a determination by the President that such a transfer is necessary, which determination would be reported to the Congress.

The bill before the House also contains $15 million to support counterinsurgency and rural development efforts in Thailand and Laos. The battle for these areas of southeast Asia has been increasing in tempo in recent months. Communist subversion is being stepped up and we must meet it.

H.R. 12169 thus will provide support for efforts to meet aggression and resist subversion in these key countries of southeast Asia—Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos. The funds being requested are small in comparison to our military efforts, but they are not less important.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House will help in the short-run struggle against communism and the long-run battle against the ancient enemies of man.

As President Johnson said in his foreign aid message to the Congress:

> We extend assistance to nations because it is in the highest traditions of our heritage and our humanity. But even more because we are concerned with the kind of world our children will live in.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 12169, which will provide one more step toward a world of stability, peace, and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the rule is adopted, and I would now like to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a point on the rule?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and for his explanation of the bill which is to be considered here, H.R. 12169, as made in order by House Resolution 742. My question pertains to the rules of procedure of the House and particularly to lines 6 and 7 of the resolution, where "all points of order against that bill are hereby waived."

Would the gentleman from Massachusetts advise me, in his wisdom and that of the Committee on Rules, what there is in this bill that might be subject to a point of order and, secondly, who made the request that this be included in this rule and, thirdly, why it is good procedure under these particular circumstances?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Actually, I do not know where a point of order lies. All I do know is it is the procedure of the Committee on Rules, when we have a rule to write we tell the Parliamentarian and he writes it for us, and we go on from there. I do not know whether there is a point of order that lies against the bill. As I recall it, yesterday the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs said, having gone over the bill with the Parliamentarian, that he knew of no points of order but that they thought it was best because of the importance of the bill that they waive points of order so, in case there is a technicality ruled against it, it would protect it.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. But, is the distinguished gentleman telling the House that the Committee on Rules does not write the rules under which we consider legislation in this House?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Of course, we have as an adviser on matters of this nature the Parliamentarian, as do all the Members of the House.

Mr. HALL. Is there any question in the gentleman's mind as to whether or not there is anything in this bill that is not germane? Was any point submitted that would require waiver of all points of order against the bill?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. No. I would submit there was not.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is a poor way to legislate. We have adequate rules of procedure which are updated every 2 years and which have been our rules since the time of Jefferson for the handling of matters pertaining to rules of germaneness, the Ramseyer rule, and every other indication that we ordinarily concern ourselves with concerning points of order. If they are to come in here, as they did indeed yesterday, when we had a protest vote against the rule requested by the Committee on Ways and Means, and, if all supplementals or deficiencies and appropriations come in with waivers of points of order and "gag rules" preventing amendment—and this is a perfectly good rule here except for the waiver of all points of order—there are bound to be objections, no action "without objection," and none will be considered under unanimous consent, and I place the House on notice that there will be protest votes all along.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. All I can say to the gentleman from Missouri is that to my knowledge there are no points of order in this legislation. However, the committee felt that the bill was of such import that it did not want to take any chances, and so the waiver of points of order was placed in the bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I understand what the gentleman from Massachusetts is saying—this was inserted by the Parliamentarian or by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and it was passed routinely, without consideration by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. It was suggested by the Parliamentarian.

Mr. HALL. And, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there is nothing in the bill itself that might be subject to a point of order?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. It was inserted by the Committee on Rules at the suggestion of the Parliamentarian.

Mr. HALL. Well, Mr. Speaker, the House in its wisdom can determine later whether the bill contains areas therein and whether it might be subject to a point of order. But with this resolution passing as written we have no right to work our will under these circumstances.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentleman presently in the well of the House, and the Committee on Rules, am I to believe now that it is becoming fashionable to simply write waivers of points of order in the rules clearing bills to the House floor?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. There was a request that this be done.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, is it just fashionable to do it?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Iowa was in the Committee on Rules when the debate transpired yesterday. The gentleman was there, and he knows that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs asked for this particular rule, after he had talked with the Parliamentarian. At that time the gentleman could have, if he so desired, opposed the rule and the granting of the waiving of points of order that the gentleman's chairman offered before the Committee on Rules, but the gentleman sat there mute.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, let us get the record straight. I sat immediately back of the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania said he did not know of any reason why points of order should be waived on the bill, and I thought that was sufficient.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. But, nevertheless, he asked for this rule.

Mr. GROSS. Who is "he" who asked for a waiver of points of order?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN]. I presume he was speaking for the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GROSS. Who is "he"? The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee? The chairman of that committee said that he was not asking that the points of order be waived.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. But Dr. MORGAN explained to us that he had requested the rule that was suggested to him, after he had consultation with the Parliamentarian. For that reason he was offering that rule, and that is why we adopted it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not know when that happened, and I insist he did not make such a request. If there is a rollcall vote on the rule I will vote against adoption for the reason that no case has been made for a waiver of points of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of New York). The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 742 provides for a 3-hour rule for the consideration of H.R. 12169, which is a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of

1961. It does waive points of order, but it is open for amendment.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, authorizes the appropriation or $415 million for the remainder of fiscal 1966 to support U.S. operations in southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic, and to build up the contingency fund. None of the money is for military assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the funds are intended for the following purposes: $275 million for Vietnam, $7.5 million for Laos, $7.5 for Thailand, $25 million for the Dominican Republic, and $100 million for the contingency fund, which makes a total of $415 million.

Mr. Speaker, of these funds for Vietnam, $175 million will be used to import essential consumer goods and industrial materials required to keep the economy going. The remaining $100 million is for the rebuilding of war-damaged villages, roads and bridges, increased refugee relief, and to finance increased counterinsurgency operations.

Mr. Speaker, the $7.5 million for Laos will be used to finance a civilian air transport to outlying areas cut off from direct government contact, and to purchase the supplies carried in by the airlift.

Mr. Speaker, the $7.5 million earmarked for Thailand is to be used to expand programs aimed at strengthening the exposed northeast area against Communist subversion from neighboring Laos just across the Mekong River. Training of local police improved communications and expanded health, education, and agriculture programs are planned.

Mr. Speaker, the bill provides $25 million for the Dominican Republic. The sum of $15 million will be used to help finance the Government and the remaining $10 million is earmarked to continue such projects as road repairs, community development, and irrigation programs.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill authorizes $100 million to be added to the contingency fund for use in the last 3 months of fiscal 1966. The funds are to meet unexpected needs, not known ones, or programs Congress has previously rejected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I do not have any requests for time but do reserve the balance of my time.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. **O'NEILL** of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts to order the previous question.

The motion was agreed to.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks previously made.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **LIPSCOMB**. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. **MORGAN**. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

Mr. **LIPSCOMB**. Mr. Speaker, I was going to object to the vote on the resolution on the ground that a quorum was not present.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair had declared the resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. **LIPSCOMB**. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet and I want to object to the vote on the resolution on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair wants to be fair and wants to protect the rights of Members. Since the gentleman states that he was on his feet for that purpose, without objection the actions by which the resolution was agreed to and the motion to reconsider was laid on the table are vacated.

Mr. **LIPSCOMB**. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the resolution on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 360, nays 11, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—360

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Michel
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger

NAYS—11

Andrews, Glenn
Ashbrook
Dickinson
Gross
Gurney
Hall
Passman
Pool
Quillen
Rogers, Tex.
Watson

NOT VOTING—61

Ashley
Bandstra
Blatnik
Brown, Calif.
Burleson
Casey
Cederberg
Chelf
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Cohelan
Cooley
Corman
Dawson

Dorn
Dowdy
Dyal
Edwards, La.
Farnsley
Fino
Fisher
Fulton, Tenn.
Goodell
Grabowski
Grover
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Holifield
Irwin
Kee
Kirwan
Landrum
Long, Md.
Matthews
Miller
Moorhead
Multer
Olson, Minn.
Pepper
Powell
Purcell
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Roudebush
Scott
Senner
Smith, Iowa
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Vigorito
Walker, Miss.
White, Idaho
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Zablocki

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Miller with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Irwin.
Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Casey.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Long of Maryland.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Teague of Texas.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Vigorito with Hr. Hansen of Iowa.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Farnsley.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Purcell.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Resnick.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 12169, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 12169 authorizes $415 million of additional funds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. Most of this money is for Vietnam, and I believe it is fair to say that if it were not for the war in Vietnam, we would not have this bill before us.

Now I know that there are some of us who disagree with the policy our Government is following in Vietnam, but I do not believe that even those who disagree with our policy will find themselves in opposition to this bill.

As far as I am aware, none of the critics of our policy has advocated an immediate pullout of U.S. forces and termination of U.S. assistance.

I believe everyone will agree that as long as our boys are fighting in Vietnam, we must back them up, and, although this bill provides no military assistance, the funds which it authorizes are absolutely essential if the civilian population is to cope with the devastation of war and the demoralization caused by inflation in that country.

The funds authorized by this bill are to be used as follows:

For Vietnam	$275,000,000
For Laos	7,500,000
For Thailand	7,500,000
For the Dominican Republic	25,000,000
To replenish the contingency fund	100,000,000
Total	415,000,000

VIETNAM

It is not necessary for me to describe the effect which the war has had on the economy of Vietnam. Villages, roads, and bridges have been destroyed. Crops have been damaged and the movement of rice to markets has been interrupted. The Government is not able to collect its normal revenues, and it needs more money than ever to carry on the war effort.

This bill authorizes funds to assist the rural population to deal with war devastation and to finance the import of additional supplies of very essential commodities. The sale of these commodities will absorb some of the rapidly expanding purchasing power resulting from the presence of U.S. personnel and the large-scale construction program made necessary to supply and to shelter our forces in that country.

At the same time, the proceeds of the sale of these commodities will augment the war budget of the Government of Vietnam.

As I pointed out a minute ago, there is no money in this bill for military assistance. The organization and procedures of the military assistance program are not designed to support combat operations. The Committee on Foreign Affairs agrees with the recommendation of the President that the supply of military equipment and services to the Vietnam forces should be at the discretion of our commander in the field and that the same logistics system should serve both United States and Vietnam forces while this present war is going on. Authorization of the funds to finance military equipment for the use of our own forces in Vietnam and for the Vietnamese forces is now under consideration by the Committee on Armed Services.

Just yesterday morning I appeared before the Committee on Rules at the same time the Armed Forces representatives appeared, and a rule was granted on their bill. I am sure under the leadership of the House, it will be up for discussion next week.

LAOS

The $7,500,000 for Laos is needed primarily to meet the problems of supplying the civilian population of that war-torn country. There are a considerable number of refugees who have to be taken care of, and many villages inhabited by people who are strongly anti-Communist are cut off except for air transport. The United States finances civilian air transport to supply these people and the expansion of airport facilities in order to carry the load.

THAILAND

The Communist campaign of terrorism and subversion in Thailand has been accelerated, particularly in the northeast and the extreme south. The $7,500,000 provided for Thailand is to finance the expansion of the civil police, including additional helicopters and a village radio network, and to extend the rural development program to more villages.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

The funds authorized in the bill will provide $25 million for the Dominican Republic. Most of it will go to pay salaries and other expenses to keep government services going until the revenues of the Government of the Dominican Republic can be restored, and the rest to finance such essential economic programs as road maintenance, repair of irrigation ditches, and community development.

CONTINGENCY FUND

The large item in this bill that is not programed is the contingency fund.

The bill authorizes $100 million to replenish the contingency fund. Last summer, the President requested and Congress voted $50 million for the contingency fund. This was the first time in 10 years that the Executive had asked for less than $150 million for the contingency fund, although in some years the actual drawings on the contingency fund were substantially lower.

The $50 million has not been enough to meet the demands on the contingency fund this year. It has all been programed, and the bill provides $100 million to take care of unforeseen situations or to deal with problems which are known to exist but where the amount of money required cannot yet be determined.

The Congress has established the policy, which is accepted by the Executive, that the contingency fund will not be used to finance projects or operations which are already programed or for which Congress has refused to provide funds.

There is no way we can tell whether $100 million will be enough or whether it will be too much. The Agency for International Development has in recent years made a good record of returning to the Treasury any unneeded portion of the contingency fund.

The committee believes that, considering the present world situation, it is in the national interest to provide the full amount requested, with the understanding that if all the money is not needed, it will not be spent.

The expanded Vietnam program has increased the cost of administration to pay the salaries of additional personnel, to meet the cost of recruiting the limited number of people with the necessary qualifications who are available for service in Vietnam and provide the necessary office space, equipment, and rental of quarters.

Section 610(b) of existing law prohibits the use of the transfer authority or other discretionary authority contained in the Foreign Assistance Act to augment appropriations for administrative expenses. For this reason, an additional authorization is required for this purpose, and the bill makes $1,400,000 available for such use.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is very, very important to our effort in South Vietnam. As I said before, no military assistance is provided in the bill, but it is important to carry on our effort there. I hope that the House will pass the bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished chairman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that this money is being requested and authorized on an "illustrative" basis, in that if the administration does not need this money for southeast Asia, it could be allocated to and spent in any other country in any part of the world where we have an AID program or even in countries where we do not have an AID program at the present time?

Mr. MORGAN. I am sure if the gentleman from Louisiana will read the hearings conducted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, he will find that the President has already had to draw on funds temporarily unused to the amount of $64 million to keep the program going. The money in this bill will have to replace what has already been drawn and spent. The money is actually needed right now.

Mr. PASSMAN. I appreciate the gentleman's response; but is it not true that this money in this bill is being requested on an "illustrative" basis, and that it is not earmarked for South Vietnam or any other country? It is not like all other foreign aid: It is on an "illustrative" basis and may be spent wherever the AID agency pleases? If it is not true, please point out where in this bill you have earmarked money for South Vietnam.

Mr. MORGAN. I have already pointed out to the gentleman from Louisiana that $64 million is earmarked to replace funds already spent.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is that provision in this bill?

Mr. MORGAN. It has already been spent.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is there such a provision in this bill?

Mr. MORGAN. It has been explained in the hearings.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am talking about this specific bill. The program is on an "illustrative" basis. I have been handling the appropriations bill for this program for a long, long time, and it is still on an "illustrative" basis. Funds in the annual appropriation and in this bill are not earmarked for any particular country. Also the contingency fund of $100 million can be used in any country around the world. In fact, AID testified before my subcommittee that they may not need it and may not spend it. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the chairman for yielding to me. Is it not a fact that the appropriation bill considered by the gentleman from Louisiana is also on an illustrative basis and that it does give transferability authority?

Mr. MORGAN. This particular authorization has been justified on the basis that the need exists in South Vietnam and in the neighboring countries of Laos and Thailand.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I always seem to get this monstrosity of a program through the House on that basis. But when you, the authorization committee, make it legal to appropriate on an illustrative basis, we have no other alternative other than to go along with such a flexible procedure.

This is just another piece of the giveaway program. If you earmark these funds for South Vietnam, I will vote for it and apologize to this House for making this statement. You are not going to earmark these funds, and AID will have the right to spend it wherever they please.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman, who has not always been a supporter of the program, has not been able to earmark it down through the years, I believe that what we must do is trust the administration now, as we have in the past.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman has made my point for me. I want to thank him for it. We understand it is not earmarked, and you have no assurance that 15 cents of it will be spent in South Vietnam, so far as the language of the bill is concerned.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman's own bill is always set up on an illustrative basis. I believe the chairman made a point that the money has already been borrowed from other areas in order to fund the activities in South Vietnam.

Mr. PASSMAN. I read the hearings, and I still do not know where the money has been spent. It is the same old cabbage.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that if the contingency fund in the amount of $100 million is approved it can be spent in Indonesia or on behalf of Nasser or Sukarno, or in any other place around the world?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman understands the definition of "contingency fund." Of course, it can be used anywhere there are unforeseen emergencies, anywhere around the world. The gentleman knows, as I know, that in the bill of last year we established a special contingency fund for South Vietnam in the amount of $89 million. It has all been allocated to that area. This is the reason why none of the $50 million from the contingency fund was used in South Vietnam. The gentleman can be sure, without that special contingency fund for South Vietnam, the $50 million would have been used in South Vietnam.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today presents a very serious question for many people, including myself, who have been critical of our foreign aid programs for many years. If this bill is to be supported—and I think it should be—it should be supported on the basis of the fact that we are in Vietnam. Whether we like it or not, we are there. If we are there, we should provide every resource, every facility for our fighting men there.

It may be said, perhaps, that in this bill we are being overgenerous. I think we are. In my judgment there is a place where this bill can be reduced and should be reduced. But we must not err on the side of denying any dollars to the activity in Vietnam which will lead to its speedier conclusion and may in any sense result in the saving of lives. Upon that sober basis, I think this legislation should be considered.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is not perfect. It is not without fault. It does not do many of the things that ought to be done. It leaves unanswered certain questions.

However, it is a step in the right direction and possibly, only possibly, the best step that we can take at this time. There are areas about which several of us on the committee who filed supplemental views were deeply concerned. First of all, we are concerned that ships of friendly nations, ships of countries to which we have given assistance, are even now continuing to carry goods and cargoes into North Vietnam, into the harbor at Haiphong. We feel something should be done about that, something far more than has been done and is being done.

Secondly, although we did not go into this in the supplemental views, we are aware that great delays are being encountered in the offloading of cargos at Saigon and Da Nang and elsewhere. We think this is inexcusable. If, during World War II, we could, by the use of breakwaters and otherwise, unload fantastic amounts of cargo and great numbers of men onto the Normandy beaches in a combat situation, then there is absolutely no excuse, Mr. Chairman, for the fact that cargo ships are lined up waiting to be offloaded in Saigon and elsewhere in Vietnam. This, I say, is inexcusable.

Thirdly, Mr. Chairman, everyone who has visited Vietnam comes back with reports that there is a black market there. Admittedly, in a wartime economy, it is difficult to stop black-market operations, but if they cannot be stopped entirely, at least they can be limited. We who filed supplemental views suggested a means by which this could be done. We suggested that all civilian dependents be sent home. There are no civilian dependents there now of U.S. Government personnel, military and civilian, but there are some contractors' civilian dependents there. We have reason to believe that if these dependents were sent home, at least one type of black-market operation would be curtailed, if indeed not done away with completely.

Reference has been made to the contingency fund. For this fiscal year there was provided $50 million, which was all committed or at least earmarked in the first 7 months of the fiscal year, none of it for Vietnam.

At the request of the President, special funds for southeast Asia were made available which were or are being used in Vietnam. Now we are asked to provide another $100 million in contingency funds for the balance of this fiscal year. At the maximum this will only be 4 months. I think that is far too much. In a period when we are tightening our belts and we are trying to continue programs here at home and do a great deal for people abroad the contingency fund should be and can be severely limited. I am sure that an opportunity will be offered to the Members of this House to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude as I began by saying that although this bill before us is one which presents many questions and raises many doubts and leaves issues unanswered, if we take the position that the war in Vietnam must be won, if we take the position that we cannot deny anything which will contribute either directly or indirectly to victory there, then I think we must support this bill.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to compliment the gentleman from Indiana for his very excellent statement as to his reasons for supporting this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12169.

I fail to see how Congress could do otherwise, any more than it could fail to authorize payment of the water bill for the fire department while it was in the midst of attempting to stamp out dangerous fires in many parts of the city.

The bill before us today is emergency legislation. It is designed to authorize the expenditure of $415 million in tax dollars, most of it to be spent in the short space of the next 4 months, in order to repair the damages caused in many parts of the world by ignorance, by unconcern, by miscalculation and misunderstanding.

It even provides an additional $100 million for our $50 million "petty cash drawer" in case dollars are needed to sprinkle on other brush fires which might erupt in any part of the world.

I am sure that the Congress will enact this bill into law rapidly, as it should. This money is needed, and quickly, in such places as South Vietnam, Laos, the Dominican Republic and Thailand.

But throwing dollars at our problems is not a solution to them, no matter how many dollars we have and however tempting this solution may appear. The best that dollars can buy is time. The worst is complacency and the failure to even see problems as they develop.

We need more fire prevention as well as fire control in the world, and we can't have it unless and until we start using these dollars as tools to implement foreign policy rather than as replacements for a foreign policy.

Unfortunately, the funds we are authorizing today are not tools, not implements, but payments for mistakes. Let us hope we have fewer of them in the future.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ADAIR. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MIZE. Will the gentleman in the well please give me a few hypothetical illustrations on which this money from the $100 million contingency fund could be spent?

Mr. ADAIR. I think the chairman of the committee answered that a little earlier. I could only use generally the same illustrations. A contingency fund is, as its name implies, a fund to be used for unseen eventualities. We in the Congress and particularly in the House and those of us on the Committee on Foreign Affairs have been in the past—and I count myself among those—particularly critical of the way that the contingency fund can be used, but there are—and I will say to the gentleman very few—limitations, as long as it falls within the broadest outlines of foreign aid, on the manner in which this fund can be used. It can be used for situations which arise, for example, in a country which is newly threatened with revolt. It can be used for problems which present themselves in the field of education or matters of that sort. It is subject to the very widest use.

Mr. MIZE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman heard the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for foreign aid. Is it accurate that these funds are not tied down or that this authorization of funds is not tied down to Vietnam?

Mr. ADAIR. It is true that by the terms of this bill it is not tied down to Vietnam nor indeed to southeast Asia.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, could I ask the gentleman one further question?

Mr. ADAIR. Let me continue. However, if you read the record of the hearings, and if you consult the report, there is no question as to the intent. Since the gentleman has opened the question let me state that we are acting upon this as a measure apart from some money for the Dominican Republic, a measure basically for southeast Asia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Accordingly, I would think that the administration which has presented it to the Congress in that way as a measure to contribute to stability in southeast Asia would feel bound to use it for that purpose.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, why would not the administration have this in this bill?

Mr. ADAIR. That is a question which the gentleman, I believe, should address to the author of the bill.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am quite interested in this question.

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am very happy to point out that of the money which has been earmarked, $275 million of this request has been justified on the basis of its need in South Vietnam.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will yield further, yes, but—no, no, if I could interrupt there just a minute. You are not responsive to the issue. You say "earmarked," and that struck my interest.

But then you go on, as has just been talked about, and say something else. I want to find out why it is not actually tied down and actually earmarked by language, and not on the basis of just these statements.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If the gentleman will yield further, it has never been earmarked in such fashion in any of the history of the foreign aid bill. During the history of the foreign aid bill it has never been specifically earmarked.

Mr. CURTIS. I know, and that is one of the troubles with this bill.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Or any other appropriation.

Mr. MORGAN. Or in the appropriation bill. The gentleman from Missouri wants to change the rules on matters of this kind.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I believe that is one reason our foreign aid programs have been so poor, if I may draw that conclusion. Certainly, to come here at a time when we are in war over there, and say that this is for Vietnam and if you expect to get the vote on the assurance that that is what it is, I certainly believe that this rule should be changed and we should tie it down.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt if I will vote for this unless it is tied down, because I have seen instances in these programs and I am about to conclude that the administration does not follow what it says in those examples which it gives as to where the money is to be spent. We could not rely upon this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes. I say in response to the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri that it is my understanding we will have an opportunity to connect these more closely and explicitly with Vietnam and southeast Asia.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, will a possible amendment be offered?

Mr. ADAIR. I understand that such is the case.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to develop one other point, if I may. I was trying to find—and I have not had an opportunity to look through all of the hearings, although I have read the report—I was interested in seeing what balances we have not just in the foreign aid funds, but Public Law 480 funds, and how this money that we recently voted for the Asian Bank, which I hope will be available particularly in Vietnam, how this is coordinated. But I find no discussion of it contained in the report. As I stated earlier, insofar as I have been able to ascertain from the report, and I have not read the hearings, there has been no interrogation on this point.

Could the gentleman tell me whether the committee did go into all aspects of financing that is available in Vietnam, not just through this bill, but through the use of Public Law 480 funds, the lending that might be available in the Asian Bank, and so forth?

Mr. ADAIR. Having in mind the great multiplicity of lending institutions that are available for activities here and elsewhere, I would have to say to the gentleman, it would be almost impossible to go into all of them. Some of them do not even come within the purview of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We did give some consideration—perhaps not enough—to the general subject.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would permit me to make this observation before he yields further, it seems to me that is what we would expect the Committee on Foreign Affairs to do even though it is not within their jurisdiction—at least to have a knowledge of the funds that would be going in to hit at the same problem so at least there would be some consensus of this whole problem that the House could consider.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. There is a complete report on all of the expenditures available for all Members. But if I might follow up what the gentleman from Indiana has already said and nail it down, we are talking about funds primarily to be used in Vietnam. For instance, the $100 million of this request is for additional economic assistance that will be used for rural construction and counterinsurgency activities. AID needs $175 million for Vietnam to help finance the import of essential commodities in order to help combat inflation.

Rice imports needs $21 million.

Medicines and pharmaceuticals requires $9 million.

Needed for petroleum products, $12 million.

Needed for iron and steel, $50 million.

Needed for fertilizer imports, $4.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, over half of these commodities will be utilized in areas outside of Saigon. All of the $275 million is pinpointed for use in Vietnam.

Mr. CURTIS. In what way is this tied down? This is simply a statement. How can the Congress know that this actually is the way this money will be spent?

Mr. GALLAGHER. We would assume, of course, that the administration is telling the truth, as we have during all the time that we have had this program in operation.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will yield further just for this observation, that is the whole point that the gentleman from Louisiana made, as I understand it, and to the extent that I have been able to study this matter of expenditures, the administration—and this is not just this administration, it was true in the Eisenhower administration as well.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. There was not this kind of followthrough on how they spent the money.

Mr. GALLAGHER. There has been that kind of followthrough and that is why we have confidence that the money will be properly used.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, the gentleman is saying that he feels I am in error in concluding that there has not been a followthrough?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes; I would conclude that the gentleman is in error if he says that there has not been a followthrough on this.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] raised the question of committee consideration of the Southeast Asian Development Bank. That was subsequent to the hearings held by the committee on this bill. Moreover, we are never consulted by the Committee on Banking and Currency, so far as I know, with respect to financing any of these wonderful giveaways around the world that they get into.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman tell us whether or not there is any existing statutory authority at the present time to permit the President or someone to order the dependents of the U.S. citizens back home?

Mr. ADAIR. The President in my opinion has the authority. I think there is no doubt about it. It has been exercised, I am told, in a number of instances.

Mr. CAHILL. Can the gentleman advance any logical reason as to why this authority would be utilized as far as military personnel are concerned and not so far as civilian dependents are concerned.

Mr. ADAIR. Not at all. That is the point I was trying to make earlier and I appreciate the gentleman's concurrence in my views.

Mr. CAHILL. I think the gentleman is making an excellent point. One of the things that I have observed is that there is a tremendous housing shortage in Saigon particularly. I think this is one of the elements involved in the black market and certainly it is something that needs looking into. I think the gentleman has made a very valuable contribution to the discussion of these problems.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to point out that all civilian personnel of the Government have been ordered home. The only civilian personnel remaining there, or family of personnel, are the wives and families of the private contractors who are there.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to compliment the gentleman from Indiana for his constructive criticism. I have always had a great deal of respect for his position in this regard and for his sincere endeavor. I would like to ask the gentleman a question at this point. Is it not true that the criticism that you have brought out on the floor at this time regarding civilian dependents and supplies was thoroughly discussed by us in the consideration of this bill and that at the present time we have the statements to the effect that the supplies have been speeded up and that we might take up the problem of civilian dependents?

Mr. ADAIR. The gentlewoman is correct. Efforts are being made. My point is that they are tardy and far too little. If we can get cargoes across beaches under combat conditions, I see no reason why we cannot do the same in areas where there is no danger of aerial attack.

Mrs. KELLY. I agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK].

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, I think we sometimes tend to forget, when we talk about AID appropriations, and funding, and economic development, and all the other technical jargon, that at the grassroots, out where the action is, the AID program means people at work—dedicated people; people with a job to do; people who get tired and scared and shot at, and worried, and who keep right on doing their jobs the best way they can. I would like to tell you about just one of these men I met during my recent trip to Vietnam.

I spent 1 day in the Mekong Delta with the U.S. operations mission there. I could not get in the area I was supposed to visit because they were afraid for my safety. The man running that area was Eduardo Navarro.

Eduardo Navarro is a retired U.S. Army colonel. He knows how to use a gun if he has to but he does not carry one. He is a civilian working for the Agency for International Development as a Provincial representative in Vietnam near the Cambodian border. He is concerned with the welfare of 250,000 Vietnamese in an area infested with Vietcong. After being ambushed several times on the road to Saigon, he finally gave up driving. He has had several narrow escapes from daytime bombings in the streets of the city.

The villagers regard Ed Navarro as their friend. He works closely with the Province chief and American and Vietnamese military personnel to improve life in the Province while maintaining the best possible security. About 30 of his villages are considered secure and have qualified for Government help by routing out the Vietcong and agreeing to carry out self-help projects.

He is proud of the more than 100 schools which have been built by the village parents with cement and roofing supplied by AID. Nearly 200 teachers have been trained in short courses. Several clinics have been built and stocked with medical supplies from the AID commodity import program. Occasionally, the Vietcong steal them but the people know where they come from.

He uses his warehouse of food-for-peace wheat, oils, and dried milk as payment for work to benefit the community and make life worth fighting for.

On a demonstration farm 2 miles out of town, production is being increased by use of fertilizer and new seed. The Provincial hospital has a new surgical wing built by AID, staffed by a team of Filipino doctors and nurses paid by their own Government.

In fact, no aspect of life is overlooked. All the resources of AID in Vietnam are available to Eduardo Navarro to help the Vietnamese people build a better life. Not many Americans will ever hear of Ed Navarro or of his counterparts in every Vietnamese Province. But we in the Congress must not only know of what they are doing, we must support them. Perhaps this war cannot be won by civilians armed with seed, cement, and goodwill, but neither can it be won without them.

I believe the budget requests for AID are minimal and I call for their speedy approval.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would address a question to the chairman of the committee, if I might have his attention. This bill, as I understand it, and as I believe the Members of the House understand it, is to provide additional funds for economic aid to the Vietnamese and contiguous territory, plus $25 million for the Dominican Republic.

Mr. MORGAN. Plus $100 million for the contingency fund.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. But is not the bill designed for the purpose of aid to Vietnam? There is nothing whatever for the military effort.

Mr. MORGAN. Seventy percent of the funds in the bill are designed to support the war effort in South Vietnam.

Mr. GROSS. Then why should we be dealing in this supplemental with any other areas other than those enumerated in the bill?

Mr. MORGAN. We are not. That is my opinion. I understand that all of the supplemental appropriations requested in this bill are for areas that are of vital importance to the security of this country.

Mr. GROSS. Will not the distinguished chairman agree with me that there is nothing whatever in the language of this bill that holds its provisions to Vietnam or any other specific place in the world?

Mr. MORGAN. As the gentleman knows, this is a supplemental authorization and is an amendment to the regular foreign aid bill.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; it is an addition to the regular foreign handout.

Mr. MORGAN. This is the procedure. Any other method would require us to bring out a separate AID bill for South Vietnam. Is that what the gentleman is suggesting? This is an amendment to the regular AID bill.

Mr. GROSS. I think a substantial number of the Members of the House are willing to vote for a bill today supplementing the foreign aid appropriations where such funds are designated for the purpose of doing something about aiding and bringing about a successful conclusion of the Vietnamese situation and sorry state of affairs in the Dominican Republic. It will be my purpose later on to offer an amendment to the bill to restrict the expenditures to those areas. It will be my further purpose to move to strike out all of the contingency fund increase, and I will argue that point later, because as the supplementary views in the report clearly show, not one dime of the $50 million previously appropriated—and this was the statement of the distinguished chairman before the Rules Committee yesterday—was used in Vietnam. So it is incredible that we should be called upon today to provide $100 million to beef up the contingency fund when we are dealing with a bill specifically designed to take care of the situations in the Dominican Republic, in Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MORGAN. Is it the gentleman's intention, on Tuesday next, when H.R. 12335 comes to the House, containing approximately $4 billion for military use in southeast Asia planning, to do the same thing and to pinpoint it in the same way?

Mr. GROSS. There is a great difference between military assistance and the giveaway program.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not believe there is. It is all part of the same thing.

Mr. GROSS. Especially when the giveaway program can go to any country in the world under the terms of this bill—to any country in the world.

Mr. MORGAN. Is it the gentleman's intention to pinpoint each item in the military authorization for Vietnam?

Mr. GROSS. Surely the gentleman is not trying to compare military assistance with this bill, which happens to come from the committee of which I am a member. I know a little something about this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is making an argument about the economic portion of the bill, but I still would like to have an answer to my question in regard to military funds authorized for the same area.

Mr. GROSS. I happen to know something about this bill. I am not a member of the Armed Services Committee and, therefore, I cannot say that I know as much about military assistance needs in the areas covered by this bill.

Does the gentleman know about the military bill? I shall be glad to support amendments, if the gentleman will offer them, with regard to military assistance, if he can find anyplace where we are going to give military assistance to anyone outside the southeast Asia area unless that country is fighting in Vietnam.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has no intention to offer amendments. What I am trying to say to you, Mr. GROSS, is that I have confidence in my President. When he says he is going to spend $275 million in Vietnam I have confidence that he is going to spend it in Vietnam.

Mr. GROSS. Then suppose you tell me what happened to the $50 million in the contingency fund which was expended last year? Suppose you tell me where the President is going to use the $100 million in 120 days or less. Suppose you give me some idea as to that.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. GROSS, there was a contingency fund every year of the Eisenhower administration and every year since, and not one dime of this authorization has ever been programed in advance. If you will allow me the time, I will read that information into the RECORD.

Mr. GROSS. No; the gentleman controls ample time for that.

Mr. MORGAN. As to all of the expenses since 1956.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute, now. You have ample time or time of your own.

Mr. MORGAN. And not one dime out of the contingency fund has been programed. You know the definition of "contingency fund" and I know it. It is for unforeseen emergencies.

I do not know today where one dime of this money is going to be spent, and I do not believe the administration does.

Mr. GROSS. We put $50 million into the contingency fund last year.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; and I know where every dime of it was spent. So do you.

Mr. GROSS. Let us get it in the RECORD.

Mr. MORGAN. You know and I know that security is involved, and we cannot introduce it in the RECORD.

Mr. GROSS. Much of it ought to go in the RECORD. Much of it should not be classified. It should be made available to the people who pay the bills.

Mr. **MORGAN**. You know very well that it cannot be put in the RECORD.

Mr. **GROSS**. You know that there is plenty of it that ought to be put in the RECORD.

I believe we ought to take a look at the help we are not getting in Vietnam these days, along with the tremendous expenditure of money we are making and being called upon to make under the terms of this bill.

So far as I know, there are only three countries—Australia, New Zealand, and South Korea—which are supplying any combat troops at all. New Zealand is supplying one battery of artillery. Australia is supplying a battalion of combat troops. And South Korea, on the basis of the last information I have is supplying a division of combat troops.

I have not seen any figures with regard to casualties of Koreans. I suppose they are engaged somewhere in Vietnam, but the newspapers do not provide us with the casualty figures insofar as the Koreans, the Australians, and the New Zealanders are concerned.

Otherwise they are deeply gratified—as Henry Cabot Lodge said when he appeared before the committee not too long ago—the other countries of the world are deeply gratified that we are doing the fighting and dying in Vietnam, along with the South Vietnamese.

Let us consider the Philippines, for instance. At present the Philippines have 70 personnel in Vietnam. These consist of military and civilian medical teams and a military psychological warfare detachment. Would one not believe that the Philippines could make some kind of combat contribution to the war in Vietnam, to some of the fighting and dying going on over there?

Japan has provided over $55 million worth of economic assistance to Vietnam. This is money. We are talking about money exclusively now. This is reparations money they owe the Vietnamese as a result of their defeat in World War II that they would pay under any circumstances. Yet the State Department has the colossal gall to hand out a statement of this kind indicating that the Japanese are making a contribution in Vietnam when they give them $55 million of money which they owe them as reparations for damage when they occupied the country in the last war.

You talk about having confidence in people. Let us have a decent and a fair story from some of these people in the State Department and in the White House.

Greece has contributed medical supplies. I do not know how much. This is the State Department report which says Greece has contributed medical supplies. I hope it is remembered that we put a lot of money into Greece in other years, yet we get no real help in stopping communism elsewhere.

Turkey has provided medicines and has also offered to provide some cement. Some cement—no troops.

Iran has contributed 1,000 tons of petroleum products to Vietnam and has dispatched a medical team.

Hundreds of millions of American dollars are going into India, a country that had 5 million or more under arms in World War II yet it will not provide a single combat soldier to help us out in Vietnam. India has provided cloth for flood relief, says the State Department, and has under study the creation in Vietnam of a factory for the preparation of tea and another for sugar so they will have tea with their sugar and sugar with their tea. This is within the framework of a program of technical assistance and economic cooperation. India is also considering providing equipment for what? For a blood transfusion center. They do not offer to give any blood, but will provide the center for somebody else to give their blood. How nice. Pakistan.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mrs. **BOLTON**. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me the additional time.

Pakistan has contributed some financial relief for flood victims, and it, too, donated some clothing to Vietnam. No troops.

Israel made a gift of pharmaceutical supplies and has offered to train Vietnamese in Israel in various fields, whatever that means. No troops.

Belgium provided medicines. How much? The State Department does not say. No troops.

Canada is providing a professor of orthopedics at Saigon University. A big help. Also about 200 scholarships both academic and technical. They are also providing about $150,000 worth of flour. If I remember correctly, Canada has been selling about $400 million worth of wheat a year to Red China, but they cannot afford to get into Vietnam on a bloodletting basis. So, no troops. I almost forgot—Canada has agreed to construct an auditorium for the Faculty of Sciences at Vietnam's Hue University.

Denmark has provided medical supplies and is willing to train Vietnamese nurses in Denmark. No troops.

France since 1956, says the State Department, contributed $111 million in assistance to South Vietnam. That is since 1956. A big contribution. No troops.

Germany has provided 12 personnel in Vietnam and has agreed to provide 14 more for a total of 26. They, too, are providing a large amount of help. No troops.

Ireland has contributed 1,000 pounds to Vietnam through their Red Cross. No troops.

Italy, where we have dumped more billions of dollars—and I mean billions—have provided a nine-man surgical team and are providing science scholarships. No troops.

The Netherlands. The Dutch have given antibiotics. No troops.

Spain has provided 800 pounds of medicines and has agreed to send a military medical team to Vietnam. No troops.

Switzerland, the home of a lot of our gold and bank accounts. I wish there were some way we could find out how many of the black marketeers and corruptionists in Vietnam have unnumbered bank accounts in Switzerland as well as some other people. However, the Swiss have provided microscopes for the University of Saigon. No troops.

Now we get down to Britain, which is threatening to invade little Rhodesia and bring that friendly country to its knees. In one of the most outrageous enterprises in the history of this country, President Johnson has joined the British in their boycott of Rhodesia. The British have provided six civilians for the British advisory mission in Vietnam and a professor of English at Hue University. With 8 Vietnamese already in training in England, Britain has agreed to provide for 12 more this year.

That is the British Empire or what is left of it. They are perfectly willing, apparently, if all else fails and they are losing their boycott of Rhodesia—they are perfectly willing it seems to send two divisions there to beat that little country down and stir up more ferment and more trouble in Africa in the process. Apparently the explosion and massacres in Nigeria have not given the United States enough to handle for awhile, so this administration has to help stir up more trouble in Rhodesia.

Now getting to Latin America, the Argentines have sent two observers to Vietnam to examine the possibilities for Argentine assistance. They are going to send some observers down to find out whether there is any place for them to do any fighting or dying in Vietnam.

Brazil has provided coffee and medical supplies. No troops.

In the Dominican Republic they are having their own troubles, but they have offered some cement.

So it goes around the world where we have frittered away at least $130 billion trying to buy friends and influence people. Yes, as Lodge reports, most of the rest of the world is deeply gratified that we are fighting and financing the war in Vietnam.

Mr. **MORGAN**. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. **KING** of Utah. Mr. Chairman, there are some who may be reluctant to approve further public funds for nonmilitary purposes in South Vietnam until they are assured that private philanthropic agencies are also given a full opportunity to assist. Let me assure the members of this committee that private philanthropic groups are giving valuable assistance in South Vietnam. Their story is a noble one, that deserves to be told.

A recent on-the-spot survey by representatives of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service reported that "the refugee situation in Vietnam is in good hands." They found 43 voluntary agencies with either operational or supporting interest in Vietnam. Their varied programs are supplementing that of the Government of Vietnam and the Agency for International Development. These nongovernmental groups serve special needs and establish direct person-to-person relationships where Government programs cannot operate so easily. Twenty-eight private agencies were running refugee relief programs.

For example: CARE is distributing packages financed by donations of the American people, including school supplies, tools, and seeds; needle trade kits to accompany sewing machines, and rice, salt, and fish, purchased locally.

Catholic Relief Services is expanding its services by 2 percent for school lunch programs, family feeding stations, and relief of war victims. It will quadruple its shipments of medicines, expand its vocational schools and cooperatives, and increase orphanages and social welfare services.

Church World Service took part in the initial refugee program in 1954 when 800,000 Vietnamese fled south. It has returned to Vietnam to serve the new influx of refugees, providing nurses and medical units, community development and agricultural teams, and some supplies for direct relief.

Other church-related agencies providing similar services and supplies include the Christian Children's Fund, the American Friends Service Committee, and the Mennonite Central Committee. Other agencies with special competence are helping with the blind, lepers, orphans, foster parents, public health, and rural electrification.

The International Rescue Committee, in cooperation with AID, has accepted the responsibility for six medical teams to be assigned to refugee areas. Leading American drug companies already have donated a substantial supply of drugs for civilian use, and the Medical Civic Action Program will distribute them throughout Vietnam.

International Voluntary Services has been operating a program in Vietnam since 1957. Under an AID contract, IVS has 50 young men serving throughout the rural regions, working on projects in agriculture, science education, teaching English, and in work with youth and refugees.

The number of refugees will soon exceed a million, and will seriously tax the resources of all agencies. The most pressing need, according to the American Council of Voluntary Agencies, is for more personnel. Supplies there are, but people are needed to help in the camps where 450,000 refugees are now being cared for, and in the villages to which they return or are resettled. Doctors, nurses, administrators, social welfare, and community development experts are wanted on short- and long-term assignments both by voluntary agencies and by AID.

In spite of all the difficulties, the refugee problem in Vietnam is being handled with vigor, and great self-sacrifice. I, for one, want to see that every cent of the AID request is provided for this vital work.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Utah. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment and commend the gentleman from Utah for pointing out to the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and to the country, the splendid effort being made by the private, voluntary, and religious organizations in Vietnam and in the rest of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I would add to the remarks of the gentleman, if I may, that our Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements has studied the scope of organizational contributions to human betterment, in the areas of economic well-being, education, health, and all others. Our study fully corroborates what the gentleman has reported about the voluntary agency and religious group effort to help in South Vietnam. The report shows that there are several thousand such organizations in the United States helping throughout the entire world, and it is estimated that such private assistance amounts to about $600 million a year.

This represents a substantial and knowledgeable effort on the part of U.S. citizens to express their interest in the welfare and freedom of other people of the world.

This is a story which ought to be told more frequently. It is a story that all of the American people ought to understand and in which they ought to take great pride.

Mr. KING of Utah. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation because I believe it is necessary that the U.S. Congress provide all necessary funds for Vietnam and southeast Asia.

We people on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House have had adequate hearings and have discussed this legislation and the need for it. I would say to the House, I believe this is a good bill and should be passed so that there will be adequate supplemental foreign assistance authorization for the fiscal year 1966 under H.R. 12169.

I have several amendments I think should be placed in the legislation. The first one refers to the $25 million for the Dominican Republic which is shown on page 3 of the section-by-section analysis of H.R. 12169.

I recommend that item should be specifically made by the United States not as a grant, but on a loan basis. The reason being this item is not just for current expenses but is to help on capital budget costs in the Dominican Republic. Capital expenditures should as a policy be advanced on a short- or long-term basis.

As a matter of fact, in the hearings we had the statement from Mr. Bell of AID as follows:

> Our money has been going to an increasing extent to capital development, to technical assistance and to more permanent construction and long-range efforts to establish a stronger economy in the Dominican Republic.

When the purpose of the $25 million is for longtime capital purpose, then I believe Congress should specify it should be on a loan.

But you say to me—FULTON, are we going to be depriving the Dominican Republic Government of needed assistance? The answer is "No."

If you will look at page 20 of the committee hearings, you will find that since the date of the revolution which occurred on April 24, 1965, through January 10, 1966, the great U.S. Government and the greater U.S. taxpayers have put in $86.3 million as grants to the Dominican Republic. These were supporting assistance grants for Government operations and maintenance.

In addition to that, there is $50 million current 1966 authorized money in the President's contingency fund plus $4.1 million carryover from 1965. I am not allowed to give you the details of it, but there is an allocation of $37.3 million to the Dominican Republic out of $54.1 million remaining in that contingency fund as of this time. That is not obligation—that is allocation. So that adding the $86.3 million makes a total of $123.6 million that the United States is providing now to the Dominican Republic.

The President now proposes to add $25 million more as a grant. So this addition will mean since April 24, 1965, U.S. grants of $148,622,000.

I believe that is one of the highest rates of grants we have ever had to a country of this size.

But you say to me—How about the present loans of the Dominican Republic? They have some loans under 1 year—$30 million worth of loans due under 1 year. Those loans are owed to foreign banks. So we in Congress are just simply going to pick up the $25 million of commercial foreign bank loans.

The Dominican Republic Government owes $153.5 million on loans that are from 1 to 8 years maturity. The United States could make a 40-year loan to the Dominican Republic with 1-percent interest for 10 years, and 2½-percent interest for 30 years. This type of loan is authorized under present Federal acts. So that if the United States gives the Dominican Republic $25 million as a loan on a long-term basis, they are not in such bad shape, as the United States has really given wonderful help to the Dominican people as follows:

U.S. assistance to the Dominican Republic, Apr. 24, 1965, to Jan. 10, 1966

Supporting assistance grants for Government operations and maintenance	$86,300,000
Administered through OAS	57,000,000
Administered through AID	29,300,000

Approximately $40 million of these funds have been used to pay salaries of employees who were on Government payrolls, or were employed by municipalities or Government-owned corporations before April 24, 1965; $12 million was made available to the Government-owned sugar corporation through a loan by the Organization of American States. The balance was provided for disaster relief including food and medical supplies and emergency public works activities which are being undertaken by the provisional Government and AID.

Technical assistance grants totaled	$4,438,000
Agriculture	941,000
Education	396,000
Transportation	212,000
Public administration	1,161,000
Community development	128,000
Other projects	1,600,000
Development loans authorized:	
National Housing Bank	5,000,000
Food for peace	7,858,000
Title II emergency program	3,007,000
Title III approved fiscal year 1966	4,851,000

Another question you should ask me is who are the creditors of the Dominican Government and to whom are those loans owed? Obligations from 1- to 8-year maturity are owed to the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank, and the U.S. Treasury.

On loans over 8 years, obligations of the Dominican Republic Government are owed to the International Bank, AID, Export-Import Bank, and to the U.S. Treasury under Public Law 480, title IV.

Why should the United States adopt a business basis and free enterprise policy toward the Dominican Republic at this time? The reason is that the Dominican Government is holding many businesses that are now Government owned and Government operated. These businesses are being operated at a deficit. The Dominican economic situation is this. First, there is a low rate of savings and investment. Nobody much in the Dominican Republic is saving or trying to help their government by avoiding inflation and seeking stable economic conditions.

Second, the Dominican exports are still being emphasized on commodities like sugar and cocoa which are in great oversupply at the present time and low priced on the international markets. The Dominicans have not changed their agricultural programs to realism and effective demand. This should be done at once both at home and abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Let us face it. Too large a share of the economy of the Dominican Republic is owned and operated by the Government at a loss. If we will simply insist in this Congress that the Dominican Republic change over and make immediate plans for changing to a private economy, the U.S. taxpayers will be much better off, rather than financing indefinitely the $5 million a month Government deficit, and deficiencies in foreign trade because of inflation at home and continued deficits caused by excessive imports compared to exports.

My other point is this: I propose to offer an amendment to cut the President's contingency fund for from $150 million, which it would be if Congress adds $100 million more under this bill, to $100 million total for the 3-month period to the end of the current fiscal year or June 30, 1964. As has been pointed out, this contingency fund will be spent over a 3-month period—over April, May, and June of this year—so that if the President has $50 million added on by this bill as I propose he will be getting undesignated contingency funds at the rate of $200 million a year. This is in addition to the $89 million special contingency fund for southeast Asia we in Congress have given the President for use in this current fiscal year, which is all the President asked.

In the current fiscal year we have in the contingency fund $50 million currently authorized and appropriated, and allocated but not yet obligated. In this fiscal year 1966 we have also $4.1 million of contingency funds carried over from 1965. That means a total of $54.1 million presidential contingency funds on hand now, of which about $37 million has been allocated to the Dominican Republic and the rest to other places, which I should not give specifically.

My amendment will give the President $50 million more for the remaining 3 months of this fiscal year, until June 30, and I believe that is enough. If it is any larger, if the crisis anywhere abroad is any larger, I believe the President should come to Congress and get an authorization.

So I would say to this House of Representatives that we should hold the purse strings and watch expenditures closely. We should not move this contingency fund back up to the $200 million contingency fund annually as it had been some time previously, several years ago, when the amount authorized and appropriated was not fully used.

The reason I say that is as follows: In fiscal year 1965, $150 million was authorized for the President's contingency fund; $99.2 million was appropriated and, as a matter of fact, the obligations were only $57 million. In 1966 there was $50 million authorized and appropriated, which appears to have carried the contingency fund for 9 months. So I believe $100 million extra added on for a 3-month period is at too great a rate for the President's contingency fund. I therefore recommend by my amendment that $50 million now be added by the Congress to the President's contingency fund for the remaining 3 months after enactment until June 30, 1966. This will result by my amendment in a budget saving of $50 million.

I do not favor Congress blindly authorizing and appropriating large sums of undesignated, unallocated, and unprogramed funds.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of this committee, with his typically accurate and effective argument, has stated the basic reasons for this legislation. Most of the money in this bill is for the economic support of South Vietnam. This little country is wartorn and threatened with runaway inflation. She has committed thousands and tens of thousands of her sons to battle, and all reports that have come to my attention have indicated that her men are fighting with ever-increasing effectiveness, and that they are giving magnificent accounts of themselves in the field.

But this bill is also a part of a wider effort about which our President spoke in his great address in New York City last night. He said:

> The strength of America can never be sapped by discussion—we are united in our commitment to free discussion. So also we are united in our determination that no foe anywhere should mistake our arguments for indecision—or our debates for weakness.

As this House acts on supplemental legislation for supporting our civilian and military men in Vietnam, I have no doubt that there will be vigorous debate. But let there be no mistake about our determination to resist Communist aggression in Vietnam. We have not sacrificed in Western Europe, in Berlin, in Greece and Turkey, in Korea, in the China Straits, in the missile crisis in Cuba, and now in Vietnam in vain. We are going to be true to our great principles of freedom, and to our commitments to help others preserve their independence.

I have heard it said that this is not a popular war, as if any war were popular. Some say the public does not understand why we are fighting—why we have such a vital interest in southeast Asia. And I say, as the President said last night—if you do not know, if you are not sure, ask the men who are there. They know.

Or ask the South Vietnamese, who have fought so valiantly to defend themselves. Ask the widows of the village chiefs who have been murdered by the Communists. Ask their sons and daughters. And they will tell you what Communist terror really means.

Or go through southeast Asia and ask leaders of Thailand, Malaya, the Philippines, Japan, why the war in Vietnam is important, and they will tell you.

Or, if you still do not believe, ask the Communists. They know what they are doing. They are not just fighting to win in Vietnam. They are fighting a so-called war of liberation which is a prelude to similar wars in every other underdeveloped country in the world. As the commanding general of North Vietnam said recently:

> If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, then it can be defeated everywhere in the world.

Let us be clear on this point—we are not fighting against a Democratic revolution within South Vietnam. We are not even fighting just the Vietcong. We are fighting Communist aggression. It is a different form of aggression than we faced in Berlin or Korea, or Cuba, but for that reason it is even more dangerous. Earlier forms of Communist aggression were easier to combat. People's emotions are more readily aroused in a war of invasion than they are in a war of infiltration. The Communists know that, and they are counting on us not to have the will to fight.

By passing this legislation by an overwhelming vote the House will demonstrate once again to the entire world, and especially to the Communists, the resolve of our country to stand firm against communism.

As the most powerful democratic nation on earth, we must bear the heavy responsibilities and burdens of leadership. The price of leadership is sacrifice—of men, of resources, of the normal pursuits of life. But these are small compared to the costs of failure. We have shouldered burdens before, and there is a long, hard road ahead.

But there is a human greatness in the democratic spirit, and in the soul of America, which will sustain us now as it has in the past. Without heroics, but with quiet courage and determination, Vietnamese and American men and women are proving once more the strength of free societies.

Sergeant Walling, U.S. Army, was such a man. You may remember what the President said about him:

> On the 19th day of June, this year, a young and brave American set out into the jungles of a distant land—half a world away. He walked at the side of a patrol of young and brave Vietnamese.
>
> Their purpose—and his—was to defend freedom against its aggressors.
>
> The name of that American was Harry A. Walling.
>
> He was a sergeant of the U.S. Army—and a proud member of the proud Special Forces who wear the green beret.
>
> When the Vietnamese patrol came under attack, the only thought of Sergeant Walling was for the patrol—and its success. He gave no thought to safety or to self. Those who recovered his body found that, before he died, Sergeant Walling had fired his every round of ammunition.
>
> We have come today to bestow upon Sergeant Walling one of our country's highest honors. No medal, no words, no eulogies of ours can honor him so highly as he has honored our country and our cause.
>
> But we can—and we must always—honor ourselves by working everywhere we can, in every way we can, for a world of peace in which the young and the brave need not die in war.
>
> When Sergeant Walling fell, he left behind his young widow and three young children—the oldest age 3, the youngest now 4 months. Mrs. Walling's bravery is no less than her husband's.
>
> Two nights after she learned her husband would never return, Mrs. Walling wrote out a message to the other wives of her husband's unit. That remarkable letter has deeply touched all who have read it—including the Commander in Chief. I would like to read these lines from it:
>
> "I know you are all afraid for your husbands and love them as much as I loved my husband. He loved me just as your husbands do you, and he didn't want to die. He had so much to live for. But he was a brave man and a fighting man. My husband died for what he believed in, and if he had a choice of where and how he would die, he would choose the same place—fighting for a decent world for his children to grow up in.
>
> "So don't let the world, the loneliness, the despair, and the fear get you down. Stand as tall as that man of yours who wears the beret and thank God you got him * * * my prayers are that all of your husbands come home to you safe and well."
>
> I am proud now on behalf of the Nation to bestow the Silver Star posthumously upon Sgt. Harry A. Walling.

Mr. Chairman, Sergeant Walling knew why he was in Vietnam. Now is the time for this House to show, once again, that it does too.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I gladly yield to the distinguished minority leader of the House.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the distinguished majority leader's yielding to me at this point. I subscribe almost entirely to what the gentleman from Oklahoma has just said. I want to emphasize that we on our side of the aisle strongly favor a position of strength against Communist aggression in South Vietnam, southeast Asia, Berlin, or anywhere else throughout the world. We have in the past and will in the future.

I am proud of the fact that the House of Representatives is taking up this important legislation today, acting upon it, I believe, constructively, acting upon it promptly, with a minimum of controversy and, I trust, with a minimum of opposition.

It does deeply disturb me, however, that some Senators at the other end of the Capitol—I do not question their motives—are delaying the consideration of and the approval of legislation that is important to the execution of a policy of strength in southeast Asia. The enactment of this legislation will have an important impact, a favorable one, on the morale of our troops and our South Vietnam allies. Prompt action in the Congress will demonstrate to our enemies that the elected representatives of the American people can act affirmatively and constructively with the backing of a majority of the citizens in this great country.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman for what he has said. Certainly the House can demonstrate this afternoon, by the size of its vote and by the expeditious manner in which it acts, how it stands on this matter.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to direct constructive criticism toward this bill and the general problem which we face. I first wish to compliment the chairman of our committee for the very scholarly, the very distinguished, and the very statesmanlike manner in which he has conducted the operations on this side of the Congress. I would think the very least I could say about this bill as we process it this afternoon is that we are proceeding in a more practical way than our counterpart committee on the other side of the Congress and in a more practicable and reasonable fashion. I do commend the chairman, therefore, for his leadership and his soberness, even though I may not always agree with where he is leading us.

I should like to point out that there is really no argument for the passage of this bill. It is a $415 million blank check for 4 months; that is, for the remaining 4 months of this fiscal year. If we had assurance that this money was intended entirely for South Vietnam in direct and practical support of our efforts there, I would have no criticism of it, but the fact of the matter is, as it was brought out in the discussion earlier by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], that there is not a single dollar of this that must reach Vietnam. It could be diverted to any place in the world.

For the Congress to hand the AID agency or the State Department a blank check for $415 million is, in my opinion, an abdication of legislative responsibility. If we were to pin this money down without any doubt and were in effect to say to the American public the situation in Vietnam is so complicated and so dangerous in all its ramifications that we absolutely need $415 million for that world trouble spot, then I would not object. But that is not what we are saying here this afternoon. I suppose it would be asking too much for the Members to have their attention directed to the supplemental views. However, if you will note, this report was written because we wanted to provide some constructive suggestions and voice some practical ideas on how this bill should be analyzed by the Members. I should like to reemphasize a number of points. For example, the question of AID borrowing millions of dollars from other sources supposedly to assist programs in Vietnam; the completely loose bookkeeping procedures followed in the various agencies with which we are working. None of these charges in the supplemental views have been answered because they cannot be answered. At the same time I am sure the Members are not really asking for an answer. From what I have gathered, the determination of the President—and I am commending him in it—has been greatly fortified by the return of the Vice President from a recent trip to eight capitals where he was received enthusiastically and some degree of at least verbal, if not actual, support was given to our efforts. I would certainly hope that any vote here this afternoon would be interpreted as support of the basic position of our country as outlined by the President and not the unfortunate and headline-hunting type of procedure followed by the other body. But I do not think it is at all practical or wise for the House of Representatives to have its action interpreted as handing the AID agency $415 million to spend as they please. In the atmosphere of the crisis in Vietnam, we are giving this agency, which probably has the poorest overall record for efficiency and effectiveness, this huge sum without any practical conditions attached. I do not believe any sober reflection could sustain this. I do hope when we finally get to the bill for fiscal 1967, there we emphasize the fact that we ought to keep stringent congressional control of these funds. Secondly, we ought to study these funds in the light of their practical use and not the blind support which is demanded by the executive branch.

We could do a far more reasonable task of supporting the President if we would ask more constructive and necessary questions, not in the spirit of unnecessary criticism but in the spirit of helpful criticism, which he sorely needs.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, not to invoke an unharmonious note into this discussion, I do not want the RECORD to state, as indicated, that the majority view was less than sober, as the gentleman has said, and to reflect here and there upon the sobriety of the decision of the majority members of the committee.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct that impression. No agency in the history of our Government has been more closely scrutinized, down through the years, than has the AID agency. To say it has the poorest record in efficiency is not quite accurate. All of us look it over very carefully. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], looks at it very thoroughly, this House reviews it very thoroughly. I believe the record of efficiency of the AID agency is really one of the high-water marks of governmental efficiency, especially under the able direction of Mr. David Bell.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, may I say when I used the term "sober," it is to compare our actions with those of the committee of the other body. That is the context in which it is used.

However, Mr. Chairman, when we think of this $415 million blank check and the fact that it is being requested to support a war effort in South Vietnam, it raises many other additional questions. I relate an incident which supposedly occurred in a parliament of a so-called friendly country.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that during debate in this parliamentary body, one of the parliamentarians rose with a resolution asking or demanding that its government declare war on the United States. When the shocked members wanted to know why, he explained it thusly: That their government was bankrupt, their people were grumbling at the lack of progress and comfort, and he felt that by declaring war on the United States and immediately losing the war, the country would then qualify for massive rehabilitation at U.S. expense.

Mr. Chairman, it appears that this resolution was going to pass in this parliamentary body and that they would have declared war on the United States, so as to reap the benefits which they hoped would follow. At that point a very astute member of that body rose and raised one question. This question was: What will we do if we win the war?

Mr. Chairman, what will it take to put South Vietnam back into its normal, quiet, sleepy, traditional basis? I do not believe it is at all realistic for the United States to be pumping these millions of dollars into dubious domestic programs in South Vietnam, when their economy, their traditions, and everything else involved in the history of that country, will show that they are not equipped to absorb it.

To sum it up, logical support of the President is an act of statesmanship. This blank check is irresponsibility.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GRIDER].

COMMODITY IMPORTS

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Chairman, the Congress has before it an urgent supplemental request from the Agency for International Development for $275 million in order to carry on its program of supporting assistance in Vietnam.

The bulk of this appropriation will be used to finance imports of essential commodities.

During 1966 it will be critically important to step up the export of American steel, oil, medicine, building supplies, and machinery to support the general economy and avoid disastrous inflation in South Vietnam.

Inflationary pressures will mount in 1966 unless Vietnam can import roughly double its 1965 imports and unless other stabilization measures are taken. If not checked, runaway inflation in Vietnam could cancel many of our most important gains.

We must see to it that the shoe is not lost for want of a nail.

With a war-disrupted economy, South Vietnam has been unable to earn the foreign exchange needed to pay for these imports. Without them, the economy cannot function. Without enough of them, the already serious burden of inflation would become backbreaking.

Most of the commodity imports financed by AID move through regular commercial channels—meaning about 2,000 licensed importers in Vietnam. These merchants pay for aid-financed imports with their own currency, the piaster. The payment goes to the Vietnamese Government which uses the money to finance the war effort. AID requires that these imports be American made and that the American supplier be paid in dollars by AID when he ships his merchandise to Vietnam. Thus, AID is not providing dollars to Vietnam that can feed a black market in currency.

There is a black market in Vietnam, but it is not being fed by our aid. U.S. personnel in Vietnam, both civilian and military, are paid in script to avoid currency inflation. But in any country where foreign exchange is rationed for essential purposes, there are those who seek to obtain hard currencies for their personal use and are willing to pay high prices for dollars or pounds or francs. American officials and the South Vietnamese Government are attacking these problems at their source, and the improvement of the Vietnamese administrative ability and strengthening of controls will tend to dry up black market operations.

But the surest way to eliminate such operations is to bring supply more nearly in balance with demand—and this is what the commodity import program is designed to do. It may seem a small part, but let me assure you it is an extremely important part—of the total effort to help repel Communist aggression and to help the Government of Vietnam develop a society resistant to subversion and capable of independent progress.

AID's commodity import program for Vietnam may be as important to our ultimate success as any of our military weaponry. I fully support the supplemental request to carry this program forward.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACGREGOR. In light of the statement that the gentleman has made about the commodity import program strengthening the Cao Ky government, I wonder if the gentleman would comment on the testimony of Mr. Bell, the AID administrator, which is found on page 8 of the hearings where Mr. Bell stated:

> But I would not argue in the slightest there is not some diversion both in the sense of people putting money outside the country in Hong Kong and Switzerland, and in the sense of significant amounts of resources being obtained by the Vietcong from Saigon and the import system.

I assume he was referring to the fact that we are not dealing here in the commodity import program with the South Vietnamese Government but rather with private importers who may in many cases misuse the privilege they have of exchanging piasters for military pay certificates at very profitable rates.

Mr. GRIDER. I will say to the gentleman, this of course is a possibility. I mentioned in my remarks that this condition was being improved. I would not suggest, and I do not think the gentleman would suggest that the whole import program be turned over to the Government. We are trying to stimulate private enterprise in South Vietnam.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. The gentleman indicated in his statement that the recipient of this aid is the Government of South Vietnam. It is my understanding that the direct recipient, and properly so if we are going to recognize the value of the profit motive, is the private business sector in South Vietnam. That sector, of course, pays taxes on many of these commodities—rice is not one of them—but on many of these items included in the commodity import program. Is that not a correct statement of how the commodity import program works?

Mr. GRIDER. That is not to say that we should abandon the program because some of the people importing have been guilty of misfeasance; no.

Mr. MACGREGOR. And that the gentleman from Minnesota did not say or suggest.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12169, the supplemental foreign assistance authorization for fiscal year 1966.

Having just returned from an official but brief trip to South Vietnam for the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives, I believe it is important to report briefly on a few of the matters before the House today.

It is correct that this overall authorization of $415 million is essential to the success of our joint efforts in South Vietnam—for financing the import of essential commodities, for rural construction, for port expansion, for refugee relief, and for general development.

The conflict in Vietnam cannot be won by military means alone because the military operations there are important largely as they allow the country to proceed with its social and economic reconstruction programs. Given the defeat of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese main force units, the civil actions programs in the villages and hamlets may have the security with which to proceed.

I would like to stress to my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, the seriousness and the magnitude of the problem—and the major job that has to be done.

First, a word about the general logistic situation and the port of Saigon. We are some 3 to 4 months behind in catching up with our supply effort and our logistic needs. This has not been clearly stated, and I think it should be. The administration did not anticipate—even though this may have been difficult to foresee—the magnitude of the supply buildup. They did not get on top of it fast enough nor establish clear priorities.

Moreover, the Government in Saigon has been very slow to organize and direct the actual port operations. For many years there have been six or more different agencies involved—a system that is inefficient if not worse. At last I think we have had some serious discussions with the Government in Saigon on the need for single port management, and we are now starting to take corrective and vigorous measures to catch up. The new port at Cam Ranh Bay is encouraging, and new port and airfield facilities now under construction will markedly help. However, it is still a major problem.

Second, the question of inflation is real. During the past year the price of rice to the consumer in Saigon has gone up about 40 percent. Hopefully Prime Minister Ky, with a budget of 55 billion piasters, will try to keep expenses in line.

It is something of a commentary on the conflict in South Vietnam, and also an element in this import financing program, to note that a few years ago South Vietnam exported about 300,000 tons of rice. It was a significant part of the rice bowl in southeast Asia.

Today, because of Vietcong terrorism and the actions of main force units, Saigon has to import about 400,000 tons of rice. This is a measure of the problem.

The real job ahead, however, lies in the rural areas; in the villages and hamlets of South Vietnam representing about 80 percent of the people. We should recognize in this House that this is very nearly a lost revolution. For almost 20 years or more, very little has been done by the Government in Saigon to meet the revolution of rising expectations, to reach and work with the people in the villages, to offer them genuine participation in their Government and their future.

Hopefully, and at last, a program has been started that will give the people of South Vietnam some hope that the Government cares about their concerns, is going to work with them, and is going to meet the problem. During my recent trip I visited a village where the civil action program is in operation and a camp where political action workers are being trained. In the camp there are 3,000 students enrolled. The women are being trained in first aid, teaching, and health education; and the men are being taught construction and trade skills, the elements of rebuilding hamlet government, and necessary paramilitary skills.

Once trained, the students are divided into teams of approximately 40 members and sent back into the province from where they were recruited by the South Vietnamese province chief. They will work, live, and sleep in their villages. All too often in the past because of the Vietcong terror, village and hamlet chiefs left their village in time of peril to seek sanctuary in the district of provincial capital. Needless to say, this did not always enhance respect for them in their own villages. By the end of 1966 it is expected that civil action teams will be in 1,000 of the country's 12,000 villages and hamlets in four areas.

But I do not think we should kid ourselves about the nature, the character, or the extent of this commitment. We are dealing with a situation that is political and military—unless there is real security in the villages and hamlets, the pacification program will not really get off the ground. Over 20,000 village and hamlet chiefs have been assassinated in the last 3 years—one of the most recent was the tragic assassination of the popular mayor of Ap Quang Nam, a quiet, peaceful village which appeared to be on the road to pacification.

Equally the civil action program and rural reconstruction are long range and will take at least 5 years—possibly 10 or more.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I would state that unless the central government in Saigon initiates genuine and far-reaching reforms in education, in land reform, in opening opportunities to the refugees, and in creating a sense and a conviction as to opportunity and participation for all people in South Vietnam, the work in the villages will not be supported and hope will be dashed.

We and our allies are committed in South Vietnam. We must fully back our men in the field—whose morale is magnificent—and we must do all we can to encourage South Vietnamese efforts at reform and reconstruction. Hence the need for this authorization which I support today.

And at all times we must utilize every resource of diplomacy—including the United Nations—to reach the conference table and an honorable peace.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, if I have been surprised by anything in this discussion today, I must confess that what surprises me most is the unanimity of opinion that seems to be apparent. If I had a hat, I think I would take it off in salute to those gentlemen who have joined in a bipartisan foreign policy effort which is so vital to the security of the United States and to the free world. I would trust that we would have more of this kind of support of our effort on the part of both sides of the aisle.

I am a strong one for dissent, and I am a firm believer in discussion. I think the discussion here today, however, has made it extremely clear—at least to me—that everyone recognizes full well the depth of the crisis. We might have doubts; we might have reservations; we might have wishes; we might have our "druthers"; but it looks like what we are going to do is to support this authorization as a matter of correct policy for the United States of America just as we supported the resolution giving the President the full authority in 1964 to use armed force in Vietnam. And we ought to support this authorization because it is the right thing to do.

I do not know what is going to happen in the other body or what kind of debate will take place in the other body from this time forward. But for me here today I am perfectly satisfied with the discussion and the debate which has transpired in behalf of the American people.

We have been holding hearings in the Foreign Affairs Committee almost daily since we reconvened this year. We have had full debate and discussion either in the full committee on the authorization or in one subcommittee or another on this entire subject of southeast Asia, including Vietnam. Everyone has had ample opportunity to get their viewpoint across, to be heard, to criticize, to delve, to contradict, to distract, or to do anything they want to do.

All members certainly have ample opportunity here on the floor, to say anything they wanted to about the policy of this country. But we are at the crux of United States-Vietnam policy today with the vote on this particular authorization. With the transpiring of the events since we last convened here in this body, we know a major change has taken place not only in Vietnam and around the world but also in the thinking of the American people. That is why this vote is important.

When we vote today we give a resounding vote of support to the President, and we are giving a resounding vote of support to the policy of this country.

I shall support this authorization and the necessary appropriation and the subsequent defense supplemental authorization and appropriation, because, as far as I am concerned, the military effort and the economic effort in Vietnam are inseparable in the policy of the United States in dealing with the problem of Vietnam, southeast Asia, the free world, and the security of the United States.

I am delighted at the courageous statement on the part of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], who says he will support, if I understood him correctly, this authorization for those very same reasons.

We all have recognized the tremendous cost of doing a job that needs to be done and that has never been done before in the history of the world, in waging the kind of fight we are fighting in Vietnam and at the same time trying to help in maintaining a government and reconstruct the country while the warfare is going on. This only points out what we should have recognized and do now recognize, that we—the United States and the free world—must have a nonmilitary answer to the subversive thrusts of communism anywhere in the world.

I disagree with those who say that we ought to always support the status quo, or that we should let people stew in their own juice, or that we should let the rest of the people of the world wallow in the depths of their own misery. This indicates to me a kind of blindspot, that we in the United States can live in someway apart from the rest of the world, and that we can bulldoze our allies into doing what we want to do when we want to do it, as if they have no sovereign rights, no right to independent thought, no right to independent action.

Certainly I get aggravated because other countries do not agree with me and my country at a time when I think they ought to. But is this not the very strength of our free and democratic system? The United States makes no claim of having a totalitarian hold on the rest of the free world. We act in concert but do so voluntarily. Is not this the kind of freedom we fight for? We are trying now to help the people of South Vietnam, who have fought for 100 years to throw off the yoke of oppression. Is this not what we are trying to do? Of course it is. We know it—the whole world knows it.

Most of the American people care, support this principle, and the price not only to assure the security of the United States, but also to assure that freedom as such—the concepts that we hold so dear and that we have fought for and that we are fighting for right now—have a chance to live. Because without that, then the money does not have any meaning.

So I want to join all of you today on the floor of this House who say: "We trust our President, our military and political leaders who support this request pending here." I believe that we have to do what is necessary, in what is a war zone, not only in the military sense but in the political sense.

Mr. Chairman, I have one concluding thought. I trust this authorization will be overwhelmingly approved. It should be.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, my participation in this debate, completely unexpected, was prompted by the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], who made a disclosure on the floor of this House which, to say the least, surprised if not amazed me, when he recited the participation of other nations to the war in Vietnam.

Now let it be known, I have supported the administration completely in its views on Vietnam because I believe if Vietnam falls, so does all of Asia fall. I also believe that our Nation should keep its word. We were a signator to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. I quote from that treaty. Article IV reads:

> Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any State or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger, etc.

This document is one of the legal and moral bases for our involvement. We are keeping our pledge. But what about the other signators to the treaty? What about the other nations in Asia who are so vitally affected?

I would like to propound three questions either to the Chairman or to any member of the Committee. In view of the reasons advanced as to why we are in Vietnam I would like to know, first, what are the Asian countries doing to protect Asia? It seems to me that if there were a flood in Pennsylvania and I were asked to come over and help the people of Pennsylvania to still the floodwaters, I would expect every Pennsylvanian to be there helping me. Our people want to know why Asia is not helping Asia.

The second question is this: What are the other signatories to this treaty doing to help implement the treaty and to carry out their word of honor that they would participate and oppose aggression?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Third, and I guess the most important question, because I think the first two questions are already answered by the disclosures of the gentleman from Iowa—the most important question is this, in my judgment, and I believe it is in the judgment of the American people: What is the administration doing to—and for want of a better word I say—to persuade the Asian countries and the signatories under this treaty to make a comparable—if not an equal at least a comparable—contribution to the one which we are making by giving each day that goes by our men in order to save southeast Asia for the Asian countries and for the world and to carry out our pledge?

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] for an answer to those questions.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that there is a considerable effort being made on the part of our allies to bring stability and peace to southeast Asia. While one of the gentlemen on the other side has derided the efforts of some of these nations, nevertheless Australia is making a substantial contribution. Australia has sustained casualties and men have been killed. South Korea is making a substantial contribution. They have 20,000 troops there and there is an additional troop contingent earmarked for Vietnam. The British, as signatories to the treaty, have 50,000 troops in Malaysia fighting the same kind of problem which we have. We have significant forces in Japan. The Philippines are our great friend and ally. They are sending troops.

I am sure history will record that Thailand is making one of the great and valiant contributions to the activities in Vietnam. New Zealand has troops there. India and Pakistan, of course, we recognize have problems of their own, but by and large there is a great contribution being made by our allies there.

I think our Secretary of State and our Vice President, on the recent trip he made, have had some encouraging reports on the contribution which is going to be made on the part of our allies. I think we should start to focus on what is being done instead of what is not being done.

Mr. CAHILL. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to finish the last minute by making this observation. I have particular reference to the signatories to the treaty. The United Kingdom, New Zealand, France, Australia, Pakistan, and, of course, what the gentleman from Iowa put into the RECORD which is represented by him at least to have come from the State Department delineating what their contributions are. My only point is this, Mr. GALLAGHER. I, of course, as I say, have supported the administration but I think there ought to be a greater effort made on the part of the administration to bring to the attention of these countries in southeast Asia the great danger which is facing them. They should be urged, if not persuaded, to make a contribution of military forces. I think the signatories to this treaty also ought to be urged to do likewise, because until they do that our people at home do not realize and do not appreciate that they are making what should be one of the real contributions to this overall effort.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, today, as we all know, some 200,000 American men are engaged in a war on the mainland of Asia, some 10,000 miles from our shores. Last night the President of the United States said he could not predict how long we would bear this burden. There is mounting evidence that the more men we involve in the jungles of Vietnam, the more men North Vietnam and the Vietcong are committing.

The escalation continues.

Mr. Chairman, it is reliably reported that the United States may have to double its manpower in Vietnam to 400,000 men, or even 600,000 men, in order to stabilize the situation and to bring under control any significant part of the territory of South Vietnam.

The callup of Reserves appears to be imminent.

Mr. Chairman, on past occasions on the floor of this House I have expressed my reservations and my misgivings about our policy in southeast Asia. I have proposed alternatives. On June 10, 1964, during debate on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964, I urged a negotiated settlement and spelled out specific proposals. I pointed out then that any solution must be accompanied by genuine economic and political reform. Now we are engaged in a land war in Asia, a war that prominent U.S. military experts have advised us against. Since May 5 of last year when I opposed the $700 million supplemental appropriation for military activities in Vietnam, a war in which we were supposedly performing an advisory capacity under the military assistance program, has been converted to an American war which we are in fact waging on a much larger scale.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it has been a fundamental error to rely, as we have, upon a military solution and to have underestimated the economic aspects, the social aspects, and the political aspects of this struggle.

We are today considering a bill which is concerned with the economic aspects, concerned with the social aspects, and concerned with the political aspects of this struggle. It provides $175 million for the commercial import assistance program, which in effect is a program to support the war-torn economy. It provides $100 million for what is called rural construction.

In the past our AID programs have not put sufficient emphasis on this rural construction effort. They have not given enough attention to the need to reach the people out in the countryside.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill. I do so even though much of the money and effort will be drained off by the growing conflict.

I hope we will be able to see some daylight in reaching into the hearts and the minds of the people in South Vietnam.

This is a struggle which, if it is going to be won, is going to have to be won politically; it is going to have to be won diplomatically, and in terms which the people themselves will be able to understand.

However, as long as the war escalates, our economic assistance program tends to become an extension of the military program since it is used to meet the effects of the war, not to develop a future peacetime economy.

U.S. military expenses in Vietnam are running at about $10 billion a year, while economic aid for Vietnam is costing about half a billion dollars a year.

In yesterday's New York Times, Seymour Topping, respected southeast Asia correspondent, writes:

> The South Vietnamese population is, according to all accounts, suffering more from military operations, terrorism, economic dislocation and corruption than at any other time during more than two decades of intermittent war.

He goes on to say that the social fabric of the country "seems to be unraveling."

We should recognize that the $275 million increase in AID funds are unlikely to bring about significant changes in the dreary and frustrating picture described by the New York Times correspondent as long as the war continues to expand.

The American people should not be misled into thinking that our AID dollars will build a Great Society in South Vietnam. The fact is that, of necessity, more, and more AID money is going into the support of the war economy and not on economic development that will have long-range benefits for the Vietnamese people.

Eighty percent of the population lives in rural villages, but AID, because of the war, can take only token steps to improve the lot of the peasants.

In appearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on January 26, Secretary of State Dean Rusk said:

> The free Vietnam we seek to preserve through military efforts and sacrifices must not be undermined by economic and social chaos and despair. The expanding scale of Communist aggression and military response have added new dimensions to the task of AID.

He added that he regarded economic assistance programs in Vietnam as of equal importance with military assistance efforts.

An increasingly larger share of AID funds will have to be directed to the task of keeping the Vietnam economy from collapsing under the inflationary pressures produced by the war. Rural construction programs in the villages and rural areas to develop school systems, water supplies, health stations, and agricultural know-how will be affected by the need to use funds to check the runaway inflation and by the realities of the military situation. Vietcong terror and destruction will prevent their implementation in 75 percent of the country.

David E. Bell, Administrator of AID, in appearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, stated that our supporting assistance obligations had reached $235 million by the end of 1965. This is almost the entire amount—$255 million—appropriated for fiscal 1966.

To cope with rampant inflation, AID has expanded the financing of commercial imports. Of the additional $275 million that is sought, a total of $175 million will be allocated to this import program. And Mr. Bell states that he expects these inflationary pressures to be far more severe in 1966.

Assuming the supplemental funds authorized by the bill before us are appropriated, it is estimated that some $370 million of the total $530 million AID funds for Vietnam for fiscal year 1966 will be used for this import program. For fiscal 1967 this figure is expected to increase to $420 million.

This program finances the import of both consumer goods and industrial materials to keep manufacturing and construction going, and to absorb the increased purchasing power. The disruption of the economy by the war necessitates this expanded assistance.

In addition to the $175 million to finance an expanded import program, a total of $100 million is asked for an expansion of counterinsurgency efforts or for "logistics, construction, welfare, and development projects." Here again, it is clear that these efforts for the most part are related to the military situation in the country and are war-support measures, involving construction projects to ease critical problems caused by damaged bridges, highways, clogged ports and warehouses. Also some $20 million is needed to operate the growing refugee program, again a war-related project.

Only about $50 million of the total $530 million available is intended for the rural pacification or rural construction programs that attempt to satisfy some of the basic needs of the 13 million Vietnamese peasants.

It has been reliably estimated that at least $390 million of the total $530 million will be spent on programs and projects that can be attributed to the deterioration of the Vietnam economy because of the war. Therefore, only some $140 million is to be used for economic development programs, either of the rural variety or of the type involving the construction of highways or the training of teachers.

While I support this supplementary authorization, we should not be deluded into believing that these funds will somehow open up a new era in the economic development of Vietnam and that this will turn the military tide.

Can war be waged and meaningful, grassroot economic development of a peasant economy be carried out concurrently? More than $2.7 billion has been poured into economic assistance programs in Vietnam in the last decade. Because it has mainly been used to support the savage war, there are precious few results to show for our munificence.

Let us not expect any dramatic results from the $275 million that we are asked to approve for Vietnam today. Let us be frank with ourselves and with our fellow Americans.

The war in Vietnam has claimed many victims, including Great Society programs at home. The long-range purpose of the AID program is one of the casualties. I fear that this will continue to be the case until there is peace in that war-torn country or at the very least until there is a cessation of hostilities.

The goals outlined by the President at the Honolulu conference are both admirable and praiseworthy. Plans were articulated for more intensive efforts to pacify the countryside by economic and political means so that a government apparatus can be set up that might be responsive to the needs of the vast majority of the population.

President Johnson has said:

> The war we are helping them fight must be won on two fronts. One is military. The other front is the struggle against social injustice; against hunger, disease, and ignorance; against political apathy and indifference.

Of course, we ought to direct our energies and efforts to the second front that the President talks about.

However, it is going to be almost impossible to succeed against political apathy and indifference while the Vietnamese peasant is trapped and buffeted by this war. One day the Vietcong attack his village and destroy his home; the next day American bombers wreak havoc in his hamlet, in quest of the Vietcong.

The limited rural pacification program that AID is undertaking may be about all that can be done in the incredibly difficult circumstances of a full-scale land war. If the Vietnamese peasant is to be persuaded, if imaginative programs concerned with the welfare of the Vietnamese people are to be set up in the provinces, then first a way to end the fighting will have to be found. Only then can meaningful economic development of the country be carried out.

If the Saigon Government hopes to be successful when free elections are finally held, it must forge firm political, economic, and social links with the people.

Mr. Chairman, the United States is now encouraging the central government to adopt a program which will build hospitals, and health stations and schools, and help with the development of the agricultural economy. This, the President talked about at Honolulu as the second front in this war. But let us face the fact that we are really not going to be able to succeed with this second front so long as it is operated concurrently with an enlarged and escalated military effort.

The second front to gain the support of the people, the war to conquer disease and hunger in South Vietnam, is hamstrung by this total involvement in military operations. As long as the South Vietnamese peasant is caught between the Vietcong on the one hand and the U.S. military forces on the other, he simply is not going to have an opportunity to develop the relationship which is needed with his own government.

So, Mr. Chairman, while it is necessary to expand and extend our economic assistance, nevertheless, we should not believe that this will open up any Great Society for the people of South Vietnam. This is doing nothing more than enabling them to keep their heads above water economically. It should be recognized and supported for what it is.

It is imperative that we spare no effort and leave no stone unturned to reach a peaceful solution of this tragic conflict.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. **MORGAN**. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. **RYAN**. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for yielding me the additional time.

In summary, I believe the objectives of this proposal, particularly of the rural construction program, are meaningful objectives, and I hope that from this point on a great deal more effort will be put into political and social programs which should, if properly carried out, reach the people. This is a struggle for the hearts and minds of men. In the long run it will be won by the power of our ideals.

Mrs. **BOLTON**. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. **FRELINGHUYSEN**. Mr. Chairman, the discussion today has indicated quite clearly why we can be confident that there will be virtual unanimity in favor of this bill. I surely hope that will be the case because in my opinion, this is a most important bill. It is important also that we move with reasonable speed.

There has been some indication during the debate today about whether or not we are wise in mounting the military effort that we have been making in Vietnam. However, there can be little debate on the advisability of the funds which are being sought in this bill. These funds are not being requested to prosecute a war, although they are, as President Johnson indicated, of equal basic importance to our military effort there. Unquestionably, the aid which will be provided in this bill will be used to help provide a strong front against aggression. As Vice President HUMPHREY said at a briefing at the White House today, we are concerned both with a war against aggression and a war on misery.

Quite briefly, these funds are to help us in the latter struggle.

I should like very briefly to report what the Secretary of State said before the Committee on Foreign Affairs when he justified the funds. I quote:

> The free Vietnam we seek to preserve through military efforts and sacrifices must not be undermined by economic and social chaos and despair. The expanding scale of Communist aggression and our military response have added new dimensions to the task of AID. Without our AID programs we could win the major military battles in Vietnam and still lose the war and the peace.
>
> For this reason I regard our economic assistance programs in Vietnam as equal in importance, although not nearly so large in scale, with our military assistance.

I should also like to give the two major reasons why the Secretary of State appealed for these funds.

He says the first reason is to meet, and I quote:

> First, to meet the rising and severe threat of inflationary pressures, additional funds are needed to finance imported goods; $175 million are now needed to finance importation for commercial sale of goods such as rice, construction materials, petroleum products, fertilizer, drugs, and many other commodities. In this way we contribute to economic and political stability, by offsetting shortages in local production and maintaining morale essential to the entire effort.
>
> Second, $100 million is needed to fund new or expanded activities to strengthen the Government of Vietnam's work in contested rural areas. These AID operations include refugee relief—

And we have heard of the many hundreds of thousands of refugees who are presently in South Vietnam—

> provision of medical teams and individual doctors and nurses; building or repairing of hospitals and veterans' rehabilitation centers; leasing of ships for coastal and ocean supply operations; expanding civil airlift capacity; building of warehouses, bridges, roads; repair of war-damaged rail and other facilities; installation of temporary and permanent electric power services; construction of workers' housing and training centers; police equipment and training—

Quite obviously, the list is long. The needs of South Vietnam are tremendous. It is quite evident that if we do authorize the money, it will be spent in that country and, of course, in the countries around Vietnam in the amounts which have been requested.

I myself believe that an argument can be made to support earmarking funds in a foreign aid bill. In this case, however, it is unrealistic for us to argue that there is any need to earmark these particular funds. It is quite obvious that the basic necessity is there. The necessity is obvious from the fact that we have already borrowed almost $64 million from other funds within the foreign aid program. From the amount being requested, that sum must be reimbursed. So the basic issue should be, not how much might be diverted to areas not of primary concern such as Vietnam, but how much more will be needed in that country.

Whether or not language is put in the bill to require earmarking, it is quite clear the administration will do as it has indicated. We have every reason to trust them.

One final point, Mr. Chairman. There has been some indication of dissatisfaction with the contributions of our allies to the effort we are making in Vietnam. Of course, our effort is tremendous. Of course, every effort should be made to have that burden shared with our friends and allies and others who have an interest in southeast Asia. Yet we do ourselves no good and we surely are not recognizing the contributions that our allies have made, or that they might make, by in effect belittling and sneering at what they have done.

In many cases these countries are poor and primarily concerned with their own problems. In many cases there has been a substantial contribution already made, and more are evidently in the works. Without any question the neighbors of Vietnam realize the importance of what is going on there. There is an increasing awareness of the practical problem that we have faced up to so deliberately.

Quite practically, one of the reasons why some of our small allies or our less wealthy allies have not done more may be because they are somewhat intimidated by the nature and the size of the effort of the United States. When we can afford to pour the billions of dollars that we do into this effort of ours—and it is primarily our effort—it does make any minor contribution from a small country seem like very little. Yet the sacrifices involved in order to make those small contributions should, I believe, not only be recognized but should be received with thankfulness.

In conclusion I should simply like to reiterate that the funds we are requesting here today are a relatively small part of the fight and the effort which we are making in southeast Asia. But these funds are of equal importance and significance to our military efforts in the success of our efforts. I hope we are virtually unanimous in supporting the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. **MORGAN**. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. **MATSUNAGA**. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, but I had the good fortune of going on a study mission to the Orient during the last congressional recess.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12169. I do so because I have seen what our dedicated AID people have done and are continuing to do in our friendly Asian countries. They have performed and are continuing to perform near miracles in helping our Asian friends to help themselves.

In Taiwan, for example, our AID people have helped to create such a viable agricultural economy that the farmer and the farmworker enjoy a higher income than the factory worker.

In Korea, our AID program under Public Law 480 has been so successful that we have virtually wiped out hunger and so-called spring scarcity in Suwon Valley and other once poverty stricken areas. I was never so proud of being an American as I was last November, as I stood atop a knoll overlooking the rice fields of Suwon Valley, and the Governor of Kyonggi Province pinned a medal on my chest as he conferred an honorary citizenship on me. I knew then that I was being so honored, not because I looked like one of them, or because I spoke their language, but because I was an American and represented that country which had helped them to live the better life that they are now enjoying.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Korea are truly grateful for what we have done to help them through our AID programs.

And so are the people of Japan, Okinawa, the Philippines, Taiwan, Thailand, and South Vietnam. But there is much more that needs to be done and must be done, if we are to win the peace, especially in South Vietnam.

In South Vietnam the farmer cultivates a land capable of great productivity. Despite a primitive system of agriculture, inadequate tools, and lack of technical knowledge, South Vietnam used to be the rice bowl of southeast Asia. The Vietcong with their acts of terrorism have changed it from a land of abundance to a land of hunger.

Plagued by mass murders, fire, and destruction, South Vietnam has become an importer instead of an exporter of rice.

With the assistance of American AID programs the people of South Vietnam are striving to make the land productive once more in the midst of war. AID seeks to give the Vietnamese farmer a stake in his country and a chance to live in peace and security. More than 1,000 agricultural extension agents have been trained with U.S. help since 1955. More than 800 of these are working in the rural areas of the country. Three new vocational agriculture schools have more than 1,500 students enrolled. And an increasing number of skilled specialists have been graduated from agricultural colleges since 1962. Experimental stations in agriculture have been established with U.S. help in a nationwide network.

A national seed board has been organized to plan and expedite the multiplication of superior seed varieties, tested and produced by the experimental stations. Improved rice seed has been distributed to more than 50,000 families. Where fertilizer has been distributed, crop yields have increased by as much as 40 percent; and these programs are continuing. Pesticides, too, are helping the farmer increase his yields—he can take advantage of these benefits through liberal credit programs—and he does.

He has been able to get breeder pigs, corn to fatten them, and concrete to build sties. An AID-sponsored veterinary program has eliminated hog cholera—a serious killer disease, and the farmer now has new income from the sale of his pigs, and he can continue moving toward a better life.

Until peace comes to the land, however, its fullest productivity cannot be realized. And so, we give to our allies in South Vietnam the benefits of crops grown in our own land. Through the food-for-peace program, in what must be the most graphic illustration of what the program can mean, we are making a number of our products—such as sweetened condensed milk, wheat flour, rice, and vegetable oil—available to supplement the produce of South Vietnam.

Progress has been made in the fishing industry, too. At least 14 major fish markets and wharves have been built and put into operation. More than 10,000 boats have been equipped with motors, and all time highs are being reached in the catches. Thus fishing is becoming a major source of income and the increase means that food is available at lower cost to the Vietnamese consumer.

Mr. Chairman, through AID programs we have been able to show the South Vietnamese that he now has a stake in the outcome of the war. By helping himself and learning new and better methods, the Vietnamese farmer realizes now that he is building for a better future for himself and his loved ones.

If we are to win the war in Vietnam we must continue to expand our efforts to improve Vietnamese agriculture and provide a solid basis of security for the Vietnamese people. If we are to win the peace we must increase our efforts to export our know-how and show-how to those in need. This our dedicated AID people have done most commendably, and through the support of Congress must continue to do.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I wish to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] for his excellent statement. It is a pleasure to report to the House on the great service that he rendered our country on his tour of the Far East during the congressional recess. He was certainly a one-man ambassador of good will for the United States and the American people in all the friendly Asian countries we on the committee visited.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I have been deeply interested through all of this debate, interested particularly in the unanimity that seems to pervade this Chamber. We do not agree on all of this bill, and a good many of us would like to see the contingency fund changed. We will see what happens when the amendments are suggested.

The war there is something that we are quite unable to understand unless we have been fortunate enough to have gone over there, as I was fortunate enough to go to Europe during the war, and to have seen the way things really happen.

You have seen what it does to our men. I hope you saw what I have had told to me so many times—the tremendous courage of our soldiers and their certainty that they are fighting the fight for right, for freedom, for everything that matters in living, and that they propose to win.

I hope this bill will make possible in our explanation of it to our people at home, and of the use that is made of the money—that we will be able to demonstrate more and more each day that we are there because we were invited; that we are still there because we cannot betray those people over there and leave them to the Communists.

It is my earnest hope, Mr. Chairman, that this bill may be passed practically, if not entirely, unanimously.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to share in this rising tide of unanimity and to announce my support of this legislation that we are considering here today.

I, too, want to compliment those Members on the other side of the aisle who have recognized that support of our country and support of the President in these difficult days does require that we join together at times like this with the objective of backing up our men in uniform and our civilian administrators who are in the field in southeast Asia and at the same time helping to strengthen the social fabric of our friends in South Vietnam.

It is particularly important in considering this legislation to see just what it does in its significant sections.

Mention has already been made of the $175 million that would go for the financing of additional imports, but it is in the $100 million section, I think, that most of the impact resides. This section affects people. It involves refugee relief. It involves activities to improve conditions in rural areas. It involves the provision of doctors and nurses and medical teams. It involves the construction or the repair of bridges, roads, and rail facilities. It involves the construction of hospitals and workers' housing. Finally, it involves training of police and security forces who will help to bring to the countryside and to the people protection from the depredations of the Vietcong which have terrorized them for so long.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] said that we are not going to build a great society with this program. That is true, but I am sure that no one connected with this bill at any stage had any idea that we would do such a thing. First of all this is an emergency program and is limited in scope. Second, the element that has been preventing us from moving into the field of assistance where we could consider cooperation on a peacetime program has not been any activity of ours but the aggression of North Vietnam and the terroristic activities of the Vietcong. Certainly we could cooperate in a peacetime constructive program if these destructive activities were curtailed or eliminated.

This then is foreign aid, but it is foreign aid that is specialized and limited. I certainly have no doubt, even though doubt has been expressed here today by some people, as to what will be the destination of the funds that are authorized in this legislation. There is no question in my mind that not only these funds but several times the amount of the funds provided in this authorization could be and will be probably used in a relatively brief time in South Vietnam.

Of course, we are dealing through this bill and through the defense appropriation bill which will come to us very shortly with the aggressive Communist imperialism. Certainly we want to do everything we can to repel this imperialism.

Incidentally, in considering the activities and contributions of some of our allies and associates I should like to add to what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], said about some of them; namely that there are two other countries who have very substantial problems of their own and are still dealing with them. One of these is Malaysia where the British have contributed 50,000 troops, and the other is Indonesia which is going through revolutionary throes now because of the Communist aggression in that country.

So I think this legislation does say that this program is important. It does say that it is needed now. It does say that it is so important that it cannot wait for regular legislation to be taken up in the normal process of things. It is serving a vital program of our Nation. It is backing up the 500,000 men of the Republic of South Vietnam who are in the field and are saying by their presence there that they are worthy of our support. I am sure that the House will do no less than give its overwhelming and I hope unanimous backing to this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman I, too, want to say that I am pleased at the unanimity that is shown here this afternoon on this particular piece of legislation. There may be disagreements on some elements of it. I think the House is aware of the fact that I have been as much of a critic and watchdog of the AID administration as most anybody in the House. I asked the Secretary of State when he was testifying before our committee on this bill about the black marketing in Saigon. I pointed out that when the staff director of our committee and I were there we had been apprised of one person who sent a substantial sum of money back to the United States. The Secretary assured us that day he would have the matter looked into very closely. I have learned only today that one civilian employee of a contractor out there has been ordered out of the country and has had his passport invalidated because he sent back $30,000 to the United States and could not explain how he got it.

This sort of thing is, unfortunately, almost inevitable in a situation like this, but I am delighted to be able to say that the people responsible for the AID program and for our conduct out there are alert and that when these matters are brought to their attention they do something about them. I believe that is a helpful thing, as far as I am personally concerned, and should be as far as the House of Representatives is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter that I would like to mention. I would like to sort of apologize to the House of Representatives. There have been a lot of remarks made on the other side of this building which I believe have aided our enemies out there, because I believe they are hoping for us to get tired of this war and quit. I further believe that is the reason they think they are winning.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday the junior Senator from my State made a personal attack upon the Secretary of State and said that he ought to resign. On behalf of the people of my district I want to apologize, because I supported the junior Senator a year ago last fall. He ran 1,025,000 votes behind the President in Ohio, the junior Senator's majority in the entire State of Ohio was 16,000 votes. He received a larger majority than that in my district.

So, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my constituents I want to apologize for his intemperate attack upon the Secretary of State, whom I think is doing a great job under very difficult circumstances.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I am delighted to yield to my fine colleague from Ohio, the Congressman at Large, and who represents all of the State of Ohio.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] for the courageous position he has taken here today in offering an apology to the House of Representatives and to the Nation for the quite intemperate remarks of the junior Senator from the State of Ohio made in the other body here yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the people of the State of Ohio, I would like to join with the gentleman from Ohio. I feel we can be doves and hawks and of various opinions without resorting to such disagreeable tones.

Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished gentleman from the State of Florida [Mr. FASCELL] said earlier this afternoon, these are times when great unanimity must be displayed by those of us on the side of freedom.

I feel that the intemperate personal attack upon the most distinguished foreign minister this Republic has had in many years is certainly out of order, and I certainly offer an extreme apology on the part of the people of the Buckeye State.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the distinguished and hard-working gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I support this legislation, and I support the President's position. As I told a member of the administration today, the gentlemen on the other side of the Capitol who are attacking us, who are attacking our being in South Vietnam, have nothing to lose politically, because if we win this thing they have 4 or 5 years to go before they are up for election, and everyone will forget their position.

Mr. Chairman, if, God forbid, we should lose it, they can say "I told you so."

So, Mr. Chairman, they have nothing to lose politically; they cannot lose.

In conclusion, I would like to allude to one remark that our junior Senator made. He said he would sleep better at night if somebody else were Secretary of State. Well, if he sleeps at the switch much more than he does now, he will be asleep 24 hours a day.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a statement on H.R. 12169, a bill to authorize the appropriation of supplemental funds for fiscal year 1966 AID economic assistance programs totaling $415 million.

A significant portion of this supplemental request, $275 million, is designed for use in South Vietnam. I traveled to Vietnam after the 1st session of the 89th Congress adjourned last year because I wanted to see for myself the existing conditions in this distant land where our servicemen are fighting to preserve and protect the freedom of the people of South Vietnam.

It is apparent that the mood of good will which prevailed when American troops first landed is showing definite signs of deterioration. There is a possibility that our relationship with the South Vietnamese people could further deteriorate as the full impact of American spending hits the economy and more of the technically skilled South Vietnamese move to cities adjacent to U.S. military installations where huge construction projects are being pushed to provide logistical support for our combat troops. One Cabinet Minister in the South Vietnam Government told me with a trace of irony in his voice, "An American staff sergeant earns more per month than I do."

In my opinion, the only way the war in South Vietnam can be won is to win the battle for the hearts and the minds of the people.

The past year has demonstrated that a clear and unequivocal military policy by the United States could produce a rapport with the South Vietnamese Government for the benefit of the country. If our policy is just as clear with respect to the South Vietnamese Government instituting social, political, and economic reforms, can we not expect a greater response in this direction than ever has occurred in the past? I think that the United States must not only implore, but demand, that the Ky government overhaul its policies and the apparatus of its administration to guarantee a maximum of public acceptance and identification with the national government in Saigon. We must insist on general elections at the earliest possible time. We should not be satisfied with lip service being given to reform. We should insist that positive steps be taken.

It is not an easy task to remake a poor nation into a developed nation. Nor is it easy for the government of a poor nation to gain the confidence of its people. I was told by U.S. officials in Vietnam that 70 percent of the people are illiterate. A majority of South Vietnam's 15½ million population is tied to the land in little better than subsistence agriculture. Only 18 percent of the children who complete primary school go on to secondary school and a significant proportion of the children never go to school at all. There are over 1 million refugees from the combat zones banded together in numerous camps awaiting relocation of the cessation of hostilities to return to their own farms and villages. There are few schools available for children of refugees and sanitation conditions in the camps are primitive at best. Disease is widespread throughout the country. One Navy corpsman told me that if there were enough soap available for the people in the villages and if they would use it, disease could be cut down 50 percent.

The people do not have a sense of national identity the way Americans do. The nation-state is for us the focal point of political loyalty, economic strength, social order, and defense against foreign enemies. The Vietnamese have social and cultural homogeneity; but never having known true statehood, and after being a colony of France from 1885 to 1954, they have but limited loyalty to the National Government. An overwhelming majority of village dwellers in the countryside have never seen a high National Government official, let alone never having voted for one. Too often the only contact the people have with the Federal Government is the payment of taxes, with no services or security being provided in return. Living as many of them do in wretched physical circumstances, they are relatively easy targets for Communist propaganda and promises. There is no way of avoiding the fact that 22 percent of the population and over 50 percent of the land in South Vietnam would not be under the control of the Vietcong if the people themselves were not actively or tacitly accepting the Communist presence. The problem is intensified because of poor communications between villages. Roads are few in number and travel is made hazardous as a result of repeated Vietcong ambushes along the highways. Telephones and telegraph are nonexistent in many parts of the countryside. The fact that the people have no national identity does not mean this must always be so.

The United States has entered into a substantial economic aid program for Vietnam. In fiscal year 1965, we contributed $283.2 million. We have already obligated all of the $255.5 million appropriated for fiscal year 1966 and we are asking for supplemental funds in the amount of $275 million. The object of our program is to develop the resources of the country and to give the rural and urban population a feeling that there is a better life obtainable in the future and that their own government is better able to provide it than the Communists. Among other things, the United States is supplying agriculture extension services, fertilizers, pesticides, and medical care; building roads, schools, and hospitals, and helping develop local government administration in rural areas.

In my opinion, we are not doing enough for the approximately 800,000 refugees that are currently in the South Vietnam Government controlled areas. I visited a number of camps where the conditions were very poor. Sanitation facilities are often nonexistent and educational opportunities for the children are totally unsatisfactory. A small vocational training course has been initiated to provide technical training for less than 1,500 persons. This is insufficient to have any real impact upon the refugee population. There is no question that South Vietnam is going to need an increasingly large number of trained technicians to support industrial growth. An effort should be made to train these refugees who sit in their camps all day without work. By doing so, many of these homeless people could be kept temporarily occupied and made productive members of the society, rather than charity cases draining off an inordinant amount of the nation's limited capital resources to keep them alive. It is commonly pointed out by AID officials that most of the refugees are women and children who are waiting to return to their villages and to their agricultural way of life. This does not mean, however, that many of these refugees would not prefer an education and vocational training so that they could take up a new life in the urban areas.

It has also been suggested by AID officials that if life is made too pleasant in the refugee camps that the refugees will not want to go back to their farms and work for a living. No one is suggesting that the refugees be made permanent welfare cases. What I am saying is that the refugee children should be able to receive as good an education as other children in the country. To date the children of the refugees are offered a substantially inferior education, with many refugee camps not providing any schools at all. Only an infinitesimal percentage go to secondary school upon the completion of primary school. This situation must be corrected.

I am disappointed that of the $275 million requested for supplemental economic assistance to South Vietnam in a current fiscal year, only $11.6 million is allocated to refugee programs. What is more, $10 million of the $11.6 million is already obligated to pay past debts. This leaves only $1½ million in fiscal year 1966 to finance programs designed to aid approximately 800,000 refugees. This is dangerously insufficient to ease their condition and to promote their allegiance to the Government of South Vietnam.

It is significant that the refugees are made homeless by terrorist activities of the Vietcong, American, and South Vietnamese bombardment and combat in and around their villages. The refugees have made a positive commitment to come over to the side of the South Vietnamese Government. They did not go to the Vietcong secured areas. We must not allow this large population of tired, frightened, and homeless people to become so frustrated in their refugee camps by lack of concern for their well-being and inability to carry on productive lives that they become a force for sedition rather than a force in support of the South Vietnamese Government. There can be no excuse for failure to take positive action regarding the present condition and future destiny of the 800,000 refugees in South Vietnam today.

I am voting in favor of this supplemental appropriation bill because I feel that it is needed. It is essential that an economic and social revolution accompany our military efforts in Vietnam. Our economic assistance is the critical prerequisite to such a revolution taking place. Although we know there is a corruption in South Vietnam and although we know that much of our AID funds are siphoned off to the personal advantage of numerous corrupt officials, still the program is necessary. We must work to tighten up the administration of the program, but we must not sacrifice the program itself because of certain failures in that administration. I would like to say in conclusion that I think that David Bell, the Director of AID, has done a magnificent job in bringing new imagination, talent, and leadership to our economic assistance program. I am confident that he has the ability, if any man has it, to insure the success of the AID program in South Vietnam.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to join with my colleague in urging favorable consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill before us. I should like to speak particularly on behalf of the $25 million amount contained in that bill for assistance to the Dominican Republic.

It is worth noting, that the provisional government of Hector Godoy operates under the most severe handicaps. Thirty years of dictatorship followed by political instability and the destruction and hatred of civil war have left the Dominican Republic ill prepared to create a democratic society.

Yet, that is what the Organization of American States, the United States and Dominicans of good faith are committed to today. Elements of both left and right would exploit the heritage of tyranny and the present unrest to gain control for themselves, but the provisional government is determined to steer a course toward democracy, and it is in this, that additional assistance is needed from the United States.

Support of the provisional government and of the Organization of American States by the United States has helped to prevent anarchy in the country. Gradually, that assistance is being shifted from emergency stopgap aid to development assistance that will build a foundation upon which the people of the Dominican Republic can create a democratic society.

The provisional government has had the support of OAS troops from the United States and Latin American countries. Technical and economic assistance has been given to prevent economic deterioration and to give the Dominicans themselves time to raise from the ashes a new society.

The cost has been great. Yet, if dollars, and technical assistance, and an understanding heart can be substituted for bloodshed and destruction, we must be prepared to pay the price. A hemisphere at peace, where men may lead good lives and may know social justice is our goal. It was the goal of the nations that met at Punta del Este in 1961. It is the goal of the Alliance for Progress. It must remain our goal until every vestige of hopelessness and violence born of desperation is banished from our hemisphere.

We are asked now to do that which is deemed necessary to give the Dominicans time to conduct an orderly election in June and to install a democratic government. For now, I am convinced that the immediate task of supporting the provisional government warrants our making available the supplementary amount requested by the President

I urge my colleagues to approve the supplemental appropriation that is before us.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I support the administration's request for a $25 million supplemental appropriation for the Dominican Republic.

The Dominican economy has been beset with a number of enormous problems in recent years. Following the fall of Trujillo, the Dominican people demanded a better way of life and something more than a subsistence wage. High wage levels, however, created increased demands for imports, the meeting of which created balance-of-payments difficulties. Spending for consumption of imported goods left little for capital investments, public or private.

In 1964, this situation was further complicated by a spectacular drop in sugar prices, in which the economic health of the country rests.

The civil war has severely dislocated economic activity in the country. Total production of goods and services has declined and unemployment has increased. Commercial activity in Santo Domingo still suffers from the turmoil of last April. Strikes and other disturbances continue to plague the country.

The U.S. objective in assisting the Dominican Republic is twofold. On the one hand we are providing aid to relieve immediate suffering, to build stable conditions conducive to the holding of free elections, and get a society moving again. One example is assistance to repair of irrigation ditches which both liberates a material resource and provides the opportunity to put human resources to work again. To this effort other nations of the hemisphere have contributed medical personnel and emergency food supplies.

At the same time, we are looking beyond immediate measures in an effort to help the Dominicans start the task of building for the long-term growth of their country. The United States is providing technical cooperation to advise the Dominican Government in long-range problems of administrative, fiscal, and monetary reform. We are assisting the stimulation and expansion of food crops and the diversification of agriculture. We are helping community development projects including rural access roads, reforestration, and community centers, in all of which the great part of the job is borne by the local populace. Teacher training and vocational education are also being assisted in other efforts to reach the people directly.

While today, the most immediate need is for short-term assistance, assistance which has to date directly affected more than 200,000 people, this effort is a step only in a long-term drive to help a nation help itself. I urge support of this appropriation as a measure vital not in putting out a fire but as a link in a program to build an environment in which fires will become less likely.

The threat of Communist subversion is still very real in the Dominican Republic. Cuba stands in the Caribbean as a constant reminder of Communist ability to seize power by force and fraud.

Economic stability in the Dominican Republic and throughout Latin America is the best possible insurance against communism and that is the purpose of this appropriation.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, for the past several years I have voted against foreign aid legislation. My reason has had a single purpose; namely, to register a protest against a program which in sum has been too often poorly conceived and poorly administered. By this I do not mean to say that there has been no good in our foreign aid programs. But I determined some time ago that the only way to encourage the necessary reforms was to put the executive branch on notice that there were those in Congress who are dissatisfied enough with its overall operation to give it a vote of no confidence.

The bill before the House today is a supplemental request to the bill which I voted against last session. Its basic purpose is to support our efforts in southeast Asia and especially in South Vietnam. While I am certain there are many aspects of this program that could and should be improved, I do not believe that this crucial hour with so many boys in daily combat is the time to register a protest which might in any way be construed to indicate a lack of support on my part for our overall effort in South Vietnam.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, because the attention of the American people is generally focused on reports from the war front in Vietnam, little is known of our fight to provide a permanent line of defense in the struggle for men's minds in Vietnam.

With cement, roofing materials, and technical assistance supplied by AID, the people of Vietnam are building thousands of classrooms throughout the countryside. Of 9,000 classrooms constructed in the last 5 years, 1,600 were put together by the villagers themselves—a fact which has not been lost on the Vietcong. Knowing the value that the Vietnamese people place on the education of their children, the Communist guerrillas hesitate to destroy these new schools.

The steady accumulation of teaching facilities—made possible by the assistance of U.S. aid—now embraces half of all the primary school age children of the country. And AID is introducing practical subjects into the public school system to help the people solve their immediate problems; to grow better crops, improve their health, and raise standards of nutrition.

More than 14 million textbooks have been distributed by AID, and in the nation's four normal schools and 21 industrial schools, AID is helping to train teachers in new techniques of practical instruction. The normal schools are now graduating more than 2,000 teachers a year.

In addition to equipping and improving these permanent training institutions, AID is helping to set up rural training programs to meet the demand for teachers in the villages. Local citizens are being prepared to take over classrooms after 3 months of intensive instruction. In one region of the country, the emergency sessions have provided nearly 600 new teachers. By way of incentive, the Vietnamese Government has increased the monthly rate of pay from $6 to $14—well above the average per capita income of the people as a whole.

A U.S.-financed television network is being set up to extend public education to every hamlet in the country. "Airborne classrooms" will be broadcasting courses to television receivers in community centers around the country. This new TV circuit represents an important advance in the war on ignorance as well as a way of answering the Communist propaganda being circulated by the Vietcong.

These are additional reasons why we must support H.R. 12169—to win the peace in southeast Asia.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, the request for supplemental AID appropriations which we are considering today will make possible the expansion of certain AID programs, particularly in the field of agriculture.

As a result of the President's Honolulu meeting with Premier Ky and the Vice President's tour through southeast Asia, the United States is planning to step up its programs of assistance to the rural areas of Vietnam.

In addition to the food-for-freedom program, AID is already conducting numerous other programs to help raise the level of living of rural people in Vietnam. These existing programs will form the basis of the expanded programs.

In Vietnam today, AID is conducting programs in four agricultural subject-matter areas as follows: First, agricultural service and extension; second, crops and livestock production; third, credit and cooperatives; and fourth, agricultural resources development.

Some accomplishments to date are:

First. Extension training: The 1,004 Vietnamese agricultural extension agents have received valuable training from AID specialists through a systematic in-service training program. After having their own skills upgraded, these Vietnamese extension workers have assisted 1 million farmers in increasing their agricultural production and in raising their level of living.

Second. Assistance to youth: During 1965, the number of 4-T club members reached 46,454 in 1,200 clubs. These are the equivalent of 4-H Clubs in this country.

Third. Agricultural research: Since 1962, agricultural research stations released more than 20 high-yielding varieties of field crops and vegetables.

Fourth. Participant training: Between 1951 and 1965, 611 Vietnamese received special agricultural training in the United States or in a third country under the AID participant training program.

Fifth. Information program: In 1965, AID assisted the GVN in producing over 3 million leaflets and booklets and over 230,000 posters and wall newspapers. Also, AID helped to produce 45 radio tapes, 514 radio broadcasts, and 22,000 technical magazines for use by professional agricultural workers.

Sixth. Sewing machines: In 1965, our AID mission distributed 1,000 sewing machines to needy rural families and leaders.

Seventh. Fisheries: In the fisheries program, AID assisted in establishing 79 fishing cooperatives with 17,000 members. Also, fish production has increased from 52,000 tons in 1955, valued at VN$3.3 billion, to 368,000 tons in 1965, valued at VN$15 billion. Approximately 10,500 powered junks are now in operation, an increase of 6,900 since 1962, and 50,000 sets of improved fishing gear have been distributed. There are now 15 fish-landing facilities to assist marine fishermen.

Eighth. Livestock: Swine production increased from 1,694,000 head in 1955 to 3,600,000 in 1964. The chicken population increased from 16,655,000 in 1960 to 22,401,000 in 1964. About 33,000 improved chickens and 315,000 hatching eggs were distributed or sold at nominal prices from January 1964 to May 1965. There are 27 commercial farms with an average flock of 5,000 birds each.

Ninth. Fertilizer: Approximately 276,000 metric tons of fertilizer were imported in fiscal year 1965 as compared to 42,877 metric tons in 1955. This fertilizer was used by 700,000 farmers on about 2 million acres and provided approximately VN$1.5 million additional farm income.

Tenth. Plant protection: For the purpose of increasing agricultural production, assistance was given in setting up a plant protection service, training the local staff, and providing necessary equipment. Through this system, crop losses from insects, diseases, and rats were reduced by 50 percent between 1961 and 1965. About 360,000 farmers participated in antirat campaigns in 1964 using 39,000 tons of rat poison. They killed an estimated 38 million rats, saving about 95,000 tons of food. In 1964, about 600 tons of insecticides were used by 500,000 rice farmers and 2,000 vegetable farmers. The program saved about 150,000 tons of rice.

Eleventh. Irrigation and water resources: Since 1954, improved practices in irrigation canals, flood protection, and salt water control have been applied to 610,000 acres. In 1965, approximately 24 miles of new irrigation canals were completed and 5 miles rehabilitated; 42 dams were built or restored which benefited 27,740 acres of land.

These accomplishments under existing AID agricultural programs should be a source of pride and satisfaction to all of us. Our affirmative vote on this request for supplemental appropriations will make possible the expansion of these vital programs and bring new hope and progress to the rural people of Vietnam.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the measure before the House of Representatives, H.R. 12169 to authorize appropriations of supplemental funds of $415 million for fiscal year 1966 for economic assistance programs.

The funds previously appropriated to AID for this fiscal year have not met the needs in a few of the important danger areas of the world, particularly Vietnam, for which the bill now under consideration provides $275 million in supporting assistance funds.

We know that the problem in South Vietnam is the determined effort of North Vietnam to impose its will by force. We know that Hanoi has sent arms, and tens of thousands of armed and trained men—including units of the North Vietnamese Regular Army—into South Vietnam. This is why U.S. forces are in that country. We will continue to repel this aggression while we persist in our efforts toward a peaceful solution. These efforts to date have been numerous, and in the past months have been carried into every major capital of the world. They have brought no encouraging response from Hanoi. Even while we halted our bombing of North Vietnam, the military operations of the north continued.

The expansion of Communist aggression has called for the increased military response of the United States and, thus, added to the task of AID. Our economic assistance programs in South Vietnam are as important as our military assistance. We must, together with other free nations of the world, reinforce economic and social progress in that country, so that a social revolution—as well as peace and freedom—can be obtained in southeast Asia.

I have said that the funds appropriated by Congress have not met the needs of AID; in fact, tney do not cover even one-half of the currently estimated requirements for fiscal year 1966. Two principal elements are involved in the request for supplemental funds: First, to meet the rising threat of inflation, $175 million is needed to finance the importation of food, drugs, and other commodities; and second, $100 million is required for new or enlarged Government activities in rural areas.

I also support the request for the following additional funds included in H.R. 12169: First, $7.5 million each in supporting assistance for Thailand and Laos, to assist them in developing and maintaining economic and political stability, and to withstand increasing Communist pressures; second, $25 million for the Dominican Republic, where last April's revolution resulted in economic and political instability, and where we—with the Organization of American States—are determined to help the provisional government reach a stable environment prior to the coming elections; and third, $100 million to replenish the now-exhausted AID contingency fund.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure in its entirety.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, the Republic of Vietnam is presently engaged in a courageous struggle for survival against the threat of Communist subversion. Despite the long and difficult war, the Vietnamese are determined to create a new nation, and the institutions essential to sustain that nation, during the years ahead. Whether you talk to a farmer working in the ricefields or to a high Government official, you will quickly learn that the people of Vietnam place a high value upon educational opportunity. Consequently, the war against the Vietcong has not obliterated this goal or weakened the resolve of the people to improve educational opportunity. Instead, it has created a strong sense of urgency which is shared by both the Vietnamese Ministry of Education and the AID mission.

The program of educational assistance, which was conceived jointly by the representatives of Vietnam and the United States, has been characterized by two approaches. First, a long-range program was organized to develop a system of education which will produce the trained manpower required for social and economic progress. This system is planned not only to facilitate the transfer of knowledge and the training of skills, but also to assist in creating a society which will initiate and successfully absorb social and economic change.

A second major thrust has been the development of a special-impact program which offers the benefits of education to rural people. This program has limited, immediately attainable goals and will offer tangible evidence to the Vietnamese villagers that their government is interested in their welfare and is utilizing its resources and personnel to meet their needs.

With these two approaches in mind, AID's educational assistance to the Republic of Vietnam has been largely concentrated in four principal projects: First, hamlet schools; second, instructional materials; third, vocational education; and fourth, teacher training.

The hamlet school program was initiated in 1963 to expand elementary educational opportunities as rapidly as possible. This grassroots project has resulted in 3,203 classrooms in addition to 1,600 self-help classrooms that were constructed by the villagers themselves. More than 5,000 teachers have been trained through special 90-day courses. Programs for 1966, 1967, and 1968 call for annual goals of 2,500 classrooms and 4,000 teachers. At the ratio of 60 children per classroom—the typical class size in Vietnam—this program has provided schooling for 320,000 Vietnamese boys and girls. In the future, thanks to the AID program, many thousands more will have their first opportunity to attend school.

In a typical Vietnamese classroom, the children do not have books. To correct this situation, an instructional materials project was organized to provide textbooks and other educational aids such as maps and charts. Committees composed of Vietnamese teachers, artists, and editors, with an American adviser, have produced manuscripts at a phenomenal rate in fields such as arithmetic, health, history, and geography. These books were printed in Manila, Hong Kong, and Saigon. The Republic of China has printed

500,000. Australia will print and deliver 1,200,000 this spring. All together, more than 7 million books have been printed and shipped to Vietnam. In 1966, an additional 5 million will be printed and delivered. For an average of 22 cents per copy, more than 1,600,000 Vietnamese children will carry these books into hamlets and homes throughout the 43 provinces of Vietnam, offering visible proof to their inhabitants that the Government of Vietnam and the people of the United States share a deep concern for their future.

Within the framework of vocational education, the Republic of Vietnam has been assisted in four major divisions of training. In the trade-technical program, AID has constructed, equipped, and developed four polytechnic schools which will each accommodate 800 students. These schools offer courses in fields such as forging and welding, machine shop, auto mechanics, electricity, woodworking, drafting, and diesel mechanics. More than 3,000 students are enrolled in these schools.

At the Phu Tho Polytechnic School in Saigon, 4-year and 2-year college-level teacher training courses have been established, under the competent advisory assistance of the Southern Illinois University contract team, which will make Vietnam largely self-sufficient in the training of vocational teachers and eliminate the need for an extensive program of study in the United States.

More than 6,635 Vietnamese students are enrolled in all types of secondary level trade and technical schools. With continued support of the existing programs, and the development of short-term trade training programs, over 10,000 students will be provided with an opportunity to acquire useful skills.

In the field of agriculture, 3 secondary schools—with an enrollment of 1,300 students—have been established with AID assistance. In Saigon, a college of agriculture, with an enrollment of 320 students, offers a 4-year curriculum which includes courses in the general fields of animal husbandry, horticulture, agronomy and agricultural engineering. These schools will be expanded and improved in future years.

Presently under construction are 20 2-year rural trade schools which will offer courses to elementary school graduates as well as short-term courses for adults and out-of-school youths in carpentry, metalworking, bricklaying, masonry, engine mechanics, and handicrafts. The basic purpose of these schools will be to meet local community needs rather than to follow a stereotyped national curriculum. Provision is made, however, for students to follow an educational program leading to secondary and higher education.

The Ban Me Thuot technical school, which is part of this program, offers a 4-year trade training program to elementary school graduates from the mountain Provinces of Kontum, Pleiku, Phu Bon, and Darlac. These courses are patterned to meet the unique needs of the Montagnards. Seventeen schools are now under construction with one, the Long Xuyen rural trade school, completed and in operation. Each school will have an enrollment capacity of 300 to 400 students.

At present, there is only one engineer training institution in Vietnam, located at the National Technical Center at Phu Tho, Saigon. A 4-year curriculum is offered in electrical, civil, and mechanical engineering as well as a 3-year technician training program in these same areas. A 4-year marine navigation course is also offered. A new 3-year technician training course in chemical technology was opened in fiscal year 1964. Currently, there are 792 students enrolled in the entire college. A survey of engineering has been completed, and a program to improve the quality and quantity of the courses is now being considered.

Vietnam has received substantial assistance from AID in the field of teacher training. Four normal schools, which are capable of enrolling 2,100 prospective elementary teachers, have been built and equipped. A laboratory elementary school enrolling 450 children and an inservice center designed to upgrade teachers and administrators have also been completed. The teacher training program has been improved and expanded from a 1- to a 2-year program.

In the area of secondary education, improvements include the construction of new colleges of education, for training teachers, and attached model demonstration high schools at the Universities of Hue and Saigon. Now in full operation, these facilities will graduate over 500 new teachers annually. They will also provide comprehensive secondary school opportunities for more than 1,800 high school students in an environment featuring better methods of teaching, new approaches to curriculum, and innovations in administrative practices. Currently, 190 teaching candidates are enrolled in a special 1-year training program at the University of Saigon in an effort to expand educational opportunities in the first year of the secondary school program.

Despite the ravages of war, considerable progress has been made through the AID program in expanding and improving the educational opportunities of Vietnamese youth. It is obvious that additional efforts will be required if we are to fulfill the task of providing the human foundations to support the survival and growth of the courageous Vietnamese nation. I believe every American will welcome the opportunity to share in this task.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the supplemental economic aid appropriation for Vietnam. In our efforts to combat the so-called "wars of national liberation," those thinly disguised but effective tools of the international Communist conspiracy to take over developing countries, we have come to realize that economic and social measures are equally, if not more important than military measures. This means that a very heavy responsibility devolves upon the civilian programs of counterinsurgency. The Agency for International Development has the largest share of this civilian responsibility. It deals with the very roots of insurgency in working to alleviate the grievances of the people on which the Communists capitalize in seeking and gaining support of the population in these "wars of national liberation."

In preventing, as well as in stopping, these Communist-operated political wars, the efforts of the AID are indispensable. In Vietnam, the AID has a specially designed and unique program for reinforcing our political and military efforts. Not only does it alleviate the suffering of hundreds of thousands of refugees, but it has programs for assisting the Government to be more responsive to the needs of its people and thereby demonstrate that our way of life in the free world offers a better alternative than communism.

Such things as self-help projects and medical care in the rural areas, in the districts and in the provinces, constitute an orderly social revolution and a reinforcement of the essential political development which is required to sustain military victory. Indeed, if we attain military victories, as we expect to continue to do, they are in danger of going for naught, after blood and suffering on the part of our noble U.S. servicemen and the valiant armed forces of the Government of Vietnam, unless economic and social progress, such as that which is supported by the AID, is not only continued but accelerated. That would be made possible by our affirmative action on this supplemental appropriation for Vietnam.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, for the first time since I was elected to Congress I am going to support a foreign aid authorization bill.

When a nation is at war then it becomes mandatory we make every effort to win that war. I consider this bill an integral part of our effort to achieve peace in Vietnam.

In my mind these funds are essential to the success of our operations in Vietnam. I am convinced that to withhold such funds would mean a lessening of our chances of success. These funds are for import financing, for rural construction, for port expansion, for refugee relief, and for development. They have equal importance with our military effort itself.

The casting of this vote does not mean I have changed my view concerning many aspects of foreign aid. To the contrary, most of the criticisms I have made in the past years are still valid.

This vote is cast to support an extraordinary effort which our country is making and reflects extraordinary support of that effort.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, in considering the present legislation, I would like to point out what appears to be a significant and encouraging new U.S. foreign policy emphasis on active assistance in the process of peaceful social and political reform and economic development in southeast Asia.

Most Americans, I am sure, will applaud this hopeful sign of our determination to provide forward-looking leadership in that troubled part of the world for the struggle to conquer the age-old enemies of hunger, disease, and ignorance, and to build the basis for democratic institutions and free elections.

This more positive attitude toward solving the problems of the underdeveloped world is certainly welcome, for it seems to represent a major public shift in our foreign policy approach. And it could well mean a move away from what had come to be viewed as a basically defensive post-Korean conflict stance—aimed primarily at stabilizing the status quo in Asia.

The new approach calls for a more dynamic attitude designed to help meet the rising expectations of Asia's restless millions by providing urgently needed self-help assistance in such important fields as education, health, agricultural production, industrial development, community water and sewage facilities, village security, refugee resettlement, and tax and land reform.

In addition, we are now actively promoting the spirit of regional cooperation in southeast Asia by participating in the huge Mekong River development project, which will provide tremendous power, irrigation, flood control, and related economic benefits to each of the neighboring Mekong Basin countries of Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam.

Another very promising endeavor which we are fully backing is the newly created 27-nation Asian Development Bank with headquarters in Manila. This further example of worthwhile regional cooperation may prove to be one of the most effective long-range financial tools to develop Asia's virtually boundless human and natural resources—and help lift the burden of poverty that has been her lot since ancient times.

A fourth new U.S. foreign policy initiative is also designed to meet the turbulent challenge of the emerging nations. This is the recently announced food-for-freedom program to greatly increase American agricultural exports to food-shortage countries.

Besides harnessing our own amazing food-producing capacity to help fulfill the immediate pressing needs of an exploding world population, this program will also serve as a means to stimulate expanded local food production in the underdeveloped nations themselves.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I am, of course, vitally concerned with these significant events on the international scene, for they seem to foreshadow a more dynamic American leadership role in promoting the cause of freedom.

Success in this progressive and forward-looking program of social reform and economic development, together with an end to the conflict in Vietnam, could help build strong and firm foundations for peace among all the nations of the world.

For that reason, I strongly urge my colleagues to give their overwhelming support to the supplemental foreign assistance authorization measure presently before the House—as an expression of endorsement for this hopeful and encouraging development in American foreign policy.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of our time on this side.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) Strike out "$369,200,000" and substitute "$684,200,000".

(b) In the first sentence, after "President" insert ", without regard to section 649,".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On the first page, immediately after line 9, insert the following:

"(c) Immediately after the first sentence, insert the following:

" 'Funds appropriated under this section after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, shall be available solely for use in the following countries and within the following dollar limitations: Not to exceed $275,000,000 shall be available solely for use in Vietnam, not to exceed $7,500,000 shall be available solely for use in Laos, not to exceed $7,500,000 shall be available solely for use in Thailand, and not to exceed $25,000,000 shall be available solely for use in the Dominican Republic.' "

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing whatever complicated about this amendment. It neither takes from nor adds to the dollar amounts. It simply earmarks the bulk of the funds contained in this bill for spending in southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic, and not somewhere else in the world.

I call your attention again to the fact that in this bill there is not one word which designates the purpose for which these funds should be spent—the purpose that I am sure we in the House of Representatives intend that they should be spent.

It has been said it would be unrealistic to designate where these funds ought to be expanded. Well, nothing could be more realistic than to designate where they are to be expended. I would say to the gentleman who made that remark only a few moments ago that he serves on a committee which authorizes the expenditure of a good deal of money. I have heard him quite often criticize the flexibility and castigate those on the majority side for failing to write into legislation restrictions on the expenditure of funds. I am surprised that here today that he would say it is unrealistic to specify where these funds are to be spent.

One of the purposes of this bill and one of the purposes of all bills authorizing the expenditure of funds is to direct how and where the money shall be spent. That is all my amendment does. Anything less than that is an abdication of control on the part of the House of Representatives.

So I offer my amendment in the hope that the chairman will accept it and then we can go on from here.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. I wish the gentleman would examine very carefully what is involved here. I am sure he did not when he drew up his amendment consider the borrowed money, $63 million and some hundred thousand that has already been borrowed in this program, $27,700,000 from the International organizations and $36 million from supporting assistance funds in other countries in southeast Asia. Now with the limitation imposed by the gentleman's amendment, you are going to bar absolutely the repayment of these borrowed funds amounting to almost $64 million.

Mr. GROSS. This amendment makes available exactly the same amount of money as is made available in the bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, but you put a limitation on it.

Mr. GROSS. All it does is to prohibit transferability, and put it to the use for which it is intended.

Mr. MORGAN. The way I read the gentleman's amendment, you provide not to exceed $275 million solely for use in Vietnam, $7.5 million for Laos and $7.5 million in Thailand and not to exceed $25 million to be available solely for use in the Dominican Republic. You have it tied down tight.

Mr. GROSS. Why not?

Mr. MORGAN. What are you going to do about the repayment of borrowed money?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Iowa knows my position generally on the question of mutual security legislation throughout the years. He and I have had some differences in this regard. I am going to support this legislation, but I think the gentleman's amendment is sound and proper.

If I could make a suggestion to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the question that he raises—how would the AID agency repay to the one or more of the other programs from which funds have been borrowed to support the effort in Vietnam, I would suggest that the AID agency over the years has been very prolific in deobligating funds and reobligating them for other programs. This is not an uncommon thing. This has been done many, many times. So I am certain that in this instance here, they could deobligate and they could reobligate from the funds that are then made available. This is done a hundred times a year or more by AID. I think it can be done here in these circumstances. I think in all honesty the gentleman from Iowa's amendment is a good one. It would more clearly identify specifically and spotlight where we are putting the money. I hope the gentleman will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I should like to ask the gentleman—how can you borrow from an account when in the beginning it is appropriated in a lump sum and not earmarked for any project anywhere on the face of the earth? It is a lump sum appropriation and the administration could borrow from one fund to transfer from one fund. In reality under this appropriation they could justify the funds for a project in Vietnam and yet take it and build a summer resort in Morocco. Where are they borrowing from inasmuch as the funds are not earmarked to start with? What are you borrowing from? I think that is a question that should be answered.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Far be it from me to try to answer when there are Members here who are more expert than I am, but I believe the gentleman from Louisiana knows better than anybody that the $3.2 billion—whatever the exact amount was that was made available for fiscal year 1966—was not all in one account. It was in several accounts and they do have the right to transfer from one to another. Perhaps that is what the chairman of the committee was referring to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that general debate proceed for an additional minute.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I will agree to the request for the additional time, but if there are any further requests for extension of time, I shall object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. We do know that these funds are appropriated in lump-sum amounts. They are appropriated on an illustrative basis. The agency says, "We believe we need the money for these particular projects and these particular countries, but we have the right to spend the money anywhere we want to." I am making that as a statement of fact. Inasmuch as you do not allocate the funds, from what account are you going to borrow? I want that question answered, if I can get an answer.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the chairman of the committee will want to answer the question.

Mr. PASSMAN. It does not appear that he does.

Mr. GROSS. If the expenditure is not nailed down here and now they may well be borrowing this money for other purposes. As the gentleman has suggested, they may be borrowing it for the purpose of building summer resorts in Morocco.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think we would be establishing a very bad precedent here if we agreed to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa, because down through the years in the foreign aid bill we have never specifically authorized *x* number of dollars for this country and *y* number of dollars for another and *z* number of dollars for another country.

If we start this, I promise you that there will be lobbyists around here lobbying for amounts of money for their countries the like of which we have never seen.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am sure that the gentleman recalls that a few years ago we did earmark money for Spain.

Mr. HAYS. That is correct, but I think it was a mistake. I think I voted for it at the time. Experience taught me that we ought not to do it, because the next year—I do not want to mention the countries by name—ambassadors from a half dozen other countries came to see me in an effort to earmark an amount of money for their countries. If we do so again, we will have lobbyists around here the like of which we have not seen before.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr HAYS. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do you not think it would be better to have the lobbyists here than over in the State Department?

Mr. HAYS. No; and I will tell you why. First, I do not think they are over there. Second, I am even more interested in another point about the gentleman's amendment.

I was out there, and I am very much worried about what is going to happen in Thailand, because that is the next target. In fact, they are moving in there right now. They are moving in from the north and from the south. I do not know whether $7.5 million is enough for Thailand or whether it is not. But I do not want to tie the hands of the administration so that if they decide they have to meet this threat and they have to meet it fast, they cannot do it.

We might very well want to take some of this $275 million that the gentleman wants to earmark for South Vietnam and use it in Thailand.

I give the Thais pretty high marks because they have stood up against the Communists. They have really stood up against China.

There was a cartoon not long ago in a magazine that showed Chou En Lai and Mao Tse-tung looking at each other. One of them said, "I don't trust these Russians. They are too oriental."

I give the Thais high marks on that, too, because when the Chinese Ambassador—or at least I read this in the newspaper—called on the Prime Minister of Thailand to protest the use of the bases in Thailand for our Air Force, the Prime Minister looked at him straight in the eye and said, "You had better get some new spies. They are giving you wrong information. There are no American planes in this country."

In other words, he gave them back some of their own propaganda medicine, and I think it was good for them.

Of all the places I visited out there I was impressed about as much by the attitude of the Thais, who are a little country, who are close to the common frontier with the Chinese Communists, and who have not hesitated to stand up and be counted on our side. I do not want any amendments that will hamstring us if we in an emergency have to give them more than this amendment would earmark for them.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Is it not true that as far as the borrowing is concerned, this money was borrowed from projects already programed and not expended?

Mr. HAYS. That is exactly correct.

Mrs. KELLY. Following that up, is it not possible that if agreed to, the amendment would limit any further appropriation or authorization under this basic law for the rest of this year?

Mr. HAYS. It would certainly limit it, and it might put more money than the gentleman from Iowa wants in the one place and less in another, depending on how much they have borrowed from these obligated funds and already obligated somewhere else. I do not think this is a very complicated situation.

Mr. ADAIR. There has been concern expressed here earlier today lest this money which is to go to southeast Asia should be diverted elsewhere. It is not the intent of the gentleman from Ohio that this money is in fact to be used in southeast Asia in furtherance of our effort?

Mr. HAYS. Certainly it is my intent that it is to be used in southeast Asia. I do not go so far on any appropriation as to say that, if the Chinese Communists attack in India, which is in southeast Asia, we could not use some of it there. It is not mentioned here, but we might. But I am sure it is the intent of all of us that it be used in southeast Asia, and in the Dominican Republic, which has been mentioned. But certainly I do not think that we ought to tie it down country by country and say "You are going to get so much" and "You are going to get so much."

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before us—an AID supplemental request for $415 million—involves economic assistance funds. Because of the saddening death of Admiral Nimitz, we are not now considering the Department of Defense supplemental request.

Most of the funds requested—$275 million in supporting assistance—will be used in Vietnam. While this is a much smaller amount than the funds required to continue our military effort, it is every bit as important.

The challenge in Vietnam is not simply a military challenge; it is economic and political. The brave people of South Vietnam must know that their hard struggle will result in a better future—their future and their children's future. The farmers, schoolteachers, merchants, workers, mothers, students and soldiers must see that the seductions of the Communists are illusory; they must see that a future in independence and freedom will secure the benefits of social justice and growing prosperity—more schools, better health facilities, thriving farms, rising incomes and opportunity to advance.

I regard the additional funds requested by AID for use in Vietnam as indispensable to the efforts by the South Vietnamese themselves to secure this future.

Secretary Rusk has already testified to the Foreign Affairs Committee:

> Without our AID programs we could win the major military battles in Vietnam and still lose the war and the peace.

Secretary Rusk added:

> For this reason I regard our economic assistance program, although not nearly so large in scale, as equal in importance with our military assistance. We fully intend to reinforce the economic and social progress that South Vietnam has been making during a brutal war and in spite of unremitting destructive efforts by the enemy.

One hundred million dollars of this request for additional economic assistance funds for Vietnam is for rural construction and counterinsurgency activities. More than two-thirds of the funds for these projects will be used for activities outside Saigon.

These funds will be used for a variety of provincial operations. They are administered under exceedingly dangerous circumstances by some very brave AID representatives.

These funds will be used for rural schools, to complete the construction of 15 rural trade schools, and about 830 hamlet school classrooms. They will be used to repair many other schools which have been either destroyed or damaged by the Vietcong. AID expects that during the next 3 years, it will be possible to build 3,700 new classrooms and train 12,000 teachers. I cannot imagine a better way to demonstrate to the Vietnamese the benefits of a free and secure future.

About $9 million is needed for the expansion of rural health facilities in Vietnam. Most hospitals in the provinces are simply inadequate. They are old, outmoded or deficient in essential requirements. Through AID programs, new hospitals are built. Additional funds are needed to support surgical teams on detail to AID to assist provincial hospital operations.

Expanded assistance for agricultural improvements is also required. Our efforts in this area is one of the key tools in the campaign to win the support of the people. Agriculture and agricultural programs have suffered terribly from the savagery of the war. The Vietnamese farmers' land is often the battle scene; the agricultural technicians' access to the farmer is often limited by Vietcong activities. In spite of these great obstacles, some remarkable successes are being achieved through AID programs; progress must continue.

The list of AID efforts to improve the lives of the Vietnamese and support the war effort is long. Funds are needed for basic improvements in several municipal centers of South Vietnam, such as low-cost housing and sewerage and drainage requirements. Relief for refugees must be expanded. Warehouses must be built and ships leased for coastal and ocean supply operations; war-damaged rail facilities must be repaired; it is necessary to install temporary and permanent electric power services and construct workers' housing and training centers. Public safety and police improvement activities must be accelerated to help establish adequate levels of physical security for the Vietnamese people.

The $175 million is also needed by AID in this fiscal year to help finance commodity imports to combat inflation. To cope with the severe inflationary pressures which threaten economic and political stability, the United States must expand the financing of commercial imports. For example, $21 million is needed for rice imports; $9 million for medicines and pharmaceuticals; $12 million for petroleum products; $50 million for iron and steel, and $4.5 million for fertilizer imports. Over half of these commodities will be utilized in areas outside Saigon. Without this vital assistance, destructive inflation would overcome our efforts to maintain a sound economy in Vietnam in the midst of the war.

It cannot be denied that all of these requirements are expensive. It likewise cannot be denied that they are necessary if we are faithfully to support the aspirations of the Vietnamese people for a better life and support the valiant efforts of our own fighting men in Vietnam to win this future. There is no alternative—except defeat and surrender in this beleaguered land—to meeting this situation by providing the President the funds which are needed to do the job now.

The bill before you also contains requests for supporting assistance funds for three other troubled lands: Thailand, Laos, and the Dominican Republic—$7.5 million are needed for Laos and Thailand each. In these countries, the peoples are faced with increasingly menacing Communist pressures. Funds are needed now to meet these threats by increasing non-military security activities financed by AID and intensifying rural development projects in vulnerable areas. In Thailand additional funds are required now to assist the Government of Thailand in its major expansion of the civil police program. To improve the effectiveness of the border patrol and provincial police in combating Communist infiltration, additional helicopter, radio communications and weapons support is needed. Steps are also being taken to meet increasingly the needs of the rural populace, especially in the threatened northeast area of Thailand, by, for example, bringing potable water facilities to the villages there. This surely is the way to build the foundations of resistance to Communist intrusions.

In Laos new moneys are needed to attend to a variety of unanticipated needs. Refugee relief must be accelerated, airlift operations stepped up, and airport facilities improved. Additional funds for this year are needed to help the Government of Laos stabilize its influence and control in contested areas, especially through work with rural peoples.

In the Dominican Republic the United States has a vital interest in the realization of the elections which are now planned for June. The United States has provided large amounts of assistance to prevent the aggravation of the economic and political instability which followed last year's revolution. We must continue to provide budget support if we are to help the provisional government avoid the kind of chaos which would destroy the possibility of meaningful elections—$25 million are needed in the next 4 months to foster a stable environment in the Dominican Republic.

The President has also requested Congress to provide AID with $100 million in contingency funds to replenish funds already exhausted through use in emergency and trouble spots around the world. I heard Secretary Rusk when he testified:

> It is absolutely essential that a sufficient amount of contingency funds be on hand for the remainder of this fiscal year to permit us to respond immediately and effectively to emergency situations or unforeseen requirements which engage the interests of the United States.

It is impossible to predict precisely if all these funds will be used or where they will be used. The point is that we must be prepared to deal decisively with unforeseen crises in southeast Asia, Africa, Latin America, or wherever.

I would like to comment briefly on some of the supplemental views expressed by five minority members of the committee.

These gentlemen express concern about "graft, corruption and black market activities." These are real problems in the wartime situation of Vietnam. But the impression should not remain that the Vietnamese leadership is corrupt or indifferent to crime or that the management of U.S. military or AID efforts in Vietnam is lax. There are two distinct types of problems which occur in a large-scale war effort such as now exists in Vietnam. First is diversion or corruption involving our assistance programs. AID's auditors and end-use inspectors are in Vietnam working to keep such diversion to a minimum. Their record is good. As a matter of fact, the Controller of the Agency is in Vietnam right now reviewing and improving audit and inspection procedures.

The second type of problem is profiteering, black market operations and corruption in the economy itself. Many of the charges and reports concern this type of problem. Vietnamese civil authorities are being assisted by American police advisers in a major campaign to deal with such corruption. It is occurring—but it is being vigorously attacked.

The supplemental views question the need for additional funds for the contingency fund. They point out that none of the original $50 million has been used in Vietnam. They do not mention the $89 million special fiscal year 1966 contingency fund for southeast Asia—which has been needed and used in Vietnam—and which has been exhausted. I am sure that criticism would not be slow to come if the United States were not to deal effectively and promptly with emergencies and crises which might arise during the remainder of the year. As the supplemental views admit, contingency funds are not always fully used. As a matter of fact, AID has a good record since 1961 of not using contingency funds if they are not needed. If funds are left over, it is up to the Congress to reappropriate or not—and I am sure we can make that choice when the time comes.

The supplemental views complain of manipulation of funds by AID's borrowings from other programs to meet needs in Vietnam. They suggest that borrowing is evidence of over-funding of other programs. This is simply not the case.

What AID has done is "borrow" from programs where funds were not needed until the last part of the year. These borrowed funds will need to be replenished—some of them by the end of March.

The borrowing that has been done is in full compliance with the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act—provisions enacted by the Congress. Each of these has required a determination by the President that the transfer is necessary. And who can dispute the necessity of meeting urgent requirements in Vietnam.

I am pleased to note—at least from their statement that they are "in agreement with the majority of our colleagues"—that these gentlemen do intend to vote in favor of a foreign aid authorization. I commend them for it.

Mr. Chairman, the world we inhabit is precarious and fragile. Most all of us recognize the world responsibility as a world climate of stability and security, of progress and hope. We also recognize that the price for bearing these responsibilities is not cheap, and the best evidence of this recognition would be a vote in favor of the supplemental request at hand. Those funds for economic assistance support in the truest sense our own best aspirations for the world in which we live.

The cruel dilemma of Vietnam hangs heavy over our Nation. It hangs heaviest over the head of President Johnson. Everyone can criticize or offer suggestions as to what should or can be done. However in the end the burden is his. The people of this country elected him our President and our Commander in Chief. His judgment has never proven unworthy of the trust which the people of this country placed in him.

Some ask how did we get to Vietnam and this is a fair question that should be answered. Perhaps it is a time to trace the course which lead to Vietnam and place it in its proper perspective.

The Eisenhower administration on numerous occasions stated unequivocally that southeast Asia was of prime strategic meaning to the United States and that a threat to that region or to any one of the component countries, would also represent a threat to the security of the United States. In that period, when the Korean experience was quite fresh, aggressions against southeast Asia or Indochina were equated with the aggression against Korea in terms of significance to the United States and the free world.

In September of 1953 Secretary Dulles declared that the outcome of the struggle in Indochina "affects our own vital interests in the Western Pacific." In a speech 6 months later, Dulles referred first to the resources of southeast Asia and then stated:

> The area has great strategic value. Southeast Asia is astride the most direct and best developed sea and air routes between the Pacific and south Asia. It has major naval and air bases. Communist control of southeast Asia would carry a grave threat to the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, with whom we have treaties of mutual assistance. The entire Western Pacific area, including the so-called offshore island chain, would be strategically endangered.
>
> President Eisenhower appraised the situation last Wednesday (March 24) when he said that the area is of "transcendent importance."

A little later, Dulles stated that Communist conquest of southeast Asia "would seriously imperil the free world position in the Western Pacific" and he then explained the importance of Vietnam to southeast Asia as a whole:

> We realized that if Vietnam fell into hostile hands, and if the neighboring countries remained weak and divided, then the Communists could move on into all of southeast Asia. For these reasons, the Eisenhower administration from the outset gave particular attention to the problem of southeast Asia.

Secretary Dulles in subsequent speeches put his position even more clearly when he said on one occasion that Chinese Communist aggression in relation to the Pacific or southeast Asia area "would be a deliberate threat to the United States itself," and on another occasion:

> Communist armed aggression in southeast Asia would in fact endanger our peace and security and call for counteraction on our part.

Somewhat later, toward the end of 1954 the Secretary, speaking on the SEATO Treaty before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said that it would be reasonable to conclude if the Communists turned to armed attack in that region they were "starting on a course of action which is directly aimed at the United States; that we are the target."

Once more in 1959, when evidence began to come to light that North Vietnam was renewing its efforts to take over the south, President Eisenhower said:

> The loss of South Vietnam would set in motion a crumbling process that could, as it progressed, have grave consequences for us and for freedom * * *. Our own national interests demand some help from us in sustaining in Vietnam the morale, the economic progress, and the military strength necessary to its continued existence in freedom.

It was in an awareness of this real interrelation of the security of the United States with that of southeast Asia that the U.S. Government negotiated and concluded the Southeast Asia Collective Defense—Manila—Treaty in 1954. This treaty which established the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, with Thailand, the Philippines, Pakistan, Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, France, and the United States as members, was undertaken as a contract to defend southeast Asia. The nature of this contract will be discussed below.

The signers of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty for the United States were John Foster Dulles, H. Alexander Smith, and MIKE J. MANSFIELD. With the advice and consent of the Senate, the treaty was ratified by the President on February 4, 1955, and entered into force on February 19, 1955.

Article IV of the treaty provides:

> 1. Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any state or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of United Nations.
>
> 2. If, in the opinion of any of the parties, the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any party in the treaty area or of any other state or territory to which the provisions of paragraph 1 of this article from time to time apply is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area, the parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense.
>
> 3. It is understood that no action on the territory of any state designated by unanimous agreement under paragraph 1 of this article or on any territory so designated shall be taken except at the invitation or with the consent of the government concerned.

In a protocol entered into simultaneously the parties unanimously designated "for the purposes of article IV of the treaty the States of Cambodia and Laos and the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam."

The United States, in a special understanding set forth in the treaty, limited its obligation "to act" under article IV(1) to cases of Communist aggression, including armed attacks by "the regime of Ho Chi Minh in North Vietnam." The United States agreed in the event of other aggression or armed attack to consult under the provisions of article IV(2).

OBLIGATION TO ACT—INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE

In the event of armed attack as in Vietnam, each party is bound under article IV(1) to act "to meet the common danger." Article IV(2) "applies primarily to the threat of overthrow by subversive measures, internal revolution which might, perhaps, be inspired from without, but which does not involve open interference from without." This obligation is individual, as well as collective, and does not depend on consultations or agreement. This interpretation of the treaty obligation, widely held by the SEATO parties, was given formal expression in a joint communique issued by Secretary Rusk and Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman of Thailand on March 6, 1962:

> The agreement of each of the parties to act to meet the common danger "in accordance with its constitutional processes" leaves to the judgment of each country the type of action to be taken in the event an armed attack occurs.

But each party is committed to act on its judgment that an armed attack has occurred:

> The Secretary of State assured the Foreign Minister that in the event of such aggression, the United States intends to give full effect to its obligations under the treaty to act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. The Secretary of State reaffirmed that this obligation of the United States does not depend on the prior agreement of all other parties to the treaty, since this treaty obligation is individual as well as collective.

Almost all the SEATO parties have endorsed this statement. None has registered objection.

In the current hostilities, the Republic of Vietnam has not requested formal collective action by the SEATO Council. However, at Vietnam's request, the United States has acted individually, and collectively with other countries, including several SEATO allies, to meet the common danger arising from the armed attack against "the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam." These measures are not actions by the SEATO Council, but they are actions in discharge of parties' obligations under the treaty.

SOUTHEAST ASIA-U.S. PEACE AND SECURITY

The meaning of the treaty commitment was underscored by Secretary Dulles in his report to the President:

> The purpose of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty is the creation of unity for security and peace in southeast Asia and the Southwestern Pacific. * * * Although the United States has no direct territorial interest in southeast Asia, we have much in common with the people and governments of this area and are united in the face of a common danger that stems from international communism.

A week after the treaty was signed, Secretary Dulles explained to the Nation:

> Any significant expansion of the Communist world would, indeed, be a danger to the United States, because international communism thinks in terms of ultimately using its power position against the United States. Therefore, we could honestly say * * * that Communist armed aggression in southeast Asia would, in fact, endanger our peace and security and call for counteraction on our part.

Testifying before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Secretary Dulles said:

> The language used here which has now become, I would say, almost conventional with reference to these treaties, makes perfectly clear the determination of our Nation to react to [Communist] armed attack.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations reported the treaty and protocol by a vote of 14 to 1. In its report, the committee made clear its understanding of the importance of the new commitment:

> This treaty constitutes an important step in the evolution of U.S. policy to create a system of collective security in the West Pacific area. It is the latest addition to the protective network of the mutual defense treaties which have been concluded by the United States with Japan, Australia and New Zealand, the Philippines and Korea.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Designed to promote security and to strengthen the fabric of peace in southeast Asia and the Southwest Pacific, the treaty is intended to deter aggression in that area by warning potential aggressors that an open armed attack upon the territory of any of the parties will be regarded by each of them as dangerous to its own peace and safety.
>
> The principle underlying this treaty is that advance notice of our intentions and the intentions of the nations associated with us may serve to deter potential aggressors from reckless action that could plunge the Pacific into war. To that end, the treaty makes it clear that the United States will not remain indifferent to conduct threatening the peace of southeast Asia.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The committee is not impervious to the risks which this treaty entails. It fully appreciates that acceptance of these obligations commits the United States to a course of action over a vast expanse of the Pacific. Yet these risks are consistent with our own highest interests. There are greater hazards in not advising a potential enemy of what he can expect of us, and in failing to disabuse him of assumptions which might lead to a miscalculation of our intentions.
>
> For these reasons, the Committee on Foreign Relations urges the Senate to give its advice and consent to the ratification of this treaty.

On February 1, 1955, the U.S. Senate approved the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty by a vote of 82 to 1. Senator Langer cast the lone negative vote. Thirteen Senators were absent and not voting, but with respect to each it was announced that if present and voting, he would vote "yea." Among the 13, 2 Senators were absent for illness: Lyndon B. Johnson and John F. Kennedy. The others were Barkley, Bennett, Chavez, Daniel, Dirksen, Hennings, Hruska, McCarthy, Monroney, Potter, and Young.

The commitment to protect the Indochina states from Communist aggression was a central consideration emphasized by each of the four principal speakers in debate on the floor of the Senate supporting the treaty:

> Senator George. The nations of the free world sustained a serious setback with the loss of northern Vietnam to the Communists. The peril to the southern area, the free territory of Vietnam, as well as to the remaining associated states, Laos and Cambodia, is serious, continuing, and unrelenting. It is important that our Government should act promptly to give approval to this treaty as an act of confidence in the determination of other governments in the area to defend their freedom, individual liberty, and independence.
>
> Senator Smith. The net effect of this provision is to serve notice now and for the future to the Chinese Communists—and, I may say, to any Communists in the area * * * that they shall not encroach further on this area of free nations. They are no longer free to isolate and absorb the countries of southeast Asia, one by one. Laos or Cambodia or South Vietnam or Thailand cease to be individual entries on their timetable of conquest. That was taken care of by the special protocol which was added to the treaty at the time it was signed.
>
> Senator Mansfield. The Southeast Asian Treaty is another part in the total pattern of strength which we have been trying to create throughout the free world. The armistice agreements at Geneva did not end the need for a pact in the southeast Pacific area; rather it emphasized it.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The treaty area is defined in the treaty itself and also in a protocol to the treaty which brings in Laos, Cambodia, and the free portion of Vietnam as treaty territory which, if attacked, would be under the protection of the treaty * * * those states welcomed the fact that the mantle of protection of the treaty was thrown around this area.
>
> Senator Wiley. We all know what the loss of that part of the globe would mean to our own security. And we must not weaken our own resolve at this critical moment. Recent information, in contrast with pessimistic advice received earlier, appears to offer greater hope for a favorable outcome in free Vietnam. Surely now is not the time to dampen the morale of its people and its leaders.

INDOCHINA

The Manila Pact was negotiated in the shadow of the 1954 Geneva Conference on Korea and Indochina. When the Geneva Agreements on Indochina were signed by the French military command and the Communist Vietminh, the threat was clear that the Communists might attempt to take over the whole of Vietnam by internal subversion or armed aggression. At the conclusion of the Geneva Conference President Eisenhower declared that the United States would "not use force to disturb the settlement," but he warned "that any renewal of Communist aggression would be viewed by us as a matter of grave concern." The formal declaration by the U.S. Government at the 1954 Geneva Conference was worded more strongly. It stated we "would view any renewal of aggression in violation of the aforesaid agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security."

At Manila, Secretary Dulles warned the conference of the insatiable ambition of international communism:

> We know that wherever it makes gains, as in Indochina, these gains are looked on not as final solutions, but as bridgeheads for further gains.

It was to contain this bridgehead that the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty was negotiated.

Secretary Dulles acknowledged that President Eisenhower and he "had hoped that unity would be forged in time to strengthen the negotiating position of the free nations during the Indochina phase of the Geneva Conference. However, this proved impracticable. The Geneva outcome did, however, confirm the need for unity." The Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty was fashioned to meet this need.

REAFFIRMATION OF THE COMMITMENT

The U.S. commitment to the defense of South Vietnam derives from a basic conviction that the vital interests of the United States are engaged in the struggle of the peoples of southeast Asia to build societies in their own way free from aggression from the Communist powers. This commitment has been reaffirmed by three Presidents. With the support of Congress, each took the action that was necessary in his time to honor that commitment.

As early as October 1, 1954, President Eisenhower undertook to provide direct assistance to help make South Vietnam "capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." On May 11, 1957, President Eisenhower and Ngo Dinh Diem, President of the Republic of Vietnam, issued a joint statement which noted "the large buildup of Vietnamese Communist military forces in North Vietnam" and stated, inter alia:

> Noting that the Republic of Vietnam is covered by article IV of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, President Eisenhower and President Ngo Dinh Diem agreed that aggression or subversion threatening the political independence of the Republic of Vietnam would be considered as endangering peace and stability.

The two Presidents "looked forward to an end of the unhappy division of the Vietnamese people and confirmed the determination of the two Governments to work together to seek suitable means to bring about the peaceful unification of Vietnam in freedom in accordance with the purpose and principles of the United Nations Charter."

As North Vietnam's aggression mounted, President Kennedy declared, on August 2, 1961:

> The United States is determined that the Republic of Vietnam shall not be lost to the Communists for lack of any support which the United States can render.

On December 7, 1961, President Diem appealed for additional support to meet North Vietnam's efforts to impose a Communist regime. In his reply of December 14, 1961 President Kennedy recalled the U.S. Declaration at the Geneva Conference of 1954 and reaffirmed that the United States was "prepared to help the Republic of Vietnam to protect its people and to preserve its independence."

THE JOINT RESOLUTION OF AUGUST 7, 1964

President Johnson has reaffirmed these commitments many times, and, on August 7, 1964, the Congress adopted, by vote of 504 to 2, a joint resolution which stated the commitments as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.
>
> SEC. 2. The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.
>
> SEC. 3. This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, except that it may be terminated earlier by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

During the floor debate, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations was asked by Senator COOPER whether the joint resolution fulfilled the requirement of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty that the United States act by constitutional processes:

> In other words, are we now giving the President advance authority to take whatever action he may deem necessary respecting South Vietnam and its defense, or with respect to the defense of any other country included in the treaty?

Mr. FULBRIGHT answered directly:

> I think that is correct.
>
> Mr. COOPER. Then, looking ahead, if the President decided it was necessary to use such force as could lead into war, we will give that authority by this resolution?
>
> Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the way I would interpret it.
>
> This provision is intended to give clearance to the President to use his discretion. We all hope and believe that the President will not use this discretion arbitrarily or irresponsibly. We know that he is accustomed to consulting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with congressional leaders. But he does not have to do that * * *. I have no doubt that the President will consult with Congress in case a major change in present policy becomes necessary.

The joint resolution of August 1964 decided that the United States is prepared "as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom." South Vietnam has asked for that assistance, and the President has taken the necessary steps in consultation with the Congress.

MUTUAL DEFENSE AGREEMENTS IN THE PACIFIC

The Manila Pact is only one of a number of bilateral and multilateral arrangements made to facilitate the exercise of the inherent right of collective self-defense acknowledged in article 51 of the United Nations Charter. The United States has entered into bilateral mutual defense treaties in the Pacific with Japan—most recently in 1960—Korea, 1953; the Philippines, 1954; and China, 1954; and it is a member of the tripartite Anzus pact with Australia and New Zealand, 1952.

Everyone of these treaties obligates the United States to act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes—the formula used in the Manila Pact. This U.S. commitment, given in advance, to act in accordance with its constitutional processes in the event of Communist armed attack, is the linch-pin of the free world collective security system.

Thus U.S. commitment in South Vietnam, growing out of the Manila treaty and its protocol, must be met, in view of the aggression which is being mounted from North Vietnam, if the Manila treaty is to be regarded as a credible commitment. Were we not to help South Vietnam to defend itself, each one of the other SEATO nations which is under threat would most probably conclude that it could not count on American support, and we could expect to see accommodations being made to an aggressive communism which no one of the countries of southeast Asia could resist standing alone. Since our understandings with other allied countries in East and southeast Asia are stated in terms which are virtually identical to those in the Manila treaty, it is reasonable to assume that those countries too would feel obliged to reappraise their basic policies on the basis of a much more doubtful assumption of U.S. help in case they come under attack.

Under these circumstances we would have to assume that with the passage of time the bases in the Western Pacific to which we now have access would be shut off from us and that much territory and many resources now in friendly hands would no longer be so. Not only in that region but around the world the firm basis for the free world's system of collective security would have been badly if not irreparably shaken.

I think the vote today will demonstrate while we all seek peace we also possess an awareness of the commitment of this country. We have also a commitment to those young men who are doing the fighting that validates this commitment. They are entitled to our support.

The very risk that makes a treaty necessary in the first place carries with it the possibility that some day it may become operative. So too our responsibility becomes greater when our troops are committed to battle. Let us continue to discuss, let us continue to seek honorable negotiations but let us recognize that the answer to this challenge by communism like all its many challenges rests not with them. It rests with us.

Shall we continue to believe in ourselves? Shall we retain the faith of our convictions possessed of the knowledge that our ideals are more meaningful than our armies? Shall we retain our courage? For if we do then there is hope that Vietnam may be the dawn of a lasting peace in a world where men shall only fight their real enemies, misery, poverty, disease, and ignorance. I think we do.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to use the allotted time. I merely want to say, and I would like to add a footnote, that I have not studied this bill in detail. I do not know the fine points of it. I am not a member of the committee. But as I came in the door I heard the gentleman from Ohio make some remarks about the junior Senator from New York, and I might say that I am a good friend of the Senator from New York——

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman did not hear me correctly. I said the junior Senator from my own State. I do not bear any responsibility for the junior Senator from New York. I am a good friend of his, too.

Mr. DOW. Then I apologize.

Mr. HAYS. It is the junior Senator from Ohio that I was talking about.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I question the wisdom of my getting into this debate. I have profound respect for the distinguished chairman of this committee and every member of the subcommittee. It is his responsibility to get the authorization bill approved. Subsequently the Committee on Appropriations will have to consider the authorization.

I would like to be corrected if I am wrong. There is actually no borrowing going on anywhere. We may use the term "borrowing," but the allocation that the President made out of the United Organization funds is money that was unobligated. Had these funds been obligated, they could not have been retrieved. It was unobligated funds that the administration used, that is if they have been used. I am making a statement of fact, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MORGAN. Of course this money is already appropriated. The gentleman's bill appropriated it.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is not the question. Had it been allocated to specific projects?

Mr. MORGAN. Of course it has not been allocated to specific projects.

Mr. PASSMAN. Then you are not borrowing it, you are merely using funds that have not been obligated.

Mr. MORGAN. I am reading from the gentleman's own bill. International organization programs authorized by section 302, $144,755,000. This is a program that they borrowed from.

I am reading now from the executive branch's section-by-section analysis that came up to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

> AID has already "borrowed" $36 million of essential supporting assistance programs and programs financed by the special southeast Asian contingency fund. In addition, $27,700,000 has been temporarily transferred to supporting assistance from funds appropriated for volunteer contributions for international organizations.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, that is correct, but what you are actually doing is obligating funds for projects in South Vietnam from money that had not been obligated or turned over to international organizations. I repeat, if the funds had been turned over to these international organizations they could not have been recalled or deobligated and reobligated as is the case with a multitude of other funds that are allocated or obligated on a bilateral basis, by the AID agency through the country and projects.

I just had a look at the budget. In the budget there are 15 different requests for foreign assistance of some type for fiscal year 1967. The total amount is $8,505 million. I can assure the gentleman that this does not include any part of the Defense budget other than mutual security military assistance. May I say the total of unexpended funds from these 15 bills, to be dispersed in the future may exceed $20 billion. The authorization request before you will merely enable the administration to increase the pipeline and I dare say not a dime authorized by this bill would actually be expended until 1968, if then.

The President laid the foundation for this supplemental when he came before the Congress last year. Read his message. He said that at some subsequent date, if we need the funds, we are going to ask Congress to appropriate them. I predicted at that time that there would be a supplemental in excess of $1 billion, which would make it the largest foreign aid bill in the history of America if you picked up the international organizations and the other facets of foreign aid.

If the gentleman will accept this amendment and earmark these funds specifically for South Vietnam, for the first time since I have been a Member of Congress I will vote loud and clear for this particular authorization, but you have struck it out of the bill somewhere along the way. Some of you had the idea that you should earmark the funds in reading your own bill before the committee, but it has been stricken and again you are asking for an open end appropriation whereby you could or could not allocate and spend these funds in South Vietnam. Again it is on an illustrative basis. We may spend it there, but again we may not. So, if the gentleman will accept this amendment, inasmuch as he has made his case on the basis that the money was needed for South Vietnam, you will give some of us an opportunity to use the propaganda that is being used downtown that we are doing this on account of the war in South Vietnam. If that be true, then let us allocate it and let us put in the supplemental in the other body when it goes over sufficient money to pay back the pittance of $64 million which you said we had borrowed. You have not borrowed it but have spent it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall try to bring this argument back into focus. This amendment was never considered in committee. No one introduced it, including anyone in the minority. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] is inaccurate in that particular statement.

Now let me say this: The programs had been scheduled on a 12-month basis. We still have 4 months to go. Ninety-six million dollars has already been borrowed from programs that have been scheduled. Twenty-seven million dollars has been scheduled for the 12-month program of the international organizations. This includes a multitude of organizations that would be unfunded for the balance of the 4 months if this amendment were adopted. Second, $60 million has been borrowed from the Korean funds.

Now, it makes no sense to talk about fighting communism in South Vietnam if we allow programs in Korea to go unfunded. The rigidity of this amendment would preclude the transferability of the funds that we have here and have borrowed under previously allotted sums of money for programs of supporting assistance that would be used in Korea. Further, barring unforeseen circumstances, these funds will be used for the purpose stated by the administration; that is, the United Nations, Laos, Thailand, the Dominican Republic, and to reimburse funds previously borrowed, as I have stated.

This is a tremendously rigid amendment which has never been passed by any previous Congress that has considered the foreign aid bill. It is possible emergency situations in Laos or Thailand might require some transfer of funds. If we adopted this particular amendment, we would be unable to shift funds from Thailand to Laos or from Vietnam to Laos or Thailand. We would be unable to shift funds to the Dominican Republic or, if we had no further need for funds in the Dominican Republic and had a greater need in South Vietnam for them, we would be unable to do that. So, to reimburse the $96 million we have already borrowed and which the committee of the gentleman from Louisiana has appropriated, it seems to me we cannot adopt this amendment. Even if we were thinking about it, what we would be doing is starting down an entirely new path and setting rigid precedents that have never been imposed on any President in any previous administration. So this has not been a well thought out amendment. I am sure the purposes are sincere. We are voting to support our effort in South Vietnam, but let it not be so rigid that we cannot fight communism wherever the emergency arises. By adopting this amendment what we would be doing is putting some programs on an 8-month basis when they have been scheduled and programed on a 12-month basis.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I state again, and I am not quarreling with the gentleman, but the facts should be made known: You are not borrowing; you are merely allocating funds from previously appropriated, unobligated funds. You have nothing to pay back. I shall set forth that at the proper time.

If the gentleman will yield further, I want to ask one question: Using it in the extreme—I would not want to get into the hearings that are yet to be published—under the bill that is being considered, the authorization bill, if approved, funds out of this authorization could be allocated to Egypt, Indonesia, or any other of the 98 nations where foreign aid is being or could be dispersed in fiscal 1966, if the administration should so desire.

Is that not a statement of fact?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to answer the gentleman to the effect that the gentleman from Louisiana is quite aware of the program. But what we have done, in effect, is that while we might not have obligated these funds—and we are getting involved in semantics here—the fact of the matter is we have projected our program in Korea on a 12-month basis. We have borrowed $60 million from that program. If we adopt this amendment, the rigidity of this amendment would preclude our paying back the supporting assistance fund in Korea the funds that we have already taken out of that fund to support our effort in South Vietnam. That is just how simple it is.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman did not answer my question, which is this: Could these funds be allocated to Egypt and to Indonesia?

Mr. GALLAGHER. The question is that they could be allocated to Korea.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman has made my point.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

I came over to the floor of the House this afternoon with the intention of voting for H.R. 12169. But I find, without the amendment, it will be impossible for me to vote for the measure.

Mr. Chairman, I thought that this money was earmarked for South Vietnam or at least for southeast Asia. But instead of earmarking the authorization, the Committee has merely amended section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 by raising supporting assistance from $369,200,000 to $684,200,000.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], has raised a very valid objection. I have heard the gentleman from Louisiana say that the AID, the State Department, can obligate, reobligate, and deobligate all in the same day. If we pass this measure without earmarking the $315 million for use in southeast Asia, the war in South Vietnam could end tomorrow and the State Department could spend all of the funds in Timbuktu the following week.

Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to the authorization next week coming out of the House Committee on Armed Services. I serve on the House Committee on Armed Services. I raised a similar objection to the authorization in that committee. I feel that this is one of the valid objections to the operations of the foreign aid program. The Congress just does not exercise control over the operations of the foreign aid program. If this money is for use in southeast Asia, why should there be any objection to earmarking.

In my opinion—and I have been watching this for 6 years now in the House of Representatives—it is an absolute exercise in futility for us to go through the procedure of authorizing and appropriating, when the State Department can obligate, deobligate, and reobligate all in the same day.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I would say that we have the same problem with reference to the defense apppropriation, because the Pentagon and the Defense Department is doing the same thing through the process of reprograming.

Now I did vote for the authorization in the Committee on Armed Services. That will be before the committee next week, but the problems are completely different. You can buy a bomb in the United States but you do not know whether it will be dropped in North Vietnam, South Vietnam, or Laos. But here we can exercise control at least to the extent of having it spent in Laos and Thailand and South Vietnam, which is the reason why the President has asked for this authorization.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. I would like to have one more clarification of this bill. I respect this great committee but as I understand the situation, no money has been "borrowed." I am familiar with this procedure. Actually what has happened and what does happen is that they allocated money or funded programs for South Vietnam that would have normally been allocated to other projects, programs, or countries. It is just a question now of whether you are going to get more money to allocate funds to Korea and to other programs that have been temporarily underfunded. Had the money been obligated then, of course, they could not have allocated it to another program or country. In reality the AID has not borrowed money. It makes a good case of argument but it is not factual. The AID is merely allocating funds that normally would have gone to some other country. If this authorization bill is approved, they will merely fund these programs at a subsequent date.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. Do I understand the gentleman to say during the gentleman's discussion of this amendment that he is going to favor the same kind of amendment to the bill, H.R. 12335, when it comes on the floor Tueday?

Mr. ICHORD. No. I do not think you could possibly limit the effort in fighting a war. I do think we should try to exercise more control even in the Committee on Armed Services. But when you are spending money for construction of airfields and for the purchase of numerous weapons and many new weapons that we are going to have come into play in South Vietnam, I do not think we can possibly earmark our authorization. We have made some progress, I will say to the gentleman, in the Committee on Armed Services. We did extend last year the authorization for line items to include track vehicles. Previously we only authorized specifically for missiles, aircraft, ships, and other large items of hardware.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for 12 years I was a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. Each year we had to consider the necessary appropriations for the funding of the total mutual security and/or AID program. In the process of considering this program, every year you ran into these kinds of terms. The executive branch of the Government would come before the committee and say, On an illustrative basis we are asking for this much money.

They could not be specific in pointing out the precise dollars for a precise project. The presentation was always illustrative. Each would also tell us that after the money was made available or the obligational authority was forthcoming, then they would program something—the precise dollar against a precise program.

Then they would eventually obligate the precise obligational authority against the project in a country. This was normal procedure. Then, of course, it was just as normal to deobligate if a project fell through or if its justification was not warranted after further consideration. Then that obligational authority would be made available for another project in another country and there would be a reobligation.

Now when comments are made that money is borrowed from one program or project from one country or another, I suspect—and I would like to see the books—that they had gone no further than programing at this stage of the fiscal year. Even if they had, knowing full well they will get this authorization and this appropriation—and I am for them—they can deobligate and they can reobligate. The net result will be purely a bookkeeping transaction.

It would be very interesting if the books were up here and we had people to look at them. I suspect the facts are they have gone no further than the programing. Even though they have they can deobligate and if they can deobligate, they can reobligate.

Let me just conclude with this observation, Mr. Chairman. It has been pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio that this is an unusual circumstance. I agree. Maybe the fact that it is an unusual circumstance is the reason why we should earmark. It would justify earmarking here when we have not done so in the past. We are seeking on this occasion to indicate our full support for our program in Vietnam and in these associated areas in southeast Asia.

There is no better way in my judgment than to be specific with the earmarking as long as we are convinced that the earmarking will in no way interfere with the operation of the program.

I am confident if the books were laid right out on the table in the well of the House, the facts would be—yes the facts would be—that they have not gone any further than the programing. If they had, they can deobligate and reobligate to take care of any borrowing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first of all as far as the semantics are concerned with respect to resupplying existing programs. We have authorized and appropriated funds on an illustrative basis for programs for the present fiscal year under the regular program. If it becomes necessary, even as a contingency, that it may be required to use some of these funds to finish out the present fiscal year, it would be my purpose in supporting this authorization to be sure that those funds previously authorized and appropriated would not be disturbed or that we would have to modify existing previously approved programs.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I rise only for the purpose of trying to clarify the general situation here. I have not worked with these figures as many Members have. But it is my understanding that this so-called loan or deobligation or whatever it is was made from the Fund for International Organizations and Programs, and that the sum total of that Fund, if I read the correct figure, is $144 million-plus. I also understand that that Fund involves obligations of the U.S. Government in connection with our contributions to various agencies and that these obligations are fixed.

If that is true—and I am merely rising for information—we would want to put the money back as contemplated in this bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Florida yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. To a degree I am asking for information, too. It is my best recollection that the appropriations for the fiscal year 1966 for the international organizations were—and this was a separate amount—100 million-plus—and that that money could not be transferred out of that to help fund to the extent of the full amount.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Florida yield further?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I understand that that $27.6 million was taken from that specific fund, the entire amount of which is an obligation to the United States. That is my understanding.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I will yield to the gentleman from New Jersey because I promised him I would do so, but I would like to proceed with what I started to say on my own time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The debate today indicates what I said earlier, and that is we are being unrealistic if we are suggesting that there is any necessity right now to earmark these particular funds in the way that is being proposed by this amendment. I think we might have less reason to hesitate about earmarking them than we have had. But there is no need for it in this case. We are talking about a 4-month program. That means surely there will be a dislocation of existing programs if we do not have the flexibility which so-called open-ended authorization would provide in this 4-month period. Had we had discussion like this in the committee, we might have come up with a different conclusion. More difficulty would arise if we should now say that these funds can only be allocated in certain amounts as to certain countries.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to complete what I intended to say, and if there is any time remaining, I shall be glad to yield to those desiring me to do so. I understood the statement to be made on the floor that the committee had earmarked funds for a particular country in this bill for the general program and that subsequently we struck that out. I cannot find that language anywhere in this bill. It was not brought up in committee, and there was no amendment to that effect. We did have a country earmarking with respect to administrative expenses and the transferability for that purpose. We put a ceiling and a limitation on those funds, but not on the others. In my judgment, this is no time to talk about changing the whole concept of authorization and appropriation, at a time when it is clear we do not need it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 52, noes 71.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Gross and Mr. Gallagher.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 73, noes 142.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania: On the first page, immediately after line 9, insert the following:

"Sec. 2. Of the funds appropriated under the amendment made by the first section of this act not to exceed $25 million shall be available for use in the Dominican Republic on a loan basis."

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is not to change the amount but simply to see that the amount listed in the report and hearings for the Dominican Republic should be certain to be on a loan basis. By that I mean the adoption by Congress of a loan rather than a grant policy for capital expenditures on U.S. foreign aid. The question comes up as to how much has the Dominican Republic received from the United States in grants and loans from the time of the revolution. Since the date of the revolution, on April 24, 1965, the United States has made available to the Dominican Republic $86.3 million until January 10 of 1966.

There is now in the current President's contingency fund $54.1 million of unobligated funds. As of now, $37,322,000 of this current contingency fund has been allocated to the Dominican Republic, most of which is for their budget use for the Government. I am not allowed to give you the specific amounts as distributed in the Dominican Republic, although I can hardly see why the information is confidential when the Vietnam listing by category is given and the United States is at war there.

This makes a total already of $123,622,000 U.S. credits made available to the Dominican Republic since April 24, 1965. That is pretty good financing for a revolution in these short months.

The President now requests for the Dominican Republic another authorization of $25 million. The question is should Congress make this a grant or a loan by specific designation, or just leave the question open? My position is that these funds should be a loan. The reasons for that position are these: First, they have a low rate of savings and investments in the Dominican Republic. The people are not seriously helping themselves, and we U.S. taxpayers should insist on their doing so.

The second point is that the Dominican Republic has not yet changed their agricultural program to meet present realities and market conditions, so that they vary their Dominican exports. They are still emphasizing sugar heavily and cocoa, which is in excess and overabundant supply at world market prices that are low.

The third point is that the U.S. taxpayers should insist that the Government of the Dominican Republic emphasize the free enterprise system and get out of its many businesses. There are too many businesses in the Dominican Republic that are owned and operated by the Dominican Republic. Too large a part of the businesses are government-owned or operated. My position is: Congress should definitely state the U.S. policy that this $25 million is a loan. We can make it on a 40-year basis from the U.S. Treasury, the first 10 years at 1 percent interest and the remaining 30 years at 2½ percent interest. The U.S. statutes already authorize that procedure generally.

As to the current Dominican budget and their loans, of June 30, 1965, the Government owes $30 million to foreign commercial banks on terms of 1 year or less. On a 1-to-8-year basis of maturities, the Dominican Government owes approximately $153.5 million. If Congress or the administration puts the $25 million in cash as a grant to the Dominican Republic, all the U.S. taxpayers are doing is picking up the tab for $25 million of the $30 million of the loans of the foreign banks which are due on the current under-1-year basis.

How about Dominican foreign loans that have maturities over 1 to 8 years? On those loans there is money owed to the U.S. Treasury, the International Bank, and the International Monetary Fund. On Dominican loans with over 8 years maturity, there is money owing, but that is to U.S. AID, the Inter-American Bank, U.S. Treasury under Public Law 480, section 4, and also the Export-Import Bank. So actually U.S. institutions are owed most of the long-term Dominican obligations. My object is to serve notice to the Dominican people and their Government to get their economic and budget houses in order. Revolutions are expensive.

My question is, Why, when it is stated that this $25 million is for capital funds in large part, capital budget expenditures, does Congress not specifically label and treat it then as capital investment? Mr. Bell, Director of U.S. AID, stated on page 20 of the hearings, regarding Dominican aid:

> Our money has been going to an increasing extent to capital development, to technical assistance, etc.

Under those circumstances, as this is capital investment, then Congress should specifically treat the $25 million as a capital loan and lend it on a long-term, 40-year basis.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I wonder what is the reason for the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I am reading from page 100 of the hearings and from the colloquy between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] and Mr. Sternfeld, who came up to testify before us:

> Mr. FULTON. The question comes whether Congress should not now, at this time, make U.S. supporting assistance on a loan, rather than a grant base, rather than adopt the policy to have loans in the future after these grants.
>
> Mr. STERNFELD. That is our proposition, Mr. FULTON. It is our intention that the $25 million we are requesting here will be provided to the Government on a loan basis, at this time.
>
> Mr. FULTON. So that there is no more aid going to the Dominican Republic on a grant basis?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. I just cannot understand why the gentleman himself, since he raised this at the hearings, would appear on the floor and offer an amendment to this effect.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Well, the answer to it is this: Unless we in Congress specifically say that this loan policy is the intent of the Congress, I think they will change it and move it around and make it on a grant basis. So I am simply tying this commitment down based upon what the administration said in answer to me, that it will be a loan, and that we in Congress adopt a policy right now of having loans for the Dominican Republic for capital expenditures, and that we say it directly.

So. I am really just outlining the intention of Congress and really outlining the intent of what Mr. Bell says on page 20 when he says:

> Our money has been going to an increasing extent to capital development.

When it is capital development, Mr. Chairman, I agree with you that it should then be on a loan basis.

If this is the specific legislative intent as you state, then I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield further to my good friend and chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. During the hearings it was definitely and specifically stated on three occasions by Mr. Sternfeld, the witness, that this aid to the Dominican Republic would be on a loan basis.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. That makes the legislative intent complete.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 2. Section 451(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended by striking out "$50,000,000" and substituting "$150,000,000".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On page 2, line 3, strike out "$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$100,000,000".

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union will note that by the bill there is added $100 million as an addition to the President's contingency fund for the current year, that is, the fiscal year expiring on June 30. There are 3 months remaining after the enactment of this bill authorizing this money. So such authorization for the President's contingency fund will be at a rate, if we calculate it annually, of $400 million, because this present $100 million increase is only for 90 days. Therefore we are increasing the President's contingency fund at a rate of $400 million a year. This is too much undesignated funds by blanket authorization of Congress.

That is too much of a rate of expenditure, without designation or request by the President for Congress approval; my amendment would say to the President, "We will give you $50 million more in the current fiscal year to spend until June 30, in addition to the $54 million you already have in your contingency fund."

Mr. Chairman, the President right now has a contingency fund of $54.1 million; $4.1 million is the carryover from fiscal year 1965; $50 million is authorized and allocated already in the 1966 fiscal year in which we are now operating, and which expires on June 30. That has been allocated, I might say, but not obligated. That means it has only been tentatively programed, and can be changed by a bookkeeping entry, alone.

Now, the question comes up: Will Congress increase the contingency fund by $100 million more? My answer to that question is this: "Mr. President, I think if we give you a contingency fund whereby you can spend $50 million in the next 90 days after you get this money, until June 30, 1966, that is a very good rate, because it is equivalent to giving you $200 million for your fund for a year." That is quite a rate of spending by one Government source, without designation or authorization by Congress.

In the 1965 fiscal year the appropriation for the contingency fund was $99.2 million, and the amount obligated or used was only $57.2 million. In this fiscal year the authorization is $50 million and the amount appropriated is $50 million. But I do believe if the President has contingency funds to the extent that he will have $100 million that is not obligated between now and June 30 in his special contingency fund to spend as he wants, that is sufficient.

You might say, was this contingency fund in any respect for the military? No; no part of it is for the military.

Second, is any part of it designated? No; no part of it is designated.

Third, are there enough funds for southeast Asia? Yes; the amount presently programed by this bill is $415 million, of which $350 million is for southeast Asia, and only $25 million for the Dominican Republic. We must remember also that this Congress gave the President an extra and special contingency fund of $89 million specifically for southeast Asia last year for use until the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 1966.

So what Congress will be doing is this. My amendment will be adding $50 million more to the President's present contingency fund of $54.1 million. So he will have in his pocket, unspent as of this time, to spend between now and June 30, 1966, $104.1 million. I think if there develops anywhere in the world, a new, unforeseen, and a bigger emergency than that, the administration should come back to the Congress with a specific request for authorization and then Congress would promptly give them the money. My point is that Congress should be consulted.

This contingency fund can be used any place. So if the Congress wants to keep its authority and wants to keep its hand on the till and wants to be told what these emergencies and contingencies are, then I think we have to make the administration come back here for authorization and study of policies by the committees of Congress who have jurisdiction.

So I recommend that my amendment be adopted giving the President $50 million for his contingency fund for the 90 days after enactment, to June 30, 1966. My amendment carries the figure of $100 million because there is $50 million there now and I increase it $50 million more so it makes it $100 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has expired.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have a substitute amendment and if the gentleman from New Jersey will yield so that I may offer my substitute amendment, he can then speak to both amendments.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I will yield the floor.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On the first page, strike out line 10 and all that follows down through line 3 on page 2.
>
> And renumber the following section accordingly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing complicated about this. I try always to offer amendments that are easily understood.

This amendment would simply strike out anything for the contingency fund. I offer the amendment for the reason, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said in part, that there was $50 million for the contingency fund in the regular appropriation bill for this year but not one dime was expended in Vietnam. This bill deals with Vietnam. Moreover, under the terms of this bill the contingency fund, if you vote $100 million more, can be spent anywhere in the world for anything at any time and at any place. There is nothing in this bill that would prohibit it. It can be used to pay the accounts of the deadbeats in the United Nations, for instance. Why I can think of 100 similar examples of how the money could be used. There is no limit.

There is no reason in the world why we should vote $100 million to beef up the contingency fund for a period of only 120 days, or until the end of the fiscal year.

How foolish could we possibly be, to vote a $100 million contingency fund here today in view of the fact that only $50 million was approved for this entire fiscal year and it was not necessary to spend a dime or a dollar of that amount in Vietnam.

Let reason prevail. I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, the reason no money was expended on Vietnam under the contingency this year was that we had a special contingency fund provided under section 451 of $89 million specifically obligated for Vietnam last year. That has all been used and all of it has been used in Vietnam. The additional $54 million which was in the contingency fund has already been programed. There is no money remaining in that fund whatsoever.

If we adopt this amendment, it would be the first time a President of the United States did not have a contingency fund.

In 1956 we had a $100 million contingency fund.

In 1957 we had a $100 million contingency fund.

In 1959 there was a $200 million contingency fund.

In 1960 there was a $155 million contingency fund.

In 1961 there was a $250 million contingency fund.

In 1962 there was a $300 million contingency fund.

These were the authorizations. I might say too that the Congress has language in the act now which states that if the President does not use the money for the purposes outlined or defined as a contingency, it must be returned to the Treasury.

In 1963 when the contingency fund was not completely used, $127 million was returned to the Treasury.

The fact of the matter is if we adopt this amendment, the President would be without any funds whatsoever to take care of any contingency that might arise in the Dominican Republic or in Vietnam or in any of the dozen flash points throughout the world. This would be the first time that the President of the United States would not be provided with a contingency fund by the Congress. I think that is not the intent of this body. We have never done it before to any President regardless of party, and I do not think we should start now. There is no money in the contingency fund now and I do think we owe it to the President and to ourselves to put this amount in the bill so that the President will have the money to provide for the security of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Page 2, line 3, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and by inserting immediately after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'Funds appropriated under this subsection after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, shall be available solely for use in Vietnam'."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if this bill is for the purpose of taking care of Vietnam, then let us take care of Vietnam. Let us not have any shilly-shallying around here. Unless you limit this, the money can be used to pay the dues, as I have said before of the deadbeats in the United Nations. It could be used to underwrite, so far as I know, the million dollars that the U.N. is extracting from American taxpayers to support the Technical College in Havana which is training Communists to carry out subversion and guerrilla warfare in Latin America.

This contingency fund, I say to you again, is wide open to be used in any part of the world at any time. If you mean what you say and say what you mean, adopt this amendment and at least see that the money is used in Vietnam.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This again is a limiting amendment which would tie the President's hands.

The definition of "contingency fund" since 1956, when Eisenhower was President, has limited the contingency fund to unforeseen emergencies. It has never been limited to any country any place in the world. The contingency fund has been available wherever the emergency occurred.

There has never been any limitation on the use of the contingency fund—never. If you are going to handcuff the President we might as well not even vote for this bill.

We are in a war. This money is needed. Let us trust our President with this money. Let us get ahead with our job so that the boys over there can go on with the job of winning this war.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I agree with everything that our Chairman has said. I would like to point out this situation. Suppose North Vietnam decided to send a division of troops into Thailand tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. We might then want some of this contingency fund in order to rush some reinforcement there.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I shall give you another example of how the contingency fund today is being used, and that is to finance the boycott of Rhodesia. I cannot help but wonder if we put $100 million into this fund, if the British decided to use military force in Rhodesia, whether the contingency fund would not be tapped either to finance them in that enterprise or to send American troops over there.

Mr. MORGAN. I have not investigated the situation of Rhodesia. This measure has nothing to do with Rhodesia. The contingency fund might be used to help the neighbors around Rhodesia, but it has nothing to do with the boycott of Rhodesia.

Mr. GROSS. It could be used to support the British in their boycott of Rhodesia.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. In addition to what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] pointed out, if there was no money in this contingency fund, we would not have it available to support troops if we had to send them into Thailand.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The question has come up as to whether at any time the contingency fund was specifically designated. I would point out that last year in chapter 5, contingency fund, section 451, the following statement appears:

> In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for use in southeast Asia such sums not to exceed $89 million as may be necessary in the fiscal year 1966 for programs authorized for parts I and II of this act.

So there has been a designation of a contingency fund by section on the $89 million bill we passed last year. So why the objection this year?

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is exactly the section I read to the gentleman when I opposed his amendment.

That was an additional sum. If he wants to earmark an additional sum for Vietnam, let us do it. All of that has been explained.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That is not the point.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I read that to the gentleman before. This was an additional amount.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The Chairman had said that there was no special designation.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to read it again. I have read it twice already. But if the gentleman wants to earmark a sum for Vietnam, let us do it, but let us not limit the President's authority to meet emergencies in other parts of the world.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have not participated in this debate, and in the pleasant climate of unanimity that seemed to prevail it had been my intention to remain silent, contenting myself with voting for the bill after the shouting was over.

But when my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, brought Rhodesia into the framework of the discussion, implying that there was something evil in our insistence upon equality among the people of that unhappy country, I could not in good conscience, continue to maintain my silence. Virtue, Mr. Chairman, is not something that is up for barter. Morality is not among the wares in the marketplace. Our position as regards Rhodesia is based upon our national morality and our sense of virtue, and it is certainly not a stance we have taken to please England or anyone else. It is the position that conforms to the still voice of conscience within our own people.

Our virtues and our moralities do not change with the scenery of different parts of the world. What we stand for, and fight for, and for which we give to the utmost in Vietnam, is that for which we stand and fight and give in Rhodesia.

It is the right of self-determination of peoples everywhere, their right themselves to determine by the will of the majority the kind of government under which they will live and the kind of lives they will make for themselves and their children.

I cannot make it too clear that the issue in Rhodesia is essentially the same as the issue in Vietnam. The brutal fact is that in Rhodesia the great majority of the men, women and children, the Africans by race and ancestry, are not permitted the right of suffrage and are denied equality of opportunity. That is a condition we as Americans cannot condone. It has no part in the world of freedom to which we belong and for which we are risking so much in Vietnam and elsewhere.

We are happy that the Government of Great Britain is similarly minded as to Rhodesia, and the right of the majority of the people of that country to control their own destiny. But we are not beholden to Britain, nor Britain to the United States, because our two countries think alike and act with similar response when the virtues and the moralities are in issue.

The United States stands for the right of self-determination in Vietnam and in Rhodesia, and all the world around.

That is all, Mr. Chairman. I give back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHAMBERLAIN

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: Page 2, line 3, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and by inserting immediately after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'No part of the funds appropriated under the preceding sentence after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, shall be used to provide assistance to any country which permits any ship or aircraft under its registry to transport any equipment, materials, or commodities to or from North Vietnam unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest of the United States and reports such determination to the Congress.' "

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered is one which eliminates a glaring loophole in existing legislation. It is my hope that Members of both sides of the aisle will join me in this effort to make clear, beyond doubt, the intent of the Congress to use the economic power of our Nation in support of the servicemen whom the Nation has sent to the south Asian theater.

This amendment is comprehensive in scope. It denies assistance from the United States to any nation that permits its vessels or aircraft to transport any goods of any kind to North Vietnam. It means simply that the U.S. taxpayer will not be providing support to any nation that is involved in the business of transporting goods to our enemies in this bitter struggle.

Under existing law, foreign aid provided by our taxpayers is withheld from nations whose ships transport strategic goods or items of economic assistance to North Vietnam. The present law is thus restricted to certain types of commodities. It does not prohibit the grant of assistance by the United States to a nation whose ships transport to North Vietnam nonstrategic articles which are sold on ordinary commercial terms.

I think it important that the intent of Congress be made clear by the adoption of this amendment. By its adoption the Congress issues a warning to the other nations of the world that they can expect no further help from the United States unless they cease carrying goods to North Vietnam.

The amendment which I am offering leaves an escape hatch for the President if he cares to use it. The amendment, following the provisions of existing legislation permits the President to waive its prohibition if he determines that withholding of assistance to any country affected by the amendment would be contrary to the national interest of the United States and reports such determination to the Congress. To avoid controversy at this time on the question of the latitude which the President should enjoy in the conduct of foreign relations, and after discussions with the distinguished chairman, I include this clause in the text of the amendment.

I recognize that attaching this amendment to this particular bill is in a sense a symbolic act since this measure provides assistance to only a few nations. None of the nations specified in the bill would, to my knowledge, be affected by the prohibition contained in my amendment. The measure, however, does provide a contingency fund, and my amendment could operate to prevent the grant of aid to some nations from this fund. Though the adoption of this amendment may be symbolic, it is important. It is important above all for the Congress to let Americans who are fighting in Vietnam know that they are supported by the full economic power of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely essential that we make the whole world aware of this country's unrelenting determination to bring an end to free world trade with Hanoi. The most recent report of the State Department, all but claiming elimination of this trade, is unfortunately premature. During last month, for instance, the unclassified report I received from the Department of Defense acknowledges that there were seven free world vessels in North Vietnam. But let no one take comfort in this figure for the truth is more than double that. We are, it would appear, returning to the level of traffic that existed 6 months ago.

We, especially here in Congress, must not let a single opportunity pass that offers the prospect of creating a roadblock for those who would profiteer while others die to safeguard freedom.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, because H.R. 12169 is described as a supplemental foreign assistance authorization, it is most necessary for some of us who have over the years opposed foreign aid to express our views on this bill for the record.

If this were just another broad program of foreign aid I would have no recourse but to oppose such an authorization. The question must be put bluntly, Is this only another worldwide foreign aid program? The report accompanying this bill written by the chairman of our Committee on Foreign Affairs makes it very clear and plain that what is involved here are additional funds primarily for Vietnam, closely related to our war effort there.

As we read the provisions of the bill itself it becomes apparent that to reach the objective stated in the report it must be amended to certain sections of the 1961 act. For the reason that there are no limitations spelled out in the bill earmarking these funds for Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand it would seem that the purpose contained in the report should be included with equal particularity in the bill itself. It is for such reason that I have supported the amendment which circumscribes the great bulk of these funds for Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand and I am hopeful that through some parliamentary procedure, perhaps by a motion to recommit, there may be a record vote that would leave no doubt that these funds are not simply more foreign aid funds but instead special purpose funding for use in the war in southeast Asia.

This morning it was my privilege as a member of the House Armed Services Committee to hear a report from Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY who had returned only last evening from an extended trip to Vietnam, Australia, India, and the Philippines. The Vice President emphasized that the recent Honolulu conference was a turning point because there a determination was reached that we should not only continue to wage the military struggle against the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese but at Honolulu we committed ourselves to carry on another war against misery, hunger, illiteracy, poverty, and disease throughout South Vietnam. I came away from this briefing convinced that we have an aggravated problem to deal with in South Vietnam that ranks almost equal in importance to our military effort to stop the Communist aggression.

The funds authorized by this bill are for such worthwhile projects as port expansion, refugee relief, and rural reconstruction. Who can say these activities are anything but just another face of the war. Along with many others I have opposed foreign aid consistently and repeatedly over the past several years. It is my intention to oppose indiscriminate handouts in the future. It should be clear enough that there is a sharp difference between peacetime economic assistance to the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America, on the one hand and special wartime help to Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand.

One of the differences which immediately rises to the surface of any discussion is the fact that frequently in the past we have left behind a package of aid without adequate administrative personnel to direct or maintain an oversight of its use. On the contrary, in Vietnam and the neighboring countries of Laos and Thailand this present aid will be completely geared or meshed to the military effort. Much of the opposition to foreign aid in so many parts of the world has been based on its maladministration, for many long years. Opposition has been outspoken because military assistance has been contained in the same package with economic aid. It has never made very good sense to me for military assistance to be administered by the State Department rather than by qualified, experienced military personnel. It was good news to learn the President has recommended that in the future no military operations be financed by the Foreign Assistance Act. Notwithstanding this pronouncement for the future, it seems to me we have some good assurance because of the presence of our topflight military commanders in southeast Asia that this special or particular allocation of foreign assistance will in fact be just as much military assistance as if so titled or labeled.

We must remind ourselves anew that it is the presence of our military forces that have created some of the problems of the Vietnamese people. Their government is completely helpless to expand its revenues by taxation, yet they are faced with vital work of repairing war damage to their bridges and highways. They have a huge refugee bill that must be met.

Equally as important as the repair of damage is the counterinsurgency measures such as restoring of farms, and combating disease, in order that the rural population may be given a renewed will to carry on their resistance against the Vietcong.

In Laos there are areas that are now being contested by the Communists and some must be supplied by air. In portions of northeast Thailand the civilian population is being subjected to virtually the same terrorist tactics of murder and assassination as in South Vietnam. Who can argue that funds to strengthen the police units patrolling these besieged northeast Thailand communities is anything but a military effort?

In a word, under the circumstances of the present moment the real justification for H.R. 12169 is embodied in the proposition that if we don't send this $275 million to Vietnam and the additional $15 million to Laos and Thailand, then the remaining alternative is that we are going to have to send more American troops. The choice between our alternatives is made easy.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. I just want to say that I have followed the gentleman's work on this amendment since early last year. I know he has devoted a great deal of time and study to the ships going to North Vietnam. I have read with interest the last several insertions and speeches he has put in the RECORD on this subject.

I have examined the amendment very carefully, and it conforms with the so-called Castro-Cuban amendment. I think it is a good amendment and, speaking for the Committee on Foreign Affairs, we will accept it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to extend my thanks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Funds made available pursuant to section 1 of this Act shall be available for transfer for expenses authorized by section 637(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and incurred in connection with programs in the Republic of Vietnam.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 610(b) of such Act, which relates to transfer between accounts, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Not to exceed $1,400,000 of the funds appropriated under section 402 of this Act after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, may be transferred to and consolidated with appropriations made under section 637 (a) of this Act for such fiscal year, subject to the limitations of subsection (a) of this section and subject to the further limitation that funds so transferred shall be available solely for administrative expenses incurred in connection with programs in the Republic of Vietnam."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 742, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put then en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. **DERWINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The **SPEAKER**. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. **DERWINSKI**. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DERWINSKI moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 12169) to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On the first page, immediately after line 9, insert the following:

"(c) Immediately after the first sentence, insert the following: 'Funds appropriated under this section after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, shall be available solely for use in the following countries and within the following dollar limitations: Not to exceed $275,000.000 shall be available solely for use in Vietnam, not to exceed $7,500,000 shall be available solely for use in Laos, not to exceed $7,500,000 shall be available solely for use in Thailand, and not to exceed $25,000,000 shall be available solely for use in the Dominican Republic.' "

Mr. **MORGAN**. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 169, nays 213, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

YEAS—169

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashmore
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Callaway
Carter
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Everett
Findley
Fino
Ford, Gerald R.
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gettys
Goodell
Gross
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Henderson
Herlong
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Moore
Morton
Mosher
Murray
Nelsen
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Stephens
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

NAYS—213

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Beckworth
Bell
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Clark
Clevenger
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Duncan, Oreg.
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hardy
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kupferman
Leggett
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meeds
Mills
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Murphy, Ill
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Redlin
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Selden
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vivian
Weltner
White, Tex.
Wright
Yates
Young

NOT VOTING—50

Ashbrook
Baldwin
Bandstra
Bolling
Burleson
Casey
Cederberg
Chelf
Clausen, Don H.
Cohelan
Dague
Dawson
Dorn
Dowdy
Dyal
Edwards, La.
Farnsley
Fisher
Grider
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Kee
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Landrum
Mackay
Matthews
Miller
Moorhead
Multer
Rivers, S.C.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Saylor
Scott
Senner
Smith, Iowa
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Vigorito
Watts
White, Idaho
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Zablocki

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. White of Idaho against.

Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Senner against.

Mr. Dowdy for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.

Mr Scott for, with Mr. Grider against.

Mr. Saylor for, with Mr. Zablocki against.

Mr. Harvey of Indiana for, with Mr. Cohelan against.

Mr. King of New York for, with Mr. Rostenkowski against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. Hansen of Iowa against.

Mr. Cederberg for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Mackay against.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia for, with Mr. Miller against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Multer with Mr. Dague.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Matthews with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Casey with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Watts.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Farnsley.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Chelf with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Dyal.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. **MORGAN**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 350, nays 27, answered "present" 3, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS—350

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Collier
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Devine
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley

Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lipscomb

Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Michel
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke

Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vivian
Waggonner
Watson
Weltner
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger

NAYS—27

Abbitt
Ashmore
Brown, Calif.
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Derwinski
Dickinson
Fuqua
Gross

Gurney
Haley
Hall
Ichord
Lennon
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pool
Rogers, Tex.

Satterfield
Shipley
Smith, Va.
Stephens
Tuck
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Williams

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Conyers
Diggs
Powell

NOT VOTING—52

Ashbrook
Baldwin
Bandstra
Bolling
Burleson
Carey

Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chelf
Clausen, Don H.

Cohelan
Colmer
Dague
Dawson
Dorn
Dowdy

Dyal
Edwards, La.
Farnsley
Fisher
Grider
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert

Kee
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Landrum
Mackay
Matthews
Miller
Mize
Moorhead
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Saylor

Scott
Senner
Smith, Iowa
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Vigorito
Watts
White, Idaho
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Zablocki

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. Zablocki for, with Mr. Dowdy against.

Mr. Miller for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Dyal for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Cederberg for, with Mrs. Roudebush against.

Mr. King of New York for, with Mr. Saylor against.

Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Mr. Kornegay for, with Mr. Hagan of Georgia against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Mize.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Mackay with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Dague.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mr. Senner with Mr. Teague of Texas.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Casey.

Mr. Farnsley with Mr. Chelf.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Matthews.

Mr. Grider with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Vigorito.

Mr. Hansen of Iowa with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. ABERNETHY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the Members of the House to the address by the President of the United States last night on the occasion of receiving the National Freedom Award in New York City. The President delivered one of his greatest speeches, a speech which manifested not only strength but also the resolution of the President of the United States, which is shared by this House and by the people of this country, to the cause of human freedom.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the majority leader for calling to the attention of the House the magnificent address made by the President of the United States last evening in New York. It spells out with great clarity why we are in Vietnam and what our objectives are.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I should also like to commend the Members of the House of Representatives on both sides of the aisle for the responsible attitude that they have taken as Americans and not as Republicans or Democrats in supporting our Nation's determination to resist naked Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman from Louisiana has said, and I associate myself with his remarks. I do not know whether it is as well known as it should be around the country, but I can assert with complete confidence that the House of Representatives and its Members in overwhelming numbers support the policy of the United States in South Vietnam. We have whatever will, whatever determination is required to see the job through to a victorious conclusion. We will not falter. We will not fail.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert with my remarks the text of the President's message in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 24, 1966]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S REMARKS AT THE FREEDOM AWARDS

Twenty-five years ago—to a world darkened by war—President Franklin Roosevelt described the Four Freedoms of mankind:

Freedom of speech and expression.

Freedom of every person to worship God in his own way.

Freedom from want.

Freedom from fear.

Franklin Roosevelt knew that these freedoms could not be the province of one people alone. He called on his countrymen to assist those who endured the tyrant's bombs and suffered his oppression.

He called for courage—for generosity—for resolution in the face of terror. He said that:

"Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights—or keep them."

Wendell Willkie—Franklin Roosevelt's opponent in the campaign of 1940—shared his belief that freedom could not be founded only on American shores or only for those whose skin is white. "Freedom is an indivisible word," he said. "If we want to enjoy it, and fight for it, we must be prepared to extend it to everyone, whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us or not, no matter what their race or the color of their skin."

That was Republican policy 25 years ago. It was Democratic policy 25 years ago. It is American policy tonight.

How well have we done in our time in making the four freedoms real for our people, and for the people of the world?

Here in America we accord every man the right to worship as he wills. I believe we are more tolerant of religious or sectional differences than we were a quarter of a century ago. The majority of our people believe that a qualified man or woman—of any race—any religion—any section—could hold any office in the land. This was not so clear in 1940.

We are committed, now—however great the trial and tension—to protecting the right of free expression and peaceful dissent. We have learned to despise the witch hunt—the unprincipled harassment of a man's integrity and his right to be different. We have gained in tolerance—and I am determined to use the high office I hold to protect and encourage that tolerance.

I do not mean to say that I will remain altogether silent on the critical issues of our day. For just as strongly as I believe in other men's freedom to disagree, so do I believe in the President's freedom to persuade. Let me assure you that I will do everything in my power to defend both.

AMERICAN RECORD

Twenty-five years ago "freedom from want" had the ring of urgency for our people. The unemployment rate stood at 14½ percent. Millions of Americans had spent the last decade in the breadlines or on farms where the winds howled away any chance for a decent life.

Tonight there are still millions whose poverty haunts our conscience. There are still fathers without jobs and children without hope.

Yet for the vast majority of Americans, these are times when the hand of plenty has replaced the grip of want. For the first time in almost 9 years, the unemployment rate has fallen to 4 percent.

This liberation from want—for which we thank God—is a testimony to the enduring vitality of our competitive economy.

It is a testimony also to an enlightened public policy, established by Franklin Roosevelt and strengthened by every administration since his death.

That policy has freed Americans for more hopeful, more productive lives.

It has relieved their fears of growing old—by social security and medicare.

It has inspired them with hope for their children—by aid to elementary and higher education.

It has helped to create economic opportunity—by enlightened fiscal policies.

It has granted to millions, born into hopeless deprivation, the chance of a new start in life—by public works, private incentive, and poverty programs.

For the Negro American, it has opened the door—after centuries of enslavement and discrimination—to the blessings America offers to those willing and able to earn them.

Thus we address the spirit of Franklin Roosevelt, 25 years after his message to America and the world, with confidence and with an unflagging determination. We have served his vision of the four freedoms essential to mankind—here in America.

DENIED ELSEWHERE

Yet we know he did not speak only for America. We know that the four freedoms are not secure in America when they are violently denied elsewhere in the world.

We know, too, that it requires more than speeches to resist the international enemies of freedom. We know that men respond to deeds when they are deaf to words. Even the precious word "freedom" may become empty to those without the means to use it.

For what does freedom mean when famine chokes the land; when new millions crowd upon already strained resources; when narrow privilege is entrenched behind law and custom; when all conspires to teach men that they cannot change the conditions of their lives?

I do not need to tell you how five administrations have labored to give real meaning to "freedom"—in a world where it is often merely a phrase that conceals oppression and neglect.

Men in this room—men throughout America—have given their skills and treasure to that work. You have warned our people how insatiable is aggression—and how it thrives on human misery.

You have carried the word—that without the sense that they can change the conditions of their lives, nothing can avail the oppressed of this earth—neither good will, nor national sovereignty, nor massive grants of aid from their more fortunate brothers.

You have known, too, that men who believe they can change their destinies will change them.

Armed with that belief, they will be willing—yes, eager—to make the sacrifices that freedom demands. They will be anxious to shoulder the responsibilities that are inseparably bound to freedom.

They will be able to look beyond the four essential freedoms:

To the freedom to learn, to master new skills, to acquaint themselves with the lore of man and nature.

To the freedom to grow, to become the best that is within them to become, to cast off the yoke of discrimination and disease.

To the freedom to hope, and to build on that hope, lives of integrity and well-being.

This is what our struggle in Vietnam is about. This is what our struggle for equal rights in this country is about.

We seek to create that climate—at home and abroad—where unlettered men can learn, where deprived children can grow, where hopeless millions can be inspired to change the terms of their existence for the better.

THREAT OF TERROR

That climate cannot be created where terror fills the air.

Children cannot learn—men cannot earn their bread—women cannot heal the sick—where the night of violence has blotted out the sun.

Whether in the cities and hamlets of Vietnam, or in the ghettoes of our own cities, the struggle is the same. It is to end the violence against the human mind and body—so that the work of peace may be done, and the fruits of freedom won.

We are pitting the resources of the law—of education and training—of our vision and our compassion—against that violence here at home. And we shall end it—in our time.

On the other side of the earth, we are no less committed to ending violence against men who are struggling to be free.

It is about that commitment that I wish to speak now.

Tonight, in Vietnam, more than 200,000 young Americans fight for freedom. Tonight our people are determined that these men shall have whatever help they need and that their cause—which is our cause—shall be sustained.

But in these last days there have been questions about what we are doing in Vietnam, and these questions have been answered loudly and clearly for every citizen to see and hear. The strength of America can never be sapped by discussion—and we have no better or stronger tradition than open debate in hours of danger. We believe, with Macaulay, that men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely.

We are united in our commitment to free discussion. So also we are united in our determination that no foe anywhere should mistake our arguments for indecision—or our debates for weakness.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

What are the questions that are still being asked?

First, some ask if this is a war for unlimited objectives. The answer is plain: It is "No." Our purpose in Vietnam is to prevent the success of aggression. It is not conquest; it is not empire; it is not foreign bases; it is not domination.

It is to prevent the forceful conquest of South Vietnam by North Vietnam.

Second, some ask if we are caught in a blind escalation of force that is pulling us headlong toward a wider war that no one wants. The answer—again—is "No." We are using that force—and only that force—necessary to stop the aggression. Our fighting men are in Vietnam because tens of thousands of invaders came south before them. Our numbers have increased—because the aggression of others has increased. The high hopes of the aggressor have been dimmed, and the tide of the battle has turned. Our measured use of force must be continued. But this is prudent firmness under careful control. There is not, and there will not be, a mindless escalation.

Third, others ask if our fighting men are to be denied the help they need. The answer is again, and will be, a resounding "No." Our great Military Establishment has moved 200,000 men across 10,000 miles since last spring.

These men have, and will have, what they need to fight the aggressor. They have already performed miracles in combat. The men behind them have worked miracles of supply—building new ports, transporting new equipment, opening new roads.

The American forces of freedom are strong today in South Vietnam. And we will keep them so. They are led by a brilliant and resourceful commander—Gen. William C. Westmoreland. He knows the needs of war and he supports the works of peace. When he asks for more Americans to help the men he has, his requests will be immediately studied, and, as I promised last July, his needs will be met.

Fourth, some ask if our men go alone to Vietnam—if we alone respect our great commitment in the southeast Asia treaty. Still again the answer is "No." We have seven allies in SEATO and five of them are giving vital support, each with his own strength and in his own way, to the cause of freedom in southeast Asia.

Fifth, some ask about the risk of wider war—perhaps against the vast land armies of Red China. And again the answer is "No," never by any act of ours—and not if there is any reason left behind the wild words from Peiping.

We have threatened no one—and we will not.

We seek the end of no regime—and we will not.

Our purpose is solely to defend against aggression. To any armed attack, we will reply. We have measured the strength—and the weakness—of others, and we know our own. We observe in ourselves—and we applaud in others—a careful restraint in action. We can live with anger in word as long as it is matched by caution in deed.

Sixth, men ask if we rely on guns alone. Still again the answer is "No." From our Honolulu meeting, from the clear pledge which joins us with our allies in Saigon, there has emerged a common dedication to the peaceful progress of the people of Vietnam—to schools for their children, to care for their health, to hope and bounty for their land.

The Vice President returned today from his constructive and highly successful visit to Saigon and other capitals, and he tells me that he and Ambassador Lodge have found a new conviction and purpose in South Vietnam—for the battle against want and injustice as well as the battle against aggression.

So the pledge of Honolulu will be kept, and the pledge of Baltimore stands open—to help the men of the North when they have the wisdom to be ready.

We Americans must understand how fundamental is the meaning of this second war—the war on want. I talked on my farm last fall with Secretary Freeman, and in my office last week with Secretary Gardner—making, over and over again, the same central point: The breeding ground of war is human misery. If we are not to fight forever in faraway places—in Europe, or the far Pacific, or the jungles of Africa, or the suburbs of Santo Domingo, then we must learn to get at the roots of violence. As a nation we must magnify our struggle against world hunger and illiteracy and disease. We must bring hope to men whose lives now end at two score or less. Without that hope—without progress in this war on want—we will be called to fight again and again, as we must today.

Seventh, men ask who has a right to rule in South Vietnam. Our answer there is what it has been here for 200 years: The people must have this right—the South Vietnamese people—and no one else. Washington will not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. Hanoi shall not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. We will insist for ourselves on what we require from Hanoi: respect for the principle of government by the consent of the governed. We stand for self-determination—for free elections—and we will honor their result.

Eighth, men ask if we are neglecting any hopeful chance of peace. And the answer is "No." A great servant of peace, Secretary Rusk, has sent the message of peace on every wire and by every hand to every continent. A great pleader for peace, Arthur Goldberg, has worked at home and abroad in this same cause. Their undiscouraged efforts will continue. How much wiser it would have been, how much more compassionate toward its own people, if Hanoi had come to the bargaining table at the close of the year. Then the 7,000 Communist troops who have died in battle since January 1—and the many thousands who have been wounded in that same period—could have lived at peace with their fellow men. Today—as then—Hanoi has the opportunity to end the increasing toll the war is taking on those under its command.

Ninth. Some ask how long we must bear this burden. To that question—in all honesty—I can give no answer tonight. During the Battle of Britain, when that nation stood alone in 1940, Winston Churchill gave no answer to that question. When the forces of freedom were driven from the Philippines, President Roosevelt could not and did not name the date we would return. If the aggressor persists in Vietnam, the struggle may be long. Our men in battle know and accept this hard fact. We who are at home can do as much. There is no computer that can tell the hour and day of peace, but we do know that it will come only to the steadfast—never to the weak in heart.

Tenth. And finally, men ask if it is worth it. I think you know the answer. It is the answer that Americans have given for a quarter of a century, wherever American strength has been pledged to prevent aggression. The contest in Vietnam is confused and hard, and many of its forms are new. Yet our purpose and policy are unchanged.

Our men in Vietnam are there to keep a promise made 12 years ago. The Southeast Asia Treaty promised—as Secretary John Foster Dulles said for the United States—"that an attack upon the treaty area would occasion a reaction so united, so strong, and so well placed that the aggressor would lose more than it could hope to gain." But we keep more than a specific treaty promise in Vietnam. We keep the faith for freedom.

PRESIDENTS' PLEDGES

Four Presidents have pledged to keep that faith.

The first was Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his state of the Union message 25 years ago. He said:

"We are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations for our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers. We know that enduring peace cannot be bought at the cost of other people's freedom."

The second was Harry S. Truman, in 1947, at a historic turning point in the history of guerrilla warfare—and of Greece and Turkey and the United States. These were his words:

"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

"I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way."

The third was Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his first inaugural address. He promised this:

"Realizing that commonsense and common decency alike dictate the futility of appeasement, we shall never try to placate an aggressor by the false and wicked bargain of trading honor for security. Americans, indeed, all freemen, remember that in the final choice a soldier's pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner's chains."

And then 5 years ago, John F. Kennedy, on the cold bright noon of his first day in office, proclaimed:

"Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

This is the American tradition. Built in free discussion, proven on a hundred battlefields, rewarded by a progress at home that has no match in history, it beckons us forward now to the work of peace in Vietnam.

We will build freedom while we fight, and we will seek peace every day by every honorable means. But we will persevere along the high hard road of freedom. We are too old to be foolhardy and too young to be tired—too strong for fear and too determined for retreat.

Each evening when I retire, I take up—from a bedside table—reports from the battlefront and from the capitals of the world. They tell me how our men have fared that day in the hills and valleys of Vietnam. They tell me what hope there seems to be that the message of peace will be heard, and this tragic war ended.

I read of individual acts of heroism—of dedicated men and women whose valor matches that of any generation that has gone before. I read of men risking their lives to save others—of men giving their lives for freedom.

Always among these reports are a few letters from the men themselves.

If there is doubt among some here at home about our purposes in Vietnam, I do not find it reflected in these letters. Our soldiers, our marines, our airmen, our sailors, know why they are in Vietnam. They know—as five Presidents have known—how inseparably bound together are America's freedom and the freedom of her friends in the world.

Tonight I ask each citizen to join me—in the homes and meeting places our men are fighting to keep free from oppression—in a prayer for their safety.

I ask you to join me in a pledge to the cause for which they fight—the cause of human freedom.

I ask you for your help—for your understanding and your commitment—so that this united people may show forth to the world that America has not ended the only struggle worthy of man's unceasing sacrifice—the struggle to be free.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to sponsor legislation that would make permanent the school milk program. This act may be cited as the Children's Special Milk Act.

I include myself among that large group of Members of this body who were shocked at the proposed slash of $82 million in the school milk program.

In the President's budget message of January 24, we were told that "many older and lower priority activities" would have to be reduced or eliminated "in order to finance the costs of our efforts in southeast Asia."

It is obvious that a certain belt-tightening is in order as a result of our grave obligations in southeast Asia.

But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the health and nutrition of our Nation's youngsters, cannot and must not be a matter of lower priority in the wide ranging concerns of our National Government.

I do not intend to belabor my colleagues with a statistical-studded brief on the acceptance and growth of the school milk program, how much true good it has accomplished, and how vital it is to millions of schoolchildren.

However, an eloquent insight to the value of this program can be obtained from the following letter I received from B. T. Smith, administrator of a school district in northern Wisconsin.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Smith's letter at this point in my remarks:

JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 1,
Winter, Wis., February 17, 1966.

Hon. JOHN RACE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE RACE: Communications are coming in to me with regard to the possibility of cutting off a good percentage of the funds for Public Law 874, for National Defense Education Act, and for the school milk program. All these programs are of great concern to us here in northern Wisconsin—as I suspect they are in other communities where the income per family is very low.

Our school district for which we are directly concerned is made up largely from low-income families. We have 30 or more children from families living on nontaxable lands. These families contribute nothing in helping to finance the cost of schools or their municipal governments. Yet their children need and deserve an education—and they need food. Some of these families have insufficient income to provide family necessities.

Much is being done in this, our country to combat poverty—but on the other hand, the young people in our area have been denied work programs. To take away the aid from Public Law 874 means that others in our area will have to provide school lunches for the children of needy parents and they will also have to furnish them with teachers.

The programs I have mentioned above have helped us a great deal but to take them away will hurt not only the children of the area—it will hurt all of us. Our school taxes are up to the limit now so cutting down on the programs, National Defense Education Act, Public Law 874, and the school milk program, will mean a definite problem for us.

If there is a desire to help people who have low incomes, or are impoverished, the programs as they now stand have helped. The other antipoverty programs have not helped us in any way.

Our board of education met last evening and each member was much concerned about the possible legislation to cut the aids mentioned above.

I am sure that you, as Representative, will realize that these losses will affect your areas, too.

I hope that you can find it in your heart to move against any bill to cut these funds.

My best regards to you.

B. T. Smith,
Administrator.

Yes, I do find it in my heart to move against any bill that would scuttle a program that has proved itself so valuable to children and their families in every State of our Nation.

I think I can say without contradiction that I represent a district which ranks as one of the top three of four districts in this country in milk production. We in the Sixth District of Wisconsin—a district that has more cows than people—are fully aware of the nutritional values of milk and dairy products.

For generation after generation the people of my district have been producing milk products for the Nation. The people of my district have contributed enormously to the health and vitality of all Americans, all too often at the expense of a full share of our national prosperity.

Thousands of Wisconsin dairy farmers have continued to serve the Nation's needs, hoping against hope it seems, that sooner or later the Nation would take them in as equal sharers in our prosperity.

Many thousands of others have been forced to abandon that hope and are now leaving their farms at alarming rates. Now, our National Government seems to be trying to kick them off the farms, at the very time it should be taking drastic measures to halt the bolt.

Has our Government grown so big, and so calloused, and so out-of-touch with reality that we have come to the incredible situation of having some budget bureaucrat, or even computer, sit in an office here in Washington and announce that hereafter little children no longer need milk? That the Nation no longer needs dairy farmers? That bullets and bombs for southeast Asia are more important than the health of our Nation's youngsters?

I pray that such a time and circumstance never occur in this country.

Yes, I represent thousands of dairy farmers.

But I also represent in this Congress of the United States the interests of my Nation and its people.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I serve notice that I will not and cannot go along with a budget bureaucrat's decision to strangle the school milk program.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record my bill which would make the school milk program a permanent program, with a funding of $110 million for fiscal 1957.

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Children's Special Milk Act".

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed, under such rules and regulations as he may deem in the public interest, to encourage the consumption of fluid milk by children in the United States in (1) nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, and (2) nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children. For the purposes of this Act "United States" means the fifty States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

Sec. 3. All sums appropriated under this Act, less such amounts as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable and necessary for his administrative costs and reserves, shall be allocated at the earliest possible date for the use of nonprofit schools and other nonprofit institutions desiring to participate in the program and shall be used to reimburse such nonprofit schools and other nonprofit institutions for fluid milk served to children. Any such allocation, or portion thereof, which the Secretary shall determine will not be fully utilized by any such nonprofit school or other nonprofit institution as then allocated, shall be reallocated by the Secretary so as to accomplish maximum use of such funds.

Sec. 4. For the purpose of carrying out this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, not less than $110,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, not less than $115,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and each succeeding fiscal year thereafter, not less than $120,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, under unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, I submit certain communications I have received on the subject of the proposed curtailment of funds for the school milk program:

Milk Industry Foundation,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1966.

Hon. John A. Race,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Race: We solicit your support for continuance of the special milk program which in fiscal year 1965 was used by 92,005 schools and child care institutions where 2,966,800,000 half pints of milk were consumed. By comparison, 70,132 schools participated in the national school lunch program and used 2,876,150,103 half pints of milk in fiscal 1965.

This usage of milk aggregated nearly 3 billion pounds. Had this milk not been so used, there can be little doubt that it would have been acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation in the form of nonfat dry milk, butter, and cheese, since approximately 5.7 billion pounds on a milk equivalent basis was actually acquired. The direct cost at the present support price would have been $103 million, the exact amount Congress appropriated for the special milk program for fiscal 1966. In addition, there would have been the cost of acquiring, handling, packaging, and transporting the products which would have been made from the 3 billion pounds of milk used in the school lunch and school milk programs.

While commercial consumption has shown a gain during the past year and some further gain is expected this year, it now appears that an estimated 3 to 4 billion pounds of milk in the form of nonfat dry milk, butter and cheese will be acquired under the price support program in 1966.

In the light of these circumstances it makes extremely good sense to continue the special milk program. Nearly 22,000 more schools and child care institutions use this program than use the school lunch program. More children are benefited by having a nutritious energy-giving food in the form of milk.

At a time when our Government is spending millions of dollars to rehabilitate school dropouts, is enlarging the food stamp program, and carrying on a war against poverty, it is inconsistent to curtail a program that adds to the health, energy, and vitality of children who are in school and thereby helps them to stay in school. This is especially true with respect to the 22,000 schools and institutions which, because of lack of facilities, funds, or for other reasons do not have a school lunch program.

We of the Milk Industry Foundation, a trade association of milk processors having members doing business in every State of the Nation, including of course your State, respectfully request your help in maintaining the special milk program at a level where all schools and child institutions wishing to participate may do so.

Sincerely,

Robert H. North,
Executive Director.

Wisconsin Council of Agricultural Cooperatives,
Madison, Wis., February 11, 1966.

Congressman John A. Race,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Race: The Wisconsin Council of Agricultural Cooperatives strongly protests the proposed unprecedented 1967 budget cut of $82 million for the special milk program for schoolchildren. We urge that the special milk program budgets be restored to $103 million, the current appropriation; preferably funds for this program should be authorized at $115 million.

The proposed reduction of $19 million in the school lunch program should also be restored by Congress.

A reduction of the size proposed is tantamount to complete elimination of the special milk program. Complete elimination would divert about 1.5 billion pounds of milk now consumed as fluid milk into manufactured dairy products.

USDA reports indicate the price for milk eligible for fluid consumption was $4.63 per cwt. in 1965—compared to $3.33 for milk used for manufacturing. The difference in the two prices is $1.30 per cwt. The 1.5 billion pounds of milk times $1.30 per cwt. would mean a loss of $19.5 million in dairy farmers' purchasing power.

The special milk program is one of our most effective vehicles for insuring good eating habits and at the same time improving diets of all children. Certainly this important aspect of the program should not be based on ability to pay.

Does the administration realize how much milk consumption in schools will decline if the cost per half-pint is increased? A study in Chicago schools revealed that an increase of 1 cent per half-pint on white milk and chocolate milk reduced consumption by 40 percent. This fact alone should give cause for serious reconsideration of the proposed action.

We urgently request that you do your utmost to combat efforts to reduce the special milk program appropriations. The program, as we know it, has the support of not only dairy farmers but the general public as well. Our younger generation would be dealt a disservice by the U.S. Congress if appropriations for this program are dropped below the current level.

Sincerely yours,

Charles L. Farr,
Dairy Economist.

Wisconsin Council of Agricultural Cooperatives,
Madison, Wis., February 11, 1966.

Congressman John A. Race,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Race: The Wisconsin Council of Agricultural Cooperatives directs your attention to the serious situation facing dairy farmers in Wisconsin. Now underway is a serious downtrend in the Nation's milk production—resulting from farmers leaving dairying, severe culling of cows and inferior quality feed. The situation could be alleviated by increasing the level of the support price for manufactured grade milk (currently at $3.24 per cwt. for 3.72 percent butterfat milk). The increase in the support price for milk would be achieved by increasing the purchase prices for butter, cheese, and powder at which the Commodity Credit Corporation would pay for dairy products under the price support program.

U.S. milk production for October 1965 was 2.3 percent under the previous year; November, 3 percent; and December, 4 percent. Total production for this period in 1965 totaled 28.2 billion pounds; the lowest since 1960 when production for the same period was 27.7 billion pounds. If milk deliveries continue at these levels for 1966, total production could approximate 123 billion pounds—down 2.5 billion pounds from 1965. A decline in milk production on U.S. farms of this magnitude would reduce supplies to minimum levels.

Support purchases of dairy products for 1965 accounted for 5.7 billion pounds of milk equivalent—compared to 7.7 billion pounds in 1964. The 1965 figures are the lowest since 1960 when purchases amounted to 3 billion pounds of milk equivalent. If the decline in farm production materializes and commercial demand continues upward, there will not be adequate stocks of dairy products available to meet total demand for products in the fall months. Thus, support purchases would be nonexistent except for the flush (spring) months of production.

Dairy farmers' income would be improved through the increase in support price. Thus, dairy farmers would be in a stronger position to meet the ever rising production costs and the Nation would have ample supplies of milk and dairy products—essential for an adequate diet.

An immediate increase in the support price for milk is vital to the butter-powder industry. Currently, the butter and powder prices are near support levels and the gross return to a dairy plant for 100 pounds of 3.5 percent butterfat milk processed into butter-powder is approximately $3.68 (59.33 cents times 4.2 pounds butter plus 14.54 cents times 8.2 pounds powder). However, because of the strong cheese market, Wisconsin butter-powder plants report paying prices from $3.60 to 3.75 per hundredweight for farm bulk tank manufactured milk. Margins are barely adequate, if adequate, for defraying production costs (labor, depreciation, and supplies). Immediate relief is needed or many persons will suffer financial losses, plants will close, jobs will be lost, and farmers will be without markets.

The current cheddar cheese price is quoted at 41.75 cents per pound for 40-pound blocks—compared to a support price of 36.1 cents per pound. Thus, an upward adjustment in the support price will have no immediate effect on the cheese market, but will improve the financial position of the butter-powder plants.

If the dairy industry develops an export market (commercial and payment in kind) and the Government fulfills its obligation for dairy products in foreign lands, a steady supply is essential.

Supplemental to the price support program is the authority given to the Secretary of Agriculture in section 709 of the 1965 act to purchase dairy products on the open market to fulfill commitments.

We cannot stress strongly enough the urgency of the depressed and chaotic conditions facing dairy farmers, the dairy industry and the economy of Wisconsin. Therefore, your deliberate and forthright action in raising the level of the support price for manufactured milk is solicited.

Sincerely yours,

Charles L. Farr,
Dairy Economist.

The Dairy Council of Milwaukee,
Brookfield, Wis., February 15, 1966.

Hon. John Race,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Race: America's future rests squarely on the youth of today. To insure a steady growth in a strong, healthy, vigorous America, we must develop a strong, healthy, vigorous group of junior citizens. No other Federal programs have proven themselves like the school lunch and the school milk programs have, in providing the nutrition and proper diet, so necessary to the development of fertile minds and healthy bodies.

The proposed reduction in funds for the school lunch and school milk programs in the national budget, does not appear to be congruous with an increase in the budget for the poverty program and foreign aid. It is false reasoning to deprive schoolchildren of the nutritional benefits of their programs which have no readymade distribution supervision.

We urge you to use every avenue open to you to restore the budget on the school lunch and school milk programs to adequate levels.

Sincerely yours,
The Dairy Council of Milwaukee,
Edwin Schmidt, *Secretary.*

Allenton, Wis.,
January 26, 1966.

Hon. John A. Race,
U.S. Congressman,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Race: I am a dairy farmer in the town of Wayne, Washington County, Wis., and I urgently plead with you to make available sufficient funds for the school milk and lunch program. The cut in the budget is surely going to hurt the farmer and is not good for the youngsters in school. Milk is good, pure food. I'm sure it's money well spent.

Sincerely,

Paul L. Schmitt.

Pure Milk Products Cooperative,
Fond du Lac, Wis., January 26, 1966.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: In behalf of some 15,000 dairy farmer members of Pure Milk Products Cooperative and hundreds of thousands of other farmers, school systems, children and their parents, this letter is to inform you that there is deep concern everywhere at efforts on the part of the executive branch of our Government to bring about the announced sharp reduction in the school lunch and school milk programs.

We are greatly concerned with the budget proposal which would cut the school milk appropriation for the coming fiscal year to little more than a third of current appropriations and reduce sharply the school lunch funds.

These programs have provided vital contributions to the nourishment of millions of schoolchildren who might otherwise suffer from malnutrition or lack of an adequate and balanced diet. To curtail these important programs, is to shortchange the children of our Nation, and to further encourage a lack of physical fitness on the part of youth of our country. It is inconceivable that we should shortchange our own children under the pretext of a balanced budget, while devoting hundreds of millions of dollars to foreign aid programs.

Not only are these school milk and school lunch programs important in meeting the nutritional needs of our children, they are also important factors in the building of proper diet habits in citizens of the future, and in establishing and maintaining markets present and in the future for the hard-pressed dairy farmers who are the backbone of American agriculture. Reduction of these programs is another slap in the face of this important segment of agriculture. They, the dairy farmers and dairy industry are still dazed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's efforts to drive milk prices downward by the purchase of oleomargarine instead of butter for use in the diets of needy Americans and to fill domestic commitments.

We understand that the Bureau of the Budget has issued a directive to the USDA to withhold several million dollars of the money which Congress had already appropriated for use in the school milk program for the current year. We consider this a serious shortchanging of millions of underprivileged and improperly nourished schoolchildren. In addition, it thwarts the decisions in which Congress took acton to provide proper funds for these programs.

We urge immediate action to correct the flagrant departures from the stated objectives of the Great Society program. This can be done by restoring to the programs the funds appropriated by Congress, and by restoring to the budget for the coming fiscal years the money necessary to maintain both the school milk and the school lunch programs at current operating levels.

Sincerely,

Wm. C. Eckles,
General Manager.

VIETNAM

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, it is the source of no little satisfaction to a Member of Congress who supports his President on a matter of national urgency, to know that the people and the responsible press of his district also give the President their support.

On successive days, February 8 and February 9, two of the Nation's great newspapers editorially expressed such support. The two editorials spoke of two vital questions involved:

First, our justification for being in Vietnam, and the attitude of the Vietnamese, and second, the two-dimensional aspects of the conflict.

In its editorial, the Dallas Morning News supported wholeheartedly the President's statement that "were the Communist aggressors to win in Vietnam, they would know they can accomplish through so-called wars of national liberation what they could not accomplish through naked aggression in Korea—or insurgency in the Philippines, Greece, and Malaya—or the threat of aggression in Turkey—or in a free election anywhere in the world."

The News went on to say, "South Vietnamese have given the lie to the earlier claims by the peaceniks that their hearts were not in the fight for independence."

The following afternoon, the Dallas Times Herald editorially commented on the President's conference in Hawaii and his statements, adding:

> We must work as diligently at easing hardships and improving the peasants' lives as we have at formulating military strategy.

And—

> Judging from President Johnson's insistence in Hawaii, the largely one-sided battle will gain this needed second dimension.

I am sure that many of my colleagues would like to read these excellent editorials in their entirety, and I am, therefore, attaching them to these remarks for the Record.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Feb. 8, 1966]

The Reason Why

The President's speech in welcome to South Vietnam's Premier represented pure Johnson. It was a tough, succinct, hard-hitting speech.

President Johnson used the occasion to blast those "special pleaders" who urge the country to sell out the South Vietnamese and our own troops. He used it to sum up, briefly and well, the reason why the defense of Vietnamese integrity is of critical importance to this country and to the world. The speech he made got the job done.

The South Vietnamese have given the lie to the earlier claims by peaceniks that their hearts were not in the fight for independence. They have continued to fight and die by the thousands in a war that seems to have no limits and no end. They fight, not only as soldiers, but as civil officials and administrators, who go to posts in Red-plagued areas where they are lucky to live for a month. The villagers themselves, whose lot is often harder and more terrifying than that of the soldiers, have continued to resist.

"They fight," the President said, "for the essential rights of human existence—and only the callous or timid can ignore their cause."

Unfortunately, there are some of both in the President's own country and he had some choice words for them:

"There are special pleaders who counsel retreat in Vietnam. They belong to a group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope. Were we to follow their course, how many nations might fall before the aggressor? Where would our treaties be respected, our word honored, our commitment believed?"

Over and over again these special pleaders have asked: "Why are we in Vietnam?"

If the Vietnam critics were listening to the President's speech, they heard the reason explained to them. But it seems doubtful that they were because, as he pointed out, they are deaf to all save the gloomy sounds made by themselves and their kind.

However, the reason that this country has given the lives of more than 1,300 of its young men to defend Vietnam is a valid one, and the President stated it well. He said:

"Were the Communist aggressors to win in Vietnam, they would know they can accomplish through so-called wars of national liberation what they could not accomplish through naked aggression in Korea—or insurgency in the Philippines, Greece, and Malaya—or the threat of aggression in Turkey—or in a free election anywhere in the world."

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Feb. 9, 1966]

A Two-Dimensional War

The degree of mutual understanding apparently achieved between President Johnson and South Vietnamese Premier Ky at their amicable Hawaii conference is encouraging. The two leaders may still differ on emphasis in the anti-Communist war, but fertile areas of agreement also have been found, judging from official statements, for a positive, grassroots program to aid the Vietnamese people and thereby win their support for the Ky government.

The Saigon leadership still prefers to talk more of escalated military action than about the civilian reforms needed to win the ultimate struggle with the Vietcong at the individual and village level. But Ky and his aids have shown encouraging cooperativeness in Honolulu to President Johnson's insistence that more emphasis be placed on improving the conditions in all areas as they become secured from rebel terror by military conquest. This undertaking will be even more difficult—and less dramatic—than successful combat "search and clear" operations. But realistically, it will be impossible ever to win anything but a tenuous temporary hold on any portion of Vietnam but a handful of cities by military means alone.

This is the paradox of the conflict: It can be lost through military weakness, but it cannot be won purely by military strength. The succession of Saigon governments dominated by military men have too long failed to face this reality of the dual struggle, and so have many American assistance strategists. Now, judging from President Johnson's insistence in Hawaii, the largely one-sided battle will gain this needed second dimension.

There can be no cause for overoptimism about the chances of quick success in the tedious task ahead in the villages. Similar efforts have been made before, with dismal results. But the critical situation demands a new and broader attempt, aimed at building model facilities for giving the backward, war-weary Vietnamese populace every reason to prefer Saigon leadership to Vietcong occupation. Ample American aid and know-how, skillfully applied, could still work wonders.

The United States has helped establish showcases of superior Western culture and living standards elsewhere, as in West Berlin—where the contrast with communism's meager offerings was so painful the Reds had to wall in their people to keep them from flocking to it. Admittedly the job is more difficult in a remote agrarian Asian setting—but so is fighting a war. We must work as diligently at easing hardships and improving the peasants' lives as we have at formulating military strategy. At the technological level, the Vietcong can't compete. We are not making fullest use of the best weapons we have for winning over the people who are real pawns in this struggle—and keeping them "won."

PROPOSED CODE OF ETHICS FOR CONGRESS

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise with some hesitation and reluctance to discuss a matter that to me is both unpleasant and embarrassing. Perhaps I am breaking an unwritten rule. But the issue is of such burning importance that I hope I will be forgiven if my words seem out of order or improper in any way.

For the past few weeks I have been shocked to read a series of columns by Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson which have made serious charges against the alleged activities of a Member of the other body, and his alleged relationship with Julius Klein, a public relations man, lobbyist, and registered agent for Germany.

What I found particularly painful in these columns was the nature of the charges made. It was not easy for me to read that a Member of the other body stood accused of carrying out assignments for a registered foreign agent in behalf of a foreign government.

In other words, these columns purport to show that a strange and unexplained relationship existed—or still exists—between these two men.

One letter, which I found particularly offensive, was written by a Member of the other body to a member of the German Cabinet. It strongly suggested that Members of the Congress, both Republican and Democrat, endorsed Mr. Klein and habitually seek his advice. I considered this presumptuous statement an insult to me and many of my colleagues, since it presumed to speak for me and was totally untrue.

I found the stories related in these columns so hard to believe, as a matter of fact, that I telephoned Jack Anderson and demanded to see evidence of these charges. Mr. Anderson invited me to his office to inspect his files. I sent a member of my staff to Mr. Anderson's office. He was received cordially and given full cooperation. As a matter of fact, he spent over 3 hours going through Mr. Anderson's files, which consisted of copies of correspondence, telegrams, and memos between the two men, as well as the reports of private investigators. My assistant saw all of the original material quoted in the columns, all of which he told me was unquestionable authentic. He also saw material which has not yet appeared in print, and which he assures me is even stronger and more sensational than what has already been printed in the newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to judge or condemn other people. But it seems to me on the basis of what I have seen, and in the absence of refutations or denials by the parties concerned, that these newspaper accounts might indeed be true. And if they are, one cannot avoid speculating on their implications.

The American people have had their faith shaken in the past. Only a few months ago Congress received a very bad press when armies of lobbyists invaded Capitol Hill to get sugar quotas for their clients. And, of course, before that there was the Bobby Baker scandal, which needs no further amplification from me. Over the years, influence peddling and conflicts of interest have always been unwelcome—but hardly unknown—intruders in Washington.

No one questions the right—rather, I should say the absolute duty—of a Congressman to fight for the legitimate interests of his home district and his constituents. That is one of the reasons we are here. But we must all be constantly aware of the dangers of developing too close a relationship with people or companies, and being drawn into the web of opportunity.

These situations, and the suspicion and shame they bring to Congress, emphasize the need for a congressional code of ethics. The nature of the position of a Member of the Congress of the United States gives him virtually unlimited freedom of action. He should not be left completely to his own judgment—because judgment is elastic, and varies between individuals.

Once having established such a code, Congress must enforce it. Why should we wait until a newspaperman or some investigative agency blows the whistle.

It is the responsibility of Congress to draw the line and define the boundaries of proper behavior for its Members. It has shirked this responsibility for too long. According to the present system, Congress avoids scrutinizing its Members' activities too closely. The most flagrant violations of the public trust are overlooked, in strict accordance with traditional "club" rules.

This is wrong. I would like to remind every one of my colleagues that none of us is an innocent bystander. When the mud flies, it gets all of us dirty. We all live in one House, under one roof, and we are judged collectively by the people.

No one questions the fact that the overwhelming majority of the Members of the Congress of the United States are dedicated and highly principled people, motivated by the finest instincts. As a matter of fact, the same Jack Anderson devoted a full column last Sunday to a series of short profiles of a number of Congressmen who are scrupulous almost to a fault.

A popular song proclaims, "Happiness is different things to different people." I submit that ethical behavior is in the same category. With Congress setting a standard—and enforcing it with determination—all of us will feel a little more comfortable knowing that we must all measure up to the very same standard of proper behavior.

I firmly believe that the time of decision has arrived for us to look deeply inside ourselves, individually and as a body. Past and recent events have made it clear that one Congressman's ethical standard may not be quite exactly the same as another's. And so, for the protection of both of them, and for the Nation as a whole, I urgently request at this time that Congress give priority attention to the establishment of a code of ethical behavior for the guidance of its Members.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, while the battle for freedom continues in Vietnam, the United States and the Government of South Vietnam are making serious efforts to improve conditions in the hamlets and villages. Too often, however, the good we have done—and are doing—in the field of community development is obscured by the smoke of the battlefield.

It is about time we told the world more about the less visible war in South Vietnam.

The Agency for International Development provides cement, steel, building materials, equipment, food, books, and other needed materials. But just as important, it provides people—American specialists in community building. They go there of their own volition; they are staying of their own volition. Usually, the Vietcong leave the AID technicians alone. They know that the villagers are ready and willing to protect their American friends and the the things they have built together.

Few Americans can realize what it means to a village to receive help in digging a well or making a more efficient windmill. Few Americans know what it means to have the rice harvest doubled. Few Americans can know what fish from a newly stocked pond can mean to a Vietnamese family's diet.

Yes, AID is helping Vietnam's villagers build things a man will fight for. At the end of 1964, over 8,000 self-help projects had been completed and another 6,000 were underway. In the first half of fiscal 1965 alone, some 1,600 self-help projects had been approved and 500 completed, projects involving more than 80 different activities including construction of public meeting places, rice and fish drying platforms, classrooms, bridges, privies, road and bridge repair.

The natural tendency is to think of community development programs in statistical terms but the real success of the program cannot be so measured. Its true value lies in the fact that by working together the people develop a community spirit.

Participation in the selection and management of the project is spirited, the projects are often a source of pride, and the villagers begin to have a stake in their own future. Such involvement and identification can be a key factor in defeating the Vietcong.

Community development programs, encouraged and supported by AID, are proving every day that freedom can deliver what communism can only promise.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the dedication of our AID employees in Vietnam and I call for quick approval of this request to enable them to continue their fine work.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, Estonians everywhere celebrate a landmark in the rich history of their homeland. On that day in 1918, 48 years ago, the executive committee of the National Council of Estonia proudly proclaimed to the world that henceforth the Republic of Estonia would stand in the ranks of the free nations of the world.

The road to independence had been a long one for the brave people of Estonia, filled with bitterness, death, and anguish. After the prize had been won, Estonians were forced to take up arms once more to defend their freedom. Bolshevists tried to establish their rule and push Estonia back into Russian tyranny. German volunteers, who aimed at reestablishing German supremacy, also had to be expelled. Finally, in 1920, Russia signed a peace treaty with Estonia in which she "voluntarily and forever" renounced all claims to the territory and people of Estonia. The young republic was now free to settle down to an era of economic productivity and progressive government.

Independence for Estonia ushered in a period of significant achievement in all phases of national life. Once independence had been won, Estonians plunged fearlessly into tasks of economic, political, and social reform. The new government immediately took over the large estates owned mostly by the nobility and distributed them to the men who had fought so bravely for independence and to many others who had never known the joy of owning their own land. As a result of the land reform program, agricultural production expanded tremendously.

On the political and social fronts, great progress was also made. A democratic constitution was adopted. Legislation was passed, requiring all children between the ages of 7 and 14 to attend school. Nearly all citizens learned to read and write. Schools were built at an impressive rate. Estonia supported professional and technical schools that trained lawyers, doctors, dentists, engineers, artists, and musicians. An 8-hour day was introduced.

Music, art, and cultural pursuits of all kinds flourished as Estonians enjoyed the blessing of freedom without fear of government reprisal. The number and scope of newspapers grew considerably.

In 1939 Estonia boasted 15 daily newspapers. Freedom of religion was complete, and the various religious denominations were able to conduct their affairs as they chose.

For 22 years the noble Estonian people worked to establish a strong and independent state, only to witness sorrowfully the end of independence with the coming of the terrible Second World War. In 1940, the Russians brutally occupied Estonia and staged fake elections, which made Estonia a part of the Soviet Union. In the first 12 months of Soviet occupation more than 60,000 Estonians of all ages and classes, or about 5 percent of her total population, were either killed or deported. On the night of June 13-14, 1941, alone, more than 10,000 were removed from their homeland forever.

German rule supplanted Russian domination from 1941 until 1944, when the Soviet Union again tyrannized the little land. With the return of Russian rule, numerous arrests were made, many Estonians were put to death, and thousands were deported to Russian labor camps. Peasant farms which had been so proudly and carefully tended, were brought into collectives. Industries were nationalized. Religion was discouraged. Education was changed to conform to Russian ideas. Russians replaced the majority of Estonians in places of authority in the Government. Estonians were again subjected to the horror and indignity of deportation. In 1945 and 1946 about 20,000 Estonians were deported. The third large deportation occurred in 1949 when about 40,000 persons, mostly farmers who had resisted collectivization, were wrenched forever from their homes and families.

Estonians have suffered greatly under Russian tyranny. Yet through all the long years of hardship and oppression the people of Estonia have carefully preserved their own language, ancient folklore, way of life, and their indomitable will to be free. They have never relinquished the fervent hope that someday their freedom will be restored.

We who enjoy the blessings of liberty reaffirm on this glorious Estonian independence day that we will never cease our efforts to bring freedom to all men everywhere. We thus observe today both a glorious event in the life of Estonia and a renewal of our own sense of duty toward all captive peoples. With this in mind, it is a happy privilege for me to extend warmest best wishes to my many friends of Estonian descent in my own Ninth District of Massachusetts, in the United States, and throughout the world on their independence day.

Congratulations to a great people.

WATER MANAGEMENT—ITS MEANING

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a very frank and elucidating discussion on water management was presented to the National Water Conference in Washington last December 9, by John E. Kinney, a sanitary engineering consultant from Ann Arbor, Mich. It merits wide circulation, particularly among Federal, State, and local government officials.

Mr. Kinney is convinced, and I think properly so, that lack of understanding and professional competency—in company with bureaucratic ambition—are preventing or at least delaying development of solutions to our water problems. He contends that the water famine is more a famine in knowledge and ideas than in water.

Candid criticism of this nature is refreshing and instructive. While voicing his objections to the overall approaches to water problems, Mr. Kinney is quick to cite instances where proper leadership is accomplishing sound water management. He credits the Ohio River Sanitation Commission for its progress in pollution control, and Governor Rockefeller is commended for his New York State program because "he substituted facts for platitudes, understanding for regulations, and technical assistance for public indictments."

If, as it now appears, industry and the general public are going to give the Rockefeller program the support and cooperation that it merits, New York's discouraging outlook for water supply will be reversed in a relatively short time. The ORSANCO record is a case history in effective pollution reduction.

When eight States joined in 1948 to form a compact—ORSANCO—approved by Congress to pool their resources and police powers for control of interstate water pollution on the Ohio and its tributaries, more than 99 percent of the population along the thousand miles of river discharged raw sewage and a variety of industries poured volumes of dregs and waste into the once-clear waters. Today treatment plants are in operation or under construction for 94 percent of the valley's sewage, and 90 percent of the 1,730 industrial plants along the waterways have installed facilities that meet ORSANCO's basic-control requirements.

ORSANCO has come a long way, but its members will not be satisfied with a job that is only partly finished. There can never be a letup along a waterway where population continues to rise and more and more generating, processing, and manufacturing plants are located. The major lesson to be learned from ORSANCO is that it was not formulated upon the selfish interests of a single community or State, nor was it conceived in an atmosphere of panic that emphasizes immediate needs without thought of long-range planning. The attack on Lake Erie pollution has been slow in coming, but the program now underway will be successful if all the affected States—and Canadian Provinces as well—join together in the same spirit and with the same vigor that has been the history of ORSANCO.

America can lick the water problem, but it is going to take a heap of understanding, determination, and money. Pollution abatement alone is not enough. Water must be used efficiently, recycling of industrial water for reuse is an important factor; and converting brackish and ocean waters to fresh water is mandatory. There are still dams and reservoirs to be built, but, as Mr. Kinney points out, their desirability and serviceability must be determined by accurate statistics and not by political expediency.

Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I should like to have the Kinney address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

WATER MANAGEMENT—ITS MEANING

(By John E. Kinney)

The Peanuts comic strip by Schulz provides a course in psychology and a means of assessing the forces in water management. If you follow Charlie Brown's daily entanglements with human nature, the observation that viewpoint makes the difference will adequately explain why we have platitudes on water management but no common understanding as to its meaning.

Those who appraise the tactics of Lucy, his principal adversary, have an intimate understanding of why the importance of water management is not sufficient justification for a common resolution of its meaning.

When Charlie Brown attempts to rationalize some action or hope, he soon learns he stands alone. If he attempts to convince Lucy, the results can be nearly fatal. Her classic remark, after bowling him over—"I had to hit him. He was beginning to make sense"—offers the essence of the rationale and reaction by many who have issued ultimatums based on preconceived ideas or desires.

If Charlie Brown attempts to seek support from Linus, there is promise but no action. Linus, the epitome of insecurity, can be easily dissuaded by Lucy with an admonition such as: "Don't burn all your bridges behind you."

Enlisting the support of Sally or Violet is even more hopeless. The cause may be serious but it can't, in any measure, match the importance of hair styling, clothes or any other item of similar personal concern. And Schroder, his life is dedicated to Beethoven.

Even Snoopy, the dog, lets Charlie know there is a responsibility for the master to feed the subject but this responsibility should not be confused with any assumed authority to command respect or action.

Our protagonists in water management can be categorized into these counterparts in the Peanuts comic strip. The word protagonist is used advisedly. The heat of dissention, the incompatability of objectives and the stridently voiced demands support no other.

SCOPES OF MANAGEMENT

The trend continues to let today's expediency control rather than anticipate tomorrow's needs. For example, the glamour of the big dam with the scenery of the lake it creates is more appealing than the importance of the land flooded or the availability of water from below the surface of the earth.

Yet there is a reserve in water supply not far below land surface which, according to Geological Survey estimates, is some 34 times the annual runoff of all the rivers in the Nation. There is probably an equal volume in deep ground storage. Our underground water supplies exceed in volume those in our lakes and reservoirs. This should be a sobering and reassuring factor but it gets little attention. Rather than manage surface and underground waters jointly, we rely on one or the other. Our much-publicized water famine is more a famine in knowledge and ideas than in water.

The limitations in adequately defining water management are evident in other actions. In some areas transfer of water from one drainage basin to another is not acceptable, even when it could pay long-term benefits. Other areas rely solely on imported water and, under one pretext or another, make no effort to utilize or reuse waters within the area.

And if that is not sufficient cause for confusion, some believe that treating waste waters so as to make them as clean as possible will solve our dilemmas. Others, meanwhile, with more understanding, are arguing for a classification of waters, just as land use is classified. These persons argue that all uses should be provided for in every area but not necessarily all in the same water.

There are also controversies over present and future uses. The present economic importance of the water resource to our way of life can be argued as all important, or lightly dismissed with the nebuolus inanity that water is so important to our future continued existence, economics cannot be a limiting consideration.

Through all this three things are apparent:

1. Water development (so-called water management) in this country has been characterized by short-term solutions without the knowledge, understanding, or data which would allow decisions to be made with more logic and a better insight into the results of choices open to us.

2. The details can be all important. The picture of a sewer outfall or a low reservoir is more important than the corrective program underway.

3. Specific areas of self-interest have nurtured a public concept of perennial water shortages and gross pollution. This is being exploited for political vote-getting purposes. It has also led to a tendency for some in high positions in Government to grasp for authority and funds, not for purposes of protection of society, but for organizational and professional power and aggrandizement of self or agency.

PERSONAL MEANING OF MANAGEMENT

Going back to the Peanuts comic strip provides a method to depict a very large segment of the public. Represented by Linus, they consider water adequately managed as long as they reap the benefits and do not feel the fury. For most this means no flood damage, and, more importantly, when they turn on the faucet the water flows clean and safe to drink.

Their thoughts encompass no more than that until they read articles on droughts or on polluted beaches. At such times the negative controls; they perceive the lack of management.

For these people the only remedy necessary is a dam, a strong law, or a Federal subsidy. But whatever remedy is adopted, it must be now.

Real panic sets in if this soul of insecurity should be told that the water may stop flowing from his faucet by the year 2010, or that the lakes are dying. To forestall such horrendous possibilities, he will gladly endorse any project advertised as a guaranteed solution. This endorsement doesn't require a check on the accuracy or immediacy of the crisis. Nor does it await any independent, technically competent evaluation of the real value of the proposed cure.

"Dying Lake Erie" has excited many wakes. The disturbed individuals attending the demise of this body of water have neglected to learn that the best-educated estimates of the actual time of the death is some 10,000 years from now. The more immediate problems of education, slums, and delinquency are either of less importance or too much of a challenge for those who emotionally demand action now to save Lake Erie.

In an emotional pitch before the "United Action for Clear Water" conference called by the United Auto Workers in Detroit on November 6, a representative from HEW told the union members that the lifeblood of jobs in the steel, chemical and paper industries is water; that Lake Erie is rapidly dying—"filling in with algae and solids"—and with its death there goes their jobs. The fear of loss of jobs with loss of income is real. The threat worked. The audience wanted action to force the industries to stop polluting the water now—to stop destroying the lake which is providing the water for their jobs. One wonders why the industries don't appreciate that pollution will close down their mills.

I have yet to hear any audience discussing juvenile delinquency, attacks on women, or substandard education reach the emotional pitch generated at meetings demanding action to save Lake Erie. Our sense of values at times is most questionable.

AN EXAMPLE OF ACTION

If you were to investigate your home area activities carried on under the guise of water management, the confusion of agencies involved would be a revelation. The blinders worn by those promoting progress at any cost might not be readily apparent but with time would be evident.

As an example, consider the proposal now underway to place a reservoir on a creek upstream from Ann Arbor, Mich., in the Huron River basin. This reservoir is touted to the public as providing flood control, low flow augmentation, water supply, recreation and habitat for fish and wildlife. Since everyone is promised a benefit, the public appeal is terrific.

Ann Arbor's future water needs could be supplied by simply connecting to the Metropolitan Detroit authority, but developing further surface supplies seemed more desirable to some. To get a study at no cost as well as a vehicle to invite Federal funds for construction, the assistance of the Corps of Engineers was solicited by a basin promoting committee.

Since the Corps is limited to projects which have flood control benefits, some justification had to be devised. If the lower river channel is not widened as much as planned, and if the optimistic population forecasts are accurate for the year 2000, then it was estimated that a possible flood damage of $145,000 a year might then be realized in the lower river. The door was opened for a "free" study.

Ann Arbor has secondary treatment of sewage. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare report estimated a need of four times their reported present low flow in the river by the year 2015 to provide high dissolved oxygen downstream from the treatment plant.

However, it seems HEW used data considered in error and the low flow is now said to be three times that reported. The Corps of Engineers is assuming no responsibility for determining the accuracy of measurements. So far HEW has not agreed to revise its report. The flow augmentation benefits are as subject to criticism as are the flood benefits.

Only one of six possible sites has been promoted. The site covers some 14,000 acres of the most fertile agricultural land in the basin. The natural flatness of the land will result in only 1,500 acres with water more than 9 feet deep. Over 6,000 acres will have less than 2 feet of water.

Some of the less desirable features are glossed over. Because this creek drains fertile farmland, the algae now in farm ponds will bloom in abundance in the shallow water. As the water level drops the algae will die and the city water supply can expect continuous taste and odor problems, such as it now experiences in spring and fall. The mudflats will provide excellent mosquito breeding.

Of greater significance, however, is the limitation on the Corps of Engineers which orients all considerations toward flood control benefits. This bias does not allow a total and impartial assessment of the area's economic and social needs.

Regardless of the term "multipurpose," incompatible purposes such as low flow augmentation and recreation cannot be best served by the same reservoir. In a given area several single-purpose reservoirs could be vastly more effective. Yet, the Corps of Engineers mission denies this possibility. And, in addition, the value of land as a resource must be considered as of comparable significance in satisfying future area needs. Evaluating land in terms of today's markets, and water in terms of value 100 years hence, is less than reasonable.

Objection by the farmers to the loss of their land is considered as selfish by many concerned solely with the dire forecasts of future water shortages. However, we cannot continue to dismiss alternatives to basin needs simply because groups employ the tactics of Lucy and either dominate decision or destroy objection by scornful comment.

WHAT IS THE MEANING OF WATER MANAGEMENT?

At present there are platitudes and sound scientific generalizations espoused by professional and student. But, among the public, water management is simply defined by each person as satisfying or promising to satisfy his personal wants. So long as there is the promise, there is no demand to ascertain facts or evaluate projections on alternatives. Education has provided tools for enhancing our scale of living but it has failed miserably in enhancing the ability of the individual to think objectively.

If Charlie Brown were to look at the history of the ancients who used water in expertly designed structures but perished because they did not use water and land wisely, and if Charlie were then to study in detail the manner in which we Americans are also building expertly designed structures but not using our water and land wisely, his conclusion undoubtedly would be that, regardless of how sincere or how well intentioned unbridled enthusiasm may be, it is no substitute for competency. Charlie would express it quite simply: "Good grief."

WHAT IS NEEDED FOR WATER MANAGEMENT

Our ever-increasing pandemonium continues because we lack competent leadership and argue over ill-defined goals. This situation could be corrected:

If the principal task of scientific water resources investigations is kept separate from the equally important functions of law enforcement, regulation, and capital construction;

If the executive branch of the Government accepts the responsibility of establishing a more reasonable balance in the budget among the various needs for research, investigation, and construction;

If the Bureau of the Budget would learn how the costly "comprehensive planning" by HEW and the Corps of Engineers is being deliberately bypassed by HEW in order to establish precedent and authority, under the guise of pollution control, before the comprehensive surveys are concluded;

If the technically competent assert professional status by assuming responsibility for recommendations in difficult decisions; and

If political and technical leaders define specific goals and guidelines rather than continue the fallacy that a continuing progression of ever-stronger laws with increased appropriations can substitute for competency.

Leadership in accomplishing water management is possible. ORSANCO (the Ohio

River Valley Water Sanitation Commission) has shown how the pollution control aspects can be attained. And now Gov. Nelson Rockefeller has taken the cry out of crisis in New York State. In lieu of denunciation of deplorable conditions, he directed attention to specific goals. He outlined a 6-year program to cost $1 billion, and the people bought it. Governor Rockefeller substituted facts for platitudes, understanding for regulations, and technical assistance for public indictments. While he promised to attempt to get Federal moneys, he induced the people to use their own money and get started.

History will separate the leaders from the haranguers. The means is simple and has stood the test of time. Fanciful inventions and distortions of fact, whether deliberate or not, give glory which is soon exhausted "for the mind can repose only on the stability of truth."

And that goes for management of water, too. We need less "Good grief" and more "Let's play ball." We need fewer Lucys and more Charlie Browns.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the distinguished majority leader what is the program for the remainder of this week and for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman, this concludes our legislative business for this week, and it will be our purpose, after announcement of the program, to ask to go over to next week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District day. There are no bills. But Monday is being set aside for eulogies for our late beloved colleague, Albert Thomas, of Texas.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day, and there will be considered H.R. 12889, the supplemental defense authorization bill, under an open rule with 3 hours of debate, waiving points of order.

For Wednesday and the remainder of the week there will be considered:

S. 1666, to provide for additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

H.R. 9963, the Alaska Centennial of 1967, under an open rule, with 2 hours of debate.

H.R. 12322, the Cotton Research and Promotion Act.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of Members of the House today to the 48th anniversary of Estonian Independence Day. Unfortunately, the brave people of Estonia are now among the captive peoples of communism, and this great day in their history cannot be celebrated in their homeland because of the tyranny of their Red rulers.

We must rededicate ourselves, therefore, on this great historic day for the Estonians, to continued efforts to see that freedom is restored to these proud people and all the other captives of communism.

The Estonians proclaimed their independence after the tsarist government fell and from 1918 until 1940, when their country fell to the Communist forces, they enjoyed a period of freedom and progress.

We must not only commemorate historic national days such as Estonian Independence Day, Mr. Speaker, but we must take practical steps to indicate our interest in the restoration of freedom to the captive peoples of communism. One such practical move would be the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations, an action which I have repeatedly urged the House to take.

I also think the Voice of America should provide lengthier and more effective broadcasts to pierce the wall of Communist propaganda and deliver the truth to the people of Estonia. In recent years, Mr. Speaker, the Voice of America has been cutting back both its hours of broadcast in the Estonian language and in the nature of these broadcasts. The Voice of America gives straight news only and is fearful of offending the Soviet Union under the policy of the present administration. I believe the Estonian people deserve the truth, and the Voice of America should be a vehicle for delivering it to them to counteract the brainwashing of constant propaganda from their tyrannical Moscow oppressors.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, last night I attended a dinner at the Washington Hilton Hotel commemorating the 20th anniversary of the Employment Act of 1946. In our Capital City of Washington, D.C., unemployment of unskilled persons is as high as any other place in the United States. Welfare costs are enormous in Washington, D.C.

Nevertheless, every single waiter and busboy who served the guests at this celebration of the Employment Act was imported from Europe. Each imported worker takes a good job from some unemployed U.S. citizen.

Each waiter last night was recruited by the hotel from throughout Europe. Each waiter last night was cleared by the Department of Labor under Public Law 414.

We heard messages from three Presidents telling how great and effective the Employment Act has been. President Johnson reported how good the employment conditions are in the United States today—but he did not mention the hotel and restaurant industry in our large cities.

Where is the Federal Government, where are the District officials, where are the labor unions, where are the poverty workers who sit by idly and unconcernedly, permitting thousands of workers from Europe to be imported to work in hotels and restaurants in Washington, and other U.S. cities, taking jobs from U.S. citizens who are unemployed, and on the welfare and relief rolls.

Cannot our local unemployed citizens be trained for these jobs more effectively, and more profitably, than recruiting and importing foreign workers?

This incongruous situation may be too practical and mundane for consideration in the intellectual atmosphere of the symposium held in conjunction with the 20th anniversary of the Employment Act of 1946.

But how can governmental officials, labor union bosses, and unemployed workers continuously ignore the importation of one kind of labor force—and permit able-bodied U.S. citizens to remain and to atrophy on the welfare rolls?

Perhaps the hotel industry in Washington, D.C., cannot afford to pay wages high enough to attract a domestic labor force. Perhaps the hotel industry cannot afford losses. Perhaps labor union officials in the hotel industry lack the courage of the labor union officials working in the agricultural industry. Perhaps the Department of Labor is more interested in the hotel industry than in the agricultural industry. Perhaps the poverty program cannot train hotel and restaurant workers.

Also, Mr. Speaker, how can we permit the permanent importation of foreign hotel and restaurant workers when many unemployed U.S. workers eagerly seek these good and desirable jobs and, at the same time, deny growers of vegetable row crops any opportunity to import workers even temporarily to avoid crop losses at peak harvest times when few domestic workers desire farmwork at all?

I would like an explanation of this seeming paradox—from the Department of Labor, the administration, a labor union official, or from the Washington, D.C., Welfare Department. I suspect that any factual explanation would be embarrassing to every group and agency involved. I do not, therefore, expect an explanation. But refusal to explain does not make the situation correct or tolerable.

BIG GOVERNMENT—FRIEND OR FOE?

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Younger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roger A. Freeman, senior staff member of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, at Stanford University, delivered an address on January 9 before the San Diego Open Forum, entitled "Big Government—Friend or Foe?"

Mr. Freeman has developed some very thought-provoking suggestions which I am sure will be of interest to all of the readers of the Record interested in Government.

His address follows:

Big Government—Friend or Foe?

(By Roger A. Freeman, senior staff member, the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, Stanford University, San Diego Open Forum, January 9, 1966)

"DAS LIED VON DER GLOCKE

"Wohltaetig ist des Feuer's Macht
Wenn sie der Mensch bezaehmt, bewacht,
Und was er bildet, was er schafft,
Das dankt er dieser Himmelskraft;
Doch furchtbar wird die Himmelskraft
Wenn sie der Fessel sich entrafft,
Einhertritt auf der eignen Spur,
Die freie Tochter der Natur.
Wehe, wenn sie losgelassen.
—"Friedrich von Schiller."

[Translation]

"THE SONG OF THE BELL

"Beneficent the might of flame,
When 'tis by man watch'd o'er, made tame;
For to this heav'nly power he owes
All his creative genius knows;
Yet terrible that power will be,
When from its fetters it breaks free,
Treads its own path with passion wild,
As nature's free and reckless child.
Woe, if it casts off its chains."

In the year 1965 the American people enjoyed—more or less—$675 billion economy and a $210 billion government. While all Americans, from right to left, like a steady and rapid increase in national income and product, they are less than unanimous in their feelings about the expansion of government. Some believe that government has grown too fast, become too big, and should be cut down to size. Others are just as convinced that government is not doing nearly all it ought to, that it is being starved and should be enlarged. A third group's argument is not so much with the size of government itself but with what it does and how it does it. So, it seems to come down largely to a question of what government should be doing—or leave alone.

Governments, the Declaration of Independence proclaims, are instituted among men to secure certain unalienable rights among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It goes on to say that whenever government becomes destructive of those ends, the people have the right to alter or abolish it.

Nobody—or almost nobody—has argued that government in the United States has become so destructive that it ought to be abolished. But many observers are critical of the course set by government and would alter its direction if they could. Some question defense and foreign policies and hold that our national security, present and future, is in jeopardy, that it is less well protected from potential aggression than it need be or should be.

Others contend that government's domestic activities have not helped to secure and widen the liberty and pursuit of happiness of its citizens. Government, they say, is of course doing many things without which a civilized society could not exist. But its tendency to extend the range and intensity of its functions and to penetrate deeply into affairs which used to be regarded as being in the private sphere, narrows and endangers individual freedom. That, they hold, is the very nature of government. "Liberty has never come from the government," Woodrow Wilson wrote, reminding us that "the history of liberty is the history of limitations on governmental powers, not the increase of it."

Thomas Jefferson, in his later years, looking back over the experiences of his long life, concluded that "the natural progress is for liberty to yield and for government to gain ground." Just 15 years ago a freshman Massachusetts Congressman wrote:

"The scarlet thread running through the thoughts and actions of people all over the world is the delegation of great problems to the all-absorbing Leviathan—the state. * * * Every time that we try to lift a problem to the government we are sacrificing the liberties of the people."

That young Congressman's name was John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Throughout recorded history men who fought for liberty fought against a government. At times, of course, they warred against a foreign ruler. But more often they battled a domestic government they deemed to be tyrannical. The observance of democratic procedures, many Americans believe, assures us of the preservation of liberty and eliminates any possibility of tyranny. But the holding of elections, even if honest and free, does not protect a minority against oppression by a majority. Nor does it safeguard a majority against a chief executive who commands the power and skill to bend or beat legislators, communities, local officials, civic, and business leaders into submission. All member countries of the United Nations maintain some symbols of democracy although in many or most of them the people have little power over the conduct of their government.

When a government tightens the rules under which its residents must live and limits their freedom of action, it always does so in the name of the people and for their presumed benefit. It may retain established rituals and honored traditions by which it stakes out a seemingly respectable claim to legitimacy. Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin claimed to be governing in the long-range interest and for the good of their citizens, many of whom (and at times a majority of whom) believed, at least temporarily, that it was all done for their own "liberty and pursuit of happiness." Almost 40 years ago Mr. Justice Brandeis, one of the leading liberals of his day, warned:

"Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evilminded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning but without understanding (*Olmstead* v. *United States,* 277 U.S. 478).

If we define freedom as the ability of the individual to make meaningful choices between known alternatives, then it follows that the extent of his freedom depends on the range of decisions which he can make for himself and his family or which are being made for him. The larger a share of his product or resources government takes from him and spends for him, the less he can allocate to his manifold needs and wants—for housing, education, health, support of aged parents, etc.—according to his own judgment, desire or preference. Even if his freedom of action is not explicitly circumscribed, the economic penalty for exercising it—such as preferring a nongovernmental to a governmental "free" service—becomes prohibitive. And as a central government enforces uniformity in all local areas throughout its realm, it destroys its citizens' freedom of choice.

This seems to suggest that the basic issue is the size of taxing and public spending and that the extent of individual liberty can be measured by the percentage of the national income or product which is channeled through government. An often repeated definition of the difference between a liberal and a conservative is that the liberal wants government to spend more and the conservative wants it to spend less.[1] There is just enough truth in this oversimplification to make it plausible and widely accepted. But it misses some crucial points and does not aid understanding.

Conservatives and liberals alike recognize that in the second half of the 20th century the government of an industrial nation, and a world leader at that, must be big government. What divides liberals and conservatives is not so much their views on the necessary or desirable magnitude of public spending as a conflict on the needs and means of government.

I am not at all certain that at this point in history public expenditures in the United States would be much lower, if any, if conservatives set public policy rather than liberals. But I am sure that part of the funds would be allocated to other purposes than now, that the money would be spent in a different manner, that taxes to foot the bill would be differently structured, and that responsibility and decisionmaking power among levels of government would be significantly changed.

IS GOVERNMENT GROWING?

Before discussing the major ideological and policy issues I need to clarify some questions of fact. Conservatives have tended to show in their presentations that public spending has grown disproportionately fast in recent years and decades. But reports by liberals commonly reveal no extraordinary expansion. They say, or seem to be saying, that Government is not really growing when facts and figures are expressed in meaningful terms. Both sides back up their claims with the ceremonial impressiveness of research and statistical tables. Much as I hate to become involved in statistical arguments which are hard to unravel and explain, I cannot avoid dealing with this disagreement on the historical record.

---

[1] I am using the terms "liberal" and "conservative" in the sense in which they have come to be generally understood in the United States although this is a perversion of their original and true meaning and differs from their use abroad.

Slightly over a year ago in a speech to the Committee for Economic Development President Johnson said:

"Total Federal spending in 1965 will be the lowest in 14 years in terms of our gross national product. * * * There are fewer Federal employees now than there were a year ago when I took office."

In his January 1965 budget message Mr. Johnson offered this comment:

"We have good reason to expect that Government expenditures in the years ahead will grow more slowly than the gross national product, so that the ratio of Federal spending to our total output will continue to decline * * * had Federal civilian employment kept its 1955 relationship to population, Federal employees would have totaled 2,747,000 on June 30, 1964, more than 275,000 above the actual number as of that date."

The conclusion from this is clear: Federal spending grows at a slower pace than the national product, Federal employment more slowly than population. That parallels the impression which a number of books and articles by liberal economists aim to give us.

Let us first talk about the size of governmental employment which has been a sensitive subject ever since the famous charge in the Declaration of Independence:

"He has * * * sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people; and eat out their substance."

Over the past 10 years Federal civilian employment grew 6 percent which is one-third of the rate of the simultaneous increase in the U.S. population of 18 percent. This seems to reverse a long-range historical trend: In the first half of this century the U.S. population doubled while Federal employment multiplied tenfold.

But, as so often, the total hides some significant facts:

Between 1955 and 1965 employment in the Defense Department declined by 13 percent, in the Post Office Department climbed 16 percent (almost parallel to population) and in the rest of the executive establishment jumped 31 percent. In other words, a sharp and disproportionate increase of Federal employment in domestic fields was partially offset by a cutback in defense. Moreover, the rise in Federal employment was kept down by delegating the field administration of most of the new and expanded Federal programs to State and local governments. Thus, the added employees were statistically classified as State and local, although they carry out programs enacted by Congress, work under orders from Washington agencies, and are at least in part paid from Federal funds.

Total governmental employment (Federal-State-local) jumped 46 percent over the past 10 years while U.S. population grew 18 percent, private employment 16 percent. In 1955 there was one person on the public payroll for every 8.1 in private employment, by 1965 the ratio was down to 1:6.2, and still falling.

Now let us look at the spending picture. The final fiscal data for 1965 are not yet available, but I am certain that when the new budget documents are released, in about 2 weeks, they will show that total Federal spending in 1965 (the cash-consolidated budget, not the administrative budget which omits about one-fourth of all Federal spending) as a percentage of gross national product was not the lowest in 14 years, as President Johnson predicted it would. They will, however, disclose a remarkable record of stability in Federal spending in proportion to national product: Federal expenditures grew 73.5 percent over the past 10 years, gross national product 71.1 percent. This seems to confirm the statement that Government is not growing more rapidly than the national economy.

But we find a parallel here to what we discovered in Federal employment: Outlays for national defense increased 24 percent—barely ahead of the intervening rise in prices—and if we add space research and technology and international affairs to arrive at a total that we might call national security, they went up 37 percent. In other words, national security spending barely rose when expressed in constant dollars, and declined as a percentage of gross national product. The cost of domestic Government services meanwhile jumped 173 percent, an advance at two and a half times the rate of growth in gross national product. It may be worthwhile noting that the administration spent $2 billion less for defense than it had estimated a year ago, $3 billion more for all other purposes.

While Federal spending for civilian purposes soared 173 percent, personal consumption expenditures rose only 66 percent. Families and individuals increased their personal outlays for food by 40 percent, for clothing by 44 percent, for housing and household operations by 77 percent. In other words, government consumption gained sharply on personal consumption over the past 10 years.

To view the trend in historical perspective: it required 160 years—from 1789 to 1949—for Federal expenditures for civilian purposes to reach a level of $10 billion. It took only another 17 years, to fiscal 1966, to lift them from $10 billion to over $54 billion. That dramatic boost in Federal spending since World War II is sometimes explained as having been made necessary by a lag on the part of State and local governments. But State and local governments raised their appropriations for local services several times faster than the simultaneous growth in population and prices. Just in the past 10 years they boosted expenditures from their own sources by 110 percent of which less than 40 percent can be attributed to added numbers of people and higher prices. On a per capita, constant dollar basis governmental spending (Federal-State-local) for domestic purposes grew at three times the rate of personal consumption between 1954 and 1964. This may have been good, bad or indifferent. But it does establish that the domestic activities of government have been growing at a dramatic rate, in relative as well as in absolute terms. And it suggests that we carefully consider where a continuation of current trends will take us.

THE COST OF GOVERNMENT

Governmental expenditures in the United States in 1964 equalled 32 percent of the gross national product and 39 percent of the national income, with most of those huge funds collected in the form of taxes. American taxpayers have been bearing their load with a remarkable patience, probably for two reasons: (1) Tax rates were boosted to their exorbitant levels during wartime when the public was prepared to put up with almost anything; (2) A substantial share of the taxes enjoys a low visibility, being hidden from sight through indirect taxation and withholding.

The share of defense (including space and foreign aid) has declined from 82 percent of all public expenditures in 1944 to 44 percent in 1954 and to 30 percent in 1964. But Government revenues still equal the percentage of gross national product they reached at the height of World War II. This means, (a) that taxation has been maintained at approximately its wartime level with cuts in some taxes offset by boosts in others, and, (b) that taxes were not kept high for defense but in order to expand the domestic activities of government.

It is now generally recognized that a burden of the size which the American taxpayer has been bearing for close to a quarter century represses economic growth. But hopes for effective tax relief are likely to be disappointed as long as public services keep growing at a spectacular pace.

Because heavy taxes are economically and politically painful, the U.S. Government has been reluctant to impose rates high enough to meet expenditures. Its budget has shown big deficits for 6 years in succession—and has been in the red for most of the past 36 years. This helped to keep taxes lower—but how much genuine relief did it provide?

The value of the dollar was cut to less than half over the past 25 years, which amounts to a confiscation of much of the lifetime savings and retirement income of many millions of men and women. Some of them just tightened their belts, some joined the ranks of our "poverty population," and not a few were forced to depend on public assistance or on charity. The big cushion of accumulated savings kept price rises to a more moderate level than might have been expected in so many years of budgetary deficits. But does perpetual inflation, which means expropriation from large segments of the population, seem to be a fair method of financing government?

The rate of inflation has turned more moderate in the past 10 years: consumer prices rose 18 percent, prices in the gross national product 22 percent. A 20-percent loss in 10 years may not appear excessive but when it is applied to fixed incomes or to insurance, bonds, or savings accounts over a long period or a lifetime, it amounts to a severe punishment of the provident for putting their trust in the dollar and the promises of the U.S. Government. It also boosts the interest cost of mortgages very substantially.

The dollar is further endangered by our continuing negative balance of payments and the resulting loss of one-third of our gold reserve. Although the private economy has had a consistently favorable balance of payments, Government action has almost exclusively focused on business activities—through restraints which are called voluntary and by threats of more drastic compulsory controls—instead of putting its own house in order.

The overall weight of taxation may possibly do less economic damage than its structure. Our income tax rate scale acts like a schedule of graduated speeding fines which are intended to discourage speeding. Some drivers will speed regardless, hoping to get away with it, but most will take it easy. So may taxpayers.

It is unlikely that men will work to the limit of their capacity if they know that a substantial share, or the greater share, of the product of their efforts will be taken from them. We put a penalty on effort and success and place a premium on leisure for the potentially most productive segment of our population. The top rate was cut from 91 percent to 70 percent in 1964 but the progressive character of the income tax was reinforced.

The economic cost of steeply progressive taxation is no deterrent to its protagonists. Demand for redistribution of income through progressive taxes and parallel action on the spending side is a fundamental tenet of the liberal faith. It is based on the ethical concept that the rewards and punishments of the market are inherently unfair, that success is fortuitous and failure undeserved, that accidental and environmental factors rather than individual endeavor determine human fate, and that to correct those injustices, Government must overrule the market through the political process.

Those who believe otherwise hold that there is a positive relationship between merit and success where market forces are permitted free play, that applied intelligence and sustained effort will as a rule and with some exceptions prevail over environment and find their deserved reward, and that consistent failure is no accident. They regard governmental redistribution of income through steep progressive taxation to be tyranny—besides being economically harmful.

A man from whom government takes 40, 50, or up to 70 cents out of every additional dollar he earns may regard this system as exploitation of an economically productive minority by a vote-strong majority and view his status as one of involuntary servitude to forces and for purposes he deems objectionable. If he cannot find an escape hatch—a so-called loophole—he may resolve not to serve (i.e., work) any more than he necessarily has to and prefer to extend his leisure.

The cost of big government of the type we have known for some years is probably greater than the number of dollars it spends. It includes the losses it causes by inflation, the slowdown in economic growth through ill-conceived taxation, the discouragement of some of its best talent to put forth a maximum effort.

THE SERVICES OF BIG GOVERNMENT

Most of the major services which government provides such as education, welfare, roads, parks, and dozens of others are legitimate subjects of public concern. Their benefits are all-pervading and society could not progress or even exist without them. They justify and require many billions of public spending. The question is: How much is genuinely needed and where do we reach the point of diminishing returns?

About 8 years ago John Kenneth Galbraith in "The Affluent Society" advanced the proposition that the consumer luxuriates while government and its services are being starved. His solution: tax the former more heavily so as to expand the latter. Galbraith has since become the prophet and spokesman for governmental expansion, probably more because of his eloquence than of his reporting of facts or economic analysis.

Those who oppose the Galbraith thesis are said to be "against government." This is sheer calumny. It makes no more sense to be against government than to be against electricity. Both are essential and friends of man—if they come in the right quantity, when and where needed. A surge of power, beyond need or capacity, at the wrong place or in the wrong form, will wreak havoc and may turn into a killer—whether it be electricity or government.

Many accepted the Galbraith thesis because it seemed to explain a well-known phenomenon: public services always appear to be inadequate or scarce—space for driving and parking, funds for assistance to needy, classrooms and teachers, public parks and sanitation and dozens of others. But there is no shortage of automobiles or TV sets or houses or clothing.

Why is this so? Because there is no limit to human wants or desires. Our appetite for private goods is disciplined by the necessity of paying for them. There can be no shortage of goods in a free market for people willing to pay a fair price (save for war or emergency conditions or temporary dislocations). When effective demand rises unexpectedly, supply will soon catch up with it.

But most public services are not paid for by the user directly or not fully; they seem to come "for free" with the cost borne by somebody else or by that distant abstraction "the government." And as long as goods can be had gratis or below cost, demand will always exceed supply.

Galbraith ridiculed American extravagance in automobiles and homes and contrasted it with our miserliness toward schools and public parks. But the record tells us that over the past 10 years private spending for automobiles increased 75 percent, public spending for education 146 percent, private spending for housing and household operation 77 percent, for private recreation 76 percent, for local public parks and recreation 141 percent. If we carry the comparisons farther back, they show a similar picture. Public consumption has been rising twice as fast as personal.

Enrollment in public education grew 42 percent over the past 10 years, employment in public education 73 percent. School construction proceeded so rapidly that there are now three pupils less per classroom in the public schools than there were 10 years ago. Has this reduced the complaints about shortages? Of course not. We just lifted "standards." The number of public welfare employees jumped 61 percent in the past decade while the number of recipients rose only 34 percent. More welfare employees were authorized when Congress and State legislatures were promised that added staff would be able to "get people off the rolls" and make them self-supporting. What happened then? The population under 18 years increased by 27 percent, the number of families with a cash income under $3,000 (in constant 1964 dollars) fell by almost 3 million (from 27 percent of all families to 18 percent) but the number of children on the AFDC rolls doubled.

Freeways are jammed and curb parking is filled up for miles around. This will continue no matter how much we spend on road construction as long as government lets drivers use freeways that cost up to $23 million a mile without a direct charge and permits them to occupy precious street space for free or cheap storage instead of reserving it for moving traffic. If a department store marks desirable merchandise down to half price or gives it away, it will be mobbed and soon run out of goods. So will government. What would happen if gas or electricity were supplied as freeways are? Probably just what happened to water in New York where it is unmetered.

Of course, many public services cannot be charged to the user. But if they are financed at the local level, there is at least a semblance of a market test to balance desire for services with their tax cost. If the bill can be passed on to the national treasury, there will be no limit to demand.

Need for free public services is like greyhounds chasing a mechanical hare. No chance of catching up—ever. Demand will always be far ahead of supply because so-called standards will be pushed up as soon as performance approaches old standards.

As we tend to move away from the test of the market and the judgment of the community we are increasingly left in a storm-tossed sea without compass or anchor. If we leave it to those who are experts in or committed to a particular problem or function to judge how much we ought to spend on the object of their concern, we wind up in chaos. If we let special interest groups or local areas decide how much they get from the national treasury, we invite political logrolling. And if we turn it over to men who have much to gain from added spending but need take no responsibility for facing the bill, we reap extravagance and inflation.

It is unfortunate that there are few objective and firm tests of how much needs to be spent on a public service and even fewer gages by which we can measure its results within a reasonable time. Cost-benefit ratios are largely hypothetical (you get the answer you put in), almost always highly controversial, and useful only in few fields. Government lacks the impartial yardsticks which business applies to judge new projects and measure results. If government had produced the Edsel, it would still be making it—turning out huge quantities and giving them away below cost.

There is no automatic shutoff valve or circuitbreaker in government. Rather, the process seems like an endless spiral. As taxes go up taxpayers depend more heavily on government for services and feel more entitled to demand them. And as services are added, taxes go up again.

Over the span of American history much of the public task, of functions that required broad participation or couldn't pay their way, was accomplished by voluntary action, as Richard Cornuelle recently reminded us in an inspired book, "Reclaiming the American Dream." Civic initiative and performance have a proud and indeed unique record and retain a vast potential. But increasingly, publicly controlled programs have been not supplementing but supplanting voluntary action, hiring away its best talent, discouraging its supporters, quenching their enthusiasm, and threatening to dry up its support.

It may be hard to fight city hall but even tougher to compete with billions from the State capitals or Washington. Former University of Chicago Chancellor Lawrence A. Kimpton said some years ago: "It is hard to market a product at a fair price when somebody down the street is giving it away." Enrollment in higher education was evenly divided between public and private colleges not so long ago. At present trends private institutions will be lucky within a few years to enroll 20 percent of the students. That will mean a far heavier burden on taxpayers and a narrow choice (if any) for students. Will this advance the cause of education?

That government is engaged in many activities which are eminently beneficial, no reasonable man will deny. But in too many of its pursuits we must ask government: "Are you helping to solve the problem or are you part of the problem? Are you working toward a solution or are you making the problem insoluble and permanent?"

A faulty governmental program that does not involve the spending of huge amounts is remediable. When prohibition tried to solve a grave problem by a direct approach and turned out to be a cure worse than the disease, it was repealed. But it is well nigh impossible to abolish a big spending program. Its protagonists or recipients will deny that it has failed and explain results which did not come up to promises as the consequence of insufficient funding and inadequate time. According to its spokesmen there is nothing ever wrong with a public program that could not be corrected by doubling appropriation and staff, extending coverage and territory, or boosting salaries.

If consistent failure over many years would lead to corrective action, the farm support program would long have gone into limbo. It has not solved the problem of surpluses and low farm income and burdens the consumer and taxpayer twice: by higher food costs and by higher taxes.

At the rate at which we are going, the U.S. Government will within a few years have poured the astronomical sum of $100 billion into farm price supports. But we are farther from a solution than ever and in spite of all attempts at control, had another record farm crop last year. Suggestions by the country's largest farm organization that Government prepare to get out of the program and ease into a free market are being coldshouldered.

It has been proven time and again that Government by setting a price above the market creates a surplus and by mandating a price below the market, whether on publicly supplied or privately produced goods and services, creates a shortage. If a store undertakes to sell $1 bills for 50 cents, it will soon run out of them and if it tries to sell them for $2, it will keep them forever. That's why we have a shortage of driving and parking space, as I mentioned earlier, and why we have a surplus and unemployment of low-skilled workers whose wage rates are set by Government above the market and above their productive capacity. A further raise in minimum wages will condemn added people to perpetual unemployment and subsistence on the dole. And the farm price support program goes on and grows—while Government builds more big dams to supply farmers with irrigation water at a fraction of its cost—to grow more crops.

When the Social Security Act was proposed, 30 years ago, Congress and the public were told that old age and survivors and unemployment insurance would slowly but surely diminish the need for the dole (whose ill effects President Roosevelt decried), that it would reduce crime and juvenile delinquency, illegitimacy, family break-up and numerous other social ills. Coverage and benefits were later expanded several times, disability insurance was added, but public assistance rolls kept growing at a rapid rate through periods of rising income—as did the rates of crime, juvenile delinquency, illegitimacy, desertion, and the other evils which the welfare programs were supposed to cure or at least improve. That may have been no mere coincidence.

To be sure, social insurance has proven its worth and, in my opinion, ought to be expanded. But the federally directed public assistance program, judging by its results, is one of the worst failures among our governmental services. Suggestions to offer physically able persons work relief instead of a dole are being as strongly resisted as ever.

The urban renewal program is another example of misdirected governmental action. In a speech on May 27, 1962, New York Mayor Robert F. Wagner recognized this frankly:

"Once upon a time, we thought that if we could just bulldoze the slums and build shiny new public housing for low-income people, all social problems involving these people would virtually disappear. This has turned out to be not so.

"Once we thought that if we built enough playgrounds and other recreational facilities, juvenile delinquency would disappear. This turned out to be not so.

"Once we thought that having discovered a magic bullet to kill the micro-organisms that cause venereal disease, we had conquered venereal disease. That turned out to be not so.

"In these and many other instances, we solved one problem and uncovered two others."

Too often, well-intentioned governmental action did not just uncover two new problems for an old one. It created them.

Slightly over a year ago Martin Anderson in a penetrating analysis "The Federal Bulldozer" demonstrated the failure of the slum clearance program. In 13 years it destroyed more than four times as many dwellings as it constructed. Moreover, 9 out of every 10 of the new apartments were beyond the reach of the poverty families whose housing had been torn down. Civil rights groups now call it the "Negro removal program." Anderson concluded that the question is not whether urban renewal could be or should be revised. He suggested that it should be abolished because the promises held out for it proved to be a mirage, and the job could more effectively be done by private action.

A few weeks ago University of California Sociologist Nathan Glazer wrote that building new houses won't solve the slum problem because "the slums of any city will tend to equal the number of people defined as social problems, regardless of the quality of design and construction." But does anybody believe that the urban renewal program will go anywhere but up—now that a newly created Cabinet Department can more effectively promote it?

The plight of the cities is coming in for growing attention and Life magazine devoted a double issue to the subject 2 weeks ago. It defined the cities' primary problems as money and jurisdiction. But money troubles—growing demand for public services and an inadequate tax base—are only symptoms of the disease; they are its result, not its cause. The middle and upper income classes which historically provided the cities' economic base and resources as well as civic leadership have been engaged in a mass exodus and are being replaced by new residents who have little to offer in support, contributions or leadership but need and demand vastly expanded public services. The trend seems to be intensifying and brews more trouble for cities in the years ahead.

The flight from the cities is not necessarily a natural phenomenon like the weather or earthquakes. It is of course partly due to rising affluence. But to a large extent it can be traced to perverse public policies. To be sure, city policies are not designed with the intent or for the purpose of driving out the higher and middle class families and attracting the poor—but they could not be much different if they were. Some of those policies are the result of Federal influence or commands. Many are citymade. So, people vote with their feet—to escape to a more congenial jurisdiction from a government whose course of action they found to be beyond their power to influence.

There is no sign that cities are about to adopt policies designed to reverse the trend of migration—to attract middle and upper income families and to discourage low income families from coming in and taking over. Nor are they likely to, as long as the National Government pays the greater share of public welfare and defrays 90 percent of the cost of freeways which make it easier and cheaper to commute to city jobs from distant suburbs. And because underpriced expressways bankrupt commuter railroads, the Federal Treasury is now starting to subsidize the building of rapid transit lines.

To abolish poverty is a noble idea but certainly no new idea. The American people have long been engaged in the most effective antipoverty program the world has ever seen. They changed the historical distribution of income from a pyramid to the shape of a pear or diamond. Between 1929 and 1963 the number of households with an income under $2,000 a year (1963) declined from 30 percent of all families to 11 percent; of those under $4,000 income, from 68 percent to 29 percent. But though some tried, nobody has yet succeeded in eliminating the lowest 20 percent from the statistical tables.

A few billion dollars of public money would indeed be a cheap price to pay for a program that can wipe out poverty in our midst within a few years, or within our lifetime. But what proof is there that it can? It is yet too early to judge the results of the new antipoverty program. But already the major agencies administering it, the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Office of Education, find themselves engaged in campaigns all over the country to overcome the objections of mayors, boards of education, and communities. The mayors are of course not opposed to getting Federal money and spending it. They agree with the program's major goals but not with its methods. The Federal agencies succeed in breaking down resistance only by using their power to hand out or deny several billions of Federal money—an argument to which every elected official must sooner or later submit. It is apparent that State and local authorities would not apply their own tax funds to the type of program now instituted if compliance were not a condition for getting a share of the Federal money.

The theory that underlies the present Federal programs is that poverty is a deficiency which is bound to perpetuate itself through generations unless eradicated by governmental action of the type now being initiated. If that hypothesis were true, most of America's 194 million residents would still be poor, ignorant and unemployed, as their ancestors were when they landed on these shores. It seems to me that the history of the United States, of our strong mobility upward and downward, stands as living proof of the fundamental error in this theory. The American record suggests that the condition of poverty is not so much a cause but a result, and that it can best be remedied—in cases where it can be remedied—by the individual.

Undoubtedly, certain of the new programs will help some of their participants to overcome handicaps and to improve their productive capacity. But they may also be sowing the seeds of social ills worse than those they set out to cure. One thing seems certain: that the antipoverty program accelerates the trend toward monolithic government in the United States.

BIG GOVERNMENT AND CENTRALIZATION OF POWER

In establishing a federal structure with an intricate system of checks and balances the Founding Fathers aimed to disperse authority so widely that no one branch or level of government and above all, no one man, could prevail over the others. They concluded from history that concentration of power corrupts and sooner or later leads to abuse and tyranny.

We all know that within our lifetime—of the older generation, that is—an unprecedented transfer of power took place which tremendously strengthened the hand of the National Government and particularly of the President. The most potent factor in this shift was the growth of Federal grants-in-aid which now total over $14 billion. Through over 200 authorizations they give Federal agencies the deciding voice in most public services which used to be determined and run by State legislatures, city councils, school boards and by the communities themselves. The issue is not that of historical States rights. It is an issue of individual rights—because freedom is indivisible. A central government that holds sway over local governments also holds sway over individuals. Most residents of the United States are now dependent upon the National Government in some form—for wages, promotions, grants, subsidies, orders, or pensions—or are subject to favors or harassment by regulatory or tax enforcement agencies. Few can afford any longer to voice objections to Presidential policies or commands (euphemistically called voluntary guidelines) or dare stand up for their rights. Enforced consensus and conformity have become the rule because the penalty for deviation is too severe.

As long as we maintain local diversity, citizens who find themselves in the minority in their home areas can move to jurisdictions whose policies or governments they prefer. When uniformity is imposed, the individual's choice and the right of communities to exercise home rule and local autonomy end.

The multiplication of Federal grants had led to a vertical functional autocracy of the Washington bureaucracy which supersedes the self-government of local areas that used to characterize the American scene. If grants were intended to aid States and local governments, as is often asserted, they could be given without conditions, to be spent at the discretion of local authorities. That was in fact proposed in 1964 by Walter Heller when he was Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. But the Heller plan was quickly killed because Federal agencies would not have been able to control the actions of States, counties, cities, or school boards. Other proposals, of allocating certain Federal taxes to States or local governments or to permit tax credits for State and local taxes, suffered the same fate, and for the same reason.

Big government means concentration of power in the hands of the Central Government with all the consequences which such a power monopoly implies.

BIG GOVERNMENT AND SECURITY

Adequate protection of the lives and safety of its citizens is government's first and foremost commitment. For this reason the United States devotes bigger resources to national defense than to any other single public function. But the share of defense has been falling and of last account totaled only 30 percent of all government expenditures, as I mentioned earlier. It was this decline that enabled domestic services of government to stage a dramatic expansion over the past 20 years. The question is: What came first? What was the controlling consideration in the changed allocation of public funds?

In a carefully documented study of postwar budget formation, Samuel P. Huntington of the Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University, found:

"In both the Truman administration before the Korean war and in the Eisenhower administration after the war, the tendency was:

"1. To estimate the revenues of the Government or total expenditures possible within the existing debt limit;

"2. To deduct from this figure the estimated cost of domestic programs and foreign aid; and

"3. To allocate the remainder to the military."

This suggests that defense was allocated whatever money was left after everybody else got his share.

More recently, however, the Department of Defense has been acting as its own budget cutter—in contrast to other agencies which fight hard for the highest possible appropriations. At the 1964 National Tax Conference a high Defense Department official [2] answered a charge that Federal agencies were pushing for expansion:

"Oddly enough, the bureaucrats in Washington, certainly in the Defense Department, are the ones that are trying to hold down Government expenditures in the appropriation of funds. In the last few years—and this extends into the Eisenhower administration and even into the Truman administration—we've had to fend off additional moneys voted by the Congress for particular projects.

"So we're put under pressure from all sources: from the Congress, from the public, from interested associations to spend more money and I think on balance we resist more than we yield."

That would be all to the good if our national security position versus potential aggressors, that is, forces which would destroy us if given a chance, had improved in the period since World War II and if our relative defensive strength had grown in recent years. But those propositions are highly doubtful, to say the least.

The Soviet Union devotes twice as large a share of gross national product to national defense as the United States, as Timothey Sosnovy, Soviet economy specialist at the Library of Congress, has pointed out and the threat from Red China is growing every year. Communist countries have vastly expanded their territory and population, their economic, technological and military power over the past 20 years, and they have been able to raise their status and influence in the rest of the world and make our position more vulnerable or at least more difficult.

The rapid dismantling of our Armed Forces after World War II invited the Communist takeover of Eastern Europe and large sections of Asia. Aggression in Korea, Vietnam, and other places was not unrelated to our seeming unpreparedness. In Korea our troops were almost pushed into the sea and the United States, for the first time in its history, had to settle for a draw. In Vietnam we have for some years now been unable to cope with a seemingly far inferior opponent.

The number of military projects or programs scrapped, deferred, or slowed down in recent years is in the hundreds. They were not discarded because military experts doubted their value or effectiveness in strengthening our defenses. The decisions fell against the military because the expansion of domestic services was deemed more urgent by the powers that be.

The Skybolt air-to-ground missile, nuclear rocket Rover, manned space glider Dyna Soar, Pluto ram jet rocket engine and numerous other projects were turned down although the leaders of our Armed Forces demanded them. Approval of nuclear carriers was denied and authorization of manned (follow-on) bombers too long delayed.

A fallout shelter program which could save millions of lives and might deter a would-be aggressor was deemed to be too expensive as was an effective anti-missile-missile system. A few months ago the Nike X missile seemed to be on the verge of approval. When escalation in Vietnam called for larger funds, were offsetting savings to be made by tightening up on civilian type services? Not at all. The Nike X antimissile missile and other defense projects fell victim to budget cutting. Again, as in earlier years, the armed services lost out to more charmed services—domestic welfare programs. The consequences of such policy are awesome to contemplate.

Potentially more critical to national security than money are the time, attention, and efforts of our governmental leaders which are now overwhelmingly spent on domestic affairs. Inadequate study and consideration may have been responsible for the Bay of Pigs disaster and for many other troubles which flare up from time to time in distant parts of the world.

"Congress Needs Help" was the title of a recent investigation and TV review of the inability of "absurdly overworked" Congressmen to be adequately informed on the vital issues they are called upon to decide. Members of Congress cannot give sufficient time, study, and thought to defense and international affairs because they are overloaded with civilian projects. The President, according to the a Newsweek story of December 20, 1965, explained that in 1965 he had concentrated on civilian affairs "to get the domestic problems out of the way so that I could give more time to foreign problems." Some may regard this to be the wrong order of priority. In this day and age a President might conceivably be so occupied with our national security that he could not devote most of his time to pushing the expansion of domestic public services.

Our safety at home is no better protected than our security abroad. In fact, it may be less so. An American, or a local resident, can walk the streets of most major foreign cities without fear, even at night. But that may not be advisable in some residential neighborhoods of Washington, Chicago, and other metropolitan centers. The failure of government to safeguard its citizens is now so widely recognized that a book "How To Protect Yourself on the Streets and in Your Home" (accompanied by a letter from the head of the FBI) seems to be on the way to becoming a bestseller. (This may be an interesting reverse shift in responsibility: from government to the individual.)

The United States, the country with the highest standards of living, is also the world's most crime ridden. The most powerful Nation which once set out to make the world safe for democracy seems unable or unwilling to make its city streets safe for walking home at night. Crime is rising six times as fast as the population according to the latest FBI report.

There is only one possible explanation for this phenomenon: we have not been able to convince would-be offenders that "crime doesn't pay." They expect to get away with it. And they may well have concluded from a study of reports on crimes, arrests, convictions and terms actually served, that the statistical odds are not too discouraging.

It is obvious that governmental action in combating and suppressing crime is woefully inadequate. But so far not enough has been done about it—nor about the fact that almost 50,000 men and women are killed each year in traffic accidents, largely because governmental attention and effort are preoccupied with other pursuits.

In conclusion: Government has multiplied its domestic activities in recent decades, making a steadily growing number of Americans dependent upon its benefits and favors, extending the area of coercion, while not adequately meeting its responsibility to protect the safety of the Nation and the individual. That course, if pursued much longer, gravely threatens personal and collective liberty and security. It is high time for us to quit devising new programs which Government may adopt or enlarge as substitutes for personal effort and to start thinking of means to strengthen the challenge to the individual to deal with his own problems.

Government can be and should be man's best friend—and it is, if it fulfills its primary tasks well. To the extent to which it neglects its foremost duties in order to expand recklessly in other directions and harms the body politic, it becomes a foe and should, in the words of the Declaration of Independence, be altered. The time has not come when we can afford to abolish it.

DOLLAR BLOCKADE OF CUBA NEEDED

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the United States to declare a dollar blockade of Cuba so that American taxpayer funds do not contribute to the export of Communist subversion throughout the Western Hemisphere. I make this suggestion after observing plans by the United Nations to provide Cuba with over $3 million in special funds for the University of Havana and an agricultural research station. Please keep in mind that the United States contributes 40 percent of the funds used by that U.N. special agency.

It means that $1.2 million of U.S. money would be used in the project. And what do they teach at Havana "U"? More subversion of the hemisphere, of course, because the university branch to be helped is headed by Russian and Cuban military personnel.

---

[2] Henry E. Glass, Economic Adviser to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

Brazil and Paraguay have strongly objected to helping Castro through the U.N., and for good reason. Brazil and Paraguay are both principal targets of Communist subversion directed from Cuba. Just last month the Communist tricontinental congress on subversion was held in Cuba and was formally designated as the headquarters of Communist subversion in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. If we contribute funds to this unwarranted U.N. project we will be underwriting that subversion.

A similar effort to provide U.N. funds for Castro's Cuba was scrapped 3 years ago due to protests from many of us in the Congress. Apparently the planners do not give up easily, but my opposition to such a scheme remains just as strong.

I was dismayed by the published reports of the official U.S. attitude toward such assistance to Cuba as stated by U.N. Ambassador Roosevelt. He says the United States will register an objection on principle, but will not withhold our share of the fund or demand rejection of the proposal. This is bureaucratic doubletalk of the worst order. It is inconceivable that any government can be against something as frightening as communism and still support it.

Mr. Speaker it is hoped that public and congressional indignation will defeat this latest proposal as it did 3 years ago.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in offering congratulations to the freedom-loving people of Estonia and her many sons and daughters in America as they observe February 24 as the anniversary of Estonia's declaration of independence. It is sincerely hoped that the encouragement and good wishes expressed by many today will serve to further inspire the Estonian people to resist communism.

The fact that modern Estonia has been under the heel of the U.S.S.R. continually since 1944 and has not succumbed to Soviet pressures to accept communism is a truly remarkable accomplishment.

Today I would like to call attention to one particular argument to which the Communists like to refer, namely, the allegation that since membership in the Soviet Union, Estonia's industrial expansion has increased. What is not said and what we should remember is that before the U.S.S.R. captured Estonia in 1944 the country had substantial industries of its own.

The Soviets applied enormous pressures and exercised almost inhuman cruelty against the people to increase industrial output. Furthermore, this was done at the expense of providing consumer goods and a program for increasing the living standards of the Estonian people, areas in which the Soviets exercised almost total disinterest. It is estimated by competent authorities that the Estonian people are materially in worse condition today than they were 25 years ago.

It is conditions like these to which the free world must address itself in shedding light on actual conditions of the millions of people held captive by U.S.S.R. Our continued observance of the historic declaration of independence on February 24, 1918, is an indication to all the world that Estonia's plight is of concern to us and that we are committed to her liberty.

YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM SUPPORTS A STRONG VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Martin] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Young Americans for Freedom—YAF—has been recognized as the leading student organization in the Nation supporting a strong U.S. foreign policy in South Vietnam. Practically since its founding in 1960, YAF has been regarded as a highly effective conservative youth organization, and YAF's position on the Vietnam question has given it greater recognition.

It goes without undue comment that I am highly interested in the student developments regarding Vietnam throughout the Nation, but the activities of college students both for and against the U.S. position in Vietnam on the college campuses of the Southern States are of particular interest to me.

It has been encouraging to learn of student organizations, like YAF, who are supporting a strong U.S. foreign policy. During the past year the student protest demonstrations from the left have grown in proportion, size, number, and volume. It is gratifying to a Member of Congress to hear of responsible student organizations like YAF, the Young Republicans, and even the Young Democrats in some instances, who are not only offsetting the leftwing student protests by having rallies supporting a strong Vietnam policy but who are also launching many constructive programs.

Mr. Speaker, the position of YAF on foreign policy questions is derived from the Sharon statement which was adopted in conference at Sharon, Conn., September 9–11, 1960, at the founding of the organization. In the Sharon statement are found the guidelines for determination of YAF's position on foreign policy questions:

> In this time of moral and political crisis, it is the responsibility of the youth of America to affirm certain eternal truths.
>
> We as young conservatives, believe:
>
> That we will be free only so long as the national sovereignty of the United States is secure; that history shows periods of freedom rare, and can exist only when free citizens concertedly defend their rights against all enemies;
>
> That the forces of international communism are, at present, the greatest single threat to these liberties;
>
> That the United States should stress victory over, rather than coexistence with, this menace; and
>
> That American foreign policy must be judged by this criterion: does it serve the just interests of the United States?

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of serving on the National Advisory Board of YAF along with many distinguished Members of the two Houses. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Buchanan], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Abernethy], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Broyhill, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Dorn], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Haley], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Glenn Andrews], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Callaway], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Watson], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Williams], serve with me on this Advisory Board. In addition to these Members from the Southern States, there are 30 more Members from the two Houses who also serve on that board.

Mr. Speaker, last fall I had the distinct pleasure of speaking at a testimonial dinner honoring one of the greatest men of the other House, the Senator from South Carolina, Strom Thurmond. This testimonial dinner was held in Birmingham, Ala., a city of fond memories to the Senator.

At this testimonial dinner, the Senator made some pertinent comments regarding the Vietnam question. In part the Senator stated:

> On the international scene, you are faced with dangers to freedom from a succession of little wars and the even more dangerous diplomatic remedies to terminate them, as is demonstrated by the events this year in the Dominican Republic, and, I fear, may be soon again demonstrated in Vietnam. The military action of the Communists in Vietnam is at this point of less peril to freedom than is the potential for concessions to the Communist aggressors which may be granted in the terms of a political termination of the military hostilities.

The Senator went on to comment:

> The greatest threat is an idea, or, more precisely, a mental attitude or orientation, even a way of thinking, which is induced by an idea.

Mr. Speaker, the Senator concluded his moving address by a challenge to the young people of America which bears directly on the Vietnam issue:

> In your own time, however, you are faced with a prevalence of moral and political relativism, which is more extensive, more pervasive and more dangerous than ever before. It is your greatest obstacle in your struggle for freedom. You are the best hope for freedom. You can fulfill your promise if

you will but resist moral and political relativism by continuing your disciplined adherence to an absolute code of spiritual and philosophical values. You must continue to refuse to compromise with expediency. You must maintain the courage to defy the consensus. You must continue to choose the harder right instead of the easier wrong.

Young Americans for Freedom, as many other organizations throughout the South, have answered this call.

At the national convention of the organization, commemorating its fifth anniversary, here in the Nation's Capital early last fall, the YAF delegates unanimously passed a resolution calling for the commitment of sufficient number of ground troops to combat the guerillas now active in South Vietnam. YAF applauded the commitment of United States might and prestige on behalf of South Vietnam and supported the recognition that the war must be won on the ground as military success is a precondition for the political and social developments which will ultimately decrease the ability of the Communists to lure peasants into giving aid and comfort to the Vietcong.

South Vietnam

Whereas we share the administration's view that what the Communists chose to call "wars of national liberation" constitute nothing more than a new form of aggression which must be resisted as a threat to the establishment of true peace; and

Whereas the current aggression against South Vietnam takes its primary inspiration and direction from the north and has as its ultimate object the conquest of all of southeast Asia, a fact recognized by those countries in the area who have sent significant amounts of combat personnel to share in the burden of defeating the Communists; and

Whereas we believe that this Nation is required by considerations of national interest and by moral considerations of the highest order to come to the aid of the people of South Vietnam and other countries of southeast Asia in their defense against aggression; and

Whereas while South Vietnam fails to measure up to the full standards of freedom to which we in this country have become accustomed, the present form of government nevertheless affords a greater opportunity for the ultimate development of truly liberal institutions than would a Communist regime: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Young Americans for Freedom applauds the commitment of U.S. might and prestige on behalf of South Vietnam and supports the recognition that this war must be won on the ground in South Vietnam as military success is a precondition for the political and social developments which will ultimately decrease the ability of Communist recruiters to lure local peasants into giving aid and comfort to the Vietcong; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the administration demonstrate its intent to take whatever action proves tactically necessary to assure that the successful termination of the war will not be unduly delayed, including such measures as (a) the commitment of sufficient numbers of ground troups to combat the guerrillas now active in South Vietnam, (b) effective air action against Soviet-built missile sites around Hanoi and Haiphong, (c) the beginning, by calculated aerial and naval bombardment, of the destruction of the industrial capacity of North Vietnam, (d) by instituting a naval and air blockade of North Vietnam, all of these steps to be taken to induce North Vietnam to cease in its support of the troops in the south, and (e) the clear communication to Communist China that any overt intervention by that country will result in retaliation by the United States and by our allies such as Nationalist China.

YAF's activities in the Southern States have followed a well-designed pattern of constructive action. In Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia, YAF chapters have engaged in constructive activities supporting the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, a news article in the Wednesday, October 27, 1965, edition of the Durham, N.C., Sun, entitled, "Leader in YAF Hits Protesters," illustrates the attitude of YAF toward the leftwing protest demonstrations. The article follows:

Leader In YAF Hits Protesters

Washington.—A leader of the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) blasted the student anti-Vietnam protests here in the Nation's capital today as a deliberate attempt to defeat the cause of freedom in Asia and the world.

In making the denouncement, Randal C. Teague, a member of YAF's board of directors and the leader of its southern program, said, "Students who are burning their draft cards and organizing programs to avoid the draft and to thwart the American effort against communism in Asia are in a minority on the college campus. What they are doing is wrong—legally and morally. Those who are in violation of Federal laws shoud be prosecuted and severely punished by the courts."

Teague, a student himself, went on to say, "These students are not conscientious objectors. Their actions show shades of absolute anarchy. As many national leaders have pointed out, there is strong evidence that many of these protests have been led by the extremists of the radical left who often associate themselves with Communist-leaning groups. Responsible students have no sympathy with those who are deliberately flaunting the law by burning their draft cards, by blocking troop and supply convoys, and worst of all, by demoralizing those valiant fighting men in Vietnam today who are risking their lives to insure the security of freemen."

The YAF leader concluded by saying, "When our Nation issues a call to arms, it is our duty to respond to it, whether we personally like it or not. Every American, from the youngest to the oldest, deserves to support his Government in time of national emergency, and surely the war in Vietnam is one of the gravest situations confronting the world today."

At its recent national convention in Washington, YAF passed a strong resolution unanimously calling for the commitment of sufficient numbers of ground troops to combat the guerrillas now active in South Vietnam. The resolution also called for effective air action against Soviet-built missile sites around Hanoi and Haiphong, the beginning by calculated aerial and naval bombardment of the destruction of the industrial capacity of North Vietnam, and by the institution of naval and air blockade of North Vietnam. The resolution concluded with the call to issue a clear communication to Communist China that any overt intervention by that country will result in retaliation by the United States and by our allies.

In a telegram dated November 1, 1965, the Southern region of YAF called upon the Attorney General of the United States to prosecute violators of Federal draft statutes. The text of the telegram follows:

Hon. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

The Southern region of Young Americans for Freedom representing thousands of responsible college students strongly supports Justice Department efforts to prosecute violators of Federal draft statutes. These violators must be prosecuted if respect for law and order is to prevail. We urge full execution of Public Law 89–152 against all draft card burners. We commend efforts to prosecute those deliberately disrupting the American war effort. While we support the right to peaceful protests, we cannot condone riotous demonstrations. In our opinion many of the recent protests border on sedition and treason. We support a strong administration policy on winning the war at home as well as abroad.

Randal C. Teague,
Regional Director.

Mr. Speaker, an appropriate release to the newspapers, radio, and television media was issued subsequent to this telegram to make clear to the public the position of YAF on the draft-card burners. I ask unanimous consent that this release may appear in the Record at this point.

Student Leader Asks Katzenbach To Prosecute Draft Violators—November 1, 1965

Washington.—A southern student leader today supported the Justice Department in arresting and prosecuting violators of Federal draft laws.

Randal C. Teague, a national board of directors member of Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) and its southern spokesman, advised Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach in a telegram today that "the southern region of YAF, representing thousands of responsible college students, strongly supports Justice Department efforts to prosecute violators of Federal draft statutes."

Teague went on to say, "These violators must be prosecuted if respect for law and order is to prevail. We urge full execution of Public Law 89–152 against all draft-card violators." Public Law 89–152 is the law carrying a fine of $10,000 or 5 years' imprisonment, or both, for any person who knowingly destroys or mutilates his draft card. The law was enacted to carry a severe penalty against the draft-card burners at recent student demonstrations against U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

The telegram concluded, "We commend efforts to prosecute those deliberately disrupting the American war effort. While we support the right to peaceful protests, we cannot condone riotous demonstrations. In our opinion, many of the recent protests border on sedition and treason. We support a strong administration policy on winning the war at home as well as abroad."

YAF is regarded as the leading student group supporting a strong policy in Vietnam. Its national chairman, Tom Huston, of Indiana, appeared on ABC's "Issues and Answers" this past Sunday to present the opinion of students supporting a strong U.S. policy in Asia.

YAF has a southernwide program of donating blood to American soldiers in Vietnam, aiding refugees and orphans fleeing from war-torn North Vietnam, sending mail to our American soldiers, praising them, to let them know the majority of American students are behind them, a petition campaign in support of a strong administration policy, and the presentation of debates and speeches on Vietnam on various campuses.

During my recent tour of South Vietnam and southeast Asia, one of the problems of the war which struck me most clearly was the lack of sufficient material support from our allies in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and from our allies throughout the free world. While the Republic of South Korea and the Australian Government have sent troops to South Vietnam, the remainder of the free nations of Asia or the free world have contributed little to winning this war against aggression. Unfortunately, Allied support is far from being at the level required to sustain the effort.

YAF realized this shortcoming in our foreign policy efforts, and in an attempt to inform the American people, on and off the college campus, of this inadequacy, the southern offices issued a call for more Allied support in Vietnam. This release follows:

STUDENT GROUP CALLS FOR ALLIED SUPPORT IN VIETNAM—NOVEMBER 8, 1965

WASHINGTON.—The southern spokesman of the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) called for greater military and economic support in Vietnam from our allies today. Randal C. Teague, a student at the American University in the Nation's Capital, called for expanded assistance to win the war in Vietnam from our allies in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and from throughout the free world.

In making the pronouncement, Teague said, "Since 1961, the United States has borne the burden alone of defending South Vietnam and its people. Not only the security of all Asia but ultimately the security of all nations will depend on the outcome of this war. It is time that our allies help the United States win the war. Mere moral support is not enough."

Teague went on to say, "We not only need more fighting men and materials, but winning the war in Vietnam will require greater commitments of medical corpsmen to doctor the civilians, schoolteachers to educate the children, engineers and construction teams to build roads and hospitals, and agricultural experts to increase food production. We must win the war with the people, and our allies are surely in a position to supply the technicians required to help the people."

He concluded by saying, "President Johnson and the administration should not only encourage our allies to help us secure the freedom of South Vietnam because of Communist China's continual threat to Asia, but they should also encourage our allies to stop trading and shipping with Communist China and North Vietnam. Our American soldiers are being shot at and killed by North Vietnamese soldiers whose nation is being economically aided by our allies. It just doesn't make sense."

With the exception of troop commitments from South Korea and Australia, very little assistance has come from our allies.

YAF is regarded as one of the leading student organizations backing a strong policy in Vietnam. The student group has launched programs on college campuses in the Southern States to donate blood to American fighting men, to collect food and clothing for refugees fleeing war-torn North Vietnam, to have fraternities and sororities adopt Vietnamese orphans, and to offset the student protest demonstrations.

One of the problems in the college movement in this Nation in support of a strong administration policy has been proper coordination of activities. When blood donation drives, petition campaigns, debates, speeches, and many other actions are going on simultaneously across the Nation and throughout the South, it is difficult to get across to the American people that these actions are more significant and more representative of true student opinion than the one-shot protest demonstrations led by the radical left.

In order to obtain the needed coordination throughout the Southern States, Young Americans for Freedom, Inc., is sponsoring the Southern Student Victory in Vietnam Committee—SSVVC—which is calling upon the support of all campus organizations supporting a strong policy. They have called upon support from the College Young Republican clubs, the Young Democratic clubs, YAF chapters, and any other independent or affiliated group.

The purposes of SSVVC were outlined in a release of November 23, 1965, and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for its inclusion in the RECORD at this point.

SOUTHERN STUDENT VICTORY IN VIETNAM COMMITTEE FORMED—NOVEMBER 23, 1965

WASHINGTON.—The formation of the Southern Student Victory in Vietnam Committee—SSVVC—to support a strong U.S. foreign policy in South Vietnam by the demonstration of student support was announced here in the Nation's Capital today. The new committee will operate on over a hundred college campuses in eight States of the South.

The committee's formation was announced by Randal C. Teague, the southern spokesman for the Young Americans for Freedom, Inc. (YAF), a conservative youth group, and Alfred Regnery, the national director of the recently held symposium for freedom in Vietnam and YAF's national college director.

In announcing the formation of SSVVC, Teague, who is its southernwide field director, said, "We seek the earnest support and cooperation of all college students and organizations who are supporting a firm policy in southeast Asia. We will serve as the principal vehicle through which all student activities in support of the U.S. policy in South Vietnam can be channeled. We call for the support and cooperation from the college Young Republican clubs, the Young Democratic clubs, the YAF chapters, and any other student organization, affiliated or independent, which seeks victory in Vietnam."

Teague, a student at the American University in Washington, D.C., went on to say, "Much student activity has already been going on in the South, but during the next year this activity will greatly increase. It is not only desirable, but essential, that these activities be properly coordinated. SSVVC is such a coordinating unit."

SSVVC will undertake programs on college campuses to sponsor debaters and speakers on over 50 college campuses; to sponsor blood donation drives to give blood for American fighting men in South Vietnam; to form local Victory in Vietnam Committees on 107 campuses which serve as target sights; to send food and clothing to refugees and orphans fleeing North Vietnam; to have college fraternities and sororities adopt orphan children in Vietnam; to circulate petitions calling for a strong foreign policy position in southeast Asia; and several other constructive programs.

SSVVC and its cooperating groups will participate closely with the International Youth Crusade for Freedom in Vietnam with debate-in's on December 7 and student rallies supporting the war effort on January 7 and 8 of next year. YAF leaders are challenging members of leftwing student protest groups which have been instrumental in the burning of draft cards to debates on December 7, the anniversary of Pearl Harbor attack. Major rallies have been planned for January throughout the world.

In addition to Teague and Regnery, the steering committee of SSVVC will be composed of the field directors for each State within the jurisdiction of the new committee. The steering committee's membership was announced as Judy Whorton, a student at Samford University in Birmingham; Timothy C. Ohr, a student at St. Petersburg, Fla., Junior College; Guy W. Mayes, Jr., a student at Emory University in Atlanta; James E. Green, a student at Duke University in Durham, N.C.; Charles C. Hooks, Jr., a recent graduate of the University of North Carolina now residing in Gaffney, S.C.; Michael Everhart, a student at Southwestern at Memphis; and Thomas B. Wright, Jr., a student at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Va.

An indication of the substantial public support which the SSVVC received is an editorial which appeared in the Clearwater, Fla., Sun of Monday, December 6, 1965. This editorial follows:

PROTESTING THE PROTESTERS

With the activities of the right-leaning Young Americans for Freedom most middle-of-the-roaders cannot always see eye to eye, but with the latest YAF project few can take exception—their creation of the Southern Student Victory in Vietnam Committee.

The newest YAF project thus becomes part of a growing national protest against the draft dodgers, draft card burners, and peace demonstrators.

As announced by Randall C. Teague, a former Pinellas County resident and now a student at the American University in Washington, D.C., the Southern Student Victory in Vietnam Committee has been organized to support a strong U.S. foreign policy in Vietnam, and will operate on a hundred college campuses in this country.

Teague details the aims of the new youth movement:

"We seek the earnest support and cooperation of all college students and organizations who are supporting a firm policy in southeast Asia. We will serve as the principal vehicle through which all student activities in support of the U.S. policy in South Vietnam can be channeled. We call for the support and cooperation from the college Young Republican Clubs, the Young Democratic Clubs, the YAF chapters, and any other student organization, affiliated or independent, which seeks victory in Vietnam."

Some of the projects of the SSVVC, reports Teague, will be to undertake programs on college campuses, sponsoring debates and speakers; to sponsor blood donation drives to give blood for American fighting men in South Vietnam; to form local Victory in Vietnam Committees on 107 campuses; to send food and clothing to refugees and orphans fleeing North Vietnam; to have college fraternities and sororities "adopt" orphan children in Vietnam; to circulate petitions calling for a strong policy position in southeast Asia.

Tomorrow, the 24th anniversary of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, will find the new group participating with the International Youth Crusade for Freedom for Vietnam with debates with leftwing student protest groups which have been instrumental in the burning of draft cards.

We welcome YAF to the fast-growing ranks of young people and Americans generally who are getting plenty fed up with this left-wing lunatic fringe, and who are letting our servicemen in Vietnam know in no uncertain terms that we are behind them all the way.

Mr. Speaker, the Southern Student Victory in Vietnam Committee has been successful. Civic support of the campus program, as indicated in the Clearwater Sun article, has come from every area of the South.

At a regional conference of YAF's State officers for the Southern region, held in Atlanta on February 12, new Vietnam-related programs were formulated to spearhead an even larger program to support a strong policy in Vietnam.

YAF has been cautious in handling the Vietnamese situation. They are supporting a strong policy—not just an administration policy. They are prepared to deviate from the policy of any administration when that policy does not coincide with the necessary action required to sustain the war against Communist aggression. YAF has been and will continue to be, I am sure, committed to an administration policy only so long as that policy is consistent with that criterion set forth in the Sharon statement for determining American foreign policy: does it serve the just interests of the United States?

HORTON URGES REDEDICATION TO LIBERATION OF ESTONIA

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the observance by our fellow Americans of Estonia's 48th anniversary of its declaration of independence is a fitting tribute to the Estonian people. The hope is ever present that through commemorating this event of Estonian history, those Estonians now held captive and in virtual slavery by the Russian Communists will continue to be inspired to resist Russian efforts to make them reject their historic cultural heritage.

In man's quest for liberty, few struggles surpass those of Estonian patriots. From Russian occupation between 1721–1918 Estonia not only succeeded in surmounting Russification programs, but Estonian culture actually thrived. During that period even though under Russia's heavy oppressive control, Estonia's music, poetry, plays, and books flourished. A remarkable tribute to a tenacious people. In addition, this period also nurtured Estonian nationalism which showed itself in the Estonian rebellion of 1905. Though Russian soldiers ruthlessly crushed the revolt, the spark of nationalism still burned and emerged again in 1917–18.

Under Russia's provisional government of 1917, autonomy was granted to Estonia. She was given the right to elect a parliament and administer her own laws. German successes in pushing Russian troops out of much of the Baltic area encouraged the Estonian Government to proclaim Estonia an independent state. That declaration was issued on February 24, 1918, and for the next 2 years the fledgling nation was forced to fight both Germans and Russians in order to preserve its independence. Finally on February 2, 1920, the Communists signed a treaty in which all previous claims over Estonian territory were renounced.

The next 20 years were busily spent on improving the domestic situation, but the Estonian people kept a constant vigil on Russian intentions. That policy was well founded as the infamous Mutual Assistance Treaty of 1939 indicated. The treaty enabled Russian forces to legally occupy Estonian territory. Not content with the treaty provisions, Russia presented Estonia with an ultimatum on June 16, 1940, which amounted to complete capitulation. Through Russian manipulation and intimidation a new Estonian Government amenable to Moscow took over on June 21, 1940. In July this government proclaimed Estonia a Soviet Socialist Republic.

From mid-1941 to the end of 1944, nazism replaced Russian terror, murder, and deportation. But unfortunately for the Estonians, World War II's end resulted in the return of Russian occupation and membership in the Soviet Union.

The tragedy and suffering of Estonia's people under Soviet Russia are almost beyond belief. Their ability to endure and continue their own culture in light of Russian occupation and impositions is a truly marvelous feat. But how long can we expect that resistance to continue without more tangible aid from the free world? In an attempt to help alleviate this problem I have sponsored House Concurrent Resolution 290 which would have the President instruct our United Nations representative to initiate action on Russia's forced occupation of the Baltic States.

I know and feel what this day represents to men and women of Estonian origin the world over. I am privileged to represent a large number of these people living in the Rochester, N.Y., area. It is my fervent hope that as Estonians and their millions of supporters in America commemorate Estonia's 48th anniversary they will rededicate themselves to work together for their people's liberation and freedom.

TO IMPROVE THE WEATHER FORECASTING SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, southern California has been besieged by the most violent storms in recent history during the past few months and costly damage to private, commercial, and military property has been widespread. Continued interruptions in air and land operations of the military have resulted from sudden storms and the same interferences have caused considerable indisposition to commercial and private traffic as well.

Agricultural operators have suffered greatly from the recent unusual weather conditions and all of these interests may well have fared better if sufficient advance storm warnings had been available. Across the border in Mexico the damage from these storms has been even more devastating and the loss of life, far greater. The region south and southwest of San Diego seems to be the area from which a great many of these violent storms approach. It has long been recognized as a sparse data area for meteorological information, and this fact has recently been confirmed again to me by the Administrator of our Environmental Services Administration. Some information is obtained on an irregular basis through our cooperative program of taking observations by merchant ships and aircraft crews of international flights who report in-flight weather conditions when passing through that region. We also receive some satellite surveillance for the detection of major storms and weather systems.

Our Weather Bureau has, in the past, given consideration to the establishment of a weather station for both surface and upper air observations on Guadalupe Island, Mexico, but the establishment of such a weather station has yet to be accomplished. The exhorbitant financial loss suffered by our Government and our private citizens makes it imperative that the Congress act quickly to authorize the establishment of meteorological observation stations on Guadalupe Island, Mexico, for the purpose of improving the weather forecasting service within the United States.

Accordingly, I am today introducing legislation aimed at accomplishing this purpose and the text of my bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to improve the weather forecasting service of the United States, the Administrator of the Environmental Science Services Administration shall take such action as may be necessary to establish a meteorological reporting station of Guadalupe Island, Mexico. In taking such action, he shall cooperate with the State Department and other departments and agencies of the United States, with the meteorological service of Mexico, and with the World Meteorological Organization.

FOREIGN-FLAG VESSELS ENGAGED IN TRADE WITH NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ASHBROOK.** Mr. Speaker, during the 89th Congress I, along with other Members of the House from both political parties, have protested against the self-defeating policy of doing business with foreign-flag vessels which are engaged in trade with North Vietnam. It is exasperating enough to learn that free world trade with North Vietnam has increased about 138 percent since 1955, when the United States first began asking other non-Communist nations to help in exerting economic pressure on that avowed foe of the free world. But it has been downright discouraging to reflect that ships which profited from trade with the United States had a business-as-usual policy with the mortal enemy of American soldiers in Vietnam.

The Department of Commerce has declared that it will deny Government-financed cargoes to foreign-flag vessels which called at North Vietnam ports on or after January 25, 1966. Although this certainly is a step in the right direction, I must agree with the presidents of the International Longshoremen's Union, the National Maritime Union, and the Seafarers International Union that the administration's directive blacklisting ships transporting cargoes to North Vietnam is too weak and ineffective.

Following are details of the regulations as they appeared in the Federal Register of February 12, 1966:

> The Maritime Administration is making available to the appropriate U.S. Government departments the following list of such vessels which arrived in North Vietnam ports on or after January 25, 1966, based on information received through February 10, 1966.

Flag of registry, name of ship	*Gross tonnage*
British:	
Shienfoon	7,127
Shirley Christine	6,724
Wakasa Bay	7,044
Cypriot: *Amon*	7,229
Greek: *Agenor*	7,139

> Sec. 2. Vessels which called at North Vietnam on or after January 25, 1966, may reacquire eligibility to carry U.S. Government-financed cargoes from the United States if the persons who control the vessels give satisfactory certification and assurance:
>
> (a) That such vessels will not, thenceforth, be employed in the North Vietnam trade so long as it remains the policy of the U.S. Government to discourage such trade; and
>
> (b) That no other vessels under their control will thenceforth be employed in the North Vietnam trade, except as provided in paragraph (c), and
>
> (c) That vessels under their control which are covered by contractual obligations, including charters, entered into prior to January 25, 1966, requiring their employment in the North Vietnam trade shall be withdrawn from such trade at the earliest opportunity consistent with such contractual obligations.
>
> Nicholas Johnson,
> *Maritime Administrator.*

VOLUNTARY WAGE GUIDEPOSTS REFUSED BY AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY AND HIS COLLEAGUES

Mr. **BURTON** of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MORSE.** Mr. Speaker, I believe that the House must view with considerable concern the refusal of AFL-CIO President George Meany and his colleagues to accept the voluntary wage guideposts proposed by the Council of Economic Advisers for this year.

The idea of guideposts was first put forward in the 1962 Economic Report of the President. At that time President Kennedy said:

> If labor leaders in our major industries will accept the productivity benchmark as a guide to wage objectives, and if management in these industries will practice equivalent restraint in their price decisions, the year ahead will be a brilliant chapter in the record of the responsible exercise of freedom.

Implicit in the late President's remarks was the fear that without this restraint, inflation could nullify whatever economic progress was made. Inflation continues to haunt our economy. With the growing number of people living on fixed incomes in their later years, the danger of inflationary pressures which reduce purchasing power and devalue the dollar is particularly acute. Thus the "productivity benchmark" referred to by President Kennedy must continue to be our standard for wage decisions.

Ideally, we would prefer that Government remain entirely neutral in the decisionmaking process that takes place in the private sector. But we must accept the fact that economic pressure at home and crises around the world demand the careful cooperation of business, labor, and Government.

The proposed guideposts will not guarantee wage-price stability and economic growth, but in my judgment, they represent reasonable standards to guide private decisionmakers in making responsible judgments in the public interest.

The administration should not use these voluntary standards as an excuse for questionable attempts at enforcement. Such recent attempts indicate that we need to review our stockpiling policy. They do not warrant abandonment of the guideposts.

Labor should not set itself above the national interest in sustaining economic growth within a framework of restraint. The times demand responsibility from us all.

A BILL TO INCREASE SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. **BURTON** of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Skubitz] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SKUBITZ.** Mr. Speaker, two major specters haunt the American people today—fear of a major war in Asia and the threat of widespread inflation.

The sad effects of inflation are especially felt by our senior citizens, most of whom live on fixed incomes either through retirement or on social security. Although the social security check is the same each month, the cost of everything from food to footwear continues to rise at an alarming pace. From 1958 until the most recently enacted increase in social security cash benefits, recipients suffered a 7-percent loss in buying power.

To correct this unfortunate and unnecessary problem, I am introducing a bill today which will provide automatic increases in social security benefits as the cost of living rises. This bill calls for an increase of 3 percent in the benefits whenever the consumer price index reflects a similar jump in the cost of living.

This method alone among the many proposals for improved benefits can be accomplished without any further increase in social security taxes. According to cost studies by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the growth of the economy will provide the necessary revenues to make the cost-of-living adjustments proposed in my bill.

In my opinion this is a just and equitable bill that should be passed. We have an obligation to fulfill to our elderly constituents, for we have created this hydra-headed monster and the responsibility is ours. After all, much of the cause of our present inflation can be directly attributed to the wild spending programs in which our Government is presently engaged.

Inflation, as we all know, means everything costs more.

While prices are spiraling so are the taxes. Social security taxes were boosted with the passage of medicare; excise taxes are being raised back to where they were before and the collection of income taxes is being accelerated. Now the President and his advisers are talking about increasing income taxes even more so that the poor taxpayer is left with less to pay for commodities which cost more.

At the current rate of climb, one-half per cent a month according to the Department of Commerce, the cost of living will go up a highly inflationary 6 percent this year. From the first of last year to the first of this month it rose 4.1 percent, and it looks like it will beat both the Russians and us to the moon. In terms we all understand this means on the average an individual has to lay down $1.04 on the counter today for what he paid $1.00 for a little over a year ago, and by the end of this year it will cost a dollar and a dime for what you could get with a dollar last year.

Individual items have jumped more than others: bacon has jumped 61 percent in the last 10 years, a man's wool suit has increased 23 percent in price, and a loaf of bread costs 17 percent more.

Until a more responsible attitude toward government spending is assumed and inflation is stopped, we must do whatever we can to protect those who are hurt the most—the ones living on a fixed income, like our social security folks. I hope Congress acts swiftly and favorably upon my proposal to raise benefits as inflation goes up.

EXPORT SURPLUS OR TRADE DEFICIT?

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, since 1960 the Department of Commerce has been announcing an export surplus year after year, ranging from $4.5 billion to $6.9 billion. Recently the 1965 trade surplus was given out as amounting to $5.2 billion. Although this was still at a high level, it was a decline of $1.7 billion from the high-water mark of $6.9 billion in 1964.

These high surplus figures have been used both as a measure of the competitive force of our industries in foreign trade and of the great value of exports to our balance of payments deficit. The amounts reported each year have been set against the cost of foreign aid, tourist expenditures abroad, and so forth, to demonstrate the valuable function of exports and their service in offsetting deficits incurred from other sources.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we have been deluding ourselves and singing high notes of optimism when there was little or nothing to be optimistic about, so far as our trade balance and our competitive standing in the world are concerned.

For one thing, our official export statistics have included all the sales and shipments arising from AID appropriations. In other words, our export reports include goods that we ourselves have paid for out of the Treasury. By this measure it would be easy to double our export surplus. We need do no more than increase foreign aid expenditures sufficiently.

Secondly, we have been reporting our imports at what they cost at the foreign point of shipment, neglecting to add freight and insurance costs incurred in bringing the goods to this country. This is a naive practice and we are one of the few countries that adhere to this method. With respect to imports coming from Europe, Asia, and Africa, this understates the cost by some 25 percent. On imports of $21.3 billion, which was the level of our 1965 purchases abroad on the basis of foreign value, the undervaluation would be serious. The true figure would be closer to $25 billion.

If we wash out these two unjustifiable practices from our trade statistics, our export surplus vanishes. This is to say, if we value our imports at their true cost and if we exclude from our exports the goods that we sell, not competitively but because we subsidize them or give them away, we actually incurred a deficit of some $2 billion in 1965 in our foreign trade.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to be gained by deluding ourselves in this manner. On the other hand, much harm can come from such an odd practice. We generally pride ourselves on basing policies on facts, or trying to do so. Otherwise our judgment loses its value.

Why do we then persist in this practice of self-deception? I can think of three reasons that would explain the stubbornness. One is that a large trade surplus would be a great credit to the trade agreements program. It would bear out the predictions made on behalf of the program and the hopes centered in it. It would justify the undertaking by the fruits it had borne.

Not to be overlooked is the reflection that a large export surplus would also put a pleasing sheen on the feverish efforts and motions of the Department of Commerce to promote exports. With no surplus to show for these efforts it might be more difficult to coax more money out of Congress.

The third item is perhaps the most pernicious of the three. The so-called export surplus is used as evidence that the industries of this country are indeed competitive in world markets. Moreover, the high surplus shows that we could absorb further drastic tariff cuts with little risk of damage to our industries.

If the authentic results of our trade demonstrate that we are not really competitive abroad except in two or three products, our trade position takes on a wholly different complexion. The fact is that so far as exports of manufactured goods are concerned we have been experiencing a shrinking in our share compared with other countries. The principal exception is machinery. Our exports of this item have boomed hand in hand with the rising tide of investment of our industries abroad. This may be temporary and may result in shrinking foreign markets for goods shipped from this country in the future. Exports of farm products have also risen to record heights, but this swelling volume is attributable to shipments under Public Law 480, food for peace, and similar programs. They do not reflect an improvement of our competitive position in agricultural products.

It seems unthinkable that under these circumstances we should offer to the world another 50-percent tariff reduction. Recently, Mr. William M. Roth, Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, in a speech before the United States-Japan Trade Council, said:

> Actually, much has been accomplished so far in Geneva. Items to be excepted from the across-the-board 50-percent cut in industrial tariffs were tabled in November 1964. Our exceptions were kept at the barest minimum consistent with considerations of overriding national security.

Referring to the so-called Kennedy round he also said:

> This ambitious effort, the greatest in the 20-year history of GATT trade negotiations, will not fail because of any lack of will or determination of the United States to see it through to a satisfactory conclusion.

So, Mr. Speaker, the policy is to push through the 50-percent reduction in any event. If the facts of our nonexistent trade surplus that have recently come to light do not greatly temper the determination mentioned by Mr. Roth, we can only wonder what is the administration's real attitude toward domestic industry. Is it to be sacrificed willy-nilly because Congress passed the Trade Act over 3 years ago under the false impression that we were riding high in foreign export markets?

I do not believe that we should plunge blindly ahead with further drastic tariff reductions when our trade statistics, if properly reported, would reveal our weak competitive position in world markets.

We would be ill advised, I am convinced, to proceed under the assumption that present high levels of production and employment in this country would justify opening up our market to growing volumes of imports when it is clear that so far as really competitive trade is concerned we are running a deficit. If there is any doubt about this deficit, I think it should be cleared up.

I am joining others who have introduced a joint resolution calling on the Commerce and Treasury Departments to issue summary trade reports that will show our true competitive standing in the world rather than obscuring the facts. I trust that the Ways and Means Committee will hold early hearings so that all doubts can be resolved.

FRED BUSBEY, THE RUGGED INDIVIDUALIST

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it was a great shock to me to learn of the passing of my very good friend, Fred Busbey, who served in this body with distinction in the 78th, 80th, 82d, and 83d Congresses. Inasmuch as he was elected from what is generally known as a politically marginal district, he was not able to have continuity of service and the opportunity to demonstrate his full worth. Notwithstanding this, in each Congress that he served he contributed immeasurably to its deliberations.

We frequently use the descriptive term "rugged individualist" without our always being quite certain what it means. But I think that anyone who was privileged to know Fred Busbey would understand exactly what is meant when we refer to him as a "rugged individualist."

He was a man of convictions, with courage of his convictions, and more than just ordinary courage. He would fight to the bitter end, even if he stood alone, for what he believed. Nothing could deter him.

During World War I, he served as a Regular Army sergeant, and he participated in some of the hardest fought battles of that war. He was proud of this, and justly so. And as I fondly reflect on Fred's service in the Congress, he showed the same ruggedness and determination and ingenuity that somewhat typifies a military sergeant. He did not seek glory for glory's sake. He sought results, and he got results.

With the passing of Fred Busbey I have lost a very fine friend. He will never be forgotten by any of us privileged to know him.

McNENNY FISH HATCHERY AT SPEARFISH, S. DAK.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is very unfortunate to find that the 1967 budget for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife does not include any proposed expenditure for the current building and expansion program being undertaken at the McNenny Fish Hatchery at Spearfish, S. Dak.

The McNenny hatchery, constructed in 1951, produces rainbow and brown trout primarily for stocking waters in the Black Hills trout management area. This area contains about 175 miles of trout streams and 1,900 acres of trout lakes, which provide an estimated 800,000 man-hours of angling annually. In addition to this, this hatchery supplies 17 counties in western South Dakota, 21 counties in western North Dakota, 10 counties in eastern Wyoming, and a large Bureau of Reclamation reservoir in Nebraska. The average annual production of all species is about 70,000 pounds.

During the past several years the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and State and local governments have constructed numerous new impondments in South Dakota, and the three neighboring States. Many of these reservoirs provide excellent trout fishing; however, to maintain the fishery, frequent planting of fingerling fish is required. Requests for fingerling trout by management agencies exceed the present production capabilities of the hatchery.

The McNenny hatchery also serves as a production test center for the formulation and testing of fish diets. This has resulted in significant improvements in our ability to produce quality diets at substantial cost savings. A new building is needed to house testing and diet formulation equipment, and to provide additional fingerling production facilities. With funds provided in fiscal year 1966—$25,000—a well is at the present time being drilled to supplement the hatchery's water supply.

The development program, which I shall outline in a moment, must be undertaken to increase the production of fish and to improve efficiency of operations immediately. The expanded facilities would mean about 100,000 pounds of trout could be produced annually, approximately doubling the present fingerling production.

The development program includes the following items:

Pipeline	$10,000
Broodstock raceways	20,000
Production building and facilities	120,000
Residence	20,000
Sewage disposal system	20,000
Equipment	15,000

Therefore, the total estimated cost of the program is $205,000. I urge the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee and each Member of this House to carefully consider this building program, and urge that the necessary funds be included in the 1967 fiscal year budget so this important construction program can continue without interruption.

FEDERAL REVENUES FOR USE IN STATE PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining several of my Republican colleagues in introducing legislation to share a portion of Federal revenues with each State for use in public elementary and secondary education.

The bill would establish an educational assistance trust fund, into which 1 percent of the revenue received from the Internal Revenue Code and tariff schedule would be deposited the first year, 2 percent the second year, up to 5 percent the fifth year, and thereafter.

Tax sharing for education is based on a two-part formula: half of the money would be returned to the States on a per-student basis; the other half would be based on the amount of effort each State is currently putting into education. "Effort" is defined as the percent of gross personal income spent on public elementary and secondary education.

The concept of tax sharing to bolster the State's abilities to provide those services which are within its domain is an attractive one to all those who fear intervention by Washington in local matters. Education, along with other services, is becoming more and more difficult for States to afford. State taxes have risen steadily, from $4.9 billion 20 years ago to $24.2 billion in 1964. In 1963 alone, property taxes rose 7.3 percent over 1962 rates, sales taxes increased by 8.7 percent, corporation taxes by 7.5 percent, and personal income tax by 6.3 percent.

All this has been caused by the increase in State and local expenditures. These have risen by 600 percent since the mid-1940's. The cost of education alone has risen over 700 percent in that time, from $3 billion in 1946 to $22 billion. And this outlay for education is expected to double by 1972.

State and local taxes have risen about as high as they can go, with the Federal Government preempting so much of the national income through Federal income tax. This leaves State and local governments in the position of having no place to turn except to the Federal Government.

However, the knowledge of local situations, needs, and problems is at the local and State level. They are far better able to improve their educational programs themselves. Gigantic Federal programs too often result in Federal control and the imposition of rules which are not in the best interests of education in all areas.

This year we have seen several localities in the United States refuse aid under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, because they feared overcontrol by the Office of Education. They would rather struggle along in freedom than lose control of the education of their children to those in far-removed offices in Washington.

For experience has taught us that Federal subsidy brings Federal control. The tax-sharing plan, however, lets the Federal Government provide the funds and lets the States determine how these can best be used to supplement their own efforts.

Built into the formula is the assurance that no State will then decide to sit back and let Uncle Sam pay the bills, for the amount a State receives depends in great part upon its own per student expenditures. If anything, this will spur the States on to greater effort.

To assure that the money is spent for education, plans will be submitted by the Governor to the Comptroller General of the United States each year, and at the end of the year an audit must be submitted to show actual use. This approach gives a tremendous boost to the education of our young people. Per pupil expenditures can increase greatly through Federal contributions and at the same time, incentive will be provided for each State to make even more effort on its own.

There would be no need for a great expansion of Federal personnel in Washington to administer the program—it would be handled by the local officials already on the job. It would yield us the greatest return on our investment, for it would utilize the best capabilities of each level of government.

Our federal system is a precious freedom which we must strive to preserve and strengthen. It is built firmly upon the Federal-State cooperation and division of powers and responsibilities, such as I propose in this bill. And like every other precious thing we know in America, its strength is in the education of each new generation to carry it on and

protect it. Surely, then, we can make no wiser investment in our Nation's future than by the speedy passage of this bill.

ROTATION NOW IN VIETNAM

Mr. SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. RONCALIO], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that from thinly populated Wyoming, with less than 320,000 human beings, six families have been called upon to pay the supreme price of the escalation of our Vietnam military posture.

These six fatalities are:

First. Alma Jack Stumpp, Afton, Wyo.

Second. Ernest Taylor, Jr., Kaycee, Wyo.

Third. Robert Fred Guthrie, Cheyenne, Wyo.

Fourth. Craig Blackner, Lyman, Wyo.

Fifth. Sam Lee Delos, Ten Sleep, Wyo.

Sixth. Ladd Condy, Cheyenne, Wyo.

What is particularly tragic, Mr. Speaker, is that in the case of at least two of the above war casualties from Wyoming had there been some type of rotation policy in effect in Vietnam their lives might have been spared.

Mr. Guthrie, a young man from Cheyenne, Wyo., was killed within 30 days prior to the completion of his tour of duty—after a 4-year hitch as a corpsman in the U.S. Marines.

On November 17, 1965, Ernest E. Taylor—a specialist 4th class—from Kaycee, Wyo., was killed in action. Two days before, he had written to friends that he expected to be released from combat duty on December 10 to begin his trip home, following his stretch of duty. In this case he was killed less than 3 weeks prior to the completion of his tour.

These two deaths show again the necessity for a review now of the military policy that asks far too much of a few while far too many get by giving far too little in this process of defending America in time of its military engagements.

Because of my own personal experience in the 1st Infantry Division in World War II, Mr. Speaker, an American Regular Army Division again engaged in combat in Vietnam—I believe it is proper to call to the attention of my colleagues at this time this glaring inequity in the Armed Forces of the United States. I have, accordingly, written to the Secretary of Defense suggesting a rotation policy for men in combat, and if none is forthcoming, I shall introduce legislation to that effect.

It is evident, Mr. Speaker, that these conflicts in policing the world—and particularly our Vietnam commitment—may extend for a long period of time. This being true, a certain number of set days in combat or "in contact with the enemy," becomes the only real goal which a fighting man understands in carrying out the daily ordeals of combat.

We in the Halls of Congress, we in the safe, well-fed sectors of America, may be moved by the euphonious principles daily restated in these difficult times. But to men eating the C-rations and sleeping in swamps, to men digging holes in the jungle and fighting and dying—so many days in combat and then home—this is the only language they truly understand.

A man in combat feels one thing above all else—and that is that he stays alive in order to come home to his loved ones. If a rotation policy is in effect, he is a better soldier because of it. If one is not in effect, Mr. Speaker, he has no goal; he has only bleakness and a constantly doubtful moral factor at best, which will always affect his proficiency.

I stress again, Mr. Speaker, experience has taught us that the first thing for which any man fights is his self-preservation. I believe we had better establish a firm and definite policy of rotation for our great fighting men now. It should be so many days in combat, during all of which they may look forward to returning home. Thus somebody in the training camps or civilian life in America, can take their place to carry on the fight which means so much to so many.

I believe a strong immediate rotation policy should be placed in effect so that at least five riflemen with the most overseas duty per company per month should be rotated home and replaced with recruits from stateside.

I believe these five men should come from every combat unit in South Vietnam, and I believe that at least two men should be rotated home from all support, supply, and other noncombat units now in these theaters of operations.

Mr. Speaker, I stress that this is a matter of equity and of the basic concepts of justice—and I hope my colleagues will take an interest in this vital matter.

In World War II in the Big Red One—the 1st Division—it was said that there were two ways to get home, by rotation or in a pine box—in a mattress cover, to be exact. In my sparsely populated district, which is the State of Wyoming, Mr. Speaker, six young men have come home so far via a pine box. It is time now to assure that the next six to come home to Wyoming come home alive and well, and able to know the respect and admiration of a grateful people.

THE WAR THAT FOREIGN AID FIGHTS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am told by those who have visited the battlefronts in South Vietnam that average life expectancy in Vietnam is only 35 years. You may be surprised to learn, however, that this figure has nothing to do with the bullets of the Communist enemy. This figure is the result of the ravages of other enemies: disease, hunger, and ignorance. The United States is engaged in a war on these killers as well as the terror and death spread by the Vietcong.

The soldiers on this second front are the teams of doctors being trained with the help of U.S. medical personnel and equipment provided through our AID program. Medical centers in Hue and Saigon are now graduating 150 doctors a year to take charge of the country's expanding medical services. More than 12,000 health centers have been established and stocked with medicines in rural health programs manned by 8,000 newly trained village health workers. When the United States started its battle against disease and squalor in Vietnam, there were fewer than 200 civilian doctors attending to the medical needs of 16 million people.

The importance of this effort is not diminished by the fact that Vietcong guerrillas destroy some of the new health units as soon as they are constructed. In every village where a Government health center is caring for the sick and undernourished there is visible proof of which side is concerned with the welfare of the people, proof which the Vietcong seek to obliterate.

The AID-supported health program started with the introduction of sanitary water supplies in the ancient capital of Hue, as well as in Saigon. In rural areas, outdoor sanitary facilities have been added.

A major campaign against malaria which was initiated with the help of U.S.-trained malaria teams, has reduced the incidence of new cases to less than 2 percent a year.

Deaths from malaria have been reduced from 35,000 in 1958 to 2,000 in 1965. Seven million people have been vaccinated against cholera, and 8 million more have received vaccinations and treatments for other diseases.

American civilians are responding increasingly to the Vietnamese Government's call for medical help. The latest group of American doctors to volunteer their services in Vietnam included 30 Cuban refugees. One hundred personnel from the U.S. Army Medical Civilian Action Program are also serving.

While there are many inadequacies and shortcomings in our AID program in Vietnam, there is no questions but that this humanitarian effort equals or exceeds in importance our military effort there. The Agency and the administration are now making a major effort to win the nonmilitary war in Vietnam—and are successfully persuading the South Vietnamese Government to place more emphasis in this direction. This effort as fully deserves our support as the military authorization on which we will shortly be acting.

SMALL BUSINESS NEEDS HELP

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which must be passed if the small businessmen of this Nation are to receive the assistance the Congress intends they receive. My bill would separate the revolving funds under the Small Business Act so that the Small Business Administration could not reach into direct business loan funds even if some widespread disaster would justify that action. In the case of a disaster requiring additional financial assistance from SBA, a separate supplemental appropriation would be required. The thrust of this bill is to keep inviolate the small business direct loan program which has been so important to the small businessmen of the Nation.

The legislation I have introduced would not increase the SBA appropriation but would divide it into three separate revolving funds reserved for specific purposes. The Small Business Act now provides for only one with allocations set administratively within SBA.

My bill would establish one revolving fund for direct business loans under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act, prime contract authority under section 8(a), and loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in the amount of $1 billion.

A second revolving fund totaling $300 million is set up for disaster loans under section 7(b) and section 7(b)(2). The third separate revolving fund is set up for programs under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958—except for title IV of that act—and the bill authorizes $461 million for this fund.

My bill also sets limits for the amounts of loans, guarantees and commitments which may be outstanding at any one time under each of the three funds.

Mr. Speaker, the need for legislation such as I have introduced today has been amply demonstrated on a number of occasions in recent years. The recent transit strike in New York City dramatized the seriousness of the failure of the Small Business Administration to seek funds necessary to maintain an effective direct loan program. Congress must take take immediate action to provide these funds.

Although SBA suspended its direct loan last October 11, it took no steps to obtain sufficient funds to avert economic disaster should an emergency arise. When the transit strike became an extended emergency, thousands of small businessmen were faced with economic ruin and SBA had no resources to assist them. Instead, SBA was forced to hastily round up extra funds to provide direct loans. There is some question whether the $20 million SBA raised from a revolving fund was enough to meet the need. But the main point is that SBA's mad dash for money was precisely the wrong approach and should not have been necessary.

Suspension of the direct loan program is now in its sixth month and SBA officials still are unable to tell us when they will be able to lift the moratorium. True, SBA is studying ways of better organizing the loan program, but that is little comfort to the businessman who needs a loan now.

I urge all my colleagues to join with me in taking positive action to put the small business direct loan program back on its feet. We can afford no further delay.

ESTONIA—INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor to extend congratulations to the thousands of supporters in America of Estonian independence and to the captive people of Estonia on this February 24, the anniversary of their independence. While the Estonian nation has experienced many misfortunes since their 1918 declaration of independence, the ebullient quest for freedom and liberty that was once achieved, remains strong today.

Yes, Russia still wields its overpowering influence in Estonia, but even 22 consecutive years of Russian occupation have not succeeded in destroying the Estonians' determination to remain true to their own cultural heritage.

The shameful and sometimes barbaric treatment of the people of Estonia at the hands of the Russian Communists is surpassed perhaps only by that of Nazi Germany. Proof of Russian brutality and virtual extermination of much of Estonia's people lies in the stark population statistics of 1934 and 1959. During that 25-year interval the Estonian population decreased by approximately 120,000. Primary methods employed by the Soviets which account for those losses were purges, deportations, and murders. Many Estonians were forced to become refugees, many of whom were able to come to America. But this policy of the Russians had another facet; the number of Russians in Estonia grew by more than 167,000 during the same period. It is estimated that more than 240,000 persons from the Soviet Union have "migrated" into Estonia. We are all aware that the purpose of this Russian program was to dilute Estonian nationalism through a tremendous influx of persons loyal to Mother Russia. However, strong Estonian resistance to this imperialist Russian subterfuge has been a leading factor in its failure and is quite reminiscent of the historic failures during the 1721–1918 period of czarist Russian occupation.

Americans of Estonian descent have continued their activities in support of liberty for their captured brethren. America can take pride in the fact that she has welcomed to her shores more than 60,000 Estonian refugees from Nazi and Communist persecution. Though naturally concerned about events in Estonia, these Estonian-Americans have freely joined in the fight to improve man's condition wherever he is found.

While much of the world's attention has been focused on such vital issues as Vietnam and proliferation of nuclear weapons, we must not lose sight of the plain and overriding issue of fundamental human freedom. The people of Estonia are unfortunate victims who bear witness to the fact that the struggle for freedom is not limited to the "undeveloped" areas of the world. It is being carried out wherever one group of people uses force or intimidation to subject another group to its will. It is in this light we should consider the case of Estonia.

It is a travesty of the meaning of freedom that these people must be forced to observe the passing of another anniversary while in the cruel and vise-like grasp of Communist Russia. Let us in everyway possible and at every opportunity call to the world's attention the plight of the people of Estonia and the rest of the souls Communist Russia still maintains in virtual bondage.

VASCO DE SOUSA JARDIM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening in my hometown of Newark I was privileged to join with many of my friends in the community in paying tribute to one of New Jersey's most distinguished citizens, Vasco de Sousa Jardin. Founder, editor, publisher of New Jersey's weekly Portuguese language newspaper, Vasco Jardim's influence extends well beyond New Jersey and well beyond his ethnic associations. And for his more than 40 years of service to the community and to his fellow Portuguese-Americans, Vasco Jardim was singled out to receive the highest civilian honor that can be awarded by the Government of Portugal: Conferral of the Order of Prince Henry.

It was a joyous occasion, this dinner, and I was honored myself by being asked to participate in the events. His Excellency Vasco Viera Garin, Ambassador of Portugal to the United States, made the presentation to Mr. Jardim, while such leading figures within the Portuguese-American community as Father Jose L. Capote; Father Anthony Monteiro; Donald B. Gomes, the chairman; Frank Soares, cochairman; Dr. Manuel L. da Silva, toastmaster; Antonio Braga, recording secretary; Mrs. Daniel Rodrigues, corresponding secretary; and Mario Teixeira, Jr., treasurer, were responsible for the well-organized success of the entire affair.

Vasco Jardim typifies the great men who have made America great since our early days. Born in the Madeira Islands of Portugal, he came to this country in 1920, settled and married in one of the largest Portuguese-American communities in southwestern Massachusetts, moving to Newark in 1928. Even as in Fall River and New Bedford, Vasco Jardim immediately became a powerful force for good in his new community.

As a reporter, he was always aware of his responsibility for truth; as a citizen, he helped weld into the community those of his own ethnic heritage and helped the community to wipe away the artificial barriers that are often set around ethnic groups.

Many years ago John Donne wrote:

> No man is an island sufficient unto itself.

Each of us is touched, each of us is affected and changed, for better or for worse, by the actions of others. Because this is true, all of Newark, all of New Jersey and so many communities beyond our State lines stand in the debt of the man we honored last Saturday evening.

Good deeds are as the stars which shine brightly in the dark sky of night. We do not notice them in the sun-filled glare of day-to-day living; but they are there, nevertheless, to brighten the world at an hour when it most needs brightening. Saturday night we paid tribute publicly to one who so has brightened the world; to one who has given so much without reckoning the cost; to one who has labored so valiantly without regard for reward.

Vasco Jardim has made the world a little richer, a little warmer and a much, much better place for all of us. To which we can only add our sincere and heartfelt thanks and our prayers that he will long continue to do so.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I consider the setting aside today of our legislative duties for a few moments to recognize Estonia's independence anniversary as being a fitting tribute to the Estonian people. And yet, as I offer my congratulations to Estonia and to her many friends here in America, the occasion leaves me with mixed emotions. First, I am very privileged and grateful to wish Estonia well, but at the same time I am saddened when I reflect on the suffering and sacrifice that country has had to endure only to find itself still under the heel of Soviet Russia.

Estonia is a proud land. She endured almost 200 consecutive years of czarist domination before she achieved her independence on February 24, 1918. However, in spite of that fact, her nationalist fervor took root and culminated in the country's becoming independent in 1918. Ridding one's country of foreign troops almost singlehandedly is not an easy thing to do. And in addition, Estonia had to fight German troops on one front while repelling Russian forces on another.

While attempting to solidify their newly won independence, the Estonians quickly discovered that running an independent state is not a simple matter. But the people eagerly joined in and the battle for domestic progress and stability was joined.

Soviet Russia had no intention of permitting that attempt at democracy so close to its borders to succeed, and merely awaited an opportunity to quash the Estonian Government. That opportunity was provided through the fanaticism of Hitler and World War II. Through heinous, brutal, and illegal methods, Russia gained control of the country in 1940, and resumed that control in 1944. Tragically, that control exists today.

Free men and women must determine how much longer that situation will exist. We must accept our responsibilities and play our roles, no matter how small or large, and examine Russia's imperialistic relationship with Estonia.

As we join in wishing congratulations on the anniversary of Estonian independence, let us try to make that event a living reality once again.

REV. GAETANO RUGGIERO

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last week the city of Newark was saddened by the passing of one of its outstanding citizens and spiritual leaders, the Reverend Gaetano Ruggiero. Father Ruggiero's loss is a deep sorrow to the thousands of us who knew him, and the parishioners of St. Lucy's Church, which he served as pastor for almost 34 years, will long miss his kind and inspiring guidance and leadership. But we can take solace in remembering the many years during which we were blessed by his work among us. Under unanimous consent I place in the Record at this point an editorial and a column by Vince Tuzzolo from the Italian Tribune of February 18, 1966, which eloquently express what we all feel about Father Ruggiero:

[From the Italian Tribune, Feb. 18, 1966]

Rev. Gaetano Ruggiero

Those of us who were privileged to know and love Rev. Gaetano Ruggiero, and there are many, were saddened this week by his death.

He was first of all a dedicated priest and the beloved pastor of St. Lucy's Church for more than 33 years. But he was more—much more. Sincere, friend, spiritual adviser, family counselor, you could call him all of these and still not capture with words his personal magnetism and momentous achievements.

He exemplified the qualities that have elevated the standards of our community to the high plane on which it is firmly established.

Our only comfort is that he has joined Almighty God whom he served so well for so long.

His mortal remains are buried on the grounds of St. Lucy's Church. His spirit will live on.

[From the Italian Tribune, Feb. 18, 1966]

Father Ruggiero

The passing of Rev. Gaetano Ruggiero, beloved pastor of St. Lucy's Church has left a void in the hearts of the thousands of parishioners who over the years have occupied pews and sat attentively as the good padre read the gospel or delivered a meaningful sermon with purpose. That they will miss the likeable little priest, who won his way into the hearts of many and succeeded to earn the respect and admiration of the most hardened parishioners goes without saying.

A deeply dedicated man of the cloth, Father Ruggiero, was best known for his warmth and understanding, qualities which were reflected in his ready smile and mirrored in the sparkle of his eyes. Much like the shepherd who led his flock, Father Ruggiero, was a stalwart leader who stood as a guiding influence among the people of the parish. Testimony to his talents are the many successful accomplishments during his pastorate. The completion of the church, the erection and decoration of the Chapel of St. Gerard Shrine and the new rectory along with the St. Lucy's Community Center. His last act was the signing of a contract for the installation of air conditioning in the church.

It can also be said that Reverend Ruggiero was proud of the St. Lucy's Bugle and Drum Corps, national champions and winner of many titles and competitions. It might also be added he was somewhat delighted over the championships garnered by the St. Lucy baseball teams. Although, never known to be athletically inclined, Father Ruggiero was an advocate for good clean athletic and recreational participation. He viewed this form of exercise as a healthy outlet for the abundant energies stored up in the bodies of our young. Although he often added as an afterthought, "they are less likely to get into mischief."

There is much that can be said of this humble, kind man, whose career spanned more than 50 years in the priesthood. He studied at the Acireale Seminary in Sicily and attended the Gregorian University in Rome where he earned his bachelor of divinity and doctor of canon law.

He came onto St. Lucy's in the year of 1932 as pastor to succeed the late Msgr. Joseph Perotti. He completed much of the work started by the late Monsignor while realizing many of his own initiated programs.

Man and boy, the writer had known Father Ruggiero for many years, first as a parishioner and in the years to follow as a follower and supporter of his many projects.

He was blessed with a great retentive memory and knew the faces and names of almost all the parishioners and their offsprings. We will still remember the events of our first meeting and introduction. "Tuzzolo," he had said, "yes, you are the son of Theodora." My mother was a deeply religious woman. In fact, we daresay she was in church more than she was home.

The moments we recall best of Father Ruggiero are those in which we found him in his office at the rectory. At his desk, writing a letter and on other occasions immersed in deep meditation. There were other times when, listening to his stereo, he was carried away by some familiar aria and hummed along with the tune. He loved music and some of his leisure hours were spent listening to the classics. He knew practically every score of all the operas.

Then there was the time early last year when the writer, in company with Anthony Coppola, called on the Father to tell him he had been selected for the Tribune Award as the "Outstanding Citizen." His first reaction was one of surprise. Then, recovering from this unlooked for event, he turned to us and said, "While I am deeply grateful for this honor I am sure there are many others more deserving." Father advised us to look elsewhere for someone else. However, we assured him we would not take no for an answer, as this was the decision of the awards committee.

Out of respect for him we conceded to give him time to think it over, stating that his acceptance would in a large sense do us honor. We were happy to find on our next visit several weeks later he was to give his consent.

There are countless things we remember of this wonderful little priest, whose wise counsel and spiritual guidance enriched the lives of the many of us who had the benefit of his teachings. Requiescat in pacem.

NEWARK 300

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last Friday evening an ambitious, resourceful and challenging project was unveiled to commemorate my hometown's tercentennary. Under the directorship of Thomas C. Murray, a teacher at Essex Catholic High School, the students of the high school put together a topical review of Newark's 300 years.

Even if I had not been a lifelong resident of Newark, I would still have been pleased and favorably impressed by the scope and thoroughness of the student's work. "Newark 300" gives deserved attention and new dimension to the many and varied roles which our city has played through 3 eventful centuries of history—from the hazards and hardships of early colonial life to the search for values and individual identity at the dawn of the space age.

A bustling community, rich in culture and tradition long before the Declaration of Independence, Newark retained its early pioneering spirit as its driving force through years of growth and greatness as it became a leader in manufacturing, commerce, banking, and transportation, and an important contributor to the cultural enrichment of the Nation.

It is always fascinating to poke among the burned-out ashes of yesterday's fires the peek behind the curtained cobwebs of the past. We find so much to stir our fancy, so much to cause us to reflect.

No one knows this better than Miss Miriam Studley, the inspired director of the New Jersey Room of Newark's Public Library. Wisely enough, the students of Essex Catholic dedicated the book they they compiled on Newark's history to Miss Studley, for she was genuinely deserving of this tribute.

When skillfully applied, the lessons of the past help us to understand the present that we may build a better future. With this in mind, I suggested that this anniversary salute be dedicated to the Newark of tomorrow.

Three hundred years have taken their toll. Blight has crept into older neighborhoods. Some buildings have deteriorated beyond repair and usefulness. Narrow horse-and-buggy streets need to be widened to accommodate modern vehicles.

The Federal Government has recognized its responsibility to help the big cities solve the problems induced by age and urbanization. And Congress has been accelerating programs of Federal aid for vitally needed renewal projects, for new housing, for new roads, for replacement of outworn municipal equipment.

Newark has been getting its fair share of Federal aid. Wherever one looks in Newark today, one is heartened by the sight of new construction rising on locations where eyesores recently festered. The facelifting is going well. The telltale wrinkles of old age are being smoothed over, and a new, young Newark can confidently look ahead to a promising future of gracious growth—economically, socially, culturally.

"Newark 300," its director, Thomas C. Murray, its creators, the students of Essex Catholic High School deserve the thanks, the praise of all Newark citizens for their singular contribution to understanding our past, planning our future.

TO IMPROVE AND UPDATE THE FEDERAL-STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, H.R. 13037, designed to improve and update the Federal-State Employment Services, and to make them into the kind of institution which these times demand. A similar bill has been introduced in the other body by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. The Select Subcommittee on Labor, of which I am chairman, and the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee of the other body, chaired by my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator CLARK, have planned joint hearings to begin on or about March 1. It is our hope that these hearings, the hearings that have been held on Employment Service and Manpower Problems by our two subcommittees in the recent past and the report of the Secretary of Labor's Task Force on the Employment Service will provide a record on which the Congress can, this year, move to meet the growing needs in this area.

The bill which I have introduced today does not, let me assure you, seek to create a monolithic, federalized, public employment service which will try to, or be able to, swallow up the private employment services. Let that tired old charge be laid to rest right now.

On the contrary, this bill will not only strengthen the Federal and the State manpower services, but empowers the Secretary of Labor to cooperate actively with the private employment services, as well as with other public agencies and private groups which may be able to serve the goal which all those interested in the manpower problem seek to reach—a state of affairs in which job openings are widely publicized, in which qualified workers are available to meet industry's needs, and in which the new techniques of information exchange are placed at the disposal of the entire manpower services profession—public and private, State, and Federal.

This great Nation's human resources, Mr. Speaker, are the real cornerstone of our national strength. These resources are rich and they are varied, but the demands upon them are growing as rapidly as human ingenuity can devise new products, new skills, and new ways of doing things.

In times past, people have commented on the tragic irony of starvation in one area and food surpluses in another. An equally tragic irony is the fact of labor shortages in one part of our economy and unemployment in another. If we are to see our manpower resources used wisely, if the age of automation is to be, as indeed it can be, an age in which the benefits of technology are to be placed at the service of human beings, we need an active national manpower policy. And if we are to have such a policy, we need the tools to shape and carry out such a policy.

The Manpower Services System which this bill seeks to create is one of those tools. I hope the Congress will consider it, will shape it further to meet our national manpower needs, and make it available to the American people.

LEGISLATION TO INSURE SPECIAL SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to insure that the special school milk program is extended with an adequate appropriation to assure the continued availability of milk at a moderate price for consumption in our Nation's schools.

I was concerned with the earlier action of the Budget Bureau in refusing to release $3 million already appropriated for the special school milk program this year, and I am deeply disturbed by the proposal to cut funds for the school lunch program by 12 percent and the special milk program by almost 80 percent for the coming fiscal year.

These programs have through the years proven to be especially effective means of assisting schools in providing nutritionally desirable diets to grade and high school students at moderate prices. I feel they have in this important manner contributed to the health and development of the Nation's future generation.

During fiscal year 1964 nearly 60 million school lunches and over 50 million additional half-pints of milk were served to students in the State of Iowa alone under these extremely successful and popular programs. I have personally visited in 68 schools in northeast Iowa this fall, and have eaten with students in their cafeterias. I know how valuable the programs are to the overall education effort in the State.

I can see no need to reduce these successful programs which cost relatively little and have provided enormous nutritional benefits for the Nation's students at the same time that new and unproven proposals are receiving additional funds. Moreover, the effect of these cuts is almost certain to impose further strain upon already overburdened property taxes and local school budgets, as well as to increase the cost of milk to our schoolchildren.

It is, of course, extremely important to closely review all programs of Government to avoid unnecessary expenditures. I am afraid, however, that when the unquestioned benefits of providing proper nutritional advantages for so many of the Nation's students is weighed against the comparatively small cost of the program, the proposed reductions may prove to be unwise economy.

I sincerely hope that hearings will be held on this legislation at an early date by the appropriate committees of Congress, and that the benefits of the programs will be extended.

LEGAL AID FOR INDIGENTS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, recent news accounts disclose that David G. Bress, U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, has rejected a proposal to provide indigent suspects with lawyers during stationhouse interrogations by the police. Washington Post, February 15, 1966. The proposal was submitted by the neighborhood legal service project, which is part of the war on poverty program in the District. The suggested stationhouse legal aid program would have been manned by the project's staff attorneys and volunteers from the local bar associations. At a time when the resources of this Nation are being mobilized to help the poor, it is most disturbing that the U.S. Attorney in the Nation's Capital should not allow legal assistance to be made available to indigent suspects in the stationhouse.

At issue here is the question of the point at which a criminal suspect becomes entitled to legal assistance, and whether the indigent suspect may be denied the opportunity for legal assistance at the stationhouse which the wealthy suspect is able to obtain.

It is difficult to understand why the U.S. attorney would turn down an offer to provide such legal aid to indigents. Apparently the Federal Government's policy of encouraging legal help to the poor is not fully understood—in any event, it is not being fully effectuated.

Apparently one of the reasons the U.S. attorney rejected the proposed offer of legal aid at this time is that he desires to await the outcome of five cases pending before the Supreme Court which raise many questions concerning a suspect's rights in the interrogation stage a criminal case. The pending cases are: *California* v. *Stewart*, No. 584; *Miranda* v. *Arizona*, No. 759; *Vignera* v. *New York*, No. 760; *Westover* v. *U.S.*, No. 761; *Johnson* v. *New Jersey*, No. 762.

These cases reflect the split among the lower courts over the scope in the Supreme Court's holding in *Escobedo* v. *Illinois*, 378 U.S. 478, June 1964, where the Court reversed a murder conviction because Escobedo had confessed after the police refused to let him see his lawyer, who was in the stationhouse at the time, asking to see Escobedo. In effect, the Court held that the fifth amendment's privilege against self-incrimination and the sixth amendment's guarantee of defense counsel do extend to the police station. No one can predict with certainty as to how much the Escobedo decision will be clarified by the Court in the pending cases. However, it is virtually certain that the Court will resolve the issue which splits lower courts around the country today. That is, whether the police must advise a prime suspect of his right to remain silent and his right to a lawyer before eliciting a confession from him.

Of course, it is necessary to emphasize that where law enforcement officials have not yet "focused" on a particular suspect, they remain free and unhampered to investigate criminal cases by gathering information and evidence from witnesses without applying the strict ruling of Escobedo.

If the Court holds that the police have no such obligation, the Escobedo decision will have then been limited to the peculiar facts in that case. Rarely do lawyers appear in the precinct house while a suspect is being questioned. Nor are many suspects worldly enough or financially able to afford an attorney. However, it would be difficult for the Court to limit the Escobedo decision to only those situations where a suspect's attorney is already present at the stationhouse and the suspect specifically requests to see him.

For, as the Court there stated:

> Nothing we have said today affects the powers of the police to investigate "an unsolved crime," by gathering information from witnesses and by other "proper investigative efforts." We hold only that when the process shifts from investigatory to accusatory—when its focus is on the accused and its purpose is to elicit a confession—our adversary system begins to operate, and, under the circumstances here, the accused must be permitted to consult with his lawyer.

Meanwhile, it would be appropriate for U.S. law enforcement officials not to worsen the existing plight of indigent accused persons by declining to permit them to have legal assistance. The offer of the neighborhood legal service project of stationhouse legal aid provided a singular opportunity for the U.S. attorney in the District of Columbia to assume a role of national leadership with respect to protecting legal rights of accused persons.

It is to be regretted that a more affirmative response was not forthcoming.

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker—

> The news may be good or bad—we shall tell you the truth.

These words were spoken in the first broadcast of the Voice of America, in February 1942.

With these words, America embraced a mighty principle, a principle which should be our eternal guide.

The agency, in a recent booklet, explained itself in lean, admirable prose.

It said:

> The Voice of America speaks to the world for America, for the Government, and for the people of the United States. It seeks to make U.S. policies intelligible. It seeks to inform. It attempts to associate the people of the United States, in their daily lives, their progress and their yearnings, with the legitimate aspirations of all people everywhere.

In my judgment, the Voice of America is effective in direct proportion to its candor and objectivity. When it is candid, when it is objective, when it reports a diversity of opinion, it is doing its job. When these elements are missing, its effectiveness is bound to decline.

If the Voice is to be listened to—it must get through. The former obstacle of jamming has disappeared in Eastern Europe, for example, except for Bulgaria. But you must attract and hold listeners in the face of radio competition from friends and adversaries. You do this by programing, packaging, and credibility. Basically, you must be listened to, and you must be respected. The interrelationship is a persistent one.

The Voice of America speaks the language of truth in 37 of the world's languages. Every day, an audience of tens of millions is reached directly in those 37 languages. In addition, 28 other languages are used for special programs. Incidentally, we broadcast more hours in "Worldwide English" than any other language.

The raw statistics of the Voice of America operation are impressive.

Packaged programs, totaling 13,000 hours are placed each week on local stations abroad.

The Voice has 100 transmitters, 56 of them overseas. This insures clear transmission in most of the world.

The Voice broadcasts close to 800 hours weekly. This compares to the U.S.S.R.'s 1,350, Red China's 900, the United Kingdom's 630, and the United Arab Republic's 580. I trust that we make up in quality any deficit in quantity.

The budget for USIA's radio arm for fiscal year 1966 is $30.1 million.

Voice of America news editors transmit about 50,000 words of news every day. Special material is also prepared for individual countries.

There has been a revolution in communications in the 24 years since the Voice of America was born. The mass production of transistor radios, for example, has dramatically enlarged the potential listening audience. Over the years, the Voice has adapted well, for the most part, both in personnel and equipment.

I had the good fortune to become personally acquainted with the Voice in early 1962, when the distinguished Edward R. Murrow, as head of USIA, was carrying the Agency to new highs of professional pride. Since that time I have cut nearly 125 tapes for transmission to Eastern Europe.

I have found the top leadership of the Voice, including the desk officers, to be highly skilled and dedicated men. They do not tire of learning more and more about countries they are broadcasting to, while keeping fully apprised about America. Moreover, the practice of interlacing Foreign Service officers into the Voice's administrative machinery brings fresh men and fresh viewpoints into play. John Chancellor, the new director, is the first professional radioman to head the Voice. The appointment of this highly respected newsman emphasizes the importance of the Agency.

A few weeks ago, I was privileged to be a member of the congressional delegation which took part in the dedication of a new hospital in Krakow, Poland, a hospital built, in part, with counterpart funds.

Although the Polish press did not carry any coverage of the dedication until after the event, we found that the man on the street was well informed—thanks to the Voice of America—about both the hospital and about our delegation.

I had a personal experience which added deeply to my impression that the Voice has a wide audience in Poland. While in Krakow, I was called out of a dinner and informed that a shy young man was asking for me. It turned out to be my first cousin. He had learned from his village priest, who had heard the news on Voice of America, that I was a member of the delegation. Whereupon he had traveled all night on a train, hundreds of kilometers, and slept in a train station, to greet his American relative. It was a moving personal experience.

While I have had occasion to be more familiar with the Voice of America's European activities, I know of its increasing emphasis on Latin America, Asia, and Africa. A free flow of information to these continents is in our interest, in the short run and in the long run.

The Voice must resist the temptation to color its news summaries and interpretations for short-run advantages. Understandably, there have been and there may continue to be such temptations when crisis situations erupt.

We in the Congress must resist similar temptations. In exercising our supervisory responsibilities, we can best serve our Nation in 1966 by holding the Voice to the high purposes it began with in 1942:

> The news may be good or bad—but we will tell you the truth.

ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, by speeches, programs, awards, and other activities we in America today offer our recognition of Estonia's 48th anniversary. I am very proud that we have continued to offer our support and encouragement to those millions of brave people in Estonia who are held in captivity by Moscow.

Historically, however, Russian domination in Estonia has not been a new phenomenon. From 1721 to 1918, the tiny nation had been held in subjugation by czarist Russia, which had expected much effort to make the Estonian people "russified." Though suffering death, deportation, hunger, and other deprivations at the hands of Russia, the strong ties to her cultural past have sustained Estonia in resisting cultural incursions by the Soviets.

The declaration of independence of February 24, 1918, was one of the great landmarks in Estonian history, but brave and courageous deeds have been a common occurrence in that country. Therefore, I hope that as we in this country offer our congratulations to the anniversary of that February 24 event, we will pledge ourselves to stand ever ready to assist Estonia in whatever way we can in order to break Russia's stranglehold on the Estonian nation. These heroic and gallant people certainly deserve a better fate than that forced upon them by Communist Russia.

THE TAX MEASURE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TODD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I support the tax measure we voted upon. It will accelerate the rate at which taxes are paid into the Treasury. And it will reimpose excise taxes on telephones and automobiles which we voted to remove last year, when we did not believe the demands of the conflict in Vietnam would be so great.

I support the tax measure because it is a necessary step to avoid inflation. It follows the monetary policies of the Federal Reserve System, shown in sales of Government bonds and the increase in interest rates.

But I fear the tax measure is not enough to do the job: The projected deficit is up. Unemployment is less than 4 percent, and the unemployed are, by and large, not possessed of the skills which are in demand. Thus, the unemployment rate among those who have skills needed is much less than 4 percent. Plants are operating in excess of 90 percent of capacity. Our balance of payments continues unfavorable. Commodity and consumer price indexes continue to move upward.

Our Nation is committed to a major effort to prevent southeast Asia from becoming dominated by China. At this time, large sums are required for our military operations, and increasingly large sums will be required for our development programs, designed to bring civil peace to areas secured by military operations.

We expect discipline and sacrifice of those who bear the battle. We should demand no less of ourselves at home. This is why we cannot permit inflation to occur, for it is incompatible without responsibilities.

The alternative to vigorous monetary and tax policy to avoid inflation is the imposition of price controls. As we know from past experience, price controls are only temporary palliatives and sooner or later they create such hardship and malallocation of resources that they must be removed. They are completely artificial and incompatible with a free competitive system in which prices are allowed to adjust, in the marketplace, to demand and supply. They lead to black markets, bureaucracy, and a great deal of waste of effort. Some further tax increase, in my opinion, is preferable to price controls as a means of avoiding inflation.

I suggest that study be given, if price rises continue, to the imposition of further excise taxes upon goods which are competing for scarce resources with our defense efforts. Such taxes would both drain off inflationary dollars, and reduce the demand for scarce commodities. They would not interfere directly in the free play of market forces. They would not affect those sectors of the economy not related to the defense effort. They would not require changes in the wage-price guideline formula.

Voluntary guidelines, in the long run, are not a substitute for wise and responsible fiscal policy which give the marketplace full play. I hope this Congress will give further attention to the implementation of sound fiscal policy, so that the role of direct and indirect controls can be minimized, and sooner, rather than later, completely eliminated.

BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, 1966, I wrote to Hon. John W. Bush, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, expressing my concern over the serious boxcar shortage existing in the Nation and the recent car distribution order issued by the Commission directing the Southern Railway System to turn over 350 boxcars each week to Western railroads to relieve boxcar shortages in the West.

Chairman Bush replied to my letter on February 23, 1966. The text of his letter is as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 23, 1966.

Hon. BASIL L. WHITENER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITENER: This will acknowledge of your letter dated February 17, 1966, protesting Commission car distribution directions as contributing to boxcar shortages in the East.

The ownership of plain boxcars by U.S. class I carriers is inadequate to meet the demands of the shipping public. From January 1, 1956, to date, the available supply of this type of equipment has been reduced by more than 190,000 cars; and there continues to be in excess of 2,000 plain boxcar retirements per month over replacements. The shortage of this equipment is not limited to one area, but exists in most sections of the country. The Commission has no authority to require carriers to purchase new equipment or to repair unserviceable equipment. The Commission does have the responsibility, however, to maintain an equitable distribution of the available supply of cars.

The Commission has in effect several car distribution directions designed to move empty plain serviceable boxcars, with inside length less than 44 feet 8 inches and doors less than 8 feet wide, to areas in greatest distress for this type of equipment. More than 20 railroads are affected by these directions, and most of them are cooperating with the Commission in an effort to alleviate a shortage which currently is reported as in excess of 10,000 boxcars per day and where in some sections of the country shippers are being deprived of sufficient cars to meet 50 percent of requirements.

The carriers located in the eastern and southern districts as a group indicate that they have in excess of 100 percent of plain boxcar ownership on line. The northwestern district of the country is currently attempting to operate with 76 percent of ownership on line.

I am sure that you appreciate the fact that the Commission must be ever alert to the national requirements. However, the car situation will be closely watched, and any adjustments will be made which are deemed necessary to assure everyone his fair share of the available car supply.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. BUSH,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, the information that he has given me confirms the statements I made in the House on February 22, 1966. The critical boxcar shortage in the Nation cannot be relieved through distribution service orders or by an increase in the fee one railroad must pay another railroad for the use of its freight equipment.

The problem can be solved only by an accelerated program of boxcar construction. It is a serious problem affecting the economy of the Nation and the national defense. The Congress, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the railroads should give immediate attention to the situation.

WASHINGTON'S NATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and appalled this morning when I opened the Washington Post and discovered that the Federal Aviation Agency is contemplating spending $150 million of the taxpayers' money to turn the Washington National Airport into a jet-age airport.

Now, I am just as much in favor of modern air travel as anyone else in this country. And I believe firmly that our airport facilities should be constantly updated and upgraded to make way for improved air service.

But the facts surrounding the FAA's sudden compulsion to make National Airport a field for jet-age travel are curious indeed.

It has been only a few weeks, now, since the FAA suddenly announced that it would allow two- and three-engine jets to land and take off at National. That decision came as a surprise to many people, I know—particularly those who live in the highly congested, built-up residential sections around National Airport.

Such a decision may or may not have seemed justified to the FAA, based on the research facilities it has been using.

But the present announcement is another matter entirely.

Let us look at some figures. Let us look at the background.

Dulles International Airport was first opened to the public in 1962. Ever since that time the rate of traffic for the two airports has been just about the same—the airlines and their passengers use National Airport by a 9 to 1—or better—margin.

In the year ending in December 1963, there were 12,074 departures in scheduled service from Dulles compared to 98,432 from Washington National. The following year the ratio was 10,887 for Dulles to 96,520 at National.

In the 12-month period ending June 30 last year there were a total of 10,633 departures from Dulles compared to 97,556 from National.

Here we are with what is admittedly one of the world's greatest, most modern, and most architecturally impressive and beautiful airports—Dulles International—within a short drive of our Nation's Capital. And it is being bypassed by air traffic and we are being told that we must spend another $150 million to make Washington National bigger, better, and more modern.

What justification is there for this?

Dulles is a masterpiece of construction. Is it, also, a white elephant?

It cost the American taxpayers $119,200,000 to open Dulles to the public in 1962—$108 million for the terminal, hangars, and runways and another $11,200,000 for access roads to Interstate Route 495.

It cost the taxpayers $38,779,709 to open Washington National Airport to the public on June 16, 1941, and make the systematic improvements to it which have been needed in the years since that time.

The most fantastic comparison I have seen thus far, however, has to do with the cost of operating the two airports annually.

Dulles, with only 10,633 departures in the last 12-month period, cost the taxpayers and users a total of $3,984,298. At Washington National the cost was $3,258,447—and National served nearly 10 times as many flights as Dulles did in the same time period.

There seems to be little justification for the FAA's sudden determination to glut Washington National with a massive influx and outflow of high-speed jet travel. I, for one, am deeply disturbed by this announcement. And I suspect that a large number of my distinguished colleagues in this body are, also.

While we do everything we can to keep our airport facilities abreast of modern change, we must, at the same time, keep the safety and welfare of the citizens who live in this densely populated region in and around Washington uppermost in our minds.

The FAA's front-page headlines this morning do not indicate that this Agency is mindful of the dual responsibilities it bears by law to the traveling public and those who live near airport facilities. Unless it can do both, it should contemplate a good deal more carefully before it rushes into print.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD INTEREST RATE HIKE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I oppose inflation and would do everything in my power to resist it because inflation hurts the average consumer, the little man, most of all. But inquiries have been coming into my office from my home district, San Antonio, relating to the general tightening up of money since the Federal Reserve Board voted by a bare 4-to-3 majority last December to hike the discount rate. It seems to these people, and to many others, that the action of the Federal Reserve Board has created a good deal of inflation this year.

Now, these inquiries are very disturbing to me because they clearly show the ill effects of the interest rate hike, and they are difficult to answer. I wonder therefore whether the Federal Reserve Board members who voted for the discount rate hike will help me satisfactorily explain to the homebuyer in San Antonio why he now has to pay 6 percent interest on a federally insured home mortgage loan? How can I explain to the homebuilder why his sick industry will probably grow sicker this year, while other industries enjoy record profits? How can I explain to the unemployed and underemployed carpenter, bricklayer, electrician, and others in the sick homebuilding industry that their plight is the direct result of recommendations made by a handful of bankers and adopted by a 4-to-3 vote of the Federal Reserve Board, and that there is nothing that I can do or that any other elected official can do to reverse the decisions of those bankers?

These are all valid questions, and they demand answers. For my part, those few who constantly argue for higher interest rates, and who now are insisting on removing the 4¼-percent interest ceiling on long-term Government bonds are either unusually selfish or unusually dense.

ESTONIA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersy [Mr. McGRATH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 48th anniversary of Estonia's proclamation of independence as a democratic republic. Since that important event occurred, the history of this gallant people has been replete with both progress and setbacks, but the lesson of history is that although Estonia is today under the oppressive thumb of the Soviet Union, there is hope that this, too, will pass.

A mere 9 months and 4 days after declaring her independence, Estonia was attacked by Soviet Russia. This attack occurred only 13 days after Russia had declared that all peoples of the former Czarist Russia were free to secede from Lenin's "new Russia."

Again in February—February 2, 1920—after having repelled the Communist invaders for 14 months, Estonia succeeded in signing a peace treaty with Russia, and in September 1921, she was admitted to the League of Nations.

An armed coup d'etat by Communist groups on December 1, 1924, failed of success, and later investigations disclosed that the Soviet Union initiated the plan and had infiltrated the leaders of the uprising and a large number of fighters and arms into Estonia.

Democracy flourished in Estonia until September 1939, when the Soviet Union, threatening war as an alternative, forced upon that brave nation a mutual assistance treaty under which Estonia was compelled to establish a number of Russian naval and air force bases on her territory.

The following June, the Soviet Union presented to Estonia an ultimatum demanding establishment of a new government friendly to the Soviet Union and granting of free passage to additional Soviet troops. The next day—June 17, 1940—Soviet troops marched into an occupied Estonia. On June 21, a puppet government was imposed on Estonia by Moscow. To complete this annexation, Russia admitted Estonia into the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union as a Union Republic, and a Communist constitution was adopted by the Estonian puppet government on August 25, 1940.

From that day to this, Estonia has suffered under the Russian Communist yoke, but that gallant nation has never reconciled herself to the status of a Soviet colony. Therefore, today, Estonians in their homeland and those of Estonian birth and their descendants here and elsewhere in the free world, reiterate the hope that history will, indeed, repeat itself and Estonia will soon again join hands with the free nations of the world.

EMPLOYMENT OF THE POOR AS TEACHERS' AIDS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 89-10

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that will exempt the earnings of poor people employed under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act from consideration as part of this income or resources under the public assistance laws.

We have very correctly made an exemption for certain earnings of public assistance recipients before. Poor persons hired under the Economic Opportunity Act do not have to count part of their income under that act in determining their eligibility for public assistance. Thus, a mother on AFDC can work part time under an antipoverty program without it resulting in a deduction of her welfare payment.

This is sensible for two main reasons. This gives an incentive to the welfare recipient to accept part-time employment through the education aid program and thereby learn skills which may lead to eventual full-time employment and self-sufficiency. The second reason this exemption should be made is that we would merely be taking Federal funds out of one Federal account to place it back into another Federal account with no benefit to the individual employed.

I was most impressed by the statements submitted by Sargent Shriver to the ad hoc subcommittee on the war on poverty last April 30. He recounted the great advantages of employing the poor in these programs. Let me quote him:

> The employment of the poor in jobs other than menial ones is a significant way of securing their participation in the program. Positions such as health aides and teacher aides represent new career opportunities in fields which have previously been reserved for those with college training. They represent a new avenue of hope for the poor at the same time that they assist the trained professional—the registered nurse or teacher, for example—in increasing his effectiveness. In addition, the poor who fill these jobs can provide an important means of communication between the impoverished and the rest of the community. They can help community action agencies to be responsive to the real needs of the poor.

What Sargent Shriver has said about the poor participating in the Economic Opportunity Act certainly applies also for their participation in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs. Title I is aimed at helping the schools and the schoolchildren in less prosperous areas of the city or State. We should encourage the mothers and older children in these areas to accept employment knowing that it will not result in an immediate reduction in their welfare aid.

That is the aim of H.R. 13073.

The language of my bill is almost identical to the exemption included in Title VII of the Economic Opportunity Act.

I hope there will be broad support for this reform.

H.R. 13073

A bill to amend title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, to provide that payments received thereunder shall be disregarded for certain public assistance purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title II of the Act of September 30, 1950, Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PURPOSES

"SEC. 213. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of titles I, IV, X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act, a State plan approved under any such title shall provide that—

"(1) the first $85 plus one-half of the excess over $85 of payments made to or on behalf of any person for or with respect to any month under this title or any program assisted under this title shall not be regarded (A) as income or resources of such person in determining his need under such approved State plan, or (B) as income or resources of any other individual in determining the need of such other individual under such approved State plan; and

"(2) no payments made to or on behalf of any person for or with respect to any month under this title or any such program shall be regarded as income or resources of any other individual in determining the need of such other individual under such approved State plan except to the extent made available to or for the benefit of such other individual.

"(b) No funds to which a State is otherwise entitled under titles I, IV, X, XIV, or

XVI of the Social Security Act for any period before the first month beginning after the adjournment of a State's first regular legislative session which adjourns after the date of enactment of this section shall be withheld by reason of any action taken pursuant to a State statute which prevents such State from complying with the requirements of subsection (a)."

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRALEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, during our consideration of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, I voted for the motion to recommit and against final passage of the bill.

I should like to state that while I favored many aspects of the measure, such as the graduated withholding rates, quarterly payments by the self-employed of their estimated social security tax, and an increase in the percentage of tax to be paid currently through withholding, estimated tax payments or both, I felt compelled to vote against the bill because of the provisions relating to excise taxes on automobiles and especially telephone service.

I recognize the validity of the argument that adjustments must be made if the budget is to be kept as nearly in balance as possible and if we are to keep our commitments in Vietnam.

On the other hand, the Excise Tax Reduction Act has been in effect approximately 8 months. It would seem to me that the budget and defense experts in the administration should have been aware of the fact that we had, last June, a costly commitment in Vietnam which would require additional funds, and they should have planned accordingly. Quite frankly, I believe that there was poor planning on the part of those experts.

I feel that it was wrong to reduce these taxes last year if it was known that a large proportion of those taxes would have to be reinstated within 8 months; and if the budget and defense experts, who recommended and supported the tax cuts, did not honestly know this last year, we need a reexamination of the personnel, policies, and procedures involved to see if we can come up with more realistic forecasts. I do not think it is fair to the American taxpayer to reduce a portion of his taxes and then within less than a year restore them either by design or poor judgment.

For that reason I voted against the bill. I am hopeful that in the future our budget and defense experts will be able to project into the future better than they have in this instance.

SENATOR PAT McNAMARA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VIVIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for the vast majority of my constituents, when I say that it was with the greatest regret and personal sadness that I learned that the great senior Senator from Michigan, PAT McNAMARA, will retire at the end of this year.

PAT McNAMARA has been an outstanding servant of the people of Michigan; he has been a respected and beloved legislator; he has been, to many of my colleagues, and to me, a valued mentor. In the 12 years that PAT McNAMARA has served his State and his country, he has been a driving force behind some of the most important social legislation of the century: Hospital and health care for the elderly, aid to education, civil rights, and the first concerted Federal efforts to fight poverty.

As the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, he has been responsible for programs that are helping to provide thousands of cities and towns with capital improvements that are soon translated into new jobs and improved health and welfare. This is the proud legacy that PAT McNAMARA will leave our Nation when he retires next January.

After a lifetime of dedicated service, first as a leader in trade unionism and then in public service, PAT deserves to be able to ease up a bit. I wish him well in his retirement; but the Michigan congressional delegation and the people of Michigan will miss his leadership in the coming years.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that this afternoon when one vote came on a quorum call and another on adoption of the rule on the foreign aid bill I was with Dr. Irving Muskat, chairman of Interama, in conference with the Honorable John Macy, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, relative to some vital aspects of Interama and was not able to get back in time for these votes. However, I have, of course, voted on the other votes respecting the foreign aid bill, including final passage of the bill today.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT 14TH ANNUAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as a strong believer in the power of prayer, I was deeply moved, as were others present, by the remarks of President Lyndon B. Johnson at the 14th annual President's prayer breakfast meeting, held last Thursday, February 17.

Burdened by the weight of decision-making demanded by his high office, and having to make decisions calling for sending of American young men into the battlefields of Vietnam, our President stated that he has found the courage to face the next day in prayer. He quoted the words of another tormented President of a past generation, Abraham Lincoln:

> I have been driven to my knees many times by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go. My own wisdom and that of all about me seem insufficient for the day.

President Johnson added that his strength comes not only from his own prayers, but also from the prayers of the mothers who have given their sons to our country, and who in their great sorrow still found the courage to write him and to pray for him. The President was preceded by the world renowned evangelist, the Reverend Dr. Billy Graham.

Mr. Speaker, in the hope that those who did not hear the president may gain a better understanding of the heart and mind of our great leader by a reading of the complete text of his moving and inspiring remarks made on February 17, 1966, at the 14th annual President's prayer breakfast held at the Shoreham Hotel here in Washington under unanimous consent I include it in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE 14TH ANNUAL PRAYER BREAKFAST AT THE SHOREHAM HOTEL, FEBRUARY 17, 1966

Dr. Graham, my beloved friend, Senator CARLSON, distinguished guests at the head table, my dear friends, I am pleased to return again to our annual prayer breakfast to be among so many of my old friends. In this room this morning we have been privileged to hear one of the great speakers and leaders of our time. He has been heard by some of the great leaders of the most powerful nations in the world, yet not a single one of us is ashamed to say, "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help."

Just a few blocks from here, on the front of the National Archives, is an inscription, "The past is prologue." As your President, I have had many occasions to realize the truth of that statement. Throughout our long history our Presidents have struggled with recurring problems. The way they handle those problems and their successes or failures can guide us in the actions that we are called upon to take today.

But there are some things that history cannot teach us and among them is how to bear, without pain, the sending of our young Americans into battle and how to fill the aching void as we wait for the news of their fate and how to console the wife, or the mother, or the little children when that news is bad.

These are the times when I recall the wisdom of Abraham Lincoln when he said, "I have been driven to my knees many times by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go. My own wisdom and that of all about me seem insufficient for the day." In private prayer at unusual moments, I have found courage to meet another day in a world where peace upon earth is still only an empty dream.

The Prophet Isaiah tells us, "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk, and not faint."

I believe that with all my heart, but in these troubled times I am sustained by much more than my own prayers. I am sustained by the prayers of hundreds of Americans who daily take the time to look up from their own problems in order to try to give me a little encouragement in mine. Not long ago I received a letter one morning from a mother whose son had been killed in Vietnam. She spoke of the pain and the loss and the tears that are ever ready to flow, but through all of this were words of encouragement for me from this dear little lady.

In her letter she concluded, "Mr. President, I wish I could tell you all that I feel in my heart. There just aren't words, so we ask God to bless you and your little family, that He will guide you in all the terrible decisions that you must make. As long as we believe, our strength is in our faith in God and He will never fail us."

My countrymen, in those words from that dear mother are to be found the greatness of this Nation and also the strength of its President.

FINANCING OF WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the fine explanation of H.R. 12752 provided by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], and I appreciate his appeal for our support of its enactment.

I likewise appreciate the very pointed admonitions set forth by the ranking minority Member the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]. It is heartwarming to know that an issue as vital as the financing of the war in Vietnam has such bipartisan support. However, I also agree with my colleagues who feel most strongly that this is, at least to some degree, discriminatory legislation.

Last June we removed the excise tax on many, many items, including a partial removal of the excise tax on automobiles and telephone charges. It occurs to me that we might have turned to the more luxury-type area to reimpose the excise tax. A tax on luxury items is certainly not one that touches the impoverished or the workingman. I concede also that the machinery is still in operation for collecting the excise tax on automobiles and telephones, and for that reason, it seems most appropriate that this be the area, though I reluctantly agree, where additional revenue must be found.

We all loathe war and none can deny that we are now engaged in a cruel war in Vietnam. Our servicemen dare not be denied the implements of war or the necessities for their subsistence, but since we are now engaged in this involvement I find no recourse except to approve the proposed Tax Adjustment Act of 1966.

I do so with the hope that in a very brief period of time we can restore these tax cuts and that the additional costs of warfare will be lifted from the backs of our taxpayers. While making this necessary adjustment now, I agree most wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], that we need to eliminate all unnecessary expenditures for domestic purposes—and such eliminations can be made. However, those who are suffering from inadequate economic resources today, those who have been disadvantaged by years of economic drought as many of the inhabitants of the Appalachia region, should not be made to suffer the first expenditure cuts. Wise expenditures of aid for these areas will help to replenish the Treasury in the future and improve income.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly express approval of the legislation in the hope that what we do here today, out of prudence, will provide assurances for victory in Vietnam.

THE REDWOODS DESERVE BETTER THAN COMPROMISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on conservation, delivered yesterday, is one of the most far-reaching and farsighted on this subject, of all time. The President is to be highly commended for his generally excellent program, and particularly on his proposals to combat water pollution.

California's Governor Brown deserves credit for his efforts leading to the inclusion of a Redwood National Park in this program and for his work to secure provision of appropriate economic adjustment payments.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would be less than candid or honest if I were to say the administration's redwood proposal is adequate to preserve this great and unique resource. Unfortunately, it falls far short of what is necessary if any meaningful stands of redwoods are to be preserved for future generations of Americans.

It takes a thousand years or more to grow mature redwoods, and, once cut, much longer still to establish a climax forest, if indeed that is possible at all. This point, incidentally, is not the opinion of novices or special-interest representatives. This point was made by the National Park Service in its report of September 1964, prophetically entitled "The Redwoods, a National Opportunity for Conservation."

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the administration's bill would appear to ignore this very message. It appears to disregard the simple but staggering fact that only 10 percent—or 200,000 acres—of this country's original redwood forest remains today. It appears to ignore the reality that last year alone some 15,000 acres of redwood giants fell to the woodman's ax, and that more are being felled—many in the very area proposed for preservation—as we talk.

These facts plainly indicate that bold action is required, but bold action does not characterize the administration's plan.

This plan calls for a 43,392-acre park in the Mill Creek area of Del Norte County, including the present Jedediah Smith and Del Norte Coast State Parks. But when these State parks are included, only some 25,000 acres would be added to protected status; only 7,800 acres of additional virgin redwoods would be included, and much of this is either of mediocre quality or in the process of being cut.

This Mill Creek area is primarily important as watershed protection for the two existing State parks. It would not compare in quality or variety, in scenic or recreational features, with the 90,000-acre park at Redwood and Prairie Creeks which 28 of our colleagues in the House have joined me in calling for, and which 16 Members of the Senate introduced yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I am also disturbed about the plan to provide a separate unit of 1,400 acres in Humboldt County to protect the world's tallest trees. It is not that these trees do not need protection; they need it desperately. But this provision of only 1,400 acres raises false hopes that they could be preserved for long. Once the surrounding valley slopes are logged off, as they inevitably will be, the tallest redwoods will be exposed to wind and flood and soil erosion which will quickly number their years.

The most serious weakness in the administration's proposal, however, Mr. Speaker, is the omission of the Redwood and Prairie Creek Valleys, where sweeping vistas combine with primeval forest and wild, clear streams in a setting of unmatched grandeur. Here nearly 80,000 acres of unprotected forests are available, 33,000 of which are forested with virgin redwoods.

This is the area originally identified as most desirable for a redwood national park in a National Geographic Society study.

This is the area first recommended by the National Park Service.

This is the area for a redwood park supported by the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, the National Audubon Society, the National Parks Association, the Men's Garden Clubs of America, the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, the Nature Conservancy, Trustees for Conservation, Citizens for a Redwood National Park, and the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs.

This is the area provided for in bills introduced by 45 Members of the House and Senate.

It may very well be, Mr. Speaker, that insufficient funds presently exist to acquire this entire area of primary desirability. But the answer to this limitation is not to put the limited funds available to second best use.

The answer is that if only $56 million is available, it should be put to use in buying the best land available; $56 million can make a very desirable start in acquiring an outstanding Redwood National Park in the Redwood Creek area, though certainly an even more desirable one could be purchased with more plentiful funds. And if we begin in the right place we can make appropriate additions as this becomes possible.

Compromise is not worthy of this great resource. Let us pursue its preservation with the vision, imagination and determination it deserves.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times this morning, in an editorial entitled, "Retreat on Redwoods," comments thoughtfully and perceptively on this very problem. I commend it to our colleagues' attention:

RETREAT ON REDWOODS

In his message on conservation yesterday, President Johnson put forward an excellent program to combat water pollution, on which we will comment later, and he reaffirmed his support for several desirable bills now pending for national parks and seashores.

But on one of the most controversial of current issues in this field—the size of the proposed Redwood National Park in northern California—his stand is a sharp disappointment.

For some months the administration has been wavering between two plans. One, embodied in a bill by Representative COHELAN, of California, would establish a 90,000-acre park. More than a score of House Members have introduced similar bills. The alternative plan drafted within the Interior Department provided for a drastically smaller park. It would have afforded no protection to Redwood Creek Valley, which has the best surviving stand of primeval redwoods. But it would have been much more acceptable to the commercial interests that want to saw these ancient trees—some of them more than 2,000 years old—into lumber for use as building material, fenceposts, and similar purposes.

Public protests against this timidly conceived, grossly inadequate plan led to the last-minute compromise which the administration sent to Congress yesterday. It is a compromise that will satisfy no one who understands the values at stake in the preservation for all time of these unique, magnificent trees. We note with surprise and regret that Senator KUCHEL, of California, has agreed to sponsor this highly unsatisfactory bill, and with even more surprise and regret that Secretary Udall lends his reputation as a conservationist to such an unworthy compromise.

Only 43,000 acres are to be included in this proposed park. Since this acreage includes two existing State parks, little more than half of the land would be newly protected. Moreover, fewer than 7,000 acres would consist of primeval redwoods. The Redwood Creek Valley would remain available for private exploitation—except for one pathetically small enclosure of 1,400 acres, isolated from the rest of the park.

Buying up these redwood lands from private owners would be expensive, but dollars cannot be decisive when the asset is irreplaceable. As President Johnson so eloquently said in his message, "Despite all of our wealth and knowledge, we cannot create a redwood forest, a wild river, or a gleaming seashore." We urge Congress to take the President at his word and to create a Redwood National Park worthy of his rhetoric and of the great trees that are an indescribably beautiful part of America's natural heritage.

"END MEASLES" CAMPAIGN IN RHODE ISLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in its recent "end measles" campaign, the Rhode Island Medical Society's Child School Health Committee and the Rhode Island State Department of Health took dead aim on one of this Nation's deadliest killers and cripplers—measles—in an effort to remove this mortal threat to our children from the State scene.

The entire State has been lavish in its commendation of the medical profession for recognizing and publicizing the critical need that exists for extensive vaccination of children against measles, and for its outstanding cooperation and personal involvement in this statewide public health program.

Both Dr. Rudolf A. Jaworski, chairman of the medical society's child school health committee, and Dr. James E. Bowes, chief of the epidemiology division of the State department of health are to be congratulated for the splendid manner in which they organized and operated this program.

But I wish to pay special tribute to the more than 300 doctors and 500 nurses who volunteered their services—many at great personal sacrifice—and gave so generously of their time to conduct the "end measles" clinics, and to do the job right, as expressed by the campaign's motto, "Once and for All."

The clinics were a huge success, despite the heaviest snowstorm of the year. Perhaps the real unsung heroes were the parents whose ingenuity led to the use of almost every known means of transportation in bringing their children to the clinics for vaccination. And I must not overlook the many couriers who battled the elements in rushing supplies of vaccine from central depots to outlying clinics.

Rhode Island is also indebted to the Communicable Disease Center of the Public Health Service. From their regional office in Boston, they provided professional assistance when the campaign was being planned; and they provided a number of high-pressure jet-injectors for administering the vaccine and qualified personnel to operate them when the children were being vaccinated. CDC will also conduct a follow-up survey, contacting numerious Rhode Island physicians who were involved in the campaign, to obtain meaningful data on relative reaction rates. Doubtless, the Public Health Service will report to the Nation the possibilities indicated from Rhode Island's campaign.

As a result of this statewide immunization program, the end of measles among the present generation of Rhode Island children is in sight and State planning for the future is on a firm and sure basis.

I am extremely proud that Rhode Island's "end measles" campaign was reported in a recent issue of Time. But there is a story behind the story that appeared in Time that tells why my home State was ready for a statewide vaccination program at this particular time.

Even before Rhode Island planned its statewide vaccination program, there was evidence in the State that measles was no longer to be considered as one of those childhood phases nearly every youngster has to go through.

Relatively few citizens across this land have ever heard of a small community in Rhode Island called Burrillville; but when measles finally joins polio, smallpox, and diphtheria on the list of diseases modern medicine has virtually eliminated, Burrillville will assume its proper position. Because, in the fight against measles, Burrillville has already achieved a kind of immortality as the first community in the country to conduct a townwide measles clinic.

Its first clinic was held early in 1963 and was followed by another clinic later that year. Its third clinic was held in February of 1965 and a fourth was conducted last October.

So when Burrillville joined this year's statewide "end measles" campaign, it was actually holding its fifth measles clinic.

Great credit is due Dr. Ernest J. Smith of Burrillville, who pioneered these antimeasles clinics, and to his corps of helpers from the Burrillville-Glocester District Nursing Association. "Without their help it would not have been possible," Dr. Smith has said, adding that the particular procedure used in Burrillville involved hard work, and that it was successful only because of the fine cooperation of the local nursing association. In this regard, I am not only proud as a citizen of the State of Rhode Island, proud to represent its people in the Congress, but I am also proud from a familial standpoint: My sister, Margaret Fogarty, serves as the supervisor of the Burrillville-Glocester District Nursing Association.

Thankfully, their efforts were publicized in various medical journals and served as an inspiration for other communities to adopt similar programs.

The effectiveness of the Burrillville campaign may be gaged by one statistic: During last year's measles epidemic in Rhode Island, when more than 2,000 cases were reported throughout the State, Burrillville escaped with 4 cases—and none of those who contracted the disease had been inoculated by Dr. Smith.

Great oaks can grow from little acorns. The immunization program that began in the small town of Burrillville was later adopted and proved to be successful on a statewide basis. One need not go far afield to project a nationwide undertaking with equal success in stamping out once and for all this deadly disease.

The American public must be made to realize that measles has become one of the principal child killers today, and that each year new thousands of children develop penumonia and other serious diseases from measles. Even when fatality does not result, measles leaves in its wake permanent brain damage and a host of behavioral and emotional problems.

National morbidity and mortality records show that some 500 children die annually from measles, and that approximately 4,000 children develop encephalitis and must spend the rest of their lives in homes for the mentally retarded.

This situation can be remedied. Medical research has already shown us how to prevent this kind of tragedy. The Journal of the American Medical Association, commenting editorially, has stated:

> With the development of a safe and effective vaccine, * * * measles and its complications can be virtually eliminated. All that is needed is wide acceptance and diligent use of the available vaccine.

By responding to the expressed will of the American people that good health is no longer the privilege of some, but the right of all our citizens, and by enacting so many key health measures to that end, the first session of this Congress won the designation of the "Health Congress." To live up to that reputation, we can do no less than to move promptly and swiftly to make certain that appropriate measures are taken in our home States to insure the ultimate defeat of measles as a killer and crippler of children.

If Rhode Island, the Nation's smallest State—and I hasten to remind you that this applies only to its geographical area—if Rhode Island can produce heroes and heroines for a statewide campaign to end measles, it behooves all of our States to move in the same direction.

I feel that within many State borders there are other Dr. Ernest J. Smiths—physicians with true pioneer blood—who need only the encouragement of their communities to try something big and new.

Surely, each State has its Dr. Rudolf A. Jaworski and its Dr. James E. Bowes, ready, willing, and eager to mount a similar campaign.

Certainly, there are other nurses whose measure of dedication equals that of my sister—Margaret Fogarty—able to insure the cooperation between local nurses and local doctors for other statewide "end measles" campaigns.

And, finally, given the facts and the reason why, no American citizen can find it in his or her heart to say "No" to workers in such a humanitarian cause.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (at the request of Mr. GRAY), for Thursday, February 24 through March 4, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RONCALIO, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COHELAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOGARTY, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. REUSS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Utah), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.
Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN in two instances.
Mr. MAILLIARD.
Mr. LIPSCOMB.
Mr. WIDNALL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOWDY.
Mr. POWELL.
Mr. MULTER.
Mrs. KELLY.
Mr. NEDZI.
Mr. MCGRATH.
Mr. BURKE.
Mr. WOLFF.
Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.
Mr. MORRISON.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 28, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God." has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 89th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (2 U.S.C. 25), approved February 18, 1948: THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, 17th District, New York.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2086. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for improvement in supply support for aircraft under the military assistant program for the Republic of China, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2087. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2088. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for postaward audits to detect lack of disclosure of significant cost or pricing data available prior to contract negotiation and award, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2089. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on employee personal property claims settled during calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of sections 240–242, title 31, U.S.C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2090. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 6, 1966, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Washburn Harbor, Wisconsin, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 14, 1960; to the Committee on Public Works.

2091. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of the status of construction, alteration, or acquisition of public buildings authorized, pursuant to the provisions of 40 U.S.C. 610(a); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 12322. A bill to enable cottongrowers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research and promotion to improve the competitive position of, and to expand markets for, cotton; with amendments (Rept. No. 1300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 13037. A bill to amend the Wagner-Peyser Act so as to provide for more effective development and utilization of the Nation's manpower resources by expending, modernizing, and improving operations under such act at both State and Federal levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 13038. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 13039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment, for purposes of the Federal income tax, of the sale or exchange of livestock on account of an adverse weather condition or certain disasters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13040. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948, as amended, relating to the acquisition of property for the Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H.R. 13041. A bill to provide needed additional means for the residents of rural America to achieve equality of opportunity by authorizing the making of grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in community development districts designated by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 13042. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, to provide economic assistance to local governmental bodies affected thereby, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 13043. A bill to provide for a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 13044. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to impose an import tax on electricity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13045. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to impose an import tax on natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 13046. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $3,000 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 13047. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 13048. A bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 13049. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1924, to revise existing law relating to the examination, licensure, registration, and regulation of optometrists and the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 13050. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to make discrimination because of age in employment an unlawful employment practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 13051. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13052. A bill to establish a National Highway Traffic Safety Center to promote research and development activities for highway traffic safety, to provide financial assistance to the States to accelerate highway traffic safety programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 13053. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include drugs requiring a doctor's prescription among the medical expenses with respect to which payment may be made under the voluntary program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 13054. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall acquire additional land for the Beverly National Cemetery, N.J.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 13055. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 13056. A bill to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 13057. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the planting of crops on acreage diverted under the cotton, wheat, and feed grains program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 13058. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 13059. A bill to govern further development of the national cemetery system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 13060. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 13061. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 13062. A bill to amend the Act of August 4, 1950 (64 Stat. 411), to provide salary increases for certain members of the police force of the Library of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 13063. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to authorize a limited experimental program of insurance for mortgages executed by nonprofit organizations to finance the purchase and rehabilitation of deteriorating or substandard housing for subsequent sale to low-income purchasers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 13064. A bill to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 13065. A bill to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 13066. A bill to strengthen State and local governments, to provide the States with additional financial resources to improve elementary and secondary education by returning a portion of the Federal revenue to the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 13067. A bill to amend the joint resolution designating June 14 of each year as Flag Day (37 U.S.C. 157) to provide appropriate recognition of the pledge of allegiance to the flag and its author, Francis Bellamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 13068. A bill authorizing the establishment of meteorological observation stations on Guadalupe Island, Mexico, for the purpose of improving the weather forecasting service within the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 13069. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 13070. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 13071. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 13072. A bill to facilitate the entry of alien sons and daughters of World War I veterans of the U.S. Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 13073. A bill to amend title II of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, to provide that payments received thereunder shall be disregarded for certain public assistance purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 13074. A bill to provide for the acquisition of the historic home in the Nation's Capital of Albert Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury under President Thomas Jefferson and President James Madison, as an official residence for the Vice President of the United States, and to provide for its preservation as a historic building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 13075. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 13076. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 13077. A bill to provide for the construction of wells and other facilities necessary to provide a supplemental water supply to the lands of the Mirage Flats Irrigation District, Mirage Flats project, Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 13078. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 13079. A bill to promote the integration of education in the Nation's public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 13080. A bill to amend the act of January 21, 1929, as it relates to the methods by which certain lands held for the use and benefit of the University of Alaska may be sold, leased, or exchanged; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 13081. A bill to amend the Social Security Amendments of 1965 so as to eliminate therefrom certain provisions which deny hospital insurance benefits to certain individuals otherwise eligible therefor because of their membership in certain subversive organizations or their prior conviction of crimes involving subversive activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 13082. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 13083. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER of Mississippi:

H.R. 13084. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the U.S. aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 13085. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act, to provide that an individual under a total disability for 2 months shall be considered "disabled" for benefit and freeze purposes even though the disability is not permanent, and to permit the payment of disability insurance benefits to an individual from the beginning of his disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 13086. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants (supplementing those made under sec. 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) for basic water and sewer facilities in suburban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 13087. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants (supplementing those made under sec. 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) for basic water and sewer facilities in suburban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 13088. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants (supplementing those made under sec. 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) for basic water and sewer facilities in suburban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 13089. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants (supplementing those made under sec. 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) for basic water and sewer facilities in suburban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 13090. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants (supplementing those made under sec. 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) for basic water and sewer facilities in suburban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 13091. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants (supplementing those made under sec. 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965) for basic water and sewer facilities in suburban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.J. Res. 849. Joint resolution to require that reports on imports into the United States include the landed value of articles imported, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.J. Res. 850. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a Representative Government Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H. Con. Res. 596. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H. Res. 748. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Res. 749. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CALLAWAY:

H.R. 13092. A bill for the relief of William F. Bell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13093. A bill for the relief of Grady Benefield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 13094. A bill for the relief of Chris G. Ings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 13095. A bill for the relief of Henry Gibson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 13096. A bill for the relief of Monte H. Walker; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13097. A bill for the relief of Hillary Lockhart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 13098. A bill for the relief of the survivors of Justin E. Burton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 13099. A bill for the relief of Ismay Emeline Benn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 13100. A bill for the relief of George Andreopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 13101. A bill for the relief of Mario P. Navarro, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

334. The SPEAKER presented a petition of John L. Purcell, Los Angeles, Calif., and others, relative to a pension for veterans of World War I, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Fino Introduces GOP Demonstration Cities Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation designed to focus attention on part two of the administration's plan to socialize American residential patterns—the "Federal coordinator" called for in the administration's "demonstration cities" legislation.

My bill, in many ways similar to the "demonstration cities" legislation introduced by the administration, contains similar program and financial provisions, but deletes the section calling for a Federal coordinator and substitutes a Federal information officer. The bill also deletes language requiring cities to have a plan for social renovation before they can qualify for Federal aid. The bill adds a provision stating the sense of Congress that the program is not to detract in any way from the powers of local government to control and administer existing Federal grant-in-aid programs.

This legislation—substituting a Federal information officer for a Federal coordinator—to my mind removes the Federal fishhook from the self-improvement carrot the President is offering to the cities of our Nation. I believe in billions for rebuilding our cities, but I do not believe in spending a cent for the undermining of local government.

I do not believe that Federal aid programs should be the vehicle of social experiments. My bill cuts the "social experiment" angle out of the program. I believe in creative federalism and I support that part of the administration bill encompassed in my bill. I am 100 percent opposed, however, to encroaching centralism as represented by the Federal coordinator, whom I call a commissar for he would be nothing less. My bill is a good bill. It is truly dedicated to rebuilding our cities in accordance with the timeless American tradition of local self-government. The Fino bill takes the encroaching centralism out of the program and leaves the creative federalism. I believe that this is the way to do the job.

Chester W. Nimitz: An American Naval Immortal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, 4 days before his 81st birthday, Fleet Adm. Chester William Nimitz died. This Nation, and especially the hundreds of thousands of American servicemen who served under him, now sadly join in a farewell tribute to a great U.S. naval figure. He came from a small town in Texas to eventually command and lead to complete victory the greatest naval force ever assembled on this globe. His service to his country can never be forgotten and his attributes as an American officer will stand always as an example of the finest in a great tradition.

Following his graduation as seventh in a class of 114 in the class of 1905 of the Naval Academy, Admiral Nimitz handled a wide variety of assignments in a meritorious manner. His rise in his chosen career was finally capped by a tour of 2 years—1945–47—as the highest uniformed naval officer in this country. But he will always be remembered as the man who assumed command of the Pacific Fleet in the dark days of December 1941 and who led it to a brilliant victory over Imperial Japan. Combining a great strategic perspective, an eminently successful tactical competence, an ability to get the most from his men, and a resolution to persevere until victory, he led the American naval forces through a series of battles and campaigns to Tokyo Bay in September 1945. He started with a badly hurt fleet and nursed it and built it into the greatest striking force the world has ever seen.

After his outstanding military career he continued his public service in many positions of a private and public character. He always displayed his traits of geniality, humanity, and intelligence in a fashion to do honor to himself and his Nation. He finally retired to his home near San Francisco in 1956. It is with great pride as an American that I extend to his wife and four children my deep respects and sincere condolences on this sad day.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, it has been 26 years since the illegal seizure of the Baltic nations. In an era when the United Nations is expanding its membership yearly, many people have never learned of Lithuania's history and its tragic fate. Indeed, a sizable percentage of member states was not even in existence when Lithuania fell to Soviet perfidy.

On February 16, we observed the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. Lithuanian Americans have led the fight to inform the world of their homeland and of their homeland's loss of freedom. Lithuania is not a make-believe nation. It has a rich and honorable history going back to the 13th century. The takeover of this small nation stands as a clear example of the expansionist tactics of the Soviet Union and of its indifference to the principles of freedom, democracy, and self-determination.

The United States has refused to recognize the incorporation of Lithuania into Russia. We thus reiterate our support for the principle of self-determination and for the moral and political implications of this principle.

I congratulate the Lithuanian-American organizations in the United States for their long and tenacious fight in behalf of this cause.

One Hundredth Birthday of Millville, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago this Saturday, on February 26, 1866, the pretty city of Millville, in Cumberland County, N.J., held its meeting of incorporation and, during that evening, voted itself out of the "township" classification and into the "city" category. This event is being celebrated Saturday in Millville with a centennial parade and civic banquet.

The parade will be complete with bands, marching units, and floats, and promises to be a highlight of Millville's 100th birthday celebration which officially began on January 10, 1966.

On that day, a reenactment of the first town council meeting ever held in Millville was staged in a town meeting during which residents of Millville donned the costumes current 100 years ago and portrayed the roles of the original participants. It was probably the first town meeting ever held in which the participants received curtain calls.

Saturday's parade is the second in a series of events being staged by the Millville Centennial Corp., to mark the end of the city's first century. On July 4, there is scheduled a gigantic community picnic and fireworks display, and on June 30 through July 2, the formal celebration will conclude with a historical pageant.

Mr. Speaker, today Millville is known as "the Holly City of America" to note the fact that the traditional Christmas season decoration is grown there in great profusion and provided to holiday time markets throughout the Nation. Millville now has some 20,000 residents and, although it is a relatively small community by some standards, its citizens are looking forward to growth and progress during their city's second century. This spirit is inherent in the manifesto which the Millville Centennial Corp. issued at the beginning of the 100th birthday celebration.

The manifesto states that Millville intends to create new civic awareness among all its citizens, plans to uncover new civic leaders, stimulate the local economy, honor its heritage, and focus its attention on the future.

I might note that two of Amercia's most famous personages have joined in the centennial celebration. The Millville "Brothers of the Brush," a group of male residents who have grown beards reminiscent of the style of 1866, invited Astronauts Frank Borman and James A. Lovell—whose Gemini V beards became quite widely remarked upon—to accept honorary memberships in Millville's bearded brotherhood, and both accepted.

I cannot help but be proud of the spirit exhibited by Millville's residents—paying honor to yesterday while, at the same time, preparing carefully and systematically for tomorrow. I am proud to help mark the 100th anniversary of the incorporation of this progressive, charming city and look forward to joining with Millville's celebrants Saturday.

The Kuwait National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, February 25 marks the date on which the people of Kuwait will observe their annual National Day. The House will not be in session tomorrow, the actual date of this observance, and I am therefore taking occasion today to extend warm felicitations to His Highness Shaikh Sabah al Salim al Sabah, the Amir of Kuwait; and to the Kuwaiti Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Talat al-Ghoussein.

The celebrations this year will lay emphasis on Kuwait's entering her fifth year as an independent state. All of Kuwait's many friends agree that her accomplishments after only 5 brief years of independence rival, and in some cases even surpass, those of many older members of the international community.

Little is known about Kuwait's early history, but during its modern period one of its most significant acts was the signing of the 1899 agreement with Great Britain. That document gave Kuwait a large degree of internal self-government with British guarantees of her political integrity and guidance in foreign affairs. This relationship ended on June 19, 1961, when Kuwait became a fully independent and sovereign nation. Even the quiet manner of achieving her independence is testimony of the high quality of political leadership found in Kuwait.

Her tremendous supply of oil, the backbone of the economy, has given Kuwait's citizens a per capita income in excess of $3,000 per year. Crude oil production averaged more than 2.3 million barrels daily in 1964, an increase of 10 percent over 1963. The positive benefits of this national wealth have not been monopolized by a few groups or individuals, but have been shared domestically and through foreign aid. The social services such as free health, education, and public works programs make similar programs in the "advanced" nations blush. Every indication points to the prospect that this trend will continue at an even greater pace in the future.

As I mentioned earlier, Kuwait has not neglected her responsibilities to assist those countries less fortunate than herself. Through the Kuwait Fund for Arab Economic Development—KFAED—she has offered project development loans totaling in excess of $105 million through 1964. In addition, other loans totaling more than $225 million by the end of 1964 were extended to other Arab States.

Under the guidance of His Highness Sabah al-Salim al Sabah Kuwait has played a very active role in international affairs, and has been a dependable participant in such organizations as the United Nations and the Arab League.

I am certain that I echo the sentiments of the entire Congress when I offer congratulations and best wishes to the progressive and hard-working people and Government of Kuwait as they celebrate their national holiday. May their dynamic example of a state truly dedicated to the enrichment and fulfillment of its people serve as an inspiration to other nations who are trying to build their own national destinies.

Nation's Best Minds Advise President Johnson on Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson in a recent letter made this historic statement in a personal message:

> Whatever else history may say, it must record that everything this Government is trying to do is the result of the collected wisdom and judgment of the best minds in the country. And I alone will take responsibility for all final decisions.

This statement first appeared publicly in my newsletter, Capitol Comments, on February 14, 1966, in which it was pointed out that the Vietnam conflict apparently is entering a significant new phase of reconstruction and pacification.

Under unanimous consent I insert this issue of Capitol Comments in the Congressional Record, believing it to be of interest to my colleagues and to Americans generally.

The newsletter follows:

VIETNAMESE CONFLICT ENTERS NEW STAGE

(By Joe L. Evins)

This week in Washington was marked by major and significant developments in the continuing Vietnamese crisis. The conflict seemingly is moving into a new stage. This became apparent with the recent meeting of President Johnson and other high American officials with officials of the South Vietnamese Government during the week in Honolulu, Hawaii.

Following this meeting a joint declaration was issued in which the goals of the two nations were announced. A concerted effort will be made to build a democratic nation, beginning at the grassroots level.

According to the announcement, as areas are liberated from the Vietcong, American and Vietnamese teams will move in to launch basic programs, in education, in economic reform, in agriculture, and in health to create stable and self-governing communities.

It is most significant that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Agriculture attended the sessions at Honolulu and then moved on to South Vietnam to begin immediate work on these programs to build free, self-governing, democratic communities.

It is also significant that President Johnson dispatched Vice President Humphrey to visit South Vietnam to continue the momentum for this positive program of reconstruction and pacification gained at the session in Hawaii.

The Governments of the United States and South Vietnam agreed on these main points at Honolulu:

To resist aggression.

To work for the social improvement of the people.

To strive for self-government.

To promote free, democratic elections.

To attack hunger, ignorance, and disease.

To continue the quest for peace.

President Johnson is continuing his firm, reasoned direction of the conflict and there are strong indications that our American forces are inflicting sustained, substantial and telling losses on the Vietcong and on invading Communists.

In response to a letter which your Representative sent to President Johnson concerning the Vietnamese conflict, the President said in reply:

"Whatever else history may say, it must record that everything this Government is trying to do is the result of the collected wisdom and judgment of the best minds in the country. And I alone will take responsibility for all final decisions."

The President has an awesome, lonely, and grave responsibility in safeguarding the interests of freedom and halting the onrush of communism in southeast Asia, and at the same time, avoiding the missteps that would trigger a nuclear war.

The President is moving in the direction of achieving an honorable peace without a general war. There could be no greater responsibility placed upon the shoulders of any man—and the President needs our support in this critical time.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I take note of the 48th anniversary of the independence of Estonia. Estonians all over the world would like to say that their nation continues to be free and independent, but they cannot. On June 17, 1940, the army of the Soviet Union brought that freedom to an end by brute force of arms.

In two short decades Estonia had made marked progress toward the development of a thriving democratic system. Despite the hard times experienced by other democratic states during the period between the Great World Wars, universal sufferage and democracy triumphed in Estonia. Her economy grew because of a skillful mixture of public and private ownership of the means of production.

As examples of the progress made during independence, area under cultivation rose by 17.5 percent, grain production by 45 percent, milk yield by 67 percent, railway line length from 800 to 1,434 kilometers, and 56,000 more farms were erected as a result of land reform. In 1934, 95.1 percent of the inhabitants of Estonia lived on earned income, the mark of a true democracy. Such progress could have continued through today, but for the aggression of the Soviet Union, in violation of explicit treaty obligations.

Under Soviet occupation the income of the average Estonian fell by 33 percent. An exporter of food before 1940, this valiant nation, thereafter, subsisted at the pleasure of her conquerors. Not only did the people suffer from the lack of food, but they also endured massive extermination and banishment to forced labor camps deep in the Soviet Union.

The sordid record of communism in Estonia is there for all to see. Our country must continue to take interest in the Estonian cause to repair the damage of Soviet occupation and strive toward the reestablishment of a free and independent Estonia.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, Estonia was one of the smallest countries to regain its independence toward the end of the First World War. The country, on the northeastern shores of the Baltic with just over a million inhabitants, had been made part of the Russian empire early in the 18th century, and its people grudgingly endured the oppressive czarist regime of two centuries. In 1917 when the czarist autocracy was overthrown by the Russian revolution, all national groups once subjected to the czarist regime felt free, regained their liberty, and proclaimed their national independence. The Estonians did this on February 24, 1918, and founded the Estonian Republic.

In this newly established small, democratic Republic the sturdy, patriotic, and thrifty Estonians, did wonders in the course of their free existence during the next two decades. Besides rebuilding their war-torn and ravaged country, they made tremendous advances in every phase of their national activity. They were perfectly happy in their beloved homeland. But their happiness was short lived. When the Second World War broke out Estonia's independence was threatened. In 1940 the country was overrun by the Red army, occupied, and then made part of the Soviet Union.

Thus ended the freedom of the Estonian people, and since then they have been living under totalitarian dictatorship. With the establishment of the Communist regime there since the end of the war, the unhappy Estonians have been locked up in their country, and are deprived of their freedom. There they endure the abominable yoke of their Communist taskmasters and pray for their eventual liberation. On the 48th anniversary of their independence day we wish them fortitude and patience in their struggle for their freedom and independence.

Supervisor Fred Haight: A Great Humanitarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON H. CLAUSEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, a very close friend and former colleague of mine, who served the people of Del Norte County for many years, has recently departed from our midst. While many of the Members of Congress were not privileged to know this gentleman, I am, under leave to extend my remarks, taking this opportunity to include comments that I have made that portray the character of one of the great humanitarians and public servants in and for the county of Del Norte, Calif. Mr. Fred Haight literally gave his life to the people of Del Norte County:

Supervisor Fred Haight: A Great Humanitarian

Our friend, Fred Haight, has been called to the great beyond. In learning of a friend's passing, one immediately recalls the many events and activities that took place as a result of one's association with that person. I am certain many people in Del Norte County are doing just this very thing.

While Fred Haight was principally known as the supervisor from Smith River and as chairman of the board of supervisors for our beloved Del Norte County, he was affectionately known as "Uncle Fred" to his many friends who knew and loved him. His many deeds, that were most often carried out without fanfare or publicity, will be remembered well into the future. He was in his glory when he was doing things for people—be it his constitutents, his community church, his many friends, and in particular, young people and children.

It was my privilege to serve with Fred Haight on the board of supervisors for many years. We agreed on many issues and we also disagreed, but with each passing year of service, I became better acquainted with "Uncle Fred's" manner of serving his people.

On the lighter side, a mutual interest in sports, particularly baseball, provided a strong bond between us. For many years, prior to my time, Fred Haight was an outstanding catcher in Del Norte baseball circles. During my pitching days in Crescent City, my former teammates and the faithful Crescent City merchant baseball fans will recall Fred's attendance at every home game. I will always remember that familiar face—typical of a former catcher—sitting behind homeplate watching to see if my curve would break or if I would throw the pitch that he thought should be thrown.

His genuine interest in road development, agriculture, aviation, county buildings and, in particular, the hospital and humanitarian programs, brought much in the way of social progress to his community and county.

These are but a few of the fond memories that many of us will retain always. I know all of Del Norte County will agree in saying respectfully to Fred Haight's family, "We thank you for sharing this very warm, congenial, and lovable 'country gentleman' with us." He certainly gave his full measure of devotion to the many causes he believed in.

A Clear Voice in the Stormy Sea of American Maritime Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 23, 1966, I had the privilege and honor of introducing my distinguished colleague and chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Honorable Edward A. Garmatz, Democrat, of Maryland, at a luncheon held in his honor by the Propeller Club, Port of Washington. The remarks of Chairman Garmatz on this occasion represent a clear voice in the presently stormy sea of controversy surrounding American maritime policy. It is a call to return to reality and get on with the task of promoting the American maritime industry.

I submit to my colleagues the full text of the remarks of Chairman Garmatz, which are both timely and perceptive in view of the present plight of the American maritime industry.

Remarks of Hon. Edward A. Garmatz

Mr. Clark, members of the Propeller Club, Port of Washington, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a pleasure for me to appear before the Propeller Club of the Port of Washington.

The Propeller Club was founded to preserve the maritime heritage of our Nation and it is a symbol of our maritime industry and the American merchant marine. I am proud to say that I appear before you as a member—for I have enjoyed membership in the Propeller Club.

It is something more than simply a very genuine pleasure for me to address you today.

The broadly based objectives of the Propeller Club of the United States to promote, further, and support an American merchant marine adequate to meet the requirements of national security and economic welfare of the United States apply to all of the 50 member ports within and without the United States and to the 15 student ports. They are the objectives sought to be fostered by the more than 10,000 dedicated individuals who make up our national membership.

Interest in the furtherance of these objectives is at a high level in all of the constituent ports.

And I wish to compliment the national and local leadership that is presently exerting itself to make the Propeller Club an effective force in the vital maritime affairs of our country.

But there is something special about this club—not that there is any greater interest or dedication to our objectives than there is elsewhere.

The something special is due to the unique concentration of representatives here in Washington of virtually every element that goes to make up the great complex of American maritime policy and all of its contributing components.

Just a quick look at a roster of the membership of the port of Washington bears this out.

From the Government you have many members from most of the executive departments, including, of course, the numerous bureaus and agencies within such departments.

You have vice presidents and other high officials of most of the leading shipping and shipbuilding companies.

The major maritime trade associations are well represented.

Maritime labor is widely represented.

There are naval architects, steamship agents, leading manufacturers' representatives, and lawyers galore. You have beauteous lady members, Madeleine Carroll, and Congresswoman Leonor Sullivan.

So, it is a special privilege, and I believe very fitting, that I should appear before you today to make what is virtually my maiden speech since election to the chairmanship of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I am greatly pleased to see so many members of the committee here today.

I am looking forward to the coming years, and I am here to give you my pledge that I will do all in my power to carry out our national maritime policy and vigorously foster the objectives of the Propeller Club of the United States.

Although I have seen written reports that I am slanted in one way or another, I can promise you that my efforts will be directed in behalf of the overall good for the American merchant marine.

In my 18 years in Congress I have never witnessed a period when our national maritime policy has been the subject of so much uncertainty and confusion. Notwithstanding a clear statutory statement of policy, with a full set of implementing guidelines, we seem to be not only without a propeller, but apparently without rudder and helmsman as well.

At a time when the Soviet Union is expanding the size of its merchant fleet at a faster rate than any other nation of the world, the American merchant marine is experiencing a record decline.

I am concerned about the confusion and uncertainty that exists and I am concerned about the steady decline of this country as a maritime power.

It seems to me extremely shortsighted for this country to allow such a situation to exist and continue.

Our maritime industry should be a major and vibrant part of our economy; it is essential not only to our national defense—as the Vietnam conflict has once again proved—but to our commerce. If properly promoted, the merchant marine could by itself overcome our adverse balance of international payments.

Let us look at a few facts.

It is indeed ironic that the present budget calls for only 13 new vessels during the fiscal year 1967. In 1964, when 100 new merchant vessels were delivered to the Soviet Union, only 16 new vessels were delivered for United States registry.

A little over a year ago, the Soviet Union had 464 merchant vessels under contract in shipyards, including 111 tankers. As of the same date, the United States had only 39 new vessels under contract, including 1 tanker.

At the present time, the United States—the major power of the world and by far the world's major trading nation—ranks 12th in new vessel construction.

We rank behind such countries as Argentina, Brazil, Finland, and Peru.

For a nation whose growth and greatness have come from seapower, can these facts be other than alarming?

I have always considered that our basic maritime policy is sound.

Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, we have developed the world's most efficient and most modern liner fleet—even though inadequate in numbers. The detailed provisions of this act, however, have not been adequate to promote strong bulk carrier and tanker segments of our merchant marine.

Succeeding Administrations have failed to seek the necessary implementing legislation or administer that which has been provided.

I would not attempt to contend that any statute, in the face of changing time should remain unaltered for 30 years.

And we can have a more realistic program for assisting American-flag bulk carriers and tankers, without at the same time destroying that part of the act which has been successful. Some new legislation may be needed. Let us have it and we will act on it.

At a time when we should be considering a positive program for broadening the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to extend its benefits to all segments of the American merchant marine, we are floundering on the sea of uncertainty.

At a time when our domestic shipbuilding program should be at its peak, the present budget proposes a program that is the all-time low.

I am tired of reading analyses of the Interagency Maritime Task Force Report, or of the Report of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee. The business of our committee is legislation, and without a legislative program to consider, we are left to theorize like everyone else.

I am confident that President Johnson aims to dispel the atmosphere of despair that now prevails in our maritime program, as he has done in other areas. The picture is not entirely bleak.

Our country has the world's only nuclear-powered merchant vessel, the NS *Savannah*.

We are on the verge of a technological breakthrough in the field of nuclear propelled commercial vessels, and the time is ripe for us to begin the second phase of our nuclear ship program.

The United States has the world's best, the most modern, and most productive liner fleet—but we need more such vessels in private ownership to serve our complex society and the uncertain but demanding needs of war.

With assistance in vessel research similar to that of the American aircraft industry, I am convinced that our domestic shipyards could become competitive with foreign shipbuilders.

Lastly, but most importantly, most segments of maritime labor have tried to be reasonable and realistic in accepting reduced manning requirements resulting from automation.

There is virtually no industry in this country that is not subsidized either directly or indirectly through some protective measures. The American merchant marine is not unique in the assistance that it requires. Our economy has been able to flourish with the highest standard of living in the world as the greatest trading Nation because our industries with governmental assistance have been able to become the most productive industries in the world.

Recent technological developments in ship design, propulsion equipment, shipbuilding, and cargo handling signify that a major technological breakthrough is imminent. Increased productivity is now possible in the maritime industry as never before.

Automation programs are reducing the impact of the differential between higher American-flag labor costs and foreign costs.

We are at a critical time when we must move forward with a program to promote all segments of our American merchant marine and our domestic shipyards so that these industries can achieve maximum productivity in our economy. There appears to be every hope that with such a realistic and positive program, subsidy cost to the Government will eventually be reduced, rather than increased.

Our committee is most anxious to cooperate with the administration in any constructive new maritime program that will be presented.

Unfortunately, perhaps, too much emphasis has been placed on focusing on the revolutionary proposals in the Interagency Maritime Task Force report, rather than recognizing that in principle very few people disagree on what should be the main ingredients of a sound maritime program. For example, everyone agrees that:

1. We must build more vessels for operation under the American flag;

2. We must develop a realistic program for assisting American-flag bulk carriers and tankers;

3. Government interference with the steamship industry should be minimized and management should in most cases be free to exercise its own prudent business judgment;

4. Subsidies should be to the greatest possible extent direct rather than indirect; and

5. Our subsidy program should contain an element of incentive.

These principles form the basis for developing a sound new and expanded maritime program.

I do not agree with the proposal that we should permit vessels under this program to be built abroad. Such a step would, in my opinion, be inconsistent with the best interests of our country and our economy, and would have an extremely detrimental effect on our international balance of payments.

I am hopeful that the Administration will not recommend such a proposal as a part of the new program.

Similarly, I do not agree with those who would seek to abandon our cargo preference laws.

Such proposals emanate from theoreticians who have no real interest in the American Merchant Marine. Foreign-flag merchant marines have too many built-in and hidden nationalistic advantages and too many preferences of their own for us to consider it realistic at this time to repeal our cargo preference provisions.

On the other hand, as new efficient bulk carrier vessels are constructed for American-flag operation, and—if they are paid a direct operating subsidy—the differential in rates for the carriage of cargo in American-flag bulk carriers as opposed to foreign-flag bulk carriers should be largely eliminated.

Again, I am hopeful that the Administration will not recommend that we abandon our cargo preference statutes.

I also do not agree with those who would contend that we should completely do away with the essential trade route program.

It seems to me that this program is sound and that it has worked well. Perhaps some modifications could be made so as to allow the operators increased flexibility—but I believe that there must be the assurance that adequate American-flag service will be available on each essential trade route to meet our goals and commitments around the world and build our national economy in all areas of the country.

Insofar as passenger vessels are concerned, I am convinced that they are necessary as a part of our American Merchant Marine for national defense reasons and for economic and social reasons as well.

More and more people of the world are beginning to travel. The great percentage of these people prefer to travel by surface transportation. There is a great untapped market that is available for ocean transportation services.

I believe that this country must take steps to encourage the construction of several large capacity, low-fare superliners that will place ocean transportation within the economic means of the major part of our great society.

In short, I am enthusiastic that we can build upon the framework of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and develop a new, far-reaching program to promote all segments of the American Merchant Marine. I am most certainly optimistic.

The progress of our Nation has been one of steady development and evolution—we cannot destroy what we already have, but must use what is good to plan and create our programs for the future. This is the essence of the Great Society, and I am confident that its logic will soon be applied to the maritime industry.

Yesterday was George Washington's birthday. He was a man of great wisdom. He knew that history is eloquent in demonstrating that any nation which takes the easy way of permitting its commerce to be carried by foreign-flag ships—which rents the service and space it is too lazy or too shortsighted to provide, is embarked on a policy of dependency that has ended every time with the nation in question becoming a second-rate power.

Washington knew this truth and warned against its neglect. In closing, I would like to quote the words of George Washington:

"We should not overlook the tendency of war to abridge the means, and thereby at least enhance the price, of transporting productions to their proper markets. I recommend it to your (Congress') serious reflections how far and in what mode it may be expedient to guard against embarrassments from these contingencies by such encouragement to our own navigation as will render our commerce and agriculture less dependent on foreign bottoms which may fail us in the very moments most interesting to both these great objects * * *. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure."

Thank you.

This Is My Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, during my service in the U.S. Congress, I have tried to keep the people I am honored to represent informed of my activities and record in Congress, as well as the policies of the Federal Government. In my years here, some 16,000 bills have been voted on in the House of Representatives. Along with others of us, my record has been on several occasions misrepresented by falsehood and half-truths from the mouths of selfish special-interest groups and political opponents. I here spread my voting on the issues, that each person may determine for himself that my record has been made in the interest of the people.

I voted for the tax reduction bills, which have encouraged industrial and business expansion and produced more jobs. Three substantial tax reductions have been enacted during my service, and each had my full support.

I consistently vote for an invincible national defense, and oppose every proposal to weaken our Nation through unilateral disarmament. I believe our fighting men should have the best possible equipment in ample supply. I will continue working to that end.

I voted for the bill to prevent and control the pollution of waters, and to provide for the development of our water and land resources.

I voted for the bills relating to community health services, and to provide for the development of programs to help the aging, and to provide for health research facilities.

I opposed the act which causes higher consumer price for coffee.

I voted for increased social security benefits, disability benefits, and increases in old age pensions and other assistance.

I voted to reduce the voluntary retirement age to 62, and for widows, to age 60, and to allow greater earnings before reduction in social security benefits.

I voted for education and training benefits for veterans, and for other GI benefits.

I voted to improve the Railroad Retirement Act.

I voted to provide more educational opportunities for our young people, and to provide loans to students. I have assisted the schools and colleges in our district in their applications for funds and loans amounting to many millions of dollars, and have successfully assisted them in their other problems with the Federal Government.

I have successfully introduced and enacted bills to ban pornography from the mails, and to allow prosecution of purveyors of pornography in the jurisdiction where deliveries are made, and have supported other bills to protect decent people from this obnoxious traffic. I continue to oppose distribution of Communist propaganda through our post offices.

I have introduced and supported bills to strengthen the criminal laws of this country, so that people might be safe on the streets.

I have responded to every request from a community for assistance in its economic development and in its dealings with the Federal Government. This has resulted in a large number of grants and loans for hospitals, water and sewer systems, libraries, housing, airports and airport construction, remodeling of public buildings, new post offices, public facilities, and countless other improvements.

I have aided numerous industries and businesses that are locating in our district, or expanding their operations in our district, in their applications for loans and other assistance from the Federal level. Our growth in this respect has far exceeded the expansion in any other comparable area.

At times, cities and businesses have come to me for help after losing hope of success, and I have succeeded in getting favorable action.

I have helped thousands of individuals, including farmers, businessmen, labor, veterans, housewives, the aged, disabled and dependent persons in presenting their claims and problems to the various departments of the Government. I regard this opportunity of service as a privilege, and among my most treasured possessions are the letters of appreciation which I have received from these people who have contacted me after all other hope of receiving help or consideration had been exhausted.

In fact, an ex-Congressman who lives in our district, and his son, a State senator, not knowing what to do, refer to me problems which they consider hopeless, or too much trouble to bother with, because they know of my success and effectiveness in championing the causes of the people. They know I am eager to attain all that our district and our people are entitled to, and that I will continue to fight after the weak and lazy give up. I am one who does not mind working long hours every day for the cause of right.

I voted against the proposals to loan money to Russia and other Communist countries. I consistently vote against giving assistance or aid to the Communist countries through foreign aid gifts, or otherwise.

I voted for the proposal which would have denied foreign aid gifts to any country which is trading with or aiding North Vietnam in any way. I am strictly against lending aid or comfort to our enemies in any way.

I consistently vote to save many billions of dollars by cuts in foreign aid, in various excessive departmental budgets, and other unnecessary and wasteful spending. All waste and extravagance should be eliminated, and fiscal responsibility practiced.

I actively support amendments to the Trade Agreement Act to protect farmers, cattlemen, labor, and oil, mineral and other industries from imports from low-wage and slave-wage countries, which are so harmful to domestic producers and American labor.

As the result of investigation by a subcommittee of which I am chairman, I prevented the destruction of the homes of thousands of low-income families, most of whom were Negroes. Those people came to me in desperation, and I am humbly proud of their resolutions which have commended our successful effort to save their homes and businesses from despoilers who sought their homes for private profit in the name of urban renewal.

I voted for the bill to eliminate the provisions of the Railway Act, which had been reducing the annuities of the wives of retired employees.

I voted for the bill to regulate and control exports to Communist countries.

I voted for the bills to provide loan insurance and supplementary direct loans to assist students to attend business, trade, and vocational schools; to provide loans for college students; to provide vocational schools to train the unskilled for better jobs; and to provide for needed medical library services.

I voted for a "clean elections" proposal which would have provided penalties for illegal voting.

I voted for the proposal which would have required apportionment of summer jobs in Government, so each district would have its proportionate share.

I voted for the bills to increase the pay for members of the armed services.

I voted for the bill for cost-of-living increases for civil service retirees.

I voted for the bills to build good roads and highways, which have resulted in the hundreds of miles of highways and farm-to-market roads which have been built and are now being constructed in the counties of our district, and which will bring us more and better roads as fast as construction is possible.

I voted against liberalizing our immigration laws, feeling that increased immigration will take jobs away from our citizenry, and increase our welfare costs.

I voted for cost of living increases in disability compensation. It had not been raised since 1933.

I voted for the resolution in opposition to the intervention of international communism in the Western Hemisphere. I oppose treasonable inroads of communism in our country and in our hemisphere.

I voted for authority to make or insure loans to nonprofit groups to establish water systems and sewer systems for rural areas.

I introduced a bill to restore the right to have voluntary prayer and Bible reading in school. I believe the Supreme Court, in forbidding this time-honored custom, violates the constitutional guarantee that there should be no law which interferes with religious freedom.

I vote against any bill which would destroy the freedom we enjoy in America. I do not believe American citizens are ready or willing to surrender their liberty to a dictatorial centralized government.

As chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I conducted an investigation which resulted in revoking a license which had been granted to a society of homosexuals to solicit charitable funds to promote their society. I do not believe any branch of government should lend its sanction to such an abomination.

I voted for Congress to control the purse strings, and against back-door raids on the Public Treasury.

I voted for the minimum wage bill, and to adjust the salaries of civil service and postal employees.

I voted against recognizing Red China, and for preserving our treaty rights in the Panama Canal Zone and in Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba.

I voted for control of drugs, and to tighten our internal security laws.

During my congressional service, more money has come into our district from Washington, by millions of dollars, than has gone from our district in Federal taxes. In this way and others I have exerted my efforts to develop our district.

It was upon my request that Congress appropriate the money for the survey for the development of the Trinity River Basin, which subsequently resulted in the authorization of that project, and appropriations to carry it on. I actively supported similar survey and development of the Sabine, Neches, and Angelina River basins. I was instrumental in obtaining approval of the projects for the Attoyac and San Jacinto Rivers.

I worked effectively to obtain funds for the construction of Rayburn Dam at McGee Bend on the Angelina River, and to secure congressional approval for the Toledo Bend Dam. The enhancement of the economy of the areas involved is already apparent to the extent that some who opposed these developments now seek to claim credit for them. We have now built the base, and our strides forward will rapidly accelerate.

I introduced bills to set aside part of Federal income tax revenues to each State to aid education without Federal control, and to provide additional income tax exemptions for students and their parents, to be known as the Education Incentive Act.

As a member of the powerful Judiciary Committee, it has been my privilege to give unceasing support to the right to own private property, the free enterprise system, to the preservation of liberty and individual freedom, and the other God-given rights and privileges of American citizenship.

I oppose deficit spending, and vote against the annual increase in the national debt. Fiscal responsibility demands that the Government live within its income. A day of accounting must come, and the longer it is delayed, the harder it will be to face.

I supported the bill to provide protection for union members and the public from exploitation, racketeering and embezzlement, and to give rank and file members a proper voice in union affairs, and to guarantee honest elections of officers.

I voted for the accelerated public works appropriation, which has brought many millions of dollars to our district.

I voted for the bill to promote the coordination and development of outdoor recreation, and to bring tourists to our district.

I voted for the bill to assist the States in providing additional research facilities at experimental stations.

I vote to retain legislative authority in Congress, and continually and consistently oppose the surrender of these powers to the Executive, as being dangerous to the people. I support local control of local affairs, and oppose all attempts to impose Federal domination.

I support separation of church and state.

I believe in local control of our schools, and oppose Federal control over education.

I support and vote for bills to guarantee local and States rights, as well as individual rights, from being usurped by the Supreme Court. The Constitution does not give legislative authority to the Court.

I support REA, in order that farm homes may have electricity and telephones.

I support FHA and other such loan programs, so that more people will be able to own their homes.

I voted for the use of farm surplus foods to assist needy Americans. I believe we should take care of our own, instead of giving away everything we have to foreign nations. Charity begins at home.

I vote against proposals to impose bureaucratic controls over individuals and localities. Such controls destroy the God-given freedoms which have made us a great nation.

I vote for the school lunch program and the milk program for children, in order that our young people may have proper nourishment.

I voted for legislation to preserve small business institutions and free competitive enterprise, and for the bills to take the Government out of competition with private business.

I support the bills to require uniform procurement practices in the Armed Forces, to eliminate duplication, waste, and exhorbitant prices.

I vote for the antitrust laws, to preserve competition and to secure equal opportunities for all persons to compete in trade or business.

I was a leader in the fight which restored the tidelands to Texas, after the Supreme Court had attempted to deprive us of the property we had dedicated to our schools.

I voted for the bill which would have protected State laws from the whims of the members of the Supreme Court.

I vote to keep intact the Texas national forests. Proceeds from timber sales help support school districts and county governments, making tax rates lower for individuals.

I voted to increase personal and dependency exemptions for income tax purposes, and introduced a bill to raise the exemption from $600 to $1,000. Increased cost of living would justify this action on the part of Congress.

I voted to outlaw the Communist Party, and to prohibit Communists from serving in representative capacities.

I supported the proposal to grant aid for the construction of nursing homes and health services for the aged and the chronically ill.

I supported the program to provide more trained teachers for deaf children.

I support the programs for conservation of soil, water, and other resources, and for the flood control.

I voted for legislation to increase the salaries of the teachers under our jurisdiction, and was chairman of the House conference in a joint conference committee with the Senate which successfully accomplished this increase.

I voted for the bill to provide legal assistance to indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts.

I voted to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of social security benefits, and to provide social security benefits for the disabled.

I vote for the people and against the alien philosophies which are adverse to the interests of America, by whatever name their adherents may call themselves.

I voted to guarantee the right of trial by jury in Federal courts.

The above list could be multiplied, but may be summed up by saying that I supported a realistic foreign policy, based on America's interests, rather than trying to "buy" friends. I vote for economy in Government, curbs on inflation, and for military procurement by competitive bid to save billions for the taxpayers. I oppose unwise, wasteful spending, high taxes, and the huge public debt which mortgages our children's future.

I support the right to own property, even if it is merely the clothes I wear. The disciples of the socialistic alien thought, who say I vote wrong, and who are trying to purge me from Congress, would deny to any of us the right to own our property, little though it may be.

This is my record. The socialists do not like it, but I do not believe Americans are yet ready to accept socialism as a way of life for freedom-loving people.

By regular visits to every county in our district, I make myself available for the personal services I can render individual citizens in their problems and contacts with the Federal Government and its agencies. Through regular questionnaires, letters, and personal contacts, I am able to ascertain the wishes of the people of our district in regard to pending legislation and national issues, in order to be a true representative of the people, rather than the rubberstamp of out-of-State pressure groups.

More Flags for Vietnam: Nations Supporting the U.S. Effort in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the United States is not the only country assisting South Vietnam in its struggle against conquest by its northern neighbor. Although we wish more substantial assistance were being provided by more nations, we should not overlook the valuable military, economic, or sometimes political and moral support which has been rendered by other nations. We should not forget which nations are willing to stand up and be counted on our side.

Three nations have made the supreme commitment of sending troops, and risking the lives of their sons for the cause of freedom just as the United States and the Republic of Vietnam must do. These nations are Australia, which has sent one reinforced battalion of 1,500 men; New Zealand, which has sent one artillery battery of 300 men; and the Republic of Korea, which has sent a reinforced division of 17,000 men and supporting forces totaling 3,750 men. Other military assistance has been provided by Malaysia, which has supplied training to Vietnamese for counterinsurgency operations and some armored vehicles; the

Philippines and Nationalist China, which have sent psychological warfare as well as medical personnel; and Thailand, which has military air detachments in Vietnam and supplies training for South Vietnamese Air Force personnel.

In addition to these countries which are sending military assistance, more than 30 nations are supplying or have agreed to supply some sort of nonmilitary assistance. In most cases this support signifies an affirmation of their support for the struggle against agression. Belgium, Brazil, Denmark, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, India, Ireland, Israel, Laos, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Spain, Turkey, and Uruguay have sent medicines and flood-relief aid. Canada has provided educational assistance, medicines, flour, and aluminum warehouses. Western Germany has provided assistance for agricultural development, physicians, technicians, and ambulances. Iran has sent petroleum products and Ireland has provided financial support. Japan has sent economic assistance, technicians, medical supplies, radios, and ambulances, although it holds the Japanese Constitution prohibits sending troops. Laos has provided refugee relief. The United Kingdom has provided financial assistance, and Venezuela is sending rice. Even traditionally neutral Switzerland has provided 30 microscopes.

In total, 31 nations have supplied some sort of tangible assistance. Eight more have agreed to provide assistance of some kind.

There is another kind of support which has been provided which I would like to mention, and that is political and moral support. For many years the United Kingdom, as a cochairman of the Geneva Conference of 1954, has supported the basic policies of the United States when the other cochairman, the Soviet Union, sought to issue messages condemning United States or South Vietnamese policy. Similarly Canada, as a member of the International Control Commission, has repeatedly helped protect the free world interests against unfair charges by the Communist side. Other nations have voiced support in important resolutions in international or regional organizations such as the United Nations or SEATO.

All of these contributions have been welcome and appreciated. Nevertheless, in view of the magnitude and importance of the task in South Vietnam, we have every right to ask for more.

Survey of the Atlantic Alliance in the Milwaukee Journal's Great Decisions Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, one of the excellent traditions of the Milwaukee Journal is the yearly series of articles published in its Sunday editorial section on the "Great Decisions" confronting the Nation. Last Sunday, February 20, the future of the Atlantic alliance was the subject of this series.

Eric Waldman, professor of political science and director of the Institute of German Affairs at Marquette University in Milwaukee, contributed a succinct yet comprehensive survey of the political and military problems of NATO. Professor Waldman is a leading expert on this subject.

In the other article, I outlined my view of a hopeful trend in the Atlantic alliance on matters involving the Common Market, trade, aid, and international monetary reform.

I include the articles hereafter:

GREAT DECISIONS, 1966: WESTERN EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES—EUROPE WEATHERS TEMPESTS—BRIGHTER SKIES PREDICTED

(NOTE.—The two articles below relate to the third week's topic in the Great Decisions series, which poses the question: "End of the Atlantic Alliance?")

(By Representative HENRY S. REUSS)

Crisis is the normal state of affairs for the Atlantic alliance. Prophets of doom saw the end coming when President de Gaulle blocked Great Britain's entry into the Common Market in January 1963; when the multilateral nuclear force (MLF) proposal was sunk almost without trace at the end of 1964; when the Common Market went into shock a year ago. The glorious alliance, the grand design, and the free world community have all been pronounced dead. My reaction is like that of Mark Twain when reports of his death were brought to him. The reports seem greatly exaggerated.

If the United States can take its eyes off the cobra stare fixation of southeast Asia long enough to get on with the task of rebuilding the Atlantic community, the happy Marshall plan days of unity can be here again.

Today I see some brighter colors across the whole spectrum of transatlantic cooperation in economic, political and military matters:

1. An outward-looking Common Market: The United States from the beginning supported the continental Common Market on the premise that it could be widened to include all of Western Europe; that it would pursue outward-looking, rather than narrow nationalistic policies; that the economic prosperity which it engendered could spin off to the rest of Europe and the world.

We placed particular reliance on two supranational aspects. The Common Market commission, an international body with the sole power of initiating common action, and the end of the system of one member veto, taking effect this year, by which one dog in the manger Common Market member could drag the others down to its level.

President de Gaulle announced some time ago that he was out to wreck both these provisions. But when the smoke of battle cleared from the meeting of the Common Market ministers at Luxembourg late last month, the five—Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg—stood fast. If they continue to stick to their guns, a Common Market which will be outward looking, and which others can join, again becomes a hopeful possibility.

PAYMENTS GAP SHRINKS

2. World trade: The Common Market crisis cast a pall over the Kennedy round negotiations at Geneva, which have to be completed by June 1967. The American position, as set forth in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, is to achieve a significant reduction of trade barriers on a multilateral basis. Had France succeeded in bending the Common Market to its will, the chance of meaningful negotiations would have dwindled.

Now we need to press full speed ahead with Kennedy round negotiations. Our first line of attack should be to attempt an across-the-board negotiation with all of the 65 negotiating countries, which between them account for 82 percent of world trade.

But if France should become intransigent, we must not let the entire negotiation fail because of it. As an alternative fallback position, we should make clear our readiness to negotiate with the other 64 countries, accounting for 77 percent of world trade. An intransigent France should be denied the most-favored-nation treatment benefits of such a resulting 65-nation trade liberalization agreement.

Incidentally, discreet rattling of this "secret weapon" would itself be the best guarantee of a more cooperative France at the bargaining table.

3. International monetary reform: The historian will record with regret that the United States did not move vigorously in the early sixties to bring its international payments into rough balance, and to embark upon a long overdue reform of the international monetary system.

For years we allowed our payments deficit to hover around the $3 billion mark, and we proceeded to lose gold—and control over our domestic economy—in the process. Worse, because our payments were still badly out of balance, the countries of Europe were not ready to undertake monetary reform.

In 1965 we have done much better. Our payments deficit is down to some $1.3 billion. And early this month we tabled before the Group of 10—the leading financial nations of the Atlantic community—our proposal to create a composite reserve unit which can, to some extent, supplement gold and the dollar as the free world's monetary mechanism. There is much negotiating still to do before agreement is reached. But at least we have started.

4. Development aid: While the Atlantic countries have been growing richer every year, the developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are making little progress, and in many cases are growing poorer.

Recently hopeful signs have appeared that the developed world is recognizing its joint responsibility toward the developing countries.

The House of Representatives this month passed the bill to set up an Asian Development Bank, in which the 19 developing countries of Asia will join with the Atlantic countries to provide long-term economic aid to Asia.

In addition to the United States, Germany, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and nine other European countries have made generous contributions. France alone is conspicuous by its absence.

Together with the Inter-American Development Bank for Latin America, and with the new African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank can channel help on a multilateral basis to where it is desperately needed.

5. Military security: France's removal of most of her military power from NATO command, and her insistence on a separate nuclear striking force, have damaged the NATO structure. But the central idea of one for all and all for one in the military defense of Europe remains. If the Soviet Union is to be persuaded to act with restraint, and if a beginning to discussions for German unification and a more humane order in middle Europe is sought, most leaders realize, the West must stick together.

France may, if she wishes, insist that the United States remove her European supply line from France's soil. If she did, we could set up more direct supply lines to our troops in Germany through north European ports, incidentally achieving some savings on our balance-of-payments expenditures. Life could still go on.

UPGRADING THE OECD

If President de Gaulle wants NATO headquarters removed from France, there are other places in Europe where it could be installed. And Secretary McNamara's proposal for a continuous consultative procedure on nuclear arms for the NATO alliance seems a far more satisfactory approach than the ill-fated multilateral nuclear force, which aroused apprehension of a possible German finger on the nuclear trigger.

6. Improved institutions: Attempts over the years since NATO was formed in 1949 to put political and economic flesh on its military bones have been unsuccessful. But there is another organization in being which, with a little beefing up, could provide a truly dynamic institution for Atlantic cooperation. This is the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, created in 1961.

OECD's purpose is to achieve full employment without inflation in its member countries, to contribute to the economic expansion of developing countries, and to expand world trade on a multilateral, nondiscriminatory basis. Its members include the United States and Canada, almost all the European countries including the neutrals, and Japan—generally, the advanced countries of the free world.

The trouble is that the OECD today lacks the prestige and the independence to initiate common solutions for the free world's problems of trade, aid, payments, and economic growth. Its decisionmaking body, the council, only infrequently holds meetings at which its members are represented by high ranking, ministerial level officials. And it lacks a genuine executive agency, such as the Common Market's commission, as well as a consultative legislative assembly.

President Johnson could give Atlantic cooperation a forward surge by calling for a three point upgrading of the OECD; permanent ministerial level representation on its council; an independent executive commission, perhaps of five "wise men," to initiate proposals and make recommendations to the council; and a parliamentary assembly of legislators drawn from the legislative bodies of the member nations to debate and make recommendations concerning the central business of the OECD.

NATO's Illness: Diagnoses Differ

(By Eric Waldman)

The well-publicized troubles of the Western defense alliance have given some support to the view that "NATO is dead"—or at least in its terminal illness. According to this line of thought, the crisis in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization does not involve mere organizational difficulties or differences of strategic opinion, but is the sign of an irreversible disintegration process. Therefore, in 1969 when the North Atlantic Treaty expires, the alliance formed 17 years ago to build a powerful collective deterrent against further Soviet expansion in Europe will actually come to an end.

These pessimistic views about the future of NATO call for an examination of some of the major factors which brought on the current crisis.

One of the most important points at issue is the question of the continuing need for an Atlantic collective security system. Some observers feel that NATO has outlived its usefulness because of the fundamental changes in Soviet foreign policy toward the West.

CITE SOVIET THAW

While the relatively hard Soviet position on Vietnam has clouded the picture somewhat, those who argue that NATO is obsolete point to the restraint which the Soviet Union has exercised for some time in dealing with the Western Powers as proof of the peaceful coexistence policy. They believe that the cold war has ended with a relaxation of tensions in Europe and that a costly military alliance is no longer required.

Exponents of this view would see merit, in fact, in a complete breakup of NATO, since they feel it would further accelerate finding solutions to some of the still unsolved problems of European unity and security, such as final treaty arrangements between the World War II victors and Germany.

A diametrically opposed analysis holds that there is no substantial change of long range Soviet intentions and that it was and still is the strength of NATO's deterrent power which prevented the Soviet Union from pursuing a more aggressive policy toward the West.

Champions of this interpretation of the situation in Europe can point at the approximately 90 Soviet divisions stationed in central and eastern Europe, the 3,000 modern tactical aircraft ready for immediate employment, and the 800 medium-range ballistic missiles equipped with nuclear warheads and pointed at West European targets as strong indications of a continuing danger from the East. It is explained that a decrease in the deterrent power of NATO, or its complete disintegration, would result in a revival of Soviet aggressiveness as in the immediate post-World War I era.

DE GAULLE'S IDEAS

That U.S. policymakers give much weight to this view is evident from the continued presence of more than 300,000 men of the American Armed Forces in Europe, including about 220,000 in West Germany and 6,000 in Berlin. This is half again as many American troops as are fighting the hot war thus far in Vietnam.

An entire complex of problems has been thrust upon NATO by the French chief of state. President de Gaulle's policies and actions are strongly influenced by the following concepts:

His notion of an expanding "European Europe" from the Atlantic to the Urals requires a disintegrated Eastern Europe, which he suggests could only become reality if preceded by a similar process in the West.

France is destined to be the leading continental power and therefore British and American influence must be curtailed in Europe.

Germany must not be permitted to share in any nuclear arrangement since this would result in strong Soviet reaction detrimental to easing of control in Eastern Europe and would challenge France's superiority on the Continent.

Since the "nation state" is the primary historical and political unit, integration, or subordination as De Gaulle prefers to call it, is contrary to a nation's interest and has to be opposed. This concept applies equally to NATO, to the European Common Market (EEC), and to other European organizations.

No nation can indefinitely rely on another country's nuclear power for its own security. France, therefore, must have its own force de frappe. De Gaulle realizes that the limited French nuclear potential (it is estimated that France may have 3 percent of the West's nuclear weapon power by 1970) cannot compete with the nuclear might of the Soviet Union, therefore he insists on the strategic concept of immediate massive retaliation directed against major cities as a deterrent against aggression.

The broad scope of De Gaulle's policies makes it possible for many observers, including American experts on Europe, to agree with one or more of his views and at the same time strongly reject others.

The official U.S. view opposes De Gaulle's position and favors further steps toward European and Atlantic military integration as necessary for an effective Western security system.

Washington appears greatly annoyed by the doubts expressed by Europeans—and the French are by no means the only ones—that the United States would commit its nuclear forces in the case of a Soviet attack in Europe. Neither repeated pledges made by American Presidents and Secretaries of State, nor the American forces sent to Europe in past wars, have convinced all our European partners of our credibility.

Nor do some admit the futility of a nuclear deterrent of the size France can maintain.

A French atomic strike, American strategists warn, would fail to hurt substantially the Soviet retaliatory capability and therefore could only serve to trigger total destruction to its user.

The United States, sympathizes with those NATO partners, including West Germany, which want to participate in nuclear decision making related to the defense of their own countries. The ill fated multilateral force (MLF) was an American attempt to provide for this participation in a small fraction of the available nuclear forces without giving up final United States control on their employment. However the scheme met with only lukewarm support in Western Europe and bitter opposition from the Soviet Union. The recently created nuclear planning committee may prove a more acceptable means to provide the NATO partners with the status of nuclear consultants.

Recently efforts have been made to update NATO strategy and to provide the means for a flexible response to Soviet aggression. The doctrine of massive retaliation, the exchange of the most destructive nuclear weapons whatever the provocation, had lost its credibility. But the failure of the NATO countries, except the United States and West Germany, to supply adequate conventional forces has kept the means for flexible response below desired levels.

STRATEGIC JUSTIFICATION

Despite all the difficulties enumerated, the U.S. administration clearly considers the continuation of NATO still essential to its own and Western Europe's security. Efforts will continue to find a basis of cooperation with all NATO countries, including France, even though at times it appears a frustrating endeavor.

The strategic view that the nation's military policy must be based not on the attitude of a potential opponent as it appears at the moment, but must consider his capability (which does not change so rapidly), seems to be the justification for persistent United States efforts to help NATO survive its recurrent crises.

Over 1,300 Southeastern Louisiana College Students at Hammond, La., Support President Johnson's Vietnam Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a resolution signed by over 1,300 students at Southeastern Louisiana College in my hometown of Hammond, La., supporting this country's policy in Vietnam. I have forwarded this resolution to President Lyndon B. Johnson to show the President and the entire country how these many young people are patriotically supporting the United States in its struggle in South Vietnam.

The students at Southeastern strongly support their President's policy. In addition to this resolution they sent a similar resolution with a large number of signatures to our troops in Vietnam before Christmas. I feel that these young people represent the finest tradition of our American heritage. I am sure that the sentiments expressed in the resolution represent the views of an overwhelming majority of our citizens throughout the country.

The following is the resolution sponsored by the Southeastern Louisiana College student government and signed by the hundreds of students at that institution:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the United States of America is involved in a military conflict in Vietnam; and

Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson is Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces; and

Whereas the American foreign policy is being applied to its best effect in Vietnam: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the student government of Southeastern Louisiana College, Hammond, La., representing the entire student body, go on record as being in full support of our Federal Government's policy in Vietnam; be it further

Resolved, That this body honor the men in Vietnam by rising for a moment in silent prayer; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be recorded in the official minutes of the student government senate and that a copy be sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The following is a letter which I received from James J. Brady, president of the student government at Southeastern:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORRISON: On behalf of the student body of Southeastern Louisiana College, I am forwarding to you a copy of the resolution supporting our President's and Government's position in Vietnam.

As you can see this resolution is accompanied by a list of over 1,300 names of students on our campus who support this position. These names were collected by various members of the student body at different places on the campus.

This petition is not the neatest nor the most attractive that might be composed, but the sincerity of the students whose names appear on this roll reflect the true greatness of our republic.

I, therefore, ask that you make known our position concerning Vietnam to the President and to the other members of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. BRADY,
President, Student Government.

And finally I include the letter which I sent to the President along with the resolution:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is with great pride that I forward to you a petition signed by 1,300 students of Southeastern Louisiana College, located in my hometown of Hammond, La., expressing the support of these young people for our Nation's policy in Vietnam.

The letter transmitting this petition, from Student Government President James J. Brady, reflects the hope of our country through the courageous attitude of this student body.

I am very pleased and happy to submit this petition to you.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

John F. Kennedy Junior High Dedicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure and privilege to deliver the Dedication Day address on February 20, 1966, for the John F. Kennedy Junior High School, Randolph, Mass.

I would like to especially commend Mrs. David Good, for her excellent portrait of our late and beloved President, John F. Kennedy. Mrs. Good's art career began and continued through her high school years at the Academy of the Assumption. She received her B.S. in art education in 1962, having attended the Massachusetts College of Art and has devoted much of her time to substitute teaching in the Randolph High School, attending painting courses and serving on art juries in local contests.

Mr. and Mrs. Good, both natives of Randolph, and their five children reside at 535 South Main Street, Randolph. An exhibition of Mrs. Good's paintings will be on display during March at the Brockton Public Library, Brockton, Mass.

Following is an account of the ceremonies, which appeared in the Quincy Patriot Ledger, of February 21, 1966, along with the text of my address and the dedication program.

[From the Quincy Mass.) Patriot Ledger, Feb. 21, 1966]

FIVE HUNDRED AND FIFTY ATTEND CEREMONIES: JOHN F. KENNEDY JUNIOR HIGH DEDICATED

RANDOLPH.—The new John F. Kennedy Junior High School was dedicated yesterday in ceremonies highlighted by tributes to the late President's interest in education and concern for the country's youth.

LATE PRESIDENT PRAISED

Senator James R. McIntyre, mayor of Quincy, and U.S. Representative JAMES A. BURKE, Democrat, of Massachusetts, both praised the late President and spoke on his interest in education.

Congressman BURKE said Kennedy's vigor appealed to the youth of America and, in turn, youth had a "manifold responsibility to a past Congressman, Senator, and President."

Senator McIntyre was introduced by Raymond P. McGerrigle, school committeeman and chairman of the dedication committee.

More than 550 persons attended the ceremonies.

A portrait of President Kennedy was presented to the school by Mrs. David Good. The portrait will be hung in the school's library. A new American flag was also given to James L. Topham, Kennedy School principal, by Mrs. Dorothy Tolson, president of the Amvets Post Auxiliary.

OTHER SPEAKERS

Others speaking at the dedication included Dr. John Collins, headmaster at Newman Preparatory School, Boston; Norman Silk, chairman of the Randolph selectmen, and William J. Doherty, chairman of the school planning and building committee.

Participating in the ceremonies were the color guard of the Randolph Veterans' Council, the Kennedy Junior High School Band, under the direction of Leonard Rapoza; Deborah Christian, Paul Maloof, Edward Tedesco, architect; Rev. J. Sidney Kearns, pastor of St. Mary's School; Charles Green, school committeeman; Richard Coburn, finance committee chairman, and Rev. Arthur Bowler, minister of the First Congregational Church.

Prior to the ceremonies, the school was open for inspection by residents. The split-level building houses 28 regular classrooms, 11 specialized classrooms, a cafetorium with stage and kitchen, library, gymnasium, guidance rooms, and a teachers' room. The outdoor site encompasses a football field, baseball diamond, tennis courts, and areas for physical education.

DEDICATION: JOHN F. KENNEDY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, RANDOLPH, MASS., FEBRUARY 20, 1966, 3:30 P.M.

PROGRAM

Flag raising, color guard: veterans council—American Legion, DAV, VFW, AMVETS.

Invocation: Rev. Father John S. Kearns.

"The Star-Spangled Banner": John F. Kennedy Junior High School Band, Leonard Rapoza, director of music.

Salute and Pledge of Allegiance: Deborah Christian, Paul Maloof.

Greetings and introduction of guests: Raymond P. McGerrigle, chairman.

Presentation of keys—Acceptance: Mr. Edward Tedesco to Mr. William J. Doherty and Mr. Charles Green.

Presentation of portrait of President John F. Kennedy: Mrs. David Good.

Acceptance of portrait: Mr. Peter J. Davin, chairman, school committee.

Acceptance of American flag: Mr. James L. Topham, principal.

Introduction of speaker: Thomas L. Warren, superintendent of schools.

Remarks: Hon. JAMES A. BURKE, Congressman, 11th Massachusetts District.

Benediction: Rev. Arthur Bowler.

March—Military escort: Bennett, John F. Kennedy Junior High School Band.

DEDICATION COMMITTEE

Raymond P. McGerrigle, chairman; William J. Doherty, Daniel Hayes, Thomas L. Warren, William J. Lynch, Henry Lesser.

PLANNING

The school planning and building committee and the school committee presented to the town meeting members on March 4, 1963, the proposal to build a new junior high school in the center of Randolph.

This special town meeting of March 4, 1963, authorized the school planning and building committee and the school committee to apply for Federal funds under Public Law 560 of the 83d Congress for the purchasing of preliminary and final plans for a new junior high school.

This procedure was followed, and the town was able to borrow, interest free, the sum of $68,371 for architects' fees.

The economical, yet educationally functional building, is the result of many, many hours of thoughtful planning by the members of the school planning and building comittee, the school committee, and the administrators. It was opened for classes on Monday, November 22, 1965, coincidentally on the second anniversary of the assassination of the President.

FACILITIES

An egress walkway to the southeast from the school property to Alfred Terrace was constructed together with a steel fence along the entire east boundary to protect the property of homeowners.

Studies are now being made into the possibility of providing a second egress road to alleviate the traffic congestion.

A permanent sewer system was made from the school to the trunkline on Pleasant Street through an egress obtained through the Lind property.

The split level building, designed to follow the natural contours of the site contains the following: 28 regular classrooms, 11 specialized classrooms, shops or laboratories, a cafetorium with stage and kitchen, a library, a gymnasium, guidance rooms, and a teachers' room. Maintenance-free materials have been used and, wherever necessary, acoustic materials have been amply provided. A variety of color has been used throughout in order to provide a pleasant atmosphere for work.

MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL PLANNING AND BUILDING COMMITTEE

Chairman: William J. Doherty; secretary, James J. Tantillo; George Beatty, John A. Dellea, Daniel Hayes, Kenneth J. Bradbury, Eugene Solon, Henry Lesser, Walter Winston, Harvey Teed, Raymond P. McGerrigle.

MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE

Chairman, Peter J. Davin; secretary, Mrs. Marie Helm Cormey; Charles E. Green, Jr., Mrs. Patricia M. McDermott; Raymond P. McGerrigle.

Architect: Edward J. Tedesco Associates, AIA.

General contractor: Tocci Bros. Construction Co., Inc.

Clerk of the works: Bruce Dunbar.

Principal: John F. Kennedy Junior High School, Mr. James L. Topham.

Dedication committee: Raymond P. McGerrigle, chairman; William J. Doherty, Thomas L. Warren, Henry Lesser, William J. Lynch, Daniel Hayes.

EDUCATIONAL CONSULTANTS

Thomas L. Warren, superintendent of schools; William J. Lynch, assistant superintendent of schools.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The school planning and building committee wishes to express its thanks to the town meeting members, the board of selectmen, the school committee, and the superintendent of schools and the assistant superintendent of schools—and gratefully acknowledges its appreciation to all who have so generously contributed assistance.

The Randolph school committee wishes in the name of the school system personnel and the pupils to thank the townspeople and the members of the school building and planning committee for their cooperative efforts in providing this excellent and much-needed school building.

"Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."—John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States—1961–63.

The sculptor: Bert Kilgore, the sculptor who executed the bas relief of John F. Kennedy for Edward Tedesco Associates, is a native of Wakefield, Mass., and presently resides in Woburn. Although he has worked in various parts of the country, most of his sculpture has been for New England architects.

Mr. Kilgore received his formal art training in the School of the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston. His works are to be found in many parts of New England.

His sculpture is architectural and he considers the portrait at the John F. Kennedy Junior High School to be an ideal example of collaboration between the arts of architecture and sculpture. The depth of the carving and recession of the marble panels into the brick wall indicate that this work was not an afterthought on the part of the architect, but rather a preconceived idea carried through to completion.

PORTRAIT OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mrs. David Good, painter and donor of the excellent portrait of our late, beloved President John F. Kennedy, is a resident of Randolph, and graduate of the Massachusetts College of Art.

Her painting of the late President has been called one of the finest for the way in which it has caught the firmness, yet the youth, humor, and courage of the man.

SITE

The site of the school is most ideal, being centrally located on a sloping eminence overlooking to the north, the St. Mary's Parochial School complex and to the east, the town of Holbrook.

Access to the school is from Mill Street with a road named in honor of Mr. William Hurley, a veteran of World War I and a long-time resident of the immediate area.

The 16-acre site was purchased by the town of Randolph from Mr. Lind for $43,600 and has been extensively landscaped with a football field, baseball diamond, tennis courts, and areas for physical education.

STATISTICS

Acreage: 16.87 acres.
Building area, 86,910 square feet.
Student capacity: 1,000 students.
Parking capacity: 185 cars.
Building cost per square foot: $15.60.

Expenditures:

General contract including site development	$1,560,400
Planning and supervision	112,320
Clerk of the works	12,450
Furnishings and equipment	133,123
Miscellaneous	14,301
Unexpended	4,406
Total appropriation	1,837,000

State: 50 percent.

DEDICATION AT RANDOLPH JOHN F. KENNEDY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL BY HON. JAMES A. BURKE

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, faculty members, and friends, I am delighted to have been invited to speak at the dedication of this beautiful junior high school, named in memory of our late and beloved President John F. Kennedy. This dedication ceremony has particular significance to me because I had the honor of serving in the U.S. Congress under his direction as President. John F. Kennedy always had an intense interest in education. As a Congressman from Massachusetts, in one of his early educational proposals, John Kennedy said: "I am aware that Massachusetts is not an island unto itself, and its progress, its peace, its prosperity, and ultimately its survival depend upon the wisdom and enlightenment of the public school graduates in every part of the country." Let us not forget that much of the educational legislation passed during the last session of Congress was originally initiated by John F. Kennedy.

His youthful vigor appealed greatly to the younger generation and they immediately began to identify themselves with the President. President Kennedy encouraged their confidence by choosing the youth of America to represent our country abroad under the auspices of the Peace Corps. He realized that the future of our country was in their hands and emphasized to American youth the importance of staying in school and completing their education. We, of Massachusetts can be justly proud of our schools and the remembrance that one of our native sons was elected to Congress, went on to become a great Senator, and a dearly beloved President of the United States. These attainments should be emphasized to the students of John F. Kennedy Junior High School, since they too can become the future leaders of America. John F. Kennedy was so proud to be the President of a democratic society because he believed that only in a democracy did the future leadership depend so much on educational preparation.

Our Government has made education free and available to every American, beginning with the elementary school and continuing through high school. Junior high school is an important transition, the transition to greater maturity and learning. It is with the introduction of junior high school that the student begins to sort out his knowledge and attains a greater proficiency in subject matter.

Those of you who will be studying and teaching at this beautiful John F. Kennedy Junior High School have a manifold responsibility, a responsibility to a past Congressman, Senator, President, and educator. It is up to all of you not to allow specialization of subject matter to consume the student as well as the teacher. Having broad interests is most important in keeping our democratic way of life alive.

Unfortunately, President Kennedy did not live to see many of his educational ideals enacted into legislation, but let all of us here cherish his name and be inspired by his educational beliefs. In a message to Congress, President Kennedy referred to education as a "keystone in the arch of freedom and progress." Today, let us remember the name of John F. Kennedy as a keystone in the structure of this school. I know that I share with all of you the hope that this school will endure and flourish with all of the beauty and greatness inherent in its fine name.

Estonian People Remembered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, each year on the appropriate days, Members of this Chamber join their fellow Americans throughout the world in remembering that millions of persons in countries behind the Iron Curtain live their daily lives subjected to Soviet imperialism. It is well that we vocally remember, thereby keeping alive even a faint hope that someday the captive nations of Europe may join the international community as free and independent members of the family of nations.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to the greatness of the Estonian people, and to recall that 48 years ago these proud people declared themselves independent. They then reestablished their national independence which they had lost in the course of imperialist Russian expansion to the west. But the Estonian people were able to enjoy their freedom for merely two decades. The new masters of Russia—the Communists—with their Red army—overran and occupied the country during World War II. That these traditionally free people are not free today is one of the great tragedies of our times.

Since World War II began, approximately 55 former colonies representing about 1.5 billion people have gained their independence, these peoples constituting about one-third of those living today, are free. In many more cases, western colonial powers helped and nurtured their colonies toward responsible independence. What we in the West and most of the newly independent countries fail to realize is that during this same period of time, not a single colony of the Soviet Union has become an independent state. In fact, the Soviets have expanded their empire where they have been able, and have brutally repressed those under their yoke who have sought to attain their freedom.

Yet it is the Soviets, employing the Marxist dialectic, who have branded the Western nations as the colonial powers, when in fact, Mr. Speaker, behind the Iron Curtain lies the largest colonial empire the world has ever seen and suffered with. We ought to recognize the spurious Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for exactly what it is: a colonial empire which makes a mockery of sovereignty, freedom, human justice, and social conditions.

We shall not let ourselves be fooled by the Russian propaganda agencies. Life in this "worker's paradise" is difficult, as the Estonians watch their wherewithal being shipped out of their country; as they watch their women and children being forced to work hard and long hours and days for no apparent increase in the nation's standard of living; as they crave the amenities of life, especially clothing, only to be told, "perhaps next year"; as the majority of Estonians outside the major cities live in substandard housing, many of these units having only outside plumbing; as wages rarely rise, and almost never faster than the cost of living. It is a sorry life, but it should not surprise us to see this. The millions of people in the captive nations learned a long time ago that the true nature of Russian socialism is somewhat less than colonial poverty.

We are not deceived. We shall not forget. The Estonian people have our faith, our trust, and the everlasting hope for a brighter tomorrow.

From Cracker Barrel to Computer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit, for inclusion in the Record, a speech presented by our distinguished colleague, Congresswoman Catherine May, at the International Consumer Credit Association Conference on February 20, 1966, at Sacramento, Calif.

Congresswoman May's speech, entitled "From Cracker Barrel to Computer," presents a timely and informative discussion of the consumer in America today at the food market.

She points out that modern packaging and marketing have resulted in large-scale gains to the consumer in improved products and lower costs, and that the vast majority of those in the industry are conscientiously and sincerely trying to do the best job possible in serving the public.

I invite attention to Congresswoman May's speech. She does an excellent job of "setting the record straight":

From Cracker Barrel to Computer

(Address of Congresswoman Catherine May, International Consumer Credit Association, 29th Conference, Credit Women's Breakfast Club, Sunday, February 20, 1966, Sacramento, Calif.)

First of all, may I say thank you for this opportunity to participate in the International Consumer Credit Conference. You in your profession have been working with the consumer for many years. So, we have something in common. I was in Congress when the Government discovered the consumer. This was a fascinating experience, especially for a housewife who had been naively assuming that I had been around all the time. Today, however, I can proudly announce to you without fear of contradiction that Mr. and Mrs. Consumer of America have the Government seal of approval and are now officially in existence.

At this point, may I say that my attempts at levity in these opening remarks are only partly serious. I realize that many people view the consumer movement today with both cynicism and suspicion. This is certainly not to be wondered at because so many self-appointed spokesmen for consumers just don't seem to know what they are talking about and so many self-appointed protectors of the consumer have proposed a number of very impractical—even improbable—legislative solutions. But, nevertheless, the consumer movement gains its impetus and popularity because of a vacuum in consumer information—because the abundance of our age has quite honestly brought bewilderment and confusion to the men and women who shop our fabulous modern-day stores. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the food industry. So, this morning I'm going to talk about the consumer and her grocery store.

The National Commission on Food Marketing was created by Congress in 1964 for the purpose of making an 18-month study of our entire food marketing structure. I am a member of this Commission and I have found that one of the most absorbing aspects of the study has been in the area of the tremendous changes that have come about in the way we get food from farm to dinner table as compared to 20 years ago. A little recognized but very important fact is that one day back in 1953 the United States became the first country in the history of the world to develop to the point at which a larger percentage of its work force was engaged in the tasks of distributing goods and performing services than were engaged in the tasks of producing goods. Modern home economists point out that their jobs have changed because the home has ceased to be a production unit and has become instead a consumption unit. What is true for the American home today is also true of the American economy. In the sense of the employment of most of our population, we are a consuming and a marketing Nation, not a producing Nation and there is a very big difference, which is dramatically illustrated in what has happened to our food industry. In a few short years we have come to the place where only 8 percent of our population is engaged in producing food—and fewer than 10 percent of all the farms in America account for fully half of total American farm sales. In this same span of time, we have seen the disappearance of corner grocery stores—known as the "Ma and Pa" stores—as they are being replaced by the huge one-stop convenience shopping centers. Change in this field is still occurring rapidly and we have no idea yet what the future will bring.

Come to think of it, maybe we do have some idea and I'm not sure that the prospect is so pleasant if it goes this far. I read the other day about a new supermarket in West Germany which has become fully automated. Everything is displayed behind glass. The customer presses a button when she comes in the store. This button turns a turnstile and gives milady a shopping token. She wanders through the aisles looking at the various displays. When she sees something that strikes her fancy as a good idea for the family dinner, she drops the token into the vending machine, punches a button and the machine delivers the product while marking the price on the token. When all her various food items have been chosen, she drops the token into a payment slot and receives her bill. She then puts her money into another machine and it delivers her change. The owners pointed out that this automated type of shopping protected the little woman from "temperamental clerks, coupons, salesmanship, and shoplifting temptations." Columnist Phyllis Battelle made a whimsical comment on this store in one of her columns the other day when she said, "drop your token in the slot and don't be surprised if you hear, 'I'm sorry; the calf's liver you have dialed is not a working liver—please dial a pork roast.' "

Well, however little the prospect of this type of progress may please—in food shopping we have come from cracker barrel to computer. And, in the process, the great public issue called consumerism has had a meteoric career.

I think most of us thought we were pretty well off until our protectors began to tell us that our supermarkets are jungles and our department stores usurers. Now people are lining up to get the chance to protect us from all this—and from ourselves. For a number of reasons that I will spell out in some detail here today, I'm beginning to believe that we may need protection from them.

This is not to say that these self-appointed consumer spokesmen are not sincere and nobly motivated. Yet I think that in their zeal to protect us all in the marketplace, they have failed to grasp a number of fundamental truths about the way in which our economy works, and about the nature of poverty, which many of their actions are said to alleviate.

Turning to the marketplace first, it seems to me that my protectors have failed to recognize either the motivations or limitations on businessmen in a consumer-driven society.

Businessmen are not, we should all understand, either better or worse, or more honest or less so, than any other group of human beings. The vast majority are simply trying to do an honest job for their companies, and to earn a profit by performing a service for which a number of people will pay. There are, of course, some quick-buck operators who profit by deceit. There always will be. But most are not dishonest, and much of the appeal of the so-called consumer spokesmen is based on the misconception that most businessmen are cheats.

By the same token, these critics of business have, I believe, badly underestimated the practical, existing legal, and competitive limitations on the ability of a businessman seeking long-term growth for his company to do so through deception.

It should be pointed out for the record that our Nation today is not without laws designed to protect consumers in the marketplace. The Federal Government is involved in 296 programs to help the consumer—118 of these activities directly protect and advance consumer interest. Costs of these programs total over $100 million a year and employ over 7,000 Federal workers full time.

Just as an example, the Federal Trade Commission, after testifying in support of a new packaging and labeling legislation because, according to its Chairman, it was powerless to act in the field, found only a couple of months ago that it has always had, after all, the power to stop cents-off labeling when its effect is misleading.

Important as these existing legal restraints are, however, of equal importance is the power of free choice in a competitive, consumeristic economy.

Most consumer goods industries today are highly competitive and individual items usually earn very small profits per unit of sale. I'm told that in the food industry, for example, it takes 3 years for a typical new product to earn enough money to pay off the initial investment and begin to generate a real profit.

This means that selling this item just once isn't going to get anyone anywhere.

Enough consumers must prefer it over alternatives and choose it regularly—not just once—in order for the manufacturer to get his money back. In other words, it's repeat business—not the one-shot sales—that pay off. And I am convinced by my own experiences as a shopper that businessmen try hard to earn this repeat business, and that those who do not earn it don't get it.

This protection, regulated by competition in the consumer interest, is the very heart of our free enterprise system. I think it's a good system, and one that works.

Yet it is precisely this system which the consumer spokesmen so distrust that they would substitute for it their own judgment about what it is that I, as a consumer, most want. I do not question their sincerity of purpose. I do question their ability to make my value judgments for me. And when faced with a choice between regulation by a system and regulation by men, I'll take the system. It's slow and cumbersome, in many cases, but it is not susceptible to whim or prejudice, and it works.

The second truth about the marketplace that our new consumer spokesmen have often failed to grasp—and this is the reason I'm afraid we may need protection from them—is that it is possible to get more consumer protection than we are willing to pay for.

For another built-in protection we get from our system has resulted from the development of efficient, high-speed machinery and other cost-cutting manufacturing procedures designed to bring consumers the things they want at low unit costs. Since many of the self-styled improvements consumer spokesmen say they want me to have would arbitrarily overturn many of these economies, they would add to the cost of the merchandise I buy. This might give me more protection and certainty, but I question whether it's really worth it.

For example, mass production techniques require that packages be filled and weighed in bulk, rather than individually. This means that 100 1-pound packages of something will weigh 100 pounds, but each individual package may weigh slightly more or less. Actually, in practice, many manufacturers tell me that they purposely overfill their packages so that any errors will be more likely to occur by overfilling than by underfilling. One cereal manufacturer adds a pound of product to every 24 pounds, so that the total weight of a case of any of his products will actually weigh more than the total listed weight of the contents.

Most regulatory agencies have recognized that this mass weighing is an absolute necessity if we are to have the cost-cutting benefits of mass production. It is a compromise that I find easy to understand, but many consumer spokesmen have labeled it a form of economic cheating. In some cases, movements have been started to abolish the current systems of tolerances. I don't think it's worth the cost.

Another example has to do with the size of consumer packages and their net contents. Few consumer spokesmen seem to recognize the fact that the system I find doing so well, and they find so dangerous, has built a high degree of standardization in package size. Again, the reason businessmen have done so is to give their companies—and, because of competitive forces, the consumer—the full benefits of mass production.

Let me give you one classic example on this point. In an attempt to drum up support for Federal control for packaging and labeling one of our chief spokesmen for the consumer in Government refers to a survey she made some time ago. She sent a number of housewives out and asked them to choose from a supermarket the cheapest—in terms of price per ounce—products in several categories. These ladies found a lot of trouble when it came to buying tunafish and now this is being used as an illustration of packaging fraud. I'll be the first to tell you that when you stop by the tunafish display in the average market you are going to have to make some decisions on selection because there are so many different kinds of packs of tuna. And the reason there are so many different kinds is because one is designed to one job and another, another. I buy one kind of tunafish for salad and another type if I am going to use it in a creamed dish. The tunafish packer knows that this is what I want in the way of selection. So, he packs tuna in whole pack and chunks, in oil, and in brine. But each of these different kinds of products is put in the same size can. Naturally, the weight between cans is going to vary because of the way they are packed. Whole tuna in oil, for example, will have a different weight than chunk tuna in oil, even though they are both in the same size can. Why do manufacturers do this? Well, simply so that they can get maximum use out of their can making and can filling machinery and still offer variety to consumers. This makes for good consumer values. Yet, many of the consumer spokesmen cry that this causes confusion and that the weight should be standardized instead. And, they make no mention of the fact that this will add to costs. Again, I question whether this kind of protection is worth the price.

The main thing here is that there has been a sizable and regrettable misunderstanding in the minds of these very well-meaning people about what consumers actually want in terms of value. Most of the consumer movement today is involved in trying to push through legislative and administrative measures to assure that consumers can always find the thing that costs them least per ounce.

But speaking for myself—and, I believe, most other shoppers—I can assure them that, while price comparisons are important, they are only part of the way in which I judge value. Of far greater importance, it seems to me, is the intangible, subjective question of whether or not a product is going to satisfy myself and my family.

If we want bran flakes, for example, the fact that oatmeal may (or may not) be less expensive per pound doesn't really make any difference to me. The value really lies, in that case, in the more expensive product. And making it easier for me to make this—to me—essentially meaningless comparison isn't going to earn my appreciation, especially if doing so has raised the cost of both products.

But, the consumer spokesmen say, this is of vital importance to the poor, and should be done for them. Yet while it is unquestionably true that helping the poor get more for their money is a worthy enterprise, I sincerely question whether the mass of consumer protection ideas will really do the job.

I question this because I believe that the most common consumer protection measures are designed to solve essentially imaginary problems, ignore the real problems, and in any case, mistakenly assume that treating poverty's symptoms will somehow cure the disease.

It is a fact, I believe, that supermarket shopping today does present some problems. But the problems are not those of simple price comparisons. A more basic problem is the fact that businessmen's sheer inventiveness and ingenuity has spawned such a great variety of new and tempting products that how to best use them presents some very real shopping problems.

These are problems of abundance, not foisted off on an unsuspecting public, but offered us in an atmosphere of free choice. Many consumer spokesmen say this itself is a bad feature of the American marketplace and that the confusion this creates should be diminished by somehow restricting the number of new products that come on the market. How this would be done, I do not know. I am convinced that shoppers are more grateful to the businessmen who found they could package au gratin potatoes in convenient packages than they are to their spokesmen who, in the hysterical discovery of the obvious, complain that the packaged form is far more expensive than the ingredients.

The real problem is not standardizing boxes or contents. The real problem is educating and training people to make the best use of the abundance that is available to them. And solving the problem begins with an effort directed at the people, rather than at the products.

The fact that a shopper can instantly recognize the lowest cost item available to her in a certain category is meaningless if she hasn't got enough money to buy the product in the first place. The fact that a buyer of something on credit can instantly recognize a high rate of interest is meaningless to him if he needs the product and can't get the credit at a lower interest rate.

Concerning credit, the pressure is building for passage of credit control bills.

You should know and be pleased that your California statute regulating credit and installment sales of goods and services, which I believe is known as the Unruh act, is looked up to nationally as a model law. In it, we see reasonable legislation that has met the needs of the consumer and industry exceptionally well. It has furnished to the consumer adequate information upon which to make a decision on choosing the businessman to whom he will offer his credit.

Likewise, conformity with the law has presented no problem to the seller who wishes to follow the precepts of good business. The proof of the Unruh act's sufficiency is in the fact that it has stood the acid test of years. Proposals to amend it—allegedly for greater protection of the consumer—have been rejected when the spotlight showed up the fuzzy thinking behind such proposals. These, in fact, were poorly concealed efforts to put a straitjacket on the granting of credit to service retailing's customers and to facilitate merchandising.

For many Americans, poverty is a very real and grinding truth. What can be done to mitigate it should and must be done. But careful listing of price comparisons or interest rates are of little help to someone who can't read or judge. And it seems to me that if anywhere near half the effort currently being expended in the name of consumer protection were spent instead on educational efforts aimed at helping make smart shoppers out of today's buyers, something far more valuable would be accomplished.

Supermarket people tell me that the real secret to wise buying in their stores involves simply building a shopping list around a set budget, and then sticking to the list when you get to the store. Additionally, a recent U.S. Department of Agriculture study shows that shopping a store's specials will allow a consumer to chop 16 percent a year off of her food expenditures.

My point is that manufacturers and retailers, competing for our patronage, offer us values. We will be best off as we best learn to turn these honest competitive efforts to our own advantage, turning the attributes of the system to our own use. Only this way can we get the protection we really need.

I think by now you have gotten the point that I do not believe that we should look at today's supermarkets as a vast wasteland. As consumers we should look with grateful eyes on the supermarket as a bountiful, even though often confusing and bewildering, symbol of the inventiveness and ingenuity of the food industry and the abundance of the Nation's farms. In trying to make a balanced judgment of value, I ask myself, "Am I willing to pay the price of some confusion and doubt for the tremendous variety of wonderful food that is being brought to me and my dinner table in an ever-increasing palatable and convenient form?" My answer is, "Yes, sir," without qualification. I'm glad to pay the high price of seasonal and sharply reduced markets. And, as a working wife myself, I would be the last to suggest to 8 million women who divide their time between a home and a job that they can't have the convenient food forms that make their tasks less burdensome. And those are only a couple of the alternatives that would arise if some of the regulators of the marketplace had their way.

Instead, there is a very practical and possible way to reduce the price of confusion in choicemaking—not by turning the Nation's supermarkets into a stultifying panorama of bland similarity but rather educating consumers to the point that they can best use the variety which is offered.

There is a great challenge here to many persons in our country—to the food editors, to the home economists, to our schools and to our consumer education services at various levels of our government. Too few people are trying to help our consumers buy wisely in relation to their needs. One housewife's "giant economy size" can easily be another housewife's waste. Consumer education should be oriented more to the buying and using of foods than to cooking. Formalized education in our schools has a tremendous challenge to keep pace with new products and services and changing methods or distribution. In only a few schools are they meeting this challenge. As one critic commented the other day, "Virtually all courses in the field are cup-and-teaspoon oriented while we live in a thaw-and-serve age." Yet, just last year, half the population of the United States became 25 years old or younger—40 percent of our population is under 20. Studies show that 80 percent of all teenage girls shop for their family's food and spend one-fourth of the entire family food budget—97 percent of them help plan the meals and help cook them. This is a real challenge in consumer education starting at the teenage level.

And I would like to give the knuckles of industry a gentle rap in this connection. What are they doing in the field of consumer education? As one industry spokesman admitted the other day, "We have, perhaps, become so interested in engineering change that we have neglected to tell anybody about the significance or implications of the changes in terms of the basics of shopping cart and kitchen economics, rather than dead statistics."

The whole point I am trying to make is that an educated consumer is a protected consumer. And a dynamic, changing, keenly competitive food industry makes a happy and fortunate consumer.

To quote myself from a speech made some time ago,

"All the Government officials and all the Government laws in the world are as nothing compared to the impact Mrs. America has on Mr. Manufacturer and on Mr. Storekeeper when she makes up her mind to buy one brand over another. And when she makes that decision, no power on earth can save the businessman or the producer of the product who made the mistake of displeasing her. She has done and is doing a wonderful job in needling, inspiring and in regulating American business enterprise.

"And, to reward her, I want to protect her. Not with more Government regulations and laws—I want to protect her freedom of choice."

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. Franklin Paul Harris, minister, McKendree Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, as this historic body begins its session today, may each Member relate himself to Thee, for in the matter of minutes we shall be up with the sweep of today's immediate tasks and we may easily lose our sense of direction and mission. At the same time each one of us is committed and consumed by minute details. May each one of us have an objective sense of what we are doing and how we are doing it. May this objective view be Thy view. Give each one of us the power to let go clearly those things which impede or hinder the working of Thy will in each of our lives and in our work. May we individually have a sense of fulfillment as we keep spiritual goals before us.

Enkindle in each of us this morning a contagious and helpful spirit with those with whom we work.

We thank you, Eternal Spirit, for this privilege of being a part of this great and historic body, of helping to make laws, and the obligation of keeping these laws. In the spirit of adventure and challenge of this day of unfinished tasks, give us at its close a feeling that we have done our best; and if we have had a thousand chances, this one thing we did in response to our conscience: "We have done that which we think is right." In God's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 24, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements during the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—SATURDAY SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have discussed with some persons, principally members of the press, my intention of holding a session on Saturday.

The reason for such a session would be simply to try to accommodate those who wish to make speeches. I do not anticipate any votes on Saturday, but I feel that Senators who are delaying a vote on this very vital measure by making speeches—which they have every right to make—should make them, and we should hear no more complaints that Senators cannot make speeches because they have not had the opportunity to prepare them, or their secretaries have not had the opportunity to type the speeches, or they have not had the opportunity to have mimeographed copies made for the press. If Senators wish to speak, they ought to speak.

I shall not press for a vote on Saturday if anyone wishes to insist that the Senate should not vote tomorrow; but if a Senator cares to offer an amendment that could be disposed of by a voice vote—which we do frequently; more often, in fact, than we do it by yea-and-nay votes—I would hope that we could vote on the amendment.

I urge Senators, if they wish to be heard on this measure before we vote on it, that they come and speak now. This measure is important, it is vital, and it is urgent. We have other measures waiting that we wish to schedule immediately after we conclude consideration of this matter, which are equally urgent. We have a measure in the Foreign Relations Committee which we hope to report within the next day or so, a measure to provide funds which are needed for the present fiscal year, to provide aid for those who are our allies in Vietnam today. We have, in the Senate Finance Committee, a tax proposal to help carry the Government's cost of carrying forward the struggle, and the costs of Government in general, to try to reduce the deficit that the Government will otherwise face. Every day we delay in passing that measure is costing this Government $7 million.

We wish to move on with the Senate's business.

We have been advised, and I am sure in complete good faith, that those who oppose the measure and those who seek to amend it are not seeking to prevent a vote, nor are they seeking any unreasonable delay. We were given reason to believe that perhaps by today, or by the conclusion of business today, we could have voted on the measure. I would certainly urge that all those who wish to make speeches to let us know of their intentions, so that we can try to accommodate them; because otherwise we must plan to keep the Senate in session long hours starting next week, to reach a vote on this very crucial and important matter, which is of such great concern to the entire Nation, and certainly to the people of this country.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have nothing but high regard for the acting majority leader's sincere efforts in seeking to push to a vote on this matter quickly. He is perfectly entitled to follow his own parliamentary course, although I wish to say that, as our leader, he does not speak for himself alone in his position of leadership, but has some obligations to other Senators, too.

I say most respectfully that I am sure there will not be any votes today and there will not be any votes tomorrow. If he holds the Senate in session tomorrow, I doubt very much whether a quorum will be present. The message went out last night that it was generally thought that the plan was to come in Monday morning, stay in session late Monday, come in Tuesday, and stay in session late Tuesday, and see if we could not get the matter out of the way by Tuesday. I think that is the course we should follow.

The acting majority leader, as he knows, is in the saddle, and can follow whatever parliamentary procedure he wishes. I wish to note, however, that there are some subjective matters involved also. We owe it to our fellow Senators, as a matter of courtesy, just common parliamentary courtesy, if we are going to have the kind of session that I think we will have tomorrow—a session with many absentees—to recognize that a Senator is entitled to speak on the floor of the Senate in the hope, at least, that perhaps there will be present some Senators with open minds, who can be persuaded. I shall speak today, but I believe there are some Senators who will not be very happy about the suggestion that they come in tomorrow and speak to an empty Chamber.

They may speak to an empty Chamber anyway. The Senator from Louisiana and I have both done that many times. But it is one thing to speak to an empty Chamber when there is a quorum in the precincts of the Senate, and it is another thing to speak to an empty Chamber when one is being put in a position where, as a pro forma matter, he is called upon to make a speech because there is an unwillingness on the part of the leadership of the Senate to let the matter go over until Monday, when there will be no question about a quorum being present.

The Senator from Louisiana may do as he wishes, but I do wish to say in behalf of my colleagues that I do not think it is fair to have such a session on Saturday. I think we should take judicial notice of the kind of session it will be. I shall be here. But there will not be any votes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator certainly has the power to see to it that there will be no votes on Saturday, unless it were decided to make a motion that it is not debatable, which is always within our power. But I would say that, generally speaking, when a Senator is addressing the Senate and he has as many as a dozen Senators listening to his speech, that is par for the course so far as the average Senate speech is concerned.

In most cases, if a Senator has about a dozen Senators listening to him, he should be delighted. The press is available. The wire services are available to everyone. A speech made on Saturday catches a good dateline because it is just fine for the Sunday morning press. Therefore, I would hope that anyone who is not prepared to speak today will be prepared to speak tomorrow, and will be available at that time. If no one is available to speak tomorrow, and if there is no disposition for the Senate to vote on Saturday, we will put the matter off until Monday. On Monday, we expect to have a long session. If we cannot vote on Monday, then we expect to have a long session on Tuesday, until such time as this matter can be brought to a conclusion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am inclined to concur with the sentiments uttered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Frankly, I have told Senators on my side of the aisle who are going home to make speeches that they could be assured there would be no votes tomorrow. Therefore, I feel that I would be in a difficult position if there were any votes, or any endeavor was made to have a vote tomorrow.

I can be a little more specific than the Senator from Oregon. Tomorrow, I believe that there will probably be 45 Senators out of the city. Obviously, therefore, a vote on any substantive matter tomorrow would find them away, and they would not feel very good about it after the leadership had assured them of no votes tomorrow.

As for speeches, that is a different matter. Many times I have talked to the Senate and my voice came back to me from those hard walls, unintercepted by any great multitude hanging on every word that I uttered in the Chamber. That is no new experience for me.

I therefore trust that my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana, will not press the point with respect to any votes tomorrow because, if he does, I would have to get down on my knees and apologize to those to whom I gave assurance that they could be away with safety, that they could make their speeches and not have somewhere in the back of their heads the overriding fear that while they were halfway over the country on their way toward making a speech, perhaps the Senate was voting. They would be very unhappy over a situation of that kind.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is within the power of a single Senator to assure the Senate that there will be no votes. I have done it myself. I recall on one occasion that a conference report came before the Senate, and I was very much opposed to it. I had been one of the conferees, and I was outraged about the whole matter, so I took to the floor of the Senate and discussed it until the early hours of the morning, as I recall. It was a Friday night, and many Senators were irritated and annoyed because they had dinner engagements, and commitments for Saturday.

I believe that the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], was one such Senator and he asked me, "How long do you plan to keep this up? I have a dinner engagement to make."

I think I told the Senator, "You can safely be away until midnight. I assure you that nothing will happen. I will still be here."

We did not vote that evening and we came back the following day. Of course, it did not make me popular with Senators, to tell them that there would be no votes on Saturday. But there were no votes on Saturday, and the Senate finally voted on Monday.

Mr. President, I have been in the Senate long enough to know that a single Senator can assure the Senate that nothing will happen.

I recall on another occasion, when a Republican majority leader, standing in the same position now occupied by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], moved to table an amendment by the Senator from Oregon. The Senator from Oregon felt that was not fair parliamentary procedure to follow, and he took to the Senate floor and told the Senate, "You can all go home. Get a good night's rest. Nothing will happen." That was about 11 o'clock at night I believe.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The next morning, I received word that I could remain in bed because nothing was going to happen any time soon. I believe that the Senator from Oregon concluded his speaking after approximately 24 hours. Therefore, Senators could have gone home all day and the following day.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So it is within the power of a single Senator to assure the Senate that nothing is going to happen.

I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I should like the Senator from Louisiana to know how much I appreciate the accuracy with which he quoted me. Every word is true. I said they could go home.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator said that we could go home and get a good night's rest. We had a leisurely breakfast, and had lunch the following day, before we came back. That is what many of us did. The Senator went far beyond the assurance which he had given the Senate. I am, therefore, well aware of what a Senator can do. I have made efforts along that line myself, on occasion.

At this moment, I am not here to criticize those who take full advantage of the powers and rights which they enjoy as Senators. That is one of the great things about the Senate. In all probability, a rollcall vote is unlikely tomorrow. If we do have any kind of voting, the probabilities are that it will be more or less pro forma, where we merely have a voice vote on something.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield at that point?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It would be on something that would be agreed to anyway, but if we cannot do anything else, we might get a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is any amendment pending?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, there is not.

Mr. HOLLAND. What pro forma vote could we have, except to adjourn or recess?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We might give consent to someone to put a newspaper article in the RECORD, or we might move to dispose of some unobjected to legislative matter that might come before the Senate, something on the calendar to which we could agree without any serious objection.

But, I do not anticipate that this pending measure will be voted on tomorrow. In fact, I would be willing to assure the Senate that, on tomorrow, we would not finally dispose of the measure, and will not even go to third reading.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 6568. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, and the oils crushed therefrom, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1009).

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE HEARINGS ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported the following original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 76); which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia two thousand five hundred additional copies of its hearings of the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, entitled "District of Columbia Home Rule, Delegate to House of Representatives" (S. 268, S. 1118).

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON SUPPLEMENTAL FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FOR VIETNAM FOR FISCAL 1966—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported the following original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 77); which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations fourteen thousand additional copies of its hearings on Supplemental Foreign Assistance, Fiscal Year 1966—Vietnam, of the Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 228); which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-ninth Congress, $25,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2979. A bill to extend coverage of the State Technical Services Act of 1965 to the territory of Guam; and

S. 2980. A bill to increase from $75 to $100 per month the amount of benefits payable to widows of certain former employees of the Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2981. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. INOUYE):

S. 2982. A bill to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands by amending the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the duty-free entry of certain articles grown, manufactured, or produced in the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. METCALF):

S. 2983. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act by adding a new title X thereto which will establish a program to protect adult health by providing assistance in the establishment and operation of regional and community health protection centers for the detection of disease, by providing assistance for the training of personnel to operate such centers, and by providing assistance in the conduct of certain research related to such centers and their operation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2984. A bill for the relief of Trevor Hodgson, his wife Thelma Hodgson, and their children John Hodgson and Sarah Hodgson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE HEARINGS ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE

Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 76) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on District of Columbia home rule, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. BIBLE, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON SUPPLEMENTAL FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FOR VIETNAM FOR FISCAL 1966

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 77) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on supplemental foreign assistance for Vietnam for fiscal 1966, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

RESOLUTION

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 228) providing additional funds for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HILL, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INCREASED PENSIONS FOR WIDOWS OF FORMER LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill that would increase the pensions of the widows of lighthouse keepers from $75 to $100 a month.

The last increase to the widows of certain employees of the Lighthouse Service was in April 1958. That was when the pension was increased to the present rate, $75 per month. Previously, they had received $50 per month.

Today, there are 409 widows of retired lighthouse keepers, and we are all aware that cost-of-living increases have made 1958 figures presently inadequate.

In 1939, the Lighthouse Service was transferred to the Coast Guard. Lighthouse keepers had the choice of going into the Coast Guard or to continue as lighthouse keepers until they reached retirement age. During the last session of Congress, we enacted a law raising the retirement pay of former lighthouse keepers. However, we overlooked their widows. This bill will rectify that situation.

In January 1966, there were 542 retired former lighthouse keepers. Statistics for the last 6 years indicate that an average of 40 have died each year. The widows of these men cannot be expected to subsist on a pension that has not changed since 1958.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2980) to increase from $75 to $100 per month the amount of benefits payable to widows of certain former employees of the Lighthouse Service, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN PROCUREMENT BY THE COAST GUARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of the Treasury, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary together with a memorandum relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2981) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and memorandum presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, February 8, 1966.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a bill, "To authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard."

This proposal results from the requirements of Public Law 88–45 which provided that no funds could be appropriated to or for the use of the Coast Guard for the procurement of vessels or aircraft or the construction of shore or offshore establishments unless the appropriation of such funds had been authorized by legislation enacted after December 31, 1963.

This is the third bill to be submitted since the adoption of authorization procedures for Coast Guard acquisitions and construction. The format employed in the last submission is continued. Also continued is the practice adopted last year of including all items of acquisition, construction, and improvement programs for the Coast Guard even though the provisions of Public Law 88–45 appear to require authorization only for major facilities and construction. Inclusion of all items in the proposal obviates the necessity for separation of the program into two parts; one requiring authorization and the other requiring no authorization.

With respect to what may be referred to as minor items, the bill does not itemize the aids to navigation projects or the advanced planning projects for which comparatively minor sums are required. The inclusion of all the items under these general headings would have unduly lengthened the bill. It should be noted that the authorization for aircraft includes replacement of existing aircraft as well as augmentation aircraft to enable the establishment or enlargement of aviation units. Additionally, it includes associated spare parts and ground support equipment.

There is attached a memorandum listing in summary form the procurement and construction programs for which appropriations would be authorized by the proposed bill. In further support of this legislation, the cognizant legislative committees will be furnished detailed information with respect to each program for which fund authorization is being requested in a form identical to that being submitted in explanation and justification of the budget request. Additionally, the Department will be prepared to submit any other data that the committees or their staffs may require.

It would be appreciated if you would lay this proposed bill before the Senate. A similar bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress and that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

Summary of fiscal year 1967 U.S. Coast Guard program for procurement of vessels and aircraft and for construction of shore and offshore establishments

VESSELS

For procurement, extension of service life, and increasing capability of vessels.

Procurement:	*Thousands*
1. 3 high-endurance cutters to replace 3 large overage cutters	$42,000
2. 1 river tender to service aids to navigation on the Arkansas River (see construction item (19) for mooring)	710
3. Preliminary to procurement, design icebreaker to replace windclass icebreaker	1,000
4. Preliminary to procurement, design new oceanographic cutter	500
5. Preliminary to procurement, design small cutter intermediate in size between present patrol boats and medium-endurance cutter	250
Increasing capability:	
1. Install secure communications equipment on 3 high-endurance cutters to provide communications compatibility with the Navy	600
2. Install prototype of balloon tracking radar with improved capability on high-endurance cutter	250
Extension of service life:	
1. Enlarge operations centers on 2 225-foot high-endurance cutters	140
2. Improve Coast Guard icebreakers (including former Navy) by improving habitability, installing oceanographic facilities, secure communications equipment and facilities for turbine helicopters	3,760
Total vessels	49,210

AIRCRAFT

For procurement of aircraft.

1. 3 long-range airplanes to replace 4 overage medium-range airplanes at air station, Kodiak, Alaska (see construction item 17)	9,004
2. 5 medium-range fixed or rotary wing aircraft to replace 5 overage medium-range fixed-wing aircraft	7,650
3. 2 helicopters for improved search and rescue protection at Cape May, N.J. (see construction item 16)	1,150
4. 10 helicopters to support icebreaker operations previously supported by Navy helicopters	6,300
Total aircraft	24,104

CONSTRUCTION

For establishment or development of installations and facilities by acquisition, construction, conversion, extension, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including the preparation of sites and furnishing of appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following:

1. Station, Umpqua River, Oreg.: barracks, messing and operations building; equipment building; and public family quarters	405

Summary of fiscal year 1967 U.S. Coast Guard program for procurement of vessels and aircraft and for construction of shore and offshore establishments—Continued

CONSTRUCTION—Continued

	Thousands
2. Station, Coos Bay, Oreg.: operations building, garage, and public family quarters	$550
3. Base, Milwaukee, Wis.: administration, industrial and buoy maintenance building; dock; and breakwater on leased premises with long-term lease	1,392
4. Depot, Southwest Harbor, Maine: barracks and mess building, piers, and public family quarters	723
5. Station, New Canal, La.: utility building, bulkhead, and dock	124
6. Base, Governors Island, N.Y.: industrial facilities, piers	5,000
7. Station, St. Ignace, Mich.: barracks, messing and operations building, garage, piers, breakwater, and public family quarters	603
8. Station, Grand Isle, La.: moorings, bulkhead, public family quarters, and completion of loran-A station	1,115
9. Air station, South San Francisco, Calif.: barracks and sickbay building, rehabilitation of existing barracks as administration and messing building, transmitter—emergency operations building	1,300
10. Various locations: transportable communications units	410
11. Base, New Orleans, La.: third and fourth floors of administration building, gatehouse, shop buildings, and moorings	715
12. Station, Rappahannock River, Va.: barracks, messing, operations building; bulkhead; pier; and public family quarters	515
13. Radio station, Long Beach, Calif.: transmitter installation	84
14. Radio Station, Kodiak Island, Alaska; transmitters and antennas	73
15. Station, Marathon, Fla.: barracks, administration and operations building, storage building wharf, bulkhead and seawall	383
16. Station, Cape May, N.J.: hangar, offices, shop building, and improve mooring (see aircraft item (3))	1,062
17. Air station, Kodiak, Alaska: improvement of hangar doors (see aircraft item (1))	200
18. Base, Terminal Island, San Pedro, Calif.: supply warehouse	367
19. Moorings, Pine Bluff, Ark., to support Arkansas River Aids to Navigation tender (see vessel item (A2))	318
20. Various locations: Aids to navigation projects including, where necessary, advance planning and acquisition of sites	2,168
21. Loran-A stations, Galveston and Port Isabel, Tex.: transmitter, power, and storage buildings	1,394
22. Academy, New London, Conn.: cadet barracks	2,092
23. Recruit training center, Cape May, N.J.: administration building	828
24. Reserve training center, Yorktown, Va.: Engineman school classroom and laboratory building	398
25. Various locations: public family quarters	5,500
26. Various locations: advance planning, construction design, architectural services, and acquisition of sites in connection with public works projects not otherwise authorized by law	$1,967
Total shore establishments	29,686

PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands by amending the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the duty-free entry of certain articles grown, manufactured, or produced in the Ryukyu Islands.

Under article 3 of the peace treaty with Japan the United States was granted authority over the Ryukyu Islands, the principal one of which is Okinawa, one of our major military bases. In exercise of this authority Congress declared in the Price Act, Public Law 86–629:

> Every effort shall be made to improve the welfare and well-being of the inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands and to promote their economic and cultural advancement, during such time as the United States continues to retain authority over the Ryukyu Islands.

Over the years despite many fine accomplishments, the trade of the Ryukyu Islands, a U.S. dollar area, has shown substantial deficits. In fiscal year 1965, imports were $210,704,000 but exports only $79,403,000. Imports from the United States were $31,418,000 but exports to the United States only $5,085,000. Most of this trade balance gap is made up from American expenditures in these islands and the pressures for more American aid will continue as long as this balance of trade remains so lopsided.

To encourage development of Okinawan industries and trade so that the economy can eventually stand on its own feet, this bill proposes to allow Ryukyuan products into the United States duty free as long as the islands are under U.S. jurisdiction. When the United States relinquishes jurisdiction, the rate of duty will increase in gradual steps until it is 100 percent. At present Ryukyuan products pay full U.S. duty although no duty is charged in Okinawa on imports from the United States.

The existing tariff schedules provide precedents for special treatment to areas for which the United States has special responsibilities. These are Guam, Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific and the Philippine Republic. This bill is patterned after these provisions.

Generally Okinawan products that will benefit from the bill are light manufactures and cottage industries. Specifically excluded from the bill are pineapple products and sugar, all of which are sold to Japan. Any textiles imported from Okinawa into the United States are limited by a quota agreement between the High Commissioner and the Department of Commerce. This bill will not affect that agreement.

Also excluded are products which contain more than 20 percent of their value in foreign—non-Ryukyuan materials except such foreign materials as are exempt from duty in the U.S. tariff schedules. This provision protects against the exemption from duty being used merely as a device to assemble foreign goods for shipment to the United States. This is more restrictive than the provisions for Guam, Samoa, and the Virgin Islands which allow up to 50 percent in foreign materials.

This bill in strengthening the economy of Okinawa will help to reduce its dependence on American aid, carry out our responsibility as administrator of the Ryukyu Islands, enable the Defense Department to carry out more effectively its mission in Okinawa of protecting our vital interests in the Far East and further cement the good relationship enjoyed with the people of the Ryukyu Islands.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2982) to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands by amending the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the duty-free entry of certain articles grown, manufactured, or produced in the Ryukyu Islands, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. INOUYE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADULT HEALTH PROTECTION ACT OF 1966

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the 89th Congress convened a little over a year ago with a clear call from the President and people of this Nation. Our job was to act effectively on urgent legislation essential to a society in search of greatness. And high on our agenda for action were the medicare bill and proposals to increase health resources of the Nation.

In short order, we passed:

Medicare, which is expected to cost at least $3.5 billion by 1967, with a supplemental appropriation of $9 million for the development of needed out-of-hospital services and facilities.

The killer diseases program, with over $300 million to be spent for research and treatment of heart diseases, cancer, and stroke.

Amendments to the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963 to extend the authorized construction program and student loans for 3 more years, and to create new scholarship grants and improvement grants to medical and allied professional schools.

Amendments to the Health Research Facilities Act of 1956, authorizing construction grants of $280 million.

Amendments to the Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 which authorize grants to improve facilities and services for the mentally retarded and handicapped children.

Amendments to extend community health services to control the communicable diseases and to develop better and more widely distributed health care for the chronically ill and aged.

But the work done by the "health" Congress of 1965 was a new breakthrough rather than a final triumph. Our major advantage now is that we are better able to judge what must yet be done. Just as Newton once said he could see farther than his predecessors because he could stand on their shoulders, Congress has built an observation platform high enough to give us new perspective on the health needs of a nation.

We can now recognize more clearly, for example, that our medical resources are already strained at this critical moment of increasing demand. Dr. Howard A. Rusk, director of the Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation at New York University, summed up the medical manpower situation in his column of January 2:

> Increased training of health personnel is essential.
>
> To maintain our present ratio of 140 physicians for every 100,000 persons, 330,000 physicians will be needed by 1975.
>
> This will necessitate the annual graduation of 11,000 students, 3,600 more than the 1959 total.
>
> However, estimates indicate that by 1975 our annual graduation rate will be only 9,185.
>
> The Surgeon General's Consultant Group on Nursing estimated in 1963 a projected need for 850,000 practicing professional nurses by 1970. This compares with a national supply of 550,000 in 1962, of whom 117,000 were working only part time.

Also reporting on the nurse shortage, the New York Times said in an editorial on November 9, 1965:

> It is hoped that the Nurse Training Act of 1964, providing $283 million in aid to schools of nursing over the next 5 years, will bring the total number of registered nurses in practice by 1970 to 680,000. But even if this goal is reached, it will provide for only 38 percent of hospital patient care.

As doctors and others become increasingly alarmed about manpower deficiencies, we also hear questions about the heavy demands made upon the precious time of the physician. At the recent White House Conference on Health, for example, Dr. Robert M. Zollinger, professor and chairman of the Department of Surgery at Ohio State University, said:

> No physician can today or in the foreseeable future have the time to take total care of his patients, and he must depend upon auxiliary help. I foresee that, by special training now proposed for the physician in family practice he will serve more and more as triage officer by directing his problem patients to special centers for definitive treatment.

The Surgeon General of the United States, Dr. William H. Stewart, addressed the same Conference and said:

> Year by year, our top professional personnel are being trained to perform still more complex tasks. How long can each profession afford to hang onto its simpler functions—the routine filling of a tooth, for example, or the several easily automated steps in a medical examination? How can we train the physician or dentist to make full use of the skills available in other people, freeing himself to perform only those duties for which he is uniquely qualified?

Demands on physicians and other professionally trained persons are further intensified by what might be called our system of crisis medicine. It is a system that demands superb skills, advanced knowledge and training, and excellent facilities for the care of the sick, but it is a system designed for maximum effectiveness at a time of emergency: illness or accident. For many of the very poor—the slum dweller, the migrant worker, the elderly pensioner—our advanced medical system might as well have been on another planet. In a nation now committed to delivery of best possible health care to all citizens, obviously much more must yet be done.

If we are to improve dramatically the health and the health care of our Nation, there is one simple fundamental step we can take: a concentrated effort at the early detection in order to help prevent the onset of serious illness and the reduction of its severity.

Obviously, it is impossible to prevent all chronic illnesses—and it will become increasingly difficult to deal with them, using present methods, as larger numbers of Americans add more years to their lifespans.

But such illnesses could be held to a minimum, and the extent of disability or limitation of activity could be controlled or delayed if—

This Nation does all possible to keep people out of hospitals, not only for humanitarian reasons but also to keep the costs of medicare to a minimum.

This Nation anticipates that shortages in medical manpower, together with increasing demands for professional treatment as the aging population of this Nation grows each year, will cause an intensifying need to make the best possible use of the experience, human understanding, and special training of those professionally trained persons who fight illness and death every day.

For these reasons I am introducing today a bill to establish a national program for health maintenance.

THE ADULT HEALTH PROTECTION ACT OF 1966

Mr. President, it has been said that war is the tragic consequence of failure by its preventive diplomacy. If I may draw a parallel, the costly and often futile treatment of long-term illness and disability represents the failure to prevent, or at least control, chronic disease and to maintain health.

Preventive medicine is not a new idea. One aspect of preventive medicine familiar to all is environmental—purifying our water supplies, reducing air pollution, exterminating mosquitoes. Almost every child is painfully familiar with the preventive medicine of the smallpox vaccination, the diphtheria shot, and the measles shot. The dramatic results of this sort of preventive medicine can be seen in the increased life expectancy of today's American, and the virtual elimination of some diseases within our borders. But the heavy emphasis on this aspect of preventive medicine has had some other obvious repercussions. As some diseases have been conquered, others have taken their place. The drastic rise in the number of deaths caused by heart disease and by cancer can in part be explained by the simple fact that more people live longer, escaping the killer diseases of childhood. In concentrating on environmental health, immunization, and other primary preventive measures, we have done part of the job; we have created a healthful environment for the individual but we have neglected an equally important task: the maintenance and preservation of the health of the individual. This is an increasingly essential complement to the program of environmental health. As far as we know now, heart disease and cancer cannot be conquered by environmental health measures alone. But they can be forestalled or effectively treated by early detection in the individual. We have the techniques, the knowledge, and the equipment to detect the early signs of these and other crippling chronic diseases such as glaucoma, diabetes, and hypertension. The kind of preventive medicine I am discussing is already being practiced on a limited scale in many parts of the Nation. It is not visionary but eminently practical and vitally necessary.

Therefore, in my judgment, it is time that we had a national program for the early detection of tendencies toward serious illness. If this Nation established such a program now large enough and effective enough, we could then have the facts and the new techniques necessary to prevent and reduce chronic illness in middle and late years.

Accordingly, I have drafted a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act by adding a new title authorizing a program to protect adult health through the establishment of locally operated health protection centers for the detection of disease.

Any person past the age of 50 would be eligible for such screening if he wished to have it.

Centers would use automated or semiautomated screening techniques which have already proven their worth in everyday use.

Eventually, millions of Americans could thus be encouraged to think in positive terms about the prevention of illness at a time in their lives when prevention is possible.

The beginnings of such a program are contained in the provisions of this bill.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS

This bill would authorize the Surgeon General to make grants to medical schools, community hospitals, health departments, and other public or nonprofit agencies to establish and operate health protection centers.

REGIONAL HEALTH PROTECTION CENTERS

The regional health protection centers would provide a series of basic tests to detect abnormalities in the cardiovascular, respiratory, gastrointestinal, genitourinary and musculoskeletal systems, as well as defects in metabolism and organs of special sense. Specific diseases or conditions to be tested for might include: First, hypertension, heart muscle enlargement, and disease; second, mouth, lung, breast, cervical, and other cancer; third, diabetes; fourth, kidney disease; fifth, glaucoma; sixth, tuberculosis; seventh, rheumatoid arthritis; eighth, gastrointestinal bleeding; ninth, anemia; tenth, obesity; eleventh, respiratory insufficiency; twelfth, vision impairment; thirteenth, hearing impairment; fourteenth, hypercholesterolemia; and fifteenth, gout.

The tests would be administered by technicians, nurses, and medical specialists using automated or semiautomated equipment which has already been proven to give swift, accurate, and reliable results. The results of these tests, along with data provided by the person undergoing the health appraisal, would be fed into a computer. It is estimated that the battery of tests could be administered within 2½ hours.

The results of the tests, summarized by the computer, would be referred to the private physician of the person tested. In cases where the person either did not have a private physician or was medically indigent, the test would be referred to a physician in accordance with local practice.

The regional health protection centers are intended to provide an efficient means for the detection of abnormalities or indications of disease. They would not replace full examinations. Their purpose is to place in the hands of the examining physician a summary of basic data and to place promptly under a physician's care a person with indications of possible disease.

The centers would be under the supervision of physicians, but they would be principally staffed by technical personnel. Health counselors would be on the staffs of the centers to explain the purpose of the tests, to insure proper referral and to follow up those cases where prompt medical treatment was indicated by the tests.

Health appraisals and disease detection tests would be available to any person age 50 or above on a voluntary basis.

The regional health protection centers would conduct training programs in the operation of technical disease detection procedures and would research and develop new disease detection tests and equipment. Additional grants to the regional centers would be authorized for operational research and for the establishment of internships to give on-the-job training to physicians, nurses, social workers, and technical personnel. The centers would also conduct community education programs on preventive health care.

The availability of these testing services would be intended to encourage men and women approaching retirement to take regular health examinations and to facilitate the giving of full examinations by practicing physicians.

COMMUNITY HEALTH PROTECTION CENTERS

The Surgeon General would be authorized to make grants to medical schools, community hospitals, and other community health service agencies for the establishment of community health protection centers. They would be linked by data transmission lines to the regional centers and could use the more sophisticated electronic equipment and other facilities of the regional centers for the evaluation of some tests.

One of the criteria for the awarding of grants to regional centers would be their ability to provide services to the small community centers. Although the community centers would be directly connected to the regional centers, they would not necessarily be operated by the same institutions which ran the regional centers. One purpose of the community centers would be to make the services of the regional centers more widely available to a greater number of people. Special facilities might be developed to meet particular needs. For example, mobile units might be used in rural areas.

OTHER PROVISIONS

A 12-man Advisory Council on Adult Health Protection would be established to advise and assist the Surgeon General in the administration of this program.

The Surgeon General would be authorized to contract with educational institutions or other appropriate organizations for the conduct of educational programs. He would also be authorized to contract with profit and nonprofit organizations for the research and development of equipment, systems, or processes which would improve disease detection procedures.

Let me emphasize—this point bears emphasis—that the centers would not be treatment centers. They would not be diagnostic centers. They would be laboratories which give data to physicians, who would interpret that data and deal directly with patients when consultation would be needed.

The bill I am introducing requires that in every case the results of the screening test be given to a practicing physician. The health protection centers would not be equipped or intended to provide treatment, although the staff of the centers would be expected to follow up cases and to make sure that a participant was promptly brought under a doctor's care if treatment was indicated by the tests. Even should the screening tests show no indications of possible disease, the data would provide basic information to a physician on his patient which would be extremely helpful for a full physical examination by a doctor or as base line data in future examinations.

Doctors would thus be given more time to perform the executive, expert functions that only they can perform. They would be given more time and more facts to help more people.

As the population continues to increase—especially the elderly population which is most susceptible to chronic disease and disability—physicians and others in the health professions will need all the time they can get.

COST OF CHRONIC ILLNESS TODAY

Before proceeding with our discussion, we should be aware of the important difference between the terms "disease," and "illness." Disease is a pathological process which may not necessarily produce symptoms. Illness—or sickness—is a condition that comes from disease. Present knowledge does not permit us to prevent the onset of the majority of chronic diseases. However, available knowledge can be utilized as a potent weapon to prevent, mitigate, or delay the onset of the illness which is a byproduct of these diseases. An example is atherosclerosis, or hardening of the arteries. An individual may have advanced atherosclerosis with no obvious symptoms of the disease. He thus has a chronic disease without illness. Diagnosis in the crucial preclinical stage can have a far-reaching effect upon the future health status of that individual.

Our failure to provide a nationwide program of health appraisal leading to early diagnosis may be directly charged with the high cost of chronic illness today.

Here are some appalling facts:

Chronic disorders afflict about 74 million Americans, some of whom have more than 1 ailment.

Among individuals 65 years old or older, more than half are functionally limited to some degree.

Last year, more than 990,000 persons died of heart diseases.

It is estimated that as many as 25 percent of the Nation's adults are currently afflicted with heart disease.

Cancer takes 250,000 lives each year.

The President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke has reported that these diseases alone cost the Nation close to $30 billion each year in lost productivity and lost taxes due to premature disability and death.

Arthritis now claims 13 million sufferers—and costs the U.S. economy over $1 billion yearly. It cripples more people in low-income families than in other groups and disables more people than any other chronic disease.

More than 20 million people are affected by blindness, deafness, epilepsy, mental retardation and other neurological disorders.

Two million are known diabetics.

Almost 1.5 million over 40 years of age are afflicted by glaucoma.

Presently, we are spending $4 billion a year for maintenance and medical care of disabled people through public assistance programs, in annual compensation and pension payments to veterans by the Veterans' Administration, and in Federal-State moneys for basic support of vocational rehabilitation services.

And, the Public Health Service is currently authorized to spend some $53 million for various programs attacking a number of the chronic diseases by means of extended community health programs, for demonstrations in new care service techniques—especially for heart disease and stroke—for cancer cytology, for screening for diabetes, for support for the artificial kidney, for community programs attacking arthritis and rheumatism, and for treatment facilities for chronic respiratory disease, epilepsy, and other neurological disorders.

Just this month, I obtained some figures on the prevalence of chronic conditions among persons 45 years of age and over. This is approximately the age group with which my legislation is concerned.

Prevalence of chronic disease in persons over 45

	Per 1,000 population
Hypertension including hypertensive heart disease	292
Arthritis and rheumatism	180
Chronic bronchitis	100
Hearing impairment	90
Coronary heart disease	58
Vision impairment	51
Diabetes	50

Source: Public Health Service.

If these statistics seem to suggest that we have already been tardy in establishing detection and prevention programs, we can draw some comfort from pioneering work begun under private, State, or local auspices. The most dramatic and significant example is the automated multiphasic screening project operating for the benefit of workers and their families on the west coast to members of the Kaiser Foundation health plan.

This program, in fact, almost serves as a pilot precedent clearly showing the practicality and value of an effective screening program.

THE KAISER FOUNDATION PROGRAM

To those who use the Kaiser program, the word "multiphasic" merely means "comprehensive." Within 2½ hours they receive a battery of tests comparable, and in some respects superior, to traditional testing made without benefit of automation.

I will describe the procedure in some detail because of its direct relationship to my legislative proposal.

In the multiphasic health checkup, one patient registers every 2½ minutes, and is through in 2½ hours.

Upon arrival at the screening center, each participant registers at the reception desk. He receives a series of questions on IBM cards to which he will respond during waiting intervals between tests and, when completed, to be fed into the computer.

The first procedure involves an electrocardiogram and heart sound recordings for the detection of heart abnormalities.

After the test is completed, the participant is asked to drink a measured amount of chilled, carbonated sugar solution. This is in preparation for the drawing of a blood sample 1 hour later for the blood sugar test for diabetes. Before coming to the center, the individual was instructed to fast for a minimum of 4 hours in preparation for this test. A timecard is stamped to record the exact time the sugar solution is taken.

Weight, height, and body build measurements are recorded directly on the IBM card. This information is important for future use, as changes in these base measurements at a later date could indicate the onset or development of a chronic disease.

A chest X-ray is then taken. This procedure is important not only for the detection of tuberculosis, but can yield significant information on other types of pathology in the lung, heart, large blood vessels in the chest cavity, and bony structure of the chest.

For women over 40, there is mammography, an X-ray examination of the breast. This procedure has proved to be a valuable aid in early diagnosis of breast cancer and other breast conditions.

The eyes are next tested. Visual acuity is recorded, and eye pressure tests are conducted for the detection of glaucoma.

A test to measure lung capacity follows. This test is aimed at the detection of emphysema.

Hearing is then tested with an audiometer, and results are recorded on a graph and then transferred to the computer card. The computer is programed to read out results in terms of hearing loss.

At this point, the 1-hour interval after drinking the sugar solution is reached. Blood is drawn and used for several groups of tests. Blood serum from this sample is placed in the autoanalyzer, and eight complicated tests are conducted simultaneously, with results available in 11 minutes. Among other vital findings, these tests indicate the possibility of diabetes, high cholesterol levels, chronic liver disease, gout, kidney disease, loss of calcium from the bones, and certain digestive diseases. Whole blood is used to determine the hemoglobin level and the white blood-cell count, thus throwing light on the presence of diseases such as anemia and leukemia.

A urine sample is then taken and tested for evidence of kidney infection and other diseases of the kidneys, as well as diabetes. Results are automatically recorded on the IBM card.

Following this procedure, a photograph is taken of the inside of the eye which has the value of not only visualizing the optic nerve, but also the condition of the small blood vessels which are representative of those throughout the body. This test can yield important information about the presence of a wide variety of systemic diseases, including diabetes, leukemia, advanced hypertension, and even increased pressure within the head.

As a finale to the screening line, the blood pressure and pulse rate are recorded, and the information is correlated by the computer with other tests and diagnoses.

In the case of certain tests, the computer is so programed that where abnormalities are identified, the person may be immediately called back for related tests or a recheck of the test taken. When all the results are completed and the information is recorded and fed into the computer, a printout is received from the computer which gives a health profile of the individual. The printout is provided to the physician for use in initiating the diagnostic and therapeutic measures indicated.

The efficiency and effectiveness of this automated system may lead one to think that this is a thoroughly depersonalized, assembly-line procedure. Fortunately, this is not so. The technicians and nurses have been carefully selected not only for their specialized abilities but for their personal qualities, as well. They are able not only to perform their tasks skillfully, but to maintain a cheerful attitude.

Though still in its early stages, the program has already yielded important summary findings. Almost 50,000 multiphasic examinations have now been completed.

Do these automated health estimates actually lead to diagnoses?

Among 9,760 participants on whom completed diagnostic examination records were available, the doctors confirmed the health appraisal findings as follows:

Verified diagnoses from findings of multiple screening procedures[1]

	Rate per 1,000
Hypertension and hypertensive heart disease	88.6
Anemia (women)	51.4
Emphysema and bronchitis (men)	34.2
Coronary heart disease	28.1
Diabetes	28.0
Gout (men)	9.5

[1] Program conducted by Permanente medical group in Oakland, Calif.

Here is concrete evidence of the priceless value of the preliminary health estimates in the ultimate control of heart disease, arteriosclerosis, diabetes, and many other degenerative diseases of aging.

The electrocardiogram found heart abnormalities in almost 18 percent of the women examined and in about 21 percent of the men.

Women examined showed a consistently higher percentage of impaired visual acuity than males, about 7 percent of persons in the age group 50 to 59. Photographs of the inner eye revealed some abnormalities in almost 1 of every 10 persons, including retinal arteriosclerosis—an important index to other aging and arteriosclerotic processes—in 3 percent of all patients.

These are just a few facts pulled at random out of the multiphasic program's most recent report. The electronic brain used to report out this information can also combine the results of a wide range of tests and pose probabilities—which are infinitely helpful to the individual physician in his task of performing a more detailed examination leading to diagnosis.

In the year between September 1964 and the end of August 1965, a preventive health service research program was instituted by Kaiser directed toward investigating the preventive aspects of chronic illness and disability. The health protection centers established by my bill will do this kind of research into the techniques of health appraisal and preventive medicine.

But one of the strongest arguments for support of health appraisal services is this: the availability of a centralized, complete health estimate facility serves to motivate people to come in for preliminary testing, particularly people who would not go to a doctor unless they were critically ill or experiencing acute pain or other frightening physical symptoms. Neither the stigma of supposed hypochondria, nor the guilt of taking up a doctor's time unnecessarily, are present.

EXPERIENCES WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

Mr. President, I first addressed the Senate on "Preventicare" in September 1965. Soon after, I wrote to physicians, educators in medicine, public health directors, and others asking for their opinions and experiences. The replies were for the most part enthusiastically receptive. I ask unanimous consent that a number of these replies be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. In addition, several letters give information on the effectiveness of screening programs that were limited to a relatively small geographical area or to one or a limited number of diseases.

For example, the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York reminds me that Mount Sinai Hospital in that city has instituted "the practice—which many hospitals have adopted—of doing a complete battery of tests on patients when admitted. The belief is growing that the cost of doing this, instead of the individually selected tests related to a patient's clinical needs is no higher and the higher productivity of meaningful results enables the physician to render a better qualitative service to his patient."

Dr. John A. Cowan of the Michigan Department of Health writes that his State has been doing multiple screening examinations since 1954 among apparently healthy young adults employed in small industries.

> The results have been very satisfying—

He says—

> and have revealed that many people who believe they are perfectly well have conditions which predispose to chronic diseases or have beginning chronic diseases which have not as yet become symptomatic.

While a battery of health tests cannot replace the complete history and physical examination of a knowledgeable personal physician, Dr. Cowan sees in my proposal "the means of detecting asymptomatic disease" and "to promote health to a large group of our population."

Dr. A. L. Chapman, now with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of Health, writes me about an early demonstration project he developed in a housing project in Indianapolis in 1949.

Among the first 1,000 apparently well adults who were screened, about 1,200 conditions were found. Of these, one-third were serious: nephritis, heart disease, hypertension, diabetes, tuberculosis, syphilis, arthritis, glaucoma. About two-thirds were vision and hearing defects, overweight, and other less serious—but correctible—conditions.

Shortly after that, Dr. Chapman writes, a comparative study was done at the Boston Dispensary. A group of 1,000 apparently well adults received 3 different types of examinations conducted by 3 different teams. The first was a $10 routine physical examination; the second, an abbreviated physical costing $5; and, the third, a multiple screening examination conducted largely by technicians and costing about $1. An evaluation of the effectiveness of these three types of examinations showed that more pathological conditions were found by multiple screening than by either of the—then—more orthodox physical examinations.

I also have a letter from Dr. Murray Grant, Director of Public Health for the District of Columbia, enclosing a recent article—which I shall request to be included in the RECORD—concerning a screening program that has been underway here in the District for the past 2½ years and with which some of us are familiar.

Dr. Grant believes that this "bears considerable similarity" to what I am proposing, and calls our attention especially to the cost figures, the evaluation, and the results of the operation thus far.

> Further than this—

He writes—

> I have within the past few months initiated an even larger disease detection program at our Southwest Health Center, which is now operating a full time program of this nature for all persons in the District of Columbia over the age of 40.

Dr. Grant also mentions that this program is rather unique and is not yet duplicated in many other communities.

Recently I learned of a multiple screening program conducted in a low-income area in New York City to detect previously undiagnosed illnesses among adults. I was shocked to learn that almost one-third of the persons who participated in the screening program had important health-related conditions that had not come to light prior to the program. The findings indicate that of every 1,000 persons in the area, one could well expect to uncover the following rate of previously undiagnosed illnesses: 107 cases of high blood pressure; 101 cases of diabetes; 19 cases of abnormalities of the heart; 30 cases of glaucoma; 5 cases of active tuberculosis; and 5 cases of cervical cancer.

I was also impressed with a recent report about a diabetes detection program in San Jose, Calif. Within 28 months, 8,008 persons past the age of 35 were screened. One out of six persons—1,436 in all—were referred to private physicians for more definitive diagnosis. Positive diagnosis of diabetes was made for 347 patients, or 27 percent of the 1,280 patients on whom reports were returned by the physicians.

The Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York offers a periodic general physical examination which they believe 20 to 25 percent of their subscribers avail themselves of. HIP also informs me of two recent programs to detect unsuspected glaucoma and breast cancer, the latter an intensive program to determine the value of periodic screening. Early results suggest that the breast cancer program is discovering a significant number of breast cancers that would have otherwise remained undiagnosed, of which a large proportion were still localized when found.

Mr. President, many of my correspondents offered valuable suggestions, some of which I have incorporated in the present bill. A few raised cogent questions which I would like to discuss now. These points will, I am sure, be fully discussed and explored during hearings on the bill.

TIMELINESS OF THE PROPOSAL

Several of my correspondents felt that my proposal is ill timed. They pointed to the large number of health service programs for which we appropriated funds at the last session, on top of already existing health legislation. Some urged that we wait to see how well our local hospitals, health agencies, and university medical centers are able to cope with new community care programs already authorized before asking them to assume still another health service responsibility.

In my view this is somewhat like saying that because we are busy giving polio and flu immunizations we cannot add routine PKU testing as a means of preventing mental retardation in children. It is totally inconsistent with the American spirit to put off doing something vital to national welfare.

For generations we have faithfully and persistently reached one frontier of medicine after another. Prevention of communicable diseases has long since become part and parcel of the objectives of public health. But the prevention of chronic diseases remains a hidden frontier, one we have not yet crossed despite all the time, effort, and money we are spending in research and in experimentation to find ever more successful treatments.

My bill does not propose immediately to establish hundreds of elaborate health appraisal centers all around the country. Within 5 years we would have five regional centers and 20 related community centers in progressive operational stages. These will demonstrate the feasibility of extending similar services to other regions of the country as needed.

I am convinced that this is an eminently reasonable way to begin an attack on chronic disease. To delay now will only postpone the eventual day of reckoning, and the longer we delay the more we will burden our health service facilities with the provision of care for illness and impairment which might have been avoided or minimized.

I might add that the length of time it took to enact medicare is a good argument for immediate consideration of ways to offer preventive health services The hour is already late.

SUPPORT FROM THE MEDICAL PROFESSION

No health program—neither my proposal nor any other—is going to succeed fully without acceptance and use by medical practitioners. Time and time again it has been demonstrated that the federally assisted programs which succeed are those which enlist the participation of local physicians and their medical societies during planning stages.

I recognize the same need and the same opportunity in planning for the health protection centers provided for in my bill. I think we can demonstrate to the private physician the time-saving virtues of preliminary health estimates as an aid to the diagnostic work he must do personally. Automated summaries are not diagnoses. Rather, they offer a detailed health estimate on which a more complete, more accurate diagnosis may be based.

MANPOWER SHORTAGES

Almost all of the medical experts who had reservations about this proposal brought up the problem of recruiting and training personnel and the possible drain on already limited health care personnel.

I am well aware of the statistical shortage of doctors, nurses, aids, and medical rehabilitation specialists, and the estimated additional numbers needed, for example, by 1975. There is a sizable school of thought, however, which reaches beyond the numerical shortage and asks whether we are using our available supply effectively. In the field of nursing alone, many studies have shown the waste of professional nursing time in the performance of clerical services or in duties which do not demand their level of professional skill and judgment. I believe it is also common knowledge that many doctors are continuing to perform services which a nurse or technician could safely provide.

So we need to look at how we are using our health manpower resources as well as at how to recruit and train more of them.

Chronic illness care has not attracted practitioners as has acute medicine and surgery. But I believe there will be a strong attraction to the proposed multiphasic testing projects—because automation is new, because results of the tests are produced rapidly, and because dramatic findings of heretofore asymptomatic disease often turn up in the patient's health estimate summary.

My proposal also has a built-in safeguard. The health protection centers will receive grants to train their own professional and technical personnel to adapt basic medical and allied knowledge to the demands of the automated procedures.

Now, as to the risk of draining already short supplies of medical manpower in order to offer more efficient preventive services.

It seems to me that our entire national philosophy is geared to the prevention of undesirable circumstances or conditions. We seek to prevent war, to prevent poverty, unemployment, air and water pollution, crime—even to prevent national and local environmental ugliness.

We have never faltered in our forward movement toward these goals for fear of being unable to recruit skilled professional or technical personnel to do the job. We have created the programs—and people have come forward to staff them.

I submit that the comparatively small numbers of medical and paramedical personnel can be found without jeopardizing existing health services, and they will be people with sufficient vision to want to be part of a team which is not undoing damage but preventing it.

Extensive Federal support is being provided to increase supplies of medical manpower of all kinds and to give them training in the management of chronic illness and disability prevention. Surely, these efforts must not and will not bypass the most fundamental service of all—early appraisal leading to early detection of incipient chronic diseases.

AGE LIMITATIONS

My bill provides that any adult aged 50 or over may be admitted to the multiphasic testing program in the region in which he resides.

Many correspondents suggested that younger individuals should be included. They pointed to the advantages of early identification of abnormalities in men of draft age or, for example, of application of cancer cytology to young women.

However, it would be unrealistic at this time to hope to reach an entire population—as some have suggested—from infancy onward. Actually, pediatrics practice is in large part preventive and offers sound periodic health maintenance and care services to children.

I have no desire to eliminate the young adults to whom we must hand the future. But in order to keep the size and number of the health protection centers within realistic bounds and still to come up with useful results, I thought it advisable to start with the critical decade, the fifties, and to include our older citizens as well, whose limited financial means may keep them out of any program of systematic health examination.

I see this as immediate and essential to back up medicare; to identify the chronic diseases before they become a major care problem, heavily overtaxing community health resources, and to bring people into desirable treatment programs before they reach the age of eligibility for social security health insurance benefits.

RELATIONSHIP WITH NEW HEART, CANCER, AND STROKE COMPLEXES

Some experts have suggested that the health protection centers should be part of the regional heart, stroke, and cancer complexes established by truly historic legislation last year.

As I understand that program, which is just beginning, its principal purpose is to provide for the cooperation of medical schools, clinical research institutions, and hospitals so the latest advances in the treatment of heart disease, cancer, and stroke may be brought to the patient through locally or regionally administered programs of research, training, and continuing education.

This excellent program is directed at the treatment of illness and is a coordinated attack on three major killers. My proposal is aimed at early detection and ultimate prevention, the maintenance of good health rather than the treatment of illness. I think that it is wiser, so that we can have the fullest discussion and study of the goals and methods of preventive medicine, that the Adult Health Protection Act be considered separately from the heart, stroke, and cancer bill.

It is obvious that the two programs as they develop should be closely coordinated. I think that in actual practice the health protection centers and the heart, stroke, cancer complexes would be in close touch for the exchange of information and new techniques. Certainly both programs share the same basic goal—the improvement of the Nation's health. Ultimately, they would be joint partners in working toward that goal.

COMPUTER RELIABILITY

Several people have challenged the reliability of computerized health data, pointing out that only a physician is qualified to interpret medical findings, establishing significant relationships by use of his professional judgment.

Please let me reemphasize. The computerized health estimate is not a diagnosis. It is a service to the physicians who will make the diagnosis. Furthermore, the health protection centers will be under medical direction. Where determinations are necessary on any of the data, a physician will make them.

I do not think it necessary to defend computer accuracy in the field of health any more than in industry or in space science. We have ample evidence from many reports, however, that the computer readings—of blood chemistry, for example—may be more consistently correct than manual readings which cannot be completely free from a margin of human error.

Dr. Ralph Thiers, of Duke University, reported last September that chemistry tests run at three hospitals, both manually and by automatic analysis, proved that the automated method can detect unexpected abnormalities often enough to significantly help physicians to understand and treat their patients. Dr. Thiers said that the data leave little question that a significant number of additional clinical chemistry abnormalities are being discovered by automation which manual analysis had missed.

This is one one example.

You are probably aware that the Public Health Service is already developing and testing additional electronic screening methods for detection or measurement of disease—the spirogram, to record lung function important in bronchitis-emphysema; the phonocardiogram, to record heart sound; the electroencephalogram, to record electrical impulses given off by the brain.

Some of you may recall a demonstration in New York of an electronics system for analyzing electrocardiograms. Over 700 civil leaders participated, including Governor Rockefeller, and my distinguished colleague, Senator JAVITS.

In this demonstration, ECG's were taken, recorded on tape, transmitted by long distance telephone to a tape receiver and computer at George Washington University, here in the District. The computer took 20 seconds to compare the incoming ECG with thousands of similar cases stored in its memory. In 3 minutes plus 4 seconds, the heart's ability to transmit electrically, discharge, recharge, and drive itself had been determined and printed electronically in New York. The computer also sent back the average number of heartbeats per minute and gave a brief analysis of the data.

Thus, we find not only efficiency in the use of computers but economy as well.

So much for the major objections which have been raised.

Mr. President, recently I read a most provocative article in the New York Times magazine by Prof. Jean Mayer, Harvard professor of nutrition and lecturer on the history of public health. He indicts the health professions as nourishing "an obsession with death which disregards the greater importance of the value and significance of life."

Priorities for health programs, he says, "ought not be established on the basis of mortality statistics which make such conditions as blindness, deafness, tooth decay, mental illness, and arthritis appear insignificant," but on the basis of real human needs.

He points out:

> We are not yet used to thinking of subjecting our whole population to competent and continuous preventive care.

Yet this is the only type of medical care which makes sense. More than anything else, Dr. Mayer believes, we need discussion leading to a national plan for prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation.

I respectfully suggest that my "preventicare" proposal will carry us one step closer to this goal.

Our object was well expressed during the White House Conference on Health by Dr. George James, adviser to the President and former New York City commissioner of health. He said that the ideal system would put comprehensive medical service within the reach of everyone. The emphasis would be on preventive medicine and on a continuous effort to identify and treat disease at the earliest possible moment. The purpose? A useful and satisfied human being as well as a healthy body.

Let us replace obsession with death with devotion to life. Modern science has given us a longer lifespan; now modern preventive medicine can give us the good health so that those years need not be years of suffering and decline but years of health and well-being.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a number of articles and letters relating to this proposal be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the articles and letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2983) to amend the Public Health Service Act by adding a new title X thereto which will establish a program to protect adult health by providing assistance in the establishment and operation of regional and community health protection centers for the detection of disease, by providing assistance for the training of personnel to operate such centers, and by providing assistance in the conduct of certain research related to such centers and their operation, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. METCALF), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The articles and letters presented by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey are as follows:

STATE OF GEORGIA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
Atlanta, Ga., January 10, 1966.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Your similar letters of November 23, 1965, to the director of our chronic illness and geriatric service, Dr. Albert H. Robinson, and to me, enclosing your proposal for health protection centers have been studied. We are stimulated and encouraged. This letter represents our combined thinking.

I have been working for over a quarter of a century attempting to develop an effective health maintenance plan for all Georgians and your letter has given me a glimpse of what could well mean a major breakthrough into an optimum sickness prevention program.

Prevention seeks to eliminate a cause; treatment seeks to minimize a result. This is the keystone of health protection, for it is always many times more economical to prevent illness than to treat and rehabilitate the ill. It follows, then that we must not let "sick call" for the relatively few crowd out health maintenance for the many.

There is no possible question that the aged sick need the medical care which medicare legislation was hopefully designed to provide for them, but it must not be thought of as a wand that we can wave on the citizen's 65th birthday, magically bringing him health and well-being. We must—we can only—build the foundation for that good health during his younger most productive years. Any other course will inevitably lead to an oppressive national financial burden, a caseload level too heavy to be handled by available, or conceivably available, medical resources, and finally, by injustice to the over-65 citizen himself.

The key to achieving medicare's goal is to insure that each group that reaches its 65th birthday, each succeeding year, comes from a healthy population. I am convinced that your proposed multiphasic screening health protection centers could play a major role in reaching this objective, provided that their facilities were available to what is, in Georgia's experience, the primary population group, the labor force.

Georgia has a total population of slightly more than 4 million people, living in 1.1 million households. These homes are supported by the salaries and wages of Georgia's 1.5 million labor force. The 1.5 million wage earners, generally heads of these households, exert more influence upon the remaining 2.5 million Georgians than any other force. They, therefore, should be the initial primary beneficiaries of any health maintenance program. The labor force not only produces the wealth we need, but also most effectively represents the population we serve.

Emphasis on the prevention of illness among the wage-earning group has a twofold objective: (1) The productive member of each family is kept in health so that income needed for support is provided internally and the need for outside financial assistance is minimized; and (2) the wage earner, as the most influential member of the family, becomes a natural and effective medium for teaching other members of his family the "take-home health" he has learned on the job.

Within the Georgia Department of Public Health we have developed and are operating an employee's health service which is providing this type of health protection. All of our 30,000 State merit system employees are eligible for periodic screening for early detection of illnesses. Unfortunately, geographic distances prevent the service from being readily available to many of them, underlining, on our own doorstep, the need for such a comprehensive program as your proposed centers would implement.

Our experience to date has confirmed the value of our Georgia State Employee's Health Service. It is well evidenced by the continued valuable service of a growing number of employees, including a number of key administrators, who probably would have been lost as State servants and family providers except for early detection of serious illnesses. Early case finding usually enables the employee to keep his job and pay for his needed treatment out of earned income. This is infinitely more desirable than the alternative of waiting until advanced disease forces him to give up his job and become a nonproductive burden on his family and on our economy.

Senator WILLIAMS, I have long been convinced that each individual has an inescapable responsibility for his own health that he cannot delegate to any other person or agency. However, it is equally true that each individual has limitations on his own resources for maintaining health, regardless of his status in life. Whenever the demands exceed his personal resources he must turn to community resources for the additional assistance he needs. It must be remembered that individual resources are not limited to money alone, but include education, knowledge, skills, technique, equipment, and even the desire to maintain good health.

Your proposed health protection centers could be of inestimable value as a community resource to help Americans to live up to the inescapable responsibility each has for maintaining his own health.

Medicare will demand the investment of large sums of taxpayer's money, as well as the use of a substantial portion of our national medical resources. It is good business practice—and good, solid humanity—to enable persons approaching the eligibility age for medicare to take reasonable care of their own health prior to becoming eligible. Periodic multiphasic screening for early detection and referral to early treatment for potentially disabling disease is the best way I know to assure the maximum return from the medicare program.

A recommended screening schedule could be: (1) An initial screening at the age of 40, and unless the findings indicate more frequent intervals, rescreening once every 3 years until 50; (2) a screening every 2 years while in the fifties; and (3) a screening once a year beginning at age 60. This schedule, subject to modification with experience, would initiate screenings at the age when the majority of chronic illnesses begin to manifest themselves, accelerating the frequency of screenings with advancing age until, during the years of greatest risk from chronic illness, at least annual screening would be required. Emphasis should initially be placed on screening wage earners within each family, then expanded to other family members as facilities and skills are developed.

Our experience with the multiphasic screening of 1.4 million Georgia citizens during the decade 1945–54 proved to us that screening by itself is not our objective: Any screening program must have a well-organized referral and follow-up system as an integral part of the program if its objective of health care for all those found to need medical attention is to be attained. Our health referral program for medical rejectees from the Armed Forces provides us with conclusive evidence that this is still the case. Discovery of an illness or defect does not of itself assure that the patient will automatically seek the required medical care. In most instances professional guidance such as is provided by our health referral consultants, is necessary to motivate the patient to seek adequate care.

Equally essential for effective case finding is epidemiological followup of contacts and suspects, as demonstrated by the work of our communicable disease investigators in venereal disease detection and referral to treatment and, more recently, the startling effectiveness of a similar technique in tuberculosis. Similar investigations of blood relatives of cases with hereditary metabolic disorders such as diabetes mellitus show promise of comparably effective results.

Senator Williams, my answer has been extensive because I believe in what you are trying to do. In fact, I sincerely hope that the State of Georgia may be selected to pioneer a State-wide, automated multiphasic screening program with provision for referral to treatment and follow-up such as I have described. I believe that the know-how we have acquired is unique.

We have within the Georgia Department of Public Health the leadership needed to develop the program. I know that most of us realize that much illness can be prevented, and that prevention is more economical of money and human suffering than is treatment. We must use prevention of disease and illness as the control mechanism to keep medicare manageable. By using multiphasic screening on a scheduled basis according to age, we can keep it manageable. And we can concurrently achieve another major objective—maintaining the health and productive capacity of our labor force.

Please accept my personal thank you for devoting your attention and energies in this field of preventive medical services that so badly needs your assistance. Do not hesitate to call upon me if I can help you in any way.

Sincerely yours,
Lester M. Petrie, M.D.,
Director, Branch of Preventable Diseases.

Michigan Department of Health,
Lansing, Mich., December 9, 1965.
Hon. Harrison A. Williams, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: I was very happy to hear about your proposal for providing screening and preventive medical services to the adult population. We have, as you implied in your speech in the Congressional Record, accomplished a great deal in terms of legislation for caring for the sick and disabled. Under the amendments to the Social Security Act we have medicare and other maternal and child health services. The sick are given the benefits of modern curative medicine in the two extremes of life—early life from conception until the age of 21 and later for the older person 65 years of age and over. Very little is being done for the group in the great productive years from 21 to 64 to conserve the health of those who must work and pay the taxes to care for the two groups aforementioned. Any program that can assist in the conservation of this group should pay rich dividends both to the individual concerned and to society as a whole. The provisions of medicare and the new legislation for regional health programs for heart disease, cancer, stroke, and related diseases will not solve our problem of preventing disease and disability. Multiple or multiphasic screening activities are now an important component for the early detection of incipient chronic disease and disability. They separate those persons who presumably have abnormalities from those who presumably do not. Such activities save the time of the physician who can spend his time in a more productive manner for those who need his diagnostic and treatment skills and acumen rather than use a disproportionate part of his time for examination of healthy individuals. When such tests can be done by technicians and automated, they can be done expeditiously and at very modest cost.

In Michigan we have been doing multiple screening examinations since 1954. These have been done mostly in apparently healthy young adults employed in small industries. The results have been very satisfying and have revealed that many people who believe they are perfectly well have conditions which predispose to chronic diseases or have beginning chronic diseases which have not as yet become symptomatic. Ideally, screening examinations should be done on all people 30 years of age and over but as a beginning I think they should start not later than 45 to 50 years of age. Until the medical profession as a whole has also seen the value of such screening examinations, the idea of a complete annual physical inventory for every person is not susceptible to practical attainment for obvious reasons. Physicians have been trained to diagnose and treat overt disease and disability. They have had little training in preventive medicine and not oriented to conservation of health. Our population as a rule is not motivated to go to a physician unless they are either sick or have pain. For these reasons, as well as the fact that if all persons went for an annual physical examination there would not be enough physicians available to treat the sick, it makes the provision of annual physical examinations for the population purely idealistic. It is necessary to find some practical substitution for such complete yearly examinations. A battery of health tests is not as satisfactory, of course, as a complete history and physical examination by a knowledgeable personal physician. Nevertheless, it can be the means of detecting asymptomatic disease and in promoting health to a large group of our population. In my opinion the time has come for us to prevent sickness rather than spending all of our time in patching up those who are already sick or disabled. The greatest thing that could be done for the older population is to find, treat, and counsel those in the great middle years when they are incubating the diseases which will later cause them to require prolonged care and hospitalization.

I am enclosing some statistics from some of the multiple screening programs that have been done here in Michigan.

Incidentally, if you plan to have hearings on this legislation when it is introduced, the Association of State and Territorial Chronic Disease Program Directors, of which I am the current president, would appreciate an invitation to testify.

Sincerely,
John A. Cowan, M.D.,
Director, Division of Adult Health.

Tulane University,
School of Medicine,
New Orleans, La., December 1, 1965.
Hon. Harrison A. Williams, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of November 23 and the attached copy of your Senate speech outlining the need for a health maintenance program. I will appreciate it if you will send me information on the proposed legislation as it develops.

I fully agree with your views and can only reinforce your suggestion that the passage of Public Law 89–97 makes a program of early case finding both necessary and a sensible economy. Meanwhile, I wish to include a copy of Värmland study carried out in Sweden. This was a preliminary study and it seems that in 2 years' time this is intended to cover all of the Swedish population. The meeting in Värmland in September was attended by Dr. James W. Sweeney, director, Tulane biomedical computing system, because the Swedish study is tied in with the Tulane computer. Many of the automated techniques of recording have been worked out by Dr. Sweeney. You will therefore understand our interest. We are presently negotiating with the Public Health Service the establishment of a multiple screening program for elderly persons in New Orleans.

May I add my congratulations for your leadership in developing this excellent program.

Yours sincerely,
J. C. S. Paterson, M.D., F.R.C.P.,
Associate Dean and Director.

The University of Alabama
Medical Center,
Birmingham, Ala., December 13, 1965.
Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: You are to be congratulated on your interest in the need for a health maintenance program for Americans. Automated centers such as described by Dr. Collen at Permanente may well provide a partial answer to improving health. I would personally be very pleased if I lived close enough to take advantage of the comprehensive screening process described by Dr. Collen.

If one considers the economical value of keeping our most productive people on the job, this factor alone could justify consideration of such massive screening starting even earlier than 50 years of age. If a preventable disability is detected at age 40 when there are still 25 years of productive work years to be expected, this may prove to have more impact on our economy than the detection of the person who has only 15 years of expected productivity, or who has retired from active work in the labor market.

I would like to have any information you have in regard to the proposed bill to provide disease detection centers. I hope the bill will include specific provisions for the educational programs which are necessary for such disease detection centers to be truly preventive in nature. The educational components should consider both those necessary for education of professional people and for education of the lay public.

I shall appreciate any information you can send me about the developments in regard to your proposed bill. Please accept my best wishes for your success.

Sincerely,
Helen L. Tinnin, Ph. D.,
Assistant Professor of Preventive Medicine and Public Health.

Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York,
New York, N.Y., December 8, 1965.
Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on your proposal to establish an adult health education program under the terms set forth in the summary which accompanied your letter of November 23, 1965.

When we examine the natural causes of disease we find that one of the stages is the period during which the disease is developing but goes unrecognized. It is not accompanied by recognized symptoms, nor does the involved person feel the need for medical care.

The above stage may very well antedate age 60, and I am in agreement with you that the need for a sound health maintenance program could bring substantial benefits to individuals at age 50.

I regret that my present professional services do not afford me the chance to have case studies and statistical data applicable to your project. I can, however, advise you that hospitals are beginning to introduce the practice of doing a complete battery of tests on patients admitted to their inpatient accommodations. The belief is growing that the cost of doing this, instead of the individually selected tests related to a patient's clinical needs, is no higher and the higher productivity of meaningful results enables the physician to render a better qualitative service to his patient.

One of the hospitals which has instituted this practice, involving automated equipment, is the Mount Sinai Hospital, 100th Street and 5th Avenue, New York, N.Y. Your office may wish to get information about this program directly from Martin R. Steinberg, M.D., director.

I am also taking the liberty to suggest that your office contact George James, M.D., former commissioner of health and presently dean of the Mount Sinai School of Medicine and executive vice president of medical affairs. He has spoken and written extensively on health maintenance and has, during his tenure as commissioner of health, helped organize plans for a municipal hospital to include in-patient services, ambulatory services, health center programs, welfare center activities and community mental health programs. His health center concept deals with the problems of all age groups in much the manner you propose for the older groups.

I am heartily in favor of what you want to accomplish through your proposed program. I am, however, disposed to believe that the health protection centers should not be free standing facilities but integrated with medical schools, community hospitals, etc. They would, in this way, be kept in the mainstream of hospital and medical activities.

The proposed health protection units might then be the satellite resources to promote their availability to many for whom accessibility to the larger centers would be difficult.

I hope you will find these comments and suggestions helpful.

Sincerely yours,
M. Hinenburg, M.D.,
Medical Care Consultant.

The Brookdale Hospital Center,
Brooklyn, N.Y., December 21, 1965.
Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: In reply to your letter of December 10, the following information is offered.

The Brookdale Hospital Center, at all levels—board of trustees, medical board, and staff—has recognized the need for dramatic changes in the traditional role of the general hospital as a provider of health care. We have therefore gone on record as committed to involvement in programing for the health needs of the community. To further these aims, a department of community health has been created. This unit has full departmental status at the same level as the traditional departments, e.g.: medicine, surgery, etc.

With the financial support of the Gerontology Branch, U.S. Public Health Service, we have formulated firm plans for a hospital-based complex which provides sufficient portals of entry for the individual in the community to meet his changing health needs. The key characteristics of the program are: availability, accessibility, continuity, integration, and acceptability. The health services are to be available when the need arises; situated so that the person can get to them; providing a continuum of care, avoiding the episodic health care at crises; consider the individual in his medical, psychosocial and economic milieu; and are utilized by the people of the community.

The components of the hospital complex are: general hospital; ambulatory care services, including outpatient department and home care; geriatric health station; extended care facility; and day hospital. The latter two units will be housed in a community health center to be completed in 1969.

We have concluded negotiation of a contract with the New York City Department of Welfare to provide comprehensive medical care to all OAA patients in the hospital's core area, approximately 3,000 in number. This activity will be housed in a geriatric ambulatory care center building scheduled for completion in the summer of 1966. This building will be eminently suitable for accommodating the geriatric health station.

This geriatric health station, originally conceived as a traditional health assessment facility, has been reevaluated in the light of the Permanente project and the advances in technology in this field. During the past year we have been exploring the possibility of establishing a highly automated and computerized system. We have established the feasibility of automated ECG, spirometry, EEG, and blood chemistry, being fed into a computer such as the IBM 1130 or 3200 system, to produce a referral scale. If coding of a self-administered health questionnaire is added to the above (as in the Permanente project), an efficient economic health evaluation process is achieved.

Of primary importance is the conservation of time required from the health professionals. This permits maximal utilization of professional skills at the appropriate levels and expands the number of individuals who can be evaluated many fold.

This geriatric health station or health maintenance unit would be another portal of entry into the hospital-based complex for those individuals with no private physician.

The population of this hospital's core area is approximately 500,000 with 50,000 to 60,000 individuals 65 years of age or older. In many parts of this area there is an estimated 90 to 95 percent incidence of medical indigency. A large proportion of the population is Negro and Puerto Rican.

There are, as expected, unmet health needs, lack of health maintenance information, and poor or absent motivation. We are therefore anxious to provide a health maintenance program for the aged, not only as a preventive health measure, but as the first step in an educational process which will draw the individual into the mainstream of health care. Unfortunately, we have no funds for this part of the program.

It should be noted that a computer complex as described above could service satellite health stations where the various procedures could be performed and the information relayed to it for processing.

The provisions of your proposal will create services which the new Federal legislation fails to consider and which are essential for proper health care programing. The Brookdale Hospital Center and other community hospitals throughout the country who have accepted the challenge of change in their role as health care providers, will receive the support they so urgently need to meet this challenge.

Cordially,
Leo Gitman, M.D.,
Chief, Gerontology Section.

Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York,
New York, N.Y., December 22, 1965.
Hon. Harrison A. Williams, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Williams: This is in response to your recent letter concerning your proposal for a health maintenance program for Americans.

One of the benefits covered by the premium in the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York is a periodic general physical examination. We do not have precise figures on the proportion of our subscribers who avail themselves of this benefit, but the impression is that about 20 to 25 percent have such an examination each year. A research project conducted several years ago in one of the HIP medical groups indicated that with special efforts this proportion could be increased appreciably.

More recently the research efforts related to the detection of unsuspected disease has been directed at specific conditions. One of the programs is attempting to integrate glaucoma screening into group medical practice with the aid of nonmedical personnel trained to perform glaucoma. The other is an intensive program to determine the value of periodic screening examinations of the breast for the lowering of mortality from breast cancer. Each breast examination includes palpation by a highly qualified clinician and mammography (soft tissue X-ray). Early results suggest that the screening program leads to the detection of a significant number of breast cancers that would have otherwise remained undiagnosed and that a large proportion of the cases are still localized when found. Additional observations are being made to see whether these results are stable and whether mortality is improved because of the earlier detection of breast cancer.

With regard to your proposal, it represents a means for overcoming many of the present deterrents to increasing the proportion of the adult population that periodically receives a comprehensive physical examination. These deterrents include high costs, inconvenience to the patients and a serious drain on physician time which is already in short supply. However, there are several questions associated with the establishment of regional health examination centers which deserve attention. For example, will it be possible to spread the network sufficiently to make the centers readily accessible to the population in rural and urban areas, in the North, South, and West? Also, how will the program relate to the physician responsible for the followup care of the patient so as to avoid fragmentation and discontinuity of medical services? And, what is the most desirable age for initiating periodic health examinations?

I hope that the preceding proves useful to you in considering the scope of your legislation.

Sincerely yours,
Sam Shapiro,
Director, Division of Research and Statistics.

State of Maryland,
Department of Health,
Baltimore, Md., November 30, 1965.
Hon. Harrison A. Williams, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: Needless to say I was delighted to receive your letter of November 23, 1965, expressing interest in wider application of known techniques for comprehensive screening for early evidence of certain chronic diseases. It so happens that this is one of my chief personal interests, and I am trying to step up action as rapidly as possible among our 24 local health departments in Maryland in establishing this capability. Indeed one of our best local health departments on the Eastern Shore near Delaware (Wicomico County-Salisbury) has just submitted such a special project proposal.

Last year one of the major innovations in public health services in Maryland was a program for statewide mass cytologic screening for cervical cancer in women. The enclosed June 1964 departmental bulletin describes this program in some detail. Both the Governor and the legislature decided to back us on this effort, the ambitious goal of which is nothing less than writing an epitaph for cervical cancer. Other reprints are included to give you further details of the effectiveness of this approach as described by one of the test's developers, Dr. Hugh J. Davis, of Johns Hopkins Medical School.

My reason for calling this particular screening program to your attention is that the specific target population is women 30 to 45 years of age. This well illustrates the important principle that different chronic diseases and disabilities have different target populations with respect to the age, sex, and other characteristics of the population. It would be a mistake, I believe, for such legislation to prescribe specific age limit. For example, the lower limit of age 50 which is cited in your letter would rule out the most important screening program we are now conducting, namely the cytologic screening for cervical cancer in women which is described above.

A number of chronic diseases and disabilities start very early in life so that effective preventive medical measures must be adapted accordingly. An excellent example of this is amblyopia exanopsia (blindness in one eye) which occurs when poor visual acuity in one eye or muscle imbalance in the preschool age child goes undetected. This is a condition in which vision fusion never takes place during the crucial developmental years. The image from one eye is blurred by some disorder such as poor visual acuity, astigmatism or muscle imbalance so that when the child tries to fuse this image with that of his good eye, he does not see well. He automatically and unconsciously suppresses the blurry image of his weak eye, and in so doing stops it from developing. The eventual result is blindness in one eye unless this condition is picked up by simple screening tests before 6 or 7 years of age. Blindness in this case is therefore preventable.

If the problem is not found, the child is in trouble. He will never have normal depth perception, for this requires two eyes. He may have difficulty in school. He will certainly be limited in the kinds of jobs he can do as an adult. He will be a much less safe driver, and more exposed to all sorts of accidents. And should his good eye be damaged by disease, or by one of the 300,000 eye accidents in this country each year, he may be left virtually blind.

Here then is an excellent example of a screening test to prevent a chronic permanent visual disorder which must be carried out at 3, 4, or 5 years of age.

As you well know the country was startled to learn from the medical examinations by Army Air Corps doctors in World War II, that 1 out of 25 men were blind in one eye and usually didn't know it. At this rate each year 100,000 American children are passing the point at which they can be rescued—all for want of a simple, inexpensive and brief vision screening test.

These two examples of screening tests are but a few of the many examples which I could give you to detect chronic and disabling diseases at a stage where their disabling effect can be prevented or greatly ameliorated. Diabetes can now be economically and readily detected by a screening blood sugar test. Glaucoma, a major cause of blindness, can be readily detected through tonometry, but few adults have ever received this simple test. Mammography is being utilized more and more to detect early breast cancer.

Gadgetry is only a very small part of this process. What is needed are programs of organized community action by professionals and trained technicians—in other words public health programs. Screening techniques should be incorporated into medical practice, so that screening examinations are followed by a thorough history and physical examination by a physician, thus broadening his capacity to detect early disease.

Now that large expenditures are about to be made for chronic illness and disabilities in older citizens (for conditions which often could have been prevented or mitigated), your letter which strikes a note for an early detection is most timely. Detection of new cases of heart disease, cancer, hypertension and arteriosclerosis is an essential complementary component to the regional medical complex bill just passed by the Congress. Screening examinations have particular application to medically indigent populations in case finding.

In Maryland, I look forward to the development of broad and comprehensive screening facilities—health protection centers to use your phrase—as a well established year round service in all of our 24 local health departments. This Department will fully support your efforts to achieve this.

I would especially like to congratulate and commend you for this superb paragraph from your speech from the Congressional Record of September 24, 1965:

"Only a major national commitment to apply the principles and techniques of preventive medicine on a mass basis will stem the rising tide of an increasing burden of medical care in terms of manpower, facilities, and dollars. We have the technology capacity to do this."

Nothing could more fittingly describe the basic philosophy of public health.

We appreciate you referring this question to us and hope that you will call us if you feel that we can be of further help.

Sincerely yours,
William J. Peeples, M.D.,
Commissioner.

Government of the District of Columbia, Department of Public Health,
Washington, D.C., November 30, 1965.

Hon. Harrison A. Williams, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: This will reply to your letter of November 23 in connection with the need for a health maintenance program.

As I understand your proposal, it calls for the development of a disease detection program provided free of charge for all persons over the age of 50, with referral of those found to have health defects to their private physician or to public facilities in the case of those not able to afford private care.

The development of this kind of chronic disease detection program has been a goal of many of us in the public health field for some time. I believe that every individual over 40 (rather than 50) should have access to facilities which enable them to receive screening tests for a variety of diseases such as you have cited in your summary. In the case of some of these diseases, such as diabetes, testing at an earlier age even than 40 is desirable. The point, of course, is that the earlier one finds a disease entity in an individual, the more likely is that individual to be able to receive effective treatment. It is clear, for example, that an individual who develops glaucoma and has some degree of blindness as a result can receive treatment aimed at retarding further development of blindness; this treatment, however, cannot turn back the events that have occurred. In other words, the degree of blindness already contracted by the patient will remain. This same basic principle is true of other disease entities. While we must admit that our current knowledge of some of these diseases makes efficient treatment difficult this should not preclude us from doing everything possible to detect the disease at an early date and doing everything within our power to provide medical and ancillary services aimed at preventing the disease from marching on its irrevocable course to disability and even early death. Further than this, early detection of disease may also serve to initiate steps aimed at rehabilitation. Again, the earlier this is undertaken, the better for the patient and for society.

While there is little question in my mind that the best place for these screening tests to be carried out is the office of the family physician, it seems unlikely that this procedure will take place at least for a high percentage of our citizens. Therefore, the proposals you have outlined appear, in general, to make a great deal of sense. I would, of course, wish to reserve final judgment until I have an opportunity to review, in detail, the exact legislation you hope to introduce, and I would be most appreciative if I could receive said legislation and hopefully have an opportunity of reacting to it.

As an indication of my interest in this matter of disease detection, I am enclosing a recent article concerning a program that has been underway in the District of Columbia for the past 2½ years and that bears considerable similarity, I believe, to what you are proposing. You may be interested in the cost figures, the evaluation and the results of the operation thus far. It is, of course, currently an on-going operation. Further than this, I have within the past few months initiated an even larger disease detection program at our Southwest Health Center, which is now operating a full-time program of this nature for all persons in the District of Columbia over the age of 40. I recognize, of course, that many other communities in the country do not currently have this kind of program and, as I understand it, your proposed legislation is designed to meet this need.

I would point out what, I am sure, is quite obvious to you; namely, that the development of this program creates increasing demand for health manpower, not merely to staff the units but, more important, to arrive at a final diagnosis and provide appropriate treatment. It is this latter phase of the operation that can produce considerable problems. There is, of course, no use whatsoever in developing a disease detection program unless it is subsequently followed, and at an early date, by expeditious handling of the patient with a view to providing the necessary treatment and rehabilitation. The obvious question then arises as to whether there exists in many communities the health manpower readily available to meet this increased demand. This question is not easy to answer, but I am sure you will find that there are many in the health field who do not believe that an adequate supply of manpower currently exists for this purpose and that the number that do exist might preferably devote their time to handling the acute medical problems that need immediate treatment.

May I express my appreciation to you for allowing me to react to your proposals and to hope that I may have an opportunity of deliberating further in connection with this matter at some appropriate time during the course of the next session of Congress.

Very sincerely,
Murray Grant, M.D., D.P.H.,
Director of Public Health.

State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Department of Health, Providence, R.I.,
November 30, 1965.

Hon. Harrison A. Williams, Jr.,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: I was pleased to learn of your interest in the possibility of establishing semiautomated centers for the early detection of certain specific chronic diseases in apparently well older people. Legislation such as you would propose would have my unqualified approval.

As you well know, screening programs are a limited substitute for a complete physical examination given by a qualified, competent physician interested in preventive medicine. Under ideal circumstances, such examinations would be desirable for all adults over the age of 40 years. Realistically, however, one must realize that this is not an obtainable objective. Therefore, we must compromise by applying screening tests to large numbers of people.

The use of automated procedures in screening programs is a new and exciting prospect in public health today. We, in Rhode Island, have been sufficiently interested in the program at Kaiser-Permanente to send two members of our staff to Oakland to see it in operation.

No person who has studied the health needs of adults would seriously question the advantage of early recognition of chronic illness. Only by early detection and energetic management can we control conditions such as health disease, cancer, and stroke.

I hope you will introduce your proposal, and I hope the American Congress will have the wisdom to see its merits. I hope, also, that if this proposal becomes a reality, the State of Rhode Island will have the privilege of being selected to operate one of the proposed centers.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH B. CANNON, M.D., M.P.H.,
Director of Health.

CITY OF MILWAUKEE HEALTH DEPARTMENT,
Milwaukee, Wis., December 2, 1965.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have received two letters from you, both dated November 3, 1965, relating to a proposed Adult Health Protection Act of 1966. One letter was addressed to me as commissioner of health of the city of Milwaukee, the other was routed to me from Marquette University School of Medicine where I serve as professor and chairman of the department of public health.

I have reviewed the summary of your proposed Adult Health Protection Act of 1966 and, speaking generally, I am enthusiastic about the intent and scope of the proposed legislation.

The Milwaukee Health Department already possesses an appreciable quantity of automated equipment needed to carry out a broadly based multiphasic screening examination program in this community. Currently, the principal impediment to launching a full-scale program is the lack of financial support to employ the necessary personnel. I am engaged in pursuant of some limited financial assistance from the Public Health Service for this purpose.

I certainly feel a broadly based multiphasic screening test program should be available to any person age 50 or over who desires to participate. To limit the program to persons 65 years of age and over would seriously impair one of the primary purposes of the program; namely, the early diagnosis of disease. Early diagnosis is an essential step to the institution of early treatment.

The only significant criticism I have of the proposed Adult Health Protection Act of 1966, as summarized in the enclosure transmitted with your letter, relates to establishment of five health protection centers, to be followed at a later date by establishment of health protection units linked to centers by data transmission lines. I believe that one or two health protection centers, to carry out the functions delineated in the third paragraph of the second page of your summary, would be in order. The most meaningful benefits of the program will ensue through rapid development of many health protection units in many communities.

I feel that there is no need for the health protection units to be linked by data transmission lines to the centers, where interpretation of some tests, such as electrocardiographic tracings, could be performed by centralized electronic equipment. Small, highly sophisticated electronic interpreters will soon be available at a cost so low as to justify their placement in the individual health protection units. For example, an American corporation will go into production, on or about May 1, 1966, for manufacture of digital-analog computers which will automatically record and interpret electrocardiographic data. The cost of such a unit will be approximately $4,200. When one considers the cost of an electrocardiograph, which the health protection unit would require, and linkage of units to centers by data transmission lines, I am sure it would be more economical to have the interpretations performed electronically right on the testing premises. In addition to saving in cost, there are other advantages, which I will not attempt to enumerate here.

Very truly yours,

E. R. KRUMBIEGEL, M.D.,
Commissioner of Health.

NEW JERSEY OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATION,
Trenton, N.J., December 10, 1965.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PETE: I am taking the liberty of sending you a copy of the resolution which was passed by the New Jersey Optometric Association at their annual meeting, Sunday, December 5, 1965.

Secondly, I am enclosing a news release that was sent from our public information office regarding our resolution. This was sent to all the dailies and weeklies in the State.

Pete, I think it is of great significance and I hope of interest to you that the preventicare resolution was passed unanimously by those in attendance at our annual meeting.

The New Jersey Optometric Association is completely in agreement with your concept of the need for a health maintenance program for adult Americans. You can rest assured that when your bill is filed, this organization will be 100 percent behind it.

Hoping this letter finds you in the best of health, I remain, with kindest personal regards,

Very truly yours,

HERBERT L. MOSS, O.D.

BAYLOR UNIVERSITY,
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE,
Houston, Tex., December 4, 1965.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you for your letter of November 23, 1965, along with a summary of legislation now being drafted to establish health protection centers.

The concept underlying your proposal has obvious merit. Indeed, consideration was given to this subject by the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke, and I would hope that further consideration would be given in the implementation of the centers program as authorized by recent legislation.

Accordingly, I would support an intensive study of this proposal toward development of this concept as a practical means of advancing our health programs.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL E. DEBAKEY, M.D.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS,
MEDICAL BRANCH,
Galveston, Tex., December 14, 1965.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I have read with a great deal of interest your letter of November 23, and the copy of your address of September 24, 1965, relating to the need for a health maintenance program for Americans.

The purpose of this letter is to express to you what I feel to be the very great importance of programs designed primarily for the earliest possible detection of any disease process. Since the head of our research computer center here at the medical branch is also a member of our departmental staff, you can understand that we feel that a program such as you visualize will definitely entail the development of automated or semiautomated centers.

Whereas I can understand why you would wish to give priority to those individuals 50 years of age and over, I should also like to emphasize the importance of providing such services to all age groups. Just as a single example, if cancer of the uterine cervix is to be reduced as a major public health problem, early diagnosis must be aimed at those women in their early twenties. There are many other examples, most of which I am sure you are well aware. I merely want to point out that in my opinion, there should be no age restriction relative to the eligibility of medical care of this sort.

You are to be congratulated for your active interest in and support of this particular type of health maintenance program. I hope you will be able to keep us informed of further developments on the proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

DON W. MICKS,
Professor and Acting Chairman, Department of Preventive Medicine and Public Health.

YALE UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
New Haven, Conn., December 7, 1965.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you for your letter of November 3 and for the copy of your important speech to the Senate.

To a very substantial degree your remarks reflect our views. We would be inclined, however, to go a little farther than you. For instance, although we agree that medicare is a vital step and that the heart, stroke, and cancer program is of great importance both of these are essentially therapeutic programs and are not oriented to the prevention of the chronic diseases of aging which are so important today. We believe that the preventive approach to these diseases is the only one which will produce long-lasting results. When once these diseases have started, therapy can at best ameliorate but can rarely cure. Very early detection is vitally important.

Our other point of disagreement reflects what you yourself have said in the second paragraph of your letter—that further study has led you to believe that age 60 or even 50 might be a realistic age limit in a program designed to detect indications of disease. For many diseases, 50 is far too late. I would place the optimum age for the initiation of this program at about 35. If, for instance, abnormal levels of lipids are detected at this age it is probable that the eventual development of coronary heart disease can be made much less likely by initiating the appropriate diet. If on the other hand the abnormality is not detected until the age of 50 or 60, it is too late. I would point out that one of the most serious trends in this country today is the increasing frequency of cardiovascular disease in the forties and early fifties. The initiation of this program at the earlier age is perhaps even more important in the prevention of cancer, especially of the uterine cervix. These techniques are highly effective and can, for all intents and purposes, eliminate death from this condtion. However, the cellular changes which preface the development of overt cancer can commonly be detected in the 30-year age group.

In spite of these criticisms, which are after all matters of detail, I would like to offer my sincere congratulations on your immensely important proposals and I would much appreciate further information on the proposed legislation as it is developed.

Sincerely yours,
Anthony M. M. Payne, M.D., F.R.C.P.,
Chairman.

The University of North Carolina School of Public Health,
Chapel Hill, N.C., December 6, 1965.
Hon. Harrison A. Williams, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Your recent letter to Dr. W. Fred Mayes, dean of the University of North Carolina School of Public Health, has been called to my attention with the suggestion that it would be appropriate to communicate to you any views regarding the proposed legislation dealing with adult health protection.

I am most impressed with the insight into the natural history of most chronic diseases which is suggested by your proposal, inasmuch as the only possibility for significantly altering the impact of the chronic diseases on our population lies in early detection, diagnosis, and treatment as indicated.

You are aware, I am sure, that much of the health progress of this century has been achieved through the application of public health procedures which either prevent disease from developing, or prevent its development to a more advanced stage when treatment is noneffective or less effective.

There are none who would wish any less emphasis on treatment, but I would hope that our enthusiasm for heart, cancer, and stroke centers and related programs could be extended to include appropriate attention to the application of existing screening procedures on a broad basis. One would further hope that research for the development of new screening techniques and for the most effective methods of organizing such programs will not be neglected.

Much of my conviction regarding these points stems from my interest in the field of chronic disease control. This has led to an opportunity to survey various patient populations receiving care for long-term disorders. The study of nursing home patients in North Carolina (see enclosed reprint) revealed that the application of appropriate preventive techniques at earlier periods might have materially delayed the onset of some of the complications demonstrated by these patients.

That we continue to record deaths from cancer of the cervix in females, that blindness due to glaucoma continues to be diagnosed, that we constantly need to remind ourselves concerning the unknown diabetics in the population—all of these serve as justifications for the program which you have envisioned.

I will be interested in hearing how the proposed legislation is received in Congress. Thank you for the opportunity to express my feeling.

Yours very truly,
Charles M. Cameron, Jr., M.D., M.P.H.,
Professor, Public Health Administration.

The Johns Hopkins University School of Hygiene and Public Health,
Baltimore, Md., December 14, 1965.
Hon. Harrison A. Williams, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: I wish to add my strong support for your proposal Adult Health Protection Act of 1966. The proposed health protection centers would represent a most important contribution of the enormous problems we face in delivering medical care to individuals and communities efficiently and effectively.

The emphasis in this country on the categorical, disease oriented, approach both to medical research and to medical treatment, and the emphasis on professional specialization have been associated with enormous advances in our fundamental understanding of disease processes. In the long haul advances in the health of the people, both through prevention and through medical cure, will come from such work. In the short haul, however, this approach militates against the provision of optimum medical care and the prompt delivery of what knowledge we now have. In the short haul it is medical care which interests society and it is early diagnosis which provides the greatest opportunity for favorably influencing the health of those now alive.

I have visited Dr. Morris Collen's "multiphasic health checkup program" in Oakland and believe in many respects it represents an important component in the medicine of the future. His critical approach to the study of the sensitivity, specificity, yield and costs of the various tests employed are most important aspects of the work at Kaiser-Permanente.

I support your approach to the initial establishment of five centers in appropriate universities. There is still much work to be done on the development of health protection centers before they could be efficiently utilized on a large scale by smaller institutions. Nevertheless their full impact can only be realized when such facilities are made available in local community institutions. For this reason the phasing of your proposed program seems appropriate.

I hope you will keep me informed about the development of the proposed legislation. If there is anything I can do to add my support, please let me know.

Yours sincerely,
Kerr L. White, M.D.,
Professor and Director.

State of West Virginia,
Department of Health,
Charleston, W. Va., December 16, 1965.
Hon. Harrison A. Williams, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: I appreciate receiving your letter of November 23, enclosing a copy of your speech in the Senate regarding a health maintenance program for adult Americans.

I thoroughly agree with the concept of objectives. I have worked in the field of preventive medicine and public health for the last 19 years, during which time I have observed, personally, the effects you have brought out in your speech.

I would appreciate a copy of your proposed bill when it is drafted. Please contact me if I can assist you in any way.

Sincerely,
N. H. Dyer, M.D., M.P.H.,
State Director of Health.

Department of Health,
Paterson, N.J., December 9, 1965.
Hon. Harrison A. Williams, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: Thank you for your letter of November 23, and the accompanying material on the proposed Adult Health Protection Act of 1966. The establishment of such health protection centers, as are envisioned in this program, would be a major step in the direction of making health services and the best knowledge of American medicine available to the general public.

The serious gap between medical advances and available health services is one which this great Nation can no longer afford. Although perhaps less dramatic than the saving of lives by treating the sick and infirm, it would certainly make important strides in orienting the attitude of the American public and the medical profession to the value of periodic preventive services and the vast economy effected in this manner. The individual and cumulative health of the Nation would be immeasurably improved.

May I commend you for your foresight in the public health interest. With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,
J. Allen Yager, M.D., M.P.H.,
Director, Department of Health.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
Department of Health,
Harrisburg, Pa., December 6, 1965.
Hon. Harrison A. Williams, Jr.,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: Your proposal to foster the establishment of health protection centers throughout the United States is as timely as it is important.

In 1949, Dr. Leonard Scheele first established a Division of Chronic Disease in the Public Health Service and appointed me Chief. An intensive study of this complicated problem convinced me that one thing that was badly needed was a combined screening operation that would pull together those screening tests that were specific, quick to perform, and economical. The first paper published on multiple screening, I believe, was the one I prepared for Public Health Reports in 1949.

A demonstration project was developed in a housing development (Planner House) in Indianapolis. I predicted that more than 1,000 pathological conditions would be found in the first 1,000 apparently well adults screened. About 1,200 conditions were actually found. Of these, one-third were serious conditions—nephritis, heart disease, hypertension, diabetes, tuberculosis, syphilis, arthritis, glaucoma, etc. About two-thirds were vision and hearing defects, overweight and other less serious (but correctible) conditions.

Shortly after that an interesting comparative study was promoted and financed by the division at the Boston dispensary. A group of 1,000 apparently well adults were subjected to three different types of examinations conducted by three different teams.

The first examination consisted of a routine physical examination then in vogue—auscultation, percussion, inspection (cost about $10).

The second examination was an abbreviated physical examination—shorter in time and less detailed (cost about $5).

The third examination was a screening examination conducted largely by technicians—multiple screening (cost about $1).

An evaluation of the effectiveness of these three types of examination showed that more pathological conditions were found by multiple screening examinations than by either of the orthodox physical examinations.

Our experiments in multiple screening were then extended to cover population groups in large cities. One of these was Richmond, Va. Here a multiple screening unit was established in a large department store and mobile units were set up on street corners and in factories.

The American Medical Association established the Health Information Foundation which financed a study of the Richmond, Va., multiple screening project—convinced doctors and lay people would be opposed to it.

Actually, a large number of physicians—over half if I remember correctly—felt it was a good thing. Most of the people screened favored it. Many said they would be happy to pay $10 to $20 a year more taxes if they could be screened each year. The exact statistics were contained in a one volume report published in the early 1950's by the Health Information Foundation.

As an experiment, Dr. McGough, health officer of Alexandria, Va., persuaded the city medical society to approve a multiple screening week in November 1951. Later he tried to abandon it because of the time drain on the staff. However, the public and the medical society insisted that it be continued. It was still a feature of the Alexandria city health program as recently as 2 years ago.

Traditionally, in the training of physicians little emphasis has been placed on prevention. Until recently few medical schools paid more than lipservice to it. Embryo physicians were largely taught by surgeons, internists, neurologists, and other clinical specialists. They saw an acutely ill patient operated on and recover. This was dramatic. The clinician became the hero—his footsteps to be followed.

Hence, it is understandable that busy clinicians in your town and mine, too busy often to attend medical society meetings, seldom develop an appreciation of the value of prevention. They never really see the social and economic value of preventing premature or unnecessary disabling complications of disease. They are firemen skilled in their trade of putting out fires but giving little thought to the far greater economy of preventing them.

Therefore, the development of the health protection centers that you propose in local hospitals will do more to teach physicians the value of prevention than anything else that could be done.

In addition, the additive experience of person after person finding out that they had sugar diabetes or high blood pressure before they ever knew it would be highly motivational to others in the community. Personal experience, personal testimony is the most potent type of motivational education.

And the administration of these health protection clinics, hopefully, would involve the local health department, the local hospital, and local physicians in a tangible cooperative venture that could draw preventive and curative medicine much closer together, something that can't be done by speeches.

For generations emphasis was placed on clinical medicine. Following World War II several fortuitous scientific and political factors converged to bring about an amazing expansion in basic research. Through both these eras prevention, application, and public health stood by watching, support lacking.

In typically American fashion the pendulum had to swing far to one side before swinging back. Now the shelves are brimming with unused medical discoveries and techniques. And enlightened congressional leaders like yourself are evidencing more awareness of this fact than the medical profession itself.

Perhaps then, with this type of support, health protection centers can be developed, effective local health departments can be financed, and the dividends from the billions of dollars expended on basic research can finally be used for the full benefit of people.

Sincerely yours,

A. L. Chapman, M.D.,
Assistant Surgeon General (Retired),
U.S. Public Health Service.

State of New Jersey,
Department of Health,
Trenton, N.J., December 6, 1965.

Hon. Harrison A. Williams, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: Your proposal to establish health protection centers is bold and stimulating. Your presentation to the Senate was masterful.

The logic of periodic examinations is clear. It is strange that the mechanism is used so little.

I have been interested in "multiphasic screening" for a long while, but have had very limited success. My enthusiasm has waned, but could readily be revived.

The Kaiser Foundation pilot program should provide new understanding with respect to yields, acceptance and use by people and costs per remediable defect found. I have not seen papers coming out of the Kaiser project. I notice that in Dr. Collen's letter, which you quoted, he said that conclusive statistical data were not then available.

We do fairly well in diabetes detection in New Jersey, but are having a hard time on cervical cancer testing. The latter is expensive as it is now done. Additional Federal dollars are about to be put into cervical cytology and several New Jersey hospitals are applying for grants.

There certainly should be more large, carefully operated and evaluated programs such as you proposed.

Sincerely,

Roscoe P. Kandle, M.D.,
State Commissioner of Health.

Health Insurance Plan of
Greater New York,
New York, N.Y., December 9, 1965.

Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: We are interested in your proposed legislation to establish health protection centers.

As a nonprofit organization with 31 medical groups providing comprehensive medical care to more than 700,000 men, women, and children in the Greater New York area, we are continually seeking better and more efficient ways of providing medical care. We are eagerly awaiting the findings of the large-scale mass screening experiment by the Permanente medical groups in Oakland and San Francisco.

We are currently establishing a centralized clinical laboratory where chemical, bacteriological, cytological, and tissue specimens may be brought from all of our 31 medical groups and where automated equipment will be used and highly skilled personnel will be employed. Such a laboratory, working in connection with health protection centers such as you propose, would be ideal.

We are also under contract with the National Cancer Institute studying mammography as a possible method of early detection of breast cancer and through which it is hoped that the mortality rate from this disease will be decreased. Thirty thousand of our subscribers are in the study group and 30,000 are in a control group.

For several years we have worked on various methods of early detection of glaucoma and have trained nurses and technicians in the performance of this delicate test.

We all have much more to learn about early detection of diseases and how to apply the many new advances being made in this field.

HIP has long supported progressive health legislation and your letter leads me to believe that your proposal is one we would wish to support. We would like to work with the Public Health Service and the Department of Health of New York City in establishing a model health protection center in New York City.

Sincerely yours,

James Brindle,
President.

State of California, Department
of Public Health,
Berkeley, Calif., January 13, 1966.

Hon. Harrison A. Williams, Jr.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Williams: Thank you for your letter of November 23, 1965, concerning a proposed health maintenance program for adults. We would appreciate any information you can supply about the bill presently being drafted to establish centers for disease detection.

Multiphasic screening for early detection of disease has received a considerable amount of attention in California for many years. Our first report of such a program was published in 1949.[1] The accumulated literature has now become very extensive.

The Commission on Chronic Illness in 1957 described screening as "the application of screening tests rapidly and economically to large population groups, to identify persons who probably have abnormalities so that they can be referred for diagnosis and, if indicated, for medical care."[2] Screening is not a substitute for comprehensive medical examinations. Rather, its immediate objective is to identify persons who, though unaware of a health problem, are likely to be benefited by prompt medical evaluation and care. There is a real need for careful evaluation of the possible contribution of multiphasic screening to health. Several years ago we encouraged Dr. Morris F. Collen, director, medical methods research, the Permanente Medical Group, Oakland, Calif., to undertake such a study.

With financial support from Public Health Service grants, Dr. Collen and his staff started this important research in 1962. The principal objective is "to evaluate multiphasic screening as to its effectiveness in the prevention of illness, and in the reduction of morbidity and morality." Several members of the California State Department of Public Health serve this endeavor in an advisory capacity and regard it as one of the most important current studies in the entire field of chronic diseases.

The present results of Dr. Collen's research leads us to believe that 5 to 10 more projects of the same magnitude should be undertaken promptly. Your proposed bill would permit this development. Then we would be better equipped to judge whether multiphasic screening programs merit vastly increased support. Convincing evidence of the value of several screening tests already exists and these should be widely utilized in screening programs; for others the evidence is either tenuous or nonexistent and they should be further studied.

Our experience in promotion and development of screening programs indicates the importance of adapting each endeavor to the special interests, needs and capabilities of the community being served. Efforts to introduce comprehensive sophisticated programs will succeed in some areas but not in others. In the latter case it is far better to begin on a modest scale that is acceptable and feasible. Both situations require extensive planning and preparation. Participation of local physicians, paramedical personnel and related official and voluntary health agencies is essential.

You raised the question of a minimum age of eligibility for multiphasic screening. We feel that there should be no arbitrary age limitation. Though in general the yield of newly detected disease is higher among older persons, it is not always so. For example, amblyopia ex anopsia ("lazy eye") is a disease of early childhood. The best opportunity for correction of this significant cause of blindness arises when it is detected and treated before the patient is 5 years old. The most efficient screening programs direct their attention primarily to segments of the population with high prevalence of the condition to be detected. Age is an important but by no means the only factor used to identify such populations.

---

[1] Canelo, C. K., Bissell, D. M., Abrams, H. and Breslow, L.: A multiphasic screening survey in San Jose, Calif. Med. 71:409–413 (Dec.) 1949.

[2] Commission on Chronic Illness: Chronic Illness in the United States, Vol. I, Prevention of Chronic Illness. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press for the Commonwealth Fund, 1957. p. 47.

We hope these comments will be helpful. Please do not hesitate to call on us if we can be of further assistance.

Very sincerely yours,

LESTER BRESLOW, M.D.,
Director of Public Health.

[From the Medical Tribune, Jan. 8, 1966]

HYPERTENSION: NEGLECT IN PREVENTION AND TREATMENT

Although it is widely held that medical science now has the means of lowering the blood pressure of most hypertensive individuals, it is questionable whether physicians are successfully using available techniques for a significant part of the patient population.

In connection with a review of recent epidemiologic studies of hypertension, Drs. Oglesby Paul, professor of medicine at Northwestern University Medical School, and Adrian M. Ostfeld, professor of preventive medicine at the University of Illinois College of Medicine, observed that in their own experience "all too often inadequate and only short-term medication has been prescribed without adequate followup."

Field studies in Michigan, Illinois, Georgia, and Massachusetts indicate that in the United States the prevalence of high blood pressure runs to several million at the present time. But while the death rate from hypertensive diseases appears to be declining, the role of the medical profession in bringing this about is uncertain, according to the review.

One serious aspect of the problem, Dr. Paul told Medical Tribune, is that busy physicians still tend to concern themselves with acute illness rather than with long-term preventive measures in noninfectious chronic disease.

"Prevention is becoming part of everyday medicine," said Dr. Paul, a former president of the American Heart Association, "but not in the field of hypertension, where it is relatively neglected. Physicians apparently have not thought too much about the effect of hypertension from the point of view of long-term application of available therapy."

He cited a study in Baldwin County, Ga., where only 30 percent of the known hypertensives were found to be under treatment and where the blood pressure of no more than 14 percent was considered to be adequately controlled. His own unpublished data along the same lines led him to suspect that the Baldwin County situation "might be true all over," Dr. Paul said. Improvement may be looked for, he added, only when asymptomatic patients and their physicians become sufficiently concerned about future trouble to interest themselves in continued followthrough treatment.

In their review, Drs. Paul and Ostfeld conceded that data on differing methods of managing hypertension are limited by varying diagnostic criteria and lack of true controls. They said that better statistics than are now in hand are difficult to get and may, in fact, never be obtained because of reluctance to interrupt treatment of severely hypertensive individuals. However, they pointed to a report by Dr. A. W. D. Leishman, of the Royal Infirmary, Sheffield, England, that over a 5-year period management of patients with ganglion-blocking agents or guanethidine cut the probability of death to from one-third to one-sixth that of comparable patients who received no hypotensive drugs. Comparison was made only between patients originally presenting with diastolic pressure of 120 mm. Hg or higher.

Findings of epidemiologic investigations generally accepted, said Drs. Paul and Ostfeld, include the increased frequency of hypertension in the Negro, with mortality from hypertensive diseases among nonwhites in all parts of the United States running more than double the rate of whites. Other studies show a concentration of higher pressures among the obese, the middle aged, and the elderly. Still others reveal the importance of genetic influences in hypertension, although the degree of importance remains a subject of lively controversy.

The Framingham study, the review noted, has demonstrated that from age 30 to past 60 increasing morbidity and mortality from cardiovascular disease appears to be associated with rising levels of blood pressure, systolic or diastolic. Other apparent factors in the prevalence of high blood pressure, they also concluded, are rapid cultural change and social conflict. On the other hand, there is less agreement in studies on the part played by renal infection, dietary salt, or the hardness or softness of drinking water.

It was pointed out that while cigarette smoking does not appear to be a cause of hypertension, it would be wise for hypertensive patients to avoid the practice. "Cigarette smoking by persons with high blood pressure appreciably increases the risk of coronary heart disease," the report said, "and our data demonstrate this additional risk in striking fashion."

[From PHS World, February 1966]

AUTOMATED PHYSICAL

Computers have joined the ranks of paramedical personnel. Thanks to these automated aides, a rapid, thorough, accurate, and inexpensive health examination may soon be available to everyone. Developed by the Kaiser Foundation Research Institute of Oakland, Calif., with PHS support, the "multiphasic health checkup" features an electronic laboratory capable of completing in 2 hours test procedures that would require 2 days by conventional methods.

The automated checkup is being used by the Permanente Medical Group, an association of close to 1,000 physicians that offers comprehensive medical care to bay area subscribers to the Kaiser Foundation Health Plan.

Medical and health authorities hold that much of the disability now afflicting some 74 million Americans might have been prevented if they had had periodic checkups. But such examinations are tedious and expensive, and most people—lulled by their feeling of relative well-being—figure that what they don't know won't hurt them. Moreover, the average physician's waiting room is so crowded with sick patients that he has little time for those who are supposedly well.

The Permanente approach promises to solve this impassé through automation and electronic data processing. A comprehensive prediagnostic workup, featuring the results of more than 30 tests and procedures, is available to the examining physician minutes after its completion. He is thus able to confine his efforts to specialty examinations which require his professional skill.

The first phase of the examination, which is now being given some 40,000 Permanente subscribers annually, consists of a self-administered family and personal medical history of 600 questions. The answers yield information on health habits and apparently minor abnormalities, often provide clues to the development of "silent disease."

About 200 of the questions, requiring only true-false responses, are printed on individual prepunched IBM cards. The patients drops each of these cards into one of two boxes marked "true" or "false." Answers to the remaining 400 questions are keypunched for data processing.

Phase 2 consists of an elaborate battery of automated tests (14 blood chemistries, X-rays, hearing and vision, urine analysis, electrocardiogram, tonometry, etc.). Results are processed immediately and collated with phase 1 data, creating a prediagnostic information package for the internist.

Phase 3 consists of a series of examinations performed or evaluated by physician specialists: proctosigmoidoscopy, mammography, retinal photography, cervical cytology.

The checkup concludes with the printout of a provisional diagnosis by a computer previously programed by the examining internists.

Continual correlation of symptoms with diagnoses insures continued growth in the program's diagnostic capabilities. Dr. Morris F. Collen, director of Permanente's medical methods research, makes this prediction of the program's potential: "Diagnosis is defined as the identification of a specific disease * * * as screening becomes more comprehensive, precise, and quantitative, disease detection approximates disease diagnosis and automated multiple screening approaches automated diagnosis."

The costs of this comprehensive 2-hour examination are an estimated $25 per patient. Dr. Collen suggests that these costs could be duplicated by any group examining 1,000 or more patients monthly.

An unusual feature of the checkup is its emphasis on the individual—the chemical levels of body fluids and physiological responses to disease and stress differ from patient to patient. The determination of individual test norms permits more definitive diagnosis of borderline cases.

For example, a simple pressure test determines the patient's reaction to pain and allows the physician to assay the value of a subjective statement such as "I have a slight chest pain." This pain-action index may later be coupled with a personality test to predict the probable frequency and duration of hospitalization.

How do patients like this cool, mechanized medicine? They like it. They find that the technicians, nurses, and medical specialists manning the test stations have, thanks to automation, the time to explain the tests and their purpose.

The far-reaching implications of automated disease detection are reflected in a bill scheduled for presentation to the Senate by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Democrat, of New Jersey. Called the Adult Health Protection Act of 1966, the measure proposes Federal grants for the establishment and operation of health protection centers. The centers would offer a series of basic diagnostic tests to people 50 or above on a voluntary basis, with center personnel using automated or semiautomated equipment.

[From Business Week]

DIAGNOSIS BY COMPUTER SPEEDS HEART CHECKUP

(A new electronics system for analyzing electrocardiograms in minutes uses a central information bank that will someday help doctors anywhere to spot heart attacks in time.)

Doctors have one device that's a two-edged sword in the fight against heart attacks. The electrocardiogram helps them (1) spot and correct conditions that are likely to lead to an attack, and (2) diagnose the damage done after a heart attack strikes. But analyzing an electrocardiogram most often turns out to be a long—and costly—business, at a time when speed is vital.

Now a system for analyzing electrocardiograms by computer is in operation, and promises to save countless lives. Further, the day is fast approaching when a complete heart disease profile of the Nation will be computer-recorded, and available for research, clinical analysis, and consultation by any doctor.

The new computer system was demonstrated last week in New York at a meeting of the State County Officers Association. The demonstration was conducted by Control Data Corps., of Minneapolis, the U.S. Public Health Service, and the New York State Health Department. During it, about 750 men and women attending the meeting had their EGG's taken and analyzed by Control Data's 160-A system.

TAKING THE TEST

In an atmosphere similar to that of a hospital clinic, the officials stretched out on beds while technicians fastened electrodes to their arms, wrists, and chests. The electrodes led to a standard ECG machine, with tape recorder attached, that was developed by Computer Instruments Corp., of Hempstead, N.Y. From the recorder, a dataphone transmitted the information by long distance telephone line to a tape receiver and computer at George Washington University.

In Washington, the computer took 20 seconds to compare the incoming ECG with thousands of similar cases stored in its memory. In 3 minutes and 4 seconds, the heart's ability to transmit electrically, discharge, recharge, and drive itself had been determined and printed electronically in New York. The computer also sent back the average number of heart beats per minute, and gave a brief written analysis of the data.

LOWERING COSTS

The applications of a system like this are vast. Approximately 35 million electrocardiograms are taken in the United States each year. They cost the patient $10 to $15 each. With electronic analysis, the patient pays only $1.50 to $2. This is because analysis is the most costly part of an ECG.

What lower cost means is that someday everyone in the United States will be able to afford an ECG on a routine basis. According to Dr. Cesar A Caceres, chief of the instrumentation field station of the PHS, if such system could be used regionally—to serve the whole Northeast, for example—individual ECG cost might drop to as low as 5 cents.

CURRENT USE

Caceres estimates the control data system and related equipment represents an investment of $250,000 to $500,000. A modified system was introduced just 7 weeks ago at Hartford (Conn.) General Hospital. Caceres says: "Now we think it's feasible for community use. Now it's a matter of people and money."

PHS officials see the system as particularly valuable for the doctor who isn't a heart specialist. No matter how isolated he may be, says PHS, he can tap by phone a store of cardiovascular knowledge that has been compiled by hundreds of scientists over many years.

THE FUTURE

ECG analysis is only the first of a series of computer screening programs whose use the PHS plans to encourage.

Coming up for computer analysis are spirograms, which record the chest sounds important in diagnosing such problems, as bronchitis and emphysema; phonocardiograms, which record heart sounds; electroencephalograms, which record electrical impulses given off by the brain, and other tests.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 3, 1966]

Medical Repackaging Urged

(What kind of long-range thinking is shaping the Great Society? President Johnson says that one of the most important aspects of the Great Society is the health of its people. The following interview with one of the President's advisers in medicine and health reports the goals that are being developed for his consideration in this field. This is one of a series of interviews with Presidential advisers on the Great Society program.)

(By Robert Cahn)

New York.—A broadening view of the role of public health and medicine in its relation to American society is under discussion as part of the long-range planning of the Johnson administration.

As seen by one of the leading thinkers in this field, the present situation is like this:

If it were possible to establish an ideal system, from the viewpoint of the medical profession, it would provide universal access for everyone to comprehensive medical service. Emphasis would be on preventive medicine and on a continuous effort to identify and treat disease at the earliest moment.

The object would be the broadest possible: a useful and satisfied human being as well as a healthy body.

However the medical system of today grew up on a less coordinated basis. So it is regarded as more realistic to improve it in the direction of wider goals than to attempt, at present, to redesign and rebuild the system.

ADVISER QUOTED

These conclusions are those of Dr. George James, an adviser to President Johnson on health and medical programs.

In his interview with this newspaper, Dr. James made clear he was not outlining official White House policy.

He does speak, however, as an authority with 25 years' experience in public health. He was a 1965 Bronfman Prize winner for work in public health. And he only recently resigned as commissioner of health for New York City to start a new medical school, which he will direct, at Mount Sinai Medical Center, New York.

Dr. James says the highest priority need is for pilot projects to try out new ways of doing things, or bringing together the pieces of the fragmented medical care system.

"The Federal Government could encourage and support such projects on a contract basis, as is done in Defense," says Dr. James.

"Instead of having the Federal Government taking only a judicial role of setting aside large sums of money and asking people to compete for them, or establishing large, uniform, set programs, why not have more money available for demonstration projects in comprehensive, high-quality medical care, sponsored, originated, or developed by the Federal Government?

"We need to find new ways of delivering this comprehensive medical care. Then for the ones that prove effective, a steady improvement in the quality of care of our large medicare-type programs can be effected.

"The premium would be on constantly improving the quality of care, rather than uniformity."

Dr. James says it is of overall importance to get continuous treatment for as many people as possible in the formative stages of disease, the stages before it is ordinarily discovered.

He admits he does not have a ready solution for getting this done in a free society.

"I don't think the way to get people to go to clinics is to scare the daylights out of them," Dr. James says.

Nor does he believe the answer is in compulsion or getting court orders so that everyone is required to have medical attention.

"Somewhere along the line in trying to get high-quality, comprehensive health and medical service made available to all, we have to watch that this does not disturb other values in our democratic society."

OBSTACLE SEEN

Dr. James sees the overemphasis on specialization in the delivery of health services as a deterrent to reaching what he says should be the primary health goal of the Nation: universal access to high-quality comprehensive health and medical services. And this goal is related to the overall desire to reduce to as near zero as possible the useless periods in human life.

"We need to teach and practice medicine according to the way things are, not the way we would like them to exist," Dr. James says. "The conditions that people have are not necessarily the things that medicine today is most interested in. Medicine is not as interested in geriatrics [care for the elderly] or dealing with ambulatory cases, for instance, as it is in specialized acute diseases.

FOUR STAGES LISTED

"In lower Manhattan, there are three medical centers where an indigent person can get open-heart surgery," he continued. "But until recently there was not a single place where the same indigent man could have his teeth fixed. This was because the medical practitioners were doing what they wanted, not what was needed.

For the first part of the goal—"universal access"—Dr. James says the need includes better ways to make health and medical services available to everyone.

This would mean repackaging health services. It might be opening a clinic in an apartment house in a poor area. It might be educating people to the needs they have for treatment. Or it might be something as simple as making it possible for people to get medical help without having to climb stairs or take a taxi.

In defining the term "high-quality comprehensive health and medical services," Dr. James outlines the case for the philosophy that the natural history of disease goes through four stages, and should be attacked in all of these phases.

Stage No. 1 is the environment or genetic patterns believed to be the causes of disease. Too little attention is given to this stage, he says.

PREVENTION STRESSED

"Anything that anybody can do to interrupt the history of disease in favor of the patient is preventive medicine, medical care, and public health," Dr. James says.

"For instance, the best surgeon in the finest operating room may save—if he is fortunate—1 out of 20 lung-cancer patients. But if we could keep children from starting smoking, we could save most of the 20 from that disease.

"So maybe a seventh-grade schoolteacher who could prevent the children in her class from ever starting smoking—if she could do that—would do more to control lung cancer than the greatest chest surgeon in the world."

Dr. James defines the second stage of disease as preclinical—when it has started, but has not been discovered. The hope of the medical profession here is for having the patient come for care even when he believes he is well. And during the visit to a clinic or hospital, the patient could be given tests to disclose diseases that were starting. Also a continuous record of his physical condition could be kept.

IMPACT WEIGHED

Dr. James asserts that when much of our major disease reaches stage 3—clinical treatment—probably it is too late.

"Of the 20 leading causes of death, modern medical science has demonstrated its ability to make a major impact on the trend of only a few of them," he says. "And among the leading causes of disability, medical science has, to my knowledge, made a major impact on none of them.

"The great need here," he maintains, "is to develop better techniques of treating disease, finding out more about it, and putting to the fullest application everything we know."

Dr. James says that medical care should be continuous, rather than episodic as at present, and should also be patient centered and family centered. Ideally, he says, one doctor or one team should follow through with one person or a family. Even if the patient has to go to a specialist other than the team, Dr. James urges, records should be kept in a central place with the team.

Dr. James describes the fourth stage as the restoration of functions, allowing the individual to lead as normal a life as possible if a cure is not obtained, or if the individual is elderly.

SOCIAL WORK USEFUL

"This area has been studied less than anything else," says Dr. James. "No medical center can be said to practice high-quality medical care if within its community any significant number of people are not receiving adequate care."

But more than treatment in a hospital or clinic is required, says Dr. James.

"It is debatable whether the doctor is the best captain of the team for this stage. What we are after is restoration of the function. The social worker, for instance, might be more useful than the doctor in encouraging an elderly man to get out of his house and become useful again.

"The goal of extending life expectancy from 70 to 75 years is really a short-term goal. There is more to life than adding 5 years."

[From the International Conference on Health and Health Education, Philadelphia, Pa., July 3, 1962]

THE HOSPITAL—AN INSTRUMENT FOR HEALTH EDUCATION

(By Morris Barrett, M.P.H., Director of Health Education, the Lankenau Hospital)

Except for the hazards incident to the war, human life today is longer and healthier than ever before in the history of the world. Science has unraveled the mystery of one disease after another and the application of science has led to disease control until we can almost proclaim that anyone may have good health if he will follow the established rules of hygiene.

Certain chronic illnesses, accidents, mental problems, and social and economic conditions are as yet not within our control. But the health of most of us could be materially improved and our pleasure of living increased if we could only live a little more intelligently.

The basic enemies that have plagued man throughout history; namely, ignorance, disease, and poverty need no longer take their toll of lives and sickness with the greater application of health knowledge.

But can people be induced to be intelligent concerning health? There is abundant evidence that they will blindly follow fads which promise health of body or mind and that they will pour fortunes into the laps of unscrupulous charlatans who offer them panaceas for everything under the sun. But will they think? Have they the full strength of mind to look critically at their health prejudices, hobbies, and fads? We rarely worry about the things we understand, and we seldom understand the things we usually worry about.

In spite of the increases in the average length of life and the expectancy of life at birth, society has not learned to adjust and meet the problems created by the exploding population, especially the aged. Life in the later years may be spent in a futile effort to perpetuate and cling to youth or it may contain the richest, fullest, most productive years man has ever dreamed. We are on the threshold of conquering many of the chronic diseases of man, including our knowledge of the human cell itself. We are on the threshold of rocketing the biological limits of man to 100 years of age and more. An overall view of public health shows that never before have our new health frontiers expanded at a greater pace.

But, however we look at the matter, the fact remains that new approaches and new tools must be developed to combat the health problems of tomorrow, undreamed of but a decade ago. With the advent of jet transportation, and rapid communication, the horizon of medicine and public health is no longer limited to the local or even national level. Today it extends out to the international scene and perhaps, not too many years from now, we may be reaching interplanetary communities.

Lankenau Hospital has long believed that a modern community hospital, beyond its primary purpose of providing treatment, has the responsibility to serve as a dynamic center of information on the utilization of medical science for maintaining positive health—for staying well and keeping out of the hospital.

In order for a hospital to be more than a repair center, it must develop an entirely new concept and function in its service to the community. Hospitals today should engage qualified public health educators to widen and improve the scope of their program. This will require a complete reorientation and education of board members, administrators, doctors and nurses, and other hospital personnel.

A hospital with a firsthand knowledge of the facilities and services which contribute to health education in its community will undoubtedly provide a more effective service for its patients and their families. A hospital is one place within the community where the public should be able to get accurate information about health maintenance. The hospital with an alert staff should answer questions about detection, diagnosis and treatment of disease, for the rehabilitation and reemployment of patients and assistance for their families. Also, the hospital should serve as a source of referral on health education matters for schools, industry, adult groups, civic organizations, and health and welfare agencies.

In addition to serving as an information center, the hospital should use all available channels of communication such as newspapers, radio and television to make the facts about health available to the public.

Health education can be a word in a hospital program, or health education can be a dynamic, moving force upon which to build. The program, to be effective, must be positive and simple, it should emphasize the "do's" rather than the "don'ts," and should be aimed at specific groups and needs; must lead to action; and eventually should embrace the health problems of the community.

Health is a relative term meaning different things to different people. To the sick, it means getting well. To the well person, its value is preventing sickness and achieving a fuller, richer life. To the general public, health is desired for its contribution to fundamental human wants. A health education program does not say "Do this and you will be healthy." It must relate action to more specific and immediate objectives of the individual, family, and community.

In the changing hospital of today, we must develop dramatic and effective methods of communication which will influence human behavior, develop habits of thought and action, reach the unreachables, and create and maintain a family and community consciousness of optimal health.

There are two major problems facing communities today in the health area. First, the ever-widening bridge between scientific health knowledge and the application of knowledge by the home, school, hospital, and community; and second, the problem of the widening and more complex structure which further abstracts community action and citizen participation for effective planning and progress.

The White House Conference on Children and Youth, held in 1960, voiced strong support for improved health education emphasis in America's schools. Of strategic importance are the recommendations urging that the curriculum provide opportunities for all children and youth, regardless of residence, color, creed, or economic or social situation, to develop a healthy and realistic concept of self and to develop the best possible physical and mental health. The challenge facing health and physical educators is to increase the impact of all health teaching, whenever it may appear in the curriculum. The hospital should be prepared to make a significant contribution in achieving this goal.

The U.S. Public Health Service reported recently that because of broad public failure to implement new research findings, each year 40,000 persons die of cancer, 20,000 die of rheumatic heart diseases, and millions more suffer needlessly from other ailments. It is a costly timelag. And, combined with inadequate health education, it may well signify one of society's greatest waste.

The end of health education is not the spreading of facts about health. If this were our objective, the job would be rather simple. The goal is to motivate people, to help them help themselves and others. Knowledge of health, is but the first step in assuring a favorable influence upon behavior.

Over the years, programs of health education have broadened and changed in character. Particularly significant has been the inclusion of what might be called the positive approach. This stresses the maintenance of health rather than avoidance of illness. Inasmuch as the borderline between health and disease is vague, educational programs designed to provide action should be meaningful, specific, and positive.

Lankenau Hospital's health education program is directed to serve three main groups: the hospital, the schools and the community. Its primary purpose is to increase the impact of health teaching and knowledge, so that children and adults will be motivated to practice good health habits and assist in the improvement of community health.

The role of a community hospital to develop a program for positive health is now being practiced at Lankenau Hospital. Its expansion and growth will undoubtedly occur over the next few years. It will serve and is serving now as a laboratory to investigate, experiment and implement health education processes. The need to take the ever-increasing scientific knowledge which is being stored away in medical journals and textbooks and apply it to everyday living becomes the major challenge of health education.

Planning a hospital health education program is not a simple task nor is there a blueprint to follow. The composition and nature of the program will depend upon the energy, planning, leadership and resourcefulness of the hospital personnel involved. Toward this end Lankenau Hospital has made an excellent beginning.

REMARKS ON SLIDES SHOWN IN CONNECTION WITH DR. BARRETT'S REMARKS

1. The following pictures (not printed in the RECORD) highlight some of Lankenau's services as an instrument for health education:

2. Expectant parents classes are offered as a community service by the Lankenau health education program. These classes are sponsored by members of the obstetrical and pediatric departments. To date, almost 2,500 couples have attended these classes.

3. Lankenau can demonstrate the strides it has made in eliminating the hazards of infants with its well baby clinic. The periodic examination of youngsters is an outstanding service in promoting better health for mothers and children.

4. The immunization program has helped pioneer the development of new vaccines. Lankenau Hospital played a significant role in the new measles vaccine.

5. The diabetes program not only treats the many victims of this disease, but also

carries out educational activities. Programs on good nutrition, exercise, and rest help the diabetic live a normal and productive life.

6. The child guidance clinic is another unique service showing Lankenau's concern for children. This valuable resource is a much needed prevention program for youngsters involved with emotional and mental problems.

7. The teenager has been a neglected person in hospital programs. Lankenau's new adolescent unit, the first in any Philadelphia hospital, now provides special inpatient care and outpatient services for this age group. This unit is called Teen Towne.

8. If the patient's operation is complex and his condition requires constant observation, he will be placed in an intensive care unit, Lankenau's latest step in progressive patient care.

9. The health examination service is intended to encourage well people to recognize the importance of periodic health examinations, and to detect any abnormal condition as early as possible.

10. For the early detection of cancer and other diseases, Lankenau's cancer detection center helps patients discover this disease in time to treat it most effectively.

11. Lankenau Hospital offers a special counseling service for problem drinkers. In addition to helping the victim with his drinking problem, marital problems are often resolved.

12. The focal point of Lankenau's health education program is the health museum; the only one of its kind in any American hospital. Each year over 50,000 schoolchildren and adults visit this exciting program. A popular adjunct to the health museum is Pandora, a transparent, life-size figure.

13. One of the most important contributions of Lankenau's health education department is the sponsorship of health education conferences and forums, designed to supply the community with the latest health information on preventive medicine and research findings.

14. Groups visiting the hospital are invited to see entertaining and instructive pictures from Lankenau's excellent library of films and health topics.

15. In the area of physical fitness, Lankenau Hospital has pioneered in the most comprehensive physical fitness study made in the United States since the 1938 Boston survey. Also, Lankenau's studies in the problems of aging concern themselves with the medical, social, economic, and recreational needs of this group.

16. A new community program being planned is the medical health career service for schools in this area. This will provide a practical experience in hospital service to senior high school students interested in pursuing a career in medicine or other allied fields.

BASIC COMPENSATION OF TEACHERS AND TEACHING POSITIONS UNDER DEFENSE DEPARTMENT OVERSEAS TEACHERS PAY AND PERSONNEL PRACTICES ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6845) to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MONRONEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Senators MONRONEY, YARBOROUGH, RANDOLPH, CARLSON, and FONG conferees on the part of the Senate.

A SECOND FRONT IN THE WAR ON HUNGER—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 488

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on February 10 President Johnson sent to Congress a message concerning a war on hunger. The bill embodying these proposals, S. 2933, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], contains three programs.

Title I authorizes the sale of agricultural commodities both for foreign currencies and for dollars on credit terms. This title specifies that the President shall take into account efforts of countries to help themselves toward a greater degree of self-reliance.

Title II authorizes the donation of agricultural commodities for such purposes as to meet emergency food needs for victims of disasters, to provide food for work, community development programs, and to carry out the United States pledge to the world food program.

Title III provides that currencies which accrue from foreign currency sales shall be deposited to the credit of the United States to be used for such purposes as financing U.S. expenses abroad, developing new markets for U.S. agricultural commodities, procuring military equipment for common defense, promoting economic development, financing educational exchange programs, making loans to U.S. firms for business development and trade expansion, and financing research.

I stand solidly behind the high-minded purposes of this legislation, as stated so eloquently by President Johnson in his message to Congress.

The world faces severe food shortages in the decade ahead, as many experts have pointed out, unless we are willing to take steps now to meet the coming challenge.

The problem exists primarily in the underdeveloped areas of the world, where populations are growing much more rapidly than the supply of food can be expanded.

Historically, traditional societies expanded food production along with population by expanding the acreage under cultivation. Today, however, many densely populated underdeveloped countries have little new land that can be brought under cultivation. Studies show that increased production in the future must increasingly come from higher yields per acre. This method of increasing food production is vastly more difficult than the traditional method. It requires a reasonably high level of literacy, capital, a "market oriented" economy, and support from the rest of the economy in the form of fertilizers, insecticides, and other products. These are precisely the things that are lacking in the underdeveloped regions of the world.

The food for freedom bill will enable us to assist underdeveloped land in developing some of these "preconditions for a yield per acre takeoff."

However, let us consider what would happen if we were successful beyond our wildest dreams, if we could raise yields in the underdeveloped lands at the same rate at which they are increasing in the developed areas. The French have raised wheat yields 2.3 percent per year. This is one of the most successful performances in Europe, and when compared with the French population increase of 1 percent per year, has meant real progress in France. But the French performance would not have been adequate had it been confronted with population growth rates as high as those which prevail in many underdeveloped countries.

Or take the United States as an example. We have raised wheat yields 2.7 percent per year from 1935–39 to 1960–62. When combined with our 1.7 percent rate of population growth this gives us a net gain in output per capita of 1 percent. If this rate of wheat yield increase had been achieved in Brazil, with a population increase of 3.1 percent per year, however, output per capita would have declined.

Let me now quote briefly from page 20 of "World Population and Food Supplies, 1980," published by the American Society of Agronomy. This gives an even more revealing picture of what would happen should we bring the rate of growth of production in underdeveloped lands up to that in developed areas:

> Consider these facts. The agricultural land resources of the two economic regions (developed and underdeveloped) are approximately the same. The 1960 population of the developed world was less than 0.9 billion, that of the less developed world was more than 2 billion. The projected increase between 1960 and 2000 for the developed world, according to the United Nations medium level projections, is 0.4 billion and that for the less developed world is nearly 3 billion.
>
> Now let us interchange the projected growth in population of the two regions. The developed world would then absorb the 3 billion and the less developed world, the 0.4 billion. The United States, with about one-fourth of the agricultural land resources of the developed world, could expect to accommodate one-fourth of the 3 billion total (750 million). This amounts to an addition of about 190 million per decade—roughly the equivalent of our current population every 10 years.
>
> What would happen to our food consumption levels under these circumstances? Our standard of living? Our educational system? The level of employment? But we are much better prepared to absorb increases of this magnitude than are the less developed regions. We have the capital, the agricultural and industrial technology, and the high levels of literacy and education. And we have a much more favorable land-man ratio to begin with.

This statement alone illustrates that the United States with all its riches could not stand the rate of population growth now taking place in the underdeveloped world. Thus we cannot escape the fact that even if we bring the growth of food production in these underdeveloped areas up to what it is in the developed half of the world, we will still be fighting a losing battle in the war against poverty and famine. Losing, that is, unless we do something about the other half of the equation—population growth.

President Johnson recognized this problem when he said in his message to Congress:

> A balance between agricultural productivity and population is necessary to prevent the shadow of hunger from becoming a nightmare of famine.

With this bill we are going to be investing substantial amounts in economic development. In his 20th anniversary message to the United Nations President Johnson stated:

> Let us act on the fact that less than $5 invested in population control is worth $100 invested in economic growth.

When experts tell us how difficult, indeed almost impossible, it will be to bring increases in food production in underdeveloped areas up to the level of increases in population, it makes no sense to spend millions of dollars to feed all these additional hungry mouths unless we also render assistance to allow individuals, if they choose to do so, to exert some measure of rational choice over just how many additional hungry mouths we shall have to feed every year. We must look to the causes of our problem; if we treat only the effects we shall never win our battle.

I am therefore proposing two amendments to the food for freedom bill. The first amendment would add the provision of "family planning services" to the items that the President shall take into account as evidence of self-help on the part of the recipient nation.

The second amendment would allow not less than 15 percent of the currencies which accrue from foreign currency sales to be used for "financing programs emphasizing maternal, child health and nutrition, and family planning services, and research activities related to the problems of population growth." This part of my amendment is similar to one discussed in the House on February 21 by Representative PAUL TODD of Michigan.

I believe that these two amendments would be very helpful in bringing into the picture the other side of the dual-natured enemy we are fighting. We must attack both the cause—population increasing faster than food supplies—and the effect—insufficient food to feed the population. What I suggest here is a limited step, a prudent step. Let us make this beginning.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendments lie at the desk through March 1 so that Senators who wish to add their names as cosponsors may do so. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendments be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The amendments (No. 488) were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

> On page 2, line 22, after "people" delete the comma and insert "and in providing family planning services,".
>
> On page 3, line 6, strike out "and" and insert in lieu thereof "(e) and (i)".
>
> On page 12, line 21, strike out "and".
>
> On page 13, line 4, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof "; and".
>
> On page 13, immediately after line 4, insert a new subsection (i):
>
> "For financing a program emphasizing maternal welfare, child health and nutrition, and family planning services, and research activities related to the problems of population growth, for which purpose not less than 15 percent of the currencies received in any country shall be reserved, to be made available, at the request of such country, under the procedures established by the President to carry out the foregoing provisions of this paragraph through any agency of the United States, or through any international agency or organization of which the United States is a member and which he determines is qualified to administer such activities."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 2892) to amend section 5(l) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide benefits for children of deceased railroad employees who are over the age of 17 and below the age of 22 and are attending an educational institution as full-time students, the name of the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESCHEDULING OF HEARING ON MILES W. LORD TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the public hearing scheduled for Wednesday, March 2, 1966, at 10:30 a.m., on the nomination of Miles W. Lord, of Minnesota, to be U.S. district judge, district of Minnesota, vice Dennis F. Donovan, retired, has been rescheduled for Wednesday, March 9, 1966, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 25, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1904) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Introductory remarks made by him when introducing Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, and her speech delivered before the American Road Builders National Convention, on February 23, 1966, at Denver, Colo.

STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA NOT SWAYED BY LEFT-WING PROPAGANDA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, within the last few days there have been two occurrences in the student body at the University of Florida at Gainesville, Fla., which indicate clearly that a vast majority of the students there are patriotic young Americans and are not being swayed in their convictions by the left-wing propaganda which is now underway at some other institutions of higher learning in our Nation.

The first such instance which I shall mention occurred on the weekend of February 12 and 13, 1966, when a tremendous patriotic mass student meeting greeted four returned veterans from Vietnam service and when both students and the citizens of the town showed every honor and encouragement to the four returned veterans. The story of the affair is well told in the Associated Press news article appearing in the St. Petersburg Times of Monday, February 14, entitled "The Boys Will Know and Be Proud." The facts are that upon hearing that the small minority of college students who do not support U.S. policy in Vietnam were planning an anti-Vietnam war protest march in downtown Gainesville on Saturday, February 12, the student body organized and carried out a counter demonstration entitled "Operation Appreciation" after securing through the armed services the presence of the four young service veterans just returned from Vietnam who are named in the article. According to the reports, the protest march of the small minority group attracted only about 20 of the university's 16,000 students, whereas practically the entire remainder of the student body turned out to do honor to the veterans from Vietnam and to express appreciation for their service and support of their comrades still fighting in Vietnam. I ask that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BOYS WILL KNOW—AND BE PROUD

GAINESVILLE.—"The guys in Vietnam will hear about this, and they'll be proud."

That was the reaction of 2d Lt. Edward W. Spinaio, 28, of Venice, Calif., to the honors being showered on him and three other combat veterans, as representatives of the GI's.

They are on the receiving end of Operation Appreciation, a 4-day affair sponsored by students at the University of Florida.

"You can't know how much we appreciate this," Spinaio said. "These people are our own age—they're our own generation. When they do something like this for us it means so much more than a political speech."

Enjoying the weekend with Spinaio are 2d Lt. Kenneth H. Carey, 24, of Green Cove Springs, Fla., 1st Lt. Orville Hengen, 23, of Rapid City, S. Dak., and 1st Lt. William R. Hill, 22, of Kenosha, Wis.

Saturday night the four veterans partied at the new quarter-million-dollar Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity house with their dates for the weekend, each one a campus beauty queen.

Wherever the soldiers have gone, they have been honored guests.

Gainesville merchants put them up in a plush hotel and loaned them new cars for their stay.

Bellboys and waiters refused tips.

They were greeted on the street by strangers wanting to shake their hands.

Sororities and fraternities spruced up weekend parties and competed for a few minutes of their time.

The men's dates included Miss University of Florida, Donna Berger, 19, of New Orleans, and two former university queens.

Spinaio said he plans to present University of Florida students with a treasured war memento—the battle flag of a Communist supply ship sunk in Bonrow Bay, February 19, 1965. Spinaio won a Bronze Star for his part in that operation.

A mass student meeting tonight will end the veterans' busy weekend. Student groups have promised to present the men with 200 pints of blood collected last week for the war effort.

Student body president, Bruce Culpepper, said Operation Appreciation was to show servicemen and citizens alike that only a small minority of college students do not support U.S. policy in Vietnam.

A longplanned antiwar protest march through downtown Gainesville Saturday attracted only about 20 of the university's 16,000 students.

The four Vietnam veterans were brought to the campus through the efforts of Culpepper with the aid of officials at Fort Bragg, N.C.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the second of the outstanding performances of the members of the student body at the University of Florida occurred at the polls on the university campus when there was a direct issue between the so-called Freedom Party and the majority group at the university. The Freedom Party candidate for president of the student body received 187 out of the some 8,500 votes which were cast. A year ago this same so-called Freedom Party had received nearly 900 votes. Apparently the vast majority of the young men and young women who are students at the University of Florida are thinking and acting soundly and as real Americans and I thought that the Congressional Record should convey this fact to other Senators and to the Nation as a whole. I regret the fact that the photographs appearing in the press of those who participated in the anti-war protest march—and in the effort to secure the presidency of the student body for a leftwing candidate—cannot be shown in the Congressional Record. These pictures show the typical bewhiskered, long-haired individuals among the participating male students. I shall not endeavor to describe the participating female students. I ask that the article from the Miami Herald of Tuesday, February 15, entitled "Students Rebuff Freedom Party at University of Florida" be copied into the Record at this time as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Students Rebuff Freedom Party at University of Florida

Gainesville, Fla.—A radical leftwing student political party was rebuffed at the polls by University of Florida students last week, apparently ending fears of a "Little Berkeley in the South."

Bushy-haired Alan Levin, 22-year-old philosophy major from Miami, collected only 187 votes as presidential candidate of the Freedom Party. Some 8,500 were cast.

One year ago his counterpart won nearly 900 votes.

Before the election, Levin had said it wouldn't be at all bad if the University of Florida took on the manners of the University of California at Berkeley, where mass student protest movements threw academic life into a turmoil after December 1964.

Levin and the Freedom Party campaigned to lift the university restrictions on student drinking, gambling, sexual activity, or "any such private moral decision."

The platform called for an end to discrimination in fraternities, ideological restrictions on campus clubs, and compulsory military training programs. It also asked free tuition and the availability of contraceptives.

Levin said he has some Marxist and some pacifist leanings, but stresses his identity as a "Camus rebel," after author Albert Camus. It means pursuit of freedom in every form, he says.

The election put an end to fears of a growing radical movement, but it did nothing to dissuade Freedom Party members in their activities.

With a sign stuck in the ground reading, "Florida Free Speech Area," Levin and Lucien Cross, 19, a heavily bearded sophomore from Miami, almost daily set up card tables on the lawn of the university library.

They sell or offer free antiwar literature.

Of a handful of card table proprietors which descended on the lawn last month with pamphlets on subjects ranging from legalizing marihuana to advocating civil rights, Levin and Cross are the only ones who defied an administration order to get merchandising permits or leave.

"This is a form of censorship and we feel it is unconstitutional," says Cross. They refuse to obtain a permit or quit selling their pamphlets, although a disciplinary committee is now considering what to do with them.

"I think before the trimester is over we'll be out," says Levin. "Because we didn't get many votes I'm afraid the administration will read into it that we aren't supported by the students and will have no compunction to expel us."

Dean of Students Lester Hale favors a free speech area. But he says Freedom Party members are forcing a confrontation in their refusal to get permits.

"As long as the students were expressing themselves in that area, they were acting entirely within the concept of academic freedom allowed on campus," he says. "When they began to sell things they came up against a longstanding policy prohibiting merchandising or sale without a permit."

He says most students are upset over the actions of the library nesters and consider it an intrusion on their rights.

"What they are asking is a lifting of all restrictions of all the mores of our society," says the dean.

Although Levin says Freedom Party includes some 35 to 40 hard-core student members, only about 20 students turned out for a Saturday morning antiwar protest march from the campus to the Alachua County Courthouse.

Some 6 or 8 clubs and movements work under the Freedom Party. With overlapping memberships, the organizations include the Gainesville Committee To End the War in Vietnam, the free speech movement, the Student Group for Equal Rights, Students for a Democratic Society, and the Student Peace Union.

The Freedom Party has as many nonstudent as student members. The party has used a ramshackle house, called the Freedom Forum, one block from the University of Florida campus, as headquarters. However, it was closed this winter.

"We didn't always have the money to pay the utilities bill, and it gets cold in there," says Bonni Greenspan, 20, a former University of Florida student from New York City.

A well-known name among party members is Dr. Ed Richer, a former humanities professor at the university dismissed last year after he was hailed for leading a civil rights march in Ocala.

Richer, a short, balding man of 37, is lobbying the administration for permission to sell a half dozen journals on campus. He says some are Communist and adds that he agrees with only one editorially.

"Whether we agree with them or not isn't the issue," says Cross. "We're asking the constitutional right of freedom of expression."

Levin sees victory in the defeat of the Freedom Party.

"This year we had a totally radical program, one without compromise at all. We consider the election basically an advance for the party, because those 187 voted for a recognized radical political philosophy."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as an alumnus of the University of Florida, I am indeed proud to report these facts to the Senate and to the people of the Nation.

I am also proud to report that a similar showing was made last week in Atlanta where my other alma mater, Emory University, showed, through its present students, exactly the same fine spirit of patriotism that was demonstrated at the University of Florida. I shall not endeavor to cover this matter in detail in the Record for the reason that I note from the press that both of our distinguished Senate colleagues from Georgia participated in the demonstration at Atlanta and I am sure that they have made or will make some report of the huge and enheartening rally of students not only from Emory, but from the other institutions of higher learning in the Atlanta area which the two Georgia Senators honored by their attendance and participation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there are no other Senators who wish to speak in the morning hour under the 3-minute limitation, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] may be allowed to speak for such time as he desires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Senator from Iowa is recognized.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the President and the Secretary of State have on several occasions told the people of the world why we are in Vietnam. They have made it clear beyond reasonable doubt that we are not there to obtain bases, for we have ample base facilities elsewhere in the Far East. We are not there to seek to preserve a colonial interest, as France once did. We are not there to invade and take territory away from North Vietnam.

We are there for the unselfish purpose of helping those less fortunate than ourselves to be free from Communist aggression and, with our assistance, to have a chance to build a better life for themselves. If materialism was the only guidepost of the people of the United States, we would not be there.

We are there because of our obligations under the treaty forming the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—SEATO—which was ratified by the U.S. Senate 82 to 1 in 1955, and, it might be noted, signed by the late Secretary of State and two Members of the Senate, including the present majority leader, in behalf of the United States. Under article IV of the treaty each signatory "recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes." The protocol to this treaty designated Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam for the purpose of article IV. As Secretary of State Rusk pointed out in his recent testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee, the far-reaching implications of this commitment were well understood by the Members of the Senate, and he quoted from the committee's report which accompanied the resolution of ratification:

> The committee is not impervious to the risks which this treaty entails. It fully appreciates that acceptance of these additional obligations commits the United States to a course of action over a vast expanse of the Pacific. Yet these risks are consistent with our own highest interests.

It should also be pointed out that on February 22 of this year, the house of delegates of the American Bar Association unanimously approved a resolution that the position of the United States in Vietnam is legal under international law, and is in accordance with the charter of the United Nations and the Southeast Asia Treaty.

We are there because failure to live up to our treaty obligations would lay a foundation for success of Communist aggression under the guise of a so-called National Liberation Front; and this success, in turn, would encourage similar movements elsewhere in the world, including Latin America, where our national security would be more immediately threatened. Moreover, confidence of other nations in our treaty commitments would be justifiably shaken. Whether we like it or not, our historical development and economic and military power have placed the United States in the role of leader of the free world. With this leadership comes the responsibility of living up to our word; and if our word is no good, the ideological struggle of the free world with the Communist world will deteriorate. Not only would this have a profoundly adverse effect on free world nations, especially the smaller ones, but it could well cause the uncommitted or neutral nations to look to the Communist world for what they might then regard as inevitable world leadership.

We are there in strength and numbers because of decisions made by the President of the United States. These decisions followed the southeast Asia resolution, which the administration recommended to the Congress and which the Congress approved on August 7, 1964, with only two dissenting votes of the entire Senate-House membership. Among other things, the resolution recites:

> That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.
>
> The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southest Asia. Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

During the debate of this resolution in the Senate, Senator Cooper, of Kentucky, and Senator Fulbright, of Arkansas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who was floor manager of the resolution, engaged in this colloquy—page 18409, Congressional Record for August 6, 1964:

> Mr. Cooper. Then, looking ahead, if the President decided that it was necessary to use such force as could lead into war, we will give that authority by this resolution?
>
> Mr. Fulbright. That is the way I would interpret it.

MISCALCULATION

It is well known that miscalculation by the enemy of our capabilities and firmness of purpose brought us into World War II. It is also well known that miscalculation by the Communist leaders of North Korea resulted in the Korean war. And I would suggest that miscalculation has been responsible for the war in Vietnam. Somewhere along the way, the leadership of the United States failed to get across the message to the Communist leaders in Hanoi that their aggression would not pay off and would, instead, cost them dearly.

Where our leadership fell down, only the Communist leaders can say. But it can be suggested that temporizing of the U.S. Government with the glaring violations of the 1962 Geneva agreement on Laos by the leaders in Hanoi, leaving several thousand of their armed forces in Laos after our forces were pulled out, may well have encouraged their escalation of aggression in South Vietnam. Indeed, it was not until February of 1965 that our leadership made it clear that there would be no privileged sanctuary above the 17th parallel.

Peace can best be secured by preventing a would-be aggressor from miscalculating—from deciding that aggression will be profitable.

"ESCALATION"

One of the reasons for some of the confusion besetting the American people over our course in the war in Vietnam is misuse by some writers and speakers of the word "escalation."

When an enemy invades a country, there are some who would say it is "escalation" to drive the enemy back home where he belongs. However, I would think that the right of self-defense would never preclude taking such action. If misuse of the word "escalation" should deter a timely and effective response, then civilization will most certainly be governed by the law of the jungle.

On the other hand, if the objective is to merely stop the aggression, it could be argued that excessive force—such as an invasion of the enemy's homeland, would constitute an escalation. If, because of the enemy's capabilities and intentions, merely putting a stop to his aggression could be reasonably expected to be followed by renewed aggression, such escalation might be warranted—as is generally agreed was the case with the invasion of Germany in World War II.

In the case of the war in Vietnam, our policy has been to not invade the north and to take only such careful measured action as is necessary to put a stop to aggression. In short, we are not seeking an unlimited war, with unlimited objectives and unlimited responses. It is most unfortunate that escalation has occurred on the enemy's side. But if we are to be denied an effective response to his escalation, we will either be defeated or, at best, suffer numerous casualties which could have been avoided by a timely and effective response.

No one, of course, knows what further escalation will be carried out by the enemy. However, with the tremendous economic and military power we possess, coupled with the resolve to make an effective response to the enemy's escalation, it should be obvious that the enemy is headed down a dead-end street. As the war goes on and the enemy's problems grow worse, and as his hope for a weakening in our national resolve diminishes, this will become obvious to him. That is why no responsible military leader in the Far East agrees with the conclusion of the so-called Mansfield report that the prospect is for "an indefinite expansion in the direction of a general war on the Asian mainland."

RED CHINA

Concern has been voiced over the possibility of Red China's coming into the war by sending armed forces into South Vietnam. Everyone is hopeful that this will not happen. But the question is over the degree of this possibility. Some speak of it as a likelihood if we take action appropriate to putting a stop to aggression in South Vietnam with a minimum loss of life to the allied forces fighting against aggression. To them I would say that if aggression is not to be effectively resisted because of fear that Red

China will come in, then Red China's psychological warfare which is being waged against us will have paid off and our economic and military power will be of little use in preventing aggression.

Others believe there is only a remote possibility that Red China will come in, and they are counting on our leadership to make it clear beyond a shadow of a doubt that Red China will never find it profitable to do so. The decision is hers to make, but it is the responsibility of our leadership to so conduct our affairs that there will be no further miscalculations. Resolute leadership is the answer, one well-known world leader told me during my recent trip to the Far East.

There are some who recall that Red China was not expected to enter the Korean war, and so, they say, we should not be confident that Red China will not enter this one. There are two differences, however. First, we have made it clear that there will be no privileged sanctuary in Red China such as was the case beyond the Yalu during the Korean war; and, second, we are not engaged in committing our troops to North Vietnam, whereas we did send our troops in North Korea. In short, the ground rules are different, although I would guess that the first difference is much more important in Red China's deliberations.

THE SOVIET UNION

I would be the first one to recognize that all is not well between Red China and the Soviet Union. But I would also point out that the Soviet Union has much to gain by a long-continued and costly war in Vietnam if, as we are told, her objective is to defeat the United States economically if not militarily. She has committed no manpower or resources to speak of in this war; whereas we have committed a substantial number of our finest men and billions of dollars of our resources. Under such circumstances, why would anyone think that the Soviet Union does not wish to see this war continued?

When it is suggested that we deny the port facilities at Haiphong by precision bombing or by mining the waters to prevent the flow of petroleum feeding thousands of trucks in the North Vietnamese logistics system as well as tons of other supplies and munitions to be used against us in the south, concern is expressed that this might cause tensions with the Soviet Union, whose ships are delivering much of these items to North Vietnam. Nevertheless, I would remind my colleagues that a resolute decision at the time of the Cuban missile crisis did no more than cause tensions. And the fact that tensions may have resulted if Russian technicians were lost when we bombed out some ground-to-air missiles last year did not prevent us from taking such action.

Realism compels the conclusion that not until the cause of Hanoi's aggression is lost can we expect the Soviet Union to make a meaningful contribution toward a settlement, and it would be prudent not to count on it even then.

BOMBING CANNOT END WAR

During my Far East trip I spoke with all high-ranking diplomatic and military officers and their staff members in South Vietnam and most of the other countries in that area. Not a single one ever suggested to me that bombing will end the war. Still, at the recent Honolulu conference, an unnamed top U.S. Defense Department official saw fit to release to the press the statement that "no amount of bombing of North Vietnam can end the Vietnam conflict."

The fact that this individual made such a release when no responsible official has suggested that the contrary is true leads one to believe that either this official is very uninformed about the thinking of our military and diplomatic leaders; or that this was a calculated effort on his part to divert attention from the real point upon which all military leaders in that theater of operations agree: that more effective bombing by concentrating on more important logistics targets will shorten the war—and reduce the number of casualties among the allies.

I do not know of anyone who has been advocating massive and indiscriminate bombing of North Vietnam. But there are a great many of us who believe that precision bombing of key logistics targets would require fewer sorties of our aircraft while at the same time effectively reducing the numbers of enemy troops and the quantities of munitions and supplies flowing into the south to be used against our ground forces. If political decisions prevent our military leaders from taking this action, the war could go on for a long, long time and be more costly in battle casualties. I hope that the unnamed top U.S. Defense Department official will squarely face this reality and not persist in statements which may divert public attention from it.

ALTERNATIVES

The public hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have produced only two alternatives to the program now being followed.

One of these takes the form of suggesting that the United States does not have sufficient interest in South Vietnam to warrant the commitment we appear to be making; that we are such a great and powerful country that we would not suffer any loss of standing in the world if we were to withdraw; that the Soviet's withdrawal of offensive missiles from Cuba was followed by world approbation as being in the interest of world peace. Such a suggestion, of course, is contrary to the judgment of the Senate in ratifying the SEATO Treaty. Moreover, it logically raises the question of how small is that country which does not warrant our commitment? Or how big must a country be to warrant our commitment? The answer was never offered. The suggested analogy of the Soviet's withdrawal of offensive missiles from Cuba rests upon the failure to recognize the difference between the Soviet Union's act of aggression and the U.S. action to prevent aggression pursuant to a treaty obligation.

The other alternative is the so-called holding strategy or stalemate. Its implication is that the fruits of Communist aggression are to be locked in by permitting the status quo. This would not discourage aggression, and it would be totally unacceptable to the Government of South Vietnam which is dedicated to restoring the territorial integrity of that country. Moreover, I have said before that anyone who has seen what I have seen in South Vietnam, and knows of the plans I know about, could never conclude that the best we can hope for is a stalemate.

I do not say there are no possible alternatives, but those which have been proposed are not helpful.

FREE ELECTIONS

Critics of our Government's policies in South Vietnam have condemned the United States for supporting the refusal of the Government of South Vietnam to live up to the Geneva agreement of 1954 in permitting free elections to decide the future of all of Vietnam. Such criticism fails to recognize that free elections in the sense in which we use the phrase—as distinguished from the sense used to describe the elections held in Moscow, for example—were not possible at that time. When the voters can make only one choice because of their terror over Communist retaliation, are we supposed to look at only the form and not the substance of what is taking place?

The Secretary of State has made it publicly clear that we will abide by truly free elections of the South Vietnamese people when they are able to engage in such elections without their choice being predetermined by Communist terror.

LACK OF SUPPORT FROM SEATO COUNTRIES

The point has been made that the United States is carrying most of the load on the side of the allies in South Vietnam and that the failure of other SEATO countries to more fully participate demonstrates that they do not share our views.

Of course, the same argument could have been made about our position in the Korean war. Technically this involved the United Nations; but as a matter of substance, the United States and South Korea carried most of the load—just as the United States and South Vietnam are carrying most of the load in the war in Vietnam. However, merely because other nations did not more fully participate hardly suggests that we were wrong in Korea.

The most practical answer to this point is that the United States is far better able to carry most of the load than the other signatories to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. Pakistan is a poor country which is most immediately concerned over the Kashmir dispute with India. Thailand is primarily concerned with the defense of its own borders and, although cooperating with the United States, must reckon with the public declaration by Red China that it is next on the target list for a Communist-supported war of national liberation. The Philippines is supporting the United States with bases and has already sent some medical personnel to South Vietnam—and more aid is forthcoming. But we should understand that this is not an affluent country.

Australia has 1,500 troops engaged in fighting in South Vietnam, and New Zealand has an artillery battalion there. We are hoping for more troops from these countries, but there is no question over their support of our position in this war. Australia is particularly sensitive to the prospect of Communist aggression spreading through southeast Asia.

The United Kingdom supports the position of the United States, but has not seen fit to supply fighting forces. However, I would not think we should be too hasty to criticize their delay in doing so, for the United States delayed sending troops to help in World War II for what must have seemed to the British an awfully long time—granted that we supported their position from the beginning.

France, of course, has exchanged ambassadors with Red China and has not forgotten that the United States did not send troops to assist her before her defeat at Dienbienphu.

Under the foregoing analysis, I must conclude that the point of lack of support by our SEATO allies as an indication of the error of our position does not stand up under scrutiny.

COMPROMISE

It has been suggested that we should be willing to compromise and that our failure to set forth some specific points on which we are willing to do so amounts to calling on the enemy for unconditional surrender.

With respect to Hanoi, we have made it clear that our objective is for the Communist leaders to cease and desist from directing, controlling, and supplying war materiel and manpower to the Vietcong military forces in the south; and naturally to recall the North Vietnamese troops from the south back home where they belong. As the lead editorial in the Washington Post for February 23 points out, the cessation of aggression against South Vietnam does not require any loss of territory, surrender of forces, or impairment of sovereignty of North Vietnam; and that, instead, it is really North Vietnam which is calling on the allies for unconditional surrender by demanding that we recognize the so-called National Liberation Front as the sole representative of the South Vietnamese people.

With respect to the Vietcong forces in South Vietnam, we have made it clear that they are to cease and desist from being directed, controlled, and supplied by the Communist leaders of the north; and that they are to stop their armed attacks so that the people of South Vietnam can live in peace and freedom. These are the minimal objectives spelled out by the President in his speech at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore last April 7. In the same address, the President made it clear that "we will not withdraw either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement"; and his speech left no doubt that a meaningful agreement would have to achieve the minimal objectives he had outlined. As I pointed out in my speech to the Senate last August 16, entitled "The Real Meaning of Unconditional Negotiations," what the leaders in Hanoi understand and what others should understand is that any negotiations which lead to something less than achievement of the minimal objectives stated by the President would be meaningless, and that only with respect to matters beyond these objectives can negotiations be unconditional. I must say that if there is to be objection that freedom of the South Vietnamese people from terror and an opportunity for their self-determination in truly free elections is unconditional surrender by the Vietcong, then the objection overlooks what this war is all about.

It has been suggested that we should be willing to "compromise" by, for example, agreeing to a "coalition" government for South Vietnam in which the Communist Vietcong would "share the responsibility." Such a suggestion ignores the hard lesson which should have been learned from a similar "compromise" agreement for Laos. The lesson is that when a Communist front is permitted to share in the government, its leaders are not willing to abide by the agreement and, instead, seek to take over the government by subversion. Also, such a suggestion is completely unacceptable to the South Vietnamese Government because it would "lock in" the fruits of Vietcong terror. The suggestion apparently proceeds from the "stalemate" approach which, I have pointed out above, is neither warranted by the military situation nor acceptable to those who wish to make it clear that aggression does not pay off. As the lead editorial in the Washington Evening Star for February 21 said:

> Peace and an end to terror is the first prerequisite to any political solution in Vietnam whether it is brought about by negotiation or military victory. After peace is established and the free movement of people in South Vietnam is assured, the people of the country should decide their own future government by heavily supervised free elections.

The late President Kennedy received full support from the American people and, indeed, from the free world when he stated that "the freedom of West Berlin is not negotiable." We are following this principle by making it clear that the freedom of South Vietnam is not to be compromised, and that we cannot "honorably and humanely" disengage ourselves militarily until freedom is assured.

CONTINUING EFFORTS FOR PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT

At my press conference, which was held in Saigon at the end of my week's tour of South Vietnam, I stated my conclusion that our initiative for talks, discussions, and negotiations should continue, but with two provisos:

First, that they not be accompanied by any slowdown in our military effort; and

Second, that there should be a clear, joint effort by the United States and South Vietnamese Governments in these activities.

The first proviso obviously is to demonstrate that aggression does not pay off and to enable the allies to negotiate from a position of strength. I felt it appropriate to include the second proviso, because the "peace offensive" during the bombing pause had been so highly publicized as a personal effort by the President of the United States as to lay a foundation for concern of some officials in some capitals that our Government was changing its position that this is a Vietnamese war; and that any settlement which would result from the "peace offensive" would, perhaps, conflict with the territorial integrity of South Vietnam.

I do not say that this concern was well founded, because both the President and the Secretary of State have made clear on many occasions that our minimal objectives relate to all of South Vietnam and not just a part of it. In any event, there has been no response except insults and impossible demands from Hanoi.

Although there has been some criticism of the timing of our publicized efforts to work for a peaceful settlement through the offices of the United Nations, I am satisfied that for a long time unpublicized efforts—which may often be the most effective—have been going on. Neither France nor the Soviet Union has been at all helpful, and it would appear that their negativism in the Security Council will continue.

Under such circumstances, it would seem proper and timely for the United States and its allies in South Vietnam to explore the possibility of encouraging a conference of Far East nations for the purpose of undertaking to persuade Hanoi to enter into peaceful negotiations. A precedent for action along these lines was established when the Organization of American States assumed jurisdiction over the dispute in the Dominican Republic. Further, on January 18 the President called for U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank through a $200 million contribution as our share of a capitalization of $1 billion. There are 19 eligible Far East nations which have pledged to participate in this Bank: Afghanistan, Australia, Cambodia, Ceylon, Nationalist China, India, Iran, Japan, South Korea, Laos, Malaysia, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, South Vietnam, and Western Samoa. If these countries can join together to operate a bank for economic development, they ought to be able to join together to seek peace in their area. Japan, which will be the largest financial participant of these 19 nations, or the Philippines, which knows so well the meaning of aggression, are particularly well suited to assume leadership in calling such a conference as I have suggested. Perhaps they could do so as cosponsors.

In any event, I would like to see this administration encourage a conference of the Far East nations participating in the Asian Development Bank as a meaningful step toward peace in southeast Asia.

Although our initiative for talks, discussions, and negotiations must go on, we should not let our hopes for peace cause us to lose sight of the fact that it takes two sides to talk, to discuss, and to negotiate. The fact that the other side has shown no interest whatsoever in doing this does not mean that we should change our minimal objectives. To do so would be peace at any price.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the editorial from the February 25 issue of

Life magazine; the lead editorial in the Washington Sunday Star for February 20, entitled "Taylor Told Us What We Have To Do"; an article entitled "The Story of the United States and Its Stake in Asia," which appears in the February 28 issue of U.S. News & World Report; another article from the same issue entitled "Just What Is the Vietcong?" and an article from the January 31 issue of Newsweek magazine entitled "Thailand: The Anatomy of a Domino."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Life, Feb. 25, 1966]

VIETNAM: THE WAR IS WORTH WINNING

(By Hedley Donovan, editor-in-chief, Time, Inc.)

The war in Vietnam builds up. It is often called a war without "fronts" or "lines," but there are authentic battles, and all too authentic casualties, in rising number. There is a quickening of ambush and counterambush, patrols, sweeps, and armed convoy runs, up and down the 900-mile curve of this lovely, tortured land. The buildup is felt from the sector of the "Paddy Rats," the 21st ARVN Division (Army of the Republic of Vietnam), at the tip of the steamy Mekong Delta country, all the way north to the U.S. 3d Marine Division encampments in the wildly complicated terrain around Da Nang—jungles, canals, ricefields, swamps, red clay hills, sharp little mountains, teeming towns, broad sand beaches. In shabby, swarming Saigon, people speculate about all the VIP traffic from Washington; many of them work prodigiously hard; some profiteer and racketeer, and at least a few work for the Vietcong at night.

The supply lines pump harder. They stretch back halfway around the world, through the Philippines and Okinawa, through Hawaii, to the training camps in California and Georgia, the factories in St. Louis and Cleveland.

Vietnam begins to dominate the public life of the United States and the private thoughts of many an American family. It dominates the Presidency of Lyndon Johnson, the economic outlook, the intellectual climate.

But it is still a mystifying war to many Americans, despite heavy press coverage, loud public "dialog," and all the earnest expositions of Lyndon Johnson, Robert McNamara, and Dean Rusk. It is certainly not a "popular" war (though it may be noted, to the general credit of mankind, that there aren't many popular wars nowadays). Some of the country's misgivings are reported elsewhere in this issue, not the sloganeering of the well-publicized "Vietniks," but the thoughtful, responsible dissent and doubt.

In this article Life offers its own general judgments and guesses about Vietnam. What might it take to end the business? What would be "victory"? What is this strange war all about?

For all the war's strangeness and difficulty, and for all the dangers and uncertainties ahead, our side in fact is doing fairly well.

The war need not last a generation, or 10 years, or 6 or 7 years (to cite one curiously precise guess that recent press stories attributed to unnamed Pentagon "observers"). There is a reasonably good chance the present phase of the war can be successfully wound up in 1967, or even in late 1966.

President Johnson's "peace offensive" was well worth trying, and there is still a remote possibility that the diplomacy he set in motion could lead to a satisfactory negotiated settlement of the war.

The likeliest ending is not around a conference table, however, but in a quiet withdrawal of main-force North Vietnamese units, after they have been hurt enough, back to the north, and a gradual tapering off of the Vietcong military effort in the south.

This would not leave South Vietnam fully pacified by any means; there would still be strong VC pockets, and sporadic violence and terrorism. But the war of battalion- and regiment-size battles, and big air strikes, would be over.

In the next phase of the struggle, though there would still be shooting, the war would be essentially economic, political, psychological. Heavy U.S. economic aid would still be required, and some continuing U.S. military presence. This phase might, indeed, last for some years.

We are not bogged down in Asia. We are deeply, inescapably involved with Asia and have been for decades. The involvement has its perils; it also holds high promise.

The war in Vietnam is not primarily a war about Vietnam, nor even entirely a war about China. It is a war about the future of Asia. It is very possibly as important as any of the previous American wars of this century.

In fact, this ugly, maddening, big-little war may someday be remembered as a historic turning point. Many peoples of the West as well as Asia could have reason for gratitude to the extraordinary generation of Americans now serving in Vietnam (their harassed chiefs in Washington might even rate a word or two of thanks), and to the long-suffering troops and people of South Vietnam.

In the United States the most persistent question about Vietnam is why the injection of 200,000 Americans has seemingly made so little difference.

The injection of the 200,000 has in fact made an enormous difference. It prevented what otherwise might have been the collapse of the South Vietnam Government and Army, late last spring, and the defeat of all the previous years of American effort.

When Senator FULBRIGHT and Walter Lippmann and other opponents of the administration policy say, as they frequently do, that our side controls no more territory today than we did a year ago despite all the buildup and fighting in 1965, they are being technically accurate and totally misleading. A year ago, the South Vietnam Government's grip on what it ostensibly held was beginning to disintegrate very rapidly. The startup of U.S. air operations against the north in February 1965, and the arrival of the first few thousand U.S. marines in March, briefly slowed but did not halt the deterioration. The Government continued to lose territory and population through spring of 1965, and more fatefully, the ARVN was losing its last thin reserve of mobile battalions, while the people were losing their last shreds of confidence that the Vietcong could ever be defeated.

Perhaps because they never confessed how desperate the situation was last May and June, neither the Saigon government nor the Johnson administration has given any detailed accounting of how much better the situation is today. In the United States, this leaves critics free to argue that no amount of U.S. effort and sacrifice seems to accomplish anything in Vietnam, so we should disentangle ourselves from a hopeless venture on the best terms we can get.

A turnaround did begin in early summer. By that time the United States had 75,000 troops in South Vietnam, and on July 28, President Johnson made his announcement that another 50,000 were on the way. The announcement itself had a salutary effect on the stability of the Saigon regime and on the attitudes of the fence-sitters, a numerous element, understandably enough, in the Vietnamese population.

Today, although there is no such thing as total security anywhere in the country, including the most heavily guarded military bases, the Saigon government has reasonably good control of territory containing about 50 to 55 percent of the country's population. This contrasts with a highly precarious control of about 45 percent last June. The territory under the Government's control includes all the cities, all 43 of the provincial capitals, all but half a dozen of the 241 district capitals. There has been a decided extension of Government control in the populous Mekong Delta area, source of most of the country's rice supply and in the past a rich recruiting ground for the VC as well as the ARVN. About 20 percent of the country's population is in disputed or fluid territory or places that neither side is bothering with at the moment. The rest is under fairly solid VC control. The VC dominate at least half of the country's area, but much of its domain is jungle, mountain, and mangrove swamp.

The 10-man military directory headed by Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky has now been in office 8 months, which nobody would have dared predict last summer. It can scarcely be described as strongly entrenched or broadly popular, but it looks much more effective than the revolving-door regimes that followed the fall of Diem (9 of them in 19 months). It has lived down the bombastic pronouncements of Ky's first weeks in office, suppressed one minor coup attempt, and made some fairly convincing announcements about the drafting of a new constitution and the introduction, perhaps next year, of a limited measure of democracy. With powerful prodding and backing from the U.S. Embassy and AID mission, it began an ambitious new program of economic reconstruction in the more or less pacified parts of the countryside. There have been previous efforts—and failures—in this field: the "strategic hamlets" program, the "new life hamlets," etc. The Ky regime has been going at it quite seriously, however, and its program now has the direct and insistent patronage of Lyndon Johnson himself, as announced at Honolulu and amplified by the new wave of emissaries he sent to Saigon.

Meanwhile, South Vietnam's badly battered army has had a chance to catch its breath. A number of understrength units have been considerably beefed-up in men and equipment. The desertion rate has been reduced, though it is still shocking. There has been an encouraging pickup in defections from the Vietcong—11,000 in 1965 versus 5,000 in 1964. One of the most sensitive indicators of all—the willingness of people out in the countryside to furnish intelligence on VC movements—points to a healthy increase in popular confidence in the ultimate defeat of the VC.

Where does the war go from here? The most urgent need right now is to break the bottleneck in port facilities. Saigon itself is a second-rate river port, 50 twisting miles upstream from the South China Sea, with antiquated docks and stevedoring techniques. Until a few months ago virtually all oceanborne supplies for the South Vietnam economy and the war had to pass through this one congested port. Last June, U.S. Army Engineers and civilian contractors went to work at the superb natural harbor of Cam Ranh Bay, previously untouched, and before the end of this year it will be handling more cargo than Saigon. Construction work continues at a furious pace at Cam Ranh Bay; facilities are being expanded at Qui Nhon Danang and lesser ports; and some improvements are in progess at Saigon. At most of these places, however, ships still wait 30 to 40 days for unloading. It will probably be another 2 to 3 months before the ports are fully equal to the support of the troops already in Vietnam, and capable of supplying new arrivals. Almost equally high priority must go to the enlargement of military storage facilities and improvement of the highways in the major operating areas.

How many more U.S. troops will be needed for the big-unit phase of the war? Fewer than half the U.S. troops now in Vietnam are actually available for offensive operations against the Vietcong on the ground. As in any war, the men up front are supported by a long train of medics, truckdrivers, construction battalions, headquarters staffs, etc. And in this particular war, where VC suicide squads can turn up almost anywhere, we have thousands of combat-unit men tied down by static-defense duties around our major bases. Perhaps 80,000 to 90,000 of the Americans now in Vietnam are available for serious offensive action; only about 50,000 of these can range far from their bases to seek out the VC.

Total strength of the South Vietnam armed forces is generally put around 650,000 to 700,000 men, but this total must be stripped down even more drastically. There are perhaps 25,000 to 40,000 South Vietnamese troops, including some tough marine and airborne battalions, that could be considered fully mobile offensive forces, unencumbered by fixed-defense responsibilities. Adding in a robust little Australian-New Zealand contingent, and the marine brigade and "Tiger Division" that Korea has sent, the allies have a total striking force of 150,000 men at the most and by the maximum mobility test the total would be more like 100,000.

They are up against a fanatically brave and highly resourceful army of about 90,000 men, Vietcong main-force units plus perhaps a dozen regiments of the North Vietnam Army, always free to group and strike against a weaker force wherever they can find it, since they themselves hold no intrinsically valuable territory that ties them down to defense. (The VC may have another 100,000 men in small local cadres, in porter gangs along the supply trails, part-time guerrillas, etc.)

The much quoted dictum that it takes a 10-to-1 superiority to suppress a determined guerrilla force is not regarded as gospel in Vietnam. No modern counterguerrilla army has ever operated with such a tremendous margin of firepower and mobility as the United States has introduced into Vietnam. But it is generally agreed that we will need a manpower superiority of at least 2 to 1 and very possibly 3 to 1 in mobile offensive forces.

Most of the reinforcements will have to come from the United States. Among the Vietnamese themselves there is not very much young manpower not already in one uniform or another, though some existing ARVN units can probably be upgraded into a higher offensive capability. No very significant allied contributions are in sight. We must be prepared, therefore, for the total U.S. commitment in Vietnam to rise from the present 200,000 men to at least 400,000 men, assuming that half or more of the new forces are in ground combat units that can seek out the Vietcong. This would mean a commitment about on the scale of the Korean war at its peak.

But what if the enemy simply feeds more and more men into the war? The fact is he would find it very difficult to match our buildup. The VC have pretty well scraped the bottom of the barrel in recruiting within South Vietnam. From the north it is possible to infiltrate only 2,000 to 4,000 men a month over the Ho Chi Minh trail, and the capacity can't be much increased as long as we keep up our air attacks. Conceivably, North Vietnam might decide on overt, all-out invasion of the south, and launch the rest of its army—perhaps a dozen firstline divisions, totaling more than 200,000 men, across the demilitarized zone along the 17th parallel.

Then there would indeed need to be a big American Army in Vietnam—perhaps the "million men" who figure in some of the forebodings here at home. But for the enemy to pour men down the narrow coastal corridor, or in fact try to get large bodies of troops into the south by any other route, would be to sacrifice most of the advantages of the hit-and-run jungle warfare he is so expert at. Every time full regiments have been brought to battle by U.S. forces, the enemy has been badly beaten.

If North Vietnam went all out, it would have to offer us concentrated targets—massed troops, big supply depots, clogged roads and trails. Ho Chi Minh would be risking his whole army, and with it his rule. The repeated U.S. assurances that we do not seek to overthrow the North Vietnamese regime would surely be the first casualty of any all-out attack from the north.

Let us guess, then (there are no guarantees about Vietnam), that the North does not come down in a big way, that the U.S. buildup proceeds, that the bottleneck in the ports is largely overcome this spring. By summer the effects of all our effort should really begin to be felt on the battlefields. A point comes in a war when momentum develops; cumulative and multiplying effects spread across a whole theater; one action goes well, and things seem to go better in half a dozen other places. The momentum was running strongly for the Vietcong in early 1965. It could be running strongly for our side in late 1966.

Barring a negotiated settlement, nobody will ever be able to name the exact date when the present phase of the war came to an end. But the day should come, late this year or next, when it will be possible to add up some such set of facts as this: dwindling southbound traffic on the Ho Chi Minh Trail for several months; increase in northbound traffic; no firm contact with a full VC regiment or battalion for several weeks; occasional capture of VC or North Vietnam "regulars" now operating with small local guerrilla units; extension of government control to territory containing 75 percent of the population; decline of VC "incidents" within this territory. This would be the end of the big-unit war, and the first instalment of "victory," and this the United States does tacitly recognize. To turn the South over to communism, which would almost certainly be the consequence of a peace negotiated from a few enclaves, would be "defeat."

Assuming we will not settle for that, and that we persevere through the big-unit war, we should then see Hanoi quietly deescalate. We would presumably stop bombing the north, and perhaps announce a provisional and gradual schedule of withdrawals of a major part of the American force. (The north could come back in, of course, but so could we.)

In the new phase of the war, more and more of the military responsibility would revert to the rebuilt ARVN, which by then should include a number of highly equipped, trained, and seasoned units, increasingly capable of dealing with the small-scale VC attacks which would doubtless persist for some years, or moving against some of the remote VC redoubts.

Increasingly, the American support of South Vietnam would be channeled into economic, medical, educational aid. In civil terms as well as military, the Vietcong are deeply entrenched in considerable areas of the countryside. Their political, economic, and psychological hold on village life will not necessarily disappear just because their troops go underground. The Saigon government will have to prove that it can provide the villages physical safety from the VC, but more important for the long run, that it is not simply a rival gang of tax collectors.

So the second installment of "victory" would come, probably not before the early 1970's, when VC activity in South Vietnam had been reduced to the proportions of a police problem, when all or almost all the American troops could be brought home (we still keep two divisions in Korea), when a thoroughly viable economy was operating, when an independent, effective and stable government (by the standards of Asia, not Switzerland) seemed established. That would be victory for the prodigious American effort in this country of 15 million people some 8,000 miles from San Diego.

In a way, it doesn't sound like much. For these modest purposes, in a far distant place, can the United States really be preparing to send hundreds of thousands of Americans into battle and spend tens of billions of dollars, allowing a bitter divisiveness to come into American life, courting abuse from world opinion, and running a faint risk of war with China, and even world war III?

The Communists say that the Americans wouldn't do all this just for the sake of Vietnam, and in this they are absolutely right. But the Johnson administration has never successfully articulated the broader purposes of our Vietnam commitment and the very promising possibilities it could create. It is deplorable that such a courageous and farsighted policy should be so badly explained.

The administration offers a good many dull and lofty generalities about helping to preserve the freedom of South Vietnam. These are not entirely satisfying since South Vietnam is not really a nation yet—it is an artificial half of one of three countries carved out of a former French colony only 17 years ago—and in its short life it hasn't ever been fully free, either of Communist aggression or domestic autocracy.

The administration is more eloquent and persuasive when it stresses the importance of honoring our commitments. If we do not stand fast in Vietnam, who else will trust our guarantees? This leads into the familiar domino argument—if South Vietnam falls to communism, Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand would go next; Malaysia, Singapore, and Burma soon after; then Indonesia; neutralism, anti-Americanism and pro-Peiping sentiment would spread in India, the Philippines, Japan. The damage to U.S. credibility could spread further—to Berlin and NATO, Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Rusk do not themselves spell it out in such lugubrious detail, but that isn't necessary. Honoring our commitments has become a kind of shorthand for a whole train of disasters that could ensue if we pulled out of Vietnam.

It is a sound argument, at least as applied to the southeast Asian peninsula, but it is a needlessly grim, backs-to-the-wall sort of argument. It casts our whole effort in South Vietnam in negative terms—as something we must do to prevent a catastrophe. This negative argument offers no hint of the very difficult problems that face Communist China today, or the ways in which those problems have been intensified by our stand in Vietnam. It offers no vision of the positive good that could be accomplished in Asia if our Vietnam effort succeeds.

You would never know it, from listening either to the Johnson administration or its critics, but China had a very bad year in 1965. Despite the advance handwringing in the United States, the fears early last year that China might "come in" if the United States bombed North Vietnam or put ground combat units in South Vietnam, China did not come in. Nor did the growing U.S. effort in Vietnam prove to be "the one thing that would bring China and Russia back together." If anything, China-Russia relations are worse than a year ago, and Vietnam seems somehow to have inflamed matters.

Vietnam is precisely the kind of "war of national liberation" that China has proclaimed to be the wave of the future all through the underdeveloped regions of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the Communist revolution that would sweep the "rural" areas of the world and eventually bring down the world "city" of Western Europe-United States-Japan. (The Soviet leadership sometimes wonders whether Russia is considered part of the "city," too.) China has given loud polemical sponsorship to the Vietcong-North Vietnam cause, and it supplies a good part of the north's arms, but it has been very careful to avoid any move that might bring a direct confrontation with the growing U.S. power in Vietnam.

And this certainly had something to do with the decline last year in China's prestige among the underdeveloped and uncommitted. In the India-Pakistan skirmish in September, China attempted a kind of ultimatum to India, but India paid very little attention, and China had to back down. China has suffered several recent rebuffs in its courtship of the new African states, and is even having a noisy quarrel with Castro. The upheaval in Indonesia, starting with the suppression of the Communist coup attempt on October 1, has been a major defeat for China, replacing what had been an increasingly Peiping-oriented policy with a strongly nationalist independent line.

South Vietnam is one of the last major positions not buttoned down, all around the rim of China. Laos is mushy, of course, though its neutralist and pro-Western factions have been doing fairly well in the exotic little war against the pro-Communist Pathet Lao. Neutralist Burma also seemed last year to respond to events in Vietnam and began acting as neutralist toward China as it long has toward the West. The most sensitive of all China's frontiers, of course, are the long reaches where it faces the Soviet Union. The state of Soviet-Chinese relations must contribute, to say the least, to sensations of isolation in Peiping. But if South Vietnam is held, China is substantially "contained" on the borders facing the non-Communist world. This could open up a whole new era of promise and growth for the potentially prosperous and stable nations of southeast Asia.

South Vietnam itself could be a dazzlingly successful country. It has immense wood and timber resources, limitless water, hydroelectric possibilities, rubber, superb beaches and scenery, energetic, attractive people. Along with the tragic destruction of war, it is also acquiring, willy-nilly, the best port facilities between Hong Kong and Singapore, and half a dozen first-class airfields. It shares the great Mekong Valley system with Cambodia, Thailand, and Laos. President Johnson, in one of the few really affirmative specifics he has ever put before Asia, made a generous offer of U.S. aid for a big Mekong Basin project in his Johns Hopkins speech of last April. In a situation which permitted some degree of trust among these countries, an international effort to harness the Mekong could be one of the most exciting engineering and political ventures in the world.

If southeast Asia, instead of being a temptation to aggression and a threat to world peace, became a strong point of economically vigorous and fully independent states, the beneficent effects would spread well beyond the peninsula itself. Communist China would be contained in the best sense, not just in military positions but in terms of performance, by the dynamism of Japan on the northeast and this healthy new growth center to the south. South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Burma, Indonesia would all benefit to some degree; even India's staggering problems would look a little less hopeless.

It might be that these vistas will be opening up at the same time that the first major changes in the Chinese Communist leadership take place. Mao is 72, and said to be sick, Chou En-lai is 67; most of the rest of the Politburo, old comrades of the long march of the 1930's are in their late sixties. If the defeat of the Communist attempt to take over South Vietnam comes around the same time that new men are moving into power in Peiping, this could be a very interesting moment in history. In several interviews with foreign visitors, Mao has expressed with startling frankness his doubts as to the revolutionary militance of the next Chinese generation. They might even be men with whom the West could attempt a comprehensive settlement of the major issues dividing us: nuclear proliferation, China trade, the partition of Korea and Vietnam, the status of Taiwan, admission of mainland China to the U.N.

In the past 25 years Asia has experienced three epochal changes that would have filled up several centuries' worth of slower paced, old-fashioned history. World War II, the first war ever to sweep all of Asia, brought all of Asia irrevocably into the main currents of world politics. The breakup of the British, French, Dutch, and Japanese colonial empires created a dozen new nations—total population 800 million—of meager civil experience but powerful aspirations for a better life. Meanwhile the Communist takeover of China gave the earth's most populous country the most strongly centralized government it has known since the Ch'in dynasty fell in 207 B.C. Out of all this upheaval a new Asia will form. The pattern is not yet set. Vietnam is one of the places, at the moment the most crucial place, where the next Asia is being shaped.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Feb. 20, 1966]

TAYLOR TOLD US WHAT WE HAVE TO DO

The great debate conducted last week at the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should help clear the air of some of the doubts surrounding our strategy and prospects in Vietnam. Gen. Maxwell Taylor's testimony seemed to us the high-water mark of the clarification process.

There was nothing uncertain about the trumpet which General Taylor took with him when he appeared on Thursday. His message came through loud and clear. If there are those who still do not understand our policies and purposes in Vietnam, it must be because they do not want to understand.

An indication of the extent to which the message came through cropped up on the Senate floor while General Taylor was testifying. The critics said they expected the floor "debate" on the President's request for a supplementary appropriation to wage the war to go on for days. Perhaps it will, since extended debate is close to the hearts of Senators. But the tipoff came with the disclosure that the critics have abandoned plans to emphasize their dissent by tacking a rider onto the bill authorizing the appropriation. This rider would have said that the authorization did not represent an endorsement by the Senate of the President's Vietnam policies. This project was abandoned, as it should have been, for obvious reasons. The critics could not muster the votes to adopt it, and they were unwilling to accept the political risks of trying unsuccessfully to pull the rug from under the President while some 205,000 American troops are engaged in Vietnam.

Why are those troops in Vietnam, and what are they doing there?

General Taylor said the United States has become involved in the war in Vietnam as a result of the obligations assumed by this country in the southeast Asia treaty, ratified by the Senate, and pursuant to the broad discretion given the President in the 1964 congressional resolution which was adopted with only two dissenting votes.

To define our purpose there, he borrowed from the President's Baltimore speech of April 7, 1965. "Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam and its freedom from attack. We want nothing for ourselves—only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way."

He conceded that we have secondary objectives. One is to prove that communism's so-called wars of liberation are costly and doomed to failure. This is in our own national interest because the Communists, if they succeed with this phony tactic in Vietnam, will strike again in some other place, perhaps much closer to home in Latin America.

As General Taylor describes it, our strategy in Vietnam consists of four components. The first is to increase the effectiveness of our ground combat against the Vietcong and the infiltrators from North Vietnam. He thinks this effort is increasingly successful and that the recent comparative casualty figures prove it.

The second involves the use of air power against military targets in North Vietnam, and he is wholly opposed to the view that this should be abandoned. Bombing cannot completely block the supply and infiltration routes. But it can severely penalize the other side and make it impossible for Hanoi to maintain and supply large forces in the south.

The third component consists of the nonmilitary activities, the effort to create a viable economy in South Vietnam. This effort cannot be significantly successful until a more secure military situation is achieved. The fourth component is the continuing search for an honorable and acceptable peace.

General Taylor told the committee that all four parts of this strategy are interrelated, all are indispensable. "We must be successful on all fronts. The key, I believe, is inexorable pressure at all points, directed at the will, the ability, and the means of the Communist aggressors."

The man who formerly was chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and for 13 months our Ambassador to Saigon thinks that this four-point strategy, if we stay with it, will be successful.

Some of the Senators were dubious, but with the exception, of course, of Senator MORSE of Oregon, they did not directly challenge the General's views, and most certainly they did not offer anything in the nature of an alternative to the strategy which he spelled out. They didn't because they haven't any to offer.

Senator MORSE is a special case. His cross-examination consisted for the most part of a niggling, legalistic argument that we are engaged in an illegal, even criminal, war. He also thought that the American people, in time, will shoot down the policies advocated by General Taylor and the President. Perhaps so, if the people accept Senator MORSE as their guide—which we do not think they will do.

General Taylor, a layman, did not pretend to be an expert in the area of diplomacy or international law. This was left to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, who dealt effectively with some of these broader aspects of the problem in his Friday appearance.

The general, naturally, was most effective when, under questioning, he dealt with the military aspects of the war.

He is utterly opposed to the "holding" strategy. To accept this, he said, would be to abandon our South Vietnamese ally, to assign our own troops to a "most inglorious mission," and to destroy all hope of getting an honorable settlement.

He does not believe that Red China, if we adhere to the strategy which he outlined, will enter the war. In contrast to the Chinese intervention in Korea, Peiping is on notice now that there will be no privileged sanctuary this time. General Taylor does not believe the Chinese will accept the risks and the punishment certain to follow intervention.

Finally, he thinks we can "win" this war, being careful to point out that by winning he is not talking about forcing the enemy to capitulate or to totally destroy him. His belief is, if we keep the pressure on, that the time will come when the men in Hanoi will decide that talking is better than fighting.

For the life of us, we cannot see that the United States has any option but to proceed along the lines that Maxwell Taylor has recommended, and to apply the necessary force to produce the just result we seek.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 28, 1966]

THE STORY OF THE UNITED STATES AND ITS STAKE IN ASIA

People are asking: What stake does this country have in far-off Asia? Why get involved in a war 8,000 miles from home in a part of the world little known to Americans?

The U.S. Congress has been hearing that the thing to do is to try to get out of the Vietnam war at almost any cost. American interests, it is argued, lie in Europe, in Latin America, in Africa, not much in Asia.

But is that the case? Is American involvement in Asia something new?

A quick glance at history indicates the opposite. Vietnam is the fifth war of consequence for the United States in the Pacific. The blood of almost 440,000 Americans is invested in that part of the world. The United States, as a result, is regarded as not likely at this late date to cut and run from its historic role as a major power in the Far East.

American interest in Asia goes all the way back to the days of the American Revolution. The interest has always been alive, although the United States at no time was a colonial power in the mold of the British, French, or Dutch.

SHIFTING BURDEN

Today the French and Dutch have quit all responsibility for maintaining a balance in Asia. The British confine their main interest in that part of the world to the area of Malaysia westward into the Indian Ocean—and are striving to shift the policing burden in that area to the United States.

Americans whose interest in Asia goes back more than a century and a half right now find their responsibilities are becoming not less but greater.

Yankee clippers carried the American flag to Asian waters for the first time in the 1780's when Britain controlled the Atlantic and looked unfavorably upon shipping interests of its breakaway colony. The War of 1812 and the era of Napoleon emphasized U.S. trading interests in the Pacific, rather than the inhospitable Atlantic.

By 1833 the Americans had a treaty of commerce with the Kingdom of Siam—now Thailand. Later, in the 1840's, the United States won concessions from China on a basis of friendship at a time when Britain was using force.

Over the years, other powers strove to break up China and split up the territorial spoils. The United States accepted trade concessions, but always opposed efforts to Balkanize that part of the world.

It was an American, Commodore Matthew C. Perry, who convinced the Japanese in 1854 to end their isolation and move into the modern world.

People forget, too, that the purchase of Alaska from Russia in 1867 placed American-owned territory within sight of the mainland of Asia.

Isolation from Europe: All through this period, the United States was pursuing a very firm strategy: isolation with regard to Europe, cooperation and conscious entanglement in the Far East.

Then, in 1898, the Spanish-American War catapulted the United States conclusively into Asia as a ranking power.

A force of 70,000 U.S. troops was engaged in a guerrilla war in the Philippines from 1899 to 1902. This was a counterinsurgency war that compares in some ways with the fighting today in Vietnam. It left U.S. military power implanted off the mainland of Asia.

On the mainland itself, 2,500 American troops joined other nations' contingents that rescued foreign nationals trapped by fanatical Chinese in Peiping during the Boxer Rebellion in 1900. Where other powers sought indemnities and got them, the United States used its money to bring Chinese students to America.

The United States, all the while, was using its growing influence to keep Asia on an even keel, enforcing the open door policy in China, inducing Russia and Japan to make peace at Portsmouth, N.H., in 1905. It was the personal intervention of President Theodore Roosevelt that was felt in Asia in that period.

What history reveals is this: By the start of World War I, the United States was deeply enmeshed in the affairs of Asia—and had been for many years before this Nation was forced to turn to Europe to help bail Europeans out of the troubles arising from that war.

U.S. flag in Pacific: American holdings in the Pacific were already substantial. The U.S. flag flew not only over the Philippines, but over Midway—occupied after the Civil War—and Guam, Wake Island, and Hawaii, all under U.S. control by the turn of the century. The United States held nothing comparable in the Atlantic, nor does it today.

Present aim of the United States in Asia is not substantially different from that which emerged after the great war of 1914–18—to keep any one Asian nation from swallowing up all the others.

Today the threat is Red China. Then the danger was from Imperial Japan, driving for a "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere." It was fear of Japanese expansion into Russia, in fact, that led U.S. troops to join an allied expedition into Siberia in 1918.

Japan moved boldly into Manchuria in 1931. The United States spoke out strongly, but did nothing. In 1934 the United States told the Philippines to get ready for independence, giving the appearance of a nation ready to disengage from Asia. The Japanese sinking of the U.S.S. *Panay* in the Yangtze River in China was followed by the fall of Nanking, with Japan still convinced that the United States would not fight in the Far East. Finally, in 1941, it was the aftermath of the Japanese invasion of French Indochina that brought a positive American reaction—the freezing of Japanese assets in the United States. With this, the assault against Pearl Harbor was set in motion.

Defense need: After the devastating blow at Pearl Harbor, it was realized in the United States that, with modern means of sea and air transportation, its west coast was as vulnerable as the east coast. In World War II, people suddenly seemed to discover for the first time that the defense of Asia was as vital to U.S. security as the defense of Europe.

It now is more than 20 years since the end of World War II. Some bitter lessons—and war's great costs—have largely been forgotten. The Pacific campaigns left 106,000 Americans dead and 172,000 wounded. The great armadas and armies that fought in the Pacific required the spending of $120 billion. U.S. victory in 1945 deepened the responsibilities of this country in Asia. Americans had restored freedom to the Philippine Islands, liberated South Korea, forced Japanese from China, Indochina, and huge areas of southeast Asia.

Immediately, the United States set out to help free these areas from the colonial rule of prewar days. The British, French, and Dutch were encouraged to quit Asia. Power vacuums were created which the United States has since been obliged to prevent the Communists from filling.

In 1950, the promise of another vacuum opened for the Communists, this time in Korea. When a hint was made by the United States that its Pacific defense line bypassed South Korea, attack came swiftly.

The choice for the United States was clear: Move in and fight to save a small country from being gobbled up, or abandon it—abandoning at the same time a stake built up over the course of more than 150 years of involvement in Asia.

Outcome of a war: War in Korea cost almost 34,000 Americans dead and 103,000 wounded. The cost was $18 billion. Yet there was no U.S. victory. This time, the United States chose to settle for a truce without clear-cut victory.

The Chinese Communists sought out other opportunities to expand. They teamed up with Vietnam leader Ho Chi Minh, who drove the French from Indo-China in 1954. In the years since, still tied to Ho, the Chinese have skillfully moved toward a Communist takeover of South Vietnam.

As U.S. officials look back at Korea, they recognize lessons that could be learned from the sad experience of that war. One is that Communist China has shown itself to be waiting to fill any vacuum in Asia that the United States creates by its withdrawal, or hint of withdrawal. Another is that Red China, if left unpunished for aggression, as it was in Korea, will simply gather its strength and move on to make trouble in another area.

Not by sentiment alone: The United States as a result is committed to Asia not only by history and sentiment, but by binding military treaties with several nations.

The Senate has approved mutual-defense pacts with South Korea, Japan, Nationalist China, the Philippines, and with Australia and New Zealand. Those countries have America's word that they will be defended from Red attack.

Still other countries have a pledge from the United States through the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. The SEATO pact, now a dozen years old, binds the United States directly to the defense of Thailand, for example, in case of Red aggression. A special set of protocols offers SEATO help to South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, if they ask for it.

Postwar commitments of the United States were entered into successively by four Presidents—Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. All got substantially the same advice from senior American diplomats and military leaders:

Surrendering to Communist China in the postwar period makes no more sense than surrendering to imperial Japan would have made in 1941. In other words, America's stake in Asia is far too great to be abandoned.

An economic goal? Just what is it that is at stake?

The argument is sometimes heard that the real stake for the United States in Asia is economic. The fact is, the United States has no need for the rubber, rice, or strategic metals of Asia. It is true that the United States is now exporting $5.5 billion worth of goods to Asia each year, with a trade balance in America's favor of a billion dollars—but the loss of this trade might somehow be made acceptable with a cutback in U.S. aid to the region, and other measures.

As seen by U.S. policymakers, it boils down to security. Since 1950, the overriding objective of the United States in Asia has been to contain Red China, with an eye not only to the safety of smaller nations, but to the security of the United States itself.

With Vietnam and southeast Asia in Communist hands, the United States soon would be forced to retreat from its "forward strategy"—a line of advanced Pacific bases now hemming in the Red Chinese. Withdrawing to Alaska, Hawaii, and the west coast would be too close for comfort in this era of bombers, missiles, and submarines. That is a view shared by top U.S. military experts.

American officials, looking ahead, sense greater danger than ever before from one great power—Red China—if it should be left with a free hand in all Asia. They are made uneasy by the prospect of a rapprochement between China and Russia, or of a future that might lock together more than 700 million Chinese with the industrial prowess of Japan.

Red China, looming as a nuclear power without outside help, is seen as on the way to being a greater direct threat to the United States than Japan ever was.

Since the 18th century, the United States has grown to be a major power in Asia, with a commitment so massive that Vietnam is seen as only one phase. In the view of the leaders of the U.S. Government, it would be a tragic and dangerous error to abandon that commitment now.

UNITED STATES AND ASIA: JUST WHAT IS THE VIETCONG?

SAIGON.—Pressures are building to negotiate directly with the Communists' Vietcong and their National Liberation Front to end the fighting in South Vietnam.

The United States is now saying a way can be found to include the Communists in any truce conference.

Questions are raised, as a result, about the Communist groups and their right—if any—to a voice in the future of South Vietnam.

Just what is the Vietcong?

It is an insurgent guerrilla army. The Communists who control that army have a party—the People's Liberation Party—which directs both the political and military war in South Vietnam.

Then what is the National Liberation Front?

Secretary of State Dean Rusk told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 18 that the Liberation Front is "a Communist-front organization intended to give support to the deliberate fiction that the war in Vietnam is an indigenous revolt."

Is the front a government?

Not really. Nobody has ever had a chance to vote for or against it.

It has a flag. It has a sort of cabinet, and has representatives in every Province. The front also has representatives in Hanoi, Peiping, Algiers, Moscow, and Budapest. But no nation in the world has recognized it as a government.

Where is the front's capital?

It doesn't have one. Its headquarters is a cluster of brick and thatch houses and a network of tunnels in the jungles of northern Tay Ninh Province, within easy reach of the "sanctuary" of Cambodia.

Who is head of the NLF?

A colorless, "independent" lawyer-politician from Saigon—Nguyen Huu Tho—is chairman of the presidium. Other members of that presidium are politicians and Communists not widely known in South Vietnam.

Then who governs the Communist areas of South Vietnam?

The People's Revolutionary Party, which is the Communist Party, and the Vietcong together have a "shadow government." There is an executive at the top; commissars and central committees at the provincial level; and, at the grassroots level, district and village chiefs.

Were these officials elected?

Only at the village levels. And even there the commissars, all Communists, controlled the elections.

Do the Communists collect taxes, run schools, operate hospitals?

Yes; just as if they had a legal government. They do this wherever they have military power.

The Vietcong developed an ingenious system to pay for the war. They seized land from the landlords and gave it to the peasants. Now the Communists collect taxes that are higher than rents used to be. When they need extra food, they seize it and make payment with worthless promissory notes.

The Vietcong also levies taxes on every bus, truck, and sampan that moves through the countryside. In the cities held by the Saigon Government, the Vietcong terrorizes merchants into paying tribute.

Don't the Vietcong and the Liberation Front claim to be independent of North Vietnam?

Yes, but the record disproves that claim. In September 1960, Hanoi publicly urged the insurgents in South Vietnam to form a "broad, united" front to help unify all of Vietnam. It wasn't until 4 months later that the front was organized.

Until last year, the Communist People's Revolutionary Party stayed in the background. Now the party claims it is leading both the Vietcong and the Liberation Front. Most of that party's workers have had from 6 months' to 2 years' training in the north, and they hold most of the responsible jobs.

Do they get orders from Hanoi?

All the evidence points that way. Hanoi's Council of Ministers and the Lao Dong, or North Vietnam's Communist Party, control the strategic direction of the war in the south.

Would the Communist Vietcong or the Liberation Front win a free election in South Vietnam?

That is doubtful, at least right now. Few peasants know who is head of the Liberation Front, or even who is Premier in Saigon. In the villages, the government that interferes least with an individual's life is the most popular.

The Vietcong is popular in areas where control has been light and land was distributed. It is unpopular wherever terror was used, or men dragged off for military service.

But doesn't the Vietcong actually control the countryside?

This varies from day to day. Most villages are in the "twilight zone," not fully controlled by either side. Those villages have been terrorized and fought over for 5 years.

Peasants in the "twilight zone" have little regard for either side in the war. That's why it would be unrealistic to count on a free election to show how strong the Vietcong actually is in South Vietnam.

[From Newsweek, Jan. 31, 1966]

THAILAND: THE ANATOMY OF A DOMINO

To any Western visitor inclined to think of Thailand as a semibarbaric land ruled over by Yul Brynner, Bangkok comes as a stunning surprise. Out in the Gulf of Siam, long strings of foreign freighters ride at anchor waiting to unload their cargo at the city's bustling port. Amidst the din of hotel construction around Charoen Krung Road, Chinese storekeepers hawk bolts of bright Thai silk and glistening trays of expensive sapphires to a steady stream of eager tourists. At night, as the lights of thousands of colored neon signs illuminate the city's bars and bathhouses, the pampered youth of Thailand's jet set speed up in flashy sports cars to chic Pat Pong Road where they while away the evening in luxurious nightclubs.

Far to the north of the capital, there is a vastly different scene. In the isolated Mekong town of Nakhon Phanom off-duty U.S. airmen watusi wildly with hostesses in low-cut sequined dresses at the seedy Civilized Hotel. And near the airbase at Korat, crew-cut GI's, strolling arm in arm with their heavily rouged Thai girl friends, pause to peer up into the afternoon sun as yet another sleek F-105 Thunderchief roars off on a mission over Laos.

Boom: This contrast—between the peaceful prosperity of Bangkok and the carpe diem atmosphere of the burgeoning base towns in the hinterland—is symbolic of today's Thailand. One of the most affluent countries in all of southeast Asia, Thailand is riding the crest of an unprecedented economic boom. Shiny new cars and motorcycles jostle each other in Bangkok's noisy streets. In the lush green countryside, peasants tending the rice fields carry their own transistor radios. But Thailand is also a country geared for war. Though Thai leaders are highly reluctant to admit it, their nation is already playing a crucial role in the battle for control of Asia. All U.S. air strikes against Communist forces in Laos originate in Thailand. And before the current U.S. peace offensive went into effect, American planes based in Thailand accounted for at least 80 percent of the bombing raids over North Vietnam.

For a nation which is justifiably proud of its record as the only country in southeast Asia never colonized by the West, Thailand is finding it difficult to adjust to the growing U.S. military presence on its soil. But from Field Marshal Thanom Kittikachorn, the country's dapper, mild-mannered Prime Minister, on down, most responsible Thai leaders have come to realize that history has given them very little choice in the matter. For whatever doubts may be voiced in some U.S. quarters, the Thais believe unreservedly in the domino theory—which posits that if Peiping is allowed to topple any country in southeast Asia, the remaining nations, one after another, will succumb to Chinese influence. Indeed, the Thais are convinced that Communist China is on the march in Asia. And they are keenly aware of the fact that, after South Vietnam, their country is next on Mao Tse-tung's list of candidates for wars of national liberation.

Political assassinations: In fact, Communist China has made its intentions toward Thailand abundantly clear. In recent months, Peiping-backed guerrilla bands have stepped up their activity in Thailand's impoverished northeast region and heavily forested Kra isthmus in the south. During the past year, the guerrillas have been responsible for an estimated 21 political assassinations. Chinese Foreign Minister Chen Yi has flatly stated that "we hope to have a guerrilla war in Thailand before the year is out" and to underscore that threat, Peiping announced last December that it had merged two Thai revolutionary groups under the name of the Patriotic Front of Thailand.

All this, of course, sounds ominously like the initial stages of the war in Vietnam. And in some ways, Thailand gives the appearance of being ripe for Communist subversion. The Thai armed forces, for instance, number only 130,000 men (including a horse cavalry division) and are top-heavy with officers. Bangkok's bureaucracy is, in many matters, thoroughly knotted in its own redtape. Most important, the government, which traditionally has controlled only Bangkok and the central plains near the capital, is just now extending its influence out to its frontiers.

Pro-Hanoi: First priority has been given to the northeast. On the face of it, the problems in that remote region seem almost insurmountable. For one thing, most of the 10 million peasants who eke out a bare existence from the northeast's arid plains are ethnically of Lao extraction and feel little or no loyalty to Bangkok. For another, during the French Indochina War, some 60,000 Vietnamese refugees—mostly from North Vietnam—fled to Thailand's northeast. "There's no doubt," says a high-ranking U.S. military officer, "the Vietnamese refugees are linked to the Thai Communist movement. By and large, they are pro-Hanoi."

Recently, the Communists have begun a systematic program of infiltration and indoctrination of villages along the Mekong River. In Nakhon Phanom Province, for example, many of the males of Ban Dong Luang village attend secret Communist meetings on an average of once a week. Meantime, the Patriotic Front of Thailand, which is run from China by a former Thai lieutenant colonel named Phayum Chulanont, has ordered a step-up in the number of small-scale attacks against provincial police patrols.

Propaganda: While the Northeast is the main worry, the narrow, 1,000-mile-long Kra Isthmus also offers fertile ground for Communist subversion. There, Peiping has a readymade Communist organization—the 500-odd Chinese guerrillas who fled Malaya in 1960 with their leader, Chin Peng, after the failure of their 12-year insurrection against the British. Playing upon the traditional discontent of the Moslem Malays, who comprise a majority in the peninsula's southernmost provinces, the Communists pass out propaganda pamphlets and even give lectures in village schools. Says one knowledgeable American official: "The Communists have recruited enough Malays and others to field about three battalions."

Against this impressive array of sore spots on the Thai body politic, however, the nation can point to some important strengths. Not the least of these are its cherished tradition of national independence and the survival of its ancient monarchy; though the role of the monarchy is now purely ceremonial, 38-year-old King Phumiphon, a talented jazz clarinetist, and his coolly beautiful Queen Sirikit, 33, are genuinely revered by the country's peasants.

Beyond this, the vast majority of Thailand's 30 million people are united by a common religious faith—Buddhism—and, despite the presence of minorities in the Northeast and the Kra Isthmus, the Thai population is far more homogeneous ethnically than those of most southeast Asian nations. Perhaps most important of all, the Thai Government has demonstrated impressive ability to bestir itself where questions of national survival are involved.

To counter the Communist threat, Thailand began its own version of the war on poverty as long ago as 1959. Since then, the Government has devoted a whopping 70 percent of its annual budget to such social-welfare programs as road construction, dam projects, agricultural stations and schools.

One shot: As the first step in this program, the Thai Government established 14 so-called mobile development units in 6 critical Northeast Provinces and the Kra Isthmus. Originally conceived as a one-shot emergency "impact" program, the bureaucracy entwined MDU's largely failed in their objective to encourage rural communities to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps. But by mid-1964, a second project, called Accelerated Rural Development, was launched under the decentralized command of Deputy Province Governors.

Learning from the MDU experiment, each ARD team is staffed by U.S.-trained technicians who are assigned on a permanent basis to keep previously started projects going. In addition, Government-sponsored community development units work side by side with the technicians to help develop riceroots political leadership. "ARD hasn't gone forward as rapidly as we wanted it to," says one U.S. official, "but there has been real progress." To which another American adds: "Sure ARD has some troubles, but let's not expect a degree of perfection from the Thais which we have never achieved ourselves."

Behind the effort to increase the stake of the rural areas in Thailand's blossoming economy (gross national product: $3.3 billion) stands perhaps the best staffed Government in southeast Asia; most ministers and bureaucrats are university graduates and nearly all are intensely patriotic. But this gifted elite is highly exclusive. By rough estimate, only about 1 percent of the Thai population has any real voice in the policies of the Government, which has led some observers to dub the system "old school Thai."

Included in this tight circle of power are leading members of the aristocracy, Government ministers, army generals, wealthy businessmen, property owners and a small professional class—many of whom are related to each other or linked by business interests. Not surprisingly, in this sort of system corruption thrives. (When he died in 1963, former Prime Minister Sarit Thanarat left behind 150 "minor" wives, 51 private cars and an estimated $140 million.) To Americans accustomed to a stricter ethics in public affairs, all this is shocking. "The Thais may be our allies," says one administration official, "but they're crooked as hell and I detest them for it." The Thais themselves, however, for the most part accept corruption as standard business practice and see nothing ethically wrong with it. In fact, according to the newspaper Siam Nikorn: "The general attitude of the local people toward corrupt practices here is that the more one indulges in them, the more one gains esteem and social status."

One of the few exceptions to this rule is Prime Minister Thanom Kittikachorn. In his first public statement upon assuming power after Sarit's death, Thanom declared: "I hate corruption." And last month, in his New Year's message to the nation, Thanom admonished the Thais: "Do good, have morals, be honest."

Personally and publicly, Thanom follows his own prescription. Though he was a protégé of the sybaritic Sarit, his name, amazingly, has never been connected with a scandal. Instead, he rose to power on the strength of his reputation as a reliable soldier. And, thanks in part to his unfailing courtesy and amiability, the 54-year-old Thanom has had a stabilizing influence on Thai politics during a period of increased Communist pressure. Dressed in his bemedaled field marshal's uniform, the Prime Minister travels extensively over the country and is received everywhere with warm cordiality by the Thais. Among his Ministers, he has the reputation of coming to decisions slowly—but sticking to them once he has made up his mind.

"Iron man": When he took over the Prime Ministership more than 2 years ago, Thanom was generally expected to be quickly knocked aside by more ambitious military leaders. His success in holding on to the reins of government is attributable to the fact that he shrewdly lined up the necessary support—most notably that of Army Gen. Praphas Charusathira.

A bluff, moon-faced professional soldier who wears sinister-looking dark glasses to shield his one good eye, Praphas is universally credited with being the "iron man" of the Thai Government. As Deputy Prime Minister, Deputy Supreme Commander, Commander in Chief of the Army and Interior Minister, Praphas controls more power in Thailand than any other single man—including Prime Minister Thanom. "In terms of raw authority," says a top Western diplomat in Bangkok, "Praphas could take over the Government tomorrow. But I doubt he would do it. He recognizes his own unpopularity, and if he dumped Thanom he would be in trouble." Another important consideration is the fact that Praphas' daughter is married to Thanom's son—and in Thailand, family ties are taken very seriously.

Indeed, relations between the two men are reportedly very smooth. While the decorous Thanom keeps the machinery of Government turning over, Praphas revels in his power to pull strings. Up each morning at 5:30 to drive a few balls on the golf range, he is behind his desk by 10 and receiving a long line of official visitors. To Westerners, Praphas' soldierly bluntness can, at times, seem downright anti-American. "Help from the United States is not adequate," he declared in a recent interview with Newsweek's Robert K. McCabe and Merton D. Perry. "We have more American troops here now, but assistance to us has been reduced. It doesn't meet the needs. Now we would like to have antiaircraft weapons and your military authorities say it is not necessary because, in case of attack, they would send their planes to defend us."

Despite such tough talk, however, Thailand's leaders have firmly cast their lot with the United States in Asia. This policy, in fact, dates back to 1950, when Thailand was one of the first countries outside the United States to contribute troops to the U.N. force fighting in Korea. In 1954, Thailand joined the U.S.-sponsored Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and Thailand's Pote Sarasin was elected SEATO's first Secretary-General. At the height of the Laotian crisis in 1961–62, Washington and Bangkok concluded a defense agreement and President Kennedy dispatched 5,000 troops to Thailand.

Since then, the United States has sunk an average of $40 million a year into Thailand, building up a vast pool of military supplies (enough to support a whole division) and an extensive network of roads. Significantly, the U.S.-constructed $20 million Friendship Highway and its Bangkok bypass, linking the capital with the Communist-exposed northeast, are both capable of carrying heavy U.S. tanks. In addition, the United States is spending $12 million to turn the Thai naval base of Sattahip on the Gulf of Siam into a huge air and seaport complex which, in an emergency, could handle a sudden influx of U.S. troops.

Bases: Along with the construction projects, U.S. troop strength in Thailand has more than doubled since 1962 to some 12,000 men. The troops, two-thirds of whom are Air Force men, are under the command of tough, balding Maj. Gen. Richard G. Stilwell, chief of the Military Assistance Command—Thailand. Last week, from Takhli in the west to Ubon in the east, from Udon in the northeast to Korat in the heart of the country, U.S. jets from nine squadrons reached into Laos to bomb the Ho Chi Minh Trail. Standing by at Nakorn Phanom was an air-sea rescue squadron of helicopters and amphibious planes.

Technically, the planes operate out of Thai—not American—bases; in practice, though, the airfields have been greatly expanded and integrated into the chain of U.S. bases which rings China from the Sea of Japan to the Indian Ocean. Already, the U.S. presence has caused some friction among the stanchly independent Thai. Explains Air Chief Marshal Dawee Chullasapya: "There are three categories of Thai on this question. The first group feels it's very good to have the United States involved—that we haven't the resources to fight Peiping and Hanoi. The second feels, 'No, we are independent; we do not want foreign troops on our soil.' And the third? All they want to do is to be left alone to make money. Sooner or later, the second group will change its mind."

What this simply means is that the Thai—who concluded alliances with the

British in the last century and the Japanese during World War II—have decided to follow their longstanding tradition of accommodation with the paramount power in Asia. Indeed, if the United States were to lose heart and pull out of Vietnam, it is almost certain that Thailand would just as quickly come to mutually acceptable terms with the only other great power remaining in the area—Communist China.

And this, of coures, underscores the real significance of the domino theory. As originally set forth in 1954 by President Eisenhower, the domino theory rested on the simplistic proposition that if any Asian nation fell to the Communists, the others would follow—flop, flop, flop—one domino after another in a neat row. Obviously, however, nations rarely react to any situation so neatly and predictably. In southeast Asia, as in the rest of the world, circumstances of geography, history, and culture make for as many potentially difference reactions as there are countries.

Hegemony: Thus, in the event of a U.S. defeat or withdrawal in Vietnam, it is unlikely that Communist governments would automatically be installed everywhere in southeast Asia. True, the weakest country of the lot—Laos—would probably have to be written off as lost. But on the other hand, Cambodia, Burma, and Thailand might have a chance of maintaining some semblance of their independence—provided they acknowledged the reassertion of China's historic hegemony over the area. It also seems reasonable to assume that Malaysia could not continue as a pro-Western bastion. And in Indonesia, the recent flip in favor of the anti-Communist generals might flop the other way. Ironically, too, any hope that North Vietnam might ultimately develop into a "Titoist state" would vanish, since it would no longer be able to play off Moscow against Peiping.

None of this, of course, can be viewed as a pleasant prospect. And it is precisely to prevent this prospect from becoming reality that the Johnson administration has reaffirmed and increased the U.S. commitment to Vietnam. So long as that commitment holds, the strong and stable Thai are given a good chance of solving their problems in relative peace. For as one Thai provincial governor notes: "Potentially, Thailand could be a second Vietnam. But right now the Government is taking effective action." And an experienced U.S. official, who recently arrived in booming Bangkok after a tour of duty in beleaguered Saigon, emphatically adds: "I'm not afraid that Thailand will be the next Vietnam. The Thai have so much going for them."

MR. AND MRS. EARL HARWELL HOGAN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1520) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Earl Harwell Hogan, which was on page 2, lines 6 and 7, strike out "in excess of 10 percentum thereof".

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

M. SGT. BERNARD L. LaMOUNTAIN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 851) for the relief of M. Sgt. Bernard L. LaMountain, U.S. Air Force (retired), which was, on page 2, line 9, after "Act." insert:

> No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MARY F. MORSE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 577) for the relief of Mary F. Morse, which was, on page 2, line 6 after "Act." insert:

> No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Henry Allen Moe, of New York, to be Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I also report favorably from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare sundry nominations in the Public Health Service. Since these names have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations ordered to lie on the desk are as follows:

Eugene J. Gangarosa, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

PEACE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jack Hood Vaughn, of Virginia, to be Director of the Peace Corps.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the nomination. I have agreed with the leadership not to ask for a yea-and-nay vote. There are many absentees this afternoon, and there are also many who prefer not to have a yea-and-nay vote. As long as the RECORD shows my opposition to the nomination, my record is clear.

Mr. President, I speak in opposition to this nomination not only in my capacity as the Senator from Oregon, but also in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs. I have tried for a good many years, Mr. President, to work hard and diligently in the field of United States-Latin American affairs, and I am perfectly willing to stand on the record that I have made.

I oppose Mr. Vaughn because as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, in my judgment, he was grossly incompetent.

At the time that Mr. Gordon was under consideration for his new appointment, which is to succeed Mr. Vaughn as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, I made certain comments in the hearing on the Gordon nomination. I said, in essence, that I was very much concerned about United States-Latin American policies, because in many instances, when the chips of freedom have been down in Latin America, the United States walked out on freedom. Mr. President, that is one of the sad conclusions I have been forced to come to in my work on the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs.

Mr. President, that is a point of view I have expressed on many occasions here in the Senate in recent years.

On too many occasions the policy of the United States in Latin America has been a policy that can be accurately described as walking out on freedom in Latin America; and before I finish these brief remarks, I shall give additional reasons supporting that conclusion.

On February 9, 1966, the Vaughn nomination was before the Foreign Relations Committee, and Mr. Vaughn was called upon to make any statement that he cared to, setting forth his qualifications and his views on any matter, as is always the privilege of any nominee.

As the hearing reports on the desks of the Senators show on page 2, he said:

> I was really very unhappy at Senator MORSE's comment that when the chips of democracy are down in Latin America we walk away. Unhappy because I don't think it is true, and I don't think the facts will bear that out.

Mr. President, any nominee has the right to make any statement he wishes at the time of his hearing. He certainly has the right to disagree with any Senator. He certainly has the right to appear before the committee and say that, in his opinion, a Senator is not speaking the truth. But, of course, he should not expect, after he makes such a statement, that the Senator will not reply by supporting his own position in regard to a matter that the nominee has said is not the truth.

So I obliged Mr. Vaughn then, as I oblige him further on the floor of the Senate today.

Mr. President, at the hearing, as the Senators will see on page 11, I replied to Mr. Vaughn in these words:

> Mr. Vaughn, I have taken note of your views on my views on Latin America, and I want you to understand that I know nothing that could possibly concern me less than your views on any of my views or on any other subject. I want you to know that as far as I am concerned I shall vote against your nomination because, in my opinion, your work as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs disqualifies you for any appointment and I shall vote against this appointment.
>
> When you talk about my views in regard to walking out on freedom when the chips are down, I want to say to those of you in the State Department who advised our President on December 10, 1963, to recognize that shocking, tyrannical, military junta in the Dominician Republic that you were advising him to walk out on freedom; and when on December 14 he recognized that Dominican tyranny, he walked out on freedom; and the policy of our Government in recognizing a military junta in Honduras was a walkout on freedom; and when we recently threw our support behind the new military dictatorship in Brazil, I think we walked out on freedom again in Latin America; and when some years ago we pinned a medal on a tyrant in Venezuela, we walked out on freedom, and Latin America recognized it; and when we recognized and worked with that tyrant in the Dominican Republic by the name of Trujillo, we were walking out on freedom; and when we proceeded also to give support to the tyrant in Cuba by the name of Batista we walked out on freedom; and I shall always be proud to point out that from the very beginning I opposed any cooperation with Castro because he was another tyrant. Thus we can go on and outline the sorry record of our Government time and time again in supporting tyranny in Latin America. The reason why we have a lot of troubles in Latin America is because too often we do support tyranny in Latin America.
>
> So we are so far apart that I am delighted to agree to disagree with you. I think that there is no question about the fact that you and Mann and Rusk have given bad advice to our President and, therefore, I couldn't possibly vote for you for this nomination, and I shall not.

Mr. President, there are many other examples of our walking out on freedom in Latin America. I note that I did not mention our recognition and financial support of the current military junta in Guatemala. Beyond that, it all depends on how far we wish to go back, whether we wish to go back to the sending of marines into Haiti, whether we wish to go back to the shocking treatment that we gave our sister Republic to the south of us, Mexico, or whether we wish to go back to these many black marks against the United States in regard to its record vis-a-vis Latin America, there it is—indelibly printed on the pages of history.

I cannot give support to the nomination of one who, in my judgment, has been a party to advising our Government to walk out on freedom time and time again during the time that he was Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs.

Need I point out for the RECORD also that it was not so long ago we walked out on freedom in the Argentine, when we gave support to that tyrant who was in charge of the Argentine who had set up, for all practical purposes, a police state; namely, Peron.

Wherever and whenever we have supported military juntas and dictatorships in Latin America, we have walked out on freedom in Latin America. Mr. Vaughn, when he was Assistant Secretary of State—as is Mr. Mann, and I am sorry to say I have come to the conclusion that it is also true of Lincoln Gordon—supported the military juntas. In my judgment, we cannot support military juntas and be on the side of, and support, freedom in Latin America.

It is well known in the Senate, at least it is well known in the Committee on Foreign Relations, that for many years I have spearheaded a drive in the committee to try to put the brakes on the U.S. aid program in connection with supplying military aid to Latin America.

As a result, and with the support which I have received in increasing numbers year by year, we have greatly reduced military foreign aid to Latin America, but not enough. We still furnish too much military aid to Latin America. It is military aid which builds up military oligarchies there. It is military aid which keeps down freedom there. It is military aid that plays into the hands of the Communists wherever we send such aid.

Mr. President, that is the great issue of policy which confronts us. Of course, I do not limit it to Latin America, but I am talking about my experience as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs. I have told it before, but for the RECORD today let me say that a good example of the harm which military aid does to the image of the United States in Latin America is what I observed in Lima, Peru, when President Kennedy sent me down there as chairman of his inaugural delegation at the time of the inauguration of the new President of Peru. For 3 hours and 15 minutes, I sat in the military reviewing stand and watched a military parade conducted in connection with that inauguration, and saw over 40 Sherman tanks and mile after mile of other heavy American military equipment rumbling down the boulevard.

I kept asking myself, "What is this all about? What is the need for this kind of military equipment?"

It was pointed out to me that if I would look at the officers of the Peruvian Army, I would not find any Indians there. They are the privates and the noncoms. But, a military oligarchy has been built up, and was built up in the military junta which preceded this particular change of administration. I applauded that change of administration, but let me say that the junta was not responsible for it; the people of Peru were responsible for it, for this military equipment and the training of these non-Indian Peruvians as officers under a U.S. military program had built up a military oligarchy in Peru. Mr. President, I believe that to be a mistake. Therefore, I was not surprised—on that day, and the following 2 days that we remained in Peru for the inauguration ceremonies—that delegate after delegate from delegation after delegation around the world in Lima at that time, came to me, as they did to other members of the U.S. delegation, to express their concern about the kind of military aid which we were pouring into Peru, not only to Peru but also to many other Latin American countries.

They asked us over and over again, "What are you Americans thinking of? By what reasoning do you think this is going to enhance opportunities for freedom in Latin America?"

It is this kind of aid, Mr. President, which makes Communists; for the Communists use this kind of aid, pointing out to the masses of people—many of them illiterate and unenlightened—that of course the United States is using its military might to suppress movements for freedom in Latin America.

Mr. President, Americans do not like to hear it, but the sad thing is that we think so much more of ourselves than do most people in the underdeveloped areas of the world, that it is a little difficult for us, really, to look in the mirror and see ourselves for what we are. The U.S. image around the world is not one of beauty in the eyes of so many people in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

The military aid which we have been pouring into Latin America, even at a reduced rate, is doing great harm, in my judgment, to the Alliance for Progress program. This program is a great program and has great potentialities, but military aid of the kind we are pouring into Latin America, as we let down freedom through that military aid, is a handicap to the Alliance for Progress program. That program was envisioned by President Kennedy as a great economic program, exporting the most devastating weapon against communism that we can export to Latin America, or anywhere else in the world; namely, the weapon of economic freedom, seeking to export economic freedom of choice for the masses of any underdeveloped country.

This year I shall renew my urgings to cut deeper into military aid for Latin America because, to the extent that we continue it—and the nature of it—at the present level, we will continue to let down freedom in Latin America and create misunderstanding rather than understanding, if we do not reduce our military aid.

Mr. President, I cannot support nominees of a President who underwrites the kind of policy which jeopardizes our opportunities to strengthen freedom in Latin America or, for that matter, anywhere else in the world.

In closing my comments in opposition to the Vaughn appointment, let me repeat that I shall never forget December

10, 1963. It was on December 10, 1963, on the implementation of the advice the President received on that day, that on December 14, 1963, was paved the way for the United States fiasco in the Dominican Republic, was paved the way for United States outlawry in the Dominican Republic. For in my judgment, the course of action which we have followed in the Dominican Republic, as also the course of action which we are following in South Vietnam, puts us beyond the pale of international law and violates our international obligations under the treaty and under the commitments which we have made, not only in the Dominican Republic but also elsewhere in the world.

On December 10, 1963, the President called a group of us down to the White House, and in the Cabinet Room we listened to a report from the State Department advocating the immediate recognition of the military junta in the Dominican Republic, plus financial and military aid support.

The old story, the same old cracked record was played again—there was about to be an overthrow of the civilian commission. Of course, the civilian commission was a tool of the military junta itself. They were going to overthrow it. This coup was going to be anti-American. It was going to be bloody. They were going to overthrow it. One of the reasons was that the civilian commission had not been able to deliver a U.S. recognition of the junta. I knew then I had heard just about everything, for I never knew that recognition by the United States was on the auction mart. That was part of the argument. We were told if there was to be stability, we would have to recognize the junta. There would never be stability if we did not bring the military dictatorship into it. It was pointed out that the leftists had already hidden in the mountains, and if they were not getting Castro support yet, they would be getting it in time. That is always worth a lot of votes, but I think it is a cheap waving of the flag.

I listened. When my advice was asked, I pointed out that the wrong group was there to give us advice; that we should have that advice from our democratic friends in Latin America. We should have the advice of the President of Chile and Colombia, the President of Venezuela, the able Mr. Betancourt, the new President of Costa Rica, Mr. Figueres, and Mr. Belaunde of Peru. We also ought to have Mr. Luis-Marin. We ought to call the roll of every democratic leader in Latin America. Then I said if we called them their advice would be opposite from the advice the State Department was giving. I said that if we recognize these juntas we only strengthen potential military juntas throughout Latin America; and there would be placed right in their hands the weapons with which to seek to stifle freedom. I pointed out that, when Bosch left the Dominican Republic, the constitution did not go with him, and all the provisions of the constitution for succession remain, and that we must there, as elsewhere in similar situations, make it perfectly plain that we are going to recognize constitutionalism, and not the overthrow of constitutionalism.

I also said on that occasion, although it was not the first time, "Mr. President, if you follow this advice, we will demonstrate once again that, when the chips are down in Latin America, the United States cannot be counted on to support freedom, but walks out on freedom."

That was on December 10, 1963. On December 14, 1963, the President recognized the junta. Members of the press reached me as I was flying to a university in the South to deliver a lecture. I gave them a synopsis of what was said at the White House.

The statement ended up with the observation I had made at the time of the Gordon hearing, with respect to Mr. Vaughn's position. I said, once again, when the chips of freedom are down in Latin America, the United States walks out on freedom.

Mr. President, regrettably on the advice of his advisers in the State Department, on December 14, 1963, the President recognized that junta in the Dominican Republic, and it led to a tremendous amount of bloodletting. These things cannot be done without having the letting of blood.

Mr. President, much of Latin America is a razor's edge. Much of Latin America is in a state of flux. Our policy should not be the shocking policy we have followed in the Dominican Republic. Our policy should be the policy of recognizing and supporting constitutionalism, not tyranny, not military juntas, not dictatorships.

Our policy should not be one of allowing for a suspension of constitutionalism in Brazil, supported by our then Ambassador to Brazil and by our State Department, which unfortunately, in my judgment, again misled the President of the United States. This course of action is going to cause us great trouble in Latin America. This course of action is the course Vaughn followed as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America. It is a dangerous and unsound policy. It constitutes a great disservice to our people and this country.

Therefore, I cannot support this nomination and wish to go on record in opposition to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jack Hood Vaughn to be Director of the Peace Corps?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jack Hood Vaughn to be Director of the Peace Corps? [Putting the question.] The nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lincoln Gordon, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Lincoln Gordon, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of State?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, prior to the hearings on Mr. Gordon, I had hoped I might be able to vote for his confirmation. But he talked himself out of my vote at the hearings, for I reluctantly came to the conclusion that here was another junta man, and here was a nominee who testified he favored the coup that took place in Brazil.

The hearings are on the desks of Members of the Senate.

There is no question about the fact that this military junta in Brazil suspended the constitution. There is no question about the fact that it placed great limitation on the operation of the legislative processes of Brazil. It even went so far as to place some Members of their Parliament under arrest. It followed the edict of its dictator.

The semantics of the State Department did not change the nature of the power of the head of Brazil. He is a dictator and, of course, by edict he saw to it that potential political opposition was silenced and some even found it necessary to flee the country.

I hold no brief for Mr. Kubitschek, but I say that if we believe in democratic processes, then the people of Brazil should have the right to determine whether or not they want to elect Kubitscheek as their President.

They had him as their President for a time. Apparently his course of action as their President left a deep and large reservoir of public support.

If we really believe in the constitutional process and if we really believe in democratic action, if we mean more than just lipservice to constitutionalism, then I am at a loss to understand how we can be pouring millions of American taxpayers' dollars into this dictator of Brazil as we have done since he took over, and as this administration intends to do with increased millions.

Oh, I know Brazilian forces are being used in the Dominician Republic to carry out American policy. I know that. But that does not make anyone right in that picture, either our Government or theirs.

And so, when this nominee testified, as can be seen in the hearings, that he approves of the course of action that is being followed in Brazil, in my opinion he disqualified himself for the post of Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs.

Mr. President, that appointment will frighten democratic leaders in democratic countries in Latin America. This appointment will be interpreted, and cannot be properly interpreted in any other light, as the appointment of a man as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs who supports juntas; a man who thinks it was all right to lay aside constitutionalism in Brazil, who apparently thinks it is proper to follow a course of action against political opposition, such as the dictatorship of Brazil followed toward Kubitschek, and other potential political opposition in the country.

I am at a loss to understand their policy.

Mr. President, I would not let the Record close today without filing this caveat, for I am satisfied that history will bear me out. I am satisfied that a great loss to American prestige will occur and possibly a great loss in terms of blood and revolution in Latin America. Our policy will be proved wrong again. Once again in Brazil, when the chips of freedom were down, the United States walked out on freedom.

I cannot vote to confirm a nominee as Assistant Secretary of State who made the record that he made at our hearings.

I shall vote against the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Lincoln Gordon, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of State?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Lincoln Gordon, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of State? [Putting the question.] The nomination is confirmed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George A. Avery, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Charles M. Duke, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Advisory Board of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul L. Sitton, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Advisory Board of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion of Mr. Muskie, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PRESS CONTINUES TO CRITICIZE SCHOOL MILK CUTBACK PROPOSAL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, from time to time I have directed the attention of my colleagues to articles which have appeared in the Nation's press criticizing the administration's proposal to cut the special milk program for schoolchildren by 80 percent. The Springfield, Mo., Leader-Press, in an editorial of February 14, vigorously supports the present program and roundly condemns the proposed cut.

As the paper points out in discussing the school milk and school lunch programs:

> Here were two related programs that drew no political fire; almost everybody liked them.

The Leader-Press also asks if "any other program in welfare has been so popular and so cheap, relatively."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record. I hope that my colleagues will read it with care and join the 41 Senators who have cosponsored with me legislation to make the present school milk program permanent.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Springfield (Mo.) Leader-Press, Feb. 14, 1966]

Who Flipped?

President Johnson has demonstrated at times that he can wield a wicked ax when it comes to budget hacking. Yet—and it seems almost incredibly paradoxical to some Americans—he also can ladle lavishly from the public purse when it comes to promoting his "Great Society."

Now in his recommended budget slashes for the school milk and school lunch programs, it appears the President has confused the ax and the ladle—or perhaps he confused the programs.

Both of these programs were instituted years ago, primarily with two ideas in mind: to help the price-oppressed farmer; and to provide milk and hot lunches to tens of thousands of children who otherwise would not get them.

The success of the programs was far greater even than anticipated. Surplus foods acquired by the Federal Government in farm price support programs were utilized; and some of the great milk surplus then suffered was drained away, helping dairymen who were producing at prices actually below production costs. But the greatest, farthest reaching, most surprising benefits were to the children themselves.

Children, whose parents could afford it, paid for their lunches; those less fortunate were fed along with the others, and perhaps only a few persons were the wiser. There was no shame for the child, little stigma of charity, and tens of thousands received hot, attractive, well-balanced meals they otherwise would never have known. Surprisingly, even children from families of better means were, in the main, better fed, since their lunch money no longer went for sweets.

The milk program may have been even better, for children who had balked at milk at home learned to like and demand it, as did other children who seldom had milk at home because of the cost. Uncle Sam bore half the cost of the milk; the child, the rest. But if there were children who couldn't afford even that mite, schools usually provided funds to see that they weren't slighted.

Here were two related programs that drew no political fire; almost everybody liked them.

But the economy-minded Mr. Johnson has proposed that $19 million be trimmed from the school lunch program funds, and that the school milk appropriation be whacked from $103 million to $21 million—this in the face of tremendous gains in school populations.

Also, the President has recommended that the children receiving such help meet a "means test," that is, that they must be qualified as "poor" to receive milk and school lunches.

Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican, of New York, said last week he could see no sense in seeking "new and unproven" social welfare programs at the expense of tried and true ones. The Republican indicated he would fight the budget slash for the programs.

And from his own party, the President has found other critics. Wisconsin's two Democratic Senators have been quite critical: Senator William Proxmire is waging almost daily warfare against the proposed cuts, both in speeches and in the Congressional Record. Senator Gaylord Nelson slaps at the "poor" certification requirements and questions if any other program in welfare has been so popular and so cheap, relatively.

That is unquestionable, too, for about 17 million youngsters daily share in a program that means much to them, yet costs less than $100 million a year.

When Mr. Johnson viewed his proposals as sound economy, it must have been on a night he'd flipped one too many switches in the White House.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR McNAMARA SOURCE OF REGRET FOR NATION AND ITS CITIZENS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is with regret that I note the decision of our colleague, Senator Pat McNamara, of Michigan, to bring to a close his distinguished career of service in the U.S. Senate. Since coming to this body in 1958 I have worked closely with the senior Senator from Michigan in the development of a number of significant pieces of legislation which have become law. He has been a forthright friend, a loyal ally, and a leader of insight and dedication. I was unable to be present on the Senate floor last Wednesday when a number of Senators gave recognition to this talented legislator. On that day I was in Denver, Colo., where it was my privilege to introduce Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson at the annual convention of the American Road Builders' Association.

In the Senate Committee on Public Works, which he chairs, it has been my responsibility to serve with our colleague during consideration of such major proposals as the Appalachian Regional Development Act, the Area Redevelopment Act, omnibus flood control measures, air and water pollution bills, public roads construction authorizations, and public works acceleration.

As ranking member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and chairmar of its Subcommittee on Labor, Senator McNamara has been at the forefront of those responsible for much of the recent and responsive legislation which will be meaningful to future generations of our citizens. The poverty program, Federal aid to education, important health bills and legislation dealing with labor-management relations, all reflect the handiwork of this conscientious and able gentleman.

In the Special Committee on Aging the impact of Pat McNamara's convictions continues to be felt. He was the leading advocate of a separate Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—a concept which has since become law. He has championed the cause of our Nation's 18 million elderly, seeking for them wider employment opportunity, adequate housing, and appropriate medical attention. The passage of medicare during the 1st session of the 89th Congress is due in considerable measure to the effective efforts of our cherished friend from Michigan.

No reference to the legislative accomplishments of Pat would be complete without noting his important contributions in the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Since coming to the Senate in 1955 Pat McNamara has been a resolute fighter for legislation which would assure equal rights and responsibilities under the law for all citizens.

Mr. President, I join wholeheartedly with other Senators in praising Pat McNamara for the devotion with which he serves the citizens of Michigan and the United States. He has been a stanch friend and a courageous advocate of imaginative, yet realistic, legislation. The Senate will be the poorer for his retirement. I trust that he will continue to favor us with his counsel as we face the tasks which lie ahead, and I deem it an honor to have labored at his side.

BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recently I had an opportunity to reread some clippings sent me a number of months ago concerning invasions of privacy. One of the most provocative of these was a short article from Redbook magazine by Miss Margaret Mead.

It is a drastic understatement to say that it provides food for thought for those of us struggling with possible Federal legislation in this field.

Miss Mead's thesis is that "public safety and individual privacy are, in fact, inseparable." This seeming paradox is particularly true in our new, complex urban society.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Redbook magazine, April 1965]

Our Right to Privacy

(By Margaret Mead)

Privacy—the right to live part of one's life out of the public eye, according to one's own choice, and free from interference by others—is taken for granted by Americans. The right to privacy is closely bound up with our sense of individuality and our belief in the value of personal choice. It includes the freedom to come and go and to speak wherever one may be without the feeling of being under observation. The desire for a personal life of one's own choosing is part of the American dream of the open frontier; today the expectation of greater freedom of choice keeps a stream of people moving from small towns into our larger towns and cities. Yet the very strength of our commitment has created a dilemma in which both personal privacy and public safety are in jeopardy.

We are faced by two kinds of danger. The first has to do with the invasion of privacy by the new technology—the devices that enable an outsider, often an anonymous outsider, to break in on a person's life without his consent and even without his knowledge. Wire tapping and the use of hidden microphones to overhear confidential conversations are perhaps the most familiar. But there are many other such devices—cameras with telephoto lenses, film that can be used to take pictures in the dark, listening devices that can be beamed from a distance and the so-called lie detectors—all of which vastly enlarge customary spheres of observation. Generally speaking, people connect their use with crime detection, but the inference is that they can be used against anyone almost anywhere.

The second danger arises out of an apparent indifference on the part of ordinary citizens to crimes that are committed in public, sometimes before their very eyes. There are the crimes that take place on dark, lonely streets, or in empty corridors and elevators of huge buildings. There are also the holdups and muggings and murders that take place in broad daylight in full view of passersby. In recent months there has been a national outcry against such crimes as these and against the apathy of those who do not lift a hand to help the victim of an attack. There has also been an outcry against the activities of private citizens' groups organized to protect their home neighborhoods. The result is bafflement and a sense of outrage.

Although these two dangers appear to be quite different in their effect upon personal security, they are actually only two parts of one picture whose components have become disassociated in our minds. How has this happened?

In the first place, we have somehow ceased to recognize that responsible knowledge of who someone is, where he is, and what he is doing is as much a protection of innocence as it is a deterrent to crime. In the public view the policeman, the immigration, and the customs official, the fire inspector, and many others with legal investigatory powers have come to be regarded as enemies of privacy. We have lost sight of their protective role and have confused personal privacy with privacy from the law.

Still another source of confusion exists that goes back to a rejection of the viewpoint of the small community where everyone is known and no sharp distinction can be drawn between neighbors' sanctions and public action. In a small community common knowledge, based on watching and listening, on memories of past events witnessed or surmised and on shared gossip, is a form of protection, but it can also be turned against any person or group whose standards the community neither understands nor accepts. People in a small community may protect only too well the eccentricities of those who "belong"; their accumulated knowledge, however, leaves little room for privacy.

In contrast, life in a large city offers extraordinary possibilities for anonymity. In the accepted sense there are virtually no neighbors. People living on the same street seldom know one another's names; even those who have lived in the same building for many years may have little idea of how any individual among them spends his time. In a city, inveterate window watchers looking down at the streets may go entirely unnoticed, and their efforts to pry seldom affect anyone's feeling of privacy. In a city it is possible to move in 10 different circles of friends whose several paths never cross. There is no one to listen in on a party line, no one to make officious comments, no one to spread insinuating rumors in an ever-widening circle.

By the same token there may be no one to lend a helping hand. A desperate cry for help may go unheeded. Indeed, no one may recognize it for what it is. Experience of city living among strangers of many different backgrounds has the effect of lowering most people's alertness; their assumptions about what is happening so often turn out to be incorrect. If a man is lying in the street, who knows whether or not help is already on the way? A street chase may be real or it may turn out to be part of a scenario enacted in a natural setting. A cry in the night might mean that someone is in trouble but it might not. Who can tell? Let the police or other people handle the trouble—if it is real. It is safer not to become involved. Lending a hand to a stranger may be dangerous; summoning help may lead only to a string of infuriating questions about oneself.

So we have come full circle. However, one new thing emerges—the confusion of anonymity with privacy. The anonymity of city life does, of course, offer a person privacy from the prying eyes of neighbors and aging relatives, and from the long memories of people who "knew him when"; it offers freedom from petty sanctions; it relieves the individual of the necessity of continually asking himself, "What will people say if * * *?" Compared to life in a small town, it allows each individual much greater latitude. But it also encourages a kind of blindness and deafness to the well-being of others. And this, in the long run, results in harm to everyone.

The confusion, the failure to distinguish between anonymity and privacy, suggests that many people have stopped at a halfway point in their adaptation to city living. They have welcomed its privileges without asking what responsibilities these entail. They have welcomed its freedom without asking what safeguards are necessary. The anonymity that is an inevitable aspect of urban life rules out many forms of behavior and knowledge that serve to protect people living in a small town. Having left these behind, people do not ask what the urban alternatives may be. Instead, they tend to attribute to impersonal watching and listening all the motives of personal curiosity and prying.

Yet if we are to reap the benefits of urban freedom and privileges, we must overcome the hazards of not knowing and not being known. Recognizing the nature of the hazards is a necessary first step. Finding new means of protection is the second. This brings us back to the new technology—but in a different context. For the devices we have rejected because they can be (and have been) used to invade individual privacy can also be used to insure the public safety, without which privacy itself becomes a nightmare isolation.

Public safety and individual privacy are, in fact, inseparable. The question we face is not whether one must be sacrificed to the other but, rather, whether we prefer to risk the loss of both or are willing to work toward the development of a new sense of responsibility and trust consonant with urban living. Above all, we need to rethink the uses of modern devices for watching, listening, and recording, and to recognize their safeguarding functions in protecting the potential victim from attack, the potential thug and murderer from carrying out a crime, and the bystander as well, whose feeling of helplessness in a situation of danger has been unfairly branded as apathy.

As steps on the way, we need to go over every point at which the anonymity of the individual may cease to exist or at which the investigatory powers of public officials may be brought into play and to analyze what really is involved. We need to ask why the police patrol the streets, why fire inspectors must have free entry into buildings. We also need to ask what changes we have already accepted—why we are willing to be fingerprinted at our schools or jobs and why it is important for everyone to carry means of identification—and what hindrances stand in the way of other new forms of behavior.

In the past we accepted the policeman walking his beat as an insurance of the safety of people and homes and shops. More recently we have come to take for granted the roaming radio patrol car—the same police officers, but only occasionally present on any one street and less personally related to a neighborhood at a greater remove. Would not a device by which the sights and sounds of a street could be continually monitored be a safer one? Like the familiar policeman on his beat, the man watching and listening in a nearby police station would be attuned chiefly to a break in the ordinary pattern. He would not, any more than the patrolman, look at or listen to each passer-by, children on the way to school or workers on their way to their offices. Like the patrolman, his eyes and ears would be attuned to the unusual—the cry of someone who fell, the scream of someone afraid—and help could be dispatched where and when it was needed. So, also, the witness to an accident or a crime would know that he could, with a gesture or a shout, summon help.

In smaller, old-fashioned apartment buildings we accepted the presence of the doorman and the elevator man, who between them could keep entrances and corridors under surveillance and look after the needs of tenants. But in great modern apartment blocks, even a dozen guards could not provide full protection in the long, empty corridors and the elevators. Tenant groups have discovered this for themselves, and have discovered as well the difficulty of summoning additional aid when trouble occurs. Here again, the presence of listening and watching devices—and the knowledge that one watching person, trained for emergencies, was paying attention—would allow people to come and go with security.

These are only two examples of the conditions under which our new technology could be put to constructive use, expanding and transforming older forms of urban protection to meet the needs of modern living and actually widening the areas within which individuals know that they can live their own lives safely. The new devices would return to the ordinary wayfarer the protection he once had on the street, on train and subway platforms, in the corridors and on the elevators of huge buildings, and on lonely freeways (where no one will stop by a stopped car) at night. But their full adoption would mean more than this. It would signify a new stage of responsible acceptance of an urban style of living.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT EFFORTS: POLLUTION

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, President Johnson's plan to transfer the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Department of the Interior is the logical next step in the fight to clean up our waters and to keep them clean.

The sad fact is that even while our efforts to combat pollution have been increasing, pollution itself has been increasing at a faster pace. Despite the steps that have been taken since the enactment of the first antipollution legislation in 1948, we have come to the point where one of our Great Lakes is almost beyond the point of rescue and another is fast approaching that deplorable condition. The waters of many of our rivers are today unfit both for human consumption and agricultural and industrial uses.

Last year in the Clean Waters Act Congress provided for the establishment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration because it had become all too plain that the problem demanded much more than a purely public health approach.

The transfer of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to the Department of the Interior gives recognition to the fact that pollution is but one of a number of problems we must meet if our rivers are to be used wisely, and by the very nature of water itself the attack upon pollution must be carried on in the context of a unified water conservation program. The Department of the Interior has traditionally been concerned with the wise conservation and development of our water resources. Assigning the war on pollution to the Department will complete the gearing up process. The full, comprehensive, and concentrated fight to clean up our rivers can now begin.

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM SHOULD BE UNCONDITIONALLY FUNDED

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, under the auspices of the Americans for Democratic Action, 100 experts in urban problems recently urged President Johnson to support, as a priority administration request, unrestricted funding of the rent supplement program authorized by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

As Senators know, the President has specifically requested full funding of the rent supplement program in the supplemental bill soon to be considered and in the fiscal year 1967 regular Appropriations Act. The President's request is very encouraging, in my opinion, because this rent supplement program is one of the most significant and imaginative acts of the Congress since 1949 to meet the acute housing needs of our low-income families.

As the signers of the ADA letter to the President correctly argued, the rent supplement program was envisioned by the Congress as a way of making it possible for private builders and landlords to offer good housing to the poor. It is, Mr. President, a private builders program and, therefore, there should be no undue restrictions as to approval of individual projects by local public officials.

The President has made it absolutely clear that the fears expressed by some Members of the Congress last fall, that the program would benefit others than the poor, are completely unfounded.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a press release and the text of the letter endorsed by the 100 experts in the housing field, along with their names and identifications be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the press release and letter, with the list of endorsers, were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Americans for Democratic Action,
Washington, D.C., February 12, 1966.

Fund HUD's Rent Supplement Program Unconditionally, Experts Tell L.B.J.

Washington, February 12.—One hundred citizens—all experts in urban problems—yesterday asked President Johnson to support "as a major administration priority" unrestricted funding of the rent supplement program of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

Calling the rent supplement program "the most important new housing policy to aid low-income families since 1949," the 100 sociologists, city planners, municipal commissioners, builders, labor leaders, political scientists, and others—including one former big-city mayor—who speak from 22 U.S. cities and major metropolitan areas, endorsed a letter to the President signed by Americans for Democratic Action.

(The rent supplement legislation authorizes HUD to pay rent supplements for low-income families whose incomes are below the amount permissible for occupants of public housing and who fit into one of several categories: physically handicapped, 62 or older, displaced by urban renewal or highway projects; or presently housed in substandard dwellings.)

Leon Shull, national director of ADA, indicated two main problems with the rent supplement program as it stands now:

"First," said Shull, "the program is not funded because the House failed to appropriate any money for it. The legislation stated the maximum amount of money which can be appropriated, but actual appropriation must be a separate congressional action.

"Second, the House Appropriations Committee put into the legislation the provision that projects must be part of a workable program or officially approved by the local community."

"This means," Shull explained, "that precisely those areas—such as suburbs—which offer the only real hope for permanent relocation of displaced or badly housed poverty-stricken persons, could continue to exclude low-income and minority families merely by failing to have a workable program or a set of city fathers who approve of the law.

"In other words, making funds conditional on a workable program circumvents the intent of the legislation, which was to help the ill-housed poor by making it possible for private builders and landlords to offer good housing at rent subsidized by the government."

ADA in its letter stated:

"Low-income families invariably spend more proportionately per unit for housing than other families, a family earning a low income is often forced to spend as much as

35 percent of income on housing. We believe the rent supplement program is a valuable tool precisely because it lowers rent costs for low-income families while at the same time provides such families with decent, safe and sanitary housing."

As income of occupants rises, the supplement decreases until occupants can pay the entire rent and continue to live in the quarters with no supplement.

ADA's letter also pointed out that since the rent subsidy program does not involve matching grants, local officials should not have veto power over programs which involve them, neither administratively nor financially.

"Since eligibility for the rent supplement program is limited to the maximum income permissible for public housing occupancy, to suggest that rent supplements is not a program to benefit low-income families, as the bill's opponents have, grossly distorts the real facts," the letter stated.

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1966.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We believe that the rent supplement program adopted by the Congress in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is the most important new initiative in housing policy to aid low-income families since 1949. If the rent supplement program is adequately funded, and is used in our metropolitan areas—cities and suburbs—it will be a basic tool to eliminate slum housing in which so many of our poor now live.

Regrettably the House of Representatives failed to appropriate funds for this program. While the Senate appropriated funds, the program was not funded. Until the rent subsidy program is funded it cannot aid low-income families in their housing needs.

The purpose of the rent subsidy program is to aid low-income families who are either physically handicapped, elderly, occupy substandard housing, or have been displaced by governmental action. The legislation assures that only low-income families will receive the program's benefits.

Since eligibility for the rent supplement program is limited to the maximum income permissible for public housing occupancy, to suggest that rent supplements is not a program to benefit low-income families, as the bill's opponents have, grossly distorts the real facts.

Low-income families invariably spend more proportionately per unit for housing than other families; a family earning a low income is often forced to spend as much as 35 percent of their income on housing. We believe that the rent supplement program is a valuable tool precisely because it lowers rent costs for low-income families while at the same time provides such families with decent, safe, and sanitary housing.

As important as funding the rent subsidy program is, it is necessary that the program be allowed to function as Congress intended it—without undue restrictions. In 1965, however, the House Appropriations Committee limited the use of the funds of the rent subsidy program by requiring that rent subsidy program projects must be "either part of a workable program or * * * have been officially approved by the local community concerned."

These restrictions are unwise public policy, and will severely cripple the rent supplement program. Many communities do not have workable programs. Also, since the rent subsidy program does not involve a matching grant, local officials should not be in the position of having a veto power over a program that neither involves local officials administratively nor financially.

Mr. President, the legislative solution is obvious. To end blight and increase decent, safe, and sanitary housing requires funding the rent supplement program, and without restrictions. We respectfully request your public support on this matter as a major administration priority. Its success will be a great victory in the war against poverty and an end to slum housing.

Attached is a list of endorsers of this letter. Their organizational and institutional affiliations are listed for identification purposes only.

Respectfully yours,
LEON SHULL,
National Director.

ENDORSERS OF RENT SUBSIDY LETTER TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

John Anderson, attorney, San Francisco, Calif.

Ellis Ash, administrator, Boston Housing Authority, Stoneham, Mass.

David Baum, assistant professor of law, College of Law, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Henry C. Beertiz, attorney, Philadelphia, Pa.

James Besheres, associate professor of sociology, MIT, Newton, Mass.

Richard F. Bolan, assistant to the director, Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Studies, Cambridge, Mass.

Richard H. Buford, commissioner of licenses and inspection, Philadelphia, Pa.

Terry Chisholm, executive director, Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations, Philadelphia, Pa.

Carla Cohen, city planner, Washington, D.C.

Theodore Coggs, former president, National Bar Association, Milwaukee, Wis.

M. Todd Cooke, Jr., banker, Philadelphia, Pa.

Harvey Cox, associate professor, Harvard Divinity School, Boston, Mass.

Robert Craft, inner city development project, Milwaukee, Wis.

Louis Danzig, executive director, Newark Housing Authority, Newark, N.J.

Paul Davidoff, chairman, department of city planning, Hunter College, New York, N.Y.

Terry Dellmuth, public welfare consultant, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mrs. Cushing Dolbeare, managing director, Philadelphia Housing Association, Philadelphia, Pa.

James R. Dumpson, chairman, Hunter School of Social Work, Hunter College, New York, N.Y.

Edward Eichler, California home builder, San Francisco, Calif.

Maurice Fagan, executive director, fellowship commission, Philadelphia, Pa.

Bernard Farber, professor, department of sociology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Graham S. Finney, executive director, council for community advancement, Philadelphia, Pa.

Edwin H. Folk, executive director, Philadelphia Citizens Committee on City Planning, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mrs. Frankie M. Freeman, attorney, St. Louis, Mo.

Bernard Frieden, associate professor of city planning, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

James J. Gallagher, professor, Institute for Research of Exceptional Children, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Herbert Gans, associate professor, Teachers College, Columbia University; Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y.

Daniel Glaser, chairman, department of sociology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Arnold Greenberg, attorney, San Francisco, Calif.

Charles F. Grosser, associate professor of social work, New York University, Graduate School of Social Work, New York, N.Y.

Arnold Gurin, associate professor of social administration, Florence Heller Graduate School of Social Work, Brandeis University, Newton, Mass.

Chester W. Hartman, Samuel Stouffer Fellow Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Studies, Cambridge, Mass.

Philip Herr, lecturer on city planning, MIT, Newton, Mass.

Gerald Hill, attorney, former director of the Governor's Advisory Commission on Housing Problems, San Francisco, Calif.

Robert Hoyt, pastor, Education Ascension Lutheran Church, urban affairs consultant, Northern Missouri Synod, Milwaukee, Wis.

Lawrence Howard, Human Relations Institute, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wis.

Theodore Husted, Jr., vice-dean, University of Pennsylvania Law School; president, Philadelphia Housing Association, Philadelphia, Pa.

William W. Jeanes, attorney, Philadelphia, Pa.

Marshall Kaplan, executive director, Institute for Planning and Development, San Francisco, Calif.

John Kearney, Mayor's Advisory Committee on Housing and Community Organization; executive director, Independent Voters of Illinois, Chicago, Ill.

John Langhorne, associate director, special services department, United Community Services of Metropolitan Boston, Brighton, Mass.

Jay A. Larkey, M.D., chairman, Medical Advisory Committee, Planned Parenthood Association, Milwaukee, Wis.

Milton Lebowitz, professor and chairman, Community Organization Division, Fordham University, New York, N.Y.

Thomas V. Lefevere, attorney, Philadelphia, Pa.

Phillip E. Lerman, president, Wisconsin State Board of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education, Milwaukee, Wis.

Mrs. Frances Levenson, director, Demonstration Rehabilitation Project, New York, N.Y.

Joan Ann Levin, assistant research professor, Florence Heller Graduate School of Social Work, Brandeis University, Cambridge, Mass.

Michael Lewis, assistant professor, department of Sociology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Charles Liddell, executive director, United South End Settlement of Boston, Needham, Mass.

Milford Lieberthal, Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

David Liederman, assistant director, Roxbury Federation of Neighborhood Centers, Winthrop, Mass.

Joseph Litterer, professor of business administration, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

David Ludlow, director, American Friends Service Committee, Housing Opportunities Program, New York, N.Y.

Kevin Lynd, professor and chairman of the faculty, Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Studies, Watertown, Mass.

John McDowell dean, Boston University School of Social Work, Boston, Mass.

Herbert McLaughlin, architect, San Francisco, Calif.

Bertram McNamara, district director, U.S. Steel Workers District No. 32, Milwaukee, Wis.

Daniel Mandelker, professor of law, School of Law, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Seymour Mann, director of Public Administration and Urban Affairs Program, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville Campus, Edwardsville, Ill.

Robert March, executive director, Roxbury Federal of Neighborhood Centers, Boston, Mass.

Roger Montgomery, director, Urban Renewal Design Center, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

William W. Nash, associate professor and chairman of the Department of City Planning and Regional Planning, Harvard Graduate School of Design, Winchester, Mass.

Troy R. Nestmeyz, assistant dean, Graduate School of Public Administration, New York University, New York, N.Y.

Eleanor B. O'Connor, board member, Philadelphia Housing Association, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rai Okamoto, architect and urban designer, San Francisco, Calif.

Robert Osborn, assistant professor of political science, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mrs. Sue Osborn, League of Women Voters, Philadelphia, Pa.

James Pawley, executive director, Urban League, Essex County, N.J.

George Pazik, executive vice president, North Town Planning and Development Council, Milwaukee, Wis.

Walter Phillips, assistant professor, Department of Sociology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

P. W. Purdom, professor of environmental engineering and services, Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia, Pa.

Lee Rainwater, professor of sociology, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Henry T. Reath, attorney, vice president, Philadelphia Housing Association, Philadelphia, Pa.

Janet Reiner, consultant, Institute for Environmental Studies, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Carleton C. Richards, M.D., board member, Philadelphia Housing Association, Philadelphia, Pa.

Alan Sagner, Levin-Sagner Urban Redevelopment Corp., Newark, N.J.

George Schermer, human relations consultant, Washington, D.C.

Richard Scobie, director, tenant relations, Boston Housing Authority, Newtonville, Mass.

Malcolm Scott, Jr., director, Council on Equal Housing Opportunity, Philadelphia, Pa.

Joseph A. Singer, builder, Philadelphia, Pa.

Ann Louise Strong, acting director, Institute of Legal Research, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Michael L. Strong, attorney, vice president, Citizens Council on City Planning, Philadelphia, Pa.

Adolf Sturmthal, professor, Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Phillis B. Taylor, coordinator, Housing Information Service, and Fair Housing Council, Philadelphia, Pa.

Richard K. Taylor, executive director, Fair Housing Council, Delaware Valley, Pa.

Morton I. Teicher, dean, School of Social Work, Yeshiva University, New York, N.Y.

Harry M. Tiebout, Jr., associate professor of philosophy, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Rev. Homer Tucker, chairman, Social Welfare Division of Greater Newark Council of Churches, Newark, N.J.

Wayne Vasey, dean, George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Francois C. Vigier, assistant professor, city planning and urban design, Harvard Graduate School of Design, Cambridge, Mass.

Donald C. Wagner, research professor, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

William Wainwright, associate professor of philosophy, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

David A. Wallace, professor, city planning, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

John Williams, antipoverty community action representative, Philadelphia, Pa.

James Q. Wilson, director, Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Studies, Cambridge, Mass.

Nochem Winnet, attorney, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mildred Fairchild Woodbury, board member, Philadelphia Housing Association, Philadelphia, Pa.

Arnold Zander, retired president, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, Washington, D.C.

Frank Zeidler, past mayor of Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wis.

CIGARETTES, WOMEN, AND ADVERTISING

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the results of the first large-scale study of women cigarette smokers have now been released by the National Cancer Institute.

The study, authored by the director of statistical research for the American Cancer Society, Dr. E. Cuyler Hammond, revealed that among women cigarette smokers the death rate from coronary heart disease and lung cancer is twice that of nonsmokers and that women smokers have much higher death rates from emphysema, cirrhosis of the liver, cancer of the mouth, pharynx, esophagus, and pancreas than do women who never smoked regularly. This new study parallels the findings of the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health which reported in January of 1964 that men smokers had nearly a 1,000 percent higher death rate from lung cancer than nonsmokers.

The new analysis once again illustrates that the more one smokes and the longer the smoking period, the more likely that person is to die from any one of several diseases at an early age.

Equally important, the study offers new evidence that these death rates decline as the length of time increases from when a former smoker stopped the habit.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the February 23 New York Times reporting on this subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 23, 1966]

SMOKING HAZARDS TRACED IN WOMEN—HIGH DEATH RATE FROM HEART DISEASE AND LUNG CANCER FOUND IN MAJOR STUDY—EARLY DATA CONFIRMED—REPORT BY CANCER INSTITUTE ALSO PARALLELS FINDINGS OF SURGEON GENERAL'S PANEL

(By Jane E. Brody)

The first large-scale study of women cigarette smokers shows that their death rate from coronary heart disease and lung cancer is twice that of nonsmokers, it was reported yesterday.

The study, released by the National Cancer Institute, also disclosed that women smokers have much higher death rates from emphysema, cirrhosis of the liver and cancer of the mouth, pharynx, esophagus and pancreas than do women who never smoked regularly.

However, the report said that death rates among women smokers from all causes were considerably lower than those among men smokers.

Dr. E. Cuyler Hammond, author of the report, said this apparently reflected the fact that women smokers, as a group "smoked fewer cigarettes per day, inhaled less deeply and started the habit later in life" than men smokers.

In an interview yesterday, Dr. Hammond also noted that men, whether or not they smoked, "have much higher death rates from virtually all diseases that can occur in both sexes." He explained this might be due to men's different way of life and to the probability that women are somewhat more resistant than men.

Dr. Hammond's study, which covered 440,558 men and 562,671 women, paralleled the findings of the Advisory Committee to the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service. In January 1964 the committee reported that men smokers had nearly a 1,000 percent higher death rate from lung cancer than nonsmokers.

The new study found that men smokers aged 35 to 84 had a 920 percent higher death rate from lung cancer. For men who never smoked regularly, the rate was 12 deaths per 100,000 persons each year. For cigarette smokers, it was 111 deaths per 100,000.

WOMEN'S RATE NOTED

For women smokers aged 40 to 74, the death rate from lung cancer was found to be 16 per 100,000 a year, and for nonsmokers it was 7 per 100,000, or 220 percent higher for smokers than for nonsmokers.

The subjects of the study were enrolled in the project between October 1959 and February 1960. All answered detailed questionnaires distributed by more than 68,000 American Cancer Society volunteers.

Dr. Hammond, who is director of statistical research for the American Cancer Society, said his study went into far greater detail about female as well as male smoking habits than the Surgeon General's report did. The study investigated all causes of death at various ages and related them to the amount of cigarettes smoked, for how long, the depth of inhalation, at what age smoking started, and how long ago it may have stopped.

The study reinforced earlier warnings that the more a person smokes and the longer the smoking period, the more likely he or she is to die from any one of a long list of ailments at an earlier age. It also showed that these death rates declined as the length of time increased from when a former smoker stopped the habit.

Dr. Hammond's study showed that while women who smoked between 1 and 19 cigarettes a day (less than a pack) had a lung cancer death rate nearly equal to that of nonsmokers, the rate for women who smoked more than a pack a day was 4.76 times higher than that of nonsmokers.

The lung cancer death rate among women who inhaled was found to be 3.7 times that of nonsmokers and twice that of smokers who did not inhale.

HEART DISEASE STUDIED

The study also disclosed that the death rate from coronary heart disease among men smokers age 45 to 54 was 2.81 times higher than for men who never smoked regularly. Among the smokers, each year 422 per 100,000 men in that age group died of coronary heart disease, while among nonsmokers only 150 per 100,000 died from this disease.

In women smokers, the coronary death rate was twice that of nonsmokers—66 per 100,000 as compared to 33 per 100,000 each year.

However, the death rate from stroke was found to be 50 percent higher for women smokers than for men smokers in the 45-to-64 age bracket. Among women smokers this rate was 69 per 100,000 a year, compared with 33 per 100,000 for nonsmokers—or 2.11 higher for the smokers.

Among men smokers, the death rate from stroke was 74 per 100,000 a year, compared with 53 per 100,000 for nonsmokers—or almost 1.5 times higher for the smokers.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the 1964 Surgeon General's report concluded that cigarette smoking was a significant health hazard, and recommended that the Federal Government take some remedial action. A year passed, but Congress ignored the advice.

Fortunately, the Public Health Service and the Federal Trade Commission did not. The PHS instituted an ambitious public education program aimed at bringing the message of the report to the citizen. It also planned investigations into why people take up and continue smoking, and it conducted studies in the technology of safer smoking.

The FTC, after public hearings, promulgated regulations requiring a health hazard warning on all cigarette packaging and cigarette advertising. The Commission acted on the premise that it already possessed sufficient authority to require such warning statements. I shared that assumption but, as questions of their authority were bound to arise, I introduced legislation specifically spelling out the powers under which the Commission could require the cigarette warning statements.

When Congress took no action during 1964, I reintroduced the legislation in the 1st session of the 89th Congress. The distinguished and able chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee [Mr. MAGNUSON] also demonstrated his concern for this health issue by introducing his own measure requiring a cigarette health hazard statement.

January of 1965 also saw the response of the cigarette industry to the FTC ruling and the Neuberger and Magnuson proposals. The industry established a self-policing cigarette advertising code. The declared purposes of the code were "to establish uniform standards of cigarette advertising" and to provide means whereby compliance could "be ascertained promptly and fairly." The section of the code concerning the standards of cigarette advertising is as follows:

ARTICLE IV

Advertising Standards

SECTION 1. All cigarette advertising and promotional activities shall be subject to the following:

(*a*) Cigarette advertising shall not appear

(i) On television and radio programs, or in publications, directed primarily to persons under 21 years of age;

(ii) In spot announcements during any program break in, or during the program break immediately preceding or following, a television program directed primarily to persons under 21 years of age;

(iii) In school, college, or university media (including athletic, theatrical, and other programs);

(iv) In comic books, or comic supplements to newspapers.

(*b*) Sample cigarettes shall not be distributed to persons under 21 years of age.

(*c*) *No sample cigarettes shall be distributed* or promotional efforts conducted on school, college, or university campuses, or in their facilities, or in fraternity or sorority houses.

(*d*) Cigarette advertising shall not represent that cigarette smoking is essential to social prominence, distinction, success, or sexual attraction.

(*e*) Natural persons depicted as smokers in cigarette advertising shall be at least 25 years of age and shall not be dressed or otherwise made to appear to be less than 25 years of age. Fictitious persons so depicted in the form of drawings, sketches, or any other manner shall appear to be at least 25 years of age in dress and otherwise.

(*f*) Cigarette advertising may use attractive, healthy looking models, or illustrations or drawings of persons who appear to be attractive and healthy, provided that there is no suggestion that their attractive appearance or good health is due to cigarette smoking.

(*g*) No cigarette advertising shall contain a picture or an illustration of a person smoking in an exaggerated manner.

(*h*) Cigarette advertising shall not depict as a smoker any person well known as being, or having been, an athlete.

(*i*) Cigarette advertising shall not depict as a smoker any person participating in, or obviously having just participated, in physical activity requiring stamina or athletic conditioning beyond that of normal recreation.

(*j*) Testimonials from athletes or celebrities in the entertainment world, or testimonials from other persons who, in the judgment of the Administrator, would have special appeal to the persons under 21 years of age, shall not be used in cigarette advertising.

SEC. 2. No cigarette advertising which makes a representation with respect to health shall be used unless:

(a) The Administrator shall have determined that such representation is significant in terms of health and is based on adequate relevant and valid scientific data; or

(b) If the Administrator shall have determined it to be appropriate, a disclaimer as to significance in terms of health shall be set forth in such advertising in substance and form satisfactory to the Administrator; or

(c) The Administrator shall have determined that the representation with respect to health in such advertising is not material.

SEC. 3. The inclusion in cigarette advertising of reference to the presence or absence of a filter, or the description or depiction of a filter, shall not be deemed a representation with respect to health unless the advertising including such reference, description, or depiction, shall be determined by the administrator to constitute, through omission or inclusion, a representation with respect to health. If the Administrator shall have determined that such advertising constitutes a representation with respect to health, the provisions of section 2 of this article shall apply.

SEC. 4. No cigarette advertising shall be used which refers to the removal or the reduction of any ingredient in the mainstream smoke of a cigarette, except that it shall be permissible to make a representation as to the quantity of an ingredient present in the mainstream smoke or as to the removal in toto of an ingredient from the mainstream *smoke, or as to the absence of an ingredient* normally present in the mainstream smoke, if:

(a) The Administrator shall have determined that such representation is significant in terms of health and is based on adequate relevant and valid scientific data; or

(*b*) *A disclaimer as to significance in terms of health shall be set forth in such advertising* in substance and form satisfactory to the Administrator; or

(c) The Administrator shall have determined that a disclaimer is unnecessary for the reason that the representation in such advertising has no health implication or that such implication is not material; and

(d) The quantity of such ingredient is determined and expressed in accordance with uniform standards adopted by the Administrator for measuring the quantity of the ingredient present in the mainstream smoke, provided, that, until such uniform standard is so adopted, the quantity of such ingredient may be determined and expressed in accordance with any recognized scientifically valid method disclosed to the Administrator without any requirement of confidential treatment.

SEC. 5. Any advertising determined by the Administrator to be in conformity with the code may include the following legend: "This advertising (label) conforms to the standards of the Cigarette Advertising Code."

How well is the code working? What changes have occurred in cigarette advertising in the past year? An assessment is put forward by Sam Blum in the March issue of Harper's magazine. Mr. Blum states that cigarette ads "look much the same, and feel much the same, and sell much the same." He quotes an adman as to how this business-as-usual approach is done within the code:

> As one adman interpreted the rules for me, "You can't win a swimming meet, then pull yourself out of the pool and reach for a cigarette, the way we used to do it. That would suggest that the cigarette renews your wind, and God knows it doesn't. As a matter of fact, you can't even be breathing hard in a cigarette commercial. So we're limited to the less athletic sports. We go sailing, we go trout fishing. We pitch horseshoes. We go to the track—and maybe the horses get winded but the smokers don't. And we play ping-pong. We can have boy-girl fun in the water, but if we want to show surfing, the smokers are on the beach watching. If it's water skiing, the guys smoking are in the boat. You can sit there dressed for tennis, looking like a champ, and as long as you don't play you can smoke.
>
> "Or there's the other thing we can do. You might not have noticed it, but the guy who has been swimming or water skiing, he'll change his clothes or put on a shirt, to indicate a time lapse—then he's allowed to smoke. And something else—our water skiers these days fall off."

In summing up, Mr. Blum writes:

> The advertisers would indeed be in a tight spot if it were not for the still-open approach of associating smoking with the romp in the woods, the picnic on the beach, the gang around the piano, the half-witted joke.

Then this revealing sentence:

> Happily for the advertiser, though not surprisingly, this is the very approach that has proved to be the most successful these past few years.

Just whom is the cigarette advertising code serving, the industry or the public?

I ask unanimous consent that the article just mentioned be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being *no objection, the article* was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Harper's magazine, Feb. 14, 1966]

AN ODE TO THE CIGARETTE CODE

(By Sam Blum)

(NOTE.—How do you sell a well-known health hazard without actually *telling people* it is good for them? Well, the advertising industry has *solved its problem in some* wonderfully subtle ways. Sam Blum reports that he is a former three-packs-a-day man who now smokes a pipe and is not fond of it. He writes for numerous magazines, and it was while interviewing lung cancer patients for a medical article that he gave up cigarettes. Born in Wilkes-Barre, he now lives in Manhattan—the world center of polluted air, he calls it.)

For more than a year now, cigarette advertising has been tightly regulated by a voluntary, industrywide code, drawn up by the nine leading cigarette manufacturers themselves. As everyone, both friend and foe of cigarette advertising, agrees, this code was created to soften much stricter orders which the Federal Trade Commission announced in 1964. To the tobacco industry the most objectionable of the FTC rulings was the demand that all cigarette advertising carry a health warning. This, the tobacco industry felt, was not only unnecessary and un-American, but bad business. As Bowman Gray, chairman of the board of R. J. Reynolds & Co., and spokesman for the industry before both the House and the Senate, testified in early 1965, "It would negate the whole force of the advertising." The FTC should therefore be forbidden to demand a warning in advertising. And he won.

Congress, in legislation signed by President Johnson in July 1965, specifically forbade the FTC, at least for the next 4 years, to demand that advertising carry the warning that cigarettes kill. The cigarette companies were instructed to mention on their packs that "Cigarette smoking may be hazardous"—and so cast doubt on the scientific certainty that it is hazardous—but for other regulation they were clearly to turn to their own code.

Robert L. Meyer, ex-Governor of New Jersey and administrator of the code, has told Congress, "I am a judge, as it were, and the code is my statute. * * * I do not see myself as an image-maker for, or a detractor from, the industry, nor is it my business to increase the sales of cigarettes nor to depress them."

The code does, according to Meyner, have two main goals: (1) to prohibit advertising appeals primarily directed to persons under 21, and (2) to prohibit cigarette edvertising making health claims. To the degree these two goals of the code permit, the Governor has indeed great power. His decisions are absolute. He passes on everything from television commercials to the words on the pack itself, to the actual name of the brand. (This last, however, applies only to the names of new brands. Although great debate raged about the subject, it was decided that manufacturers could not be expected to give up years of investment in a brand name. Thus, despite the implied health claims, U.S. Tobacco was allowed to keep the name "Sano," and Brown & Williamson, Life.)

It would be hard, however, to agree with various trade papers which have reported that the code is "changing the face of advertising." Its face, and probably its heart as well, seem totally unreformed. Pall Mall's people are still particular; Winston's grammar hasn't improved. There are, in fact, very few major campaigns (an exception would be Carlton's, which relied on tar and nicotine statistics as a main selling point) that really have changed in ways that are instantly noticeable. But if we look at the ads more carefully, we find that although they look much the same, and feel much the same, and sell much the same, there are at least a few new principles operating.

A CHANGE OF CLOTHES

On health claims, the Governor has used his veto rights broadly. For example, lest it be thought an athlete's endorsement constitutes the unspoken claim that his favorite brand hasn't hurt his wind, one section of the code forbids the depiction "as a smoker, of any person well known as being or having been an athlete." Thus has a hearty source of their last years' income been shut out for Phil Rizzuto, Richie Ashburn, Ralph Kiner, Bobby Thompson, and others. Another section states, "Cigarette advertising shall not depict as a smoker any person participating in, or obviously having just participated in, physical activity requiring stamina or athletic conditioning beyond that of normal recreation." This had led to wonderful subtleties.

As one adman interpreted the rules for me, "You can't win a swimming meet, then pull yourself out of the pool and reach for a cigarette, the way we used to do it. That would suggest that the cigarette renews your wind, and God knows it doesn't. As a matter of fact, you can't even be breathing hard in a cigarette commercial. So we're limited to the less athletic sports. We go sailing, we go trout fishing. We pitch horseshoes. We go to the track—and maybe the horses get winded but the smokers don't. And we play ping-pong. We can have boy-girl fun in the water, but if we want to show surfing, the smokers are on the beach watching. If it's water skiing, the guys smoking are in the boat. You can sit there dressed for tennis, looking like a champ, and as long as you don't play you can smoke.

"Or there's the other thing we can do. You might not have noticed it, but the guy who has been swimming or water skiing, he'll change his clothes or put on a shirt, to indicate a time lapse—then he's allowed to smoke. And something else—our water skiers these days fall off."

Meyner, possibly unexpectedly, has also used his powers to say no to claims in the area of mental health. As one of the Governor's staff of seven explained, "you can't show someone in a bad mood, or tired, or tense, lighting a cigarette and then feeling better."

Over the years many, if not most, advertisers have implied a powerful tranquilizing or antidepressant quality in their products. A group of commercials done in precode days for Spring cigarettes became widely known in the industry as the "suicide series," for typically the woman in the empty railroad station in the middle of the night appeared so intensely depressed that it seemed possible she would leap in front of the train before she had a chance to light up a Spring and go into her manic stage. Camel commercials showed the first deep drag virtually quieting hurricanes at sea. And Kool commercials still (though a good bit less strongly than in the past) suggest that one of the lows in human life comes when one has smoked too much and cigarettes taste lousy and you're about to give up the habit—but help and happiness are at hand if you have a friend who will offer you a Kool. Most of this form of advertising is disappearing, much to the detriment of commercials' dramatic effects.[1]

Written into the code is the regulation that no cigarette advertising shall contain a picture or an illustration of a person smoking in an exaggerated manner. The practical effect of this is that nobody is permitted to inhale deeply any longer. Nor is he permitted to do a big take, or react with a huge smile. "I explain to actors these days," one director said to me, "that it isn't supposed to look like they're taking dope. We need a very short, fast drag, and then a very fast exhale. An actor might have to take three drags in 20 seconds of commercial time without looking as if he can't wait to get cancer. The main thing is that he's not supposed to be knocked out by it. It's not the greatest thing that ever happened to him. It's just good. You see, the cigarette companies are in a strange spot these days—they're trying to say the stuff's great and not say it, at the same time."

As cigarette salesmen have known for years, the direct promise is only a small part of cigarette selling. One salesman oriented toward motivational research explains, "We're not trying to sell cigarettes, we're selling a way of life, an exclusive club which has its own song, its own passwords, and a membership of millions. You say, 'Come on over to the L. & M. side.' You talk about Marlboro country; you form an in-group of us Viceroy smokers and create an image of the swinging people who smoke your brand. We're saying, 'Look attractive, feel at ease, smoke Burpos with the filter of straw or that carcinogenic taste, and you'll never again be lonely.' "

FRESH, HEALTHY, AND OVER 25

Such promises are of course not put into words. Salem has never directly stated that it is a passport to a world of well-scrubbed, young, romantic people, but as my salesman friend insisted to me, "If the video didn't imply that, what reason would there be to show it? That's the reason no one is really worried about the code. They can't stop us from showing good-looking people doing good-looking things."

The code is specific on that matter: "Cigarette advertising may use attractive, healthy-looking models, provided that there is no suggestion that their attractive appearance or good health is due to cigarette smoking."

Under these circumstances Governor Meyner has found himself in a bit of a bind. He is aware that the same appeals of romance, snobbishness, masculinity, and youthful high spirits that attract adults also attract adolescents. But as he recently pointed out to me, "There is, after all, nothing in the code that says all efforts to promote cigarette smoking by persons under 21 are forbidden." Meyner's view is that he is charged with eliminating only appeals directed primarily to youth. But he is therefore faced with the ghastly problem of somehow separating them from appeals made to young and old alike, which under the code are completely permissible. In a few instances he is aided by clear and direct provisions of the code itself. For example, the code today forbids advertising in "comic books" and in comic supplements to newspapers. It prohibits the distribution of sample cigarettes to persons under 21, and proscribes cigarette advertising in school, college, or university media (and the Governor takes this provision to mean alumni publications as well as student newspapers).

---

[1] As for the health claims of filters, the administrator has cracked down in curious ways. Although the illustration of their unwrapped filter still graces the back of a Lark pack, the words that explained and praised it have changed. They now state, "Between two outer filters Lark has an inner chamber of charcoal granules treated to enrich the flavor by Lark's own special process (U.S. Patent pending) * * * etc." It is no longer called "modern," nor is it billed as a *scientific purifier*. In the scrupulous excision of health claims, the Governor has cut from virtually all copy about filters those subtle claims of prophylaxis, "modern," "neat," "pure," and even "white," and the "filter" must stand unmodified by even the science-fiction labels Micronite, Selectrate, Deepweave, Fortified, and Activated.

However, even when alerted to the fact that such copy changes are taking place, most readers and viewers are at a loss to find them. On having them pointed out, they are unable to say what difference they make. For example, take Tareyton's highly successful 3-year-old campaign, "Us Tareyton smokers would rather fight than switch." A typical full-color, full-page pre-code ad showed an attractive model, chin jutting somewhat pugnaciously, wearing a self-satisfied smile and a black eye; and the copy, in part, stated, "Get the charcoal filter with the taste worth fighting for." The word charcoal has now been dropped. The ad also used to say, "Tareyton has a white outer filter, and an inner filter of activated charcoal." Today it is "Tareyton has a white outer tip * * * and an inner section of charcoal." Precisely why the administrator has disallowed charcoal in one spot and permitted it in another, or has vetoed "white outer filter" and admitted "white outer tip" remains, to me at least, an unsolved mystery. Similarly, no one seems sure why Parliament is forbidden to speak of its "recessed filter," but is permitted to refer to its "filter that is recessed in."

Other than campus publications and comic pages, however, no other form of media was declared off limits. But the vague statement was written into the code forbidding ads "on television and radio programs, or in publications, directed primarily to persons under 21 years of age." The unsolved problem which has been facing the Governor this past year has been to decide which these programs and publications are. It seems clear that the traditionally smoke-free "Boys' Life" and "Captain Kangaroo" will remain officially forbidden ground, but what of "Ed Sullivan," "Peyton Place," "Wide World of Sports," or "Beverly Hillbillies," the latter a cigarette-sponsored show directed primarily at adults that at one time appeared to have within its audience 28.8 percent of all the children in the United States between the ages of 2 and 12? To carry out his mandate literally, Meyner would be forced virtually to ban cigarette commercials on television, and that is precisely the blow that the code was forged to ward off. So far this dilemma is unsolved.

But in the tobacco industry's desire to protect youth, certain very specific requirements were written into the code which, for whatever good they may do, are being policed with great care. As the head of R. J. Reynolds, makers of Winston, Salem, and Camel, has testified, "We are not for getting the youth to smoke * * * the appeals in the advertising the cigarette manufacturers are doing today are directed toward the adult mind and the adult population."

One of the requirements written into the code is that all persons appearing in cigarette ads or commercials be at least 25 years old and look it. Meyner has proved to be extremely serious about this, and actors reading for cigarette commercials are now required to bring their birth certificates along with them. Even that is not enough. A great number of commercials have now had to be reshot because some models over 25 have impressed Meyner as intolerably well preserved. On one occasion a scene was vetoed because the smoking lady—cute enough, but 30-plus—was wearing a sweater which must have seemed to the Governor unacceptably girlish. Reshot with the same actress wearing a dress, it passed.

The women in the cigarette ads remain youthful. Their kittenish way of lighting a fellow's L & M while staring in his eyes does suggest the danger that they will set fire to his nose, but this is carping. They act for all the world like teenagers in an Italian movie, despite what their birth certificates might say. But there is probably no avoiding this. This is the main selling point advertisers are permitting themselves to make about their cigarettes—the people who smoke them have great fun and a lot of laughs, and they are an indispensable part of having a good time.

In part, this sort of thing is occurring because Meyner, under the code, has been closing off other approaches. The clampdown has taken place under his rather loose interpretation of two provisions: "(1) Cigarette advertising shall not represent that cigarette smoking is essential to social prominence, distinction, success, or sexual attraction; and (2) testimonials from persons who, in the judgment of the Administrator, would have special appeal to persons under 21 years of age, shall not be used in cigarette advertising."

On the first provision, precode advertising never claimed that smoking was essential to anything, but the Governor has chosen to stretch the word "essential." No one, in fact, quite knows what he means by the broad interpretation, but he has turned down plots in which smoking was merely associated with big-business deals, upper-class status, or seduction, and vetoed story boards (the shooting scripts of the commercials illustrated in a comic-strip style) if the cigarette seemed to be directly promoting a romance or marriage. There is no rule, however, against dating couples or people in love smoking. Similarly, although a cigarette can't be shown helping the editor steady his nerves while trying to make his deadline, there is no reason for him not to reward his taste once the paper has been put to bed.

The second provision, forbidding testimonials by persons of special appeal to the young, has been taken to mean fictional testimonials as well. The Marlboro man, for example, who is a cowboy, and as such is the American boy's classic hero, can no longer deliver the sales talk himself. Now he just does the acting job, while the announcer reads the copy. Camel, however, has been dramatizing the work and smoking habits of one Brian McAllister, who docks the big ships when they come into harbor. Why can he talk and a cowboy not? The Governor answers, "I was in the Navy and saw a lot of docking pilots, and they're just not glamorous to me." Others in the Governor's office suggest, however, that the matter has been thought over and Brian will probably soon be muted.

In theory, heroism of any kind has been pulled far down. As one gentleman involved with Marlboro explained to me, "We used to shoot the Marlboro man as if he were the Jolly Green Giant, Paul Bunyan, Jack Gonads; now we've had to work him down to life size. He's just a cowboy, going about his business. I don't know whether it's from the code office or where, but instructions go out not to shoot too low with a wide-angle lens and make him look like Superman. He's supposed to come out interesting, compelling, but human, and the message that's supposed to come over through the video is just that he likes to smoke and this is the particular cigarette he likes. Personally, I think it's a lot more effective commercial this way. Nobody believes in fairy tales, anyway."

IN A TIGHT SPOT

So with a deemphasis on heroics, athletics, sex, money, success, health, and extreme youth, the advertisers would indeed be in a tight spot if it were not for the still-open approach of associating smoking with the romp in the woods, the picnic on the beach, the gang around the piano, the half-witted joke.

Happily for the advertiser, though not surprisingly, this is the very approach that has proven to be the most successful these past few years. Winston's rise to the top of the filter field and its coming within a percentage point or two of Pall Mall's top spot among all cigarettes, seem to be based mostly on a swinging jingle that claims only that it "tastes good," and an insistence through words and pictures that Winston smokers do indeed have fun. When American Tobacco dropped its "Hungry for flavor? Tareyton's got it" campaign for the lighthearted black-eyed smokers who did not switch, their sales zoomed. Small wonder American hopes to repeat the miracle for Lucky Strike filters with the equally simpleminded symbol of a partially eaten hat.

Fears of discussing these changes and what these changes mean are widespread within both the advertising industry and the tobacco industry. The official statement by the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. on the code and what the code has meant, is "No comment." The other companies have not been much more enlightening. Most ad-agency people and producers of commercials who are willing to discuss these matters asked not to be quoted by name. It was requested by the code office that no one be quoted except the Governor, and much that he had to say was prefaced "off the record."

The reason for all this shyness is hard to explain, but the question so many seemed to raise was "Why pick on me?" As one person did explain to me, "I know darn well cigarette smoking may give you cancer and all the rest of that stuff. I gave it up. But growing tobacco is legal, making it into cigarettes is legal, and selling them is legal. If the Government ever says it's illegal to advertise them—fine—I'll look for another job. As of now, I feel like an honest man."

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the real issue in the cigarette controversy is still consumption. The latest Hammond study has once again shown that the more one smokes and the longer that one smokes the greater the risk. It has once again demonstrated that for those who now smoke and who have smoked heavily for many years, their health risk will be substantially reduced if they cut down or eliminate their smoking.

When Congress passed the Cigarette Labeling Act last year, it rejected the contention of the Federal Trade Commission and the junior Senators from Oregon and New York [Mr. KENNEDY] that the health hazards of cigarettes merited the inclusion of warning statements in cigarette advertising. Of the proposals then before Congress, it was the only one which seemed likely to actually deter, to reduce consumption.

Congress at that time refused to grasp the nettle of medical realities. Instead, it adopted with relief the compromise presented by the Commerce Committee; that is, enjoining the FTC from enforcing its advertising regulations on cigarettes for 3 years and imposing a warning statement on cigarette packages only. The committee report stated:

> No warning in cigarette advertising should be required pending the showing that these vigorous, but less drastic, steps have not adequately alerted the public to the potential hazard from smoking.

And what were these "vigorous, but less drastic, steps"? The Cigarette Advertising Code, the smoking education campaigns, and the warning statement on the cigarette packages.

As I said during the Senate hearings, no member of the committee who spoke on the issue during the hearings, nor any witness before the committee, appeared to believe that the inclusion of a warning statement on the packages would have either any or more than minimal effect on cigarette consumption. The Public Health Service and the State health and education systems are the first ones to admit that our present smoking education programs are woefully inadequate, unsophisticated compared to the cigarette advertising, and short of proper financing. And now the article by Sam Blum dismisses the effectiveness of the Cigarette Advertising Code.

The issue here is human life and suffering. How much longer will Congress pretend that the cigarette controversy has gone away for 3 years? How much longer will Congress pass on the other side of the road, oblivious to those contracting emphysema, lung cancer, and heart disease from cigarettes? A certain cigarette is advertised as one with its "filter recessed in." By its inaction, Congress is seemingly advertising that its courage is recessed in.

SURRENDER

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President:

> It is being widely argued by those who oppose the Government's policies in South Vietnam that we are making the surrender of North Vietnam a condition to negotiations—

The Washington Post points out in a recent editorial. It continues:

> What the United States is asking of North Vietnam is the cessation of aggression against South Vietnam—and that does not require any loss of territory, surrender of forces, or impairment of sovereignty.

The Post asserts:

> When North Vietnam insists that the United States recognize the National Liberation Front as the sole representative of the people of South Vietnam, however, it itself is asking for the surrender—an unconditional surrender by the United States and the South Vietnamese.

The editorial to which I am referring is remarkable for its clarification of the issues before us, and with this in mind I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 23, 1966]

SPEAKING OF SURRENDER

It is being widely argued by those who oppose the Government's policies in South Vietnam that we are making the surrender of North Vietnam a condition to negotiations. What the United States is asking of North Vietnam is the cessation of the aggression against South Vietnam—and that does not require any loss of territory, surrender of forces or impairment of sovereignty.

When North Vietnam insists that the United States recognize the National Liberation Front as the sole representative of the people of South Vietnam, however, it itself is asking for a surrender—an unconditional surrender by the United States and the South Vietnamese. On January 24, Ho Chi Minh sent to 14 Communist countries and other interested parties, the letter explicitly making this condition. He said: "If the United States really wants peace, it must recognize the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam [the political arm of the Vietcong] as the sole genuine representative of the people of South Vietnam and engage in negotiations with it."

It is remarkable that this language has not been recognized by everyone as the equivalent of a surrender ultimatum. The NLF, from the beginning, has been only an arm of North Vietnam. As an Australian Government study pointed out last summer: "The National Liberation Front for the liberation of South Vietnam was established as the instrumentality of the Communist Party of Vietnam, the Lao Dong Party, itself the governing party of North Vietnam." New Zealand's white paper on Vietnam pointed out: "The Vietcong military and political apparatus in South Vietnam is an extension of an elaborate military and political structure in North Vietnam." It concludes that "North Vietnam has committed aggression against the Republic of Vietnam under the guise of a 'war of national liberation'."

It cannot be denied that the NLF, directed from Hanoi, has been able to get numbers of South Vietnamese to join the Vietcong. But it is an organization conceived in Hanoi, as an arm of the North Vietnamese Communist Party, and as an instrument of the North Vietnam state. Were the United States to agree to recognize the NLF as the sole representative of South Vietnam, it would be tantamount to recognizing the Government of North Vietnam as the sole representative of South Vietnam. That, obviously, would be a total surrender.

One could look at such a capitulation in two ways. Those who say we have no stake in Asia and should never have intervened in South Vietnam, still would have to acknowledge that we did intervene and that we made clear commitments of our power by congressional enactment, by treaty, and by the declaration of authorized officials. Capitulation of this kind would betray those commitments.

Those who admit we have a stake in Asia and an interest in containing communism there would have to acknowledge the infinite calamity of (in practical effect) surrendering in the field a force of 700,000 men willing to fight on our side in the continuing struggle against aggression in Asia. And that would be but the beginning of our losses. Many others now willing to fight with us, in the face of our withdrawal in South Vietnam, surely would make their accommodation with the forces of aggression on the Asian mainland.

The administration has been reproached for not mobilizing in Asia the sort of an international concert of powers we formed to contain Communist aggression in Europe. We ought to have more allies and more contributions from the allies we have. But we may be sure that whatever international help we now have, we would have less help and fewer allies from now on, in containing Communist aggression in Asia, if we withdrew from South Vietnam under conditions amounting to a surrender.

The power that is demanding a surrender in South Vietnam is North Vietnam, when it asks that we recognize the NLF as the sole representative of the South Vietnamese people. It is a surrender that would abandon American commitments now and imperil American ability, in the future, to continue any effective resistance to Communist aggression on the Asian mainland.

DEMONSTRATION CITIES ACT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, through its Executive Committee of its Board of Governors, has warmly praised the spirit and commitment of the President's message on cities. It has, in action taken on January 28, 1966, specifically endorsed the concept of the new city demonstration program, which is embodied in S. 2842, which, with 15 of my colleagues, I introduced on January 27.

NAHRO is a very respected and influential association of some 6,000 local housing, urban renewal, and code enforcement officials and agencies. I am encouraged by their action and I am confident that with their assistance we can enact a vigorous program to meet the problems of our cities in a comprehensive fashion which recognizes both human and physical renewal needs.

The NAHRO executive committee has also specifically recommended the funding of the rent supplement program, which is one of the most important achievements enacted by the Congress in the Housing Act of last year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news release dated January 28, 1966, from NAHRO be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

National Association of Housing,
and Redevelopment Officials,
January 28, 1966.

The National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, by action of the executive committee of its board of governors, today warmly praised the spirit and commitment of the President's message to the Congress on the cities, and specifically endorsed the concept of the new city demonstration program. NAHRO is an association of some 6,000 local housing urban renewal, and code enforcement officials and agencies.

In making the endorsement, NAHRO President Frederic A. Fay said: "NAHRO members are deeply concerned and involved with the improvement of living in cities and urban areas. We recognize that only a commitment of the highest order in both energy and resources will be sufficient to turn the tide of blight and waste. NAHRO is ready to work cooperatively with other interests, public and private, at both national and local levels, to achieve the President's goals. On the local level, we recognize that only a comprehensive approach involving the full commitment of many disciplines and agencies can insure success. At the national level, we know that coordinated assistance from many Federal departments is necessary."

The NAHRO executive committee specifically—

1. Commended the President for his recognition of the need for comprehensive local community planning and programing;
2. Applauded the President's emphasis on the need for coordination of all Federal assistance programs on a local level;
3. Endorsed the concept of the city demonstration program and promised its efforts in devising the most workable demonstration methods;
4. Recommended the funding of the rent supplement program;
5. Expressed approval of the approach to assisting the development of new communities, based on the idea of unifying rather than dividing central cities and outlying areas;
6. Praised the approach of incentives to achieve metropolitan area planning and coordination;
7. Expressed the hope that the city demonstration program would result in the funding of public housing, urban renewal and codes assistance programs by the Federal Government at an accelerated level, sufficient to meet an expanding pace of activity.

TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE ALBERT THOMAS OF TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Congressman Albert Thomas served my home State and his Houston district in the House of Representatives for nearly 30 years, and was one of the most respected and talented Representatives that has ever been elected to Congress.

His death Tuesday, February 15, 1966, leaves a vacant place in the hearts of every Texan, for this devoted man had earned the warm friendship of all of Texas, not just his home district. Albert Thomas was one of those Representatives with very unusual abilities who was quietly successful in his duties.

Seldom did he claim the public limelight with his remarkable accomplishments, but often he succeeded with quiet determination and able work behind the scenes.

His reliable talents and responsible voice will be missed both in the Congress of the United States and in my home State of Texas; a man of his principles and ability does not pass from the scene without notice, but is remembered far past his time, for his accomplishments extend into the future and his character is an example without limitations. Texas has never sent an abler Congressman to Washington.

Albert Thomas was my best friend in the Texas congressional delegation. He constantly did things over and beyond the call of duty and beyond the call of friendship. In 1964, sick unto death, after major surgery a number of times for cancer, he arose from a sick bed, of course without any request from me to a man so ill, and campaigned his district day after day for my reelection to the Senate. He thought I was in danger. It is characteristic of the man that he arose from a sick bed, without requests for his aid, to speak all day long on my behalf at rally after rally.

To his dear wife Lera Thomas, and his daughters, Mrs. Anne Lasater and Miss Lera Thomas, he left a priceless legacy. Albert Thomas was a man among men.

As a tribute to Albert Thomas' long career I ask unanimous consent that the two front page articles from the Houston Chronical of Tuesday, February 15, 1966, entitled "U.S. Representative Albert Thomas, 67, Dies of Cancer; Powerful House Figure" and "L.B.J.: 'Thomas Worked Hard, Served Well,'" along with the three articles on page 10 of that same issue entitled "Philosophy as Congressman," "He Shunned Social Whirl, Worked Hard, Kept Fit," and "Kennedy Praised Thomas Night Before Assassination" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

In addition I ask that articles be printed from the front page of the Houston Post of Thursday, February 17, 1966, entitled "Johnson Among D.C. Mourners," "His Family Greeted at Airport," and on page 6, "45 D.C. Officials To Be at Rites for Congressman Thomas," and "Thomas Memorial Is Passed by Texas House."

From the Wednesday, February 16, 1966 Houston Post, I ask unanimous consent that the three front-page articles entitled "Rites To Be Held Friday," "Houston Feels Loss of Thomas," and "Death Leaves a Lonely Place" be printed along with "Folks Came First" on page 11, and "Thomas Always for Houston, Harris Growth," "Thomas' Death Dealt Texas Influence a Blow," and "Chamber of Commerce Praises Thomas" from page 9.

In addition, I ask that the three editorials: "Ave Atque Vale, Albert Thomas" from the Friday, February 18, 1966, Houston Chronicle, "Albert Thomas Served Ably" from the Wednesday, February 16, 1966, Houston Post, and "Congressman Albert Thomas" from the Wednesday, February 16, 1966, Houston Chronicle be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Feb. 15, 1966]

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE ALBERT THOMAS, 67, DIES OF CANCER; POWERFUL HOUSE FIGURE—SERVED IN CONGRESS 30 YEARS

U.S. Representative Albert Thomas, 67, of Houston, a powerful Member of Congress for 30 years, died of cancer at 4:08 a.m. (Houston time) today at his home in Washington.

His entire family was present when the end came after a lengthy illness.

At his bedside were his wife, Lera, and two daughters, Mrs. Edward A. Lasater, of Houston, and Miss Lera Thomas, a student at the University of Texas.

TREATED HERE RECENTLY

Only a few weeks ago Thomas had undergone treatment in Methodist Hospital here, but he returned to Washington to take his place in the House. He had filed his candidacy in the May Democratic primary for reelection in the November general election.

Thomas would have been 68 on April 12.

Death came to Thomas at the pinnacle of his career.

Thomas ranked No. 2 on the powerful House Appropriations Committee, on which he had served since 1941.

He was chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Office Appropriations, a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, and a member of the Senate-House Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Few served longer in Congress than Albert Thomas. At the time of his death, he ranked 11th in seniority among the 435 Members of the House and 8th among Democrats. Thomas and W. R. POAGE, of Waco, both of whom came to the House on January 3, 1937, were outranked in the Texas delegation only by WRIGHT PATMAN and GEORGE MAHON.

Thomas' death leaves the House divided between 291 Democrats and 140 Republicans, with 4 vacancies.

COULD DELIVER

Among his constituents, the tall Texan with the bow tie was a courtly charmer. He had a gift for gaging what the folks at home needed and wanted, and most of the time he was able to deliver—big.

One of his colleagues once said, with as much admiration as humor: "Albert has been a good pack rat for Houston."

His fattest plum for Houston was NASA's Manned Spacecraft Center. But the project that took most of his attention over the years was improvement of the Houston ship-channel, which has made Houston the Nation's third largest port.

Thomas was genial and generous. But as a guardian of the taxpayers' purse strings, he could be a stern and stingy country banker who often made enemies of favor-seeking colleagues.

OBSTACLE COURSE

Since 1949, he had headed the appropriations subcommittee on independent agencies, which scrutinizes the budget requests of 26 Government agencies. It becomes known as the Thomas Obstacle Course, and few bureaucrats emerged from it unshaken.

Once Thomas leveled his gaze at a rebellious budget bureau director and icily inquired: "Do you realize you're just a creature of Congress?"

From 1953 until 1964, Thomas chaired the subcommittee handling all deficiency appropriations. This meant that any Government section running short of money before the end of the fiscal year had to get a nod from Thomas for excess spending. These deficiency bills sometimes reached $3 billion a year.

The subcommittee was abolished early in 1964 by the appropriations committee chairman, the late Clarence Cannon, of Missouri. It was a considerable triumph for Cannon, who through the years had lost many a battle with Thomas over fiscal matters. When Thomas did lose to the Cannon forces on the appropriations committee, he usualy rectified the loss by going to the floor of the House and persuading his colleagues to overrule the committee action and back the Thomas position.

BEHIND SCENES MAN

In all his years in Congress, Thomas never sponsored a major piece of legislation that bore his name. His major role in Congress was handling the huge appropriations bills each year. Many of his legislative triumphs were in the form of amendments to other bills. His genius lay in his ability to work behind the scenes to get things done for Houston.

Albert Thomas rarely spoke on the floor of the House except when managing bills by his committees. But on those occasions he proved to be an adroit and shrewd debater.

His manner was calculated to disarm. He would prop his glasses on top of his head, drape an arm around the microphone and soft-soap the opposition trying to kill his bill. When he referred to a colleague in debate, Thomas always went protocol one better by using two complimentary adjectives, such as "our able and genial friend from Iowa."

FIRE ACHESON

But he could be bullish in anger.

In 1951, he demanded that President Truman fire Secretary of State Dean Acheson, declaring that Acheson "should have quit or been fired long ago."

A year later, when Truman blasted one of Thomas' economy amendments (perhaps Truman remembered when Thomas' subcommittee lopped off more than $734 million from his 1950 budget), Thomas fired back:

"This is just another example of hasty, ill-considered action. It seems to be his (Truman's) pattern to needle Congress every time his budget is cut."

FOUGHT BOTH PARTIES

Thomas' concern over wasteful spending was never partisan. While he warred with President Eisenhower over what he called tight money policies and foreign aid giveaway he could with full conscience lead the fight to kill President Kennedy's $568 million fallout shelter program.

Before medicare became a household word. Thomas was saying: "If the problem of big medical bills proves too big for the medical profession to solve by itself, the pressure of Congress to do something will be irresistible."

Thomas concealed behind his carefully cultivated air of moderate southern conservatism a strongly liberal voting record.

The Conservative Americans for Constitutional Action, which began compiling vote scorecards in 1957, gave Thomas a cumulative rating of 14 percent .

RATED LIBERAL

The Americans for Democratic Action, a liberal group, gave Thomas an 80 percent for the 88th Congress and a 77 percent for the second session. Thomas did well with the ADA because he supported the Democratic administration, which ADA uses as its guideline.

He was, in the truest sense, a masterful politician. He voted for the workingman, well aware that from the beginning his strongest support came from the labor unionists who toil in Houston's massive industrial complex.

But for 21 years, when he represented all of Harris County, Thomas also had surprising support from Houston's businessmen, bankers, oilmen, and cattle barons. They might have frowned a bit about his liberal leaning, but that was all. The benefits he reaped for Houston in Washington were sweet balms that came with blissful regularity.

In 1958, when Harris County was divided into two congressional districts, Thomas chose to represent his "podnahs" in the shops and plants north of Buffalo Bayou. He didn't change his style though. Why tinker with a good thing?

Thomas' routine vote every year against foreign aid was, in a sense, his annual public statement to the Texans back home that he was, in truth, a southern conservative and not a northern liberal.

ROOTS STAY HOME

Although he made several trips abroad, his interest in foreign affairs was minimal. His roots were sunk in rural America.

His father ran a general store in Nacogdoches, where Albert Thomas was born on April 12, 1898. He came to Houston to attend college.

He used to say his political tendencies began to show in his days at Rice Institute. "I was a great handshaker," he would say, and then ruefully admit that his grades were none too good.

It was the same at the University of Texas Law School. But he stopped shaking hands long enough to get a degree by 1923.

He returned to Nacogdoches, became one of the best opossum hunters in the county and was elected county attorney. Thomas prosecuted dozens of murder cases and sent several men to the electric chair. He married his childhood sweetheart, Lera Millard.

He came to Houston in 1930 when he was appointed an assistant U.S. attorney.

In 1936, Albert Thomas agreed to run for Congress at the urging of three newspapermen. He was 38, a comparative unknown with little money. But he shook hands and won a runoff spot against Houston's wily mayor, Oscar Holcombe.

SHOOK HOLCOMBE

In the runoff, Thomas defeated Holcombe 33,866 to 25,021. Holcombe, though he went on to serve 11 terms as the city's mayor, never again sought higher office.

The margin of Thomas' upset victory was virtually 100-percent support from the labor bloc north of Buffalo Bayou.

As a freshman on the House Labor Committee, Thomas was instrumental in strengthening the minimum wage hour bill by putting an additional 1 million persons under its provisions.

In 1941, he was the only Texan in the House to vote against the Smith antistrike bill, declaring, "The Smith bill reflects a deep distrust and dislike for people who work." His fellow Texan in the House, Lyndon Johnson, voted for the bill.

On the other hand, Thomas could say of John L. Lewis: "He has defied the Government for his own selfish gains."

During his third term, Thomas voted with the Roosevelt administration 10 times; against it 8 times.

He had his differences with Truman, but became a trusted friend and adviser to Kennedy and then Johnson.

CLOUDY FORECAST

Sometimes his crystal ball was cloudy. In 1937 he assured Texans: "A third term is the farthest thing from President Roosevelt's mind."

In 1937, he declared: "Keep a cool head and quit talking war and we won't get in it. We don't have to get in it. Europe has enough manpower now."

But in August of 1941, Thomas came uncomfortably close to prophecy when he said:

"There will be a showdown, possible within 3 weeks, between this Nation and Japan. There may be some shooting with the U.S. Navy taking part."

In 1945, a reporter asked him if he thought an atomic bombing would make conventional invasion of Japan unnecessary. "Who ever heard of a foot of any land being taken and held by an airplane?" he asked.

A year later, he warned that Russia and the United States would someday vie in the world's greatest arms race.

In 1947, he said all four major powers ought to get out of Germany. "If you leave the Germans to their own devices," he said. "They'll take care of the Russians."

He later called for rearming Germany and Japan and warned:

"We can't stop communism with American dollars. The only language that Russia understands is that of strength and preparedness. The way to stop communism is to have a mighty air force that can strike at Russia's back door from aircraft carriers."

But Thomas, who served as a lieutenant in World War I, felt that civilians should control the military.

He had a deep distrust of the military both as money wasters and as potentially dangerous to democratic institutions.

LEADS TO NASA

His espousal of the NASA concept of space exploration and his steady support of the agency grew out of his personal determination to keep space research in civilian hands.

His consistent opposition to a mass fallout shelter program was based not only on what he considered its excessive cost, but also his opposition to the use of shelters as a tool of military offense, as conceived by Pentagon planners.

He said of the Supreme Court's 1954 desegregation decision:

"I think the decision is a good one. In moderation, the problem can be worked out."

In 1956, when testing of the High Court's decision began to cause friction between the races, Thomas declared, "I suggest the NAACP immediately go fishing. Yes, it would be worthwhile for all of us to go fishing."

He liked cool heads. "Sway a little, bend a little and be courteous," he once told a younger colleague.

In 1959, he was the only Congressman from 11 Southern States to vote against the stringent Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill.

VOTED CIVIL RIGHTS

In the last session of the 88th Congress, Thomas supported the administration throughout and voted on final passage of the tax cut, the civil rights bill and the poverty program.

After that, he did not want to run for reelection.

That April he called one of the Chronicle's Washington reporters to his Cleveland Park home. He said:

"If I live until the end of the term, I will be 67, and will have served 30 years. I'm not a healthy person. I have to take a handful of pills every day of the week. It wouldn't be fair for me to run again."

CANCER

Then he explained that he had had three operations for cancer.

Expressions of regret flowed in, from President Kennedy on down to the workingman north of Buffalo Bayou.

But by late June, his doctors' reports were optimistic and Thomas was feeling better. President Kennedy and Vice President Johnson were eloquent in their insistence that he return to Congress.

Since Speaker Sam Rayburn's death in 1961, no one had been able to coordinate the Texas delegation, which can be powerful when held together. Kennedy and Johnson felt Thomas could handle the job if he took an interest in it.

Thomas was still taking a "wait and see" attitude when he and other members of the Texas delegation accompanied President Kennedy to Texas late in November 1963. The purpose of the trip was to gage Kennedy's popularity in Texas and to try to shore up the differences between the feuding State Democrats.

On the plane trip to Houston, Kennedy asked Thomas to help him mend the rift between the Texans and Thomas agreed to try. On the night of November 21, Thomas heard the young President praise him before thousands attending a testimonial dinner of Thomas' honor.

ASSASSINATION

The next day in Dallas, Thomas was in the motorcade when President Kennedy was shot.

And he stood near Lyndon Johnson in Air Force 1 when Johnson was sworn in as the 36th President of the United States.

After the shock of the assassination wore off, Thomas put duty above self. He put the cancer that haunted him out of his mind and filed for his 15th term.

"If the folks want me to run," he said, "I'll run."

He won easily over his Republican and Constitution Party opponents.

He had planned to spend Christmas in Houston, but he was home only 2 weeks when the old trouble flared again.

On December 9, he flew to the naval hospital at Bethesda, Md., for treatment.

RICE SCIENCE CHAIR

It was while he was preparing for this treatment that H. Malcolm Lovett, vice chairman of the Rice University board of governors, announced the establishment of the Albert Thomas chair of political science.

Mrs. Thomas was here to acknowledge the university's recognition of her husband.

Out of the hospital and back in action, Thomas on January 21 introduced a resolution in the House commending President Johnson for his efforts in limiting the spread of nuclear weapons around the world.

Two days later, Thomas announced he would be a candidate for reelection this year. A week before, President Johnson personally had urged Thomas to run again, saying he needed Thomas' advice and counsel.

"With those thoughts in mind," Thomas said, "I am offering my service again to my people for another 2 years."

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle,
Feb. 15, 1966]

L.B.J.: "THOMAS WORKED HARD, SERVED WELL"

WASHINGTON.—Flags of official Washington dipped to half staff today to mark the death of Representative Albert Thomas as President Johnson led Government officials in eulogizing the powerful Houston Congressman.

The Chief Executive saluted Thomas, a longtime friend, for his "devotion to the people he served and loyalty to his friends," and said "his death leaves a lonely place in the lives of those who knew him best."

Mr. Johnson's sentiments were contained in a statement issued by the White House shortly after word of Thomas' passing reached the President.

The statement said:

"Of the qualities that made Albert Thomas a remarkable man, devotion to the people he served and loyalty to his friends, stand higher than all.

"I knew him—and knew him well—for a long time. He loved Houston and the Congress of the United States.

"He worked hard. He served well.

"His death leaves a lonely place in the lives of those who knew him best."

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle,
Feb. 15, 1966]

PHILOSOPHY AS CONGRESSMAN

Albert Thomas respected power and he knew how to use it in the Halls of Congress.

From his committee posts, he was in a position to grant and extract favors in agencies ranging from the Federal Communications Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, through the Securities and Exchange Commission and the General Services Administration.

Philosophically, from his voting record in recent years, Thomas had to be considered a liberal. The liberal Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) consistently gave him high marks in its voting index, while the conservative Americans for Constitutional Action rated him zero or close to it.

But he pleased his Houston constituency and economizers elsewhere by his careful scrutiny of budget requests of independent agencies. Except possibly in the field of space, bureaucrats had to justify their requests down to the penny. He was Congress leading supporter of manned space exploration.

Thomas was one of a handful of Texans and southerners who voted for the 1964 Civil Rights Act. His vote delighted liberals. But he also pleased conservative businessmen, many of whom supported the $11.5 billion tax cut bill that same year, by his support of that measure.

On matters of fiscal policy, Thomas was not a down-the-line conservative, however. He drew the displeasure of business when he voted in 1962 for a bill closing tax loopholes for corporations and individuals.

In foreign policy, Thomas generally followed the Democratic Party line. He supported the foreign policies of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, including their requests for foreign aid.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Feb. 15, 1966]

Thomas Had Talent for Friendship—He Shunned Social Whirl, Worked Hard, Kept Fit

Before cancer weakened him, Albert Thomas had the reputation of being "boss" of the House of Representatives gymnasium.

It was his daily routine, until he was 61, to keep fit with a round of handball and rowing machine work.

Thomas shunned the Washington social circuit, and frequently remained in his office late at night doing the "homework" for which he was so noted.

It was done so thoroughly that it was a brave Congressman who tried to trip him on facts about a bill Thomas was handling.

Thomas had his private offices on the second floor of the Cannon House Office Building, oldest of three structures housing House Member offices. His was an old-fashioned, rather dark room cluttered with black leather, overstuffed furniture.

Photographs covered the walls. Most of them were of past and present members of the Texas congressional delegation, most of them autographed, and of his grandchildren.

One of his favorites was a photo of his grandson vested as an acolyte of the Episcopal Church.

But Thomas regularly spent most of his day in the office of the Independent Agencies Subcommittee, a two-room affair on the ground floor of the House side of the Capitol.

The committee room itself was filled largely by an enormous round table which subcommittee members and their witnesses sat. In session time the table was usually heaped with bound volumes of the committee's working papers. In a corner was a telephone booth where Thomas took private phone calls.

Adjacent to the subcommittee room is the chairman's private office, furnished with a desk and easy chairs. This was where Thomas frequently prepared for conferences with close associates and favorite newsmen. Unlike his personal office, which was staffed by women, the subcommittee chambers were a strictly male preserve.

Thomas and his wife had a wide circle of friends in Washington, and they preferred to entertain at home. They lived at 2901 34th NW., in a fashionable section called Cleveland Park. The house is a two-story, red brick colonial-type home, located on a small corner lot.

Some of Thomas' neighbors included Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach, Comptroller General Joseph Campbell, Navy Secretary Paul H. Nitze, Mrs. John Foster Dulles, and Columnist Walter Lippmann.

Thomas' favorite Sunday night supper was a bowl of chili. He liked to serve guests tamales made in Texas.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Feb. 15, 1966]

Kennedy Praised Thomas Night Before Assassination

The night before John Kennedy was killed, he praised Albert Thomas as a man "old enough to dream dreams and young enough to see visions."

In a testimonial to Thomas here on the night of November 21, 1963, the 35th President of the United States declared:

"We meet here tonight to pay tribute to one of the most valuable Members of Congress, Albert Thomas, of Texas. For many years I have been proud to call him my friend, a source of reliable help and responsible advice.

"And when I read in the press that he felt the time had come for the retirement his many years of labor so richly deserve, I personally called Al Thomas and asked him to give up his retirement for the good of the country. For this man is, in many ways, one of the most remarkable Members of Congress."

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Feb. 17, 1966]

Representative Thomas' Body Flown Home by Air Force—Johnsons Among District of Columbia Mourners

(By Charles Culhane)

Washington.—A light rain fell from a leaden sky as the friends of Congressman Albert Thomas paid their last respects to him at a funeral service in Washington Wednesday.

President Lyndon B. Johnson and Mrs. Johnson were among the mourners at the service in the Bethlehem Chapel of the Washington National Cathedral at 11 a.m. Wednesday.

The body of the Congressman was in a casket draped with an American flag in front of the altar in the arched chapel.

A wreath of red, white, and blue carnations from President Johnson stood to the right of the casket. The altar was decked with bunches of white roses, white chrysanthemums and white stock.

The Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., the dean of the National Cathedral, presided at the service reading the "Office for the Burial of the Dead" from the Episcopal Book of Common Prayer.

Mrs. Lera Millard Thomas, the wife of the Congressman, Mrs. Anne Lasater and Miss Lera Thomas, his two daughters, sat in a pew in the front of the chapel across the aisle from the pew where President and Mrs. Johnson sat.

A group of eight uniformed Capitol Hill policemen wearing white gloves acted as pallbearers at the funeral service. The chapel was filled to capacity.

The funeral procession went directly from the National Cathedral to Andrews Air Force Base near Washington where an Air Force plane was waiting to bear the body back to Houston. The plane took off at 1:10 p.m. eastern standard time.

Meanwhile, several hours after the body of the Congressman left Washington for the last time, Senator John G. Tower, Republican, of Texas, offered a formal speech of condolence on the Senate floor.

Senator Tower made the speech in the absence of Senator Ralph Yarborough, Democrat, of Texas, his senior colleague, who was in Illinois to make a speech. The Senate adjourned in honor of Thomas after Tower spoke.

"Despite his influence and interest in national affairs, he always remembered best his own constituency, laboring long and hard in behalf of the Houston area, its people and their interests," Tower said.

"Support for Congressman Thomas came from all quarters—labor, industry, business, banking, shipping, farming, ranching, and many others.

"Houston, the State of Texas and the country are indeed better off as a result of Congressman Thomas' service. His constituents, his State and his country will all miss him."

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Feb. 17, 1966]

Representative Thomas' Body Flown Home by Air Force—His Family Greeted at Airport

(By Bob Lee)

Congressman Albert Thomas returned home to Houston to stay Wednesday.

The Air Force C-118 carrying his body touched down at Houston International Airport at 6:25 p.m. Five minutes later it came to rest at the gate 13 parking ramp.

Mayor Louie Welch, Police Chief Herman Short, and several other city and county officials were there to meet him.

He was accompanied home by his wife, Mrs. Thomas, their two daughters, Miss Lera Thomas and Mrs. Anne Lasater, of Brazil, his secretary, Rose Zamaria, and two committee aids, Homer Skarin and Keith Mainland.

Thomas, 67, who served Houston for 28 years, died Tuesday in his Washington home after a lengthy and characteristically stubborn struggle with cancer.

Funeral services will be at 2 p.m. Friday in the First Methodist Church of Houston.

The burial will be at the Veterans' Administration Cemetery at Steubner and Airline Roads.

An honor guard and pallbearers from Fort Sam Houston will pay last respects to Thomas, a tall man who cast a long shadow in the U.S. Congress.

He will lie in state at Settegast-Kopf Funeral Home, 3320 Kirby.

A small crowd watched as the flag-draped bronze casket was lowered by a forklift from the nose of the plane.

Many of the people had been waiting for more an hour.

They represented several nationalities and ethnic groups.

"He was a friend to all of us," said a Negro woman.

Mayor and Mrs. Welch were the first to meet Mrs. Thomas, a small woman dressed in plain black.

Other officials crowded around.

There was very little said other than: "I'm so sorry. He was a great man."

"Thank you."

The family was escorted to black limousines.

At 6:45 p.m., the casket was lowered and taken between tall rows of 20 fire department and 14 police department honor guardsmen who stood at attention in white-gloved salute.

The light of a flashing rotating red beacon atop a police car cast shadows on their faces.

The casket was placed into a Settegast-Kopf limousine. A procession of 10 black cars, escorted by motorcycles went down the Gulf Freeway to Milam, then out Milam to the Southwest Freeway to Kirby.

Officials at Settegast-Kopf said they expected "hundreds" to pay their last respects to Thomas, Thursday and Friday mornings.

There are no restrictions as to hours persons may pay their last respects at the funeral home, officials said.

Six pallbearers, an eight-man rifle honor squad, and a bugler from Fort Sam Houston will pay the last tribute to Thomas.

On Friday, beginning at noon, Roland Pomerat, Rice University carillonneur, will play a special half-hour memorial concert in honor of the distinguished Rice alumnus. It will be played on the 72-bell Rice electronic carillon in Rice memorial chapel on campus.

Dr. Charles Allen, pastor at First Methodist, will officiate at the services, which will be televised by KTRK–TV.

A 50-Member delegation from the U.S. House of Representatives—including most if not all of the Texas delegation—and several Members of the Senate are expected to attend the services. Hundreds of the Congressman's friends and constituents are also expected.

First Methodist seats about 2,500 persons. Officials said those unable to be seated will be able to hear the service through a public address system.

Thomas will be buried in a special plot set aside for him.

Hundreds of persons—including President Johnson—praised Thomas for his work in the Congress.

As the flag-draped casket was carried from the fork lift to the waiting limousine, a small boy bundled in a big coat asked:

"Who's that, Grandpa?"

The old man looked down at him, "A man, son. A man."

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Feb. 17, 1966]

Forty-five District of Columbia Officials To Be at Rites for Congressman Thomas

Washington.—A group of more than 45 Washington officials, including most of the Texans in Congress, were scheduled to go to Houston Friday to attend the funeral of Congressman Albert Thomas.

A spokesman for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration said James E. Webb, the head of the space agency, will be among them. He was a close personal friend of the veteran Houston legislator.

The Congressmen are scheduled to fly to Houston by a special Air Force jet leaving Andrews Air Force Base near Washington about 10 a.m., e.s.t., Friday, and arriving in Houston about 12:30 p.m., c.s.t.

The Texans in Congress who are to attend the funeral are:

Senators Ralph Yarborough and John G. Tower; Representatives Bob Casey, Houston; Joe Pool, Dallas; Wright Patman, Texarkana; Jack Brooks, Beaumont; Lindley Beckworth, Gladewater; Ray Roberts, McKinney; Earle Cabell, Dallas.

Also, John Dowdy, Athens; Clark Thompson, Galveston; J. J. (Jake) Pickle, Austin; W. R. (Bob) Poage, Waco; Jim Wright, Fort Worth; Graham Purcell, Wichita Falls.

Also, John Young, Corpus Christi; Eligio (Kika) de la Garza, Mission; Richard C. White, El Paso; Omar Burleson, Anson; Walter Rogers, Pampa; George H. Mahon, Lubbock; Henry B. Gonzalez, San Antonio; and O. C. Fisher, San Angelo.

Congressman Olin E. Teague, of College Station, will be unable to attend the funeral because he is on an inspection trip in the Far East.

A number of former colleagues of Congressman Thomas on the House Appropriations Committee also have been delegated to attend the funeral. They are:

Representatives Michael J. Kirwan, Democrat, of Ohio; Jamie L. Whitten, Democrat, of Mississippi; John J. Rooney, Democrat, of New York; John E. Fogarty, Democrat, of Rhode Island; Joe L. Evins, Democrat, of Tennessee; Otto E. Passman, Democrat, of Louisiana; Tom Steed, Democrat, of Oklahoma; Frank T. Bow, Republican, of Ohio.

Also, Edward P. Boland, Democrat, of Massachusetts; Charles R. Jonas, Republican, of North Carolina; Melvin R. Laird, Republican, of Wisconsin; John J. Rhodes, Republican, of Arizona; Daniel J. Flood, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; Winfield K. Denton, Democrat, of Indiana; William E. Minshall, Republican, of Ohio; Robert N. Giaimo, Democrat, of Connecticut; Thomas G. Morris, Democrat, of New Mexico; and George E. Shipley, Democrat, of Illinois.

Several Members of the House who served with Thomas on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy also have been authorized to represent Congress at the funeral.

They are Representatives Chet Holifield, Democrat, of California; Melvin Price, Democrat, of Illinois; and Craig Hosmer, Republican, of California.

City Resolution Praises Thomas

Congressman Albert Thomas "brought a keen mind, a strong character, and a sensitive appreciation of human problems to his position," a resolution of the Houston City Council said Wednesday.

It added that the veteran Congressman "has thereby maintained a lofty plane of legislative and personal principle and ethics that has brought him the esteem and respect of members of his own beloved Democratic Party, the loyal opposition party and the American people in all sections of the land and of all political and philosophical persuasions."

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Feb. 17, 1966]

Thomas Memorial Is Passed by Texas House

Austin.—By unanimous vote Wednesday, the Texas House of Representatives passed and sent to the Senate a memorial resolution in honor of Congressman Albert Thomas, who died Tuesday.

Speaker Ben Barnes then named the 12-member Harris County house delegation to represent the State at the longtime Congressman's funeral Friday in Houston.

The resolution passed by the house and which will pass the senate Thursday, was signed by all of the members.

It termed Congressman Thomas "one of the great voices of the U.S. Congress" and drew attention to the fact that the Nacogdoches-born attorney attained eminence before seeking the congressional seat he held since 1937.

"Though all his years of service bore the mark of high statesmanship and moral courage, his last years were additionally distinguished by his personal courage. His indomitable spirit never flagged and he served his district and his Nation in illness and suffering with the same self-sacrificing devotion as had always been his want."

The house adjourned in memory of and in tribute to the late Congressman.

Tuesday, the house passed a memorial resolution in honor of another Houstonian, William Lockhart Clayton, who died February 8.

He was instrumental in the development of Houston into a modern metropolis as well as being influential in national affairs.

"His visions of oil, cotton, sulfur, and the great Houston Ship Channel provided much of the alchemy for the success of the city, to which he devoted much of his time and money after moving there in 1917," the resolution said.

Clayton was cofounder of Anderson, Clayton & Co., the world's largest cotton firm. He was also the creator of the Marshall plan, generally acknowledged to be the greatest act of international generosity in history and which had its conception in a memo he jotted on the back of an envelope.

The longtime Houstonian never sought public office but exerted great influence on the political life of his times and held a number of high Federal posts.

The house also passed Wednesday a memorial resolution honoring H. E. Treichler of Houston, a leading figure in the Texas sulfur industry for nearly half a century. Treichler died recently. He was consultant director and a member of the Pan American Sulphur Co.'s executive committee.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Feb. 16, 1966]

Representative Thomas' Body To Be Flown Home Today—Rites To Be Held Friday

(By Charles Culhane)

Washington.—The body of Congressman Albert Thomas will be flown over Washington for the last time Wednesday as an Air Force plane bears him home to Houston.

Thomas, 67, died in his home in Washington Tuesday after serving Houston for more than 28 years in Congress. He had suffered several years from cancer, although he carried on his work much of the time in spite of it.

The White House said President Johnson will attend a memorial service for Thomas at 11 a.m. Wednesday in the Bethlehem Chapel of the Washington National Cathedral.

The funeral for Thomas will be held at 2 p.m., Friday at the First Methodist Church of Houston, 1320 Main, and Dr. Charles L. Allen, pastor of the church, will preside.

Burial will be in the Veterans' Administration Cemetery on Steubner Airline Road near Aldine Road, north of Houston, a cemetery for which Thomas worked in Congress.

President Johnson may come to Houston for the funeral.

The President telephoned Mrs. Lera Millard Thomas, the Congressman's wife, Tuesday to express his sorrow, and Mrs. Johnson visited the Thomas home.

Mrs. Thomas and the couple's two daughters, Mrs. Anne Lasater and Miss Lera Thomas were with the Congressman when the end came about 5:15 a.m., Tuesday. He was in a coma at the time of death.

Mrs. Lasater, who lives in Brazil where her husband manages ranch properties, and Miss Thomas, who now lives in Houston, arrived in Washington during the past weekend to be with their father.

Mrs. Thomas and her two daughters will accompany the body of the veteran Houston lawmaker on the flight to Houston Wednesday.

Homer Skarin and Keith Mainland, longtime committee aids to the Congressman in the House, will be with the family on the Air Force plane.

The plane is scheduled to leave Andrews Air Force Base near Washington at 1 p.m. central standard time and arrive in Houston at 6:30 p.m. central standard time.

American flags flew at half-staff all over Washington in honor of Thomas Tuesday as his family and friends in the Capital mourned his passing.

Thomas, who was noted for his hard-working habits as a Member of the House, had visited his office in Washington as recently as 2½ weeks before his death.

Dean Francis B. Sayre, the dean of the Washington National Cathedral, will preside at the service for the Congressman Wednesday.

A spokesman for the Veterans' Administration said Thomas will be buried in a special plot on the mall of the cemetery.

The body is to lie in state at the Settegast-Kopf Funeral Home, 3320 Kirby Drive in Houston, Thursday until noon Friday.

Speaker of the House John W. McCormack, Democrat, of Massachusetts, said Tuesday he will name 50 Members of the House to attend Thomas' funeral in Houston representing Congress.

Most of them will be members of the Texas delegation in the House and members of the House Appropriations Committee on which Thomas served for many years.

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, the dean of the Texas delegation in Congress, said shortly after the House opened its session Tuesday, "It is my sad duty to announce the death of Albert Thomas, of Texas." The House then adjourned until Wednesday in his memory.

Thomas was not widely known outside of his home district in Texas, but Members of Congress and high officials of the executive branch of the Federal Government knew him as one of the most powerful and influential men on Capitol Hill.

He entered Congress in January 1937, and gradually climbed up the ranks of seniority until he was second-ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee. He was next in line to Congressman GEORGE MAHON, Democrat, of Texas, the chairman of the powerful committee which holds the purse strings of the Federal Government.

Thomas was chairman of the House Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations for several years.

As subcommittee chairman, Thomas oversaw the spending of billions of dollars each year in Federal funds for such agencies as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Aviation Agency.

Thomas is credited with being the prime mover in getting the Government to decide on locating the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston although he sometimes jokingly deprecated his role in the matter saying "Oh, I was just the waterboy."

Thomas was born in Nacogdoches, April 12, 1898, and he was graduated from Rice University with a bachelor of arts degree. He received his law degree from the University of Texas. He served in World War I and was discharged as a lieutenant.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Feb. 16, 1966]

HOUSTON FEELS LOSS OF THOMAS

The loss of Albert Thomas' skill and talent in Congress will be difficult to replace, leading Houstonians said Tuesday.

Gail Whitcomb, president of the chamber of commerce, called his death a tragic moment for Houstonians.

"We have lost one of our most capable and dedicated public servants," he said. "This man has been such an inspiration to so many that we must resolve to move forward with all the many things he has worked so hard so many years to accomplish.

"This is the way he would want it, and this is the way he has shown us, even up to the time of his death. We grieve, and yet we rejoice that we had him with us as a neighbor, a friend, and a public servant for so many years."

Mayor Louie Welch said: "Houston and Harris County have been beneficiaries of the great talent and energy of Representative Thomas during a most crucial period of development and growth. His monuments in Houston extend from the flood control dams of Addicks and Barber to the Manned Spacecraft Center.

"I know all Houston joins Mrs. Thomas and the family in mourning the passing of a great citizen of Houston, Tex., and the Nation."

Federal Judge Allen S. Hannay said he considered Thomas as one of the most valuable people in Texas since the death of Representative Sam Rayburn.

"He was the most valuable Congressman to Texas, and the most valuable citizen in Houston," the judge said. "I had quite a bit of correspondence with him in which I expressed myself along these lines. He [Thomas] always thanked me most profusely."

Oveta Culp Hobby, chairman of the board and editor of the Houston Post, said:

"The statement that the people of Harris County are going to miss Albert Thomas can be made with complete sincerity. Few congressional districts in the Nation have been served as ably.

"Yet in addition to a constant alertness to the needs and wishes of his constituency, he handled with great skill the financial needs of a wide range of national activities ranging from atomic energy to the welfare of veterans.

"He was a truly dedicated man, and the Nation could use more like him."

Robert R. Gilruth, Director of the Manned Spacecraft Center, said:

"I feel a deep sense of personal loss in the passing of Congressman Albert Thomas. In our official work together he demonstrated always a keen insight into national affairs, and the ability to unerringly support the proper program at the proper time. Our Nation will greatly miss his wisdom and guidance."

William N. Blanton, Sr., who is in his 14th year as a member of the port commission and served for 22 years as executive vice president and general manager of the chamber of commerce, said:

"I think Houston and Harris County have lost an eminent Congressman whose contributions have been outstanding. He was a popular and greatly beloved man and we're going to miss him. He has been a great factor in the building and development of our great port."

Dr. Philip G. Hoffman, president of the University of Houston, said few Members of the Congress "have ever served with the dedication and effectiveness of Albert Thomas."

"His remarkable knowledge of government and of the needs of his district was matched only by his willingness and ability to meet those needs," Hoffman said. "The University of Houston, with other institutions and the citizens of this area, was much in Congressman Thomas' debt. Texas and the Nation are poorer with his passing."

U.S. Attorney Woodrow Seals said "the worth of Albert Thomas to the people of Harris County will not be fully realized for years to come."

William P. Hobby, Jr., executive editor of the Houston Post, said:

"Houston, Texas, and the Nation have suffered a grievous loss with the passing of Albert Thomas. He represented his district and State ably. As the second-ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, he was one of the best informed Members of the Congress on the workings of the executive branch.

"He always used his great knowledge in the interest of the Nation."

City Councilman Lee McLemore said Thomas' death was "the passing of a rare breed of politician," adding: "We will miss his force and drive for the people of our Nation, especially in Houston. His handshake and smile were his bond."

City Councilman Frank Mann, who supported Thomas in his first race for Congress 30 years ago, recalled Thomas' first campaign speech.

"He was to speak in Baytown and he was afraid his opponent (former Mayor Oscar Holcombe) was much stronger there," Mann said. "He got up to talk and some old boy hollered 'Pour it on, Horsefly,' and Albert knew he was on home ground. That was his nickname up in Nacogdoches and Lufkin."

Mann remembered that Thomas called him in Austin in 1937, when Mann was in the legislature, and asked him to check on "that young man who was running for Congress." Man checked and predicted the young man—Lyndon B. Johnson—would win. He did.

District Judge William M. Holland said the public had suffered "a great loss."

"Thomas always served his constituents. He was a very intelligent congressman," Holland said. "People have always said that no matter what they wrote him about they always got very prompt answers."

District Judge Sam W. Davis, a friend of Thomas for 35 years, said he considered Thomas "one of the great congressmen in the country."

"The greatest thing of many great things he did for Houston and Harris County was getting NASA here," Judge Davis said. "His passing will be an irreparable loss to the people of Houston and Harris County."

County Judge Bill Elliott said:

"It's doubtful any congressman—any congressman—ever contributed more to the economic and cultural growth of his district than did Albert Thomas. He will not be able to be replaced."

Dr. S. M. Nabrit, president of Texas Southern University, said:

"I considered Albert Thomas not only our congressman but a personal friend. On my very, very first day on the campus of Texas Southern University, he made it his business to come out and visit me and let me know he was my Representative in Washington. Since that time he has left no stone unturned to do everything possible for our university and the Negro people in the 22d and 8th Congressional Districts.

"In other words, he has served the entire Houston community without any respect to district boundary lines."

James W. White, professor of English at TSU and new president of the Houston Business and Professional Men's Club, said, "We all regret very much the passing of this great man. His loss will be felt by all."

Don McCullar, business manager of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees Local 1550, and a candidate for president of the Harris County AFL–CIO, said:

"We're just shocked and deeply grieved to learn of the passing of this great American. He has stood out as a truly dedicated public servant who represented people in all walks of life with equal sincerity. The working people of Harris County and Texas have lost one of the greatest friends they've ever had."

City Councilman Johnny Goyen said "Harris County and the Nation have lost one of the great men of our times."

Councilman Robert S. (Bob) Webb said Thomas was "a great statesman whose weight and influence in behalf of Houston, of Texas, and the Nation will be greatly missed."

Councilman A. L. (Curly) Miller said "he served well; he did a wonderful job."

County Commissioner W. Kyle Chapman said:

"It's a great loss to the entire Nation, especially Harris County. I know of no one who has worked longer and harder and more diligently than Albert Thomas, keeping in mind at all times the welfare of the entire Nation."

Commissioner E. A. (Squatty) Lyons said, "It's very regrettable to see such a fine man leave this life at a comparatively early age."

Commissioner V. V. Ramsey called Thomas a "great American" who has "probably done this city more good than any other man."

Judge Spurgeon E. Bell of the First Court of Civil Appeals said, "Texas, and particularly Harris County, has lost a very distinguished, capable, and valuable public servant."

George E. Pletcher, Houston attorney, called it "a powerful loss."

"Congressman Thomas was admired, loved, and respected by all who knew him," McKaskle said. "His career in Congress was 30 years of devotion and service to the friends he loved so much. He was a powerful influence in many circles of Government and through this he was able to do much for the Houston area. We will miss his wisdom and the unusual ability he possessed in getting the job done."

Royal H. Roussel, staff associate of the Houston Chamber of Commerce, formerly stationed in Washington in that job, said:

"I've known Albert Thomas a very long time. He was one of the really great ones. Houston and the country have suffered a tremendous loss."

A number of others called for comment were out of town and unavailable.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Feb. 16, 1966]

Leaders Praise Thomas: "Death Leaves Lonely Place"

Washington.—President Johnson, paying tribute Tuesday to Congressman Albert Thomas, called him a remarkable man who worked hard and served well.

"Of the qualities that made Albert Thomas a remarkable man," Mr. Johnson said, "devotion to the people he served and loyalty to his friends stand higher than all.

"I knew him—and knew him well—for a long time. He loved Houston and the Congress of the United States. He worked hard. He served well. His death leaves a lonely place in the lives of those who knew him best."

Many Government leaders and fellow Members of Congress also praised Thomas.

"The loss of Albert Thomas was a very sad one," said House Speaker John W. McCormack, Democrat, of Massachusetts. "He was a bulwark of strength in serving the people of our country. His passing is a great loss to the Congress and to the country as a whole."

A new Cabinet member, with whom Thomas had had a long association in his capacity as chairman of the independent offices subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, called Thomas "one of the most forceful and respected leaders in Congress."

Continuing, Robert C. Weaver, secretary of Housing and Urban Development, said: "His mastery of the appropriations process and his intimate understanding of the programs he reviewed was second to none. We will miss his responsible counsel."

Administrator James E. Webb of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, one of the 19 independent agencies whose appropriations requests are heard by Thomas' subcommittee, said:

"His friends in NASA who mourn his loss extend from coast to coast."

The idea of bringing industries and universities into the space program, instead of making it entirely a Government project, "was one of his dreams, and it has been brought to fulfillment in his lifetime," Webb said.

Senator Ralph W. Yarborough, Democrat, of Texas, termed Thomas' death "the loss of one of Texas' greatest men in public life.

"His devotion to his constituency and his diligent work is seldom paralleled in public life," Yarborough said. "Texas has never had a better Congressman. He was my best friend in the Texas congressional delegation."

"Albert Thomas was a dedicated and effective servant of his district and the entire State for more than 30 years," Senator John G. Tower, Republican, of Texas, said. "His leadership and wise counsel will be missed both in Texas and in Washington."

Thomas' colleague from Harris County, Congressman Bob Casey, said the contributions of Albert Thomas "to the growth of Houston and Harris County are visible at every turn of the road * * *. He will indeed be missed not only by the people of Houston but by the Nation as a whole."

House Majority Leader Carl Albert, Democrat, of Oklahoma, called Thomas "one of the most effective and articulate Members of the House of Representatives. He was a friend of mine who befriended me in many ways. We have lost a great American and one of the outstanding Members of Congress of all time."

House Democratic Whip Hale Boggs, Democrat, of Louisiana, said:

"In the face of great pain and suffering for almost a decade, Albert Thomas worked tirelessly on for the benefit of his State and our Nation.

"In the last decade of his life," Boggs continued, Houston entered its greatest era of advancement—a truly fantastic period of growth and prosperity.

"This thriving and progressive city of today is a living monument to Albert Thomas. It was he who launched Houston into its finest hour."

Congressman George Mahon, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, noted that Thomas over the years handled some of the Nation's most important legislation.

Congressman Clark W. Thompson, of Galveston: "I am shocked and grieved to learn of the passing of my old friend.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Feb. 16, 1966]

Thomas Always Had Time: "Folks" Came First

(By Franklin Reed)

Washington.—It was November 20, 1945, and a 16-year-old Houston youth, in Washington to appear on a radio program, dropped by the office of Congressman Albert Thomas.

Possibly, the young Houstonian thought, a busy Congressman could take 30 seconds to shake hands with someone from the old hometown.

The Congressman took 30 seconds to shake hands. Then he took 30 minutes to chat with his visitor in the office; another 30 minutes to take him to lunch—most memorable of all to the visitor—another 30 minutes to take him onto the floor of the House of Representatives to sit and listen, enraptured, as if he were a Congressman himself.

All this, when the visitor would have been sufficiently flattered with a simple handshake.

As much as anything, this was Albert Thomas. He seemed to feel that nothing was too good for the home folks. The fact that one of them might be only 16 years old and couldn't vote didn't make a bit of difference to him.

And thus it is that a man who could easily be remembered for big things may come to be remembered more for little things—thousands of seemingly inconsequential acts, courtesies and favors for the best people in the world to him, the residents of the Eighth Congressional District of Texas.

At his death, Houstonians in uncounted and uncountable numbers are probably calling forth some personal memory of the Congressman.

Maybe it was a lunch date, or a phone call, or a letter of congratulations or condolence, or an appointment to a service academy, or help in cutting through the redtape of Washington.

As they do this, this is their memory of Albert Thomas.

The writers of the Constitution wanted the House of Representatives to be close to the people. Thomas, though he had great power and prestige, which often make a man remote, never forgot this.

How is it that I know so much about that 16-year-old Houston youth? I was that youth.

[From the Houston Post, Feb. 16, 1966]

Thomas Worked Always for Houston, Harris Growth—Water Boy on Spacecraft Center, He Said

The death of Congressman Albert Thomas deprived Houston of one of its best friends.

The 67-year-old Congressman, at the time of his death one of the dozen most powerful men in the House of Representatives, is generally credited with getting the multimillion dollar Manned Spacecraft Center located at Houston.

A hard worker, jealous of his power but rarely one to sing self-praise, Thomas described his role in the acquisition as "just the water boy." Others, though, said it was the biggest Federal plum in Thomas' long career.

President Kennedy, the night before he was assassinated, paid homage to Thomas as a statesman who helped steer Houston and the Nation into the space age.

"Albert Thomas is a man young enough to dream dreams and old enough to see visions," said the President.

Only 10 other men now in the House have served longer in the House than Thomas. Before his death, he was the second-ranking Democrat on the power Appropriations Committee.

For many years he was the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices, which screened appropriation requests of all the independent agencies of Government such as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Veterans' Administration, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Federal Communications Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the General Services Administration and many others.

For several years he was also chairman of the House Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations, which considered all supplemental appropriations requests for all Federal departments and agencies.

He was also a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the powerful House-Senate committee having jurisdiction over the Atomic Energy Commission, for several years until his death.

It was this combination of positions based on seniority which made him so powerful in Congress and so influential with the agencies of the executive branch.

During his 29 years in the Congress—his 30th year began last January—Thomas worked consistently to help the economic growth of Houston and Harris County.

In exchange, the voters returned him to their Nation's Capitol 14 times—a record unsurpassed by any other U.S. Representative from Harris County.

He helped secure Federal funds over the years for widening and deepening the Houston ship channel. He was a prime mover in the campaign to take the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot on the ship channel out of the hands of Government and turn it over to private developers for industrial use.

Thomas reached his peak in power and prestige after his Democratic colleagues elected him chairman of the House Democratic caucus in January 1964.

A few months later he announced he would retire after 1964 because of ill health, but because of the "home folks" he changed his mind.

Thomas was a master of the handshake and the "How are you, pardner?" routine, but he avoided the weekly luncheons of the Texas delegation in Congress.

Instead he prided himself on the time he spent in the mornings and evenings doing his "homework" for legislation he had to consider.

Between sessions of Congress Thomas spent most of his time touring government agencies to see first hand their needs and what they were doing with the taxpayers' money.

He made inspection tours, in connection with his duties in the House, to England, France, Belgium, Germany, Turkey and the Soviet Union.

Thomas was noted for his courtly manner even in the heat of debate on the floor of the House. He drew appreciative laughter from his fellows more than once when he turned back the bitter opposition of another Member with an extravagant compliment.

At other times he could be scathing when something displeased him.

Thomas dressed neatly but conservatively and the bow ties he wore were one of his trademarks. Another familiar trait was his eyeglasses in their familiar position high on his forehead.

Born April 12, 1898, in Nacogdoches, Thomas was the son of James and Lonnie Langston Thomas. He was graduated from Rice University with a bachelor of arts degree and received his law degree from the University of Texas.

He was admitted to the Texas bar in 1927 and was county attorney for Nacogdoches County from 1927 to 1930 when he moved to Houston to accept an appointment as an assistant U.S. attorney.

He resigned from that office in 1936 to run for Congress in a field of 12 candidates. He defeated Oscar Holcombe, who had served several times as mayor of Houston, in the runoff election and started his term in the House in January 1937.

He has served continuously since as a U.S. Representative.

Thomas married the former Lera Millard, of Nacogdoches, on October 21, 1922. They have two daughters, Mrs. Edward A. Lasater and Lera Thomas. The Thomases have two grandchildren, Lauren Lasater, born in 1963, and Lera Lasater, born in 1965.

The couple's Washington home, a two-story structure, is furnished almost completely with the antiques Mrs. Thomas collects as a hobby.

On two occasions Thomas was presented with a new Cadillac, gifts of appreciation from his constituents. The Houston Sales Association named him Texas Salesman of the Year for his efforts toward making Houston a center of space technology.

In Baytown there is a traffic circle named after the late Congressman.

But the high point in Thomas' achievement-studded career came in November 1963, when President Kennedy and then Vice President Lyndon Johnson and their wives came to Houston to attend a testimonial dinner in the Congressman's behalf.

The President said of Thomas:

"I don't know of anyone who has been a greater help in trying to get the job done, not just for Houston and not just for Texas, but for the entire United States, than Albert Thomas.

"He may not be so well known outside of this district in Texas and in Washington, but I can tell you that when he rises to speak in the House of Representatives, they listen; so do some Senators, and so do we down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue."

Thomas left Houston with the Presidential party. He was in Dallas when Kennedy was assassinated and in the airplane when Johnson was sworn in as the new Chief Executive.

During World War I Thomas served as a second lieutenant in the U.S. Army. In the second world war he served on the subcommittee which passed on appropriations for the U.S. Navy.

In 1950 he was elected chairman of the Texas delegation.

For 8 more years Thomas represented the whole of Harris County—the most populous district in the Nation. When the county was divided into two congressional districts, Thomas chose to represent the people who lived north of the bayou.

In 1964 a U.S. Supreme Court decision led to the redistricting legislation of 1965 which gives Harris County a third U.S. Representative next year.

Representing an area that grew from one to three Congressmen, Thomas retained his prestige and continued his efforts to improve the economy of the country.

Though given a high rating by an ultra liberal group, Thomas kept a tight hold on the Nation's purse strings by consistently making reductions in appropriations requests. However, he fought against cuts in the national space budget.

Thomas once said the achievements of which he was proudest were the establishment of two shipyards at Houston, a tank assembly plant and the Dickson gun plant with its ordnance contracts and the rebuilding of Ellington Air Force Base—all during World War II—and the location of the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston in 1961.

The Congressman was called a statesman by President Kennedy. But Thomas was also a politician.

The tall, thin man with the ready smile and firm handshake was an imposing figure—but he never forgot his people. In opening a speech, he included everyone: Colleagues, guests, children, visitors, newsmen and others . . .

When President Johnson signed the Federal airport aid program bill in 1964, Thomas added his special touch to the ceremony. He ingratiated himself with women news correspondents by passing out the special pens the President used in signing the bill.

He handed out four pens to the girl reporters before his pipeline of pens was shut off. One of the guests at the bill signing remarked knowingly to another:

"Honey, I believe he is running again."

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Feb. 16, 1966]

THOMAS' DEATH DEALT TEXAS INFLUENCE A BLOW

(By Felton West)

The death of Congressman Albert Thomas is a blow to Texas power and prestige in Congress—especially that of the Houston area—which cannot be overcome for many years.

The 67-year-old Houston Congressman held influential positions in the House of Representatives into which no Texan can step without accumulating years of seniority starting from scratch.

He was the No. 2 Democratic member of the House Appropriations Committee—ranking below only Chairman George H. Mahon, Democrat from Lubbock, in seniority.

He was chairman of the committee's subcommittee on independent offices, which considered the annual appropriations for almost all agencies of Government except the Cabinet Departments and their components. He was also a member of the Department of Defense appropriations subcommittee.

He and Mahon, slightly younger at 65, were the only Texans on the Appropriations Committee.

Any Texan added to the committee will have to start at the bottom on the committee and work his way up year by year, in the process of living long and getting repeated favor of the voters every 2 years, before he achieves the power and ability Thomas had to look out for Texas and local interests.

In addition to his post on appropriations, Thomas had, because of his seniority and expertise in Federal fiscal affairs, positions on two joint committees of Congress—the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which considers legislative matters involving the Atomic Energy Commission and the use and control of atomic energy, and the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-Essential Federal Expenditures, which recommends reductions in Federal spending and keeps watch on the growth of Federal employment.

With this combination of posts and his wide acquaintance and respect among his colleagues in the House and counterparts in the Senate, Thomas was able to look out for Texas and Houston interests in a way few others in the Texas delegation could.

It was in recognition of this fact that many of his friends urged him to seek reelection in 1964 for his 15th term even though he wished—and announced his intension—to retire because of his cancerous condition.

Others in the 23-member House delegation, and Texas' two U.S. Senators, almost always looked to Thomas for help in getting appropriations for Texas projects.

But his death not only deprives the Houston area and Texas of a powerful promoter and protector of their interests; it also dilutes their voice in national affairs. Thomas' thinking carried a lot of weight in the shaping of nationwide programs, such as the space effort and civil defense.

What will happen to his power positions now?

It is probable that another Texan will be appointed by the Democrats to the 46-member Appropriations Committee, but if so he will be the low man on a 34-member Democratic totem pole.

He will not be eligible for a subcommittee chairmanship until he has stacked up many years of seniority on the subcommittee, no matter how many years he has already been in Congress and serving on some other committee. It would take him much longer to become chairman, or No. 2, on the full Appropriations Committee.

Though it is probable that another Texan will be put on the committee, there is no certainty even of that. Most of the other most populous States—specifically, New York, Illinois, California, Florida, and New Jersey—are represented by two Democrats. Including Republicans, New York, Ohio, Illinois, and California have three members each on the committee. But only 28 of the 50 States have Democrats on the committee and 15 States have not a single Democrat or Republican on it.

Demands for representation from at least some of these 15 are inevitable when the Democratic members of the House Ways and Means Committee, who make up the Democrats' committee on committees, decides on a committee replacement for Thomas.

But if the Texas House delegation gets solidly behind one candidate with sufficient seniority, congressional observers believe that the Texan they get behind will get the post because of the size of the State's delegation.

The most likely Texas choice of those probably interested is Representative Lindley Beckworth, Democrat, from Gladewater, who is now serving his 12th 2-year term in the House but only his 5th consecutive one since being out of Congress for 4 years in the 1950's.

Nine other Texans have more seniority in the House than Beckworth, but with the exception of Representative John Dowdy, of Athens, they have worked themselves up the seniority ladder on other committees to chairmanships or near-the-top rungs they probably will not want to abandon to go to the foot of the Appropriations Committee.

A member of the Appropriations Committee may serve on no other standing House committee.

Representative Dowdy might desire the appropriations position, but because of his record of voting at odds with the administration and the Democratic majority, congressional observers regard him as unlikely to meet the approval of the Democratic Committee on Committees and have solid support from the Texas delegation.

Other Texans who are most likely to be interested in the position and have anywhere near the seniority likely to be needed are Representative Bob Casey, of Houston, now serving his fourth House term, and Representatives Henry B. Gonzales of San Antonio and Graham Purcell of Wichita Falls.

The latter are serving their third terms, but Gonzalez came to the House via a special election and has a few months' seniority on Purcell.

Several other Texans with less seniority would undoubtedly desire the post, but are considered to have no chance for it.

No matter which Texan gets the committee position, if one does, he cannot get Thomas' subcommittee chairmanship just as he cannot inherit the committee seniority.

That can be expected to go to Representative Joe Evins, Democrat, of Tennessee, the No. 2 Democrat on the subcommittee, as long as the Democrats control the House.

There is no way of predicting whether a Texan will be chosen by the Speaker of the House to succeed Thomas on the Joint Committees on Atomic Energy and Reduction of non-Essential Federal Expenditures.

But it is likely that Congressmen from other States with great seniority will be named to these.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Feb. 16, 1966]

Chamber of Commerce Praises Thomas' Courage, Determination

The Houston Chamber of Commerce paid tribute to the late Congressman Albert Thomas and extended its deep sympathy to Mrs. Thomas and members of the Congressman's family in a resolution adopted Tuesday.

The chamber cited Thomas' "record of distinguished service to Houston and Harris County" and said in part:

"Congressman Thomas was a stanch advocate of economy in governmental operations * * * he was a constant foe of 'backdoor' spending, believing that all appropriations should go through the full checks and balances of established congressional procedures.

"His leadership in connection with the location here of the NASA Manned Spacecraft Center was an outstanding example of his thoroughness and effectiveness. * * * Standing almost alone, he overcame powerful forces in the Congress to get the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot declared surplus.

"A courtly man, with a courteous but positive approach, he campaigned actively every 2 years for reelection, traveling the highways and byways of the county, shaking hands with those he represented and listening to their views on public issues.

"During the long and trying months of his final illness, he demonstrated almost superhuman determination and courage in continuing to meet his official responsibilities and to serve his constituency."

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Feb. 18, 1966]

Ave Atque Vale, Albert Thomas

This is a sad day for Houston and Harris County.

It is the day on which one of our most distinguished sons, Albert Thomas, for 30 years the representative in Congress of the 8th District of Texas, is laid to his final rest.

His loss is hard to accept, even though we had advance warning of it. The state of his health had been precarious for 3 years and more. But he carried on so courageously and so well that when the blow fell none of us was really prepared for it.

During most of his career in Congress Albert Thomas represented all Harris County; in recent years, since the county was divided into two districts, he has represented only the north half. Yet the interests of the entire county remained uppermost in his heart, as is evidenced most dramatically in the fact that the Manned Spacecraft Center, which he did so much to help locate here, is not in his own 8th but in the 22d district.

And it is all of Harris County that mourns him today, along with Texas and the Nation. All Harris County extends its sympathy to the wife and daughters of its veteran Congressman.

Many of the Nation's great came here today for the funeral. Those of his constituents who cannot join them at church service and graveside do so in spirit.

Albert Thomas, hail and farewell.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Feb. 16, 1966]

Albert Thomas Served Ably

Few congressional districts in the Nation have been served as ably as Harris County during the long tenure of Representative Albert Thomas. At the time of his death and for many years before, he was a member of the powerful House Appropriations Committee. In this capacity, he had a major part in obtaining for the county such Government installations as the Veterans' Administration hospital (originally a Navy hospital) and the Manned Spacecraft Center.

If the success of a Congressman is measured by what he does for the people of his district, Albert Thomas was greatly successful. But doing things for Harris County was only the bread-and-butter part of his 29 years in Congress. As chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee that handled funds allotted to some 40 Government agencies, ranging from the Atomic Energy Commission to the Veterans' Administration, he sought to represent all of the people of the United States in seeing to it that the money was spent wisely.

He was regarded as one of the hardest-working Members of the House. He was at his office early every day, and frequently took work home with him at night. When bureau officials seeking money appeared before his subcommittee, they usually found he knew as much about their subject as they did. Within the committee and on the floor of the House, he often voted against administration projects he considered unwise or wasteful.

Thomas was born in Nacogdoches in 1898. He was graduated from Rice University, served in the Armed Forces during World War I, and received his law degree from the University of Texas Law School. He also attended Harvard University Law School for a time.

He was serving as county attorney at Nacogdoches in 1931 when he was offered a place in the office of the U.S. district attorney here during the Hoover administration. When Douglas W. McGregor became U.S. attorney after the election of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Thomas remained in the office as an assistant.

He gained considerable fame in the Federal courts of the district as a prosecutor. To underworld characters he helped convict, he was known as "Vinegarroon."

In 1936, the office of Congressman from the Eighth District, which then included all of Harris County, became vacant when Representative Joe Eagle retired to run unsuccessfully for the Senate. Thomas became one of more than a dozen candidates.

Thomas and former Mayor Oscar F. Holcombe were in the runoff primary, and Thomas won. It was a political upset, and a tribute to the Thomas smile and handshake.

The county's population was much smaller then than it is now. Television was still to be born, and if a young man in politics wanted votes, he had to get out and meet the voters. Thomas, by traveling around the county from early morning until late at night, met most of them.

In election years since, he usually won reelection easily.

Albert Thomas learned how the people of this county felt about him November 21, 1963, when some 3,300 attended a banquet in his honor. It was held in the coliseum. Among those who said complimentary things were President John F. Kennedy and then Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson. Mr. Kennedy was killed the next day in Dallas, and Albert Thomas was present in the plane when Mr. Johnson took the oath as President.

He also was honored in 1965 when the Brown Foundation gave $500,000 to Rice University to establish the Albert Thomas chair of Political Science.

Thomas' death, although not unexpected, was a shock to all who knew him and loved him. The Post joins many friends throughout the Nation in sympathy for Mrs. Thomas and his daughters. He will be long remembered here and in the Halls of Congress.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Feb. 16, 1966]

Congressman Albert Thomas

To the Nation Albert Thomas was a towering figure on the House Appropriations Committee and for many years the key member of that committee so far as several important agencies of Government are concerned.

To the district he represented he was a Congressman extraordinarily devoted to his "home folks" and their interests, and as extraordinarily successful in protecting and advancing those interests.

To the hundreds of Congressmen who served with him in the House over the years he was one of the hardest working Members, one of the most knowledgeable, one of the best allies, and one of the toughest opponents in a legislative fight, one of the best friends.

For, although often called a "loner" because he worked such long hours and gave little time to the Capital social whirl, he had a great capacity for friendship as well as for commanding the respect and admiration of his colleagues.

It would be difficult, indeed, to give Albert Thomas sufficient recognition for his labors in behalf of his constituents.

One thinks first, perhaps, of the location of the Manned Spacecraft Center of NASA here in Harris County. The largest share of the credit assuredly goes to him.

But many monuments to Albert Thomas stand in Houston and Harris County. He had a hand in getting for this community the Veterans' Administration hospital, the Sam Houston Coliseum, the new Federal building, the Dickson gun plant of World War II fame, among many other such services to his community.

And during all his 30 years in Congress he worked hard and successfully for the continuing development of the Houston ship channel. A great deal of the credit for the successive deepenings and widenings of the waterway belongs to him.

Besides those monumental services to Harris County, Thomas also found time to do thousands of favors for individual constituents.

It was a fortunate day for Harris County 30 years ago when Thomas, then the assistant to the U.S. district attorney here, decided to run for Congress.

The Eighth District of Texas grew in population until for years Albert Thomas represented more people than any other Congressman. It was a heavy responsibility to represent more than twice as many persons as the average Member of the House. At length Harris County was redistricted and the Eighth District became the north half; last year a second redistricting reduced it to what might be described as the northeast third of the county.

Through his long service Thomas rose in seniority to 11th in the House (8th among Democrats). More important, he rose to the immensely powerful position of No. 2 member of the House Appropriations Committee.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Office Appropriations he wielded vast influence for many years. As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense he had much to say about expenditures which in recent years have been running about half the Government's total. Another of his positions of great influence was his membership in the Joint Senate-House Committee on Atomic Energy.

It is no wonder that when Thomas announced almost 3 years ago his intention of retiring, he was flooded with requests for reconsideration.

These came from the President, John F. Kennedy; the Vice President, Lyndon B. Johnson; from hundreds of his colleagues in the Congress; and from uncounted thousands of citizens of Harris County and Texas.

Even then—in April 1963—he had carried on for some time despite illness and pain. He had undergone three operations for cancer. Assuredly the veteran representative of the Eighth Texas District had long since earned the right to rest, to live out whatever time remained to him on this earth free of the pressure of official duties, free to enjoy to the full the company of his family.

But that was not to be. In the face of such impressive evidence that top officials and constituents alike wanted him to carry on, there was nothing to do, for one with his devotion to duty, but to remain in harness. He ran again, for his 15th term. He served on, working those long hours except when his health demanded he spend some time in the hospital.

Only last January 22 he announced that he would seek his 16th term. He had recently been home and had had impressed upon him once again that his people wanted him to continue to represent them. He had just had another letter from President Johnson telling him he needed his help and counsel.

The tribute which President Johnson paid Representative Thomas says so much in a few words we repeat it here:

"Of the qualities that made Albert Thomas a remarkable man, devotion to the people he served and loyalty to his friends stands higher than all.

"I knew him, and knew him well, for a long time. He loved Houston and the Congress of the United States.

"He worked hard. He served well.

"His death leaves a lonely place in the lives of those who knew him best."

During his lifetime Thomas was paid many honors, only a few of which there is room to mention here.

The Albert Thomas appreciation dinner held in the coliseum November 21, 1963, was probably the largest seated dinner ever held in Texas. There were more than 3,200 persons in attendance; a Cadillac was presented to the Congressman; among those present were President and Mrs. Kennedy and Vice President and Mrs. Johnson.

Last year the Brown Foundation made a $500,000 gift to Rice University for the Albert Thomas chair of political science. The Congressman and George Brown were freshmen together there in 1916 and were lifelong friends.

The magnificent gymnasium in the new Sam Rayburn House Office Building is named in honor of Albert Thomas.

Those are a few of the honors heaped upon him. There will be more. And the longtime Congressman from the Eighth District of Texas will live in the history of his State and Nation.

DE GAULLE AND HO

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the Philadelphia Inquirer believes Charles de Gaulle's message to Ho Chi Minh adds another obstacle to President Johnson's quest for unconditional peace negotiations in Vietnam.

The paper said:

> It has been increasingly clear for some time that Charles de Gaulle is actively interested in blocking any settlement in Vietnam that would be satisfactory to the United States and to the South Vietnamese Government.
>
> The President of France could not bear to see Americans victorious against the Communists who dealt a humiliating defeat to the French on the same field of battle a dozen years ago.

The Inquirer concludes:

> What De Gaulle seeks to promote is an American surrender.

In our quest for peace we must take into consideration all such matters as the one discussed in the editorial of February 17, to which I have referred, and therefore I suggest that we make it a part of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Charles de Gaulle and Ho Chi Minh

It has been increasingly clear for some time that Charles de Gaulle is actively interested in blocking any settlement in Vietnam that would be satisfactory to the United States and to the South Vietnamese Government. The President of France could not bear to see Americans victorious against the Communists who dealt a humiliating defeat to the French on the same field of battle a dozen years ago.

Now, in a remarkable letter to Ho Chi Minh that fairly drips with patronizing warmth and friendliness, De Gaulle gives a hint of how far he is prepared to go in his obsession to frustrate U.S. objectives in Vietnam. He has told the leader of Communist North Vietnam, in effect, that he can count on French assistance in seeking an end to the war on terms agreeable to the Reds and compatible with their aims of conquest.

The De Gaulle letter declares that "the population of South Vietnam should be able, without external intervention, to form a representative government, which, in any event, cannot be done while the war goes on." In this and other passages De Gaulle indirectly, but unmistakably, condemns U.S. military action in defense of freedom in South Vietnam and dismisses the existing Government in Saigon as unrepresentative of the South Vietnamese people. This is the exact line of the Communists, who want the Vietcong terrorists, supplied and controlled by Hanoi, recognized as the governing authority in South Vietnam.

It is extremely unfortunate that United Nations Secretary General U Thant, in a hasty and ill-considered expression of his personal view, has given endorsement to De Gaulle's unwarranted and unhelpful intrusion upon the Vietnam scene in this crucial time of delicate diplomacy. Mr. Thant would better serve the cause of peace, and the objectives of the U.N., if he exercised greater caution and shrewder judgment in evaluating the purpose of De Gaulle's meddling.

Charles de Gaulle's message to Ho Chi Minh adds another obstacle to President Johnson's quest for unconditional peace negotiations in Vietnam. What De Gaulle seeks to promote is an American surrender.

TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I was greatly encouraged to have brought to my attention the resolution passed unanimously by the special convention of the American Veterans Committee on February 13, 1966, which endorses the truth-in-lending bill, S. 2275.

I ask unanimous consent that the American Veterans Committee resolution be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution Regarding Truth-in-Lending Bill, S. 2275

Whereas payments on installment and mortgage debt now account for over one-fifth of average family income in the United States;

Whereas veteran and nonveteran consumers alike have the right to plain information on what they are going to have to pay when they borrow money;

Whereas testimony before the Senate Banking Subcommittee and other groups have shown widespread concealment of high interest charges on consumer credit through misleading methods of stating financial costs;

Whereas veteran and nonveteran consumers would benefit from the passage by the Congress of the truth-in-lending bill: Be it

Resolved, That this special convention of the American Veterans Committee endorse this bill and urge its support by all chapters of the American Veterans Committee; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to Senator A. Willis Robertson, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, and to Senator Paul Douglas.

(Passed unanimously by special convention of American Veterans Committee, Washington, D.C., February 13, 1966.)

EARTHQUAKE DAMAGE TO ALASKA FISHERIES DISCLOSED

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the far-reaching consequences of the devastating Alaska earthquake of March 1964 have, by no means, been fully appraised. While Federal, State, and local authorities cooperated devotedly and effectively in rebuilding much of the physical damage on land, still other consequences not fully grasped at first have now come to light.

The current issue of the Fishermen's News, February 1966, devotes a large portion of its space to a graphic description both in text and in pictures to the far-reaching devastation of the fisheries in Prince William Sound, long one of the great productive areas. It is clear that steps must be taken at the earliest possible moment to try and repair this damage and restore the area's great natural resource, the pink salmon.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Prince William Sound Earthquake Loss at $1 Million" with the subhead, "Spawning Bed Damage Threatening Current, Future Pink Salmon Runs," be printed in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Prince William Sound Earthquake Loss at $1 Million—Spawning Bed Damage Threatening Current, Future Pink Salmon Runs

(By Lone E. Janson)

A million dollars a year. That's what the continuing effects of the 1964 Good Friday earthquake are costing the fishing industry in Prince William Sound, Alaska, according to the best educated guesses available. These figures are based on 2 years of research in the Prince William Sound, epicenter of the big shake.

When things began to dance around that March 27 of 1964, eggs from an escapement of 1.3 million salmon were already within the gravels of the sound; 6 million mature salmon were out at sea, already feeling the urge to return to their native spawning beds, many of which would no longer exist when they arrived.

During the 5½ minutes that the earth shook, the floor of Prince William Sound was shattered and cracked in numerous places, great areas of the crust slipping and sagging as much as 6 feet down; these were the subsidized zones, mostly in the northern third of the sound. Other areas were fractured and split and finally pushed upward; the uplift zones, mostly in the southern third of the sound. There was a slice through the middle which remained about the same level.

The greatest uplift was 33 feet at the southwestern tip of Montague Island. MacLeod Harbor on that island was uplifted 31.5 feet.

Following the quake came the big Tsunami, the tidal wave, tearing up trees and spawning gravels, washing its load of smothering silt into the spawning beds of the salmon streams.

When it was all over, the salmon biologists of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and scientists of every stripe began to work, trying to figure out exactly what did happen to us. Early that spring, Wally Noerenberg, head of pink salmon research in Alaska, and Prince William Sound salmon biologist Bob Roys were out on the sound with a small task force pumping eggs and taking samples.

They found extensive damage to salmon alevins within the gravel from three sources: (1) Mechanical damage from the disturbance of gravels during the shake, (2) silt, with its deadly smothering effect, and (3) massive destruction of streambeds by the Tsunami.

The estimated loss of salmon eggs was 235,000.

When the salmon came in that summer, the biologists were out to meet them and study and observe what the salmon did when they could not reach their uplifted home spawning beds or found them deeply flooded or silted.

Now, 2 years later, the picture is beginning to emerge quite clearly. From the Geological Survey has come confirmation of changes in land level which the researchers estimated in the field; and from the camera lens has come mute but eloquent testimony of the tremendous effect the Good Friday earthquake has had and is continuing to have on pink salmon in Prince William Sound and elsewhere.

It is the uplift zones, with about 191 streams and about half of the sound escapement, that the greatest damage is being sustained. In some streams salmon have managed to reach spawning gravels, only to have the entire stream percolate underground and leave great populations stranded and unspawned, dead upon the beach. In others, they have been unable to reach their natal gravels and have chosen other places to spawn; unstable stream beds which quickly find new channels, either washing out the eggs or leaving them dry and soon dead. In places of very great uplift, the instability was particularly marked; erosion is proceeding at an enormous rate and the devastation of salmon eggs approaches an overall 93 percent mortality. One stream in MacLeod Harbor has chiseled a new stream bed so deeply since the quake that there is a 6½-foot strata along the bank, just in 2 years time.

In the zones of subsidence, there are the effects of flooding and siltation. It is more difficult to measure the damage here, except where there are such obvious conditions as massive destruction or debris blocking streams.

Intertidal spawning has always been one of the distinguishing features of Prince William Sound pink salmon runs. In many cases intertidal spawners chose their native gravels even though there was little left but boulders and silt; survival in such cases has been poor. In the zones of greatest uplift, naturally the greatest percentage of salmon shifted to new—and usually unstable or unsuitable—sprawing beds, as high as 95 percent in MacLeod Harbor, an overall 50 percent shifted to new intertidal beds in the uplift zones.

It has been calculated that the definitely known loss in Prince William Sound alone is $905,000 in 1965; it is expected that they may be even higher in this, the return cycle of the earthquake year. Furthermore, unless man can help tip the balance, it will continue in the neighborhood of a million dollars a year until mother nature has time to stabilize her streams and her populations of fish; some entire races may be wiped out by then.

There are things we can do, if we can get funds for the work. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game had laid out a program which they feel would help to minimize the losses. Their recommendations:

1. A survey of the disturbed areas of the sound by qualified engineers to determine whether the erosion rate stabilization in the uplifted area can be accelerated, i.e., costs, time needed, etc.

2. A cleanup of the subsided salmon spawning areas by gravel cleaning, debris removal, etc.

3. Have a mobile unit (back hoe or small tractor) on hand during spawning and the means to transport it, that could be used to eliminate the salmon stranding problem.

Appeals have been made to the Alaska congressional delegation for earthquake relief or conservation funds of some sort to accomplish this work quickly; we need and ask support from other segments of the fishing industry for our cause, for we know that this is not only our loss; there are many fishermen, tendermen and cannery people dependent on the resources of Prince William Sound either wholly or in part.

Until the damage to spawning habitat is repaired, either by Nature or by man helping nature, we will continue to lose a million dollars a year in Prince William Sound, epicenter of the Good Friday earthquake.

MARION—A MODERN PRISON

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recently the St. Joseph News-Press, of St. Joseph, Mo., published an excellent article on the Federal penitentiary at Marion, Ill. The article was written by an able newsman and longtime friend of mine, Harold M. Slater, who is city editor for the paper. Mr. Slater's article describes clearly the operations of the Federal Prison System at Marion which is our most modern penal institution. The prisoners confined at Marion are for the most part those who present the most difficult custodial problem. With few exceptions, the prisoners have been transferred to Marion from some other Federal institution because they present special problems. Such prisoners in years past were sent to the "Rock," Alcatraz Island, before it was closed down. Anyone who has had the opportunity to visit Alcatraz will find a vast difference in physical facilities between it and Marion, but the latest security technology has made Marion practically as inescapable. Any loss in security, and at most it is only slight, has been more than compensated for by the increased capability to carry out rehabilitation programs.

To bring to the attention of my colleagues the work of the Bureau of Prisons at Marion, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Slater's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARION: A PRISON MODERN IN THEORY AND FACILITIES—UNCLE SAM HOUSES TOP CUSTODIAL RISKS AT NEW PENITENTIARY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Through arrangements made by U.S. Marshal F. M. Wilson, a News-Press staff member last week visited the relatively new and much-discussed Federal penitentiary at Marion, Ill., accompanied by Deputy Marshal Paul Caster of Kansas City.)

(By Harold M. Slater)

MARION, ILL.—Of the more than 30 penitentiaries and reformatories operated by the U.S. Bureau of Prisons only one is officially classified as a maximum security institution.

It is the Marion Penitentiary deep in the rolling prairie of this south Illinois country. Less than 3 years old, it is the newest of the Federal prisons and certainly the most modern.

Relatively few men actually are sentenced directly to Marion. Most of its inmates are men transferred here because they have shown themselves to be custodial risks, real or potential dangerous troublemakers at other Federal institutions.

HOUSES 475 INMATES

The fact the Marion Penitentiary now housing 475 convicts alone is designated maximum security among the U.S. prisons does not in any way detract from such places as Leavenworth and Atlanta which long have done an excellent job in handling the dangerous and vicious types of prisoners.

Marion—with its up-to-the-minute security safeguards such as closed-circuit television of its halls—is especially equipped for keeping secure men regarded as definite risk. Thus it is to Marion that many of the toughest Federal prisoners are sent.

But Marion is more than a place for safekeeping. It is not a place where convicts are hustled into a cell to be pretty much forgotten as humans until their time is served. It is—and its officials emphasize this—a prison that offers convicts maximum facilities for revamping their lives and emerging good, useful members of the free community.

No less modern than the prison structures and electronic equipment at Marion is its warden, Greg V. Richardson. A tall, gently spoken man of youthful appearance, his looks belie the fact he has had 20 years of experience as an official of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons.

MAIN OBJECTIVE

A man of quiet determination, Warden Richardson to all indications runs Marion prison with a firm hand, intent on accomplishing one primary objective:

"I'd like to see every man come out of this prison a better person than when he went in, once more prepared to mingle in the society of fellow men and make his own way in the world," Warden Richardson said at lunch within the walls the other day.

His program stresses three things: Education, a change of attitude by those imprisoned, and the teaching of what he calls the work habit. He explains the latter with:

"Many of the men who land in prison have never known what it is to hold a steady job. Here we are trying to get them into the habit of working an 8-hour day to make them better adjusted to the world outside."

SOME CAN'T READ, WRITE

Some men who are sent to Marion don't know how to read or even write their name. They can learn how at the prison. Classes in the prison range from the first grade through university.

The college classes are taught by instructors from Southern Illinois University in the nearby town of Carbondale. A total of 12 university classes have been offered during Marion's brief history with five now in session. The college classes are at night because the instructors are busy during the day with their own classes at the university.

Could a convict conceivably win a degree, such as a bachelor of arts, by getting all his college subjects at Marion prison?

The answer, for two reasons, is "very unlikely." First, a prisoner can't take as many regular courses at a time as a regular college student and probably wouldn't be incarcerated for a sufficient period.

SWIMMING FACTOR

Second, one of the required courses of Southern Illinois University is swimming. And Marion prison has no swimming pool.

In many prisons, the convicts complete their work tasks, are fed, and then hustled into their cells for the evening and the long night. Not Marion.

"We offer programs each night until 10," said Warden Richardson. In addition to classes to attend in the evening, the men can paint, watch television, read in the library, play games (but not poker), engage in leathercraft work or merely visit.

"Often," said the warden, "maximum security means a minimum of movement by prisoners. It isn't that way at Marion though."

The prison has a toastmasters international club called the Gavel Club and it has an active chapter of Alcoholics Anonymous. Men can attend those meetings during the evenings or they can go to group counseling sessions if they so desire.

Attending school and university classes is entirely on a voluntary basis, although eventually the prison may institute a rule that each convict must go to class until he attains at least a sixth grade plus education.

TAKE UNUSUAL PRECAUTIONS

Because Marion has such a high percentage of security risks some unusual precautions have to be taken. For example, in many prisons officers wear their keys dangling from their belts. Not at Marion though. The keys are kept in trouser pockets, on things attached to the belt.

There is a reason for that.

Men confined develop almost unbelievable thinking processes and tricks of memory as they plan to make an escape or get in some banned section of the prison. Not too long ago a prisoner at Marion merely by glancing at a key on an official's belt drew the outline from memory, then fashioned a key from plastic. The plastic key was detected in time. A check revealed the prisoner's drawing was accurate; the plastic key would actually open the lock.

In the center of the complex of prison buildings is the control room. Enclosed in bulletproof plate glass and entered only by going through two steel doors—only one of which can be opened at a time—that room is truly the heart of the prison.

The man in charge there, among his host of duties, keeps his eye on the screen of the closed circuit television. Twelve gates, in prison they are called grills, are under his direct control, and no one goes through one of them unless he pushes the proper button.

NINE OUT OF SIGHT

Nine of those grills are out of his vision, but through the closed circuit television he can see just who it is who wants to go through the gate. Through the public address system he can determine exactly what that person's mission is.

The grills, electronically operated, are double affairs. That is there are two within a relatively few feet of each other. When the first one is entered, one steps into the waiting area and stays there until the grill is closed. Then, and only then, is the second gate opened to allow him to proceed.

The men in the control center have the duty of keeping track of exactly where every inmate is at all times. Also they guard the multitude of keys to storerooms and other places that figure in the prison picture.

At strategic places in Marion prison there are telephones painted red. They are in the warden's office, the control center, etc. If an emergency rises, the prison official doesn't even have to speak through the emergency telephone. He just has to lift it or kick it off the hook.

BUTTON LOCKS ALL GATES

If he doesn't speak into it within 15 seconds of its removal of the receiver from the hook, the man on duty at message center pushes the panic button.

That, by electronic process, automatically locks every gate in the prison until the crisis is over.

So far, no one ever has escaped from inside the walls at Marion, so tight is the security.

"But it could happen right now while we are talking," warned E. A. Campbell, security officer specialist. A man credited by Warden Richardson with knowing the answers to everything about Marion, Mr. Campbell is a veteran of police and prison work. He was an officer at Alcatraz prison until it closed. Before that he had been a guard at the Missouri State penitentiary, where he saw duty during the gory prisoners' riot of 1954, and before that a St. Louis police officer.

A right-hand man to Warden Richardson is Harold Feldkamp, his administrative aid, who is well acquainted at Leavenworth, where he formerly was employed in the prison. Mr. Feldkamp also is one who knows all the ins and outs of the prison and its populace.

THREE MEALS DAILY

Prisoners at Marion are fed three meals a day, are entitled to a free haircut every 10 days, have three complete changes of clothes, and by working can earn from $10 to $50 a month. No convict is permitted to spend more than $15 a month. The reason is evident: Those with more money to spend might build up control of other inmates.

The prison food is this good: In the dining room at Marion there hangs a certificate of award from the National Restaurant Association, a distinction also shared by other Federal prisons. The menu for prisoners each day closely approximates that for officials.

Cleanliness is an outstanding factor at Marion. The place fairly glistens from its highly polished tile floors up.

FOOD CAFETERIA STYLE

But nowhere in the confines is that clean look as apparent as in the dining hall. Food is served cafeteria style, with prisoners sitting four to a table in plastic body chairs. No one is assigned to a table; he eats where he wants to eat.

Some prisons, for security reasons, bar knives and forks, allowing only spoons for eating. Marion doesn't. Knives and forks are passed out with the plastic food trays. To, prisoners are permitted to talk at the table.

Outside of a few dormitories for convicts who enjoy what amounts to the freedom of an honor brigade for work outside the prison buildings, Marion offers individual cells for each prisoner. There is no crowding. The place could easily accommodate close to 100 more than its present population.

When the prison complex was turned over to the Bureau of Prisons 2½ years ago it was little more than a hollow shell of steel, concrete and stone. The prisoners since then have, in effect, built their own prison. They handled the decorating task, much of the facility installation work, and generally put the place into its present condition.

PRAISED BY WARDEN

"I wasn't here when they started that work and so don't presume to take credit for it," said Warden Richardson. "I want to give the men and those in charge my sincerest congratulations for the work they have accomplished here at a major savings to the taxpayers."

Even now a work crew of prisoners is engaged in building an extension to one of the prison structures. Also the convicts handle the maintenance of the prison, including plumbing and electrical work, under the supervision of professionals from the prison service.

Working in those tasks also is a means of enabling the men in prison to learn a trade that may be useful when that fateful day of release comes.

Marion has a sports program, including softball and basketball, but barring contact sports, such as football, boxing, and wrestling.

"When someone gets hurt in those games there is always a chance for ill feeling. We try to avoid that," a prison officer said.

As said before, no one has gotten over Marion's walls as yet but if and when one does he'll face more problems. Around the prison is a high fence with a topping of barbed wire. A pull of 9 ounces on any of the wire strands sets off flashing red lights in the escape area in addition to alerting the guards stationed in the towers outside. The escaper would be a "setup" for armed fire if he sought to move further.

Only one building at the prison is more than two stories in height, and it is only three stories. The reason for low buildings is that such structures can have flat roofs offering the guards in the towers an open view of anyone who has climbed up there with escape intentions.

SEES MORE CHANGES

Warden Richardson feels the entire picture of prison technology has changed in the past several years; that it will change much more in the immediate years to come. His goal is to have Marion prepared to meet that change and make the necessary adjustments—and to make certain there are no escapes in the meantime.

His prison is indeed one for men difficult to handle. In the past the talk about such men was based on the premise of hardened old criminals.

So this may come as a shock:

The average age of men sent to Marion, the only maximum security prison in the Federal system, is 23 years.

HOPEFUL SIGNS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the New York Journal-American praises the fact that as this Nation advances along toward the Great Society "so much attention now is riveted on measures—legislative, mechanical, and persuasive—to reduce, and hopefully eliminate, the appalling destruction of life in traffic."

The paper points out:

> President Johnson has not hesitated to call it highway anarchy and slaughter. If anybody things the words too alarming, he needs only to be reminded that in 1 year more than 49,000 American lives have been crushed out in traffic accidents.

These unpleasant figures are ones which we must keep before us, and because the article sheds light on the matter of such deep concern, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT PRICE SAFETY

As the Nation advances in the field of human and humanitarian furtherances called the Great Society, it is encouraging that so much attention now is riveted on measures—legislative, mechanical and persuasive—to reduce, and hopefully eliminate, the appalling destruction of life in traffic.

Legislation for safety installations in cars, now in prospect in Washington; continuing research and development by the automobile manufacturing industry to devise protective equipment; pleas from many sources that the driver take care, all promise action as a shocked Nation realizes the vicious extent of highway mortality.

President Johnson has not hesitated to call it highway anarchy and slaughter. If anybody thinks the words too alarming, he needs only to be reminded that in 1 year more than 49,000 American lives have been crushed out in traffic accidents. With 3.5 million persons injured and property losses estimated in the billions.

How many potential Einsteins or Presidents or just plain homebody Americans were lost in the sudden termination of the sources of this might-have-been wealth of the Nation?

We shudder in horrified realization of the diabolic nature of war when the casualty lists come in but thus far have accepted, with relative equanimity, the traffic havoc that in two decades has cost us more lives than all our wars.

The price of safety is small. It is an organized, intelligent, coordinated determination by drivers, public authorities, manufacturers, and the designers and builders of highways to give priority to the protection of life and limb.

FOSTER CARE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Monday, February 21, I introduced legislation on behalf of myself and Senator MORSE to establish a new program of grants to the States to provide aid to children in foster care.

Although the Federal Government has long recognized that it must bear part of the responsibility for the welfare of our needy, dependent children, Federal child-welfare programs are oriented primarily toward children living with their families.

It seems strange to me that there is a distinction made between a foster child and a dependent child living with his family. Certainly, no child is more dependent on outside help than the child separated from his parents by death or family disaster. Until now, because of an arbitrary distinction of the law, the Government has in practical effect ignored the plight of this child.

Aid to families with dependent children—AFDC—provided under title IV of the Social Security Act, is a typical example. The purpose of this program is to provide needy children with the economic support they need for their health and development; to assure them of an opportunity to grow and mature in their own family environment; to enable them to receive an education that will help them realize their full potential; and to permit them to share in neighborhood and community living.

The foster child's need for a normal life is certainly as great, if not greater, than the need of a child living with his parents. Yet, it is virtually impossible for him to qualify for aid under the AFDC program.

Federal law requires that a foster child receiving AFDC aid must have been placed in foster care by court order and he must also have received aid from the State AFDC program in or for the month in which court proceedings were initiated. Moreover, no AFDC aid is available to children in public child-care institutions.

As a consequence, only 5,779 of all foster children in private homes and voluntary child-care institutions were receiving aid under this program as of June 1965.

Nor do foster children fare much better under the general child-welfare programs provided by title V of the Social Security Act.

Although foster care is included in the definition of child-welfare services under title V, Federal funds are not earmarked specifically for foster care purposes. Moreover, appropriations for title V programs are limited, and the result has been that States have seen fit to use Federal funds to bolster other child-welfare programs.

During the fiscal year 1963, a total of $180,800,000 in Federal and non-Federal funds was spent on foster care services. Federal participation in foster care under title V, however, amounted to only $4,900,000, or 2.7 percent of the total funds spent for foster care.

Yet statistics show that there is as great a need for Federal help to the foster child as to the dependent child in his own home. As of March 31, 1964, there were 254,300 children in foster care throughout the Nation. Of these, 10,900 were in public child-care institutions; 66,400 were in voluntary child-care institutions; and, 177,000 were in foster family homes. Today, there are an estimated 300,000 children in foster care. The financial burden of providing care and services for these children falls primarily upon State and local governments and upon voluntary agencies supported by charitable contributions.

The bill I introduced Monday would permit the Federal Government to make a substantial contribution in providing adequate care for children in foster care.

The bill provides that each State may receive a Federal grant, on a 50-percent matching basis, of not more than $45 a month for each child living in a foster family home.

In addition, each State would receive a nonmatching Federal grant of $20 a month for each child receiving care in a public or private nonprofit child-care institution.

The Federal Government would provide 75 percent of the cost of those services provided by State and local personnel which have been determined necessary to promote the welfare of children in foster care.

The Federal Government would also underwrite the total cost as determined necessary for training personnel for work with the State and local agencies.

And, the Federal Government would underwrite 50 percent of the cost necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the program.

In order to qualify for assistance under this program, each State would be required to have its plan of welfare and related services for children in foster care approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Requirements for the State plan are modeled after those required for States for aid to families with dependent children. In addition, States would be required to take appropriate steps to assure that Federal funds will not replace State and local funds now used to finance foster care services.

Because the bill establishes a new program exclusively for children in foster care, funds received under this program would in no way reduce a State's share of Federal money for general child-welfare programs under title V of the Social Security Act.

A large majority of children in foster care live in foster family homes. Except for the child who is unable to conform to a normal family life, there seems to be widespread consensus among authorities in the field that foster family care is preferable to institutional care.

Studies indicate that many couples who are well qualified for foster care work would like to have a foster child. Financially, however, they are unable to provide for another member in their family. The provision in this bill for maximum Federal grants of $45 a month for children in foster family homes is intended to help more families assume responsibility for foster children.

As important as money in persuading families to take foster children are the services State and local personnel provide for the child's welfare.

Foster children are not children like yours and mine. Because of the deprivation they have suffered, their personalities and needs are more complex. Without the assistance of highly specialized professional counselors and caseworkers, a foster child's lack of understanding, his inability to communicate, and his deeply imbedded hostilities toward adults make it almost impossible for a couple to establish a true parental relationship with the child. Unfortunately, professional assistance is all too frequently unavailable, and foster parents may be forced to give up the child. In fact, the turnover among foster parents runs as high as 33 percent a year.

The provisions of this bill for professional services and the training of personnel will greatly assist in remedying this situation.

The foster care program in my State of New Jersey is, I believe, representative of the basic programs of other States. In New Jersey, each child boarding in a foster family home receives $65 a month in State and local funds. This payment is intended to cover board, clothing, dental, and regular medical expenses.

For children requiring specialized treatment for unusual problems, such as a physical handicap, an emotional disturbance, or a disease like diabetes, the State will pay up to $153 a month, in State and local funds, depending upon the services or treatment required.

Most children in the New Jersey foster care program are boarded in foster family homes. There are, in addition, however, what are known as foster shelter homes. These homes are staffed 24 hours a day to provide special services on a temporary basis and are customarily equipped to care for between four and six children. The State alone subsidizes these homes at a rate of $28 a month for each bed.

New Jersey, unlike other States, has no public child-care institutions. Children whose welfare is the responsibility of the State and who cannot be placed in foster family homes are placed in private nonprofit institutions under contract with the State welfare agency. For these children, the State pays up to $150 a month in State and local funds.

New Jersey's program is not substantially different from foster care programs in other States. There are, however, notable variations. In New Jersey, the cost of foster care services generally is borne equally by the State and county governments. Several States rely almost exclusively on State funds. A few States, however, provide virtually no State money or administrative machinery for foster care programs, preferring instead to allow local governments and voluntary agencies to do the job.

All foster care programs, nevertheless, share common problems—overtaxed budgets and significant increases in the number of children in foster care.

New Jersey officials with whom I spoke only the other day told me that approximately 100 additional children each month enter the New Jersey foster care program. At the end of last November, New Jersey counted 7,688 children boarding in foster family homes. A realistic estimate of the children in foster family homes this month approximates 8,000. Next year the increase in foster children in expected to rise above 100 a month.

The upward surge in the number of foster children in New Jersey corresponds to the national trend which has established itself within recent years.

For the years 1957–64, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare tells me that there was a nationwide increase of 35 percent in the number of children in foster care. For the year 1963–64 alone, the nationwide increase stood at 4.6 percent.

This year, New Jersey is moving to meet the increased demand for aid and services for foster children. The State assembly has been requested to assure a basic payment of $77 a month for each child in foster family care. Other States, faced with problems similar to New Jersey's, are now, or will soon be, faced with the necessity for providing more money for foster care.

The problem is more easily identified then solved, however. As the need for foster care services has risen, so too has the need for child-welfare services in general. Consequently, States are faced with demands for increased funds in all child-welfare programs. Coupled with the expanded services expected of State and local governments in all fields, these needs will not be easily met.

Officials with whom I have talked privately express the view that the already substantial increase in the numbers of foster children does not adequately reflect the need for expanded and intensified foster care services. They point out that many State budgets are now so overburdened that only limited numbers of new children can be admitted into foster care.

Clearly, Federal assistance is mandatory. I would hope, therefore, that every effort will be made to bring this legislation before the full Senate at an early date.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point an explanation of this proposal.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL TO AMEND TITLE V OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO PROVIDE GRANTS TO THE STATES FOR AID AND SERVICES TO CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE

The bill provides a Federal contribution equal to one-half the amount appropriated by the State, up to $45 of Federal money per month, for each child living in a foster family home.

In addition, each State would receive a nonmatching Federal grant of $20 a month for each child receiving care in a public or private nonprofit child-care institution.

The Federal Government would provide 75 percent of the cost of those services provided by State and local personnel which have been determined necessary to promote the welfare of children in foster care. Under certain conditions the services of private nonprofit agencies under contract with the State agency can also be included.

The Federal Government would also underwrite the total cost determined necessary for training personnel for work with the State and local agencies.

And, the Federal Government would underwrite 50 percent of the cost necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the program.

Because the bill establishes a new program exclusively for children in foster care, funds received under this program would in no way reduce a State's share of Federal money for general child-welfare programs under title V of the Social Security Act.

The bill authorizes an open-end appropriation and requires that States take appropriate steps to assure that Federal funds will not be used to replace State and local funds now used to finance foster care services.

The bill includes standard provisions establishing the method for making payments to the States for reimbursement in the case of overpayment and for the termination of payments under specified circumstances.

Any child under age 18 who is living in a foster family home or in a public or private nonprofit child-care institution would be eligible for aid under this program.

The program will be administered by the State agency responsible for other child-welfare programs operating in the State. In most cases, this agency will be the State welfare agency.

In order to qualify for assistance under this program, each State would be required to submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for his approval a plan of welfare and related services for children in foster care.

Requirements for the State plan parallel the statutory requirements now in effect for assistance under title IV of the Social Security Act which provides aid to families with dependent children.

The State plan must call for the development of an individual welfare plan for each child receiving aid under this program. Individual welfare plans will include a continuing study of the child's needs and of the most suitable available home in which he can be placed, and a periodic review of his case. In carrying out each plan, the services of private nonprofit child-care agencies and organizations may be used.

States are required to permit all persons seeking aid under this program to apply for such aid and to furnish aid to eligible individuals within a reasonable time.

Children in foster care will also be eligible for medical benefits provided under title XIX of the Social Security Act in States where the Kerr-Mills program is in effect.

The provisions for foster care, title IV, section 408, of the Social Security Act (aid to families with dependent children) will be allowed to expire and foster children who received AFDC aid will be entitled to assistance under this program.

MAKING A SOCIAL REVOLUTION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the declaration of Honolulu would be only rhetoric if there were no followup, Columnist Robert G. Spivack has noted in his column in the New York Journal-American.

But he goes on to document the followup that has already begun as well as more that will continue in the future.

Declaring that "now the story of how the Johnson administration is following up can be told," Mr. Spivack relates that the President laid plans several weeks before Honolulu to send Vice President HUMPHREY to the Far East to let our allies know that we were just as determined to press for a democratic social revolution in Vietnam as we were to end the Vietcong reign of terror.

Mr. Spivack added:

> But this was only the beginning. The administration was quietly seeking out the views of top experts on underdeveloped nations as to Vietnam's real needs and how they might be met.

After reviewing these efforts, Mr. Spivack said:

> The real measure of administration determination was to be found in the specialists named to accompany the Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman on his mission to Saigon, and their specific assignments.
>
> If one were asked to draw up a blueprint for social and land reform these are the men who would be consulted.

Noting that other steps are planned, Mr. Spivack added:

> The next mission to Vietnam will be one of educators. Then we will send medical and health experts.

He concludes:

> This is how you really make a social revolution.

The article traces the first steps of what I hope will be a successful long-range effort to rehabilitate South Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that Robert Spivack's column which appeared in the February 24, 1966, New York Journal-American be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING A SOCIAL REVOLUTION

(By Robert G. Spivack)

WASHINGTON.—Rev. Dr. Duncan Howlett of All Souls' Church of Washington, a Unitarian, is one of the Capital's most militant and outspoken liberals, a man of conscience and integrity. After a long silence and much soul searching he says that in the light of the declaration of Honolulu, he backs the administration's position on the war in Vietnam. Peace and freedom "are not necessarily consistent," he told his parishioners, because "sometimes a nation must fight for freedom."

Dr. Howlett accepts on good faith the administration's pledges to work for a genuine social revolution in South Vietnam. But the declaration of Honolulu would be only rhetoric if there were no followup.

Now the story of how the Johnson administration is following up can be told. The President laid plans several weeks before the Honolulu conference to send Vice President HUMPHREY to the Far East with the explicit assignment of letting our Asian, Indian, and other allies know that we were just as determined to press for a democratic social revolution in Vietnam as we were to end the Vietcong reign of terror.

The plans were well underway by January 18, but announcement was held up because it was necessary to clear the Vice President's itinerary and security arrangements with the other governments involved.

But this was only the beginning. The administration was quietly seeking out the views of top experts on underdeveloped nations as to Vietnam's real needs and how they might be met. The various AID efforts of the past, what they accomplished and what they failed to accomplish, were reviewed.

Among those at Honolulu, in on the planning sessions, was Robert R. Nathan, the former national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action. Nathan has long been familiar with Vietnamese problems, going all the way back to the midfifties.

But the real measure of administration determination was to be found in the specialists named to accompany Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman on his mission to Saigon, and their specific assignments. If one were asked to draw up a blueprint for social and land reform these are the men who would first be consulted. The experts who went on the Freeman mission included:

M. L. Peterson, director, California Agricultural Experiment Station (crops); C. B. Ratchford, University of Missouri (home improvement, rural youth, extension programs); K. D. Naden, executive vice president, National Council of Farmer Co-ops (cooperatives and credit); W. D. Criddle, Harza Engineering Co., of Salt Lake City (irrigation and drainage); H. S. Swingle, professor of fisheries, Auburn University (fisheries); W. J. Darby, biochemist, Vanderbilt University (plant protection); R. F. Dwyer, Dwyer Lumber & Plywood Corp., Portland, Oreg., (forestry); C. R. Wharton, Agricultural Development Council, Inc. (land reform); and O. G. Bentley, dean of agriculture, University of Illinois (livestock).

Other steps are planned. The next mission to Vietnam will be one of educators. Then we will send medical and health experts.

This is how you really make a social revolution.

REDUCTION OF FUNDS FOR AGRICULTURE RESEARCH

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the agriculture research community is deeply disturbed because of the administration's proposal to reduce sharply the funds for their work. In Kansas, this would mean a major dimunition of research on sorghum breeding and wheat quality projects, to name two important areas.

Ralph L. Foster, editor of the Kansas Farmer magazine, in his editorial column "As Kansas Farmer Sees It," ably summed up the situation. I ask unanimous consent that this fine editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT THE WAY TO PAY FOR A WAR

Cost of Vietnam and the Great Society is quickly reaching to the grassroots. Agricultural research is one of the items sacrificed in President Johnson's proposed budget for fiscal 1967. We can't agree that this is the place to economize.

Apparently the usual illogical assumption that we already know enough about food production, so let's cut it off for awhile has been applied. We have never had enough agricultural know-how and we never will so long as the world is short of food.

Cuts in Federal support for research in Kansas hits at some vital spots. Reductions amounting to $220,000 would come mostly in grain research. If the cuts stand, all sorghum breeding work at the Fort Hays branch experiment station will be eliminated. Much of the wheat breeding and wheat quality and wheat disease investigations will be stopped.

To stop wheat quality research now when great effort is directed toward higher quality varieties for hybrid crossing seems particularly unwise. Hybrid wheat promises to provide a great stride in meeting the need for more cereal protein foods.

Although we must all recognize that the Federal treasury is overburdened, the judgment that leads to curtailment of progress in this vital industry is open to serious questioning.

Agricultural research is not something that can be turned off and on like a spigot. It is not a 1-day nor a 1-year job. It is a continuous program. We hope that Members of Congress who understand the importance of maintaining our agricultural progress will fight to retain our grain research programs.

ASSURING A FUTURE FOR SMALL BUSINESS AND THE SBA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as my colleagues are aware, there has been considerable preoccupation during the past year with the situation in southeast Asia. An unfortunate consequence has been a diversion of attentions and energies that would otherwise be devoted to more peaceful pursuits.

The Select Committee on Small Business, of which I am a member, was created in 1950 as an indication of the concern of Congress for one of these fundamental pursuits—the welfare of the nearly 5 million American small and independent businesses.

In 1953 and 1958, the Congress and the Presidency demonstrated bipartisan support for assistance to small business. Congress enacted two Small Business Acts and created the Small Business Administration in order to carry out the declared congressional policy:

> The Government should aid, counsel, assist, and protect, insofar as it is possible, the interests of small business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise * * * and to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of the Nation.

The businessmen of my State know the value of independent and self-reliance. Oregon was founded by self-reliant pioneers. Its businesses were, from the beginning, small businesses. Even now, Oregon has a great many locally established and independent enterprises.

With the passing years, society has grown more complicated. Federal tax laws and regulations have become infinitely complex. Oregon founded one of the first State tax courts to deal with ever-increasing complications of State and local taxation. Bookkeeping, marketing, finance, patent practice, and other management skills have developed into technical specialities. It has thus become progressively more difficult for a man to fulfill the American dream of establishing his own business and maintaining it successfully by his own efforts.

A graphic example of this difficulty is my State of Oregon. While the number of business failures throughout the Nation in 1965 was almost identical to 1964, business failures in Oregon increased 32.5 percent. These figures are as follows:

Business failures

	1965	*1964*
Nation	13,514	13,501
Oregon	338	255

Source: "Slight Overall Change in 1965 Failures but Strong Contrasts by Size, Line, Location," Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. release, Jan. 26, 1966.

PARALYSIS OF THE SBA LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. President, small businessmen of Oregon have informed me of their deep concern over the grinding halt of the small business loan program, which can only worsen the situation in my part of the country. Undoubtedly, there has been bitter disappointment as businessmen in need discover that the Small Business Administration has been refusing to accept applications for loans since October 11, 1965.

SBA loans have helped translate dreams into reality for thousands of enterprising men and women. The figures show that small business loan assistance has, since it was initiated in 1954, been made available to 57,335 firms. In addition, the more than 700 small business investment companies, established pursuant to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, have raised that total considerably.

The following composite statement of firms helped by management assistance programs gives us an insight into the extent to which the small business community of this country has turned to SBA for assistance over the past decade:

Small businessmen assisted by SBA management assistance programs

Attendance at workshops	7,500
Individual counseling	178,000
Counseling under SCORE program	12,000
Attendance at courses and conferences	235,000
Contacts through intraindustry management programs	350,000
Publications sold or distributed in response to requests	33,000,000

IMPORTANCE OF INDEPENDENT SBA REPEATEDLY REAFFIRMED

The independent status of the Small Business Administration has recently been questioned. It was reported in the Washington Post of February 4 that consideration was given to incorporating the SBA into the Commerce Department.

Several Senators drew attention to the undesirability of such an action on both political and economic grounds. They pointed out that an SBA transfer would represent false economy, since the assistance furnished by the SBA is not only fully repaid—with interest—but this interest and the fees charged by SBA defray a large proportion of its operating expenses.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] recalled for us the reasoned statements of leaders now in the executive branch which were delivered in support of the congressional enactment of section 4(a) of the Small Business Act that:

> The Administration shall be under the general direction and supervision of the President and shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government.

I was happy to see a report in the Washington Post of February 18 that:

> The White House has sent word to Capitol Hill that it is shelving the plan to transfer the SBA to the Department of Commerce.

I hope this indicates that the matter has been put to rest permanently.

The administration would reap benefits of its support for SBA in many areas. One of the aspects which is deserving of discussion is in foreign relations. I understand that the USIA buildings in many countries have been displaying extensive wall exhibits on the subject of what the Federal Government is doing to aid and encourage small business in the United States.

It is probably fair to assume that such exhibits would be well received because in most countries, other than the United States, business enterprises are on a much smaller scale. Thus, many of their firms would be classified as family, independent, and small business. What I have just said applies particularly in developing countries which are seeking to build entrepreneurial classes from small beginnings. Our small business programs, as pictured by the USIA, have great potential for evoking a favorable impression among our friends and allies.

There are those who wish to paint an image of this country as "dominated by a few large corporations." Those people should come to the United States and see what a free enterprise economy can do. It is worth noting that over the past 30 years, while our population has increased 51 percent, the number of businesses in the country increased 67 percent. Small business presently accounts for about 94 percent of all lines of industry and commerce in this country, including some 300,000 manufacturers. However, it would certainly be difficult for our Government, in all honesty, to maintain this posture if it proposed to dismantle the SBA and transfer its protective functions to a department where they will be admittedly ineffective. I know that many Senators would regret to see the administration placed in such a position.

CONSTANT VIGILANCE REQUIRED

It seems that the Congress must remain constantly alert toward the welfare of the small business community, and to focus attention upon weaknesses that may appear in the system. There are presently two such areas. First, there is the absence of leadership. The post of Administrator of the Small Business Administration has been vacant since September 8, 1965. The legal organization of the SBA makes it impossible to have anyone appointed to the post of Acting Administrator. Second, there is the complete abridgment of the loan program in October.

This seems to be quite an untidy state of affairs, but to small businessmen across the country, it is more than that. Hopes for starting businesses have undoubtedly been scrapped, and plans for expansion have been curtailed. For the 338 Oregon firms that failed, these lapses have been a cause of tragedy and despair.

The press is full of stories about the economy reaching new heights, but the small businessmen who need and are unable to obtain assistance from the SBA are not likely to be sharing these gains. This raises a serious question as to those who should receive the benefits of our economic expansion, and the role of the Federal Government in making such determinations.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in October of last year reported to the Senate that stringency of credits for exporting has quite possibly inhibited smaller businesses from entering and participating in the development of overseas markets.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] have reviewed the domestic credit picture and demonstrated how the progressive restraints on credit over the past half year are tightening the screws on the small businessman. Senators JAVITS, PROUTY, and ALLOTT have voiced similar concerns.

It is pertinent to call attention to the fact that developments such as the decreased liquidity of commercial banks, as described by the Federal Reserve Bulletin of December 1965; the program of the Federal Reserve and its member banks to screen credit requests minutely during this year; and the increased needs for cash to pay advance income tax collections, will hurt the small businessman far more than they will hinder the big corporations.

Under these circumstances, the importance of the Small Business Administration's loan program, as a source of last resort, becomes progressively more important. The presence of the SBA as a reservoir of counsel and assistance that the small businessman can call his own is also critical under these conditions.

To continue the impairment of SBA's effectiveness is thus to allow a predictable increase in competitive injury to small business, and to the people who are striving to make these businesses successful.

To do away with the SBA at this point would amount to a body blow to the independence of business in general in this country; to the 5 million small firms in particular; to some of our basic national values; and to our international reputation.

Mr. President, I feel that the growing body of opinion which has been expressed by Members of the Congress on this subject should be persuasive.

It is my hope that the administration will assure a bright and independent future for small business by early and favorable action to restore leadership and funds to the Small Business Administration. I have expressed this hope to President Johnson in a recent telegram. I ask unanimous consent that this telegram be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> FEBRUARY 2, 1966.
>
> Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
> *The President,*
> *The White House,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> Have been informed that there is under consideration a proposal to transfer functions of Small Business Administration to another department of Government.
>
> Strongly urge that such a proposal not be submitted to Congress, but that every effort be made to strengthen the programs of SBA, particularly the loan fund. Have encountered numerous problems in Oregon due to lack of adequate loan funds for handling of ordinary SBA loans. Strengthening SBA as independent agency would be a step forward in the public interest.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> WAYNE MORSE.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPLEMENTARY MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 2791.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my 20 years in the Senate, I have never made a speech that I considered of so much importance to my record, in accordance with my sights as to the interests of my country, as the speech I am about to deliver. I fully appreciate the fact that once again I occupy a minority position on the floor of the Senate. I am also well enough informed in the history of the Senate to know that repetitively in the history of this great legislative body minority points of view of one period frequently become majority points of view.

As I have said in my State in recent days, I say on the floor of the Senate now: I am perfectly willing to let the people of Oregon be my judge and history be my appraiser, for I am satisfied that the course of action in foreign policy that this administration is leading us into is a course of action that future generations of Americans will rue.

No one can understand my position on this issue of foreign policy unless he fully understands my very deep conviction that the United States is on the way toward leading mankind to a third world war. That is one of the major premises of my view. Follow the course of action that the President is now following, and it is unavoidable that the United States will end up in world war III, out of which will come no victors, not even our own country. Therefore, I urge the American people to analyze carefully the bill that is the pending business of the Senate, for the reasons that I shall now, at some length, set forth.

The pending bill, S. 2791, is the most open ended invitation to the continued expansion and escalation of the Vietnam war that could be requested by a war department or granted by a Congress. I read to the Senate the sentence which constitutes one of the major premises of this speech. Unless one understands the point of view of the senior Senator from Oregon in regard to this sentence, I am sure there will be great difficulty in understanding the basis for my position. So I repeat this sentence again:

"The pending bill, S. 2791, is the most open end invitation to the continued expansion and escalation of the Vietnam war that could be requested by a war department or granted by a Congress."

I read section 401(a) of Title IV:

> SEC. 401. (a) Funds authorized for appropriation for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States under this or any other Act are authorized to be made available for their stated purposes in connection with support of Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam, and related costs, during the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense may determine.

That is a quotation from the bill. I did not misquote. That is what the bill provides. Let us comprehend it, if we can. It is difficult to do so, I know. But I shall repeat it:

> SEC. 401. (a) Funds authorized for appropriation for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States under this or any other Act are authorized to be made available for their stated purposes in connection with support of Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam, and related costs, during the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense may determine.

This is a bill, I digress to say, that goes far beyond fiscal year 1966. We are going to permit use of all Defense Department appropriations for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 "on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense may determine" to finance all free world military activities in Vietnam.

I am one Senator who does not believe in government by men. I do not intend to give the present Secretary of Defense or any other Secretary of Defense such personal power. I do not intend to throw away our precious checks under our constitutional system for a 2-year period and vest them in the Secretary of Defense.

Therefore, I say we are providing a blank check on American defense spending for expanding this war into Laos and Thailand; and when we get through paying and equipping the armed forces of South Korea and the Philippines, we will see the war spread to those countries, too.

Under this bill, and in this title, we are making the Vietnam war an American war. No longer is there any pretense that military aid to the forces of South Vietnam is aid to a separate and independent military identity. Their forces are to be funded out of our American military defense spending. I predict that this provision, which is totally unlimited as to amount and as to countries, will serve to further destroy the integrity of such neighboring countries as Thailand and any other country that is included in it.

I pause to point out that I have colleagues in the Senate for whom I have a high regard, as they know, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the acting majority leader, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who have been on record in this debate as saying that there are no political questions involved, that it is merely an authorization bill.

They lose me in that argument, for this bill is pregnant with policy. This bill is a bill that seeks to put the Congress on record in support of a whole chain of policies. I worry about the chain reaction after those policies are adopted. This is an authorization bill that supports a policy of using American taxpayers' money by the millions of dollars, and it can go into the billions before we get through, in support of the armies of South Korea, the Philippines, and any other country that we can get to go in.

The bill authorizes these funds to make them "available for their stated purposes in connection with support of Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam, and related costs, during the 2 fiscal years 1966 and 1967."

Later I shall talk about financing mercenaries, but I cannot forget the history of the American Revolution and the attitude that our revolutionary forefathers had toward mercenaries. Mr. President, it does not make it any cleaner to have us finance mercenaries, but that is what we are doing, and that is what this bill would authorize. No longer will they be financed through military aid to their governments, but right out of our own Defense Department appropriations.

Can there be any doubt that when the American taxpayers fully appreciate that we are financing these indigenous armies as part of our own, the American people are also going to expect that they be subject to American command, and that their governments make whatever adjustments the United States deems necessary for the prosecution of the war? Or is it possible that we are going to turn American troops over to the command of these other armies?

Mr. President, I want to warn the American people, as I shall warn them throughout this speech this afternoon, that we have before the Senate a bill that is so semantically phrased and so cleverly worded that, unless there is an analysis of the bill placed at the availability of the American taxpayers at the crossroads and communities of America, the American people are going to live to discover that this administration has led them into obtaining a blanket authorization for a course of action that, in my judgment, cannot possibly be reconciled with the precious constitutional rights, checks, and guarantees.

I repeat the last paragraph. Can there be any doubt that when the American taxpayers fully appreciate that we are financing these indigenous armies as part of our own, the American people are also going to expect that they be subject to American command and that their governments make whatever adjustments the United States deems necessary for the prosecution of this war.

This is one way for countries to be subverted. This is how all hope of national integrity is sacrificed. This is how the United States will expand this war beyond South Vietnam until all of southeast Asia is aflame with guerrilla warfare at best and conventional warfare at worst.

This is how we are destroying whatever chance there might be that independent countries could be encouraged and built up as a bulwark against either communism or China, or both.

Once these small countries of southeast Asia become amalgamated into the American Department of Defense, as they are in this bill, not only do they lose all hope of independence, but the United States becomes wholly responsible for them.

BILL AUTHORIZES EXPANSION AND EXTENSION OF WAR

This is not a bill that finances what has been done. It is a bill to finance a continued American penetration into southeast Asia.

Look at the language of section 302. The bill authorizes certain construction in support of military activities in southeast Asia, and for other purposes. Section 302 reads:

> The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities which he determines to be vital to the security of the United States, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment in the total amount of $200,000,000.

Do not tell the American people again, I say to the Secretary of State and to the President, that the United States seeks no military bases in South Vietnam or in southeast Asia.

I regret that my President said that in New York the other night, as he has said so many times. This bill cannot be squared with that statement. We are building large, powerful military installations in southeast Asia and in Thailand, and all the world knows we are not going to walk out on them. The provision in this bill for the building of those installations is the proof of the inconsistency between the statements of our President and what we are doing.

How well I remember, in 1964, as I campaigned in 14 States for my President, promises he made in regard to the course of action that he was going to follow vis-a-vis the war in Asia. He did not keep them.

Mr. President, differences between the semantic pronouncements of the President and America's course of action in southeast Asia cannot be squared, so I point out that in my judgment we shall continue to be very unconvincing to the people in the underdeveloped areas of the world, and, in fact, unconvincing to people throughout the world, when we say we seek no bases. For we are building them. This bill authorizes still more. They will be there for a long time, and so will we.

Once we proceed to build the bases called for in section 302 of this bill, reason dictates that our presence will be there for a long, long time to come. In fact, we will have to be there, if we are to carry out the objectives being announced by our President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense, as I shall point out later.

Section 302 refers to installations and facilities "vital to the security of the United States." Who is to say what is vital to the security of our country? Not the Congress. Under this bill, it is the Secretary of Defense. It is he who is authorized by the bill to establish the outposts of American military command, that will thence have to be defended by all the resources of this Nation that may be required to defend them. These so-called vital interests are not in the Western Hemisphere, for the short title of this bill explains that it refers to military activities in southeast Asia.

Since when, and in what act of Congress, is southeast Asia defined as vital to the security of the United States, justifying any unilateral action that may be needed on our part to defend it? The most that can be cited is the SEATO Treaty, which, however, does not define the area as vital, but refers to a "common danger" to all SEATO members, which danger has never been seen by our SEATO partners.

The resolution of August 1964 cites southeast Asia as an area where the United States regards "the maintenance of international peace and security" as vital to our interests. I submit that the continued intrusion of large-scale American military forces, bases, and navies in this area, as provided by the bill, will destroy what little international peace and security is left to the people of Thailand, Laos, Malaysia, and eventually Burma and Cambodia, for the war that is lapping at their shores will engulf them, too, if it is allowed to proceed on its present course.

This bill calls for the opposite of the so-called enclave theory. It calls for the construction of bases not only on the coastal areas of South Vietnam, but anywhere in the deep interior of Thailand, and possibly Laos.

Let the record show that the senior Senator from Oregon supports the enclave theory of General Gavin. I have listened to the administration witnesses, and in my judgment, they have not touched it as far as rebutting its soundness is concerned. Oh, there is talk that those of us who oppose this war in Vietnam have no program. We have a program, Mr. President, and we have offered it over and over again; but it is not a program of escalation. It is not a program of following a course of action in southeast Asia that we fear will lead to a war with Red China—and once we are in that war, I think it is absurd for anyone to think that Russia will sit on the sidelines.

Mr. President, I know the Pentagon would like to pooh-pooh the enclave theory. But, Mr. President, the enclave theory does not weaken the defense of the United States; it strengthens it, and makes possible a course of action where others can come in, on a multilateral basis, to keep the peace. But as we follow a program of expanding the war—and that is the administration's program, Mr. President—we make it that much more difficult for a multilateral peacekeeping action to be applied to the war in southeast Asia.

The enclave theory, as General Gavin pointed out, does not mean retreat. The enclave theory does not mean that we put our troops over there at the mercy of the opposition. To the contrary, the enclave theory gives protection to those troops, by not sending them out into more expanded conflict, to kill more of them.

I know an attempt is being made to create the image of those of us who are opposed to expanding this war, that we are letting down our boys. My reply is that those who are seeking to follow the administration's course of action in southeast Asia will have to assume the responsibility for the letting of the blood of many of those boys, who would never bleed if we adopted the enclave theory. Because, Mr. President, the enclave theory gives us a strong defensive position, gives protection, may I say, to the South Vietnamese as well, and is a program that stops the escalating of the war and the advancing of aggression.

The administration simply does not want to face up to what the enclave theory would do as far as giving us a program that will make possible halting of the killing to the degree that is now going on, and giving a basis for our representatives before the United Nations to make a much stronger case for the United Nations to come in and declare a cease-fire, and announce to the opposing sides that it is going to send in, in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter, whatever number of divisions are necessary to enforce a peace.

That is a program for which some of us have been pleading a long time. For the administration to say that it is no program is to beg the question. What is needed is an enforced cease-fire in southeast Asia. What is needed is for the signatories to the United Nations Charter to begin to live up to the obligations of their signatures. What is needed is not to keep the issue behind the scenes in New York City but to get it out into an open meeting of the Security Council and let the nations of the world on the Security Council stand up and be counted.

Mr. President, Drew Pearson has an interesting column in this morning's Post, and I ask unanimous consent to have that part of it dealing with this problem printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection the excerpt from the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH HELD UP U.N. DEBATE

(By Drew Pearson)

There were two inside reasons why the United States appeared to walk up the hill to the U.N. Security Council on Vietnam, then walk down again—away from debate.

Reason No. 1 was because Prime Minister Harold Wilson of England asked us to.

Reason No. 2 was because the Russians, while not asking a postponement, made it diplomatically clear that it would put them in a better position with the Chinese.

The British request was made because Prime Minister Wilson was going to Moscow and hoped that he could do some good with the Russians prior to any forensic slugging match in the Security Council. He hoped to persuade the Russians to join Britain in reviving the former British-Russian partnership for peace in Indochina.

Wilson had previously requested President Johnson to hold off bombing North Vietnam until his trip to Moscow, but the President did not do so; so it was decided that the United States could at least honor the request for debate postponement in the U.N.

BITTER COMMUNIST BATTLE

Second inside reason was considered even more important—namely, the strategy of not playing into Chinese hands by putting the

Russians on the spot during their bitter debate.

On March 29, one of the most important Communists conferences in the last 48 years will be held in Moscow. It will see a final showdown between the Russians and the Chinese, with possibly a diplomatic break resulting.

Russian politicians have been traveling around the Communist world campaigning for the votes of Communist countries against the Chinese. The situation is not unlike an American election during which, at times, Khrushchev deliberately tried not to rock the international boat in favor of the American rightwing. Likewise, it was decided in the Johnson administration not to do anything which would rock the boat in favor of the Chinese.

The U.N. Security debate would have put the Russians on the spot by forcing them to veto peace talks. The Chinese have been pounding them with the accusation that they are the "lackeys of American imperialism," trying to pull "American chestnuts out of the Vietnam fire."

Ambassador Arthur Goldberg had a 2-hour session with President Johnson immediately after his return from Honolulu, at which time it was decided not to proceed with a U.N. showdown over Vietnam now. This column can reveal that the above reasons were among the most important factors discussed.

DAWDLING BUREAUCRACY

Chairman Paul Rand Dixon of the Federal Trade Commission, trained by Senator Estes Kefauver as a rootin'-tootin' trustbuster, is now following milk-and-water policies that would make Kefauver turn over in his grave.

For 5 years the Trade Commission has been dawdling over unfair monopoly charges brought against the Community Blood Bank in Kansas City. An FTC investigator made a thorough probe. Extensive hearings were held. It was conclusively shown that certain Kansas City pathologists, working inside certain hospitals, boycotted the blood of one blood bank in order to favor a doctor-organized blood bank.

Despite the finds of monopoly and trade discrimination, Chairman Dixon is still sitting, holding up action.

U.N. GO-ROUND

Before the last Security Council debate, Ambassador Goldberg was urged by one State Department official to charge the Russians with pussyfooting for peace. He declined.

"I'm not running for office," he told his State Department friend. "I'm trying to make peace."

Henry Cabot Lodge, now Ambassador in Saigon, formerly Eisenhower's Ambassador to the U.N., made speech after speech before the TV cameras, verbally punching the Russians. It sounded great domestically, boosted him as a candidate for Vice President on the Nixon ticket. But it didn't help the cold war thaw which Eisenhower eventually worked out with Khrushchev.

Here is an illustration of how rough the debate is getting between the Russians and the Chinese. The Communist paper Hung Chi recently charged: "The new leaders of the Soviet Communist Party * * * want to sow dissension in Chinese-Vietnamese relations and help the United States in its peace plot. They want to find a way out for U.S. imperialism, to enable it to occupy South Vietnam permanently." Backing up the Chinese contention that Russia is collaborating with the United States, Hung Chi cited two books published inside Russia on American-Soviet relations which, it said, transformed Presidents Johnson, Kennedy and Eisenhower into "partisans of peace instead of arch war criminals."

Mr. **MORSE.** Mr. President, the column points out in essence that some of our alleged allies in the United Nations have been trying to avoid a debate in the Security Council. The column states that the Prime Minister of Great Britain Mr. Wilson has been urging that the debate be kept behind the scenes. Russia does not wish debate to be a matter of public discussion because she has a large Communist conclave coming around March 29 and prefers to have the matter postponed. However, that should not stop the United States from insisting that the matter be brought out in the open. Great Britain and Russia and every other member of the Security Council have a treaty obligation. As was pointed out to me in a long telephone conversation this morning with one of our greatest living American historians, Professor Commager of Amherst, that is what the Security Council, he pointed out, is for. That is the commitment of the signatories to the United Nations Charter.

Mr. President, the time has come, in this hour of world crisis, to find out whether the United Nations Charter is to survive. If members of the Security Council are not willing to put it to use now, then, in my judgment, they will have to assume responsibility for murdering the United Nations. For I cannot imagine a crisis that will face mankind more serious than the present one. Nor can I imagine a crisis which dictates more clearly that every member of the Security Council should proceed to carry out that country's obligation under the terms of the charter.

Mr. President, what is needed is to have the Security Council proceed to exercise its peacekeeping functions, to announce to the United States and the South Vietnamese on the one hand, and to the North Vietnamese and Red China on the other, that the United Nations will keep the peace, that the United Nations will not stand by and let the warring factions in southeast Asia lead mankind into a massive war.

I have been heard to say so many times—and make this fleeting reference to it—that when the United Nations has followed its peacekeeping function, it has kept the peace. It is true that probably none of the other crises has been of the same magnitude as this one, but they could have developed into a world war. The United Nations does have a record of keeping the peace in the Congo, in Cyprus, in the Gaza strip, in the differences between Pakistan and India. It has also, without going as far as it was found necessary to go in those cases, exercised great influence with other potential threats to the peace of the world.

No member of the United Nations can justify stepping aside or avoiding Security Council action and not assume responsibility in history for walking out on that nation's responsibility as a member of the Security Council. But, I add, that if the Security Council will not take jurisdiction, or if one or more members of the Security Council veto the taking of jurisdiction, then my country should insist that the procedures of the General Assembly be brought into play. My country should insist upon the calling of an extraordinary session of the General Assembly to consider the threat to the peace of the world.

I have no doubt that it will get whatever support it needs for the calling of such extraordinary session. I also have no doubt as to what course of action will be taken in the General Assembly for I think there is, now, at long last, a worldwide recognition that the holocaust in southeast Asia can very well, in the not too distant future, throw mankind into a massive war.

That is why I was heard to say at the time of the Honolulu conference—the President, having spoken there—that I hoped he would come back and go to New York City to the United Nations and make the plea for a United Nations' takeover in southeast Asia, and make the commitment that when the United Nations decrees a cease-fire order, the United States would respect it and abide by it and give it every cooperation in carrying it out.

It is said that the Vietcong, North Vietnam, and Red China do not belong to the United Nations. I know that. But, the commitment of the signatories to the United Nations Charter was not that they would only enforce the peace and keep the peace in disputes between member nations—read the charter—but the commitment of the signatories was that they would keep the peace or join in an effort to keep the peace wherever there was a threat to the peace, irrespective of whether that threat was being made by members or nonmember nations.

Mr. President, if that were not true, then the United Nations Charter became a scrap of paper the very moment it was signed in San Francisco.

Further, if we had that kind of alinement for peace, the ceasefire order would be but the beginning. It would then be necessary for the nations who have pledged to join together to keep the peace, to make a series of offers for control of the territory, and administration of the territory, and for the number of years it might take to make it possible for the people of the area to develop the knowledge, the wherewithal, and the conviction that they should support the principle of self-determination.

Mr. President, it means that under that kind of approach we might very well have a reconvening of the Geneva Conference. As I have said so many times in my discussions on that subject, it is sorely needed. It is no longer a taboo subject in this country. Even this administration is paying lipservice to the reconvening of the Geneva Conference. In fact, the American Ambassador has said on occasion that if the Geneva Conference were called, we would be at Geneva the next day.

Before I finish my speech, I shall point out what the reconvening of the Geneva Conference would mean. It would be quiet different from what the war hawks have wanted, for a reconvening of the Geneva Conference would mean negotiating with Communists as well as with free nations. We should and we are going to have to if there is going to be peace.

I shall share the deprecation of everything communism stands for and that is shared by any Member of the Senate, but those Communist nations have the same sovereign rights as the United States or any other nation. That just happens to be a reality of international law. In my judgment, it is hopeless to think that there can be any negotiation with them on bilateral relationship between the United States and these Communist nations. That is one of the great mistakes in the President's whole program, although he has not put it in those words.

It is very interesting to notice the sidestepping and toe dancing that characterize the verbalization of this administration with respect to the delicate and difficult problem of what is going to be our relationship with Communist nations. We are going to have to negotiate with them, but we ought to stop trying to advance the point of view that it can be done on a bilateral arrangement. That time has gone for all time in this dispute. We are going to have to negotiate with them as a party to a larger group, a multilateral group, where we will be on one side of the table, and the Communists on the other side of the table, and a group of noncombatant neutrals at the head of the table, operating the procedures at the table.

That is why I say I think that kind of negotiation, once we have the enclave program adopted, once we have the cease-fire ordered, and nations send over whatever number of men are necessary to enforce the cease-fire, will be the kind of negotiation that runs a very good chance of bringing the Communists to that table and making it possible for the United Nations or the Geneva Conference to work out a trusteeship or a protectorate or a program of joint action that will give us some hope of preserving the peace in southeast Asia and then building up the people.

When certain persons talk about building up the country, I talk about building up the people, so that in a matter of a few years they can decide for themselves the kind of country and the kind of government they want throughout Vietnam.

So I say, those who say we have no plan simply mean that those of us who are opposed to them refuse to support them in their warmaking plans. Ours is not a warmaking plan. It is a peacekeeping plan. Ours is a plan that seeks to bring to an end the killing and seeks to substitute for the killing the enforcement of a peace.

As I have said, this bill calls for the opposite of the so-called enclave theory. It authorizes construction of bases not only on the coastal areas of South Vietnam, but in the deep interior of Thailand, and possibly Laos.

According to Secretary McNamara's testimony on pages 52 and 53 of the hearings, about $975 million of existing and new military construction money is to be spent in South Vietnam, the remaining $666 million elsewhere in the general area to support our activities in South Vietnam.

One does not need to go to the Armed Services Committee room and read the portions that are marked "deleted" in the printed hearings to know that deletions of this kind refer to countries like Thailand and Laos where our military penetrations are not a military secret, but supposedly a diplomatic secret.

U.S. OBJECTIVE IS TO DESTROY VIETCONG THROUGHOUT SOUTH VIETNAM

What is printed in the hearings is enough to destroy the claim that there is little difference between the Gavin-Kennan proposal for Vietnam and the administration objective.

In fact, I think the difference between the Gavin-Kennan program and the Johnson-Rusk-McNamara program is the difference between the high sunlight of noon and the black midnight of 12 o'clock at night—all the difference in the world. They are poles apart.

The administration objective in South Vietnam is to clear the country of the Vietcong and restore General Ky to full control over the people and territory of South Vietnam. That is what was in the President's Honolulu speech and here is the military funding that will be needed to carry it out.

May I digress to point out that there has been little talk by this administration that what it seeks to do is to entrench Ky in power; what it seeks to do is destroy the Vietcong. Not only that, as I shall point out later in this speech, the plan also, once he is entrenched, is to then give him support for the takeover of all Vietnam, because Ky, like our first puppet, seeks a reunification of all Vietnam on the terms of Ky, as Diem wanted it on the terms of Diem.

While making that point, let me also point out that this administration has little to say about who the Vietcong are. The Vietcong are South Vietnamese. We have had various estimates made in the record, but I think it is an understatement to say that 75 percent, and higher, of the Vietcong are South Vietnamese.

This administration only talks about the soldiery of the Vietcong. Mr. President, the Vietcong happen to be a population of people in South Vietnam engaged in a civil war with other South Vietnamese. Oh, I know the administration does not like to mention that it is a civil war, but so it is, and has been from the beginning.

The Vietcong consists not only of soldiers but of families, men, women, and children.

Then, we read in the morning newspaper, in the account of the action that took place yesterday, of women and children carrying the ammunition to their Vietcong soldiers and taking away the dead and the wounded, and it has been going on from the beginning.

This administration has falsely represented that the Vietcong represent only a group of terrorist soldiers. The Vietcong from the beginning have have a substantial part of the population of South Vietnam, in control of more than 50 percent of the land area of South Vietnam. Spokesmen for this administration in testimony admit that the Vietcong control probably as much as 60 percent or more of the land area of southeast Asia. We get a variety of figures from them as to how many people they control, but it is understatement to say they control a substantial population, a substantial number, in the neighborhood of one-third of the population of South Vietnam.

Let me make it clear, as I have so many times during the last 2½ years, as I have spoken from this desk in opposition to our foreign policy in southeast Asia. There is no doubt about the inhumanity to man that has been practiced by the Vietcong soldiers. But why? Why has this administration tried to gloss over the fact that the terror and shocking brutality involved in this war in South Vietnam has not been limited to the Vietcong?

But if one reads the press of free foreign nations and sees the photographs in the foreign press of free nations, then, one recognizes the terror of the South Vietnamese Army, too.

How does one explain it? I do not know how to explain it except that we are dealing with a people with a different sense of human values, a different culture, and different background.

Most of them are illiterate. They are a people who have struggled for years and years in a war-torn country. I suspect that what has happened is that there has been a dulling of sensitivity. I suspect that what has happened is that the suffering caused by the horrors of war has destroyed many human values. But I do not like to see our country countenance it. I hate to read stories and see pictures in the foreign press depicting also the brutality of the South Vietnamese soldiery and see pictures of American Armed Forces standing by.

I referred a few moments ago to the long telephone conversation I had this morning with Professor Commager. He said:

> I hope you will point out again, Senator, as you have before, the nature of this man Ky. There is no question that he is a tyrannical puppet of the United States. Now he is denying—I think it is obvious that he is denying it because it hurts his image—that he ever said that his main hero was Hitler; that he ever said that what South Vietnam needs are several Hitlers.

As Professor Commager said this morning, it should be made clear again that there is no question that Ky did say that. There is no question that the interview he had with the London Mirror was accurately reported. That is a pretty costly statement, so far as his image is concerned.

He is the kind of tyrant that our Government is sacrificing the lives of American boys to sustain, but they will not be sacrificed with my vote.

I have pointed out that we are dealing with a country, in South Vietnam, that is composed of a divided population—the Vietcong and the South Vietnamese, so-called. Not all Vietcongs are Communists. My guess would be that a substantial majority are Vietnamese Communists; but among the Vietcong are many who are not Communists. Interestingly enough, some of the top officials of the Vietcong are not Communists. The average American citizen thinks that the members of the Vietcong are merely roving bands of brigands.

But, Mr. President, there are Vietcongs who have families. There are Vietcongs who hold positions among their people.

We talk as though we have a right to establish on a permanent basis, a government in South Vietnam sympathetic to the United States, and to move next to supporting that government in a takeover for the reunification of Vietnam—south and north. This bill provides the funds that will finance that kind of foreign policy in southeast Asia.

My answer is that that is not our business. My answer is that it happens to be the business of the United Nations or, under the canopy of the United Nations, the business of the Geneva Conference. But it is not our program.

I say that the bill is a military funding bill that is needed to carry out the President's wrong foreign policy in southeast Asia.

I point to Secretary McNamara's statements on page 105 of the hearings in response to a question from Senator SMITH:

> Senator SMITH. Mr. Secretary, are there any plans to escalate and step up the offensive in Vietnam?
>
> Secretary MCNAMARA. Well, there are preparations being made, and they are reflected in this fiscal 1966 supplement, for substantially increasing our deployments to South Vietnam and raising the rate of activity of our air units there. Whether or not we will carry out such higher rates of activities and actually deploy all of those additional forces is a decision that only the President can make, and no such decision has yet been made.
>
> His instruction to us is to be prepared to meet such higher deployments and such higher rates of activity should the need for them arise.

I wish to go back to that statement. In the light of that statement, I am at a loss to understand the argument of any Senator who says that the pending bill is not a policymaking bill, that the bill is only financing what we are now doing.

What does Secretary McNamara mean when he says that preparations are being made and that they are reflected in the fiscal 1966 supplemental bill? Preparations for what? Preparations for the course of action raised by Senator SMITH's question when she asked: "Are there any plans to escalate and step up the offensive in Vietnam?"

The answer of the Secretary of Defense means "Yes."

He says they are reflected in this fiscal 1966 supplemental bill. The money is in there.

This is dangerous. It is dangerous to authorize in advance funds for an escalated war. This is a policy that should be rejected, and I say to the American people: "As fast as you come to understand the hidden policy in this bill, reject those who support it. It is your only hope. It is the only check you have got left, for you are losing your check in the Congress, as I think the vote next week will show. It is up to you, the people, whether you want to put your stamp of approval by way of a free ballot on such a policy. And, if you do, you have only yourselves to blame."

That is why this Senator has announced in his State that he will support no candidate for office in his State who supports this policy of an escalated war.

What else does this statement mean? The Secretary of Defense says:

> These preparations are reflected in this supplement for substantially increasing our deployments to South Vietnam.

That means men. That means that they are asking for authorization for funds to send increasing thousands of American boys into southeast Asia.

I want the American people to know that. I want the American people to know what is hidden in this bill, the policy called for by this bill. What else does the Secretary of Defense say? He says: "and raising the rate of activity of our air units there."

This means that they are putting in this bill authorization for funds that will permit them, at the decision of the Secretary of Defense subsequently, to have an escalated air program in southeast Asia. People try to pooh-pooh the position of those of us who are opposed to this war when we say that we are concerned that it is going to lead to a war with Red China and Russia.

Our fear—and it is not fear alone—is based upon inevitable cause-to-effect reasoning. If we escalate this war in the air, we are going to get ourselves involved in an airpower course of action that cannot avoid bringing in China and Russia.

That is General Gavin's great fear, and he testified to that effect time and time again during the day of hearings that we held. I say to the American people: "You, the American people, saw him and heard him."

That is General Gavin's concern. That was the concern of Ambassador Kennan, as he answered questions during a day of testimony. The American people saw and heard him.

That is the reason that these two great experts—one a great foreign policy expert, Ambassador Kennan, and the other a great military expert, General Gavin—tried to forewarn Congress and the people of this country: "If you follow the foreign policy of this administration in southeast Asia, you increase the great danger of a war with China and Russia."

Oh, but what so-called escape or exit do they leave in this bill? They say that this can happen under this bill only if the President so decides. I know. They think they put a Senator in a very difficult and thin ice position if they put him in a position in which he decides that he must say: "I don't want to give the President that discretion."

It is not a difficult position for me, for I will not give the Office of the Presidency of the United States, with my vote, at any time such arbitrary, unchecked discretion. It is not safe for freedom. It is not safe for a democratic form of government.

Listen to what the Secretary of Defense said:

> Whether or not we will carry out such higher rates of activities and actually deploy all of those additional forces is a decision that only the President can make, and no such decision has yet been made.

I do not propose to put him in a position in which he can make it, not with my vote. The bill should not be passed with that power in it, for either the President or the Secretary of Defense.

Let me say that the American people are entitled to have Congress see where it is going at all times. This is a blindfold bill. This is a bill that covers up. I believe that Congress should reject this language of the bill and make it clear that it wants to know before the fact, not after the fact, what our course of action in Asia is going to be.

I continue with the hearings, Mr. President, on page 105:

> Senator SMITH. If there aren't any ammunition shortages in the Vietnam fighting and if there aren't any plans to escalate and step up the fighting in Vietnam, then why have you recently opened a half dozen or more ammunition plants directed to start operations on increased ammunitions?
>
> Secretary MCNAMARA. To be prepared to support higher deployments and higher rates of activity. We have laid out over the period of the next 18 months—through June 1967—possible levels of deployment, and possible rates of activity which are higher than present levels of deployment and rates of activity, and in order to be prepared to support them, we are requesting funds to procure the ammunition for such higher deployments and higher rates of activity.

There you have it. There you have it in all of its dangerous implications. "We are asking you," he says in effect, "to buy a pig in a poke. We are asking you to give advance approval, but you do not know what you are approving, for an escalation of this war, if the President and the Secretary of Defense, under the authority given in the bill, decide that should be the course of action."

Who wants to talk to me any more about a government of law? Pass this bill, and you have taken the people of this country much farther down the road toward government by executive supremacy and government by secrecy. I have said it before, but I shall keep on saying it, because repetition is necessary for the learning process: We are already a long way down the road toward government by secrecy and government by executive supremacy.

Mr. President, we must stop this march toward government by executive supremacy and government by secrecy. We have got to insist that the American people be told the facts. We must insist, Mr. President, that this administration be not allowed to hide behind the emotional sanction that it is waving in front of the American people constantly these days: "We cannot tell you—it is not safe to tell you—you must trust us."

Well, Mr. President, when you find them untrustworthy in the future, that will not bring back the lives of large numbers of Americans, both in the armed services and in civilian life, which will be lost if they lead us into the third world war.

Elsewhere, Secretary McNamara was pressed by Senator MCCLELLAN to describe and define our military strategy and tactics in Vietnam. The Senator's question appears on page 112 of the hearing record and it was:

> Are we going to continue fighting what appears to be a holding action?

Secretary McNamara. I don't believe that we would characterize our present military strategy or present tactics as holding actions. On the contrary, we are taking the offensive, seeking to find and destroy the enemy bases and forces, and we propose to continue to follow that strategy and tactic, using whatever forces are required to accomplish it in order to convince the Vietcong and particularly the North Vietnamese who are directing their operations, that they cannot win in the south, and therefore, must cease their attempt to subvert and destroy the political institutions of the south.

Senator McClellan. That is why it occurs to me that it is primarily a holding action. We are just going to hold on and show them they can't win.

Secretary McNamara. No, sir.

Senator McClellan. We are not taking the initiative and offensive to bring them to that decision by a military defeat. But simply by showing them that they can't drive us off.

Secretary McNamara. No sir; I don't believe that is correct. We are seeking, as I say, to find and destroy their forces in South Vietnam. The point of difference that lies between us may be with respect to our objectives. We do have limited political objectives in South Vietnam. They are not to destroy the North Vietnamese Government, they do not involve application of military power to North Vietnam for any purpose other than to reduce the capability of the North Vietnamese to support and direct the Vietcong activities in the south. Nor are our objectives in the south designed to provide permanent military bases for us there, nor are they designed to force South Vietnam into association as a member of Western alliance. Our objectives are limited solely to preserving the independence of the South Vietnamese and their right to determine their own destiny.

Now, following that limited objective, we have developed this military strategy which I have outlined.

Senator McClellan. I understand in a general way our political objectives. We are not trying to take over the North Vietnam Government or to destroy it as such. We are simply trying to make certain first, of course, as you say, that the South Vietnam Government is preserved and the integrity of that country is preserved. That is No. 1, I am sure.

But we are fighting North Vietnam.

Secretary McNamara. We are what, sir?

Senator McClellan. We are fighting North Vietnam. I don't care how or what words you use or what phraseology, we are fighting North Vietnam, she is our enemy, not just the Vietcong. And the point I am getting at, is, is it our policy just simply to use only limited means to destroy and make limited effort to destroy North Vietnam's war potential, warmaking power, while we simply sit down there and try to hold the fort, so to speak, and convince them, "Well, you can't drive us out. This may take 10 years, 5 years, or what."

"I want to get, I want to know if that is really our policy as of now, just to stay there and show them they can't drive us out, and that is the end of it.

Secretary McNamara. No, sir; I don't believe it is. As I have said, our military strategy which is associated with the political objective of preserving the right of the South Vietnamese to determine their own destiny is to find and destroy the Vietcong and North Vietnamese forces operating in South Vietnam.

A few sentences later, the Secretary added:

> If the circumstances change, if the North Vietnamese add greater force, if the military risk associated with our present policy increases beyond the limits we presently see, it might be desirable or necessary in the future to modify that strategy (deleted).

Mr. President, after that word "deleted," let me say to the American people, "You should know what was deleted. You are the ones who are going to do the dying if this goes askew."

This, of course, is quite in keeping with the Honolulu speech of the President at the Honolulu airport on February 6, when he said:

> We will leave here determined not only to achieve victory over aggression, but to win victory over hunger, disease, and despair.

Mr. President, I digress to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that General Taylor and others at the hearings had a little difficulty in recalling who talked about victory. I pointed out in the hearings that the President has been talking about victory.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a moment?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I believe that the American people are finding it difficult, even as Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives are, to find out what goes on in some of these hearings. I just opened the record of the hearings at random, after the Senator from Oregon mentioned the word "deleted," to page 265, and I read as follows:

> I am asking for your personal opinion.
>
> **General Johnson.** [Deleted.]
>
> **Senator Symington.** [Deleted.] Mr. Chairman, may I have this question off the record?
>
> **Chairman Russell.** Yes. Off the record, Mr. Reporter.
>
> (Discussion off the record.)
>
> **Chairman Russell.** Back on the record.
>
> **Senator Symington.** One final group of questions.
>
> [Deleted.]
>
> ### USE OF NAVAL AND AIR SUPPORT
>
> General Wheeler pretty well handled my good friend General Gavin's statement the other day.
>
> [Deleted.]

And so on, and so on. All the essential information in this volume has been deleted. The people of America cannot find out from reading it, and Members of Congress cannot find out from reading it, unless they go into the secret room and go through the information which has been deleted. This document is essentially useless for consideration of this very important bill.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Montana, that I could not agree with him more. Let me warn him that such talk is dangerous in the view of many.

Mr. METCALF. All of us believe in security, of course. But time after time, if we try to read this document—and again I open it to page 172—we find as follows:

> **Secretary McNamara.** [Deleted.]
> **Senator Jackson.** [Deleted.]
> **Secretary McNamara.** [Deleted.]

How can anyone follow an essential discussion of what we need in Vietnam, or any other place, if none of the information is given to us?

Mr. MORSE. That is my point. That is the best definition I can give the Senator of government by secrecy and the dangers which I have pointed out in regard to it.

Here we have a Secretary of Defense who hides behind executive privilege, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who also hides behind executive privilege, which they can do if they wish, and refuse to come out in an open, public hearing and discuss policy. As the Senator from Montana has stated, neither he, nor I, nor anyone, so far as I know, would ask for disclosure of any security information. There is no danger of that. That is why I believe it is so unfortunate that my President took to the television and supported Secretary McNamara and General Wheeler in their refusal to come before a public hearing and discuss public policy, because the President underwrote government by secrecy when he did that. The President must be checked.

Everyone knows—and I have seen it happen innumerable times, it happened the other day in the Rusk testimony—that whenever a Senator asks a question which the administration witness thinks involves a security matter, he merely says:

> Mr. Senator, I cannot answer that in a public hearing. I should like to have you lay it aside and I will answer it in executive session.

It is automatically laid aside, and we subsequently meet and go into it in executive session.

But, we are talking about policy in this bill. We are talking about the policy of escalation. We are talking about the policy of giving to our President this unchecked power. This should all be discussed in a public hearing.

Mr. METCALF. But those are the essential questions which they have refused to answer. Those are the essential questions that the American people are hungry to know——

Mr. MORSE. And are entitled to know.

Mr. METCALF. They are seeking to know and they are entitled to know.

Mr. MORSE. That is right.

Mr. METCALF. Many of them are.

Mr. MORSE. That is right. That is part of the burden of my argument. That is why I believe we speak at a historic time. I doubt if we can find another time in the history of the Republic where the danger is as great as it is at the present hour in the development of a government by executive supremacy and secrecy. I believe that it is so dangerous—as someone said to me this morning—that we, who oppose this war, have burned all our bridges. Well, I believe it is so dangerous that, if that is true, I am willing to burn the bridges.

The warning must be raised.

I hope we can get a vote on the issue. I hope it is true, as I read in the press today, that the great Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell]—and I know of no greater one in the Senate—when next week I offer my amendment to this bill that seeks to rescind the resolution of August 1964, will offer a substitute, and that the substitute will be a reaffirmation of that resolution, and that the Senate will vote on it and then let the American people know.

I cannot force that vote, but this question having been raised as a logical outcome of my colloquy with the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], I want to say the American people are entitled to that vote. They are entitled to adjudge those of us who vote on that resolution for or against.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. The whole point the Senator was making and that I was trying to make is that the people of America do not know the facts. They have not been informed. They cannot possibly find out from the administration, or executive department. So, no matter how the Senate votes, no matter how the House of Representatives votes, the people of America do not know the facts and the conditions under which we are voting.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is right. That is my case.

Mr. METCALF. That is a tremendously unfair situation.

Mr. MORSE. That is my case.

Aside from the issue of our legal commitment in Vietnam, there is the quite separate question of our objective there. It has been repeated often by the administration that our objective is to restore our own American choice of a government to all of South Vietnam. We say we welcome elections, but, of course, we mean elections held after the country and the people have been pacified. And by pacification, we mean that American troops go through the countryside and wipe out whatever Vietcong resistance can be found and the local South Vietnam troops occupy the cleared area and establish a half-military, half-civilian authority in our wake. When we have established that condition throughout all of South Vietnam, then presumably we will be ready for an election.

This new authorization for weapons and bases and additional manpower is another installment in the war effort it will take to accomplish that objective. And as Secretary McNamara pointed out, if North Vietnam responds to this particular American escalation in the ways it has in the past, then there will have to be new and further steps taken beyond those contemplated in this bill.

NEW MANPOWER INCREASES PROVIDED IN BILL

I call the attention of Senators to the tables furnished by the Secretary of Defense which appear on pages 14, 15, and 16 of the hearings. There we see that the plans of the Defense Department call for increases in active duty military personnel by a net total of 452,843 to be financed by this measure. That increase is planned to be realized by the end of fiscal year 1967.

It is in there. Three hundred forty-seven thousand of these men are expected to be added by June of 1966.

I say to the American people that this bill provides in its very terms—it is not spelled out but it was revealed in the hearings—for sending to South Vietnam, if they so decide to send them, 400,000 additionl men. Send them over there. Send them over there to escalate the manpower.

I should think that Senators would see how obviously dangerous it is. I do not know how anyone can vote for this bill providing for that kind of manpower escalation without writing an entire series of checks into it requiring step-by-step approval by Congress.

Let me say that this is not all. This is not the limit. This is the manpower they discussed in the Armed Services Committee.

I want the American people to know my fear. My fear is that if this bill is passed and there is authorized this kind of escalation and it results, as I think it will result, in a war with China, there will be a minimum of 3 million American troops on the mainland of China within 24 months after war breaks out. That is, total war. We have no right to play with that danger. We have no right to support a bill that is based upon U.S. unilateral military action primarily in Asia, and then pretend, as the President did in his speech in New York City the other night, that we seek peace.

Surely Senators who continue to delude themselves that this pending measure merely finances what has already been done and what is now being done have not read the hearings. The purpose of the new authorization is substantially to increase our ground and air operations in southeast Asia and to provide both the manpower and the material to do it. Our immediate objective is to eliminate the Vietcong forces from South Vietnam and to establish General Ky as the unchallenged authority throughout South Vietnam.

I have been heard to say on this floor that with the extent of manpower and firepower we are prepared to put into South Vietnam, we can probably occupy the entire area and suppress the rebellion. I do not see how the Vietcong have stood up to our pounding from air, sea, and land as long as they have. We have now proved the duplicity of our statements of last year that we were using nontoxic gases for humane purposes. We are now dropping tear gas from helicopters to drive the Vietcong into the open just before we unleash B–52's upon them with their loads of 51 bombs each, each bomb weighing 750 pounds.

The fact is that we are using gas in Vietnam just the way it has always been used in warfare—not to subdue the violent without injuring the innocent, but to render an enemy incapable of defending himself so he may more easily be killed. It was that purpose of gas that was outlawed by international convention and it is that convention that applies to our use of gas in Vietnam as much as it applies anywhere else.

What does our country offer as an alibi? "It is tear gas," one should read the articles of war. They do not say that a country cannot use gases except tear gas. They prohibit all gases, and for the reason I pointed out in my speech.

The article of war is violated when we use a gas that puts an enemy in a position where he cannot defend himself and thus it is made possible to kill him because he has been incapacitated by gas. It is the gas that is prohibited.

In other words, we are bringing to bear upon the Vietcong the ultimate in sophisticated scientific weapons. We are all horrified at decapitations and disembowelings that are committed by the Vietcong by hand. But we apply on a far larger scale the more impersonal but equally horrifying terror weapons of the laboratory. Under the new escalation contemplated by this bill, I do not doubt that the Vietcong as an organized fighting force will be destroyed unless they get help by means of an equivalent build-up from North Vietnam, from the Soviet Union, or from China.

I spoke some minutes ago about the terror of the Vietcong and the terror of the South Vietnamese, pointing out that horrible picture that was published some time ago of a Vietcong prisoner with a rope around his neck and forces of the South Vietnam conducting a tug of war over his helpless body.

From the evidence and the pictures published, we know of other acts of terror on the part of the South Vietnamese and the Vietcong. We use napalm bombs. We burn out villages. We kill women and children with them. We have the admission from our Government that of the 793,000 refugees, a majority of them became refugees because of American bombing. People are aghast to read of our poisoning of rice fields.

I said the other day that I met with 31 ministers, at their request, in Madison, Wis., last Saturday morning, as they presented to me a letter which I placed in the RECORD last Monday. Mr. President, you should have heard those ministers protest the immorality of our warmaking. Read their letter. It is one of the most symbolic protests I have heard in this whole debate, a public confession of those 31 ministers that they have failed to live up to the spiritual obligations in their pulpits, while we have followed the shocking course of warmaking action.

Mr. President, the church bells of America should toll as a symbol of the course of action our Government has followed in this war.

I know there are those who will try to read into the remarks of the senior Senator from Oregon criticism of our soldiery. There is no basis for that. But there is criticism in my remarks of the policymakers of my Government in conducting this war. I mean that criticism, for I think they have put us in a very difficult position with respect to negotiating a peace. That is why I think others must come in to do most of the negotiating for both sides in the controversy. If we follow our present course of action, we shall be bogged down in South Vietnam for a long, long time.

UNITED STATES WILL HAVE TO OCCUPY SOUTH VIETNAM INDEFINITELY

But even if the Vietcong do not receive outside help, the American occupation will have to continue indefinitely, and it will be opposed not by conventional, standup battle, but by underground terror bombings and assaults of the kind that have been waged against foreign occupations since the beginning of human history.

It was brought out time and again in our hearings that a U.S. defense of coastal areas only would cause the collapse of the Saigon government, despite its 700,000 armed forces who are presumably pitted against 230,000 VC's. That is the extent of the viability of the Saigon government. We cannot even restrain the use of U.S. forces to certain areas without its collapsing.

It was also ironic that the Secretary of State should try to advance the concept that if both the United States and North Vietnam withdrew completely, the Saigon government could prevail over the Vietcong. All the figures and all the information available to us completely refutes that contention, for the Defense Department estimates that some 15,000 Vietnamese troops are present in South Vietnam, whereas 205,000 U.S. troops are present.

North Vietnamese or no North Vietnamese, it is only the U.S. Armed Forces that are holding up General Ky. All the northerners could go home tomorrow, and Ky would still fall if the Americans did not remain. That is the evidence of the Defense Department figures.

What they mean is that we can never go home if it is our objective to restore General Ky or one of his successors to power throughout South Vietnam and keep him in power.

ALTERNATIVE IS A BIGGER WAR

The alternative to a buildup in U.S. forces while the opposition remains stationary, is a buildup in U.S. forces matched by an equivalent increase in Communist forces.

I have not read every word of the hearings before the Armed Services Committee. But I have gone through them rather carefully. And I find not one mention of what the Defense Department, meaning the administration, believes the response of the opposition will be to our buildup projected under this bill. Is it assumed that North Vietnam, Russia, and China will do nothing? If that is the assumption, on what is it based?

Or is there evidence that North Vietnam will increase its own military strength in the South? Or will the Soviet Union pour more equipment into North Vietnam to be used in the South? We are preparing another escalation in the war, and we are doing it in this bill without so much as a hint as to what the response of the opposition may be.

I have quoted Secretary McNamara's statement on page 115 of the hearings, wherein he said that if the North Vietnamese add greater force, if the military risk associated with our present policy increases beyond the limits we presently see, it might be desirable to change our strategy of not seeking to destroy the government of North Vietnam. But as to the possibilities and expectations of the administration as to what the response of North Vietnam will be, I find nothing. Nor are we given any hints about possible reactions and responses from the two great Communist powers, China and Russia.

We have already been through the experience of the failure of the bombing of the north to force Hanoi to the bargaining table. We were all assured a year ago that air raids on North Vietnam would quickly demonstrate to her the potential destruction the U.S. Air Force and Navy could visit upon her and bring her to the sensible conclusion that in the face of such overwhelming power she should seek the best peace she could get at the negotiating table.

That expectation has proved false. The reaction of Hanoi was just the opposite. The Defense Department and Secretary Rusk contend now that she has increased her support to the Vietcong; and certainly her negotiating conditions have hardened. Felix Greene, a British citizen whose political views are said to be leftist, reported to an audience at the University of Oregon last week that his travels in North Vietnam convinced him that our bombing is unifying the people of North Vietnam behind their Government. Whether his opinions are suspect or not, we have no observers of our own in North Vietnam to tell us differently, and certainly Greene is right in asserting that bombing attacks have usually had the effect of solidifying public opinion in support of a war rather than destroying the will to resist.

It is true, however, that articles written by other foreign correspondents, as they report in foreign newspapers, tell the same story that was told by Felix Greene to the University of Oregon audience last week.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the article telling of Mr. Greene's appearance at the University of Oregon, which was published in the Eugene Register-Guard of February 16, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FELIX GREENE DECLARES AT UNIVERSITY OF OREGON: "U.S. BOMBING RAIDS UNIFYING NORTH VIETNAM"

(By Karen Waggoner)

"We are caught in a series of unfolding events—like a Greek tragedy," said Felix Greene Tuesday night at the University of Oregon.

But the tragedy he described was not Greek. It was American and Vietnamese.

Greene is a British citizen who has maintained a residence in California for about 20 years. The only American-based correspondent to travel frequently in the Communist Chinese mainland, Greene spoke to an overflow audience in 150 Science. Those who were not already standing joined in giving him a standing ovation.

Greene returned recently from spending much of the winter in China and North Vietnam. He said he talked extensively with peasants, military leaders, editors and professors and obtained an exclusive interview with North Vietnamese President Ho Chi Minh.

"We cannot understand Vietnam without knowing China," he said. He then outlined three great events which he feels have influenced the mood of the Chinese people:

China's remarkable economic recovery after the setback of the early 1960's. "There is no shortage of food in China," Greene said—rather there is a problem of storage and refrigeration.

The "defection" of the Soviet Union. China has decided that Russia can no longer be considered a fraternal country in communism. The Chinese feel they are the lone upholders of Marxism, Greene said.

The Vietnamese war. The Chinese are certain they will be drawn into a major conflict with the United States, Greene observed, and they are preparing for an invasion of their country. According to Greene's observations, cities in southeast China have been partially evacuated and the civilian militia has been enlarged.

But he saw the mood of the people as relaxed and confident. "They know that they could win what most modern military leaders have warned against—U.S. involvement in a land war with China," Greene said.

"North Vietnam," Greene said, "is a country over which war hangs like a cloud." Hanoi's boulevards, he observed, are scarred with air raid shelters; most of the children have been evacuated, and jeeps, trucks, and buses creep about camouflaged.

The "Hanoi industrial complex" of U.S. military jargon, Greene said, is purely a myth. The town boasts only a largely evacuated textile plant, a bicycle plant, a small iron works, and a few truck repair shops, Greene said, yet few targets hit by our air raids are even this formidable.

Greene said he traveled through heavily bombed areas just before the bombing lull and brought back pictures of a hospital, a school, a small bridge, and an old folks' home destroyed by bombs.

"What the bombing has done is what bombing has always done—it has unified and solidified the people," Greene said.

"The U.S. offer for peace talks," said Greene, is as senseless as Hitler's request for discussions after the fall of France." Greene asked what the attitude in this country would have been if Japan had requested peace talks immediately after Pearl Harbor.

The Vietnamese people are emotionally involved in this war, he said. During an air raid an "amazing thing happens." The girls jump into trenches with their guns and the old people bring tea to the soldiers, he said.

"What irritates Washington most," Greene said, is the Vietnamese confidence that they will win. They beat France, he said, and do not stand in awe of a major power.

Mr. MORSE. What does Secretary McNamara, Secretary Rusk, or the President think will be the response of Hanoi to the increased deployment of troops and increased air activities provided for in this bill? Senators do not know. If the administration has any opinion, it has not revealed it.

BILL WILL MAKE POLICY OF ESCALATING WAR

In voting on this bill, Senators are not voting on whether or not to finance a given policy. We are being asked to make the policy in this bill.

For most of the discussion about Vietnam, the administration has quoted the 1954 letter from President Eisenhower to Premier Diem as the foundation for American intervention in Vietnam. Then, on August 17, 1965, President Eisenhower repudiated the idea that his pledges or commitments to Diem involved American military intervention. He said of it:

> We said we would help that country. We were not talking about military programs, but foreign aid.

Mr. President, I used in the hearings the other day the newspaper clipping setting forth President Eisenhower's statement just referred to. I now have that newspaper clipping, written by Max

Frankel, entitled "Military Pledge to Saigon Is Denied by Eisenhower," which was published in the New York Times of Wednesday, August 18, 1965.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY PLEDGE TO SAIGON IS DENIED BY EISENHOWER

(By Max Frankel)

WASHINGTON, August 17.—Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower demurred gently today at President Johnson's frequent suggestion that U.S. military actions in Vietnam were the consequence of a Republican commitment given 11 years ago.

Although asserting strongly at a news conference that "the Communists must be stopped in Vietnam," Mr. Eisenhower denied that he had ever given a unilateral military commitment to the Government of South Vietnam. His administration saw no need for such a commitment in 1954, he said, and was offering aid, not "military programs."

General Eisenhower's statement appeared to be a mild objection to President Johnson's interpretation of a letter he wrote to Ngo Dinh Diem, then the President of South Vietnam, in October 1954. The disagreement is significant because of the continuing debate about whether the United States must fight in Vietnam to keep its "word" and "honor."

LETTER OFTEN QUOTED

President Johnson contends that he feels compelled to honor the commitments given not only by his Democratic predecessor, President Kennedy, but also by General Eisenhower. The President has often cited and quoted from the 1954 letter as evidence.

Last June, for instance, Mr. Johnson read the entire letter at a news conference and then remarked: "In the case of Vietnam, our commitment today is just the same as the commitment made by President Eisenhower to President Diem in 1954—a commitment to help these people help themselves."

When asked about the letter today, Mr. Eisenhower said: "We said we would help that country. We were not talking about military programs, but foreign aid."

The former President said "there was no commitment given in a military context, except that as a part of SEATO." This was a reference to a protocol appended to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty in September 1954, extending the treaty's protective provisions to Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam, which were not eligible to sign.

LETTER EXPRESSED CONCERN

Laos and Cambodia have since described themselves as neutral, outside the pro-Western treaty arrangement. The U.S. program of massive military assistance to South Vietnam was undertaken in 1961 without application to SEATO, apparently because Washington was unable to obtain the then necessary unanimous support of the other members—Britain, France, Pakistan, New Zealand, Australia, the Philippines and Thailand.

Mr. Eisenhower's letter to President Diem spoke of Washington's grave concern about the future of South Vietnam in the face of enemies without and within. He was therefore offering aid, Mr. Eisenhower wrote, "to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means."

The main emphasis of the Eisenhower letter was upon "needed reforms" and "standards of performance" that the United States expected in return for its aid. The former President said he hoped the Diem government would be "so responsive to the nationalist aspirations of its people, so enlightened in purpose and effective in performance" that it would be respected by friends and foes alike.

The general view here is that the Diem government failed in its later years to meet those standards, a failure that is thought to have contributed to its overthrow in 1963.

In talking with reporters after a meeting this morning with House Republican leaders, Mr. Eisenhower said that he had received intimate briefings on Vietnam and that it would be unwise for him to discuss the specific situation at the moment. But he said that if the Communists are not stopped in Vietnam, "it would be harder and tougher to try it somewhere else."

LETTER EXPLAINED

This afternoon, after meeting with Republican Senators, he was asked about the meaning of the 1954 letter. "At the time," he replied, "we did not see the need for a major military effort in Vietnam."

It was after the overthrow of Mr. Diem and eight or nine subsequent governments, he added, that the United States found itself where it is today. He did not say whether he blamed the Kennedy administration for contributing to Mr. Diem's downfall.

Administration officials, meanwhile, reported today that Edward G. Lansdale, a retired Air Force general with extensive experience in Asia, would leave for Vietnam next week to become a special assistant to the new U.S. Ambassador, Henry Cabot Lodge.

As a colonel on the joint U.S. military advisory group in the Philippines 15 years ago, he won recognition for his energetic but unorthodox contributions to the defeat of Communist Huk rebels. Later, he served for 3 years in Vietnam, as a friend and adviser of President Diem.

Mr. Lodge met the general 2 years ago and apparently was impressed by his belief that military action against guerrillas was useless unless enhanced by political economic programs insuring safety to the South Vietnamese people.

General Lansdale is known as an individualist who believes in personal action free of the more customary bureaucratic restraints, a method of operation often attributed also to Mr. Lodge.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, since then, the administration has stopped referring to that letter and to the pledges of previous Presidents. It has instead begun invoking the SEATO treaty as the basis for the American intervention.

Not even at the time of the Tonkin Bay resolution was the SEATO treaty said to be involved. All that Congress was asked to pass upon at that time was the question of whether we would endorse the action of the President in defending American military vessels against attack in international waters. That was the issue. SEATO was not invoked then, and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] said in explainng the resolution at the time that the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty was not at issue.

He did say in answer to a question from the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] that the resolution could be considered as the constitutional process whereby the United States could act under paragraph 1 of article IV of that treaty. But that was not the request of the administration at the time. Further, I completely disagree that there is the slightest justification for contending that the resolution could be considered as the constitutional process whereby the United States could act under paragraph 1 of article IV.

It was clear in August of 1964 that the landing of 200,000 American soldiers was in no way contemplated.

SEATO RATIFICATION FOLLOWED ASSURANCES THAT NO LAND ARMY IN ASIA WOULD BE CREATED

And in fact, the landing of an American army in southeast Asia was never contemplated under the SEATO treaty at all. Secretary Rusk sought in his appearance before the Foreign Relations Committee the other day to create the impression that Congress has always conceded the grave risks involved in SEATO. He said:

> The far-reaching implications of this commitment were well understood by the Committee when it recommended, with only the late Senator Langer dissenting, that the Senate consent to the ratification of the treaty.

I suggest that the Secretary of State, and every other Senator go back and read the hearings of November 1954 on the treaty. They will find something quite different than what Secretary Rusk testified to. They will find assurance after assurance and assumption after assumption that adherence to the treaty was with the understanding that no American army would be landed in Asia.

Secretary Dulles told the Foreign Relations Committee:

> I might say in this connection, departing somewhat from order of my presentation, that it is not the policy of the United States to attempt to deter attack in this area by building up a local force capable itself of defense against an all-out attack by the Chinese Communists if it should occur. We do not expect to duplicate in this area the pattern of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its significant standing forces. That would require a diversion and commitment of strength which we do not think is either practical or desirable or necessary from the standpoint of the United States.

I remind Senators that here, in this pending bill, we are being asked to do what we were told would not be done under SEATO, and that is to establish a land force in southeast Asia entirely financed and equipped and paid for by the United States. Indigenous armies are to be incorporated into our own defense setup. It is true that NATO countries participate in the organization's military forces on a much higher level of equality with the United States than do Thailand, Laos, South Korea, and the Philippines under this bill. But we are still doing under it what Secretary Dulles told us in 1954 would not be done.

I continue to quote from the Dulles testimony:

> We believe that our posture in that area should be one of having mobile striking power, and the ability to use that against the sources of aggression if it occurs. We believe that is more effective than if we tried to pin down American forces at the many points around the circumference of the Communist world in that area.
>
> It may very well be that other countries of the area will want to dedicate particular forces for the protection of the area under this treaty. But we made it clear at Manila that it was not the intention of the United States to build up a large local force including, for example, U.S. ground troops for that area, but that we rely upon the deterrent power of our mobile striking force.

Later, in answer to a question from Senator George, who was then chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, about the differences between NATO and SEATO, Secretary Dulles again assured the Senate that no land forces would be committed to southeast Asia under it:

> Secretary DULLES. There is a very sharp difference, which I think I suggested in my statement, between what we contemplated under the Manila Pact, and the North Atlantic Treaty.
>
> NATO, of course, is the North Atlantic Treaty "Organization"; that is what the O stands for. That is not an inherent or necessary part of the treaty.
>
> As a matter of fact, when the North Atlantic Treaty was before the Senate and the Senate consented to its ratification, there was at that time no serious thought of creating a North Atlantic Treaty Organization. That came as a later development.
>
> In the case of the Manila Pact, we have tried to avoid the use of the word "SEATO." I did not use it in my presentation. It is not in the documents before us. We are trying to get away from that word because it implies a Southeast Asia Treaty Organization comparable to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. That organization is designed in the case of the North Atlantic Treaty to build up a defensive force on the Continent of Europe which itself would be sufficient to resist attack by the Red armies.
>
> As I point out, that is not now the purpose under this treaty. We do not intend to dedicate any major elements of the U.S. Military Establishment to form an army of defense in this area. We rely primarily upon the deterrent of our mobile striking power. That we made clear to our associates in the treaty, and that is our policy.
>
> It would involve, in the opinion of our military advisers—Admiral Davis is here and can confirm that—it would involve an injudicious overextension of our military power if we were to try to build up that kind of an organization in southeast Asia.
>
> We do not have the adequate forces to do it, and I believe that if there should be open armed attack in that area the most effective step would be to strike at the source of aggression rather than to try to rush American manpower into the area to try to fight a ground war. So that we do not intend, Mr. Chairman, to have under this treaty any such local combined forces as have been created in Europe under the North Atlantic Treaty, and which goes by the name of NATO.

I repeat again, for the benefit of the present Secretary of State, the basis on which the Senate ratified SEATO; it was the policy not to create a land force under SEATO or to send American forces to be part of it—

> That we made clear to our associates in the treaty—

Said Secretary Dulles—

> and that is our policy.

And it was the policy for which the Senate ratified the treaty. Yet Secretary Rusk said on February 18, 1966:

> These then are the commitments we have taken to protect South Vietnam as a part of protecting our own peace and security. We have sent American forces to fight in the jungles of that beleaguered country because South Vietnam has, under the language of the SEATO Treaty, been the victims of "aggression by means of armed attack."

Secretary Rusk either has not read the legislative history of the treaty, or he forgot to tell us about it the other day.

I say to the Secretary of State and to President Johnson, you are pursuing a policy under the cloak of SEATO that the Senate was assured would not be followed when it ratified the treaty.

I say that also for the benefit of my friends in the American Bar Association, for they are supposed to know something about legislative history and how it is made. The undeniable fact is that Secretary of State Dulles, when he presented the SEATO Treaty to the Senate for ratification, pointed out that SEATO did not mean what Secretary Rusk, the other day, said it means.

I will tell you what is the matter with Rusk. He is drowning in a sea of diplomacy, without a liferaft, and he is grasping for straws, trying to justify an unsound course of action now by pleading SEATO. But his predecessor in office, Dulles, put him out of court, by his own testimony which I just read, at the time that Dulles asked the Senate to ratify the treaty.

That treaty has to be interpreted, for its meaning, in the light of the representations that a Secretary of State solemnly and in good faith made to the Senate.

The administration does not have a leg to stand on in its belated reliance on SEATO.

So I say to my Secretary of State and my President: You are pursuing a policy today that was not suggested, was not contemplated, and was not requested of Congress in August of 1964, when it adopted the Tonkin Bay resolution.

Senators are voting now, here, and in this bill to change the policy of avoiding a land war in Asia. We are being asked now to change the SEATO policy from one of rejecting a large-scale ground force of American and other forces into one of creating and financing just such a force.

We are being asked to provide in the bill the military organization comparable to the NATO organization, which was repudiated by our Secretary of State when this treaty was up for ratification.

I tell Senators that you are buying a pig in a poke when you vote for this bill. This is not the funding or the followup of a policy established through the constitutional processes of the United States.

This is the policy being made in this bill. And it calls for the beginning of an American adventure into land war in Asia. It calls for the assumption of financial responsibility for the armed forces of Thailand, South Korea, South Vietnam, and possibly the Philippines, not one of which countries is able to finance either its own military forces or its own domestic stability.

I take you to the testimony of Secretary McNamara on the pending bill. On page 7 we read:

> Included in our supplemental request for fiscal year 1966 is about $200 million for the support of South Vietnam's armed forces and other free world military assistance forces engaged in that country. These requirements have heretofore been financed in the military assistance program. However, now that large U.S. and other free world military assistance forces—e.g., Korean—have joined in the defense of South Vietnam, the maintenance of separate financial and logistic systems for U.S. and military assistance forces is proving to be entirely too cumbersome, time consuming, and inefficient. The same problem was encountered at the outset of the Korean war. It was solved, then, by programing, budgeting, and funding for all requirements under the military functions appropriations and providing a consolidated financial and supply system for the support of United States, Korean, and other friendly forces engaged in that effort. This arrangement gave the field commanders maximum flexibility in the allocation of available resources and improved the support of the forces employed. We are proposing essentially the same solution for the problems now being encountered in South Vietnam.
>
> Under the proposed arrangement, all unexpended balances of fiscal year 1966 and prior year military assistance funds for South Vietnam would be transferred to and merged with the accounts of the military departments; and all additional funds required for the support of the forces of South Vietnam and other free world military assistance forces in that country would be authorized for and appropriated to the accounts of the military departments. The remainder of the military assistance program would be legislated separately.

And in the committee report, we find the words:

> Section 401 would authorize separate and later appropriations action that would make Department of Defense appropriations during the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 available for the support of the South Vietnamese and other free world forces in South Vietnam and for related costs.

Hereafter, if we pass the bill, the Defense budget will apply to all the countries furnishing any forces at all in South Vietnam.

That is a change in the policy of SEATO in a magnitude that Senators do not seem to understand. It is the exact opposite of what Secretary Dulles assured the Senate would be the policy of the United States.

SEATO IS NOT BEING USED FOR COLLECTIVE DEFENSE

Moreover, despite the name of the treaty—Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty—it is not being used for that purpose at all. After dropping references to the Eisenhower letter, the administration relied upon paragraph 2 of article IV of SEATO which permits us to consult with other members in case of some subversion or revolution within the treaty area.

But the weakness of this intervention is emphasized by the fact that we are under no obligation whatever to act under this provision. In fact, Secretary Dulles also nailed down that situation in the hearings of November 1954. In a colloquy with Senator Green, of Rhode Island, he said:

> Senator GREEN. Is there not some provision in the treaty—I thought I saw it as I glanced through it—that we join in putting down insurrections in these countries?
>
> Secretary DULLES. No, sir. There is provision that if there is a subversion, threatened subversion, of the political independence of any country, then we will consult together what to do about it.
>
> Senator GREEN. That is subversion then.
>
> Secretary DULLES. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator GREEN. Well, isn't that another word for insurrection?

> Secretary DULLES. I would think insurrection is a form of subversion, yes.
>
> Senator GREEN. Then we are obliged to help put down a revolutionary movement.
>
> Secretary DULLES. No. If there is a revolutionary movement in Vietnam or in Thailand, we would consult together as to what to do about it because if that were a subversive movement that was in fact propagated by communism, it would be a very grave threat to us. But we have no undertaking to put it down; all we have is an undertaking to consult together as to what to do about it.

Well, Mr. President, the administration as of the last month or so is not relying on that section any more. That one blew up in their faces. The bubble burst. So now Secretary Rusk is frantically grabbing for the straw which is not going to float him.

ARMED AGGRESSION UNDER SEATO

The administration, as of the last month or so, is now relying instead upon paragraph 1 of that article. That paragraph states:

> Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any state or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I wish I had a transcript of the telephone conversation I had this morning with Professor Commager whom, as I stated earlier today, I believe to be one of the two or three greatest living American historians. All I wish to do is give my interpretation of his reaction to Mr. Rusk's alibi. Professor Commager is completely at a loss to understand it. He says that he has just completed writing an article pointing out his views as to the complete erroneousness of Mr. Rusk's position. I hope to have a copy of that article by Monday or Tuesday of next week, at which time I shall discuss it and make it a part of the RECORD.

Mr. President, this great American historian in effect said to me that there is not a scintilla of suport for Mr. Rusk and the administration belatedly falling back upon SEATO to justify their course of action in South Vietnam.

There is no establishment that an aggression by means of armed attack has occurred insofar as the treaty members are concerned. Where is the finding of the SEATO foreign ministers council that an armed attack upon South Vietnam from North Vietnam has occurred? The only such finding has been made by the United States. As the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has pointed out so often in the recent hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee, the reason we have no substantial help from other countries in Vietnam is that no one has considered the war there to be an armed aggression of the kind that would threaten the peace and security of themselves. When Indonesia, Malaya, Burma, Cambodia, Japan, and India, all non-SEATO members, made no such finding, that is bad enough, but neither have our other major SEATO partners—Pakistan, France, and Britain.

Surely the evidence of even our own Defense Department is skimpy in this respect. Its latest figures, dated February 14, 1966, indicate that 11,100 North Vietnamese troops are in the south. When 11,000 troops enter to buttress a local force of an estimated 73,000 regulars and another 100,000 militia, while 200,000 American troops enter to buttress 700,000 South Vietnamese forces, it is no wonder that the world is skeptical of our allegation that an armed aggression from the north has occurred.

Mr. President, when the world knows of our bombing in North Vietnam before we even claimed an armed attack by them; when the world knows of our joining with South Vietnam in violations of the borders of North Vietnam; when the world knows that we were involved in the Tonkin Bay incident by giving coverage to South Vietnamese boats which we fully equipped—they know that we are not in a position to talk about attack or aggression. They know that history will record the mutuality of aggression by the United States and the South Vietnamese, and by the Communists.

What company to be in. No, we have no case on SEATO. That will be the finding.

But the administration claims to see it, even if the other powers with much more at stake than we do not see it. And it is, again unilaterally so far as other treaty powers are concerned, invoking paragraph 1 of article IV of SEATO to combat it.

Mr. President, reciprocity is one of the most basic principles of international law. I wish to stress it in this argument, that I am not talking about another abstract principle, but reciprocity is one of the most basic principles of international law.

Where do we stand on reciprocity?

If one partner refuses or is unable to perform this treaty obligation, the other parties are relieved of any obligation to perform. The general principle was stated in a thorough article as follows:

> However widely the various meanings of the word "reciprocity" may differ, one idea underlies them all—that of the interrelation of action and counteraction, or, to put it more exactly, that of one side's action, whether consummated or expected, providing the motivation for that of the other side. (Lenhoff, "Reciprocity: The Legal Aspect of a Perennial Idea," 49 Northwestern University Law Review 627.)

I was no little amused to hear of the resolution which the house of delegates of the American Bar Association passed the other day. The Committee on Foreign Relations sent them a wire asking them to send it the memorandum in support of the resolution. I shall await that memorandum with great interest. But, I hope, if they have not got it prepared that they will read Mr. Lenhoff's article published in the Northwestern University Law Review, because the American Bar Association was unkind enough to suggest that the Senator from Oregon did not have any legal authority for his position.

Well, Mr. President, I have been putting legal authority in the RECORD for 2½ years, but I am afraid that on this subject they are guilty of nonreading as to my position.

To continue, applying this principle to Vietnam we find that the obligation under SEATO becomes a self-imposed one, apparently, without any reciprocal obligation by our treaty partners. We have 300,000 men involved in this conflict—if we include those in the naval service in the waters surrounding Vietnam. According to the Department of Defense, our seven SEATO treaty partners had a total of some 1,600 men in Vietnam as of January 15, 1966. Australia had 1,400; New Zealand had 150; Thailand had 17; the United Kingdom had 12; the Philippines had 70; France and Pakistan had none and will never have any because they do not support our policy. Arthur and Don Larson have stated the question of reciprocity under the SEATO treaty this way:

> It must be remembered that our obligation under this treaty does not run to South Vietnam. South Vietnam is not a party, and indeed has on its part agreed to nothing. The commitment of the treaty runs to the other signers. As long as the other signers acknowledge no obligation to us to send troops in the present circumstances we have no such obligation to them.

We are using SEATO not as a collective commitment among interested and affected parties, but as an American hunting license to do what we choose to do in Vietnam. We are using it as license to bomb whom we choose, to fight whom we choose, to send American military forces where we choose, without any regard whatever for the fact that the other treaty partners have not made any finding of an armed aggression from the north that for them, would bring paragraph 1 of article IV into operation.

Even Secretary Rusk will not go so far as to say that we have a legally binding obligation under SEATO. Prior to his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations on January 28, he had never stated that we were in Vietnam because of a SEATO obligation. This is an afterthought.

On two specific instances—mark this, and mark it well—in the last few years the Secretary has told the committee in executive session that we were not acting in Vietnam under SEATO. One was during his testimony on the southeast Asia resolution.

From this floor this afternoon I ask the Secretary to deny it.

Therefore, I am unable to reconcile his statements to us in executive session and his statement to the committee on February 18 that:

> It is this fundamental SEATO obligation that has from the outset guided our actions in South Vietnam.

The Secretary tells us one thing privately and another publicly. We can only wonder whether he was holding out on the committee in August of 1964 or trying now to deny that there is a change in American policy from what it was then.

I have shown that the only obligation under paragraph 2 of article IV of

SEATO is that the parties consult to decide what, if anything, to do about the problem under discussion. Consultation at the SEATO ministers meetings has, up to now, resulted only in ringing statements which, in practical effect, urge the United States to do more in Vietnam.

We have not asked for SEATO action in Vietnam.

We have not called the SEATO foreign ministers together and asked that they invoke paragraph 1 of article IV.

We have not sought a collective finding of an armed aggression within the treaty area.

We have simply heard the American Secretary of State Rusk declare it. When did the hostilities in Vietnam cease being a subversion and become an armed attack? Even Mr. Rusk has not said. Presumably it was a few days before his testimony of January 28, 1966; otherwise, the United States would have been guilty of violating the requirement of paragraph 1 that all actions taken under it be reported to the Security Council.

This is the point Professor Commager stressed so emphatically in my conversations with him over the telephone this morning, pointing out the failure of the United States to follow the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

In April of 1964, the previous rule whereby SEATO members had agreed to act only by unanimous vote was altered to permit a majority to take collective action if there were no negative vote. Abstentions would not count as negatives.

Why has not the United States sought a majority decision that armed aggression has occurred? Do we fear that even a majority of the other seven treaty partners would not share our finding? Or do we fear that France or Pakistan or others would cast a negative vote?

Since SEATO is clearly not acting as a collective defense body, have the members which do have troops in Vietnam reported their actions to the Security Council as the treaty requires? Or were we acting as a self-appointed agent for the handful of soldiers that Australia and New Zealand have sent when we made our long-delayed report to the Security Council 3 weeks ago? I am glad we at last made it.

There are too many loose ends lying around for a case to be made for justifying our action in Vietnam as a formal response under this treaty. To dragoon the American people into a war on so casual an invocation of a treaty is to call into question all our mutual and collective defense agreements, for the administration is laying down the principle now that only the United States has duties under these treaties and that we seek and expect no reciprocal duties and contributions from any of these so-called partners. Apparently we do not seek even a common understanding with them of the existence of a common danger in the treaty area.

This indeed, is to transform a collective defense agreement into a hunting license for unilateral American interventions.

If the administration wants to continue to insist on an obligation to the Ky government, it should clear the air and state that this is a unilateral gesture without foundation in international law. But the contention that we have a binding legal obligation under SEATO is too farfetched for me to accept.

General Taylor is at least refreshingly honest about the U.S. commitment. He does not seem to have fallen for the phony legalisms we hear from Secretary Rusk about our commitment to the Vietnamese Government. "Our obligation is to the people of South Vietnam," not the government, he said. This is an interesting observation but one which any international lawyer would find quite humorous. Obligations are made to governments and through them to their people.

To accept General Taylor's thesis would place this Nation in the unusual position of going over the heads of the official governments which we deal with every day and making any commitment we choose—directly to the people of the country. If international relations are reduced to this absurdity we might as well do away with the Senate's treaty-making powers—our treaties would be what the President promised. I am not ready to permit President Johnson, or any President, to commit this Nation in advance to a course of conduct which could lead to war without congressional approval.

That is why I say that if it does wish to invoke that provision, it must come to Congress for a resort to the "constitutional processes" referred to in that same provision.

By the testimony of Secretary Rusk, and of Secretary of State Dulles who presented SEATO to the Senate, the policy of the United States against committing or sponsoring land forces in Asia is going to be changed. I deny that that question has ever been put before the Senate. The resolution of 1964 did not contemplate such a change in policy, and the casual discussions on the Senate floor of the future possibility of invoking SEATO under other circumstances do not suffice.

I say to this administration, "If you want to invoke paragraph 1 of article IV of SEATO, you must come to Congress and ask for a declaration of war. That is the only way the constitutional processes whereby the paragraph can be invoked will be served. If you can sustain a finding that an armed aggression by North Vietnam has occurred, then this Government is obliged to declare war before it sends a vast army into South Vietnam."

The 1964 resolution is not a declaration of war. It is not a delegation of the authority to declare war. It authorizes nothing, and in fact, the word "authorizes" does not appear in it at all. The context and purpose of that resolution was to repel an attack upon U.S. ships in international waters; the context and purpose of the pending bill is to create a land army, to include American forces, to act to meet a formal armed aggression in complete reversal of the historic American policy of not putting land forces in Asia.

For the President to try to justify his current military policy under the language passed by Congress for a quite different situation is a failure to fulfill the language of the SEATO treaty itself.

It is a failure to fulfill the language of the Constitution of the United States, which empowers Congress to declare war and does not empower the President to make war in the absence of a declaration of war.

ARE WE MAKING A BONA FIDE EFFORT TO SEEK UNITED NATIONS ACTION?

Although we have, at long last, formally laid the Vietnam war before the United Nations, there is still much to be said of our role there. The intervention in Vietnam continued for some 4 years or more before we observed the procedures of the U.N. Charter. We have placed the United States in the unenviable position of picking and choosing those occasions when we will use the U.N. for the purposes for which it was intended, and those when we will flout the plain provisions of the charter.

I do not envy the job of Ambassador Goldberg in trying to explain our actions. We have done much to destroy the effectiveness of the United Nations in our shameful disrespect for that body during the Vietnam conflict. It has set back for many years the slow and painful process of working toward peaceful settlement of international disputes. Although the President has at last formally brought the dispute before the Security Council this does not make our past conduct any more legal.

As I have said so many times, we have been in violation of the charter for the last several years. Our initial failure was in refusing to obey the mandate of article 33 and "first of all seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means." It was not until the President's speech at Johns Hopkins last April 17, 5 years after our involvement began to grow, that we indicated an honest willingness to engage in negotiations. This is far from living up to the spirit in the words "first of all."

We seem to have thought that since we were big and powerful we could get away with ignoring this mandate. Goodrich and Hambro, in their book of commentary on the United Nations Charter, place the question typified by Vietnam in this perspective:

> It should also be clear that a dispute between a very small and a very powerful state cannot be brushed aside as unimportant or lacking in danger from the point of view of its consequences to the peace. It is not sufficient to say that the small state would never endanger peace and security by attacking its powerful adversary. If the very strong power, to take a purely theoretical example, should seek to help itself and intimidate the small state, there would still be present a danger to the peace of the world.

If we really believe in the United Nations it is not for us to decide when we will and when we will not live up to the charter. The charter is not a water faucet to be turned on and off to suit our purposes.

Each time the administration has upped the ante of our military effort in Vietnam, it has sought to minimize it by giving lipservice to the United Nations. So, when we had the Tonkin Bay resolution presented to Congress, we requested the Security Council of the U.N. to consider the matter at the same time.

But what did we ask it to consider? Not the threat to the peace that existed even then in southeast Asia.

Not at all. Our Ambassador told the Security Council on August 5, 1964:

> I have asked for this urgent meeting to bring to the attention of the Security Council acts of deliberate aggression by the Hanoi regime against naval units of the United States.

That is all. That is all we took to the Security Council in 1964. The naval incident in the Gulf of Tonkin between American and North Vietnamese vessels.

I was very disappointed to hear the Secretary of State the other day make statements that I thought endangered a misleading of the American people in regard to our relationship with the United Nations, giving the impression that we have been taking this Vietnam issue to the United Nations time and time again.

There was a formal presentation of our charge that Hanoi was violating our rights on the high seas in respect to the attacks on our naval vessels. But there was nothing said about the situation in South Vietnam into which we had injected thousands of U.S. soldiers.

The other language of the Secretary of State, that he was careful not to specify and particularize, deals with informal discussions behind the scenes in the United Nations. There was nothing formal and nothing official.

I recall that on one occasion U Thant came to Washington, D.C., and there were some consultations here. Ambassador Stevenson and Ambassador Goldberg had informal but unofficial conferences in New York City. That is not laying the matter before the United Nations. The Secretary of State knows that.

A matter is laid before the United Nations by following the formal procedures of charter.

We did recently, when at long last, but unfortunately with an olive branch in one hand and bombs in the other, we laid the whole issue before the Security Council. It was years late.

We are there now, formally. We put the whole issue there. As I said earlier this afternoon, in discussing it from another angle, I hope my Government will use all of its prestige, all of its influence, to try to get the issue out in open debate before the Security Council and let the world see who it is now that seeks a peaceful solution. If that cannot be done, or if it is done and our request is vetoed, then I renew my plea that my President and my Ambassador at the United Nations make a historic plea to an extraordinary session of the General Assembly to try to have the members of the General Assembly—and I think they will be successful—to assume their responsibilities for peacekeeping and agree to use their peacekeeping forces to enforce a cease-fire in Vietnam. Then the General Assembly can proceed to work out the myriad of understandings, concessions, compromises, and conscionable agreements that will be necessary to bring order and peace to that troubled area of the world under the aegis of either the United Nations or the reconvened Geneva Conference.

We say that we are willing to go back to the Geneva Conference. We certainly ought to be willing to go back and work within the framework of the original agreement, with such modification as can be worked out on the part of those who will then have the solemn responsibility of trying to end this threat to the peace of the world.

On many subsequent occasions, as I have just referred to them, President Johnson and other administration spokesmen said they had spoken with the Secretary General to see what he might do to intercede with North Vietnam on behalf of peace. That is a perfectly agreeable procedure, and is in fact one of the steps that should occur under the injunction of article 33:

> Parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choosing.

But requesting help from the Secretary General did not relieve of the obligation to follow the other injunctions of the charter.

Having the judge over for lunch, or calling on him in his chambers, is not the same as going to court. And we have been obliged to go before the court of the Security Council ever since we first sent our forces into the Vietnam war.

It was not until January 30 of 1966 that we finally squared ourselves with the procedures of the charter. It was highly unfortunate that at the same time we did ask the U.N. to take jurisdiction, we made its job much harder and the possibility of its effective action more remote, by increasing the intensity of the war at the same time.

And under this bill, we will increase the scope and intensity of the war even more. We are doing it on our initiative, not that of North Vietnam. We are going to expand the level of our manpower, the scale of our air raids in both north and south, and the geographic area of the war here in this bill.

That is why I question how bona fide our appeal to the United Nations is, when we also hear our administration downgrade, belittle, and minimize the chances for any effective U.N. action.

On January 30, 1966, Ambassador Goldberg did address a letter to the President of the Security Council, as follows:

> I have the honor to request that an urgent meeting of the Security Council be called promptly to consider the situation in Vietnam.

"The situation in Vietnam" is the issue that should have been put before the Security Council in August of 1964, and even before that.

At least, it is there now. And the United States has also presented a proposed resolution to deal with it. Our resolution, presented to that meeting, has five operative parts. They are that the Security Council:

> 1. Calls for immediate discussions without preconditions * * * among the appropriate interested governments to arrange a conference looking toward the application of the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 and the establishment of a durable peace in southeast Asia.
>
> 2. Recommends that the first order of business of such a conference be arrangements for a cessation of hostilities under effective supervision.
>
> 3. Offers to assist in achieving the purposes of this resolution by all appropriate means, including the provision of arbitrators or mediators.
>
> 4. Calls on all concerned to cooperate fully in the implementation of this resolution.
>
> 5. Requests the Secretary General to assist as appropriate in the implementation of this resolution.

The press carries stories nearly every day that the United States really has little faith that anything will come of that resolution. We are hearing again about the need for discussion on a bilateral basis among the large powers in order to find a means of settlement.

Let me add quickly, Mr. President, because I almost forgot to do so, that these five points in no way constitute a term of reference by way of a limitation upon the jurisdiction of the Security Council now. These are only the suggested solutions of our country; they in no way limit the alternatives the Security Council may consider. The Security Council is free to consider not only these proposals, but the proposals of anyone else, both inside and outside the Security Council.

But the stories are appearing again to suggest that the United States would prefer to keep the subject of Vietnam on a bilateral basis, rather than through the U.N.

But what is coming of these private consultations? What is the Soviet Union doing to try to prevail upon North Vietnam either to cease its activities or negotiate? All that I have heard is to the effect that neither the United States nor Britain has been able to achieve any progress in getting the Soviet Union committed to a use of its influence to stop the war.

The non-U.N. diplomatic channels, by the admission of our own administration, are simply getting nowhere in ending the the war or producing peace talks.

That is why I say that if we encounter a Soviet or French veto in the Security Council, we should seek action by the General Assembly. There is plenty of precedent for that, and in fact, the United States has taken the lead in earlier situations in moving a stalemated issue from the Security Council to the General Assembly.

We did it in the case of Korea, and we did it again in the case of the Congo. The charter itself gives to the General

Assembly the function of discussing "questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security."

This authority is contained in article 11, which also provides that it "may make recommendations with regard to any such questions to the state or states concerned or to the Security Council or to both."

However, article 12 states that the Assembly shall not make any recommendation with regard to a dispute while it is pending before the Security Council. But it may discuss it at any time, and may make recommendations when the Security Council is no longer considering it.

It made them in the case of Korea and in the case of the Congo, with the urgent support of the United States.

Surely we can stand for no less in a conflict to which we are a party. We must, it seems to me, if we are to fulfill our obligations under the charter to help keep the peace through its organs and procedures.

A VOTE FOR BILL IS A VOTE TO SEND MORE AMERICANS TO FIGHT IN ASIA

Certainly the effort will be made to cast into disrepute any opposition to this measure with the charge that opposition means a failure to support the boys who have been sent there. But I say that support for it means that the Americans already there are only the first installment on the thousands more who will be sent, and the deaths which have already occurred are only the first of hundreds that will follow. For in this bill, we are undertaking to clear all of South Vietnam of the Vietcong, and we have not the slightest idea whether this operation will meet with overt intervention from other powers on the other side.

I am not in favor of enlarging and expanding the war.

That is the reason why I discussed at some length, earlier this afternoon, my complete support of the program outlined by Ambassador Kennan and General Gavin. I am not in favor of sending more and more troops to Vietnam to do what President Johnson himself said only a year and a half ago Asians should do for themselves.

Only 5 years ago, we had 3,000 soldiers in Vietnam and Congress was told we had to support them with more men and equipment. So the next year we had 11,000 there and again Congress was told it must support them with more men and equipment. In 1963, we had 16,000 there, and Congress was told they had to be supported. So in 1964, the figure rose to 23,000. That was only a year and some months ago, and we were told that we had to pass the Tonkin Bay resolution in order to support those 23,000 men. So now we have supported the 23,000 and added more, to a total of 200,000.

I think that one figure is 205,000 on the land, some 95,000 more on naval units and in units within, shall I say, the precincts of South Vietnam, making a total in round numbers of some 300,000.

And now some Senators believe they must support the 200,000 with 400,000 and after that, the next figure being heard is 600,000. There is already talk of 800,000. I said earlier this afternoon that, in my judgment, if we end up in a war with Red China, within 24 months or so it will be 3 million. Where will we get them? What will we do with our other commitments elsewhere in the world? How can that be called support for the men now there?

It is so dangerous that it is unthinkable. It is so fantastic that I am at a loss to understand a colleague who could consider it favorably.

Mr. President, such a program is not a program of supporting men. It is a program of supporting utter folly. It is not limiting our losses, but exposing the men already there to dangers of land war in Asia that American official policy has opposed throughout all our history, right down to the adoption and ratification of the SEATO treaty itself.

A vote for this bill is not a vote to support the men already there. It is a vote to double the men already there, to expand the war into Thailand, and to provide American financing for a military force in Asia that Secretary Dulles assured us was not the policy of the United States when we ratified the treaty in 1954.

WAR AUTHORITY RESIDES IN CONGRESS

These are some other considerations that my colleagues should bear in mind as we debate the Vietnam policy issues. First, let us consider the question of whether the Congress has delegated to the President the power to wage war in Vietnam. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution, as I have said so many times, gives Congress the explicit responsibility to declare war. It was no accident that our Founding Fathers placed this responsibility in the hands of the people, speaking through their representatives in Congress. Well aware of the British King's power to make war, the authors of the Constitution clearly did not wish to give one man comparable power in our system.

During the Constitutional Convention, the business of declaring war was always treated as a legislative function. In none of the drafts was there any question of where this power should reside. Earlier drafts gave the Congress the power of "making war." The change in this phrasing to "declare" brought the only debate on the war power during the Convention. This debate demonstrates quite clearly the constitutional drafters' intentions. The noted constitutional authority, James Grafton Rogers, relates the incident in this way:

> Pinckney objected to the assignment of "making war" to the legislative. Congress would be too slow, he said. The Senate would be a better designation. Butler suggests the President should be given the authority. "Mr. Madison and Mr. Gerry moved" to insert "declare" striking out "make war," leaving to the Executive the power to repel sudden attacks. Sherman, Gerry, Ellsworth, and Mason all protested against leaving war altogether to the Executive. On a vote of eight States to one "declare" was chosen with some explanation that this word left the "conduct" of the war to the Executive while the Congress only could declare it.

My footnote is to Farrand, "Records of the Federal Constitution," volume 2, page 318.

Mr. President, as we turn back these pages of history, as I have just done in this part of my manuscript, we see the human equation. We realize that then, as now, men representing free people weighed, debated, discussed, and evaluated alternatives, and finally selected the language which, in definitive terms, wrote the guarantees into our Constitution.

It is so easy for people to overlook the fact that the same processes recur continually in a democracy: the same processes now taking place in Congress in regard to this great historic issue. We in this Congress are coming to grips, in my judgment, with basic abstract principles of constitutionalism that may very well be as vital to the lives of future generations of Americans as the great constitutional debate to which I have just referred became vital to the rights of each one of us living in the year 1966.

For after all, these basic principles of government are never settled with finality in a democracy. That is why we have that great school of constitutional jurisprudence that points out that this organic document is dynamic and not static; it is a living word, and not a dead hand.

What I am trying to do today, in part, is to make Senators aware, if I can, that I think their obligation, in this critical hour, is as historic as the obligation of those who wrote the Constitution when they reached a final judgment on article I, section 8 of the Constitution, and vested the power to declare war in the Congress. For here is a bill which really deals with an attempt—and it is an abortive attempt, but it can have its effect—at giving to the President of the United States an Executive power that should never be vested in him.

In "The Federalist" Hamilton wrote:

> The President is to be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. In this respect his authority will be nominally the same with that of the King of Great Britain, but in substance much inferior to it. It will amount to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces, as first general and admiral of the Confederacy, while that of the British King extends to the declaring of war and to the raising and regulating of fleets and armies—all which, by the Constitution under consideration, would appertain to the Legislature.

That is Hamilton.

Some people say declarations of war are outdated, that events move too quickly and world affairs are too complex for adhering to the letter of the Constitution. This misses the point the Founding Fathers tried to drive home—the people must be brought into this decisionmaking process. James Grafton Rogers stated the underlying rationale of the Founding Fathers this way:

> War must be "declared," because it reaches many people. A declaration is in part a summons to citizens. It also gives notice that many legal rights are changed. Treaties are canceled. Trading and even corresponding with enemies is no longer proper. Enemy persons and property are restrained. Con-

tracts and debts suspended. Our ships at sea and our own property and citizens abroad have only the protection force can provide. Vast and autocratic control of people by the Government is released by a declaration of war—the right to control prices, ration food and clothing, even to seize factories and to arrest our own people without the right to demand the charges against them or secure public trial.

The Constitution says, therefore, in effect, "Our country shall not be committed formally to a trial of force with another nation, our people generally summoned to the effort and all the legal consequences to people, rights and property incurred until the House, Senate and the President agree."

Mr. President, that has been the plea of the Senator from Oregon over 2½ years. I do not know how many times I have pointed out the effect of a declaration of war. I have argued here on the floor of the Senate—but I wish to make it a part of this speech—that a declaration of war, as Grafton Rogers points out in the quotation that I have just read, and expands and expounds upon it in the text itself, changes immediately our international relations with every other nation in the world.

That is why I have said so many times that, in my judgment, one of the reasons why this administration has not proposed a declaration of war is that such a proposal would leave no room for doubt on the part of the American people that the administration is leading the country to war; not to peace.

A declaration of war would probably result in certain war acts on the part of the United States that would be bound to bring us into immediate conflict with many noncombatant nations in the world. I have cited over and over again, but I wish to cite once more, that if we had a declaration of war against North Vietnam, what would undoubtedly follow would be either an embargo or a mining of Haiphong Port and Harbor.

That would lead to great difficulties with many neutral, noncombatant nations, including Great Britain, Canada, France, Italy, and the Scandinavian countries and would raise the question as to whether they would lower their flags to that blockade.

I have pointed out many times, but it needs to be pointed out again for the RECORD, that I seriously doubt the Union Jack would ever be lowered to such a blockade because, if it were lowered, it would be the first time in the history of the British Empire that the Union Jack was ever lowered to a blockade to which the British Empire was not a party.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Missouri in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Southern States had considerable difficulty in obtaining supplies during the Civil War, and my recollection is that the Union Navy did not let any ships come through its blockade. Therefore, would the Senator from Oregon explain why British ships did not come to our aid at that time?

Mr. MORSE. Because the British Government, as the Senator well knows from reading his American history, was sort of a "Jekyll and Hyde" in that war, and my statement stands.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My recollection is that they provided us with a very fine ship which sank a great many Yankee ships. At least, the British built the ship, and we had the use of it. I believe the name of the ship was the *Alabama*, which did a magnificent job. It sank many Yankee ships.

It seems that the Union side was continually outraged about that, for a long period of time; but my recollection is that the British did not send any ships through the Union blockade. The South sorely felt that they should, that we were a nation fighting for its independence, and that the British should have sent their ships through the blockade, just as France came to the aid of the Colonies at the time we were fighting for our independence from Great Britain.

Mr. MORSE. I stand on my statement. I do not know what the Senator is replying to. The history of the British Empire is that it does not lower its flag to a blockade unless it is one to which it is a party and has approved.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What I was saying was that Britain seemed to approve enough of the South to let us have this fine battleship, the *Alabama*, during the Civil War, which was of such great help, and for which the South was deeply grateful to England.

Mr. MORSE. How is that an answer to my observation? My observation is a historic observation. I am merely saying that we do not get the British Empire to lower the Union Jack unless we can get the British Empire to agree that they will respect a blockade or will be a party to it.

Let me ask the Senator from Louisiana, does he believe that the Union Jack is going to be lowered to a blockade in Haiphong Harbor?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I was not even advocating a blockade.

Mr. MORSE. I am not asking the Senator whether he advocates a blockade——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I respectfully suggest to the Senator that he has made a great number of statements which I believe to be very much in error. In fact, I refer him to the unanimous vote of the American Bar Association that some of his statements are in error. With regard to this particular matter, the Senator said that the Union Jack is never lowered to a blockade. It has not been lowered because they do not send their ships in to make it necessary to lower the Union Jack.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator does not quote my full statement. Why does not the Senator quote the full statement? I stated that the Union Jack is never lowered to a blockade, that the history of the British Empire shows that the Union Jack is never lowered to a blockade unless the blockade is approved by them or they are a party to it. I am asking the Senator the question, does he believe——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would say that there is no record that the British Empire approved of the blockade that the United States placed on the Confederate States during the War Between the States. As a matter of fact, they let the Confederacy buy this fine battleship which raided Yankee merchant ships on the high seas, which would indicate that they did not disapprove.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Louisiana tell me what he is trying to prove?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator stated that there is no record of the Union Jack ever being lowered to a blockade——

Mr. MORSE. That is not what I said.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Unless the British Government approved the blockade. Then what did the Senator say?

Mr. MORSE. I repeat and I will say it again, Do we believe that the Union Jack would be lowered to an American blockade in Haiphong Harbor? Then I stated, What is the history of the British Empire? It does not lower its flag to any blockade unless the British Empire approves of that blockade or is a party to it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am saying to the Senator that during the American Civil War, there was no showing whatever that Britain approved of the Union blockade which it conducted against the Confederate States—no showing whatever.

As a matter of fact, the indications would be that the British Government had enough sympathy for what the blockade was doing to the South, to expect that British merchant ships, being the true traders that they were, would have been sent through that blockade, but they did not attempt to go through. They did not lower the Union Jack. They just did not send in the ships. The same thing was true with the blockade of Cuba a short time ago.

We turned the Russian ships back. We did not have to turn any British ships back. They understood the blockade was there and their ships stayed away.

Mr. MORSE. Who had their support?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They just did not come in.

Mr. MORSE. Why does not the Senator go back to the spring of 1962, when there was all this talk about blockading Cuba, which was never stretched? What was the position of Canada and Great Britain, and a good many of our NATO allies then? They advised our Government not to stretch a blockade. That is the point I am making.

We did not blockade any shipping into Cuba in 1962 except Russian ships carrying missiles.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Well, the generality of the Senator's statement——

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Senator, what does he believe will happen—and we should find out—if we have a declaration of war and we blockaded Haiphong?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Well, based on what the Senator has said, if we placed a blockade on Haiphong Harbor and British ships did not go through, or even if they did, it would not conflict with the generality of what the Senator has stated.

It would in effect be in sympathy and approval of a blockade that we have. The Senator just got through saying that Britain warned us not to go through with the blockade of Cuba, but the Senator will notice that not a British——

Mr. MORSE. We did not have one at the time I am talking about. But when we get to the fall of 1962 and those Russian missiles were in place in Cuba, then our allies rallied to our cause and Great Britain and France and all the other allies in NATO supported us. But, that is because we had a case. Prior to that time, we did not have a case.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am not advocating a blockade at this time. I am saying that my recollection of history is that this Nation blockaded on occasion when Britain was not alined with the blockade.

I have specifically in mind our Civil War. Britain was not alined with the North against the South. At that point Britain was a neutral, although her sympathies were to a considerable extent with the South.

Mr. MORSE. They did not go through the blockade. Therefore I fail to understand what the Senator is trying to prove.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Based on the Senator's own statement, the assumption is meaningless. If we were to put a blockade around Vietnam, the British ships would not try to go through it, as they did not try to go through the blockade in the Civil War, or through the blockade of Cuba during the missile crisis.

Mr. MORSE. If we blockaded North Vietnam, I do not believe the Union Jack would respect that blockade. I believe there are a good many other flags that would not respect the blockade either.

Certainly the Russian flag would not respect the blockade. I know of no surer way of getting into war with Russia than to start sinking some Russian ships seeking to go into Hanoi Harbor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator says they would not respect the blockade. They did respect it once before, or twice before. I merely say that the Senator makes this statement, and that he is satisfied with its accuracy.

He had repeated it so many times, however, that I felt once in a while I should say there is no reason for saying that what he says is necessarily so. To quote the words of one of the songs from Porgy and Bess, "It Ain't Necessarily So."

Mr. MORSE. I am issuing the warning to the American people. It is a factor that should be considered.

There are two possible reasons for the existence of hostilities in the absence of a congressional declaration of war in Vietnam. One, that the conflict there is not a war; or two, that the Congress has delegated to the President the power to wage a war.

There is no question in my mind about the existence of a war in Vietnam. This is not an emergency situation where the President was compelled to act without congressional approval to protect vital national interests. We had 800 men there in 1960, 3,000 in 1961, 11,000 in 1962, 16,000 in 1963, 23,000 in 1964, and 300,000 in and around Vietnam today. Senators who should know predict that we may eventually have 600,000 men there.

This was not an emergency buildup. There has been a steady escalation which now points toward a major war. The mothers, wives, and friends of the 300,000 Americans fighting over there know that this is a war. After seeing how quickly action was completed on the new GI bill of rights, I think even the Congress realizes that this is now a real war.

I do not question the President's power as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces to protect vital national interests by military action when necessary. I am well aware that our Nation's history is replete with instances where military action has been taken in foreign lands without a congressional declaration of war.

DIFFERENCE FROM KOREAN WAR

There can be war without a declaration of war. As a practical matter there is no way the Congress can stop a President's military adventures, except through its control of the purse strings. But never before in history has the President engaged this Nation in a major conflict without a firm basis in national and international law. It is said that the war in Korea was fought without a declaration by the Congress. The important distinction is that in Korea we were fighting under the banner of the United Nations in fulfillment of our treaty obligations. We should have had a declaration of war.

Article 39 of the charter provides for a determination of the existence of any "threat to peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression" by the Security Council and for its determination of what measures shall be taken to restore peace.

On June 27, 1950, the Security Council passed a resolution calling on member nations to assist the Republic of Korea in repelling the attack from the north. It may be argued that this was not sufficient authority for President Truman to send 280,000 troops to fight on Korean soil. I do not wish to become involved in that issue now. But I do want to stress the differences between the two situations. Instead of fighting to uphold the United Nations Charter and the peacekeeping decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, as we did in Korea, we are violating both its letter and its spirit by our conduct in Vietnam. We are guilty of abusing the very instrument we fought to uphold only 15 years ago.

The Department of State seems to believe that declarations of war are old fashioned. In a memorandum submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations some months ago, the Department made a number of remarkable statements. It stated, for example, that—

> In this century declarations of war have come to imply dedication to the total destruction of the enemy.

I must assume from this statement that the Department has no intention of recommending that the President ask Congress to declare war unless our goal is total destruction of the enemy.

This is a novel interpretation of history, for as recently as World War I, President Wilson asked for a declaration of war simply "to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war." If the Congress accepts the Department's current interpretation of its constitutional power to declare war, it will be guilty of complete abdication of its responsibilities.

The memorandum also states that a declaration of war has no bearing on whether use of force is lawful or unlawful under international law and that—

> The only relevant legal question is whether the use of force is justified.

To carry this logic to the extreme would take us back to the law of trial by force. Our officials mouth great platitudes about building a body of law for the settlement of international disputes through peaceful means. Every nation at war believes its position is sound and that its use of force is justified. I have no doubt that North Vietnam thinks we, not they, are the aggressors. As long as nationals continue to flaunt the United Nations Charter and decide for themselves when force is justified, international law will be little more than a jungle where power settles everything.

One interesting line in the State Department memorandum states that a declaration of war would "reduce our adversary's own reasoned approach to a solution." I had not been aware until I read this that the Department of State considered the Vietcong or North Vietnam "reasonable" in any way. In fact, the public pronouncements coming out of the Department try to make us believe that we are dealing with the devil himself. Perhaps the Congress has not received all of the signals coming into Mr. Rusk's antenna.

According to the memorandum:

> The President has power under article II, section 2, of the Constitution as Commander in Chief to deploy U.S. military forces to Vietnam for the purpose of assisting South Vietnam to defend itself from armed aggression by North Vietnam.

Under this logic we could escalate our involvement to a nuclear war with China and Russia without a congressional declaration of war, since we started out only in assisting South Vietnam. This is the old case of the camel getting its nose under the tent.

Throughout the development of our involvement, the Congress has been forced into positions where its hands have been tied by decisions already taken within the executive branch. The Executive has tried to force the Congress into retroactive rubberstamping of actions already taken. The Foreign Relations Committee is now faced with a $415 million supplemental aid bill, most of it for Vietnam. AID has already borrowed $56 million from other funds appropriated by the Congress in the expectation that the Congress would come through promptly with the additional funds and take it off the hook. If the Congress does not vote the funds soon, our Government will be in default on its solemn obligations to international organizations from which most of the money was borrowed. AID will then charge that the Congress, not the Executive, is the party responsible. I am tired of the Executive trying to blackjack the Congress this way. There can be nothing in the nature of a true partnership between the two branches under these conditions.

CONGRESS HAS NOT DELEGATED WARPOWER IN ASIA

Since the Congress has not declared war, the President's course of action must be founded on a delegation of authority by the Congress if it is to be legal under our constitutional system. The President misses no opportunity to state that the Congress has approved his actions, and the war generally, by approving the southeast Asia resolution. This was not a blank check as the President has interpreted it and the congressional intent has been distorted beyond recognition by what this administration has done. Let us look at the record for a moment.

Before I do, one will read an interesting debate back in August 1964, if he will turn back to it and see the number of reservations made by Members of the Senate before they voted. They tried to protect their flanks, may I say good-naturedly, by saying they were not granting a blank check, they were not giving unchecked power, when they were voting for the resolution.

As I indicated in the debate, I did not believe their arguments were very convincing then, and I do not now. But we will see whether any of them want to give the blank check now, for if there ever was a bill in which Congress gave a blank check to the President, it is the pending bill.

On August 2 and 4, 1964, U.S. Navy destroyers became involved in incidents with North Vietnamese torpedo boats. The President ordered retaliatory action by bombing naval facilities in North Vietnam. On August 5, he asked the Congress for an expression of support for his action.

When the southeast Asia resolution passed the Senate on August 7, there were only some 16,000 men in Vietnam. Their mission was to advise and train the military forces of South Vietnam; they were not engaged in offensive combat operations except in their advisory capacity with the Vietnamese troops. By that time 200 American boys had lost their lives in Vietnam. Our total military and economic aid program for the fiscal year which had just ended was about what we spend for 2 months' ammunition now. Only 2 days after the President signed the resolution he said this:

> Some others are eager to enlarge the conflict. They call upon us to supply American boys to do the job that Asian boys must do. They ask us to take reckless action which might risk the lives of millions and engulf much of Asia and certainly threaten the peace of the entire world.

This was the setting for the Congress action on the southeast Asia resolution.

Today we have 205,000 men in Vietnam and about another 100,000 afloat or working out of offshore bases. Our men are no longer advisers, they are deeply involved in combat operations; nearly 2,700 boys have now lost their lives over there. This fiscal year alone we will spend on the Vietnam war almost as much as we spent for the entire cost of the Korean war.

Early this afternoon I discussed the position of President Eisenhower and the statements he made, which I put in the RECORD; that he made no commitment for the sending of military personnel to South Korea; that he was talking in terms of aid.

Of course, there are many Republicans in and out of Congress, in positions of leadership, who are pointing out to the people of this country that no Republican administration has sent any military personnel to South Vietnam.

My intuition tells me that we are going to hear much of that in the months ahead. My political intuition tells me that we are going to hear it said in many places in the campaign of 1966, that it was the Democrats who sent boys to die in South Vietnam, and not the Republicans.

I would like to see us get on bipartisan and not partisan terms on this issue. I think we could if Republicans and Democrats would rally 'round the type of program that I have discussed earlier this afternoon and which is shared by a good many people in this country.

I submit that Congress had no intention of approving in advance a war of this magnitude in August 1964. I shall always be proud to be able to say that I was one of the two Members of this body who refused to be stampeded into voting for that resolution. I think many Senators regret that they voted for it.

The record should be crystal clear as to what was contemplated when Senators voted on the resolution.

I wish to digress from the manuscript to pay very deserved tribute to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. It takes a big man, and I believe it takes a true statesman, to do what he did, which was similar to what great President Kennedy did after the Bay of Pigs: to assume responsibility for his leadership on this resolution.

Many of us heard BILL FULBRIGHT on the nationwide CBS television interview. He said in effect that he had come to the conclusion that he had made a mistake; that he had not given the matter the thought and the analysis that he wishes now he had given to it.

We heard him say something to the same effect the other day in the Committee on Foreign Relations. That takes a big man. I am very proud to follow his leadership on so many aspects of this great, critical issue. He and I differ in some particulars, but I am proud to be associated with the common objectives that we have in mind. I am proud to support BILL FULBRIGHT as he takes the criticism and is subjected to the unfair attacks that are made upon him, and in many of the articles that I have read, gross misrepresentations of his point of view.

He said on that same program that a great power, a great nation, can change a bad policy without losing face. He proved that a great statesman can do the same thing. I have heard it said that a fool defends his mistakes, whereas a wise man corrects his errors. Our Government could profit from his example.

BILL FULBRIGHT has had many great hours and made many monumental contributions to world peace and freedom in the 21 years we have served in this body, so when I refer to the colloquy that took place in 1964, I refer to it only as a matter of historic record, without the slightest implied criticism of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I have made the foregoing comments this afternoon as part of the historic record that I think should be made.

The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who was handling the resolution, in a colloquy with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] a few minutes before the vote, made clear his intent, the intent of the committee, and, I think, the intent of the Senate. Senator NELSON stated:

> However, my concern is that we in Congress could give the impression to the public that we are prepared at this time to change our mission and substantially expand our commitment. If that is what the sense of Congress is, I am opposed to the resolution.

He proposed an amendment which contained this declaration of policy:

> Our continuing policy is to limit our role to the provision of aid, training, assistance, and military advice, and it is the sense of Congress that, except when provoked to a greater response, we should continue to attempt to avoid a direct military involvement in the southeast Asian conflict.

In responding, the junior Senator from Arkansas, who was handling the resolution, said about the proposal:

> It states fairly accurately what the President has said would be our policy, and what I stated my understanding was as to our policy; also what other Senators have stated. In other words, it states that our response should be appropriate and limited to the provocation, which the Senator states as "respond to provocation in a manner that is limited and fitting," and so forth.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The Senator has put into his amendment a statement of policy that is unobjectionable. However, I cannot accept the amendment under the circumstances. I do not believe it is contrary to the joint resolution, but it is an enlargement. I am informed that the House is now voting on this resolution. The House joint resolution is about to be presented to us. I cannot accept the amendment and go to conference with it, and thus take responsibility for delaying matters.
>
> I do not object to it as a statement of policy. I believe it is an accurate reflection of what I believe is the President's policy, judging from his own statements. That does not mean that as a practical matter I can accept the amendment. It would delay matters to do so. It would cause confusion and require a conference, and present us with all the other difficulties that are involved in this kind of legislative action. I regret that I cannot do it, even though I do not at all disagree with the amendment as a general statement of policy.
>
> Mr. NELSON. Judging by the RECORD of yesterday, many Senators do not interpret the resolution in the same way.
>
> Mr. FULBRIGHT. Senators are entitled to have different views. However, most members of the committee, with one or two exceptions, interpret it the same way.

If the President thinks this is a blank check to be filled out in American lives and treasure as he sees fit, the Constitution has become a meaningless document and the Congress has gone the way of the dinosaur.

I do not question the authority of the President to take the initial actions—such as the sending of advisers—which started us on this road to a major war in Asia; but there is a constitutional line beyond which he cannot logically go without a formal declaration of war.

I am unable to point to the day and action when this line was crossed. But there is no doubt in my mind that it has been crossed and that we are now in an undeclared war, contrary to the letter and the spirit of the Constitution. Only the American people acting through their elected representatives have the right to declare war and this right has not been delegated to anyone for use in southeast Asia.

POWER OF THE PURSE IS A MAJOR CHECK UPON EXECUTIVE

Clause 1 of section 8, article I of the Constitution gives to the Congress the power to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States. Clause 7 of section 9 of the same article states:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

The power of the purse is, in the first clause, given to Congress and in the second, it is specifically forbidden to the executive. It is a limitation upon the executive, and does not restrict Congress in appropriating moneys in the Treasury.

Our pending measure is not the expenditure in the strict sense; but it is the law under which appropriations shall be drawn from the Treasury by subsequent statute. Surely the control of public expenditures by Congress is a time-honored check upon the executive branch that our constitutional framers were very careful to write into our basic law.

In fact, in the Federalist No. 58, Madison declares:

> The House of Representatives cannot only refuse, but they alone can propose, the supplies requisite for the support of government. They, in a word, hold the purse—that powerful instrument by which we behold, in the history of the British Constitution, an infant and humble representation of the people gradually enlarging the sphere of its activity and importance, and finally reducing, as far as it seems to have wished, all the outgrown prerogatives of the other branches of the government. This power over the purse may, in fact, be regarded as the most complete and effectual weapon with which any constitution can arm the immediate representatives of the people, for obtaining a redress of every grievance, and for carrying into effect every just and salutary measure.

The noted constitutional authority, Edward Corwin, tells us:

> Congress has, to repeat, vast powers to determine the bounds within which a President may be left to work out a foreign policy. Indeed, it may effectively block Presidential policy by simply declining to pass implementing legislation—for example, appropriations. It results that, in proportion as the prosecution of a foreign policy—the Marshall plan for instance—requires lavish expenditure, so is the insistence of the body that controls the Nation's purse strings that it be accepted as a partner in the determination of the objectives of our diplomacy likely to increase.

That statement is taken from Professor Corwin's great book, "The President: Office and Powers, 1787–1957," at page 192.

I suggest to Senators that this authorization bill may be the last time Congress will have an opportunity to exercise a braking influence upon the war in Vietnam before it becomes irreversible. I hope that before voting, Senators will consider the testimony of Secretary Dulles in 1954, setting forth the policy of the United States not to try to create any land army to meet an armed aggression under article IV of SEATO. That policy was sound when Dulles declared it and when the Senate accepted it.

It is being reversed in this bill. Once we are committed to contributing American forces to it, and paying for the rest, we stand to face not only North Vietnam, but China, on the mainland of Asia.

Do not think for a moment that there is no policy issue in this bill, for it is the policy issue of involving Americans completely and almost alone in an Asian land war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the war message of President Wilson, delivered on April 2, 1917, and the war message of President Franklin Roosevelt following Pearl Harbor.

There being no objection, the messages were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILSON'S SPEECH FOR DECLARATION OF WAR AGAINST GERMANY, APRIL 2, 1917

I have called the Congress into extraordinary session because there are serious, very serious, choices of policy to be made, and made immediately, which it was neither right nor constitutionally permissible that I should assume the responsibility of making.

On the third of February last I officially laid before you the extraordinary announcement of the Imperial German Government that on and after the first day of February it was its purpose to put aside all restraints of law or of hunanity and use its submarines to sink every vessel that sought to approach either the ports of Great Britain and Ireland or the western coasts of Europe or any of the ports controlled by the enemies of Germany within the Mediterranean. That had seemed to be the object of the German submarine warfare earlier in the war, but since April of last year the Imperial Government had somewhat restrained the commanders of its undersea craft in conformity with its promise then given to us that passenger boats should not be sunk and that due warning would be given to all other vessels which its submarines might seek to destroy, when no resistance was offered or escape attempted, and care taken that their crews were given at least a fair chance to save their lives in their open boats. The precautions taken were meager and haphazard enough, as was proved in distressing instance after instance in the progress of the cruel and unmanly business, but a certain degree of restraint was observed.

The new policy has swept every restriction aside. Vessels of every kind, whatever their flag, their character, their cargo, their destination, their errand, have been ruthlessly sent to the bottom without warning and without thought of help or mercy for those on board, the vessels of friendly neutrals along with those of belligerents. Even hospital ships and ships carrying relief to the sorely bereaved and stricken people of Belgium, though the latter were provided with safe conduct through the proscribed areas by the German Government itself and were distinguished by unmistakable marks of identity, have been sunk with the same reckless lack of compassion or of principle.

I was for a little while unable to believe that such things would in fact be done by any government that had hitherto subscribed to the humane practices of civilized nations. International law had its origin in the attempt to set up some law which would be respected and observed upon the seas, where no nation had right of dominion and where lay the free highways of the world. This minimum of right the German Government has swept aside under the plea of retaliation and necessity and because it had no weapons which it could use at sea except these which it is impossible to employ as it is employing them without throwing to the winds all scruples of humanity or of respect for the understandings that were supposed to underlie the intercourse of the world. I am not now thinking of the loss of property involved, immense and serious as that is, but only of the wanton and wholesale destruction of the lives of noncombatants, men, women, and children, engaged in pursuits which have always, even in the darkest periods of modern history, been deemed innocent and legitimate. Property can be paid for; the lives of peaceful and innocent people cannot be. The present German submarine warfare against commerce is a warfare against mankind.

It is a war against all nations. American ships have been sunk, American lives taken, in ways which it has stirred us very deeply to learn of, but the ships and people of other neutral and friendly nations have been sunk and overwhelmed in the waters in the same way. There has been no discrimination. The challenge is to all mankind. Each nation must decide for itself how it will meet it. The choice we make for ourselves must be made with a moderation of counsel and a temperateness of judgment befitting our character and our motives as a nation. We must put excited feeling away. Our motive will not be revenge or the victorious assertion of the physical might of the Nation, but only the vindication of right, of human right, of which we are only a single champion.

When I addressed the Congress on the 26th of February last, I thought that it would suffice to assert our neutral rights with arms, our right to use the seas against unlawful interference, our right to keep our people safe against unlawful violence. But armed neutrality, it now appears, is impracticable. Because submarines are in effect outlaws when used as the German submarines have been used against merchant shipping, it is impossible to defend ships against their attacks as the law of nations has assumed that merchantmen would defend themselves against privateers or cruisers, visible craft giving chase upon the open sea.

It is common prudence in such circumstances, grim necessity indeed, to endeavor to destroy them before they have shown their own intention. They must be dealt with upon sight, if dealt with at all. The German Government denies the right of neutrals to use arms at all within the areas of the sea which it has proscribed, even in the defense of rights which no modern publicist has ever before questioned their right to defend. The intimation is conveyed that the armed guards which we have placed on our merchant ships will be treated as beyond the pale of law and subject to be dealt with as pirates would be. Armed neutrality is ineffectual enough at best; in such circumstances and in the face of such pretensions it is worse than ineffectual: it is likely only to produce what it was meant to prevent; it is practically certain to draw us into the war without either the rights or the effectiveness of belligerents.

There is one choice we cannot make, we are incapable of making: we will not choose the path of submission and suffer the most sacred rights of our Nation and our people to be ignored or violated. The wrongs against which we now array ourselves are no common wrongs; they cut to the very roots of human life.

With a profound sense of the solemn and even tragical character of the step I am taking and of the grave responsibilities which it involves, but in unhesitating obedience to what I deem my constitutional duty, I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the Government and people of the United States; that it formally accept the status of belligerent which has thus been thrust upon it; and that it take immediate steps not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defense but also to exert all its power and employ all its resources to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war.

What this will involve is clear. It will involve the utmost practicable cooperation in counsel and action with the governments now at war with Germany, and, as incident to that, the extension to those governments of the most liberal financial credits, in order that our resources may so far as possible be added to theirs. It will involve the organization and mobilization of all the material resources of the country to supply the materials of war and serve the incidental needs of the Nation in the most abundant and yet the most economical and efficient way possible. It will involve the immediate full equipment of the Navy in all respects but particularly in supplying it with the best means of dealing with the enemy's submarines. It will involve the immediate addition to the Armed Forces of the United States already provided for by law in case of war at least 500,000 men, who should, in my opinion, be chosen upon the principle of universal liability to service, and also the authorization of subsequent additional increments of equal force so soon as they may be needed and can be handled in training. It will involve also, of course, the granting of adequate credits to the Government, sustained, I hope, so far as they can equitably be sustained by the present generation, by well conceived taxation.

While we do these things, these deeply momentous things, let us be very clear, and make very clear to all the world what our motives and our objects are. My own thought has not been driven from its habitual and normal course by the unhappy events of the last 2 months, and I do not believe that the thought of the Nation has been altered or clouded by them. I have exactly the same things in mind now that I had in mind when I addressed the Senate on the 22d of January last; the same that I had in mind when I addressed the Congress on the 3d of February and on the 26th of February.

Our object now, as then, is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world as against selfish and autocratic power and to set up amongst the really free and self-governed peoples of the world such a concert of purpose and of action as will henceforth insure the observance of those principles. Neutrality is no longer feasible or desirable where the peace of the world is involved and the freedom of its peoples, and the menace to that peace and freedom lies in the existence of autocratic governments backed by organized force which is controlled wholly by their will, not by the will of their people. We have seen the last of neutrality in such circumstances.

We are at the beginning of an age in which it will be insisted that the same standards of conduct and of responsibility for wrong done shall be observed among nations and their governments that are observed among the individual citizens of civilized states.

We have no quarrel with the German people. We have no feeling toward them but one of sympathy and friendship. It was not upon their impulse that their Government acted in entering this war. It was not with their previous knowledge or approval. It was a war determined upon as wars used to be determined upon in the old, unhappy days when peoples were nowhere consulted by their rulers and wars were provoked and waged in the interest of dynasties or of little groups of ambitious men who were accustomed to use their fellow men as pawns and tools.

We are accepting this challenge of hostile purpose because we know that in such a government, following such methods, we can never have a friend; and that in the presence of its organized power, always lying in wait to accomplish we know not what purpose, there can be no assured security for the democratic governments of the world. We are now about to accept gage of battle with this natural foe to liberty and shall, if necessary, spend the whole force of the Nation to check and nullify its pretensions and its power.

We are glad, now that we see the facts with no veil of false pretense about them, to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the German peoples included: for the rights of nations great and small and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience.

The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them.

Just because we fight without rancor and without selfish object, seeking nothing for ourselves but what we shall wish to share with all free peoples, we shall, I feel confident, conduct our operations as belligerents without passion and ourselves observe with proud punctilio the principles of right and of fairplay we profess to be fighting for.

I have said nothing of the Governments allied with the Imperial Government of Germany because they have not made war upon us or challenged us to defend our right and our honor. The Austro-Hungarian Government has, indeed, avowed its unqualified indorsement and acceptance of the reckless and lawless submarine warfare adopted now without disguise by the Imperial German Government, and it has therefore not been possible for this Government to receive Count Tarnowski, the Ambassador recently accredited to this Government by the Imperial and Royal Government of Austria-Hungary; but that Government has not actually engaged in warfare against citizens of the United States on the seas, and I take the liberty, for the present at least, of postponing a discussion of our relations with the authorities at Vienna. We enter this war only where we are clearly forced into it because there are no other means of defending our rights.

It will be all the easier for us to conduct ourselves as belligerents in a high spirit of right and fairness because we act without animus, not in enmity toward a people or with the desire to bring any injury or disadvantage upon them, but only in armed opposition to an irresponsible government which has thrown aside all considerations of humanity and of right and is running amuck.

We are, let me say again, the sincere friends of the German people, and shall desire nothing so much as the early reestablishment of intimate relations of mutual advantage between us—however hard it may be for them, for the time being, to believe that this is spoken from our hearts. We have borne with their present Government through all these bitter months because of that friendship—exercising a patience and forbearance which would otherwise have been impossible.

We shall, happily, still have an opportunity to prove that friendship in our daily attitude and actions toward the millions of men and women of German birth and native sympathy who live among us and share our life, and we shall be proud to prove it toward all who are in fact loyal to their neighbors and to the Government in the hour of test.

They are, most of them, as true and loyal Americans as if they had never known any other fealty or allegiance. They will be prompt to stand with us in rebuking and restraining the few who may be of a different mind and purpose. If there should be disloyalty, it will be dealt with with a firm hand of stern repression; but, if it lifts its head at all, it will lift it only here and there and without countenance except from a lawless and malignant few.

It is a distressing and oppressive duty, gentlemen of the Congress, which I have performed in thus addressing you. There are, it may be, many months of fiery trial and sacrifice ahead of us. It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance. But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free. To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. God helping her, she can do no other.

President Roosevelt's Message Asking for War Against Japan, December 8, 1941

Yesterday, December 7, 1941—a date which will live in infamy—the United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by naval and air forces of the Empire of Japan.

The United States was at peace with that nation and, at the solicitation of Japan, was still in conversation with its government and its Emperor looking toward the maintenance of peace in the Pacific. Indeed, 1 hour after Japanese air squadrons had commenced bombing in Oahu, the Japanese Ambassador to the United States and his colleague delivered to the Secretary of State a formal reply to a recent American message. While this reply stated that it seemed useless to continue the existing diplomatic negotiations, it contained no threat or hint of war or armed attack.

It will be recorded that the distance of Hawaii from Japan makes it obvious that the attack was deliberately planned many days or even weeks ago. During the intervening time the Japanese Government has deliberately sought to deceive the United States by false statements and expressions of hope for continued peace.

The attack yesterday on the Hawaiian Islands has caused severe damage to American naval and military forces. Very many American lives have been lost. In addition American ships have been reported torpedoed on the high seas between San Francisco and Honolulu.

Yesterday the Japanese Government also launched an attack against Malaya. Last night Japanese forces attacked Hong Kong. Last night Japanese forces attacked Guam. Last night Japanese forces attacked the Philippine Islands. Last night the Japanese attacked Wake Island. This morning the Japanese attacked Midway Island.

Japan has, therefore, undertaken a surprise offensive extending throughout the Pacific area. The facts of yesterday speak for themselves. The people of the United States have already formed their opinions and well understand the implications to the very life and safety of our Nation.

As Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, I have directed that all measures be taken for our defense.

Always will we remember the character of the onslaught against us.

No matter how long it may take us to overcome this premeditated invasion, the American people in their righteous might will win through to absolute victory.

I believe I interpret the will of the Congress and of the people when I assert that we will not only defend ourselves to the uttermost but will make very certain that this form of treachery shall never endanger us again.

Hostilities exist. There is no blinking at the fact that our people, our territory, and our interests are in grave danger.

With confidence in our Armed Forces—with the unbounded determination of our people—we will gain the inevitable triumph—so help us God.

I ask that the Congress declare that since the unprovoked and dastardly attack by Japan on Sunday, December 7, a state of war has existed between the United States and the Japanese Empire.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that, following the printing in the RECORD of the war messages of President Wilson and President Roosevelt, there be printed in the RECORD two telegrams and my reply to one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the messages and reply were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUGENE, OREG.,
February 23, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR MORSE: The hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have had a salutary effect upon public understanding of the grave issues involved in the Vietnam conflict. We congratulate you and Senator FULBRIGHT for your courage and urge that your efforts continue until a thorough understanding and consensus is reached.

LANE COUNTY DEMOCRATIC PRECINCT COMMITTEE MEN AND WOMEN MEETING IN HARRIS HALL.

DETROIT, MICH.,
February 7, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Fifty trade unionists who comprise the steering committee for a broad union conference on peace and U.S. foreign policy met in this connection Sunday and unanimously requested you be sent the following message:

"We have followed your efforts to halt the war in Vietnam with the greatest admiration. We support your protest at the resumption of air strikes against North Vietnam, likewise the present critical hearings now being held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, also your current effort to secure repeal of the Senate August 10, 1964, resolution on Vietnam. We submit that we have no commitment to the present government in Saigon nor can we have regardless of events in Honolulu. We submit that only the people acting through the Congress have the legal right to commit this Nation to this or that course of action. We congratulate you on your courage and high resolve to get this country on the road toward peace. We wish to extend to you our cordial invitation to the conference to be held in Detroit at the Central Methodist Church House, Woodward at Adams, Sunday, March 6, at 3 p.m."

MAX MARK,
Member, Local 1295, American Federation of Teachers.
ART FOX,
Member, Ford Local 600 UAW.
CHUCK WALTERS,
Member, Dodge Local 3 UAW 9309 Memorial, Detroit, 48228.

FEBRUARY 24, 1966.

MR. CHARLES WALTERS,
Dodge Local 3, UAW,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. WALTERS: I want to tell you how much I appreciated your recent wire in support of my position on our country's involvement in southeast Asia. The large number of wires such as yours which I have received in the past few weeks has indeed been encouraging.

Although I sincerely wish I could be with you on March 6, I regret that I shall not be able to do so as I have a longstanding previous commitment on my calendar for that date.

With appreciation and best wishes for a successful conference.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have sought in my speech today to set forth the major premises of the position of the senior Senator from Oregon on the pending bill and the main premises for the opposition of the senior Senator from Oregon to conducting the war in southeast Asia on the scale and in keeping with the policies that have characterized it to date.

I have sought in this speech to answer, once again, the charge that continues to be made, without any reference to the proposals that we who are opposed to the war have submitted, over and over again, proposals for a different course of action. I went into some detail this afternoon in a discussion of the major features of such a program. I have sought, as I said at the beginning, to fulfill what I consider to be a trust that I owe to my position in the Senate and that I owe to the people of the sovereign State of Oregon, who elected me, and that through them I owe to the people of the United States.

Now I should like to have the attention of the acting majority leader for a moment. I have spoken at much greater length than I thought would be necessary, and I shall not speak longer tonight. I have certain materials that I shall want to discuss on Monday, including a more detailed reference to some of the constitutional and international law authorities, and a reference to an article that has just been written and is in manuscript form, about which the author, a professor at Amherst University, spoke with me at some length over the long-distance telephone this morning.

On Monday, before I offer my amendment, I shall recapitulate briefly the main points of my position, and also to discuss in the RECORD the Geneva accords of 1954, and the extent to which it is my view that we stand in violation of them. I shall want to relate those violations to my great concern as to what our policy is going to be if, as, and when we succeed in eliminating the Vietcong and establishing Ky in charge of South Vietnam, with the announced purpose, which has always characterized the leaders of the Government of South Vietnam, of the reunification of all of Vietnam—of course on their terms.

I am sure that that recapitulation will not be of an unreasonable length. But I thought my acting majority leader ought to know, so that he will not feel that I have in any way misled him. I do not intend to.

I am in a position that is not unknown to the Senator from Louisiana. I have seen, in my years here in the Senate, the Senator from Louisiana in the minority, and sometimes he speaks at some length.

I say good-naturedly that there are so many on the other side to talk and so few of us, and so much to be said, that I have to consume more time than some of my colleagues wish I would consume.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if the Senator would permit a statement by me, I have made speeches at length when I have been right and when I have been wrong. I am not sure when I have been wrong, but I have made enough long speeches to be sure that I could not have been right all the time.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has never heard me say that I consider myself to be right all the time. However, he has heard me say that sometimes it seems to me that when I commit a mistake, mine is always a blooper and the other fellow's is merely a mistake.

I have never felt myself more right than I have felt myself to be right in the last 2 years in the position I have taken on this issue.

I am willing to come in early Monday morning. I shall discuss some of these matters that I have not taken the time to discuss today. I think I have done rather well in getting through as much of my material as I have.

Mr. President, I do want to call to the attention of the Senate, as my last point, and give the source of the citation of Mr. Commager this morning. Mr. Commager said he thought I ought to refresh my memory as to the position taken by the Government at the time of the Suez crisis. I had quite forgotten about it. I did immediately check with the library. I shall want to discuss that and have the material put in the RECORD.

I did not have time to do this before I rushed over here to make my speech. I have not had time to do my paperwork on it. I believe I owe it to Professor Commager to point out the source of this information and the soundness of what Professor Commager pointed out this morning, that at the time of the Suez crises both President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles took a position that I think is particularly apropos of the problem that confronts us.

Their statement issued at the time was that the use of military force to solve international disputes could not be reconciled with the principle of the United Nations Charter to which we have all subscribed.

They also supported the view that the United Nations is alone charged with the responsibility of sending people to the Middle East and throughout the world.

The professor pointed out to me—and I checked it with the library, not that I needed to check it, but he wanted me to—that the Soviet Union proposed a joint action with the United States at that time, and Secretary Dulles rejected the Soviet proposal as unthinkable and said that any intervention by the United States or any action except by a duly constituted United Nations peace force would be counter or contrary to everything the United States is charged by the United Nations to do.

I think that is true. I think Dulles was right, and that President Eisenhower was right. However, I want to doublecheck it, and be sure that I have not taken it out of context.

I did want to make the statement today, before his weekend was over, but I want the Senator to know that, in fairness to all concerned, I intend to make a very brief statement upon the research I shall do over the weekend as to the application of the Suez crisis by way of analogy to the present crisis.

It is material of that type that I shall be discussing on Monday, plus what I have said would be the discussion of the declaration of the Geneva accords.

With that understanding, I see no reason why we cannot start voting, even on Monday. If we come in early and stay reasonably late Monday night, and come in early on Tuesday and stay reasonably late on Tuesday night, I see no reason why we cannot dispose of this issue with finality by that time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I do not care to deny to any Senator the right to make his position clear, nor to insist that his position be understood by the Senate.

I am not going to run roughshod over anyone.

Starting on Monday I am going to start asking for unanimous consent to vote. Even though it is repeatedly denied, I shall continue to ask for it.

This matter is extremely urgent. I know that the President thinks so, and I know that those who are in charge of the Department of Defense seem to think so. I believe that the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the committee, thinks so.

We are eager to vote on the measure. I do understand how strongly the Senator feels about the matter. He has made that amply clear during the last year, or perhaps during the last 2 years. I completely respect the position of the Senator and I know that he respects mine. I am sure that he, as a veteran, and one of our best minds, thinks the same.

Senators certainly have a right to make their position clear. I respect the right of the Senator.

I am prepared to say to the Senator—and for the benefit of anyone concerned—that as far as I am concerned, there will be no vote on this measure tomorrow.

I do want the Senate to meet tomorrow because I would like to be in a position to say to those Senators who might come in and say: "I have a speech to make and I want to explain my views on the matter," that the Senate was in session on Saturday. I can then ask them why they did not come in on Saturday.

However, if they will not make their speeches on Saturday—and I fully realize the right of Senators to insist that the matter go over to Monday—I am not going to try to interfere with that right.

I know what a futile and useless thing it would be to try to pass the bill Saturday.

I have been a party in opposition to measures here on occasions when I felt that we were gaining some headway while we were carrying on a rather lengthy debate.

I respect the right of persons who feel they are making headway to do that. I do not think anyone is engaged in a filibuster if he is picking up votes. If he is merely standing still and spinning his wheels, I am inclined to think that he should recognize that fact himself.

The Senator has made a fine argument for his case. While I do not agree with his argument, I have heard it many times and I must admit that he makes a good, logical presentation.

I can assure the Senator that there will be no votes on the pending measure tomorrow. If the Senator wishes to address the Senate on Monday, I shall be glad to ask unanimous consent that he be recognized after the morning hour on Monday. Otherwise, the Senator can take his chances on obtaining the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should not like to place myself in any privileged position on Monday. I will be recognized early on my own turn. I would rather leave it that way.

I am sorry not to be in a position to speak tomorrow, but I shall not be able to complete the research in time for a speech tomorrow. I would prefer not to speak until I am absolutely settled, myself, that I have done my bookwork thoroughly. I know the President's position of leadership in regard to this matter, and I have been so busy all afternoon that I do not know what has been going on in the cloakrooms. But nobody has whispered to me that they have any speakers lined up for tomorrow. My suspicion is that there is not a single one of them.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If nobody else shows up, I shall be here.

Mr. MORSE. I know. I hope I am wrong, but I think we are going to be here without speakers. Then we shall have to handle the matter in a parliamentary way.

I wish someone had come to the Senator from Louisiana—I think they owed it to him—and told him they would be here to speak tomorrow. Such information as I got as late as lunch was that no one would be here tomorrow to make a speech; and I think we shall be in a position, then, where we will have to meet and adjourn; and in my own view, that is a waste of time, if I am correct in my major premise that nobody will be here to speak. If someone were prepared to speak, the Senator from Louisiana, as acting majority leader, would know it by now; or at least he is entitled to have been notified by now as a matter of courtesy, if nothing else. There is one thing I have always tried to do, and that is work with my leadership on these parliamentary matters.

My honest belief is that unless something has happened while I have been holding the floor here this afternoon, there is not a single prospective speaker to show up tomorrow. If that is true, then I think there is a serious question as to whether the Senate should call us back tomorrow.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have sent wires, as of now, to 100 U.S. Senators, including myself, saying, "If you have a speech to make, please come make your speech."

If we cannot dispose of any speeches on the Vietnam authorization, then perhaps we can dispose of some speeches that somebody might wish to make on the high cost of living, or the prospect of a tax bill, or something else; and insofar as they do, we are that much further along. Even if we dispose of nothing but having a Senator make an insertion in the RECORD on some matter totally irrelevant to this debate, we will be at least that much closer to the time we will be able to vote on this measure

I have called on Senators wishing to make speeches to make them. If there is nobody else who wishes to make a speech, if the spirit moves me, perhaps I shall make a speech.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be here. I hope the spirit does move the Senator; I would like to listen to him.

But the Senator may have seen me smile about 30 minutes before I finished my speech, when there was handed me another speech, which I have no intention of making today or tomorrow. It is on the problem of the matter of what is going to be the future status of the Small Business Administration. I have joined with others in sending a wire to the President in opposition to the transfer that is contemplated. But I thought the Senator would be pleased to know I am not making that speech tonight.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is perfectly all right with me.

Mr. MORSE. And I do not contemplate making any speeches irrelevant to the pending business tomorrow.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have nothing else to do this evening. It is perfectly all right with me if the Senator wishes to speak. I will stay and hear it, knowing that the Senator would not read the speech if he did not think it worthy of being heard here.

Mr. MORSE. It is a speech worthy of being made on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, because it is so apropos to parts of my speech, to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum of law, prepared by a group of American lawyers, which holds a view different from that of the American Bar Association, together with a letter of transmittal from that group submitting the memorandum to the President of the United States under date of January 25, 1966.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAWYERS COMMITTEE ON AMERICAN
POLICY TOWARD VIETNAM,
New York, N.Y., January 25, 1966.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: Following the issuance by the Department of State in March 1965 of a memorandum captioned "Legal Basis for U.S. Actions Against North Vietnam," our committee, in consultation with leading authorities in the fields of international law and constitutional law, undertook to research the legal issues, culminating in the memorandum of law (here enclosed).

Our committee's memorandum of law has been endorsed, among others, by Profs. Quincy Wright, of the University of Virginia; Wolfgang Friedmann, of Columbia University; Thomas I. Emerson, of Yale; Richard A. Falk, of Princeton; Norman Malcolm, of Cornell; D. F. Fleming, of Vanderbilt; David Haber, of Rutgers; Roy M. Mersky, of the University of Texas; William G. Rice, of the University of Wisconsin; Chancellor Robert M. MacIver, of the New School for Social Research; Profs. Robert C. Stevenson, of Idaho State University; Alexander W. Rudzinski, of Columbia; Darrell Randell, of the American University in Washington, D.C.; and Profs. Wallace McClure and William W. Van Alstyne, both from Duke University and the World Rule of Law Center.

For the reasons documented in our memorandum our committee has reached the regrettable but inescapable conclusion that the actions of the United States in Vietnam contravene the essential provisions of the United Nations Charter, to which we are bound by treaty; violate the Geneva accords, which we pledged to observe; are not sanctioned by the treaty creating the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization; and violate our own Constitution and the system of checks and balances which is the heart of it, by the prosecution of the war in Vietnam without a congressional declaration of war.

The principal argument advanced in the State Department's memorandum is that our Government's action in Vietnam is justified under article 51 of the United Nations Charter sanctioning "individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations." However, South Vietnam is indisputably not a member of the United Nations and, indeed, under the Geneva accords of 1954, is merely a temporary zone. Moreover, since the Geneva accords recognized all of Vietnam as a single state, the conflict in Vietnam is "civil strife" and foreign intervention is forbidden. We do well to recall that President Lincoln, in the course of our Civil War to preserve the union of the North and the South, vigorously opposed British and French threats to intervene in behalf of the independence of the Confederacy.

In addition, the right of collective self-defense under article 51 is limited to those nations which are within a regional community which history and geography have developed into a regional collective defense system. The United States—a country separated by oceans and thousands of miles from southeast Asia and lacking historical or ethnic connections with the peoples of that area—cannot qualify as a bona fide member of a regional collective defense system for southeast Asia.

The State Department's memorandum also contends that the actions of the United States "being defensive in character and designed to resist armed aggression, are wholly consistent with the purposes and principles of the charter and specifically with article 2, paragraph 4." Yet article 2, paragraph 4, declares in clear and unambiguous language that "all members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

The State Department's memorandum also attempts to justify our Government's actions in Vietnam on the ground that the "North Vietnamese have repeatedly violated the 1954 Geneva accords." But this statement ignores our Government's antecedent violations of the pledges we made. On July 21, 1954, Under Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith in a declaration confirmed by President Eisenhower, pledged that our Government would not "disturb" the Geneva accords and would "not join in an arrangement which would hinder" the rights of peoples "to determine their own future." However, the United States departed from these pledges when, on July 16, 1955, the Diem regime announced, with American backing, that it would defy the provision calling for national elections, thus violating the central condition which had made the Geneva accords acceptable to the Vietminh. And the United States also chose to ignore the ban on the introduction of troops, military personnel, arms, and munitions into Vietnam and the prohibition against the establishment of new military bases in Vietnam territory—provisions set out in the Geneva accords. It is an historical fact that the refusal to hold the elections prescribed by the Geneva accords, coupled with the reign of terror and suppression instituted by the Diem regime, precipitated the civil war.

In the light of the foregoing, more fully detailed and documented in the enclosed memorandum, we submit, Mr. President, that the State Department has incorrectly advised you as to the legality of U.S. actions against Vietnam.

We further submit, Mr. President, that the frequent citation of the pledges given by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy to aid South Vietnam afford no justification for U.S. intervention in Vietnam. President Eisenhower has stated that his administration had made no commitment to South Vietnam "in terms of military support on programs whatsoever." President Kennedy insisted that the war in Vietnam was "their war" and promised only equipment and military advisers. Hence the historical facts fail to support the point advanced. Beyond this, these Presidential pledges do not even have the status of treaties, not having been ratified by the Senate. Manifestly, the obligations assumed by our Government under the United Nations Charter, with the advice and consent of the Senate, transcend any Presidential pledge undertaken vis-a-vis the South Vietnamese regime.

Our Government has often urged that our presence in South Vietnam is solely to preserve freedom for its people and to uphold the democratic process. Yet the series of regimes supported by the United States in South Vietnam have been authoritarian in character, quite without popular support and largely indifferent to the welfare of the local population. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, on June 30, 1964, commenting on the consequences of massive American involvement in Vietnam, stated, "Well, that means we become a colonial power and I think it's been pretty well established that colonialism is over. I believe that if you start doing that you will get all kinds of unfortunate results; you'll stir up antiforeign feeling; there'll be a tendency to lay back and let the Americans do it and all that. I can't think that it's a good thing to do."

As we have stated, our committee has also come to the painful conclusion that our Government's action in Vietnam violates the clear provision of our Constitution which vests in Congress exclusively the power to declare war—a power not constitutionally granted to the President. The debates in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia make explicitly clear that warmaking was to be a purely legislative prerogative and the President was not to have the power to wage a war or "commit" our Nation to the waging of a war, although the Executive was intended to have the power to repel sudden attacks.

In pointing out that the President lacks constitutional power to make war, our committee does not imply that a declaration of war by the Congress is desirable. Rather, we mean to point out that the failure to abide and conform to the provisions of our Constitution inevitably lead to tragic situations.

In alerting the American people to the unconstitutionality of the war being waged in Vietnam, we are following the example followed by Abraham Lincoln who, in a speech made on January 12, 1848, before the House of Representatives opposing the war undertaken by President Polk, set out the reasons which impelled him to vote for a resolution which declared that "the war with Mexico was unnecessarily and unconstitutionally commenced by the President."

Our committee conducted its research because of a deep sense of responsibility as members of the bar and because of our dedication to the principle of world peace through law. It was the American lawyers who conceived and nurtured this principle, and after holding conferences on four continents (San Jose, Costa Rica; Tokyo, Japan; Lagos, Nigeria; Rome, Italy), finally convened the First World Conference on World Peace Through Law at Athens, Greece, in July 1963.

In the proclamation of Athens, the declaration of general principles for a world rule of law, among other things, declared that "all obligations under international law must be fulfilled and all rights thereunder must be exercised in good faith."

Mr. President, we submit that our Government's intervention in Vietnam falls far short of the declaration of principles at Athens, Greece, in July 1963, and is in violation of international agreements. The rule of law is the essential foundation of stability and order, both between societies and in international relations. When we violate the law ourselves, we cannot expect respect for the rule of law by others. Our present unilateral intervention is an offense, we submit, against the spirit of American institutions.

As lawyers, we feel that the national interest is best served—indeed it can only be served—by (a) a commitment that our Government will be bound by and implement the principles of the Geneva accords of 1954, and that the main provisions thereof be the basis for the establishment of an independent, unified neutral Vietnam; (b) an invocation of the provisions of the United Nations Charter to assure peace in southeast Asia; and (c) a declaration that there will be no further bombing of Vietnam, that we will agree to a cease fire, and publicly declare that the United States is willing to negotiate directly with the National Liberation Front—a point endorsed by leading Senators and Secretary General Thant and mandated by article 33 of the United Nations Charter requiring that the "parties to any dispute * * * shall first of all, seek a solution by negotiation * * * or other peaceful means of their own choice," and that all elements of the South Vietnamese people should be represented in that country's postwar government.

Respectfully yours,
Robert W. Kenny,
Honorary Chairman.
William L. Standard,
Chairman.

American Policy Vis-a-Vis Vietnam, in Light of Our Constitution, the United Nations Charter, the 1954 Geneva Accords, and the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty

MEMORANDUM OF LAW

(Prepared by Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam, Hon. Robert K. Kenny, Honorary Chairman)

Executive committee

William L. Standard, Chairman; Carey McWilliams, Vice Chairman; Joseph H. Crown, Secretary.

Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam, 38 Park Row, New York, N.Y.

American Policy Vis-a-Vis Vietnam

The justification of American involvement* in Vietnam has troubled lawyers in the light of the literal language of our Constitution and the United Nations Charter. Though the United States initially entered South Vietnam only to advise, American troops, now numbering 125,000,[1] have moved from a passive to an active combat role. American forces have mounted repeated air strikes against targets in North Vietnam. Is such action, raising the threat of large-scale war, consonant with our Constitution, our obligations under the United Nations Charter, the provisions of the southeast Asia collective defense treaty?

Observance of the rule of law is a basic tenet of American democracy. Hence it is fitting that American lawyers examine the action pursued by our Government to determine whether our Government's conduct is justified under the rule of law mandated by the United Nations Charter, a charter adopted to banish from the earth the scourge of war.

We shall explore and assess the grounds advanced to justify the course of conduct pursued by our Government vis-a-vis Vietnam. In section I, we examine American policy in the light of the United Nations; in section II, in the light of the Geneva accords and the southeast Asia collective defense treaty; and in sections III–IV in the light of our Constitution. Mindful of the grave importance of the issues, we have exercised the maximum diligence in the preparation of this memorandum which is fully documented.

I—THE UNITED STATES IN VIETNAM: THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

The Charter of the United Nations was signed on behalf of the United States on June 26, 1945, by the President of the United States, and was ratified on July 28, 1945, by the Senate.[2] Thus, the United States became a signatory to the Charter, along with 55 other nations (there are now 114), obligating itself to outlaw war, to refrain from the unilateral use of force against other nations, and to abide by the procedures embodied in the Charter for the settlement of differences between states. In essence, the obligations assumed by member nations under the United Nations Charter represent the principles of international law which govern the conduct of members of the United Nations and their legal relations.

The Charter of the United Nations is a presently effective treaty binding upon the Government of the United States because it is the "supreme law of the land."[3] Indeed, the Charter constitutes the cornerstone of a world system of nations which recognizes that peaceful relations, devoid of any use of force or threats of force, are the fundamental legal relations between nations. The following provisions of the Charter are relevant:

(a) "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations" (ch. I, art. II(4)).

(b) "The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, and shall make recommendations or shall decide what measures shall be taken * * * to maintain or restore international peace and security." (Ch. VII, 39.)

It is thus plain that signatory members of the United Nations Charter are barred from resorting to force unilaterally and that only the Security Council is authorized to determine the measures to be taken to maintain or restore international peace (apart from the question as to whether or not the General Assembly has any residual authority by virtue of the "Uniting for Peace" resolution for this purpose when the Security Council is unable to meet its responsibilities[4]).

It may be recalled that in 1956, Israel justified its attack on the Egyptian forces in the Sinai Peninsula "as security measures to eliminate the Egyptian Fedayeen 'Commando' bases in the Sinai Peninsula from which raids had been launched across the Israeli frontier." Starke, "Introduction to International Law," fourth edition, London, 1958, at page 83 et seq.

When Great Britain and France introduced their troops into the Sinai Peninsula, under claim of a threat to their vital interests, the "preponderant reaction of the rest of the world was to condemn this action as inter alia, a breach of the United Nations Charter." Starke, "Introduction to International Law," fourth edition, London, 1958, at pages 85–88.

When the Soviet Union suggested a joint military operation with the United States to restore the peace in the Middle East, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles rejected this proposal as "unthinkable" (New York Times, November 6, 1956). Dulles declared:

"Any intervention by the United States and/or Russia, or any other action, except by a duly constituted United Nations peace force would be counter to everything the General Assembly and the Secretary General of the United Nations were charged by the charter to do in order to secure a United Nations police cease-fire."

At a news conference on November 8, 1956, President Eisenhower, answering an announcement of the Soviet Union at that time, declared that the United States would oppose the dispatch of Russian "volunteers" to aid Egypt, saying that it would be the duty of all United Nations members, including the United States, under the clear mandate of the United Nations Charter to counter any Soviet military intervention in the Middle East. The President said:

"The United Nations is alone charged with the responsibility of securing the peace in the Middle East and throughout the world." United Nations Action in the Suez Crisis. Tulane Studies in Political Science, volume IV entitled "International Law in the Middle East Crisis."

To the fundamental, substantive and procedural requirements and conditions vesting sole authority in the United Nations to authorize utilization of force, there are only two exceptions set forth in the charter. The first exception is found in article 51 of chapter 7:

"Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures to maintain international peace and security."

Article 51 of the charter marked a serious restriction on the traditional right of self-defense. As was stated by Prof. Philip C. Jessup in his work, "A Modern Law of Nations," published in 1947 (at pp. 165–166):

"Article 51 of the charter suggests a further limitation on the right of self-defense: it may be exercised only 'if an armed attack ocurs.' * * * This restriction in article 51 very definitely narrows the freedom of action which states had under traditional law. A case could be made out for self-defense under the traditional law where the injury was threatened but no attack had yet taken place. Under the charter, alarming military preparations by a neighboring state would justify a resort to the Security Council, but would not justify resort to anticipatory force by the state which believed itself threatened."[5]

The traditional right of self-defense, even prior to the adoption of the United Nations charter, was limited. As stated by Secretary of State Daniel Webster in the Caroline case,[6] and as adopted in the Neurenberg Judgment in 1945, any resort to armed force in self-defense must be confined to cases in which "the necessity of that self-defense is instant, overwhelming and leaving no choice of means and no moment of deliberation." [7]

---

*For a historical background, see Robert Scheer, "How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam" (A Report to the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Post Office Box 4068, Santa Barbara, Calif., 93103); sample copy free.

[1] President Johnson, in his news conference of July 29, 1965, stated:

"I have today ordered to Vietnam the Air Mobile Division and certain other forces which will raise our fighting strength from 75,000 to 125,000 men almost immediately. Additional forces will be needed later, and they will be sent as requested." (Presidential Documents, vol. 1, No. I, p. 15, Aug. 2, 1965.)

[2] See Historical Note under title 22, United States Code, sec. 287. By the act of Dec. 20, 1945, c. 583, 59 Stat. 619 (22 U.S.C. 287–287e), Congress enacted "The United Nations Participation Act of 1945," empowering the President to appoint representatives to the United Nations and to render various forms of assistance to the United Nations and the Security Council under specified terms and conditions.

[3] The treaties to which the United States is a signatory are a part of the fundamental law, binding upon all officials and all governmental institutions. Art. I, sec. 2, clause 2, of the U.S. Constitution confers power upon the President to make treaties with the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate. Art. VI, clause 2, of the U.S. Constitution provides that treaties so made, together with the Constitution and the laws of the United States made pursuant thereto, are "the Supreme Law of the Land." *Missouri* v. *Holland*, 252 U.S. 416, 432–434; *Hines* v. *Davidowitz*, 312 U.S. 52, 62–63; *United States* v. *Pink*, 315 U.S. 203, 230–231; *Clark* v. *Allen*, 331 U.S. 503–508.

[4] The constitutional validity of the "Uniting for Peace" resolution adopted in 1950, is disputed.

[5] In support of his views, Professor Jessup noted:

"The documentary record of the discussions at San Francisco does not afford conclusive evidence that the suggested, interpretation of the words 'armed attack' in Article 51 is correct, but the general tenor of the discussions, as well as the careful choice of words throughout Chapters VI and VII of the Charter relative to various stages of aggravation of dangers to the peace, support the view stated." (Jessup, "A Modern Law of Nations," p. 166.)

In expressly limiting independent military action to instances of armed attack, the founding nations explicitly and implicitly rejected the right to the use of force based on the familiar claim of "anticipatory self-defense," or "intervention by subversion," or "pre-emptive armed attack to forestall threatened aggression," and similar rationale. Such concepts were well known to the founding nations if only because most of the wars of history had been fought under banners carrying or suggesting these slogans. More importantly for our purposes here, however, the United States was aware of these precepts before the Senate ratified the United Nations Charter and consciously acquiesced in their rejection as a basis for independent armed intervention.[8]

It has been authoritatively said that the exceptional circumstances stipulated in article 51 are "clear, objective, easy to prove and difficult to misinterpret or to fabricate".[9] The wording was deliberately and carefully chosen.[10][11]

Hence article 51 can under no circumstances afford a justification for U.S. intervention in Vietnam, since the Saigon regime is indisputably not a member of the United Nations and, indeed, under the Geneva Accords of 1954, South Vietnam is merely a temporary zone not even qualifying politically as a state (See Section II infra), even if it be assumed that an "armed attack," within the meaning of article 51, has occurred against South Vietnam. For, as has been shown, article 51 is operative only in the event of "an armed attack against a member of the United Nations." Hence, neither the right of individual self-defense nor the right of collective [11] self-defense can become operative.

It has been claimed that United States intervention in Vietnam is sanctioned under article 51 on the ground (1) that South Vietnam is an independent state; (2) that South Vietnam had been the victim of an armed attack from North Vietnam and (3) that the United States, with the consent of South Vietnam, was engaging in "collective self-defense" of that country, as claimed by the United States in a communication to the United Nations Security Council in March 1965 (U.N. Chronicle, vol. 2, p. 22). To sustain this claim, all three elements must be satisfied.

This claim is untenable, however, on several grounds. First, South Vietnam was not recognized as an independent state at the 1954 Geneva Conference (see sec. II, infra). Even if it had become a de facto state in the course of events since 1954, the infiltrations from North Vietnam cannot be deemed to constitute an "armed attack" within the purview of article 51.

Since the Geneva Accords recognized all of Vietnam as a single state, the conflict whether of the Vietcong or Ho Chi Minh against South Vietnam is "civil strife" and foreign intervention is forbidden, because civil strife is a domestic question—a position insisted upon by the United States in its civil war of 1861. Ho Chi Minh can compare his position in demanding union of Vietnam with that of Lincoln, when Britain and France were threatening to intervene to assure the independence of the Confederacy (and with the added point that the national elections mandated for 1956 in the Geneva Accords were frustrated by South Vietnam with apparent support of the United States; see sec. II, infra). Nor should it be overlooked that Lincoln had very little support from the people of the South, who generally supported the Confederacy, while Ho Chi Minh has a great deal of support from the people in South Vietnam organized in the National Liberation Front whose military arm is the Vietcong. There is, therefore, a basic issue whether the hostilities in Vietnam constitute external aggression (by North Vietnam) or "civil strife." Here it should be noted that the United Nations is authorized to intervene where civil strife threatens international peace, as the United Nations did in the Congo, in accord with article 39 of the charter—but individual states are not permitted to intervene unilaterally.

The third element requisite for the invocation of the right of collective self-defense under Article 51 presupposes that the nations invoking such right are properly members of a regional collective system within the purview of the United Nations Charter. The point here involved is: Can the United States validly be a genuine member of a regional system covering southeast Asia. Article 51 and Article 53, dealing with regional systems, were interrelated amendatory provisions intended primarily to integrate the inter-American system with the United Nations organization (see fn. 8, 13, 15). The concept that the United States—a country separated by oceans and thousands of miles from southeast Asia and bereft of any historical or ethnic connection with the peoples of southeast Asia—could validly be considered a member of a regional system implanted in southeast Asia is utterly alien to the regional systems envisaged in the charter. The "Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty"—connecting the United States with southeast Asia, architectured by Secretary of State Dulles, is a legalistic artificial formulation to circumvent the fundamental limitations placed by the United Nations Charter on unilateral actions by individual members. However ingenuous—or disingenuous—the Dulles approach, SEATO is a caricature of the genuine regional systems envisaged by the U.N. Charter. A buffalo cannot be transformed into a giraffe however elongated its neck may be stretched. The Dulles approach to collective defense treaties employed legal artifice to circumvent the exclusive authority vested in the United Nations to deal with breaches in the peace. Articles 51 and 53 were intended to make a bona fide integration of regional systems of cooperation with the world system of international security—but these envisaged regional systems which historically and geographically developed into a regional community—not contemplating a regional system which fused a region like southeast Asia with a country on the North American Continent. SEATO is not a regional agency within the letter or spirit of the U.N. Charter as to authorize the United States to claim the right of collective self-defense even if there had been an armed attack on a member of the United Nations geographically located in southeast Asia. If artifices like SEATO were sanctioned, the path would be open for the emasculation of the United Nations organization and the world system of international security assiduously developed to prevent the scourge of war.

Hence article 51 cannot be properly invoked for (1) South Vietnam does not have the political status of a state; (2) even if South Vietnam were deemed a de facto state, the infiltrations do not constitute an "armed attack" within the purview of article 51; and (3) the United States cannot claim the right of "collective self-defense" in respect of a regional system involving southeast Asia.

Apart from article 51 (inapplicable to the situation here), the only other exception to the renunciation of the "threat or use of force" by member states is found in chapter VIII of the charter dealing with regional arrangements. Article 53 of said chapter contains two paragraphs of particular significance:

(a) "The Security Council shall, where appropriate, utilize such regional arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority. But no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council, with the exception of measures against an enemy state, as defined in paragraph 2 of this article." (Ch. VII, art. 53(1).)

Paragraph two of that article provides:

(b) "The term enemy state as used in paragraph 1 of this article applies to any state which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory of the present charter."

With respect to regional arrangements therefore, it is clear that no enforcement action may be undertaken without the authorization of the Security Council of the United Nations, save and except in only one instance; against any state which, during World War II, was an enemy of any of the charter,[12] to wit, Germany, Italy and Japan. Since Vietnam was manifestly not an "enemy state" within the purview of article 53(b), enforcement action under SEATO is unauthorized and cannot be justified in view of the express restrictions set out under article 53(a) of the United Nations Charter.

In summary, the United Nations Charter obligates all of its signatory members to refrain from the threat or use of force, and only the Security Council (apart from the residual authority (see footnote 4) granted the General Assembly under the "uniting for peace" resolution) is authorized to determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression and to determine the measures to be taken to maintain or restore international peace. To these salient provisions, there are only two exceptions: the first, the right to self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations; and, the second, the right of nations to enter into appropriate "regional arrangements," subject, however, to the provision that no enforcement action shall be taken under such arrangements without the authorization of the Security Council, the only exception to the latter requirement being with respect to measures against an enemy state, as defined in the charter.

---

[6] See, Louis Henkin (Professor of Law and International Law and Diplomacy, Columbia University), 57 "American Society of International Law Proceedings," 1963, at p. 152, Moore's "Digest of International Law," vol. II, p. 412.

[7] Henken, ibid.

[8] Hearings on U.N. Charter, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 79th Cong., 1st sess., July 9–13, 1945, at p. 210.

[9] Henkin, ibid.

[10][11] "* * * at the Conference itself, every word, every sentence, every paragraph of the Charter's text was examined and reconsidered by the representatives of 50 nations and much of it reworked." (Report to the President on the results of the San Francisco Conference [by the Chairman of the U.S. Delegation, i.e., the Secretary of State, June 26, 1945], hearings on U.N. Charter, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 79th Cong., 1st Sess., at p. 41.)

[12] The reason for this exception appears clear. When the charter was signed in San Francisco on June 26, 1945, peace treaties had not yet been finally signed by the allied nations with each of the enemy states. Reparations, sanctions, territorial changes, had not then been finalized. And so, in order to permit necessary flexibility in these respects, this sharply limited exception, permitting action against an enemy state in World War II by an allied government, was spelled out.

We have shown that none of the aforestated exceptions can be invoked by the U.S. Government with respect to its conduct in Vietnam. It follows therefore that the fundamental requirements of the United Nations Charter with respect to the renunciation of force and the threat of force are directly applicable to the actions of the United States.

One other noteworthy charter provision is article 103 which subordinates all regional and treaty compacts to the United Nations Charter.

"In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the members of the United Nations under the present charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present charter shall prevail." (Ch. XVI, art. 103.)

This supremacy clause was drafted to meet the predictable reassertion of dominance by the great powers within their respective geographic zones or hemispheres. Because of the unhappy history of a world fragmented by such "spheres of influence," the supremacy clause and the restrictions on the use of force under regional agreements emerge as limitations upon the superpowers even within their own geographic zones. It is significant that the United States not only accepted these limitations, but actively supported their incorporation within the charter.[13]

Article 103 makes clear that the obligations of the United Nations Charter prevail vis-a-vis the obligations of the SEATO treaty. Indeed, article VI of the SEATO expressly recognizes the supremacy of the United Nations Charter (see sec. II infra). Moreover the frequent citation by President Johnson of the pledges given by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and himself to aid South Vietnam afford no justification for U.S. intervention in Vietnam.[14] In the first place, these pledges or commitments do not even have the status of treaties, for these Presidential pledges have not been ratified by the Senate. And even if these Presidential pledges had been solemnly ratified by the Senate, any obligations thereunder must yield to the obligations imposed under the United Nations Charter by virtue of the supremacy clause embodied in article 103. Nor would the illegality of U.S. intervention in Vietnam be altered by the circumstance that the Saigon regime may have invited the United States to assume its role in the Vietnam conflict. The supremacy clause of the charter manifestly prevails and cannot be annulled by mutual agreement of third parties.

It is by virtue of the supremacy clause that the Secretary General of the United Nations has called the world's attention to the emasculation of the authority of the United Nations resulting from actions taken by regional agencies without reference to the Security Council.

We believe that any fair study of the United Nations Charter will affirm the observations of Prof. Lewis Henkin, of Columbia University, when he speaks "of the law of the charter":

"So far as it purports to prescribe for the conduct of nations, it consists, basically, of one principle: Except in self-defense against armed attack, members must refrain from the threat or use of force against other states * * * the rule of the charter against unilateral force in international relations is the essence of any meaningful concept of law between nations and the foundation on which rests all other attempts to regulate international behavior. It is a rule which all nations have accepted and which all have a common interest essential to law."[15]

It appears difficult to escape the conclusion therefore, in the light of the aforesaid, that the action of the U.S Government in Vietnam contravenes essential provisions of the United Nations Charter. The U.S. Government has decided for itself to use armed forces in South Vietnam and to bomb North Vietnam without authorization of the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations. The failure of the United States to honor its obligations under the United Nations Charter is a regrettable but inescapable conclusion which we as lawyers have been compelled to reach. We, as lawyers, urge our President to accept the obligations for international behavior placed upon us by our signature of the United Nations Charter.

II—THE UNITED STATES IN VIETNAM: THE 1954 GENEVA ACCORDS AND THE SEATO TREATY

Officials of the U.S. Government have nevertheless asserted, on different occasions, that the actions of the United States in Vietnam are consistent with the U.S. duties and obligations under the United Nations Charter and sanctioned by the treaty creating the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO).[16] The conduct of the U.S. Government has been justified as support of a legitimate government defending itself against insurrection from within and aggression from without. We have demonstrated above that even if this latter position were accepted on its face, unilateral conclusions and actions taken by the Government of the United States upon the basis of such conclusions are violative of the firm obligations under the United Nations Charter. However, we do not let the matter rest with this assertion, but proceed to an examination of the validity of the claims made by the U.S. Government in support of its conduct in Vietnam.

The Geneva agreement, under which the war between Vietnam and the French was terminated, effected the division of Vietnam into north and south, at the 17th parallel. The said "agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam," entered into in Geneva on July 20, 1954, provided that the division of Vietnam at the 17th Parallel was only "a provisional military demarcation line," on either side of which the opposing forces could be "regrouped"—"the forces of the Peoples Army of Vietnam to the north of the line and the forces of the French Union to the south" (ch. I, art. 1).[17]

---

[13] Hearings on U.N. Charter, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 79th Cong. 1st sess., supra, n. 6, at p. 306.

On May 15, 1945, Secretary of State Stettinus issued a statement at the San Francisco Conference regarding the Act of Chapultepec vis-a-vis the United Nations organization which declared (so far as here pertinent); Hearings on U.N. Charter, op. cit., p. 306;

"As a result of discussions with a number of interested delegations, proposals will be made to clarify in the charter the relationship of regional agencies and collective arrangements to the world organization.

"These proposals will—

"1. Recognize the paramount authority of the world organization in all enforcement action.

"2. Recognize that the inherent right of self-defense, either individual or collective, remains unimpaired in case the Security Council does not maintain international peace and security and an armed attack against a member state occurs. Any measures of self-defense shall immediately be reported to the Security Council and shall in no way affect the authority and responsibility of the Council under the charter to take at any time such action as it may deem necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.

"3. Make more clear that regional agencies will be looked to as an important way of settling local disputes by peaceful means."

The first point is already dealt with by the provision of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals (ch. VIII, sec. C, par. 2) which provides that no enforcement action will be taken by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council. It is not proposed to change this language.

The second point will be dealt with by an addition to chapter VIII of a new section substantially as follows:

"Nothing in this chapter impairs the inherent right of self-defense, either individual or collective, in the event that the Security Council does not maintain international peace and security and an armed attack against a member state occurs. Measures taken in the exercise of this right shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under this charter to take at any time such action as it may deem necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."

The third point would be dealt with by inclusion of a specific reference to regional agencies or arrangements in chapter VIII, sec. A, par. 3, describing the methods whereby parties to a dispute should, first of all, seek a peaceful solution by means of their own choice.

The United States delegation believes that proposals as above outlined if adopted by the Conference would, with the other relevant provisions of the projected charter, make possible a useful and effective integration of regional systems of cooperation with the world system of international security.

This applies with particular significance to the long established inter-American system.

[14] President Johnson, in his news conference of July 28, 1965, declared:

"Moreover, we are in Vietnam to fulfill one of the most solemn pledges of the American Nation. Three Presidents—President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and your present President—over 11 years have committed themselves and have promised to help defend this small and valiant nation" (Presidential Documents, vol. 1, No. 1, p. 15). President Eisenhower has stated that his administration had made no commitment to South Vietnam "in terms of military support on programs whatsoever" (the New York Times, Aug. 18, 1965, p. 1).

[15] Henkin, in 57 "American Society of International Law Proceedings," 1963, supra, n. 6, at p. 148. See also in further explication of Professor Henkin's succinct conclusion: Statements of Hon. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State, the testimony of Senator Millikin, and the testimony of Mr. Pasvolsky, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for International Organization and Security Affairs, in hearings on U.N. Charter, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 79th Cong., 1st sess., supra, n. 8, at pp. 34–147, 210, 95–100 and 304–307; Jessup, "A Modern Law of Nations" (1947); Proclamation of Athens and Declaration of General Principles for a World Rule of Law, adopted by the First World Conference on World Peace Through Law, Athens, Greece, July 6, 1963; Francis T. P. Plimpton, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, State Department Bulletin, vol. XLIX, No. 1278, Dec. 23, 1963, pp. 978–979.

[16] Geneva Conf. Doc. No. IC/42/Rev. 2, in 1 "American Foreign Policy"; 1950–55 Basic Documents 750; New York Times, July 24, 1954, p. 4.

[17] It is relevant to note that at the time this provision was agreed upon, the Vietminh occupied all but a few "islands" of territory to the north of the 17th parallel as well as approximately two-thirds of the territory south of that line. See map showing areas of South Vietnam under Vietminh control at end of May 1953 in Henri Navarre, "Agonie de L'Indo-Chine" (1953–54) (Paris,

The Geneva agreement makes plain that the division of the 17th parallel was to be temporary and a step in the preparation for a general election to elect a government for a unified nation. Pending such election, "civil administration in each regrouping zone [was to] be in the hands of the party whose forces are to be regrouped there" [art. 14(a)].

The day after the aforesaid cease-fire agreement was entered into, representatives of Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (Vietminh), Laos, France, the Peoples Republic of China, the U.S.S.R., and the United Kingdom affirmed The Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference on the Problems of Restoring Peace in Indochina, July 21, 1954.[18] The declaration emphasized that the north-south division was solely a means of ending the military conflict and not the creation of any political or territorial boundary. Article 6 of the declaration stated:

"The Conference recognizes that the essential purpose of the agreement relating to Vietnam is to settle military questions with a view to ending hostilities and that the military demarcation line is provisional and shall not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary."

This constitutes a recognition of the historical fact that Vietnam is a single nation, divided into two zones only temporarily for administrative purposes pending an election. This being so, the action of the North Vietnamese in aiding the South Vietnamese, to the extent that it has taken place, neither affect the character of the war as a civil war nor constitutes foreign intervention. It cannot be considered an armed attack by one nation on another.

The United States is in fact a foreign nation vis-a-vis Vietnam; North Vietnam is not. The latter by the Geneva Agreement was to participate in an election not to determine whether North and South Vietnam should be united, but to select a government of the nation of Vietnam, constituting all of Vietnam—north, south, east, and west. It was the refusal on the part of the Diem regime and the subsequent "governments" of the south, supported by the United States, to participate in such elections that opened the door to the present conflict.

It was also stated in the declaration that the clear objective of settling political problems and unifying the nation was to be by means of free general elections. Article 7 of the declaration provided:

"The Conference declares that so far as Vietnam is concerned, the settlement of political problems effected on the basis of respect for the principles of independence, unity and territorial integrity, shall permit the Vietnamese people to enjoy the fundamental freedoms, guaranteed by democratic institutions established as a result of free general elections by secret ballot. In order to insure that sufficient progress in the restoration of peace has been made, and that all the necessary conditions obtain for free expression of the national will, national elections shall be held in July 1956, under the supervision of an International Commission."[19]

The reference to "national elections" reinforces the evidence of the historical status of Vietnam as a single nation. To present the picture, as the United States repeatedly has done, as though North Vietnam were an interloper having no organic relationship to South Vietnam is to ignore both the applicable legal principles and treaties and the facts of history.

Although the United States participated in the discussion leading up to the Geneva accords, it did not sign the final declaration. Instead, the U.S. Government, through its Under Secretary of State, Walter Bedell Smith, made its own unilateral declaration[20] on July 21, 1954. In this declaration, the United States took note of the Geneva agreements and declared that the United States would "refrain from threat or the use of force to disturb them, in accordance with article 2(4) of the Charter of the United Nations dealing with the obligation of members to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force."

Referring to free elections in Vietnam, the United States declaration stated:

"In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through elections supervised by the United Nations to insure that they are conducted fairly."[21]

Thus the United States recognized the fact that Vietnam was a single nation. Nevertheless the justification of United States policy today ignores this admitted fact. The United States persists in its denial that it is intervening in a civil war. It seeks to justify the bombing of North Vietnam by the United States on the basis that North Vietnam is a foreign aggressor in South Vietnam.

Nor is this all. The United States further pledged "that it will not join in any arrangement which will hinder" the reunification of Vietnam, and concluded with the hope that:

"The agreement will permit Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam to play their part, in full independence and sovereignty in the peaceful community of nations, and will enable the peoples of the area to determine their own future."

No election was ever held pursuant to the Geneva Accords, although both the International Control Commission (composed of India, Poland, and Canada) and the United Nations announced readiness to supervise such elections. South Vietnam announced that it did not regard itself obliged to take part in the elections because the participation of North Vietnam would render such elections not free, a position apparently supported by the State Department.[22] In 1955, following the Geneva Accords, then Prime Minister of State Diem repudiated the Geneva Agreements and refused to hold the elections. Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his Memoirs, suggests a further reason for Diem's refusal to hold elections pursuant to the Geneva Accords:

"I have never talked or corresponded with a person knowledgeable in Indo Chinese affairs who did not agree that had elections been held at the time of the fighting possibily 80 percent of the population would have voted for the Communist Ho Chi Minh as their leader rather than Chief of State Bao Dai.[23]

The consequences of the repudiation of the Geneva Accords were delineated by Senator ERNEST GRUENING in a speech to the Senate on April 9, 1965:

"That civil war began—let me repeat, because this is crucial to the issue—when the Diem regime—at our urging—refused to carry out the provision contained in the Geneva Agreement of 1954 to hold elections for the reunification of Vietnam. That was one of the underlying conditions of the Geneva agreement. The civil war began and has continued with intensified fury ever since * * *. For over 800 years, before its conquest by France, Vietnam was a united country. After defeating the French in 1954, the Vietnamese went to the conference table at Geneva, agreeing to a settlement only on condition that reunification elections be held. Yet, nowhere in President Johnson's speech of April 7, 1965, at Johns Hopkins University is there held out a hope of ultimate reunification of Vietnam. He conditioned the ultimate peace 'upon an independent South Vietnam instead'."

In view of all of the aforesaid, the assumptions and justifications for our governmental policy in Vietnam do not appear to have support, either in law or in fact. The conduct of the U.S. Government in Vietnam appears plainly to violate the terms of the Geneva Accords and to repudiate solemn pledges to "refrain from the threat or the use of force" to disturb the Geneva Accords.

Moreover, nothing in the provisions of the southeast Asian Collective Defense Treaty would appear to justify the conduct of the U.S. Government in Vietnam. The SEATO Treaty was signed in Manila some 7 weeks after the signing of the Geneva Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Vietnam. The SEATO Treaty became effective in Feb-

---

1956) p. 37. Thus, by the cease-fire agreement the Vietminh gave up substantial areas of territory in what is now called South Vietnam.

An article in the New Republic, May 22, 1965, p. 29, by the Honorable Henry W. Edgerton, senior circuit judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, brilliantly delineates the provisional character of the "Government" of South Vietnam and casts doubt on the juridical claim to the existence of that government.

[18] See "Further Documents Relating to the Discussion of Indo-China at the Geneva Conference" June 16–July 21, 1954 (London) (Her Majesty's Stationery Office, Cmd 9239), 1954 (referred to as "Geneva Accords"). The French-sponsored Bao Dai regime, which was not endowed as yet with any real political substance, did not sign the Geneva accord; not until 1956 did France relinquish control over South Vietnam; the Republic of Vietnam was proclaimed on Oct. 26, 1955, but French troops were not completely evacuated from the country until Nov. 1, 1956.

[19] Note that article 7 stipulates that the elections were to be antecedent to and a necessary condition for the "fundamental freedoms, guaranteed by democratic institutions" and that the elections were to be held "in order to insure * * * that all the necessary conditions obtain for free expression of the national will." This particular portion of the Geneva Accord has frequently been quoted out of context, with the key phrases in reverse order, in order to justify the refusal to hold elections on the grounds that the necessary conditions did not exist.

[20] See "Extracts From Verbatim Records of Eighth Plenary Session," Geneva Accords.

[21] Nowhere in its own declaration did the United States recognize the political partition of Vietnam; insofar as it referred to the country, it designated it as "Vietnam," not "South Vietnam" and "North Vietnam."

[22] See, Question No. 7, "Questions and Answers on Vietnam," Department of State publication No. 7724, August 1964, p. 8. See also footnote 19, George McT. Kahin and John W. Lewis, professors of government at Cornell University, in their article, "The United States in Vietnam," which appeared in the June 1965 issue of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, note (op. cit. p. 31):

"When on July 16, 1955, the Diem government announced, with American backing, that it would defy the provision calling for national elections, it violated a central condition which had made the Geneva Accords acceptable to the Vietminh. Regardless of what sophistry has been employed to demonstrate otherwise, in encouraging this move the United States departed from the position taken in its own unilateral declaration. And France in acquiescing abandoned the responsibility which she had unequivocally accepted a year earlier."

(Citing—Allan B. Cole, ed., "Conflict in Indo-China and International Repercussions," a documentary history, 1945–1955 (Ithaca, N.Y.) 1956, pp. 226–228; and Donald Lancaster, "The Emancipation of French Indo-China" (Oxford, 1961), pp. 370–372.

[23] Dwight D. Eisenhower, "Mandate for Change: The White House Years, 1953–1956" (London, 1963), p. 372.

ruary 1955, following the treaty ratification by eight member states—the United States, France, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, Pakistan, and the Philippine Islands.

By the preamble and by article I of the SEATO Treaty, the parties acceded to the principles and supremacy of the United Nations Charter in accordance with article 103 thereof, which it will be recalled, provides as follows:

"In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the members of the United Nations under the present charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present charter shall prevail."

The supremacy of this provision was expressly reiterated by the eight SEATO nations under article VI of said treaty, in which each solemnly agreed that the SEATO Treaty:

"* * * does not affect the rights and obligations of any of the parties under the Charter of the United Nations, or the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security."

The key provisions of the SEATO Treaty are to be found in article IV. Paragraph 1 thereof permits the use of force by one or more member states only in the event of "aggression by means of armed attack." But where the integrity or inviolability of any territory covered by the treaty is threatened "by other than armed attack" or "by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area," then, paragraph 2 of article IV requires, as a prerequisite to intervention, that "the parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures to be taken. * * *"

The consent of all eight SEATO nations was originally required before any military action under article IV could be undertaken by any of them (New York Times, May 28, 1962). Later, this rule was modified so that action could be undertaken if there was no dissenting vote—i.e., an abstention would not count as a veto (New York Times, April 19, 1964). At the last two annual meetings of the Ministerial Council of SEATO, France has refused to support a communique pledging SEATO backing for South Vietnam against the Vietcong (New York Times, April 15-16, 1964; May 3-6, 1965; see also, Los Angeles Times, May 3-4, 1965). It would appear that with the threat of a French veto a formal SEATO commitment in Vietnam has not been sought by the United States. However, even if there had been unanimity among the SEATO nations, the provisions of article 53 of chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter will still prevail:

"But no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council. * * *"

Manifestly, no such authorization has ever been conferred, either by the Security Council of the United Nations, or by the General Assembly, from which it follows that American action in Vietnam clearly cannot be supported by reference to SEATO.

So long as the United States remains a member of the United Nations, our right to intervene is circumscribed by the provisions of the United Nations Charter. As members of SEATO, our right to intervene is limited, both by the requirement for unanimity among all of the eight treaty nations and, in addition, by the superseding requirement of article 53 of chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, prohibiting any enforcement action under a regional arrangement without the authority of the Security Council. Our justification for acting contrary to our solemn obligations under the United Nations Charter appears tenuous and insubstantial. The fact of the matter is that the U.S. Government has simply acted as its own judge of its own interests in patent disregard of the fundamental law embodied in the United Nations Charter.

III—CONSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS OF UNITED STATES INTERVENTION IN VIETNAM

This disregard of the rules of the charter, inherent in U.S. intervention in Vietnam, is compounded by the fact that such intervention is also violative of our own Constitution. Whatever doubts may have existed prior to the President's "Report to the Nation Following a Review of U.S. Policy in Vietnam" [21] (set out at his news conference on July 28, 1965), as to whether U.S. action in Vietnam constituted the conduct of a war, the President in that report made it explicitly clear that "this is really war," noting that "our fighting strength" was being raised from 75,000 to 125,000 "almost immediately" and that "additional forces will be needed later, and they will be sent as requested." Can the President's conduct be squared with our Constitution (apart from the obligations imposed upon member states by the United Nations Charter)?

It is the genius of our constitutional system that ours is a government of checks and balances. A dangerous concentration of power is avoided by the separation—in Articles I, II, and III of the Constitution—of the legislative, executive, and judicial powers. The doctrine of "separation of powers" is fundamental to, and is one of the "great structural principles of the American constitutional system." [25] The Supreme Court has recently characterized this "separation of powers" as "a bulwark against tyranny," *United States* v. *Brown — U.S.* —, 33 Law Week 4603 (June 7, 1965). The Supreme Court had earlier said:

"The power to make the necessary laws is in Congress; the power to execute in the President. Both powers imply many subordinate powers. Each includes all authority essential to its due exercise. But neither can the President, in war more than in peace, intrude upon the proper authority of Congress, nor Congress upon the proper authority of the President." Ex parte Milligan, 4 Wall 2, 139 (1866).

Classically stated by Blackstone [26] and derived from Plato, Aristotle, Polybius, Cicero, Machiavelli, Harrington, Locke, and Montesquieu,[27] this constitutional separation of powers was deliberately carried over by the Framers into the conduct of foreign affairs. For, contrary to widely held assumptions, the power to make and conduct foreign policy is not vested exclusively in the President, but is divided between him and Congress, with each endowed with complementary, but separate [28] powers and responsibilities.[29]

Thus, in making and carrying out general foreign policy, Article II, Section 2 requires the President to have the "Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." And the President also requires the advice and consent of the Senate to "appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls."

When statecraft fails and the question becomes the ultimate one of war or peace, the Constitution imposes a tight rein upon the President. His participation ends at the threshold of the decision whether or not to declare war. Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 11, that power is confided exclusively to the Congress.[30] There is no mention of the President in connection with the power to "declare war." Under the Constitution, Congress alone must make this decision. The Clause does not read "on recommendation of the President," nor that the "President with advice and consent of Congress may declare war." As former Assistant Secretary of State James Grafton Rogers has observed: "The omission is significant. There was to be no war unless Congress took the initiative." Rogers, "World Policing and The Constitution," p. 21 (Boston, 1945).

"Nothing in our Constitution is plainer than that declaration of war is entrusted only to Congress." *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company* v. *Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579, 642 (1952) (Jackson, J.).

That the President lacks constitutional power to make war is underscored by the historic statement made by President Woodrow Wilson on the night of April 2, 1917, when he addressed the Congress in a joint session:

"I have called the Congress into extraordinary session because there are serious, very serious, choices of policy to be made, and made immediately, which it was neither right nor constitutionally permissible that I should assume the responsibility of making." [31]

President Franklin Roosevelt also heeded his constitutional responsibilities and was also mindful and sensitive of the constitutional limitations applicable to the President when, before a joint session of the Congress on December 7, 1941, he requested the Congress for a declaration of war following Pearl Harbor.

---

[24] Presidential Documents, vol. 1, No. 1 (Aug. 2, 1965), pp. 15–19. See also State Department bulletin, April 26, 1965, p. 606; State Department bulletin, May 24, 1965, passim; State Department bulletin, May 31, 1965, p. 838, Krock, "By Any Other Name, It's Still War," New York Times, June 10, 1965.

[25] Corwin, "The President: Office and Powers" (New York, 1957), p. 9.

[26] Blackstone, "Commentaries on the Law of England," 146 (7th ed. 1775).

[27] Cf., Sharp, The Classical American Doctrine of "Separation of Powers", 2 U. of Chi. L. Rev. 385 (1935).

[28] "One of the most striking facts in the institutional philosophic history of the United States (is) that the legislative-executive quarrels during the colonial period convinced the colonists of the desirability of a separation of powers rather than a union of powers." Wright "Consensus and Continuity," p. 17 (Boston, 1958).

"The doctrine of separated powers is implemented by a number of constitutional provisions, some of which entrust certain jobs exclusively to certain branches, while others say that a given task is not to be performed by a given branch." *United States* v. *Brown*, supra—U.S., 33 Law Week, at p. 4605.

[29] Story, "Commentaries on the Constitution" (Boston, 1833), passim, Dahl, "Congress and Foreign Policy" (New Haven, Conn., 1950); Robinson, "Congress and Foreign Policy-Making: A Study in Legislative Influence and Initiative" (Ill., 1962).

[30] Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 of the Constitution reads:

"The Congress shall have the power:

* * * * *

"1. To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water."

[31] President Wilson went on to say:

"With a profound sense of the solemn and even tragical character of the step I am taking and of the grave responsibilities which it involves, but in unhesitating obedience to what I deem my constitutional duty, I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the Government and people of the United States; that it formally accept the status of belligerent which has thus been thrust upon it; and that it take immediate steps not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defense but also to exert all its power and employ all its resources to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war."

The decision to place the responsibility for declaring war exclusively in Congress as the direct representative of the people, and not even to provide for the President's participation in that decision was a most deliberate one by the Framers.

The Constitutional Convention had been urged to rest the power to declare war, the "last resort of sovereigns, ultima ratio regum," in the executive, or, alternatively, in the Senate. 3 Story, "Commentaries on the Constitution," par. 1166. The arguments were made that "large bodies necessarily move slowly" and "despatch, secresy, and vigor are often indispensable, and always useful towards success." Story, ibid.

When the issue was debated at the Convention, Mr. Gerry stated that he "never expected to hear in a republic a motion to empower the Executive alone to declare war." Madison and Gerry "moved to insert 'declare,' striking out 'make' war; leaving to the Executive the power to repel sudden attacks." The motion carried. Farrand ed., "Records of the Federal Convention" (New Haven, 1911), II, pp. 318–319.[32]

Nowhere in the debates is there support for the view that the President can wage a war or "commit" our Nation to the waging of a war. On the contrary, warmaking was to be a purely legislation prerogative. The only use of force without a declaration of war that was contemplated as the debates clearly show, was "to repel sudden attacks."[33]

These constitutional provisions that only Congress shall have the power to declare war and that Congress has the sole responsibility to raise and support the armies, to provide for a navy, and to impose the taxes to provide the funds to carry on a war, reflected a profound distrust of executive authority and a corresponding reliance upon the legislature as the instrument for the decisionmaking in this vital area. Bemis, "The Diplomacy of the American Revolution" (New York, 1935), pp. 29–35.

These provisions reflected things painfully learned during the early colonial period, when every major European war had its counterpart on the American frontiers. The Colonies were therefore determined to end the imperial authority to decide for them what wars they should enter and what the outcome of those wars should be. Savelle, "The American Balance of Power, and the European Diplomacy 1713–78," in Morris ed., "The Era of the American Revolution" (New York, 1939), pp. 140–169.

The Convention was not only determined to deny warmaking power to the President, but was also unwilling to entrust it to the Senate alone. To assure the fullest consideration, the Framers therefore provided that the House of Representatives, larger and more representative than the Senate, should also be brought in to decide this vital question. The action and decision of the whole Congress were therefore constitutionally made necessary to this fateful undertaking.

"The Constitution says, therefore, in effect, 'Our country shall not be committed formally to a trial of force with another nation, our people generally summoned to the effort and all the legal consequences to people, rights and property incurred until the House, Senate and the President agree.'" Rogers, "World Policing and the Constitution" (Boston, 1945), p. 35.

Concededly there have been many instances, when the President has sent U.S. Armed Forces abroad without a declaration of war by Congress.[34] These have ranged from engagements between pirates and American ships on the high seas to the dispatch of our Armed Forces to Latin American countries.

These precedents cannot justify the present actions without bringing to mind Swift's comment on "precedents" in "Gulliver's Travels":

"It is a maxim among these lawyers, that whatever hath been done before, may legally be done again; and therefore they take special care to record all the decisions formerly made against common justice and the general reason of mankind. These, under the name of precedents, they produce as authorities to justify the most iniquitous opinions; and the judges never fail to directing accordingly."

Here it is important to distinguish our country's involvement in the Korean war. For the United States fought under the aegis of the United Nations pursuant to a definitive resolution of the Security Council authorizing and directing the employment of Armed Forces of member states, so that the United States was thus performing its solemn obligations undertaken in becoming a signatory of the United Nations Charter, a treaty which is the "Supreme Law of the Land." But in the Vietnamese situation, there has been no authorization by the Security Council; indeed the Security Council has not even been seized of the matter, has not been requested to entertain jurisdiction of the present conflict.

It is therefore unfortunately vitally necessary, although trite, to recall that "the Government of the United States has been emphatically termed a government of laws, and not of men." *Marbury* v. *Madison*, 1 Cr. 137 (1803). Under a government of laws, the President is not free from the checks of the Constitution of the United States; the President is not free to assume the powers entrusted solely to the Congress. Ours is not a government of executive supremacy.[35]

Here it is fitting to recall that on May 6, 1954, at a time when the fall of Dien Bien Phu was imminent, then Senator Lyndon Johnson, as Democratic leader of the Senate, at a Jefferson-Jackson dinner, criticized the Eisenhower administration in these terms:

"We will insist upon clear explanations of the policies in which we are asked to cooperate. We will insist that we and the American people be treated as adults—that we have the facts without sugar coating.

"The function of Congress is not simply to appropriate money and leave the problem of national security at that."[36]

A New York Times survey (June 14, 1965) reports widespread "uneasiness" over the President's foreign policies: that the American academic world "is intellectually and emotionally alienated from the President, to whom it gave such strong support in the election"; that there is "increasing—and mutual—hostility between the President and many segments of the press"; that many Democratic Members of Congress are "restive and unhappy * * * over what they regard as [the President's] high-handed manner of making and carrying out decisions on foreign affairs"; that many friendly governments abroad "are apprehensive about Mr. Johnson's use of national power"; that among these views are expressions of "dismay," the unreliability of CIA and FBI reports which the President accepted, the lack of clear policy, the disregard of "principles, support or advice."

It is therefore imperative that Congress guard zealously against any executive usurpation of its exclusive power to declare, or to decline to declare war.

President Johnson has not been unmindful of the damaging consequences inherent in the violation of the separation of powers. As recently as August 21, 1965 the President vetoed a $1.7 billion military construction bill, calling it "repugnant to the Constitution." In a stern message to Congress, the President described certain sections of the bill as clear violations of the "separation of powers"; warned Congress to stop meddling in the prerogatives of the executive branch (New York Times, August 21, 1965, p. 1). Yet the President has not hesitated to intrude upon the exclusive power vested in Congress to declare war.

IV—CONGRESS HAS NOT DECLARED WAR IN VIETNAM; ITS JOINT RESOLUTIONS ARE NEITHER A SUBSTITUTE FOR A DECLARATION OF WAR NOR DO THEY MAKE PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S WARMAKING CONSTITUTIONAL

Congress has not declared war in Vietnam and the President does not claim that any declaration of war supports his actions in Vietnam. In fact, the President is reported to be extremely reluctant to ask Congress directly to declare war.[37] Instead, the President is reported (New York Times, June 19, 1965, p. 10) to believe that authority for his actions may be inferred or extracted from the Tonkin Bay Joint Resolution of August 6–7, 1964 (H.J. Res. 1145; Public Law 88–408, 78 Stat., 384, 88th Cong., 2d sess.) and the Joint Resolution of May 7, 1965 (H.J. Res. 447; Public Law 89–18; 79 Stat. 109, 89th Cong., 1st sess.) making a supplemental appropriation to the Defense Department for the Vietnam operations.

The Tonkin Bay resolution is not a declaration of war. At most, it is an ultimatum—if that. It "approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression." It goes on to express the view that "the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia 'is vital' to the national interests of the United States" and declares the readiness of the United States to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed forces, to assist any member or protocol SEATO state to defend its freedom. The resolution, however, provides that all such steps shall be "consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty."

---

[32] The Framers concluded and provided that "the power of declaring war is not only the highest sovereign prerogative; but that it is in its own nature and effects so critical and calamitous, that it requires the utmost deliberation, and the successive review of all the councils of the nation. War, in its best estate, never fails to impose upon the people the most burdensome taxes, and personal sufferings. It is always injurious and sometimes subversive of the great commercial, manufacturing, and agricultural interests. Nay, it always involves the prosperity, and not infrequently the existence of a nation. It is sometimes fatal to public liberty itself, by introducing a spirit of military glory, which is ready to follow, wherever a successive commander will lead; and in a republic whose institutions are essentially founded on the basis of peace, there is infinite danger that war will find it both imbecile in defense, and eager for contest. Indeed, the history of republics has but too fatally proved, that they are too ambitious of military fame and conquest, and too easily devoted to the views of demagogs, who flatter their pride and betray their interests. It should therefore be difficult in a republic to declare war; but not to make peace." Story op. cit., § 1166.

[33] Manifestly the residuary power left to the President—"to repel sudden attack" contemplated attacks on the country's geographical territory—not "sudden attacks" in far-off lands, such as southeast Asia. Cf. Tonkin Bay Joint Resolution of Aug. 6–7, 1964, discussed in section IV, infra.

[34] See U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and Committee on Armed Services, hearing, "Situation in Cuba," 87th Cong., 2d sess., Sept. 17, 1962 (Washington, G.P.O., 1962), pp. 82–87; Rogers, op. cit., especially pp. 93–123.

[35] "With all its defects, delays, and inconveniences, men have discovered no technique for long preserving free government except that the executive be under the law, and that the law be made by parliamentary deliberations," Mr. Justice Jackson, concurring in *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company* v. *Sawyer*, supra, 343 U.S. at 655 (1952).

[36] Jackson, "Role and Problems of Congress with Reference to Atomic War," May 17, 1954, publication No. L 54–135, Industrial College of the Armed Forces.

[37] Wall Street Journal, June 17, 1965, "The U.S. May Become More Candid on Rising Land-War Involvement," pp. 1, 16.

It is clear that Congressmen who voted for the Tonkin Bay Joint Resolution were not voting a declaration of war in Vietnam. The resolution does not mention North Vietnam nor China; indeed it does not even mention Vietnam. It was "passed in the fever of indignation that followed reported attacks by North Vietnamese torpedo boats against U.S. fleet units in Tonkin Bay." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 10, page 12990. There is no evidence that Congress thought or understood that it was declaring war. It took no contemporaneous action which would have implemented a declaration of war. And the remarks of several Members of the House and Senate during and since the debate on the resolution reinforce the conclusion that the Tonkin Bay Resolution was not regarded as a declaration of war. Congress manifestly cannot delegate to the President its exclusive power to declare war; and even under the specific terms of the Tonkin Bay Resolution, the President's actions neither conform nor are consonant with the Constitution—and, as we have seen in the earlier analysis, the President's actions are not consonant with the Charter of the United Nations, nor with the SEATO Treaty.

In passing the May 7, 1965, resolution, authorizing a supplemental appropriation for the Vietnam operations, Congress was confronted with a fait accompli which severely circumscribed its action. Its constitutional check on the will or errors of the Executive was by the President's message, reduced to its power of the purse. Such a circumscription will not necessarily prevent unwise or unpopular decisions or allow for the exercise of the full discretion which the Constitution intended Congress to have, and for it alone to exercise. Nevertheless, a resolution authorizing an appropriation does not constitute a declaration of war, nor can it constitutionally authorize the President to wage an undeclared war.

The presidential assumption of powers vested exclusively in the Congress concern arrogations of power which convert republican institutions, framed for the purpose of guarding and securing the liberties of the citizen, into a government of executive supremacy. If the Constitution has such elastic, evanescent character the provisions for its amendment are entirely useless; presidentially-determined expediency would become then the standard of constitutional construction.

Under the rule of law, compliance with the forms and procedures of the law are as imperative as compliance with the substance of the law. A lynching is a totally inadequate substitute for a trial, regardless of the guilt of the victim. What Mr. Justice Frankfurter wrote in another context is equally applicable here: "The history of liberty has largely been the history of observance of procedural safeguards." *McNabb* v. *United States,* 318 U.S. 332, 347 (1947).

Under our system, constitutional powers must be exercised in a constitutional manner by constitutionally established institutions. Disregard of fundamentals in an area concerning the highest sovereign prerogative affecting the very lives and fortunes of its citizens in the interest of a short term expediency undermines " 'constitutional morality' to such an extent that the maintenance of the order itself is endangered." Friedrich, "The Philosophy of Law in Historical Perspective," p. 216 (Chicago, 1963).

Finally, it cannot be overemphasized that even a declaration of war by the Congress would not negate the violations of our obligations assumed under the United Nations Charter or negate the violations of international law inherent in United States intervention in Vietnam.

Conclusion

A learned authority in international affairs has stated:

"Bluntly, all the rules about intervention are meaningless if every nation can decide for itself which governments are legitimate and how to characterize particular limited conflict. Unless we are prepared to continue a situation in which the legality of intervention will often depend upon which side of the fence you are on, and in which, therefore, our policy becomes one of countering force with force, we must be willing to refer questions of recognition (i.e., legitimacy of the government involved) and characterization of a disorder (i.e., whether an armed attack from abroad or a civil war) to some authority other than ourselves. The United Nations is the most likely candidate for the role." [38]

The United States has not observed the letter or spirit of its treaty obligations with respect to the action taken in Vietnam. World order and peace depend on the willingness of nations to respect international law and the rights of other nations. The United Nations is a symbol of the rejection of fatal policies which led to World War II, and an acceptance by the peoples of the world of the principles of collective security, and the avoidance of war and the use of armed forces in the settlement of differences between nations. The United Nations was intended to insure the preservation of international peace, security, and justice, through rules of law, binding upon all member nations. The fundamental condition for the effective functioning of the United Nations is the observance on the part of all signatory nations of the obligations assumed under the charter. Only in this way can the awesome potential of a third world war be prevented.

We have concluded that the U.S. Government is in violation of its treaty obligations under the U.N. Charter. We urge upon the Government that all steps be immediately taken to undo this illegality by an immediate return to an observance of the letter and spirit of the provisions of the U.N. Charter.

This is a solemn hour in history. We have a moral obligation to history to return to the high purposes and principles of the United Nations—to honor the pledges we solemnly assumed—to settle international disputes by peaceful means—to refrain in international relations from the threat or use of force.

At this fateful hour, we do well to recall the prophetic dream of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the architect of the United Nations, who upon his return from the Yalta Conference in his last address to the Congress in March 1945, said:

"The Crimea Conference * * * ought to spell the end of the system of unilateral action, the exclusive alliances, the spheres of influence, the balances of power, and all the other expedients that have been tried for centuries—and have always failed. We propose to substitute for all these, a universal organization in which all peace-loving nations will finally have a chance to join."

Should we not, 20 years after President Roosevelt's hopeful dream—20 years after the advent of the nuclear age with the awesome potentiality of incineration of our planet and the annihilation of our civilization and the culture of millenia—should we not "spell the end of the system of unilateral action * * * that has been tried for centuries—and has always failed"?

Mr. MORSE. In closing, I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana for the courtesies he has extended to me. It grieves me as much as he has told me it pains him that we find ourselves in such diametrically opposed positions on this issue, but it is our duty to follow the course of our judgment; and I hope that if anyone is planning to make a speech, he will extend to the Senator from Louisiana the cooperation of coming and making it tomorrow, rather than on Monday. There may be some instances in which Senators are not prepared to make their speeches tomorrow, but will be on Monday. I shall understand that also.

I yield the floor.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TOMORROW UNTIL 12 O'CLOCK NOON ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1966

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, while the Senator from Oregon is here, and before he leaves, I have agreed to everyone else's unanimous-consent requests today, and when we meet tomorrow, I am fully aware of the fact that it might be difficult to obtain a quorum, if someone cares to insist on it. I shall not insist that we stay in session, in the event that a quorum cannot be obtained.

I ask unanimous consent that when we meet tomorrow, in the event a quorum is not present, the Senate then stand in adjournment until noon on Monday.

Mr. MORSE. I think we certainly should do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SUPPLEMENTARY MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has made a very strong argument for his position. He has done so repeatedly. As one Senator, I have consistently disagreed with the full burden of that for which he contends.

The Senator made reference to the fact that an amendment was offered at the time when we had the resolution in August of 1964, authorizing the President to take all necessary steps to resist further aggression. The Senator said—and I assume he correctly quoted the debate; I have no reason to think otherwise—that an amendment was offered saying that we would send no troops there unless we were further provoked.

At the time of that resolution, Mr. President, even if that amendment had been agreed to, the President would still have been completely within the authorization had he put the same troops there that are there today, because when the forces of North Vietnam proceeded to react to the fact that the United States struck back at Communist aggression, the President would, in good conscience, have been in a position to say that we had been provoked, that this was outright, overt aggression by the forces of North Vietnam invading South Vietnam, and upon that basis, we would send into South Vietnam what forces were necessary to defeat the aggressor and stop his further aggression.

---

[38] Roger Fisher, professor of law at Harvard University, "Intervention: Three Problems of Policy and Law" found in Essays on Intervention, a publication of the Marshon Center for Education in National Security, Ohio State University Press, pp. 19–20.

The legislative history made at that time would have been well within the resolution, even if the Nelson amendment had been agreed to, as I understand it.

The Senator has made an eloquent argument that this Nation should go to the Security Council with this matter. It has gone to the Security Council, and we have seen what happened. Nothing. If the Security Council gets around to acting on it and making some recommendation, it would finally be vetoed by the Soviet Union. We knew that.

I suppose if the Security Council had been as it is was in earlier days, we would have been there sooner, as the Senator has suggested we should have been. But keep in mind, Mr. President, that the hopes the world entertained for the Security Council have been dashed by the Security Council a great number of times. I quit counting after it passed the 100 mark. The Security Council, nowadays, does not have the business that it had back in the early days of the United Nations, not really the volume of business that would have been anticipated, because the Soviet Union has completely frustrated it by repeated vetoes to the extent that people know in advance that the Soviet Union is going to veto the matter, and they are on notice about the futility of many peacekeeping measures for which the Security Council was organized. This causes me to ask: Why do we not disband the United Nations in part and relegate it to doing that which it is capable of doing and organize something better to take its place with regard to those things that it cannot do in the hope that the fallacies upon which the Security Council and the United Nations were organized might yet be achieved by something better organized to serve the purpose?

For example, I recall as a serviceman wearing our Navy's uniform, when the United Nations was being organized, listening to the discussions about the veto of the great powers in the Security Council. The question was being asked then, What would happen if the great powers could not work together, suppose the United States and the Soviet Union, Great Britain, France, or China were not able to work together, what would happen then? The answer was given, well, if these great powers cannot work together, nothing would happpen, nothing would be achieved. Thus, the whole thing was set up on the theory that the great powers would work together. Then we found that one of our allies in the war was intransigent and difficult to work with, and so determined to extend its domination over its neighbors that all efforts to make the United Nations work were being constantly frustrated by Russian vetoes. Over a period of time, we came to realize that we had to find some other way to try to achieve our objectives.

The United Nations gets credit for one big plus. When the Russians stomped out in anger and disgust at the sight of the Nationalist Chinese on the Security Council, contending that that seat should be occupied by the Red Chinese, during the period that they were not there, aggression occurred in South Korea. Hurrah—hurrah—for once, the Security Council was able to vote a meaningful resolution, which was the position of the United States to resist aggression from North Korea.

During that brief period, while the Soviets were out of the Security Council in protest, the United Nations did succeed in voting that something good might happen. The United States then proceeded to send its troops in, taking the casualties, and did 90 percent of the fighting. The allies that we had in the United Nations succeeding in doing 10 percent—with the United States paying their expenses, of course, for doing that 10 percent. Many of them were recipients of our aid at the time. However, we appreciated what they were able to do.

For some nations, it was a considerable effort, particularly for Turkey, which gave us substantial help. Turkey is a relatively small country, compared to our own.

In the case of Vietnam, we were on notice that if we went to the Security Council nothing would happen, that North Vietnam would throw our note back in our face when we approached them, to try to negotiate or reason with them, as we had tried to do before, and it would be vetoed by the Soviet Union.

As one of those who once served as a delegate to the United Nations, we were well aware of what would happen if all the friends of Red China would get together—the whole Communist bloc plus some smaller, backward nations where Chinese embassies were very active. They would all be on their feet vilifying the United States, saying every horrible thing that the tongue of man could turn to, which would be published and republished, along with all kinds of false charges and accusations that could be dreamed up by the small and backward countries. These Communist lies would be distributed by their polly parrot repeaters at great length and headlined across the Communist world and read wherever Communists could hope that it might have effect upon someone.

But, to please Senators—and when the Pope came out suggesting the same thing—the President decided to go along with them and have a try at this frustrating experience—and that is all it has been.

Thus, in the last analysis, we get down to the fact that if we are going to resist Communist aggression, the United Nations is not going to save us, Mr. President.

Somewhere along the line people have to have the courage to stand up and face aggression. When they sign a contract with someone and the other fellow breaks his word a hundred times, and does not perform in good faith once, we have to take the view that if the contract is not binding on the other fellow it is not binding on them.

That is our reaction to the so-called Geneva accords which the Senator has discussed, and which he will undoubtedly discuss again.

Mr. President, this Nation has many times placed its soldiers on the field of battle. I recall that the Constitution states that Congress shall declare war, but it is also clearly within the power of the Commander in Chief to put troops in the field of battle in the absence of a declaration of war. In other words, the Commander in Chief can make war, although Congress alone can declare war.

Now, we have committed acts of war more than 125 times in the absence of a prior declaration according to the document which was prepared for the joint Committees on Foreign Relations and the Armed Services, at the time the conduct of the war in Korea was being discussed.

In the absence of a declaration of war, when we were provoked we have either defended positions, put troops ashore somewhere, or engaged in fighting—many, many times.

I heard someone contend that the number is 175 rather than 125. In any event, it is a very large number.

Sometimes, we expressed our approval of the acts of the President, after the fact. In a small number of cases—it is a relatively small number, indeed, such as the declaration of war in World War II—did we actually declare war prior to the existence of a state of war between this Nation and some other nation.

Most declarations of war have declared that since a certain date—a date prior to the declaration—a state of war has existed between this Nation and some other nation.

In most instances, in passing a declaration of war, we have merely recognized the state of facts which have already existed at the same time, recognizing that the Commander in Chief already had the power to commit troops to action prior to a declaration of war by Congress.

The entire war in Korea was fought under such circumstances, without the declaration of war.

The late Senator Taft stood on the Republican side of the aisle repeatedly criticizing President Truman for putting our forces in Korea and keeping them there in the absence of a declaration of war by Congress. He was not one of those who objected when the troops were first sent in, but he made a logical, legal argument.

In the case of Vietnam, President Johnson was doing what he could to help the small nation of South Vietnam defend its independence. Our ships were there as a part of that effort. Our ships were attacked on the high seas by the North Vietnam torpedo boats and we struck back. Not only did we strike back, but we also struck at the bases from which those torpedo boats had come. That was an act of war.

In other words, it was an act of war by us, but it was provoked by the attack made upon us, which was also an act of war.

We then passed a resolution, stating first, that we approved of what the President had done.

Then, well recognizing that from North Vietnam could be expected a very severe reaction, knowing they might decide to do a great number of things, any one of which would be an act of war, either against us or against the friendly government in South Vietnam, we said that we further authorized the President to take whatever action he deemed necessary to resist further aggression.

I do not have the resolution in my hand at this moment, but as I read that resolution, it not only authorized the President to take whatever steps in his judgment were necessary to defeat and resist further aggression, but it gave him a mandate to do so. He was the judge of whether the steps he was taking were sufficient.

When the enemy troops marched down from North Vietnam, if, in the President's judgment, use of American troops was necessary to meet the threat from the troops sent down by North Vietnam, in my judgment the President had not only the right but the duty to use the forces this Nation had available to it to defeat the aggression that occurred.

Therefore, the President has violated no international agreements.

Article 51 of the United Nations Charter clearly states that any nation has a right to engage in collective self-defense. In fact, it states that nothing in the charter—which refers to every article in the United Nations Charter—would impair the right of any nation to engage in individual or collective self-defense.

We had a collective defense treaty involving the whole area of southeast Asia. We added to that treaty a protocol to include South Vietnam.

When the aggression occurred there, we had the treaty obligation to do certain things, with a certain amount of latitude. We had a right to decide how far to go. But we had no right to ignore the aggression.

When Congress passed the resolution last year with regard to the Gulf of Tonkin incident and the Communist aggression there, we expected that the Communists might strike back at us. We made specific reference to the southeast Asia collective defense treaty, saying that we felt that treaty was involved and it was our obligation to act under it.

The British, it is true, have not come in. The British have perhaps 50,000 troops in southeast Asia, in the Malayan States and elsewhere, defending the position of their Empire against Communist aggression and seeking to bring the people of that area into a self-governing status under which they will have free elections and rule themselves, hoping that the end of British colonialism will not mean the beginning of an existence under Communist slavery.

We signed the treaty. We made reference to the treaty. We have urged our allies to comply with the treaty. Five of them have sent help to Vietnam. One of them has sent a large number of troops.

However one may criticize our allies, whatever may be their weaknesses, with all the misapprehensions we may have about them, it is my judgment that any noncommunistic government is better than any Communist government on the face of the earth. I do not know of any anti-Communist government that I regard as being worse than a Communist government. If one can show me one that is, I would like him to point it out to me, because I would like to know of such a Communist government that is better able to or that offers better prospects for its people or for their aspirations for freedom than any anti-Communist government.

I would like to know what Communist government is better than any anti-Communist government. At least, in an anti-Communist government, if the citizens do not like the government, and it has all the faults that one can conceive of, the people can change it.

As a neophyte Senator, I remember all the things that were said against Chiang Kai-shek, and they impressed me. I wondered if the world would not be better off if he were defeated. Of course, I learned better.

Then we heard many things said against the Batista government. So Batista was thrown out. This Nation stood silently by and did not lift its hand in the last stages of the Batista government, when a Communist war of liberation was taking over.

There is an old saying:

> Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me.

We have seen how these wars of liberation work out. We should have learned that we should resist that kind of Communist takeover in the future.

We have a great many lawyers who agree with the position those on our side take. The Senator has said he has mustered some lawyers on his side. I assume he has. I put in the RECORD a list of international law professors, outstanding men, and those professors of international law agree with the argument I have made.

The American Bar Association voted by a vote of 279 to 0 in agreement with the position I have taken.

I agree that some one group of lawyers, or perhaps even a considerable number, might agree with the opposite side, but there are perhaps a hundred thousand lawyers of sorts in the country. When we consider that there was a unanimous vote by the American Bar Association, that is rather impressive to this Senator.

One Senator feels that this Government was acting unlawfully.

What we are doing, in my judgment, is in the finest traditions of America. We are helping a friend whom we have a treaty obligation to help resist aggression. We are helping that friend resist Communist aggression.

The last time I read the figures, and I am sure the number has increased by now, more than 50,000 innocent civilians in South Vietnam were murdered by the Communists because they did not want to swear allegiance to the Communists in South Vietnam—45,000 troops from South Vietnam have been killed fighting in battle for their country. A far greater number of them have been wounded in fighting for their country. When one compares the size of that country to the size of this country and considers the losses those people have sustained in fighting against the Communists, those losses are greater by comparison than the losses this Nation has ever sustained in any of the wars we have engaged in in our history. They even exceed the sacrifices made by both sides during the War Between the States, which, relatively speaking, was a war in which this Nation suffered its greatest losses.

So, Mr. President, whatever differences one may have, in support of our Government and in support of our men who are fighting there, I felt I should briefly state for the record how I feel about what this great Nation is doing to help those who deserve to be free and who are fighting to preserve and protect themselves from the snares of Communist slavery.

Every generation has been called upon in the history of this country to bear arms in defense of the Nation and in defense of freedom somewhere in the world.

While we regret that we must call upon our succeeding generation to do so it has been my privilege to observe the training of many of these young men and to see their spirit and courage.

There is no doubt in my mind that they will be entirely worthy of those who fought in the same great fighting units of which they are presently a part.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, February 26, 1966, at 10 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 25, 1966:

PEACE CORPS

Jack Hood Vaughn, of Virginia, to be Director of the Peace Corps.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Lincoln Gordon, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

George A. Avery, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years expiring June 30, 1968.

NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

Brig. Gen. Charles M. Duke, U.S. Army, to be member of the Advisory Board of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

Paul L. Sitton, of the District of Columbia, to be member of the Advisory Board of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299.

To be lieutenant colonels, Women's Army Corps

Bouton, Irma V., L195.
Brinegar, Maurine O., L531.
Deady, Virginia R., L167.
Howes, Alice N., L146.
Stout, Ariel E., L126.
Thompson, Ruth D., L121.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson Delivers Significant Address on Highway Beautification at American Road Builders National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on February 23, 1966, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson was the principal speaker at the American Road Builders Convention in Denver, Colo.

The theme of the 3-day conference of the highway construction industry and related industries was highway beautification, a field in which Mrs. Johnson has provided inspiring leadership. The significance of this conference was attested to by the presence on the program of Representatives GEORGE H. FALLON, chairman of the House Public Works Committee, and WILLIAM C. CRAMER, ranking minority member. Representing the administration were the Under Secretary for Transportation of the Department of Commerce, Alan S. Boyd, his Deputy, Lowell K. Bridwell, and Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator. Much of the credit for a successful conference belongs to Maj. Gen. Louis W. Prentiss, retired, executive vice president of the American Road Builders Association, deputy executive vice president, Burton F. Miller, other staff members, and all persons who spoke during the event.

Mrs. Johnson's address on the closing day of the convention was the high point of the meeting, as evidenced by an attendance of over 900 persons. The First Lady's commitment in this field was expressed not only in her penetrating remarks, but also in her willingness and desire to greet personally more than 700 guests in the receiving line.

I commend to Members of the Senate, Mrs. Johnson's concept of "the new slide rules of public values" to be applied not only to highway construction but to the entire range of public works. The First Lady's challenge to Government agencies to improve their relationships with the public is a matter of first-rate importance to us all. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of Mrs. Johnson's speech and my introductory remarks.

There being no objection, the speech and introductory remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, INTRODUCING MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT THE AMERICAN ROAD BUILDERS ASSOCIATION CONVENTION LUNCHEON SESSION, DENVER HILTON HOTEL, DENVER, COLO., FEBRUARY 23, 1966

The theme of this convention of the American Road Builders Association is timely in its emphasis on highway beautification.

These years of the middle and late 1960's will, I believe, be acknowledged by later commentators as a period of our greatest effort to preserve the treasures of the American landscape and the values of our natural resources. A full measure of the credit for this awakening of a new national consciousness belongs to our First Lady.

For the first time, in our time, a concern for esthetic values has brought beauty out of the galleries and studios onto the highways and byways of America. And it is one of the ironies of our culture that the area of esthetic values—which many American men have customarily left to the direction and governance of women—has been brought into the mainstream of political and commercial life by the wife of the President of the United States.

There is irony here, but also much wisdom. The commitment for beauty is a part of our life and should not be cloistered. As the President stated in response to the White House Conference on Natural Beauty last year, "Beauty cannot be a remote and just an occasional pleasure. We must bring it into the daily lives of all our people. Children, in the midst of cities, must know it as they grow. Adults, in the midst of work, must find it near."

Thus, if we are to create a truly Great Society, esthetic values must become an organic component of the visual scene—protecting natural beauty still unmarred, eliminating the ugly, and restoring those areas that have been despoiled.

Our programs for beauty must apply to our public buildings as well as our public highways, our cities as well as our countryside. For beauty is not mere ornamentation added to something already created—it is an organic quality, infusing the whole, and interwoven with the very fabric of our experience.

There have been but a few First Ladies whose force of character and personality have propelled them beyond being solely a wife and helpmate to the President. These women have left their imprint on the tone and quality of American life. Such a person is Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, who will be long remembered for having challenged all citizens to a new regard for the preservation and creation of beauty.

REMARKS BY MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, AMERICAN ROAD BUILDERS ASSOCIATION, DENVER, COLO.

Senator, members of the American Road Builders Association, the President asked me to bring you his personal greetings today. Both of us deeply appreciate the wholehearted support which your organization has given to the highway beautification program.

So I am glad to have this opportunity to thank you in person and also to discuss with you what I feel is the most exciting public works program in the history of mankind.

By 1973, the country—you primarily—will have completed the Interstate Highway System.

This highway program is staggering in its size. It is 35 times as large as the Panama Canal, Grand Coulee Dam, and St. Lawrence Seaway combined.

Above that, in the next 6 years, you are planning to build half-a-million miles of road.

Your creations, your works are as public as any can be. They are public property. They are open to all and for the service of all. And inevitably they affect the lives of the people, for better or for worse. Therein lies both the glory and the burden of road-building.

Whether we will one day stand in pride and be able to say "well done" depends very much on the skill and imagination and sheer determination we put forth in the next 6 years.

And that is why I accepted your invitation to come here today and say to you that your countrymen are counting on you. I know because I hear from them day after day.

There is a rising tide of desire in this country to make our towns and our landscapes everything they can be—in beauty as well as in service.

I'm not bringing you any news because I know that this is very much on your minds, too, and that the meetings you attend, more and more, discuss and are concerned with such new demands as "social and esthetic values," "scenic vistas," "historic routing"—an unheard-of vocabulary today.

But let's take a look at why it is a most necessary vocabulary today.

We are the road-buildingest nation on earth. There are 3,600,000 miles of streets and roads in our land—nearly a mile of pavement for every square mile of land, and a lot more of this country is going under concrete and asphalt.

In disturbing that much of the turf of this beautiful country, we have a special obligation—not only in terms of land use, but also in an esthetic sense. We are obliged to leave it looking as good if not better than the way we found it.

The scope of this obligation becomes staggering when you look at the statistical side of the story. Every day, American industry is producing enough cars to form a bumper-to-bumper line 125 miles long. Last year, we had 90 million registered vehicles traveling our Nation's streets and roads. In the next 4 years, it is predicted that will swell to more than 100 million. That means more roads, more parking facilities, more bridges, more cuts and fills.

We are a nation on wheels and our affluence and leisure have whetted our appetite to enjoy the journey—not just head for the destination.

Today, the average American commuter spends 350 hours each year behind the wheel of his car just driving to and from work. On weekends, he's off in the car again, driving to the ocean or the mountains or just around the city—what in yesteryear they called "motoring." There's more of this than you realize—35 percent of those on the road are driving for pleasure.

Driving for pleasure is the most popular form of recreation in America. It exceeds baseball, swimming, fishing, any form of sport. The challenge of a civilized society is to make those hours on the road refreshing and enjoyable ones.

Last spring, I took a trip down in Virginia. For one small segment we drove along Highway No. 1, with its jumble of signs and junkyards, the landscape blighted. And then we swung over to Interstate 95—that sweeps up the rolling hills of Virginia between tall stands of oaks and evergreens laced with white dogwoods. From this road itself, you know why Virginians love their State.

We all know the difference between the road that beckons and the road that depresses.

I know what a lift of spirit and surge of pride I feel when I drive up over the crest of the hills back home near Llano, Tex. There, in the distance is Pack Saddle Mountain, and on either side of the broad right-of-way, a long sweep of bluebonnets and then a roadside park, golden with daisy-like wildflowers, and picnic tables under the live oaks.

Every time I see that sight, I bless the garden clubs that started the wildflower program in Texas, and the highway department that has expanded and nurtured it.

In the kaleidoscope of my most cherished memories is a road through Vermont in early October when the majestic mountains are covered with maples—flaming torches of scarlet and crimson against the evergreens. Astors and goldenrod line the roadside, and I remember nature's bounty of pumpkins and apples piled high at roadside stands.

Certainly, this lush display of color is one of the most priceless resources of the State of Vermont. Knowing this, the Governor is proposing legislation to create a scenic corridor one mile wide along certain portions of its interstate highways to protect its native charm.

The Merritt Parkway in Connecticut is an early ancestor of our present great freeways, but to drive along it, is still to drive through one of the most enchanting natural gardens in the world.

Along the Pacific coast, the first designated "scenic highway" in the Nation is a dramatic road that hugs the jagged cliffs above the surf, and winds its way from Carmel, Calif., to the Hearst San Simeon Castle.

These great roads not only get you from "here" to "there," but they afford a revelation of America's great beauty along the way.

It is the difference between just pouring asphalt or concrete between two points or building a landmark—a monument—that will live. I, as a citizen, am proud, not only of the result, but of the kind of talent that produced it. If I were the roadbuilder, my pride would be very keen and very personal.

This is a difference illustrated best by the story of how Sir Christopher Wren one day walked unannounced and unknown among various craftsmen who were raising the timbers and placing the bricks of his St. Paul's Cathedral.

According to legend, Sir Christopher approached one carpenter and inquired:

"What are you doing?"

"I'm following the plans," the carpenter replied, without even stopping his hammering.

Of a workman pushing a barrow loaded with materials, the architect asked: "What are you doing?"

"Working for wages," was the reply.

Then Sir Christopher went up to a mason who was applying mortar to bricks and asked: "What are you doing?"

Somewhat taken aback, the stonecutter put down his trowel, stepped away from his work, looked up at the half-formed structure, and said:

"Why, can't you see? I'm building a cathedral."

Pride in works is one of the most substantial joys in life. It gives a cathedral—and a highway—the lasting quality of greatness.

Today, millions of Americans have been traveling far and near and looking at their new highway systems with fresh eyes. A few months ago when the Highway Beautification Act became law, it marked the beginning of what I hope will be many considered public decisions in behalf of beauty in America.

Within your hands and hearts is the opportunity to implement this legislation with imagination, and with vision about the future of your country.

Most of the news stories about the legislation have featured the fact that it provides funds, and authority, to screen automobile junkyards and control billboards along the Nation's major highways.

That is a dramatic and evident need, but a less publicized and most exciting facet of the act, to my mind, is that Congress has appropriated 3 additional cents for every dollar of Federal highway funds—a total of $60 million—to be used for the acquisition and maintenance of beauty spots adjacent to highways.

States can use their money for such items as—

A meadow of wildflowers where motorists can take time out to stretch their legs and breathe the fresh air.

A scenic overlook—Colorado and the Rocky Mountain States are spectacularly rich in potential.

A yet-untouched stand of timber, where travelers can picnic.

An entrance to each State marked by some of the trees and flowers most typical of it. In Washington, D.C., we plan to plant cherry trees at 10 entrances this spring. They will be a wonderful introduction to the city.

The possibilities are almost limitless for a beauty-minded citizenry through whose communities and countryside the highways run.

You, in the roadbuilding profession, have done so well in your work that the public now takes the safety and utility of your pavement surface for granted. But what they remember about a trip are the masses of blooming flowers along the roadside and the stunning vistas, and the delightful camping and picnic spots.

As one highway official told me, "That's what brings in the fan mail."

One point that concerns me particularly is that each year it costs American taxpayers $100 million to clean up the litter on our roadsides.

It is an interesting side of human nature, but one of the byproducts of beautification is the sharp reduction in vandalism.

We have had that experience in Washington in landscaping some of the schools. Broken windows cost the District of Columbia about $118,000 each year. I stood in front of a school one day and counted 26 broken windows on one side alone. But (and here is the magic) at the nine schools we have landscaped, the breakage has dropped to almost nothing.

I believe we will see some of the same results along the highways. The motorist is just not as likely to toss that soft drink bottle into a roadside park or a well-maintained landscape. If we make our travelers beauty conscious, that $100 million litter cost each year may very well diminish sharply.

I know that you know there is a rising aspiration for beauty abroad in the land.

And there is an increasing effort of State governments to compete for the tourist dollar.

The highway—and the beauty which Congress has now made possible with the new bill—offers States a perfect opportunity to use these funds to beckon the tourist.

More and more States are now planning their State line information centers.

I love that sense of welcome I feel when I cross the State line into Florida and I am met by palmettos and palms.

I suggest that States would do well to use their native trees and flowers at their State lines as a welcoming natural backdrop. For instance, glossy magnolias and crepe myrtles in the Deep South; giant saguaro cactus rising like sentinels in Arizona and the West; fields of purple lupin in Wyoming; tall evergreens in the great Northwest—all of these offer great possibilities and bespeak the State's individuality.

What a tragedy it will be if we do not make our highways instruments of beauty as well as convenience in the vast construction program which lies ahead of us.

Much of what we have talked about are the easy-to-solve problems—really the joy of construction and the imagination we can put to it.

But you and I well know that unavoidable knotty problems still rest with us. Simply, it is "Where do you put the road?" Always there is someone who will be hurt.

I cannot solve these problems, but I know they exist. I hear about them most emphatically and you do, too.

They will become larger.

Even though we are growing wiser about them, they will become more numerous as the interstate highway program goes into its final and most complicated months and increasing mileage is planned in cities.

The voices that you have been hearing—and that I have been hearing—are going to rise in volume. For that voice is the voice of all of us—reaching out, aspiring to a better, more constructive, more lovely world.

The standard criteria on the routing of roads, such as careful consideration of the taxpayers' dollar and safety, are, of course, still with us.

But a civilized society—and a humane government—can do more than that. And plainly, it is clear that we must also weigh in the social and esthetic values of the routing.

We must improve the public hearings which the law requires to be truly open hearings and openminded hearings at an early stage of planning. Hearing all sides is time consuming, but empathy and understanding can help both sides realize each other's problems. And it does require tolerance on both sides.

The citizens who don't want the new highway to split up their neighborhoods, destroy their homes and places of business, their schools and churches; the preservation groups who don't want an historical landmark demolished; the conservation groups who want to keep the natural contours of the land, protect the stream valley, the great forests, the vistas and wildlife—all of them deserve not only the right to be heard, but a right to be heard sympathetically, with the new slide rules of public values.

They won't always win. They can't always win. But let's not just fall into the attitude: "I'd rather fight than switch." Sometimes our technical know-how at an early stage can produce a better route.

Anyone in public life—and that, I believe, includes you and me—learns to respect public opinion and the new appearance of a public need.

There is great room for improvement in the relationships of Government agencies with the public, as well as with each other.

And I urge you—at the earliest possible time—to review your plans with all who might be affected. You have done this in working with fish, wildlife, and recreation agencies. But this type of relationship should be extended to those who speak for other public interests—the private as well as the official groups.

Those who so often are your critics can come to understand decisions if they are alerted to you problems and your goals early enough.

While it is true that the public is demanding, you have already shown them they are not asking for the impossible.

New equipment advances have provided the machinery to make beauty more possible. Your developments in new mowing equipment are fantastic. Today they can give the sides and back slopes a manicured look never possible 5 years ago.

Your machinery can tunnel under mountains and in precious parts of cities. You can maneuver to preserve the vistas. You are not defeated by terrain. You have developed great engineering know-how and I know you will continue your inventive efforts.

Now lies before us the opportunity for great understanding, great human know-how.

I have no doubt you will rise to these challenges with all the skill that the public has come to expect—and that our country deserves.

SENATE

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1966

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Dear Heavenly Father, we pause at the beginning of this new day to receive Thy blessing and empowerment. We turn to Thee for Thou art our light and life, our hope, and salvation.

As a nation, we come with our sins to be confessed, with our hopes to be renewed, our better purposes to be strengthened, and our lives to be reconsecrated.

Descend upon this Chamber and its Members in power according to the need. Enlighten minds, strengthen wills, and give peace to all people and all lands.

In the name of Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 25, 1966, was dispensed with.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the requirement for a quorum call previous to the making of a unanimous-consent request providing for the holding of a vote at a certain hour, be dispensed with.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I shall not insist on a live quorum, but I say to my able friend the Senator from Louisiana that I urge him not to make such a request at this time. I suggest that he suggest the absence of a quorum, to give the minority whip an opportunity to speak with some of his colleagues.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I temporarily withdraw my request. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the able acting majority leader what his schedule is.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would hope that we could commence voting on this measure. If Senators do not wish to make speeches, I would like to ask unanimous consent that we start voting next week on the measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana to rescind the order for the quorum call? Debate is not in order.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The legislative clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Presiding Officer, in his capacity as a Senator from the State of Montana, objects.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may not reserve the right to object. He may either object or not object. The Senator from Montana has objected.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I withhold my objection, Mr. President.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that commencing on Tuesday, debate be limited to 1 hour to each side on each amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana has objected.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KUCHEL. Will the Senator from Montana withhold his objection for one moment, so that I may——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum call is in process. The Presiding Officer, in his capacity as a Senator from the State of Montana, has objected to the rescinding of the quorum call.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Chair. I did not realize that the Chair had responded to a request to rescind the quorum call.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The quorum call will continue.

The legislative clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 139) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joseph W. Keene, of Louisiana, to be U.S. marshal, western district of Louisiana, term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

John M. Imel, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. marshal, northern district of Oklahoma, term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Saturday, March 5, 1966, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I would hope that Senators desiring to make speeches would be present to make them. If anyone will notify me that he is anxious to make a speech, I will be glad to stay in the Chamber to listen.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday debate on each amendment be limited to 1 hour for the proponent and 1 hour for the majority leader or the acting majority leader; and that debate on the bill be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—let the RECORD clearly show that the distinguished minority leader, last week, speaking for the minority, urged the Senate to proceed to vote so that a supplementary military authorization now pending before the Senate, and urgently requested by the administration, might be speedily approved—as surely it will be approved—by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President——

Mr. KUCHEL. On this occasion, let the RECORD show that there will be no objection by the minority to the unanimous-consent request, because the Members of the minority desire now to proceed to a vote.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair asks the acting majority leader when the unanimous-consent agreement would become effective.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. On Tuesday.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. At the session on Tuesday?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Starting on Tuesday at noon.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished acting majority leader why do we not make the same request to hold true for Monday, day after tomorrow?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Because I am on notice that some Senators present would object to Monday.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I would object to that, merely because I heard the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] state yesterday that he had a speech to deliver on Monday on the subject, and I believe that we should hear him. I would have no objection to the Tuesday request.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri withhold that request for a moment until I can ask for the yeas and nays on the pending question?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I withhold my request.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I ask for the yeas and nays on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KUCHEL. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the amendment?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. This is a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute; yes. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, is the Senator willing to withhold his request?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado wishes to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would the Senator from Missouri be willing to withhold his request for a quorum call long enough to see if any Senator wishes to make a speech today on the pending measure, because if any Senator does wish to speak on the measure, I should like to offer the Senator the opportunity to speak before a quorum call is suggested. This is because I am on notice that it will be difficult to get a quorum, and if no quorum is present the Senate will then stand in adjournment until Monday. Last night, I sent out telegrams to 100 Senators, in which I stated that if they desired to make speeches on the pending measure I urged them to make them. Therefore, if there are any, out of courtesy, we should let them make them.

Mr. President, if Senators are not present, I shall move to adjourn, but if the Senator from Missouri wishes adjournment to take place after the calling of the quorum, I should like to do it then.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I have not withdrawn that suggestion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 37 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Douglas
Ellender
Fulbright
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Metcalf
Monroney
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Randolph
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senators from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS and Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER and Mr. MORTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is detained on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1966

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on Friday, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until noon on Monday.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri may ask for the yeas and nays, and the clerk will call the roll, but on a motion the Senator may not reserve the right to object.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I do not know of any holiday in South

Vietnam, but I withdraw my request for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana. [Putting the question.]

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 43 minutes a.m.) the Senate adjourned, in accordance with the order of Friday, February 25, 1966, until Monday, February 28, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.